

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

61 VICTORIA, 1898

VOL. XLVI.

**COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE THIRD DAY OF FEBRUARY TO THE
TWENTY-FIRST DAY OF APRIL INCLUSIVE**



OTTAWA

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

1898

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILFRID LAURIER,

P.C., G.C.M.G., Q.C., D.C.L. (*Oxon.*)

AT THE OPENING OF THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

1898

(CABINET FORMED 13TH JULY, 1896)

President of the Privy Council (Premier)	Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER, P.C., G.C.M.G., Q.C., D.C.L. (<i>Oxon.</i>)
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Hon. Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT, G.C.M.G.
Secretary of State	Hon. R. W. SCOTT, Q.C., LL.D.
Minister of Justice	Hon. DAVID MILLS, Q.C.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. Sir L. H. DAVIES, K.C.M.G., Q.C.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. F. W. BORDEN, B.A., M.D.
Postmaster General	Hon. W. MULLOCK, Q.C., M.A., LL.D.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. S. A. FISHER, B.A.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. J. I. TARTE.
Without Portfolio	Hon. R. R. DOBELL.
Minister of Finance	Hon. W. S. FIELDING.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. A. G. BLAIR.
Without Portfolio	Hon. C. A. GEOFFRION, Q.C., D.C.L.
Minister of the Interior	Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON, Q.C.
Minister of Customs	Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON.
Minister of Inland Revenue	Hon. Sir H. G. JOLY DE LOTBINIÈRE, K.C.M.G.

[*The above form the Cabinet.*]

Solicitor General Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK, Q.C.

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

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS :

Hon. Sir JAMES DAVID EDGAR, K.C.M.G.	<i>Speaker.</i>
LOUIS PHILIPPE BRODEUR, M.P.	<i>Deputy Speaker.</i>
Sir JOHN G. BOURINOT, K.C.M.G.	<i>Clerk of the House.</i>
LAPLANTE, Mr. J. B. R.	<i>Clerk Assistant.</i>
Lieut.-Col. HENRY ROBERT SMITH	<i>Serjeant-at-Arms.</i>

OFFICIAL REPORTERS :

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRD SESSION OF THE EIGHTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA

1898.

ADDINGTON—John W. Bell.	DIGBY—Albert J. S. Copp.
ALBERT—William J. Lewis.	DORCHESTER—Jean Baptiste Morin.
ALBERTA—Frank Oliver.	DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Louis Lavergne.
ALGOMA—Albert Edward Dymont.	DUNDAS—Andrew Broder.
ANNAPOLIS—John B. Mills.	DURHAM, E. Riding—Thomas Dixon Craig.
ANTIGONISH—Colin F. McIsaac.	DURHAM, W. Riding—Robert Beith.
ARGENTEUIL—Thomas Christie.	ELGIN, E. Riding—Andrew B. Ingram.
ASSINIBOIA, East—James Moffat Douglas.	ELGIN, W. Riding—George Elliott Casey.
ASSINIBOIA, West—Nicholas Flood Davin.	ESSEX, N. Riding—William McGregor.
BAGOT—Flavien Dupont.	ESSEX, S. Riding—Mahlon K. Cowan.
BEAUCE—Joseph Godbout.	FRONTENAC—David Dickson Rogers.
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.	GASPÉ—Rodolphe Lemieux.
BELLECHASSE—Onésiphore Ernest Talbot.	GLENGARRY—Roderick R. McLennan.
BERTHIER—Cléophas Beausoleil.	GLOUCESTER—Théotime Blanchard.
BONAVENTURE—Jean François Guité.	GRENVILLE, S. Riding—John Dowsley Reid.
BOTHWELL—James Clancy.	GREY, E. Riding—Thomas S. Sproule.
BRANDON—Hon. Clifford Sifton.	GREY, N. Riding—Hon. Wm. Paterson.
BRANT, S. Riding—Charles Bernhard Heyd.	GREY, S. Riding—George Landerkin.
BROCKVILLE—Hon. John Fisher Wood.	GUYSBOROUGH—Duncan C. Fraser.
BROME—Hon. Sidney Arthur Fisher.	HALDIMAND AND MONCK—Hon. Walter H. Montague
BRUCE, E. Riding—Henry Cargill.	HALIFAX— { Robert L. Borden.
BRUCE, N. Riding—Alexander McNeill.	{ Benjamin Russell.
BRUCE, W. Riding—John Tolmie.	HALTON—David Henderson.
BURRARD—George Ritchie Maxwell.	HAMILTON— { Thomas Henry MacPherson.
CAPE BRETON— { Hector F. McDougall.	{ Andrew Trew Wood.
{ Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart.	HANTS—Allen Haley.
CARDWELL—William Stubbs.	HASTINGS, E. Riding—Jeremiah M. Hurley.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Frederic Harding Hale.	HASTINGS, N. Riding—Alexander W. Carscallen.
CARLETON (O.)—William T. Hodgins.	HASTINGS, W. Riding—Henry Corby.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—Hon. C. A. Geoffrion.	HOCHELAGA—J. Alexandre Camille Madore.
CHAMPLAIN—François Arthur Marcotte.	HUNTINGDON—Julius Scriver.
CHARLEVOIX—Louis Charles A. Angers.	HURON, E. Riding—Peter Macdonald.
CHARLOTTE—Gilbert W. Ganong.	HURON, S. Riding—John McMillan.
CHATEAUGUAY—James Pollock Brown.	HURON, W. Riding—Malcolm Colin Cameron.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Paul V. Savard.	INVERNESS—Angus McLennan.
COLCHESTER—Firman McClure.	JACQUES CARTIER—Frederick D. Monk.
COMPTON—Rufus Henry Pope.	
CORNWALL AND STORMONT—John Goodall Snetsinger.	
CUMBERLAND—Hance J. Logan.	

- JOLIETTE**—Charles Bazinet.
- KAMOURASKA**—Henry George Carroll.
- KENT (N.B.)**—George V. McInerney.
- KENT (O.)**—Archibald Campbell.
- KING'S (N.B.)**—James Domville.
- KING'S (N.S.)**—Hon. Frederick W. Borden.
- KING'S (P.E.I.)**—Augustine Colin Macdonald.
- KINGSTON**—Byron Moffat Britton.
- LABELLE**—J. Henri N. Bourassa.
- LAMBTON, E. Riding**—John Fraser.
- LAMBTON, W. Riding**—James Frederick Lister.
- LANARK, N. Riding**—Bennett Rosamond.
- LANARK, S. Riding**—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
- LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE**—Dominique Monet.
- L'ASSOMPTION**—Joseph Gauthier.
- LAVAL**—Thomas Fortin.
- LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, N. Riding**—Francis Theodore Frost.
- LEEDS, S. Riding**—George Taylor.
- LENNOX**—Uriah Wilson.
- LÉVIS**—Pierre Malcolm Guay.
- LINCOLN AND NIAGARA**—William Gibson.
- LISGAR**—Robert Lorne Richardson.
- L'ISLET**—Arthur Miville Dechêne.
- LONDON**—Thomas Beattie.
- LOTBINIÈRE**—Côme Isaïe Rinfret.
- LUNENBURG**—Charles Edwin Kaulbach.
- MACDONALD**—John Gunion Rutherford.
- MAISONNEUVE**—Raymond Préfontaine.
- MARQUETTE**—William James Roche.
- MASKINONGÉ**—Joseph Hormisdas Legris.
- MÉGANTIC**—George Turcot.
- MIDDLESEX, E. Riding**—James Gilmour.
- MIDDLESEX, N. Riding**—Valentine Ratz.
- MIDDLESEX, S. Riding**—Malcolm McGugan.
- MIDDLESEX, W. Riding**—William Samuel Calvert.
- MISSISQUOI**—Daniel Bishop Meigs.
- MONTCALM**—Louis E. Dugas.
- MONTMAGNY**—Philippe A. Choquette.
- MONTMORENCY**—Thomas Chase Casgrain.
- MONTREAL, St. Anne**—Michael Joseph Francis Quinn.
- MONTREAL, St. Antoine**—Thomas G. Roddick.
- MONTREAL, St. James**—Odilon Desmarais.
- MONTREAL, St. Lawrence**—Edward Goff Penny.
- MONTREAL, St. Mary**—Hercule Dupré.
- MUSKOKA**—George McCormick.
- NEW WESTMINSTER**—Aulay Morrison.
- NICOLET**—Joseph Hector Leduc.
- NIPISSING**—James B. Klock.
- NORFOLK, N. Riding**—John Charlton.
- NORFOLK, S. Riding**—Hon. David Tisdale.
- NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)**—James Robinson.
- NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E. R.**—Edward Cochrane.
- NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W. R.**—George Guillet.
- ONTARIO, N. Riding**—Duncan Graham.
- ONTARIO, S. Riding**—Leonard Burnett.
- ONTARIO, W. Riding**—Hon. Sir James David Edgar,
K.C.M.G.
- OTTAWA (City)**—{ Napoléon A. Belcourt.
William Hutchison.
- OXFORD, N. Riding**—James Sutherland.
- OXFORD, S. Riding**—Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright,
G.C.M.G.
- PEEL**—John Featherston.
- PERTH, N. Riding**—Alexander Ferguson MacLaren.
- PERTH, S. Riding**—Dilman Kinsey Erb.
- PETERBOROUGH, E. Riding**—John Lang.
- PETERBOROUGH, W. Riding**—James Kendry,
- PICTOU**—{ Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, K.C.
M.G.
Adam Carr Bell.
- PONTIAC**—William Joseph Poupore.
- PORTNEUF**—Hon. Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière,
K.C.M.G.
- PRESCOTT**—Isidore Proulx.
- PRINCE, East (P.E.I.)**—John Yeo.
- PRINCE, West (P.E.I.)**—Stanislaus Francis Perry.
- PRINCE EDWARD**—William Varney Pettet.
- PROVENCHER**—Alphonse A. C. LaRivière.
- QUEBEC, Centre**—Albert Malouin.
- QUEBEC, East**—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P.C.,
G.C.M.G.
- QUEBEC, West**—Hon. Richard Reid Dobell.
- QUEBEC (County)**—Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.
- QUEEN'S, East (P.E.I.)**—Alexander Martin.
- QUEEN'S, West (P.E.I.)**—Hon. Sir Louis Henry
Davies, K.C.M.G.
- RENFREW, N. Riding**—Thomas Mackie.
- RENFREW, S. Riding**—John Ferguson.
- RESTIGOUCHE**—John McAlister.
- RICHELIEU**—Arthur Aimé Bruneau.
- RICHMOND (N.S.)**—Joseph A. Gillies.
- RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)**—Michael Thomas Stenson.
- RIMOUSKI**—Jean Auguste Ross.
- ROUVILLE**—Louis Philippe Brodeur.
- RUSSELL**—William Cameron Edwards.
- ST. HYACINTHE**—Michel E. Bernier.
- ST. JOHN (N.B.) City**—John Valentine Ellis.
- ST. JOHN (N.B.) City and Co.**—Joseph John Tucker.
- ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE**—Hon. Joseph Israel Tarte.
- SASKATCHEWAN**—Thomas Osborne Davis.
- SELKIRK**—John Alexander Macdonell.
- SHEFFORD**—Charles Henry Parmalee.
- SHELburnE AND QUEEN'S**—Hon. William Stevens
Fielding.
- SHERBROOKE**—Hon. Wm. Bullock Ives.
- SIMCOE, E. Riding**—William H. Bennett.
- SIMCOE, N. Riding**—Dalton McCarthy.
- SIMCOE, S. Riding**—Richard Tyrwhitt.
- SOULANGES**—Augustin Bourbonnais.
- STANSTEAD**—Alvin Head Moore.
- SUNBURY AND QUEEN'S (N.B.)**—Hon. A. G. Blair.
- TÉMISCOUATA**—Charles Auguste Gauvreau.
- TERREBONNE**—Léon Adolphe Chauvin.
- THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE**—Hon. Sir Adolphe
Caron, K.C.M.G.

TORONTO, Centre—George Hope Bertram.	WELLINGTON, C. Riding—Andrew Semple.
TORONTO, East—John Ross Robertson.	WELLINGTON, N. Riding—James McMullen.
TORONTO, West—{ Edward Frederick Clarke. Edmund Boyd Osler.	WELLINGTON, S. Riding—Christian Kloefer.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.	WENTWORTH AND BRANT, N. Riding—James Somerville.
VANCOUVER—William Wallace Burns McInnes.	WENTWORTH, S. Riding—Thomas Bain.
VAUDREUIL—Henry Stanislaus Harwood.	WESTMORELAND—Henry A. Powell.
VICTORIA (B.C.)—{ Thomas Earle. Hon. Edward Gawler Prior.	WINNIPEG—Richard Willis Jameson.
VICTORIA (N.B.)—Hon. John Costigan.	WRIGHT—Louis N. Champagne.
VICTORIA (N.S.)—John L. Bethune.	YALE AND CARIBOU—Hewitt Bostock.
VICTORIA (O.) N. Riding—Samuel Hughes.	YAMASKA—Roch Moise Samuel Mignault.
VICTORIA (O.) S. Riding—George McHugh.	YARMOUTH—Thomas Barnard Flint.
WATERLOO, N. Riding—Joseph E. Seagram.	YORK (N.B.)—Hon. George Eulas Foster.
WATERLOO, S. Riding—James Livingston.	YORK (O.) E. Riding—William Findlay Maclean.
WELLAND—William McCleary.	YORK (O.) N. Riding—Hon. William Mulock.
	YORK (O.) W. Riding—N. Clarke Wallace.

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

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

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

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 3rd February, 1898.

The Parliament which had been prorogued from time to time, was now commanded to assemble on the 3rd day of February, 1898, for the despatch of business.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

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

MR. SPEAKER,—

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

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned,

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House, that I have received from the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions pursuant to "The Dominion Controverted Elections Act," certificates and reports relating to the elections :

For the Electoral District of London ;

For the Electoral District of the County of Brant ;

For the Electoral District of the West Riding of Assinibola ;

For the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Simcoe ;

For the Electoral District of Champlain ;

For the Electoral District of L'Assomption ;

For the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Ontario ;

For the Electoral District of Beauharnois ;

For the Electoral District of King's, P.E.I. ;

For the Electoral District of Richmond, N.S. ;

For the Electoral District of Lunenburg.

By which the said elections were dismissed and the sitting members declared duly elected.

VACANCIES.

MR. SPEAKER. I have also the honour to inform the House that during the recess I have received communications from several members notifying me that the following vacancies had occurred in the representation, viz. :—

Of Joseph Lavergne, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Drummond and Arthabaska, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

Of Charles Eugène Pouliot, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Temiscouata, by decease.

Of J. B. Romuald Fiset, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Rimouski, by being summoned to the Senate.

Of William Lount, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Toronto Centre, by resignation.

Of Fabien Boisvert, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Nicolet, by decease.

I accordingly issued my several warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts respectively.

MR. SPEAKER. I have also the honour to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a communication under date of 14th January, 1898, owing to the absence from Canada of the Speaker of the House, that he had received notice that a vacancy had occurred in the representation of the electoral district of Quebec Centre, in consequence of the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by François Langelier, Esquire, and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, in accordance with subsection 2 of section 8, Chapter 13 of 49 Victoria (Revised Statutes of Canada) issued a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

NEW MEMBERS.

MR. SPEAKER. I have further the honour to inform the House that during the recess the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has received certificates of election and return of the following members :—

Louis Lavergne, Esq., for the Electoral District of Drummond and Arthabaska ;

Charles Auguste Gauvreau, Esq., for the Electoral District of Temiscouata ;

Jean Auguste Ross, Esq., for the Electoral District of Rimouski ;

George H. Bertram, Esq., for the Electoral District of Toronto Centre ;

Joseph Hector Leduc, Esq., for the Electoral District of Nicolet ;

Albert Malouin, Esq., for the Electoral District of Quebec Centre.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Jean Auguste Ross, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Rimouski, by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and Mr. Guay.

Albert Malouin, Member for the Electoral District of Quebec Centre, by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and Mr. Belcourt.

George Hope Bertram, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Centre Toronto, introduced by Sir Louis Davies and Hon. Wm. Paterson.

FIRST READING.

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

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I have observed with great pleasure the remarkable advance in the political importance and material prosperity of Canada during the year which has just closed.

The loan recently effected has shown that the credit of Canada has never stood so high in European markets, and affords reasonable ground for expecting that the burthens of the people will, in the near future, be materially reduced by the substitution of a much lower rate of interest on our indebtedness than that which now exists.

I congratulate you upon the exceedingly cordial reception accorded to the representatives of Canada at the Jubilee ceremonials, and also upon the warm appreciation manifested everywhere throughout the Mother Country in reference to the conduct of Canada in materially reducing the rate of duty upon goods imported from the United Kingdom into the Dominion.

The action of the Imperial Government in denouncing the treaties with Germany and Belgium also affords most satisfactory evidence of their desire to facilitate your efforts to promote the closest possible commercial relations between Canada and the remainder of the Em-

Mr. SPEAKER.

pire, and will, I trust, contribute materially to the development of Imperial trade.

The extraordinary gold discoveries recently made upon the Yukon and its tributaries, appear likely to result in an enormous influx of people into that region, and have compelled the Government to take prompt action for the preservation of law and order in that distant and almost inaccessible locality : measures will be laid before you for that purpose.

A contract has been entered into, subject to your approval, for the completion at the earliest possible moment of a system of rail and river communication through Canadian territory with the Klondike and principal gold fields, which it is expected will secure to Canada the larger portion of the lucrative traffic of that country.

The bountiful harvest with which we have been favoured by a benevolent Providence has contributed greatly to the increase of our prosperity, and I am glad to note that the trade and commerce of the Dominion, and more especially the amount and values of her principal exports, have increased greatly during the past eighteen months, and there is good reason to believe that this improvement may be maintained, if not augmented, during the remainder of the present year.

I observe with pleasure that certain Government contracts recently let contain provisions calculated to suppress the evils of the sweating system.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

The accounts of the past year will be laid before you.

The Estimates for the succeeding year will likewise be placed upon the Table at an early date.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

Measures will be submitted to you respecting Superannuation, the repeal of the present Franclise Act, and a plebiscite on the question of Prohibition.

These and other measures I commend to your earnest consideration, invoking the Divine blessings upon the important labours on which you are again entering.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no desire to interpose any objection to considering this Speech, but I think it would be more convenient to pursue the usual course and adjourn until Monday.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. That is not the usual course; the usual course has always been the contrary, to take into consideration the Speech from the Throne on the following day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no particular objection, but I think that is not the ordinary course. Does the hon. gentleman propose to adjourn the House until to-morrow and take up the consideration of the Speech to-morrow, or to pursue the usual course of considering it on Monday?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. My hon. friend is in error, the usual course is to adjourn the House until the following day, and this is the course which I propose to follow on the present occasion; this has been the course in every other instance, so far as my memory goes. I need not say, however, that if it would be more convenient to my hon. friend to take it into consideration on Monday, I would be very well disposed to oblige him in that respect.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am in the judgment of the House, but I think that was the course pursued on the last occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER. On the last occasion a similar motion was carried.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If that be the case, I will not interpose any objection to the consideration of the Speech to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved:

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

REPORTS.

Report of the Joint Librarians of Parliament.—(Mr. Speaker.)

Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries (Marine Branch).—(Sir Louis Davies.)

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 4th February, 1898.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

UNITED STATES REGULATIONS IN THE YUKON.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to draw the attention of the right hon. the First Minister to the great anxiety felt by the people of this country, and especially of British Columbia, respecting the arrangements that have been made by the United States of America regarding communication by the Chilkoot and White Passes. I shall be exceedingly glad if the Government will lay on the Table any information on that subject, so as to relieve the public tension that exists in regard to it. It is quite possible the Government may be able to give the House the information now, as the matter is of a very pressing character. I am told that parties who have gone from Victoria and Vancouver for the purpose of fitting out for the Canadian Yukon gold fields, are now returning and going to Seattle to get their supplies, because they think it better to pay the Canadian customs duties on American supplies when they reach the border of Canada, than to be subjected to the onerous and oppressive regulations that at present exist. So far as large companies are concerned, it is a matter of vast importance. Every member will see that where hundreds of independent individual miners are going into a country it becomes a most exasperating and oppressive condition for them to be obliged to pay \$9 a day, as a telegram from the Board of Trade of Victoria states the people are called upon to pay, for a person to escort them through a few miles of American territory—I will not say American territory, because it is practically disputed territory, and the question whether it belongs to the United States or to Canada should long ago have been settled. I am quite sure the First Minister will see the great importance of this matter and will give it that prompt attention which its importance demands.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I quite realize the anxiety that is felt, not only by my hon. friend, but by the whole of the Canadian public in regard to the subject to which he has just called attention. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman realizes that the Government have not been derelict in their duty in that respect, and that they have done whatever it was in their power to do to bring about a more satisfactory state of things than that

which now exists. I am not in a position at this moment to make any communication on the subject, but I have reason to hope and believe that at an early day, perhaps early next week, the Government will be able perhaps to make some communication.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the attention of the Prime Minister to one other matter? I see among many important points touched in the Speech from the Throne there is one with respect to a Yukon railway, about which we have no information before the House and no papers. Does the hon. gentleman consider we are to discuss this subject without that information, or will it be given to the House at an early date?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). As my hon. friend has observed, the Speech from the Throne refers to this matter, and proceeds to say that the contract entered into by the Government is subject to the approval of Parliament. The intention of the Government is to proceed with that measure at once, to have the Bill introduced on Tuesday next, and of course, all the papers will be laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. In the meantime we shall have to discuss the Speech without them. We shall have to depend on the "Globe," as usual.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). We can perhaps do better without papers sometimes.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. BERTRAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some degree of diffidence to perform the task which now devolves on me in moving that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency in reply to the Speech from the Throne. When asked by the leader of this House to assume this responsibility, I was deeply conscious of my inability to worthily perform such an important duty; but I realized that in being asked a compliment was being paid to the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and under those circumstances I could not do otherwise than show my appreciation by accepting, even though that acceptance brought with it an obligation which I hardly hope to satisfactorily fulfil. I am encouraged however, by the fact that a new member speaking for the first time in this House under such circumstances has always had the hearty sympathy and kind attention of all members on both sides of the House. I

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

venture to rely upon that same sympathy and that same attention while I proceed to make some references to the Speech of His Excellency.

The Speech opens with a reference to the increased importance and material prosperity of Canada during the year that has just closed. I am sure we all rejoice at the prosperity of Canada, and we also rejoice most heartily that Canada occupies a larger place in the British Empire than she ever occupied before, and that she also occupies a larger place in the eyes of other nations than at any previous time in her history; under these circumstances we may fairly congratulate the country on the position we now occupy in this respect. It is also most satisfactory to know that the credit of Canada is continually on the ascending scale, that on the European market her credit stands higher than ever; and as we continue to borrow money at lower interest and our credit steadily improves, these will tend to lessen the burdens of the people and at the same time supply us with money to open and develop the latent resources of this country.

The cordial reception which was accorded to the Canadian representatives at the Jubilee representation, I think, should afford this House a great deal of satisfaction. The magnificent reception tendered to the Prime Minister of this Dominion at the Jubilee was one that I am sure struck a chord in the hearts of the people, and although I frankly admit that the commanding personality of the Prime Minister had something to do with that reception, still on the other hand we all know that the action of this Parliament at its last session in seeking to bring about closer relations with the mother country and giving the mother country a better opportunity to secure trade with this Dominion, especially as regards exports, as compared with some other countries, also touched a chord in the hearts of the people of Old England, and this action of the Dominion Parliament was rapidly followed by the abrogation of the German and Belgian treaties, a result we had never been able to accomplish, but which was the response made by the mother country to the action of this Parliament. In that respect the action of the Canadian Parliament, followed by the action of the mother country, succeeded in accomplishing that which previous Parliaments had been trying to secure for a considerable period, but had never succeeded, and this was the response made by the people of England to the action of this Parliament on that particular occasion.

The Speech alludes to the Canadian Yukon Railway contract, and as this question has attracted considerable attention and is one of very great importance indeed, I desire to make more than a passing allusion to that portion of the Speech of His Excellency. It is one in which we are all interested; it is one relating to a matter of the

greatest consequence to the country at large, and it is one which should be approached in a calm and judicious spirit for the purpose of ascertaining, as far as we possibly can, what is best for the interests of the country, and when we have arrived at that conclusion, of proceeding at once to act in accordance with the conclusions at which we have arrived. I think the House will agree that the Government deserve great credit for the active measures adopted by them to have law and order administered in the Yukon district, because a new problem had to be solved. A tremendous number of people had gone in there during last year, and a very large number are going in this year, and something had to be done for the purpose of maintaining law and order in that country, and the Government deserve the thanks of the people for the prompt and hearty way in which they looked into and dealt with that matter, a result particularly due to the Minister of the Interior and his actions in that connection. We have a new development in this country, which, as I have said, is a matter of very great importance indeed. Although of course there is no way of arriving at the actual figures, yet it is estimated on somewhat good authority that from fifty thousand people to two hundred and fifty thousand will be wending their way to the Klondike territory during the year 1898. Whether that be the case or not it is difficult to say, but one fact is generally agreed upon, and that is, that there will be a tremendous rush of population into that district. If 100,000 people go to our mining regions this year, the volume of business that will be developed will surpass anything before experienced in Canada. It is, therefore, a matter of very great consequence to our whole people that active measures should be immediately taken to secure to Canadians the enormous trade which will follow in the wake of this great influx of people.

Now, Sir, what has been going on during the last few months? We have seen a struggle, waging for some time past in order to secure that trade. I do not blame the people of the United States for doing everything in their power to secure the commerce of that region, and if they have advantages which in some respects we do not possess on account of our having to pass over American territory to enter the Yukon district, I do not blame the Americans for availing of these advantages to the utmost extent of their power. On the other hand the people of Canada are most anxious that steps should be taken to secure this trade for them. That is the idea that is dominant in the minds of our people at the present time. They believe that every effort should be put forth to secure that the trade of the Yukon should be turned to the profit of Canadians, and not to the enrichment of the people of the United States. We have the great difficulty to contend with at the

present moment that our own country is almost inaccessible through our own territory, and our people on their journey to the Klondike are submitted to many inconveniences such as the imposition of duties on goods purchased in Canada. The problem was one which our Government had to deal with and to deal with at once, because time is the essence of everything, and in my humble judgment we could not afford to allow even one year to pass. We all know that when trade runs in a certain channel at the commencement, it is likely to develop in that channel and it is a work of great difficulty to divert it afterwards. I say, Sir, that it is the first duty of our Government to secure that the trade of the Klondike should pass through its natural channel, through Canadian territory, so that we may reap the advantage of it.

Another important consideration has to be taken into account. We all know that mining booms do not last for ever, and although I have no desire to reflect upon the reports made by any one, yet we have no right to suppose that everything said regarding that territory will be found to be absolutely true. Each one who runs in quest of gold does not find it, and there can hardly be a doubt that a great number of people who go to the Klondike will be disappointed. During the past year thousands have been wending their way with supplies, over the mountains and through the passes of that region, and when that number is increased by a further fifty thousand people, or perhaps a hundred thousand, it is absolutely necessary that provision should be made to enable large numbers to get out of the country rapidly and safely. If there was not a means provided of enabling people to return, there would to my mind be very great danger of disaster befalling a large number of the people, should they be unable to return if things do not turn out as they expect. It is therefore well that our Government should consider this particular phase of the question. I need not dwell upon the great necessity for a railroad into that country over Canadian territory, nor need I dwell upon the vast advantages which the people of Canada will derive from securing the Klondike trade; these are facts that are patent to all. There is no difference of opinion upon these points, and therefore I will not dwell at greater length upon them.

I shall now proceed to deal with a subject upon which perhaps there may be a difference of opinion, and in respect to which a course might be taken which the people and the Parliament of this country would not endorse. Under ordinary circumstances, I believe it is the duty of every government to consult Parliament before entering into any large contract at any particular time. That, I believe, is a principle which should at all times be held to be sound, and I have no desire to withdraw from it. But at the same time, if circumstances arise which

make it imperative that immediate action should be taken for the purpose of carrying out the principle of the greater good to the greater number, for the purpose of promoting the interests of the whole country, then I say that the Government should not hesitate to take such action. We know perfectly well that some of the best things that are accomplished in business are accomplished by men who have pluck and boldness in their natures, and the same thing applies to the government of a country. A government that is bold and plucky in doing what they think is best will satisfy the people of the country better than a government destitute of courage, and which is afraid to act promptly. I agree also, that in the case of any large contract, it is a most important thing that we should advertise for tenders. That, I think, is fair and right. It is a sound principle, and the question which this House has to consider is, whether the Government was justified under the present circumstances in letting a contract without calling for tenders, and doing that without consulting Parliament. We will have to come to a conclusion on these questions in accordance with the facts and in accordance with what we think to be best in the interests of the country at large. There is one thing in connection with the letting of that contract which I think is unprecedented. There may be some members of this House who know to the contrary, but I am not aware of tenders ever having been asked for the construction of any railway or any great work, on the basis that no money was to be paid for that work. There are few contractors indeed who would feel inclined to tender on any large work with the understanding that they were to be paid in something that it was difficult to attach a monetary value to. I therefore say that this extraordinary and unprecedented circumstance had to be taken into consideration. It may perhaps be said that the Government should have given a liberal cash bonus for the construction of that road, and should have retained the land, but I believe the principle laid down by the Government in this respect will be supported by the country at large. That principle is, that that great and inaccessible region which is fit for nothing else than mining, should itself be responsible for the cost required to develop it. After all, we must remember that the building of a railroad into that country is not like building through agricultural lands, where for years there would be permanent sources of revenue to such a road. We may build this railway into the Klondike and something may happen which would render it to be of less value afterwards. It is therefore a most important thing that that country itself should be made to pay the expenses of building a railroad through it. That being the case, I believe the great mass of the people of this country will agree, that

Mr. BERTRAM.

the action taken by the Government was proper. I am inclined to think that if the Government had called for public tenders on the same basis that they have arranged for this contract, there being no money payment, there would be few tenderers indeed. I am sure that the business men of this country will recognize that the Government would have had very little chance of receiving tenders and of providing for the immediate construction of this railway on such a basis. What would have been the effect of the Government advertising for public tenders for the construction of this railway on the basis that no money should be paid, but that it should be paid for in mineral lands? It would look very much as if the Government of Canada themselves had no faith in that country, because they were not disposed to put any of their own money into the work. Therefore, I claim that such a course would have been fraught with great risk and danger. More than that; had the Government failed to obtain a satisfactory tender for the building of the railway on that basis, it would have been ten times more difficult for them afterwards to negotiate a contract for its construction than if such a course had not been pursued. The arranging of a contract on such a basis, with no money payment, had to be a matter of negotiation, from the necessities of the case; and therefore, I believe that the action of the Government in endeavouring to ascertain by negotiation whether a satisfactory arrangement could be arrived at for the construction of the railway will meet with the approval of the people of this country. I maintain that the circumstances of the case called for immediate action. We could not afford to lose one year's trade of that country, which certainly would have been lost if the Government had gone about the matter in the usual way, by calling for public tenders; and for such a loss the people of this country would have held the Government responsible. I know that when you look at the number of millions of acres of land given to the contractors for the building of the railway, the figures look large.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERTRAM. But when you look at the map, and see the quantity of land granted, compared with the size of the whole country, it does not look so large after all. Moreover, what does that grant of land to a company mean? In my judgment, it means simply the adding of so much to the mineral development of the country at large. We know that the company, to be able to get anything at all out of the lands, will require to develop them; or, if they sell them to another company, that company will have to develop them; and I maintain that the de-

velopment of those lands will not interfere with the development of other lands, while their development will add tremendously to the business of the country at large. Some exception may be taken to what has been called a monopoly to the railway contractors in the provision that for five years no other railway shall be built into that country. Now, it seems to me, in reading over that contract, that the Government have simply made provision that no railway into that country will be bonused or chartered by this Parliament for the next five years if it comes from any part of the American territory. We know that a great many companies are applying for railway charters for railroads intended to run into the country from the Pacific coast over American territory; and the American Government, by means of customs duties, would have power to control the business of such railways. I do not believe that this Government or this Parliament would be justified under any circumstances in bonusing a railway running into that country with an outlet in American territory. Therefore, I say that it was of great importance that the Government should see to it that any railway assisted by them should pass over Canadian territory. The navigation of the Stikine River is free: the territory over which the railway will run from Glenora to Teslin Lake is Canadian; and from Teslin Lake to Dawson City, I understand, there will be unbroken navigation. So that when this railway is built we shall have a means of access into that country which will redound greatly to the trade and credit of Canada. Allow me further to say this, that to ask any contractor to make a deposit of \$250,000 as security that the contract shall be completed within the time specified, when the contractors themselves are not receiving any money for the work is, I think, something unprecedented in the history of railway construction in Canada; and from the character of the contractors, I am inclined to think that that railway will be completed within the time. If that is done, it will be one of the greatest feats ever accomplished in this country, and will make the people of other countries feel that after all, when action or work of any kind is required, Canada can do her share, and her Government can be relied upon to act promptly. Another important feature of this contract is that the Government reserve alternate blocks of land, so that when the company engage in prospecting or development work, this country will get the benefit of it without any cost to itself; so that whenever the company add value to their own lands, they will add value to the Government lands, which will repay this country to a great extent. In that way I believe the country will reap more benefit than it would have done if the Government had proceeded to develop these lands itself.

Reference is also made in the Speech from the Throne to the bountiful harvest and to the increase in the trade of the country. In this congratulation I think we can all most heartily join. We all know that a bountiful harvest is necessary to make the country prosper and to increase the business of our manufacturers and merchants: and we had a very satisfactory harvest last year.

But there is another matter which, although not alluded to in the Speech, I desire to refer to very briefly, as having contributed to the material advancement and business of this country, and that is the manner in which the Government have dealt with our fiscal policy. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, this House will agree with me when I say that business cannot be done, business cannot be developed and expanded, unless there is confidence throughout the land, and I maintain that this Parliament, by its action last session in the revision of the tariff, gave the business people of this country a confidence which they did not possess to the same extent before. There was an impression among a certain class that the fiscal policy of the Liberal party was not as sound as it ought to be.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERTRAM. But now that it is complete—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! Oh!

Mr. BERTRAM. There was an impression, I do not deny it, in the minds of some business people and manufacturers that the fiscal policy of the Liberal party could not be relied upon to the same extent as the fiscal policy of the Conservative party. I admit that—but a change has since come over those men. The manufacturers and the business men of this country now realize, more than they ever did before, that this Government, that the Liberal party, mean no harm whatever to the business interests of the country. That feeling of confidence has permeated the whole land, and helped to create new channels of trade, new business and new developments, and therefore I say that the fiscal policy of this Government has been of great benefit to the Dominion as a whole.

It is not my intention to go at any length into that particular question, but still I would like to set myself right, and I wish to say that while I do not pretend to be able to agree in every respect with the Government, or that every member of the Government will be able to agree with me in everything I say, I shall none the less give it a generous and an ardent support. It does not necessarily follow that I am called upon to endorse everything that comes from it—for I do not suppose it claims infallibility—but I have no hesitation in endorsing the fiscal policy of this Government. I go further than that, I say that the

pledges which the Liberal party made to the people of this country regarding tariff revision have been redeemed in every particular. I am quite well aware that such is not the opinion of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). I had great pleasure in reading the hon. gentleman's speech, made at Winnipeg the other day, because whenever the hon. gentleman does speak, he speaks eloquently and forcibly, and I always like to read what he has to say. In that speech I found the following paragraph:—

Who is there that does not know that these gentlemen went over this country for eighteen years denouncing the policy of protection and declaring that every vestige of protection should be uprooted and scattered to the winds, and that a free trade policy should prevail.

Now, I quite agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition, that if such had been the conduct of the Liberal party during eighteen years, that party would be unworthy the confidence of the people. But I do not agree with the hon. gentleman in his statement of fact. By putting an extreme interpretation upon some particular catch phrase, by carefully selecting some paragraph from some particular speech, he might strive to create the impression that the speaker thus quoted was in favour of absolute free trade, and that such was the policy of the Liberal party. But all that does not alter the outstanding, the underlying fact, that the Liberal party never had any intention of abolishing the customs duties of this country. The old Liberal policy did not do anything of the kind. The Liberal party was in power before, and it had a tariff policy of about 17½ per cent. That was not a free trade policy. That could not be called a free trade policy which imposed a duty on goods imported. What I understand by a free trade policy is a policy which would allow the manufactures of other countries to come into this country free of duty. A policy of that kind is an impossible one, one which never was intended and never was expected. We all know that even the old Liberal tariff of 17½ per cent would not now meet our requirements, the expenses of the country had been increased to such an extent that it was impossible to go back to that tariff; and it became necessary to raise the duties in order to meet the increased requirements of the country. But what did the Liberal party promise? It pledged itself to reduce the tariff; it pledged itself to do what it could to apply freer trade principles to our tariff consistent with a proper regard to the interests and the requirements of the country, and it pledged itself also not to overlook the fact that we had not as free a hand to deal with the tariff as we would have had if there had been no protection during the past eighteen years. And I claim that the Liberal party has carried out its pledges in

Mr. BERTRAM.

this respect. What did it accomplish in the tariff revision of last year? The duties were greatly reduced on a long list of goods—I feel disposed to make this statement because such substantial reduction is not generally known throughout the country. The duties under the old tariff were so mixed up on the specific and the ad valorem basis that nobody could tell what the percentage of duty was. But when you combine these duties and convert them into a percentage on the value, you then begin to understand what the reductions really were. It is not my intention to go into the particulars, but I have the document here and can prove what I say. I say that the Liberal party last session reduced the tariff on a great many goods manufactured in this country to the extent of 10, 15, 25, 35 and 40 per cent. I call these heavy reductions in the tariff on goods imported into this country, and I say, therefore, that the Government have fulfilled their pledges to reduce the tariff as much as possible, and I am inclined to believe that no one thought for a moment that the Government would have lowered the duties to the extent they did. The tariff was pared down to a revenue basis, which is the basis on which the Liberal party has always held our tariff should be imposed. Extreme protection was struck off entirely. The ordinary requirements of the country were considered, and the tariff reduced to a revenue basis. That revenue tariff benefits all the interests and industries of the country much more effectually than could a protective tariff. In that respect I claim, therefore, that the tariff has been reduced materially and levelled down to a revenue basis, and in so doing the Government have fulfilled the pledges they had made, because it was never for a moment contemplated that these duties should be entirely struck off and the manufacturers of other countries admitted free. I desire also to repeat here what I have said elsewhere. We have had a tariff agitation for a long number of years, we had a revision last year, and the time has now come when we should have permanency and stability. Permanency and stability are required in the tariff of a country to enable its trade and business to extend; and now that a new era of prosperity and business revival is dawning upon us, it would be a great mistake indeed to discuss impending changes in the tariff. I do not mean to say for one moment that there should be no change whatever for some years to come, or a considerable time to come. New conditions and circumstances may arise which will require some changes in the tariff; but what I say is that the tariff revision of last session was so complete and satisfactory to the country at large that even many members of the Conservative party have been unable to find very serious fault with it,

and that being the case, we ought to have permanency and stability in our tariff. But on the other hand, we ought also to be ready, when new conditions arise, to make any further changes which may be necessary.

Allow me to illustrate what I mean in that respect. Take, for instance, the duty on lumber. We know that the tariff was revised last session, but American lumber is admitted to this country still as it was before, free of duty, while Canadian lumber which was formerly admitted into the United States free of duty, is now dutiable. In the discussion that went on it was impossible to regard the log and the lumber duties otherwise than as interdependent and affecting one another, and it is most reasonable that the legislation of the United States on this subject of the lumber duties should be regarded in deciding upon the legislation upon that subject for Canada. This question has been before the public for a considerable number of years. At present, while American lumber comes free into Canada, there is a duty of \$2 per thousand on lumber going into the United States. Thus a new condition has arisen, and, while I do not say that a duty should be imposed upon American lumber coming into this country, I do say that, new conditions having arisen, the Government will be bound seriously to consider the question in the light of those new conditions and decide the problems that are thus raised so as to promote the best interests of the country at large.

I am very glad to find a reference in the Speech from the Throne to the fact that the Government has abolished, so far as Government contracts are concerned, the sweating system. This shows that this Government, after all, is alive to the interests of all classes of the people and seeks to do what is best for all. I am glad to see, also, that there is some reference in the Speech to the questions of superannuation, the Franchise Act and the plebiscite. These are a part of the pledges of the Liberal Government and the Liberal party and I am glad to find them mentioned in the Speech of His Excellency because it is an indication that the Government intend to redeem their pledges with regard to these important questions.

It is not my intention to take up the time of the House much longer. I look to the future of this country with great confidence. There was never a time in our history when the people were so confident of the future of the country as they are now. It is a great satisfaction to me; it is a great satisfaction, I am sure, to the Liberal party and to the country at large to find that the prognostications of our friends of the Opposition as to what would befall the country if the Liberals came into power have not been realized. We know that confidence reigns throughout the land, and

that confidence is a prime cause of increase of business. And so we look forward with hope and confidence to the development of the latent resources of the country to the greatest extent possible. And with such an immense territory, with such an energetic people and with such an efficient Government we may expect great things. We should be proud that we are living under such a free system of government and under such good institutions as we enjoy. I know of no country under the sun in which I would rather live than in this beloved Canada of ours.

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) In rising to second the Address to be presented to His Excellency in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I must confess, at the outset, that when asked by the leader of this House to accept that very honourable task, I did somewhat hesitate to assume the onerous responsibility of the duty devolving on me; and the more so, as in rising for the first time in this House, to address the representatives of the people in the Commons of Canada, methinks I hear, Mr. Speaker, a warning voice issuing from the seat you occupy, or rather I fancy I hear still echoing through this House the voices of former speakers who have achieved such brilliant oratorical triumphs under similar circumstances; and, although deeply conscious of my own inability, I crave the indulgence of all members on both sides of the House.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that there is a two-fold obligation involved here: that of seconding the Address which now devolves on me, and that of listening to the few remarks I am about to make, a task which devolves on you. I shall perform my task to the best of the ability which divine Providence has imparted to me; and, as to the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, the plaudits which have just greeted me, as also the experience of the past, warrant me in believing that they will hear me throughout with that kind indulgence they have unfailingly bestowed on those who, like me, have craved the same, under similar circumstances.

The hon. member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Bertram), who has just taken his seat, has so exhaustively covered the ground that there remains but a few ears of corn for me to glean in the otherwise extensive field of the Speech from the Throne, and at the risk of repeating more or less correctly in French what the hon. gentleman has so well said in English, I will perform my task to the end, within the limited space of time allotted to me. The year 1897, that has just closed, will be recorded in history as one pregnant with the most memorable events of this latter part of the nineteenth century. Were history to record nothing but the celebration of the sixtieth anniversary of Her Majesty's reign, the majestic propor-

tions of which are being emphasized as we recede from it, that event alone would suffice to immortalize the year 1897, the precious remembrance of which will be handed down to the remotest posterity by poets, historians and orators, as an unprecedented celebration in the history of mankind, when it was given us to witness a genuine outburst of loyalty and devotion on the part of the English people, and of the outlying portions of the Empire, which were so worthily represented at the foot of the Throne of Her Majesty, and in particular, the Dominion of Canada, represented by our most distinguished Prime Minister, the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Lady Laurier.

In after years, when scrutinizing the history of civilized countries, many a one will pause in wonderment before the apotheosis conferred by a nation on a woman we all admire, and let me add, Mr. Speaker, a woman we all love, and with the poet of old, the student of history will then cry out: Stop, traveller, you are travelling on sacred ground; Sta. viator.

I may perhaps, in my turn, be allowed to look back at past events, as far back as the outset of the present reign, which did not begin under very auspicious circumstances for our country. In 1837 a most gloomy period of our history, when the crown of Great Britain was being placed, perhaps with a trembling hand, on the head of a girl sixteen years old, this country, which has been called the finest jewel of the British Crown, threatened to be buried under the ruins of a domestic strife that had developed into a bloody revolution, and the great Papineau, who might be called the Canadian Daniel O'Connell, was then thundering out his fiery philippics, protesting against the abuses of the authorities, and arraigning the provincial government for their arbitrary and tyrannical course. The constitution of 1791 was then tottering under the repeated blows of its assailants, and amidst the bitter strife of the contending factions, the dawn of the era of 1841 could be foreshadowed, with the union of Upper and Lower Canada, which, in the mind of its author, was calculated to give the death blow to the French Canadian nationality; a consummation which was happily averted, through our being brought into daily contact with a people as much distinguished for their energy, their spirit of enterprise as for their love of progress: I mean the British people.

Through the radiancy or rather contagion of good example, a miracle has been wrought; and instead of our nationality being buried in the grave prepared for it, a new life, on the contrary, was infused into it. As years rolled by, many prejudices disappeared, and on the day when it was given us to see a French Canadian occupying the exalted station of adviser of the Crown and Prime Minister of the country,

Mr. GAUVREAU.

may, more, on the day when it was given us to see a scion of that people who, in 1837-38 had risen in arms against the Government of the day, intrusted with the mission of representing at the foot of the Throne of Her Majesty—and how nobly he fulfilled his mission, with what dignity and honour for himself we all know—a colony in which the British element predominates, and the French Canadian element is in a minority; on that day, Mr. Speaker, I say, British statesmen undoubtedly must have been satisfied that a colony where such tolerant views and harmony prevailed, where religious, political and civil liberty were so well understood and applied, without any of those terrible struggles, the offspring of religious bigotry, being engendered through the diversity of religious creeds; undoubtedly, I say, on that day, these statesmen must have come to the conclusion that such a colony was ripe for liberty and the moment had come for that people to take rank among the free states in the greatest Empire of the world, with the power of making their own treaties, and weighing enough in the balance to be able to exact and bring about the denunciation of treaties by which trade was being handicapped and the development of the natural resources of the country was being retarded and checked. 1837, 1867, 1897; these three epoch-making dates are pregnant with lessons not only for us, men of the present generation, but also for those who will come after us. Now, Sir, I ask, what position do we occupy to-day in the eyes of the world, on the very morrow of the Jubilee celebration, of the grand apotheosis conferred by a people gathered from the four corners of the globe, on that sublime woman, Queen Victoria, Empress of India? I am well aware that 1897 is the Jubilee year; but I am also reminded that it was marked by the discovery of the Klondike gold mines, an unlooked-for and most welcome discovery of untold wealth, and one well calculated to fill with hope the breasts of all Canadians who wish to see our country rich and prosperous. The gold fever is raging in every quarter of the globe, and is spreading among the most enlightened people of the old world. Powerful syndicates are being formed, at the head of which appear the leading men in financial, commercial and aristocratical circles of Great Britain, and those powerful syndicates are going to invest their capital in this country and thus assist the exploiting, on a large scale, of the fabulous wealth of the gold fields of our new Eldorado. As the Jasons of old, the gold-seekers, from the different countries of the world are about to rush to the conquest of a new golden fleece, the access to which is perhaps still more difficult in our days than it had proved in times gone by; but I am sure it will give better and still more remunerative returns. I would fain borrow the pen of the author of the Arabian

Nights and possess the talent of the great masters of oratory to set in a proper way before this House the enormous advantages accruing to the country from these discoveries which are fast assuming the proportions of an international event, owing to the intense excitement they have aroused throughout the civilized world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, fortune smiles on us and wealth comes to us from several other quarters. There really seems to be a conspiracy of political events to produce prosperity, as if the Government of this country had inherited from some good fairy the conjurer's wand. Through their wise and enlightened policy, a new impetus has been given to trade, and by a readjustment of the tariff on just and equitable lines, a new era of prosperity has been ushered in, a consummation so long wished for by the people of the Dominion. Were you to put the question to the farmers of this country, a most interesting and necessary class of our population, they would, I am sure, tell you that the country is blessed with prosperity and that everywhere the fires of content are blazing upon the hearthstones. To dispel every vestige of doubt, Mr. Speaker, let us hearken to the voice of the people speaking through the by-elections that have been held within the year, and here we have a decisive and authoritative answer to the question. But let me rather say this: that the hon. gentlemen who, like myself, have the honour of representing in this House purely agricultural constituencies, know very well that their constituents are contented and full of hope.

Why, Sir, is it not a fact that agricultural products are fetching most remunerative prices? Is it not a fact that wheat has reached an un hoped-for price? Is it not a fact that the sale of our cattle is fetching very good prices, compared with those of previous years, thanks, undoubtedly, to the wise policy inaugurated by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), in connection with a very ticklish matter, the abolition of the quarantine with the United States? And let me seize this opportunity to tender, in the name of the country, my heartfelt thanks to the hon. Minister of Agriculture for having established a cold storage system which has proved a complete success and the advantages of which are now before the country in such a way as to carry conviction in the minds even of those who shut their eyes to the evidence of facts.

Now, if we turn to the manufacturers, a most important factor in the commercial development of a young country like ours, they will also tell us honestly that prosperity is ours again. It would, forsooth, be an idle task for them to deny it, in the face of the increase that has taken place in our foreign exports, as shown by the statistics; nay, more, they would tell you, Sir, that they have felt all their doubts dispelled,

and confidence returning with the positive assurance given them that in this matter of tariff readjustment, no rash change should be attempted, but, on the contrary, every change in it should be cautiously made, as warranted by the exigencies of the hour. Let us glance at the table of the failures, a most infallible barometer of the increase or decrease of national prosperity, and one which shows us whether we are on the ascending scale in the commercial sphere, or whether we are slowly verging to bankruptcy. I do not think I am going beyond the mark in stating that there was a decrease of 15 per cent in the number of failures last year, compared with those of the previous year. Those statistics are more eloquent than all the speeches we could make on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, although I do not take much stock in the statements of newspapers, however, allow me to quote in this connection, the words of a Montreal paper, "La Patrie," which has an extensive circulation in the country:

Canada is truly a privileged country. We have no international imbroglio to fear; our institutions are working harmoniously; every day we are discovering new resources, and at this time of writing, there is no country in the world on which the eyes of Europe are riveted with more interest than on this land of ours.

As the impartiality of such a statement, coming from a Liberal newspaper might be suspected, let me refer to another great daily of the city of Toronto, a Conservative newspaper; and here is what the "World" said in the same connection:

We are entering upon an era of great, immense developments. Within the next decade, we are sure, our population will have doubled. The year which has just commenced will be marked by astounding progress throughout the west, British Columbia and the Yukon.

There is no gainsaying it, Sir, the discovery of the Klondike gold fields and their working on a large scale will rapidly increase the tide of immigration to this country, and secure us a large and healthy class of settlers, and Canada, which has so much to gain by such a movement, far from trying to check it will, on the contrary, do her best to develop it by all the means within her power. Immigrants from all parts of the civilized world will come to swell our population, develop our latent resources, and build up the country, while our fertile, limitless and attractive prairies of the North-west will witness a large influx of settlers who shall make it their home, securing thereby, if not wealth, at least a certain comfort and an assured future. History repeats itself, Sir, and once the gold fever is over which, anyway, cannot but be temporary, it will be the turn of Manitoba and the North-west Territories to benefit by this movement; and then, with a wise, honest and economical Government, which means a Liberal Government, at the head of the

affairs of the country, with a system of laws than which none is better, with a rapid growth of population and, meanwhile, a steady development of our wealth, then, I say, will come the day when yearly deficits will be replaced by wonderful surpluses, the application and effects of which for this country cannot be overestimated at this remote date.

Mr. Speaker, I could further say that the exodus has been checked, that the financial equilibrium has been restored, but I must come to a conclusion, as I realize that allowing myself to be carried away by the marvellous things which meet my gaze, when raising the curtain of the future, I am apt to forget that I am taking the time of the House and I must not abuse the indulgence of the hon. members. Let me, Sir, before I resume my seat, tender my thanks to the Government of this country and congratulate them for having given us more than idle hopes. I know that the hon. gentlemen who now sit on the Treasury benches, are not satisfied, as was the case under the Conservative rule, with a deluge of words in a desert of ideas, but, on the contrary, that all promises are redeemed. I know that the Government are not satisfied with governing, but that they make it a point to forecast events, and through that political foresight not only is the stability of a government secured, but our finances and commercial prosperity are likewise made stable. Truly, fortune smiles on us; wealth is ours; and to quote the words of the hon. gentleman who was at the time the young and talented member for Drummond-Arthabasca, we are no longer threatened with the chastisement of Tantalus, but rather with the effects of the over-indulgence experienced by Gargantua. At all events, prosperity is ours once more, and if I rightly understand the utterances which re-echo from all parts of the country, peace, union, harmony are going to prevail in this country. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to give expression to a wish from the innermost depths of my heart, and it is this: may the day soon dawn over this country we all love so much, when we may be enabled, in a common feeling of brotherhood, all and every one of us, men of British, French Canadian, Scotch or Irish descent, whether Protestants or Catholics, may we, I say, all repeat in unison, so that they may re-echo to the remotest corners of the Dominion, that sublime message sent by heaven to the earth, those sublime words which re-echoed throughout the heavens of Galilee under the light of the Star of Bethlehem: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." who have it to heart to make this Canada of ours a rich, free and prosperous country, through the union of all our fellow-countrymen, irrespective of the diversity of creeds and languages.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure that the House has listened with very great

Mr. GAUVREAU.

interest to the addresses just delivered by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) and the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau). I congratulate the House very heartily upon at least having present, in the able representative of Centre Toronto, the gentleman who is responsible for the existing tariff of this country. We had a good deal of curiosity to know how such a remarkable production was brought about: but we were informed, during the election campaign in Centre Toronto, that the architect of the tariff was the gentleman who has just, with so much ability, given us his opinions. We knew that he was a distinguished manufacturer, we knew that he had a very large and important industry connected with machinery and hardware; but we did not know, until the revelations made during the discussion in that election, that the hon. gentleman had constructed, line by line, the present tariff, that there was not a single article from A. to Z. that had not passed under his careful inspection, and—I think he went very far towards saying—received his imprimatur. Now, Sir, it is always a satisfaction to know who is responsible in these cases. But I was a little surprised that the gentleman, although the architect of this great tariff, and having the advantage of having a very admirable model prepared beforehand for him to follow, should make the very remarkable admission that he did make during his interesting address. That admission was that there was a great deal of consternation throughout this country caused by anticipations of what the Liberal party would do if they got into power. What was the cause of that consternation, what was the reason for it? Why, the reason was that there were a number of people in this country who believed that these gentlemen were sincere, that they really meant what they said when in Opposition, and that if they obtained power they would carry out the pledges they had given to the people. And I think I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bertram) what relieved the public mind, what it was that gave that buoyancy to the feelings of the business men of this country that he says they at present enjoy. The reason is that these business men found that they were mistaken in supposing that the Liberals were sincere. The business men found that these gentlemen who, during eighteen years—except for a brief period when they were advocating unrestricted reciprocity and the taking of the tariff of United States as a model for Canada—had been declaring that if they obtained power they would tear up protection root and branch, who had been saying, in the forcible language used by the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on the other side of the water that protection was a curse to Canada—instead of redeeming their pledges had called in a bloated manufacturer who had been fattening upon

the vitals of the country to frame a tariff for this Dominion.

That, I think, must in some measure account for the tariff that has been constructed. I can only say, Sir, that the presence of that hon. gentleman in this House to-day, the speech made by him as the architect of this tariff, as the man upon whom the Government depended for its construction, and the declaration that he has made, all prove that the statements made by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) that this was only an initial step, and that they were going straight on to redeem their free trade promises, were a mere delusion; for we now learn that the tariff is a finality, that for ten years, as the hon. gentleman promised the people of this country during the Centre Toronto election, no change was to be made in this tariff. And there is no doubt that he was warranted in saying so, because the right hon. the First Minister, on returning to the shores of Canada, stated, in the first public announcement that he made, that one of the greatest injuries that could be inflicted upon the country was the tinkering of its tariff, and that it must rest where it was. Now, I do not know whether that would quite satisfy the hon. members who sit behind the Government and who have been led to believe that the few reductions in the tariff, slight as they were, were only the entering wedge which was to be driven steadily in until a free trade tariff was attained. I do not know how these gentlemen will be pleased, but I think that the people of Canada will read with great satisfaction that there is to be no more tinkering with the tariff, and no further reductions made in it. They know that Canada has attained its present position under the operation of a tariff very much like that which the hon. member for Centre Toronto is in favour of; they know very well that Canada owes its present position to such a tariff; that by its means it was lifted out of the slough of despond into which it sank when those hon. gentlemen were in power before, at a time when poverty and want were stalking through this country until a protective tariff was brought forward. They know that under the protective tariff every industry in this country was re-invigorated, that hundreds of industries which it had been impossible to carry on previously, were brought into existence, that labour has been employed, and that money and wealth have been distributed throughout this country in virtue of that protective tariff. Therefore, I say that it is no wonder that the intelligent people of this country acquainted with those facts, were greatly dismayed at the promise made to implement the pledges that had been given to Parliament before those gentlemen came into power. Now, however, I think the people are becoming reassured. But what does the hon. gentleman say?

Does he mean to tell us that the tariff of the Conservative party was not sufficiently protective, because, as one of his first steps, he has had the duty on coloured cottons increased? If we are to understand that, it will be another evidence to the country of the power of that hon. gentleman, and another assurance to the country that while he sits in this House he will not permit of any trifling with this offspring of his that he is so proud of having brought into existence.

Now, Sir, I am unable to follow to any great extent the very eloquent address delivered by the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau). I understand that hon. gentleman is a poet, and although I was not able to follow his address in the French language as closely as I would like to have done, I understand that he attributed the existing prosperity of trade in Canada to the present Government. Well, Sir, they say that there is a license permitted to poets in dealing with hard facts which is not permitted to ordinary individuals, and I think the hon. gentleman must have been exercising largely his poetic license when he made that statement. The hon. member for Centre Toronto frankly stated that one of the chief causes of the present prosperity of Canada, at which we all rejoice, because we are all equally interested in it, was the bountiful crop with which Providence had favoured this country. I do not suppose that even a poet would consider it quite right to claim credit to the Government for what Providence had done for the country. But there is something else which was not referred to, and which has also had an important bearing on this question, and that is the high price of wheat, the fact that wheat, one of the great staple exports of this country has within the last year, doubled the price which it has commanded for several years previously. Does the hon. gentleman claim credit to the Government for that fact? Does he mean to say that they are responsible for the famine in India, or for the drought in Russia?—because, unless he does, he is not able to claim credit for the Government for the high price of wheat. Sir, there is no one branch of industry that owes one jot or tittle of its prosperity at this moment to any act of which this Government has been guilty.

Now, Sir, I propose to come to the Speech itself. I find that the first matter mentioned here, and to which allusion was made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto, was the loan recently negotiated by the Finance Minister in London. I do not hesitate to congratulate that hon. gentleman upon the success of his loan. We were all rejoiced to learn that the loan was negotiated on terms so favourable, that is a matter of common congratulation to the country. But I do not think that anything that has occurred in that connection warrants the

statement in the Speech "that the credit of Canada has never stood so high in European markets." I deny that. I say that when the late Government went out of office, and when the hon. gentleman went to London, he found the credit of Canada standing just as high as it stands to-day; therefore that statement is not justified by the facts. The loan was a creditable one, it reflects credit upon the country and upon the Finance Minister, and we are all delighted with it. But it is not true to say that he obtained a price better than the 2 per cents yielded at a premium of 7, at which they stood when we left power, and at which they stood when the hon. gentleman went across the Atlantic. I appeal to the hon. gentleman who was formerly Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) in verification of the statement that the great improvement that took place to the credit of Canada in the money markets of the world, took place when we were able to pass from 4 per cents to 3 per cents, and obtain the price that we did, and under the administration of the Conservative party those 3 per cents gradually reached a premium of 7 per cent. But there is another point in regard to that loan to which I want to call the attention of the House, and particularly of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Richard Cartwright), and that is that I am able to claim that the action taken by the present Finance Minister supports a view that I held in a very strong controversy with the then Minister of Finance, and that was in regard to the question whether it was best, in the interests of Canada, that a loan should be put on the British market at a fixed price, or at a minimum price, and tenders asked for. The hon. gentleman and I had a very fierce controversy on that subject, as he will no doubt remember, and I claim that the present Finance Minister is a convert to my view rather than to that of the hon. gentleman with whom I discussed the subject.

Now we come to that most interesting of all subjects, the Jubilee, and I am certain there is no member in this House, and there is no person in this country, belonging to any party or any class, whose heart was not thrilled with the liveliest emotion at that wonderful celebration. The spectacle exhibited to the world of Her Majesty the Queen surrounded not only by millions of her loyal subjects vying with each other in devotion to her throne and person, but surrounded by representatives of all the great outlying portions of the Empire, was a spectacle that will not soon be forgotten. I say more. I believe that the exhibition of power manifested when England, without drawing a ship from a foreign station, without drawing a ship from her great fleet in the Mediterranean presented to the world a display of naval power such as had never before been witnessed, was a spectacle not

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

only calculated to excite feelings of loyalty and satisfaction in every British heart, but to contribute to the peace of the world. I wish to take this opportunity, and in doing so I am representing the feelings not only of every member on this side of the House but of every individual in the country, to tender my hearty congratulations to the right hon. leader of the Government, who represented Canada on that occasion, on the distinguished honours which he obtained. I could not, however, help wondering, when in common with all the rest of us, I yesterday gazed with admiration on the right hon. gentleman bedizened with the order of the Grand Cross of St. Michael and St. George, and the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour of France, what his democratic friends thought, those who used to be roused to wild enthusiasm when he denounced with scorn those as tin pot titles. I am afraid when the temptation was placed before the hon. gentleman he was something like Bob Acres with his courage—his democratic sentiments oozed from his fingers' ends, and being unable to resist the temptation he yielded to it. However, Sir, I look upon it as a matter of advantage to the country that the right hon. gentleman, being now duly installed in a most noble and distinguished order, will be prepared to maintain that which is not the least important of British institutions, by which Her Majesty marks her appreciation of services rendered to the Crown by the bestowal of these important orders. Everyone will agree with the reference made by the hon. mover of the Address to the distinguished personality of the right hon. First Minister. We all appreciate it, and we were all gratified to know that in the person of the Prime Minister the Dominion was represented on the other side of the water by one whose personality was such that we could all be justly proud of him. We all recognized the force and truth of that admirable portrait painted by the great Latin orator of Cambridge University, Professor Sandys, when he declared that the right hon. gentleman spoke eloquently in two languages. His eloquence gave him additional force, for there are no people in the world, with perhaps the exception of the French, who are more affected by eloquence than the British public. But before I pass on, I wish to make one observation that escaped me in regard to these orders. I observed with some little surprise from the decorations worn by the right hon. gentleman, that he had accepted the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour of France. I could not understand it—I cannot understand it now. I had a similar honour tendered to me by the King of Belgium when I had the honour of representing Canada as commissioner at the Antwerp Exhibition. Knowing, as I did, that no British subject could accept a foreign order, except with the consent of the Crown, I went to the Colonial

Office and saw Sir Robert Herbert, who was the Chancellor of the Order of St. Michael and St. George, if I remember rightly, at that time. I applied for permission to accept an order precisely similar, except that one was from Belgium and the other from France, to that received by the right hon. gentleman. That permission was refused; and it was not only refused, but Sir Robert Herbert placed in my hands a statute which declared Her Majesty had not the power to consent to the acceptance of a decoration from a foreign power except for services on the battlefield. I do not know whether my hon. friend won his decoration on the battlefield; but unless he did so, I cannot understand why he should appear as Prime Minister of Canada wearing a decoration that I understand to be prohibited by the authority of the Crown, except in cases in which Her Majesty is able to give consent, and that alone applies to a distinction won on the field of battle.

To pass to more serious subjects, I regret that the eloquence with which the right hon. gentleman enthralled the people with whom he came in contact on the other side of the Atlantic, was not used in the interest of Canada. I watched narrowly the course which the right hon. gentleman pursued during the time he was representing this country, and it is with the deepest regret that in the discharge of the duty which I owe to this House and the country, I am compelled to say that instead of having used wisely his eloquence, which at such a time might have accomplished more for Canada than perhaps at any other period in our history, the right hon. gentleman forgot what was owing to the Dominion and turned back not only on Canada but on himself, and used the high authority with which he was clothed to do the greatest injury to Canada that it is possible for any man to do. What was that? I dare say this House has not forgotten that the subject of preferential trade has been discussed in this country. What is preferential trade? Preferential trade is the policy of adopting an arrangement between the British Government and her colonies under which colonial products will go into the markets of England free as at present, while the products of foreign countries coming into competition with them will be subjected to duty.

In 1884 the Right Hon. Mr. Foster, one of the most distinguished men who ever adorned the Liberal ranks in the United Kingdom, founded the Imperial Federation League with a view of drawing more closely together the colonies and the mother country. He did me the honour to consult me on more than one occasion, and I told him that after giving the subject the closest consideration, I had arrived at the conclusion that what would bind the colonies and the mother country indissolubly together was a policy of preferential trade

such as I have referred to. The answer of the right hon. gentleman to me was: Well, I am a free trader, but I am not so fanatical a free trader that I would not be perfectly willing to adopt that policy to accomplish such a result. Mr. Foster unfortunately died, and a number of the members of the Imperial Federation League were not so emphatically in favour of going as far as he would in that direction. I had not taken much part in the Imperial Federation League from its formation down to 1889, but in the latter year I was pressed to attend the annual dinner of the league, and to give my view in regard to the status of the question in Canada. I repeated there that in order to cement the tie that bound the colonies to the Crown, it was in my judgment necessary to adopt a policy of preferential trade under which the interests of Great Britain would be greater in her colonies, and under which the colonies in return would evince their gratitude by giving a corresponding advantage to British products in the markets of Canada. That became the subject of a very lively discussion, and I am quite certain that it had something to do with the dissolution of the Imperial Federation League. At all events, the difference of opinion that arose in the league on that occasion led to the formation of the United Empire Trade League in March, 1891. That league was formed by leading gentlemen of both parties in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords, who advocated by all means in their power the adoption of this policy of preferential trade on the basis I have stated. They waited on the Marquis of Salisbury in 1891, and put before him the great advantages that would accrue to the Empire if Great Britain adopted the policy of placing her colonies on a better footing than foreign nations in her markets. The Marquis of Salisbury replied: That is a very grave question; it is one for which the public mind is hardly prepared, and he told the deputation to go forth and promulgate their views, and that if the people of the country were converted to that doctrine, then their battle would be won, because the Government would offer no opposition. As a result of this, at the close of the last general election in England, those gentlemen were able to go to Lord Salisbury and point out to him that a very great number of the representatives in Parliament had been elected as avowed supporters of preferential trade. Lord Salisbury then said that it would be impossible to take up the scheme unless some plan were put forward on business principles. Our Parliament in 1891 resolved that when the British Government would admit to the United Kingdom the products of Canada upon better terms than those accorded to the products of foreign countries, then Canada would be prepared to make a corresponding reduction of duty in favour

of British goods in her markets. In 1894 the historic conference took place in Ottawa, at which were represented Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Canada and England, and after full discussion a resolution was adopted affirming the principle of the resolution passed by the Parliament of Canada, and asking that Her Majesty's Government would favourably consider the question. Unfortunately, it fell to the duty of the Marquis of Ripon to reply to that appeal, and I need not tell any person who is acquainted with English politics that the Marquis of Ripon was Colonial Secretary in a Government which rested upon a very narrow majority in the House of Commons, and which, however otherwise well disposed, was not in a position to deal with such a question as that. When the members of the United Empire Trade League went back to Lord Salisbury in 1896, and pressed him to give effect to the declarations that had been so thoroughly sustained throughout the country at the general election, he told them he wanted a scheme. In that year I came to Canada—as I dare say some hon. gentlemen will recollect—and I was invited to deliver an address before the Montreal Board of Trade. In that address I endeavoured to show the practicability and the feasibility of the adoption of that policy, and I urged it in the strongest possible manner. The Toronto "Globe," the organ of the great Liberal party in this country, criticised my action, and said: Why should Sir Charles Tupper waste his time and his breath in advocating preferential trade in Montreal, when it is a policy which every man in this country will hold up both his hands in support of; and the "Globe" further said: The battle has to be fought in England. Well, the "Globe" was right in that. I have no hesitation in saying that when on this great Jubilee occasion, Canada had an opportunity of being represented by the leader of this Government, that battle would have been won if it had been fought in England by him. Sir, I shall give you my reasons for entertaining that opinion. My answer to the "Globe" was: It is quite true that the battle must be fought in England, and that is why I am here urging upon the boards of trade at this meeting in Montreal, and all over Canada, to send delegates to represent them at the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, and press there this question of preferential trade. The Toronto Board of Trade passed a resolution affirming the policy in the strongest and most emphatic terms, and suggesting precisely how, in their opinion, it should be carried out. That resolution read as follows:—

Resolved, that, in the opinion of this conference, the advantage to be obtained by a closer union between the various portions of the British Empire are so great as to justify an arrangement as nearly as possible of the nature of a Zollverein, based upon principles of the freest exchange

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

of commodities within the Empire, consistent with the tariff requirements incident to the maintenance of the local government of each kingdom, dominion, province or colony, now forming part of the British family of nations.

That was very specific and very clear. An hon. gentleman who is now a member of this House, although he was not then, Mr. Osler, was sent to represent the Board of Trade, and to press this resolution. I have only read the last clause of it, because that is the most important; and when he had put that resolution before the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, who opened the conference, made a most important and striking speech, in which he substantially endorsed the resolution passed by the Board of Trade, and maintained that the policy was perfectly practicable of accomplishment on those terms. He said:

If they (the colonies) desire, as we desire, and as we believe they do, this closer union—if they are willing to make some sacrifice of their present arrangements and convictions in order to secure it—let them say so. Let the offer come voluntarily from them, and I believe it will be considered in this country, not in any huckstering spirit, but that it will be entertained as part of the great policy which is intended to unite in the closest bonds of affection and of interest all the communities which are under the British flag and all the subjects of Her Majesty throughout the world.

The next authority we have on that important question is no less distinguished a person than the right hon. the First Minister. He was then appealing to the people of this country to give him power, and was stating to the people what he would do if they clothed him with power; and I think that every member of this House will admit that no more solemn obligation can rest on the shoulders of any public man than the obligation to redeem honourably, honestly and faithfully the pledges he gives to the electorate when he is seeking power at their hands. This is what he said at London, on the 17th of May, 1896:

In regard to this question of preferential trade, Mr. Laurier desired to say that Sir Charles Tupper was no more favourable to the idea than himself.

He went on to say:

My hope is—nay, my conviction is—that on the 23rd of June the Liberal party will be at the head of the polls; and then it will be the Liberal party, with its policy of a revenue tariff, that will send commissioners to London to arrange for a basis of preferential trade.

These were the terms in which the hon. gentleman pledged himself to carry out the policy of preferential trade if he obtained power. Under these circumstances, had we not a right to expect that some effort at all events, on his part would be made to show that he had not attempted to delude the people of this country with false promises, only to trample them under his feet

and to turn his back upon them after they had accomplished the purpose of securing for him his position of power and influence? The hon. gentleman had the opportunity placed in his hands, and I hold in my hand the speech with which he was met by His Grace the Duke of Devonshire at Liverpool on landing, on the very threshold of his entrance into England, on which occasion, as hon. gentlemen know, the Duke of Devonshire made a speech which brought down upon him next morning the denunciation of the extreme free traders and Cobdenites all over the United Kingdom. They declared that he had shown on that occasion that for the purpose of meeting the views of the colonies he was prepared to turn his back on free trade and adopt a preferential tariff between England and her colonies. He said:

Very few disciples of free trade fifty years ago would have believed for a moment that at this time France and Germany would be carrying on an enormous trade under strictly prohibitive conditions, and not only that they would not have opened their markets to us, but they would be competing over us for the possession of as large a portion as possible of the surface of the earth, not for the purpose of opening it up out of the universal benefits of free trade, but for the purpose of excluding from those portions English trade. The world has not become the commercial paradise which was predicted in the early days of free trade opinion, when it was hoped that free trade would bind all the nations of the earth so closely together that it would be a matter of comparatively little importance by whom they were ruled, or under what influence they were governed. We have since learned by painful experience that no old nor new markets are being thrown open to us by the influence of free trade alone, and that if we want to provide for increasing commerce, which is necessary for the support of our increasing population, we must find those markets for ourselves, and must use every opportunity either of expanding or consolidating our colonial possessions.

Here was the evidence, given in the strongest terms, that His Grace was prepared to follow in the lines so admirably laid down by Mr. Chamberlain, of adopting a policy of preferential trade within the Empire. Sir George Turner, the Premier of Victoria, was present on that occasion, and I will read as short an extract as possible from his speech, although I should like to read a longer one, in order to give the House the spirit of the position he occupied:

If proposals be made to us which will show us that the whole of our trade, the whole of our dealings can be on fair, just and equitable terms conducted with Great Britain, we will only be too willing to enter into that bargain, because we know that that will be manifestly for the benefit and advantage of all of us who are part of this great Empire.

The Premier of New Zealand, the Hon. A. J. Seddon, said:

I am proud that it has been reserved to us to listen to the admirable address which His Grace has given this afternoon. Since thirty years

ago, when this matter was first discussed, there has gone forward a movement which will increase in strength and volume until all doubts be removed, and that, instead of that, which you all require going to foreign nations, we can give you that help; we desire to do so. Help us to do it and you are doing your duty to the great Empire to which we all have the honour to belong. Let me remind you of what took place at the conference in London in June last. There the thinking men of our nation, those who command our manufactures, those who command the commerce and trade of our country, showed that they desired to put to the world, and to put to those in charge of Imperial affairs what their views honestly were upon this subject. And he who is at the present moment at the head of colonial affairs—I allude to the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain—said: "Let the colonies come to us with a proposal or proposals, and it shall not be treated in any huckstering spirit." Nothing was done under that until recently, but there was a conference held of the Prime Ministers of Australia at Hobart, and a resolution was passed in which we said that we had not arrived at that stage at which proposals should be made, but that the situation is so grave and serious that, in the interests of the colonies and of the Empire, it should be inquired into.

I regret to say that instead of the right hon. gentleman realizing what every honest man in Canada looked to him for, instead of doing what he had solemnly pledged himself to do, he turned his back upon Canada, he turned his back upon himself, and rejected this very proposal at the outset, which, I have shown, step by step, accumulated such tremendous cogency and force. These are the terms in which he spoke:

I claim for the present Government of Canada that they have passed a resolution by which the products of Great Britain are admitted on the rate of their tariff, at 12½ per cent, and next year at 25 per cent reduction. This we have done, not asking any compensation.

Are there any terms in the English language which the hon. gentleman could have used that could be more opposed to the pledge he had given? Because the whole question was one of compensation, and that was a question which Mr. Chamberlain declared would be decided in no huckstering spirit. If the colonies, he said, would make a proposal to give benefit to Imperial trade, the British Government were ready to consider the advisability of giving that preference to the products of the colonies in the British market which was of such vital consequence to Canada. The right hon. leader of the Government went on to say:

There is a class of our citizens—

Mark, Mr. Speaker, the sneer. What did the "Globe" tell the right hon. gentleman? The "Globe" told him that every man, woman and child who was old enough to know and realize the importance preferential trade would be to Canada was of one opinion, and that was that it was most desirable to get it. And yet we have

from the right hon. gentleman this sneer, not at the Conservative party alone, but, if the "Globe" stated the truth, at every intelligent person in the country.

There is a class of our fellow citizens who ask that all such concessions should be made for 'quid pro quo.'

But that is, Mr. Speaker, the very basis, the foundation of preferential trade within the Empire.

The Canadian Government has ignored all such sentiments.

Was that the language the right hon. gentleman held in London, Ont., when he said he was as strong in favour of preferential trade as I was, or the language he used at Toronto when he said that his best efforts would be used to obtain that preferential trade, of such vital importance, on the lines suggested by the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain? The right hon. gentleman continued:

We have done it because we owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain. We have done it because it is no intention of ours to disturb in any way the system of free trade which has done so much for England.

If the right hon. gentleman were in a position to cut adrift from the obligations which he solemnly assumed and which rested upon him, if he were in a position to place a value upon a Cobden medal that was over and above all the interests of Canada, then it would have been all right for him to use such language. No terms that can be found in the English language more calculated to violate the pledge the hon. gentleman had given to the people of this country as to what he would do when in power. And when he was clothed with power, and on that great jubilee occasion, when the English people were ready to give us everything for nothing almost, he had no right to say on behalf of Canada that he was looking simply to this mess of pottage which he had made up his mind to secure. I shall not have to labour much to bring every unprejudiced mind in this House to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman did not realize our just expectations and failed to discharge that duty towards his country which his country expected him to discharge. Again, at Birmingham Mr. Chamberlain, in glowing language, showed the vital importance of adding the tie of interest to the tie of sentiment, of having a mutual bond of self-interest binding the colonies and the mother country together, of recognizing this principle of commercial confederation. But what language did my right hon. friend use? He said:

Many schemes of union had been suggested, but they all had the fatal objection of interfering with the freedom of trade of the colonies.

Does the hon. gentleman say that we want such freedom of trade in the colonies as will prevent our products, when sent to the great markets of the United Kingdom, obtaining higher prices than they obtain

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

now? I think that such an interference with our trade would be welcomed by every man of any intelligence. My right hon. friend continued:

The colonies had already granted certain concessions to the mother country, but they asked for no 'quid pro quo,' no pound of flesh.

I have, Mr. Speaker, been fighting the battle for preferential trade actively since 1839 down to the present hour, at the boards of trade all over the United Kingdom, and in every section whenever the opportunity offered, and the bitterest opponent of preferential trade never took grounds stronger, more emphatic, more determined against it than the right hon. gentleman took on this question, which, the organ of his party declared, was considered by every man of intelligence in Canada as of great importance to our country, and which he had himself endorsed in the fullest possible manner. Let me quote still stronger language which the hon. gentleman used, as if he were determined to break down, at once and for ever, this agitation for preferential trade between the mother country and her colonies:

What we give you by our tariff we give you in gratitude for the splendid freedom under which we have prospered. It is a free gift. We ask no compensation. Protection has been the curse of Canada; we would not see you come under its baneful influence—for what weakens you must weaken us.

Now, Sir, this is the mode in which the hon. gentleman disappointed the just expectations of the people of this country in reference to this vitally important question of preferential trade. I leave it to the judgment of this House, I leave it to the candid consideration of every intelligent man in this country, whether I should not fail in my duty as a member of this House and as a citizen of Canada if I did not draw attention to the facts.

But, Sir, the right hon. gentleman seems to be equal to any fortune. When I came from England, I was interviewed on the subject of what had taken place on the other side of the water, and I then gave expression to the view I am expressing now—that the leader of the Government when clothed with power to represent the Dominion on this great jubilee occasion had utterly failed to redeem the promises that he had made. And the hon. gentleman himself seems to have come to the conclusion that I was not very far wrong. He attended a banquet at Toronto and made a speech there. Let me contrast that speech with his previous utterances. The hon. gentleman, having performed the acrobatic feat of taking a double somersault between Canada and Great Britain had returned to Canadian soil and now found himself face to face with the men he had betrayed. I do not use too strong a term when I say that he had betrayed the men who took him at his solemn pledged word

and gave him power to accomplish this great work for Canada, seeing that though, having such an opportunity as a man does not have more than once in a lifetime to do a great work for his country and gain a reputation that would live through all time in the hearts and minds of Canadians, yet he, dazzled with this Cobden medal craze and desiring to add this brilliant decoration to the others he had obtained, turned his back upon himself and upon Canada. But, when face to face with the men he had betrayed, what did he say? He said:

I have only this to say with respect to this charge of these self-constituted diplomats—

Well, Sir, I have never called myself a diplomat, although the hon. gentleman was good enough to confer this distinction upon me. I hope I have not proved more unworthy of it than the right hon. gentleman himself proved in his great diplomatic feat with the United States when he unbosomed himself to a newspaper reporter and paraded a long series of matters that he intended to discuss with the American republic. And, by the way, I told the hon. gentleman at the time that that kind of diplomacy would not pay, that it would not do to attempt to accomplish a great diplomatic feat in that way; and I think that he has come to the conclusion that I was right. He has had evidence enough of it. He and his colleagues have been down to Washington, they have virtually been on their knees time and again to the Government and the Congress of the United States, and have come back utterly discomfited, so much so that the ire of even the great lover of the United States, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) has begun to rise, and we hear him saying at least that we must stand upon our dignity. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has no diplomatic talent, because I find that, after this good-natured sneer at your humble servant on the subject of diplomacy, he endeavoured to show that he was a practical diplomat, that he had, in fact, exhibited an amount of diplomacy that was really remarkable and most creditable. I can only say that I will give to the House the language of the right hon. gentleman on that occasion, which will show the kind of diplomacy he was prepared to use. He said:

Certainly, if I thought I could have obtained for my country, for the products of Canada, a preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain, I would not only have been wanting in patriotism, but I would have been wanting in reason—I simply would have been an idiot—if I had failed to obtain such preference. (Laughter and applause.)

I have not used any language so strong as that which the right hon. gentleman has used towards himself. But I cannot contradict him, seeing that it is exactly what he did.

As I have said before, that is diplomacy with a vengeance. He went on to say that he had got the denunciation of the treaties, that there was nothing now in the way, that the coast was clear and the ground ready for discussion, and that the discussion could go on with the hope of obtaining some satisfactory solution of the problem. Where is he now? He has turned his back upon free trade and upon Cobdenism. Returning to his own country he gives it as the only excuse why he did not try to get preferential trade that he could not get it. One is reminded of the old quotation:

It was all very well to dissemble your love,
But why did you kick me downstairs?

Though he dissembled his love for Miss Preferential Trade, there was surely no reason for kicking her downstairs as an evidence of his affection for her. But the right hon. gentleman is not altogether wanting in diplomatic talent, for he has really adopted the policy of his great French diplomatic prototype. We all know that the name of Talleyrand will be handed down to future generations as that of one of the most accomplished diplomats that ever lived, and the basis of Talleyrand's diplomacy was that ambassadors were sent abroad to lie for their country—that an ambassador could not be expected to tell the truth.

I observe by the conversation going on between the leader, the hon. gentleman opposite and his colleague (Sir Richard Cartwright) that I am being subjected to some criticism. I may possibly have attributed the saying to the wrong person, but we know that Talleyrand's maxim was that a lie was all right if the truth could be reached by means of it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I was just wondering if the motto the hon. gentleman has quoted applied to High Commissioners as well as to Ambassadors.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now, having questioned the right of the hon. gentleman to the character of a diplomat, I had occasion to run my eye over the history of Talleyrand and find some remarkable likenesses in the right hon. gentleman, to him. No doubt, he will be deeply gratified to hear what I say, for he knows that I am comparing him with one of the most astute diplomats that the world has ever seen. Those who are interested in the matter will find in Appleton's encyclopedia of biography, under the title Talleyrand, the following:—

Here the question occurs, therefore, What were his convictions? Faith in what any single party might understand by principle Talleyrand had not; yet he possessed some rare quality of mind which, to him, supplanted the place of such a faith, and which has been aptly designated a 'supernatural indifference'—an indifference not to his own fate, but to whatsoever event might befall the men or the institutions surrounding

him, so that his own schemes remained buoyant. Napoleon's summary judgment of him is perhaps nearer the truth than any more laboured criticism, and his words are these: 'Talleyrand was always in a state of treason, but it was a treasonable complicity with fortune herself; his circumspection was extreme, he conducted himself towards his friends as if, at some future time, they might become his enemies—'

I think there is a little resemblance there.

—“and towards his enemies as though they might become his friends.”

I think we have had some evidence of that, too, not very long ago.

This, after all the apologies we have read of him, seems to be the sum of the matter, and however admirable such a character might be as a minister of foreign affairs, there is surely too much of the Mephistopheles element in it to satisfy any lover of honesty; it is a judgment, also, by no means *ex parte* in character, for the fact stated is implied in the very apology for him. What else is the argument that he shifted from one party to another, lest he should partake in the threatened corruption of the body of which he foresaw the decay, except another way of stating his treasonable complicity with fortune? and what would any cause be worth if all its supporters were in this state of perennial treason towards it? What, again, is the moral worth of that man, however great his capacity, who supports a cause on condition of its success?

Now, Sir, I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman will accept that in full of any criticism of him as regards the likeness that I have discovered between him and his great French prototype. But, Sir, the Toronto "Globe" came to his rescue. They found that the hon. gentleman was in a very tight place. They knew that he had declared in Toronto what he would do if he got into power, and they knew that he had done the very reverse of what he had promised, that he had done everything that man could do to prevent any person harbouring a sentiment favourable to preferential trade. The "Globe" came to his rescue with a falsehood—nothing more or less; and I will prove that, because it was not merely a misstatement—the "Globe" understands this question too well to be mistaken. They came to his rescue with this statement:

It is just as well that the real facts of the matter should be known. During the visit of the colonial premiers to Great Britain, Mr. Chamberlain made the proposition that there should be absolute free trade between Britain and her colonies, on condition that the former placed a small customs tax on commodities from foreign countries.

Is that true? The right hon. gentleman knows that it is false. He knows that no such thing took place between the Premiers. What did take place between Mr. Chamberlain and the Premiers is on record. Mr. Chamberlain has placed it on the Table of the House of Commons, and has given the most emphatic contradiction to the "Globe". Now, I will quote the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

hon. gentleman against himself and against the "Globe," and I will show that the statement made in the "Globe" that Mr. Chamberlain's policy was one of absolute free trade, is the very reverse of the truth. Mr. Chamberlain declared in the presence of the assembled Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, that he adopted the Toronto resolution, which was in favour of a revenue tariff, and that is the construction that hon. gentleman placed upon it himself. Now, Sir, the First Minister, in Toronto, on the 4th of June, 1896, is reported to have said—speaking then as leader of the Opposition:

Now, the statesmen of Great Britain—

I ask the attention of the House to this, because it sums up the whole case with a clearness, a perspicuity and an accuracy that I think are calculated to excite the admiration of the friends of preferential trade.

Now, the statesmen of Great Britain have taught that the governments of the colonies have come to a time when a new step can be taken in their development. What is that? That there should be a commercial agreement between England and the colonies. That practical statesman, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, has come to the conclusion that the time has come when it is possible to have within the bounds of the Empire a new step taken which will give to the colonies in England a preference for their products over the products of other nations. What will be the possibilities of such a step if it was taken?

The hon. gentleman was then seeking power, not abusing it after he had got it.

We sell our goods in England. We send our wheat, our butter, our cheese, all our natural products, but there we have to compete with similar products from the United States, from Russia and from other nations. Just see what a great advantage it would be to Canada; if the wheat, cheese and butter which we would send to England should be met in England with a preference over similar products of other nations. The possibilities are immense.

Then the hon. gentleman was seeking the suffrages of the people. But not so when he begged England to turn her back upon that policy and to have nothing to do with preferential trade because it involved protection, and protection had been a curse to Canada, and he, as a Canadian, was anxious that England should be spared any such misfortune.

England does not expect that we should take her own system of free trade.

There is the answer to the "Globe," there is the true answer, there is the policy of Mr. Chamberlain, as outlined in the clearest terms.

England does not expect that we should take her own system of free trade such as she has it; but I lay it before you that the thing the English people would expect in return is that, instead of a principle of protection, we should adopt a revenue form of tariff pure and simple. These are conditions on which we can have that boon.

The hon. gentleman said that his policy was a revenue tariff policy, and that he was in a position to obtain that. Now, Sir, I think we have disposed of that question for the moment. We have shown that the right hon. gentleman has utterly failed to realize the just expectations of the people and the Parliament of Canada, but that, on the other hand, he has done all that man could do to strike down a policy that every person knows is of vital importance to this country. When it is remembered that the United Kingdom consumes a hundred millions of bread and meat more than she can raise and that, under that policy, we could furnish the whole of it from Canada, "just imagine," to use the eloquent and graphic illustration of the right hon. gentleman, just imagine the possibilities of such a condition of things.

Now, Sir, I come to that clause in this Speech in reference to the Jubilee, in which we are asked to congratulate ourselves

—upon the warm appreciation manifested everywhere throughout the mother country in reference to the conduct of Canada in materially reducing the rate of duty upon goods imported from the United Kingdom into the Dominion.

They did not do it, Sir. Not only did they not do it, but there never was a more complete delusion imposed upon any country than that imposed upon the people and press in England in reference to this pretended policy of preferential trade brought forward at the last session of this Parliament. We drew attention to that at the time. There is no doubt that it served a purpose; there is no doubt that almost the whole of the London press and of the provincial press through England caught at the prospect and became wildly enthusiastic in favour of that policy. And why? Why, Sir, as a rule, it was understood that the resolution proposed by the Parliament of Canada was one to prevent any country that did not do as England did, accept the goods of Canada without any duty at all, from enjoying the same advantage. A gentleman wrote a long article in one of the quarterlies, and the whole basis of his argument was that the policy of Canada had been laid down emphatically, that no other country than England could enjoy this advantage, because no country could enjoy it unless she received the goods of Canada upon the same terms that England did. The whole thing was a complete delusion, but it was considered to be a most wonderful advantage to England. Merchants and manufacturers in the United Kingdom, all those who are anxious to sell their goods, were led to believe that Canada was offering a mighty boon to the people of England, without money and without price, that a great reduction was being made in the duties, which would be the means of building up and increasing trade between that country and the Dominion. All this was based on a complete delusion, which was thoroughly exposed in this House last session. But I must say

this to hon. gentlemen opposite: all this furore, all this excitement, all the interest created on this subject in the United Kingdom was due to us and not to you. Where would you have been with your preferential tariff if we had not fought you to the death at the polls in 1891, and prevented you carrying out a policy of adopting the tariff of the United States as against England? If you had not been defeated and driven back, if the country had not been rescued and saved from the treasonable attempt to undermine the British institutions of this country as well as her commercial policy, you would not have had it in your power to take off one-eighth of the duty on goods coming in from the United Kingdom. Did I use too strong a term in designating it a treasonable policy to British institutions? What did we hear the other day? Hon. Edward Blake—why he did it I cannot quite understand—travelled through this country, reminding the people that when an attempt was made by the Liberal party to break down what he regarded as British institutions and adopt an American policy in this country, he had abandoned his party and had left their ranks. The Liberals having been defeated at the polls by the Conservative party, the country had been rescued, and the Liberal party had been able to adopt a policy which would enable him to sleep with them once more. I think the right hon. the First Minister will admit that one of the ablest of the premiers who attended the International Conference was the Right Hon. Mr. Reid, Premier of New South Wales. What did Mr. Reid say? Let me read as neat a bit of sarcasm—it consists of only three sentences—as I ever heard. Speaking at a meeting of the Chambers of Commerce, he said:

Might he make a startling announcement? His friend, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, had announced by the Canadian people a reduction of the somewhat heavy duties as a recognition of the principle that bound them together. He honoured him and the Canadian people for that step. If he had come to tell them that one of the most flourishing parts of the Empire—New South Wales—was about to open her ports to British commerce with a tariff fairer than her own, they would hail the announcement with great pleasure. Unfortunately it occurred two years ago. (Cheers and laughter.) If it had only occurred in this memorable year of the Jubilee, he had no doubt that the Premier of New South Wales would have been the fiscal lion of the hour. (Laughter.) But he had the misfortune to achieve his free trade victory in the mother country of Australasia two years ago. (Cheers.)

Canada was about to take off a percentage of the duties on English goods imported into the Dominion, and there was wild excitement, every merchant, manufacturer and artisan thinking he was forthwith to be made rich. Members of this House know the result. The New South Wales Government had removed, not one-eighth, but the whole of the duties from goods coming into that colony from England, and yet

their action had never excited a word of commendation or an expression of satisfaction for the benefit conferred.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret very much to detain the House at such length, but the subjects brought before the notice of the House by the Speech seem to make it necessary to do so, and after all perhaps it is the most convenient mode to deal with these questions in order to save the time of the House. When you, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair I had come to the proposal of the Government last session in regard to preferential trade, and it will be in the recollection of the House that a very sharp issue was made between the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches and those on this side of the House. We have now reached the point when we are in a position to deal more effectively with those questions than we were then. When the Government proposed, with a great flourish of trumpets, to show their loyalty by establishing a preference in favour of goods imported from the United Kingdom, we joined issue with them, and told them it was impracticable under the measure they proposed to accomplish anything of the kind. The House will recollect that we were met on that occasion by the united phalanx of the Treasury benches, who held that those treaties did not apply. The resolution offered to the House read as follows:—

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the Reciprocal Tariff herein referred to, are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce, or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty, or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada, at the reduced rates of duty provided in the Reciprocal Tariff set forth in Schedule "D."

The first point we took in respect to that measure was, that the Government could not pass it, that they could not obtain the assent of the Governor General to it, that he would at once tell them that under his instructions it was impossible for him to pass a measure of that kind. That objection was treated with great contempt by hon. gentlemen opposite. But in the course of a month they grew wiser, and they returned and very quietly proposed the clause which we said would be necessary in order to enable the Governor General to give his sanction to the Bill or to any Act whatever. This clause provided for the introduction of all the countries which under treaty with Great Britain might be found to be entitled to the reduction. Hon. gentlemen opposite,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

notwithstanding the fact that they submitted that clause to the House and amended their Bill, declared without any hesitation or qualification that this was done as an act of caution, that there was no doubt as to the Government's position, and no hon. gentleman was so loud and pronounced as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and in referring to that hon. gentleman I desire to say that I learned with pleasure of the honours conferred on him by the Crown and I hope he will long live to enjoy them. That hon. gentleman scouted the idea presented from this side of the House, and he delivered a long argument, which was heralded in some rather important journals in England as an important deliverance on this constitutional question. It was stated as an explanation of the fact that no reply was made to the refutation of that hon. gentleman's argument, that although a young man of some prominence, the hon. member for Halifax had made a reply, it was not necessary to answer it as the Government were anxious to close the debate. I believe the fact is that the argument presented by the hon. member for Halifax was so overwhelming that the Government sought in vain among the legal talent of the opposite side of the House for any one to undertake a reply. I think I am correctly informed when I say that the answer the Government received from their supporters in the legal profession was that the answer of my hon. friend was overwhelming and unanswerable, and that is the true reason why the debate was allowed to close without a reply being attempted. What has been the result? The result has proved, notwithstanding the loud-mouthed affirmations of the Minister of Marine, that there was no foundation for his argument, that it was a mass of sophistry and perverted the historical position of the question, and in fact there was nothing in it. It will be remembered that when the First Minister asked what his view of the question was, he rose and gave it with great confidence. He said the Government had examined all the treaties of the world, every treaty of every country, and had found that England was the only country that would be entitled to preference under that clause, and therefore it would give a complete preference to England. That was the position taken. Hon. members on this side of the House asked what about Belgium. The reply they received was that Belgium was excluded, and the Government were quite certain there was not another country in the world except England that would come within the preferential clause. After two or three days' discussion the Government ascertained that New South Wales would be entitled to it, as its tariff was absolutely lower than that of England; that she could not be excluded, but she was the only exception. We suggested that Holland, Japan and other countries could claim the benefit of the

clause, and that it would be impossible to shut them out. What has been the result? Here we have a sheaf of Orders in Council extending from 23rd April to 5th November, containing what? Day after day the scales have fallen from the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they have learned that all the statements from this side of the House were absolutely correct and could not be controverted; country after country has been admitted and order after order has been passed, and hon. gentlemen opposite find they have only succeeded in throwing the business and trade of this country into inextricable confusion by their absolute inability to deal with a question that ought not to have required the slightest discussion at the hands of any intelligent man who had any knowledge whatever of public affairs. That is the position that these gentlemen are in, and what is the result? Where, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, is this vaunted preference for England that was heralded far and wide by them? They admit themselves now that it has no existence, and that they have admitted country after country to the preference. In all this, there was no excuse for the Government. They had under their own hands, in the archives, all the data that would enable them to deal with this subject in a business-like manner, and attention to which would have prevented them experiencing all these humiliations they have suffered, and all the confusion into which they have thrown the business of the country. As I pointed out at the time, Canada is a part of the International Customs Union, and in consideration of the money paid by this country, the Government receive from day to day, from the Central Office in Belgium, any alterations which take place in the customs tariffs of those countries which come within the purview of the International Customs Union. The Government have no excuse for the manner in which they acted. The declaration of the right hon. the First Minister that there was no country in the world except England that was entitled, under that resolution, to this preferential tariff, has been proven to be utterly foundationless. This pretended preference for England has proved to be an utter delusion and a snare, and all this furore which was caused in this country and in England as to the preferential tariff being valuable to the mother country, has been demonstrated to be an absolute farce. That is the position in which these hon. gentlemen are. When the Minister of Finance introduced these tariff resolutions to the House, I ventured to say to him: You cannot give this preference to England alone, and his answer to me was: Well, we have done it. With all the arrogance that the most profound ignorance would warrant, the Finance Minister said: You must not tell me, we cannot do it, for we have done it, and to-morrow morning every customs-house within the Dominion of Canada

from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean will enter British goods at a reduction of one-eighth. I told the hon. gentleman then: You are only humiliating yourself all the more; you will have to admit twenty other countries to this same privilege, and you will be forced to the humiliation of instructing your officers, whom you have now misled, that they will have to refund every cent of duty that all these countries have paid in excess of the duties charged on English goods. That is the predicament of the Government to-day, and one more humiliating it would be impossible to imagine. Read this sheaf of instructions sent out day after day, as the scales fell from their eyes, and you find that they have discovered that twenty-six countries, in addition to England, are entitled to this privilege. This is the result, notwithstanding that the First Minister declared with all confidence that his Government was perfectly satisfied that there was not another country in the world but England which was entitled to the privilege. That is the humiliation which has fallen upon the Government of Canada in connection with this pretended preference which was put upon the Statute-book, and which will stand there as a monument of the utter incapacity of this Government to deal with a question which no intelligent person could possibly be excused for not knowing how to deal with properly. I am not quite sure that it was altogether incapacity, but it is either an evidence of the most crass ignorance, or worse still, it was done with knowledge of the fact, and was an attempt to mislead the House and the country in reference to a most important fiscal question. As the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is well aware, the Government provided that all these goods from Great Britain must be direct importation. They changed that, and any person who goes through this sheaf of explanations and instructions given to Government officials will find, that they countermanded all these orders and provided that when goods came from Great Britain, whether direct or indirect importations, they must be admitted at the reduced rate. As a result, the most inextricable confusion has been imported into the whole business.

I am glad to see the Finance Minister in his place, because he has no doubt a vivid recollection that when I ventured in my modest way to suggest, that there was doubt as to the possibility of such a thing as he proposed to do under this resolution, he retorted: We have done it. Well, Sir, you did do it, and what did you do? Why, you placed on the records of this country, evidence of the incapacity of the Finance Minister of Canada to understand the first principles of a fiscal question with which he had undertaken to deal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I am glad I came in time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad the hon. gentleman did come into the House, because I should not have ventured to say that unless he were present. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) told us last session, that he had given a preference to England, but what does he say now? He sees that he stands face to face with the fact, the startling and astounding fact—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In saying this, I am only quoting the language of one of the most eulogistic papers this Government possesses. I refer to the London "Canadian Gazette," the columns of which are filled with the most fulsome flattery of this Government individually and collectively. This London "Canadian Gazette," the subsidized organ of this Government, on the 16th of September last, heads an article:

The tariff in operation.—A startling result. And it says:

The Canadian preferential tariff has now been in operation for four months, and what is the effect? We published the official figures last week for the year so far as expired, and let us see how the record of British exports to Canada stands for the four months at the lower tariff. The result is at first sight a startling one.

These are the words to which the hon. gentleman took exception, believing that they were mine; but they did not originate with me. They are taken from their own organ as a condemnation and exposure of what was done. They state that there has been a decline, and then they go on to give the amount of the decline month by month for May, June, July and August, totalling £171,565 sterling less than for the same period of the previous year. And yet this was the mighty boon given by the preferential tariff, which was to make everybody in England rich, and which caused such a wild fervour as to what this country was doing.

This is, we say, startling. It is certainly not what we had been led to expect.

And what was the result? The year closed with a decrease of \$3,567,554 of goods imported from England as compared with the previous year. That is the gigantic preference that was given to England. I might draw attention to another fact which is rather striking in view of the very bold, high tone taken by the Government in this House as to how they were going to treat the United States of America. They had met with a repulse there, and they came back here bursting with indignation, and threatened in tones of thunder on these benches what they were going to do to that country. They were going to treat every country as it treated Canada. Well, Sir, England treated this country with open arms, admitting everything that we could send to her without let or hindrance. She

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

has taken millions more this year, without a farthing of duty, than she took in the previous year, although that was the greatest year for the exports of this country to the United Kingdom in the history of the country. And, Sir, what is the position of the United States? Why, Sir, while you have a decrease in our imports from England of over \$3,500,000, you have an increase of over \$3,000,000 in the imports from the United States, the country which you were going to teach to be careful how she offended this Government. Well, Sir, the hon. Finance Minister went down to Sheffield, where he made a speech and also gave an interview; and what did he say? Did he say that they had done it? No; he said they had not done it at all. He said:

In this way, not by any act of ours, but by the effect of these Imperial treaties, the preferential tariff as between England and the continental nations, came to an end. For the present, therefore, there is no preferential tariff in Canada for British goods.

That is the humiliating position the hon. gentleman was obliged to take there. But he gave them a little comfort at the same time, and I trust, for the honour of Canada and for the honour of the hon. gentleman himself, that his words will be made good. What did he say? Why, Sir, he said that when the treaties came to an end, then Canada would give Great Britain the preferential tariff—that as soon as the denunciation of the treaties occurred and took effect, on the first day of August next, the result would be that Canada would honourably carry out her proposal to give a preference to Great Britain. Am I correct in saying that the hon. gentleman in England led the British public to believe that would be the case—that when the denunciation of those treaties took place, the tariff of this country would give this preference to England?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is quite safe in assuming that any statements I made to the British public were entirely correct.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I read something for the information of the hon. gentleman?—because I think he got a hint from an hon. gentleman not a hundred miles away from him to be very careful what he said; and it is evident that the advice was not lost upon him. He said:

After the first of August, 1898, the Belgian and German treaties will come to an end, and thus all obstacles to preferential arrangements between England and her colonies will disappear. Then the terms of the preferential tariff will apply to the products of Great Britain, and to such of her colonies as are willing to adopt a liberal trade policy towards Canada.

These were the words of the hon. gentleman, and as he says that what he said in England may be relied on with the utmost confidence—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Or in Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think in Canada, because in Canada he said they had done it, and now he says they have not done it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend quoted me fairly, he would find that I said that we had done it, but by the action of the Imperial authorities, not by any action of ours, it for the moment came to an end.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But the hon. gentleman forgets that in the position he occupies he ought to have known then, as he knew afterwards—and if he did not know it, I do not know any one else, unless it was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), who was equally oblivious to the fact—that those treaties were binding. The hon. gentleman said :

If there were no treaties to interfere with us there would be to-day one-eighth off, and on the first of July next there would be another one-eighth off ; but the treaties will check us until the first of August, on which date the two-eighths reduction will have come into operation.

The hon. gentleman knows that it cannot come into operation under his clause even when the treaties are terminated, for he has been told so by the highest authority. The Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain has told the Premier, and he has laid the statement on the Table of the House of Commons, that under that clause or any similar clause, no preference can be given to the United Kingdom, and he has explained why. Because, he says, of a clause in all the most-favoured-nation treaties which England has in the world—and Canada, he says, is bound by many of these treaties: and they cannot be denounced, because there is no period specified for their denunciation. A treaty which has no time specified for its denunciation can only be terminated by war—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Or by common consent. The Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, has explained to the right hon. the First Minister that under no such clause as that can any preference be given to England—why? Because the most-favoured-nation treaties declare that whatever is given by one country to another must be given to every country which has most-favoured-nation treatment. Mr. Chamberlain explained this so plainly that a child of ten years old could understand it. In fact, I was ashamed, almost, when I read the explanation to see the minuteness which he appeared to think necessary in order to make it perfectly plain. He has maintained that Canada cannot give this preference by any such clause as has been put on the Statute-book, which provides that any country which has as low a tariff as the minimum tariff of Canada is entitled to come in, but that Canada must pass an

Act giving that privilege to the goods of Great Britain, nominating and giving it to nobody else. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to do that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Had not my hon. friend better wait for the budget?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I have the answer now. I have the hon. gentleman here in black and white. I have here his own declaration that that is what they intended by it; and as that is the only means by which they can do it, I take it for granted that they will do it.

But there is a very serious difficulty in my hon. friend's way which he has probably not thought of, and of which, in justice to him, I ought to remind him. A very important interview took place recently, on a very interesting occasion in London, between the right hon. the First Minister and the Cobden Club. On that occasion my hon. friend was decorated with this medal which he seems to value more than the keeping of good faith with the people of Canada, and these are the terms on which that medal was given. Lord Farrer, the most bitter foe of preferential trade that can be found within the British Empire, a most able foe, and one who is so determined a free trader that he denounces every form of reciprocity as one of the most insidious and improper forms of protection, made the speech of presentation, and these are the terms on which my right hon. friend was decorated with the medal :

There is a party amongst us who would willingly discriminate against German and Belgian goods, and who look upon the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties as a step towards what they have been pleased to call the commercial federation of the Empire—a system under which commercial union in the different parts of the Empire will be fostered by laws excluding or discouraging foreign goods. If this were to be the consequence of what you have done, I need hardly say that we of the Cobden Club would not have been here.

This language is very significant. Lord Farrer went on to say :

It is because we believe that your efforts are founded on the opposite principle, and will be followed by opposite results, that we, followers of Adam Smith and of Peel, of Bright and of Cobden, are here to congratulate and to thank you. You do not ask us to abate one jot of our free trade principles.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Let my hon. friend listen to what follows and see whether he will endorse that statement :—

You ask for no preferential treatment—

I do not hear my hon. friend say "hear, hear" to that, and I am very glad of it, because it proves the accuracy of the "Globe's" statement that every man in Canada, of every class and party, is in favour of preferential trade. Lord Farrer continued :

You ask for no preferential treatment, you make yourselves as large a step in the direction of free trade as your present circumstances will permit, and you desire to treat the rest of the world as you are now treating us.

What does my right hon. friend think of that? Does he not see at once that the medal which decorates the right hon. leader of the Government and which he seems to value so highly, is a barrier—complete barrier, so far as he is concerned—to the carrying out of the pledge he gave the people of Sheffield. That pledge was that Canada would honourably carry out—and I trust that the promise will be redeemed even if this medal would have to be surrendered—the preference he had avowed on the floor of Parliament and in face of the world that he was desirous of giving to England, and England alone, for the First Minister declared that England was the only country that was going to benefit from the preferential treatment. I say, Mr. Speaker, that Canada would be humiliated to the last degree if, under these circumstances, we would hesitate, when these treaties are denounced, in carrying out the pledge given by the Minister of Finance to pass an Act, under which that preference could be given to England and England alone. As I have said before, it is a very serious matter for the right hon. the First Minister. The medal must go. My right hon. friend, instead of drawing back on that occasion and explaining that there had been a misapprehension, when these vital terms, so far as the interests of Canada are concerned, were stated to him, spoke as follows:—

Canada has adopted freedom of trade, I hope and believe, as her guiding star. Other countries may follow, and probably we may expect that all countries issued from England will one after another follow her example. I was a free trader before I came to England, I am still more a free trader after seeing what free trade has done in England.

Nothing could be more conclusive. The contract was sealed and signed. The president delivered the medal and pinned it to the breast of my right hon. friend, and therefore it is impossible that any step can be taken by him for preferential trade with Great Britain except on terms which will compel him in honour to return that medal. Having received it under false pretenses, he is obliged in honour to return it, and the sooner he does so, the better, in my opinion, it will be for him. I believe it is made of gold, but whatever the metal may be of which it is composed, that hon. gentleman will find that that medal will be a millstone around his neck and will drag him down to destruction in the presence of the free and enlightened electorate, if he continues to wear it on the terms on which he has received it. I cannot conceive a more unfortunate position for Canada to occupy than that of having the right hon. gentleman, after all this shower of decorations,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

turn around and say: Well, we did not intend it after all. We simply humbugged you and gained our object in the meantime, but have no intention of carrying out what we proposed.

Now, I have drawn the attention of the House to what this preferential trade amounted to last year. There was the striking fact that instead of having done anything for England, this mighty boom, for the giving of which the hon. gentleman was held up as a saviour of his country, when on the other side of the Atlantic, had the effect of reducing the exports of Great Britain to Canada to the lowest point they have reached since confederation. Suppose the people of England had known that at the end of the year, British exports to Canada would have been reduced by three and a half million dollars, they could have concluded that no people would have been so insulted and misled by the statements of any public man. Here is a striking article that came from London on the 21st of September, when the people over there began to get their eyes opened and to find out that their trade was decreasing instead of increasing. The able and diligent secretary of the London Chamber of Commerce issued a circular in which he said:

The expectations of the free traders have undoubtedly been disappointed by the extension, to practically all countries except the United States, of what was supposed to be an exclusive British preference.

The English people thought, in the innocence of their souls, that when the First Minister of Canada stood up in Parliament and declared that under that clause no country except Great Britain could enjoy the benefit of it his statement was correct, but they found out how little dependence could be put on it.

This has tended to check the expected diversion into purely British channels of trade now done through Britain with France, Germany, etc.

Another retarding influence is the absence of exact official information as to the intentions of Canada after August next. Will the preference then be exclusively British?

They had not then seen, I suppose, the speech of my hon. friend at Sheffield.

The great difficulty is the lack of exact official information as to the intentions of Canada.

That is the question which the hon. gentleman has got to answer, and the answer to that question involves the character of the Government of Canada, it involves the confidence of the British people in the word of a Canadian Minister.

I pass on now to the denunciation of the treaties. On the other side of the Atlantic the right hon. the First Minister held up this preference everywhere as a mighty boon. He told the people there of the population of Canada, of its enormous resources, of its great wealth, and he stated how delighted the people of Canada were, without any quid pro quo, refusing to ask

anything in return, in pure love and affection, to give this mighty boon to Great Britain. The hon. gentleman has the most remarkable faculty of any public man I ever knew for never making any two speeches alike on any public question.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I know some who have quite a different quality.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Quite so, and I would rather be known to the end of time as one who repeated the same sentiments than to be fairly charged with never making two speeches alike, and never maintaining a principle a second time, but always making every speech a contradiction of a previous one. I have watched the hon. gentleman's career, and have studied his public speeches with the greatest care and attention. I ask any hon. gentleman on either side of the House to name a single principle, a single public question, upon which the right hon. gentleman has affirmed anything without afterwards turning his back upon that position and affirming exactly the opposite. In my judgment, this is a fatal characteristic. If there is one thing more than another of vital importance to the country it is that there should be faith in the statements of public men. I charge the right hon. gentleman here and now with having violated every principle he ever professed. I know not a single exception, I am open to conviction, and if it can be shown that I am wrong upon a single point and if the hon. gentleman can name a single issue upon which he has not repudiated his own utterances, I stand ready to tender him an apology. On the other hand, I can name a score of the most important public questions on which he has at one time advanced one opinion and at another time the very contrary, just as I have proved that he did with regard to the question of preferential trade. In England he told them that this preference was a great boon. I wonder if the hon. gentleman does not think that the intelligent people of England will call to mind the old maxim "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes." Does he not think that they will begin to wonder how this was paraded as such a boon to them when they find that it has been followed by the reduction of their trade with this country of three and a half millions below the worst year they ever experienced before? But the hon. gentleman again, in that wonderful acrobatic style of which he is past master, vaults to the other side on his appearance in Canada. In England this was a mighty boon given to them, but he no sooner reaches Montreal or Toronto than he presents it in an entirely different aspect as a great sacrifice that England was asked to make for Canada, that they had to sacrifice 60 to 40 per cent in order to denounce the treaties. And thus on the same instrument and with the same theme he

plays an entirely different tune on this side of the Atlantic from that he played on the other. I do not think that that style of policy will last very long. It may do once, but I do not think that you can repeat it with the intelligent English people; and I think that great humiliation is in store for Canada when the English people learn, as they are learning by bitter experience, that they have been completely deluded, and that, notwithstanding all the furore, this preferential trade with Canada which was to have been such a boon was not merely a myth, but the very reverse of an advantage.

Now, not to show any undue partiality, I desire to say a few words to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). I dare say that hon. gentlemen opposite remember that there was a great convention of the Liberal party held in this city in 1893. They then settled what was to be the policy of the party. Many policies had been discussed and promulgated through the country, but now they came together and made a policy or pretended to do so. Then the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was sent as a missionary to the maritime provinces to explain what the change in policy was. He told them that there had been a good deal of misunderstanding with this unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, but this was all settled, and the party had agreed upon their policy for the future—it was to be a pure free trade policy. Speaking in 1893, he said:

Well, gentlemen, I say no more. Whatever doubts or differences there may have been about our trade policy in times past, there is none now. Our platform is clear and definite. To-day the people stand face to face with such an issue, and the next contest is to be won between free trade and protection.

He wanted to show what free trade was. He did not mean absolute free trade—nobody supposed that—but a revenue tariff. He said:

A 17½ or 20 per cent tariff was high enough to give protection to the manufacturer. If it were not, the manufacturer should go down.

Why did he allow a manufacturer, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) to make a 30 per cent tariff? I am glad he did so, as I think it was in the interest of Canada. But the hon. gentleman when he does that, must not claim to be a free trader. But what does the hon. gentleman suppose is the rate of duty exacted by the Government of Canada upon English goods under this preferential policy during this year? It is no less than 30.69 per cent. The hon. gentleman declared that a 17½ per cent tariff was enough, but upon the goods brought from England the duty charged was over 30 per cent.

My hon. friend and I had a little controversy on the question of discrimination, and I dare say that he remembers it. I thought

then that he was serious. When this great Liberal Convention made a declaration to the world that the tariff of Canada discriminated against Great Britain, I thought the hon. gentleman was really serious. But I said then it was not true, and I hold that opinion still. I not only said it, but I proved, as I think, to the hon. gentleman when he discussed this question, that he was entirely wrong, and that he had based his impressions as to discrimination upon erroneous data which examination showed to be unfounded. But that did not cure him. The hon. gentleman, in London, committed himself to the same declaration where he said :

In 1895, the last year to which he had access to the tables, Great Britain took \$60,000,000 worth of Canadian products, while the United States took only \$40,000,000. Canada took from the United States \$60,000,000 worth of her produce, and only \$30,000,000 worth from the mother country. When the Liberal party came into power in Canada—

Mark this, Mr. Speaker.

—they thought something should be done to reverse these figures, this state of affairs. If it had been brought about by natural causes, those causes might well have been left to work out their own results ; but when they saw that they were produced by artificial means, they determined that all the obstacles in the way of development of trade between Canada and the mother country should be removed.

What does the hon. gentleman say to that now ? Was that sound or was it unsound ? Was that all a delusion ?—as I told him a year ago it was a delusion. If that is good argument, then the Liberal party having brought about a change in those figures, the discrimination, if discrimination there has been, has been increased by this Government, because the figures show that the very reverse of what he promised in England has taken place. Now, I call the hon. gentleman's attention to that, because I trust it will make him a little more careful when dealing with subjects of this kind that really require some attention.

I now come to notice another branch of the subject, and that is a declaration made by the First Minister at the Board of Trade meeting in Montreal. I wish to invite the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to this subject also ; and I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of telling that hon. gentleman how glad I am to find that he has reached that higher stage in the order to which he and I have the honour to belong, and also express the hope that the hon. gentleman may long live to wear the Grand Cross of St. Michael and St. George with all the dignity which is so natural to him. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, on a recent occasion, made a speech which was in most remarkable contrast to the speeches that hon. gentleman has been in the habit of delivering for the past twenty years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am afraid you have not read all my speeches.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I never lose an opportunity of enjoying a thing of that kind. The hon. gentleman absolutely was gracious enough, and I thank him for it from the bottom of my heart, to say, at a famous gathering in Toronto on a recent occasion, that Providence had had some little share in the blessings that have attended the country during the present regime, and he referred to it as a happy coincidence. I have no hesitation in saying to the hon. gentleman that I would prefer to see them sit on that side of the House till the last hour of my life, than to witness any check in that prosperity and progress which every man in Canada knows are vital to the advancement of our country. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman made a statement, the accuracy of which from such a distinguished source, as he knows, will become historical, and he will admit with me that when an error is made in statements that will be handed down to future generations, it is important that the error should be corrected. He is reported to have said :

Among the many pleasing incidents that had attended the celebration of Her Majesty's Jubilee last summer, not the least pleasing was the manifest recognition of the right of Canada to precedence among all British Colonies, so amply shown by the magnificent reception accorded to Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

I say to the hon. gentleman that that is not true. I tell the hon. gentleman that no person witnessed with greater pride and pleasure than myself, the position occupied by the right hon. gentleman who represented Canada on that occasion. But that he had any precedence that Canada has not enjoyed for many long years, I deny. I say that Sir Alexander Galt, who represented Canada as High Commissioner in the city of London, was accorded by the Crown, by the Mansion House on every great social and festive occasion, the first position as belonging to the premier colony of the Empire. When Sir Alexander Galt was appointed High Commissioner for Canada, he was at once unanimously elected by all the representatives of the self-governing colonies in London, to be their chairman. When I had the honour of succeeding Sir Alexander Galt I received the same precedence at the hands of the Crown, I was unanimously elected to the same position, and during my twelve years, more or less, of residence in the city of London, no person was ever sustained in a more loyal, a more enthusiastic, a more kindly manner than I was as the representative of Canada, the head of the self-governing colonies of the Empire. Under these circumstances I say that it is not just to attempt to change an historical fact, and to make it appear that any change took place in

that regard. As I said before, the right hon. gentleman who represented Canada on that occasion naturally took the place that has long since been assigned to Canada as the first colony in the Empire.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. More than a colony.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is more than a colony, and from the time that she became more than a colony down to this hour, without any question on the part of any other portion of the British Empire, the first rank and position have been accorded to whoever represented her on every occasion. I say that was the position Sir Alexander Galt occupied, that was the position that I had the honour to occupy, and that is the position occupied by Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal to-day, whether at the Mansion House, or at any of the great Guilds or on any royal function—whatever it be, he takes his place as the representative of Canada at the head of all others. Although this is not a matter of great import, I still feel bound to put my hon. friend right on that point.

The First Minister addressed a banquet at Montreal on December 17th, and I find some reason to criticise what he said on that occasion. He spoke as follows:—

If I may be privileged on this occasion to say one word of my own personal self, I would say that for many and many years it has been my hope that I would not close my eyes, that I would not sink into the grave, before I had seen Canada lifted up to the state of a nation. (Cheers.) Well, I may now die, for this day I have seen.

No person would regret more than I that any such fate should befall the right hon. gentleman, for we shall always have the most sanguine hope that the Liberal-Conservative party will come into power when an appeal is made to the people, provided the right hon. gentleman continues to lead the Government. He further said:

I was in Paris, in the land of my own ancestors, when the telegraph wires flashed the news that England had denounced the treaties which she had for twenty years and more with Germany and Belgium. What was Canada before that day? On the continent of Europe what was it—in France, in Germany, and everywhere else? Simply a name—simply a blotch on the map, and nothing more.

Did any person ever read such transcendent nonsense—that Canada, until the denunciation of the German and Belgium treaties, was a blotch on the map and nothing more. I do not know what stage of the dinner had been reached when the hon. gentleman delivered his speech, but it must have been late. Again, he said:

But when the day came that, at the instance of Canada, England, a great nation, denounced her treaties with—

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend says "hear, hear." I will prove to him that the statement is not true, and that it was not done at the instance of Canada. He has gone off at half-cock. Again:

—Germany and Belgium, and signified to the German Zollverein and to Belgium that twelve months hence those treaties would cease, on that day I felt a proud citizen, because on that day my dreams were realized, and Canada became a factor among the nations of the earth.

The hon. gentleman must be a veritable Rip Van Winkle; he must have been asleep during the last twenty years if these are the opinions he holds as to the position Canada occupies. The right hon. gentleman stated on another occasion that the reason why Canada was a nation was because she was free. Would freedom make a nation? Are the Manxmen a nation? They are tolerably free. Does the hon. gentleman really mean to say that freedom makes a nation? It is not freedom. Freedom is very well for a nation, but it is only a constituent part. What more? Did confederation do nothing to make a nation of Canada? Why were the hon. gentleman's lips sealed in face of the fact acknowledged by the civilized world that the confederation of the British North American provinces was one of the most important events that ever transpired? Why had he no word to say in favour of confederation? Was it because it owed nothing to him? Was it because the party to which he belonged, the Rouge party of Lower Canada, fought confederation to the death, and had they been able to maintain their views and sentiments, there would have been no Canadian confederation to-day and no nation for the hon. gentleman to talk about? It was to that great, powerful, brave, determined and patriotic French Canadian, Sir George Etienne Cartier, probably above all others, that we owe confederation. Had Sir George Cartier not had the courage and patriotism not only to take up that measure but to fight it through in spite of all the opposition that the party to which the right hon. gentleman belongs could give him, confederation would not have become an established fact. Instead of recognizing the services of the man who had done more to make Canada a nation than perhaps any other man in British North America, they never ceased to persecute him until they hounded him into an untimely grave. That was the recognition given to the man to whom the national position of Canada to-day is due. Had the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway nothing to do in making a nation of Canada? When I went to Washington at the invitation of that eminent and eloquent American, Mr. Bayard, a gentleman who recently occupied the position of ambassador from the United States to England, I was the Secretary of State, he met me and taking me by the hand, said: "Sir Charles Tupper, the

confederation of Canada and the construction of a great inter-oceanic line of railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific, has made Canada a nation and we might as well recognize the fact." Those measures which statesmen of the first rank in England treat as of the most vital importance to the mother country, never pass the lips of the right hon. gentleman, I believe, from the day he set his foot on the shores of Great Britain and France down to the time he left. What about the Treaty of Washington? Had we no national status when the Imperial Government sent as one of the joint High Commissioners to Washington Sir John Macdonald to deal with the fisheries question and to protect Canadian interests. And when it was provided that that treaty, which settled all those great questions between the United States and Great Britain at that time, could not come into effect except by the Parliament of Canada giving its ratification thereto, was there no national significance in that arrangement? The right hon. gentleman knows there was. I need not refer to the occasion on which I had the honour, as one of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries, nominated by Canada, but representing Great Britain as fully as did the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain to visit Washington, where after three months we succeeded in negotiating a treaty that received the unanimous consent of the Parliament of Canada and was only defeated by a party vote in the Senate of the United States, but which treaty and the *modus vivendi* established under it had been the means of settling all questions touching the Atlantic fisheries in a satisfactory manner and so as to remove all friction. Had Canada no nationality when Her Majesty's Government, for the first time in the history of a colony in the Empire, decided to take a Canadian, a person nominated by Canada, and appoint him to the position of plenipotentiary representing Her Majesty's Government and charge him with the duty of negotiating a treaty between France and Canada? Was there no national characteristic in that act? The right hon. gentleman talked a good deal in Paris regarding improved trade relations, but I do not think he mentioned the fact that the Government which preceded the present Administration had negotiated with the present foreign Minister of Finance, M. Hanotaux, a brilliant and able statesman, commanding confidence not only in his own country but in other countries, and that a treaty was negotiated between that statesman and myself. I think I know why the right hon. gentleman did not refer to that treaty: it was because on that question, as on every other, so far as I am aware, he has been on both sides. He voted against it, and when his following was going the other way he changed his vote and supported it. That was Talleyrand's idea of diplomacy. What does the right hon. gentleman (Sir

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Wilfrid Laurier) say to the position I occupied in Paris in 1893, when for the first time in the history of Canada, or in the history of any part of the British Empire outside the British Islands, a representative of Canada took his seat at a great International Conference on equal terms with the representatives of Russia and of Germany, and the representatives of the other twenty-four powers who joined in that conference? Was that, or was it not, a recognition of the national position of Canada? It was; and the hon. gentleman knows that compared with that, the denunciation of the Belgium and German treaties is utterly insignificant. Thus, at Brussels, at St. Petersburg, at Vienna, and in London, Canada was represented by a person named by the Government of Canada, and took his place on equal terms with the other representatives of other nations. What does the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) say to the international arbitration on the Behring Sea question in Paris, when on the nomination of the Government of Canada, Her Majesty's Government selected a Canadian to act as agent of the Imperial Government, and selected the late Sir John Thompson to sit alongside Judge Hannen as a representative of the British Government. Was not that a great international function? Were we a mere blotch on the map then? The hon. gentleman could not dare to have intimated any such thing to the statesmen whom he met in Paris, because they knew differently. It is a libel upon the fair name of Canada and the position she occupies to make such a bombastic speech as the Premier did in Montreal, wherein he said: We were a blotch on the map. It appears to the hon. gentleman that it was simply the denunciation of the treaties with Belgium and Germany that made Canada a nation. But the hon. gentleman must have forgotten a speech he made a few weeks before his visit to Montreal. Let me read it to see if he really did think that Canada was a mere blotch on the map. This speech was made on the 19th of June, and as the treaties were not denounced until the 30th of July, therefore Canada was still a blotch on the map. Sitting alongside of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales at the Imperial Institute did the right hon. gentleman speak about Canada as he did at Montreal? Oh, no; he said then:

Sir, the colonies were born to become nations. In my own country, and perhaps also in England, it has been observed that Canada has a population which in some instances exceeds, in many other instances rivals the population of independent nations, and it has been said that perhaps the time might come when Canada might become a nation in itself. My answer to that is simply this:

You can imagine, Sir, and I can imagine, and I imagine with pride, the manner in which my right hon. friend would draw

himself up to his full height as he gave utterance to this magnificent sentence :

My answer to that simply is : Canada is a nation.

It was a blotch on the map then, but yet the hon. gentleman, under the warming influence of the Imperial Institute dinner, thought that it was really a nation. He continued :

Although Canada acknowledges the suzerainty of the sovereign power, I am here to say that independence would give us no more rights than we have at the present day.

Put that alongside of the speech at Montreal, in which he declared that Canada was a blotch on the map until the treaties were denounced, and I think the right hon. gentleman will find that he will have to curb his eloquence, and allow his judgment to control it a little more. I ventured to criticise rather strongly the statement that these treaties were denounced at the instance of Canada. The hon. gentleman is a splendid opportunist ; he never loses his chance, he avails himself of every opening. He happened to be in Paris when the Belgium and German treaties were denounced, and if you read his pathetic speech on that occasion to the people of Paris, you will find that he said that he had accomplished the denunciation of the treaty—he did not say anything about Belgium—with Germany. And then, when the right hon. gentleman went a little further, and—master of that acting, which I think must be sincere, because I can hardly imagine any one doing it so perfectly in insincerity—when he pointed out with choked utterance and tears streaming from his eyes, how he had stood before the monument at Strasbourg ; then, although he did not say it, he left it to be inferred that he had the pleasure of avenging that blow on Germany by the denunciation of the treaty. At Halifax, having seen my criticism, the right hon. gentleman said :

Sir Charles Tupper was quite right in saying : “I did not get the treaties denounced ; it was Mr. Fielding.”

I beg pardon of the Finance Minister for naming him, but this is a case which really requires it. The Premier there stated it was entirely due to Mr. Fielding. He explained to the Halifax audience :

But when Mr. Fielding came with his tariff and gave a preference to British goods, then, Sir, the British nation, finding that we were making the sacrifices ourselves, and doing it without asking any reward, generously came forward and granted what had been heretofore refused. This credit, I say, is due altogether to my friend, Mr. Fielding.

Now, we have it at last, that in the person of the distinguished Finance Minister of Canada, we see the man who was in at the death, the man who succeeded in the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties. But, Sir, that is not true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I will put my hon. friend the Finance Minister on the stand to prove that there is not a word of truth in it. Some people may imagine that when treaties are denounced, it is not an important matter to know who denounced them. But in my mind, it is important, and for this reason : I say that Canada obtained the support, as she has been in the habit of obtaining for the last dozen of years—I speak from personal experience—and the enthusiastic and active co-operation of every representative of the colonies in Great Britain. I say I would be an ingrate if, after Canada had enjoyed again and again at my instance the co-operation, and the successful co-operation—

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What does the hon. gentleman wish to call attention to ? Does the hon. gentleman think that, if one is dealing with a question in which he has been personally interested, there is anything objectionable in stating the fact ? I think not. At all events, it appears to me scarcely seemly to make an interruption of that kind. I say that at my instance, again and again, on occasions of the greatest importance to Canada, I invited every representative of a British colony to meet at my office, where I put before them the measures which I wished them to support, and obtained for those measures their hearty support and co-operation ; and we went in a body to the Colonial Office, or to the office of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or to whichever office the question to be dealt with appertained ; and I say that I would be an ingrate if, after having secured the combined influence of all the representatives of the colonies, given by them most heartily and fully, I threw them aside when I ceased to need them any longer. I say nothing would be more unseemly than for any person to put forward on behalf of Canada the claim that this thing was done by or at the instance of Canada alone, which, as I have said before, is not true ; and I now give the proof of the hon. Minister of Finance of what I say. He was speaking at the Cutlers' feast down in Sheffield, in the presence of gentlemen who would have resented it if any attempt had been made to claim for Canada the exclusive credit of the denunciation of those treaties ; and this is what he said :

In conclusion, I have to say that the action of Her Majesty's Government, at the request of the Colonial Premiers—influenced possibly by the action of Canada—the action of Her Majesty's Government in denouncing those treaties, which seemed to be a barrier between the mother country and the colonies, is one which deserves and receives the profound gratitude of the people of Canada.

I endorse every word of this, which was uttered in good taste ; and it was infinitely more to the interest of Canada that a statement of that kind should be made and that

credit should be given where credit was due, than that anybody should attempt to grasp the whole credit for Canada. But I have a higher authority than the Minister of Finance. I have the statement made on the floor of the House of Commons by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, who ought to know, as it was he who obtained the denunciation of the treaties. He narrates the facts, and there they stand on record to give the most emphatic and complete contradiction to every one of those statements which the hon. gentleman has put forward here, there, and everywhere, that Canada has done this thing. What does she say?

The Premiers of the self-governing colonies unanimously and earnestly recommend the denunciation at the earliest convenient time of any treaty now hampering the commercial relations between Great Britain and her colonies. This was the unanimous wish of all the self-governing colonies, and it was accompanied by a most important and significant resolution, which was this: "That, in the hope of improving the trade relations between the mother country and her colonies, the Premiers present undertake to confer with their colleagues with a view to seeing whether such a result would be properly secured by preference given by the colonies to the products of Great Britain." On receipt of these resolutions the Government decided to withdraw their adherence to the treaties.

I call attention to this statement, and it is an important one, because it is only justice to every man who had a part in a measure so important to this country and all the other colonies, that it ought to be recognized; and I do not think it will be necessary very soon to say anything more on that subject. But, as I said before, the hon. gentleman never appears to be able to maintain any single principle for any length of time. On the question of Imperial Federation, what did he say? At the St. Jean Baptiste Society here, on November 7, 1891, he said:

There are people in my country who say that an imperial federation, that is, a federation between England and her colonies, would be the best alternative for Canada. As far as the Monroe doctrine is applicable to Canada, I am in favour of the Monroe doctrine. I do not want any European interference in our affairs, and it would be suicidal on the part of Canada to engage herself in a federation that would force us to take part in all the wars that Great Britain, on account of her position, is obliged to undertake in all parts of the world. I consider that this fact alone suffices to turn the Dominion from any such idea.

On a very important public question, the question of a closer combination and federation between the mother country and this country, these were the views put on record by the hon. gentleman in a formal speech to people who were hanging on his words and treasuring them up as jewels beyond all price. Well, Sir, what did the same hon. gentleman say in England on the same question? I will not refer to Mr. Goldwin Smith's insinuation, that the social

environments of colonists across the water are apt to turn their heads sometimes; but I want to know what the hon. gentleman has to say to the statement he made to the St. Jean Baptiste Society, and the following statement which he made before the London Chamber of Commerce—I think, at the Hotel Metropole. The hon. gentleman will, no doubt, remember it, because he will remember the enthusiastic cheers which greeted his every utterance from the time he rose to his feet until the time he sat down. The hon. gentleman said:

At no distant date it was manifest to all that the parting of the ways would be reached by England and her colonies, and when the parting of the ways should have been reached the problem would be whether the colonies would be more closely united with the mother land or whether their relations should cease altogether. The colonies had a national pride, and no tie and no bond would be permanent in the colonies until it gave to its pride the greatest possible expression.

What did the hon. gentleman mean by that? Is that what he meant when he was talking to this St. Jean Baptiste Society?

In Canada they had unbounded faith in their own country. When she had reached the full development of her manhood nothing would satisfy but Imperial representation. He knew that this question was not free from difficulties, but it was the part of strong men to undertake difficulties.

Well, Sir, I dare say the House remembers the story of the man in days when people used to prepare a little for the bon-mots which they used at dinner parties. He said to a friend: "I am going to say a clever thing to-night." "What is that," asked his friend. "That I cannot tell you," he said; "but when there is a little lull in the conversation, just say: 'Samson was a strong man,' and see what will happen." At the dinner party his very obliging friend waited till there was a lull in the conversation, and from a seat at the end of the table he called out, "Samson was a strong man," but the other did not pay any attention. He called it out in a louder tone, and then his friend looked up and said: "No doubt he was, but you must be a deuced sight stronger to be able to drag him in here without either rhyme or reason." It will require a veritable Samson to accomplish what the hon. gentleman says. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the subject of colonial representation in the British Parliament has been discussed for years until at length it has ceased to be the subject of discussion, because every one who has examined it knows right well that the difficulties in the way are such as to render colonial representation in the Imperial Parliament absolutely impracticable. The hon. gentleman was not there in his individual capacity but as representing Canada. Where did he get the mandate to say to the people of England that Canada is prepared for a Parliamentary federation of the Empire—that she is prepared for Imperial confeder-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

ation? What did the hon. gentleman mean? I know that he attempted to qualify his statement on another occasion by saying that of course such representation must not involve the giving up of any part of our autonomy. But my right hon. friend will excuse me when I say that that is absolute nonsense and absolute contradiction of terms. There can be no representation in the Parliament of Greater Britain by the colonies except such a confederation is formed as exists in Canada to-day. And then all these great questions that now devolve for settlement on the Federal Parliament of Canada would necessarily devolve upon that Imperial confederation; and the people of Canada, before they can become a party to an Imperial Parliament, embracing the colonies, held at St. Stephens, four thousand miles away from where we are now sitting, must come to the conclusion that the Dominion Parliament will occupy, as regards the Imperial Parliament, the position that Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island occupy in relation to this Parliament. Is there a man with a head on his shoulders within the domain of Canada who would entertain such a proposition for a single moment, even if practical? But it is utterly impracticable, and when the hon. gentleman declared a policy in direct opposition to the language he used when speaking on the same subject in Canada, he showed that he entirely forgot himself in the midst of the Jubilee celebration. The hon. gentleman brought this subject of Imperial federation up again and again. He regretted that he could not hope to live to see its fruition, but that he hoped some other French Canadian would live to teach freedom to this Parliament of Greater Britain in days after he was gone. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman entirely forgot himself. I am happy to say that I am very near the conclusions of these criticisms.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no doubt that it is almost as unpleasant to hon. gentlemen opposite to listen as it is for me to speak, but, Mr. Speaker, I have a duty to perform, and when a gentleman, who has been clothed with the great power and responsibility of representing this country in England, did not discharge that duty as he should have done, I should fail in the performance of my duty if I did not rise to comment on his extraordinary course. Here is another case in point of the same change of front, to which I have felt it my bounden duty to call the hon. gentleman's attention so many times. He said, at the same meeting of the St. Jean Baptiste Society, held on 7th November, 1891—not so long ago:

It has also been said that we should establish a line of steamers between England and her possessions, by virtue of which trade could be cultivated between Canada and the British Empire

to the exclusion of the rest of the world. I have only to say, with regard to such an idea, that it is absolutely absurd.

Those were the right hon. gentleman's views on the fast line.

For my part, I prefer the Yankee dollar to the British shilling, especially when the dollar is so near and the shilling is so far away.

Put that speech of the hon. gentleman alongside the brilliant and eloquent eulogy of the fast line service which he gave the other day in Toronto, and you will see, Mr. Speaker, that I am not beyond the mark when I say that I have searched the records in vain to find the hon. gentleman speaking twice on the same subject without speaking each time in a different voice. That change of face policy, no matter in what direction the face is turned, is a dangerous one. The man who is capable of holding to a policy, who, having carefully examined it, boldly avows it and stands by it, is the only man who can reasonably expect that an intelligent people will long continue to follow him. I am doing, I trust, a great service to my right hon. friend when I call his attention to the fact that the record he has so far made is one that renders it absolutely impossible for any intelligent man to place the slightest confidence in anything he may say at any time and at any place. What did he say in Quebec, the other day, on the same subject of the fast line? He said:

There was, gentlemen, one question which agitated for a long time public opinion in this country, and especially in the city of Quebec. That was the question of the fast line. You have heard it spoken of for a long time. You know that promises were not wanting, but that nothing was done.

Was that true? Will any man in this House who knows anything of the question dare to tell me that nothing was done by the late Government? Why, we took this question of the fast line up. Parliament devoted one hundred thousand pounds per year to it for ten years. It was found that the promoters could not do anything, and Parliament, at the suggestion of myself, after communication with the Duke of Devonshire, increased the subsidy to \$750,000. A year was expended by a very energetic man, Mr. Huddart, who has the contract between Australia and Vancouver. I had been instructed by the Government to give Mr. Huddart all the aid I could, and did so. I saw the great shipping companies, I saw the great naval construction armament company, of which the Duke of Devonshire was chairman, and Lord Brassy a director, I saw a large number of gentlemen deeply interested, who would have given anything to take up the question of a fast line between Great Britain and Canada, but they all said it was absolutely impossible to finance the scheme upon a subsidy of that kind. What, then, did we do? The hon. gentleman said that nothing was

done. I ask him if nothing was done when, under those circumstances, representing Canada, I went to the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, the Colonial Minister, and got from him a pledge to contribute from the British exchequer £75,000 sterling per annum for ten years. Was it doing nothing when, under the authority of this Parliament, we advertised for tenders, and obtained one from the Messrs. Allan, including the Glasgow Allans, people of immense wealth, and who sent one of their partners over here to negotiate the matter. We got a tender, and everything was arranged, and the only thing wanting was the signature of the Governor General to the Order in Council accepting the tender, subject to ratification by the English Government. Was that doing nothing? It is true that His Excellency refused, although he knew that the Order in Council was drafted under the authority of Parliament, for the purpose of saving time, and although there was no excuse for refusing to sign, because the contract provided that it was subject to the approval of the House, which was then to meet in three weeks. Yet it was refused. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) came into power. I put my dignity in my pocket and when I went out of office I wrote him a letter and begged him to get the signature of the Governor General to the Order in Council, as it would save a year. It would have saved two years. By the first of May next, that fleet of fast steamers that the hon. gentleman now declares to be so eminently important to Canada would have been crossing the Atlantic, shortening the time and making Canada the highway and thoroughfare for the mail communication and travel of a great part of America and Great Britain. But the hon. member did not do it. He took a very extraordinary course. Nothing was done about signing the Order in Council. But the hon. gentleman did something. What was it? One of his colleagues came out at a public meeting at the Board of Trade of Quebec and denounced the fast service and said that it was not wanted, and this was the gentleman the Prime Minister sent to England to negotiate for the fast line service. Is it any wonder it failed? He knows, and the Minister of Finance knows as well as I do, that when the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) left England, and when the Finance Minister left England, they despaired of accomplishing anything with relation to this contract. Two years have been lost, and not a keel has been laid. A contract may have been made, and, after a great struggle, the securities may have been got upon the pledge to return them; I do not believe they could have been got upon any other terms. But where is the work? Not a blow has been struck. Two years have been lost, and you will have to begin de novo, and you will have to avail yourselves of what we secured, and that

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

is the aid of the Imperial Government to the extent of £75,000 sterling per annum.

I have only one more remark to make in regard to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I regret that I am compelled to make it. I read with amazement the following statement made at the Canadian Club dinner by the right hon. the First Minister:—

The time might come when Canada might claim a more intimate union than at present, but so long as England sent to Canada as representatives of the Crown such men as they had had he did not think there would be any desire for change on the part of Canadians. (Hear, hear.) Canada had been exceedingly fortunate in the men who had come out there to represent England, and Lord Aberdeen had endeared himself to all Canadians.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will any man in this House say "Hear, hear" to the following sentence? I do not believe it. Sir, I do not believe there is a man so lost to propriety.

He had shown that he could pass through a crisis, keeping an even balance among all parties.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That only shows what hon. gentlemen are capable of. I ask the First Minister, I ask him in the presence of this House and of the country, whether he knew or did not know that when that change of government occurred in which he said the Governor General showed that he could keep an even balance among all parties, the Governor General's conduct was denounced by the press representing more than half the electors of Canada?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Almost every portion of the Conservative press denounced the course pursued on that occasion as a violation of the constitution. I proved on the floor of this House by evidence that no man could meet, by evidence that the First Minister did not meet then and cannot meet now, that he had violated on that occasion every British and every Canadian precedent. Under the circumstances—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think that the hon. gentleman should withdraw that remark.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not know that I was out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a rule of the House, which is well known, no doubt, to the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), that nothing is to be said disrespectful to the Governor General.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You entirely mistake me, Sir. I am not saying anything disrespectful of the Governor General, because the First Minister assumed the responsibility of the act, and I have the right to deal with it and to find fault with him

for supporting a violation of the constitution.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When gentlemen opposite have a weak case they never want to allow the other side to be heard. I always feel that I occupy a strong position when they will not hear the truth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it would be in order for me to read a speech delivered in the interest of the Liberal party by the Governor General of Canada a few days ago in Toronto, a speech supporting the policy of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and opposing the policy of the Conservative party.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The reason I called the hon. gentleman's attention to the rule is that, as I understood him, he said that the Governor General had violated the constitution. Perhaps I misunderstood him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, if you will read the debate which took place on the change of government in this House, you will see that I not only stated that, but proved it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression he has just used with regard to the Governor General.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that if hon. gentlemen will refer to the debate I speak of, they will find that, with the Speaker in the Chair, I was allowed to speak for over an hour and to lay before the House reasons to show that, in my judgment, the constitution had been violated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I expect the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression he has used with regard to the Governor General. We are not referring to the debate which took place last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am perfectly in order in referring to a debate which took place last year.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not dispute that, but I say that the hon. gentleman should not use the expression I have referred to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman does not find that in the debate—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I expect the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman does not find that, with the Speaker

in the Chair, I was allowed to debate that question, I will be quite prepared to withdraw that statement. And I am quite sure that my hon. friend will see the justice of that remark. Now, I propose—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to close very shortly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think hon. gentlemen will improve their position by these interruptions. They will find that nothing will be gained by trying to stifle debate. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have all but done—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But there are one or two subjects to which I wish to refer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman will say that I am mistaken in saying that the rule I have referred to exists. It is absolutely against the rules of the House to speak disrespectfully of the Governor General, and I think it is contrary to the spirit of those rules to say that the Governor General has violated the constitution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What I say, and what I did say, was that, in my judgment, such was the case, and that the responsibility was assumed by the hon. gentlemen opposite. I have been in this House for a great many years, and I have heard this question discussed again and again. I can refer you to a case where Mr. Mackenzie was the leader of the Government in this House and when a question arose of a similar character. I only wish to maintain the rights of the members of this House, and I wish to do so with all deference to the Chair. I should be very sorry to say anything that was not entirely in accordance with the rules of this House. But I differ on the question of fact, and you cannot make me say that I do not think that the Governor General violated the constitution. I could not conscientiously say that, because I do not think that it would be true. I say, therefore, that when the right hon. gentleman assumed responsibility for the act, I deal with him. The hon. gentleman maintains that I am wrong, that the Governor General did not violate the constitution.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a very poor subterfuge.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman may think it is a subterfuge.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman will not withdraw the expression which he has used against the Governor General.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not prepared to say that, in my judgment, the

Governor General did not violate the constitution. I say that when this matter was a subject of debate, I was permitted by the Speaker in the Chair to go a great deal further than anything that I have said to-night.

Mr. WALLACE. If I might be allowed to say a word—when you first arose to call attention to a point of order, you called the attention of the leader of the Opposition to the fact that he must not reflect upon the Governor General, and you sat down, Sir. Then, Sir, because a clamour arose on the other side of the House, you got up again and asked him to take it back.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think that the hon. gentleman has a right to reflect upon the decision that I have just given.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have very little more to say, and I will conclude my remarks as soon as possible. But I want to say a few words with reference to the Yukon Railway, as it is mentioned in this Speech.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Chair having ruled that a certain expression is out of order, it is imperative that the gentleman who has used that expression, should withdraw it, else he cannot continue his speech, according to the rules of this House. It is also distinctly out of order to discuss the ruling of the Chair after it has been formally made.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what you are doing now.

Mr. CASEY. No after-discussion can affect that decision. I ask you whether the hon. gentleman is in order in proceeding with his speech after refusing to withdraw the expression which you have ruled to be out of order. I think the House will sustain me in raising that point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is very much to be regretted that the hon. leader of the Opposition will not withdraw the expression which he has just used concerning the Governor General. But I understand him to say now that the Government is responsible for the Governor General's action, and that the attack he has made was directed against the Government. Consequently, I understand him to withdraw any expression which is injurious to the Governor General himself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear. I pass away from that disagreeable subject with great pleasure. Before I sit down I want to—

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. I want to have it understood from the hon. gentleman himself that he withdraws the expression complained of. Does he say that he withdraws it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He has just declared that he withdraws any expression

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

which was injurious to the Governor General.

Mr. CASEY. Has he said so?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He has said so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now that the great constitutionalist on the other side of the House has been set right, I will proceed. I am a little surprised at reading the next paragraph in the Speech:

The action of the Imperial Government in denouncing the treaties with Germany and Belgium also affords much satisfactory evidence of their desire to facilitate your efforts to promote the closest possible relations between Canada and the remainder of the Empire.

Now, Sir, what does that mean? Can any person on the other side of the House tell me what is meant by "the remainder of the Empire"? It goes on to say: "and will, I trust, contribute materially to the development of the Imperial trade." Now, Sir, I believe that paragraph indicates a want of knowledge on the part of the Government of what has taken place and of what the denunciation of the Belgian and German treaties means. If the First Minister wrote that paragraph, I could understand it, because we know that, notwithstanding all the discussion that has taken place in reference to the German and Belgian treaties, the right hon. gentleman has never mastered the subject and does not know what those treaties involve. I hold in my hand a speech made by that hon. gentleman at Quebec on his return, wherein he said:

There can be no doubt of the advantages which Canada will gain from the denunciation of those treaties, the greatest, undoubtedly, being the increased fiscal independence for us as a nation. Those treaties were in the way of the fiscal arrangement which we could have made with the sister colonies, or even with foreign nations, because the moment any such arrangement has been made, Germany and Belgium would have to step forward and claim such arrangement without giving anything in return.

Now, I beg to inform my right hon. friend that he is entirely mistaken, that the German and Belgian treaties have no more to do with arrangements between Australia, or South Africa, and Canada, than they have with China. What prevented trade arrangements being entered into between Canada and the other colonies, especially Australasia, was this: that in the constitution of the Australian colonies, there was a provision that they could not make any differential fiscal arrangements without the assent of the Home Government, and consequently they could not even make arrangements between Victoria and New South Wales. Some time ago the constitution was so amended as to enable them to make interprovincial arrangements within Australasia; but the fact remained that no Australian colony could make trade arrangements with Canada. In consequence

of the resolution passed by the Ottawa Conference asking that these difficulties in the way of interprovincial arrangements should be removed, the Imperial Government introduced a Bill into the Imperial Parliament which made it possible to make what arrangements we pleased between Canada and any part of Australasia. A treaty was made between New Zealand and Canada years ago. Under that Act of the Imperial Government, all difficulties were removed.

I desire to refer for a moment to a very interesting part of the Speech, and it is that which refers to the Yukon. There is a paragraph in the Speech which reads as follows:—

The extraordinary gold discoveries recently made upon the Yukon and its tributaries, appear likely to result in an enormous influx of people into that region, and have compelled the Government to take prompt action for the preservation of law and order in that distant and almost inaccessible locality; measures will be laid before you for that purpose.

Of course, I will not discuss the arrangements that have been made with respect to the preservation of law and order there, except on one point, and to that I desire to draw the attention of the Government for a moment. I dare say, some hon. members have discovered that there is somewhere an Ottawa liar, that occasionally statements are sent to the press over this country from Ottawa which are entirely false and unfounded. I read one of them. It is dated January 28, and was sent, not to Toronto or Montreal, where it would immediately have met with contradiction, but to British Columbia and the North-west Territories, for the purpose of having an injurious effect on the character of a public man before there is any possibility to contradict it:

While parties have been here wire-pulling at Ottawa for weeks back to obtain permits for taking whisky to Yukon, Sir Charles Tupper is said to have got ahead of all his compeers and obtained for the Klondike Mining and Transportation Company a permit for the sale of 50,000 gallons from the British Columbia Government. It will be taken to the northern boundary of the province and shipped from there as the purchasers see fit. It is computed that the company can make several hundred thousand dollars on the venture.

I say to this House that this statement has not the slightest foundation in fact, that I never applied for a permit to send a gallon of whisky to the North-west, Klondike, or anywhere else. It says that I applied to the Government of British Columbia. That government has no power to grant a permit to take a gallon of whisky into the North-west Territories, as every member of the House knows. The statement was simply a falsehood manufactured without the slightest basis. I probably would be the last man in Canada who would do anything of the kind, even if I had an opportunity. And why? I had the honour to

propose the prohibitory law which applies to the whole North-west Territories, and when Minister of Customs I carried that measure through Parliament; and I was in a position to say, at a temperance breakfast to which I was invited in London on one occasion, when they were talking about prohibitory enactments and their practicability, that I had the honour of obtaining from Parliament a prohibitory law covering the largest portion of the earth's surface to which such a law was ever extended. Gentlemen present asked: Was it carried out, did it do any good? I answered: Yes, it did a great deal of good, and you will see it was vigorously enforced when I tell you that on board of a Canadian Pacific Railway train the pocket of a member of Parliament was searched by the Mounted Police, a flask found and its contents emptied on the ground. This will be further apparent when I tell you that at a great banquet tendered to Lord Dufferin, after his visit to the North-west, the only liquor obtainable in which to drink his health was Perry Davis' Pain-killer; thus you will see how vigorously the law was enforced. This question came up before the company of which I was chairman, and I said to them: I am under the impression—I have had nothing to do with the subject for some time—that there is a prohibitory law in force there. I sent a message to Mr. Blount, my private secretary, who applied to the Government and was told that a prohibitory law was in force and no person was allowed to take liquor into the North-west. This was conclusive evidence and closed the subject. I may say, for the information of the Minister of the Interior, that it was added that, as the Minister of the Interior was a strict prohibitionist, there was every hope he would maintain that principle. I can only say that he will have my hearty sympathy in every possible effort to prevent the introduction of liquor into the North-west Territories. In my judgment, there is the same objection to its introduction in the Yukon district as in the other part of the North-west Territories. One of our strong reasons for prohibiting the manufacture, use or sale of liquor in the North-west Territories was the danger of inflaming the minds of the Indians and leading to trouble, for at that time there was a very small number of whites and a very large number of Indians in the territory. In my judgment, one of the great difficulties to be apprehended in respect to the Yukon country is an influx of 100,000, 150,000 or 200,000 people from all parts of the world, including many men of very lawless character, and I believe all measures the Government can adopt to prevent the introduction of intoxicating liquors in that country should be taken in the interest of the country.

I now come to the contract for a railway from the Stikine to Teslin Lake. I do

not intend to discuss this subject until the papers are laid on the Table. It would be premature for any hon. member to arrive at a settled conviction in one way or the other until the whole case has been presented to the House and we have heard from the Minister of the Interior, and obtained the papers so as to know the ground on which the action adopted by the Government has been taken. But I want to refer to a slanderous attack made on myself in reference to that matter. The character of any member of this House is of importance to every one in it, to whichever side he may belong, and whatever can be done should be done to discountenance unfounded, slanderous statements calculated to affect the character of a public man. I refer now to the "World" newspaper of Toronto, and I characterize the statements there made as the most cowardly attempt to slander the character of a public man I have ever met since I have been in public life. If the "World" had had the courage or manliness, instead of dealing in malicious, lying inuendoes, to make a statement to which they could be held responsible, I could forgive them, because I would suppose that, believing they had good ground for the statement they made, they felt warranted in the public interest in making it. I say that no more serious personal attack can be made on the character of a member of this House than to charge him with being corruptly concerned in any contract given by the Government. The public man—I care not who he may be or what member of this House he may be—the public man who can be shown to be corruptly connected with any contract in which public money or public property is to be used, is guilty of an offence that ought to deprive him of a seat in this House, and to drive him out of public life. I may say for the information of the House, that since the House rose, and while I was in my room, some kind friend sent me a copy of "La Presse," and I will do "La Presse" the justice to say that they have not exhibited the contemptible cowardice that the Toronto "World" has exhibited in dealing with this subject. "La Presse" charges me distinctly with being a party to, and with being personally interested in the Mann-Mackenzie contract. One of my French friends will read it to the House more accurately than I could, but I read French sufficiently well to at once understand and to appreciate the slanderous character of the statement in that paper. The moment I read it, I addressed the following telegram to Mr. Donald McMaster, Q.C., of Montreal:—

Please see "La Presse," Feb. 2nd, fourth page, second and third columns, where it is stated among other things, that I am personally interested in the Mann-Mackenzie contract, and that with Messrs. Blair and Sifton am conspiring to profit out of it at the expense of the country. Demand immediate retraction and apology;

Str CHARLES TUPPER.

otherwise desire you to institute criminal proceedings without delay.

These gentlemen will now have an opportunity in a court of justice of showing what foundation they have for this slander. During the last five minutes in the House, I have received the following reply to this telegram:

Montreal.—I have your telegram about "La Presse," and it is receiving my best attention.

DONALD McMASTER.

That is the course which I am prepared to take with any responsible man in this country, or any responsible newspaper in this country, that ventures to attack my public character in relation to a matter of this kind.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state to the House exactly what I know in relation to this matter. When hon. gentlemen opposite were good enough to relieve me of the responsibilities and emoluments of office, I found it necessary to turn my attention to business, and I could not think of any business in which I could engage that would be more valuable to Canada than to endeavour to use the influence that I had obtained by long residence in London, among financial and commercial men, in drawing British capital into Canada, for the development of our country. I hope, Sir, there is nothing in that course that does not commend itself to the approval of every person. Well, Sir, having been very successful in meeting with a generous response to my application for money from capitalists in England, I felt it my duty to use every effort in my power to secure a wise expenditure of that capital and a satisfactory return, because I know that on the result of dividends being paid, it would be possible to obtain any amount of capital for Canada, to be used for so important a purpose. Well, I visited British Columbia, and I went carefully through the gold, and silver, and copper, and lead mines in the Western Kootenay and Slocan district, with the result that I came to the conclusion that the mineral wealth of British Columbia was almost inexhaustible, and that all the impressions I had previously formed had fallen far short of what I now believe the reality will prove to be. One of my companies being the Klondike Mining, Trading and Transport Corporation, I got all the information I could with reference to the gold fields of the Canadian Yukon, and I came to the conclusion, after giving the subject the best consideration in my power, that it was of vital importance to Canada that we should establish an all-Canadian route. The hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) visited the Chilkoot and White Passes, and I must say that I had no hesitation in publicly commending his energy and his attention to his duties in that regard, because I felt that was due to a public man,

who at a good deal of personal inconvenience visited the country to obtain the knowledge which was necessary to enable him, as a Minister of the Crown, to formulate his policy. Under the conviction that I owed it to Canada to do everything in my power to conduce to what I had come to the conclusion was absolutely essential to the best interests of Canada, I called upon the Hon. Mr. Sifton, Minister of the Interior, as soon as he returned to Victoria. I told that hon. gentleman the conclusion at which I had arrived. I told him that from the best information I could get from well qualified sources, I had come to the conclusion that there was one route, and one route alone, which in the first instance it was absolutely essential should be taken up by the Government and developed, and that was the route on the Stikine River, going from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake and thence down by the waters. I pressed that upon him very strongly, with a view of getting the earliest possible means of communication with Dawson City, because I had a discussion on the matter with Major Walsh, a very able officer in the service of the Government, as to the probability of his getting in, and knowing the difficulties he had to encounter, I believe it would take him a very long time. I told the Minister of the Interior that I believed it would be found practicable to send an ocean steamer to the mouth of the Stikine River when the ice had formed, and with horses and sleds and provisions and equipages of every kind, to go up on the ice to Glenora or some portion of the upper part of the Stikine River, and by a sled trail go down on the ice to Teslin Lake long before navigation would be open at all. I pressed on that hon. gentleman in the strongest and most emphatic manner I could his duty as Minister of the Crown to spare no effort to endeavour to accomplish a connection in that way. I told him I had interviewed the Government of British Columbia, and they had assured me they were prepared to co-operate with the Government of the Dominion in opening, in the first instance, in the absence of the railway, a sled trail, to be made into a trail as soon as the snow went off. I went further; I said to the Minister of the Interior: You heard me make a very strong speech last session on the floor of the Commons in opposition to Government aid to railways. I said: I am prepared to take it all back so far as this road is concerned. I said: I am so convinced of the vital importance to Canada of at once establishing a railway connection between the Stikine River and Teslin Lake that, so far as I am able to judge, if you will take the scheme up vigorously and put it through at once as a Government work—I believe you will have the hearty support of the Parliament of Canada and the people of Canada

as well. I believe now that the importance of that work cannot be overrated, and I will tell you why. Every one who has paid any attention to this subject knows that although the loss of life has been comparatively small, yet the sufferings of those going to the Klondike have been intense, and the destruction of horses which have died by the thousands on these Chilkoot and White Passes was a perfect disgrace, and attracted a great deal of attention. But what was more. I felt that as the Government of the United States claimed the territory over some fifteen or sixteen miles on both of these passes, they were in a position to offer such obstruction, and they did offer such obstruction, to Canadian enterprise and Canadian energy as to make it vitally important that an all-Canadian route should be obtained. So that, instead of having to go on any territory claimed by the United States, they should be able to go from Victoria, Vancouver or any other part of Canada into that country without touching American territory at all. I may have overrated the importance of it, though I do not think I did. But I felt it my duty as a public man to take the position I did; because there are some questions that are higher than party. Of course, from a party point of view it is desirable that the Government should make all the mistakes they will; but when it comes to be a question between Seattle or San Francisco being the base of supplies for all the thousands of people that will go into the Canadian Yukon territory instead of Canada, I say it becomes a matter of the most vital importance to the whole country. Under these circumstances I pressed on the hon. Minister of the Interior the importance of using the best means in his power to secure the end in view. The paper to which I refer, the "World" newspaper, had brought out, perhaps through some espionage—no, it could not be that, because the statement was false. It stated that I had an interview with Mr. Mann and Mr. Mackenzie in Vancouver. I met Mr. Mackenzie in the train. I met Mr. Mann in the public hall of the Vancouver Hotel. He never was in my room; I never was in his; I never had an interview with him or with Mr. Mackenzie; and when that contract was signed and sealed, I was as ignorant of it as any man in this House. When it was made public by the papers in Montreal, I happened to be there on business—and my hon. friends behind me know pretty well what that business was. I certainly did not know that anything of the kind was going on. After coming back here I called on the Minister of the Interior and asked him what prospect there was of getting this sledge road through at once, because unless the work was done at once the ice would be gone and the opportunity would be lost. The hon. gentleman told me that he was not in a position to inform me, because it was a

confidential matter ; but, he said, "I expect to be able to give you information in a very few days." That was all that took place between the hon. Minister and myself. He gave me no information ; I did not know the Government were negotiating with Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie at all, or that they had a contract, or that the Government were not going to do the work themselves. I feel it my duty to make that frank statement to the House.

I do not intend to take up the contract itself until we have the papers before us ; but I think the Government may well turn their attention—and the sooner they do so the better—to the mining regulations of that country. One of the gravest charges made against this contract—and it is a very strong charge—is that while a wealthy and powerful body of contractors have only to pay a royalty of one per cent, ten per cent is exacted from the miners. I may say that what took place between the hon. Minister and myself in British Columbia I stated publicly at a banquet given to me in the city of New Westminster, and I did it designedly, for the purpose of bringing public opinion to sustain the pressure which I was endeavouring to bring upon the hon. gentleman. I took great exception to the mining regulations, and I am glad they have been modified ; but I am satisfied that when the matter is examined, it will be found utterly indefensible to exact a royalty of ten per cent. Why, Sir, what does it mean ? You must remember that the mining in that country is not carried on by capitalists ; it is poor man's mining. It is a description of mining in which a man with a vigorous constitution and a year's provisions to sustain him, and clothing, and a pick, a shovel and an axe, possesses all the appurtenances he requires to carry on the business. Suppose a man goes in at the risk of his life, as many did, or at the risk of his health, as many did, and takes up a mining claim ; and suppose, by dint of great industry he takes out in the course of a year \$22,500 worth of gold. Wages are enormous, the cost of living is enormous, the circumstances under which the work is done are of the most terrible character, and it is not at all unlikely that it will cost him \$20,000 to take out the \$22,500. What is the result ? The result is that you deduct the first \$2,500 before you assess the product ; that leaves \$20,000, on which ten per cent is \$2,000, and the man has \$500 left for his year's work, while the Government has \$2,000. That in brief is the argument, and I think that what would meet with the most hearty approval of this country would be the reduction of the royalty imposed on the miners, if not to one per cent, certainly to not more than two per cent. In the province of British Columbia, a poor province, where there are an immense number of mines, the royalty on gold is one per cent. In the province of Nova Scotia, where gold-mining has been

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

carried on as a successful industry for many years, the royalty on gold is two per cent. I believe that if the Government will give this subject their careful consideration, they will come to the conclusion that there is no act they could do that would meet with more hearty approval in this House or out of it, than a great reduction of that heavy charge.

There is another point of grave importance, and as there are probably some negotiations going on in reference to it, I want to direct the attention of the House to it. It is this. The Government of this country have an opportunity which they never have had before and never will have again, of dealing with the unjust labour laws of the United States of America. Every person recognizes, and it came to be recognized in this House, that the right hon. First Minister was obliged to pledge himself at the last general election, that, if he could not obtain a modification of the repeal of those labour laws that were found to be so oppressive to Canadians along the border, or to Canadians who wanted to go into the United States for work, this Parliament would be asked to retaliate by passing a similar act. Now, Sir, no country can complain with any foundation if another country adopts its own legislation ; and what I would ask this House and the Government seriously to consider in the interest of Canada, is to pass a law to provide that the same laws shall be applied to the citizens of any country which that country applies to Canadians. While the United States shut us out from obtaining a free miner's license or from working in a mine in the United States, I would not allow a citizen of the United States to work in our mines. I would simply adopt their own legislation with reference to alien labour, mining and everything else that affects the mutual rights of the two people. If they complained of it, they would complain without any possible ground of justice ; and I take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the Government to a matter which I regard as very important ; and that is the desire and determination of the United States to capture to a large extent the gold and trade and business of the Canadian Yukon district. I believe this Government have an opportunity that will never occur again. Now, Sir, I am sorry to have taken up so much of the time of the House, but I shall close in very few words. I am delighted to find the Government are going to bring in a Superannuation Bill. I believe that the frightful injustice perpetrated since the Government came into power must convince every member of this House that the sooner the superannuation law is changed the better it will be.

With reference to the Franchise Act, I would like to take this early opportunity of saying—I do not know that I am able to speak for every person, but certainly I can

speaking for myself and a great many other members of the party—that, in my opinion, a universal suffrage law based on a satisfactory residence in the country and constituency, with a cheap form of registration, would solve this difficulty which, I frankly admit, exists, of a very expensive Act, and would avoid the humiliation proposed of our people electing members to this Parliament on different franchises in different provinces. I beg to apologize to this House for taking up so much of its attention, and I must express my regret to my right hon. friend for not having been able to conclude my remarks at an earlier period, and thus giving us earlier the pleasure of listening to him.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have listened, Mr. Speaker, without any astonishment to the extraordinary harangue—I cannot call it a speech—in which the hon. gentleman has vented out the spleen and disappointment which have filled his soul ever since a certain day in the year 1896 which I shall not further harrow his feelings by mentioning. Well, knowing my hon. friend, having had a long experience of his ways and methods, I must say that I was prepared for a very large share indeed of wild and extravagant declamation, but I must pay him the compliment—doubtful though it be—that upon this occasion he has fairly out-Heroded Herod, or, to speak more accurately, out-Tuppered Tupper. But such is the high estimate which we have formed, on this side of the House, at all events, of his power of vituperation, of his recklessness of statement, of his faculty of distortion, that, for my part, I repeat it again, I heard it all without any astonishment. My hon. friend is not in a happy frame of mind; he is angry; he is choleric; he is wrothy—and the cause is not at all far to seek. I once heard upon the floor of this House our friend Joseph Rymal declare that there was not a she-bear deprived of her cubs half so ferocious as the Tory party when deprived of office. If that was the cause of the hon. gentleman being choleric and wrothy, we can easily account for the extraordinary outbreak of disappointment and bitterness we have just heard from him. There are many things in the speech of many hours to which perhaps I might reply, but my hon. friend will pardon me if I say that the speech of five or six hours to which we have listened this afternoon and evening, was well characterized this afternoon by the hon. gentleman who seconded the Address, when he spoke of a deluge of words in a desert of ideas. I must say for my hon. friend that I cannot follow him in everything he has said. I cannot, for instance, follow him in the statements he made, which were decorated with such adjectives as “want of ability,” “humiliation,” “incompetency” and “profound ignorance.” After all, we must all submit to the laws of fate. The laws of fate are in-

exorable, and painful as it may be to us, it is evident that it is our fate as a Government not to come up to the expectations of my hon. friend. My hon. friend is not the first man who, smarting under a sense of disappointment, finds some solace for himself in reviling those who are stronger than he. Shakspeare has shown us Thersites, deformed and scurrilous, venting his spleen on account of his deformity, in the camp of the Greeks, by abusing the leaders of the army; and after a more vicious tirade than ever, concluding by this pious ejaculation: “I have now said my prayers; let the Devil Envy say amen.” It would have been quite in order for the hon. gentleman, when he concluded his speech, to have said, like Thersites: Now that I have finished my prayers, let the Devil Envy say amen. My hon. friend has weighed us and found us wanting, and he has seen the signs on our walls of our condemnation. I must say that such a judgment and such a verdict, uttered in so solemn a manner, might prove disquieting and disturbing were it not for the fact that we know, from many an experience, that whether as a judge of events or as a prophet, my hon. friend is the very reverse of a Daniel. Where in the world has he seen the signs of condemnation?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Toronto “World.”

The PRIME MINISTER. I must confess that I have not thought of that, but the Toronto “World” evidently does not comprise Toronto Centre, which sent us, some few weeks ago, so able a representative as the one to whom we have had the pleasure of listening this afternoon. Neither has he seen signs of condemnation in Temiscouata, which elected by acclamation my hon. friend (Mr. Gauvreau) who seconded the Address. Neither has he seen them in Rimouski, where my hon. friend was also elected by acclamation, because hon. gentlemen opposite did not dare try the issues with us. Neither did he see any in Drummond and Arthabaska, where the hon. gentleman's friends did try the issues and were snowed under by a majority of over 700. Neither did he see them in Nicolet, an old Conservative county, which was carried by its present representative in 1891 by one of a majority, which he lost in 1896 by 130, or something like that, and which he has now carried by a majority of over three hundred. Neither has he seen signs in Quebec Centre, where my hon. friend (Mr. Malouin) has just been elected by acclamation. My hon. friend has spoken in somewhat extravagant language. There might perhaps be something to retort to, if one were blessed with the happy faculty, which is so natural to him, of blowing his own trumpet and singing his own praises. But I must confess to my hon. friend that in that art, in which he is past master, I am absolutely incompetent. I must further confess—and I do so with due humility—that

if he judges us from the summit of his own estimate of himself, he has very good reason to be severe upon us.

It is not every man who can say that he has made Canada. To-day my hon. friend gave the testimony to my late lamented friend, Sir George Etienne Cartier, that he had been one of the foremost promoters of the confederation of Canada. But I must tell the hon. gentleman that in doing this tardy justice to Sir George E. Cartier he was very unfair to another gentleman, he was very unfair to no less a person than Sir Charles Tupper, because we have it upon the authority of Sir Charles Tupper himself that he it is who made Canada. On a certain occasion he spoke in this manner:

My history is the history of the Dominion of Canada; my history is the history of the confederation of Canada; my history is the history of the progress and prosperity of this country.

Sir George E. Cartier was one, Sir John A. Macdonald was another, George Brown was another who, we were all under the impression, had had a good deal to do with the history of confederation, but they were simply puppets in the hands of my hon. friend; he, and he alone, did it. Well, Sir, I have only this to say to my hon. friend: Every thing is relative in this world. I will not compare him to ourselves, but I will simply answer him in the language of a celebrated gentleman in the old Parliament of France in the time of the revolution, in the language of L'Abbé Maury, who being taunted once by Napoleon that he thought a good deal of himself, said: "No, I think very little of myself when I judge myself, but I think a great deal of myself when I compare myself with others."

What shall I say now, Sir, of the unseemly attack, of the most unseemly attack, which was made by the hon. gentleman, without any provocation whatever, upon the representative of the Queen in this country, upon the Governor General? Sir, I can always forgive a man for speaking hard words in the heat of debate, but I cannot forgive a man for making a deliberate attack upon a gentleman who cannot defend himself, and then sneaking out of the consequence through a poor subterfuge such as we had an exhibition of to-day. However, Mr. Speaker, we can allow this to pass. That attack will do no harm to the august person against whom it was directed. Neither the honour of Canada nor the credit of Canada will suffer by it; if anybody is to suffer by it, it is the hon. gentleman who, forgetting himself, forgetting his station, used the unseemly language which we have heard this evening.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend told us this afternoon that he was not a poet; but I think he showed us that he could take many licenses, though they were not poetical. But I must give him this credit, that he did not attempt to challenge the figures and

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

the statements brought forward by my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) when he spoke of the prosperity of this country. Canada is prosperous as it never was before. The fact is that ever since this Administration came into office, Canada has gone forward with leaps and bounds. The hon. member for Centre Toronto this afternoon said nothing but what is well known, when he said that Canada occupies a prouder station to-day, not only within the Empire but throughout the world at large, than she ever did at any previous period of her history. The fact is, Sir, that Canada has seen more progress during the last eighteen months than she ever realized at any similar previous time in her history. When the historian comes to write the history of this country from confederation up to the present time, he will make a jump from the year 1867 to the year 1897, and will date from the latter year a new era in the national development of this country. Neither did my hon. friend challenge the statement, though he has denied many things, that Canada has been blessed by Providence with a bountiful harvest. In the days of the old regime a good harvest would have been attributed to the National Policy. I have heard that said. We simply give credit to Providence for our blessings in this respect. But if we have good harvests we have also good prices. My hon. friend hastened to say that it was not due to the tariff. If I were to use the same kind of language formerly used by himself and by his friends, I would say directly that the price of wheat is due to the tariff. Why, Sir, has not wheat risen to the price of \$1 per bushel, and have we not heard the statement made by followers of the hon. gentleman that \$1 a bushel was the Grit price of wheat. We have got back to the Grit price of wheat. But we do not claim anything of the kind. We never claimed that the prices of the products of the land could be regulated by the tariff. What we do claim, however, is this, that the tariff has been revised in such a fair and judicious manner as to give confidence to the people of this country, and to make it possible for them to take advantage of every opportunity that offers to increase our trade with the world. We do not go beyond that claim. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman had still some little blame to cast upon my hon. friend who framed the tariff. He claimed that what changes we have made in the tariff had proved unprofitable to the people of Canada. Let me quote him an authority which he will admit upon this point, as strong and valuable as any authority that can be quoted. Mr. Edward Gurney, the late President of the Toronto Board of Trade. This is the way he spoke of the changes which have been made in the tariff:

I believe that in a large measure the confidence of to-day is attributable to the able and

intelligent treatment of this question by the Government of the day, which, while it has not pleased us all, and has in some instances seemingly sacrificed interests in a way not readily appreciable by a business man, has on the whole been broad, coherent and consistent, and a due regard for the present and future of Canada should restrain Ministers of the Crown and others from intimating that the tariff has in it no stability, and that the safe position for business to assume is that which I once discovered on a tombstone: "Stranger, be thou all eye, all ear, all expectation, lest death steal upon thee in an unwary moment."

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman did not speak very long upon that subject. But he devoted some three or four hours of his speech to discussing the question of preferential trade, and especially in an effort to show my own derelictions in that regard. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to speak of the manner in which I had endeavoured to represent Canada at the Jubilee celebration, and I thank him for the kind words that he used in that connection. But at the same time he did me the honour of attacking me personally for the course which I had pursued in England in reference to the matter of preferential trade. I must say, however, that the attack which he made upon me was very moderate compared with the attacks which are made every day by the press which supports him. In the press which supports him I am represented every day as a traitor. Treason is a word which I find in almost every article of those newspapers. And, by the way, I may mention that even the hon. gentleman made use of the same expression in one portion of his remarks. Well, Sir, the word treason does not affect me very much. I am getting accustomed to it. Why, Sir, in the press which receives inspiration from my hon. friend, in my own province, for months and for years I was daily denounced as a traitor to my race and to my religion; while in the press that supports him in the other provinces, the theme upon which they enlarge is that I am a traitor to the whole country. All I can say is that there is about as much truth in the one charge as there is in the other. But what is the next charge brought against me by the hon. gentleman? He says that I have turned my back while in England upon the cause of preferential trade. Let me give him my answer—it will be direct and simple. My answer is, that if to-day the idea of preferential trade is no longer a vain and idle one, if there is any spark of living truth in it, if it is ever to become an accomplished fact, the first step towards the realization of this idea was taken last summer when I was in England. Sir, the hon. gentleman knows it quite well. Let me put a question to him. Is it not a fact that up to last summer all theories of preferential trade within the Empire were met with one insurmountable difficulty? The insurmountable obstacles was the ex-

istence of the German and Belgian treaties. The hon. gentleman knows it right well. The press that he inspires knows it as well as he does. Why, the boys in the streets that sell the newspapers know it as well as he does, everybody knows it. But in order to bring him once more fresh to the attention and to the knowledge of his blind and deaf followers, let me give them here now the very text of the treaty with the German Zollverein:

Article 7. The stipulations of the preceding articles, 1 to 6, shall also be applied to the colonies and foreign possessions of Her Britannic Majesty. In those colonies and possessions the produce of the States and the Zollverein shall not be subject to any higher or other import duties than the produce of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of any other country of the like kind, nor shall the exportations from those colonies or possessions to the Zollverein be subject to any other or higher duties than the exportation to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

It is quite plain that so long as these treaties were in existence, all idea of a preferential tariff within the Empire had to be abandoned. Sir, the fact is well known to the hon. gentleman and to his friends, because they have laboured also to obtain a repeal of these obnoxious treaties; but they laboured in vain, they laboured perhaps with more zeal than discretion or judgment. We all recollect the most pathetic speech delivered by my hon. friend last year in this House wherein he recited the efforts which had been made by his party to obtain the denunciation of these treaties, the efforts made by Sir Alexander Galt when High Commissioner in London, the efforts made by himself while he occupied the same position, the efforts made by Sir John A. Macdonald, by Sir John Abbott, by Sir John Thompson, by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster). Yet all these efforts, all these solemn protests and petitions made in season and out of season, were without avail. Sir, according to an old Greek legend the Empire of the world was promised to the man who could untie the Gordian knot. And there were ambitious men at that time, there were Tuppens in those days as there are now, and the Tuppens of those days wore out their fingers in the attempt to unloose the intricate cords. They failed, every one of them, until at last Alexander of Macedon came, and he simply solved the difficulty by cutting the knot. Well, Sir, the Alexander of Macedon who has solved the question in our day is my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. It was he who solved the difficulty by cutting the knot when in his tariff last year, he assumed the position that England had authority to denounce the treaties, or he could refuse the offer which we made to her. Such was the position when I left for England. If I had followed the example of the hon. gentleman, I should have gone about to advocate preferential trade. I should have asked

for the pound of flesh. If I had blundered as he blundered, I would have failed as he failed. But I pursued a different policy. I did not go about asking for the pound of flesh, I did not go about advocating the cause of preferential trade. Instead, I adopted the tactics of old Cato in Rome, who never made a speech in the Senate without in some way bringing in his famous denunciation "Delenda est Carthago." In every speech which I made in England, and heaven knows I made a good many, I never failed to impress upon the British public that they should give us help in obtaining from the Government the denunciation of those treaties. Well, Sir, on the 1st of August last, the treaties were denounced. Now, the hon. gentleman stated this afternoon, repeating what he has stated before in still more forcible language than he stated to-day, that after all we had obtained no advantage for Canada, that our policy had proved a complete fiasco, that though we had obtained a denunciation of the treaties we deserved no credit for it. Let me call a witness against the hon. gentleman here. I will call against him no less a person than the "Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., G.C.M.G., C.B., M.P., Ottawa (late Prime Minister and ex-High Commissioner for Canada)." The treaties were denounced on the 1st of August. On the 7th of August there was issued a prospectus of the "British Empire Finance Corporation, Limited," and at the head of the board of directors I find the name of "Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., G.C.M.G., C.B.," and all the rest. Let me read the opening words of this prospectus:

This company was formed to acquire and develop within the British Empire, and under the security of British laws, industrial undertakings and other enterprises of a sound character, and to assist in opening up the resources of the colonies and dependencies of Great Britain. The recent denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties, and the removal thereby of the restrictions hitherto existing upon preferential inter-British trade, will have the effect of developing enormous and profitable resources hitherto neglected in the colonies, and will throw open new fields for highly remunerative investments.

Sir, this is the result of our policy, acknowledged by the hon. gentleman himself when he had more interest to speak the truth than he has upon the present occasion. But that was not enough. After that victory had been achieved, the hon. gentleman says that if we had advocated the cause of preferential trade and asked for a quid pro quo, asked a preference against all other nations we would have attained it. Well, Sir, he has said so, he has said many things. He is a prophet after the event, he has been often a misguided prophet. On the 29th of July, not more than two days before the treaties were denounced, the hon. gentleman staked his reputation on the statement that our policy was an absurdity, was a

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

blunder, and the day would never come when it would be anything else, it would always remain a blunder. Two days afterwards he had received his own answer in the fact that the treaties were denounced, and the week after he could make the statement which has just been read. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman goes further. He says that in taking the position that I did take, I went back not only upon my policy, but upon myself. The hon. gentleman stated I had abandoned the cause of preferential trade. What I stated in Canada was, and by the words I stand, that if ever the cause of preferential trade is to become an established fact within the boundaries of the British Empire, it can only be upon the lines of free trade. The hon. gentleman has quoted in support of his doctrine the authority of Mr. Chamberlain. I take issue with the hon. gentleman. Mark my words, let them be marked on the other side. I say neither my hon. friend nor any one of the apostles of preferential trade on the other side of the House would accept preferential trade on the lines laid down by Mr. Chamberlain. The only man in England who has thoroughly studied preferential trade, given attention to it and taken an intelligent and statesmanlike view of it is the distinguished gentleman who is now at the head of the Colonial Office. Before I proceed further, I should like to know from hon. gentlemen opposite whether they are protectionists or not. Would it be an unfair question if I were to ask the hon. leader of the Opposition if he is a protectionist, or if the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is a protectionist, or if the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is a protectionist, or the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who has always been a strong apostle of preferential trade, is a protectionist? No doubt they will one and all say they are protectionists, not only for Canada but also for England. Now, let me quote the language of Mr. Chamberlain. That hon. gentleman spoke several times on this question, but his most notable speech was that delivered at the Canada Club dinner in London on March 25th, 1896, and this is the speech from which hon. gentlemen have often quoted. Here is the very language used by Mr. Chamberlain:—

I have laid down four propositions which I think cannot be controverted. The first is that there is a universal desire among all the members of the Empire for a closer union between the several branches, and that, in their opinion, as in ours, this is desirable—nay, it is essential for the existence of the Empire as such. My second proposition is that experience has taught us that this closer union can be most hopefully approached in the first instance from its commercial side. My third proposition is that the suggestions which have hitherto been made to us, although we know them to have been made in good part, are, when considered from the point of view of British interest, not sufficiently favourable to be considered by this country.

My fourth proposition is that a true Zollverein for the Empire, that a free trade established throughout the Empire, although it would involve the imposition of duties against foreign countries, and would be in that respect a derogation from the high principles of free trade and from the practice of the United Kingdom up to the present time, would still be a proper subject for discussion, and might probably lead to a satisfactory arrangement, if the colonies on their part were willing to consider it.

Now, who in the Opposition is willing to come to the question on this basis, that there should be no customs duties within the empire? Let him rise in his place. Let hon. gentlemen opposite tell the people of Canada that they are prepared to advocate a system of preferential trade on the basis that there shall be within the empire no customs duties whatever. Let them say they are willing to give up our customs duties against Great Britain, I do not say against Germany, France or the United States. Among hon. gentlemen opposite none will prove to be so loyal an apostle of preferential trade as to say that he and his associates are willing to give up protection against Britain. Do we not know that the National Policy, of which even at this late date we heard a eulogy on the floor of this House to-day, was intended to stab the trade of Great Britain? Let me proceed further with my quotations from the speech of Mr. Chamberlain. This is how he concluded this part of the argument:

But the principle which I claim must be accepted, if we are to make any, even the slightest progress, is that within the different parts of the Empire protection must disappear, and that the duties must be revenue duties, and not protective duties in the sense of protection, for the products of one part of the Empire against those of another part.

This is very plain. Mr. Chamberlain says in so many words that within the empire there can be no protective duties by one part of the empire against another part. Are hon. gentlemen opposite ready to assent to this proposition? They will not have the chance of making declarations contradictory to the position they occupy. The answer was made by the hon. leader of the Opposition last session when discussing the effect of the reduction of 25 per cent which we were offering to Great Britain. This is how he characterized it:—

The industries of Canada built up at such enormous cost, industries which have made Canada what it is to-day, industries that represent an enormous amount of capital invested, industries that have enriched Canada by the progress and prosperity she has enjoyed while they have been in operation. These industries will become paralyzed again when exposed to a reduction of 25 per cent on this general tariff, and one after another they will succumb.

I must say the hon. gentleman has again proved a false prophet. Although a reduction has been made, not of 25 but of 12½ per cent, never at any time in the history of

Canada have her mills been so fully employed. Let me go one step further. Let me take the proposition of Mr. Chamberlain as he made it. No one will deny, every one will admit that there is grandeur in his proposal. I do not discuss it from the economic point of view, but simply from the political point of view, and I do not hesitate to say there is grandeur in the idea of a galaxy of nations acknowledging the same allegiance and all bound together by the ties of free trade. But is that the idea hon. gentlemen opposite have in their minds? No; they could not rise to the high conception presented by Mr. Chamberlain, but they would drag him down to the low level of their own paltry conception. The truth is that the question of preferential trade at the present time has to be discussed from the point of no customs tariff existing within any part of the empire, and I do not say that Canada is now ready for it. Canada is not ready to give up its customs tariff, and so long as Canada is not ready to give up its customs tariff, it is no use to preach the doctrine of preferential trade, whether here or in England or anywhere at all.

I have not much to say in regard to what the hon. gentleman has stated with respect to the Klondike Railway. I rather commend the course he has taken on this occasion on this subject. There is a good deal, however, to say with respect to the mining regulations, which also can be deferred to a future occasion. I am not prepared to say that I agree with everything said by the hon. gentleman in this respect, though I am strongly of the opinion that we should endeavour by all means to keep that far distant part of our country for our own people. Great developments have taken place since last session. Canada has at all times been able to boast that it is endowed by Providence with many rich gifts. Her fertile plains and valleys are certainly not surpassed in any other country; her forests are not equalled by the forests of any other land; her fisheries are rich; but suddenly gold discoveries have been made in our own territory which, if they prove as extensive as they are supposed to be, will no doubt make Canada one of the most famous gold producing countries. But this discovery has been made under very exceptional circumstances. It had been supposed up to the present time, that gold was, as it were, a product of the sun, to be found only in these regions adjacent to the equator. The discovery in Canada has been made well within the land of the midnight sun, the land of almost perpetual winter. The same has taken place in this case which has taken place at all times in history after a discovery of gold, from the time that Jason and the Argonauts went in search of the Golden Fleece down to our own generation, when the discoveries of gold were made in California and Australia—thousands of men rush at once in search

of the precious metal. If we remember that this Yukon district, but for its gold, is absolutely barren, and that it does not produce a pound of food, we cannot be surprised that it should have engrossed at once the attention of the Government in order to give it in the first place something like a substantial judicial administration, and then in the second place an easy and speedy means of communication. I thank my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) for his commendation of the efforts put forward by my colleague the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). The Minister of the Interior, at great inconvenience to himself, proceeded at once to the ground to find out what was the best means and the shortest route to obtain immediate access to these gold-producing regions, and he came to the conclusion, which I am glad to say is shared by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper), viz., that a line of railway from the waters of the Stikine River to Teslin Lake would be the most expeditious route, I have seen it stated somewhere that the route should proceed from the interior. I do not say that this would not be a good idea if we were calculating only what should be the ultimate route to be selected. But I do not give this present route from the waters of the Pacific to the waters of Teslin Lake and and the Yukon River as a finality. It is simply a route for immediate communication, and it is intended to provide food and supplies next winter for the thousands of men who will be in that region. That is the object, and the only object we had in view. It was not to establish a perpetual permanent route for a communication which might be more in accordance with the interests of the country—that has to come later. At the present time the only thing we had in view was that the thousands of men who should go into that country the coming summer would not be exposed to starvation next winter, and that there should be an easy and speedy mode of communication to reach that far-distant land.

I shall not now discuss the contract which we made, for it is not opportune at the present moment to enter into such a discussion. Let me say further, that one of the characteristics, and one of the most important objects of the contract which we made, is not only to have a railway communication completed on the first of September, but to have a sleigh road opened by the first of March. That is one of the great objects we wished to accomplish. I shall imitate on this point the action of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper), and I shall not discuss the subject further, because as I stated this afternoon, the discussion shall commence not later than Tuesday next.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that there is one point, if only one, in which I am able to agree with my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper), though he spoke some five or six hours. I agree with him, and most

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

cordially join him in the flattering and well-merited compliments which he paid to the mover and seconder of this Address. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Bertram) was preceded here by his fame as an orator, and he has shown us to-day that he can discuss all the questions which affect this country of ours, as intelligently as any old parliamentarian could. My hon. friend from Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) has shown us, from the literary speech he has delivered, that we can expect a great deal from him.

My hon. friend from Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) dilated eloquently upon the lessons to be derived from the Jubilee celebration.

The Jubilee celebration was remarkable chiefly for two distinct and characteristic features. In the first place, it was above all things a tribute of devotion and personal attachment to the Sovereign, to the noble woman who during the course of a long life in the most exalted station has ever displayed those qualities which grace her sex, gentleness and generosity, and who at the same time has shown that she was possessed of those sterner attributes which made her the model of sovereigns, as she was already the model of women, and which have so much endeared her to so many millions of subjects. Of all the touching scenes which were witnessed on Jubilee Day, none was more touching than the singularly warm, singularly sincere expressions of devotion, of love, and of affection, which spontaneously went forth to Her Majesty from her subjects in the poorer quarters of the great metropolis.

From another point of view, the Jubilee celebration was as suggestive as it was impressive. It was a revelation of the wonderful development which has been attained by the British Empire, a revelation of its strength, of its extension, of its cohesion. Those who saw the Jubilee procession from Buckingham Palace to the Cathedral of St. Pauls, could not but have their minds carried back to the ancient days of Rome, to those famous pageants where the victorious general ascended the Via Sacra in a blaze of glory and triumph. It was a triumph indeed, was that procession from Buckingham Palace to the Cathedral of St. Pauls; but it was a triumph, how different, how widely different, from the triumphs of ancient Rome. Here was not a warrior coming after a campaign, laden with the gory spoils of many provinces, or many kingdoms, or with thousands of slaves and prisoners fettered to his chariot—the triumphant in this case was a woman, a woman no longer in the flower of youth, but already marked by the hand of time, and in her cortege were the men of many lands and of many religions—men from the black races of Africa, men from the yellow races of Asia, men from the mixed races of the West Indies; Christians, Mahomedans, Buddhists—but free men all. Free

men all, some of them wearing the uniform of the British army and proudly marching to the strain of England's martial airs. And when in front of the noble temple, under the canopy of Heaven, the vast throng reverently invoked the blessing of Almighty God for the aged Sovereign and her vast dominions, a thrill passed over every one present, and each felt in his heart the conviction that, as the Roman Empire had been built up by force and violence, so it had been destroyed by force and violence; but that the British Empire lived, and could live ever, upon the eternal laws of freedom and justice.

And as it is for the British Empire as a whole, so it is for every component part of that Empire. That is the inspiration which shall ever guide us in the discharge of the duty which the Canadian people have entrusted to our care, and it is with this resolve that we, on this day, meet the Commons of Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I think I owe it to myself and the newspaper with which I am connected that I should make some reference to the statements made here to-night by the hon. leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman has referred to slanderous statements. I can only say this, that we have had on the floor of this House to-night, in connection with the Governor General, something that is slanderous, something that is discreditable to the hon. gentleman who vilified the Governor General as he did to-night. This is not the first occasion on which that hon. gentleman has been criticised by newspapers. If I can gather anything from his speech to-night, he is saying something against the "World" and in favour of a newspaper which dubbed him "a political cracksman." Now, if the hon. gentleman has been misunderstood in regard to this question, he has only himself to blame. On Thursday of last week, on the day when the "Globe" newspaper announced the terms of this Yukon deal, the hon. gentleman found himself in Montreal early on that day. He went into the "Witness" office and asked to be interviewed, and on that occasion he made this statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that I never was in the "Witness" office in my life.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is the "Gazette" I intended to allude to. The hon. gentleman went into the office of that paper to be interviewed, and was interviewed, and this statement was published in the "Gazette" of the following morning and also in the "World." It is dated, Montreal "Gazette," Friday, January 23, and it says:

Sir Charles Tupper left for Ottawa yesterday (Thursday) afternoon. Before returning to the capital he granted an interview to a "Gazette" representative. Questioned with reference to

the Government's Yukon policy, Sir Charles said: "I notice with very great pleasure the announcement that the Government have promptly provided for the maintenance of an all Canadian route to that great gold mining centre, towards which the eyes of the world are now strongly directed. I have no doubt that the measures that they have taken to secure the prompt construction of a sled road between the Stikine River and Teslin Lake, to be made into a good trail as soon as the snow disappears, and followed by the construction of a railway to be opened by September next, will meet with the approval of Parliament. I regard these measures of incalculable value to Canada, and shall be only too glad to give the Government the best support in my power on a question of such vital importance at this moment."

Then the hon. gentleman got on a car and came to Ottawa. Here, the same night he sent for the reporter of the Toronto "Mail" and gave out an interview with himself, showing an energy that is more than surprising in order to get his views before the public and his approval of the deal, and in the "Mail" of the following morning there was this announcement:

Ottawa, Jan. 27.—(Special.)—[Thursday.] Sir Charles Tupper was asked by your correspondent to state his views regarding the Yukon Railway. As to the arrangement made with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, Sir Charles Tupper said that they were men who had the capital, resources and energy to carry it out. They were probably the only men in Canada who could put the undertaking through in the time that it was specified. Sir Charles gave the Government credit for acting with such vigour as it had shown, and asserts that the opening of the Canadian route strongly urged by him upon both governments interested is the proper course to pursue.

On Friday morning that interview did not appear in the "Citizen" of Ottawa, but instead of it there appeared this rather ominous sentence in an article on the Yukon deal:

And then, think of the tremendous influence a corporation thus richly endowed will be able to wield in the lobby. There may be found supporters of the deal in unexpected quarters. The Government itself has priceless favours at its disposal in the administration of the Yukon gold fields.

The hon. gentleman in making that statement, which he did in several interviews, as leader of the Opposition, to my mind committed a serious blunder. If the Opposition have a case against the Government's policy in regard to the Yukon, it is because first of all they made that contract without consulting Parliament. That is our contention, and I hope it is a sound one. But there is another contention which I will argue as being at the basis of parliamentary government in this country, and it is this, that not only is a government bound to consult Parliament, especially within six days of the meeting of Parliament, but the leader of an Opposition is bound also to consult his followers, and not to commit them to a

policy upon which they have not been consulted. We have already had an example of this in this country, and the reason the Conservative party sit on this side of the House is because the Conservative leaders undertook to "jolly" their party into accepting a measure without consulting their friends in the House, as they were in duty bound to do. I stand here to maintain that principle. The leader of the Opposition should have called his followers together before committing them on this question, and most of all he should have awaited the announcement of the full policy; he should have held back; he should have suspected something wrong on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite rather than to have run in and approved of what he is not now quite sure he will approve of when it comes before the House. Now, what happened in Montreal? Why, on Friday night, the "Herald," the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, quoted Sir Charles's statement, which appeared in the Montreal "Gazette" of that morning, and proceeded to use it to bolster up the case of the Government. Their case apparently required a great deal of bolstering. The Toronto "Globe" took up five columns on the first day to bolster up this deal, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I think, took great care that no person should get information of this deal except the "Globe" newspaper.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Nonsense.

Mr. MACLEAN. The "Herald's" article of Friday night was quoted later on by the "Globe," and what does it say:

No one will appreciate better than Sir Charles Tupper the supreme importance and advantage which attach to the unusual safeguards which the Government have obtained as a result of the caution and firmness with which they have moved.

Now, the hon. gentleman seems so anxious to approve of this project—I hope he is going to condemn it later on—that he supplied the Montreal "Herald" with all the ammunition it required. There was a lot more in the "Herald" that night. It had an interview with Col. Tisdale approving of the transaction, and these interviews and the editorials based on them were quoted by the "Globe" of Monday, as follows:—

The Montreal "Herald" has been interviewing public men on the Government's Yukon Railway project. Sir Charles Tupper was among those who gave his views. He had no doubt the measures taken would meet with the approval of Parliament.

I have some doubt whether they will meet with the approval of Parliament.

"I regard these measures," he said, "as of incalculable value to Canada, and shall be only too glad to give the Government the best support in my power on a question of such vital importance at this moment." Sir Charles's only

Mr. MACLEAN.

regret was that the bargain was not more speedily entered into, because a great deal of useless expenditure has no doubt been involved by the delay.

Has the hon. gentleman only one regret now in connection with that contract?

I hope he will have a great many, and that he will present them to this House. The "Globe" then goes on to quote the "Herald" as follows:—

Col. Tisdale, another member of the late Conservative Administration, who happened to be in Montreal was also interviewed. He said: "It was necessary to place the work in the hands of reliable and energetic men, and the Government had certainly succeeded in doing this. In the matter of time, he thinks the Government was fully justified in acting promptly and in not waiting for Parliament to meet. Delay was to have been avoided at all hazards."

And Col. Tisdale seems to have the idea that there were not other "reliable and energetic men" to do the work. Where is my hon. friend, the member for Glengarry? Does he say that there is only one firm in this country which can do this work—that no one but Mann & Mackenzie can do it? Why, Mr. Speaker, there are scores of contracting firms in Canada who can do that work just as well and who would do it much cheaper. I protest against the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) taking advantage of his position to say that only one firm could do the work, because he thus gives up half the case that will be urged against the contract when it comes up in the House.

On the same Saturday "La Patrie," the organ of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) took occasion to reply to what "La Presse" had stated on Thursday evening. "La Presse," said "La Patrie," is trying to destroy the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Some hon. MEMBERS. En Francais.

Mr. MACLEAN. The word used is "détruire," and I suppose, according to the hon. gentlemen, the proper translation of "détruire" is to knife. "La Patrie" went on to say:

"La Presse" objected to the Yukon proposal at the very moment when Sir Charles Tupper, the Conservative chieftain, had proclaimed that this contract would be of incalculable benefit to Canada, and that he would be only too happy in helping the Government in this measure.

Does the hon. leader of the Opposition mean to say that the monopoly clauses in that contract, are of vital importance to this country, and that he will do all in his power to endorse both of those transactions? Will he stand up to-day and say, as he says in his interviews, that he endorses that land grab and that monopoly?

Then, on Saturday "La Patrie" felt justified in publishing the following editorial from which I quote for the benefit of the House:

The sagacity and the energy of our friends in Ottawa in this matter have been recognized by Sir Charles Tupper himself—

The great leader himself recognized this—

—and by the Hon. Mr Tisdale and by other Conservative chiefs.

The "Globe" has been getting its whole defence of this deal from quotations from what the hon. leader of the Opposition has said in its favour, and on January 29th it said :

The general tone of the press—
Which I deny—

—including Liberal-Conservative and Independent, is favourable to the Government plan for an all-Canadian route to the Yukon district. The "Mail and Empire" says the route is that favoured by Sir Charles, and in an interview published in the Montreal "Gazette," Sir Charles gives his unqualified approval of the scheme.

On behalf of the Conservative press of Ontario—and I think I know them, and I believe they respect me—I desire to say that they are opposed to that deal, that they are opposed to the monopoly clauses and above all opposed to the principle of not putting up that great contract to tender. But what occurred in this city of Ottawa? The "Citizen" of Friday last had the paragraph I have already quoted; but on Saturday morning, instead of using the interviews given to the "Mail" it published this article signed by "Onlooker," and the writer of which, I believe, is not very far away from the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. MACLEAN. All I can say is that the ex-Minister of Finance was met on the streets of Ottawa by a friend of his—at least so I am told—who went up to him and congratulated him on the excellent article, and the hon. gentleman was so pleased with the compliment that he did not deny the authorship.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman would allow me one moment, I desire to say that there is not a word of truth in that from beginning to end.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman say that it was not his article?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman may be very smart. I was not referring to the article, but to his statement.

Mr. MACLEAN. I gave the statement on hearsay. But I now give him the fact that he was the writer "Onlooker" of that article, and now give him the opportunity of denying it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is a journalist, and he knows that as such he is not doing a manly thing in trying to get a secret which is a secret of the editor and the writer alone.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman will not deny that when the hon. leader of the Opposition was seeking in every way possible to commend this contract, the writer of this article signed "Onlooker" was busily arraigning the Government for this Yukon deal, and I can only tell the ex-Finance Minister that this article is the clearest and straightest indictment of the Government that I have yet read in connection with this transaction.

Mr. FOSTER. That is good for "Onlooker."

Mr. MACLEAN. And it is to his credit, and I direct the attention of the leader of the Opposition to this article and the charges which it contains against the Government, and I would ask him to say whether he was faithful to his duty and to his party—and he, as leader, has a duty to his party as well as we as are privates—in rushing headlong to approve of a transaction which is condemned, in the article to which I refer. However, I do not propose to read it to-night, because a great many have seen it but there is one phrase in it which the writer, describing the Toronto "Globe," appeared to be describing a politician well known in this country :

Alas, the Toronto "Globe" has descended to be a prospectus writer to every doubtful Government proposal, the advance agent as it were with its posters—flaring and grandiloquent—for each succeeding scheme of wasteful expenditure and monopoly.

And all this occurred at the very moment when the Conservatives of Ontario were interested, more than at any other time, in what I have called before to-day the transportation problem. If there is one thing which struck the Conservatives of Ontario more than another, it was the indecent way in which at the close of the last session of the Ontario legislature, two subsidies were rushed through, which, we have now found out, were for the benefit of the same people who control the Yukon Railway. The Conservatives of Ontario were discouraged; they saw some connection between the subsidies voted at Toronto and the Yukon deal at Ottawa, and looking forward to the elections about to come off in our province, they expected the Opposition at Ottawa to expose the iniquity of all these deals. Instead of that, however, they found the Conservative leader of the Opposition rushing forward in the most anxious way to approve of the policy of his opponents. This grab at Toronto is in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as is also this Yukon monopoly, and the Conservatives in Ontario and elsewhere in Canada are getting tired of finding their party and especially their leader approving all these projects for the aggrandisement of the Canadian Pacific Railway, introduced in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Last session many Conservatives were very sore at the fact that the Crow's Nest Railway job—I call it a job—had the unqualified endorsement of the leader of the Opposition. We who were here wished to oppose that project; we thought the hon. gentleman would see his way to oppose that project. But an effort was made to make of us a registering machine for the decrees of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not wish to be put any longer in that position. When the Crow's Nest Pass was up, the leader of the Opposition closed his speech then in these words:

I do not intend to detain the committee in listening to my very voice further than to say that I regard the measure now submitted to the committee as of such great importance that I am not disposed to deal with it too critically, nor have I the means at my disposal to do so. I can only say that if this is the best proposal that can be submitted to secure the prompt construction of the road, I for one am prepared to give it my humble support.

When is this perpetual support to these Canadian Pacific Railway deals to end, especially when they are proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite and supported by our friends on this side of the House? We have got to decide on some settled policy in regard to these matters on this side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, and the first plank of that policy will be to trust Parliament and to give every contractor in this country a fair opportunity to tender for Government work. The people in Ontario are altogether in favour of a change in regard to the policy of the Opposition on railway matters. We have got something at stake. We propose—at least some of us propose—to educate the people in regard to these railway questions. We are trying to introduce something that is progressive and in the interest of the people, and not in the interest of the great Canadian Pacific monopoly. We propose to condemn such unconstitutional propositions as the one now before the House. If it had not been for such papers as the Toronto "World," which had the courage to speak out, which had the courage to check the hon. gentleman, the Conservative press of this country would have been silenced in connection with this deal. Indeed, an effort was made to silence the Conservative press, an effort was made to drag them into this deal, but thank God, there is not to-day a Conservative paper in Canada that approves of the deal, and there is not a Conservative paper in Canada that approves of the conduct of the hon. gentleman in rushing forward to sanction this project, or his conduct in going about the country to give it his approval, as he did in Montreal, and especially when his own friends, like the writer of that article signed "Onlooker," when newspapers all over the country were

Mr MACLEAN.

getting ready to denounce this most iniquitous proposal, as I consider it to be. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of some pain to me to make an explanation of this kind. It requires some courage in a member of this House or in a newspaper to state frankly and boldly what he or it thinks. The "World" may not have said what it desired to say in a way that would please the hon. gentleman. Newspapers have got to act quickly sometimes; public opinion must be stirred, and sometimes they have to say things that they cannot directly prove. But if the hon. gentleman has any complaint to make, he must blame it on himself, and especially must he blame himself when he finds the Toronto "Globe" publishing a cartoon which shows the leader of the Government on one side and the hon. gentleman on the other, sanctioning the Government's policy. He should not blame the "World" newspaper for what has happened: he should blame his own indiscretion, and most of all he has himself to blame for not trusting his party, for not consulting his party before he endeavoured to commit them to a policy that is against the public interests of Canada, which is against constitutional practice, and which, if continued, will end in placing this country in the power of the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the greatest, the strongest, and most dangerous monopoly in this country to-day.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 7th February, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved:

That the Order for the consideration of the motion for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session have precedence over all other business except introduction of Bills.

Motion agreed to.

GALLICIAN SETTLERS.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to bring to the attention of the Minister of the Interior a report that appears in "Le Manitoba" of 2nd February, from the Rev. R. P. Page, who arrived the day before in Winnipeg from his mission among the Gallicians established in the neighbourhood of Yorkton. He reports that they are in a state of the greatest destitution and are without the necessaries of life. The report is in French, but I can summarize it by saying that Mr. Page gives the idea that these people are in a state of want. He says that the attention of the Minister of the Interior has been called to this, and I should like to know from the Minister whether the report, which is very serious, as to the condition of these people is well-founded, and if so, what steps have been taken by the Government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The Immigration Commissioner at Winnipeg has full instructions from me to take such measures as may be necessary to prevent any destitution amongst these people. An officer of the department is stationed at Yorkton who is especially acquainted with every family among the Gallicians settled there, and he has the matter under his personal supervision. I think it quite impossible that the report which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) refers to, can be correct, but I will take immediate steps to have inquiry made.

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN. I should like to ask the Prime Minister, whether the rumour which is now widespread, that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has been promised the appointment of Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, is correct?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The rumour to which my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) alludes cannot be widespread, because it never reached me.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS REGULATIONS AT SKAGWAY AND DYEA.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, whether he is in a position to make any communication to the House in regard to the question of the customs arrangements in force at Skagway and Dyea? The right hon. gentleman said he would give us the information as early as he possibly could.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not in a position to give the information to-day, but I affirm what I stated the other day, that we expect to be

in a position to make such a statement at a very early date.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY CONTRACT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask whether my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) expects to lay on the Table of the House to-morrow, the Mann-Mackenzie contract for the construction of the railway?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In connection with that subject it would be very interesting if we could have an estimate; if only a probable estimate, but the most correct estimate that can be given, of the amount of gold that has been taken out of the Canadian Yukon country, and as far as may be possible, what proportion of that has been taken out by Canadians, and by persons from other countries.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not sure to what extent we can supply the information just now asked by my hon. friend, but I am sure that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) will do all in his power to give every possible information on that subject.

THE UNITED STATES RELIEF EXPEDITION TO THE YUKON.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior, or the First Minister, whether he can give any information to the House as to whether the United States Relief Expedition has started into the interior of the country; if so, from what point, and if any United States troops are to accompany it beyond the Canadian frontier.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The information in my possession is to the effect that the United States relief expedition was to sail from some American port for Skagway on or about the first of February. Since then I have received no information. The question of the accompanying of this expedition by United States troops has been a subject of communication between the Government at Washington and the Government here. United States troops under arms will not accompany the expedition over Canadian territory. The question of whether United States troops not under arms shall be allowed to be sent over Canadian territory, for the purpose of more expeditiously reaching American territory on the other side of the 141st meridian, is now under consideration and negotiation between the two Governments.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bertram for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, in some respects the position assumed by the First Minister on Friday last is unique in the history of this Parliament. I suppose not the most cynical Grit sitting opposite to me would arise in his place and deny that it is of the utmost importance that a public man who leads a great party in this country, whose record extends through many years of opposition to a Government whose policy he did not approve of, and who had made public and repeated pledges to the electorate at various times and in various places—that it is, I say, of the utmost importance that a public man under these circumstances should honestly and thoroughly keep his pledges, and when he came to power, if to power he came, by virtue of the suffrages of the electors, that he should, as the leader of a Government and entrusted with power to carry out the policy which he had previously advocated, at least keep faith with the electorate and carry out those policies which he had deliberately and repeatedly promised from time to time when he was seeking the suffrages of the people. If that be true—and I think both sides of this House will agree in maintaining it—the leader of the Government, now that he has been a year and a half in power, and able to embody his policy in the active work of administration and in public enactment, must have expected to be called upon to listen to a criticism of that eighteen months, and must have felt that it was his duty to have answered the chief points in that criticism. But, Sir, instead of that, the hon. gentleman seems to have been surprised—more than that, to have been somewhat galled. He seems to have felt that it was almost treasonable that my friend the leader of the Opposition should have pretended to call him to account for his one and a half years of stewardship—should have placed before him the pledges he had made, and pointed out their non-fulfilment, and urged with force and strength and logic the position of the Government as against that of the Opposition in this respect. But, Sir, my hon. friend, as I said, appears to have been surprised that such should have been even thought of: and it did seem to me, when he arose and accused my hon. friend of being in an angry and disappointed mood, that he himself offered to this House a spectacle of almost childish anger in the position he took with reference to the criticism that had been made. The hon. gentleman must not allow the adulations and honours which have been his

Mr. SIFTON.

meed for some eighteen months now, to lead him to suppose that he is above criticism, or that, when he takes his place in this House, he is not to stand on a level with every other representative man, and give reasons for his actions, and reply to charges which are made against him. If he does have that idea, the sooner he divests himself of it the better. Now, Sir, what did the hon. gentleman give as a reply to the able and exhaustive, and I am bound to say, the temperate arraignment by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition of his policy during the last eighteen months as compared with the pledges of seventeen years? He commenced by showing his anger, and by administering what he supposed was a severe, but what seemed to me to be a somewhat childish castigation to my hon. friend. He then went on to boast of many things that had been done, without thinking it worth while to prove one of them. He made a meagre and somewhat unfortunate statement as to the proposed Yukon deal. That, he declared, was after all but a temporary measure, intended to get in supplies for next winter. He gave a confused and altogether inadequate explanation of the position he took in Great Britain with reference to preferential trade, on which point he was most strongly arraigned by my hon. friend, and will be held to account in this country from one end of it to the other.

And then, like a good general—no, Sir, but like a man who aspires to be a general, and has never studied the true tactics and science of war, he seeks by a display of rockets and fireworks to divert the attention of his own followers, at least, from the paucity and meagreness of the reply which he has made to the criticisms passed upon him. It is just as if he had a guest who came to him in the morning, stayed with him all day, and got neither dinner nor supper, but whom, late at night, the hon. gentleman took to the door of his hospitable home, put a Roman candle in his hand, touch it off, and as his guest of the day saw it splutter and explode and watched the green and blue lights far off in the heaven, said to him: Au revoir, monsieur, you must now consider you have had an excellent dinner and a good substantial supper, and I wish you a pleasant night's sleep. Well, that is all the right hon. gentleman's followers got from him. Are the hon. gentlemen who sit beside my right hon. friend satisfied with that answer of their leader?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. One man—one man out of the whole following is satisfied, and he a Minister of the Crown. Well, Sir, if the party opposite is satisfied with that answer of the leader, the Opposition on this side can afford to be thoroughly satisfied.

But I propose, even though I have to

travel over some of the grounds traversed by my right hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper)—and he went over the ground very fully—to make some points, even on the same line, as strongly as I can, in the faint hope that possibly some one of my right hon. friend's colleagues, seeing the utter insufficiency of the reply of their leader, may essay to do something worthy of the occasion. Now, with reference to the Speech from the Throne, upon which this debate is proceeding, we may sum up the first part of it as being an assertion with regard to the political importance, the material progress and the good credit that Canada enjoys to-day. Well, that political importance and that material progress and that good credit, whatever it may be, gentlemen on this side most heartily appreciate and are thankful for. But to say that certain things exist is one thing, and to say that they exist because the party opposite is in power and because my right hon. friend leads that party, is quite another thing. Who made it possible that Canada should have this distinguished political importance which she enjoys in the British world to-day, this material progress and this good credit? I think all will agree with me that three conditions are necessary, and these do not spring up in a day or grow up in a night. These are stable political conditions, good transport facilities, and a varied industrial development. These three conditions are of steady, solid and long growth—not of the mushroom type which spring up in a single night—and we have to clearly and honestly see the difference between the existence of the fact itself and the attributing that existence to certain causes. My hon. friend may boast of these three attributes which Canada possesses, and in boasting of them do honour to himself and his country, but when he seeks to make it apparent that these are in any way the results of the action and policy of his Government, then he makes a claim which we are perfectly justified in discussing. Stable political conditions are necessary, every one will admit. But what would have been the political condition of the Dominion if a certain agitation, begun in a certain portion of the Dominion, carried on by a certain gentleman who to-day occupies the position of Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) had been successful? We cannot forget—it was not more than fourteen years ago—when a gentleman by the name of Fielding, a resident at that time in the province of Nova Scotia, entered upon a propaganda which had for its purpose the taking of Nova Scotia, and if possible New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island out from this confederation and the formation of a union amongst themselves of these provinces. It is fortunate for us that the good sense and long-headedness of the people of New Brunswick and Prince Edward

Island did not allow them to go the length of even sympathizing with the views of the hon. gentleman, and it speaks well for that caution of the hon. gentleman, which is, perhaps, to a large extent, his best characteristic, that when he saw it was hardly possible to accomplish his purpose, he let the agitation die out and it has never been heard from since.

But if Mr. Fielding, the Finance Minister of to-day, had been able to work out his sweet will, this Dominion would not be what it is to-day, and these stable conditions, which contribute so much to our political importance and good credit, would not exist.

Memory takes me back also to the agitation, not many years old, participated in by my right hon. friend and his colleagues to his left and his right, when the Liberal party bowed before Mr. Erastus Wiman and his commercial union scheme with the United States, and which they carried on with might and main, even after the defection of their strongest man and old-time leader (Mr. Blake), who characterized it as likely to dis sever the good relations which heretofore existed between Canada and the mother country and lead to intimate political connection with the United States. The good, hard common-sense of the electorate of Canada balked the attempt, but if it had not been balked, if these hon. gentlemen opposite had been successful, where would be now the stable conditions which gives political importance and good credit to Canada in the Jubilee year of Her Majesty?

Sir, with reference to good transport facilities, who does not know that one of the best indications of Canada's credit in the old world is the quotations of Canadian Pacific Railway stocks. It is almost, if not really, as good as the quotations of Canada's Government securities, and why? The quotations of Canadian Pacific Railway stocks is the barometer of the commercial credit and expansion of this country, and they go up as monied men and business men in commercial centres read into them the progress and expansion of the trade and traffic of this country. Where was the Liberal party, under the leadership of my right hon. friend and his predecessors, when the fate of the Canadian Pacific Railway was hanging in the balance, waiting upon the vote of this Parliament, when it was fighting for its existence, and when the Dominion of Canada felt through and through that as fortune went on, that occasion, so would the weal or the disaster of the country and of the whole Canadian people.

It had at that time assumed such an importance, was of such a nature, that if it had failed, it would have been a failure of Canada, and would have been so regarded in the different countries of the world. When the battle was fought for industrial

improvement in this country, the National Policy was started in 1876, where were hon. gentlemen opposite, who to-day talk of the political importance, the material progress and of the good credit of this country? They were banded in complete and in utter opposition to both the principle and practice of protection. They followed the same course from that time, but were thwarted again, by the good strong common sense of the electors of Canada. In 1887, their former leader bowed his head to the inevitable and counselled his party to accept an established fact and make the best of it, but was thrown over for giving that advice, and the battle went on under a new leader until—strange nemesis—in 1897 the new leader in the hour of victory turned around and embraced that very principle and practice which for seventeen years his party had denounced. Sir, these are the things which have made Canada a country whose political importance, material progress and credit are noteworthy throughout the world and are regarded with pride by every Canadian.

Another point that is taken up in the Speech from the Throne is a promise—no, not a promise, but a hope, a somewhat distant hope held out that the burthens of this country shall be decreased. How? Decreased, Sir, by reason of the good credit of the country standing on the foundations which I have spoken of. We are told that the credit of this country will enable the Finance Minister, when the present loans fall due bearing a comparatively high rate of interest, to renew them with loans bearing a lower rate of interest. So that the present Grit doctrine with reference to lightening the burthens and reducing the taxes of the people takes an entirely new form; it is to be measured by the decrease in the rate of interest that can be got when we come to renew our current loans. Oh, what a fall was there! And yet we are told that all pledges have been kept. Who of us is there whose ears are not still ringing with Grit denunciations of the Liberal-Conservative party? Who does not clearly remember their hot and streaming tears of sympathy for the overburdened electors? And what did they promise to do, these true knights of financial science who had bared their swords and buckled on their armour and who were going into the contest to rescue the overburdened electors and to release them from their shackles of over-taxation and expenditure? What was their doctrine then? They cried that the burdens of the people were monstrous and must be alleviated. How? By lessening taxation, by economy, by reduction of expenditure and of the debt. But we have heard nothing of that within the last eighteen months. All that has passed away into that-not-very-far-off oblivion where lie buried side by side the many pledges that the Grit party has made within the last seven-

Mr. FOSTER.

teen years. Ah, no, I must not forget that there is another method. The valiant Knight of Denunciation of former years spoke not long ago since in the city of Toronto. He had but little hope for decreasing expenditure then. He must have felt that new light had dawned upon him, for I doubt if ever before he had stood on a platform when the staple article of his speech was not a denunciation of the burdens put upon the people and asseveration of his desire and his intention to lessen them by doing away with over-expenditure and lessening the taxation. When he spoke at Toronto he had not even thought of this patent device of the Finance Minister to hold out the hope of a little lightening of the burdens of the taxpayers in future years when our current loans are renewed, which will be soon, but he was going to decrease the burdens of the people by bringing in population. Last year he sympathized with some gentleman on this side of the House belonging to the maritime provinces and deplored the little increase in population as compared with former times. But to-day, Sir, this young and lusty Knight intends to endeavour in every way he can individually and collectively with his party to increase the population of the country and so lessen the per capita burdens of each individual.

The next thing referred to in the Speech is the reduction of duties, that is the tariff measure which was introduced and carried through this House last year and which produced, it is said, such a favourable impression in England. And the reference is not veiled but open that one of the great merits of that measure was that it produced a wonderful feeling of sympathy in Great Britain. Sir, I should think that this should be one of the last things in the course of their history as administrators of this country that hon. gentlemen opposite would allude to, for, if there is anything which was commenced under false pretenses, which was based upon false grounds and which has led in every case to humiliation, backdown and disaster, it is that particular feature of the tariff legislation which they carried through the House last year. What are the facts with regard to that so-called preferential legislation? In the first place these hon. gentlemen legislated in the face of treaties which were well known and which for thirty years had been on the records of the Imperial Parliament and had been sanctioned by statutes of that Parliament. They legislated in the face of despatches which, over and over again affirmed the scope and validity of those treaties and their binding character. They legislated in the face of actual decisions worked out in the practical business of customs administration. Canada had been in one or two or more instances reminded of the existence of these treaties, and asked that she should adhere to them in good faith, which Canada did do. They uttered their legal dicta, those gentle-

men, some who were lawyers and some who were not, with the greatest assurance that they were right and that every one else was wrong. Why, even the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), though disclaiming to be learned in the law, thought that as a man of common sense he might venture his opinion, and he did. His opinion was that as these were not preferential in their nature, that as they were wide open, so to speak, and for the acceptance of all under conditions which were specified, they did not partake of the nature of discrimination, and consequently they were not in violation of those treaties, and would not so be held. The hon. gentleman differed from some of his colleagues as to this legislation. On the one hand, many of his colleagues declared then and have declared since that this was preferential legislation, a preference for Great Britain alone; but the Minister of Trade and Commerce declared that it was not preferential in essence, that it was not meant for Great Britain alone, but was open to the whole civilized world. He says :

But I say with respect to the offer we now make, that it is not a preferential offer at all in the true, legal sense of the word. That offer is open to all the whole world. The Americans may avail themselves of it, and so may the Germans and the Belgians. The whole world are welcome to avail themselves of it on the same terms and the same conditions on which England may take advantage of it.

And then in another part of his speech, he says :

If the Americans were willing to give us full and fair reciprocal advantages, I would recommend trading with them for the benefit of Canada and the Empire, too; and I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) may find out before he is many years older that very probably, although I admit it is a little round-about way, this is not a bad way to get it.

So that the Minister of Trade and Commerce had this idea, that it was not meant for England primarily or particularly, but that it was open to the whole world, and that under its operations he expected to compass the round of the nations, taking them in one by one, and amongst them, and not the least, the United States of America as well. But, Sir, the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government gave his legal opinion, too. Of course, the hon. gentleman has been a long time engaged in politics, and political strife is not very consistent with the daily duties and readings of a law office; but such knowledge as he had, and such legal lore as he could summon, were brought to bear upon this question, and when I asked him across the floor of the House if he would tell the House before we were called upon to vote whether :

He considers that if this resolution passes and becomes law he is bound to give the same treat-

ment to Belgium and Germany and other countries that have with Great Britain most-favoured-nation treaty clauses ?

He said :

If you want my answer now, I decidedly say that it does not apply to either Belgium or Germany.

But, Sir, the climax was reached when my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), as the legal luminary and Ajax of the party, set his gigantic legal intellect into evolution, and forcibly—speaking in the physical sense—made his points, one by one, to the discomfiture of all opponents, and of the Law Lords of Great Britain. He said :

I thereby submit that in the face of our customs autonomy, and in the absence of any such restrictions as exist in the Australian Constitutional Acts, and in virtue of the limitation on the treaty-making powers of the Crown, and the absence of Imperial and colonial legislation giving effect to these treaties, they do not apply to Canada. * * * * I say that this resolution neither discriminates nor differentiates, it attaches no terms which are not common to Great Britain and to all countries, and if Great Britain's fiscal system entitles her, as it does, to the immediate benefits which are daily flowing from the acceptance of our conditions, and if Germany and Belgium do not get the same advantages now, it is not because of our legislation or our offer, but because of their own refusal to comply with the conditions which we have put in our offer.

And when the hon. leader of the Opposition ventured to say that there had been some little legal argument made upon this side of the House, my hon. friend rose indignantly to reply :

He was supported in his position by the other Ministers, some of them, not altogether undistinguished as lawyers in the locality from which they come.

Of course, not comparing with my hon. friend, but then they were not altogether undistinguished. But he said :

Can the hon. leader of the Opposition produce the opinion of a prominent lawyer, or even of a fledgling lawyer, endorsing the absurd and ridiculous statement? He, the leader of the great Conservative party, is, I am proud to say, alone in the position which he takes.

Well, Sir, this legal Ajax of the Government took himself, and his arguments, and his title, and went to London. He argued the case forcibly and learnedly before the Law Officers of the Crown. He urged all that he had urged here, and I suppose a great deal more. And, Sir, what was the result? That after a little time the answer came, and a tolerably distinct answer it was. The Law Officers advised :

That the Crown is bound by the German and Belgian treaties in respect of trade between these countries and Canada, that the obligation in these treaties that the produce of Germany and Belgium shall not be subject to any higher or other duties than those which may be im-

posed upon similar articles of British origin, is absolute and unqualified, and as the United Kingdom has been admitted to the benefit of the Canadian reciprocal tariff, Germany and Belgium are entitled to it also. * * * The Law Officers advise also that on the admission of Germany and Belgium, the benefit of the reciprocal tariff must be extended to all countries entitled in Canada by treaty to most-favoured-nation treatment in tariff matters. Notice was given on the 30th of July to terminate the treaties, and in the meantime effect should at once be given in accordance with the undertaking given by your Ministers to the Law Officers' decision, the excess of duties levied should be repaid on demand. Despatch follows by mail.

That is the answer, that is the humiliation, that is what I consider the disaster; because it can never add to the prowess and standing of Canada when its Government takes a position so adverse, so patently adverse, to great treaties and enactments, and finds afterwards that objections had been fairly taken to it. A better way than that might have been found, and I will point it out by-and-by. But nothing daunted the vallant knight. He came back, wearing the laurels of his defeat with a jaunty air, and was tendered a banquet at Charlottetown. He waxed eloquent while speaking; metaphors and similes crowded into his brain, and he declared:

The germ planted in 1892 has grown and flourished into a green bay tree, and to-day the birds of the air, not only in this country, but in the countries of Europe, are lodged in its branches.

It seems to me that when I read Bible history in my school days—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. And the reckless jollity with which some hon. members meet this remark shows that, judging from themselves, they have little faith in my reading it when I am grown up—it seems to me when I read Bible history, that a green bay tree was something to which the wicked were likened; and my hon. friend, without knowing it, was most appropriate in the simile which he used. But my hon. friend will have a quarrel soon with his right hon. leader, because his leader declared here on Friday that the first step was taken in this matter when he was in England last year and when the treaties were denounced. Now, it appears that his lieutenant declared at Charlottetown that the germ had been planted in 1892, that it had grown for five years until it had come to be this mighty bay tree. And to what purpose was this mighty bay tree prostituted? The birds of the air, not only in this country, but in European countries, nestled in its branches. Later on in his speech the hon. gentleman, wearing still, I say, with a jaunty air, the laurels of defeat, said something like this:

With reference to the preferential trade resolution, he had been appointed to argue the case

Mr. FOSTER.

before the Law Officers of the Crown. He would not weary his hearers with a synopsis of the argument. Suffice to say that he had been successful.

“And now the unity of the Empire is a proclaimed fact, ringing up and down the universe,” he added. My hon. friend has a disposition which I envy him. In success he can smile and be jubilant; in the bitter hours of defeat he smiles equally and is equally jubilant, because he thinks he has been successful even when he has been defeated.

So much, then, with respect to the legal position of the matter. But, Sir, there is something which is more blameworthy than this. The hon. gentlemen opposite created a false impressiion at home, which means much, and abroad, which means more, with respect to this clause in their tariff. The impression they created was that it emanated from the desire largely dominant in the Canadian heart for exclusive trade relations with Great Britain and the British Empire, and they heralded it abroad in Canada and in Great Britain, as being a measure which gave its advantages to Great Britain, and to Great Britain alone. That was the impression which was sought to be created in this country, and which hundreds of thousands of people believed to be the true state of things until the whole matter was sifted and explained. It was the impression it produced in Great Britain, which ran into the Jubilee celebration and which lasted somewhat longer than the celebration, but reached an inglorious end at last when at length the result of the investigation of the facts came to be known. No less a person than Mr. Kendrick Murray, the secretary of the London Chamber of Commerce, says that

The expectation of the traders has undoubtedly been disappointed by the extension to practically all countries, except the United States, of what was previously supposed to be an exclusive British preference.

Mr. Kendrick Murray simply echoes the impression made everywhere and cultivated sedulously in Great Britain, that this was a meed of benefit given solely to Great Britain and her traders. I think, Sir, that it is very unfortunate when hon. gentlemen, because they cannot agree among themselves as to a definition of their policy, add two meanings to it and arrange to adopt either of them by which they will be able at the time to do the most good; to argue that the clause is not preferential exclusively to Great Britain, when they have to meet men in favour of wider commerce; that it is exclusively for Great Britain, when they have to meet the sentiment that asks and longs for the closest exclusive trade relations between Great Britain and all her colonies. It is particularly unfortunate that Great Britain should ever have the experience of finding out that a Canadian Prime Minister and a Canadian Government were

so unfortunate in the expression of their policy, to say the least, that they led the British people to believe they gave one thing when in fact they were giving another and a very different thing.

But what has been the effect of this course? Hon. gentlemen opposite have been shown to be all wrong in their action; duties collected have had to be repaid, with the attendant costs; the scope of the clause was larger than they had intended, and if one says in excuse: Well, when notice was given by Great Britain that the treaties would be denounced, it was found by the decision of the Law Officers of the Crown that until the denunciation became effective the most-favoured nations' goods had to be admitted under that clause, if any one as an apologist of the Ministry makes that argument now, I cite him the other fact, and that is, that under that clause the Ministers themselves have opened up the benefits of it to nations and countries which have no most-favoured-nation treaties with us at all, and are entirely outside the pale. Hon. gentlemen opposite first denied that the effect of the clause would go further than England. They were wrong. They then denied that it would go further than Belgium and Holland at all events. They were wrong. They next denied that it would go further than the most-favoured treaty nations. They were wrong. Japan and the Netherlands came and demanded entry for their goods under this clause, and they were accorded entrance. To-day, as Mr. Kendrick Murray states, there is not a great country in the world whose commerce is worth much, outside the United States, which is not having the advantage of the same clause; and yet hon. gentlemen were Jubilee heroes and took Jubilee honours which largely came to them on the faith they inculcated that Canada had in the Jubilee year made a magnificent and exclusive gift to Great Britain out of good heart and good will alone.

What have been the results of this action? It was stated that it would make a great change in the commercial trend, and that Great Britain's trade with this country would increase under this preferential advantage of one-eighth first, and later of two-eighths or one-fourth. Has it? The facts have a right to speak, the facts must be heard; and as the facts were against hon. gentlemen in those other particulars I have mentioned, the facts are equally against them in this respect. The truth is that the imports from Great Britain to this country have suddenly fallen under the one-eighth advantage which those hon. gentlemen claimed they had given to Great Britain. We have, unfortunately not received the last quarterly report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, which should have been due on 1st January, I think, and so there is nothing to go on in the way of public record but the first quarterly report and the English re-

turns. Let me take the English returns first. I find by the English returns that the exports of Great Britain to British North America for the nine months ending 30th September, 1896, were of the value of \$12,800,000. For the same period of 1897 it was \$11,765,543, or a decrease of 8½ per cent in English trade so far as England's exports to this country are concerned, assuming that the imports to Newfoundland were equal in both periods.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright. I did not catch what my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is quoting.

Mr. FOSTER. The nine months ending 30th September.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. How are you making your comparison, for 1895 or 1896?

Mr. FOSTER. 1896 and 1897 are the two years.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I thought you said 1895?

Mr. FOSTER. There was a decrease of 8½ per cent in English trade with us. In cotton goods there was a decrease from \$1,729,353 to \$1,450,241; in linens from \$573,347 to \$446,579; in laces, silks and that like, the reduction was from \$33,823 in one case to \$20,911, and in the other from \$114,936 to \$77,739. Iron and steel goods decreased from \$2,309,000 to \$1,669,900, and apparel decreased from \$1,395,642 to \$1,152,314, and so on through the list that is given. Now, I am free to admit that this takes in but five months of the actual working of the preferential tariff, but at all events that is the state of things as developed by the Trade Returns from Great Britain.

How is it then with reference to the imports from the United States; because one great glory of this new legislation was, that it was to increase British trade with us and to decrease United States trade with us; at least to change the relative proportions of the two. From the United States, during the eight months up to the 31st of August of these two periods, the import of corn in the last period increased to \$2,267,901 as against \$1,761,230 in the preceding period. The imports from the United States of manufactures of iron and builders' hardware, increased from \$379,546 worth to \$389,015 worth, and so on through a considerable list. I cannot avoid upon this point, calling the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to an argument that he once made; seriously made I have no doubt. I want to present it to him and to ask, if he will seriously make it again. I know his stubborn adhesion to a thing he has once said, even though it be wrongly said, but I have yet hope that in this case, the thing is so patent and so clear, that my hon. friend

will say that he has erred. In 1897, in this House ("Hansard," p. 1244) Sir Richard Cartwright said :

Under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, England and the importation of England's goods was discriminated against to an extraordinary degree. In 1896 we exported to England, apparently, \$66,000,000 worth of our products ; to the United States, \$44,000,000 worth. We bought from England, \$32,000,000 ; and from the United States, \$58,000,000. There, if you will, is a genuine practical discrimination to an enormous extent against England and in favour of the United States, under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now comes an afterthought ; it struck him and he gave it vent :

I have always said that the National Policy was a Yankee device imitated from the Yankees, and in fact a benefit to them chiefly, and there is the proof of it.

Well, Sir, if the tariff of his opponents, the National Policy tariff, discriminated, as he called it, and discriminated to that extent against England in favour of the United States, what is the result of last year's Liberal tariff ? It is astounding. It is that in 1896 we exported \$66,000,000 worth of products to Great Britain and \$44,000,000 to the United States ; and in 1897, we exported to Great Britain \$77,000,000 and to the United States \$49,000,000, being an increase in exports to Great Britain of \$11,000,000, and an increase of exports to the United States of \$5,000,000. But when we come to the discriminatory part, it stands in this way : That whereas in 1896, we took from Great Britain \$32,000,000—and so discriminated against Great Britain enormously according to the Minister of Trade and Commerce—yet in 1897 we took only \$29,000,000. And, whereas we took from the United States \$58,000,000 in 1896, under this preferential tariff which was to remedy this gross discrimination against Great Britain, we actually took \$61,000,000 of their imports.

Now, Sir, the logic in the case is irrefutable. If there were an enormous discrimination against Great Britain under the former tariff measure, to the extent of these imports relatively, it is still greater and still more enormous under the new tariff, because under it the imports are less from Great Britain and the imports are greater from the United States of America. But, Sir, it was stated that this new tariff would reduce the taxation ; that is, would reduce the rate of duty. Has it done so ? Taking the three months' report of my hon. friend, the report from July to September of 1896, I find that the total imports were \$17,690,000, the duty paid \$5,210,000, and the percentage of duty 29·56 per cent. That, be it remembered, was in 1896, under the old tariff. During the three months under the new tariff the imports were \$17,764,000, the duty was \$5,127,000, and the percentage rate of duty was 28·86 per cent. That is,

Mr. FOSTER.

under this new tariff—without protection, and when all its robbery and attendant piratical influences and effects were swept away, and the new and rejuvenated tariff of the hon. gentlemen was brought in—the total reduction in the percentage of duty in the three months compared with the three months in the preceding year (in which first three months the preferential tariff was in vogue) the total reduction of duty amounts to the enormous sum—and now the burdened taxpayers will surely breathe freely—the reduction in the rate of duty amounts to the enormous sum of 70-100ths of one per cent. If ever that old Latin quotation : "the mountain laboured and brought forth a ridiculous mouse," ought to be resuscitated for use, this is the proper time to call it to the attention of my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright). But, Sir, the hon. gentleman went still further. The First Minister, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Finance, and every one of the Ministers, and all of those who echoed their words have declared, that the tariff has been revised from the old protectionist basis, and that now we have practically a revenue tariff.

The right hon. the leader of the House said on Friday last that he had fulfilled his pledge : that there should not be a duty for protective purposes, but simply for revenue purposes. I take the goods which were imported and which I referred to in the illustration when I was comparing the imports from Great Britain, and figuring out the percentage of duty under this tariff, what is the result ? Clothing is now 31 per cent. Does my hon. friend mean to tell me that 31 per cent is only a revenue duty, and that there is no protection in it ? Dress goods, 32½ per cent—is that a revenue duty, with no protection in it ? Knitted goods 32 per cent ; hats and caps, 30 per cent ; cottons, bleached, dyed and coloured, 31 per cent ; coal, 23 per cent—is that a revenue duty, may I ask the Minister of Finance ? Rice, 59 per cent—is that a revenue duty, I may ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce ? I remember his impassioned deliverances of many years ago against that rice duty ; and here we have—I am not sure that it is not concealed under the mechanism of a double duty—a duty of 59 per cent on the people's rice. Manufactured cotton goods, 27½ per cent—is that a revenue duty ? Cutlery and hardware, tools and implements, 27½ per cent. Pickles and sauces, 32 per cent ; provisions, lard, meats, &c., fresh, 32½ per cent ; and coal oil—I forbear to wound the susceptibilities of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) by stating just what the amount of that duty is ; but I beg leave to call his attention to these words :

It was a specific duty of seven and one-fifth cents per gallon at that time, and Mr. Davies

asserted that the rate amounted to a protection of 123 per cent on the coal oil imported into Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. He concluded with a touching appeal to the House for sweeping away this enormous anomaly. He said: "I plead on behalf of the mass of the people—not on behalf of the rich people in cities and towns, who have their electric light and gas—but for the great mass of the people who are obliged to buy this oil. This is class legislation of the worst kind. It bears most seriously upon the Maritime Provinces, and it bears with enormous weight upon the poorer classes in the Maritime Provinces."

And yet this is a duty for revenue purposes, and there is not a vestige of protection in it! Shall I go any further in attempting to prove the statement with which I commenced, that in the whole outcome of that legislation the Minister's words and predictions have been falsified in every respect by the decisions of the law officers of the Crown, by the arbitrament of the facts, and by the course of business history during the last six months; and to-day, Sir, we have a tariff law in effect which gives privileges to nine-tenths of the foreign countries in the world, and withholds them from nine-tenths of our sister British colonies, all in the name of kinship and imperial unity. We have, Sir, a tariff under whose operation we find that Great Britain's trade decreases, that that of Belgium increases, and that that of Germany increases, and despite which the trade from the United States increases as well. But, Sir, they say, look at the increased exports; that is a proof that this policy has been successful. Is it? Let us see. The increased exports are in round numbers \$16,900,000 this year. I am going to say nothing about the higher prices, and nothing about famines and causes for these higher prices; every one understands them. But I am going to subject to scrutiny that argument which they have been vaunting throughout the length and breadth of this country as a proof of the wisdom of their policy, that though the imports have fallen off, the exports have increased by \$16,900,000. Well, Sir, I do not suppose that the very fact of hon. gentlemen having put this clause in their tariff late in the year 1897, made apples four times as great a crop for exportation as they were in the year before, and gave \$1,000,000 of an increase in exports. I do not suppose that clause or that tariff legislation was the cause that the export of butter was doubled, giving a little over \$1,000,000 to the good of the export column; that wool increased in export by twice as much, and added \$600,000 extra to the volume of exports; that hides added \$500,000; that grain added \$6,000,000; that flour added \$1,000,000; that the mines added \$3,200,000; and that the forests, including manufactures of lumber, added some \$4,000,000; making in all \$17,500,000 more than the total increases in exports. Not one of these articles was

affected in the remotest degree by the tariff legislation of last session; and in reference to every one of them, if any effect can be claimed for any policy, it can be claimed for the policy which was initiated and established by the Government which preceded that of hon. gentlemen opposite, and which they had the good sense to follow out and not to destroy. Wherever these gentlemen have fulfilled their pledges, they have hurt the industries of this country. They have not hurt as many industries as they otherwise would have done, I may call to the attention of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), because they have not kept those pledges which he was naive enough to say had caused a feeling of distrust and want of confidence in the Liberal policy all through this country. Nor, Sir, has their tariff in any respect lessened the burdens of the country. A rather peculiar thing which is worth mentioning, is this. I find that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was in London, and whilst there he addressed a meeting; I am not sure but it was a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce; and in the course of that address, he made several statements which call for notice. In the first place, he effectually condoned all his sins of fifteen years in affirming that this country was burdened beyond redemption by the debt which had been piled up, by declaring to an audience of business men in the heart of London:

While it might be mentioned that the Government had to some extent mortgaged its future by reason of the large expenditures which had been incurred by developing the illimitable natural resources of the country, they did not, however, face the future with fear and trembling, but with confident hope and assurance. They felt that what they had incurred they would be able to pay.

And what they had incurred was for the purpose of developing the illimitable natural resources of this country. But, Sir, he went further:

They felt that what they had incurred they would be able to pay; and in the present year, by making both ends meet, they had given the best answer to those who had asserted that they had acted too hastily.

Did the Government make both ends meet? Had the Finance Minister so certified to the Minister of Trade and Commerce? Was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries under the impression that he was electioneering somewhere in Prince Edward Island under the shadow of that green bay tree, under which the wicked too often shelter themselves, and was just as oblivious of what ought to be truthfully stated there as he is sometimes in the electioneering campaigns in this country? He stated to the business men, the financiers of London, that this Government were making both ends meet this year, and so were erecting for them-

selves an imperishable monument. How did they make both ends meet? By spending the largest sum on consolidated funds account that has ever been expended in this country—by incurring a deficit of \$519,981 on current consolidated expenditure account alone. Yet, he says, they made both ends meet. And over and above this, they have spent on capital account \$4,000,000 and increased the debt by over \$3,000,000. And yet this kind of reckless statement is made in financial London to the statesmen and business men of Great Britain, that this Government had made both ends meet, and so had earned for themselves the plaudits of all good men. But there were some other admissions. There was, at one time, he said, in the Dominion, arising from causes which he could not explain, a sort of desire or premonition that the future of this country would be bound up with the future of the United States. Did my hon. friend try to explain that? Did he try to investigate the causes? Could he not have found them? Could he not have found them in the campaign of 1891, in which he and his party ran full tilt for discrimination against Great Britain and the closest commercial relations with the United States, as being the foundation of such an impression? And yet my hon. friend, again sheltering himself under the shade of that green bay tree, naively put it aside as something too deep for his explanatory powers to grapple with.

Sir Louis Davies is also reported as having said :

He observed that Canada, small as was her population, had fought the battle of life under a system of fiscal government that he did not approve of. He was a free trader.

Now, some one said the other night, in the course of this debate, that there were no free traders amongst the Liberals. I think it was the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Bertram). If he did, I now ask him to revise his statement. When a man stands up in the middle of London and says to his audience: "I am a free trader," what does it mean? Does it mean that he is a revenue protectionist to the extent of 29.86 per cent? Surely not. But one impression could be given, namely, that he was a free trader, as the term is understood in Great Britain—a free trader of the good old Cobden school. The only impression could be that he stood on the very same platform with his leader Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was so good a free trader of the Cobden school, that he put away from him and Canada—which is the most serious part of it—the best opportunity we ever had of getting trade relations with the Empire which would be invaluable to us. He also took up the argument of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the policy of the past had been discrimination against Great Bri-

Mr. FOSTER.

tain and that the policy of this Government was just the reverse. But I have shown you how this Government has acted towards Great Britain. Later on, he went on to say, much the same as his leader :

That England has protected us with her army and fleets, she has given us civil and religious liberties, she has never asked us to contribute one cent towards that army and fleet. Out of the fulness of our heart and our love we have now yielded to the desire to cement more strongly the bond of union which ought to unite the mother country and the colonies, and are prepared to propose a preferential tariff, the result of which will be that British goods will be admitted to Canada much lower than any foreign goods.

Now, the date of this meeting I do not know, because it is not given here, but I take it, that it was probably after—yes, it was, as I see by the context—after the decision of the law officers of the Crown, that we were bound by the treaties. Now, if there was any meaning in that sentence, it means that these hon. gentlemen, having found out that they were mistaken, and having run through with this comedy of theirs, are now prepared, at the earliest date this session, to excise that article from their tariff and to place in the tariff a clause which shall give to Great Britain, and Great Britain alone, preferential advantages—not admitting any other country to a participation in them. I mention that to clinch the argument made by my hon. friend the other night and to add weight to it. But if we are to believe that, what are we to believe with reference to the statement of the hon. Finance Minister, who, when asked at Sheffield whether there would be any change in the tariff, declared :

We do not believe in tariff tinkering; it hurts business. Therefore, although I did not go so far as my free trade proclivities would have carried me, there will be no more important changes made at the next session.

Now, if this change is made, it will be a most important change; and there is, therefore, diametrical opposition between the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) and the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding).

In another part the Minister of Finance was asked squarely the question: "Do you intend to give Great Britain exclusive preferential advantages by legislation?" And my hon. friend, with that caution which he exercised over much, because sometimes it does not conduce to clearness or perspicuity, replied pretty much in these words: I must tell you, Sir, in answer to that question, that having put our hand to the plough, we do not intend to turn back. Now, Mr. Speaker, that may be either a negative or a positive or nothing at all. I wish we could get a definite reply from my hon. friend. I suppose that if I were to meet

him some very cold morning and say to him : Good morning, it is a very cold morning, he would not say "yes" or "no," but would say : Well, I think we will have to be guided by the reading of the thermometer. He would be very careful not to commit himself.

Now I proceed to another branch of the subject. It is brought out by the assertion of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) that the Ministry have fulfilled all the pledges they ever gave. That was his statement. Now, the hon. member for Centre Toronto is tolerably past the years of youth. He is not an old man, but old enough to know the importance of the statement that he makes. Had he really looked into the matter, had he read the pledges, and had he come to the conclusion that he could stand in the face of the House of Commons—not on a hustings platform—and make the statement that the Ministry had fulfilled every pledge they had made? I am afraid my hon. friend will have to revise that position. Let us see one of the pledges that the Ministry made. Here, I may say that pledges can be made in two ways by a party in opposition. They can be made by the trend and meaning of statements impressed generally upon the people, or they can be made, in so many definite words, clearly declaring for certain things. In both those respects, the gentlemen who to-day are governing this country have made pledges, over and over, to the people which they have not pretended to implement and which they do not propose to implement. Why, what shall we think of the position taken by my hon. friend the Postmaster General, and the later position taken by this Government of which he is such a distinguished, clear-headed member.

My hon. friend, when he was a member of the Opposition, fought hard and long, he observed widely and keenly, and came to the conclusion that one of the most dangerous elements in the political life of to-day was this facility with which governments could modify or control the actions of the members who supported them, by dangling offices before their eyes. I am not going to say he was wrong; but if he was right then, what business has he to sit in the Government which violates that principle to-day? No reason except that of preferment and emolument. If a man believes as a cardinal principle that it is corrupting and debasing to the politics of this country that members shall sit behind the Government with promises of offices in their pockets, he has no business to remain in a Government which does that thing. Are his words not fresh before the members of this House :

Sir, if the Government of the day can dangle public offices before their followers, and induce a few, and perhaps an increasing number, to aspire to these positions, instead of representing their constituencies here and exercising an un-

biased judgment and a wholesome influence upon the Administration of the day, they become mere parasites upon the Administration and cease to voice the opinions of their constituents. Not only do they do that, but moving among their colleagues, they become, as it were, corrupting agencies among their own ranks. And so, a small percentage of persons in that position are likely to impair the independence of the whole body. So it has become, in my opinion, a crying abuse, and Parliament is cast down from its high position. And not only is the will of the people being interfered with, not only is Parliament being subordinated to the Administration, but there is even a worse evil growing out of this abuse. All through the country the electorate, noticing these things, are coming to the conclusion that the highest aim a man can have in seeking public life is that he may, through Parliament, find his way to a comfortable position for life. If that becomes the highest aim of those who seek public life, then public life becomes a means, not of advantage to the public but of private gain. And thus we shall have coming into public life office seekers, place-hunters, instead of those ready to make sacrifices for the love of their country, and ready to undertake the labours of public life for the good they can do in the interest of the people. So that whether we view this evil with regard to its influence on the existing House, or with regard to its demoralizing influence upon public opinion, in either case, I submit, it is of such pernicious character as to demand the earliest interference on the part of this Parliament.

He introduced a Bill, and in advocacy of that Bill said :

How can a member of this House, who has the promise from the Government of a position of emolument be free to vote or take a stand as a representative of the people against the will of the Government? However independent he may desire to be, that relation entirely destroys his usefulness as a representative of the constituency which sent him here.

Men will come here not to serve the country generally, but the government of the day, in order that they themselves may profit and the interests of their constituents will only take a very secondary position.

I ask my hon. friend : If that were true then, if those words were the outcome of an honest heart and a firm conviction that public policy should be moulded upon the sentiments then expressed, why does he remain in a Government which for eighteen months has violated every canon that he laid down and has practically reduced men in this House to a condition of vassalage by raising an expectancy of office yet to come? Sir, there sat over yonder, during one or two sessions of this House, a gentleman, the law partner, I believe, of the leader of this Government. And it was common report all through this city, and that from the best of sources, that a judgeship was his, and it only required the time that was necessary in order to make that arrangement before he should take his seat upon the bench. How comes it, Sir, that Mr. François Langelier sat in that seat over yonder, at variance with his party's management, from top to bottom, at variance upon pub-

lic questions which were debated in this House, and yet said no word. Not until a year and a half had passed and he felt that which had been promised him by the Premier of this country was likely to slip out of his grasp, did he make the ignoble kick on ground of patronage, while questions of principle had been passed over again and again. Will the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) justify his Government? And will my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) justify his leader in holding out—no, not holding out, but actually putting into the pocket of a member of this House—the promise of either a judgeship or a governorship, a promise which he had to implement, not because of good will, but because forced by the revolt of his followers against delaying the gift of patronage to his supporter? Sir, who cannot remember that after Mr. Masson, a member of this House, and a supporter of the previous Administration, was appointed to a judgeship in the western part of Ontario, appointed at the end of a Parliament—though, I suppose, that makes no difference in principle, still, it was at the end of a Parliament—who cannot remember how these hon. gentlemen, who to-day fill Ministers' seats, were loud in their declarations against the iniquity of this thing? Why, Sir, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) then described the appointment as a crime on the part of the Government, and a shame, and a disgrace. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated that Mr. Masson had been sitting one session, if not two, in this House in practical defiance of the Independence of Parliament Act, and, to all intents and purposes, with that appointment in his pocket. And such instances can be multiplied twenty times, showing the abandonment of former principles. And yet my hon. friend from Centre Toronto rises as a new member in this House and declares upon his solemn faith that the Government has implemented every pledge made to the people. Here was a pledge, not made in a speech merely, but more strongly by a resolution moved and a Bill introduced and strongly supported by gentlemen then in opposition and now leading members of the Government of this country.

Then, Sir, what with reference to the promise of public works and subsidies? How often has that been declaimed against by good Liberals? Of course, I am not now speaking of my hon. friend from Centre Toronto, for he is a good Tory. He is Liberal-ized for the nonce, but in his heart Tory principles are strongly entrenched. He it was who came to Ottawa when the first gun of tariff change was to be fired, and sat down beside the Finance Minister and with him went over the tariff line by line, taking good care that certain manufacturers of hardware should be well protected. But Liberal-ized as he is, what has he to say to this pledge I have referred to? I appeal,

Mr. FOSTER.

no less, to my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), an honest man. I ask if for seventeen years he did not take strong ground with his confreres against the promise of public works as a means of bonusing members and their constituencies? He undoubtedly did. It does him honour. He was joined by every member of the present Ministry. Up and down this country the people were taught to believe that, when the Liberals came into power, there would be no more of these things, that no more should promises be given to members of large franchises being voted to them and great subsidies to their counties. What do I read?

I, the undersigned, declare that on several occasions during the months of March and April last, and before coming to power, Hon. Mr. Laurier, the Prime Minister, gave me the assurance and the formal guarantee that he would have voted by the Parliament of Canada in favour of the South Shore Railway Company, composed of Messrs. Hyacinthe, Beauchemin, J. M. Fortier, estate of Hon. L. Tourville, estate of Joel Leduc, F. X. Choquette and others, the subsidies in cash required for the construction of the South Shore Railway from Sorel to Chaudière Junction, near Lévis, and that the said subsidies will be voted at the present session this year at Ottawa, at least from Sorel to St. Gregoire.

R. M. S. MIGNAULT, M.P.

Yamaska, May 14, 1897.

That was read in the heat of an election contest in that same county of Yamaska, in order corruptly to influence the electorate. Sir, some excuse may be given for a Minister who may say, in looking over a section of country, Yes, I think that is a section of country which ought to be benefited in a certain way, and when I get into power, if I do, I will use my influence to have money granted for developing that portion of the country. That is one thing. It is going far, but it may be justified. But there is no justification in making a special promise to a special man, or a special company, or a special set of individuals. That is a corrupt promise, meant only to be a corrupt promise, usable only for purposes of corruption. And yet my naive and innocent friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram)—and he will be more careful before he is in this House many months—rose and in all the blush of his maiden speech, declared that the Ministers have implemented every pledge that they ever made to this country. Sir, do I need to go further with these pledges? They can be found by the score, they are all over this country, and before this session of Parliament is through, many of them will be brought to the attention of this House. These are sufficient to prove the statement that I have made. So, Sir, the First Minister himself went down to Nicolet, in the heat of a contest where a railway was really the only politics that there was before the people. Did he introduce Mr.

Leduc this afternoon? For Mr. Leduc was elected. But there was a war, a battle royal, between two companies for railroad subsidies. When the First Minister went down he said, amongst other things—well, he did not go so far as to promise out and out that a subsidy would be granted, but he said to the assembled electors substantially: You all know that if you wish favours from the Government in the way of a subsidy for your railway, it is better for you to send a supporter to the Government than an opponent. Now, Sir, the right hon. gentleman is wrong in that statement. He, as the Prime Minister of this country, has no business so to promise the people's money—that is what they always called it before. It is not so much looked upon as the people's money now, it is the Government's money. The franchises of this country are rapidly becoming the possession of the Government to be doled out as the Government wish, being fully persuaded that by proper appliances they can induce their obedient followers to register the decrees which they in secret conclude ought to be carried out. But, Sir, to take the people's money and go down to an independent electorate, and to stand as the Prime Minister before that electorate and say: If you want a subsidy you yourselves know it is better to send a supporter of the Government than an opponent—it is virtually taking the public money and promising it to his party for the sake of getting a supporter in this House. What shall we say with reference to the Minister of Public Works? So much is to be said that I dare not enter upon that fertile field of investigation very far this afternoon. But the Minister of Public Works had a bad half hour at Lévis during a certain political turmoil down there, and he argued bravely and waited patiently, and by and by the only way that he could bring his audience was to say: Don't you want elevators here in Lévis? A cry went up from all quarters, Yes, yes, yes. The Minister knew how to do it. He goes down and publicly promises them elevators, speaks of his friend the Minister of Railways, how disappointed he is that he is not there with him to see what could be done in the way of public works for Lévis. These Ministers are paragons of purity when in opposition, but apostles of corruption when once they have got possession of the Government benches and of the public treasury. Yet they have kept all the pledges they gave to the honest electorate of this country. Surely the hon. member for Centre Toronto owes this House an apology for such a statement. I shall say nothing of numerous others, but I am inclined to call as witnesses some hon. gentlemen from that side of the House, and some supporters of the old Liberal party. There sits the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). Does he believe that the Government have im-

plemented all their promises? Has he had any conversation since Friday last with the member for Centre Toronto? Have no heated passages occurred between them? The member for Centre Toronto, having revised the tariff on protectionist lines, says that the Government has implemented all its pledges; but the member for East Assiniboia, speaking to his constituents, declared a few days ago, 19th January:

We, in East Assiniboia, are not wholly satisfied on the tariff changes. I have, however, often stated that a government cannot sweep the whole thing away in a year or two. The Conservatives would have been very pleased to see us do it, for it would have created such a panic that they would have swept the Liberal party out of office.

What an admission. If the Liberal party had been true to their pledges and brought their legislation on, it would have created such a panic that, in the opinion of the member for East Assiniboia, and he is right, it would have swept them out of office.

Instead of doing that, we have begun by cutting off a few inches at a time of the dog's tail, and by and by we will get to the body.

Never, my hon. friend from Assiniboia, will you get beyond the last outward tip of hair on that dog's tail, except you march over the dead body of the hon. member for Centre Toronto. That tail is a long tail, and there are many, many hairs at the very end of that tail, and you have not plucked out one yet. And before you get to that dog's vulnerable body you will be many, many years older than you are today. So there is one hon. gentleman who does not think that the Government has implemented its pledges. Near him sits another, if my eyes do not deceive me, the good-looking member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). Now, Sir, the good-looking member for Lisgar—who, I see, acknowledges the compliment—owns a paper, and he has been giving loose to western ideas in that paper, of which here are some:

If the Liberal Government yields to the pressure that is now being brought to bear by prominent Liberals at Ottawa to have the duty on binder twine, which, according to legislation last session, will be entirely wiped out in a few months, retained, it may as well make up its mind to fully capitulate to the protectionists, for, with the exception of barbed wire, it will then have been practically abandoned every free trade or revenue tariff outpost which was occupied by the party for so many years.

That is very good, but here is something better:

From the literature which the Liberals circulated prior to the election, we expected to see the duty on agricultural implements entirely swept away, but instead of that the implement manufacturers are placed in a better position than ever by a reduction in the duties on the raw materials which they require.

Then he mentions coal oil ; but, again, I forbear on account of my sympathies for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But he ends up with this encouraging statement for my hon. friend for Centre Toronto :

It was also disturbing to the free trade mind to see Mr. Bertram, the new Liberal member for Centre Toronto, elected upon a platform of non-disturbance of the tariff, and to find no repudiation of the sentiment from Ottawa. To say the least, it was disquieting to the average reform mind in the west, which has been confidently counting upon a steady scaling down of the tariff from year to year.

There is another one disappointed. What shall we say of the organ of the Patrons, the "Farmer's Sun." There are Patrons here, and the "Sun" was the staunch defender of these virtuous men when it was so easy to be virtuous, to wit, when in Opposition. What does the "Sun" say. It says :

It is impossible to deny that so far they have disappointed us. They were to frame a tariff for revenue only, and the principle of protection was to be set aside. They were to practice rigid economy, cut down all unnecessary expenses, and abjure all extravagant schemes. They were to settle the railway grievances of the North-west. In all this they have so far failed, and what they have done is scarcely worth the efforts made by independent men to effect a change. The tariff is little less protectionist or burdensome than it was before. That there has been any appreciable reduction of duties is not clear. The small concessions that have been made, as in the case of binder twine, have borne the character rather of sops to free traders than of moves in a broad and bold policy of free trade. The protectionist manufacturers appear to be satisfied, and they have reason for their satisfaction. The farmers are dissatisfied, and their dissatisfaction is well founded. What will be the effect of the preferential clause is not yet clear. But we may be pretty sure that it is meant rather for political effect than as a fiscal revolution. It cannot fail to put a weapon into the hands of our commercial enemies in the United States and to discourage the free trade party there.

There is another important element which contributed to place the party in power in their places, that is not satisfied. Here is the Simcoe "Reformer." It says :

There was a good reason for introducing Sir Oliver into the Senate with the portfolio of Justice, for the Liberals were very weak in that august and venerable body, having at that time only Senators Scott and Power possessing even low average debating ability, and certainly no Liberal was so qualified for the Ministry of Justice as Ontario's Premier. But Mr. Laurier reached out further than was either prudent or considerate for his old supporters when he brought in Fielding to supplant Cartwright in the Finance Department, a position he is not, never was, nor never will be, qualified to fill with a tithe of the ability that the old warhorse possesses, and whose style becomes rather the precise linendraper than the man who has his office and its responsibilities in a firm grip. Then Mr. Sifton was brought in, though no one can reasonably claim for him exceptional ability

Mr. FOSTER.

or even quickness or safe judgment. He is said to be a man strongly endowed with a keen eye to family advantages and given to petty vindictiveness. Not satisfied with the selection of the above imported, the new Premier brought in Mr. Blair, the piebald Premier of New Brunswick, who for years was recognized as a somewhat questionable manipulator of men, and who comes nearer to the general conception of the "practical politician" than any man who ever held a portfolio in a Liberal Government, if we except the present Minister of Public Works.

Nothing too good for Tarte—even if it be a backhanded compliment from the Simcoe "Reformer." That paper further says :

Mr. Blair was said by those nearest to him to be ready to drop on either side of the fence, and is further said to have demanded the portfolio of "railways and canals or nothing" when he was asked to join the Federal Government. Why this "Mokanna" wanted the railways and canals is best known to him, but the fact of his impudent demand being acceded to is enough to give us pause in asking if the firm hand was at the helm. The partial outcome of Blair's admission to the Government is the Drummond County Railway purchase and the impending scandal, together with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway deal, etc. Then the absurd climax was reached when Mr. Laurier called into the Cabinet Mr. Dobell, a Quebec Tory and son-in-law of the late Sir David Macpherson.

There is another Liberal who does not think the pledges given by hon. gentlemen opposite have been implemented. I notice that the member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has had occasion to give tongue as well. He has not been pleased by these Yukon mining arrangements. Who has been ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Tupper.

Mr. FOSTER. These regulations have been changed three times, and who knows but there are other changes in progress. The member for Alberta said in his paper :

It is a relic of barbarism worthy of the most benighted savage races. It is a piece of high-handed robbery, and is going to be the means of once more having Canada's name thrown to the winds by the swindling operations of politicians. The Yukon law just passed is reserving every alternate gold claim to the Government, so that whenever an election is to be called the Government can bribe any person or corporation it wants to with an odd gold mine or two. It is going to retard the whole Dominion by curtailing the trade of the merchants, the freight and passenger carriage of the railways and steamers and ordinary pack and wagon freighters.

He added :

On several occasions the people of Canada have had to assert their rights against villainous legislation. This is one more occasion when this will have to be done, and blood shed that should not be.

The sooner Sir Wilfrid Laurier comes back to look after his brood of irresponsibles, the better for himself and party.

I find the Dundas "Banner" declares "there are just as many leeches for blood under the Grit rule as under the Tory rule";

and the "Plaindealer" declares there are too many Cabinet Ministers. There is another pledge unfulfilled. The leader of the Government and his supporters are pledged to the country to reduce the extravagant list of Cabinet Ministers. The present Postmaster General opposed it in the days when he was in Opposition, the days when it was easy to be virtuous in those respects. Now he says nothing; but the "Plaindealer" places its finger on the sore and says that now is the time when this pledge can be implemented. Sir Oliver is going out, let us have one Minister less. But Sir Oliver has gone out, and another has taken his place and there has been no diminution in the number. As to the Intercolonial extension, it says:

Why should Reformers as well as others not suspect a deal which puts millions at the command of a gentleman who was instrumental in buying a \$30,000 plant for the sons of a Minister?

The \$30,000 was party funds, forsooth! So was the \$45,000 that caused the Pacific scandal, that hurled from power the most popular First Minister Canada ever saw.

Even the Hamilton "Times" is down on the Ministers for riding about in private cars. How our hopes have been blighted! At the first trip by the Prime Minister made to this city it was heralded from one end of the country to the other that he, a good democrat, would not use a private car, but chose to ride in the regular first class car alongside his fellow citizens. The right hon. gentleman soon got over that. The examples offered him were too many and too bad. When the Minister of Public Works, who is so dominant in almost every proceeding, set the pace with his private car and coloured porter and surrounding luxuries and eating delicacies like a bird, the Prime Minister very soon followed the example, and I believe he took a special down to Rivière du Loup all by himself. The Hamilton "Times," that good old Liberal paper, raises its Puritanical voice in denunciation of Ministers who when out of office attacked and scathed the Government of the day for using private cars, and yet when hon. gentlemen opposite came into office they used them just as much as their predecessors. And the member for Lisgar, in a late issue of his paper, said that now the Prime Minister should implement his pledge, that there would be one less Minister, at least, in the Cabinet.

Here is the opportunity, take advantage of it, and implement the pledge that you made. I shall not read to this House that scathing arraignment from the Huntingdon "Gleaner" of last year's session of Parliament, on the broken pledges and the increased expenditure. There is one probably greater than all, and to which I must allude, because the impression was made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce himself, and he, I am sure, never wishes to create an impression that he

does not honestly try to implement. That hon. gentleman, on a certain occasion, wrote a letter to the Patrons of Canada. It was written before the election, and was meant for consumption and to catch the Patron vote, and in that letter the Minister of Trade and Commerce wrote:

What are the other planks of the Patron platform affecting Dominion politics? They are these: (1) Economy of administration; (2) purity and independence of Parliament; (3) tariff for revenue only; (4) reciprocal trade; (5) protection of labour from monopolies; (6) no railway bonuses. Now there is simply no single one of all these objects which the Liberal party have not been fighting for, moving resolutions for and doing their very best to obtain any time during the last twenty years.

The hand-book of Liberal principles published during the recent campaign declared the identity of the Liberal and Patron policies as to bonuses, and said:

The policy of bonusing railways by cash and land grants from the Dominion Government has become a fruitful source of jobbery, speculation and corruption. Under its operation favourites of the Government have been enriched. The policy of granting these subsidies has repeatedly been condemned in Parliament by the Liberal party, and this resolution (of the Patrons) is in harmony with the attitude of the Liberal party upon this question.

There is the pledge of the Minister of Trade and Commerce; there is the pledge of the hand-book of Liberal principles; both of them have been violated; for never in an equal space of time in the history of the Canadian Parliament have more bonuses in money and lands of the country been given by a Government, in the first place acting in camera and making the arrangements simply for their followers to register; then coming down to the House and forcing their measures through. The first thing they did was, in view of a by-election to take over and operate for six months or more the Baie de Chaleur Railway, for which proceeding they had no warrant or resolution of this House, for which they had no vote of this House, and for which they had no legal or constitutional right. They made a loss to the people of Canada, and then they came down here and cried pecavvi, and got their friends to vote them \$12,000 to make up that loss. Under the plea of urgency, the Minister of Railways in camera with his colleagues made a binding arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway and Drummond County Railway, which contemplated a capital investment of \$7,000,000. They made that arrangement without a resolution of Parliament, without discussing the advisability or the inadvisability of it, and without taking into their confidence either their own party or the House. Relying upon the argument of necessity, they came down to the House at the last, and when the back benches revolted, the Government said: The Government is pledged to it, they have sign-

ed the contract, you must see us through or we will go out. Are these the free conditions under which the Government should administer the franchises and money of this country? And, Sir, the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, although an undertaking which had been discussed, and the principle of which was conceded, these gentlemen opposite hurried to put it in commencement and operation by giving nearly two millions more dollars than the road could have been obtained for by the preceding Government, or obtained by them for that matter. They did this on the childish plea that they had gotten from the Canadian Pacific Railway promises of general freight reductions, but before one-third of the line is graded, for business reasons and business reasons alone, the Canadian Pacific Railway has made an almost equal cut of their rates over all the Northwest and through that great section of country. Not a single Government paper ventured to say that anything else than business considerations led to this reduction.

And, Sir, this other deal, the Yukon deal, which is now facing the country, was sprung upon the country, sprung upon Liberals as well as the Tories, sprung upon the country one week previous to the assembling of the people's representatives, sprung upon the country after secret conference, when no one, not even the most intelligent of our people, knew that such a thing was in the wind, except, of course, those who were interested, or who the Government wished to become interested. It came before the country through the "Globe," which the Government took into its confidence, and through which it sent forth its policy, and now through the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), with a slight addition; and through the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), with another addition, and a most unfortunate one, which was that after all it was but a temporary expedient. The Government came before this House with these conditions signed, sealed and delivered; the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) declaring ten days ago that one condition of the contract was, that in twenty-six days, before this Parliament could possibly debate, thoroughly discuss and pass this measure, one part of that contract was to be finished by Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie. Sir, these are things which may well cause Liberals who are not sitting in Parliament, Liberals who are not asking and looking for favours, Liberals who have no designs upon front benches or fat positions; these are things which may well make these Liberals back in the country (and good men all this country through), ask themselves: Whether or not we have come to the pass in our parliamentary history where the Ministry take the franchises of the country and dispose of them as they will, in

Mr. POSTER.

secret, and then rush them through Parliament by their majority without affording any opportunity for free and manly discussion. It is no wonder that the "Farmer's Sun" feels that in this respect the promises and pledges and past history of the Liberal party are not being implemented by them when they are in office.

And now, Sir, I come to another subject. I am not going to put before my right hon. friend his own pledges made in the city of Toronto, where he absolutely and unconditionally promised that if he got into power he would reduce the expenditure by two or three millions at least. He has made no effort to do this, but on the contrary these expenditures have been kept up to a larger amount than ever before. I am not going to take the thousand and one pledges on all the subjects which he has given; given lightly without a thought perhaps of their tendency and consequences, and when they are brought to his face, treating them just as lightly as if hereafter it was to be a legend, a tradition only, that in Canada amongst public men public faith and public pledges were an honourable guarantee that ought to be honourably borne and honourably kept. I want to proceed to my right hon. friend's position in England on this preferential trade business, and I must ask him to give me his attention whilst I try to discuss the question. The subject has been discussed, but I propose to put the question to him again, and I propose to put it again and again, and I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will put it again and again until we have some satisfactory explanation from the Government benches; or until we prove that the position taken by the right hon. gentleman was highly detrimental to Canada, was unauthorized by the people of Canada, and was such as he, as the representative of this country, should not have taken. This investigation requires close attention, and the first point that I wish to make is as to what was the position of the right hon. gentleman in Canada on preferential trade. His position was set forth in two speeches—one made in London and the other made in Montreal. What he said in London was this:

We would have for our goods a preference which would not be given to the goods of another nation.

I call attention to these words, for this purpose. My hon. friend took another position after that. He took a position of opposition to any trade arrangement with Great Britain which would make it necessary for Great Britain to become protectionist to the extent of putting a discriminating duty upon foreign imports; but when he was in London, giving his policy to the electors, he declared that the project of preferential trade did include the necessity of Great Britain

giving preferential treatment to the products of Canada, to a certain extent at least. He went on to state :

That practical statesman, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, has come to the conclusion that the time has come when it is possible to have within the bounds of the Empire another step taken which will give to the colonies in England a preference for their products over the products of other nations.

That is clear ; it shows what was clearly in the hon. gentleman's mind.

What would be the possibilities of such a step if it was taken ? We sell our goods in England. We send our wheat, our butter, our cheese, all our natural products, but there we have to compete with similar products from the United States, from Russia, and from other nations. Just see what a great advantage it would be to Canada, if the wheat, cheese and butter which we send to England would be met with a preference over similar products of other nations. The possibilities are immense.

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the new and progressive Secretary of the Colonies, has declared that the time has come when it is possible to discuss that question. But, Sir, if England is going to give us that preference, England would expect something from us in return. What is it she would expect ? England would expect that we would come as closely to her own system of free trade, as it is possible for us to come. England does not expect that we should take her own system of free trade such as she has it ; but I lay it before you that the thing the English people would expect in return is that, instead of a principle of protection, we should adopt the revenue form of tariff, pure and simple. These are the conditions upon which we we can have that boon.

Is not that as clear as anything the hon. gentleman has ever said ? The points are clearly defined : first, that England will give us a preference for certain of our goods ; and, second, that we shall have to come as closely as possible to England's free trade, though she does not expect us to conform to it altogether ; but we shall have to give up the protection idea, and that is the condition upon which we can have the boon. If ever a pledge was given by a public man just previous to an election that he would in Great Britain favour preferential trade for this country under these conditions, it was given by Mr. Wilfrid Laurier, as he was at that time, in the city of London. Now, in Montreal a little earlier than that, he stated :

In regard to this question of preferential trade, I desire to say that Sir Charles Tupper is no more in favour of the idea than I am myself. He added : " My hope is—nay, my conviction is—that on the 23rd of June the Liberal party will be at the head of the polls, and that it will be the Liberal party, with its policy of a revenue tariff, that will send commissioners to London to arrange for a basis of preferential trade.

I want to emphasise that remark. Where were the commissioners to be sent ? Sent to England, to arrange a basis of preferential trade. With whom ? With the British

Government. Not sent to a public meeting at Liverpool, which was the first place where the hon. gentleman opened his mouth, and where he did all the damage. I make this point now, in advance of my argument, that under that pledge, in view of the invitation of Mr. Chamberlain to a conference of the colonial Premiers at which commercial union was the first subject to be discussed, it was the hon. gentleman's bounden duty to have sealed his lips close until he sat with Mr. Chamberlain and with the other colonial Premiers at that conference. Did he do that ? We will see later on. The only point I wish to affirm now is that he knew the conditions of preferential trade when in London and in Montreal, and he pledged his honour as a public man in favour of them.

What more, Sir ? Have I need to say that there was a call for a conference ? Here is the despatch that was sent out on the 23th of January, 1897, and it was an invitation to discuss many subjects of the greatest interest to the Empire, such as commercial union, colonial defence, and so forth, commercial union being placed first on the list.

Then, Sir, they passed the preference tariff, so-called, and that was heralded in England as being exclusively for British products. There were the advance steps already taken. Public opinion had been cultivated in this country until nine out of every ten men would have welcomed preferential trade with Great Britain on those terms if it could have been got. Public opinion was being moulded in Great Britain until a great change had taken place there, and, under the influence of the Jubilee year, British trade sentiment was seeking for the basis of a compromise which would bring the colonies into commercial union with the mother country, and was ready under the generous impulse of the time to give to Canada and the other colonies all that possibly could be given to bring it about. The soil was well cultivated here, and well cultivated in Great Britain. The sower of the seed more than any one else in his capacity at that time, was crossing the briny Atlantic. How will he sow the seed, and what is the seed he will sow ? Then, Sir, when Mr. Laurier, as the representative of Canada, stepped off the vessel at the Liverpool docks, and made his way to that assemblage that was gathered to meet him, headed by the foremost men in the Cabinet of the country, what was the condition of things in Great Britain ? There was a great exultation of colonial importance among all classes, and the idea of inter-Imperial trade and inter-dependence never had been at such a tense heat. There was an intense feeling that something practical should be done in the Jubilee year to cement this union, and to add commercial bonds to those of loyalty and blood already existing. There was generous trend in British sentiment to go further than the old Cobdenistic theories would

warrant, for the sake of the practical end in view, namely, the great future development of the Empire as a whole, at home and in the colonies. There was a Government which had invited proposals through its Secretary of State for the Colonies, and had sent the Duke of Devonshire and Lord Chancellor Halsbury to Liverpool, who held out the hand of welcome in such a definite way as to call down upon them the animadversions of every Cobdenite in England. What did the Premier of Canada do? More than that, there was to the common-sense British mind the pressure of outside competition and foreign tariffs narrowing their foreign market and impinging on their home market, which was gradually rooting out long settled ideas and causing a revulsion of opinion in favour of a practical business tariff. At that auspicious moment, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his brother colonial Premiers made their entry upon British soil. What did Sir Wilfrid, as the representative of Canada, do? Did he keep the pledge which he gave to the electorate here, that he would favour preferential trade, involving preferential duties by Great Britain and involving a preferential tariff by us? Did he keep his pledge that he would send a delegation to talk this matter over with the Government of Great Britain? Did he, if he had not anything favourable to say of it, keep his mouth sealed until he met Mr. Chamberlain and the members of the British Government? Or did he open his mouth to stimulate, with all the eloquence at his command, that public opinion upon which Mr. Chamberlain must have relied to carry to a practical conclusion that one project which he set so much store by. No, Sir, before he saw Mr. Chamberlain, before the Premiers met in conference, in the face of the invitation of the Duke of Devonshire and Lord Chancellor Halsbury, immediately on landing at Liverpool, he drew on his musty store of old Cobdenism, and declared that as for preferential trade, Canada would have none of it. "Ours is a free gift," he said. "We ask no compensation. Protection has been the curse of Canada. We would not see you come under its baneful influence, for what weakens us must weaken you." Then and there he put the quietus on the movement for preferential trade with Great Britain—against his pledge given to the people of Canada; against every dictate of prudence that a statesman should have been guided by; in advance of the conference to which he and his fellow-Premiers had been invited for the discussion of that very subject, and for the devising of a plan to further this very same preferential trade. Then passed, in a moment, the labour of many years in this Dominion. Then passed, in a short moment, the labours which for the past five years have been unremitting and herculean in Great Britain towards the

Mr. FOSTER.

same end. Then passed, the opportunity which the Colonial Secretary had long waited for. No wonder, when that statement was wafted from Great Britain to the world Mr. Chamberlain said:

It would have been hard enough to carry through the idea had all the colonies been persistent and enthusiastic advocates of it, but Canada does not favour it, and New South Wales opposes it. These are the leading colonies, and with them in practical opposition, it becomes impossible, and I would not now touch it with a pair of tongs.

No wonder Lord Rosebery said that:

Mr. Chamberlain had a proposal which had some force and gained some strength, but now, "it must be approached with the reverence due to a corpse," for Canada's Premier has said that "if the British Empire is to be maintained, it can only be on the condition of the most absolute freedom of trade."

So passed for many a year, not only the most auspicious moment for the gaining of this great boon for the colonies, for Canada, for the Empire, but passed for many a year, I fear, any successful hope of bringing British statesmen to the point of again imperilling their influence with their people to educate them towards so great and so far-reaching a project. No wonder Mr. Asquith declared afterwards that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had given a death blow to the heresy that it was wise and opportune, under any circumstances, to deviate one hair's-breadth from absolute free trade, and that it would have been a pity if he and the colonies had gone in favour of asking England to put the least preferential duties on goods from foreign countries.

So to-day the hon. gentleman occupies this unenviable position, of having made a pledge to the people of Canada of having defined the principles on which the pledge was to be carried out, of having bound himself, if a public man ever did bind himself, to have a conference with the Government of Great Britain on the matter, of having gone across the ocean to hold this conference, and then, immediately on landing, before any conference could be held, using his mighty influence—an influence which was temporary, but none the less strong at that moment—against the project he had pledged himself to foster, and which was dear to the hearts of everybody here and becoming dear to the hearts of many of the citizens of the British Isles. Why did my hon. friend do that? Was it through devotion to the interests of Canada? No, Sir; it was due to his devotion to the principles of free trade as laid down by Cobden. In an interview at Birmingham, and on the occasion when he accepted the Cobden medal, he made it plain that the reason why he was against preferential trade was that it involved two things. One was—and that was the chief objection—that it would make England forego free trade and cause her to err into the paths of protection to the extent

of putting on a preferential duty on foreign products. Is it any wonder that an influential trade journal should have said :

From the day he landed in England until the day he left he seems to have been oblivious to the fact that in his mission he was the representative of all Canada. He seems rather to have imagined that he was sent there for his own self-glorification and in the interest of his party. * * * When he arrived in England he found a large and influential section of the politicians and press full of enthusiasm over the preferential policy of Canada and energetically discussing the corresponding duty of finding some equivalent advantage which Great Britain might confer on Canada, even by so doing it might be necessary to modify the free trade policy of the past fifty years. The complacent Sir Wilfrid, following up his usual policy of conciliation, which means abandonment of claims, relieved the merchants, manufacturers and politicians and the press from all necessity of further discussion by informing them that they were troubling themselves without cause, because Canada neither wished for nor would accept any favours. It is little wonder that he achieved much popularity through such a surrender of Canada's claims.

And again :

We have frequently directed attention to the fact that every trade journal in England entertains the opinion that preferential tariffs on the part of the colonies involve an equivalent preference on the part of Great Britain. During the grand Jubilee celebrations in England it may have been all right and proper that the accomplished and eloquent Premier of Canada should dilate on the loyalty of Canadians, their affection for Her Majesty and their attachment to British institutions. It may have been quite fair that Sir Wilfrid Laurier should claim credit for the fact that Canada granted preferential tariff treatment to England without any stipulation for an equivalent, but it was an act of supreme folly for him to tell the British Government and people that Canada neither hoped nor desired any preference for its products in the markets of the mother country.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER. I was going on to prove the motive which the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had in opposing preferential trade, and any possible offer of preferential trade in Great Britain. I had set it down to the theory, which he himself had expressed not only at Liverpool but at other places, that he was opposed to preferential trade with Great Britain because it involved the placing of preferential duties, and, to that extent, protective duties, by Great Britain upon the goods imported from foreign countries, and that he believed to be inimical to and a violation of free trade doctrines and principles, and that this violation would result to the injury, primarily of Great Britain, secondarily of the colonies. Now I find that the right hon. gentleman

was interviewed by the London "Chronicle," and the interview was published on the 15th June, which was before the conference with Mr. Chamberlain, if I remember rightly, and before the denunciation of the treaties. Amongst other questions put to him by the interviewer was this :

"We have heard of schemes of preferential duties based upon English duties against the foreigners, and we have heard, too, of ideas of Zollverein."

"Zollverein ?—"

—said the right hon. gentleman—

"Well, as I understand it, a Zollverein means, in the very nature of things, protection—a tax upon imports of some kind, and at this moment I would not be prepared to fall in with such a proposal."

Again he said :

"We are quite content with British rule now, and our latest revision of the tariff shows it. No, no, a Zollverein must mean protection, and protection is the greatest of all mistakes. Yes, I am quite convinced of that—quite convinced—protection is the greatest of all mistakes."

"But—"

said the interviewer—

"—the colonies are young, Mr. Laurier," I said jestingly, "and what are weakly infant industries to do without a wall to shelter them from the cold blasts of competition?"

"Oh, yes," said Mr. Laurier with fine scorn, as if meeting an old and very fraudulent friend, "yes, yes, infant industries? Protection is the greatest mistake even for them."

* * * * *

"But the idea of a Zollvereinist," I said to Mr. Laurier, "is, of course that England should lead the way. You would not say 'No' if England proposed to tax wheat and meat from the United States, and Russia, and the Argentine while admitting free of duty your Manitoba No. 1 hard wheat, your Alberta ranch beef, and your rosy apples from Annapolis Valley?"

To which Mr. Laurier replied :

"Well, no, perhaps not. If England were willing to give us a preference over other nations, taking our goods on exceptionally favourable terms, I would not object. It would not be for Canada to shut herself out from the advantage. It would be a great boon for the time. But how long would it last? Would it be an advantage in the long run? That is what men who think beyond the passing moment have to ask themselves. Suppose England did such a thing, and abandoned her free trade record. She would inevitably curtail the purchasing power of her people, and do you not think we should suffer from that, we who alone have natural resources enough to feed you millions from our fertile lands? I have too great belief in English common sense to think they will do any such thing. What we have done in the way of tariff preference to England, we have, as I said, done out of gratitude to England, and not because we want her to enter upon the path of protection. We know that the English people will not interfere with the policy of free trade, and we do not desire them to do so. We know that buying more goods from England she will buy more from us, and so develop trade, and the moment trade is developed Canada is benefited."

"Then, Mr. Laurier, you stand for a free trading British Empire, and have shown by your tariff proposal how it may be brought about?"

And the answer comes :

"At one time I might have thought something of a Zollverein, but when I reflect, it is not good policy, and England will not adopt it."

The same principle comes up both in the address on the presentation of the Cobden medal and in the reply by the right hon. gentleman when he accepted it. The keynote of the condition upon which the Cobden medal was presented to the right hon. gentleman was that he was believed to be a representative of that unflinching Cobdenism which in England is totally and generically opposed to anything like the imposition of discriminating or preferential duties because they savour of protection, and which, while it welcomes as much trade as possible with the colonies will not care for that trade and does not want it, if it has to take it on the condition of imposing even the lightest duties upon foreign goods, as that would admit the principle of protection. The acceptor of the Cobden medal in his answer repeated almost the very words and duplicated exactly the meaning of Lord Farrer who presented the Cobden medal to him, and therefore sealed the terms which I have stated, that he himself was so much of a free trader that he could subscribe to the Cobden idea, and take the Cobden medal, because he believed that it would not be for the benefit of England first, or for Canada afterwards, that the slightest deviation should be made in England from the absolute free trade ideas.

Now, while I have no quarrel with the hon. gentleman because he holds these ideas privately and as strongly as he may, I do say that he had no mandate from the Dominion of Canada or from the people of Canada to present these private and strongly-held ideas of his, however right they may have been, as the views and the wishes of Canada in this matter, because they most certainly were not. Now, Sir, what is the excuse the right hon. gentleman has given for his action, for taking the first opportunity at the Liverpool meeting, to wholly deny and negative any idea of preferential trade? What is his excuse for not having waited for the conference? What is his excuse for not having carried out the pledge that he gave in Toronto, in London and Montreal? The excuse is given first in his absence by the Toronto "Globe," and afterwards by himself when he returned to this country. And what said the Toronto "Globe?" at a very critical point in the Centre Toronto canvass, if I mistake not, where the question of preferential trade was being warmly discussed. Suddenly one morning the Toronto "Globe" came out with what appeared to be an official or semi-official statement of the case, which made every reader look

with both eyes and which caused very serious thought to all throughout that city. This is the "Globe's" statement :

Conservative newspapers keep up a constant fire of criticism on Sir Wilfrid Laurier because, as they allege, he refused to agree to a preferential tariff between Britain and Canada, as proposed by Mr. Chamberlain.

It is just as well that the real facts of the matter should be known. During the visit of the colonial Premiers to Great Britain, Mr. Chamberlain made the proposition that there should be absolute free trade between Britain and her colonies, on condition that Britain placed a small customs tax on commodities from foreign countries.

Now, Sir, I think I have a right to ask, and I think this House has the right to the answer. I would ask my hon. friend if that statement in the Toronto "Globe" was true, and if after he landed at Liverpool and between that and the conference, or at the conference, any such proposition was made to him categorically by Mr. Chamberlain as is stated here in the Toronto "Globe," namely, a proposition that on the condition of there being absolutely free trade between Great Britain and her colonies, Great Britain would place a preferential duty upon some of the great products of Canada? I think we have a right to that answer, and I hope my right hon. friend will give the House an answer to that question.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that the conference which took place between Mr. Chamberlain and the Colonial Premiers was confidential. A report has been made of everything that took place in those conferences, but so far no authority has been given to publish it, though it is probable that at some future date, not very remote, the conference will be given to the public. But the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that, until I have authority to publish it, I am not at liberty to say what took place there.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I take two positions: first, that if these papers are yet confidential and cannot be brought down to this House, how was it that the "Globe" newspaper, at a critical moment, made a semi-official announcement in categorical language as to the proposition that had been made and the reply of the Premier? That is one question, but there is another, Sir, which is stronger yet. If these papers are not in a position to be laid before the House, what right had my hon. friend to state to this House, last Friday night, that the only condition upon which preferential trade could be discussed was the condition that there should be absolute free trade and no customs duties between the different parts of the Empire? Is he in a position to state that authoritatively because Mr. Chamberlain made that proposition to him? He is, or he is not. If he is in a position to state it before this House,

he is in a position to lay on the Table the papers with reference to it to substantiate it; if he is not in a position to lay the papers substantiating it before the House, he is not in a position to quote information from that proposition and from those papers. Now, Sir, the right hon. gentleman can take whichever of those positions he pleases. In either case somebody has leaked, somebody has made an announcement that he had no right to make, or there is no such announcement to be made—one or the other. Now, as we can get no categorical answer, let us argue the point. In the first place, let us call the right hon. gentleman himself. The right hon. gentleman himself, in London and Toronto, declared that a condition of this preferential trade was, not that there should be absolute free trade, no customs duties amongst the different parts of the Empire, but that there should be no protective duties; that is, a revenue tariff must be the basis on which it could be framed, and that only. That is the hon. gentleman's statement in those places. The hon. gentleman's statement goes to prove that at that time, at least, there was no such proposition, and he did not understand Mr. Chamberlain's words uttered at that time as having such tendency. We go one step further. Mr. Chamberlain, in 1896, made a statement in London, at the Canada Club, or before the assembled chambers of commerce—I do not know which—it makes no difference. It is not possible, in reading what Mr. Chamberlain said, to torture his words uttered at that time into an absolute and unconditional statement of a basis upon which this must proceed, namely, that there should be no customs duties, but absolute free trade, between the different parts of the Zollverein. More than that, I read from the hon. gentleman's own speech on Friday a quotation from Mr. Chamberlain, speaking in 1896, in which that gentleman said:

But the principle which I claim must be accepted if we are to make any, even the slightest, progress, is that within the different parts of the Empire protection must disappear—

Not a revenue tariff, not a customs tariff.

—and that the duties must be revenue duties, and not protective duties in the sense of protection for the products of one part of the Empire against those of another part.

That, Sir, is the sensible view of the case, that is the view the London "Times" took, for no sooner had the "Globe's" semi-official statement been cabled to England, than the London "Times," in an editorial, stated that it could not believe it, that Mr. Chamberlain was a practical man, and it could not believe that he had ever laid down hard and fast lines of that kind. More than that, Sir. By the circular of June 28, 1897, calling the Premiers of the colonies to a conference with Mr. Chamberlain and other members of the Government during the Jubilee period, Mr. Chamberlain invites

them, not to discuss a hard and fast proposition, but to discuss the question of commercial union. They went to England, they met Mr. Chamberlain, and the latest utterance we have from Mr. Chamberlain is in the official reports of that conference, so far as it has been made public, where Mr. Chamberlain speaks to the assembled Premiers and outlines the subjects which they are to take up. After outlining certain other subjects, he takes up the one of commercial relations, and says:

I pass on, then, to another question, and that is as to the future commercial relations between this country and her colonies. How far is it possible to make the relations closer and more intimate? I have said that I believe in sentiment as the greatest of all the forces in the general government of the world, but at the same time I should like to bring to the reinforcement of sentiment the motives which are derived from material and personal interests. Undoubtedly the fiscal arrangements of the different colonies differ so much among themselves, and all differ so much from those of the mother country, that it would be a matter of the greatest complication and difficulty to arrive at any conclusion which would unite us commercially in the same sense in which the Zollverein united the Empire of Germany.

That is not the statement of a man who had reduced his ideas to a hard and fast proposition and flung it as a sine qua non amongst the Premiers of the colonies. It is the statement of a broad-minded business man, permeated by a strong purpose, and willing to give and take and confer as to how that great purpose may be brought about. He goes on:

But this is a matter upon which at the present time, rather than suggest any proposals of my own, I desire to hear the views of the gentlemen present.

Can anything be clearer than that Mr. Chamberlain was not in a position to make any hard and fast proposition to the colonial Premiers? "Meanwhile," said Mr. Chamberlain, as though unwilling to let the least possible chance for an understanding on this matter to escape him:

Meanwhile, however, I note a resolution which appears to have been passed unanimously at the meeting of the Premiers in Hobart, in which the desire was expressed for closer commercial arrangements with the Empire, and I think it was suggested that a commission of inquiry should be created in order to see in what way practical effect might be given to that aspiration.

Gentlemen, said the right hon. Secretary of the Colonies, I have no hard and fast proposition. This subject is surrounded with difficulties, and I do not want to present such a one to you. I ask you to think it over and confer with me here and now. But if you think it is best to take more time to consider it, follow out the suggestion, if you will, of the Hobart Conference, and have a commission, and I will appoint some one to act with you on that commission; and in that way take time, which is a fac-

tor in these things, and we will probably get to some conclusion that can be practically worked out. He goes on :

If it were the wish of the other colonies to join in such inquiry, Her Majesty's Government would be delighted to make arrangements for the purpose, and to accept any suggestions as to the form of the reference, and the character and constitution of the Commission, and would very gladly take part in it.

That is the latest from the right hon. Secretary of the Colonies ; that is his statement when the assembled Premiers of the colonies were before him in that conference : that was the statement he made after the ruthless tongue of the right hon. gentleman, at the first available opportunity, in Liverpool, declared that Canada would have nothing to do with preferential trade, that she wanted Great Britain to pursue the path of old Cobdenism, and not to be led away by any impractical suggestions that might arise from a century and a time far different from those in which Cobden lived.

Sir, I say this, that the Toronto "Globe," in my opinion, never placed that semi-official announcement there without some authority—and it could only come by leakage—if it came straight and embodied the truth of the conference of Premiers in England. I say, that the Premier on Friday last laid down an absolute condition which he could only have laid down on the ground that that had been stated to him in England and by the authority of the British Government, and if he was not prepared to lay the papers of that conference on the Table of the House, I submit he had no right to draw a conclusion from the papers on the assumption that such a proposition was made, especially when all the probabilities of the case go most strongly against the assertion that Mr. Chamberlain ever made such a proposition. It would not have been business-like, and Mr. Chamberlain's conduct in regard to this question from the first has been eminently broad-minded and business-like. The hon. gentleman said :

I did not go about advocating the cause of preferential trade.

We have seen he did not. No, he went about denouncing it, he went about declaring that Canada would have none of it. That is the way he fulfilled his London, Toronto and Montreal pledges, and that is the way he misrepresented the sentiment of Canada in its business point of view. Like Cato, he cried from morning till night, "Delenda est Carthago," and went about Great Britain chaunting the chant of death instead of the note of life, a new-born life which was just appearing above the horizon, and which promised such great strength, development and permanence for the British Empire throughout the world.

If preferential trade—

Mr. FOSTER.

he says,

—is not a vain and idle dream.

Mind you, the right hon. gentleman almost asserts it is a vain and idle dream—he gives it conditionally—if it is not, he says, the first step was taken when I was in England, namely, on August 1st. Whilst those treaties existed no idea of preferential trade could be entertained, said the right hon. gentleman. He has confounded results with causes which bring about results. He has not distinguished between an idea and the realization of the idea. He thinks that the realization, so far as the denunciation of the treaties is concerned, having taken place when he was in England, that was the first step, when in reality, if not the last, it was very nearly the last step. The idea produces the realization in every great reform and change that takes place in the world. The idea is to be sown, nurtured, cultivated and spread until it gathers force beneath its covering so as to break down intervening barriers and come to its full realization. Yet the hon. gentleman, filled with his own importance, declared that not a step was taken towards this realization till he was in England. The despatches which have passed between this and other colonial governments from 1880 until the present time, the conference of 1894, when representatives of all the British colonies met in this city and passed a resolution in favour of preferential trade, count for nothing, the influence is nil. The resolution of this House of Commons praying for this same arrangement by petition and a resolution affirming the willingness of this House to grant preferential treatment to Great Britain, count for nothing as moulders of opinion and as contributing to a final result. The work of Englishmen, hundreds of thousands of them, good men and true, who for the last ten years have been working for free trade as against the bare tenets and bald results of free trade, those men and their labours count for nothing : the first step was taken when the right hon. gentleman was in England. For years we laboured in vain, all barren of results. The Gordian knot was there and not untied until Alexander of Macedon came and ripped it up with his little sword. I congratulate Alexander of Macedon ! But I will take the liberty of saying to the right hon. gentleman that the Gordian knot or a sphinx-like puzzle is scarcely to be compared in its solution, which must be instantaneous, if at all, to a great forward movement amongst a great Saxon people, which has for years made for breaking down long-established barriers and the opening up of a new commercial era which will add to the life-blood, strength and prosperity of the British Empire.

A better way, I think, I could have counselled, and it would have been this : That the right hon. gentleman should have decided first plainly and clearly what to do, to

give preferential trade to Great Britain, and put it in the tariff just that way, and no other way, so that it would come into effect when Great Britain removed the treaties which prevented it from taking effect. Then we would have violated no treaties, we would have traversed no decisions. Then we would not have brought ourselves into humiliation and disgrace on every point taken by the Government, and the trade of Canada would not have been thrown into confusion, and we would not have had to eat the leek; and, in my view, it would have been infinitely more effective in Great Britain, for the people would have seen in the Canadian tariff an exclusive preference for British trade the moment they chose to allow it to go into operation by denouncing the German and Belgian treaties. That course would have obviated every difficulty; it would have appealed to the British mind infinitely more than the course which was adopted, and with that provision on our Statute-books, I doubt whether the right hon. gentleman would have dared to go over to the United Kingdom and raised his voice against preferential trade. It is a pity for Canada that this provision should not have been embodied somewhere, so that it would have controlled the right hon. gentleman.

To sum up. The right hon. gentleman is opposed to preferential trade because it involves protective preferential duties by England. This, he considers, would be a violation of free trade principles; this would be hurtful, primarily to Great Britain, and secondly to the colonies; therefore, he is opposed to preferential trade now, and, as preferential trade can never be brought about without a preference, which involves these very things, so his position is clear: he is opposed to preferential trade now and for ever.

I ask my hon. friend the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), whether or not he declared in Toronto, that he was an ardent preferential trader, that he believed in it, and whether or not he canvassed votes on that statement? In his heart I believe he is, as the most of Toronto's business men are, preferential traders to a degree. He (Mr. Bertram) has heard the statement of his right hon. friend whom he follows. I ask him to settle in his own mind as to whether such a leader will lead him—a follower burning for preferential trade, and a leader burning with such an ardent desire to preserve the musty cobwebs of Cobdenism, that he is now and will be henceforth and for ever, opposed to preferential trade because it involves protective preferential duties being put on by Great Britain. A man cannot serve two masters and be honest with himself. If my hon. friend (Mr. Bertram) is a preferential trader from conviction, he must drive preferential trade into his leader, or, he cannot follow a leader who leads him into the depths of the Serbonian bog, rather

than into the light and freedom of commercial intercourse between the different parts of the British Empire.

I come now to mention another point in the Speech, in which it deals with the Yukon Railway project. We have not before us information as full as we should have had; that is locked up where so much other information is; in the breasts or in the pigeon-holes of the cabinet of this country. But we have certain information given to the Toronto "Globe," expanded a little by the mover of the Address (Mr. Bertram) and commented on very briefly by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. The remarks I made this afternoon show my attitude with reference to this question from the *prima facie* point of view. This Government from the very start has shown a disposition to nullify the importance and the powers of Parliament. It did it in a high-handed way, when, after having voted down all the appropriations for the succeeding fiscal year, not only in detail, but a proposition to give a credit vote for two months; it then, when the elections were over and it was brought into power, by Governor General's warrants—a thing opposed to the spirit of the constitution, and to the actual legal enactment upon the Statute-books—this Government expended, or took power to expend nearly two millions of dollars. The Government made the next plunge on a railway deal, in which, without a resolution or authorization of this Parliament or a vote therefor—they having consequently as little power to undertake the arrangement as they would to drain the Red Sea—they undertook at a political crisis to administer a railroad not owned by the Government, and wrongfully involved this country into \$12,000 of expenses, and they had to come down and get themselves indemnified by having that sum voted by Parliament. Last year under the plea of urgency, a plea which has been utterly swept away by succeeding events—because the urgency of last year has prolonged itself into a year's time and the roads are not taken over, and the Minister of Railways is not in a position to operate them—but under a plea of urgency, on a matter which had never been discussed in this House, and for which there was no consent or resolution of the House, they bound themselves by a hard and fast contract to an expenditure which involved the setting aside of a capital of \$7,000,000 with which to meet that yearly expenditure. And, Sir, they dragooned their followers into voting that in this House, they dragooned the House into voting it too, and by what means? By means the most disreputable, Sir, that were ever employed by a Government in this country. An agreement which was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne is concluded, no papers laid on the Table of the House, a contract kept in the pocket of the Minister of Railways for nearly two months, and then at

last thrown on the Table of the House, without a report which is worth the paper it is written on, and kept to within ten days of the prorogation of the House when not more than one-third of the members of Parliament were in their places. That is the work of this Government with reference to great railway deals involving the expenditure of vast sums of money. A plea of urgency, a plea of the public weal! Here, Sir, we have it again. A scheme in which secrecy is the prominent factor, in which suddenness is joined with secrecy. In the face of Parliament assembling within ten days, a rush and a route is made to carry the thing through; and worse than all, there is granted a monopoly with two clauses, which clauses of monopoly are in my mind reprehensible from beginning to end. What I consider the strongest *prima facie* case against the Bill is: That a railway 150 miles in length, a bridge standing between two great routes of travel and over which tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of travellers must go and come, is placed under the watch and ward of two gentlemen with a monopoly for ten and five years, and with a subsidy more to be considered and of graver moment than a money subsidy taken from the coffers of this country—a subsidy which consists of the pick of three and three-quarter millions of acres of placer and lode mining country, in that which is supposed to be the richest of all gold countries.

This is the *prima facie* case. There must be something very strong that has not yet been given to this House, which can overthrow that *prima facie* case. As it looks now, it is by all odds the most daring, the worst, and the fullest of possibilities for widespread corruption, of any scheme that has ever been placed before this or any other House of Commons. And as we look upon it now, I am bound, as a member of this House who is jealous that Parliament shall not be robbed of the privileges which it cost so much to gain, who does not wish to be a mere registering machine for the secret compacts of the Government, who does not wish to put into the hands of two men, however reputable they may be—and I am saying nothing against these two enterprising contractors—the strongly auriferous deposits of the richest gold country in the world—so supposed to be; and that supposition is acted upon in this very transaction by the Government itself. Now, Sir, if the Government, when they lay these papers on the Table of the House, have got dynamite under them, or can show that there is some overwhelming state reason why this should be done, it may change my opinion; but I am bound to state that *prima facie* the case is a bad one, and until that bad flavour is taken away, I for my part propose to oppose the scheme.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is its justification.

Mr. FOSTER. It is well when a man believes himself buoyed up on a sufficient reason.

Now, Sir, the right hon. gentleman says:

Canada is prosperous as never before. Since this Government came in Canada has gone ahead by leaps and bounds. More progress has been made in eighteen months than in any other previous period of her history.

This is only a boast, however. There was not a figure given to sustain the statement. I shall be glad as one citizen of Canada, if that statement can be borne out by the facts. I like to see this country prospering; I would like to see her progress in every succeeding year greater than that of the year before. But let me ask my hon. friend again, as I did earlier in my address, if Canada is prospering, why is it? Canada is prospering because of the impetus given to her prosperity by the rich mining development of the country, which began in 1890, in the celebrated Slo-can district in British Columbia, and which, by prospecting, by patient endeavour and by the reaching out after indications and the explorations following thereupon, with the employment of courageous labour and capital, has been expanded in its area, until to-day in British Columbia proper, we suppose, with reason, that we have one of the greatest mineral regions in the world. The same thing applies to portions of Ontario—and I am speaking now simply of the new developments, not of the old; and to this we now add later development of the great country to the north, including the so-called Yukon district, and the district lying to the south of it, between that district and British Columbia proper. This mining development has added a life and energy and impetus to the prospective prosperity of Canada which is having an undoubtedly exalting and uplifting effect on the business interests of the whole country. But have the hon. gentlemen in their eighteen months of power brought all this about? The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was good enough to say, either in Nicolet or in Lévis, that gold, too, had been discovered since this party came into power; and I have no doubt that his audience, looking up into his honest face, paid the greatest deference to that statement, and wondered what a demi-god indeed they were privileged to have as a member of the Government, who, with a power greater than that of the genii of old, when once he came into a position of trust and emolument, passed his wand lightly over the stretches of British Columbia, up the regions of the Seine and Rainy River, and even to the far-away snows and mountains of the Yukon, and conjured to the surface the glittering and shining gold.

For the sake of the mining interest they took power to have all the smelting for British Columbia done within British Columbia—took it with a flourish of trumpets. The power remains there, but the hon. gentlemen have not exercised it. Since they took that power, a mine operated in Rossland has erected its smelter in Northport, south of the line, right in the face of the power these gentlemen took, and they have not stirred. They have done nothing for the mining interest, and yet the development of the mining interest is to-day the chief factor in the swelling prosperity of Canada.

The Yukon regulations are such that anybody who runs may read them. Three times, at least, they have been changed, each time having been arranged evidently without consultation or proper knowledge; and they have had to be ripped in pieces and re-arranged when proper knowledge and representation were brought to bear upon them; and to-day they are in a position which is unsatisfactory in a very large degree to the mining community from one end of this country to the other.

What have they done with regard to the increase of trade? They have added no vessel to the carrying fleet on the Pacific. They found it there when they came into power, the work of their predecessors. They have added none to the West India route; they found a good line of steamers there when they came in. They have added nothing to the Atlantic service; but they have done this. They found a contract for a first-class service on the Atlantic which, had it been carried out, would have given a first-class service within two years. They tore it up. They gave into the hands of one of their practical men the authority to get a new contract. Two years afterwards there is no more certainty of its being got through their own brokers, than there was at the time they tore up the Allan contract and essayed a new attempt. So, Sir, you may go through the whole piece. When you ask yourselves what they have done, the answer comes back again: whatever good they have done, they have done because in trade and fiscal matters they did not carry out their pledges; whatever harm they have done, they have done because they did carry out their pledges. They have been wise enough to carry out and extend those measures with regard to agricultural products, immigration and the canal system which were parts of the settled policy of the late Government, which were instituted in most cases and carried on by them. But, Sir, I think the sublimity of nonsensical oratory was reached by my right hon. friend, when, raising himself to his full height, he declared that the historian of the future would jump from 1867 to 1897. What historian? The true Grit historian who wants to shut his eyes to every good in his opponents and

every fault in his friends. Yes, he would like to skip the period between 1867 and 1897. He would like to skip the disastrous record of a Grit Government from 1874 to 1878. He would like to skip, for the credit of his party, the record of an Opposition, which for seventeen years fought every progressive measure, beginning with the National Policy, ending by getting into power on their opposition to these measures, and after they got into power, turning round and embracing every measure which they had cursed for seventeen long years. The Grit historian would like to skip that period, but for any man of light and leading to stand before a House like this and a country like Canada and declare, in his elation and self-gratulation, that because he was now Premier, in 1897, the future historian of this country would skip the period from 1867 to 1897, is to present a spectacle of self-complacency and personal vanity unique indeed. The historian, he coolly tells us, would skip all that splendid development of prosperity, nationality and industry, which has had no parallel in any country; he would skip the additions of territory—Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, the North-west Territories, none of them would be worth mentioning—and yet the possession of this united territory is our warrant for our credit as it stands and our prospects for the future. He would skip the building of those splendid arteries of commerce—the Intercolonial Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the canal system of this country, including the "Soo" Canal. No historian, the right hon. gentleman calmly assures us, will consider those worthy of a paragraph. In his anxiety to reach the period when the right hon. gentleman became Premier, he will be silent as to all these. The rise and progress of the varied industrial life, which has lifted this country from the plane of a pastoral, and fishing, and lumbering community to that of a great country able and sufficient to carry out the improvement of its natural sources, and to lay tribute upon every great country that supplies raw material, by bringing that raw material to its own shores and with its own brains and its own muscle, making it up in Canadian factories and Canadian workshops. All that would be skipped. Those splendid ocean routes which to-day carry commerce between us and the east—a rapidly increasing commerce—and carry our commerce to various other ports of the world—no mention of these by the historian in his eagerness to reach the period when the right hon. gentleman became Premier. All this splendid history of the welding together of scattered provinces into a premier confederate colony—all this, in the hon. gentleman's mind amounts to nothing. The historian would have but one object in his eye—the Laurierian period, commencing in 1897. Sir, I think that the historian of the future, as the historians of

the past, some of whom are still with us, will never skip that splendid period in the history of this country in which the energized soul and life of this confederation showed itself in every movement, every purpose and every project. The man who misses that, misses the gist and quality of early Canadian history, and he would be condemned to eat the husks for the remainder of his life if he made so grave a mistake. Sir, biblical history tells us of a celebrated character named Nebuchadnezzar who, residing amidst the luxuries of great Babylon, came, at a certain time, to think he had made it all, and lifted up his voice and said: Is not this great Babylon which I have builded. He suffered from something which has a long Greek name, and for that he was obliged to go out and eat grass for seven years with the beasts of the field. I present this terrible example to my right hon. friend and warn him lest a similar fate should befall him.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). No doubt, Mr. Speaker, the debate up to the present has been one of a rather unusually instructive and interesting character, and I am free to say that all the various gentlemen who have contributed to it, from the mover and the seconder down to the gentleman who has just taken his seat, have distinguished themselves in their respective ways. I am free also, Sir, to confess that I am lost in admiration. I do not know which deserves the greatest credit—the tactical skill of the leaders of the Opposition or the sense of party loyalty and party discipline evinced by their supporters. Some of us perhaps were a little disposed to think that the hon. baronet, who leads the Opposition, was just a trifle verbose in his opening, but I am sure that I speak the unanimous sense of this side of the House when I tell him that we would have listened to him twice as long for the sake of his peroration and the incidents which followed.

Sir, the spectacle we had the pleasure of beholding on Friday night was one which, in a pretty long parliamentary experience I think, I may say, was equalled by few and surpassed by none, save on the one memorable occasion, about two years ago, when seven Ministers of the Crown saw fit to withdraw their advice from His Excellency in the interval between the presentation of the Address and the consideration thereof. Now, I am not able to speak with authority of the ceremonial which may attend the opening of the Conservative caucus, but I would just venture to suggest to the chairman of that institution, whoever he may happen to be, that if it conforms to the ritual which prevails on such occasions, I do not think he could do better than open the proceedings by a reference to that famous passage in Dr. Watts which, I dare say, hon. gentlemen opposite will remember, and which runs thus:

Mr. FOSTER.

Birds in their little nest agree,
But 'tis a shameful sight,
When children of one family
Fall out and scratch and bite.

Now, while my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Foster) has, as is customary with him, given us a display marked with great rhetorical skill, we cannot but feel that he is rather thrown away upon this generation.

Mr. FOSTER. A stiff-necked and rebellious generation.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. So you find it. I remember long ago, an editor (a naughty Reform editor it was this time) suggested that if the hon. baronet who leads the Opposition had lived nineteen centuries ago and practised the healing art in the city of Jerusalem, it was almost certain that Sapphira would have preferred him to Ananias every time. Similarly I may observe that I think my hon. friend opposite, the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has come into this world about two thousand years too late. I do not think it would have been possible now, or even at that early date, to have constructed a philosopher out of him, even of the cynic kind, although he has some affinities thereto, but I am bound to say that, in my poor judgment, a most magnificent sophist has been lost in him.

Mr. FOSTER. The old sophist was a very fine gentleman.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Well, he was; and I am free to say, that the hon. gentleman, as a juggler with facts, as a deviser of innuendoes, as a twister and perverter of plain and obvious truths from their plain and obvious significance, might match any sophist of them all. He is facile princeps there.

But nevertheless, the hon. gentleman has still his moments of weakness. It was quite right of him to deny the soft impeachment levelled at him by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), when he was charged with having produced that somewhat spicy article signed "Onlooker," in a journal of this city. But it was not discreet of him to reproach my hon. friend from East York with breach of journalistic confidence. I fear he gave himself away. Perhaps he will pardon me for making a suggestion. Of course, it is not for us to pry into the domestic secrets of the hon. gentlemen, but it is rumoured that the hon. gentleman opposite, and some parties with him, are rather disposed to dethrone the honourable baronet from his place of pride in favour of the hon. gentleman beside him. Permit me to say that I think that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) might find that a very barren victory. He may find that the old lion is capable of being dangerous still. And, as Lord Byron remarked of

one of his favourite heroes, with a slight amendment :

Though old he was a Tartar,
And not at all disposed to prove a martyr.

Furthermore, Sir, you and I know that in all well-regulated families of any standing, whether they be private or political, there are reasons for not hastily deposing persons of experience like the hon. baronet. In all these families there are cupboards, and in all these cupboards there are skeletons. Now, Sir, let us suppose for one moment that the hon. baronet should take to telling the House and the country all he knows of his hon. colleagues. And just fancy—suppose his colleagues were to take to telling the House and the country all they know of the hon. baronet. As to the hon. leader of the Opposition, I trust he will not misunderstand me, that he will not think I am aiming to proselytize him when I say that, in my opinion, from the time that he returned to Canada to this moment, he has shown most unmistakable clear grit. Nevertheless, his valour ought to be tempered with a little more discretion. I would suggest to him that there is no use of running amuck against exalted personages, as he did the other night. I am not prepared to say that he is not justified by tradition and precedent. As well as I can recollect, it has been the old and time-honoured Conservative belief that you may always rotten-egg a Governor General if he does not happen to agree with you. Some members of the party have even emphasized this view by burning Parliament buildings and by publishing annexation manifestoes in order to express their extreme distaste at the conduct of the representative of Her Majesty. At the same time, I can believe that the hon. gentleman is not quite so rancorous as he appears. If I am not altogether mistaken in recalling a certain interesting occasion, not so very long ago, in this city, among the many costly tributes which were tendered to the hon. gentleman, not the least costly, not the least elegant, was one presented by the exalted personage referred to. Therefore, I infer that the hon. gentleman is not so implacable as he seems. He may have thought it well to imitate the children of Isreal, who revenged themselves on their enemies by accepting from them jewels of silver and jewels of gold before they went out into the wilderness to look for more.

Now, I desire to state—and I am sure that I speak the opinion of hon. gentlemen beside me—we do not for one moment deprecate any fair or proper criticism of our proceedings; that is the business of the Opposition. We did it according to the best of our abilities when we sat on that side of the House, and we certainly cannot object if they do the same. But criticism, in order to be effective, must have some sound foundation. I notice the criticism made

by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), and concurred in by the leader of the Opposition, a criticism of a very remarkable kind, to which I wish to call the special attention of their friends and ours. Sir, these hon. gentlemen declare that they have proof positive in the public returns of the utter failure of our policy to encourage trade with England. And what does the House suppose is the proof they give? Sir, it was said by the hon. baronet, and endorsed by his friend beside him, that the proof of the utter failure of our policy is to be found in the fact that in the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1897, the imports from England amounted to \$29,412,000, being a reduction of \$3,000,000 odd, and that hence our policy had failed. Well, Sir, surely these hon. gentlemen do not wish to conceal from the House that our policy came into effect only at the end of the tenth month of the year—on the 23rd of April, 1897, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) brought down his Budget. Up to that time the whole of the trade was carried on under the tariff framed by these hon. gentlemen. Now, no human being supposed or expected for one moment that within two months we could change the operations of eighteen years. Sir, I take these figures, and from these identical figures I deduce the strongest possible condemnation of the policy of these hon. gentlemen. In the twenty-five years from 1873 to 1897, our imports from Great Britain fell from \$68,000,000 to \$29,412,000. Sir, that was the result of their policy. That loss that the hon. gentleman speaks of, including that deficit of \$3,000,000 odd, is due directly, clearly and unmistakably to the policy of these hon. gentlemen themselves. This was five-sixths more their year than it was ours, even allowing—which I cannot for a moment allow—that we should have been able within two months to materially affect the ordinary course of trade. So it is plain and clear to a demonstration—the logic is inevitable, as the hon. gentleman said—that the exact result of their policy was to double our trade with the United States, as far as imports were concerned, and to reduce more than one-half the trade from England. Now, Sir, I will tell hon. gentlemen opposite, that if they want to criticise our policy, they must wait a little. In the first place, the effect of our tariff does not fairly begin until the first of August next, when the 25 per cent reduction takes effect. If on the first of July next the tariff returns show the same results relatively that they do to-day, still more, if on the first of August, 1899, the tariff returns show that our trade with England has diminished and trade with the United States has increased, then we may say, and say with some truth, that our well-intentioned and liberal exertions to aid English trade have not had the success we expected.

But to say on the evidence adduced by those hon. gentlemen, on the evidence of our

returns down to July, 1897, which embrace but two months of the whole year, that there is the smallest justification for the assertions they have made, that our policy has failed, is to trifle with the intelligence of this House and with the intelligence of their supporters in the country and elsewhere. Now, I do not feel particularly called upon to rise to the high moral altitude which mark the opening of the hon. gentleman's speech. All I can say is that I hope that in the future his practice will correspond to it, for up to the present time we have had, I am sorry to note, a marked divergence between his moral platitudes and his practical performances. But when he talks of our crude tactics and strategy, and more particularly when he wants to know whether we are satisfied with our leader, Sir, I think it is time to ask him whether he is satisfied with his. He is good enough to call attention to the quotations of the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1898, and to remark that those are tolerably clear evidence and go to prove the high status of Canadian securities. Perhaps he would tell us what Canadian Pacific securities ranged at in 1896 when he left office. As to the moral quotations which go to show the difference between the position of Canada then and the position of Canada now, Sir, I do not want to recall those painful pages in our history; but let those men who desire to do so, mark the difference between the Canada of to-day and the Canada of 1891. Let them turn to the pages of the English journals which rang from one end of the United Kingdom to the other with the painful record of the corruption and the political debauchery, which was exposed in the committee rooms of this House in 1891, and let them compare those with the innumerable compliments justly and deservedly paid to Canada and to the representative of Canada during the course of the year which has just passed.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman was pleased to enlarge at great length upon the humiliation, upon the disgrace, which marks the position of Canada because, forsooth, the English law officers choose to disallow our contention as to the actual effect of a certain clause in our tariff. Of course I am not going to rely on my own judgment in a matter of this kind, but I have to tell the hon. gentleman this, that there are two wholly different contentions as to the effect of a reciprocity treaty, and consequently as to the effect of such clauses as we introduced. He knows right well that there is one school of jurisconsults, and a very good school, too, who hold with us, and there is another who hold with the English law officers of the Crown; but it is not worth our while to discuss now which of those may or may not be correct. This I have to tell him: The greater the difficulties that stood in our way, the greater the legal and technical obstacles that stood in our way, the greater the opposition to the carrying out of our po-

Sr RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

licy and the denouncing these treaties, the greater the credit that is due to this Government, and due especially to my hon. friend beside me, for conquering those difficulties, for obtaining the object we desired, and for reversing the policy injudiciously and indiscreetly entered into by former English Governments, and for obtaining for Canada the proud distinction of having been the first colony to emancipate herself and to emancipate her sister colonies from restraints which should have never been laid upon them, by the confession of the Premier of England himself. I say that was as great a political and diplomatic triumph as could well be conceived, and I repeat that the greater the obstacles, the greater the credit of the achievement.

Now, I return for one moment to the criticism on the result of our preferential tariff. Sir, the House will remember that that hon. gentleman put it in somewhat this fashion. He declared, as I took down his words, that we were giving privileges to nine-tenths of the foreign countries that traded with us, and denying them to nine-tenths of our own sister colonies. Who that heard those words and was not familiarly acquainted with the details of our trade and navigation, but would believe that we had entirely failed in our attempt to exclude foreign countries from the benefits. What is the fact? Why, Sir, that of the total volume of imports into Canada in the last year, six-tenths nearly came from the United States which are all excluded from the benefit of it, and three-tenths or thereabouts came from Great Britain, which are admitted. What does the remainder amount to? Why, Sir, deduct Germany, deduct Belgium, and deduct France, all of which were specially entitled under special treaties, one of which we ourselves had concurred in, and there hardly remains half a dozen millions, and those half a dozen millions are chiefly composed of such articles as tea and sugar, as to which the clause in our tariff did not apply at all.

Now, I turn to another matter on which the hon. gentleman bestowed considerable attention, and which it is certainly desirable we should bestow some attention, although I am bound to say that I fail to note any particular concurrence between the views advocated by himself and those of the hon. gentleman whom I suppose he still continues to call his leader, as to the question of our contract for opening up the Yukon and the Klondike. He is perfectly well aware, and I am perfectly well aware, that it is entirely out of the question to discuss with any profit the details of this measure until it is brought before the House in the shape of a Bill, and until the contract is laid on the Table. But there are certain, broad clear and distinct matters of fact as to which the House are at present in a position to form a fair opinion. Now, Sir, I am

perfectly ready to admit, if it gives any satisfaction to the hon. gentleman, that I would have greatly preferred, as my colleagues would have greatly preferred, to have been able to deal with this question in the ordinary way and by the ordinary methods; we would have been very glad indeed to have been able to have a proper survey made of this route, and we would have all been delighted to have asked for tenders at public competition. But, Sir, we did not do so, and I think we will be able to show the House that if we had done so, we would have utterly failed, on technical grounds, in doing our duty to the people of this country, we would have exposed the interests of Canada to very great peril, and that under the circumstances which exist there was no option whatever for us to act otherwise than we did act. I do not in the slightest degree deprecate the hon. gentleman's criticism, or the criticism of any other hon. gentleman as to the line which we saw fit to adopt; but I do desire to place more particularly before our own friends and before the country at large, briefly the reasons which led us to adopt this extraordinary and unusual course. Now, Sir, I think there is no man who has paid the slightest attention to the affairs of the Yukon, but realizes that there is need of very great speed in opening up that country if we are to avert a grave disaster in the event of any large number of people finding their way into that country with the present communications remaining as they are. I think, in the next place, that every man, in spite of the rhetorical declamation of my hon. friend, will admit that in this matter those persons who are going to expend several millions of their own money, not the money of the people of Canada, mind you, for the purpose of carrying out this enterprise, are taking tremendous risks. There is no use in gainsaying the fact that this matter in its present shape is a huge gamble. Our duty, I think, required us not to risk the money of the people of Canada; our duty, I think, required us to take measures to secure that if this did turn out, as we hope it may turn out to be a very rich country indeed, the people of Canada should have their share of the profit while they escaped taking any risks. I should like to know, given those conditions, what plan, scheme or device hon. gentlemen opposite have to propose. What better scheme could they devise? It is idle to say we should have waited till the House met, then have called for tenders, then have entered into the long and tedious negotiations which of necessity would have elapsed before we could have finally adjusted so difficult a matter to our minds. Had we done so, farewell to any hope of obtaining adequate communication with the Yukon this year. This would have been a disaster, in view of the extraordinary influx of people which we have reason to believe will flow into that country. Had

we sat still and failed to rise to the occasion, had we failed to do what I say is clearly and manifestly our duty to do, who would have been so loud in denouncing us as utterly incompetent and unfit to hold our places as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat? Sir, suppose, and it is supposable and it is an imaginable condition that after all it is said and done we find there is no such huge amount of gold as we expect in the Klondike and Yukon, and suppose we had undertaken the construction of the railway and spent millions of money in endeavouring to exploit it, and then received nothing, how this Chamber would have rung with denunciations of our folly and incapacity. I now take the other alternative, which we all hope will prove to be a fact. Let us suppose that these regions furnish the richest gold fields known in the world, that they possess huge and rich placers—what then? The people of Canada stand to receive dollar for dollar, pound for pound, in thus opening up the country. I repeat that we stand in that position without risking a cent or a copper. I do not wonder that the hon. gentleman takes exception to such a proceeding; it was not the way he and his colleagues went about such matters.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They gave both land and money.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Just one observation more. I trust, and here I appeal to the better sense and better feeling both of the right hon. gentleman and of his colleagues, that throughout this discussion we shall be wise enough and prudent enough to preserve a courteous and temperate attitude towards the United States and its proceedings. I have always felt that in dealing with our neighbours, the golden rule is: 'suaviter in modo, foriter in re.' We propose to act on that maxim. In a case like this, bluster is worse than useless. There is no doubt these boundary questions are both difficult and tedious. The Government of Canada in dealing with this matter are necessarily acting under a sense of grave responsibility. They are responsible to Canada first, they are responsible to the Empire in the second place, and I hope and trust that while we shall stand firmly together to protect the just rights of Canada, both sides of the House will agree to conduct the discussion so far as may be so far as affects the pretensions or claims of the United States in a calm and dignified manner, and assuredly this is infinitely more likely to bring about a proper solution of these difficult questions than any bombast or any declamation on our part. We will not surrender the rights of Canada; neither, on the other hand, are the Government going to be forced forward into taking injudicious action to please a small section of the population. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was good

enough to inquire why we thought the Canadian Government deserved some reasonable measure of the confidence of the people. Well, Sir, I am happy to tell the hon. gentleman that it seems to me there are good and sufficient reasons why the present Government should ask and receive the confidence of the majority of this House and the confidence of the majority of the people. The hon. gentleman could not deny, he did not dare to deny, that to-day the credit of Canada stands at the highest point which the credit of the Dominion has ever reached. The hon. gentleman could not deny, although he tried to minimize the force of my hon. friend's statement, that the trade of Canada has been extending by leaps and bounds for the last eighteen months. In olden times does not the House remember with what energy and emphasis my hon. friend and those behind him insisted on the fact that the best, the most startling and astonishing proof of the great success of the National Policy was that in one year, I believe, the exports exceeded the imports by something like \$1,000,000 or thereabouts. In our first twelve months the exports exceeded the imports by \$17,000,000; for the next six months the exports exceeded the imports by \$20,000,000. How those hon. gentlemen would have glorified themselves had they had such a record to show, and yet how easily and carelessly almost, the ex-Finance Minister passed it over to-day. Sir, it is a matter which I think warrants the Government receiving the confidence of the House and the country that, as I have said and as my right hon. friend has said, never since the day of confederation has Canada, as a country, been treated with anything like the same consideration on the part of England and other countries as Canada receives to-day; and I say with confidence that we owe that consideration to a very large extent indeed to the policy of this Government, which the hon. gentleman tells us has done nothing to secure it. It is a matter of no trifling moment, as he knows right well, that treaties with important countries like Germany were denounced because they conflicted with the policy of Canada and because the Canadian Government requested the British Government to do so. And as a trifling proof that the confidence of the people has not weakened in the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues, must I recall to the hon. gentleman's memory the long roll of Liberal victories that have marked the course of the Liberal party since it came into power? Does the hon. gentleman consider it of no consequence that whereas we met Parliament eighteen months ago with a majority of 22—I think that was what the hon. baronet claimed when members were selected for the various committees—now I think we can count 47 good men and true to support the Government. Does the hon. gentleman consider it a matter of no moment that

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Prince Edward Island has declared itself Liberal by a most decisive majority? And what does the hon. gentleman say in regard to Nova Scotia?

An hon. MEMBER. Only shreds and patches.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. And the hon. gentleman will also remember that five gentlemen were introduced by my right hon. friend and his colleagues the other day, and I think not one new member was introduced by the Opposition.

An hon. MEMBER. Beware of the Ides of March.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We will take care how to cross that river when we come to it. The plain fact is this, to my mind, that we have had almost too much good fortune. I am not desirous of seeing the Opposition weaker. I have learned the truth of the advice given by an old and eminent English statesman that the best guarantee of good government is to have on the other side of the House an active, well organized and unscrupulous Opposition. Two of those requisites are there already, and I hope hon. gentlemen may yet secure the third. I will not for one moment deny, I do not desire to deny that the task of the Government of Canada is in many respects a delicate and difficult one. We are bound on the one hand to take advantage of our opportunities and to make the most of them for the good of the country; we are bound on the other hand—and we have had our lesson during the eighteen years we spent in the wilderness—we are bound on the other hand, to avoid discounting the future as was done so freely during that period. Sir, it is a matter of common notoriety that every day, almost every hour, any quantity of projects, many of them projects of merit, are submitted for the consideration of the Government. Now, with respect to these I have to say frankly, that it is not enough to secure the co-operation and aid of the Government, that the project should be good per se. We hold that more than that must be shown. It must be absolutely necessary in the general interests, and it must be one which promises reasonably speedy results.

It is no fault of ours that we came into power to find this country saddled with a very heavy debt; it is no fault of ours that we find this country saddled with a very heavy expenditure; that we find it saddled with a very heavy taxation, although we have tried to reduce it to a reasonable extent. Nor is it any fault of ours that we have heavy direct engagements to meet, which were left behind by the hon. gentlemen opposite. Here I may take the liberty to criticise one of the illustrations given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). He was good enough to tell us that all the

gain that he could find was something like three-quarters of one per cent reduction on the tariff. Well, I think his reduction, after two years cogitation was about one-fortieth of one per cent, so that at any rate we are thirty times better than he is. Be that as it may, I want to point out to him, because I am not sure he understands it, and I want to point out to the House, that this question of taking averages is essentially a fallacious one. The effect of such a tariff as he had on the Statute-book with its heavy specific duties, with its tendency towards high protection was largely this: that a great many articles were absolutely prohibited from entering into this country at all. Now, I could draw a tariff, and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) if he applied his mind could also draw a tariff, in which there would appear to be a comparatively small sum levied, and it is a comparatively low average rate of duty, and which at the same time might exclude so many goods as to act as an extremely heavy burden on the people of this country. Where there are two tariffs, both ad valorem, there might be some reason in his comparison, but where he compares a tariff, largely specific, or specific and ad valorem, with a tariff which is chiefly ad valorem, he entirely mistakes the real trend and condition of the case when he alleges, that he can show there is only at present this apparent reduction, and he will remember that one-half of our scheme has yet to come into effect, which he does not seem to have taken at all into consideration—he will find that the reduction is probably much more considerable than he states.

Then, Sir, it is not our fault if our income is very heavily mortgaged. Those hon. gentlemen who have listened to the remarks I have made from the other side of the House in past years, will do me the justice to remember that the point I chiefly insisted upon on all occasions, in opposition to the projects of the hon. gentlemen then in power, was this: that they were mortgaging the entire income of the country. I know of no country where the available funds in proportion to the expenditure are so small, where the mortgages, so to speak, of our collective income are so large as in Canada to-day; and it is no credit to the Ministers of Finance of the period to which he alluded, that that state of things should have been permitted to exist. I have said that the immediate chances of large retrenchments are not great, and for this simple reason: that we have not got \$38,000,000 or \$39,000,000 to cut and come upon, but that we are practically cut down to a matter of \$8,000,000 or \$9,000,000, and what retrenchments can be made must be made from that comparatively limited area.

I have stated before, and I repeat it now, that the best way to improve our condition is by such measures as my hon. friend the

Postmaster General has taken, who I hope will be able to show the House when his estimates come down, that the huge deficit amounting to nearly three-quarters of a million of dollars which has so long prevailed between revenue and expenditure in the post office, is being wholly extinguished. Another mode by which I hope—although I admit there are great difficulties in the way of my hon. friend (Mr. Blair)—another mode by which I hope the public revenue can be enlarged and practically speaking the burdens of the people greatly reduced, will be, by such improved administration of our railway system, that we may obtain some moderate return on the \$55,000,000 sunk in the Intercolonial Railway. Another thing, which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) treats lightly enough, is that the success of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) on my left, has paved the way for an enormous reduction ultimately in the burdens of the people. To-day, on our sinking funds and ordinary interest we pay a matter of about \$12,000,000 a year. If the policy of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) succeeds; if we are able within a moderate space of time to get rid of the sinking funds, and to reduce the rate of interest on our debt to 2½ per cent or thereabouts, the result will be that the \$12,000,000 charges that now stand in our books will be reduced to \$7,000,000. Those are modes in which substantial and great savings can be made; those are modes to which my hon. friends in the Cabinet are applying themselves with all diligence. But, Sir, in the course of eighteen months we cannot overcome the consequences of the folly of our predecessors in power; the Augean stable takes more time to clean, and in eighteen months we could not be expected to overcome the results of accumulated errors and misconduct of eighteen years. I add this: there is every reason to believe that the policy of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), in taking advantage of these mineral discoveries, to which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) opposite rightly attributes a good measure of the prosperity we hope to enjoy, is likely to result in a very large addition to the population of our country, and in that way too, a very large and important reduction in the burdens of the people will be made. If we can bring down the gross expenditure to \$35,000,000 on a population of 7,000,000, I take it the country will be a great deal better off than with a gross expenditure of \$40,000,000 and a population of 5,000,000. These things I think are now within measurable distance.

Sir, for that end, as I have said, we must ask for time. We must ask for something more; we must ask for the same loyal and generous support from our friends that has been so freely given us in the past. We on our part are bound to try our best to deserve it, and to that end, among other things, I am authorized to say, that the

Government in the endeavour—we are aware that engagements were incurred during last session, which were calculated to strain the resources of the country to some extent—in that endeavour, we desire therefore to incur in this session as few expenditures as we possibly can, consistent with the absolute needs of the country. One thing more. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) could not conclude his speech without alluding to the “ruthless tongue” of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is the first time I have heard that epithet applied to my right hon. friend, although there is no doubt that he has deserved on many occasions high eulogy for his powers as an orator. He (Mr. Foster) talked of the humiliation and disaster we have encountered, and he had the audacity to tell us that he believed the future historian would dwell with pride and pleasure on the eighteen years during which he and his friends held power. Sir, the future historian whether he be Grit or Tory, if he be an honest man, will feel himself compelled to say when the time for writing the history of Canada comes: that Canada never sustained a greater misfortune than when in 1878 it turned out Alexander Mackenzie and replaced him by the hon. baronet and his friends. I have before this maintained on the floor of Parliament, and I am prepared to maintain it again: that if an honest debit and credit account be taken of the resources of Canada in 1878 and the resources of Canada when these gentlemen went out of office, the balance would tell very heavily against them. Putting aside the mere material question, the well-known enormous depreciation of property of the greatest portion of the population which went on during that period, what, after all, is the real wealth of the country? The real wealth of the country is the number of intelligent, God-fearing and industrious men and women who exist in it; and when, Sir, in the history of Canada, did Canada see so poor and mean a record as during the eighteen years of these hon. gentlemen’s management? As I have said before, I am astonished at the audacity of any hon. gentleman hailing from the maritime provinces, and most of all hailing from the province of New Brunswick, who, with the knowledge that his own province was reduced to a state of atrophy for ten years, with no increase to the population, rises and tells us that the last eighteen years will be for ever bright spots, bright and particular stars, in the history of Canada. Sir, I tell the hon. gentleman that the result of those eighteen years was, as his own conduct in 1896, and the conduct of a great many of his associates at that time, showed, so to debauch and degrade and demoralize public life in Canada, that it may well require more than eighteen months to restore it to the position it formerly occupied.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Though I have good hopes that within a reasonable space of time, having set our faces in the right direction, we may succeed in achieving a great improvement, I do not mean to say that any country could trust these hon. gentlemen for eighteen years and not be materially the worse for it. I know well that they have alleged that they added to the wealth of Canada. They did no such thing. They added to the wealth of a few individuals in Canada, and they impoverished the great mass of the people. I repeat that if a just and true estimate were taken, it would be found that if you placed on one side the increase of the debt, public and private, and the enormous depreciation of property which took place throughout Canada, and on the other side everything they choose to claim as additions to our wealth made during that period, the debit account would be very heavy against them. On the other hand, I tell the hon. gentleman and his friends that there never was a period in the history of Canada when our public life had sunk so low as it had during the concluding years of their reign. We are bound to take example by these hon. gentlemen. I am perfectly willing to hear their criticism, and I am bound to say that I regard the hon. gentleman as to a great extent the right man in the right place. His volubility will be well used in calling in question what we have said on previous occasions. I am not disposed to differ from him on that head: I welcome his criticism; I am glad he should make it. But I am not prepared to allow him or any other hon. gentleman on that side to contend that Canada had anything to be proud of under their regime.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the members on this side of the House have, so far, any great reason to complain of the manner in which the debate has gone on, or to regret much that has been said from the Treasury benches. I think this House was somewhat surprised that a man with the parliamentary experience and knowledge of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was reduced to such a poor line of argument and declamation as he has given an exhibition of this evening. We have heard better speeches than this from the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and, if he will allow me to say so, we recognized in some of the personal language in which he indulged, the old member for South Oxford, who, on account of those serious crimes and misdemeanours, in the opinion of his party, was deposed from the position of financial adviser and locked up during the last general election. It seemed to us, last session, that the lesson had done him good, for a more urbane, courteous and delightful parliamentarian it was impossible to pick out from the benches opposite than the hon. Minister of Trade and

Commerce. But he itches for the old authority he once wielded, and I fear that in his jealousy and rage he is venting his spite on us instead of on the men who sit round him and who think so little of him. The hon. gentleman, I say, was slightly personal. I have a right, I think, to claim that. He invaded, not only the home of my respected sire, but he came into the nursery which I am responsible for, and brought before this House of Commons in the debate on the Address some tittle-tattle in regard to some personal relations which had existed with a certain high personage in this country, to whom no reference has been allowed on this side of the House for almost any explanation whatever. While I will not go into personal matters as to what happened before that certain high personage made a grave constitutional mistake—if that expression be allowed—and merited in this House, and out of it, the condemnation of the Canadian people, let me come to the reminiscence the hon. gentleman gave us when he said that the Tory party had been fond of rotten-egging Governors General, and let me remind him—perhaps it is unnecessary to do so—that no Governor General was ever rotten-egged by the Conservative party since that hon. gentleman left the party. But there has been at least one Governor General in Canada, Sir Edmund Head, who had for a long time to submit to the vilest abuse of a personal character at the hands of the Reform party, which that gentleman has joined, their press and their leaders heaping upon him epithets so gross and abusive as would not to-day be suggested by any person in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, either on your right or on your left. Then, the hon. gentleman, in the pitiful manner in which he attempted to dodge the points made in this debate on this side of the House, made the confession that, after all, in regard to reciprocal legislation, or reciprocity treaties, there were two schools; and the trouble, to sum up his argument, is this, that he either led or followed his colleagues into the wrong school. The hon. gentleman was bold enough—and there is no limit to his audacity, as we know—to discuss troubles which were brewing, as he supposed, on this side of the House—personal difficulties and personal differences. It did seem to me, if my vision was good, that some colleagues of his got very restless as he referred to party troubles. It did seem to me that the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine), the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Madore) and the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), not to mention a whole host of that majority of which he boasts, all moved restlessly in their chairs and felt that a direct personal allusion to them might be uncomfortable. Then

the hon. gentleman, later on, in discussing the argument of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), spoke of six-tenths of the imports, as I caught the figure, being from the United States, which had been excluded entirely from the preferential clause, and he commented on the omission of the hon. gentleman to take that into account in the calculation he made. That enables me, in passing, to remind the Government and the House of a peculiar feature of that tariff that has not been dwelt upon very much in the debate so far. While the Government were pretending—ior, according to their own admission, it has turned out to be a pretense and nothing more—that they were consumed by a love and affection for the mother country, which they had been singularly deficient in for a great many years past, and were giving to the mother country great gifts and concessions, and while it was true that 'nominatim' the United States did not and could not enjoy this so-called preferential portion of the tariff, great care was taken, as we see by the results, to give the United States a tremendous preference in fact by the transfer of certain articles from the dutiable to the free list. Of this transfer the United States got the greatest benefit, owing to the choice made of the articles put on the free list, and the proximity of the United States to the Canadian market. In the case of iron and steel, and in the case of coal also, a marked preference has been given the United States.

If I recall another portion of the hon. gentleman's argument aright, he went on to rejoice, and to me it was an intense pleasure to find him rejoicing over prosperity in Canada. We are agreed in this respect, that there is a great prosperity in the country about which we can boast; but as to the causes of that prosperity, his modesty did not prevent him from ascribing them to the act to the policy and action of the Government. I am sorry that I cannot take that view, and the hon. gentleman himself has furnished us with reasons for being somewhat stubborn. I hold in my hand a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman—one more carefully considered than that he has just delivered—in which he assured the Liberal convention that fiscal reform was all good enough in its way, but that while something might be done for our benefit by fiscal reform, no prosperity could come to this poverty-stricken country, this country in which ruin and devastation prevailed at the time, unless we had free admission into the markets of the great American Republic. But the hon. gentleman to-night, forgetting that theory which he held for so long a time, endeavoured, in the excitement and enthusiasm of the moment, to take credit for the fact that in spite of the barrier being raised in that market higher against us than before, our trade has increased and prospered. He

took credit entirely for the acts of the Canadian Government, whether wise or otherwise, which were wholly independent of the co-operation and support of the country to the south of us; and towards the end of his remarks, the hon. gentleman gave us the secret of his line of conduct, when in Opposition, by telling us the kind of Opposition which practically he had promoted. Desperate indeed it was, and while the hon. gentleman feels now that he is in a position no doubt to instruct, there is one feature in that lesson which I, for one in this House, do not feel at all tempted to imitate, and that is his determination to suspect something wrong in everything the Government did. Much, however, as I may suspect the Government in general, I do not intend to discuss any phase of policy which they may lay on the Table of this House in any such spirit during this or any other session when I may occupy a seat in this House. I followed the hon. gentleman's remarks with great attention, and I do not think that it is necessary for me, with all respect to the hon. gentleman and the ability he possesses, to make further reference to what he said.

But this is a debate of great interest. It is a debate which will be carried on, I think, for some time with great interest and benefit to the country, because it concerns subjects of moment, and which are becoming all the graver and more important for the scant attention they are receiving from hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, after the very exhaustive treatment of them by those who have already spoken from this side of the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite must remember that, however strong they may feel their position to be, these subjects are being canvassed, and are exciting the people from one end of the country to the other. Charges are being preferred of a most serious character concerning the promises they have made and the pledges they have violated. To the very thorough discussion of broken pledges concerning the tariff and preferential trade, and retrenchment, and the independence of Parliament, the only answer of the First Minister practically was this: We have, notwithstanding all that, carried the elections, and the Queen's Jubilee was one of the most glorious experiences of my life. That, however, will not satisfy the country. All the excitement attending that happy year and all the loyalty for which this country is famous will not relieve hon. gentlemen opposite from the necessity of meeting the charges made against them. There must be, before this debate is over, a more reasonable attempt made to meet those charges, if these hon. gentlemen are to continue in the lucky career that so far has been theirs—capturing seats here and there throughout the country.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

I want to press home an unpleasant charge, because I believe it my duty to do so, and I call the First Minister's attention to it, because it has been made, not altogether by one as much opposed to him as I am in public life, and because it comes from a great legal authority. It comes from a gentleman who has co-operated with him in this House. It is the opinion of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), delivered in the presence of my hon. friend when he was in Opposition, it is true, and given on a subject to which I have frequently called the attention of the Government. In 1891 great excitement took place over a Federal election, and the leader of the Government, the then leader of the Opposition was charged with having accepted the terms of a most important conference known as the Quebec conference of 1887—a conference that decided to reorganize or readjust the whole financial arrangements between the Federal Government and the different provinces. That was perhaps the most important subject decided by the conference, and that involved a very large expenditure of money.

The leader of the government in Quebec, the ally of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government here, stated that the leader of the Opposition of that day promised to give effect to this, if he came into power, and he had bound himself by a solemn engagement to give at least a majority of 15 votes to Mr. Laurier. One of my colleagues in the late Government, the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) in this House resurrected a question and answer between the hon. gentleman and Mr. Desjardins, who was in the House at that time, whether the leader of the present Government admitted that the statement which Mr. Desjardins had made was correct, and he admitted that he had accepted the terms of the Quebec conference. And then the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), sitting in this House, used expressions—and I only repeat them to show how strong his opinion was—that not merely had a bargain been made in 1887, but part of the bargain had been carried out, with the promise of the present Prime Minister to redeem these pledges and to carry out the terms of the Quebec conference of 1887 when he came into power, the leader of the party in the province of Quebec had been able to obtain the votes, not only had his own government succeeded, but he had been able to obtain a majority in the province of Quebec in the election of 1891 for the present leader of the Government. And the hon. member for North Simcoe said, that if there ever was a bargain and sale, then the present Prime Minister was bought and sold by the premier of the province of Quebec, and that the Prime Minister had

got his majority in the province of Quebec by corrupt and scandalous means. That language was used in the right hon. gentleman's presence; but the language, whether fair or unfair, covered the opinion of the hon. member for North Simcoe, based upon admitted facts in regard to the readjustment of the provincial subsidy. And I have not been able yet to obtain the slightest hint from any occupant of the Treasury benches that the promise of the right hon. gentleman is to be redeemed. In this debate I would ask and press the question upon the gentleman, whether he is able now to say if he has the slightest intention of carrying out the terms of the Quebec conference of 1887.

Now, after this pitiful condition of affairs—for that it is pitiful, those who consider these promises and these pledges made at the time and under the circumstances, and not merely the absence of the performance or the absence of the excuse for the non-performance, must see—it need not surprise us to find the dissensions to which I have referred, and the incapacity which has been demonstrated and no attempt made to defend it or explain it away, in regard to our financial matters. We have practically repeated in Canada an Aberdeen Ministry—Aberdeen in the sense of being torn by dissensions, Aberdeen by reason of its incapacity. And as that incapacity becomes notorious, as did the incapacity of a former Administration of the same name, I have no doubt that the same fate will overwhelm it. I might be charitable and suggest an excuse to the Prime Minister for not keeping these promises. One will have to cudgel his wits very hard to suggest even a plausible excuse. But as I see these charges pressed home and an absence of any explanation from the Treasury benches, when, indeed, I find the hon. gentleman, even on the question of prohibition, endeavouring to hedge and to frighten off those who would otherwise vote for prohibition, should he give them an opportunity, in the manner which has been proposed, I have to suggest to him an excuse which was given by Mr. Hall Caine on one occasion during his visit to this capital. Speaking after dinner on an important question, he asked that his statement should be taken qualifiedly owing to the time of the evening when he spoke. And he illustrated thus: Once upon a time, a rat was drowning in a vat of beer, and a cat passing by, the rat appealed to her to save him, saying that death from the fumes was so horrible that it would infinitely prefer to be eaten by the cat. A bargain was then and there made on this basis. The cat gave its paw to the rat, which jumped out and at once ran into a hole near by, and, while brushing himself off, looked out. The cat reminded him that there was part of the bargain which had escaped his memory, that in consideration of the assistance given him, he should submit to be eaten. "Oh," said the rat,

"that promise was not binding; as you saw yourself. I was in liquor at the time I made it." That is the only possible suggestion that I can offer to the hon. gentleman for his failure to carry out this long string of promises, some of them made after dinner, all of them brought to his memory time and time again, yet never fulfilled.

I wish to make an observation to the mover (Mr. Bertram) of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. And I have a small quarrel with him, seeing the secret is now out how it came about that my representative in the Cabinet, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the Minister from the province of Nova Scotia, was not able to hold up the Nova Scotia end in the readjustment of the tariff. We have some important industries in the province, and I believe those industries have the good will of the Minister of Finance. I have reason to believe that, and have never had reason to believe the contrary. But it is clear, after the statement of this gentleman in Toronto, who wished to obtain articles of our manufacture in the steel and iron works of Nova Scotia at a lower rate, so as to be able better to handle his finished product, as he would consider it, he readjusted that tariff in the very way that the Minister of Finance and I did not wish to have done. And I say that what has given him joy—and after all is said and done, and since it cannot be mended, I hope it has given him better than joy, some substantial return—I wish him to understand that it has been largely at the expense of Nova Scotia labour; for, while the tariff has so far not caused the works in Nova Scotia to be closed down altogether, the way in which they have been kept open since the time that tariff was changed to their detriment has been by reducing the wages of the workingman. I do not think the hon. gentleman from Centre Toronto, in making the tariff, was compelled to reduce the wages of his workmen or employees.

I desire to draw the attention of the Government to a serious subject, and not in a captious spirit shall I approach it. It is a subject of importance to both the east and west of this country, it a subject occupying a great deal of the attention of the boards of trade, and it is a subject which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce referred to in general terms when he spoke of the conditions that existed in the large political sense, and the forbearance that should be exhibited by Canada in dealing with, if I understood him to say, matters of foreign relations, as we can act in those matters only through those who advise the Queen outside of our own Cabinet. Now, this is a subject not wholly of the Yukon Railway. I agree with those who have spoken in this debate that a subject so grave as that, and indeed so exciting, is much better and more calmly discussed when the House is

in possession of all the facts. For instance, the statement made in answer to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) to-day, was a statement that removed a great many rumours that have been going about in connection with this question of the transport of troops. It is well in those matters, I think, to have official facts before coming to a definite opinion, and in that I agree with the hon. member for York, whatever one's impressions on the prima facie statement of the facts may amount to. But I would refer rather to some questions in connection with the laws of this country as they stand, laws over which we have complete control. I see the Minister of Customs is not enjoying altogether my observations, but still if I could obtain his attention for a moment, I would remind him that there is no difference of opinion, as I understand it, in this Parliament as regards our coasting laws being in their nature reciprocal. It has been the policy of Canada to concede privileges where privileges could be obtained from the United States in that matter, and where our marine was not allowed coasting privileges in the United States, it was the policy of all Parliament's and of all Government's to see that their privileges were similarly curtailed. Yet it is a fact that at present these laws are not equally administered, and in the great clutch that is being made for trade in Alaska and in the North-west Territories, by cities on the Pacific Coast from San Francisco upwards, the United States shipping is enjoying at present a most unfair advantage, because the laws of the United States are being administered sharply so as to prevent any Canadian bottom taking Canadian goods coming from an American railway to an American port, on to a Canadian port. They prohibit a Canadian vessel carrying United States freight from any eastern United States city from a Canadian port to either San Francisco or to the northern ports of the United States, while our officers allow United States vessels to carry Canadian freight from Canadian ports to Canadian ports. The subject has been brought to the Minister of Customs, formally, as I have been advised, and I draw again formally his attention to it, because the people on the coast have a right to complain particularly when the rivalry is now so keen. Their desire is this that if the law advisers advise the hon. gentleman that the present legislation of Canada is not as restrictive upon her rivals in shipping as American legislation is upon us, then the hon. gentleman should hasten to this House and have our laws put in a condition which generally they were supposed to hold.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Will the hon. gentleman state wherein he thinks that our laws are more liberal to United

States coasting vessels than their laws are to us?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the case I put, that we now permit United States vessels to carry Canadian freight to Canadian ports, directly or indirectly. For instance, we allow a vessel to bring Canadian freight from a Canadian port and by transshipment to a Canadian port, but the United States laws do not allow that, for though a vessel is going between a foreign port and their own port, their idea is that you should not carry the freight of United States, directly or indirectly, between two United States ports. It may be as I say, and I guard myself, that under the state of our coasting laws that point has been overlooked, and that it is the rivalry and competition that have brought this out. But the subject has been brought up, and a suggestion has been made which I think a reasonable one, as Congress is even now, I am told, engaged in considering how far they can further restrict our coasting trade, that we should watch that legislation, and that we should be consistent with our past attitude and—we can do nothing else—restrict their privileges in our ports to the extent that they restrict our privileges in theirs. No matter what one's economic principles have been in the past on tariff matters, I understand that in coasting matters the two parties are at one.

Now, there is another important question that should not be overlooked in connection with this question of railway construction into the Yukon and in connection with the Stikine River. I am told that it is of urgent importance that some proper means should be taken for the safety of vessels passing through the canon. I am told, for instance, that it is absolutely unsafe for a vessel to attempt to go up when one is coming down, and that the situation in the river is such that there is grave danger of vessels meeting at that point. I am told a suggestion has been made that a telephone should be operated there so as to signal when a vessel is coming down and when another is going up. The reason that I drag these questions into the debate upon the Address, Mr. Speaker, is their extreme urgency, and any one who has followed the thought, so to speak, among the miners, commercial men and transportation companies, will fully appreciate that no time should be lost in considering such matters as this when they are brought to the attention of the Government, and I understand that most of these subjects have been before the Government since November last. Now, there has been in that connection a question of great moment on the Pacific Coast. In speaking of this matter I do not for a moment pretend to pose as the mouth-piece of the people on that coast, who are so well represented in Parliament, but it happens that the point to which I wish to

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

call attention concerns the people of the province, one constituency of which I have the honour to represent, equally with the people of the Pacific Coast. In this question of transportation the people of the east are directly connected with the people on the Pacific, and the supplies that are held for the purpose of being sent into the Yukon, as every one understands, are obtained in large measure on credit from eastern warehouses. And consequently this is a subject of very grave importance. I think I am within the mark when I say to the Government that whoever was to blame for the delay, whether the Canadian Government or circumstances over which they had no control, there has been very bitter disappointment expressed in the cities of Victoria and Vancouver in connection with the absence of anything like a full realization of their hopes as regards spring business. They had made the best preparations, they had spent enormous amounts in advertising their facilities and ability to supply all who wished to enter the Yukon country. They had been persistent in their representations, the correspondent of the "Globe" having complained of the manner in which the boards of trade had deluged the Ministers in regard to the necessities of those people whom they represented. But these were in no sense the desires and necessities of those people alone; they were pioneers of what might have been and may yet be a tremendous development of Canadian trade, and being on the spot they were in a position to send good advice to the authorities in connection with this subject. There was a telegram sent by the Minister of the Interior on the 3rd January, which gave every one in Vancouver and Victoria much pleasure and satisfaction. It was a telegram definite in its terms, without any qualification whatever, and it stated that arrangements had been made with the authorities of the United States whereby the exaction of a fee of \$9 a day from Dyea to Skagway, across disputed territory, possibly even British, which had to be paid any man taking goods through those sub-ports of the United States into Canadian territory would be removed, and consequently this tax, which amounted almost to a prohibitory tax so far as those routes were concerned, being out of the way, there was nothing to prevent any wise and prudent man from making his arrangements and accordingly incurring very large liabilities in obtaining supplies. Large and small traders went to work and laid in large quantities of goods on that score. Hon. gentlemen can hardly realize, unless they have been there, the intense disappointment felt when on 22nd January those people were informed that nothing definite had happened since 3rd January respecting those regulations, and when the people learned by men coming down that this enormous inspection fee was not only

retained but acted on so as to deter men from going into the country with supplies. Ordinary men were not able to pay officers of the United States customs \$9 a day while travelling over that stretch of the disputed territory. Those telegrams were hard enough to read and to understand. But the Prime Minister even to-day has had to say he cannot remove the anxiety of the people in the slightest degree, and consequently this anxiety and bewilderment still continue. In the meanwhile all rival American cities, Seattle in particular, are enjoying a great measure of success over those troubles that were supposed to have been removed on January 3rd. I will not be led at this stage to make certain observations that the Government are aware I could make by way of complaint against the action of the United States. I will refrain from doing so, and will content myself by saying that if when all the documents are brought down, it is quite clear that the Canadian Government have neglected any step they could reasonably have taken, they will most undoubtedly be held strictly to account for neglect in such an important matter. That is but reasonable, and that is what is expected. In that connection, however, whether I speak for one section of the country or another, I believe the spirit of Canada is in such a condition that not only would it be a popular thing for the Government to do, but the day will come when some Government will have to do it, and that is to use an old expression, fight fire with fire, and so far as we have it within our ability, outside of those matters which appertain to the Imperial Government, we shall have to meet the United States, our commercial rivals, in the same spirit and temper with what they continually meet us. I say if the Americans, not appreciating the manner in which they have been considered as regards any complaints reaching the Government regarding their rights of navigation on the Yukon and Stikine,—and there were several cases when complaints were made—having no regard for the promptitude with which this Government carries out all treaty obligations which affect them and the extraordinary liberality of our laws with respect to mining, and our treatment of them in Canadian Alaska and our North-west Territories as compared with the manner in which Canadians or British subjects have been treated in American Alaska or in the American States—I say the time has come, and come now to legislate on these lines. They cannot complain, nor could such a complaint be framed as would be considered by any impartial court as being of any value or moment, because our concessions have up to the present time not brought us anything, not a concession on their side on any feature of the legislation. I would impress this view on the Government. They are for the moment all powerful and are in a position to

meet this spirit which I believe exists in the country, which will dominate the country and dominate its politics, for our wheat fields and gold fields already have become famous and we have succeeded in attracting the very best minds of the mother country and the very best element to come here and to settle, and the Government will excite a movement from the British Isles by adopting the policy I suggest, which is to keep the valuable rights in those territories and mining districts for the citizens of those countries in which British subjects can obtain similar rights. Name no country, but carry on a reciprocal system of legislation in general, and the Government will do a great work by accelerating the influx into that country of the classes of people we want, and they will also do a great deal in keeping out possibly an element that is undesirable even in the country from which those people may come. So much in general, and I only speak of the subject in general, in order that I may as far as possible attract the attention of the Government to these questions which are of such great importance to the country at the present time and which are so disturbing in some of their aspects as regards business which is now being carried on, and which without adjustment I fear will involve many people in Canada in a condition of absolute ruin.

I am not going to travel, so far as I can possibly avoid it, over the subject of preferential trade, not wishing to repeat what has been said before. I shall state as my opinion, that preferential trade is going to be the great question for the people of this country and of the Empire. In my mind, preferential trade is now in a singularly happy condition. The only point upon which I differ from the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is that I do not believe that the ill-advised utterances of the Prime Minister have killed that movement; on the contrary, I believe it is not in his power, any more that it is in the power of Mr. Chamberlain, to kill a movement of that character. While I believe that the course of the right hon. gentleman was to retard the movement and to block it for a moment, yet all the signs of the political horizon seem to make for its strength and progress. It is a marvellous thing that in England you could obtain any time, let alone at formal conferences, the consideration and attention of either of the two political parties to a subject which undoubtedly does involve all the heresies such as Mr. Asquith, Lord Rosebery and the Cobden Club friends of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) charged against it. He would be a bold man who would deny that this subject is now being ably threshed out by the Colonial Minister himself, and that it is a movement which is receiving great encouragement from him. But it is a question which the soldiers as well as the statesmen of the Empire are discussing, and

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

it is a subject which concerns the army and navy of England as much as it does her commercial interests. It is a question that will not down and the future for it is hopeful.

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) seems to excuse himself so far as he may for the violation of his pre-election promises by the supposed hostility of Mr. Chamberlain to any practical method of carrying out preferential trade. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who in the course of his speech dwelt so much on the absence of customs duties in connection with Mr. Chamberlain's idea, went on to read from Mr. Chamberlain's speech an extract which showed that never for a moment has the Colonial Secretary dreamed that a system of preferential trade in the Empire could be obtained in any other way than through customs.

If I am not out of order, Mr. Speaker, and I do not wish to trespass upon the rules of the House in this connection, I may perhaps point out that Lord Aberdeen has given utterance to opinions, at Toronto in 1897, and I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether I am correct in supposing that when Lord Aberdeen addressed the National Club, he spoke the views of his advisers, and whether, when on that occasion he discussed the subject of preferential trade, he was speaking the views of the right hon. gentleman and those who sit with him? It would be important in connection with my observations to know that.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) knows very well that when Lord Aberdeen spoke on the occasion to which the hon. gentleman has referred, he did not speak as the Governor General of Canada, but he spoke simply as Lord Aberdeen.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then Mr. Speaker, is it permitted for me to discuss the speech of Lord Aberdeen when he spoke in Canada not as the Governor General?

Mr. SPEAKER. With reference to criticism in this House on the course of the Governor General, I am inclined to think that the proper rule for us to follow is: that in reference to any public question on which His Excellency speaks or acts, his speeches or his acts are not free from criticism in this House, because there is for all public acts of the Governor General a responsible Minister on the floor of this House who has to answer. Of course, I mean that in such discussion there must be the greatest propriety and respect in the language used. I do not think we can debar ourselves in this House from discussing the public acts of the representative of the Crown. With reference to private acts or speeches of the Governor General,

I apprehend that the greatest possible respect should be shown to the high position which he occupies here, and to the fact also, that in this country, while he occupies that high position it is impossible for him to defend himself from attacks that may be made against him personally. The name of His Excellency the Governor General should be as seldom as possible brought into our discussions. If the matter is not a public one, the least we say about the acts of the gentleman who occupies the position of Governor General the better. If reference to his private acts can possibly be avoided in the public interest, it is my opinion that they should be avoided. I would not say that under all circumstances this House would be debarred from discussing such a question, but I would strongly urge the impropriety of discussing the private acts or utterances of His Excellency the Governor General. If possible it should be avoided, and if it is not possible to avoid it, then it should never be done without the greatest possible respect for His Excellency.

Mr. POPE. Is it possible for the Governor General to act in Canada in the dual capacity of Governor General and Lord Aberdeen?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to add to any embarrassment, by discussing what it is quite clear suggests itself to your mind; the propriety of Lord Aberdeen speaking on this subject at all. That is not the purpose of my reference. I want to find out where the Government of the day stand in regard to the gentleman whom they are supposed to advise. I say it is an extraordinary thing—not in regard to Lord Aberdeen—it is an extraordinary thing that there has come to pass such a condition of affairs as this: that on a question which now, perhaps more than any other, divides the two political parties in Canada, the Governor General can make a speech on such a subject, give expression to his views, and yet have no Government and no Minister who will dare to say that he spoke by their authority. I believe myself that there is no precedent in the constitutional history of this country, at any rate during the Victorian era, for such an extraordinary course that a representative of the Queen is left high and dry, stranded absolutely, and in such a position that though he has given his views in the most positive manner, with all the weight that attaches to his position, to the electors and public of Canada, he has not now a Cabinet which will dare to say that he spoke their views on that occasion, and spoke after consideration with them: for I venture to suggest that the only occasion on which it might be possible that a gentleman in his position, representing our Sovereign, could speak, would be after he had a Cabinet or a Prime Minister ready to take full responsibility for all that he said

and to adopt those views as their own. Therefore, without dwelling on that subject, because it is apparent how unfair and how extraordinary it may be if we come to this in Canada, that there may come to us a Governor General, an august person, a man having a great influence from the very position he holds, who will throw himself into the political arena without any responsibility whatever, assisting either political party in the country, and yet in this position that sometimes there will be gentlemen in the Government who will accept responsibility for him, and at other times, when it is not convenient, they will decline to take any responsibility whatever. But I wish to point out that Lord Aberdeen, in speaking in Toronto, fell into the very same error as hon. gentlemen opposite; and because of his observations, and what followed them, I think there is great strength in the position of the Opposition that has not been altogether dwelt upon, as to the change that is coming over public opinion in England. Lord Aberdeen, at Toronto, felt that the policy held by the Canadian Opposition on the question of preferential trade was impracticable, and he instanced the unfortunate position in which were the sugar planters and the sugar trade in the West Indies, and the strong claims the planters had, and the strong appeals they were making to the mother country: but he pointed out how absolutely impossible it was, owing to the view that existed in England on the subject of free trade, to expect for them any relief: and the argument was, how much more hopeless it was for rich and abounding Canada to expect any success for preferential trade. Lord Aberdeen's observations were hardly made when information came from England giving the impression that the English Government does intend to come to the relief of the sugar planters of the West Indies. Since Lord Aberdeen was in England a great change has come over public opinion there, and therefore the opinions he expressed on that occasion exposed the weakness of the advice so quickly that it should not, I submit, under any circumstances weigh with the people of this country. The Prime Minister, however, lays too much stress upon and attaches too much importance to the views of Mr. Chamberlain. Mr. Chamberlain is a valuable ally and has seen more quickly perhaps into the subject and its future importance to the Empire than any other man in England. The Prime Minister himself avowed before the election that he was by no means dismayed. But the success of the movement depends on no one man. No movement of any importance could hope to succeed if for its success we looked to the opinions of one man or another, as individuals. We must look to the importance of the cause itself, and the right hon. gentleman, while he is running away from this subject and changing his

opinions about it, has not answered the arguments which he himself used in its favour in Toronto when he spoke of the value it would be to Canada and to the Empire. If nothing else will bring it about, the necessities of the Empire will promote it; and no man, I take it, will to-day deny that the necessities of British trade are very great. What is assisting to change the minds of many men in England on fiscal questions is the extraordinary and unprecedented competition which British trade is receiving at the hands of the very countries which the free traders long ago prophesied would be laid low or would be comparatively unimportant rivals through the adoption of protectionist heresies. I wish to argue with the right hon. gentleman, to win him back, if I can, to the views he expressed and the pledges he gave in June, 1896, to bring him again into the ranks of those who advocate what is an undoubted boon to this country, and what he himself recognizes as such. Look at the changes that have taken place. Peel was an out-and-out protectionist, and a day or two afterwards he was the leader of the movement for the repeal of the Corn Laws, which was his great reform. But I come from Peel at once to the right hon. leader of this Government; for how often has he changed his opinion on that very question? It has been proved in this House that the hon. gentleman was in 1871 an avowed protectionist; and when he excused himself before the Speaker for entertaining those views, on the ground of his extreme youth, he was rather embarrassed, as he will admit, by "Hansard" being produced and proof being given that in 1876 he was also an avowed protectionist; and I want to remind him that in 1879 he used this language, as reported in "Hansard":

He would not be averse to a moderate system of protection to those industries which we had the ability to create, but which required, at the outset, assistance against foreign competition. He knew these views were not held by those who surrounded him, but they were his views.

When the hon. gentleman reached England in 1897, he was a free trader, and he became a member of a club which denounces not only protection, but also denounces reciprocity and fiscal federation as masks for protection. Then, again, how public men can change their opinions. Let him consider that it is not altogether certain that those who oppose preferential trade in England will continue to do so. The hon. gentleman, in 1891, advocated preferential trade with the United States. In 1896 he approved preferential trade with Great Britain. He thus advocated two policies, the one the opposite of the other. And in 1897 Lord Rosebery gave us his opinion of the right hon. gentleman's work in England. I take the following telegraphic summary of his remarks:—

Manchester, Eng., Nov. 2.—Lord Rosebery addressed a large meeting here last evening in con-

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

nection with the centenary celebration of the Chamber of Commerce. He reviewed the history of free trade, elaborately eulogizing what he described as its "advantages to England."

Lord Rosebery contended that the condition of agriculture abroad, despite bounties and protection, was little better, and in some cases was worse than in England. He quoted Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Dominion Premier, as "a most illustrious authority, sustaining the view that it is free trade which has preserved and consolidated the British Empire." He fully agreed with Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He declared that any deviation from absolute political and commercial freedom would only weaken the bonds holding the Empire together, and that "anything in the direction of an Imperial Zollverein would weaken the Empire internally, and excite the permanent hostility of the whole world, already seriously excited by British prosperity under free trade."

He said he "would tread softly in the presence of the idea of a Zollverein," for he believed it already dead. It behooved them to walk strongly and warily in the path of the Empire, but such a Zollverein would form a permanent menace of war.

Lord Rosebery, I believe, on that occasion, gave my right hon. friend the palm for having contributed to the death of this project of an Imperial Zollverein.

This brings me to another change of base on the part of my right hon. friend which, I hope, will convince him that because a man argues for or against a certain cause to-day is no reason for believing that the light will not come to him at a later period. In 1893 the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) forestalled the present Government in their so-called preferential trade policy, and it is interesting to look back for a moment at what the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce then said concerning the policy which he shortly afterwards attempted to adopt. On that occasion the right hon. leader of the Government read this part of the resolution of the hon. member for North Simcoe:

That the tariff ought to be amended also by a substantial reduction of the customs duties in favour of the United Kingdom, in whose markets all Canadian products are admitted free of duty, and of these nations which, under treaty obligations with Great Britain, would be entitled to the same advantages.

Now, my right hon. friend objected in toto to that clause which I have just read, and yet which is the identical policy governing the administration of the affairs of this country during the last year. He objected to it on several grounds. He was opposed to sentiment having, at any time, anything to do with the control of our fiscal policy, and he said that if the proposition were to carry, sentiment would in this case carry consequences so wide and so large, they would simply prove a weight to Canada. That was a dire prophecy regarding the putting in force of a policy which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) now claims as better than all others. My right hon. friend went on to say:

But when the proposition of the hon. gentleman is not only to reduce the duties on British goods, but also to reduce the duties on goods of all countries with which Great Britain has commercial treaties, the proposition, if adopted, would offer a serious obstacle to the future course of Canada.

And later on, in the same speech, he further opposed any such policy as that which has governed us during the past year, as involving a serious disturbance of revenue and wide economic revolution. So that I press this instance in the lives of interesting public men, on the hon. gentleman's notice and ask him to take courage and not, on account of Mr. Chamberlain's supposed vacillation, which I do not think exists, on the question, abandon the cause which he has already admitted is fraught with so much benefit to this country.

Then Mr. Ross is no mean authority. The Hon. George W. Ross has come out as an exponent of this policy, and, at any rate until he receives the Cobden medal, will, I fancy, be true to the cause.

Then we have the colonial premiers meeting in England, and as I do not think full reference was made to that interesting occasion, I might add to the history of the movement by referring to the meeting of the colonial premiers on June the 12th, when the chairman mentioned that "the object of the United Empire Trade League was the furtherance of mutually advantageous trade, on a preferential basis, between all who shared allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen." The chairman was a member of the English House of Commons, and the Lord Chancellor, in speaking on that occasion, said:

He, as a Minister of the Crown, had to be doubly cautious, but he could say that he had been a rank protectionist all his life, and he had not forgotten the fact. Under these circumstances, and remembering, after all, that the tie which united nations and the colonies to the mother country must be, in a certain degree, the interest of those who directed its counsel, it certainly was no unimportant matter that they should endeavour to preserve the trade of the Empire and to get employment for its people. As long as the interests of all were preserved, he believed it would be impossible to set the colonies against the mother country or the mother country against the colonies.

At the same meeting Sir George Turner said:

He believed the colonies would be very glad indeed to give some preference, so that they might trade with Great Britain for goods which they now received from other countries. He thought the proposition should come from Great Britain, and he had no hesitation in saying that any advance from Great Britain would be received in no huckstering spirit, but with every desire to enter into a fair, reasonable and equitable arrangement—such an arrangement as will be advantageous to all parties.

And the Hon. C. C. Kingston, Premier of South Australia, said:

It was a conference of Australian Premiers, whose first object was to discuss the matter which was the object of that league. There was unanimity of opinion upon that matter. At the same time, it occurred to them that it would be better if the mother country and her statesmen were to formulate proposals for their acceptance. Any such suggestions would receive the most sympathetic consideration in the lands from which the Ministers came; for, above all, in their trade relationship, in every relationship they would infinitely prefer that their transactions should be with their own kin and their own flesh and blood.

Now, in addition to what was said by those authorities, and which is sufficiently encouraging to show that in the mother country and in the colonies the subject has been seriously considered and carefully discussed, I have a word to say. But I would like to define my own position, so far as this question relates to our own tariff. I am, as I have always been, a protectionist, and yet I say that there is nothing in any of the opinions that have been expressed by those who have favoured the subject in England that would make it impossible for such arrangements to be carried out by those who are sincere and consistent protectionists, because while I advocate protection, I have always belonged to the party in Canada who are not extreme protectionists but advocate a revenue for tariff based on protection—a tariff which shall give the protection necessary to foster our interests and at the same time enable us to obtain sufficient revenue. Mr. Chamberlain and men of that character know full well that in a colony like this there is no possible way of obtaining revenue for federal purposes without a customs tariff, and the only difference between us is whether that should be arranged, having careful regard to the necessity of protecting interests, or without any regard whatever to the interest of trade and manufactures.

Now, I believe that a union between the colonies and the mother country that would throw down any necessary protective tariff or any necessary element of protection would neither be good for the mother country nor for the colonies. Loyalty in the colonies to the mother country is not loyalty to the English manufacturers. We should be a great load and a great drag to those in the mother country were we to adopt any policy that would weaken us on our own ground and in our own plans of bearing our responsibilities and discharging our duties. Nevertheless, I believe that concessions could be made and arrangements brought about that would not interfere with any of the great interests of this country, manufacturing or agricultural, that would substantially effect this object in view. The hour is late and I shall content myself, considering the easy task that lay before me when I rose, with making one or two observations on this question on the nationality of this country. I believe

in the nationality of this country. I believed in it long ago, and I have done what little I could with the younger men of Canada in boasting of that nationality and encouraging its growth whenever the opportunity arose I was so educated in the party to which I belong. But how was Canada made a nation? There are independent judges. I propose to quote one, a gentleman whose name has been spoken with great respect, a gentleman who had the pleasure of meeting the right hon. leader of this Government and ascertaining from him all that he could say on behalf of Canada and on behalf of the party to which he belonged. The gentleman I proposed to quote, evidently had studied carefully the politics and the history of this country. No doubt he had read in the London "Standard," for instance, the observations of the right hon. gentleman's colleague, the Finance Minister, in informing the English public as late as 1886 that the whole tendency of the Canadian system is to squander money in the far west. No doubt he knew of another ally of the right hon. gentleman, the present Attorney General of Nova Scotia, who, speaking in the presence of the Finance Minister when they went to electrify and educate the electors of the county of Annapolis, said that it was war against God and nature and against every element of geography to attempt to establish any consolidated nationality under our present union. He knew that the right hon. gentleman's allies had endeavoured as the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has explained to tear to pieces the Canadian confederation. He knew that Mr. Blake in 1871, had denounced the Canadian Pacific Railway undertaking as fatal to the existence of the union, that Mr. Blake in 1880 had moved to postpone its construction, and in 1881 had denounced the contract as fatal to the future of Canada. And knowing all this, and seeing what had been done in spite of these objections on the part of powerful men of Canada, realizing the position that Canada had obtained under a Liberal Conservative Government that had been able to carry out these great schemes, he settled the questions as to who had made Canada a nation. This gentleman, the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, speaking in the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce on January 18th, 1898, said:

Why, it is not so long ago since the greater part of the Dominion of Canada was considered to be nothing more than a wilderness of snow, in which with difficulty a few wild animals were trapped for the sake of their skins. (Hear, hear, and a voice, "What about the Klondike?") And its prosperity is only due to the fact that within a few years that magnificent enterprise, the Canadian Pacific Railway, opened up this vast country, opened the greatest wheat fields in the world, and is going to open up probably the greatest gold fields in the world. (Hear, hear.)

That is the tribute paid by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, the Colonial Minister,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

to the work of the Conservative party in Canada, bitterly opposed, opposed tooth and nail by the gentleman who, last year, claimed all the credit for Canada being a nation.

Mr. DAVIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORTS.

The Civil Service List.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Tables of Trade and Navigation.—(Mr. Paterson.)

Report of the Department of Inland Revenue.—(Sir Henry Joly de Lotbiniere.)

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 8th February, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BETTER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 2) to promote the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have been asked to explain the Bill, and I desire at this stage to offer a few words of explanation. The introduction of this Bill, I presume, is becoming a transaction which savours somewhat of monotony in this House. If I consulted my own wishes and my own interests as a politician, I certainly should not introduce this Bill. I am conscious that it has stood in my way in a political sense, and has made me unpopular to some extent among my fellow-members in this House. I have felt, however, as a matter of duty, that the introduction of this Bill was a step in the public interest; and, being of that opinion, I have introduced it session after session, and not for any purpose of acquiring popularity; for I am not so stupid as to suppose that I am acquiring popularity in taking the step that I take to-day. The Bill introduced to-day differs from the Bill of last session. It embodies but one provision, that prohibiting the publication of Sunday newspapers, which provision re-

ceived the sanction of the leader of this Government last session, and the sanction of Sir John Thompson when he was Premier of this Dominion, and I presume that it will pass without objection. I have dropped the other provisions of the Bill, hoping that by doing so this feature, which I consider the most important and essential pertaining to the measure, will without difficulty receive the sanction of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PUNISHMENT OF SEDUCTION AND ABDUCTION.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, for the purpose of making more effectual provision for the punishment of seduction and abduction.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SAFETY ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. CASEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 4) further to secure the safety of railway employees and passengers. He said: This is the same Bill as that which I introduced last year on this subject, as amended by the committee to whom it was submitted. The House will remember that a select committee was appointed to consider this Bill, and that committee heard evidence and consulted long and earnestly on the subject of its various clauses, and the Bill as now introduced is the result of that investigation. I would call the attention of hon. members to the blue-book containing the evidence taken before that committee, including some very important matters relating to British legislation on the same subject. During the last session of the Imperial Parliament, an Employers' Liability Bill, involving the same principle as the Bill I am now about to introduce, was adopted, and it has been in force since. That Bill is given in extenso in the blue-book referred to, and I think it would be well worth the while of all members who have railway men among their constituents to look into that blue-book.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RAILWAYS.

Mr. CASEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) respecting drainage on and across the lands of railway companies. He said: This Bill is also similar to the one for the same purpose which I introduced last year. The Bill only got so far as to be considered by the Railway Committee. When we got there I was asked by the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) to

let the Bill stand over, as he had some hope of introducing general legislation on the relation of railways to the public this session. I hope of course, that he will see his way to introduce such legislation; but I re-introduce this Bill, which is founded entirely on the Act on the same subject which is in force in Ontario, as an indication of what I think should be done in the matter. Of course, I shall be prepared to withdraw it if the Government introduces satisfactory legislation on the same subject.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty the Queen and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company. He said: I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that it will be agreeable to the House if I should accompany the motion I have just made for the introduction of this Bill, with a fairly full explanation of its different provisions. The Bill, as it is framed, does not correspond entirely with one dealing with a similar subject introduced in 1881 by the late Government to regulate and confirm the contract which had been entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That Bill did not confirm the contract, as we propose by the present Bill, but simply conferred on the Governor in Council the general power to issue a charter and incorporate a company.

We have deviated from that course in the present instance to this extent, that we propose Parliament to constitute the corporation and confer upon it the powers, of which it should properly be put in possession, and leave substantially nothing remaining to be done by the Governor in Council. The Bill fairly divides itself into two rather separate and distinct classes. The first, which covers only one or two sections, confirms the contract. That, of course, will be at once conceded to be the important portion of the Bill. The other clauses, which are quite numerous, are the customary ones, creating and conferring powers upon the corporation as to the capitalization and the other incident and necessary provisions for the company's full equipment. I do not think it will be considered at all necessary that I should detain the House with any explanations regarding those clauses, but rather draw attention to the important features of the Bill.

Now, Sir, for a proper understanding of this very important question, I think it is essential that hon. members should, as far as possible, be put in possession of the facts, circumstances and considerations, which

have impelled the Government to the particular line of action they have taken in this matter. In this I may be departing from the usual course on the first reading of a Bill, but I think that the gravity of this subject and its general importance, will afford sufficient justification for my course; and I think it will be admitted that such a departure should rather commend itself to the House, having regard, first, to the urgency and next, the very great importance of the whole subject. Hon. members of this House will recollect quite clearly that before the close of last session, evidence was pouring in upon us of the immense discoveries of gold that were taking place in the Yukon district, and returning parties from that remote region were bringing us the most fabulous accounts of its mineral deposits. No one who is at all interested in public affairs could fail to realize that very important questions were likely to arise in that country in connection with these great gold discoveries. The Government had, therefore, as soon as the session of Parliament was over and it was possible for them to give attention to the matter, pressed upon their consideration the solution of—not one problem alone—but various problems of very great magnitude. We had to devise some means of solving the question as to how civil government should be effectively established and carried on in that region; we had to provide for the protection of life and property and the general preservation of public order, and we felt that in a great measure involving these was the question of providing proper transportation facilities into and out of that country. It became clear to us that we should immediately address our attention to dealing with these problems in a manner which would be most effective and best promote good government and the general welfare and prosperity of the country. In obtaining information with regard to the probable influx of people into that country, we were led to believe that the number of people who would be likely to seek the Yukon region during the present year would be exceedingly large. I believe that agents of transportation companies, who have the means of acquiring accurate information and forming a pretty fair judgment, advised—at least some of them did—that as many as 250,000 people would be finding their way into the Yukon country during the present year. Others connected with transportation companies also did not form so high an estimate of the probable numbers, but a large proportion of them, at all events, put the figure at 100,000, and none, so far as my information goes, put it as low as 50,000.

Now, what does the influx of such a number of people mean in transportation requirements? Why, the statement is made by officials of the Department of the Interior, speaking from actual knowledge, that it is

Mr. BLAIR.

unsafe for a man to go into that country unless he has assured at least supplies to last him a year, and the estimate is that a year's supplies will average in the neighbourhood of a ton per man. Now, supposing only the smallest number estimated seek to enter that country during this year, supposing there should only be 50,000 going to the Yukon, what would that involve? Why, it involves the transportation of 50,000 tons of supplies of all kinds. That is the information which I have from official and other sources. Well, the Government had to consider this difficulty—the getting of 50,000 tons of freight into that country to meet the demands of 50,000 people, with the facilities at their disposal absolutely inadequate for the transfer even of a considerable proportion of that quantity of tonnage. I dare say that some hon. friends opposite may think people are not likely to go into that country unless they are equipped sufficiently for such an expedition. But that is not the result of the observations of the officers of the Government. People will go there—indifferent, careless or thoughtless as to what will be their condition when they get there. Each will go in the hope, perhaps, that there will be no scarcity of provisions, at any rate, that there will always be a little margin for a few people, without stopping to think that there may be others in precisely the same case.

Now, Sir, if this information given to us is accepted—and, as a responsible Government we could not do other than accept the information we had received—what was the duty of the Government? I ask, Mr. Speaker, what was the duty which devolved upon the Government and what course ought we to take under the circumstances? With such a probability staring us in the face, could we afford to allow any time to be wasted; could we allow months or even weeks to go by which should be utilized if we were to meet the demand for transportation facilities? However desirous we might be, as we all would naturally be, to consult Parliament on this subject, to take the opinion of the representatives of the people and to ask authority before we had in any degree committed the Government to action, could we, I say, under the circumstances in which we were placed, realizing the responsibility that devolved upon us, do otherwise than we have done? I put this strongly, I desire to put it strongly, because the facts admit of our doing so. Under the circumstances, with the facts we had before us, with the knowledge we possessed, no course was open but that of prompt, immediate and instant action. If we had failed—let me put that to hon. gentlemen who surround me—if we had failed in acting upon our knowledge and convictions in this regard, should we not have been unworthy of confidence? Life, property, order, the prestige, the credit, the honour of Canada—these were

involved in our meeting in a sufficient manner the demands which were in this way forced upon us.

Now, it may be said : You had a force of North-west Mounted Police in that section ; why could you not rely on them to preserve order ? What could they have done in the face of such a condition of things as we believed might possibly arise in that country ? What would be the use of a small force with thousands of starving men about them struggling for the possession of the scanty supply of food that there might be there. Such a struggle would probably result in a perfect carnival of crime, and would reflect most deservedly upon the Government and people of Canada. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if, in making this statement upon the facts which I have presented to you in this brief way, I am exaggerating the obligation which rested upon the Government ? In what direction did the duty of Government lie ? Remember, Mr. Speaker, further, this condition of things which I have depicted to you is a condition of things which we regard as likely to arise in our own country, not in some remote disconnected section of the world in which we have no particular interest, but within the boundaries of Canada, for the good government of which, for the protection of life and property within which we are as much responsible as we would be in any of the settled portions of Canada. As we are thus responsible, a failure to realize and prepare for the duties which rested upon us could not have failed to cast the utmost discredit upon the Government and people of Canada.

Another imperative reason for immediate action, which I feel justified in mentioning, is that, if the precious metals abound in that country to the extent to which it is represented they abound, a question of Canadian trade immediately and necessarily arises. The importance of securing that trade and preserving it to Canada becomes a national question of the greatest interest, and makes it all the more important, and all the more necessary that we should act promptly, lest by inaction on our part this important trade, or a very considerable part of it, should be diverted, and might not at any later period return. This demand for action on our part, from the business men of Canada, from the manufacturers, the farmers, the wage-earners, from all classes in Canada, was that we should see to it that this trade should not be lost to us—for it is ours, it is within our own borders and of right belongs to us, if, by any legitimate or proper means we can secure it for the people of our own country. Looking at that phase of the question also, I ask what was the nature of the duty which lay upon the Government of Canada ? With these convictions, with this sense of responsibility, ought we to have waited until it was too late to act for this year ? Ought we to have deferred ac-

tion with fear and trembling lest we might perhaps do something which Parliament might not in every particular approve ? Ought we to wait for fear of inviting condemnation, or ought we to act ? Our conclusion was that we should act. And we did so relying upon the good sense of Parliament—of both branches of Parliament—for the approval of our action when the whole measure in all its bearings is understood.

Now, Sir, I have endeavoured, briefly, and I am quite conscious I have done it very feebly, to state the situation as the Government found it in that country. And I may say that immediately after the last session of Parliament, feeling that all the information that it would be possible for us to procure ought to be procured, and that information should be as accurate and reliable as possible. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) himself proceeded to the Pacific Coast and went to, or very nearly to, the scene of action in that country, passed through two or three of the passes and made himself acquainted with the situation as far as it was possible for him to do. Further, he despatched officers, competent and reliable officers, to look the ground over and explore it. He sent railway engineers to find out what were the most advantageous and the most favourable routes for railway construction, so that he might be satisfied and be in a position to satisfy the Government in regard to this question of railway construction and the best routes that were to be found which could be taken advantage of with the least possible delay. The gentlemen who were employed by him for that purpose gave their very best attention to the duties with which they were entrusted. They worked faithfully and energetically, but the task was an arduous one, and it was quite impossible even to finish their labours earlier than they did ; and it was not until about the 15th of December that we received from these officials their reports.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask the Minister of Railways if he will be good enough to lay a copy of these reports upon the Table of the House ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there will be no objection to my hon. friend being furnished this information. My recollection is—and the Minister of the Interior will be able to set me right, if I am wrong—that while he received an interim report about the latter part of the month of December, their final report was not received until towards the middle of January. You will see, therefore, that we had not been in possession of information very long before we took action. Perhaps it might be of interest to the House for me to state in a brief way the general result of the information which was furnished by these officers. There are a number of possible routes for a railway

from the coast into that country, but I think I am drawing a fair conclusion from the reports before us when I say that there are practically only five routes which could be considered debatable at all. The first is what is called the Skagway or White Pass route to Tagish Lake, and thence by the Hootalinqua River, the mileage of which is estimated at about 123 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Between what points ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. From Skagway through White Pass to the Hootalinqua River.

Mr. FOSTER. How far is it to Tagish Lake ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know exactly. I judge it is probably in the neighbourhood of 80 or 90 miles. The second route which they refer to is through the Chilkat Pass to Fort Selkirk; that route is between 300 and 350 miles long. The third route is through Chilkat Pass to Tagish Lake and the Hootalinqua River, and is about 110 miles long. The fourth route is from the Taku Inlet to Teslin Lake, 145 miles long. The fifth is from Glenora or Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake, 150 miles long. Now, of the five routes which we had before us, we had no hesitation, after fully considering them all, in rejecting the four first which I have named. We rejected them upon various grounds, but one principal ground was applicable to them all. In respect to them all it was necessary that they should cross a portion of the territory from the sea which was claimed, or at all events, was in the possession of a foreign government. We regarded that as a serious objection, as one which would be regarded unfavourably by the people of Canada; we regarded it as an objection which would strongly impress the business men and business interests of Canada, and we therefore rejected those routes. I need not go into all the details with regard to those various routes. Some of them were very expensive. The White Pass route, we believe, would cost a great deal of money; The Chilkat Pass route would cost a great deal of money; probably, among all these four the Chilkat route is, though the longest, the most favourable from a business point of view, and one which, were it not for the national considerations, might be very favourably regarded. But they were all rejected as not coming within the conditions which the Government of Canada concluded ought to exist before we should undertake the construction of a railway into that country. Now, a railway by the Teslin Lake route was decided on, the distance of which is, as I have said, estimated to be about 150 miles. In order to utilize that route, vessels will reach the ocean port in closest proximity to it at Fort Wrangell, a distance probably of not more

Mr. BLAIR.

than 150 miles from Telegraph Creek or Glenora.

Mr. FOSTER. In what territory is Fort Wrangell ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is probably in the United States territory; at all events, they claim it, and they are in possession of it, and have a customs port at Fort Wrangell. But the Stikine River, whose waters we propose to use, is a river that, under treaty with that country, we are entitled to use without being subject to any conditions. Navigation upon it is open to us as it is open to them.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask another question for information? A vessel starting from Victoria, bound with freight and passengers for Glenora, will it be able to go to Glenora and be able to land its goods on the wharf there for the railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly not, unless it is a very shallow craft.

Mr. FOSTER. Where will it have to unship ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The ocean transit will terminate at or in the immediate neighbourhood of Fort Wrangell, near the mouth of the Stikine River.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the hon. gentleman, for the sake of clearness: Does he mean to say, that such goods starting from Victoria and reshipping at Fort Wrangell, a port in United States territory, and going up to Glenora, even though we have free navigation of the Stikine River, will not be subject to the United States customs ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I am quite justified in going that far, and in saying that a ship which is freighted from Victoria or Vancouver, the object of which is to effect a transshipment at or near Fort Wrangell, may do so without encountering any obstacles from customs authorities—I think so. I will show the House why I think so. I presume, that if an ocean steamer proposed to land at Fort Wrangell and tie up at the wharf there, and unload goods at that port, they would be subject to the customs authorities; but I know no reason myself why a craft such as is used, or any other small craft available for the transshipment of this freight by the Stikine River, should not lie alongside a steamer which carries freight from our own ports to Fort Wrangell or to that locality, and transfer the freight from the larger to the smaller vessel, and the latter might then pass on its way. However, whether I am right or not in this, that is the condition that exists.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend will not think I am interrupting him, for this matter is, by his own admission, one of very great moment. As those four routes were thrown aside by the Government because of that consideration, has the Government taken the precaution of getting an authoritative statement from the law officer of the Crown on that point?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not, Mr. Speaker, obtained any opinion from the law officer of the Crown on that subject.

Mr. FOSTER. Or has my hon. friend, or any member of the Government, got from the United States Government their contention and claim as to what would be their rights under such circumstances?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot inform the hon. gentleman what information any other member of the Government may have received upon this subject. I am stating the case as it appears from my own knowledge and my own information with regard to it.

The situation, then, is this: vessels laden with freight for Telegraph Creek and the Yukon country may come to Fort Wrangell and many unship. If for the time being it may be necessary to go through some formality with the United States customs authorities, the difficulty would be very slight and far less onerous than elsewhere, the expense would be exceedingly trifling and the other conditions would be very much more favourable than could possibly exist if they had to travel over a long stretch of foreign country, involving the attendance and payment of the United States officers, as we have been doing for some months past in connection with other routes. The Stikine route was decided on by the Government largely because it afforded the nearest approach to an all-Canadian route that was possible under the circumstances; and it becomes possible, or will become possible, if in the future there should be found to be any difficulty whatever in the way of the use of the Stikine River or the approach to it, as suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite—for the Government to have a railway connected with the railway known as the Stikine and Teslin Lake line, extending from Telegraph Creek south, and there brought to an ocean point which is purely and exclusively in Canadian territory, and thus guarantee us for all time against any possible contingency as regards our Canadian line.

Mr. CHARLTON. What would be the additional mileage?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would add about 200 miles to the Teslin line, and this is the scheme which the Government has been promoting,

and it is mentioned in the contract which I am now submitting to the House.

We have, as I have said, concluded that the railway must be built; we have concluded that it must be built this season; we have concluded that the proper site for the railway under all the circumstances is from Telegraph Creek or from Stikine River to Teslin Lake. With those preliminary conclusions arrived at, I will now direct the attention of the House to the contract itself. The Government knew, or at all events we thought we knew, what was wanted in this direction. Then came the question as to how we could get what we wanted, and upon what terms could we get what we wanted. Some people have said: You ought to have advertised for tenders and asked contractors for what price they would build it. We had not time; it would not be possible to do so under any circumstances. It was not possible within the short time of ten days or a fortnight, which was about the limit of time we had available, to issue advertisements and receive tenders; it would take about that length of time to get out the advertisements alone, much less to receive offers and consider them as many people offer, ignorant of the difficulties surrounding the situation and without knowing the character of the undertaking, would have offered to enter into a contract. This is not a class of undertaking in which you would advertise for tenders. We have never done so, it was not done by our predecessors, and I presume it will never be done by any Government. The reports and information which those officers to whom I have referred furnished us, were to the effect that a railway by the Teslin Lake route could be built and got into running order by the 1st of September next, if we acted with promptness and expedition. If hon. gentlemen agree in the conclusions at which I arrived, that it was our duty to act, to build this line, that the proper route under the circumstances has been selected, and that railway communication is indispensable in view of the conditions existing or likely to exist in that country, the further conclusion is irresistible that we should act at once, without a moment's delay. If the people of the country realized as strongly as we do the imperative duty resting on the Government, they would think that we were making a laughing stock of ourselves by inviting tenders for this contract. That is the view I take in respect to this measure, and that is the view of the Government in deciding to grapple with the situation at once, and trust to the good sense of Parliament and the country to say that we could take no other than the course we adopted. Some hon. members also say that it was our duty to invite tenders on the basis of a grant of a smaller quantity of land. How could we estimate the value of

the land? We did not propose to give any money to the enterprise; we proposed that the Yukon territory should pay for the railway. How could we tell the value of the land; how could we tell in advance and fix for purposes of a tender the value of a land subsidy? One man would regard a million acres as worth millions of dollars and by letting his imagination have full play, that it contained untold quantities of gold. Another man, more canny, careful and conservative, might think there might not be a thousand dollars worth or a whole dollar's worth of the precious metal in the millions of acres offered. Thus, one man would take one view, another man another. We could not tell what value to place on the land, and no body of men, I do not care whether they possess the wisdom of Solomon, could decide what would be a fair and reasonable estimate to put on the land. It rests on chance, on conjecture wholly.

An hon. MEMBER. It is a gamble.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it is absolutely a gamble, nothing more and nothing less. Therefore, we could not publish to the world that we would give 5,000 acres per mile, less 5,000 acres might not catch the fancy of persons wishing to undertake the construction of the road. We could not offer 50,000 acres, for it might prove too much, and while a less amount might suffice to induce capitalists of a speculative turn to enter into a contract. We could only do as we did: when we found men willing to negotiate on a reasonable basis and enter into a contract, then to push forward the work with all reasonable speed and expedition. I do not think it would be possible to make a more irrational, a more absurd, a more utterly childish proposition than that in such an undertaking and in a great emergency, we should ask for tenders on ten day's notice, and ask the price at which contractors would be prepared to carry out the work.

As to Mackenzie & Mann, they called on the Government. Other gentlemen called on us as well—they were not the only people who called.

Mr. FOSTER. Who did?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We had quite a few people. I was not in Ottawa much at that time, and I am not as well informed with respect to those minute particulars and details as is my hon. friend Mr. Sifton. He will take occasion to enlighten the House fully on the matter. I know there were others. There were others who said they represented large amounts of capital and had untold means behind them and were willing to talk railway. But none of this large capital ever materialized; and, as far as I know, we did not get our eye on

Mr. BLAIR.

the credentials to establish how solid and capable these people were to carrying out the undertaking. However, we did have two gentlemen to make us an offer, we had Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and I suppose my hon. friends opposite will not sneer at their capabilities. They had been looking this thing over, and I believe they made overtures to my hon. friend as to the construction of this railway, or, to be correct, perhaps I should say, not as to the construction of this railway, but as to the construction of another railway, namely, the Chilkat Pass Railway, which naturally business men would much prefer to construct rather than the other. The result of their approaching the Government and of the negotiations which took place between us, was, that they were induced to drop their Chilkat enterprise and to take up with the Teslin line.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. member (Mr. Blair) permit me to ask him if the Chilkat Railway is what he called No. 2 line?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Chilkat Railway would be No. 2 line. It is a line, I may say, which we could not build under any possible circumstances in less than two years, and which, therefore, would not answer in the present emergency. We knew Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and anybody who knows these gentlemen, knows them to be responsible men, to be capable, strong, experienced men, to be men who have carried forward large enterprises of this same description, and who could not be bettered by any men in Canada. I am not going to say they are the only men in Canada who would be capable of carrying this work out, but I am going to say that they were the only two men in Canada that we knew of who were willing and capable of contracting to carry the work out. Therefore, after the negotiations, which covered a number of days after the most careful consideration by the members of the Cabinet, as a whole and individually, after every member of the Cabinet had studied the question, impressed with its great importance and with the immense desirability of making an arrangement that could be defended—after all this, and after my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), in the most indefatigable manner, had given his continued labour to the bringing about of a proper solution of these negotiations, we came to an understanding with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and the contract has been entered into which is now before you.

Whatever may be said with regard to the features of this contract, we have, at all events, the satisfaction of knowing that the men we have entrusted with its carrying out, are men who are admittedly on all hands competent to do it, and who will do it if it is in the power of con-

tractors to perform. There is some satisfaction in that, and I believe I am entitled to claim on behalf of the Government that in that respect our position is absolutely unassailable.

This brings me to the contract itself, and just at the outset I desire to convey as clearly as I can, in a general bird's-eye view, as it were, of its clauses and of its provisions, some idea of it before I get into a closer examination of its details. What the Government wanted to accomplish was this: we wanted to secure a sleigh road within six weeks from the 25th of January last, all the way from the mouth of the Stikine River to Teslin Lake, with shelters and stopping places provided every twenty-five miles along the entire route; we wanted to build a railway, suitably equipped, up to the standard of the Kaslo and Slocan narrow-gauge railway, 150 miles, or thereabouts, from the navigable waters of the Stikine to the navigable waters of Teslin Lake.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the estimated cost of that 150 miles of narrow-gauge road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimated cost?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the figures exactly before me, but I understand it was estimated to cost in the neighbourhood of \$25,000 per mile. Of course it might cost something less than that in a different part of the country, where there are greater facilities for construction. I am glad the hon member (Mr. Charlton) has invited my attention to that matter. It is impossible for any one to say just what the cost of the railway may be. Transportation, of course, is very expensive, and the conditions are absolutely and entirely different from those which prevail in other parts of Canada. The high rate of wages, cost of living, severity of the climate and many other conditions enter so very largely into the calculation of cost, that even an experienced person, unless he himself had prosecuted similar work in that country, would scarcely be justified in affirming that he knew what the cost of such a work would be.

Mr. FOSTER. Did I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) aright in saying that, after sending engineers and explorers and receiving their reports, he, as Minister of Railways, signed a contract giving so much for the building of the road, and has not under his hand an estimate from his engineers of what that road would cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) precisely understands: that I have not under my eye an estimate, or a statement professing to be an at all close

or accurate statement of what the probable cost of that railway would be. Now, not only did we desire to have completed and equipped this railway with great speed, but—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) if any such statement had been asked for from the engineers who went over the road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot say. The hon. member (Mr. Montague) will understand that I have not been in communication with the engineers.

Mr. FOSTER. Somebody ought to introduce the Bill who does understand it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The idea of the hon. gentleman and my idea, as to who should introduce the Bill, may not agree. The aim of the Government was in this contract to secure, further, that this railway should be constructed with such speed that railway trains carrying freight and passengers would be steaming over the whole line by the first of September next, and thereby to secure two months open navigation this year of the Teslin Lake and following waters. In the fourth place, it was the object of the Government to build a line by an all-Canadian route, thereby applying every available means for securing the vast anticipated trade of that region for the people of our own country. In the fifth place, it was our object to secure necessary steamship transport facilities from Teslin Lake to Dawson City immediately on the opening of the railway, and to so settle the terms of the contract as that the Yukon country should, as it were, pay for these advantages itself, so that not a dollar of the cost should be paid by the Government of Canada, or a dollar of liability assumed by us in that regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the objects which the Government desired to accomplish in making the contract; these are the objects which we have succeeded in accomplishing in the making of the contract, and we have received from the contractors no less a sum than a quarter million dollars deposit as security for the faithful carrying out of the contract by them.

Mr. FOSTER. On which you pay interest?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. On which we pay interest, while the money remains in our hands, unless it shall be forfeited.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). And on which we receive interest.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And upon which we receive interest as well as pay interest.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you putting it out at interest ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose the Minister of Finance should have introduced this Bill, so that he could have answered that particular question as well. Now, Mr. Speaker, what do the contractors get from the Yukon country, or, if you will, from the Government, in consideration of these covenants and these undertakings on their part—five substantial and important covenants and undertakings ? They are to get 25,000 acres of land per mile, selected in blocks at least six miles by twenty-four miles in area. No block can be selected less than six miles in width by twenty-four miles in length. Of these blocks four portions will be taken and become the property of the company, and alongside of them will be an equal number of alternate lots which remain the property of the Crown.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me, I do not clearly understand. Every block the contractors get must consist of a block six miles by twenty-four miles, which they own themselves ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of which they own one-half. There must be eight sections in each block selected. The moment a stake is put down, a base line is started and a selection is made. The company cannot get from the area they select more than four blocks of three miles by six for themselves, alongside of which and located alternately between which are blocks of the same size which remain the property of the Government ; so that each area selected consists of a block not less than six miles one way by twenty-four miles another way. Now, the selections are to be made subject to conditions and reservations to which I will refer later, and which go to show that the utmost care and caution has been exercised by the Government ; so that if the company should happen, as the result of the efforts they may make in prospecting those lands, to strike upon a valuable gold area, they cannot absorb or monopolize it all, because the Government blocks lie immediately alongside of those of their own which may contain these valuable mineral deposits. There is another important reservation, that if it happens that the company asks to have an area staked out which covers or includes a mining claim or claims which have been already located and recorded by any free miner, such a claim is at once excluded from the selection. It does not pass with the grant, but continues to be the property of the free miner and remains outside of the title which passes ultimately to the company.

Mr. FOSTER. Who selects the base line ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The base line, as will be seen

Mr. BLAIR.

when I come to discuss the clauses of the contract, works almost automatically, except that the starting point is to be made at the request or selection of the company. The company may send out their prospectors, and they may conclude that they have struck an area which is likely to be profitable. Then they indicate to the proper officer of the department the place where they want the stake put down. The stake is there put down, if it does not include a watercourse or is outside of the provision of the contract which refers to watercourses. The stake being placed, the line called the base line must be run from it in a direct course either due north and south or due east and west, and that base line runs down the centre of the tract with three miles on each side of it, together making the six miles which constitutes the length, as it were, of the blocks, and the next three miles constitute the width of the block which the Government owns, and so on along this base line until at least eight blocks have been run off. There may be more ; there is no limitation on the number. The company may ask that there may be two or any multiple of two added to the eight blocks, and they may add blocks on each side annexed to their own area up to a limited number. But there cannot be less than twenty-four miles by six miles laid out in any one selection. In addition to the reservation which I have spoken of with regard to the free miners' claims, we reserve from the power of selection the waters of certain important rivers which are mentioned in the contract, and certain important lakes which are also mentioned there. We reserve the beds and the banks up to high water mark, and twenty-five feet beyond it, on each side of all the rivers named in the contract, and the lakes which are also named.

Mr. FOSTER. And the company does not get those ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It cannot get those ; it cannot acquire any rights in respect of those ; so that, on all the great lakes and rivers in that important country, which cover and include a very considerable portion of what we believe will be the placer-mining of the country, we have absolutely precluded the company from acquiring any interest whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend mean by a watercourse—because this is very essential—a dry bed in most seasons of the year, such as Bonanza Creek and Eldorado Creek, which are now being staked out and worked as placer claims ? Does he mean that those courses which are at some period of the year watercourses, though not navigable, are rivers, so that the company cannot get them ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I say that every one of the beds and banks up to twenty-five feet beyond high water mark of all the rivers and lakes named in the contract are absolutely and entirely excepted from the selection by the company. Whether they are dry or whether they are wet is utterly immaterial.

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. gentleman is giving as a reason why this contract should be accepted, that the river beds—

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am stating the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman may be stating the facts, but surely I have the right to ask him, for the sake of a clear understanding, at this time, whether he is really sure, that he is doing anything more than reserving from this company the navigable and navigated streams and lakes. Is he sure?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I have told the hon. gentleman that each of the rivers named in this contract is, to the extent of its full width, and up to high water mark on each side, and for twenty-five feet beyond, excepted from the operation of this contract and not within the right of selection by the company. I have said that and nothing more, and I would thank the hon. gentleman, when he quotes what I have said, to state it accurately. I presume we may be asked: Why did you give so many acres as 25,000? Why did you not give the contractors less? Well, I may frankly acknowledge that the reason was because they would not take less. We could not force them to take less. We bartered and negotiated with them. Members of the Government and sub-committees of the Government—sub-committees constituting pretty nearly the whole numerical strength of the Government—urged on Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann every conceivable argument in order to get them to reduce their terms. And we did get them down very much below, I can assure you, the demands they made, but we could not get them below 25,000 acres per mile, and therefore did not. I had some little curiosity myself, when I asked the question here, to know how many thousand acres per mile these hon. gentleman, in their combined wisdom, putting all their heads together, with all the knowledge they possess, would say should be given to Mackenzie & Mann as the consideration for this contract. I would like any one of them to reply. Or would any one of them, having a sense of the responsibility which rests upon the members of the Government, dare to say that they would rather insist on taking off 5,000 or 10,000 from that contract per mile and throw the whole contract to the dogs, than face the country with the proposition to add 10,000 or 15,000 acres per mile to the terms

proposed? That is the question. It is not a question what these gentlemen, with their pockets full of money and ready to invest untold millions in that Klondike country, would be willing to give, or what value they would be willing to attach to these lands; but what amount would these hon. gentlemen, if they themselves were determining the question, feel they ought not to exceed, at the risk of a failure of the negotiations. That was a pretty serious question for the Government to face, and we had to face it. We came to the conclusion that if we could not get 5,000 acres per mile taken from the price, it was our duty to give Mackenzie & Mann the 25,000 they exacted as a condition of their taking up the contract.

When you come to think about it, what is there in the question of 1,000 or 5,000 or 10,000 acres out of the millions we have up there, and which we do not know are worth anything or not? It is a pure question of chance—absolute chance in every particular. It is all very well for gentlemen who do not intend to invest a dollar in the enterprise, who, if they had thousands, could not be induced, under any conditions, to hazard an investment in the securities of this company—it is all very well for such gentlemen to cry out about the waste of \$50,000,000 actual value given this company to build this railway. But if you were to ask them to take up one of the company's bonds at perhaps 95 per cent discount—no, they would be too careful and cautious to invest in so hazardous an experiment. They would not take the risk, but they will make these wild statements, because they hope thereby to discredit a political opponent. But coming down to the question of business, coming to the responsibility of concluding the negotiations, I want some one of them to tell me how many thousand acres he would feel the public interest would impel him to insist on the company's taking off, the refusal by the company to take off, which would justify the Government in putting an end to the negotiations. I do not know, for my part, whether the company of Mackenzie & Mann has made a profitable contract or not; I do not know whether they are going to make a great lot of money out of this thing or not. I sincerely hope they may. They deserve to do it, and I hope they will. And I say this, notwithstanding the carping criticism of gentlemen who write for the newspapers under the nom-de-plume of "Onlooker," and who criticise a great transaction like this in a picayune spirit, somewhat after the fashion of a parish vestryman dealing with the question of a five-dollar expenditure, or who, when they are not so criticising, are slandering better men—men who prize and value their character in the community at least as high as the hon. gentleman does, and who set as high a value upon their moral status. I say,

therefore, although I have no more interest than my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, in this transaction—and I believe in my soul he has not a farthing interest in it—although I have no interest directly or indirectly, I do hope that these contractors or the company which may become associated with them, may make handsome profits out of this venture. They deserve to do so. Why, if when we were facing a serious crisis—for I say it was a crisis in the history of our Dominion—these gentlemen, who are all responsible men, were willing to assume the responsibility of carrying this enterprise through, who is it who will be small enough to deny them handsome results? I certainly would not. If they, by the expenditure of their means, by their energy and business and organizing capacity can find precious metals of great value in this territory, and develop it, who is going to prosper? Is there any business man, is there a producer or manufacturer in Canada, who will not benefit by the enhanced prosperity and increased business which will flow from the development of this country, if these people have the valuable property hon. gentlemen opposite say they have? But the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite are mere conjectures, utterly incapable of proof.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend any information as to the acreage of the placer areas in the Yukon district?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not any available for the hon. gentleman at this moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Have my hon. friend and the Government placed any value at all upon this acreage of placer mining country which is to be chosen by these gentlemen—any value at all per acre?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt the hon. gentleman, with his large financial and business experience, and his somewhat extensive mining knowledge, will be able to form a judgment on that question perhaps as well as any member of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. But I am not introducing the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has formed any judgment as to the value of these lands? Now, we are proposing to give the contractors 25,000 acres per mile, guarding the selection of these lands as carefully as it is possible for us to guard it. Whether we have given them in one of these acres a bonanza or a second Eldorado we do not know. We may have done so; but we may not. It is all a chance, but it is one of those chances in which happily for the Government and

Mr. BLAIR.

the country, the risk is all carried and borne by the other parties to the contract. We do not assume any risk; they do. And, Sir, upon all the principles which govern business transactions it is only fair that if these people who will carry this risk, who will expend their millions in carrying out an enterprise for the benefit of this country, should reap magnificent results. I do not think the people of Canada will refuse them the benefits which they have thus deserved. We take none of the chances; they take them all; and I think that, under the circumstances, this must be the strongest confirmation of the policy and the conduct of the Government in the judgment of any fair-minded man. I do not expect hon. friends opposite to approve of this thing. But I am glad to know that in the main, in the substantial features of this contract and this policy, we have the approval and commendation of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) who leads the Opposition. I am glad that that hon. gentleman has taught some of his supporters that there is in the ranks of the great Conservative party at least one man who has had enough business experience, enough experience of the responsibilities which attaches to members of Government, who has enough patriotism and breadth of mind to rise, for the consideration of a great public question, above the mere consideration of party ends and party interests. I have not very often been the recipient of compliments from my hon. friend opposite; I do not know that we have exchanged any of a flattering kind, nor do I expect any in the future. But I will say that if the party were constituted of such as some who have given expression to their views upon this question in this House, then, I think the party would not deserve to be led by a man of the breadth and capacity of the hon. gentleman who now leads the Conservative party in this House. Outside of all these questions on the value of the land, and so on, which must be a matter of mere guess, of speculation and conjecture at the best, I feel confident that the country would reap its benefit not by the holding of these lands particularly. It would reap no special benefit from that. These lands must go to somebody, somebody must acquire them in order to work them—otherwise they are no better than if no precious metal lay under the soil—we are not doing any more than is done, even by the great country to the south of us, for when they convey an acre of land they pass the title to all minerals without reservation even of the precious metals. In this case we get the railway built in that country by giving away its lands, and the Government will find its account in the increased business which will result to Canada if a fraction of these imaginary ideas as to the value of this property is realized as the result of the contractors.

Now I have endeavoured to cover the general features of this contract as carefully and as fully as I could, and now I proceed to give a synopsis of the different sections of the Bill. The contract is dated 25th January last and is executed by the Minister of Railways through the Minister of Inland Revenue, I being myself absent, and the Minister of the Interior on one part, and Mackenzie & Mann on the other. Under the first clause the contractors covenant to build a railway with proper terminal facilities from the navigable waters of the Stikine River in British Columbia at or near the mouth of Telegraph Creek, Glenora, or the mouth of Clear Water River to the navigable rivers of Teslin Lake, an estimated distance of about 150 miles, by the 1st of September, 1898. The railway is to be of the general standard and gauge of the Kaslo and Slocan Railway in British Columbia. Owing to the extreme urgency and need of having trains over the line as soon as possible, and not later than the 1st of September, a proviso is added that, for the purposes of the season of 1898, and of complying with the requirements of the contract as to completion, it shall be sufficient if on or before that day the contractors have the track laid so as to permit of the operation of the railway, although the whole work be not fully completed so as to entitle the company to claim acceptance of the road by the Government, or to earn its land subsidy. As time will not permit of plans being made, submitted and approved of in the usual way before location of the line of railway, and before the work of construction is carried on, for the protection of the Government, and to prevent an undue extension of the line and larger mileage, the land subsidy, it is provided, shall not be allowed upon a larger mileage than the Minister considers reasonably necessary for covering the distance between the terminal points.

Clause No. 2 provides for the submission to Parliament, at the next session, of a Bill to confirm the contract and to authorize the terms thereof being performed, and for the incorporating a company with power to acquire and contract, and to carry out its provisions, and power also to build and operate the railway I have described, together with an extension thereof and branch lines; the most important of which is an extension southward into British Columbia to a point capable of being made an ocean port, and an extension northward to Dawson City. Power is contemplated by this clause to be given the company to build a line when, but not before, the Governor in Council may consent, from Lynn Canal to Fort Selkirk.

Mr. HAGGART. What distance is that?
The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. From the Chilkat Pass.

Mr. HAGGART. How many miles?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Three hundred to three hundred and fifty miles from the Chilkat Inlet. This power, you will observe, was held in reserve. There has been as yet, no charter granted by Parliament for the construction of a line through the Chilkat Pass. We anticipated that an application might be made. The same view which the contractors had that this was the most desirable of all routes to build would influence contractors or promoters to take up this enterprise, and the Government thought that it would be only reasonable, since we refused to allow, or to encourage or aid the construction of a line via the Chilkat Pass to Fort Selkirk, by Mackenzie, Mann and those with whom they were associated, but induced them to take up this other work on an all-Canadian route, not to allow any other company to be incorporated for the purpose of constructing a road that would enter into direct and probably successful competition with the all-Canadian line built by these contractors.

Now it is needless for me to add that the land subsidy is only contracted for in respect of the line from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake; with respect to the other lines and branches mentioned, the Government assumes no obligations to ask Parliament for a grant in aid of their construction. It is further provided in the second clause that the Act of incorporation of the company shall give the company power to build wharfs and docks, to acquire and operate steam and other vessels in connection with its railway; to erect telegraph and telephone lines; to carry on mining and smelting operations, and other incidental powers connected with the development of the mines; the power to issue land grant bonds and bonds to secure the company's undertaking.

Clause No. 3 provides that upon the incorporation of the company and the assignment of the contract to the company by the contractors, and the company's covenanting with the Government to carry out the same, and upon the railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake being completed and accepted by the Government, the contractors shall then, but not before, be relieved from personal responsibility thereunder, and the company shall be substituted for Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and the company shall be deemed to be the contractors and shall be bound to carry out the work contracted to be performed.

Now, Sir, I come to clause 4. This clause is what has been characterized, or will be characterized, I suppose, as the monopoly clause. I want to put the facts before this House, at all events, as they strike my mind, and I claim that this clause, instead of being objectionable, is one of the most, if not the most, defensible clauses in a contract composed of defensible clauses from beginning to end. I think that this clause ought properly to be called, not a monopoly

clause, but a clause for better securing the trade and business of the Yukon district for the Canadian people. The clause was in fact forced upon Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann: it was not forced upon us, but was forced upon them by us. I repeat what I said before. The company desired to build that line. We said: No, we cannot permit it. Well, then, they said, somebody else will build that line if we go on and build by the Teslin route, it being, from a business point of view, the most favourable. We said: We will not allow it for a term of years, at all events; and in our own interests it was done, not in theirs, because the contract could not have been entered into unless we were prepared to give them some protection against the destructive competition which would arise if this other route were built—destructive not only to the company, but, as I have suggested, destructive to Canadian interests, we believe. The clause is not inserted therefore in their behalf, but for the protection of our own interests. It provides for a line of railway from the Lynn Canal through the Chilkat Pass to Fort Selkirk, if the Government authorized or required it to be built; and if they were disposed to aid it, the aid should be given to them and no others. If we felt that the work ought to be proceeded with, then we would simply yield to the request when the time arrived, which they pressed upon us now. That is to say, we should allow them to take the work up which otherwise, in the absence of our refusal, they would have taken up at the present time. I have said that this line of railway would doubtless be authorized into that portion of the Yukon country as the best commercial route. The railway contractors would feel like making use of this route as the one most desirable from a business point of view. But the Government felt that they could not reasonably expect a responsible company to take up the Teslin Lake route if they were liable to be met with competition at the hands of a company who should own a route from the Lynn Canal, and the clause was for this reason, chiefly, inserted in the contract. It is quite unnecessary to say, but I may perhaps say it, that this does not in the slightest degree interfere with any existing charters which have been granted. We only engage to ask Parliament to consent to stay its hand for a term of five years, from the incorporation of another company in that neighbourhood, or from the incorporation of a company from the boundary into the Yukon country. We have had present in our minds this fact, that between now and the expiration of that date, we will be able, by exploration surveys, and by careful examination of the ground, to determine whether or not an assured all-Canadian route from east of the Rocky Mountains, can be found running in that direction from Edmonton west, and whether, in that period,

Mr. BLAIR.

such a line could possibly be constructed. In the meanwhile, five years will afford us an opportunity to investigate that question, to which, I think, I may say, in passing, it is the intention of the Government to direct its early attention. Now, by clause 5, the company are entitled to receive, during ten years from the 1st of September, 1898, in preference to any other company, such land or money subsidy as the Government may authorize to be granted in aid of the extension of the railway from the Stikine River to an ocean port in British Columbia if we decide that it is necessary to do so, if Canadian interests demand that it shall be done; and we engage that they shall have the first offer of any aid that we are willing to give for carrying out that undertaking.

Clause 6 provides that the tolls to be collected by the company upon its line of railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake shall be fixed by the Governor in Council, and the tolls so fixed shall not be liable to reduction until the railway has been in operation for four years; then, at the expiration of which time the tolls shall be reduced by 25 per cent; in other words, for seven years from the date of the going into effect or operation the original tolls as fixed may be reduced by 50 per cent. The rate so fixed may continue three years longer, when the general railway laws of Canada will take effect as respects the company's tolls.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has any determination been arrived at as to the granting of tolls?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. None.

Mr. CHARLTON. So much per mile, per passenger, or per ton?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No; those are details that, I may say, Mr. Speaker, we have not yet had time to deal with officially.

Under clause 7 of the contract, the lands granted to the contractors shall be free from taxation for ten years from the granting thereof, except as respects municipal taxation by any incorporated city, town or village in the Yukon provisional district.

Clause 8 is an important one, and imposes on the company the obligation within six weeks from the 25th of January last to construct a practical sleigh road from the mouth of the Stikine River to Teslin Lake, and to provide suitable shelters or stopping places for travellers at intervals of not more than 25 miles along such road.

Clause 9 compels the company to provide, or to arrange with others to provide, steam-boat transport for freight and passengers between the terminus of their railway on Teslin Lake, or any other terminus or from any extension thereof, northerly to and from Dawson City.

Clause 10 requires the company, within ten

days after the execution of the contract, to deposit as security \$250,000. That amount, I believe, has already been deposited.

Clause 11 is one which, in a general way, provides for the aid or grant of 25,000 acres per mile.

I referred in my previous remarks to the manner in which the lands are to be selected. The selection is governed by the clauses and sub-clauses of clauses 12, 13 and 14 of the contract chiefly. The scheme of division or selection provides that the Government shall own alternate blocks with the company. This is a valuable provision and reserves, it appears to me, to the Government a full participation, equal with the company, in the benefits of any valuable minerals which may be discovered. The blocks into which the land selected shall be divided are to be not less than three miles in one direction by six miles in the other, or than eighteen square miles in all. Not less than eight of these blocks can be taken in any one selection, and of these eight, the odd-numbered blocks belong to the company, and the even-numbered blocks to the Government. It is, therefore, provided that when the company makes any selection at all in any locality, the selection must cover and include an entire block of twenty-four miles in one direction by six miles in another. It may include any number of blocks additional which the company may choose, but the number shall not be less than I have stated. A block twenty-four miles by six would mean 144 square miles, and would contain 92,160 acres. So that it will not be open to the company in earning its entire subsidy, to make more than eighty selections of blocks in all that region, one-half of which, as I have stated remain the property of the Crown.

Important exceptions are made in two directions. First, the Government reserves the beds of the principal rivers of the region—the Yukon, Lewes and Hootalinqua—and the beds of the Lakes Teslin, Bennett, Tagish, Labarge and Marsh, and between twenty-five feet beyond ordinary high water mark on each side of these rivers, and on all sides of these lakes, the contractors are debarred from making any selection of lands. These reservations, it will be observed, still continue available for the general public to carry on placer or sub-aqueous mining, and it will be still open to the Government to apply its regulations, authorizing companies to carry on sub-aqueous dredging or other operations, without these presumably valuable parts of the country being subject to claim or selection by the company.

Another important exception which the contract provides for is that all mining claims actually held, and recorded pursuant to Government regulations by free miners up to the time that the selection is made, and the lands are especially reserved following such selection, are excepted from

the grant, and although any of these claims may be found within the territorial limits of a block, the claims do not pass to the company, but are expressly excepted therefrom. The lands may continue open to the staking of claims, under the mining regulations by miners, and subject to the mining regulations, until they have been earned by the building of the railway. Land selections are permitted to be made as each ten miles of the line is reported upon by the Government engineer to be completed within the terms of the contract, and when a selection is made after the completion of these ten miles, the lands so selected are reserved for grant; and from the time of the reservation, claims may not be staked out by free miners or other selections made thereon; but the grant of the land will not pass, nor will the title become vested in the company until the final completion of the whole line.

Clause No. 13 allows the contractors three years from the 1st September, 1898, to select one-half of their lands, and six years from the same date to select the balance. The object of the company will naturally be to stake out their lands and make their selections as soon as possible, so as to prevent the location of miners' claims; but the time afforded the contractors has been considered by the Government a reasonable time, seeing that they will require to organize their parties for prospecting throughout the country, and such prospecting over so difficult and extensive area will likely consume quite a considerable time.

Mr. CASEY. Within what area may they select?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Within the boundaries of the territories west of the Mackenzie River. Clause No. 15 secures the free rights of passage and use along the navigable or floatable streams within any lands selected by the contractors, and they covenant not to impede navigation in any way; and if any stream is diverted by them from its natural channel, an equally navigable or floatable channel shall be provided in lieu thereof.

Clause No. 16 contains in express terms the proviso that all mining claims actually held and recorded shall be excepted from the grant, as I have above mentioned.

Clause No. 17 deals with the important question of royalty. The Government has reserved a royalty of 1 per cent upon all gold mined by the company upon lands which they have acquired, and which are mined by placer or alluvial or hydraulic mining; and this royalty shall continue so long as there is any royalty upon these classes of mining. If at any time the regulations with respect to placer or hydraulic mining are changed, and no royalty whatever is imposed thereupon, the royalty upon the production of the company would of

necessity cease. The same royalty, however, upon quartz mining shall be imposed and will be continued, notwithstanding that a royalty under Government regulations might not be imposed on other quartz mining. It is anticipated that the operations of the company may, in view of the reservation of the beds of the rivers and lakes referred to in clause 14, be chiefly in the line of quartz mining. This rate of 1 per cent corresponds with the rate which is paid in the province of British Columbia on all precious metals, and it is felt that the imposition of any higher rate or royalty would seriously militate against any financial arrangements which the company might need to make for the carrying on of the undertaking.

The general effect of clause 18 is to permit of a reservation of two blocks of the five to which the company would be entitled on their land subsidy on the completion of each ten miles. The two blocks may be selected as each ten miles are completed, and are then reserved for the company, and as a necessary consequence excluded from location by others. The remaining blocks, however, which go to make up the whole acreage for the full line, could not be reserved until the line is accepted as fully completed, and until that event occurs no grant from the Crown will issue. It will be seen that the Government is hereby reserving, as an additional security for the final completion of the undertaking according to the contract, three-fifths of the lands which will be earned by completion of the railway. The remaining clauses are less important.

Clause 19 provides that in case any land is accepted out of the blocks taken by the contractors on account of miners' claims or otherwise, the quantity so accepted shall not be counted in the acreage of land to which the company is entitled.

By clause No. 20 the contractors shall upon application sell to actual settlers, at prices to be fixed by the Governor in Council, any arable land which may be found in the country, and which may form part of their selection under the contract; provided, however, that the minerals and the rights to mine shall be reserved in such sale.

Clause 21 contains an engagement on the part of the Government to send an engineer at once to make an inspection and approve of any ten miles of the line of railway which may have been built.

Clause 22 provides that the grant of land selected by the contractors under their contract shall be in fee simple, and shall include all precious metals and minerals—reserving only the royalty.

Clause 23 declares that a provision shall be made in the Act incorporating the company against any discrimination in operating its railway as between customers, either by discriminating rates or otherwise.

Mr. BLAIR.

Clause 24 provides that water available for hydraulic or placer mining on the contractors' lands, or on the Government lands, shall be used by those mining on such lands under regulations established by the Governor in Council.

The last clause provides for the submission of the contract for the approval of Parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have concluded my reference to this Bill, and I am afraid that I have about exhausted the patience of hon. members. I desired to put this matter as fully as possible before the House on the first reading, in order that the Bill might not go before Parliament and the country unaccompanied by such explanations as I have been able to make with reference to its provisions. I believe, Sir, that this Bill will stand close examination. The Government has great confidence in this measure and in the wisdom of its clauses, and all we desire is that the Bill shall be fairly examined and that it shall be well understood. We have taken the responsibility—in some sense, an unusual and exceptional responsibility—of entering into this contract so close on the eve of the session of Parliament. We could not conscientiously see that we had any other course open to us, and we were obliged to take the responsibility upon ourselves, reluctantly, regretfully I may say, but none the less imperatively. We put this Bill before Parliament, and we put it before the country, as the expression of our confident judgment with regard to what the needs of the situation called for. In doing this we have acquitted ourselves of our responsibility, and it will remain with Parliament; not with one branch of Parliament alone, but with both branches of Parliament, to say whether or not this Bill shall become law.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not my intention to discuss the Bill at any great length at this stage, because I have not had an opportunity of reading the contract which has been laid on the Table just now, or of reading the Bill itself. However, from what I have heard, it is the most extraordinary Bill that was ever introduced to the Parliament of Canada. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) was introducing a simple measure for the purpose of building a railway, but the character of the measure, perhaps, justified his warmth of expression, for he found it necessary to criticise the actions of the leader of the Opposition, and to further criticise in no very complimentary terms some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. It should be a pure business transaction with regard to which there was no need for warmth of expression. It is a simple question which has to be discussed upon the Bill itself.

The Bill, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) stated, is in two parts. One is to ratify a contract entered into by the Government with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann,

and the other part provides for the formation of a company, or the giving of a charter to a company, which authorizes these gentlemen to transfer their contract and gives them power to build the road under the contract with the Government. That is a perfectly justifiable proceeding, and precedents can be found for it in the action of previous Governments. The first thing to be considered is the necessity for building this road, and I may say that the Minister of Railways has perhaps made out a case in reference to that, with which I shall not quarrel. As to the plan and the route adopted for the road, I intend to offer a little criticism now reserving of course my fuller comments for a later stage. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) stated that there were five plans before him, three of which were rejected on account of their passing over portions of American territory, and it was the decision of the Government to have the road entirely upon Canadian soil. As I understood the Minister (Mr. Blair), the road proposed to be built is from a place called Glenora to Teslin Lake. Glenora is on the Stikine River, in Canadian territory, and, of course, Teslin is also in Canadian territory. But in order to reach Glenora we have to pass up the Stikine River from Fort Wrangell. As we all know, that part of the Stikine River is in American territory, and by the Treaty of Washington we have a common right with the Americans to navigate the Stikine River. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) asked the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) whether he inquired what our legal rights were as to the navigation of that river, and although he had decided upon this road and told us he preferred it on account of its being an all-Canadian route, yet he stated that he had not made inquiries from the legal department of his Government as to what our particular rights on the Stikine were. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) presumed that an ocean vessel sailing up to Fort Wrangell had the privilege of lightening her cargo and passing it from there to Glenora, because, as I understood it, that part of the Stikine River between Fort Wrangell and Glenora is not navigable for ocean steamers. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) followed the controversy between Canada and the United States, he must know that, notwithstanding our having the right of navigation on the Stikine River, the Americans insist upon making the customs regulations in reference to that river, and he must also know that where the Americans have the common right of navigating our rivers, we insist upon a similar right of regulating our customs, and have always insisted upon it. The Americans have the right of navigating the St. Lawrence River, but does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) know that we insist upon making the customs regulations, and does he not also know that the Americans insist upon making cus-

toms regulations in reference to the Stikine River and all such other rivers within their territory upon which we have the right to navigate? Instead of this being an all-Canadian route, we have the right to go to Fort Wrangell, and the very doubtful right—although it has the authority of the Minister of Railways—of lightening the load of an ocean steamer and carrying it from the port of Fort Wrangell to the point at Glenora.

Mr. FOSTER. In another vessel.

Mr. HAGGART. Exactly; in another vessel altogether. How would we like, if the Americans, who have the right to navigate the St. Lawrence on equal terms with our own people, should take a vessel down to the head of our canals, lighter it into American vessels at our own port, without customs regulations at all, and navigate it down the St. Lawrence to Montreal? We never would allow them that right. We never claimed such a right, and we have no right to claim it, with regard to the navigation of the Stikine River, and no nation like the Americans will ever grant us any such rights on that river. These are the facts, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) had better inquire into them before another step is taken in the proceedings under this Bill. He had first better find out what our legal rights upon the Stikine River are. Admitting the necessity of this road, for, though I have not had time to consider it, I think the Government have some justification for building even a temporary road, as the Premier calls it, for the purpose of establishing traffic facilities in that country. You will notice the extraordinary arguments of the hon. Minister of Railways. He states that a gentleman connected with transportation in this country estimated the number of people who would go into that country next year all the way from 250,000 down to 50,000. The hon. gentleman's opinion may be correct; I have no doubt it is. He founds his argument upon the lesser number, and estimates that each person will take in a ton of goods per year, or 50,000 tons. Then, in another breath, the hon. gentleman goes on to ask what is the value of these lands which we are giving to the company. It is all a gamble, he says, a matter of speculation. Yet he built up a case which proved the advisability of giving the company as little land as possible for the simple reason that the traffic over the road is to be of the enormous extent he mentioned. What kind of a road are we going to have? The hon. Minister tells us that the Government engineers went over the country, but he does not tell us what the gradients of the road are to be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think you have got all that in the standard.

Mr. HAGGART. I know the standard of the Kaslo and Slocan Railway as well as the hon. gentleman does. It is a road built among mountains, twisting around a hill, with a curvature perhaps fifty times greater than anything that will be necessary on this road. We know nothing about this road, for we have not the report of the engineer, which, I suppose, the hon. gentleman will lay on the Table of the House before another stage of this Bill is taken. The standard of the road, he says, is to be that of the Kaslo and Slocan Railway. What kind of a road is that? A narrow-gauge road, with rails twenty-seven or thirty pounds to the yard—the same kind of rails as those at present used on Galt's line of railway from Lethbridge to the boundary of the United States. I believe the contractors have bought the rails and the old engines of that road for the purpose of putting them on this road. At any rate, the road is only going to be a temporary road, as the hon. leader of the Government stated the other evening—a narrow-gauge road, built upon any gradients and with any curvature the contractors may think fit, so long as it comes within the specifications of that mountain road built by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from Kaslo to Slocan.

Mr. FOSTER. Not built by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. HAGGART. It was an independent road, but it was afterwards obtained by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I thought you knew all about it.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps I am mistaken on that point. I did not know who the possessor of the road was, but I have been over it, and I know exactly what its character is. What are the Government to give for the building of this road? They are to give 25,000 acres of land per mile, or for the whole road, 3,750,000 acres. How to be selected? To be selected, according to the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways, in alternate sections of six miles by three, the Government getting the alternate sections of the same size. The hon. gentleman says: Oh, what is 25,000 acres of land in such an immense area as we have in the North-west Territories? As an hon. gentleman stated the other evening, it is but a blotch on the map. Although many Government parties have been sent out to explore the country, I make the statement, that there has not yet been found in the whole of Alaska gold-bearing lands to the extent of 3,000,000 acres; and the amount you are giving here is not to be judged in comparison with the extent of the whole country, but with the extent of the gold-bearing area, and I venture to say that it will be found to be equal to at least one-half of the whole gold-bearing area of that country. How will the hon. Minister build

Mr. HAGGART.

the other road which he says he intends to build from Edmonton? How is he going to make the extension from Glenora southward? He has given away half of the gold-bearing lands of the country for the purpose of building a tramway 150 miles long, on which he does not know even what toll shall be charged. He boasts of the bargain he has made with the contractors, but he does not know what the bargain is. He says he is going to have the tolls reduced 50 per cent in four years, but he does not know what they are to be in the first year. It is the duty of the hon. gentleman also to give this House the estimates of his department of the cost of building that road. He has the survey of the route made by the engineers who went over the country and located the line, and we want to know what the quantities are so as to judge whether he is making a good bargain with these parties or not. We want to know all the particulars, because we can judge from the quantities just as well as the hon. gentleman can. Why does he give the contract to these parties without tender? He says it had to be done in a hurry. Did any one in the country know that he was negotiating with these parties for the building of this road? Did the people interested in that country know anything about it? Nothing whatever. He says he took offers from other parties. He says, further, that he had only ten days in which to arrange the matter. Could not the hon. gentleman have consulted six men, or ten, or eighty, and have sent to them private invitations to tender for the construction of this road, just as easily as one? I am not saying anything against the contractors whom the hon. gentleman has selected. They are two efficient men, well able to perform their part of the contract: but there are other contractors in the country as able as they are, and every one of these men had a right to be asked to make an offer by private tender for the building of that road. Further, the contractors have a monopoly for the next five years. The hon. gentleman, if I understood him rightly, said that the Government have pledged themselves that they will not charter a line of road which starts from American territory and runs into that particular portion of the country, because the Americans might charter a railway through their country, and thus enable people who wished to go into the country to do so by a much shorter line than the Mann & Mackenzie road.

The Government have pledged themselves not to grant a charter to any party for a number of years, if I understand the hon. gentleman aright, or to give a monopoly. Further than that if the Government desire to extend the road southwards at some future time, and if they intend to give bonuses for the purpose of assisting such extension, either in the shape of cash or land grants, these gentlemen are to have that contract too. Not only have they

the contract for the building of this 150 miles of road, but they have the ownership of it as well. The Government will not own the road. This 150 miles will belong to these parties themselves. I did not hear from the hon. gentleman whether they are bound to run it. They are bound, I think, under the contract, to run it for one year, and then they may close it up and make all they can out of the 3,750,000 acres of gold land which they will have. It is too ridiculous. Is there any company in the world which, if it had the selection of 100,000 acres of gold land in that country, or land on which gold is likely to be found, who could not go to Toronto or Montreal or London or any other financial centre and raise more money three times over than is required to build the 150 miles of road which this Government are giving over to this company. I think there is not a business man in the country who knows these facts, who, if he had 100,000 acres of gold land—not to speak of 3,750,000 acres—in a section of the country such as this is reported to be—because, after all, we are predicating all we are doing on the information we have at present with reference to that country—there is not a business man who could not raise, under these circumstances, three times the amount required to build this line. The hon. leader of the Government ought to be informed as to whether this is likely to turn out a paying speculation or not. No doubt the Government are informed from the parties they have up there—the Mounted Police, the officers of Customs, the officers of the Department of the Interior. The Government must know the capabilities of that country at present, and if the probabilities are one tithe what they are reported to be in the newspapers, a more monstrous bargain was never made by any Government. That any such bargain will pass the Parliament of Canada, although the hon. gentleman says it will, I very much doubt. I will venture to say, from the information I have at present with reference to that transaction, that no member of this House who values his constituency, who looks to the probability of being returned again, will ever vote for a Bill of that kind. The idea—the whole country was rejoicing in the discovery, we saw the daylight, we saw the prospect of the country becoming a great nation, we supposed we had the largest gold field at present in the known world, the eyes of every nation in the world were looking towards us, the hon. gentleman himself estimated that 250,000 people would go into that country this year, and yet he gives away one-half of that country for the purpose of building this tramway of 150 miles. Oh, but he says, he has reserved the beds of most of the streams. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have looked at this Bill. These streams, one of which is the Yukon, and two or three lakes, are reserved, in not one of

which, I believe, has there been any gold found—because we all know there is no gold found on the main streams of the Yukon, or very little, or in this Teslin Lake, but on the little streams that flow into the Yukon at different points. Does he reserve the gold in these small streams? No, but he gives the contractors the right to all the gold that can be found in them, he gives the contractors the beds of the streams themselves. Although a stream be navigable, the contractors can divert it, so long as they give the rights of navigation on the diverted streams, but the bed of the stream is theirs.

I am not acquainted with the full details of the Bill. I would ask the hon. gentleman what my hon. friend has asked for, that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) shall bring down all the reports which he has with reference to the minerals in that country. He has had an officer, I believe, up there who is very well posted.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The House will be put in possession to-morrow of all the information and reports, in the fullest detail, in the possession of my department.

Mr. FOSTER. And the maps?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, everything I have.

Mr. HAGGART. Will they be supplied to each member?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Just as fast as they can be prepared. Of course the hon. gentleman will perceive it will be somewhat difficult to prepare the copies for each member.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a map already prepared which takes in that line of the coast and gives all the routes, and I think each member ought to have that.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman will say what is required in order that they may have the fullest information, I shall endeavour to supply everything they desire.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand from the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) that the engineers who went and surveyed—I do not know whether they located or not—but who went over the different lines of railways belonged to the Interior Department, and the information was furnished to that department and not to his.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, the reports were made to me.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like information with regard to that.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It will be brought down.

Mr. HAGGART. And I shall postpone until then further discussion of this im-

portant subject, which was introduced, I must say, in a manner most unusual—I have never heard of a measure of this importance introduced before the Queen's Speech is passed. It is an extraordinary proceeding, and perhaps it is better the House should be fully informed in the matter, and be taken into the confidence of the hon. Ministers, for they are setting a precedent which perhaps it would not be advisable to follow in other cases. I shall reserve further and fuller discussion of the Bill until I am better informed of the details.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not wish to detain the House, but the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has made some very wild statements which call for comment, and which I am surprised a gentleman of his experience would venture to risk his reputation by making. In the first place, he stated, amid the cheers of his followers, that the Government had given away one half the territory of this particular country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. One-half of the gold-bearing portion. Now, I have it on the authority of Mr. Ogilvie, who is certainly fairly well acquainted with that country, that its gold-bearing territory exceeds 125,000 square miles. Now, what does that amount to? It amounts to no less than 80,000,000 acres, and we are giving this company 3,750,000 acres, or one acre out of every twenty, to construct a road for the purpose of developing that enormous territory. We keep over 76,000,000 of acres for ourselves, while they get 3,750,000 acres. Now I am amazed to find an hon. gentleman who has been a Minister of the Crown rising on the spur of the moment and making such extravagant statements as the hon. gentleman has made in an attempt to discredit the Government for their action in parting with this land under the circumstances. All experimental lines constructed in Canada have not been by any means of great value to their promoters. If my hon. friend is at all acquainted with the experience of those who engaged in constructing experimental lines into the mountainous sections of the United States, rich in the precious metals though we knew them to have been, he knows that not 10 per cent of those lines are to-day in hands of the original owners. Nearly all of them have been closed up and are now lying idle, or they are being operated by the men who took the bonds. Considering the absolute necessity for the construction of this line, considering the extreme emergency which the Government had to face, I think that their course has been the best one and that it is advisable that immediate access should be given to that country without going over American territory. Even suppose it is found out, after the road is built, that these men who received a grant of the land and

Mr. HAGGART.

who are going to build the road have received a very valuable territory, even though it prove to have almost inexhaustible stores of mineral wealth, it must not be forgotten that they risk enormously to get it in undertaking what they have bound themselves to do. I hope for the sake of the country that they will carry out what they have undertaken. I believe this will prove a good bargain for us. One notable feature about it is that it is not characterized, as were contracts entered into in former years by hon. gentlemen when in power, by any condition committing the credit of the country to the expenditure of a single dollar. The taxpayers are not called upon to pay a farthing.

Mr. WALLACE. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the discussion is precipitated on the first reading of the Bill, as the contract involves a discussion, a somewhat full discussion in response to the invitation of the Minister of Railways, without our having the advantage of reading the documents, and without our having had an opportunity to weigh the various propositions involved in the contract and in the Bill. I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that I am not at all envious at seeing them sit upon that side of the House. But while the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was speaking, I did regret, and I regret now that just for one short week these gentlemen were not on this side of the House. Remembering as we do their denunciations, their numerous objections in discussing everything submitted by the late Government, I know that many of them are sorry that they are not here so that they might give vent to their indignation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Name.

Mr. WALLACE. Name? Well, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), the hon. member for North Lambton (Mr. Lister), the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). I could name a score more who would be delighted to have even for one single hour a chance to engage in their old work of denunciation. For, in all their history, in the history of this Parliament there never has been such an outrageous proposition submitted to it as this.

When I saw the advance posters a week or ten days ago in the "Globe" newspaper, I thought it was such a very bad bargain; but I had no idea of the full iniquity of it until it was laid bare by the Minister of Railways attempting to defend it while submitting it to the House. Why, he told us in the course of his speech that the great object of this particular railway was to furnish a Canadian route; that the other schemes Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4, though they had many

advantages and although he said one of them had undeniable advantages over this route, they all had this disadvantage that they went in part through American territory. But when he was questioned on the matter when he was asked as to the navigation of this river he halted, he hesitated and finally made a guess. But the fact is that this road commences about 125 miles up the Stikine River. According to the hon. gentleman's own statement, Fort Wrangell, near which the navigation of the river commences, is in United States territory. When questioned, he admitted that ocean steamers could not sail up the Stikine River but that their cargoes must be transhipped at a point at or near Fort Wrangell and taken up in flat-bottomed steamers. So the Minister of Railways states, and so our information is, independent of his statement. And the hon. Minister says that if you go into the harbour of Fort Wrangell and tranship products there to a river steamer you will have undoubtedly to pay the American duty on those goods in order to bring them into Canadian territory at the beginning of the railway. Before these gentlemen come before the House of Commons and the people of Canada and say that they are making a contract for an all-Canadian route they should be prepared to show that it is really an all-Canadian route. They are not able to say that with regard to this contract. The Minister of Railways himself says that the goods must be transhipped and when transhipped must pay duty. Knowing the Americans as we do, knowing the history of their intercourse with Canadians, knowing the advantage they have taken of Canadians at every opportunity, we know that we can not expect any concessions or favours from them. Carrying out the law they will have the power, according to the Minister of Railways and Canals, to levy the American duty on every dollar's worth of Canadian goods sent up the Stikine River, though we have the free navigation of that river for ever, thanks to the foresight and prescience of the late right hon. Sir John Macdonald, the Government has to demonstrate, as they have not yet done, that it is a Canadian route in reality before they can expect to get the approval of the House of Commons or the people of the country for this contract.

The Minister of Railways and Canals has failed to prove that point, and therefore I say the House must pause, the House must wait for the information before they can approve of a contract which, while it was heralded as an all-Canadian route. The Minister of Railways and Canals himself has demonstrated to-day that it is not an all-Canadian route in the sense in which we desired it to be, that is, giving us free access through Canadian territory for Canadian goods without paying duties to American custom-houses.

Now, there is another consideration. The Government say that, in considering

this contract, they were brought face to face with a case of urgency fraught with many disastrous possibilities. In the first place, they say, they had to provide for the administration of justice in that country, and that if we wanted to send up North-west Mounted Police, we could not do so unless we had transportation facilities by which to send them. That calls to mind the fact that Major Walsh, who has been sent up there to administer affairs in the Yukon territory, has not arrived there yet. I cannot give the exact date, but I think I am correct in saying that his appointment was made several months before he started for the Yukon, and during this time he was going around the country. I hope the Government will explain the reasons why Major Walsh and the officers and men of the North-west Mounted Police accompanying him remained here for two months after their appointment before they started for this district, knowing the severity of the winter, and knowing all the conditions that prevailed there, making travel in the winter season difficult, if not impossible. Speaking from memory, his appointment was made in the month of August, and he and his party did not start on their trip until about October; fully two months elapsed from the time of his appointment until he was sent away. Well, the consequence has been what might have been expected, that he has been stayed on the route, that he has gone a short distance towards his destination, and that he and his party are now tied up on the route, far away from Dawson City, far away from those thousands of people for whom he was required to administer law and order. But, Sir, judging from the history of other portions of this country, judging from what has been done elsewhere, there is not much danger under the British flag of law and order being set at defiance. Do we not know that at Rossland, in British Columbia, there is a population composed of similar elements, sometimes called a lawless population, a large portion, at any rate, of which is composed of miners and adventurous spirits, and no strong force was required to keep them in order? The statement has been made—and I believe it is true, because I have been there myself and know the circumstances—that in Rossland, with its 6,000 of population, only one constable was needed for the whole community. Law and order prevail, and a man's life is just as safe there as it is in the city of Ottawa. People could travel round at any hour of the day or night, and without any fear of being molested. However, I think it is quite a proper safeguard to send a force to the Yukon territory, a moderate force, not one involving such an enormous expense; because I think the returns will show that the expense of sending so large a force up

there at the time has been very great, and that it was not a wise arrangement to have made at that time. Now, Sir, I come to another important point, the necessity for building this railroad and for making the bargain the Government have made with the contractors. The Minister of Railways told us that the estimates that had been made of the number of people who are likely to go in there; he did not venture to make the estimate himself, but he told us that men who ought to know, men who had given the transportation problem a great deal of attention, expressed the opinion that 250,000 people might be going into the Yukon in the year 1898; while conservative estimates made by these same gentlemen would not reduce the figures to less than 100,000. But, said he, taking half of the lowest estimate that was made, look at the enormous number of people that would require transportation facilities, look at the absolute necessity of a railway being built in there. Look, said he, at what is given to these men for building a railway through this country, not a country where a trade is to be built up by slow degrees, not a country to be opened up by years of toil, by an agricultural community, but one being brought into life and existence at once, a country which may receive an influx of 100,000 people during a single season. Mr. Speaker, we cannot tell yet what they are to get for building this railway. We are not told what the company is to get for these steamers which they are to build. But if you take as an estimate for this cheap tramway that they are going to build, \$15,000 a mile, which I have no hesitation in saying will amply suffice to build that road, you have two and a quarter million dollars, and you can add a million to that as the cost of the sleigh road.

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

After Recess.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair I had referred to the fact, which I lamented and which I am sure the House and the country will regret, that the Government when they came down with this important proposition, and submitted it to the House, were not able to present a clearly cut statement as to the facilities for bringing in Canadian goods into Canadian territory. Transshipment could take place at Fort Wrangell, under direction of the American customs authorities. The Minister of Railways had to confess that if transshipment took place at Fort Wrangell the American duty would have to be paid, but he expected that out in the open sea they could transfer goods from ocean steamers to flat-bottom steamers, but would have to go up the Stikine River into American terri-

Mr. WALLACE.

tory where the American Government would not permit transshipment or business to take place. It was claimed for the contract and the Bill presented to this House to-day as its great merit that the proposal is for an all-Canadian route, signifying and conveying the impression through the country that this route has nothing to do with the American customs or anything to do with United States control. I was proceeding to call attention to the contract itself. I had referred to the fact that the cost of the road, 150 miles of construction, would involve an expenditure of \$15,000 per mile, and I assume that as an outside estimate for this narrow-gauge tramway which has been proclaimed by the Prime Minister himself as only a temporary structure. Taking the cost at \$15,000 per mile, the total expenditure thereon would be \$2,250,000, and, allowing a very large margin indeed, the cost of the cheap flat-bottom steamers for river service might be placed at \$1,000,000, making the total expenditure for railway and steamers \$3,250,000. The cost of operating the road for one year might be placed at \$750,000, which is also a very extravagant estimate; and this would place the cost of road construction, steamers and operating expenses for the whole of one year at \$4,000,000. This is the responsibility that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann have undertaken. It is no doubt a large enterprise—it is so large that it frightened the Government from undertaking it. But looking at the other side of the picture, and taking the figures which the Minister of Railways has given as a conservative estimate, and not taking 250,000 people as the number that will be transported, according to the estimate of transportation companies, into that country during the present year, 1898, but reducing the number to 100,000, how do the figures stand as to receipts from the railway and steamboats after they have got into operation? The result will appear like this. One hundred thousand passengers will pay \$100 each, and I am very much below the mark in placing it at that figure. Those people going in will thus pay \$10,000,000. Assume that one-half the number should return during the year—people will be going and coming constantly—and pay the same rate, but they will have to pay higher no doubt going up than coming down, there will be \$5,000,000 from passengers making the return trip. Taking the estimate of the Minister, that every passenger will require a ton of freight and placing it at the rate of \$50 per ton, the receipts under that head would be \$5,000,000. The rate of freight as well as passengers would be gauged and controlled by the competition which the company would have to meet. What would be that competition? There is the overland route, and we know the enormous sums these people have to pay. The Minister of the Interior no doubt will come down with a very large account for ser-

vices in carrying in freight for the Government. The public press reports that the cost of taking in a few tons of freight was \$80,000 to the Government ; I do not know whether that is correct or not, but the press reports that expenditure. Another competitor for passengers and freight would be the route by the Yukon River. In order to reach there vessels have to sail from Victoria about 2,600 miles to the mouth of that river. It is 1,700 miles up that river in addition before Canadian territory is reached. The river is filled with shoals and sandbars, it is exceedingly dangerous navigation for river steamers ; wood is very scarce along the route because the latitude is so very high, and there are innumerable difficulties in connection with the route. Steamers are only able to make one trip a year, and sometimes they cannot make even the round trip, so the expense of going that way is exceedingly high. This railway company will regulate its rates according to the competition which I have outlined. When I place the rates at \$100 per passenger and \$50 per ton for freight. I am placing them much below the figures charged. Taking, then, the receipts as \$10,000,000 from passengers coming in, \$5,000,000 from passengers going out, taking the freight at 100,000 tons at \$50 per ton, the receipts during 1898 would reach \$20,000,000. The total expenditure for the construction and operation of the road for the year and the building of steamers and all expenses I place at \$4,000,000, leaving an enormous profit for the contractors. But supposing that instead of 250,000 people, which the Minister indicated as the number likely to go into the country, we take the lower number 100,000 upon which latter number I have made this calculation and cut that number in two, let us make a calculation on the basis of 50,000 passengers, which is a lower estimate than is made by the Minister or any competent authority. The receipts from 50,000 passengers on the basis of \$200 each would be \$10,000,000, as against a total expenditure of \$4,000,000, leaving for the one year a net profit of \$6,000,000, over all expenditures. Yet we are told that they are enterprising men who have taken their fortunes and lives in their hands ; that the Government, with all the information from miners who have brought down gold, with the reports of their officers as to the exceeding richness of the country, the Government were yet afraid to tackle the question. But in addition to giving these contractors control for this year, the Government give them control, and exclusive control, for years to come over this territory as regards the carrying of passengers and freight. What more do they give these contractors ? I am more than amazed.

We were told by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), whose vision, I am afraid, is obscured by that palace at Regina, that Mr. Ogilvie reported

that there was 125,000 square miles, or 80,000,000 acres, of this gold-bearing country, and that this grant would be only one acre in twenty. If the hon. member for North Wellington gives that as his opinion and quotes it to affirm its truth, then so much the more censure upon the Government that they were afraid to undertake the work instead of giving these contractors an enormous quantity of gold-bearing lands for no consideration whatever, because if the member for Wellington is right, the very charter to build the road and run the steamers on the route would give them more than a proper recompense. But, Mr. Speaker, what about those three and three-quarter millions of acres ? The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) tried to draw attention away from the fact that mining in that country is placer mining, located in the beds of the rivers and in the little creeks, and that the Government has provided that the line shall be three miles at the base and extending up wherever the company chooses to locate. The company will, of course, locate right away, and when they do locate they are to have blocks of three miles by six miles, or in all 325 of these blocks. As the Minister explained that they have to take an area of six miles by twenty-four miles, of which the Government shall have one-half and the contractors the other half, then, on account of these blocks, six by twenty-four miles, extending up the river twenty-four miles, the company will take possession of just 81 rivers. If they take forty-eight miles, or twice the distance up the river, they will have forty of these immensely rich creeks, such as Bonanza Creek, and these others that Mr. Ogilvie, in his report, tells us about. The Government now tells us that this was a case of urgency. Why, they knew of the richness of this country long ago. They had the reports of Mr. Ogilvie as early as July last, and they had the people returning from that country with great quantities of gold. The later evidence is only confirmatory of the evidence given long ago, because these rich discoveries have been made for years. I remember that in 1893, five years ago, I sent a customs officer up there, and the first year he returned four or five thousand dollars in customs revenue, which has been increasing year by year in consequence of the number of people going in there. However that may be, the enormous riches of that country were clearly established in December, 1896, and the news of it came out to civilization in July, 1897. Here is Mr. Ogilvie's report :

Twenty-one above discovery on Bonanza was the one which first proved the value of the district. The owner of this claim was in the habit of cleaning up a few tubfuls of dirt every night and paying his workmen at the rate of a dollar and a half an hour. Claim No. 51, El Dorado, next produced a pan of \$57. This was succeeded by one of upwards of \$80. Then come one of

\$112. Soon after, claim No. 16 showed up a pan of \$212.

One pan, held in a man's hand and the gold shaken out, returned \$212. Why, I am told that a pan yielding 10 or 20 cents makes it profitable enough for a man to earn \$10 or \$20 a day, while here is a single pan making \$212.

And this is what caused the intense excitement in that country. I believe the excitement outside was even greater than it was there. The news went down to Circle City late in December, and it at once emptied itself and came up to Dawson. The scenes of the Forty-Mile rush were repeated. The miners came up any way they could, at all hours of the day and night, with provisions and empty handed.

Mr. Ogilvie has been recognized for years as making most conservative estimates, and yet he says here :

Bonanza and Eldorado Creeks afford between them 278 claims.

Two hundred and seventy-eight claims, Mr. Speaker, would not be as many as are included in one of those three by six miles claims of which the contractors get 325 to make up their three and three-quarter million acres.

Their several affluents will yield as many more, and nearly all of these claims are good. I have no hesitation in saying that about a hundred of those on Bonanza will yield upwards of \$30,000,000, and about thirty on the Eldorado will yield a million each. These two creeks will, I am quite confident, turn out from \$60,000,000 to \$75,000,000, and I can safely say that there is no other region in the world that has afforded so many home stakes—that is, fortunes enabling the owners to go home and enjoy the remainder of their days at their ease—considering that the work has had to be done with very limited facilities, the scarcity of provisions and of labour, and that the crudest appliances only are as yet available. When I tell you that to properly work each claim ten or twelve men are required, and that only 500 were available that season, it will give you an idea of the difficulties which had to be contended with.

Mr. Ogilvie winds up by saying :

This will be the largest, as it is probably the richest, gold field the world has ever known.

That is the opinion of Mr. Ogilvie, and that is the report upon which the Government have acted. They tell us now : Oh, we had to do something. And what did they do ? They gave 5,860 square miles of these valuable claims, not scattered all over the country, but for every ten miles of road the contractors build, they are entitled to drop on their claim, and I venture to say that, while they have an army of railway builders working there day and night, they will have another army of prospectors who will take possession of all these creeks that show to be any way rich. Does any one mean to tell me that Eldorado and Bonanza are the only creeks with enormous quantities of gold ? No ; there are others and others, and this company, having the right to take

Mr. WALLACE.

these for every ten miles of road they build, will every fifteen days be enabled to take a fresh claim. They will have Eldorado and Bonanza creeks innumerable for this contract. This Government has given away half of all the riches up there, and I shall show clearly that they have given a large part of the other half away, too.

Now, Sir, how could this be a case of urgency when the Government knew all about it in July ? They certainly knew it in August, and they did nothing. They knew it in September, October, November and December, and yet nothing was done. It is true, that the Minister of the Interior went up there and started Major Walsh on his mission when it was impossible to get through. He is now hundreds of miles from Dawson City, where he will have to remain until navigation opens in the spring, and perhaps after all he will wait to get through on this new railway and this new line of steamers.

But we were told by the Minister of Railways that they had tried in every way to get this contract accepted by these gentlemen. It was almost pathetic, Mr. Speaker, to hear the hon. gentleman reciting to this House the efforts that they had made. He shed copious tears evidently, and besought these gentlemen to accept less than 25,000 acres per mile. He said that it was not the spasmodic shedding of tears, but that day after day he was surrounded by a large committee of the greater number of the members of the Cabinet, who implored those hard-hearted contractors to consent to take less than 25,000 acres per mile. I am quite sure that all the members of the Cabinet were not present. I am quite sure that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was not there. He had many other public duties to perform. He was down in the province of Quebec quelling a rebellion, fighting his old-time friends. He had his hands full. It appeared at one time that his hands were more than full. I am certain that if the Minister of Public Works had been there he would not have consented to give this contract to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. He would have undertaken the job himself. He has many friends who are on the lookout for something too, as past experience has proved, and if they had known that these negotiations were going on from day to day they would have been on hand. The Minister of Railways tells us that he was down on his knees every day beseeching these stony-hearted contractors to accept a little less than 25,000 acres a mile, and he implored us on this side of the House to say how much less we would have asked these contractors to take. Mr. Speaker, I would have asked them to take 24,999 acres a mile less than they got, and then they would have been getting an enormous profit. I am sure that I am not speaking at random when I say that if the contractors of this

country had known that the Government were making a contract with some one, or were anxious to get some one to build the railroad, and were offering such enormous, such unparalleled subsidies, there would have been a hundred such contractors in Ottawa within twenty-four hours ready to bid each other down, and to take far less than these contractors are to receive from the Government. But, Sir, these negotiations were going on; the people of this country knew nothing about them; no one knew that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann were in Ottawa, day after day, negotiating and planning to get this contract. If they had known it, there is not a contractor or a capitalist in this country who would not have been willing to put his money into the work without these enormous subsidies of the richest mineral land the world has ever seen.

Now, Sir, the hon. Minister asks: "What were we to do?" Why, Sir, are the Government incapable of taking any action? Has the governmental machinery broken down, so that the Government are incapable of undertaking anything themselves? Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann have surrounded themselves with competent and capable engineers, with staffs of experienced workmen, with all the appliances necessary for rapid railroad building, and the Government could have secured the services of men like Mr. Mann or Mr. Haney—because we have the best railroad builders, I believe, in the world to-day—men of experience not only in our own country, but in all other countries. The Government could have gone to these men and said to them: "We want to have this road built as expeditiously as money and appliances can do it, we want you to use every effort to get it built, and we will pay you liberally and handsomely for your services for six months or a year." Could not the Government have secured the services of able and competent men, of the very men who are doing this very kind of work in this country to-day? Why, Sir, it is a reflection on the Government themselves to say that they were unable or incompetent or unable to undertake such a task, when the urgency of the case required that Canada should be up and doing. But it appears that they were letting the months go by, one after another, and doing nothing until the month of January came, when they said: "We must meet Parliament in February and something must be done, so that we can go before Parliament and say, see what a progressive and enlightened Government you have." Even the Minister of Railways himself did not seem to have any reports, or any definite knowledge of the situation or of the country through which the road was to be built, or of the cost of the road. He has not explained any of these things to this House, and I presume it was because he had nothing to explain. But, Mr.

Speaker, this was the course that was taken: a rash, mad, headlong, precipitate bargain was made without due consideration of the consequences—giving away for nothing the richest gold fields the world has ever seen, and giving them away unnecessarily; because plenty of men would have built this road without asking for any such bonus.

Now, Sir, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said before six o'clock that this was an excellent bargain. He said that if these men do make money they are risking enormously, and he did not believe it was a good bargain for them. According to the evidence and the information we have, which is reliable and accurate, they are risking nothing; they are going into as sure an enterprise as they ever went into in their lives. He tells us that the experience of the United States is that these roads are not profitable. I will venture to say that our good friend was simply speaking at random. He told us further, that not ten per cent of the original promoters of these roads own them to-day.

Well, I characterize that as a similar statement, because I do not think the hon. gentleman can mention a road to-day which is in that condition. If he can, I would like to hear from him what one it is. Now, there is one other point, and I think it is a very important one in connection with the building of this road. We are told that the Government are imposing a royalty of 10 per cent on all the mines operated by all miners throughout the country. But this company is not to pay 10 per cent to the Government, but only 1 per cent. Now, suppose that a mine is being operated and that it costs \$90 to produce \$100 worth of gold, the 10 per cent they have to pay to the Government will leave the enterprise without a dollar of profit to those who are dealing direct with the Government, but if they deal with this company, which only pays 1 per cent, there will be a clear profit of \$9 per 100. What more? Take Eldorado and Bonanza Creeks, where Mr. Ogilvie estimates will be taken out between \$60,000,000 and \$75,000,000, what is to prevent this company going to these men who are mining on those creeks and saying to them: Drop your claims with the Government, we will take them up and make a bargain with you. We will divide the 10 per cent, taking 5 ourselves and allowing you 5. You will thus save 5 per cent, and Mackenzie & Mann will make an equal amount. That can be done, and the additional advantage to these miners will be this, that whereas each miner has to pay \$15 for a license each year to the Government, and only gets a yearly license that has to be renewed with the Government; in the case of lands obtained from Mackenzie & Mann, they will have the fee simple for ever, they will have the Crown grant transferred to them without any

condition, and have to pay no mining license. But in the case of Government mining lands, the miner must pay a miner's license, must work his mine, and have the license renewed on his claim every year. So that there is every inducement to the men on these claims to make another bargain, and make it with Mackenzie & Mann rather than with the Government. That I consider an enormous advantage to these men, because it will make it the interest of every miner in the country to pay them tribute.

But the "Globe" newspaper, in commenting on this scheme, told us that the Government has wisely prevented agricultural lands from being given to this syndicate, and has protected the farmers up in these northern regions. Mr. Speaker, British Columbia extends to 60 degrees north latitude. All these lands which the Government have given must be north of that 60 degrees. As a matter of fact, all the mines that have been discovered are probably north of 64 degrees, a region where there can be no agriculture, for 66½ is the Arctic circle—a region where there is no farming and no necessity to protect and to preserve agricultural lands. These contractors do not want agricultural lands. What they want is mining lands. They have 325 of these claims, three miles by six miles. They have, wherever they may choose to select them, and they will undoubtedly select them at the places discovered to be valuable mining territory. Why, they can cut their lands up into almost innumerable mining claims and placer claims. I see by the mining regulations that a bar-digging claim may be 100 feet wide, and dry-digging has to be 100 feet square, or one-fifth of an acre. Creek and river claims may be 500 feet long and not more than 100 feet wide, which is somewhat less than an acre. The bench claim is to be 100 feet square, or less than one-fifth of an acre. Why, with 25,000 acres for one mile of road they could have 25,000 of those acre claims or 25,000 of those smaller claims and be practically owners of the country, because a Government claim, subject to 10 per cent royalty, is not nearly so desirable a property as the Government contractors' land with only one per cent royalty, and with the fee simple and no yearly license to pay, and none of these onerous responsibilities with which the Government may saddle the placer and other mines in that country.

I believe that the Government should take some means to effectually return to Canada a part of the large expenditure which they have incurred and are likely to incur in the future in carrying on the Government of the country, and in carrying out the regulations which they have imposed, but it appears that the first regulations which they made have been abrogated. New regulations have been made, which,

Mr. WALLACE.

we are told, will be equally unsatisfactory in their results, and if it be true that the contractors have only to pay 1 per cent, while those working the Government claims will have to pay 10 per cent, I am quite sure that will have the most unsatisfactory result, so far as the obtaining of revenue by the Government from these properties is concerned.

Another point that I did not understand the Minister of Railway's reference to is this. The Parliament of Canada, at its last session, granted two charters for building railways from the Pacific Ocean into that country. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what he proposes to do with reference to these.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). We do not propose to do anything. We leave them severely alone. I presume we are not going to interfere with any rights given by Parliament.

Mr. WALLACE. They do not get 25,000 acres of mineral lands per mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the probabilities are rather against that.

Mr. WALLACE. The other one has got it all. I think there are two ways in which the Government have been negligent, and have not acted as they might have to protect Canadian interests. We have seen during the past season—and I am sure it must have been a matter of regret to every Canadian—that it was persistently heralded throughout the world that this great mineral wealth, these great mines of gold, were in Alaska, in the territory of the United States. And I am told that Seattle, on the Pacific coast, is doing the largest business in providing private outfits and supplies. What I blame the Government for is for not having taken steps in the first place, to let it be known throughout the world that these mines were in the Dominion of Canada, solely under Canadian control, and that Canada was going to look after them in her own interest and the interests of the British people. And another thing—and the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) referred to that the other day, and, for my part, I think it is one of the most important matters that has to be dealt with in regard to that rich country—we should treat the United States in this matter exactly as the United States treats us Canadians. They will not permit Canadians to go in there and become free miners and to take up the mining lands as we permit them to do in Canada, and why should we give them greater privileges than they are ready to give us? It may be quite true that where we are inviting people in, where we are urging them to come in and assist in developing the country, we must make liberal regulations in order to accomplish that end. But the people are rushing

to that country, they are bound to get there. Not only are Canadians going there, but people from the British Islands and British residents from Africa, Australia and New Zealand and residents of foreign countries as well. I contend that the first duty of the Government, seeing that there are such enormous riches in that country, was to proclaim that we will have regulations reserving these riches for British subjects. But the Government instead of considering these things, instead of taking that loyal and patriotic stand, have utterly neglected their opportunities. We found the members of the Government scattered during recess, scarcely one of them being found in Ottawa. They have utterly neglected their duties in regard to this important matter. They allowed matters to drift along almost until the time that the House was to sit, and then they made a precipitate rush to do something. But it is imperative that British interests, that Canadian interests, should be looked after and not lost sight of. As I have said, the people are rushing in there, and you could not keep them out, perhaps. But you can make regulations which will confine this wealth to British people. We are told that the business of the country is slipping into American channels. Efforts should be made by the Government to open up avenues of trade and to secure the entry of Canadian goods into that country. Few realize the enormous quantity of goods consumed in a mining country. Take, for instance, the West Kootenay country. Eight years ago the customs revenue did not amount to \$20 per day in the whole of that country. To-day, as the Minister of Customs will tell you, there is a customs income of more than \$1,000 every day. Besides, there is an enormous quantity of Canadian goods consumed. This, for a population of 20,000 people, gives an idea of the enormous trade in such a country. So it may be with our Yukon country, that richest of countries, with its 100,000 people, as it is estimated there will be at the end of the coming season. This means from \$5,000 to \$10,000 a day of customs duties to the benefit of the Government, besides the sale of an immense quantity of Canadian goods in that country. But, so far there appears to have been apathy and neglect and utter want of consideration for the interests of Canada by this liberal, by this progressive Government that we are told is always alive to the interests of the country—but which fails to do anything when the opportunity offers.

I have shown that the Government has not a clear-cut, decisive knowledge of how Canadian goods are to go into that country, even if this railway were built to-morrow, without paying American duties. They have given this company a subsidy by giving them practically an exclusive right to build a road there which will yield them a profit, as I have shown, of more than double the cost of the road in the first year. They

are giving them untold wealth in mineral lands which they are handing over to them. They are neglecting British interests. In every business operation in connection with that country they have not considered the interests of the people of Canada, but have been practically permitting the United States to control our business affairs. But what was more humiliating still, Sir, we have read in the papers that the American Government was sending supplies in there to relieve the wants of these people. Why, we were told that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) went down to Washington to consult the Secretary of War there, because the Secretary of War was ill and could not come up to consult our Government in the matter. What had the Secretary of War to do with giving relief to starving humanity? Are there no other departments of the United States Government charged with that duty? The reason their action was, as I read it, that they wanted to get a military foothold, they wanted to get some sort of possession of our Canadian territory. We know what their dealings with Canadians and British people have been. They get a foothold here and a foothold there, and when they once get possession, it is exceedingly hard to dispossess them. We were told by the Minister of the Interior yesterday that negotiations were going on at the present moment for American troops without arms to go through Canadian territory, so as to reach another portion of United States territory. I should like to know what portion. I should like to know why this permission should be given, or what necessity there is for their going through Canadian territory, a privilege never granted to Canada by the United States Government in the past, even when it was urgently required. The Minister of the Interior told us that whatever rights we had would be sacredly guarded by the Government, that he would see to it that none of the rights that Canada possesses to-day should be sacrificed to the United States. I remember him speaking of that in Kamloops, and that sentiment was loudly applauded by those present. But I was grieved when I saw in the papers—it was denied afterwards—that the American army was going to be permitted to go in. The statement made yesterday is a partial acknowledgment that negotiations are on foot for that purpose. I think we should give the American Government to understand, that if there is want, if needy people are to be provided for, the machinery of our Government is amply sufficient to provide what is necessary in that regard; that if the American people see fit to send supplies to those of their people who are in need, they can trust the Government of Canada fairly and honestly to distribute it, without permitting American soldiers to perform that duty. Sir, I think that is humiliating to the people of Canada. It is quite unnecessary, and I hope the Govern-

ruent will in future, as I am afraid they have not been doing in the past, study the interests of Canada and of Canadians only.

Mr. MORRISON. I am somewhat surprised at the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and which he has been labouring to give to the House for the last two hours. I would suppose that an ex-Minister of the late Administration should have had something more substantial to present to this House on such an important question. I am equally surprised at the few remarks which the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) made to the House to-night on this matter, surprised at the depths of ignorance he displayed on matters pertaining to a department over which he had control for some years. The reference he made to some of the railroads, particularly to one mentioned in the contract, surprised me all the more inasmuch as it is a piece of road with which he ought to have been very familiar; and when he displays such lack of knowledge of matters with which he is presumed to have been conversant, what opinion can we form of his remarks in relation to a matter which has sprung up so recently as the one now before the House? The hon. gentleman, in referring to the road which was made a criterion in the contract, or a model for the railway under consideration, stated that it extended from Kaslo to Slocan, which would be equivalent to saying that a certain road extended from Toronto to the province of Ontario. The Kaslo and Slocan Railway is a very well known railway in the province of British Columbia, and ought to be well known to the ex-Minister of Railways. It is a road which I think was built during the incumbency in office of that hon. gentleman, and why he should have been so far afield in his reference to it, I cannot understand. I will not say that he intended to mislead the House and the country in his reference to the Kaslo and Slocan Railway because it has been selected by the Minister of Railways as a model by which Mackenzie & Mann are to build this road from Teslin Lake to Telegraph Creek. As a member seeking for information from hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this matter, the remarks of the ex-Minister of Railways gave me the impression that he was not endeavouring to present his views properly and honestly before this House. I think that hon. gentlemen who speak upon this question ought to endeavour to present their views as fairly and squarely as possible to the House, so that we may be able to form an opinion as to whether the Government did right or wrong in making this contract. This is a matter equally important to us all, whether we be Liberals or Conservatives. It is a matter out of the sphere of politics altogether, and I hope that the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite to drag it into the sphere of parish politics, will fail. I know that there is

Mr. WALLACE.

plenty of common sense on the other side of the House, and I believe it will come to the surface on this occasion, and that many hon. gentlemen opposite will support the Government in regard to this important matter. The hon. member who last spoke expatiated at great length upon the millions that would be made by somebody in consequence of something in connection with this work. He far exceeded the famous Colonel Sellars in that respect. Now, as an hon. member stated to-night, a man who will go to work and transact business on paper, deluding himself into thinking that he is prospering because he may figure out large dividends, is very apt to come out at the wrong end ultimately. Sir, the figures which the last speaker has given the House are altogether fallacious and misleading, and he made an entirely wrong application of them. As he laid so much stress upon figures, let me give him a few by which I come to an opposite conclusion. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, did not know that at the present time there are 7,000 people inside the passes of the Yukon country, and that there are 3,000 people on the Yukon River waiting the opening of navigation on that river. That is 10,000 people, at any rate, who, beyond all peradventure, will be in that country in a very short time. The only present means of transporting goods in bulk into the Yukon territory is by way of the Yukon River during the season it is open for navigation. At the present time there are very few boats on that river; it is estimated by those who know that even at the height of navigation there will not be more than twenty-five boats having an average capacity of 125 tons, carrying provisions, passengers and freight up to St. Michael's, and beyond to Dawson City. Now, twenty-five boats with an average of 125 tons, and making two trips in the season—which is the maximum number of trips they can make—can carry 6,250 tons of provisions next summer. As I said, there will be 10,000 people in there soon after navigation opens. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken, thought a conservative estimate would place at 50,000 the additional number of people who will go in there by some means or other. It is a matter of calculation that it will take 25,000 tons of provisions to feed 50,000 people, and I have shown that the utmost capacity of the boats now plying on that river, is 6,250 tons. Where are you going to get all the provisions to feed not only 50,000 people, but 60,000 people? The 50,000 people who will go in there will not go by the Yukon River, they must go over those passes, that is if they can get over them, and what does that mean? Of food, baggage, machinery and tools, all of which are absolutely necessary to every man who goes in there, about two tons will be required to every man. For 50,000 people there will be required 100,000 tons of material, food, provisions, ma-

chinery, &c. Now, the lowest possible rate, the lowest known rate so far, at which goods have been transported in there, has been six cents per pound, while it is well known that 10 cents per pound is the prevailing rate at present, and has been for some time. Ten cents per pound means \$200 a ton, or \$20,000,000 to transport 100,000 tons into that country for the accommodation of 50,000 people, which is admittedly the minimum number who are expected to go in there. Any person who has been at Vancouver, Victoria or New Westminster during the past six months must be specially blind if he could not see that at least 100,000 people would be in the Yukon country this season, and may have gone there since I left the coast. Vancouver is filled with people, Victoria is likewise filled; trains going west are all crowded; in Vancouver and Victoria there is hardly a house vacant, the hotels were packed to their capacity and rooms could not be engaged in advance. That is, however, only an earnest of what is coming upon us. When it is considered that in order to transport in that northern country 50,000 people, it will cost something like \$20,000,000 hon. members can readily see the tremendous problem that faced the Government. The item of transportation is but one item. Suppose 100,000 people come to the Pacific Coast, and I think there is no member in this House who knows anything about the condition of affairs who will not conceive that that is a conservative estimate—suppose that number come to that part of British Columbia en route to the Klondike, they will spend on average \$500 at various points on the Pacific Coast for outfitting. What does that mean? It represents an expenditure of \$50,000,000. Add the cost of transportation and you have \$40,000,000 more. So from the items of fitting and transportation for 100,000 people there will be nearly \$100,000,000 expended. That appears incredible; but it is a matter of simple multiplication, and we must pay a little heed to the inevitable. I contend, and assert it boldly that this state of affairs will occur beyond peradventure, if it does not exist at the present time, it will prevail within the next few months. The Government were not blind to it; but they realized that if the minimum number of 50,000 were to go in there—and they would do so or die in the attempt—the existence of a state of affairs which offered no means of affording succour to them, because they would be in need, would involve most serious responsibility. What would be the attitude of this House towards the Government if they had been so recreant to their duty as not to have adopted the most extraordinary and the earliest steps possible to solve the problem, without waiting for tenders and without consulting the ex-Controller of Customs or the ex-Minister of Railways? I contend it would have been nothing less

than criminal if the Government had not taken the very first means of providing in some legitimate way for getting food into the Yukon country for the large number of people who will go there within the next six months. I contend, if there was nothing more, that that was a sufficient justification for the Government to enter into the contract which has been made and which is now under discussion. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to indulge in vagaries. It is difficult to believe that they stated what they think, and extravagant statements were indulged in this afternoon by two of the speakers from whom we would have expected a little more common sense in the discussion of such an important matter as that now before the House. The last speaker ought to know, because apparently he had taken care to gather together a lot of statistics, which, however, were not applicable to the present discussion, that one of the reasons for taking these active steps in providing communication was that it cost the mounted police \$1,000 per ton to move their supplies a distance of 26 miles. What opportunity for transport would an individual have, no matter how much means he might possess, when it cost such a large amount for an able-bodied force like the mounted police to move their freight? The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) stated, after indulging in a great deal of chaff, that the Government ought to take very pronounced steps in regard to the attitude assumed by the United States in the matter of Yukon customs regulations. To that extent I quite agree with him. That is, however, just what the Government has done. The Government in letting the contract to build this road entirely within Canadian territory has struck a death blow to the trade carried on by Americans, who have been capturing and in fact purloining trade belonging to the people of Canada. By building this road from the head of Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake it will kill the trade by the Lynn Canal, which is in American territory. It will divert all the Yukon trade into Canadian channels, and our Canadian cities on the Pacific Coast will prosper and benefit, and that means that our eastern cities will prosper and benefit, because our Pacific Coast cities are likewise entrepôts for the business centres of the east. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) knows that very well, and in fact all business men know it. True, none of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House are business men, and so they may be pardoned for losing sight of that fact. As I contend, the strongest blow that has been delivered to American trade has been the letting of a contract for a Canadian road which will divert trade to Canadian territory.

—Mr. WALLACE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will permit me to say a word. I

am a business man and the hon. gentleman is a lawyer.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will remember that I formed my opinion entirely from his discourse. The ex-Minister of Railways rang the changes on the fact that goods going up the Stikine River would have to be transhipped, and he deprecated the action of the Government in entering into a contract that was considered an all-Canadian route, whereas it was not, and in this way he endeavoured to mislead. That is a difficulty which I am certain the Minister of the Interior will explain to the satisfaction of this House and the country.

Mr. HAGGART. I took the words of the Minister of Railways for that statement.

Mr. MORRISON. I am now dealing with the remarks made by the hon. gentleman. The Minister of the Interior will, I am quite positive, satisfactorily deal with that phase of the contract; I am quite satisfied of that from conversations I have had with him, and I will not go further into it. Even assuming that the obstacles referred to by the hon. gentleman do exist—and I deny it—is he so ignorant of the geography of the country as not to know that at Port Simpson, in Canadian territory, ships might call very easily and without very much delay, transfer their goods and send them up to Telegraph Creek. Another fallacy indulged in by both hon. gentlemen was emphasizing the fact that those three millions or more acres of land given to the company were gold-bearing mineral lands. That is a fallacy of fallacies. Certainly the information and knowledge possessed by those hon. members is different from everything that has been published or talked about regarding this matter. I venture to say that not one acre in ten thousand would even have colour along the route of that road, or in the vicinity of it. It is not a quartz mining country as far as we can understand. If Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie take their chances on the land containing gold, and it is not positively known that there is gold there, I cannot see what argument gentlemen opposite can make out of that. The contractors cannot take the land with them; it remains there. Were it known definitely that those vast stretches of territory were very rich in gold, or did contain gold, then there might be some shadow of argument in the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite. However, the gentlemen who took this contract have to take their chances. I cannot say that the contract was one-sided, either in favour of the Government or against it, and it would be manifestly unfair if it were so. If the Government made a contract with Mann & Mackenzie by which these gentlemen were to lose money and be

Mr. MORRISON.

ruined, the Government would be as open to criticism as gentlemen opposite think they are in the present instance. I agree with the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) that it is regrettable that the debate should have been precipitated at this stage, and consequently I have simply endeavoured to give one or two reasons to show the great urgency with which the Government were met with in considering the matter. If there were no other considerations for what is termed precipitation than these instances I have pointed out, they would be sufficient justification for the Government to enter into the contract, which I am quite confident will meet with the entire approval of the country and of the majority of the members of this House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We must all regret that the discussion of this very important question has been precipitated in Parliament before Parliament has really been informed what there is in the subject and what are the details of this contract which has been given to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. I was somewhat astonished at my good friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) criticising the gentlemen who have already spoken on this side of the House, and saying that they had talked vague generalities instead of going into the details of the measure. Well, I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) what else he could expect, since the Bill was presented only this afternoon, and since the explanations which the Minister (Mr. Blair) gave were nothing more than quotations from the Bill itself. My hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) said that the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) had displayed great ignorance of that country, and of the affairs of his department when he presided over it, because he (Mr. Haggart) happened to say that the model railway in connection with this transaction ran from Kaslo to Slocan. When my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) has been some years in the House he will know that we are all apt to make these slips; and beside, I may tell him, that in the province of Ontario, the Kaslo and Slocan Railway is perhaps not known to be run to Sandon or the concentrator of the Noble Five Mine, yet the people in that province, though they may have only a vague idea of the Slocan district, at any rate know that the town of Sandon, which the Kaslo and Slocan Railway connects Kaslo with, is the centre of the Slocan district.

I listened to my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison), who has spoken as a member from British Columbia, expecting that he would not talk vague generalities, but that he would give us some information with regard to the reasons why this contract, placed before this House by the Government, should be adopted. I am bound to say that my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) did give some facts, facts which to me prove three things.

In the first place, he proved conclusively to my mind that the Government did not begin the consideration of this subject nearly early enough, and his speech all through was a condemnation of governmental delay in the consideration of this question, which he regards, and which the House regards, as a most important one. The next thing which he (Mr. Morrison) proved was, that a railway should undoubtedly be constructed, and he proved that to a House that was very willing to accept the proof, however poorly given, because as I take it, the feeling upon this side of the House as well as upon the other side is in favour of that view. But, the question before Parliament is not as to whether it is important for Parliament to provide transportation facilities to the rich fields of the Klondike—we are all agreed upon that—but the question is as to the best mode of providing it, and as to the economy of the arrangement proposed to be made by the Government with two contractors, namely, Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie. The third thing which my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) proved to the satisfaction of the House, when he stated the enormous trade which this railway was about to do were it completed, was that no grants were necessary, but that the road would be such an enormously remunerative one that this Parliament, instead of giving money or treasure for its construction, should have received a bonus from those who were given the right to construct it, since they were likely to make an immense amount of money out of its operation.

Now, Sir, I have stated to begin with, that it is in no carping spirit that the gentlemen on this side of the House discuss that measure. I do not believe there is a gentleman upon this side of the House who is not as anxious to see proper facilities for freight or passengers provided for that rich section of the country as are the members of the Government themselves. We regard it as a most important matter, and indeed perhaps as more important than some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House regard it, for I noticed with some little astonishment that some gentlemen opposite, who two or three years ago were known as the watch-dogs of the public treasury, slept in sweet repose while this contract was being discussed by one of their leaders, the Minister of Railways. The speech of the Minister of Railways this afternoon was, according to the authority of old parliamentarians, a somewhat strange proceeding, and if it were a strange proceeding in point of the time at which it was delivered, it was a still stranger proceeding as a justification of the contract and arrangement which has been placed before this House. Sir, a Bill upon any subject introduced by the Government to the House of Commons, is the conclusion of the Government after its deliberations upon that subject, and so far as that question is con-

cerned speaks for itself. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), in making his explanation to the House, has merely made running comments upon what that conclusion was, but he has failed to give the House what he might well have been required to give it, namely, the reasons which found weight in the minds of the Government in impelling them to the conclusion which they reached, and which is voiced in this House by the Bill which has been presented for our consideration.

Why, Sir, look at the position of affairs this afternoon. Here was the Minister of Railways introducing one of the most important measures as regards transportation to which this House of Commons has ever listened, and yet, when he was explaining that he had bound the contractors down so that they should have their transportation maximum rates reduced year by year, or after a certain period of years—and he was exceedingly anxious to show the House that in a very short time they would cut the freight and passenger rates in two—after he had gone to all the trouble of explaining this to the House, he was asked what was the highest rate they would be allowed to charge at the present time; he was unable to say that he had any information on that subject. I give that as a sample of the explanations that were given of the Bill, and I ask my hon. friend from New Westminster whether, in view of such explanations, he will repeat his statement that we should be condemned for talking vague generalities in connection with this important subject.

Now, Sir, the address of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals divides itself into two portions, as he divided his Bill into two portions. In the first place, he discussed the question of the necessity of the railway, a matter to which I have already referred, and upon which there is scarcely a division of opinion in this House. But let me remind the hon. gentleman that he did not tell us at what time the consideration of this very important subject was taken up by the Cabinet. He said—and I took his words down—that he gave the subject immediate consideration after the session; and yet, if we are to believe the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who has just spoken, the full Cabinet was not here during the summer, but month after month passed by before these gentlemen came to consider, as a Government, the subject, for a disregard of which, he says, they would have been held guilty before the eyes of the whole world. Now, Sir, we shall require to know, and I suppose the papers will give us some light on the subject—when this subject became a question of consideration before the Government, when it was decided to construct such a road in some way, when information was begun to be gathered for that purpose, and when authorities were consulted as to the

best routes and the proper mode of construction.

The next point to which my hon. friend refers is the justification of the contract which he has presented to the House this afternoon. What were the reasons he advanced in its justification? In the first place, he said that these contractors were very excellent contractors indeed. No one in this House will deny that. They are Canadians of whom Canada ought to be proud. They are Canadians who have made a splendid success of their business. They have done good work wherever they have done work. But to say that the contractors are very estimable men, and to say that they have performed their work in a very satisfactory manner wherever they have done work, is not to admit for a single moment that the well-established practice that great contracts such as this should be open to public tender to many other contractors equally able to build it, should be disregarded and thrown to the winds. Sir, a picture has been drawn, but it can never be sufficiently drawn, of the extreme indignation that would have arisen on this side of the House against the late Government had any such proceeding as the one followed in this case been followed by the predecessors of hon. gentlemen opposite. I can well understand every one of these gentlemen, from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) down to the humblest member who graces a seat on that side of the House, rising in a perfect whirlwind of anger, and charging every sort of corruption against the Conservative Administration. We are not here to charge corruption or any improper conduct. If there has been anything of that kind it will come out sooner or later before the public or before the Parliament of Canada. But we are here to say that the well-established rule for the granting of such great powers and privileges by public tender should not have been disregarded in this case, but that it is a safe and sound principle, and one that should be followed by a Liberal as well as by a Conservative Administration. In saying this I am not saying one single word against the contractors, nor charging collusion of any kind; but I am saying that hon. gentlemen opposite have in this respect deserted every principle for which they contended on this side of the House, and with an eloquence which covers thousands of pages of "Hansard," during the time they were sitting to the left of the Speaker in this House.

The next point which my hon. friend made was that it was a good route. Well, Sir, if it be a good route, I fail to see by what manner of logic we can be asked to make a bad bargain. It may be the very best route which the country affords, and yet for all we know this may be the very worst bargain that could be made for that or any other route. Why, Sir, it is simply childish to stand up in Parliament and ask

the representatives of the Canadian people to pass this Act to confirm a private arrangement with private parties, discussion in connection with which was only known to the Government and those parties, simply because they are good contractors and because it is a good route. Even as to the route, however, opinion does not seem to be unanimous; for, if I remember correctly, only a few days ago a prominent gentleman belonging to the other side of the House, well knowing the importance of Klondike and Alaskan matters, publicly stated that it was one of the worst routes that could be selected, at least by a Government. But, as I can only talk vague generalities upon that point, not having the information of either the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) or the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), I will not continue to discuss the question of route, but will only repeat what I said, that the excellence of the route is no justification whatever for a private contract having been entered into with these parties.

The next ground on which the Minister of Railways justified the contract was that it was a good bargain. Well, Sir, what is a good bargain? A good bargain, it appears to me, in plain, simple language, is this, where you give something and get value in return; and, after the Minister of Railways declared it to be a good bargain, how did his knowledge present itself to this House? He was asked, in the first place, if he had an approximate idea of how much this railway would cost for construction, and he was absolutely unable to give even the merest approximate of an idea as to what it would cost. Then he was asked what the value of the lands was, and he gave an answer which appeared to me to be hardly worthy of the dignity of a Minister of Railways. He asked the ex-Minister of Finance whether he knew. Sir, we have scarcely ever seen such a thing as that done by a Minister of the Crown when asked a question on a grave and important subject. I quite understand that the lands were worth nothing—the ex-Minister of Finance knew that full well—that the value was not in the lands, but in the minerals. Well, I know that the question of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and the question of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) was not as to the value of the mere soil, frozen or unfrozen, but as to whether the Government had any reliable information, or any information at all, as to the value of the mineral lands and the timber lands of which they were giving many millions of acres to the contractors for the construction of this road. In other words, he gave no answer at all. He had no conception of the cost of the railway and no conception of what we are giving, and yet he had the hardihood to tell the House that we should accept the proposition because it

was a good bargain. Sir, there never was such a proposition made to the Parliament of Canada, and never such feeble reasoning advanced why such an important matter could receive the sanction of this House and country.

The next question is raised by my hon. friend the member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison). He says that the contractors build the railway and take their chance. Sir, they build the railway, but they take no chance at all.

An hon. MEMBER. They take the gold.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They take the gold, as my hon. friend says. They have the power to select these lands all over that great region of country; and if I know Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, they are clever, clear-headed business men, who are not going to select the lands to which my hon. friend from New Westminster referred as perhaps not having a cent's worth of gold in a ton of earth. They will be bound to select the richest land they can find, and nobody in this House or country will blame them for doing it. They take no chances, because they have the power to select 3,750,000 acres of mineral land and timber lands in that country, as their reward for the construction of this road; and if I am not incorrectly informed, there is before the Parliament of British Columbia at the present time a Bill giving them an actual cash subsidy as well. Well, here is the point: The Government are asking this House, so far as the statement of the Minister of Railways is concerned, to jump into this enormous contract without giving us any information as to value of what we are giving or what we are getting.

The next point to which the hon. gentleman referred was, that it was a Canadian route. Well, that was pretty well discussed this afternoon, and I think that the House is at present in a condition of doubt as to whether this is an all-Canadian route or not. It is true, we had an explanation this afternoon, and we are promised, according to the statement of my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), an explanation of the explanation to-morrow afternoon. It is a pity that the Government in presenting this matter to the House did not put a gentleman to introduce it who understood it and could have given us an explanation that we might have discussed here and now. It is a pity that we have to await for a re-explanation on a most important point, and it is not complimentary to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), if the Government of which he is a member consulted the Department of Justice on a matter concerning which great international difficulty may arise, and gave him no information concerning it before he stood up to introduce his Bill. When the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) was asked this afternoon whether the Department of Justice had been

requested to give an opinion as to the international difficulties likely to arise in connection with customs at the very beginning of the project, he was compelled to answer that he did not know whether any such opinion had been asked of the Department of Justice, or whether any opinion had been expressed by the authorities of the United States as to our rights or want of rights in this connection. That is a point on which this House will need enlightenment.

But there is another respect in which, I think, the Government have absolutely failed, and that is the point referred to by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) and by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) this afternoon. Sir, when the Government were endeavouring to make a Canadian policy for the Klondike, it would have been very easy indeed to have a much more pronounced Canadian policy than they did, even if they have selected an all-Canadian route. A few months ago, when there was a rush to the quartz-bearing and galena-bearing districts of British Columbia, very great excitement arose, and there was very great pressure of public opinion that we should reserve these mineral locations for Canadians alone and refuse them to the people of the United States. To my mind, that was a debatable point, because in the refractory ores of the Rossland district and the somewhat expensive working mines of the Slocan district, it was important that we should have more capital than Canada had at that time at her command, for the purpose of development, and it was a question of serious consideration as to whether these claims should be reserved for the pure and simple occupation of Canadian and British subjects, or thrown open to the world. But, as has already been pointed out, no such thought comes in when you come to discuss the placer beds of the Klondike region. Instead of capital being required for development, instead of thousands of dollars having to be spent in running expensive tunnels and sinking expensive shafts, all that is required is the man with his shovel and energy and pluck to dig out gold for himself; and I have no hesitation in saying that the proper policy for this Parliament to pursue is to declare that these lands shall only be staked out by people who are subjects under the British flag, and not by foreigners. And I take that position in no mean or carping spirit, but because this Parliament should mete out to the people of the United States and every other foreign country the treatment that is meted out to us. I have here the United States Mineral Statutes. The first clause is one simply reserving the mineral lands of the United States as the property of the people of the United States, but the very next clause requires that a man who locates a claim there, whether lead or silver, or gold, or anything else, must be a

citizen of the United States or declare his intention of becoming a citizen, before he can put a stake into the ground and claim a foot of territory. I have had experience in connection with that very matter myself. When I came to stake a claim to mineral lands in the United States, I was immediately put to the test of citizenship in that country before I could legally hold one single foot of ground.

An hon. MEMBER. Read the statute.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will not only read the clause, but I will say this, that in this House, this afternoon, there is a prominent member who purchased land in the State of Washington which had been properly located by a citizen of the United States. He purchased the lands and paid his money, and they proved to be valuable. But shortly afterwards the legislature of the State of Washington passed an Act which did him out of his ownership of those lands, and he lost the money which he paid to the locator, and has no rights whatever under the laws of the State of Washington. Here is the clause, Sir :

All valuable mineral deposits in the lands belonging to the United States, both surveyed and unsurveyed, are hereby declared to be free and open to exploration, and the lands in which they are found to occupation and purchase by citizens of the United States and those who have declared their intention to become such, under regulation prescribed by law and according to the local customs or rules of miners in the several mining camps so far as the same are applicable and not inconsistent with the laws of the United States.

And further still, Sir, if the location is owned by a corporation or syndicate, every member of that syndicate must be a citizen of the United States before he can own a share of these mineral locations. And what do we see to-day? Let me read a statement made in the daily press of to-day which bears directly upon this question. This is a despatch from Montreal :

The Canadian Pacific Railway people are feeling very sore to-day over a recent act of the United States Government. Some time ago the Washington authorities asked the different railways, the Canadian Pacific Railway amongst others, to tender for the carrying of 500 reindeer and 75 attendants from New York to Seattle. The tender of the Canadian road was \$247.60 per car, but the American Government awarded the contract to the Pennsylvania Road, whose tender was \$286.72, or a total loss to the War Department, on 35 cars, of \$1,369.20.

In other words, to take some supplies to the very country we are discussing, the Government of the United States are willing to lose about \$1,400 rather than to give an hour's labour to Canadian workmen. That being the case, I say it is the duty of this Parliament to proceed immediately not only to the consideration of railway facilities to the Klondike, but to say that so far as the rich mines of the

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Klondike are concerned, we will reserve them for Canadians and to give labour to Canada's people.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I regret that I had not the opportunity of speaking a few words on the Address before the introduction of this Yukon Railway Bill, for owing to an important engagement, I shall be unable to be present when the debate on the Address is concluded. Another reason for my wishing to be present is that I have learned to admire the Speech from the Throne even on short acquaintance. I was glad to see in the Speech that the bountiful harvest was mentioned as one of the causes of our national prosperity. I suppose that the country has an idea that good times and bad times are manufactured right here on this sacred spot on Parliament Hill.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not desire to deprive the House of the pleasure of hearing my hon. friend on the Address, as he has not been able to speak before. But he is perhaps not aware that the debate on the Address has not been adjourned, but will be resumed as soon as this debate is over.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I have just stated that, owing to an important engagement, I shall not be able to be present, a matter which I regret. I was not going to speak on the Address. I was about to say that such a favourable mention of the good crops in the Address ought to set the country right in the matter, and so tone it up for the shock it will receive when it reads the particulars of this Yukon Railway deal. I have read everything I could see and have listened to everything I could hear in connection with this Yukon Railway. I did hope that the debate on the Address and this debate would bring out some new facts which would improve the character of the bargain and make it more palatable to the Canadian people. But I have heard nothing to change the opinion I formed when the terms were submitted to the country and were first published in the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite. I want to speak in a spirit of deep humility, for I am at a new game when I attempt to discuss engineering questions. This Bill represents a bargain which the Minister of the Interior has made for the building of 130 or 150 miles of tramway through a country that presented no natural obstacles and where supplies can be delivered by vessels at the starting point. I thought the bargain was a bad bargain when I read its terms when first given. I think the bargain is a bad bargain now that I have heard all that has been said in its defence. I am not opposed to the building of this tramway, and I am not one of those who take any stock in the cry that the Minister of the Interior went to Wash-

ington to betray the Yukon country to the Yankees. The fact that geographical conditions enabled our American friends to dictate the terms on which Victoria, Vancouver and other Canadian cities should trade with Dawson City, that single fact alone was a reason why this country should assume any reasonable expenditure, yes, a liberal expenditure, in order to overcome those geographical conditions and establish the right of Canadians to trade in their own country. The Government could have counted on the support of public opinion in any reasonable expenditure, and a very reasonable expenditure would have done all that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann are going to do for Canada.

The subsidy of 25,000 acres per mile gives these favoured gentlemen nearly 4,000,000 acres of gold fields in the Yukon. It may be argued that, excluding the gold claims already taken up there are not 4,000,000 acres of gold claims in the Yukon. Well, if the supply of gold claims run short, Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, with their right of first choice, will be able to take up everything in sight. Then the road they are building will be an easy approach to the Yukon country, which will be largely the private property of the interests that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann represent. This will be the net result of the arrangement, as I understand it. In order to get a tramway which can be built for the cost of a dozen or two of the public buildings which the late Government used to plant in county towns of doubtful constituencies, Canada gives these contractors the right to 4,000,000 acres of gold lands in the Yukon wherever they can be found. I have tried to see the merits of this Bill, but for the life of me I cannot see where it can be justified.

The immediate construction of this tram-road is a boon to Canada, but its resources could have secured this boon without giving away a good third of the gold claims that will ever be discovered in the Yukon. I submit that the Minister of the Interior made a bad bargain for the country, because he has given away scores of dollars of its wealth for every cent that will be invested in the building of this tram-road. I say he has made a bad bargain for his party, because he could have dealt openly and fairly in the matter. The road from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake was the key to the whole transportation question. When the hon. gentleman came back from the Chilkoot Pass he could have let it be known that the country would pay no cash subsidy, but would give the franchise to the men who would do the work within the stated time for the smallest area of mineral lands.

I am satisfied that within thirty days, if he had started on time, the Minister of the Interior could have had a better offer than this bargain, and I do not think he possibly could have got a worse one. I am not

questioning the efficiency of these contractors, I suppose they are capable men. But Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann were not kings in the contracting world until they built the Dauphin Railway for the Manitoba government. Up to that time there were several greater contractors in Canada. But the Minister of the Interior found these men out, and his friends put them forward as the only two men in Canada who could take up this small job of building a tramway within the time fixed by the Government. The country may think that there are other pebbles on the beach, but no, it is all a mistake. Canada has only two contractors, Mr. Daniel Mann, of Montreal, and Mr. William Mackenzie, of Toronto. If my memory serves me aright, these two gentlemen wanted to build the Crow's Nest Pass Railway for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir William Van Horne thought he could get on without them, but he will change his opinion now that they are going to build the Teslin Lake Tramway on terms that will give the Canadian Pacific Railway—well, pretty much everything that they have not got already. This agreement, Mr. Speaker, represents a crime which the Liberal Government are about to commit in the name of economy. The Conservative Government had a habit of committing its crimes in the name of patriotism. I was a Conservative but I thought that the late Government were too subservient to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I apologize to any member of the late Government who will accept the offer of my vain regrets. The Conservatives in power gave largely to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but they at least allowed the company to open up its resources which were the country's gift. The Liberals in power have allowed the Canadian Pacific Railway and its friends to reap where they have not sown. Sir William Van Horne sat down without other people's enterprise and opened up the Kootenay country, and then this Liberal Government comes along and gives three million dollars of the country's cash to build a railway for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Last session the cry was "save the country's commerce," and three million dollars went to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the Crow's Nest Pass road, and the coal lands which should have paid for this road, went to Cox and Jaffray and their associates in British Columbia. This session the cry is "save the country's money." The treasury must be guarded against a cash subsidy for the building of a tram road which would only cost a few hundred thousand dollars all told; the treasury is guarded by a bargain which gives to friends of the Canadian Pacific Railway, gold fields up to four million acres, on which they can issue millions and millions of dollars worth of stock in England. Of course, it will de-

velop the country, and if the country is being benefited, we know that will aid these gentlemen. The Kootenay country was developed without any help from the gentlemen who grabbed the coal fields, and the Yukon country is not very far from being developed without the help of the gentlemen who are enfranchised to build a tramway which will pay from the start, and will take up all the gold fields in sight. If the Liberal party in Canada is proud of the dealings of this Government with the Canadian Pacific Railway, then all I can say is that the Liberals in Ontario at least must judge their friends by one law and their enemies by another law. If the Conservative Government had come down to Parliament with any such arrangement as this, why, the organs of the Liberal party would have shrieked about awarding public franchises by public competition. The Liberal party, when they were in Opposition, did not have any confidence in a Conservative Government. A Liberal party in Opposition that criticised everything that was open to criticism, must have troubled Mr. Van Horne and the Canadian Pacific Railway; the arrangement which prevailed last session must have been far more satisfactory to Sir William, and as long as he was satisfied, there was not a single word from the gentlemen who direct the policy of the Liberal-Conservative Opposition in this House. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has suddenly become an authority of great repute in the Liberal party. The Liberals rejoiced when their organs told them that he had certified to the good character of the Crow's Nest Pass road, and they rejoiced much more when their organs told them that he had said this Yukon Railway bargain was without spot and blameless. I know that the candid friend is not popular, but for the sake of my duty I will endanger my popularity by telling the Conservatives in this House that they will never get back the confidence of the country by supporting every deal that the Canadian Pacific Railway wants, and by opposing every deal that the Canadian Pacific Railway does not want. If the Conservative party has made up its mind not to lose the favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it may as well give up any idea of gaining the favour of the country. I do not believe that the Conservative party has anything to expect from the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why should the Canadian Pacific Railway support the Conservative party in Opposition? The Canadian Pacific Railway opposed the Liberal party in Opposition. In election after election its influence was used to crush every Liberal candidate who could be crushed by such means. The Canadian Pacific Railway has not lost anything by its hostility to the Liberals when in Opposition. I must say for the Liberal Government that it may have its vices and its faults, but this Crow's Nest Pass deal and

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.

this Yukon Railway bargain show that it has at least the Christian virtue of returning good for evil, and blessing in office the men who cursed them in Opposition. There is nothing to be gained by the Conservative party in running after Sir William Van Horne's band wagon. Before Sir William Van Horne will withdraw the influence of his powerful corporation from the Liberal Government, he will want to see what he can get from the other side. The best thing the Conservative party can offer Sir William Van Horne at present is a slow note, and before he withdraws the political influence of his great corporation from the present Government he will want to see gilt-edged securities. I would be the last man in the House to raise the cry against the Canadian Pacific Railway or against the capital required to develop the country. Whenever the Canadian Pacific Railway or capital takes long chances, I think they should have the chance of winning large profits; but when the Canadian Pacific Railway and its friends, as in the Crow's Nest Pass road and this Yukon Railway deal, are to benefit from other people's enterprise in opening up these regions, then this Government treats these men as if they were the pioneers who created the resources to which they are attached for their own profit. I say the Liberal party in office in this respect has been false to the pledges of the Liberal party in Opposition. This Government owed everything to the country and nothing to the Canadian Pacific Railway; and it occurs to me they act as if they owed everything to the Canadian Pacific Railway and nothing to the country. I have detained the House longer than I intended on this matter, but I feel very strongly in connection with this Yukon Railway. I feel that the country is being betrayed by the men who should be its defenders. I do not presume to offer advice to any gentleman. The Yukon Railway bargain will prove to be a disgrace to its authors, and if the Opposition in this House chooses to make itself an accomplice in the transaction then honourable gentlemen who are responsible for the policy of this opposition can answer to their constituents. I am responsible to my constituents. I am speaking for the people who sent me here, and on their behalf and in their defence, I will vote against the ratification of this bargain every chance I get.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With the consent of my hon. friends, I will move at this stage:

That the Order for the second reading of Bill No. 6, intituled: "An Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty the Queen and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company," be made the first Order of the Day on Tuesday next, and

on subsequent days after Questions to be put by Members, until the said Order is disposed of.

Motion agreed to.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL AND MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the House for a few moments to a matter which I regard as of very great importance. It will be remembered that at the last sitting the question was brought before the House of the responsibility of the Government for a speech made by His Excellency the Governor General at Toronto on a recent occasion, and the right hon. the Prime Minister, as will be seen by reference to "Hansard," when he was asked whether he assumed the responsibility for that speech, said :

The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) knows very well that when Lord Aberdeen spoke on the occasion to which the hon. gentleman has referred, he did not speak as the Governor General of Canada, but he spoke simply as Lord Aberdeen.

Now, Sir, I take the position that the attitude assumed by the right hon. the First Minister is entirely at variance with the system of parliamentary government which prevails in this country, that it is opposed to all the authorities, that it is opposed to every precedent and that in fact it discloses a condition of things which would simply be found intolerable. The idea that a gentleman occupying the exalted position of Governor General of Canada is to be permitted to address a public audience on questions of political controversy in this country, and that the Government of the day shall refuse to accept the responsibility for those utterances, is, I undertake to say, entirely in antagonism with the principles of government that are recognized not only in Great Britain but in Canada. The right hon. gentleman will see, if he will turn to "Todd's Government in the Colonies," page 52, the statement that in no case is the Governor responsible to a local Parliament for his conduct in office. That is a thoroughly well understood principle. The Governor General is responsible to the Imperial authorities alone ; he is not responsible to this Parliament in any shape or form. But fortunately we are able to meet that difficulty by having the constitutional practice of holding the Government of the day responsible for every utterance on a public question of that character in reference to the local affairs of this country—holding the Government of the day responsible for every utterance of that exalted personage. In "Todd's Parliamentary Government in England" will be found the following passage :—

The only deviation on the part of William IV. from the strict rule of abstinence from all pol-

itical conversation with persons not of the number of his "immediate constitutional advisers," was when, at the request or with the knowledge of his Ministers, he would invite an interview with some peer or lord of Parliament, for the purpose of endeavouring to allay the violence of party strife, or of promoting the success in Parliament of Ministerial measures which he deemed of vital consequence, and which were in jeopardy through the extent of opposition they were encountering.

Then on page 254 there is the following statement :—

During the Grey Administration, in November, 1831, a circumstance occurred which induced the Premier to address a word of caution to the King, lest the strict line of abstaining from the expression of political opinion towards persons not in his constitutional service might be overstepped without the knowledge or consent of Ministers.

I think nothing could be stronger and more emphatic than the statement to which I have referred.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. gentleman intends to follow his remarks with a motion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I intend to follow my statement by a motion, but it will require some little time in order to deal fully with this question, which is of the greatest possible importance if we are to have any reference in this country to constitutional practice and precedents. At page 52 of "Todd's Parliamentary Government in British Colonies," will be found the following :—

Under certain circumstances—as where the points in dispute involved a question of Imperial policy—the Governor would be entitled to invoke the interposition of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies before surrendering the contest. It is, in fact, his duty invariably to communicate to the Secretary of State any difference of opinion between himself and his Ministers which involves the question of his responsibility to the Crown in connection with the responsibility of his Ministers to the local Parliament. If the Crown should decide against the Governor, he must yield the point in dispute or resign. If the Crown oppose him, the contest is immediately transferred from the agent to the principal, from the Governor to the Imperial authority, from whence his powers are derived. In no case is a Governor to be held personally responsible to a local Parliament for his policy or conduct in office.

One of the great advantages of British institutions, and I hold it to be a very great one indeed, is the fact that under the British constitutional system the representative of the Sovereign holds a high and exalted position, above and distinct altogether from the conflict of party ; and the result of that is of the most vital importance to the country, because it enables all parties and all classes of the people to join in supporting the authority of the Crown and in exhibiting that respect and confidence to Her Majesty or Her Majesty's representatives

which it is quite impossible to prevail under any other system. If the view presented to this House by the First Minister, that the Governor General is permitted to enter into the political conflict in this country, that he is enabled to make addresses on questions of public controversy, on a question that at this moment presents a broad line of demarcation between the two great parties; if it is to be supposed that so exalted a personage as the representative of Her Majesty can come down into the arena of public discussion and take one side or the other without any person being held responsible for that action, it will be at once seen that it is utterly at variance with the principle that places Her Majesty or the person who represents Her Majesty in a colony on a plane on which no such conflict can arise between them and any party in the State. By reference to "Todd's Parliamentary Government in British Colonies," vol. 2, page 805, the following statement will be found:—

Remember that the first care of a Governor in a free colony is to shun the reproach of being a party man. Give all parties and all the Ministries formed the fairest play.

That is a letter from Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, who in 1859 was Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies. That puts on record exactly the view that prevailed in Great Britain, and which prevails wherever constitutional practice is known and recognized. Then, on page 815 will be found:

The position of a constitutional governor towards those over whom he is set as the representative of the sovereign, and especially in relation to his ministers, is one of strict neutrality. He must manifest no bias towards any political party, but on the contrary be ready to make himself a mediator and a moderator between the influential of all parties, and he must be uniformly actuated solely by a desire to promote the general welfare of the province or dependency of the Empire committed to his charge.

It is not necessary that I should quote any stronger authority than that. I may say, that in "May's Parliamentary Practice" (page 312) will be found the following:—

Her Majesty cannot be supposed to have a private opinion apart from that of her responsible advisers.

This places the matter in the strongest possible juxtaposition to the attitude assumed here by the right hon. the First Minister, who told us that if Lord Aberdeen made a speech, not as Governor General, but as Lord Aberdeen, he was entitled to his opinion, and it was a matter which, in fact, did not concern the Government; and consequently they did not hold themselves in the slightest degree responsible for any statement that might be made by His Excellency the Governor General in regard to any political question whatever.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

I may say that we have had the question under discussion before, and it was then disposed of in a manner that every one in this House will regard as entirely conclusive, and which must necessarily settle all controversies in relation to it. On that occasion there was placed on the records of this House the opinion, not only of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, but the opinion of the then leader of the Government, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. The question then arose in connection with a speech made in British Columbia by the Earl of Dufferin, Governor General. It was in regard to the appointment of Senators, and His Excellency took the ground of vindicating the good faith of his Administration, which he regarded as important should not be challenged, and which he also regarded as not taking any part in what might be called a partisan controversy of any kind. Mr. Mackenzie said ("Hansard," 1877, page 373):

I accept the responsibility and am quite willing to account to the country or to the House, which the hon. gentleman says I must do.

Sir John A. Macdonald said ("Hansard," page 373):

I concur with the hon. gentleman that he cannot be responsible for the speech of another individual when he does not know of it. He is, however, responsible for every utterance of the Governor General, except when that illustrious individual expressly states that what he states he says as an Imperial officer by Imperial command.

That is the only, that is the sole, that is the single occasion on which a person holding the exalted position of Governor General of Canada could make any statement without the inevitable result of his Ministers being held responsible for it. Otherwise, as you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible for the rule of this House to be maintained which prevents any disrespect to the Governor General. That is avoided by the established rule and principle that the Government of the day must do one of two things: they must accept the responsibility of every utterance of the Governor General—save and except the instance to which I have just referred—or they must resign, and the Governor General must find some persons to take their place who will accept that responsibility, or he then is placed in the position of being amenable to the Imperial Government. I invite the attention of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to this language of Sir John A. Macdonald:

It is important that that principle should be laid down if we are to be a free country. If responsible government is to be maintained, this principle should be strictly upheld, and I am surprised to hear an hon. gentleman occupying the position of Premier of this Dominion, who boasts that not only is the country under responsible government, but that its constitution is moulded after the same plan and on the same

line as the British Constitution, should aver that he is not responsible for the language of the illustrious individual who so worthily represents the Crown in this country.

* * * * *

This is the first occasion since 1841 that I have heard this doctrine denied and repudiated by the leader of what was the great Reform party. The representative of the Crown can have no more rights in Canada than the Crown itself, and the Crown could not make any utterances on public affairs for which some Minister would not be responsible. Some Ministers must be responsible for every announcement, every statement, every opinion expressed by the Sovereign, and, if that principle is once abandoned, then we shall return to the old system so much decried, and for which the old official party, both in Upper and Lower Canada, were attacked and properly attacked.

Again Sir John Macdonald, speaking in the same debate :

So much are Her Majesty's Ministers in England responsible for the utterances of the Sovereign, that a member of her Cabinet is always with her, whether she goes to Balmoral, France or the Isle of Wight, so that no question affecting the public weal, or the exercise of her power or prerogative as a sovereign, could be answered by her except on the responsibility of one of her advisers.

* * * * *

We have the right to believe that every utterance on public matters by the Governor General is held to be an utterance for which the Ministers are responsible, and we have no right to say or believe that any such utterance is made by him except upon the advice of his Ministers.

* * * * *

If it should happen that the representative of the Sovereign should do here what the Sovereign would never do in England, namely, make a declaration for which his Ministers were not responsible, then they had a plain duty to perform, to state that they would not be responsible for the statement, that they did not sanction it, and that it was made without their advice, and they must take the constitutional privilege of relieving themselves of the responsibility.

The remarks of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie in reply will be found at page 375, "Hansard," 1877. He said :

I admit the responsibility of the Ministers for every utterance made by the Governor General respecting public affairs, or which has any bearing on public affairs, but I do not believe that either Her Majesty in England or her representative here is bound in every word or sentiment uttered to consult the Ministers, or to have the Ministers at hand always to consult.

* * * * *

The statement I made was that I was responsible—

That is evidently a clerical error, and the word "not" is clearly omitted. It should read :

The statement I made was that I was not responsible for any inaccuracies in the Governor General's speech, that I was not responsible for any utterance in it of the nature referred to by the hon. member for Cumberland.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You said : "I cannot be responsible for the utterances of another individual."

That was precisely the position taken by the right hon. gentleman last night on a similar occasion. Mr. Mackenzie added :

I say that yet—responsible for the utterances of another individual on matters not affecting state affairs. * * * To prevent any possible misconception, I repeat that I believe now, and have always believed, that the Ministers must necessarily be responsible for every utterance coming from the Governor General affecting public affairs. I mentioned that I was not responsible for the inaccuracies referred to.

This refers to certain verbal inaccuracies that had occurred in the Governor General's speech.

Now, Sir, we have here not only the parliamentary authorities on this question, but we have the fact established that on the floor of this Parliament both the leaders of the two great parties in this country admitted in the plainest and most distinct terms their entire responsibility for every utterance of the Governor General on questions of public affairs. The only case in which the Ministers are not responsible is the case laid down by the authorities, in which the Governor General makes a statement on Imperial questions by the command of the Imperial authorities. That is the sole and single case in which the Ministry of the day are not held to strict account and responsibility for every utterance the Governor General makes ; and I say it will be quite impossible for any person reading the speech delivered by the Governor General on the occasion to which I have referred, to say that it was not on a question of public affairs. It was upon a question of the sharpest possible controversy at the present moment between the right hon. gentleman opposite and the Liberal-Conservative party in this House and in this country, that is, the question of preferential trade : and upon that question the Governor General delivered himself of a speech in which he went into an elaborate argument to show the utter impossibility of Canada hoping to obtain anything in the shape of preferential trade. His Excellency pointed out to the National Club, before which this speech was delivered, the fact that if the Imperial Government would allow the great interests of the sugar industry of the West India Islands to be destroyed without making any effort to save them, or without being able to come to their rescue, because it would interfere with the principles of free trade which govern in England, it was utterly impossible that Canada could expect that the principles of free trade would be trespassed upon in any way in Great Britain by the Imperial authorities for the purpose of giving to Canada the advantages that she would enjoy under a system of preferential trade. I say, it would be impossible to find any case in which a Governor General made a statement more completely and directly bearing upon a question of political contro-

versy between the two parties in this country; and to say that a person occupying so exalted a position as the Governor General of Canada can take part in political controversies, taking one side or the other and make statements, without his Ministry at once accepting the entire responsibility of those statements, is in complete antagonism with every authority that is to be found bearing on this question, and with the universally recognized practice in Great Britain and the practice as clearly and undoubtedly established in this country by the concurrent sentiments of two gentlemen occupying the distinguished position of Prime Minister, one of the Conservative, and the other of the Liberal party. The consequences must at once be seen. It requires no argument from me to show this House the utter impossibility of the hon. gentleman shrinking for a single moment from assuming the entire responsibility of the utterances of the Governor General on an occasion of that kind, without involving, as you, Sir, and every person in this House must see, the unpleasant consequences of having the conduct and the speeches of the Governor General of Canada made a subject of political discussion and animadversion in this House and out of it. The rules of this House prevent any such thing, and the very fact that they do shows what a monstrous thing it would be, apart from the invasion of the principles of responsible and parliamentary government, for any party in this country to be subjected to animadversions and criticisms upon a question of partisan politics in the country without an opportunity of dealing with them on the floor of this House. In a free country, having parliamentary government, the responsibility for the Governor General's utterances on every question of this kind is wisely devolved upon the Government of the day, and all difficulty of uttering a disrespectful word of His Excellency is avoided; because, when the responsibility of his utterances is assumed by the Government of the day, you then have a free opportunity of discussing the question without entrenching in the slightest degree on the rules of Parliament. I hope that the hon. gentleman made that statement unadvisedly. I hope he is not prepared to maintain it, because, if he is, I can only say that he takes a position which no English statesman would venture to take, a position which has been repudiated, as a possible position for a Minister of the Crown to occupy, by the leaders of both the great parties in this House on a former occasion. There is no statement which the Governor General of Canada can make—I affirm it without fear of contradiction here or elsewhere—on a matter of public affairs in this country, as to which the hon. gentleman will not be obliged to do one of two things: he must either assume the entire responsibility for it, under the system of parliamentary government that exists in all its fulness here,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

as it does in England, or he must resign his position as a Minister of the Crown, and allow His Excellency to seek for advisers elsewhere. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I have no fault to find with the constitutional doctrine which my hon. friend has just stated to the House. I would simply remark to him that upon this occasion he is trying to raise a tempest in a tea-pot. As to the doctrine which he has laid down, there is no one in this House, or out of it, who could take a single word of exception to it. Whenever and wherever His Excellency the Governor General offers any opinion on public questions affecting the people of Canada, which may be in controversy between the two parties in this House, of course it goes without saying that his advisers are responsible and must take the consequences. But my hon. friend knows that His Excellency, in the discharge of his duties, is called upon, on many occasions, to express views publicly upon other subjects than the political questions which affect the people of Canada. His Excellency may be called upon to attend an agricultural dinner, and my hon. friend will not contend that his advisers should be held responsible for the opinions which he may see fit to express on agriculture. Or His Excellency may be called upon to preside at a dinner of artists, and if he there exposes his views on art or letters or things germane to them, I do not suppose that the ministerial responsibility will be held to extend to such expressions of opinion. Or, as has been the case within my own experience, His Excellency may be called upon to attend a dinner of commercial travellers, and my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) and myself have had the pleasure of being at the same board with His Excellency at the commercial travellers' banquet; and if His Excellency speaks on commercial matters, I suppose the ministerial responsibility would not govern his opinions on such matters. But on every occasion, whatever it may be, whether it be a commercial or an agricultural dinner or a dinner of artists, on which the Governor General expresses views and opinions upon the public questions of Canada, then of course his advisers are responsible and gladly responsible. Now, when I was asked yesterday the question which was put to me by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), I answered at once that His Excellency, on that occasion, had spoken as Lord Aberdeen. If on that occasion he spoke as the Governor General—and he would have spoken as the Governor General if he uttered any opinion affecting at all the political welfare or the public questions of Canada, or the question which is at present at issue, the preferential trade question—his advisers are quite ready at once to accept the responsi-

bility for everything he said. But, in my opinion, on that occasion His Excellency said nothing whatever which related in any way to the question of preferential trade; and when the question was put to me yesterday, I spoke vaguely, I must say, at the time, from the recollection and the impression which I had gathered from a casual perusal of His Excellency's remarks. I have thought proper to refresh my memory since, and I find from a report which, I suppose, my hon. friend will not impeach, the report of the "Daily Mail and Empire," the following language of His Excellency on the question at issue:

We can all appreciate the attractiveness of any plan which would at once operate as a stimulus and development of our staple agricultural industries, but I think we may also reasonably express a hope that the attractiveness of such a plan, at least while it is necessarily one of theory rather than of practice, will not divert attention and energy from the work of paving the way for further extension along the ordinary and natural lines towards increase of Canadian trade, by such methods, for instance, as are indeed at present being pursued with so much encouraging success—for example, the successful attention given to the best ways of packing and shipping perishable products, and the use of the system of cold storage, and so forth. In speaking thus, it must not be supposed, as I have already hinted, that there is any want of appreciation of a sort of "royal road" to large and rapid development, but sometimes an apparent short cut, especially if there is an unexpected wire fence intervening, is not in the end the quickest. As to practical attainment, it is interesting to notice what has occurred with reference to the sugar industry. For some time past, and, I am afraid, at the present moment, certain parts of the Empire—Queensland, and, more particularly, some of the West Indian islands—have been and are suffering much because of the unremunerative price of sugar. What is the cause of this? It is well known. It is the result of the high bounties given by the French and German Governments to the sugar manufacturers in those countries, amounting to about 30 shillings (\$7.50) per ton. The result is that the British sugar grower is confronted with this artificial disadvantage, which has caused a fall of nearly 40 per cent in the price of sugar in Great Britain. The old retail price was about 4d. (8 cents) per pound; it is now from 2d. (4 cents) to 2½d. (5 cents). It has very naturally been suggested that if the British Government would put a countervailing duty upon foreign sugar sufficient to counteract the effect of the foreign bounty, the grower in British colonies could compete with a prospect of reasonable profit. Of course, the result would be also to raise the price of sugar, but only to the extent of something like a halfpenny per pound. A commission has recently sat upon this subject, but the result is that though one distinguished member of the commission recommended countervailing duties, the commission as a whole do not report in favour of that remedy.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is that the "Globe" report?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, it is the "Mail and Empire."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The

next paragraph is the one I have particularly marked, it appears in the "Globe," and seems to have been left out in the "Mail and Empire."

The PRIME MINISTER. I will come to that later on:

They felt that although sugar could not be regarded as so fundamental a necessity as other foods, they could not see their way clear to recommend this, because the majority of the people would not be in favour of it. My object in mentioning this is to lay stress on the methods proven to be the ordinary methods of excellence in securing the best markets. (Applause.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would my hon. friend allow me to read into that from the "Globe" the paragraph I refer to.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will read it myself from the "Globe." But let me, before I go any further, say that I cannot find in this language of His Excellency any expression of opinion or doctrine but simply a statement of fact. But if my hon. friend is so very hypercritical that he will find in this language of His Excellency any expression of doctrine on public questions, I say here, on behalf of the advisers of His Excellency, that we endorse and hold ourselves responsible for it. Let me read from the version of the "Globe." We have all had the experience of having our speech reported. Those of us who have been some years in public life have had more or less experience of reporters, and we know that reporters—not through any fault of theirs, probably the fault is ours—do not always report our views as we feel convinced we have expressed them. Sometimes—I suppose most of the time—it is ourselves who are in the wrong, and sometimes it may be they, but it is no unusual thing to find a speech reported in two different papers, and each report show some considerable divergencies from the other.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will save the right hon. gentleman the trouble of reading the "Globe" report. I compared his reading of the "Mail" report with it down to the words: "The commission as a whole do not report in favour of the remedy." Down to that point, the report in the "Mail" is word for word what it is in the "Globe," but if the hon. gentleman will take the "Globe" and read the following paragraph beginning: "This is so obviously significant," he will appreciate the position I take.

The PRIME MINISTER. Up to these last words: "In favour of that remedy" the reports are the same, but there is one sentence more in the "Globe":

This is obviously significant. It seems to mean, for one thing, that a proposal to increase the cost of sugar, even to the small extent of a halfpenny per pound, would not have much pros-

pect of acceptance. The inference, then, would be that a similar increase, or even a smaller increase on foodstuffs of an even more fundamental character than sugar would not be more likely under present circumstances to be adopted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Which of these two reports is the accurate one—the report of the “Globe” or the “Mail”? Let us suppose—I do not want to get into a controversy about that—but let us suppose that it is the report of the “Globe.” There is one sentence more on the same line of the speech which evidently was guarded on the part of His Excellency which, so far as I can see did not intend to go into controversial politics but simply made a statement of facts. It seems to me that under such circumstances, to draw the inference that His Excellency actually went into the political arena is an inference not at all warranted by the facts of the case. His Excellency guarded himself very carefully it seems to me, from the imputation which is now cast upon him and did not give the slightest expression of opinion on either one side or the other. He simply laid down the difference in that way, made a comparison between food and sugar and went no further. But if my hon. friend wishes to be hypercritical and put in the most unfavourable construction upon these two different reports; if, instead of taking the one which seems most consistent with the traditions of the high office of Governor General, he wants to take the report more favourable to his view of the case in order to make a point against His Excellency, I have only this to add and to repeat—that the advisers of His Excellency stand by every word that has been stated by His Excellency as being in every particular true and correct. More than this I will not say. After fighting so long the battle for responsible government, the Liberal party will be found at all times ready to stand by the constitutional doctrine of the olden days. We do not want any personal government in this country. We have responsible government, and we will stand by it. Again, I repeat that the advisers of His Excellency stand by his words, but I disclaim on the part of His Excellency any desire to descend into the political arena, to enter into controversial discussion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not propose to prolong the discussion, because, as I understand the right hon. gentleman, and as I think the House understands him, he has receded from the position that he, confessedly somewhat carelessly, assumed last night. But I wish to add to the extract from the “Globe” another extract from the “Globe,” which the right hon. gentleman did not read and that extract following immediately after that read by the right hon. gentleman is as follows:—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

My object is to lay stress upon the methods which have been approved for securing the best markets for the best products.

And when this was cabled to England, very shortly afterwards, the summary given—a fair summary, as I consider of either the “Mail” or the “Globe” report, bore out the view I have taken. The London “Globe” (England), observed: “At a banquet given at Toronto to Lord Aberdeen, the Governor General considered it incumbent on him to discourage Canadian statesmen from conceding further fiscal advantages to the mother country. He assured his audience that Great Britain would never reciprocate and enforced that proposition by reminding them that the present Government had refused to save the West Indies from ruin by putting a corresponding duty on bounty-subsidized sugar imports.” The right hon. gentleman seemed to refer to inaccuracies in these reports. He is in a position to enlighten the House on some future occasion and give them the exact facts. But I am informed on the best authority that His Excellency’s manuscript went both to the “Globe” and to the “Mail and Empire.” I made that statement in good faith, but the question could be inquired into whether the press misrepresented the Governor General’s words.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS REGULATIONS AT DYEA AND SKAGWAY.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I do not wish to speak on the subject which has just been discussed, but I take the opportunity when the motion is before you, Mr. Speaker, to mention to the leader of the Opposition at the request of the Prime Minister, the information that has reached the Department of Customs with reference to the new regulations which have been issued by the United States government with reference to the transfer of goods at Dyea and at Skagway. On the second of this month new regulations were framed and they have reached the department, having been sent by the treasury at Washington. As the hon. gentleman remarked the regulation that was enforced with reference to the transport of goods over that strip of country over which the Americans claimed to exercise jurisdiction had been carried on hereto by a United States officer accompanying the party who was entering Canadian territory, and he was remunerated at the rate of \$6 a day together with expense of maintenance.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. About \$9 in all.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. About \$9 in all. That was felt to be a hardship, and one could see that it was a hardship especially if there were only one or two in the party. The regulation now in force continues that, but adds two other pro-

positions. The party may file a bond with sufficient security, then the goods may pass through this strip of territory over which the United States claim to exercise authority, and upon a certificate of the goods entering Canada that bond is cancelled. The other proposition is that the party, if he prefers, may deposit the amount of the customs duties with the collector at Skagway or Dyea. He will enter the goods and will take with him the manifest and a duplicate entry. This duplicate entry he will present to the United States officer, the United States having made provision to put an officer on the frontier, and this officer will examine the bill of entry, check off the goods by that bill, and if he finds that all the goods are intact he will give a certificate that such is the case, and the party, upon producing that certificate or sending it to the officer at Dyea or Skagway will get a refund of the money.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I ask the hon. gentleman is the party to send all the way back for the money?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will refer to that. As I mentioned the first course remains in force in case parties may desire to adopt it. But a bond may be filed and sufficient securities, and not money deposited, and on the exportation of the goods the bond will be cancelled. But, as I suppose there is no responsible transportation company, I do not very well see myself how they would be able to give a bond with the securities at present. It is possible that the third proposition may be the one that parties may avail themselves of, that is, depositing the amount of duty, taking their entries with them, and having them cancelled after examination by the officer at the frontier. The proposition is of course that he gets the money back where he deposited it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When he is coming out next year, he will get his money back.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is when the certificate gets back to the place where the money was deposited, certified by the sub-collector at the frontier that the goods were passed into the territory. When that certificate, duly endorsed by the party who deposited the money, reaches the officer with whom he made the deposit, then he gets it back.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the distance across?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. About 15 miles. That engaged the attention of the Customs Department, and the department submitted, with a view to encourage Canadian trade and facilitate transportation of Canadian goods, an Order in Council to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, when the certificate of

the party entering that country has been duly certified and vouched for by the American officer, to authorize the Canadian officer there to cash that voucher or that order out of the customs money that our own officers will have, at par, or should any one happen to have purchased their vouchers, properly endorsed from the party who had them, to accept them in payment of customs duties. We think that will make it much pleasanter for men entering goods into that country. His Excellency was pleased to give his sanction to that order, and it will be the duty of the department, under the authority thus conferred, to make such regulations and send such instructions to our officers at the port as will enable this to be carried out, I trust, with perfect security to the revenue, and with great convenience. I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me, to parties entering that country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman able to say whether these instructions have reached the officers at Skagway and Dyea?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They have just been decided on, it is only within the last day or two that they have received this regulation. It was adopted by the Treasury Committee on the 2nd of February. I may say with reference to another subject that will be of interest, perhaps, that the Customs Department have had inquiries from British as well as Canadian parties with reference to navigation in the Yukon. The question has been asked whether British vessels or Canadian vessels navigating the Yukon would be permitted to touch Canadian ports or land at places in order to purchase wood and supplies. In the new regulations that have been issued, that is provided for, and it is permitted under Customs supervision. Also in the navigation of the Yukon and Porcupine, regulations are made for the transfer of goods on to river boats at St. Michael's destined for Canadian points.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is that under the Customs supervision, too?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. Do I understand the Minister of Customs to say that an American officer is placed on the Canadian boundary to cancel entries going through American territory?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, the Canadian going in, say at Dyea or Skagway, presents his entry with the amount of duties, and he deposits that money, he carries the duplicate of the entry with him. The United States have placed one of their officers at the boundary.

Mr. WALLACE. I want to ask whether, during all these months, there has been no

American officer at the boundary until now?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. Hitherto an officer has accompanied our officer from Skagway or Dyea. When that certificate or voucher is given, it will be cashed by our own Canadian Customs officer, and instead of requiring the individual to go back to Dyea or Skagway and get his money, it will be cashed by him, and our officers will collect it after it has been duly endorsed by them.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. Before I put the motion, I would like to mention that the last part of the discussion upon it is of course an irregular discussion, because a motion to adjourn was moved for the specific purpose of bringing into question the responsibility of Ministers for the action of the Governor General. But the subject is so exceedingly important in every way that of course the irregularity was not noticed. But I do not want the House to consider this as a precedent, because on a motion for a specific purpose to adjourn the House, the subject cannot be changed.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

Order for resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bertram, for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in answer to his Speech at the opening of the session, being read,

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I would ask my hon. friend whether at this hour it is worth while to proceed with the adjourned debate.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. There are 40 minutes to 12 o'clock, perhaps that will dispose of an ordinary speech.

Mr. **FOSTER**. We expect an extraordinary speech.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. If my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) thinks he cannot dispose of the subject in forty minutes, I would not force him to go on.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. I would suggest that the hon. member who moved the adjournment of the debate before, has still a right to move its further adjournment at present.

Mr. **DAVIN** moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT.

Public Accounts for the year ending 30th June, 1897.—(Mr. Fielding.)

The **PRIME MINISTER** moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and at 11.25 p.m. the House adjourned.

Mr. **WALLACE**.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 9th February, 1898.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ALIEN LABOUR BILL.

Mr. **TAYLOR** moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) to amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of aliens.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Explain.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Government requests me to explain the Bill I have just introduced. I may say that I regret very much that he was not present last year when this question was under discussion. It will be within the recollection of many members of this House that I have for several years introduced a Bill bearing this title. At the session before the last, two years ago, the right hon. gentleman requested that the Bill which I then introduced should be allowed to stand until the following session, owing to the fact that no legislation, except the Estimates, would be put through that session. I acceded to his request on the understanding that I should introduce the Bill the next session, and that he would lend his valuable assistance to the passing of a Bill, word for word and line for line, similar to those that were enforced against Canada by the United States. I introduced a Bill similar in every respect to the one I had brought before the House for several years, and which was a copy of a portion of the United States law, but to my surprise, when I arrived here, the first day of last session, I found that the Government had put up one of their supporters to forestall me, and had introduced a Bill, line for line and word for word, the same as mine, as far as it went, but added two or three clauses similar to a proposition then before the United States Congress, which the United States Congress proposed passing that session. The Government referred both Bills—the one proposed by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan) and the one I had introduced—to a sub-committee composed of two members of the Government, two of their supporters, and three members of the Opposition. I was a member of that committee. The committee sat and reported to this House a Bill to which I did not give my consent. I objected to the amendments that were added as making the Bill, in my opinion, unworkable and useless; and I would ask the right hon. gentleman now how many actions have been taken to prevent Americans from being employed in Canada, under the Act passed last year. Has it been enforced? Now, let me read

a letter written by the hon. Secretary of the Treasury at Washington in reply to a letter sent by the Canadian Carriage Company at Brockville :

Washington, D.C., Dec. 28, 1897.

Canadian Carriage Co.,
Brockville, Ont., Canada.

Sir,—I am in receipt of your communication of the 23rd inst., addressed to the Honourable the Secretary of the Treasury, in which you state your firm is considering the matter of establishing a branch in Morristown, a small place directly opposite Brockville, in the United States, and requesting to be advised whether it would be in violation of our laws for the department to accord you the privilege of sending at certain times your superintendent and foreman, and occasionally some skilled workmen across the river daily to perform services in this country.

In reply, I call your attention to the Acts approved February 26, 1885, February 23, 1887, and March 3, 1891, inclosed herewith, from which it appears that this department cannot grant the privilege desired, and that the action as contemplated by you, if carried out, would be in violation of law.

Respectfully yours,

T. V. POWDERLY,

Commissioner, General.

There was the request made to establish a branch industry in the United States and have the superintendent of the works on this side visit that branch occasionally to see how it was being carried on, and that request was refused. In reply to it, the American authorities sent a copy of all the American Acts in force against Canada and other countries. The Acts that the United States have in force against Canada I have embodied in this Bill. The Bill contains some fifteen clauses, and is designed to do what the Prime Minister promised should be done—to bring into force into Canada an Act, word for word, and line for line, similar to that of the United States, and an Act that will be workable. This Bill repeals the Act passed last session and substitutes in lieu thereof, word for word, the Act passed by the United States against Canada. That is what I have always fought for; that is what the workmen of this country expect at the hands of this Government in order that Canada and Canada's labour shall be kept for Canadians. During the year a number of representations have been made to me that there were flagrant violations of the existing law and that neither the Government or anybody else paid any attention to them, the Act being, apparently, unworkable. I was urged to introduce a Bill that would meet the case, and I have done so. I hope it will meet with the unanimous approval of members on both sides of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

POLLING DAY A HOLIDAY.

Mr. PENNY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) to amend the law respecting holidays. He said: I have found that on election day a great many citizens have been deprived of their votes owing to being obliged to attend to their business, particularly working-people, who are not allowed time to be absent from their work. The object of the Bill I have introduced is to make election day for the Dominion of Canada a public holiday.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Mr. Joseph Hector Leduc, Member for the Electoral District of Nicolet, introduced by the Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and Mr. Bernier.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERVISORS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 10) to authorize the appointment of a board of civil service supervisors. He said: This is a Bill similar to the one I introduced last year. The object is to authorize the Government to appoint a board of civil service supervisors to investigate and regulate the civil service of the Dominion—both the inside and the outside service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. BRITTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 12) further to amend the Criminal Code of 1892. He said: The purpose of this Bill is to except from those sections of the Criminal Code which require corroborative evidence, sections 181, 189, 190. Those who take the trouble to look at the Criminal Code will see that section 181 has reference to girls over 14 and under 16; and sections 189 and 190 refer to another class of cases. I think there will be abundant reason shown why these should be excepted. Another point in this Bill is that it allows an appeal, after application to the Court of Appeal, and the Court of Appeal giving leave to any person accused who has asked the trial judge to reserve a case. The law at present provides that the accused cannot apply to the Court of Appeal for leave except with the consent of the Attorney General. When such a right is given in civil cases, it seems to me much more should it be given in criminal cases. The last point of the Bill is to repeal section 748, which allows the Minister of Justice to grant a new trial in

criminal cases. I think that point is one well worthy the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 7) to regulate freight rates on railways.—(Mr. Reid.)

Bill (No. 11) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting cruelty to animals.—(Mr. Penny.)

Bill (No. 14) respecting the attachment of salaries out of moneys in the hands of the Government of the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Richardson.)

MOUNTED POLICE PENSIONS.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 13) to amend the North-west Mounted Police Act. He said:—Under the Mounted Police Pension Act, as it stands to-day, twenty-five years' service are necessary to entitle a man to claim a pension; I propose to amend that by reducing the time to twenty years. At present he may be compelled to retire and receive his pension after twenty-five years' service, and by this amendment I propose to make the time twenty years.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to direct the attention of the Government to a very important point in regard to the Bill which was submitted to the House yesterday. The House will recollect that I said I would defer any discussion on that question until it came up for its second reading, which is usually the time when discussions on important measures of that kind are taken. It has occurred to me, however, that it is my duty under the circumstances, and after a careful examination of the Bill, to draw the attention of the Government to the provision clothing the contractors with the necessary power to carry out the work, and to point out that an important omission has been made therein. The great object, as recognized by every person, I believe—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will conclude with a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should observe that the Orders of the Day have been called, and I do not think it is in order to move the adjournment of the House, in order to discuss this question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will not discuss it, then. However, the point I wish to
Mr. BRITTON.

draw attention to is so important that if I were to reserve it until the second reading of the Bill, my right hon. friend would have some reason to complain that his attention had not been called to it before. It is solely in that view, and in the hope that the difficulty may be met to some extent, that I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to it now. The object of all friends of that measure, certainly the avowed object, the object that is entertained everywhere in view of its importance, is based on the desirability of having an all-Canadian route, and it appears to me that under these circumstances the practice that has been adopted in the United Kingdom, the practice that has been adopted in the United States of America on more than one occasion, as no doubt the hon. gentleman will remember, should have been adopted here in order to preserve its character of an all-Canadian route, because it is absolutely necessary to provide against the transfer of that contract and of that charter to a foreign company, which would, in my judgment, entirely invalidate and destroy the effect of it. I need not call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the enormous extent of those mining territories that the contract proposes to hand over to this company, greatly enhances the importance of such a provision being made, and I assume that there will be no difficulty on the part of the Government in inducing the contractors, although it appears not to be in the contract or in the charter, to consent to such a provision as would entirely preserve the Canadian route which the Government desires, from being transferred to a foreign country and thus defeating the object that it has in view, and from transferring a large portion of important Canadian territory in the same way. I draw the attention of the right hon. gentleman to it now in the hope that he may be able to effect such an arrangement before the further consideration of the measure, as at present there appears to me to be an absolutely fatal difficulty in the way.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not sure that I share altogether the anxiety of my hon. friend with regard to this question. At all events, the consideration which he has given to it is worthy the attention of the Government, and certainly I am very grateful that he has directed our attention to the point. We will give it the best consideration that we can in the meantime.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Bertram for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in answer to his Speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the opinion of one coming from the North-

west Territories in regard to the Speech from the Throne; I also rise to say something of the present political situation in this House and in the country, as suggested by the Speech from the Throne and illustrated by the debate. Sir, the debate this year is the most extraordinary debate which, I believe, has ever taken place on an Address in any Parliament. Sir, from this side of the House two powerful arraignments of the Government's position have been made; but from the Ministerial benches, although the two foremost men on that side of the House have spoken, the replies have taken the character of playful badinage, as though the right hon. gentleman who leads the House and the hon. gentleman who wears now Grand Cross of St. Michael and St. George, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, thought that the people of Canada took no stock whatever in the charges made by hon. gentlemen from this side of the House, or else thought that to those charges there was no answer possible, and that therefore the best way to cover them up was by trying to make a joke and then sitting down, in the vain hope—vain assuredly it is—that the people of Canada, or, at least, the Liberals of Canada, would be taken in by a policy so obvious as that. Now, Sir, it has been thus far a very peculiar debate, and I want to call attention to one of its peculiarities. We have had several comparisons. The Prime Minister compared the leader of the Opposition to a very famous character in classical poetry. Now, my right hon. friend will excuse me if I tell him that there is no such character in Homer or in Shakspeare as Thersites, but there is Thersites. My hon. friend throws back his head. My hon. friend is eloquent in two languages, and it is therefore excusable, when speaking in the tongue that was originally foreign to him, but in which he is now a master of expression, that he should occasionally mispronounce a word. But he knows as well as I do that in academic halls he was guilty of an unpardonable offence in making the *i* short in Thersites. However, it was a very extraordinary and inapt comparison, because Thersites is a low ill-shaped railer against the great men of Greece in the Trojan war.

The ex-Minister of Finance compared the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to Ajax. And in the play of Troilus and Cressida Thersites rails at Ajax and rails even at Achilles, but this is to be noted, that in nearly everything he said of Ajax, all who knew anything of Ajax, would agree with him. Hon. members have all been in the comparative line in this debate. My hon. friend who leads the Opposition compared the right hon. gentleman to Prince Maurice de Talleyrand, and I leave that where it is. The Prime Minister compared the Finance Minister to Alexander of Macedon. I wish I had a spiritualistic

telephone and could transmit the compliment to the great leader of armies wherever he may be. Then the ex-Finance Minister compared—I am bound to say that when comparisons come from this side of the House and I do not agree with them, I am prepared to express my opinion—compared, not, I think, appropriately, the Prime Minister to Nebuchadnezzar. I do not recognize the appropriateness of the comparison of the leader of the Opposition to Thersites any more than that made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he compared the leader of the Opposition, not to an individual, but to the whole body of the Israelites of Egypt spoiling the Egyptians and then going out into the wilderness to search for gold. But they did not go to search for gold: they went into the wilderness to go to the promised land and were fed on manna in the meanwhile. If the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) is now in the wilderness, he is as certain to go to the promised land as were the children of Israel, although to do it will not take forty years.

Let me say, as I am speaking of the form of these speeches, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce—I am sorry he is not in his place—for a man of his experience in Parliament, for a man of his social culture, was guilty of one of the most extraordinary parliamentary crimes that has been ever committed. What was that? I deprecate, unless under extreme necessity, bringing the name of His Excellency into debate in this House. But what did the Minister of Trade and Commerce do? He actually made a reference, which I have here—it would be unbelievable if I could not refer to it—in order, as he thought, to make a point. Because the leader of the Opposition brought before the House certain utterances of His Excellency—the Minister of Trade and Commerce actually suggested that my hon. friend should not have done what no doubt he thought was his duty. And why? Not because it was wrong, not because it was an unparliamentary proceeding, but because he was the recipient of a tribute from their Excellencies on an interesting occasion. This is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said, at the close of his suggestion that it was the Tory party that burnt down the Parliament buildings:

If I am not altogether mistaken in recalling a certain interesting occasion, not so very long ago, in this city, among the many costly tributes which were tendered to the hon. gentleman, not the least costly, not the least elegant, was one presented by the exalted personage referred to. Therefore, I infer that the hon. gentleman is not so implacable as he seems.

What the hon. gentleman means to suggest is that the acceptance of a present or gift from a man occupying an august position, by a man occupying one of the highest posi-

tions in the colonial Empire of Britain would be something in the nature of a bribe, a bribe for silence or for expressed flattery. It is one of the most scandalous things that ever took place in Canada, and it is especially scandalous coming from a man of the years and authority and occupying the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce.

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) used a phrase which I believe has been unjustly dealt with on this side of the House and even by his own colleague. I believe injustice has been done to him. The right hon. gentleman said that when the historian sat down to write of Canada he would take the years 1867 and 1897; and I must say the hon. member for York fell into what I deemed an error. He fell into this interpretation of the remark of the Premier, that what he meant was this, that the historian would be engrossed exceedingly by the wonderful events that occurred in the summer of 1896 and he would have nothing to say respecting all the events that passed during the previous thirty years, but he would write a history of the country from 1897 on; and the Minister of Trade and Commerce actually flouted the idea, scouted the idea, drew himself up and put on the most indignant countenance, and it is a countenance which from long practice can look fierce and indignant to an extreme degree, and he said, in effect: do you suppose the historian would bother himself with the events of the last thirty years? What I fancy the right hon. Prime Minister, and he will correct me if I am wrong, intended was that 1867 was the beginning of an epoch, and as that year was the beginning of an epoch, so 1897 was the beginning of an epoch too. That is a rational statement on the face of it, and is not open to the laughter that would greet a proposition that the historian would not note what had taken place for thirty eventful years. What was the note of 1867 and the note of those thirty years? National Expansion. Who were the men who gave the keynote at that time? They were Macdonald, Tupper, Cartier, Brown and D'Arcy McGee. Those powerful minds, some of whom remained with us until lately, and one leading name still adorns this House. I repeat, what was the note of those thirty years? It was national expansion, the national expansion of Canada. And in the hands of the Conservative party, what was done? Province after province was added to the confederation, the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, the canals were enlarged and deepened, the North-west was acquired, and at last, Canada was rounded into the proportion of a nation, so that when the Prime Minister went over to represent us in England at the Jubilee, he represented not a mere colony like New South Wales or Victoria, but he represented seven colonies and a vast territory of continental proportions, a galaxy of

Mr. DAVIN.

colonies, he represented a country that was bound to take pre-eminence and to take national bulk in the eyes of the Empire and the world. And what did it? It was the note of national expansion and the men whose inspiration that note was; some of these men are sleeping in their peaceful graves, but their names live forever, and one of them though sleeping in his long home in the Kingston graveyard lives by his deed and his thought, so that to-day we can say of him as the poet of Albrecht Durer, and which has been translated by Longfellow, who may thus be parodied:

Dead he is not, but departed;
For the truly great man never dies.

Well, Sir, in 1873 a change took place. The Government was not beaten but Sir John Macdonald resigned, and why? It was because he and his Government had made a contract with Sir Hugh Allan and the charge against Sir John was, that he sold the contract. It was supposed to have been an extravagant bargain, but at this day Liberals and Conservatives, and all thoughtful men know that so far from being an extravagant bargain, there is not an engineer of authority you can speak to who will not say: Neither Sir Hugh Allan nor any company could have built the road on the terms that were made with him; and as for selling the charter, that charge has been long since exploded. What happened then? Well, as may be seen in this country to-day, as was seen in 1896, and as has been seen all through our history, the Conservative party is much more sensitive in regard to the character of its public men than is the Liberal party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, it is true, and there is a reason for it. That reason I need not refer to in a detailed analysis, but if you go into the past history of both parties you know very well that not merely did the genius of rule and the instinct of government belong to the Conservative party, but from one reason or another they had within them more of the light of culture than had the Liberal party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. That is no reproach to the Liberal party; they could not help it probably, but anyway it is a fact. Now, Sir, the result of that charge made in 1873 was that it created a furore throughout all Canada, and Conservatives that never cast a Grit vote in their lives, voted Grit in 1874 when Mr. Mackenzie went to the country. And some of those electors who came back in September, 1873, to put the Conservative party in power, and many of their children and their relatives voted again against the Conservatives in 1896. They voted against the Conservatives last election not entirely because of the school question, for they were dissatisfied about other matters as

well, but amongst us in the North-west Territories and in Manitoba, the language of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), language that he used from Halifax to Vancouver, the language that he used in the Windsor Hotel at Montreal, when the banquetting room was placarded with "Death to protection," and every possible motto that could indicate that protection was a curse to the country, the language of the right hon. gentleman at Sohmer Park, and at Winnipeg where he declared: "Protection was slavery as bad as African slavery in the South," and he would rescue us; all that had something to do with changing Conservative votes into Liberal votes. Then the right hon. gentleman came to Moosomin, and dwelt upon the dreadful iniquity of the tax on farming implements from which he would relieve us; at Regina the same silver voice declared that he would leave no tax on implements, and at Moose Jaw when he asked what the freight rates were, he said it was a dreadful thing, and he was going to sweep away the freight rates. Thence he went to British Columbia, and wherever he went he just said the thing that at that moment would please the people, and many of the people believed him.

Does the right hon. gentleman suppose for one moment that the people of the country did not take him seriously? They did take him seriously. They voted for him and they said: We will take your note of hand. But now that he has been in power twenty months, and in his third session, they say: We want you to redeem your notes, we have had enough of the sunny ways, do you suppose that your promises and your pledges are to be regarded as mere barren brambles in these sunny ways? In this year of 1897 our country has had national expansion; we are over five millions of people and the credit of Canada stands as high to-day almost as that of the mother country in the money markets of the world. The portals of time are thrown open. Are these gentlemen who are now clothed with power, who have the priestly garments of the time on, in whose hands fate has put the wand of office; are they able to pronounce the shibboleth which entitles them to enter these portals? The portals of time are thrown open to admit the new era, and do these hon. gentlemen know the word that will entitle them to enter? Sir, the note of these thirty years was national expansion, but the note of 1897, and for the immediate future which lies beyond, is Colonial equality in Imperial union. Can these gentlemen opposite pronounce the word? They feel the breeze and power of the time in their garments, and they look down the road that should be taken, but it is with a haggard and restless and unfamiliar eye, and they are afraid to tread the path that fate calls on this country to take.

I say that the note of this time is colonial

equality in Imperial union, and when the right hon. gentleman went to England he should have sounded that note; we expected him to sound it. He did not represent the Liberals alone—and we know from the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) that there are Liberals who are preferential trade men—but he represented Conservatives as well; and from the language that we, and I in my humble way used in this House, when he was about to start, to the best of our power we gave him a God-speed and declared our confidence in him as a man fit to represent us in England. But the right hon. gentleman apparently did not know; some extraordinary spell was on him; the language that he used in Montreal, and in Toronto, and in St. Johns, was forgotten; there was some malison on him, so that one could apply to him the words of the great modern poet:

How could the light that lit you for a space
Fall, through sick weakness of a broken will,
To the dead cold damnation of disgrace?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House for one moment to what is not in the Speech, and which we western members had a right to expect. I see the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has left the Chamber. When he heard me mention the word Moosomin, I saw he took to his heels, because I manage to make even him hear me when I speak on North-west matters.

Mr. BENNETT. He has gone to read Dan Rose's book.

Mr. DAVIN. Dan Rose's book? Do you suppose that is what is in his mind now? No. He silently dreams of the golden crop that is to come to him from Klondike arrangements. Dan Rose's book, forsooth! it is but the narrow-necked clams that give appetite to the feast that is before him. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of the Interior told us at Moosomin that he was opposed to the National Policy. He denounced the National Policy; he condemned it. Sir, the National Policy is there to-day. It was a pleasant thing to me as an old Torontonian to see the face of the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram); but, Sir, it was of ill-omen to the farmers of this country to see the Address moved in this House by a leading manufacturer, and to hear that hon. gentleman assure us that the manufacturers need not be afraid—that though for a time they had no confidence in the Liberals, yet now they know the Liberals, and they know they can have confidence in them. What does that mean? It means that he knows that the Government are not going to carry out their pledges to the farmers. But of still worse omen was it when the Prime Minister brought a certificate of character—from whom? The Prime Minister has been held up to us in the west as the good Samaritan who was to heal our ills,

the liberator who was to free us from slavery, and to break the chains of protection on our ankles, and the gyves on our wrists, put there by the trusts and combines of the manufacturers; and to whom does the Prime Minister fly for a certificate of character? To Mr. Gurney, who is not only a great manufacturer, but the head of the greatest trust on this continent, the stove trust. It is very like a man who had posed as a saint going to the master of the infernal regions for a certificate of his purity.

Well, Sir, we expected to see some evidence in the Speech that we should get tariff reform. We expected to see something about coal oil; we expected to see an announcement from the Minister of the Interior that we should have a Bill bearing on Dominion lands, which would get rid of the odd sections in the North-west Territories, which also the hon. gentleman promised at Moosomin. We expected to see something about a Hudson Bay Company. But not one of these things is to be found in the Speech. Now, is it a wrong thing to hold public men to their pledges? I am sorry the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) is not here, but I am going to quote him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.
Where did he go?

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, I think he thought that I might deal with him. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is not here to hear it, but the country's ear is open, and tomorrow morning the country will hear what that hon. gentleman said. On page 133 of a pamphlet of speeches published in 1878. Mr. Cartwright, as he then was, said:

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Why go back so far as that?

Mr. DAVIN. Are they afraid of their utterances, Mr. Speaker? This is a statement of a general truth that I am going to quote, and I ask the attention of my hon. friend from Hamilton to it:

I say that it is our duty to stamp the mark of public reprobation, as I now do, on men who have proved out of their own mouths thus false to the high trusts you committed to their hands.

Well, Mr. Speaker, is it necessary for me to quote the promises made by the Prime Minister to reduce the tariff; to take the duty off coal; to take the duty off coal oil or to greatly reduce it; to relieve the agriculturists as regards implements? It is not necessary; they are well known; and to refer to them and point to this speech is to make the greatest possible condemnation of the Prime Minister and his colleagues. But, Sir, I am not going to content myself with that. I will not go so far back as 1878. Here is the Liberal campaign sheet of 1882. If you examine the tariff as it was in 1881, you will

Mr. DAVIN.

find that within a fraction it is very much the same as the tariff of to-day. The tariff of to-day, in regard to many things a poor man buys, is higher than that of 1881. Now, I ask your attention to this language, referring to the tariff of 1881:

RESULTS OF THE N. P.

The N. P. imposed a rate of duties that largely increases the cost of sugar, that increases the cost of stoves and hardware, that increases the cost of ploughs and all agricultural implements, that makes cottons and woollens dearer than would have been the case under the previous tariff, and that benefits a few individuals at the expense of the masses. To show, for instance, how the Canadian farmer is made "to pay for his whistle" by the present tariff,—

This is as true of this tariff as of the tariff of which it was written:

—we may adopt an illustration of a day's work and life on a farm, which cannot be questioned on the ground of accuracy. The farmer starting to his work has a shoe put on his horse with nails taxed 41 per cent, with a hammer taxed 40 per cent, cuts a stick with a knife taxed 27½ per cent, hitches his horse to a plough taxed 30 per cent, with chains taxed 27½ per cent. He returns to his home at night and lays his weary limbs on a sheet taxed 30 per cent, and covers himself with a blanket that has paid 70 per cent. He rises in the morning, puts on his humble flannel shirt taxed 60 per cent, shoes taxed 30 per cent, hat taxed 30 per cent, reads a chapter from his Bible taxed 7 per cent—

I believe that tax is off now. I remember that it was said of a lawyer who used to drive a very hard bill, that before he sat down to write it he said his prayers.

—and kneels to his God on a cheap carpet taxed 30 per cent. He sits down to breakfast: eats from a plate taxed 40 per cent, with knife and fork taxed 30 per cent, drinks his cup of coffee or tea sweetened with sugar taxed 45 per cent, seasons his food with salt taxed 35 per cent, pepper 35 per cent, or spice 35 per cent. He looks around upon his wife and children, all taxed in the same way—

Now, mark this, and I call the attention of the First Minister to it—

—takes a chew of tobacco taxed 100 per cent—

Well, tobacco is higher now; I suppose it is taxed 125 per cent.

—and if he indulges in a cigar he has first to pay a tax of 120 per cent, and then he is expected to thank John A. that he lives under the freest government under heaven.

What we would write down now is that he is expected to thank Sir Wilfrid Laurier that he lives under a Government that keeps every one of its pledges.

Now, as bearing on that topic, let me show you this illustration, and I may tell you that it is one which has created some feeling throughout the North-west Territories. There is not a shop in the Territories, where tobacco is sold, in which the man inside the counter does not say to the purchaser:

Which will you have? This is the Conservative plug, and here is the Liberal plug. I now show you, Mr. Speaker, a specimen of each plug, and can any one be surprised that the customer should say: Give me the Conservative plug, for that is a solid plug. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is, and just compare it with the other—the Liberal plug. Well, there is the same difference between the Liberal policy and the Conservative policy. The Conservative policy is solid and sound and what it professes to be, but the Liberal policy is just as that Liberal plug of tobacco—too light, and the people will not have it. Neither will they long stand the light weight which these gentlemen are now dealing out to them.

Let me read further from this, which was the campaign sheet of the Liberal party in 1882. It is headed "Taxes"—and mark you, Mr. Speaker, the present Government has kept the tariff about the same as it was in 1881, which they then so vigorously denounced, as you will see by this pamphlet. Here is what I find, at the very start, in this pamphlet:

Taxes.—Sir John, by his National Policy, committed himself to the policy of levying taxes on grain and coal.

Well, we can likewise say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, by retaining that same tariff to-day, has committed itself to the policy of levying taxes on grain and coal. Then the pamphlet goes on:

Such a tax has raised the price of every ton of coal the poor man has to buy.

Why, we know it has, especially we in the North-west, where fuel is dear and scarce; and these hon. gentlemen opposite have consequently not kept their promise to the poor man when, by their tariff, they retain this tax. I further read:

The tax on coal has also increased the cost of production. An increase in the cost of production reduces the profits of manufacturers—a reduction of their profits lowers the rate of the workingman's wages. It at the same time raises the price of fuel to the workingman, as the tax on wheat has raised the price of his bread. Sir John's policy, then, weakens home manufactures, lowers the rate of wages, and increases the cost of living.

Well, that is the language in which the Liberal party denounced a tariff which was practically the same as the tariff we now have. We know what they have done about cotton. They condemned, when in Opposition, in the strongest possible manner, the tariff on cotton, and yet they have, when in office, raised the duty on the poor man's cotton. In view of those circumstances, is it to be supposed that the farmers of the North-west, or the farmers of this country generally, can be content? How can they be content, when they find that promise after promise has been belied? We were promised in the North-west, and we took great stock in the promise, that the

expenditure would be lowered. But what has taken place? The expenditure has been raised by \$1,400,000. I shall not give you all the items, but only those that most concern us in the Territories. I must again express my regret at not seeing the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in his place, because I intend bringing something before the House which interests him, and which, if he will not answer here, he will have to answer later before Canada. He promised to reduce the expenditure in the management of the Indian Department, and he took away from Regina the Indian Commissioner's Office, on the pretense that he would thereby lower the expenditure. He also dismissed men wholesale from the Indian Department on the same pretense. But what are the facts? At this moment, in 1897, the cost of running the Indian Department is \$17,000 higher than it was in 1896. How is he going to get over that? I would like to have him here to explain, but I suppose he will, if I may quote one of the figures used by the right hon. First Minister; hide his head in the sand like the ostrich, and kick out at the stars, at gods and men, vainly supposing that such tactics will save him from popular reprobation.

Let me take one or two other items. The interest on the debt has been increased by \$143,000; the cost of the militia has been increased \$530,000, and the mounted police—what do you think has been done with regard to that? The policy which the Government has adopted with regard to the mounted police leaves the North-west Territories at this moment in great peril. The ranchers out there are in great excitement because the word has gone out to take the mounted police from Fort McLeod and Calgary up to the Klondike. The policy of reducing the mounted police has had the effect of alarming the people of the North-west, and left the Government, too, when they wanted men for the Klondike, in a tight and difficult place. They reduced the mounted police, one of the finest forces in the Empire, by 150 men, and how much do you suppose they saved? They saved just \$6,000. They ought to have saved \$150,000, because their calculation was that each man cost \$1,000. But instead of saving \$800 or \$1,000 per man, they reduced the force by 150 men or more and saved only \$6,000.

But I must hark back again to the tariff, because I see the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) has come in, and I wish to remind the House that that hon. gentleman expressed his disappointment with his own Government last summer, and should like to hear what he has to say here on the same subject. They had a meeting in Winnipeg, at which the hon. gentleman attended, and at which he told a doleful tale. He told them that when he and his fellow-Liberals from the west tried to get a reduction on implements they found that it was not they, the representatives of the

farming province, who had the ear of the Government, but Mr. Frost and the other implement makers.

I want to call the attention especially of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) to the fact that the expenditure has been greatly increased, and that consequently in this respect neither have the Government kept their word. I want to show what is said by some of their own supporters on that point. You will remember, Sir, that the "Gleaner," which is a supporter of the Government, called attention to the strong utterances of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in favour of keeping down expenditure. The "Gleaner" then showed what the expenditure was; it showed that the expenditure had increased to \$54,000,000, and quoting the strong language of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, it denounced him for not carrying out his pledges especially in the absence of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The "Gleaner" did more than that. It went over the conduct of the Liberal party and condemned that party. There cannot be the least doubt that whether we look at the expenditure or at the way we have been treated in the matter of the tariff, or whether we take promise after promise, not a syllable of any of the promises made in Opposition has been implemented by hon. gentlemen in office.

Take another promise that was given us—the maintenance of the purity of Parliament. Why, Sir, has there ever been such a scandalous violation of the independence of Parliament as was witnessed in this House in the conduct of Langelier? To make the position of judge a football of party exigencies was bad enough, for it was calculated to lower the character and dignity of the judicial office, but to take the Lieutenant-Governor's position and treat it in the same way was, I hold, derogatory to the dignity of the Crown. Again, these gentlemen were going to give us purity of administration. Why, Sir, you cannot speak of it without laughing. I do not see the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) in his place, that apostle of purity, the gentleman who declared that Greenshields was a man and a brother because he gave \$30,000 to buy a paper for the Minister's sons; the gentleman who does not see anything shameful in what, when he was before the court in the Grenier matter, he declared on oath he had done; a gentleman who, I believe, does not know the conscience of the Liberal party. The conscience of the bulk of the Liberal party is sound.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad to hear that cheer. There may be gentlemen looking for positions who are as Langelier was here, who have their letters in their pockets and who, by-and-by, if they are not met, will shake those letters in the face of the

Mr. DAVIN.

Prime Minister and make him toe the mark. But though there may be such men, I say that the heart and the conscience of the Liberal party throughout Canada are sound, and they are outraged by the fearful spectacle presented ever since this Government came into power. From the moment it took office until the present time the Government has gone from bad to worse, sinking deeper and deeper in ring after ring that smells with piscatorial effluvia. And now we have this Klondike deal as it is called. When the Liberal party was in power before, just as now, they began to grow corrupt. And not only that, they began to have differences among themselves. But, Sir, no act of corruption of the old Liberal Government, not the Foster affair, not the Neebing Hotel, not even the Steel Rails amounted to anything compared with the Drummond deal, the Crow's Nest Pass deal, and now this gigantic Klondike affair. This last has all the appearance of an enormous trust of which the Government are a part. You cannot look at it for a moment without seeing that there are millions in it for more than one. With the money in this Klondike deal they can buy up the whole country from Halifax to Vancouver. It is an attempt to raise money to cover past indebtedness in the late election—you see I know something about your affairs. It is intended to put half a million here, and half a million there, and half a million elsewhere—I do not know for whom, but there is more than one "boy," you may be perfectly certain, in this. It is intended to make a corruption fund for the next general election.

Mr. BENNETT. How much for Hardy?

Mr. DAVIN. And something, I suppose, for Hardy. But let me say, Sir, with some experience as a politician, that you cannot win an election with money alone.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) laughs. He knows right well that you cannot win an election with money alone, for all the money that Mercier gave him for New Brunswick and elsewhere did not enable him to win that election. I have just said that differences arose in the Liberal party when it was previously in office. But they were nothing to those of the present time, just as the corruption of the party when Mackenzie was in power is nothing to the corruption of the present time. But let me say that it probably does not come home as close to the right hon. gentleman, as it would have come to the leader in Mackenzie's time. As I understand it, the right hon. gentleman has adopted what is called the English Cabinet System, a system that the late Sir John Macdonald leaned to latterly, though I believe that for the greater part of his

time, Sir John carried on his Government as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said once, by Order in Council, that is to say he kept a string on his Ministers, he kept a certain check upon them, and in that way he kept things pretty straight. But the right hon. the present Premier follows rather the system that is followed in England. He holds a Minister responsible for his department, and then says to the country: This man is in charge of this department, he is responsible, and the Prime Minister gives him a free hand. What is the result? He has taken in, for instance, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) with ten years' reputation for corruption in New Brunswick, such as no provincial Minister ever had, and he has given him a department in which he may plunge his arms, not up to the elbows merely, but up to the shoulders in the public treasury. Although the hands of the Prime Minister may be clean, though he may have in regard to these things the poor virtue of clean fingers yet morally before the people of Canada he is responsible for what these people do. There is the Minister of the Interior, with energy very useful to his friends, but whose rashness and inexperience have been strikingly illustrated in Indian Affairs and in the Klondike. We were taunted, he had the audacity to taunt us here with divisions amongst ourselves. This from a party, the wing of whose army which is strongest and on which the Prime Minister most leans is honeycombed with internecine jealousies and torn to pieces with internecine strife. Let me read a picture by a great hand of what has been going on in Quebec. This is from a paper which I am sure will be an authority with every man in this House. The article is headed: "A Bundle of Sticks," and this is the picture it gives of the Liberal party in Quebec.

An hon. MEMBER. What paper?

Mr. DAVIN. The "Star," an independent paper. This is what it says:

When there were rumours the other day of war between Norway and Sweden, we could not help feeling a pang of pity for his unhappy Majesty, the King of Sweden and Norway. It must be a painful thing for a monarch to have to declare war against a brother monarch; but it must be particularly painful when the other monarch is himself. The only sovereign who could act in this dual capacity gracefully is the German Emperor. He is about the only great general who could successfully lead a cavalry charge against himself, and at the same time form himself into a hollowsquare to receive the charge.

But we have something like this anomalous state of affairs in the present condition of the great Liberal party of this province. What is the Liberal party of this province if not the party of Tarte, Préfontaine and Beausoleil, the party of Stephens, Guérin, Rainville and Bickerdike? This is the party that has not only proclaimed war against itself, but is prosecuting the war most vigorously. The elements of union are

by no means lacking, for we have Tarte and Beausoleil marching together shoulder to shoulder in a punitive expedition against Préfontaine. If Préfontaine is to be Mayor, then Tarte and Beausoleil will know the reason why. Mr. Préfontaine is threatened with an expensive campaign, when, but for his Liberal friends, he might have had an election by acclamation. But this does not prevent his forming an offensive alliance with Mr. Tarte for the purpose of ousting Mr. Beausoleil from the representation of the East Ward. And although Mr. Beausoleil will have to fight like the doughty warrior he is to save his own seat, it does not prevent him joining heartily with Mr. Préfontaine in the siege of the Hon. Joseph Israel Tarte in the Department of Public Works.

It requires a war map to follow all the complications of this most interesting fight in detail. But the offensive and defensive alliances may be briefly summed up as follows: Tarte and Beausoleil against Préfontaine; Préfontaine and Beausoleil against Tarte; Tarte and Préfontaine against Beausoleil. Was ever anything like it out of comic opera? The only hope of an early termination of this most complicated warfare seems to be in the intervention of some friendly powers. When Rainville and George Washington Stephens get through pummelling each other at Quebec, and Bickerdike and Guérin will allow one another to get up, they may be able to interfere effectively. Meanwhile, it is awfully embarrassing for Tarte, Préfontaine and Beausoleil. When any two of them meet, they do not know whether to fraternize or "shoot at sight," and their distressed commander-in-chief, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, hasn't the least idea where he is at.

Now, Sir, that is a good picture of the state of things in Quebec, given by an artist on the spot; and yet we are told by the hon. gentleman who is Minister of Trade and Commerce that there were great dissensions amongst this party. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was good enough to suggest that there were skeletons amongst us. Well, Sir, there may be a skeleton in our party; I should think it a very odd thing if a large party could be found without a solitary skeleton. But, Sir, on that side of the House, because we know it well—there is a whole dissecting-room; and I have not the least doubt that if we can get at the facts, and probe them properly—take this Klondike business—why, if we can probe that, and probe it well, we will find that not merely have they a whole dissecting-room, but in that one particular deal a charnel-house of corruption.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he has been on two or three occasions somewhat unparliamentary in using so freely the term "corruption." It is not a term which, I think, can be bandied across the House with reference to individual members at all. I find it stated in Denison's and Brand's decisions that:

An hon. member having spoken of another hon. member as having been "detected in the grossest practice of corruption" is called upon to withdraw the word.

Mr. DAVIN. "Detected."

Mr. SPEAKER. "Detected" or "guilty," it is exactly the same thing. The hon. gentleman certainly would not accuse an hon. member of being guilty unless he supposed he had been detected. So I see no difference in the cases. I hope the hon. gentleman will have some regard to that rule.

Mr. DAVIN. I agree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker. May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, as a favour to show me how I have offended against that ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has thrown charges of corruption across the House this afternoon on several occasions. The hon. gentleman accused the Minister of Railways of having been for ten years, I think he said, a notorious corruptionist in New Brunswick—or words almost to that effect. That is quite out of order. Had I drawn the attention of the hon. gentleman to it at the time, as I probably should have done, I would have required him to withdraw them.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, if I have said anything unparliamentary, I desire to withdraw it. I wish to bow entirely to your ruling, but do I understand that it is wrong to say that if we could probe this Klondike matter thoroughly we would find ourselves in a charnel-house of corruption? Is that unparliamentary?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman referred to any individual member of the House as being guilty of corruption he would be out of order. General terms like that might be admissible, but I am speaking of their application to individual members.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, I am going to read the words of a former leader of yours, and a former leader of the Prime Minister, words that will apply to that Klondike affair, fit it pat. I have no doubt they will be received with the respect that they deserve. I hope it is not unparliamentary to say that there is about that Klondike matter a strong piscatorial effluvium.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, I do not think it is at all unparliamentary for the hon. gentleman to endeavour to fly over the heads of the House.

Mr. DAVIN. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to fly over their heads, I want to reach their hearts, if I can. I am aiming, as far as I can, to produce some repentance, and I am also seeking to impart enlightenment. My aim, Sir, is to make converts in this House and converts outside; and I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that within the last twelve months, and I am sure you will be glad to know it, my missionary efforts, my seeking to bring people out of political darkness into political light,

Mr. DAVIN.

have been most successful. Now, one of the things I object to in that Klondike business is its secrecy. I say there is no reason for making a secret contract. I condemn also the policy of hurrying it on on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, signing a contract when you could either have delayed it for a week, or else called Parliament to meet three or four weeks earlier, and lay it before Parliament. I object to having Parliament dethroned. I object to having Parliament deprived of its functions of supervision and scrutiny, and I object most strenuously to the monopoly. I object most strenuously to the tremendous price paid, 25,000 acres per mile, 25,000 acres, instinct with gold, pregnant with gold, for building a railway that will not be able to do the work. Mark me, the railway that has been described by the Minister of Railways will not be able to do the work that is necessary to be done over that country. Now, listen to what the Hon. Edward Blake said, and it will fit pat to this affair:

They pride themselves on their Pacific Railway contract.

I do not know that we could with truth say that they pride themselves on their Mackenzie & Mann contract. I do not think that they are very proud of it. The Minister of Railways, when he was introducing his Bill yesterday, presented the most extraordinary spectacle I ever saw, and I have had some experience in parliamentary life. I never in my life before saw a man introduce a Bill and get violently angry with some imaginary opponent, hit out right and left, flame up purple red with indignation at some critics that rose before his inflamed fancy, and do a lot of boxing in anticipation of the fight that was to take place three or four days ahead. I know that there are timid men on this side. I know that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is a man of some timidity, and of course the timidity of the leader of the Opposition is well known, the timidity of the old war-horse of Cumberland is notorious. I know well that it was calculated to frighten them; but I may tell you, Mr. Speaker—and I have no doubt the House on both sides will hear this with gratification—I have spoken since with the leader of the Opposition, with the member for York, and with the late Minister of Railways, and I find that although their nerves were slightly disturbed for a time, they are now convalescent and in a normal condition. Well, this is the language of Edward Blake:

I condemn that bargain as improper, being made in secret, without public tender, contrary to the existing policy of the people and of Parliament, and opposed to the provisions of the law.

I condemn it as extravagant, since the enterprise will cost us \$60,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres

of the choicest lands, while the road is to belong to the company, which will realize the cost of its part of the work out of its land and money subsidies.

I condemn it as outrageous, in conferring on the company a practical monopoly, for twenty years, of the trade of our North-west Territories, and large privileges and exemptions, very valuable to them and still more detrimental to the public.

I condemn it as indefensible, being consummated in the face of a tender to perform the same obligations for \$3,000,000 less money, for 3,000,000 acres less land, without the monopoly of trade, without the exemptions from taxation, and on other conditions much more favourable than those of the contract.

Why, Mr. Speaker, I condemn on the very grounds stated by Hon. Mr. Blake, and the country will also condemn, that Klondike contract, and I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that a policy of silence will not enable them to escape from their responsibility. The name of my leader, the leader of the Opposition, was connected by the papers with this Klondike matter, and you will remember, Sir, it was stated here by the leader of the Opposition that he had telegraphed to his lawyer to sue "La Presse" for making a charge against him as having been connected with the transaction. I have here a letter written by Mr. Donald Macmaster, Q.C., in respect to this. It is as follows :

"La Presse" says it loyally accepts your statement made in the House, and expresses regret for having said what it did.

So that "La Presse" has apologized for the charge made against Sir Charles Tupper, and that sweeps to the winds the assertion that Sir Charles was in any way connected with that Klondike deal.

Mr. BRITTON. Where is the contradiction from the "World" ?

Mr. DAVIN. The "World" did not make any charge ; it merely made a suggestion. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) is a cautious man and an experienced journalist. He may tremble on the threshold, but he does not rush in where angels fear to tread. In connection with a boast made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, which was referred to here to-day, I want to call attention to some of his own words. We have just seen the right hon. Premier and one of his colleagues introduce one of the victors at the by-elections. We had in that extraordinary reply, delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, a statement that the victories at the by-elections were evidences of popular confidence. I have here a speech delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in 1892, and there is in it a paragraph headed "Unexampled Successes," and it has reference altogether to by-elections. What did he then say ? He stated that the successes of a Government in the

by-elections are no indication whatever of the feeling throughout the country, because, he says, what is perfectly true in Canada, that the advantages of the Government in the by-elections are so great that fighting the Government is equivalent to meeting a man who is playing with loaded dice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Whose speech was that ?

Mr. DAVIN. It was delivered by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. He said :

Yet, nevertheless, with all those things against them, we find the Government sustained at all points throughout Ontario, and absolutely winning 18 out of 20 by-elections. Sir, the mere statement of those figures is in itself enough. Does any sane human being who knows anything at all of the conditions of political life believe for one moment that this result was obtained by honest means ? The thing is an absurdity. Those figures carry condemnation on the very face of them. "As well defend Sodom." As well say that it is possible to cast double sixes eighteen times out of twenty. Sir, it is only possible on one condition, and on one only—that the dice are loaded.

Thus according to the hon. gentleman whenever a Government wins by-elections in great numbers, the dice are loaded. But we had an election recently in Ontario, which was significant. I allude to Centre Toronto, which sends here as its representative a large manufacturer, who made a defence of the Government in a peculiar way. The hon. gentleman defended the Ministry, and I am bound to say that while he was delivering his maiden speech in this House there was not a blush on his cheek ; I watched him closely and there was not the slightest change in his complexion, but there was a hesitancy in his speech when he faltered out the statement that the Government had kept their promises. It is of course supremely in his interest and in those of the manufacturers he represents that the assertion should be forced down the throats of the constituencies that election promises have been kept. What is the significance of that election ? Does it mean that Toronto supports the Government ? The hon. gentleman himself believes in preferential trade ; he had to lift the Conservative banner in order to win that constituency. He unfurled the banner of preferential trade ; and I am bound to say I do not know where his own leader is as regards that banner, but at all events the hon. member for Centre Toronto made it his flag of victory. Not only so, but he told the people, just as he told the House the other day that the Liberal party—I am not going to labour this point because it has been well covered by other speakers—never professed free trade but only a reduction of the tariff. We had, however, the eloquent language of the Prime Minister in Winnipeg, on which occasion he stated that

he was for free trade as it is in England. I am calling attention to the significance of the recent Toronto election. That constituency originally was a Liberal one. First, in 1872 Robert Wilkes defeated one of the most popular Tories in Canada, Frank Shanly, by a majority of 182. In 1874 he defeated Angus Morrison by a majority of 380. In 1875 Mr. John Macdonald was elected by acclamation. In 1878 we had to put up a Liberal, Robert Hay, who was at one with us on the National Policy, in order to win the seat. In 1882 Mr. Hay was again returned. In 1887 and 1891 Mr. Cockburn carried the constituency. Then Mr. Lount carried it by a majority of 240. Next it was carried by my hon. friend (Mr. Bertram) by a majority of 250. I must say to my hon. friend that it was a small majority, and I will tell him why. It was a small majority because he is an ideal candidate for that constituency; he is a good speaker on the platform; he is a successful manufacturer and commercial man, and he waved the Conservative banner as he went before his constituency. Out of nine contests, five Liberals were returned and four Conservatives, and Centre Toronto may thus fairly be claimed to be a Liberal constituency. With two Liberal Governments, the Dominion and that of Ontario working for him, my hon. friend, instead of his having a majority about equal to that secured by Mr. Lount, who was not an ideal candidate, he being a lawyer, he should have had 1,000 majority. What were the facts? This Klondike deal had some connection with the Centre Toronto contest. One of the leading men in the Klondike deal had put up money to enable the constituency to be carried by the Liberals; and the whole thing had been arranged to return the present member by acclamation, but the young Liberal-Conservatives became alarmed. If they had gone into the field in time, and if that magnificent speech made by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) on the Saturday night, that great battle note of economy showing up the dreadful fall of the Liberal party from its principles, if that speech had been made one week earlier, I believe—much as I am pleased with seeing my hon. friend (Mr. Bertram) here—I should have been still more pleased to have seen my hon. friend, Mr. Howland, representing that constituency.

I have quoted the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that it was a proper thing to hold men to their utterances, and now I want to deal with what I deem to be the most serious charge against the Government, and that is their conduct and the conduct of the Prime Minister in regard to preferential trade. I never heard a more complete indictment made in my life, in a court of justice or anywhere else, than was made by the leader of the Opposition the other day in this House in connection with this question. The Minister of Trade

Mr. DAVIN.

and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) replied to the leader of the Opposition and to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). Did the Minister prove that any statement made by these two gentlemen was unfounded? Not at all. But he thought it a sufficient thing to say indirectly, that the leader of the Opposition was a liar, for he said if he had been in Jerusalem 1900 years ago, Sapphira would have preferred him to Ananias.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And he was not called to order, either.

Mr. DAVIN. There is no calling to order under these circumstances. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have known the leader of the Opposition politically, and personally also, for thirty years, and I say that there is not a man who can stand up and show that any statement of fact ever made by that hon. gentleman was unfounded. The only charge I ever heard made against him with the least colour of foundation was, that he was too hopeful of the North-west, for it was contended that the North-west did not come up to his anticipations. Let me in this connection refer to that part of the Queen's Speech which mentions the North-west. Why, Sir, the farmers are rolling in wealth now in the North-west Territories. About Indian Head, Regina, Moose Jaw, Moosomin, all over the Territories and over Manitoba too, the farmers of the North-west are rolling in wealth, and banking sums varying from \$1,000 to \$15,000 clear profit on individual farms. That is the country which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has opened up and was so hopeful about. The leader of the Opposition quoted the language of the Prime Minister in London, Toronto and elsewhere, and also his conduct in London and Liverpool, and he made the charge that the Prime Minister did not properly represent Canada—not in demeanour—but in connection with the grave business that presented itself. The Minister of Trade and Commerce met that charge by saying by application, that the leader of the Opposition was a liar; but does he suppose for one minute the people of Canada, or the Liberals of Canada, will accept any such reply as that? The Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke of cutting the Gordian knot, as the Prime Minister had boasted that the Gordian knot was cut. Why, Sir, both of them forgot, that they declared from their very seats there, that there was no Gordian knot to cut, and the Prime Minister when he went to England said so. And, when all these things are pressed home to these gentlemen, they content themselves with making a few jokes and having recourse to metaphor. Sir, the thing is too grave to be allowed to slip by like that, and I wish to call the attention of the House and of the country to the state of the preferential trade question at this moment. When the

Prime Minister was seeking power he declared at London that he was in favour of preferential trade; that Mr. Chamberlain was in favour of it also, and that he (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he got into power was going to get us preferential trade. He made the same declaration at Montreal and at Toronto, and he made it at St. Johns, P.Q., also, and this illustrates a very peculiar feature of the right hon. gentleman. The way in which he made the declaration at St. Johns, P.Q., may be an explanation of the extraordinary position he is in to-day, because I cannot believe for one minute that the Prime Minister would wilfully falsify, and my theory of the position the Prime Minister is in is this: That out of perfect lightness of heart and a desire to say what is pleasant on all occasions, he went and said (because he found it was popular all over Canada) that he was in favour of preferential trade. Now, it has been shown that the Prime Minister contradicted himself in this matter, and I am going to show that such is his levity of mind, when he was leading a great party and seeking power, in the same speech and almost in the very same breath, he made the same contradiction that is on record as between his utterance in Liverpool and his utterance in London. I have here his speech made in St. Johns in the province of Quebec, in July 7th, 1896. He said:

To-day your principal market is the British market. It is possible for us to make an arrangement by which England will give us market for all our products, if we give something like reciprocity to certain British products. I am for that policy.

There is preferential trade with England for you, but mark what he says in the next paragraph:

We can be on good terms with everybody, and that is the thing we have set before us. If we establish good relations with the United States, we may perhaps have the benefit of the re-opening of the negotiations, and the renewal of the treaty of reciprocity.

Here in the same breath, in two contiguous paragraphs of his speech, the Prime Minister stated he was for preferential trade with England and for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. The contradictions that have been pointed out by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) and by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) are thrown in the shade completely by this contradiction made in the same speech, and it explains what otherwise is almost inexplicable: the extraordinary contradictions which arise in the utterances of the Prime Minister. I have studied the right hon. gentleman and analysed him carefully, and I believe these contradictions arise from the fact that he has not thought down to rock-bottom the great political questions of the day, and founded principles thereon. There is no stability of principle

there, and his amiable facile nature leads him to say pleasant words on all occasions. Of course, that is very nice, but it is not desirable in a leader of a government or in any politician, speaking on great questions. I really fear that if my right hon. friend had to address an audience of rats, he would say to them that he took a great interest in rodents, that they were the most interesting of quadrupeds, and he would not mind taking them into his confidence and assuring them that he himself had a penchant for cheese.

The right hon. gentleman quoted from Mr. Chamberlain, and curiously enough the quotation showed that Mr. Chamberlain was at one with himself, as he spoke in London. He said in London that he was in favour of a revenue tariff, and that a revenue tariff and preferential trade would go well together. Mr. Chamberlain, in the quotation which the right hon. gentleman made from his speech, said that there would have to be a modification in the tariffs of the colonies, and it would have to go in the direction of a revenue tariff; and we all agree that there would have had to be modification.

Now, the Minister of Trade and Commerce declared that there was a great difficulty in bringing about a denunciation of the treaties. The hon. gentleman is either trying to bamboozle this House and this country, or he is grossly ignorant of the state of opinion in England at that time. The movement had been in existence in England for years. My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) not only found a strong feeling existing in England in favour of preferential trade, but he helped to increase it, and he knows very well that that feeling existed not merely among the statesmen of England, but amongst the farmers and merchants all over the country. There was a going-out towards preferential trade; and our charge against the Prime Minister is not that he killed the movement—because I do not believe he could kill it—but that he dazed and staggered it for the time being. He hit it a deadly blow, but I do not believe he knocked the life out of it. Now, Lord Salisbury has been quoted and Mr. Chamberlain has been quoted; but I am going to quote to you not only what Lord Salisbury said, but what the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour said in regard to that subject, and it is very important. I am not only going to show you what Mr. Balfour said, but what was taking place all over England, of which these gentlemen seem perfectly ignorant. On the eve of the Jubilee there was hardly a nook in England where, in mechanics' institutes, and in various little literary societies this question of preferential trade was not discussed. I have here a report of one of those meetings—that of the South Wilts Chamber of Agriculture, which took place at Bath. At that meeting a Mr. J. W. Titt

made a long argument in favour of preferential trade, and quoted the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour, among others, as follows:—

Should the colonies desire to adopt the policy of a customs union, and the treaties between Great Britain and Belgium and the Zollverein interpose obstacles in the way of the realization of such a desire, it would be the duty of Her Majesty's Government to consider how to remove those treaty restrictions and to shape their course accordingly.

You see that the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour regards preferential trade and the denunciation of those treaties as correlative—as bearing something the same relation to each other as a plate does to the meat you eat off it; and for any one of these hon. gentlemen to say: If we had asked for preferential trade, we would not have got the denunciation of the treaties, is something like a man who is invited to dinner saying, "I will eat your meat, but I will not have your plate." or, "I will take your plate, but I will be hanged if I will eat your meat," and then coming back and saying, "I got the plate, but I didn't get the meat; if I had asked for both the plate and the meat, I should not have got either." Here is Mr. Arthur Balfour saying that the two things are correlative, and that one of the reasons for denouncing these treaties was, that they stood in the way of preferential trade. Now, Mr. Speaker, does any man who listened to it, believe for a moment that there is anything in the statement that it was difficult at that time to get these treaties denounced. Why, Sir, for years many people were trying to get them denounced, and they were in this position. If you travel through an Alpine country—through the Valley of Chamouni, for instance—you will sometimes see an avalanche above you, and the ligament that holds it has been worn away so much that a girl going through the valley and shouting or singing will so shake the avalanche that the ligament which holds it gives away and the avalanche comes down. That was precisely the position in which these treaties stood. The ligament that held them had long been wearing away. Here is the quotation this man makes from Mr. Chamberlain:

The colonists have with the mother country a common origin, a common history, a common language, a common literature, a common love of liberty, and law, common principles to assert, and common interests to maintain.

Then he quotes the Earl of Rosebery, who is a charming and refined man, but I never thought that he was the figure for Romeo when he was made the leader of the Liberal party. He has recently given utterance to some things which I do not like on this subject, but here is what he said in the quotation to which I refer:

It is, as I believe, impossible for you to maintain in the long run your present loose relations to
Mr. DAVIN.

your colonies, and preserve those colonies as part of the Empire. I wish to say that on the grounds of commercial interests alone this question is worthy of the consideration of our great commercial communities.

Then he quoted the Marquis of Salisbury as far back as 1887. This question, which by the mere word of the Premier was swept away, was discussed as far back as 1887! and here is what the Marquis of Salisbury said in regard to it at that time:

The Marquis of Salisbury, in a letter dated April 5, 1887, in reply to a correspondent, stated that "he did not imagine that differential duties in favour of our colonies, whatever might be said for or against them, can be properly described in the term 'protection.'"

Showing in what direction his mind was going. This writer also quoted a long article from the San Francisco "News-Letter," which pointed out how important this scheme of preferential trade was, and what a dangerous thing it was to the power of the United States. It said that it would make an imperial United States of Great Britain, and give it an amplitude of power such as it never had before. And, Mr. Speaker, connected with this question is the question of defence, on which let me say one word. Why, Sir, any contribution which these colonies will have to make, by-and-by, towards the defence of the Empire will be a mere flea-bite. The same fleet will be needed for Imperial defence that is necessary for Imperial England to maintain and the colonies will have doubled their wealth. At the meeting I speak of, this resolution was proposed:

That in the opinion of this chamber—the Chamber of Agriculture of Wiltshire—the commercial federation of Great Britain with all her colonies and possessions on a trade basis, giving preferential treatment to all within the Empire, is of the most supreme importance.

Mr. John Hall seconded it and said that if England wanted to keep her colonies she must have something more than sentiment to bind them to her.

The right hon. gentleman told the people in a bunkum strain that he knew the heart of John Bull. Why, here is John Bull himself—the farmers themselves—talking. Here we are at the heart of John Bull, in the great county of Wiltshire, and what the people there say is that they want something more than mere sentiment to bind the colonies to the mother country. Lord Folkestone was present and supported the resolution, and Mr. Carpenter said:

He had always been opposed to protection, but he should support the resolution in favour of the federation of the Empire.

What happened? The resolution was passed at that meeting unanimously.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When was that?

Mr. DAVIN. On the eve of the Jubilee. It was an important event, and only one of many. It was held on May 22nd, 1896. That was the state of opinion all over England when the right hon. First Minister went across. England was then prepared for the very thing the right hon. gentleman subsequently declared for in the west. I am not going to repeat in detail what happened, because we all know it. My right hon. friend went to Liverpool, the Duke of Devonshire held out to him his hand for preferential trade, and my right hon. friend put it rhetorically and scornfully aside. He said Canada did not want it, that what Canada gave was a free gift. At that time he had not made those speeches, the burthen of which was 'delenda est Carthago,' those speeches which were all for the denunciation of the treaties, because when he went to the banks of the Thames, he told the "Chronicle" man: "We say those treaties do not apply." So that on his visit to London during the Jubilee, that knot which he declared Alexander of Macedon had cut, he, the master of Alexander of Macedon, who is now before us, then said did not exist. A change afterwards came over the spirit of his dream, but only when all the harm had been done. He went to Toronto on his return, and attended the banquet of the Board of Trade in that city, and there, where of course they were all preferential trade men, he did what he always does, and what illustrates my analysis of the right hon. gentleman—the only analysis creditable to him that I have been able to make of his character. Wherever he happens to be, he wants to say something pleasant; so that although he had in England declared that he did not want preferential trade, although he had in England accepted the Cobden Club medal, and the encomiums of Lord Farrer, who, in presenting the medal, laid stress on the opinions dear to the Cobden Club—although he had done all this, what did he say at Toronto?

It was said he should have demanded preferential trade from Great Britain as well as the getting rid of the obstructive treaties, but if he had asked for both he would have received neither. He had appealed, not to John Bull the man of business, but the man of big heart. One step had been gained, the step that first had to be gained, and if he had attempted more, it would have meant failure. The way was clear now to preferential trade, so soon as Great Britain was ready to grant it.

Why, we have the proof that not only were the statesmen of Great Britain ready to grant it, but that England herself, the great heart of John Bull, was beating for this preferential trade. But what does the hon. gentleman tell us when he comes back? He tells the Board of Trade at Toronto that while he was the guest of these men, while accepting that

Cobden medal, while enjoying their sumptuous hospitality, all his statements, his statement that Canada wanted nothing in return whatever, were all a piece of sly diplomacy, a piece of dexterous perfidy. It pains me—and I say it unaffectedly—to find a First Minister of Canada playing such a role.

We have had, during this debate, some very extraordinary and very strong literary comparisons. For instance, the leader of the Opposition has been compared to the scurrilous and unsightly Thersites. Now, when we take the course of the right hon. gentleman on this preferential trade question, there is a comparison that suggests itself, and I do not make it in any offensive sense. If you take the career of Milton's Satan, after he meets his followers in Pandemonium, and follow it from that out, you will find a most extraordinary similarity between it and the course of the right hon. gentleman. Satan's account to his followers of his exploits in duplicity, as recorded in "Paradise Lost," bears a remarkable similarity to my right hon. friend's account of his doings on the other side. I suppose that, in all his reading, the hon. gentleman may have read the comedy of Foote. It is a comedy that was borrowed from the French, and the humour of it consists in this, that the hero gets himself, by reckless statements, into scrape after scrape; but still his confidence in his extraordinary resources, his imaginative power of concocting, is so great that he never doubts for one minute that he can lie himself out of any scrape that he gets into. Well, he was a feather-brained man of fashion; but you will remember that when the grand divan of demons takes place, as recorded in "Paradise Lost," Milton's terrible hero declares he is going to deliver them out of hell, and that he will alone first explore the way. He meets Death and Sin, and, true to his policy, flatters them. Then he visits the country of Chaos and Old Night, and promises to reduce the new created world to darkness, which promise he has, of course, no intention of keeping and which is contrary to what he promised his fellow demons. Then he meets the Angel of the Sun, to whom he represents himself as what he is not in order to gain certain information, and then he transforms himself completely, and is found at the ear of Eve whispering suggestions to her. Again, in the assumed character of the Serpent, he assures her that he has eaten the forbidden fruit, which he has not, and that if she will eat of it, she will become a god, which he knows she will not. When brought before Michael and charged with his unlawful intrusion into Paradise, he first says that his object was to fly from pain. When taunted with being the first to fly from pain, he replies that that was not his reason, but

that his object was to avoid hazarding his armies in untrod ways and first spy out himself the new created world. Now, mark the way Milton, the great Puritan poet, makes the Archangel Michael reply :

To say and straight unsay, pretending first
Wise to fly pain, professing next the spy,
Argues no leader, but a liar traced.

Satan then returns to Pandemonium and boasts of what he has done, but in the midst of his boasting, his professions are belied by the degrading transformation which takes place, when he and all his followers are suddenly changed from angelic forms into hissing serpents. The leader is transformed into a serpent and his followers take the new shape, and looking at the speeches we have listened to from the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the hon. member from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), it would seem as if these gentlemen had assumed the garb of dissimulation adopted by their leader and propose to rival him in duplicity. Before quoting Mr. Chamberlain's last speech let me clinch this matter about the professions of free trade. I have here a despatch from Montreal dated 30th November, which says that the "Star's" London cable says: that the Cobden Club is quite satisfied with the position of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. And this is the character they give him, a character that may be very useful to him, but I shall be glad to know how it will be received by the gentlemen who listened to his silver eloquence at the famous Board of Trade banquet :

In view of the adverse comments made in Canada and elsewhere on the fiscal policy of the Dominion Government, the committee think it right to state that they have reason to be satisfied that the present Administration at Ottawa is inspired by a genuine desire to advance on the lines of free exchange so far and as rapidly as possible, consistently with prudent regard for the difficulties created by the long rule of a high and comprehensive protective system.

Here, as late as November, the Cobden Club states that it was quite satisfied with the Prime Minister; and from this and from his utterance of last night, notwithstanding what his supporter from Toronto Centre, speaking under circumstances when a member is supposed to express the very ideas of the Premier, said, he must be held to be opposed to preferential trade. In conjunction with the opinions I have quoted of the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour, of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself, of Lord Salisbury, made before the Jubilee, take what Mr. Chamberlain said, speaking at Liverpool three weeks ago in favour of closer union with the colonies, speaking of the Jubilee, he said :

It was the growth of an overmastering and a universal desire in favour of closer union.

You will observe that, Sir. Of course as has been shown by what other hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIN.

men have quoted in this House, and as I have further established by the opinions of these Wiltshire farmers, they were ready, in the glow and heat of that jubilee period to do more than meet us half-way if we had reached the hand to them. Mr. Chamberlain proceeds :

It is not for us to take the initiative. We would rather follow the lead; but what I think I have already accomplished is to convince them that wherever they live, however far their home may be from the centre and from the mother land, we, at any rate, are prepared to meet them more than half-way in any proposal they may make to us (cheers), in any desire which they may express for their closer union (cheers); and, gentlemen, it will come (hear, hear), if not in our day, then in that of our successors.

Later on he says :

But, in whatever way it may be presented to us, we shall not be deterred either by the economic pedantries or the selfishness which is a virtue with some politicians from giving favourable consideration to any proposals which our brethren across the seas may make to us. And in such a consideration, I for one—

I ask your attention to that—

—do not believe the English people will keep a strict account of profit and loss.

So that to-day the sentiment is precisely the same as it was. And now, harking back to what I said before, the note throughout the British Empire at this moment is a note of colonial equality in the Imperial Union, and the men we have on the Treasury benches of Canada cannot sound that note.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) attempted to reply to the statement made by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) as to the effect of this tariff in discriminating against England. Why, Sir, the returns show it. The "Sun," of Toronto, pointed out what was shown by these late returns in reducing the imports from England. Is not that sufficient to show discrimination against England and to show that this so-called preferential clause gives no preference to the mother country? But I have a curious testimony on the same subject. I have here the "Iron Age," a journal published in the United States. And what did it say of this tariff as soon as it was passed :

The new tariff, therefore, cannot be properly described as one discriminating against the United States. A further examination of it and of the attitude of the Government will completely free it from any suspicion of being anti-American. It is not too much to say, indeed, that it shows strongly a pro-American bent. First of all, there is the offer of reciprocity. Next, there is the treatment of American products in the general tariff.

As to this offer of reciprocity the "Sun," which I have already quoted, says that whatever the Ministers may say, their ob-

ject is not to have a preference with England, but to have a preference with United States. And the Toronto "World," which has been referred to here, had articles a short time ago declaring that the Ministers were looking to Washington. And here we have this American paper saying that the tariff has a pro-American bent :

Of all the changes made in the general tariff, the most sweeping were those made in the duties on iron and steel and the manufactures thereof. Large slices were taken off most of the old duties, and some of the most important articles, such as mining machinery and—next year—barbed wire, were put on the free list. What foreign country will receive most, if not all, the advantage of this? Clearly the United States. It is true, Britain gets her goods in at a rate of duty now 12½ per cent, and next year 25 per cent, less than the general rate, but nobody supposes, the Government least of all, that she can ship iron and steel goods into this country against the United States competition.

Looking over the whole list of Canadian imports of iron and steel goods, we find in nearly every article that the balance is enormously in favour of the United States.

Then the "Commercial," a Canadian journal, says :

Even if bar iron, of which, until recently, we imported altogether from the United Kingdom to supplement our own output, a larger quantity is now supplied to us from over the line than from Great Britain, our imports of bar iron in the fiscal year ending June 30 last amounting to \$52,827 from Britain and \$56,587 from the United States.

This is in line with the figures given yesterday by the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster). The whole article goes on strongly to point out that this tariff is more in favour of the United States than of England. So that this so-called discrimination in favour of England is a sham. The Gordian knot is an afterthought on the part of the right hon. Prime Minister. There was no Gordian knot to be cut by Alexander of Macedon, and there was no such difficulty as the Minister of Trade and Commerce tried to make out in getting the denunciation of these treaties for which he claimed so much credit for the Premier.

Let me say of the right hon. gentleman that so far as representing us personally in the Jubilee was concerned, I think he represented us well. He is a gentleman, he is a man of culture, he is a fine orator, and he represented us well in those respects. I have seen a letter written by a lady high in society in England, commenting on the Premier, and she said that the reason the Canadian Premier was thought so much of was that, compared with the other Premiers, he was a much more refined man. Well, we all know that, and I have always borne testimony to the fact, and the Conservative party had better take note that there are educated and social fads which have to be reckoned with. I was glad to see

what Mr. Willison said in his account in the "Globe," although he probably exaggerated a little, for the London papers did not say that our Premier was the most prominent figure. The "Spectator" made it clear that the six most prominent individuals, after Her Majesty, were all soldiers, mentioning Beresford as first amongst them. But I have no doubt whatever that my right hon. friend behaved himself in such a way as to look for no allowances—to quote my own language of last session—to be made for him. I was glad to see that he attracted so much of Imperial public attention, and if my patriotic pride received a dash at all, it was in this: It pained me for a moment to observe that this Imperial public attention was divided with my right hon. friend by the South Australian kangaroo. Now, Sir, the kangaroo has, to some extent, the best of it, for he has remained under the royal roof and has become a royal institution; and although I am glad to see that the right hon. gentleman has come back with a title, if that was necessary to his happiness, honoured by Her Majesty, still the Atlantic rolls between him and the eyes of royalty, whereas the eyes of royalty rest on the South Australian interesting importation. But there is one other advantage the kangaroo has. The cries of the kangaroo are the same today as they were then, and they have always been the same, and he jumps in precisely the same way. But I am afraid, Sir, that the cries of my right hon. friend will continue to vary, and that he will jump and box the compass in the same eccentric fashion that he has done in the past.

As to titles, I want to say something more about them. The right hon. gentleman went to Renfrew and there a clergyman addressed him and said: "Sir Wilfrid Laurier." The right hon. gentleman said: "No, not Sir Wilfrid, plain Mr. Laurier. I am a democrat to the hilt." Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the meaning of that? Did the right hon. gentleman mean that he was a social democrat or a political democrat? He cannot have meant that he was a political democrat, because that would mean favouring an undivided government of the people, and would show that he was anti-monarchic, and I believe that he is loyal to our constitution. He must have meant that he was a social democrat, and did not want those factitious distinctions to separate him from his fellow-men. I am with the right hon. gentleman in that. A man may be loyal to the British Empire, a man may be thoroughly devoted, as I am, to the British Empire, and yet may feel that with us here in Canada, where after all we are a great democratic community, titles are a mistake. For instance, there is one title that we cannot wear without being ridiculous. The moment you make a man a lord in Canada

he flies the country, because in Canada he is a lord without a slave. For instance, Lord Mount-Stephen, when he received that title, intended to live in Montreal, but he found that somehow it would not do, there was something ridiculous about it. When he would go into the St. James Club, and they "my-lord" him, they were ready to laugh in his face. It does not suit. The only thing that seems able to go down is the title of Sir, a knighthood or a baronetcy. So I assume that the hon. gentleman meant a social democrat. Here was a pledge to that portion of the people throughout Canada who feel strongly on the subject. You will find them amongst the farmers, in cities, in Toronto and elsewhere, men who believe that it is a mistake to have titles in Canada. That was a pledge to these people that he would not take the title. There was no necessity for it, such as may sometimes lead to a change of political opinion. This was a matter entirely within my right hon. friend's own will; and yet the shoes were not old that carried him to Renfrew when he took a title and became a right hon. ; then he goes over to Paris and takes a Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour. Why, Sir, it is one of the most extraordinary things in his extraordinary career. It may be said of him as was once said of a Roman Emperor, that if he had not reigned, everybody would have said he could have reigned magnificently. After my right hon. friend became Prime Minister, in twenty short months, say in two years, judging him by his utterances prior to the election of 1896, and his utterances since, he has gone through the whole compass, boxed every point of that compass; so that the quadrature of Laurierian opinion is one of the most difficult things that was ever attempted; you might as well attempt to square the solar parallax. I see my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has come in and I would like to call his attention to some things that I have said, even at the risk of repeating myself. I wish then to say to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that in his absence I have read that fine utterance of his in a speech made in 1878, in which he said, but in more eloquent words than I can use, that nothing was juster than that an engineer should be hoist with his own petard; in which he said that nothing was juster than to gibbet men with their own utterances; to compare their performances with their utterances, and to show them up to the people of Canada. I have also quoted that hon. gentleman's statements in regard to economy, and I have shown that their economy has taken the form of adding \$1,400,000 to our expenses. I have quoted the hon. gentleman's utterance in regard to purity, and although I will not say that there is an utter corruption. I may say, to put it in an indirect way, that the people of Can-

Mr. DAVIN.

ada are not in a mood to believe that there is very much purity on those benches. I have also called attention to the fact that this great veteran of parliamentary life, this master of parliamentary fence, this master of all the arts of Parliament, of all the weapons in the whole armoury of parliamentary debate, that when he rose to reply to the ex-Finance Minister and to the leader of the Opposition who had made the greatest indictment that had ever been made against a Government, all he could say was that, in metaphorical language, the leader of the Opposition was a liar, that if the hon. gentleman had lived 1900 years ago Sapphira would have preferred him to Ananias. I see that the hon. gentleman is greatly amused at his own joke. Does the hon. gentleman think, however, that with such gingerbread as that the people will be satisfied? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that when the people see this Queen's Speech they will be satisfied with such a meagre bill of fare when they supposed they were going to a substantial banquet? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the Liberal party which he educated up to believe in purity, to believe in economy, to believe in crushing corruption in every form, to believe contractors were dangerous persons to entrust with power—does he believe that the people will be satisfied with what we now see taking place? I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to what is said about contracts in the speech from which I have already quoted. I hinted that this business was—and in designating it I suppose I shall have to refer to some one entirely outside of this House—in its complexion and construction that of an enormous trust. Here is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said as to the sources of supply for a Government that wants to be corrupt:

The Red Parlor, alias the protective manufacturers (of which the hon. member for Toronto stands a distinguished ornament, and Mr. Gurney is powerful in the stove trust), all of whom were expected to contribute in proportion to the advantages they received.

Next in order comes the contractors on public works. Here there is every opportunity for a corrupt government, and the evidence given before the committee of the House last session show it was made the most of.

I ask the attention of the House particularly to this statement in view of the Klondike deal:

The Minister practically holds almost every contractor at his mercy, and except in the case of a dispute and of some party turning Queen's evidence, detection is a very difficult matter.

Look at this Klondike matter. I read the contract yesterday. It is within the power of the Government to allow the company to make enormous earnings under any circumstances, but a mere turn of the hand on the part of the Government could put millions in their pockets. What does this mean on

the eve of an election, when a party can go to these men and say that the party requires \$200,000 or \$300,000? Of course it will be forthcoming. That is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce meant. As the hon. gentleman has now come to his seat, I will again revert to the tariff. The hon. gentleman said in that speech:

This state of things is due to a fiscal system which has turned a considerable percentage of our most active business men into legalized robbers, how much to the steady and systematic debauchery of the subsidized press, and how much to the spectacle of direct, continuous and organized corruption with which every politician is only too familiar.

"Legalized robbers" is the phrase that the Minister applies to manufacturers, and it must be remembered that those manufacturers are to-day as well protected as when he made that speech.

Mr. FOSTER. Better.

Mr. DAVIN. The member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) says they are better protected, and that they have confidence. What hope then have the farmers of the North-west Territories of having those promises implemented, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce refuses to answer the appeals of his own party and the appeals of the independent press? The hon. gentleman must have read what the "Star" said of him—that he is the last plank to which the pure Liberals of this country were clinging. That journal declared that he is the last hope of the pure Liberals to save them from the boodling element. How is the hon. gentleman doing it? In a weak and ineffective way he defends the Klondike deal, and hon. gentlemen opposite, knowing well that he is a powerful man and a man of experience and knowledge, awaited his statement in response to the cheers that greeted him the other night. They were cheers from the Liberal ranks that the hon. gentleman has not received in other days. They marked a lingering hope that there was still one sound plank in the Government, which would stand fast in putting down boodlers in contracts entered upon by the Government; and the "Star" appealed to him, and the best element of the Liberal party appealed to him, but I am sorry to say there is no sign that the hon. gentleman is going to rise to the opportunity afforded him.

I have here a paragraph written by Mr. Willison, from London, and which appeared in the "Globe" on October 23rd, 1897. Mr. Willison wrote, praising the right hon. the Prime Minister:

But while ornate and eloquent, it was soon found that his head was in thorough command of his tongue, and that he could not be stampeded by any organized demonstration of cheering or led into by-paths by the seductive luring of even the Duke of Devonshire or Mr. Chamberlain.

What was the seductive luring of the Duke of Devonshire and Mr. Chamberlain but the candid and broad offer of preferential trade? So we have it stamped and driven home that as regards Canada obtaining preferential trade, although the Prime Minister found on visiting England that not merely the statesmen, but the farmers were prepared to accord it, he cast it aside and came back and declared it was all a piece of frippery, a piece of diplomacy. Of course we cannot take stock in it, none whatever. In regard to this matter I do not think it is necessary to say anything further, for if ever there was a nail driven home, that nail has been driven home.

I spoke about promises not being kept. One of the promises is a very interesting one at the present moment, for it seems to be that one of our North-west institutions in the future is to be the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). One of the promises made was this, that the Government would not spend money on expensive buildings in small places. But what did we see last session? We saw—and probably that is the explanation why the hon. gentleman is coming up to reign at the palace at Regina—the hon. member voting with twenty Tories against the present Government. On concurrence he moved a resolution in regard to public buildings and was supported by nineteen members, including the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain), and some other good Liberals. Thus we had the hon. gentleman voting against his party, and I rather think he planned to make things unpleasant for the Government just as Mr. Langelier had done; and as Mr. Langelier was hoisted on the bench, so the hon. member for Wellington is going to be a figure-head for the North-west vessel, now breasting its future, for it has just been launched into practically responsible government, and I suppose this appointment will be made partially because the hon. gentleman intended to make it unpleasant for his friends. There was another promise that has not been kept. It was a promise in regard to the votes for railways. That promise has not been kept, and there is not a promise made by the party now in power that has been kept.

We are entering on a new era. Although we are entering on a new era, who are the real leaders of the country? The Conservatives. One epoch is ever the child of another. The epoch that has gone before this epoch of thirty years, the epoch of national expansion, was the natural father of this epoch of colonial equality in imperial union, and yet we hear from the Government nothing but a faltering cry. But throughout the Dominion of Canada that note is strong, and that note will receive expression, and when the first opportunity occurs the people of the country will overthrow this Government, which stands with its pledges violated, its honour stained,

its record lowered in the dust by its own conduct for these twenty months. That Government, Sir will at the first opportunity, melt away like, in the rays of the sun in early spring, a mockery king of snow.

Mr. BENNETT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, that the members would be very much interested in the lecture which is to be delivered this evening by Mr. Ogilvie on the Klondike region. For my part, speaking on behalf of the Government, we are in the hands of the members. If it is the wish of our friends on both sides, we are willing to accede to it. May I ask if there is any probability that we shall soon see the end of the floods of eloquence which we have listened to for several days, so that the debate can be concluded this week.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So far as I can see, I do not know of any disposition to continue the debate much longer, and I think it is very near its termination. I must say that I think it would be of great advantage to the members to have an opportunity of hearing the very interesting, instructive and able lecture of Mr. Ogilvie.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 10th February, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Report of the Auditor General for the year ending 30th June, 1897.—(Mr. Fielding)

MOUNTED POLICE PENSIONS.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 15) further to amend the Mounted Police Pension Act, 1889.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. DAVIN.

FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Franchise Act and make provision in lieu thereof. He said: The object of this Bill is to repeal the existing Franchise Act and to substitute therefor the laws of the different provinces as to the qualification of voters, polling divisions and preparation of lists.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bertram for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, when, last evening, I moved the adjournment of the debate, the hon. leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) asked the leader on this side (Sir Charles Tupper) when this flood of oratory might be expected to cease. I can promise the right hon. gentleman that so far as I am concerned, there will be no attempt at oratory. While the hon. gentleman assumed an air of jocularly, I was fully convinced that there was within his breast a deep and earnest desire that this debate might at once close. He would desire that, no doubt, because of the fact that, as he must know, the eyes of the people of this Dominion are upon himself and the gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches with him. The hon. gentleman knows that Canadians are a reading people and that they are anxiously perusing the newspapers of the day. Aye, and worse still for the hon. gentlemen and his friends, he knows that that which is to-day throughout the Dominion the greatest moral force, the independent press, is strongly against him and those associated with him. Why, Sir, even such partisan newspapers as the Montreal "Witness" from time to time denounce the hon. gentleman. Such newspapers as the organ of the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the Simcoe "Reformer," issue by issue, are reading lessons to the hon. gentleman and his friends. And now and then, from the honest columns of the Huntingdon "Gleaner," comes the complaint that the hon. gentlemen are to-day, after eighteen months of power, false to every pledge they made in the long eighteen years when they were in Opposition. Therefore it is, I believe, that the hon. gentleman desires and asks that this debate should be at once brought to a close. Moreover, he knows that a storm is rising in his following. I do not refer to the men who sit there with their positions in their pockets

and who, therefore, readily respond to the crack of the party whip. I do not refer to the men similar to those who sat here last session with judgeships and lieutenant-governorships in their pockets, men so suspicious of their leader that they would not take his word, but must needs have him write his promise. I do not ask, or intend to ask, that these hon. gentlemen should listen to a word I say, for I know that words of mine would be wasted upon them. Nor do I seek to be heard by the hon. gentlemen who in the past year have been hurrying from one end of the civil service to the other in order to have their friends and relatives foisted into public positions. Who, knowing what the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) had said in years past, would have believed that he would be one of the first to have a hungry political friend, aye, a relative, too, given a place in the Kingston Penitentiary? Who would have expected that the hon. gentleman would sit here having in his pocket the promise of the lieutenantship of the North-west? And it is a notorious fact that such is the case. Only the other day, in the plenitude of his zeal to do his party a service, he jumped up unasked and endorsed the Yukon deal, though the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills) tells him that the deal he is prepared to endorse may be so modified and changed as to be almost unrecognizable.

The hon. gentleman should restrain his ebullition, he should restrain his gratitude, and exhibit at least some decency by showing that while he is grateful, he is not boastful of having been so easily mollified. Now, the hon. gentleman who moved the Address in this House, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), made, in my opinion, a very debatable address. He boldly plunged into the pastime of throwing down challenges, and one of the most wonderful statements the hon. gentleman made was that to-day the Dominion of Canada was proud in the fact that it has a Government that had redeemed every pledge that it had made. Redeemed every pledge to whom? Why, redeemed the pledge made to the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost) that the duty should be kept on agricultural implements. But have they redeemed the promises they made to the farmers of this country that the duties should be removed from agricultural implements? Have they redeemed any of the long list of pledges that they made in respect of tariff changes in this country? Sir, I join with great pleasure in the congratulations from this side of the House, as well as the other, that in Ontario to-day, aye, Sir, and throughout the whole Dominion, we are enjoying a greater prosperity than we have been for years past. But surely the hon. gentleman will not be so arrogant as to claim credit for that for his own party. There is not a man who reads, or a man who runs, but knows that had it

not been for the immense mineral development of British Columbia and the Yukon district, to-day throughout Ontario the woollen mills that are running full time would all be closed. Those are some of the causes that have brought about the prosperity that we are all rejoiced to know exists in the country. But the country knows very well that the state of confidence now prevailing in the Dominion to-day is due to the fact that the Liberal-Conservative press from one end of the Dominion to the other, instead of assailing the Government by decrying the state of the country, have loyally upheld the interests of Canada, and claimed that the times were better and were improving. The Conservative press has not resorted to the schemes and machinations the "Globe" was wont to resort to, in hounding down the country and depicting it in the darkest colours. I say that hon. gentlemen opposite have to thank the people of this country for having some confidence in them to-day; they have also to thank the Conservative press throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion for its patriotic course. Now, Sir, the leader of the Government was not at all happy I think the other night in addressing the House. It seems to me that some of the hon. gentlemen who sit behind him and who are to-day independent—and I trust there are many independent men on that side of the House—could not have been pleased to hear the hon. member for Centre Toronto, with his well-known protectionist principles, stand up in the House and champion the cause of this Government, this Government whose members had for years appeared before the people of Canada with promises that if they were returned to power they would break the shackles of industry, and do away with the monopolies which they claimed were existing in this country. Why, Sir, if there is a bloated monopolist to-day in this House, apart from the hon. member for North Leeds, who is well protected, it is the hon. member for Centre Toronto who, had he not declared in strong terms in the city of Toronto on the eve of his election, that he was a protectionist, would not be seen in this House to-day. Why, Sir, where were the Ministers upon that occasion? Where was the Postmaster General? Where was the Controller of Customs? Why did we not see the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the city of Toronto on that occasion appealing to the electors in the strong and vigorous language that he used years ago, calling the manufacturers scoundrels great and scoundrels small, who were bleeding the people of Canada white. None of them were found there. But the hon. member for Centre Toronto, in one of his addresses on that occasion, said:

I say there should be no further revision of the tariff of any consequence for at least ten years—

And the newspapers report that that sentiment was greeted with loud applause. Then he went on :

—so that the people can go on and do business without hesitation. We stand on that plank at present, that the tariff should be left as it is, and give the business men a chance to go on and develop the trade of the country without fear of any change in the tariff.

Why, Sir, who ever heard of such humiliation, who ever heard of such a backing down on the part of a political party? I believe that to-day the large majority of the electors of this country, if the opportunity were afforded them at the polls, would say that the hon. gentlemen had by their practices done exactly what was expected of them. We find to-day that in Canada the two great parties are no longer divided on the question of free trade and protection. I think it would be better for some hon. gentlemen opposite, some of the independent members, if such there are, that they should take action after the example of their ex-leader the Hon. Edward Blake, who, when he saw that he could not allow himself to be dragged down to the point of making a complete somersault in politics, boldly went out of his party and at least preserved for himself a clear conscience and a knowledge of having retained the respect of the honest men in this country irrespective of politics. But that change having taken place, and the line of demarcation between the parties being no longer drawn between free trade and protection, the distinction between the parties must now exist in respect to the action of the leader of the Government on his recent visit in England, the line between the parties in this country must be based on the question whether the party in power are or are not in favour of preferential trade with England. From this side of the House the declaration has gone up in unmistakable terms that the Liberal-Conservative party are a unit on that platform, and when the time comes I believe our party will await with confidence the verdict of the people on that issue. Now, Sir, the leader of the Government and his party followers have completely changed their position, have changed their views on protection, and embraced the policy of their opponents. The hon. gentleman the other night saw fit to make no denial of the many strong charges made against him in that respect, and in a very petulant mood, in a very angry tone, deprecated the opinion that had been expressed on this side of the House. He said that such utterances were humiliating, unparliamentary and improper. Well, I cannot help but think that the term "humiliation" as applied to the hon. gentleman's party is correct, that is provided they have any sense of humiliation. If they have no sense of humiliation, then I must submit that it must be at least annoy-

Mr. BENNETT.

ing. Then the hon. gentleman complains that they have been charged with incompetency in their administration of public affairs. Well, there is a difference of opinion on that point. I am sorry the Postmaster General is not here at the present time because, if there is any gentleman in this House or in this country who thinks that the Postmaster General has not shown himself thoroughly incompetent for his office, then I am greatly mistaken. Why, what did we see? We saw the Postmaster General of Canada issuing an order that the postage on letters from this country to Great Britain was to be three cents, when the merest lad, almost, in the country must have known that there was an international postage arrangement. What is the humiliating position to-day in which the people of this country find themselves? If they send a letter to a friend in the old country the result is that their friend has to pay postage again, unless it has been paid in this country by the department. Could there be a more absurd action taken by any Minister than that? I am sorry for the sake of the hon. Controller of Customs that he, with his lusty lungs, made that announcement in the city of Toronto. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman roared that statement out. However, he has a quarrel with the Postmaster General for presuming on his innocence, I will not say the ignorance of the Controller of Customs, because it was no business of his. Now let the First Minister recall this fact, that the gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches to-day are not masters of the people, but they are the servants of the people of this country, at all times and on all occasions. No answer has been made in the replies delivered by the leader of the Government and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who affected very old jokes and attempted to be jocular with the House; but those hon. gentlemen dare not go into Ontario constituencies and attempt such defences of their party. Do they not know that to-day in Ontario, where the local elections are being waged, one of the greatest charges against the present provincial administration is that their friends and allies in the House have been false to the promises they have made and that it is rebounding on the administration of that province. Friends of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce must have felt almost sorry for the hon. gentleman the other night when the gallant knight laboured to perpetrate jokes, which, no doubt, had been ready cut and dried for the last three months. I did admire the hon. gentleman in his old trenchant and flashing style, when he assailed the National Policy, and all who heard him the other night must have come to the conclusion that Richard is not himself, that he is a different person now when he is a hanger on to office, because the hon. gentleman is only a hanger-on, for he was al-

most pushed out of the Cabinet, but he still is a hanger-on, although having little standing-ground. There is a special reason why the right hon. leader of the Government felt a little testy. He evidently felt annoyed at being called to account for his past declarations as a democrat. Who would have thought that the right hon. Premier, who promenaded though the country as a democrat, would be the man ready at the first opportunity to accept a glittering bauble when proffered him. But the right hon. gentleman was at a disadvantage in this, that he had the honour thrust upon him, he could not refuse it; and for that reason, as an act of courtesy, he accepted it at the hands of Her Majesty. How different was the position of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He cannot complain that undue advantage was taken of him, and that he was not advised in advance, for on the day he landed he had knighthood thrust on him. The hon. gentleman's fame had gone abroad, even over to England. I do not know whether it was due to the great legal opinion he delivered last year on preferential trade, but at all events the hon. gentleman's reputation had preceded him, and in fact he stated in an address to his constituents regarding the acceptance of a title, "I wish to be fair and honest. Before I accepted it, I consulted my friends, because I had been advised that the honour would be proffered me." Those hon. gentlemen are to be congratulated on their knighthoods; and while there was a question whether the right hon. Premier was entitled to take a decoration from France, owing to the fact that it could be accepted by a British subject only in case it was given for distinction or prowess on the battlefield, I must say that if this nefarious Yukon deal goes through, there will be several others whose actions in the gold fields will entitle them to honour. Passing from the trade question, let me now consider another phase of public questions. What was and has been during the last eighteen years, particularly in Ontario, the cry and claim of the leader of the Government and those associated with him but that they wanted in Canadian politics nothing but clean men. The hon. gentleman has certainly a very vague and strange idea of what a clean man is in politics. Shades of Alexander Mackenzie! shadows of George Brown! when you look at the motley assortment who sit on the Treasury benches. Every one recollects Alexander Mackenzie's famous letter in which he told privately a friend that he was sitting holding his arms on the public treasury. And why? Because he was afraid of the camp followers and hangers-on. And what a spectacle is presented today. The public treasury is guarded by men who are, if their evidence is true, far from being above suspicion. Fancy the

Minister of Public Works in this country, the head of the greatest public spending department, a suppliant at the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway for a paltry \$3,000. Why, the Minister of Public Works knew his man, and there is no doubt Mr. Shaughnessy knew his man, whom, for a paltry \$3,000, he could get under his thumb.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not wonder that the hon. gentleman laughs, because it was a small effort. His next job was \$20,000 for the Drummond Railway deal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is not one word of truth in what the hon. gentleman has said.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. BENNETT. I regret I have not under my hand the evidence in the Grenier case.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no evidence of what the hon. gentleman says. There is not one word of truth in it. He will say it again, perhaps.

Mr. BENNETT. I read the evidence in that celebrated case, and surely the hon. gentleman will not deny that he got a loan of \$3,000 from Mr. Shaughnessy. Does the hon. gentleman deny it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not deny it. The hon. gentleman is asking a question. He said he read in the evidence in the Grenier case that I borrowed a sum of money from Mr. Shaughnessy. The facts of the case are these. I have already stated them to the House, and I will state them again. Years ago Mr. Shaughnessy came to me, after I had made great financial losses, and offered me a loan of money. I declined to take a loan of money from him. Then it was suggested that my sons, being in the printing trade, might get an advance, which would be repaid in printing. The amount has been repaid in printing, from the first dollar to the last dollar.

Mr. BENNETT. This shows how easily the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), with a lieutenant-governorship in his pocket, is satisfied. What has the hon. Minister proved by the statement he made? He said that years ago Mr. Shaughnessy came to him and proffered him a loan of money. I accept the statement that years ago Mr. Shaughnessy proffered him a loan of money, which he refused. At that time the hon. gentleman was a hanger-on of the Conservative party, and the reason Mr. Shaughnessy approached him was in order to secure his services with the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman stands convicted. Why should Mr. Shaughnessy approach the hon. gentleman and proffer him money when he was the

hanger-on and in the close confidence of the Ministers in the then Conservative Administration? I care not what the hon. gentleman's friends may think of it, or what they may say of it, but this I do know, that sitting among the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite are men who are ashamed to see in this House and in the Government a man occupying the position of Minister of Public Works who is under such obligation as is that hon. gentleman. Can anything be expected in the way of impartial conduct, can anything be expected of a man who is under the very hands of speculators and jobbers? Is it any wonder that the whole country is affrighted at the spectacle of a man of his stamp and class holding the position he does. What does the Montreal "Witness" say of him? I observe the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is advising the Minister of Public Works he had better keep quiet. I always admired the sagacity of that hon. member, and cannot help but think that at the present moment he is so advising the Minister.

Why, Sir, look at the independent press of this country to-day. Look at friends pressing and crowding the Minister of Public Works to the wall. Ah, Sir, if there is a man secure in the Cabinet to-day, it is the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), for he can stand on his pedestal and dare and defy the whole Liberal party. What is the Prime Minister reported as having said in the province of Quebec a while ago? He said: that if the Minister of Public Works had to leave the Cabinet, he too would have to go. They are a kind of political Siamese Chang and Eng, when one dies the other expires, when one dies the life blood of the other will sap away and he too must go.

We were told that we were to have clean government in this country. That is what some of the hon. gentlemen opposite tell us, but what do some of their own friends say about it? There sit on that side of the House some hon. gentlemen from the province of Ontario who are men of wealth and men of independence. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is known throughout the province of Ontario as being a wealthy man. He, from time to time has shown signs of independence; and what is the opinion of the hon. member for Norfolk of the motley assortment who now sit on the Treasury benches? That hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) very properly was accorded by his constituents last fall, on the anniversary of his twenty-fifth year of public life, a demonstration that I think befitted the hon. gentleman, and which was proper and meet. On that occasion an address was presented to him (Mr. Charlton) and if anybody should happen to read that address, they might run away with the opinion that it had been written by the hon. gentleman himself, but I should say it oc-

Mr. BENNETT.

curred rather in this way: His style of writing and style of speaking has become so popular where he lives, that all the editors have become inoculated by it, and you will consequently see that this address is the writing, or rather the style of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Anyhow, on that occasion, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) was presented with an address, and I will read you a sample brick from that address to show you how his style of writing is eagerly followed and copied in that county:

Not only as a party leader have you achieved success and fame, but the name of John Charlton as orator, economist, financier, moral reformer and deadliest foe of vice is a household word with every Canadian family.

Further in this address it goes on to say, and I agree with every word of it, as I agree with what has been said in the past:

We believe it to be your proud distinction to have made an impression on Canadian hearts and homes second to that of no man of your time. There may be those more adroit in political fence, there may be those more versed in artful ways, there may be those who have more wires and strings in hand, but no man in public life holds a securer place in the confidence and esteem of his fellow countrymen.

Well, Sir, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) knows the men who sit behind him; aye, Sir, he knows every one of them, and which one of them did he mean was a political fence? If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) did not write the address he certainly acquiesced in it, and made a most proper reply. Sir, I have always understood that a fence is the man who stands between a thief and the one who has been robbed, and who the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) meant are the fences in that aggregation of hon. gentlemen opposite, is in his heart, but on the present occasion I will be bound to say he will not speak. He says:

They are more adroit in wire-pulling.

Well, I will not ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) to make an explanation on that score, because although he is not of the Cabinet, I do not think he has yet despaired that he may receive the position of Ambassador to Washington. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is one of the men that his political friends wish to get rid of. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is to go to the North-west because the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) would not go, and as if the Liberal party had designs on his life, a little time ago, the "Globe" newspaper selected the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to go to the Yukon as ambassador. There must be a deep game going on, when they would want to push from the front ranks the men in the party who on one or two occasions have manifested some signs

of independence. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton)—and his friends know it full well—is capable of taking a little adulation and flattery, and this lets in a little light on the secrets of the party, because in this address his admirers go on to say :

‘It is our firm belief that your accession to one of the highest offices of state would be an assurance to all who love morality, justice and equality and hope for advancement, that the halcyon day of Canadian prosperity had surely dawned. This grand and imposing element of your fellow countrymen will never rest until your guiding hand assists in the control of the ship of state.

I wonder which of the present Ministers are helping the hon. gentleman to get into the Cabinet. The “Globe” newspaper wants to send him to the Yukon, and I believe there is not a helping hand extended by any one member of the combination to draw the hon. gentleman in. Then, in a boastful spirit, and I have no doubt it went down very well with the hon. gentleman, his adulators referred to a phase of his political past which is rather inconsistent with the actions of John Charlton, moral reformer, and deadliest foe of vice, because they say this of the hon. gentleman :

The proud position of your party to-day can be regarded by no fair-minded man in any light other than as largely due to your generous bounty.

Well, Sir, I have heard of the hon. gentleman’s generous bounty with the electors in his own riding ; I have read of one dollar bills, and two dollar bills finding their way into cooking stoves, as exposed in the courts in the hon. gentleman’s election trials. Is that the bounty that the hon. gentleman or his friends refer to ?

Mr. CHARLTON. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) to correct a misstatement ; one among a great number. I never have had an election trial.

Mr. BENNETT. I thought the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) would drop into the hole ; he came down without shooting. Why, I knew it was not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton). He has always been too canny to have an election trial ; it was his brother who was the wicked partner. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will declare that that was disclosed in the evidence in one of the election trials of his brother. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has said that I have made misstatements, but surely he will not repudiate that magnificent address, and surely he will not blame me for bringing before this House—and I trust before a small section of the country—portions of that address, which show the high esteem and the high regard in which he is held.

There was another gentleman in this House last session, and he had an excellent opportunity of finding out the companions with whom he was fettered ; I refer to the late hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr.

Lount). That gentleman (Mr. Lount) came here heralded as a great lawyer, as a great advocate, and as a man who would speedily come to the front. Mr. Lount came here but he soon quit the company in which he found himself, and why did he ? I shall read from the Toronto “Globe” of Nov. 16th, and these are the reasons, among others, why Mr. Lount quitted the company he was in :

A man, however, had to think of something more than the public interests. His time had been encroached on so much that it became a question to him whether he would have to live on his parliamentary allowance, retire from public life, or become a professional politician. He was not prepared to do the latter. However inefficiently he might have discharged his work in Parliament, his record was clean from any taint of foul or wrongful doing. Nor would he descend to the position of making up professional losses by advantages to be gained in public life.

Mr. Lount sat right among these hon. gentlemen, he was closeted with them, he was surrounded by them, and when he looked on every hand and saw what he declared to be the making up of professional losses by unprofessional conduct and by disgraceful actions, he was not prepared to be associated with that party any longer. When these hon. gentlemen talk of giving to the people of Canada a clean administration, they must by their actions, and not by their words, show and prove to the people of Canada that they want nothing but clean men in public life.

Now, the hon. gentlemen, after a long recess, have brought before this House and the people of this country a proposition most startling in its magnitude. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) properly stated that the Government of the day was a bold Government and a plucky Government. Sir, I agree with the statement of the hon. gentleman that they are bold. Why, they are bold even to madness. I agree with him that they are plucky. Why, Sir, no men could possibly have the pluck these hon. gentlemen have, if they followed reasonable and rational conduct. Why, Sir, what have they done ? They come to-day before Parliament with a proposition which for magnitude has never before had its equal or has never been approached by anything in the manner and form of a public undertaking. These hon. gentlemen are prepared to give away the very greatest riches that have ever been disclosed in the whole world—for what ? For a consideration most paltry and most absurd. One needs only to go back six months in the political history of Canada to see how coolly and cautiously all these plans have been laid. One has only to peruse the files of the “Globe” newspaper and read what that paper has said on behalf of the men behind this immense contract, to see that it is not the sudden thought of a day, but a monstrous scheme

which was brought into existence months ago, and is only now sprung upon public attention. When the hon. Minister of Railways brought the scheme before the House, what excuse had he to offer for lack of explanation? If the proposition is of the extent which the country believes it is, no Minister should come before the House and the country without being fully prepared to explain it in all its details. Why, Sir, who are to-day behind this huge scheme? Look into the public prints of Ontario. Boldly and without a blush, not wishing to retract or withdraw, are to be found Mann & Mackenzie, a large firm of public contractors. Allied with them are Mr. Robert Jaffray, Senator Cox and other men who are known as large capitalists in the province of Ontario; and beside and beyond all this, all these men are known to be in close touch with the political party of the day. The hon. gentlemen at the outset make this excuse: they say there is reason for producing this proposition at the present time because time is flying and the proposition must be taken up at once. Why, Sir, one would imagine that it had only been within the last few weeks that the great wealth of the Yukon district had been known to the people of this Dominion. The Ministry underrate the intelligence of the people of Canada, when they say that, because away back in May, 1897, it was well known to the public press of Canada that unlimited wealth was to be found in the Yukon district. Then, the Government had before them the reports of the explorations of Mr. Ogilvie, their own surveyor; they had maps of the country; they had all the information that they have to-day. Why, then, did not the Government come down a year ago with this proposition? Simply by reason of the fact that they knew that the proposition was so wild and so great that they were afraid to spring it upon their supporters in this House, much less upon the country. But Mann & Mackenzie waited and got exactly what they wanted; they got an opportunity to show to these gentlemen their strength and power in the province of Ontario. The Centre Toronto election was a tribute to it, the monied power of Mann & Mackenzie gained the fight for them; and from the moment the Government, pleased with their success, were willing to take upon themselves the burden of this contract. Sir, there is no excuse for the Government coming before Parliament and the country to-day and telling them that this matter is of such urgency and of such pressing moment that it must necessarily be proceeded with; because a year ago the Government possessed all the facts which they are in possession of to-day.

But there is another proposition of the hon. gentlemen in which they violated all their ante-election promises. They have come before this Parliament to-day, as they did in the case of that nefarious Drummond Railway deal, and have asked their follow-

ers—what? To vote through a contract into which they have entered without asking their followers whether that contract is or is not agreeable to them. The hon. leader of the Government wishes this debate to come to a close. No wonder he does, because he saw last year what a public discussion in this House was. He saw in this House last year, by the long discussion which took place on the Drummond deal, and by the nature of the exposure of it in the public prints, that that scheme was, as I believe it is, effectually killed. The people of this Dominion have to thank the Conservative party for having ripped in the bud one of the most outrageous steals and raids on the public treasury ever attempted; and hon. gentlemen will find to-day in this House a spirit of independence so strong among the independent members on their own side, that they will be forced to withdraw this Bill. Why, Sir, at the outset the Government bring down a Bill and ask their supporters to take it in its entirety; and after they have heard the complaints that have been made, the Minister of Justice has been forced to admit in the Senate that the contract is not a binding contract; that the contract which has been submitted to Parliament is not a contract that they will be asked to ratify, but that such changes will be made in it as the supporters of the Government will be willing to accede to. Why, Sir, what does all that prove? It proves that the very boldness of these exploiters of the raid on the public treasury, Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, did not themselves believe that they could pass through Parliament a scheme of this kind; and so they have gone into the work, asking the Ministry to make the best possible deal they can, and they will consent to that arrangement. Why, it is idle to address hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to any professions they have made, because they throw them all to the winds. No sense of decency is left in them, and I am pleased to know that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is in the city to-day, because we may look to him to denounce this Government, as he did the late Government, for what he was pleased to term raids on the public treasury. I hope that he will, in accordance with the wishes of his constituency—and I know the wishes of many of his constituents—denounce this outrageous raid which to-day is being made on the public treasury. Why, here are men who for years were protesting that every contract should come before Parliament, that its terms should be submitted to Parliament and assented to before the Government were committed to it—here they are to-day taking the high ground of not asking the intervention of Parliament but of bringing down to their subservient followers a bill of fare and telling them that they must accept it in its entirety. But I am pleased to be able to say that the

opposition which has been manifested to this scheme in this House and the exposures of it made by the press throughout the country, have had the effect of forcing the Government to capitulate, so that we had the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills) telling us yesterday in the Senate that the Bill was so bad the Government would not call on its followers to swallow it in its entirety. These hon. gentlemen are plunging into this enterprise, without knowing where they stand; although one would imagine that, guided by the experience of the past, they would be very chary before taking any more leaps in the dark.

What is the proposition with regard to construction? They come before Parliament to-day with a proposition, the strongest plea in favour of which is that they are about to construct an all-Canadian route. But, at the same time, they are forced to admit, as hon. Ministers did yesterday, that they are not sure of their ground even in that regard. When the Stikine River is reached, they know that there must of necessity be transshipment from the larger to the smaller vessels, and they know that such transshipment is amenable to the customs laws of the United States. True, the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) said yesterday that he believed an arrangement had been entered into for transshipment into Canadian vessels going up to Dawson City by the St. Michael's River. I would now ask that hon. gentleman if his statement that arrangements had been made with the United States Government to permit the interchange of commodities from ocean-going vessels to river boats in the Yukon River is also applicable to the Stikine?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). As I remember it, in the United States regulations, the name of Stikine does not specifically appear, but they mention Juneau, Dyea, and, I think, St. Michaels and other ports in this country. I think that is the wording. I can show the hon. gentleman the rules, but I have not got them under my hand.

Mr. BENNETT. Surely the hon. gentlemen are not going to take such a leap in the dark as that, after the experience with the English postage and the preferential trade matters. No wonder the London "Times," in view of the course of the Government on postage and preferential trade matters, should have thrown out the word of warning which I will read for the benefit of hon. Ministers:

In any case, goods carried by this route have to be transhipped from ocean steamers to river steamers at Fort Wrangell, where the American customs levy their duties. It appears, however, that the actual navigation of the river, as long as it remains within the Alaskan boundary, is guaranteed as free by our treaties with Russia and with the United States. We are bound to assume that the Government of the Canadian

Dominion have taken all these matters into account before entering into the contract for the railway, which is intended to effect the connection between the Pacific coast and the Yukon.

I suppose, however, the Government expect blind support from their followers, even if no reasonable solution is given of that question.

Now, if there is one clause in this whole Bill that should be denounced, and denounced without stint, it is the monopoly clause. For the next ten years, no other railway is to be allowed in that country, and contractors may extort—and I think that is only a fair word to use in view of the enormous powers conferred upon them—what rates they please from those who will have to use their railway. For the first four years they are allowed to charge whatever rates they please; but we will assume, for the sake of argument, that they will charge at the rate of \$1 per 100 pounds. After four years, they are only to charge at the rate of 75 cents per 100 pounds, carrying out their calculation on the basis of \$1 per 100 pounds. Three years after they are allowed to charge 56 cents per 100 pounds, so that to-day these hon. gentlemen are giving this gigantic monopoly the privilege of charging their passengers and customers a great deal more than they are prepared to accept in seven years from to-day, or nearly 50 per cent more than a proper and fair rate. Yesterday the House was treated by one of the British Columbia members to an estimate of the vast amount of freight that would be taken from this country, and when one takes that into account, one cannot help seeing that the privileges conferred under this monopoly clause are simply enormous.

Now, if it be correct, as is stated by the hon. Minister of Justice in the Senate, that changes are to be made in this agreement, all I can say is that this side of the House can fairly take credit to themselves for having drawn this concession from the Government, and as we have made these hon. gentlemen converts to protection in the past, so we may congratulate ourselves on having made them converts in this matter.

But when one comes to realize the immense grant of lands that the Government have given to these contractors, one is almost staggered at its gigantic proportions. Last night Mr. Ogilvie, the surveyor, whose name is now world-wide, owing to his connection with the Yukon district, made this statement, as reported in the public press, that there are 149,000 square miles of mineralized lands in that country. Under this proposition, this company is to have 5,850 square miles of those lands. And what kind of lands? Not such lands as may be allotted to them by the Government, but the very pick and choice of the best lands in that country. I make an estimate on this calculation, which is a fair calcula-

tion, that of the 149,000 square miles of territory, five per cent will be the very best and choicest mineralized lands, and the House will see, at a glance, that these contractors are to have 5,850 square miles of the very choicest mineralized lands. What is worse than that, they are not bound to select their lands at once but are given time, so that the hardy pioneer, the sturdy miner, who, at the risk of his life, goes into that country, becomes simply a prospecting agent in the hands of Mann & Mackenzie for their benefit and nothing else. Why, Mr. Speaker, the boldness of the proposition is such as to startle any one. And no wonder the hon. gentlemen are anxious to have this startling proposition rushed through the House.

Now we can make comparisons. I have information that I believe to be correct, showing the fabulous wealth of that country. I have had the privilege of conversing with a gentleman who recently returned from that country. One can hardly believe that the tales that are told on that subject are within the realm of truth. But it was to be expected that great gold deposits would be found there. In the northern part of British Columbia for the last forty years rich gold finds have been made, and across Behring Straits, in Russian territory, it is a notorious fact there are mines that have been worked to the greatest extent and have yielded unbounded wealth. It was a matter of conjecture, therefore, that in this Yukon district there were exceedingly rich deposits. And to-day we find men going there and taking up small holdings of one or two hundred feet, which holdings yield not thousands merely, but millions of dollars. But yet it is intended to throw away this vast quantity—5,850 square miles of the finest mineral lands in that whole country for the benefit of this gigantic monopoly and those who are behind it. Why, does this House know that the famous mine known as Le Roi mine in British Columbia, covers a space of only 162 acres, and does the House know that \$3,000,000 has been offered for this 162 acres? Yet the wealth of British Columbia does not begin to compare with the untold wealth of this Yukon district. The confidential reports of Mr. Ogilvie are before the department, but the department ignores them, and puts into the hands of this gigantic monopoly 5,850 square miles of the best mineral lands in that country. Sir, the people of the province of Ontario, I know, expect from the men who sit on the other side to remonstrate against this proposal. I see before me on that side men of means, men who are not place-hunters, men who have not been placated within the last six months by the gift of paltry offices for the benefit of needy relatives, men who are expected to stand up for the interests of the Dominion. I appeal to such men as the hon. member for North

Mr. BENNETT.

Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to assert their independence. I appeal to the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain), to the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), to the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan). I was going to say the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), but he has been placated since last session by having the postmastership of Goderich given to his son-in-law. I do appeal with some confidence to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and also to the hon. member for Kent, a gentleman of means who is not an applicant for any office at the hands of the Government, a man whose constituency expects from him some remonstrance in this matter. I expect as much from the hon. member from West Durham (Mr. Beith). And so I could go through the whole list. I do not wish to be personal, but there are men on that side of the House who, if the public prints are correct, stand in as unenviable a position as did Langelier who represented Centre Quebec until his recent appointment to office. The names of these gentlemen are in the public prints and in the mouths of their friends as being recipients of the Government's bounty. I do not expect from men who have positions in prospect any remonstrance against such a proposition as this, but I do expect from such gentlemen as those I have named, as well as from some other provinces than Ontario, that they will manifest their disapproval of this proposition.

But after this Government has given away the richest heritage the country ever had, what are we to get in return? Why, the Prime Minister told us that the building of this tramway is only a temporary arrangement after all, and that within a little time some substantial means of communication with that district must be provided. Where are the hon. members from the North-west? Where is the hon. member from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), the member from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), whose constituents expect them to stand up for the construction of a line from Edmonton? What are these hon. gentlemen to have in order to help along the line through their country? Mackenzie & Mann are to have over half of the richest lands of the Yukon; who, then, is to pay for the line of railway from Edmonton that must be given to these hon. gentlemen to placate them and secure their vote for this monstrous proposal? Why, for that they must come back to the older provinces; and we shall be asked to plunge our hands into the public chest to aid this line of railway so as to conciliate the constituents of these hon. gentlemen simply because they have subserviently accepted this scheme to make Mackenzie & Mann multi-millionaires.

Where is Mr. Mackenzie to-day? It is announced in the public press that he is

en route to England. This great scheme does not affect him enough to keep him in the country to look after it and assist it through Parliament. He knows he need not be here; he knows that willing hands are here to force the deal through. But Mr. Mackenzie is accustomed to guide great enterprises, and he is now on his way to England—to do what? To lay before English capitalists the contract he has with the Canadian Government, to show them that he has the abounded wealth of the Yukon in the hollow of his hand. And he will be able to come back to this country with a company formed, the stock of which will amount—to thousands, as I was about to say—no, but tens of millions of dollars. Never was such a proposition laid before Parliament to despoil the whole country of its greatest wealth. Why, as compared with this, some of the arrangements of this Government are puny, are pigmy things. Yesterday afternoon the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) referred to what has been called the “Dan Rose book.” It is scandalous for the Dominion of Canada to have emblazoned on such a book that it is authorized by the Dominion of Canada—a cheap-jack scheme to put into the pockets of a party hack like Rose three or four hundred thousand dollars. And as a reward for what? For services rendered by him in St. John’s Ward to secure the election of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram). It is a disgrace to the Dominion to have offered on the public news-stands a book of that kind, filled as it is with cheap advertisements, and on the outside the announcement that it is authorized by the Dominion of Canada. I am told on good authority that the book which is to-day being sold at 50 cents a copy could have been produced at 10 cents a copy at the Printing Bureau here. What would have been the effect if it had been so produced? Why, the Government could have flooded Europe and the United States with that book, and it would have been the greatest advertisement that Canada ever had. But instead of that it is handed over to a party heeler to make a large profit for himself. Then we are told in the next breath that Parliament is going to get 10,000 copies of the book. May I ask, if there is any Minister here who knows anything of these trifling matters of the Yukon deal or the book, is that book to be distributed among the members of Parliament? I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if there is any Minister who is enough concerned in this trifling Yukon deal to inform the House—

Mr. LANDERKIN. Put a notice on the paper.

Mr. BENNETT. I accept the statement of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). I regret that he is not a member

of the Cabinet. I think he is much more able and much more fit to be one, and he is certainly much more courteous, than the most of them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not think you are a judge.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman says I was mistaken in thinking that he was courteous. I will admit that I took for substantial the veneer. Now, may I ask the Ministers, will any one of them condescend to tell us if this book is to be distributed to any extent by the Government, either in Canada, the United States or Europe, or to members of Parliament?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). There are 20,000 copies to be distributed.

Mr. BENNETT. Where?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Very largely to be given to members to distribute.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Might I suggest to the hon. gentleman that if the book is now published, members of Parliament have reason to expect promptly to receive copies of it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I can assure the hon. gentleman they will be placed in the hands of members of Parliament the moment they are received, and a good many more than one copy.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to transgress much longer on the time of the House. But I want to say this, that I do not appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite for any change of heart, with very few exceptions, on this question. I have seen those hon. gentlemen opposite subservient to the party whip two sessions ago, and I know that they will, most of them, always be responsive to that. But those hon. gentlemen must remember that the time will come when they must come down from the lofty position they are taking as masters of the people, and become servants of the people. Let them remember that never did a political party in the province of Ontario present the humiliating spectacle that that party presents to-day. Outside of this Cabinet there is not a man sitting behind the Government who aspires to a Cabinet position, not a single one. Fancy, in the great province of Ontario, the banner province, as it has been heralded, of Liberalism, to be backed up, not by men with ambition to come to the front ranks in their country, but by men who wish to drag from their masters positions such as they think themselves capable of filling. Why, who could believe that such a spectacle would be presented by the Liberal party? Who could imagine the present state of

things who remembers how often those hon. gentlemen declaimed throughout the province of Ontario that when they did come into power there would not be found a man ambitious enough in their ranks to ask for Cabinet preferment? Yet we see their humiliating position to-day. There sit to-day behind the leader, men before whom for months there has been dangled the position of a judgeship at Toronto. Their friends know it. The former member for Centre Toronto had the promise dangling before him until he became disgusted, and retired from the House. There are two gentlemen there to-day who, if they intended to remain in public life, would not be so subservient as they are, but would be kicking against the pricks. To-day a Senatorship in the province of Ontario is dangled before them, because the Government feel it gives them the votes of two or three men who sit behind them. To-day, and for years past, positions have been dangled before the hungry followers of the hon. gentlemen, and well enough they know it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is no hunger in the land now.

Mr. BENNETT. But sometimes my hon. friend experiences drought. Now, Sir, I take this occasion to protest, in the name of the constituency that I have the honour to represent in this House, against this gigantic, this monstrous, exploitation of the public treasury. I protest against it in the name of common decency, because it is not common decency to give untold millions of dollars worth of property away to any exploiters of the public treasury. Sir, I say that as long as this session does last, and I trust the session will run into months before this monstrous proposition will be accepted by this House, I shall oppose it. I trust that as we have already, by discussion in this House, affected the public mind, and even affected some of the independent members on the Opposition side, because we have forced the Minister of Justice yesterday to state that the Government are prepared to recede from the position they originally took—so do I hope and trust that by discussing this matter to the bitter end, we shall secure some modification of the contract, while the Government may still go on with the work, which I am pleased to see has been commenced, because every hon. gentleman on this side of the House, I believe, is in favour of the construction of that road at the earliest possible date. But let the Ministers come to the House with a reasonable and fair proposition, and I am bound to say that it will receive the support and hearty acquiescence of every hon. gentleman on this side of the House. But so long as they ask us to approve a proposition as monstrous as this one, then I can tell the Government that so far as my humble efforts are concerned, even at the risk of pre-

Mr. BENNETT.

longing this session many months, it will meet with my determined opposition.

Mr. CRAIG. I would not rise to address the House at this moment if I thought any member on the other side wished to take the floor, but as I understand none of them will attempt to speak, I will go on and discuss some features of the Address. I am sure that all the members on this side of the House join in congratulations on the prosperity of the country, although I cannot agree with some of the reasons which are stated, and which have been given by the hon. member for Centre Toronto, for this prosperity. In the few remarks I shall make I intend to criticise, in some respects, the speech of the hon. member for Centre Toronto. He claims that while some share of the prosperity this country is now enjoying came from a bountiful harvest, for which we are all thankful, yet the chief part of this prosperity came from the fiscal policy of the Government, adopted at the last session of Parliament. He says:

This Parliament, by its action last session in the revision of the tariff, gave the business people of the country a confidence they did not possess before.

Sir, this is a remarkable statement, and I would ask why the revision of the tariff last session gave the business people confidence. I answer that it is because the tariff was not materially changed. The people of this country had been listening for eighteen years to hon. gentlemen opposite, then in Opposition, who declared that protection was the curse of this country; that as soon as they came into power they would do away with every vestige of it; that the tariff would be entirely changed, and they would go as far as they possibly could in the direction of free trade; that while they could not adopt free trade at the present time, yet free trade was the goal at which they aimed. I say the people of the country listened to that, and a great many of them believed what was said. Many of the farmers of the country believed that when the Liberal party came into power free trade would be in a great measure introduced. The business men and manufacturers feared these promises would be carried out, and as the hon. member for Centre Toronto said, referring to the tariff of last year, that tariff gave confidence to the business people because the principle of protection was retained. I wish it to be distinctly understood that it was not because free trade elements were introduced in the tariff, it was not because the party now in power carried out their promises and pledges made in Opposition that confidence was restored, but it was because they retained the principle of protection and thereby showed the people they were not going to destroy our manufacturing industries all over the coun-

try which had been built up by the National Policy. The hon. gentleman also said :

There was an impression—I do not deny it—in the minds of business people and manufacturers that the fiscal policy of the Liberal party could not be relied upon to the same extent as the fiscal policy of the Conservative party.

That was a very natural impression, and the hon. gentleman said it existed. Why? Because the people took the Liberal party at their word and believed they were sincere; they had listened to speeches delivered by the present First Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and thought they were sincere in making those promises, and that they were not delivering speeches simply in order to get into power, when all their promises and pledges would be cast aside. They were told that the Liberal party believed in free trade and would put in practice their professions if they came into power, and the general impression prevailing over the country among business men, and especially among manufacturers and workingmen, was that their policy was not so sound as it ought to be. I was very much amazed to listen to the hon. member for Centre Toronto, when he said that the pledges made by the Liberal party in the country had been redeemed in every particular. The hon. member who seconded the Address is a poet. I think a poet should have made that remark, because it should not assuredly have been made by a business man. How any man could look at the pledges and promises made by members of the present Government when in Opposition, read them carefully and calmly, and declare that those pledges had been fulfilled in every particular, is more than I can understand. But it depends, no doubt, on the members who may be considered to represent the Liberal party. If the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Frost), the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood), or the Minister of Customs, are collectively or individually taken as representing the party, then I can understand the statement, because all those gentlemen have in past days declared their belief in the principle of protection. Under the Mackenzie Government they advocated protection. They told Mr. Mackenzie how the workingmen in Montreal, as a result of the tariff, were starving and soup kitchens were being established, and they asked the Government to adopt protection. But if the present Premier, or the Minister of Trade and Commerce, or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is to be considered as representing the Liberal party, I do not understand how the party have fulfilled their pledges. We all know how those hon. gentlemen denounced protection, how they said it was a curse to the country, how they proclaimed that, when they got into power, they would demolish every vestige of protection. Those declarations were

familiar to members of this House and to the people of the country, and the "Globe" reported those promises and pledges and gave them as a reason why the party should be returned to power. At all events, that proved to be one reason why they were returned to power. It was, however, only one reason. Another great question came up, and that proved an important factor; but a leading reason in the western country, no doubt, was the declaration of leading members of the Liberal party, that if returned to power, they would frame a tariff in the direction of free trade. The hon. member for Centre Toronto made another remarkable statement. He said :

Now, I quite agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition that if such (denunciation of protection) had been the conduct of the Liberal party during eighteen years, that party would be unworthy of the confidence of the people.

I pronounce hon. gentlemen opposite unworthy of the confidence of the people on the ground stated, because I hold that any party which makes pledges and acquires power and casts them aside—some of the parties say they never made such pledges—is unworthy of the confidence of the people. I know there are many staunch Liberals today who think the Government have not done their duty and have not fulfilled their pledges, and I was very much surprised that a man possessing the intelligence of the hon. member for Centre Toronto should imagine for one moment, even after indulging in a stretch of his imagination, that the Government had carried out their pledges.

Leaving the tariff out of the question, one of the great pledges made to the country, and it is one that met the approval of all parties, was that the Liberal party would inaugurate a system of strict economy. They said that if put in power, they would not permit wasteful expenditures, as the Conservatives had allowed, and that they would not bring down large estimates for great public works. Have they carried out that pledge of economy? In order to answer that question it is only necessary to look at last year's Estimates. Those brought down and passed exceeded any Estimates ever submitted by the Conservative party. So it requires no argument to prove that, in respect to their pledge of economy, hon. gentlemen have failed most signally. I am glad they failed in their pledge regarding the tariff, as a man who believes in protection and who defends the National Policy. I am as strong a believer in protection as I ever was. I have thought over and considered the subject, and have looked abroad in the country and weighed the policy of the United States, and I repeat, I am as strongly in favour of protection as ever, and I am glad the Government departed from all their pledges so far as the tariff was concerned. If I could commend them for any action, it would be for that: I do commend them for it. If their followers

are satisfied, I am quite satisfied on that score. The hon. member for Centre Toronto further said—and in this statement I think he was rather giving away the secrets of the party :

They never intended to give free trade, because it would be impossible.

It all depends on what is considered free trade. A great many speeches were delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite during one session in favour of free trade, and the hope was expressed that such a policy would be adopted as soon as possible. Yet the hon. gentlemen now declare they never intended to carry out free trade. If that statement was scattered among ardent Liberals, they would be surprised. I spent much time, during my contest, in showing that free trade was impossible, because my opponents were in favour of free trade. I pointed out that we must have customs-houses and collect revenue. They said the Government would adopt the free trade policy and would remove the obnoxious duties. Now the member for Centre Toronto says the present Government never had any such intention. He further said :

The predictions of the Conservatives have not been fulfilled.

In what respect does the hon. gentleman mean? We said that if the tariff was reduced materially and protection taken away, then the greatest calamity would come upon the country. And if the Conservative prediction has not been fulfilled—Why? Just so far, and no further than to the extent they have retained the fiscal policy of the Conservative party, is the country prospering. If the Liberal party had cut the tariff down as they promised to do, then our prognostications about disaster and financial panic would have been fulfilled. But I am glad they took the advice of some of their supporters who are largely interested in the commerce of this country, and did not interfere with the tariff as it was feared they would. I regret to say that in the town of Port Hope some of those unhappy things have come to pass. We have a binder twine factory in that town employing about 70 hands, which for seven months last year ran day and night, and paid out \$500 a week in wages. To-day that factory is closed, and the men who worked in it are walking idle about the streets, no doubt feeling not very friendly towards the Government in power. There was a duty of 12½ per cent on binder twine coming into this country, but the Liberal Government have removed that duty and so the Port Hope factory is closed. I cannot imagine on what logical grounds the Government can hope to please the farmers by allowing binder twine in free, when they do not allow agricultural implements in free, except indeed that the men who manufacture binder twine have not such a strong influence with the Gov-

Mr. CRAIG.

ernment as the men who manufacture agricultural implements. No other reason appeals to my mind. Agricultural implements cost more to the farmer than does binder twine, and yet a duty is retained on agricultural implements while the manufacture of binder twine is destroyed in this country. The idea in removing the duty was that binder twine would go free into the United States, but to-day, manilla binder twine, such as we make here, is met with a duty of 45 per cent in the United States. Why should we allow the factories in the United States to manufacture binder twine and send it into Canada free, when if we make binder twine in Canada and send it into the United States, we must pay a duty of 45 per cent. It is altogether a strange policy for this Government to adopt. I have seen that a short time ago the Government was asked to re-impose the small 12½ per cent duty on binder twine, and I trust they will do so, because I think the condition under which this manufacture exists at present is very anomalous and not creditable to them. I am not speaking for the Consumers' Cordage Company, but I am speaking for the workmen who are idle in the town of Port Hope. I have no interest in the Consumers' Cordage Company, but I have in those honest workmen, and I want to see them employed again. One of the very best workmen amongst them has already been compelled to go to the United States, and I do not want the others to be forced to emigrate in order to get work in a binder twine factory across the line. When the Conservatives were in power, the Liberals charged us with driving people out of the country, and I trust, now that the absurdity of the thing is so apparent to them, that they will not force these men to leave Canada to make binder twine in the States and send it over here. I want to see binder twine made in Canada, and I want to see part of it made in Port Hope. The price of this commodity is not excessive; it is in fact very low, and there was no reason whatever for removing the duty. The prison made binder twine, the patrons' binder twine factory, and the competition among other factories are sufficient guarantee that the prices will be kept down.

The right hon. the Premier quoted the opinion of Mr. Gurney who was President of the Toronto Board of Trade, in support of the tariff of the present Government. Now, Mr. Gurney and other Conservatives were satisfied with this tariff because they expected something a great deal worse from the party now in power, and they were glad to find that they got off so well as they did. Mr. Gurney and other manufacturers believed the Liberals were going to carry out their promises, and they were pleased to find that when the Liberals got into power they did not do so. I hold, Sir, that the present tariff law of the Government,

together with the speech of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) is a strong justification of the fiscal policy of the Conservative party.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer, although I do not know that what I shall say will have any weight with the Government. We find that this rich region of the Klondike is now being advertised all over the world, and that men are pouring into that country from all directions. We have been told in this House, that the American mining laws do not allow any except naturalized citizens to own mining claims in their country. Is it not well that our Government should consider whether they would not take a leaf out of the book of the United States Government. Is it not well that they should consider whether they will continue to allow Americans (who will not allow our citizens the same privilege) to go into the Klondike, buy up the rich claims, and carry Canadian wealth out of Canada. I am not in favour of any harsh restrictions, but I do believe the Americans cannot blame us for copying them; on the contrary they should take it as a compliment. If they are willing to reciprocate in that matter, we might do the same, but so long as they prevent Canadians owning mining claims in their country, it is, I believe, wise for us to consider the urgency of our doing the same thing. I am a strong believer in the policy of Canada for the Canadians, and especially in a matter of this kind. This gold is not unlimited, it will not last forever, and I believe we should make some discrimination between foreigners and British subjects in regard to our mining regulations.

I have a few words to say on this Yukon railway contract, and only a few words as the subject will be fully discussed later. I was a little surprised, as many members on both sides of the House no doubt were, at the speech of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) in introducing this Bill. His speech was very energetic indeed, but to my mind it was from beginning to end an apology, an attempted defence of the contract. I notice he appealed to his own followers from the start, as if he knew that in their minds strong arguments existed against the contract, and as if he knew that undoubtedly there were strong prejudices to be overcome. Referring to the fact of the contract being signed so short a time before the calling together of Parliament, the Minister said, that this contract was signed by the Government under the circumstances regretfully and reluctantly. He excused the whole thing on the ground of urgency, but to my mind the more that contract is looked into the worse it appears, and the more we examine its details the more indefensible it is. It seems to me that if the Government can defend this contract successfully, they can defend anything. Now, as to the character of the

road that is to be built there. The Montreal "Witness" yesterday stated, that it was not what should be expected from what is known as a Government road, and they conclude that it is not much of a concern after all. A great many people in this country will hold the same opinion as the Montreal "Witness." If it be true that 50,000 people are going to the Klondike over this road during the coming season, not to speak of the numbers coming out, and if they are to carry the thousands of tons of freight we read about, then the road should be more substantial than it is proposed to be.

That is one thing that should be insisted on: the road should be a substantial road. But it is said that it is to be a narrow-gauge road, that the rails to be used are light rails, which have been used on another railway, and that the locomotives are old. I do not know whether this is so or not; but these matters should be found out before this contract is ratified, if it is to be ratified by Parliament. We should see that the road is not a mere temporary road, as it has been described, and as the Montreal "Witness" says it is, but a good, substantial road. I notice that the Premier says that this road is simply a temporary one, intended to provide immediate communication for the thousands of men who will be in that region next winter. He would not say that it was even the best route, and he mentioned another route from Edmonton which he thought would be preferable. No doubt, he said that to satisfy the members from the North-west Territories. But if this is only a temporary road, to be built for the purpose of providing food and supplies for the people in the country next winter, then I think it is absurd to pay any such price for it. What are we going to pay for that road? It is said that we are not to give any cash for the road, and that is held up as a great argument in favour of this contract. That argument might appeal to some people; but if we are not going to give cash, it is well to look at what we are going to give. We are going to give 3,750,000 acres of land—in my mind, practically the whole of the gold-bearing land of that country; because when we consider the opportunities these men, who are sharp business men with unlimited means, have of selecting that land, in three years and six years, we can see that they can easily send out prospectors and find out where the gold is, and take it all. But we are going to give them more than that large quantity of land. We are going to give them a monopoly for many years, and the right to charge just what they please. In considering this matter, it struck me that there would be a great many men willing to build this road for the monopoly alone, without the land. But it is said that it is all a matter of chance—that perhaps this road will not

be wanted in a few years at all. But that argument was knocked on the head by Mr. Ogilvie in his lecture last night, when he said that there would be enough gold in that country for the next ten years at any rate, how much longer he did not know, for everybody who went in there. So that for ten years at any rate, this road would have plenty of traffic. Then, these men have not only the land and the monopoly, but they have an immense business already waiting for them. If this were a road for which they would have to wait for several years for business to grow up, there might be some justification in paying a large price for it; but in this case thousands of people and thousands of tons of freight are waiting for this road; so that there will be plenty of business as soon as the road is opened to pay these men immensely for all they have put in to it. So that they have not only lands and the monopoly, but they can fix their own rates as they please.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman is not stating the case fairly. It is provided in the contract that the tolls are to be fixed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. CRAIG. Is it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. The hon. gentleman's predecessor made the same mistake, but I did not think it worth while to interrupt him.

Mr. WILSON. How long do the rates last when they are fixed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For the first four years they must be fixed by the Governor in Council, and after that they are reduced automatically.

Mr. CRAIG. There is no doubt the Government will allow liberal rates.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Fair rates.

Mr. CRAIG. I take that for granted. At any rate, they have a monopoly, with very good rates. I have not been able to read this contract yet—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I thought that. Will the hon. gentleman refrain from criticising it until he has seen it, and then he will come round and vote for it.

Mr. CRAIG. I am taking the Minister of Railway's version of it; I do not know whether he knows anything about it or not. I think he was asked what the rates were, but he did not know. I think it would be well to fix the rates in the contract; for I have not enough confidence in the Government to think that they will have the rates fixed to suit me; I think they will be more likely to have them fixed

Mr. CRAIG.

to suit the contractors. I was rather amused at the Minister of Railways stating that the reason they did not give these men less than 25,000 acres a mile was because they would not take less. When he is asked why the Government do not fix lower rates, he may say the same thing—because the contractors will not accept lower rates. Then, what will the Government do? I do not know. I suppose they will say, "We could not do anything better, so we had to let them go." When the Minister of Railways was explaining this contract, he said he did not know whether the contractors would make anything or not, but he hoped they would. Well, I think he has a very good idea that they will, and I am sure the contractors have. He said that it was only a matter of chance—that there might not be much gold in the country after all. The hon. gentleman does not appear to have read Mr. Ogilvie's report. When he was speaking, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) suggested that it was a gamble. The Minister of Railways was pleased to have that word suggested to him, and he said it was a gamble. Well, I do not think it is a gamble at all for the contractors. I do not think there is much of a gamble about it when they will have a monopoly and good rates, and a business waiting for them, which will pay them over and over again.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Are you prepared to take a few thousands of stock?

Mr. CRAIG. Send them around to me and I will see.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not a dollar.

Mr. CRAIG. As I said, I do not intend to make any more remarks about this deal. But I thought it was only right that I should call attention to some of the statements of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), when he claimed that the Liberal party had fulfilled all their pledges. I want him to point out one pledge that they have fulfilled in reference to the tariff. I am glad, and I think the country is glad, that they have not fulfilled their pledges. More than that, I say that the hon. member for Centre Toronto was elected because they had not fulfilled their pledges, and because he was able to say that he was a protectionist and in favour of preferential trade, and other measures which the Conservative party had been advocating for years.

All these things the Conservative party have advocated for years, and if he only sat in his right place instead of on that side—if he only sat on this side, where I think he ought to be, I do not think he would stand up and say that the Liberal party had carried out its pledges. He would not, however, have to modify his ideas on

the subject of protection, because he stands just where we do on that question. I do not know whether it is vain to hope that there will be members on that side of the House who will refuse to support this contract.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There will be more on that side.

Mr. CRAIG. If these hon. gentlemen look at the matter as I do and see it with my eyes—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But the hon. gentleman says he has not read the contract.

Mr. CRAIG. I listened to the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), and I supposed that he had read it. I listened to him attentively and took notes of his speech, and I take his interpretation of the contract, and fail to see how any independent member of this House can support it. I intend to read it carefully at a future time, but I have heard sufficient from the hon. Minister of Railways to justify me in condemning it at present; and trust it is not vain to hope that there will be some members on that side with sufficient independence to oppose this iniquitous measure, if they find it is not in the interests of the country. I know that party ties and party prejudices are strong, but there are times when they should be cast aside, and I do hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will read this contract for themselves and study it carefully, and if they think it is not in the interest of the country, have the courage to vote against it. If they do, this contract, which I hold is indefensible, judging it by the explanation of the hon. Minister of Railways, will not pass this House.

Mr. SPROULE. But for the item in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, which refers to the Yukon Railway, I would have contented myself with silence on that Speech for the present, and have trusted to the chance of saying what I have to say upon the various measures announced in it, as from time to time they engage the attention of this House during this session. It appears to me, however, that this question is too momentous to let pass in silence, and we would not be doing our duty, as representing the people, if we refrained from lifting up our voices, at the earliest possible day, in condemnation of this deal. Now, I ask myself, for the moment, what has been the record of this Government in the short time they have had office. They had been in power barely twenty months; and although the Toronto "Globe" published the other day a statement that up to the present they had redeemed literally every specific promise they had made to the people, I am quite sure that that statement, even coming from that

high authority, will not be accepted by the country as correct in the face of the well known facts. I asked myself, when the "Globe" made that statement, did it refer to the policy of protection, every vestige of which was to be abolished, as we were so often and vehemently told by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) should his party ever get into power. Well, in spite of those professions, we found that in the tariff brought down last year protection was there very much the same as in the old tariff which it replaced. Of that I do not complain, but I complain of the dishonesty of the men who told the country that the interests of the Dominion required the abolition of every vestige of protection from our tariff, and who, when they got into power, found it convenient to belie their own statements by doing just the reverse. Then, I ask myself, is it in the abolition of monopolies that this Government has carried out its pledges? Why, look at the Crow's Nest Pass transaction, which they put through last session, and look at the Mann & Mackenzie contract now engaging the attention of the House, and in which we have conclusive proof that the present Government are the champions of the most dangerous monopoly which, in my judgment, it has ever been sought to establish in this country. We were unable to prevent the consummation of the Crow's Nest Pass monopoly last session, and we are to-day asked to consent to another which, in my estimation, is the worst of all; and this notwithstanding the pledge of these hon. gentlemen to destroy, when they got into office, every vestige of monopoly in the country. What an unenviable record they are building up for the party! I content myself now with merely a rapid mention of these facts, which must show the electorate how far these hon. gentlemen have been deceitful in their professions and inconsistent with the line of policy they laid down themselves.

At an early stage of the last session of Parliament the right hon. First Minister informed this House that he was compelled to go to England to pay his respects to Her Majesty on the occasion of the Queen's Jubilee, as representing this important colony of the British Empire. When he left, we were all buoyed up with the hope, knowing his great ability, that he would admirably represent this country and accomplish what the people of Canada desired so much at the time. We hoped that he would endeavour, as much as possible, to obtain preferential trade between this and the mother country for the advantage of both, seeing he has so frequently said to the Canadian people it was desirable and that he was in favour of it. The right hon. gentleman left behind him at home his right-hand man, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce

(Sir Richard Cartwright), who was supposed to be the soul of economy, who would let nothing pass that was not stamped by the most rigid economy, which these hon. gentlemen told the people was what was absolutely required. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was left here so that the people of Canada might feel certain that nothing but the most rigid economy would be practised during the absence of the First Minister. Well, my right hon. friend went to England, and at the earliest opportunity, when the intimation was given him that there was a strong probability the people of this country would receive preferential trade and that England would form with her colonies a commercial Zollverein by which we would obtain advantages that foreign countries would not enjoy, the hon. gentleman cast the intimation aside almost with scorn. He said that Canada, in her loyal generosity, was prepared to give the people of Great Britain advantages in her own markets which other countries had not, and that Canada wanted nothing in return. If the right hon. gentleman had been dealing with his own money, I could understand his acting in that generous way, but I fail to understand how he can be justified in rejecting a boon that would have been of the greatest benefit to us. Did the people of Canada expect anything of the kind from him? Did they send him over for that purpose? No, if he had told them before they entrusted him with the duty of governing this country, that he intended doing anything of the kind, they would have elected him to stay at home, and would never have given him the opportunity to represent this country in England. He would never have had the opportunity of telling the people of England that Canada did not want anything in return for the concessions she had given England. For years we had been endeavouring to educate the people of England to the desirable standpoint of entering into negotiations with us which would be mutually advantageous, and yet, at the very time when there was an immediate possibility of accomplishing this, the right hon. gentleman told the people of England we did not want it. He then came back ornamented with the Cobden medal. I notice that since then all the cartoons of the hon. gentleman show him with the Cobden medal prominently displayed on his breast, and no doubt that will stick to him as long as he lives. This is one of the evidences of inconsistency in his public career, a thing above all others, I imagine, that he ought to be ashamed of. As to the title he accepted, I say nothing about that. But when he comes before the people with a tariff affording practically the same protection as was given before, and then goes to England and convinces them that he, more than all others, had supported the cause of free trade in

Mr. SPROULE.

Canada, he shows that he was equal in a certain kind of statesmanship to that shown by Napoleon Bonaparte, who was a master in representing himself as the champion of different causes, the antipodes of each other, in different places. The right hon. the Premier convinced the Cobden Club that he was a free trader; he convinced the manufacturers of Canada that he was as much a protectionist as the Conservative Government. That is not a very enviable record.

But to come back now to what is proposed in the Speech from the Throne. I should not have risen in this debate but for the proposition in connection with this Yukon Railway. Hon. gentlemen opposite came into power declaring that if they were returned to power they would destroy monopoly, they would not give away the public domain or the public money in any way so as to fasten a monopoly upon the country. But we have submitted to us at the very beginning of this session a contract and Bill which establish, to my mind, the most outrageous monopoly and gives it an enormous area of the most valuable part of our territory. What are the grounds on which the sanction of Parliament is sought in such haste for this arrangement? The Premier has made a request that the second reading of this Bill should be moved next Tuesday and that the debate continue day by day until it is finished. This, it is said, is necessary because of the urgency of the case. Now, we are all agreed as to the necessity of a railway into that country at the earliest practicable day. But we are not agreed as to the consideration it is proposed to give for the building of the road, nor are we agreed that the matter should be decided upon the exceedingly meagre information before us. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) was asked for information, but his answer was that the Government had not had time to get it. If there is not time to get reasonable data, how can the Government ask the House to consider the question? We are here to do business on business principles. We are supposed to represent the average intelligence of the country, and to ask us to go it blind in this way, to decide such an important question on almost no information, is nothing less than an insult to the intelligence of the people's representatives, and to the people themselves. The Minister of Railways was asked: Where are the reports of the engineers? And his answer was: We have none. How then do you know what the railway is likely to cost? We do not know, he says, we have only made a guess. But, in the next breath, he says: We have sent engineers over the route. It seems that even the Minister of the Interior has gone over the route or examined two or three of the passes, doing the work not only of Minister but of engineer as well. If he has made a report to the Government surely that report ought to be

given us so that we may be enabled to judge of the merits of this proposal, as members of the Government have been. What excuse is given for this great hurry and for passing this Bill with meagre information? We are told that the urgency is great. But, as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) said, who created that urgency? It was known two years ago that gold was plentiful in that country, for it was being sent down in large quantities for the payment of customs duties on goods coming into that country. The agent of the Government, Mr. Ogilvie, has been there for years. He sent down reports from time to time. And the reports he sent down show us the almost fabulous wealth in that country. Then, why did not the Government act earlier? What urgency could there have been to justify entering into a contract ten days before Parliament was to meet. Ten days will not make so very much difference, but if it would, why not call Parliament ten days earlier? I object to this also because it was a contract entered into in secret. Why was it so made? If I have a piece of land to sell, I naturally advertise it so that I may attract the greatest number of buyers. And if a private firm have a contract to give they advertise for tenders. Why not do the same in this case. It may be said that we have only one or two contractors fit to do that work. How can that be known? We have had many contractors who have carried on gigantic works in an admirable manner. Who knows but that we have a dozen or twenty contractors who can do as well as Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. The very fact that this contract was made in secret, brings it under suspicion in the public mind. The very first thing to be done was to make this project public, so that the financial corporations of the world might have the opportunity to bid on it. But, as a matter of fact, even the members of Parliament did not know that such a contract was in contemplation. How then could the financial companies of the country be aware of it? Who did know about it? Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie certainly did. The Minister of Railways was asked if he has consulted any other firm, and he replied, yes. But when asked who they were he said he did not know. Either he had forgotten, or he had never been told. It would be interesting to know what other firms were consulted. Besides Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie, Senator Cox, who seems to get an inkling of all these things, had some information about it. Then where was Mr. Jaffray, a friend of the Government, a gentleman who is known as one of the liberal givers of the party. But the rest of the country seems to have known nothing at all about the matter.

Then, the consideration given for the construction of the road is infinitely too large. If we can believe but a part of what we hear, it is plain that land to be given con-

tains fabulous wealth entirely out of proportion to the expected cost of this road. We listened to Mr. Ogilvie last night, and he gave us valuable information about that country. He told us, for instance, that one man bought a small claim of about 250 feet square for \$4,000, paying \$500, all the money he had. He worked for a few months, and at the end of that time, by his own unaided labour, he had taken \$15,000 worth out of that hole, and it was said to be no bigger than a grave in which a man could lie. Now, if one single man, with his pick and shovel and his little trough, can take that out of one hole, and there are so many of them there equally rich, then I say that we are giving away land in that country possessing fabulous wealth. What are we giving? We are giving 25,000 acres of land per mile. There is nothing to show what should be the outside limit of the amount of land that we will give; we will at least give that. It is estimated that we will give at least 3,750,000 acres of that land. And how is it selected? It is selected in a way that enables the contractors, or the company that represents the contractors, or the corporation, to take up all the gold-bearing lands in that country that are not already taken up. It gives them power in that contract to freeze out every man that has grub-staked his claim there, and who is working it successfully at the present time, if they can get the land around it. Now, I say we are giving entirely too much. During last session of this Parliament, had it not been for the Upper Chamber, this country would have been committed to an expenditure yearly representing a capital of seven million dollars for the Drummond County Railway, and the advantages that we were to receive from the Grand Trunk Railway for the Intercolonial Railway coming into Montreal. During last session, also, we gave away what we believed to be the most wealthy part of the mining lands in British Columbia in the shape of coal lands to another company known as the Crow's Nest Pass Company. We gave them a large amount of land and about three and three-quarter million dollars to build a railway there. We also gave them a monopoly, besides the coal land there, for all time to come, and we consider that coal is the most valuable mineral we have in that country to-day. Now, at the opening of the present session, the first thing that meets us is a proposition to give a large tract of the richest gold lands that we have in the country. We give these people a right to control, so far as we know, all the gold lands that we possess in that country at the present time; indeed, we give them a great deal more, because, after they take what is given to them, they can cover all the gold lands that we possess at the present time that are not already taken up, and yet they will not have selected half the land that is coming to them. I think we are giving too great a consideration entirely. And for

what? For building what is practically a tramway out of the old rails of the Lethbridge Railway, the old cars and the old iron that is lying there, and worth nothing to the people that own it to-day except what it might be sold for as old iron. In order to secure transportation facilities into that country, we are going to give away the massive wealth that is contained in the gold-bearing areas of that country. But we are told that we do not know what it is going to cost. Now, if we do not know what it is going to cost, and the Government do not know, then I say they should not ask this House to sanction the contract, going it blindly, as they are doing in this instance. The country expects better of them, the country expects that when they submit anything to this House, it will be accompanied by such information as will enable the representatives of the people to judge fairly whether it is a good bargain or a bad one, whether it is in the interest of the country that it should be sanctioned or whether it would be against the interest of the country if we did so. Therefore, I say, that in view of the lack of information, we are justified in refusing to sanction this contract. But then, we are told, as an important consideration, that we require an all-Canadian railway route; and yet, in the next breath, when the Minister of Railways and Canals was asked, Is this an all-Canadian route, where is the starting point of this railway, he tells us that it is in the United States. Then, if it is in the United States, how can it be an all-Canadian route? Now, we are told that one of the things above all others that is most to be desired is, that it should be gone on with at once. People are going in there, freight is waiting there for some means to carry it, we are hampered with that transportation trouble, and with the freight regulations that the United States may impose upon us in the way of a customs duty, and therefore we want an all-Canadian route. The "Globe" told us that it is an all-Canadian route, but the Minister of Railways says that it is an all-Canadian route that starts in the United States. Then, if it starts in the United States, it cannot be an all-Canadian route. Now, we have only a right to use that river at Fort Wrangell the same as the United States have, and, notwithstanding the fact that we start there, and notwithstanding the concessions that the Minister of Railways says the United States are giving us to-day, they may change these concessions to-morrow, if it suits their purpose, and they may hamper us to such an extent that we cannot carry on trade successfully from that point; so that that great consideration of an all-Canadian route will then entirely disappear, and will prove not to be what it is now represented to the people of Canada. It is not an all-Canadian route, because the point from which it starts, Fort Wrangell, is in the United States. Now, I say the

Mr. SPROULE.

contract gives this company a monopoly in transportation and a monopoly in mining. We raised a great complaint against the contract that was entered into by the Ontario Government with the Engledeue Company about their mining belt in the province of Ontario, and we thought that was a dangerous monopoly. But it sinks into insignificance when put alongside this one that you are now proposing to give this company. Why, they can control the transportation in that country, and take immense sums out of the people for transporting the stuff that is likely to go in there in the next few years, if they keep the tolls as high as they are likely to keep them. They would make enough out of transportation alone, saying nothing about the gold-bearing lands, to pay them for the cost of this railway two or three times over. But they have control over these transportation rates for several years. The Government says that we cannot have another road there for several years. Now, we heard a great deal of complaint from hon. members on that side of the House, when our friends were in power, with regard to the dangerous monopoly that was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company when they went into Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and they fought that point so strongly and educated the sentiment of the people in that western country to such a pitch that they were almost up in open rebellion against that monopoly; they created a feeling in Ontario against the so-called monopoly; they made protestations so loud before the electorate that one would have thought they would be the last people in the world ever to give a monopoly to any company in transportation. But no sooner are they in power, than they go further themselves than the previous Government, and they give even a more dangerous monopoly than that could possibly be. Why? Because Manitoba and the North-west Territories must settle up slowly, and the amount of goods carried over that road for a few years is very small. But here we are told there is a large quantity of freight waiting to be carried by some company, by some road, and therefore whatever is done to create traffic there will be done inside the next two or three years. Greater development will take place in that country in the next two years than took place in the North-west Territories, with regard to freight, in some ten or twelve years. Therefore, the monopoly is dangerous in proportion to the necessity of having a route. Then, it gives a monopoly over mining, because every prospector in that country becomes an agent for this company. They have a right, as soon as they find lands with gold in paying quantities in any locality, at once to run their base line. By the powers given them they can run it in almost any direction; they can run it north, or south, or east, or west; they can run it according

to the general line of the water-course of a lake or stream. Then, when that does not satisfy their purpose, they can vary it and change it in one direction or the other. So that practically you say to them: You can plant your stakes anywhere, you can run your base-line in any direction, even so as to take up the land around where a man has been working for months and where he has ascertained that there is gold in paying quantities. I should like to ask a question which seems to be very important and interesting to the poor man. What is to prevent this company, in the event of a man finding gold in a certain place, acquiring all the lands surrounding his claim, which would be only a few hundred feet square? What is to hinder the company so hampering the miner in his operations that it will be practically impossible for him to continue his operations? In such an event, he would not be able to travel through the company's property without becoming a trespasser, and he would have no means of transportation except by their will and pleasure. How can a miner carry on his operations under such conditions? The miner would be forced to sell his property, for he would have no means of ingress and egress. Does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries say he would not.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do.

MR. SPROULE. What right would he have to go in and out in order to carry on his operations?

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He would have perfect right of access.

MR. SPROULE. Is it given to him in the contract?

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It does not matter whether it is expressly stated, he possesses it at common law.

MR. SPROULE. It must be at common law, or under the mining law, or under this contract.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Have you read the common law to ascertain the fact?

MR. SPROULE. I have tried to find out from those who ought to know, from legal gentlemen who are members of the House, and they have been unable to tell me that it is so. They do not think it is so. I am therefore justified in supposing it is not so, and I have the right to ask for this information because it is very important for every poor miner who has endured the hardships and at length found a spot where gold can be mined. This is a point that should be made plain, because the miners do not know their position, and in my opinion they will be hampered and forced out of their claims and this gigantic company

will take control, the miners being obliged to sell at whatever price the company will be disposed to give, and that will not be the outside value. There is another very important consideration which seems to have been lost sight of, and it is this. The company can sell out their contract to an English company or to any foreign company, and no doubt Mr. Mackenzie is going over to England for that purpose. Possessing those rights you could float companies over there with capital of millions, or keep half or three-fourths of the stock in your own hands; these men will be able to raise money to build the road fifty times over, and let the new company come out and prospect the lands, and at the end leave the present contractors multi-millionaires. One clause of the contract reads:

3. Upon the incorporation of said company and upon the assignment by the contractors to such company of this agreement, and upon the said company covenanting with the Government to carry out the same, and upon the said railway from Stickine River to Teslin Lake being completed and accepted as aforesaid, the contractors shall then, but not before, be relieved from personal responsibility hereunder.

We are told the country needs an all-rail Canadian road. But suppose this company sold all its rights to an American company in California or New York interested in controlling transportation routes to that country, how easily they could secure that control. There is no provision that this shall continue to be run as an all-Canadian route. In view of the absence of such a clause it is little less than childish to declare that it provides that we control our transportation route, which will mean keeping the trade in the hands of and for the interest of Canadians. There is nothing, I repeat, to prevent the contract being sold to an American, English or German company, giving them this great gold region and the control of the transportation route, in opposition to the interests of British Columbia, Manitoba, the North-west Territories as well as the eastern provinces. There is nothing to prevent the contractors selling out and any other corporation acquiring the contract. What, then, would be the position? We would be in the position similar to that of the United States towards the Alaska Company, which controls that territory. The company would acquire vested rights, and we could not interfere with them because there had been a sacred contract made with Parliament which could not be broken, and the people of Canada would thereby be called upon to suffer from the shortsightedness of the Government which made the contract. It is a shortsighted contract, and a bad one for the people of Canada. Let hon. members look at the relative percentages to be paid as royalty. This great and wealthy corporation, which can make millions out of the mining rights on their lands, are

asked to pay a royalty of one per cent on the gold mined, while the poor miner who has been obliged to meet great difficulties and even lie out in the snow in that inhospitable country, is charged 10 per cent royalty. We give the company the same rights as the miner, but we only ask one per cent royalty from them. This amount is either too low as regards this corporation or too high towards the poor miner. There is no power which can convince the miner that he is receiving full justice from the Government when they demand 10 per cent royalty on the gold he takes out as the result of his labour and hardships, while at the same time they ask only one per cent royalty from this corporation. An hon. member has handed me a clipping which appears to support my contention. The paragraph is headed: "Millions in It," and is from a paper published in the province of Quebec. It is as follows:—

Mr. Mann, one of the contractors of the Yukon Railway, it appears, declared yesterday in Vancouver that this year his line would carry between two hundred and fifty and three hundred thousand tons of freight. At \$50 a ton—an extremely moderate rate—that will give a revenue, for the first year, of fifteen millions for a line that will not cost three millions. And it is to allow two contractors to do such a good stroke of business that the Government grants them nearly four millions of acres of gold-bearing lands.

We are justified in concluding that that statement is true, because it is founded on a fair estimate of the quantity of trade that must be handled by that company. This royalty is undoubtedly too large to be paid by the poor miner. The discrimination is in favour of the wealthy, and against the poor man, who is already handicapped in life, as is every man who earns his living by the labour of his hands and the sweat of his brow. This contract gives power to the company to squeeze every miner out of the country. This is protection for the poor labourer with a vengeance. It is, however, complete protection for the great corporation and the wealthy men who already have everything with which to protect themselves; it is according to my mind one of the greatest strokes of protection possible for this powerful corporation and the least protection that could be afforded to the poor man who is working on his claim.

Hon. gentlemen have only been twenty months in power and already they have built up a record, in the course of which they have failed to carry out their promises and pledges to the people. Formerly everything was for the poor man, to-day everything is for the rich man, as was also seen in the contract for the Crow's Nest Pass. That deal was forced through at the end of last session when most of the members had gone home, and the first piece of legislation this session is in reference to this

extraordinary deal. When we take 5,860 square miles out of the gold-bearing lands, what will be left? Scarcely anything worth leaving, and this corporation will practically own the gold-mining region, while at the same time they will possess a monopoly of transportation under the contract, when Parliament passes it, but I trust Parliament will not pass it. What will the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) say? His platform was: No monopolies and no more assistance to railways. What will the members from the North-west say, for they endorsed the platform of the Patrons? What will the hon. member from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) say, for he fought against monopolies and railway grants for years past? What will the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Somerville) say? These gentlemen were always crying in days past: "Down with the monopolies; restrict rich corporations; do not give assistance to railways in land grants or in money grants out of the public treasury." What will the hon. members from British Columbia do in regard to this contract, and this monopoly? They know as well as I do, they know better than I do, that this monopoly will be against the interests of their country, as it will to a great extent lock up in the hands of these great corporations the gold fields of that country for all time to come. What will these members say if an American company gets control of the transportation which this contract gives? But, we are told: Oh, but the Government control the freight rates. Do they? As I read the contract it only provides for supervision over the tolls collected by the contractors or the contractors' company on the line of railway, between the Stikine River and Teslin Lake. But this company are to put boats on that river, and they are to carry freight from the terminus of the line down to Dawson City, and will any one tell me that the Government can control the rates to be charged on the other parts of the route? The Government have no power to interfere with rates except on the line of railway, and in all other cases the contractors have unlimited right to do as they please. The contractors get their freight at Fort Wrangell, and the Government control the tolls over the line of railway, but they do not and cannot interfere with the tolls over the greater portion of the route where the high rates no doubt will be imposed. Who is going to give information to the Government as to whether the rates charged by the contractors are fair or unfair? Will the rates be based on the cost of transit to-day when you have to go through these mountain passes by dog trains and submit to the many inconveniences which exist? Upon whose recommendation will the rates be fixed by the Government? Why, the company will come down to Ottawa here and make representations that it is worth so much to carry that freight

through, and by these representations of the contractors the Government will be influenced. The Government have sent no persons up there to obtain for them reliable data and information, or if they have, they have carefully kept it from the representatives of the people in this House. We are justified, Sir, in coming to the conclusion that the freight rates which will be charged there in the first instance will be both exorbitant and extravagant. The other evil connected with the contract is that you cannot disturb the freight tariff first established for four years. Why, Sir, with free competition in that country, in four years the whole face of the situation would be changed with regard to railway tolls. My friend (Mr. Domville) who is now advocating a road through from Edmonton—to my mind one of the most valuable routes of all—what does he think of this contract? The contractors have control of the transportation now. His road will get no support but this road will get everything. What chance have the people of the North-west Territories to get any road into that Yukon country, when every consideration is given to the present contractors, and none will be given to them for five years?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. That does not extend to the North-west Territories.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Which does not?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It does not interfere with building a railway from Edmonton.

Mr. **SPROULE**. It does not interfere, I suppose, but that road will get no assistance. If you give all the assistance to one route you handicap all the others.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Oh, no.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Certainly it does. You say you will not give any assistance to railways for a number of years.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No such thing.

Mr. **SPROULE**. How much land will you give any other road, then?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman is not fair; he knows that is not the case. If the hon. gentleman reads the contract, he will see that only relates to lines running from the international boundary.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Will the hon. Minister (Sir Louis Davies) be kind enough to read the contract. I have read it and I know that is what is said.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I say that provision only relates to lines running to the international boundary line, and does not relate to any

line running to the North-west Territories or to any point upon the Canadian railway.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Does the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) say that they have not contracted and agreed to give no franchise rights to build a road there for some years?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do most assuredly say that we do not. The hon. gentleman's mind is filled with a wrong conclusion altogether. There is nothing of the kind in the contract.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I ask the hon. gentleman to read the clause and then set me right if I am wrong.

Mr. **CAMPBELL**. Take a half hour after dinner, Doctor, and you will understand it.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I am not speaking to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell). He will have enough to do to square himself with his own constituents on this question.

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

After Recess.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Mr. Speaker, before you left the Chair at Six o'clock, a controversy arose between the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) and myself regarding what I considered the portion of the monopoly given to this company, that is, as to the right of any other company to build a railway into that district. In justice to the Minister and also to myself, I am pleased to say that I had not correctly read the clause. In reading it hurriedly in the very short time at my disposal, I failed to grasp the whole extent and meaning of that portion, and therefore I did an injustice to the Minister. But it still contains a very important monopoly to the company, and I will read it, so that it may be plain to those who take any interest in it:

For five years from the first of September, 1898, no line of railway shall be authorized by Parliament to be constructed from Lynn Canal or thereabouts or from any point at or near the international boundary between Canada and Alaska into the Yukon District, and for five years from said date no aid in land or money shall be granted to any person or company other than the contractors and the contractors' company to assist in building any such railway.

The important feature of that clause, I take it, is this. Any company building a railway rapidly into that country would naturally run it from the international boundary or from Lynn Canal, because that is the shortest and most available route for obtaining ingress into and egress from the country. This makes the monopoly to this company all the more important, for they will control it for at least five years. No other company can expect or will receive any assistance from the Government for a competing line, for it is provided:

The contractors and the contractors' company shall be entitled to receive in preference to any other person or company during ten years from said first of September, 1898, such aid or assistance in land or money as the Government may be authorized and may see fit to grant in aid of a line of railway from the Stickine River to an ocean port in British Columbia.

In one instance, they have a monopoly for five years, during which time no other corporation will receive a charter or be assisted by the Government, and in the other instance they have the option of any assistance that is given for ten years. So, I say it becomes a very important monopoly to them and a very dangerous one to the country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will pardon me, I know, because he is now stating the contract correctly. I wish to call his attention to one limitation which he has omitted, that the company are only entitled to the option for ten years to build for the best terms the Government can get to an ocean port, but even that option does not extend to any line built to Ashcroft or to Edmonton or to any point along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway or to any other portion of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that. That was the important difference, I understood, between the hon. Minister and myself. But they have this option, which I consider a very dangerous one. I have said that the contractors have control not only over the railway transportation, which is to be regulated in the first instance by the Governor in Council, but over the transportation on the river to this extent :

The contractors or contractors' company shall provide, or arrange with others to provide, steamboat transport of freight and passengers between the terminus of said railway on Teslin Lake, or other terminus northerly thereof, and Dawson City to and fro.

Now, I hold that the monopoly of the transportation of goods over the railway gives the company a special advantage in controlling the steamboat transportation on the river. As they will handle the goods in the first instance, another company cannot get as fair a chance to carry the goods after they leave the railway as their own company or the company they arrange with. Then, the Government have taken no power to control the steamboat rates, and the steamboat companies, which will transport the goods five or six times the distance the railway will, will be under the control of this company. Consequently, their monopoly will give them the power to control the freight rates for the whole distance. While the Government takes power to fix the rates for the short distance over the railway, it leaves the company with full power to charge exorbitant prices upon freight taken for a long distance over their own steam-

Mr. SPROULE.

boat lines or over the steamboat lines they arrange with.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend will see that as regards the railway line there is no competition, and we have taken power to control the rates. With regard to the water line, there may be fifty steamboat companies in competition with each other, which forms a sufficient control without our making provision for control.

Mr. SPROULE. I see that plainly ; but I will suppose that I am sending goods over the Canadian Pacific Railway to Manitoba or the North-west Territories, and I reach a point where two railway lines are available. There I might have competition, but the goods having to be consigned over the Canadian Pacific Railway in the first instance, gives that company a power to make it impossible for me to utilize another railway line and get the advantages of the competition. We find that railways do exercise this power to-day to the disadvantage and inconvenience of the public. For that reason, I say the contractors have practically a monopoly over the steamboat transportation, and we have no control over the freight rates they may charge to the people in that country. I understood the hon. Minister of Railways, I do not know whether correctly or not, to say, with regard to the deposit, that the contractors deposited \$250,000 in cash, and that we were to get the interest on that deposit.

Mr. WALLACE. No, they get it.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood him to say that we get it. I thought that was absurd, because if they put their money on deposit, I do not see why they should not get interest on it, and that is what the contract says. Then, this contract practically gives the contractors a roving commission to build railways all over that district. Does the Minister deny that ? If so, I will give him the clause.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is right.

Mr. SPROULE. It gives them the power to build—

An extension northward to Dawson City, and an extension southward to a point in British Columbia designated by the Government and capable of being made an ocean port, also a line of railway from the waters of Lynn Canal to Fort Selkirk or thereabouts, by way of Chilkat Pass, also branch lines of railway from any points on the company's railway to any property owned by the company, also lines of railway from any navigable waters to any property owned by the company.

It does not specify the navigable waters, and therefore practically all they have to do is to get property anywhere, and then build to any of the navigable waters in that

country in any direction, north, south, east or west.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to that, because I am quite sure he will not object when he knows the facts. Suppose this company run a base line of forty, fifty or one hundred miles from Teslin Lake—suppose they run a base line and determine to build a large smelting works and carry on quartz mining and spend a large amount of money in development. Will the hon. gentleman object to giving them power to build a railway to carry their quartz to navigable waters?

Mr. SPROULE. No, but suppose another company has property in that country and wishes to build to some navigable water.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is nothing to prevent it.

Mr. SPROULE. And this company objects on the ground that they have the right to build a line in the same direction from their property to the same navigable water.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That does not exclude any competitive line that Parliament may choose to grant a charter to.

Mr. SPROULE. No, but this company has the right to build the line, and will claim that Parliament has no right to grant competition in that locality.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, yes, it has.

Mr. SPROULE. This company will put that up as a vested right, no doubt, so that practically they are given a roving commission to build railways all over the country, as I understand it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Would you object to that?

Mr. SPROULE. No, if the same right were given to all others. What I object to is giving it to one company alone. If you give it to everybody else, I have not the slightest objection. The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) dilated with a great deal of force on the provision denying them the right to the bed of navigable rivers, and the "Globe" claimed that this provision was inserted so that the company might be prevented from interfering with the placer mining of the poor man. But we find that this was not the object. We find this was limited to certain specified rivers and lakes, and looking up the map to see where these specified rivers are, we find that they are not in the gold-bearing district at all. What are they:

No portion of the beds of the rivers Yukon, Lewes, Hootalinqua, or of the lakes Teslin, Bennett, Tagish, Labarge or Marsh.

Not one of these is in the district where the gold is known to exist in large quantities.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not the Yukon River?

Mr. SPROULE. The gold-bearing beds are not on the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The gold-bearing beds, which have been discovered so far, are not on the Yukon but on the tributaries to it.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But the hon. gentleman knows that these rivers run through that portion of the territory which Mr. Ogilvie has reported to be the gold-bearing district.

Mr. SPROULE. The public were led to believe that this was done to safeguard the placer mining, whereas it was not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Let me explain why it was done. I happen to know pretty well, because I was at the making of the contract. It was done to preserve navigation. These rivers form the navigable waters down to Dawson City, and from the reports of Mr. Ogilvie and others it was found absolutely necessary to protect the interests of companies who would run boats up and down that river, by giving them the right to stop at any stopping place on either side of the river, so that we not only reserve the bed of the river, but twenty-five feet on each side, for landing places wherever they could be found. Thus any number of lines will be at liberty, without prohibition from this company, to have these stopping places.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman had been present when the Minister of Railways made his explanation—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was not, unfortunately.

Mr. SPROULE—he would have heard that hon. gentleman say that this was to prevent gold mining in the beds where the poor miners were carrying on operations. The object of the clause may be a very good one, but the country was misled by the explanation of the "Globe" that it was intended to protect the poor man in his placer mining, whereas it has no connection with that at all, because it is not in these rivers and lakes that gold has been found in any paying quantities up to the present time.

The contract also provides that "the contractors shall upon application sell to actual settlers for farming purposes, at prices to be fixed by the Governor in Council, any arable lands forming part of these selected

hereunder," and the "Globe" dwelt on that at great length. But this applies to a country where, according to Mr. Ogilvie, you could only raise potatoes if you kept them blanketed all summer. The newspapers supporting hon. gentlemen opposite dilated on this. They said: We did not do as you did in the North-west case, leave it optional to that company to put on their arable lands any price they like. We, on the contrary, have safeguarded the people who will go into farm there, by compelling the company to sell to them at prices fixed by the Governor in Council. What object could these newspapers have, except to hoodwink and blind the people when they advanced such an argument? Why, all the information we have shows that it is absolutely impossible to grow anything in that country which is grown on the farms here, and that in fact there is no arable land in it. I believe that this is a very bad bargain and I condemn it. I condemn it, first, because it is a secret bargain, made in secret with parties whom we do not know—because no publicity was given to it and no tenders invited. No information was given to capitalists that such a road was under consideration and required, and the contract was entered into, in this secret manner, with individuals who are, in all likelihood, going to make a great deal out of it and give the country a very small return.

I condemn it because we are asked to enter into the contract without any information to enable us to estimate the cost of it, the quality of the road when built, or the amount of money we are giving for it. We have none of the data that would enable us, as representing the people, to intelligently deal with it.

I condemn it because we are, so far as any one can judge, with the information available, paying entirely too much for it.

I condemn it because it creates a monopoly of transportation, a monopoly of mining, which will assuredly be detrimental to the individual miner and prospector as well as to the people of the country generally. There can be no doubt whatever on that point.

I condemn it because it gives power to crush out the poor miner and labourer, whose rights are not protected against a powerful corporation. They cannot fight such a corporation, and a miner, after prospecting for a length of time, using his means and labour and undergoing hardship, whenever he reaches the paying goal, can be crushed remorselessly by that powerful corporation.

I condemn it because it is not an all-Canadian route. That is one of the strong grounds on which we are asked to support it—that it will be an all-Canadian route, which will ensure to the people of Canada the right to carry on their own trade, through their own country, without any competition.

Mr. SPROULE.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. But there is no doubt that the United States have it in their power to hamper us by means of customs regulations and prevent our effectively using that road, if they so desire.

I condemn it because there is nothing in the contract to prevent the company from selling out to any foreign corporation at any time, and putting it in the power of a foreign company to control transportation to the detriment of Canada and the Canadian miner.

I condemn it because it establishes a bad precedent that will be quoted as a justification for every scaly transaction that may be presented to Parliament in future.

I condemn it because the suspicious circumstances surrounding the whole transaction savour of a job out of which some parties are likely to make a great deal of money without giving value to the country in return.

I may say that there is one strange coincidence which particularly struck me in connection with this matter. It was a peculiar time when this was announced to the world, at the same time as was the dissolution of the Ontario House. The provincial legislature had prorogued, but there was no dissolution. The papers on both sides said that there was to be a dissolution, and the election would immediately follow, but it was held back, nobody knew why. But the very day after this bargain was announced the dissolution took place. Here were just grounds for suspicion. We find politicians interested in the advancement of the party of the Dominion, and in the province co-operating. Take, for instance, Senator Cox, Mr. Jaffray, Mr. Willison, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Mann and others. There is no power that can convince the people of Ontario that there is not a heavy subscription coming out of that deal to be used in the provincial elections against the opponents of the Liberal party. I hope it is not the case. I should like to see the time in Canadian public life when both parties would go to the country upon a fair and honest basis, without advantage being taken by either in the expenditure of money or in the use of patronage by which they can deal out cold justice or warm justice as the circumstances may require. I feel that we have not yet reached those happy days. I believe that the time will come when it will be shown that in the election now about to be held the Government party had at their disposal money which they used in it that came directly or indirectly out of the secret contract entered into at that time.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, while there are some things in the Speech from the Throne that pleases me, there are some things, as sometimes happens, that I cannot approve. As a matter of course I think

that the Government has done well in recognizing the bountiful harvest as the great cause of our prosperity. Another cause of that prosperity is not that, as the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) said, the Government had carried out its pledges, but that they have not. The only pledges that they have really carried out in their tariff legislation is with reference to binder twine and barbed wire. And we have seen the effects of taking the duty off binder twine. We have had the hon. Senator Cox down here with a deputation to interview the Government on that subject. He told them that he had bought stock in binder twine industry under the protective tariff for which he had paid par, and, if they did not restore the duties he would be glad to take fifteen cents on the dollar for it. Not only that, but he said that this company had large dealings with the bank with which he was connected, and if the duty was not restored the bank would be unable to make further advances to carry on the business. That is a very serious state of things. Then Mr. Ballantyne, a prominent Reformer of western Ontario, representing the patron binder twine concern, was here with a deputation of stockholders—I presume they were stockholders—in that concern for the same purpose. What action the Government has taken, of course, I do not know. I hope they will restore the duty, because I would rather see our manufacturers prosper than to see their men walking the streets idle because the Government is trying to be consistent on this small scale. I would like to refer the hon. member for Centre Toronto to his neighbour, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). That hon. gentleman publishes a paper in Winnipeg, in which he said a very short time ago that if the Government put binder twine on the dutiable list again, they would have abandoned all that they contended for except with regard to barbed wire. From what I have seen of the hon. member for Lisgar, I take it that he is a very strong free trader when he is in the west, but when he comes east his policy is not to quarrel with the Government. I would like to give the hon. member for Centre Toronto evidence that the Liberal party did pledge itself for free trade, that is if the leader can pledge his party. I think that no person will deny that the Premier at a public meeting in Montreal in the general election campaign of 1896 promised that he would take the duty off iron and coal. I presume the reason he made these specific promises was that he had been talking free trade very strongly, and fearing that he was in danger of alienating the manufacturers, offered them free materials in this way as an inducement on the other side. Not only that, but the hon. gentleman, in a speech at Grand River, in Gaspé county, in August, 1895, said: "If he were Prime Minister he would make it his busi-

ness to remove the duty on pork and flour." The hon. member for Centre Toronto knows that not one of these four articles has been placed on the free list. The Government did reduce the duty on flour, but so very little that the change had no practical effect. I desire to refer to the utterances of another prominent member of the Government, although he does not occupy so prominent a position in the Government as it was anticipated he would—for obvious reasons. I refer to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). It was said that a direct bargain was made by the leaders of the Reform party that if they came into power they would not have Sir Richard Cartwright as Finance Minister, the manufacturers being afraid to trust him because he was such an ardent free trader and had made such strong statements throughout the country. He said:

We will collect a revenue by duties placed upon articles which we cannot produce in Canada, as that is the only possible method of taking every vestige of protection out of the tariff and still raising a revenue.

I believe that is the principle adopted in England, and so the main effect of duties is to increase the revenue. We know that a few years ago the Minister of Trade and Commerce talked very extravagantly of the National Policy robbing the people. He has said time and again that it filched from fifty to one hundred million of dollars a year out of the pockets of the people for the benefit of the manufacturers. Supposing that to be true, I do not know of language strong enough to characterize the acts of the present Government, because, if the ex-Finance Minister, Mr. Foster, is any authority, they have only reduced the tariff 71 one hundredths of one per cent; consequently they are still taking very nearly 100 millions out of the pockets of the people, in addition to what goes into the public treasury. But I think the good sense of this House does not credit that statement. I think that was probably one reason why the Liberal party kept the Minister of Trade and Commerce off the stump during the last election, namely, because to his extravagant statements, they were so extravagant that the people could not really believe them. I have several other extracts from speeches of the hon. gentleman. On October 25, he said:

The time is ripe for very extensive and far-reaching reforms. I, for my part, would be sorry to see the issue dwindled down to a mere question of revenue tariff. We need, among other things, a radical readjustment, not only of our tariff, but of the whole system of taxation.

Now that puts me in mind of an incident that occurred when the Mackenzie Administration was in power some years ago. They fell into the habit of having successive deficits, until the sum total became a very serious matter. So they said they must raise more revenue, and the present Min-

ister of Trade and Commerce, who was then Finance Minister, undertook to readjust the tariff. After tinkering with it for a considerable length of time, they paid the highest compliment they could to the policy of their predecessors, by adopting their duties, only adding 2½ per cent. That is just what they have done in this present Parliament; they have pursued the same course in open violation of all their pledges made to the country during the time they were in Opposition. Now if you will look at "Hansard" for 1893, page 714, you will find this :

Our policy from first to last has been to destroy protection, which has been grinding out the vitals of the country.

Sir, I would like to ask the hon. member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Bertram) if he has ever seen the speeches of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, or whether he entirely ignores him as a leader of the party, or whether he feels that he cannot be bound by the expressions of any leader. I will say this for the hon. member for Centre Toronto, that I was much pleased with his address on the whole, particularly with his manner of delivery. Of course I did not agree with his matter altogether, as we see things from very different standpoints. Now I will give you another one of the strong statements of the hon. Minister with reference to free trade and protection :

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours. This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

Now that was putting it very straight and strong. Well, there is another hon. gentleman in the Cabinet who talks a good deal, who is a very nice fellow, but he seems to change his opinion pretty frequently also. I do not know whether he is able to give reasons for the change or not. Sometimes hon. gentlemen feel called upon to give reasons and sometimes they do not. I refer now to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). He is leading the House to-night, and he is doing it admirably. Speaking at Middleton, in 1893, he is reported to have said :

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

Now, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he thinks the coun-

Mr. WILSON.

try has pronounced in favour of the Liberal party on these lines. If he does think so, then I think the Liberal party is acting very unfairly towards the country, because if the country pronounced in favour of the Liberal policy, certainly the party ought to carry out that policy. But when they came to power they found that they had made statements the fulfilment of which the country would not sanction, and promises that their followers in Parliament would not endorse. Well, what did they resort to? They appointed a commission to go all over this country and interview the manufacturers, business men and farmers. They had ridiculed the Conservative party for doing the same thing; but I do not ridicule the Reform party for doing it; I think they acted wisely and well. I think it is much better that they should break their promises, that their leader should be discredited, and the whole party, for that matter, than that the country should be ruined by their keeping their pledges. Now the leader of the party made some other promises. The Liberal party in our part of the country is always posing as the party of purity. They have looked upon other people as not being quite as good as they were. During the last election campaign they tried to make the people believe that the Conservative party was a party of corruption, and I think perhaps they almost persuaded them that it was so. Therefore it is not to be wondered at that a large number of people believed in the principles enunciated by the leader of this Government, in the city of Toronto, in 1896, where he made this statement :

When last Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in Toronto he delivered a speech at the Massey Hall, in which he said that no man who had been connected with any questionable transaction should hold a position of honour and responsibility under the Crown.

I believe all the people in the city of Toronto would endorse that remark. I believe the people of this country as a whole would endorse that principle; and I hope that the time will soon come when we will have no other class of men in the Cabinet. I may say that for my own part I wish there were no other class of men in this House, because I think that the representatives of the people should be men who are above suspicion. He went on to say :

He cited several French cases in which public men had been compelled on mere suspicion to abandon public life. He added that this was the standard of morality that he would set up. He would give us clean men, men of whom not one unfavourable criticism could be uttered.

This was the language used by the hon. gentleman at the same time that one of his most intimate friends was the famous Mr. Ernest Pacaud, a gentleman who had taken \$100,000 of the public money of the province of Quebec to carry on elections, trying to elect the Liberal party in 1891.

and whatever was left was spent in protesting the seats of Conservative members. Then there was Mr. Charles Langellier, who was Secretary of State in the Quebec Liberal Government. He was helping Mr. Pacaud to get these letters of credit discounted, and it was shown clearly before the commission appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor, that these men had corruptly taken public money and spent it for election purposes. I do not intend to go into that particular matter any further. I am sorry the Minister of Railways is not in his seat at the present moment, and in his absence I should like the leader of the House to give me his attention for a moment. I find it reported that at a public meeting held in Kingston about 31st January, a telegram was read purporting to come from the Minister of Railways. Mr. Harty read a telegram from Mr. Blair promising that a contract for three engines would be given to the locomotive works for construction at once, with a promise that another order would follow after Parliament had made the necessary appropriation. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman now leading the House if he is aware whether Mr. Blair sent such a telegram.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I am not.

Mr. WILSON. Is it a secret as to whether such an Order in Council was passed or not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not heard of it.

Mr. WILSON. Then, we must take it for granted that it was a bogus telegram.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not suggest that. I simply say I do not know.

Mr. WILSON. It looks as if it had been sent to influence the electors of Kingston to vote for Mr. Harty. The present leader of the Government, who is so pure, and announced his policy so clearly, and stated what kind of men he would secure to form a Cabinet, seems to have a very dear friend, one who has been a very dear friend to other men in politics, and who still says he is a Tory. About the first man called to office was the very intimate friend of Connolly—I refer to Mr. Tarte, and I am sorry he is not in his seat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member must refer to an hon. member by the constituency he represents.

Mr. WILSON. I will take that back, and say, the Minister of Public Works. It was not stated with the intention of being an insult to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. But I observe the hon. gentleman made the mistake in mentioning other names.

Mr. WILSON. I am very much obliged to the Deputy Speaker for calling me to order. I was going on to say that about the first man asked to become a member of the Cabinet was no less a person than the present Minister of Public Works. At Lévis, on 17th or 18th December last, the Minister of Public Works explained how he entered the Cabinet. He said:

I regret to know that certain groups have not full confidence in me. I have done for the best. I have often been tempted to go back to journalism. When Sir Wilfrid Laurier called me into his Cabinet, I said, "You know I am a poor man; allow me to attend to my business." But he said, "I have received the support of many Conservatives. I want you in the Cabinet to represent them."

It was very liberal for the First Minister to appoint the hon. gentleman to represent those Conservatives who had voted with him at the last general elections. I know some Conservatives who, perhaps, do not look upon the Minister as their representative.

I wish to call the attention of the House for a few moments to a statement made by the Minister of Public Works at the Grenier trial. The hon. gentleman was put into the witness-box and there made a statement under oath: that Mr. Pacaud had come to him and made a proposition that if the Opposition in the local House of Quebec offered no opposition to the award of Mr. Whelan's claim, he would give him \$5,000. The Minister of Public Works said he went to the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Taillon, who said he was not going to offer any opposition to it, and Mr. Pacaud paid him the \$5,000. The Minister said that he was doing no wrong, that he was not a member of Parliament, that it was not public money, that he did not take it for his private purposes, that he used it for political purposes, and the great virtue of the expenditure was that it weakened his opponents just to that extent. There are many Reform papers published in the country, and it may be interesting to observe what they say in regard to the Minister of Public Works. The following article appeared in the Huntingdon "Gleaner" in the early part of October:—

He (Mr. Tarte) was to have been paid a salary of \$4,000 as organizer and actually got only \$1,300, which he spent for the party. That he bled contractors and politicians aspiring to seats, and received Government money for which he had given no value, he frankly acknowledged, yet claimed he was innocent, because he spent the money for party purposes.

His entire defence is to be rejected with indignant scorn. What is wrong in the individual is wrong in the politician, and the man who extorts money for his party is morally as bad as he who extorts it for himself—the only difference in the former case being that he does not add selfishness to obtaining money by crooked means. Under the rulings of the judge, the jury found Grenier guilty, but that does not exonerate Tarte, who leaves court with a reputation black-

ened by his own admissions. Tarte was the go-between to press claims that could not be advocated openly, and took pay for the services rendered or expected.

That is the way in which the leader of the Government built his Cabinet, that is the kind of men he took in; the Minister of Public Works was the intimate friend of Pacaud and also the intimate friend of the First Minister. I have several other extracts from newspapers at my hand, but I will not trouble the House with them.

I want to call the attention of the Postmaster General for a moment to the fact that some members of this House have carried in their pockets appointments during a year and a half. A gentleman sat in this House for two sessions, according to his own statement, after being promised a lieutenant-governorship, if he was not appointed to a judgeship before a vacancy in the higher position occurred. The Postmaster General is, no doubt, so busy in the department looking up confidential letters, that he does not observe these matters, and yet during the last session of the last Parliament he introduced a Bill providing that no gentleman should be eligible for Government office until one year had passed after the expiration of the Parliament. Then, too, quite a number of members of Parliament have been appointed to office during the short reign of this Administration, and I certainly think the Postmaster General owes to this House an explanation of his occupying a seat in the Government which allows such things to be done.

There are certain extraordinary things in connection with this Yukon Railway contract, and not the least remarkable was the extraordinary speech of the Minister of Railways in introducing the Bill to the House. He told us in effect: It is a huge monopoly; we do not know what we are giving to the contractors, we do not know what the railway will cost, and we do not even know whether Canada has a right to tranship goods at Fort Wrangell, a proceeding which is necessary in order to reach the railroad. The Government knew of these gold discoveries since before the House prorogued last June, and it does seem strange to me that they should not have sent engineers to have the lands surveyed and a report received in time to call for tenders. They go it blind; they do not know what the land is worth, they do not know what the road will cost, and they never had an estimate made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was an estimate made.

Mr. WILSON. Then, if there was, the Minister of Railways seemed to know nothing about it, because he told the House there was no estimate made. The Government take credit that they have power to fix the rates on this railway, but they take good care that the rates shall be fixed for

Mr. WILSON.

ten years, with two reductions. They first say there shall be no alteration of the rates for four years, then that there shall be a reduction of 25 per cent, and then in another three years a further reduction of 25 per cent. Does not that mean that the people who send in their goods when the railway is first completed, will have to pay double what the freight is worth? Does any one believe that after seven years the railway will carry goods for half what is charged to-day, and not make a profit? I do not think so, and I do not think the Government think so either. The clause is not a proper clause, for it means practically that the contractors can fix whatever rate they like for several years, and then their line comes under the general provision of the Railway Act. I was at Mr. Ogilvie's lecture last night, and I was much pleased with it, as, I believe, every one else was. Mr. Ogilvie told us of a man who was not the sole owner, but had only an interest in six claims, and his share for one winter amounted to \$106,000, and during the following summer he sold his interest in these claims for \$2,000,000. That is the kind of land that this Government is going to give 3,750,000 acres of land to build a railway 150 miles long; and in addition to that they are fixing the rates on that railway at about double what they should be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer for a moment to the preferential trade question, and I wish to refer to it because of the lecture delivered by no less a prominent Reformer than the Hon. G. W. Ross, at Toronto, on the 5th December last. He gave a great many instances of public men there who are in favour of preferential trade, but whether the action of the right hon. the Prime Minister in England will not totally destroy our chance of preferential trade or not is now a serious question, and, in my opinion, the right hon. gentleman's Jubilee speeches have had a strong tendency in that direction. He tells us himself that he did not advocate preferential trade anywhere, and that he told the people of England that what Canada had done for English commerce was a free gift. We used to be told in the old days, that if the Liberals were in power we would get reciprocity with the United States. Well, they have been over a year and a half in office, and we have not got a reciprocity treaty yet, and I do not think we are any nearer to it than when they came into power. Here are the views of the Hon. G. W. Ross on this question of reciprocity with the United States:

The conclusion is thus irresistibly forced upon us that, so far as Canada is concerned, it is utterly useless to entertain the idea of a reciprocity treaty with the United States for the purpose of removing either present or future irritation. Our experience, in many cases bitter and humiliating, is against any expectation of that kind. I am, therefore, reluctantly I must admit, obliged to eliminate from the consideration of this ques-

tion all speculation with regard to its effect upon international relations.

Had the treaty of 1854 been continued for some years longer, it is doubtful whether the advantages to Canada, great as they no doubt were, would not have abated substantially by the resuscitation of industries which the civil war had destroyed.

Trade follows the flag and British subjects follow British trade. For the further settlement of this country, as well as for strengthening our relations with the Empire, our obvious policy is to develop trade with Great Britain.

That is the speech that might be made by any Tory, and I would advise hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to read that speech as I did. I also read the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Toronto, and I looked upon it as a very moderate and reasonable speech. I was glad to see that the hon. gentleman frankly admitted that the Liberals made a great many promises in eighteen years; a good many of which had not been carried out, though he hoped in time they would. I believe it will take a long time, and I hope so, too. For my part, I am glad that the great Liberal party has thought more of the country than they have of their pledges.

Mr. POPE. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, when speaking of the Minister of Public Works, should be rather more careful of the reflections which they make upon the character of that hon. gentleman, because he has taken his oath that he is a Conservative. He has stated that he is in that Government to represent us there, at the special request of the First Minister of this country, and while I must say the selection does not show a very high appreciation of us Conservatives in the mind of the First Minister, yet he has made it, and we are in duty bound to recognize the selection as at least a powerful portion of the organization that sits opposite to us. A man who can dictate, as the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has dictated, a man who can thrash men in and out of office, who can damn them politically in our province, man after man, no matter how big or important they may have been in the past, whatever party they may belong to, a man who has played with them fast and loose, and has left them politically in the gutter, rolling in the mire, some of them Conservatives and some Liberals, is a man of whose wonderful power we as Conservatives have a right to feel proud. It only shows that if the Cabinet opposite were composed of Conservatives, what a wonderfully powerful organization it would be. When one of the weakest and most uncertain of our number is placed in their midst and dictates to them right and left, we can realize what would happen if other men whom we could easily name had found a place there. But, Sir, the right hon. First Minister has been criticised for the selection he has made of his Ministry. I presume

we will all admit that it is the right hon. gentleman's own business to associate himself with such men as he sees fit; but, Sir, while we recognize that principle, the right hon. gentleman can well understand that this House and this country will form a certain judgment of his nonest intentions by the associates he gathers around him.

Now, Sir, look at that Cabinet. I have no reflection to make upon its personnel; but I say that in its formation the greatest tribute was paid to the Conservative party for what they have said and what the country has said of them in the last seventeen or eighteen years. There were two things that were laid down: first, that the policy advocated by the Liberal party was unsound, and consequently the Opposition in this House did not contain the men out of which to form a Cabinet. We see in front of us a Cabinet of strangers, men drawn from the different provinces because they are specialists. Their special art is known in their respective provinces. They are men of grand artistic tastes, and they have operated in their several fields for years, and have built up the reputations they possess. We see gathered in that Cabinet a combination of men and reputations such as never sat in any cabinet of this country of ours. Take the province of Quebec, in which I have a right to be particularly interested. Of the hon. gentlemen who sat on this side of the House and supported loyally, faithfully, and well the First Minister during many years of Opposition, I ask you to look over these front benches, and christen the Minister who ever had a seat on the Opposition side of this House during those years. Were we not right in saying, then, that the ability did not exist among the Liberal members of this House, so far as the province of Quebec was concerned, out of which to form a Ministry? And has not the right hon. First Minister endorsed the position we took in that respect? It may be a reflection, and in my opinion it is a sad reflection, upon the ability and the faithful services rendered to the right hon. gentleman by more than one man who sits on the Government side of the House to-day, and who occupied a seat on the Opposition side for ten or fifteen years. But as the hon. First Minister deals with his own following, we have a right to measure the sincerity and confidence of the man. If we measure him first by the way he has treated the principles advocated by himself and his party in Opposition, the promises he made to this country, over and over again, for seventeen years, and place alongside of that the treatment that he meted out to his faithful followers and supporters during all those years, I ask by what rule of common sense should I be asked to have confidence in the right hon. First Minister? If the right hon. gentleman had been able to form that Government from the Liberal element in

his following, there would not have been so much cause of complaint as we know exists, and justly exists, in the province of Quebec among the old Liberal element. But, instead of that, where did he find the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte)? Who could have placed that hon. gentleman's political bed? Where did he ever stop over night? He was up before four in the morning; he could not stay in one bed twenty-four hours; he was out of one thing and into another. Then, take that hanger-on to the Government, the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell)—where did the right hon. First Minister find him? Where did he search him out? Not on the fence. I do not think he had even got up on the fence. I think the right hon. First Minister let the bars down, and let him walk through.

Mr. DAVIN. He says he is one of the first men of Canada.

Mr. POPE. Yes, one of the future first men. He is the Minister who is going to build the fast line of steamers from England to Canada.

An hon. MEMBER. Bottle-shaped ships.

Mr. POPE. Yes, bottle-shaped ships, and he has been nearly two years at the business; and I want to say that after he has expended two years more with the combination he is engaged with to-day, he will be just as near the finish of the business as he was when he began. Messrs. Peterson, Tate & Company are respectable men, but they have not any financial standing in England, and I do not believe it is possible to complete the contract through these men. The only result of the arrangement has been to postpone, from year to year, what would have been a great boon to this country.

Now, Sir, this discussion has taken a very wide range, and we all, I suppose, may feel at liberty to deal with almost anything that may be found in the political atmosphere. In reference to the preferential trade arrangements, so-called, that were made by the right hon. First Minister in England, when I read the speech delivered by him at Liverpool, I was so astonished that I could not believe that I had received the right report; and I was only the more astonished when I heard the right hon. gentleman in his seat in this House give the weak explanations he chose to give in connection with that matter. As a farmer I had looked forward to the bringing about of preferential trade arrangements with Great Britain as the greatest possible boon—in fact, as the only guarantee that we could stand in relation to Great Britain in a better position than any other part of the world. It is well known that the right hon. leader of the Opposition and those who sit behind him were strongly in favour of the propositions which had been mooted by Mr. Chamberlain and other Imperial

Mr. POPE.

statesmen, who had said that they were prepared to entertain such arrangements as would bring about an Imperial Zollverein, or a preference for the productions of the colonies in the markets of Great Britain. We thought we would be required, without doubt, to make some sacrifice, when the right hon. First Minister said two or three times from his seat in the House: would you be prepared to do this or do that? I say, as a member of the British family, as a Canadian representing a Canadian constituency, that we would not ask Great Britain to make sacrifices in our interests that we were not prepared to meet by reciprocal sacrifice on our side. Sir, we would no more refuse to do that than would the British Government think of asking us to make concessions that they were not prepared to meet.

During the six months that I had the pleasure of being in England I had the opportunity of meeting from time to time men of some importance—members of boards of trade and others, among whom this question was a lively subject of discussion, and in no instance did I hear any of them ever suggest asking that we should give to Great Britain something and receive nothing in return. They always said what can you do for us? And I laid out to them what I think is quite as sound, that there was an abundance of trade for us both, the preferential interchange of which would benefit each. In the first place, as a manufacturing nation, we were young and immature, and our industries ran on the cheaper lines of products, whereas they being a much older and well equipped manufacturing people, who produced rather the higher grades than the lower, there was scarcely an article of manufacture which could be mentioned in which there was not opportunity for us to arrange a sliding scale by which they could obtain a preference in our market. In return for this, I said, we expect you to give us a preference in your market for the productions of our farms and forests. That would make us the heart and centre of the British Colonial Empire. We are the greatest agricultural country, for our population, in the world, and every article produced on our soil would then find a better price in the English market than in any other markets under the sun. We are now getting good returns, but if hon. gentlemen opposite fancy that the temporary high prices and prosperity which we are enjoying to-day and which is so welcome, is going to see them through to the end they will find they are sailing under false colours. To-day the only man in any business in any country who is making money over and above his fellow-men is the one who has a preferential position, either by a patent or some other arrangement; and if this preferential trade arrangement had been effected, as it could have been, we would have had

a patent which would assure prosperity from generation to generation to the growers of the produce of our soil. The vexed question of immigration would have been settled, as every immigrant leaving Europe would have known that after he landed in Canada the product he sent to the English market would have been worth more than if grown on American or any other foreign soil. I believe that preferential arrangement would have been easy to realize if the right hon. First Minister had had the required business capacity. Fancy a man leaving this country and going across to make a bargain, and then, when he arrives at Liverpool, saying: I will give you everything for nothing. A more unbusiness-like proposition never was laid before any people. The sentiment of England at the time was strong in favour of better trade arrangements with the colonies. You might go into any theatre or any public place you choose in the country, and if you wanted applause all you had to do was to get off something in favour of closer colonial connections or against German competition. All that Mr. Chamberlain, such was the state of public sentiment at the time, had to do to satisfy the English people with the position which we desired to obtain in the English market, was to declare that it required the denunciation of the Belgian and German treaties, and that would have been done in the twinkling of an eye. There was a man who felt disappointment pretty keenly when he read the speech of the right hon. leader of this Government. That man was the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, who had spent time and energy, and exposed himself to all sorts of criticisms, to make the Greater Britain what the Central Britain is to-day among the nations of the world. He had used every effort, he had spoken frequently, he had distributed literature throughout England to prepare the public mind for the reception of his new theory, and he found all his labours, all his efforts, destroyed in a second by the speech delivered by the right hon. gentleman on landing at Liverpool. I cannot conceive as a business man how the right hon. gentleman came to take the position he did. Whether the motion of the waves as he passed over the ocean affected his mental equilibrium and cut him loose at the wrong time, I do not know. Whether visions of the honours which were to be showered on him or of the meeting with Her Majesty, whether the prospect of future knighthood, or the recollections of speeches delivered in Boston or elsewhere, had turned his brain and made him feel that he was compelled to make this sacrifice of his country's interests, I cannot say, but certainly his first speech to the people of England was a most unfortunate one. Great must be the political honours which required a sacrifice of such magnitude as that which the hon. gentleman made immediately on

landing. But whatever be the cause that hurried him into that temporary moment of insanity, the result was most unfortunate to this country. It will hold us back for years and keep us standing simply on the same footing as other parts of the world when we might have obtained a preference in the English market.

It is not my intention to detain the House for more than three or four minutes, but I could not conceive it consistent with my duty to sit down without referring to the Yukon contract. I have been unfortunate in my efforts to speak on this occasion. I intended to speak yesterday, but when the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) delivered that Latin speech which so interested us, all the Latin got into my head, and I quite forgot my native tongue and could not venture to address the House. I had just got my courage up to-day and was about to speak, when my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) rose and caught the Speaker's eye, and I had to give way. I intend to speak on this railway question at a later stage and do not propose now to pass too serious reflections upon the Government for the policy they are pursuing. I can see that great deliberation was given to this contract. I can see, as the hon. Minister of Railways said, that a full Cabinet had considered this question. As I look over the various clauses, I can see the impress in each of different people. I can see in one clause the work of the great mind of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). Sir, any man would know it in the dark as the work of the hon. gentleman, and he is entitled to all the credit for it as his crowning effort in the great contract.

They call this a railway. Why do they not call it by its proper name—a steam tramway? Let them tell the people what the First Minister has said, that this is a temporary means of transport, a steam tramway built into that country. Anybody who knows that western country knows that the difficulties of railway construction are confined to the fringe or along the coast line, and, as you go north, these difficulties lessen and at last entirely disappear. I have not seen the profile of this road; I do not know that there is one. The hon. member who at this moment leads the House (Sir Louis Davies), intimated that there is one. The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), a day or two ago, said there was not. But I see that he has been driven from the Cabinet since that time. I understand that a meeting of the greater cabinet was held to-day, in which some serious troubles arose, the result of which is that neither the Minister of Railways nor the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is present to-night. We regret their absence. These difficulties arise in every political family. I have been a member of a family in the past in which some difficulties arose. I offer my hearty

sympathy to hon. gentlemen on the other side. The proposal, then, is to build a steam tramway over a line, the engineering difficulties of which are confined to thirty miles. After that you reach a plateau which carries you to your destination. The cost of that part of the road will be—let us say, double what it would be in this section of the country—about \$15,000 a mile. I venture to say, that you can let the contract at that rate. Do not tell us that the putting in of this sleigh-road is one of the considerations that we get. No man would undertake a contract in that country without putting in a sleigh-road. A contractor who would attempt to do without such a means of transport would be simply crazy. He must get his goods in and have them distributed along the line, and establish camps and offices. Nobody has any objection to this sleigh-road being built, but the Government must not put that forward as a reason why we should give up a big portion of our territory.

Now, as to the earnings of the road. Comparison has been made, and will be made, outside with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not do that here, where people know better. As a matter of fact, they do not rise at all, having apparently lost the use of thier limbs. But outside of this House, they will rise and compare this arrangement with the arrangement made for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But there is no comparison. The Canadian Pacific Railway was a transcontinental line, far more difficult to build in many points. Then, it was a railway, not a tram-road, and was built to a standard far higher than this is to be. Moreover, the company had to make their own traffic. They ran through an uninhabited section, where the traffic was so little that hon. gentlemen opposite, then on this side, declared that they never could earn enough to pay for grease for the wheels. Hon. Edward Blake, then leader of the Opposition, said that the country through which the railway passed was full of moss, morasses and swamps. The road had to go through the mountains, which were difficult to surmount and which yielded no traffic when they were surmounted. That was the description of the country given by these hon. gentlemen, and that was a patriotic pride they manifested in this great national highway, which now they bow down and worship. But to-day, for this little tramway, there is traffic waiting. Traffic is being booked every day in London, in New York, in all the principal cities of the world—people going to the Klondike. I am told that some 80,000 or 90,000 have been booked by the Cook people alone. This is vastly different from what it would be if the contractors had to depend on mere uncertainties. The people who are going to the gold fields with their equipage, will pay an average of at least

Mr. POPE.

\$50 apiece on this road. Suppose that 100,000, or even 50,000, people go over the road. There you have the figures, and you can calculate it for yourself. Add it up, multiply it, do anything you like with it, and you will find that there is a profit in it. Subtract all you want to, and you will still have enough to pay for building the road. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) smiles.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Why not make it \$100? Or suppose you make it \$10.

Mr. POPE. No.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Why not?

Mr. POPE. It is not enough. You must count on a reasonable figure.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What would the hon. gentleman call a reasonable figure?

Mr. POPE. Fifty dollars.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If we could get it done for one-third of that, what would you say?

Mr. POPE. The hon. Minister is like the rest of the Liberal party in the House; they can hint and suggest, but they dare not say. He is a responsible Minister of the Crown, and is a party to this contract. They are all in it: the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), as I have intimated—he has a hand in it, too. And neither of these hon. gentlemen dares to stand up and say that a man with ordinary equipage—some men will have half a ton, others will have four tons, but take the average—will get over that road for less than \$50. No man will object to paying that, and I will bet money that as a matter of fact, they will pay more. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries dares not rise in his place and say that they will pay less. Several hon. gentlemen have asked whether members who object to the present contract will subscribe stock in this enterprise. This is their stock argument—I apologize for the pun. Will the hon. Minister tell me, or will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) sitting alongside of him tell me, that he would accept a proposition to build that road for less money? I am willing he should take time to consult his colleagues; and if he will come back here and say that they will accept a bona fide offer, I tell him that I will produce in less than three days an organization of men who will undertake to construct that road—and who will put up the forfeit of \$250,000—for a subsidy a great deal less than it is proposed to give under this contract.

The hon. gentleman thinks that I am bluffing him. Well, Sir, if the contract is not a hard and fast one, as was stated by the Minister of Justice in the Senate, he has an opportunity of knowing whether I

am bluffing; he has an opportunity of putting it to the test. The people will then know whether there is more than one set of contractors in Canada capable of undertaking the construction of a tramway 150 miles in length, at the longest. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether this distance of 150 miles is correct, or whether it is 125. We have not the data upon the Table of the House, and therefore I will not discuss that point. I can only say, as everybody else would say, that the character of the two gentlemen who have undertaken this contract is quite sufficient, so far as their reputation as contractors goes, to warrant that they will carry out their part of it, there is no doubt about that. But to say that it is not in the public interest that the Government should have searched through this country, either by newspapers or by private tenders, or by any other means they chose to adopt, to ascertain whether there were other contractors in Canada who were able and willing to undertake this work, I cannot for a moment admit. When they decided to build this piece of road it would not have cost them anything to do so, because they have no postage to pay, the Government get their stationery free, and they could have written to various contractors without it costing the country a cent, and then they would not have been in the miserable position of the Minister of Railways who bewailed the situation in this House when he said that they could not beat them down any more. Who was beating them down? Mackenzie & Mann on the one hand, or the Government on the other? The Government disclosed, by the very fact that they did not advertise, by the very fact that they made no noise about it, that they were not seeking for other competitors. They were conducting a private negotiation with these gentlemen, whether it was honest or dishonest, I am not here to say. I am not here to charge the Government, but they must know that the country is suspicious of secret bargains, and they must expect that reflections will be cast upon them from one end of Canada to the other. Although hon. members in this House may speak strongly upon the question, I can tell the Government that they will find that people in the country will speak upon it more strongly still. Why, I should suppose that this Government, as a safeguard to themselves, as a mere act of discretion, as wise and prudent administrators of public affairs, would have advertised, would have communicated at least with men capable of carrying out their agreements with the Government, to see if it was not possible for them to make a better bargain. I am astonished especially at this bargain when I remember that the Government had to counsel them a business man like the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), a gentleman whom they let through the bars, a gentleman whom

they found perched, either on the fence or just over it—some hon. member suggests under the fence, but I cannot believe that the hon. gentleman from Quebec West, in the hour of victory, would have been found under the fence. But that we were told by the press at the time that the hon. gentleman became an outside member of that Government because he was a business man, and we remember that his entry into the Government was heralded by the Montreal papers as a guarantee of the business capacity of this Cabinet. Sir, that is true, and that the hon. gentleman, with his wide experience, should have allowed his innocent colleagues, men unversed in business, men who had been so long in political life that they had lost their cunning, that they no longer possessed business acumen—I say it is incredible that the hon. member for Quebec West should have allowed them to make such a contract. I warn the Government that they will be subjected to severe criticism throughout the country for entering into this secret bargain, a bargain made behind the curtains. I can only repeat what has already been said in this House, that I do not believe such an exhibition of incompetency can be found in the history of any Parliament in the past, and I hope after this question has been threshed out in the House, and in the Senate, and if it ever gets there, before the people also, that we shall never have another like it.

Mr. ROGERS. I wish to say just a few words before this motion is put. I do not intend to trouble the House with a long speech, nor have I a pile of newspaper clippings before me from which to quote, as many other hon. members have been doing. I think that the circumstances in which the country finds itself at present, are quite sufficient to engage our attention, without our going back ten or a dozen years. I wish to say a very few words on the question of tariff reform. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), during his election campaign, made certain statements which I must say put the farmers of this country on their ears. I did not mind it so much because we often hear things said on election platforms that are only meant to do duty for the time being. But when I heard the statement reiterated in this House, I felt that I could not let it pass without saying a few words in condemnation. We were led to suppose in the past that some changes would be made in the tariff by which the burdens resting upon the farmers of this country, would be to some extent lessened. We had hoped during the last two sessions that we would get some relief, and were willing to wait patiently, knowing that our numbers in the House were too small to enable us to bring much direct pressure to bear upon the Government. We have been charged with being influenced by the party

whip. It is too often the case that men measure other people's corn by their own measure. I am proud to say for the honour of the Patrons that neither party has ever attempted to approach them with any inducements to gain their support; both of the old parties have had too much respect for us, and too much respect for themselves, to do anything of the sort, either directly or indirectly. We are responsible for our acts to our own constituents. But charges have been circulated among my own constituents in an underhand way, that I had pledged myself to support the Reform party, that I had even put it in black and white. But the men who sent me here have too much confidence in me to believe that I would ever be untrue to their interests. The Reform party have never approached me directly or indirectly.

Speaking not only for myself, but for others, I say that I would not have considered such approaches, if made. In regard to the tariff, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bevan) has stated that it was a permanent settlement. We do not consider it so; we believe it will be amended. We are anxiously waiting for reform to be made, and we have continued to entertain hopes along that line. Undoubtedly the Government are not responsible for what the member for Centre Toronto has said, but I should like to have an expression of opinion from the leaders to the effect that they are not in accord with that sentiment. It would relieve myself and my colleagues very much. Hope deferred sometimes makes the heart sick, and we did not expect this blow. Probably I am speaking prematurely and should wait the announcements in the Budget Speech, but I can give a word of caution and an expression of opinion that the farmers are not satisfied with the tariff. They have great burdens to bear, and we felt that the National Policy was too heavy to carry, and it was becoming more burdensome every year. We are sometimes asked why we support hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I fail to understand, speaking from a farmer's standpoint, why we should support the advocates of the National Policy. I was in times past prepared to give the National Policy a trial and to give weak manufacturers an opportunity to become established. We have done so nobly and have stood by them, but we have had no good results. Our population has not increased, the pecuniary circumstances of our people have not improved and our mortgage debt is higher. We must all regret to observe by the returns that the chattel mortgages are \$2,000,000 more in Ontario alone than they were formerly. I cannot see where the National Policy has aided the farmer. We had hoped that some little reform or slight benefit would be given them by changing the tariff, and it may yet take

place. It is said that the present preferential tariff has had no good effect because our imports from England have fallen behind. Such may be the case. The business men, no doubt, feel the effects of the present position of the farmers, because of the fact that instead of buying luxuries and thereby increasing their imports, they are endeavouring to pay off their debts. We have been satisfied with the necessaries of life and have endeavoured to unload their debts. The country at large will feel the effects of this action during a few years to come, for I believe there is such an influence at work. Farmers have been brought to realize that they must buy in the cheapest markets and look out for themselves, because they have to compete with all other nations. We have looked after the other man long enough. As regards the progress of the country, we have increased our exports to \$60,000,000. But I do not see what the Government policy has to do with that increase. With a tariff ranging from 30 per cent to 35 per cent farmers have been obliged to work harder, during longer hours and do more business to enable them to pay their indebtedness. They are obliged to do so in order to secure the increased exports to the value of \$60,000,000 and thus make the country grow and prosper. Speakers at meetings of boards of trade and other business gatherings always refer to what the farmers are sending out of the country; we never hear anything of what the manufacturers have exported. This is additional proof that the wealth and prosperity of the country depends on the farmers. If additional steps are not taken to relieve the burdens of the farmers and general elections come around, the little wedge entered in favour of tariff reduction will receive such a blow from the agricultural sledge hammer as will make the combines and trusts shake and fall. This is simply a note of warning, and I hope hon. gentlemen will not follow the idea presented by the hon. member for Centre Toronto, that the tariff revision so far as it has gone is permanent and nothing more can be expected. We hope for better things at the hands of the Government. What encouragement would the farmers have to supporting hon. gentlemen opposite. This country has had too much protection, and the farmers' representatives cannot be expected to ally themselves with the Tories. They would laugh at us if we did it. I did not seek election, and I come here to act the best I can for the farmers and for my country. As regards the new Klondike deal, I do not think it necessary to say much about it, because if the full details as to the contract had been studied fewer speeches would have been delivered. The only point to which I object is that the Government did not ask some other contractors to hand in bids. If we had any support, there

would have been greater opposition to the Crow's Nest Pass arranged last year. The farmers will never send a representative to vote away any more money for railways, and will not sanction such action on the part of their representatives whether Liberals or Tories. I desired to express my view on the tariff, and that is my excuse for rising and addressing the House to-night.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House more than a few minutes, and I take advantage of the opportunity offered me before the debate closes of saying a few words in respect to the question before the House. Referring particularly to the first clause of the Speech from the Throne, I am sure that every hon. member on this side of the House can join in congratulating the Government and the Finance Minister upon the success which attended the floating of the recent loan in the markets of the old country and upon the high place which the credit of Canada occupies in the financial centres of the world. But, Sir, I am sure that if our country does occupy that very high position, and if her credit stands higher than that of any other dependency of the Empire, it has been due to the policy which has prevailed in Canada for the past eighteen or twenty years. And if success has attended the efforts of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) in making such a satisfactory loan in the old country, we, upon this side of the House, can congratulate ourselves that in furtherance of his mission he received the hearty support of the Conservative party. He was not harassed, as his Conservative predecessors were harassed by hon. gentlemen who now occupy prominent positions in the Government of the country, and who, in order to defeat the efforts of former Finance Ministers, decried the country and its public men, that they might embarrass the efforts to obtain the best price for Canadian bonds.

We, on this side of the House, can congratulate ourselves, and join with hon. gentlemen opposite in rejoicing at the magnificent success which attended the Jubilee celebration in London during the past year, and upon the very honourable and important position which the Premier of Canada occupied in that demonstration. I am not saying too much, Mr. Speaker, when I say that no gentleman in public life in Canada is better qualified, or better fitted by his eloquence and by his courtly grace, to represent all classes and creeds of Her Majesty's subjects in this Dominion, than is the right hon. gentleman who at the present time is First Minister of Canada. We have not found fault, upon this side of the House, so far as I am aware, with the measures which the Government have taken for the preservation of law and order in the new country which is being opened up and developed, but we cannot help saying that, if the views which hon. gentlemen opposite

once presented as to the utility of the Northwest Mounted Police, and as to the necessity of maintaining that force in the numbers and the efficiency which the late Government of Canada did—we cannot help thinking, that if these views had prevailed, the Government of the day would not have been able as expeditiously and as cheaply to despatch into the Yukon territory an efficient and effective force for the preservation of law and order.

We recognize, too, on this side of the House, the desirability and the importance of having constructed at the earliest possible moment an all-Canadian route, by means of which those who are going into that country can reach it most expeditiously and at least cost. We believe that every effort should be made, and that the Government should be given every reasonable assistance in at once promoting the construction of such a route. We believe that, as far as practicable, the trade of the Canadian Yukon should be kept for Canadian business men, or for our fellow British subjects across the ocean, and we believe also that every reasonable assistance should be given to those who might be called upon to engage in the construction of that road. But, as has been already said by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, the draft contract which has been presented to us is one of the most remarkable documents which was ever submitted to the Parliament of Canada, and is one of the most extraordinary contracts which was ever entered into between parties. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) told us that this contract was an extraordinary one, in that the contractors were not being paid by a cash subsidy from the Dominion Treasury. Well, Sir, for my part, I would much prefer to know what the actual cost of that road was to be, and, as a representative of the people in this House, I would far rather give my vote in favour of some definite sum to aid the contractors in the construction of this road than give them a monopoly and give them a vast portion of our national domain, which, so far as I have heard, no gentleman in this House has yet attempted to estimate the value of. How can it be said that this stipulation in the contract which is before us, is not costing the people of this country anything? Has any gentleman opposite attempted to estimate the enormous value of the lands which it is proposed to give these gentlemen as a consideration for the construction of this railway? If the stories which are told of the fabulous wealth of that Yukon district can be relied on—and some of them are worthy of credence, because they have been told us by a gentleman in the employment of the Dominion Government upon whose veracity we can rely—if these stories are true, the wealth of that country is beyond conception, and if the privileges given the contractors in the selection of that vast area of territory are crystallized into law,

then these contractors, lucky men, will be able to make for themselves and their associates in this deal fortunes that will be little short of colossal. Therefore, I say, in the public interest, in the interest of the people of Canada from one end of the country to the other, in the interests of the development of that country, in the interests of those who go into prospecting and mining in that country, it would have been much more practicable and much more reasonable, in my humble judgment, if this House were asked to vote a specific sum of money, which would be all the contractors would receive for the performance of the work they have undertaken.

As I read this contract, the contractors have been given the monopoly of the transportation by that route for five years to come. That being the case, may we not fairly estimate that the profits upon the traffic of bringing in men, supplies and provisions will also be something enormous? The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Bertram) said that on good authority it was estimated that from 150,000 to 250,000 people might be expected to go into that country this season. Most of these will be conveyed over that railway for a portion of the distance, and so long as they remain there the provisions necessary for their sustenance will have to go in by that road. And, Sir, what limitation is fixed upon the tolls which these contractors, who will own the road after it has been constructed, may levy upon the traffic? For four years they will be permitted to charge tolls fixed by the Governor General in Council; but that these tolls will be upon a generous scale is manifest by the fact that after four years they are to be reduced by 25 per cent and remain at 75 per cent of the original amount for the next three years. After that time, a further reduction of 25 per cent is to be made and to remain at that rate for the three following years, so that not until ten years from the first of September, 1898, and after these gentlemen have enjoyed the enormous advantages which this monopoly will give them, is this railway to be brought under the general law by which the tolls on Canadian railways are adjusted. It is an enormous advantage that for the construction of this tram line we should give these contractors the monopoly proposed under this contract. It has been said, that it might be damaging to the credit of Canada if the Government had asked for tenders for the construction of this railway, and had not been successful in having more than one contractor to make a bid. It is stated in the public press to-day, that more than two months ago gentlemen who represented themselves as agents of the Messrs. Rothschild in London, made an offer to this Government to construct a road from Pyramid Harbour on the Lynn Canal, via Dalton trail, for 5,000 acres per mile and no monopoly. That statement

Mr. CLARKE.

is published to-day, Mr. Speaker, and I ask if there is any truth in it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman want to see the road built from the head of the Lynn Canal?

Mr. CLARKE. I merely asked the question, Mr. Speaker. If there is any truth in the statement, that reputable and responsible gentlemen who represented the great firm of Rothschilds & Company offered to construct the road by the Chilkat route, for a subsidy of 5,000 acres per mile, without any monopoly clause in their contract? I draw attention to that fact, because it dissipates the argument which has been advanced by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) to show that the course of the Government was a wise and judicious course, in making this secret arrangement with Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie, and not giving the other great contractors of this country an opportunity to tender for the work. The gentlemen who have got this contract are well known reputable citizens and first-class contractors. I do not think any fault has been found with them on this side of the House. I believe they are thoroughly competent to do the work, and will do it according to the specifications; but I say that they have no right above all other men engaged in contracting in Canada to be given this monopoly, and I hold that the Government, if they had done their whole duty, would have given not only Mann & Mackenzie, but all other competent contractors in Canada, an opportunity of stating on what terms they would do the work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We gave the very gentlemen to whom you refer an offer to build this very road.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask if the gentlemen to whom the hon. Minister says he gave the offer were Messrs. Smith & Bratnover?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. You said the agents of the Rothschilds.

Mr. CLARKE. These gentlemen, I understand, professed themselves to represent the Messrs. Rothschilds.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is the hon. gentleman in a position to state one of two things—either that the gentlemen whose names he has mentioned represented the Rothschilds, or they did make such an offer to the Government?

Mr. CLARKE. I asked the hon. gentleman if it was a fact, as stated in the public press to-day, that these gentlemen did make an offer of that kind, and did represent themselves as being the agents of the Roths-

childs, and did offer to construct a road through the Chilkat Pass for 5,000 acres a mile without any monopoly ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Mention their names.

Mr. **CLARKE.** Messrs. Smith & Bratnover.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I never heard of them.

Mr. **CLARKE.** Then we may contradict the statement made in the Montreal "Star" to-day that such an offer was made by these gentlemen. Will the hon. Minister say that no other offer was made for the construction of a road into that territory ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** No, I will not say anything of the kind, because it has been already explained, time after time, that the Government were determined that the road to be built should be a Canadian road, with its termini on Canadian soil, and we did not think that it was in the interest of the Government to consider the construction of a road with one of its termini on American soil.

Mr. **CLARKE.** That may have been in the interest of the Government, but I maintain that it would have been in the interest of the people of this country—

Some hon. **MEMBERS.** No, never.

Mr. **CLARKE**—if the Government had publicly given the contractors of Canada, those of sufficient substance to undertake the work, the opportunity to tender for it, so as to place all upon an equal footing.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** The hon. gentleman will permit me to say, as I did not catch the name he mentioned, that the gentleman who does represent the Rothschilds in this country had the question put to him, whether he would make a tender to the Government, and, after considering the whole question and examining all the information the Government could place before him, and cabling to his principals at home, he wrote to the Government that after the fullest consideration he declined to touch it at all.

Mr. **CLARKE.** Then, Mr. Speaker, I am to understand, so far as the information has been vouchsafed to us—and of course I accept the information as being absolutely correct—that there was one firm of contractors at least in the old country who were looking for work of this kind, and who were prepared to undertake it. That fact in itself, I think, should have been sufficient to warrant hon. gentlemen opposite in asking more than one Canadian firm of contractors as to the terms on which they would construct this work. If I understand the provisions of this contract correctly—I have only read

them cursorily once or twice—after this road is constructed, these men will not be compelled to operate it for five years or for three years, or for one year, and there is no provision in the contract for the road being taken over by the Government itself. Now, in view of the statement made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries—and I understood him to say at an earlier stage that he had a great deal to do with the drafting of this contract—I think it would be only fair to this House and the country that the cablegram which he says he sent to the Rothschilds, and the intimation which the Government received from them that they would not undertake this work, should be laid before us, so that we should understand exactly the terms of the Government's proposition to them.

Now, importance has been given by the hon. member for Centre Toronto to the necessity of having this work constructed as speedily as possible, for the purpose of procuring and retaining the trade of that country for Canadian business men, and because it is absolutely essential in view of the large immigration which is expected to take place into that country, that those who go there should be supplied with the necessary provisions. Now, what kind of a road is to be built to perform this important service ? We are told that this road is to come up to the standard of some road called the Kaslo and Slocan Railway. I believe that is a narrow-gauge concern also. What kind of a road is that for the purpose of carrying supplies and provisions into the country, the development of which will in all probability go on with enormous rapidity ? I am told also that the contractors for this work have bought the second-hand rails and engines which were formerly used on the narrow-gauge road built by the Messrs. Galt from Lethbridge to Dunmore, for the purpose of using them on this railway, which is to form the main route to the Canadian Yukon. I understand that these rails are twenty-seven or thirty-pound rails, and that the road will in fact be a tramway. We have a tramway in the city of Toronto, and I understand that the rails used upon it are not twenty-seven or thirty-pound rails, but seventy-five or eighty-pound rails. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot congratulate the Government on the wisdom of their action in entering into this contract under these conditions. But, Sir, look at the enormous grant of mineral lands which the Government give to those contractors for doing this work—3,750,000 acres. We are told that we should congratulate ourselves that the people of Canada are not giving them any bonus in the shape of cash or money. But, Sir, is this mineral land worth nothing ? Have these 3,750,000 acres of gold-bearing land no value, or will they have no value when this road is constructed ? Is it not the veriest twaddle—I use the word with the greatest

respect—to say that the people of Canada are paying nothing for the construction of this road, when they are giving this enormous quantity of valuable mineral land to the contractors, and tying it up in their hands for all time to come? I stand subject to correction, but I believe that this grant of 3,750,000 acres is equal to a strip of territory eighteen miles wide, extending from the city of Toronto to the city of Montreal. Sir, I ask hon. gentlemen if—the contractors having the right of selection anywhere and everywhere throughout this great territory, and to the extent that I have mentioned—it is not reasonable to suppose that they will secure the richest and most valuable portions of that territory which their surveyors and inspectors can lay their hands on? I say that this contract, entered into as it was within a few days of the opening of this House, entered into secretly, without others being given the opportunity to bid for and estimate upon it, is a contract that will reflect discredit upon the business men of the Administration, and will not commend itself to the good sense and judgment of the people. We have heard the strictures made by hon. gentlemen opposite on their predecessors for having given away large tracts of land to secure railway construction, but not one word so far have I yet heard from any hon. gentleman on that side in denunciation of the conduct of his leaders in tying up this land, which promises to be one of the richest portions of British America.

Just one word more with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) as to the action of the Government in carrying out its pledges with respect to the revision of the tariff. According to the "Hansard," the hon. gentleman said:

I say that the pledges which the Liberal party made to the people of this country have been redeemed in every particular.

And he declared further that:

The tariff was pared down to a revenue basis, which is the basis on which the Liberal party has always held our tariff should be imposed. Extreme protection was struck off entirely.

I would like to ask the hon. gentleman by what sleight of hand were the objectionable features—that is, the protective features—in the tariff eliminated in the revision which took place last year? Does the hon. gentleman think this country is to be hypnotized by such language as he uses? What changes were made last year in the duties levied upon the staple articles which are manufactured in the constituency the hon. gentleman has the honour of representing? How were the protective features of the old tariff eliminated? The hon. gentleman was one of the architects of this new tariff, but I challenge him to show how that tariff has fulfilled the pledges which his leaders gave

Mr. CLARKE.

to the country before the 23rd of June, 1896. Sir, among the principal articles of manufacture in Toronto are agricultural implements. I am happy to say that one of the largest and most flourishing of these manufactories in Canada is situated in the constituency of which I have the honour of being one of the representatives; and if hon. gentlemen opposite were honest in their declamations for many long years against the iniquities of the National Policy and had carried faithfully out, after they obtained power, the pledges they had made in opposition, that industry would not be as flourishing and prosperous as it is. If it does flourish, it is because these hon. gentlemen did not have the courage of their convictions, because they dared not carry out the pledges they had made to the agriculturists of the North-west. I ask what changes were made in the tariff affecting agricultural implements? Has the tariff been reduced? Are the farmers not being bled as white by the duties under this tariff as they were under the old tariff? Has any change been made? Yes, but it has been in the direction of favouring the manufacturer rather than the consumer. A change was made reducing the duty on certain items which give an advantage to the manufacturer, but give none to the individual who is always in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite—the poor, unfortunate consumer.

Furniture is another staple article of manufacture in Toronto. What change was made regarding furniture? Did they reduce the tariff on furniture? Not a bit of it. The gentleman who is now running as the Liberal candidate in South Toronto, gave his opinion as to the changes in the tariff so far as that trade was concerned; and speaking on behalf of my hon. friend (Mr. Bertram), the gentleman to whom I have alluded, Mr. Rogers, said at St. George's Hall on the 23rd of November last:

As a manufacturer, I feel that in Mr. Bertram the manufacturers, not only in my own line of business, but in every other line, will have a friend on the floor of the House of Commons in Ottawa. As a manufacturer, I am pleased to say that the trade which I am connected with has received the fairest treatment from the present Government. In 1896 about half of the furniture manufacturers of this province publicly declared their belief that the Government under Sir Wilfrid Laurier would accord them fair and equitable treatment. To-day you may travel from one end of the province to the other, and you will not find a solitary furniture manufacturer but will admit that the tariff legislation of the present Government is fairer to them than that of the late Conservative Government.

How can that tariff be fairer to them and be as fair to the consumer at the same time? Where does the consumer come in under the new arrangement? What consideration has been paid to his interests? I might go on and enumerate other articles manufactured in Toronto—bicycles, musical

instruments, stove and iron work, and boots and shoes—do the changes made in the duties on these articles justify the assertion of the hon. member for Centre Toronto that the Government has been true to its pledges and discharged its duty to the country by carrying out in power what it professed in opposition? I do not find fault with the Government for not altering the tariff upon these articles, but I am endeavouring to point out that the country will not accept as Gospel the statement of the hon. member for Centre Toronto that the Government had lived up to their pledges. He could not sit in this House if he had given utterance, during the last two months, to the views held by his leader and lieutenants before June, 1896. Had he done so, the people of Centre Toronto would have had none of him. It is only because he appealed to the manufacturers and assured them that if he went to Ottawa, he would advocate a tariff of stability for at least ten years, that they returned him to this House. I did not intend to occupy the time of the House at great length, and will take another opportunity to say something about this great Yukon deal. But I wish to remark that, in my humble judgment, it would have been much wiser if our Government, in view of the high credit our country now enjoys, especially in the mother country, had first ascertained as nearly as possible, from competent men in their own service what amount would be required to construct that road in the most approved and substantial way, which would give the merchants and business men of Canada the cheapest transport facilities and best possible returns and the best facilities for development, and having borrowed the amount, have given the work of construction out by public competition.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not rise for the purpose of making a speech on this question, but simply to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), who has been kind enough to answer the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke). Would the hon. Minister tell us what was the date of the letter from the agent of the Rothschilds?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot remember the date, but it was before the contract was entered into with Mann & Mackenzie.

Mr. INGRAM. How long before?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Some short time before.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman say whether it was within a month or a week before?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Order.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, I am to understand that in asking this civil question I shall not get a civil answer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, I will give the hon. gentleman a civil answer. I tell him that the letter from the representatives of the Rothschilds to the Government declining to have anything to do with the building of this road, under the condition that it had to be built by next September, was sent to the Government a short time before the Government agreed with Mackenzie & Mann.

Mr. INGRAM. It must have been less than a month before Parliament assembled. Then I should like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether any of our Canadian contractors were furnished with any of this information that they might be in a position to tender for this work?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not in position to say whether there were other Canadian contractors than Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who is not here at the moment, will give the information he wants. I have named these two or three contractors that I know of myself.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to say the other day that this work was of such urgency that the Government had not time to furnish other contractors in this country with information respecting the construction of the road. Now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tells us that the Government furnished the Rothschilds with all the information they desired and they refused to take the contract. Then there was an injustice to Canadian contractors. I am convinced that had the contractors of this country been given the same information as the others were, the Government would not be obliged to pay 25,000 acres a mile for the construction of this tramway.

Mr. OSLER. I desire to speak only for a few moments, in order to put myself on record at this stage of the proceedings. I do not think it necessary to refer at length to any part of the address of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram). He is a very late convert to the protection doctrine. I heard his speeches in Toronto with great pleasure, and I should have voted for him with a great deal of pleasure, only that I was loth to vote for one who had been such a sudden convert. I was not sure he would stick. I believe that so long as the hon. gentleman is engaged in manufacturing, in the building of ships and so on, in which I hope he will prosper, I believe that he will be a thorough protectionist, and that the interest of the manufacturers, at all events in his own line, will receive the warmest sup-

port at his hands. I am very glad further to notice that the members of the Government have apparently delegated to him entirely the management of taxation of this country, so far as the manufacturers are concerned. And I believe it would save a great deal of the time of this House, if our hon. friends on the Ministerial benches would agree to accept the fact which they know, and we know and the country knows that they have turned a somersault, and are not themselves at all as they knew themselves when they came into power. We know that they have been false to every view they then expressed. And they know we know it. Let them only accept the fact, and we shall save a great deal of time and a great deal of discussion in this House. So long as they have the hon. member for Centre Toronto and a few other level headed business men in their ranks, I have no fear that the tariff will be changed to the detriment of the country.

Now, as to the proposed Klondike deal I am loth to speak of it until further particulars are presented to the House. I assume that the report of Mr. Jennings, the engineer, will be presented to this House showing his estimate of the cost of this road. Mr. Jennings is a man whom all of us, I think, have confidence. He has been over the route, as I understand it, and his report must be in the hands of the Government. But whatever his report may be, I, for one, object absolutely and utterly to the terms of this contract. We have placed ourselves in a humiliating position, in a position which might be taken by a South African State or a South American Republic. We have placed ourselves lower than even China. China sought for a loan, and the powers of Europe asked her to grant a concession to give special powers in that country for a certain length of time. But, poor as she is, shaken as she is, China has apparently refused the offer with scorn. Sir, if you are going into any enterprise, the cheapest way to accomplish that enterprise is to pay the cash for it. The man who has not the cash to pay always pays more. I make the statement here, and I defy contradiction, that if I went to London to-day with the contract which has been offered to these gentlemen, of the pick of 3,750,000 acres of the best mineral lands in the Yukon region, I could sell that land to-morrow for more money than the 25,000,000 acres of land granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway could ever have been sold for. I am not saying that all is gold that glitters, or that all that Mr. Ogilvie tells us is true. But I say that if the Government believes Mr. Ogilvie's statements, if they place sufficient confidence in them to say that it is absolutely necessary to have a road into that district at once, then I say that the Government are justified in spending the money themselves and are absolutely wrong in locking up such an enormous quantity of

Mr. OSLER.

land. I do not believe that any member of the Government realizes what has been done under this contract. You have made a slave of every prospector who goes into that country for the next five years. Every man who goes in there with an outfit on his back will find one of Mackenzie & Mann's agents looking after him; and if he makes a find they will stake it out and will get all the claim except what the prospector may have registered. Of course he can register his own claim, but who will be likely to get to the office first, the contractor with his complete outfit or the prospector who is obliged to trudge on foot to the place of registry?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has not read the regulations. These provide that the prospector does not need to go to the office of the district in order to register. Any five of them can come together, elect one of their own number as registrar and register with him.

Mr. OSLER. Yes, and he will have one claim and these contractors will have the rest.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But the whole five can register claims.

Mr. OSLER. And how many acres will their claims cover?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And if there are fifty, they can all register.

Mr. OSLER. Yes, and even fifty claims—how much ground—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Or five hundred.

Mr. OSLER. And how many acres will even five hundred take up? Five hundred men could not take up the claims even on one creek. Now I do not believe that the Government have realized at all what they have been doing. They are building what has been described as a tramway with 25 or 30-pound rails. These rails were laid on the Gault road from Lethbridge to Dunmore, to carry coal practically only to supply the Canadian Pacific Railway and to carry also a few cattle. And the rails were taken up. Why? Because they were too light to do the business. The smallest snowfall or the least difficulty of any kind was enough to block the road. And so the road had to be reorganized and a million dollars more borrowed to lay down heavier rails. These are the rails that the Government are allowing the contractors to put down on this track for a distance of 150 miles.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has no authority for that statement whatever.

Mr. OSLER. Is it provided that they may put down light rails?

Mr. DOMVILLE. Did the hon. gentleman ever see a 25-pound rail in his life?

Mr. OSLER. Yes, lots of them. Now, there must be either one of two things: Either that the traffic on the road will be so light that the 25-pound rail will suffice or else that road won't do the business at all. The Government are making a contract about which they know nothing at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I tell the hon. gentleman that he can have no authority for that statement.

Mr. OSLER. I would ask the Minister if there is anything said in the contract as to the weight of the rails.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will see himself, if he looks on the face of the contract, that it is to be up to the standard of the Kaslo and Slocan road.

Mr. OSLER. What is the weight of the rails?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The contract does not specify what the weight of the rails should be, but the rails on the Kaslo and Slocan, which is the standard, are 45 pounds.

Mr. OSLER. Very well, let it be 45 pounds—it doesn't make much difference. Still, it shows that the Government have entered into this contract, apparently, without considering that matter at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am afraid it shows that the hon. gentleman is prepared to condemn it without proper consideration.

Mr. OSLER. I am prepared to condemn the contract, as I see it now, and it will require a great many engineers' reports to make me change my mind. Still, I would be the first man to rise and say that I had been mistaken, if you can show me that this is a necessary thing to do. It has been stated outside that there are private reasons that the Government cannot divulge, why this road should be built at once, and why a secret contract should have been given. Now, if these reasons exist, I say the Government had no right to entrust the building of that road to any private contractors, the Government should have built that road themselves—although it is a terrible risk to run—under their own supervision. I acknowledge that it would be better even to risk the building of it under the direction of the Minister of Public Works and of the Minister of Railways, at the cost of the country, rather than to have it built under this contract. I can see no reason for sanctioning this contract, and, unless better reasons are given than we have yet heard, I cannot understand how members on the Government side can swallow the contract. But if they do so, I, for one, will hereafter

never refuse to believe the story, either that Jonah swallowed the whale, or that the whale swallowed Jonah.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the question is submitted to the House, I feel it my duty, not only to myself and to my constituents, but to the country, to enter my solemn protest against this House sanctioning the contract. I just want to say that in the Address presented to this House at the opening of the last session, His Excellency stated that Bills for a plebiscite and the repeal of the franchise Act would be submitted. We have the word of the right hon. Prime Minister, made on more than one occasion, that the first act of this Government would be to repeal the Franchise Act. We have also the pledge of the Prime Minister to the temperance people of this country that a plebiscite would be submitted at the last session. Both of these questions, in my opinion, as the Prime Minister's word was behind them, demanded urgency. Now the same questions appear in the Address presented by His Excellency at the opening of the present session. They were both permitted to lie over for the past year because there was no urgency. But this question of the Yukon Railway is now submitted on the ground of urgency, and must take precedence over the Prime Minister's pledge to the temperance people and to the country in general on both these other questions, which, in my opinion, are very important. Now, I must say that the Ministers must have been in possession of all the facts in regard to that Klondike country fully two years ago, certainly at the close of last session. But in place of grappling with the question, some of them ordered new palace cars to be made that they might go on a jaunting tour around the country, and they spent the whole season taking trips from one end of the country to the other, some of them going across the ocean, and all this time the Klondike boom was going on, and they were making no provision for the people either getting in or getting out. Now, within eight or ten days of the meeting of Parliament, they come down and say: This is a question of urgency, and they want to raise money to help carry the Ontario elections. Mackenzie & Mann were our friends, and we entered into a contract with them. My hon. friend the leader of the Patron element in this House has made his speech to-night. I wish he had read to the House the declaration of the Patron organization, that he and many others sent broadcast throughout this country, proclaiming on every hustings that if sent to Parliament, they would oppose the subsidizing of any railway either by land or by money. That is the platform of the Patron organization; yet my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) comes to the House and makes a statement that he has been charged in his own constituency with having sold out to the Prime Minister just before the elections.

I agree with the hon. gentleman that I do not think that that charge could have been made before he was elected, but I think it can be made since his election, and since the Postmaster General went to him and the rest of the Patrons that were elected to this House, and said to them: If you want patronage in your constituency, you have got to support this Government. They accepted the bait and took the patronage, and have gone into the Liberal caucus ever since, and have been supporters of the Liberal party. They were in their caucus to-day and swallowed the Yukon deal, giving away, as my hon. friend from Toronto says, an equivalent of a strip of country 16 miles broad, extending from Montreal to Toronto. And yet they came here to oppose any grant to a railway either of money or land. Mr. Speaker, I must say that, in my opinion, the Government have placed in the mouth of His Excellency, in his Speech, a statement that is not entirely correct, when they compelled him to say:

A contract has been entered into, subject to your approval, for the completion at the earliest possible moment of a system of rail and river communication through Canadian territory with the Klondike and principal gold fields, which it is expected will secure to Canada the larger portion of the lucrative traffic of that country.

Now, the Minister of Railways has submitted a Bill to the House in which it does not appear that this railway will establish communication through a Canadian territory with the Klondike. Therefore, is that statement in the Speech correct?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** It is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, the route passes through a river, part of which is not Canadian territory, but is in American territory. We have treaty rights to go there and do certain things, but the route is not wholly in Canadian territory, some 125 miles of it is through American territory. Yet His Excellency is made to say in his Speech that we have agreed to build a road and have river communication wholly in Canadian territory, whereas that statement is not correct. I rise simply to enter my protest to the Yukon scheme. I intend to offer it opposition at every stage when the Bill is brought before the House, and I hope a large number of hon. gentlemen opposite, when they hear from their constituents, as many of them will before this debate closes, will see that this Government have gone back on their pledges, that they have given a contract to friends, secretly, without compensation, something they denounced from pillar to post during all the eighteen or twenty years they sat on this side of the House. The hon. member for Frontenac (**Mr. Rogers**) made the statement that he partially forgave the Government in regard to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. He forgave them because he was advised by his

Mr. TAYLOR.

son, who knew a good deal more than he did, to leave the House before the Minister came down with the Crow's Nest Pass scheme, and he was not here to vote for or against it, that arrangement having been put through during the last hours of the session when there was only a bodyguard here to transact the legislation of the country. This is a different scheme. It is not going to cost the country a cent, they say, the Government are not giving any money; but they are taxing every person who goes over the road and are giving the company a stretch of country 18 miles wide by 350 miles long. I think when the hon. member for Frontenac and many other members hear from their constituents, I repeat, as they will do before the vote will be recorded, they will come to the conclusion, that if they want to represent the people another term, they must vote differently from what they pledged themselves to do in Room 16 to-day.

Some hon. **MEMBERS.** Go on.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am quite willing to go on and occupy the time of the House, if necessary; but I simply rose to express my opinion and to enter my protest against the consummation of the contract that has been laid before the House.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I must, from the very outset, confess that it is always a matter of surprise to me to see how the First Minister sways all those who support his Government in this House, and the people of this country will, no doubt, share my astonishment when they learn that my hon. friend has succeeded in silencing the hon. member for North Wellington (**Mr. McMullen**), and several other friends of his who had previously made it a rule never to let the Address pass without participating in the debate, either to approve or to condemn it. At the time when the Conservatives were at the head of affairs in this country, the followers of the Prime Minister used to make themselves conspicuous by the sallies of their wit; they used to wax eloquent when pointing out to this House the nefarious effects of the Government's policy! Now that the same policy is being attacked by the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, the hon. Prime Minister, through some occult influence, has succeeded in gagging all his friends, thus preventing the hon. member for North Wellington from advocating the Government's policy. And by thus reducing them to silence, what untold tortures, I ask, did not the Prime Minister inflict upon his friends who used so strongly to raise their voices against the Conservative policy and uphold with such vehemence his own policy!

The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, is like a magic lantern through which the supporters of the Government are made to

see all the marvels of the policy of the Cabinet. But, Sir, I do not think the electorate will appreciate the marvels exhibited through this magic lantern with as much enthusiasm as the supporters of the Government do. The criticisms which have been passed upon that policy by the hon. members who have so far taken part in the debate, show beyond a doubt that the Liberal party have no policy of their own; that the financial policy advocated by them was borrowed from the Conservatives, after being somewhat altered by the preferential clause introduced, last year, into the tariff, and the just value of which can only be appreciated next year. As to the railway policy adopted by the Administration, it is at best but a slavish copy of the policy framed by the old Government. As far as the other departments are concerned, their policy, I believe, is not up to the standard of efficiency set up by the defunct administration. According to what was stated by His Excellency, in the Speech from the Throne, one would be led to believe that during the year just elapsed, the Pactolus had rolled its golden waves all over the various provinces of Canada, scattering everywhere political and commercial prosperity.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier.) Hear, hear.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) But, for my part, Sir, I hold that the prosperity with which Canada was blessed during the year that has just closed is, in a larger measure, to be attributed to Divine Providence than to the policy of the present Administration. The Government, I believe, ought to be grateful for that prosperity of which they now boast, not only to Divine Providence, but also to the old Administration.

The PRIME MINISTER. (Translation.) To Providence only.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Both to Providence and to the previous Administration: to Providence, in the first place, for the bountiful harvests with which certain provinces of Canada have been blest, and, in the second place, to the old Administration, for the steadily increasing credit which the Government have inherited from their predecessors, in taking the reins of power, a credit, I say, which has enabled them to borrow money at lower interest, so that the credit of the Dominion on the European markets now stands on a par with that of the best governed and most prosperous nations of the world. The hon. Prime Minister, when he came into power, found our credit established on a sound basis. He found a country with immense resources and possibilities, and potentialities, a country perfectly equipped, financially and commercially speaking. But now, according to the Speech they have put in His Excellency's mouth, one would be led to believe that

the whole credit for our prosperous situation was due to the Administration now at the head of affairs.

As I just remarked, Mr. Speaker, according to the Speech from the Throne, one would be led to think that the Pactolus had rolled its golden waters over all the provinces of the Dominion and that the Government alone were responsible for those blessings. But with reference to the province of Quebec, the only one that has given to the present Government, at the last election, a substantial majority, the trouble is that that province unfortunately, has not been blessed with as abundant a harvest as the other parts of the Dominion have been. Were now the hon. Prime Minister to go through the rural constituencies of his native province, he could easily satisfy himself that, owing to the straitened circumstances in which, not only the farming community, but also the business men in our towns and cities find themselves, the province of Quebec is far from enjoying an unprecedented prosperity. The Prime Minister could satisfy himself that the Pactolus, in the year that has just closed, did not roll its golden sands over that portion of the country; that the condition of affairs could considerably be bettered, and that Providence has frowned upon the province which gave the Prime Minister his majority. Actually the state of trade is considerably embarrassed, and our farmers are in more straitened circumstances than they ever found themselves in for many years past, in spite of the blessings of the present Administration, in spite of that prosperity which the Government make their boast of in the Speech from the Throne.

The Prime Minister stated, in the course of his remarks in reply to the leader of the Opposition that his policy had been endorsed from one extremity of the country to the other; and in order to substantiate his statement, he adduced the fact that his Government had seen victory perch upon their banner at all the by-elections that had been held, more particularly during the past year. Mr. Speaker, the by-elections that have been held in the province of Quebec are by no means an index to the prosperity of the Government's policy. Let the hon. Prime Minister recall to mind, let also his colleagues and his political friends in the province of Quebec remember the statement over and over again made by them before the electorate of that province, at the last general elections: that, if the electors wished to know what was the policy of the Liberal party, they should give that party a chance of administering the affairs of the country during this Parliament. Notwithstanding the depression which prevails in the province of Quebec, the electors of that province thought it their duty to confirm the lease of power they had previously granted the Prime Minister, for at least the whole duration of this Parliament. It was owing to this determination of the electorate

that, yielding to the entreaties of the Premier's supporters who, at the by-elections, begged of them to continue the present Administration in power and give the Ministers a chance to govern the country for the full term of this Parliament, the electors of Quebec gave them a favourable verdict in nearly all the constituencies, which, with the exception of Nicolet, were previously represented in this House by supporters of the Government. Such is the reason why the electors have decided to continue their confidence to the present Administration.

With reference to the county of Nicolet, every one knows, and the Prime Minister and his friends know also, by what means they have succeeded in carrying this electoral division, which almost invariably had given its support to the Conservative party. The hon. Prime Minister himself knows perfectly well the means which were resorted to, in order to convert the Liberal minority into a majority in the county of Nicolet. The hon. Prime Minister knows that the influence of both the Federal and Local Governments had to be brought into play, in order to bring about that political change in Nicolet. The hon. Prime Minister knows that three railway companies had combined to give their support to the Government candidate. He knows what the representatives of these companies have done, or, if he does not know it, he will have a chance of learning it during the trial of the election petition which will soon unroll before the legal tribunals; he will learn to what an extent illegal and corrupt practices have prevailed, and such, in all likelihood was the reason which prompted the majority to vote in favour of his candidate. Having had the honour of visiting some parts of that constituency at election time, I was a witness to the unheard of attempts made by the shareholders of the Drummond County Railway Company to induce the electors of the Nicolet County to give their votes to the Administration of the day.

The Prime Minister himself, on nomination day, with that suave eloquence and craftiness in which he is such a master, was heard to declare before the electors of Nicolet that if they wished to have a railway built through the northern portion of their constituency, which is the most densely inhabited of the whole electoral district, it would be much better for them to send a supporter of the Government of the day, and that they would stand a better chance of having their railway constructed if they sent a supporter of the Government as their representative in the Commons than they would have with a member sitting on this side of the House. The hon. Premier knows that his political friends, strong by this statement, did not fail, during the last electoral contest, to develop the idea which he had enunciated on nomination day, and that they went in that direction much further than he himself did. He knows very

Mr. DUPONT.

well the statement made by his friends at the private meetings that, in case the Opposition candidate were returned, it was all over with the building of the railway through that electoral district, which the voters had so much set their heart upon, in order to develop the resources of their county. It was through those manoeuvres that the Liberal party carried the riding. That is why the Prime Minister was enabled to come and state on the floor of the House that at all the by-elections in the province of Quebec, a verdict had been given in favour of his policy, as he had carried every one of them. Let the Prime Minister allow me to tell him that had we fought with equal arms, and had we had fair-play, a different result would have been reached, and a verdict would have been obtained against his policy in several by-elections that have lately been held in the province of Quebec. But, Sir, the Conservatives are not the only party from which criticisms of the Premier's policy are heard. We all know to what manoeuvres the present Government had to resort to in order to prevail upon their followers to support their policy. Everybody knows the attitude taken by the Hon. François Langelier, who has resigned his seat in this House in order to ascend the judicial bench of his province. What was the statement made by the Hon. Mr. Langelier concerning the policy of the Administration? What did a large number of the friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite state in the same connection? They censured the course taken by the First Minister and his colleagues in this House.

Sir, I have just been looking over the statements made by Mr. Calixte Lebeuf, an important member of the Liberal party in Montreal, in which he strongly censured the position taken by the First Minister and his colleagues towards their old supporters. I will spare the feelings of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) and refrain from repeating before this House the severe criticisms passed upon them by a large number of their friends, which are recorded in the press of the country; but I will only tell the Premier that when he states that his policy had been endorsed by the whole province of Quebec, he cannot expect us to sit silent here without bringing to his recollection what his own friends think of his political course, and that of his colleagues in the Administration. The course pursued by the Hon. François Langelier, and by other members of the Liberal party, on the occasion I have just mentioned, was calculated to create a very painful feeling among the French members of the Bar of the province of Quebec, as also in the ranks of the hon. gentlemen sitting opposite. Why, Sir, here is a gentleman, occupying a high station in his party, and enjoying the general esteem of his party, who—I was going to say rises

in arms against his leader—stands up for his rights as an old Liberal, claiming that the old members of the party are being ousted by new-comers. Unfortunately for him and for the old Liberals, the Hon. F. Langelier surrendered, under inauspicious circumstances, and on bad grounds, which can not meet with the approval of men who have at heart the honour of public life. The Hon. F. Langelier and the old Liberals whose representative he was supposed to be appear, from the course held by them, to have been actuated by no other motives but that of patronage. The First Minister was censured because he had not implemented the promises made to the Hon. F. Langelier, by delaying his appointment either to a judgeship or to the governorship of the province of Quebec. Sir, there sat yonder, in this House, during two or three sessions, a gentleman, the Hon. Mr. Langelier, who had in his pocket a letter from the Prime Minister containing the promise of either a judgeship or the governorship of the province of Quebec. How, then, I ask, Sir, could Mr. Langelier act with independence, when called upon to vote on measures of public policy before this House? I hold, Sir, that the action of the Prime Minister, when giving by writing to one of his supporters, long beforehand, the promise of an important public office, was an infringement of the Independence of Parliament Act, an Act which the hon. gentlemen opposite ought to have as much respect for as the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have; an Act, I say, which the hon. Premier and his friends, at the time when they sat on the Opposition benches, strongly censured us for violating. Never yet, Sir, through my long experience in this House, have I met with such an outrageous infringement of that Act. The statements of the Hon. François Langelier are on record, showing that he, at least, was not in a position to give an unbiased opinion on the questions of public policy on which he was called upon to vote. I am sorry to have to say that, upon that occasion, the Bar of the city of Quebec has pursued an extraordinary course, when they tendered a banquet to the Hon. Mr. Langelier who had, when leaving public life with a stain upon his name—

Some hon. MEMBERS. (Translation.)
Order, order.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I am referring, Sir, to the attitude of Mr. F. Langelier, when he was engaged in active politics, and I think I am in order in so doing. The stand taken by Mr. François Langelier was clearly an open infringement of the Independence of Parliament Act, and I may tell the hon. gentlemen opposite, who are largely responsible for the infringement of that Act, that their course has not met with the approval of the country.

The hon. First Minister, in the course of his remarks, laid much emphasis on the increase in the volume of trade, as an index to an almost unheard of prosperity. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that, in many cases, such an increase in the volume of trade was but the forerunner of a commercial and industrial crisis, and I refer him in this connection to the Reports on Trade and Navigation for the years 1873 and 1874, which show that, when the Mackenzie Government came into power, the first year of their administration was remarkable for an extraordinary swelling in the volume of trade, while the end of that administration was noted for an unprecedented commercial crisis in the history of the country. Let us hope, Sir, that history will not repeat itself, and that the increase that has taken place this year in the volume of our trade will continue; that our commercial prosperity will be of a permanent and stable character and that the expansion of our exports and imports will not be, as it was in 1874, the forerunner of an unprecedented crisis in the trade and manufactures of the country.

Now, Sir, coming to our trade and tariff regulations, we would have, I think, the right to expect from the First Minister and his colleagues, in the readjustment of these matters, that they did not concern themselves so much with the interests of Great Britain and those of the United States, or of any other nation. The Canadian tariff ought to be framed for Canada alone, and exclusively for her own benefit. When the question is to frame our tariff, to regulate the trade movement of Canada, with a view to raising a sufficient revenue for the needs of the administration of our public affairs, the Premier has no business to grant favours to the mother country. We have not to concern ourselves with any other interests but our own; and I may just as well tell the hon. gentleman now, that I could never understand the fact of the Government giving, last session, preferential trade to the mother country, or a reduction of 25 per cent on all articles imported from Great Britain. I do not see any reason for maintaining this preferential tariff in favour of Great Britain, a policy which, in my humble opinion, cannot but result detrimentally to Canadian trade. Great Britain, I may be told, admits Canadian products free of duty on her markets; but it must be borne in mind that this is not a special favour granted to her Canadian colony. Great Britain extends the same privilege to every nation. It was in order to accommodate her own population that the British Government decided to open the markets of the United Kingdom to the whole world. Therefore, we owe no debt of gratitude to her on that account; we owe no reciprocity to the mother country in return for the advantages which we share in common with the other nations which are holding commercial intercourse with her. I now proceed to deal

with one of the most important paragraphs of the Speech from the Throne, one which has roused a great deal of interest throughout the country and in this House, if we may judge from the criticisms it has provoked on this side of the House. I refer to the railway intended to reach the Yukon gold fields, the construction of which is announced by the Government. I do not intend to discuss the Government policy in that respect until all the papers are laid on the Table. But I may just as well say now that if the route chosen by the Government is not the best that could be selected, they are very wrong in granting the company such a large subsidy as that mentioned in the Bill. The route chosen by the Government to reach the Yukon country is said not to be an all-Canadian route. From the geographical situation of that region, I understand that the only means to secure an all-Canadian route, to reach the Klondike region, would be by starting from the Edmonton district. The Government have decided to give to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, the contractors of the proposed line, in addition to the monopoly, a land subsidy of 3,500,000 acres of auriferous lands. What will there be left of those lands to the Government? What would be the cost of a land subsidy for a railway from Edmonton to the Yukon gold fields? In looking over the map, I see that there is a distance of 1,600 miles of railway to be built, in order to reach the Yukon by an all-Canadian route. The proposed railway may only be of a provisional character; and possibly the Government might, next year, decide to build a permanent railway, and they might again have to grant 3,500 acres of land for a distance of 1,600 miles, to the company undertaking to construct that all-Canadian route; then, all the auriferous lands, now the property of the Dominion, will fall into the hands of the railway companies.

The First Minister understands better than any one else the danger of such a monopoly. My hon. friend, who has long been a resident of the Eastern Townships, knows all the difficulties that were thrown in the way of colonization in that important portion of the province of Quebec, by the British North American Land Company. The Premier knows how dangerous and prejudicial to the Eastern Townships that monopoly proved, and yet, the Government are creating in that remote Yukon region a monopoly a hundred times more iniquitous than that created in the Eastern Townships by the British Government in favour of the company I have just mentioned. All the auriferous lands, now the property of Canada, will fall into the hands of monopolists, who were so strongly denounced by the Premier and his colleagues, when they sat on this side of the House. Now, these very monopolists are becoming, as it were, an essential factor in the development and prosperity of the country. When they sat

on this side, the hon. gentlemen looked upon them as a very dangerous class. They even censured the Conservative party for allowing these monopolists to grab the public domain. The First Minister, by endorsing that land grab and monopoly in favour of the Mackenzie & Mann Company, has turned his back and given the lie to all his past professions concerning the railway policy of the country. He has abjured all the past professions of his party, and the country will wonder at the hon. gentleman's inconsistency. I would have approved of a liberal aid in favour of the construction of an all-Canadian railway, from Edmonton to the Yukon, by granting either a money subsidy or a land subsidy outside of the Yukon gold fields. Moreover, we have now reliable data on the auriferous deposits in the vicinity of the Rocky Mountains, and it is known beyond a doubt that gold is found in large quantities, not only in the Yukon region, but also on the rivers which flow through the North-west of Canada. Last season, gold was found on the Peace River, and in paying quantities on the great Saskatchewan. Gold in paying quantities is reported by experienced miners to have been found on most of the rivers flowing through the North-west and the Rocky Mountains.

The Government, instead of groping along and giving away millions of dollars worth of auriferous lands to the Mackenzie-Mann Company, could have, with equal chances, undertaken without delay the building of an all-Canadian route. From the information laid before this House, I am in a position to state that a railway to the Yukon could be constructed through Canadian territory, and with the facilities at our disposal, several auriferous regions still unknown and unexplored for want of railway communication could be opened up. The Government have no idea of the enormous sums of money they are giving away for the construction of this railway. They are entirely in the dark as to the value of the property they are giving to a company of monopolists who, like the North British American Land Company in the Eastern Townships, will part with their lands only at extortionate prices, beyond the reach of poor miners. At the time when they were members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in this House, the hon. First Minister, in particular, and his colleagues were loud in their denunciations of the Conservative Government; they were always heard thundering and clamouring for reforms. I shall not take up the time of the House in expatiating upon all the reforms they used to clamour for. I shall confine myself to one of the reforms which the hon. Premier and his colleagues pledged themselves to accomplish, should they come into power; I refer to the reformation of the Upper House.

The hon. gentleman and his friends had set their hearts upon the reform of that

body. It was one of the topics they liked to dwell upon before the electorate, at election times, to rouse popular prejudices. All their candidates were loud in their denunciations of the Government for not reforming the Upper House which, they said, was composed of malignant old men. Will the hon. gentlemen pretend that they have reformed the Senate so as to make it more useful, more efficacious, more representative than it was before their coming into office? Certainly not. On the contrary, the Government, instead of making the Senate a more representative body than it was under the Conservative Administration, have made it less representative. So far as the province of Quebec is concerned, the Senate is no longer a body in which the equilibrium is preserved, a body in which the various elements of our population are fairly represented. To tell the truth, the cities of Montreal and Quebec are the only centres which are represented in the Upper House. The hon. gentlemen opposite who, during the last electoral campaign fawned on the farming community, ought, so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, to have made the Upper House a body truly representative of the popular interests; they ought to have selected a larger number of Senators out of the farming community, as representing the landed interests of the country. Why, Sir, the Senate, so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, is no longer represented but by the cities of Montreal and Quebec, as both these cities have a majority of representatives in the Upper House. Montreal gentlemen have been selected as members of the Senate, and the press of that latter city and of the city of Quebec have extolled to the skies a policy of scorn and contempt towards the agricultural community, a policy, I say, of ostracism of that class from the Senate. It is merely going against the spirit and intent of the federal compact thus to ostracise the farming community from the Senate, and to deprive the vast majority of our fellow-citizens of the representatives they are entitled to, as they form the four-fifths of our population. The Government have deprived the farming community, representing the four-fifths of our population, of a majority in the Senate, a majority which entitled them to a fair representation in our Upper House. So, the Government of the day, where failing to walk in the footsteps of their predecessors, have perpetrated an egregious blunder. Instead of reforming, they have deformed the Senate. Speaking of the province of Quebec, I may say that the First Minister and his colleagues have made the Senate a less representative body than it was under the Conservative rule, so far as the opinions of the people and the public interests in general are concerned.

Before I resume my seat, I may add that, so far as the railway policy of the Government is concerned, I reserve to myself the

right of more fully criticising it, when all the papers relating to it are laid on the Table. The First Minister, I hope, and his colleagues shall see to it that all the papers relating to the Klondike gold fields are translated into French for the benefit of the inhabitants of the province of Quebec, as a large number of them intend, this year, seeking that region. The First Minister and his colleagues, I trust, will see to it that all the public papers, published in English, concerning that region, are translated into French and fairly distributed to the inhabitants of our province who intend seeking the Klondike gold fields.

Mr. McNEILL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY— KASLO-SLOCAN RAILWAY PLANS.

Mr. HAGGART. Before the motion is carried I desire to ask the Prime Minister, if he will be in a position to lay on the Table of the House, as promised, the information contained in the report of the engineer on the Yukon Railway. I would like also all the information in the department in reference to the Kaslo and Slocan Railway. As the Minister of Marine has made an important statement to-day, I would also wish him, if he would, too, lay on the Table of the House before we consider the Yukon deal, all correspondence with the Rothschild's agents in reference to this particular work, or correspondence with any other parties who called upon the Government.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). All the documents are being prepared, but I do not know about their being laid on the Table of the House to-morrow. They will be brought down as soon as they are ready, and I hope they will all be on the Table when the Bill is discussed. As to the Kaslo and Slocan Railway that is a new thing, and I will have to refer to the Minister of Railways.

Mr. HAGGART. The Department of Railways has approved of the plan and location of the Kaslo and Slocan Railway, and there is no trouble in getting it from the Department of Railways and laying it on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The hon. gentleman thinks he is well informed with regard to the action of the department on the Kaslo and Slocan Railway. Does he know if this is a Dominion line of railway or if the department had to pass on it?

Mr. HAGGART. Surely when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) makes it a standard of this road, he must have in his department all information in reference to the Kaslo and Slocan.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) will answer my question.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know. Perhaps it is a provincial and not a Dominion road, and did not necessarily pass through his department, but I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) that they are obliged to furnish all the information to his department. I do not know whether they have done it or not, but it is their duty to do it, and if they have received any assistance whatever from the Dominion Government, either in the shape of a subsidy or in any manner, the road had to be approved by the officers of his department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) stated with the utmost confidence that the plans were in the office. I take it he spoke from actual personal knowledge that the plans had to pass through that department and were passed upon by him.

Mr. HAGGART. Not at all. The hon. gentleman must know that I never see the plans as head of the department. They are passed on by officers of the department. I do not know whether the plans are in the office or not. I never looked at a plan in the office, and I suppose the hon. gentleman has not done so either. If the hon. gentleman says he has no plans in reference to the Kaslo and Slocan, of course it would be impossible for him to lay them on the Table.

Mr. SPROULE. How does he know about the standard of this railway then?

Mr. WALLACE. The answer given by the Minister of Railways and Canals was not quite satisfactory to me. The contract with the Yukon Railway fixes the Kaslo-Slocan as the standard, and I understood the Minister to say that there were plans of the Kaslo and Slocan in his department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did you; well, I did not say it.

Mr. WALLACE. The question was asked whether the information would be laid on the Table, and what I would like the Minister to say is if we are to have the information. The Minister has placed the Kaslo and Slocan as the standard, and of course he did not go it blind. He must have his information which justifies him in fixing that as the standard, and now we want the information brought before the House before next Tuesday, so that we will be in a position to discuss the whole matter intelligently. Is the Minister prepared to give the information?

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) was slightly inaccurate in stating how the matter arose, because if my memory serves me at all, the ex-Minister himself undertook to state what was in the department.

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. WALLACE. That is immaterial. Will we get the information?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Any information which is in the department I will be happy to furnish.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not quite an answer. The Kaslo-Slocan has been fixed as the standard of the Yukon Railway, and we must have information about the Kaslo-Slocan so as to enable us to form an opinion as to whether it is a good standard or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall be happy to furnish all the information in the department. I cannot furnish it if it is not there.

Mr. WALLACE. It might be got in time.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN. There is great anxiety in Alberta amongst the ranchers there in consequence of the police being taken away to go to the Klondike. I am told they are to be taken away from McLeod and Calgary, and some of the ranchers have written to me suggesting that there might be difficulty in recruiting. I believe there is recruiting going on in the North-west Territories and Manitoba. They have suggested that even if sufficient recruits are obtained they will be raw and untrained and unfit for the work. I can myself assure the Prime Minister that when a recruit first enlists in the mounted police he is not fit for prairie work as it requires some time to get them accustomed to it. The ranchers have suggested to me that the difficulty might be got over, if, instead of filling up the ranks with raw recruits the Government were to recruit from the permanent force in the East. It would relieve the West very much if the right hon. the Prime Minister would make an announcement in regard to that.

The PRIME MINISTER. The policy of the Government with regard to this matter was explained last session, and I can only repeat that it is the intention to keep these exposed points, McLeod and Calgary well protected by the police force.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 11th February, 1898.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

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

Mr. **SPEAKER** read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

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

Government House,

Ottawa, 11th February, 1898.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 17) to amend the Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.—(Mr. McMullen.)

DRAINS CROSSING RAILWAYS.

Mr. **CAMPBELL** moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 18) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This is an Act to provide for the crossing of railways by drains, and also to protect farmers along the line of railway from fires that take place and frequently do a great deal of damage to their property situated along such lines. As the House knows, it is almost impossible to get drainage across or under a line of railway, and in the western part of Ontario we have suffered greatly from that cause, and this Act provides a remedy. I may say that a somewhat similar Act has also been introduced by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), and I propose, after the second reading of this Bill, to have it referred to the same committee that will have consideration of the Bill of the hon. member for West Elgin; and I think we will be able to consolidate the two Bills so as to make one perfect Bill out of them.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS DUTIES IN ALASKA.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Gov-

ernment to an important telegram published in the Montreal "Gazette" of this day, in regard to two important subjects that have been mentioned in the House, namely, the Yukon Railway Bill and the question of coasting regulations. A telegram from Washington states that there has been reported by Senator Frye from the Committee on Commerce, a Bill to amend the navigation laws affecting the coasting trade of the United States. The telegram states:

The Bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations for the transshipment of goods imported into the United States from any foreign port by sea or river route, and also amends the present law found in Section 2108 of the Revised Statutes so as to read as follows:—

"The master of any foreign vessel, laden or in ballast, arriving, whether by sea or otherwise, in the western waters of the United States from any foreign territory adjacent to the northern, north-eastern or north-western frontiers of the United States, shall report at the office of any collector or deputy collector of the customs which shall be nearest to the point where such vessel may enter such waters; and such vessel shall not transfer her cargo or passengers to another vessel or proceed further inland, either to unload or take in cargo, without a special permit from such collector, issued under and in accordance with such general or special regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, from time to time prescribe. This section shall also apply to trade with or through Alaska. For any violation of this section such vessel may be seized and forfeited. The Bill provides for the forfeiture of any merchandise shipped from one American port to another, 'either directly or via a foreign port,' in any other than an American vessel."

I may just add one word to that, without proposing to discuss the subject at all. That is already a construction of the law in the United States which does not obtain under our law at present, as I am advised. For instance, a cargo of American freight coming from an American port cannot be transhipped at a Canadian port and carried on to a United States port. All I pressed for the other night, as hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches will understand, was, that while it is within the right of the United States so to legislate, we must meet them half-way whenever they do it, by similar legislation.

A like provision is also made in regard to the transportation of passengers by a foreign vessel from one American port to another, except that the penalty in this case is placed at \$100 each. The penalty under the existing law is \$2. The Bill is made to take effect after its passage.

May I also ask the Government's attention to what it seems to me would be of great assistance in the debate on the railway Bill, and I ask the particular attention of the Minister of the Interior, who is familiar with the subject and understands how far in connection with the present negotiations regarding the boundary it is possible to comply with my suggestion. My suggestion is that upon a copy of the map

already presented to the House there should be placed indications, for instance, red marks would do, showing the positions in the disputed territory that the United States at present occupy by customs or other officers. I think that would be quite sufficient. Of course, I do not know how far the Government would be warranted in marking what is disputed territory, nevertheless I think it would not confound any proper conception to mark the points they have already occupied in the territory with customs officers.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). It might be as hard to find the disputed boundary as the real boundary.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I do not press for any impropriety being committed, but I think this can be done, that on the map could be marked the points the United States occupy by officers of any character, customs, or otherwise.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). First, with respect to the question asked as to the boundary line. The difficulty arises at three points particularly. First, in the territory around the Stikine River. There is, however, a provisional boundary, which was run some years ago and provisionally adopted by both Governments?

Mr. **FOSTER**. How far inland is that?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I scaled it on the map, and from the mouth of the river it is about twenty-two miles—not twenty-two miles in a straight line, but that distance following the windings of the river. There is therefore no present difficulty there. Our officers have been sent there for the purpose of establishing a post just within the provisional line of the Stikine River, and they have been furnished with maps showing the provisional boundary line.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. When was that provisional boundary line established?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Speaking from recollection, it was some time in 1876 or 1877. Difficulties also arose in the White Pass, behind the village of Skagway, and at Chilkat Pass behind Dyea. I believe our contention is that Skagway and Dyea are really in Canadian territory, but as the United States have had undisputed possession of them for some time past, we are precluded from attempting to take possession of that territory.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. May I be excused for saying that I do not think the hon. Minister meant to say "undisputed possession."

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. There has been no protests made. It must

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**.

be taken as undisputed when there has been no protest made against the occupation of that territory by the United States.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. A claim, I suppose, was made and adhered to?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. There is nothing in the records to show that any protest has been made—an unfortunate thing for us, but it is a fact. I do not know that that particularly affects the discussion, because there has been no real discussion about that particular point. We have taken the position that there can be no doubt raised as to the Canadian territory beginning at the summit; we have taken the position that the claim of Canada to occupy the territory inside of the summit from the boundary at White Pass and Chilkat Pass is not deniable, and we cannot admit it is debatable, and we have instructed our officers to establish posts as near the boundary as physical conditions will permit.

Mr. **FOSTER**. How far from the water line?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. About fifteen miles from tide water. An accurate survey has not been made in the White Pass, but the distance is about the same, fifteen miles. Therefore, so far as possible under the present conditions, the idea of the hon. gentleman has been carried out, and our officers have been instructed to locate themselves as nearly as possible to the summit on the north-eastern side and to take the summit of the White Pass and Chilkat Pass as the boundary line, without making any admission as to the right of the United States to the territory on the seaward side.

DREDGING LEASES ON THE YUKON, &c.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I wish to call the attention of the Government to an advertisement which appeared in the Chicago "Record," which reads thus:

THE KLONDIKE, YUKON AND COPPER RIVER COMPANY.

This company is organized on the co-operative plan, and will send thirty to forty skilled men into Alaska and the North-west Territory to engage in transportation, mining, dredging, prospecting and merchandising. They own their own ocean steamers, river boats and dredges. They have secured a lease of fifty miles from the Canadian Government for dredging the Klondike, Yukon, Indian, Stewart and McQueston rivers, where the gravel beds and sand bars are exceedingly rich in gold. They hold the Government contract for carrying the mail from Seattle to Sitka, Juneau, Skagway and Dyea.

We have a number of very important names given as those going on the expedition:

Rev. Frank B. Vrooman; Hon. D. I. Murphy, former U. S. Commissioner of Pensions; United States Senators Wilson and Blackburn; Hon. G. D. Meiklejohn, Assistant Secretary of War.

And some others. The point to which I wish to call the attention of the Government and the House—I do not want to discuss it—is that the statement is made that this company has secured a lease from the Canadian Government of fifty miles for dredging the Klondike, Yukon, Indian, Stewart and McQueston rivers. If the Government have done so in the face of the present laws and the Mining Act, it seems to me to be a very serious matter.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As to the statements made in the article from which the hon. gentleman quoted, of course the Government have no information beyond that possessed by the hon. gentleman except it relates to action taken by the Government. Regulations were framed some time ago for the issuing of leases for dredging. Under those regulations any one is entitled to apply for a lease—no leases were given to any particular person. The first applicant was treated as having a prior right as in an ordinary mining claim. A very large number of applications have been filed, I am informed by the officers of the department. My present impression is, speaking from memory, that no leases have been issued yet. My instructions were not to issue any leases until the 15th of the month; but I can get the hon. gentleman the information if he desires and definitely state what the fact is. If any lease has been issued, it is one granted in the ordinary way and under the ordinary regulations.

Mr. FOSTER. Are those regulations included in the report laid on the Table as placer mining regulations?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think they are included in the printed regulations which were issued. There were several editions printed, and they were printed separately and printed together.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman lay on the Table copies of whatever leases have been issued?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We can lay a list on the Table, if the hon. gentleman desires. I do not think any leases have yet been issued.

Mr. DAVIN. If any have been issued, will the hon. gentleman lay a list on the Table of the House?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give a statement that will afford the hon. gentleman full information as to what has been done.

MR. JENNINGS'S REPORT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to lay on the Table copies of Mr. Jennings's report on the various routes

to the Yukon. I have given instructions that the various maps referred to be blue printed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If orders have not been given for the printing of these papers, I would suggest that a motion be passed authorizing the Printing Committee to have them printed without delay.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They have not been printed, and there is no objection to the suggestion made by my hon. friend. I have given instructions to have the maps and plans blue printed and a number of copies furnished for the use of members. The reason why I have not been able to lay them on the Table to-day is that the weather has been so dark that the officers have not been able to make the prints up to this time. I hope to have them to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Those papers should be sent to the printer. If it is necessary that a motion to that effect should be made, I hope the House by common consent will allow my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) to make it. If he does not do so, I shall move, Mr. Speaker:

That the Rule be suspended, and that the papers laid on the Table by the Minister of the Interior be printed.

Mr. DAVIN. I beg to second that.

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bertram for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, I can without the slightest affectation say, that I have never before risen in this House with so much reluctance as I rise on this occasion, to speak upon any subject which has engaged our attention. Not at all, Mr. Speaker, because I have any reluctance to criticise the actions of hon. gentlemen opposite, and to criticise them freely when I think they are wrong, but because I feel a very great reluctance to say anything which may be hurtful to the feelings of a gentleman who is himself so conspicuous for his knightly courtesy to every member of this House, a gentleman, who I venture to say, has done more than any other living parliamentarian to elevate the tone of the debates in this House, and who would himself be, I am sure, reluctant needlessly to wound the susceptibilities of any one of God's creatures. I repeat, Sir, I rise with reluctance to say anything which may be hurtful to the feelings of an hon. gentleman having the characteristics which I have described, and which I believe belong to the right hon. the

Premier of Canada. But, Sir, if I were not to speak on this occasion, I believe that I should not be discharging my duty, however painful it may be for me to describe the course which has been pursued by my right hon. friend, in the manner in which I shall be obliged to describe it. I feel I should not be doing my duty to my constituents, and I should not be doing my duty to that great cause which is dearer to me than any other public cause in all the world, were I to remain silent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I rise in this House to discuss public questions I generally find myself in a somewhat unenviable position, for I know that there are some hon. gentlemen behind me who think that I am not a good enough party man; and I know that every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House thinks I am far too good a party man, and so it is that I am generally between two fires. However, I fancy that, on this occasion, I shall not in anything I have got to say, offend the susceptibilities of any hon. member on this side of the House at all events, because I think their views and mine jump pretty well together on this question. What I propose to discuss in the few remarks that I shall offer to the House, is the conduct of the right hon. gentleman opposite in connection with the question of preferential trade. I listened in this Chamber to my right hon. friend's defence, or attempted defence of his conduct; I listened to it with the greatest possible attention, with anxious attention, and having listened to what he had to say, I came to the conclusion that if an angel from Heaven had come down to this House he could not have persuaded any unprejudiced mind that the right hon. gentleman had kept faith with the people of Canada. That is a hard thing to say. It is a hard thing to say of any hon. member of this House, but it is a harder thing to say of the right hon. gentleman, my feelings with reference to whom I have already described, and it is a very, very hard thing to say of a gentleman who is the Prime Minister of Canada, and who was representing Canada on a most conspicuous occasion when this unfortunate occurrence took place.

But, Sir, what was the right hon. gentleman's defence? It will be in the recollection of hon. members that so soon as the cablegram was published in the press of this country setting out the startling intelligence that the right hon. gentleman had spoken against preferential trade in the mother country, I called the attention of this House to that cablegram, and it will also be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) who sits beside the Prime Minister to-day, and who was then leading the House, said that they all had perfect confidence in the discretion of the Prime Minister, and he (Sir Richard Cartwright) took me somewhat roundly to task for, as he

Mr. McNEILL.

described it, needlessly wasting the time of Parliament in reference to an idle newspaper report. But, Sir, it has turned out to be a fact, an unhappy fact, that that cable report was true. The right hon. gentleman himself admits that it was true, and he attempts to justify his course. Now, what is his justification? In the first place, the right hon. gentleman says that he did not press for preferential trade, because he was afraid of asking too much; because he was afraid that if he did press for preferential trade he would not get anything at all. I want to ask the right hon. gentleman here: What justification has he for making that statement in this House? I want to ask the right hon. gentleman: Why he thought that he could not get preferential trade if he asked it? I want to ask the right hon. gentleman: Why it was that he supposed that the right hon. Mr. Chamberlain would not be prepared to negotiate on the basis of the very proposal that he himself had made? Why did he (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) think that, when he found that not only was that proposal before him, but that the Duke of Devonshire met him in Liverpool on his arrival and welcomed him with a speech which the whole press of England declared to be a foreshadowing of the adoption by the Imperial Government of that preferential proposal. I want to ask him (Sir Wilfrid Laurier): Why he thought he could not obtain preferential trade, or not so much as he wanted to get, when he found that at that very meeting the Prime Minister of New Zealand supported the proposal. Let the right hon. gentleman recollect that the Premier of New Zealand was a convert, or rather that his colony was a converted colony to the principle. Let him recollect that New Zealand was one of the three colonies that opposed the proposal at the colonial conference here; and here was the Premier of that colony backing up the proposal—backing up the suggestion of Mr. Chamberlain which the Duke of Devonshire had practically supported in the afternoon. And yet the right hon. gentleman says he thought that if he pressed for preferential trade, he would be asking too much; and he asks this House to accept that as an excuse for his course. He says that if he had asked for so much, he thinks he could not have obtained the denunciation of the treaties. Why, the right hon. gentleman must surely think us very stupid. The right hon. gentleman surely understands that the denunciation of the treaties was a condition precedent to Mr. Chamberlain's proposal being carried into effect. The right hon. gentleman does not seem to realize, or at least he thinks this House does not realize, that the denunciation of the treaties was one of the very principles embodied in Mr. Chamberlain's proposal. There could not be any preferential trade without the denunciation of the treaties. And yet the right hon. gentleman says that because he

wished to have the denunciation of the treaties, he refused to discuss a proposal which implied the denunciation of the treaties. The right hon. gentleman seems to me to have somewhat misapprehended the gravamen of the charge against him. The gravamen of the charge against the right hon. gentleman is not merely that he did not press for preferential trade in England; but the gravamen of the charge against him is that having told the people of Canada that he would do what he could to secure preferential trade, he not only did not press for it, but he opposed it. He fought against it, he argued against it, he used his influence against it. He threw the whole weight of the seven confederated colonies of North America and the North-west Territories against it, and he bore it down and for the time being smothered it. This is the gravamen of the charge against the right hon. gentleman, and it is useless for him to come here and tell us that he was afraid to press for preferential trade lest he should not get as much as he required, when he was not attempting to press for it, but to destroy it. Has the right hon. gentleman made any defence whatever to that charge in this House? Is he capable of making any defence to that charge? If he is, I will sit down and allow him to do so, and I shall be glad to hear him give any reasonable explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. McNEILL. There is an hon. gentleman sitting behind the right hon. Prime Minister who thinks, I presume, that everyone is moulded in the same mould in which he himself is cast. I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that it is not so. I say distinctly that if the right hon. the Prime Minister can get up in his place in this House and defend the Prime Minister of Canada in the eyes of the civilized world from the charge that is levelled against him to-day, I for one shall be glad to hear him do it. Now, what did the right hon. gentleman do within a few hours of his arrival in Liverpool? He was met, as I have already pointed out, by the Duke of Devonshire. In the afternoon the Duke of Devonshire made a speech in which he declared that free trade had not come up to the expectations of its supporters in these latter days—a speech which, as I have said, was interpreted by the press of the United Kingdom as foreshadowing adoption of preferential trade by the Salisbury Government. It was a speech made by a statesman who, perhaps more than any other in England, jealously weighs every word he utters on any great question; a speech made by a statesman who perhaps more than any other of the first rank in England is slow to depart from old principles and adopt new ones; a speech made by a statesman, who by his patriotism and his sober common sense and prudence has endeared himself to

the best men of all parties in England; and this statesman, this leader of the Liberal Unionists, this man who had been the leader of the great Liberal party in England itself, told the right hon. gentleman that in his judgment and in the judgment of many others free trade had not come up to the expectations of its supporters. And what did the right hon. gentleman do? After this speech had been made by this statesman, who was an old free trader, a colleague of Mr. Bright himself, what did the right hon. gentleman do? In the evening of the very day on which the Duke of Devonshire had made that speech, the right hon. gentleman flung Mr. Chamberlain's proposal into his face. He told the Duke of Devonshire that he wanted no preferential trade for Canada, after having pledged to the people of this country, right and left, over and over again, his solemn promise that he would do all he could for it. He told the Duke of Devonshire that we wanted none of it. He told him that it savoured of protection, and that protection was a curse to Canada; and he even assigned as a reason for his not wishing to have preferential trade, that he did not wish to interfere with that very free trade which the Duke of Devonshire said was not at this present time and in these altered conditions producing such satisfactory results as its supporters would desire. What is the right hon. gentleman's defence? Is there any defence? Does any hon. member of this House venture to say that the defence offered by the right hon. gentleman the other night touches the gravamen of the charge against him at all?

Well, he has another line of defence. His other line of defence, as he told the people in Toronto, and as he told us here the other night, is, that Mr. Chamberlain's proposal smacks too much of free trade, that we could not in Canada adopt it, because it implies free trade within the Empire. It was, he said, too much free trade. But my right hon. friend surely remembers that he is precluded from making any such statement, because in England he said that he opposed it on account of its being too much protection. How, then, can he explain his opposition in England on the ground that it was too much on the lines of free trade? But the hon. gentleman told us in Toronto, and tells us here, that Mr. Chamberlain's proposal was free trade within the Empire, without any customs duties. I have the hon. gentleman's words. He said that there was to be "no customs tariff existing within any part of the Empire"—that that was Mr. Chamberlain's proposal—and that it was because of that he opposed it. Now, as my hon. friend beside me, the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster), pointed out, the right hon. gentleman explained in London, Ont., to the people of Canada what Mr. Chamberlain's proposal was. He carefully explained it, and when he went to England he thorough-

ly understood what it was. With the consent of the House, I shall quote a little more fully than my hon. friend did what the right hon. First Minister told the people of Canada Mr. Chamberlain's proposal really was. But before doing so, let me draw the attention of the House to a question which the right hon. gentleman himself asked me, and it is partly because of that question that I have risen to address this House. The question which he did me the honour to ask me was this: Are you prepared to adopt preferential trade on the basis of the proposal of Mr. Chamberlain? Now, Mr. Speaker, I will give my answer to my right hon. friend, an answer which, I think, will be sufficiently explicit and definite and unambiguous; and the answer I make to him is this: Yes, I am prepared to accept preferential trade, on the basis of Mr. Chamberlain's proposal, as explained by the right hon. gentleman himself in London, Ont., to the people of Canada. Now, I will read to this House what Mr. Chamberlain's proposal was, as explained by the right hon. gentleman himself. What he told the people in London, Ont., was this:

Mr. Chamberlain spoke upon that subject a few weeks ago. I might quote the whole of his speech, but I have not time at such a meeting at this. Let me quote some portions of it. He says: "It seems to me that if the principle of a revenue tariff were to be adopted by the colonies there would be a reason for calling a council of the Empire, and I cannot but think that something like a satisfactory and workable arrangement may be arrived at.

That is what the right hon. gentleman told the people in London Mr. Chamberlain's proposal was. He went on to say:

"But it is a preliminary condition that the colonies should adopt a revenue tariff. (Hear, hear.) We are to have in London in June a meeting of the boards of trade of the colonies to discuss that question. The 'Times,' discussing this very question, spoke as follows:—'Tariff for revenue is to be accepted as a fundamental principle for that agreement. It is only tariff for protection, as between different parts of the Empire which must be abolished. If you want to have preferential trade, a tariff for revenue must be adopted, but you cannot have preferential trade so long as you have protection.'"

There is reason in that. We can well conceive that the English people should tell us: "If you desire that we should give a preference to your products in our markets, it is only fair that we should expect from you that you will treat our own manufactured products in a different spirit from that which you are treating them now. You are treating our products in a hostile manner. We do not ask you to go the length that we go; we do not ask you to remove a customs tariff altogether. We only ask you to remove the protective system. It can be conceived that you want a customs tariff, but bring it down to the point that it will simply be a revenue tariff, a tariff for your own benefit, but not a tariff hostile to us, and then we will be ready to discuss the principle of preferential trade." Upon another occasion, the "Times" said again, that the Imperial Government would consider the considerable concessions involved on her side in

Mr. McNEILL.

a conciliatory spirit, even though to do so would involve a derogation from the high principle of free trade and from the practice of the United Kingdom up to the present time. Mark the concession they are willing to submit to, to tax their own goods if we do it simply for revenue, and we shall have the boon of preferential trade. These are the conditions under which we can have preferential trade. What do you want in this part of Canada to-day? What is it you want for your products, manufactured or natural? There is only one thing you want, markets, markets, markets, and nothing else. (Applause.) You have here the possibility of having the largest market in the world, the market of England. You may have it on certain conditions. You may have it by renouncing the principle which is to be found in your tariff. What are you going to do, I want to know? Sir Charles Tupper tells you that you can have the two things together. I repeat that you cannot have the two things together; you can have one of the two, but you cannot have both. The Canadian people have now to make their choice. What will be their choice? Their choice will be for a revenue tariff and for preferential trade.

Now, the right hon. gentleman has given us his revenue tariff. We know what he means by revenue tariff now; and he says that, under such a tariff as he now has, we may have preferential trade. And so I am prepared to support a proposal to adopt preferential trade on the basis of a revenue tariff as understood by the right hon. gentleman.

Now, what Mr. Chamberlain told us was that protection must disappear as protection. But suppose he had gone further and had said: We must have free trade pure and simple. Then, I would have been prepared to say that I would enter into negotiations with Mr. Chamberlain in order to endeavour to secure preferential trade on more favourable terms. Could there be any reason why I should not negotiate? What does Mr. Chamberlain tell us in his speech? I had thought to read a portion of it, but I have been talking too long already. How does he tell us he came to make the suggestion he did make? He gave us the reason for it in this speech—it was the action of this House and the action of the colonial conference that induced him to make that suggestion. It is a perfectly insignificant question, in comparison with the main question, whether hon. gentlemen opposite or those on this side are entitled to the credit for having induced the Imperial authorities to take the view of this subject that they now hold. But, at the same time, it is scarcely consistent with human nature that we should sit quietly and allow hon. gentlemen opposite whom we have been fighting for years, gentlemen who, the other day, were supporting a policy the very reverse of this, a policy of which the essence was, as explained by its principal advocate in this House, discrimination against every country except the United States. I say it is hardly consistent with human nature that we should be expected to sit here quietly and allow them to run away with

the harrows in that way—if I, a humble farmer, may use an agricultural simile. If hon. gentlemen will forgive me, perhaps it is as well that I should read a few sentences from Mr. Chamberlain's speech that the House and the country may see what gave rise to this change in the opinions of the Imperial authorities. It was at the Canada Club, on the 26th of March, that Mr. Chamberlain delivered this epoch-marking speech :

There were prominent men on both sides of the Atlantic who at one time assumed that the manifest destiny of Canada was to be absorbed in the great republic upon its southern frontier. Ah! that was the opinion; it is an ancient controversy—and I do not think it necessary to refer to it now, except to mark the contrast between the doubt and hesitation of those days and the determination now of every son of Canada to maintain his local institutions, his special identity, and at the same time to draw closer the bands which unite him with the great parent state. Well, sir, the recent isolation of the United Kingdom, the dangers which seemed to threaten us, had evoked from all our colonies, and especially from Canada, an outburst of loyalty and affection which had reverberated throughout the world, which had had a great effect, and which testifies to a sentiment which is deeper than words can express. And, sir, it answers the question that we have sometimes asked ourselves. We had been told by cynics that these explosions of loyalty and affection are superficial, that they are ornaments of after-dinner oratory, but that they do not bear the test and trial of serious conflict—that if a war should ever arise the mother country would be left to her fate, and that the colonies would take care of themselves. Sir, that idea, at any rate, must have been dispelled by what has recently occurred. The shadow of war did darken the horizon, and to none of her subjects was the shadow more ominous than it was to our fellow-citizens of Canada. And yet, if that had happened, it would in the first instance have had to be borne by Canada, yet there was no hesitation on the part of the people and Parliament of Canada to say that, in this matter, although it did not affect their interests, it affected the honour of the British Empire, and they made a common cause with us, and they were prepared, shoulder to shoulder, to bear all with us that may arise. Well, sir, their decision was emphasized in the debate to which the president referred. It took place recently in the Dominion Parliament, and the moral of it was summed up.

He then refers to some words of mine in words of compliment which the House, I am sure, will excuse me from repeating. He continues :

I call your attention to the last words of the orator. He speaks of our common Empire, and he struck the right cord when he so described it. For the Empire of Great Britain is the common heritage of all her sons, and is not the appendage of the United Kingdom. Now, Sir, in the course of that debate many speeches were made, all to the same effect, and the resolution was unanimously passed with acclamation. But, again and again, allusion was made to the opportunity, to the occasion which every community of the Empire was bound to seize, and the hope was expressed that something might be done to bring us nearer together. We share that hope. I ask you now, gentlemen, is this demonstration, this almost universal expression of loyalty from all our colonies, to pass away without a serious effort upon

the part both of colonial and Imperial statesmen to transform these high sentiments into practical results? I have thought it right, on the first time I have had the opportunity of speaking to you, at least to call attention to the position of this great question which has been before us now for a great number of years, which has attracted intensely the sentiments of the people, but which has not, up to the present time, resulted in anything like a practical scheme.

Then he goes on to deal with the matter, and says :

I observe in the "Times" this morning a telegram from Canada, which tells us that Mr. McNeill, the gentleman who moved the patriotic resolution to which I have referred, has moved another resolution in the House of Commons of Canada, by which he proposes to declare that it is in the interests of Great Britain and the colonies that a moderate ad valorem duty, independent of any existing duty, should be imposed both by the colonies and by the mother country, upon all exports from foreign countries. That, therefore, is a suggestion, for I will call it no more. It is not a formal proposition, but it is a suggestion which has been made to us by our colonies for carrying out a system of commercial union. Sir, at any rate, a proposition of that kind is entitled to respectful consideration, and if we object to it, we ought, I think, to propose an alternative, or we ought—this is the other opportunity for us—to say at once that all we have said, all we have done, all we have thought about Imperial unity, had been thrown away, and the idea had been abandoned as a bad one.

He quotes the resolution passed by the conference, which I have overlooked in reading. Now, then, there is the occasion, there is the reason for Mr. Chamberlain's action, explained by himself, told to us by himself; and it is perfectly useless for hon. gentlemen opposite to suggest that what they have done has been the cause of all that we have seen accomplished. Now, I do not wish to be unfair to hon. gentlemen opposite at all. I think what they have done has had a most material effect in the immediate denunciation of the treaties. I admit that, I have admitted it, and I admit it still. But it was only in the sense so eloquently and graphically described by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Davin) the other day. It was simply that it snapped the slight thread which held us to the treaties—that was all. The thread was almost entirely worn away before the action of the Government snapped it. Now just allow me to say this, Mr. Speaker, that during all the time that I have been, in my humble way, endeavouring to discuss and to promote this matter, not since 1891 when we moved an Address, have I ever troubled my mind about the denunciation of the treaties. If any hon. gentleman has ever thought it worth while to pay any attention to what I have said on the floor of this House, and certainly many hon. gentlemen to whom I have conversed in private can bear testimony to the same effect, they will find that I have never troubled about the denunciation of the treaties. And why, of late years? Because, as I have stated, if I want to buy

a horse from a man, knowing already the quality of the horse, and the horse is in his stable and the door is shut, I do not set about making a great fuss with him to open the door. I show him, first, that it is worth his while to let me have the horse, then I know the door will be opened, and must be opened. And so when any one has said to me in private conversation with regard to this matter, Oh, but what about the treaties? I have always said: Never mind the treaties, the treaties will go just as soon as the people of England are persuaded that it is worth their while to let them go. And I admit now that hon. gentlemen opposite, by the course they have pursued, persuaded the people of England that it is now worth their while to let them go. I quite admit that, and I give them credit for it, so far as credit can be given for an action which had an effect upon the English mind which was not altogether justified. Therefore, so far as the denunciation of the treaties is concerned, I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite need plume themselves so much upon it. Now, Sir, I want to ask this very simple question of the right hon. gentleman, and I would ask him to be good enough to lend me his attention for a moment while I do so. He has asked me a question, and now I want to ask him a question, and I want to ask it in all courtesy, strongly as I feel about this matter, strongly as I feel that the right hon. gentleman has done so much to dash down the hopes that I and all those who have been labouring with me, have entertained in reference to this question. I want to treat the matter in all courtesy; and I want the right hon. gentleman, in view of the fact that he has offered no defence whatsoever to this House or this country for the course that he has adopted—I want to ask the right hon. gentleman why he did it. I want to ask the right hon. gentleman why it was that he did not keep faith with the people of Canada. I, for one, do not believe that the right hon. gentleman was capable of getting up in London, and in Toronto, in Montreal, and in other places, and deliberately seeking to deceive the people of Canada. I don't believe it, not for a moment. I want to know why it was that he has done what he did do. A suggestion has been made by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Davin), whose presence in this House, I am quite sure, is hailed with pleasure by both sides of this House—I am sure there is not an hon. member, whose opinion we would value on either side of the House, who does not recognize that the hon. gentleman adds lustre to those debates in this House in which he takes part. I say that that hon. gentleman offered a suggestion, offered an explanation, that I, for one, cannot accept. I cannot believe that the right hon. gentleman opposite, out of mere lightness of heart and kindness of disposition, would go about from one part of the country to another, say-

Mr. McNEILL.

ing in one place one thing and in another part of the Empire something the very opposite, without any regard for principle whatsoever. I can not believe that, and I do not believe it. There must be some other reason than that. Those who have sat in this House with the right hon. gentleman, as some of us have done during the time that the Manitoba school question was before this country, know very well that there is probably not another man in Canada who can more carefully guard his words, than the right hon. gentleman opposite, or who can better talk platitudes and speak solemn nothings when it suits his party exigencies, than the right hon. gentleman. Therefore, I say that the right hon. gentleman never spoke as he did speak on this question for the reason described by my hon. friend behind me—never. The right hon. gentleman was not speaking platitudes in regard to this question, what he said was all practical and pointed. His words were unmistakable and unambiguous, clear, distinct and definite; and he declared himself to be in favour of preferential trade. Therefore, the explanation offered by my hon. friend behind me will not hold water. Then it has been suggested that the right hon. gentleman was seized by some members of the Cobden Club, or some of the Manchester School people, or Cobdenites, in Liverpool. That has been suggested during the course of the debate, and it has been suggested that they warped the right hon. gentleman's mind in reference to this subject. Are we to believe that the right hon. gentleman, within a few hours of his arrival in Liverpool, at the instance of some Cobdenites, deliberately and without consultation, reversed the policy of his own Government? Does any one believe that the right hon. gentleman, in the first speech that he ever delivered on the shores of the United Kingdom, had not carefully considered what he was going to say, and had not carefully prepared his speech? Let any one who thinks so, read the speech and see if it does not bear marks of the most careful and finished oratory. Therefore, that explanation will not hold water either. The hon. gentleman left Canada determined not to press for preferential trade. The hon. gentleman did not do otherwise, how could he press for preferential trade? Had he done so he would have stultified himself. What was his own policy, what was the policy that he had placed on the Statute-book before he left? His policy was one of trading with all the world upon equal terms. That was the policy he had placed on the Statute-book here. The ink was scarcely dry, and the hon. gentleman left almost before the conclusion of the discussion of that policy; and how could he go to England and advocate a policy the very opposite, not one of trading on equal terms, but a policy of preference. We all recollect very well the scene, when I endeavoured to elicit from the Finance Minister, who is not now

in his place, whether the Government were really in favour of preferential treatment of English goods. The hon. gentleman frisked about behind one excuse and another excuse, behind one shelter and another shelter, like a squirrel running round a dead tree: he hid himself behind one excuse and another, and at last he got to the very utmost extremity of the most rotten branch of the tree, and when I pressed him, he said the Government preferred the substance to the shadow. This was just after I had proved that there was no substance in the preference the right hon. Premier was giving to England, and I forbore to cast another cruel stone at the hon. gentleman. There the matter rested. The hon. gentleman could not go to England to advocate preferential trade—it was absolutely impossible.

The question arises: What was the cause, what was the pressure, what was the overwhelming, deadly pressure which placed the right hon. gentleman in the position in which he stands to-day? Where did it come from? That is what I want to know, and what this country will want to know before this question is settled. The hon. gentleman—I am sure, in good faith—made the pledge to Canada. What was the pressure and where did it come from, which led him to break his faith with the people of Canada and set an example to the civilized world of as gross a breach of public faith as is recorded in history? What was the pressure, and where did it come from, which led the right hon. gentleman to risk the defeat of his Government on this question, as he knew he was risking defeat? That is the question I should like to ask, and it is a question to which the people will want to receive an answer before they have done with the matter. Now, I have done with this subject. I have to thank the House for the great patience with which it has listened to me, and I will just say I do not intend at this time to discuss the Yukon question further than to say this, that, so far as it at present appeals to my mind, it is in this way: I heard the Minister of Railways say, or at least I understood him to say, that he did not know what the cost of the building of the road would be, and that he had not the slightest idea of the value of the land proposed to be given to the company for building the road. That is an extraordinary position for the Government to be placed in. When I was in England lately—I only came back at the latter end of October—I found the people were intensely interested, almost, one might say, excited, with respect to those gold lands in the Yukon and Klondike, and it seems to me that the quantity of selected gold land which is granted to these men for the building of this tramway is something which, if manipulated, as it may be manipulated on the London market, may produce, not only millions of dollars, but millions upon millions of pounds sterling. That is

how the matter strikes me at present. I shall listen with great interest to what may be said on the other side of the House with respect to this extraordinary contract. I hope I shall be prepared to give hon. gentlemen opposite the benefit of fair-play, so far as my mind is capable of doing it; but I will say that so far this seems to me to be one of the most extraordinary transactions ever proposed to any British Parliament.

Mr. McMULLEN. I had no intention of occupying the time of the House by speaking on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and I would not have done so except for the very pointed—I might say, discourteous—attack upon the leader of the Government regarding preferential trade, that great and important question to which the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) devoted the principal part of his address. I think it is just as well we should clearly and distinctly understand the propositions that were brought under the attention of Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, and if hon. gentlemen opposite can show that the hon. gentleman in a single instance ever expressed himself as favourable to any of the propositions originating on this side of the Atlantic, then I think my hon. friend will be willing to admit that a mistake was made. What were the propositions? First, there was the proposition from Mr. Chamberlain himself. That proposition was that free trade, as now existing in England, should exist throughout the British Empire.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Never.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I challenge the hon. gentleman to put his finger on any evidence for that statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will allow the hon. gentleman an opportunity of putting any question to me and of contradicting anything I have said, when I have finished. Mr. Chamberlain outlined the proposition, that free trade between the British Empire and the mother country was, in his opinion, the only basis upon which any concessions could be made, that is, that the goods of England should come into Canada on the same terms as the goods of Canada into England.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Never.

Mr. McMULLEN. And that we should have a fair interchange of commodities the same as they have between the several States of the United States.

Mr. McNEILL. That is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there any one prepared to accept that proposition? I think our circumstances preclude our acceptance of such a proposal. We have to collect revenue by a tariff for revenue purposes, and, while we are in our present financial position, we cannot possibly accede to any pro-

posal made on that line. What was the next proposition? It was one that originated in Canada. A conference of colonial Premiers was called and held in Ottawa. At that conference a certain proposition was made. The hon. member for North Bruce read part of it, and he led the House to suppose that Mr. Chamberlain was prepared to accept that proposition. I will read Mr. Chamberlain's utterances in London before the Canadian Club on this question. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) read part of that speech, but he did not read it all, and the reason he did not read it all was because the balance did not suit him, as it would not prove what he wanted. These gentlemen opposite have got into the way of garbling speeches for the purpose of trying to make a point against the First Minister. Mr. Chamberlain dealt first with the problem that I have already presented to the House, and then he goes on to say:

I pass on, then, to the second proposal which has been laid before a similar congress to this, and which found expression at the great conference at Ottawa a year or two ago, that is, a proposal which has been favoured by some of our principal colonies, and which has been advocated with great force and eloquence by leading colonists. It is the very reverse, in spirit at any rate, of the proposal I have just been considering, for whereas the first proposal requires that the colonies should abandon their system in favour of ours, this proposal requires that we should abandon our system in favour of theirs, and it is in effect that while the colonies should be left absolutely free to impose whatever protective duties they please both on the foreign countries and upon British commerce, they should be required to make a small discrimination in favour of British trade, in return for which we are expected to change our whole system, and impose duties on food and raw material.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) read that length in his speech, but he did not read the rest, and so I will read the balance for him:

Well, I express again my own opinion when I say there is not the slightest chance that in any reasonable time this country, or the Parliament of this country, would adopt so one-sided an agreement. The foreign trade of this country is so large, and the foreign trade of the colonies is comparatively so small, that a small preference given to us upon that foreign trade by the colonies would make so trifling a difference, would be so small a benefit to the total volume of our trade, that I do not believe the working classes of this country would consent to make a revolutionary change for what they would think to be an infinitesimal gain.

The hon. gentleman for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) read the first part of the speech but he did not read the second, simply because it did not suit his purpose. Now, if any hon. gentleman opposite will get up in this House and prove by quotations from Mr. Chamberlain or any other member of the Imperial House of Commons, that they are prepared to accept a trade policy such as was outlined by the Ottawa conference, and if they can show that Great Britain is

Mr. McMULLEN.

prepared to negotiate on these terms, I am quite sure that members on this side of the House will be glad to know it. We have read every word that has been uttered on this great question, and from day to day there are stronger evidences that England is only too well satisfied with her present trade policy to think for a moment of changing it, because we desire the change for the purpose of getting a benefit in her markets. I notice a cablegram in the Montreal "Gazette" of this morning which I think is worth reading. It says:

London, February 10.—In the House of Commons to-day, Colonel Howard Vincent moved an amendment praying the Government to turn its attention to the stimulus given foreign competition with British trade by tariffs and bounties, resulting in a great increase of imports and a decrease of exports. He expressed the opinion that the only remedy was the imposition of countervailing duties.

The Right Hon. Chas. T. Ritchie, President of the Board of Trade, replying, announced that the Government was engaged in endeavouring to convene a conference of the powers with a view of securing the abolition of sugar bounties. He said the Government was also making representations to Germany to secure more favourable rates for British trade over German railways. Mr. Ritchie declared his belief that British trade was never healthier than now, adding that foreign barriers were less dangerous than the barriers erected among themselves, as, for instance, the recent engineers' strike.

He concluded by saying he was convinced that they could achieve nothing by abandoning Great Britain's free trade policy. The amendment was then rejected without a division.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) tried to impress upon this House that the feeling in Great Britain for a change of policy was so strong, and was so voiced by prominent members of the British House of Commons, that it had just about reached the point of accomplishment when unfortunately the Prime Minister of Canada happened to throw a wet blanket on the whole thing. Well, that is making a mountain out of a mole hill. There is not a single word or utterance that has been spoken by the leading statesmen in England, that would ever warrant the belief that they were prepared to make the concessions that our people would like to see them make. We would be all glad to have preferential trade. We would be rejoiced if England to-morrow would admit into her markets on a preferential basis the food products of Canada. It would be a decided advantage to us, but the feeling in England is so strong, that any man who would dare to introduce a measure tending in the direction of the re-imposition of protective duties would not live politically for twenty-four hours. The extract which I have read from the speech delivered last night in England by the President of the Board of Trade proved that most conclusively. The ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) pointedly challenged the course taken by the right hon. the First

Minister, and the leader of the Opposition lectured us for four hours on the same subject, but after all, when it comes down to the point, these gentlemen opposite are never able to produce an argument to show that what the people of Canada are anxious for in this respect, is at all possible of attainment.

Now, I am amazed to find that some hon. gentlemen who are in opposition to the right hon. First Minister, expressed themselves, when in England at the Queen's Jubilee, in the most approving terms of the course the right hon. First Minister took on that occasion. I have before me a speech made by Colonel Denison of Toronto, and no man in this House will venture to say that Colonel Denison is not a most respected and devoted Canadian citizen, and a Conservative at that.

Mr. CLARKE. He is not a Conservative.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, he is. Now, what did Colonel Denison say? You will find this in the Toronto "Globe," of August 3rd last. I will not weary the House by reading the whole speech, but I will make one or two short extracts from it:

He acknowledges that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, while in Great Britain, acquitted himself after the manner of a statesman, and that he displayed particular sagacity in his discussion of the question of inter-Imperial trade with the British people.

He says again:

As a Canadian, I am well satisfied with the way in which Sir Wilfrid Laurier upheld the dignity of Canada.

Colonel Denison was asked:

What is your opinion of the probable effect of the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties?

He replied:

The denunciation of these treaties marks an epoch in the history of the British Empire. The power of Canada has made itself felt, not only in British but in European diplomacy. It has affected Germany, Belgium and other countries, and every one of these countries knows that it was Canada's influence that produced the result. Another point in connection with the denunciation of these treaties is that it is a tremendous step towards preferential trade within the Empire. Great Britain was going along half asleep. Canada has wakened her, and made her sit up and think. She has been jostled out of the rut she has been following, and is now in a position to proceed in the direction that may be in her own interest and in that of the Empire.

With regard to the Prime Minister's attitude on free trade, Col. Denison said:

His remarks were general and theoretical. The great point of the whole movement was to secure the denunciation of the treaties. Nothing could be done while these treaties were in existence, and in my opinion it would have been a most indiscreet thing for Sir Wilfrid Laurier to have pursued any line of argument that would have aroused the hostility of the great free trade party in Great Britain. The great point was to

secure the united influence of all parties in favouring the denunciation of the treaties. The denunciation of these treaties was an important step in advance.

Again, he says:

If ever we get a preferential tariff it will be on this most important ground; we will never get it as a quid pro quo for the small advantage in our market.

That is with regard to the bread supply of England. He pointed out that England was largely dependent upon the United States and Russia for her bread supply, and that in case of war she would be largely at the mercy of those two countries; and then he went on to point out that if we ever got anything in the way of preferential trade, it would be as a matter of prudence on the part of England in order to secure her bread supply from friendly colonies and nations instead of having to take it from hostile nations. That was the ground for the prospect of getting preferential trade.

I want to draw the attention of the House for a few moments now to the charge made by hon. gentlemen opposite that the Reform party have not kept their pledges. I cannot understand why these hon. gentlemen have made such a determined onslaught upon the Government at this very early hour of the session, unless it is that they want to try to build up some kind of argument for Mr. Whitney and his followers to use in the Ontario elections. I fancy that they want to enable him to show that charges of bad faith have been hurled in the face of the Government in this House, and that they have nothing to say in reply. Now, Sir, we want to say this, that the Reform party have kept their pledges; they have done what they promised to do; and they are going on to carry out faithfully and determinedly the balance of all the pledges they made to this House. There is no doubt that the tariff has not yet been fully applied to all the commodities that are imported into this country. But the hon. ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) said that the present tariff was virtually the old tariff, without any of the advantages pronounced by the new tariff. The only change, he said, that was made in it was one-hundredth of one per cent. My hon. friend must remember that the full application of the tariff has not yet been experienced by the people of this country; but they will come to realize its full advantages, I presume, about the 1st of August next, when the preferential clause will come fully into force. Now, I want to give the hon. ex-Finance Minister some answer to the charges he made that there was no difference between this tariff and the old tariff, and that the prices of goods were just the same as before. Now, let me give some items to show the reduction of duty under the new tariff as compared with the old—and I

hope the hon. ex-Finance Minister will listen :

	Old Tariff Rate.	New Tariff Rate.
	p.c.	p.c.
Wire nails, shovels and spades..	35	26½
Linens, napkins, table cloths, &c.	35	26½
Cuffs, shirts, knitted goods, &c..	35	26½
Woolen cloths and clothing.....	35	26½
Gloves, mitts, suspenders, &c....	35	26½
Braces, wall paper, &c.....	35	26½
Earthen and stoneware.....	30	22½
China and porcelain ware.....	30	22½
Wrought iron, nails and spikes..	30	22½
Hats, caps and bonnets.....	30	22½
Iron castings.....	25	18½
Builders' and other hardware....	32½	22½
Cutlery.....	25	22½
Files and rasps.....	35	22½
Axes and scythes.....	35	18½
Adzes and saws.....	35	22½
Machinery.....	27½	18½
Clocks and watches.....	25	18½
Cotton fabrics (white).....	25	18½
Cotton fabrics (coloured).....	25	22½
Socks and stockings.....	37	26½
Window glass (plain).....	20	15
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Pig iron.....	4 00	1 87½
Iron and steel ingots, per ton....	5 00	3 00
Bar iron, per ton.....	10 00	5 25
Cast iron pipes.....	10 00	6 00

In addition, barbed wire is free, and binding twine is free. Now, the hon. gentlemen opposite, ever since the opening of this session, have been hurling across the floor statements to the effect that the new tariff was virtually the same as the old tariff, that it is a protectionist tariff from beginning to end, that no reduction of duty has been made to the people of this country, that no concessions have been made to the consumers. What have they to say of this list? Is it true, or is it not true? I maintain that it is true. Well, I suppose that we will have them still get up and reiterate the charge that there is no reduction in the tariff, that it is just what it was before. But there is one thing certain, any reduction that was made in the tariff was made with the view of altering it into a revenue from a protective tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they made their tariff, started with the determination to take care of the manufacturer first and of the revenue next. The revenue of the country was with them a secondary consideration, but hon. gentlemen on this side, when they remodelled the tariff, did so with the view of consulting the interests of the consumers first and then considering those of the manufacturers. Our endeavour was to give the people of this country the ordinary commodities of life at the very lowest cost and at the same time give our revenue the fullest benefit to be derived from the duties. Notwithstanding the assertions to the contrary of hon. gentlemen opposite, I maintain that that feature is the main feature of the present tariff; and hon. gentlemen

Mr. McMULLEN.

will find, if they examine the matter impartially, that there is considerable advantage to the consumers in this country under the present tariff, when compared with that of the late Government, and I feel satisfied that the people of this country will realize, as they purchase the various commodities, that there is certainly a change in their favour. From day to day and from week to week, as they become accustomed to the purchase of useful commodities under the new tariff, they will find that there is an advantage somewhere, and will credit it, and credit it properly, to the tariff.

Another point to which I wish to refer is the charge of hon. gentlemen opposite that there has been no reduction in expenditure, and that consequently this Government has not redeemed its promise in that respect. Now, I contend there was a reduction in the expenditure last year. No doubt there has been very considerable expenditure connected with the Klondike section, which was not anticipated, but taking the expenditure in the different departments, there has been considerable reduction. The facts were brought before the House last session, but hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have forgotten them, I will state them again for their benefit in order to try and help them to cultivate a better recollection. Take, in the first place, the charges on management of the public debt, last year, there was on this item a reduction of \$15,000. There were also the following reductions:—

Civil Government	\$ 36,000
Penitentiaries	67,000
Legislation	83,000
Quarantine	16,000
Militia	330 000
Railways and Canals, chargeable to income	140,000
Public Works, chargeable to income	176,000
Ocean and River Service	48,000
Lighthouse and Coast Service	40,900
Fisheries	74,000
Indians	46,477
North-west Mounted Police	145,000

And in the Post Office Department, there was a reduction of \$150,875. I fail to understand how hon. gentlemen opposite, in the face of this record, can get up and reiterate the charge that no reduction has taken place and that no efforts have been made to reduce the expenditure. I am amazed that hon. gentlemen would so expose—shall I call it their ignorance—their blindness to the condition of things, that they will persist in saying that this Government is making no effort to reduce expenditure. I earnestly hope they will not continue that line of argument.

We were treated to a long speech from the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He too boiled over with indignation at the manner in which the right hon. First Minister discharged his duties when in England. He delved through the annals

of history, sacred and profane, to find some personage with whom to compare my right hon. friend. The ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) referred to the green bay tree, and the hon. gentleman attempted to make use of that comparison. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) made reference, in his speech, to Ananias and Sapphira, and the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) thought he would go one better and made use of another personage in sacred history. Well, Mr. Speaker, these references set me thinking if there was not some character in history to whom I could compare my hon. friend from West Assiniboia, and after some reflection I failed to think of anybody except Samson who, we are told in Sacred Writ, on one occasion slew a thousand men with the jawbone of an ass. The comparison is not quite complete because my friend from Assiniboia has not yet succeeded in performing that feat, but there is one thing certain, that he has wielded that deadly weapon in this House for a considerable number of sessions without in the slightest way injuring anybody. He endeavoured to make a strong argument against the First Minister, but it fell flat, just as all the other arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite did, based on the flimsy foundation which hon. gentlemen opposite have to content themselves with, when seeking to attack the Government.

Now, I did not intend saying a word on this Address, but I have listened to so many statements, including those of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) absolutely destitute of foundation, that I could not any longer endure in silence and allow them to pass uncontradicted. I hope these hon. gentlemen will now give the present Government some credit for the economy that has characterized our public expenditure this last year. More than that, we hope to ask their kindly consideration to further reductions this year, and from year to year, I am certain the Government will make an honest and earnest effort to administer the affairs of the country honestly and well.

We have had to listen to insinuations cast out with regard to the Klondike contract. I was somewhat amazed myself to hear the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Sproule) make the insinuation that immediately after the completion of this contract the Ontario elections were hurried on, the writs were issued and everything in readiness, thereby inferring that large contributions for the Ontario elections have been made by the parties who have entered into this contract.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the belief.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentlemen opposite are putting us in their shoes. That was their way of handling things. The history of poor McGreevy, who is now in his grave, justifies us in coming to the conclusion that that was the course they adopted. Mr. Mc-

Greevy admitted that from time to time he was bled to death, in the various government contracts he entered into, so that in the end he had hardly enough to live on. But these hon. gentlemen opposite need not attempt to measure us by their half-bushel measure. I am positive that the Government are going to carry on the affairs of this country honestly and well, and are not going ruthlessly and foolishly and extravagantly to spend public money, as hon. gentlemen opposite did when they were in office. The country is now looking for better things and it is going to have them. The people are going to have honest administration. The hon. gentleman may look, he may investigate, but he will find nothing to the discredit of the Government. Their experience will be that of a poor Scotchman of whom I have heard. He went to bed one night in the same room with an Irishman. They had a little poteen, part of which they used before they retired, but left a little drop in the bottom of the bottle with which to wet their lips in the morning. In the night, the Irishman took the bottle and swallowed what it contained. In the morning, early, the Scotchman rose and crept around to where the bottle was. His friend, hearing him, said, "What are you looking for?" The Scotchman replied, "Oh, nothing." "And that is exactly what you will find there," replied the Irishman. Hon. gentlemen opposite may search, they may have their investigations, but they will find nothing. They will find honesty; they will find that the affairs of the country have been well and prudently handled. I do not wish to detain the House, but I thought it my duty to answer, though in my humble and limited way, the statements from the other side of the House with regard to the tariff and preferential trade.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the hon. gentleman sits down, I would like, with his permission, to ask him a question. I would like to know whether this is his farewell speech, or may we hope for another?

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sure I shall please my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) when I say that I know it would cause him a sigh of regret were I to leave them here. I beg to assure him that he will have the pleasure of seeing me for some years yet in this House, I hope. And I hope to live for many years to see the hon. gentleman occupy the distinguished position that he occupies today.

Mr. BERGERON. Before my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) rose, I had intended to say that I did not at all admire the silence of hon. gentlemen opposite. Like my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill), I feel that, following my own inclinations, I would rather not speak than to occupy, even for a few moments, the attention of the House. But, though hon. gen-

tllemen opposite have received instructions from their leader to say nothing, we, on this side, have a duty to the country to perform, and for that reason I claim the indulgence of hon. gentlemen. The fact that hon. gentlemen opposite have not answered the just criticisms of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House is not due, as some might think, to a solemn indifference, but it is due to a well-calculated and discreet silence. The only one who has broken that silence is the hon. member for North Wellington. I should have been surprised had he not broken through the discipline of the party. I remember that, some time ago, the hon. leader of the Government told me that the Liberal party was more difficult to discipline than the Conservative party, because every Liberal member had a mind of his own and was proud of it. I wish to congratulate him on having changed all that. He has stolen that also, along with the rest of the policy of the Conservative party. It is most natural that gentlemen opposite should have received orders to remain silent. There are not four men on that side who stand on the same platform, and my right hon. friend the Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knew that if these gentlemen were allowed to give expression to their ideas, the Speech would have been torn to pieces and the policy of the Government smashed. But my hon. friend from North Wellington has broken through the rule for silence. For six long years, in your chair, Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to the hon. gentleman. I am glad to say, I learned many things from him. I will not make any imputations, like my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster). I know the hon. member for North Wellington to be a fighter, and I admire him for it. But the tone we hear from North Wellington is different from that we heard last session. If I am not mistaken, the very last resolution against the Government voted on in this House last session, was proposed by the hon. gentleman. He was not then satisfied. He is now. I congratulate him. But I congratulate still more the leader of the Government.

All we have had in this debate, except the little episode to which I will return in a few moments, was the remarks of the few gentlemen who form a sort of mutual admiration society. First, we had the speech of the hon. gentleman who moved this Address. And let me say at once, that the impression made upon me by the hon. gentleman as a debater was a very good one. I believe he is an acquisition to the debating power of the House. He is perfectly satisfied with everything. That is quite natural. For eighteen long years we listened to speeches from hon. gentlemen opposite, then sitting on this side, clamouring against the National Policy and denouncing the manufacturers, who, they said, were stealing the money of the people. But the hon. gentleman, at that time, was taking advantage of the National Policy to build up a great for-

Mr. BERGERON.

tune for himself. And, having done so, it is natural that he should say he is satisfied. He believes that the Government has kept all its pledges to the people. It is evident that he was not here to listen to the speeches of the hon. gentlemen when in Opposition, or to take part in making their platform in 1893. If the hon. gentleman is satisfied with the tariff, let me give him a piece of advice. There are two schools of thought on the fiscal policy of this country among hon. gentlemen opposite. One, the protectionist school, is under the tutorship of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte); the other, the free trade school, is under the direction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). Now, my advice to the hon. member for Centre Toronto is to stick to the Minister of Public Works; for, the moment that hon. gentleman leaves the Government or loses his influence, the National Policy, which has made my hon. friend from Centre Toronto so happy, and which he so strongly favours, will disappear and will be succeeded by the free trade policy of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. We also heard the speech in seconding the Address from the hon. member of Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau). I spoke, a moment ago, of a mutual admiration society. The hon. member for Temiscouata made a very nice little speech in French. He has been called a poet, and I think he is one. I hope he will speak often in the House, because we have too little poetry here. I was by no means surprised at the compliments he paid the Premier. We know the relation between the two, and we know what would have been the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite in former years concerning what has taken place. If I read the newspapers correctly, there was a convention of the Liberal party in Temiscouata, and the choice of the convention was Mr. Pouliot. And the Minister of Public Works sanctioned that nomination and made a great speech in favour of Mr. Pouliot, and said he would carry the county by acclamation.

The present member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau), stood in spite of the convention, and I think there were five or six men supporting him, whereas Mr. Pouliot had eighteen or twenty. He stood against the Minister of Public Works to fight the Government, and declared he would stand in spite of any other candidate. He maintained that position, and as kicking has been doing a great deal of good on the other side within the last few months, he has carried his point. When the Prime Minister came back from England and got the present member of the county elected by acclamation, the Conservatives did not wish to increase the bad feelings of a divided party, such as the Liberal party presented when the present hon. member carried the county at the by-election. So it was not surprising to hear that hon. gentleman congratulating the Premier of this Dominion.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have heard two other speeches in this House, which I think should have received some answer from hon. gentlemen opposite. The leader of the Opposition made a speech which I think is one of the best and soundest ever made in this House of Commons. The people of this country know where to find him, and they know where the Conservative party in the Dominion stands to-day. That was supplemented by the very able speech of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), a speech such as that hon. gentleman is accustomed to make. Then we had the spectacle which I mentioned a moment ago, of hon. gentlemen opposite professing to believe that these speeches did not require any answer on their part. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say that if I understand constitutional government aright, there are, as there ought to be, two political parties in the country. Their great aim and their laudable ambition is to obtain power. But above this aim to obtain power must be the higher aim of safeguarding and promoting the best interest of the country. A party who is working simply for the sake of obtaining office, is not a political party in the constitutional sense in which the party system prevails in England. So, Sir, I say, starting from that point, I arraign the Government, from the Premier downward, in that for eighteen or twenty years they had been clamouring against the National Policy, and on attaining to power they have adopted in principle the very policy they had been combatting. I say that the Government of the day have been deceiving the people of this country. I say they have seized power upon a false issue. I want to know what answer they can make against this charge. Sir, on one occasion last year I heard the right hon. gentleman make an assertion which caused me some pain. After an hon. member on this side of the House had been charging the Government with numerous tergiversations, what answer did the right hon. gentleman make? All he could reply was: Yes, and we are here. Is that the way to discuss political questions? Is it a question of merely running for power, is it a question of deceiving the people of this country? Can they tell one story to the people and, after arriving at power, can they turn their backs upon all their previous record? What guarantee can the electors have in the good faith of their political leaders? And this has been done by a party which call themselves Liberal, a party which boasts of having fought in the past for the constitutional liberties of the people. Let me repeat, because we cannot repeat it too often, that the Government of the day are not fulfilling the pledges that they made to the people of this country before the elections. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) congratulated the Government upon the prosperity of the country to-day, saying

that our credit is good. Yes, and if it is good it is because for eighteen years the Conservative party administered the affairs of this country; if the credit of Canada stands so high to-day in the markets of Europe, it is because, during eighteen years, the manufacturers, and the workingmen, and the farmers, of this country enjoyed the benefits of a Conservative Government, who made of Canada one household of safety and security. Now, Sir, we heard the other night a very eloquent speech from the Prime Minister; and let me say here, and I hope no one will reproach me for it, that in listening to the right hon. Premier speaking the English language with such eloquence and with such prescience, I could not but feel proud of him as a French Canadian, occupying the high position he now occupies. But, Sir, that is as far as I could go, because, after examining what he said, and reading it over, I found that he had made no attempt to answer the arraignment made against his Government by the leader of the Opposition. Then we heard a speech by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). It struck me in listening to him that it was almost worth while for the Conservatives to be in Opposition in order to witness the remarkable change that has taken place in that hon. gentleman. When he was in Opposition everything was blue, everything was going to ruin, the country was going to bankruptcy. But since the hon. gentleman sits on the Government benches his face is wreathed with smiles, everything is all right, the people are happy, the farmers have immense crops, and all this is due to the Government. The workingmen are working overtime, the manufacturers are busy, and if we have reached almost a millennial condition of things, it is owing to the Government in power. I have always had a good deal of esteem for that hon. gentleman personally, but I must say that I thought it was childish in him, not to attempt any answer to the speeches made by the eminent leaders of the Opposition. Then happened what I think was the order given by the right hon. Premier to his friends, not to speak any more. It was quite natural. I was thinking, however, of what would happen if my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) would only get up, who, when in Opposition used to speak four or five hours in thundering against the National Policy, if this hon. gentleman had only been let loose, what an awful mess he would have made of it. But let me say a word with reference to the congratulations showered by the hon. member for Centre Toronto upon the Minister of Finance for making the Government loan. I think he said that credit was due to the Administration for the favourable terms on which that loan was made. The Jubilee was also mentioned in the Speech from the Throne; in fact a great part of the Speech from

the Throne is composed of congratulations upon everything the Almighty has done for this country—the harvest, the loan, and the Jubilee. Well, Mr. Speaker, so far as the Jubilee is concerned, I, for one, am ready to say that I think the right hon. gentleman did honour to Canada in the way he represented this country in England, and I intend shortly to discuss some of the things which he said there. But speaking of him in his quality of representative of Canada, I am pleased to say, that even if his career were to close now, his public performances and speeches in England will always form a bright page in the history of Canada. I will not say anything of the Yukon Railway contract, because that will soon come before the House in a position where we can discuss it better than we can to-day. As regards the harvest, some hon. gentleman opposite has been kind enough to say that the Almighty had something to do with it, although the press of the Liberal party throughout the country seems to attribute it almost exclusively to the fact that Canada has a Liberal Government in power. Now my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has attempted to answer the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and I think that the hon. member for Bruce is to be congratulated on having succeeded in drawing forth an answer from the other side. The hon. member for Wellington says that he entirely agrees with the position taken by the First Minister the other day in regard to preferential trade. Now, Sir, if I understand aright the discussion that is taking place, and the remarks made by the Premier and by the hon. member for North Bruce, there was nothing to justify the remarks of the hon. member for North Wellington.

The member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said this: That when the right hon. Premier was in Canada and saw the leader of the Opposition going round and meeting with success in advocating preferential trade with England, the right hon. gentleman visited three cities, London, Montreal and Toronto, I think, and said: I too am in favour of preferential trade with England. What did it imply? It implied a preference on all goods going from Canada to England and a preference on English goods entering Canada. The member for North Bruce also pointed out that when the First Minister left Canada he was sincere or he was not sincere in his intention. If he was sincere, when he arrived in England he deceived the people of Canada to whom he had promised preferential trade. If he was not sincere, he had deceived the people when he advocated a policy of preferential trade similar to that advocated by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said it was impossible for the Premier to obtain preferential trade because Mr. Chamberlain, forsooth, was in favour of

Mr. BERGERON.

free trade as they have it in England. That assertion, I say, is not according to the facts. What happened at the Toronto Board of Trade, when this question was discussed, I well remember, although I have not the newspaper report with me. Mr. Osler moved a resolution to form the basis upon which we could have preferential trade with England. That resolution was accepted in England by Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the resolution presented by Mr. Osler was accepted by the Chambers of Commerce in London?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend has not said anything of the kind.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I beg your pardon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The resolution carried by the Board of Trade of Toronto under the chairmanship of Mr. Osler, was accepted by Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The resolution was not even presented, it was withdrawn. Even amendments to that resolution were withdrawn and a substantive resolution prepared by the Chambers of Commerce was carried. The Toronto resolution, therefore, never went before the Chambers of Commerce.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I was present.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman the proof. When Mr. Osler as the delegate of the Chamber of Commerce of Toronto, went to London and tabled his resolution, Mr. Chamberlain, in his address, adopted that resolution as the basis upon which he was prepared to negotiate the question with the colonies.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The hon. gentleman was not there, I was present, and I know the resolution was not submitted to the Chambers of Commerce in London, and it was not accepted by those chambers. It was moved, but it was understood even before it was moved that amendments would be proposed, and Lord Strathcona was to make a speech in favour of it. Even that could not carry the resolution through, and it was withdrawn; a new resolution was proposed by the Council of the Chambers of Commerce and carried in preference to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As this is a question of fact, the House will no doubt be glad to have the evidence respecting it before members.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. If it is the wish of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure the House is willing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have no objection myself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have the evidence in print, and I should not be prevented from reading when I have under my hand Mr. Chamberlain's own words to the Chambers of Commerce—

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The statement—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. This discussion is absolutely out of order. If it is the wish of the House that the discussion should go on, very well; otherwise, the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), who has the floor, should be permitted to continue his speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no wish to interfere with the order of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have the proof under my hand.

Mr. BERGERON. I stated a few moments ago, and I will repeat the statement, that the resolution presented at the Toronto Board of Trade, and which spoke about a tariff for revenue, was repeated almost word for word in a speech delivered by the hon. Premier in London, Canada. This is what he said:

England does not expect that we should abandon our own system of trade such as we have it, but I lay before you what the English people would expect in return—that instead of the principle of protection we should adopt a revenue form of tariff, pure and simple.

Those are the words of the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) will surely not discuss those words, because I have the report and the right hon. gentleman is present in his seat.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). You are speaking of two different things.

Mr. BERGERON. What the House no doubt wishes to obtain is the answer of Mr. Chamberlain. This is what Mr. Chamberlain said at the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). What meeting was that?

Mr. BERGERON. This report is taken from the "Times" of March 10th, 1896. It is a report of Mr. Chamberlain's opening speech at that Congress. He said:

And I admit that, if I understand it correctly, I find the germs of such a proposal in a resolution which is to be submitted to you on behalf of the Toronto Board of Trade. What is that resolution? I hope I correctly explain it. That resolution I understand to be one for the creation of a British Zollverein or customs union, which would establish at once practically free trade throughout the British Empire, but would leave the contracting parties free to make their own arrangements with regard to duties upon foreign

goods; except that—this is an essential condition of the proposal—that Great Britain shall consent to replace moderate duties upon certain articles which are of large production in the colonies.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read on.

Now, if I have rightly understood it, these articles would comprise corn, meat, wool and sugar, and perhaps other articles of enormous consumption in this country, which are at present largely produced in the colonies, and which might be, under such an arrangement, wholly produced in the colonies, and wholly produced by British labour. On the other hand, as I have said, the colonies, while maintaining their duties upon foreign imports, would agree to a free interchange of commodities with the rest of the Empire, and would cease to place protective duties upon any product of British labour.

Mr. McMULLEN. Read what Mr. Chamberlain said after that. You are afraid to do it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BERGERON. I have not been in the habit of making speeches in this House which are mostly composed of recitations, but I used this extract in order to answer the interruption of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood), and to show him that what had been advocated by the Toronto Board of Trade had been accepted and endorsed by the right hon. the Premier and by the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, and the Premier of Canada when he went to England advocated a totally different thing.

Mr. McMULLEN. We challenge you to read the balance of the speech.

Mr. BERGERON. There is enough already there for the hon. member for North Wellington, and he will hear more of it later on. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is a very clever man.

Mr. SPROULE. In his own estimation.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman from Grey (Mr. Sproule) may think me a bad judge of character, but I believe the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is very clever, and as a business man he has figured out several articles to which preferential trade would not apply. He told us about iron and numbers of other articles which come from the States, and to which preferential trade is not applicable. Now that is clever, but it is not as clever as he think it is, because I had an idea that he would tell the House that there is actually free trade in the country at the present time; at all events if he does not say so in the House he will say so in the country. The Minister of Public Works tells us in his paper that every one is satisfied in the country, and that the Liberal party is united as one man, but if he goes into his office in Montreal, he will hear the Grits of the pro-

vince of Quebec clamouring, not only against him—in this I think they are wrong because he is one of the best men the Government have—but clamouring against the whole Liberal party. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is a very painstaking man, and he has been at work figuring out the reductions in the tariff, as he used to figure out the Auditor General's Report in the good old days. But the hon. gentleman forgot to tell us anything about the tariff on cottons, which is higher to-day than it was when the Conservative Government was in power. When I occupied that Chair, Mr. Speaker, (Mr. Brodeur) which you now fill so ably, I listened to long speeches from the hon. member from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) upon cottons, and upon the amount of money that was wrung from the poor people of this country to swell the purses of the bloated cotton manufacturers. How does it come that the hon. member for North Wellington has nothing to say about the tax on cottons to-day, when it is actually higher than it was under the National Policy. Where has the Liberal party shown that they have reduced the duty on coal oil? We used to hear the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Sir Louis Davies) and the members from the Northwest Territories, tell us about the terrible tax upon the poor people, but that tax exists to-day pretty nearly the same as it was before, and the people are paying the very same prices as formerly, for if there has been any reduction in price it has gone into the pockets of the middlemen. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) told us his story about the man finding nothing in the bottle. It is not quite a new story, but although I have heard it perhaps hon. gentlemen have not, and a man cannot be blamed for not knowing the latest yarns. However, there is an application of that story and it is, that when the Government of the day disappears after the next elections, and when the Conservatives come back to power, they will find nothing in the public chest, just as my friend's Irishman found nothing in the bottle.

Mr. GIBSON. That is your old story.

Mr. BERGERON. I know hon. gentlemen opposite pretty well and that will be their story. I wish to refer for a moment to the reference in the Speech from the Throne to the Franchise Act. The matter will be discussed fully later on, but I wish to say now, that if the Government bring down a measure which will be efficacious and will not be costly in its operation, they can at once rely upon my support. I believe that they should bring in a good Franchise Act immediately, for it was an outrage to see the people of Nicolet voting recently on a list made in 1894.

Now, Sir, with regard to the plebiscite, I have some remarks to make and some advice to give. Although my right hon. friend (Sir

Mr. BERGERON.

Wilfrid Laurier) is not a total abstainer, and like myself thinks a glass of wine not a bad thing, yet when he was in Opposition he used to speak pretty kindly to those who favoured prohibition. Well, Sir, those who sow the wind will reap the whirlwind, and that is what is going to happen to my right hon. friend. He used to favour prohibition in the old days in Opposition, when prohibition embarrassed the Government then in power, and now that the tables are turned he will experience the same embarrassment. If this plebiscite is carried out it will be an expensive affair, costing two or three hundred thousand dollars or it may be \$400,000, and in the end it will make no difference at all in the status of the prohibition question. Gentlemen on both sides of the House know very well that it is an impossibility to enforce prohibition in this country and even though the majority of the electors should favour it, they know very well that it cannot be carried out. In 1879, I heard Sir Leonard Tilley deliver a speech on the question in this House, and if you refer to "Hansard" you will find that speech recorded there. Sir Leonard Tilley had been Premier of New Brunswick. He was a total abstainer all his life, but in that speech he told us that the floors of the legislature of New Brunswick were flooded with petitions asking for prohibition, and when he yielded to these petitions the consequence was that his Government was beaten in the House, and in the country afterwards, and he came to the House of Commons to tell us that he was opposed to prohibition, because it was impossible and impracticable. Instead of trying by the plebiscite to throw sand in the eyes of these good people, who favour prohibition, a great many of whom are sincere and some of whom are not sincere, it would be much better to have strict license laws strictly enforced, and to have inspectors to see that the liquors sold are of good quality and not injurious to health. Another thing which should be done is to put down smuggling. At this very moment there is an immense amount of smuggling in the country, and the liquor got in that way is of bad quality, and being sold at a lower price than the liquor sold under legal restrictions, is extensively consumed and is most damaging to health. If the money which the plebiscite would cost were spent in a more practical and beneficial way it would be of far greater service to the people of the country.

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

After Recession.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at Six o'clock for recess, I was talking about the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne relating to the plebiscite. Before leaving that subject, I desire to say one or two words more about it. I have

given reasons for believing that the money to be spent for that purpose will be thrown away, as it will have no practical result. I believe every hon. member of this House is in favour of temperance, as it should be understood. No one deploras more than I do the evils of intemperance; but if we all agree that far, we seem to disagree as to the proper mode of remedying those evils. My opinion—and I give it for what it is worth—is, that temperance can be promoted and the evils of intemperance thwarted only by moral suasion, not by an Act of Parliament. I believe that, if our priests and clergymen of any and every denomination would preach and work together in that direction, their efforts would do more good than any law we could pass in this Parliament. Why, Sir, even the Salvation Army—and I am very happy to say so here, on the floor of Parliament—in their own way have done more good and are now doing more good in that respect than any law passed by this Parliament could do. The right hon. the First Minister will remember, I am sure, a great deal better than I can, the proof of what I am saying that was given in the province of Quebec some forty or fifty years ago by a man who was then called the Rev. Father Chiniquy, who is to-day the Rev. Mr. Chiniquy—a man who has done a great deal of good by preaching in favour of temperance in the province of Quebec. I have met in my own county and in other counties men who have declared to me that if they were saved to live until the day they spoke to me, they owed it to the sermons they had heard from the man whom they still called Father Chiniquy.

Now, Sir, I want to say one word more in answer to my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who brought out the testimony of a man whom I have not the pleasure of knowing, but of whom I know a great many good things—Mr. Denison, of Toronto, who had given a certificate of character to my right hon. friend. I desire simply to say that Mr. Denison may be, as I believe he is, a most honourable man; but when my hon. friend from North Wellington says that Mr. Denison is a Conservative, he does not, I think, fairly represent Mr. Denison's position in politics. Mr. Denison is, and has been for over twenty years, an employee of the Ontario Government at the respectable salary of \$4,000 a year, and any certificate that he would give to the First Minister I, at any rate, would take 'cum grano salis.'

Mr. SOMERVILLE. He has been a Tory for forty years.

Mr. BERGERON. The fact that he is employed by the Ontario Government shows that he is not a Conservative.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It shows that the Ontario Government is a liberal government.

Mr. FOSTER. It will not be after the first of March.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. member for North Wellington, who is strong on figures, has tried to make us believe that everything promised by our friends when out of power has been fulfilled. He spoke about the expenditure and the public debt. I do not know where he got his figures, for I find by the "Canada Gazette," which is the paper we can all swear by in this House, that the gross debt of Canada has been increased since these hon. gentlemen have been in power, by \$13,232,779.52. Then, the hon. gentleman says that our expenditure has gone down. That is not what I find by the "Canada Gazette," which states that the expenditure in 1896 was \$1,979,336.17, and in 1897, \$2,362,255.52, or an increase since hon. gentlemen opposite came into power of \$382,919.35. This is for the year 1897, the year in which hon. gentlemen opposite could control the expenditure. I merely mention these figures to show that the hon. member for North Wellington has to be very accurate in his figures, since we are obliged to criticise the acts of the Government he supports.

Now, I have discussed, as briefly and as well as I could, the questions raised in the Speech from the Throne. I agree entirely with His Excellency in what he says in the last paragraph, where he recommends these few matters to the consideration of the members, invoking the Divine blessing upon the important labours upon which we are again entering. If there ever was an occasion on which the Governor General should implore the Divine blessing on the Government, it is the present one. They need it, and they need a great deal of it.

I have been looking through the Speech for something which I have looked for in vain, and I am going to bring that matter to the attention of my right hon. friend. I hope he will not be angry at me for doing so, because I feel it to be a duty on my part. I want to tell him that I am surprised not to find in the Speech from the Throne anything relating to the schools of Manitoba. For six or seven years we have heard of that question in Parliament and out of Parliament. Everybody who knows anything about the school question, knows that it has been the subject of Grit machinations from the commencement. It has been so in the province of Manitoba, where the premier of that province kept himself in power and made himself popular with the majority by ill-treating the minority. At that time hon. gentlemen did all they could in the different provinces of the Dominion to excite fanaticism on that question. My right hon. friend knows that the organs of the Liberal party in Ontario and in the maritime provinces did their utmost against coercion. The right hon. gentleman knows that the man for whom I think he has the

most consideration in the province of Quebec, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), was at the head of a phalanx who were preaching in that province that the minority in Manitoba were oppressed because the Government here were not doing what they ought to do, and urging the Dominion Government to use every means in their power to redress the grievances of the minority in Manitoba. This lasted during the time the question was before the different courts in Canada and out of Canada, in accordance with a motion which had been carried in the House of Commons, at the suggestion of Mr. Blake when he was the chief of the Opposition, and seconded by the right hon. gentleman himself. In the session of 1896, a measure called the Remedial Bill, was brought into this House by the then Government. This Remedial Bill, although not as perfect as some gentlemen would have liked it to be, was approved of and accepted by the minority and all those who sympathized with the minority of Manitoba; but the right hon. gentleman, on that occasion, to the surprise of everybody except his most intimate friends, moved the six months' hoist. Nobody knew better than the right hon. gentleman what that meant. He knew that it simply meant to kill the question, and he did it for that purpose. I believe he was sincere enough in that, because he could not have pleaded ignorance. It was at the end of a Parliament. The right hon. gentleman and his friends, and even some of our friends, joined together to prevent the passing of that measure. We went to the country. The provinces which the right hon. gentleman, I imagine, had his eyes upon as likely to sustain him for his action in moving the six months' hoist, did not answer very well to his expectations. The grand old province of Ontario, where some fanaticism was expected to be found, did not answer as my right hon. friend had hoped. Neither did the maritime provinces; and the province of Manitoba did the reverse of what he could have expected. And his faithful friend in Manitoba (Mr. Martin), who had done more than anybody else to inflict this grievance on the Manitoba minority, was defeated at the polls. Even his other hon. friend (Mr. Tarte), who had pleaded, as an equal extremist on the other side, was also defeated, showing that the people know where their friends are when they want anything in the best interests of the country, and are not to be carried away by fanaticism. Our hon. friends on the other side were very much surprised at the vote given in Quebec, and well might they be. The people of that province supported my right hon. friend, not because they expected he would drop the school question, as he has done, but because they did not understand very well the Remedial Bill. Unfortunately the Conservative press in the

Mr. BERGERON.

province of Quebec was not up to what it should have been.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It never is.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend need not be anxious on that point. The Conservative party in Quebec unfortunately was not organized as it should have been, and the people of that province really thought that the right hon. gentleman would, on obtaining office, carry out his pledge that he would accomplish more than could be obtained under the Remedial Bill, and that he would render justice to the minority of Manitoba. To his faithful electors of St. Rochs, in Quebec East, he said that he would use the sunny ways of conciliation, and that if these sunny ways were not successful then he would use the strong machinery of the Government at his disposal, if elected Premier, in order to force the province of Manitoba to do justice to his and their compatriots, and co-religionists. We know now what his sunny ways meant. We know now they meant the abandonment of the cause of the minority, but the people did not know it then, and they relied on the promises he made to them. The people of Quebec believed in him and put him in power. What then happened? My hon. friend had promised that as soon as he would be in power, he would send his Minister of Justice to Manitoba to discuss the question with the proper authorities there and endeavour to reach a settlement. The hon. Mr. Mowat did not go to Manitoba, but the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) did, and we know how he settled everything without even doing the minority the compliment of consulting them at all. The settlement was simply one agreed to by Mr. Greenway and the Minister of Public Works, and the minority had no voice in it at all nor did they accept it. My hon. friend, however, did not care about that, he had not the slightest regard for the minority or the pledges of his leader, but accepted something entirely different from what the right hon. gentleman had promised to obtain. Not only did my hon. friend escort into this House the man who was the author and the instigator of this injustice perpetrated on the minority (Mr. Martin), but by the deal he carried through with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), after he came into power, he brought into this House and into his Cabinet the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who was one of the chief agents in carrying through this injustice and preventing its remedy. Sir, he did more than that. Sir, the Conservative party, I am proud to say, has always in the past, and I hope will in the future, so manage the affairs of this country as to obtain the approval of the best elements of the people and particularly of the clergy in general. But it has always ruled as a political party and has never

gone out of Canada to obtain the opinion of anybody as to how it should manage public affairs. My right hon. friend did otherwise. Although he had not effected any settlement in Manitoba, he thought that as he was First Minister of the Dominion, and bears a French name, and professes the same faith as the oppressed minority, he could go, with every hope of success, to the highest authority in his Church and plead that, in the interests of the country, the settlement he had made, or rather the semblance of a settlement, should be accepted. My hon. friend did not at first go in person, but sent over a delegate—at least Father Proulx, a priest in the province of Quebec, went to Rome with the approval of the Government, and spent a few weeks there in the endeavour to persuade the Propaganda that the settlement was a good one. Father Proulx' mission having signally failed, an old Papal Zouave, Mr. Drolet, supposed to have great influence at Rome, was sent over. But his efforts were so futile, that he was instructed to come back, his expenses being altogether out of proportion to the services he was rendering.

Mr. SCRIVER. What about the by-elections?

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend can take all the comfort from them he chooses. After the failure of the Rev. Mr. Proulx and Mr. Drolet, my right hon. friend sent the Solicitor General of Canada (Mr. Fitzpatrick) over to the Holy See, and the Solicitor General brought with him a lawyer from London. Mr. Russell—a Roman Catholic lawyer—in recompense of whose services, a change was made by the Government in their law officers in London. These two gentlemen went to Rome. My hon. friend the Solicitor General went there as a full-fledged Minister, with the title of His Excellency, and, assisted by Mr. Russell, tried what he could do, with equal want of success. Then my right hon. friend himself went over, but he did not stay in Rome very long. I hope he was well received, but from my experience of the Holy City, it takes many days there before one can see anything. My right hon. friend was only there a week, and his short stay inclinès me to believe that he did not obtain there the reception he expected. At any rate, he did nothing. Everything points to the fact that the present Government of Canada asked the opinion of the Holy Father in Rome. I do not blame them for having done that, but what I blame them for is for not having followed it after they did get it. What answer did they receive? Were they told that the settlement was a good one? Not at all. They were told that it was insufficient, inefficient and unacceptable. Now, Mr. Speaker, every Liberal candidate who presented himself for election in the province of Quebec during the last two years, declared on every hustings, even at the last by-elections, that

when the Holy Father would speak, he would bow obediently to his mandate. If I am not mistaken, the hon. Solicitor General himself declared that he would resign his seat in Parliament if the position taken by the Government was not sanctioned by Rome. I was surprised not to find any mention of the school question in the Speech from the Throne. Does my right hon. friend think he can drop it in this manner? I do not pretend to speak for the whole Opposition, but speaking for myself and many others, I can tell him that all the people in this country who have any feeling on the subject at all, will remember in good time the conduct of the right hon. gentleman. My hon. friend was anxious to obtain power, the ambition was a laudable one, and he succeeded, but the office cost him a great deal. I do not believe that he was looking for honours, because we all know that he is a democrat up to the hilt; and if he was covered with honours, no doubt he will bear them with a great deal of dignity. But how long is this going to last? Can any settlement be said to be made of any question unless the settlement is based on justice? I say not. In what position does the minority of Manitoba stand to-day. My hon. friend knows it well, and he knows too that he will have to render an account of his conduct towards them. He need not delude himself with the hope that the fanaticism of a certain class of people is going to stand him in good stead in the long run and keep him where he is. Let me say here that there are two men in this Dominion whose names will be revered in the history of this country.

I am sure that I speak not only for those I represent, but that I echo the sentiment of many people, not only in the province of Quebec, but throughout the Dominion, when I say that the names of Sir Mackenzie Bowell and Sir Charles Tupper—two Protestants, not of the same faith as the First Minister and mine, not of the same faith as the minority of Manitoba—will be held up to public honour for having come out boldly in behalf, not of separate schools considered as a distinct question, because they favoured it, but of upholding the constitution of the country. They came out boldly, they risked their reputation, they risked their hold on their own party—they did more than that, they probably lost power through their devotion to the constitution. But when the history of this country comes to be written, their names will appear in golden letters as those of men who practically and manfully stood by the constitution. And here let me say that there is no use in taking any other course in this country. It is impossible for any party to rule the Dominion of Canada without rendering justice to everybody, and particularly to the minorities. Any one who tries to rule otherwise will in the end signally fail, and failure

is what my hon. friend must expect when he is called upon to render an account of his stewardship to the people.

The expenditure instead of decreasing has increased. The revenue has increased within the last two months, due to a favourable tide in the affairs of this country, but not in any way due to the Government. They promised they would not give bonuses to railways. But they have given them. You cannot walk in the lobbies of Parliament to-day without meeting gentlemen who are here soliciting bonuses for different railways throughout the Dominion. They declaimed against members of Parliament accepting public positions. I am not a radical on this subject. I do not believe that because a man is a member of the House of Commons he should be debarred from accepting a position which he is fitted to fill. But we know how hon. gentlemen opposite spoke against it. Take the case of Mr. Mason. He was a lawyer, a good lawyer; he had been a member of Parliament for years and had discharged his duties faithfully, and he had given notice of his intention not to seek re-election, but to devote himself to his practice. A judgeship became vacant and was given to him. I think that under the circumstances it was quite natural that it should be offered to him and that he should accept it. But did we not hear the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), hour after hour, thundering against granting positions to members of Parliament and even presenting a Bill to prevent it in the future. And yet, how many members have been appointed to office in the twenty months since the right hon. gentleman came into power. I do not want to make insinuations, but it is quite possible that there are others with promises of office in their pockets. A case arose recently in Quebec which exemplified the only point in which these gentlemen have not gone back upon their record—that is in their loyalty to the party. One evening the papers were full of the great happenings in Quebec—a great revolution was impending. And what was it about? It was not a question of principle or a question of constitutional law, but a mere question of patronage, an hon. gentleman writing against his Premier because a promise made to him two years ago was not fulfilled. What has been the outcome of it all? The dismissal of a Lieutenant-Governor who desired to remain Lieutenant-Governor after some interchange of letters with one of the Ministers; another gentleman was put in his place and another gentleman appointed a judge, that is all. Now, it seems to me we should be above these things here. Now that hon. gentlemen opposite are in power, which was what they sought, let us all work together, we in Opposition and they in power, if they wish it and so long as they do right by the country. We will then have less party fighting in

Mr. BERGERON.

this country and more practical work, for nobody on this side will be jumping up to propose prohibition or any other scheme of that kind which has no serious basis in the minds of the people. Let us work together for the good of the country. In a few days the question will be brought before us of the best means of dealing with the mines of the Yukon. I believe that all should be done that can be done by the Government of Canada to help the development of that country. I believe we have in that country the greatest gold deposits in the world, but I fear that we may lose the advantage they would confer upon us, if we do not take immediate advantage of our opportunities. But, greatly as I desire to see that wealth developed, let us not seek that end by squandering the people's money or granting monopolies which will defeat the very object we have in view. However, we can deal with that subject more fully when the Bill is before us. There are other things that we can do. Nature has given us the great outlet to the sea, the St. Lawrence. Within the last few years we have seen that our American friends are ready to spend money freely in gigantic efforts to prevent the trade from the west and the great lakes from coming through Canada. Only recently in the legislature of New York they have voted \$17,000,000 to help in widening and deepening what they themselves call a ditch, the Erie Canal. Why, because they understand the importance of carrying the immense wealth of the west through their own channels. Why do not we take equally strong measures in Canada instead of discussing nationalities, discussing religion, discussing other matters which should not be brought before this House. Why do not we work together and deepen our canals, not to fourteen feet only, but to twenty feet if necessary, in order to bring down these immense cargoes that float on Lake Superior and Lake Huron to Quebec, and, if possible, to send them unbroken across the Atlantic. Even the Americans themselves admit the advantage of the St. Lawrence route. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will remember that in 1891 or 1892, the representatives of a great American company came here and secured a charter which would enable them to bring these immense vessels drawing 25 feet of water by the St. Lawrence route and through Lake Champlain to New York and thence across the ocean. Let both sides of this House work together, we in Opposition not wishing to get back into power unless it is for the best interests of the country, not seeking power for the sake of office, but willing, until our policy commends itself to the people, to remain a constitutional Opposition, declaring our principles clearly as we have done, so that the people may understand exactly where we stand and judge us accordingly. We have a great inheritance here. We the people of Canada,

have a great inheritance here, probably the finest country in the world. We have immense resources. We want population; we want help; we want hands. Let us people the immense country in the west, let us work hand in hand for the advancement of our country, remembering that we are the descendants of the two greatest nations of the world, remembering that we have a duty to perform in the development of this Dominion; remembering that we owe it to those who shall come after us, to do everything in our power to aggrandize this country and to increase the wealth and improve the condition of the people. If we do this we shall be true to our trust; if we do this we shall show to the people of the world at large that the descendants of dear old France and beloved old England are ready to do their duty under the glorious flag under which we live and under which I hope this Dominion will long remain and greatly prosper.

Motion (Mr. Bertram) agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved:

That the said Address be engrossed and presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of this House as are of the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved:

That a Special Committee of five members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on Thursday the 3rd February instant, to be composed of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir Adolphe Caron and Sir Louis Davies.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a motion on the paper which is rather important, but as the day is somewhat advanced, we will defer taking it up until Monday. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 9.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 14th February, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

TRANSIT OF GRAINS IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DOUGLAS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 19) to regulate the transit of grains in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. He said: The object of the Bill is to ensure to the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories the right to ship grain stored in flat warehouses on the lines of the railway, a privilege which they enjoyed up to the end of last year. That privilege in some districts has been removed. We are exceedingly desirous that the privilege should be continued, and the Bill contemplates the continuation of this privilege.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LAND SURVEYS IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether the surveyors of the department have been surveying lands in the North-west? What lands they have surveyed for the year ending 30th June, 1897? What lands they have surveyed from 30th June, 1897, up to the present time? What lands they have surveyed in the neighbourhood of Fort Qu'Appelle?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. Yes. 1 and 2. As the 30th

June is not the close of the year for surveying operations but rather the middle of the surveying season, it is practically impossible to give an accurate answer. The last published report of the Department of the Interior gives detailed information as to surveys made in the calendar year 1896, and the report which is now being prepared for submission to Parliament will contain detailed information as to the surveys made in the season of 1897. No lands were surveyed in the neighbourhood of Fort Qu'Appelle since the 30th June, 1897.

INDIAN RESERVES IN QU'APPELLE DISTRICT.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

What acreage was covered by the Indian reserves in the Qu'Appelle district on the 30th June, 1897? Are the boundaries of the Indian reserves to-day in the Qu'Appelle Valley the same as on the 30th June, 1897? Have lands prior to that date available for the use of settlers been surveyed into reserves? Has the area of hay lands available for the use of settlers been decreased in consequence of such surveys?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. 291,328 acres. 2. Yes. 3. No. 4. No.

CARETAKER AT BATHS, BANFF.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether John Walker was, from, May of 1890 until the 31st July, 1897, in the employ of the Dominion Government as caretaker of the Cave and Basin Baths at Banff? Whether he was dismissed on the latter date? If so dismissed, why?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. John Walker was employed as caretaker of the Cave and Basin baths at Banff from the 2nd May, 1890, to the 31st July, 1897. His services were dispensed with on the 31st July because his method of discharging his duties was not satisfactory.

MEDALS FOR NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether the Minister of Militia has advised that medals be given to the members of the North-west Mounted Police who were engaged in the suppression of the rebellion in 1885?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The Comptroller of the North-west Mounted Police having applied in April, 1886, for medals for the men of that corps who were under fire during the campaign of 1885, the question was submitted to Council and the medals were awarded by the Imperial authorities. One hundred and sixty-three medals and clasps were delivered to the Comptroller of the North-west Mounted Police on the 15th of September, 1887.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether any attempts have been made by the Government to obtain from the Government of the United States reciprocity in trade between this country and the United States? If so, what success has attended such attempts?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, informal negotiations have taken place between the British authorities and the United States authorities; not with a view of the reciprocity question alone; but with a view of settling, if possible, all matters now in dispute between Canada and the United States. If my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) will move for the correspondence I will be very glad to place it on the Table of the House.

NORTH-WEST INDIAN RESERVES.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

1. What is the number of Indian reserves in the North-west Territories?
2. What is the number of Indian reserves in Manitoba?
3. What was the object of removing the Indian Commissioner's office from Regina to Winnipeg?

The PRIME MINISTER. 1. 94. 2. 44. 3. The Indian Commissioner reported that he could more conveniently and economically transact his business from Winnipeg, and the object was to accomplish that result.

NORTH-WEST INDIAN SUPPLIES.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

1. Whether any instructions have been given to the officers of the Indian Department in the North-west Territories and Manitoba as to the persons from whom they should purchase supplies and to whom they should give work?
2. If so, through whom were such instructions given, and if given, at whose instance originally were they obtained?

The PRIME MINISTER. 1. Yes. 2. Through the department. I have not been able to ascertain at whose instance originally such instructions were obtained, but they were sent under my direction.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

1. What is the number of the North-west Mounted Police at the present time in the North-west Territories?
2. How many have been drafted away to the Yukon?
3. What steps, if any, are being taken to increase the number of the force?

The PRIME MINISTER. 1. The number of police in the Territories, including scouts, dog drivers, and special constables, is 548. 2. The number of police in the Yukon, including scouts, dog drivers and special constables, is 162; total 710. 3. All suitable

candidates who apply in person at Regina, are engaged. During the month of January there were about forty applicants, twenty-five of whom were employed on probation. Sixty of the police now in the Territories are under orders to proceed to the Yukon.

EDMONTON AND PRINCE ALBERT ROUTES TO KLONDIKE.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

1. Whether the attention of the Government has been directed to the route via Edmonton and the route via Prince Albert to the Klondike?

2. What opinion has the Government formed as to their feasibility?

3. Whether the Government intends to take any steps to make one or other or both of these routes more available for persons going to the Klondike?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Government has been directing attention to the question of the route via Edmonton and the route via Prince Albert to the Klondike. For answer to the other two questions, I would refer the hon. member to the Supplementary Estimates, which, when brought down, will show what action the Government has determined upon in this matter.

MAILS AT ST. THOMAS.

Mr. INGRAM asked,

1. Who are the parties that tendered for carrying the mail between St. Thomas Post Office and the railway stations?

2. What was the amount of each tender?

3. Who received the contract?

4. What is the amount the contractor is to receive from the Government?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) (By the Minister of Agriculture). Tenders for the services referred to, and which are being performed under a contract expiring on the 31st March, 1898, were called for and twenty-two tenders were received. The contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer at the amount of his tender and the matter was placed in the hands of the inspector for the purpose of having the necessary contract executed. The department not having yet been advised as to whether the contract has been executed, it is not advisable at present to give the other particulars asked for but if that portion of the question is renewed after the contract is made, the particulars asked for will be given.

CUSTOMS ON THE YUKON.

Mr. McINNES asked:

1. What are the terms of the agreement recently made at Washington, D.C., between the hon. the Minister of the Interior (representing the Canadian Government) and the Government of the United States, regarding the difficulties of transportation and trade connected with the Yukon gold fields?

2. Has the said agreement been lived up to: (a) By the Canadian Government, (b) By the Government of the United States?

3. Is the Government aware that the United States authorities at Skagway and Dyea continue

to compel all purchasers of Canadian goods to take an official escort while crossing the disputed territory—and to pay \$6.00 per day for such escort?

4. What steps have been taken by the Government to prevent this intolerable discrimination and otherwise to secure the fulfilment of the said agreement by the United States?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. The arrangement referred to was an unofficial one and consisted of an understanding that regulations should be issued by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, which would render effectual the privilege of bonding Canadian goods over territory in the possession of the United States at Dyea and Skagway, and deal with the navigation by British vessels of the rivers upon the Alaskan coast, the navigation of which is secured by treaty. 2. The regulations respecting the bonding privilege above referred to have been issued, though not yet officially communicated to this Government. 3. The Government is aware that the charges referred to have been levied. 4. It is believed that the new regulations referred to above will prove satisfactory.

G. T. AND O. A. & P. S. RAILWAYS.

Mr. MACLEAN asked,

Whether it is the intention of the Government, under the powers conferred upon them by the Railway Act, to compel the Grand Trunk and Ottawa and Parry Sound Railways to give the public better train connections at Scotia Junction, and to compel the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway to adjust their differences as regards the traffic between Toronto and North Bay, and restore the accommodation that existed on or before January 25th?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Government realizes the gravity of the situation with regard to traffic arrangements between the railways mentioned in the question by the hon. member, and have been giving the subject very serious consideration; but have not yet concluded as to what course, if any, it is competent for them to take under the powers conferred by the Railway Act.

KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked,

Has an order been given by the Department of Railways and Canals, or Public Works, to the Kingston Locomotive Works, for locomotives, and if so, at what prices are those to be supplied?

(b.) Were tenders asked for from the Kingston Locomotive Works and other firms as to these locomotives?

(c.) To what parties have letters or telegrams been sent, announcing that such contract had been given to the Kingston Locomotive Works?

(d.) Has any member of the Government sent any such telegrams or letters to either Hon. Mr. Harty or the President of the Liberal Association at Kingston, and if so, at what date?

(e.) Was the purchase of such locomotives authorized by an Order in Council, and if so, what is the date of such Order in Council?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). No order has yet been given by the Department of Railways and Canals to the Kingston Locomotive Works for locomotives. (b.) Tenders have not been recently asked from the Kingston Locomotive Works or other firms. It is the intention, however, of the department, as soon as specifications and plans for a new locomotive have been completed, to open negotiations with the Kingston Works on the subject of the building of some locomotives for the Intercolonial Railway, as the department desires and intends, so far as practicable, to give to a Canadian firm the preference in the manufacture of the locomotives which the Government may require. (c.) No such letter or telegram has been sent as is referred to in this sub-question. (d.) No such telegrams or letters have been sent by any member of the Government as is referred to in this sub-question. (e.) No purchase of locomotives has been authorized by Order in Council.

PAYMENTS OF INTEREST TO QUEBEC AND ONTARIO.

Mr. **HENDERSON** asked,

1. What is the actual amount of interest paid by the Dominion Government to the Provincial Treasurer of Quebec during the year 1897 ?

2. What was the actual amount of interest paid by the Dominion Government to the Provincial Treasurer of Ontario during the year 1897 ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). (1.) On account of interest on balance of Common School Fund, \$5,000. The cheque for this amount was returned by the Quebec Government. (2.) Five per cent interest on \$2,394,000, the amount of capital on account of North Shore Railway subsidy per Act 47 Vict., c. 8, \$119,700. (3.) Five per cent interest on the amount of capital, \$2,549,213.60 granted to the province of Quebec in 1884. This amount, \$127,460.68, was entered by the Dominion Government under the heading "Subsidies to Provinces" (Act 47 Vict., c. 4). (4.) On account of interest on Common School and other trust funds, \$70,000. (5.) Five per cent interest on \$2,848,289.53, the amount of capital granted to the province of Ontario in 1884. This amount, \$142,414.48, was entered by the Dominion Government under the heading "Subsidies to Provinces" (Act 47 Vict., c. 4).

DUTY ON BINDER TWINE.

Mr. **TAYLOR** asked,

Has the Government been urged to re-impose an import duty upon binder twine, and has a definite reply been given to the request, or is the matter still under consideration ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). The Government were asked to impose a duty on binder twine. As in the case of other tariff deputations, the parties who made the request were informed that the

Mr. **TAYLOR**.

Government were not prepared to make a statement as to details of the tariff in advance of the Budget.

ST. HELEN'S ISLAND.

Mr. **LEMIEUX** (by Mr. Guay) asked,

1. Is it true that the Militia Department intend to set apart a portion of St. Helen's Island to be used exclusively for military purposes ?

2. If so, will the public have free access there to as in the past ?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). 1. By an Order in Council of the 3rd June, 1874, the Department of Militia and Defence allowed the corporation of the city of Montreal to use that part of St. Helen's Island which was not occupied for military purposes, on condition that such permission could be withdrawn at the will of the department. During last summer it was found necessary to enlarge the ground thus reserved for the militia, and the fence was accordingly extended so as to embrace a larger area. This was done in conformity with the arrangements of 1874. 2. The public never had access to the portion of the island fenced in for the military, and this rule will continue in force as regards the whole of the land now fenced in as above stated.

LINE OF STEAMERS BETWEEN CANADA AND FRANCE.

Mr. **LEMIEUX** (translation) (by Mr. Guay) asked :

1. Have proposals been made to the Government for the establishment of a line of steamers between Canada and France ?

2. If so, what is the nature of such proposals ?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier.) The Government did receive one or two proposals in that direction. As to the nature of those proposals, I would suggest to my hon. friend to make a motion to that effect.

STOREKEEPER OF LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. **QUINN** asked,

1. How many persons have been named to the position of storekeeper of Lachine Canal, lately occupied by Michael Bahen, who was dismissed last May ?

2. What are their names ?

3. When was each appointed ?

4. Who is the present incumbent ?

5. Why was the position vacated in each instance ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). 1. Three persons have been named to the position of storekeeper of Lachine Canal lately occupied by Michael Bahen. 2. Their names are Denis Casey, Robert Anderson, Chas. Le Bouthillier. 3. Denis Casey was appointed on the 1st May, 1897. Robert Anderson was appointed on the 8th July, 1897. Chas. Le Bouthillier was appointed on the 30th October, 1897. 4. The present incumbent

is Chas. Le Bouthillier. 5. The position was vacated in the case of Denis Casey because he could not keep books properly, and of Robert Anderson because he neglected his duty.

THE GANANOQUE DRILL SHED.

Mr. TAYLOR asked,

(a.) Has the Government removed the drill shed at Gananoque from the site sold to the town for the purpose of a high school ?

(b.) Did the Government give the town a deed of the site for the sum of a thousand dollars ?

(c.) Has the town paid for the said site ; if so, when ?

(d.) Did the Government promise to remove the drill shed within a reasonable time ?

(e.) Is the Government aware that the High School is greatly inconvenienced by the non-removal of the building ?

(f.) Was part of the drill shed taken down to enable the High School building to be erected in 1895 ?

(g.) What disposition was made by the Government of the lumber and timber of that part of the building that was taken down—was it sold by tender—who was the purchaser—how much did the Government get for it—or is the report true that it was given away to one of the Government supporters to repair his wharfs and buildings with ?

(h.) Has the Government rented a warehouse from Mr. C. E. Britton, in which to store the arms and ammunition of the volunteers force ? If so, when, and for how long ? What rent have they agreed to pay for the said warehouse ?

(i.) Has the Government purchased a new drill-shed site from Mr. J. B. Turner ? If so, what price did they pay for it ? How much land does the site contain ?

(j.) Was the said C. E. Britton the defeated candidate for the House of Commons in the general elections of 1882 and 1887 ? Was the said J. B. Turner the defeated candidate for the House of Commons in the general election of 1891 ?

(k.) Was the renting of the warehouse from Mr. Britton and the purchase of the drill-shed site from Mr. Turner, to in part recoup them for their election expenses ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). (a.) Not entirely. A sufficient part has been removed to enable the High School buildings to be erected.

(b.) The title deed in favour of the corporation was sent to Geo. Taylor, Esq., M.P., on the 27th December, 1895, to be transmitted to the corporation. (c.) Yes. By deposit receipt, received 16th November, 1895. (d.) Yes, or rather the town council (on 4th July, 1895) agreed "to permit the remainder of the drill shed to remain on the present site for a reasonable time." (e.) It is stated. The inconvenience is stated, in a letter from the Mayor of Gananoque, dated 28th April, 1897, to be that "the shed stands an unsightly affair and also endangers the school buildings from an insurance point of view." One cause of the delay is that the transfer of the land for the new site was only completed on 13th November last and the removal of the shed was impossible before that was done. The drill shed con-

tained arms and clothing and the removal of these to a temporary armoury was necessary. This could not be fully effected until last month. Mr. J. B. Turner agreed some time previously to pay \$200 for remainder of old shed, not already taken down, and to take it down within two weeks of date of purchase of new site. This could not be done until the arms, &c., had been removed from old shed. Mr. Turner has been notified that the shed is now ready for removal.

(f.) Yes, authority telegraphed to Mayor 9th July, 1895. (g.) The council (Mayor's letter of 4th July, 1895) undertook "to take down, and remove and store at our expense" the portion which was to be taken down and to "rebuild a new end to said drill hall for present purposes." Presumably the old materials were in part used to rebuild the new end. Mr. C. E. Britton in a letter dated 21st October, 1897, offered \$20 "for that portion of the old drill shed which was torn down and stored inside and outside of the remaining portion" which then remained. On the recommendation of Lieut.-Col. Cotton, A.A.G.A., this offer was accepted. (h.) Yes ; the Government being under obligation to remove the remainder of the old drill shed from the site sold to the town council, in 1895, and the shed not being fit to stand the strain of removal to the new site, it became necessary to secure, temporarily, a suitable building in which to store arms, &c. The Assistant Adjutant General of Artillery recommended, and the Q.M.G. approved of the building selected. Lease dated 20th September, 1897, for one year from 1st October, 1897, with right of renewal. Rent \$150 per annum, owner to put up all internal fittings required for arms, ammunition, stores and clothing, which he has done, using the fittings from the old drill shed. (i.) Yes. The lot was selected by the then D.O.C. of the district, now the Assistant Adjutant General of Artillery, and approved by the Q.M.G. as being the best available. The deed is for \$2,500. Three lots, frontage of 60 feet each, extending back to the river—size of level portion for building about 180 feet by 95 feet. (j.) I have not inquired. (k.) I am informed by Col. Lake, Q.M.G., that both matters were recommended by the District Officer Commanding and himself without any suggestions from the department, or outside, and without any knowledge of either Mr. Britton's or Mr. Turner's political opinions. From the inception of the negotiations which were begun in 1894-95 between the town council of Gananoque and the late Government, as a result of which the country has been compelled to buy a new site for a drill shed there, one Geo. Taylor, of Gananoque, seems to have taken an active part therein. In the autumn of 1896, said Taylor strongly urged the purchase of the J. B. Turner lots, claiming that the late Government had, through a former Minister of Militia, committed the country to the

purchase. He requested me to write to His Honour the Governor of Manitoba—who was the former Minister referred to—for confirmation of his statement, which I did, and, in reply, received a practical confirmation of said Taylor's statement. In view of said Taylor's presumably intimate knowledge of the matter I respectfully refer the member for South Leeds to the said George Taylor for information as to what disposition Mr. J. B. Turner may have made of the purchase money received by him. For the further information of the House I will read a letter just received from the aforesaid J. B. Turner :

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call your attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) is reading, in the way of reprisal, a lot of information, for which he was not asked. I wish to ask you, Sir, whether that is perfectly in order or not ?

The SPEAKER. There is no doubt that answers to questions must be upon the question asked. This is a very long series of questions, and it is very difficult for one to decide, what is or what is not bearing upon the matter. There is a rule, repeated over and over again in the authorities, which allows Ministers of the Crown more latitude in answering a question than would be allowed to a private member. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) will confine himself as far as possible to the question.

Mr. FOSTER. May I be allowed to say, Mr. Speaker, that that course may be persisted in, but there is an opportunity for reprisal on this side of the House.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). In view of the question put, and in view of the statements I have made, no one can deny that the answer I have made is entirely pertinent ; I am not able to say that the question is pertinent. The following is the letter :

Gananoque, Feb. 12, 1898.

Hon. F. W. Borden,
Minister of Militia,
Ottawa.

Sir,—In reference to Mr. Taylor's questions in regard to who I am, and in relation to the price paid for the drill shed site purchased from me by your Government, I beg to inform you that Mr. Taylor agreed to recommend the late Government to purchase the same site for the same purpose, for the sum of six thousand dollars (\$6,000), and he informed me that the Hon. Mr. Patterson, now Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba and late Minister of Militia, wired from Winnipeg to the present Government that he had recommended the purchase of the same site for the drill shed ; all of this can be proved by the most positive evidence. I think it only right that you should be placed in possession of this information, and will be glad to substantiate it by further evidence, if necessary.

I have the honour to be,
Your obedient servant,
J. B. TURNER.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

PLACER MINING AND TIMBER LICENCES IN THE YUKON.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. To whom have permits, licenses or leases for timber lands in the Yukon district been granted by the Government, and what quantity to each, and the amount paid therefor ?
2. To what persons or corporations have leases, licenses or permits been granted by the Government for placer mining or dredging for gold, and what is the extent of ground covered, and the fees paid in each case ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. On the 5th April, 1897, the agent of the department at Dawson City was authorized to issue a permit to Messrs. Harper & Ladue to cut timber at \$2.50 per thousand feet, B.M., but the department has not yet been advised whether such permit was issued. No other permits, licenses or leases for timber lands in the Yukon district have yet been granted, but timber berths have been disposed of by public tender, and the following statement shows who have so secured them, the amount paid therefor and the area :

Name.	Bonus.	Area.
A. S. Cross.....	\$1,009 60	5 sq. miles.
A. McLean.....	1,001 65	do
E. Vachon	1,005 50	do
G. S. McConnell.....	897 46	do
The Klondike Trading & Transportation Co. . .	200 00	do
J. I. Johnson.....	921 25	do
H. Domville.....	1,105 35	do
J. R. Perry.....	1,109 75	do
A. S. Kerry.....	505 00	do

In addition to the bonus, dues are to be charged at the rate of \$2 per thousand feet, B.M., on the timber cut. 2. No licenses, leases or permits have yet been issued for dredging for gold in the Yukon district, but an application from Mr. Robert Anderson for an hydraulic mining location on Hunker Creek was, on the recommendation of the Gold Commissioner, entertained, and authority was granted by Order in Council of the 12th January last for the issue in favour of Mr. Anderson of a lease covering a strip two and one-half miles long by one-half mile wide. The fees to be paid consist of a rental of \$500 per annum, and a royalty of 10 per cent on the output of gold after it exceeds \$20,000. It may be added that since Mr. Anderson's application was dealt with by Order in Council, regulations have been made as to dredging leases. Several applications are now before the department and will be dealt with under these regulations. As the granting of placer mining claims in the Yukon district is in the hands of the Gold Commissioner at Dawson City, it is impossible to state what persons or

corporations may hold the same, what is the extent of the ground covered or the fees paid; but I shall hand to the Clerk of the House a duplicate of the only return received from the Gold Commissioner, and a copy of the regulations under which he acted in reference to the mining locations referred to in such return.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that be printed in "Hansard"?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection that it should be printed in "Hansard."

The following is the return from the Gold Commissioner above referred to by the Prime Minister:—

REPORT FOR THE TIMBER AND MINES BRANCH.

Statement of Receipts by Dominion Lands Agents at Dawson, Yukon District, from Mining Locations at the Yukon Agency, for the period from the 16th June, 1897, to 14th July, 1897.

Date.	Number of Receipt.	From whom Received.	Entry or Location Number and Short Description.	Amount.
				\$ cts.
1897.				
June 16..	1	Thos. J. Williams.	27, Last Chance.	15 00
do 16..	2	William Farrell.	10, Gold Bottom Creek	15 00
do 16..	3	William Concourse.	45, below Disc. on Hunker.	15 00
do 17..	4	Ben. Wilson	28, Last Chance.	15 00
do 17..	5	Jas. Wesley Dodser.	9, above outlet on Gold Bottom	15 00
do 22..	6	Jas. Burke	5 (bench claim), between 5 and 6 Eldo	15 00
do 22..	7	Wm. E. Reaves.	Bench claim, rear of 6 and adg. Eldo	15 00
do 22..	8	Henry Vondar Heid	1, Dominion Creek	15 00
do 22..	9	Frank Beiderman.	Disc. claim, 2½ miles from head of creek	15 00
do 22..	10	Wm. Amos Hart.	6, Henderson Creek	15 00
do 23..	11	T. S. Lippy.	16, Eldorado, renewal.	100 00
do 23..	12	S. J. Miller.	Dominion Creek, below claim of L. C. Hansen	15 00
do 23..	13	Andrew Donnelley	27, Dominion Creek	15 00
do 23..	14	Anton Zaceo	3, Moose Creek	15 00
do 23..	15	Tom Moglebust	38, Hunker Creek	15 00
do 23..	16	Frank Montgomery	11, Gold Bottom	15 00
do 23..	17	Chas. A. Briggs.	8, Home Stake Gulch	15 00
do 23..	18	Victor Graham	12, from mouth Gold Bottom	15 00
do 24..	19	Chas. E. Lindig.	6, Dominion Creek	15 00
do 24..	20	Michael Ruvan.	1, Dominion Creek	15 00
do 24..	21	T. H. Belanger.	4, Last Chance	15 00
do 24..	22	Omer Tétu.	6, Last Chance	15 00
do 24..	23	Jas H. Gee.	Stuart River	15 00
do 24..	24	Chas. Drugan	4, Indian Creek	15 00
do 24..	25	John L. Bell	7, Throindinck Mining Discovery	15 00
do 24..	26	Ben. Atwater	16, Gold Bottom	15 00
do 24..	27	Chas. Lincoln	5, Indian Creek	15 00
do 24..	28	Ella Joyal.	15, above Discovery on Slate Creek	15 00
do 25..	29	Joe Bertram.	18, above Discovery on Slate Creek	15 00
do 25..	30	F. M. Kelly	26, Henderson Creek	15 00
do 25..	31	Bernard H. Moran	Too-Much-Gold-Creek	15 00
do 25..	32	Frank E. Wilson.	27, Henderson Creek	15 00
do 25..	33	Wallace Gerow.	Indian Creek	15 00
do 25..	34	Warren L. Stetson	Indian Creek	15 00
do 25..	35	Geo. H. Reynolds.	4, Indian Creek	15 00
do 25..	36	Chas. Peterson.	29, Above Gold Bottom	15 00
do 25..	37	Fred. K. Mills	3, Indian Creek	15 00
do 25..	38	William Coates	69a, Below on Bonanza	15 00
do 26..	39	Anton Viale	Slate Creek (Too-Much-Gold)	15 00
do 26..	40	John Vanderstein.	9, Indian Creek	15 00
do 26..	41	G. Ernest Alexander	Indian Creek	15 00
do 26..	42	Frank Leonard.	Fraction (Cut No. 397)	15 00
do 26..	43	Charlie Cullen.	16, Homestake Gulch, Bon	15 00
do 26..	44	Charlie Cullen	Indian Creek	15 00
do 26..	45	John Brothers	32, Indian Creek	15 00
do 28..	46	Louis Lavoie.	13, above mouth Gold Bottom	15 00
do 28..	48	Frank S. Lindig.	2, Indian Creek	15 00
do 28..	49	Albert H. Gowant	Indian Creek	15 00
do 28..	50	Wm. H. Davies.	13, from mouth of Victoria	15 00
do 28..	51	Joshua Mummy	15, Indian Creek	15 00
do 28..	52	Joseph Beck.	1, Indian Creek	15 00

Statement of Receipts by Dominion Lands Agent at Dawson, Yukon District, from Mining Locations at the Yukon Agency, &c.—Continued.

Date.	Number of Receipt.	From whom Received.	Entry or Location Number and Short Description.	Amount.
1897.				\$ cts.
June 28.	53	Chas. W. Hall.	11, Indian Creek.	15 00
do 28.	54	Edwin A. O'Brien.	6, Indian Creek.	15 00
do 28.	55	Benj. Levy.	35, below Disc. on Hunker.	15 00
do 29.	56	John E. Braum.	35, Indian Creek.	15 00
do 29.	57	Frank Pichon.	Indian Creek.	15 00
do 29.	58	Henry Willott.	73, above Disc. on Bonanza.	15 00
do 29.	59	Thos. W. McGrath.	30, Henderson Creek.	15 00
do 29.	60	Peter Valde.	4, Homestake Gulch.	15 00
do 29.	61	William T. Brown des.	4, bench claim, 2nd tier.	15 00
do 29.	62	William L. Thorp.	3, bench claim, Bonanza.	15 00
do 29.	63	Geo. L. Stewart.	5, bench claim, 2nd tier, Bonanza.	15 00
do 29.	64	Just. Hogg.	2, Homestake Gulch.	15 00
do 29.	65	John Heitman.	26a, fract. above Disc. on Bonanza.	15 00
do 30.	66	James Bristin.	3, above old Disc. Gold Bottom.	15 00
do 30.	67	Thomas Lloyd.	15a, fract. below Disc. Bear Creek.	15 00
do 30.	68	Geo. Torpain.	1, Indian Creek on Delia Creek.	15 00
do 30.	69	Robt. G. Brownlee.	1, above Last Chance Hunker.	15 00
do 30.	70	Tim. Cornolly.	25, Indian Creek.	15 00
do 30.	71	Lewis Corkist.	24, Indian Creek.	15 00
do 30.	72	Wm. P. Grainger.	16a, fract. Gold Bottom.	15 00
do 30.	73	John R. Howe.	29, Last Chance.	15 00
July 1.	74	Henry Bernard.	8, Indian Creek.	15 00
do 1.	75	Wm. Fouteux.	15, above Disc. Last Chance.	15 00
do 1.	76	Louis Bono.	2 and 3, fract. Dom. Creek.	15 00
do 1.	77	Louis Langlow.	12a, fract. Eldorado.	15 00
do 1.	78	Cornelius J. Keavany.	Bench adjoining 9 and 10, Eldorado.	15 00
do 2.	79	Ben Wilson.	8, Indian Creek.	15 00
do 2.	80	Thos. Sherwood.	1a, fract. Gold Bottom.	15 00
do 2.	81	Abraham H. Anderson.	55, below Disc. on Hunker.	15 00
do 2.	82	Andrew Gustafson.	Bench claim abutting 9 Eldorado.	15 00
do 2.	83	August Peterson.	0, Fox Creek, adjg. Bonanza.	15 00
do 2.	84	Stanley Kurzek.	1, above on Fox.	15 00
do 2.	85	Geo. F. Compton.	11, Sulphur Creek, Miller Creek.	15 00
do 3.	86	John Engle.	4a, Gold Bottom.	15 00
do 5.	87	Harry Berryman.	47b, fract. Eldorado.	15 00
do 5.	88	Phillipe Fortin.	5a, fract. Last Chance.	15 00
do 5.	90	Chas. F. Nelson.	7, Indian Creek.	15 00
do 5.	91	Wm. H. Maloy.	59, above Disc., Bonanza.	15 00
do 5.	92	Jno. W. Donovan.	7, Indian Creek.	15 00
do 5.	93	J. Adolph Johnston.	5, Homestake Gulch.	15 00
do 5.	94	Charles Brouin.	30, Dominion Creek.	15 00
do 5.	95	Samuel J. Mathews.	1, Gulch joins Bonanza Valley.	15 00
do 5.	96	Edward W. Engelbrecht.	4, above upper Disc. Dom. Ck.	15 00
do 6.	97	Geo. Butler.	3, on Creek joining Bonanza.	15 00
do 7.	98	Hugh McArthur.	33, Dom. Creek.	15 00
do 7.	99	Edward Mowohan.	5, Monte Cristo Gulch, Bon.	15 00
do 7.	100	Pearl H. Hebb.	4, do do do.	15 00
do 7.	101	John J. Corbett.	11, Too Much Gold Creek.	15 00
do 8.	102	Wm. H. Davis.	30, above frks. Last Chance.	15 00
do 8.	103	Fred. Trumph.	46, below Dis. on Hunker.	15 00
do 8.	104	Nathan Lewis.	35a, Hunker below Discovery.	15 00
do 8.	105	John A. Carlisle.	35c, below Discovery Hunker.	15 00
do 9.	106	Geo. M. Prentiss.	4, bench abutting G. C. 5 Eldo.	15 00
do 9.	107	Orrin Woodman.	Bench claim adj. 42.	15 00
do 9.	109	Pat. H. Stafford.	At Narrow below Disc.	15 00
do 9.	110	Lawrence Olsen.	33, above Disc. Last Chance.	15 00
do 9.	111	Fred. Bensing.	Narrow, below Dis. on Hunker.	15 00
do 9.	112	Chas. Lincoln.	18a, Gold Bottom Creek.	15 00
do 10.	113	Joseph Tapella.	13a, mouth Golden Bottom.	15 00
do 10.	114	A. H. Barker.	12, Victoria Creek.	15 00
do 10.	115	W. A. Hensley.	5a, joining claim of Burke Eldo.	15 00
do 10.	116	Arthur V. Wentworth.	6b, bench claim.	15 00
do 10.	117	Gus. Johnson.	8, below W. D. Dom. Creek.	15 00
do 10.	120	P. E. De Ville.	1, Magnet Gulch. joins Bonz.	15 00

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Statement of Receipts by Dominion Lands Agents at Dawson, Yukon District, from Mining Locations at the Yukon Agency, &c.—*Concluded.*

Date.	Number of Receipt.	From whom Received.	Entry or Location Number and Short Description.	Amount.
				\$ cts.
1897.				
July 12..	121	Thos. O'Shea	18 Victoria Creek.....	15 00
do 12..	122	Evarard Sagor	9a, fract. Hunker	15 00
do 12..	123	Thos. L. Sagor	8a, fract. Hunker	15 00
do 12..	124	Thos. Lynch.....	5, Chief Gulch	15 00
do 12..	125	Pat. Regan.....	6, Chief Gulch	15 00
do 12..	126	Chas. Gilbert	21, below upper Disc., Dom. Ck.....	15 00
do 12..	127	Alfred Pelkey.....	13, Dom. Creek, below U. Dis.....	15 00
do 12..	128	Henry Godin.....	1, bench claim, Eldorado.....	15 00
do 12..	129	Jno. L. Bell	9, above upper Disc. Dom.....	15 00
do 12..	130	A. R. Bannerman.....	11, below upper Disc. Dom	15 00
do 12..	131	Thos. R. Moore.....	35b, Hunker Creek, (fract.)	15 00
do 12..	132	Wilfred Guvin	8, below lower Disc. Dom. C.....	15 00
do 13..	133	J. S. Bernard.....	4, Irish Gulch joins Eldo.	15 00
do 13..	134	Anton Dahl	0, Home Stake Gulch	15 00
do 14..	135	Thos. H. Shallows.....	8, above Disc. Last Chance	15 00
do 14..	136	Jacob Vogler.....	17, below lower Disc. Dom	15 00
do 14..	137	James Monroe.....	13a, below Disc. Bear Creek.....	15 00
do 14..	138	Constanz Lachmitt.....	10, above L. D. Dom. Creek.....	15 00
do 14..	139	Archie Shelp.....	1, Nugget Gulch adj. Eldo.....	15 00
	585	A. P. McKellar.....	44, Hunker Creek.....	15 00
	583	S. Peterson.....	1, Homestake Gulch.....	15 00
	584	G. P. Bunt.....	12, Gold Bottom.....	15 00
		<i>Renewals.</i>		2,140 00
July 10..	118	Jas. Rowan.....	25a, Bonanza, renewal	100 00
do 10..	119	Frank Phiscator.....	2 Eldorado, do	100 00
do 5..	610	Jeff. Talbut & Fdk. Trumpf.....	3 B. D. on Glacier, laid over 1 year.....	15 00
do 5..	611	De Wolf, Galezzi, Haufman Malette	6, Glazier Creek, do	15 00
do 5..	612	De Wolf, Galezzi, Haufman Malette.....	5b, Glazier Creek, do	15 00
do 10..	613	David Swanson.....	17b, Miller Creek, do	15 00
do 10..	614	J. J. Pubram.....	19a, Glazier Creek, do	15 00
June 16..	609	R. W. Dryden & A. L. Thayer.....	24 B. D. Miller Creek, do	15 00
				\$290 00
June 26..		Fritz Kloke	Ren. fee for quartz claim.....	5 00
do 26..		Fritz Kloke	Mill side	5 00
				\$10 00

With P. C. No. 1189—1897 ; Ref. 47,478 on 146,591 T. & M.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING PLACER MINING
ALONG THE YUKON RIVER AND ITS
TRIBUTARIES IN THE NORTH-
WEST TERRITORIES.

(Approved by Order in Council No. 1189, of 21st
May, 1897, as amended.)

Interpretation.

"Bar diggings" shall mean any part of a river over which the water extends when the water is in its flooded state, and which is not covered at low water.

Mines on benches shall be known as "bench diggings" and shall for the purpose of defining the size of such claims be excepted from dry diggings.

"Dry diggings" shall mean any mine over which a river never extends.

"Miner" shall mean a male or female over the age of eighteen but not under that age.

"Claim" shall mean the personal right of property in a placer mine or diggings during the time for which the grant of such mine or diggings is made.

"Legal post" shall mean a stake standing not less than four feet above the ground and squared on four sides for at least one foot from the top. Both sides so squared shall measure at least four inches across the face. It shall also mean any stump or tree cut off and squared or faced to the above height and size.

"Close season" shall mean the period of the year during which placer mining is generally suspended. The period to be fixed by the Gold Commissioner in whose district the claim is situated.

"Locality" shall mean the territory along a river (tributary of the Yukon River) and its affluents.

"Mineral" shall include all minerals whatsoever other than coal

Nature and Size of Claim.

1. "Bar diggings," a strip of land 100 feet wide at high-water mark, and thence extending into the river to its lowest water level.

2. The sides of a claim for bar digging shall be two parallel lines run as nearly as possible at right angles to the stream and shall be marked by four legal posts, one at each end of the claim at or about high-water mark, also one at each end of the claim at or about the edge of the water. One of the posts at high-water mark shall be legibly marked with the name of the miner and the date upon which the claim was staked.

3. Dry diggings shall be 100 feet square and shall have placed at each of its four corners a legal post upon one of which shall be legibly marked the name of the miner and the date upon which the claim was staked.

4. Creek and river claims shall be 500 feet long measured in the direction of the general course of the stream, and shall extend in width from base to base of the hill or bench on each side, but when the hills or benches are less than 100 feet apart, the claim may be 100 feet in depth. The sides of a claim shall be two parallel lines run as nearly as possible at right angles to the stream. The sides shall be marked with legal posts at or about the edge of the water and at the rear boundaries of the claim. One of the legal posts at the stream shall be legibly marked with the name of the miner and the date upon which the claim was staked.

5. A bench claim shall be 100 feet square, and shall have placed at each of its four corners a legal post upon which shall be legibly marked the name of the miner and the date upon which the claim was staked.

6. Entry shall only be granted for alternate claims, the other alternate claims being reserved for the Crown to be disposed of at public auction, or in such manner as may be decided by the Minister of the Interior.

The penalty for trespassing upon a claim reserved for the Crown shall be immediate cancellation by the Gold Commissioner of any entry or entries which the person trespassing may have obtained, whether by original entry or purchase, for a mining claim, and the refusal by the Gold Commissioner of the acceptance of any application which the person trespassing may at any time make for a claim. In addition to such penalty, the mounted police, upon a requisition from the Gold Commissioner to that effect, shall take the necessary steps to eject the trespasser.

7. In defining the sizes of claims they shall be measured horizontally irrespective of inequalities on the surface of the ground.

8. If any person or persons shall discover a new mine and such discovery shall be established to the satisfaction of the Gold Commissioner, a creek and river claim 750 feet in length may be granted.

A new stratum of auriferous earth or gravel situated in a locality where the claims are abandoned shall for this purpose be deemed a new mine, although the same locality shall have been previously worked at a different level.

9. The forms of application for a grant for placer mining and the grant of the same shall be those contained in forms "H" and "I" in the schedule hereto.

10. A claim shall be recorded with the Gold Commissioner in whose district it is situated within three days after the location thereof if it

is located within ten miles of the Commissioner's office. One extra day shall be allowed for making such record for every additional ten miles or fraction thereof.

11. In the event of the absence of the Gold Commissioner from his office, entry for a claim may be granted by any person whom he may appoint to perform his duties in his absence.

12. Entry shall not be granted for a claim which has not been staked by the applicant in person in the manner specified in these regulations. An affidavit that the claim was staked out by the applicant shall be embodied in form "H" of the schedule hereto.

13. An entry fee of \$15.00 shall be charged the first year, and an annual fee of \$100.00 for each of the following years. This provision shall apply to locations for which entries have already been granted.

14. A royalty of ten per cent on the gold mined shall be levied and collected by officers to be appointed for the purpose, provided the amount so mined and taken from a single claim does not exceed five hundred dollars per week. In case the amount mined and taken from any single claim exceeds five hundred dollars per week, there shall be levied and collected a royalty of ten per cent upon the amount so taken out up to five hundred dollars, and upon the excess, or amount taken from any single claim over five hundred dollars per week, there shall be levied and collected a royalty of twenty per cent, such royalty to form part of the Consolidated Revenue, and to be accounted for by the officers who collect the same in due course. The time and manner in which such royalty shall be collected, and the persons who shall collect the same, shall be provided for by regulations to be made by the Gold Commissioner.

Default in payment of such royalty, if continued for ten days after notice has been posted upon the claim in respect of which it is demanded, or in the vicinity of such claim, by the Gold Commissioner or his agent, shall be followed by cancellation of the claim. Any attempt to defraud the Crown by withholding any part of the revenue thus provided for, by making false statements of the amount taken out, shall be punished by cancellation of the claim in respect of which fraud or false statements have been committed or made. In respect of the facts as to such fraud or false statements or non-payment of royalty, the decision of the Gold Commissioner shall be final.

15. After the recording of a claim the removal of any post by the holder thereof or by any person acting in his behalf for the purpose of changing the boundaries of his claim shall act as a forfeiture of the claim.

16. The entry of every holder of a grant for placer mining must be renewed and his receipt relinquished and replaced every year, the entry fee being paid each time.

17. No miner shall receive a grant of more than one mining claim in the same locality, but the same miner may hold any number of claims by purchase, and any number of miners may unite to work their claims in common upon such terms as they may arrange, provided such agreement be registered with the Gold Commissioner and a fee of five dollars paid for each registration.

18. Any miner or miners may sell, mortgage, or dispose of his or their claims, provided such disposal be registered with, and a fee of two dollars paid to the Gold Commissioner, who shall thereupon give the assignee a certificate in form "J" in the schedule hereto.

19. Every miner shall, during the continuance of his grant have the exclusive right of entry upon his own claim, for the miner-like working thereof, and the construction of a residence thereon, and shall be entitled exclusively to all the proceeds realized therefrom, upon which, however, the royalty prescribed by clause 14 of these regulations shall be payable; but he shall have no surface rights therein; and the Gold Commissioner may grant to the holders of adjacent claims such right of entry thereon as may be absolutely necessary for the working of their claims, upon such terms as may to him seem reasonable. He may also grant permits to miners to cut timber thereon for their own use, upon payment of the dues prescribed by the regulations in that behalf.

20. Every miner shall be entitled to the use of so much of the water naturally flowing through or past his claim, and not already lawfully appropriated, as shall, in the opinion of the Gold Commissioner be necessary for the due working thereof; and shall be entitled to drain his own claim free of charge.

21. A claim shall be deemed to be abandoned and open to occupation and entry by any person when the same shall have remained unworked on working days by the grantee thereof or by some person on his behalf for the space of *seventy-two hours, unless sickness or other reasonable cause be shown to the satisfaction of the Gold Commissioner or unless the grantee is absent on leave given by the Commissioner, and the Gold Commissioner upon obtaining evidence satisfactory to himself that this provision is not being complied with may cancel the entry given for a claim.

22. If the land upon which a claim has been located is not the property of the Crown it will be necessary for the person who applied for entry to furnish proof that he has acquired from the owner of the land the surface rights before entry can be granted.

23. If the occupier of the lands has not received a patent therefor, the purchase money of the surface rights must be paid to the Crown, and a patent of the surface rights will issue to the party who acquired the mining rights. The money so collected will either be refunded to the occupier of the land, when he is entitled to a patent therefor, or will be credited to him on account of payment for land.

24. When the party obtaining the mining rights to lands cannot make an arrangement with the owner or his agent or the occupant thereof for the acquisition of the surface rights, it shall be lawful for him to give notice to the owner or his agent or the occupier to appoint an arbitrator to act with another arbitrator named by him, in order to award the amount of compensation to which the owner or occupant shall be entitled. The notice mentioned in this section shall be according to a form to be obtained upon application from the Gold Commissioner for the district in which the lands in question lie, and shall, when practicable, be personally served on such owner, or his agent if known, or occupant; and after reasonable efforts have been made to effect personal service, without success, then such notice shall be served by leaving it at, or sending by registered letter to, the last place of abode of the owner, agent or occupant. Such notice shall be served upon the owner, or agent, within a period to be fixed by the Gold Commissioner before the expiration of the time limited in such notice. If the proprietor refuses or de-

*72 hours means 3 consecutive days of 24 hours each.

clines to appoint an arbitrator, or when, for any other reason, no arbitrator is appointed by the proprietor in the time limited therefor in the notice provided for by this section, the Gold Commissioner for the district in which the lands in question lie shall on being satisfied by affidavit that such notice has come to the knowledge of such owner, agent or occupant, or that such owner, agent or occupant willfully evades the service of such notice, or cannot be found, and that reasonable efforts have been made to effect such service, and that the notice was left at the last place of abode of such owner, agent or occupant, appoint an arbitrator on his behalf.

25. (a.) All the arbitrators appointed under the authority of these regulations shall be sworn before a justice of the peace to the impartial discharge of the duties assigned to them, and they shall forthwith proceed to estimate the reasonable damages which the owner or occupants of such lands, according to their several interests therein, shall sustain by reason of such prospecting and mining operations.

(b.) In estimating such damages, the arbitrators shall determine the value of the land irrespective of any enhancement thereof from the existence of minerals therein.

(c.) In case such arbitrators cannot agree, they may select a third arbitrator, and when the two arbitrators cannot agree upon a third arbitrator the Gold Commissioner for the district in which the lands in question lie shall select such third arbitrator.

(d.) The award of any two of such arbitrators made in writing shall be final, and shall be filed with the Gold Commissioner for the district in which the lands lie.

If any cases arise for which no provision is made in these regulations, the provisions of the regulations governing the disposal of mineral lands other than coal lands approved by His Excellency the Governor in Council on the 9th of November, 1889, shall apply.

FORM H.—APPLICATION FOR GRANT FOR PLACER MINING AND AFFIDAVIT OF APPLICANT.

I (or we) _____ of _____ hereby apply, under the Dominion Mining Regulations for a grant of a claim for placer mining as defined in the said regulations, in (here describe locality) and I (or we) solemnly swear:

1. That I (or we) have discovered therein a deposit of (here name the metal or mineral).

2. That I (or we) am (or are) to the best of my (or our) knowledge and belief, the first discoverer (or discoverers) of the said deposit; or:

3. That the said claim was previously granted to (here name the last grantee), but has remained unworked by the said grantee for not less than _____

4. That I (or we) am (or are) unaware that the land is other than vacant Dominion land.

5. That I (or we) did, on the _____ day of _____ mark out on the ground, in accordance in every particular with the provisions of the mining regulations for the Yukon River and its tributaries, the claim for which I (or we) make this application, and that in so doing I (or we) did not encroach on any other claim or mining location previously laid out by any other person.

6. That the said claim contains, as nearly as I (or we) could measure or estimate, an area of _____ square feet, and that the description (and sketch, if any) of this date hereto attached, signed by me (or us), sets (or set) forth in detail, to the best of my (or our) knowledge and ability, its position, form and dimensions.

7. That I (or we) make this application in good faith, to acquire the claim for the sole purpose of mining, to be prosecuted by myself (or us) or by myself and associates, or by my (or our) assigns.

Sworn before me at _____ this _____ day of _____ 18 _____ .
(Signature) _____

FORM I.—GRANT FOR PLACER MINING.

No.....

Department of the Interior,
Agency, _____ 18 _____ .

In consideration of the payment of the fee prescribed by clause 13 of the Mining Regulations for the Yukon River and its tributaries, by (A. B.) of _____, accompanying his (or their) application No. _____, dated _____, 18 _____, for a mining claim in (here insert description of locality).

The Minister of the Interior hereby grants to the said (A.B.) _____, for the term of one year from the date hereof, the exclusive right of entry upon the claim (here describe in detail the claim granted) for the miner-like working thereof and the construction of a residence thereon, and the exclusive right to all the proceeds realized therefrom, upon which, however, the royalty prescribed by clause 14 of the regulations shall be paid.

The said (A.B.) _____ shall be entitled to the use of so much of the water naturally flowing through or past his (or their) claim, and not already lawfully appropriated, as shall be necessary for the due working thereof, and to drain his (or their) claim free of charge.

This grant does not convey to the said (A.B.) _____ any surface rights in the said claim, or any right of ownership in the soil covered by the said claim; and the said grant shall lapse and be forfeited unless the claim is continuously and in good faith worked by the said (A.B.) _____ or his (or their) associates.

The rights hereby granted are those laid down in the aforesaid mining regulations, and no more, and are subject to all the provisions of the said regulations, whether the same are expressed herein or not.

Gold Commissioner.

FORM J.—CERTIFICATE OF THE ASSIGNMENT OF A PLACER MINING CLAIM.

No.....

Department of the Interior,
Agency, _____ 18 _____ .

This is to certify that (B.C.) of _____ has (or have) filed an assignment in due form dated _____ 18 _____, and accompanied by a registration fee of two dollars, of the grant to (A.B.) _____ of _____

of the right to mine in (insert description of claim) for one year from the _____ 18 _____.

This certificate entitles the said (B.C.) _____ to all rights and privileges of the said (A.B.) _____ in respect of the claim assigned, that is to say, to the exclusive right of entry upon the said claim for the miner-like working thereof and the construction of a residence thereon, and the exclusive right to all the proceeds realized therefrom (upon which, however, the royalty prescribed by clause 14 of the regulations shall be paid), for the remaining portion of the year for which the said claim was

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

granted to the said (A. B.) _____, that is to say, until the _____ day of _____ 18 _____.

The said (B.C.) _____ shall be entitled to the use of so much of the water naturally flowing through or past his (or their) claim and not already lawfully appropriated, as shall be necessary for the due working thereof, and to drain the claim free of charge.

This grant does not convey to the said (B.C.) _____ any surface rights in the said claim, or any right of ownership in the soil covered by the said claim; and the said grant shall lapse and be forfeited unless the claim is continuously, and in good faith, worked by the said (B.C.) _____ or his (or their) associates.

The rights hereby granted are those laid down in the Dominion Mining Regulations, and no more, and are subject to all the provisions of the said regulations, whether the same are expressed herein or not.

Gold Commissioner.

N.B.—The provisions of these regulations are liable to be changed at any time. Copies of the latest regulations may be obtained by applying to the Department of the Interior, Ottawa, Ontario; or to the Gold Commissioner at Cudahy, Yukon District, North-west Territories.

DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

1. When does the Government propose to commence through traffic from Montreal over the Grand Trunk Railway and the Drummond County Railway, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway?

2. What new officials have been appointed by the Minister of Railways with a view to traffic by the above route? What is the salary of each and the date of his appointment?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Government proposes, and has great hopes that it will be able, to commence through traffic from Montreal over the Grand Trunk Railway and the Drummond County Railway, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, on the 1st March, 1899.

The following new officials have been appointed with a view to traffic by the above route:—

A. H. Harris, general traffic manager, 1st December, 1898.....	\$5,000
T. H. Underwood, chief clerk, 1st January, 1898.....	900
T. B. Odell, clerk, 1st January, 1898.....	600
J. A. Ryan, messenger, 1st January, 1898.	120
James Hardwell, division freight agent, Montreal, 1st January, 1898.....	2,000
F. W. Thompson, clerk, 1st January, 1898	800
— McKillop, messenger, 1st January, 1898	120
J. B. Lambkin, district passenger agent, Montreal, 1st January, 1898.....	1,400

Savings have been effected in the offices at Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John which about equalize the salaries, rentals, &c., now in effect, that is to say, the traffic department of the Government railways system is being modernized without increasing the cost to the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. Thanks for the additional information.

LIQUOR PERMITS IN THE YUKON.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

Does the Government of Canada assume and exercise the right to grant permits for the sale of liquors in the Yukon district?

If so, to whom have permits for this purpose been granted, for what quantities, and for what consideration in such case?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Under the North-west Territories Act, the right to grant permits for taking liquor into the North-west Territories, of which the Yukon district is at present a part, is conferred upon the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories.

Prior to the assumption of office by the present Government an arrangement had been made by which the Lieutenant-Governor issued permits for the Yukon district only upon the request of the Minister of the Interior. This practice has continued up to the present time. From a communication received from the Premier of the North-west Territories, it appears that the Governor of the North-west Territories now claims that under the amended constitution of the Territories the right of the Lieutenant-Governor to issue permits should only be exercised on the advice of his Ministers. The question remains in abeyance for the present and no permits are being issued.

2. If the hon. gentleman will state within what period of time he desires the information asked for in the last clause of his question, a return will be prepared giving the information.

COPYRIGHT IN CANADA.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (by Mr. Foster) asked,

1. What position is the question of the powers of the Canadian Parliament respecting copyright in Canada now in?

2. Does the Government propose to introduce any legislation upon this subject during this session.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1. In March, 1895, Her Majesty's Government suggested to the Canadian Government that so soon as convenient one of the Canadian Ministers, or some other gentleman duly authorized by them and fully conversant with the subject, should go to England and discuss the matter personally with Her Majesty's Government. In accordance with the suggestion Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice, was authorized on behalf of the Canadian Government to proceed to London and confer with Her Majesty's Government on the subject. He did so in the summer of 1895, and reported the result of the conference to the Canadian Government. No action has yet been taken upon the report. 2. The Government has not decided to introduce any legislation during the present session.

ALIEN LABOUR ACT.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Has the Attorney General of Canada consented to institute any prosecutions under the Alien Labour Act (60-61 Vic., chap. 11)?

Has the Attorney General of Canada caused any person or persons coming into Canada, contrary to the prohibition of the Act, to be taken into custody and returned to the country whence he came?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). W. F. McCreary, of Winnipeg, was on 23rd of July, 1897, authorized by the Minister of Justice at that time to institute proceedings under 60-61 Victoria, chapter 11, and prosecutions for violation thereof, and to authorize such proceedings and prosecutions when he deemed it advisable so to do. Agents were also appointed in other parts of Canada who were instructed in case the United States authorities were enforcing their law with respect to aliens as against Canadians upon the adjoining boundary, to report to the department cases of violation of the Canadian law in the same locality, and to take proceedings where directed by the department. No persons have been taken into custody by the Attorney General and returned to the country whence they came.

TIMBER LIMITS IN YUKON DISTRICT.

Mr. DAVIN. The first three questions of which I had given notice have already been answered. I would, however, ask the others, as follows:—

Whether H. Domville has had timber limits granted him on Lake Labarge or elsewhere in the Yukon?

If timber limits granted to H. Domville, is this grantee related to the hon. member for King's, N.B.?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The name of H. Domville is included in the names I have just given. The department is not in a position to state whether he is or is not related to the hon. member for King's.

MR. WHITE, EX-DEPUTY POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Mr. BENNETT asked,

Is W. H. Griffin, whose place of residence is given as England, and superannuation allowance \$2,239.92 per annum in the Auditor General's Report, a former Deputy Postmaster General of Canada? Is Wm. White, formerly Deputy Postmaster General, now in receipt of a superannuation allowance? If so, when did the same commence, and what is the annual allowance as such? Is the said Wm. White still in the employ of the Post Office Department of Canada, or has he been since the date of his superannuation (if he has been superannuated), and if so, what have been his emoluments in addition to his retiring allowance? If still in the employ of the said department, how much longer is it intended to continue his services?

What is the salary of the present Deputy Postmaster General Coulter ?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). Mr. W. H. Griffin, at one time Deputy Postmaster General of Canada, was superannuated on the 1st July, 1888, by the Government of that day. Mr. Wm. White, formerly Deputy Postmaster General, after service in the Imperial and Canadian Post Office Departments for over fifty-one years, was superannuated at the statutory allowance of \$2,240, commencing on the 1st of August last. Since his superannuation he was employed to inaugurate the system of case examination of railway mail clerks throughout Canada as authorized by the Post Office Act of last session, and conducted such examinations in the various provinces of Canada. In this work he was engaged in all seventy-seven days, for which he was allowed in full all travelling and other expenses and charged the sum of \$460.50. On the 29th December, 1897, Mr. White had completed the duties so assigned to him. He may be called upon to conduct future examinations.

The salary of the Deputy Postmaster General is \$3,200 a year.

GRAIN TRADE AT FORT WILLIAM.

Mr. DOUGLAS asked,

Will the Department of Inland Revenue furnish the House with a detailed statement of the grain trade at Fort William, giving the number of bushels of wheat under each particular grade received into the elevator under the supervision of the Government inspector, and the number of bushels passing out under each particular grade under the same supervision ?

Does the inspector at that point furnish the department with an annual detailed statement of the same ? If not, why not ?

The **MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE** (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). Instructions have been sent to the Government Inspector at Fort William to prepare at once the detailed statement asked for. The present regulations of the department do not call for all the information now asked for, but only for monthly statement of the grain received into the elevators, but not for the grain passing out of them.

TRANSIT OF CATTLE EXPORTED.

Mr. MACLEAN asked,

Is it the intention of the Minister of Agriculture to publish the report of George S. Macdonald or any other agent of the Government appointed to inquire into the defective accommodation provided for the ocean transit of cattle exported from Canadian ports ?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). It is not the intention of the Minister of Agriculture to publish the report referred to ; but it will be available for the inspection of any member of the House who wishes to see it.

Mr. BENNETT.

WHARF AT POINT CLAIRE.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. Has the Government called for tenders in regard to the construction of a wharf at Point Claire, to defray the expenses of which a sum of \$4,000 was voted last session ?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the construction of said wharf this year ?

3. If not, why not ?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows :—1. No. 2. The matter of the site is now under consideration.

FLOODS AT STE. GENEVIEVE.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. Has the Government made any investigation as to the cause of the yearly floods caused by the Ottawa River at Ste. Geneviève, in the county of Jacques Cartier, and alleged to be due to public works executed by the Government on the river ?

2. What is the result of such investigation, if any has been made ?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to erect a dam upon the river-side at Ste. Geneviève ?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to undertake any work in this connection this year ?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). The Department of Public Works has caused an examination to be made by one of its engineers in reference to the steps that might be taken to prevent the recurrence of floods complained of at Ste. Geneviève, and the whole matter is now under the consideration of the department.

RIVER ST. PIERRE WORKS.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. Has the Government called for tenders in connection with the works on River St. Pierre, along the Lachine Canal, for which a sum of \$40,000 was voted last session ?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with said works this year ?

3. Will the dredging, cleaning and widening of River St. Pierre be carried on the whole length of the river, and if not, then up to what point ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). 1. The Government have not called for tenders in connection with the works on the River St. Pierre along the Lachine Canal, for which \$40,000 was voted. 2. The Government have been endeavouring to arrange to proceed with the work, but the municipalities through which the river runs object. 3. It is proposed to deepen the river where necessary from the mouth of the culvert under the canal to the mouth of the canal.

NEW ENGINES FOR THE INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

1. How many engines have been purchased by the Government in Philadelphia or elsewhere during 1897 ?

2. From whom was each engine purchased? Who were the makers thereof, and in what year were they built?

3. What were the prices paid to the vendor of each engine?

4. What was the cost of each when delivered on the Intercolonial or other Government railways in Canada?

5. Upon what officer's recommendation was each of said engines purchased?

6. Did one of said engines come to Montreal on its way to the Intercolonial? and was it sent to Moncton from Montreal by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway? If so, why was it not sent by way of the Grand Trunk and Intercolonial to Moncton?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). 1. Two engines were purchased in Philadelphia by the Government in 1897 as models for future construction, one being a compound cylinder, the other a single expansion. 2. The engines were purchased from Burnham, Williams & Company, Philadelphia, who were the makers of the engines. 3. One of the engines was built in 1892, and the other engine was built in 1897. 4. The price paid to the vendors for the engines was \$10,000 each. 5. The cost of each engine when delivered on the Intercolonial Railway was \$10,000. 6. These two engines were purchased on the recommendation of the general manager of the Canadian Government Railways, and after inspection thereof by an expert mechanical engineer on behalf of the department. 7. One of the engines came to Montreal by the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was sent to St. John by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway because it was more convenient to send it that way than by the Grand Trunk and Intercolonial Railways to Moncton.

NEW RAILWAY STATION AT MONCTON.

Mr. **POWELL** (by Mr. Gillies) asked,

1. What was the total amount paid to the first of February instant for the construction of the new railway station at Moncton, and for alterations and improvements in Moncton station yard?

2. How much of the expenditure in connection with such construction was charged to current expenditure and how much to capital account?

3. What expenditures have been made in connection with the plumbing and heating apparatus for the new station at Moncton?

4. Has the work of plumbing and heating apparatus been done by day's work or by contract? If by contract, was the contract let by tender, and if so, to whom and for what amount? If the work was not let by tender, who was the contractor and what was the amount of the contract?

5. Did the contractor for the station building at Moncton tender for the work of plumbing, and if so, what was the amount of his tender?

6. If the work of plumbing and putting in the heating apparatus in the Moncton railway station is being done by day's work, who has charge of the work or under whose direction it is being done?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). 1. The total amount to 1st February, 1898, for construction of the

new station and for alterations and improvements in station yard at Moncton was \$91,348.32. 2. The whole \$91,348.32 was charged to capital. 3. The expenditure made in connection with the plumbing and heating apparatus for the new station has been \$3,181. 4 and 5. The work of plumbing and heating apparatus is not being done by day's labour, but by contract. The contract was let by tender. The contract was first made with James Doody. It was subsequently cancelled, new tenders were invited and the contract awarded to McManus & Co. at \$8,277. 6. The plumbing and heating is not being done by day's labour but by contract under charge of Mr. W. B. Mackenzie, chief engineer.

BRAKESMEN ON THE INTERCOLONIAL

Mr. **BELL** (by Mr. Borden, Halifax) asked,

1. Has the number of brakemen on the Intercolonial Railway trains been reduced? If so, upon what trains and why was the reduction made?

2. Are further reductions in the number of brakemen contemplated? And what number of brakemen is it the policy of the Railway Department to allot to each passenger train?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). Yes, the number of brakemen on the Intercolonial Railway has been reduced, upon the following trains:—Nos. 1, 2, 19, 20, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 41, 42, 49, 50, 55 and 56. These reductions were made on account of the business being dull. No further reductions in the number of brakemen is contemplated. It is the policy of the railway to allot to each passenger train as many brakemen as the business of the road requires from time to time.

DR. ROUGHSEGE AND GOLD PERMITS.

Mr. **MACLEAN** asked,

1. Has the Government given a permit to Dr. Roughsedge, of Edmonton, or a company represented by him, to dredge for gold in the Peace River or any of the rivers in the North-west Territories?

2. If so, to what area does said permit apply, and what revenue is to be paid to the Government?

3. Were tenders invited for the privilege accorded to Dr. Roughsedge?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. A lease to dredge for minerals in a portion of the Peace River has been issued to Dr. Roughsedge, of Edmonton, but not to a company represented by him. 2. The length of the river leased is five miles. The rental is \$50 yearly, for each dredge to be used. The lessee shall also pay to the Crown a royalty of two and one-half per cent on the output after it exceeds \$10,000. 3. Tenders were not invited. The lease was issued under the regulations.

APPOINTMENT OF MAJOR WALSH.

Mr. MACLEAN asked,

1. What is the date of the appointment of Major Walsh, Administrator of the Yukon district?
2. For what period is the appointment made?
3. What instructions are given to Major Walsh in his capacity as Administrator?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. 15th August, 1897. 2. No specified period. 3. Instructions are contained in Order in Council, which may be moved for in the usual way.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that order be laid on the Table of the House?

The PRIME MINISTER. If so desired.

LOBSTER FISHING IN BAY OF FUNDY.

Mr. COPP (by Mr. Logan) asked,

1. Does the Government intend making a regulation prohibiting the taking of lobsters less than 10½ inches long in the Bay of Fundy?
2. If so, when will it come into force?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has considered the necessity of increasing the 9-inch size limit for lobsters to 10½ inches in the Bay of Fundy and favours the change, but has not yet made a recommendation to Council. 2. In any event the measure would not come into force before 1st January, 1899, but ample notice will be given to all interested parties, if the change is made.

GRANTS OF LAND TO COLONIZATION COMPANIES.

Mr. DOUGLAS asked,

What were the conditions on which public lands in the North-west Territories were handed over to the various colonization companies—such as the Commercial Colonization Company, the York Colonization Company, Montreal Colonization Company, the North-west Land Company, &c.?

On what principle were they allowed to tax the settlers with a double price for the lands under their control?

How many acres of said lands have now been abandoned to worse than waste?

Is the Government prepared to take any steps to have these abandoned lands thrown open again for settlement? If so, when?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. The odd-numbered sections within the tract were to be sold to the company, or party, undertaking to colonize it at \$2 per acre, payable one-fifth in cash at the time of entering into the contract and the balance in four equal annual instalments, and also to

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

pay the Government five cents per acre for the survey of land, payable in four equal annual instalments, all with interest at 6 per cent per annum. They were obliged within five years from the date of contract to colonize, such colonization to consist of placing two settlers on each even-numbered section and also two on each odd-numbered section. Subsequently it was found that little progress was being made by the companies, and in order to protect themselves for the money paid on account, which amounted in some cases to simply the first payment and in others to only a little more than that, the Government entered into an arrangement by which the companies were given patents for lands at \$2 per acre, covering the amount paid in by them on account of their purchases, the balance of land reverting to the Crown. In a number of instances in this settlement the companies received lands not only for the amount of money paid in by them on account of purchases, but in the calculation to ascertain the amount of land to which they would be entitled was included \$160 for each settler placed upon lands by the companies and also the amount of money expended by them on roads, bridges, &c., within their tract. In some cases the Government allowed companies to take scrip instead of lands to cover the amount. 2. The department appears to have no control of the companies as to the price charged the settlers for lands which has passed to the companies. 3. There is no record as to the waste lands. All lands abandoned by the company reverted to the Crown. 4. The abandoned lands are open now and have been for years past, excepting portions which have been set apart for railway subsidies.

APPOINTMENTS TO MAJOR WALSH'S FORCE.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

1. How many mounted police were in the Yukon district prior to Major Walsh's appointment?
2. What is the monthly cost per man?
3. How many have been added since, either now being in the mining districts of the Yukon or on the way thither?
4. What amount of money has been expended on the whole force included in the above two clauses—for wages and transport from July 1, 1897, to date?
5. What officials under pay of the Government are at present in or on the way to the Yukon district—and the yearly pay of each man, not including mounted police?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. Twenty-four. 2. Approximately, \$125. 3. One hundred and sixty. 4. Approximately, \$130,000, including transport of provisions for all Government officials in the Yukon, and for relief of distress.

List of officials under pay of the Government by the Department of the Interior at present in or on the way to the Yukon District, and yearly pay of each.

Name.	Rank, &c.	Salary.
		\$ cts.
James M. Walsh..	Commissioner.....	5,000 00
F. C. Wade.....	Registrar.....	2,000 00
H. A. Bliss.....	Accountant.....	900 00
H. H. Norwood...	Inspector of Mines..	1,500 00
Jas. D. McGregor.	do	1,500 00
T. D. Pattulo....	Secretary	900 00
A. F. Hurdman...	Surveyor's Assistant	600 00
Thomas Fawcett..	Gold Commissioner, Surveyor, &c.....	1,800 00
James Gibbons...	Assistant Surveyor..	1,095 00
R. W. Cantley....	do	1,095 00
J. A. Cadenhead..	do	1,095 00
E. D. Bolton.....	do	1,095 00
J. A. Clark.....	Clerk and Steno- grapher to Mr. Fawcett.....	900 00
Robert Barrow...	Surveyor's Assistant	480 00
R. H. Fortune....	do	480 00
Louis Carbonneau.	Cook with Major Walsh.....	600 00
John B. Marcelle..	Guide with Major Walsh.....	365 00
Isaac Collin. . . .	Guide with Major Walsh.....	365 00
Toussaint Collin..	Guide with Major Walsh.	365 00

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my right hon. friend if there is, outside the salary, any allowance for rations or travelling expenses ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not prepared to give an answer now, but I will give it at an early day.

TIMBER BERTHS, DISTRICT OF SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

1. What number of timber berths are held by the Moore and McDowall Company, Limited, north of the north branch of the Saskatchewan River, in the District of Saskatchewan ?
2. Have all ground rents due on said berths been paid ?
3. Have all moneys due to the Government for royalty on timber cut and manufactured been paid ?
4. Has the company a mill in operation as required by the regulations ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. The Moore & Macdowall Co., Ltd., held under license eight timber berths comprising an area of 265.43 square miles, but the company has assigned them to Mr. Geo. Burn, of Ottawa. 2. All rents on said berths have been paid up to the 31st December, 1898. 3. All moneys due to the Government

for royalty on timber manufactured and sold have been paid up to the 30th June, 1896. 4. The company has not a mill in operation, but Mr. Burn has advised the department that negotiations are nearly completed for the purchase of the saw-mill formerly operated by the company, and that this mill will probably be in operation in the near future.

DREDGING IN TORONTO HARBOUR.

Mr. CLARKE asked,

1. What sum was expended by the Government in 1896 and 1897, respectively, for dredging in connection with the works for the protection of Toronto harbour ?
2. Was the work of dredging awarded each year by public tender ?
3. What was the price paid per yard for dredging in 1896 and in 1897, respectively ?
4. Name and address of the person or persons by whom the work of dredging was done in each year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Nothing expended in 1896 for dredging in Toronto harbour. In 1897 the sum of \$5,310.26 was expended. 2. The work was not awarded by public tender. 3. The price paid the contractor was at the usual rate paid by the department for work of that kind, namely, \$8 per hour actual working time. The contractor worked from the 29th June to the 26th November dredging 37,214 cubic yards, the cost per cubic yard being 14½ cents. 4. W. E. Phin, Brantford, Ont.

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS IN MANITOBA AND THE N.W.T.

Mr. CHARLTON asked,

How many acres of land have been granted to railway corporations in Manitoba and the Canadian North-west Territories up to the 1st of January, 1898 ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The total area pledged is 39,725,130 acres. The total area earned by construction is 28,406,090 acres.

EXPLORATIONS OF PASSES IN THE YUKON.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

What explorers and engineers have been sent out by the Government to investigate the condition of the routes and passes from the Pacific into the Yukon ; what is the date of the departure of each from Ottawa, and the date of their leaving Victoria or Vancouver for the north ; when did they reach these points on their return, and at what time did the Government receive each report ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Arthur St. Cyr, D.L.S., J. J. McArthur, D.L.S., W. T. Jennings, C.E., Morley Ogilvie, C.E. (assistant to Mr. Jennings), A. B. Ross (assistant to Mr. Jen-

ings), and J. F. Richardson, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Service. Mr. St. Cyr did not go direct from Ottawa, but left Golden, B.C., on the 9th May, 1897. Left Victoria for the north on the 15th May, 1897. Returned to Victoria on the 13th December and to Ottawa on the 24th December, 1897. Reports were received by the Government on the 7th August and 18th October, 1897. Mr. McArthur left Ottawa on the 17th May and Victoria on the 25th May, 1897. Returned to Victoria on the 4th October and to Ottawa on the 19th November, 1897. Reports received on the 11th September and 16th October, 1897. Mr. Jennings left Ottawa on the 18th August and Vancouver on the 30th August, 1897. Returned to Vancouver on the 1st November, 1897, and to Ottawa on the 17th December, 1897. Reports received at various times as fast as received by Mr. Jennings from his assistants up to the 20th January, 1898. Mr. Ogilvie left Ottawa on the 20th August and Vancouver on the 31st August, 1897. Returned to Vancouver on the 4th December and to Ottawa on the 12th December, 1897. He reported to Mr. Jennings. Mr. Ross did not go from Ottawa. He left Vancouver on the 30th August, 1897, and returned to Victoria on the 4th February, 1898. He reported to Mr. Jennings. Mr. Richardson did not go direct from Ottawa. He left Victoria on the 15th August and returned to Vancouver on the 2nd October, 1897, and reported verbally to me. His written report was received on the 6th December, 1897.

GRAIN TRANSPORTATION BY CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. RICHARDSON asked,

Whether any agreement has been made between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Elevator Company of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, whereby the said railway company agrees not to accept grain from farmers at any point where grain elevators have been built? If so, whether such agreement is not ultra vires of and contrary to the provisions of the general Railway Act?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Not aware of any agreement existing between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Elevator Company of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, whereby the said railway company agrees not to accept grain from farmers at any point where grain elevators have been built. If such has been done, it would appear to be contrary to the 246th section of the Railway Act.

FLOODS ON OTONABEE RIVER.

Mr. LANG asked,

1. Has the Government made any investigation as to the cause of the yearly floods on the Otonabee River, and alleged to be due to public works executed by the Government on the river?

2. What is the result of such investigation, if any has been made?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to undertake any work in this connection this year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Government employed Mr. Richard Rogers and Mr. George Pope to make an investigation into the matter of a number of claims for alleged damage to properties along the Otonabee River, and as to the cause of such, if any. The result of the investigation was, that damage did occur, but not from any public works having been built, they were caused by the deposit of large bodies of saw-dust along the river. The Department of Railways and Canals does not at present see the necessity of undertaking any work in that connection, and, therefore, do not propose to do so this year.

GOVERNMENT WORKS ON RICHELIEU RIVER.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. What was the estimated cost of the Government works on the Richelieu River at Belœil?

2. How much has been expended upon these works up to the 5th February, 1898?

3. How much will it cost to complete said works?

4. Why were tenders not called for the construction of said works?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. The estimated cost of the work at Belœil, built of cribwork, was \$11,000, not including superintendence. 2. The sum expended to the 5th February instant, is \$7,118.05. 3. The estimated amount required to complete the work is placed at \$4,500. 4. Tenders were called for the construction of the works at Belœil in December, 1894, and the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderers, Messrs. Bélanger, Amos & Mignault, who transferred it to Mr. Beaulieu who took some steps to proceed with the work, but was absolutely unable to carry it on. On the 25th March, 1896, an Order in Council was passed by the late Government cancelling the contract in question and authorizing that the work be completed by day labour, which course has been followed by the present Government.

CATTLE SHIPMENTS TO BELFAST.

Mr. HUGHES asked,

What steps, if any, have been taken by the Government to secure the opening of Belfast, or other suitable port in Ireland, to shippers for the admission of Canadian cattle on terms similar to those governing their admission into English and Scotch ports?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). This subject is receiving the earnest attention of the Government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

TIMBER LIMITS.

Mr. DOMVILLE asked,

Will the Government state the names of all persons or corporations that tendered for timber limits under the advertisement lately placed in two public papers, and the amount offered by those that tendered for each limit?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Here is a schedule of individuals or companies who have tendered for timber berths in the Yukon district and the amounts offered for the same:

SCHEDULE of Individuals or Companies who have tendered for Timber Berths in the Yukon District, and of Amounts offered by them for the same.

Name of Individual or Company.	Amount offered.
	\$ cts.
North American Transportation Co....	2,500 00
J. M. Guerin.....	50 00
M. Guerin.....	50 00
J. J. Guerin.....	50 00
The Klondike Mining, Trading and Transportation Company.....	200 00
The Klondike Mining, Trading and Transportation Company.....	200 00
The Klondike Mining, Trading and Transportation Company.....	200 00
A. S. Cross.....	1,009 60
A. McLean.....	1,001 65
J. I. Johnson.....	921 25
H. Domville.....	1,105 35
G. S. McConnell.....	897 46
J. R. Perry.....	1,109 75
E. Vachon.....	1,005 50
F. Weir.....	50 00
W. H. Stewart.....	250 00
W. Stewart.....	350 00
J. Davidson.....	200 00
J. Burns.....	250 00
W. H. McAuliffe.....	300 00
J. Davidson.....	300 00
R. Hastey.....	250 00
R. Hasty.....	250 00
J. J. Heney.....	300 00
H. R. Dunne.....	200 00
J. Heney.....	250 00
J. Murphy.....	250 00
L. R. Sharky.....	31 00
W. T. Drysdale.....	71 00
T. Raphael.....	26 00
Geo. E. Kidd.....	101 00
J. G. McLaren.....	101 00
T. A. Watterson.....	31 00
E. Patterson.....	51 00
A. E. Kupkey.....	101 00
E. S. Leetham.....	31 00
H. G. Houghton.....	26 00
J. L. Cariton.....	26 00
W. H. Hurdman.....	26 00
A. L. Clark.....	101 00
T. P. Connor.....	101 00
J. Connor.....	151 00
H. Wallace.....	51 00
R. H. Connor.....	101 00
J. Straton.....	31 00
J. H. Cormack.....	31 00
F. I. Daniels.....	26 00

Name of Individual or Company.	Amount offered.
	\$ cts.
A. Straton.....	26 00
C. H. Ferguson.....	26 00
N. E. Agar.....	26 00
H. A. Munn.....	25 00
D. Carmody.....	25 00
M. King.....	15 00
M. King.....	10 00
J. Holland.....	25 00
C. F. Kelly.....	20 00
C. McCready.....	23 00
*F. M. York.....	250 00
S. Barber.....	25 00
L. F. Backus.....	105 00
Drake Jackson.....	100 00
C. J. Smith.....	100 00
S. Pels.....	75 00
A. S. Kerry.....	505 00
G. Bradley.....	75 00
H. D. Helmeck.....	100 00
C. H. Cobb.....	50 00
F. P. Armstrong.....	27 00

*This berth was found to be in the province of British Columbia.

REGINA TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether all the indebtedness of the Regina Territorial Exhibition has been paid?

Whether the prize of \$20 won by Arthur L. Davies, of Moose Jaw, for an essay on "How to make the farm pay," has been paid? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). No. In reply to the question as to whether the prize of \$20 for an essay has been paid, my answer is, no. It was one of several accounts about which further information had to be obtained before payment. It was returned to the accountant at Regina for information. That information was not received by the department before the vote passed last session had lapsed, and consequently until a re-vote is obtained from Parliament those further accounts cannot be paid. Mr. Davies's account is one that was approved, and will be paid when the vote is passed.

YUKON RAILWAY—ROTHSCHILD'S AGENTS.

Mr. INGRAM asked,

Who was the agent or agents representing the Rothschilds, to whom the Government supplied information regarding the construction of a railway in the Yukon district?

On what dates or dates was it furnished, and what was the nature of the reply thereto?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have not the information under my hand to answer that question, but I expect that all information in relation to it will be laid on the Table to-morrow.

CRAIGVILLE AND STROUD MILLS MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. TYRWHITT asked,

What does the present contractor receive for carrying the mails between Craigvale and Stroud?

When tenders were called for, were any others received than that of the present contractor?

Was the contract given to the lowest tender?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (by the Minister of Agriculture). The contractor for the mail service between Stroud and Craigvale railway station receives 19½ cents per trip, or, as the service is daily, \$61.03 per annum. There were two tenders received for this service at the time tenders were called for. The contract was given to the lowest tenderer at the rate of his tender.

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS—SIDE- WALKS.

Mr. BERGERON asked,

Who was the contractor for the paving in asphalt of the sidewalks, etc., around the Parliament Buildings?

Who furnished the materials for such work, especially the cement, &c.?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The lowest tender was accepted; it was that of the Sicily Asphaltum Paving Co. 2. All the materials were supplied by the contractors.

Mr. FOSTER. Did you accept the lowest tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes; I meant to say that.

CREAMERIES IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN moved for:

1. The number of creameries in the North-west Territories under the management of the Government.

2. The number of patrons each.

3. The amount of cream received for the year 1897 up to the last month for which returns have been sent in.

4. The amount of butter made in such creameries in 1896 and in 1897, respectively.

5. The number of creameries run during the winter months and the amount of butter made during these months.

6. The amount of butter exported during 1896 and 1897 respectively.

7. The prices received in 1896 and 1897.

8. The average price of butter received by farmers in the North-west Territories not connected with the creameries prior to the establishment of such creameries.

9. The average price paid by local dealers now.

10. Copies of the memorial from North-west farmers sent last year, either to Professor Robertson or the Minister of Agriculture, or to the Government of Canada, with reference to the working of the creameries in the North-west Territories.

He said: Mr. Speaker, some years ago when the subject to which this motion relates

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

was first brought before this House, there was a scepticism on both sides as to the fruitfulness of the idea of lending money for creameries in the North-west Territories; but even with the partial information we have at the present moment, we are face to face with the most gratifying facts, which show that no money was ever employed by a Government more fruitfully than the money that has been employed upon what is called the creamery policy in the North-west Territories. It will be remembered that at the time the proposal was made by me many doubted whether it was a practical proposal which ought to meet with acceptance at the hands of statesmen; but, Sir, to-day the policy has vindicated itself beyond the most sanguine hopes. With even the partial knowledge which is at my command, I am able to lay before this House and the country a statement of things that will be a source of gratification to every patriotic man, especially to those gentlemen who, like my hon. friend from Huron, take an interest in our dairy industries. We have in the North-west Territories—and every day is vindicating the truth of this proposition—the finest and most extensive ranching land in the world; we have the finest and most extensive areas of free agricultural country in the world; and now it is being established that we have in the North-west Territories the largest and richest gold-bearing lands in the world. So that the farmer and the rancher in the North-west Territories, especially the rancher, to whatever point of the compass he looks, has at the present moment a magnificent market. He has a magnificent market in the old country. The results of the creamery policy to which I have referred show that even already we have a great market in Great Britain. But that market, as we have it now, is only a fraction of what it will be in a few years. Then, turn to the west, and you have in the Kootenay in British Columbia, and in the Klondike, a market which probably surpasses that of Great Britain; and the ambition of the North-west rancher does not need to stop at the Klondike, at the Kootenay, or at Great Britain. His eye and heart can extend beyond the broad Pacific, and find another great market in Japan. Japan, as those of my hon. friends who have followed the history of that country know, in addition to the many modern movements to which it has had recourse in embodying western ideas and western methods, has made the attempt through its Government to become a great dairying and cattle-raising country; but, after spending \$12,000,000 upon experiments, the Government of Japan has given up the attempt as a mistake, and to-day there is no better market in the world for our dairy products than Japan offers. So that Canada is in this position. She lays her hand on the mane of two great oceans

which are highways and also vast store-houses of sources of wealth; and the North-west Territories, which are the heart and body of Canada, find that whatever way they turn, at the present time the largest and most paying markets for their products present themselves.

Now, there is no such agent, as my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan), who often spoke from this side of the House, and with great instruction to us all, knows for advancing the progress of a stock country as up-to-date dairying, and we want to become a stock-raising country second to none. The very first necessity of good dairying is a good sire, and the next step is to get a good cow, and the way to get a good cow is to have a good strain on both sides—a strain of great milk-producing record. That is what we need. Now, a cow that will produce 250 pounds of butter in a year will cost just as little to keep as a cow that may only give 200 or 150 or even as low as 100 pounds, but a cow producing 100 or 150 pounds of butter will not pay, whereas one producing 250 pounds will pay, and the man who is lucky enough to own fifty or 100 of such cows will have from his dairying process a good income.

The three essentials are breed, feed and trouble. The breed I have dwelt on. The choicest milk-producing foods can be produced in the North-west Territories, with a fruitfulness not equalled, I believe, by any part of the continent of America. We can produce corn for the purpose of ensilage, and the sunflower that we produce in the North-west Territories would fill the heart of an Ontario farmer with envy, so large is its disk and so rich in seeds. We can have wheat-bran 'sans pareil,' and the North-west can produce mangels and all the roots to a perfection of quality that cannot be surpassed and rarely equalled. I was speaking a moment ago about the cow. The cow in the North-west Territories can, I believe, be supported for much less than the cow in almost any other part of Canada. In most parts of Canada, I think, the cow which is properly treated will cost at least \$30 a year, but successful stock men assure me that they can sustain their cows at much less cost. Now, in 1893, in pursuance of the policy that we had inaugurated a few years before, we had inspectors travelling all over Manitoba, and these dairy inspectors worked in Manitoba until 1895, when an inspector was appointed by the local government, and I wish to point out what the result of the dairying has been as a clear result of that policy, which we inaugurated, and which, I am happy to say, is being pursued with zealous imitateness and successful energy by the present Government. Sir, in the winter a meeting took place of the Manitoba Dairy Association, and in their report I find the following, to which I ask the attention of hon. members :

The increase of dairying from year to year has been almost phenomenal. It is estimated, from a reliable source, that 776,000 pounds of creamery butter were sold out of the product at an average price of 16.4 cents per pound, giving a total receipt for butter of \$127,264. It is also estimated, from the same source, that 886,000 pounds of cheese were made, which sold at an average of 7 cents per pound, making a grand total of \$189,284 for dairy produce. This estimate is, if anything, below the actual amount manufactured. The increase in the value of the output for creamery butter alone is \$41,612.

I believe that in the North-west we can show, speaking comparatively, results as gratifying; and when the returns to a motion I have on the paper are made, I think it will be found that at the end of October we had produced something like 473,796 pounds of butter. There are creameries at a score of points in the North-west Territories, and at least two creameries—in Innisfail and Red Deer—where the experiment is being made of running all winter, and so far it has been successful and they are selling their butter—all they can make of it—at 25 cents per pound. Mark that as an indication of what can be done in the North-west Territories, that at the present time we are running two creameries in the winter, and I congratulate the Department of Agriculture on the fact. It shows this, that such is the character of our climate, especially in the west, in that part of the country where the North-west purrs in the winter to the chinook wind, there is no difficulty keeping our cows and getting milk from them and running creameries all winter. Far better work will no doubt be done henceforth, because there cannot be the least doubt that our people required to be educated. The farmers, at first, did not know how to take care of their cream and had to be trained. They are now trained; and even the professional butter-makers, the officers under Professor Robertson, they too require to be trained to the conditions of the country just as the best farmers that came up there from Ontario, but did not understand the peculiarities of the climate, required to be trained in order to make farming the complete success that it is now in the North-west. The cream gatherers themselves require to be trained.

Now, I should like, in order to show the House the progress stock-raising is making, to refer to one district in the North-west Territories, although not bearing directly on dairying, as a sample—I refer to Medicine Hat and Maple Creek. The value of their exports for the past year amounted to \$178,000.

The value of the cattle exports was.....	\$125,000
do do slaughtered.. . . .	33,000
do do dairy production.	20,000
do do hides.....	1,000
Total.....	\$178,000

The number of cattle shipped out of the district was 33,850, and the number of killed 800, making in all 4,150 head of cattle. The average price obtained was \$27.50, some of the steers having brought the first-rate price of \$40 and more. For the year 1898, we shall have in Medicine Hat and Maple Creek, a much better choice. For instance, in Maple Creek we shall have a large creamery next summer, and instead of having \$20,000 as a result, taking the value of the butter product, we shall have a much better showing.

In Medicine Hat and Maple Creek they are fully alive to the market I spoke of, the Klondike market. We have already sent thither 80 head of cattle, which, I may tell you, have sold at an enormous price, realizing a fortune for the enterprising man who took them up. Helped by the Department of Agriculture, helped by the suggestions of Professor Robertson, to whose originality, energy and determination to be up to date, no language can do more than justice at any rate, they will send butter from Maple Creek next year to the Klondike, to the Kootenay, and they will export to Japan and England, the butter being packed not in timber packages, but in tins, the patterns of which Professor Robertson brought from France and which are now being manufactured in Montreal and in St. Boniface, Manitoba. I have inspected the packages myself. The butter is hermetically sealed in the easiest possible manner without being touched by the hand or by any instrument that could injure it in the least. In these packages butter can be sent to the Klondike, to Kootenay or to England. It is not necessary that the butter should be in large and clumsy packages; it may be put up in pound packages. In consequence of this we anticipate a very great trade. On the 7th December last a convention took place in Regina attended by delegates from all points east of Moose Jaw. Many questions were discussed, some of which I desire to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister. The point which the delegates seemed to have most at heart, was that the Government might reduce the charge for the manufacture of the butter. At present the charge is four cents for manufacture and 1 cent for a sinking fund. Some delegates thought that could be lowered to advantage, for, while it may not exceed the cost at a small creamery, it does exceed the cost at a large creamery. Of course, even if the butter is made for less than four cents, in the end the advantage goes to the farmer, for, after his indebtedness is cleared off, if there is any surplus, the Government will undoubtedly hand it over to the patrons of the creamery. But I wish to tell the Minister, whose attention may not have been directed to this meeting, the arguments that were used there. One was that the price of wheat is so high that, unless the suggestion is adopted the attention of dairymen may be

Mr. DAVIN.

turned away from the dairy to wheat growing, and the dairy movement may thus be retarded. In regard to that, I confess I should be very sorry if any of the farmers of the North-west took so shortsighted a view as that. Nevertheless it is my duty to bring to the attention of the Minister this argument, which was used by men who, from the first, have taken the very greatest possible interest in dairying.—for instance, by my friend Mr. William Watson, of Moose Jaw, who was, I think, the first man outside of this House to suggest that the Government of the day might lend money fruitfully for the purpose of helping the dairies in the North-west. Another argument that was used was this—that the consequence of the operations of these dairies is, that, whereas formerly the farmer making his butter in his private dairy sold it for 7 cents a pound, he now sells it to the local dealers at 20 cents a pound. This is not merely because the system of dairying established in the North-west educated the farmer in the methods of butter making, educated the most of the farmers who can afford it to have a separator and a Babcock test, but by finding a market for the butter produced by a large number of farmers, has reduced the competition in the local centres. The result of this—I do not say that I endorse or approve of it—has been to excite a certain jealousy in the minds of some of the patrons of the creamery. If the farmers who are not patrons of the dairy get more for their butter in consequence of the dairy, we all including their brother farmers who are connected with the dairy, should rejoice. But the suggestion was made—this also by some of the best men in connection with dairying—that the dairy should also sell in the local centres. I bring before the Minister the ideas presented at this very interesting creamery parliament, one of the most interesting events that have taken place in the North-west. I think they made out a case that ought to be considered by the Minister whether he cannot, with due regard to the interests of the dairying industry lower the amount taken from the farmer for the cost of manufacturing the butter. When it was said—as I said myself—Supposing they were to lower it to 3½ cents or 3 cents, which was your contention, and in the three years the indebtedness was not paid, but there was a deficit, what then? The answer was this: Then let the Government take five years, and to that I ask the attention of the Minister. Now, Mr. Watson, of Moose Jaw, who was there, said he was sure that the Government would not be a loser at three cents. Another point to which I asked the special attention of the Minister was this. Mr. Watson said:

The Government should give them a detailed statement of the cost of every factory, hired labour, fuel, boxes, parchment paper, salt, oil, freight, commission, insurance, cost of machin-

ery, &c., so that at the end of the term, when they came to take over the factories themselves, they might know how they stood. This would educate the several boards of directors and patrons, and enable them all the better to take up and continue the creameries after Professor Robertson ceased to operate them. It was essential that the creameries should pay well, especially if the high price of wheat continued, which might tempt many to neglect the creameries in favour of wheat growing. At the Moose Jaw factory they did not know the cost of anything—paper, prints, and so on.

I would suggest that certainly that should be done. I know that there is no one more alive than Professor Robertson to the advantage of educating the farmers to take hold of those creameries when the time comes that he withdraws from them. I am quite sure that this point has not been overlooked by him. But it may be, as Mr. Watson suggests, that enough has not been done to enable the farmers to become educated in running those creameries after the Government withdraws its hand. Now, at this convention we had some very important statements made, that will be gratifying to the House. Mr. John Hawkes, of White-wood, told us :

That he did not think there was a single farmer in his district that relied wholly upon grain.

So that in one great district the wise policy of mixed farming seems to have been carried out. Again, Mr. Hawkes says :

Their butter averages almost one pound to the inch, not quite. They were operating four months, and they made 46,871 pounds of butter.

Another suggestion of Mr. Hawkes is that the creamery should do everything it could to save the farmer labour. A suggestion of great importance was made by Mr. Watson that there should be a travelling separator.

He looked forward to the time when there would be a travelling separator as in Iowa. Such a separator, travelling twenty or thirty miles a day, separated 5,000 to 7,000 pounds of milk, and took the cream the same night to the creamery.

A committee was appointed during the day to take notes of the discussions, and formulate the opinions expressed in the resolutions. The committee was as follows :—

The president, William Watson, John Hawkes, L. G. Bell, J. R. Mitchell and Thomas Grayson, and they reported as follows :—

We are of opinion that all patrons should be charged the same ratio per pound of butter for hauling, irrespective of distance.

That in the interests of cleanliness, all butter-milk washings and refuse, where practicable, should be removed to a distance of at least half a mile from the creamery.

That cream haulers should be responsible for the condition of the cream delivered by them at the factories. This provision is intended to ensure adequate care in collecting the cream.

Patrons should understand that it is to their interest to send the cream in the best possible condition.

We recommend the universal adoption of separators, and we believe cream gathering would be preferable to hauling milk.

We believe experience proves that route hauling should, as a rule, be adopted in preference to individual hauling.

As representatives of the creameries of Assiniboia, we are of opinion that a less sum than four cents should be charged by the Government for the manufacture of the butter, and that a reduction to at least 3 cents a pound should be made, such reduction to apply to 1897, with its heavy initial expenses. Further, we are of opinion that this would conduce to a large increase of business, and be to the advantage of the dairy interests in general ; further, that if at the end of three years the Government are not fully reimbursed, they should continue in their occupancy of the creameries until such time as they are repaid.

I think that when a delegation composed of Mr. Hopkins, the president, from Moose Jaw, and of the names that I have read on that committee, representative men from nearly every point, and when they make a recommendation like that, it deserves the attention of the Minister. They recommended :

That some arrangement should be made at all the creameries for the supply of all creamery butter to meet the local demand.

That is the point I brought before the Minister. I expressed a certain doubt that was on my own mind at the time, and of that, I think, I spoke to some of my hon. friends. But it must be said that these gentlemen are the men interested, they are the farmers, and of course they could speak with much more authority than I could. In view of their character, I cannot but think that the Minister should also give great consideration to their suggestion.

We recommend that every patron should receive a weekly statement from the butter-maker of his butter test, either by entry in the patron's pass-book or in such other way as may be convenient.

That with a view to the directors' taking over the respective creameries at the end of the term, a detailed statement of all the costs and expenses of the respective creameries be furnished by the Government to the directors every year.

The report was submitted to the delegates, and was unanimously adopted.

Before concluding my remarks on this subject I wish to state to the Minister what was reported by the delegate from Grenfell, Mr. J. R. Mitchell, and it will gratify every hon. gentleman in this House who is interested in these matters. Mr. Mitchell said :

Their creamery had been quite a success. They were well satisfied with it. It has passed their highest expectations. They had 400 cows guaranteed, and before the season was out they had 700—

So that they had 300 more than was guaranteed before the season was out.

—and more would have come in if they could have got at their cream easily. They had five routes of an average of about twenty-eight miles each, and the average cost per mile was about seven cents. The average cost per pound of butter was 1.29 cents, the lowest (July) being 1.12 cents, and the highest (October) 1.60. Referring back to the routes, he would say that the longest route was thirty miles, the all-round trip. They paid by the trip, the highest being \$2.75, and the lowest \$1.15.

Now, Sir, I have exposed the views of the patrons and of the directors of the creameries in the North-west Territories, and I think I have shown the most gratifying condition of things in the North-west Territories. And you lose its significance if you regard it merely as a result. It is a result, and a most gratifying result of our policy, but the gratification that is to be derived from the result is small compared with the gratification that can be derived from it as a forecast, as an assurance of what during the present summer and during the summer of 1899, and in future will follow this policy, which when I first brought it forward in this House was received with so much scepticism by hon. members on both sides.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Before the adoption of the motion, which I need hardly say I am very willing indeed should pass the House unanimously, I should like to say a few words in regard to this matter. In the first place, I would say to the hon. member that the information asked for in this motion will be brought down within a few weeks. All accounts of the North-west creameries have not yet been fully received, but the staff of the Department of Agriculture, the dairying branch, is now employed on those at hand, and the details of which have been almost completed; within a week or two these details will be absolutely complete, and so soon as the accounts have been copied they will be furnished to the House.

I should like to draw attention to a few of the matters to which the hon. gentleman has alluded to-day. First, I should like to say that the hon. member has evidently informed himself in regard to the information asked for in my department, and from the tenor of his remarks I am pleased to see that he endorses the policy of the department in the work it has been doing and is now doing, and that in his investigations there he has obtained a vast amount of information and opinions in regard to these matters which thoroughly meet his approbation and endorsement. I may say, in amplification of the remarks of the hon. gentleman, that the results which he has pointed out as having been obtained in the district of Assiniboia have been equally evident in the districts of Alberta and Saskatchewan. The work of establishing creameries in the North-west Territories is by no means local, but in consequence of

Mr. DAVIN.

the arrangements which we were able to carry out last year this benefit, which has been enormous to the people enjoying it, has been spread over the whole Territories, and the results have been uniformly and everywhere equally successful. I would just point out in regard to the hon. gentleman's explanation that this policy was outlined some years ago, that it is true the hon. gentleman did lay down a proposition which involved a somewhat similar policy to that which we are carrying out; but fortunately since that policy was laid down by the hon. gentleman, the Government and the department under my control have been able to amplify that policy very much indeed, and from an expenditure of \$15,000 a year during the last two years we were able to run last season sixteen creameries and sixteen skimming stations in the North-west, thereby altogether benefiting thirty-two different localities in the Territories, and conferring on them the inestimable boon which the hon. gentleman has described to the House. Sir, this boon has been a very great one for more reasons than the hon. gentleman has pointed out. Before the Government took hold of those creameries in the North-west, the creamery industry, the dairying industry there had been to a certain extent discredited. Private individuals and corporations had embarked capital in creameries and cheese factories in various districts, and in doing so had invested considerable sums, probably a little beyond their means in many instances, with a result which was financially disastrous. The patrons, on whose patronage the success of the creameries were entirely dependent, had become thoroughly distrustful of the companies organized and carrying on creameries, and were afraid to send their milk there because they feared the butter resulting from the manufacture of the milk might be seized to pay the debts of the creameries, and they would not get a return for the supply of milk sent. As the result of this state of affairs many of the creameries had to stop manufacturing, and those continuing to manufacture were running in a comparatively small way and not paying expenses. This condition of affairs was not only disastrous to the people who had embarked money in the industry, it was not only disastrous to the companies and to the patrons, but was also casting discredit on the North-west as a field for the dairying industry, and those who came to the country were unfortunately impressed with the idea that there was not that room for skilful mixed farming or dairying which to-day has been thoroughly established by the experiments of the department during last season. This result is, I think, even more important than the result following any particular financial advantage to an individual company or corporation, or to any of the patrons, because it is an advantage which affects our whole North-west

Territories, rendering it more attractive to immigrants entering the country by showing that they are in a suitable territory in which the ordinary methods and the higher methods of agriculture may be successfully introduced. This is going to be not only an advantage to the Territories and their inhabitants but a distinct advantage to the whole Dominion, and, therefore, I think it is a complete justification for asking this Parliament to meet the expenditure necessary to place on a sound footing and thoroughly establish this industry in the North-west Territories.

Sir, the hon. gentleman has alluded to several details to which I will now refer, because he illustrates some of the advantages derived and some of the arrangements which have been made in the Territories for carrying on this industry. Let me at the outset allude to the fact that at this very time there are two of the creameries in the North-west Territories being operated. Had the statement, that it was possible for creameries to run in the North-west Territories during the winter season been made a few years ago, it would have been received with ridicule by members of this House and the people of the country; but as a matter of fact two creameries in the Alberta district are running to-day supplying splendid specimens of winter butter for export. This shows how fully and completely the North-west Territories are suitable for dairying in all its branches. The hon. gentleman has spoken about our export of North-west butter. I should like to draw the attention of the House, in endorsement of what the hon. gentleman has said, to the eminently good quality of the products of those creameries. In the early part of the season we did not find a sufficient market in the North-west itself or in the adjoining province of British Columbia for the whole of the output of the creameries we were running there. We turned our attention, as was natural, to the English market, and a large quantity of butter made in the Territories in the earlier part of 1897 was exported to England. One particular shipment was sent from Prince Albert to Montreal in cold storage, and thence to England in cold storage, and it was sold upon the English market within two shillings of the price that the best Danish butter sold for on that day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What quantity.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Within two shillings per 100 pounds of the market price for that day of the best Danish butter. This was a most extraordinary tribute to the excellence of the butter which our people are able to make in the North-west Territories. But before the middle of the season was reached we found that there was growing up a large demand for this butter in the western part of our own Terri-

tories, in connection with the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, the increase of population in the mining regions of British Columbia, and so we did not send any more of this butter to the English market, because we found we could get a better price for it in these western districts. It was therefore due to the patrons of the creameries, that instead of sending the butter to England we should send it where we got the best prices. Had we known what was going to come, we would actually have done better not to have sent a single pound of butter to England this year. I point this out to show the immense advantage to the dairy interest and to all other interests in the North-west Territories, has been the stimulation of this western local market for their produce. Notwithstanding that fact, I believe we were justified in sending that butter in the early part of the season to England. It was important that our butter should secure a good reputation in England, and for this purpose it was advisable that we should send some of this butter there so that we should know everything in connection with it from the time it was made until it reached the consumer. In this connection I might point out that had it not been for the arrangement my department made, in providing for cold storage accommodation for the transport of our butter from the point of manufacture in Canada to the point of consumption in the British market, we could not have obtained these splendid results. As a matter of fact, the establishment of this chain of cold storage has this year enabled us to see our butter quoted on the English market at a higher price relatively, than it ever has before been quoted at.

I shall say a word or two in reply to the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) in regard to the manufacturing price of butter in the Territories. It is true that we charge 4 cents a pound there, and this would be looked upon in Eastern Canada as rather a high price. But the cost of manufacturing there is greater than in Eastern Canada, and in order that we should actually pay the expenses we have to charge a higher price than we would down here for the same service. But there is another phase of this question to be dealt with. A large creamery doing a large business can afford to manufacture for a less price than a smaller creamery doing a small business. The facts are these: In several of the creameries in the North-west Territories, the four cents a pound charged for manufacturing has more than paid the expenses of manufacturing. In the majority of creameries there, however, it has not paid these expenses, and the dairy vote has been called upon to a considerable extent to make up these deficits. I would also point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), and to the House, that in managing those creameries in Manitoba and the North-west

Territories, not only do we have to pay the actual expenses of manufacturing so many pounds of butter in a particular creamery, but for the purpose of carrying on the business properly, we have had to have in the North-west Territories, two general inspectors during the whole season, and their salaries and travelling expenses have to be paid by the department. These expenses and salaries are not charged in the 4 cents a pound, to the individual creamery, nor to the individual pound of butter. It is, however, a necessary expense if these creameries are to be managed thoroughly and successfully. I can say in that connection, that the success of the North-west creameries has been largely due to the efficient and skilful inspection and supervision of the two gentlemen in charge there this summer.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I venture to say, that if a fair share of the expenditure in connection with the general inspection, and the cost in connection with the establishment of these creameries had been charged pro rata to every creamery in not one of those creameries during the last season would 4 cents per pound have more than paid the total expenses of the creamery. But, so that there shall be no injustice and so that no individual creamery can complain that they are being charged higher than necessary, and that their money is being used to pay a deficit in other creameries; I would tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) and the House, that I have made an arrangement, by which any surplus which remains in any individual creamery—the surplus over the actual expense of the manufacturing at the cost of 4 cents per pound—that surplus will be credited to the individual creamery towards the extinction of their debt to the Government. Therefore, although we do charge a little more in individual instances than is necessary for the working expenses of that individual creamery, the surplus accrues to the benefit of the patrons of that creamery, just as much as though we reduced the actual cost per pound of manufacturing. In consequence of this, and in consequence of the payment of the one cent per pound towards the sinking fund, which we charge on every pound of butter manufactured there, I venture to say that if next year the success in some of the larger creameries is equal to the success this year, and with the expansion of business which we can fairly hope for, at the end of next year, several of these larger creameries will have extinguished absolutely the debt which they now have incurred towards the Government.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think, Sir, that that success will be of far greater benefit to these individuals and to

Mr. FISHER.

the Territories generally, than would be the momentary advantage of having a half cent or a quarter cent less per pound charged them. I want to point out that if we can show—and I am satisfied we will be able to show it at the end of next season—that certain corporations in the North-west Territories had been able to incur a heavy debt—in some instances nearly \$2,000 to the Government of Canada to place their business on a firm footing, and in two seasons have been able to extinguish that debt; it is one of the greatest boasts the farmer of the North-west Territories can make, and it is a benefit that will accrue not only to these individuals but to the whole dairy and agricultural interests of this country. If the constituents of the hon. gentleman who have passed that resolution will take these things into consideration, I think they will find that they fully justify us in not reducing the price of manufacturing in these particular instances at once, and that the course we have taken will result in greater benefit to them as well as to others. It would perhaps be unfortunate were we largely to reduce the cost of manufacturing, because when the Government ceased to run these creameries, private individuals might find that they would have to raise the price afterwards. That would be a most unfortunate occurrence, and would place those private persons, who are to-day in a position of partnership with the Government, at a great disadvantage in the future.

Now, I wish to refer to the question of the price and the selling of this dairy produce in the local market. The hon. gentleman has pointed out, what I can thoroughly endorse, that the export of the butter made in the Government creameries is an export which could not exist at all were it not that these creameries were put on their feet and run by the Government. I venture to say that while these creameries were being run by private enterprise, the product of them was not successfully placed for export. Private dairy butter in the North-west Territories, as in other parts of Canada, is not suitable for the export trade. I say this advisedly, although I well know that there is a considerable quantity of private dairy butter exported from Eastern Canada. But it is a well known fact that to-day the reputation of Canadian butter on the English and other foreign markets is entirely dependent on the export of the creamery butter; and that were dairy butter sent out from this country alone, or were the creamery butter no better than it, a favourable result would not have accrued to the reputation of our butter in those markets. The fact that this creamery butter is exported from the different localities in the North-west Territories relieves the local market from a considerable surplusage of butter. Were that butter placed on the local market, the price of all butter, creamery and dairy, would drop to a considerable extent, probably below the

export price of the creamery butter. This would be a misfortune to the private dairymen, who are to some extent the object of the envy of the patrons, because it would reduce the price of their product; but it would in a short time eventuate in the price of all butter, creamery and dairy, being lowered in those local markets; and the result would be unfortunate for the whole country. The hon. gentleman evidently endorses this position, and would not advise me to flood these local markets with creamery butter which is suitable for export. It is true that in consequence of the fact that this creamery butter is exported, the dairy butter in the particular localities has been improved in price. I am very glad to find that this is the case.

I should be glad if the Government were able to run creameries all over the North-west Territories, so that there would be no private butter made in the country; but that is impossible with the means at my disposal, and I do not think this House or the country would endorse an attempt by the department to do that. What the department has tried to do, and I think successfully, has been to prove to the country at large that the dairy industry is an industry suitable to the North-west Territories, and one which, conducted on business principles, can be profitably and successfully established there. Having done that, we must leave it to the enterprise and business ability of the people of the North-west to continue to carry on the business for themselves. When that time comes, I have no doubt that a great many more creameries than now exist will be established, and the result will be an enormous new industry which will add immensely to the profit of farming in the North-west Territories, and consequently will accrue to the enormous profit of all the eastern parts of this country, where the manufacturers and the merchants look to the North-west for markets, and where the commercial lines of transportation look to the North-west for a demand for the goods they carry. At the same time that we are able to show the world that we have in the North-west Territories fields which can produce sufficient grain to supply the graineries of the whole world, to an extent which both in quantity and in quality is unlimited, we can also send out into the world this higher and more profitable product, for which there is an almost illimitable market in the old world, thereby enhancing the attractiveness of our North-west Territories to the incoming immigrant, and establishing a system of mixed farming, which I am sure, the hon. gentleman and others who have studied the conditions of agriculture in those territories believe is the true and permanent kind of farming to be carried on there.

The hon. gentleman has alluded to another matter about which I wish to say a word or two before sitting down; that is, the ex-

port trade to Japan and the East, and the trade with the mining sections of British Columbia and the Klondike. The hon. gentleman alluded to a new kind of package that was being used. Some time ago, long before I took the office I now occupy, my attention had been turned to the tropical trade in butter. That trade was largely in the hands of France, not because the French people made a special quality of butter, but because they had invented a machine by which packages could be sealed hermetically without the use of solder or heat; and they were thus able to put up butter in such a shape as to incur no risk of damage, and that gave them command of the tropical trade. After I came into office, one of the first things I did last year was to authorize Professor Robertson to visit Paris and find out all he could about that machine, and if possible obtain one, so that we might make experiments, first, with regard to the Japanese trade, which I had first in my mind, and also with regard to the West India trade. We obtained a machine, but it was brought out too late last season to send any butter to Japan or the West. It has, however, been used in Nova Scotia, and I have made arrangements for continuous shipments of butter to be made this winter to the West Indies and Bermuda. I have received a despatch in regard to the first shipment which states that there is a most satisfactory demand for the butter sent from Nova Scotia to the West Indies, and I believe that in the near future we shall have an opportunity of greatly extending that trade, and practically cutting out the butter trade of old France in those islands. The same kind of thing is possible for us in the east, and having paid considerable attention to the demand for our agricultural products in Japan, having read with the greatest interest the report of the commissioner sent by my hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) to Japan last summer, I am satisfied that we have the opportunity of opening a great trade there also in these articles. At present, the taste of the Japanese has not been cultivated for butter or cheese, but still there is a fair demand, and the first shipments, made some five or six weeks ago, arrived in first-class condition. I may say that they were not sent in tins, as the tins were not ready, but in ordinary wooden tubs, and we got a cable despatch asking us to send as much more of that kind of butter as we can.

The moment our dairymen can overtake the demand for their products in the mining districts and the western districts and the local demand in the Territories, they will have an opening in the far east for the supply of millions and millions, where there is another illimitable market, even greater than any that may exist in the present market for our butter products in the old country.

I am glad indeed to endorse this motion and to have the opportunity of saying these few words in explanation of what I consider a most successful piece of work in the North-west Territories.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the motion is put, I wish just to say a few words more. It will have been observed that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) twice emphasized the importance, from an immigration point, of the work done in connection with the creameries in the North-west Territories. It will be impossible to exaggerate, from any standpoint, the work done in connection with these creameries, but I merely want to refer to that from this point of view alone. It will be remembered that when I first brought forward a motion, in this House, for the purpose of encouraging the farmers of the North-west Territories to go into the business of scientific butter making, I proposed it should be regarded as a part of our immigration policy, and the reason I did so, was, first, because I knew there could be no aid to immigration more effective than that, and next, because I was open to the retort that it was not a very business-like proposal to suggest that the Government should go, to a certain extent, in conjunction with private individuals, into this business of carrying on dairying. It was to get rid of that difficulty that I suggested it should be regarded as part of our immigration policy.

I wish just to say a word or two more. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) was, I think, acting as Minister of Agriculture in 1895. That was one of the sessions I was pressing on the Government that \$20,000 should be advanced by them for that purpose, and on that occasion, my hon. friend from York assured me that a vote for the money would be placed in the Estimates. I thought it would be brought down in the supplementaries, and telegraphed to that effect, but for some reason or another—although my hon. friend had endorsed the policy—the item did not appear. I suppose it was because money was scarce, but whatever the reason, it did not appear, but neither I nor anybody else could be more impressed than was my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) with the necessity of carrying out this policy, and in fact that policy was adopted by the late Government. I only regret that they did not jump at it when I first proposed it, and I am bound to say, as I have said before, that the hon. Minister of Agriculture deserves commendation for carrying out this policy of lending money to the farmers of the North-west Territories for this purpose. I make this statement because of a controversy that has arisen in the North-west Territories. The telegram that I sent was sent in good faith, in the belief that the item would appear in the Supplementary Estimates, but we know, that no matter what Government

Mr. FISHER.

may be in power, it occasionally happens a Minister believes he can put a sum in the Estimates, which afterwards, for some reason or another, he finds it impossible to do. I am very much obliged to the House for having given me its attention when I brought before it the condition of the creameries in the North-west Territories, and I thank the hon. Minister for his readiness in agreeing to this motion, so that we can have still fuller information, because nothing can be so much, in my belief, in the interest of the North-west Territories, and indirectly of Manitoba and of all Canada, than that the people should understand how, in this respect as well as others, the North-west Territories are progressing.

Motion agreed to.

SUBSIDY FOR DAIRYING PURPOSES.

Mr. DAVIN moved :

That in the opinion of this House, it would be expedient to place \$15,000 in the Estimates for dairying purposes in the North-west Territories.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I have no objection at all to the motion, but I would ask the hon. gentleman to drop it, because I am making the necessary appropriation in the Estimates for carrying on the work.

Motion withdrawn.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence, charges, evidence and reports in connection with the case of Benjamin Palmer, formerly lighthouse keeper at Palmer's Point, King's County, N.B.—(Mr. Foster.)

Copies of all correspondence, advertisements for tenders and answers thereto, reports and Orders in Council, and a list of all permits, licenses or leases granted, containing names of the grantees and extent of territory given and conditions attached to each, the amount paid and to be paid therefor in respect of gold placer mining or gold dredging areas in the North-west Territories and the Yukon district.—(Mr. Foster.)

Copies of all correspondence, calls for tenders, tenders received, reports and Orders in Council, contracts entered into and all related papers in respect to the winter steamship service from St. John and Halifax to Great Britain since 1st July, 1897.—(Mr. Foster.)

Copies of all correspondence, calls for tenders, tenders received, reports and Orders in Council, permits, licenses or leases, with the names of the parties receiving them and the conditions attached thereto, and generally all papers in connection with the disposal of timber berths or areas in the North-west Territories, including the Yukon, since 1st July, 1897.—(Mr. Foster.)

Copies of all papers and correspondence respecting the enforcement of coasting laws of Canada on the Pacific or Atlantic coasts.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Return showing names of commissioners appointed by the Government to inquire into the conduct of all employees of the Civil service in

the province of Quebec since 23rd June, 1896, and the amount paid to each commissioner as salary or travelling expenses.—(Mr. Monk.)

Copies of all correspondence, estimates, tenders, reports and petitions addressed to the Government in regard to the construction of a wharf at Point Claire, in the County of Jacques Cartier.—(Mr. Monk.)

Copies of all correspondence, estimates, tenders, reports and petitions addressed to the Government concerning the yearly flooding of farm land at Ste. Geneviève, in the County of Jacques Cartier, consequent upon public works in the Ottawa River.—(Mr. Monk.)

Return showing the cost of "Hansard" for each year from and including 1890 to 1897—the return to cover the cost of reporting, transcribing, translating, printing, binding, circulating through the post office or express offices and all other expense connected with the present system of reporting and publishing the Debates of the House.—(Mr. Ellis.)

Reports, recommendations, &c., of the Council of the Montreal Bar, addressed to the Minister of Justice, concerning the judges of the province of Quebec.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Return giving: (a.) The names of all civil servants who have been superannuated between the 13th of July, 1896, and the 1st of February, 1898;

(b.) The age of each servant so superannuated;

(c.) The years of service of each person so superannuated;

(d.) The amount per annum each person had been in receipt of;

(e.) The amount of superannuation each person is to receive per annum;

(f.) The names of the new appointees in the Civil Service since said 13th of July;

(g.) The age of each such new appointee;

(h.) The amount to be paid to each new appointee.—(Mr. Taylor.)

PREFERENTIAL DUTIES.

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

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With the consent of the House, I would beg leave to make an inquiry of the Government. I see that a very important announcement has been made in another place with regard to a very important subject, and I wish to ask the Government if that announcement may be regarded as authentic, because, I am sure, it will cause a great deal of gratification. That announcement is that, on the expiry of the Belgian and German treaties, the proposed reduction of 25 per cent will only apply to goods from the United Kingdom. I called the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to the subject, and he seemed to think that I would have to wait for that announcement until the budget speech was made, but as it has been made in another place and is of great importance, I wish simply to say that I hope the Government will be able to confirm the statement as authentic, and I only regret it has not been accompanied with the expression of the desire that the products of Canada should receive a pre-

ferential position in the United Kingdom. But apart from that, I think, certainly, speaking for myself, that it is the only course open to the Government under the pledges made, on what has taken place, and I wish to express the great gratification I felt on learning that announcement, and I hope the Government will be able to ratify it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am more than pleased to hear that my hon. friend is gratified at what has been said in the other House. I am sorry to hear, however, that his happiness is not yet complete, and would hope that it had been complete. The only thing I can say at present, is that when the budget speech is made, I hope my hon. friend will have every reason to be even more than pleased and satisfied than he is to-day.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 15th February, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY— MOTION FOR INVESTIGATION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved:

That a special committee of the House be appointed to inquire into the expenditure of the subsidies granted by the Parliament of Canada in aid of the construction of the Drummond County Railway and into all negotiations and transactions between the Government of Canada and any member or officer thereof, or any person in its behalf, and the Drummond County Railway Company, or any director, officer or person in the company's behalf, relating to the acquiring of the said railway by the Government; with power to send for papers, persons and records, and to report the evidence to this House, together with the opinion of the said committee thereupon.

He said: The reasons which compel the Government to make this motion will be understood by every one in this House, and I presume also appreciated by everybody. Last year the Government undertook to extend the Intercolonial Railway from the present terminus at Chaudière to Montreal. I am under the impression that this scheme had been engaging the attention of previous governments for some years past. The Government selected a route which had the advantage of being, by twenty miles, shorter

than the route existing between Lévis and Montreal over the Grand Trunk Railway, and which had the further merit and advantage of avoiding the chain of mountains which are adjacent to the St. Francis River near Richmond. But, suspicious as to the dealings of the Government with the company in question—the Drummond County Railway Company—having been thrown out to the public, the Government deem it their duty to court every inquiry and to see that all charges may be properly ventilated.

I therefore beg to move the motion on the Order paper, and I propose further:

That the committee be composed of seven members, as follows:—Messrs. Lister, Carroll, Mc-Isaac, Morrison, Haggart, Borden and Powell.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is that Mr. Borden of Halifax?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then that should be added.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the object of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) be to remove every cloud of suspicion in connection with this transaction, I may suggest that that object would be better attained if he were to embody in this resolution, substantially the resolution which was moved in another place upon this subject, and as notice has been given of such action being taken, it appears to me that it would be very unsatisfactory to the House and very unsatisfactory to the country, if the investigation in this House were so narrowed as to lead to the impression that a full and complete investigation into this subject is not desired. The imputations in connection with this matter, as my right hon. friend knows, did not emanate in this House but in another place, and action was taken there upon certain statements which were made. It therefore appears to me, that if my right hon. friend wishes this committee to subserve the purpose, and the very important purpose, to which he has drawn the attention of the House, he would do well to consider whether it would not be better for him to follow the course I have suggested.

If my right hon. friend is not disposed to take that suggestion, I would ask him to amend this motion by striking out the words "Parliament of Canada" in the second line, so as to enable the House to be in possession of very important facts which would be excluded if these words were retained. I do not intend to take up the time of the House any further than to make this suggestion to my right hon. friend, and I would be exceedingly glad if he would accept it.

The PRIME MINISTER. This committee has been moved for after very careful consideration, with a view exactly of having the truth, and the whole truth, come out, on all the allegations which have been made

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

as to any wrong-doing which may have taken place in connection with this transaction. I have no objection at all, if the hon. gentleman makes a point of it, to accept that suggestion, and to strike out of the motion the words "by the Parliament of Canada."

Mr. FOSTER. Make it read, "by any government or municipality."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). "All subsidies granted" surely embraces everything.

Mr. FOSTER. If you grant the first amendment, the second comes as a natural consequence.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the fourth line, instead of saying, "between the Government of Canada," make it read, "between any government and any municipality."

The PRIME MINISTER. The charge is made against this Government, and it is this Government whose action should be inquired into.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No charge has been made in this House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman led us to believe that the inquiry would cover everything, and stated that he desired that the full truth should be obtained. The suggestion made by the late Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is that not only dealings with this Government, but dealings with any other government, should be inquired into.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have surely enough to answer for our own sins.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I think that the right hon. leader of the Government, the moment he brought in his resolution, laid fair ground for the request I am going to make; and the moment he admitted the first amendment, he laid a fair ground for making the whole resolution consistent with the spirit of the first amendment. The hon. gentleman, without any charge, so far as I know, having been made in this House at all, other than on a business basis, moves this resolution for the appointment of a committee to investigate the Drummond county deal, commonly so-called. Now, I imagine that my right hon. friend can only base that action on one of two things, if he wishes an open and full investigation, to which there shall be no bounds or restrictions, but in which the chief and only idea is to get at the whole truth. The hon. gentleman has reference, I suppose, to charges which have been made outside of this House—charges of a double nature: first, that from a business point of view this was an extravagant and intolerable bargain; and secondly, that there were circumstances in connection with the deal which were not what they should be. My hon. friend can

only ask for this committee on one or both of these grounds. Now, the very moment he does that, if he wishes to have a clear and full investigation, he should not hamper it by restrictions. Consequently, the amendments which have been asked for are perfectly right and proper, and I think my hon. friend will concede that much. But the point I rose to make was this. The hon. gentleman is inviting an investigation into the proposition which was made by the Minister of Railways last year, when he asked for authority from this Parliament to enter into certain contracts with the Drummond County Railway Company and with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. If the charges which my hon. friend appoints this committee to investigate are true, there is no getting away from the fact that this Parliament and the country will not sanction the deal, and will not sanction the expenditure of one dollar of their money upon the deal. My hon. friend came to Parliament last year, and through his Minister of Railways, asked for authority to carry this deal through, and he did not get it. From these two things, there follows this—and it is the groundwork of the plea I wish to make before this House to-day—that until this committee have investigated this matter in a business and other point of view, and reported to this House that it is without stain, as regards the one point, and that it is a tolerable and reasonable proposition as regards the other, my hon. friend, by all rules of good conduct, of business, and of constitutional procedure, is estopped from going one step further towards the carrying out of that bargain for which he asked the authority of this House, and the authority for which he did not get. Yesterday, the Minister of Railways informed this House that he proposed to open these lines for traffic from Montreal over the Intercolonial Railway, with all the paraphernalia and expense attached thereto. That is a point which I think my hon. friend ought very seriously to consider. So far as I am concerned, I protest against the hon. gentleman involving this country in expense in carrying out a proposition for which he asked the authority of Parliament, and for which he did not get that authority; and if that were not enough to estop him and his Government, the very fact that to-day he has asked for a committee to make a solemn and thorough investigation of this transaction, and to see whether or not it is one that could be approved of by this country, certainly estops him from going one step further with the expenditure of the people's money without having received any authority by an Act of Parliament, which he must have to authorize it in perpetuity, until that investigation has been held and the result of the committee's work is put before this House, and the authority is given. That is the point I make. It is an appeal I make my hon. friend, whether he allows it or not, and it is an appeal

which, I believe, will have weight with the public of this country.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman has, of set purpose, deliberately attempted to mix up two altogether different and foreign questions. The hon. gentleman cannot have forgotten that he has knowledge of the charges having been made in this House, although he disclaims any such knowledge; and if he himself did not make charges, numbers of gentlemen sitting on his side did—thinly disguised, it may be—but which were clearly understood in this House and out of it to attach moral and legal turpitude to members of this Government in connection with this transaction. The Government of this country, although the hon. gentleman and his friends would not take the responsibility of making any formal charge in this House, do not propose to submit to the charges in silence, even as they are made. We propose, inasmuch as these charges were repeated by the hon. gentleman and his friends in other places, that, in so far as they affect the honesty and integrity of the Government and each individual member of it, they shall be fully investigated.

The Government drafted the resolution so broad that they thought it would meet with the approval of the other side, and the moment the hon. leader of the Opposition suggested that it should be further broadened by striking out the words of limitation "Parliament of Canada," so that it should embrace all subsidies from the provincial as well as this Government, we consent to the change. But now the hon. gentleman, not satisfied with the resolution as it stands, in its broadest sense, wants to have a business inquiry to ascertain whether it was apart from all question of wrong-doing or fraud, which he and his friends evidently now want to shirk—from a business standpoint a prudent bargain. Sir, the hon. gentleman says that we failed to carry our measure last year. We did not in this House, and although it was defeated in another place, the hon. gentleman knows that the Government took authority from both Houses to expend sufficient money to test the running of that road for twelve months. My hon. friend, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) has the amplest authority to spend sufficient money in the leasing and running of that road for the full year in order to test whether the statements made from this side, with regard to its earning powers, were correct, or whether the fancies in which hon. gentlemen opposite indulged last year were based upon truth. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Blair) proposes to carry out the instructions he received from the House in that regard, and the House will be in possession of the fullest evidence as to the business capacity and status of the road and everything connected with its commercial management, after the experiment has been made which

my hon. friend asked the House to accede to, and which the both Houses did accede to last year. There is no connection between the charge of moral turpitude and wrong-doing and the business management of the road itself, or whether, as a commercial experiment, the transaction was a good or a bad one. That will be decided by the results of the yearly lease, and I think that when we have made the concession asked for by the hon. leader of the Opposition, we have made a concession which ought to satisfy every hon. gentleman who wants to see a most thorough investigation made into these charges by this House.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman proposes to limit the scope of the inquiry a great deal more than I would like to see it limited. The principal charge made by this side last session was that it was an improvident bargain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. HAGGART. One of the reasons given was that this road had been offered for a far smaller sum than the present Government have paid for it. Would it not be a most improvident transaction, in the eyes of this House and country if, after the preceding Government were offered this road for one-half, or perhaps less than one-half the amount which this Government agreed to pay, they still committed themselves to that transaction? That is a fact which we will not be permitted to inquire into at all in this investigation. The only thing we are to inquire into is a charge which I have never heard made in this House—that part of the subsidies which were given to this road passed improperly into the hands of some members of the Government. The gravamen of the charge made from this side of the House was that the road could have been obtained at a price less than one which the Government have paid for it, and if you widen the scope of the inquiry and allow us to bring evidence to show what that road was offered to the late Government for, then the question may arise before the country: How is it that a road, which is not changed in character, assumes a value double the amount previously estimated when a new Government comes in and makes a bargain. That is the charge that was made on this side, that it was an improvident bargain.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Has the hon. gentleman read the resolution?

Mr. HAGGART. I have.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman will read it, he will find that it is broad enough to cover the very point he is seeking to make.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman gives an interpretation to the resolution,
Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

and is an authority upon legal points, perhaps, which we will have to accept in this House, and which we have accepted before. The resolution reads:

That a special committee of the House be appointed to inquire into the expenditure of the subsidies granted by the Parliament of Canada in aid of the construction of the Drummond County Railway and into all negotiations and transactions—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HAGGART (reading)—

—between the Government of Canada and any member or officer thereof.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HAGGART. Does that refer to the late Government of Canada?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly.

Mr. HAGGART. If it does, the resolution is broad enough to cover the question I propose. The principal object I had in rising was to see that it was broad enough to inquire into the question whether the expenditure was one that was justified, having in view the fact that an offer was made of this road for a much smaller sum than what the present Government has paid.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). You will remember, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt, the debate which took place last year on that question of the purchase or lease of the Drummond County Railway. Many things were said but no evidence was adduced. My name and the names of my sons were mentioned. I challenged investigation. I challenged any hon. gentleman to make a specific charge. No specific charge was made in this House, but responsible men, men who were formerly Ministers of the Crown, men who know the English language, went out from this Parliament and made speeches. One of these gentlemen who made speeches is the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). He went to Centre Toronto—where, I may say, he was not very successful—and after having declined to make charges against me in this House, he there spoke of me as follows: In the first place, he said, that I have sons. Yes, Mr. Speaker, kind Providence has blessed me with a family.

Mr. FOSTER. I take that back and leave it to be inferred that it is due to the gentleman himself and not to Providence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I thank Providence for having given me sons and I hope that they will neither forget nor forgive my hon. friend for having dragged their young names into the political arena. They have a right to their reputation. They are just beginning life, and the hon. gentleman did not do a manly thing in accusing them of improper actions. I hope that some

day or other they will enter this Chamber—one of them at any rate, and both if I can have my own way—when they will be able to answer my hon. friend or any other members who desire to criticise them. What did the hon. gentleman say. This is what he says :

And, Sir, just about the time that this Drummond County Railway business was going on, though Mr. Greenshields would not give anything to Mr. Tarte, he could put \$30,000 into a paper to buy it, and give the title to Mr. Tarte's sons.

Well, Sir, I ask if it is possible to utter a more cruel slander against myself and against young men who, I say again, have a right to their reputation. I say that there is not one solitary word of truth in the statement that my hon. friend made. I insisted upon this investigation going on before my peers of the House of Commons. I challenge my hon. friend to make good the statement he has made. He cannot do so. He has uttered a slander; and, unless he takes back the statement he has made, I brand him as a man who states things which he cannot prove. And, in the province of Quebec, in all Canada, I am sure, it will be held that a man who says that which he does not and cannot know to be true, that of which he has no evidence, is bound to take it back or be branded as unworthy to occupy a seat in this House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It will probably be interesting to the House now to get down to business. The proposition laid before the House by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) is to enlarge the scope of this inquiry so that we shall be able to find out by the evidence of witnesses whether or not the bargain entered into by the Government with the Drummond County Railway was an improvident bargain. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) says we should not go into any such inquiry, because, as I understand him, this would be known after the Minister of Railways has operated this road for some time. After the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) spoke, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said: I did not read the resolution rightly, but now, after reading it a second time, I see that it is wide enough in its scope to allow the committee to inquire into this state of facts also.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at all. I said it was large enough to inquire into any transaction with the present or late Government. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) was referring to an offer made to the previous Government showing the road was less valuable than we said, and said that offer could not be taken in evidence under the terms of this inquiry. I pointed out, and he accepted my statement, that it could.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Very well; the proposal laid down by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is that we should not go into the investigation to find out whether this is or is not an improvident bargain, because after operating the railway some time we shall find that out anyhow. But as a business proposition would it not be much better to have this inquired into by a committee rather than find it out after spending an enormous amount of money in operating the railway? A few witnesses could be brought here and they might convince the House that the bargain made last session was a very improvident one, and thus the fact would be established at very little cost. On this side of the House, so far as I know, there is not the least desire to limit the scope of the inquiry; all we ask is that it should be so large that it would include also, as has been stated, the terms of the resolution proposed in another place. Hon. gentlemen opposite, surely, have nothing to fear. The virtuous Minister of Public Works, whenever this Drummond County Railway is mentioned, flares up and gets into a terrible passion. He cannot control himself. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) to try and keep cool. If he cannot keep cool otherwise, he should take a dose of bromide of potassium, or of Mrs. Winslow's soothing syrup—or Abbey's effervescent salt, they say, is very good. Mr. Greenshields, I believe, belongs to the company which sells this salt, and, if the hon. Minister does not like to get a supply of it himself, he might send one of his sons. Hon. gentlemen on the other side seem to dread this inquiry much more than we do. If the inquiry is now moved for in this House, it is because the supporters of the Government have forced them to do it. It is common comment in the streets, you hear it every day, and especially since the Yukon deal has been before the country. Liberals everywhere say: We swallowed one deal, but we will not swallow the Yukon deal. But what, above all, was it that made this investigation necessary? It was the extraordinary speech made in this House last session by the Minister of Public Works. Why, Sir, charged, as he was, in the public press with being interested in the deal, he rose in this House and said that "La Patrie" newspaper, in which he writes every day, which is his organ, which, if report is true—I do not know whether it is true or not, and I do not state it as a fact—virtually belongs to him, was bought for his sons with a cheque for \$30,000 furnished by the president of the Drummond County Railway.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never said that in the House or outside of it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. "Hansard" is there to tell what the hon. Minister said, and if

he reads "Hansard" he will find out what he said. He was probably so excited at the time that—

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Read it.

Mr. CASGRAIN—that he does not remember what he said, but this side of the House, and the whole House, and the press of the country understood him to say what I have just stated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Read.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Now, take another point—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read, read.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask hon. gentlemen to keep order. The hon. member (Mr. Casgrain) must make his speech in his own way, so long as he observes the rules of the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Sir, I repeat that that is what was understood by the House, by the press of the country and by the whole country; and it was because of that speech that this investigation was brought on, and the hon. gentleman knows it. I am glad it is to be held, and I hope it will be thorough. Not only that, but he almost wrecked his party by that speech. Is it not extraordinary that a man should rise in this House and say that it is not he who owns the newspaper bought with this money, but his sons? We did not drag the names of his sons into this controversy. It was he who did it to serve his own purposes. And if to-day, we are obliged to speak of this subject, which is not an agreeable subject, it is not our fault, but the blame lies wholly upon the shoulders of the hon. Minister of Public Works himself.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I move that to-morrow the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:—

That it is expedient to grant and appropriate twenty-five thousand acres of land in the Northwest Territories for each mile of a railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake, according to the terms of the contract relating to the said railway, copy of which contract has been laid before this House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. CASGRAIN.

CANAL OFFICER GALBRAITH.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask a question of the Minister of Railways which, though of little moment to the House, is of considerable importance to the gentleman concerned. The hon. gentleman had an officer in the canal service at Port Colborne, more remotely at Maitland, named Thomas J. Galbraith. Mr. Galbraith informs me that his resignation as an officer of the Government was forwarded to the Minister of Railways and Canals, and I rise for the purpose of asking the hon. gentleman whether he has received the resignation, and if so, whether it has been acted upon? I may state that this is a matter of some little importance to the gentleman to whom I refer, which the Minister will understand when I inform him that Mr. Galbraith is a candidate for the representation of the constituency in the local legislature of the province of Ontario. The nomination is to be held in a week from Tuesday, and Mr. Galbraith is naturally anxious to know exactly his legal position before the day of nomination. I would therefore ask the hon. gentleman to look into the matter and to let us know exactly how the officer stands.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I recollect the fact that Mr. Galbraith forwarded me his resignation, though not accompanied by any explanation further than that he felt that the amount of salary which he was receiving was not sufficient to enable him to continue in the office. On receipt of the resignation, I handed it over to the Deputy Minister with instructions to put it through in the ordinary course. Now that the hon. gentleman has called my attention to the importance of having the resignation accepted in due form, I will see that it receives immediate attention.

INDIAN LANDS, QU'APPELLE VALLEY.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior to an important matter, and if necessary, I will conclude with a motion. Yesterday I received an answer from my right hon. friend to a question that was addressed to the Minister of the Interior, in regard to the surveying of land into the Indian reservation, and I gathered that whoever prepared that answer for the Government is under the impression that nothing has been done to interfere with the rights hitherto enjoyed by settlers in the Qu'Appelle Valley in respect of lands that are now claimed to be Indian lands. I have in my hand a newspaper published nearest to where these reserves are, and I have had letters of the

same purport as the article I am about to read for the information of the Minister of the Interior. This article is from the "Vidette," of February 9, and is headed "Surveyed in." So far as I remember its politics in the past, it has been, I believe, a paper of Liberal leanings.

A few days ago it was announced officially that the land lying along the north side of the Qu'Appelle Valley, and opposite Muscowpetung's reserve, had been annexed to the already large tract of land held by the Muscowpetung Indians. This means that it has been surveyed into that reserve. To many it will appear as if this was a matter of very little moment. We have an abundance of land, why not let the Indians use it? This, together with the idea that we should treat the Indians "whiter" than the white is responsible for the fact that the Indians already own the best strips of land in the country, and for the ever-recurring aggression by the Indian Department upon contiguous land, we must protest against it and demand that the system be stopped. This is no reason why this land should be surveyed into the reserve mentioned. The Indians do not cultivate the land they have. For pasturing purposes they have all they need, and in the matter of hay it is a fact that right in this same block of reserves last year application was made by private individuals to buy the hay left standing after the Indians had cut all they wanted, but the department refused to sell it, and acres upon acres of splendid hay had to rot as a consequence. This is an almost yearly occurrence, showing that these new additions are not necessary for hay purposes.

Now, what is the result of this surveying in? White settlers will not be allowed to obtain hay permits on the annexed portion. No matter if the Indians have ten times more than they need and the whites nothing, the result will be the same—rot, for the whites can't touch it. As a consequence, the settlers will have to go back probably miles to obtain the hay necessary to their existence. It will benefit nobody and injure many.

An instance of the uselessness of this "surveying in" process was shown in the case where a coulée was surveyed into one of these same reserves two years ago. This coulée contained wood, and the Indians coveted it. It was "surveyed in," and although a lot of the wood was of good building dimensions it has all been chopped into firewood and sold. The Indians are no better off. There isn't a stick of it left, and the comfortable stables, &c., that could have been built out of it, had the settlers had a chance to use it, are conspicuous by their absence.

The Indian Department is guilty of a gross mismanagement in allowing this thing to continue. Settlers have gone in, knowing that these lands could be used by permit, and to withdraw that privilege on any other conditions than actual sale is breaking faith with them, and has caused, and is causing, a vast amount of discontent wherever practised.

We insist upon this practice being discontinued. It is creating a discontent which must result in retarding immigration into those districts; furthermore, that discontent is liable to find expression in a manner which may surprise the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, such an article as that could not be written by any editor at Indian Head contiguous to the Muscowpetung's reserve, and in the place where all

that takes place in the Qu'Appelle Valley is patent to the residents of Indian Head, and such an article as that could not have been written unless there had been this surveying process of which he complains, and what I complain of is therefore that the department is misinformed as to what has been taking place. But how can I suppose that? I cannot suppose for one minute that the officers would go there and include in this Indian reserve land that the settlers hitherto had used, without having received instructions from the department. I do not know what explanation the Minister of the Interior can give in regard to this matter, but in order to afford him the fullest opportunity, I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The answer given to the hon. gentleman yesterday is correct, so far as the information in the possession of the department goes, and so far as my personal knowledge and recollection go. I am perfectly certain that the statement made yesterday conveyed a correct idea of the facts; but it has been suggested that some one is under a misconception as to what is going, and for the hon. gentleman's satisfaction, I will endeavour to find out what has given rise to the report to which he has referred, and furnish him with the information at a subsequent date.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire, with the permission of the House, to say a word in personal explanation. I find that, in my absence from the Chamber on Friday, an hon. member of this House, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), made use of these words:

I will read Mr. Chamberlain's utterances in London before the Canadian Club.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot, of course, reply to a former speech, and he must confine himself strictly to a personal explanation.

Mr. McNEILL. I have no intention of doing anything further than entering on a personal explanation. If I exceed that, I trust you, Mr. Speaker, will call me to order, for it is certainly not my intention to do so.

I will read Mr. Chamberlain's utterance in London before the Canadian Club on this question. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) read part of that speech, but he did not read it all, and the reason he did not read it all was because the balance did not suit and would not prove what he wanted. Thus hon. gentlemen opposite have got into the way of garbling speeches for the purpose of trying to make a point against the right hon. First Minister. Mr. Chamberlain dealt first with the problem that I

have already presented to the House and then he goes on to say :

The hon. gentleman then read a passage of considerable length from Mr. Chamberlain's speech, and he then said :

The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) read that length in his speech, but he did not read the rest, and so I will read the rest for him.

He then proceeded to read some other portions of the utterance of Mr. Chamberlain, and continued :

The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) read the first part of that speech, but he did not read the second, simply because it did not suit his purpose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to enter into any kind of discussion with the hon. member for North Wellington. I have no desire whatever to make this House a scene for the bandying of disagreeable words backwards and forwards across the floor. I simply wish to call attention to what the hon. gentleman has said, and I simply wish to put myself right with the House and the country, and to allow the House and the country to judge between me and the hon. member. I do not think that among those hon. members with whom I have had the privilege of sitting in this House for the last sixteen years, there are a great many who would rise in their places and say that I was capable of deliberate dishonesty. However, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has accused me of deliberate dishonesty, and I feel that, however painful it may be to be obliged to allude to a matter of this kind, it is due to myself and to my constituents that I should put the matter right.

An hon. MEMBER. Sit down.

Mr. McNEILL. May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to protect me from the rude interruptions of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot say I heard any very great interruption. I was listening so closely to the hon. gentleman to hear his personal explanation. I really think that, having led up at such length, the hon. gentleman should now make the explanation.

Mr. McNEILL. I cannot make any explanation if hon. members are allowed rudely to interrupt me by telling me to sit down when addressing the Chair in a perfectly respectful manner, and in a manner not deserving of these rude interruptions. When I quoted from the speech delivered by Mr. Chamberlain at the Canadian Club, I quoted from that speech in order to prove one point, and I will tell the House what that point was. I will show what that point was by quoting from what I said, in order that there can be no mistake about it :

If hon. members will forgive me, perhaps it would be as well that I should read a few sentences from Mr. Chamberlain's speech, in order that the House and the country may see what

Mr. McNEILL.

gave rise to the change in the opinions of the Imperial authorities.

I was not referring at all to what Mr. Chamberlain's proposal was ; I was showing why Mr. Chamberlain had come to make a suggestion, and the quotation I made from Mr. Chamberlain's speech had reference to that, and to that alone, and had no reference at all to the subject to which the hon. member for North Wellington referred. Formerly I had referred to Mr. Chamberlain's suggestion, and had read a quotation with respect to that suggestion, not a quotation from Mr. Chamberlain, but a quotation from a speech delivered by the right hon. leader of the Government in London, Ont., and reported in the Toronto "Globe." If there was any garbling of Mr. Chamberlain's suggestion with respect to preferential trade made by me in the course of my address to the House, it could only have been in that portion of my speech in which I quoted from the right hon. gentleman leading the House. If there was any garbling, it was done by the right hon. gentleman, and not by me.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Is that a personal explanation ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) must allow me to say, that in making a personal explanation it is manifestly out of order to raise another personal question. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) is an old and experienced member of this House, and the extreme length to which his explanation has gone, I really think would quite warrant me in saying that his personal explanation has now been made. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) wishes to make any distinct point that he did not garble, perhaps he could say so in a few words. The time of the House should not be taken up with these long explanations and arguments which are not personal explanations.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, I will not intrude upon the time of the House, if you say I should not do so, further than to say this : that the hon. gentleman from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) quoted a passage from a speech of Mr. Chamberlain, which he said I read up to a certain point ; now, the hon. gentleman was in the House when I spoke, and I wish to say that I did not read one solitary word that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) said I read. I wish to say further—and I hope you will consider it a personal explanation, Mr. Speaker—that I did not quote one word from the speech of Mr. Chamberlain which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) quoted from, nor did I refer to it at all. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) said he was quoting from Mr. Chamberlain's speech made at the Canada Club, while he was not quoting from that speech at all but from an entirely different speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) has, I am afraid, rather taken advantage of my permission to proceed as the latter part of his speech could hardly be called a personal explanation.

CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved second reading of Bill (No. 6) to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty the Queen and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company. He said: It is not my purpose to speak at length at this stage of the Bill, further than I deem it necessary to refer to the statements which were made by hon. gentlemen opposite in the debate which arose after my explanation on the first reading of the Bill. A great many of the members of this House, prominent and influential members of the Opposition, commented upon the explanatory observations which I then made, and I desire to avail myself of the present opportunity to refer to these statements, lest perhaps another equally favourable opportunity may not be afforded me. In the course of the remarks made by these hon. members, they succeeded in misstating what I had said, in attributing remarks to me which I did not utter, and in representing that the Bill which is before the House, and the contract which we were asking the House to confirm, contained clauses which were not to be found in either document. Any person who followed the speeches then delivered, and who heard the explanations which I made, would conclude that there was something very much resembling an organized and deliberate purpose upon the part of these hon. gentlemen to misrepresent me in every particular possible. I do not say that these gentlemen were moved by any such set design, but I do say, that if they had been so influenced, they could not have succeeded in a more marked degree than they did in attaining their object. It appeared to me that in discussing a business proposition before this House, as a deliberative assembly we ought to have been willing to have considered it in the light of the explanations which were actually made, and in the light of the material which was before Parliament. You had the full contract upon the Table of the House, you had the Bill with all its clauses fully explained—and I claim fairly explained to the House—and the gentlemen who spoke upon this Bill and referred to this contract had all that material, and the substantial portions of it published in the public press and brought before them several days before this discussion arose. I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that from the course which these hon. gentlemen pursued it is not an unreasonable inference to draw, that they had not the most unbounded faith in the strength of the

objections which might be taken (if any) to the Bill, and so they found it necessary to resort to—I will admit if you like—an unintentional system of misquotation of my remarks almost from beginning to end.

Now, Sir, I intend before I sit down to take occasion to refer to the chief of many of these statements, but before I proceed to touch upon those particular matters, I wish to occupy the attention of the House for a few moments, while I pass hastily in review what appears to me to be the present state of the controversy in regard to this question. It is not denied, I understand, that it is imperatively necessary in the interests of Canada, in the interest of its business and of its governmental considerations, that there should be a railway constructed into that Yukon country. Not only is that not denied, but if I have followed successfully the speeches that were delivered by these leading gentlemen in Opposition, I take it that they admit that it is the duty of the Government—and that if Government had failed in this they would have failed in their duty—to have taken, and to take immediate means whereby that railway shall be assured. I go further, I think it is admitted by hon. gentlemen opposite, or was admitted, and I have confidence it will be admitted to-day, that not only is it necessary that a railway should be laid down in that country, but that it should be constructed without delay; that it is a work which demanded immediate attention, and that we would again fail in our duty if we did not avail ourselves of every possible means to ensure the earliest possible construction of that road. In other words, that we should see to it that a railway was laid down, whereby we might transfer the immense quantity of tonnage which the influx of population into that country will require, before the close of the coming season of navigation, and which railroad should connect the waters of the Pacific, or the navigable rivers which flow into the Pacific, with water navigation into the interior of that country. Now, Sir, I do not think I am overstating the propositions which will be admitted on the other side of the House, when I say, that those two essential and important propositions have received practically the unanimous consent of this House, as well as the universal assent and approval of the country.

If I am right in this assumption, then what remains? First, we will take the question of route. I admit that possibly there may be in the minds of members of this Parliament some doubt as to whether the Government has selected the most favourable route which they could have chosen for the purpose at this time; but I venture to say that the more the question is discussed and the more it is considered, the clearer will be the conclusion drawn by Parliament and drawn by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Government

have made the only possible selection, admitting that the railway must be built and admitting that it must be built at once. I shall state to the House why I think I am warranted in drawing that conclusion from the facts. What are the facts? There are only five routes which are known to us as presenting any possible advantages for the construction of a railway. When you look over all these routes and put them side by side, and examine their respective advantages and disadvantages, you will find that after all there is no choice—that the only railway you can lay down is the Stikine-Teslin Railway. A railway through the Chilkat Pass could not be built this year or in less than two years, and when it was built it would cost a great deal more money. I admitted that it presented commercial advantages greater perhaps than any of the other routes which have been before us: but the Chilkat route must be laid aside as not even possible of consideration when you admit that it is a question of urgent need and immediate action. And, mark you, I am speaking entirely outside of the question of international difficulties which might possibly arise in connection with these routes. What I have said with regard to the Chilkat route applies with equal force to every one of the three others: and the only route to which these objections will not apply is the route which the Government have chosen. Putting to one side altogether the question of international difficulties—such as customs regulations or bonding privileges or any of the other difficulties which might arise from crossing foreign territory—we find ourselves impelled necessarily to the conclusion that of all the routes the only one which remained for the Government to choose was the route which we have selected, and which is contracted for in this Bill. Now, taking up this question of international difficulties, how does it arise? Hon. gentlemen have attributed to me, during the course of my explanatory remarks the other day, a statement which I did not make, a statement which, so far from my having made it, is diametrically the contrary of the statement I did make. I will point out to the House wherein what I said has been either misconstrued or misrepresented. It was said by one gentleman, I think the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), that, in speaking of the Stikine-Teslin route, I had put it forward as an all-Canadian line—as having advantages over any other line because it was an all-Canadian route; but that I admitted that, even availing ourselves of the navigable waters of the Stikine River, we would be obliged, in order to reach the Stikine River terminus of the Teslin Lake Railway, to pay customs duties at Fort Wrangell. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am not depending on my own recollection of what I said; but I can refer

hon. gentlemen to the official debates, if they care to verify the correctness of what I say, that no such statement was made by me. I stated then, what I still think, that at Fort Wrangell there will be no difficulty; and there are not likely, in my opinion, to be any serious obstacles raised against our use of that river for commercial purposes. I say that, because we have treaty rights in that river; and I am not willing to assume that the enlightened Government of the United States is going to violate its treaty obligations, and put itself outside the pale of civilized nations, as it would do if it took any such step. I think it is unwise for influential and prominent members of Parliament to put forward any such assumption in the debates of this House. I think it is unfair for us to refer in such terms to the Government of a country that lies alongside of us, whose people we know, with whom we must in the future have many relations, and with whom it is in our interest, as I think it is theirs, to remain on the most cordial and friendly relations. I do not think any question ought to be concluded in this House, or any argument presented in this House, on the assumption that the Government of that country will be found refusing to recognize their treaty obligations or refusing to treat this Government precisely on the same terms as we would have treated them in a like case, and as they would be treated by other civilized nations. I say this, because I want it distinctly understood that, in the view which I have taken and which the Government have taken with regard to the route we have selected, there is no question which really requires to be reconsidered by us in respect to this matter of treaty obligations or international relations or customs difficulties. I do not think that question is in this case at all, and I will tell the House why I think it is not. It would be, if there were any other route to which you could point where the same difficulties might not arise. It would be a question with respect to any of the four routes which we have discarded. I say that by none of those four routes could you reach your own territory without encountering customs obstacles from the United States; and that is a matter which we ought to weigh. But so far as these difficulties may arise, if they do arise, it appears to me they will arise to a tenfold greater degree, and in a much more serious manner, with respect to any one of the other four routes, than they can possibly arise with respect to the route which the Government have chosen. So that, if it is admitted that the railway must be built into the Yukon, and that it must be built at once, then I say there is no reason why we should regard any one of these routes as more favourable than the one we have selected; but there are many reasons why we should regard

the Teslin Lake route as less objectionable in that respect than any one of the other four. I did not make the statement the other day with regard to what the United States Government might do, if we were obliged to tranship at Fort Wrangell which the hon. gentleman has attributed to me. I did say—and on reference to "Hansard," you will find it—that if one of our ships went to the pier at Fort Wrangell, and tied up there, and unloaded its freight on the wharf, no doubt we would be called on to pay customs duties; but, so far as the mere question of transshipment was concerned, I did not say that there would be any serious difficulty in the way. Therefore, I think it is a legitimate matter of complaint on my part against those gentlemen who heard what I did say, that they should attempt to bolster up their case by putting in my mouth statements which I did not utter. I take it that the Government, in dealing with this question, were bound to make such a selection of route as would furnish the surest guarantee in its power that we were providing an all-Canadian route. I think we would have failed to meet the just and reasonable expectations of the people if we had chosen any other route than the one we did. It may possibly be, as I have said, that the customs officers at Fort Wrangell may claim, under the regulations of the United States Government, that our transshipments should take place under their eyes. But supposing they should, what great hardship would there be in that? What great wrong would be done to us? That would be only the fair and reasonable exercise of precautions by the United States Government, that before foreign ships should be allowed to take advantage of the right to navigate the Stikine River, which they have under treaty, the United States authorities should, in order to protect themselves against smuggling, or any other frauds that might be committed by persons using that river, exercise this power of overseeing transshipment.

I went on then to point out that if the case were even more serious, the Government had in its power a means by which we could meet the reasonable demands of the people and provide an adequate and complete remedy to any such difficulties should they arise. What was that? I went on to point out that all we had to do was to utilize the railway we were now proposing should be built, by extending it to the south a distance of not over 200 miles, which, we are informed, would then secure entirely through our own territory, an all-Canadian line from the Pacific to the navigable waters of Teslin Lake. Now, I did state that, and in doing so, I think I made a fair statement of the positions in which the Government are. I assume that we are dealing with this question as a deliberative body, I assume that there must be a desire on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite

to deal with the facts as they exist and not to deal with what their imagination may suggest to them. Assuming this, I take it for granted that there will not be, on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, any motion presented in this House or in committee, during our discussion of this Bill, which will declare that any other route than the one we have chosen was the proper route for the Government to have selected. I venture to predict that we shall have the House with us on that question. We have the country with us, I think, unquestionably, so far as these points are concerned; and I want now to come down to where the controversy really arises. We have the country with us on the question of the necessity for building the railway this year, and on the necessity of getting as long a time for open navigation on the waterways in the fall as possible for the purpose of transshipment, and we shall have the country with us, when fully informed, with regard to the propriety of the route we have chosen.

Then, what are the difficulties or the objections which are fairly debatable with respect to the Bill? They arise, it appears to me, solely and wholly upon and around the question as to whether, under the circumstances, we have been too liberal in the terms which we awarded to these contractors and whether the work ought to have been undertaken and carried through with less land subsidy than that which we have offered. That is the whole question, it does appear to me, and I think that if we approach the further discussion of this measure from that point of view, we will be confining ourselves to a matter which may fairly be open to debate. Now, it is just here that I wish to make some references, and I make them briefly, to the speeches that were made the other day. I find that the hon. gentleman who had the honour to fill the position which I am now occupying (Mr. Haggart) did not content himself simply with stating it once, but repeated that I had said that the goods must be transhipped and that when transhipped they must pay the American duties. I think the hon. gentleman repeated that statement three times, as will appear from reference to "Hansard." The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) fell exactly into the same error, and I am at a loss to see how, if he attempted to follow me in my remarks, he could fairly have committed it. He said:

The Minister of Railways and Canals had to confess that if transshipment took place at Fort Wrangell, the American duties would have to be paid, but he expected that out in the open sea they could not transfer goods from ocean steamers to flat bottom steamers, but would have to go up the Stikine River into American territory, where the American Government would not permit transshipment or business to take place.

My hon. friend from West York will not find in anything I then said, anything which

will justify the words which he has attributed to me.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me if I interrupt him. He charges me with having attributed to him the statement that the goods which were lightered at Fort Wrangell would have to pay customs duties, he is mistaken. What I said was that they were subject to the American customs regulations—which is entirely different.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman may have intended saying something other than what he did say.

Mr. HAGGART. That is just what I did say. If the hon. gentleman will show me that I said otherwise, then he is correct.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have a clipping here from "Hansard," and according to that the hon. gentleman said :

The Minister of Railways himself says that the goods must be transhipped, and when transhipped must pay duty.

If the hon. gentleman will follow up his speech, he will find that he repeated that statement at least twice. I do not think anything more erroneous could possibly have been said.

Mr. HAGGART. Is that in the "Hansard" ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I have the clipping from "Hansard," and it is that I am now reading.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the page ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the page, but simply the clipping.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is the statement as contained in "Hansard" :

The Americans insist upon making customs regulations in reference to that river, and he must also know that where the Americans have the common right of navigating our rivers we insist upon a similar right of regulating our customs, and have always insisted upon it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman must not read something else, and then say I am not quoting correctly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What I said is this—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has the right to interrupt provided the hon. member who has the floor does not object.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He has no objection, and the hon. gentlemen behind him, who have raised the point of order, have no right to object. What I said was that the hon.

Mr. BLAIR.

gentleman had not given us the page of "Hansard" from which he quoted and that the quotation I gave was the declaration made by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was saying that the hon. gentleman must not read something else and then ask the House to infer that what I read is not in the "Hansard." I freely concede that the hon. gentleman may perhaps have intended to say something else, but did not succeed in carrying out his intention, and he did succeed—not only once but two or three times—in misrepresenting my position.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is a question of veracity—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will not, until ruled out of order by the Speaker, and no insult from any member on the other side will compel me to take my seat. Mr. Speaker, what I say is this—that the hon. gentleman has challenged the accuracy of a statement made on this side of the House. We have read the statement of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), and, if we are mistaken, I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) could very quickly and very easily set us right by giving us the page and line which he relies upon as his authority.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the page. I am sorry to say, my secretary did not indicate the page ; but I have here a clipping which is marked as being from the speech of the hon. gentleman. I think the page and line can be found, and they will be found for the satisfaction of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is speaking from a brief, as he was the other day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is not wise to jump at conclusions too hastily. I find that the hon. member for West York made a similar statement, as follows :—

The Minister of Railways had to confess that if transshipment took place at Fort Wrangell the American duty would have to be paid.

I cannot give the page of "Hansard" from which this is taken, but this is a clipping from the speech made by the hon. gentleman the other day. I complain of these misrepresentations—and these are samples of many—because, I think, they show an attempt to becloud and confuse the discussion. I think hon. gentlemen opposite would give better evidence of their confidence in their own case, if they relied upon the facts and not upon misrepresentations and misquotations.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I be permitted to suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Blair), that when an hon. member on this side assures him that he has made a mistake in quoting him, and when he cannot find the statement in his speech, as reported in "Hansard," it is not competent for the hon. Minister to charge the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) with having made a misstatement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I have gone as far as the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) himself would think he was justified in going, when I admit that, so far as the statement made by the hon. member for South Lanark is concerned, I did not attribute to him any wilful misrepresentation.

Mr. HAGGART. I have read the whole speech, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will not find in it the statements he attributes to me.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of Railways misses the point. He has read certain words, which he attributes to the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart). His friends beside him have had plenty of time to find it, if it were there. Have they found it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not time myself to find it. As I have said, I read from a clipping made by my secretary, who, I think, is a careful man, and the words I have read are the exact words of the clipping.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let me now come to another class of statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, referring to the land grant and the value of the lands. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) made this statement, as it is given to me, and as I presume it will be found in "Hansard"—

Mr. MONTAGUE. I hear some hon. gentlemen on the other side say, "It is in Wallace's." I think the hon. Minister should now withdraw what he has sa'd.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will withdraw it the very moment it appears to my satisfaction that it is not in "Hansard."

Mr. MONTAGUE. But the hon. gentlemen about him have told him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have every confidence of the material which has been furnished me. The hon. member for South Lanark, referring to the question of the value of the lands, said :

Although many Government parties have been sent out to explore the country, I make the statement, that there has not yet been found in the whole of Alaska gold-bearing lands to the extent of 3,000,000 acres ; and the amount you are giv-

ing here is not to be judged in comparison with the extent of the whole country, but with the extent of the gold-bearing area, and I venture to say that it will be found to be equal to at least one-half of the whole gold-bearing area of that country.

Now, it does appear a very extraordinary thing that, in discussing the question whether this land grant was an excessive one, such a statement as I have read should be brought forward. Of course, the gold-bearing lands discovered in Alaska do not equal 3,000,000 acres. Has anybody been in a position to affirm that gold-bearing land to the extent of half a million acres, or even a hundred thousand acres, or even a thousand acres, exist in that Yukon territory? As I understand the statements made, they are, that the lands which may be found to contain, in some portion of their area, the precious metals, cover an area of about 125,000 square miles. But I apprehend that no person is insane enough to believe that Mr. Ogilvie or other gentlemen who are informed with regard to that country, pretend to say that all the lands within that area are gold-bearing lands. They simply say that, in their judgment, one could not point to any portion of the country within the area given and say, from its geological or other condition, that the precious metals will not be found in that locality. I suppose that, as a matter of fact, the whole gold-bearing area which has been discovered up to date would not amount to more than one hundred acres, if it were put in a compact area. Still, we find that it contains a great deal of gold. An argument founded upon such a statement as that I have given seems to me to be without force or reason, and cannot be used to discredit the statements I presented to the House. Then, again, the hon. gentleman said :

I think there is not a business man in the country who knows these facts, who, if he had 100,000 acres of gold land—not to speak of 3,750,000 acres—in a section of the country such as this is reported to be—because, after all, we are predicating all we are doing on the information we have at present with reference to that country—there is not a business man who could not raise, under these circumstances, three times the amount required to build this line. The hon. leader of the Government ought to be informed as to whether this is likely to turn out a paying speculation or not.

An argument altogether based upon the presumption that it is possible to go and point, and to learn—I suppose, by means of a divining rod or some other apparatus of that kind—just where gold is, is of no force. Just as though it were not a matter that must depend altogether upon exploration and prospecting. And in connection with such exploration and prospecting there may be thousands of places suspected of containing gold in which not a particle of gold will actually be found. You cannot speak of these numbers of acres, as the hon. gentleman spoke of them, basing his state-

ments upon the presumption that these lands are of necessity gold-bearing lands. If they were gold-bearing lands, we would know how to deal with them. It is a matter of conjecture, as I stated, entirely a matter of chance. Now, some references were made to what is called the monopoly clause, in respect of which the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) misrepresented—though I do not say, intentionally—what I stated. This is what the hon. gentleman said:

He is going to have the tolls reduced 50 per cent in four years, but he does not know what they are to be in the first year.

Well, I stated to the House that so far as the question of tolls was concerned, it was not yet settled. It did not appear to be necessary for the Government to take up the subject of tolls and determine them at this stage. The Government, however, has reserved to itself the right to settle what the maximum tolls upon the road should be, and I take it that the Government will see that no unreasonable tolls are exacted. I notice it is assumed by some hon. gentlemen on the other side—I am not sure but that the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) was the gentleman who made this statement, but I am not going to attribute it to him positively; I can, however, say that it was made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace)—that \$100 per passenger would be a reasonable sum, would be even less than ought to be allowed for the carriage of a passenger over this railway. Well, according to the hon. gentleman's ideas, it appears to me that the company would find him a very desirable person to deal with in regulating the rates.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend is misquoting me. I never made any such calculation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say that I can attribute it with certainty to the hon. member for West York.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I rise to a point of order. I made a statement to this House, and an hon. gentleman behind the Minister deliberately contradicted me. I ask whether that is in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is certainly out of order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I suppose I am the member he refers to, but I did not contradict him. On the contrary, I said that he did not say it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I apologize to the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was, however, one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who did make a specific statement to that effect, and I will read what he did say as reported in the "Hansard."

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. FOSTER. Name.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member for West York.

When I place the rate at \$100 per passenger and \$50 per ton for freight, I am placing them much below the figures charged.

Now, I would suggest that the company could not get into better hands than those of the hon. member for West York; I think they would be apt to fare very much better if they were dealing with him in fixing the rates, than they would fare in the hands of the Government. It seems to me that, while we reserve the right further to consider the question, the rate suggested by this gentleman was altogether unreasonable, and was an excessive rate to allow for any such purpose. Then in the same connection that hon. gentleman represents that I stated to this House that, in my judgment, and from the information I had received, there would be at least 250,000 people using this railway during the present year; and upon the strength of that assumption, and according to the rate he was going to allow, and that he assumes the Government would allow as the minimum price of fares and tolls over this railroad, he apparently convinced himself that at least ten millions of money would be cleared by the company during the first year's operation. Well, it is no wonder that, with such an estimate, made by gentlemen of the vivid imagination of some of those who discussed this question, that there would be 250,000 people utilizing this railway during the present year, and at the rate of tolls charged that they assume the profit will be enormous. Now, Mr. Speaker, I surely could not have been so understood by the hon. gentleman, I made no such statement. I said that an estimate was put as high as 250,000 by persons who were connected with the transportation companies, as the number who would probably find their way into that country during this present year. I did not represent that I believed the number of people would use this railway if we built it; because people are already commencing to go in there, and before the railway is built a very large number will have gone in. But I spoke of 50,000 as being a not unreasonable estimate. I also said that the tonnage that would be required to supply that number could not find its way into the country except over a railway, and I pointed to that as a reason for the necessity of constructing the railway. That is the way I desired to put it. I think it cannot be claimed that in making the statement which I did to the House, I exaggerated the facts in any way, I think I endeavoured to put them fairly, and within reasonable limits. I think I have grounds for complaint that those hon. gentlemen opposite should have apparently been so unfortunate in criticising the statements that I did make to the House. With reference to what is called the monop-

oly clause, I want to say one word further. I did not fail to point out to the House that that clause in the contract gave full power to the Government to regulate and fix what they considered would be a reasonable toll. Yet during the course of the discussion, gentlemen speaking upon the subject assumed that there would be no check at all upon the charges that the railway would be allowed to make, and that there would be no maximum rates to which the company would be confined. That was an assumption which will be found running through a number of the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, there is nothing clearer, it appears to me, than the fact that we have reserved in this contract to ourselves the control of the rates. But we have to be careful how we fix them, we have to see to it that the rates are reasonable, and I think that I can safely say now on behalf of the Government, that if this contract is confirmed, we will not be likely to fix the rates at anything like the figure which the hon. member for West York thinks would be a very reasonable sum. Having this power in our hands, we will exercise it with care, and it will be found that no just reason for complaint will exist as to the arrangement we shall make.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? I understood him to say that the Government has not yet decided as to what the maximum rate will be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The rates have not been before the Government, as I have already stated. Those rates are to be fixed by Order in Council, and the time has not yet arrived for the fixing of the rates, and therefore they have not been fixed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It was only a suggestion, and I know I was completely out of order in making it. But the Government would facilitate the passage of the measure if the rates were considered, and the Government were willing to give an opinion on the subject.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman can rest fully assured that the Government will apply their very best judgment to this question, but they will not be much guided by the expression of opinion given by the hon. member for West York in relation to the tolls.

Mr. DAVIN. Did the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) say it was a reasonable amount?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I took it so. That hon. gentleman said:

When I place the rates at \$100 per passenger and \$50 per ton for freight, I am placing them much below the figures charged.

The hon. gentleman based his argument on the assumption that \$100 would be the rate the company would be allowed to charge for passengers and \$50 a ton for freight. The rates once being fixed, as I think they will be fixed carefully and guardedly, it will be a proper thing after the road has been for a time in operation, when the business has been established, the country developed, and the promises realized in regard to it, that the rates should be reduced, and we have made provision for a reduction after the expiration of four years.

I do not propose to go into further details with respect to the particulars in which I think my statements have not been correctly understood or have been misrepresented. But I wish to offer an observation or two with respect to one charge that has been preferred, or perhaps what I might describe as an assumption which some hon. gentlemen opposite have put forward. It has been assumed that in the explanation I made I had been either unwilling or unable to answer the questions put to me, and I observe that the cue given by speakers on the other side of the House has been taken up by the press, and it has been assumed by the Opposition press on all sides that in introducing the Bill I had not informed myself with regard to some important matters upon which I had been interrogated by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have taken the trouble to look carefully over the report again to see just what were those questions I failed to answer, and from which inferences were drawn by hon. gentlemen opposite which I am free to say were entirely unwarranted. I was asked, in the first place, whether there was not an estimate of the cost of the proposed line of railway. I was asked by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as to what was the estimated cost of the line. I stated to him that it was estimated to cost \$25,000 per mile. Next I was asked by hon. gentlemen opposite whether I was prepared to say that estimate was relied upon by the Government, or something equivalent to that. I am prepared to say here, as in fact I stated at the time, that I did not consider we could place very much confidence on estimates made with respect to the cost of building a railway in that country. The cost of railway construction depends so largely upon climatic conditions, upon the distance it is necessary to carry supplies, materials and plants, and on a variety of conditions involving an unknown quantity that no one could make a very safe estimate as to the cost. I notice an estimate by our engineer in which he says the cost for such a line would be about \$25,000 per mile, and I observe there are particulars in that estimate which I do

not think I would be warranted in accepting as the cost of railway construction. I have no reflection to make on the engineer's estimate in that regard, but I know it is not a sufficiently large estimate for laying down rails there to place the cost at \$250 per mile. That is the cost estimated in this country when every condition is favourable.

Mr. PRIOR. Is that not an estimate for a broad-gauge road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would be for a broad-gauge road, but there would be very little difference between the cost of laying down forty-five pound rails for a narrow-gauge and fifty-six pounds for a broad-gauge road. The estimate, if my memory serves me, is \$250 per mile for laying down fifty-six pound rails on a broad-gauge road. When that statement is made that such a sum would suffice in that western country, hon. members do not take sufficiently into account the conditions which prevail—that, at all events, is my opinion. We have it that wages rule there somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$15 per day, and the cost of supplies is very high; but even if the rate of wages is very much less than I have stated, \$250 per mile would be quite inadequate. I would not therefore feel justified in pledging myself to that estimate as one that should be accepted. I observe further that \$30 per ton is put down for the cost of rails as being an adequate sum. I cannot conceive that it is possible to purchase forty-five pound rails here or wherever they are manufactured, and pay the freight to lay them down in that distant region at a cost of \$30 per ton. I should consider that the freight alone would amount to very nearly that amount; that is my judgment, whether it is right or wrong. So it is folly for hon. gentlemen opposite to assume that the railway can be built for anything like the amount they assume in their statements. Then I am told that I did not answer the question as to what was the area of gold-bearing lands. Who is able to answer that question? I should like to find the individual who would like to commit himself as to the dimensions of the gold-bearing area; if it is wholly problematical; there may be a little or may be much, but for any one to state what he believes to be the gold-bearing area would be simply to trifle with the judgment of Parliament and the country. Hon. members have had before them for a considerable time the statement that in the opinion of the officers of the Interior Department there are 125,000 square miles where-in gold may be found. No man, I think, can say any more than that; and when the hon. member for York asked me to state what was the area of the gold-bearing lands, I in reply acknowledged my want of information on the subject, and every other

Mr. BLAIR.

person, if he were frank, would make a like admission. Then, again, I am told that I did not state the value of the lands which are being granted to the contractors and that as I was absolutely wanting in knowledge, and was utterly unequipped to put the Bill before the House, because I did not give to the House a statement of the value of these lands. Could anything more absurd be suggested than that I should undertake, in my place in this House, to state the value of that acreage? I could not tell; I have not an idea of it; who has? I think I asked a very fair question when I asked the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) if he had any judgment on that matter. He told us he did not know; he could not have any judgment on it, and I have not any, I frankly acknowledge.

We may fairly complain that this question has been approached in a very unfair, and on the whole in a very improper way by hon. gentlemen opposite. They have undertaken to assume that the terms of this contract could not be defended, because they say—some of them like the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) only insinuates but others like the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) makes the bold declaration—that there has been dishonesty in this transaction and that it is founded in fraud. That is the spirit in which hon. gentlemen opposite have been approaching the consideration of this question. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says:

There is no power that can convince the people of Ontario that there is not a heavy subscription coming out of this deal to be used in the Ontario provincial elections against the opponents of the Liberal party.

That is a bold statement. I was going to say it is a brazen statement, but as I do not want to use any offensive term, I will just call it a bold statement. We have all grades of suspicion, insinuations and charges made by hon. gentlemen opposite. Probably most of them are willing to assume the attitude which was claimed the other night by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) when he said, that the attitude of men in Opposition ought to be an attitude of suspicion.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) set it out as a cardinal point of his doctrine and principle, that every man in Opposition ought to regard a Minister of the Crown as devoid of all principle and honour.

Mr. MACLEAN. I did not say that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That practically is the principle which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) does not hesitate to avow, and he is a

leader of public opinion and the head of an influential, and I suppose he would claim, a very good family newspaper. The objections of the members of the Opposition seem to be based upon the assumption, that it was impossible for the Government to deal with this question in an honest way and with an honest desire to arrive at the best solution of the problem which they had to face. That is the spirit in which this subject has been approached by the Opposition. Is it to be wondered at, when such an idea influences hon. gentlemen opposite, that there is extreme difficulty in their discussing the question in a rational way and in a business-like spirit. If the question could be approached in a proper spirit, it would tend much more to the enlightenment of the country, and much more to our reaching wise and proper conclusions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, inquiry was made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, as to whether it was proposed to make any provision whereby this railway, if constructed and the contract confirmed, should be prevented from falling into the hands of foreigners. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is anxious that Canadian interests shall be fully safeguarded, and that is a very reasonable desire on his part, and one with which this Government fully sympathizes. Their desire has been from the first to preserve Canadian interests at all hazards. There does appear, however, to be a very serious difficulty in the way of our providing that the owners of the stock of the company, when it shall be organized and this stock put upon the market, shall not be able to transfer that stock in the same manner and as freely as all other corporate stock is transferred. That, perhaps, would be an unfair thing to provide. We have never done it before, and in my opinion it would not be a precedent which it would be well for us to establish. But I do think, and it is the feeling of the Government, that we could incorporate in the Bill some reasonable clause which would prevent the possibility of this railroad falling under the control of foreigners. The Government would approve of our inserting a clause somewhat similar to that which was adopted when the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill was before Parliament, and which provided that the majority of the directors should be British subjects. When the Bill is in committee, if it is the feeling of the House that such a clause should be introduced, I do not think there would be any objection to its adoption.

There is another matter which we thought it would be well for us to incorporate in the Bill when it reached the committee stage, and I will mention it now so that it may be understood. We propose to insert a clause which will make the operation of the road obligatory upon the contractors, and after the transfer, obligatory upon the com-

pany. There may possibly be a question as to whether a sufficient implication arises from the existing clause to make that duty incumbent upon the company, but if there is any doubt as to that a clause can be inserted imposing that duty upon the company operating the road. With these observations, Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have listened with great interest to the speech which has just been delivered by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), and I must say that I fail to find any very great additional light thrown upon the subject, beyond that which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) gave us on a former occasion; with the exception—and a very important exception it is—that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) recognizes the fact that this contract was entered into without taking that precaution which was taken when the Canadian Pacific Railway charter was granted by this House, and in which was inserted a provision making it necessary, that the majority of the directors of that company should be British subjects. That is a very material matter, and its omission by the Government from the contract goes to show the great precipitancy and haste with which the contract was drawn. I may say, Sir, that having made a few remarks—not exactly upon the subject itself—but in relation to it, I stated I would reserve for discussion on the Bill an expression of my views with regard to the very important question which is now before the House. We have had already, in the debate on the Address, a great deal of discussion on this question, which will render the duty of dealing with it now much less onerous than it would otherwise have been. But I may say that I agree with several of the points that have been submitted by the hon. Minister of Railways. I agree—and I do not think there is any member on this side of the House who differs in opinion with that hon. gentleman—as to the great importance of having this railway constructed. I believe, Sir, that no difference of sentiment will be found in this House upon the absolute necessity of everything being done that can be done by this Parliament to ensure not only that a railway shall be constructed into the Canadian Yukon, but that it shall be, as far as possible, an all-Canadian route. I had the pleasure of spending some six weeks in the province of British Columbia, during which time I gave the closest possible attention, as I stated on a former occasion in this House to this question; and I may say very frankly, that it is extremely difficult for gentlemen who do not give personal attention to matters of this kind, to grasp their importance in all its magnitude. We dealt last session, in the Railway Committee, and subsequently in this House with

questions of this character; but I am free to say to the House that, although on that occasion I gave the best consideration in my power to the question of the two charters which were brought before us, I had known absolutely nothing on the subject. When I came to give attention to these important questions on the spot, during my visit to British Columbia, and had my attention drawn to the various means of obtaining access to that country, and when I was called upon to look at this matter in the light of making the development of that great Canadian gold field subservient to the business and trade and prosperity of Canada, I found that its magnitude had not been fully appreciated when we were dealing with the subject in the House last session. I may say frankly to the House, that I do not believe it is possible to overrate the importance to Canada of adopting every measure necessary to secure the trade of that region, which I believe will be something enormous. One would be afraid to venture to use figures in relation to it, because any calculation one would make would probably be regarded as extravagant. I believe it would be impossible to overrate the importance to Canada of securing, at the earliest possible moment, and as far as practicable, an all-Canadian route, so that that great trade shall accrue to the benefit of Canada, instead of benefiting a foreign country. In my judgment, from the first moment the great importance of that Canadian Yukon gold field attracted public attention, there has been a most determined effort on the part of the United States of America and of citizens of that country to grasp and turn to their own advantage all the enormous benefit that is to be derived from the furnishing of supplies to the people who go in there, and to provide for their transit into and out of the country. Therefore, when my attention was directed to this subject, I gave it the most careful consideration in my power, regarding it, not as a party question, but as one of vital importance to every Canadian; and having felt it my duty to examine the question, in the light of all the information I could get while on the Pacific coast, where I was receiving a great deal of attention, I came to the conclusion that the route by the Stikine River and Teslin Lake was, not only the best route, but the only available route for the construction of a railway during the present season. Having arrived at that conclusion, I felt it my duty, as the question was one far above and beyond party, to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who had been giving it his personal attention, to the subject in an interview I had with him in Victoria; and I ventured to suggest to him, that if the Government of Canada would grapple with that question vigorously, and would undertake to secure the prompt con-

struction of a railway from Stikine River to Lake Teslin, I believed they would receive the hearty support of the Parliament of Canada. I have seen no reason to change that opinion. As I told the hon. gentleman on that occasion, I was known to be strongly opposed to Government railways, as a rule. I pointed out to this House, last year, what had led me strongly to deprecate the construction of Government railways. But this I regarded as a case of exceptional character; and if the Government would take the matter up and promptly secure the construction of a railway that would open up communication at the earliest possible day, I believed that Parliament would take no exception to the course. Well, Sir, I confess that when I suddenly learned—because, as I have said to the House before, I did not know that the Government were in communication with any parties in regard to it—when I suddenly learned, when in Montreal on business of another description altogether, by an announcement in the "Herald," and by some speeches that were made at a banquet the night before by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, that arrangements had been made for the construction of a railway from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake, I did not hesitate to express my gratification that a measure which I considered absolutely necessary to secure the enormous trade of that country to Canada, in connection with the development of the Canadian Yukon gold fields, was to be adopted, and I perhaps went further than one, under such circumstances, ought to have gone in expressing, not only my satisfaction, but the hope that the measure would be of such a character as would secure the support of Parliament. Having had my attention drawn, in the most pointed manner, to the great magnitude of this trade and the danger that I felt, under existing circumstances, was looming in the near future, of its being diverted away from Canada beyond recall, I expressed the satisfaction I felt that that subject had been taken up and that road provided for. I may say that a good many things have happened since, that a good deal of light has been thrown upon that subject, from that time down to the present, and that we approach it to-day with a fuller knowledge and are in a position to deal with that important measure in all its bearings in a way in which it was quite impossible, with the brief information that we then had at our disposal, to deal with it previously. If I formed a hasty opinion, if I expressed myself strongly on that occasion—but no more strongly than I felt—I did so in the light of all the information we had before us, which I glanced at hastily that morning; and I find that I am not alone in arriving at the conclusion that the character of that measure has been changed in the gravest and most important way by the information which has since been furnished

the House. Under those circumstances, I feel it my duty to give to the House the grounds for the manner in which I view that question at present and the grounds for the opinions which I then entertained. It has been stated in the press that the question at present between the Opposition and the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches is a question between the Stikine route, as to which the contract has been made, and another and different route which is promoted by parties with whom Lord Rothschild was connected. I have no hesitation in saying at once that I entertain no such opinion. I have no hesitation in saying that I should oppose much more strenuously the expenditure of a dollar of public aid or any assistance whatever from the Government to the latter route than I would to this. I am not aware that any person on this side of the House has advocated that route. What I understand hon. gentlemen on this side to say is that the fact that a company with which Lord Rothschild was said to be associated was prepared to construct that railway for 5,000 acres of gold lands per mile, instead of 25,000, was the evidence, and the strongest evidence that could be given, that the amount given by this Government is an altogether extravagant grant. I said that although difficulties have presented themselves, difficulties that ought not to have presented themselves in connection with this Stikine route recently, notwithstanding these I do not hesitate to say that I infinitely prefer the route now under consideration to any route that crosses a foot of territory claimed by the United States, and all the other routes to which I have referred are open to that objection. From Pyramid Harbour down to Dyea and Skagway and Taku Inlet—not so much Taku Inlet but all the others; the Taku Inlet route is placed beyond consideration by the fact that glaciers render it absolutely dangerous for vessels to attempt to reach that inlet—but all the other routes from the Pacific coast are, in my judgment, infinitely more objectionable than the route now under consideration. There are other routes—all-Canadian routes. There is the projected route from Ashcroft by the old Telegraph trail away through to Telegraph Creek. There is the route through Edmonton, and also the route from Prince Albert, whose greater length would perhaps render it more objectionable. These are all Canadian routes, but not routes that can be made valuable to-day for the purpose of facilitating ingress into that country. It is on that ground that while I feel that the Edmonton, and the Prince Albert, and the Ashcroft routes will all furnish valuable trails, their long distance from the sea is against their practicability from a commercial and national point of view, as compared with the route chosen. They will be used for the important purpose of carrying

cattle and supplies out of the great Northwest and the Peace River to this great Canadian Yukon gold field, and to a certain extent by persons proceeding from the eastern portion of Canada, but it is impossible to expect that they could be used for the purpose of rivalling the modes of ingress that now not only cross territory claimed by the United States but have had the effect of absolutely making Seattle and San Francisco the basis of supplies for the whole of that great Canadian Yukon.

Having said this much on the question of routes, I would draw attention, for a single moment, to the fact that I have not been alone in taking the view I have taken as to the result of additional light that has been thrown on this subject—a subject which has become one of immense importance and to which the attention of the House may be very fairly called. I hold in my hand the views of a portion of the press that only in extreme cases, cases of great importance, they ever venture to criticise the acts of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I would draw attention to the points on which they claim the information first given to the country with regard to this great question is entirely changed. I now refer to the "Daily Witness," of Montreal, which has the following article:—

THE GREAT YUKON BARGAIN.

The details of the bargain with the Mackenzie-Mann syndicate reveal objectionable features that do not appear in the information which came to light before the presentation of the contract to Parliament. It was not then known that the railway was to be a very narrow gauge one. It was not then realized, as seems to be admitted, that the Stikine is not navigable for sea craft, and that bulk must be broken in American waters, and there are, as we have pointed out, possibilities connected with the parcelling of the land grant which are interesting to contemplate.

There would seem, at all events, to be every probability that if there is really any great wealth in the country the syndicate will have no difficulty in reaping the first-fruits of it. It looks as though they would be likely to acquire for themselves or to make a profit on almost all the gold lands discovered up to the amount of their available grant. With the power of laying down a base line as may best suit their own advantage, and with the power of securing an uninterrupted territory of 24 miles long by 3 miles in breadth, it looks as though the syndicate could secure the best of the land without sharing on equal terms with the Government. * * * By getting their land through the syndicate, too, the miners, prospectors, or private companies would only have to pay a royalty of 1 per cent instead of one of 10 per cent.

Now, the basis of this contract, the very ground on which the hon. Minister of Railways claims the support of Parliament and the country for this measure is that if very valuable lands are given to the contractors, the Government will secure lands alongside equally valuable, because they have the alternative lot of three square miles. I will

deal with that question too, but in the meantime I will—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That gentleman is evidently in error, is he not?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will endeavour to show my hon. friend that he is not in error. I will produce a diagram for the consideration of this House, which I believe will startle the hon. gentleman. It will deal with this important question, which lies at the root and foundation of the whole measure. There is just one sentence more:

By getting their land from the syndicate, too, the miners, prospectors, or private companies will only have to pay a royalty of 1 per cent instead of 10 per cent.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). What is the date of that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is dated the 11th of February, after the contract was brought down. And, so in the case of the editor of this paper, having, on the first blush, given an enthusiastic endorsement to the scheme, he is obliged to qualify it by pointing out the reason of his change on facts revealed by the contract and the papers. I only draw attention to this because I think hon. members are entitled to the fullest explanation from me as to the reasons which have induced me to take the position that this contract is so improvident as not to entitle hon. gentlemen to ask the favourable judgment of this House upon it.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the House rose I had drawn its attention to the fact that the Montreal "Witness" had shown six important points in which the country had not been informed of the character of this contract until the contract and papers were laid before the House. I do not intend to speak longer on that point.

I have to deal now with another question of the greatest character—the question of private tender. If there is one point on which hon. gentlemen opposite placed themselves on record in the clearest manner during the time they sat on this side of the House, it was the gross impropriety of the Government of the country entering into a private contract with any parties for any purpose. And I can also say that, that the gentlemen who sit on this side of the House always agreed most cordially with the principle, making an exception only of cases of such urgency as to make it absolutely necessary in the public interest to pass by that important parliamentary principle of public

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

tender and contract and adopt a private tender. But, the reasons must be of the strongest and clearest character. Well, Sir, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, in introducing this Bill, of course, felt that this was a very important question and one to which he must address himself: and he appealed to this House to relieve the Government on that question and not to hold them responsible for the violation of the well established principle that all important matter should be submitted to public tender, upon the plea of urgency. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not in his place, but I am not very much surprised. I must deal with him, however, as though he were present. A number of his ministerial colleagues are here, and their being here will make his absence of less importance. He disposed of that question and swept away every ground of excuse on the part of the present Government by almost his first sentence in introducing the Bill. This is what he said:

Hon. members of this House will recollect quite clearly that before the close of last session, evidence was pouring in upon us of the immense discoveries of gold that were taking place in the Yukon district, and returning parties from that remote region were bringing us the most fabulous accounts of its mineral deposits. * * *

It became clear to us that we should immediately address our attention to dealing with these problems in a manner which would be most efficient and most promotive of good government and the general welfare and prosperity of the country. Now, in obtaining information with regard to the probable influx of people into that country, we were led to believe that the number of people who would be likely to seek the Yukon region during the present year would be exceedingly large. I believe that agents of transportation companies, who have the means of acquiring accurate information and forming a pretty fair judgment, advised us—some of them did—that as many as 250,000 people would be wending their way into the Yukon country during the present year.

Now, Sir, I need not add another word to show that, according to the Minister of Railways and Canals, this Government, in July last, before this House rose, were in full possession, were in full knowledge, of the condition of things which then existed and which was likely to exist. They had before them the fact that there were enormous gold discoveries, and that an enormous influx of people would go into that country during the present year, and all that we have learned since, according to the declaration of the Minister of Railways on the floor of this House, the Government had before them. What did they do? Why, they were bound at once to ask this House then in session—for he says it was before the House rose—to clothe them with power to deal with the extraordinary and unexpected, but absolutely revealed, condition that then existed before the country. Is that reasonable, or is it not reasonable? They do not say that it was during the recess of Parliament, when the representa-

tives of the people were not here to be consulted, but they say that they knew, that they had the whole thing before them, that parties well acquainted with the subject had estimated that 250,000 people would go into that country this year; in short, that there was then existing a condition of things of the gravest and most important character. Now, I say to those hon. gentlemen opposite that they failed, utterly failed, in the discharge of their duties to this House and to this country when, under those circumstances, they went to sleep, and instead of dealing with the great public emergency, as they ought to have dealt with it, they adopted a course of absolute do-nothing, leaving this Government and this country in a very unfortunate position. Why, Sir, is there a Canadian within the bounds of this wide Dominion who had not a blush of shame upon his face, when he found the United States Government proposing a vote of \$200,000 to keep people from starving in Canada, and to obtain shelter, protection and food for a great number of people within the bounds of Canada? Why, Sir, it was a disgrace to this country, a disgrace brought upon this country by this Government. Now, with the knowledge which the Minister of Railways and Canals declared the Government possessed before this House rose, did they take any action? We find that Captain Walsh, a very able man, was appointed by the present Government, but altogether too late in the year to go into that country. With the knowledge which the Minister of Railways tells us they had before them, was it not their duty to take measures by which communication should be kept up with Dawson City, with the 6,000 or 7,000 people in it? Nothing was easier. At that time they had that information before them, everything was open and palpable, but they did nothing. They waited months and months, junketing about the country, first in one direction, then in another. I do not know if my hon. friend the First Minister is responsible for that, because he had other duties to perform, and was not here. But I say that his colleagues whom he left behind him, shamefully neglected their duties to this House and to this country. In July last, when this House was in session, was anything easier than for them to ask their friends in this House—and their opponents in this House would have joined them with perfect readiness in placing at their disposal any sum of money that was needed to protect Canada from the disgrace that has fallen upon it. Well, Sir, what did they do? Every person knows that all they had to do was to establish two posts between Teslin Lake and Dawson City, or between Tagish Lake and Dawson City, and provision those posts, as they could easily have done at the time; and then mail communication and personal communication with Dawson City could have

been kept open with perfect ease throughout the entire year. And what has been the result? Captain Walsh was sent out, but too late to get into the country, and after wasting hundreds of thousands of the public money of this country in trying to get provisions and supplies over White Pass, he struggled on to Tagish Lake, and then made a desperate effort to get down when too late in the season. There is their officer and his mounted police, at an enormous expense to the people of this country, making a vain effort to get into that country, and they are not there yet. And what is worse, thousands of pounds' worth of provisions, and even valuable lives, have been lost in an ineffectual effort to get into that country. That is the position, Sir. Talk to me of urgency! talk of urgency in letting the contract on the 25th day of January in reference to this matter! Why, Sir, it is an insult to this House. Look at the public records, and you will find that these hon. gentlemen who appear to have no knowledge, no information, concerning that country, yet had in their hands, in the archives of the Government, Mr. Ogilvie's survey of 1887, describing the whole country, describing all these routes, describing everything; and he is a man whom they have shown that they regard, and properly regard, as entitled to their confidence, a man who, by every act of his since the hour that he was clothed with official power in that country, down to the present, has shown that he was worthy to be in the civil service of Canada. That man, Sir, had made a survey of this country, and he had given evidence that was then lying in their archives. They had no occasion to go to any further trouble, as they must have known, seeing, if they could see anything beyond their immediate surroundings, the absolute necessity of immediate action, but they remained asleep and allowed this country to drift into the position we now find it occupies, not only throughout this continent, but throughout the continent of Europe, the most humiliating position that it was ever placed in. Does not a blush of shame rise to the face of every Canadian, when he knows that throughout Europe, throughout the civilized world, people were reading of this wonderful thing, that the Government of a foreign country had absolutely to go to their Congress and get a large vote of money to keep people from starving in Canada? Why, Sir, it is calculated to bring contempt and disgrace upon the people of this country. But it was part of the design of that country alongside of us, from the first hour of these great gold discoveries down to the present hour, to take advantage of them, and they have succeeded until now in making all these things serve their own purposes, and contribute to the advantage of their own countrymen, instead of ours. That is the position. It was heralded all over the world that the gold discoveries

were in Alaska. When the matter was investigated it was found that instead of being in Alaska they were in Canada, and all the Alaskans deserted their country to seek for gold within our territory. The gold discoveries in Alaska were so utterly insignificant compared with the rich gold fields of Canada, they rushed over the border and entered our country in order to enrich themselves. I believe this proposal was only an attempt, an attempt I am afraid that was too successful, on the part of the people of the United States and its government to take advantage of this pretense to get a large quantity of American goods into the Canadian Yukon gold fields without paying duty, when they saw no other means of doing it. That is my impression, and the very fact that not an ounce of food has reached that country, although we hear, from day to day, from our Yukon territory, and that there is no anxiety whatever in regard to the food question, goes to support my impression. But a government never committed a more gross dereliction of duty in the history of Canada than when, knowing, as the Minister of Railways and the Government did know in July all about the transportation problem, they allowed the opportunity to pass and Parliament to separate without giving them authority or means to deal with this question.

Well, Sir, what then? They employed Mr. Jennings, a civil engineer of the highest character and the highest standing. And in naming that gentleman I feel bound to say that I never witnessed such a spectacle as this House witnessed to-day, and I hope never to witness such a spectacle again. I ask the oldest member: Did you ever know a Minister of Railways lay on the Table of the House the report of an engineer, and then spend one hour in decrying him and seeking to prove that he did not know what he was writing about? When asked what authority the Government possessed for taking steps in regard to the railway contract, they brought down this report and laid it on the Table. Why did the Minister of Railways act in a manner that had never been followed before under any Government, spending a large portion of his speech in showing that his engineer knew nothing and that he could teach him the first principles of engineering? I may fairly compare my knowledge of the administration of the Department of Railways with that of the hon. gentleman who now occupies that position. I have spent years in that office and had an opportunity of learning that there is no man in the public service more entitled to the confidence and respect of the House and the country, or of the Government of the day than Mr. Jennings; and yet we had to listen to this tyro in the administration of the railway system telling the House that Mr. Jennings does not know what he is talking about, after he has placed Mr. Jennings's

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

report on the Table of the House for our information. What is the meaning of it? The meaning is this, and I will explain it to the House. I may say that I never exchanged a word with Mr. Jennings except to shake hands with him in Victoria and ask him some casual questions, to which he replied: "You must excuse me, Sir Charles. I am a Government officer and cannot say a word on any of these matters, except to my Government." I quite recognized his position, and accepted the statement. But when the Minister of Railways has brought Mr. Jennings's report here, what is the reason he is denounced by the head of his own department? Because from cover to cover there is not a word or a line in the report that does not condemn the contract. Show me a single word in Mr. Jennings's report that does not condemn the contract, and then I will retract what I have said. Mr. Jennings has no desire to condemn the contract, he wants to give all the support he possibly can as an engineer to the Government under whom he serves; but he is an honest man and has a reputation to sustain that compels him to tell the plain, unvarnished truth when called upon by the Government for a report.

When did Mr. Jennings commence this work? The Minister has told the House that this was a vital question for the whole country. Hon. members will be astounded to learn from Mr. Jennings's report that he commenced the work on 25th September, at Stikine. That is late enough—that is bad enough. What was done during all the intervening period? July, August and September, three months gone and not a blow struck, not an attempt made on the part of this Government, knowing as they did, as the Minister of Railways has admitted, the great urgency of the case and the importance of immediate action; they slept for three months before they put an engineer in the field in order to get the information they required. But they did not require it. They had Mr. Ogilvie's report and survey, the accuracy of which has never been questioned, covering the whole ground and dealing with the whole question. The Minister of the Interior met Mr. Jennings on 25th October, a month afterwards. Does any man mean to tell me, does any intelligent man in this country believe that Mr. Jennings, coming on the steamer from Wrangell to Victoria with the Minister of the Interior, did not give him every particular with respect to this matter? Does any man mean to say that Mr. Jennings said: You must wait, Mr. Minister of the Interior, till I make my report, which will take some time. It passes belief. I know the Minister of the Interior well enough to be satisfied that before he had been three hours with Mr. Jennings he would be in possession of every fact and all the information. Mark, that was on 25th October.

On 1st November they came to Victoria, and I had there the pleasure of meeting them on that occasion.

When was this contract signed? The Minister of Railways tells us that the Government were compelled to violate that sacred principle recognized throughout the world that public contracts must be let by public tender, and only in case of most extreme urgency would the Government be justified in doing anything else. When, I repeat, was the contract let? On 25th October the engineer completed his work and the Minister was put in possession of all the facts, but the contract was not let until 25th January. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that when they were in possession of all the facts and in possession of Mr. Jennings's report on the 25th October, they had not an opportunity of giving out the work by public tender and contract? It is an insult to the intelligence of this House and an insult to the intelligence of the country. I do not hesitate to say that Mackenzie & Mann are two of the most eminent contractors in Canada, their characters are the highest, they are men of great ability and resources, as every person knows, and they are well qualified to take charge of a public work; but there are scores of contractors as good as Mackenzie & Mann. Why did not those other contractors have a chance? If the Government did not wish to advertise, why did they not send out a leaflet or memorandum to a dozen of the great contractors in Canada to say: We are proposing to construct a railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake; we want to know what is the smallest quantity of gold lands in the Canadian Yukon country you will take to do the work? It would not take long to write that out; it would not take long to put it in the post and place it in the hands of a score of the best contractors in Canada, and if the Government did that I will undertake to say that they would have a different story to tell now. But, Sir, that is not what the Government wanted. They wanted to put this contract into the hands of particular persons. That is perfectly evident. Why should they stake their reputation; why should they give the lie to all the declarations they have made in this House for twenty years, if they had not an object by secret and private tender to prevent the carrying out of that great principle for which they have fought and contended on the floor of the House. I want the Government to answer that; and, Sir, they have got to answer it to the intelligent people of this country. It is because for some reason best known to themselves—I will not make an insinuation because I am bound to believe that everything is honourable and straightforward, unless I know to the contrary, and I do not know anything to the contrary. That I say frankly,

but I do say that the Government must answer to this House and answer to this country, why they should give this enormous territory of the gold lands of this country to Mann & Mackenzie for constructing this 150 miles of railway. I defy them to give an answer that will satisfy the honest, independent yeomanry and electorate of Canada. I say I defy them; I do not believe it is possible for them to do so. I have shown that in July last they knew they required that work to be done, if they knew anything, and I have shown that in October they had their engineer's report in their hands, or at least he was in communication with the Minister of the Interior, who could learn everything he wanted to know in the course of a few hours. Yes, the Government continued down to the 25th of January, in secret without any knowledge on the part of anybody—aye, more, dangling contractors upon their hands, and having them hovering about the office of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and negotiating with him month after month. They deluded and deceived these people, who at large cost to themselves were here in Ottawa for the purpose of seeing the Government with reference to the construction of this work; and these people woke up one fine morning to see they had been trifled with, and that this contract was handed over secretly and privately to Mackenzie & Mann. That is the condition of things and I do not believe hon. gentlemen opposite can justify it. If they can I shall be very glad to hear their justification.

But, Sir, what more? When this contract was signed, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), whom I do not see in his place—as I said before I am not surprised at that, for of all the speeches that I ever heard before in this House, his speech on the introduction of this Bill was the most astounding—except the one he made to-day. It is only fair to him to say that he went one better to-day, but with that exception I have never seen such a spectacle. What must his colleagues have thought of him? There is a party in the United States of America—I am not very well versed in American politics, and I do not know quite what their principles were—but I know they were called Know-Nothings.

Mr. FOSTER. They are all dead.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, but there is one remaining, and he is here, and he is the Minister of Railways and Canals of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. He is dead too.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He has not the vitality he formerly had, but he is here at all events, and I could not help thinking of that interesting body of American politicians when I heard the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) undertake to introduce this measure to the House. The

Minister of Railways came back here to-day, and instead of giving us any information, which we were all hungering and thirsting to obtain with reference to this marvellous work, no wonder he spent a couple of hours or whatever time it was, talking about everything except this contract. He (Mr. Blair) had a long discussion with my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), and he (Mr. Blair) could not be convinced that his clerk who had made out his speech for him it appears, did not correctly get everything down, and so he was prepared to swear for the clerk and against the "Hansard," and against everybody else, rather than to admit that he was making a very curious spectacle of himself. The Minister (Mr. Blair) is not here to-night, and I am afraid that poor clerk is being birched now for failing so signally in making out his speech for his august Minister. Let me read, for the information of the House a short but pithy extract from a very independent political journal in Canada with reference to the speech of the Minister of Railways (Mr Blair) in introducing the Bill. It says :

The Minister of Railways does not know the probable cost of the Yukon Railway ; he does not know if the Government engineers were ever asked for an estimate ; he does not know anything about the value per acre of the land the Government is giving away ; he does not know how far it is to Tagish Lake ; he does not know whether there will be any difficulty with the United States customs about making connections between his new railway and the Pacific Ocean ; he does not know anything about the rights of Canada at Fort Wrangell ; he does not know the position of the United States Government with regard to allowing Canada to tranship at Fort Wrangell. But, for all that, we notice, the Yukon Railway contract is made between Her Majesty the Queen, represented by the Hon. A. G. Blair, Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) does not say what the independent journal is ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Montreal "Star."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, the Montreal "Star," a journal that in the throes of the last general election was a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite ; a journal that abandoned the support of hon. gentlemen opposite when these gentlemen forgot what they owed to themselves and the country. That is the paper to which I allude.

Sir, is it any wonder that after such a criticism as that, stung to the quick, the Minister of Railways and Canals comes into this House, and instead of talking about the Stikine and Lake Teslin Railway enters into a discussion in which he is all wrong about what hon. gentlemen on this side of the House had said, and the criticisms of that journal. Every man in this House

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

knows—none better than the gentlemen who sit behind the Minister of Railways and Canals—that every word of what the "Star" states is true, and that more profound ignorance never was exhibited on the floor of this House by any man who ever undertook to expound a Bill. Then, to make the spectacle utterly sublime, to make the spectacle surpass anything we had ever witnessed in this House, we find the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) taking up the rest of his time in denouncing the engineer upon whose report he asks us to adopt this contract. And why ? Because, as I have said, the Minister could not find a line in the whole report from "A" to "Z" but what condemns the contract and shows that this Government stand arraigned to-day before this Parliament, and before the people of Canada for having made a contract that no man in their ranks is able to justify. We have seen in this House a spectacle that it is not often our lot to witness. We have seen red-hot shot fired into the Government from this side of the House day after day and hour after hour, met by dumb silence. Why ? Because hon. gentlemen opposite had no answer, and because my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who is a great tactician, I admit, finding that the rank and file of his party were rising in revolt against this monstrous contract, passed the word amongst them, "silence," if any one speaks we will be ruined, if one man speaks he will be answered by the man alongside of him." I congratulate my right hon. friend upon observing these tactics in reference to that matter. But we did get a few words out of the mouth of a gentleman, who we believe has the Lieutenant Governorship of the Northwest Territories in his pocket. That is the only man in the whole party, who has a word to say in its favour. It is not for want of ability. We all recognize the ability and talent of hon. gentlemen opposite, and we know that whenever they have a semblance of a case, they will put it with all the force and all the tact in their power ; but it is only when they are brought face to face with a condition of facts for which they have no answer, that they are compelled to fall back on a policy of silence, in the hope that that will protect them. Was it or was it not right, I ask, that the people of Canada should expect this Government, before signing a contract by which they were giving 3,750,000 acres of rich gold lands to a company of contractors, to have made known to themselves what our rights at Wrangell were ? The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that distinguished Know-nothing, who has signalized himself by the introduction of this Bill, and who has again signalized himself to-day by, if possible, greater ignorance of the measure he undertook to introduce to this House, can perhaps answer. Tell me, I ask the hon. gentleman, in the presence

of this House, how you dared to put your signature—he did not put his signature, he got some one else to do it—to that contract without first knowing what the rights of the people of Canada were at Fort Wrangell? You admitted, in your speech on the introduction of the Bill, that you did not know anything about it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will please address the Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He admitted, Mr. Speaker, that he did not know anything about it. It was vital. You were giving away 3,750,000 acres of the rich gold territory of Canada for the construction of a railway—what for? For the purpose of making an all-Canadian route. Were you, or were you not, bound in honour—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Was he, or was he not, bound in honour, I say, to ascertain before he signed that contract whether it would be of any good to us—whether we would be blocked at Fort Wrangell? Is that a reasonable question, or is it not? The hon. gentleman, when he was asked that question, on the introduction of the Bill, said, "I do not know." And so he said to any question of any importance that was presented to him, from the commencement to the end, "I do not know; I do not know anything." He was a Know-nothing. What more? Why, Sir, every person knows who knows anything about this subject—I have the evidence here under my hand—that at Fort Wrangell, under the treaty between Russia and Great Britain, we had an absolute right to free egress and ingress over the River Stikine, to and from the ocean, and that without any hindrance whatsoever. The United States bought that country, but they could not buy what Russia could not give. Unfortunately, by an oversight, that treaty was renewed with the United States of America, who knew that the people of Canada and every British subject in the Empire possessed an indefeasible right to go in and out of the River Stikine without let or hindrance of any kind whatever—these are the words of the treaty; and in the new treaty they provided that we had the right of free navigation of the Stikine River, subject to such regulations as might be found necessary.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Who was to blame for that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, Sir, I will not go into that. There is an old classic adage which my hon. friend will understand without my calling it to his attention, that prevents a single word. But we were taken advantage of by the United States of America in the construction of the present treaty, and they are in a position to give us

hindrance; and, therefore, I say this Government, before they gave away this gigantic territory of Canada to two contractors, were bound to ascertain whether we could use the road profitably after it was constructed. That is the position I take, and I think it is incontrovertible. I have the evidence of that, in the shape of a telegram which I have in my hand, headed "United States Action—the All-Canadian Route." I have told you that, from the first hour the United States found that these great mineral treasures, surpassing perhaps anything the world has ever seen, were on the eastern side of the boundary of Alaska, they have been working might and main, pulling every string; and this is one of the reasons why I agree with the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that it was vital to Canada to get an all-Canadian route. We know what has happened whenever any of our people have had to cross an inch of their territory. What happened last year, when poor Canadians wanted to cross a strip of territory which nobody can say belongs to the United States—because it is disputed; and it is a most unfortunate condition of things that it is in dispute. When they approached the disputed territory, a poor Canadian was taken by the neck and was told, "You cannot take your horses there until you pay \$30 a head." That is the way the Canadian was treated, and that is the way we may expect to be treated by that great republic so long as the public men of Canada are ready to rush to Washington and get down on their knees. I say the time has come when, in my judgment, Canada will be compelled, in vindication of its position, to assert in the clearest, most emphatic and distinct manner its independence of the United States of America. Thank God, Sir, we are independent of that country. We have a territory, we have resources, we have everything that makes us and our country the envy of the world. That is our position, and we are in no sense of the word dependent. But so long as a Government can be found in this country which, every few days, is prepared to send one of its numbers to Washington—I am glad to see the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his seat. I blushed with shame when I read in the "Globe," the other day, the statement that he had gone to Washington to go down on his knees again.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is not my habit, and I find it inconvenient at present.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad he does, and I hope he will never do it again. We have had too much of it. What have you got for it? Look at the history of the relations between the United States and Canada, and let me ask Canadians, what have we got by truckling to those people? We have got Alien Labour Bills, McKinley

tariffs, Dingley tariffs, and now we have this measure at present before the Congress of the United States. After tolerably reasonable arrangements had been made, which were announced by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) the other night, what follows?

The next day, Mr. Frye, a Senator of the United States, introduced a Bill into the United States Senate to adopt a policy by which if a Canadian vessel, in the enjoyment of her indefeasible right of navigation from the mouth of the Stikine River, should neglect at Fort Wrangell to pay a certain deference and respect to the United States authorities, what happens? Is she fined? No, but confiscated. That is the position. That is the result of all this abject humiliation which we have exhibited towards the United States. Sir, the time has come, I do not hesitate to say, when, if Canadian rights are to be maintained in Canada, we have got, as a Parliament and Government, to show that great republic that while we are ready to do everything men can do to maintain the most friendly and harmonious commercial and every other kind of relations with that great country, we are not prepared to sacrifice the indefeasible rights of Canadians at their bidding.

What reason have they for supposing that they can trample on us with impunity? Sir, my right hon. friend has given them the reason. When seeking the suffrages of the people, he followed me to Windsor, and there outbid me on this question, as he did on other questions in Quebec and Ontario. When I went there—I had been a good while out of the country, and if I saw Mr. Taylor, the hon. member for Gananoque in the House, I would have to apologize to him—but when I went there and they told me the position they were in, I said in the public hall at Windsor, in the presence of a large body of Americans: Gentlemen, you have stated to me that you are labouring under gross wrongs, that the rights and privileges we give to Americans on this side, are denied to you when you cross to the bordering republic, and I have no hesitation in saying that if I should be sustained at the polls, I will introduce a Bill into the House of Commons, unless those unfair labour laws are repealed in the United States, which will be word for word and line for line, the same as theirs. I will give them back a little of their own medicine. Sir, what happened? My right hon. friend followed me there and outbid me. He found that the heather was on fire, and he said that the moment he obtained power he would endeavour to have those laws changed, and if they were not changed, he would have a similar law passed by the Parliament of Canada to protect the rights and interests of Canadians. Well, Sir, after he did gain office, what did he do? He called to his aid that Machiavellian colleague of his, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

(Sir Louis Davies) and said to him: My dear friend, I want you to engineer this little matter for me. I have pledged myself personally and in every other way that I would retaliate on the United States and I am in a very tight place. And my right hon. friend got his colleague to emasculate the Bill and then put in a suspending clause. That suspending clause is in operation to-day, and so long as it is, the United States will say: Our rifles are met by pop-guns; we can fire away, and there is no danger of their hurting us. Sir, they know my hon. friend is not prepared to keep his word to the electors in this any more than in anything else. He has sacrificed the electors, and the result is our American neighbours go on, step by step, trampling on the rights of Canadians from day to day with perfect immunity. That is the condition of things, and that will have to be met. I do not hesitate to say, as a public man—and I take the responsibility in the face of the world—that my policy would be to treat the United States of America precisely as they treat us. In reference to alien labour laws, tariffs, mining laws and everything else, I would mete out to them the same treatment.

Look at Canada to-day, and what do you find? Why, you find the humiliating spectacle, that while no Canadian is permitted to cross the boundary of the United States and dig a pound of ore out of a mine or do a day's labour in the mine, much less than own one, you will find Americans coming into Canada and taking in the great district of Rossland and throughout British Columbia and now away in the Canadian Yukon gold fields—the best that can be found—with the freedom and audacity of full-fledged Canadian or British subjects. Is that fair or just or right? I asked my right hon. friend to lay on the Table of the House, if he could, a carefully prepared estimate from the best sources in his power of the amount of gold taken out of the Canadian Yukon gold fields, and by whom taken out. Let him lay such a statement on the Table, and I undertake to show that for every dollar a Canadian has got, an American has got \$500. Is there a man in this country who will say that that is right, considering the laws that the Americans enforce against us, and the manner in which our people are treated when they go into the United States on a similar errand. I trust the day will come when this Government will see that they owe it to the independent character of Canada and our people to say to the American republic: Unless you change your system, we shall treat you as you do us. They could not complain. Imitation is the sincerest flattery, and I would flatter them in that way. I would copy, line for line and word for word, their laws in relation to tariff as far as I could. When they were putting up the McKinley and Dingley tariffs, I would not have taken off the duty of corn and let it free into

this country to impoverish our farmers, nor would I have reduced the duty on iron so as to let the Americans come into Canada and take work out of the hands of Canadians, but I would adopt in tariff matters, mining, labour, and everything else in this country precisely the policy they adopt towards us. Could they complain? They could not with the slightest show of reason, but it is because we have submitted from day to day and from year to year these exactions and this injustice at their hands, and for that reason alone, that you have these regulations about the Stikine, of which I make no complaint, followed up by the Bill introduced into Congress that proposes to strike down those regulations and completely paralyze Canadian trade. What does the despatch from Washington say? It says they are going to use that Stikine question to secure for the American fishermen permanent bonding privileges, on the Atlantic coast. They have an eye all over the world for their own interests and have no hesitation in making use of every right which Canada is entitled to and can justly ask, to force from us some concession to which they have no right.

The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, who I am sorry was not here when I was paying him a little attention a short time ago, says he cannot tell of anything about the tolls to be charged on this proposed railway. What is the reason? This is not a private but a public matter. It is not a private matter between the Department of Railways and Canals and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. It may be that the Government are keeping this as a little string to pull whenever desirable. But that is not business. It is a public matter which this House has a right to know. Have not the thousands of Canadians, who want to go into that Canadian Yukon country, the right to know something about what tolls they will have to pay over this railway when it is built? Why do you hold over these contractors, in 'terrorem,' this means of pressing them? There is no reason for your doing so. The hon. gentleman as usual does not know. So far as I can learn, he does not know anything about the department over which he has undertaken to preside. If he did, he would know it was his first duty to this House and the country to make a fair, honest, candid statement of what he is prepared to do for Canadians who require to go over that road. Is not that reasonable? He says there has been no estimate made. Well, he is wrong as usual. There has been an estimate made. If he will look at the report of that distinguished engineer, Mr. Jennings, whom he took half an hour to-day to discredit, after asking us to pass a contract on the faith of his report, he will find that Mr. Jennings estimates the cost per ton at \$50 to be carried over that railway. If he will look at page 24, he will find that an estimate has been made of the cost of the road. And

mark you, Mr. Speaker, in this estimate, Mr. Jennings was speaking—not of a tramway, not of a narrow-gauge railway, not of a railway with second-class rails and engines and cars, bought for a song from the Lethbridge road—but of a first-class railway. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said to us: Just think of the freight on these rails and these locomotives and other things that have to go in. He assumed they were coming from Europe, I suppose, or the United States of America where he is so fond of going when he wants railway supplies. The hon. gentleman does not seem to know anything about the contract, and he will be surprised when I tell him that the rails are second-hand rails of 28 pounds to the yard and require to be freighted only from Lethbridge to Vancouver and sent by steamer from Vancouver to Glenora. Mr. Jennings estimates that the cost of a railway—not a narrow-gauge railway with second-hand equipment, but a properly constructed railway with rails of 56 pounds to the yard—will be \$3,200,000. It costs \$3,957,000 for 208 miles, and I want to know from the hon. Minister why he is building the railway from Glenora. That is not the recommendation of Mr. Jennings. All the authority that we have in relation to this matter is Mr. Jennings's report. He never recommended a railway from Glenora to Teslin, but from Little Cañon, 96 miles from the sea, and 208 miles from there to Teslin Lake. What did he say? Perhaps I had better read it. It is very interesting, and I think it will be new to the Minister of Railways and Canals who, probably, has not seen it. What does the hon. Minister think of the engineer who he sent out, and about whom he had such a small opinion when he referred to him to-day?

At times the river is too low for speed with a reasonable cargo, or, the stream may be very high and the riffles—

What does that mean? I confess, I do not know. I must fall back upon the Minister of Railways and Canals to know what "riffles" are. What is a "riffle"?

—the riffles difficult to make headway against, with the additional danger—

Mark the word. We are going to entrust the lives of Canadians to this river.

—of drift trees or snags getting foul of the steering gear or wheel. The latter danger is most to be feared when the channel is contracted, such as in Little and Klootchman's Cañons, where, if any mishap occurred to the vessel's machinery, she would at once be carried against the rugged rock walls by the swift, swirling disturbed waters.

We have listened two days to the Minister of Railways and Canals and he never told us that.

The distance of 96 miles between Wrangell and Little Cañon can be made by a powerful steamer

in one day, whereas by reason of the swift and difficult water above it takes two days more to reach Telegraph Creek, a further distance of only 54 miles, or 150 miles from the sea. Therefore, with these facts before one, it seems reasonable that on a route where safe and speedy transit is contemplated, it is advisable to commence the railway section well down the valley at a point to be determined on below the Little Cañon, and on the left bank of the river, 96 miles from the sea.

I am in the judgment of the House when I ask the Minister of Railways and Canals why he made a contract to build from Glenora or Telegraph Creek, when he had the declaration of his engineer, an able and experienced man, that the proper place to build from was 96 miles further down at a point that could be reached by a steamer in one day and the dangers and disasters of attempting to go beyond avoided. We have had no light upon that subject, we have had no explanation whatever. According to the engineer it would only cost \$746,000 more to build from there than from Glenora. When you are going to give away a country as large as England to secure the building of this road why should you not require the contractors to spend this additional sum in order to get a safe and proper road where your own engineer stated it could be made. The estimated cost of that road from Glenora to Teslin Lake under this contract was \$3,200,000. Mr. Jennings has actually ventured—I am afraid he will get into trouble—to make an estimate of the cost of carrying passengers and freight, and the Minister of Railways and Canals has placed it on the Table—I suppose he did not see it. Mr. Jennings estimated that for 12,000 passengers, a very small number compared with the 50,000 that the Minister was prepared to carry into that country, at five cents a mile—a very moderate charge of which I do not think any one will complain—there will be a revenue of \$99,000.

The freight at \$50 per ton amounts to \$450,000. The gross earnings, Mr. Jennings estimates therefore for this company on this 150 miles of railway, are \$494,000. Now, the Minister of Railways and Canals will find here an estimate made by a man who knows what he is doing—for I know him to be a man of the highest character and standing as an engineer—and his estimate proves that the working expenses will be only \$55,000 a year, while the profits will be \$494,000, about half a million a year of profits on 150 miles of railway.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). The engineer speaks of other deductions besides the working expenses.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course you cannot build a railway without paying interest on the money, you cannot carry on a railway without depreciation. But I am showing that on that 150 miles of tramway, running through that country, with second-hand rails, half a million dollars a

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

year is a pretty fair profit, even if they did pay interest on the money. I did not require to refer to either depreciation or interest, for everybody knows these have to be borne by the contractors. But here is the fact that the cost is \$3,200,000, and after deducting the working expenses on the utterly insignificant estimate, in my opinion, of what the real number would be, that is 12,000 people instead of 50,000 people who would go over the road, still you have half a million dollars profit. Now, under these circumstances, I think the House will begin to wonder what induced this Government to take the course they did. Can anybody understand why they should, under these circumstances, hand over 3,750,000 acres of rich gold lands to these contractors for building 150 miles of railway where it ought not to be built, a railway which is dangerous to get at, according to the engineer's statement, instead of going a little further down stream to the Little Cañon and building there? Can anybody explain what induced these gentlemen to make such a bargain? Why, you have only to take the report of the engineer to find that, having given them permission to enter upon the ground and build that railway, and levy these tolls, that ought to have been abundantly sufficient without giving them anything else, and the contractors would still have had a handsome and promising commercial enterprise. But, you say, it has to be built in a hurry. We are told there was urgency, urgency from July last, although the Government had the report in their hands of an able engineer who had made a thorough survey of all this country, they had the report in their hands in July last when they knew this had to be done.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What was the date of Mr. Ogilvie's report?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. 1887.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. But the month?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, I do not know; I am in the same position as the Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Let me inform the hon. gentleman that Mr. Jennings's report was not made until the 25th of October, 1897.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am talking about Mr. Ogilvie's report, which you had in your possession since the Minister of Railways declared in this House the other day that everybody was excited in this country, and he foresaw what a tremendous rush of people there would be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say anything of the kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why, I have read to the House the words of your speech. The hon. gentleman does not even know that. This is what he said :

Hon. members of this House will recollect quite clearly that before the close of last session evidence was pouring in upon us of the immense discoveries of gold that were taking place in the Yukon district, and returning parties from that remote region were bringing us the most fabulous accounts of its mineral deposits.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That is something altogether different from what the hon. gentleman said.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What did I say ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. member stated that I said in my explanation the other day that the members of the House knew, before the close of last session, that crowds of people were then pouring in and would be pouring into the Yukon country, whereas I said nothing of the kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I will read that to him also :

Now, in obtaining information with regard to the probable influx of people into that country, we were led to believe that the number of people who would be likely to seek the Yukon region during the present year would be exceedingly large.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Does the hon. member say that I stated the other day that that information was procured and was in the possession of the Government before the House prorogued last session ? Because that is what is now stated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have shown the hon. gentleman the evidence of his declaration that before the House rose this excitement prevailed with reference to the Yukon country.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That is one thing, but the hon. member has stated a totally different thing, and has put into my mouth a statement that I did not make.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman does not state the particular day on which these transportation people gave him this information. But at the same time he speaks of this wild excitement, he goes on to speak of the people that would be pouring into that country, and would be coming out of it. That was in July, therefore I have shown that the hon. gentleman's statement that there was any urgency is contradicted by his own evidence given to the House when he said he had before him, before the House rose, the data upon which he ought to have asked this House to clothe the Government with authority

to deal with a matter of such urgency, and to advertise for tenders.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. member must not say that I said we had this information in our possession at the time the House prorogued last year, because we did not have it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I tell the hon. gentleman that he had the information in his hands before the 25th day of October, when Mr. Jennings made his report.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That is a totally different thing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Minister of the Interior had this information, and yet the contract was not made until the 25th of January. Therefore, there was abundant time for the Government to have asked for tenders, to have sent out a message to a score of contractors, if they could have taken no other way, in order to ascertain for how much of these valuable gold lands in the Canadian Yukon they would build this 150 miles of railway.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Does the hon. member say, even assuming that to be the case, that that is his justification for attributing to me a statement as made before the prorogation of Parliament last year, which I did not make ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is very apt to build mountains upon mole hills. The hon. gentleman, in the speech in which he told us of the public excitement, tells us also of the information which he had. But he does not give the date. Therefore, I am to assume, what everybody in this country with a head upon his shoulders would assume, that when he describes the fabulous wealth of that country, and the people that were pouring into it—

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** What I did say, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will permit me, was that we set to work to procure information after prorogation, and the result was the information which I laid before the House the other day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I did not draw the dates to a week or to a month. But I say that no person on the Treasury benches can deny that they had the clearest information a Government could have, as to the probable great influx of people into that country.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** When ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why, from the very day that you learned, before the House rose, what the Minister of Railways and Canals has told us in his speech.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Not at all. The hon. gentleman is stating what is entirely incorrect.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had Mr. Ogilvie's report, dated July 27th. Does he deny that an officer of the highest character and standing in the service of this country gave him under that date the information which I have quoted?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I think that on the date mentioned the Government had no reason to expect a large influx of people into the Yukon country. When I speak of a large influx, I mean a large body of people such as could not be handled with existing resources.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman had no idea from the report of his officer and the evidence given of enormous gold discoveries that there would be a large influx of people, he was the only man who failed to entertain that idea. But the hon. Minister's own officer on 27th July, said:

News has gone to the coast; an unexampled influx is expected next spring.

I think the hon. gentlemen had better find some other grounds of controversy than the small points they have endeavoured to raise in respect to this matter, for such will only cover them with the greatest confusion.

But I do not intend to be turned aside from the argument that I wish to address to the House on this subject. I have already stated to the House that at one time I was Minister of Railways and Canals, and I may as well repeat it in the presence of the Minister of Railways. I have been for a long time a member of this House. I have stood here as Minister of Railways. I was in this House when that great man, for a great man he was, Alexander Mackenzie, filled the office of Minister of Public Works, which then included that of Minister of Railways and Canals; but to-day was the first time in my experience when a Minister of the Crown so far forgot himself as to lay a report of an engineer on the Table of the House and ask the House to accept that as evidence, and then stand up and decry that engineer and attack his report. That is a spectacle which remained for the hon. gentleman to exhibit: it has never been exhibited before and for the respect of Parliament I trust it will never be exhibited again. What more? Mr. Jennings has shown—and I have shown him to be a high authority—that the profit on the railway per annum will be half a million dollars, without anything else. What do those gentlemen do? They give to the contractors 3,750,000 acres of choice, picked gold lands over the Canadian Yukon gold field. I was amazed, I had no idea of that when I first saw a notice of the contract. I never dreamed that the contractors were to be permitted by the Government to select

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

3,750,000 acres of choice gold lands in the Canadian Yukon gold field.

Some little question was raised to-day about what Mr. Ogilvie said. I trust that the Minister of the Interior will not be driven, as the Minister of Railways has been driven, to decry his own officer in order to endeavour to bolster up a bad case. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) stated in the House the other day an important fact. The Minister of Railways, it appears, does not know anything about the gold fields, whether they are worth anything, he does not know whether gold deposits exist, or how far they are of value, or whether they have any value; but the hon. member for North Wellington told him the other day, on the authority of Mr. Ogilvie, that there were no less than 80,000,000 of acres of gold-bearing lands in the Canadian gold fields of the territory. Is that a good authority, or is it not? If it is, then I think the hon. Minister must not tell the House that he knows nothing of the Canadian gold fields, whether they are worth anything, or whether 3,750,000 acres of land will be merely a burden on the hands of the contractors who own them. I was amazed when I found this bargain had been made. I had no conception of it until this contract came down. And then what did I find? Did I find that the statement of the Minister of Railways which he ventured to make to the House was correct? The very reverse. He said that although they were giving the contractors this large territory of gold-bearing land, whatever the value was Canada would possess an equal value.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That we held alternate blocks.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean of equal value? If the hon. gentleman will refer to the arguments he used in favour of the contract he will find that the idea presented was that whatever value the contractors got, Canada would have an equal amount. An examination of the contract, however, discloses the startling fact, for it is a startling fact, that the gentlemen who made the contract have been too much for the Government, that the Minister of Railways and the Minister of the Interior have been dough in the hands of the contractors, that they moulded the Ministers to their own liking, and hon. members can see that such is the case if they read the contract. Read the clause that relates to the disposal of the gold lands, and what do we find? Clause 12 says:

12. The lands shall be selected by the contractors along base lines, and the base lines may be of two kinds:

1st. The contractors may take as a base line a line which will correspond with the general course of any lake, river, stream or watercourse, such line to be determined by survey, or approximate survey, to the satisfaction of the au-

thorized agent of the Minister of the Interior, and to follow the general course of the lake, river, stream or watercourse for the required distance; and

2nd. The contractors may take as a base line a line commencing at any point located by them and running from such point due north, east, south or west. The land along a base line shall be divided into blocks, each block to extend 3 miles along the base line and to extend 3 miles backwards on each side of the base line. On each base line there shall be at least 8 of such blocks, but there may be more at the option of the contractors. These blocks shall be numbered from 1 up consecutively, the odd-numbered blocks shall be the property of the contractors, the even-numbered shall remain the property of the Government. The contractors shall take at least four blocks on each base line established by them for the purpose of selection but shall not be bound to take more, but they may take as many more as they desire and as circumstances permit. Thus, upon each base line so established there shall be laid out a tract not less than 24 miles along the course of said base line by 3 miles on each side thereof in width, making eight blocks of 3 miles by 6 miles. Provided that if in the selection of lands along any base line the courses thereof prevent rectangular blocks being laid out, such blocks shall be adjusted to the required angles, preserving as far as practicable, blocks of an area of 3 miles by 6. Any shortage or surplus of such area shall be adjusted by the prolongation or shortening of such base line.

That, I take, Sir, is the clause of the Government. But the contractors pushed in the last clause. It was perfectly obvious that they were too many altogether for the Government, and they got this clause put in which gives them a complete control of all the rich available gold land throughout the territory. This clause which I shall read is in complete antagonism with the whole basis laid down, which is, that there shall be alternate blocks, and that if the contractors got three square miles of valuable gold land the Government would get the next. I am right, am I not? I do not think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) has read the contract or he would not give such a ready acquiescence. The clause says:

The contractors may also at their option select additional blocks lying on either end of any odd-numbered blocks, along the base line, but such additional blocks must be three miles square each, and they shall not exceed three in number on each end of each such odd-numbered blocks.

What is the result of that? It is perfectly startling when you come to examine it. It is inconceivable that any gentleman who knew anything about this business would have been guilty of such a complete sacrifice of the interests of Canada. I do not hesitate to say, that under these two clauses these contractors are in a position to go over the whole of the Canadian Yukon gold field, and get everything that is of any value and leave the Government practically nothing. I shall show the House upon what I base that statement. Here is a diagram, and I trust some means will be found of embodying it

in the "Hansard" for it reveals the whole story. What is the fact? Mark, not the Government, but the contractors start the base line where they please. They run north or south or east or west, wherever they think it is in their interest they should run. Suppose they find that there is a valuable streak of rich alluvial gold-mining property for 24 miles, and they want it all themselves and do not want the Government to have any, what will they do? They will start the base line at a right angle with it, and they will give the Government the even-numbered sections, taking care that the odd-numbered sections they take are full of gold. They give the even-numbered section that has nothing in it to the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, that is it, look at the diagram. They then put three blocks of three square miles each on the end of the gold streak in both directions, and they have got 24 miles of rich gold land three miles wide, and the land alongside has nothing on it. If gentlemen on that side of the House think that is justice to Canada, then they have not investigated the subject. Here is a memorandum based on the Mann-Mackenzie contract given in the Montreal "Star" of the 9th February, 1898, which states exactly the terms of the contract, as I have read them:

MEMORANDUM BASED ON THE MANN-MACKENZIE YUKON CONTRACT, AS GIVEN IN THE MONTREAL "STAR" OF FEB. 9, 1898.

By the terms contained in section 12 (2) it would appear that the Government stipulated for the reserve of alternate blocks on the base line in order to take an equal share with the contractors in any benefits arising from the minerals distributed in the neighbourhood of the locations selected by the contractors.

But, apparently at the instance of the contractors, a proviso was added to section 12 (2) of the contract, which proviso will enable the contractors to exclude the intervention of reserved Government alternate blocks in the mineral-bearing direction they may find yields remunerative returns.

The accompanying explanatory sketch is made roughly to a scale of $\frac{1}{4}$ inch to a mile.

Under article 12 (1 and 2) the contractors have the right to locate their base lines—of not less than 24 miles in length. The base lines are to be divided into lengths of 3 miles. Across the dividing points are drawn divisional lines 6 miles in length, forming 8 equal areas of 3 miles by 6 miles. Each of these is called a block, and the blocks are to be numbered consecutively from 1 to 8, or more if the contractors desire longer base lines.

The odd-numbered blocks—and at least 4 of these on a base line of 24—are compulsorily assigned to the contractors. The even-numbered blocks are reserved by the Government.

The central shaded portion of the accompanying sketch—extending 3 miles on each side of the base line—falls to the contractors.

The unshaded parts of the central portion are alone reserved by the Government.

So far the object the Government had in view in arranging for alternate block reserves is provided for by the contract.

But the proviso added to section 12 permits the contractors to select, if they wish, three additional blocks, each of three miles square, at each end of each odd-numbered block on the base line.

The additional lots which the contractors may at their option select are shown on the sketch. No provision is made in their case for the reserve of alternate blocks.

Assume, then, that the contractors have gained information—through their own prospectors or other channel, such as the opening up of claims—that along the line covered in the sketch by block III. and its 6 additional 3 miles square blocks, there is rich mineral-bearing land. All the contractors will then have to do to secure possession of it uninterrupted by alternately reserved lots, is to select a base line so that it shall cross the valuable site at an odd-numbered block.

The area which the contractors can thus secure, uninterrupted by alternately reserved blocks, is 24 miles in length by 3 in breadth (or 72 square miles)—sufficient, probably, to embrace all the valuable mineral-bearing land discoverable in one neighbourhood—and even to include the valleys of streams.

Moreover, as illustrated by the sketch, the terms of the contract permit the contractors to secure 4 such areas in connection with even the minimum base line of 24 miles in length—or in all 288 square miles in any district they may select.

The argument that the provision in the contract secures to the Government equal chances of equally rich land with the contractors is fallacious, for the proviso to section 12 enables the contractors to arrange for the choice of a base line so located that they may have no intervening reserved lots interrupting their selected mineral-bearing land.

Also, the enormous areas which the contract permits the contractors to secure in any part of the Yukon district is calculated to stay the immigration of gold-seekers.

Now, Sir, I submit that that is an unvarnished statement of facts, which proves conclusively that the Government have been completely outgeneralled by the contractors, and that the contractors are in a position in laying out their 3,750,000 square acres of gold-bearing country, with such information as they will command, to completely exclude the Government and to exclude the mining population from anything like a fair or just opportunity of competing with them.

I want to draw the attention of the House for a moment to another point, and that is that the Placer, Gulch, River, and Creek claims will average considerably less than one and a half acres in size. 3,750,000 acres will make 2,500,000 claims, for which prospectors must pay a rental of \$15 a year each to the Government, or \$37,500,000 a year rental. How does that strike hon. gentlemen?

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If it were true, it would strike us very badly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I want to know whether it is true or not true, that you give 3,750,000 acres of gold-bearing

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

lands to this company without one dollar of rent, and that you charge to every poor miner who, at the risk of his health and life, goes into that country to struggle for his family, \$15 a year rental. I say that the rental on the gold claims you give to these contractors, if applied in the same way and at the same rate at which you apply it to poor individuals, will equal \$37,500,000 per annum.

THE PRIME MINISTER. That goes with the statement about the wheat in Manitoba.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My right hon. friend will, I trust, remember that that is an old story, as unfounded as anything could possibly be. My right hon. friend will know that that was a calculation to which I never committed myself in the slightest degree. When I read it to the House, I asked the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), "Have you seen that calculation?" And he said, "Yes." I simply read the arithmetical calculation, which was perfectly correct, but I never endorsed any expression that such an amount of wheat would be raised in the North-west Territories, and I think it is time my right hon. friend let that buried slander remain buried, as I do not think resurrecting it will be creditable to him or to anybody else. It has been too often refuted to require any further notice on my part. I do not say that amount would be realized to the contractors; but suppose one-half, suppose one-fourth, suppose one-tenth of it would be, is that nothing? Is \$3,000,000 per annum nothing to give to these contractors? And that would not be one-tenth of this amount. I am giving the calculation arithmetically, and I say it is monstrous. It shows that these gentlemen did not examine this matter when they went into it. There is another thing. For every claim you give to the prospector, he has to take out a free miner's license at a cost of \$10 a year; and, assuming that there is only one prospector to each license, though there may be half a dozen, and every one of them requires a mining license to work in the mines, on the 2,500,000 claims the Government would receive \$25,000,000 per annum in licenses. My right hon. friend may think that this is a matter of amusement, and may be disposed to treat it jocularly; but I tell him that the intelligent people of Canada will not treat it jocularly. I say, the hardy miners, who have gone into that country at the risk of health and life, in the hope of bettering their condition, will not treat it jocularly, when they find that they and every person they employ will be obliged to pay \$10 a year into the coffers of this country, while Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie are in possession of 3,750,000 acres of these lands without paying a single dollar. The hon. gentleman will find, I think, that the intelligence of this country is too great to laugh down any statement of that kind. What more, Sir? That would be the result,

to say nothing of the royalty. That would be a concession to these contractors, as against the miners who occupy an equal space in the country, of no less than \$62,500,000 a year. Suppose it amounted to only one-tenth of that, you still have a frightful exhibit, which I do not think will be regarded with amusement by the people who suffer from it. Well, Sir, what more? When you say to these poor men, who have perhaps mortgaged their farms, as many of them do, for the purpose of getting the outfit and the provisions necessary to last them a year, that, for every ounce of gold they take out of the bowels of the earth, after \$2,500 have been deducted, they must pay the Government of Canada 10 per cent, what do you think will be the feelings of every one of these men—and there will be a hundred thousand of them at no distant day? What do you think will be the attitude of these men, who find that rich contractors can get 3,750,000 acres of this land without paying a royalty of more than 1 per cent on all the gold they take out, with all the other enormous advantages they enjoy while the poor individual struggling miner is compelled to yield up to the Government 10 per cent of all the gold he takes out? As I have said before, suppose that, with all his industry and the industry of the people he is able to employ, he takes out, in the course of a year, \$22,500, what becomes of it? You deduct \$2,500 under your mining laws, and you make him pay you \$2,000 out of the remaining \$20,000; and every person knows—it is the history of gold-mining throughout the world—that every pound of gold extracted from the bowels of the earth has cost a pound to take it out.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). What will Mackenzie & Mann be getting, if it costs them a pound for every pound of gold they will get?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the men who have been engaged in wringing the gold from the bowels of the earth, and have spent their lives in the work, have not had the soft spot that Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie have. Of course, men have made gigantic fortunes in gold-mining—hundreds of thousands of pounds sterling in a comparatively short time; but other men have lost it. But take the average production of gold-mining throughout the world, and it will be found that it has cost practically a pound of expenditure for every pound of gold that is got out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to put this to the hon. gentleman. Suppose a poor miner, by his energy and industry, gets \$22,500 of gold in a year, and spends \$20,000 in doing it, the result is, that he has at the end of the year \$500, and the Government

has \$2,000, for his year's toil and difficulty. That is an illustration, and one that is germane to the subject under discussion. I put this in all seriousness to the hon. gentleman. I say, that a more damning evidence of injustice to the poor miners of this country cannot be left on the records of this country than to maintain a royalty of 10 per cent against individual miners, and to allow these contractors off at 1 per cent.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). That is the way to despoil the Americans, those people you think so much of. Three-fourths of the miners are Americans, and you get it out of them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not quite know what my hon. friend means. I dare say he thinks he does, but I do not. What I say is this, and I do not thank my hon. friend for endeavouring by interrupting me to change the current of my thought, when I am engaged fighting the battle of a class of men in this country who, almost above all others, are entitled to the respect and consideration of this House. Where is the Canadian, from one end of this great country to the other, more entitled to our sympathy and consideration than the man who leaves home and wife and children—everything that is dear to him—and goes out to that Yukon wilderness to struggle to better his condition. I say he is entitled to respect and consideration, and I say more. I say to the Government, in all seriousness, that a graver mistake they could not, in my judgment, make than endeavour to wring that ten per cent out of the individual miner, and I will tell you why. Sir, an act of injustice inflames the minds of everybody. And when these people learn that these contractors are only paying one per cent into the treasury of Canada while ten per cent is wrung out of their hard earnings, you will make of every miner that enters that country an enemy of the Canadian Government. These people will conspire to cheat and defraud the treasury, and they will feel that they are only doing justice to themselves when they adopt every means to prevent that flagrant wrong being done them, and the treasury of Canada will get less money at the end of the year out of this ten per cent than they would out of one per cent. In Nova Scotia the royalty is 2½ per cent, in Ontario I believe there is none, in British Columbia there is 1 per cent royalty on gold, and in the Yukon the Government propose to put on 10. I say that under the circumstances, to collect that revenue you will have to send out there a body of mounted police who will more than eat up all you will get out of these miners, and I trust, from the bottom of my heart that this matter will receive the attention from the Government which it deserves, and if this contract is to be forced through Parliament with all its injustice and extravagance, I trust that, at all events, this blot upon the transaction of charging the poor miner 10

per cent and these contractors only 1 per cent will be removed.

I do not intend to detain the House further than to say that while most anxious to see this all-Canadian route opened as promptly as possible and to see a course taken that will enable the development of this great gold field to proceed rapidly, while most anxious to witness the effects of that development of the trade and commerce of Canada, I believe the Government on this occasion have the opportunity, deeply interested as the American people are in this gold country—such as they never had before and probably never will again—of obtaining the revision of these unjust laws passed by the United States against Canadians, and I trust they will make use of that opportunity, and the result will be an entirely different condition of legislation in that great republic.

While feeling anxious to see an all-Canadian route open and while feeling that this was as near to an all-Canadian route as we could obtain this season, I hold the Government will be compelled to go a step further. I believe that, to get an all-Canadian route the Government must, directly or indirectly, on fair, honourable and just terms, secure the extension of the railway from Portland Channel or Observatory Inlet for 200 miles on to Telegraph Creek, and thus obtain from an ocean port in Canada an all-Canadian route that will be worthy of the name.

I thank hon. members for their indulgence. I had no idea of detaining them so long; but the question was of so grave importance, that I thought it would be an injustice to the House and to myself if I did not express my views.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. (Mr. Sifton.) Inasmuch as the administration of the Yukon district, of which so much has been said, has fallen largely to the charge of the department of which I am the head, it has been thought well that I should make some observations explanatory of the position of the Government and of the facts and circumstances leading up to the introduction of this Bill, although such explanation might possibly have come more properly, under other circumstances, from an older and more experienced member of the Government. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), who has just sat down, has been a long time in public life. He has told us a great many times, in the very short time I have been a member of the House, that he has been Minister of Railways and Canals, and that he has been High Commissioner. He has been at intervals Finance Minister and High Commissioner—in fact, we hardly knew, those who were not in the confidence of the Government, whether the hon. gentleman was inside or outside of the Government. Then he was for a very brief

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

and much regretted period Premier of Canada. And now he occupies the responsible position of leader of the Opposition—at least, Mr. Speaker, he is the titular leader of the Opposition; but after the address to which we have listened to-night, coupled with what we have heard and seen during the last month or so there remains a very serious and grave doubt as to whether he is the leader of the Opposition or whether, to use a vernacular expression, the tail wags the dog or the dog wags the tail. The hon. gentleman I hope will not take offence if I make use of an old adage, and suggest that I may be permitted to quote Philip sober against Philip drunk, and to indicate to the hon. gentleman that it requires a much more lucid and coherent explanation than he has favoured us with to-night to explain the radical change in the views he entertained in regard to the contract which is now before this House. The hon. gentleman has favoured us with several expressions of this kind since I have been in the House—that he had never in the course of his parliamentary experience seen such an exhibition as this, that or the other. Will he say if he ever, in the whole course of his parliamentary experience, saw an old and experienced leader of a party dragooned in the light of day by the fag end of his party into abandoning his position upon a public question? I do not want the hon. gentleman to take offence at what I say, for the expression is only used because it is an adage and I do not coin it myself—but we heard Philip drunk to-night and now I ask the members to listen to Philip sober. The hon. leader of the Opposition was Philip sober when he was interviewed, and when he expressed his opinion in the "Mail and Empire" of January 28th—I suppose that is the date, as the interview is dated the 27th January. The authenticity of this interview is vouched for by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), the gentleman who in the Conservative party fills the role of private detective and regulator of the party leader. It appears that Sir Charles Tupper was asked by the correspondent of the "Mail and Empire" to state his view regarding the arrangements the Government had made. This is what he said:

He stated that the route chosen is the best that could have been selected. "When I was in the west," he said, "I made inquiries, and I reached the conclusion that Canada ought at the earliest possible moment to have communication with the Yukon. I impressed it upon the British Columbia Government that it should co-operate with the Dominion Government to insure the construction of a link between the Stikine River and Teslin Lake. At Winnipeg I declared that the undertaking was a necessity, and when I returned to Ottawa I went immediately to Mr. Sifton. I impressed upon him the absolute necessity of opening up the route to secure Canadian trade. I said to him: 'You heard my arguments against Government construction on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. I am willing to

withdraw all that if you will go ahead and give that country a railroad. As a matter of principle, I am opposed to Government construction, but here is a case in which I quite concede the country ought to be prepared, if necessary, to build the road in order to secure an all-Canadian route and to secure the trade of the Yukon for Canada.' "

The hon. gentleman was willing to change his opinion in the course of twelve months. I have no doubt he thought then that that was a rapid change, but it is nothing to the change that has taken place since then. He is acquiring greater rapidity in changing his opinions as time goes on, and if he does not get better control of the hon. member for East York, I fear he will be obliged to change more rapidly still.

As to the arrangements made with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, Sir Charles Tupper said that they were men who had the capital, resources and energy to carry it out. They were probably the only men in Canada who could put the undertaking through in the time that it was specified.

The same hon. gentleman to-night stood up and held his hands up high and declared that this Government should have given to all the contractors in Canada an opportunity to tender for this work, and he demanded of the Minister of Railways and Canals and of the Government why it was that we did not give to every contractor in Canada such an opportunity. Yet he himself had declared on the 27th of last month that these contractors were the only ones who could do the work within the time. It is surely not necessary to follow in detail an address composed of criticisms of that kind. I will not weary the House by following the hon. gentleman's incoherent abuse of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, but I may be allowed to refer to a few of the eccentricities of his address. Now, Sir, he considers that the Government ought to have acted with more promptness. But so many of his followers—if he has any, if they can be considered his followers, but at any rate some hon. gentlemen on the other side—think we have gone too fast. But the leader of the Opposition thinks the Government ought to have acted more promptly. This interview is a very valuable document, and it is very desirable that it shall very fully and completely be embalmed in "Hansard" immediately after the speech of the hon. gentleman.

Sir Charles considers that the Government ought to have acted with more promptness. That much valuable time had been lost, and if his suggestions had been acted upon, the project would be in an advanced state by now.

Of course, we know that if the hon. gentleman's suggestions were acted upon in all cases there would be no blot upon the Administration, everything would be done exactly as it ought to be done.

The fact that a trail was to be put through in six weeks, so that the distance between the Stikine River and Teslin Lake may be covered in three days, is in his judgment of great importance. He thinks shelters should be erected at suitable places for the accommodation of the flood of traffic that will go in.

The contract provides for them.

The completion of the road by September is slower work than might have been done had the question been grappled with earlier. Still, it will be of the utmost importance to Canadian interests.

It is difficult to understand how we could have gotten the ice out of the Stikine River by making the contract earlier, but the hon. gentleman seems to think so, and I am giving his opinion.

Sir Charles gives the Government credit for acting with such vigour as it has shown, and asserts that the opening of the Canadian route was strongly urged by him upon both Governments interested as the proper course to pursue. He does not anticipate any trouble with the United States in transferring cargoes from the ocean boats to river boats at Wrangell.

Neither did my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, and yet the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) spent nearly an hour in abusing the Minister of Railways and Canals for using an expression almost precisely similar to that used by himself in this interview.

If, however, such should happen, Canada has Fort Simpson to fall back upon which will be equally serviceable.

That will be interesting in the light of the criticism the hon. gentleman has addressed to this House to-night on the subject of this contract.

The hon. gentleman, when he rose this afternoon, evidently addressed himself to the task of getting out of the difficulty he was in, of turning his back upon this question, and of explaining the extraordinary change of attitude. He evidently felt very much oppressed by that task. But I notice that he addressed himself much more cheerfully to it this evening. Possibly the idea had just occurred to him that he could draw a red herring across the trail by indulging in an hour's abuse of the Minister of Railways and Canals, an idea which, apparently had not occurred to him in the afternoon. So, as the main reason why he changed his attitude upon this question, he said, that further light had come to him. And, as one of the other great authorities which had changed its opinion on account of the new light that had come, he quotes that very reputable and well known paper the Montreal "Witness." At least, he quotes part of it. I suppose it would not be kind for me to refer to the fact that sometimes the hon. gentleman does not quote the whole of a document which he submits to this House. In this particular case he has not quoted the whole, or even

the material part, of the document which he was reading for the purpose of explaining the position he took before this House. Now let me read it :

The details of the bargain of the Mackenzie-Mann syndicate reveal objectionable features that do not appear in the information which came to light before the presentation of the contract to Parliament. It was not then known that the railway was to be a very narrow gauge one. It was not then realized, as it seems to be admitted, that the Stikine is not navigable for sea craft, and that bulk must be broken in American waters, and there are, as we have pointed out, possibilities connected with the parcelling of the land grant which are interesting to contemplate.

Will the hon. gentleman say that these were the reasons that caused him to change his opinion, and that the "Daily Witness," of Montreal, is in the same position as he is upon that question ?

An hon. MEMBER. Read on.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Well, we will read the balance of it :

We doubt, however, if a business man acting in his own interest would, even with all considerations fully before him, recall the bargain as a whole, if he could, much as he might wish he could alter many of its details. We doubt if any of the Government's critics would, were the case their own, recall the bargain.

The hon. gentleman quotes as a reason for changing his opinion, an article which approves of the contract, and states that it would not be recalled if it could be. Now let me—

Mr. DAVIN. Read all the article.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I trust that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) will not allow this debate to terminate without addressing the House on the subject, and he will have an opportunity of reading the article himself when he comes to speak. Another thing which the hon. gentleman did, and which I thought was somewhat beneath the dignity of a gentleman of his age, and position, and experience, was to make an attack upon my hon. friend the Minister of Railways which was totally unjustified by anything that was said by my hon. friend. He alleged, again and again, that the Minister of Railways had attacked the engineer of the Government, Mr. Jennings. Now, I listened to my hon. friend when he was speaking, and I think I know an attack when I hear it, and I think I can recognize whether a gentleman speaking of an engineer's report, is speaking in a hostile tone and attacking it ; and I assert most positively, and there is no man who listened to my hon. friend who will not assert with me, that there was nothing whatever in the words of the Minister of Railways to justify the statement that he made an attack upon the engineer's report, nothing whatever. Mr. Jennings made an estimate of the cost of a railway.

Mr. SIFTON.

If the hon. gentleman will read that estimate he will come to the same conclusion, in the light of his great railway experience of which we are so constantly reminded, as my hon. friend the Minister of Railways came to, as I come to, as anybody will come to who reads that report, and who endeavours to get any knowledge whatever of the actual cost of the work. He will come to the conclusion that that estimate was based on normal prices and normal conditions, and that abnormal prices and abnormal conditions such as will prevail in the execution of this contract, must be taken into account when the cost of the work which is going to be done by these contractors, is taken into consideration. That, it appears to me, is a fairly intelligible proposition, and it is a proposition which no intelligent man reading that report, can fail to grasp. That is the proposition which the Minister of Railways made this afternoon ; I make that proposition now, and I am not attacking Mr. Jennings, the engineer, who was employed by me for the purpose of making that report, and who has my complete confidence, and the complete confidence of every member of the Government. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to look at the report and see the prices that are figured on there, he will see that ordinary prices and ordinary cost of material are all that is figured on ; and extraordinary conditions, the extraordinary difficulties of getting freight up the Stikine River, the large number of special steamers that have to be purchased and employed by them for that purpose, all the difficulties that crowd upon contractors when they are forced to do their work --all these circumstances have to be taken into account ; and I am satisfied myself that one-half more at least than the price Mr. Jennings has placed there would not more than satisfy the increased cost that will be brought upon these contractors by reason of the extreme haste with which the work has to be pushed along. I have thought it necessary to mention that fact simply because of the unreasonable and, to my mind, the ridiculous attack that was made by the leader of the Opposition upon the Minister of Railways and Canals in connection with that phase of the question. Then my hon. friend spent a large portion of his time in endeavouring to play upon words, to attach a meaning to a casual sentence in my hon. friend's opening statement in connection with this Bill, that nobody had the slightest idea was intended to be conveyed by that sentence. There is no necessity for misrepresentation, there is no necessity for trying to twist things into what they do not mean, and what everybody knows they do not mean. We all know exactly what we knew last session about the Yukon country ; there is no dispute about it. If I recollect aright, the printed report was not brought

down before the House prorogued, but at the request of some hon. members I had some copies made of the most interesting portion of Mr. Ogilvie's report, and my hon. friend the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) particularly asked for a copy, and copies were given to him and given to others, and we know perfectly well what information was in our possession. We had the information of Mr. Ogilvie's report in which he says that there had been some extraordinarily rich finds of gold made, and that there was likely to be an influx of people. An influx of people would be understood by any intelligent man at that time, reading that report about a far-off and almost unknown district, a district that had attracted no attention whatever, a district that had not attracted the attention of the late Government sufficiently to induce them to provide the most ordinary facilities for the administration of law, until a change of Government took place, and this proper provision was made—I say that what any person would have understood by that, what I understood by it, what the hon. member for Lambton understood by it, what all the members who discussed the British Yukon Railway Bill understood by it, what the leader of the Opposition himself understood by it, was that there would probably be a few more hundreds of people going in, a few more hundreds of miners going into that district, than had gone in the previous year. This mining had been going on since 1886. In that year the Stewart River was prospected and worked, and ever since that time odd companies of miners have been working there. But will anybody in his senses undertake to say that when this Parliament prorogued we had any information whatever which led to the supposition that tens of thousands of people were going to the Klondike district last fall and the coming year? Why, nobody dreamed of such a thing. It is easy to be wise after the event, and if the hon. gentleman can prove events backwards, and hold people responsible for not knowing what is going to happen in the future, then he can hold his political opponents responsible for a great deal, and it would be a very convenient method of political argument. But I assert, Mr. Speaker, that there has not been one moment of delay in connection with any of the work devolving upon the Government of this country by the development of the Yukon district. I assert that the hon. gentleman can take the records of his party, he can look back over the history of the development of the great west, and he can find, time after time, when prompt action was required, no action was taken by the late Government, as a result of which they had two rebellions on their hands, and millions of dollars of the people's money were lost. Why, Sir, at the very earliest moment we could get any definite information, we acted; and I say no one in his sense would

have been justified in taking the opinion of Mr. Ogilvie—who for two years had been in the Yukon district and totally shut out of the civilized world—as to there being likely to be an influx of people into that country, to mean that there would be a general and an unprecedented rush to that country. No one respects Mr. Ogilvie more than I do, but he would be the last man to expect a Minister of the Crown, in charge of the department in which he was employed, to take a cursory statement of that kind as an intimation that people from the whole world would flow into the Yukon district. How could he know? He had no communication with the outside world. The only people to whom he could be referring would be the few miners in the immediate neighbourhood of the Yukon on the Alaskan side, whom he might expect to come over and stake claims on the rich creek which he had reported as having been discovered, and in respect to which he reported that a couple of men had taken out gold to the value of so many dollars to a single pan. The report was very short. I read it over several times and discussed it with several members of the House, and we were in doubt as to whether it was even likely at that time that the discoveries would amount to anything or not. Yet it has been urged to-day that a responsible Minister of the Crown should have come down to Parliament and recommended an expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars on such a statement. It is the craziest thing a man ever dreamed of, and the leader of the Opposition would have been the first man to have denounced me for making such a recommendation and asking an appropriation before I knew exactly the purpose for which it was required. Even after the district became known as a gold-bearing region—and it did not become so known until the arrival of the first steamboat from Alaska, bearing a large quantity of gold, the arrival of which created great excitement—nothing definite was before the Government as to the richness of the discoveries or as to the discoveries being so extensive as to warrant any large or exorbitant expenditure in connection with the Yukon district. But prior to that time, some steps had been taken. I did not leave the matter in the same shape as it was left by hon. gentlemen opposite, who year after year neglected, so far as I know, to even read the reports of the officers they sent into that country. Prior to that time, I had taken steps to send there a gold commissioner, instructed and authorized to transact the business that would arise in connection with mining claims, with two assistants, this force being deemed amply sufficient for the work so far as we had any idea of it at that time. As the excitement increased, we took such further steps as seemed to be necessary. We adopted measures to increase the number of the mounted police and to have them selected and all

necessary supplies forwarded as quickly as possible. But we did not realize, and I do not think the House will blame us for not realizing until the summer had nearly passed that there was going to be anything like the rush to that country which materialized last fall. We only saw what was going on around us, and what we could gather from our reading of the newspapers from day to day; and, not being desirous of taking steps of importance not justified by the facts, and not being desirous of making expenditures we could not justify, we only took the steps that were absolutely necessary at that time. Later on we found, on account of the totally unprecedented circumstances which had arisen, and which were likely to arise, we had to take further and much more extensive steps in connection with the protection and provisioning of that country, as to which I will take the liberty of giving some facts in a few moments. I have spoken only of this particular phase of the question for the purpose of showing that the hon. leader of the Opposition, in his utter desperation, in his desire to conceal from the House and the public the fact that he has been switched into line by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), has endeavoured to put a meaning on the words of the Minister of Railways which they do not bear, and to make an attack on the Government's position, in which they are impregnable and not open to attack. Then, the hon. gentleman proceeded to make an attack upon myself; and I do not know whether I like the hon. gentleman better when he attacks me or commends me, but, on the whole, I think I prefer the attack. My hon. friends around me are rather suspicious when the hon. gentleman commends me. The hon. gentleman said: "Why were steps not taken in regard to pushing forward this work when Mr. Jennings met the Minister of the Interior and came down with him on the "Quadra" from Wrangell to Vancouver. Will any man believe that Mr. Jennings did not communicate all the necessary information in regard to this route to the Minister of the Interior when they travelled together on the steamer?" Does any member believe that a Minister in his senses would take steps to have a railway constructed from Stikine River to Teslin Lake to get into the Yukon River by the Hootalinqua River, when he did not know whether that river was navigable or not? That, I presume, is the way in which the Minister of Railways, in the plenitude of his experience, would have proceeded.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Sir Charles Tupper), I mean. The hon. leader of the Opposition has given great attention to some parts of Mr. Jennings's report, and I recommend him to give

Mr. SIFTON.

some attention to some other portions. If the hon. gentleman will look at page 13, he will find a report dated January 6th, by Mr. Arthur St. Cyr. This report Mr. Jennings did not receive until a few days later, and I do not think I received Mr. Jennings's report until the 13th or 14th of the month. I could not have called for tenders for the construction of the work on Mr. Jennings's report because the report to which I have alluded, as necessary, was the report to be made by Mr. St. Cyr, who was sent by Mr. Jennings, under my special instructions, to ascertain whether Teslin Lake and Hootalinqua River were navigable or not. So, when we commenced our proceedings, we had an intelligent plan in our minds, and when we got our reports completed, we knew certain facts beyond a doubt, and that the route we selected was a route which would be a proper one for Parliament to adopt for the purpose of getting passengers and supplies into that country. We could not have known anything about it from Mr. Jennings's report, if there had been no report made as to the navigability of the waters below. This report was dated 6th January; it was sent to Mr. Jennings a day or two later, and it got into my hands about January 13th. The contract was signed on January 25th; and I think the House will agree with me, without any further discussion, that no additional answer whatever is required to the strictures of the hon. gentleman on the Government for not having proceeded with more speed. I do not know that it is necessary for me to make any more detailed reference to the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) except to say that among the principal reasons, or alleged reasons, which he gave this afternoon for his change of mind, was that another offer had been made to construct a line of railway from Pyramid Harbour by way of Chilkat Pass and Fort Selkirk, for 5,000 acres a mile. That alleged offer, that mythical offer, seems to have had an extremely disturbing effect upon the mind of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper). Well, it will probably have the effect of relieving the hon. gentleman's mind when I tell him that this alleged offer is a figment of the imagination of some of our newspaper friends, and that no such offer was ever made to this Government or to any member of the Government. Therefore, the comparison which has been made in the press, and to some extent in the House, between the project we are now discussing, and the offer alleged to have been made, is not at all in point, for as I have said no such offer was ever made. I desire to make that statement very clear, because in the most extraordinary way, a way that seem to me is not at all creditable to some of the newspapers which have taken it up, it was at once taken for granted that this offer had been made. When the Minister of Railways made his statement and noth-

ing was said about any such offer having been made, it might have at least been taken for granted that the Government ought to have been interrogated on the subject, and some definite information secured, before it was assumed that such an offer had been made and refused.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my hon. friend a question ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Railways when speaking stated definitely that other persons were conferred with, that other contractors, or companies, or corporations were mentioned ; several of them. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) is no doubt perfectly acquainted with all the steps in the negotiations. They appear to have been carried on by word of mouth, but at the same time I think he will agree that it is the right of the House to have a full explanation from him, as to all such parties who conferred, and what was the purport of their propositions, and what was the purport of the conferences that went on. It would be very gratifying to the House to have that knowledge.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is perfectly correct to say that there were verbal discussions, but it is not in any sense of the word correct to say that any offer was ever made to the Government for the construction of any railway on any of the routes mentioned, except what are described and set out in the papers laid on the Table this afternoon.

I would like to repeat that statement for the purpose of making it more definite if I can. I repeat that the papers which were laid on the Table this afternoon, contain all the offers of any kind whatever that were ever made to the Government in connection with the building of railways to the Yukon, so far as I am aware. I may say upon that point—not in material qualification of it, but simply for the purpose of avoiding even the slightest possible inaccuracy, that as the House will perfectly well understand, there were conferences and informal drafts of memoranda discussed between the Government and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann when the negotiations were going on ; but there was nothing even then in the shape of a formal offer and from time to time these drafts were amended and changed until eventually the contract was agreed upon between the Government and these gentlemen. The proposals that were submitted, were made in the terms set forth in the letters, of which copies were laid on the Table of the House this afternoon, and the House is therefore in possession of the fullest information on the whole subject.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words in regard—not to the railway project—but to some circumstances leading up to

an intelligent understanding of the subject with which the Government has had to deal. I said, and I repeat : that I do not think it can be laid to the charge of the Government that there was one moment's delay in connection with the administration of the affairs of the Yukon district that could possibly be avoided. Every step was taken just as promptly as it could be taken ; and it was taken under the very greatest difficulties and under the most disturbing and harassing circumstances. When it first became evident to the Government that special measures had to be taken in connection with this district, the House will understand that there was no officer in the Department of the Interior—with the exception possibly of Dr. Dawson who some years before had made a geological exploration trip through that district—there was no officer in the Department of the Interior available for the purpose of consultation who had a personal and accurate knowledge of that district. And, in the steps that were in the first instance taken and everything that was done until I met Mr. Ogilvie at Vancouver on the 1st of October, until that time, we had to depend upon the vaguest and most indefinite information. We had the survey, we had Mr. Ogilvie's report, but I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite, that as to information which would enable us to intelligently do the work which we had to do, these reports were not of very much assistance to us. For instance, we found it was absolutely impossible to find out definitely and positively at what time and at what period the lakes and the rivers in the lower part of the district were frozen. We found it was impossible to discover what the state of the Passes was likely to be at that time of the year, and all we could do was to send on our mounted police, let them take their supplies, send them over the Passes and let us know the result of their efforts. Reference was made by some hon. gentleman, whom I do not now remember, to the appointment of Major Walsh ; and with reference to that I may say that, although Major Walsh was appointed somewhere about the middle of August, he only accepted the post upon the express condition that he should not be asked to leave before the 15th of September. It is not a light thing for a man to accept a post involving the imminent risk of his life, involving the entire uprooting of all his business and social relations ; but Major Walsh loyally accepted the position which was tendered him by the Government. He has loyally done the work, done it in a manner beyond all praise, and for which this country will ever owe Major Walsh a debt of gratitude ; but he was justified in making the condition that he should not be asked to take his departure for the Yukon until the 15th of September. When the 15th of September came, we had reports to the mounted police officials here, showing that the officers who had con-

sented to go through the White Pass with their supplies had been struggling in that pass amidst the rain and the mud and all the frightful difficulties which accumulated around them there; and they had almost utterly failed to get the supplies necessary for them across that pass. All they could think of doing was to get twenty men through, with the supplies necessary to take them to Dawson City. The remainder of the men were stuck in the pass. The Government approved of the suggestion that I should go out with Major Walsh, and take such steps as were necessary to overcome the difficulties. I went with Major Walsh; no time was lost; and from that time to this, without cessation, Major Walsh and his men have been labouring under difficulties of which the members of this House can have no possible conception, for the purpose of provisioning and keeping up the posts in the task of saving the lives of the unfortunate men who are constantly going out. While my hon. friend treats this question with that jocularly which he can assume so well, and with that fierce abusiveness which he can assume equally well, but neither of which was particularly adapted to the discussion of such important public business, I think the Dominion of Canada can afford to look with some degree of pride at the fact that from the summit of the mountains, where the provisional boundary line is marked, to the 141st meridian, there is no starvation, and that there is just as good law and order as there is upon the streets of the city of Ottawa—that the word of an officer of the Canadian Government in that district is law, even if it is sent by letter by a dog-driver to a man a hundred or a hundred and fifty miles away. That has not been done without some self-sacrifice and some effort. I take no credit for it, but I claim credit for the men who have overcome difficulties that have not been overcome, so far as I am aware, by any other men connected with the administration of the affairs of the Government of Canada. I believe, Sir, that our American friends are in a state of total helplessness in regard to their territory. General Alger, the Secretary of War, being sick, and unable to come here for the purpose of getting information, the War Department expressed themselves as almost totally without the requisite information to deal with the question they had to deal with—because they had almost the same state of affairs in their territory that we had in ours. General Alger telegraphed asking me to go to Washington for the purpose of giving them information, because he was lying sick in bed. My hon. friend taunts me with wanting to go to Washington. I saw nothing wrong in going to Washington to give United States officers information which would enable them to extend relief to starving people of the United States, and I would be willing again to go to Washington for that purpose if I

Mr. SIFTON.

thought it possible to effect thereby the saving of even one life in that district. Even the American press, particularly on the Pacific Coast, not too friendly to ourselves or even to myself, because they credit me, not altogether wrongly, with making pretty strong efforts to assist our friends in Victoria and Vancouver, and incidentally and indirectly the merchants and manufacturers of Canada generally in getting their share—and their share ought to be the whole—of the Klondike trade; the newspapers published on the Puget Sound, at Tacoma, at Seattle and at other places in the United States, without a single exception, give the strongest testimony to the fact that our officers, from Major Walsh's camp down to the summit of the mountains, where for the present the Canadian jurisdiction ceases, have been indefatigable and most successful in preventing starvation; and up to this time, so far as my information goes, not one single man has died of starvation on that terrible route. Somebody the other night—I think it was the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace)—in a sarcastic tone, wanted to know why Major Walsh was camped far from Dawson City. In the name of common sense, what would he be doing at Dawson City? We have forty mounted policemen and a sufficient staff of officers there to do the work. Major Walsh is at the place where he was told to stay, attending to the business he was sent to attend to; and when in his good judgment every provision has been made there for the purpose of meeting emergencies, then, and not till then, he will go on to Dawson City to do the work which is intended to be done there. I would not like to be here to have to explain that Major Walsh and his men had gone on and locked themselves up at Dawson City, and left the people to get out as they could, and perhaps starve on the way. Major Walsh is doing the work he was sent to do, and he is doing it, as I said before, in a manner beyond all praise; and, Sir, it is a pleasure to me, in the heat of a political discussion to be able to say one word here in commendation of the efforts of a man who, not impelled thereto by any financial necessity or by any desire for emolument, has thus sacrificed his own peace of mind, his safety and his convenience for the sake of doing what he believed to be his duty to his country.

Perhaps I have said enough on that subject. I want now to say just a few words to indicate what my conclusion was upon the possibilities of that country. I will not burden the House very long with it. The report which Mr. Ogilvie has made, and which embraces the results of the more recent discoveries of that district, is now in the hands of the members. In case the members of the House have not all had opportunity to follow its pages through, I will take the liberty of reading a short ex-

tract from it which gives a fairly comprehensive résumé of what may be expected, and what opinion ought to be held in regard to the future possibilities of that district. I read this because I think it is well that we should try to get an intelligent idea of what this country is, and I read it particularly for the benefit of the members of the Opposition; because the discussions which some of them have given us upon the possibilities of that region and the ease with which gold mines may be found indicate that they not only have not read this report, but that they have never read any account of any gold-bearing country in the world; and even if the members on this side of the House find it a little tiresome, I will request our hon. friends on the other side of the House to give it attention. Mr. Ogilvie says:

With these facts before us we may confidently assert that we have here a region situated in the North-west Territories upwards of 300 miles in length and 500 or more miles wide along the southern boundary, for this zone extends south-eastwards into British Columbia, and we may reasonably assume westward to and across the 141st meridian, for some of the streams heading on and near it, discharging into the Pacific Ocean west of Mount St. Elias, yield gold on their lower stretches, and we may reasonably assume the upper parts are gold-bearing, too. Farther inland gold has been found on the upper waters of the Tanana, near the head waters of the Forty-mile, and in 1873 and 1874 Harper and Harte found some gold on the south branch of White River, in the vicinity of the boundary line, all of which is a justification for this assumption. Thus we may conclude with reason that all that portion of the North-west Territory westward from the easterly limit of the Yukon water system to the 141st meridian, will prove more or less gold-bearing.

The westerly boundary of this region—the 141st meridian, or international boundary—is upwards of 300 miles in length; the southern boundary—the 60th parallel of latitude—is about 500 miles long, and the north-east boundary, and irregular line from the 60th parallel to the 141st meridian, in latitude 65° approximately, is upwards of 600 miles long. These three lines bound an area of about 125,000 square miles, over which gold is scattered more or less profusely.

At many of the points mentioned it will pay well for working even under present conditions, and at many others it will pay well when we have such facilities as we expect to have during the next year for entering and developing that region. Attention may be directed to the fact that the whole of that vast district owes its now world-wide reputation to the richness of 140 claims in the Klondike division. One hundred of these are on Bonanza Creek, and about 40 on Eldorado. To use a mining term, many of those claims are "world-beaters," and if the indications now known are worth anything at all they are worth from sixty to seventy millions of dollars in those two creeks.

Taking this division as a whole, including the three creeks named, affluent to Indian Creek, a district some 35 miles in length and 25 or more miles in width, if the indications can be relied on, there are one hundred million dollars in sight in that area. No one can guarantee this amount, but the prospects so far developed point

to that sum pretty conclusively. This district is exceptionally rich.

I commend that to the attention of the hon. leader of the Opposition, who seems to think that these contractors will be able to walk in there and find these tracts lying around every mile or two.

Nothing has ever been found like it heretofore in that country, in fact, in very few countries has anything been found like it, and while we cannot confidently assert that other finds as valuable as it will be made, it is altogether improbable that gold is scattered over such a vast extent, and only rich at a point which is less than the 140th part of the total area.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Quite correct. The hon. gentlemen opposite, if they think they are easily found, will have the first chance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, they have not.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They can engage their prospectors and send them out there. There is nothing in this world to prevent these hon. gentlemen locating their claims right now, and they will have from now until the 15th of June to get their claims located before the railway company will have the privilege of making one location. I will talk to these hon. gentlemen about mining claims after a little while.

If we add to this part of the northern area of British Columbia, we increase it nearly two-fold, and the comparative area of the Klondike district is much lessened.

Thus says Mr. Ogilvie. Now, here is the opinion of a man who has been there for years, and who talks as a reasonable man should:

Taken all together, we have a vast field with fair prospects, as fair, it may be claimed, as any other equally extensive region in the world. The natural conditions are not as favourable as in many other parts, but time and enterprise will no doubt agreeably modify many of them, and the reward may be great.

That is a fair statement of the conclusion of Mr. Ogilvie and of the conclusion which anybody would come to who went into the matter carefully and endeavoured to collect the information that is now available.

Let me point out to the House now some of the difficulties of a territorial character under which the Government labour in dealing with this problem. I was somewhat surprised to hear the remarks which were made on this subject by the leader of the party which, we are told by the erudite and scholarly member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) so often, has the instinct of Government, whatever that may be, and which, he says, is possessed exclusively by hon. gentlemen on that side. One of the great proofs of that instinct, I should think, would be unanimity and loyalty. And when you see a party which displays so much har-

mony as that perfect accord which exists between the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) and his leader, and between another of its leading lights, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and his leader—when you find a party whose leading spirits are so intimate and perfectly united in brotherly love—when you find this perfect loyalty among them to one another, with no such thing, for instance, as setting a private detective on their leader's track to find out when he is interviewed by a newspaper reporter, you find a party undoubtedly possessed of the instinct of government. I do not pretend that this is altogether germane to the question; but the remarks of the hon. member for West Assiniboia about the instinct of government are really so amusing that it is difficult to refrain from adverting to them. I was somewhat surprised to find an hon. gentleman who leads the party that has this instinct of government to such an intense degree, proceeding to-night, in a manner which would not do credit to the most obscure stump-speaker that ever addressed a backwoods audience, to discuss, in the most unqualified terms, the most delicate international relations existing between the Government of this country and the Government of the United States. Why, I am astonished, Mr. Speaker, that an hon. gentleman who has been years in the public service of the country, does not seem to realize that speeches of that kind are calculated to lead to the direst calamities and difficulties between nations—speeches which inflame the public mind and the sentiments of people who do not know better, who do not know the responsibilities which rest upon members of the Government in difficulties of that kind. The United States Government are, upon the Pacific Coast, met with very great difficulties. They have a population there which is very much excited over the possibilities of the Klondike trade, and who, perhaps, are not too careful as to what the results may be from the measures which they are urging on their government. I should say, from the conversations I have had with members of the United States Government, that they realize the responsibilities that rest upon them as the government of a civilized country, and we, on our part, recognize the responsibilities that we are under as the Government of a civilized country, dealing with another civilized country in a civilized, decent and courteous way. So far as the Government of the United States is concerned, there has been no cause for complaint on the part of this Government with regard to the methods they have seen fit to adopt in connection with the affairs of this district. We have met with every courtesy at their hands, and, although they have difficulties—for political difficulties do not exist alone in our country—and cannot always do what they would like to do, I would venture to say, that the common sense of hon. members, not only on this side, but on the other

Mr. SIFTON.

side, will agree with me when I say that it was an act of the greatest possible friendliness on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to amend their regulations and provide such regulations at Dyea and Skagway as are calculated to facilitate and promote Canadian trade. I venture to say that this is one of the things which the Canadian people will remember, and which the dominant political party that represents our people will remember, with gratitude when discussing questions of this kind.

These regulations were changed, and our friends at the Coast now tell us that they are perfectly satisfactory with the additional arrangements that were made by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) for the purpose of more effectually carrying them out and more effectually promoting their object. In addition to that, our mounted police have gone through United States waters and through United States territory without question. Every facility that could be given has been given to us; and, while at present, there remains some business to be done in connection with the Stikine River and the navigation thereof—as to which I shall speak at a later period—I say that we have had up to the present time, so far as the United States Cabinet is concerned, the most fair and reasonable and courteous treatment. It would not be a proper thing for me as a member of this Government to listen to the blatant statements, made in this House to-night without making this statement in justice and fairness to the Government of the United States.

Now, it is easy for gentlemen, especially for hon. gentlemen who write letters to newspapers over signatures other than their own, to minimize difficulties. But let me explain to the House the difficult position we were placed in with regard to this territory. If hon. gentlemen will refer to the map, they will see that Dyea and Skagway, at the entrance to this Yukon district, are nearly a thousand miles from Vancouver. And we could not send in an officer, we could not send a rifle or a revolver or a single charge of ammunition or a pound of provisions without the leave of the United States. It would have been an act of war for us to send our people and our officials with their arms and ammunition without at least the tacit leave of the United States. It certainly would have been such if we had gone through their territory or their waters after we had been forbidden to do so. We were in the position of having to provide for a vast territory a thousand miles from the nearest of our cities, and we could not get into it without going through the waters or the territories of the United States. And our hon. friend who leads the party with the instinct of government would have had us wave the bloody shirt and say we would have nothing to do with these grasping Yankees. He would have found

that he did not own the territory in six months or so if he had followed that policy. His officers would have been starved to death. He would not have been able to assert his jurisdiction or to carry on the administration of the territory for six months. All that the authorities of the United States needed to do was to say they could not see their way clear to allow us to send troops or police through their territory, and we could not have complained much at that. We might say it was unkind or unfriendly, but that is all. And those who wished might have gone to the Yukon country, but we could not have got there to provide them with the benefits of government or to enforce any regulations. There would have been no trouble about mining regulations then. Whoever liked could have gone in; there would have been no law or order; the good name and the fair name of the Dominion of Canada would have been disgraced.

This was one of the difficulties we had to contend with; I say again that we have been treated, with regard to that point, with the utmost friendliness by the Government of the United States. I want my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) with whom I think I have had some communication, and who, I think, has probably been influenced to some extent by the natural excitement in regard to the questions of trade upon the Coast, to understand that, while there is the strongest possible feeling in the Pacific Coast towns in regard to this question of trade, we have had no cause of complaint against the United States Government, because of their dealings with us upon this question. As my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said in his remarks upon the Address, there was something to explain in regard to issuing the regulations at Dyea and Skagway which I had promised would be forthcoming in a short time. It is quite true there was a delay, which delay has not been very fully explained. I do not know that I have any particular right to demand an explanation from the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. When I was there he said that the regulations would be issued in such a way as to facilitate our trade in any reasonable way that we had a right to expect and that he thought he would be able to get them out in a short time. He was not able to get them out just as soon as he expected, but I have not felt that I was entitled to demand any explanation from him in connection with the matter. I did get a telegram from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to the effect that the delay was caused by the fact that he wished to consult the collector of customs in Alaska and get some information with regard to local matters which he thought he ought to understand before he issued the regulations.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Since the hon. gentleman has been good enough to refer to some remarks that I

made, I would like to ask him what I suggested in my remarks should be answered, and which is not altogether what he seems to think. The question I wish him to have explained is, why he sent a telegram on the 3rd of January to the effect that regulations had been decided upon between the United States Government and himself by which these odious exactions would be removed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They have been removed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But this telegram on the 3rd of January was not a promise but a positive assurance to the people of the Coast that these regulations had been amended and changed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Secretary of the Treasury did assure me that he would at once issue regulations which would have the effect of doing away with the necessity of paying these fees, and I so telegraphed to the Board of Trade of Victoria, and, I think, that of Vancouver. The regulations were to have been drafted and issued at once. I had no doubt, when I sent that telegram, that they would be drafted and issued in a day or two, but it was put off from time to time. But, as I said, I did not feel that I had the right to demand an explanation, because the Washington authorities have treated us most courteously, and I presume that the delay was because the Secretary of the Treasury wanted to consult the collector of customs of Alaska before he had them sent up. That was a reasonable explanation, and I do not feel that I was justified in complaining. But from time to time, I did communicate with Washington for the purpose of inducing the issue of the regulations as fast as possible.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With the permission of the hon. gentleman, I would like to ask him a question. I do not do it for a factious purpose. What I wished to reach was, if possible, a more definite explanation of that point. I never challenged the good faith of the hon. gentleman, but I did refer to the positive assurance which he made, undoubtedly on the assurance given to him at Washington on the 3rd of January. Then I asked an explanation, which I do not think the hon. gentleman has yet given, how it was that this positive assurance which he conveyed to the people of the Coast, was not observed. The hon. gentleman said the United States authorities observed the utmost good faith. I would venture to differ with him there. If his telegram was founded upon facts, they had given him a positive assurance that these exactions would be at once removed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the hon. gentleman is drawing it very fine. I think if he were a member of a government and a member of another government stated that he would do a cer-

tain thing, and, finding that, as a matter of prudence, it would be necessary for him to get a little more information from some of his officials, he did not do it for a few days after the time he said he would, he would not consider that it was a violation of his promise, that it was an act of bad faith. I think the explanation is perfectly clear. Now I was adverting to the enormous difficulties under which the Government laboured in dealing with this question, and I had just referred to the difficulty which arose from the fact that in order to get into the country we had to go through United States territory.

Mr. PRIOR. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Does he say that there is no other route by which he can get into the Yukon country than by going through American territory?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I said we could not get in by any other way at that time. When I make a statement of that kind I assume that the hon. gentleman would make the qualification which any person would make in the light of the ordinary knowledge of geography which everybody has. We can get across by way of Edmonton. I started a party of police that way before I went west myself, and they just got across the summit of the mountains the other day. We could have started a party by way of Ashcroft or Kamloops, and they might possibly get through with their lives. But for all practical purposes, and that was the sense in which I was making the statement, the only way that we could get in was by going through American territory. Mr. Speaker, I am not in the best of health, and not equal to continuing the debate further to-night; and as I have a number of other matters to refer to, I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 16th February, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) presented the report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House.

Mr. SIFTON.

The report was read as follows:—

No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Angers,	Lemieux,
Belcourt,	Lister,
Bennett,	McAllister,
Bergeron,	McCarthy,
Blair,	McCleary,
Borden (Halifax),	McClure,
Britton,	McInerney,
Bruneau,	McIsaac,
Cameron,	Madore,
Carroll,	Malouin,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Mills,
Casgrain,	Monet,
Choquette,	Monk,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Morrison,
Davin,	Mulock,
Fitzpatrick,	Powell,
Flint,	Quinn,
Fortin,	Russell,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Sifton,
Geoffrion,	Tisdale,
Haggart,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Ives,	Wood (Brockville)—46.
LaRivière,	
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	

No. 2.—ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Fitzpatrick,
Beausoleil,	Fortin,
Bell (Addington),	Hale,
Bennett,	Harwood,
Bourbonnais,	Hurley,
Carroll,	Legris,
Chauvin,	Logan,
Copp,	Meigs,
Cowan,	Roche,
Desmarais,	Rogers,
Dugas,	Seagram,
Earle,	Somerville,
Ethier,	Tyrwhitt—27.
Ferguson,	

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

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

Messieurs

Angers,	Ives,
Beattie,	Jameson,
Beausoleil,	Kaufbach,
Belth,	Kendry,
Belcourt,	Klock,
Bell (Pictou),	Kloepfer,
Bennett,	Landerkin,
Bergeron,	LaRivière,
Bernier,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bertram,	Lavergne,
Bethune,	Lemieux,
Blair,	Lewis,
Blanchard,	Lister,
Borden (Halifax),	Livingston,
Borden (King's),	Logan,
Bostock,	Macdonell,
Bourassa,	Mackie,
Britton,	MacLaren,
Broder,	Maclean,
Brodeur,	MacPherson,
Brown,	McAllister,
Bruneau,	McCarthy,
Burnett,	McCleary,
Calvert,	McCormick,
Cameron,	McDougall,
Campbell,	McGregor,

Cargill,
 Caron (Sir Adolphe),
 Carroll,
 Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
 Casey,
 Casgrain,
 Champagne,
 Charlton,
 Chauvin,
 Choquette,
 Christie,
 Clancy,
 Clarke,
 Cochrane,
 Corby,
 Costigan,
 Cowan,
 Craig,
 Davies (Sir Louis),
 Davin,
 Davis,
 Dechêne,
 Desmarais,
 Dobell,
 Domville,
 Douglas,
 Dugas,
 Dupont,
 Dymont,
 Edwards,
 Ellis,
 Erb,
 Featherston,
 Fielding,
 Fitzpatrick,
 Flint,
 Fortin,
 Foster,
 Fraser (Guysborough),
 Fraser (Lambton),
 Frost,
 Ganong,
 Gauvreau,
 Geoffrion,
 Gibson,
 Gillies,
 Godbout,
 Guay,
 Gullet,
 Guité,
 Haggart,
 Hale,
 Haley,
 Harwood,
 Henderson,
 Heyd,
 Hodgins,
 Hughes,
 Hurley,
 Hutchison,
 Ingram,

McHugh,
 McInerney,
 McInnes,
 McIsaac,
 McLennan (Glengarry),
 McLennan (Inverness),
 McMillan,
 McMullen,
 Madore,
 Malouin,
 Martin,
 Maxwell,
 Migneault,
 Mills,
 Monet,
 Monk,
 Montague,
 Morrison,
 Mulock,
 Oliver,
 Osler,
 Parmalee,
 Penny,
 Pettet,
 Pope,
 Poupore,
 Powell,
 Préfontaine,
 Prior,
 Proulx,
 Quinn,
 Ratz,
 Reid,
 Richardson,
 Robertson,
 Robinson,
 Roche,
 Rogers,
 Rosamond,
 Ross,
 Russell,
 Rutherford,
 Savard,
 Sriver,
 Sifton,
 Snetsinger,
 Sproule,
 Stenson,
 Sutherland,
 Talbot,
 Tarte,
 Tisdale,
 Tucker,
 Tupper (Sir Charles),
 Turcot,
 Tyrwhitt,
 Wallace,
 Wilson,
 Wood (Brockville),
 Wood (Hamilton)—173.

Calvert,
 Caron (Sir Adolphe),
 Carroll,
 Carscallen,
 Casey,
 Choquette,
 Cochrane,
 Corby,
 Cowan,
 Craig,
 Davies (Sir Louis),
 Davin,
 Desmarais,
 Dupont,
 Dymont,
 Earle,
 Edwards,
 Ellis,
 Ethier,
 Fitzpatrick,
 Fraser (Guysborough),
 Fraser (Lambton),
 Gauvreau,
 Gilmour,
 Graham,
 Gullet,
 Hodgins,
 Jameson,

Maclean,
 MacPherson,
 McAlister,
 McClure,
 McDougall,
 McHugh,
 Marcotte,
 Martin,
 Meigs,
 Migneault,
 Monet,
 Moore,
 Morin,
 Morrison,
 Mulock,
 Paterson,
 Penny,
 Perry,
 Prier,
 Proulx,
 Roddick,
 Rosamond,
 Russell,
 Savard,
 Sriver,
 Stenson,
 Tucker,
 Yeo—80.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Eleven Members.

No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Bain,
 Bazinet,
 Bourbonnais,
 Broder,
 Brodeur,
 Brown,
 Cargill,
 Copp,
 Davis,
 Douglas,
 Dupré,
 Earle,
 Erb,
 Ferguson,
 Fitzpatrick,
 Flint,
 Hodgins,
 Hughes,
 Hurley,
 Ingram,
 Joly de Lotbinière
 (Sir Henri),
 Kaulbach,
 Landerkin,
 Lang,
 Leduc,

Mackie,
 McGugan,
 McInerney,
 McInnes,
 McMillan,
 McNeill,
 Marcotte,
 Maxwell,
 Mills,
 Monk,
 Moore,
 Morin,
 Pettet,
 Quinn,
 Ratz,
 Rinfret,
 Roche,
 Ross,
 Sriver,
 Semple,
 Snetsinger,
 Stubbs,
 Tolmie,
 Wilson,
 Wood (Brockville)—50.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Bain,
 Beattie,
 Beith,
 Belcourt,
 Bell (Addington),
 Bell (Pictou),
 Bennett,
 Bethune,
 Bourbonnais,
 Broder,
 Brodeur,
 Burnett,
 Joly de Lotbinière
 (Sir Henri),
 Kaulbach,
 LaRivière,
 Lavergne,
 Leduc,
 Legris,
 Lemieux,
 Livingston,
 Logan,
 Macdonald (Huron),
 MacLaren,

No. 6.—ON PRINTING.

Messieurs

Bergeron,
 Bourassa,
 Charlton,
 Dupont,
 Ellis,
 Foster,
 Gibson,
 Hughes,
 Landerkin,
 LaRivière,
 Macdonald (Huron),
 Maclean,
 McMullen,
 Montague,
 Oliver,
 Parmalee,
 Perry,
 Préfontaine,
 Richardson,
 Somerville,
 Sutherland,
 Taylor,
 Tisdale—23.

No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Bergeron,	Lister,
Bertram,	Macdonald (Huron),
Blair,	Macdonell,
Borden (Halifax),	McCarthy,
Borden (King's),	McCleary,
Cameron,	McClure,
Campbell,	McGregor,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McInerney,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McIsaac,
Casgrain,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Champagne,	McMullen,
Clancy,	Madore,
Clarke,	Malouin,
Cochrane,	Mills,
Costigan,	Montague,
Cowan,	Morrison,
Craig,	Mulock,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Oliver,
Dobell,	Paterson,
Domville,	Powell,
Fielding,	Quinn,
Fitzpatrick,	Rinfret,
Flint,	Rosamond,
Foster,	Sifton,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Somerville,
Fraser (Lambton),	Sproule,
Frost,	Sutherland,
Ganong,	Tarte,
Geoffrion,	Taylor,
Gibson,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Gilmour,	Hibbert),
Haggart,	Wallace,
Hughes,	Wilson,
Jameson,	Wood (Brockville),
Landerkin,	Wood (Hamilton)—69.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Nine Members.

No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Angers,	Ives,
Bain,	Kaulbach,
Beattie,	Kendry,
Beausoleil,	Klock,
Beith,	Kloepfer,
Bell (Pictou),	Landerkin,
Bernier,	Lang,
Bertram,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Blair,	Legris,
Blanchard,	Lewis,
Borden (King's),	Lister,
Bostock,	Livingston,
Bourassa,	Logan,
Britton,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brown,	Macdonald (King's),
Bruneau,	Macdonell,
Calvert,	MacPherson,
Cameron,	McAlister,
Campbell,	McCarthy,
Cargill,	McCleary,
Carscallen,	McCormick,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McDougall,
Champagne,	McInnes,
Charlton,	McIsaac,
Chauvin,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Clarke,	McLennan (Inverness),
Cochrane,	McNeill,
Copp,	Madore,
Corby,	Malouin,
Costigan,	Marcotte,
Cowan,	Migneault,
Craig,	Morin,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Osler,

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Dechêne,	Paterson,
Dobell,	Penny,
Domville,	Perry,
Dugas,	Pettet,
Dupré,	Pope,
Earle,	Poupore,
Edwards,	Powell,
Ethier,	Préfontaine,
Featherston,	Pricr,
Fielding,	Reid,
Fortin,	Richardson,
Foster,	Robertson,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Rosamond,
Fraser (Lambton),	Ross,
Frost,	Russell,
Ganong,	Rutherford,
Gauthier,	Scriver,
Geoffrion,	Seagram,
Gibson,	Sproule,
Gillies,	Stubbs,
Godbout,	Sutherland,
Guay,	Talbot,
Guillet,	Tarte,
Guité,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Tisdale,
Hale,	Tolmie,
Haley,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Henderson,	Hibbert),
Heyd,	Wallace,
Hughes,	Wilson,
Hutchison,	Wood (Hamilton),
Ingram,	Yeo—129.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 9.—ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Bain,	Legris,
Bazinet,	Lewis,
Beith,	Macdonald (King's),
Bell (Addington),	Macdonell,
Bell (Pictou),	Mackie,
Bergeron,	MacLaren,
Bernier,	McCormick,
Blanchard,	McGregor,
Bostock,	McGugan,
Bourassa,	McHugh,
Bourbonnais,	McInnes,
Broder,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Burnett,	McLennan (Inverness),
Calvert,	McMillan,
Campbell,	McMullen,
Cargill,	McNeill,
Carscallen,	Marcotte,
Casey,	Casey,
Christie,	Martin,
Clancy,	Maxwell,
Cochrane,	Meigs,
Davin,	Montague,
Dechêne,	Moore,
Douglas,	Morin,
Dupont,	Morrison,
Dupré,	Mulock,
Dyment,	Oliver,
Edwards,	Parmalee,
Erb,	Pettet,
Featherston,	Pope,
Ferguson,	Poupore,
Fisher,	Proulx,
Frost,	Ratz,
Gauthier,	Reid,
Gibson,	Richardson,
Gilmour,	Rinfret,
	Robinson,
	Roche,

Godbout,
Graham,
Guay,
Guillet,
Guité,
Haley,
Harwood,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hurley,
Hutchison,
Ingram,
Joly de Lotbinière
(Sir Henri),
Lang,
LaRivière,
LeDuc,

Roddick,
Rogers,
Rosamond,
Rutherford,
Seagram,
Semple,
Sproule,
Stenson,
Stubbs,
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Taylor,
Tolmie,
Tucker,
Turcot,
Tyrwhitt,
Wilson,
Yeo—108.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Fourteen Members.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the said report be concurred in.
Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That a Message be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz. :— Messieurs Bergeron, Bouassa, Charlton, Dupont, Ellis, Foster, Gibson, Hughes, Landerkin, LaRivière, Macdonald (Huron), Maclean, McMullen, Montague, Oliver, Parmalee, Prefontaine, Richardson, Somerville, Sutherland, Taylor, and Tisdale will act as members on the part of this House on said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MAXWELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 20) further to amend the Chinese Immigration Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. MAXWELL. Mr. Speaker, the explanation will be very short. The Bill is simply to raise the per capita tax from \$50 to \$500.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPERIOR COURT AT MAGDALEN ISLANDS.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked,

1. Has the hon. Minister of Justice been informed that the autumn term of the Superior Court was not held in 1897, at the Magdalen Islands ?

2. If so, what cause prevented the holding of the said term ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I understand that we have received no such information.

MONTREAL CIRCUIT COURT.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked,

1. Is it the intention of the Government to appoint at an early day a third judge of the Circuit Court at Montreal ?

2. Have the Government been informed of the number of writs issued and cases heard and decided by that court during the year 1897 ?

3. If so, what is the number ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This subject is now engaging the attention of the Government, and a solution will be given during the present session.

THE ELEVATOR MONOPOLY.

Mr. RUTHERFORD asked.

Whether the Government has taken, or is about to take, action to assist the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west in abolishing what is known as the elevator monopoly ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Government are fully alive to the importance of the subject which is raised in this question. It is now engaging their attention, but they have not yet reached a conclusion.

WYEBRIDGE-WYEVALE POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. BENNETT (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

Who is the present mail carrier between Wyebriidge and Wyevale ? When does the contract of present carrier expire, and for what length of time was his contract ? Was such contract given on public competition, after tenders being duly advertised ? Has the present contractor been notified that his contract will be cancelled before its expiry ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). William Edwards is the contractor operating the service mentioned, the contract being for four years, expiring on the 31st of December, 1899. It was awarded after public competition. The contract contains a clause enabling the Government to cancel it on three months' notice, and notice of the cancellation has been given in order to permit the Government to give a daily mail service to certain points, namely, Vasey and Elliot's Corners, instead of a tri-weekly service, which they now have.

POSTMASTERSHIP OF WAVERLY, ONT.

Mr. BENNETT (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

Has John Bannister been removed as postmaster of Waverly post office, Ont. ? Were there any complaints against the said Bannister ; if so, were such complaints in writing ? If the said Bannister was removed from the said office,

was an inquiry made into his conduct as postmaster, and if so, was any report submitted to the department in writing, and if so, by whom ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). Mr. Bannister has been removed from the postmastership of Waverly, Ont. It was reported to the department in October last that Mr. Bannister had not given personal supervision to his office for nearly three years, but had left the management of it to his assistant. It was further stated that Mr. Bannister was not competent to discharge the duties of the office, which was and is a money order and savings bank office, satisfactorily. The report in question was made in writing by the post office inspector, who was personally cognizant of the facts.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS—SWEATING.

Mr. **CLARKE** (by Mr. Davin) asked,

1. In what contracts that have been awarded by the Government is there a clause prohibiting "sweating" ?
2. What is the amount of such contract ?
3. To whom have such contracts been awarded ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). In reply to the first question, I beg to say that in the contracts for the supply of clothing for the militia there is a clause prohibiting sweating. In reply to the second, the contractors are: L. H. Boisseau, Montreal, \$29,601.50; Marsolais & Monday, \$11,035. These two contracts are for the supply of militia clothing. There are two other contractors in the Post Office Department—Willis & Co. and the Ottawa Supply Co.—for the supply of mail bags for a term of four years, but the amount is not ascertainable, depending entirely on the quantity that the Government may order during the four years.

FIRST REGIMENT ILLINOIS NATIONAL GUARDS.

Mr. **CLARKE** asked,

Has the Government been asked to give permission to the First Regiment Illinois National Guards to visit Canada during the summer of 1898, bringing their arms with them? And if so, has the permission been given ?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA** (Mr. Borden). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: The First Regiment of Infantry of the Illinois National Guards applied through the United States Secretary of State for permission to visit Canada, bearing arms, in July next, and by an Order in Council of the 24th December last, such permission was granted.

Mr. **BENNETT**.

CUSTOMS DUES AND OFFICIALS AT ST. HYACINTHE.

Mr. **MONK** asked,

1. What were the total receipts from customs dues at the port of entry of St. Hyacinthe, from 1st of July, 1896, to 1st of July, 1897 ?
2. How many customs officials were employed at said port of entry on 30th June, 1897 ?
3. How many officials have since been added at said port, and at what salary ?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). I beg to give the hon. gentleman the following information asked for:—1. \$48,157.47. 2. Two. 3. None.

THE FAST LINE NEGOTIATIONS.

Mr. **IVES** (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

1. What is the present state of the negotiations between the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Petersens, respecting the fast line ?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to give the proposed contractors further time to sign a contract, and what further time? How often has the time been extended already ?
3. Is there any definite date now fixed within which time the contract must be signed, and if so, what is the date fixed ?
4. What amount of money has been deposited by the Petersens with the Government in connection with this matter and under what circumstances, terms and conditions? Is this money liable to be forfeited to the Government, and under what circumstances ?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to say: 1. There are no negotiations going on at present between the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Petersens respecting the "fast line." 2. It is not the intention of the Government to give the contractors further time to sign a contract, nor has the time been extended already—in fact, the contract was signed on the 22nd day of March, 1897, and full copy of the text thereof was published in the "Return and Proceedings of the House of Commons" every day from 31st day of May until the 14th day of June, 1897, and in the Votes and Proceedings of the 14th and 15th days of June, 1897. 3. Is answered by the preceding. 4. The amount of money deposited by the Petersens with the Government was £10,000, with a guarantee to the satisfaction of the Minister for a further sum of £10,000, as per terms of section 13 of the contract in question. Section 14 of the contract provides for the forfeiture of the amount deposited and of the guarantee in the event of the contractors making default.

DUTIABLE IMPORTS.

Mr. **FOSTER** asked,

What was the value of the dutiable imports into Canada from 1st July to 31st December,

1897, and the amount of duty collected thereon, and similarly for the like period of 1896 ?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). The total value of dutiable goods entered for consumption and the duty collected thereon, during the six months from 1st July to 31st December in the years 1896 and 1897, is as follows:—

Year.	Entered for Consumption.	Duty Collected thereon.
1896	\$31,989,671	\$ 9,683,691 71
1897	35,045,087	10,365,682 35

FISHING LICENSES.

Mr. **INGRAM** asked,

What amount did the fishermen pay for a license to fish pound-nets in the waters of Lake Erie, situated opposite the counties of Essex, Kent and Elgin, for the year 1897 ?

What amount do the Government propose to charge this year for licenses to fish in the same waters ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). The amount paid by the fishermen in the waters of these lakes opposite those counties was the usual amount paid, with the exception of the small piece of coast lying between Point Pelee and the entrance to the Detroit River, where, under special circumstances reported on by the Inspector of Fisheries for Ontario, exception was made last year and the amount for that year reduced one-half. Hon. members for the Counties of North and South Essex, Kent and Elgin waited upon me the first day this session met, and made strong representations in favour of a reduction or equalization of rates being made all along the waters of Lake Erie. I took a note of their representations and handed the same to the Commissioner of Fisheries, Mr. Prince, and as soon as I receive his report I shall be able to state exactly what will be done in the coming year.

IMMIGRATION TO THE YUKON.

Mr. **McINNES** asked,

Is it true that Major Walsh, Commissioner in the Yukon district, has issued instructions to the officers under him not to allow any one to enter the said district unless he has with him 1,000 pounds of provisions ?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to say that although not definitely advised by Major Walsh, the Government have reason to believe that he issued an order requiring all persons entering the Yukon district to carry with them provisions for not less than six months. To avoid misunderstanding, the police stationed on the frontier were instructed, in the early part of this month, that they could do no more than advise people not to proceed to

the interior with less than six months supplies; that there was no authority under which force could be employed.

INTERCOLONIAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. **CASGRAIN** asked,

1. Have any reductions been made in the salaries of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway, passenger and freight department, since A. H. Harris was appointed general traffic manager ?

2. What are the names of such employees ?

3. What were their salaries before such reductions ?

4. What are their salaries now ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to say: 1. Yes, reductions have been made in the salaries of three of the employees of the passenger and freight departments since Mr. Harris was appointed general traffic manager. 2. The names of these three employees are N. Weatherston, P. O'Rourke and D. R. McDonald. 3. Before such reductions took place Mr. Weatherston, freight and passenger agent at Toronto received \$104.16 a month; Mr. O'Rourke, travelling passenger agent, was paid at the rate of \$65 a month, and Mr. McDonald, city agent at Quebec, received \$91.66 a month. 4. Their salaries now are as follows:—Mr. Weatherston as travelling agent is paid \$75 a month, Mr. O'Rourke as city ticket agent receives \$50 a month, and Mr. McDonald as ticket agent, Quebec, is paid at the rate of \$50 a month.

POSTMASTER AT COBOURG.

Mr. **GUILLET** asked,

1. Is the Government aware that the postmaster of Cobourg attended and occupied a seat on the platform of the Reform Convention of West Northumberland, held on the 29th January ultimo, which was called to choose a candidate to contest that riding in the present Ontario elections, and that he canvassed on behalf of one of the candidates and cast a ballot on that occasion ?

2. Is the Government aware that he since attended a committee meeting at Bewdley, county of Northumberland, in the interest of the Reform candidate chosen by said convention ?

3. Does the Government propose to make an impartial investigation into this conduct of the postmaster of Cobourg ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). The Government is not aware of the postmaster at Cobourg having attended either of the meetings referred to in the question.

QUESTION DROPPED.

On the question,

Has the Hon. J. Israel Tarte, a member of the Government, any knowledge of a reply being made to the document addressed to the Holy

Father and signed by the said Hon. J. Israel Tarte and forty-four Senators and members of the House of Commons and was read by the hon. Minister of Public Works on the 30th March, 1897? If so, what is the nature of the reply? If not, does the hon. Minister of Public Works expect an answer? If not, why not?—(Mr. McDougall.

Mr. SPEAKER. This question is scarcely a proper question to put to the House, because it does not relate in any way to the business of the House or the business of the Government. Therefore, I think it should not be put.

Question dropped.

HAWAIIAN VESSELS.

Mr. DOMVILLE asked,

Whether there is any existing treaty under which vessels owned or registered in the kingdom of Hawaii have full navigation in Canadian waters, and would be liable to duty on hull or machinery?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). There is no treaty with Hawaii under which vessels of that country are entitled to coasting privileges in Canadian waters. Such vessels would only be liable to duty on hull and machinery on application for Canadian registry.

DISMISSAL OF MR. RORY McNEIL.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked,

1. Why was Mr. Rory McNeil, section foreman at West Bay Road, dismissed from the service of the Cape Breton division of the Intercolonial Railway?

2. Was his dismissal asked for by anybody; if so, by whom?

3. Was there any charge against him; if so, by whom, and was there any investigation?

4. Who was put in his place, and was he in the railway service before?

5. By whom recommended?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Mr. Rory McNeil, section foreman, West Bay Road, was dismissed from the service of the railway on the ground of offensive partisanship. 2. His dismissal was asked for by Dr. McLennan, M.P. 3. A charge of offensive political partisanship was made against McNeil by Dr. A. McLennan, M.P. No investigation was made. 4. D. C. McDonald, trackman at McIntyre's Lake, who has been in the service of the railway since 1891, was put in McNeil's place. 5. D. C. McDonald was recommended for employment by Dr. Cameron in 1891.

HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION.

Mr. ROCHE asked,

1. Has the Government come to any decision on the basis of the report submitted by the commander of the late Hudson Bay expedition,

Mr. MULOCK.

as to the practicability of that route as a commercial enterprise?

2. If so, what is the decision?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The report of the commissioner of the late Hudson Bay expedition was prepared some time ago, and is now being printed. I hope to have it in a short time to place in the hands of hon. members. The importance of the decision referred to in the question is so important as to require a good deal of consideration. I do not think that any hasty conclusion should be reached. But, at the earliest possible moment after the report is in the hands of the members and the Government have had an opportunity to consider it, a conclusion will be reached.

TRANSLATION OF MR. OGILVIE'S OFFICIAL GUIDE.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Government whether they intend to have Mr. Ogilvie's work on the gold-bearing lands of the Klondike and the Yukon, entitled "The Klondike Official Guide" translated immediately into French, so as to have it ready for distribution at the earliest possible moment among the French-speaking population of this country?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation.) It is the intention of the Government to have Mr. Ogilvie's work translated into French and published at the earliest possible moment, and I hope this work will, before long, be completed.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask a question on that point. Members receive a great many requests, I dare say, for the important information gained by Mr. Ogilvie during his many years in the Yukon. Now, when such an application is made to a member, I suppose all he has to do is to put his hand in his pocket and pay Mr. Rose 50 cents for the book and send the book to the applicant. Or is the Government going to give the public any results for the payment of the public money with reference to that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The Government will have 10,000 copies of this pamphlet for free distribution. The Government think that this is a reasonable number to be provided for free distribution, and, if additional copies are required, it is reasonable that parties asking for them should buy them.

Mr. FOSTER. How is the distribution to be made?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A certain number will be given to each member in a few days.

An hon. MEMBER. How many?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR
A considerable number; I cannot say exactly how many at present.

KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS—
GANANOQUE DRILL SHED.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a few remarks with reference to questions I had on the paper, which were asked and answered during my absence on Monday. If necessary, I will conclude with a motion in order to put myself right. The first question I asked was as follows:—

Has an order been given by the Department of Railways and Canals, or Public Works, to the Kingston Locomotive Works, for locomotives, and if so, at what prices are those to be supplied?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not quite understand what question the hon. gentleman is raising. As I understand him, it was with reference to a question which was answered the other day. Does the hon. gentleman propose to move the adjournment of the House on an important question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I explained, Mr. Speaker, that I was ready, if necessary, to put my remarks in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I merely wished to know.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I understand that the hon. gentleman wants to move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss a question put by him the other day with reference to the drill shed at Gananoque.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is it, then?

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to make a few observations with respect to a reply given by the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Militia to questions put in my name, which answers are not satisfactory, are not really answers to my questions, and I want to draw the attention of the Ministers to them.

The PRIME MINISTER. In so far, at all events, as the questions refer to the drill shed at Gananoque, which were answered by the Minister of Militia, I submit that the hon. gentleman is not in order, because he has given notice of motion, which appears on the paper as follows:—

Order of the House for copies of all correspondence between the mayor and corporation of Gananoque, or any other person, with the Government in reference to the removal of the drill shed at Gananoque. Also, all correspondence in reference to the sale or purchase of a new site. Also, all offers made by the president of the Agricultural Society of Gananoque, or any other person, offering to rent or sell a suitable building in which to store the arms and clothing; and also, all other correspondence with the Government dealing with this question.

This is the same subject that he proposes to make his remarks about, I understand, and it is not competent for him to move the adjournment of the House to discuss that question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot, as the leader of the House points out, anticipate a question on the Order paper placed there by himself on a motion to adjourn. If there is another point which is not covered by a motion on the paper, a point of public importance, the hon. gentleman is in order to proceed as he proposes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I purpose, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the questions respecting the Kingston Locomotive Works. If in doing so, I put myself out of order, I hope you will draw my attention to it, and I will gladly resume my seat. I was reading the questions I had asked and had reached that part lettered "B"; the questions proceed as follows:—

(b.) Were tenders asked for from the Kingston Locomotive Works and other firms as to these locomotives?

(c.) To what parties have letters or telegrams been sent, announcing that such contract had been given to the Kingston Locomotive Works?

(d.) Has any member of the Government sent any such telegrams or letters to either Hon. Mr. Harty or the president of the Liberal Association at Kingston, and if so, at what date?

(e.) Was the purchase of such locomotive authorized by an Order in Council, and if so, what is the date of such Order in Council?

The answer I received was as follows:—

No order has yet been given by the Department of Railways and Canals to the Kingston Locomotive Works for locomotives. (b.) Tenders have not been recently asked from the Kingston Locomotive Works or other firms. It is the intention, however, of the department, as soon as specifications and plans for a new locomotive have been completed, to open negotiations with the Kingston Works on the subject of the building of some locomotives for the Intercolonial Railway, as the department desires and intends, so far as practicable, to give to a Canadian firm the preference in the manufacture of the locomotives which the Government may require. (c.) No such letter or telegram has been sent as is referred to in this sub-question. (d.) No such telegrams or letters have been sent by any member of the Government as is referred to in this sub-question. (e.) No purchase of locomotives has been authorized by Order in Council.

Now, if the hon. Minister will read the speech made by Mr. Harty, a member of the provincial government, which appears in that gentleman's newspaper organ at Kingston, the "Whig," on Tuesday, February 1st, he will read the following:

I think the workingmen have some knowledge of the interest I have taken in them for a number of years. I have never lost sight of the desirability of aiding the workingmen. Mayor Livingston suggested to me the manufacture of locomotives for the Intercolonial Railway, and that we do something to get the contract for Kingston. I wrote Mr. Blair (Minister of Rail-

ways and Canals), and have just received a telegram to-day. He says he intends giving Kingston Works the opportunity to build three locomotives for that railway, the specifications of which will be sent at once. My desire is to give home manufacturers the first preference, and I am glad the work is coming here.

I wrote Mr. Blair, the Minister of Railways and Canals, and have just received a telegram to-day.

He quotes the telegram here, word for word.

He says he intends giving the Kingston works an opportunity to build their locomotives for the railway, and the specifications of which will be sent down.

Then Mr. Harty adds :

My desire is to give home manufacturers the first preference, and I am glad the work is coming here.

Now, the same paper commenting on it editorially, says :

The assurance with which Mr. Harty closes his speech, given on the authority of the Minister of Railways, that an order had been given for locomotives to be built here, was a fitting termination to a speech that was encouraging throughout.

The "Globe" of the same date, 1st February, says, in reporting Mr. Harty's speech :

Before sitting down he read a telegram from the Hon. Mr. Blair announcing that the Kingston Locomotive Works had received an order to construct three locomotives for the Intercolonial Railway, an announcement that was greeted with great applause.

Now I will just leave it between the hon. Minister of Public Works of Ontario and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals here, as to which answer was correct, the one he gave me the other day, or the statement made and the telegram read by the Hon. Mr. Harty on the first instant. I hope the work is coming to Kingston. I am sorry the contract is not let, and I hope the Minister will do as he agreed in that telegram that he sent in reply to me, in which he says that the specifications would go forward in a few days. I hope he will carry that out. Now in reference to the question the Prime Minister raised in answering the motion on the Order paper for papers, there is a statement made in the answer given to me that will not appear in the papers, but which is personal to myself, and I want to make a personal explanation. The question No. J on the paper reads as follows :—

Was the said C. E. Britton the defeated candidate for the House of Commons for the general elections of 1882 and 1887? Was the said J. B. Turner the defeated candidate for the House of Commons in the general election of 1891?

The Minister in reply to that question, says :

I have not inquired.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Now I think there are returns made to Parliament of all the general elections. He has the information, and I think, to treat me civilly, he should have turned up the Government returns and said, I find in the returns made to the Government the names of the gentlemen.

An hon. MEMBER. Did you know?

Mr. TAYLOR. I did know, but I wanted him to know, and I think the Minister should have answered the question respectfully. Further down he makes a personal reference to myself which I think is uncalled for, because the question was not on the paper at all. He says :

In view of said Taylor's presumably intimate knowledge of the matter, I respectfully refer the hon. member for South Leeds to the said George Taylor as to what information has been in his possession.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Order. The hon. gentleman is there speaking of the Gananoque question.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is that a question of which the hon. gentleman has given notice?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; this is a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will be good enough not to confuse a personal explanation with his discussion on a motion. If it is a strictly personal explanation it must be done in a very few words. But he must not, in doing so, discuss in any way the subject of the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not discussing it, because the motion on the paper does not cover it, and this is a question that was not on the paper. The Minister went far out of his way to make an insinuation.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order. The hon. gentleman is now commenting upon an answer made to this question by the Minister of Militia and Defence, and that portion of the ground is covered by his motion, of which he has given notice.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not remember seeing the notice. Is it on the paper?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not on the paper.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is on the Votes and Proceedings of this day.

Mr. SPEAKER. The notice that the hon. gentleman has put upon the paper seems only to cover correspondence and offers.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is all.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must be careful not to refer to any correspondence or any offer, but confine himself strictly to matters outside. I think the House would be disposed to allow him to

make a personal explanation, but without making any personal reflections himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. I purpose keeping strictly within the rules of the House. The notice on the paper calls for correspondence and has no reference to the subject I am now discussing. The answer the Minister gave me referred to something that was not in the question, neither is it in my motion calling for papers. He said :

In view of the said Taylor's presumably intimate knowledge of the matter, I respectfully refer the hon. member for South Leeds to the said George Taylor for information as to what disposition Mr. J. B. Turner may have made of the purchase money received by him.

I claim, Mr. Speaker, that there is an insinuation here made by the Minister of Militia that Mr. Turner sold his property at a price to some person, and he refers to me as if I got a commission on it. Now if he insinuates by that reference to me that I received any commission, or that any person that I know, has received any, he states something that is unfounded. I have been in this House for some fifteen years, the records of the late Government are in the hands of the hon. gentleman, and I ask for the papers for the purpose of getting the correspondence brought down to this House. They can bring down everything they have got, and they will find no reference—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not refer to correspondence.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not referring to correspondence, but I am asking the Government to bring down all the papers they have in their possession, including communications from me to the late Government, and they will find that not a cent of the Government's money ever came from any contractor or anybody else into my hands. The Minister makes an insinuation here that I participated in the sale. He read a letter here. I ask for the correspondence. This will come down. I may just say that in the letter of Mr. Turner that he read here, and that was uncalled for, there is not the shadow of a truth, for I never recommended to the late Government or anybody else that this lot be sold for \$6,000.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is the hon. gentleman's motion

Mr. TAYLOR. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) was on his feet to address the House when we declared the motion carried. I also wish to make a few remarks on this very same question.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman from Kingston was really on his feet without my seeing him, of course I could not de-

clare the motion carried. Was the hon. member on his feet when I declared the motion carried ?

Mr. BRITTON. I was, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to say a word or two in reference to this question, and to the answer that was given to the question in reference to locomotives to be made at Kingston, if there are any such. I think the answer agrees with my recollection of what took place at that meeting. There was no pretense whatever at that meeting, nor was there any statement of the tenor of the telegram to the effect that a contract had been given, but there was the statement that an opportunity would be given to the Kingston Locomotive Works to tender, or to offer for this work. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to go back a little on that question. This question of giving work to the Kingston Locomotive Works has never been, to the slightest extent, a political question, so far. As far back as the early part of last session, it was understood that the Government were about to get one or more locomotives from an American locomotive factory. I then interrogated the Minister of Railways on the subject, and wanted to know why, if locomotives were to be purchased for the Intercolonial Railway, they could not be manufactured and purchased in Canada on as favourable terms and containing as good work as locomotives obtained from the United States. The hon. Minister told me that possibly a locomotive from American works could be got cheaper than one in Canada, if they took into consideration that duty was not paid, but the Government would be willing to purchase Canadian locomotives so long as they were equally good and as cheap as locomotives purchased in the United States. I think that was a fair answer. I then wanted to know if an opportunity would be given to manufacturers of locomotives at Kingston to compete. The Minister replied : Certainly, whenever locomotives were required for the Intercolonial when the specifications were ready, and they were then being prepared, an opportunity would be given to the Kingston factory to compete for the work. The question on further discussion seemed to resolve itself into this, that possibly locomotives could be obtained cheaper in the United States than from Canadian locomotive works if the duty was not taken into consideration. The argument was advanced as between Canadian and American establishments, that the Dominion Government should not for one moment consider this question of duty, but act in such a manner as, if possible, to give the work to the Kingston establishment. I may say that my interest is wholly the interest of Kingston and Canadian manufacturers ; my object has nothing political in it, and those interested in the Kingston works are opposed to me politically ; but I preferred to promote the interests of Canadian manu-

facturers, and Kingston manufacturers particularly, to any question of politics whatever. In order therefore to impress upon the Minister of Railways the views held by myself and others that the question of duty should be considered, a deputation came here from Kingston and saw the Minister of Railways, and the hon. gentleman then said substantially what is stated in his telegram, and has always stood by that view, that so soon as the specifications were ready, if the Kingston establishment was able to do as good work as could be done in the United States establishments, it would have the opportunity to tender, and would have the preference. That was all that could be done. But there was delay in furnishing the specifications, and only comparatively recently have those specifications been received. The gentleman at Kingston became impatient, and the mayor, as representing the city, took the matter in hand, and inquired when the work would be given out. Let hon. members bear in mind that Mr. Harty was formerly the managing director of the works, and he was expected to see that all possible orders should come to the Kingston establishment. No doubt he wrote the Minister of Railways.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the hon. gentleman state that the telegram printed in the "Whig" was the same as that read?

Mr. BRITTON. So far as I recollect it is; there is no difference whatever between the telegram in the report and that received—at all events in substance they are in perfect accord. This is an unfair attempt on the part of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to drag politics into a question of this kind. All parties, Conservatives and Reformers alike, are equally interested in having all work that can be done in Canada, performed here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I agree in the main with the statement that has just fallen from the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat. But in his statement he has not presented the case in accordance with his own views. I understood him to say, and I think he repeated it twice, that the duty should not be taken into consideration. I hold that the duty should be taken into consideration, and that before the Minister of Railways decided between an American tender and a Canadian tender he should add the Canadian duty to the American article, and if, with that duty added, the Canadian article was lower than the American, the article produced here should have the preference.

Mr. BRITTON. It is evident I did not make myself understood, because that is my view, and it is the view we were attempting to impress on the Minister.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) on Monday asked a ques-

Mr. BRITTON.

tion, and in his reply the Minister of Railways said:

No such letter or telegram has been sent as is referred to in this sub-question.

An hon. MEMBER. Read the question.

Mr. INGRAM. The question was:

(c.) To what parties have letters or telegrams been sent, announcing that such contract had been given to the Kingston Locomotive Works?

I have read the answer given by the Minister at that time. Yet to-day we find the hon. member for Kingston stating that the question is not a political one and that the statement made by Mr. Harty was not for political purposes. The hon. member also stated that the men employed in Kingston Locomotive Works are opposed to him politically, and he approved of the statement made by Mr. Harty, that he had received a telegram from the Minister of Railways stating that an order would be given to the Kingston Locomotive Works for three locomotives. I ask the hon. gentleman or any other hon. member in the face of a provincial election taking place in Ontario to-day whether any one who knows Mr. Harty would consider he had any political object in making that statement in Kingston? It was done solely for political purposes and for the purpose of making votes. A telegram has been read here to-day, but I understand there were two telegrams. Not satisfied with sending the first, another was sent, to the following effect:

A further order will be given to the Kingston Locomotive Works.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman say that a further telegram was sent by me, or any other telegram?

Mr. INGRAM. I said there were two telegrams read on that occasion purporting to come from the Minister of Railways. I have made that statement on two different occasions.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never heard it stated.

Mr. INGRAM. It has been made frequently. This I hold is another proof that a change should be made in the provincial government. Hon gentlemen opposite are working hand and glove with their Ontario friends. There is more than cold justice in this telegram, for the hon. gentleman's supporters are going to receive more than justice if they send a supporter of the Ontario Government, and hon. gentlemen opposite, like the Minister of Railways, will only be too happy to send another telegram or anything else that will promote the election of their friends.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Railways has now at least heard that two telegrams were sent. He has acknowledged that one was sent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. I have heard it so stated.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman not acknowledged that one was sent?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman whether Mr. Harty, in his statement at Kingston was telling the truth or a falsehood, when he said he had received a telegram from the Minister of Railways and Canals that an order for three locomotives would be given to the Kingston works. Now, will he (Mr. Blair) give an honest answer to that, Mr. Speaker?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), I must say, finds it difficult to ask a question without doing so in the most insolent and impertinent manner. I have known the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) for a great many years. I have known him since he and I were young men together.

Mr. FOSTER. A long while ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I find, Mr. Speaker, that the association of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) with gentlemen during all the intervening years has not produced any marked effect in removing the ill-breeding and the insolent and impertinent manner which distinguished him in former days.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has gone too far. As the hon. gentleman's answer is in reply to a statement of the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Foster), I would like to say that I was sorry to hear him (Mr. Foster) urge the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) to give an honest answer.

Mr. FOSTER. Ought I have asked him to give a dishonest answer?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows quite well what I mean. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will curb his accentuation in a case of that kind; but I distinctly think that the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) should withdraw that statement about ill-breeding.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I bow at once to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I do not think that the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Foster), nor do I think that any other member of this House, has any justification for insinuating or imputing to me, that, in any answers which I have given to any questions, or in any statements I have made to the House, I have not given those answers and made those statements in an entirely honest, fair and frank manner.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand, Mr. Speaker, you called upon the hon. Min-

ister (Mr. Blair) to take back the expression he used.

Mr. SPEAKER. I heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) say distinctly that he at once took it back. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) say that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). That is more than the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) did the other night, when he was asked to take something back.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), when he rose to his feet, stated that the Minister of Railways had now heard that there were two telegrams. I have not yet heard that there were two telegrams. I have heard a member of this House say that it is stated that there were two telegrams, but I have not yet heard any one say that Mr. Harty alleged that two telegrams were received by him from me on that occasion. So far as the receipt of a telegram is concerned, I unquestionably did, in answer to a courteous letter from Mr. Harty, state to him what my intentions and purposes were as head of the department with respect to affording to the Kingston works an opportunity of competing for the engines we intended to buy. I so stated to Mr. Harty, but I did not say to him that we had ordered, or that we had entered into a contract. I could not state that to him, because such was not the fact. We have not, to this day, given the Kingston works an order. We had entered into no contract with them, and I neither could state to Mr. Harty that I had done so, nor could I state to this House, in answer to the question, that I had written or telegraphed to Mr. Harty that the Kingston works had received an order. They have not received any order. I need not say to the House that the answer I gave to the question is absolutely, entirely and literally correct. I know nothing about any subsequent telegram. I do not recollect that any second telegram was invited from me, and I do not recollect I sent any such telegram. I do not think I did, and, in fact, I am quite positive that I did not. Beyond that I cannot go. I do recollect distinctly having sent the one telegram, the terms of which have been stated by the gentleman referred to, and I have not sent any other telegram in reference to that subject.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Already spoken.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not speak. I desire to read—

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has only asked a question, and as to the manner of asking that question I have already referred.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to see the extreme sensitiveness of hon. gentlemen opposite. They seem to be afraid that some information will come out.

The PRIME MINISTER. Is that speaking to the question?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I propose that a little more information shall come out. Now, the fact is this, that, when the Minister of Railways was asked a question, the other day, with reference to the sending of a telegram to Mr. Harty about an order for engines or locomotives to the Kingston Locomotive Works, it is a fact that he gave the House the impression, he gave me the impression, that no such telegram had been sent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You had no right to infer any such thing.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I must be allowed to make my own inferences. Whilst I am quite willing to give wide scope to my hon. friend (Mr. Blair), he must allow me to make my own inferences.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak in such a hubbub as this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not propose to sit down.

The PRIME MINISTER. Question, then.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to speak to the question.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) said he proposed to speak to the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. He has said so, in so many words. The hon. gentleman stated he has already spoken to the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hon. gentlemen are not supposed to forget what has passed but a moment ago. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has spoken. He rose to his feet once more, and he said he was simply rising to put a question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The right hon. gentleman is quite mistaken, and, if he will allow me, I will point out that he is entirely under a wrong impression. What occurred was this: My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) asked a question, and when he rose to speak, he was called to order. Mr. Speaker

Mr. BLAIR.

ruled that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was entitled to speak, because he had merely asked a question previously.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is quite the reverse.

Mr. SPEAKER. The statement of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is certainly my recollection of the ruling. The first time the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) asked a question, and as to the manner of asking it I made some observations. Then, the second time the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) got up, he said he wished to speak to the question. That is as I understand it.

The PRIME MINISTER. He has already spoken.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. the First Minister reiterates, in the face of the decision of the Speaker, that I have already spoken. I think he should have done that in a tone not sufficiently loud to have been heard by gentlemen on this side of the House, at least. It is not contributing to the dignity of the House, when the leader of the House, in a tone that can be heard all over the House, refuses to bow to the Speaker's ruling.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Really, I must ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to confine himself to the question, because the good feeling of the House, which I like to see preserved, will not be improved by criticisms of that kind. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) should confine himself to the question, and I hope hon. gentlemen on both sides will observe that rule.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will be as nice as I possibly can to the right hon. the leader of the Government and to the Minister of Railways and Canals. A few days ago, the Minister of Railways and Canals was asked a question with reference to an order to the Kingston Locomotive Works.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Read the question.

Mr. FOSTER. I will read the question. When I was interrupted by the Minister of Railways and Canals—I will not say rudely interrupted—I was going on to say that the Minister of Railways and Canals was asked a question in certain terms, and it would require a pretty nice following of the question in connection with the answer, for any one in this House not to infer, as I certainly inferred, that what the hon. gentleman's answer carried was a denial that any telegram was sent with reference to an order in any way for locomotives in Kingston. I was going on to state that my opinion was that his denial did take that scope, when the hon. gentleman interrupted me. When you read the question, and look at the tense in which it was asked, whether

any contract had been given, the hon. gentleman's answer was strictly correct, so far that his telegram did not state that a contract had been given or that an order had been given. It was only a promise that an order should be given.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was not even that.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the answer is :

No such letter or telegram has been sent as is referred to in this sub-question.

And the sub-question is :

To what parties have letters or telegrams been sent, announcing that such contract had been given to the Kingston Locomotive Works ?

And the first question, of which this was a sub-question, was :

Has any order been given by the Department of Railways and Canals, or Public Works, to the Kingston Locomotive Works, for locomotives, and if so, at what prices are those to be supplied ?

Technically, the hon. gentleman may say that his answer is a true answer, so far as the question asked is concerned ; but it was not an undue inference for a person to draw who simply heard the question asked and answered, that what the hon. gentleman meant to do was to deny that any order or any promise of an order had been given. The hon. gentleman, in answering another question, was so anxious that the House should be in full possession of all the facts which could bear upon it, that he took up the time of the House in giving answers to a question which was not asked. He was very much concerned that the House should have not only an answer to the question that was asked, but all the facts in the case ; and so, after answering a question of mine as to new appointments on the Intercolonial Railway, he went on to give information which I had not asked for, to show that though new appointments had been made, there had been savings in other directions, so that the public chest was not a loser. If the hon. gentleman had been just as anxious—not more anxious, but just as anxious—that all the truth should come out in this instance, he would have stated that although no contract had been given, he had sent a telegram to Mr. Harty telling him that an order would be given to the Kingston Locomotive Works. That was just the point my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) wanted to bring out. The hon. Minister is justified in hinging his answer technically on the question that was asked ; but he might have treated the House with a good deal more openness and have explained the whole matter with a great deal more broad truth, if he had stated what was actually the fact, namely, that a telegram had been sent, promising that an order for three locomotives should be given to the Kingston Locomotive Works. This brings out one thing which it is well

for the House to emphasize, that is, that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, in his position in this House, handling to a certain extent the moneys of the whole country, which is made up of Liberals and Conservatives, is willing, from a Dominion point of view, to league himself with a man engaged in a provincial election contest—using the power of the Dominion Government and the power of the treasury of the people of the Dominion in order to help a partisan in a provincial election. Ah, but, some one says, this had no political significance. It had not ? Let us see. Here is a very significant sentence, which was uttered at the very end of Mr. Harty's speech, after the information was detailed :

I think the workingmen have some knowledge of the interest I have taken in them for a number of years.

What was the purpose of that ?

I have never lost sight of the desirability of aiding the workingmen.

What was the purpose of that ?

Mayor Livingston suggested to me the manufacture of locomotives for the Intercolonial Railway, and that we do something to get the contract for Kingston. I wrote to Mr. Blair—

For what purpose ? That the workingmen might see who their benefactors were, and pay them back on the election day on the 1st of March.

I wrote to Mr. Blair, Minister of Railways and Canals, and have just received a telegram to-day. He says he intends giving Kingston Works the opportunity to build three locomotives for that railway, the specifications of which will be sent at once. My desire is to give home manufacturers—

And the workingmen—that is a parenthesis—

—the first preference, and I am glad the work is coming here. The battle has now commenced, and all who are in sympathy with me must work.

That is the battle note which was uttered on the obliging Minister's telegram—that the workingmen of whom Mr. Harty declared himself to be such a great friend, would have the work upon three locomotives through his influence with his good friend the Minister of Railways and Canals at Ottawa. There is a direct linking together of this Government and a partisan election in the province of Ontario against all the old-time principles, without doubt, but according to the new Liberal policy.

Now, Sir, with reference to the Minister of Railways and Canals and his polite reference to myself, which I am very happy to say, without interference on my part, brought to me the kindly and powerful protection of you, Mr. Speaker, I have known Mr. Blair before he became—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not out of order. I have known Mr. Blair before he became Minister of Railways and Canals in this House, and I have known him since; and I am not going to rise in this House at any time and endeavour to throw a slur either upon his family or upon himself by instituting any comparison at all in regard to breeding generally, or any investigation as to the hon. gentleman's own breeding. I take it that there are gentlemen on both sides of this House, and that ladies and gentlemen listen to members on both sides of this House; and I think that the action and the words of any member on either side of the House can be very well judged by the House, and will be taken as a fair indication of what his breeding was in early youth, or how it, as it may have been improved or otherwise, may be rated at the present time.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

UNITED STATES OCCUPATION OF DYE AND SKAGWAY.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the right hon. First Minister whether his attention has been called to certain paragraphs that have appeared in the press, both in the United States and in Canada, to the effect that the United States Government are about to send two companies of troops to be permanently stationed at Dyea and Skagway, at the head of the Lynn Canal. That is, as you know, in disputed territory. It is a highway to the Yukon country, and the reason given in these papers is, that there are a large number of disorderly characters assembled there at present, and that troops are required to prevent any riotous proceedings taking place. I also wish to ask the right hon. gentleman whether his Government has seen fit to let the United States Government know that they have no objection to these troops being sent there, but that such permission must not be considered as an admission on the part of Canada that our claim to that territory has been withdrawn. We saw, in times past, how the sending of troops to San Juan affected the argument before the arbitration, and I, for one, would not like to see the same thing occur again with regard to Dyea and Skagway.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Government has not been informed of the intention to which my hon. friend has just referred. The Government did not know it was the intention of the American Government to send their troops to Dyea and Skagway. My hon. friend is aware that, although this is disputed territory, it has been in the possession of the United States ever since they acquired this country from the Russian Government in 1867, and, so far as my information goes, I am not aware that any protest has ever been raised by any Government against the

Mr. FOSTER.

occupation of Dyea and Skagway by the United States. It is only in recent years that the attention of the public has been drawn to it. I may say to my hon. friend, that the importance of having a delimitation or settlement of the boundary between Canada and the United States in that region is at this moment engaging our attention.

BONDING PRIVILEGES ON THE STIKINE RIVER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to invite the attention of my right hon. friend and his colleagues on the Treasury benches to a very important movement in the Senate of the United States. An amendment to the Bill now before the Senate is proposed by an hon. Senator, which provides that bonding privileges on British goods going into the Stikine River or coming out shall only go into effect upon the proclamation by the President of the United States, and the same Bill provides that, in consideration of privileges of that kind being extended to us, the American fishermen shall practically have advantages which the Treaty of 1818 denies to them. My right hon. friend is aware that an endeavour was made in 1888 to dispose of the differences between the United States and Canada with regard to the Atlantic fisheries, and he is aware that the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain and the United States jointly signed a treaty, which was sent by Mr. Cleveland to the Senate, with a strong recommendation for its adoption, as a fair and honourable solution of that question. My right hon. friend also knows that that treaty was rejected by the Senate, but when it was agreed to, the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain submitted a modus vivendi which they offered to the United States, to go into operation pending the consideration of that question by the Senate, in order to meet the case before it was finally dealt with. That modus vivendi was also accepted in the most effusive manner by the President of the United States. He recommended it to the consideration of the Senate, as one which gave the Government of the United States great satisfaction. My right hon. friend is also aware that this House passed a law giving effect to that modus vivendi, and that practically it has been in operation from that time down to the present, and my right hon. friend is now aware that the Republican President who succeeded President Cleveland, President Harrison, in his inaugural address, referred to that modus vivendi voluntarily offered by the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain—and which passed into law by Act of this Parliament and has been in operation ever since—as having removed all friction between the United States and Canada from that time. I draw attention to that and to the fact that it is now proposed to introduce a provision into an Act of Congress which is entirely at variance with

those proceedings that have taken place, and which provides that all the rights that are admitted by the United States to belong to Canada with regard to the Atlantic fisheries shall be yielded, or that there shall be no bonding privileges allowed. I draw attention to this, at this moment, because, taken in connection with the Bill before this House, it is a question of the utmost importance. I hope that my hon. friend will see its gravity and take every means in his power to prevent from going into effect a measure of that kind, which is entirely fatal to the Bill now before us.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My attention has certainly been drawn to the Bill to which my hon. friend has just referred, and I suppose the attention of every Canadian who takes an interest in the affairs of his country. But we are all obliged to remember at this moment that the Bill is not law, and I cannot, for my part, entertain the idea that the American authorities, legislative or executive, would have any intention of sanctioning any law which, in any manner, would deviate from their treaty obligations. Moreover, all this, I think, is perhaps anticipating the debate now going on, because my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) will refer at length to this point again.

CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr Blair for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) an Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty the Queen and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). I had the honour, last evening, of drawing the attention of the House to the remarkable change of front which has taken place on the part of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), and I need not further advert to that fact at present. I also consumed some time referring to a few of the statements which the hon. gentleman had made, and a few of the criticisms which he had addressed to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). The hon. leader of the Opposition made a great many extraordinary statements in criticism of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals. He went so far as to use an expression which, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, can hardly be considered parliamentary or a proper expression in the mouth of the leader of a great party, a baronet, an ex-High Commissioner, an ex-Prime Minister, an ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, and various other offices. He designated my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals

as a "Know-nothing." Surely my hon. friend was somewhat lost to a sense of what is due to his own dignity and the dignity of this House, when he made use of that expression.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I ask leave to interrupt my hon friend for one single moment to ask him whether he thinks that was a greater violation of parliamentary decorum than for one of his colleagues to call a gentleman on his side of the House "Ananias."

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** If my hon. friend will have any one who suggests that epithet on his side of the House, of course we cannot help it; the truth will come out some time. It would be quite impossible for us, at any rate, to prevent impressions of that kind being formed. But I do not suppose my hon. friend will take the position that, because some gentleman on this side intimated that there was a possible resemblance between Ananias and some gentleman on that side of the House, he is to be relieved for all time to come from all sense of decency and of the importance of maintaining parliamentary decorum.

What I was seeking to call the hon. gentleman's attention to in connection with my remarks on that subject was that while he was addressing his gentle criticism to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, he was adverting most strongly to the fact that the Government had presumed to come down to Parliament and ask for the subsidizing of a line of railway, and yet was not able to state either by speech in Parliament or in the Bill specifically what the rates for freight and passengers on this railway should be. That is a criticism that is very strongly and very repeatedly addressed to this side of the House by my hon. friend, it is a criticism that has been in the air, and has been seen in the press and heard in this House, and it has been heard a number of times while this question has been under consideration. Now the party of which the hon. gentleman is the titular leader was in control of the railway legislation of this Parliament from 1878 to 1896. I would like the combined wisdom of the gentlemen on that side of the House, before this discussion is through, to be addressed to meeting this challenge that I now make: For them to produce the case of a single railway Bill presented to this House since 1878 which stated the rates which were to be charged upon that railway. If they cannot do that let them produce a single case in which, since 1878, the Minister of Railways when he brought down a Bill for the subsidizing of a railway stated in this House what were to be the specific passenger rates upon that railway. Will they produce one single case in which they did what they have demanded and re-demanded we should do in regard to this particular railway?

Mr. MACLEAN. What about the two cent passenger rate Bill ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Are you the leader of the Opposition ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The challenge was to any member on this side.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Now, I do not intend to follow the windings of my hon. friend's (Sir Charles Tupper's) attempt to give the reasons for his change of front, or to offer any further criticisms on his remarks at the present moment.

I was endeavouring, last evening when the debate adjourned, to explain the position in which the Government was placed respecting the difficulties arising out of the administration of the Yukon district, to the end that we might give to the House and the country a fair idea of the reasons which impelled the Government to the action which they have taken and to recommend the course which they have recommended to Parliament. I pointed out that the facts were unprecedented in this respect—that we had to accept responsibility for the government and administration of a distant and almost inaccessible country, and that the only mode of access to the country (practically speaking, although not absolutely so from a geographical standpoint) was through territory which was in the possession of the United States, and which, according to international usage, it was not competent for this Government to take possession of or to exercise jurisdiction over without negotiations and the consent of the United States Government. I wish the House to take special note of the difficulties caused by that one fact when considering the criticisms addressed to us from the other side of the House based on the fact that we have not taken such action as would undoubtedly have brought about strained relations between the Government of Canada and the Government of United States. I might say, that the suggestion which was brought to the attention of the right hon. the First Minister in connection with the Stikine River, that this Government should take steps to prevent certain action being taken at Washington, comes very strangely indeed from an hon. gentleman who a night or two ago denounced most furiously and in the most unqualified terms the idea of any member of this Government having anything to do with the Government at Washington. This only shows the absolutely incoherent and inconsequential nature of the criticisms addressed to the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend perhaps will allow me to say that he has entirely misinterpreted my words if he thought that I proposed that this Government should put itself in communication with the American Government in any other way than

Mr SIFTON.

through the Imperial Government and the British Ambassador at Washington.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am quite satisfied to let the hon. gentleman's explanation stand. I was pointing out the difficulties we were under with respect to that territory, and wish to state the further fact that up to that time we were dependent, for the very supplies which our officers in the Yukon district received, upon the American transportation companies which were doing business in the United States territory of Alaska. It will at once be seen by the House that that is a most important consideration. These supplies had to pass through nearly 1,600 miles of American territory before they reached the places where our supplies had to be delivered. We might have anticipated—in fact we did anticipate—what actually happened later on, that one of the boats containing supplies, some of which, I believe, were actually ordered for our own officers in the Yukon district, was held up in United States territory and provisions taken off, and our post was left short in consequence.

I only call attention to these facts to show to the House the difficult position in which the Government was placed. Then, Sir, let me call attention to this fact, that notwithstanding the warning which was addressed to the people of the United States last summer in regard to the almost absolute certainty of starvation, if any very large number of people went into the Yukon district, a considerable number of people did go, and a very large expense has been incurred by this Government for the purpose of preventing the starvation which might have followed had not such expense been incurred. Now this is the fact which the House will have to take into consideration. There are at the present time thousands of people upon the way, and thousands more who are making their preparations to go into this district; and if, for the purpose of averting the danger of starvation of two or three thousand people of a surplus population, we have to go to enormous expense, what, Sir, would be the condition of affairs if 40,000 or 50,000 people should struggle through those mountains and find themselves at the end of the summer four or five hundred miles down in the northern part of the district, unable to return, and without a sufficient supply of provisions to take them through the winter? It is only necessary to state the proposition in order that the House may be seized of the fact that we have before us, and of the possibility of one of the most appalling catastrophes the world has ever seen, outside of what takes place in a state of war. We have therefore to consider that no matter what warnings are addressed to the people, no matter what this Government or the United States Government may do or at-

tempt to do, immense numbers of people will find their way into that territory, and if provision is not made for taking in supplies, these people will go in without sufficient supplies. We have this further to take into consideration, that the officers and men we have sent up there, the officers and men that we intend to send, would be, under such circumstances, surrounded as the officials of the United States at Fort Yukon are surrounded to-day, if the last accounts we have received can be relied upon. Our officers would be surrounded as they are by thousands of starving people, armed men, accustomed to a somewhat lawless method of life; and the inevitable result of that state of affairs would be that the authority of this Government in that district would be overthrown, and the further result would be that it would be quite impossible for this Government to re-assert and to re-establish its authority until a railroad was built and a proper system of transportation provided so that our forces and our supplies could be taken in. Let me make that clear to the House. If it should happen that 40,000 or 50,000 people should be there next fall without sufficient supplies, and our officers were left in the midst of those people, and those people felt and knew that this Government had had time to provide for proper means of transportation and had not taken the necessary and requisite steps for so doing, it would be impossible that the moral authority which our officers now exert over those people, could be retained under such circumstances. We would be face to face with the fact that 200 or 300 of our officers would be surrounded by starving thousands of armed men, of alien men, not citizens of Canada, but citizens of foreign countries, and these men would have possession of the Yukon district instead of the Government of Canada having control over it. So, Sir, we have before us the great danger of the authority of this Government being overridden, being destroyed, and the Government of that district being, theoretically, if not actually, taken out of our hands by reason of the fact that we would have failed to meet the responsibility of the case, and failed to make adequate provision for what we foresaw, and what we knew ought to have been provided for. Now, Sir, so much for the national aspect of the question. There is also another aspect. We know that for many years past upon this continent there has never been so great a movement of population to any one place as seems to be imminent at the present time in what is known as the movement to the Klondike district. It seems almost inconceivable to us to hear and read the estimates regarding the number of persons likely to go into that district. I saw the other day in the New York "Herald" a statement like this:

The statement that a quarter of a million gold-seekers will go from Seattle alone this year,

seems to be well founded, in view of the "Herald's" despatches to the effect that 7,000 have sailed in the last eight days, and that 1,000 are arriving there daily.

It is such facts as these that we have to deal with. We are told, too, that the transportation agencies in Europe are booking tens of thousands of people for the Pacific Coast, and that the immediate object of these people is to procure transportation to the Klondike district. We know, too, that the officers of the Canadian railways have made immense preparations for this trade; and, while no person can say exactly how much of it will materialize, everything points to the fact that the greatest rush that has been seen for many years upon this continent will take place during the next few months towards the Klondike district. It has been estimated, and the estimate does not seem to be an unreasonable or extravagant one, that from \$50,000,000 to \$75,000,000 will be spent in outfitting and in transportation by these people; and it does not require any lengthened argument on my part to show that a volume of trade of \$50,000,000 or \$75,000,000 is a thing to which the Government of this country should devote a large amount of attention when it is possible to secure it for Canadian merchants and Canadian manufacturers. The possibilities of trade, therefore, were very carefully considered by the Government in connection with this question, and we have done all that we could to make reasonable arrangements with our friends in the United States in order that the passage of goods through the Dyea and Skagway routes might not interfere with the work of our merchants. But this we know, Mr. Speaker, that there are 10,000 or 12,000 men at Dyea and Skagway now. We know that these people now there cannot get over these passes probably in the next three months, and that it is an almost absolute certainty that within two or three weeks there will be more people at those two places than can get over the passes between now and next fall; and as a result of this we have the fact that means of access to that country, in the course of a couple of weeks, will be practically shut off so far as those places are concerned. Therefore, it seemed to the Government as most essential that another and better method of access to the country should be provided, so that immediately it is seen that the method of access to the country by Dyea and Skagway is shut off, we will be able to divert the stream of traffic along our Canadian route, and our Canadian merchants and manufacturers will benefit by that traffic being so diverted by reason of the fact that the purchase of goods will necessarily be made in Canada. Now, Sir, these are some of the considerations which have led the Government to regard this question as one of such serious and great urgency as to justify us in taking a very strong stand in reference to it, and

in dealing with it in a way which has been described, and very properly described, as unusual. Not so unusual, however, in point of speed, in point of what may be called hurry, as to offend the experienced parliamentarian who presides over the destinies of the Opposition, because the only fault that that hon. gentleman found with us was that we had not moved fast enough. It is, Mr. Speaker, sometimes desirable that we should see ourselves as others see us, and if the House will permit me, I will just read a short extract from one of the best known and ablest commercial papers in the United States, as an indication of what our rivals for this great trade are thinking of our action in this connection. It is always a good thing to know what your opponent is doing, and while we are on the most friendly terms with the Cabinet of the United States, we know they are doing everything they can to secure this trade for their people, and they know we are doing everything we possibly can to secure this trade for our people. This is what one of their most reliable organs, the New York "Commercial Advertiser," in its edition of February 4, under the heading "The Klondike Railway," says:

The Canadian Government is sedulously following up its policy of securing all the benefits of Klondike wealth for itself. Having exacted royalties from American miners, having appropriated a proportion of the gold-bearing soil for itself—

That is a most outrageous thing for Canada to do, to appropriate a little bit of its own territory for itself

—and having imposed a heavy duty on supplies brought into the country by Americans, Canada has now chartered a railway to enable its citizens to reach the gold fields without entering American territory, and thus to cut down the profits of American transportation and supply companies.

I wonder whether our supplies would be allowed to go into the United States without paying duty

The projected railway does not make an all-rail route to the Klondike, and it will, no doubt, be long before there is one. The road is to start on the coast just south of the southern boundary of Alaska, and traverse Dominion territory until it reaches navigable water flowing down through the Klondike region. It will be many years before there will be any settlements in the northern part of British Columbia to enable the building of a railway to connect the Canadian Pacific with the new Klondike road, and by the time there are, the Klondike gold will very likely be exhausted and the Klondike railway abandoned.

That, of course, is a matter of opinion.

The thrifty Canadian Government is not risking any money on the projected road. The contractors clamoured for a subsidy and insisted that they could not be expected to construct the road without one. But Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues stood firm, and all that the contractors receive from the Government is a land grant along the route. The bargain is pronounced to

Mr. SIFTON.

be the best one which Canada ever drove in a railway negotiation,—

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will address a few remarks to the hon. gentleman in a few minutes, and I think I can satisfy him. This is a sentence that will grieve the hon. gentleman:

—as the land will never be worth anything without the railroad, and cannot prove very valuable with it, unless some unexpected mineral resources are discovered.

This is a comment on the action of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I am sure they will like to know the estimation in which their party is held by our American friends, as compared with the opinion entertained by them of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

The new railway will be a short one, to be sure, but to get it built without spending a cent of the public moneys upon it—

I cannot expect the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) to agree with this.

—is a great contrast to the prodigality with which Sir John Macdonald subsidized the Canadian Pacific, and indicates sincerity in the denunciation by Laurier and his party of the supposed corrupt relations between the Canadian Pacific and the Macdonald Government.

I commend this latter portion to the attention of the House.

An Ottawa Government organ exultantly remarks that Canada now has the key to the gold fields in her own hands, and can deal with the Americans as she sees fit. This boast might have been withheld until the road was finished. Physical obstacles or excessive cost may prevent the contractors from building it at all under the terms of the contract.

Hon. gentlemen opposite think this is a trifling matter, but others do not think it so trifling.

The same journal says that Americans have made far too large a share of the profits of the Yukon, both in the transportation business, the outfitting and the mining itself. This is true, because they have had the enterprise to secure it.

I have read these extracts to show how the matter is looked at by people who are taking the largest interest in it on the other side of the line, how it is looked at by the men who are going to suffer from the railway being put through, which will involve loss of their trade, and by which we will be able to add the trade of the Yukon to the general trade of the Dominion.

If the House will not consider it a task too wearisome, I will try and offer a few remarks in regard to the various routes by which the Yukon can be reached, with the view of affording the House a little information on the subject, which possibly I have had a better opportunity of acquiring

than have members of the House generally. First, we have the route by way of the Yukon River. That route involves an ocean passage from a Pacific Coast port to St. Michael's, at the mouth of the Yukon River, on the coast of Alaska. From St. Michael's by a river steamboat, the passenger goes to Dawson City through the United States territory of Alaska, a distance of about 1,600 miles. The Yukon is a river that, during the early portion of the season, contains sufficient water to float river steamboats carrying freight to the amount of about 500 tons. Those steamboats make one trip, fully loaded, from St. Michael's to Dawson City and return. They generally are able to make a second trip, but very seldom fully loaded. That is the information we have from the transportation companies on that river. The boats go up and down twice in the season, and make no more than two trips in the course of the year, and on the second trip, on account of low water, they are not able to take a boat-load. There are two companies doing business on that river, the North American Transportation Company, and the Alaska Commercial Company; and those are the only companies we can rely on actually to get freight up that river. Other people are building boats and intend to take them up the river next spring, but there is no certainty of those boats reaching Dawson City. The great difficulty arises from—and I need only mention the difficulty to realize the fact that a similar difficulty is met with in navigating all western rivers, and of course it applies to a river 1,600 miles long—the shoals and obstructions, which remove any certainty of boats getting up the river unless conducted by experienced men, knowing fully the navigation of the river. Some of the boats under construction may get up, but there is no assurance that they will get as far as Dawson City next season. There is also the danger connected with that route, as regards getting provisions and supplies up the river, that it may not be made available for Canadian use. There are gold developments on the American side of the line, and these may lead the Americans to use their transportation facilities for the benefit of their own people, and we are liable to be told that the supplies carried are needed for their own settlements, and thus left without any facilities. Now, the combined transportation facilities of the two companies upon the Yukon route, next year, will be about 40,000 tons for all purposes whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. This year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, this year; next season. It will be about 40,000 tons, and it would be a very liberal estimate on our part to assume that one-half of the tonnage of these companies would be devoted to the carriage of provisions and supplies to the Canadian side.

We may therefore say that we can probably count on somewhat in the neighbourhood of 20,000 tons of supplies of all kinds; remember not provisions alone, but supplies and outfits of all kinds coming in by the Yukon route. That is the very outside limit of what we can reasonably expect to come by that route during the next season.

Then there is the Dyea route. When I was at Dyea there was no method of getting supplies over the Chilkoot Pass, except by packing them on men's backs. We are now informed that a portion of the distance has been spanned by a small tramway, that another portion has been spanned by a wire cable, and that small quantities of supplies can be taken over in that way. The cost at the present time is said to be 15 cents a pound, but the capacity for taking supplies over by that route is very, very limited, and only a small amount could be transported over that pass during the season. On the Skagway trail the only method of transferring supplies is by packing on horses' and on men's backs.

Then there is the Taku route. That is the route by way of Taku Inlet, and it is best known by reason of the fact that the most active glacier on the Pacific Coast is in the immediate neighbourhood of the harbour. The harbour is a very poor one, generally filled with icebergs, as it was when I was there. This route is totally impracticable without a railway, and, like the other routes that I have spoken of, terminates in the strip of American territory which runs along the coast.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is the Stikine route, and that is the route which has been decided upon by the Government after a full and careful and deliberate consideration. The House is now in possession of the report of Mr. Jennings, a very competent and reliable engineer who was sent up there last fall for the purpose of making an investigation. I need not say to the House that Mr. Jennings did not make what could be called a survey of a railway route, for he had no time to do anything of that kind. He took a couple of professional assistants up there with him, and he had authority to take general direction of all the operations and explorations. Mr. St. Cyr, a surveyor in the employ of the Department of the Interior, was then on the ground to assist in the work, and Mr. Jennings took with him a number of labourers and others. His instructions were not to make a survey of a railway route in the ordinary sense of the word, but an exploration of the country so as to give the Government all the information in regard to a wagon road, an electric railway or any method of transportation that the Government might consider desirable or feasible through the particular districts that were placed in his charge for the time being. Mr. Jennings went there and he has now made his report, which is in the hands of the mem-

bers of the House. He was instructed at the same time to despatch a reliable officer, and he subsequently did despatch Mr. St. Cyr, who is a very reliable explorer, for some years in the employ of the Department of the Interior, and who went down from the head of Teslin Lake, through the Teslin Lake, and through the Hootalinqua River, for the purpose of ascertaining beyond a doubt particulars as to the navigability of the Hootalinqua River and Teslin Lake.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can the hon. gentleman say at what period of the year Mr. St. Cyr went there?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He went down late in the fall; I think he got through before the ice formed on the river. It was just about the time the ice was forming that he got to the junction of the Lewes and Hootalinqua rivers. We were in doubt as to whether that officer would be able to get down, because from the reports we had we thought that in all probability the ice would be formed upon the lake and upon the river before he could get there. However, we discovered, very much to our satisfaction, that our anticipation with regard to the earliness of the date that these waters froze over was entirely erroneous, and it is now known that these waters do not freeze over so early in the fall as was generally understood. Mr. St. Cyr therefore made a report, which will be found incorporated in Mr. Jennings's printed report, and in that report the particulars respecting the navigability of Teslin Lake and the Hootalinqua River are given. The members of this House will see beyond a doubt from Mr. St. Cyr's report—and I may say that he is a most reliable and experienced officer—that there is no doubt whatever about the navigability of the Hootalinqua River.

I am dwelling upon these facts because the Government do not expect the members of the House to rush into this matter blindfolded. We wish to give to the House, and we wish to call to the particular attention of the House, all the details of the information which are necessary in order to enable an intelligent judgment to be formed upon the project which we are submitting. The navigability of these waters was, of course, a prime consideration, and no steps whatever could be taken towards making definite arrangements for the construction of this road until the report of Mr. St. Cyr was in my hands, so that I could say to my colleagues: We can now consider the construction of a railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake, because we have ascertained that the waters beyond are navigable. We have now got that information, in authentic and definite form.

From the Stikine River to the junction of the Hootalinqua and the Lewes rivers the waters are navigable; from there to Daw-

Mr. SIFTON.

son City the waters are navigable for scows and canoes without interruption, and with the exception of one short space in the river, known as the Five Fingers, the waters are continuously navigable. We have not had a survey made of the Five Fingers Rapids—we have had no opportunity of doing so—but we have such information from some of our officers and other persons who have passed down that river, that we think we are justified in saying to Parliament that a very few thousand dollars will suffice to blow up the boulders which form the obstruction at the Five Fingers Rapids. It will cost perhaps \$5,000, and certainly not more than \$10,000, and the waters will then be navigable all the way from the head of Teslin Lake to Dawson City. Then, we shall have an uninterrupted water route open from the 15th or 20th of May or thereabouts—that is the best information we have—until about the 1st of November. We shall have a continuous water route from Teslin Lake down to Dawson City during that period of the year. The railway from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake will furnish the link in providing for through transportation. The Stikine River is a navigable river; I do not think anybody ever supposed that it was navigable for ocean steamers, but it is sufficiently navigable for the purposes of this traffic. This is what Mr. Jennings says about it on page 7 of his report:

The Stikine River is usually navigable for powerful steamboats of suitable design to Glenora or Telegraph Creek, a distance of 150 miles, between the 1st of May and a date sometimes well on in October—

I may say that I was at the Stikine River myself and went a short distance up the river and made careful inquiries about the dates when the ice formed in the fall; and the information I received was to the effect that it was generally very late in October—

—dependent of course on the openness of the season and the amount of rain and snowfall. Its width varies from half a mile on the lower river to 500 feet above. The depth is generally good and the channel is remarkably free from snags, sunken rocks or boulders, but at Little and Klootchman Cañons, respectively 96 and 106 miles from the sea, during high water periods when many drift trees are running, it is with considerable risk that the passage through these contracted reaches are made and delays are common, as drift-wood is liable to become foul of the rudders or wheel. The first 50 miles, or to the Great Glacier, is very good water with a moderate current not exceeding three miles per hour, while from this point upwards the channel becomes somewhat tortuous and contracted, with an increasing general rate of current varying from three to eight miles per hour; however, the exceptionally swift sections are few and usually not more than half a mile in length.

A powerful river steamer should be able to make the Little Cañon in one day's run from the mouth of the river, and the Glenora or Telegraph Creek on the second day.

Mr. Jennings makes that report after having gone up this identical river, over this

identical course, in a small steamer ; so that he is making the report, so far as this phase of the question is concerned, from absolute personal knowledge.

The sum of \$5,000 could be advantageously spent in removing snags and boulders and in placing permanent cables for use in the heavy water, principally above the Little Cañon.

I may say that the Government contemplate asking the House for authority to spend a small sum of money, whatever may be necessary, for the purpose of removing the snags spoken of, and improving the navigation of the Stikine River. That matter is now before the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), and is receiving his best attention. Of course, the House is aware that from the mouth of the Stikine River to Vancouver or Victoria the route is by ocean steamer. I am giving these details to the House so that the House will be cognizant of the route to be followed when this railway shall be completed, and the facilities for traffic which it will afford. I calculate that the average trip from Vancouver or Victoria to Wrangell will occupy certainly not more than three days, and probably will be accomplished in two days, when better facilities for making the trip are completed, and when the steamers run on quick time, as they will no doubt do during the coming season. From Wrangell to Telegraph Creek the trip should be made in two days ; from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake by the railway in one day ; and from Teslin Lake to Dawson City by steamboat in seven days. So that we shall have by September next the possibility of reaching Dawson City from Victoria or Vancouver in thirteen days. I think, Mr. Speaker, if that desirable object is attained, the House will consider that the Government have succeeded in overcoming very great obstacles, and have brought about a very satisfactory result.

Then, Sir, this is to be remembered, that Dawson City is the extreme north-western town or large settlement in the Yukon district, not far from the boundary line ; and the first boat that goes up the Yukon River only reaches Dawson City about the middle of July. It is only between the middle of July and about two months later that there is any interchange of traffic at Dawson City by the Yukon River, and one cannot order freight which can possibly reach Dawson City by the Yukon after the first of September. About the 1st of September last we gave an order for freight to be sent to Dawson City by the Yukon River, and it never got there, and it is not there yet. So that that route is practically useless for modern commercial purposes. Though it has been used by the North American Transportation Co. and the Alaska Commercial Co., they have taken plenty of time to get in their supplies, making their arrangements a year or six months ahead ; but it is a route which is perfectly useless for modern commercial purposes, when large quantities of

supplies have to be sent in on short notice. The route which we contemplate opening up will enable us to start on the 15th of May from Victoria or Vancouver, and in thirteen days to land people and provisions in Dawson City ; and from that time till late in the season, generally till from the 15th to the 30th of October, that traffic can be carried on.

There is not very much difference of opinion as to the route which the Canadian Government have selected being the best possible route for the purpose of reaching the Yukon district. Everybody who knows anything about it agrees with the Government on that point. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, although he has altered his opinion on a great many matters in connection with the contract, has not altered his opinion in regard to the Stikine route. He still thinks it is the best route. I venture to say that every member from British Columbia—men who know perhaps the most about the subject, if not personally, yet by hearsay from meeting men who do know personally—will be of the same opinion. The members of the Government of British Columbia, whom I met in Victoria, and with whom I discussed the question casually, expressed an unqualified opinion in favour of the Stikine route. So that we are in this position, that the route which the railway is to follow is the route endorsed by everybody who knows anything at all about the question. That appears to me to be a very important consideration for the House to bear in mind in considering the question now before it.

There is another phase of the question to which I wish to draw attention. Our friends of the Opposition, while they are not able to say that the Stikine route is not the right route, are still so utterly averse to honestly and fairly giving the Government credit for being right, when they know that the Government is right, that they have raised some questions about the action of the Government in connection with transshipment and the rights we have in respect to the navigation of the Stikine River. I showed last night that the Minister of Railways and Canals had practically said only the same thing that the leader of the Opposition had said. The leader of the Opposition no doubt was making a wise and statesmanlike remark when he made that statement ; but the Minister of Railways was apparently saying a most outrageous thing when he made the same statement. It seems to depend largely on who makes the statement, whether it is wise or statesmanlike. We have heard a great deal in regard to our rights on the Stikine River. I think I can give our hon. friends some light upon that subject. The boundary between the Yukon district and the territory of Alaska was settled many years ago by a treaty between Russia and Great Britain. At that time, the territory of Alaska was the property of

the Russian Crown, and a treaty was made between Great Britain and Russia, known as the Anglo-Russian treaty of 1825, a copy of which I have in my hand. I am going to call attention to this little circumstance to show with what justification the great Conservative party claim to have the instinct of Government. And let the House understand this clearly, that when the United States purchased Alaska from Russia, they became subrogated in the rights of Russia, and could by no possibility have any additional rights or any right different from or in addition to those possessed by Russia.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Or sovereignty.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Or sovereignty. They took exactly what Russia possessed. And what the subjects of Great Britain possessed, under the Anglo-Russian treaty of 1825, as against Russia, they possessed as against the United States and all others. Article 6 of this treaty provides :

It is understood that the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, from whatever quarter they may arrive, whether from the ocean or the interior of the continent, shall for ever enjoy the right of navigating freely and without any hindrance whatever, all the rivers and streams which, in their course towards the Pacific Ocean, may cross the line of demarcation upon the line of coast described in article 3 of the present convention.

That was the law as it stood upon that point until the Washington treaty—the work of our hon. friends who possess in such a distinguished degree the instinct of government—was made. We had by treaty, not the mere right of navigation, not a limited right, not a right for the purposes of commerce only, but a right for all purposes—a proprietary, a complete right—with Russia and the subjects of the Russian Government, an absolutely equal right to—not the Stikine, or Yukon, or Porcupine rivers—but all the rivers that come down and cross the line of demarcation provided in the other articles of the treaty. That was the position we would be in to-day if it had not been for the statesmanship of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. HAGGART. Does that treaty with Russia apply to the Yukon or Porcupine ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I shall talk about the Yukon and Porcupine later. Will the hon. gentleman endeavour to address his great intellect to one subject at a time ? I am talking about the rivers that cross the line of demarcation, with special reference to the Stikine River, which is of the utmost importance to us at present.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman said distinctly the Yukon and the Porcupine Rivers.

Mr. SIFTON.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We will get to them afterwards. These hon. gentlemen are getting very restless. They know what is coming, and they do not like it. Now, will the House take cognizance of the fact that the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty possessed, under this treaty with Russia, a proprietary right, for all purposes whatever, in the Stikine River until that right was interfered with by the statesmanship of our friends on the other side. These gentlemen apparently had never read this treaty. They did not know what it contained, they had not the remotest conception of what they were doing when they put this clause in the Washington treaty, which they have been boasting about ever since the question of the Stikine River came up.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him one question, and that is, whether it was not a great Liberal statesman, the present Marquis of Ripon, who was at the head of that joint commission, and who ought to have had all the knowledge from the Foreign Office in England bearing on the subject ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I admire the statesmanship of the great leader of the Conservative party, who, when his former leader made a most inexcusable blunder with regard to a Canadian matter, about which he should have instructed the Marquis of Ripon, seeks to throw the blame for his ignorance upon the Imperial officers, who should have received the requisite information from the officers of the Canadian Government. We are indebted to the sublime statesmanship of our friends on the other side for the curtailing, to a very great extent, of the privileges which we did enjoy on the Stikine River. Instead of this article which gave us an unrestricted proprietary right in the Stikine River, we have now the following :—

The navigation of the rivers Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine ascending and descending from, to and into the sea shall for ever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty and the citizens of the United States, subject to any law and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

If they had understood what they were doing, they would not have put in the word "Stikine," but have applied the provision—the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) will take note of the fact—to the Yukon and Porcupine to which it ought to have applied, if the Yukon and Porcupine were not covered by the Russian treaty, leaving out the word "Stikine," which they put in simply because they did not know the contents of this treaty. I do not need to explain to members of this House, who are experienced in public matters and many of whom have, time and

again, year after year. discussed similar matters, the difference between an absolute proprietary right to a river and the privilege of its free navigation for purposes of commerce. Free navigation for purposes of commerce is a very valuable privilege, and we are going to make use of it to the utmost possible extent, but it is not of the same value, by any means, as the proprietary right which we would have had if these hon. gentlemen had let alone at the time what they did not understand.

Coming away from the question of that treaty and coming down to the position in which we are now placed—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I rise merely for information, and would ask the hon. gentleman if I am right in understanding him to argue that our rights under the treaty between Russia and Great Britain were curtailed by this provision of the Washington treaty?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I should say yes. If the hon. gentleman desires to dispute that, I think I will be able to satisfy him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not wish to argue it, but wish to have the hon. gentleman's statement.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. (Reading.) "The navigation of the rivers Yukon and Porcupine and Stikine, ascending and descending from, to and into the sea." Every word of this clause is important. That is, we have the right to get in and out by the sea, not simply from the mouth of the river—because a point might arise there—but we have a right to go to the sea wherever it shall be. Let me finish the reading of the text:

Shall for ever—
not a limited period—

—remain free and open, for the purposes of commerce, to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty and the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of navigation.

Now, my hon. friend has to-day called the attention of the House to the fact, that certain legislation was pending before the Congress of the United States which would have the effect of curtailing the privileges of the Canadian people on the Stikine River. No legislation that can emanate from the Congress of the United States can repeal a treaty solemnly entered into by that country without violation of good faith, and this Government does not consider that it would be in any way justified for one instant in entertaining the idea that the United States would contemplate violating a treaty that they made with Great Britain. Why, Sir, the United States is a civilized country, and no civilized country deliberately violates the treaties it has

made. The only thing that could deprive the people of Canada, the subjects of Her Majesty, of the privileges which exist at the present time of the free navigation of the Stikine River, would be the voluntary abandonment of that privilege under another treaty, or a state of war between the two countries—and that, of course, would justify the abrogation of all treaties existing at that time. So that we consider ourselves in a perfectly impregnable position in regard to the navigation of the Stikine River. We have treaty rights there which cannot be taken away without our consent. Our friends of the United States Congress may pass a Bill, but not one that will violate the treaty which they have made with Great Britain. We may be perfectly certain of that; and it would be a most puerile thing, in my judgment—I give my opinion for what it may be worth—for this Government, whenever any irresponsible member of the United States Congress introduces a Bill, which, perhaps, would not have the slightest possible chance of being accepted by both branches of Congress or of receiving the signature of the President—a member who, perhaps, does not know what was in the treaty—to assume that the United States contemplated doing a thing which no civilized country would do, that is to say, to violate a solemn treaty. I have here a copy of a Bill to which the attention of the House has been called on two or three occasions, and which has been made a subject of discussion in the press of late. It is not yet law, and I do not know whether it ever will be law, but, in any event, it does not affect the question before us, because it is only United States legislation provided for the purpose of aiding the Government of the United States to carry out this treaty in a way that may be necessary for the protection of the revenue of the United States. The clause which has been referred to, is as follows:—

The master of any foreign vessel, laden or in ballast, arriving, whether by sea or otherwise, in the waters of the United States from any foreign territory adjacent to the northern, north-eastern, or north-western frontiers of the United States, shall report at the office of any collector of the customs which shall be nearest to the point at which such vessels may enter such waters;—

That is a perfectly proper thing—to have the vessel report when it enters.

—and such vessel shall not transfer her cargo or passengers to another vessel, or proceed farther inland, either to unload or take in cargo, without a special permit from such collector, or deputy collector, issued under and in accordance with such general or special regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, from time to time prescribe. This section shall also apply to trade with or through Alaska.

Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs tells me that the procedure under this Act will, in no substantial respect, differ from our own procedure upon the St. Law-

rence, the free navigation of which the United States have under identically the same treaty. It is not calculated in any way to interfere with or prevent the exercise of our right of navigation for the purposes of the commerce which we intend to build up. The only question of importance is the question of transshipment. That is a question upon which we can give no positive statement, because, although the matter has been brought to the attention of the United States Government, they have not yet expressed an opinion on the subject. It is a question which, if disputed, must be decided either by negotiation or by reference to a competent tribunal. But it must be evident that it is utterly out of the question for the Government of Canada, under the extraordinary circumstances in which we were placed, to think of opening up diplomatic negotiation and waiting until we got a question of that kind settled, before we proceeded to deal with the building of the railway. It would be a ridiculous proposition to go to the Government of the country which is now getting the largest portion of the trade which we seek to take away by constructing a railway, and, before starting to construct a railway, to try to get them to agree to something which would have the effect of taking the trade all away from them. They might possibly say that we were entitled to the privilege of transshipment; but, under the extraordinary circumstances, it would probably take us some time to get them to say so. Under the circumstances, the negotiations might be prolonged for several years. In the meantime, I fear, our people would grow somewhat impatient for transportation facilities to the Yukon district. And the miners, the poor men, for whom hon. gentlemen opposite expressed such sympathy, if they were waiting for something to eat until we made a treaty with the United States, might be sad and hungry before that treaty was signed. If it had been absolutely necessary to get the privilege of transshipment before we could make use of the road, it would be a different thing. But it is not. I can quote my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition again, who says in his interview—I have not the extract with me, but I quote his statement substantially—that, if the transshipment at Wrangell is not permitted, we can make use of Port Simpson, which will be equally serviceable.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no; I never said anything of the kind.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is always cheaper to take our goods by large ocean steamboats. When you use a little steamboat, carrying 150 or 200 tons, your transport becomes expensive. I do not pretend that it is equally serviceable to tranship at Port Simpson.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend did not hear me say that I had never said

Mr. SIFTON.

that Port Simpson was equally available. I never said that. But I did point out—and I made the statement with a view to prevent our being interfered with in the navigation of the Stikine—that, if vexatious exactions were made, we had Port Simpson to fall back upon. But I never said it was equally available, because I knew that there was a portion of the route between Port Simpson and the mouth of the Stikine that was subject to heavy weather, and that occasionally delay might be caused.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement that he did not say it was equally serviceable. He was so reported, but I presume it is a mistake. I desire, however, to point out to the House that while it is not as convenient for us to tranship at Port Simpson, yet we can tranship at Port Simpson and have a good and effective route. I made a careful examination of that subject myself when I was there. Mr. Ogilvie and myself went ashore at Port Simpson and examined the Hudson Bay Company's steamship, the "Caledonia," which was last year navigating the Stikine River, and was then pulled up at Port Simpson. The fact that the "Caledonia" was at Port Simpson proved conclusively that a boat of that quality could cross the intervening waters, because she was there and had so crossed. Inquiry demonstrated the fact that, with the exception of a very few days in the year, it is possible for a river boat constructed especially for the navigation of the Stikine River, to cross the waters between Port Simpson and Wrangell. As transshipment can take place at Port Simpson, we will have a Canadian route without any possibility of being interfered with by any regulations that may be made. It has been suggested to me to-day—I merely mention the suggestion for what it may be worth—that it is quite possible to get over the difficulty with regard to breaking bulk, if such a difficulty should be raised, by taking large barges built specially for the navigation of the Stikine, and towing them across from Port Simpson to Wrangell, and then sending them up the river. That might, no doubt, be done, and it might be a method of getting over the difficulty which might arise by reason of the increase in freight. But I mention this for the purpose of showing the House that, beyond the possibility of a doubt, this is an all-Canadian route, and a practicable all-Canadian route. We can make an all-Canadian route throughout, and that is what the Government have endeavoured to achieve. We have not come down here with a proposition that we knew nothing about, but we are prepared to give details, and are prepared to prove that the route is a practicable route, and an all-Canadian route. My hon. friend will excuse me if I justify the remark that I made, which I do not do at all with the object of showing that

he is not correct in his statement—I loyally accept his explanation that he did not make the statement—but he was reported in the "Mail and Empire," in a despatch dated at Ottawa, January 27th, as saying :

Sir Charles gives the Government credit for acting with such vigour as it has shown, and asserts that the opening of the Canadian route, strongly urged by him upon both Governments interested is the proper course to pursue. He does not anticipate any trouble with the United States in transferring cargoes from ocean to river, boats at Wrangel. If, however, such should happen, Canada has Port Simpson to fall back upon, which will be equally serviceable.

Of course, I accept my hon. friend's declaration that he did not make that statement; I only read it for the purpose of showing that I was not recklessly putting into my hon. friend's mouth a statement which I had not seen.

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

After Recess.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not intend to weary the House with references to newspaper criticisms of this contract, but I have in my hand a couple of criticisms from a journal which, so far as I have been able to observe, has endeavoured, although adverse to the contract, apparently, to be fair in its criticism—I refer to the "Evening Journal" of Ottawa. I think the criticisms of that newspaper, although mistaken, have not been intentionally unfair, and therefore I think it reasonable and proper to refer to a couple which I find in the "Journal" of the 16th inst., that is to-day. One reads as follows :—

Mr. Sifton stated in the House of Commons yesterday that the statement that the Rothschilds had offered to build a road by the Dalton trail for 5,000 acres per mile was a newspaper figment. Sir Louis Davies said in the House last Thursday that the Government had been in negotiation with the Rothschilds about a railway. Mr. Sifton's statement therefore, must mean simply that no formal figure was named to the Government by the Rothschild representatives. Messrs. Hamilton Smith and Henry Bratnobar, representatives of the Rothschilds, stated in Montreal that their principals "proposed" to build by the Dalton trail for 5,000 acres per mile. Evidently, even if the figure did not reach the Government, it was the figure the Rothschilds were prepared to abide by; and in view of the fact that the Government made a private agreement with other people, ignoring the principle of disposing of public franchises by open competition, Mr. Sifton's statement about what the Government was or was not offered is not weighty as a dismissal of the Rothschild figure.

I wish to say in reference to that article, that no proposal, in writing or verbal, direct or indirect, in any way, shape, form or manner, came to the Government from Messrs. Hamilton, Smith and Henry Bratnobar, representing, or assuming to represent, the Rothschilds, for the building of

any railway in that country. It is comparatively easy, after other men have deposited a quarter of a million dollars and assumed a responsibility for the expenditure of several million dollars, for other gentlemen to make statements about what their principals would have been prepared to do. These gentlemen, apparently, have been in Canada for some time, but they have not seen, nor so far as I am aware, have they ever even waited upon the Government, nor had themselves introduced to the Government, so far as I know, until after this contract had been signed. I also wish to point out that there is no inconsistency or inaccuracy in the statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). As I said, I do not think the "Journal" is desirous of misrepresenting the Government, and therefore I think it is only fair that it should be set right. On page 395 of the "Hansard" my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said, in reference to a statement made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) :

The hon. gentleman will permit me to say, as I did not catch the name he mentioned, that the gentleman who does represent the Rothschilds in this country had the question put to him, whether he would make a tender to the Government, and after considering the whole question and examining all the information the Government could place before him, and cabling to his principals at home, he wrote to the Government that after the fullest consideration he declined to touch it at all.

That is very clear; but that gentleman was not Mr. Hamilton Smith nor Mr. Bratnobar; that gentleman was Mr. Kersey. I desire also to say that although in his written proposal, which has been laid before Parliament, he did not state that he represented the Rothschilds, yet he furnished to the Government the names of persons whom he assumed to represent, and amongst those names which he furnished to the Government were the Rothschilds firm, as well as several other leading financial people in Europe. The Government could hardly be expected to imagine that, when a gentleman was here representing the Rothschilds and negotiating with us, somebody else in Montreal, who had not introduced himself, was also representing the Rothschilds. That will dispose of the idea that we had any other or any better offer than the one we have laid before the House.

I was adverting to the question of the Stikine route when you, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair at six o'clock, and I want to say just a word or two, particularly to my friends in the North-west and British Columbia, in relation to the route, the all-Canadian route, to the Yukon country from the North-west, which I presume every patriotic Canadian would be very pleased to see opened up by the construction of a railway. I have seen an intimation that there was opposition to this project in Manitoba,

the North-west, and also to a certain extent in some parts of Ontario, which was alleged to exist on the ground that it was not a route all through Canadian territory, but was hostile to or in substitution of a railway by way of the North-west Territories. Now, if my hon. friends will take the map which accompanies Mr. Ogilvie's report they will see that one of the strongest points in favour of the Stikine route is that it is the continuation of, the natural complement to a route from the North-west to Peace River and thence to the Yukon; that it is the shortest, the best and in fact the only way of striking that country and getting in there. I am not in a position to speak of this route with absolute definiteness and correctness, because the Government have had no opportunity of obtaining exact and full information in regard to the route on that general line. But we know that the Peace River pierces the mountains, that there is a practical through route that way, and we know it is the only practicable route for many hundreds of miles north of the Yellow Head Pass, and that the Yellow Head Pass would be too far south for the purpose. That at all events is my opinion, and as the matter appears to me at the present moment—from a cursory examination—it would be too far south. Peace River valley will bring us to Halfway River, and from Talchudy Lake we reach Stikine River and Telegraph Creek and go forward on this line to the navigable waters of Teslin Lake and the Hootalinqua River. So we have not only an all-Canadian route, but a complement route from the North-west, and the only possible route we can make use of from that portion of the country. That is a point to which I wish to direct particularly the attention of members from the North-west. I refer to it in this general way, and if hon. members will take the map and study it for themselves, they will see at once that this conclusion is absolutely correct. I shall now speak of the advantages of this route. The Cassiar and Cariboo districts of British Columbia are very rich. They have been retarded in their development only by lack of railway facilities. I was told by a gentleman who is manager of a company now seeking to operate in the Omenica country that there is a great stretch of mineral lands in that district and in Cassiar, and, while there is not the richness of Bonanza Creek, there is sufficient mineral to admit of profitable and successful operations being carried on with suitable mining machinery. With proper transportation and mining facilities this company would carry on extensive works and make a profit on its capital. These districts, I say, have been held back by reason of the lack of transportation facilities. But the railway project now proposed to be undertaken would open up the Cassiar district almost completely, and go far towards satisfying the demand for railway

Mr. SIFTON.

facilities there; it would develop the country north, and, in addition to furnishing the Cassiar district with railway facilities, we would secure the natural complement of the enterprise by extending the railway down to Alice at the head of Observatory Inlet, and to an ocean port. Thus the road would traverse the northern part of British Columbia, opening and developing the rich districts of that province, and afterwards reach and develop the Yukon country, and thus it would develop those communities to which the people of the North-west Territories would be able to send their cattle and horses and in which they would find a market for their agricultural produce.

Mr. PRIOR. In what direction does the hon. Minister say the railway will be continued?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is contemplated to extend it from Telegraph Creek down to Alice Inlet, at the extension of Observatory Inlet, which will be seen marked on the map. The distance is about 200 miles; and although we have no engineer's report on that territory, we have made pretty careful inquiries from Hudson Bay officers and others who have special knowledge regarding it, and we are assured that without doubt it is a practicable route for a road between those two points.

I have adverted to this matter in connection with the enterprise in order that members of the House, from the west particularly, may see that in considering this matter we have not lost sight of their interests. Members from Manitoba and the North-west know very well and thoroughly understand that in any project of this kind I at least will be most sedulous in looking after the interests of Manitoba and the North-west, the fertile districts of which I hope to see settled by a very much larger population than is there at the present time and affording a much larger and more profitable market for the merchants and manufacturers of the east.

This, therefore, is the scheme we have laid before the House for its approval. In addition to possessing these advantages, it is in every sense the only available and practicable route at the present time to meet the absolute necessities of the occasion; and I leave the subject with this statement as to the project, that when this railway has been completed it will be practically the only route that will carry the ordinary commerce connected with the Yukon country. The St. Michael's route can never do anything more than a small transportation business; the routes by Dyea and Skagway are impracticable—they are practicable only until the railway is built. The result of carrying out the proposed project will be that an immense volume of trade, which we hope to see going into that country, will be forced over the Stikine route, and instead

of the thousands of miners, whom we are told by the New York "Herald" are arriving daily at Seattle, preparing to go north by American steamboats and by American routes, they will find themselves forced in their own interest to come to Victoria, Vancouver and other points in British Columbia, and there obtain their goods and outfits, take their passage on Canadian boats and travel by Canadian channels up to the Yukon district. This will be the result, we hope, and I see no reason to doubt that the hope is well founded in view of the policy we have submitted to the House. At the risk of being wearisome I will read some clauses from the contract, especially with the view of converting members of the Opposition. I have myself found, from the short experience I had in legislation before I came to this House, that it is a very common thing for even careful and systematic and intelligent members of the House, in the rush of business, not to give a very careful and thorough reading to Bills which come before Parliament. Therefore, so as to avoid any misconceptions, I shall take the liberty of reading the terms of this contract; and it will only take me a few minutes. It says:

1. The contractors covenant with the Government to lay out, construct, equip, and fully complete a line of railway with proper terminal facilities from the navigable waters of the Stikine River in British Columbia, at or near the mouth of Telegraph Creek, Glenora, or the mouth of Clear Water River, thence running northward to the navigable waters of Teslin Lake, a distance of about one hundred and fifty miles, more or less, on or before the first day of September, A.D. 1898, the said railway when fully completed to be of the general standard and gauge of the Kaslo and Slocan Railway in British Columbia and according to the specifications to be approved by the Minister of Railways.

Provided also, that the said railway shall be the property of the contractors but shall be subject to inspection and approval by an engineer to be named by the Minister of Railways and Canals before being accepted as complete by the Government.

Provided further, that for the purposes of the season of 1898 and of complying with the requirements of this contract in respect to the completion of the line on or before the said first of September, it shall be sufficient if, on or before that date, the contractors have the rails laid in such a manner as will permit of regular and efficient operation of the railway, although the whole work be not fully completed, and if the said railway be sufficiently equipped for such operation. Provided also, that the location of said railway between the points mentioned shall be such as the contractors may decide upon without filing plans thereof prior to completion, provided that the grant of land hereby contracted for shall not be made upon a larger mileage than the Minister of Railways considers reasonably necessary for traversing the distance between the terminal points.

2. The Government shall submit to Parliament at its next ensuing session a measure for the necessary Act confirming this agreement and authorizing the Government and the contractors

to perform and carry out the same, also incorporating the contractors and such others as may become shareholders into a company under the name of the Canadian Yukon Railway Company or other name approved by the contractors (herein after referred to as the contractors' company) with power to acquire and perform and carry out this agreement, and with all necessary provisions in that behalf, and with all necessary powers to build and operate a railway above mentioned and an extension thereof northward to Dawson City or thereabouts and an extension southward to a point in British Columbia to be designated by the Government and capable of being made an ocean port, also a line of railway from the waters of Lynn Canal to Port Selkirk or thereabouts by way of Chilkat Pass, also branch lines of railway from any points on the company's railways to any property owned by the company, also lines of railway from any navigable waters to any property owned by the company: Provided that the power to build said lines from Lynn Canal to Port Selkirk and said branch lines and said lines from navigable waters shall not be exercised without the consent of the Governor General in Council.

I am reading this to show that a lot of things which have been imputed to this contract, are not in it at all, that they are not contemplated by the contract, and that they never were contemplated by the Government. The House will at once see that this clause which provides for these extensions, does not at all contemplate that any bonus should be given for them. They are mere charter powers for the construction of a line of railway which any company might get on application to Parliament in the usual way, and they do not contemplate any additions to the bonus or assessments given by the Government. It is stipulated further, that the power hereinafter provided for can only be exercised upon the authority of the Governor General in Council being given. The contract continues, to say:

The said Act of incorporation also to give the company full and sufficient powers to build and otherwise acquire and operate docks, wharfs and lines of steam and other vessels in connection with its railways and property, also telegraph and telephone lines, also to carry on mining and smelting operations and such other powers as may be necessary for the due operating and conduct of all business connected with and incidental to the development and working of the lands (to be granted by the Government as hereinafter provided) and the minerals therein, including power to issue land grant bonds and bonds secured by the company's undertakings.

3. Upon the incorporation of said company and upon the assignment by the contractors to such company of this agreement and upon the said company covenanting with the Government to carry out the same, and upon the said railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake being completed and accepted as aforesaid, the contractors shall then but not before be relieved from personal responsibility hereunder and the company shall be thereafter deemed to be the parties of the second part hereto in lieu of the contractors and shall be bound as such, and be entitled to their rights hereunder.

I wish to call the attention of Parliament to this fact, that for the first time, so far as I am aware, in the railway history of this

Dominion, the Government has, in making this contract, secured not only the liability of the company, which may be worth absolutely nothing, but the personal liability of the men themselves who are going into the work, and in this particular case the personal liability amounts to a very large sum. In addition to that, of course, there is the \$250,000 deposit, which, I think, also is a departure in the railway history of Canada. The contract continues :

4. For five years from the first of September, 1898, no line of railway shall be authorized by Parliament to be constructed—

This, of course, is subject to the ratification of Parliament, the Government making the agreement to be binding if Parliament ratifies it.

4. For five years from the first of September, 1898, no line of railway shall be authorized by Parliament to be constructed from Lynn Canal or thereabouts or from any point at or near the international boundary between Canada and Alaska into the Yukon district, and for five years from said date no aid in land or money shall be granted to any person or company other than the contractors and the contractors' company to assist in building any such railway.

The House will see that this clause does not say that any aid in land or money shall be granted to the contractors or the contractors' company ; but it says that nobody else shall be permitted to build there. Now, the reading of that clause will at once dissipate the idea that there has been any monopoly granted to this company. There is no monopoly whatever. This company gets a charter to build from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake. There is no monopoly in that charter. The Legislature of British Columbia can give another charter to-morrow, or this House could give another charter. We do not bind ourselves not to give another charter ; we do not say anything about it, and, by the way, there is another charter in existence at the present time, namely, the Cassiar Central. This latter charter does not specifically name this route, but it is wide enough, as any lawyer in this House who reads the charter will agree with me, to justify any one else taking that charter, and going on, and building over the same route. There is nothing in this clause which, by any possible stretch of imagination, can be called a monopoly. As I have said, other people can get charters, and there is actually another charter in existence at this present moment. But what we do say is this : We say that nature or bad management has given somebody else the advantage over us by putting the ocean a little nearer to their territory than to ours, and that this Parliament is not going to help out that discrimination against Canadian trade and Canadian enterprise by granting another charter. We submit that to Parliament as a view which we think the representatives of the Canadian people

Mr. SIFTON.

should see proper to endorse. The contract continues to say :

5. The contractors and the contractors' company shall be entitled to receive in preference to any other person or company during ten years from the said first of September, 1898, such aid or assistance in land or money as the Government may be authorized and may see fit to grant in aid of a line of railway from the Stikine River to an ocean port in British Columbia, provided that the contractors or contractors' company are willing to undertake the construction of the same at once and completion thereof within a reasonable time upon receiving notice thereof from the Government.

The meaning of that is this—not that anybody else is prohibited from building a line of railway there ; not that we will not give a charter to anybody else ; but that, if the Government decides that it is in the interest of Canada to have a railway built from Telegraph Creek to Observatory Inlet, and is willing to give so much land and so much money to assist in the construction of that road within ten years, we shall give this company the first chance to build it. That is what that means, and that is all it means, and the consent of Parliament would, of course, be necessary before we could give assistance to this company or to any other. But the point I wish to make is that it does not prohibit anybody else. All it says is that these people, having gone in as pioneers and built the first railway and opened up the trade, if there is to be an extension of the railway to the south, they are to have the first chance to go on and build it. Now, I submit to the House that if this clause were not in the contract at all, and if two years from to-day it were proposed by the Government of Canada to have a railway built from the Stikine River down to Observatory Inlet, and another company came here and asked for assistance for that purpose, and this company came for the same purpose, this House would not wait half a minute to decide to which company to give it. This House would at once decide to give it to the company which was on the ground and in operation. What possible sense would there be in having one company with a railway extending for 150 miles and another company with a railway extending for another 150 miles ? Such a proposition would not be considered by this House as a reasonable business proposition.

6. The tolls to be collected by the contractors or contractors' company upon the line of railway hereby contracted for between Stikine River and Teslin Lake shall be first fixed by the Governor General in Council, and the tolls so fixed shall not be liable to reduction until the said railway has been in operation for four years, but such tolls shall be reduced by the Governor in Council by twenty-five per cent from and after such four years, and after the said railway has been in operation seven years they shall be reduced by twenty-five per cent off the tolls

previously reduced, but after the said railway has been ten years in operation the tolls shall be subject to the general railway laws of Canada in that behalf.

A great deal of fault has been found because we did not come down to Parliament and state what the rates would be. I called the attention of the House and my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition this afternoon to the fact that such a thing never was heard of before—that in all the railway legislation of Canada, so far as I know, no Act of Parliament ever fixed the rates of any railway, and no Government ever stated in advance what the rates of any railway would be. It is time enough to fix the rates when the railway is prepared to go into operation. The law of Canada is that no railway company can fix its rates until they are first approved of by the Governor in Council; and this is precisely the law in regard to this company, except that it provides for an automatic reduction of the rates after the first tariff shall have been fixed. I am quite free to say that, although I do not anticipate that any member of the Government would think of authorizing such a wild tariff as was suggested by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) the other night, yet the rates upon this railway will be higher, considerably higher, much higher, than the rates upon an ordinary railway in a settled country. The chances which people take in building a railway into a mining country, of their property and the trade being destroyed owing to the mining district becoming exhausted, must be taken into consideration in a case of this kind; and I would not for one instant lead the House to suppose that the rates the Government would authorize would be no higher than those on an ordinary railway in a settled country; but I do not think they will go anywhere near the figures of the hon. member for West York.

7. The land granted to the contractors or contractors' company hereunder shall be free from taxation for ten years from the granting thereof, except municipal taxation by an incorporated city, town or village within the Yukon provisional district.

I think the exception in this case is as great as the exemption. I think municipal taxation outside of incorporated towns or cities is not likely to materialize in ten years, so that the exemption amounts practically to nothing.

8. The contractors shall immediately construct a practicable sleigh road from the mouth of Stikine River to Teslin Lake, and shall provide suitable shelters or stopping places for travellers at intervals of not more than twenty-five miles along such road, such road and stopping places to be available for use at the earliest possible moment, and in any event not later than six weeks from the execution of this agreement.

9. The contractors or the contractors' company shall provide or arrange with others to provide steamboat transport of freight and passen-

gers between the terminus of said railway on Teslin Lake or other terminus northerly thereof and Dawson City to and fro.

The next clause refers to the deposit of \$250,000, which I need not read, and I need say no more in regard to it than that the deposit is in the hands of the Government.

11. In aid of the construction of said line of railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake the Government shall grant to the contractors for each mile of said railway twenty-five thousand acres of land to be selected as hereinafter mentioned from the Yukon provisional district and from that part of the North-west Territories of Canada lying west of the Mackenzie River and Liard River and north of the 60th parallel of latitude, such land to be and become vested in the contractors upon the said railway being completed and accepted as complete by the Government, and upon the said land being selected as hereinafter set forth.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the penalties apply to clauses 8 and 9, or has the hon. gentleman any idea whether clause 8 will be complied with or not?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The \$250,000 deposit refers only to the construction of the railway. It does not apply to the construction of the sleigh road. But for that we have the covenant of the contractors, which, as the hon. gentleman is perfectly aware, is just as good as the deposit.

12. The lands shall be selected by the contractors along base lines, and the base lines may be of two kinds:

1st. The contractors may take as a base line a line which will correspond with the general course of any lake, river, stream or watercourse, such line to be determined by survey or approximate survey to the satisfaction of the authorized agent of the Minister of the Interior, and to follow the general course of the lake, river, stream or watercourse for the required distance; and

2nd. The contractors may take as a base line a line commencing at any point located by them and running from such point due north, east, south or west. The land along a base line shall be divided into blocks, each block to extend three miles along the base line and to extend three miles backwards on each side of the base line. On each base line there shall be at least eight of such blocks, but there may be more at the option of the contractors. These blocks shall be numbered from one up consecutively; the odd-numbered blocks shall be the property of the contractors; the even-numbered shall remain the property of the Government. The contractors shall take at least four blocks on each base line established by them for the purpose of selection, but shall not be bound to take more—but they may take as many more as they desire and as circumstances permit. Thus upon each base line so established there shall be laid out a tract not less than twenty-four miles along the course of said base line by three miles on each side thereof in width, making eight blocks of three miles by six miles. Provided that if in the selections of lands along any base line the courses thereof prevent rectangular blocks being laid out, such blocks shall be adjusted to the required angles, preserving as far as practicable blocks of an area of three miles by six. Any shortage or surplus of such area shall be adjusted

by the prolongation or shortening of such base line.

The contractors may also at their option select additional blocks lying on either end of any odd-numbered block along a base line, but such additional blocks must be three miles square each and they shall not exceed three in number on each end of each such odd-numbered block.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I shall refer to that later.

13. The contractors shall make selection of one-half of the lands to which they become entitled under this contract within three years from the first day of September, 1898, and of the remainder within six years from that date.

14. No portion of the beds of the rivers Yukon, Lewes or Hootalinqua, or of the lakes Teslin, Bennett, Tagish, Labarge or Marsh (said lakes and rivers forming continuous watercourses), or of the banks thereof for twenty-five feet on each side of the ordinary high-water mark shall pass to the contractors under any selection of lands made under the agreement.

I may say that that clause is one which was discussed a long time between the contractors and the Government, and the contractors thought they were being unfairly treated in not being allowed free selection along these rivers, because it is well known—contrary to the statements made in this House—that there are very profitable deposits, especially along the Hootalinqua, which might be immediately made available.

15. The free rights of passage and use along navigable or floatable streams within the lands selected by the contractors shall not be impeded by them, and if any stream be diverted by them, from its natural channel an equally convenient navigable or floatable channel shall be provided in lieu, and the Gold Commissioner of the district shall decide any dispute which may arise as to whether such equally convenient channel has been provided, and from his decision there shall be an appeal to the Governor General in Council.

16. Any and all mining claims actually held and recorded pursuant to Government regulations by a free miner or free miners, and being within a block of land taken or selected by the contractors hereunder, shall be excepted from the grant and shall not pass to the contractors, provided that such claims have been so actually held and recorded prior to the base line, along or with reference to which such block is taken, being actually run and marked on the ground by the contractors.

17. There shall be payable to and reserved by the Government a royalty of one per cent upon all gold mined by placer or alluvial or hydraulic mining upon the lands selected hereunder, and if and so long as any royalty up to one per cent is levied by the Government upon all gold got by quartz mining in Government land in the Yukon district a royalty of an equal amount up to one per cent, but no more shall be payable to and reserved by the Government upon all gold got by quartz mining in the land selected hereunder.

18. So soon as any ten continuous miles of said railway between Stikine River and Teslin Lake have been completed and in running order, and certified so to be by an officer named by the

Mr. SIFTON.

Minister of Railways in that behalf, the contractors may select ninety-two thousand one hundred and sixty acres, or two blocks of land hereunder, and thereupon such blocks shall be reserved by the Government from sale or location or free miners' claims, and upon the completion from time to time in a similar way of any other ten miles, the contractors shall have a similar right to select ninety-two thousand one hundred and sixty acres, or two blocks, which shall thereupon be similarly reserved, and upon the completion of the said railway and acceptance thereof by the Government as completed, the blocks so reserved shall be granted to the contractors. All free miners' claims being excepted, as provided by clause 16 hereof.

19. In case any land is excepted out of blocks taken by contractors on account of free miners' claims or otherwise, the quantity so excepted shall not be counted in the acreage of lands to which the contractors are entitled hereunder.

20. The contractors shall upon application sell to actual settlers for farming purposes, at prices to be fixed by the Governor General in Council, any arable lands forming part of those selected hereunder. Provided, however, that upon such sale all minerals and the right to mine same shall be reserved, and this clause shall not extend to lands suitable for village or town sites.

That clause was specially put in because there are a few places where men occupy small tracts of land, which might not perhaps be designated as farm but as grazing lands, and in such cases would be entitled to have their land at reasonable prices.

21. So soon as the contractors notify the Minister of Railways and Canals to send an engineer to inspect and approve of any ten miles of the line of railway hereby contracted for, such engineer shall be sent without delay to make such inspection, and shall thereafter remain ready to inspect such each ten miles until the whole line is completed.

22. The grants of lands selected by the contractors hereunder shall be in fee simple, and shall include all precious metals and all minerals whatever, reserving only the royalties above provided for.

23. Provision shall be made in the Act incorporating the contractors' company against any discrimination by such company in operating its railways between customers, whether by discriminating rates or treatment or otherwise, or by means of its steamships or other connections or otherwise.

That clause was inserted in order that the company may not unfairly discriminate against any steamboat or transportation company and drive it off the route. The next clause relates to the use of water for hydraulic and placer mining.

What I desire to call the attention of the House particularly to with reference to this contract—which I have perhaps read at wearisome length—is this, that, in the first place, there is no monopoly of any kind whatever. In the next place, these people put up their \$250,000 to build a railway by the 1st of next September, and I venture to say there is not another man in Canada who would contract to build it by that time. If there is, I never heard of him. I did not even hear, in the midst of all the re-

markably rash assertions which we have had from the other side of the House, it insinuated that there is in Canada to-day one single man who is prepared to put his money into a contract to build that road by the 1st of September. If there is, we have had no intimation of it. They have said almost everything that could be said on the other side, but they have not intimated that any man would undertake that work and carry it out on the terms proposed.

Mr. OSLER. What forfeiture is there other than that if the road is not built by that day—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a forfeiture of \$250,000 now in the hands of the Finance Minister, and there is the personal responsibility of Mackenzie & Mann, under a signed contract, which renders them liable to the full extent of their means, whatever these may be.

Mr. OSLER. Suppose they do not build the road by that day?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They lose the \$250,000 and are liable to damage.

Mr. OSLER. They do not forfeit their charter if they only build the road within a year from next September.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They pay damages.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What damages?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That would be decided in the ordinary way in which damages are decided. We make a contract, but we cannot be at the same time court and jury to decide upon the breach of a contract that may or may not take place. The hon. gentlemen need not get restless. The fact is this, that notwithstanding all the criticism that has been made, the vital point of this contract, which is that it provides for a railway by the 1st of September, has not been met in any shape or form. There has not been any information that any man in Canada would sign that contract to-day if it were offered to him. Least of all, I think, would my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) risk his good money in the scheme.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would prefer that my hon. friend would not interrupt me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly then I shall not.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. These hon. gentlemen are not asking anything germane to the point. There are lots of lawyers to give an opinion as to what the contract means. I take it to be pretty

clear. What I further desire to say is that having made that deposit, having entered into that obligation, my judgment is that that obligation means, under the extraordinary circumstances existing, an expenditure probably in the neighbourhood of \$1,000,000. Having taken that risk, these gentlemen have no right to locate a single acre of land until they have ten miles of that railway in operation. It is inconceivable that they should have ten miles in operation before the 15th of June; and, from now until then, any portion of that country can be taken up by any of the thousands of people who are going in. If it is easy to find Bonanzas and Eldorados, as the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) seems to think, if it is only a question of getting up to the Yukon district and walking right in and finding beds of gold, why do not some of our hon. friends do it? There is nothing to prevent them. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, is the president of a company which, I see he has said in an address delivered by him in London, has secured a capital of £70,000 sterling for doing work. If it is an easy thing and a sure thing—if anybody who can command capital has only to send prospectors to that country to plant their stakes on Bonanzas and Eldorados, why does not my hon. friend do it? He has the capital and has been working for several months in connection with this matter already. We all know that when a man talks that way about a mining country, he is talking utter nonsense. We know that in the aggregate it takes more money to find and take out gold than the gold amounts to after it is taken out.

The total amount of money spent in taking gold out of placer-mining regions throughout the world, so far as known, is far in excess of what has been taken out. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) said that himself in the course of his speech. He possibly made the statement inadvertently. Far from this company having any outrageous advantages given to it, it is taking the whole responsibility, putting up the money, risking its millions, as well as its \$250,000 deposit, and risking all this upon a land grant—and the whole world has practically months to go through and take up claims before the contractors will make their selection. I need not say that this point was strongly contested by the contractors, that they protested bitterly against being put in that position, and it was only after long and wearisome negotiations that the Government got them to agree to this provision of the agreement; and then, finally, only by inserting the clause providing that they might make some selection after they had ten miles of the railway in operation. After they have ten miles in operation, they can take two blocks, that is, they can place claims in not more than two localities. After they have ten miles more in operation, they can take two blocks more, and so on. And,

while this is going on, the two hundred and fifty thousand people who, we are told, are coming from all over the world into that country, are spreading over that vast territory, prospecting and picking out their claims beforehand and taking everything that is considered by them of much value. I cannot conceive of anything more perfectly clear than that the advantage in this contract is practically on the side of the Government. For my part, if I had any money—which Providence has never blessed me with so far—I would not care to risk it in a transaction of that kind. Now, I have just called attention to this method of selection in order that the House will see how utterly false the propositions are which are being advanced by the other side of the House, based upon some of the paper calculations which do not find any justification within the four corners of the contract.

I want to refer for a minute or two to some statements made on the subject of the standard of this railway. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) is going to follow me, I believe. I want to give him some things to start his remarks on. On page 224 of the "Hansard" he delivered himself upon this contract in words which I shall quote. He said:

I know the standard of the Kaslo-Slocan Railway—

I do not think he does.

—as well as the hon. gentleman does. It is a road built among mountains, twisting around a hill with a curvature perhaps fifty times greater than anything that will be necessary on this road.

I am reading just to show how utterly reckless are the criticisms of this contract; and to expose the fact that, even a gentleman whom we have respected as a practical man of business, who was at the head of the Railway Department, and who, one would think, should speak with some degree of caution about a matter of business, especially an important matter of business, did not take the trouble of gaining the slightest bit of information on the subject he was talking about.

We know nothing about this road—

We don't? If the hon. gentleman had read the report of the department he presided over, he would have found out a good deal about this road. It is all there. The hon. gentleman's name is not appended to that report, but it is the report for the year during which he was Minister of Railways, and the slight accident of the change of Government at the end of the year is the only reason why his name does not appear there.

—for they have not the report of the engineer, which, I suppose, the hon. gentleman will lay on the Table of the House before another stage of this Bill is taken. The standard of the road, he says, is to be that of the Kaslo and Slocan Railway. What kind of a road is that? A narrow gauge road, with rails twenty-seven or thirty pounds to the yard.

Mr. SIFTON.

That is not the case. In the report of the department for the last year during which he presided over it, he will find it stated that the weight of the rails is forty-five pounds to the yard, and not twenty-seven or thirty pounds, as he says. Again, he says:

At any rate, the road—

That is this road (the Yukon road).

—is only going to be a temporary road, as the hon. leader of the Government stated the other evening—a narrow gauge road built upon any gradients and with any curvature the contractors may think fit, as long as it comes within the specifications of that mountain road built by the Canadian Pacific Railway from Kaslo to Slocan.

The road was not built by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the hon. gentleman was reminded of this by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) continued:

It was an independent road, but it was afterwards obtained by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

It was not obtained by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Even that casual observation was not correct. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company did not obtain it or control it; that company never had anything to do with the road, and has not now. For the hon. gentleman's information, I may say that it was the Great Northern Railway Company that had to do with the construction of that road, although it was built and is now being operated, and has always been operated, by an independent company. The hon. gentleman goes on:

But perhaps I am mistaken on that point. I did not know who the possessor of the road was but I have been over it and I know what its character is.

Then, why did he not tell us? He told us the very reverse of its character. Now, I will give the standard of the Kaslo and Slocan: Length of line, 31.8 miles; weight of steel rails, 45 pounds; radius of sharpest curve, 193 feet; number of feet per mile, heaviest grade, 171.6. I am reading this to obviate the necessity of the hon. gentleman reading the report of the department he presided over. Such an unaccustomed labour it would be unfair to exact from him. If any hon. gentleman will figure this out, he will find that this grade is a trifle over 3 per cent. And, of course, the heaviest grade on the road we are proposing to have constructed in this district cannot be heavier. The cost of this tramway, as the hon. gentleman calls it, was \$22,800 a mile. This is a rather unpleasant commentary on the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite who talk of its costing \$22,800 a mile to build a tramway. That was in a part of British Columbia, where the cost of building a railway—

Mr. PRIOR. If you had ever been out on that line you would find it a very different country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have been over it, and over this tramway. I rode over it thirty-one miles in less than an hour, and any one who knows anything about a railway knows that you cannot run thirty-one miles an hour over a tramway. It is a railroad, and it is a good railroad, too.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is through the best timber in the world.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It goes through a magnificently timbered belt, and is a difficult country in which to build a railroad, but not an extraordinarily difficult country, not anything like as expensive a country, taking all things into consideration, as the country from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake. There is perhaps more expense of a certain kind, that is to say, there may be a little more rock cutting; but I venture to state that there is no part of the road from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake which will be built for \$22,800 a mile. Now, my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) does know all about the standard of the Kaslo and Slocan Railway. That is the standard of the road which we are going to build.

I want to speak to the House a moment in regard to the question of the weight of the rails. The weight of the rails upon this railway, before it can be accepted by the Government and before the company can get a title to an acre of land, must be forty-five pounds, according to the standard. It is yet unsettled between the company and the Government as to whether forty-five pound rails should be laid upon the road this coming summer. If it is shown to the Government to be physically impossible to get in forty-five pound rails by the river, or enough of them, then we propose to let the company put down twenty-eight pound rails temporarily until they can get forty-five pound rails up the river, allowing traffic to go on in the meantime. That is the only advantage given to the contractors in the way of enabling them to get the road into operation by the 1st of September. It is not an advantage financially on the total operation, because anybody can see it would be much better for them to put forty-five pound rails in at once than to put down twenty-eight pound rails, and then have to take them up and substitute heavier ones.

Now, just one word about the other propositions that were made to the Government. When I opened my remarks this evening I think I made it clear that there were no other offers made to the Government than those which had been laid upon the Table of the House. The House is in full possession of everything that the Government is in possession of with respect to this matter, and I apprehend that the members of the House have

familiarized themselves fairly well with the contents of these documents. I will not weary the House, therefore, with reading them at length. The last two letters are those to which I desire to call the attention of the House. The only gentleman whom we know as the representative of the Rothschilds is Mr. H. Maitland Kersey, lately agent of the White Star Steamship Line in the City of New York, and now engaged in financing a company for the purpose of putting steamboats upon the Yukon route between various points which I have spoken of to-night at length. As the papers upon the Table of the House will show, Mr. Kersey first made a proposition a considerable time ago for the construction of a railway from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake, in which he asked for a bonus of \$6,000 a mile. The time, the 1st of September, of course, was not mentioned at all, and I need not say that Mr. Kersey had no intention whatever of even suggesting that he could build a road by that time in the proposal which he laid before us. It was intimated to him that the Government would not give a cash bonus for this railway at all, and that discussion on that question might therefore be dispensed with. Mr. Kersey came back, after having made full financial arrangements in London, and on the 21st of January he asked for an interview with me. I saw him in the presence of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, and my hon. friend the member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell). These gentlemen were both acquainted with Mr. Kersey, and I met him in company with them. I informed him that we were prepared to give a liberal amount of land. Mr. Kersey knew that 20,000 or 25,000 acres of land per mile was under discussion; and I informed him that we were prepared to give a liberal amount of land aggregating something in that neighbourhood; that we wanted the road in operation, if not finally completed, by the 1st of September; and that we wanted \$250,000 in cash deposited as a guarantee that the work should be accomplished. He placed in my hands, on the morning of the 22nd of January, this letter:

Ottawa, 22nd January, 1898.

Dear Mr. Sifton,—With reference to our conversation of last evening, I communicated fully by cable last night both to Devonshire House and Chatsworth the ideas of the Government as I understand them with regard to the construction of a railway between Glenora and Teslin. Saturday, as you are aware, is a difficult day to transact business in London, but as I had already prepared my friends for the message which was sent last night, I have every hope of receiving an answer at any moment, and that I shall be able to lay before you a definite and favourable proposition for the construction of the work within a few hours.

I may say that Mr. Kersey, before going to England, had put in the proposition for the construction of this railway. It was

no new thing with him, he was not taken unawares, he knew all about it, and had discussed it fully with his principals in London :

I advised London that the Government requested a definite decision to-day, but that in any event they would not wait after Monday. I should, therefore, be in the position to either make you a definite offer not later than Monday or to withdraw entirely in favour of other applicants. I am now having the proposal drafted on the lines of my cable so as to save every possible moment. As I advised you yesterday, we have a fleet of boats building on the coast, including two steamers and numerous small boats on Teslin Lake itself, the engines and boilers for these boats and a saw-mill being sent in over the snow, and I have further a full equipment of men, sleighs, &c., under an experienced man who knows the trail, waiting in Victoria at the present moment for news to come of the taking of the ice on the Stikine River, in order that they may proceed to open up the trail.

I understand that we should have to guarantee the construction of the road by the 1st of September, putting up a deposit, and I have so advised London.

Thanking you for your courteous attention, I am, yours faithfully,

H. MAITLAND KERSEY.

Next I have a letter dated January 23rd, 1898. I think January 23rd was Sunday, but this letter probably reached my hands on Monday morning.

Sir.—With reference to the offer which I made to you on behalf of my syndicate in early December, and to the conversation which I had the pleasure of having with you on Friday last, in relation to the construction of a wagon road and railway from Glenora to Teslin Lake, I have to advise you, after consultation with London, that we deem it inadvisable to make a further offer to the Government which would of necessity involve a guarantee of the completion of the line by the 1st of September next, and which offer would have to be based on a land grant, unaccompanied by any cash subsidy.

I have to thank you for so kindly postponing action to enable me to communicate with my friends in England, and have the honour to remain,

Your obedient servant,

H. MAITLAND KERSEY.

I think that pretty well disposes of the figment that we had better offers lying around which we could have accepted, or that anybody was willing to make a better offer than that which was made to us. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) is not in his place, because I expect that the hon. gentleman will favour us with an eloquent denunciation of this contract before the discussion is through. But we have the advantage, the very great advantage, of our enemy having written a book, or rather a letter to the newspapers, and I will trouble the House with a short discussion of some of the views of a gentleman who signs himself "Onlooker." The hon. member for East York knows who "Onlooker" is, and I am justified by what took place in this House a few evenings

Mr. SIFTON.

ago in concluding that although the hand is the hand of "Onlooker, the voice is the voice of the hon. member for York. There are two or three things in connection with the hon. gentleman's criticisms of this contract which indicate that even the hon. gentleman's facility in not accurately stating facts has been somewhat outdone in this particular effort. I must say to the hon. gentleman that out in the wild and woolly west from which I come, it is not considered very good form for a leading statesman to anticipate discussion by Parliament of an important question by abusing his political opponents in a newspaper. Of course if the hon. gentleman thinks otherwise, he can exercise his privilege. I will now refer to "Onlooker's" letter in the "Citizen," of January 29.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They have had a great deal of experience with anonymous letters.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, my hon. friend is correct. The great Conservative party is rich in such experience. I take it that this view presented in the "Citizen" is the view of that combination which is now the Conservative party in this House—that is to say it will be the official view. We had the view of the leader of the Opposition, his private view when he was first interviewed, and it was favourable to this contract in all its details, and it can scarcely be supposed that he seriously attempts to get out of that position; he practically approved of the contract, but the hon. members for East York, York and West York have been too much for the hon. gentleman and he had to change his view. I presume this statement by "Onlooker" will go down to history as the attitude of the Conservative party on this question, and that is the reason why I want to discuss it. I will not read the whole of the article, for if I did so I am afraid the House would never forgive me. The hon. gentleman in a certain part of his letter, in the fourth column, makes a statement—and if the hon. gentleman is going to indulge in literary efforts he must make his contributions shorter; for, although he can make members sit here and listen to him for three or four hours at a time, he cannot make people read lengthy articles in newspapers. Referring to the profits to be derived from the road, the hon. gentleman wrote :

Vary this calculation as you may, cut it down or increase the estimate, and it shows you that no more paying franchise could be obtained than the bare privilege of building and operating this road.

I am not going to criticise these observations at length, but I am going to show how entirely absurd is the position taken in this article, which will, I presume, be the position of the Opposition. The statement is made, it has been made in this House, and has been argued that it is a great privilege to allow the contractors to

build the railway on account of the enormous profits. There is a provincial charter in existence at the present time, held by the Cassiar Central Company, for the building of a line of railway over this route. It contains a provision for a land grant, a lease of lands with mineral rights, to the extent of 10,240 acres per mile in the Cassiar district, subject to certain conditions. The provisions are not so favourable to the Cassiar Central Company as are these proposed by this Government, and therefore that company has not been able to get any money to build the road. If we made the same conditions we would not have our railway built. So we have a railway charter in existence covering the same territory as that by our projected railway and the company has the liberal concession of 10,240 acres of land per mile under lease for thirty-five years, which is practically a deed as regards the mineral rights. That grant is subject to certain conditions in respect to payment of royalties; but I need not go into that point fully. If hon. members will look at the charter in the British Columbia statutes they will see the conditions set out, and that there is a liberal concession given to the company for building the road. The gentlemen composing the company have been in England for a year and have not been able to secure, so far as my knowledge goes, one dollar, and certainly they have not been able to build a single foot of the road. The proof of the pudding is in the eating; and if the charter is there, not only a charter but a large and liberal concession, and nobody of men can be got to build the railway, in the name of common sense what is the use of making a statement of that kind and sending it all over Canada? Is there to be no sense in statements made by public men? Here is an hon. gentleman who, for years and years, has been a member of the House, who has been Finance Minister, who has occupied the responsible position of leader of the House, and who in an anonymous letter, in an article not even over his own name, has made a statement which he knows and which every man knows to be absolutely and entirely false. Is there any justification for that sort of action?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I was about to direct the attention of the hon. gentleman to the use of the word false. We do not approve of the use of that word in the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I bow most deferentially to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and if I have said anything contrary to the usage of the House I very cheerfully withdraw it. The House, I hope, however, will not forget that this clause is in the hon. gentleman's letter. Here is another point in the letter:

For a coast and boundary line of over 1,000 miles not a rail shall for five years be laid to compete with Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie. No matter what eligible passes may be discovered, no matter what citizen may wish to build and engage in lawful transport, there stands the flaming sword of the Government flashing in the monetary defense of Mann & Mackenzie. The mere statement of this monstrous proposition instantly condemns it.

The hon. gentleman says that the mere statement of a proposition, which is in effect that this Government proposes to defend Canadian trade, is enough to condemn it. This hon. gentleman who, hour after hour, and week after week, last session lectured and denounced the Government because Canadian trade was suffering, gets up here and says that the mere statement of the fact that the Government of Canada proposes to protect Canadian trade is enough to condemn the Government's policy in regard to this road.

Now, Sir, I bring this forward for the purpose of showing that the position of the Opposition on this point is, that we, in endeavouring to protect Canadian trade, are wrong. That is a point I want this House to take note of, and that is a point I want the country to take note of. I want the country to note that we on this side are endeavouring to protect that trade from invasion, and that our friends in the Opposition are not in favour of that policy. That is clear. Again, he says:

Worse still, if worse there could be. The Government have undertaken to bind Parliament for ten years to a preference for Mann & Mackenzie for any railway between Stikine River and any ocean port in British Columbia.

That is the most ingenious way of creating a false impression that could possibly be imagined; but I need not criticise that statement, because there is something later on which will need comment.

Promising aid to them and prohibition to all others.

I would like my hon. friends on the other side of the House to take note of the fact that I have requested, and this Government have requested the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), and the combined force of the intellects of gentlemen on the other side of the House, to set to work and show wherein that contract provides any prohibition to anybody else. He goes on:

And they have an exclusive option and monopoly of this all-rail route for ten years from September 1, 1898.

There is not one single word of truth in that statement.

Now, I am going to say a few words about the selection of the land, and I will place these words in connection with the statement here, which has been repeated time and again in this House throughout the discussion, and which, I suppose, we will hear again:

These lands will not be taken haphazard, but will be selected on placer creeks and quartz leads as a powerful and active company knows so well how to do. It is difficult to estimate the value of this tremendous concession. One gulch such as the Bonanza or Eldorado creeks would bring in with a minimum outlay scores of millions of dollars.

The hon. gentleman forgets that there were men tramping up and down those streams year after year since 1882, and in all that time they only found one Bonanza and one Eldorado. Let me ask, is there any method by which this wonderful company can apply the X rays to the whole of the Yukon district and pick out Bonanzas and Eldorados. If there is, I am not aware of it. But the hon. gentleman makes the statement, and he indicates that there is the clearest probability that these contractors will find an abundance of gold.

How many such finds may become the property of those two gentlemen?

If there is any such probability of many of them being found, I would recommend the hon. gentleman to hire a few prospectors and send them out, because he has the first chance; he has several months' start of the railway company.

I want to say another thing, too, in reference to the observation of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) when he said that if this land grant were taken to London, England, it could be sold—substantially, this is what he said—for more than the 25,000,000 acres of land granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway would bring or was worth. Now, I suppose that the value of the land granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway would not be inaccurately or exorbitantly estimated at \$50,000,000. I would like to make a proposition to my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler). I may say that I have not the authority of an Order in Council for making it, but I would make the suggestion, and possibly we could make a contract of the kind I am going to propose, if the House would approve of it. This railway company has no authority to get any territory at all until they have built some ten miles of railway. Several months will elapse before that is done, and there is nothing in this contract or in this Bill to prevent the Government from now giving the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) the same privilege of selecting 3,750,000 acres of land on practically the same conditions as the land grant is given to the contractors. I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) to think it over for a while, and let the Government know if he is prepared, on behalf of himself or the gentlemen he represents, to put up \$50,000,000 in case we give him that same privilege, and if so, he can go in ahead of the railway company and take up the lands. I am not sure but that the House would sanction the proposal, and also sanction the passage of a

Mr. SIFTON.

Bill to pay the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) a liberal commission on the transaction, and indemnify him against the operation of the Independence of Parliament Act.

A few words now with reference to this question of selection. There are to be 3,750,000 acres of land. The gold is found in that territory in the beds of the water-courses, and I am told by Mr. Ogilvie—whom I asked for the special purpose of getting the information in an authoritative way—that the average width of the soil, where there is any possibility of finding gold—I am not speaking of rock ledges now, but of placer gold—the average width is not more than 300 feet. Now, if this company wants to get any gold-bearing territory at all, it is compelled to take its base line by following the general course of the stream, and to take this in blocks six miles wide and running across the supposed gold-bearing area. This map, which I here produce, is on the scale of one mile to the inch, and it shows the size of a block twenty-four miles long, such as that provided for in the contract. The company's blocks being six miles wide, that line represents the possible territory in which the company has any chance of finding gold: it represents 300 feet. They come along and follow the general line of the water-course, the average width of the soil in which it is possible to find placer gold being not more than 300 feet. The territory which they take, is 31,680 feet wide, and the soil in which they have a chance of finding gold is only an average of 300 feet. They, therefore, have a chance of getting territory 300 feet wide out of 31,680 feet. That is the way in which they must select their land, and that is the amount of territory which they have any chance of finding gold in. Now, their total grant is 3,750,000 acres, and the possible territory in which they can find anything—I am not speaking of quartz ledges now, for I will discuss that later on—is the one-one-hundred-and-fifth part of that. Out of their grant of 3,750,000 acres, they have 35,714 acres in which they have a possible chance of finding anything; not a certainty, remember—nothing more than a mere probability. Does anybody imagine that you can walk up and down the water courses and find gold in paying quantities in all of them? You can find the colour of gold; you can find that all over the North-west, in places where it does not pay at all. But these gentlemen have a possible chance of finding something that pays in 35,714 acres out of the 3,750,000 acres—equal to a piece of territory less than ten miles by six miles in extent. That is the effect of the method of selection which we have provided that these gentlemen must adopt.

Now, as to the rich lodes and ledges which my hon. friend writes about. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) is, I understand, the president or the manager of a gold mining com-

pany. I am told that the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) is also the president of a gold mining company. I can take either of these gentlemen to as rich a mining district as there is in the world, the Slocan district, in the neighbourhood of the town of Sandon, and if they will talk there, as I have done, to experienced mining men—for instance, to Mr. Macdonald, one of the owners of the Payne mine, which pays a dividend of \$85,000 a month—they will find that these men of experience will tell them that there is no doubt whatever that in the neighbourhood of Sandon there are many ledges as rich as those which are exposed. Why does not my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition or my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance get a few of them? Why does not everybody who wants to get rich in a short time get a few of them? Because the experience of every mining country in the world is that it costs a great deal more in the aggregate to develop these ledges than they are worth. Yet by what process of reasoning do hon. gentlemen apply to the men who are getting this land grant a rule that applies to no other mining country in the world? If they find rich ledges, they will find them only after they have won them by spending their time and money; and anybody else in the world, under our present mining regulations, has just as good a chance of going there and finding these rich ledges as the men who are building this railway. Why, I say, apply a different rule to this company from what has been applied to other companies? The hon. leader of the Opposition the other night made a statement which is perfectly true; he made it inadvertently; he did not intend to make it, and he tried to correct it after he did make it; but it is true just the same: that it costs more to take the gold out than the gold is worth after it is taken out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend will allow me to tell him he has no foundation whatever for saying that I attempted in any way to qualify or withdraw that statement. I did make it, and I made it without the slightest qualification.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I gathered that from the hon. gentleman's remarks. If he did not so intend, my inference is not correct. But he made the statement, and I say the statement is true; and I think I can prove it so far as the placer districts of Cassiar and Cariboo in British Columbia are concerned, which are in every respect the same in nature and in kind as the Klondike district. I have here a table which shows that in these districts from 1858 to 1880 inclusive, there was taken out \$45,140,889 in gold, which the House will agree with me was a very respectable production. Now, analyse the figures for a few minutes. I find that during that time the high-

est amount that was taken out in any one year, on the average, was \$1,222 per man, and the lowest was \$403 per man; and we all know that even the highest amount did not represent the wages and living expenses of the men who were working in those mines or anything like them. If you look down the table you will find these figures: for 1858, \$173 per man; for 1859, \$403; for 1860, \$506; for 1861, \$634; for 1862, \$517; for 1863, \$482; for 1864, \$849; for 1865, \$813; for 1866, \$893; for 1867, \$814; and so on till it goes down to \$518. This is the average amount of gold taken out per man per annum for the whole mining population; and every member of this House knows that these figures do not at all represent the wages and expenses of the men actually engaged in mining operations in those districts. Now, what I want to know is, by what process of reasoning is it argued that the same rule will not apply to the members of this company when they go to work to mine their railway land grant? There is no possible analogy which can be drawn from any mining operation in the world which will not lead to the inevitable conclusion that if these gentlemen send out a large number of prospectors and undertake to work their land grant for placer mining, they will spend more money than they will ever get out of the land grant.

I want to say on that point that I think they will make money out of their land grant, and I will tell you why I think so. Not because I think they will succeed in making any rich discoveries such as those that have been spoken of; because I cannot conceive of any reason why the same rule that applied in the very same kind of district in British Columbia will not apply in the Klondike district, especially when the expense and trouble of getting there are very much greater than they are in the other case. But in the Klondike district there are long stretches of territory where at the present time a man could take out \$4, \$6 or \$8 a day. There are large stretches of sand-bars of that kind which it will not pay the placer miner to stay and work for any length of time. But this company can take such districts, which would be unproductive if worked in the ordinary way, and they can apply to them the results of science and the latest improved methods of machinery, and make them profitable. In doing this they would employ a large number of men, and a large quantity of machinery and supplies, which would be furnished through the ordinary channels of Canadian trade; and this is one of the reasons why I think this contract should commend itself to the judgment of the members of this House.

Now, I have taken longer than I intended to take in the discussion of these matters. But I have one word more to say in regard to some statements contained in the let-

ter of "Onlooker"; and I think it would be a mistake if the House failed to understand what the position of the great Conservative party is upon another phase of this question. Here is the statement of "Onlooker":

Is Canadian trade to the Yukon dependent on this particular method of contract-giving, with its peculiar attaching conditions? Have I not read in the same paper that gave the news of this deal that a United States commercial company had placed orders to the amount of \$170,000 in Vancouver for Yukon goods? Are there not scores of able transportation companies advertising for and now actually beginning the transport of people and supplies from Canada to the Klondike, and some of them over this very route? Is there not besides the Edmonton route, the Ashcroft route, the Skagway route, and the Dyea route, for all of which Canadians are outfitting parties in every quarter of Canada? Was the future of all trade to the Yukon from Canada bound up with this particular scheme?

Now, here we have as clearly as the hon. gentleman will dare to state it, the intimation of his opinion that the position of the Yukon trade at present does not warrant any extraordinary effort on the part of the Government to secure it. We have here the intimation that we were getting \$170,000 of trade, and that surely if we were getting that amount, we ought to be satisfied. It ought to be nothing to us that our friends down on the Puget Sound were getting millions, we ought to be satisfied—being a poor and small community—with getting \$170,000, and let the millions go to our friends on the other side of the line. That is the position which the Conservative party is taking in connection with this contract, and that is the point I want the House to understand, and which I think the hon. gentleman will have to explain to the manufacturers and merchants and wholesale men of the Dominion when he comes to explain the attitude he has taken upon this contract.

As to the difficulty of carrying out the undertaking by the contractors, I just wish to quote briefly an article from the "Victoria Colonist" which is a paper that generally opposes this Government, and a paper on the Pacific Coast which probably has a more accurate knowledge of the undertaking than any newspaper, ordinarily speaking, in this part of Canada. The "Victoria Colonist" says:

Hon. Clifford Sifton has declared that the task of constructing the Stikine-Teslin Railway is almost superhuman. This is strong language, but not too strong. Few people can grasp the magnitude of what Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann have undertaken. We believe they will succeed, but only those who have made actual calculations of what must be done in order that the 150 miles of railway may be completed by September 1, can have any idea of the magnitude of the undertaking. The actual work of building the road is not a very serious matter. If the contractors were given two years in which to do the work they would accomplish it without any very

Mr. SIFTON.

great difficulty; but it is to be remembered that they have practically only four months, and that during this short period everything used in constructing the railway, except the right of way and the ballast, must be taken up the Stikine River. This is what will make the undertaking exceptionally difficult, and if the contractors can manage to carry out their bargain they will deserve the first place among railway builders. We venture to say that no men ever before undertook to build 150 miles of railway under such circumstances in the same length of time. Fortunately, both the contractors are men who have energy and experience to assist them in their tremendous undertaking, and the facts that they have put up a very substantial guarantee shows that they believe themselves able to do what they are attempting.

That is the opinion of a paper published on the Pacific Coast which usually opposes the administration of this Government. Now, I have simply referred to that to show that we who entered into this contract are not the only persons who attach great importance to the magnitude of the undertaking which these contractors are attempting.

I propose to say only a few words more with regard to one or two points brought before the House during this discussion. The term "Land Monopoly" has been thrown across this House. I think it was my hon. friend from Gananoque (Mr. Taylor), or perhaps it was the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who suggested that the men from the North-west could not be expected to support a land monopoly. I wonder that any man on that side of the House should have the assurance to talk of land monopoly. If the hon. gentlemen would like to look at a map, I will show them one that represents the fertile belt from the Rocky Mountains to the Red River and Lake Winnipeg. I will show them on that map the land monopoly of the North-west as it exists to-day. There it is. (Exhibiting map.) I live in the North-west—but let me explain the map first. Here, on this map, are the Red River and Lake Winnipeg, and there are the Rocky Mountains. This portion shows all the fertile belt, and of this fertile belt the hon. gentlemen opposite contracted to give away so much that they did not have enough there but had to go outside it. On all that enormous territory, every odd-numbered section—67,000,000 acres—has been reserved from settlement, and reserved for the benefit of the railway companies. Sixty-seven million acres—the whole fertile belt and much that is not is now a land monopoly reserved for the benefit of railway companies. Do hon. gentlemen opposite think it is the white portions of this map that show the land reserved? No, it is the black part. We mourn over that in the North-west, and therefore I had it marked in black on the map. I want the House to understand that that is the result of the land administration of our friends opposite, who claim to have the instinct of government. We have 67,000,000 acres

of land in Manitoba and the North-west Territories reserved from settlement. On that 67,000,000 of acres, I, as the Minister of the Interior to-day, cannot give a man a homestead entry. Nor can I sell a single acre of it, although there are millions of acres of that land that never have been and never will be or can be earned by any railway company whatever. But, Sir, they are reserved by Order in Council, the good faith of the Dominion is pledged to that for ever, and no Government can interfere with that reserve until the bond is literally fulfilled to the very last letter. That is the position these hon. gentlemen have put us in. I wonder that any member on that side can have the colossal assurance to talk to any member from Manitoba or the North-west about land monopolies.

Do not let us run away with terms. What is a land monopoly? We have it in the North-west. We have there millions of acres owned by corporations—owned in part by a corporation which my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) represents. And let me say, I do not blame him for that, but I thought, when he stood up the other day and said he was going to oppose this contract at every stage and every chance he got, he was not quite so bitter when the Calgary and Edmonton Bill was before the House. I did not then hear, away in the far North-west, that any tenders were called for when that road was contemplated. We all knew in the North-west that the cash subsidy to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway was enough to build the road and provide a very snug sum to go into the pockets of the promoters, as it ultimately did; but I did not hear that the hon. gentlemen who then composed the Government called for any tenders or permitted anybody else to have any share in that enterprise except our hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler). What we have in the shape of a land monopoly is this. We have millions of acres in that country owned by railway companies, and these companies are not required to do any work or spend any money. They sit down; they toil not neither do they spin. But the farmers toil and the farmers spin.

The farmers do their work: they cultivate their land and make their roads and bridges and pay their taxes and improve their land. And land goes up in value for the benefit of the railway companies. That is what takes place under the land-monopoly policy of our friends on the other side of the House. That is what is taking place now. And I tell the hon. gentlemen that there is no man sitting in this House to-day who realizes now, or who will live to realize the baneful effects of that policy upon the finest agricultural territory that the world has ever seen.

We propose, for the purpose of getting a great and valuable public work constructed under the most extraordinarily difficult cir-

cumstances, to give a land grant. Is it a land grant to which value will be given by the labour of other people or by the expenditure of other people's money? No, Sir, but a land grant which is not worth a dollar, except as it is made valuable by the expenditure and the work of the men who get it. Let the hon. gentlemen rest with that and explain to this House the coherence and logic of the position they take on this subject. I apprehend that if any man goes up and discovers a valuable claim, he will register it for himself and not for the railway company, and the company can find their own claims and register them for themselves, and they are in no respect better off for the labour the miner has performed.

I have detained the House longer than I anticipated. I look for great things from the construction of this railway; I look for great things because of the fact that I think it will largely promote Canadian trade. I think that if it is promptly and vigorously carried through, as I have no doubt it will be, it will have the effect of drawing to Canada within the next six months trade to the extent, perhaps, of twenty or twenty-five millions of dollars, that being a moderate estimate. I think it will conduce to the honour and dignity of Canada in making that country safe to us from a national standpoint. It will remove the danger of the country being not in the hands of our officers, but in the hands of an alien population who would contemn the authority of this Government. These things I look upon as important. Let my hon. friends opposite understand that if this railway project is obstructed, if it is stopped here or elsewhere, and if that territory passes from the control of Canada by reason of there being no railway communication, the people of Canada will hold them to a bitter account for it.

I have no more to say. As the Minister who has been called upon to give the most attention to this subject, I have tried to place the House in possession of the facts as well as I could. I look upon this as one step in the development of the great West which I represent, by the too great favour of the people, in this House and in this Government. And, if, in some small measure, the benefits which I have anticipated are realized, I shall only be too grateful and happy to have had some part in bringing about such very happy results.

Mr. HAGGART moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 17th February, 1898.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That a select committee composed of Messieurs Bain, Borden (Halifax), Bourassa, Sir Adolphe Caron, Clarke, Sir Louis Davies, Davin, Flint, Foster, Fraser (Guysborough), Sir Wilfrid Laurier, McNeill, Monk, Powell, Russell and Scriver be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the Library ; and that a message be sent to the Senate acquainting their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 21) to amend the Railway Act with respect to the shipment of grain.—(Mr. Richardson.)

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to mention to hon. members, that it would a good deal facilitate the proceedings of the Chair, if they would put the name of the seconder on any motion for the introduction of a Bill which they send up, as in the present condition of affairs the Chair has to pick out a seconder, and that is not quite regular.

CHEVALIER DROLET'S DREDGING LEASE.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

What privileges, if any, have been granted to Chevalier Drolet or any company represented by him, to dredge for gold in any of the rivers of the North-west Territories ? If any privileges have been granted to Chevalier Drolet or any company represented by him, at what rental have they been given, and for what term of years ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that a lease has been issued in favour of Chevalier Drolet to dredge for minerals other than coal in thirty miles of the submerged bed of the North Saskatchewan River, upon the terms set out in the published regulations. The rental is \$50 per year for each five miles, and the lease is for twenty years.

WHARF AT CHINA POINT, P.E.I.

Mr. MARTIN asked,

1. Is the Government aware that part of the wharf at China Point, in the province of Prince Edward Island, has floated up the river, and that the shipping at the wharf has practically terminated, owing to its bad condition ?

Mr. SIFTON.

2. Does the Government propose to repair the wharf, in order to be ready for the spring shipping ?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that the department has been informed that the head of the wharf at China Point, which had been considerably weakened by the action of the Tere do worm, has been carried away, and that the cost of repairing that damage is placed at \$2,500. 2. The department has no appropriation now at its disposal for the repairs in question.

MOUNT ELGIN INSTITUTE.

Mr. HEYD asked,

1. When and under whose auspices was the Mount Elgin Institute established, and who manages, controls or conducts the same ?

2. From what source did the money come to erect the buildings, and how have the funds to carry on the work of the institution been raised ?

3. Were the original buildings destroyed by fire ? If so, when ?

4. Has it been rebuilt ; if so, when ; and what was the cost ?

5. Was the whole or any portion of the cost taken from the funds of the several bands of Indians in Ontario ? If so, how much ; and what was taken from the fund of each band ?

6. If such funds were taken was it done with the consent of the council of each band ? Was there an Order in Council authorizing the taking of money from the Indian funds for such purposes ? If so, what is the date of such order ?

7. How were the amounts each band was to pay arrived at ?

8. How many pupils were in attendance when rebuilt ?

9. How many from the Six Nation Indians on the reserve ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say : 1. The Mount Elgin Institute buildings were completed in 1851, and the management of the school was entrusted to the Wesleyan Methodist Society, under whose auspices it is still conducted. 2. From contributions by the following bands of Indians to a fund called the Indian School Fund :—Chippewas of Sarnia and Walpole Island ; Chippewas of the Thames ; Chippewas of Rama, Beausoleil, and Snake Island ; Chippewas of Saugeen ; Moravians of the Thames ; Mississaugas of the Credit ; Mississaugas of Rice and Mud Lakes ; Mississaugas of Alnwick. These contributions ceased on the 30th of June, 1862, when the unexpended balance was \$38,203.74, since which time the funds to carry on the work of the institution have been provided by parliamentary grant and the said Indian School Fund. 3. No. 4. No, but a new building was completed in 1896. Exact cost is not known to the department, but \$19,000 was contributed from Indian funds, and \$2,500 was appropriated by Parliament. The Methodist Church contributed something, but the amount is not known.

5. The amount contributed from Indian funds was taken from the several bands of Indians in Ontario, as follows:—

Chippewas of Walpole Island....	\$ 3,602 80
Chippewas of Sarnia.....	2,500 15
Mississaugas of the Credit.....	2,915 04
Chippewas of Beausoleil.....	429 90
Chippewas of Nawash.....	1,407 25
Chippewas of Saugeen.....	1,520 70
Chippewas of Rama.....	33 15
Moravians of the Thames.....	1,290 70
Mississaugas of Alnwick.....	313 35
Chippewas of the Thames	1,584 90
Parry Island Indians.....	115 50
Six Nations	3,286 56
	\$19,000 00

6. The funds were taken without the consent of the councils of the bands. There were Orders in Council authorizing the taking of the money. The Orders in Council are dated 12th June, 1893, and 17th January, 1895. 7. The amounts to be paid by each band were levied in proportion to the average number of pupils in attendance from that band during a period of five years. 8. Eighty-six pupils were in attendance in 1892, when the new building was commenced. 9. Nine.

CHANGES IN CAPE BRETON COUNTY—MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked,

What changes have been made in the officials and employees of the Department of Marine, in the county of Cape Breton, since June, 1896?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I shall be very happy to give the hon. gentleman all the information he seeks, but the slightest reflection will convince him that the manner in which he seeks to obtain it is inconvenient and contrary to the usual practice. In this and succeeding questions the hon. gentleman asks for long lists of names in all the different departments of the Government in the county or in the district of Cape Breton. Another gentleman will probably ask similar questions with regard to the province of Ontario, another with regard to Nova Scotia, and so on. It is practically impossible that this information can be given in the form of answers to questions. But, if the hon. gentleman will put it in the form of a motion, I promise him that the information shall be brought down promptly.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I did not know that the list was so long.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman withdraws questions from No. 8 to No. 12, inclusive?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Shall I be permitted to move for the information now, with the consent of the House?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Oh, no. Put a notice on the Order paper.

FISHERMAN BOUNTY APPLICATIONS AT GABARUS.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked,

Who was authorized to take fisherman bounty applications at Gabarus, in the county of Cape Breton, for the last fishing season? When were such applications taken? Has the bounty been paid?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The person authorized to take the fishery bounty applications at Gabarus for the last fishing season is Mr. Joseph McPherson, fishery overseer, North Sydney, Cape Breton. The applications were taken in January, 1898. The bounty has not been paid, but the checks are being prepared as in other counties.

CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY—COMMUNICATION OF MR. HAMILTON SMITH.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask my right hon. friend the leader of the Government if he will be good enough to lay upon the Table of the House a communication from Mr. Hamilton Smith, a gentleman who represents a large number of the most eminent capitalists and financiers in the city of London, and who, I understand, has laid a proposal before the hon. gentleman that bears immediately upon this question of railway construction that we now have under consideration.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) is aware that Mr. Hamilton Smith has made any proposition to the Government he is almost as well informed as myself, because it is only two days ago since I received a communication from Mr. Hamilton Smith. There will be no objection at all to laying the communication upon the Table of the House.

CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Blair for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) an Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty the Queen and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House in reference to the Bill to form a company and to confirm a contract entered into by the Government for the construction of a line of road in the Yukon region, I regret that the information I am possessed of is not as full as I should like to have made it for the purpose of this discussion. I learn from the remarks of

the leader of the Opposition that another offer has been made to the Government. I am glad that it is the intention of the Government to bring down that communication, and I hope this information will be laid on the Table before another stage of this Bill is taken up. I would ask also that the map to accompany the report of Mr. Jennings, which the Minister said would be down in a very short time, should be laid before the House very soon. It is almost impossible for one to learn anything from Mr. Jennings's report without that map. The names mentioned in Mr. Jennings's report are not given on any map of the district that I know of. I hope full information will be brought down before another stage of the Bill is entered on or the resolution now before the House is proceeded with. Before answering the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), I may be pardoned if I refer to some remarks made by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair). That hon. gentleman made a speech the other evening in support of the Bill, founding a good deal of that speech upon some observations that he said had been made by me in the few remarks I made on the first reading of the Bill.

The hon. gentleman must have found by this time that he was entirely mistaken. A couple of days have expired since then, and the hon. gentleman has not had the courtesy to correct the observations which he made. The other part of his speech was in reference to some remarks made by my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague), which remarks he criticised. I remember perfectly well when I was delivering the speech, and I never made such a foolish remark as to say that according to the American regulations we would have to pay custom duty in using the Stikine River for the purpose of arriving at the proposed termination of the railway. The hon. gentleman asserted again and again that I made that statement. I remember perfectly well what I said in reference to the customs regulations. I corrected the hon. gentleman at the time, and if he had treated me with the courtesy with which I have always been treated by other members of the House, he would have accepted my correction and my statement of what I had said. The hon. gentleman also criticised rather severely some remarks I made in reference to the extent of the gold-bearing regions given in this concession to Mackenzie & Mann. According to the report of Dr. Dawson, who is at the head of the Geological Survey, the total area of gold-bearing land in Yukon is about 120,000 square miles. I also quoted from Mr. Ogilvie upon the subject, in which he gave a somewhat similar area. I stated that the land to be granted for the purpose of assisting the construction of this railway was 5,700 square miles; and my argument was that only about 5 per cent of the whole gold-bearing country, according to Dr. Dawson and Mr. Ogilvie, could

Mr. HAGGART.

be profitably worked, the amount these contractors might select would practically cover the whole of that profitable or workable area. The Minister of Railways was perfectly right. He said it was absurd to suppose that such large areas of gold could be workable in that country. But I will refer him to his friend the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who answered my remarks, and who said that the ex-Minister of Railways had made an absurd statement in saying that there was only 5,800 square miles of workable gold-bearing land in that country, whereas we have the reports of Mr. Ogilvie and Dr. Dawson to the effect that there are 120,000 square miles of gold-bearing land. I leave the Minister of Railways and the hon. member for North Wellington to settle the question between them.

The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) also made some remarks with reference to my statement as to the character of the road which was selected as the standard for this Yukon railway. He was sorry to see the ignorance displayed by a gentleman who had been a long time at the head of the Railway Department, and regretted that he was not better informed upon the subject in hand. What was the alleged fault I committed in speaking of the railway running from Kaslo to Slocan? He says I might as well have spoken of a road running from Montreal to Ontario, because Kaslo was nearly as big a country as Ontario. The hon. gentleman must remember that sometimes he himself makes a slip of the tongue as well as others. There is a place they call Slocan a very few miles from the end of the railway. I stated that I was over the railway and was well acquainted with the gradients and character of the road, and I thank the hon. Minister of the Interior for furnishing me with definite information last night which I intend to give to the House in regard to the character of the road which is adopted as the standard for the road the Government asks the House to authorize the contractors to build. The hon. Minister of the Interior, speaking of the Kaslo and Slocan road, said that the ex-Minister of Railways ought to be perfectly informed upon the question. Perhaps he ought to be informed upon the question. I never pretended, when I was Minister of Railways, to know all the particulars of all the roads in the country. I might as well ask the Postmaster General to be able at any time to repeat off-hand the names of the post offices throughout the country, or the details of the contracts entered into by the department for all the post offices. I have not such an acquaintance, I do not even yet know all the peculiarities of the different railways in the country sufficiently to be able to tell off-hand the gradients, or the curvatures, or the length of every road,

and I do not think that any Minister of Railways would be able to do so. But as I said before, I thank the Minister of the Interior for the information he gave me. I stated that it was a narrow-gauge road, I stated that it was a mountain road, I stated that the gradients were such as were to be found on no other road in Canada, and I stated that the curvatures were such as could only be found on a mountain road. What are the facts? The Minister of the Interior said last night that if I looked up the reports in my department when I was Minister of Railways, I would find it was a road thirty-one miles long, with maximum gradients of 171 feet to the mile. Now, I tell this House that that is the greatest gradient on any railroad in Canada except on an electric railroad, and except on one part of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Rocky Mountains. The greatest curvature is 193 feet radius, that is only a 3 per cent curvature. What curvature does 193 feet radius make? It makes a 29 degree curvature. Now, Sir, that is the maximum curvature on any railway in the country except on one small railway. That is the character of the road, three feet wide, forty-five pound rails to the yard, maximum gradient of 171 feet to the mile, and a curvature of which the radius is 193 feet, or a 29 to 30 degree curve. That is the road which is to be the standard for the road now under discussion. You can build such a road anywhere in this country, you can trail it round with a 30 degree curve, you can follow the undulations of the ground, and in most parts of the world you cannot lay down rails with more than a maximum gradient of 171 feet. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, referring to a remark I made the other evening in speaking upon this subject, says I made a mistake in reference to the weight of the rails on the Kaslo and Slocan Railway. My information was obtained from a newspaper clipping, in which I saw they had purchased the rails from the Galt road for the purpose of laying them down in the Yukon district and made an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway to take those rails quickly to the coast. The Minister of Marine arose to contradict my statement and said the standard required was the one on the Kaslo and Slocan Railway, and the company had to place rails on that road equal to 45 pounds to the yard. What do we find in the statement of the Minister of the Interior yesterday. It appears he required them to do so finally, but allowed the company in the meantime to put down rails 27 or 28 pounds to the yard, that the road may be constructed for a year with those rails and subsequently they will have to replace them with 45 pound rails, the hon. Minister arguing that this was on account of the difficulty of getting rails of that character into

the country, that it was impossible to get 45 pound rails there in time, and necessity or urgency arose from the fact that the Government required the road to be completed before 1st September next. I will state boldly here that they could obtain 45 pound steel rails quicker than they would be able to take these rails over to the coast and then to the locality where they would be required; that there are parties prepared to contract for the speedy delivery of 45 pound rails; that the Minister of Railways is entirely mistaken in his statement as to the cost of rails delivered, and that Mr. Jennings is perfectly correct in his estimate that such rails could be delivered at the terminus of the road for \$30 per ton and that a contract could be entered into at that sum. So there was no necessity for allowing the contractors to utilize old rails for the purpose of completing the contract. Now I will ask the Minister if the Government will allow the contractors to complete the road with 27 or 28 pound rails, and whether they will be allowed to draw subsidies on each section of ten miles as constructed?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. HAGGART. I have not received an answer from any responsible party to my question.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can tell the hon. gentleman they will not.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman makes the statement that those parties will not be able to earn one cent of the subsidy until one year after the work is completed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I say so, and the hon. gentleman could have ascertained that fact if he had read the contract.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the hon. gentleman admits my assertion.

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

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman may laugh if he likes. My statement was perfectly correct, and the hon. gentleman could not contradict it. My argument was that the contractors would be allowed, by the statement made by the Minister of the Interior last night, to put on this line 28 pound rails; that they would be allowed to use them for one year; that the road is not to be completed till 1st September next, and if the contractors are to be allowed to use those rails, then according to the hon. Minister's statement the contractors will not be able to obtain one cent of subsidy until one year from 1st September next. What has the Minister of Marine to say to that; is not that statement perfectly correct? The House ought to have had that statement made last night by the Minister of the Interior—the statement that none of the sub-

sidies in that section of the country will be earned, nor will the contractors be entitled to any of them for a couple of years.

I will now drop the Minister of Railways and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and offer a few remarks in reply to the speech delivered by the Minister of the Interior yesterday. I am a very poor hand at paying compliments, because I am inclined to look upon a compliment as indicating insincerity on the part of the speaker, and I think the party receiving the compliment generally looks upon it in that light. As regards the hon. gentleman, I must say that I was forcibly impressed with his argument. I was forcibly impressed with his style in the House. But as a member of twenty-five years' standing—if I may be pardoned for alluding to the fact, because I noticed that my leader last evening got a thrashing from an hon. gentleman because he stated he had been twenty-five years in Parliament and for a certain time had occupied the position of Minister of Railways—I may be permitted to say that the speech was just a little lengthy, that a speech is not exactly like a kiss and is not to be measured altogether by its length, that if the hon. gentleman had observed brevity to a greater degree it would have improved it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on hitting his leader so deftly.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to present an argument in support of the proposition before the House. He did it well; he made the best of what was a very bad case. The hon. gentleman presented a marked contrast to the hon. Minister who introduced the Bill. We had not much argument from the Minister of Railways, but the House had an argument from the Minister of the Interior in support of the proposal. For the purpose of advocating the Bill the hon. Minister divided it under several heads. He first described the business that was to be done in that country; next he sought to show how, if the Government did not build the road, we might lose part of the business; he put in the plea of urgency as one of the reasons for entering into the contract, and he gave the House a description of the different routes that might be followed for the purpose of entering that country, and he also dealt with other points. Those three first points I will deal with consecutively as did the Minister of the Interior.

The Minister criticised the leader of the Opposition for over half an hour in the opening of his speech last evening as regards my hon. friend's conduct outside of the House and his opinions in the House, in which he endeavoured to show how the leader of the Opposition changed his opinion from day to day and expressed different opinions outside the House and inside

Mr. HAGGART.

the Chamber, and he read several extracts from newspapers for the purpose of confirming his position. In all the clippings from the newspapers by the hon. gentleman in respect to the leader of the Opposition there was but one single point made, and I will explain it and deal with it. My leader admitted the urgency of the case, the great number of people who were going to the country next season, he approved of the hon. gentleman's selection of the route, he approved of the giving of the contract—provided it was given by tender or tenders were asked—to the parties to whom it was given. My hon. friend stated in an interview in Toronto that the parties who received the contract were perhaps the only contractors in the country who would be able to construct the road in the time specified.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I wish to observe on that point that the qualification about calling for tenders does not appear in the interview with the hon. gentleman. I do not think the hon. gentleman will see it if he reads the interview.

Mr. HAGGART. In the interview what the leader of the Opposition said was that Mackenzie & Mann were contractors and the only contractors in Canada who would be able to do the work in time. The leader of the Opposition spoke before he had seen the contract. He supposed that the road was to be built according to gradients commonly used in the country. He did not know it was to be a tramway, and had he known of the character of the Kaslo-Slocan with gradients of 171 feet to the mile and curvatures of nearly 30 degrees, no doubt the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) would have had a different opinion about it. There are one hundred contractors in the country who are capable of building such a road as that within the required time. We heard enough from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) upon that question, and upon the question of Phillip drunk and Phillip sober, and the instinct of government that belongs to the Tory party in Canada. In my opinion the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) dwelt too much on that for his own good.

I believe perhaps that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has made a moderate estimate as to the trade which will be done with the Yukon country this season. He was perhaps a little high in estimating that 20,000 tons can be carried in by the Yukon steamers, but from all I can hear, it seems to be a fact that forty thousand tons of supplies will be required for that country, and so we may safely rely on that estimate. The hon. gentleman is right when he says that a single steamer can navigate the Yukon for only about two trips in the year. The average freight which one of these steamers takes, is from 125 to 130 tons, and although sometimes they make a second trip, yet they cannot carry as large a quantity of freight

as on the first trip on account of the lower water which exists in the summer and fall. If we are correct in estimating that 20,000 tons can be taken in via the Yukon River, then other means will be required to take 20,000 tons over into our territory. On that point the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) argued that if we are to retain the trade of the Yukon we must provide sufficient means for its transport. Well, Sir, the members on this side of the House, as well as the members on the other side, are perfectly united on the point that there is a necessity for the building of a railway somewhere or another into that country, and that being so there remains only the question as to the choice of routes. It being the opinion of every person in Canada that a railway should be built, then it was the duty of the Government of Canada to devise such a scheme as would be in the best interests of the country. I agree with the Minister of the Interior that there was urgency for the construction of such a road, but I do not agree with him that the urgency was such as to justify the Government in adopting the course they did, and not ask for tenders. In fact, Sir, I entirely disagree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) in that regard. As I have already stated, tenders might be obtained for the construction of a road without advertising for them, because invitations could have been sent to different parties to compete, and there would be no loss of time. It is hardly necessary to say that such competition would enure to the benefit of the country.

Let me discuss for a moment the different routes available for entering the Yukon country, and in doing so I will adopt the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) that there are six possible routes. One of these is by the Yukon River, another from Pyramid Harbour up the Chilkat River, making a connection with the Lewes River at the foot of Five Finger Rapids, and thence to Dawson City. Now, without taking into consideration the navigation laws, without taking into consideration that we may pass through a foreign country, which I deny if my reading of the treaties is correct; then there is no doubt that the best route, commercially, is from Pyramid Harbour to the foot of Five Finger Rapids, and thence by navigation on the Lewes River to Dawson City. I may state that there is fair navigation on the Lewes River. The distance from Pyramid Harbour to the point I mention is in the neighbourhood of 285 miles. Mr. Jennings in his report makes it 245 miles, but I believe the actual survey gives it as 285 miles. For the first 53 miles from Pyramid Harbour there is a pretty steep grade until you get to the Plateau, but from that point to the Five Finger Rapids it is perfectly easy to construct a line of railway, and if I correctly understood the question put by my leader this afternoon the Government have had an

offer for the building of a road over that very route.

In my opinion this is the best route, commercially speaking, to reach the Yukon country, and indeed there can hardly be any question about it. Provided we have the bonding privilege of passing through the United States assured us, and providing that Pyramid Harbour is not in United States territory—and after a careful reading of the treaty and a comparison with the maps I believe it is in Canadian territory—then this route is the best one that could be adopted. But, presuming that Pyramid Harbour is in the United States, if arrangements could be made either by reciprocal legislation or by treaty between Great Britain and the United States, there is no doubt that the proper route would be from Pyramid Harbour to the Five Finger Rapids. I do not believe that this admits of argument. Now there is an objection to this route, and that objection is, that the bonding privilege, or the right which we have of crossing over alleged American territory might be taken away from us at any date. That may be sufficient justification to the Government to drop that particular route, but to me it would not be sufficient justification, because I believe that it is more in the interest of the people of the United States to retain the existing bonding arrangements, than it is in the interest of Canadians. There is only one way by which the Americans can get from Pyramid Harbour up to the gold fields which they may rightly suppose in that part of the Yukon opposite Dawson City may be in their own territory, and the only way in which they can reach that territory by railway, after passing the fringe upon the coast, is by running nearly the whole distance through Canadian territory. We, therefore, have the whip hand on them with regard to that particular route, and it is consequently to their advantage and interest to allow us the bonding privilege through their territory. It is perhaps to our interest, too, that we should make reciprocal arrangements with them for allowing goods to be bonded through our territory into theirs. I will tell you why it is in the interest of the United States to continue the bonding privileges. One of the best traffics the trans-continental lines of the United States have is the traffic in teas and silks from China to Great Britain and Europe, which pass in bond through the United States. That traffic is of more value to them than any concession in reference to the Yukon region or any other part of Canada. Therefore, I cannot but think that the United States Government would be a consenting party to a reciprocal arrangement in reference to the bonding privilege, either by legislation or by treaty, for the purpose of having the railway constructed by that particular route.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Does

my hon. friend happen to have the figures which will show what is the total value of that trade which he speaks of in tea and silks from China and Japan through the United States to Great Britain and Europe?

Mr. HAGGART. I have not the figures. The statement was made by the President of the United States or some high official, in a conversation with some gentleman—I may be misinformed, but I have been told that he said: "It is no use of talking of abolishing the bonding privileges, because the volume of trade to us is greatly in excess of anything Canada receives."

There are two other routes for a railway which the hon. gentleman spoke of. There is the one from Skagway, and another from Dyea through the Chilkoot Pass, both of which are shorter and better routes than the one proposed for getting into our territory. But they are not equal to the route from Pyramid Harbour, which passes over the old Dalton trail. Then, there is the route from Taku Inlet, which is near the Lynn Canal.

One of the arguments of the hon. gentleman was the urgency of this matter, because he was not able to make the contract for a long time. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition pointed out that the hon. Minister had Mr. Jennings's report on the 25th of October. But what was the use of Mr. Jennings's report, the hon. Minister asks, when we had no information in reference to the navigation of the Hootalinqua River from Teslin Lake to Lewes River? The hon. gentleman might have had the information, because it was in his department; or, if it was not in his department, he might very easily have got it. Dr. Dawson went up to that country in 1887, and wrote a report, particularly bearing upon the navigation of the rivers. He himself travelled on the Stikine River from Fort Wrangel up to Glenora or Telegraph Creek, and gave information in his report as to the depth of the water in that river and as to the kind of steamer which would be required to navigate it; and the hon. gentleman had the most thorough information in regard to this. Dr. Dawson also speaks of the Hootalinqua River from Teslin Lake to Lewes River. He speaks of travelling on his way back up the river from Fort Selkirk to the stream that debouches from Lake Labarge into the Lewes River.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Does the hon. gentleman say that Dr. Dawson says he went up the Hootalinqua River?

Mr. HAGGART. I did not say anything of the kind: I was very careful in my observations. I said that Dr. Dawson travelled up the river from Fort Selkirk to the stream that debouches into the Lewes River from Lake Labarge. He actually travelled over that, and spoke of it as if he had been over the ground. That part from

Mr. HAGGART.

where Lake Labarge debouches into the Lewes River up to Teslin Lake he speaks of from hearsay. He interviewed some miners in that section of the country, and gave their statements in reference to the navigation of that route. But in regard to that the hon. gentleman could have had the report of an officer of the Geological Survey of Washington, a Mr. Hayes, who went from Teslin Lake the whole distance down the Lewes River, and gives an accurate account of the whole route, in which he confirms the information given by the miners to Dr. Dawson in 1887. He said he found the information which Dr. Dawson had got from those miners to be wonderfully correct. The hon. gentleman might have had this information, for the officers of his department must have been acquainted with Mr. Hayes's report. He had thus at his command full information of the whole system of navigation from Teslin Lake to Fort Selkirk; and what does Mr. Jennings say in reference to the question? He says that Mr. St. Cyr reports to him that, after examining that particular part of the country, he found that Mr. Hayes was absolutely correct. Therefore, the hon. Minister's reason for waiting from the time he got the information on the 25th of October before letting the contract for this work fall to the ground, for he had the information in his department, or he might have had it from Dr. Dawson as fully as he got it from Mr. St. Cyr.

Then, the Minister shelters himself for having let this contract, behind his officer, because, he says, he did not get the information from the officer who was sent for the purpose of examining the route, until the 6th of January. I suppose the Minister got the information from Mr. Jennings, the officer in charge of that work, the moment Mr. St. Cyr came down to Victoria; because that information was of such importance that it would be the duty of Mr. Jennings if the Minister was not at hand, to telegraph at once that the route was fit for navigation. If the hon. Minister, and his department, had exercised due diligence, he could have had all the information on the 25th of October which he subsequently obtained, to enable him to construct the road or let the contract.

The hon. gentleman talks of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann as if they were the only men in the country who could build that road. I know both of these gentlemen, and they are both capable and efficient men for constructing the road. I differ entirely with my leader in the remark he made some time ago in Toronto in this respect. I believe there are a dozen men in the country just as capable of building the road as Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I never said to the contrary.

Mr. HAGGART. My right hon. leader says he never said to the contrary. I be-

lieve that it was possible for the Minister of Railways to have had competition for the construction of that road, and he is finding out now that he not only could have got that road built on much better terms, but could have got a road built which would be of much more advantage to this country. I refer to the road from Pyramid Harbour, 288 miles, down to the foot of Five Finger Rapids. He could have had that road built for a grant of land much less than the amount given to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. But I object to the principle of giving any land in a mining district, whether a few acres per mile or 25,000 acres. I hold to the argument which I made in the introduction of the Bill, that 100,000 acres of selected gold lands in the country would have been as good an inducement to the contractors to undertake the work as the selection of 5,000 square miles in the country. There is not a legislature in any civilized country which reserves the placer mining from the people. You could not enforce such legislation. Set a mining population into the country, let there be 200,000 or 250,000 miners in it, and all the forces of the British Empire would not prevent them mining on the reserved lands. They would compel the Government of this country to re-purchase the bargain made with Mann & Mackenzie, and the Government would have to do this at a far greater sacrifice than the bargain called for.

The next question which the hon. gentleman touched upon is a very important one, namely, whether this route, which we intend to use, is free from international complications. The hon. gentleman told us very cavalierly that, under the Treaty of Washington, we gave away the rights which we possessed under the Anglo-Russian treaty of 1825. He said that under the latter treaty we had the greatest possible rights that could be enjoyed with reference to the navigation of these streams. I admit that you cannot use words in the English language which could give a greater right to the user of rivers in a foreign country than what is contained in the Anglo-Russian treaty of 1825. That treaty, of course, was abrogated by the Crimean war. It was afterwards partly renewed by the Treaty of Paris of 1856, and there was a subsequent treaty regarding this and other subjects, the Treaty of St. Petersburg of 1859. The hon. gentleman made an attack, in this connection, upon the party I have had the honour of supporting for a number of years. Canada had, he said, the greatest possible rights in those rivers, and the party now on this side of the House gave those rights away—or a portion of them—by the Treaty of Washington. Where is the hon. gentleman's authority on the law? Is it the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies)? The hon. gentleman argued that all the obligations which Russia was under to Great Britain were retained by

Great Britain, as against the United States, when the transfer was made by Russia to the United States.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I have made no observation as yet about it at all.

Mr. HAGGART. My hon. friend did interlard a remark. He said something with reference to it, but that was the argument of the Minister of the Interior. What are the facts? By her treaty with the United States, Russia gave to the United States this country. The question then arises whether, in transferring that country to the United States, the servitude or rights of any other country attach to the transfer. If the hon. gentleman will read the speech of Mr. Sumner, in introducing the treaty between Russia and the United States, in 1867, he will find that Mr. Sumner took an entirely different view. He took the view that when one country parts with its sovereignty to another country, all the servitudes or rights limiting that sovereignty which a third country might previously have enjoyed disappear. If the hon. gentleman will follow also the debates on the Washington treaty, he will find that Mr. John Hilliard Cameron took precisely the same view, namely, that the servitudes end with the transfer of a country. The same question arose lately with regard to Madagascar. The French Government which acquired Madagascar claimed that all the treaty rights which Great Britain and the United States had in that country before the conquest have disappeared—that the acquisition by France of the sovereignty of that country put an end to these rights. The contention of Mr. Sumner was exactly the same when he introduced, in 1867, his Bill in the United States Congress. It, however, always has been the contention of the United States that the people at the source of a river have the right to navigate the whole of that river. Therefore, while the right of having Sitka as a free port, the right of navigating the different rivers or arms of the sea in the country, ended with the transfer, still, as the United States have always contended in reference to the Mississippi, when the state of Louisiana on its west bank belonged to Spain, and have always contended with reference to the St. Lawrence River, the parties living at the source of a river are entitled to its free navigation. Therefore, they abandoned the contention that Great Britain lost any of her rights to the free user of rivers from this country to the sea. They were willing to concede that. I might quote from the speech of Mr. Sumner, as it will be found in Vol. 11 of his works, page 67:

Thus, we have three stipulations on the part of Russia—one, opening the seas and gulfs and havens on the Russian coast to British subjects; the second making Sitka a free port to British subjects; and the third making the particular

rivers which flow into the Russian possessions for ever free to British navigation. Did the United States succeed to these stipulations? Among these, I may make a distinction in favour of the last which, by its language, is declared to be for ever, and may have been in the nature of an equivalent settlement of boundaries between the two powers, but whatever its term or its origin, it is obvious that it is nothing but a declaration of public law—

That was always the contention of the Americans, that the right of people living at the source of a river to its free navigation was public law—

—as always expounded by the United States, and now recognized on the continent of Europe.

The two other stipulations are different in character. They are not declared to be for ever, and do not stand on any principle of public law, even subsisting now, they cannot be for ever. I doubt if they are subsisting now. In seceding to Russian possessions, it does not follow that the United States succeeded to any ancient obligations assumed by Russia; and if, according to a phrase of common law, there were covenants running with the land, that these stipulations are in the nature of servitudes, they depend for their duration on the sovereignty of Russia, and are personal or national rather than territorial. So, at least, I am inclined to believe, but it is hardly probable to speculate on a point of so little practical value.

However, he admits—and I will ask the hon. gentleman to remember this—that the nation at the sources of a river have the most complete right to the user of those rivers. Irrespective of any treaty or arrangement made with any country, the American Government are of opinion, and have always contended, that we have virtually the right of free using of these rivers as fully as we had under the original treaty. And I will ask the hon. gentleman to insist upon that in his negotiations with that country. We live at the sources of the river, and the Americans have always admitted the right of user in such cases. And it is very doubtful if we have not the right under the treaty with Russia. If the contention is correct that these servitudes pass with the transfer of the territory, being an obligation of the territory, then we have as great rights as there possibly can be both by the treaty and by the declaration of the principal statesman of the United States as to the user of these waters. I should be sorry to see the American Government assume an entirely different attitude. I put a different interpretation on the Bills introduced in Congress. I think they are merely to enable Secretary Gage or the President of the United States to make arrangements with the Government of Canada for the settlement of pending questions. I hope it is so. I think it is to the interest of the United States to do so, and, if it is to their interest, I have no doubt that they will do it. If that is done and arrangements of that kind are made, this road is entirely useless as a commercial project for the purpose of reaching that territory. However, the hon. gen-

Mr. HAGGART.

tllemen depend for approval of their proposal upon the plea that it is entirely through British territory.

Reverting to the question of international law, the House will remember the attack which the Minister of the Interior made upon the Government which was in power when the Washington Treaty was ratified for parting with our rights. Under the Washington Treaty we have the right to navigate the Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine rivers. But the hon. gentleman says that we had the free right to navigate the Stikine by the treaty with Russia, and that the Treaty of Washington, limiting that right to navigation for commercial purposes, was actually an infraction of our rights with regard to that river. But from Lord Carnarvon's despatch we find that the law officers of the Crown and the British authorities took an entirely different view with regard to navigation of this river. If the sovereignty of this country passed by the transfer of the property of Alaska from Russia to the United States, then we had no rights to navigate the Stikine, the Yukon or the Porcupine rivers, but this right we derive from the Washington Treaty. As hon. gentlemen opposite will probably quote in reply Lord Carnarvon's report upon the subject, I will read it myself as I think it supports my contention. A very interesting case came up a few years ago in reference to a prisoner named Martin. His case came to trial, and he was convicted before Judge Crease, one of the judges of British Columbia. The judgment depended upon the interpretation of the Russian and Washington treaties. Judge Crease held that the Washington Treaty was only an extension of the treaty between Russia and Great Britain, the Russian Treaty being still in force and the Washington Treaty being an extension of it. Hon. Edward Blake, who was Minister of Justice at the time, of course supported that contention, although he criticised very severely the action of Sir John Macdonald who had negotiated the Washington Treaty. However, the subject was finally referred to the British authorities, and this despatch came out:

With reference to my despatch—

This is on the 16th August, 1877—

—and the previous correspondence on the same subject, I have now the honour to communicate to you the views of Her Majesty's Government, adopted after consultation with the law officers of the Crown, with reference to the case of Peter Martin, for whose release an application has been made to the Government of the United States. If the rights of free navigation depend upon the 26th article of the Treaty of Washington, which expressly states that navigation should be opened for the purpose of commerce, Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that a prisoner cannot lawfully be conveyed to Alaska by the Stikine River.

My contention is, although I may be wrong in my argument, that according to the opin-

ion of the law officers of the Crown the treaties were all done away with and the only rights we have to the Porcupine and Stikine River are by the Treaty of Washington. Then, because we are obliged to tranship, we are also subject to all the customs regulations that the American Government may make in reference to vessels transshipping at Fort Wrangel. We are in as bad a position at Fort Wrangel in getting at this railway from Glenora to Teslin Lake, indeed I contend we are in a worse position, than if we landed on American territory for the same purpose.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman surely does not desire to put himself on record as contending that they can make any regulation inconsistent with the free navigation of the Stikine River, contrary to the very words of the treaty.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I do not say anything of the kind, and do not intend to. The hon. gentleman knows that I did not mean that. They may make their customs regulations so obnoxious, so onerous, or so troublesome, that I think it might be better, for the purpose of getting sooner into that country, for you to land your goods at once at a United States port and travel through American territory for the purpose of reaching your railroad.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. We had better understand one another here, as this is rather important. The hon. gentleman concedes that we have by treaty a right to the free navigation, for all purposes of commerce, of the River Stikine, subject to such regulations as are necessary in that regard, but not subject to any regulations which are inconsistent with the free commercial navigation of the river. So that the free navigation of the river is absolutely secured to us by treaty, and no regulation inconsistent with it can be made.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Does the hon. gentleman not see the distinction? Does the hon. gentleman not see that a vessel going up from Victoria and which is incapable of navigating the river to the commencement of the railway, will be obliged to lighter or transfer her cargo into a lighter vessel, and is that one of the rights which you will have? Will you have the right in order to navigate the Stikine River, to transfer from a vessel to a lighter? Have you that right now? Then, if you cannot navigate by ocean steamer to the commencement of the road unless by lightering your cargo into another vessel, you can only do this by permission of the United States authorities, and they may absolutely refuse it.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman is tak-

ing very serious international ground, and I am very sorry for it.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I only take the ground that the London "Times" takes in reference to this same matter. In an editorial concerning the building of this road, and pointing out the troublesome regulations that may be made for vessels passing through the Stikine River, the "Times" hopes that the Government of Canada have made arrangements with the United States authorities for the purpose of allowing them to go through their territory. The Minister of the Interior, in discussing this point the other evening, intimated that they could secure the right by negotiation. But negotiations may take four or five years, and he says they are going to build a road and negotiate afterwards. What a pretty position we would be in if we were obliged to negotiate after the road was built. Suppose the United States Government refused the privilege to lighter in that river, what a pretty position will we be in if we have to take four or five years to negotiate. Hon. gentlemen see the difficulty of the position, and they have been inventing expedients for the purpose of getting over it. They say an ocean steamer can transfer. Where? At Port Simpson. It can lighter there, and the smaller vessel can go up to Fort Wrangel, where there would be no necessity of lightering. I see by the papers that the contractors have an island somewhere in British territory, and they think they can get over the difficulty by lightering on this island. Now, any one acquainted with that country knows well that it is impossible for such vessels as can go up the Stikine River to navigate at all times of the year the waters between Port Simpson and Wrangel, through the Dixon Channel. Sometimes coasting vessels have to lay at Port Simpson six or seven days before they can pass through the Dixon Channel, they have to pass through sixty miles of this channel before they can reach the broad ocean of the Pacific. And this is the reason why the Government ask us to support a scheme on national grounds, namely, because it is an all-Canadian route that does not pass through American territory, because it is the only line of road between the 141st meridian and Portland Channel which would be available for the purposes of commerce. I do not know what view the American Government may take of it, I do not know whether they will admit our contention that these rivers should be open to the navigation of British subjects. But I know that the law officers of the Crown, unfortunately, hold a different opinion. The opinion of the law officers of the Crown, expressed by Lord Carnarvon, is that Fort Wrangel is in American territory, that the mouth of the Stikine is in American territory, and that you have no right, except for

commercial purposes, to pass up that river, and that even though you had the right for commercial purposes, you have no right whatever to lighter a vessel. That has always been our contention in this country in reference to the St. Lawrence. We ask no more privileges from the Americans than those which we give them. Negotiations may be undertaken in consequence of which they may permit us to enjoy that right, but they will only do so if we give them reciprocal advantages, and it is only by treaty with them that we will be able to reach this road, or this tramway, for the construction of which we are giving away the immense heritage of the people. Now, the hon. gentleman, for the purpose of obtaining the support of his friends in the North-west Territories, tells them that this road is not only to be a benefit to the people of British Columbia, but is to be part of a main line of road that is to pass through the Peace River district for the purpose of making a general terminus at Port Simpson. This is not only to be a benefit to the people of British Columbia to enable them to get goods into the Yukon territory, but it is to be an immense advantage to the people of the North-west. The people of the North-west are naturally in favour of a direct route from Edmonton into that country, but they are to be pacified by obtaining connection with this line of road, so that they will have an ocean terminus at Port Simpson, where they can lay off at the Canadian end of the road and proceed by water on their journey up to Dawson City. What kind of a road are they going to get? They are going to get a road with 171 feet gradients, 30 degree curvature and three feet wide. Is that the kind of road that will satisfy the people of the North-west for the purpose of reaching the sea? Is this the kind of sop that the hon. gentleman expects will induce the people of the North-west to support his scheme? Now, in proposing this scheme, the hon. gentlemen have violated the doctrines they have always preached in this country, that is, that all public undertakings of this kind should be let by tender. They have violated that doctrine, and their plea is urgency. There was no urgency at all. The Minister had information already in his department, which was confirmed by the report of Mr. Jennings, in reference to this road. There was no urgency. Why did he not give to the people of this country an opportunity to tender for the building of this road. Why did the hon. gentleman not give other contractors an opportunity to tender, or why did he not employ Mr. Jennings, his own engineer, who went into that country and explored the different routes? Why, if it were necessary, was the Government not prepared to pay the full amount for the construction of the road, for the people are in favour of railway construction there?

Mr. HAGGART.

They would, indeed, much rather pay out money for the purpose of building that road than enter into any such bargain as hon. gentlemen opposite have made. Let the people on the coast and in the North-west understand that the people of Canada, almost to a man, are in favour of railway construction in the western country, that we are willing to go further than the Government in regard to this matter, that we are willing to incur the risk of the Yukon being a gold-mining country, and not gamble away this part of the people's heritage. We are willing, if necessary, and if we have not full rights on the Stikine River, or failed to get customs regulations satisfactory to us or bonding powers from the United States authorities for the purpose of building what would be a commercial road from Pyramid Harbour into that country, to extend the road to a British port, to Port Simpson, for the purpose of getting into that country. We are willing to vote the people's money for the purpose of building such a road and take the risk of undertaking its operation. But we are not willing to grant half the country, a gold-bearing country, to contractors, no matter how respectable they may be, and to give away the people's heritage for the purpose of building a road.

How would the Government enforce regulations for preventing miners from working on land which was assigned to Mackenzie & Mann? It would be impossible to do so. No country allows anything of that kind to be done. Look at what Australia did in regard to the building of a railway. There were some valuable mines discovered at Coolgardie, in Western Australia. The government advertised for offers for building a railway and the terms required. One firm asked a franchise to cover the use of the road for two or three years. This was given to them for a period of fifteen months. They built the road in six months, and the profits of operating it during the nine months were sufficient to cover their expenditure, and the people of Western Australia thus obtained a road to which the only subsidy given was a monopoly to a company for fifteen months, and, after it had been constructed and operated during that term, the country acquired possession of it for nothing. Did hon. members ever hear of a country where the government took from the people the right of free mining, placer mining, and locked up an immense tract of land? Such action was never done by any government on the face of the globe. The only exception in all the mines of the United States was when the Mexican Government gave to General Fremont 30,000 acres. He had a right to it by the treaty which conveyed California to the United States. He had a proprietary right over the land and minerals, but outside of that case no one can show that a single acre belonging to the United States Govern-

ment was excluded from appropriation by any miner for mining purposes. This is a most extraordinary concession, and should not be granted to any company for the purpose of allowing them to carry out an undertaking of this kind. And such an undertaking! The Minister of the Interior, last night, said: Does not the blush of shame appear on the faces of Conservatives when they look at the map of the North-west, where 69,000,000 of acres, including those in Manitoba, have been reserved from poor settlers as subsidies to railway companies? It was evident, however, that his heart warmed to his fellow-citizens in the North-west and Manitoba when he thought of settlers being deprived of lands and of huge tracts being locked up in monopolies. What are the facts? The people were anxious and clamouring from one section to another to have railways built. The policy of the Government, and the policy of the Opposition, was to have railways constructed. What benefit have those land grants proved to the roads? Have the companies made fortunes out of them? No; but the hon. gentleman was having a slap at his leader, when he made this statement. His leader stated that only 28,000,000 of acres had been granted, and the total quantity that was under promise or might be earned by railway companies was 38,000,000. He was having a further slap at his leader, because the hon. gentleman belonged to a Government which, in 1874, placed on the Statute-book, for the purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway, an offer to the people of the world to come and build this railway in sections and the Government would give 20,000 acres per mile for construction. This puts me in mind of a speech which the leader of the Opposition delivered in Montreal at one time, after Mr. Blake had been addressing an audience there. The meeting addressed by the leader of the Opposition was held in the same hall, and a huge map, showing land grants in the North-west and Manitoba, used by Mr. Blake, hung on the wall. The leader of the Opposition pointed to the map and followed the terms of the statute and with his pen extended the boundaries to indicate those which Mr. Mackenzie and his Government intended to grant. They offered 50,000,000 acres of land for building the road. If hon. gentlemen opposite had been in power, there would not have been 28,000,000 acres granted, because they were prepared to grant 50,000,000 acres for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway alone. Yet the Minister of the Interior rises in his place and rebukes members of it who have been a long number of years here, who know all the circumstances of these transactions, who are well acquainted with the policy of the party opposite, who know they were prepared to offer 50,000,000 acres of land for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and who have offered and have granted \$10,000

per mile, and, in the case of the Canada Central, \$12,000 per mile, for railway construction. In regard to land grants in the North-west, it must be remembered that those were not grants of gold-bearing lands. If it was such an objectionable, such an infamous and monstrous act, for the Conservative party to do, why are hon. gentlemen opposite following in their footsteps, and why are they now prepared to grant 25,000 acres of gold-bearing lands per mile for the purpose of building a road in the Yukon country?

Let me now analyse the contract. I may be pardoned, as was the Minister of the Interior, for reading some provisions of the contract. The hon. gentleman was somewhat in error in regard to fixing the rates. Whoever saw a rate fixed in a railway charter? There is a by-law passed by the railway corporation and it is approved by the Governor in Council, but the Minister (Mr. Sifton) forgot to tell the House that the Governor in Council may the next day make a reduction of one-half or one-quarter, and so the Governor in Council have the sole control over the matter. But that is not so in this case. We want to know what rates are fixed by this contract, and we want to know that they are not inordinate rates. The people of the country should know what they are to pay on that line, and the rates should be embodied in the contract. There is to be a reduction of 25 per cent in four years and 25 per cent more at the end of seven years, but the rate on which the reduction is to be made is to be fixed by the Minister of the Interior, because he is the Minister of Railways in reference to this particular matter before the House. Did you notice the cheers which greeted the Minister of the Interior the other night, and did you notice the dumbfounded looks of hon. gentlemen opposite when the Minister of Railways was on his feet. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) evidently has not his heart in the work. He did not even sign the contract, but left it to the Minister of Inland Revenue, who was at the time acting Minister of Railways. The Minister of the Interior is the father of the scheme.

We protest against this monopoly clause in the contract and the Minister of the Interior tells us in reply that it is harmless. Well, if it is harmless, what is it there for. No one denies that the provincial authorities have a right to charter a railway in their province, but every one knows that they have no right to charter a railway which runs to the international boundary to connect with a foreign railway. This charter provides that the only railway which could enter into competition with this particular railway we are discussing shall not be built, and so the contract prohibits all opposition to this Mann-Mackenzie line, and gives it a complete monopoly. There is at present a charter

granted by the provincial authorities from Glenora, but the provincial authorities have no right to grant a charter to any line making connection at the international boundary. I therefore say that this charter gives the Mann-Mackenzie line a complete monopoly. They have not only this immense quantity of land granted for building a road of the standard of the Kaslo-Slocan, but they have a monopoly for five years, and a safeguard from all competition from the Pacific Coast. It is true that a charter may be granted to a railway to enter the Yukon from the west, but as regards the Pacific Coast trade, no road can be chartered.

Now, with reference to some other particulars in connection with this contract. They have the land grant and they have the power of issuing bonds on it and on the undertaking to the extent of \$10,000,000. Besides that, as I read the contract, they have the right of issuing bonds on each mile of the road which is constructed to the extent of \$25,000, and if they do not issue bonds on the road to the extent of \$25,000 per mile, the difference between the deficit and the \$25,000 is added to the \$10,000,000. There is the whole scheme laid bare. They have not to expend any money for the purpose of building boats for connection with Fort Wrangel, or from Teslin Lake to Dawson City. They may make arrangements with any parties for the building of these boats, or they may hire these boats, or they may give other parties a share of the earnings of these boats, without trespassing at all upon their capital. They can issue bonds enough for the purpose of building the road on the road itself, and they can issue on the undertaking \$10,000,000, plus the difference between the bonds which they issue for the building of the railway and the \$25,000 per mile. The Bill says:

8. The capital stock of the company shall be ten millions of dollars, divided into shares of one hundred dollars each: Provided, however, that if the directors by by-law limit the issue of securities under section 17 hereof to a sum less than \$25,000 per mile for the line of railway between the Stikine River and Teslin Lake, the said capital stock may by such by-law be increased by an amount not greater than the difference between \$25,000 per mile of the said line and the sum so limited for the said issue.

Again, clause 17 provides:

17. The company may, pursuant to section 93 of the Railway Act, issue bonds, debentures, debenture stock and other securities to an amount not exceeding in all \$25,000 per mile of its lines of railway and extensions and branch and other lines, but such securities shall be issued only in proportion to the length of railway constructed or under contract to be constructed; such securities may be issued from time to time separately with respect to any one or more specified lines of railway, extensions, branches or other lines, or as to all combined; and any franchise, undertaking, tolls, income, rents, revenues, real or personal property excepted by special or general reference from the mortgages, which the

Mr. HAGGART.

company is hereby authorized to give under section 94 of the Railway Act, securing such bonds, debenture, debenture stock or other securities, shall be also accepted out of the preferential claims, and charge created by section 95 of the said Act.

There is another clause which allows the contractors to make arrangements with any person or company for the purpose of building boats to connect with this line of railway, and the contractors are not obliged to lay out one copper of their capital in that connection. It is evident from the whole proceeding that these gentlemen who have got the contract are in for a big arrangement. They have the right to build the road upon the security of the road itself. They have the right of issuing bonds up to \$25,000 a mile, but they can issue \$10,000,000 bonds upon the lands which they receive for the purpose of building this road. I have heard it argued both ways by hon. gentlemen opposite. One of them stated, and my leader took the same ground, that for every pound of gold taken out of the country a pound would be expended.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood the hon. gentleman to say something of that kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What I said was this. I spoke of what was shown by the history of gold mining in the world, without any reference to this contract at all. I was speaking in reference to the position of the individual miners in that country, and I said that it must not be forgotten that the history of the world showed that for every pound of gold produced, a pound had been expended to get it. That was my statement. It was a statement which I did not offer an opinion upon; it is an historical statement. But to say that it would cost Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie a pound for every pound of gold they took out is an entirely different story. I said nothing of that kind.

Mr. HAGGART. Then I was mistaken in regard to the hon. gentleman. Perhaps it was the hon. Minister of the Interior, who made the statement that for every pound of gold taken out of the country it would probably cost a pound of gold to take it out. Why are we going to all this trouble and expense in building this railway and opening up that country, if no money is to come out of the country? But we expect that money will come out of these gold mines; we expect that there will be a large surplus over the expense. That is the reason we are entering into the undertaking. That is the only justification for it. That would be the only justification which the Government of the country could have for entering into enterprises for the purpose of bringing people and provisions into the country. If nothing is to be made out of

the country, and if it is to cost as much to take a pound of gold out as the pound of gold is worth after you get it, I do not understand the reason for undertaking it at all.

These are some of my reasons for opposing this Bill. I oppose it because, if this is to be a commercial road, the route selected from the Stikine River is not the best possible route. I think the Government should have taken into consideration the question of extending the road into undisputed British territory, so that it would be in every respect an all-Canadian line. I think that the risk, the gambling, of the undertaking, should not be left to private individuals at all. We have reports upon that country; the Government are fully informed in regard to it. The Minister of the Interior quoted the opinion of Mr. Ogilvie as to the probable yield of gold in the different creeks. If my memory serves me rightly—I perhaps exaggerate the figures, because I had some difficulty in hearing him—he said that Mr. Ogilvie estimated that a couple of creeks, at a moderate estimate, would yield \$60,000,000, and that other creeks might possibly produce \$100,000,000. It is because of these reports that we are asked to enter into this undertaking. The Government should have come down here and asked Parliament for a sum of money for the purpose of building that road, and they should have retained the gold lands of the country for the people of the country—for the honest miners, who, without much capital, can work the mines for the benefit of themselves and their families. That chance ought not to be given to the millionaires or sold in foreign countries; and, by the by, I have heard it reported that licenses have been issued for dredging gold in the rivers of that country, for which up to yesterday the Government have received \$72,000; that large tracts of land or long stretches of rivers, ten, fifteen, twenty or thirty miles in extent, have been granted to dredging companies; that the right of dredging for gold in that country has been openly hawked about in the streets of Ottawa, and offered to foreign corporations; that speculations are being made out of dredging licenses which were obtained from the Government within the last two or three days. I oppose this Bill because it gives a monopoly of 5,000 odd square miles of that country to private individuals. I say it ought to be open to every poor man in this country to take up mining claims. The statement of my leader was correct, that not only will these men have half the gold mines in the country, but by their right of selection they will virtually have very near the whole of them. They can place a base line so that the cross line will run along the line of a creek, and they can add three three-mile sections to their odd-numbered section on each side of the base line, and in that way get pos-

session of every creek in the country. Divide the 5,000 odd miles by the number of miles in the different tracts they are allowed to lay out, and you will find that they have the right of selection in eighty different localities in the country. The Minister of the Interior says that the breadth of the streams is only three hundred feet, and the length three or four or perhaps five miles; and these men have the right of taking up twenty-four miles along every stream. They can locate their land so as to do so, and this will give them the virtual control of the whole placer mining of the country. The hon. Minister says that a prospector can go into that country and locate a claim, and that these people cannot interfere with him. But the poor fellow who goes into the country to locate a claim for placer mining can only do so to the extent of an acre or an acre and a half; and when he goes to the registry office to register his claim, what is to prevent these people who have this contract, having a person at the registry office to watch every claim that is registered, and then sending their officer to the place for the purpose of locating it for themselves? If they find that twenty or thirty or fifty acres have been taken up, this does not diminish their claim at all, because, under the provisions of the contract, they can not only cover the particular locality, but these twenty or thirty or fifty acres can be added to their claim.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman does not believe a word of that, because he knows that five miners can register on the spot.

Mr. HAGGART. I have not seen the regulations in reference to that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They have been published and distributed for a long time.

Mr. HAGGART. Suppose they do register on the spot; suppose there are a dozen or twenty miners, and suppose that every miner locates twenty or thirty acres. They will not be taking up every claim along a river. How can they register on the spot? Are there four or five hundred registry offices throughout the country? or, is there a sort of miners' meeting, as in the Australian colonies, in which the miners have a council?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. I am glad to find out that in that particular the Government have followed the Australian mining laws. If they follow the Australian mining law further, they will find that all regulations with regard to mining and with regard to how much they can take out and all disputes should be decided by the miners themselves with the right of appeal to a certain court or perhaps to the legislature. The people of

the country, I contend are the rightful owners of the country. If 150,000 or 200,000 miners go out to that country, they have the right to the ownership of the soil and everything else. They are not to be debarred from working on the alternate claims because the Government, for the purpose of building a little tramway road, which will be of hardly any use for getting in or out of the country, have chosen to deprive them of the heritage that should be theirs. I object to the scheme on this and other grounds. I say there is no justification for it. I say it is an improvident bargain.

Supposing Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann do not finish this road by the first of September next, will they not still retain their charter? Is the \$250,000 mentioned in the contract liquidated damages? We have the statement of the Minister of the Interior that we have the personal liability besides of the contractors. I say, Mr. Speaker, we have no such thing. The hon. gentleman is a lawyer, and he knows that, under the contract, the utmost amount of damages we can claim for non-fulfilment is \$250,000. And these damages are not even liquidated damages, so that we could only get out of that \$250,000 the amount we could prove the Government had lost by the default on the part of the contractors. The Government do not cancel the charter if the contractors fail to finish the road in the time provided. There is no such provision. The contractors own the road, and they need not build it by the first September. They may build it only five years later, and the utmost forfeiture they can be called on to pay—and, as I said, that is not liquidated damages—will be \$250,000.

This whole contract, from beginning to end, seems to have been forced on the Government by some one who had hypnotized it or had complete control over it, and who consequently made the contract most favourable to himself in the expectation that the devoted followers of the Government would give it in the end their support. The contractors took all they possibly could in their arrangement with the Government, relying on the force behind the Government for the carrying out of the scheme. I predicted, when I first read over the contract, that no such bargain would ever be passed by the Parliament of Canada. I stated that any man who would support such an infamous scheme would be called strictly to account by his constituents. I believe that no greater error ever was committed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I am amazed that such a foolish arrangement could have been even contemplated by gentlemen with the intelligence and experience of those leading the Government. I enter my protest against the whole thing. I believe that the people, when they thoroughly understand its true inwardness, will have none of it. I do not believe that the Parliament of Canada will ever pass such an outrageous measure, but will

Mr. HAGGART.

object to the scheme in toto. I shall have the opportunity, when this Bill is in committee, of discussing its different details, because I am unable at present to give a thorough examination to the report of Mr. Jennings without the map which is attached to it, and there are other papers which I have in my possession which I propose to discuss. I shall therefore reserve further remarks until the other stages of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Haggart) made allusion, Mr. Speaker, to a number of small points, and to these I propose to address myself a few minutes before entering into the discussion of the main question. I would, in the first place, take up the point which the hon. gentleman attempted to make, almost at the end of his speech, when he spoke about the monopoly of gold-bearing lands. The hon. gentleman said that free miners were going to be entirely excluded from the opportunity of registering their claims, because Mann & Mackenzie would have agents at the different registry offices to intercept and anticipate them. But my hon. colleague (Mr. Sifton) set the hon. gentleman right on that point by informing him that here, as in Australia, free miners, when they have struck a rich lode or claim, can register their claims on the spot just as soon as there are five of them to hold a miner's meeting. The hon. gentleman evidently had not read the regulations in this discussion. His argument fell entirely to the ground when he was informed that we had, in that respect at all events, followed the Australian regulations, and that free miners need not register in Dawson City or headquarters, but without going to the gold commissioner and without allowing Mann & Mackenzie or any of their prospectors to know anything about the strike they had made, can themselves register their claims, and these would be held inviolate against the allotments under this contract.

The hon. gentleman made much ado about the people of this country being the rightful owners of the land and about this Government having taken those lands out of the hands of the people of Canada. He spoke of the miners up there as though they were the whole people of Canada. He spoke about the thousands who are going this coming season into the Yukon territory. But the great majority of them—probably 99 out of 100 are at present—will be foreigners, not Canadians at all—men who will never dream of registering as Canadian citizens. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues in the House, yesterday and the day before, told us that the Americans were swarming in there and that the American people were going to throw obstacles in our way of governing the country. Well, it is on behalf of

these very same men that the hon. gentleman comes here and pleads against the rest of the people—the five million Canadians who live in the eastern part of Canada, and who, I venture to say, have some interest in that far off territory, and some right to reap profit out of the treasure found there.

The hon. gentleman spoke also very strongly indeed, not only of the amount of land which the contractors are going to receive under this contract, but also of their getting it immediately. The hon. member does not seem to have noticed that, according to the contract, the contractors, or the company who takes the place of the contractors, could get no title to their lands, no fee simple to the property until the road is finished and has been accepted by the Government engineer.

Mr. HAGGART. Is not the hon. gentleman mistaken? I thought they got it as they completed each ten-mile section.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That shows that the hon. gentleman has not read the provisions of the contract. If the hon. member will allow me a moment, I will explain the matter to him, and, if necessary, I will read these features of the contract. The contract provides as follows:—

11. In aid of the construction of said line of railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake the Government shall grant to the contractors for each mile of said railway twenty-five thousand acres of land to be selected as hereinafter mentioned from the Yukon provisional district and from that part of the North-west Territories of Canada lying west of the Mackenzie River and Liard River and north of the 60th parallel of latitude, such land—

And I beg the hon. gentleman to mark these words:

—to become vested in the contractors upon the said railway being completed and accepted as complete by the Government, and upon the said land being selected as hereinafter set forth.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to read him a clause? Section 18 says:

18. So soon as any ten continuous miles of said railway between Stikine River and Teslin Lake have been completed and in running order, and certified so to be by an officer named by the Minister of Railways in that behalf, the contractors may select ninety-two thousand one hundred and sixty acres.

And this land is reserved from sale. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has not read that clause evidently.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member does not seem to be able to appreciate the difference between the selection of land and getting the fee simple.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But it is reserved from sale. Nobody else can touch it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If I may be allowed, I should like to point

out that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) was contending, first, that this land was to be taken possession of by the company and everybody else shut out, and second, that this land would belong to the company, and even if they did not complete the road they would have still the possession of the land, and thus we had no security for the completion of the road but \$250,000 deposited. The hon. member knows perfectly well, although they might select the land they would not own it. And let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to this—that they are allowed to select only 92,000 acres for every ten miles out of the 250,000 acres for each ten miles of the road to which they will be entitled when the road is completed. That is to say, they are allowed to select about two-fifths of their land grant only until the road is finished. So that when the hon. gentleman speaks of the country being locked up and miners kept out of it, he is wrong to the extent of three-fifths of his whole calculation. And, as I am reminded—a point I made a few moments ago, but which I had better reiterate here so that there may be no misconception on the part of the House—although the contractors are allowed, when they have completed ten miles, to select 92,000 acres of the land they cannot and do not get any title to that land until the whole road is completed and accepted by the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But they shut out every miner from that 92,000 acres.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They do to that extent. But what advantage is that to them until they have finished their road? How can they get their money out of this land? Does the hon. member suppose that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann are going to mine in that country the same way that free miners or placer miners do? The only way they will be likely to get their return for the risk they are taking and the outlay of capital that they are obliged to make is by disposing of their lands to companies and others who wish to work that land for gold; and they cannot dispose of it until they get a fee simple title. It would be too risky for them to undertake—even if they were disposed to do so—to invest large amounts of capital upon that land until they have a free and absolute title to the land, nor will anybody buy until they have that title to transfer. They may give options to those who will agree to purchase when they get a title, but nobody will take possession of the land and accept it from the company until the company is in a position to give a title which is absolute, and they cannot get that title until the road is completed to the satisfaction of the Government.

There are one or two other things which the hon. member has adverted to which I desire to touch upon briefly. I was struck

with the remark he made in opening his speech when he referred to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair). It is true that the hon. Minister of Railways did the other night, attribute a remark made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) to the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart). I do not know that it matters very much which of these hon. gentlemen, friends, neighbours and acquaintances as they are, working together as they do under all circumstances, made this remark. But the remark, whoever made it, attributed to the ex-Minister of Railways words he was able to show clearly he had not used. But the ex-Minister of Railways to-day made a serious reflection upon his friend from West York in saying that he, at all events, would not think of making such a foolish remark. I leave it these two hon. gentlemen to decide between themselves as to the foolishness of this remark and the mistake which was made.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the remark ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will read it for the benefit of the hon. member for West York as it appears in the report of his speech in "Hansard." The hon. member for West York was alluding to the contract for the all-Canadian route, and contended that the route by Wrangel was not an all-Canadian route in the true sense of the term. He said :

Their own people say that with regard to this contract. The Minister of Railways himself says the goods must be transhipped, and when transhipped, must pay duty.

That is what the hon. member for West York said, which the Minister of Railways incorrectly attributed to the ex-Minister of Railways. Now, there is one other point that I would like to allude to in regard to the remarks of the ex-Minister of Railways, and I regret extremely to have to comment unfavourably on the statement of a gentleman who has held office in this country, and who occupies his high position in this House ; I wish to refer to his remarks with regard to our relations with the United States. The Government of the United States, the Cabinet of the United States, have certainly dealt with the Government of Canada in matters connected with this Yukon territory in the most friendly and considerate spirit. We have had negotiations with them, it is true. The Minister of the Interior went down to Washington, as he explained, at the request of a member of the Washington Cabinet, to discuss the necessary regulations, and those regulations have been amended in view of the information which was given to the Cabinet at Washington by the Minister of the Interior. I regret to find that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat seems disposed to attribute to the Government of the United States, and to

Mr. FISHER.

the people of that country at large, a certain spirit which is indicated, perhaps, to some extent, in the action of individual members of Congress, who have introduced Bills into that body, and which, interpreted in a narrow spirit, interpreted in a hostile spirit, interpreted as a desire to strike at our trade and to create unfriendly feeling between our neighbours and ourselves, might contribute to that result. But at the same time, I fancy that most of those Bills, if they are carefully examined, will really be found to contain only conditions and legislation which are perfectly legitimate on the part of the Congress of the United States, and which, if interpreted in the spirit which we have found to actuate the present Cabinet of the United States, will not interpose undue restrictions upon the carriage of Canadian goods into our territory through either the Stikine or the other route. As I said before, I regret that the ex-Minister should in this way confuse the responsibility of the Government of the United States with that of certain members of Congress who have introduced these Bills. But at the same time, the hon. gentleman showed that he really did not believe in that view of the question when he dealt with the advantages of the Lynn Canal route as opposed to those of the Stikine-Teslin Lake route. The hon. gentleman said he was quite ready to take the risk of being stopped from going through the territory which is now in the hands of the American people, because he is ready to adopt a route through the Lynn Canal into the Yukon district instead of going round by the Stikine River and Teslin Lake. The hon. gentleman was apparently quite ready to accept the delay, and enter into negotiations with the United States for reciprocal arrangements by which we would be able to get the full advantage of the Lynn Canal routes, one or the other of them. As he described them, I understood him to mean the Chilkat route over the Dalton trail into the Yukon territory, although in another part of his speech he professed to believe in a hostile feeling on the part of the United States against us. Certainly if he was sincere in his latter statement, sincere in his fear of what the United States might do in consequence of their feeling against us, he was placing himself in a very extraordinary position, when he assumed that by reciprocal arrangements we will be able to come to an agreement with the United States Government by which we may take our goods through the Lynn Canal and over the territory which they now hold and occupy, into the Yukon country. Would the hon. gentleman like to wait to enable us to get a railway into the Yukon territory until such reciprocal arrangements are made ? Would the hon. gentleman undertake to say that such an arrangement could be made with what he believes himself to be a hos-

the people, with a Government, as he professes to believe, which is inimical to Canadian trade? Would he like to wait until those negotiations have been carried through before proceeding with the railway? Does he not know well the history of previous negotiations? Is he not aware that international negotiations of this kind require a long time, and that the result is always doubtful until the very end? Under these circumstances, the contention he made in regard to the Lynn Canal routes is quite untenable, and I would strongly advise him to agree with the leader of the Opposition in his emphatic declaration, made on the floor of Parliament as well as elsewhere, that the Stikine-Teslin route is the only available one for carrying on Canadian trade with the Yukon. However, I am not at all surprised to find that the ex-Minister of Railways does not agree with the leader of the Opposition. We are accustomed to hear very different opinions expressed by members of the Opposition in this House; we are quite accustomed to find that one expresses one opinion and another immediately afterwards expresses a diametrically opposite opinion; nay, more, we find that some members of the Opposition express one opinion one time and another opinion two days afterwards, so that we can hardly expect that each and all the members of the Opposition will express the same opinion on a question even of this magnitude. Still, I would advise the ex-Minister of Railways, now being shown to have taken a position entirely untenable to accept the opinion of the leader of the Opposition, which is absolutely tenable, and which is the position the Government is taking in this contract.

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

After Recess.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). Mr. Speaker, before you left the Chair this evening I had, I think, taken up the two main points which the hon. ex-Minister of Railways had brought against this contract, and if I might be permitted, before proceeding to touch with other branches, I would just direct the attention of the House to these two points. The first which he emphasized was this, that the railway company would be able to obtain possession of a very large area of gold-bearing land and shut out from all that land the free miner. That was effectively disposed of when the hon. gentleman himself proved that his argument was based on a false premise; when he appreciated and understood that he had misread, if he had read at all, the contract, and he accepted the fact, which is an indubitable fact, that until the railway company or organization have absolutely com-

pleted their whole railway and that railway has been accepted by the Government engineers, the company do not obtain title to one single acre of that land. By that the hon. gentleman's contention falls entirely and absolutely to the ground. The next point which I dealt with before six o'clock was the hon. gentleman's contention that we had no guarantee or security for the completion of the railway, that the contractors or company to take their place might go in and build as much of the railway as they saw fit, and the most we could call from them would be the forfeiture of their deposit of a quarter of a million of dollars. The forfeiture of a quarter of a million of dollars is no light thing for ordinary individuals in this country or elsewhere, and I should like to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that while that clause is in this contract, it was not in contracts made by the hon. gentleman's colleagues on the other side of the House. I proved that that was in no sense the only guarantee we had for the completion of the railway by the same fact that I have just quoted, namely, that until the railway is completed the contractors or company who may acquire the contract obtain no title to their lands until the completion of the railway, and we thereby have the most absolute and entire security for the completion of the road. Until the railway is completed the contractors or company cannot sell one single acre of their land. They have no security if they themselves make investments in that land for its working, and, therefore, it is impossible for them to deal with or handle any portion of that land grant until they have completed the railway. I wanted to emphasize these two points, because I thought they were the essentials of the argument of the hon. gentleman, so much as I could make out his argument.

Before proceeding, there is one other point to which I wish to allude. I notice in the "Journal" this evening a statement, which is not a statement of fact, and which I was surprised to see in the "Journal," because it is generally well informed on public questions and is generally disposed to take a fair view of public questions. It appears on the editorial page and is headed: "The Kersey Offer." It says:

It appears that H. Maitland Kersey, on behalf of a syndicate, offered to build the Stikine-Teslin Railway for \$6,000 a mile cash bonus, or taking the distance at 165 miles, a total of \$990,000.

That is not a fair or an accurate statement of Mr. Maitland Kersey's offer. I have Mr. Maitland Kersey's offer under my hand; it has been on the Table of the House for some days, open to the inspection of the Press Gallery and anybody. As a matter of fact Mr. Maitland Kersey did not offer to build the Stikine-Teslin Railway for \$6,000 per mile. In the first place, the

offer was for a road over the Chilkat Pass. The offer says :

The syndicate, however, is prepared to undertaken the construction of a wagon road, to be followed by a railway if required, and to devise all possible means of transportation for the requirements of miners and others who will be anxious to reach this country in the spring.

It is understood that the Government of the Dominion and British Columbia will both assist in this development.

It is proposed, therefore, that the Dominion Government should be asked to give the sum of \$1,000 per mile towards the construction of a wagon road and not less than \$6,000 per mile towards the construction of a railroad, presupposing that the Government of British Columbia will further assist in the work.

The syndicate has made direct proposals to the Government of British Columbia.

- This shows as a matter of fact that this offer, if it can be called an offer, was made presupposing that the British Columbia Government would assist them. More than that. We have the after fact, that this offer was withdrawn by Mr. Maitland Kersey when he had communicated with his principals in England, because they were not prepared to make an offer at all—an offer at all, let me point out, which was contingent on the construction of the road before 1st September. When that offer by Mr. Kersey was made, the offer quoted by the "Journal" to-night and the offer which I hold in my hand, there was nothing in it stipulating as to the time when the railway should be built; on the contrary, there is distinct evidence in the offer that Mr. Kersey had no expectation of building the railway during the year 1898. Having put this matter right, I should like now to proceed to address myself to the main part of my argument.

First, I would refer again to another, and I think unfortunate statement which the ex-Minister of Railways made to the House. It was to the effect that it was impossible for the Government of Canada to enforce law and order in the Yukon territory; it was to the effect that if we were to give alternate sections to this railway company we would not be able to prevent free miners on the adjoining Government sections by force going on and working the lands of the railway company. The hon. gentleman has not read the whole of the regulations regarding mining in the Yukon territories; but in those regulations which—and they are entirely apart and independent of this contract—the Government have issued for mining in the Yukon territory, there are reserved to the Government certain claims, alternate lots of ten claims, and yet the hon. gentleman deliberately stated what can fairly be taken by the people, if the statement should ever be reported to the miners of the territory, as a distinct invitation from an hon. gentleman occupying a prominent position in Parliament, that lawlessness and disregard for law may be exercised

Mr. FISHER.

and may exist in our territory. Sir, it is most unfortunate; it is a direct slap, not at the individuals or personnel of the Government, but against the constitutional government of the country to declare here that it is impossible for the Government to maintain law and order within the borders of our Dominion. I am glad and proud to be able to say for my country that if that condition should ever occur, it would be the first time the Government has been defied with impunity, or that they have not been able to maintain law and order even in the furthest sections of this country. The broad question I think resolves itself into this, as regards the contract—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the hon. gentleman proceeds, will he be kind enough to indicate the clause on which he relies, that the contractors' deposit will be forfeited if the road is not built on 1st September next.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I rely on the fact that the deposit is made for the purpose of fulfilling the contract, which requires that the road shall be built within that time, and there is a distinct clause stating that until the road is built and accepted by the Government engineers the company shall not have any title to the lands.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand the hon. gentleman's argument, but it is clause 10 he refers to. Is there any other clause he relies on?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not looked over the contract particularly as to that. I contend that this contract is based upon two broad principles, which, I believe, will commend themselves to the House, to Parliament, and to the country. The first is: that we should have an all-Canadian route into that territory; and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has dealt at considerable length with the possibilities, and I might say also, the advantages of the route known as the Chilkat route, commencing at Pyramid Harbour. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) laboured a good deal to prove that the international complications in connection with that route were of no consequence, or were not likely to arise, and that, even if they were to arise, Canada would have an absolutely strong case in regard to them. Well, I prefer to take the opinion of the hon. gentleman's leader (Sir Charles Tupper), who has distinctly laid down the proposition, that this Teslin-Stikine route is the route which is in the interests of the country, as well as the only one immediately available. Not being a lawyer, and not being versed in legal lore, I shall not undertake to deal with intricate points of international law. I much prefer to leave that to those who have been trained in that profession, and I must confess that the attempt of the hon.

gentleman (Mr. Haggart) to elucidate these intricate points was not of such a nature as to tempt me to try it. It is better for men not trained in the law to leave the consideration of matters of this kind to those whose province it is to deal with them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) said, that if reciprocal arrangements could be made, the route through the Chilkat Pass, starting from territory which is now in the possession of the United States—although we Canadians pretend and affirm that it is properly our territory—if reciprocal arrangements could be made, he says, that route would be equally available with the route now proposed. Let me ask: Would the hon. gentleman wait until such arrangements could be made? Is he prepared to say that there is no urgency for the construction of a railway into the Yukon territory? Is he prepared to say that, even should there be no international complications, the route through the Chilkat Pass could be made available for the inrush of the miners who are going to the Yukon early this season, could be available for the transport of the supplies necessary for these miners, and could be available to provide against the possible—indeed, I might say, certain—starvation which would exist almost universally in that country next fall and next winter, if no railway connection is immediately established? Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) prepared to say that there is no urgency for these things to be guarded against, and is he prepared to wait until we could make reciprocal arrangements with the United States, so as to insure the carriage of our goods across the Chilkat Pass? I know very well that the hon. gentleman is not prepared to do anything of the kind. I know very well that, if he personally wished to make such a motion in this House, very few, if any, of his political friends would follow him. I know that these gentlemen on the other side of the House would prefer to follow the leader of the Opposition, who has distinctly and emphatically declared his dissent from the proposition of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart).

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) spoke about the urgency of this railroad contract. I will not go into details, with which my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior dealt so ably last night, but I do wish to speak for a few moments on a point which has not before been alluded to. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) contended that the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was in full possession of all the necessary knowledge about the Hootalingua River, as well as about the Stikine River, to have entered into a contract for the building of the railroad much earlier in the season than the contract was actually made. To prove this, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) quoted Dr. Dawson as having given in his report, in the year 1887-88, all the information that is necessary to show that

there was good navigation on the Hootalingua River from the head of Teslin Lake down to Dawson City. The hon. gentleman left it to be supposed that, upon that evidence contained in Dr. Dawson's report, if he (Mr. Haggart) were Minister of Railways, he would have been prepared to have entered into a contract to construct this Teslin-Stikine Railway, and would have risked, on that information, all that is involved in the completion of this contract and the pledging of this country to the construction of that chain of communication between the Pacific Ocean and Dawson City. Now, what is the information given in the report of Dr. Dawson? It is simply hearsay information—absolutely hearsay information. Dr. Dawson did not go up or down the Hootalingua River, and Dr. Dawson was not on Teslin Lake. Dr. Dawson, it is true, passed the mouth of the Hootalingua River on the Lewes River, and he made a stop there for a couple of days for the purpose of measuring the volume of water that came down the Hootalingua River and comparing it with the volume of water that came down the Lewes River at the junction. During the few days that Dr. Dawson was there, he conversed with some miners who had travelled somewhat on the Hootalingua River, and these miners gave the information, that they believed the Hootalingua River was as good for navigation purposes as the Lewes, and they did not think there was any interruption between Teslin Lake and the junction of the Hootalingua and Lewes rivers. Will the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) undertake to say that, if he had been in office, he would have undertaken the construction of this road and the giving of this contract on such evidence as that? Well, judging from the reckless way in which the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) spoke the other day about his information as to the Kaslo-Slocan Railway, and judging from the way in which he spoke about this contract to-night, when it was shown that he had not even read the contract or did not understand its terms, if he did read it—judging from this, it is possible the hon. gentleman would have done that, but it is not the office of a business Government, and certainly it is not the office of this Government, to make a contract of such importance as this on mere hearsay evidence.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question for information? I understood the Minister of the Interior to refer to Mr. St. Cyr's report as the one upon which the statement is made that Teslin Lake and the Hootalingua River are navigable for these river steamers. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher), at this stage of his argument, if that is the only report on which the Government make the statement that these waters are navigable?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. the Minister of the Interior informs me, that, except the information from Dr. Dawson and reports of an entirely and absolutely unofficial or unauthenticated nature, there were no reports until Mr. St. Cyr brought down his report and it was in the Minister's hand. Therefore, the delay which was complained of in regard to taking steps to enter into this contract, was a delay which was unavoidable, unless we had been prepared to do what the ex-Minister of Railways seems to think we would have been justified in doing, and which he probably would have done, had he an opportunity of doing so.

There was one other thing the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals referred to. He said he understood that there was an American report upon the Hootalinqua River. As a matter of fact, no American engineer has ever examined the Hootalinqua River. There was, I understand, in one of the documents at Washington, a report of some American gentleman who had been in that country. But would the hon. gentleman undertake to say that we were to go to the unofficial information contained in American reports, and base upon that a contract entered into by the Government of Canada? Would the hon. gentleman, who has such an opinion of the American nation and the American people and the American congressmen as he expressed here to-night, and as his friends around him have frequently expressed, undertake to base the letting of a contract like this upon American unofficial reports which he had no opportunity of gauging the value of? The hon. gentleman, when he comes to think of it, must realize that until the Minister of the Interior had the report of his own official, he was not in a position to go on and enter upon a contract for the building of that railway.

There is just one other matter I would like to speak about—the question of international complications. I do not wish to touch upon it from the legal standpoint, but from the practical, common-sense standpoint. In the first place, I do not suppose for a moment that the American Government is capable of undertaking to destroy the effect of an international treaty by customs regulations. I do not acknowledge for one moment the possibility that men in the position of Cabinet Ministers of the United States, men who are the responsible heads of a great Christian country, are going to take that ground or attempt to do so. But, Sir, supposing for a moment that they do; supposing for a moment that there are difficulties raised at Wrangel, we have in our own hands the means of overcoming those difficulties. We have, a few miles south of Fort Wrangel, Fort Simpson, where if necessary we can tranship into lighters, and tow those lighters from Fort Simpson up the Stikine River, and I believe there is another feasible proposition, which

Mr. FISHER.

is that such lighters can be constructed somewhat after the form of the whaleback vessels which are used on the great lakes, so that a string of these lighters could be towed from Victoria or Vancouver all the way up the inside channels without any transshipment or stoppage, or anything more than entering the first American port they would come to—Fort Wrangel. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, and says it is impossible. But that is a proposition which I have discussed with some practical men. They say it is perfectly feasible, and I would not be at all surprised to find that before this railway is far proceeded with the materials for its construction will be carried up to Glenora in the way I have pointed out.

Mr. PRIOR. If the hon. gentleman means to intimate that I shook my head, I did not shake my head.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose then that it was at what an hon. gentleman beside him was saying, and not at me. I say we first lay down the broad principle that this had to be an all-Canadian route. I have just tried to show that it is an all-Canadian route, and that even if complications and difficulties which we have no reason to anticipate should arise at Fort Wrangel, those difficulties could be overcome. If by any reason we found that the Stikine River during its open season could not carry the necessary freight and afford the necessary facilities for passenger traffic into that country, we have provided in this contract for the continuation of the railway southward to Portland Canal, where we have a Canadian ocean port open all the year round.

Mr. PRIOR. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Some gentlemen understood him to say that lighters and barges could be towed from Victoria or Vancouver to Glenora; or did he say, as I understood him, that they could be towed as far as Wrangel, and then transhipped?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The first explanation the hon. gentleman gave was the correct one.

Mr. PRIOR. Then I do shake my head.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What I say is this, that it is quite possible for barges or lighters constructed somewhat after the plan of the whalebacks that are used on the great lakes, though smaller in size and capacity, with a light draft and a large freight-carrying capacity, to be loaded at Vancouver or at Victoria and taken in tow of an ocean steamer to the mouth of the Stikine River, and afterwards by a river steamer up the Stikine River to Glenora or Telegraph Creek.

Mr. PRIOR. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I do not think there is any vessel which it would be safe to tow all the year round from Vancouver or Victoria, of such a draft that it could go up the Stikine River. It has to pass the Dixon Entrance, which is generally rough, receiving the whole sweep of the Pacific Ocean.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has given away his whole case, because he says he does not think barges could be constructed to go up the Stikine River all the year round.

Mr. PRIOR. I did not say that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I know the hon. gentleman did not say that, but he said something the legitimate conclusion of which was that, if what he said was true. The hon. gentleman said that it was impossible that such barges could be constructed that they could be taken up the channel, inside the Prince of Wales Island and the other islands along the coast. But this arrangement is not one for the winter or stormy season. It is one for the summer season when navigation on the Stikine River is possible, and it is only when the navigation on the Stikine River is possible that such an arrangement would apply.

Mr. PRIOR. If the hon. gentleman will pardon me, there is not inland navigation all the way from Vancouver or Victoria to Wrangel. You have to pass the Dixon Entrance, which is twenty-four or twenty-five miles wide, and very rough and dangerous to navigation. What I say is that no vessels could be built with little enough draft to go up the Stikine River, and yet fit to pass the Dixon Entrance.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has been at Fort Wrangel or not.

Mr. PRIOR. Yes, twenty-five years ago.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But I am just as well acquainted with the islands there as any one else who has the means of studying the geography of the country by the maps. I pointed out that this had been done on the great lakes, Superior and Michigan, for years, and while such large barges as are used there could not be navigated on the Stikine River, still the same principle could be applied. An hon. gentleman beside me has put this memorandum into my hand, stating that the tug "Lorne" towed a barge the other day from Victoria to Wrangel.

Mr. PRIOR. Yes, I know that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman then acknowledges that what I have outlined is possible.

Mr. PRIOR. Sometimes they can when it is fine weather, but they often have to lay

off six or seven days waiting for fine weather.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It depends on the season of the year. However, my hon. friend will have an opportunity of discussing this when his turn comes to speak, and if he will allow me, I will now go on with my argument. I have laid down the proposition that this is really an all-Canadian route, and that such was one of the main objects the Government had in view on entering into this contract. Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, Mr. Kersey and others, who made offers, all offered to build roads from the Lynn Canal, but the Government would not listen to any such offer. The Government insisted that the route should be an all-Canadian one. Do hon. gentlemen take ground against that? Are they prepared to come forward and say that they would support a route which is not an all-Canadian route. If they are not, let them admit that the whole House is unanimous upon this point, that the route, in order to be satisfactory to the people of Canada, must be an all-Canadian route. If they are not prepared to take that ground, if they wish to take issue with us on this point, I challenge them now to declare to the country that the Conservative party is prepared to favour a contract for a road whose terminus would be in American territory.

There is one other main proposition which we laid down and adhered to. That was that we would give no money subsidy for this railroad. The hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Haggart) said that he would prefer five times over that the Government should build the road with the people's money.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. An hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." I take him at his word. If that is the position which the Conservative party are going to take in this country, let us have it clearly understood and let us take up the question and debate it fairly and squarely. So far, with the exception of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), no hon. gentleman on that side, who has spoken, has taken that position. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition did not take it fairly and squarely in his speech of the other night; but if these hon. gentlemen are prepared to take that position, I am ready to face it and deal with it on its merits. But I repeat—and I say it with full confidence that the people of Canada will endorse my statement—that the people of this eastern part of Canada are not prepared to consent that a large increase of public debt, to the extent of \$5,000,000, should be saddled on this country for the purpose of building that road to the Yukon territory. The ordinary taxpayers of the country, as was so well said by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr.

Rogers) the other night, the farmers of this country are not prepared to submit to additional taxation for the purpose of opening up these gold fields. They do not care so much whether a few miles more or less of gold-bearing lands up there are devoted for the purpose of opening up and giving value to the rest of the country, but they would protest most strenuously against any large increase of debt being incurred for this purpose and a large increase of taxation being imposed on the country to meet the interest on that debt.

Hon. gentlemen opposite and their organs and friends throughout the country make calculations as to the enormous value of the lands we are giving for the building of this road. But my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) showed clearly last night what a small proportion of the lands we are giving can really be gold-bearing, that is, for placer mining. He pointed out that supposing the contractors took a strip right along the axis of a river, as is explained in the contract, supposing they should project a base line along the axis of the river, on the average the amount of placer mining which is possible in that six mile strip is only about 300 feet. He showed that supposing the contractors were able to take the whole of their lands, with that three hundred feet strip in the middle of each section, they then would only have one-one hundred and fifth part of that land gold-bearing. Supposing they and by their own prospectors or by the discoveries of some free miners that there is a good deposit of gold in the bed of a stream, and they wish to make the axis of this stream their base line, it is a well known fact—I heard Mr. Ogilvie the other night state it emphatically—that as a general rule, in one stream there are only perhaps two or three miles which are rich in good gold. The rich portion of any individual stream does not extend, as a rule, to any great length. Even on Bonanza and Eldorado Creek, the actual gold found is got out of only about six miles, at the outside, of their length. The company are allowed to fix their stake at the end of their base line. That base line is to continue for 24 miles. They cannot take less than a whole block, starting from the original point—24 miles long and six miles wide. What is the result? Of that they have the first three miles, then the Government have the next three miles, and so on. Supposing they were to find a very rich lode in that territory. They might have three miles of it; but to get that three miles, they would not only have to take that three miles by six, but three other blocks, each of them three by six, further up the stream, away from and outside that rich mine; and according to Mr. Ogilvie's statement, the chances are greatly indeed against their finding any valuable mine at all in these other three blocks. What does this mean? When they

Mr. FISHER.

take a block of twenty-four miles long and six wide, they take altogether \$2,160 acres, or nearly the subsidy for four miles. Of that amount, one-half would belong to the Government and one-half would be theirs; so that to get one single location which would be very rich, they have to take 46,000 acres, and as to the other sections beyond that, in that same block, according to Mr. Ogilvie's statement and those of prospectors, the chances are against their being exceptionally rich at all. The whole of the contractor's land grant would require 83 such lots—that is to say, 83 lots 24 miles long and six miles wide. They have therefore only actually 83 chances to get rich mines, and a large proportion, probably nearly all the rest of the land they take, will be simply the average gold bearing land in that territory. And when they do take that, they have to take alternate blocks, and every free miner has just the same chance as the company to get a gold mining privilege and a rich location.

And so, in spite of the calculations of the immense value of the land which is being given to them, the value is comparatively small. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) showed that, so far as the width is concerned—the width of six miles—only 300 feet, or 1-105th part, was likely to be good, and I have shown that, on the length along the centre of the base line, they have to take one-half of the twenty-four miles in length, or alternate blocks aggregating 46,000 acres, to secure to themselves any particular part which they may have found to be exceedingly rich.

Now, there is another point brought up by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Before the hon. Minister passes on, may I ask him a question? I do not wish to interrupt him: I ask for information. I would like to know what interpretation the Government puts upon the second paragraph of subsection 2 of section 12 of the contract.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was just going to take up that point. That is the question as to the selection of side pieces or side blocks three miles square on the ends of the company's alternate blocks in the first original sections in the first original block. First, I must confess that the graphic picture drawn by the leader of the Opposition of the dangers of this particular section appealed to my amusement, rather than to my reason. The hon. gentleman has missed one very important point of the contract. He drew a wonderful picture, showing that the company could have twenty-four miles in length by three in width; they would arrange to have that in the valley of a river, taking in, perhaps, a whole gold-bearing river twenty-four miles long. Now, the contract lays down that the base lines may be run in two ways. First, they may follow the axis of the river. In

that case the twenty-four mile strip described must run at right angles and must follow up the mountains and into the back country, where there is no more placer mining. The extra nine miles on one side and the extra nine miles on the other side gives them no more of the valley of that river than they had in the six-mile section. The hon. gentleman understands that, and will admit that that is the case.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is true.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Ah, says the leader of the Opposition, these are clever men. Instead of taking their base line along the river bank, they are going to turn it at right angles and take twenty-four miles up and down the valley of the river, and thus they will have a splendid gold section, three miles in width and twenty-four miles long, wherever they may find a rich gold river. But the hon. gentleman forgot another important part of the section to which he was alluding.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The controlling part.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The controlling part, as my hon. friend says. I said that there were two ways in which the base lines could be laid down. One is along the axis of the river. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) follows my argument and sees that it has force where that kind of base line is taken. Now, take the other way. You get a base line running otherwise than along the axis of a river. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that in this section the following is laid down :—

The contractors may take as a base line a line commencing at any point located by them, and running from such point due north, east, south or west.

Now, suppose they carry out what the hon. leader of the Opposition so graphically describes, and instead of running a base line along the axis of a river, they run it north, south, east or west by the compass. Now, if they hope to get a section twenty-four miles long by three miles wide along a river under their absolute control, they must find a river whose line runs for twenty-four miles exactly north and south, or exactly east and west, and they must take care to lay down their base line in such a way that by starting from that point in a direct line north, south, east or west, they can secure this tract on the river. Well, Sir, it is barely possible that the picture drawn from imagination by the leader of the Opposition may be found true. We know that the imagination of the hon. gentleman is always fertile. It may be, that in that country, where the rivers are tortuous, where they are diverted from a straight course every mile or two, that a river might be found whose line would be due north and south, or east and west, for twenty-four miles,

without going outside of the three-mile strip. But such a thing is most extremely unlikely. And, as one of my hon. friends suggests, suppose one or two of such rivers were to be found there, it would be of no great benefit to the contractors except through another fortuitous circumstance—that the river happened to be a gold-bearing one of extreme richness, such as the Klondike, the Bonanza or the Eldorado. But I will go further, and tell the hon. gentleman that the matter is one which has been under the consideration of the Government. As he knows perfectly well, the Government laid down the principle of alternate sections in this land grant, the Government getting the alternate sections. It was understood by the contractors that was the principle of the land grant. And when the Government saw that it was possible that the section could be so interpreted that there was even a theoretical possibility—not that we believed that it is of any value or that the imaginary picture of the leader of the Opposition was at all likely to be realized—that it might result as stated, then, so that the principle of alternate blocks and sections should be maintained in every line of the contract, as we believe it to be a right principle in giving land grants, Mr. Mackenzie to-day agreed that the same principle should be applied to their outside sections as was applied to the main block of land in the middle.

But instead of what the hon. gentleman chooses to take as a possible difficulty, this is the kind of thing which will occur if the land grant is divided, that is to say, that against and next to one of the sections given to the company in the main block, the Government will have the first three square miles section, the company the next and the Government the next.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the amended clause been drawn?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It has not, but the contractors, knowing well that the principle of alternate sections was the principle of the grant in the contract, are perfectly willing to abide by that principle, but this amendment will be made to remove any possible objection, any possible doubt as to the arrangement which might be made, showing that there was no intention on the part of the Government, and there was no intention on the part of the contractors, to try and whip the devil round the post in the way the leader of the Opposition tried to show was possible.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is it proposed to lay the amended contract immediately on the Table of the House?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It will be amended in committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will it be convenient for the Government, to-morrow or on Monday, to mention what the proposed amendment will be, as it is rather an important matter?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have given it in substance. I think the House understands it fully, and it will be drawn up in such a way that there can be no doubt as to its interpretation, and it will give effect to the idea that I have described. Now, Sir, there is another point I wish to allude to. I have tried to dispose of the contention that this land grant is so enormously valuable—not that I wish in any wise to minimize the value of the land grant. I am satisfied that the contractors, or the company that may succeed the contractors, have got a very valuable asset in the land which we have given them for the building of this railway, but I do not for one moment pretend that in getting such a contract as this signed by gentlemen of the standing of Mackenzie & Mann, the Government is not justified, nay more, that it is not proper and right for the Government to give a valuable consideration for such a valuable work. Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and the company who may take their place, will have an enormously valuable asset in the land grant which is given to them by this contract, and it is only by reason of that fact that they will be able to carry out the contract, it is only by reason of the fact that they are getting something in return for what they are giving that anybody in this country would presume to endorse this contract. Sir, what is the real value of this land grant? The Minister of the Interior showed us last night that the land grant was not so very valuable for placer mining purposes, that is to say, the land that would be available for placer mining purposes was comparatively of small extent. I have shown here to-night that they would have to take a very large amount of land for each particular place and location which they had found to be particularly rich, and which they wanted to make sure of getting control of. But there are other things in this land grant which I think are of immense value, and will accrue to the pecuniary success of the company, and I hope they will, after placer mining has come to an end in the Yukon territory. We know perfectly well by the history of gold mining throughout the world, that when large placer finds are first made, they are worked to immense advantage, particularly by poor men. We know that to that stage of mining there succeeds hydraulic mining, and we know that in successful hydraulic mining there is necessarily a large outlay of capital, and it is only by means of large companies with large capital at their disposal that successful hydraulic mining can be carried on. Successful hydraulic mining is carried on in river beds and on

Mr. FISHER.

the banks of rivers where the return of gold is not sufficient to make placer mining successful, or largely successful. By means of capital invested, by means of the machinery employed, by means of the large number of workmen that can be employed under one control and management, mud or sand or earth or gravel, which can be washed out by means of hydraulic mining, and which are of a much lower paying grade than earth which is worked out in placer mining, can still be made profitable. This, then, will occur. Much of this section of country we have described will be such as placer miners, or free miners, will never think of going into, or if they do, will perhaps try and leave after disposing of their claim and their property successfully, and the hydraulic miner who will go in there will build up a permanent and large industry for the benefit of the people of Canada. Moreover, we believe, and we hope, that the hillsides and the mountains from which grains of gold that are now found in the valleys of the streams came down, can be profitably worked in the future in the way of quartz mining. When these gentlemen have obtained the title to their land, they will no doubt be able to dispose of sections of that land where, by reason of scientific investigation, quartz lodes have been found and a sufficient quantity of gold to justify quartz mining; and then those who will rent privileges from them will be able to establish there quartz mining which will continue from year to year, and which will be a permanent source of income and revenue to the people of this country. Sir, for these reasons, I believe that while the people of Canada in giving this land grant have not given a thing which is of such large value at the present moment, still the men who are getting it are going to be able to make a fairly good thing out of it, and are going to create and continue there a profitable industry which will for years and years to come be a source of income and revenue and profit to the whole of the people of Canada. Now, Sir, a good deal has been said about the extent of this land grant, and independently altogether of its intrinsic value. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior last night spoke about land grants generally, and the ex-Minister of Railways this afternoon tried to belittle and to ridicule what he said. As a matter of fact, every statement that the Minister of the Interior made last night was absolutely correct to the closest figure. The contention of the ex-Minister of Railways was, after all, that although he and his friends had given such enormous quantities of the fertile belts of Canada to railroad corporations, Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Mackenzie's Government were prepared to have given a little more. I do not know that that has very much to do with this transaction. However, I propose for a moment to show to this House, first of all the map that

the Minister of the Interior showed last night, the map which shows the amount of fertile land in Manitoba and the North-west Territories which has been given by hon. gentlemen opposite to various railway companies in the Dominion of Canada. In the map which I am going to show the portion coloured black is that covered by the grants of land to railway companies. In that portion the alternate sections are available for the railway companies, the others still remain in the hands of the Government. But in consequence of that, it is only the parts that are not coloured black at all that are available for continuous settlement to immigrants coming into this country. Here, Mr. Speaker, is the map which I wish to show again for one moment, and I want hon. gentlemen opposite to take full cognizance of it.

Mr. DAVIN. Is not one-half of that portion coloured black, open to settlement?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have just explained that.

Mr. DAVIN. That map therefore gives a very wrong impression.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Surely the impression is this, that although half of that land that is marked black is open for settlement, or continuous settlement, it is not so, because there are alternate blocks shut up and closed, held by the monopolies which hon. gentlemen opposite have created, for increase in value by the toil and sweat of the men who go in there and settle on adjoining Government lands. Here is the monopoly.

Mr. DAVIN. Let me ask another question of the hon. gentleman. Would not the policy of Mr. Mackenzie have covered the North-west still blacker than that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is talking about past history. I am talking about actual facts in the settlement of our country, about the condition of affairs which immigrants coming in from foreign lands find in our North-west Territories; and I am pointing out a fact which, as the hon. gentleman knows well, is one of the most important factors which has interfered with immigration into the North-west Territories, which has prevented the settlement of that country to the extent that I and all Canadians had hoped for, but which, under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, did not take place, and has not yet taken place in that territory. Hon. gentlemen see on this map the quantity of land that has been locked up by the monopolies given by hon. gentlemen opposite. I wish hon. gentlemen to look at the map carefully. Now if I may be allowed I will show a similar map of the Yukon district. On this map which I now show to the House, hon. members will see one

small black patch, and that includes the land granted under the contract, the land grant which has been so much dilated upon by hon. gentlemen in their speeches. This land, hon. gentlemen will observe, covers not more than a square inch on the map.

Mr. DAVIN. Does all the map indicate land that is gold-bearing land, if it does not, is not the map a perfect fraud?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman will stop a moment, I will explain the matter.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Are the two maps of the same scale?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A map can be compared with itself, if not with another map. A part is the same scale as the whole map. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not know what a scale is. All this is what is called by Mr. Ogilvie the gold-bearing country, and the small black patch in the middle of it is the extent of the area, according to scale, given to the Yukon Railway Company as the whole of their land grant, and not only so, but it represents the only cost to the people of Canada of the building of the road. An hon. gentleman opposite, the leader of the Opposition, stated a little while ago, and it was repeated to-day, that for every pound of gold taken out about one pound is expended; and the natural question was put to him from this side of the House: If that is the case, what are Mackenzie & Mann getting?

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, nothing.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should like to tell the hon. gentleman what they are getting. If there is one thing more apparent than another at the present time in this whole question, it is the tremendous speculative frenzy which is actuating people all over the civilized world in respect to the Klondike. At the present moment thousands and tens of thousands of people in the different parts of the world have their faces turned to the Klondike. There are innumerable corporations and companies formed to deal with the various phases of that migration. There are transportation companies, companies for quartz mining, dredging, placer mining and hydraulic mining. All these companies tend to show that there exists to-day a perfect frenzy of speculation abroad in regard to the Klondike. While the leader of the Opposition said, that for every pound of gold taken out—and it is a well known fact—a pound is spent, and while such is the case as regards the whole production of gold, there are certain individuals and companies which obtain ten, fifty or a hundred times the amount of gold expended in mining it. It is due to that fact and to the speculative fever prevailing in the world at large that

people go to seek gold in the Yukon or any other territory. Were the plain facts to be, as the leader of the Opposition stated, that every pound of gold coming out of the earth took one pound of gold to mine it, and that rule prevailed in respect to every individual pound, no one would think of going to Klondike or elsewhere to conduct mining operations. In some cases, however, men secure one hundred, two hundred or three hundred times the value in gold of the amount expended in obtaining it, and every one trusts and believes that he is going to be the lucky man who will get the large return, and that his neighbours and others will lose a corresponding amount to enable him to get that return. It is only and solely due to this speculative fever that the contractors are going to be able to make anything out of the contract. If it were not for that, they would have to put their own money into the building of the road and trust to the future to get a return. But in consequence of this fact, that there is a speculative fever and that speculation is natural to most men, that indeed men are willing and anxious to go into speculation, the contracting company may be able to get out of the land a good return for the risk they have undertaken and the work they are doing. Emphatically I hope that they will. I should be glad to have it known that in Canada men possessing experience, capacity and ability to undertake great operations are welcome in this country and will have an opportunity of doing good work for the Government. I am the more glad to know, in this case at all events, that we were able to find men who did not have to come to Canada but were themselves Canadians, that we found in Canada two gentlemen who, on the confession of hon. gentlemen opposite, and on the confession of business men throughout the country, are well able to carry out this work to a successful conclusion, and that we could not get any better men or perhaps as able men to carry it out, even if we travelled to the other end of the earth to find them. I have consumed a little more time than I had intended with my remarks; but I have attempted to keep to certain great points, which I will now recapitulate. The points I wish to emphasize are these. In the first place, the Government look to making an all-Canadian route. We took that as the principle which we thought necessary to maintain and make the essence of the contract. We have succeeded in doing that, and hon. gentlemen opposite, however they may have talked around it indirectly, have not dared yet to say that their party or they themselves as a body are against that particular feature of the contract. The next proposition adopted and laid down as a principle and made the essence of the contract, is that the Klondike shall pay for the railway; that the people of eastern Canada, the workmen, and the shopkeepers and

Mr. FISHER.

the other classes, should not have placed on their shoulders an additional burden or debt in consequence of the building of the railway and development of the Klondike. Those two features are sufficient to recommend the contract to the members of this House, to the Parliament of Canada, and to the people of this country. I take my seat in the full assurance, that the moment this contract is fully understood—as I am satisfied now, after the clear and lucid explanation of the Minister of the Interior last night, it is and will be understood—the moment it is understood throughout the length and breadth of this country, the Opposition will be obliged to fall into line and support it, because the people of Canada will demand of their representatives that they should do so, and the people will endorse the Government for the action they have taken in this matter.

Mr. OSLER. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in this House I shall always be found giving credit to whom credit is due, and, in beginning my remarks on this Yukon contract, I want to bear testimony without any reserve to my admiration for the great work that the Minister of the Interior has done in trying to find out from the first what was necessary to accomplish that which we all desire, namely, to secure for Canadians the control of the trade of the Yukon. It is creditable to himself, and creditable to the Government, that he has devoted months of his time to this matter, and that he has given to us what I will accept without any question the best route, so far as we know at present, by which we can obtain an entrance to this gold-bearing territory. I find no fault with the suggestion that it is absolutely necessary for the rest of Canada to obtain communication with that country as rapidly as possible. The fault I have to find with the Government, and with the Minister of the Interior, who, I believe, has been the mainstay of this contract, is, the conditions upon which he proposes to attain the end in view.

Last night, when I heard the Minister of the Interior attacking me indirectly through my business relations, I thought that something I had said the other evening must have hit him hard, or he would not have gone out of his way to attack old contracts, old negotiations and old agreements in connection with the building of roads in the North-west. Very many allusions have been made to the building of the two roads with which I have been more or less connected; namely, the Qu'Appelle-Long Lake Road and the Calgary and Edmonton. I state here, without any fear of contradiction, that no two roads ever bonused by the Government of Canada, and no two roads ever undertaken, fulfilled their contract with the Government from beginning to end as did the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake and the Calgary and Edmonton roads. Without a single default in any agreement with the Govern-

ment, these roads were built and the contracts fulfilled. Gentlemen on the Government benches are fond of saying that wild statements have been made on this side of the House, but no wilder statement has ever been made than the statements made by the members of the Government as to the profits and moneys made out of those two roads. The Minister of the Interior ought to be the last man to make any such statement, because he has in his department a copy of every document relating to the financial transactions of these roads. So far from the promoters of the road having made money, I believe that, from first to last, one and all of them have lost money. Speaking for myself and the connection I had with them, I personally have lost money and I am poorer to-day for having had anything to do with either of these two roads. These roads were bonused by large land grants. It was found, for many years after these grants were made, that it was impossible to finance upon them. There is a report of a committee dated June 5th, 1888, showing that it cost the Government at that time \$72,755 a year to give these northern territories mail and military service. The Government gave a subsidy of \$80,000 a year for twenty years for the building of each of these roads, but that subsidy was not enough to pay for interest on the bonds on the cost of the road. The land had to be sold to get a sufficient sum of money to pay 6 per cent interest on the bonds of the road for six years. In the case of the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Road, the Government retained one-third of the land grant in consideration of this \$80,000 a year, and the Government still retains it. The remainder of these lands were sold for about \$1,000,000, and that \$1,000,000, in addition to the \$80,000 a year, was required to pay the interest for six years on the bonds issued to build the road.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I would like to ask how much they received for the sale of bonds on the Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway?

Mr. OSLER. They received from the proceeds of the sale of bonds \$2,539,000, and they received from the proceeds of the land grant sale about \$980,000. These agreements are, I think, all in the possession of the Government here, and they may be seen at any time.

Mr. DAVIS. Will you tell me the estimated cost of that road?

Mr. OSLER. The contractors were paid \$10,000 a mile, cash, to build that road. That may be a little more than it would cost now, but at that time it was thought to be a very reasonable sum, and for four or five years before that contractors had been dealing with the Government and had not been able to come to any terms on which they would undertake the contract.

The same price was offered to other contractors, but they would not take it, and Mr. James Ross and his associates took up the contract at \$10,000 a mile, and I think they made a contractor's profit out of it. I had no interest, directly or indirectly, in their contract, but I know they received that amount of money in cash. I believe the Government have all the documents in connection with the transaction, but if they have not, I shall be very glad to give them duplicates at any moment.

The Calgary and Edmonton road cost, in cash, \$12,600 a mile and a portion of the land grant. The Government now retain 407,000 acres of the land grant, as security for the \$80,000 a year, and the balance of the land grant was paid, part to the contractor, and most of it was sold to realize \$1,436,000 required to pay the interest on the bonds for six years. Both of these roads were operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The roads practically paid their running expenses, and running expenses only.

Mr. Willison, of the "Globe," last year published a little pamphlet, in which he stated that these land grants to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway and to the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway were terrible examples of iniquity. He sent these pamphlets to various members, though not to all of them. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) showed me the pamphlet, and asked me to explain it to him. Mr. Jameson came with me to Toronto. I took him in to Mr. Willison, and Mr. Willison offered freely to withdraw his pamphlet, saying that he was entirely mistaken. At the time of that transaction I was not a member of this House. I took it up in the ordinary course of business, and I made no more of that than I should of any similar transaction. I made much less, in fact, because I took £50,000 of the bonds issued by the Calgary and Edmonton Railway at par, and now I think they are worth £35,000; so that my direct loss on them to-day is £15,000.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether any other parties were allowed to tender for the building of that railway.

Mr. OSLER. Yes. That road had been bonused to the extent of 12,400 acres a mile from Calgary to Edmonton years before. Contractors had come out to look it over years before, and had refused to build it. I do not say that the contractors did not make any money out of it. They should have made money out of it. But it was the lowest price at which that road could be built at that time. No doubt it could be built for less to-day. I hope my explanation of this matter will be satisfactory. I shall be glad to give the fullest explanation of every detail to any one who wants it, as all the financial operations of these two roads came through my office. I was very sorry

that the Minister of the Interior, who ought to know about that matter made his attack upon me in connection with it.

Now, one of my reasons for opposing the terms of this contract is the experience we have had in connection with these two roads. The early policy of this country, in opening up the North-west, was to give large grants for the construction of railways, to avoid the expenditure of cash. These payments in the form of land resulted in enormous extravagance and extra cost in the building of these roads. The land had to be sold for almost nothing, and everybody connected with these contracts were supposed to have made a lot of money, because they were getting no money down. I need not say that when interested in these two roads I was not in Parliament. I was simply acting as a business man. The hon. Minister of the Interior, referring, I suppose to the land grants to these and other railways, made the statement that lands were locked up and were not paying taxes, and that that was one terrible blot on the administration of the Conservative party. I am not here to defend the action of the Conservative party at all. I am here to speak for what I believe to be the interests of the country, that is what I am sent here for. During last session the hon. Minister of the Interior had a discussion with me and Mr. Nanton, of Winnipeg, who is my partner, and who manages in Winnipeg for the holders of these lands. The hon. Minister of the Interior asked us whether if he gave us all these land grants, we would begin to pay taxes on them. I may say that both the Calgary and Edmonton and the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Companies have received, in the case of the latter especially, very small portions of their land grants. The Minister asked me whether, if all these lands were deeded to the company I would be willing, as representing the holders of them, to pay taxes on them. I told them unhesitatingly that I would because I believe it is in the interest of the North-west that all lands should pay taxes, and on all lands which I hold or am interested in I am willing to pay taxes. From that time we have striven, day in and day out, to get a selection of our lands from this Government, and we are not any nearer to receiving them than we were last session when I met the Minister of the Interior. And he stands up and accuses me personally, as a holder of the lands, of being a monopolist and preventing the payment of taxes and the settlement of the country, although he himself has not taken one step since he has been in office to grant the lands that these two companies have earned and are entitled to.

Now, I am not going to oppose this Yukon deal on any small ground. I will assume that the Minister of the Interior has selected what at the present time is supposed, from all the information we have at hand, to be the best route. I accept it as

Mr. OSLER.

the best route, and until a better route is found, I will not raise any objection to it, because I believe the Minister of the Interior in this respect has done the best he could. I find fault with this deal entirely on the ground that the Liberal party are giving for this railway what they should not give. During all the years since railways have been constructed in the North-west, so far as I can remember, the policy of the Liberal party has been against the locking up of land in the hands of railway companies. They have decried it as the most monstrous iniquity that has taken place in this country. The monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the locking up of lands in the North-west has been held up by them as the one great curse of the country. I acknowledge it. I say that when the Government first began opening up the North-west as an experiment, they thought it was best to give lands in payment for the building of railways. I believe that in the light of experience that was not a good thing. The Liberal party have opposed it for many years to the utmost of their power. They have said that it was the one thing that was fraught with danger to the country in that it nearly led to revolution in the North-west; that it was the one thing that kept the North-west back from the great prosperity that was its due. And yet, Mr. Speaker, on the first occasion after these gentlemen have attained power, the first occasion on which they are face to face with a really serious problem relative to the good of this country, what do they do? They are afraid to face the problem; they are afraid to ask the country for any money. They adopt holus bolus the policy of the Conservative party, which had already been found, I believe even by the Conservatives, to have been wrong. They rush into this transaction, and they give an enormous grant, amounting to 3,750,000 acres of the finest mineral prospects in the world to-day, to get built one hundred and fifty miles of tramway, call it what you will. They give that for the building of 150 miles of tramway, for that is all it is. One very often, in the heat of a sudden debate or argument, makes a statement that may be wide of the mark. The other evening, I said that the 3,750,000 acres granted to this road would be worth more to any one in the London market to-day than the 25,000,000 acres of agricultural lands given to the Canadian Pacific Railway for building 3,000 or 4,000 miles of road. I have been taken to task for that statement. Well, I have thought it over, and have no hesitation in repeating it to-day. I say that if you were to go on the London market to-day with the 25,000,000 acres of land in the agricultural districts of the North-west and with the choice between that land and the 3,750,000 acres of gold-bearing lands in the Yukon, the London market would pay more for the 3,750,000 acres than for the 25,000,000 acres

which the Canadian Pacific Railway received for its vast work.

The Government, having apparently no other way out of it, were so anxious to adopt the policy of the late Government, that they followed it in this case down to the smallest details. The Dominion Government, in granting lands for the Calgary and Edmonton and other roads, took very great care to exclude from those grants the enormous mineral value that might be under these prairie lands. The Government of to-day, following in its smallest details the policy of the late Conservative Government, have excluded from this magnificent grant of mineral lands, those lands on which we may expect to see orchards, orange groves and banana groves flourishing in that Yukon valley. These the contractors will not be able to control.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OSLER. You may well say "hear, hear." That hits you very hard. Now, as regards the \$250,000 deposit, which has been made security for this contract. I am not a lawyer, and when I ventured the other evening to ask a question as to whether this was the only security, I was laughed down. But to-day it is stated in the House, without any reserve and without contradiction, that that is the only security for the carrying out of this contract. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has tried to make a case by saying that these men do not get any land until they build the railway. But according to the contract they can have their lands locked up. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) last night, in pointing to the magnificent map, which he showed us, said that the great fault found with the land grants in the North-west Territories was not so much that the land had not been earned as that the land had been set aside and locked up. I contend that in the contracts now before us, there is nothing which a layman can understand—perhaps a lawyer might—that will force these men to build that road for five years. If they build only ten miles this year, they get the proportion of land to which that mileage of road is entitled, reserved for them, locked up, so that no prospector can go on it and no miner can take an acre of it.

Mr. TALBOT. Only two-fifths.

Mr. OSLER. I accept the two-fifths, but it is an enormous amount. It is the pick of the land. If they fail to build that road by next September, but have built 20 miles of it, they get the portion of land which that would give per mile locked up.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). They cannot sell it.

Mr. OSLER. Granted. But the land will none the less be locked up. The land locked up in the North-west Territories, as

shown in that black map which the Minister of the Interior exhibited, cannot be sold by the railway companies owning it. Some of it is held for five years before another railway can get it. But these mineral lands may be held for five or ten years—there is no limit of time, so far as the contract is concerned, for that land which is locked up, and if in these five years, these gentlemen build that road, they can, so far as we know by the contract, claim all their land grant.

The building of this 150 miles of road is by no means a terrific undertaking. It is an easy job. The only condition that is hard is the condition of time. I know Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. They are personal friends of mine, and there are no two men in the Dominion that I believe deserve better to make money for good, hard work; and if the road can be built, they will build it. If they do not build it, the forfeiture of \$250,000 deposit is a mere bagatelle to forfeit in order to control that amount of mineral land.

It was stated by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), in one breath, that these poor pigeons, Mackenzie & Mann, had got into a contract by which they were bound to take lands in payment for building a road into a mining region that was worthless. But the next moment, almost in the next sentence, he told us it was necessary to have this road built, because during this year 250,000 energetic miners would be scattered on over the whole of that country. Now, if 250,000 or 150,000 or 75,000 or even 50,000 go into that country during this coming year, it will pay the contractors to build that road free of bonus and at twice its estimated cost. The Government are taking great credit to themselves for not having given a money bonus. I take it that a man enjoying credit, who wants to go into an undertaking, who wants to build a house or a railway or expend money in any way, does not find two shrewd, hard-headed contractors who will build his house or railway and take in payment all the dead dogs and cats he has on his estate. He will not go to them and say: take all these, they are very valuable to you, but not to me and in return build my house. I will give you these instead of cash. Do you, Mr. Speaker, think that these contractors, men with good heads on their shoulders, are going to take a contract to build a house or a railway and accept dead dogs or cats in payment? These men know what they are doing. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton)—I am sorry he is not in the House just now for he gave me a little hard rap the other day—says that these men are going to make a terrible fiasco, that there is nothing in this at all, that they are simply running the risk and he got them to do it. At the same time, he made a sort of sporting offer across the House to me. He said that he assumed that the 25,000,000

acres of the Pacific Railway Company were worth \$50,000,000, and he would sell me a similar quantity of lands to that given these contractors for \$50,000,000. The Minister of the Interior was perfectly safe in that, because he had no authority to make the offer and I no authority to accept. It struck me at the time that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), probably after a very pleasant dinner upon the Yukon—I do not know how far he got—talking with the contractors, who were probably talking a little on the bluff, made the same sort of sporting offer to them that he did to me: Build the road, and we will give you these lands, and the contractors said all right, and took him at his word. And the hon. gentleman, feeling that he had made an offer, which, as an honourable man, he could not very well back out of, brought the bargain down to this House and asks us to ratify it.

No one in this House believes more than I do in the importance of having a railway opened up into that country. The Government have committed themselves to a belief in Mr. Ogilvie's statements fully, absolutely and up to the hilt. They believe Mr. Ogilvie's statements as to the richness of that country.

Now, if one-tenth part of what Mr. Ogilvie says with regard to the wealth of that country is true, Canada owns the Eldorado of the world, the richest gold fields ever discovered. The leader of the Government, the other evening, much to my surprise, asked for the adjournment of this House that the members might waste an evening of the time of this House—if wasted it was—in hearing Mr. Ogilvie's lecture. I believe that Mr. Ogilvie is one of the finest specimens of Canadians that we have. I believe that what he says is true, that he does not exaggerate; I feel certain that he does not exaggerate wilfully. The Minister of the Interior tells us that so many people are going into that country this year that we shall not be able to take care of them unless we make extra-special provision. Yet, at the same time, the leader of the Government asks us to take an evening out of the session of this House to go and hear Mr. Ogilvie, that it may be telegraphed and cabled all over the world that the House of Commons of Canada has adjourned for an evening to hear a report on the subject of the gold fields, a subject more important than all the deliberations of this House. Now, I believe that the gold fields are enormously rich and that Canada cannot do too much to secure the trade of that country. I accept the statement, that probably this is the best route from the Pacific, but, for the life of me, I cannot see how building this road is going to give trade to Canada. From Seattle, from California, flour and other goods are being carried up there. How can our eastern men, how can Winnipeg even, compete with Washington Territory in sending flour in there, even if the

Mr. OSLER.

Americans have to pay the duty? I have been anxious to find how we could get trade through the building of this road but I have not succeeded. The route is open to the world to send on goods.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But not on the same terms as Canadians.

Mr. OSLER. But only for the National Policy, only for the duty placed upon manufacturers by the Conservative party, the terms would be equal. If we had free trade, if the leader of the House, our Cobden medalist, had his way and we had free trade in this country, a thousand pounds of goods would go to that country from the States for every pound that would go from Canada. The Minister of the Interior spent three hours in beating the air wildly, trying to prove that this was the best route. I have not heard in this House one single objection or contradiction to that. So far as I know, we all agree, on the basis of the information we now have, that this is the best route. But the Minister of the Interior spent three hours wildly gesticulating and asserting that it was a grand thing for this country to have that route. I do not know whether it is the best route, but I assume that it is. I believe the Minister of the Interior has done his best to ascertain the facts, and I believe he has reported fairly and squarely what is the best route, and I accept it. The Minister of the Interior winds up his grand oration by threatening all who oppose him. He threatens the Opposition and, I suppose, the Senate, that if they defeat this Bill, on their heads will rest the responsibility if that territory is lost to the Dominion of Canada. No more outrageous statement could be made in any body of men in Canada. If the Minister of the Interior, or the Government, think for one instant that there is a chance of this country being lost to Canada by the advent of any number of armed men, be they citizens of what land they may, it is the duty of Canada to devote all its resources—and they are very large and will accomplish much—to build a road to the country, no matter at what cost, so that Canada may control that country hereafter as clearly and as completely as she does to-day. But what have they done? They have made a contract with two men, who put up a penalty of \$250,000 to finish this road by 1st September. Sir, \$250,000 could be deposited in this country at one hour's notice at the call of such mineral lands and such a contract. A forfeit of that amount to have the call on such land for a year is a mere bagatelle. This country would have sustained the Government in building that road, terrible risk that it is, under their own control, if there is the least suspicion that that country may be taken hold of by armed men. This contract as first presented to the House, giving a charter that the citizens of any country in the world can con-

trol. The leader of the Opposition drew the attention of the Prime Minister to that point, and they amended the contract to that extent.

An hon. MEMBER. Promised to amend it.

Mr. OSLER. Promised to amend it—so as to provide that the directors of the company must be British subjects. Sir, there is no reason why the contractors of this company should not sell out, lock, stock and barrel, their whole contract to any citizens of another country, to any speculators in the Western States. They could make four or five of their clerks British subjects and appoint them directors, and so control the line without let or hindrance. I believe that this contract has been let without due consideration. As to the international question, respecting the navigation of the rivers, I do not deal with that, because I am not familiar with it. There are others who can explain it better than I, speaking, as I do, from a purely business standpoint. The contract, when I first read it, struck me as one of the most extraordinary and startling contracts I had ever seen. I spoke of it in haste a few nights ago. I have been rather pitched into by some of my friends about it, and I have tried to reconsider the opinions I expressed. I have given due weight to the fact that the hon. Minister of the Interior, able, patriotic and honourable, as I know he is, had considered all these things. But I cannot alter the opinion I first formed, that this contract has been entered into without due consideration of what it means.

The land grant is vicious in principle. The land grant has been held up on a map by the Minister of Agriculture as a little black dot on an enormous ground. But that is not the location on which the selection of lands under this contract is to be made, it is to be made over the whole of the large area which he exposed on the map. Notwithstanding all that has been said as to the registration of five miners gathered together, I still think that the contractors are able men, and I think that if I had that contract I would see that good men were on the lookout for all able prospectors, and that when a find was made on any one of these reserves, I would be very quickly at the registry office with a base line to receive all the reserves that the few miners had not taken up. I am not very familiar with the mining regulations, but I believe about one acre is all one miner can take up—if I am wrong correct me. Now, five miners have to come together to take up and register; five miners take up five acres, fifty miners take up fifty acres, 500 miners take up 500 acres, 500 acres within this little narrow strip which the Minister produced to-night. He showed us that little black space as if there was no gold anywhere else in that vast country but on that little space. But the re-

serves these men will get, there is no doubt about it, will be the picked mineral lands of that country. I grant you it is a speculation, but the problem is now whether it is a big speculation or a little one. The Government have come to the conclusion that it is a big one, or they would not have gone to the expense of getting Mr. Ogilvie's pamphlet published by the thousands and distributed everywhere, trying to bring enormous crowds of people to that small country which, according to their own report, has too many in it already—adding more people to those who are going in there to starve, according to the theory of the Government, adding fuel to the flame which the Government are afraid will break out in that country and lose us that valuable heritage. Sir, if the Minister of the Interior were in his seat at this moment I would tell him that, as a Canadian, I believe no matter what happens in that country, Canada is able to retain it, and will retain it, as a part of Canada for all time to come. I do not believe that unless we build this 150 miles of tramway—that may be built this year or may be built two years hence, on a forfeiture of \$250,000—we are running the risk of having to send an army into that country to retain it in our possession. At the same time the Government, by advertisements and by speeches in this House, proclaim to the world that this is the richest gold country on the face of the earth. Now, I am anxious to secure the trade of that region for Canada, and I am anxious to have that region developed and become a source of strength to Canada, and whatever steps the Government may take to secure that end, I will support it. But I do not think the Government are taking the right means now to secure that end. They are running the risk of having no railway built there, they are giving away a great part of the choicest mineral land, they are making, as I said before, slaves of almost every prospector who goes into that country. If, as the ex-Minister of Railways says, 250,000 prospectors go into that country, no power that Canada can bring forward will prevent those men from mining on the lands of the contractors. The result will be that within two years Canada will have to buy back from the contractors their concessions at any price the contractors ask. I have seen no reason, I have heard no argument from the Minister of the Interior, or the Minister of Agriculture, or the Minister of Railways, that has caused me to change the opinion that I formed when I first read that contract. Many of the papers, I see, have rather insinuated that because I was a Canadian Pacific Railway director and had interests otherwise my voice would be still. I wish to say, Sir, that I am in this House, not as representing any corporate body, not as representing any one except the constituency that sends me here,

subject to what I consider the best interests of Canada ; and if at any time private interests conflict with the public interests, I get out of one or the other.

Mr. BERTRAM. After listening to the eloquent, convincing and comprehensive statement made by the Minister of the Interior in relation to the question which is now before the House, and after listening with great pleasure to the able argument which the Minister of Agriculture has addressed to the House to-day I feel that there is little I can do further, as a humble member of this House, than to emphasize some of the statements that have been made by those who have preceded me, and who are able to speak on the question much better than I can. I have also listened attentively to the argument of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), and I am glad to be able to say that in some particulars I would like to emphasize some things that he has said in connection with this question. He says, and I hope he will be able to maintain his position in that regard, that he has not come to this House for the purpose of defending the Conservative party. I hope he will be able to stand by that ; but I would like him to go a little further and to say that he has not come to this House merely for the purpose of attacking the Liberal party. I was somewhat surprised to hear him state that the contractors, of whom he speaks very highly, are in a position to withdraw or to sell out to somebody else, and be relieved of all responsibility.

Mr. OSLER. No.

Mr. BERTRAM. I understood him to say that they could sell out the whole contract.

Mr. OSLER. I said they could sell out the road after it was built.

Mr. BERTRAM. The point, as I understood him, he was making, was that there was no security that these gentlemen would carry out their agreement, that beyond the \$250,000 they had put up, there was nothing to compel them to fulfil that contract within the next four or five years. Sir, the Government made a contract with responsible parties, and besides the fact that these gentlemen have given a guarantee of \$250,000, they cannot get rid of their obligations in connection with that contract, until that railroad has been built to Teslin Lake. I do not know myself what greater security any Government could take than the security they have taken in this matter. I was also much surprised to hear the hon. member for West Toronto say to this House that the contractors may not complete the contract for two or three years. If there was one thing that the contractors are bound to do in their own interest, even without regard to the country's interests, or to the contract itself, but solely in their own interest, it is to get that railway built

Mr. OSLER.

at the earliest possible moment, because there is no guarantee that in three or four years, or ten years, from the present time, there will be any gold fields in the Klondike at all, or any trade in that country. If the contractors are going to take three or four years, they will not be able to secure the land grant. What will be the result ? The result will be that a very large number of prospectors would overrun the country, and if any land was valuable it would be taken up by them. So this is a most important matter in the interest of the contractors. They are interested in completing the contract at the earliest possible moment for the purpose of getting something out of it. Under these circumstances I was surprised at the statement made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler).

I listened to the arguments addressed to the House against the endorsement of this contract, and I thought from the high position occupied by the hon. member for West Toronto, who is an able man and occupies a high position, that if there was one member who might be expected to contribute something substantial to the debate in the form of argument against the contract, it would certainly be that hon. gentleman. I listened carefully to what he said, and while he discussed several of the details, in all his argument there was not a single statement against the contract, except this one, namely, that the Government should have built the road themselves and should not have given a land grant to the contractors. The hon. gentleman made this statement in the face of the fact that the Conservative party has been giving land grants to railways for a number of years, and thus he indicated that they were going back in that policy ; in fact the hon. gentleman practically acknowledged that after eighteen years' rule by the Conservative party during which they gave land grants, their policy had been a great mistake. I am glad the hon. gentleman has come to adopt that view, and I quite agree with him in it ; and I am sure the House will also agree with me when I say that the policy of the Liberal party is to cease giving certain land grants to railway companies. Agricultural lands should not be given to any railway company, but retained for the benefit of the people. The argument advanced by the Minister of the Interior was a strong one and one that commended itself to the House, because in granting agricultural lands what do you do ? They are made valuable by the labour of the people, and if granted to railways the people who make them valuable do not get full returns. Mineral lands must be developed by the people who own them, and they can only be developed by large expenditures. I quite agree with the Minister of Agriculture when he said that the Government had come to the conclusion which is a sound

conclusion and one which will be supported by the people, that the people of eastern Canada should not be called upon to contribute four or five million dollars for the building of a railway, the trade over which might last only a few years. That would be a purely speculative road, and the Government should not saddle the country with a permanent debt to support a railway which when built might only be used for a comparatively short period; but when the Government built a railway through permanent agricultural lands, while they were making a permanent debt they were also securing a permanent asset, and such an expenditure was justifiable. If there is one part of the Government's policy in respect to this contract of more consequence than another, it is that the Government decided, strongly and vigorously, on no account to give any money bonus but simply a land bonus for the purpose of constructing the Yukon Railway. I see no parallel between the two grants; there is a very great difference indeed between them, and we should be able to see what the difference is.

The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Oaler) also referred to the question of routes, and a little later on he disagreed with the conclusion at which he formerly arrived. I was very glad to hear from my hon. friend and the leader of the Opposition that there is no difference of opinion about the advisability of adopting the route selected. If there is no difference of opinion, why is it? It is because it was the only Canadian route that could be made available this year; any other route would have lost Canada the immediate trade of the Klondike and failed to secure the facilities we are about to obtain to get that trade, and so in that particular respect there appears to be no difference of opinion whatever. It has been stated over and over again that there might be difficulty even in connection with the Stikine route. I believe that the customs regulations question, which has been brought up, is after all not a matter of great consequence, but rather one of detail because the Government know and the country knows that it is not necessary for a vessel to go direct from Wrangel to the Stikine River to be able to ascend that river and get to Telegraph Creek. We know that cargoes can be transhipped at Port Simpson, and in my opinion the cost of carrying them from Port Simpson to Telegraph Creek would not be very much higher than from Wrangel to the Stikine and Telegraph Creek. The distance is only 170 miles from Port Simpson to Wrangel. So no matter whether the Americans act towards us in a friendly way or not, we are not dependent on them in connection with that route; but I believe they will act in a neighbourly manner in connection with the matter, for they cannot be interested in trying to thwart our efforts to

secure trade that properly belongs to us and enjoy the free navigation of the Stikine River. Even if we have to fall back on Port Simpson to enable us to enter this country, we will still be able to secure that particular trade, and there is no difficulty in that respect. The Minister of Agriculture stated that he had been looking into the matter and discussing it with other people, and he was inclined to think that barges could be towed from Victoria and Vancouver via Wrangel and the Stikine River to Telegraph Creek. From what I know, because I have given great attention to the subject, and I happen to be building boats for the Stikine, I am very much inclined to think it can be done, while I am not absolutely certain. Then of course it would be a more available route than ever for the purpose of enabling people to send goods without breaking bulk from Victoria or Vancouver to the head of Telegraph Creek. A great deal has been said regarding the cost of the railway, and it has been represented that it would be a narrow gauge road and the cost of building it would not amount to a great deal, and the contractors would be able to make a large amount of money. The Minister of Railways in his speech happened to take exception to some statements he found contained in the engineer's report, which he thought perhaps were not correct or a true estimate of the cost of building a railway from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake. The reply made to that particular part of the Minister's speech by the leader of the Opposition was one that astonished me, because he said he never in all his life beheld such a spectacle as the Minister of the Crown condemning his own engineer's report and showing that he understood the question a great deal better than the engineer. There is one feature in connection with this matter to which I desire to call the attention of the House and it is that the cost of building the railway, owing to the short time allowed the contractors, is almost doubled. I do not think it is possible that any contractor, limited to the time mentioned in the contract for the construction of the road, can estimate the cost of building the railway, for the simple reason that it was impossible to calculate the cost of wages. The road has to be built in a limited time, the contractors have to get the men to build it cost what it may, and that being so, the cost must be largely increased. Now, the statement made by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) to which the leader of the Opposition took exception, was a very reasonable statement indeed. The remarks of the leader of the Opposition in reply did not surprise me at all, because I find that when he is making statements in regard to such matters, he makes them in strong language, or to use his own word "astounding" language. Here is what the Minister of Railways said:

I am prepared to say here, as in fact I stated at the time, that I did not consider we could place very much confidence on estimates made with respect to the cost of building a railway in that country. The cost of railway construction depends so largely upon climatic conditions, upon the distance it is necessary to carry supplies, materials and plants, and on a variety of conditions involving an unknown quantity that no one could make a very safe estimate as to the cost. I notice an estimate by our engineer in which he says the cost for such a line would be about \$25,000 per mile, and I observe there are particulars in that estimate which I do not think I would be warranted in accepting as the cost of railway construction.

In support of that statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), I may say that I have also noticed that there are some items in the engineer's estimated cost of that road which cannot be accepted as correct. I believe that the engineer in making his estimate simply gave the usual cost of building a railway of that kind, and did not take into consideration the particular locality, nor the fact that this line had to be built within a very short space of time. For instance, the engineer distinctly estimates the cost of steel rails laid down at Telegraph Creek and along the line of railway at \$30 a ton. I believe the Minister of Railways is more correct when he said that it was more likely the freight would cost that to take the rails up there. Anyone who knows anything about the value of rails and the cost of transportation, knows perfectly well that rails cannot be purchased for that figure and delivered at Telegraph Creek or along this line of railway. I merely mention that particular item in the cost of construction to show that the estimate of the engineer is not based on the difficulties of the situation in this particular case. Therefore, I hold that the Minister of Railways was quite within bounds when he said that \$30 per ton was perhaps the cost under normal conditions, but it had no bearing at all upon the cost under the abnormal conditions existing in this case.

Now, we have heard a great deal regarding the Klondike and regarding the enormous amount these contractors are receiving for the construction of the railway. After all, when we come to boil down the whole question outside of this one particular item as to the extent of the land grant, all other questions are merely matters of detail. The question of the route is settled, the necessity for the railway is settled, the importance of securing for the people of this country the trade of the Klondike is a settled question, for we are all agreed upon it; and, therefore, the only one point of any great consequence upon which we can disagree is: is the Government paying too much for the construction of this railway. We can make fanciful calculations regarding the wealth of the Klondike. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) told us to-night that Mr. Ogilvie represented it

as a country of vast wealth, that there was an immense number of people going into that country, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) told us, that these contractors were getting in fact one of the richest gold-bearing countries in the world. In my opinion the conclusion of Mr. Ogilvie's report gives a true estimate of that country, and as to the possible outcome of what is taking place now. Mr. Ogilvie says:

Taken altogether, we have a vast field with fair prospects, as fair, it may be claimed, as any other equally extensive region in the world. The natural conditions are not as favourable as in many other parts, but time and enterprise will, no doubt, agreeably modify many of them, and the reward may be great.

In that paragraph Mr. Ogilvie does not speak very glowingly of the prospects of vast wealth for all. We have in this country at the present moment what I might term a mining boom, and when calculations are made at a time when mining booms are on, these calculations as a rule are not borne out by subsequent experience. That has been the case everywhere. I have no desire to cast discredit upon any report, but I believe it will be found in this as it has been found in other countries, that thousands and thousands of people will go into the Klondike, will not find gold, and will be disappointed. It seems to be a law of nature, that if you want anything valuable in this world you have got to work hard for it and dig deep for it, and gold will not be got in the Klondike simply for the picking up as some people seem to think. Therefore, when we come to estimate the value of the land concession that the contractors are getting, we have to bear in mind that that value is purely speculative. I have listened carefully to many of the speeches delivered by gentlemen on the other side of the House, and it seems to me they have mostly come to the conclusion that the contractors are running no risk at all. Mr. Speaker, I am not a millionaire, I wish I were, but any man I have ever known who made large sums of money in business speculation of any kind, took great risks, and was willing to run great risks. We all know that money is not made in large sums unless there is a great risk attending it. There are some millionaires in Canada, and if you got at their inner history you would find that years of anxiety, and toil, and disturbance of mind, and want of sleep was their portion because of the tremendous risks they were running before they became millionaires. Their experience was something that most of us would not wish to undergo, even for the sake of being millionaires. I maintain that Mackenzie & Mann are running a great risk in this particular contract. I do not mean to say for one moment that it is not possible for them to make a large amount of money. They may make money, and I hope they will, and I am sure the Government will only be too

glad to know that they made the contract pay well, because if the contractors cannot make any money out of it, then we will all be disappointed, whereas if they do make money the country will make money also. At the same time these gentlemen are taking very great risks, and if we look at the contract we will naturally ask what are the contractors receiving for the expenditure of some \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 as the case may be. They are simply told in the contract to go and look over that frozen Klondike region, and take what they can out of the ground and pay themselves. We all know that in prospecting, valuable claims are not found in a day. Prospectors sometimes work, year after year, in the best gold regions of any country without obtaining anything of value. It is only now and again that one succeeds. There is one feature in connection with this contract, which I am surprised at the contractors consenting to. Whether there was any discussion over it or not, I do not know; but if I had been in the position of the contractors, I would certainly have insisted upon being allowed to choose a certain portion of those lands the moment the contract was signed, for the simple reason that, if the statements made in the press of the country are true—and I hope they are true—there will be an enormous horde of prospectors going into that country this year, and during the next few months they will overrun the very best sections of the country. So that, before the contractors can select any of the land for the purpose of recouping themselves for their expenditure, individual prospectors will be able to secure it wherever they choose to select it, and it cannot be got by the contractors afterwards. I am surprised that the Government succeeded in getting that particular clause into the contract. I am not aware whether there was any discussion over it or not; but I am inclined to think that the contractors were opposed to that, because it does not seem reasonable that they would have signed a contract by which they assumed such heavy obligations, without being able to make a selection of any of the lands until after the middle of June, as the Minister of the Interior tells us. That is one of the risks the contractors are taking. It may end rightly enough for them, but still it is a risk, and a great risk indeed.

Now, it was stated, I think, by an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, that the railway should have been built by the contractors without a land grant at all, because the traffic on the road alone would pay them. I think it was figured out by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) that, with \$100 for each passenger and \$50 for each ton of freight, mark you, they would be able to make an enormous amount of money. But the most extraordinary thing about that observation was that, while it was going to cost \$50 a ton

to take freight over that railway, the contractors were going to be able to lay down steel rails along the line of the railway for \$30 a ton. That struck me as a most extraordinary calculation. Now, have the contractors any security that there will be traffic along that line of railway two or three years after this? I say they have not. They have no security whatever that this Klondike boom will last one year; and if it does not last, they will suffer a heavy loss; because, if the boom does not last, there will be no traffic for the railway. Therefore, I say, they have no security at all that they will get a return from that railway within a certain length of time. If it were something permanent, something that was going to last ten, or fifteen, or twenty years, or even a shorter time, you might make a reasonable calculation of the return from traffic. But I say, the contractors are taking that risk, and taking their pay in lands whose value it is impossible to estimate, and in taking it they are entitled to have a large amount of land.

Another of the obligations assumed by the contractors is the question of time, and that obligation is a very great one, because, after all, if the railway is not completed by the 1st of September, will they not be in a position to forfeit their deposit of \$250,000?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BERTRAM. And what will become of all the expenditure they will have made up to that time? The loss they are liable to incur in that particular is very great.

Now, it is late, and it is not my intention to detain the House, because, as I said before, a great many statements have been made here which have no connection with this contract, but relate to other matters. We have simply to settle the one question in connection with the contract: Are we paying too much for getting the railway built? As to the amount we are paying for it, I am free to say that we do not really know—we cannot tell. But we do know that what we are giving out of that enormous area of land is a very small portion of the entire area. When I made the statement, on a former occasion, that, although the quantity of land looked large in figures, it did not look large on the map, I got that idea on looking over the map which Mr. Jennings showed me, and on which it was only a small section of the whole area.

There is another important feature in connection with this land grant. It simply means that the company will have to go in and develop that land and make it valuable; and the business and trade which that development will make is of far greater consequence to this country than the taking out of the gold itself. The leader of the Opposition has said that it costs about as much, or more, to take the gold out than it is actually worth, and I believe that statement is true. In all gold countries, if you

consider the enormous expenditure that takes place, on the part of both individuals and companies, you will find that the actual amount of gold taken out is small as compared with the expenditure.

Mr. DAVIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman, as a business man, to explain what bearing that has on the contract?

Mr. BERTRAM. The bearing it has on the contract is this, that the Government have secured a company who will take up a certain quantity of land and develop it; otherwise they cannot get paid for the building of the railway. And the development of that land will add to the business and general wealth of the country. That is one of the reasons why I think it was an advantage to get a company to accept payment in land of that kind. The Government have done what I consider to be the very best thing in the interest of the country at large. I believe they have done a wise thing, a prudent thing, in securing the trade of that section of country to the people of this country without adding anything to the debt of the country. While the contractors may be running a great risk, they may make a large amount of money; and I say, that if they succeed in making money, they will succeed in adding wealth to the country and benefiting the country at large. The more this contract is looked into and examined, I am sure that this House and the people of this country will come to the conclusion that the Government have acted prudently, wisely and well.

Mr. HUGHES moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 18th February, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Lewes River Tramway Company (Limited).—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 24) to amend the charter of the Union Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Mr. BERTRAM.

Bill (No. 25) to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Cañon Railway Company.—(Mr. Britton.)

Bill (No. 28) to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. Davis.)

CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY BILL—AMENDMENTS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the right hon. the leader of the Government to the fact that during the debate on the Bill which is now before the House, the Government have intimated a disposition to make three very important changes. For one, the Minister of Railways and Canals said the question of a material reduction in the royalty charged to individual miners was being considered by the Government, or something to that effect. The Minister of Agriculture, I think, stated in his speech yesterday that the Government proposed to make a very important modification in the contract by the elimination of the clause, to which I took such great objection, concerning the mode in which lands should be selected by the contractors. Then the right hon. gentleman himself said that the Government would carefully consider another question to which I attach great importance, and that was a provision similar to that which exists in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, by which a majority of the directors would be required to be British subjects. Now, it occurred to me that it would facilitate the discussion very much if the Government would place on the Order paper any material changes which they propose to move when we go into committee on the Bill. I merely make this suggestion as a means of facilitating the discussion of the question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The hon. gentleman quite misunderstood my reference to the subject of a reduction of the royalties the other day. In making an argument, I compared the royalty which is reserved under this contract with the royalty which is being exacted under the regulations, and I said it was just possible that the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite might convince the Government that there ought to be an abatement of that royalty. But I did not intend, nor do I think it will appear that I did say that the subject of a reduction of royalties was now under consideration by the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think that very materially alters the position. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that that question was open for consideration,

that the Government were prepared to deal with it with an open mind, and that is about what the hon. gentleman himself says now.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. If he says it is quite possible that the arguments of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House may lead the Government to make a change, he certainly must admit that the Government were meeting it with an open mind, at all events, I had hopes that what I suggested was the case. But assuming there is a disposition to deal with these three questions, that I regard as of great importance, it appears to me, as I said, that it would be a great convenience if the changes that the Government propose to make were formulated in some way.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). When this measure was introduced by the Government we were certainly conscious that there might be in it, as there are in all such Bills, details of more or less importance which had escaped our attention, and whenever, in the criticisms offered by hon. gentlemen on the other side, our attention is drawn to any point which can be amended by legislation, when we go into committee we will certainly be only too glad to do so, and to avail ourselves of the suggestions made to us. I am not sure that I am disposed at this moment to agree with the proposition made by my hon. friend, but it is worthy of consideration, and we will think it over.

LIQUOR PERMITS IN THE YUKON.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to what appears to be a contradiction between members of the Government as to an important question, to which I think his attention should be called. I asked a question the other day as to liquor permits in the Yukon. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his answer, touched upon what is being done at the present time, and, as appears on page 493 of the "Hansard," the right hon. gentleman said:

The question remains in abeyance for the present, and no permits are being issued.

Well, I have just found in one of the daily papers that Senator Perley asked whether one Mr. Chamberlain, of Oak Lake, Man., or other persons, had been granted licenses to take spirituous liquors into the Yukon country, and Senator Mills replied:

That a permit had been granted to one William Chambers and other persons to take liquors into the Yukon country by the Dominion Government. He had, however, not been informed of Mr. Chambers's place of residence.

There seems here to be a contradiction, and I think it is important that my hon. friend's attention should be called to it.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I cannot at this moment give an explanation to my hon. friend. I got the answer from the Department of the Interior, and I can only say now that I shall apply to the Department of the Interior for further information concerning this matter.

DREDGING LICENSES.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I think it well to call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the fact that it is common talk in town that dredging licenses are being given by the Department of the Interior, and large banking transactions are taking place in connection with these dredging licenses. It is a very extraordinary thing that the public does not seem to have been made aware that these dredging licenses were obtainable, and if so obtainable, how is it that these persons who have got them, have been informed so that they could rush in, and if they are rushing in, why is it that the Government has adopted the policy of blindly letting these licenses, as it appears from the information we have that they are so doing?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Nothing at all is being done blindly. The regulations have been published to the world, everybody can take advantage of them who chooses to do so. Everybody can make application, and if he abide by the regulations which have been issued, the Government have no power but to accept the offer. As to the statement that banking operations are going on upon these licenses, the Government have nothing to do with that, as my hon. friend well knows. But there is no secrecy in this matter. The hon. gentleman may obtain all the information he cares for if he applies for it. I have only to repeat that the regulations have been published and all these gentlemen are conforming to them.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Blair for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.

Mr. **HUGHES**. Mr. Speaker, in rising to address a few imperfect remarks to the House on this question of the Yukon Railway contract, I may say at the outset that I occupy a rather embarrassing position, inasmuch as on this occasion I feel it to be

my duty to differ from the leaders of the Conservative party in the House. I am very much pleased, however, at the altered tone, the entirely altered tone that is assumed by many of the leading members on this side of the House in discussing this Bill, as compared with their manner when discussing the subject on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I trust that with the lapse of time, because a few days work great changes in the swinging of the pendulum, they may come back until many of the hon. members on this side may see their way clear, after changes suggested in the contract, and amendments made, to revert to the old Liberal-Conservative policy of Sir John Macdonald, which, I am glad to say, is adopted almost entirely throughout this contract.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES. This is another instance in which the leader of the Government and his colleagues in office have stolen the clothes of the old Liberal-Conservative party. I will not, on the present occasion, enter into the details of the contract, or enter into objections put forward, or bandy words back and forth, but I merely propose, without criticising remarks addressed to the House by my friends on this side or by hon. members on the other side of the House, to offer a few remarks, pointing out the advantages of the contract, and possibly some of the disadvantages, and making suggestions with a view to have this matter passed upon as speedily as possible by the House.

Many hon. members will remember the time when the Canadian Pacific Railway was being constructed. The policy of Sir John Macdonald on that occasion was clear and distinct; the policy of the leaders of the present Government, many of whom were then members of the Opposition, was also very marked, as you yourself, Mr. Speaker, may very well remember. Many Liberals insisted that the route all through Canadian territory should not be adopted, but that the route through the United States should be followed. The Liberal-Conservative party on that occasion stood firm, and, although there was a very great outcry in the country, although very many Liberal-Conservatives had to follow on that occasion, thinking possibly the leader was wrong in adopting the route north of Lake Superior, nevertheless, time has vindicated the policy of Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues, and we find not only the Liberal-Conservative party, but the present Government, are loud in praising the foresight of the great Canadian leader. In the present contract the Government have wisely adopted an all-Canadian route. The only fault I have to find with this policy is that they do not immediately start from a tide-water seaport in Canadian territory and

Mr. HUGHES.

construct the road entirely on Canadian soil. Undoubtedly, there is a great rush of miners into that country, of men of all classes. Many of the noblest young men of all lands are rushing thither, but it cannot be denied that many of the most reckless and lawless are also rushing thitherwards, and it is not beyond the region of ordinary possibility that all those who go to Klondike will not strike it rich, that not one in a thousand will strike it rich, and those men, finding themselves short in funds or without funds, will become lawless and reckless; and it is not within the region of possibility, it is within the region of probability, that not only will it be necessary to have the mounted police there, but also a Canadian armed force to maintain law and order. I should be very much pleased, if the First Minister and the Government could see their way clear to go forward immediately and construct a railway from Port Simpson or any other Canadian port—I care not which—and have an all-Canadian route, so that we could send our soldiers there to maintain law and order, and also secure this route to transport supplies and freight and carry out general business connected with transportation into the Yukon territory. In so doing, we would simply be pursuing the policy adopted by Sir John Macdonald and his Government in relation to all matters of this kind. During the last two sessions, when Bills were before this House and the Railway Committee, asking for termini at various ports in Alaska, I took the opportunity—and I was the only member of the committee and of the House who took the opportunity—of pointing out that no railway should be chartered by the Dominion that did not tap a terminus at a Canadian seaport. On the eastern coast, we find Portland built up entirely by Canadian trade, and yet our farmers cannot send any produce there without paying duties to the United States. Then, again, there is Boston, which is more than half a Canadian city; but neither a Canadian merchant nor a Canadian farmer can send goods or produce there without having to pay the American duties. I pointed that out last year, and the Government having conceded that an all-Canadian route should be built to the Yukon, I am determined to support that contract, even though there may be many objectionable features in it of a minor character. I propose to support it on that ground alone, if on no other.

Many objections are urged against the present contract. What are they? One objection is, that it gives a monopoly to the road. But it has been pointed out, that the Government, in reserving to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council the right to determine what the rates shall be, both as regards passengers and freight, are merely following in the footsteps of the Liberal-Conservative Government many years ago. That policy was that all railway rates

should be considered by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and that being good Conservative policy, I am in favour of it, and I am free to trust the Government to fix the rates. That they will be fixed fairly in the interest both of the railway companies and passengers, and merchants, and farmers, who will transport goods over the road, there is no doubt.

There is another objection urged, that there is a monopoly established, inasmuch as no other railway may be built there for a number of years from any foreign port along those shores. That is the true essence of Canadian national sentiment, and whatever other objections there may be to the contract, I am satisfied that no Canadian business man or Canadian statesman, politician or patriot will object to the contract on that score. I was very much surprised to hear the remarks offered in reply to the Address and the suggestion made that roads incorporated from Canada should run to Juneau or Dyea, ports built up and approached through American waters to the disadvantage of Canadian business men.

Another serious objection taken to the contract was, that the Government granted a tremendous monopoly of the lands in that country. I admit that the acreage is somewhat extensive, but, when you consider the grant, what does it amount to? According to Mr. Ogilvie, in his British Columbia speech—I did not hear his speech in Ottawa, but I have the one delivered in Victoria—there are 150,000 square miles of gold-bearing lands in that district. How much land is granted under this Bill? Why, Sir, only 3,750,000 acres; one block out of 26 is all that is granted to this railway company. Now, those who are familiar with placer or alluvial mining, know right well that this particular kind of mining is invariably found in existing or former river beds and valleys, and these placer locations vary in width from 100 feet to less than one mile on the average. Therefore, in giving the contractors the monopoly of these lands, it appears on the face of it that five-sixths of the land granted will be absolutely valueless for the purpose of placer mining. I have no doubt at all that if the wish of the contractors was consulted, they would much prefer to have simply 5,000 square miles of their own selection of land given in single square mile blocks, rather than 320 sections of land given them in 18 square miles of a block. There is no doubt of that. More than that, I believe they would prefer to take one-fifth of the land in a greater number of small blocks, than they would the immense quantity of land given them in this way. I know that from a mining point of view it would be much more advantageous to the contractors. I look upon this immense tract of land given in these large blocks of three miles by six, as almost ab-

solutely useless, or the greater portion of it.

Another serious objection which some of these gentlemen urge is that no tenders were called for. Undoubtedly the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party in the past was, where it was at all practical, to call for tenders for the construction of any great public work. It is true that in connection with the Calgary and Edmonton road, the Regina and Long Lake road, and certain sections of the Canadian Pacific Railway, this policy was departed from, and, Sir, the present case is an instance where if an excuse could ever be offered for tenders not being called, such excuse is forthcoming. We must remember that the question of time was a most important consideration in connection with this contract. I had the privilege of being in the city of Vancouver quite recently. I found such a state of things existing that agents of trading firms in Victoria and Vancouver were actually paying the way of persons en route to the Klondike, down to Seattle and the Puget Sound outfitting establishments, in order that these establishments might outfit them and send them to Dyea, Juneau and other American ports, so that these men who are entering the Klondike might not be subjected to the obnoxious American customs regulations that were then in force. These objections have largely vanished owing to the regulations having been amended, and I presume such difficulties will not longer present themselves. But there was no reason to suppose at that time that the American regulations would be amended, and it was of the utmost importance that a Canadian route should be at once commenced. As to the objection that tenders were not called for and that these lands were granted without tender, I may say that the history of the Conservative party while in office, has been, that a tender was never called for in relation to public lands granted for the construction of a railway. Therefore, the present Government in pursuing the policy which they did, adhered to the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party led by Sir John Macdonald. There was another objection urged against this contract, to the effect that it entailed a surrender on the part of the Government, and that in making the contract the Canadian Government have proven themselves more ignoble than have the Chinese in their recent surrender of some of their seaports to Germany and Russia. Well, Sir, as I view it the case is exactly the reverse. As a matter of fact the Government in pursuing the course they did have refused to surrender the control of their seaports to foreigners, and have provided that the Canadian merchant and the Canadian contractor shall have the largest share of the trade of the district, and that the foreigner will have to come in second

best. This Government has refused to surrender the control of that district to the foreigners, and so they are unlike the Chinese rather than like them. I must point out here, and I do so with the greatest pride, that the Liberal-Conservative party have not descended to the policy too often adopted by a few—I will not say by all—of hon. gentlemen opposite who in the past when any international dispute arose between Canada and the United States, had a fondness for pointing out the weakness of the Canadian case. I am pleased to say that as a rule the Conservative party in this instance have been loyal to the nation, and have not descended to point out the weak points in our armour, if any exist.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). There are one or two notable exceptions.

Mr. HUGHES. It is contended that we cannot tranship at Fort Wrangel without paying customs duties. Well, Sir, Wrangel is not the only port by which the Stikine River can be reached. I made special inquiries when I was in the city of Vancouver, with a view to ascertaining if there was any near-by port in Canadian territory where our business could be done, if the Americans refused to allow transshipment of Canadian cargoes at Wrangel. I was informed by men familiar with that coast that the navigation from Fort Simpson to the Stikine River was practicable for these small river boats 999 days out of every thousand, and that they would have no difficulty whatever in navigating these waters. All that is necessary is to take a chart of the coast, and the whole passage from Fort Simpson to the mouth of the Stikine River is as sheltered as, and even more sheltered than the Gulf of Georgia between Seattle and Vancouver or Seattle and Victoria. Therefore, were the Americans to adopt a policy of irritation in their customs regulations at Wrangel, the difficulty can be easily overcome, first, by transshipment at a Canadian point near Fort Simpson, and second, by building an all-Canadian route from Alice Arm or other convenient point along the undoubted Canadian shore. In doing this we will build up another Canadian town with which our farmers and merchants can do business rather than increase the prosperity of an American city.

The only other objection I have heard urged against this contract is, that the Government themselves should have built the road. Now, Sir, I stand here to say that had the Government undertaken to build that road I would have opposed them. Not only that, Sir, but I venture to say that my friends on this side of the House would have been even louder in their denunciation of such a policy than they are in their condemnation of this land grant. What does this land grant amount to? Figure up the acres given to the Regina and Long Lake Railway, these acres of magnificent

Mr. HUGHES.

farm lands, and you see that there has been granted to that line in the North-west Territories an area of within 100,000 acres of the acreage voted to this road. And yet, Sir, experience has shown that these magnificent lands which were granted to the Regina and Long Lake Railway and the Calgary and Edmonton Railway have not realized the expectations of those to whom they were granted; and I venture to say that experience will show the gentlemen who have accepted this land grant in the Yukon district that their expectations in that regard will not be realized either. Having reviewed the objections raised against this contract, let us examine whether it has any disadvantages. I have already pointed out the importance of having an all-Canadian route, and I would again respectfully urge upon the right hon. First Minister and his colleagues the advisability of not waiting for ten years or even one year, but at once opening up communication from Portland Canal to Glenora, first by a wagon or sleigh road, and as soon thereafter as possible by a railway. I venture to say that if the right hon. gentleman will pursue that line, not only all parties in this House, but the whole country, will to a man endorse his action. Let him give us an all-Canadian route, if not by the close of the present season, at least in time for next season's trade.

Another advantageous feature of this contract is that the railway must be completed immediately. As that feature has been fully discussed by other speakers, I will not stop to point out the advantages that will accrue to the Canadian merchant, the Canadian manufacturer, and the Canadian miner, in being able to get access to that country at such an early day by an all-Canadian route.

The granting of alternate blocks to the company has been condemned; but for every block that enriches the company, the adjoining block will enrich the nation. That was the policy that we fought for against hon. gentlemen opposite, I am sorry to say, in regard to the North-west, holding that the opening up of one block to settlement would render the adjoining block valuable. The same argument applies to these mining lands. Let them be opened up in one block, and the Government will be able to realize largely from the adjoining block. Miners will only be too glad to pay the Government a good sum or a good royalty for the opportunity of mining them.

Another advantage I see in the contract is that miners' claims are protected; and I am delighted to hear the suggestion that the royalty to be demanded from the individual miner should be reduced, because I think royalty of ten per cent is excessive. I have no belief, either, that the Government will ever be able to exact the ten per cent royalty from individual miners; it will be absolutely impossible to keep track of it, and there will be any amount of fraud and de-

ception practised to avoid paying it. I believe it would be better to require a larger payment for the claims in the way of purchase or rental; for the history of mining proves that it is almost impossible to collect a royalty, especially if it is abnormally large. I would therefore respectfully suggest that the royalty to the individual miner be materially reduced.

I find another very advantageous clause in this contract. The waters of the Stikine River up to Glenora will always be open to every vessel, whether it be Canadian or American or British, for free navigation, and therefore the company have no monopoly of that. The railway will be controlled by them, but the wagon road will always be open, and they will have no control over that. Any number of companies may run stages on that road, and how long will it take a stage to travel the 150 miles? We can easily remember the old stage routes along the frontier in Ontario, by which travellers thought they were doing very good work when they covered 50 miles a day. This wagon road will always be open, and that circumstance will compel the company to keep down their rates. Then the Hootalinqua, the Lewes and other rivers of the country are open to free navigation. Moreover, there are other routes into the country by way of Skagway, Dyea and the Taku Valley, all of which will be open to stages or transportation companies. There is no doubt that any man who wants to get into that district will have ample means of doing so without going over this railway if the company should attempt to charge extravagant or monopolistic rates.

I find also a clause in the contract providing that the rates on the railway shall be controlled by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, which will prove to be of very great advantage and is in thorough accord with Conservative policy.

Another feature of this contract which gives me very great satisfaction is this: The contractors are two Canadian-born gentlemen.

An hon. MEMBER. Where do they live?

Mr. HUGHES. One of them resides in North Victoria during the summer season. The other is a county of Halton boy, whose home is in Montreal. They are two Canadian boys who, starting from humble positions in life, have by their pluck and energy made a name for themselves, not only in the Dominion of Canada, but throughout the world. The standing of these gentlemen with the leaders of the Conservative party or the leaders of the Reform party, or with any party in the Dominion of Canada, would, I venture to say, be a sufficient guarantee that if they undertook that contract, it would be carried out in good faith. I am very much pleased to see that this contract is with two such gentlemen as Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, who will give Canadian boys employment on that railway, in-

stead of Chinese—whose policy in the past, in building railways in Canada, has always been to give Canadian workmen and Canadian tradesmen all the labour and trade it was possible for them to give. Therefore, the money which will be paid out upon this work will go to Canadian merchants and labourers, as a result of its being in the hands of Canadian contractors: whereas, if the contract had fallen into the hands of foreigners, the chances are that the great bulk of the money expended upon it would have gone into the hands of foreigners. Therefore, I contend that the country will benefit in the construction of this road as well as in the management of it.

In passing up and down the country and listening to the discussions on this question, I am free to admit that one hears any amount of condemnation of the Government for the deal; yet, when it is simmered down, it amounts to this, that the gentlemen who criticise it in the country like some who have criticised it in this House, had to admit they had never read the contract. It simmers down to this, that these gentlemen have been carried away by the headlines in the papers. It simmers down also to this fact, that certain persons saw in the endorsement of the contract by my dear old friend, the leader of the Opposition, an opportunity to take his political head off. I have no desire to see the head of that venerable old leader fall in the political arena or any other arena, but trust that he will long be spared to give to this House and country the exhibition of intellectual and physical vigour that has characterized him this session. And if he is to fall, I trust that he will fall in a different way from throat cutting.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, they would not stop at that.

Mr. HUGHES. It is all very well for us to be wise after the event. No sooner was the contract given to Mackenzie & Mann, than forthwith on every side we heard that scores of other companies could be found to do the work more advantageously to the nation. That recalls to my mind the conduct of certain Liberals at the time of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when we found these mushroom organizations going up all over the country. I do not know whether you remember it, Mr. Speaker, but I have a distinct recollection of a number of mushroom companies—I shall not use the term bogus companies—springing up all over the country, filling the columns of the Reform newspapers of the day with the most indignant protests against such a contract having been given when so much better terms could have been obtained. We all know that that is the cry of disappointed people, and therefore I am inclined to look with a great deal of suspicion on the cry of better terms that we hear so often repeated to-day.

Mackenzie & Mann have taken this contract at great risks. They have to put up money with the Government instead of receiving money from the Government. The country is not going to pay one dollar. On the contrary, Mackenzie & Mann stand to lose, in the first place, the \$250,000 they put up. I hope that even if they do not succeed in carrying out the contract to the letter, they will not lose the \$250,000, because some time has already been lost to these gentlemen by the delay in this House. They will find it a much more expensive job than they at first realized. A miner gets \$15 or \$16 a day up there for shovelling sand. Is any man going to shovel dirt for \$1 or \$2 a day when he can get \$15 or \$16 for shovelling mining clay? These contractors will find when they go to hire labour, that the figures will be higher even than those paid in that rock cutting which they undertook to excavate in the Rocky Mountains. Another thing which increases the cost is the great haste required.

Another point which nearly all the speakers who have criticised the measure omitted is this—the cost of constructing and putting steamers on the routes, the rendering streams navigable, the building of a wagon road from Glenora to Teslin Lake. All that will involve a very heavy additional cost on these gentlemen.

But the greatest risk which they run is this. It has been pointed out here that there will be 100,000 men in that country before midsummer. What will those men be doing there? I notice that Mr. Ogilvie, in his lecture, said that the Bonanza Valley was located one week after it was found out to be rich—and that was a year ago; and that Eldorado Creek was located five days after it was first discovered. These are the two centres that have given a rich name to this whole country. One of them was located in a week, and the other in five days after discovery, when there were only about 1,000 men in the whole district. By the 1st of June there will be 100,000 men there according to best authority. What will these men be doing? Five of them can meet together and locate claims, following up the rivers and valleys, and I venture to say that there will not be a single mile in which there is likely to be a mine that will not be located before Mackenzie & Mann are in a position to take up their lands. What will remain for the contractors? There will only remain the quartz rocks. We remember how in the province of Quebec, a few years ago, there was great excitement aroused by the discovery of a few nuggets of gold in the gravel at the foot of one of the rapids of the Chaudière River. Immediately there was a great cry that the whole country was rich in gold. But it was subsequently found that this gold came from the very weak quartz rocks up in the mountains. The same will no doubt be the case in

Mr. HUGHES.

the Klondike region. Undoubtedly the disintegration that takes place in the icy regions is greater than here where the waters in the spring have free sweep to the sea. Undoubtedly the gold-bearing rocks being brought down by the ice shoves in a region like the Klondike, the disintegration from the action of the water is much greater than it would be in more southern latitudes, for, as we know, all streams going north flood the districts below them and have not the free outlet that streams have which flow south. I venture to predict that that will be the case in the Yukon district, and that rich districts such as the Bonanza and Eldorado Creeks will be very few indeed. As I told Mackenzie & Mann, after I first read their contract, I thought that they had put their heads, each of them, into a halter, and that the risk was altogether too great, because the mining locations would be taken up long before they had an opportunity of selecting any rich, paying lands.

We are familiar with the history of the gold fever of South Africa, the mining fever of Nevada, California, British Columbia and Australia. The City of Melbourne alone turned out over 75,000 people to go into the Coolgardie district of Australia a year or so ago. How many of them struck it rich? Not one out of 5,000, and the fever there was just as great as it is in the Klondike to-day. I venture to say that the same thing will be the case in the Yukon district. I hope that every man who goes there will come back a multi-millionaire, but it is useless to shut our eyes to the facts. The history of the world, one age after another, is pretty much the same. The excitement in Australia, California, British Columbia and Nevada merely repeats itself in the Yukon country.

In conclusion, I would merely say that I trust the Government will lose no time in providing facilities for transportation. We have the right to transport goods under treaty up these rivers, but we have no right to the transportation of an armed force. Such a force must go in through Canadian territory. I would impress on the Government the necessity of immediately taking the matter into consideration, and at least opening up a wagon road, if not a railroad, from Canadian tide-water to the Teslin Lake or the heart of the Yukon district.

One or two other suggestions I would take the liberty of making to the Government. They should amend the mining laws of the country, so as to place them on the same footing as those of other countries whence so many miners come. These miners come into Canadian territory from the United States and there stand on an equal footing with Canadian miners.

Is that the case when our miners go to Colorado, or Montana, or Nevada, or even into Washington? Not at all; we are met

there with the alien law, and our people have to become American citizens or declare their intention of becoming such, before they can mine a dollar's worth. I respectfully suggest to the Government the advisability of considering that aspect of the case, not in connection with this contract, but in connection with the general mining law, and to require from the miners who come into that country some assurance that the country will benefit from their coming here. Why, Sir a Chinaman, or a Jap, or an American, or a man of any nation, may go into the Klondike region, locate his claim, turn over the earth with a shovel for a few weeks, and then make his way out of the country with five or ten millions, and all the benefit we have from his being here would be covered by fifty or a hundred dollars. I maintain that the mining law should be amended, so that any man coming into this country to mine should be met with a similar law to that which meets our men when they enter the United States. That is only fair-play, and no nation can complain of such treatment. I am satisfied that the whole of Canada, as well as Britain, would endorse the Government in taking such a step.

Another point I was much pleased to see brought out in the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) was, that the management of the company should be an all-British management. As soon as I heard that that had been pointed out, I knew that it would be accepted by the two Canadians who control the charter, and with whom the Government is dealing. Whether it were in the charter or not, that would be observed, and I firmly believe they would have no hesitation in accepting that suggestion, as well as the other suggestions made by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

I trust that this discussion will not be prolonged. Undoubtedly, it is within the power of the Opposition—of any Opposition—to prolong debate. The history of this House shows many regrettable instances of debate prolonged by the Opposition in the past—but not in this Parliament. I say here, advisedly, that the conduct of the late Opposition, the party of the present Government, in factiously opposing every just and beneficial measure in this House, had more effect in keeping them in Opposition than any other single thing. They would have remained in Opposition until the morning of the resurrection—and I do not believe that they would have gotten into power even then—had it not been for the negative policy of our own party, which was the cause of their success rather than anything good in the policy of the other side. Therefore, as a Liberal-Conservative, as one who thoroughly believes in the policy of the late Sir John Macdonald, I trust that there will be no factious opposition to measures which, while there may be details that are objec-

tionable, are, on the whole, in the best interests of Canada, and as well conceived as, under the circumstances, could reasonably be expected. I trust, Sir, that the members of the Liberal-Conservative party in this House will not follow in the footsteps of the late Opposition and factiously oppose everything brought forward by the Government. I can remember how, even before I was a member of this House, my blood used to boil—for I always had a warm side for everything that was for the upbuilding of our best interests—at the course taken by the Opposition of that day. Take, for instance, the case of the North-west rebellion. What policy should they have pursued? What should they have done? They should have crossed the floor and shaken hands with the Government and said: There is rebellion in the North-west; we will not discuss the cause of it now; law and order must be maintained and the rebellion suppressed; we are ready to help you. But did they do that? No, Sir; they gave, if not material support, at least moral support, to the rebellion by their conduct on that occasion. Again, on the occasion of the building of the great Canadian Pacific Railway, we found the speeches of members of the Opposition of that day used by the Americans as campaign literature in order to induce immigrants from the British Islands and from the continent of Europe not to settle in the Canadian North-west, but to settle in the United States. I could go over a whole list of such cases. There never was a Yankee fish-thief schooner caught on the Atlantic seaboard, but they pursued a similar policy—not to uphold the Government in enforcing the law, but to raise any trifling objections that could be raised. I respectfully urge upon the Liberal-Conservative party not to follow in the footsteps of our predecessors in Opposition, not to degrade ourselves to that level—I do not speak of all those who were then in Opposition and are now on the Government side of the House, because there were honourable exceptions—of the tactics pursued by some gentlemen who now constitute the Government of this nation.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If I were a greater enemy of the present Government than I am—and am not such a friend of my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) who sits behind me—I would probably wish that he should join the party of the Government; I think they would have so much trouble with him that they would be glad to get rid of him. When I heard that my hon. friend was going to support the Government on this question, I thought that he had some grave reasons for separating himself from his party upon such an important measure. I have followed his speech very carefully, and I must say that I have not found in any of the arguments he has given the House, any of those grave reasons for which, alone he

should have taken the line of conduct that he has thought fit to take before the House. The other day, I followed with a great deal of interest the speech made by the Minister of the Interior. It was a most interesting speech from start to finish, and I think that a great many of the gentlemen who sit on this side admired the hon. gentleman's eloquence and the manner in which he presented his case. His brief was well gotten up, and the case was presented with a great deal of skill. But it seems to me, if my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) will allow me to say so, that the principal points in that case were not presented, that the principal objections which members on this side of the House have to the measure were not refuted by him. We heard a great deal about Major Walsh, we heard a great deal about the hon. gentleman's progress through that country, we heard a good deal to prove that his was the best route under the circumstances—upon which question we almost all agree—but when the hon. gentleman came down to the principal points which were cited by the Opposition in objecting to the contract, he skipped over them and did not answer them at all. He reminded me of an English barrister who was arguing a case. When he had nearly finished his address, his opponent said: "You have not said anything about such and such a point, which is most important." His reply was: "I will come to that just now." But he was drawing very near the end of his argument, and his opponent drew his attention to the point again. "Oh," he answered, "I have treated that very fully." And a short time afterwards he sat down. It seems to me that the line followed by the hon. Minister was that of the English barrister.

There is one thing I will permit myself to say to the hon. gentleman. There was a feature of his speech which I did not like, and that was the manner in which he treated the leader of the Opposition. Sir, of course we may differ as to the manner in which gentlemen are to be treated in this House by their fellow-members.

I have no right, and I do not at all propose, to read a lesson to my hon. friend. But, Sir, when I speak of the right hon. leader of this House, or his trusted lieutenant, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I try to do so with that respect and deference which are due, not only to the high positions they occupy, and have occupied, in this country, but which are due also to the difference in age between myself and those hon. gentlemen. Now, of course, that is my view, that is the way in which, I take it, that relations should be kept up between the different members of this House. But it is a matter of taste, and, as everybody knows, 'de gustibus non disputandum.'

Now, Sir, I will come down to the contract before the House and to the Bill which we are asked to pass. I think one of the first

Mr. CASGRAIN.

questions we should examine is: What are the obligations of the contractors? I may say, at this stage of the debate—and I will please the House by so saying—that I do not intend to make any extended remarks; but it seems to me that, upon a question of this kind, everybody who has studied it, who has studied the documents, who has studied the reports, is almost in duty bound to give his views to the House and to the country. Well, what are the obligations of the contractors? The principal obligation of the contractors, of course, is contained in the first section of the contract. They are obliged to build a railway from Glenora, or Telegraph Creek, or Clearwater Creek, to the Teslin Lake. Then, by section 8, they are obliged to build a sleigh-road from Glenora to Teslin Lake during this present season, before, I believe, the 15th of April. Then, again, by section 9, they are to provide for steamboat transportation upon the Teslin Lake to a point upon the Hootalinqua River. Those are the obligations which the contractors undertake to fulfil under the contract before the House. They are also obliged to deposit \$250,000, upon which interest at 3 per cent is to be paid. Now, let me call the attention of the House to this fact, to which I believe, attention has already been called, that, under section 10, the only security that is given by this deposit of \$250,000 is that the railway shall be built between Glenora, or Telegraph Creek, to the foot of Teslin Lake. Now, Sir, that is the only obligation which is guaranteed by this security. There is no security for the building of the sleigh-road, the contractors are under no obligation to provide for suitable navigation on the Teslin Lake or on the Hootalinqua River; but this particular section of the contract covers solely the obligation under which the contractors rest to build a railway. There has been some difference of opinion as to what will be considered as the completion of the contract, because section 10 says that:

And on such railway being completed and equipped, and accepted as hereinbefore specified, the said sum or security shall be returned to the contractors or to whom they may appoint, and if the same be deposited in cash—

Now, if reference is made to section 1 of the contract, the House will see it is

Provided further, that for the purposes of the season of 1898 and of complying with the requirements of this contract in respect to the completion of the line on or before the said first of September, it shall be sufficient if on or before that date the contractors have the rails laid in such a manner as will permit of regular and efficient operation of the railway, although the whole work be not fully completed.

Now, does that mean that the deposit will be returned to the contractors when the road is built in such a manner as will permit of regular and efficient operation of the railway, although the road itself be not en-

tirely completed? This question is an important one to examine, when you come to consider the time when these contractors have the right to obtain the land grant in fee simple which is given to them by the contract. It is also important to know what the execution of these obligations is going to cost the contractors. It has been said by my hon. friend here, and it has been said upon the other side of the House, that the contractors are taking an enormous risk, that they are spending an enormous amount of money. Well, of course, that will be an important element in the contract, if it is so. But take the first obligation, for instance, the obligation which they will be compelled to fulfil from the outset, that is, the building of a sleigh-road from Glenora, or Telegraph Creek, to Teslin Lake. Now, I say, firstly, that the building of this sleigh-road will not cost very much; secondly, that the building of this sleigh-road will be necessary, at all events, for the contractors' own use, for their own purposes; thirdly, does it not seem very probable that any money laid out by the contractors in building the sleigh-road they will recoup themselves for by levying tolls of some kind upon the miners who will take that route into the Klondike? I do not mean to say that the contractors would be allowed to levy tolls upon the road, to put up toll-gates, and to prevent the people from passing without paying for it; but there are a hundred and one ways by which these gentlemen will be able to recoup themselves, to a great extent, for any outlay of money they will make in building this sleigh-road. Now, let us come to the railway which is to be built between the two points which I have mentioned. It has been said in this House by, I believe, my hon. friend who preceded me this afternoon, by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture yesterday afternoon, and notably by the hon. member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Bertram), that the cost of building this railway was going to be enormous. In order to prove that to the House, what course has been followed by these hon. gentlemen heretofore? We know that, when a case is to be presented to a court by counsel, or when a case is to be presented to this House by an hon. member who gets up to speak upon it, he bases his arguments, he relies for his case upon the documents which are laid upon the Table of the House. These documents are laid upon the Table for the information of the members, they are laid upon the Table so that the members of this House and the country in general may learn in a positive manner what, for instance, in a case like this, the cost of the work to be performed is going to be. I repeat what my leader said the other evening, that it is a most unusual course, a most extraordinary course, for a Government to lay reports of their own engineers, of their own officers, upon the Table of the House, and then to say: Here are our wit-

nesses, here are our documents, here is the evidence in support of our claims: and then they turn around and say: These men are competent men, we employed them, and, therefore, they must be trustworthy, but do not believe a word they say, do not believe any documentary evidence that is put before the House, do not believe these witnesses whom we bring up to sustain our case, because they are all wrong. I have read the report of Mr. Jennings, which has been laid on the Table of the House; I have read it with great care, because I expected to find in it sufficient information to guide me in the few remarks I have to offer to the House, and also in the decision I wish to be able to arrive at; but when I heard the hon. gentleman from Centre Toronto saying that Mr. Jennings could not have given the real figures, could not have taken into consideration all the circumstances, could not state the kind of road that was to be built, or the country through which it was to be built, I came to the conclusion that this Mr. Jennings whom the Government had employed, must be a fool. Why, Sir, what does he say in the very beginning of his report, addressing the Minister of the Interior?

Sir, in accordance with your desire for an interim report covering the examination of the country made by me for a highway or railway route between Glenora and Teslin Lake, I have the honour to report.

So that, although he was sent up there as he says himself, to make an examination on the ground for the express purpose of seeing how this road could be built, what were the possibilities of the country, and what the probable cost would be, still we are not at liberty to accept his judgment. I have heard it said on both sides of the House, although I do not know the gentleman myself, that Mr. Jennings is not only a most competent engineer, but that he is a most reliable man, and for that purpose he was sent up there to make a report by the Minister of the Interior, and his report was laid upon the Table of this House so as to give us information, and enable us to discuss this question intelligently. Mr. Jennings was not there for such a short time. He arrived at Glenora and Telegraph Creek on 25th September, with a rather large party, which he divided, however, so as to carry on operations within as short a time as possible, and they all went over the ground following the different routes. But Mr. Jennings specially reported on the line on which the railway is to be built between these two points; he went over the ground himself, and he was on the ground from 25th September to 15th October and he came back the same way. I take it that if this report was of no value, it should not have been placed upon the Table of the House; if it does not contain reliable information, information which we could use as the basis of an argument, then the Government acted

wrongly in submitting it to the House, and they thereby misled the House and the country. But if hon. members will read the report they will find that it is made with the greatest care, that Mr. Jennings goes into details, that Mr. Jennings has gone over this route for the express purpose of seeing what the possibilities are of constructing a railway in that district, and also what the cost of the railway would be. It has been stated by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) that the cost which is mentioned by Mr. Jennings is the ordinary cost of a railway. That is not what Mr. Jennings said, and I will refer hon. members to pages 25, 26 and 27 of the report. Here not only does Mr. Jennings give the general cost of the railway but he goes into specific detail, enumerating everything which enters into the building of a railway, and he concludes as follows:—

In conclusion, I may state that provided all arrangements are made and the location determined upon by April next, the line of railway by either route shown on the plan can be completed and in operation by September following, at a cost of four million dollars, that portion situated on the Stikine River below the crossing, including the bridge, costing \$746,000 of the total amount.

This report is signed by Mr. Jennings. He stakes his reputation on it. It is made upon data which he has collected himself, and I again say that this report was placed before the House for the information of the members, and it was only after hon. gentlemen opposite saw that if we found in this document sufficient argument to condemn the course they have pursued, they have fallen back and adopted the most extraordinary course of saying that this information is not correct, that it is all wrong and hon. members should not believe a word of what the officer says and of the information which the Government have laid on the Table of the House.

This road which is to cost \$4,000,000, according to evidence furnished by the Government, is to belong of course to the contractors when completed. The question arises—and I am now going into the second branch of the case—what are the advantages which the contractors are to reap under the contract? But not only does the road belong to the contractors, as hon. members will find if they will take the trouble to read the contract. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) said that a great many hon. members on this side of the House had not read the contract. I think he was under the impression that he was speaking for the other side of the House, because every hon. member who has risen to speak on this side of the House showed himself to be perfectly conversant with every clause in the contract and the Bill. Now, what are the powers given the contractors? The road belongs to them, as I have said. If hon. gentlemen will refer to section 2 they will

Mr. CASGRAIN.

see that a great many other powers are given to the contractors, among others, these:

To build and operate a railway above mentioned and an extension thereof northward to Dawson City or thereabouts, and an extension southward to a point in British Columbia to be designated by the Government and capable of being made an ocean port, also a line of railway from the waters of Lynn Canal to Port Selkirk or thereabouts by way of Chilkat Pass, also branch lines of railway from any points on the company's railway to any property owned by the company, also lines of railway from any navigable waters to any property owned by the company: Provided that the power to build said line from Lynn Canal to Port Selkirk and said branch lines and said lines from navigable waters shall not be exercised without the consent of the Governor General in Council.

The said Act of incorporation also to give the company full and sufficient powers to build and otherwise acquire and operate docks, wharfs and lines of steam and other vessels in connection with its railways and property, also telegraph and telephone lines, also to carry on mining and smelting operations and such other powers as may be necessary for the due operating and conduct of all business connected with and incidental to the development and working of the lands (to be granted by the Government as hereinafter provided) and the minerals therein, including power to issue land grant bonds and bonds secured by the company's undertakings.

To complete this list hon. gentlemen will please refer to section 13 and 14 of the Bill in which the powers of the contractors are again greatly enlarged, so that there is hardly any power for transportation or mining development or transportation of any kind by steam, electricity, water or land not given and exclusively given to the contractors under the contract and by the Bill. I have stated upon the authority of the gentleman sent there to examine the road what will be its cost; let me for a moment refer to the Bill which gives the contractors the right and power to raise a certain amount of money upon the securities which they are empowered to issue under the Bill. The capital stock of the company will be \$10,000,000; and if hon. members will refer to sections 17 and 18 of the Bill they will see that all the powers generally given to a company to mortgage, or raise money on their securities are given to the fullest extent to the contractors under the contract. It seems to me that—but I am not a business man, it is true, and yet I am prepared to leave it to business men to decide—that the contractors can go on the English market and raise such an amount of money to float the company as will necessitate the use of very little of their own funds in the project, and they will thus be enabled to carry it out almost entirely with foreign capital. That is not all. It has been stated in the House already, and I repeat it, that this railway will be from the very start a most paying concern. I have the figures which the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Morrison) gave to the House the other evening when the Bill was introduced. What did

he say? He said there are 3,000 people on the Yukon River at the present time, that there are 7,000 en route, that there will be 10,000 people in the country in a very short time. He further stated that 50,000 additional people would go in there this season. He said this population will take at least 25,000 tons of provisions. He went further and said that about two tons per man, of baggage, tools, provisions, &c., would be needed, and taking the number of people at 60,000 at the end of the season, the freight required would be 120,000 tons. The hon. gentleman says that it would take at present \$20,000,000 to transport 100,000 tons into the Yukon country, but mark you, from the figures which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) gave the House the other evening (and they are very interesting) it seems that at least 250,000 people will be going into the Yukon this present season. I do not mean to say they are all going to wait until this railway will be entirely completed, but I do say that most of them will go over the sleigh-road belonging to the company, and will use the railway track whether completed or not, so that the profit which will be reaped by the contractors this season alone will be immense. It is true that this is probably not a permanent line, and that it may not continue always to be a paying line, but from the data we have to-day of the enormous influx of people to that country, we may justly conclude that during the next few years the tolls on the road will suffice to pay for the railway. It has been stated by competent authority that if the contractors had merely got the franchise, or if the Government had let the world know that they were giving this franchise with the monopoly, many would have been found who would have built the road without any land grant whatever, and in view only of the profit to be reaped from the transport of freight and passengers. The Minister of the Interior endeavoured very hard to make out that in the Bill submitted to the House, there is no monopoly clause. I will call the attention of the House to clauses 4 and 5 of the Bill, and it seems to me from these clauses that it cannot be controverted, that there is a monopoly, and as exclusive a monopoly as ever was given to any contractors or to any company building a railway. Clause 4 says:

For five years from the 1st September, 1898, no line of railway shall be authorized by Parliament to be constructed from Lynn Canal or thereabouts, or from any point at or near the International boundary between Canada and Alaska into the Yukon district, and for five years from said date no aid in land or money shall be granted to any person or company other than the contractors and the contractors' company to assist in building any such railway.

Therefore, for five years no company and no person shall get authority from this Parliament to build any line of railway from

the Lynn Canal or thereabouts, or from the boundary line between Alaska and Canada. The company has the exclusive right of building any of the lines which are mentioned in paragraph 4 of the Bill, and so they have a monopoly in that respect. I will prove that this is effectually a complete monopoly for the company, by reading paragraph 5. It says:

5. The contractors and the contractors' company shall be entitled to receive in preference to any other person or company during ten years from the said 1st of September, 1898, such aid or assistance in land or money as the Government may be authorized and may see fit to grant in aid of a line of railway from the Stikine River to an ocean port in British Columbia, provided that the contractors or contractors' company are willing to undertake the construction of the same at once and completion thereof within a reasonable time upon receiving notice thereof from the Government.

Therefore, under this section of the Bill, no aid is to be given to any other person or company to build a line of railway from the Stikine River to an ocean port, if the gentlemen named in that contract say they will build it themselves. Take it for granted that the line is built from Glenora to the head of Teslin Lake, and let me ask: who is going to risk any money to build a railway from the ocean to connect with this railway which belongs to the contractors? Who is going to take the risk of building with his own means—because he can get no aid or subsidy from this Parliament—any line of railway from the coast to the Stikine River? All the other routes being shut out by the fourth clause, it stands to reason that this fifth clause which gives a preference to the contractors, constitutes in their favour as complete a monopoly as was ever given.

The third question which I propose to examine is the following:—Have the Government not made an extravagant and improvident bargain?

A great deal has been said about the land grant, and as to that I shall not speak of my own knowledge, because like many other members of the House I have not been on the ground myself, but as to the value of this land I will take the evidence put before the House by the Government. My hon. friend (the Minister of the Interior) read to the House a part of Mr. Ogilvie's report upon the richness of the land in that part of the country, but it seems to me he did not dwell very much upon the most important part of the report in that respect. At page 92 of this report, Mr. Ogilvie says:

To use a mining term, many of those claims are "world beaters," and if the indications now known are worth anything at all they are worth from sixty to seventy millions of dollars in those two creeks. Taking this division as a whole, including the three creeks named, affluent to Indian Creek, a district some thirty-five miles in length and twenty-five or more miles in width, if the indications can be relied on, there are one

hundred million dollars in sight in that area. No one can guarantee this amount, but the prospects so far developed point to that sum pretty conclusively. This district is exceptionally rich. Nothing has ever been found like it heretofore in that country; in fact, in very few countries has anything been found like it, and while we cannot confidently assert that other finds as valuable as it will be made, it is altogether improbable that gold is scattered over such a vast extent and only rich at a point which is less than the 140th part of the total area. If we add to this part of the northern area of British Columbia we increase it nearly two-fold, and the comparative area of the Klondike district is much lessened.

Taken all together, we have a vast field with fair prospects, as fair it may be claimed, as any other equally extensive region in the world. The natural conditions are not as favourable as in many other parts, but time and enterprise will no doubt agreeably modify many of them, and the reward may be great.

That is the evidence which is laid before this House by the Government itself, it is the evidence presented to the Government by a man who was sent out there for the purpose of obtaining information; and it is evidence which I think may fairly be relied upon. It has been said by gentlemen opposite that the contractors only get the odd-numbered blocks, that the Government get the alternate blocks, and that prospectors can go up there and stake claims and become proprietors by recording them, according to the mining regulations. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that these claims can only be entered by five miners when they are distant from the Government mining recorder at least 100 miles, so that if they are ninety or ninety-five miles away they will have to walk this distance to find a Government mining recorder before they can enter their claim. I do not think I am far wrong in stating, that at this very moment, or that in a very short while at all events, the contractors will have prospectors all through that country. They will take up all the rich land as soon as possible; and as for the individual miner, he will be hedged in on all sides by land taken up by this rich and powerful company.

These are the advantages which are given to the contractors by this contract. Their obligations are: to build a sleigh road, which will pay for itself, and to build a short railway of 150 miles, which will also be a paying concern, because it will be a monopoly. In addition to this, they have the right to build railways in other parts of the Yukon district. They can, if they wish, build a network of railways all over the country; they are almost the possessors of it. They have also the right to mine and smelt ores, and they are to become the proprietors of probably the richest gold mines in that country. I contend that the proportions are not at all kept between the obligations they assume, and the enormous present which this Government are giving them.

Mr. CASGRAIN.

Something has been said as to why the Government did not ask for tenders. Seeing the great importance of this work, seeing that the Government are giving to these contractors 3,750,000 acres of gold-bearing land, and seeing that it was most important for the Government to provide an all-Canadian route to convey miners and prospectors into the country, it was the Government's bounden duty to take all the necessary precautions to get this road built for the least possible money without giving away such a large extent of land. But it is said they could not ask for tenders, for the time was too short, and the case was urgent. That is not an answer to our objections. Why was the case urgent at the time these gentlemen entered into the contract? It was urgent because they had lost so much time last August, September and October. That is the reason they were obliged to make this contract so quickly and had no time to call for tenders. But the responsibility of that rests upon themselves. This state of things was brought upon them by their own dilatoriness.

Some controversy arose the other evening as to what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) said in his speech on this measure. I understood him to say that before the last session ended evidences were pouring in on the Government as to the richness of the land of that district, and as to the enormous influx of people who would be likely to go in there this season. As I do not wish to misquote the hon. gentleman, let me read the report of his speech at page 196 of "Hansard":

Hon. members of this House will recollect quite clearly that before the close of last session, evidence was pouring in upon us of the immense discoveries of gold that were taking place in the Yukon district, and returning parties from that remote region were bringing us the most fabulous accounts of its mineral deposits. No one who is at all interested in public affairs could fail to realize that very important questions were likely to arise in that country in connection with its great gold discoveries. The Government had, therefore, as soon as the session of Parliament was over and it was possible for them to give attention to the matter, pressed upon their important consideration the solution of—not one problem alone—but various problems of very great magnitude.

When, Sir? As soon as the session ended, he says. Not only one problem—not only the problem of seeing that peace was preserved in that distant country, but also the problem of transportation, because a very few lines afterwards the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said:

It became clear to us that we should immediately address our attention to dealing with these problems in a manner which would be most efficient and most promotive of good government and the general welfare and prosperity of the country. Now, in obtaining information with regard to the probable influx of people into that country, we were led to believe that the number of people who would be likely to seek

the Yukon region during the present year would be exceedingly large.

And he goes on to say that some said at that time that 50,000 people would go into the Yukon district this season, while others put the number as high as 250,000. There is no doubt that the hon. gentleman made the admission in this House—not voluntarily, perhaps, and when he did so he put the Government in a bad box—that before the end of last session the Government were aware of the enormous discoveries of gold that had been made, and that in the present season there would be an extraordinary influx of people into the country; and, from what the hon. gentleman himself said, it was the duty of the Government to consider from that moment the solution of the important problem of how this large number of people should be got into the country. If we had not the evidence given to us the other evening by the Minister of Railways and Canals, I would only have to refer to the press, not only of this country and of the United States, but of the whole world during the months of August, September and October of last year. What did we see? We saw that even the French papers published in Paris in the month of September were full of the Klondike craze, and that parties were ready at that time to start from France and come to the gold fields of the Yukon district. There was the same thing in England and all over the continent of Europe. Hon. gentlemen must have very short memories if they do not remember reading in the month of September last that there would be an enormous influx of people into that country during the present season. Why, I remember seeing in the press early in the fall telegrams from Victoria and Vancouver warning people not to start for the Klondike during the autumn, but to wait till the coming spring. It was so well understood at that time that there would be a crush of people along the border or in the towns on the Pacific Coast, that the papers were doing everything in their power to convince people that it was most imprudent for them to start till the coming spring. I say the Government could not ignore these facts; and if they had set themselves to work to solve the problem, and could not have called for tenders in the usual way, they could at least have made known to the world in the month of October that what was needed was the shortest and most practicable all-Canadian route, and that the Government were ready to give substantial aid to any contractors or to any company who would build such a road. Am I not right in saying that if these facts had been made known last fall to the world—not only to contractors in Canada and the United States but on the other side of the Atlantic—contractors could have been found who would have competed against those

with whom the bargain was made, and that in the long negotiations which, we are told on the other side, took place between them and the Government, Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann would not have been in the position of knowing that they were the sole parties who were seeking to obtain the contract, and would consequently have been disposed to accept conditions more favourable to the country.

One of the principal reasons for which we are asked not to oppose this bargain is that it provides for an all-Canadian route. Is it really an all-Canadian route? Take the facts as they are before the House. Fort Wrangel, if it is not in American territory, is claimed by the Americans and is in their possession. A great deal has been said about the effect of the Treaty of Washington in contradistinction with the Anglo-Russian Treaty of 1825, which it is said gave to British subjects the right of navigation, for all purposes, without any hindrance, upon the rivers which flow from British possessions into the Pacific Ocean. I do not propose to give my opinion upon the question as to whether the cession of Alaska to the United States abrogated the treaty which existed between Russia and Great Britain. That is a question of great moment which can be fairly dealt with, not by ordinary gentlemen learned in the law, but by those who have made a special study of international law. My hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), however, setting himself up here as a student of international law and as a critic of the great men who were engaged in the making of these treaties, went out of his way, not only to attack the Conservative party, but our deceased leader, the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, when he said that a great blunder had been committed by the Conservative party and Sir John Macdonald in giving up the rights which belonged to us under the Anglo-Russian Treaty of 1825. Not to be unjust to my hon. friend, let me quote from "Hansard" what he said on this point:

Now, will the House take cognizance of the fact that the subjects of His Britannic Majesty possessed, under this treaty with Russia, a proprietary right for all purposes whatever in the Stikine River until that right was interfered with by the statesmanship of our friends on the other side. These gentlemen apparently had never read this treaty. They did not know what it contained. They had not the remotest conception of what they were doing when they put this clause in the Washington Treaty which they have been boasting of ever since the question of the Stikine River came up.

Sir, the men who made this treaty between England and the United States—I am talking now of the Treaty of Washington—were the Marquis of Ripon, Sir Stafford Norfolk and the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald. I need not mention the others. And these are the men who, according to the Minister of the Interior, did not know what the treaty between Russia and England of 1825 contained.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). They did not know.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend repeats the statement.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** I speak with knowledge.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have great respect for the opinion of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but it seems extraordinary that in the discussions which took place upon this point, that very question was raised, and the view was held that the treaty between Russia and England had been abrogated by the cession of Alaska to the United States, and that, therefore, section 26 of the Washington Treaty had to be passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was the excuse that was given at the time.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That appears from the discussion at the very moment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at the moment, but after the Treaty of Washington was agreed to.

Mr. CASGRAIN. With all the respect which I have for the opinion of my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), it seems to me most extraordinary that such men as those I have mentioned could have set about making a treaty between these two countries on this important question, in which the very consideration of these rivers comes up, and not know what was contained in another treaty bearing on that same subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would like to be informed what discussion the hon. gentleman is alluding to.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am alluding to the discussion cited yesterday by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart).

Mr. RUSSELL. That does not very well define what the discussion was. I wish to know if the hon. member is referring to discussions which took place in this House when the Washington Treaty came up for ratification or to discussions which took place before it was ratified.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am simply referring to the quotation made by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) from the works of Mr. Sumner. I shall not lay down any rule of law on the subject. I have not the pretension to say that I am sufficiently versed in international law to decide, upon the spur of the moment, or even after considerable consideration, whether or not the treaty between Russia and England was abrogated by the cession of Alaska to the United States, but I find in the books that treaties are abrogated, not only by lapse of time, not only by extraordinary circumstances such as war, but by other

Mr. CASGRAIN.

circumstances such as, for instance, the cession of sovereignty over the territory in relation to which a particular treaty was made. Take what happened the other day in England. Lord Salisbury distinctly stated—and I suppose we are not going to sit in judgment in this House upon his opinion—that when Madagascar was ceded to the French, the treaties which England had with Madagascar were terminated by that fact; and it seems to me, although the cases are not exactly identical, that when a treaty is made between England and Russia relating to a territory which belongs to Russia, the cession of that territory afterwards by Russia to another power abrogates, by that fact alone, such treaty.

I come to another point concerning this treaty. Of course this discussion is probably not quite germane to the subject, because we have to take the position of affairs as we find them. Fort Wrangel is claimed by and is in the possession of the United States. And under the Treaty of Washington they are entitled to make regulations which shall not be in any way contrary to the terms of the treaty. But supposing even that the treaty between Russia and England should still exist, is it possible that my hon. friends can say that under the treaty between these two countries an armed force such, for instance, as the mounted police could have passed through these waters which pass through territory which belonged to Russia? Although there is a right of navigation given to countries from which rivers flow through a foreign country, so far as I can see, whenever a foreign armed force passes through that territory, whether on water or on land, it is a subject of special negotiations between the two countries. But, Sir, I find that in the House of Commons in England judgment has not been pronounced in such a summary manner as it has been here. I find this despatch in the newspapers of to-day:

London, Feb. 17.—The Parliamentary Secretary for the Foreign Office, Mr. George N. Curzon, in the House of Commons answering a question as to whether the rights and obligations respecting Alaska, under all the then existing treaties, had been transferred when the United States purchased the country, said that only certain articles of the Anglo-Russian Treaty of 1827, regarding the geographical limits, were recited in the Russo-American Treaty under which Alaska was ceded. Article 26 of the Treaty of Washington of 1871, Mr. Curzon said, provided that the navigation of the Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine rivers were to be free and open to the commerce of British subjects and American citizens, subject to the laws and regulations of either country within its own territory, and not inconsistent with the privilege of free navigation. Inquiries, he added, had been made by the British Ambassador as to what regulations were best applicable to the navigation of the Stikine River.

Now, if hon. gentlemen will look at the treaty of 1867 between the United States and Russia as to the cession of Alaska,

they will see that there is not a word in that treaty saying that at the same time that they ceded the territory the Russians ceded to the Americans the rights which they had under treaties with other nations. But, as I have said, let us take the position of the United States as it actually exists. Here is Fort Wrangel which is to-day in the possession of the Americans. They claim it as their post and they have the right to make regulations with regard to it. The treaty, section 26, says :

The navigation of the rivers Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine ascending and descending from, to and into the sea shall for ever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty and the citizens of the United States, subject to any law and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

And it is argued that this means that no regulations can be made which are inconsistent in the slightest degree with the free navigation of the river. There is no doubt about that. But, judging from our experience, judging from what the Americans are doing all along the border which separates Canada from the United States, judging from the policy they have pursued as against our workmen and labourers and against our professional men also, judging from the manner in which they have treated us when their interests are not such as to oblige them to give us as much as we give them, they can impose such regulations, such restrictions upon the transshipment of goods at Fort Wrangel as to make it cheaper for the miners who go into that country to buy their supplies at an American port and pay the customs duty when they get to Glenora or Telegraph Creek.

For these reasons I contend that this is not an all-Canadian route as claimed by the Government; and, therefore, one of the principal reasons for which we are asked to pass this measure at the present session falls to the ground. I say again that if the Government, instead of losing a good deal of time last season in the months of August, September, and even October, had gone into this question at the time, had studied the problem of which the Minister of Railways and Canals spoke the other day, if they had held out to the world inducements to contractors to build an all-Canadian route, we should probably have had before this House a proposal for a railway which really would afford an all-Canadian route from some port upon the Pacific Ocean to the Yukon gold fields. Though I am in favour of an all-Canadian route to the Yukon, though I think it is to the greatest interest of the trade and commerce of this country to have a route provided as soon as possible, I cannot help thinking that the Government has been remiss in its duty and that the advantages which are given to the contractors under the contract which is

submitted to us are too great for the return that we are to receive for them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) who has just taken his seat has a very great advantage over me in this discussion because he seems to have discovered some points in connection with the subject which have not been considered by hon. members on this side. One of the great difficulties I have had is that I have not found anything which has not merely not been touched upon but which has not been hammered out as thin as the gold-beater's leaf. Every possible aspect of this subject has been so thoroughly considered by previous speakers on both sides of the House, that it seems to me, that, so far as any hope of throwing new light on the subject is concerned, we might as well take the vote at this moment as to protract the discussion further. But notwithstanding this disadvantage—for it is a disadvantage to feel that every topic that could be discussed has already been fully considered, I propose to take up the consideration of some two or three of the points, particularly the legal points, and more especially, I may say, the international questions to which my hon. friend has latterly addressed his remarks. Perhaps I had better begin with the last part of his speech and pursue my course backwards to the first of it. He has undertaken to tell the House what was the condition of things with respect to the rights of navigation of the Stikine River at the time the Washington Treaty was negotiated through the instrumentality, to a great extent, of the late Sir John Macdonald. He has undertaken to show, if I apprehend his argument correctly—and as the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) as I partially understood him the other day also undertook to show—that the Russian Treaty by which subjects of Her Britannic Majesty had the right to navigate the Stikine and other rivers in Alaska had been abrogated, I do not know by what, but I suppose by the cession of Alaska at a subsequent date. Now I have a very strong impression, indeed I have an absolute conviction, that this was not the effect of the cession of Alaska by Russia to the United States. I may find it most convenient to deal at the same time with both the argument made by the ex-Minister of Railways and that made by my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain), upon this part of the case.

Through some inadvertence, I suppose, on the part of the "Hansard" reporters, and through some lack of sufficient attention on my own part, I did not hear and I am not able to find in the report, in the citation which was read from the speech of Mr. Sumner, the paragraphs which specially bear upon the subject now under discussion. Of course I assume that they must have been read in the hearing of the House, but I did not catch them, and the reporters of

the House did not catch them. for they do not appear in the report of the speech of the ex-Minister of Railways, as published. I think if the House, possibly labouring under the same difficulties as myself, had been able to catch those paragraphs of Mr. Sumner's speech, they would have come to the conclusion that there was not very much controversy left upon the question as to whether the rights which were conceded by Russia to subjects of His Britannic Majesty, did or did not remain intact until the time when they were surrendered, if they were surrendered—which I think is yet an open question—by the negotiators at Washington. I distinctly admit that everything that could be done to surrender them, apparently, was done at the time, through the recklessness, and through the ignorance—but I do not know as to that—of our representative; for so far as it was possible for any statesman to give away the rights of this country, or the rights of Great Britain in respect to the navigation of that river, I think that it was done by the late Sir John A. Macdonald in the negotiations that led to the Washington Treaty. But I think he was overruled by a gracious and wise Providence, and I am inclined to think that we are still in possession—but I am not absolutely certain of that, not so certain as I would like to be—of those rights, and that the rights which were accorded to Great Britain by the treaty with Russia still remain intact and still can be insisted upon. I say that if there is any question about that at all it is a question which was created by the reckless surrender of those rights by Sir John A. Macdonald at the time the Washington Treaty was negotiated.

But let me go back to the question as to whether we did or did not, previously to the negotiation of the Washington Treaty, enjoy those rights, and let me read a passage in Mr. Sumner's speech which was not read, or at least was not heard by me when the passage was read by the ex-Minister of Railways. This speech of Mr. Sumner was drawn up with unusual care and accuracy, because it was made in executive session of the Senate, and therefore was not reported, and it was upon the request of Mr. Sumner's friends that he afterwards drew up in writing the record of his speech as he was willing that it should go down to posterity. Let us see what he said:

Thus we have three different stipulations on the part of Russia: one opening seas, gulfs and havens on the Russian coast to British subjects for fishing and trading with the natives; the second, making Sitka a free port to British subjects; and the third, making British rivers which flow through the Russian possessions forever free to British navigation. Do the United States succeed to these stipulations?

Now, my hon. friend the member for Montmorency says they did not succeed to those stipulations, because he

Mr. RUSSELL.

cannot find in the treaty of cession from Russia to the United States that any mention is made of them. I suppose it frequently occurs that when a man sells his house and makes it over to his neighbour, he makes no mention of the mortgage that rests upon the property; but I never heard it suggested that for that reason he gets rid of the obligation of the mortgage. So the sole question as to whether that cession was made subject to this servitude, depends upon the question whether this was a real right or a personal right. If it was a real right, it remains upon the territory of Alaska in spite of the fact of its cession to the United States; if it was merely a personal right against the sovereign by whom the right was conceded, it could not be entailed upon his successors. Let us see what Mr. Sumner thought about that. I will read as far as the hon. gentleman read, indicating the point at which he stopped, and I will then proceed with the passage which I did not hear him read. Mr. Sumner said:

Among those I make a distinction in favour of the last,—

The ex-Minister of Railways read that fairly. —which, by its language, is declared to be "for ever"—

But he did not read that with very much emphasis.

—and may have been in the nature of an equivalent to the settlement of boundaries between the two powers.

Everybody knows that a treaty for the settlement of boundaries is not abrogated by cession. Everybody knows we depend now upon the treaties which fix the boundaries between Alaska and this country for the definition of the boundary line.

But whatever its terms or its origin, it is obvious that it is nothing but a declaration of public law, as always expounded by the United States, and now recognized on the continent of Europe.

At that stage it would appear from the report that the ex-Minister of Railways stopped reading, skipped the balance of the paragraph, and went on to what Mr. Sumner said about the other two branches. I will read the balance of Mr. Sumner's statement in reference to the third provision, which is the one in question:

While pleading with Great Britain, in 1826, for the free navigation of the St. Lawrence, Mr. Clay, then Secretary of State, said that the American Government did not mean to contend for any principle, the benefit of which in analogous circumstances it would deny to Great Britain. During the same year, Mr. Gallatin, our Minister in London, when negotiating with Great Britain for the adjustment of boundaries on the Pacific, proposed that "if the line should cross any of the branches of the Columbia at points from which they are navigable by boats to the main stream, the navigation of such branches and of the main stream should be perpetually free and common to the people of both nations."

I wonder that these very apposite observations of Mr. Sumner were not read to the House.

At an earlier day the United States made the same claim with regard to the Mississippi, and asserted, as a general principle, that "if the right of the upper inhabitants to descend the stream was in any case obstructed, it was an act of force by a stronger society against a weaker, condemned by the judgment of mankind." By these admissions our country is estopped, even if the public law of the European continent, first declared at Vienna with regard to the Rhine, did not offer an example which we cannot afford to reject. I rejoice to believe that on this occasion we apply to Great Britain the generous rule which from the beginning we have claimed for ourselves.

Now will anybody say that that was not an absolute and complete recognition by Mr. Sumner of the freedom of navigation of all rivers flowing through British territory, and through Alaskan territory, into the Pacific Ocean? It is almost inconceivable that this admission of Mr. Sumner was not known to the right hon. gentleman who assisted in the negotiation of the Washington Treaty—and I cannot understand why if it was known to him that right was ever given away, if it was given away, by the terms in which the Washington Treaty is couched. We do not need even to depend upon that, although it is of the very highest kind of authority to cite on a subject of this sort, in respect to the question whether we did or did not possess the absolute right of the navigation of the Stikine River, when we have the admission of so eminent a publicist and statesman as Charles Sumner, a man of such exalted position in the United States, and who was summoned by Secretary Seward to that very discussion, for the purpose of throwing such light as he was able upon that Alaskan transfer, when the measure was passing through the Senate—I say when we have an admission of that sort from Charles Sumner, we really do not need any higher authority, or any other authority, for the position that up to that time when these rights were surrendered, if they were surrendered, by the Washington Treaty, we had an unquestioned right to the navigation of the river. But there is other authority. There is authority which my learned friend will find in any book on international law to the effect that—

General compacts between nations may be divided into what are called transitory conventions and treaties, properly so called. The last are perpetual in their nature, so that being once carried into effect they subsist independent of any change in the sovereignty or form of government of the contracting parties, and although their operation in such cases may be suspended during war, they revive on the return of peace without any express stipulation. Such are treaties for the cession of boundary and exchange of territory, and those which create a permanent servitude in favour of one nation within the territory of another.

Showing that a servitude over the territory of another nation is put upon the same footing as a cession of boundary or exchange of territory.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman give the authority from which he has cited?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is American authority. It is cited by Sir Travers Twiss from "Wheaton's International Law," a very high standard authority, which has been re-edited over and over again by great Americans, such as William Beach Lawrence and Richard Henry Dana. This contention is made on behalf of the Dominion of Canada by Hon. Edward Blake. The hon. gentleman is perfectly familiar with that fact, no doubt; and he is also familiar with the case of Peter Martin, which shows how clearly this matter might have been established but for the negotiation of the Washington Treaty. The latter part of the 26th article of the Washington Treaty reads as follows:—

The navigation of the rivers Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine ascending and descending from, to and into the sea shall for ever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty and the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

Mr. Blake, after quoting that section, said:

At the time of the negotiations—

That is to say, of the Washington Treaty—

—British subjects had already the fullest right to navigate for all purposes all the streams flowing from the British territory in the interior through Alaska. The United States had no right to navigate any of these streams beyond the boundary of Alaska.

This is a very important consideration upon which in part depends the contention that in spite of what was done in 1871, it may still be arguable that the Washington Treaty has not abrogated the terms of the treaty of 1825.

We asked for and obtained as a concession a limited right to navigate three of these streams for certain purposes, conceding to the United States the right to navigate these three streams through Columbia on equal terms. Thus this so-called concession by the United States was in fact a concession by Great Britain to the former country, which gave nothing and got everything.

Mr. Blake then proceeded to say:

I have never been able to form a possible conjecture as to the reason for the action of the British commissioners.

I can hardly assume that they were ignorant of the rights of Great Britain under the St. Petersburg convention, or had satisfied themselves that those rights no longer subsisted.

Still less can I believe that they knowingly and deliberately determined to abandon those rights, not merely without an effort to defend

them, but without the least indication that they were attacked by the United States.

And he might have added, after they had been fully and abundantly recognized by the highest American authority when the Alaska Treaty came before the United States Senate for ratification. If the hon. gentleman desires to pursue the subject further, he will find an excellent opinion given by Mr. Justice Crease in the same direction, which seems, to my mind, to furnish conclusive reasons why, notwithstanding the negotiation of the Washington Treaty, the rights we had under the Russian Treaty still remained. No thanks are due to the negotiators of the treaty if they do remain, because the subject never seems to have been discussed or considered. The clauses of the Washington Treaty are drawn in such terms that it is evident that this contention was not present to the minds of the otherwise astute authorities who were negotiating the treaty, and they worded the treaty in such language unfortunately that when it came before the Crown authorities in England they felt that they had to decide, and did decide, that the rights of navigation were wholly dependent on the terms of the Washington Treaty. But there again, I have to complain of the manner in which the hon. ex-Minister of Railways quoted his authorities.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the hon. gentleman takes up that branch of the subject, may I ask him if, outside of the treaty of 1825, he agrees with the American view that has been raised, that England would have had the right of navigating the Yukon and Stikine Rivers?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is an absolutely unimportant matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman does not understand my object in asking it. I am quite candid, and I do not think it is an unimportant question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I only mean that my personal opinion is absolutely unimportant.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has given the House the well known views of American writers on international law, and he has cited them in connection with the treaty. But so far as I could gather, the hon. gentleman did not say that he did or did not agree with their views. I can assure the hon. gentleman that his opinion has weight with me and with other hon. members in this House on these questions, but he did not say whether he agreed with the views of the American writers on international law regarding the rights of the upper proprietors of a river through the lower portion of the river to the sea.

Mr. RUSSELL.

Mr. RUSSELL. On a question of international law, a private opinion is quite unimportant. The question is, what is the opinion and the conviction of those with whom you are dealing. International law is not law, it is only international morality. There is no sanction for it, as has been stated over and over again by authorities on the subject. All you want to know in negotiations on questions respecting international law is the view you can estop the other side from disputing; and I am contending that the United States would have been estopped from disputing our rights in this matter but for the mixing and muddling of the Washington Treaty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a pure question of morality. I do not know that I have any opinion. If I were living in the attic I would of course like to be able to get down to the street, but that would not bind the man on the ground floor to let me down. There is no law on the subject, and the question is simply what can you say that the other party is estopped from disputing.

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

After Recess.

Mr. RUSSELL. When the House adjourned at six o'clock, I was about to quote not the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, but the despatch in which that opinion is referred to. In connection with that, I wish also to say, that in presenting that part of the case, the impression conveyed by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) to most persons who heard him, and to every person who may read his remarks in "Hansard," is, in my judgment, an entirely erroneous one. He was attempting to quote the despatch from Lord Carnarvon to Earl Dufferin embodying the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, that is, the result of their opinion, but not the reasons. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) was quoting this despatch, which purports to convey the decision of the law officers of the Crown on the question as to whether our rights depended on the Washington Treaty, or depended upon the status quo before the Washington Treaty had been negotiated. Now, if the House will bear with me while I read the citation as it appears in "Hansard," coming through the medium of my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart), and then while I read the despatch itself, I think it will be found that my remark is justified when I say that any person reading the despatch as it appears in "Hansard" and then reading the despatch as it appears in the records of Parliament, will come to the conclusion that the impression which would naturally be conveyed by read-

ing the despatch as it was read to the House, is entirely an erroneous one. This is the way in which it reads in "Hansard":

With reference to my despatch (this is on the 16th August, 1877) and the previous correspondence on the same subject, I have now the honour to communicate to you the views of Her Majesty's Government, adopted after consultation with the law officers of the Crown, with reference to the case of Peter Martin, for whose release an application has been made to the Government of the United States. If the rights of free navigation depend upon the 26th article of the Treaty of Washington, which expressly states that navigation should be opened for the purpose of commerce, Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that a prisoner cannot be conveyed to Alaska by the Stikine River.

Referring to that despatch, as cited, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) said:

My contention is, although I may be wrong in my argument, that according to the opinion of the law officers of the Crown the treaties were all done away with and the only rights we have to the Porcupine and Stikine River are by the Treaty of Washington.

Just allow me to read the corresponding despatch, as it appears in the Journal, and it will be seen that a very small, but a very important, word is omitted in the last quotation, an omission which entirely changes the drift of the despatch as it reads in the official documents. The despatch is this:

With reference to my despatch of the 21st of March, and to previous correspondence on the same subject, I have now the honour to communicate to you the views of Her Majesty's Government, adopted after consultation with the law officers of the Crown, in reference to the case of Peter Martin, for whose release an application has been made by the Government of the United States.

Her Majesty's Government are advised that the demand of the United States for the release of Peter Martin cannot properly be rejected.

In communicating with the United States authorities, it should be stated, that Peter Martin is surrendered on the ground that he was a prisoner conveyed through United States territory.

The unauthorized conveyance of a prisoner through the territories of a foreign power is an infraction of the rights of sovereignty of such power, and entitles that power to demand the liberation of the prisoner, even after he has left those territories in which he was detained, and from which he has been taken without the authority and in violation of the law of the country.

This right to demand the liberation of a prisoner conveyed, without authority, through the territory of a foreign power is not affected by the question whether the prisoner is, or is not, a subject of the foreign power.

Now comes the crucial paragraph:

Being of opinion that rights of free navigation now depend upon the 26th article of the Treaty of Washington, which expressly states the navigation to be only for the purposes of commerce, Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that a prisoner cannot lawfully be conveyed through Alaska by the Stikine River.

I put it to any hon. gentleman of a legal mind or a critical mind of any cast, whether that is not a very clear suggestion that before "now," before the Treaty of Washington, the state of the case might have been entirely different.

Being of opinion that the rights of free navigation now depend upon the 26th article of the Treaty of Washington—

And why do they "now" depend upon the 26th article of the Treaty of Washington? Simply because of the difference between the terms of the treaty of 1825 and the terms of the unfortunate Treaty of Washington—unfortunate in this regard, that it may be contended, and is apparently held by the Home authorities that the earlier treaty was superseded by it. This is the article of the Convention of St. Petersburg:

It is understood that the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty from whatever quarter they may arrive, whether from the ocean or from the interior of the continent, shall for ever enjoy the right of navigating freely and without any hindrance whatever, the rivers and streams which in their course towards the Pacific Ocean may cross the line of demarcation upon the line of coast described in article 3 of the present convention.

Nothing could be broader than that, nothing could be more comprehensive than that, nothing could give a more free and absolute right to the navigation of these rivers coming from the interior to the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. DAVIN. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) read article 3, so that we may know what that strip of coast is?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I shall read article 3; it is as follows:—

Commencing at the southernmost point of Prince of Wales Island, the said line shall ascend to the north along Portland Channel as far as the point of the continent where it strikes the 56th degree of N. latitude. From this point the line of demarcation shall follow the summit of the mountains situated parallel to the coast as far as the point of intersection of the 141st degree of W. longitude; thence to the frozen ocean.

Then, there is a limitation that the line is not to be farther away than ten marine leagues from the coast. That is to say, if the summit of the mountains is more than ten marine leagues from the coast, then the line of demarcation is to be ten marine leagues from the coast; and if nearer, then the summit of the mountain is to be the line. When you come to read article 26 of the Washington Treaty, you will see how seriously that extensive servitude has been narrowed down; that is, if the Washington Treaty has the effect of narrowing it down, as there is very great reason to fear that it has.

The navigation of the rivers Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine, and ascending and descending thereto, and into the sea, shall for ever remain free and open for the purpose of commerce to

the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty and the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

Any person will see at a glance, that if the effect of a proper reading of the Washington Treaty is to substitute article 26 for article 6 of the previous treaty, our rights have been very seriously curtailed.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it not possible that they were extended?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it is possible that they were extended, though of course I shall be very happy to learn that they were. If any one can show in what respect scratching your pen through the expression "all the rivers" and putting in three rivers, and striking out the words "for all purposes generally," and inserting the words "for the purposes of commerce," are extensions I would be transported with joy, and so would every other hon. member of this House.

Mr. DAVIN. Then you will have a chance of being transported.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think any one has placed such a construction as that upon the change made in the Washington Treaty. The danger is that we have put a weapon into the hands of our enemy by the insertion of article 26 in the Washington Treaty, thus admitting that article 6 of the Russian Treaty is no longer in force. By a strained interpretation, that article 26 may be held to mean that though article 6 of the treaty of 1825 was in force up to the time the Treaty of Washington was negotiated, yet by that treaty we have practically admitted that it is no longer in force. I suppose that was the interpretation the law officers of the Crown gave to article 26 of the Washington Treaty of 1871, although I have not been able to see their opinion in extenso. It is probably in the archives of this Parliament somewhere, but I have not yet been able to lay my hands upon it. I would be very happy indeed to find that I am mistaken in supposing that it bears out the interpretation which I now place upon it, and which I assume we are bound to place upon it.

Mr. POWELL. May I ask the hon. gentleman what rivers are excluded by the treaty of 1871 which were included by the other—not in general terms, but specifically. What navigable rivers are excluded as a practical matter?

Mr. RUSSELL. As a practical matter I am not acquainted with the geography of the country. My whole contention has reference to what rights we had before on the Stikine River, and what rights we have now. If such a case as occurred before with reference to Martin were to occur again, we would in all probability find that we

Mr. RUSSELL.

had not the right to take a prisoner down the Stikine River to jail in consequence of the change that was made by article 26 of the Washington Treaty.

Mr. POWELL. That is not the point to which I directed the hon. gentleman's attention at all. The hon. gentleman is making two points—first, as to the nature of the right, and second, as to the territorial application of the right. My question had reference to the territorial application, and I asked what rivers, as a matter of fact, were excluded by the Treaty of Washington which were included by the other?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was answering the suggestion of the hon. member for Assiniboin (Mr. Davin), that the treaty of 1871 had possibly enlarged the treaty of 1825. Let the hon. gentleman aid his friend from Assiniboia by telling me how it does so.

Mr. POWELL. That is another point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have as much right to ask questions as my hon. friend, but I merely asked in reference to the hon. gentleman's question. I ask him how a form of words which expressed all the rivers in the country, was enlarged by a form of words which expressed only three of them. I think that was a fair answer to his question. The position of the matter is now that we shall probably find a difficulty in getting behind the expression of opinion which was given by the law officers of the Crown, and their ratio decidendi, which was embodied in the despatch from Earl Carnarvon. I feel in regard to that matter, very much like an old divinity professor, in reference to a text of Scripture which was attacked as spurious, and as to which a theological friend asked him what should be done. He sent a message in reply: "Probably spurious, but not to be given up without a struggle." So I think with reference to this matter, that our contention, though I will not say probably, but possibly unfounded, ought not to be given up without a struggle. I think it is just such a forlorn hope as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) had last year, when he argued the case in reference to the German and Belgian treaties, which he very skilfully, very ably and very properly argued, and which it would have been a highly improper thing for him to have surrendered without the best argument that could have been made on the subject. I say that, notwithstanding the opinions of the law officers of the Crown and the despatch of Earl Carnarvon, it is the duty of this Government to continue to insist that there is still room for the claim that the treaty of 1825 is still in force, and that we still have all the rights of navigation which were given to us by that treaty. That claim should not be given up without a struggle. No Government of this country ought to give up any legal or constitutional

or international right of the people of this country without saying the last word that can be said in favour of its being retained, and firing the last shot that can be fired in its defence.

The hon. leader of the Opposition was very greatly impressed with the difficulty of this matter. He saw that the argument was pretty conclusive that his late lamented and distinguished friend, Sir John Macdonald, had given up the rights of the people of this country in reference to the navigation of the Stikine River. What was his retort? He said: "I want to know if my hon. friend forgets that it was the Marquis of Ripon, a great Liberal, who was at the head of that convention?" What in the world has the Marquis of Ripon to do with the Liberal party or the Conservative party of this country? What connection is there between the Liberal party of England and the Liberal party of this country? The position of the hon. gentlemen opposite seems to be that if it was a wise, prudent, far-sighted and sagacious thing for Sir John A. Macdonald to get these provisions put into the Washington Treaty, then we have to give all the praise to the Liberal-Conservative party, during whose tenure of power that treaty was negotiated. But if, on the other hand, we find that that treaty from beginning to end was a blunder, and that those wise and sagacious negotiators gave away our rights, or did not know what our rights were under the previous treaty, and recklessly or ignorantly sacrificed them, then it is not the Conservative party or Sir John Macdonald that must have the blame, but the Marquis of Ripon, the great Liberal. I must confess that when I heard the praises so loudly sung of the sagacity and prudence and forethought of the deceased and lamented statesman and the great Conservative party, which possesses such supernatural omniscience and foresight—and who alone are endowed with the instinct of government—the reflection occurred to me, how was it that these omniscient authorities, these wise people, who could see so far into the future, did not foresee this little difficulty which has occurred in regard to the customs regulations and provide against it by appropriate stipulations.

Why might they not have just said: Let us just go back to this old Russian Treaty and re-enact this clause of it, or let us make it so broad and clear that there never can be any contention as to what the rights of the British Crown and subjects are with reference to these rivers Stikine, Yukon, Porcupine and any other rivers that may happen to be in this territory. Let us make it so clear that he who runs may read, and the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. Let us make it so clear that there can be no question of the possibility of your establishing regulations which will hamper our commerce, which will worry us,

which will prevent our enjoying to the fullest extent the privileges it is clearly intended we should have. Why did not these prudent, sagacious, omniscient framers of this Washington Treaty take the pains to make that matter so clear that there could be no difficulties such as those with which our hon. friends opposite are endeavouring to worry us at this moment?

But even supposing you may be driven, in the last resort, to depend on article 26 of the Washington Treaty, we have very high American authority to the effect that we need not apprehend any danger in working out our career and in making use of that river as an avenue of commerce—that we need not fear that we will be hampered with any unreasonable, improper, destructive regulations which will prevent our having free access, in and out, over the Stikine River, so far as it runs through American territory. Under this treaty we have the right to navigate the rivers named for the purpose of commerce, "subject to any laws or regulations of either country within its own territory, not inconsistent with the privileges of free navigation." Now, any regulation which unreasonably and unnecessarily hampers the commerce of this country—it goes without saying that anything which would render it impossible for us to enjoy free navigation for the purpose of commerce, such as those hon. gentlemen opposite are worrying their minds about—would be an absolute infraction of the plain terms of that treaty, as written upon the face of it, because it would, in the very terms of the treaty, be "inconsistent with the privilege of free navigation."

Mr. Caleb Cushing, who knew a great deal about the Washington Treaty, and wrote a book on the subject, and who appeared, I think, for the American Government, before the Geneva Convention, has interpreted for us what that means. He says, "that the reservation of the right to make regulations which are not to be inconsistent with the rights of free navigation, is simply a reservation of the rights of local police and regulation. 'Local police and regulation are reserved to each government.'"

Now, I do not think we need to fear any bona fide exercise of the right of local police and regulation by the United States Government in reference to the River Stikine, or any other river over which we might have the right of navigation under article 26 of the Washington Treaty. In any case, I contend that the Government were right in going ahead and assuming that we have the right of free navigation for commercial purposes of the Stikine River. But suppose that we have not, is it suggested by anybody what we should do about it? What is it that they now suggest we should do about it? I notice that our friends on the other side, in reference to all other subjects in which we come into collision, or conflict, or difference, with the United States,

always assume an extremely lofty, patriotic, Canadian, national position. They are Jingo of the first water. But now, when it comes to this particular question—I suppose because it suits the exigencies of the argument in which they are engaged for the moment—they not only drop all their Jingo positions, abandon all their patriotic and national principles, but adopt a policy which can only be described as the “policy of scuttle.” Because there is danger of some regulations being made by the United States Government which would in some way hamper our commerce, make it less convenient than it was before or than it ought to be, they propose if I understand them, that we should abandon our rights over the Stikine River, and simply vacate the premises. Is that the position they take? Do they want us to abandon practically, to all intents and purposes, the right which is given us of free commerce over that river by article 26 of the Washington Treaty? I am at a loss to understand what is the force of the argument that has been made with reference to this branch of the question, on the other side, unless it comes to that. If their contention means anything, it means that, because there may be some risk, because we do not know just what sort of regulations the United States may make, because they may stretch the exercise of their authority and go beyond what they really have a right to do, and make regulations they have no international right to make, and which would be in practical violation of the treaty, it seems to be the suggestion of hon. gentlemen opposite, if it amounts to anything, that we should practically abandon the rights of navigation given us in reference to the Stikine River by the treaty. That is the logical, legitimate result of the argument on that branch of the case which has been made from the other side of the House. If that is going to be done, I do not see where you are going to draw the line, because, if we are going to assume that the United States will exercise a power which they have no right to exercise, and which there is, I trust, no reasonable probability that they will exercise, in a way which that treaty does not give them the right to exercise it, so as to practically nullify by their regulations the rights given us by the terms of the treaty itself, then I ask you where are you going to draw the line? Why might you not as well argue that there is no sense in our building a railway from Fort Simpson to Teslin Lake, because who knows but the United States may claim that their boundary is east of where we say it is, and may include in the Alaskan territory what we claim is in ours? Is it not a logical extension of the argument made on the other side, that because the Americans may exercise at Fort Wrangel a power which they really have not under the treaty, to hamper our commerce and prevent our enjoying the free naviga-

Mr. RUSSELL.

tion of the Yukon, we must abandon that project and build elsewhere, to go still further and say that we cannot safely exercise the right of building a railway within even what we consider to be our own territory, because these barbarous uncivilized Americans—for that is the argument—this people which knoweth not the law, which will not obey the law, which will not keep its treaties—this is the statement from the other side—not ruin—will claim the territory on which we have built as their own and nullify our action? It would be an act, I say, of poltroonery on the part of any Government to assume for a moment that we do not enjoy the rights of free navigation which the Treaty of Washington undoubtedly gives us on the Stikine River, or to act in such a way as to show a belief that we cannot safely exercise them.

I shall not offer any further remarks on that branch of the subject, except to summarize what I have endeavoured to say on the matter. There is no doubt in my mind that, previously to the negotiation of the Washington Treaty, there was every reason to suppose we could hold the United States to the declaration made by Charles Sumner, when the cession of that country was made to the United States—that, when the treaty between Russia and Great Britain constituted a servitude over the then Russian, and afterwards American, territory in favour of the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, that servitude continued, notwithstanding the cession. I say, that we were then in an undoubted and impregnable position to make that contention with reference to the rights of navigation, whether by virtue of the Russian Treaty itself or the general principle which the Americans themselves had insisted upon, as the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) explained, and as Mr. Sumner admitted.

I say we stood then in an impregnable position, a position which secured our right to the navigation for all innocent purposes of the Stikine River, which is the river in question, and any other river that flows from British territory through Alaska into the Pacific Ocean. It may by some be considered possible, and was, I believe, considered by the Crown officers to be certain that the effect of the Washington Treaty was to curtail the rights we possessed under the previous treaty, and that we must take what the Washington Treaty gives us and no more, and that our rights to-day are very different from what the original treaty, not mixed and muddled and interfered with by the Washington Treaty, would have given us. If that is the position of the matter it is the duty of this Government to do what they can to restore the condition of things that existed before the Washington Treaty was negotiated, or rather to have the Washington Treaty read, not as a substitution for the article of the treaty of 1825, but to have it read as

an article which makes an affirmative statement, but contains no privative words to take away anything given us by the previous treaty. That is a reading that could have been given to the Washington Treaty, though it was never intended by the statesmen by whom it was negotiated. I have already said that this is going to be an uphill piece of work. But this Government is used to doing uphill pieces of work, and doing them well. There was a time when we thought the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties was an uphill piece of work. It could not be done at all when our friends on the other side were in power, but we find that things can be done now that could not be done before, and it is possible that a new turn may be given to this matter just as was done in the case of the German and Belgian treaties.

Now I come to a point not at all so interesting, to myself at any rate, as the matters I have been dealing with.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I would like to ask him one question. For the purposes of commerce what distinction does he make between the rights given by the Treaty of St. Petersburg and those given by the Treaty of Washington? It will come down to this, I think, whether or not the right to make regulations mentioned in the Treaty of Washington would not be as effectively implied in the Treaty of St. Petersburg. Of course, my hon. friend will understand I have no desire to interrupt his argument, but I am simply asking for information.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not at all sure that, for the purposes of commerce pure and simple, the Washington Treaty is not as good as the other. But, for other purposes, such as sending in the mounted police or bringing down prisoners, as was the exact and specific question when the case was discussed by the Crown officers, I am afraid that there will be found a great, an alarming difference between the Treaty of Washington and the treaty that preceded it.

Now, I am not sure that I was able to follow accurately the argument of my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) as to some difficulties in connection with this contract. If I followed him correctly, he attempted to make the point that there was danger, under section 10 of this contract, that the contractors would be able to come in and demand back their \$250,000 deposit before they had fully completed their work, when they only had the rails laid in such a manner as would permit the interim operation of the railway, so to speak, although the whole work was not fully completed. I think that contention will not be upheld by any person who reads the contract fairly. This is what it says:

10. The contractors shall, within ten days after the execution hereof, deposit with the Government, in cash or approved cash security, the sum of \$250,000 as security that the railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake, hereby contracted for, will be completed and equipped in accordance with the terms hereof, and on such railway being completed and equipped and accepted as hereinbefore specified, the said sum or security shall be returned to the contractors, or to whom they may—

And so on. Now, what does that mean—"when completed and equipped in accordance to the terms thereof"? I should say that that means that when it is completed as described in the first part of section 1, viz.: "up to the general standard and gauge of the Kaslo and Slocan Railway in British Columbia, and according to specification to be approved by the Minister of Railways. Provided also that the said railway shall be the property of the contractor, but shall be subject to inspection and approval by an engineer to be named by the Minister of Railways and Canals before being accepted as complete by the Government."

I should say that all these things were conditions precedent to the right of the contractors to recover back their deposit. But the hon. gentleman says: Ah, yes, but then you read further:

Provided further, that for the purposes of the season of 1898 and of complying with the requirements of this contract in respect to the completion of the line on or before the first of September, it shall be sufficient if, on or before that date, the contractors have the rails laid in such a manner as will permit of regular and efficient operation of the railway, although the whole work be not fully completed.

Now, surely, any person reading that, I think particularly any legal practitioner reading that, would say that what it means is simply this: We say to the contractors: you are bound under this contract to have this road fully completed on the 1st September, 1898; nevertheless, we will excuse you if, for the purpose of the season of 1898, you have the rails laid in such a manner as to permit the regular and efficient operation of the railway, even though the whole work be not fully completed. In other words, if that railway is sufficiently equipped for the kind of operation we describe, though not a full performance of your contract, though not such as to entitle you to recover your deposit or to claim that you have earned the consideration named in the contract, nevertheless we shall regard that as sufficient fulfilment of the contract to excuse you from any action for default. I think that is the reading to which my learned friend and colleague from Halifax would give to the contract.

Now I believe that this was the only serious legal contention which my hon. friend made with reference to the contract and with reference to the contractors' company. But he

went on to make some suggestions, that by virtue of the borrowing powers given in this statute it was quite possible for this company to get a large amount of money from English capitalists. Well, I am sure that I for one seriously object, in view of all the cares and responsibilities that members of this House have upon them in the discharge of their ordinary and extraordinary duties, I should seriously object to being asked to lie awake at night worrying my brain over the dangers to English capitalists who may be asked to put money into this enterprise. English capitalists are coming to learn how to look after themselves, and if they do not know how to look after themselves, I do not think that we need worry ourselves to take extraordinary measures to guard them from the results of their own indiscretion.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the monopoly?

Mr. RUSSELL. As to the so-called monopoly clause, so far as the hon. member refers to the power to build the road, I understood the Minister of the Interior to say that at present there is no monopoly, that there is already in existence a charter under which a road could be made substantially over the same ground as this very road which is being chartered by the Bill before the House. But what is the vice of a monopoly of that kind, a monopoly of carrying power? What is the essential, the cardinal, vice which attaches to a monopoly of that sort? I take it that the principal danger to be apprehended in creating a monopoly of that kind is the danger of extortion, and I utterly fail to see how it is possible for any railway company to be guilty of extortion if its rates are absolutely under the control of the Governor General in Council. The Governor in Council is absolutely under the control of this House, and this House is under the control of the people of this country, so that there is in the last analysis a controlling popular sovereignty with respect to the rates to be imposed upon the carriage of persons and goods over that railway; and under those circumstances I fail to understand where the word monopoly can be used in reference to this part of the contract. Now, as to the suggested land monopoly, I take my views in respect of that from the hon. leader of the Opposition, who gave them very distinctly and in a thoroughly statesmanlike manner, in an interview which I believe he has never repudiated, and from which I got my first impressions with reference to the merits of this particular transaction. The question of land monopoly was dealt with the other day by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), and he showed very clearly, and with great ability indeed, the marked contrast between this so-called monopoly and the kind of monopoly under which the North-west Territories and the interior part of this continent are suffering. He showed

Mr. RUSSELL.

that there is an absolute and direct contrast between the two things. There, the labour of the person who cultivates the land, who puts his own brains, his own money, and his own toil into the development of the country, goes to enhance the wealth of the company to whom the monopoly is given. Here, the absolute contradictory of that exists. Everybody knows it, every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House sees it, that the Government lands which lie between the lands given to the company under this Bill, are the lands which are increased in value, the lands to which any possible value is given by the prospecting work of the company, and by the developing work of the company created under this Bill. The persons who put their money into the business of developing these gold areas belonging to the company, whether they be great or small, rich or poor, in that territory, are giving value to the Government lands. Therefore the very opposite exists with reference to this contract, to that which exists in the monopoly created by the railway legislation of past Governments.

Mr. DAVIN. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that there is a distinction between the way these sections are given in the Klondike and the way they are given in the North-west?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I did not say that at all. I said there was all the difference in the world in the way they would work. If the hon. gentleman requires any further light upon that, I will refer him to the very admirable interview which was given by the leader of the Opposition to the representatives of Montreal and Toronto papers a short time ago, where he pointed out the very thing I am pointing out now. I have not the article under my hand and cannot quote it word for word, but he showed that one of the strong points about this contract was, that the Government lands lying between the areas which are given to the company, would be improved in value by the work which was being done by the company on their own lands, or by persons who lease or purchase lands from them.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to have the hon. gentleman explain that. Does he say that any miner can go in upon land belonging to the Government and take it precisely on the same conditions that he can take land to-day?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I presume he can. The hon. member who was mistaken for the ex-Minister of Railways the other day (Mr. Wallace), explained this to us thoroughly. He showed how, under the operation of this Bill, these contractors would be sending prospectors all over that country to discover where the gold was, to bring it to light and mine it, and by so doing they would develop these areas, would make that territory valuable which is not valua-

ble now, because the values are concealed and not discovered. Every discovery they make will enhance the value of Government land alongside. I suppose that in a sense the Klondike is no more valuable to-day than it was a thousand years ago, although everybody knows that it is worth hundreds of thousands, I suppose millions of dollars more than it was a while ago. Why? Simply because gold that was always there previously has been brought to light. In the same way by the operation of this Bill, the hidden wealth of that territory will be still further brought to light, and brought to light at the expense of the company. Value will be given to it at the expense of the company and the Government, for every gold area which that company discovers, will have an area alongside of it three miles square, on which it can settle down, with which it can do, if it chooses, what any individual miner can do, mine it on its own account—though I do not recommend that, or, according to a suggestion which has been made, which may not be so objectionable as most people would consider it, can pay with the values thus developed our national debt.

Mr. DAVIN. Does my hon. friend not know that that argument is precisely the one that was used for giving land in the North-west Territories, namely, that the railway would go in, and that it would enhance the value of the land, that it would have an interest in settling this new land and thereby increase the value to the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, but at the expense of the settlers.

Mr. DAVIN. This will be at the expense of the miners.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly what I thought the hon. gentleman would say. It is at the expense of Mackenzie & Mann, is it not? Are they not the miners at whose expense this work of development will be done? My hon. friend surely will not shake his head at that. Yes, I do say that this is going to be exactly as it was with reference to those railway lands. These lands are going to be developed and made valuable at a tremendous expense which nobody that I know of is willing to undertake now, except Mackenzie & Mann.

There were one or two other subjects with which I intended to deal, but in the many practical speeches delivered on the subject it has been so thoroughly threshed out, especially in the masterly address made by the Minister of the Interior and the speech delivered by the Minister of Agriculture, who explained thoroughly the working of the provisions as to the alternate system of blocks, that there is nothing left for me to add, even if I were capable of following in the steps of those hon. gentlemen who understand the matter so thoroughly and who presented it so fully and clearly to the House. I think the bonanza which the contractors are to receive may

be very extravagantly overrated. Everything depends, as regards the result of this contract, upon the amount that can be realized from operating and developing the areas of lands obtained by the contractors. It is very easy to overrate that value. Any person who will visit the gold districts in the province from which I come will find there on a small scale a condition which it is entirely possible may happen here on a large scale to the contractors, Mackenzie & Mann. Every one knows something with respect to these speculative fevers which come over the financial world, like the South Sea Bubble, and schemes of that kind, which are liable to be entirely exploded in twelve or eighteen months, within which time the public mind is disillusioned. Let us conceive it possible that instead of Mackenzie & Mann becoming responsible and taking the risk of this Yukon undertaking, the Government had entered upon the work and built the railway at an expenditure of three or four million dollars—I do not know what the expenditure will be, but even this expenditure in my opinion may be enormously under-estimated, as in the case of a man building a house the total expenditure of which is estimated at \$4,000, but the cost when finished reaches \$6,000. It may very well occur, owing to the serious difficulties to be overcome and the fact that nearly every man going there to work on the railway will find something more attractive or will go into speculating on his own account, that enormously high wages will have to be paid and the work will be prosecuted amid constant strikes. When all these circumstances and conditions are taken into account, it would be altogether likely that the Government would find, as Mackenzie & Mann may before they complete the contract, that they themselves will be in a situation on a large scale similar to that which I have seen in various places in Nova Scotia on a smaller scale. In my province men have gone into districts where there were supposed to be enormously rich deposits, they have sunk shafts and erected large crushing mills with many stamps, and after running for some time the bottom has tumbled out of the whole enterprise, and a large and valueless property has been left on their hands, for which no return can be obtained in any market. Is it not possible that these contractors may meet with an experience on a large scale such as miners in my province have sometimes met with on a small scale, and may have a large and unproductive property on their hands? It is very much, as described by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, a gamble, in which Mackenzie & Mann are bound to meet the loss, if there is any, and if a gain results, the Government cannot fail to reap the benefit of it.

Mr. McINERNEY. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to intervene in the discussion at this stage or at this time, but as no hon. member seems disposed to go

on at present I will undertake to say what I have to say on this important subject now. I have said "on this important subject," because I am bold to state that I do not believe this Parliament will have under discussion and for deliberation any subject of greater importance than the one now under consideration. I may be permitted right here to congratulate the Government in one sense upon the introduction of this measure. It is not a new scheme when one is desirous of having his past record forgotten to try and obscure his surrounding by a grand boom; and this Government, anxious to destroy its record, and anxious to have its record forgotten on the free trade question, anxious to have its unfulfilled promises and broken pledges wiped out entirely from the minds of the electors, anxious to have the pledges that it made to the French people of the province of Quebec on the Manitoba school question forgotten, anxious to have that erased from the minds of the people of that great province and from the minds of the people of the Dominion of Canada—this Government has endeavoured in this matter to drag a red herring across the track and to seek escape in this way from all their broken pledges and unfulfilled promises. The line I intend to follow in the remarks I have to offer on this subject will be first to endeavour to discuss the speeches that have been made by hon. members on the other side who have preceded me, and some very important and very able and eloquent speeches have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have received a large amount of instruction, some amusement and considerable pleasure from the remarks which have fallen from those hon. gentlemen. But I was somewhat surprised, I must admit, at the speech we have just heard from the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell). I had always understood, and the reputation that gentleman enjoys in the provinces down by the sea justified the conclusion I had held, that the hon. member for Halifax was a very distinguished lawyer in his own province, and I had hoped he would have given us some ground for that distinction in the speech he would deliver on the constitutional phase of the question now before the House. I understand the hon. gentleman is a professor of law in Dalhousie University; but it is the first time I ever knew a professor of law not to have an opinion on any question. Practising lawyers will sometimes tell you that they do not care about giving an opinion on every question asked them, but professors of law have always an opinion ready at hand on any legal question you may put to them; and I am free to say, while I never had the pleasure of sitting at the feet of the Gamaliel of Dalhousie University, those of us who have had the pleasure of listening to the Washburns, the Fosters, the Thomases, the Paynes in the

Mr. McINERNEY.

great universities of the United States have always found them ready and willing to advance an opinion upon any question that might be asked. I am surprised, therefore, that the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Russell) has not ventured to give us an opinion upon the question that was asked him from this side of the House. He was asked the plain question: "Do you believe that the treaty of 1871, entered into between the United States and England, curtailed in any degree the rights that England had as to the navigation of the rivers flowing into the Pacific Ocean, as against the rights that England had in these same rivers under the treaty of 1895?" The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) was not prepared to give an opinion upon that question, in contradistinction to the Minister of the Interior the other night, who very innocently, it seemed to me, gave away the whole position. When the hon. member from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked the Minister (Mr. Sifton) the same question that was put to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) to-night, the Minister of the Interior, a responsible member of this Government, made the strange admission that the treaty of 1871 curtailed the rights that England had under the treaty of 1825. If that had come from an irresponsible member of this House—I mean by that a man who has not the responsibility of governing the country directly as a member of the Ministry has—it might be excused; but at this critical moment, at this crucial time, for a member of the Administration, and an important member of it such as the Minister of the Interior is, to make such an admission as that, is to my mind very unfortunate, to say the least of it.

In taking up the discussion of the question to which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) directed his attention particularly, it will be wise in order to a proper and clear understanding, that the treaties should be in our hands. But, before I go into a discussion of that part of the subject I wish to call attention to an inconsistent statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell). In one part of his speech he said: "I am of the opinion that our rights to the navigation of the Stikine still remain in force, and can be insisted upon," and right afterwards he made use of these words: "The reckless abandonment of our rights by Sir John Macdonald in the treaty of 1871 is to be regretted." I ask my hon. friend how, if in his opinion our rights to the navigation of the Stikine still exist, and can be insisted upon, how he can blame Sir John Macdonald for the reckless abandonment of our rights in that same treaty? If our rights remain, how could they have been abandoned; if our rights to the free navigation of the Stikine under the treaty of 1871 still remain (and that is the opinion

of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell), then how can he blame Sir John Macdonald for giving those rights away? The inconsistent position of my hon. friend arises from this fact: he is anxious to make a case against the Conservative party; Sir John Macdonald was the respected leader of the Conservative party for many years, and so, on the one hand, my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) will argue that Sir John Macdonald, by the treaty of 1871, abandoned Canadian and British rights; while at the same time he (Mr. Russell) is driven to this strange inconsistency, that to support the position his Government must take on this question, he must hold that all the rights that England ever had upon these rivers with regard to navigation still exist. That is a strange inconsistency in the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Russell).

Now, to the proper understanding of the rights that England and Canada possessed in the Stikine and other rivers, of what was formerly known as Alaska, I have in my hand the different paragraphs of the treaties of 1825, the treaties of 1856 and 1859, and the treaty of 1871. The third paragraph of the treaty of 1825 entered into on the 28th February of that year, devotes itself entirely to explain the line of demarcation between the two countries, between Russian America, the possessions that Russia had on the north-western coast of America; and the possessions that England had in that vicinity. I must say, that so far the paragraph has not been read in full, and I think it should be on record.

Line of demarcation, commencing at southernmost point of the island, called Prince of Wales Island, which point lies in the parallel of 54° 40' N. latitude and between the 131st and 133rd degrees of W. longitude (Greenwich). The said line shall ascend to the north along the channel called Portland Channel as far as the point of the continent where it strikes the 56th degree N. latitude; from this last mentioned point, the line of demarcation shall follow the summit of the mountains situated parallel to the coast as far as the point of intersection of the 141st degree W. longitude (same meridian), and finally, from the said point of intersection the said meridian line, 141st degree, in its prolongation as far as the frozen ocean shall form the limits between the Russian and British possessions on the continent of America to the north-west.

The next paragraph, 4, is:

4. Island called Prince of Wales shall belong wholly to Russia.

2nd. That whenever the summit of the mountains which extend in a direction parallel to the coast, from 56th degrees N. latitude to the point of intersection of 141st degree shall prove to be at a distance of more than ten marine leagues from the ocean, the limit between British possessions and the line of coast which is to belong to Russia as aforesaid, shall be formed by a line parallel to the windings of the coast and which shall never exceed the distance of ten marine leagues therefrom.

Paragraph 6, which is very important, is:

6. It is understood that the subjects of His Britannic Majesty from whatever quarter they may arrive, whether from the ocean or from the interior of the continent, shall for ever enjoy the right of navigating freely, and without any hindrance whatever, all the rivers and streams which in their course towards the Pacific Ocean may cross the line of demarcation upon the line of coast described in article 3 of the present convention.

And, Sir, I make bold to give this interpretation of that clause: that the rivers that are included within the clause are the rivers that flow towards the coast, between meridian 141 and the lower point of the island mentioned as belonging to Russia. It is perhaps not wise for one to interpret matters of this kind and to make an admission that may be against national interests, but I do not think that in this case the admission will, because on other grounds we have the right that my admission in this instance might give away. I do not believe that article 6 of the treaty of 1825 gave us the right in itself to the navigation of the Yukon or the Porcupine rivers. Why? Because the Yukon River and the Porcupine River crossed the line of demarcation from the starting point of meridian 141 to the frozen ocean, more than half way between the Pacific and the Arctic Sea. But it does not cross the line of demarcation towards the coast; and the Porcupine, flowing from the water-shed of the Mackenzie in a south-westerly direction towards the Yukon, enters it after it passes the line of demarcation known as meridian 141. I wish to call attention to paragraph 9 of the treaty of 1825, because I think it is important, by which the liberty of commerce is restricted:

Liberty of commerce shall not apply to trade in spirituous liquors, firearms or other arms, gunpowder, or other stores.

So that, in the provisions of that treaty, liberty of commerce is restricted with regard to these articles. Now, Sir, I will place side by side with the paragraph of the treaty of 1825, which I have read, paragraph 26 of the treaty of 1871: and right here I want to make the statement that it seemed to me to be the height of the ridiculous that a young member of this Administration, a young man from the wild and woolly west, as he said himself, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), should undertake to charge with ignorance and negligence the men who were engaged in the drawing up of the treaty of 1871—Earl Gray, the Earl of Ripon, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir Edward Thornton and Sir John Macdonald, men whose names have become historic. This hon. gentleman undertook to charge against their memory that they were negligent of the interests of their country, and surrendered the interests of England and the rights of Canada in that treaty.

Mr. DAVIN. He said they had not read the treaty.

Mr. McINERNEY. Paragraph 26 of the treaty of 1871 is as follows :—

The St. Lawrence River ascending and descending, from the 45th parallel north latitude, where it ceases to form the boundary between the two countries, shall for ever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of Great Britain or of the Dominion of Canada not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation. The navigation of the rivers Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine, ascending and descending, from, to and into the sea, shall for ever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty and to the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of either country within its own territory not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

Sir, I make this statement, that the treaty of 1871 gives us much larger rights on the rivers of Alaska than the treaty of 1825. It clears away, at least, any doubt that ever existed as to our rights on the Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine rivers previous to 1871, and that was the object of mentioning these rivers. These were the important rivers of the country. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) was asked by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) to name one other river that flowed across the line of demarcation along the coast from British territory into United States territory, and he was unable to do so. The map is here, and on looking at it I find rivulets and small streams flowing there; but up to the present time I have not been able to obtain any information that would lead me to the conclusion that any other river of any importance flows across the line of demarcation between the two countries. The Stikine River was the important river on the coast; therefore, if there was any doubt as to England, or Canada, having the right to navigate the Stikine River, that doubt was removed when the treaty of 1871 expressly stated that England and Canada should have the right to navigate that river, as well as the Yukon and the Porcupine. So I take this position, and I recommend it to the members of the Government, in opposition to the position of the hon. Minister of the Interior—that our rights on the Stikine River have not been curtailed by the treaty of 1871. I believe the members of the Government will take, and have already taken, that position, and I here challenge any of those hon. gentlemen to get up in this House from this time forward and repeat the words of the hon. Minister of the Interior. I challenge any one of them to make the admission that our rights in regard to the navigation of the Stikine River have been curtailed by the treaty of 1871. They will not do it; there is not a member of the Administration who will do it, and I believe in my heart that

Mr. McINERNEY.

the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) is not honestly of that opinion.

Mr. RUSSELL. What opinion do you mean?

Mr. McINERNEY. I mean that any of our rights with regard to the navigation of the Stikine River were not curtailed by the treaty of 1871.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would like to ask my hon. friend: Suppose Peter Martin had not been landed on the coast of what is now Alaska, from the Stikine River, whether, if it had not been for the Treaty of Washington, of 1871—

Mr. McINERNEY. My hon. friend has a peculiar way of answering a question. They say it is an Irish way of answering a question, to ask another. I have asked my hon. friend a question, and he turns round to ask me another one.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will answer. I say, without any hesitation at all, that my impression at least—I submit it with all modesty—is, that if the Home authorities had been acting independently of the treaty of 1871, and if it had not been for the accidental circumstance of Peter Martin being landed, instead of being carried down the Stikine River, they would not have recommended his surrender to the American authorities, because they would have claimed that they had a perfect right to navigate the Stikine River through American territory, and that the prisoner would not have become a free man by reason of going over American territory. But since the treaty of 1871, the right of navigation on that river was curtailed to purely commercial purposes, and consequently they were obliged to surrender the prisoner. That is my impression, which I give with all modesty.

Mr. McINERNEY. My hon. friend had, of course, previously expressed the opinion that our rights were curtailed; but I claim that there is no member of the Administration who will take that view with him hereafter. I think it is an unpatriotic and a foolish position for the Government to assume in the face of the enemy on an important question of this kind, to admit before the struggle begins, that any of their rights have been taken away.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not admit that they had been taken away. I said that the Home authorities admitted that they had been taken away.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not deny that there are certain rights which, I believe, we never possessed on those rivers. There was no doubt at all about that. The treaty itself limits some of them by stating distinctly what some of those are. We never had the right of going over the Stikine or Yukon or any of those rivers with an armed force.

Mr. RUSSELL. Have we the right to bring a prisoner down and try him ?

Mr. McINERNEY. Does my hon. friend believe we had the right of taking an armed force up those rivers before the treaty of Washington ?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is not the question. It is not the question of taking an armed force which I put to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman evades my question, although it is a simple one to answer. When he does get on his feet to answer a question I put him, I would like to have an answer to that and not have him evade it by putting another.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was asking a question.

Mr. McINERNEY. The treaty of 1825 was of course abrogated by the Crimean War, but the treaty of 1856—the treaty of Paris—renewed, at least, by implication, the terms and conditions of the treaty of 1825. However, the treaty of St. Petersburg, passed on the 12th of January, 1859, between Great Britain and Russia, renewed in article 19 fully and specifically all the rights held under the treaty of 1825 :

In regard to rivers, the navigation in the Russian possessions on the north-west coast of America, the convention concluded at St. Petersburg on the 16th February, 1825, will continue in force.

So that every right which we had under the treaty of 1825 was renewed by the treaty of St. Petersburg of 1859.

Now, I shall depart from that great question, which, after all, has become, in the latter part of the debate, of considerable importance, and proceed to make a few remarks upon some of the speeches made by prominent members of the other side. And the first gentleman that I shall speak of is the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). That hon. gentleman, in reply to a question from the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), said that the latter could not have read the regulation governing free mining in the Yukon, or he would have known that it was not necessary for a miner to go to a record office to get his claim recorded, but that any five miners could hold a miner's meeting, name a recorder, and have their claims recorded on the spot. The hon. gentleman stopped there, leaving the inference to be drawn that that could be done in any part of the territory. But that is not the case, because regulation 23 provides :

In the event of the claim being more than a hundred miles from a recorder's office, and situated where other claims are being located, the free miners, not less than five in number, are authorized to meet and appoint one of their number a 'free miners' recorder,' who shall act in that capacity until a mining recorder is appointed by the Gold Commissioner.

What is there to prevent Mackenzie & Mann from rendering that clause in the mining regulations entirely useless. You can place ten recording offices in the Yukon territory, and there will not be one of them which cannot be reached within a hundred miles from any claim ; and these contractors will see to it, I apprehend, that this Government will have recorders placed at such positions, that every free miner shall be within 100 miles from a recorder's office. In that way, while a free miner is wending his way on foot to record his claim at a recorder's office, perhaps nearly a hundred miles distant, these contractors, with superior facilities for travel, will have one of their agents cover the distance in half the time and get at the office and have the claim recorded before the free miner can possibly get there or know anything about it.

I began to think that the hon. Minister of Agriculture might be well fitted for the office when he began to talk about navigating and navigation laws. Why, for an hon. gentleman in this House to stand up and say that flat bottom barges, such as you can tow up the Stikine River—which at times during the summer season has a depth of not more than 26 inches, I am informed—when the hon. gentleman says that flat bottom barges which can be towed up a river of that description, can be towed from Vancouver or Victoria with perfect safety any time of the year—999 days out of a 1,000 some one behind him interpolated—

Mr. DOMVILLE. He never said that.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. Minister, if here, will not deny it, and I do know that the hon. gentleman who interrupts me was here when the Minister made the statement to which I refer.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I say in contradiction to my hon. friend on the other side, that what the hon. Minister said, was that it could be towed from Fort Simpson up to Wrangel.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman is mistaken because I took down the words of the Minister of Agriculture. What he said was this :

Flat boats and whalebacks can be towed from Victoria or Vancouver to Glenora without any transshipment at Wrangel.

These are the words of the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Not 999 days out of a 1,000.

Mr. McINERNEY. Somebody on that side said that. I think it was the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He said it could be done at certain seasons.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville), who knows what a

ship is and what the sea is, knows that that is a perfectly absurd statement. Any man whoever saw the sea or a ship, knows that statement is perfectly absurd. Why, to tell anyone engaged in commerce on the Atlantic Coast that they could tow a barge, drawing not more than 26 inches of water, from Pictou or Summerside or Charlottetown up through the Gulf of St. Lawrence into the St. Lawrence River, would be to cover yourself with ridicule. Well, there is not so great a distance between the most northern part of Prince Edward Island and the most southern part of Newfoundland as there is between Graham Island and Moresby Island and Vancouver. By this scale and on this map, I should say that the width of the sea between the most northern point of Vancouver and the most southern point of Moresby Island is about 150 miles, and the width of the sea at Dixon's Entrance, between the Prince of Wales Island and Graham Island, is about sixty miles. Nobody would deny that the distance between the most southern point of Newfoundland and the most northern point of Prince Edward Island is not as great as between Moresby Island and Vancouver. And there is no part of the Atlantic Ocean where the seas sweep with greater force than they do in that district. Any navigator of the Atlantic Ocean would simply laugh to scorn any man and would say he might make a fit Minister of Agriculture, who would dare to suggest to him that he should tow barges drawing 26 inches of water from Pictou or Summerside or Charlottetown to the Gulf of St. Lawrence and to the River St. Lawrence. I am informed that the Pacific Ocean, at that particular spot, is just as bad as the Atlantic. It is a wilder sea. It has been named the "Grave-yard of the Pacific," I know not for what reason. But along the outer coast of Graham Island and Moresby Island. I am told is the graveyard of the Pacific. One of the worst places to cross in the whole Pacific is Dixon's Entrance, which is only 60 miles wide. It would have to be crossed by these barges from Vancouver and Victoria on their way to Wrangel or Glenora.

There was one other statement worthy of mention—and only one other to my mind—made by the Minister of Agriculture. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) with keen criticism had shown that these contractors, under this contract, could get 24 miles along a fine mineral bearing stream. The Minister of Agriculture came down with a suggestion that he said had been proposed by the Government and agreed to by Mr. Mackenzie, that of the added blocks on either side, the alternate blocks should go to the Government. And so we have two amendments to this wonderful Bill before it has even got into committee. Under the criticism of the leader of the Opposition the Government have agreed that the contract shall be hedged about with such security that only British

Mr. McINERNEY.

subjects shall remain in control of the monopoly. That is the first amendment. In the next place, in the case of the three blocks added on either side of a chosen block, the Government is to be allowed the alternate sections, just as in other cases.

Now I wish for a few moments to turn my attention to the speech which has been generally regarded as the strongest speech from the Government standpoint—that made by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). When that speech was concluded one would have thought from the exultant looks on the faces of hon. members opposite, that the Government would rest its case there; and I am free to infer that that is what they intended to do. But from the renewed attack that was made upon their Bill, which is vulnerable at every point, they were forced to put up since that time three different members to defend it. The speech of the hon. Minister of the Interior was remarkable in some respects. It would have been strange if the Minister to whose department this matter particularly belongs had not made himself acquainted with the conditions of the Yukon district, and if he should not have found out more than other men who have only the ordinary avenues of information could possibly know on subjects relating to that district and this contract. He spoke for four hours and twenty-five minutes by the clock, and he devoted four hours to defending propositions that had not been attacked and twenty-five minutes to the Bill itself. He said that it was urgent that the contract should be made. Nobody has contended that there was not great urgency. He claimed also that the route was the best that could be chosen, a point that had not been very much questioned. And for four hours he devoted himself valiantly to defending positions that had not been seriously attacked; but in defence of the contract itself he only spent twenty-five minutes. As to the matter of urgency, I think that, even with all the time he took to defend it, he left it still open to attack. He told us that Mr. Ogilvie's report, received at the close of last session, had given some small and vague idea of the value of the gold finds in that country and had foreshadowed an influx of people into it. Now, Sir, I have here the report of Mr. Ogilvie issued in 1897, a report that came into the hands of this Government shortly after we left here last session—at least it was put into my hands shortly after the close of the session, and it is dated 1897. I lost the copy I had received, and I thought when I came to Ottawa to obtain another. I went to the distribution office and was told that there was none there, and was referred to the Department of the Interior. I went there but there was not a copy left. I have here a copy which I got from the library, the only place in Ottawa where you can get a copy of this wonderful report issued in 1897. A peculiar thing is, that in

this book of 1897 every report from the Yukon is dated, whereas in the report which is put into our hands to-day there is not a date, and one is apt to infer that it is this report of Mr. Ogilvie upon which the Government is acting, issued in 1898 and received shortly before we came to Ottawa, and the report of 1897 is entirely ignored. Interlarded in this report of 1898 you will find views that were taken in 1898, and they are opposite text that relates to 1896, misleading and intended to mislead members of the House and the country into the belief that the information as to the vast gold-bearing areas of the Klondike and the Yukon district was only received from Mr. Ogilvie in 1898, when, as a matter of fact, the report which is like this in almost every particular was received in 1897, and I have a copy of it here.

Mr. DAVIN. The Minister of the Interior says that he gave one to the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) last session, and I got one in July.

Mr. McINERNEY. What does Mr. Ogilvie say in the report received twenty months ago about the richness of that country. From page 39 to the end at page 62, almost every line is taken up with expressions regarding the richness of every part of that country. At page 39, he says :

It is probable that we have not less than 1,400 miles of stream in our part of the district, on all of which gold can be found.

Then he refers to the Teslinto River :

Between it and Big Salmon River six other locations were met with. One of them, named Cassiar Bar, was worked in the season of 1896, by a party of four, who took out \$6,000 in thirty days. They were working there when I passed in 1887, but stated that all they could get that season was \$10 per day, and that it was then (3rd August) about worked out.

Then again, at page 40 :

I have heard the amount of gold taken off Stewart River in 1885 and 1886 estimated at various amounts. One estimate was \$300,000.

On page 41, he says :

Big and Little Salmon rivers have also been prospected, with the usual result, that more or less gold has been found everywhere. I think it may with confidence be asserted that rich finds will yet be made of both coarse gold and gold-bearing quartz. It is not likely in the nature of things that such a vast extent of country should have all its fine gold deposited as sediment, brought from a distance in past ages of the world's development. If this is not the case, the matrix from which all the gold, from these streams has come, must still exist, in part at least, and will, no doubt, be discovered, and thus enrich this otherwise gloomy and desolate region.

At page 43 :

Stewart River was pretty well worked for two seasons, 1885-86, by about forty men, some of whom made at least \$5,000. Assuming that they averaged half that amount, we have \$100,000 of

their earnings. The statement made by those of whom I inquired was that all who worked on the river for any length of time made a grub stake. Putting this at the lowest value I placed on it, \$450, and assuming that 250 men made each this sum, we have \$112,500 as the amount taken out on this stream. I have heard the sum placed at \$130,000.

Then, a later report from Mr. Ogilvie, dated 4th September, 1895, says :

Coarse gold and excellent prospects have been found on the Hootalinqua and Teslin, and there will likely be a rush there next spring. I will report more fully on that in the future.

Here, on the 4th of September, 1895, Mr. Ogilvie reports that gold has been found as far down as the Hootalinqua, and found in paying quantities, and that there will be a rush there next spring. At page 51 he speaks of Miller Creek and Forty Mile :

These are two of the richest creeks yet found on the Yukon, and are both tributaries of Sixty-mile River. Both creeks are fully located and worked, each claim being 500 feet along the creek and the width of the valley or creek bed. There are nearly 100 claims, all of which pay well. One on Miller Creek, I understand, will yield \$75,000 to \$80,000 this season, and the owner will net, it is said, between \$40,000 and \$50,000.

On page 53 :

I am thoroughly convinced that the road from the coast to some point on the head waters of the river, preferably by the Taku—

And I call attention to this, that Mr. Ogilvie did not think the Stikine was the best route.

—preferably by the Taku, if at all practicable, would convert all our part of the river into a hive of industry.

In 1896 they had his report on that subject. Further on, he says :

I am very much pleased to be able to inform you that a most important discovery of gold has been made on a creek called Bonanza Creek, an affluent of the river known here as the Klondike.

That was written on the 6th September, 1896.

News has just arrived from Bonanza Creek that three men worked out \$75 in four hours the other day, and a \$12 nugget has been found, which assures the character of the ground, namely, coarse gold, and plenty of it, as three times this can be done with sluice boxes. You can fancy the excitement here. It is claimed that from \$100 to \$500 per day can be made off the ground that has been prospected so far. As we have about 100 claims on Glacier and Miller creeks, with 300 or 400 in this vicinity, next year it is imperative that men be sent in here to look after these claims. * * * I cannot here enter into reasons for it, but I unhesitatingly make the assertion that this corner of our territory from the coast strip down, and from the 141st meridian eastward, will be found to be a fairly rich and very extensive mining region.

Then he speaks of another creek, where he says :

On the same creek two men rocked out \$75 in about four hours, and it is asserted that two

men in the same creek took out \$4,000 in two days with only two lengths of sluice boxes. They were new comers, and had not done much in the country, so the probabilities are that they got it on Bonanza Creek.

One man showed me \$22.75 he took out in a few hours on Hunker Creek with a gold pan, prospecting his claim on the surface, taking a handful here and there as fancy suggested. The Indians have reported another creek, but farther up, which they call Too-much-gold Creek.

He says at page 58 :

In the line of these finds farther south is the Cassiar gold fields in British Columbia ; so the presumption is that we have in our territory along the easterly watershed of the Yukon, a gold-bearing belt of infinite width, and upwards of 300 miles long, exclusive of the British Columbia part of it.

He says this in a report dated in 1896. I am laying particular stress upon this, because I want to show that the Government had knowledge of the riches of that country long before they intimated to us that they knew that it would be urgent upon them to get some line of communication into it, as Mr. Ogilvie himself suggested over two years ago. He goes on to say :

Before closing, I may say that every report that comes in from Bonanza Creek is more encouraging than the last. Prospecting has only begun, and up to date of mailing, November 22, very rich prospects have been found on the few claims prospected on ; from \$1 to the pan of dirt up to \$12 are reported, and no bed rock found yet. This means from \$1,000 to \$12,000 per day per man sluicing.

On the 9th of December, 1896, he says :

Of course, that may be an exceptionally rich pan, but \$5 to \$7 per pan is the average on that claim, it is reported, with five feet of pay dirt, and the width yet undetermined, but it is known to be thirty feet even at that. Figure the result at nine to ten pans to the cubic foot, and 500 feet long ; nearly \$4,000,000 at \$5 per pan—one-fourth of this would be enormous.

On the 22nd of January, 1897 :

A quartz lode showing free gold in paying quantities has been located on one of the creeks, but I cannot yet send particulars. I am confident from the nature of the gold found in the creeks that many more of them, and rich, too, will be found.

On the 23rd of January, from Cudahy, he reports :

I have just heard from a reliable source that the quartz mentioned above is rich as tested—over \$100 to the ton. The lode appears to run from three to eight feet in thickness, and is about nineteen miles from the Yukon River. I will likely be called on to survey it, and will be able to report fully.

Now, Sir, from all this I think it is fair to assume that in 1897 this Government was perfectly well acquainted with the fact that there was an enormous find of gold in the Yukon country, and that greater finds would likely take place in the near future, and it was important that they should have

Mr. McINERNEY.

set themselves to work at once. My hon. friend from Assinibola (Mr. Davin) tells me that this report was in the hands of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), a supporter of the Government, during the session of 1897. I got it later on in the summer. Now, when the Government had this report in their hands at that time—and we do not know how long before—they come down now, in January, 1898, and say that they only found out a few weeks before the House met that there was an urgent necessity to build this road, and therefore they let the contract without tenders. I say that the Government is in a peculiar position in regard to that part of the case. Then, the Minister of the Interior made this peculiar admission. He said : How could I take Mr. Ogilvie's report at its face ? or words to that effect. How could Mr. Ogilvie, iced up in that northern country, know that there was going to be a rush of people in there in 1897-98 ? Well, the fact is, that Mr. Ogilvie did know : iced up there, as he was, thousands of miles from here, Mr. Ogilvie did know, and the Minister of the Interior, sitting in his office in Ottawa, did not know. The forecast of Mr. Ogilvie was proved by results to be substantially correct ; he knew what he was talking about, and the Minister of the Interior did not know his duty in that particular.

The Minister of the Interior proceeded, at a later part of his speech, to take the leader of the Opposition to task because he tried to point out to the Government some of the International difficulties in respect to the navigation of the Stikine that might confront them. The hon. Minister said that such a speech as that brought calamitous wars between nations. What is the conduct of this Government ? They have entered into a contract to build a railway, on Canadian territory it is true, the approach to which, however, is reached through American territory, and reached by a river the navigation of which is surrounded by a considerable amount of international difficulty ; and they have entered into that contract in such haste that they have not taken time to have a conference with the authorities at Washington to learn if some arrangement might not be arrived at by which all difficulties might be swept away. I rather think such conduct on the part of the Government is the conduct that courts international difficulties, and such speeches as that delivered by the leader of the Opposition are speeches that should warn the Government to avert such difficulties.

The Minister of the Interior made another strange, a miserable admission, I think, when he said that we could not have got into that country if the United States had not given us permission to send in the mounted police. That is a strange admission to come from a Minister of the Crown. Mr. Ogilvie's book is full of in-

formation regarding men who have gone from Edmonton, and who solitary and alone, have lived for over a year on the Mackenzie River, away from civilization. That country cannot be such a terrible country to live in or travel through as some hon. gentlemen try to make out it is. Then the hon. Minister, in defence of this measure, said that no Bill had been brought down by any Government since 1878 in which the railway rates had been specified. I know of no Bill—I may be wrong, but I make the statement—brought down since 1878 which has not been subject to the railway law of the country; but this Bill is particularly and specifically exempted from the action of the railway law by its provisions. There is a vast difference between Acts introduced since 1878, and which at the present time are subject to the railway law of the country, and a Bill like that now brought down which is rendered exempt and placed outside of the power of the railway law.

The hon. Minister then proceeded to devote considerable attention to the various routes to the Yukon country. I am not here to-night to advocate any particular route. I hold no brief in favour of any particular route to that country; but I must say this, that it has not been made plain to me by any evidence the Government have offered that such is the fact, and I think the burden of proof rests on them to show that the Stikine route is the best route into that country. I am not here to prove that any other route is better than that by Stikine River, but I hold it to be the duty of the Government, when the Stikine route is that chosen for their measure, to show that it is the best route that can be chosen. There are various routes; that by the Yukon River, which flows into Behring Sea; that by Dyea over the Chilkat Pass; that from Dyea through Chilkoot Pass to Lake Bennett; that from Skagway via White Pass; then the route from Takou Inlet to Teslin Lake; and the route by Stikine River. There are the further routes by Port Simpson and the Edmonton route, which have not received very much discussion and attention up to this time in the debate. I am not going to state here to-night that the Stikine River route is not as good as any of the others, nor argue that any of the others are better than that by the Stikine; but if we take up the report placed in our hands from the engineer of the department, Mr. Jennings, and the other report by Mr. St. Cyr in connection with it, because he went from Teslin Lake down the Hootalinqua to ascertain what the navigation was on that part of the route the Government had chosen, the facts will appear. Mr. Jennings made his report on the route from Telegraph Creek and the Stikine. It has been shown by the leader of the Opposition—although it has been stated that he

has some interest in the Stikine River route, the hon. gentleman has denied the statement most absolutely, and has stated that he has no interest in any part of this scheme, and this is admitted by the Minister of Railways, and no responsible person has made any such charge without having to take it back—that according to Mr. Jennings's report there are many difficulties in connection with the navigation of the Stikine River. At page 8 of Mr. Jennings's report it is stated:

At times the river is too low for speed with a reasonable cargo, or, the stream may be very high and the riffles difficult to make headway against, with the additional danger of drift trees or snags getting foul of the steering gear or wheel. The latter danger is most to be feared where the channel is contracted, such as in Little and Klootchman's cañons, where, if any mishap occurred to the vessel's machinery, she would at once be carried against the rugged rock walls by the swift swirling, disturbed waters, and sunk by having her planking either torn out or stove in. The distance of 96 miles between Wrangel and Little Cañon can be made by a powerful steamer in one day, whereas by reason of the swift and difficult water above it takes two days more to reach Telegraph Creek, a further distance of only 54 miles or 150 miles from the sea; therefore, with these facts before one, it seems reasonable that on a route where safe and speedy transit is contemplated it is advisable to commence the railway section well down the valley at a point to be determined on below the Little Cañon, and on the left bank of the river, 96 miles from the sea.

I shall later call attention to the length, distance and probable cost of building the road as laid down in Mr. Jennings's report. The Minister of the Interior proceeded to say that everybody who knew anything about the country was aware that the Stikine is the best route and is in favour of it. If that is so, I want to make this one observation, and it is a pointed one in this respect: why was it that every contractor who tendered to build the road wanted it built by some other route? Did they know nothing about the Stikine and about the country generally? Why was it the Government took the credit for forcing the present contractors to build by the Stikine route, and not allow any other contractors who wanted the railway to go by some other route to make offers; and why did the Government bind them down to the Stikine route and to that alone? The hon. gentleman was not in a position to tell the House. He said he could give the House no positive information or opinion as to our rights of transshipment at Wrangel. Here is a Government bringing down to Parliament a measure of this importance, and after it has introduced it, forced to admit that they cannot tell us whether or not the citizens of this country have the rights to tranship their goods at Wrangel.

The Government make the boast that this is an all-Canadian route. I claim, Sir, that it is not an all-Canadian route. If it were

an all-Canadian route, that fact would be some defence for it, and I am free to admit here, that I, for one, will forego a great many advantages in favour of another route, in order to find a route into that country that will be all on Canadian soil or through Canadian waters. This route does not offer such advantage as that, because for twenty-two miles from the sea the territory that the Stikine River runs through is claimed by the United States, and international complications may arise, and I am sorry to say I believe they will arise, in this connection. Only the other day, a United States Senator placed a resolution upon the Table of Congress in favour of pressing Canada in that respect. There is no doubt that the game the United States authorities are seeking to play at the present time is, that now having got the Canadian Government into the position of having submitted a contract to Parliament which the Canadian Government is pledged to carry out, and on which its existence depends, the United States authorities say: The Canadian Government cannot carry out their contract if we put difficulties in the way with regard to the navigation of the Stikine River and the transshipment of goods there, and we will wrench them with that power which we possess, into giving us on the Atlantic seaboard concessions such as they never would have given us under any other conditions. The United States authorities will ask this Government, and I am afraid they will force this Government, into the position that the Government will have to concede certain rights on the Atlantic seaboard, rights belonging to the Canadians alone, such as the bonded privilege for fish passing from our country into the United States, and other privileges which they have been seeking for many years.

One of the defences for this contract presented by the Minister of the Interior was, that this was a difficult line of railroad to build, and that the material would cost a great deal to the contractors. When the answer was made on our side of the House, that that road would be laid with rails not more than twenty-eight pounds to the yard, the response came back from the benches opposite: That is not so; the rails will be at least 48, or 50, or 60 lbs. to the yard. However, at the very end of his speech, and when the Minister of the Interior had put up what his party followers thought was a strong defence of this contract, the Minister was forced to admit that for the present year the Government would allow the contractors to put in rails of only 28 pounds to the yard. He was asked the question: If that would not be looked upon as a completion of the contract, and he boldly answered, "No." But, Sir, that is a question of law as to whether such is a completion of the contract or not, and the opinion of the Department of Justice will have to be taken upon it. I may remark, that

Mr. McINERNEY.

there is considerable doubt in the minds of lawyers—just as good lawyers as the Minister of the Interior—that if the Government accept that road at the close of this year with 28 pound rails, it will be such an acceptance as will relieve the company from any forfeit.

I could not but be somewhat amused at the attitude assumed by the Minister of Railways, when he moved the second reading of this Bill, and his very different attitude when he moved the first reading. I have known the Minister of Railways for a great many years; it may be that there is no man in this House who is better acquainted with him than I am, and so the different positions he took upon these two occasions were rather amusing to me. On the first occasion, when he should have been calm, and courteous, and reserved, he was loud, and bolsterous, aggressive and contentious. He made a speech that at once called for attack and reply. He invited debate, and he got debate on that occasion. On the next occasion, when he was moving the second reading of the Bill, and when he should have been forcible and powerful, he was as mild as a cooing dove. He had learned his lesson. We have been told that several things took place between the first and the second readings of the Bill. We have been told that the Minister of Railways was about resigning his high and important position in the Government, and we have been told, and not without some show of reason, that a certain number of his amiable colleagues in that Government had made up their minds that the time had come when the Jonah should be thrown overboard. Why, Sir, it is a strange thing that a man who held power in the province of New Brunswick for over twelve years, a man who was able to obtain and to continue to retain the confidence of the people of that province, now, after he has been only fifteen months in the Government of Canada—it is a strange thing that, in order to bring ridicule and contempt upon the Administration of which he forms a part, you have only to mention his name in any audience in this country. And, Sir, the strange and unfortunate part of it is, that his defence comes rather from men who are opposed to him politically, and that his apparent friends sit by and see the knife put into him, and twist it after it is inserted. Now, Sir, I am not surprised at this. Any man who has studied the construction of governments in times past, any man who has turned his attention to the history of governments, knows, that when the right hon. the Prime Minister took into his Government men who looked upon themselves as demi-gods in their own provinces—that when these gentlemen came into office in this Government, they would seek to have their own sweet will, the same as they did when they were full masters down in their own petty pro-

vinces. Why, Sir, we have the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who holds down his seat with great weight, and, I think, is steady in the saddle. We have the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), whom I have already mentioned, and we have the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who, we have been told, on more than one occasion, has sulked, and sulked with considerable effect. We are told that he puts his propositions before the Government, asks them to be accepted, and if they are not accepted, he is prepared to walk out of the Government. All these rumours escape, notwithstanding the closed doors of the Privy Council, and we receive them, and they spread through the country.

Mr. DAVIN. There is Tarte.

Mr. McINERNEY. Mr. Tarte never occupied, as far as my knowledge goes, any responsible position in any government before he came into this one, and I do not think the Minister of Public Works has suffered in that regard. I believe that the Minister of Public Works sees to it pretty well—and, as a politician, I say it to his credit—that when he proposes a scheme, the majority in the Government are bound to see that it is carried out. I do not think the Minister of Public Works is going to get into any such position that he will be turned out of the Government by any faction in it.

After spending so much time—more than I intended—upon these preliminaries, I will now proceed to examine the contract which the Government have laid before us for our consideration. This is a contract under which Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann undertake to build a railroad about 150 miles in length from a point called Telegraph Creek on the Stikine River to Teslin Lake, and for which they are to receive as a consideration over 4,000,000 acres of mineral-bearing lands in the Yukon district.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Nearly 4,000,000 acres.

Mr. McINERNEY. I think over 4,000,000 acres, because I was going on to say that it will be plain that this railway will be 165 miles long, and will, therefore, take up 4,200,000 acres, and not 3,750,000. Mr. Jennings's report is that the railway from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake will be 165 miles in length, and if they build it further down, where he thinks it ought to be built, it will be 208 miles in length; but he says the distance from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake is 165 miles. I am going to calculate the consideration the contractors are to receive from Mr. Jennings's report and not from any declaration that is in the Bill itself, because the Bill does not limit them to a gift on 150 miles. It says 150 miles, more or less, which may run up to 200, or more, if necessary.

The standard of this wonderful road is to be the Kaslo and Slocan Railway, a mountain road, which I have heard from men who have gone over it is very dangerously built. I have nothing to say about it from personal knowledge, as I never was over it; but run-offs frequently occur upon it, and it is a very dangerous road, owing to the narrow gauge, the light rails, and the inferior way in which it is built, and the curvature and the grade are something extraordinary. And this is the standard that is laid down for the construction of this wonderful road of 165 miles. Now, we have been told that the report or the survey or the plans of the Kaslo and Slocan Railway are in the Railway Department. We have not seen them; I have not yet had my eye on them, and as I understand that road never received any grant from this Parliament, but is a provincial road, built by private enterprise, I do not know how the plans could be in the Department of Railways and Canals; and until they are produced here, I am going to assume that they are not there at all. The Minister of Railways has never said they were. He was rather surprised the other evening when the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) asked him whether they were not there, and he said: "I do not know that they are there at all." Here was the hon. Minister of Railways, having the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) affix his name to a contract for the construction of a railway the standard of which was the Kaslo and Slocan Railway, when he did not know himself what that standard was. Without any knowledge of those plans or of the curvature or grades of that road, or its general features or configuration at all, he entered into a contract to give this company 4,200,000 acres of land to build a railway on a standard of which he absolutely knew nothing, and admitted he knew nothing. The next clause of the contract provides that this railway when completed is to be owned by the contractors. There is nothing very strange about that, but the second part of the clause is a peculiar one:

Provided also, that the location of said railway between the points mentioned shall be such as the contractors may decide upon without filing plans thereof prior to completion, provided that the grant of land hereby contracted for shall not be made upon a larger mileage than the Minister of Railways considers reasonably necessary for traversing the distance between the terminal points.

The next clause provides that the Government shall submit this contract to Parliament and clothes the company with further and wonderful powers. It authorizes the company to extend this railway northward to Dawson City or thereabouts, and southward to a point in British Columbia to be designated by the Government. Then it charters them to build a railway from

the waters of Lynn Canal to Fort Selkirk or thereabouts by way of Chilkat Pass, and branches from any points on the company's railways to any property owned by the company, also lines of railway from any navigable waters to any property owned by the company. Here is an omnium gatherum; here is a drag-net that takes in every road that can be conceived of in that country. It specifies in the first place where this company is authorized to build further roads; it then goes on and gives them this peculiar power to construct a railway wherever they see fit from any part of their railway to any part of their property. It must be over Government land, part of it, because the Government will own the alternate blocks, and the company's land will not, I fancy, be all in one block. It gives them the further power to build and otherwise acquire and operate docks, wharfs, and lines of steamers and other vessels in connection with its railways and property, also telegraph and telephone lines, also to carry on mining and smelting operations, and such other powers as may be necessary for the due operating and conduct of all business connected with an incidental to the development of the lands.

For five years this company is to have a monopoly:

4. For five years from the first of September, 1898, no line of railway shall be authorized by Parliament to be constructed from Lynn Canal or thereabouts, or from any point at or near the international boundary between Canada and Alaska into the Yukon district, and for five years from said date no aid in land or money shall be granted to any person or company other than the contractors and the contractors' company to assist in building any such railway—

They are given a further monopoly, in that for ten years from the 1st of September no assistance in land or money shall be given to any other railway from the Stikine River to an ocean port in British Columbia. And then they are given with regard to tolls what I do not think was ever given to any company in this country before. It is admitted that the Governor in Council shall fix the tolls, but this company does not come under the railway law. After four years the tolls shall be reduced twenty-five per cent, and after seven years more they shall be further reduced twenty-five per cent, or after eleven years from the 1st of September, 1898, they shall be reduced in all fifty per cent.

That gives us an idea of what these tolls will be at the outset. If in ten years we are to reduce them by 50 per cent, they must be fairly large at the beginning. Some gentlemen ridicule some of the statements made with regard to these tolls. Some gentlemen have said that \$100 was an excessive price for going over that road. I am free to admit that I believe it is. I will be willing to admit that this company would

Mr. McINERNEY.

be in a fair way of making on each passenger over the road a profit of \$10 and out of each ton of freight a profit of \$10, and on that basis I think—although the calculation is made in another way—Mr. Jennings makes his report. If there are 50,000 people going into that country this year by that route—and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) estimates that there might be 250,000 people; he did not bind himself to any particular estimate—if there are 50,000 people going into that country by this road, then at \$10 profit per head, that will give a half million dollars profit on the passengers alone, and estimating the freight at 50,000 tons, that will give a profit of half a million dollars on the freight. This will give a million dollars clear profit on both, on that basis of calculation, for working the road for one year.

This company, in the next clause, is exempted from taxation, and I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to this matter. I do not believe knowing the Minister of Railways and Canals, as I do, that, as a lawyer, he gave his consent to that contract before it was signed by the gentlemen who signed it in his absence. It is a contractor's contract. The Minister of Railways, no matter what other men may say about him, is too good a lawyer to sign a contract like that and come down to Parliament freely and voluntarily and ask this Parliament to pass it. Here is the clause:

The land granted to the contractors or contractors' company hereunder shall be free from taxation for ten years from the granting thereof—except municipal taxation by an incorporated city, town or village within the Yukon provisional district.

Sir, it is exempt from taxation entirely, I take that view because I know that, with the tremendous monopoly of power this company will have in that district, I would like to see any part of it which will be erected into a municipal city, town or village so as to have these people taxed, if they do not wish to be taxed. It is only by an incorporated city, town or village that any municipal tax can be recovered from this company. No other tax of any kind can be gathered from it. And with all the power vested in this company, does any man say that they will not have power to prevent the incorporation of any village, town or other place, if they desire to do so. They will be free of all kinds of taxation, municipal as well as others, on all their lands in that vast territory.

Then they are to build a sleigh road, but they would have to do that anyhow, as has been shown in this debate.

Here is another provision which I do not believe the Minister of Railways ever had his eye on before the contract was signed. Here is the strangest provision in the whole contract:

The contractors or contractors' company shall provide, or arrange with others to provide, steamboat transport of freight and passengers between the terminus of said railway on Teslin Lake, or other terminus northerly thereof, and Dawson City to and fro.

What is the limit to that provision. There is none. They need not do that this year or next or in twenty years. They need not do it at all. There is no time mentioned in that clause or any part of that contract that binds this company, this year or any year, to provide steamboat transport of freight and passengers on the Hootalinqua, the Teslin or the Yukon down to Dawson City. I ask the hon. Minister of Railways now if he thinks that that is a provision which ought to be in that contract. I ask him as a lawyer, and as a lawyer who has a reputation in this country, if he would submit for the meanest client that gave him his rights to guard, such a contract as that. I do not believe he would. To say that the guardian of the rights of a whole nation would allow such a clause as that in that contract, under his hand and seal, is to cast an imputation upon the Minister of Railways and Canals and his ability that I am not prepared to cast upon him. I want to draw the attention of the Government to that because I think it is important that a time limit should be placed in that provision. Only to-night the argument was used that the building of that railway was not the only consideration these gentlemen should give the Government of the country, but that they were bound to build steamers to navigate Lake Teslin and the Hootalinqua River and the Yukon down to Dawson, to carry passengers and freight, that it would cost a lot to get material to build steamers and get engines and make the water courses from Teslin Lake down to Dawson City navigable. That has been held up to us as one of the great considerations of the contract, but the contractors are not bound to do that under the contract. There is no lawyer who would stand up and say that in the next twenty years they are bound to have those rivers navigable under that contract. There is not a man who will give this Bill a fair common sense reading and say they are bound to make those rivers navigable in 15 or 20 years. That is one of the most difficult parts of the contract they would have to carry out, if they were bound to do it. I have seen men who have been up and down the Hootalinqua and have talked to them. We meet in the hotels and on the streets men who have travelled in that country, and who have come back and who tell us the truth. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) gets a varnished tale, from some officer or man who wants to please him and carry out his purpose, but from these other men we hear the plain unvarnished truth, and they tell us that the Hootalinqua River is totally unnavigable. One man told me that he was aground in one part of it for two days in

a bark canoe. Imagine a man being aground in a canoe in a navigable river. He told me that he could not find a channel, that he could not find any deeper water than the place where he was aground. Mark Twain wrote something about piloting on a wonderful river, and it may be that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) got his information from that wonderful book. I would rather gather from his remarks that he has.

I wish to make one remark which escaped me about something the Minister of the Interior said with regard to Major Walsh. It struck most of us who have read of Major Walsh's appointment to the administration of the Yukon district, that he was to go to Dawson City, the capital of the district, and administer the government of the district there; and we were surprised when Major Walsh only got some hundreds of miles away from Dawson and lost some of his supplies, and could not get any further down the river to Dawson. But we were more than surprised, we were amazed when the Minister of the Interior stood up and informed us that Major Walsh had stayed exactly where he was sent to stay; that he had been sent to the summit to meet starving travellers from Dawson and furnish them with means of subsistence. I am going to say that the Minister of the Interior taxes our credulity to the utmost bounds when he asks us to believe a statement of that kind. I have it on the very best information that Major Walsh all through this winter has only given one meal to one man at the place where he has established himself near the summit. And that man said that he could have got as good a meal in his own shack. And moreover, Major Walsh told him that he was very anxious to get to Dawson and that he wanted him to tell McGregor to send in a dog team so that he could go down to Dawson at once. It was the day before yesterday that this was told to me. My informant is a man of some means, and he told me that he was willing to make a wager, notwithstanding what the Minister of the Interior had said, that Major Walsh is in Dawson at this hour. Will the Minister of the Interior take up this wager? He has offered wagers to members on this side, to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) and others. He has told us that this whole thing is a gamble and he has offered wagers as though to prove it. I can tell him that I will find a man who will put up money against his that Major Walsh is in Dawson, and I ask if he will accept that wager.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). What is the amount of the stake?

Mr. McINERNEY. Almost any amount.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Say a dollar and a half.

Mr. McINERNEY. I remember the time when a dollar and a half would have been quite a considerable amount to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. But now, in the magnificence and opulence of office, he throws it at me, I suppose as a slur upon my poverty, and asks me to put up a dollar and a half.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are making too serious a matter of it.

Mr. McINERNEY. I have seen the hon. gentleman take far more seriously, charges made against himself. I have seen him in this House of late, play altogether a new role. I thought the hon. gentleman was thick-skinned; I thought he could stand attack. But I have seen him writhe under the attacks directed against him by members on this side in a way that did not increase my admiration for him. I do not take anything too seriously, not even my betting proclivities. There is a wager that is open to the Minister of the Interior. There was a gentleman who once came from his part of the country—from Winnipeg. I believe—who, I think, would have taken it up, but the hon. gentleman does not appear to run in that line. He offers wagers, but he does not accept them.

Now, the selection of base lines under this contract is the next subject to which I had intended to turn my attention. But the Government have abandoned that part of the contract under the criticism of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. It is provided that the contractors shall have three years in which to select half of their land and six years in which to select the other half. Certain portions are barred from selection by the contractors, the beds of the rivers Yukon, Lewes and Hootalinqua and of Lakes Teslin, Bennett, Tagish, Labarge and Marsh (said lakes and rivers forming continuous watercourses) or of the banks thereof for 25 feet on each side of the high water mark. But it is not in such rivers as these that the gold is found in the Yukon district, according to the information we have received, but on the small streams that come in precipitous incline down the hills and empty themselves into the larger rivers; and not one of such creeks is retained for the Government or kept from the grasp of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, the contractors. The royalty which is provided under section 17 is also peculiar. The gold taken from the 4,200,000 acres of land granted to the contractors pays only one per cent royalty, while the free miner pays ten per cent. What sort of fair play is that? Is not this giving a tremendous advantage to these contractors over every citizen of this country or any other country who goes into the Yukon district? Why should these contractors pay less royalty to the Government than any other people? It has been said that this contract has been

Mr. McINERNEY.

forced upon these men, and but for these rigorous provisions they would never have accepted it. I am amazed that a Government that is supposed to guard the right of the meanest as well as of the most important citizen of this country should have given under this contract a monopoly, a special right, a particular franchise to two men against every other citizen of the country, charging these two men one per cent royalty while the man who goes in to make a living for himself is compelled to pay ten per cent. When the contractors have completed ten miles of road they will be allowed to locate a portion of the land. And here comes in, as was pointed out by my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope), the genius of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who has reserved for the people of this country the wonderful privilege of farming the arable lands of the Arctic circle, which are reserved to the people under this contract for all time to come.

It is declared that this grant shall be given in fee simple to these men, and that they shall have the title to this property as soon as the railway is completed; not when their contract is completed, not when they have put their steamers on the rivers and lakes and made these water-courses navigable, not when they have opened up communication from the Stikine River to Dawson—but as soon as the railway part of it is completed. That done they get 4,200,000 acres of land. What does that represent? Go to the common man throughout the length and breadth of Canada and tell him that 4,200,000 acres of the heritage of Canadians in the North-west have been given away and he will hardly realize what it means. But, Sir, it means as much arable land as there is in the whole province of Nova Scotia. By the census of 1891 there were not quite five million acres of land fit for tillage in the whole province of Nova Scotia. Go down and tell the people of Nova Scotia that land equal in acreage to all the arable land of their native province is to be given away to these contractors, and they will begin to realize what this land grant means. It means as much as all the occupied lands in the province of New Brunswick. By the census of 1891 there were 4,475,250 acres of land occupied in the province of New Brunswick, and there were only 1,018,704 acres of improved land, so that it means four times as much land as lies to-day improved in the province of New Brunswick. Sir, it is a tremendous gift, a tremendous gift of gold-bearing land, to be selected wherever these men may see fit out of the territory of the extent of the Yukon district. When these men get done with their selection, I am going to make the statement that there will not be a hundred thousand acres of gold-bearing land left in that whole territory between Mackenzie River and the 141st meridian.

They will have scooped it all in, they will have located it all, taking it all for themselves. Now it has been said that these men will be put to a terrible expense to build this railway; that it will cost them a tremendous amount of money; that you cannot suppose that men are going to be taken into the gateway of the Yukon and work for the same wages as men will work for in Ontario. I quite admit that, it will be difficult no doubt to keep these men at work on the route of this railway; but when contractors have found means hitherto of keeping men in their places, I have no doubt Mackenzie & Mann will find means of hiring men under the contract and of keeping them at work. Now, Mr. Jennings makes a calculation that the 165 miles of road which these men are to construct from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake will only cost \$2,850,000, and that sum will build a first-class railway. But these men are to build a road with only a 28-pound rail, old rails at that, with a curvature as they like, with whatever grade they may choose, and for doing this they are to be put in possession of over 4,000,000 acres of picked gold-bearing land. Mr. Jennings has made a calculation, but on a different basis from the one I made here, by which he gave to these people, in a single year, a profit of \$494,000. That was based upon a calculation of only 12,000 people entering that country in one year, by that route. But whereas an estimate has been made of 250,000 people on the one hand, and 50,000 on the other, going in there, if we take 120,000 as a moderate estimate—because in the medium generally lies the truth—you will arrive at a fair estimate. That will be ten times the number upon which Mr. Jennings makes his calculation of a profit of half a million dollars, which will place in the hands of these people for running the road alone for one year from the time of its construction, ten times half a million, or five million dollars of profit. That is what these men are to get outside altogether of the land grant for building this road, outside of the monopolies they will receive, outside the valuable charters given them, outside the payment for royalty, by which they have to pay only one-tenth as much as a humble citizen of Canada. Now there is another feature of this case that, up to the present time, has not been put before the House, and one which I think should receive consideration. We know that men who can see through a ladder have made application for timber limits in that country, and have paid large sums of money for timber limits there. I have been told by a man who has lived for a number of years on the Pacific Coast in British Columbia, that there are parts of the Yukon district that are valuable as timber limits alone. He was bold to state that some portions of that country would average eight million feet of lumber

to the quarter section of 160 acres, and he was a man who knew what he was talking about. Well, if that average runs over the four million acres that these men are to get, and if these men, instead of taking gold-bearing lands, took timber lands in the southwestern part of the district, they would have four million acres of timber lands. Now, according to this calculation of eight millions to the quarter section of 160 acres, that would mean 50,000 feet to the acre, and 50,000 feet of lumber to the acre, taking four million acres would mean 200,000 million feet of lumber to be cut on all this territory. Placing the profit on this lumber at \$2 a thousand, would give these gentlemen a profit on timber lands alone of \$400,000,000. Why, Sir, there is no way in which you can calculate this thing but you arrive at a conclusion that must amaze you; there is no basis of calculation you may adopt but which shows that you are giving away to these men values that are simply astounding. You may, if you choose, be sophistical and stray away from a proper conclusion, but when you start from a right basis and argue correctly, you arrive at conclusions that are simply astounding. Now there is another point I wish to mention. There is no reason to mourn over these poor contractors in this matter. The Bill which was brought down to this House capitalizes this company with a capital of \$10,000,000, and gives them moreover the privilege of extending their capital even beyond that figure. They can go into the money markets to-morrow and, authorized by this Bill, can capitalize themselves at \$10,000,000 without ever building the railway, without ever doing a single thing—they can raise more than \$10,000,000 upon their capital alone. They can do that and never strike a blow in that country. I understand that something like that has been suggested. I will assume that the contractors might put it this way: Well, we are not going to make anything out of the gold lands in the Yukon, there is not as much gold as Tom, Dick and Harry are talking about, we do not intend working the gold lands, at all. But the fools are not all dead yet, and we will take this project and finance it, and in that way we will make piles of money. This Government, Sir, puts the sign manual of their approbation upon such a procedure as that when they enter into a contract of this description. They authorize and allow these men to do that kind of thing, to hawk around in the capitals of Europe their stock list and sell their bonds and pocket a large amount of money, even though all this thing may turn out to be a myth. Sir, one of two positions must be taken by the Government. If this Yukon district, from the information they have before them, is not valuable, they should deter people from going there. If the Yukon district is a desolate region they should do all they can to stop people from

entering that country, and they should not build a line of communication by which they advertise that country to the world, and allure a great many men to leave their homes to seek their fortunes there who would otherwise remain at home. Either that or the other proposition, that it is a valuable country, and if it is, they are giving away a tremendously valuable portion of the country's wealth.

The speculative instinct is alive to-day; it has been alive in all ages of the world. In every age there have been Jasons, with their faithful Argonauts, in search of the golden fleece, setting sail for the mystic strand of Colchos; and the boldest spirits of their time have, in the romantic quest, gone "sounding on their dim and perilous way." Their adventurous prowess have been turned to Cathay, to the island continent beneath the Southern Cross, to the California Sierras, to South Africa, and more lately to the ice fields of the far Canadian North. Their glowing vision has never failed to clothe the distant hills with fabulous Eldorados, in quest of some distant, unreachable land that hung like the fringe of God's garment over the very edge of creation. I trust, I sincerely trust, that it may be found in the Canadian Yukon. But, Sir, if it is so, that lying in the stream beds, in the rivers and gulches and the quartz rocks of that great territory, those immense riches are to be found sleeping there in their virgin beds from the first instant of creation, what a tremendous gift has been made these contractors by the Government of this free country. I remember, about twenty years ago, seeing one of the greatest actors that ever held the stage, Charles Fechter, playing his great dramatic adaptation of Alexander Dumas's immortal romance, "Monte Christo," in which the hero, thrown from the Chateau D'If, cuts his way out of the dead man's sack, having the secret of the hidden treasure, and standing on an island crag, cries: "Monte Christo is mine; the world is mine." And so, standing on some peak in Yukon, the contractors, seeing the midnight sun gleaming on some glistening peak, may cry out, in view of the millions this Government have given them: The Yukon is mine; the world is mine.

Mr. McCLURE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Mr. McINERNEY.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 21st February, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Lewes River Tramway Company (Limited).—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 24) to amend the charter of the Union Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 25) to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Cañon Railway Company.—(Mr. Frost.)

DEATH SENTENCE ON THOMAS NULTY.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked,

Whether petitions have been received by the Hon. Minister of Justice, praying for a commutation of the sentence of death pronounced against Thomas Nulty, who was found guilty of murder at the last assizes for the district of Joliette?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No petition has been received asking for the commutation of the death sentence pronounced against Thomas Nulty.

INDIAN TITLE IN NORTH-WESTERN DISTRICT.

Mr. DAVIS asked,

Have any steps been taken by the Government to extinguish the Indian title in the Athabasca, Mackenzie and Yukon districts?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The question of the extinguishment of the Indian title in Athabasca and Mackenzie district is under consideration. So far as the Government is aware, there is no Indian title to be extinguished in the Yukon.

NAVIGATION OF CANADIAN WATERS BY UNITED STATES VESSELS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

1. Has the Government considered, or is it now considering, the question of Canada's right to exclude or regulate the passage of vessels registered in the United States through the territor-

ial waters on the coast of British Columbia, to and from Alaska?

2. Has the Government any policy upon the subject? If so, what is it?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Government have had that subject under consideration, but they do not deem it expedient at the present moment, in the public interest, to make any statement on the subject.

EX-JUDGE J. P. WOODS.

Mr. **ERB** asked,

(a.) Has the Government granted a retiring allowance to Mr. J. P. Woods, late judge of the county of Perth?

(b.) If so, what is the amount of such allowance?

(c.) Has the Government received a petition praying for the granting of a retiring allowance to the said J. P. Woods?

(d.) If so, whose names were attached to the said petition?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). The Government have granted a retiring allowance to Judge Woods. As to the second part of the question, the usual retiring allowance of a judge, being two-thirds of his salary, has been granted. The Government did receive a petition on the subject. The names attached to the petition were all the members of the county council of the county of Perth.

CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS IN THE YUKON.

Mr. **WALLACE** asked,

What was the amount of duties collected by customs officers in the Yukon district, giving amounts for each year separately?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). The collections in Yukon were as follows:—Year 1894-95, \$3,247.47; year 1895-96, \$21,691.45; year 1896-97, \$9,873.24; year 1897-98, \$83,834.94.

PILOTAGE INVESTIGATIONS AT ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. **ELLIIS** asked,

How many investigations have been held, under authority of the Marine and Fisheries Department, in the matter of pilotage and pilot management at the port of St. John since the year 1887?

In what years were investigations held?

What has each investigation, including charges for printing, cost the public treasury?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Three investigations have been held under the authority of the department to inquire into pilotage matters at the port of St. John since the year 1887, namely, one in 1891, by William Smith, late Deputy Minister of

Marine and Fisheries; second one in 1895 by Capt. W. H. Smith, Chairman of the Board of Examiners of Masters and Mates, assisted by Capt. Bloomfield Douglas, and third one in 1897, by Capt. Bloomfield Douglas. The first investigation, namely, that in 1891, does not appear to have been attended with any expense except that of travelling and incidental expenses of the Deputy Minister. The investigation of 1895 cost \$1,888.60, and the investigation of 1897 cost \$659.11, but all the accounts for this investigation have not been received. The charges for printing which are included in the above sums, cost \$1,033.47.

GEORGIAN BAY DISTRICT—TIMBER SAWN IN MICHIGAN MILLS.

Mr. **KAULBACH** rose to ask the following question:—

Is the Government aware of the enormous output of logs cut in the Georgian Bay district the present season, to be sawed in Michigan mills, of which the following is a statement from Saginaw, Michigan, February 14th, 1898?

TO BE SAWN IN MICHIGAN MILLS—THE ENORMOUS OUTPUT OF GEORGIAN BAY LOGS THIS COMING SEASON.

Saginaw, Mich., February 14.—The Georgian Bay district will furnish Michigan mills with a large quantity of logs the coming season. A gentleman from that region states that loggers are experiencing trouble with deep snow, and slow progress is being made. He furnishes the following approximate estimate of the quantity of logs being put in this winter by the several firms operating in the Georgian Bay district:—Alger, Smith & Co., 8,000,000; Holland Emery Lumber Co., 20,000,000; Turner & Fisher, 20,000,000; S. C. Fisher, 1,000,000; Wm. Peter, 15,000,000; Saginaw Lumber and Salt Co. and Loveland, Rays & White, 16,000,000; Ontario Lumber Co., 8,000,000; Arthur Hill & Co., 15,000,000; McArthur Bros. & Co., 14,000,000; Spanish River Lumber Co., 15,000,000; Central Lumber Co., 8,000,000; Conger Lumber Co., 20,000,000; Hale & Booth, 30,000,000; Eddy Bros. & Co., 11,000,000; Moore & Glover, 4,000,000; Victoria Lumber Co., 15,000,000; Georgian Bay Lumber Co., 20,000,000; Union Trust Co., 14,000,000; Hardy Lumber Co., 10,000,000; Pitts & Co., 20,000,000; total, 328,000,000.

With such startling revelations before us, the desire to employ labour at home, and in view of the fact of the heavy restrictions placed on Canadian lumber going into the United States market, is it the intention of the Government to impose an export duty on logs crossing into American territory?

Mr. **SPEAKER**. In regard to this question, standing in the name of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), if I were at liberty to follow English precedents, which I should like to see followed by this House, I would ask the hon. member to drop the long statement embodied in it; but such statements have so frequently been embodied in questions asked in this House in former years that the precedents are strong, and I cannot say it is out of

order; but I hope hon. members will drop a practice of this kind. With respect to the last paragraph of the question, the first portion is argumentative, and I hope the hon. gentleman will put the question omitting it.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to ask, as follows:—

Is the Government aware of the enormous output of logs cut in the Georgian Bay district last season to be sawed in Michigan mills, of which the following is a statement from Saginaw, Mich., February 14, 1898.

I will not read the extract, as it appears in the paper. I would further ask:

Is it the intention of the Government to impose an export duty on logs crossing into American territory?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The Government has no information with respect to the subject mentioned in the first part of the question. With respect to the latter matter it is not one in respect to which it is expedient to make any announcement at this moment.

A. E. KILLAM.

Mr. McINERNEY asked,

1. What position does Amasa E. Killam hold on the Intercolonial Railway, and what salary does he receive?

2. Did this same Amasa E. Killam make a claim for damages against the Government for cattle killed or injured by accident on the Intercolonial Railway?

3. When and where did the accident happen? How many cattle were killed or injured by it? What description were such cattle?

4. If Amasa E. Killam made such a claim was the claim paid? What amount was given him for each of the cattle so killed or injured?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Amasa E. Killam holds the position of inspector of bridges on the Intercolonial Railway, and he receives a salary of \$150 a month. 2. Yes. Mr. Killam made a claim for damages against the Government for cattle killed and injured on the railway. 3. The accident happened on the 14th of July, 1894, at Chandler's Cutting, so called, near Moncton. Two cattle were killed and three injured. The cattle were valuable cows of the Jersey breed. 4. Mr. Killam claimed \$500, but the claim was finally settled by paying him \$350.

EXCLUSION OF FOREIGN LABOUR ON YUKON RAILWAY.

Mr. MARTIN asked,

Does the Government intend to provide for the employment of Canadian labour only in the building of the Yukon Railway?

Does the Government intend to take any steps to provide that Canadian labour only shall be employed in the construction of railways receiving subsidies from the Dominion Government?

Mr. SPEAKER.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The necessity for constructing the Yukon Railway with the utmost possible speed rendered it inadvisable to insist upon the exclusion of foreign labour from employment on this work. In the case of the Crow's Nest Railway a clause was inserted in the contract, not only prohibiting foreign labour, but forbidding the railway company from contracting or subcontracting with foreign firms, companies or contractors on the works of the Crow's Nest Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman has overlooked the second part of the question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has not been overlooked. I stated what the Government have already done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The intention of the Government is asked here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I take it that the fact that the Government have already in a Bill included a clause adverse to the employment of foreign labour is a fair indication of the Government's intention in that regard.

COLD STORAGE FOR P. E. I.

Mr. MARTIN asked,

Has the Government taken any steps to provide cold storage for Prince Edward Island?

If so, when is it to be provided?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Last year correspondence was entered into by the Department of Agriculture with various gentlemen in Charlottetown for the purpose of securing the establishment of a cold storage warehouse there. That did not succeed, and correspondence is still continuing with the hope during the coming season that it may succeed.

REGINA INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Was Dr. Willoughby, up to June, 1896, the medical officer employed by the Government to attend the Industrial School at Regina?

Was he dismissed? If so, when and why?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Dr. Willoughby was employed by the Indian Commissioner for Manitoba and the North-west Territories, with the concurrence of the Department of Indian Affairs, to attend the Industrial School at Regina up to the 31st of August, 1897. His services were then discontinued, a medical officer having been appointed by Order in Council for the district in which are situated the Muscowpetungs and Assiniboine agencies and the Regina Industrial School.

DISMISSALS IN INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Will the Minister of the Interior lay on the Table of the House a list of those persons whose services in the North-west Territories since June, 1896, have been dispensed with by the department, and the cause of dismissal in each case?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The information asked will be laid on the Table when the hon. gentleman moves for a return in the usual way.

DISPUTED YUKON TERRITORY—DYE AND SKAGWAY.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

In the recent negotiations with the United States authorities respecting customs regulations and the shipment of goods via Dyea and Skagway to the Canadian Yukon territory, was any precaution observed or provision made so that the negotiations proceeded without prejudice to the claim that Dyea and Skagway are in British territory?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I beg to say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that the negotiations referred to were unofficial, but notwithstanding that fact, as a matter of precaution, it was stated in all cases, that such negotiations were without prejudice to any claims that might be made in reference to the settlement of the boundary question.

FAST ATLANTIC MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked,

1. What information has the Government as to the steps which have been taken by Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co., to carry out the terms of their contract with Her Majesty, bearing date the 24th day of March, 1897?

2. Have Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co. commenced the construction of any of the steamers referred to in clause 1 (a) of their said contract, and has the Government taken any steps to obtain information on this point?

3. What period of time would, under ordinary conditions, be required for the construction of the two steamers first mentioned in clause 4 (a) of the said contract, and has the Government taken any steps to obtain information on this point?

4. At what date did Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co. give and deposit the sum and guarantee referred to in clause 13 (a) and (b) of the said contract?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). With respect to the first part of this question, the Government have no special information as to the steps which have been taken by Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co., except their general assurance that they propose to carry out their contract as agreed. With respect to the second question, the Govern-

ment are not aware whether the construction has been actually commenced; the Government believe it has not been. With respect to the third question, the Government are informed that they can be constructed within the time limited. With respect to the fourth question, a sum of £10,000 was paid to the Bank of Montreal, at or about the 5th of October last; the £10,000 guarantee was executed at or about the 1st or 5th of January last.

UNITED STATES STEAMSHIP "YANTIC"—PASSAGE THROUGH RIVER ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked,

Was permission obtained from the proper authority for the passage through the River St. Lawrence of the United States steamship "Yantic"?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Permission was applied for to the Superintendent of the Welland Canal for the passage of the steamship "Yantic" through the canal, and he was authorized to grant the privilege. The "Yantic" passed through without any armament.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Might I call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) to the effect that he answered only as to the Welland Canal? The question is: Was there permission asked for passage through the river?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is, of course, to be observed that the answer as to the canals is the only permission of which the Department of Railways and Canals has any knowledge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). So far as the river is concerned, there never was any application made to the Department over which I preside, for permission. As my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) has stated, the "Yantic" came without any armament whatever and passed up as a commercial vessel.

Mr. WALLACE. Did they make an entrance and clearance at Montreal or any other Canadian port?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, at Montreal, having run down one of our ships in the meantime.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT CENTREVILLE, N. B.

Mr. HALE asked,

Was an investigation held in the case of Mr. T. Scholey, collector of customs at Centreville, Carleton County, N.B.?

If so, was the finding favourable or adverse to Mr. Scholey?

Has Mr. Scholey been dismissed, and if so, why?

For what number of years had Mr. Scholey paid superannuation abatement, and has any allowance been made to him on this account?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). The answer to the first question is, yes; to the second question: The finding was adverse to Mr. Scholey. The answer to the third question is: Mr. Scholey has been dismissed. The reason for his dismissal was, that it was established on the investigation that he had taken an active partisan part in politics. The answer to the fourth question is: Mr. Scholey contributed to the Superannuation Fund for twenty-four years. He has been refunded the sum contributed by him to said fund, with interest thereon at 5 per cent per annum. The total amount of such refund was \$146.95.

YUKON RAILWAY—MR. HAMILTON SMITH'S COMMUNICATIONS.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, if he has laid on the Table of the House the communications that he has received from Mr. Hamilton Smith in reference to railway construction in the Yukon.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No; the correspondence has not been brought down yet, but it will be laid on the Table to-morrow.

CHEVALIER DROLET'S MINING LEASE—EXPLANATION.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton.) I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact, that the information furnished me from my department with which to answer a question which was asked in the House the other day, with regard to the mining lease issued to Mr. Drolet, was incorrect, and the answer given, therefore, was incorrect. I desire, at the earliest possible moment, to correct the answer given. The answer was, that a lease had been granted, and that it was in accordance with the terms of the public regulations. As a matter of fact, the lease given to Mr. Drolet was given before the regulations were adopted, and it varies in some small particulars from the regulations which were afterwards adopted. It was not given under the regulations, because there were no regulations at the time. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) who asked the question, desires to obtain the exact terms of the lease granted to Mr. Drolet, they can be obtained by moving, in the usual way, for the Order in Council relating to them.

CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Blair for the
Mr. HALE.

second reading of Bill (No. 6) an Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty the Queen and Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.

Mr. **McCLURE**. Mr. Speaker, while it might very properly be said that little new can be presented to the House in reference to this question, it certainly cannot be said that the debate has been at all monotonous, for there has at least been considerable variety in the manner of attacking this measure by members on the other side of the House. I notice, and I think it must have been apparent to all the members of the House, that, during the last few days of this debate, there has been a very marked change in the tone of the criticism which has been directed against the Bill. I recollect very well, during the opening days of the session, that the hon. gentlemen on the other side could not find within the bounds of the English language words strong enough to utter their abhorrence, their detestation of this measure. They spoke against it with a vigour and a violence that seemed to indicate that there was in it nothing good whatever—from the classic statements of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), whose cultured tastes were offended by the piscatory effluvia which he found ascended from it, down to the more direct and positive assertions of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who most emphatically asserted that nobody could entertain a doubt but that there were large contributions to the Ontario election campaign in connection with this contract, every kind of corruption was charged against the Government in reference to this measure. The hon. gentlemen do right to be jealous in regard to public contracts. The sad experiences which this country had in the days when other gentlemen occupied these benches have unfortunately created in the minds of many people a suspicion with regard to any contract to which the Government is a party. But I ask hon. gentlemen to notice, as the country has already noticed, that there is a very marked difference between the charges of corruption which were once made against the Government of this country, and the charges which are made to-day. I recollect very well, as a student of the political progress of this country, the time when men stood up in their places in Parliament, and staking their political reputation upon the act, made charges against the Government of the day; but they did more than make charges: they demanded, they forced investigation, and they proved their charges. Not so the pure and holy gentlemen who to-day compose Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. They may make charges, it is true, but they give to this House another evidence of their angelic character, in that they are quite willing that others should rush into investigations where they do not care themselves to tread.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have no longer loud and violent denunciations of this contract. Within the last two or three days, hon. gentlemen who have assailed it have been compelled to resort to what I think may be properly called captious criticism of its various clauses. In fact, the last speaker who addressed the House (Mr. McInerney) felt himself at the outset driven into the unfortunate position of having to defend his own party before he started to attack the Government; and I propose to direct a little attention to the defence which he gave of his own party in connection with the historical events bearing on this question. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) was very much disappointed with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell). He regretted very much that he could not extract an opinion from that hon. gentleman on a point of law. Now, I think the House will bear me out in saying that in no part of the very able and lucid address of the hon. member for Halifax did he more clearly indicate his thorough grasp of the principles that govern international law than in his refusal to answer the question of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper); and I am quite confident that the hon. member for Pictou, being himself no mean authority on that subject, never could have proposed the question seriously. The question which he proposed, if it meant anything, simply meant this, that he would like to know what the opinion of the hon. member for Halifax was as to what the opinion of the United States ought to be—a question which the hon. member for Halifax very properly declined to answer. But my hon. friend from Kent made the very bold assertion that the treaty of 1825, the Convention of St. Petersburg, gave to Her Majesty's subjects no rights whatever on the Yukon and the Porcupine; and I notice that the press which supports him says that he proved it so conclusively that henceforth nobody will ever dare to make the contrary assertion again. Now, how does the hon. gentleman prove it? He proves it, in the first place, by quoting article 6 of the Convention of 1825; and, in order to be accurate in the matter, I propose to read that clause again. It is as follows:—

It is understood that the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, from whatever quarter they arrive, whether from the ocean or from the interior of the continent, shall for ever enjoy the right of navigating freely and without any hindrance whatever all the rivers and streams which in their course towards the Pacific Ocean may cross the line of demarcation upon the line of coast described in article 3 of the present convention.

Now, my hon. friend must admit, I presume he does admit, that these rivers, Yukon and Porcupine, in their course towards the Pacific Ocean, cross the line of demarcation. But he contends that they do not cross the line of demarcation upon the coast described

in article 3. Now, the sole question is, what is the meaning of these last words in this article? The answer is found in article 3, which reads as follows:—

The line of demarcation between the high contracting parties upon the coast of the continent and the islands of America to the north-west shall be drawn in the following manner:—Commencing from the southernmost point of the island, which point lies in the parallel of $54^{\circ} 40'$ north latitude and between the 131st and 133rd degrees of west longitude (meridian of Greenwich), the said line shall extend to the north along the channel called the Portland Channel as far as the point of the continent where it strikes the 56th degree of north latitude. From this last mentioned point the line of demarcation shall follow the summit of the mountains situate parallel to the coast as far as the intersection of the 141st degree of west longitude (same meridian), and finally from the said point of intersection the said meridian of the 141st degree in its prolongation as far as the frozen ocean, shall form the limit of the Russian and British possession on the continent of America towards the north-west.

Clearly, beyond all doubt, "the line of demarcation between the possessions upon the coast of the continent," and "the line of demarcation upon the line of coast described in article 3," are one and the same thing. There is nothing in the wording of the article to suggest, and by no rule of interpretation can you get out of it the meaning that one part of the line is to be considered a line of demarcation, and the rest is to be considered a line of demarcation upon the coast. Look at the very wording of the article. It starts in its preliminary to say that the line of demarcation upon the coast shall be described as follows; and then it describes one line, not two, as my hon. friend would have us believe. But, fortunately for me, I am not in the position of having to place my interpretation of this clause against that of the hon. member for Kent. We have undoubted authority upon this point. Charles Sumner gave his opinion upon it years ago; and the opinion of Charles Sumner is of the first importance here, not only because he was a man of eminence whose opinion was entitled to weight anywhere, but because he represents the opposite party, as it were, on this question, with whom we shall have to contend for this right, if we ever have to contend for it. He says, referring to the treaty of 1825:

It is provided that the subjects of His Britannic Majesty shall for ever enjoy the right of navigating freely and without any hindrance whatever all the rivers and streams which in their course towards the Pacific Ocean may cross the line of demarcation.

He does not say which may cross a part of the line of demarcation; he does not say which may cross that part of the line of demarcation below Mount St. Elias; but the line of demarcation. Evidently Charles Sumner would look upon this wonderful discovery made by the hon. member for Kent

as somewhat of a quibble. But the Hon. Edward Blake also held this opinion, for we find him writing of the treaties in this fashion :

At the time of the negotiation (that is, of the Washington Treaty), British subjects had already the fullest rights to navigate for all purposes all the streams flowing from the British territory in the interior through Alaska.

The United States had no right to navigate any of these streams beyond the boundary of Alaska. Great Britain asked for and obtained as a concession a limited right to navigate three of these streams for certain purposes, conceding to the United States the right to navigate these three streams through Columbia on equal terms. This so-called concession by the United States was, in fact, a concession by Great Britain to the former country, which gave nothing and got everything.

I feel confident that if my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) were in a position to quote the opinion of Hon. Edward Blake against the Government, he would consider it of great weight; and I trust he will give some weight to it when it is against himself.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman says there is nothing at all in the two lines of demarcation. Will he then tell me why these men who made the treaty put in the words: "and the streams which in their course towards the Pacific Ocean may cross the line of demarcation upon the line of the coast"? Will he tell me why were the words, "upon the line of coast," added if they mean nothing?

Mr. McCLURE. Will the hon. gentleman tell me why they mention the line of demarcation on the coast at the opening of the description before they undertook to define it at all? Why is it they started out to define the line of demarcation on the coast and then went on to give a description of one line, if it was intended to be two lines?

Mr. McINERNEY. Then words do not mean anything.

Mr. McCLURE. I have other authorities which I would like to quote. I may say that the hon. gentleman's opinion would have been of immense assistance to the Conservative party, if he had been here to give it in 1872, when this matter was being discussed, for among all the learned men who then represented the Conservative party, not one seems to have stumbled across the wonderful discovery which my hon. friend has shown the House. The Hon. John Hillyard Cameron, who would be considered in this House or anywhere else, considerable authority on such matters, and who made an argument in vindication of the Treaty of Washington, claimed that all the rights we had under the Anglo-Russian Treaty became abrogated by the cession of Alaska to the United States, but it

Mr. McCLURE.

never seemed to have occurred to his acute mind that there was any difference between the Porcupine, Yukon and the Stikine rivers, although such an argument would have been of immense value to him if he had been able to maintain it. But unfortunately for my hon. friend opposite, I am able to quote an opinion which he will not venture to dispute—the opinion of the great patriot and perfect statesman who led the Conservative party, and the man who made the Washington Treaty. I refer to the late Sir John Macdonald. That gentleman made a speech in the course of the debate, and in that speech he said, referring to these three rivers by name, and especially mentioning the Yukon—and his statement is very clear and emphatic, as his statements generally were:—

Sir, I am not unaware—

No doubt he became aware after the event, because there is not the slightest indication that he knew it before.

Sir, I am not unaware that under the old treaty entered into between Russia and England, the former granted the latter free navigation of all the streams in Alaska.

Is there any doubt about that? There is an opinion which I do not think the hon. gentleman will dispute. But perhaps in that I am mistaken, because if I read the history of New Brunswick aright, in the days when Sir John Macdonald led the Conservative party, my hon. friend did not give it a very loyal or earnest or enthusiastic support.

Now, what have we on this question. On the one side, we have the opinion of my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney), very emphatically and ably expressed, and we must give him full credit for the weight of his opinion. On the other hand, we have the opinion of the Hon. Chas. Sumner, the Hon. Edward Blake and the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron, and the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald. I do not wonder, therefore, very much, that when my hon. friend undertook to press his opinion on the House, he felt it necessary to present his credentials as having been a pupil of Washburne and a number of other distinguished authorities. I think the opinion of these gentlemen I have just named makes it plain beyond doubt that in the treaty of 1825, the subjects of Her Majesty were granted the right to navigate the Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine rivers for all lawful purposes. Just here I might be permitted to say that, according to the doctrine as stated in the House the other day, emanating from the Hon. Chas. Sumner, it would have been open to this country to contend against the United States that even if the Treaty of St. Petersburg had never been negotiated, we could claim the free navigation of these rivers, under the doctrine of public law, annunciated by Chas. Sumner and

always contended for and conceded by the United States. So that even if the treaty were not there, we might claim the right to navigate these rivers just as fully as we claim that right now. But under the clause of the treaty, there cannot be the shadow of doubt that we had the right to navigate the Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine for all lawful purposes. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney), however, says that the Treaty of Washington gave us wider rights than we previously enjoyed. I contend on the contrary, that it narrowed our rights, that it took away rights we had by the Treaty of St. Petersburg. Fortunately, there need be no discussion on this point. You know, Mr. Speaker, that there is not much use arguing the case after the court has decided against you. Well, on this point we have an authority we are bound to accept. We have the decision of the law officers of the Crown, which must be conclusive, in the case of Peter Martin, already quoted in this debate. Referring to the right of free navigation of rivers flowing through American territory to the sea, they said :

Although Russia could not voluntarily and without the consent of Great Britain withdraw, the rights conferred by that convention, that right, whatever may have been the nature of it, has been lost by the negotiations which led to the Treaty of Washington and by that treaty itself.

This statement proves both branches of my contention. First, it shows that the rights given by the Treaty of St. Petersburg were not extinguished by the cession of that country to the United States and could not be extinguished without the consent of Great Britain. In the second place, it shows that the rights given under the Treaty of St. Petersburg were extinguished by the Treaty of Washington. Therefore, for this reason, Lord Carnarvon says :

Being of opinion that the right of free navigation now depends on the 26th article of the Washington Treaty, which expressly states the navigation to be open for purposes of commerce, Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that a prisoner cannot lawfully be conveyed through Alaska by the Stikine River.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to tell us where the first quotation, just before the one he is now giving us, is from. I refer to the opinion of the law officers of the Crown. The latter quotation I know is in Lord Carnarvon's despatch.

Mr. McCLURE. It is from the decision in the case of Peter Martin. I cannot give the exact reference.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think it was in 1875, during the time that Mr. Blake was Minister of Justice.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Lord Carnarvon's despatch was in 1877, and is in the

journal of 1878. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him whether the statement he gave of the opinion of the law officers of the Crown was really a quotation or whether it was part of Lord Carnarvon's despatch ?

Mr. McCLURE. It is an exact quotation. You will find it in the sessional papers, Vol. XI.

Mr. HAGGART. That is Lord Carnarvon's, but we are asking about the other part.

Mr. McCLURE. The hon. gentleman will find the other part there too if he will look.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McCLURE. If the hon. gentlemen desire very much to get the information, they can get it in the same way that I got it—by looking for it. And, if they are able to show that I have made any quotations that are inaccurate, I will be the first one to acknowledge it. But I challenge them to do so. Now the hon. gentleman made another statement in regard to the treaty of 1825. He asserted that this treaty really restricted the commerce, because there were certain articles that we were not allowed to take into that country. We were not allowed to take liquor, gunpowder, or firearms up that river. To be perfectly fair, the hon. gentleman should have told the House that there was a reciprocal agreement between the parties, that none of these articles should be sold to the natives of that country ; and I am not so sure that we should not generally agree that it would have been as well had such an excellent provision been included in the Treaty of Washington as well as in the treaty of 1825. There is no doubt that under the treaty of 1825 wider rights were given us than were given under the Treaty of Washington, and that these wider and more valuable rights were narrowed or taken away by the men who negotiated the Treaty of Washington at a later date. I do not propose to discuss longer this purely legal phase of the question. I think it has been abundantly proven that we had rights, previous to the Treaty of Washington, that were wider and more valuable than the rights we got by that treaty, and that the rights which we got by the previous treaty or that we had by public law, or by whatever means, previous to the Treaty of Washington, were taken away and narrowed, and to-day we must base our contentions entirely upon the Treaty of Washington—barring, of course, the possibility of being able to argue—a question I do not enter into at present—that the Treaty of Washington could not take away those rights. We have the decisions of the law officers of the Crown on that point, and for the present that must be conclusive.

Passing from this legal view of the question, my hon. friend had a number of ob-

jections to urge to this contract. In the first place he undertook to argue—referring to the question of urgency—that the Government was not obliged to proceed with great haste, because he was able to show from the reports of Mr. Ogilvie that the Government knew as early as 1896 that that country was rich in gold and that there was a probability of a great influx of immigration into it. So far as that is concerned, the late Sir John Macdonald knew, as far back as 1872, that the country was valuable, for he says so in his speech. Why did he not go ahead and build a railway then? I do not say he should have done so. The mere fact that the country was rich in gold or had vast resources is not the justification of this Bill. The justification of it is that the Government has forced upon it a certainty that, whether it is in the interest of the country or not, in spite of all warnings, there is bound to be in the next few years an enormous immigration into that country. It is the business of the Government to see, first, that law and order are maintained there, and they must therefore have ready access to the country; second, they must guard against the possibility of famine and disaster; and in the third place, they see that the indirectly stimulated trade of that country shall enure to the benefit of the people of Canada, and for these reasons and for these reasons alone they are justified in entering into the present contract. But the hon. gentleman says that this is not an all-Canadian route, and he says that it is not the best route, that the river is not navigable. But he does not undertake to tell us where the best route is. I would advise him to take the opinion of his chief in this House, who, inside the House and outside of it, has declared, with an authority that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInerney) cannot have, as the spokesman of his party, that the Government had selected the best route, and not only that, but the only available route into that country. I understood the hon. member for Kent to say that before the Government rushed into this contract while doubts existed, they should have had some conference with the authorities at Washington and thus have secured a settlement of our rights. I take direct issue with the hon. gentleman there. I say this Government has no right to suppose for a moment that there is any doubt as to our rights on the Stikine River. We have a solemn treaty between the parties interested, in which it is agreed that we are to have the free navigation of this river for the purposes of commerce; and dealing with a free Government and a civilized people, we cannot suppose that "free navigation" means anything but free navigation. It is the duty of this Government to insist that every right we have to that river shall be maintained, and not cast doubts upon it by having any conference. We have not the broad rights we once had, and the day may come

Mr. McCLURE.

when we shall regret the sacrifice of those privileges; but the rights we have this Government have a mandate from the people of Canada to stand by, and the man who casts doubts upon them is no friend of Canada.

The hon. gentleman fears that this company cannot be compelled by the terms of their contract to put steamers on the river and lake. But if they do not put on these steamers, of what benefit will their railway be to them? How are they going to accumulate this vast store of wealth that the hon. gentleman says they are going to get out of the country? How are they going to get the vast wealth of timber, of which he speaks, down from its place of growth unless there are steamers on the river?

An hon. MEMBER. To make that \$400,000,000.

Mr. McCLURE. I am coming to that.

Mr. McINERNEY. Timber is not usually taken down in steamers.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). He is going to float it down stream.

Mr. McCLURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McInerney) will find that there are great difficulties in the rafting of logs in the Yukon country that do not exist in New Brunswick. But what about this wonderful story? The hon. gentlemen seem to fear that these men were going to become immensely wealthy by manufacturing lumber in that country. What authority did he give us for his statement? I noted the words as they fell from the hon. gentleman's lips, and they were these: "I have been told by a man who has lived for a number of years on the Pacific Coast in British Columbia that there are great lumber resources in that country." Coming from a lumbering country, my hon. friend ought to know that the gravest doubt and suspicion rest upon the information of any man who undertakes to speak as to the lumber resources of any country unless he has gone carefully over the territory instead of looking at it from a distance. The hon. gentleman quoted the opinion of Mr. Ogilvie in his opening remarks. He had so much faith in Mr. Ogilvie that he thought, that because, in 1896, Mr. Ogilvie said that country was rich, the Government should have got ready at once to build a railway into it. Will the hon. gentleman accept the opinion of Mr. Ogilvie as to the lumber resources of that great country? On pages 63 and 64 of the Official Guide, I read under the heading: "Timber for Use in Building and Manufactures," the following:—

The amount of this class of timber in the district along the river is not at all important. There is a large extent of forest which would yield firewood and timber for use in mines, but for the manufacture of lumber there is very little.

To give an idea of its scarceness, I may state that two of my party made a thorough search of all the timber land around the head of Lake Bennett, and down the lake for over ten miles, and in all this search only one tree was found suitable for making such plank as we required for the construction of our large boat.

Mr. FRASER. That is the tree the man from British Columbia saw.

Mr. McCLURE. But, fortunately, he did not cut it down, for if he had, perhaps Mr. Ogilvie could not have got his boat built.

This tree made four planks fifteen inches wide at the butt, seven at the top, and thirty-one feet long. Such other planks as we wanted had to be cut out of short logs, of which some ten to fourteen inches in diameter and ten to sixteen feet long could be found at long intervals. The boat required only 450 feet of plank for its construction, yet some of the logs had to be carried nearly 200 yards, and two saw-pits had to be made before that quantity was procured, and this on ground that was all thickly wooded with spruce, pine and some balsam, the latter being generally the largest and cleanest trunked. These remarks apply to the lumber until we reach the lower end of Marsh Lake. On the head of the river, near the lake, some trees of fair size, twelve to fourteen inches in diameter, and carrying their thickness very well, could be got but their number was small, and they were scattered.

Then, after some other remarks of a similar character, he concludes :

To estimate the quantity of timber in the vicinity of the river would be an impossible task—

And yet the hon. member for Kent, with the assistance of this British Columbia man, would undertake the impossible task.

—having only such data as I was able to collect on my way down.

That is where Mr. Ogilvie made his mistake. He should not have got any data coming down the river, he should have stayed in British Columbia, and then he would have known all about it.

I would, however, say that one-fourth of the area I have given as agricultural land would be a fair conjecture. This would give us two and a half townships, or ninety square miles of fairly well timbered ground, but it must be borne in mind that there is not more than a square mile or so of that in any one place, and most of the timber would be small and poor compared with the timber of Manitoba and the easterly part of the North-west Territories. At the boundary line I required, as I have already explained, a tree twenty-two inches in diameter at the ground, on which to erect my transit. An exhaustive search of over three square miles of the woods there, though showing many trees of convenient size for house logs and many for small clean planks, showed only one eighteen inches in diameter five feet above the ground.

It may be said that the country might furnish much timber which, though not fit to be classed as merchantable, would meet many of the requirements of the only industry the country is ever likely to have by mining.

So I do not think these people are going

to make a fortune out of lumber. Four hundred millions is the amount they were estimated to make. With a profit of \$2 on a thousand, they were going to make four hundred million dollars out of the lumber alone. Now, that was a gigantic calculation to base upon the information of an unknown man in British Columbia. I do not know whether he was a white man or not. I have a suspicion that he is very much like the story which the ex-Minister of Railways told us the other day, about the President of the United States having been reported to have said to somebody else, who said to somebody else, that reported it to him that he thought so and so was the case. In this case probably the man out in British Columbia had been told by some other Indian chief up the river that his forefathers were all of the opinion that there were great lumber reserves somewhere, but he did not know where they were. Possibly my hon. friend will find when he makes close inquiries from this very intelligent authority that the lumber has all been washed away by Noah's flood.

Mr. McINERNEY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to set him right? I do not like to see him wander so much. Let me read to him from Mr. St. Cyr's report, which has been made since the flood :

Timber of good quality was seen at several places along the Hootalinqua River. It is mostly spruce of eighteen to twenty-four inches in diameter. It grows on the islands and the flats adjoining the stream. Some pines and cottonwood of large size were also noticed.

Mr. McCLURE. Exactly. Mr. Ogilvie told us the very same thing, that from a distance these things looked very well, but when you came to examine them, they did not pan out as they were expected to do. My hon. friend should know, coming from a lumber country, that experienced men who have gone out to hunt for lumber have got to examine the trees closely in order to know the character of the lumber. Mr. Ogilvie does say that on some islands in the river there were trees of fair size, but they were confined almost wholly to the islands, and he gives the reason for it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman any further. I do not know that I can say anything new in reference to this contract; but it is perhaps only right that, coming from a province far from the scene of action, I should undertake to express the views which I think the people of eastern Canada will take on this question. We have to-day a great mining boom on in this Yukon country. I want the hon. gentleman to remember that this is not the first time the world has had mining booms. I want the hon. gentleman also to notice that there is this marked distinction, this marked contrast, between the Yukon country and every other

country in which great mining booms have taken place: That the Yukon country has absolutely no other resources except mining. This is a distinction which should be borne in mind. Years ago there was a mining boom in California. At a later date there was a great mining boom in Australia. To-day we have no mining booms in those countries. The eyes of the world are not attracted to California as they were once; men in all corners of the earth are not selling their possessions and rushing to Australia for gold as they once were. The mining boom has died out of those countries. But fortunately for Australia and for California they had vast resources of another character. They had agricultural resources, they had ports open to commerce, they had the finest climate in the world, and when the mining boom died out, they felt its indirect benefits in the stimulus that was given to other industries. We have a mining boom in the Yukon to-day. The history of the world leads us to believe that the probabilities are in favour of that mining boom dying out. Such are the probabilities, perhaps it will not, but all the chances are in favour of the mining boom dying out. And what position will the Yukon country be in then? Let the mining boom burst, and that country, having no resources of its own to fall back upon, the soil producing no food for man and little for animals, what is going to become of it? Therefore the Government have a right to look at that possibility in making their contract. I grant you they have a grave duty to perform. This stimulus that is being given to the trade of the country by the influx of miners to the Yukon district, is going to be of immense value to us. I believe that during the coming years we shall feel the pulsations of a larger life in every artery of commerce in this country in consequence of this mining boom. I believe that capital will be attracted to our country. I believe also that many hopes and many fortunes will be buried in the snowdrifts of the Yukon. But in the meantime the Government has a duty to perform. Above all others it is their duty to see that the government of the Yukon is conducted in such a way as to preserve peace and order, and secure the protection of property there. To that end it is necessary that we have an all-Canadian route into that country under our own control, for the purpose of properly governing that country. It is the bounden duty of this Government, and future generations will hold them to account if they do not perform it, to see that the barest possibility of the disaster of famine in those regions is dissipated by providing proper facilities of getting in there, of taking supplies into that country and of enabling immigrants to go in and to get out. Thirdly, it is the duty of the Government, a duty to which the people

Mr. McCLURE.

of this country will hold them, that they should take advantage on behalf of our people, of the present situation of affairs to secure, if possible, for Canada, all the benefits that arise from the stimulus to commerce. This, I believe, they are doing, but mark you, they can go no further. I believe that the people of eastern Canada are prepared to bear their fair share of the burdens in developing the North-west. I know some of them think that we have already borne enough, but I believe if it were necessary to bear more they would do it. But mark you, the people of Canada will never authorize this Government, or any other Government, to invest the public funds of this country in a gambling speculation. When the people of Canada invested their money in the Canadian Pacific Railway they thought they paid a big price, but they were building a railroad through a country which, as time goes on, will increase in value, and the resources of which can never be exhausted. But when we build a railroad into the Yukon, the experience of the world leads us to believe that a few years hence the mining boom will be over, and that country will be practically of no value. The work of constructing a railway to the Yukon is unquestionably a speculative enterprise, and I believe therefore that this Government have taken the only course which prudence would indicate. They have assumed their responsibility, clearly and openly, and have definitely announced their policy, which will find a warm response in the hearts of the people—that the Klondike must for ever pay for the Klondike.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, the Yukon railway proposition now before the House ought to be condemned here, ought to be condemned everywhere else, as indeed it is to-day condemned in this Canada of ours. Furthermore, I believe it is condemned by all thoughtful men throughout the country, who hope that the time has come when the great monopolies must be regulated, when the supremacy of the state over the great corporations must be vindicated, and when an end must be put to those monopolies under which we are to-day if we are not to become the slaves of those great monopolies. I am here to give a very simple reason why I am opposed to this contract, and my reason, I hope, will be on high grounds. I will try to express the opinion entertained by those people in this country and other countries who think that the time has come for the regulation of monopolies, for a new departure in respect to the transportation problem, and I hope yet to see something done by this House in that direction.

When confederation was inaugurated in this country the main question before the people was the interpretation of our constitution and the building up of the country by the introduction of new provinces. That

has been accomplished. The next question which came up in connection with the constitutional question was the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. After that there was the trade issue; and that was settled by the adoption of the National Policy, introduced by the Conservative party, now taken over by hon. gentlemen opposite. The constitutional question has in the main been settled. The great question to-day is the transportation problem. The great purchasing centre of the world is the British market. The countries who desire to get there are Russia, North America, including Canada and the United States, Argentina in South America, and Australia. These five great countries are trying to get produce there by paying the lowest possible freight rates, and only such countries will get there as are able to obtain the lowest freight rates for their produce. The time has come when the question should be determined: what should be the policy adopted in order to get produce there at the cheapest possible rates? That is the whole question and it is before us to-day, and hon. members and the Government are bound to take some position in respect to the solution of this problem; they are bound to do something to regulate the transportation monopoly that exists to-day. We find, however, that instead of regulating this monopoly, the Government are strengthening it and even building it up. If that is really the case, and I shall endeavour to show that such is the fact, hon. gentlemen opposite are to be condemned for the position they have taken and to be condemned for the legislation they have introduced in this House. No doubt a monopoly is created by this legislation proposed. That is apparent from the contract, and it has not been denied. It has been stated that there will be a competing road, and indeed that roads may be chartered by British Columbia. That may be so, but the fact is this, that a provincial charter has been acquired by Mackenzie & Mann including a large provincial land subsidy, and that firm is now obtaining a Dominion charter with a large Dominion land grant with it; and thus a vigorous monopoly has been created which will rule that country and which will enable the company to make their own tariff rates and in fact do as they please. Hon. members, out and out Reformers, coming from the North-west, raised the cry in this House from year to year that there was a monopoly created in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Those members from the North-west Territories who thus condemned that railway monopoly, are here to-day to propose that a monopoly in regard to freight rates shall be placed on the miners of the country. If it were wrong to create a monopoly in case of the farmers of the North-west, is it not equally wrong to create a monopoly against the miners? That is what is done by the contract—it creates a monopoly in the carry-

ing trade in which the miners of the Yukon are interested. Hon. gentlemen opposite profess to be progressive, to be in favour of progressive legislation; but so far as I can gather they are reactionists. Max Nordau has told us about the decadents of the present day, but he would find a good example on the other side of the House. They are not progressive, they are degenerates, at all events so far as the present question is concerned. They are not attacking monopoly, but strengthening it. Speaking for myself and for a large section of the community, I make bold to say that we must restrain those monopolies and declare in favour of the supremacy of the state over them; we must do something to minimize their strength and importance and not increase and strengthen them, as hon. gentlemen opposite are now doing. The last speaker (Mr. McClure) discussed the question from the legal standpoint. I can only discuss it from the standpoint of the ordinary thinking man. Viewed in such light, I say the contract is bad because its terms are bad. Because there may be urgency, is that any reason why a monopoly should be created? If there is urgency, is it wise to seek to relieve it by adopting a measure that is wrong in principle? Hon. gentlemen opposite contend that it is necessary in order to build this railway to give Mackenzie & Mann over 4,000,000 acres of most valuable mining lands. It is not necessary to do so. The Government have to-day a proposal which is a much better one for the people of this country than that accepted from Mackenzie & Mann, and I will read it to the House before I conclude. The people of the country are watching hon. gentlemen opposite to see if they carry out their promise to protect the public interest, and how can they say they are protecting the public interest in view of the large land grant proposed to be given to these contractors, and this in face of the proposition submitted by Mr. Hamilton Smith. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I now propose to read that proposition to the House, and I ask my hon. friends from British Columbia and the North-west to see whether with their votes they can justify this proposition of the Government in the light of this offer from Mr. Hamilton Smith.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is he?

Mr. MACLEAN. He is a representative of large capitalists in Great Britain, and his credentials are undoubted. He has presented his credentials to the Government, and if they care to wire to London, as he says in his letter, they will find that his credentials are as good as those of the Rothschilds themselves. His proposition is as follows:—

To the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G., Premier:

Sir,—In view of the strongly expressed opposition to the subsidy of mineral lands, with power

to the concessionaire of selection in very many different localities, I beg leave to amend my proposition of the 14th inst., as follows:—

If a charter is granted to myself and associates not later than the 10th of March next, we will agree in the present year to build a substantial railway of three feet gauge (so constructed that it can afterwards be easily changed to a standard gauge), from Pyramid Harbour to the foot of Rink Rapids, a distance of about 288 miles, on condition that the Government will give no new charter for railways from Lynn Canal in the next five years; will authorize for that term proper traffic rates, and will give us a grant in fee simple (covering mineral rights) of alternate sections of one mile square for a distance of ten miles on each side of the railway from the 60th parallel of latitude to the northern terminus at Rink Rapids; this grant would embrace a length of about 195 miles, and, being at the rate of 6,400 acres per mile of railway, would amount to say 1,248,000 acres.

In this connection I may state that very little prospecting for gold has been thus far done in this locality.

Permit me again to call your attention to the fact that the ocean terminus of this Dalton line is nearer Dawson City than the northern terminus of the proposed Stikine line.

By Dalton Route.

	Miles.
Pyramid Harbour to Rink Rapids by rail.	288
Rink Rapids to Dawson by large boats..	288

513

By Stikine Route.

Southern end Lake Teslin to mouth of Hootalinqua	60½
Hootalinqua River to its junction with Lewes	139½
Lewes River from Hootalinqua to Rink Rapids	135
Rink Rapids to Dawson City.....	225

560

If Mr. Jennings's advice be carried out that the railway should be extended ten miles north of end of Lake Teslin, the distance from inner terminus of Stikine line to Dawson would be 550 miles, or thirty-seven miles farther from Pyramid Harbour to Dawson.

Versus Mackenzie and Mann.

Or, if Government still insists on Stikine line alone, we will build that on same general terms as the provisional contract with Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann for 1,000,050 acres, but without the right of lateral or end extension of the blocks of land.

The Government is, I believe, informed as to our financial ability to execute such work, but if there are any doubts to this, a cable or so to London would speedily give the desired information.

I have the honour to remain,

Yours very respectfully,

Mr. MORRISON. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean), what is the date of that letter?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is the 18th February.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) doubt it? It was put in the hands of the Government.

Mr. MACLEAN.

Mr. MORRISON. On the 18th February. The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Saturday last.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes; Mr. Hamilton Smith put his proposition in on the 14th, and this letter is subsequent to that. He is prepared to execute this road in the same time as Mann & Mackenzie, and he is prepared to execute it for one-fourth of their land grant, and without any monopoly. That is the proposition before the people, and it is on that and on similar propositions that the Government will be judged. It is on the right of all contractors to bid for this work; it is on the record of the Liberal party that no contract should be granted unless all contractors had a chance to tender for it; it is on these propositions that hon. gentlemen opposite will be tried before the country, and will be condemned before the country, if they do not retrace their steps. If the Government opposite are condemned, they will be condemned effectually, and it will be found, as it was found after four years' trial of Liberal Government in 1873, that—as my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) said here the other day, and for which he was ridiculed—that the Liberal party have not the gifts of magistracy, and have not the instincts of government.

This proposition of Mr. Hamilton Smith is to build a railway beginning at Pyramid Harbour, and I stand here to-day to contend that Pyramid Harbour is in Canada, that the road from Pyramid Harbour right into Dawson City is entirely in Canada, and that it is a better Canadian route than the one the Government proposes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Whose possession is it in?

Mr. MACLEAN. It should be in ours, and if the hon. gentleman raises the question, then I say it is his (Sir Louis Davies) fault that it is not in our possession.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not ask if it was ours, but I asked in whose possession it was.

Mr. MACLEAN. It should be in ours, and you are responsible that it should be in our possession.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACLEAN. I do not wish to trespass on the rules by addressing the hon. Minister directly, but I say the Government is responsible if it is not in our possession. I contend that Pyramid Harbour is in Canadian territory, and that the line should be built from there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I just ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean), if he knows whether or not this harbour has been in possession of the Americans for a number of years back

—before this Government came into power at all.

Mr. MACLEAN. I know that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Away back fifteen or twenty years ago.

Mr. MACLEAN. I do not deny that for a moment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then, how does the hon. gentleman contend that this Government, which only came into power in July, 1896, could at all be responsible for the fact that the Americans held possession of it for over twenty years before this Government came into power?

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman will be held responsible for refusing this offer. He and his Government will be held responsible if they do not occupy that territory, and if they do not maintain the rights of Canada, whatever they be, in connection with it.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Next week we may have a better offer.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, it is altogether likely that you will, and there is where you stand convicted that you did not notify contractors, for the moment that this Government contract becomes widespread, men come in and offer to take it up at much better terms for the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the rise of monopolies is the most dangerous thing to the world to-day. The influence they exercise on legislatures, and the shackles they forge on the people in every direction, is exciting widespread interest all over. If, as they say, a revolution is threatened in the United States, it is because the growth of these monopolies which are getting stronger and stronger every day, and which have now become so powerful that the people of the United States have lost faith in their representative institutions. Representative institutions are to-day almost a failure in that country, and they soon will be a failure in this country, if these enormous monopolies are created and allowed to rule and dominate Canada. Sir, they, and not the Canadian Parliament, will soon be the masters of Canada. I make bold to say, that it is not Mann & Mackenzie that are here, but it is that monster monopoly, the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is the corporation that this Government are building up. True, they deny it; but I believe there was an option at the time of this proposal, and if this railway proposition goes through, it will not be many moons before the time-tables and everything else in connection with the Yukon road will be signed by Sir William VanHorne, and not by William Mackenzie. Not only do these railway monopolies threaten our representative institutions, not only have they brought the people

of the United States to think that representative government has been a failure, but they have caused the people over there to clamour for direct legislation by the people themselves. In the United States the people are to-day demanding that such matters as this should be submitted to the popular vote, and, Sir, if this Yukon Railway contract were submitted to the people of Canada, it would be condemned from one end of the country to the other. I only hope that this Government will take this question to the country; I only hope that this Bill will meet with defeat in some other quarter, and that the Government will go to the country on it. I would like to see them ask the electorate of Canada to endorse a proposal such as this, not only on its merits, or rather demerits, but in the light of this other proposal that has been made by Mr. Hamilton Smith. Let me ask: Who are bringing forward all these propositions in the country? I ask my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville) to pay a little attention to what I have to say in this respect, for he has had some journalistic experience, and so have I. Both the Yukon Railway proposition and the Crow's Nest Railway proposition of last year were brought before the people of Canada in a very mysterious way. They were first announced and the way paved for them in the columns of the Toronto "Globe," a newspaper well known to hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, I have no objection to the "Globe" newspaper, as a newspaper. It has been the Liberal organ, and it has been a very good paper for the Liberal party in this country; but something has happened within the last few years, and hon. gentlemen on the opposite side ought to know it, and probably do know it. The "Globe" has passed into the control of monopolists. Instead of being the conscience of its party, as it ought to be, it is the organ of railway exploiters, who are taking advantage of the position the "Globe" stands in to its party, and are using it for their own ends, and are using it for the ruin of the Liberal party. Let the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—let these monopolists—go into the newspaper business, if they wish, but let them go into it openly. If hon. gentlemen opposite have any interest in their party, if they have any interest in their chief organ, they will say that the day has come when the paper that professes to be their organ and to speak for them and to keep the conscience of their party—the day has come when that newspaper must pass out of the hands of these railway exploiters.

Now, all these propositions have come forward in this way. You see them hinted at in the "Globe" newspaper and other papers friendly to the Administration, and especially to the railway monopolists. This proposition has not emanated from the Government; it is not a Government proposition, as a matter of fact. It is a proposition which was brought forward by rail-

way exploiters, submitted by them to special members of the Cabinet, and by those special members introduced into this House. It is not a Government measure at all, but a measure submitted by these railway exploiters, and the Government was induced to take it up, especially through the agency of the Toronto "Globe." There is another feature of this monopoly which will come out in a very few days. The gentlemen who have made this proposition are very enterprising men, who are looking for good things all the world over. They have acquired the street railways in most of the cities of this country. They acquired the street railway franchise in the city of Toronto, for which they paid very little; and what they did was to issue bonds to pay for the entire cost of that road, and on these bonds they issued \$6,000,000 of stock, divided it among themselves and sold it to the public; and to-day that stock is at par. They have done the same thing with many other street railway franchises in this country, and with certain electric plants; and now they propose to do it with this project. I believe there is a statement in the papers to-day that within twelve months, if this project goes through Parliament, these gentlemen will be able to bond it to the extent of fifteen or twenty million dollars. And, Sir, there is another thing in the wind. If there is one thing that will help to settle the transportation question in this country—and again I appeal to my hon. friends from the North-west and British Columbia—it is state control of a railway from Port Arthur to Winnipeg. That is the key to the situation; that is the key that must be saved at any cost to the people of this country. But what are the facts, so far as hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends in the Ontario Legislature are concerned? The charter for the Rainy River Railway and the provincial subsidy that goes with it have passed into the hands of Mr. Mackenzie. Mr. Mackenzie, as the papers tell us—and I presume they tell the truth—has been in Winnipeg negotiating with Mr. Greenway, the Premier of the province of Manitoba. Mr. Greenway is staking his political reputation upon securing a railway that will guarantee a low rate for the transport of wheat from the province of Manitoba to Lake Superior. He threatened at one time to take the railway to Duluth; but I understand that his friends here asked him to abandon Duluth, and go to Port Arthur or some other Ontario port. I believe he has that end in view; but Mr. Mackenzie being in possession of the charter of that railway, without being required to make any terms as to rates or running rights over it, will have in his hands a monopoly which will have cost him little, but which he can sell for millions to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We know that hon. gentlemen opposite are to be asked to subsidize a

Mr MACLEAN.

rival railway from Port Arthur to Winnipeg; but if they cannot take a stand in regard to the Yukon Railway, how can they be expected to take a stand in regard to the Rainy River Railway? I know what they are going to do; I can forecast it, as I correctly forecast some other things that have happened. They will do as they have done on other occasions, make a pretence of regulating that railway; but the end will be that it will pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west will continue to be under their thumb. The day has come to declare for a Government railway, the day has come to declare that this Yukon Railway should be a Government railway, on which the Government should regulate the rates, not once in four years, but every day in the week. Hon. gentlemen may not take the advanced line I take for the complete Government ownership of railways; but the day has come for the complete control of railway rates by the Government, and the granting of running rights over the railways of the country to anybody who may apply for them. These are the principles that ought to govern railway legislation to-day; but they are being abandoned by hon. gentlemen opposite. The people of the United States are alive to this question. They are under railway monopolies there, but what is the proposal of one of their ablest thinkers in regard to the transportation problem as set out in the "North American Review" of this month?—and I advise hon. gentlemen to read it. This well informed writer shows the necessity of regulating railways and controlling their rates, and his proposal is to nationalize every road west of the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean. He says that will be the one cure of the evil; and we in this country must do the same thing. We must nationalize the railways, I do not care how large or how small they may be. We must keep Parliament supreme over them; we must control their rates, and we must give running rights over them to any railway that may require them. But hon. gentlemen opposite are not taking one single step in this direction. They are simply doing their best to create a new monopoly, and to allow it to be absorbed by the greater monopoly, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. FLINT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Is it his opinion that Government should have built this Yukon Railway as a Government work out of borrowed or other money?

Mr. MACLEAN. That is my view, decidedly. The Government should have built this road out of Government money, and kept it in our own hands. The people would vote the necessary money for that purpose to-morrow. If you bring down a

proposition to build that railway, for which I admit the urgency, with Government money, though I cannot speak for the Opposition, I believe every man on this side of the House would vote for it. It is not the members on this side of the House, but their own friends who may not have enough confidence in them to support such a proposition, that they need to convert. Hon. gentlemen were very careful last year in the Railway Committee to put a certain clause in all railway bills which went through that committee. There was a company chartered last year under the name of the British Yukon Company, and in that charter there is this clause :

Any Act hereinafter passed for the purpose of controlling railway companies incorporated by or subject to Parliament as to the issuing of stock or bonds, and as to rates or tolls and the regulations thereof, and as to running powers over or other rights in connection with the railway of any company by any other company, and the exercise of powers conferred upon railway companies, shall apply to the companies from the time such Act goes into effect ; but this section shall not be construed to imply that such Act would not apply to the company without the enactment of this section.

Why did they not put that clause in this railway Bill ? If they are to have a railway commission, as is hinted in the House and in the country, why do they not retain some right over this railway by that railway commission when it does come ? An honest railway commission could do a great deal to ameliorate transportation difficulties in this country, and this road above all roads, this road which is to be built entirely by means of the land of the people—for it is the people who are building the road and giving Mann & Mackenzie the monopoly of an immense quantity of land—this road above all others requires to be controlled by a commission in the interests of the people. Do hon. gentlemen opposite say that Mann & Mackenzie are building this road ? I say it is the people who are building it and who ought to own it and control it and regulate its rates and be in a position to give running rights to any other railway to whom they may see fit. The Government have not even retained the right to submit these matters to arbitration. They provide that in four years, in ten years—different times—the rates shall be reduced, but they should retain the power to regulate these rates from the start and compel the company to accept reasonable terms. But hon. gentlemen opposite, despite all their protestations out of office, are now doing everything in an off-handed, ill-advised way. Every proposal in that Bill is in direct antagonism to the public interest, to recognized principles of modern railway legislation, and especially to the principles that these hon. gentlemen advocated when in Opposition. They then clamorously contended for the submission to tender of the construction of all public works. They

then declared that no public work of any importance should be constructed without everybody having had a chance to compete. But here to-day we have them calmly ignoring this cardinal principle of their faith in Opposition and making a private treaty for this most important and expensive undertaking without the slightest pretense of having invited tenders. Had they invited competition, they would have had, inside of three days, a proposal at least just as good as the one offered to them. But instead of inviting competition, they made a secret contract, and now must take the consequences.

I hope the Bill will be defeated, first, because it is wrong in itself ; second, because it is against the principles of progressive railway legislation ; third, because it is opposed to the true interests of the people.

It only requires a few independent men to stand up on the other side and state boldly what they think and this Bill will not go through. A cove of five men on the other side would upset this proposition. If the men of the North-west are true to their principles and provinces, they will stand up in opposition to this iniquitous measure ; and if only four men on the other side rose and spoke against it, that would be sufficient to defeat it. The men from the North-west cannot sit there quietly and vote for a monopoly of this kind ; they cannot vote for this squandering of the public land of this country. The people of the North-west want to see the railway legislation of this country established on a better basis. There is not one of the representatives in the North-west who dare get up in this House and vote and support the shackling of the miners of Yukon in the way proposed by this contract and then justify their claim that the farmers of the North-west should have the shackles that have been put on them by the Canadian Pacific Railway broken. If the North-west claims that she has been badly treated by the Canadian Pacific Railway, then her representatives cannot with any grace support the putting of similar shackles on the miners of the Yukon. I believe that the public opinion of the North-west and that the public opinion of British Columbia—outside from the feeling among the merchants in the two large cities out there—is against this proposition.

Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that we must have the road and that it must be built this year. I do not deny that, but I object to the monopoly, I object to the land grab, and I say that for one-fourth of that land grab you could get the road built and keep the control in the hands of the Government. If that be the case, the representatives of the great west and British Columbia must, as honest men, oppose this measure.

Mr. MORRISON. As far as the remarks of the hon. gentleman refer to British Col-

umbia, may I tell him that he is talking twaddle.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should not make use of that expression.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am not talking twaddle, and I will go out to the hon. gentleman's country—I hope to be there this summer—and if he will call a public meeting, I will attend it and tackle him on that question, and we will find out where the twaddle is. Can these hon. gentlemen stand up here and justify this land grab? Can they go back to their people and justify such a proposition in the face of all their pledges and in the face of the new offer just read to the House? If hon. gentlemen will stand up here and condemn the Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly which has been fastened on the farmers of the North-west, I do not see how they can consistently justify this monopoly which is being put upon the miners of the Yukon.

I may have wearied the House, but I think I am speaking for the progressive public opinion of this country. I know that there is a party in this country, a progressive party—perhaps I will call it the Forward Conservatives of the country—who recognize the fact that the transportation problem is the one, above all others, which we must solve, and that if we do not approach it in the right spirit and in the right way, we shall do the country incalculable damage. But if we start in now to get on the right line, if we now regulate every railway, as it comes up, and keep control over its running rights, we will have gone a long way to improving the position. I appeal to hon. gentlemen who form the Government to withdraw this proposal or at least to modify it. But if they choose to go on and refuse to withdraw or modify the Bill, the sooner they go to the country and ask the people to approve this iniquitous measure, the sooner they will find out that they stand condemned by the people as a whole.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I wish to address a few remarks, Mr. Speaker, to the House upon this measure, and in doing so I desire, in the first place, to make a few references to those which have just fallen from the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean). I think that hon. gentleman was very much mistaken when he said that the people of British Columbia were opposed to this measure; and as his appeal was especially directed to the people of British Columbia, Manitoba, and the North-west Territories, I would advise him to read the organs of both parties in British Columbia and he will find that there is a consensus of opinion in that province, amounting to a unanimity, in favour of the Government's action. There may not, I admit, be the same unanimity after the hon. gentleman

Mr. MACLEAN.

invades that country and calls those meetings, but in the meantime we must take the facts as they are.

The hon. gentleman's whole address was directed to three points, and what they had to do in many respects with this particular contract, I am at a loss to understand. He spoke about monopolies generally—not the monopoly of this particular company—and the public ownership of railways, and the appointment of a railway commission. Now, I admit that there is much to be said in favour of the three matters to which the hon. gentleman referred. There are thoughtful men who think that the railways of a country ought to be owned by the Government, and there are thoughtful men who think that a railway commission should exist in every country, and I am sure there is not a thoughtful man in Canada who does not believe thoroughly that the continuation of extension of monopolies is not in the best interests of the country. But what have these matters to do with this question? The Canadian Pacific Railway is a monopoly, so the hon. gentleman says. When did this new light dawn upon him? What has he been doing all these years, when, as the proprietor and publisher of a Conservative paper, he stood by the men who were the authors of this monopoly? Is his new-born zeal now going to atone for his conduct in the past? But even now he has not sufficient strength to say it is a monopoly. He hints, he says: "If it is a monopoly," and I would have listened to my hon. friend's remarks with a great deal of pleasure if he had said that from the darkness in which he had groped formerly he had now emerged, and that having seen the light he is opposed to all monopolies and is sorry he ever stood by this one. But no such thing did he say. He says the "Globe" is a monopoly, and Mackenzie & Mann are a monopoly; and he mentions frequently that Mackenzie & Mann were monopolists because they own the Toronto Street Railway. That is unkind of the hon. gentleman because he did all he could to fasten that monopoly upon the people.

Mr. MACLEAN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. FRASER. In every issue of his paper, until at last he succeeded, he called upon the people of Toronto to have the cars run on Sunday, and thus make all the greater monopoly—

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a moment. I advocated in my newspaper the municipalization of the Toronto Street Railway franchise and the management of it for the benefit of the people.

Mr. FRASER. I do not refer to the handing over of that franchise to the present holders.

Mr. MACLEAN. But that is my record.

Mr. FRASER. But I wanted to show the hon. gentleman's consistency. When these gentlemen held this monopoly, he did all he could to have the cars run on Sunday and so assist the monopolists to make more money.

Mr. MACLEAN. I wanted the cars to run on Sunday for the benefit of the people.

Mr. FRASER. As to this matter of "shackling the miners," can the hon. gentleman be serious? Is he discussing the question having in view the nature of the country through which the railway goes, or does he regard it as a fine country with every advantage of Ontario or the Northwest? He says that a new offer was put in on Saturday to build for half the land. It is only, then, the difference between one-half and the whole. But, if only half the land is given, the hon. gentleman is quite ready to have this line of three-foot gauge so graphically described by hon. gentlemen opposite.

An. hon. MEMBER. It is only one-quarter the land.

Mr. FRASER. I think the hon. gentleman said 1,800,000 acres.

Mr. McALISTER. No, 1,000,000.

Mr. FRASER. I distinctly heard the hon. gentleman speak of 1,800,000 acres, but perhaps, that was for the other road?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. I will accept the hon. gentleman's statement that it is only one-quarter of the land. Then it becomes only a question of quantity. What noble consistency, to say that with four acres a monopoly is infamous, but with only one acre it is all right.

Mr. MACLEAN. I did not support the new proposition.

Mr. FRASER. Then there is no point in what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. MACLEAN. There is a point of public competition.

Mr. FRASER. Then, the hon. gentleman is not in favour of giving an acre of land?

Mr. MACLEAN. No.

Mr. FRASER. Then there was no need to urge the difference in quantity. But, after all, what is this new-born monopoly that the hon. gentleman has spoken of? Does the monopoly consist in the granting of subventions to railways in any case? If so, all the Governments in this country, and in every country in the world in the early history of railways have been wrong. But in railway monopoly that will really injure the people is one in which a railway has an advantage in a country which, by settlement,

will be an advantage for all time. This is not a monopoly according to those terms.

Now, let us know where we stand. There are three things on which we are agreed, and, if we state these clearly and set them aside, we can reach a basis for argument. First of all, it is agreed by both sides that the urgency is great, that it is absolutely necessary that this road should be built this year. Secondly, the route decided upon, according both to the Government and to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Maclean's) leader, the route which has been chosen is the best route. The hon. gentleman is sometimes strong enough to say that he has no leader. Be that as it may, I accept the sanction of the leader of the Opposition when he agrees with the Government as to the route. The third thing that we were agreed on is that the road ought to be in British territory. If it is urgent that the road should be built this summer, and if it is true, that in respect to this road days are of more value than months would be in the case of another road, then the Government is right in taking steps to save every possible moment. Then, if the route is agreed upon, the Government cannot be blamed for having chosen this route. If we all agree and we do, I trust, that in building that road, whether for purposes of peace, whether for the purpose of supplying the inhabitants with all that is necessary to prosecute their labours in that country, or to defend ourselves against lawlessness there, we should go through British territory, then we have eliminated from the discussion all that appeared at first to be the strong point raised by hon. gentlemen opposite. This leaves us but little to discuss. The question is simply whether the Government are giving too much to these contractors. But, before going on with that, I must refer to one matter that has struck me as peculiar during the days we have spent in debating this question. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) in his first interview, gave the Government credit for acting as it had acted. I was prepared to find the hon. gentleman patriotic when he was not surrounded by small souls and small minds, though his opinion that the Government had acted rightly might well cause me to doubt the fact on my own account. But when my hon. countryman came here he was at once arrested. It was a case of York, and York and York. The gentlemen from York determined that the leader should be throttled. I will not use the term applied by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) when he spoke—I will not say that these hon. gentlemen were cut-throats; I will not say that they were determined to cut their leader's throat; that would be inelegant. But these three giants decided that, in the interests of the Conservative party this man must be stopped. The sinister motives they may have

had I have nothing to do with. They were hinted at by the hon. member for North Victoria. He said the object was to depose the leader and gain his place. And when these giants of the Conservative party united, I think I can hear a member of the party say: Now is the winter of our discontent made glorious summer by three sons of York. These men came and they succeeded. For a number of days I have sat here and watched the hon. leader of the Opposition and the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) as they sat together. It was almost a representation without words of the song: "We never speak as we pass by." It was very amusing to see. There was a jerkiness to the conversation; there was a lack of sympathy in the tones of the voice; there was everything to indicate that matters needed setting right. I congratulate the leader of the Opposition upon one thing—that he has so far laid aside his own opinion for the sake of harmony that he has yielded; that he has not caused another strike on the part of the Conservative leaders such as was seen previous to his own advent to power. But a flood of light is thrown upon the whole transaction. In his better moments the ablest man in the Conservative party declared that this contract was all right. I am sure that at this moment the leader of the Opposition feels—if I may be allowed to say so—that he made a mistake in his retrograde movement, for, after all, when a great emergency arises, nothing so exalts a man as to rise above minor considerations and approve the wise and patriotic plans of those who are opposed to him.

I do not wish to speak on the question of boundary. I have little to say upon that subject, for I feel that the less we say about what we own and what we do not own there, the better. Even the opinion of the humblest member may be quoted against this. But this one thing is plain: We can in no way get more than we have. If the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite is correct, that the treaty of 1871 gave us as much right as the old treaty that we had with the Russians, then there is no need of any further discussion, because we have the rights there, they were given under that treaty. But I am not going to discuss the question, even as to the rights we have. We are now face to face with the question of getting into the Yukon; and I agree with my hon. friend the member for Colchester (Mr. McClure), that in the meantime we should hold to all we have. Sir, I did much regret that there should be found any member of Parliament who would say—I have no doubt he did it in an unguarded moment—who would even hint here, that there should be an attempt made by this Government with the Government of the United States, to go a-begging to find where we are. Would we not be in a nice position, if that was done? Would they not say at once to us: Well,

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

we will see about that. We claim this, and we claim that, and we claim the other thing. If you come here, you are not sure of your ground. That is what they would say. Surely it would be very bad policy for a man wishing to submit a question to arbitration, who had a difficulty with his neighbour as to the ownership of an adjoining piece of land, to go to him and say: Where is my line? and that in a case where he was bound to bring an action. It would be the worst policy in the world, because he would be estopped afterwards; he would be told: You did not know your own line, and you came to me to find out where your line was. That meeting would be brought up against him. No; the Government took the only dignified position that any Government could take. They said: Whatever rights we have there we are going to maintain. It was very amusing to hear the hon. gentleman opposite actually blaming the present Government. What would he not blame them for, in all his zeal against monopoly? He blames them because a port was occupied by the United States under the eye of the chief that he loved and served, served too faithfully, if not too well, for eighteen years, and he blames the present Government because they have not wrested the port from the Americans. In what way are you going to put those people out of possession? I suppose the hon. gentleman would be ready to join a filibustering party to go up there and throttle the Americans and put them out. We cannot put them out; Canada can do nothing. It is British territory, and the whole matter must be decided by the British Government. You cannot do it. Would not the very fact of raising this objection and going there to-day, so irritate the people of the United States, that nothing could be done? Now, then, if I am right, we have agreed upon the essentials of the question, namely, the urgency, the route and the territory. Then, I think the discussion is reduced to a very small issue. Now, if it was urgent, it was urgent for some purpose. I have listened to the comical exhibitions of hon. gentlemen opposite, who think that land is so filled with gold that any man can go there and walk out with his pockets full. We are agreed upon one matter, that is, that for every dollar's worth of gold that ever was mined in the world, a dollar's worth of labour, so far as we can find out, has been given. That is what gives permanency to gold, that is what makes gold the best circulating medium, because it is something for which we give an amount of human labour, as much human labour as the value that is given to it as a circulating medium. That is the reason. Now, these hon. gentlemen think that they are going to make rich finds out there. Well, I go so far as to say this, that, even if I knew that these men were going to make fifty millions out of this contract, I would still vote for

it, and I will tell you why. Suppose a man has a valuable farm or a valuable mine anywhere; say, it is worth \$100,000, and there is no access to it, he cannot utilize it or get anything out of it, and he has no money. Now, the Government have the money, but they are in this position, they have the mines there, the people of Canada have. Then, I say, it pays that man to give half the value of the mine, or the land, to get \$50,000 out of it, in order that he may get half its value. So it pays the country to give a subvention to a railway in order that the people of the country may get less than the whole value, by giving the balance of it. How, otherwise, are we going to get there? That is the principle upon which subventions are granted, that is the only reason that can be given for subventions. We hear the stories of gold. Why, every day, as I came back here when the House met at three o'clock, I expected to see a number of hon. gentlemen opposite away, flying to the Klondike, allured by the stories of gold. I understand that, at the little conference to which I referred a moment ago, a song sung by the hon. member for West York fixed the matter. I understand that, as they were attempting to get their leader into line, the point was raised: Well, perhaps the gold is not there that you speak about. Then, I understand, he sang this song, and that brought them all round:

The gold is there most everywhere,
And they dig it up with an iron bar;
And where it's thick, with spade and pick
They dig up junks as big as a brick.
Then ho! boys, go to Yukon City, go!

That settled the matter at once. That is just the view the hon. gentlemen have of it. That is the cry that may take hundreds and thousands into that gold country and send them back home poorer than they went. The fact is, that there is gold there, there may be much gold there. But it is in a country where, for months and months, nothing can be done. Hon. gentlemen speak of it as if it was a sunny climate. This railway itself can only be used for a short time, not more than half the year, at most; that is all the time it can be used to any advantage. But to get at the gold we must, as I said before, have this railway. Now, if it was urgent, I thought I could picture to myself the hon. leader of the Opposition and the position he would take. Suppose we said: Well, we will look round a little more, we will ask for offers, and perhaps by fall we will find out what we can do. I think I hear him rising and denouncing the Government for failing to give protection to life and to property. Here are people going in there by the thousands, with no opportunity of getting lumber to build their houses, with no opportunity of getting food, and they will starve. The plains will be covered with their whitened bones. The great desert in which the people of Israel

wandered, will be nothing to it. I think I hear him pleading for his countrymen, going to the wives and mothers after the death of their beloved ones, and talking to them as no one could talk with greater ability—not to soothe them, not to awaken too much anger, but to show them all the difficulties. A poor mother is found whose son was lost. "Where was he lost?" asks the sympathizing leader of the Opposition. "Lost," says she. "lost here, near the Big Salmon. And I think, as there was another river near by, called the 'Little Salmon,' that at least he could have caught fish to keep himself alive." "Ah," says the leader of the Opposition, "there is where your beloved husband fell. I know your story. I feel for you, but I must tell you that you must blame the Government, who left that country without any means of access or egress. I call upon you now, madam, to make a vow here, before me, that you and all your kin will wage a war against the Government that left that country unoccupied." Along comes a maiden fair whose lover went out there to better his condition. She is weeping for "one who returneth not," whose chamber lamp burneth—no more." Where did he die? "At the White Horse Rapids," says the almost fainting maiden. A suitable place—Death, on the White Horse, met him there. There he laid him down to die.

I charge you to say that you will never forgive the Government that so neglected its duty. Is that a fancy picture? I tell hon. gentlemen that there is not an hon. member opposite—if he is a man, as I think he is—and I know them and give them credit for heart, who would not declare, if the Government had left the country during the present year without a railway, they were justified in speaking in that way. Do hon. gentlemen not think that the Government have not the right to say that the people under their charge should not be left without being guarded. Do hon. gentlemen think about the wild rush into that country. In view of immense gold discoveries men almost lose their reason; their only thought is how to get into the country, they are prepared to spend their money or borrow money on their property to secure transportation to the place where gold is. Hon. gentlemen opposite think that gold is in the Yukon. Many people are undoubtedly leaving for that country. Was this undertaking, therefore, not urgent? If the Government had left that country as it is now, in view of the thousands going in there and the many thousands that will go in during the year, I feel they would not be entitled to our sympathy and support. When this railway communication has been gained without any expenditure of money, and when the principle that the people of the country who receive the advantage should contribute to it has been established, I wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite can op-

pose it. The Government were not confronted with the circumstances surrounding an ordinary transaction. It was not a time to reason after the method of building a road to a back concession, or carrying a road through any of the well-settled parts of any of the provinces of Canada. They were met with a condition, not a theory. The condition was this, that there was a country, and the only way of getting there was over trails or by way of the Yukon River, and the Government had to view the situation and act accordingly.

A new proposition is made. That is the easiest thing in the world to do. I have been in the same position; I have been at an auction room where articles sold at a certain price, and I would have willingly given double the amount had I known their value. Why were these gentlemen not so willing to make such propositions before, I should like to know. Any man when he becomes satisfied that a scheme is a good thing, is willing to underbid; but the men now submitting this proposition are making it on one of two grounds: they are either making it on the strength of the wild statements of members of Parliament as to the great value of the mineral wealth of the country, or in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite. They were not so ready before. During the few days that have elapsed between the two propositions, they have shown they were changing their opinions. The Government had no option, with the information at their disposal, than to make this contract and carry it out, and if to-day parties come forward and offer to do the work at one-half or one-quarter the price, I would say that we should lose three-quarters of the amount rather than give the work to them. The Government cannot afford to do so. It is very well known that this offer is made within about ten days of the time when the winter road must be finished; and this is another point that the Government had to take into consideration. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has stated that this is not the Government policy, but the Government are in the hands of a lot of men, that lack of them are the contractors who are moulding their actions, and that the Government have nothing to do except what is ordered by those behind. I do not believe it for one moment. This new offer, coming as it does now, is in itself suspicious. But if the Government had done nothing until Parliament met, as the hon. gentleman claimed they should not have done, what position would they occupy? An hon. gentleman rose in the course of this debate on the Opposition side of the House and said he was ready to fight out the question on that line if it took all summer. Hon. gentlemen opposite are well aware that the Government would have been placed in a fix; no road would have been built this

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

summer, and then when anarchy and want of food prevailed, they would have accused the Government of being responsible for this condition. Does not history prove that such is the case. I would not blame them for taking that advantage simply on party grounds. But the Government have anticipated their actions. At this time, when we are within ten days of the date when the winter road must be built, a new proposition is submitted. I will yield to no man in my view that the land should be for the people, pure and simple. I believe the land belongs to the people and I believe in the right of the people to own the land; but I believe just as fully that in order to give them access to land and to increase the value of the larger quantity, Parliament can be utilized to bring a larger benefit. It is a simple proposition. Would not the hon. gentleman and his leader—now that cordial relations have been re-established between them, for I think his leader said “hear, hear,” when the hon. gentleman announced how he would vote—if it became known that the Government had granted three or four millions for the construction of the road, have been among the first to declare that the road should have been built by a land grant, that 100,000 acres a mile would have been nothing because the land possessed no value until a railway was built. The hon. gentleman would have risen in his place in this House and have declared that the poor farmers and the poor fishermen were thus called upon to pay for the construction of the line. Is there a farmer or fishermen in Canada who would not be prepared to say frankly that they knew nothing of the Yukon country, but had heard of its mineral wealth, and if it was desirable to develop it by the construction of a railroad, it should be built from money derived out of the land. It must be remembered that there is no such thing as obtaining gold—save in a few instances—except by labour. When the people find that the Government equally with the contractors will benefit by the land grant, they will come to the conclusion that it cannot be a very bad bargain, for the Government will have alternate blocks with the contractors and will join with them in the advantages derived. Gentlemen opposite are agreed that the building of this road was urgent, and that the route selected is the proper one, then let me ask them is it not of great advantage that there should be a Canadian route. There are some members on the Conservative side who will argue when it suits them, or when they think they can make a point against the Government, that the road should be built through the White Pass and through American territory. Now, Sir, I claim that the advantages of this route selected by the Government are three-fold. First, from a commercial point of view; second, that we shall at all times have the sole right

to go on that road, and, third, because on that road our supplies can never be interfered with. Suppose, for example, the Government had given a contract to build a road partially through American territory, as some have offered to build it, I think I can hear the full-blooded Britishers on the other side of the House rising in their places and saying: That is always the way with you over there; you are always giving privileges to the Americans; why did you not build the road through British territory. When these hon. gentlemen were in power we heard a good deal from them about British ideas, but now that they are in Opposition, some of them—with a few exceptions, I must say—are ready to throw away this great boon of having a railway through Canadian territory if they think, by arguing so, they could hurt the Government. It is of incalculable benefit to Canada that we should own this railway in our own country. If within the next year or two the Americans raise any of the difficulties which hon. gentlemen opposite seem to fear, then we can go right to work at once, and almost before they have time to turn, we can complete this road all through our own territory to the Pacific Ocean. Hon. gentlemen opposite say a great deal about the vast value of the land grant, but they know as well as I do that that is all problematical, and even if the grant should become valuable to the company, I am still in favour of this contract because through it the wealth of that country will be opened up to others to participate in. I am in favour of this road because without it the people of Canada cannot share in the riches of the Yukon. What is the use of quantities of gold lying in the gulches and in the mountains if we cannot get at it and take it out. Let it not be forgotten that in less than two years if we do not now command the situation by building that road, the Americans could get up the Yukon River and swarm over the whole country. And, Sir, if we had not law and order there, and the means of enforcing law and order, they would own the country. I shall not enter into the question as to the privileges which we are giving American miners in that country. For my own part, I believe that every decent citizen that goes into a country like that to add to its wealth ought to be treated fairly, to say the least of it. I sometimes think when I hear of narrow and contracted legislation being passed in the United States that we ought to retaliate; but upon that I shall offer no opinion just now. I am in favour of the railway because it is going to give Canadians an opportunity to get at the riches which may be stored in the Klondike. Many, very many of our young men will go there; some will make money and some not, but be that as it may, in going there they can feel that all the time they are on Canadian soil. I am

in favour of this railway because by it, the men who go there can obtain supplies of food and clothing and the materials necessary for prosecuting their undertakings. What is the use of gold unless men are able to utilize it? And if our Canadians could not get at the wealthy store in this country, as they could not without a railway, what would the riches be to us? Another great advantage which this railway would give is that it will enable Canada to send out the necessary number of men to enforce law and order. What was it that for twenty or thirty years made the western states a lawless country and prevented the best elements of the population from going there to prosper? Sir, it was the lawlessness which prevailed in that country, and I may say that in my travels through Canada to the Pacific Coast and through the western states of the Union, I was glad to see the great contrast which was manifest between our country and theirs. They sent out speculators and desperadoes to their western territories, while we sent out messengers of peace. We in Canada opened up the school and the church for the pioneer, while there people depended upon the revolver and the shotgun. And to-day life and property in the far west of Canada is as secure as it is in the old and settled provinces of the east. I want, Sir, that in this new country which we are now called upon to govern, steps shall be taken to make law and order supreme. The best way to insure that is by providing at once for the civilizing influences of a railroad. I want to see it provided that when thousands of our best young men, the hope and pride of our country, enter into that country, they shall feel that the protecting influence of British law is around them as it was at home, and that they shall not be in danger of losing their lives at the hands of outlaws. The railway will secure that, and to my mind it is one of the strongest points in its favour.

Again, Sir, I am in favour of this railway because it secures the trade of that country for Canadians. Hon. gentlemen opposite for eighteen years have been talking Canada for the Canadians, and here is an opportunity for them to carry out that principle. I am in favour of getting as much for Canada as possible, and I am for allowing other countries to help Canada in her march of progress. I say that to secure the trade of the Yukon for Canada at the earliest possible moment is of vast advantage to us. Let not hon. gentlemen opposite think they are rousing the country in this matter; let them not think that from one end of the Dominion to the other, as they say, the people denounce this scheme. I tell these hon. gentlemen that when the farmers and the merchants find that that rich country is going to be opened up by railway communication, and that the Government is providing means by which

their sons and their neighbours can reach the wealth of that country, hard as is the position of our people, and heavy as are the taxes they have to bear, be they Liberals or Conservatives, they will hold up their hands in thanks and praise to the Government that not one cent of additional burden will be placed upon them in connection with the building of that road, and that the country through which it runs will bear whatever expense there is in connection with it. He will listen to the idle bickerings of hon. gentlemen opposite; and he will smile and say, "What a curious change has come over these men!" Strange indeed that the men who were ready to vote away millions and millions of acres of as good land as the sun shines on—land that must continue to increase in value as the days go by—called upon the people to hurl a Government from power because they utilized a rocky and untimbered country, whose wealth was problematical, to open it up at least to fair competition to all the people of Canada to get what was there. That country may prove to be of more value than is generally supposed; but I am satisfied of one thing: if this mining excitement is over in a year or two or three years, hon. gentlemen opposite will want to erase every word they uttered when they come to meet the fact that the company who built this railway got no money from the Government for the work. But if that country proves to be a source of wealth for many years to come, I am satisfied also that the Government did well, for they laid the foundation of its future success. For these reasons I am in favour of this measure, irrespective of the cry raised by the member who spoke last for the members from the North-west and British Columbia. He seemed to think that he was a missionary at large to call these men to repentance. I suppose he thought there was no hope for others, like myself, who are just as radical as he is. I am afraid, however, that he did not want their repentance on account of the good it would do them, but that those words were uttered because they would be published in the west, and the people there would say to their members, "You had a chance for repentance; the hon. member for East York showed you where you were wrong and called on you to repent and stand up for the good of the country, and you did not do it." Sir, I would have no quarrel with any Government for dealing with an emergency before Parliament met. There are occasions when a Government must act, and act promptly. Matters of that kind disturb me very little. I am in favour of this measure because whatever the result may be, whether these men make or lose money, the Government lose nothing. It is a speculation which may prove successful to these men, and if so it will prove successful to Canadians. One of the leading Conservatives of the county of

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

Pictou, a man whose name, if I mentioned it to the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tuppert) would show his words to be entitled to a good deal of consideration, in a letter received last night, said that there were two or three things he would like to see added to the contract, yet it appeared to him to be the very best that could be got, and the Government were to be congratulated for it. I am sure that will be the feeling of the people of this country generally when this little flurry is over, and men have time to sit down and think; and before we meet again next session, you will hear as little about this question from hon. gentlemen opposite as you do now about the Remedial Bill. They will be just as anxious to bury all recollection of their opposition to this Bill, as they would now be to obliterate almost everything they said and did upon that equally disastrous occasion.

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

After Recess.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sorry the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) is not in his place, because I wish to compliment him as strongly as I conscientiously can. We are always delighted to hear the hon. member for Guysborough on account of his eloquence and the force with which he expresses his views, and also because he is generally pretty well informed on the subject on which he addresses the House. But, Sir, on this occasion there were many things lacking. Our good friend lacked that fire and enthusiasm and earnestness which have always characterized him; and we could hardly distinguish when he was drawing upon his imagination or when he was reciting fact. When he came down to that touching story about the white horse and the maiden fair, we realized that he was on familiar ground; but when he undertook to criticise the speech of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), he was not so sure of his ground. He started out by saying that the hon. member for East York had been in the past an advocate of the Toronto street car monopoly and in favour of its being handed over to a company. When he was contradicted in that, which many members of the House could verify as well as the hon. member for East York, he was a little staggered. When he undertook to say that the hon. member for East York approved of the Rothschild's or Hamilton Smith's recent offer, he was also contradicted; because every member of the House who heard the hon. member for East York knew that he did not endorse that proposal at all, but was consistent throughout in his opinion that there should have been no grant of those valuable mineral lands for the purpose of constructing the railway, but that it should have been built either by a com-

pany, or, as he preferred, by the Government undertaking the work itself, and getting a vote of money from this House for the purpose. When he was alluding to the conspiracy of the three Yorks, the hon. member for Guysborough was equally drawing upon his imagination; for I could assure him if he were here that so far as the hon. member for East York is concerned, I have neither seen him nor corresponded with him in any way from the time this contract between the Government and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann was announced till we came to Ottawa. I might say the same thing with regard to the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), only that the statement, instead of being made for some days, could be made for more than as many months. So that when the hon. member for Guysborough made these statements, imagining they were true, they were of no more substance than the other tales he was telling to this House. But the hon. member used the argument which was used by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), which has been used by almost every member who has addressed the House on this subject, that is, that every dollar's worth of gold costs a dollar to take it out; and therefore if the Mackenzie & Mann Company take out a large quantity of gold, there cannot be a very large profit in the transaction. Well, I do not think anything more misleading could be presented to the House. If that statement is true, which I do not affirm or deny, what does it mean? It means that some men are fortunate in their search for gold and some are not. It does not prove that every man who goes in and spends a dollar in labour or money gets a dollar's worth of gold in return, but it means that there has to be an average dollar's worth of work for a dollar's worth of gold. But in this case, knowing, as we do, that these gentlemen have the selection of all the lands, they get a hundred dollars' worth of gold for ten dollars' expenditure, while the other men, who are not so fortunate, because they only get second, third or fourth choice, will expend a hundred dollars and perhaps only get ten dollars' worth of gold. It may be true that the average all round is dollar for dollar, but one man gets one hundred dollars for ten dollars and the other ten dollars for one hundred dollars. I might call attention to the fact that there are mines in British Columbia of which we hear reports, from time to time, which are yielding immense returns. Take the Le Roy, which has paid out, I am told, a very large amount in dividends, nearly a million dollars. There is a silver mine in the Slocan district, which, on a capital of less than a quarter of a million, has paid \$1,250,000 profits to its shareholders. Of course the owners of these are the fortunate ones, the ones who had the first choice, and were fortunate enough to strike the rich veins.

Mackenzie & Mann will have that opportunity, for reasons that I shall explain later; but before I do so, I wish to make reference to comments made in the House with regard to what I had said, by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair). I may say that, long as I have been in the House, I think I have never wilfully misrepresented anybody, and I have no desire to do so in this case. I think that there are fair and legitimate grounds for criticism of the proposal to the House without attempting any misrepresentation. But the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), the other day, made the charge that I had misrepresented him. He said:

The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) made a similar statement as follows:—
“The Minister of Railways and Canals had to confess that if transshipment took place at Fort Wrangel, the American duties would have to be paid.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, I did make the statement. I listened carefully and attentively to the Minister of Railways, and thought he had made the statement which I attributed to him. Of course I shall accept his correction without any qualification. The “Hansard,” too, shows that he did not make any such statement. But if I did misrepresent him, I had no “Hansard” to guide me and evidently misunderstood him, but surely when I was addressing the House, an hour or two afterwards, and when the hon. Minister was in his place, he could have easily corrected me, and I would have been very happy to accept the correction. Instead of that, however, I find by the “Hansard,” that on Tuesday, when I was not in the House, he spent nearly the whole evening doing what is popularly described as “chewing the rag,” because I had attributed to him the statement I did. I have read what he did say, and if I had understood it, as he said it, I would have made different remarks, but they would have been equally condemnatory of the hon. gentleman. He made this statement, according to “Hansard”:

I presume that if an ocean steamer proposed to land at Fort Wrangel and tie up at the wharf there and unload goods at that port, they would be subject to the customs authorities; but I know of no reason myself why a craft such as is used, or any other small craft available for the transshipment of this freight by the Stikine River should not be alongside a steamer which carries freight from our own ports to Fort Wrangel, or to that locality, and transfer the freight from the larger to the smaller vessel and the latter then might pass on its way.

I presume the hon. gentleman meant pass on its way without regard to the customs, because otherwise there would be no object in adopting that method. I presumed that these gentlemen, when presenting this contract to the House had made some arrangements and considered what was an

exceedingly important matter—first, the selection of the route, and secondly, that it was what the "Globe" proclaimed it to be—and the "Globe's" statement was declared an official one by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton)—undoubtedly and undeniably an all-Canadian route. The hon. Minister of the Interior practically said that himself, but if the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) had read anything of the Canadian Customs Act, or had he consulted the Controller of Customs, or if the hon. Minister of the Interior had done so, these gentlemen would have known that this transshipment from one boat to another would not evade the customs and would not be permitted, at any rate, because the Customs Act of our own country—which is very much on the lines of that of the United States, with this difference that where there is any variance, the United States Customs Act is a great deal more stringent than our Canadian law, says :

The expression "port" means a place where vessels or vehicles may discharge or load cargo.

No goods shall be unladen from any vessel or bulk be broken within three leagues of the coast. Entering unloading the same.

So that the proposal made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was, in the light of the customs laws of our own country, and the customs laws of the United States, I believe, are similar in that respect—simply absurd. We could not undertake to unload out on the river or ocean within three leagues or nine miles of the coast. But in addition to that the following also is the law :—

All goods imported in Canada, whether by sea, land, coastwise, or by inland navigation, whether dutiable or not, shall be brought in at a port of entry where a custom-house is lawfully established.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, they say : We claim equal rights on this river ; we claim the free navigation of it ; but here is the case of goods entering coastwise—which means in American vessels, vessels coming from one American port to another, and doing a coasting trade—and we will regulate as to that. Canadian vessels in this case, and the American vessels in the case of Fort Wrangel or these other places on the Pacific Coast, and vessels belonging to the country in possession of the port, would have to report, too, so that none of this transshipment that the Minister of Railways indicated could be done from one vessel to another without reporting to the customs authorities. And it says further :

Vessels may be boarded when within three miles of anchorage and report demanded. Officer may remain on board.

THE MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). What is my hon. friend quoting from just now ?

Mr. WALLACE. The Customs Act of Canada, and I made the statement that

Mr. WALLACE.

that Act was similar to the Customs Act of the United States, with the exception of some places where the Customs Act of the United States was still more stringent.

If any vessel enters any place other than a port of entry, unless from stress of weather, &c., the goods may be seized and forfeited, and the vessel, according to its capacity, fined a penalty of from \$400 to \$800.

So that the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways with regard to this important question of how the goods are to be brought in, is a most misleading one. But the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has told us, as also have other hon. members : Oh, but the goods can be transhipped at Port Simpson. We find that Port Simpson is 170 miles from Fort Wrangel, and we find also that this includes sixty miles of open sea navigation—open to the whole force of a western storm. Men with merchandise may risk that merchandise as they please, and insurance companies will, of course, insure it, if they get sufficient premium. But I venture to say, that neither the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) nor any of his Ministers will dare to give a certificate to any of these flat-bottomed river vessels to carry a single passenger from Port Simpson to Fort Wrangel. That being the case, all this talk about the business being done from Port Simpson and thence to Fort Wrangel and up the Stikine River in these boats is nonsense, so far as the carrying of passengers is concerned. Now, I have stated my point with regard to what the Minister of Railways complained of as misrepresentation. But what have we to say with reference to the Minister of Railways himself ? He is quick to call attention—and very properly ; I do not find fault with him—to any misrepresentations of his utterances. That being so, however, we might expect that that hon. gentleman, when he addresses the House, would be strictly fair in his representations of the statements of other members. But I have to charge him with more than one case of—I will not say, wilful misrepresentation, for that would be an unparliamentary expression—but I would like to say, of deliberate misrepresentation, which, I think, would not be going out of the way, seeing that he had before him the report of what I said when he made this misrepresentation to the House. He said :

I can, however, say that it was made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace)—that \$100 per passenger would be a reasonable sum, would be even less than ought to be allowed for the carriage of a passenger over this railway. Well, according to the hon. gentleman's ideas, it appears to me that the company would find him a very desirable person to deal with in regulating the rates.

You know, Mr. Speaker,—for you were listening at the time—that I never made any such statement or any that could be construed into one having such a meaning. But,

as if it were not enough to have one Minister put it in my mouth, the Minister of the Interior repeated it, and I think the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) did likewise. Of course, I never said that for passage over this 150 miles of railway they would charge \$100. That would be at the rate of 66 cents per mile. In order that there may be no dispute, I will read briefly to the House what I did say. I spoke, firstly, as to the cost of the road, and, secondly, as to the cost of the steamers that would navigate the rivers and lakes, and, thirdly, as to the cost of operating the railway and steamers. I will read from "Hansard" what I said :

I had referred to the fact that the cost of the road, 150 miles of construction, would involve an expenditure of \$15,000 per mile, and I assume that as an outside estimate for this narrow-gauge tramway which has been proclaimed by the Prime Minister himself as only a temporary structure. Taking the cost at \$15,000 per mile, the total expenditure thereon would be \$2,250,000, and, allowing a very large margin indeed, the cost of the cheap flat-bottom steamers for river service might be placed at \$1,000,000, making the total expenditure for railway and steamers \$3,250,000. The cost of operating the road for one year might be placed at \$750,000, which is also a very extravagant estimate ; and this would place the cost of road construction, steamers and operating expenses for the whole of one year at \$4,000,000.

That is the statement I made of the cost. Then I referred to what the receipts might be and in doing that I assumed a rate of \$100 for passengers over the whole of the route steamboats and railways. By way of showing the total receipts I said :

But looking at the other side of the picture, and taking the figures which the Minister of Railways has given as a conservative estimate, and not taking 250,000 people as the number that will be transported, according to the estimate of transportation companies, into that country during the present year, 1898, but reducing the number to 100,000, how do the figures stand as to receipts from the railway and steamboats after they have got into operation ?

In the first instance I give what I estimate as the cost of the road and the cost of the steamboat, making a very extravagant estimate of \$1,000,000 as the cost of the steamers. Then I said :

How do the figures stand as to receipts from the railway and steamboats after they have got into operation ? The result will appear like this. One hundred thousand passengers will pay \$100 each, and I am very much below the mark in placing it at that figure.

I referred in other places in exactly the same way to the cost of passengers, giving it as \$100 for passengers with \$50 per ton of freight, not over 150 miles of road, but over the whole route, including the line of steamers that will be run in connection with this road, without which the road scarcely would be of any use, if of any use at all, because, if passengers were landed 600

miles above the gold region, as they would be at the head of Teslin Lake, there would be no particular object in leaving them there, unless there were steamers which would carry them to their destination. The owners of the railway will have these steamers in operation the first day the railway is opened for traffic. So the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways, and repeated by the Minister of the Interior, that I said that the sum of \$100 would be a reasonable one for the carriage of a passenger over this railway, has not a scintilla of truth to justify it. They cannot quote one line of my speech in order to justify that statement. But they were not satisfied with misrepresenting my statement in that regard, as to what fare would be paid over the railroad and on the steamboats, but the Minister of Railways misrepresented what I said as to the number of passengers. The Minister of Railways said this :

Then, in the same connection, that hon. gentleman represents that I stated to the House that in my judgment and from the information that I received, there would be at least 250,000 people using the railroad during the present year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I never made any such statement ; I never made a statement as to what number of people would use the railway and steamboats. What I did was to take the figures as given by the Minister of Railways himself, and I did not take 250,000, I boiled it down to one-fifth of that number. In the first place, the Minister of Railways indicated that there would be 100,000, but I did not accept his figures. Then I said : Suppose there would be 100,000. I will read what I said in that regard, so that I cannot be accused of making another statement here to-day :

But looking at the other side of the picture, and taking the figures which the Minister of Railways has given as a conservative estimate, and not taking 250,000 people as the number that will be transported, according to the estimate of transportation companies, into that country during the present year, 1898, but reducing the number to 100,000 how do the figures stand as to receipts from the railway and steamboats after they have got into operation ?

Then I go into his figures as to that in another place :

When I place the rates at \$100 per passenger and \$50 per ton for freight, I am placing them much below the figures charged. Taking, then, the receipts as \$10,000,000 from passengers coming in, and \$5,000,000 from passengers going out, taking the freight at 100,000 tons at \$50 per ton, the receipts during 1898 would reach \$20,000,000. The total expenditure for the construction and operation of the road for the year and the building of the steamers and all expenses I place at \$4,000,000, leaving an enormous profit for the contractors. But supposing that instead of 250,000 people, which the Minister indicated as the number likely to go into the country, we take the lower number, 100,000, upon which latter number I have made this calculation, and cut

that number in two, let us make a calculation on the basis of 50,000 passengers, which is a lower estimate than is made by the Minister or any competent authority. The receipts from 50,000 passengers on the basis of \$200 each would be \$10,000,000, as against a total expenditure of \$4,000,000, leaving for the one year a net profit of \$6,000,000 over all expenditures.

I estimated the whole cost of the road and steamers for the lakes and rivers and the cost of operating them for one year at four million dollars. I said if these people went in that the Minister tells us will go in, and according to his estimate of \$100 per passenger both on the railways and steamers, there would be ten million dollars receipts, or six million dollars clear profit. They may say that is an extravagant estimate. But the Minister of the Interior does not say that it is an extravagant estimate. In his speech, he quotes it with approval, or else he should not have quoted it at all, he should not have quoted to mislead the House. What does he say with regard to the numbers going in :

It seems almost inconceivable to us to hear and to read the figures that are presented to us. I saw the other day in the New York "Herald" a statement like this :

The statement that a quarter of a million gold-seekers will go from Seattle alone this year, seems to be well founded, in view of the "Herald's" despatches to the effect that 7,000 have sailed in the last eight days, and that 1,000 are arriving there daily.

He says further, in commenting on this :

It is such facts as these that we have to deal with.

Now, he endorsed the New York "Herald," that there will be 250,000 people going in. He mentions the further fact that 7,000 have sailed in eight days, and that they are arriving at Seattle at the rate of 1,000 per day. The Minister of the Interior goes on to say :

We are told, too, that the transportation agencies in Europe are booking tens of thousands of people for the Pacific Coast, and that the immediate object of these people is to procure transportation to the Klondike district. We know, too, that the officers of the Canadian railways have made immense preparations for this trade ; and while no person can say exactly how much of it will materialize, everything points to the fact that the greatest rush that has been seen for many years upon this continent will take place during the next few months towards the Klondike district. It has been estimated, and the estimate does not seem to be unreasonable or extravagant one, that from \$50,000,000 to \$75,000,000 will be spent in outfitting and in transportation by these people ; and it does not require any lengthened argument on my part to show that a volume of trade of \$50,000,000 or \$75,000,000 is a thing to which the Government of this country should devote a large amount of attention when it is possible to secure it for Canadian merchants and Canadian manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much, as I am sure the whole country will regret, that these gentlemen have not taken more vigor-

Mr. WALLACE.

ous and active measures, that they had not realized the situation until the 25th of January, or a few days before the meeting of Parliament. All they had done was, so far as transportation was concerned, to send Mr. Jennings out there, and to send Major Walsh with a detachment of mounted police, with instructions to organize for the government of the country. But they had taken no steps to meet this immense commercial business that was right at our doors, and that they must have known long before was right upon us. Therefore, I say that I think I have a fair ground of complaint against the Minister of Railways and Canals as well as the Minister of the Interior, inasmuch as they have done two things : They first quoted me as stating that there would be 250,000 passengers. I mentioned no number, but I based my estimate of six million dollars profit on 50,000 going in and 25,000 coming out. That is the lowest number. The Minister of the Interior himself quotes with approval the estimate of 250,000, or five times as many as I had estimated, taking the lowest estimate they had considered at all. I have reason to find fault with them also in charging me with fixing a rate, and they seem to have taken a great deal of amusement out of the charge that I had fixed a rate of \$100 for travelling 150 miles on this tramway. I hope they will correct the statements they have made. At any rate, I have drawn the attention of the House to it. In my statement of the 8th of February they charge that I exaggerated the cost of the railway. I said at the time that it was an exaggerated estimate, because Mr. Jennings, in his report, which is in the hands of all the members of the House, speaks of a railway, a completed railway, a first-class railway, as costing \$19,000 per mile for 208 miles. But that extra road would cost a larger amount than the 150 miles that the Government propose Mackenzie & Mann should build. So that you can cut this estimate of \$19,000 per mile straight in two for a three-foot gauge railway, for a railroad that is made with second-class rails, with everything about it second-hand from start to finish, so I am informed. Made as a three-foot gauge road would be made, climbing the hills, and taking Mr. Jennings's statement all through the report, that there are very few engineering difficulties, that the road can be quickly and cheaply built, the estimate I made of \$15,000 can be easily reduced to \$10,000 per mile for the construction of that railway. I will not refer to these matters, but will present some other views that have occurred to me in regard to this subject. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) before six o'clock stated that the policy of himself and of the Government was Canada for Canadians. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that we on this side of the House have good ground for complaint. Almost every plank in our platform has been appropriated by

hon. gentlemen opposite, and without acknowledgment. We have no objection to this course, for we are glad to know that hon. gentlemen opposite are abandoning errors and are setting out on the right path in adopting the policy of Canada for the Canadians. But we can all remember that not many years ago they were advocating a policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and the hon. member for Guysborough was in the very front as an advocate of that policy, under which American goods would have to come into Canada without paying duty, and would have entered this mining region, which we are endeavouring to protect, without paying any duty whatever. And what would have become of the policy of Canada for the Canadians if unrestricted policy had been adopted? The Americans would have controlled the whole business of this country; although we had incurred enormous expenditures in administering our laws in the western region, they would have secured all the business. So the National Policy, a policy of protection for Canada, is the one that is to preserve this country, and to protect that portion of Canada for Canadians which lies in the west, and not the policy of which the hon. member for Guysborough was perhaps the most ardent advocate in this House in the days gone by. An argument used by many hon. members, including the Minister of the Interior, the Minister of Railways and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) and a number of others was that these mineral lands were of no value unless railway construction is proceeded with, and that all the value given to them will be by the exertions made by the company. I deny that proposition. I maintain that the mineral lands acquired by the company are valuable, but not through the exertions of the company, for they do not need to exert themselves in any particular. They have great advantages to offer the prospector and miner; and it must be remembered that there are from 5,000 to 10,000 prospectors and explorers in British Columbia today traversing the mountains and valleys searching for the precious metal, and that body of men will be as nothing compared with the number in the Yukon district during the present year. Five thousand or ten thousand may be multiplied by two, three or five and not exceed the number who will be in that district searching for gold during the coming summer. Suppose they find gold, what will occur? One of two things: either they will make an entry and pay ten per cent royalty, or they will give information to Mackenzie & Mann, who will take up the property, and a royalty of one per cent will then be paid. Suppose Mackenzie & Mann say: You are going out exploring, and if any of your party find gold, come in and let us know; we will give you your claim, you will then have to pay only one per cent instead of ten per cent royalty; if the ex-

pense of working is \$60, you will have \$39 clear profit as against \$30 if you enter the claim with the Government. The miner will not hesitate long. In addition, Mackenzie & Mann may say: You have filed a claim in a square of land taken up by us; however, if you will let us know the results of your prospecting, we will not only give you the advantage of nine per cent on the royalty, but other advantages as well; for instance, you pay \$15 for a license, and we will give you a deed for the land for ever, so that no one can ever disturb you. Therefore, instead of the statement made by hon. members that these contractors are going to spend money in opening up and developing that country being true, they are going to fold their arms, and allow those 10,000 or 20,000 prospectors to work, knowing that it will be to their interest to go to Mackenzie & Mann rather than to go to the Government and make their arrangements. But supposing those men have not made any arrangements with Mackenzie & Mann, what then? The men will go to make their entries, and will find that Mackenzie & Mann have taken up the location a week or two ahead of them; the prospectors will find they have no right to their claim, and that Mackenzie & Mann own three miles by six of that district. The men will ask what they can do. The reply given will be that they had better see Mackenzie & Mann; in fact, they will have to make a bargain with Mackenzie & Mann. Suppose, again, that men have found a rich deposit and they have taken out \$50,000 or \$100,000 of gold, and that this has occurred on land claimed by Mackenzie & Mann. The contractors will turn around any say to the Government, that it is the duty of the Government to protect their property, that they hold their property by deed, and they will call on the Government to recoup them for the value of gold taken out. They will argue that the Government are bound to protect any citizen in the enjoyment of his property, more especially when the Government has handed over the property, in this case, to Mackenzie & Mann. At every turn Mackenzie & Mann have the advantage. They can demand the protection of the Government for every foot of this mining property which is given to them in fee simple, and if the Government does not secure them in peaceful possession, or if somebody takes it or any part of it away from them, they have a claim in equity against the Government. The other night the Minister of the Interior said: I defy any one to show me a single line in the contract that gives a monopoly. Well, that is only trifling with words; there is monopoly written in it from beginning to end. It is monopoly and nothing else. The Minister (Mr. Sifton) told us, that there was another charter for the Cassiar and Cariboo, and that there were grants of land and money from the British Columbia Government, but he answered himself when he said

nobody would accept it. What is the use of making such comparisons when we all know that this is a huge monopoly. Did not the Minister himself tell us that never in the history of the world have mines been known so rich in gold, and did he not quote from the New York "World" with approval, the statement, that from the city of Seattle alone 200,000 people were going into this mining region, and that tens of thousands are being booked in Europe by the transportation companies for the Yukon gold fields. Here is a position of affairs never before paralleled. There have been wonderful strikes of gold and stampedes of people in Australia and South Africa, but nothing has ever been heard of to equal the movement of people in all countries towards this famous gold region. Is there no monopoly in it? Why, these contractors will have the rivers full of steamers before anybody else can get there. They will have their line of railway all but completed, and they will push in their material necessary for the construction of those boats. They will have a practical monopoly for they will have the only railroad going in there, and probably the only line of steamers. The Government have given these men a property that may turn out fabulously wealthy, beyond anything the imagination can picture. It has been stated that Mackenzie & Mann can go to England and in 24 hours bond these lands for \$20,000,000. I believe that to be correct, in view of the present state of English feeling and the excitement that exists there. After all, people cannot shut their eyes to Mr. Ogilvie's report. Here is a little bit of a valley which Mr. Ogilvie told us in his lecture the other night, contained from sixty to seventy million dollars of gold; and yet Mr. Ogilvie is a most conservative, careful man, and is the only man we know of who has not lost his head in connection with these discoveries. As the Minister (Mr. Sifton) stated, he is the only man who could walk over these gold beds without having even a desire to possess them. But this little valley with sixty or seventy million dollars in it is not the only gold location there, and if this contractors' syndicate only secures one Bonanza Creek, with its sixty or seventy million dollars, what wonderful wealth will accrue to them? Suppose they only get half of it—although as we have shown from the map they can well manage to get the whole of it—suppose they only get the half of this, or \$35,000,000, that in itself is a pretty comfortable amount. I may say that to get that gold out, it does not cost dollar for dollar, nor 95 cents, nor 50 cents for a dollar, because we know that out of such creeks as that they can get hundreds of dollars a day per man, while the other poor chaps are climbing the mountains prospecting and spending their money and getting nothing in return.

The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) also asked us: why do not others go in, and

Mr. WALLACE.

he told us that there was no one to-day who would make a better offer than the present contractors. Well, Sir, the most objectionable feature in the whole transaction is that no one else was asked to make an offer. This Government had plenty of time to ask for offers, and they did not do so. The customs returns tell us that there were \$21,000 in duties paid on goods going in there in the year 1895-96. There were thousands of people in there then, and they were there because gold had been discovered, and they were paying \$10 a day for labour, because a man could get out sufficient gold to make it profitable to give that wages. We are told that miners who could not get an ounce of gold per day, felt inclined to go somewhere else where they could get a large amount. It was known to the Government long ago that this was a rich mining centre. But last July Mr. Ogilvie's report was published, the miners came out with gold, there was undoubted proof in every way that this was the most valuable gold discovery that perhaps the world had ever seen; the Minister himself went up there and found ten or twelve thousand people at Skagway and Dyea, and thousands of others in the coast cities, and how then could he disregard those signs. Why was nothing done by him then to provide for transport? Why did he not let the people of Canada know that he was going to build a railway? Why did not he and the Government let the people know what their programme was? If he had done so, I venture to say that without going outside the confines of Canada, scores of responsible contractors would have tendered. All the genius of this country is not confined to Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie—although genius of a certain kind may be attributed to them above any others—and there are plenty of contractors in Canada who are just as able as these two gentlemen to push that work to a successful and rapid conclusion. But, Sir, the people of this country did not know that the Government intended to build the railway; they did not know the plans of the Government. If the Government had put six lines in the "Globe" newspaper, or in the Toronto "World," or in any of those great journals, every man in Canada who felt disposed to go into that enterprise, and every combination of men would be planning to accomplish the work, and the Government would have had scores of offers. Instead of that, in secret conclave, they had been in private negotiations with Mackenzie & Mann for a long time, and they had been in secret negotiation with this Mr. Hamilton Smith for quite a time.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. On what authority does my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) make that statement?

Mr. WALLACE. Were there not negotiations before the contract was signed?

The Minister of the Interior says there were.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not with Hamilton Smith.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of the Interior, I understood, read a letter from Hamilton Smith.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman is thinking of Mr. Kersey, quite a different man.

Mr. WALLACE. I confounded the two names; I supposed they belonged to the same firm. Very well, Mr. Kersey, a New Yorker, had been in communication with the Government. Mr. Hamilton Smith came in at a later period—I do not know whether before this contract was signed or not. But Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann did not come in at the last moment, because the Minister of Railways and Canals told us that day after day a large committee of the Privy Council had met those gentlemen, and had fairly gone down on their knees and begged them to take less land, but that they were obdurate and refused to do so. How long these negotiations were going on with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann I do not know. I do not see either the Minister of the Interior or the Minister of Railways and Canals in the House, and I think that is a fair cause for complaint. We are discussing a most important contract, to which the names of these two gentlemen are signed; we are making statements and asking questions, and we want full information about these matters; and these two Ministers, who are the ones specially charged with the conduct of this agreement, are not here. We are the representatives of the people of Canada; I represent 42,000 constituents, large and small, and when I ask these Ministers a question about this matter, neither of them is in the House, nor have they been here during a large part of the time that this matter has been under discussion. I am delighted to see that my few words of admonition have had some effect. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), who has just come in, has quite an innocent look on his face, as if he did not know what was the matter. I will just inform him that I was commenting on the fact that throughout this very important discussion upon a document which has been laid before the House for its consideration, signed by the Minister of Railways and Canals, or by some gentleman on his behalf, and the Minister of the Interior, we have been very seldom favoured with the presence of these two gentlemen in the House. I was referring to the fact that he had deliberately misrepresented what I said in the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Deliberately?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must withdraw that remark.

Mr. WALLACE. He deliberately stated something, Mr. Speaker, which I proved was a misrepresentation. He stated that I had made the assertion—and I must apologize to the rest of the House for going over the matter a second time for the benefit of the hon. Minister—that the contractors were going to charge \$100 on this railroad. Mr. Speaker, I never made any such statement. I have just read what I stated, and I would invite the hon. Minister of Railways and tramways—because he will have to be the Minister of tramways after this is built—to read over my statement, and he will find that I said nothing that could be construed into the statement he made. I know that as soon as he makes that investigation, he will jump up and apologize; but I am not asking for an apology; I am making my statement to the House. Another statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was this. He said that I made an estimate of 250,000 people. Well, that showed that he was a very bad arithmetician, because if I had made an estimate of 250,000 people at \$100 a piece, that would come to \$25,000,000. If, however, half that number went out, that would make \$12,500,000. If 250,000 people went in—and according to the Minister's own estimate each person would require a ton of provisions—and suppose each had to pay \$50 a ton, that would amount to \$12,500,000. The total receipts would be \$50,000,000 in one year if the number attributed to me were correct. But I did not state that number. I just made it one-fifth of that number or 50,000. I first said that if 100,000 people went in and 50,000 came out, the receipts from passengers and freight would amount to \$20,000,000; and then I said that if half the number went in, the receipts would be \$10,000,000, as against a total expenditure of \$4,000,000 on capital account for both steamships and railroad, and the operating of both steamships and railroad. That was the point I made, and I call it to the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and tramways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in response to the challenge of the hon. Minister of the Interior, here is a letter from Mr. Hamilton Smith, which I am told is published in the newspapers this evening. I have a copy of it here, which was read in the House this afternoon by the hon. member for East York, and here is one clause of it:

If the Government still insists on Stikine line alone, we will build that on same general terms as the provisional contract with Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann, for 1,000,000 acres, but without the right of lateral or end extension of the blocks of land.

The Government is, I believe, informed as to our financial ability to execute such work, but if there are any doubts as to this, a cable or so to London would speedily give the desired information.

I would ask the right hon. First Minister, when laying on the Table the letters from those gentlemen which he promised he would do to-morrow, to lay also on the Table the credentials which those gentlemen have presented, accompanying their letters.

The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) challenged this House—I do not know why he challenged us—and challenged the whole country to bring forward a man who would undertake this contract on the same terms. He said :

There is not a man to-day who is prepared to make this offer or a better one.

Well, here is a company of men of the highest repute—the Rothschilds, we are told, which is but another name for vastness of riches and responsibility—who say that for one million of acres—not three and three-quarter millions—they are prepared to accept the contract which Mackenzie & Mann have made with the Government. I say to the Government: What are you going to do about it? I would say to the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who is not here, who gave the challenge the other day to which I have referred, and which challenge meant, if it meant anything: Bring on your offer; if you do, and it is a bona fide one, we will accept—I would say to him: Well, here is the offer you challenged the world to produce; what are you going to do about it? The Parliament of Canada is not committed one particle to this contract. We ought to have been consulted. We were told all along by organs of the Government, that Parliament was to meet about the first of January. With these matters right on deck, Parliament might have met the first of December. Here is an important, an unprecedented matter. This whole session is apparently going to be spent considering the Yukon matter. It is evidently going to be a Yukon session. Why not have called Parliament together on the first of December, or first of January, and have consulted us before making this agreement? Now, I ask the Government, in view of the challenge thrown out by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), what are they going to do about this offer to construct the work for a million acres instead of 3,750,000?

The hon. Minister of the Interior read an article in some New York commercial journal, the other night—and it was a gem. Mr. Speaker, that article was not written in New York, but in Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. By "Onlooker," or another onlooker.

Mr. WALLACE. It could not have been written by "Onlooker," because his views are different.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. He may have changed them.

Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. WALLACE. This article from the New York "Commercial Advertiser," in its edition of February the 4th, under the heading of "The Klondike Railway," was read by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). I find this stated in it:

The thrifty Canadian Government is not risking any money on the projected road. The contractors clamoured for a subsidy, and insisted that they could not be expected to construct the road without one.

Where did the New York "Commercial Advertiser" get that information? I have read over the official information, I have read the "Globe" manifesto, which the hon. Minister of the Interior declared was an official statement of the case, and there is not a line in it to that effect. Where, then, did the New York paper get that information? It could only have got it from two parties—the Government or Mackenzie & Mann. They are the only parties who could have given this information which was not given to the public. Where, then, did the New York "Commercial Advertiser" get it? It is just as I said: this article must have been written by either the Minister of Railways or Mackenzie & Mann. The writer goes on to say:

But Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues stood firm, and all that the contractors received from the Government is a land grant along the route.

Well, that is not correct. They do not receive a land grant along the route. They do not receive a single acre along the route. Their land grant, or rock grant, is hundreds of miles away from the nearest portion of the railway. Yet this was quoted by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) as a correct statement of the case and of what the Americans thought of it, and it showed, he said, that sometimes an outsider finds out things which the people at home do not know.

The bargain is considered the best one that Canada ever drove in a railway negotiation.

That settles it. It must have been written by the Minister of Railways. He is proud of his work.

The new railway will be a short one to be sure, but to get it built without spending a cent of public money upon it is a great contrast to the prodigality of Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues in times past. But as the land never will be worth anything without the railroad, and cannot prove very valuable with it—

Who wrote that? I think it must have been Mackenzie & Mann.

—unless some expected mineral resources are discovered.

There is no railway there now, Mr. Speaker, and yet Bonanza Creek would sell for many millions of dollars to-day. Yet the writer of this article says—and the article is quoted with approval by the Minister of the

Interior as showing that strangers could find out the truth which we could not find out ourselves :

As the land will never be worth anything without the railway it cannot prove very valuable with it—

Why not ?

—unless some unexpected mineral resources are discovered.

Why, we have discovered them. This matter has gone beyond the region of doubt, the railway is to be built, we have Ogilvie's reports, and we have the fact that millions of dollars have been gathered in a few months out of these valleys. Yet this New York paper, which is quoted by the Minister of the Interior to enlighten us Canadians, says :

Unless some unexpected mineral resources are discovered.

Then, to make us proud of the great bargain we have secured, the writer goes on to say :

An Ottawa Government organ exultingly remarks that Canada now has the key to the gold fields in her own hands, and can deal with the Americans as she sees fit. This boast might have been withheld until the road was finished. Physical obstacles or excessive cost may prevent the contractors from building it at all under the terms of the contract.

Why, we have the whole information today. We have Mr. Jennings's report over the whole line. There is not a portion of it that he has not reported upon, and all the difficulties connected with it, and he has made an estimate of the cost for building a first-class road. We are not, and the contractors are not, proceeding in the dark. They will build it, never fear, Mr. Speaker; they have such a bonanza that they will build it pretty quickly. I have not the slightest doubt that they could sell what is practically a monopoly in the cities of the United States on the shortest notice. They could sell that out, they could build that road, they could build those steamers, they could capitalize the whole thing for eight times the cost, and make money out of it then. Now, I would like this Government to take this matter into their consideration. They have discovered, I have no doubt, that they have been proceeding precipitately—not too hastily, in the proper sense of the term, because they have not been proceeding hastily enough.

As I have pointed out, they knew the exceeding richness of this country seven months ago. In the month of July we had reliable reports of the millions of dollars of gold taken out of that country, not only from Mr. Ogilvie, but from what had been announced before his reports were received. Did not we know that all the people were making their preparations for going on to this wonderful or auriferous region? But the Government folded their hands. There

was scarcely a Minister in Ottawa; there may have been one or two. They had gone to the four corners of the earth. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was down at the seaside; the Minister of Railways was, I do not know where; but this matter which should have engrossed their attention and claimed all their time and talents was not dealt with. The Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), of course, as we all know, was in the old country, in the Imperial service for the time being, and could not be here. But we had in his place, I was going to say a better man, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), an experienced statesman, an experienced man of business. I regret that he was, physically, not up to his usual standard, or I think we might have had different results in this matter by having the questions brought to the attention of the Government in a practical way and the Government directed to some practical conclusion. They might have informed this country in August or September last that they proposed to build a railroad, if one could be built, that they proposed to open up communication with that country at the earliest moment that energy and money and talent could do it. But this was not done. The Government say they were vigilant and active. They were not. They arranged, it is true, for the administration of justice in that country, and so on; but so far as the commercial side of the situation was concerned they were not equal to it at all. Even as to the matter of administration, what did they do? We heard it announced that they had adopted a set of regulations by which alternate plots were to be given to miners and to the Government. We were told a little later that these regulations were abrogated. Still later we learned that new regulations were adopted providing for larger alternate blocks for the miners and the Government. I am glad to see that the other member of the Government (Mr. Sifton) whose name is to this contract has entered the Chamber. Not only do we complain that the Government did not realize the urgency of this case, but we say that when they did realize it in part, they acted directly contrary to all the principles that should direct a government. We find now that Mr. Kersey, Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and Mr. Hamilton Smith, representing the Rothschilds—the last perhaps, not until the contract was signed—knew about this matter. But nobody else knew of what was proposed. Why not have let every citizen of Canada and everybody else know, so that those who were enterprising enough to go into a syndicate to take part in this work might do so. I say that if Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann were to step out to-morrow there would be scores of men and combinations of men who would take their places at one day's notice. Why, Sir, they have the richest thing that ever was given to any company

in any place. You may say that the riches in this contract have yet to be determined. Not a bit of it. The people are ready to-day to buy these properties. We have been told that those who were fortunate enough to get the privilege of dredging the rivers, have already financed—that is, they have been paid large amounts of money for claims they got from the Government. But, as I have pointed out, with the facilities Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann are getting, with the choice of lands, it will be to the interest of any miner in that country to deal with the company instead of the Government to give their knowledge of discoveries to the company, which can make it worth their while. The Government is not in it in competition with this company. These contractors could sell these properties for an enormous amount to-day, whether they are worth much or little. Therefore, I say, the Government have not been true guardians of the interests of the people of Canada. They have given the greatest heritage in small space that has ever been discovered in Canada. I contend that new arrangements should be made and better terms should be secured in the interests of the people of the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Mr. Speaker, I am sure you agree with me that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has devoted as much time to this question as any other gentleman on the other side of the House, or, perhaps, on this side with the exception of a few. The hon. gentleman's criticisms are generally such as to be worthy of respect and to call for a reply. But I think the hon. gentleman himself is conscious that his case as presented was rather weak. He had spoken before on the question and I find no fault with him for setting himself right on some points on which he had not been correctly understood. I think he is right in making the correction, and gentlemen who understood him differently have accepted his statement. But, as a business man, I am sure he could hardly keep his face straight when giving the figures he has indulged in. You would hardly think that an hon. member would make use of such figures solemnly in a deliberative assembly. To say that on this contract for what he calls a tramroad, the rates of which have not been fixed by the Governor in Council, the contractors will clear \$6,000,000 upon an expenditure of \$4,000,000 in one year is rather more than he himself is prepared to believe, I think; though I have no doubt that he has perfect faith in the veracity of statements he makes when speaking seriously. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), as well as the hon. member who has just sat down, think they have introduced a new feature in this debate. They have quoted an offer which they allege has been made, as it appears in the "Journal" of to-night, by a Mr. Ham-

Mr. WALLACE.

ilton Smith, who offers to build this road for a much smaller quantity of land—some 1,000,000 acres. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), told us, I think, before the "Journal" was published, that it would appear in the "Journal" to-night.

Mr. MACLEAN. I read it from the "Journal."

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was not aware the "Journal" was out that soon. I was going to ask the hon. gentleman if he had any idea how the "Journal" got that information.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is a newspaper secret. Send down and ask the editor.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can enlighten us a little further. Who helped Mr. Hamilton Smith to get up that letter?

Mr. MACLEAN. Ask Mr. Hamilton Smith.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This gentleman said, as well as the hon. member for East York, that he represents the Rothschilds. We do not very well understand that. This is an offer made after the contract is signed, made after it is published to the world. I understand the Rothschilds to be an honourable firm. Mr. Maitland Kersey, to whom the hon. gentleman has alluded, stated that he represented the Rothschilds. We have no more reason to doubt his word than we have to doubt the word of this gentleman. Now, then, Mr. Kersey, so we are told, and it has been used as an argument by the Opposition, offered to build this road for \$6,000 cash per mile, with an addition of \$1,000 per mile for a sleigh road that was to precede it, expecting to have that supplemented by the British Columbia government. That offer was not accepted. The Government, as they thought in the interests of the country, determined that they would not pay public money for the construction of this road. That fact was communicated to Mr. Kersey, time was given to Mr. Kersey to consult with his principals, those whom he represented, whom he stated he represented, and among them were the Rothschilds. Before that contract was signed that gentleman sent a letter stating that after consultation with them—for he had been in England and had laid the scheme before them—they declined to touch it upon the grounds of a land grant alone, though he was given to understand that it might run somewhere in the neighbourhood of 25,000 acres per mile. And yet these gentlemen bring before us to-night an offer that they say has been made by a gentleman who represents, or is backed by the Rothschilds, in which he offers to take 1,000,000 acres instead of 3,750,000, when Mr. Kersey, as the representative of the

Rothschilds and others, stated that they declined to accept it at 3,750,000 acres.

Mr. MACLEAN. I did not say that Mr. Hamilton Smith represented the Rothschilds. I said he represented people who were as good as the Rothschilds, and he had given his credentials, and if the hon. gentleman will present his credentials, he will add much to this discussion.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I am not alluding distinctly to what he said. I fancy the hon. member for West York won't rise and say that he did not represent him to this House as representing the Rothschilds, for he told us that more than once in the course of his speech. We are not denying it. What I want to understand is how Mr. Kersey, representing the Rothschilds, as he said he did, communicated with them and gave them to understand that the Canadian Government were prepared to give something like 3,750,000 acres of land for the building of that road, before the contract was signed, and time was asked to consult with them, and the Government gave the necessary time, and they declined to accept it, and then another gentleman comes and represents himself to be backed by the Rothschilds after the contract is signed, saying I will do it for a million. I think there is not much in that last offer of Mr. Hamilton Smith's. I wonder if the hon. gentleman could give the "Journal" any further information in this matter. However, if the hon. gentleman or any one else associated with him will be powerful enough to get some other gentleman to write a letter and make an offer, now when the contract is signed—

Mr. MACLEAN. Will you accept it if it is a good one?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We may perhaps get this gentleman to make an offer of what he will give for a million acres of land, without going to the expense of spending a dollar on building the road. Let us have an offer of what he will give for a million acres up there, and then we will ascertain what is the value of that land. Will the hon. gentleman undertake to do that? I dare say he is very familiar with this Mr. Hamilton Smith. Will he get us an offer for a million acres of land at so much per acre without the expense of a dollar on the railway? The Government will consider it, Parliament will consider it. We would like to have an offer of that kind. It would be much more business-like than coming in with this offer now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask the Minister of the Interior if he had not any communication with Mr. Hamilton Smith before the contract was signed? I am in a position to say that I have seen the credentials of

Mr. Hamilton Smith, and I am prepared to state that he represents half a dozen of the most powerful financial corporations and gentlemen in London.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr Sifton). I have the greatest possible pleasure in answering the hon. gentleman, and saying in the most unqualified terms that I had not any communication with Mr. Hamilton Smith, nor was Mr. Hamilton Smith in communication with me, before the contract was signed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Directly or indirectly?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Directly or indirectly. I may add that a gentleman said to me upon one occasion in the course of a casual conversation, that there was a gentleman named Hamilton Smith who was prepared to call upon me for the purpose of discussing the question of a railway to the Yukon. But Mr. Hamilton Smith never called upon me, and never communicated with me—that is to say, until after the contract was signed.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. A question has been asked and answered. The hon. gentleman who has taken his seat has also alluded to a fact that has been mentioned by so many, and I am sorry to see him taking that ground, casting doubts upon the route that has been selected for this railway. A very strong reason for insisting upon the route that has been chosen in this contract is that we consider it to be virtually an all-Canadian route; and it is a pleasure to me to know that the leader of the Opposition who, while he saw reason to change his view with reference to the contract as a whole, unhesitatingly declares his belief that the route chosen is the one, pre-eminently the one, that absolutely ought to be chosen by the Canadian Government as the all-Canadian route, and as such I prefer to consider it yet, notwithstanding that I think statements have been made on the other side of the House that it is undesirable should have been made in the peculiar position in which we stand with the neighbouring nation in reference to this matter. We have the right to navigate the Stikine River by treaty, as the hon. gentleman knows, and we proceed on the assumption that that nation, being an honourable nation, we have no reason to doubt that they will recognize treaty rights. Hon. gentlemen tell us that it will be necessary to report at customs, that we will not be at liberty to tranship, that we will be made to pay a duty—all these objections they urge against this route. They advocate another route that undeniably runs through territory that at the present time—though we do not allow their claims to be valid—is in possession of the nation to the south of us, where hon. gentlemen know that we could not have direct communication except that arrangements

were made with them in which treaty rights do not apply, and where boundaries would have to be settled before any possession could be taken. We have adopted a route which we believe we have a right as Canadians to traverse, a perfect right to traverse, and in which, if necessary, to make transshipments, the neighbouring nation would never refuse by customs regulations facilities for that purpose. The route advocated by the hon. gentleman and other gentlemen opposite who differ with members on this side of the House is by the Dalton trail, a route by which, if it should appear that the American contention is right and that the territory belongs to them, it would be impossible to ever establish a wholly undisputed Canadian route. But in settling the route we have adopted, if trouble should arise, which I do not anticipate, in regard to the navigation of the Stikine River, and if it were deemed advisable that Canada should have an all-Canadian ocean port, this route is the only one by which we could attain that result. We have already received the regulations made by the United States Government with respect to the navigation of the Yukon. They have made regulations that allow transshipment on the Yukon; and in view of such regulations, we have no right to assume that any trouble will arise in regard to the navigation of the Stikine which is covered by treaty, and I am not prepared to admit that objection will be taken in regard to that river. I have no doubt that a steamer sailing for the Stikine, reporting at Wrangel, would, under the supervision of the Customs officers of the United States, be permitted to tranship, be permitted to unload from the ocean vessel to a river steamer and then proceed up the river, making it may be an inward and an outward entry and that would be all they required. I anticipate not the slightest trouble or difficulty in that direction. In speaking of an all-Canadian route the reference must be made in connection with the route under consideration, that route which the Government has asked Parliament to adopt.

With respect to the cost of the road, the hon. member for West York, when speaking on a former occasion, estimated the value at \$15,000 per mile. To-night he has revised his figures, and has declared that it can be built for \$10,000 per mile. Yet the hon. gentleman well knows that it is specially provided in this contract that the road must be up to the standard of the Kaslo and Slocan. I will read a letter from the Ottawa "Citizen" of the 15th of this month, signed by William Baillie. It is as follows:--

THE KASLO-SLOCAN ROAD.

Editor Citizen,—An editorial paragraph in your issue this morning concludes as follows:—"Those who know the Kaslo-Slocan mineral railway must know that it is unduly flattered by its selection as the standard for the passengers and freight road like the proposed Stikine-Teslin line."

Mr. PATERSON.

Respecting this matter, the inference to be drawn from your comment is that the Kaslo-Slocan is an illy-constructed and inefficient road. During a considerable portion of the period of construction of that road I was secretary of the company, and know something of the character of the work done. The road bed is not difficult, except for three or four miles of the whole length of about thirty miles. The total cost of construction was in the neighbourhood of \$600,000, or \$20,000 per mile, which for a narrow gauge road over comparatively easy road bed is a high cost, and as not a cent of money was misspent in the work it will be seen that the road must be an example of high-classed railway construction. There is no more thorough piece of mountain railway work in North America. The railway has given the greatest possible satisfaction to the people it serves, its management is extremely popular in the district, and if the Glenora-Teslin road, when finished, should meet the public demands as efficiently, both in passenger and freight services, it will meet with a success very rarely achieved in railway construction and management.

Yours, &c.,

WM. BAILLIE.

The gentleman who wrote that letter, who, from what he says himself, is in a position to know the character of the road, which is taken as the standard for the Yukon road, points out that although built with great economy, it cost \$20,000 per mile.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. gentleman know that bonds were given to the contractors, and they were sold at very much less than par, thus reducing the cash cost of construction down to a very small sum?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not aware of it. I have read a letter written by a good authority, for the gentleman was secretary of the company. Hon. gentlemen, moreover, may take the estimate of our engineers, and they will find the cost is not placed so low as \$20,000.

Mr. WALLACE. Why does the hon. gentleman take the estimate of Mr. Jennings? Why does the hon. gentleman discredit an estimate made by Mr. Jennings, who made a report to the Government and who has a high reputation?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We would not discredit Mr. Jennings. But here is a road built not under such exceptional circumstances which cost \$20,000 per mile. The hon. member for West York is well aware that in the case of the present undertaking time is the essence of the contract, and the road must be finished by the 1st of September, and that under such circumstances there will be extra charge for freight, and higher rates paid than perhaps ever before.

Mr. WALLACE. Why?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Because the hon. gentleman must know that thousands of men will be required to build the road and when they get into the country they will need to be paid high rates to keep them on the work, greater perhaps than

have been paid in any other case. With the excitement now existing and men rushing to the gold mines by thousands, surely the hon. gentleman does not expect that labourers will remain there at \$1 or \$1.50 per day? He no doubt well knows the great expense of freight and the contractors will be working with a quarter of a million dollars liable to be forfeited. He is no doubt also aware that Mr. Mann has been totally unable so far to transport his men and material on account of the rush on the Pacific Coast, and there is every reason to believe that during the greater portion of the summer there will be difficulty in securing any thing like reasonable freight rates. But under ordinary conditions a railroad of the standard fixed for this road cost over \$20,000 per mile, and yet the hon. gentleman has fixed the sum at \$10,000 per mile. The question arises as to whether any sacrifice has been made by the Government in the terms they have offered. Let us take the cost of the road at \$25,000 per mile, which I venture to say is under the mark—I am speaking of the road as completed, I am not speaking of a second-hand road, a reckless assertion made by an ex-Minister of the Crown—I am speaking of a first class road, or at least a road up to the Kaslo and Slocan standard.

Now, Sir, what are we giving this road? Twenty-five thousand acres of land per mile, which if you take the road at 150 miles gives you three and three-quarter million acres. What is that land worth? Who can tell? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) ventures the statement that the contractors can place it upon the market for an immense sum of money and make themselves rich. Suppose they do that, and men are found to buy, what will the men who buy realize out of it? Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) follow out that argument? What the Government are concerned with is: what is that land worth to the country if it remained in the hands of the Government of the country? That is what we have to consider. Now, then, let us apply a test.

Mr. WALLACE. What you are giving the contractors is the test. What they can make out of it is the test.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) take the ground that if they form a company and raise millions of dollars, the Government can operate in the same way. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) say that such would be a proper course for the Government to follow?

Mr. WALLACE. The contractors get what they can sell that land for, and they can sell it to-morrow for a large sum.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The Government and the Parliament of Canada are here to look after the interests of the country, and it is the interests of the country that we must discuss this matter. Now

here are three and three-quarter million acres of land out of seventy-six million acres in that country. How shall we ascertain what it is worth? The hon. gentlemen opposite cannot tell and no one pretends to know. But here is one test which I will give. Mr. Kersey made an offer on behalf of an English syndicate, representing the Rothschilds and others, and his offer was for \$6,000 per mile cash for the railway and \$1,000 cash per mile for the sleigh-road, hoping at the same time that this would be supplemented by the British Columbia Government when he would construct the road. He, therefore, expected to get from the Dominion Government \$7,000 per mile cash or \$1,050,000. But that gentleman and the company he represented declined to accept this land grant, and to build the road for it, and the inference is inevitable, that in the opinion of that gentleman representing English capital and the Rothschilds, he and they did not value this three and three-quarter million acres as worth \$1,050,000 in cash. They offered to take the cash on the one hand and they declined the land grant in the other, and so I think it is a fair inference to draw that they did not think the land grant worth the \$1,050,000.

Again, the "Mail and Empire," which is the chief Conservative organ had an article the other day, not dealing with this subject specially, but dealing with mineral lands, and that article has a bearing upon a point which I wish to bring forward now, in order to see if we can form anything like an estimate of how responsible parties value the land grant we have made to this railway. As is well known, the "Mail and Empire" condemns the bargain that has been made by the Government, pronounces it improvident, has used strong language in denunciation of it—not as strong perhaps as has been used in this House, or as has appeared in other papers—but denouncing it as giving away the wealth of the country. Well, Sir, in its issue of the 9th of this month, the "Mail" had an editorial in which it was dealing with what it termed the bad mining policy of the Ontario Government. It speaks of the Ontario mining regions as being very valuable—it is claimed they are as valuable as any that can be found in British Columbia, not in this article, but that claim has been made for them—and the "Mail" proceeds to discuss the conditions imposed upon prospectors by the Ontario Government, and condemns them. After reciting the difficulties that surround the prospector, it winds up by saying:

Further, after getting the location surveyed, his claim is liable to be disallowed, if he does not file the plan immediately, and when he has secured it it may turn out not to be worth working, as nine hundred and ninety-nine claims out of every thousand do turn out.

Not "may" turn out, but "do" turn out. Now, there is the estimate of the "Mail and

Empire" as to the value of mineral lands in that which it pronounces a rich mineral district, and it says that only one claim out of every thousand is worth the working there—not only "may" be, but is actually worth the working. Well, Sir, apply that same principle to that territory out of which this grant of land is to be made. Take it in the large blocks in which the contract requires it to be taken. What better assurance have we that paying claims in the Yukon will be found in any greater relative abundance than in the rich territory that is described in the "Mail" If it be a fact, as the "Mail" asserts, that only one claim in every thousand pays for the working, then divide this land grant of three and three-quarter million acres by a thousand, and you have got the result that this Government has given, so far as paying claims are concerned, simply 3,750 acres. That is, according to the "Mail," there would be 3,750 acres of paying claims in this three and three-quarter million acres, and for that you get this railway built without a cent of cash. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) gave us instances, or an instance rather of the wealth of the Yukon mines. He told us that Mr. Ogilvie mentioned two or three creeks out of which \$60,000,000 or \$70,000,000 might be taken. I was at the lecture and I think the hon. gentleman is right that Mr. Ogilvie said so, but if I remember well—and I speak subject to correction—Mr. Ogilvie also said that in these rich pay mines it would take 60 per cent to work them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) did not figure on that. Coming down on the cars the other day, I met a very intelligent gentleman who had been some years in that country; the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) were with me and we were very much interested in the conversation with this gentleman, because he was an educated man and had a knowledge of the country. He told us there were undoubtedly rich claims up there but he feared there would be great disappointment on the part of very many, and he said: You must not expect that every spot you prospect is a gold mine. The question was asked him, "Did you do any mining on your own account?" "Yes," he said, "I worked a claim, and I had \$13,000 out of it." That looked pretty well, if he had stopped there; but after a short pause he added, "It cost me \$18,000 to take it out." Hon. gentlemen do not take this into their consideration. My hon. friend speaks of the Le Roi mine. He has mentioned a good mine. How did he happen to give us the Le Roi mine as a fair sample of the mineral lands that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann might get?

Mr. WALLACE. I gave it as a sample of the good mines.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Then, the hon. gentleman admits that all that

Mr. PATERSON.

Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann get are not good mines; I have got that much from him, at any rate. Then, he mentions this Le Roi mine as a good mine. Will not the hon. gentleman be equally frank and tell this House how much he has got out of his mine? How is it paying?

Mr. WALLACE. Whose mine?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The mine the hon. gentleman is connected with—I do not know whether he is the president or not. How has it paid?

Mr. WALLACE. A very handsome profit.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How much? Will the hon. gentleman give us an idea?

An hon. MEMBER. That is private business.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It will only boom the stock.

Mr. WALLACE. You could not buy any stock; it is not for sale.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman, being actively engaged in mining, knowing whereof he speaks, no doubt with a strong company behind him—

Mr. WALLACE. A small company.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. A small company; but he can make it larger, as he has the confidence of a good many people in the country.

Mr. WALLACE. We do not want it larger.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman believes one-tenth of what he says about this Klondike region, why do not he and his company go and operate there?

Mr. WALLACE. How do you know but they are?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If they are, they are months ahead of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, with a chance of snapping up all there is there. So that his righteous soul need not be vexed; and, if his company is not in there, if the strong company represented by the hon. leader of the Opposition is not in there, and if Mr. Hamilton Smith, with his company, his millions and his Rothschilds, are not there, they can go in or send in their prospectors, by the thousands, weeks and weeks before Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann can select one particle of the land. I was going to say, what utter nonsense; but that would be wrong. If I were not in the House, would it not be right to say, what utter nonsense it is for these gentlemen to come here and talk in this way, when they can go into the country and make their selection of the lands, and make their fortune, if they believe what they say? What did the Government do? The House recognizes that there are in this contract conditions which these gentlemen

would not have thought possible, if it had not been announced to the House—that these men, without being paid a cent of money, but merely on the chance of what they could make out of the lands, knowing that rich placer claims had already been staked, and knowing that thousands, and tens of thousands, of people were at Dyea and Skagway, and on the Yukon and the Stikine, making their way into the country, and free to locate mining claims wherever they pleased, and, when they located, knowing that the Government of Canada would see to it that their claims would be recognized—that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann would have to make their selection bit by bit, as they completed their railroad, and would not be able to make their total selection till the last ten miles of the railway was built, near the 1st of September next. And yet hon. gentlemen speak as if the Government had given away the inheritance of the Canadian people. We do not want to lose sight of this fact. This is a business question, in which the whole of the people of Canada are interested. The way in which the whole of the people of Canada will be benefited by this project will not be so much by the gold that is taken out. It will be by the trade that is created by the men who dig and delve for that gold; and this Government were determined that they would do all that was in their power, if Parliament would sustain them in it, to see that the vast trade that would be developed in extracting that gold, should go to benefit the people of Canada, who own the land. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about our mining regulations and our 10 per cent royalty. They say the Government will be forced to change it. Well, the Government will do what they consider right and proper; but the Government said, when the people were flocking into that country, that it belonged to the people of Canada. When the people were flocking in there, as the hon. leader of the Opposition said, fifty Americans to one Canadian, taking the gold that belonged to the people of Canada, the Government said: We will not shut these Americans out, but we will not allow them to take that gold out without paying a substantial royalty to the people of Canada, whose money is to be expended in opening up and administering the country. If, in the course of time, after the people of Canada have gone in and have secured the trade of the country, it should be deemed advisable to reduce the royalty, we shall be at liberty to do so. But, meanwhile, where is the Canadian who will say, while these foreigners were going in, as the hon. leader of the Opposition said, fifty to one, that we did wrong in not seeking to exclude the Americans in return for their exclusive policy, but in asking them to contribute one-tenth of what they took out? Leave the question of foreigners out of the question altogether, if you will; what great general benefit to Canada would it be if

ten, fifteen, twenty, aye, or a hundred or more, of Canadians should accumulate vast wealth by lucky strikes in that territory, good as far as it goes? I would be glad if the money were in the pockets of Canadians. There would be a hundred individuals benefited, and they might be able to expend somewhat more in their living; but the benefit would be limited. That is not where the interests of Canada, as a whole, come in. But, bearing in mind the fact, so truly stated by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and which every one knows, that it costs a dollar in gold to produce a dollar in gold, the people of Canada are interested in having the trade of those men who are expending a dollar for every dollar they take out; for what does that mean? It means not a fortune to one hundred or two hundred, but it means to all the cities and towns throughout this Dominion, to every warehouse, factory and workshop, to every farmer and artisan, benefit from that trade owing to the policy adopted by this Government. It is the trade we want, it is that we are after, and the Opposition, in their unpatriotic stand, are working against the best interests of the country. And they are pursuing this unpatriotic course at a moment when the Government are bending every effort to secure a fair share—and a fair share is a large share—of that trade in this country. The trade will, at any rate, be a large one for a year or perhaps two—I hope for many a year—but we want to benefit by it just as soon as we can. We want to benefit by it this year, and we are getting it in part. But if we had that road completed to-day, who will say what the benefit would be to the people, east, west, north and south, in all the factories, workshops and warehouses of this Dominion? Yet these gentlemen are finding fault with the Government. They have not hesitated even to insult members on this side by suggesting that we are supporting a scheme which does not commend itself to us as in the best interests of the country. The Government have had exhibitions of party fealty, there is no doubt about that, and I believe they have the confidence of their supporters. But the Government does not rely on party fealty or party feeling. It relies on the merits of the question itself, it relies on the men of this House determining that this matter, on its own merits, is in the best interests of the country. And there are hon. gentlemen on the other side who, if they would speak out their minds, would give expression to an opinion favourable to this scheme.

And what more, Sir? We have had an insult cast at another Chamber, to which I would not allude, if it had not been cast so openly. When hon. gentlemen opposite know that the people's representatives, elected directly by the people, who are not bound by anything except what is due to the public interests of their constituencies—when they know that the representatives of

the people will pass this bargain on its merits, what do they do? They make appeals to another branch of this legislature to throw the measure out. I say, Mr. Speaker, that in so doing they insult that branch. Even if the members of that Chamber are not responsible to the people as are the members of this House, there are business men in it, there are men in it keenly alive to the interests of the country, men who are supposed to occupy a judicial position, and these men, when called upon by the Opposition in this House to throw out the Bill, which the people's representatives, directly responsible to the people, in this House, are going to pass, I think that that Chamber will be prepared to resent the insult when the time comes for them to act.

Mr. DAVIN. Who is it that first in the debate referred to the second Chamber?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know that it was the hon. member for Assiniboia, but it was from that side of the House, I believe.

Mr. DAVIN. No, the first one to refer to the Senate was the hon. Minister of the Interior, and he concluded his speech with a threat against that Chamber.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Is the hon. gentleman referring to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think the hon. gentleman is wrong. My hon. colleague the Minister of the Interior pointed out that the members of the Opposition were assuming a great responsibility if they refused their assent to this Bill, and if it was defeated here or elsewhere the responsibility would be on them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I think that is correct. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that that was the first time that that Chamber was mentioned.

Mr. DAVIN. In this House?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Certainly, it was not mentioned from this side before.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Had it not also been mentioned in their papers?

Mr. DAVIN. It is mentioned in the "Globe."

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Why, we know that hon. members have called upon the Senate to throw out the Bill. To-night we have heard the appeal made. We have heard in this debate appeals made to the Senate to do this. Not only that, but in almost every issue of their press there are similar appeals, and all that the hon. Minister of the

Mr. PATERSON.

Interior did was to point out that whoever would be responsible for the rejection of this measure, under all the circumstances surrounding it, would incur great responsibility. I do not view that as a threat at all, but as a statement which is perfectly correct, for I do believe that hon. gentlemen opposite would incur great responsibility if by any means they succeeded in frustrating the building of this road in the time mentioned.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As the hon. gentleman has raised, and I think myself improperly raised this point, and made statements in reference to another branch of the legislature and the actions of hon. gentlemen in this House, I think, perhaps, I had better read what his colleague, the Minister of the Interior, really did say:

It would remove the danger of the country being, not in the hands of our officers, but in the hands of an alien population who would condemn this Government. This I look upon as important. Let my hon. friend understand that if this railway project is obstructed, if it is stopped here or elsewhere—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (reading)—

—and if that territory passes from the control of Canada by reason of their being no railway communication, the people of Canada will hold them to a bitter account for it.

Now, there is a statement coming from the Minister of the Interior declaring that the people of this country will hold another branch responsible for serious consequences if they do not pursue the course he indicates. Under those circumstances, I regret the attack which the hon. gentleman has made here, and the freedom with which he has dealt with another branch of the legislature is entirely unwarranted.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I suppose the hon. gentleman takes the ground that when we hear in this Chamber hopes expressed that another branch will defeat the Bill, which they admit this House will pass, it is not proper for me to point out that in so acting they are casting an insult at the other Chamber.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not so serious an impropriety or as unparliamentary as for a Minister of the Crown to utter a threat against another branch of Parliament.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am uttering no threat.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, but the Minister of the Interior did, and I read the threat he uttered.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Does the hon. gentleman consider it is a threat to say that a legislative body will be held responsible by the people of Canada for what it does?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say that no other construction can be put upon it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I gave from my recollection what I thought my hon. colleague the Minister of the Interior said, and it agrees with what the hon. gentleman quoted. As I have said, the Government are in the judgment of the House and are prepared to abide by its decision. We have done what we considered was in the public interest in this matter. I need not enter into all the details. I need not attempt, at this stage of the debate, to go over that contract line by line and section by section. That has been clearly discussed by the members who have preceded me. But in addition to the trade that we are trying to secure for this country—which, after all, is a valuable thing for the people of this country, because it means not wealth to 100 or 200 men but to every hamlet and village throughout the country—in addition to that, there is another duty and responsibility which the Government felt. It was their bounden duty to take steps, so far as was in their power to preserve law and order in that country, to see that the safety of the people who went into that country was assured. And, in order to accomplish that in the rush that is being made in the excitement that has been manifested, extraordinary measures had to be taken. And when hon. gentlemen opposite say that we did not start early enough, I ask them to read the remarks of the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and to take their answer from him. We know how he laboured, how he bent himself to the task of the management of the Yukon country, and you heard his statement that as soon as he had ascertained positively from the report of his officers that it was possible to have uninterrupted navigation from the foot of Teslin Lake to Dawson City, we acted immediately. As he said, it would have been premature to have acted sooner. Acting promptly, the Government made this contract; they made it with men who, as everybody in this House admits, are able financially to carry out their contracts, men who have shown by their work on other contracts that when they say they will finish a road by the 1st of September they are ready to carry out their agreement. In view of the tens of thousands of people who are rushing into that country, none can doubt that there is an absolute necessity that every means should be provided in order that supplies may be carried on for their use, and also to place the Government in a position to restrain lawlessness should it appear and to retain that country to the Dominion of Canada, with all the benefits to the people that we hope for from its occupation. The future wealth of that country is problematical. I am sure that hon. members irrespective of party, desire that it may prove rich in mineral, that for years and for years wealth may

be extracted from those rocks and hills and valleys. But we know that it would be contrary to all experience for placer mining to last for a great number of years. We hope, however, that as in the Kootenay, rich quartz mines may be found. That would mean permanent settlement and the employment of machinery. That would mean towns and villages. But it would mean also that those who are to develop wealth there, to crush those rocks and extract the gold must have capital by the million. And, having a strong company there whose interests must lie largely in rock-mining by reason of the way in which they select their land, we have an earnest desire that a determined effort will be made to learn whether there is gold-bearing rock there or not. And if such should be found to be the case the people of Canada will enjoy the benefits and will share the wealth that is developed.

So, looking at the safety of the country, looking at it as a duty of the Canadian people to see to it that means of access are provided for taking in provisions and supplies to the people who go in there, having regard to the fact that it is above all things necessary that the Canadian Government shall be in a position to maintain law and order in that country, having regard to the vast trade that we hope will be developed in the mines there, we have undertaken to provide direct communication to that country by an all-Canadian route. The Government have submitted their proposition to Parliament, and on the judgment of Parliament upon this measure as a business measure, standing upon its merits alone, they challenge the House to pronounce a verdict.

Mr. MONK moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 22nd February, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Federal Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Casey.)

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. Casey.)

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Lake Bennett and Klondike Railway and Tramway Company.—(Mr. Haggart.)

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 33) to incorporate the Pacific and Yukon Railway, Navigation and Mining Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Miles Cañon and White Horse Tramway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 36) to amend the Act respecting the sale of railway passenger tickets.—(Mr. Beattie.)

ADJOURNMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I gave notice a few days ago that I would move :

That when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until Thursday, the 24th.

It has been represented to me by several members on both sides of the House that the attendance, which is noticeable to everybody, is very thin to-day, and is likely to remain so on account of the storm for the present week, and therefore it is advisable to adjourn not until Thursday but to Tuesday, 1st March. I, therefore, amend my motion, and accordingly I move :

That when the House adjourns to-day, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 1st day of March.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I would press on the leader of the Government the desirability of extending the time until Wednesday. We wish to stay at home until the election is over.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Until after the storm is over.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). We want to know the result. I suggest that an adjournment be taken until Wednesday.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think the proposition is the best answer to the suggestion now made, and that the motion as it stands is expedient in the interest of the public service. Perhaps some of our friends from Ontario may not be back on Tuesday, but they ought all to be back on Wednesday morning, and members from the other provinces will be here on Tuesday.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY— MR. HAMILTON SMITH'S PROPOSAL.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of the House the papers which I
Mr. PATERSON.

promised to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) the other day, respecting the proposal made by Mr. Hamilton Smith, and, as one of the letters from that gentleman has already been placed on the records of the House by an hon. member, I propose, with the permission of the House and your permission, Mr. Speaker, to present the whole of these letters and to read them to the House. They are as follows :—

Ottawa, 14th February, 1898.

To the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, K.C.M.G.,
Premier :

Sir,—In connection with several London associates, we have made application to the present Parliament for a charter for a railway from Lynn Canal by the Chilkat Pass to a point on the Lewes River just below Rink Rapids. As I find, upon my late return from London that your Government has made a provisional contract, which, if carried out, would prevent any charter being granted to myself and associates, I beg leave to submit the following statements and propositions :—

My associates and myself have for many years been connected with the Treadwell mine and other gold mines on the coast of Alaska, so that we have been specially familiar with that northern country. Last year, at our instance, Mr. Henry Bratnober was sent on an exploring expedition from Lynn Canal to Dawson, with instructions to see what route was best adapted for the construction of a railway from the coast to the unobstructed waters of the Yukon. He returned via the so-called Dalton trail from Rink Rapids by Hootchei and Dalton's Post, to Pyramid Harbour, noting elevations, distances and the character of the country. He was, we are informed, the second white man who had passed over the entire length of this line. His report to us was so favourable as to the many advantages of this route that as soon as your Minister of the Interior returned from the west, I approached him through a mutual friend, offering to build in the year 1898 a substantial railway from Pyramid Harbour to Rink Rapids, with no cash subsidy, but with a reasonable land grant covering mineral rights. At the time, I referred, by authority, to several of the largest financial firms in London, showing that our ability to build such a line was beyond question.

The answer I received was, that the Government might prefer the Stikine-Tealin route ; to this I replied that, in my judgment, which I felt sure, from my familiarity with the country, was correct, the Stikine line had practically no value as a commercial route, and that no sane capitalist would invest a penny in it, but, of course, if the Government would give the right assistance we would build the line, while disclaiming any responsibility for its value when constructed.

Doubtless, these informal negotiations were communicated to the Cabinet.

In this connection allow me to state that no offer to build the line was made for the house of N. M. Rothschild & Sons, as has been stated in the House of Commons.

I was then compelled to go to London, and just before leaving on my way back to Canada, was surprised to hear by cable that a contract was being arranged with other parties, and that myself and friends were not offered the opportunity of making a tender. This seemed to us strange, considering the financial strength of the names I had given as being shareholders of our proposed company, and as we were the pioneers

of the Dalton route and had given the Government full information as to its advantages.

It is now, I believe, admitted by almost all persons conversant with the subject, that the Dalton line is the most favourable of any route yet proposed, but with your permission I will contrast it with the Stikine-Teslin line.

The Stikine line commences at Fort Wrangel, on acknowledged territory of the United States, but with certain treaty rights as to the navigation of the Stikine; thence about 150 miles up that river, which sometimes from low water and other times from floods is difficult of navigation, so much so that your engineer, Mr. W. T. Jennings, in his report of 11th January, 1898, advises the construction of a railway from Little Cañon up the Stikine 54 miles to a point where the line will leave the river. The Stikine, he states, is generally open for navigation 5½ months; my information is that in some seasons it is closed fully 7 months.

I gather from Mr. Jennings's report that he advises the following route:—

	Miles.
Fort Wrangel by boat to Little Cañon on Stikine.....	96
Little Cañon by rail up Stikine.....	54
Stikine Crossing by rail to Koketsi.....	59
Koketsi by rail to Lake Mo-a-de-le (crossing divide 3,840 feet above sea level)....	14
Lake Mo-a-de-le by rail to southern end Lake Teslin (lake 2,400 feet above sea level).....	118 or 124
Along Lake Teslin to deep water by rail..	10
From deep water, Lake Teslin, to its discharge, by boat.....	50½
Teslin Lake to junction Hootalinqua and Lewes, by boat.....	139½
Down Lewes from junction Hootalinqua to Rink Rapids, by boat (elevation, Rink Rapids, 1,600 feet above sea).....	135

Total distance..... 676

Of which 96 miles are by boat up Stikine ;
255 miles are by rail to Lake Teslin ;
325 miles are by boat to Rink Rapids.

676 miles.

My information is, that at times in certain seasons the Hootalinqua is not navigable for steamboats of any size, and so occasionally portages would have to be made. Lake Teslin is not open for more than about five months, owing to its elevation of 800 feet above Rink Rapids; it, doubtless, is not open as long as the lower part of the Lewes River. Below the junction of the Hootalinqua with the Lewes boats must pass through the swift water of Five Finger Rapids, and also through Black Rapids.

Now contrast such a route, involving at least two breaks of carriage, with our proposed Dalton trail. In the latter, we start from a point on deep water, at an admirable harbour, open at all times to the largest steamers afloat, where the ships will be moored at a pier alongside the railway train; this harbour, very possible, may be in Canadian territory; then, with a grade which can be kept at 2 per cent to the coast range summit, 3,070 feet above sea, and then with easy grade and lower elevation, to the Lewes River, where boats drawing five feet can go down at all times, when the river is open, to Dawson City, or even to near the Yukon Fiats.

By the Stikine-Teslin line the distance is 676 miles, open only five months in the year, and uncertain at that. By the Dalton line, the distance by our survey is 288 miles all rail, and the

line can be kept open the year through. (Mr. Jennings states this distance to be 245 miles.)

On behalf of my associates, I now offer to build a well equipped narrow-gauge line on the Dalton route, to be completed during the present year, and so constructed that it can be readily changed to a broad-gauge line in the season of 1899, upon the condition that the Government will give no new charter for railways from Lynn Canal in the next five years; will authorize for that term proper traffic rates, and will give us a subsidy of 1,000,000 acres of land on the same general terms as the provisional contract before spoken of.

Or, if the Government insists upon the Stikine line also, we will build a light railway for the Stikine and a substantial one on the Dalton line for a concession of 2,000,000 acres. From Mr. Jennings's report one infers that the land grant in the provisional contract will be from 4,500,000 to 5,000,000 acres for the Stikine line alone.

We have devoted much time and considerable expense to this affair, having had a detailed survey made of our proposed line up to the coast summit. The standing of the London gentlemen I represent is also, as you doubtless have been informed, of the very highest. So I hope this communication will meet with the careful attention of your Cabinet.

I have the honour to remain,

Yours very respectfully,

(Sgd.) HAMILTON SMITH.

I inclose a copy of our first map which was shown to the Minister of the Interior last year.

(Sgd.) H. S.

On the 18th, that is on Friday last, I received an amended proposal in the following letter, which was read yesterday by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean):

Rideau Club,

Ottawa, 18th February, 1898.

To the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.,
Premier:

Sir,—In view of the strongly expressed opposition to a subsidy of mineral lands, with power to the concessionaire of selection in very many different localities, I beg leave to amend my proposition of the 14th inst., as follows:—

If a charter is granted to myself and associates not later than the 10th of March next, we will agree in the present year to build a substantial railway of three feet gauge (so constructed that it can afterwards be easily changed to a standard gauge), from Pyramid Harbour to the foot of Rink Rapids, a distance of about 288 miles, on condition that the Government will give no new charter for railways from Lynn Canal in the next five years; will authorize for that term proper traffic rates, and will give us a grant in fee simple (covering mineral rights of alternate sections of one mile square for a distance of ten miles on each side of the railway from the 60th parallel of latitude to the northern terminus at Rink Rapids; this grant would embrace a length of about 195 miles, and, being at the rate of 6,400 acres per mile of railway, would amount to say 1,248,000 acres.

In this connection, I may state that very little prospecting for gold has been thus far done in this locality.

Permit me again to call your attention to the fact that the ocean terminus of this Dalton line is nearer Dawson City than the northern terminus of the proposed Stikine line.

By Dalton Route.	
	Miles.
Pyramid Harbour to Rink Rapids by rail..	288
Rink Rapids to Dawson by large boats...	225
	513
By Stikine Route.	
Southern end of Lake Teslin to mouth of Hootalinqua	60½
Hootalinqua River to its junction with Lewes	139½
Lewes River from Hootalinqua to Rink Rapids....	135
Rink Rapids to Dawson City.....	225
	560

If Mr. Jennings's advice be carried out that the railway should be extended ten miles north of end of Lake Teslin, the distance from inner terminus of Stikine line to Dawson would be 550 miles, or thirty-seven miles farther than from Pyramid Harbour to Dawson.

Or, if Government still insists on Stikine line alone, we will build that on same general terms as the provisional contract with Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann for 1,000,000 acres, but without the right of lateral or end extensions of the blocks of land.

The Government is, I believe, informed as to our financial ability to execute such work, but if there are any doubts as to this, a cable or so to London will speedily give the desired information.

I have the honour to remain,

Yours very respectfully,

(Sgd.) HAMILTON SMITH.

It is to be noticed that in this first communication it is stated by Mr. Smith that doubtless these informal communications, which are here detailed, had been communicated to the Cabinet. I must say to the House that no such communication had ever been made to me or to the Cabinet by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. Upon the receipt of this letter, therefore, I called the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior to it, and he there and then stated to myself that he had never received any such communication either directly or indirectly. I thereupon wrote a short letter to Mr. Hamilton Smith acknowledging the receipt of his letter, and asking him to meet me in my office on Saturday last at 10.30 in the forenoon, which he did. With me at the time were some of my colleagues, that is to say, Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir Louis Davies, Mr. Blair and Mr. Sifton. Thereupon Mr. Smith declared that the mutual friend through whom the offer had been made to Mr. Sifton was Sir William Van Horne. It so happened that on that day Sir William Van Horne was in the city, and I therefore immediately wrote to him as follows:—

Privy Council, Canada,
Ottawa, 19th February, 1898.

Dear Sir William Van Horne :

On the 15th instant, I received from Mr. Hamilton Smith a letter as to the statements of which I would desire to communicate with you.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. Smith, in his letter, makes the following assertions:—

"My associates and myself have for many years been connected with the Treadwell mine and other gold mines on the coast of Alaska, so that we have been especially familiar with that northern country. Last year, at our instance, Mr. Henry Bratnober was sent on an exploring expedition from Lynn Canal to Dawson, with instructions to see what route was best adapted for the construction of a railway from the coast to the unobstructed waters of the Yukon. He returned by the so-called Dalton trail from Rink Rapids by Hootchie and Dalton's Post, to Pyramid Harbour, noting elevations, distances and the character of the country. He was, we are informed, the second white man who had passed over the entire length of this line. His report to us was so favourable as to the many advantages of this route, that as soon as your Minister of the Interior returned from the west, I approached him through a mutual friend, offering to build, in the year 1898, a substantial railway from Pyramid Harbour to Rink Rapids, with no cash subsidy, but with a reasonable land grant covering mineral rights. At the time, I referred, by authority, to several of the largest financial firms in London, showing that our ability to build such a line was beyond question.

"The answer I received was, that the Government might prefer the Stikine-Teslin route. To this I replied that in my judgment, from my familiarity with the country was correct, the Stikine line had practically no value as a commercial route, and that no sane capitalist would invest a penny in it; but, of course, if the Government would give the right assistance, we would build the line, while disclaiming any responsibility for its value when constructed.

"Doubtless, these informal negotiations were communicated to the Cabinet."

The Hon. Mr. Sifton, to whom I gave immediate communication of this letter, stated that the above assertion was altogether untrue. I thereupon invited Mr. Hamilton Smith to meet me this morning in my office, and he accordingly met me there in the presence of a few of my colleagues, and then, in answer to our inquiries, stated that you were the mutual friend who had communicated between him and Mr. Sifton.

Under such circumstances, I would feel obliged, if you would let me know at your earliest convenience whether, as is claimed by Mr. Hamilton Smith, you can corroborate his statement.

Believe me, dear Sir William,
Yours very sincerely,

(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

Sir William Van Horne,
General Manager, C.P.R.,
Montreal.

On the same day I received the following answer from Sir William Van Horne:

Rideau Club,
Ottawa, 19th February, 1898.

Dear Sir Wilfrid,—In reply to your inquiry of this date, I beg leave to say that I have never communicated to the Hon. Mr. Sifton or anybody else any proposition from Mr. Hamilton Smith concerning the building of a railway towards the Yukon district, nor had I authority from him to make any proposition.

Faithfully yours,

(Sgd.) W. C. VAN HORNE.

Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.,
Ottawa.

E. LALONDE, MESSENGER.

Mr. WILSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Government if they are aware that E. Lalonde, a messenger of this House, has been or is canvassing in the county of Russell?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not know whether the Government are informed of the doings of the messengers of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the Speaker has more direct control over the messengers of this House than even the Government; and, for the information of the hon. member, I would say that so far as I am concerned, I have not heard of any sessional messenger being engaged in the canvass. If the hon. gentleman has any facts in regard to anything of the kind, and would be good enough to communicate them to me, I will have the matter looked into.

Mr. WILSON. Has any messenger been given leave of absence?

Mr. SPEAKER. Not that I am aware of. Of course, I suppose the head messenger might give a short leave of absence without communicating with the Speaker. I am not aware that the messenger referred to has obtained leave of absence; but I may say that whenever any messenger of this House desires to go away and vote, no matter on which side he wishes to vote—and there are, I understand, messengers on both sides of politics—he gets leave to do it, if it can be done without inconvenience to the business of the House. Canvassing, however, is a different matter.

CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Blair for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty the Queen and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to trespass upon the attention of the House in regard to this Bill. I feel that we have much yet to learn in regard to it; but, with the elements at our disposal, there remains but very little to be said. Nevertheless, the measure is one of so much importance, the legislation which we are called upon to enact is in a certain sense so new—for we are called upon to legislate, for the first time I think in the history of this Dominion, for a great mining country—the enterprise covered by the provisions of the Bill is so great, and the grant of land is so large and important, that I feel it my duty to say a few words on the subject. Down in the province of which I have the honour to be

one of the representatives, a man on this side of the House who would remain silent and yet cast his vote against this measure would be taxed either with a semi-acquiescence in it or a total indifference to its results on the country at large. This, Sir, is my excuse. I listened last night, with some degree of amazement, to the speech delivered to this House by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). It is fair to say that he absolutely went the length of shedding crocodile tears over the fate of these two contractors. He went into rhapsodies over their patriotism, and enthused over their energy in a very loud voice. We had something of a similar character from the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), and this led me to ask myself: what is the trend of public opinion in the great province of Ontario with regard to this measure? For, Sir, in the province of Quebec many views have been expressed, but I have heard none in the direction of sympathizing with the two men who have been so prominently mentioned in this debate. There is, I venture to say, without fear of contradiction, a very different feeling in my province. The feeling there, is—and I think it is justified—that this is a very rich country, and that if, for the construction of this railway, we are, as we have been told time and again by the Government organs, giving no money, we are giving a very large quantity of gold. That is the opinion in the province of Quebec, and the opinion is there also—and it is very general among men of every political shade of opinion—that these two contractors have been singularly fortunate, and in some way, which the people cannot understand, have obtained great advantages which would not accrue to them if the Government had carried through this transaction according to the ordinary principles of parliamentary government. The fact is, Sir, in the province of Quebec—and I know there is no member from that province who will contradict me—the opinion is that, in the language of a local poet:

The largest-sized pebble to-day on the beach
Is that road to the Klondike, away out of reach,
And all of the women—and many a man—
Would be pleased to shake hands with that
fellow called Dan;
For every man that you speak of looks pale
Beside of that Mann on the great Golden Trail.

That, in a few words, expresses what the general opinion is in my province, and it is not astonishing, under those circumstances, that we should have awaited with the greatest expectancy the explanations to be given us with regard to this measure, when introduced into this House. Well, we had the explanations from the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), and I must confess that, for my own part, he surprised me more by the large, massive and majestic way in which he refused any information than even by the paucity of the information which he did give. As I have said, there

was something sweeping about the way in which he brushed aside all attempts at inquiry; and if I were to borrow from my classical recollection, I would say he reminded me of the old Roman who declared:

Sic volo, sic jubeo; stet pro ratione voluntas.

But when the hon. gentleman who more particularly had charge of the Bill—although nominally it was in another name—when the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) rose to explain its provisions and give us the information which we could only have reaped scantily out of the Government reports and books which, but a few hours before, had been laid on the Table, we all pressed forward to listen. Here was a man, we thought, surely qualified to instruct the House and satisfy the legitimate curiosity of the country. Here was a man who, but a short time previously, had travelled into that great and mysterious country, about which we know so little; here was a man who, not as an ordinary tourist, but assisted by all that his position in the Government could give him, had gone right up into the White Pass, had come back along the coast, and had had occasion, with all the authority with which he was invested, to acquire information from all sides; who had actually travelled down, if I am not mistaken, from the White Pass with Mr. Jennings himself, who had gone over that country and examined it and had gathered together all items of information. My hon. friend, the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has adverted to what took place. Why, we waited for an hour, while the hon. Minister spent his time attacking the leader of the Opposition, for the information we all desired. Now, I do not claim—I know my position in this House—to lecture the hon. gentleman, and still less do I claim to defend here the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). But whatever fault may be found with the leader of the Opposition, I think, Sir, that every one on both sides will give him credit for being a man well able to take care of himself—able, willing, and, I believe, even anxious to demonstrate that fact on every occasion. I have seen him do so under trying circumstances in my own province. But I will say this. I shall not go the length which the hon. Minister of the Interior went of saying that there might be in his manner something of the wild and woolly west, but I will say that the mode of his abuse and of his invective conveyed to me, to use a more oriental expression, something of the breeziness of the prairie. I may say that I am not aware that the leader of the Opposition ever attempted to wag me as one of his followers, and I have never attempted to wag him. He is in the chair which he occupies to-day, by the will of the members of his party. Sir, speaking more particularly for my colleagues from the province of Quebec, with whom I am in perfect uni-

Mr. MONK.

son. I can tell the hon. Minister of the Interior this, that we have passed to our leader our word, and that our word is as good as the best gold in the Yukon. If there are traitors in our party, Sir, we have no use for them. Well, if the hon. Minister will allow me, without pursuing any further this branch of my remarks—he occupies a far more exalted position in this House than I do, but I have over him the doubtful advantage of years—let me tell him this, that if he may not always be able to obtain the adhesion of members on this side, yet if he will, to some extent, moderate his mode of criticism, he will secure to himself what is, to a certain extent, far better, and that is the esteem and respect of all the members of this House.

When the hon. gentleman came to give us that information for which we were thirsting, I listened to him with a great deal more interest. I admit that he marshalled his facts ably, skilfully; but, though I listened to him with great attention, though I read his explanations carefully afterwards, he failed to satisfy me, and I am convinced that he has failed to satisfy the country at large upon some of the cardinal points on which we must rest our decision in regard to this matter. And these points are the following:—The hon. gentleman gave me no satisfaction in regard to the conditions upon which we shall be permitted to navigate the territorial rivers of the United States upon the Stikine River. He totally failed upon that subject to give me anything else than those suppositions which I had myself already. He failed also—and this is a point which, I think, will attract the attention of the country—to give any certainty as to what tolls were to be charged, what the cost of transportation was to be for those in whose behalf we are building this railway. I will say at once that I am prepared to admit the principle that this Parliament, in incorporating a railway, will not at once fix the tolls to be charged upon it; I admit that we are governed by the Railway Act and that we have a control exercised through the Government and through the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. But I say at once that the conditions in the present case are exceptional, and that, unless we obtain from the Government some certainty as to the cost of transportation, we shall be voting in the dark, if we vote this large grant. We are building this railway for a special set of travellers, who will probably go over it only once or twice. From what I have heard of the railway and of this route, I believe that the railway will have only an ephemeral usefulness. It is made to satisfy the wants arising during this year, and next year, and perhaps the year after. It is made to carry the immense caravan of gold-hunters who will arrive in that region within the next few months. These are exceptional conditions, and if we want to meet these wants

effectually, we must know what will be the cost of transportation over that railway. This takes this road out of the conditions of ordinary railways altogether. There is another point, and one most vital, on which the Minister of the Interior gave us no satisfaction whatever, and that is as to the value of the land grant which we are making. This is one of the foremost points in this controversy. Although I am at once prepared to admit—and I shall refer to this matter in a few moments—that it was impossible to give us the absolute value, still, with the means the Government had, it would be easy to give us the approximate value of that large territory which we are conceding to these contractors. Another point, and one because of which I shall give a vote dissenting from the second reading of this Bill, is that the Government failed to satisfy us as to the reasons why tenders were not asked for the construction of this work. And, as we advance in the discussion of this matter, it becomes more and more evident that it would be impossible for the Government to give us any valid reasons why this great undertaking was not set up for public competition, as it should have been. Nor did the hon. Minister in his speech give to me, at any rate, any satisfaction as to the reason why this land grant, which was exclusively under the control of this House, was not submitted to us in the first instance. These are the points on which I found the speech of the Minister of the Interior meagre to a blamable degree, and I venture to say that the country at large, at least that part of it from which I come, upon examination of the hon. gentleman's explanations, will arrive at the same conclusion.

My own reasons for dissenting from the majority in this House and for voting against this measure are manifold. But there are three principal reasons. The first of these is, that Parliament should have been consulted in the first instance. I will not take up the time of this House in going into the discussion of the principle which underlies my argument in this regard. We all know—there are few members of the House, perhaps, who are not better aware than I am—that the primary control of Parliament in all matters of grants is a principle which has been fought for during hundreds of years in England before the political institutions of that country were brought into operation here. In fact, Sir, it is a principle, as we all know, that was in operation among the Anglo-Saxon races long before the British constitution had assumed any co-ordinate form. And, though for five or six hundred years that principle was trampled under foot, that usurpation gave rise in England to struggles which filled the pages of English history. The Commons fought incessantly and courageously for the primary and exclusive control in matters of grants, until finally they obtained the vic-

tory and the principle was consecrated in the Revolution of 1688 and proclaimed in the Bill of Rights. From that time down to the present day, I am not aware that in England it has been departed from to any considerable extent. It is a cardinal point of our constitution. The idea that our Executive should in the slightest degree take upon itself, outside the control of Parliament and in advance of those discussions which must precede the final settlement of all grants, to make these grants, is one which we cannot too strongly condemn. We have brought into operation in this country the principles of the British constitution. I heard the hon. leader of the House tell us, in glowing language, what he witnessed while in England, and I heard him say that the pageant which he saw there was a pageant of different peoples representing many varieties of race and religion, but it was a procession of free people. Well, the right hon. gentleman must remember that the forces which have made the British people, and the British dependencies all over the world, great and free depend upon the conservation of just such principles as that which I am contending for in this instance.

It seems to me, therefore, that having here, in one of the British dependencies, consecrated that principle, we seem to depart, as we have departed already during the existence of this Parliament, from that principle, that first and foremost all grants must be considered by Parliament. If we depart from that principle we will slowly drift into the condition of many nations just as democratic in principle as are the nations governed in accordance with the British constitution, but among which this cardinal principle is not observed. Party spirit triumphs over these free deliberations which ought to take place in our Parliament. In this instance the violation of that principle is a flagrant one. Last year we had the consummation of the contract for the Drummond County Railway, before Parliament, and we discussed that measure. This year we have the Government of the country entering into a contract involving precisely a violation of that principle which underlies free parliamentary government in its truest sense, we have the Government entering into that contract, not a long time, but a few days before Parliament assembles; yes, I may say, even at the very moment when the House, having been summoned, probably many members of this House were on their way to the capital. This seems to me to be a most flagrant violation of the principle that in all matters of grants and expenditures of money, as it is laid down in the permanent rules of the House of Commons in England, this House of Commons must in the first instance take up the matter and consider it. Now, Sir, what is the condition of things in this country? We all know it, and we see it

operating in this very Chamber. We have party spirit in this country strong and operating continually, party lines are tightly drawn. And what does the Government do? The Government concludes a contract involving a large grant of land, before the opening of Parliament, and places that contract upon its ministerial programme in the Speech from the Throne, and brings that grant into this House in the shape of a Bill. And where are its followers? What is the position, in other words, of this House? Is it, Sir, as a matter of principle, able to deal with perfect freedom, as we should be able to deal with a subject of this kind? It is evident that the majority of this House have not that freedom, that is, it is impossible for members belonging to the majority of this House, to condemn the grant. And why is it so? It is because, as we all know, in condemning the grant they condemn the Government; in other words, the life of the Government depends upon the sanction of this very grant, and hence it is impossible for those who sit behind the Treasury benches to discuss this matter with perfect freedom. The role of members of Parliament under these circumstances becomes, you may say, of no importance, their hands are tied. The House of Commons is left with the right of veto, undoubtedly, we can veto this measure. But for my hon. friends opposite, what does that veto mean? It means the death of this Government—I am placing myself in their own position; it is a step the gravity of which may cause them to hesitate, and reasonably so. Here are men, some of whom have fought for years for the triumph of the policy defended by this Government; they have fought for years to put in power the men in whom they place their entire confidence. Now they are brought suddenly face to face with a grant of this kind. They are told that they are free, and so they are. They may exercise that supreme power which the nation has confided to them, just as they think fit. But is it surprising that under these circumstances they should hesitate when they know that an adverse vote will sweep the Government from power, will destroy some of their fondest hopes, and put in power men in whom they have no confidence at all? There is nothing surprising in that. A consequence of this is, and I think it is a consequence which cannot be brought too strongly before this House, and before the country at large, that while we are here to exercise the right of veto, nobody has any doubt as to the result beforehand. The Government, which after all is simply a grand committee of this House, called upon to carry out the resolutions of this House, should have placed the matter in the first instance before us and allowed us to deal with it freely, in an unharpered way, and then carry out the will of the House, without placing its own followers in that position. It should, al-

Mr. MONK.

lowing them the opportunity of free deliberation, without risking, as it has done in this instance, and must do in every similar instance, its own life in regard to the wisdom of this grant. I consider that our institutions are in peril by this system of procedure. I deem that we are wandering from the practice which exists in England. I know there are some instances in which governments in England have taken upon themselves the expenditure of money under peculiar circumstances, without the sanction of Parliament, but these instances are extremely rare. We are establishing here a dangerous precedent, and for this reason, if for no other, I should be inclined to discountenance this measure. Now, Sir, there is another point, it is that which regards the taking of tenders. The hon. Minister told us that he was pressed for time, he told us that the need was great, and that he was obliged to proceed rapidly. But what are the facts? We have much more than the admission of the Minister of Railways. The Minister of Railways told us what we all know perfectly well, that even before this House adjourned last year, the question of the Klondike was before the country. It is a matter of public notoriety, that during last summer the newspapers of this country, aye, and of every other country, were filled ad nauseam with all kinds of articles in regard to this gold country. We were told of expeditions, we were told of gold found there, we were told of rich gold-bearing creeks; in fact, every circumstance which we are aware of to day, we were aware of last autumn. And, Sir, what do we find? The Minister himself was in Victoria on 1st November. He came down from the White Pass on board a steamer with Mr. Jennings, and he had opportunity to get from that gentleman any information which would enable him to call for tenders. If on his arrival in Victoria the hon. gentleman had taken the necessary steps to call for tenders, he would have had many offers. However, I listened to the hon. gentleman when he taunted hon. members on this side of the House with not being able to furnish him with the names of parties who would be able to make an offer in connection with the construction of the work—a very idle taunt, to my mind, because the hon. gentleman well knew that when we met here his hands were tied, and he himself up to the present moment has not accepted, and cannot any more accept, the most advantageous offer. But the hon. gentleman surely does not do this, country the injustice of thinking that there are only two men here capable of carrying out this undertaking. Why, the hon. gentleman knows very well, whatever may be the qualifications of those two men, that they have their equals in every one of the provinces of this great Dominion, and I speak particularly in regard to Montreal. It is

not an agreeable thing to throw the names of contractors across the floor of this House, but if the hon. gentleman will come down to Montreal, he cannot, on passing through the business streets of that city, fail to meet within two or three hours scores of men quite as capable as those two men of carrying out this undertaking. After all, this is a construction company, as I understand it, and we have construction companies in Montreal which have undertaken works of this kind, and such a company might be formed there in the space of twenty-four hours that would look upon it as a mere trifle to make the necessary Government deposit, and would be able to carry out the work just as well, if not better, than those two men. And what I say in regard to Montreal is equally applicable to the large cities of Ontario. Why, in my own rural constituency, which is in the neighbourhood of Montreal, I venture to say that if this contract had been set down for public competition, as it should have been, you would have found several men who would have tendered, and who would in all probability have been able to carry out the work under better conditions than the contractors mentioned in the Government proposal. But what is the use of talking? It is idle to say that better conditions could not be obtained. The proof that the conditions are not the best conditions available is shown by the Government not following the course of throwing open the work to all contractors and then coming to Parliament and saying, here is the lowest tender. I heard the leader of the House to-day read a proposition; and it seems to me that although the object of the right hon. gentleman was no doubt to remove any blame that might attach to his colleague the Minister of the Interior, still it is clear from that correspondence, so far as I understood it, that we have a proposal from men who are reliable and willing to execute the contract on more favourable terms. What better proof can we have of the laches of the Government in not calling for tenders? Last year we had the Drummond county deal. It was a question of carrying the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal. I venture to say if the Government at that time—we all know the circumstances connected with the project—had called for tenders for the prolongation of the Intercolonial into Montreal we would have had three or four proposals far more advantageous than the terms laid before Parliament by the Government. We would have been able, without in any way weakening the confidence which the House has in the Government, to deal with the question in such a way that we would have had the Intercolonial Railway carried into Montreal before this time. What happened? The Government chose to deal secretly, as in this case. The measure was rushed through this House, and the members from the province of Que-

bec did not take any interest in it beyond voting. I commend them for it, for after all they have nothing to do but to vote under this system. The measure was defeated in the other Chamber, and if we take cognizance of some of the arguments from the Government press in our part of the country, we would have supposed that the work of Guy Fawkes was going to be repeated, and the venerable gentlemen in the next Chamber would have been blown up this year. Nothing has happened, and I do not know what has become of the measure, and in fact I do not believe it will ever again come before this House in the same shape. I believe more money has been lost to the people of the country by this system of contracting secretly and without public tender than any one has any idea of. I believe, furthermore, that more Governments have been wrecked by dealing secretly and not openly with the Government than we have any notion of. I believe, furthermore, that until a set of heroic men, because the abuse has become so great that the time has arrived to make a vigorous stand against it, undertake the task of ridding the Governments and the country of these men who are regularly in the habit of contracting with the Government without that system of public tender which is the only safeguard possible to the public funds, the country will continue to lose money and Governments will continue to be weakened. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if the principle which I am advocating had been followed, Parliament would have been called in January. Six weeks' notice could easily have been given of the works that were required to be executed in that western country, and we could have dealt with the contractors in the open light of day, and Parliament would have been filling its true role, whereas we meet at great inconvenience and merely for the purpose of registering our votes, and registering our votes on matters of most vital importance, whereas in the general discussion of the estimates Parliament still retains its free legitimate and unfettered control.

It is only when we come to these great transactions involving large sums of money, that practically the hands of the House of Commons are tied, and despite all the debate that can take place, we become merely machines for the registration of the acts of Government. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I notice from the language of the Minister of the Interior—and I think it is good to call the attention of the House to it—that the negotiations were very protracted. I notice that Mr. Maitland Kersey was in communication with the hon. the Minister some time ago, and the Minister (Mr. Sifton) said the other night:

The papers on the Table of the House will show that Mr. Kersey had made a proposition a considerable time ago, for the construction of

a railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake, for which he asked a bonus.

Further in his speech, the Minister said :

I informed Mr. Kersey that we were prepared to give a considerable amount of land. Mr. Kersey knew that 20,000 or 25,000 acres of land was under discussion, and I told him we were prepared to give a liberal amount of land, aggregating something in that neighbourhood.

Now, Sir, why was not that knowledge conveyed in a general way to all the people of this country capable of making a contract and a tender? That is a question which is agitating the public mind in my province, and it is the reason why much of a disagreeable character has been said in regard to the Government's action in this matter, and for that they have only themselves to blame. I consider these two points of great importance in the discussion: first, the fact that this grant of land was not brought before us in the first instance, and second, the fact that public tenders were not called for.

There is another point on which I am inclined to look unfavourably upon this project, and it is because the road is not what the Government has held it up to us to be, namely, an all-Canadian route. Here, perhaps I am not in accord with the hon. the leader of my party, but be that as it may, this objection which I make to the route seems to me to be of great weight. It is not an all-Canadian route, and in this connection in order not to pass on beaten ground, and to perhaps say something which may be of interest to the House, I desire to advert to our rights upon the Stikine River. I was for many years engaged in the teaching of international law, I have abandoned that branch, and as hon. members know, in our profession, we are not called upon very often to examine questions of this kind. Although I may have become rusty, still the questions involved in the discussion of this measure brought back to my mind something of what I studied in past days, and I have examined the question and wish to lay my conclusions before the House.

It may be proper, Sir, in the first instance to examine what our position would have been outside of the operation of any treaty at all. In other words, given the situation of the Stikine River, and all other rivers, flowing from British territory through Alaska into the Pacific Ocean irrespective of any treaty rights, what would our position be? There is not in international law, as we have in private law—at least in our province where the French civil law prevails—servitudes existing by the mere situation of lands. The fact that a river like the River Stikine, from British territory flows down to the sea through the territory of a foreign country, would not give us any "perfect" right to the navigation of that river, but there are "imperfect" rights upon which all authors are not agreed. It is

Mr. MONK.

pretended by some authors that the situation, more particularly of the Stikine River which we are now discussing, would give us an imperfect right to the servitude, a right to ascend from the sea to our own territory and to descend from our own territory to the sea, even through the territorial waters of a foreign country. French authors contend for that view. Mr. Wheaton, an American writer upon international law, of great repute is also of that opinion, but other authors hold a different view. Kluber is of opinion that there is no such imperfect right, that under such circumstances we cannot ask for the right to navigate that river, or that the state upon whom that demand should be made, under the principles of international law could quite reasonably refuse it. Heffer holds to that view also, and if I am not mistaken, though I have not verified the fact, it is the view of the English writers Phillimore and Sir Travers Twiss, and it is the view to which England has held down to most modern times. The English Government does not admit the principle of an imperfect right; that is the right to demand a right of way through the Stikine River under the circumstances which I have indicated. Of course within quite recent times, in 1884 or 1885, England took part in the Berlin conference; that great conference which had for its object the free navigation of the Congo and Niger rivers in Africa, and what is undoubtedly of interest to us, the United States of America were a party to that conference by which the navigation of these two arteries of African commerce was thrown open to the whole world, and England and the United States were a party to the important declaration made by that conference: that it was a principle of modern international law that under the circumstances in which the Congo and Niger rivers flow through the continent of Africa, all nations could use these rivers who had any interest there. The United States of America adhered to that principle, and the navigation of those two rivers is to-day entirely free to all the nations of the world. I have no doubt that if ever we come to discuss the question of regulations with the United States, the work of that conference will be of great benefit to us.

But, Sir, we are dealing here with a servitude created by treaty, and it was created in the first instance by the Treaty of Russia of 1825. I shall read the article of that treaty which provides for the free navigation of the Stikine. Article VI says :

It is understood that the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, from whatever quarter they may arrive, whether from the ocean or from the interior of the continent, shall for ever enjoy the right of navigating freely and without any hindrance whatever, the rivers and streams which in their course towards the Pacific Ocean may cross the line of demarcation upon the line of coast described in article 3 of the present convention.

Now, what was the nature of that servitude? The servitude created by this article was a conventional affirmative servitude giving us the right to navigate all these streams which are situated in a position similar to the Stikine River. The nature of that right is not a subject of much controversy in international law. It is a servitude, as I understand it, which adheres to the territory; it is a perpetual servitude. Its operations may be suspended by war; but, different from what exists in the case of treaties, its operation revives. All treaties are broken by war, but the servitude of this kind revives after the war "pro proprio vigore." Thus, if the Crimean War terminated the Treaty of 1825 between Russia and England, this servitude of itself revived after the war. The treaty made at Paris after the war between the parties who participated in it revived impliedly all previously existing treaties at any rate. But there is more, Sir. As I understand it, the servitude in question is a servitude which adheres to the territory; and, after the cession of Alaska from Russia to the United States it continued in our favour. That is, if I mistake not, the opinion of writers of any authority upon international law. A passive servitude of that kind passes. But, Sir, the Minister of the Interior appeared to me to have a very limited appreciation of what the value of that servitude is. I must say I was amazed at his position. As I understood him to explain our rights under the treaty of 1825, a British vessel arriving at Fort Wrangel at the mouth of the Stikine River, under the beneficent stipulations of this article 6, would have a right to go quietly up the river without any hindrance of any kind whatever—without submitting to any regulation, or being controlled in the slightest degree. This of course is a gross mistake; there is no doubt about that. Why, Sir, if that were the case, our own vessels under the treaty would have been placed in a better position than the American vessels themselves. But that is a mistake; I say it without any fear of contradiction.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). A mistake in the understanding of the hon. gentleman, not in the expression of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. MONE. The Minister of the Interior may not have used the words which I am using; but I leave it to the members of this House if he did not draw a startling contrast between our position under the Treaty of 1825 and our position under the Treaty of Washington; and he blamed the members on this side of the House and the party to which I have the honour to belong, as having been a party to the sacrifice of our rights in the latter treaty. In vehement language which I trust he may modify, he laid the blame principally upon my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in this House.

There is no such thing as free navigation such as the hon. Minister of the Interior held out to us. There is no doubt whatever that a British vessel arriving at Fort Wrangel, even under the stipulations of the Treaty of 1825, would have had to submit to a number of inconveniences which are just as great as the inconveniences which we may have to submit to now. A steamer entering the territorial waters of the United States would have to submit to the navigation laws of the United States. It would have to report. A vessel entering the mouth of the Stikine River, even under the sweeping clause I have read to the House, would be subject to the regulations of the United States in regard to police, anchoring, navigating at night and during fogs, and above all things in regard to customs. Does anybody imagine that the American authorities would allow a vessel, even under the clause of the original treaty which I have just read, to pass into the river without submitting to their customs regulations? The thing is perfectly absurd. And let me say here, once for all, that the Minister of the Interior seems to me to have gone very far when he taxed the leader of the Opposition with a desire to make war between the United States and ourselves, because we are discussing what every nation is entitled to discuss—the inconveniences which a change of territory in this route may cause to us. Why, Sir, the position taken by the Minister of the Interior is to my mind a ridiculous one. In Europe they have rivers which traverse several countries. They have the Danube, the Rhine and other rivers about which nations have been obliged to come to some understanding. But will anybody get up in this House and pretend that we are going to conclude this immense transaction, charter this railway and undertake to send our vessels through American territorial waters, without being able to discuss and examine what inconveniences that course presents? And because we do discuss these inconveniences, the hon. Minister says we are anxious to plunge the country into a bloody war. It is an absurd position to take; it is childish; it is puerile. This is a matter which we ought to discuss. It is a matter which our American friends would themselves discuss if they were placed in a similar position. They would look upon us, and rightly look upon us, as men without a knowledge of business, if we rushed this matter through without considering what inconveniences might meet us when we came to enter the territorial waters of the United States in the River Stikine.

I have indicated to this House what in my mind was the position of this country after the provisions of the Treaty of 1825 were enacted. The Treaty of Washington contains a clause which to my mind, as regards the River Stikine, is practically the same as the clause to which I have just adverted; but

that clause in the Treaty of Washington modifies the nature of our servitude. I had not the advantage of being in the House, I regret it very much, when my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) discussed this question. I have not been able yet to see what his line of reasoning was, but I will do so. But it seems to me that this clause in the Treaty of Washington limits our servitude. I will read it. Clause 26 reads as follows:—

The navigation of the rivers Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine, ascending or descending from to and into the sea, shall for ever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty and the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws, or regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

Now, as I understand the operation of that clause, it impliedly restricts a servitude. We have no longer the right to navigate upon any of the other rivers but the three mentioned in this clause, and we have given furthermore to the citizens of the United States themselves a servitude which did not exist before. We have established a servitude upon our own territories with regard to these three rivers. Of course, as my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Russell) has said, everything in international law is extremely doubtful, because there is no sanction and no code. But that is the way I understand the clause. We have limited our rights to those three rivers; but, as I have said before, I do not see that our rights are very different upon the Stikine River from what they were before. There is no doubt that had we dealt with Russia or the United States after the cession of Alaska, we would have had to submit to regulations with regard to traversing foreign territory or foreign territorial waters. We have to submit to regulations also under this treaty; and I fail to see why the Minister of the Interior or why the Government did not take the trouble to find out, as they should have and might perfectly well have done, under the comity of nations, from the American authorities exactly what our position would be on that river. There is no reason why that should not have been done. There is a comic writer—a French writer, in our province who says that the principal occupation of Ministers is to conjugate the verbs “to arrive” and “to leave”—meaning that they spend most of their time travelling. These hon. gentlemen conjugated these two verbs repeatedly during recess. They went down to Washington. We were told that they went there to obtain a great many things, which they certainly failed to obtain; but it seems to me, at any rate, that if they had taken the trouble to inquire diplomatically what we might expect with regard to regulations on the Stikine River, the information would

Mr. MONK.

have been accepted with much satisfaction, and I think they might have obtained it without any great trouble. Because, although as has been said from the other side of the House, the right of the American authorities is limited to making regulations, it has been the experience in Europe, in cases similar to this, and even in America with regard to the navigation of the Mississippi and some rivers in South America, that the regulations may be made to bear heavily or not to bear heavily, and may be carried out, even when they bear heavily, in such a way as will not be too irksome on those who have to submit to them. I think this might have been made the subject of diplomatic action on the part of these gentlemen, with very great advantage. Of course, when I say that the Treaty of Washington restricted our rights in that direction, I would not like the House to understand that I consider that that treaty was unfavourable to us in any respect. We all know it was a treaty of compromise; we all know that it secured to us some rights of very great importance. It is sufficient to read the treaty to see that. It gave us bonding rights and rights on Lake Michigan which we had not before; and speaking far more generally, the treaty was a solution which England was prepared to accept of the great Alabama claims difficulty. So that it was a compromise all round, and I am not in a position to say whether it was advantageous or otherwise, upon the whole, for us. At any rate, I do not see that it was a sacrifice, in any way, of what our rights were before on the Stikine River. Now, with regard to this branch of the matter, upon which I have, perhaps, taken up too much of the time of the House, what are the conclusions at which I arrive? I arrive at these conclusions. First, that article 6 of the Anglo-Russian Treaty and article 26 of the Washington Treaty do not greatly alter our position on the Stikine River. Second, I find that this so-called all-Canadian route is situated partly in American territory, and is open to all the objections which are incidental to the mere right of way. It is open to the objections which may arise from such regulations as may be made or the surveillance which foreign authorities have to exercise, and from their control generally, and it is open—for we must consider everything in a transaction of this kind—to the danger of complete stoppage in case of war. I consider that, under the circumstances, it would have been better for the Government to have made it an all-Canadian route; and if the route selected is the best route, it would have been better for the Government to prolong the railway from Telegraph Creek to Glenora and down to Observatory Inlet or Port Simpson. I need scarcely say that I am of opinion that for what we are now giving, we could have had that prolongation.

Now, as regards the monopoly, there is no doubt in my mind that the five years clause contains a monopoly. Of course, as the hon. Minister of the Interior pointed out, we cannot interfere with the right of British Columbia to incorporate railways. That province may incorporate a railway tomorrow; but what I understand to be confirmed by the words of the contract in connection with the five years clause, is that we undertake that for five years we will not incorporate a railway running from the Alaskan boundary line into the Yukon country, where we have jurisdiction. I may be mistaken, but that is my interpretation. Nor will we confer any benefit upon any railway running in that direction. That is a monopoly and a very valuable monopoly with regard to that territory. I am prepared to say this, that if, in every respect, the contract was satisfactory, I would be prepared to accede to that monopoly for five years, because I think, if in every other respect the contract was satisfactory and the contractors carried it out, they should not be hampered by competition in that direction. But I will not say the same thing with regard to the ten years clause, by which we are made to say that if we prolong the railway down to Observatory Inlet or Port Simpson these men shall absolutely have the preference. I dissent from that entirely. I do not think we should bind Parliament in that way. We are dealing with these men for the first time, and should first see what they are going to do, and should preserve our liberty. If everything be as satisfactory as it should be and we prolong the road in that direction, we will, as the Minister of the Interior said, probably give them the preference, but if these men do not give us satisfaction, why should we beforehand bind ourselves to them for ten years. I find that that clause by which we bind future Parliaments is not a proper one, and I dissent from it. As regards the exemption from taxation, I am entirely opposed to it. I object to exemptions on principle; moreover, I think that this land grant is quite sufficient, and that we should not add to it by giving them exemption. Taxes such as it is intended by this contract to free these contractors from are taxes which may be, and probably will be, imposed to maintain law and order in that country. I hold that these people should bear their share of any such burden. Under this Bill, they will become possessors of an immense mining estate, an immense mining region, in fact; and they should not be exempt from bearing their share of the burdens which are necessary in order to protect their own wealth.

Now, Sir, I adverted, when I began, to the question of tolls. We were asked here to confer a monopoly on these two gentlemen, and for the railway which they are going to construct we are asked to give a very large area of mining land. And what

is the purpose of this railway, as a matter of fact? It is to meet the needs of the hour; it is to afford means of transportation for a number of people, estimated at from 75,000 to 100,000, and a very large quantity of freight, which will be necessary for their use and maintenance. It is to preserve for Canada the trade and commerce which will result from the traffic. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that we should know, before closing with these men, what their rates are to be. This is not the case of an ordinary railway, and I am not prepared to trust the Government on this important point of rates, any more than the Government was prepared to trust me upon the subject-matter of the contract. I am prepared to deal generously with these men, but, at the same time, to give them almost a free hand in the matter of charges, it appears to me, is to defeat the purpose we have in view. They do not have to cater for these people: they know that the people cannot do without them, in order to get into the Yukon with their freight, and they know that those who pass over their railway will probably never pass over it again, and thus they are more likely to abuse any power that may be given them, to overcharge them. Besides the many ne'er-do-wells that are going into that country under the policy of the Government, I hope that some of our Canadians are going up also to get a share of this gold, and if that is so, we want to know what they are to be charged upon this route. I protest strongly, in the name of all those who are going to avail themselves of this route, either to travel or to send freight, against leaving the matter of toll entirely in abeyance. If we have to give these men a large territory, we should know what we are going to get, and we cannot know this unless the tolls are fixed.

As to the route, I stated, a moment ago, that I found it a very great objection that this is not really an all-Canadian route. It goes through the territorial waters of the United States, and, in that respect, it offers to my mind very serious objections. If this Teslin Lake route is really the best, we ought to take measures at once to make it an all-Canadian route by prolonging the railway to Observatory Inlet or to some port in British Columbia. But, I regret to say, the information that has been placed before us does not enable me to make up my mind fully as to which is the best route. I heard a letter read here, this afternoon, by the right hon. leader of the House, which contains information which I do not find in the report. I do not find fault with the reports, because, I suppose, the men who prepared them were pressed for time. But I question whether this is really the best route from the Pacific Ocean and whether the Dalton route is not the best. But the information laid before us is so meagre, and we are called up at such short notice to give a decision, that it is difficult really to speak

with any degree of certainty. I take the liberty, however, of calling the attention of the House to an opinion expressed in regard to the merits of this route by a gentleman who has just returned from that distant region, of which we know so little. He gives an interview to the Montreal "Daily Witness." I refer to Mr. Stevens, one of the pioneers of that country, who has acquired claims to the value of two millions. He certainly knows a great deal about the country, and, I may say, he is of opinion it is a country of great wealth, that we can pay our debt with the gold that is there. According to this report in the "Witness":

Mr. Stevens is opposed to the route chosen by the new railway to the Klondike. He says that it will involve in all seven changes, before the end is reached, and he particularly points out that new steamers will have to be built for Lake Teslin, the seas on which are exceedingly rough.

I may say that, for my own part, I was struck at first with the number of changes that this route necessitates. I am prepared to admit, Sir, that perhaps the railway will suffice for the 60,000 or 75,000 people who are going into that country; but I seriously question whether there will be boats to carry them down Teslin Lake, through the Hootalinqua River and on to the Yukon country. I cannot readily imagine that it will be possible to have boats there to convey such a vast number of people down the waterways. I think it would be with the greatest difficulty that they would get enough boats there to transport even 20,000 people, and that those who arrive at Teslin Lake, if they arrive in such vast numbers, will be left in the lurch, and will be obliged to go as best they can. I lay these views before the House, because it seems to me that we have had no information from the Government with regard to the steamer facilities that are to be afforded when these people leave the railway. For my own part, I say frankly, but always with the reserve with which I began, that my knowledge is very limited, thanks to the Government, in regard to this country, I would be inclined to think that the Alberta route, by Edmonton, is the best. I believe that it offers many advantages. In the first place, it is an all-Canadian route; it does away, at one stroke, with all these objections which the other routes present, objections requiring to be carefully weighed in this House. There is gold in the Klondike, I think, in very large quantities. But that is a matter of speculation—as the Minister of Railways says, it is a huge gamble. But there is no doubt that there is gold in the rich soil of the North-west, and the greatest advantage of this Edmonton route, as I understand it, is that it opens up a fertile country for settlement in the early stages of the route from Edmonton to the Peace River. Of course, I speak subject to correction, because I do not know very much about that country. I hope the Government will carry

Mr. MONK.

out the proposition, which I heard informally, that we should all be taken up to that country to visit it.

I would be inclined to favour that route, because it is wholly Canadian, because it contains many less changes, and because it opens up a rich agricultural country. I think also it is a more favourable route for the trade of this country. Of course you can readily imagine that if you have to tranship three or four times goods going to the Yukon via this route, the expense will be greater. Also I think transhipments would be less numerous here. By the by, in regard to transhipment, let me state that one of the rights concomitant to the right to navigate, is the right to break bulk and tranship. The hon. Minister of the Interior did not seem to know whether, under the treaty, on arriving at the Stikine River, we would be able to break bulk. Of course I am not laying down the law, but under the principles of international law the right to navigate includes with it the right to anchor, the right to tranship, and to break bulk, subject, of course, to customs regulations. Still, I am under the impression, for the reasons that I have stated, and with the very limited material at my disposal, that the Edmonton route would have been better. As regards the royalty, I must confess to you that I do not see why any difference should be made between this company and the miners. For myself I do not believe in the system of royalty, I do not believe that it is a system that can be executed easily. I think that its proper execution will necessitate an enormous expenditure of money, with very poor returns, and with a great incentive to dishonesty, and I do not believe in it at all. I think another system of taxation more equitable could be adopted. But if we are to have royalties, I say that the royalties of these great railway magnates should be exacted upon the same basis precisely as those of the poor miners. Now, Sir, I come to the land grant, which is a vital matter for us to consider in regard to this Bill. I cannot emphasize too much my regret that none of the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches have been able to tell us what the Government's conclusion is, upon the reports, as to the value. I regret that they are not able to tell us what they value this grant at. These gentlemen made the contract; they did not know when they stipulated in regard to such an important matter, what they were giving to these men, and they do not seem to wish that we, who are, after all, the masters in respect to giving away this large amount of land, should have full and entire information. That is the position, as I understand it. I regret that the Government has not been able, I do not say to locate exactly, but to locate to a certain extent, this grant. I believe that the freedom of choice is very large which is given to the contractors in the selection of this land, and it is undeniable that they

will be able to exercise that choice better and sooner than most other people; they can send in engineers in advance, and they can secure the best land. Of course, the hon. Minister of the Interior invited us to go up there and see for ourselves; he said the land was free, and we had only to go up there and we would get our share like the rest. Well, Sir, I am not prepared to leave for that region to-day; I think our duty at present is to remain here, in order to prevent the whole of those lands from being spirited away. Besides, I consider that nothing but fine talk. There is no doubt that these men are there now, if I am rightly informed. I heard the other day they had secured a very competent engineer, and there is not a man in this House or in the country who has any doubt but that they are placed in a more favourable situation to select the lands than we are, or than are the people of this country generally. But the position they occupy is very much better described by an article which appeared in a paper which is generally not unfavourable to hon. gentlemen on the Government benches, and which exposes that situation much better than I can. This article was quoted by the Minister of the Interior, but he failed to read on when we asked him to do so, in regard to the position of the company. I will read from the "Daily Witness," of February 11, a very good paper, published in the city of Montreal. This is what it says:

There would seem, at all events, to be every probability that if there is really any great wealth in the country the syndicate will have no difficulty in reaping the first-fruits of it. It looks as though they would be likely to acquire for themselves or to make a profit on almost all the gold lands discovered up to the amount of their available grant. With the power of laying down a base line as may best suit their own advantage, and with the power of securing an uninterrupted territory twenty-four miles long by three miles in breadth, it looks as though the syndicate could secure the best of the land without sharing on equal terms with the Government. Their interests and privileges are so large as compared with those of individual prospectors and miners, that the latter will find it always to their own interest to form a sort of partnership with the syndicate, or at least to "stand in" with it against the interests of the Government, and even of those of other miners, friends or partners.

The article goes on to point out in what way this syndicate will become a kind of octopus, extending its arms in every direction and swallowing up the best of those mining lands. Now, Sir, it is very difficult, I admit, particularly with the knowledge which we have at our command, to value this grant. I may perhaps awaken the attention of hon. members on the other side, by stating that it has been valued at eighteen billions seven hundred and fifty millions. I do not know if the Minister of the Interior finds that valuation excessive, but I may tell him that I do. At any rate,

it is the value which has been put upon this land grant by a Mr. Bellew. It is curious to note upon what grounds he bases that valuation. He is a practical miner, and he gives to a French newspaper in Montreal, the ground of his valuation. The report of an interview with Mr. Bellew is given in the following words:—

As to the data upon which he based his assertion that Canada would lose eighteen billions if the Government confirmed the contract with Mann & Mackenzie for the construction of this railway, Mr. Bellew answered: "I base my assertion upon the declaration of Mr. Ogilvie, who is, as everybody knows, an authority in Canada in everything that concerns mining matters. He has declared positively, and that declaration has been made public, that gold can be found in quantities, more or less large, in all parts of the land which extends from the Yukon to the Mackenzie River. That is the first point upon which I base my assertion. Then, I take into consideration the fact, undisputed, that enormous quantities of gold have been found everywhere where prospectors have worked upon the upper strata of land. Then I arrive at the following deduction: The Government has undertaken to give 3,750,000 acres of land to this syndicate. Divide this land in claims of five acres each, and you have a total of 750,000 claims."

Some claims have already been sold at from \$50,000 to \$200,000 and one of those claims has reached the value of \$1,000,000. Taking the lowest figure, says Mr. Bellew, and dividing it by two, we have a value of \$25,000 for each claim; of course it is possible that some of these claims will not be worth that amount. But after this explanation, says the writer, it does not require very much common sense to understand that the value of a claim may be placed at \$25,000. In this way M. Bellew arrives at a valuation of \$18,000,000,000, which is sufficient to pay the whole debt of the world.

If there is anything of accuracy in that gentleman's calculation, it is a pity the Government have lost the opportunity not only of discharging the whole debt of the world, but of reducing our own indebtedness which has swollen to a considerable degree.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). If that calculation is correct, and this amount would pay off the whole debt of the world, what would the remaining 65,000,000 acres be worth?

Mr. MONK. It would make us all rich, and that is very much wanted. I have given this calculation because I thought it would be of interest to the House. But for the purpose of valuation I would be more moderate, I confess. I find in Mr. Ogilvie's report, which is marked by great moderation, at page 92, something which will help us to form a very reasonable idea of the value of those lands. He says:

Attention may be directed to the fact that the whole of that vast district owes its now world-wide reputation to the richness of 140 claims in the Klondike division. One hundred of these are on

Bonanza Creek, and about forty on Eldorado. To use a mining term, many of those claims are "world-beaters," and if the indications now known are worth anything at all, they are worth from sixty to seventy millions of dollars in these two creeks.

Taking this division as a whole, including the three creeks named, affluent to Indian Creek, a district some thirty-five miles in length and twenty-five or more miles in width, if the indications can be relied on, there are one hundred millions of dollars in sight in that area. No one can guarantee this amount, but the prospects so far developed point to that sum pretty conclusively. This district is exceptionally rich. Nothing has ever been found like it heretofore in that country, in fact, in very few countries has anything been found like it, and while we cannot confidently assert that other finds as valuable as it will be made, it is altogether improbable that gold is scattered over such a vast extent, and only rich at a point which is less than the 140th part of the total area.

Mr. Stevens, who has just returned from the Klondike, maintains that there is there of placer gold ready to be cleaned out in the streams \$10,000,000 worth, and I believe there are not 4,000 men now mining in the Klondike. These data give us some idea of the richness of that land. If there are \$10,000,000 waiting to be taken out when only 4,000 miners are there, what will be the development when, according to Mr. Ogilvie, there will soon be 20,000 or 30,000 men mining there with improved machinery?

However, to come down to figures. I have taken Mr. Jennings's estimate of the cost of the road. I find, according to his estimates, which appears on page 27 of his report, the cost is placed at \$3,657,000. The Minister of the Interior told the House that this road was going to be built under abnormal conditions, and that the estimate submitted was for normal railway building. That is true; but at the same time, if I mistake not, Mr. Jennings's calculations are for a better road than that contracted for, for a first-class road. In the next place, I am informed there is not a great deal of difference between building a railway promptly and otherwise, that it is merely a question of additional men. However that may be, I know not.

But after considering this statement of what the contractors are going to spend, let us see what they are going to receive. They will obtain the ordinary subsidy of \$3,200 per mile from British Columbia, making a total of \$385,000. The monopoly which it is proposed to confer on them is of great value. The letter we have heard read to-day is proof that the monopoly is of great value, and I place its value at \$1,000,000. The value of the railway property may be placed at \$4,000,000. As regards the land grant, I am not going to place the value at \$25,000 per acre, but I think \$5 per acre would be a very low valuation. If that valuation is too high, the Government have only themselves to blame for keeping us in ignorance of its true value, and it is already reported that

Mr. MONK.

some claims have been sold for \$200,000 each. The quantity of land obtained by the contractors will not be 3,750,000 acres, but taking a mileage as 208 miles, it will be 5,200,000 acres. But taking the acreage at 3,750,000, the value at \$5 per acre would be \$18,750,000. These items in all make up \$24,135,000, which, if you subtract the cost of the road, \$3,956,000, leaves a balance of profit of \$20,178,000.

Mr. Jennings's calculations in regard to the profit from the operation of the road are most moderate. He calculates a profit of \$209,000 a year; but that is on the supposition that only 12,000 passengers would be carried and the tolls will be very reasonable. We are informed that the company will have a much larger number of passengers than that estimated by Mr. Jennings, but the contract does not state the rates to be charged. From all these facts I conclude that there is no special ground for sympathizing with these two gentlemen. I believe if we pass this Bill we shall make them very wealthy men, wealthy far beyond the dreams of avarice, and we shall be conferring on them very great favours—in fact it is proposed to give them a great deal too much.

In conclusion, let me point out that the policy of the Government, which is bound up with the consideration of this railway scheme, is a mistaken one in regard to this great country. We are living in a country of great possibilities, but this Dominion is inhabited by people who are not rich; we are a poor people and we have been called upon to make untold sacrifices for the development of Canada. Long before confederation, the people settled in this country, whether French or English, performed great sacrifices, did wonders for the establishment of this country and for its development. And, Sir, since confederation, since that remarkable event which made our people one nation—and, Sir, we are fortunate to have here to-night one of the chief men who carried out that great scheme—since confederation we were called upon to make still greater sacrifices. We made them willingly, we entered into enterprises for the development of the country; and in the prosecution of these enterprises the people of this country without any distinction, have spent an enormous amount of money and swollen the national debt to a limit which alarms many thoughtful men. Under these circumstances, what is the course which the Government has adopted in respect to that great country recently discovered, and which seems to me to have been laid open to us by Providence in order to recoup us for these immense sacrifices which we have made in the past? The Government has seen fit to throw open that great region, which is properly our own inheritance, to all the nations of the world. The Government might, it seems to me, with great advantage, have taken

a leaf out of the book of our neighbours and kept that country for the Canadian people. But instead of that they are inviting all the people of the globe to come there, and to take away that gold which in my opinion should have been reserved for ourselves. Sir, this view is not mine alone, for I find that the English papers have called attention to the fact that there will be a rush of people to the Yukon who will come merely to take the gold away. I quote from the London "Sketch" of February 2nd, 1898:

The news which reaches us that the Canadian Government has entered into a contract with a leading firm of engineers for the construction of a railway over the most difficult country between the seaboard and the Klondike Eldorado shows enterprise, and will probably hasten the stampede towards the Arctic Eden. The work is, I understand, to be put in hand at once, and to be opened for traffic in September this year. All things considered, there appears a very good prospect of the new gold fields becoming, for a time at least, a veritable sink of humanity, the favoured resort of all the loafers, adventurers, and ne'er-do-wells whose dream is to attain wealth without proportionate toll. The same thing has been seen more than once. It occurred in California, in New South Wales, in South Africa, and in Queensland.

I desire, Sir, for a moment to advert particularly to this feature of the matter. Of course, if members on both sides of the House are agreed that it is essential for us to open that great country at once, I for one would feel, in the presence of an accord which is so rare, great diffidence in offering my opinion, but, were it not for that circumstance I would be inclined to consider that the Government have recklessly sacrificed that great region in opening it up to all the world. A section of the press in my own province has pointed out that defect in the policy of the Government, and has asked why, in view of the circumstance which I have just indicated, and of the great need we have ourselves for the wealth of that Providence seat country, the Government have not reserved it for ourselves and for our children. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) reminds us at every session that he has sons.

Mr. DAVIN. He need not remind us of that; we know it to our cost.

Mr. MONK. Well, he is not the only man who is favoured with these burdens, if I may use the expression. The province from which I come is a province where there are men who have many sons, and why have not the Government seen fit to inclose that region and keep it for these young men who would seek fortune there. The only possible reason given for such a policy would be, that it would retard the development of the Yukon, and that it would perhaps mar the feverish trade which may be developed—although I think the volume of that trade has been exagger-

ated—during the coming year or two. Sir, the trade might have come more slowly, the country might have developed more slowly, but we would not have had the spectacle of thousands of foreigners taking the gold out of that country and carrying it to a foreign land. It would have been kept for our own people, it would have been spent in Canada. It is useless for the Government to tell me that that country is at present open to our people. The people who are going there at the present moment are people of money. The young men of this country who have not capital are not going there, although no doubt they could go later on. I am not going to be told that it would not be possible for the Government to elaborate some system of legislation by which that great boon would have been kept for our own people. Upon that ground as well as for the other reasons which I have given, I am not in favour of the second reading of this Bill.

Before I close, Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer to a point on which the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) expressed opinion yesterday. He told us that the time would come when we would be ashamed of the opposition we are offering to this measure as we are ashamed to-day of the position we took upon the Remedial Bill. It is, I believe, a pity that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) imported that question into this discussion. I have been silent in regard to the subject-matter of that Remedial Bill, but I am not ashamed of the position I took in regard to it, no more than I am ashamed of the position I have taken to-day in regard to this measure. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) has taken for shame, is for me and for many of those who sit on this side of the House, a sentiment of propriety and nothing else. We believe now—at any rate I do—that the cause we advocated and the manner in which we advocated it was a just cause, and we believe that we defended it in a just manner. The settlement of the difficulty connected with the grievance of the minority in Manitoba has devolved upon hon. gentlemen opposite. We have not the responsibility of it now. The responsibility belongs to the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, and who, during the last election, came into my own county and stated that the Remedial Bill did not go far enough, and that he would do full and ample justice to the minority. To-day, to redeem his promise—

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose, the hon. gentleman is only introducing that subject by way of illustration, because it is not particularly germane to the subject under discussion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) brought it up.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not hear the hon. member for Guysborough bring it up, or I

would have taken the same ground. I could not have been in the Chair at the time. So that the hon. gentleman will not proceed to any great length in that line.

Mr. MONK. I was only speaking by way of illustration. I assure you, that I am not going to drag this question into the domain of politics. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman, that neither the leader of our party nor any one of us is ashamed of our position on that question; and, when the history of this country comes to be written, I believe that the position taken by the leader of our party in regard to that question will be found to be the true and proper position. In the meantime, I am a believer in the justice of that case, and, as justice is eternal, I prefer to leave it to the treatment of hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not ashamed of the position I took upon that question, nor am I ashamed of the position I take on this question. The hon. Minister of the Interior told us that the country would call us to a bitter account for the position we have taken in regard to the opening up of this so-called all-Canadian route. I venture to tell these hon. gentlemen that, in my opinion, the policy they have adopted in regard to that great northern country is a policy of which the people of this country will disapprove. They have carried it out in a way that is at variance with parliamentary principles. They are going to be obliged to spend, if what I hear is true, an enormous sum of money to maintain law and order in that country. We are going to be called upon to make immense sacrifices to protect the vast horde of strangers who are going there, and, when all is finished and the account comes to be rendered, I believe it will be the hon. gentlemen opposite whom the country will call to a severe account for the careless way in which they have proceeded to the development of that great country, which is our own inheritance.

Mr. SEMPLE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. SCRIVEN. With the permission of the House, I desire to make the following motion:—

That the time for receiving petitions for private Bills, which expires on Thursday, the 24th instant, be extended until Thursday, the 10th March next.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the year ended June 30, 1897.—(The Minister of Trade and Commerce, Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Mr. MONK.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 1st March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— REPLY TO ADDRESS.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have received with much satisfaction the Address adopted by you in reply to my Speech at the opening of the Session of Parliament, and I rely with confidence upon your assurance that the measures submitted to you will receive your earnest consideration.

Government House,

Ottawa, 23rd February, 1898.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES OF SHIPS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 37) further to amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships. He said: There is no very radical change contemplated. The Bill proposes merely to extend to masters and mates the same principle which we extended last year to engineers, allowing temporary certificates to be issued.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GOVERNMENT HARBOURS, PIERS AND BREAKWATERS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 38) to amend the Act respecting Government Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters. He said: The object of the Bill is to meet a suggestion made by the Auditor General. Hon. gentlemen know that the wharfingers are paid a commission of 25 per cent out of the wharfage fees they collect; and it has been brought

to my attention by the Auditor General that we are not allowed by law to let them deduct the commission from the receipts. As the law now stands the whole of the receipts should be paid into the consolidated revenue fund, and then an appropriation made in the ordinary way to cover the commission. That has been contrary to the practice heretofore existing, and the Bill is to provide that the collections made by the wharfingers may be paid into the consolidated revenue fund after they have deducted the 25 per cent commission to which they are entitled.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose the Bill relates to Government piers only?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSPECTION OF STEAMBOATS AND LICENSING OF ENGINEERS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 39) respecting the inspection of steamboats and the examining and licensing of engineers employed on them. He said: The Bill is really a consolidation of all the existing statutes on the subject. The main Act has been amended from time to time until it is difficult, if not almost impossible, to discover what the law is. This Bill will simplify it by codifying it. Amendments are proposed to different sections suggested by the departmental officers. There is no radical change of any importance. The changes will be more conveniently taken up when the House goes into committee, as they are chiefly departmental and technical.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE LATE MR. PERRY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is my sad duty, Mr. Speaker, to have to announce to the House that, during the short recess which has just taken place, we have lost one of our colleagues—an old and experienced member, much respected by both sides—in the person of Mr. Perry, the member for West Prince. P. E. I. After a somewhat protracted illness, he quietly and peacefully departed this life last week. With his life was closed a very useful and honourable career. He had been connected with the public service from the early days of his manhood. Previous to the admission of Prince Edward Island into confederation, he occupied several positions of importance in the legislature and government of that province. He had been at one time the Speaker of its local legisla-

ture. At another time, he held the portfolio of Minister of Crown Lands of Prince Edward Island, and discharged the duties of the several offices he held with great credit to himself and advantage to the community. Since confederation, his services were chiefly confined to this House, and, though acknowledged by everybody as a strong partisan, everybody will agree that he was always a fair opponent. Though a hard hitter in debate, he was never offensive. I do not believe that he ever gave cause for offence to any of those with whom he crossed swords, and I believe I express the sentiments of his opponents, as well as his friends, when I say that all those who were associated with him, either as rivals or partisans, in the heat of contest on many and many an occasion, share in the sympathy felt for his family by his friends at large.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot add anything to what has been said, and so well said, by the right hon. leader of the Government. My right hon. friend's acquaintance, of course, with our late lamented friend and colleague was much more intimate than my own; but I can certainly bear witness to the uniform assiduity and devotion of Mr. Perry to the duties with which he was charged in this House, and to the efficient and kindly manner in which he discharged them. There certainly never was any occasion on which those who differed strongly with him had reason to complain of the manner in which he advocated the views he so sincerely held. I am quite certain that every hon. member on this side will join most cordially with the right hon. gentleman and his friends behind him in deploring the loss this House has sustained by the death of our lamented friend.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I have been so many years intimately associated in friendship and politics with our late lamented friend, Mr. Perry, that I would ask permission of the House to add a few words to those said so kindly and well by my hon. friend the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition. Mr. Perry was a very close political and warm personal friend of mine, and as far back as I can recollect, he was one of the most active workers of the Liberal party in the province from which I come. He entered public life in 1854, when he was elected a member of the provincial legislature for the district in which he lived, and from 1854 until confederation he remained almost uninterruptedly a member of that legislature. As my hon. friend the leader of the Government has said, he filled at times several important and responsible positions. When we entered confederation, he was Speaker of the local legislature of Prince Edward Island, and there discharged his duties so fearlessly and well as to thoroughly gain

the confidence of both parties. From that smaller sphere he passed to the larger arena of Dominion politics, and I am rejoiced to know that both sides of the House can bear testimony to the kindness, as well as ability, with which he discharged his duties as representative here, where, as in the local House, he was ever a loyal supporter of the party to which he belonged, and never shrank from any opportunity of enforcing his political convictions. He was a man of the people—one of those men who grow up among the people and are believed in by them because of their deserving qualities. He embodied in himself those qualities which are peculiar to the French Acadian race in the maritime provinces—simple as a child, true as steel, loyal and honest to those with whom he was associated; and I am sure he would desire no monument but that which the good will and affection of his fellow-citizens will build for him. I remember, some years ago, after a rather trying political ordeal through which he had passed, and when he was surrounded by a great many of his friends, he said that he felt he was drawing to the end of his life, and he wound up by saying that he wished no better epitaph to be placed on his tombstone than the one he hoped would rise to the lips of those who bore him to his last resting place, that there lay the remains of a truly loyal man. Although he was at all times a strong supporter of the Liberal party, and never swerved from his political allegiance from the time he entered political life until borne to his final rest, I think I can truly say that in all the bitter fights which took place in the smaller arena of politics in Prince Edward Island, as well as in this Parliament, he always so conducted himself as to leave behind him not one personal enemy, as he was carried to his last resting place amid the tears of his constituents whom he so long and ably represented; and I desire to take this opportunity of saying these few words of praise of the man I respected so much and loved so well.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY— MR. HAMILTON SMITH'S PROPOSAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the House if he would be good enough to lay on the Table a copy of the telegram which was sent to Lord Strathcona in reference to Mr. Hamilton Smith. The answer of Lord Strathcona having been given to the public, I think it is very desirable that we should have the message that was transmitted to him.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no objection, and shall lay it on the Table to-morrow.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COM- PANY.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Blair for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty the Queen and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.

Mr. BOSTOCK. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to address the House a few minutes on the question now before the Chair, as it is one of great importance to that part of the Dominion of which I have the honour to be one of the representatives. I think I only express the general opinion of this House and country, when I say that there is absolute necessity at present for the building of a railway into the Yukon region. The enormous rush of people going in there, the enormous quantity of supplies that will be required by these people, when they get there, to sustain existence, and the absolute necessity for the Government to be in a position to maintain law and order in that country, so far removed from the central authority—all these point to the immediate building of a railway into it as a line of policy from which we cannot escape. We are all aware, through the newspapers, of the trouble experienced owing to the necessity of going over this strip of land which at present is in the hands of our neighbours to the south of us, who, in their anxiety to look after their own interests, have put certain difficulties in the way of our supplies and people getting over that section. And therefore it is with a feeling of great satisfaction that I see this proposition presented by the Government for the opening up of a serviceable route, which, I think, will not only benefit the Dominion at large by opening up a way into that part of the country, but will ultimately have the result of opening up and developing a great part of British Columbia itself. Hon. members who look at the map will see that the route which has been chosen by the Government, starting in at Telegraph Creek and going up to Teslin Lake, will eventually become a link in the line of railway that must some day be built starting from Ashcroft or Kamloops or some other point along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which will tend to open up a very rich mineral country lying north of the present main line of the Canadian Pacific and south of the Yukon territory. We have complete proof of the richness of the mineral deposits in this country in the reports of the Geological Department, which reports show that large quantities of gold have been taken out of the various parts of this territory. Years ago when the excitement first occurred in Cariboo and along the Fraser River it caused an enormous rush of people to British Columbia. But,

owing to the exceedingly great difficulties that the newcomers found in getting into that country, though a great many came up from the south and went in there at the start, a large proportion of them came back and went away, saying that practically the country was no good. Now I do not think that any hon. gentleman in this House would be satisfied, or that the people of the country at large would be satisfied, if those who go into this Yukon country are not afforded greater facilities than those that prospectors of the Cariboo country had to put up with. The difficulties experienced in the Cariboo certainly tended to keep back the development of that portion of the country; and it was only by the enormous pluck and energy that the people manifested that the Cariboo country was opened up at all. We find, from the geological reports that the gold diggings on three creeks in the Cariboo which yielded the greatest amount of gold far and away surpassed anything that reliable information shows to have been found in the Yukon country. The returns which were obtained from Lightning Creek, Antler Creek and Williams Creek, in the first great rush in 1862 and 1863, were very much greater than anything we have heard of from Hunker Creek, Eldorado Creek, or any of the other creeks in the Yukon country reports of which reached us last year. In looking through the reports of that time, I find that on one claim on Lightning Creek, a man in one day took out as much as \$15,000 in gold. It is true that that was not repeated, but there were cases in which as much as \$8,000 and \$10,000 were afterwards taken out of the same claim. Looking through Mr. Ogilvie's report on the Yukon, I have not been able to find that anything like these amounts have been yielded by any of the creeks there that have been worked up to the present time. Therefore, we have not up to this time the same inducements to offer people that there were in the Cariboo country.

So far as the opening up of this country is concerned, we know, that the region north of the Canadian Pacific has yielded a considerable amount of gold, even if we leave the Cariboo out of account altogether. For instance, the Cassiar, between 1874 and 1888 yielded a total of \$4,299,394 worth of gold. The Omenica country between 1874 and 1887 yielded \$296,570 worth of gold. We find from the reports of Professor Selwyn that this country is also rich in quartz leads, which, so far, it has not been possible to develop on account of difficulties of transportation. As I say, the railway which it is now proposed to build will form a connecting link between the Canadian Pacific on the south and the Yukon country on the north, and will have the effect of introducing the country or private capitalists to build a line from Ashcroft or Kamloops. As soon as this country has transportation fac-

ilities, I am sure rich mineral deposits of various kinds will be opened up. I believe it will be shown to be as rich, not only in gold but in silver and lead, as is the Kootenay country to the south. The returns that have been received indicate that the Cariboo country will prove of very great value to the province of British Columbia. Now, at the present time, we have, running from Ashcroft to Quesnelle, a good wagon road which is used all the time and which is in good condition for the purposes of trade. From Quesnel to Hazelton is a good trail which can be used for pack animals. From Hazelton to Telegraph Creek there is a trail which is not in as good condition as the other, but which, I suppose, the provincial government will be looking after in order that people who go in from Ashcroft and that part of the country may be able to use it to reach Telegraph Creek, and so to the Yukon country. I am informed that quite a large number of people propose to go by this overland route to the Yukon, because they feel that there is more chance of a prospector being able to find gold on the way up; and besides, he will be able, if he so desires it, to turn off at any point. He can get his outfit set down at Ashcroft or one of these places, and, by going overland, he has a chance of striking something good at any time on his way up into the Yukon country.

When he gets up to the Teslin Lake he will be able to get rid of his outfit there, and take boat and go on down the river. This is, to a large number of people, especially prospectors who are accustomed to this kind of life, the best and most convenient way of travelling. It will be a great help to them if, when they get to a point such as Telegraph Creek they can take a railway and go on to Teslin Lake. With regard to the point that has been raised as to the navigation of the Stikine River, I do not propose at the present time to go very deeply into that matter, because it has been thoroughly discussed by lawyers who have considered the matter, and in a better way than I feel myself able to discuss it. But I will say this about it, that of course it is quite possible that our neighbours to the south may, if they see fit, put obstructions in the way of our getting into the Stikine River. But I do not think they will find it in their interest to behave in an unfriendly way, especially as it will have the ultimate result of compelling our Government to continue the line down to a more southerly point in British Columbia which will bring the railway into close connection with steamboat navigation. Consequently, I think that the better sense of our neighbours to the south will eventually prevail, and that they will see that although they have it in their power at the present time to put certain obstacles in the way of our navigating that river and making it inconvenient for steam-

boats to go up there, still they can do that for only a short time; and the fact that we can continue this railway down to a point where we can have communication by sea in our own territory will prevent them doing what they might be disposed to do if the Government had decided on building a line from somewhere on the Lynn Canal, where it would be very difficult for us to have any communication with navigation in our own territory, or with any other line of railway at present. Now, a point that has been raised in opposition to this contract is the allegation that it is going to give this company a monopoly over freight and passengers taken into that country. But I think those who have discussed this matter, and possibly the public generally, have forgotten that at the last session of this Parliament two charters were granted, which are now in force, and under both of which it is possible for a company to go ahead and build a line into that country. One of the papers supporting hon. gentlemen opposite came out the other day pointing out under large headlines that this monopoly was going to be broken after all, and stating that a company in England was prepared to go in and build a railway over the White Pass. Now, I am sure there was no idea on the part of the Government of giving this railway a monopoly such as would be detrimental to the public interests. The fact that at the time the Government made this arrangement they knew these two charters were in force under which railways could be built, is evidence that they had no idea of granting any monopoly to this company. A question has also been raised with regard to the method of the construction of this road. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) thinks this railway ought to have been built by the Government itself; but although personally I am in favour of the Government ownership of railways, and while I think the time will soon come when this matter will have to be considered very seriously by the country, still at the present moment I do not think that we are in Canada in a position to take hold of that question. I would very much deprecate any hasty action on the part of this or any other Government in legislating towards the Government construction and ownership of railways. In the present case we are brought face to face with the necessity of constructing this road as early as possible, if it is going to be done at all. An important consideration in connection with this Bill is that the work has to be done in a hurry. It is not an ordinary question of railway construction where it can be proceeded with leisurely, and finished within a not unreasonable time, but the road has to be built in a hurry for the purpose of meeting conditions which will exist there during the coming winter. The question has also been raised of building this

Mr. BOSTOCK.

road by means of a Government subsidy of money. In the present case the Government would have to expend a large amount of money for building a railway into a country which we do not know at the present moment for a certainty is going to prove exceedingly rich. We have every reason to believe that there is a large amount of gold in that country; the geological reports state that gold has been found there. But every one who has studied mining development, and who has had anything to do with mining, knows that it is a very uncertain industry, and that although at the present time excitement runs high and a large number of people are going in there, we do not know for a certainty that any other very rich diggings will be found in that country. In the case of the Cariboo country to which I have already referred, although rich mines were found in Lightning Creek, Antler Creek and Williams Creek in 1860 and 1862, since that time, although a large number of prospectors have been exploring that country, no very rich diggings have been found, and what gold has been found there has apparently been in small quantities compared with what was found in the years mentioned in those three creeks. The same condition, if our information is correct, prevails in the case of the country north of us. So far as we know, there has been only one exceedingly rich gold-bearing creek found in the whole territory. Until that condition is disproved, we are in the position of investing money in a railway when we do not know how long the mining, which is the cause of building the road, is going to continue. In a country where the difficulties are so great as on the Yukon, where the temperature is unpleasant to the ordinary individual, and where for a portion of the year, six months at all events, there is a very small amount of daylight, which has a depressing and very bad effect on men going there from warmer and more pleasant climates, many people, so soon as they realize the conditions under which they will have to live, will return. Gentlemen who were in Victoria and Vancouver last season remember the rush then setting in towards the Yukon, people starting out with the idea that they would become rich in a few days, without taking into consideration the difficulties and obstacles which they must overcome before they could even reach there. The same rush that occurred then, prevails at the present time. A large number of people are starting for that country--men who have been brought up under very different circumstances, and who have not been accustomed to roughing it and enduring hardships and overcoming difficulties such as those with which they will have to contend. Many of these men will return broken down not only in their finances but also as regards their health; and it is a very serious matter that a large number of

people should be going out there, many of whom will be probably stranded in that country in the way I have been endeavouring to show. For that reason alone, it is necessary that all possible means should be taken to gain entrance into that country, in order that those people may be reached, if necessary, and that we may prevent, as much as possible, hardships and difficulties to which those people will be exposed.

Questions have arisen with respect to the land grant proposed to be made under the contract to Mackenzie & Mann. Although I am very much opposed on general principle to the granting of large quantities of land to any railway company or to any company which will tie up the land in any shape or form and prevent the ordinary prospector and free miner from going in, in this case it is absolutely necessary that this land subsidy should be granted to the contractors who are risking a large amount of capital for the purpose of building a railway into that country, which in a short time may prove not to be so valuable as at the present moment we are led to suppose. The construction of this line will undoubtedly be conducted under very exceptional circumstances. The contractors will have to meet with difficulties probably in excess of those ever contended with by railway contractors in this country, and they certainly are deserving of receiving an adequate return for the energy and capital they are prepared to risk in a venture of this kind. Hence the Government should be prepared to make full remuneration to the contractors, who are at the present time willing and able to risk their capital in an enterprise in which Canada is not prepared to invest; and I think under the exceptional circumstances of this case, the contractors are entitled to receive a bonus such as they will receive if they carry out the provisions of the contract as they stand. Of course I take it for granted that the conditions laid down in the contract by the Government will be strictly adhered to, and that the land grant provided for in the contract will only be handed over if the contractors carry out strictly the terms of the undertaking. The first section of the contract is as follows:—

1. The contractors covenant with the Government to lay out, construct, equip and fully complete a line of railway with proper terminal facilities from the navigable waters of the Stikine River in British Columbia, at or near the mouth of Telegraph Creek, Glenora, or the mouth of Clear Water River, thence running northward to the navigable waters of Teslin Lake, a distance of about one hundred and fifty miles, more or less, on or before the first day of September, A.D. 1898.

The main object of the Bill and the contract entered into by the Government is to secure the complete construction of this road by 1st September; and if that is carried out, the contractors are deserving of

the grant which they will receive. At the same time the Government should be very particular about enforcing the provision connected with the grant of this land, and if by any chance the contract is not carried out and the road completed by 1st September, most certainly this land grant should not be given; because it would be tying up a large amount of land in the hands of these people. But if they do carry out the terms of the contract, then I think they are deserving of the recompense which they are to get under the contract as it stands at present. Now, the great necessity of having communication with and administering the government of that part of the Dominion is the principal reason why we want to see this railway built at once. On an occasion of this kind, I think one should be prepared to stand by and support the Government in carrying out a measure for this purpose under conditions such as do not arise every day, but are most exceptional in every way. I do not suppose any one can point to an instance of such a rush of people to any country as will probably take place to this Yukon country during the coming summer. Letters which we receive from England and from the United States indicate that people are going there in greater numbers than was anticipated even by those who have had the best means of obtaining information on the subject; and I think the Government would have been very remiss in their duty to the best interests of Canada if they had failed to take up this question of providing a means of communication with the Yukon country. It has been suggested that the building of an ordinary wagon road would have been sufficient. I do not consider that that would have been sufficient for the development of the country or for the enormous traffic which will require accommodation, and the Government would have certainly been very remiss if they had sat still and done nothing to open up and develop the country where so much is at stake, and where it is so essential to control the trade between Canada and that part of the North-west Territories. The cities on the Pacific Coast are at the present time benefiting very largely from this Yukon trade, and they are of course anxious to obtain and keep control of as much of that trade as they can. If the Government had been neglectful of the demands of the occasion, a large amount of trade would have been lost, not only on the Pacific Coast, but also to the eastern portions of this Dominion, because the merchants in the west naturally draw their supplies from the merchants in the east. Therefore the trade of the Dominion would have been very materially injured if we had allowed the trade of that country to pass out of our hands and go to the Pacific Coast cities on the other side of the line. We have been doing all we could in the west to control this trade and to induce

people to come our way; and if the Government had failed to take hold of this matter and deal with this railway question, the country would have had a very serious charge to make against them of neglecting the interests of the people and the commercial interests of Canada.

In these few words I have tried to place before the House what I consider to be the position of this question at the present time. I do not desire to detain the House any longer, as this discussion has now gone on for some time and we have threshed the matter out probably as fully as possible. But I think the results will show that the Government, in the action they have taken, have done the best they could at the present time in the best interests of the country.

Mr. IVES. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go over the points which have been several times most ably and clearly put from this side of the House. Nor do I propose to consider and discuss the many objections that have been raised against this Yukon Railway scheme. There is, however, one objection against this proposition which has not perhaps been very fully dealt with from this side of the House, to which I have given a good deal of study, and which to my mind is even more serious than any other single point which has been raised as an objection to it. Now, what do we find? We find that the Government propose to give the contractors 25,000 acres per mile of gold-bearing lands, to be selected by the company as they see fit, on certain conditions. In other words, in a mileage of 150 miles they will have somewhere in the neighbourhood of 4,000,000 acres. We will suppose the minimum mileage to be 150 miles. There would then be 3,750,000 acres or 87 blocks of 21 square miles each to be selected. Now, that country is either a gold-bearing country or it is not. If it is not, then I do not think that we need any railway into it at all. I do not agree with the last speaker (Mr. Bostock), who urges as one of the reasons why this railway should be built, and built quickly, that there will be a great many people going in there who may become dead broke and that the Government ought to build a railway to bring them out as cheaply and expeditiously as possible. I do not think that that is any reason why we should build a railway. But I think that the Government, by pushing through this extraordinary scheme, as they are doing, are advertising this region to the whole world as a very rich gold-bearing country. The Government then must not be surprised if thousands of individuals decide to sink their fortune out there simply because of the great advertisement which the Government, by this action, have given this country; and if, as the hon. gentleman thinks, a large proportion of these people will become broke and have to be brought back by the Govern-

Mr. BOSTOCK.

ment for charity, the Government themselves will be largely responsible. That is, however, apart from my argument. What I ask is that if this be not a rich gold country, why should we build a railway to it. Why should we induce thousands of people to leave their business occupations and break up their homes and go out there, as the hon. gentleman says, with great danger to their health? But if it is a gold-bearing country—and I may say the evidence points very strongly in that direction—it is impossible to conceive that in making 87 locations, in laying down 87 base lines, either in the general direction of the streams or due north or south or east or west, these contractors will not succeed in locating some of the richest mines to be found. I do not say how much gold they will find, but I say it is against all probability to suppose that in making these 87 locations, with the facilities they have for choosing their time and place to lay down these base lines, and with all the conditions in their favour, that these men will not get the lion's share of what gold there is in the country.

I put to the Government this question. In proposing to give these contractors some of the richest placer mines in the Yukon country and in leasing the dredging privilege on these rivers to their friends for the nominal consideration of \$100 per mile, what do the Government consider is likely to be the outcome of such a policy? The position I take is this. I say that if you carry out this contract and give Mann & Mackenzie these special advantages and privileges, you will array the miners to a man against these monopolists. The distinctions and differences between the way in which the Government propose to treat these contractors and the way in which they treat the ordinary miners, will have the effect of putting the contractors on the one side and every free miner in that country upon the other. Every free miner will consider that he is not in any way bound to protect the interests of these contractors as he feels bound to protect the interests of his brother free miners. It is the experience of all placer mining countries that vigilance committees, if necessary, are organized by the miners themselves to prevent claim jumping and claim robbing and to enforce justice—of a rough and ready kind, if you will—but still justice between miner and miner; and no matter how rich the claim, the man who makes the discovery and locates the mine is protected in his rights by the great body of free miners. That is the history of California and of all other placer mining countries. But every feeling of the free miners will be one of hostility to these monopolists—whether the monopolists be Mann & Mackenzie or Mr. Mercier who, I believe, had a grant of the dredging privilege for a large number of miles on the Yukon. Every man's hand will be against them. Now, supposing Mann & Mackenzie succeeds in locating a rich claim

among the 87 locations which they may make, on the shortest railway mileage, and supposing some free miners poach on this particular location, what is going to happen? What is sure to happen? There will be a rush of miners to the location; that section will be covered with men who will mine there in spite of all the Government can possibly do to prevent it. Will you tell me, Sir, how 150 or 1,500 mounted police are going to protect the property of Mann & Mackenzie from the poaching of free miners—men who will not have the slightest consideration for these monopolists but consider that they are free plunder for everybody. Why, when it has taken you months to get Major Walsh himself into that country—

Mr. MACLEAN. He is not there yet.

Mr. IVES. And he is not there yet, when the Government forces are scattered a few here and a few there and a few somewhere else—and when these miners are in there by the thousand, every man with a revolver in his belt and a Winchester rifle in his shanty, how are you going to enforce law and order and protect the claims of Mann & Mackenzie? You cannot do it. The whole force of Canada could not in six months restore law and order in that territory. You could not get sufficient transportation facilities to send out the number of men required to enforce law and order there, under the circumstances. And suppose these rich claims are mined under mob law, and in defiance of law, and Mackenzie & Mann are defrauded, what will happen? They will come to this Government and say: You gave us that territory where we made our locations, you gave it to us for the consideration of building a railway, which we have built, and you are bound to protect us, as well as every other individual, in the enjoyment of our rights and privileges. By your failure to do that, we have lost a million or two or three million dollars, which we can show were illegally taken out of our property, and we ask you to reimburse us to that amount. Could the Government resist payment? Can you put any clause into this contract which will excuse you from protecting the rights and property of individuals in that country? You cannot do it. Such a clause would be immoral and inoperative. Supposing you were to insert a clause into this contract to relieve you of such a responsibility, it would be illegal as contrary to public order.

I make this distinction between giving subsidies of gold lands and subsidies of agricultural and timber lands, that whereas in the case of agricultural and timber lands there is not such value as to excite covetousness, and so they are not likely to be poached upon. I say that it is different with gold mining lands. And these contractors, being looked upon as monopolists, regarded as having no rights that free miners are bound to respect, the rich portions of their lands

will be mined out in spite of all you can do, and you will have to pay year after year to meet claims made by these contractors for gold taken out of their lands by the free miner. What will the free miners say? They will say: Look at the distinctions that the Government makes between these contractors and us. They charge us \$10 a year for a free miner's license, while they charge these people nothing. They charge us \$15 when we register a claim, and not only that, but we must pay the same amount for a license every year; while these other people pay nothing; they get their land in fee simple. The Government charge us 10 per cent royalty, while they charge these people only 1 per cent royalty. We forfeit our claim if we do not pay the royalty, while these people may hold their claim for years without paying it, and the royalty may be collected from them as an ordinary debt or not at all. Why, if we do not absolutely work our claims, if we allow seventy-two hours to elapse without putting a shovel or pick into the ground, our claims are liable to forfeiture, while these men may tie up their lands for ever, and though they never work them they do not forfeit them. They may choose the best season of the year, the seasons when they can mine most cheaply, while we have to work even with the thermometer 65 or 70 degrees below zero, and, even though sick and really unable to work, if we allow seventy-two hours to elapse without working, our claims may be forfeited. Then, if we organize a company, we must pay \$100 a year as a license, and every individual who works for us must be a free miner and pay \$10 a year. These people may have their claims worked by Tom, Dick or Harry, people who are not free miners, and pay no fees. Do you suppose the people are not going to note these distinctions, and, yes, I will add, these partialities? Do you suppose they are going to respect the rights and privileges thus granted? By no means. They will take the richest claims they can find, and mine them out; and the Government of this country will pay for it in years to come. Now, I do not propose to waste the time of the House in the reiteration of this proposition, but, on the strength of my experience in this House and in business in this country, I venture to predict that if you go on with this policy, if you continue to lease these rivers for a mere bagatelle, some of which will be sure to contain rich bars, the free miners will mine out those bars in spite of all that Mr. Mercier or Mr. Drolet or anybody else can do, and you will be called upon to make good these losses. The mere bagatelle of \$100 a mile which you are getting will be lost in the thousands which this country will have to pay as compensation to these people for failure to protect them and maintain their rights as proprietors.

There is only one more point in this matter which I desire to refer to, and that is the question of the route. Now, to my mind, the bonding privilege that we should enjoy in passing through that strip of Alaska over the Dalton trail or White Pass is a more reliable and more certain privilege for us to rely upon than the privilege of the navigation of the Stikine River under the Treaty of Washington. I do not mean to say that the treaty which gives us the bonding privilege is any more likely to stand and not be revoked than the other treaties, but I do mean to say—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There is no such treaty.

Mr. IVES. There is no bonding treaty affecting the Pacific Coast—I am quite aware of that. But I understood that the Minister of the Interior was negotiating that arrangement as well as the other, and that he is as likely to get that as the other.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That has not been a question of treaty.

Mr. IVES. But I think it is quite as easy for the Government to secure from the Americans an extension of the bonding privilege to those parts as it is to make terms under their coasting laws which would not be a serious inconvenience in the navigation of the Stikine River. There is no use in closing our eyes to the fact that, at the present moment, all the cities of the western coast of the United States, as well as all the railways of the west, are taking the most lively interest in this outfitting business and are urging the Government of the United States unitedly and without distinction as to party to do something which will in a still larger degree give the outfitting business to the coast cities of the United States. Now, I do not think there is any use of our spending a single dollar expecting to obtain privileges at the present moment from the United States that would enable us to tranship at Wrangel—any concession that would not be particularly onerous. The authorities there are being urged and begged and called upon to kill this route. Before you have got your first sod turned, they are after it with a hatchet to kill it, and they are bound to kill. And, so far as this route succeeds, in so far as it diminishes the outfitting trade of these American coast cities, and gives the business to Canadian cities, so much the stronger will be the pressure. The Government will find that success means failure in this case, that any considerable measure of success means certain obstruction and failure. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture the other night proposed transportation by tug-boat and barges. Well, unfortunately, that is nonsensical and

Mr. IVES.

out of the question. If it were not so, if you could load vessels at some Canadian port and get them to the mouth of the Stikine River without lightering; then, of course, your treaty rights to navigate the Stikine would be of practical value, and you could use this route. But the information we get from all well-informed sources is that it is impossible to do this except in most exceptionally calm and quiet weather.

Mr. MORRISON. May I interrupt the hon. gentleman to inform him that, at the present time, the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company of British Columbia are putting on three or four of their boats to run from Port Simpson to Glenora. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) knows what kind of boats these are.

Mr. IVES. They may be doing it, but what measure of success have they had in it?

Mr. MORRISON. The "West Slope," another well known boat, has been plying there for a number of years.

Mr. IVES. As I understand it, they are proposing to do it, and they may probably try it, until they lose their few boats in the open water, and then they will give it up. The reports we have from navigators for the last one hundred years, covering that coast, describe conditions which would make navigation by tug-boats and barges exceedingly dangerous and risky. It is ridiculous for us to make an expenditure of three or four million dollars on the chance of being able to carry out the proposition of the Minister of Agriculture, of doing this business by tug-boats and barges. It cannot be done; it is senseless to make an expenditure with such an idea in view. What remains? The idea that we may be enabled to induce the American Government not to make regulations—because it must be admitted that they have a right to make any reasonable regulations—not to make regulations which will be too onerous to enable us to do the business. How easy it would be for them to establish regulations which, while not being considered as forbidding the free navigation of the Stikine River, would be fatally obstructive. For instance, they have a right to say: We cannot allow those goods to be lightered excepting in the presence of our officers, we do not know but that they may be sold in our own territory, in our own strip of Alaska. We must not only have our own officers on hand when these goods are lightered, but we must examine them and see what they are, the parcels must be opened and inspected, and they must be carefully inspected. We must then follow these parcels and packages until they are entirely out of our territory and up the river beyond our limits, and then we must have a bond that they will not be returned, because we cannot maintain customs posts up there.

Now, I do not say they would put these obstructions upon our business. but I say that, if they did so, they would effectually prevent that route from being used. Now, my own idea has been all along in favour of building a Government road through the Peace River district. In view of the exceeding richness of the Yukon district, and in view of the great agricultural resources of the region around the head waters of the Peace River, and the probabilities which the last speaker gave us of further rich finds being made in the Omenica and Peace River country, I think the people of Canada would be prepared, notwithstanding all that has been said about the increase of public debt and the increase of taxation, to sanction the expenditure that would be necessary to open up the Peace River country, to open up the Omenica and Cariboo country; and, if the Yukon proves to be as rich as we now think it is, to extend the road by water stretches and by railway, so as to accommodate that country. Of course, I am only speaking for myself. but, for my own part, I would support an undertaking by the Government to make a route into that country which would be entirely upon Canadian territory, and entirely free from any possibility of obstruction or interference by the United States. In that way you would tap the centre of Canadian trade, you would open up for all time a country which, in my opinion, will be rich and which will support a large population. Referring to the Peace River country in particular, I believe it is as good as the average Alberta country all over that territory; I believe it is better than the southern portion of Alberta, agriculturally speaking. I believe that this country would support the Government much more heartily and warmly—

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). Does my hon. friend refer to what is usually known as the Edmonton route, or the Ashcroft route?

Mr. **IVES**. I am referring to the Edmonton route. The engineers are, I believe, fully satisfied with the feasibility of getting from Edmonton to the head waters of the Peace River through the Peace River country, to a point where you can get west of the ridge and reach lake navigation, or the waters that you are now proposing to utilize. I think this route would be safe, it would be secure, it would be free from obstruction, and would open up a splendid agricultural country, would open up a mineral country which has proved its value by the fact that millions have already been taken from it. My information is, that the chances of quartz mining in the Omenica and Cariboo country are as good as they are in any portion of British Columbia. I do not believe that a little talk in the newspapers about increasing the public debt and increasing

taxation, in view of the good times that we are enjoying, in view of the enormous rush of people into that north-west country—I do not believe that that ought to deter the Government from taking this matter up and putting it through as it ought to be put through. I am opposed to the scheme now advocated, for the reason that I think it will lead to interminable claims being made upon the Government of this country in years to come, from the fact that they will be utterly unable to protect the grants that they give from being poached upon by free miners. I believe that we would lose more in that way alone than it would cost to complete the larger scheme.

Mr. **DOBELL**. I hardly expected to take any part in this debate, and I fear now that I can add very little to the very exhaustive discussion which has already occupied this House. But I feel some satisfaction at being able to accept the challenge which the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) made to me, a few nights ago, asking me, as a business man, what I thought of this contract from a business standpoint. I shall endeavour, as briefly as possible, to reply to that question. I shall avoid entering at all on the intricacies of international law, but I will endeavour, as simply and as concisely as possible, to enumerate the various points on which the hon. Opposition are in accord with the Government. Now, Sir, I may say that they are, as we are, quite impressed with the great value that exists in that extensive gold-bearing area which we know as the Klondike. They have knowledge, as we have also, that there will be this year an immense influx of mining population from all parts of the world, and that among these miners there will be many wild and turbulent spirits which it will be very hard to keep in order, although they are the class of men who are generally pioneers in any newly discovered gold country. The numbers likely to go in there are variously estimated at from 100,000 to even as high as 250,000. Now, the Government realizes that it is their duty to secure the maintenance of law and order and to take such steps as will ensure the supply of such food and protection as may be necessary for such a large body of people. If, after reaching any central point, say Dawson City, they should not meet with the success they anticipated, and find themselves without food, it would be necessary for the Government to look ahead and to make some provision for such a state of things. Therefore, we admit a distinct obligation upon the Government to guard against either riot or starvation, or even against a still more dangerous contingency, namely, a conspiracy that might possibly arise there to wrest that country from the Dominion. The Government, therefore, have to take prompt measures to provide against these possibilities. To this end they have decided

that a railway must be built to facilitate the shipment of food supplies and, if necessary, to send in armed men at the earliest possible date and as quickly as practicable; and in this respect I am quite sure the Opposition are with us. Now, the question was put, I think, by the late Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), why this railway was not begun last August; and I think another hon. member suggested that it might have been begun even earlier than that. But I do not think the Government have been either indifferent or dilatory. On the contrary, the Minister of the Interior left for that country early in the fall, and remained there until some time in December, visiting many of the principal points. Indeed, he went up the White Pass from Chilkat, he sent his surveyors into other quarters, and he took every possible means to ascertain what was the best and quickest possible route of reaching the mining district, and saw for himself the requirements necessary to be carried out and the difficulties which had to be provided against. He devoted much time in arriving at what he thought best to be done, and the decision he came to was that the road should be an all-Canadian road, that the first portion of it should be built from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake; and in this, I think, from the discussion that I have heard, the Opposition are still with us.

You can readily realize, Mr. Speaker, that to build a railway through an unknown region, far from the base of railway supplies, and with labour abnormally high on account of the fabulous reports of the money to be made there by mining, was an obligation which the Government naturally shrank from undertaking, and they preferred, even at a great cost, to hand over the obligation to a company, which I am glad to know possesses the confidence not only of this House but of the country at large. I think the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) bore testimony that this company had genius for railway construction greater than any other contractors in the country. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition would have had us begin this work last August, it is quite evident we had not a day to spare in January. The moment the Government came to a decision and approved of the suggestions which the Minister of the Interior brought back with him from the coast, we determined to carry out the work and entered into the contract now before the House for the acceptance of Parliament, and I believe it will receive the hearty approval of the majority of this House, and when it is properly understood, the approval of the people throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion.

The details of this contract I need not enter into. Much misconception has prevailed respecting it, many erroneous and misleading statements have been made; but

on the whole I believe it will prove a judicious, prudent and satisfactory contract. It is quite possible that by delaying and calling for tenders we might have made an agreement for a less grant of land; or the Government might possibly have undertaken the work itself, and it might have proved that the cost would have been less; but we would not have had the work completed by 1st September, a provision which this contract covers. And, Mr. Speaker, that was the great point to be attained. Who is there in this House, Mr. Speaker, who would haggle and bargain over the cost of a road like this when there is possible danger of bloodshed and suffering? I would not for one, even if I stood alone on that ground. But I claim, contrary to the words that have fallen from the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives), that there is great advantage in having a large area of the country which we have given to the contractors for this work controlled by Canadians, and working with the Government on alternate blocks, and I hold that that will be a great help to the Government to maintain their rights to property there and aid in maintaining order—that it will prove a very great factor in helping the Government, while the Government can help the contractors in return in maintaining the rights of property.

I might direct attention to the fact that a railway could have been built, and the Government could have found contractors to undertake it, at a far less cost through Chilkat Pass, but the Government decided that a road from Glenora to Teslin Lake would be the best for Canada, that it would be an all-Canadian route and would carry trade into Canadian channels. I might ask what was our object when we built the Sault Canal, at a cost of nearly \$3,500,000? We did not need it at the time, but we wanted it so as to be perfectly independent of our neighbours; and while we are doing, and while I hope we will always do in the future everything in our power to establish and maintain most friendly relations with the United States and by all means to cultivate feelings of amity towards them, I hope we will always make every effort to secure our strict independence and not place ourselves under obligations to them.

The late leader of the Opposition asked, in very emphatic terms, how the Minister of Railways dare make such a contract as this now before the House. Why, Sir, though the most insignificant member of the Government, and certainly the one least experienced, I would say we dare do anything we believe to be right and which will tend to the development of this great Dominion, and that we dare not do anything in the direction and in line with the action of the hon. members of the Opposition, which we believe is not right, to stop this work and endanger those pioneers who have gone into that country and who do

pend on us to protect them in case of need.

The leader of the Opposition also raised a point respecting the provision for alternate blocks, and he made the statement in so grave a manner that I began to think we had neglected some great interest and had not sufficiently safeguarded the provisions covering this particular division of the contract. But I am happy to assure the House that neither the Government nor the contractors have the slightest hesitation in accepting this contract as covering and embracing simply a fair division by alternate blocks, and that principle will be literally carried out and strictly followed on both sides. As regards the preference given to the contractors in the event of an extension of the work, to which many hon. members have offered objection, I reply that if any contractor builds a portion of a road, he is usually given the preference when additional works are carried out. He has nothing more than a preference. The Government would not have to pay any more to these than to other contractors if it were desired to extend the road to Portland Inlet or Dawson City; but all that is asked is that the contractors in such an event should be given the preference. It is unwritten law, it is commonly so understood whether expressed in the contract or not. It is not consistent for any Canadian to run down the value of this great gold-bearing country, but I was startled at times during the debate with the way in which the Opposition have valued these 3,700,000 acres, and none more so than the leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman laid great stress on these 3,700,000 acres being rich gold-bearing rock. Why, how can any one tell what the land may consist of. The contractors have to take alternate blocks. They may in some cases receive 24 miles of freestone or some other rock—of course I do not know the geological formation of the country—but there is no man living to-day who believes there is gold running through the whole of that country.

Another very wild statement made, and it is one on which I can speak with more assurance than I can in regard to gold, was that timber to the value of 400 million dollars was being given away to the contractors. That is more than a misleading statement; I was not surprised that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) was himself amazed and astounded when he found his calculations left such a result. I think he must have been very much like the small store-keeper who included the year of Our Lord when he made up the addition of his profits, and was a little startled at the result. The contractors, I fancy, will be very glad indeed to have some of the statements of members of the Opposition if they have occasion to go to London to float their bonds. I do not think anything could be of more service to them than some of the statements made by some of the Opposition speakers in

regard to the value of their lands. If all the wildest imaginations of these hon. gentlemen should be crystallized into fact, I think we should have no reason to begrudge the immense fortune which the contractors may make, because the Government will have the alternate blocks and the country will be benefited by the indirect advantages of having it opened up for trade. The president of the Toronto Board of Trade, in a deputation consisting of delegates from Quebec, Montreal and Winnipeg, stated he cared little for the gold, but they wanted the indirect trade which would be brought by opening up that country. We ought to rejoice that we have Canadians capable of entering into such a contract. If these Canadians have a genius for railway building greater than other contractors of Canada—and I do not say it with any want of respect to other contractors—we should be gratified that we have such men among us. Would any one say that England should not honour a man like the late Mr. Brassey, who made a great deal of money out of English and French contracts, and was able in the first line of his will to leave £4,000,000 sterling? We ought to be glad that there is a field in this country for contractors to make money and do well.

I was very much surprised to hear the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) advancing, as a serious plea against this contract, the fact of another offer having been made since it was entered into. The contract with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann was completed on the 25th of January, and on the 21st of February the hon. gentleman rose in this House and told us that another firm would have built the road for 5,000 acres a mile, and that they had made that offer on the 18th of February, just a month after the contract was completed.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, was not that a provisional contract, subject to all sorts of changes?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). No.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then hon. gentlemen say it is not a provisional contract?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is subject to the ratification of Parliament.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is a provisional contract, then, and that is where hon. gentlemen are making a great mistake.

Mr. DOBELL. Not only was there no royalty attached to that offer, and I do not know what other details may have been wanting in it, but I believe that it was nothing more than an idle effort to disturb the public mind. We all know the kind of estimate we put upon a man who comes after a transaction is closed and offers better terms. We look upon him as a wrecker—a sort of moral wrecker who goes about the world to make people unhappy, but is

never prepared to carry out any practical work. If any member of the Opposition knew of a contractor who was willing to do this work, I am satisfied that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) would have been very glad to have seen him and have talked over the matter, and given him every opportunity of making an offer to construct the road.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) stated that the province of Quebec was decidedly against this contract. On that point I unhesitatingly join issue with the hon. gentleman. I maintain that both in Quebec and in Montreal, as well as in other cities of that province, the consensus of opinion is that the Government have acted wisely and well in undertaking this contract.

I must again refer to what I think was the very unfair criticism made by the hon. leader of the Opposition against our Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). The hon. gentleman dwelt at considerable length upon an extinct body in the United States who are commonly known as Know-nothings. I was really amazed at the hon. leader of the Opposition, because his attacks are generally pretty direct. I looked into the matter and I found that every question the hon. leader of the Opposition asked the hon. Minister of Railways it was simply impossible to answer. The hon. gentleman only showed how quickly he could pick up conundrums which had no answer. I will read two or three of them to show that even to-day, after a discussion of the matter for over a week, we have arrived at no better conclusion in regard to them. He asked what would be the cost of the road. I say that no one living can tell what that road will cost. Our surveyor estimated it at about \$25,000 a mile; but he was careful to protect himself by adding that it might come to \$40,000 a mile. He had really no idea of what it would cost, as he did not know the nature of the route. Then the hon. gentleman asked the value of the 3,750,000 acres of land. If it is all rich gold-bearing land, it would take a long calculation to get at its value; but with regard to a great deal of it we do not know where it is or what it is, and therefore it would be quite impossible for our Minister of Railways to answer that question. The last question was one still more difficult—whether there was likely to be difficulty with the United States in regard to transshipping. Well, we do hope that we are going to be on better terms with the United States than we ever have been. I believe myself that we shall be when they come to understand us. We need simply straightforward, honest talk, and no brag. These questions recall to me—if I may trespass on the good nature of the House so far as to present it to them—a picture which came to my mind on the first or the second evening I had the honour of entering this House. It was during a discussion in which the hon.

Mr. DOBELL.

leader of the Opposition charged our Premier with a grievous crime. It was not with "knowing nothing," as he charged our Minister of Railways, but it was with "saying too much"; and his words made a great impression on my mind. He said our leader was wearing his "heart upon his sleeve." I turned this expression over in my mind, and wondered what it could mean. Looking it up, I found that to wear one's heart upon one's sleeve meant honour bright, frankness, candour, honesty, simple-mindedness, veracity, bluntness, to speak one's mind, probity, a gentleman of his word, bonhomie, openness, sincerity, to be artless, above-board, straightforward, truthfulness, plain speaking, to think aloud, uprightness, chivalrous; and if the hon. leader of the Opposition discards this picture, I suppose he is compelled to support the second one which I present: knavishness, truthlessness, prevarication, misrepresentation, double-dealing, pretending, equivocating, garbling, to put a false colouring, make-believe, to throw dust in the eyes, diplomacy, politic, to play false, double-tongued, fencing, duplicity—but I will not go on. I thought myself if we were going to make a picture to put at the figure-head of our ship of state I would leave it to the House which they will choose.

Mr. FOSTER. Take both.

Mr. DOBELL. I do not think I need detain the House longer. I merely wish to add a word or so. I was very much surprised indeed to find that my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives), after he pointed out all the advantages these contractors were getting, should have entirely overlooked the fact that they were bound to the expenditure of the entire cost of this railway, and the interest on that, I think, will amount to a great deal more than any sum they might save through paying the one per cent royalty instead of 10 per cent on which he dilated at such length.

With regard to the Edmonton route, that is a matter which the Government will have occasion to look into, but we could not make the Edmonton road in less than four or five years, and in the meantime we might have 100,000 people out in that country starving. I see that the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) shakes his head. I believe we could not have the road built in less time, doing our best, but in any case it would not give us what we require and are attempting to carry out, and what I hope the country will enable us to carry out, and that is to give immediate access by railroad to that district so as to guard against the possibility of a large body of miners getting in there in the expectation of finding the rich deposits of gold, to which the Opposition called our attention, and then becoming disappointed and sinking into despair, and dragging themselves back to Dawson City, without our being in the position to get there and afford

them relief. Mr. Speaker, as a business man, I have no hesitation in claiming for this contract the hearty approval of this House. It will form part of a line that can be extended at one end to Portland Inlet, and at the other to Dawson City. In the meantime, without a dollar of cash being advanced by this Government, we secure a means of transport into one of the wildest places in the world, and the immediate construction of a sleigh road which, according to the terms of the contract is to be completed "not later than six weeks from the execution of this agreement."

Mr. McDUGALL. The hon. Minister (Mr. Dobell) who has just taken his seat told us, in his opening remarks, that he was about to address the House from a business standpoint in relation to this question. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that, in my humble way, I shall be able, to some extent at least, to address myself to the question from a business standpoint. The hon. gentleman told us of the immense number of people whom the Government expected to enter that country during this year and of the necessity therefore of providing sufficient means for getting them in and sending out a sufficient force of mounted police to maintain law and order. On this side of the House, we admit that great necessity not only exists now but has existed before for the construction of some better way of getting into that country than we have. Our first object should be therefore to see what best means there are of meeting that urgent necessity; and from a business standpoint, it is our duty to examine the proposition now made by the Government and see how far it meets that necessity. Having done so, we have to consider whether or not the measure of work that we are getting and the measure of convenience that we are placing at the disposal of the people is sufficient compensation for what we are now asked to pay.

At present to get to the Klondike region from the Pacific coast, we first have to go by steamer to Fort Wrangel, a distance of seven or eight hundred miles, over territorial waters partly controlled by the United States and partly by Canada. After getting to Fort Wrangel, which is a port of entry on United States territory, we are subjected to customs regulations, and are then obliged to seek other means to get to the head of the Stikine River. We have to transfer our cargoes and passengers at Fort Wrangel into a small class of steamers or boats in order to get to the head of the Stikine River, and on arrival there, we are just at the place where we must begin to look for the benefits that are to accrue from the measure now before Parliament. The contractors undertake to build this line of railway from the head of the Stikine River to Teslin Lake, a distance, according to the papers now before the House, of 150 miles. But there are other evidences

before the House which make the distance 200 miles and 165, and so on. Taking, however, the mileage that is embodied in this Bill, the contractors are undertaking to build this 150 miles from the head of the Stikine River to Teslin Lake, and the character of the road, we are told, is to be the same as that of the Slocan and Kaslo Railway, though, according to the reports before the House, it would be quite possible to build a road very much superior to that.

The standard of the Kaslo and Slocan road was discussed between the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). During that discussion a dispute arose as to the time required to travel over that road. The Minister of the Interior said that he went over the road, 31 miles, in one hour. I went over that road on the 28th of June last. I went over it by the regular train that was run on the regular time table, and that time table allowed two hours and fifty minutes for the trip. And, let me tell you, we did not get over the road that day in the time provided in the time table, but were some minutes late in reaching the terminus. Therefore, I am not inclined to credit the statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior when he says that it is possible to go over that road with safety in the time he says he was carried over it. It may not have been by the ordinary engine or the regular train that he was taken over it. I consider it would be dangerous to undertake to drive over that road in a very much shorter time than it took the day I went over it. We went over bridges about 200 feet; we went over grades 170 feet to the mile, and curves of 30 degrees. I take it that it would be impossible for the Minister, unless he was willing to leave this world at short notice, to allow trains to run with him as rapidly as he indicates over a road of that character. I remember at one place where the train stopped for two or three minutes to allow the passengers to see how the road was built, that the track run along a shelf of rock with a perpendicular drop of 950 feet to the bottom of the ravine.

Suppose that this new road is complete to the head of Teslin Lake, on the date provided by the contract, what benefit are we to receive from it during the present year? We are told in the reports that are before the House that ice forms on the Teslin Lake and Lewes River as early as the middle of October, sometimes a little later, say the 20th of October. Now, while I fully realize that it is my duty to regard all measures coming before the House as to their effect upon the welfare of the Dominion at large, I realize no less that it is my duty in a special manner to consider how any measure affects the interests of the particular constituency I have the honour to represent. Now, let me take the case of a miner or prospector leaving my constituency intending to get the bene-

fits that will accrue from this undertaking on the part of the Government. He travels nearly four thousand miles to Victoria or Vancouver. None of the considerations provided in the measures now before the House will add one iota to the comfort of the man travelling from the far east over this distance. Having got to Vancouver or Victoria he has to go, I suppose, 700 or 800 miles by steamer to Fort Wrangel. There are none of the benefits of this measure for him so far as that part of the route is concerned. To reach the point on the Stikine River from which this road starts would occupy, I figure, 14 or 15 days, and in all that travelling there is not a single iota of benefit to him from the subsidy here provided or in the measure now before Parliament. But now they begin to get the benefit of this road. According to the hon. Minister of the Interior it will take just five hours to go from one end of the road to the other. This over, the prospector from Cape Breton is landed on the banks of Teslin Lake. He is still a long distance from the mining regions or, at least, from Dawson City. This Bill does not provide at all that Mackenzie and Mann shall provide any means either of going from Victoria or Vancouver to Telegraph Creek or from Teslin Lake to Dawson City.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Yes, it does.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Not a line of it.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman could not have read the contract.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to point out where there is any line or clause of this Bill or contract which compels Mackenzie & Mann to provide any means of communication at either end of this road.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It is specially provided.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is not, Mr. Speaker, or I do not understand the English language. I find that where this service is referred to, the Bill simply says that Mackenzie & Mann "may" engage in such an undertaking. They are not compelled to do it and there is no security that they will be compelled to do it. My poor friends come from Cape Breton and spend 16 or 17 days in reaching Teslin Lake, and there is no provision—

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Now, will the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) look at clause 9, and see if the word "may" is there. It says:

9. The contractors or the contractors' company shall provide or arrange with others to provide steamboat transport of freight and passengers between the terminus of said railway on Teslin Lake or other terminus northerly thereof and Dawson City to and fro.

Mr. McDOUGALL.

They must provide this means for transport or get others to provide it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. "May" is the word in the Bill. Admitting "shall" is in the contract, of what effect is it? There is no guarantee they shall. But to what extent and of what kind even if they do?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And for how long?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And under what penalty?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. And what is to be the size of the boats, and how many sailors is each to carry?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Now, Mr. Speaker; here is the standpoint from which it is the duty, not only of myself, as a humble member of this House, but the duty of all hon. members, to view this contract. Here is the position that our people will find themselves in who wish to take advantage of this proposed railway. According to the estimate of the Minister of the Interior, they would go over this 150 miles of railway in five hours—that is, five hours out of seventeen days—and without any definite certainty of ever getting over the remaining 600 miles to Dawson City. There is an undertaking provided for in this contract, and it is in plain words. It is to the effect:

The contractors shall immediately construct a practicable sleigh road from the mouth of Stikine River to Teslin Lake, and shall provide suitable shelters and stopping places for travellers at intervals of not more than twenty-five miles along such road, such road and stopping places to be available for use at the earliest possible moment, and in any event not later than six weeks from the execution of this agreement.

Now, will the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill tell me whether one dollar has yet been spent in building this railway, and will it be ready by the 8th of March?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman is doing his best to prevent it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. No, it was quite understood that this work should go on, regardless of what this House should do about it. The contract specifies the road must be built at once. My point is this, that the Government, in endeavouring to perform this piece of work, is at the same time trying to make the people believe that they are doing a great thing for the country. Sir, that is not the case; but they are giving a great deal of the country away for the purpose of getting this small piece of work done. Taking it for granted that the services will be supplied, either by Mackenzie & Mann, or by any other concern, on the Teslin Lake and Hootalinqua River, with a view to the continuation of the voyage to Dawson City, I estimate that between twenty and twenty-two days will be consumed in journeying from the eastern

part of Canada to Dawson City, under the most favourable circumstances. Well, now for completing this road to Teslin Lake, 150 miles long, we give 3,750,000 acres of the choicest gold lands, including the fuel on that land, whether it be coal or timber. And this fact must not be forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that these contractors are getting, not only the gold, a fee simple of the property containing all the minerals, whether gold or coal, but they are getting also the timber that is growing on any part of this land that they choose to select. And all the miner or prospector gets who chooses to come from Cape Breton to the Yukon, and who is obliged to consume twenty-two days on the journey—all he gets is five hours' ride on 150 miles of road provided for under this contract. Now, the passengers and freight having reached Teslin Lake after the 1st of September, I would like to know what means of communication it is possible for Mackenzie & Mann, or for any other concern, to place on Teslin Lake and the Hootalinqua and Lewes rivers down to Dawson that will be able to carry anything like the number of people that is expected to pass over that route during the coming season, during the four or five weeks, or even six weeks, if you choose to say so, before the close of the road by winter. In my opinion, the number of people that can possibly go over that route, and the quantity of freight that can be carried, after that date to close of navigation, will be very small indeed. Suppose we make a calculation of the quantity of freight that can possibly be carried over that railway. According to my humble way of judging this matter from a business standpoint, about 100 tons of freight per day and about 100 passengers per day are as much as we can expect Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, or any other company, to undertake to transport between Teslin Lake and Dawson. To carry that quantity of freight and that number of passengers would require two or three steamers going from Teslin Lake every week. I do not believe we can possibly expect that any company are likely to put a boat on Teslin Lake to run down to Dawson, through the dangerous channels and shallows that are known to exist on that route, of a greater capacity than about 250 tons of freight and 250 passengers. Now, at this rate, it would take about five months to carry 15,000 passengers and 15,000 tons of freight. Under these circumstances, I think we have a right to inquire what benefit we are going to derive during the four or five weeks that navigation will be open between the 1st of September and the closing of navigation next winter. What benefit are we going to get for the immense grants of valuable land we are asked to make to this company? Sir, rather than support any measure of this kind that only gives us transportation, at the most, during five or six weeks over this route in the sixteen months to come, I would go to work imme-

diately, and would have done so before now, if it was my own private business, and I would build a good wagon road over that route, and have it completed by the time navigation opened on the Stikine River. During the five months of open navigation we would be able by this wagon road to carry 15,000 tons of freight and 15,000 passengers, and that traffic would tax any means of communication possible during the next twelve, fourteen or eighteen months on Teslin Lake or the rivers to Dawson City. I may be told that this would not be a feasible and practicable plan; but in my humble judgment it would be. It would be more in proportion to the benefits we have received, or have any reason to expect to receive, from this measure now before Parliament outside of the 150 miles of railway. The estimates of Government engineers show that it is possible to build a wagon road in that country at a cost of \$1,400 per mile, so the total expenditure necessary for the road itself would be \$210,000. In order to carry 15,000 passengers and 15,000 tons of freight during five months over that road, there would be required 1,000 horses, wagons, and a complete outfit of men, &c., for the work. This outfit, I estimate, would cost about \$200,000 more. In order to have the road thoroughly equipped with men to handle the traffic in addition, I would allow \$75,000 for maintenance during the season of travel. I would further provide \$15,000 for management, clerks, etc. Thus, the road would cost at the most \$500,000, and these figures are based on the estimate of the Government engineer as to the cost of building good wagon roads in that country. We would in this way provide for the conveyance of 100 passengers per day for five months over a distance of 150 miles, and I consider that number represents as many passengers as would be likely to go over the Stikine River from Fort Wrangel, and could possibly be carried over Teslin Lake to Dawson City, with any means of communication that could be provided in that time. Now we must consider the revenue that would be derived from this source. Fifteen thousand tons of freight carried over 150 miles by horses, at a rate of \$20 per ton, would realize \$300,000. Fifteen thousand passengers at \$10 each would bring \$150,000. Calculating that 3,000 people, without freight, except ordinary baggage, should return by this route, at a cost of \$10 each, there would be \$30,000 additional receipts. The whole of the revenue derivable on this basis during five months would amount to \$480,000, or in one season a revenue within \$20,000 of the whole cost of the road. We may be told that these rates are high. They are not much higher than the rates at which freight is carried in countries that are largely populated, and that have been opened for one hundred years, and which possess railway and other transportation facilities. Viewed from a business standpoint, I hold that for

the purpose of accomplishing the transportation necessary to supply the full capacity of the expected communication beyond the railway to Dawson for the next sixteen months, it would be far better for the Government to undertake to build a wagon road—and such a road could be built by the time navigation would open on Telegraph Creek, on Teslin Lake and the Hootalinqua River. But even if the railroad was built on 1st September, it would not be of any important advantage during the coming year to our people, for it is absurd to suppose that prospectors and miners would go over it in winter; that we would convey that traffic by steamer over the Stikine from Telegraph Creek or Glenora and also across to Teslin Lake, and that people going into the country would take that route and incur the risk of being shut in on Teslin Lake. It is absurd to undertake the work provided for under the contract, and especially at the sacrifice which the people of Canada are asked to make by the Bill now before the House.

Some hon. members have attempted to make comparisons between the present contract and the contract for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1880 and 1881, it is unnecessary for me to enter into particulars with regard to that contract, because many hon. gentlemen who are now members of the House heard or have read the arguments adduced at that time, and are aware of the benefits that have accrued to the country from the building of that great work. In my opinion there is no comparison whatever between the plan adopted by the Government of that day and the plan adopted by this Government in regard to the work covered by the present contract. Some hon. members have, however, gone so far as to say that the plans are precisely alike. In 1874 the Government advertised not only throughout Canada but throughout the world for tenders for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Government from 1874 to 1878 undertook to spend \$10,000 in advertising for tenders for the building of that road. In 1874 they placed an Act on the Statute-book giving the Government power to enter into a contract, after calling for tenders for the building of the road.

They failed to get any satisfactory offer for the building of that road. Various methods were resorted to by the Government of that day, as well as by the succeeding Government, with the view of securing its construction; and finally, in the session of 1880-81, a measure was brought down to this House for the building of that railway by the present Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That measure was attacked by the Opposition of the day, and I am astonished to find, when I look at the arguments they used on that occasion, how far hon. gentlemen opposite have forgotten them to-day, when they come before us and ask us to agree to a measure on similar lines, with this exception, that the Government of that

Mr. McDUGALL.

day, before presenting the contract to Parliament, had received the authority of Parliament to proceed with the building of the railway. There is that difference between the two cases. The present Government had no authority whatever from Parliament to proceed with this undertaking in the manner in which they have proceeded with it. I do not question for a moment that it was their duty, as far as possible, to ascertain the advisability of providing for the construction of a railway or some other means of communication into that country. But, without any authority from Parliament or the people to enter into a contract, they not only undertook to do so, but they entered into this contract within a few days of the meeting of Parliament. There is this further difference between this present contract and the contract made in 1881, that the Government of that time signed the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, subject to the approval of Parliament, and the company were not allowed to proceed with the work till the contract received the sanction of Parliament; whereas, in the present case, Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie received authority from the Government to proceed with the work before the contract received the sanction of Parliament. During the discussion which took place on the Canadian Pacific Railway contract in this House in 1881, I find that the right hon. leader of the present Government spoke as follows:—

The ground taken by the Conservative party was this: the railroad should be built immediately and without interruption till finally completed; whereas the policy of the Liberals was that it should be built gradually as the wants of the country should require and its resources permit. The reason urged by the leader of the Conservative party for the immediate completion of the road was that it was a necessity of confederation, which would otherwise remain incomplete.

Is the right hon. leader of this House prepared to take this same position to-day?

What are the reasons they gave their supporters for voting in favour of this contract? What was the answer they gave to the numerous objections raised against it? It was simply this: Do not criticise, but simply accept the contract; it is the best we could get.

That is just what the Government of the day are asking this House to do: Do not criticise this contract, but accept it, as it is the best we could get. The best they could get, in face of the fact that they made a secret bargain: that they never asked any one to tender except Mackenzie & Mann. I was amused the other night when the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), in replying to a statement made by a member on this side of the House in reference to the offer of Mr. Hamilton Smith to build this railway for one-fourth the amount of the contract, told us that he had some experience of going into an auction room and seeing some goods offered for sale for which

he would be glad to give double the price. Well, I would like to know who was in the auction room of the Minister of the Interior at the time this contract was made. Mackenzie & Mann were the only persons there; we heard of no one else. The hon. gentleman proceeded:

What has seized the Government of this country, that they have been compelled to accept this contract from the syndicate? Who in the world compelled the Government to negotiate with the syndicate? What great calamity has befallen this country that the Government should be compelled to surrender unconditionally to the syndicate? If there had been a war and we had been defeated, and the Government forced to accept from the victor such terms as suited him to enforce, and if the Government came here to have the treaty ratified, would their language have been different to that used in order to induce their supporters to accept the contract?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Who was it said that?

Mr. McDOUGALL. This statement was made by the right hon. the present Prime Minister on the 21st of December, 1880, and will be found on page 191 of "Hansard" of that date. He proceeded further:

What is the safeguard, what is the guarantee that we have against the possible, I should rather say, the certain evils of the proposed system? We have, as a guarantee, only the good will of the company itself. It has been asserted on the other side that the present members of the company are men of the highest character, and certainly every one may assent to this; but if the men who now constitute the company are men of the highest character, who knows who will be the members of the company ten years hence, five years hence, or even six months hence? Who can say that six months from to-day this company will not have gone to New York, and for a money consideration bartered its interests to foreign capitalists?

I had no idea that these hon. gentlemen had made their own answer to their proposition of to-day, so far back as seventeen years ago; and a more complete answer could not be made. What is in this contract to prevent Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann going to New York and disposing of all the franchises and concessions they are getting under this contract to foreign capitalists? What guarantee have we that the necessary facilities will be provided for traffic on these 150 miles of railway? None whatever, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies). The people who want to take advantage of that 150 miles of travel are at the mercy of all those who choose to put on steamers and who can charge what they like. There is nothing in the contract which can put a limit on the exactions of the company for the transport of people and supplies over their road. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 2nd March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. SCRIVER moved:

That the time for presenting private Bills be extended to Thursday, the 17th March instant, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, as contained in their third report.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Pacific and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Dominion Building and Loan Association.—(Mr. Maclean.)

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Canadian Railway Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto.—(Mr. Maclean.)

Bill (No. 44) to confirm an agreement between the St. Stephen and Milltown Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Wood, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 45) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Brandon and South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Cowichan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. McInnes.)

Bill (No. 49) to amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. McClure.)

UNITED STATES RELIEF EXPEDITION —MILITARY ESCORT.

Mr. McINNES asked,

1. Has any application been made to the Government to allow an escort of the United States

militia or police to accompany the so-called relief expedition—gotten up in the United States—while passing through Canadian territory, into the Yukon mining districts?

2. Has any such application been granted, and, if so, under what, if any, conditions?

3. Will the provisions and equipage of this so-called relief expedition be allowed to enter Canada free of the regular customs charges, and, if so, under what, if any, conditions?

4. Are the provisions of the so-called relief expedition to be sold in the Yukon districts in competition with resident merchants, or are they to be distributed to all, if any, in need? If the latter course is contemplated, has the Government insisted on assurances that Canadians will receive consideration in such distribution equal to Americans?

5. Is any such expedition necessary for the relief of the population in the said districts? If it is, is it the intention of the Government to undertake one? If it is not, does the Government propose the farce to be carried on by foreigners within our territory, and in a manner that will injure our commercial standing with intending Yukoners and otherwise belittle our country?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). I beg to say, that such an application as that referred to in the question has been made. There has been correspondence with regard to it, which it is not deemed in the public interest to bring down at the present time. As I have already intimated, in answer to another question, leave has been given to the United States authorities to conduct their expedition through Canadian territory, but I understand that the expedition has been abandoned.

NORTH-WEST LANDS RESERVED FROM SETTLEMENT.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

How many acres of land in Manitoba are reserved from settlement?

How many acres in the North-west Territories are reserved from settlement?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). I beg to say, that the number of acres of land in Manitoba reserved from settlement is 18,386,562. The number of acres of land in the North-west Territories reserved from settlement is 83,170,228 acres. I ought to say, in explanation of this answer, that it is possible that the hon. gentleman has not put the question in such a way as to get the information which he really wants. If he wants to get the information as to the number of acres reserved of railway land grants, he should have so put the question, and the answer in that case would have been different. I simply make this explanation to avoid any misunderstanding.

TORONTO HARBOUR DREDGING.

Mr. CLARKE (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

1. What is the amount of the liability incurred for work done or material supplied, in connection with the dredging or improving of Toronto harbour, between the dates of 1st January, 1897, and 1st January, 1898?

2. What was the total amount of moneys paid between 1st January, 1897, and 1st January, 1898, for dredging or any other improvement, either work or material, in connection with the Toronto harbour?

3. What are the names of all parties to whom such moneys were paid, and dates when paid?

4. What are the names of all parties to whom any moneys are still owing? What are the amounts in each case for either work done or material supplied in connection with the Toronto harbour?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). 1. The liabilities were \$16,936.34, and they have all been paid. 2. \$16,936.34. 3. The list of names, with dates of payment, will cover several pages, and I ask that my hon. friend should move for a return. 4. No moneys are owing.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). 1. The liabilities were \$16,936.34, and they have all been paid. 2. \$16,936.34. 3. The list of names, with dates of payment, will cover several pages, and I ask that my hon. friend should move for a return. 4. No moneys are owing.

REPAIRS TO L'ARDOISE BREAK-WATER.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

1. Whether the Minister of Public Works is aware of the fact that the sum of \$2,000 was voted by Parliament during the last session for repairs to the L'Ardoise breakwater in the county of Richmond, Nova Scotia?

2. Why was not this sum, or any portion thereof, expended during the past year in the repairs for which it was voted?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes. 2. It was not expended, because the amount was too small to complete the whole of the work intended, and, in the opinion of the chief engineer, it would not have been safe to do only a portion of the work.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—RAILWAY FROM SOUTHPORT TO MURRAY HARBOUR.

Mr. MARTIN (by Mr. McDougall) asked,

1. Has the survey for the proposed railway from Southport to Belfast and Murray Harbour, in Prince Edward Island, been completed?

2. Has the survey been merely preliminary, or has any part of the said line been located?

3. Has the Government an estimate of the cost of the proposed road? If so, what is the estimate cost per mile, and what is the length of the proposed line?

4. Has the Government decided to proceed with the construction of the said road next spring? If so, will tenders be called for?

5. Has the survey for the proposed bridge across the Hillsborough, in Prince Edward Island, been completed?

6. If so, has an estimate been prepared?

7. Has the Government decided to proceed with the immediate construction of the bridge? If not, why not?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). The survey for the proposed railway from Southport to Belfast and Murray Harbour has been completed. The survey was a close preliminary one,

from which location has been made on paper, but no permanent location has been yet determined on. The estimated cost of the proposed railway is about \$9,000 per mile. The length of the proposed line is about 40 miles. It has not been decided when the construction will be proceeded with. The survey for the proposed bridge across the Hillsborough, in Prince Edward Island, has been completed, with the exception of a few test borings, which are now being made. An approximate estimate of the cost has been made, but it has not been decided when the construction of the bridge will be proceeded with. Negotiations are now pending with the local government as to the proportion of the cost they are prepared to assume.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE CLASSES.

Mr. PRIOR asked,

1. Has the class of cadets which joined the Royal Military College in 1896 been amalgamated with the class which joined the college in 1895 ?

2. Will any cadets of the class which joined in 1896, who may not at the close of their graduating year, 1899, have then taken higher standing in the amalgamated class than cadets who joined in 1895, have precedence of these in the bestowal of Imperial commissions ?

3. Under what regulations are the several Imperial service commissions, which may be assigned to the graduates of 1899, to be allotted to the amalgamated graduating class of this year ?

4. How many cadets passed into the graduating class of this year ?

5. How many and what Canadian Government appointments are offered to the graduates of this year ?

6. How many and what Imperial service appointments have been made available for the cadets passing out of the college during the current year ?

7. How many and what Canadian Government appointments are to be offered to the graduates of 1899 ?

8. How many and what Imperial service appointments will be made available for cadets passing out of the college in 1899 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Yes. 2. Yes. The standing of the two classes is kept entirely distinct. Although they are taught together and given the same examination papers, cadets who joined in 1896 do not compete on the same list with cadets who joined in 1895. 3. There are no regulations to suit this especial case, but as the Imperial authorities granted extra commissions for 1899 especially to meet the case of the amalgamated class, four commissions will be offered to the 1895 class and four to the 1896 class. 4 and 5. Ten. Of these, two have already been offered commissions in the Royal Artillery; four others have intimated their wish to take commissions in the Imperial Army; the remaining three are entering into civil life in Canada, and do not desire to follow a military profession; they have all been asked whether they wished

for a commission in the Permanent Corps; but the class is so small, there are none who are not provided for. I do not consider that, with the large classes now joining, this is ever likely to happen again. 6. Seven—Royal Engineers, 1; Royal Artillery, 3; Infantry or Cavalry, 2; Indian Staff Corps, 1. 7. It is intended, after the 1st July next, to offer all vacancies occurring in the Royal Canadian Artillery to graduates of the Royal Military College. 8. Eight—Royal Engineers, 2; Royal Artillery, 2; Infantry or Cavalry, 2; Indian Staff Corps, 2.

DATES OF MR. OGILVIE'S REPORTS.

Mr. McALISTER asked,

On what date or dates did the Government, or any officer thereof, first receive William Ogilvie's reports, sent from the Yukon District, dated 18th August, 1896; 6th September, 1896; 6th November, 1896; 9th December, 1896; 11th January, 1897, and 23rd January, 1897, respectively.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The report of the 6th September, 1896, was received on the 19th October, 1896. The report of the 18th August, 1896, on the 22nd October, 1896. The report of the 6th November, 1896, on the 16th February, 1897. The report of the 9th December, 1896, on the 27th February, 1897. The report of the 11th January, 1897, on the 16th March, 1897. The report of the 23rd January, 1897, on the 16th of March, 1897.

COLLECTOR HAGER, OF HAGERSVILLE.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked,

1. In what amount was C. E. D. Hager, collector at the port of Hagersville, indebted to the Customs Department at the time he absconded in the month of November or December, 1893 ?

2. Who were sureties to the department for said Hager ?

3. Is the department aware of Hager's present place of residence, and what steps, if any, have been taken against such sureties to recover the amount of his defalcation ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1st. The amount of the indebtedness of Mr. C. E. D. Hager, formerly collector of customs at the port of Hagersville, to the Customs Department, as ascertained by an inspector of the department and set forth in a report made by such inspector, dated January 6th, 1894, is \$2,492.04. 2nd. John H. Scott and Erastus Hager. 3rd. The department is not aware of Mr. Hager's present place of residence. No legal steps were taken against such sureties to recover the amount of Hager's defalcation. The case was placed in the hands of the Department of Justice by the Department of Customs on the 12th January, 1894, with a view to the prosecution of Hager for the recovery of the amounts embezzled by him,

and on the 26th January the Department of Justice was instructed by the Customs Department to prosecute Mr. Hager for embezzlement in addition to taking the necessary steps to recover the amount of his shortages, but before any legal steps had been taken all proceedings were suspended at the request of the Department of Customs conveyed in a letter to the Department of Justice under date 2nd February, 1894, the reason for this suspension of proceedings given in such letter being that information had been received that satisfactory arrangements would at once be made for the payment of the amount of the defalcation. It does not appear, however, that such payment has been made, and the matter is now engaging the attention of the department.

EXPEDITION TO HUDSON'S BAY.

Mr. RUTHERFORD asked,

1. Is the report of the recent expedition to ascertain the navigability of Hudson's Bay and Straits, now ready?
2. When will it be placed in the hands of members?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The report of Commander Wakeham, who was charged with the Hudson Bay expedition, was presented to the department some two weeks ago, and after being read by myself, was immediately placed in the hands of the Queen's Printer with instructions to have it printed as quickly as possible. As soon as I get it from the Queen's Printer, I will have it distributed amongst the members.

PIERS OF BRIDGE OVER BEAR RIVER.

Mr. MILLS asked,

1. Has the Government obtained a report from its engineer respecting the remainder of the piers of the old bridge in Bear River, between Annapolis and Digby counties, Nova Scotia?
2. If so, what is that report, and does the engineer consider these remains of piers an obstruction to navigation?
3. Has it yet been determined which Government, federal or local, is responsible for the removal of these remains of piers?
4. If not, does the Government intend to allow these remains of piers to stand as they are until it is determined what Government is responsible for their removal?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. The agent of this department reported in 1890 that the remains of the old bridge were an obstruction to navigation and the department has received several reports since to that effect. 2. No special report has been made by an engineer, but the department is fully aware of the existing obstructions. 3. No, it has not yet been finally determined. 4. There is no appropriation out of which this expenditure could be paid. A special vote would have to be made as these ob-

Mr. PATERSON.

structions do not come within those enumerated in the statute.

Mr. MILLS. The question is not fully answered. Does the Government intend to allow the pier to be an obstruction until it is determined which Government is responsible?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman sees that it has not yet been determined whether this Government is responsible or not. Communications have taken place, as I answered the hon. gentleman last year, with the Nova Scotia Government, with the view of inducing them to take up this subject. They did not do so, and the matter has been under the consideration of the Department of Public Works and of my department for some time back. If it is finally determined that it is within our jurisdiction, the matter will then come before Council to see if the necessary provision will be made. Under the statute we have no money to do it; it does not come within the words of the statute, and a special appropriation must be made for the purpose.

PRIZE WON IN THE TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION.

Mr. DAVIN (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

Whether N. R. J. Cameron won a prize of \$20 in connection with the Territorial Exhibition? If so, when will it be paid?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that there is no bill from any man called Cameron, but there is a bill from a man called N. R. J. Cuneman, who won a prize of \$20 in connection with the Territorial Exhibition. There are a large number of these accounts which have to be inquired into, and the inquiry was not finished before the time for the payment under the vote of last session had lapsed. A vote will be asked this session to a re-vote of the amount required to pay these bills. The bill of Mr. Cuneman is approved, and will be paid when the House votes the money for it.

LIGHTHOUSES BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND THE STIKINE RIVER.

Mr. MAXWELL (by Mr. Morrison) asked,

Is it the intention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to provide additional aids to navigation in the shape of lighthouses along the coast between Vancouver and the Stikine River? If so, can the Minister give any information on the subject, and what steps are being taken to ascertain what lights are required?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). It is the intention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to provide extra aid to navigation,

in the shape of lighthouses along the coast between Vancouver and Stikine River. The department is fully alive to the importance of this question, and the engineer of the department will proceed on board the "Quadra" up that coast at the earliest day after the agents report that the fogs along the coast permit of his doing so effectively. I expect he will leave about the 15th of March, and the "Quadra" will then proceed along the coast for the purpose of ascertaining the points where these aids to navigation are required.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. DAVIN (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

Whether the attention of the Minister of the Interior has been called to the following correspondence:—

Prince Albert, 20th October, 1896.

A. E. Forget, Esq., Regina.

My dear Forget,—I have a letter from Geo. S. Young, M.D., a good Liberal, from Gladstone, Man., who wishes to locate in Prince Albert if he can get the Government work. It is not necessary for me to inform you that a doctor is a very necessary thing for us to have, as they are continually travelling through the country and can do us a great deal of service, more especially as there is (when a certain amount of your work is given them to do) a lot from the poor in the district gratis. Please let me know about what a doctor can expect from the department by the year.

Respectfully yours,

(Sgd.) THOS. O. DAVIS.

9th November, 1896.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 25th ult., relative to the wish of George S. Young, M.D., to locate in Prince Albert, and in reply beg to state if Mr. Young, besides being a good Liberal, is a good medical man, he can count on getting a liberal share of the Government patronage.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) A. E. FORGET.

T. O. Davis, Esq., Prince Albert.

Winnipeg, 17th August, 1896.

A. E. Forget, Regina.

Orton starting on six weeks' trip among Indians. I think he should be stopped.

(Sgd.) JOSEPH MARTIN.

Mr. Forget was only too willing to oblige Mr. Joseph Martin, as the following answer indicates:—

Regina, 17th August, 1896.

Hon. J. Martin, Winnipeg.

Understand Orton appointed by Order in Council, therefore beyond my jurisdiction, but, if not, Leveque hereby authorized after consulting with Government to send another medical man.

(Sgd.) A. E. FORGET.

Whether the above-named Thomas O. Davis is the Thomas O. Davis who represents the constituency of Saskatchewan in this House? Whether the A. E. Forget, the writer of certain of the above letters, is not the gentleman who was

made Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs by the Government of Sir John Macdonald and Commissioner by the Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell? Whether the Minister of the Interior approves of making appointments on the principles indicated by the above correspondence? Whether George S. Young was appointed as suggested by Thomas O. Davis, or received any appointment? Whether Dr. Orton is still in the service of the Department of Indian Affairs? Whether the Mr. Leveque mentioned in A. E. Forget's letter of 17th August, 1896, is not a Liberal who, like Mr. A. E. Forget, was kept in office by successive Conservative Governments? If Dr. Orton was dismissed, why was he dismissed?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I propose, Mr. Speaker, at the outset to call your attention to the fact that this question resembles a stump speech more than a question which should appear on the Order paper of this House; but at the same time, I shall endeavour to give the hon. gentleman the information he asks, to the best of my ability.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman call my attention to the form of the question?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. With respect to this question, if I were at liberty to follow English precedent and my own judgment in the matter, I would rule that long statements of circumstantial and outside matters like this, in the form of this question, were not in order; but the practice has prevailed in this House for a number of years, and I am bound by the precedents and cannot rule the question out of order.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Let me say, in reply to the question, that my attention has been called to the publication of what, to the best of my recollection, is a copy of the first letter, which appeared in a newspaper known as the Winnipeg "Nor'-Wester." My attention has not been called to the rest of the correspondence, so far as I can remember. I have no knowledge whether such a letter was actually written by a gentleman named Thomas O. Davis or not; and if it was, I am not in a position to state whether he is the gentleman who represents Saskatchewan or not. The gentleman is a member of the House, and can probably give the hon. member the information he asks.

As to the question respecting A. E. Forget, I have no information as to whether A. E. Forget, the Indian Commissioner, wrote such a letter as that published in the question; but no doubt if such a letter was written the A. E. Forget referred to is the Indian Commissioner, and he is also the gentleman who was made Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs by the Government of Sir John Macdonald and

Commissioner by the Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell.

As to the next question, which reads as follows :—

Whether the Minister of the Interior approves of making appointments on the principles indicated by the above correspondence ?

I beg to say I have some difficulty in ascertaining what the question is ; but if the question is desired to elicit the information as to whether I approve of the appointment of a good Liberal to office when a vacancy occurs under this Government, I have to say that I do so most emphatically.

George S. Young was not given any appointment by this Government, so far as the records show. He was not in the service of the Indian Department. I have no information of the political predilections of Mr. Leveque. Dr. Orton was dismissed because he was considered unfit for the position he had.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY CONTRACT—MR. HAMILTON SMITH'S PROPOSAL.

Mr. SPROULE (by Mr. Maclean) asked,

On 21st February (see "Hansard," unrevised ed., p. 924) the hon. the Minister of the Interior said : "I had not any communication with Mr. Hamilton Smith, nor was Mr. Hamilton Smith in communication with me, before the contract was signed."—Sir Charles Tupper : "Directly or indirectly ?"—The Minister of the Interior : "Directly or indirectly. I may add that a gentleman said to me upon one occasion, in the course of a casual conversation, that there was a gentleman named Hamilton Smith who was prepared to call upon me for the purpose of discussing the question of a railway to the Yukon." Who is the gentleman who "in the course of a casual conversation" gave the Minister this information ? Did he go into particulars ? At what date did this casual conversation occur, and where ? Did the gentleman discuss the merits of Mr. Hamilton Smith's proposal ? What subject or subjects were under discussion in the casual conversation ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that the gentleman who in course of casual conversation gave me the information referred to was Sir William Van Horne, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He did not go into particulars. The conversation took place—I have some difficulty in fixing the time, but I have no doubt I am correct—between the time that I returned from the west and 20th December last. The conversation took place in my office in the Langevin Block. The gentleman did not discuss the merits of Mr. Hamilton Smith's proposal ; no proposal was made, no proposal was known at the time ; therefore no discussion of it took place. The next question is : "What subject or subjects were under discussion in the casual conversation ?" There were no subjects under discussion in the casual

Mr. SIFTON.

conversation other than that stated, which affect public business in any particular, and therefore I do not deem myself under any obligation to answer that portion of the question.

MR. HAMILTON SMITH'S OFFER.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Opposition asked me to lay on the Table a copy of a telegram sent to Lord Strathcona respecting Mr. Hamilton Smith. I find in the records no telegram which can be laid on the Table of the House. The telegram from Lord Strathcona, to which the hon. gentleman alluded, was the result of a private, confidential communication from me to Lord Strathcona, asking him to ascertain what was the alleged agency of Mr. Hamilton Smith as regards the Rothschilds, and if any such agency existed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the right hon. gentleman should say who made any such allegation. The Minister is aware that Mr. Hamilton Smith stated in his communication to the Government that no application had been made on behalf of the Rothschilds ; and therefore, when a telegram sent to the Government was given to the public intimating that the Rothschilds had not authorized Mr. Hamilton Smith to make any statement in their behalf, I naturally asked, what every fair-minded man in this House would say was a proper question, that we be furnished with the question that was asked ; and the right hon. gentleman gave a pledge to me across the House that the telegram would be laid on the Table to-day. I asked that the pledge be implemented. The right hon. gentleman is bound in honour to do so, and in the discharge of the pledge given to the House yesterday in regard to what appeared on the face of it to have been a misrepresentation on the part of this Government to the High Commissioner in London. Mr. Hamilton Smith had asked the right hon. gentleman if—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will conclude with a motion, if you, Mr. Speaker, think it desirable, because this is a matter of importance. Mr. Hamilton Smith is a man of the highest standing in this country and in Great Britain. He is a gentleman who, in his application to the Government showed he is associated with a half dozen of the most able and influential financial houses in London. That is Mr. Smith's position, and under these circumstances the attempt made on the part of the Government to show an apparent contradiction or something derogatory to that gentleman was at variance with everything that any hon. member would think fair and honourable treatment towards a gentleman who ap-

proaches this Government with a proposition.

Now, Sir, under these circumstances, I ask the right hon. gentleman to put on the Table of this House—as he pledged himself to this House yesterday that he would do—the message which extracted an answer from the High Commissioner utterly at variance with anything it was necessary should be given. What the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was asked by Mr. Hamilton Smith to do was this—and he knows it right well—he was asked if he had any doubt as to Mr. Hamilton Smith's position and as to his responsibility as a man who was entitled to claim the respectful consideration of this Government in relation to the construction of an important public work, that the right hon. gentleman could by a cablegram to London ascertain Mr. Smith's standing. If the right hon. gentleman had sent a message to the High Commissioner asking what is the financial standing of Mr. Hamilton Smith in London, and if in reply to that message he had received an answer that Mr. Hamilton Smith's standing was not such as he had represented it to be, there would be some reason for the refusal to lay the question cabled on the Table of the House. But, Sir, what has the right hon. gentleman done? Mr. Hamilton Smith is a gentleman of the highest standing and character, a gentleman whose financial position challenges the utmost scrutiny from the members of this Government and of this House. He is a gentleman upon whom the Government press of this country have attempted to throw discredit, but he is a gentleman who is known both in the United States of America and in England where he has spent the last fifteen years, to be associated with gentlemen of very high standing and of very high character in connection with the most important enterprises. Why, Sir, probably the richest firms in England to-day are associated with Mr. Hamilton Smith in the application to the Government for this work, and yet we have an attempt made to discredit that gentleman in the estimation of the people of this country and the members of this House, by sending a question for which there was no foundation—the answer shows that there was no foundation for asking such a question, because Mr. Smith had given the answer to that question himself when he stated to this Government, that so far as he was aware the Messrs. Rothschild had authorized no person in this country to make an application to the Government on their behalf.

Under these circumstances, I say that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) falls in what he owes to himself if he does not put upon the Table of this House the message which extracted such a statement from Lord Strathcona as was calculated to discredit Mr. Hamilton Smith, and to lead the people of this country to believe that Mr. Smith—who had gone out of his way to

tell the Government that he did not represent the Rothschilds—had made misrepresentations. I say that the right hon. gentleman went out of his way to get a contradiction of something that had never been said by Mr. Hamilton Smith. As the matter stands, the right hon. gentleman owes it to himself, he owes it to the House, he owes it to Mr. Hamilton Smith, a gentleman of the highest character and standing, backed by an amount of financial aid such as no person who has approached the Government in connection with this work possesses; I say, Sir, that the right hon. gentleman owes it to himself, to the House, and to the country, to put on the Table the message that has extracted an answer of such a character from Lord Strathcona, an answer which is calculated to throw discredit upon a gentleman of very high standing who approached the Government in regard to a very important work.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon gentleman conclude with a motion?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I move, Sir, that the House do now adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is getting into the unfortunate habit of moving the adjournment of the House whenever he has a stump speech to make to his followers. Sir, I have no objection at all to give him an answer to all the questions he has put to me. The first question he asks me is: Who was the first to allege that Mr. Hamilton Smith was the agent of the Rothschilds; where did the allegation come from? My plain and simple answer to that question is: That the allegation came from the whole of the press which supports the hon. gentleman—the Ottawa "Citizen," the "Mail and Empire," the Hamilton "Spectator," the Montreal "Gazette," and every other opposition newspaper which stated that Mr. Hamilton Smith was the agent of Lord Rothschild. Nay, more; not only was the statement made in the press which supports the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), but I venture to say that I place myself within the judgment of the House when I state that three-fourths of the gentlemen upon the other side who addressed the House upon this subject made the same statement, namely, that the Government had received an offer from no less a person than Mr. Hamilton Smith who was the agent of Lord Rothschild. That was the reason why I wanted to know at headquarters whether the statement was true or not. The Government had not any such information before it but finding that statement repeated day after day in the press, and repeated day after day upon the floor of this House, I thought I was justified—and so do I yet believe—in ascertaining whether or no the statement made, not so much by Mr. Hamilton Smith

as by gentlemen opposite, was true or not true. I inquired; I did not inquire officially, I inquired privately; and, Sir, if I do not choose at this moment to lay upon the Table of this House a private communication confidentially sent by me to Lord Strathcona, I have—if indeed I need any authority or support for that course—I have the authority and precedent of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) himself, who when leading this House not later than the first session of 1896, having sent commissioners to the Government of Manitoba to make certain proposals to that government in reference to the school question; read here the answer made by the Greenway Government, but refused to bring down the communication which had brought that answer forth.

In the face of such a precedent, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), forgetting his position, dares to say that I owe it to my own honour to bring down a certain communication. Sir, I am here to say that I am the guardian of my own honour. I am willing at all times, upon matters political to receive advice upon any question which affects my own honour, but I have no lesson to receive from the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to get into any heated state of argument, or to show any temper as my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) undoubtedly has. Why has he shown that temper? It certainly was not because—for if it be it is groundless—my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) asked a question which he had a perfect right to ask; a double right to ask, because yesterday before this House the right hon. gentleman himself (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) promised to lay that telegram upon the Table. Mr. Speaker, will that right hon. gentleman induce this House or this country to believe, that he did not know yesterday as well as to-day whether that was a private telegram or whether it was a public telegram?

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that a few evenings ago, a certain member of this House, the Minister of the Interior, attempted to read somebody a lecture upon manners, saying that in the wild and woolly west from which he comes, certain things would not be allowed. I think, Sir, that in the wild and woolly west or anywhere else, when I am addressing myself to the right hon. the leader of the House, it would be just as well for the Minister of the Interior not to intervene his bulky form between the ear that I am trying to gain and my own weak voice.

Now, Sir, I put that question, and I ask my right hon. friend to get out of that difficulty if he can. Did he not know yesterday when he promised to bring that telegram down, that it was a private telegram sent by himself? He promised it then; he has taken counsel since. And why does he not

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

bring it down to-day? Because, Sir, I believe he has conned over the wording of that telegram and he fears to bring it down. My right hon. friend tried to squirm out of his position by several devices which I am bound to expose. He said that the press had declared that Mr. Hamilton Smith was a representative of the Rothschilds, and had made an offer on their behalf. He said that three-fourths of the Opposition members in the House had stated the same, and he was very anxious to know the whole truth. From whom, Sir, could he get the whole truth better than from the man who he says the press and three-fourths of the Opposition members of this House declared had made a proposition on behalf of the Rothschilds? But the right hon. gentleman had that information already, over Mr. Hamilton Smith's own signature, for, in a letter dated the 14th of February, 1898, Mr. Hamilton Smith states:

In this connection allow me to state that no offer to build the line was made for the house of N. M. Rothschild & Sons, as has been stated in the House of Commons.

The right hon. gentleman himself was the person to whom this was addressed, and the right hon. gentleman read it in this House. He had Mr. Hamilton Smith's own word that he had never put in a proposal from the Rothschilds. And yet at this late day the right hon. gentleman tries to justify himself before this House by declaring that he was in lack of information, and had to send a private telegram to Lord Strathcona in order to get it. Sir, if the communication to Lord Strathcona was private, why did the right hon. gentleman send his private secretary all over this House to hunt up newspaper correspondents, and to get them to put into the newspapers the answer to that private telegram? If a private telegram is sent by the right hon. gentleman as Premier, and an answer comes to that private telegram, let him keep it as such. But he was in a hurry to give it to the press—why? The evident desire of the right hon. gentleman was to discredit Mr. Hamilton Smith and to make it appear to the public that he had told a lie to the Government of this country, in face of the statement made by Mr. Hamilton Smith, in his letter to the right hon. gentleman, that he did not make any proposition on behalf of the Rothschilds. I leave that to the members of this House and to the country, and to the press that has been making these allegations, and they will be the best judges of how my hon. friend stands in that connection.

Once more, the right hon. gentleman declares that my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, has contracted the unfortunate habit of moving the adjournment of the House. His memory fails him again. That custom, Sir, was commenced when the Liberal-Conservatives were in the

government of this country, and during the last few years of that Government, when the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and others who now hold Cabinet positions, took it upon themselves, against the protests of the Government and of the Speaker himself, to move the adjournment of the House at every whipstitch in order to ventilate some grievance of their own. That was when the unfortunate habit commenced. But my hon. friend has a perfect right, in a matter of this gravity, to ventilate it at once, and he can do it in no other way than by taking advantage of this rule of the House. It is a legitimate thing for him to do in this case.

But the right hon. gentleman says that the hon. leader of the Opposition is inconsistent in asking that this telegram be brought down—why? Because my hon. friend had on one occasion read a telegram to Mr. Greenway in connection with negotiations with the Greenway Government, and then refused to read a telegram from the Greenway Government. Are the cases parallel? Not at all, Sir. My hon. friend who leads the Opposition tried at that time to get the consent of the Greenway Government to have the second telegram read in this House, which they refused to give, and as an honourable man my hon. friend could not read it without their consent. It is not so in this case. The private telegram is in the trousers pocket of the right hon. Prime Minister himself, and he can give the required information in half a minute's time if he chooses to do it. The right hon. gentleman has put himself in a false position. He has committed an act of wrong against a private citizen of the Empire. He has led the people of this country to believe that Mr. Hamilton Smith is a prevaricator and an economist of the truth, and he has done it when he had, over Mr. Hamilton Smith's own signature, the information that the thing he was asking about had no foundation in fact at all.

Mr. MACLEAN. The serious feature of this incident is this, that if the right hon. gentleman sent the telegram we believe he did send, then he considered the Manu & Mackenzie agreement a provisional agreement, and if an offer was forthcoming from men of good standing to build the railway for one-fourth of what the Government proposed to give these men, then he was in honour bound to accept it; and he is also bound in honour to tell the House what question he put to Lord Strathcona.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman is missing the point before the House altogether. The Government did not want any evidence to prove that Mr. Hamilton Smith was a prevaricator.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I state that deliberately. The Government had that evidence in their possession, and that evidence has been laid before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. No evidence at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That evidence is now on record. The gentleman whom the right hon. leader of the Opposition has taken under his wing, and whom his lieutenant lauds in the House to-day, is a gentleman who stated that he had commissioned Sir William Van Horne to make a distinct proposition to this Government for the construction of the Teslin-Stikine Railway. He made that statement over his signature, and he made it, I have no doubt in my own mind, to aid politically the hon. gentlemen opposite. The gentleman to whom he referred, Sir William Van Horne, was asked by my right hon. friend the First Minister whether there was a vestige of truth in Mr. Hamilton Smith's statement.

Mr. FOSTER. No, he was not asked that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He was asked whether the statement made by Mr. Hamilton Smith was true, and he replied that there was no truth in it—that Mr. Hamilton Smith had made no such proposition to him; and Mr. Hamilton Smith stands before this country as having made an important public statement, which is contradicted in the first instance by Sir William Van Horne—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Directly contradicted by Sir William Van Horne, and his contradiction is supported by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—who has alleged that neither directly or indirectly did Sir William Van Horne ever communicate such a proposition from Mr. Hamilton Smith to him.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Or anybody else.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Or anybody else. There can be no mistake about it. Mr. Hamilton Smith was asked who the third party was to whom he had made this offer for the purpose of being communicated to the Minister of the Interior. He replied that it was Sir William Van Horne. He stated that in my presence; he stated it in the presence of three or four members of the Government. Sir William Van Horne was communicated with on the instant, and Sir William Van Horne gave the statement the most emphatic denial.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hon. gentlemen have the temerity to say no in the face of Sir William Van Horne's letter which has been laid on the Table of this House, and which is to be found in the pages of "Hansard."

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman read—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman knows that he cannot interrupt without the permission of the speaker.

Mr. FOSTER. No, but I thought the hon. gentleman would be courteous enough—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, from his long experience as a member of the House, knows that he cannot interrupt a speaker unless the speaker gives permission.

Mr. FOSTER. I just wish to ask—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask permission of the Chair—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Unless the hon. gentleman rises to a question of order, he has no right to interrupt without the permission of the hon. gentleman who is addressing the Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask just this—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. I am rising to a point of procedure. I am willing to take your advice, Mr. Speaker, and your advice is, that I have no right to interrupt the hon. gentleman unless with his consent. But how am I to get his consent, if I am not to be allowed to ask him for it?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to refuse his consent.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman was trying to stop me in the middle of a sentence. It is an old trick of his. He and I have sat in this House a good many years together, and I have watched him very closely. I have always noticed that, whenever a statement is being made which he thinks goes strongly against the position he takes, he jumps up to break the force of it by interrupting. I am perfectly willing that he should make all the interruptions he pleases, but he must do so at the proper time.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order, order.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to read this letter:

Ottawa, 19th February, 1898.

Dear Sir Wilfrid,—In reply to your inquiry of this date, I beg leave to say that I have never communicated to the Hon. Mr. Sifton or anybody else any proposition from Mr. Hamilton Smith concerning the building of a railway towards the Yukon district, nor had I authority from him to make any proposition.

Faithfully yours,

W. C. VAN HORNE.

Now, if the hon. gentleman wants to ask me a question, I shall be happy to answer him.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask my hon. friend to read just exactly what question was put to Sir William Van Horne, to which that letter was an answer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The question put to Sir William Van Horne is contained in the letter addressed by the right hon. the Premier to that gentleman on the 19th of February, 1898:

Privy Council, Canada,

Ottawa, 19th February, 1898.

Dear Sir William Van Horne:

On the 15th instant, I received from Mr. Hamilton Smith a letter as to the statements of which I would desire to communicate with you.

Mr. Smith, in his letter, makes the following assertions:—

"My associates and myself have for many years been connected with the Treadwell mine and other gold mines on the coast of Alaska, so that we have been especially familiar with that northern country. Last year, at our instance, Mr. Henry Bratnober was sent on an exploring expedition from Lynn Canal to Dawson, with instructions to see what route was best adapted for the construction of a railway from the coast to the unobstructed waters of the Yukon. He returned by the so-called Dalton trail from Rink Rapids by Hootchie and Dalton's Post, to Pyramid Harbour, noting elevations, distances and the character of the country. He was, we are informed, the second white man who had passed over the entire length of this line. His report to us was so favourable as to the many advantages of this route, that as soon as your Minister of the Interior returned from the west, I approached him through a mutual friend, offering to build, in the year 1898, a substantial railway from Pyramid Harbour to Rink Rapids, with no cash subsidy, but with a reasonable land grant covering mineral rights. At the time, I referred, by authority, to several of the largest financial firms in London, showing that our ability to build such a line was beyond question.

"The answer I received was, that the Government might prefer the Stikine-Teslin route. To this I replied that in my judgment, from my familiarity with the country was correct, the Stikine line had practically no value as a commercial route, and that no sane capitalist would invest a penny in it; but, of course, if the Government would give the right assistance, we would build the line, while disclaiming any responsibility for its value when constructed.

"Doubtless, these informal negotiations were communicated to the Cabinet."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So far as I have read is a quotation from Mr. Hamilton Smith's letter. My right hon. friend the Premier goes on to say :

The Hon. Mr. Sifton, to whom I gave immediate communication of this letter, stated that the above assertion was altogether untrue.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—(reading)—

I thereupon invited Mr. Hamilton Smith to meet me this morning in my office, and he accordingly met me there in the presence of a few of my colleagues, and then, in answer to our inquiries, stated that you were the mutual friend who had communicated between him and Mr. Sifton.

Under such circumstances, I would feel obliged, if you would let me know at your earliest convenience whether, as is claimed by Mr. Hamilton Smith, you can corroborate his statement.

Believe me, dear Sir William,

Yours very sincerely,

(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

Nothing could be plainer than the question put to Sir William Van Horne, and nothing could be plainer or more unequivocal than Sir William Van Horne's answer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If these hon. gentlemen accept his answer, I am justified in the statement with which I prefaced my remarks, that, so far as the Government is concerned, we have found Mr. Hamilton Smith to have been a prevaricator.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And I have no hesitation in saying further, that the only conclusion any one can draw from the facts is, that this man made this offer to the Government after he had first communicated its contents to the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I repeat my statement, and I make it with authority, because I asked the question myself of Mr. Hamilton Smith, and I say that Mr. Smith, having first communicated his offer to the hon. leader of the Opposition, I am justified in coming to the conclusion that Mr. Smith's offer was a mere kite which the hon. gentleman was playing for the purpose of misleading the public.

Mr. IVES. Whether Mr. Smith is a prevaricator or not, it is quite evident that these hon. gentlemen are trying to make him out one. They do not like the proposition he has made, because it is understood by the people of this country as infinitely more advantageous than the offer they accepted

secretly and suddenly for fear a better one would be made. It is quite evident, whatever may be the character of Mr. Smith, that the members of the Government are in a conspiracy—I will not say anything further—to make him out a prevaricator. But let us see how far the correspondence shows him to be a prevaricator. Mr. Smith says that he approached a mutual friend. I do not know whether it is contested or not, but I do not think it can be successfully denied, that Sir William Van Horne is at present a friend of the right hon. leader of the Government. I do not think the leader of the Government would want to deny that charge. Sir William Van Horne has not denied that he is a friend of Mr. Smith; so that Mr. Smith's statement that Sir William Van Horne is a mutual friend both of himself and the leader of the Government is certainly not a prevarication. Now, what does Mr. Smith say that he communicated to Sir William Van Horne. He says :

I approached the Minister of the Interior through a mutual friend, offering to build, in the year 1898, a substantial railway from Pyramid Harbour to Rink Rapids, &c., &c.

What does Sir William Van Horne, in his letter, deny? Does he deny that this offer was made? Does he deny any part of this conversation at all?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. IVES. Not at all, but he writes a very diplomatic letter indeed, in which he is exceedingly careful as to what he denies, and exceedingly careful not to assert anything. He happened, fortunately, to be here in Ottawa at the time. He was here, as everybody knows, lobbying for the Government to promote this Yukon Bill and push it through. He happened to be here, very handy, and received the letter, and he answers :

Dear Sir Wilfrid :

In reply to your inquiry of this date, I beg leave to say that I have never communicated to the Hon. Mr. Sifton or anybody else any proposition from Mr. Hamilton Smith concerning the building of a railway towards the Yukon district, nor had I authority from him to make any proposition.

That means simply that Sir William Van Horne received the simple communication of a simple financier from London, made to him in all trustfulness. He took him in, he swallowed him, but said nothing about it. The people of this country are not all fools, and they have the evidence of the true inwardness of this business. They understand that Mr. Smith was not a prevaricator, but made a very great mistake indeed in his choice of a mutual friend to communicate this proposition of his to the Minister of the Interior. The people of the country generally do not say that the hon. Minister of the Interior told an untruth, when he de-

nied that this proposition was communicated to him, but they have made up their mind that the Canadian Pacific Railway and Sir William Van Horne preferred the Stikine-Teslin route, and preferred Mann & Mackenzie for some reason—many think, because they are interested in the contract. Consequently, the mutual friend was mum, said nothing, but he hurried on the execution of the contract, and pushed the Government to a point from which they could not retrace their steps, and then he comes out, like the diplomat he is, and denies nothing that Mr. Smith said at all. We can only conclude that Mr. Smith trusted him and was deceived, that Mr. Hamilton Smith expected him to make a communication to the Government, and he did not do so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). Read the last clause of Sir William Van Horne's letter.

Mr. IVES. I do not know about that, but I know that the Minister of the Interior, in his declaration, as stated to the House by the right hon. leader of the Government, denies in toto that any communication was made to him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He has taken that back.

Mr. IVES. Well, I am not here every day, so I suppose I must apologize for not understanding all the sharp turns in this affair. I do know that the people of this country understand, that, for some reason, Sir William Van Horne preferred to have Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie have the contract for this road rather than that it should go to Mr. Hamilton Smith's friends, and, therefore, he kept quiet until it was too late for Mr. Hamilton Smith's proposition to be acted upon by the Government, and then he comes out and says: I did not communicate that proposition to the Government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). How do you get over the last statement?

Mr. IVES. The last statement is "I was not authorized to do so."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. IVES. Oh, well, that is very plain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. IVES. Sir William Van Horne simply says: I have no written authority; if I had gone to the Government and laid this proposition before them without a written authority and they had called upon me to implement it, I should have got my great railway corporation into a bad fix. What he means is this: Though I had this conversation that has been referred to, though I knew the financial standing of these London men to be adequate and sufficient, though I knew that Mr. Hamilton Smith and his fellow capitalists could build this road and would

Mr. IVES.

build it if the contract were given them, I preferred that the others should have the work, and as Mr. Hamilton Smith did not authorize me in writing, I say now that I was not authorized to lay the proposition before the Government. That is what it means and nothing else. As to the effort that is made to draw a red herring across the trail and make it appear that Mr. Hamilton Smith has told a lie in saying—which he never did say—that he was making an offer on behalf of Lord Rothschild, as my hon. friend has pointed out, in his letter which the Premier gave to the House in most dramatic fashion, Mr. Hamilton Smith distinctly says: "Let me correct one misunderstanding which has appeared in the House and in the press; I am not acting in any way for Lord Rothschild's firm." Yet, with that in the "Hansard" and in the public press and in the minds of the people, what is the step taken to discredit this man and make him out a prevaricator. The Premier sends a telegram which he does not dare to lay on the Table of the House, to Lord Strathcona, no doubt asking him if Lord Rothschild was a party to Mr. Hamilton Smith's offer. Lord Rothschild, being communicated with, says "No," and this is handed to the press and published through the country in order to make this man out a prevaricator. Instead of being a prevaricator it seems to me that he was simple enough to be taken in and gulled by Sir William Van Horne.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I wish to draw attention to one or two points that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ives), who has just sat down, has made. In the first place, I must congratulate the hon. gentleman upon the dramatic and ingenious way in which he seems to be able to read into Sir William Van Horne's letter a great deal that does not appear on the surface. The hon. gentleman, first of all, declined to read the final clause of that letter, which clause is a most emphatic denial of the statement made by Mr. Smith in his letter, which was quoted by the Premier, in regard to the message he sent to the Minister of the Interior. Mr. Smith there distinctly stated that he had, through a mutual friend, sent an offer to the Government. And when he was confronted by the members of the Government and asked who that mutual friend was, he stated to the Premier in the presence of several members of the Government that that mutual friend was Sir William Van Horne. Now, Sir William Van Horne denies emphatically that he had read any such communication from Mr. Smith.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, emphatically.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Hon. gentlemen may say "no," but they

cannot twist plain English words into meaning anything but what they manifestly mean; and, if words mean anything, then Sir William Van Horne plainly and distinctly states that he had not from Mr. Smith the authority referred to.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Sir William Van Horne states distinctly that he never communicated to the Hon. Mr. Sifton or anybody else any proposition from Mr. Hamilton Smith concerning the building of a railway towards the Yukon district, nor had he authority from him to make any proposition. If he had no authority to make it, on what ground or in what way can Mr. Hamilton Smith support his statement that he had made a proposition to the Government? If he did not authorize Sir William Van Horne to approach the Government, how can he imagine for a moment that the public will believe he made the proposition to the Government? It is only by reason of his statement that he, through a mutual friend, had come before the Government—in other words, had authorized that friend to make a proposition—that he has any basis for his letter and for the statement which the leader of the Opposition has been discussing here. If that is not the meaning of his words, he has no basis for his argument, and if that is the meaning of his words then, Sir William Van Horne's denial that he had any such authority is sufficient refutation of the statement.

But, the hon. leader of the Opposition, a few moments ago, without rising in his place, made a statement to which I must take exception. That statement was incorrect in fact and without justification in any way. He threw across the floor the remark that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior had withdrawn his statement, that statement being that he, the Minister of the Interior, had not directly or indirectly received any communication from Mr. Hamilton Smith.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In his own statement in reply to a question on the Order paper to-day he has withdrawn it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Minister of the Interior in no sense or way withdrew it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He completely withdrew it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In no sense or way did he withdraw it. He could not withdraw it, because, as a matter of fact, no such proposition was made to him on behalf of Mr. Hamilton Smith by anybody—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He admits that it was—

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE—
and the Minister of the Interior having

made that statement, with full cognizance of what he was saying, a few nights ago in the debate, had no reason to think for a moment of withdrawing it, because it was a true statement and he could not, with truth, withdraw it. Nor did he use any words which the leader of the Opposition could in any way construe into a withdrawal of his statement. I want the hon. gentleman and the House and the country to understand that the Minister of the Interior in no way withdraws that statement, but maintains it, and that it is a true statement in fact.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This discussion raises some important, some very serious considerations. In the first place, I desire to draw the attention of the House to the unqualified promise made by the hon. Premier only yesterday in this House. The leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) spoke as follows:—

Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the House if he would be good enough to lay on the Table a copy of the telegram which was sent to Lord Strathcona in reference to Mr. Hamilton Smith. The answer of Lord Strathcona having been given to the public, I think it very desirable that we should have the message that was transmitted to him.

And the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) replied:

I have no objection, and shall lay it on the Table to-morrow.

And to-day the right hon. the leader of the Government pretends to fly into a frenzy and makes a great ado about being the guardian of his own honour, when he says that the promise of yesterday is not binding upon him to-day. We have had other samples of his promises and we know how much he has done in the way of performance. But this beats the record, Mr. Speaker. There never has been a promise of his so quickly violated as the promise made by the right hon. gentleman yesterday and broken within twenty-four hours.

But there are other questions involved in this discussion, that has become somewhat sharp. It is a serious thing for the Minister of Marine, or for any other member of a Government, to use the extraordinary language that he used about a gentleman, Mr. Smith, or Mr. Brown, or any other man outside of this House, without having the most positive ground for his statement. He has charged Mr. Smith with being a prevaricator of the truth, he has charged him with having made a statement that had not a vestige of truth in it; and we have to-day evidence from the Minister of the Interior himself that goes to confirm, almost to a letter, the statement which he branded as being untrue. And I shall show it, Mr. Speaker. Whether I fall in that or not, I rise in the interest of fair-play to put this question to the Government: Seeing the large interests that are

at stake, the undoubted general interest taken in the offer of Mr. Hamilton Smith, the interest the right hon. gentleman himself took in that offer, the importance that he has attached to the offer in connection with this cable correspondence across the Atlantic to an officer of this Government, of which we are, it seems, to be permitted only to see a part; recognizing that it is a bona fide offer, recognizing its importance, the interest in it is sufficiently great to clear up once and for all, as it could be cleared up, this supposed confusion as to what occurred between Mr. Smith and Sir William Van Horne, and at the same time, incidentally to ascertain the financial standing and integrity and character of Mr. Hamilton Smith. Of course, that would involve the question of accuracy as between these gentlemen on the Treasury benches and Mr. Smith himself in this matter. It can be very easily done. The right hon. gentleman, if he feels himself to be on sure ground, can have a committee of this House appointed, and that committee can sift to the bottom, in one sitting, the truth or falsity in connection with these statements; and we will see whether the prevaricator is outside or inside this House. Now, Sir, I never heard the English language so twisted, sentences so distorted, in an attempt to put another construction upon a record before this House, as has been attempted on this occasion. I never heard of any man being treated so unfairly as Mr. Smith has been treated by Ministers of the Crown. As I have followed the statements of the Minister of the Interior and of the right hon. leader of the Government himself, I say there is the best evidence, on the face of it, that throughout the whole business Mr. Hamilton Smith has acted without the suspicion of attempting to misrepresent anything or any person. I say that Sir William Van Horne, in this letter, has taken the greatest pains not to contradict one single statement made by Mr. Hamilton Smith, he has taken the greatest precaution, not merely to approach it in a diplomatic way, as one might think on first blush, but to state the exact truth. But the evidence is undoubted that Mr. Smith said to Sir William Van Horne what he has said he did, that Sir William Van Horne did approach the Minister of the Interior, if we are to believe the Minister of the Interior—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I beg to say to the hon. gentleman that I do not ask him to believe the Minister of the Interior. It is a matter of perfect indifference to me whether he believes me or not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not know what the purpose of the interruption is. I do not think the Minister of the Interior was following me. I say that if the Minister of the Interior is to

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

be believed—because, judging from some remarks of his colleagues, there are members of this House that do not accept his statement to-day, as I have accepted it in good faith. I say that if the Minister of the Interior is to be believed in this matter, Sir William Van Horne did approach him, and did tell him of these informal negotiations, which Mr. Hamilton Smith says were informal. I can hardly believe it possible that any hon. gentleman will contradict the statement the Minister of the Interior has made to-day, when referring to his language used only a short time ago in the House:

That gentleman stated to me upon one occasion, in the course of a casual conversation, that there was a gentleman named Hamilton Smith who was prepared to call upon me for the purpose of discussing the question of a railway to the Yukon.

He tells us that that gentleman was no other than Sir William Van Horne. Here we have the confirmation of the statement which Mr. Hamilton Smith makes in his letter, which is to this effect: That after having had that conversation, Sir William Van Horne reported to him that he had seen the Minister—and no one has contradicted that—because, after having told Sir William Van Horne of what he was prepared to do in what he calls these informal negotiations, he says:

The answer I received—

And after what we have heard, it was doubtless from Sir William Van Horne, after he had seen the Minister of the Interior.

The answer I received was that the Government might prefer the Stikine-Teslin route.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Not from Sir William Van Horne.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How does the hon. gentleman know? I say that, taking the answer of the Minister of the Interior to-day, and taking the letter of Sir William Van Horne, it is impossible to come to any other reasonable conclusion than that Sir William Van Horne did convey the conversation which undoubtedly took place between Mr. Smith and Sir William Van Horne, to the Minister of the Interior, whether that casual conversation or some other casual conversation. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we have this fact, that Sir William Van Horne did have a conversation with Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith states the purport of it; Sir William Van Horne, when told the purport of it, does not deny that that conversation took place. He is careful not to deny what Mr. Smith says passed between them, but only that he had authority from Mr. Smith to make any proposition. Fairness to Mr. Smith, why did not the Minister of Marine, if he desired to treat that gentleman with ordinary fair-play, refer to this sentence

that Mr. Smith inserted in his communication to the right hon. the Prime Minister :

Doubtless, these informal negotiations were communicated to the Cabinet.

He could not positively be sure that what he had told Sir William Van Horne had gone direct, in so many words and in the terms named, to the Cabinet; and therefore he did not make the statement which these hon. gentlemen are so loud in contradicting. He made a very different statement. He set out with great care the facts and points of the statement made to Sir William Van Horne, and then concludes: "Doubtless these were communicated to the Government." The answer of Sir William Van Horne is, not that a single word has been misrepresented by Mr. Hamilton Smith, but all he says is: "I had no authority from him to make any proposition." What he did do, and no one will deny that he did, was to go to the Minister of the Interior, as the Minister of the Interior tells us, and tell that gentleman that Mr. Hamilton Smith was prepared to call upon him for the purpose of discussing the question of a railway to the Yukon. I venture to say that it is not to be believed by any one, until positively so stated, that on that occasion Sir William Van Horne did not tell the Minister of the Interior all he knew of Mr. Hamilton Smith as regards his financial standing, and what an offer from a man like that would mean, and what importance should be attached to it. I take it that no member on the Treasury benches will seek to make this House believe that the conversation, casual or otherwise, ended without the Minister of the Interior learning from Sir William Van Horne that Mr. Smith was a man in every way able to carry out any undertaking that he should put his name to. Therefore, under the circumstances, knowing that this gentleman's financial standing is undoubted, I do not understand myself why the Government should make such a fierce, such an unfair, such an unfounded attack upon him. I again urge upon the Government the request, that if there is any question, as they themselves have insisted, as to the facts, seeing the importance they attach to that offer, the trouble they have already taken about it, the interest in the country over the matter, they should form a committee, let them have a committee of their own choosing, to ascertain just what the facts actually were and are, where there has been misrepresentation, or where there has been any attempt to deceive or mislead. I will not conclude these observations without calling further attention to the language in a communication the Prime Minister read to this House and which was addressed to him by Mr. Smith. The right hon. Prime Minister, repeating the letter addressed to him, said—quoting from Mr. Hamilton Smith's first letter :

His report to us was so favourable as to the many advantages of this route that as soon as your Minister of the Interior returned from the west, I approached him through a mutual friend, offering to build in the year 1898 a substantial railway from Pyramid Harbour to Rink Rapids, with no cash subsidy, but with a reasonable land grant covering mineral rights. At the time, I referred, by authority, to several of the largest financial firms in London, showing that our ability to build such a line was beyond question.

The answer I received was—

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). From them ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. From Sir William Van Horne.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From those men ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am reading from Mr. Hamilton Smith's letter, quoted by the right hon. Prime Minister; and the Minister of Public Works will see that while there is an ambiguity about it, his solution cannot possibly be correct.

The answer I received was, that the Government might prefer the Stikine-Teslin route.

I have argued to-day, and I can only reason about it, that this was after the conversation between the Minister of the Interior and Sir William Van Horne.

To this I replied that in my judgment, from my familiarity with the country, was correct. The Stikine line had practically no value as a commercial route, and that no sane capitalist would invest a penny in it; but, of course, if the Government would give the right assistance, we would build the line, while disclaiming any responsibility for its value when constructed.

Let me emphasize my point, for I desire to make it, as to my mind it relieves Mr. Hamilton Smith entirely from occupying any questionable position before this House or before the country. Sir William Van Horne's letter does not deny any statement there made. For instance, he does not deny that Mr. Hamilton Smith told him he would build by either route, that he preferred one, but if the Government wanted it, he would build the other. All Sir William Van Horne says is that Mr. Hamilton Smith did not then and there authorize me to make a proposition by you to carry out the work. There, Mr. Hamilton Smith no doubt did not understand the view which Sir William was taking. But to my mind there has been nothing said in debate, there is nothing in this correspondence to show that the statement is not absolutely correct, and it is, that he told Sir William of his readiness and willingness to perform the work, and went no further; he did not make a formal offer or commission Sir William to make it. He then goes on to say :

Doubtless, these informal negotiations were communicated to the Cabinet.

The right hon. Prime Minister says in a letter :

The Hon. Mr. Sifton, to whom I gave immediate communication of this letter, stated that the above assertion was altogether untrue.

I hope the leader of the Government misrepresented what the Minister of the Interior stated to him, because it would place the Minister of the Interior in the position of being the most reckless of men. It would be absolutely impossible for the Minister to state whether that conversation occurred or did not occur. It is not pretended he was present. The conversation was one purporting to have taken place between Sir William Van Horne and Mr. Hamilton Smith. The First Minister goes on to say :

I thereupon invited Mr. Hamilton Smith to meet me this morning in my office, and he accordingly met me there in the presence of a few of my colleagues, and then, in answer to our inquiries, stated that you were the mutual friend who had communicated between him and Mr. Sifton.

The hon. Minister of the Interior says every word of that statement is true. He has said so to-day. He says Sir William was the man who communicated between them. Again :

Under such circumstances, I would feel obliged, if you would let me know at your earliest convenience whether, as is claimed by Mr. Hamilton Smith, you can corroborate his statement.

Now we will see what Sir William Van Horne says in answer to that letter, setting out the statement in detail :

Dear Sir Wilfrid,—In reply to your inquiry of this date, I beg leave to say that I have never communicated to the Hon. Mr. Sifton or anybody else any proposition from Mr. Hamilton Smith concerning the building of a railway towards the Yukon district, nor had I authority from him to make any proposition.

But the Minister of the Interior, confirming that statement, and which in detail is not denied so far as it was a conversation, said that Sir William Van Horne told him that Mr. Hamilton Smith was prepared to call upon him for the purpose of discussing the question of a railway to the Yukon. It is not for me to enter into the relations of Mr. Hamilton Smith or Sir William Van Horne, nor does it much concern the public as to whether good faith was kept by one or the other; but I say that so far as the record is disclosed, Mr. Hamilton Smith having stated what he says he did to Sir William Van Horne, and that not being denied by Sir William, any reasonable man has a right to suppose that during the casual conversation Sir William told the Minister of the Interior what he had told him in regard to his readiness and ability to carry out this work.

THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR
(Mr. Sifton). Inasmuch as to what took
Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

place in a conversation with myself as has become the subject of discussion in the House, I would have preferred not to have taken part in the debate, but when my hon. friend who has just taken his seat rose to speak, I made up my mind from something which dropped from his lips that it was desirable I should reply to him. At the same time I must confess that before the hon. gentleman sat down the necessity for the reply had apparently disappeared. I desire to call the attention of the House for a moment to the peculiar position in which our friends of the Opposition are placing themselves, and the extraordinary methods of argument to which they are resorting in order to make something out of nothing, because it is apparent that that is the attempt in which they are engaged. In the first place, we have an attempt made to saddle this Government with the responsibility of having received an offer for the construction of a line of railway involving the expenditure of some millions of dollars, which it is not alleged was ever reduced to writing or properly communicated to the Government. When it is considered that the gentleman who is supposed to have made this offer has apparently had a large experience, and has been described by the leader of the Opposition as representing very large and important business houses, hon. members must consider that a ridiculous phase of the proposition has been placed before them, namely, that this gentleman came here, was prepared to make an offer and did make an offer for the construction of a railway but never put it in writing before the Government. On its very face the proposition is silly and is quite contrary to all ordinary business transactions. It is almost enough to make a business man smile when the proposition is made.

Now, I gave an answer to a question, this afternoon, which apparently has afforded hon. gentlemen opposite a certain amount of comfort in their desire to construct something out of nothing. Let me remind my hon. friends of the old Latin maxim, which I will put in English: "From nothing nothing comes." The hon. gentlemen opposite may labour a long time, but they will not succeed in convincing the people of this country that the agent of an important English business house came to the Government of Canada for the purpose of making a proposition, and hung around here for two months, and never wrote that proposition upon a sheet of paper or submitted it to anybody. The other evening, the hon. the leader of the Opposition asked me a question, and I answered it, and I answered it, I presume, in the terms which are stated in the question upon the Order paper to-day: which is substantially correct. I said that gentleman, who, I say now, was Sir William Van Horne, being in my office one morning, said to me, that there was a gentleman named Hamilton Smith who was

prepared to call upon me for the purpose of discussing the question of a railway to the Yukon; Sir William Van Horne said: I was asked to mention his name to you; I have mentioned his name to you." Well, Mr. Speaker, that gentleman, Mr. Hamilton Smith, never called. Why, Sir, if the hon. gentleman would, about that time, go to the flat in the Langevin Block where my office is, they would have seen two waiting-rooms filled with gentlemen waiting to see me about the Yukon. I personally never undertook to keep track of them all. I was perfectly willing to interview every one who came in, if I had time to do so, and, if Mr. Hamilton Smith had called on me, I would have discussed the matter with him to the best of my ability, and I would have done as would any Minister who had a grain of sense; I would have communicated to the leader of the Government and to my colleagues the substance of what he had said to me.

Sir William Van Horne went out, after having mentioned Mr. Hamilton Smith's name, and Mr. Hamilton Smith never called, and he never made any proposition, and, therefore, when Mr. Hamilton Smith makes a statement to the effect that he had approached the Minister of the Interior through a mutual friend, offering to build in the year 1898 a substantial railway from Pyramid Harbour to Rink Rapids without any cash subsidy, but with a reasonable land grant covering mineral rights, he made a statement which is altogether untrue—altogether untrue, I say. That, I presume, almost anybody can understand. If a man comes and says, over his signature, to the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, that he approached the Minister of the Interior and made an offer, and if that man did not make an offer, and if no offer was made, is his statement true or untrue? Let any member of the House answer that question. It seems to me to be pretty clear that the man's statement is untrue. Now, Mr. Smith said that he made an offer, and he subsequently said that he made it through Sir William Van Horne. Sir William Van Horne says:

I have never communicated with the Hon. Mr. Sifton, or anybody else, any proposition.

Well, he does not say, "offer"; he says, "proposition." Does the one not include the other? Can our friends opposite get any political comfort out of the fact that the word "proposition" and the word "offer" are not exactly the same? Did not "proposition"? Why, certainly not. Sir William Van Horne says, if he had made me an "offer," that he had not made me a "proposition"? Why, certainly not. Sir William Van Horne puts it in the broadest and most general and most comprehensive way, when he says that he never made to me, or to anybody else, any proposition from Mr. Hamilton Smith concerning the building of

a railway towards the Yukon district; nor had he any authority to do so.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) allow me to ask him a question?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Certainly.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) say whether Sir William Van Horne discussed with him the substance of Hamilton Smith's proposed proposal, or the proposal that was to be made some time thereafter?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I say, most emphatically, that Sir William Van Horne never discussed with me anything of the kind. I tried to convey the idea to the House pretty clearly, but it seems to be difficult to some of my hon. friends opposite. There never was any proposition made, and so there could not be anything discussed, because it was not made. The only knowledge I had of the name of Mr. Hamilton Smith was when Sir William Van Horne said to me: There is a gentleman named Hamilton Smith who is either going to call upon you, or prepared to call, about a railway to the Yukon; I was asked to mention his name, and I have done so. Mr. Hamilton Smith did not call. The proposition was not made; it could not be discussed, and it was not discussed. It is perfectly clear, I think, therefore, that when Mr. Hamilton Smith made this statement, he made a statement which was untrue. He made a statement which he had the opportunity of retracting, and he refused to retract, and he now stands convicted by two witnesses at least—the only persons who could corroborate or deny the statement—namely, myself and Sir William Van Horne, and both have unequivocally contradicted the statement which has been made by Mr. Hamilton Smith.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary for me to say anything more about it. I cannot conceive what our hon. friends opposite are talking about. They are simply playing upon words; they are simply trying to gather some shadow of an argument out of something that does not afford an opportunity to do so. The plain statement is: Mr. Hamilton Smith said he made a proposition. He did not make a proposition, and it has been proven that he did not do so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). From the remarks of the Minister of the Interior, it will be apparent to the House, that, if there is any quibble upon words in regard to this matter, it is a quibble by hon. gentlemen opposite, and not by Mr. Hamilton Smith. As I understand it, Sir William Van Horne has not denied anything that Mr. Hamilton Smith has said. Mr. Smith has said that he approached the Minister of the Interior, offering certain things, and he mentions at

once that he understood that these informal negotiations were communicated to the Cabinet. Has Sir William Van Horne said anything which is in the slightest degree contradictory of that? The Minister of the Interior has frankly told us that what transpired at the conversation between Sir William Van Horne and himself was this: That Sir William Van Horne told him, either that a gentleman would call or was prepared to call for the purpose of making an offer to construct the railway. Now, according to the Minister of the Interior himself, this was a matter affecting to the greatest possible extent the interests of the Yukon country and of the Dominion, and the Minister was told, according to his own statement, that a gentleman representing English capitalists of the very highest standing was prepared to call upon him for the purpose of making an offer with regard to this important project. And what does the Minister of the Interior do? One would suppose that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton), if he had the interests of the country and of his department at heart, would himself take steps to communicate with Mr. Hamilton Smith. One would suppose that, if an offer of that kind had been suggested to him, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) might, in the intervals of his conversations with these gentlemen who were calling at his office, have taken five minutes to dictate a letter to his secretary, asking Mr. Hamilton Smith, if he had any offer with regard to that matter, to submit it to him. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) is in a hurry to as speedily as possible close this deal with Mann & Mackenzie, and so he closed it only eight days before Parliament opens.

It does seem very remarkable to me that the communication to Lord Strathcona sent by the right hon. the Prime Minister, was yesterday of such a character that it could properly be submitted to the House, and to-day has changed its character so that it cannot be submitted. It also seems a remarkable thing to me—I may be mistaken about it—that, if the communication sent to Lord Strathcona was of the private and confidential character which has been suggested by the right hon. gentleman, that he should have seen fit to submit the answer to it to the press of this country, knowing very well, or understanding very well—if his statement in the House is to be relied upon to-day—that the communication, an answer to which it was, could not be submitted to the House. I do not think hon. gentlemen on either side of the House can come to the conclusion that that is dealing fairly with Mr. Hamilton Smith; and, as Mr. Hamilton Smith cannot make his defence in this House, I think the right hon. leader of the Government should give him the fair-play that is always due to a man who is not here to speak for himself.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Now, there are three things that are apparent: In the first place, that Mr. Hamilton Smith had some conversation with Sir William Van Horne about this matter since these negotiations commenced—that cannot be controverted; in the second place, that Sir William Van Horne had some conversation with the hon. the Minister of the Interior about it; and, in the third place, that the suggestion to the Minister of the Interior was not acted upon in any way by him, although it had an important bearing on a subject that has been discussed in this House at great length. Now, I do not think the country cares very much whether or not there was any misunderstanding between Mr. Hamilton Smith and Sir William Van Horne or between Sir William Van Horne and the Minister of the Interior. But what the country does care about is this: whether or not there was a man with competent financial backing who was prepared to build this railway for one-fourth of the land which the Government propose to give to Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie; and if hon. gentlemen opposite think that the country is to be deluded by any question of a misunderstanding between these gentlemen, when the real question in the case is whether or not there was a bona fide offer, they are very much mistaken. It will not do to meet the country with any quibble about misunderstandings or about confidential communications which cannot be brought before this House. What the country wants to know is whether Mr. Hamilton Smith has behind him men who are prepared to build this railway for 1,000,000 acres of land. Outside of that the country does not care one sixpence whether there was a misunderstanding between these gentlemen or not. The country also wants to know whether the Minister of the Interior was properly performing his duty the other day when, knowing that Mr. Hamilton Smith, with capitalists behind him was prepared to make this offer, he would not take five minutes of his valuable time to consider it.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to call the attention of the House to a statement in regard to Mr. Hamilton Smith contained in the "Monetary Times," a paper which I believe is in accord with the politics of hon. gentlemen opposite, from which it will be seen how the people, from a monetary standpoint and apart from the political aspects of the case, view this Mr. Hamilton Smith. Of course, we expect to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition talk in this House about this most respectable gentleman, this man of great financial standing; but I want to show what the people of this country think of the offer that was made by this man of such great ability and such wonderful financial power. According to the statement made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Borden, Halifax) Mr.

Hamilton Smith complained that the Government did not seek after him. Well, I do not think it is the business of the Government to run after men like Mr. Hamilton Smith. This Government can just as easily be approached by Mr. Hamilton Smith as the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). But Mr. Hamilton Smith sat in the gallery of this House in the afternoons, and every communication that has been given to the country was given by him to hon. gentlemen opposite, and not to the Government. He has never made a proposition in writing to the Government. The only proposition he made was given out by another member who represents one of the Yorks. Now, let me say that Mr. Hamilton Smith went out into the Yukon country in company with young Mr. Onderdonk, and they examined the country together; and when young Mr. Onderdonk returned, the first thing that happened to him on his arrival in Hamilton was to be interviewed on the proposed railway in the Yukon country. Of course, he condemned the Government, because, if you remember, his father was "my friend Onderdonk," of the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition; and this young man is associated with Mr. Hamilton Smith. In the "Monetary Times," Mr. Hamilton Smith is termed, "Mr. Hamilton Smith, who represents a New York company"—not an English company, not the Rothschilds. It says:

Mr. Hamilton Smith, who represents a New York company, and talks a good deal about the Rothschilds, in a letter to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, offers on behalf of his associates, to build a railway from the Lynn Canal, on the Dalton route, 288 miles, for a subsidy of 1,000,000 acres of land. He makes it a condition that no other railway from the Lynn Canal be authorized within the year, and that he be authorized to charge "proper traffic rates." He also offers to build a railway by the Stikine-Teslin route for a subsidy of 2,000,000 acres. He claims, on the basis of Mr. Jennings's report, that the provisional contract let to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann will absorb 4,500,000. If Mr. Smith be in earnest he should have made his proposal in a formal way before the provisional contract for the Stikine-Teslin road created the actual complications.

Now, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) would like the Government to go around and peddle their offer throughout the country to Mr. Hamilton Smith or other contractors, simply because Mr. Hamilton Smith comes down here and makes a fake offer—I cannot give it any other name. Speaking on my responsibility as a member, from my place in the House, I say that no contractor of any standing would make a serious offer which he intended to fulfil without putting it in writing; and no company, to say nothing of a Government, would accept a proposition, particularly a verbal proposition, from a man who was hob-nobbing with the members of the Opposition and simply trying to put the Government in a fix. My hon. friend from

Halifax (Mr. Borden) bemoans the fact that Mr. Hamilton Smith is not able to reply. Mr. Hamilton Smith simply made the offer, and ran off to New York, and he is now on the Atlantic.

An hon. MEMBER. No, he is here.

Mr. GIBSON. Very well, whether he is on the Atlantic or in this House, he has plenty of friends on the Opposition side of this House, and we have an opportunity this afternoon of judging how much they think of Mr. Hamilton Smith and his offer. The fact of the matter is this, Mr. Speaker, their bubble has "busted"; the whole thing has been exploded. When I left for the west on Friday, I was told that we were going to have something of a wonderful character brought down to the House by the gentlemen who were advocating the case of Mr. Hamilton Smith and his Yankee partner Onderdonk—and perhaps some of our friends on the other side would like to be taken in with them.

An hon. MEMBER. They are in now.

Mr. GIBSON. They are in now. They simply wanted to embarrass the Government. That is all that this whole matter amounted to from the beginning to the end. I was told before leaving for the west last week that we were going to have some great revelations brought before the House on Monday, and it is rather singular to find that these so-called revelations should come from the two members representing the Yorks in Ontario and the Yorks in New Brunswick, and I shall leave the House and the country to judge how much these gentlemen are in accord with their leader, judging by some of the remarks we have heard from them in this House. But I say that no man occupying the position as a member of this House could declare that this Mr. Hamilton Smith has made a bona fide offer to the Government and repeat that before his constituents. There is nothing in black and white to which these men could be held. What then would be the result of negotiating with them? The Government, after they had solemnly agreed to a contract, subject to the ratification of Parliament, would have simply opened up negotiations which would have caused no end of delay, and the result of which would have been that instead of this man coming up and confirming his offer by entering into a solemn contract, the whole summer would be absorbed by the Government in looking after Mr. Smith and his phantom associates and security in New York State, and the railway would never be built in time for the coming season's business.

Mr. POWELL. There is one thing on which the House is thoroughly satisfied, and that is that the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has "busted the bubble," to use his own expression. He says that gen-

tllemen on this side are evidently anxious to be on the ground floor with the gentlemen who made the offer to the Government which the Government failed to entertain. I would ask the House if it is a perfect bonanza to be on the ground floor with the gentlemen who offered to construct this road for one million acres of land, what kind of a bonanza would it not be to be on the ground floor with the gentlemen who have got the contract for 4,000,000 acres.

Mr. GIBSON. I would not like the hon. gentleman to put words in my mouth which I did not say, and I hope he will forgive me for correcting him. I never made any reference to the value, but what I said was that there was no contract, but simply a "fake" offer from Mr. Smith.

Mr. POWELL. Then I fail to understand still further what the hon. gentleman was aiming at. An offer, as I understand, has already been made, and if there is any fakeism about it, what object can hon. gentlemen on this side have in seeking to be partners with Smith? That may be very clear to the hon. gentleman, but it is rather puzzling to myself.

Hon. gentlemen on this side are rather astonished that a gentleman who plumes himself on his title of knight (Sir Louis Davies) should be so far forgetful of the principles of honour as to defame a man unnecessarily and who is not present to defend himself. Such conduct may be looked upon as akin to that of the right hon. leader of the Government who fails to recognize any moral obligation to keep his word. The principle of elongated veracity, which seems so characteristic of that hon. gentleman, so far as keeping his promises is concerned, is only equalled by the tortuous principles of honour which are so characteristic of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies).

Just a word in reply to my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), and it was for this purpose alone I rose. As soon as this offer was made, I made some inquiries, in case these gentlemen who made the offer might have some speculative purpose in view, as to their financial substantiality. I found, in answer to my inquiries, that the gentlemen who made this offer to the Government—and I went to great trouble and took the greatest pains to find out their financial standing—are rated as follows:—I found that Mr. Hamilton Smith is a gentleman who is entrusted in England with a contract amounting in value to £4,000,000 sterling—that is about \$20,000,000, or about six times what it is calculated by the Government will be sufficient to build this Yukon Railway. He has associated with him in this offer a gentleman by the name of Harry Mosenthal. That gentleman, I find on application to the banking community, is the head of the large firm of Mosenthal Bros., and is reputed to be worth,

Mr. POWELL.

in his own name, no less a sum than \$5,000,000 or £1,000,000 sterling.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And not in New York.

Mr. POWELL. No, in London. I also find that he has associated with him in this offer a gentleman—and he is not a New York man either—by the name of J. H. Lukach, who signs on behalf of an exploration company which has a paid up capital of £1,100,000 sterling, and whose assets are estimated at no less a sum than £2,000,000 sterling. In addition to these, I find, among the applicants for this contract, Mr. Herbert Gibbs who, I am informed, is a member of the firm of Anthony Gibbs & Sons. Their exact rating I was not able to obtain, but I found that they are one of the most reliable and richest houses in London. Then I come to Mr. Lionel Phillips, another of the applicants, who is a member of the firm of Wernhor, Beid & Company, who are rated as the very richest financial firm in the whole city of London. The next gentleman I find on the list of Mr. Smith's associates is Lord Farquhar. It may be that the hon. gentleman from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) looks upon him as an American, but he was the late head of the firm of Sir Samuel Scott & Company, and was a partner in that firm with the Duke of Fife. He is, I understand, one of the rich men of England. When such men as these make an offer to the Government, all the Government have to do to prevent "fakeism" is to accept their offer; this done, there is a contract, and these men are pledged to carry it out. On the question as to whether Sir William Van Horne or Mr. Smith speaks the truth, or as to whether the ingenuity of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) is equal to the herculean task of proving that this gentleman, Mr. Smith, must necessarily and of malice aforethought be directly guilty of mendacity, I shall express no opinion, but this I shall say, that this country is going to hold these gentlemen responsible for throwing away no less than 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 acres of the richest gold fields to Mackenzie & Mann unnecessarily, when they reject an offer from men of such proved financial standing as those I have mentioned to build this railway for 1,000,000 acres. I think that the Government should take warning by the elections of yesterday. If by any possibility there could be submitted another contract after the Drummond deal and the Yukon deal, that strong right arm, as the right hon. leader of the Government was pleased to call the Hardy Government, would become withered, if not absolutely dead.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I desire just to say a word or two in reply to the hon. gentleman. I must say that, so far as his remarks about the country being in such a state are concerned, there is no proof of his

statement. I had a little experience during the past week of the feeling in the country, and I must say that I did not hear the Yukon matter mentioned once. The hon. gentleman who sits beside my hon. friend and who could have instructed him, told me that if the present Opposition had not been so foolish as to take the stand they did, the Ontario Government would have been defeated. It seemed to me that the more my hon. friend tried to prove, the less he proved. If all this money, which he mentioned, is at the back of these people, Mr. Smith and his associates, then why had they not sufficient business ability to make an offer?

Mr. McDOUGALL. They could not get into the auction room; the door was not open.

Mr. FRASER. I submit that if they did not know enough to be aware that there is a Minister and a Government, and a mail, and many other means of communication, I would only ask them to go to the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) and he would tell them. Just think of it—all this money at his back, and yet Mr. Smith did not make an offer. The evidence is irresistible that he did not. We have the testimony of two witnesses against him, and that being the case I submit that when Mr. Smith says he is associated with these other people he is not to be believed. Once you show that a man makes a misstatement—and he has clearly done so—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FRASER. Oh, well, hon. gentlemen opposite may say "No," but the Minister of the Interior says that Sir William Van Horne told him that Mr. Smith was going to call upon him. Now I call the attention of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) to that. How rich we lawyers would get on that basis. One of us is told: A rich client is going to call upon you tomorrow; but the client never has sense enough to call. The statement of Sir William Van Horne simply was that Mr. Hamilton Smith would call. The legal acumen of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) enabled him to see the difficulty at once. This discussion started upon a question whether Mr. Smith had made an offer or not, and the hon. member for Halifax saw that there was no chance for his arguing upon that. So he says that the Government should have run after this man.

Mr. BERGERON. Why not?

Mr. FRASER. That appears to be the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bergeron's) idea of how this affair should have been conducted. Was Mr. Smith interested in getting a contract? Was it a good thing for him to get a million acres of land? If so, surely he would have been sufficiently interested to go to the Government. After his conversation

with Sir William Van Horne he must have known the place to go to. Why, then, did not he call? Will the hon. member for Halifax say seriously that the Government ought to have sought him after Sir William Van Horne said that he was going to call upon them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The conversation as given by the Minister of the Interior, amounted to this: That Sir William Van Horne informed the Minister that Mr. Hamilton Smith was prepared to call upon him. What I suggested was, if he knew this gentleman was prepared to call upon him with an offer of that kind, it was his duty to communicate with him.

Mr. FRASER. That makes the case all the stronger. If Mr. Smith were prepared to call, then there was no reason why he should not call immediately. If he were ready there was no reason why he should not have been there next morning. The surprising thing is that Sir William Van Horne did not say: I am ready to bring this man now if you will receive him. When I hear of the admirable financial backing of this man, of the rich men he had behind him, the question naturally arises with me whether these men were not in earnest or whether they had not enough confidence in Mr. Smith to authorize him to make an offer. To bring this case home, suppose that the leader of the Opposition was told that a deputation was ready to wait upon him to ask him to take a certain position upon some public question, would the hon. leader of the Opposition seek out those parties? If they were in earnest, they would call upon him. This discussion started upon the issue whether Mr. Hamilton Smith had made an offer before the present contract was entered into by the Government. That is clearly disproved, and, therefore, the whole question is outside the cognizance of this House.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Our hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has laid great stress upon the fact that the gentleman upon whom we have had so much discussion, Mr. Hamilton Smith, failed to call upon the Government or to make a proposition to them. My hon. friend wants to know why Mr. Smith did not call, that is an interesting question. But it suggests a great many fellow-questions. For instance, why did not a great many other persons make offers? We are told that there are at least twenty contractors in Canada alone who are capable of carrying out this work, perhaps more than that; and that in Canada, Great Britain and the United States, there are probably a hundred parties quite competent to handle it. Why did all of these men, who, presumably, would take a good thing if they got it, neglect or fail to call upon the Government. Perhaps it would be better in the interest of the country if the hon. member for Guysborough would put the question in

another way and ask: Why did not the Government call for tenders? How is it that even Mr. Maitland Kersey, who was in Ottawa anxious for an opportunity to make an offer and representing sufficient capital to carry out this work, went away exceedingly disappointed, having entirely failed to get an opportunity to communicate with the Government.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). That is not what his letter says.

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). That is the report published.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) read his letter?

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). The fact is that no person got an opportunity to have communication with the Government. The Government in fact have informed the House that it was their deliberate purpose that no person should have such an opportunity. In the speech in which the Minister of Railways moved the first reading of this Bill and opened the discussion on this question, he stated that owing to urgency it was the deliberate purpose of the Government not to call for tenders, not to allow parties to make offers, but to confine themselves entirely to negotiations with Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie. And, in the course of the debate it has been brought out that no definite proposition was ever made by Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie. The statement was made in this House by a gentleman representing the Government, that various informal discussions took place, and finally after much discussion the Government succeeded—if we are to believe the hon. Minister of Railways—in beating Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie down to these terms on which this contract has been concluded with them. Therefore, it is not at all surprising that the Government, having deliberately refrained from calling for tenders, should confine their negotiations entirely to this firm of Mackenzie & Mann, which they had chosen for some reason which they have not communicated to the House and the country. So they were prepared to refuse Mr. Hamilton Smith had he made an offer. This is a portion, but not a very material portion, of the matter immediately under discussion. This discussion arises through the refusal of the Premier to lay before Parliament and publish to the people of Canada a telegram which, yesterday, he promised to lay before us and make public. He must have known yesterday whether or not it was in the interest of the people of Canada that they should receive the information which he to-day denies them. How is Parliament, how are the people to reach a reasonable conclusion as to the propriety of the reply given by Lord Strathcona, if they do not know the question that was asked him by the Government? It is perfectly competent for the Premier to take refuge behind the assertion

Mr **BELL** (Pictou).

that in this matter he is free to act as he pleases. But it seems a rather singular way of conducting public business to say that the communication he sends to the High Commissioner is of a private character, while the reply is not of a private character.

Now, we might perhaps spend more time in such ingenious vagaries as our hon. friend the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) indulged in a little while ago, in wondering what could be the nature of this telegram, what could be the contents of this telegram, which apparently it is so important to the Government not to submit to the people, that the Premier has chosen deliberately to place himself in a peculiar position, and moreover to place the Government in a peculiar and embarrassing position, by refusing to lay it on the Table of the House. That is, to my mind, by far the most important matter in this connection. It is the point from which we start. Now, a great deal of special pleading has been indulged in, and a great deal of perversion and verbal equivocation have been indulged in, in the endeavour to cast discredit upon Mr. Hamilton Smith on the part of the Government. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has gone so far as to make a statement about that gentleman, using his privilege of Parliament, which I do not think he will venture to make outside of Parliament, or as a private citizen.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. He would not dare to do it.

Mr. **BELL**. The fact brought out here by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), the recitation of the character and the financial strength of Mr. Smith and his associates, show that Mr. Smith is not a man of that kind, nor are his associates men of that kind, to whom one could safely address in private life such insulting remarks as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has chosen to address to him behind his protection as a member of Parliament. Now, a good deal of stress has been laid upon the fact that Sir William Van Horne has denied absolutely the statements made by Mr. Hamilton Smith. Well, I must say that according to my knowledge of the sense of the words employed, that is not an argument that can be successfully made. In the first place, there has been a good deal of discussion as to the relative meaning of the words "offer" and "proposition." The Minister of the Interior laid down the very extraordinary doctrine that the word "proposition" was more comprehensive than the general word "offer," that it included offer, whereas offer would not include proposition. Now, according to my knowledge of the meaning of words, and the customary use made of them, I think "offer" is the most general term that could be employed; and that proposition is a word which implies such details, such particularities and such necessary fixity of pur-

pose, that it is the term usually employed in describing business propositions, strictly business communications. You find the word used continually to define and to specify a certain class of offers which from their nature, from their precision, and from the fact that they are limited, are of a specific business character, such as a man must abide by, and from which he cannot depart. Now, there has been a great deal of equivocation. The Minister of Agriculture, for instance, takes the ground that the Minister of the Interior had not, in the admission he made to-day that he was approached by Sir William Van Horne, contradicted the statement that he made in the course of his speech in this House on the Yukon Bill. If I am not mistaken, that was with reference to the positive statement made by the Minister of the Interior, that no proposition had been made to the Government by the Rothschilds, and therefore it is clear that it is not a contradiction. But when the Minister of the Interior admits that Sir William Van Horne approached him on behalf of Mr. Hamilton Smith and told him that Mr. Hamilton Smith was prepared to go to him and make an offer, that does not contradict what was stated by the Minister of the Interior when he said that the Rothschilds had not made an offer. Nothing could be more evident, they referred to entirely different things, and so far beyond them that, instead of casting doubt upon Mr. Smith, they sustain his veracity, because, among other things that Mr. Smith has stated is the fact, which he absolutely states, that the offer made by him was not an offer on behalf of the Rothschilds. I believe it would be very much more to the interests of the country if the Government, instead of being able to say that they had stood on their dignity and had not run after Mr. Hamilton Smith to ask him to make an offer, had been in a position to say: We did go to Mr. Smith to see what he would do. It would be much more to their credit if they were able to say that they had gone to every other person whom they had reason to believe was of such financial ability as to be able to take hold successfully of such a work, and had asked him to make an offer. We have now this offer made last week by Mr. Hamilton Smith, by which, if accepted, they would have saved 3,000,000 acres of the mineral lands in the North-west, and in which, notwithstanding the remarks of the hon. member for Guysborough, the people of this country are very much interested indeed. Of course it is not likely that we will reach any very satisfactory conclusion here as to what should be done. We say on this side of the House that the duty of the Government was to have taken every offer they could get, to have made access to them as easy as possible. They say that was not their purpose, they say their purpose was to

make it impossible for any other person to come to them, and they give a reason for it. The whole tenor of the speech of the Minister of Railways and Canals in introducing this Bill, was that in taking that course the Government had taken the right course. Well, if they had relied upon that defence, if they had said: Mr. Smith, technically speaking, may have been said to have made an offer to us, but precisely he did not make an offer, he did not come to us and we did not go to him, if they had relied upon the statement originally made by him that it was not their purpose to go into the market and look for contractors to do this work cheaply, if they had relied upon the statement that they could secure the completion of this work more in the interest of the country by not taking tenders, if they had continued to urge that plea, to press the plea of urgency, you could understand the ground upon which they stood. But what is the position now? Now they have shifted from that position. I would point out this fact, that they have entered upon a futile undertaking in endeavouring to discredit the offer of Mr. Hamilton Smith, by attempting to prove either that he lacks veracity, or that he lacks financial ability. That is a work that the Government will inevitably fail in accomplishing. The more they endeavour to carry that work to a successful completion the more will they arouse suspicion in the country. People will ask why it is that this gentleman, whom facts stated here show to be a man of great financial strength, with associates of great financial strength, failed to come into communication with the Government. There is no doubt he made a reasonable attempt to do so, he employed a mutual friend for that purpose; but after informing the Government that he was ready to make that offer, he apparently never received an opportunity to make it, and the end of it was that he was compelled to come in at the last moment with his offer. He has made an offer which unquestionably must be contrasted with the offer the Government have decided to accept; and I believe that any attempt to induce the people of Canada to think that this is a fake offer, an offer not to be considered because an endeavour is made to show that Mr. Hamilton Smith has failed in the matter of veracity, has been guilty of prevarication, is bound to fail most conspicuously. There is more reason, a great deal, in my mind, to believe that in this matter there might be room for suspicion that the gentleman who went between the parties in this matter might have had some interest in not doing more than, perhaps, complying in a measurable way with the wishes of Mr. Hamilton Smith. It cannot be denied that Sir William Van Horne did carry out the wishes of Mr. Hamilton Smith in conveying, in a sense, to the Minister of the Interior the

offer that Mr. Smith had made. But it is not at all in evidence that he did more than that; and it may be that Sir William Van Horne held the same opinion at the time he made that offer, or entered into that conversation, that he apparently held when he wrote the letter which has been printed and read in this House to-day, saying that he had not authority to make a proposition. Well, there can be no question at all about that, I think. Sir William Van Horne ought to be the best judge of what authority he had, and how far he was warranted in going on the strength of a conversation held with Mr. Smith. But the fact that he is in a position to state that he had not authority to make a proposition does not at all contradict Mr. Smith's statement that he conveyed an intimation to the Government that he was prepared and willing to make them an offer. There is no contradiction there at all. I think that, finally, a great deal turns in this discussion upon the specific use of the words, and I think a good deal of attention might be well directed to the selection by Sir William Van Horne of the peculiar words he used. He had "no authority," he says. Now, it is quite competent for a gentleman in conversation with another to make a proposition and to say to him: I will be pleased if you will communicate that to another person; and that gentleman would be perfectly competent to turn about and say at a later stage in the negotiations: I had no authority to make any proposition. He might not even be required to go the length of saying that he had no written authority; he might say: I had no verbal authority. I was not explicitly authorized to make any proposition to the Government. The result of the whole discussion, I think, is this, that after threshing this matter out as we have done, the fact remains that it is proven, first of all, that Mr. Hamilton Smith was correct in saying that he had communicated with the Government through a mutual friend; secondly, that that mutual friend, Sir William Van Horne, did make that communication to the Minister of the Interior. But what is required to substantiate everything said by Mr. Smith himself or by his friends? Not another word. Every material statement made by Mr. Hamilton Smith is proved either over the signature of Sir William Van Horne or by the admissions of the hon. Minister of the Interior in this House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a few words on this question before the debate closes. It is quite clear to me that the Opposition are trying to create an impression in the public mind of this Dominion, that an offer has been made by Mr. Hamilton Smith to construct this railway. I would recommend hon. gentlemen, if they want to get at the bottom of this affair, to place a notice on the Order paper asking

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

the Government to lay on the Table all offers received for the construction of a railway in the Yukon. Mr. Hamilton Smith's offer would then come down with the rest, if any offer was made. It is apparent that the leader of the Opposition has been over-anxious and over-zealous in trying to raise difficulties in the way of the Government carrying through this measure. From his extended parliamentary experience, no doubt, he thought it would be a capital move if some man could be induced to make a tender very much below the terms of the contract proposed to be entered into with Mackenzie & Mann; and Mr. Hamilton Smith evidently was willing to allow himself to be used. He was willing to be made a tool of for the moment in order to carry out what, no doubt, the leader of the Opposition considered would be a decided party advantage, if he could only get it accomplished. Mr. Hamilton Smith went a certain distance; but, unfortunately for the Opposition, he did not go far enough. When it came to placing his proposition in black and white, Mr. Smith did not do it. He did not go so far as to have an interview with the Minister of the Interior. He sent word by a high dignitary that he wanted an interview with the Minister, that he intended to have an interview, but he gave no intimation as to whether he proposed to put in an offer or not. At all events, that idea was not communicated to the Minister of the Interior. Mr. Smith went a certain length. If the leader of the Opposition had been in his place, he would, no doubt, have gone "the whole hog;" but Mr. Smith backed down and did not go the length of placing himself in the unenviable position of implicating financial friends in England, when in reality, he had no power or right to do anything of the kind. The leader of the Opposition used him very well to the length he would go. Hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to show that an offer was made by Mr. Smith to build the road, and that 2,000,000 acres of land would have been saved, if that offer had been accepted. The most stupid elector will see through the fallacy, and the humbug that the Opposition are trying to practice with respect to this whole scheme. They have spent the whole afternoon with the hope of laying down grounds on which they could arraign the Government for recklessness in closing a bargain without giving an opportunity to Mr. Hamilton Smith to make an offer, and in endeavouring to show that he was anxious and earnest to make an offer to build the road at a less price. But Mr. Smith had not enough stamina to go forward and make a distinct offer to build the road. The result is, that hon. gentlemen opposite now find themselves in the position of realizing that the bubble is burst, or, as an old member of this House said on a memorable occasion, there is nothing to it. Hon. gentlemen opposite have laboured to convey this

impression to the public, but, when they go to the country and attempt to show that any blame attaches to the Government and that this is a proposition that should not be carried out, they will utterly fail.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, is a business man, and the leader of the House claims that this Government is a business Government. Let us apply business principles to this transaction of letting this contract and the dealings of the Government with Mr. Smith. We will suppose that there are three gentlemen who are trustees of a large estate. They employ an agent to dispose of that estate. The people of this country have entrusted this business Government with the lands of the North-west, and the Yukon, and all the public lands, the Government acting as trustees. They employ the Minister of the Interior to look after the Crown lands and to act practically as their agent. Private trustees, in a business transaction, appoint an agent to dispose of their lands. If a gentleman comes along and makes an offer for a certain tract, the agent considers the offer and may be disposed to accept it. Another party, however, says: I know a gentleman who is prepared to make a better offer. Whose duty would it be to go to that other party? If the agent should accept the first offer, what would be the opinion of the trustees? It would be that the transaction looked as if the agent got a slice, and the trustees would decide that the agent should not dispose of any more of their land. What will the people say, when they find that the trustees to whom they have committed the entire lands of the country have acted in a similar way? The Minister receives an offer to build a railway for a bonus of certain lands. He is informed that other gentlemen are prepared to make a better offer. Would it not be the Minister's duty, as it would be the duty of an agent for private individuals or trustees, to place himself in communication with these parties and say: We understand you are prepared to make an offer. Have the Government acted on business principles? They have simply acted in such a way that the people have a right to say that the transaction looks suspicious, to say the least of it; and private individuals or trustees of an estate would dismiss an agent who transacted business as the Minister of the Interior has transacted business connected with dealings with the lands of the country.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Federal Life Assurance Company of Ontario, and to change the name to the Federal Life Assur-

ance Company of Canada.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Lake Bennett and Klondike Railway and Tramway Company.—(Mr. Haggart.)

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 33) to incorporate the Pacific and Yukon Railway, Navigation and Mining Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Miles Cañon and White Horse Tramway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY— MR. HAMILTON SMITH'S PROPOSAL.

Mr. POPE. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, we were engaged in discussing a very important question upon the motion to adjourn. The hon. gentlemen on the other side, or rather some of them outside of the Cabinet who chose to participate in the defence of the unfortunate position occupied by the right hon. the leader of the Government, have been trying to defend a bad case. True, not many independent members on the other side of the House rose to offer a defence of the Ministry in their peculiar position, but we find the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) equal to the occasion. I am quite sure that since the last general election even that hon. gentleman himself will recognize that he is hardly an independent member. Immediately after the elections, and when his party got into power, he was ambitious for a ministerial portfolio, but not succeeding I understand that he was then to have gone to handle the delicate scales of justice upon the bench of his native province. Later, however, the story is, that he will soon occupy a gubernatorial mansion in the west. Be that as it may I trust that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has not crowded out of that very comfortable lodging the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), for most of the hon. members of this House would rejoice to visit the latter hon. gentleman at Regina. I am sorry to learn that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) intimated in the House the other evening that he did not intend to be Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, but if that be so I would remind the hon. gentleman that it creates a breach of contract between himself and myself, because he had already arranged for first quality cigars, &c., upon my visit to that section of the country. I trust that he will be faithful to the agree-

ment entered into with me outside of this House and afford me the opportunity of calling on him at Government House.

Now, Sir, it has been stated here, and great stress has been laid upon it by hon. gentlemen opposite, that in connection with Mr. Hamilton Smith's case, we have no written proposition, no written document tendered to the Government in the early stages of Mr. Smith's inquiry as to whether his proposition would be received or not. I do not myself place much importance upon that. If Mr. Hamilton Smith had become acquainted with the fact that there were negotiations going on between the Government and contractors for the construction of this road, he must have learned it through some avenue of information of which the general public was ignorant. It must have been told to him that those negotiations were of a quiet and private character, and that the contract or bargain would be made without the public being aware of it. Under those circumstances Mr. Hamilton Smith must have seen that the bargain should be handled in a very delicate manner, and there is nothing strange to me in the fact, that knowing Sir William Van Horne he should have asked that gentleman to inquire of the Government whether they would be prepared to receive or entertain a proposition from him. Not having received any reply from the Government to the effect that they would be prepared to receive his proposition—and under the circumstances in which this deal was brought about and in which this contract is being forced upon the country and upon this House—it would have been most astonishing if Mr. Smith would have offered a proposition, for he had no friendly communication direct with the Government of the day such as some gentlemen who are closely allied with this contract evidently did have. But, Sir, the Minister of Railways told us when he introduced the Bill that he had laboured earnestly and hard, and that the whole Government had exerted their power in order to bring down the demands of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and to compromise as far as possible with these contractors. We are bound to believe from this statement that the Government did make desperate efforts behind the curtains to bring the contractors down to the terms of the present contract, and if that be true, one would think that the Government could have gone a little further in trying to get a good bargain for the country. No man will say—I do not care whether it is the First Minister or the last Minister, or no Minister at all—no man will say that Hamilton Smith does not represent great capital, and that no man travelling through this country to-day or to-morrow has more capital at all times under his command for proper investment than has Mr. Smith. Under these circumstances, and knowing that Mr. Hamilton Smith was pre-

pared to make them an offer, or was prepared to see them, then when the Government were putting forth these strenuous efforts which they claim were in the interests of the country, why, forsooth, did they not at least endeavour to have an interview with Hamilton Smith, even though they were bound—under some peculiar circumstances that have yet to be explained and that the future history of this country has to reveal—even though they were bound to Mackenzie & Mann, and tied down to bar out all others. Even if it were only to bring these contractors to the position which the hon. gentleman himself admitted he would like to have brought them to, to agree to a better contract in the interests of the people of this country, I do not see why hon. gentlemen did not call upon Mr. Hamilton Smith to submit his proposition.

Now, this debate arose from a very singular position, which had been repeatedly referred to, and which, I think, will stand being referred to again and again. The right hon. First Minister stated in this House, only yesterday, that to-day he would lay on the Table of the House a certain telegram which he himself had sent to Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal; and every citizen of this country who esteems the honour, and integrity, and word of the First Minister of Canada, would expect to see that promise fulfilled and the message forthcoming. The right hon. gentleman gives us the answer which was published; but the message which was promised yesterday, is not forthcoming to-day—why? Mr. Speaker, somebody has been consulted; the wiser head has been interviewed. Another gallant knight, who sits on the front benches, who is the boss of the circus, has been asked, and he says, "Don't you do it; the wording would be a give-way. Sir Wilfrid, don't you venture;" and, of course, actor as the Prime Minister is—and we are bound to say, a more or less successful actor—he thought the dignity of his position and his honour were at stake, and he would stand behind that and refuse to give the message to the people of this country. Sir, the honour and the dignity of the Prime Minister of Canada is precisely what the people of this country make it. What was once said by the right hon. gentleman, "I am a Democrat up to the hilt," holds as good to-day as it did on the day he uttered it; and, if the right hon. gentleman supposes that, as Prime Minister of this country, he possesses greater integrity than the people he represents, I say he is standing on an uncertain footing, of which, sooner or later, the people of this country will remind him. A people are always true to those who do not forget their position; but they are always jealous of public servants, no matter how great or important they may be, who, even from a desire to shield their Government or their party, even for a mo-

ment forget to be frank, honest and straightforward, and neglect to fulfil to-morrow the promise they make to-day. When a Government come to that position, they will be called down by the people, and will be called to a reckoning at the earliest opportunity.

Having been refused that message, Mr. Speaker, we are compelled to indulge in speculation as to what it contained that was so fatal to hon. gentlemen opposite that they dare not give it to the public press and to the people of this country; and I presume I have as much right to speculate upon it as any other member of this House. I would say that there must have been something in that message which would indicate that, if this man Hamilton Smith was a responsible man, worthy of the confidence of the Government, from a financial standpoint, his proposition would be entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite even at this late stage. If that be true, and if that message was shown to the boss of the circus, the gallant knight from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), he must have immediately said: "It will not do for you to read that message. If you give that to the House, if you lend that information to the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, it will prove that this is an open bargain, which is capable of being dealt with, and we shall be showered with offers from contractors from various parts of the world to give us all and more than all we will gain by this contract, and for far less money—aye, for half or one-fourth of the money value we are giving under this contract." Well, Sir, the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House had a moment of meditation last night—a moment of deep and thoughtful meditation. A few people were speaking in one part of Canada, and hon. gentlemen did not like the sound of their voices. Those people had been reading and listening, and they tried to speak; but, weighed down as no electorate was ever weighed down before, by the patronage and the tyranny, as you may call it, of two governments, they had to speak under that tremendous load; but still, hon. gentlemen know that they have spoken. They have spoken emphatically, and some of them are still whispering; and until they get done whispering, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House do not feel certain of their position. Under these circumstances, I say, we have to speculate. Would it have been possible that Lord Strathcona could have received some such message as this: "Hamilton Smith's offer fatal to us in Ontario elections; Hamilton Smith represents himself as Rothschilds' agent; cable he is not at once, otherwise my right arm will be amputated." Could a message of that character have found itself trickling along under the deep waters of the Atlantic, and meeting the timely hands of our old friend and colleague in this House, Lord

Strathcona? Every man who knows the genial and versatile character of that hon. gentleman's political career, knows how kindly disposed he would be to all parties. He would be the precise man to trust with a delicate message of this kind. I know of no hon. gentleman anywhere who would be more willing or anxious to serve those who keep him where he is than Lord Strathcona. Not that he requires the position, but he is a business man. "Business is business" with him, even in his old age; and, Sir, as he sits over there in those sumptuous parlors, enjoying the leisure and the dignity of his position as representative of a country which is no longer a colony but a nation, he knows that his name will be mentioned in cablegrams, which will be laid or be refused to be laid, as the case may be, on the Table of this House, that he will still be kept alive in history, and that if he were to go out of that position, his future life—be it long, as I hope it will be, or short, as I hope it will not be—will be closed, so far as the career of diplomacy and politics is concerned. Thus still with him "business is business." Under all these circumstances, enjoying his position over there—and everybody who has had the pleasure of being received by the High Commissioner knows full well the enjoyment he has in his position—he was the gentleman to entrust with that message. Possibly, a message may have crossed the wires, not so carefully worded, because it is not all members of the Government sitting opposite who are so careful of the words they use—they do not all handle the English language so delicately as does the right hon. First Minister; some of them have two arms and strike out with both from the shoulder, and possibly Lord Strathcona may have received a cable message as follows:—

Cable me at once that Hamilton Smith is universally acknowledged throughout the whole world as a colossal, unparalleled and unmitigated howling prevaricator.

The cable wire being made of strong and particularly good metal, that message, strong as it is—though not fully representing the force, I acknowledge, of the hon. Minister, because he, no doubt, could have dictated a stronger message than my weak imagination possibly can—might have found its way over and been received; and when you think of the old age of the High Commissioner, you can imagine the nervous condition into which it threw him and imagine his wringing his hands and running around and bringing in the servants, and saying: "Something must be done at once,"—and so the cable answer came. Or, Sir, he might have received another and still a third cable, because there is another hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who is—I do not wish to say materially but specially interested in this matter—and that is the Minister of the Interior. He is the second

father, for, I suppose, under the circumstances, we must say that the Minister of Railways is really the legitimate father of this Bill. But it has a foster father in the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), and it is he who has to deal with this, and he does not make any bones about it, but says, we may suppose, in his message :

Hamilton Smith's offer on behalf of the Rothschilds to build the Yukon Railway for 1,000,000 acres of land is having a disquieting influence on the public mind. Cable me at once that he does not represent the Rothschilds.

Now, we have to draw on our imagination ; and undoubtedly some hon. gentleman on the other side, if not on this, who has a greater power of imagination than I, will give us other messages eclipsing perhaps those I have mentioned, because I am beginning to think, under present circumstances, that we have an imaginary Government, and under those circumstances, we may expect to find on the other side of the House greater imagination than on this.

However, as hon. gentlemen may think that I have no foundation for these imaginary telegrams and that all this is made up out of the whole cloth, let me call the House's attention to certain facts and records of history on which I have based my suppositions. The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), who plays an important part in this Government, has not always been Minister of Railways. He has not always occupied a seat in this House, but he has been, as is well known, Prime Minister of the province of New Brunswick. They hold elections in New Brunswick, and there are just the same sentiments to be dealt with there as we have to deal with in this province. There have been in the past occasions in New Brunswick when the Government had to call upon the faithful—when imagination had to be used, when cables or telegrams have had to be sent and answers received ; and among others, we find this telegram which was sent when the hon. Minister of Railways was First Minister of New Brunswick. The telegram was sent to the Hon. David McLellan, Provincial Secretary, St. John :

I am pleased to learn from my agent that the Government have signed a contract with me for subsidy to dry dock. The other improvements which I am prepared to make will depend upon the people of St. John supporting the Government candidates, so as to aid me in securing further subsidy. I have already expended \$20,000 in acquiring land in your city for proposed works, and have all arrangements completed to go ahead immediately on the additional subsidy being granted. I wish you and your ticket success.

J. D. LEARY.

This is dated New York, January 17th. And in the investigation that followed, Mr. Pugsley, who was then Solicitor-General of the province of New Brunswick, of which the Minister of Railways was First Minister,

Mr. POPE.

acknowledged under oath that he himself prepared that telegram, sent it down to Mr. Leary, and asked him to repeat it for the benefit of the electors. So when the hon. gentlemen opposite found themselves in such straits and difficulties, it was nothing more than natural that the gentleman who had unravelled one knot—not the Gordian knot, because that was cut by another member of the Government—but a smaller knot down at St. John, should come to the rescue of the right hon. leader of the Government, and say to him : follow the example of myself as a successful Prime Minister in New Brunswick ; follow the example of my Solicitor-General, and send a message to Lord Strathcona. Do not trust him with the reply, but dictate the reply yourself—business is business—tell him what reply you want. So in drawing this little quiet picture, I have not been drawing something that is unnatural, but something we have foundation for.

My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), during his speech this afternoon, said that we were trying to get the Government into a fix. Sir, that is impossible. They have got themselves into a fix. There is no question about that. It was impossible for this Opposition to place those hon. gentlemen in so miserable a position as the one they occupy. They know that they dare not give the information to this House upon this very point, which they themselves possess, and which they promised us only yesterday. Am I to go back to my section of the country and tell my people that the First Minister of this country, who behind the shield of his dignity should stand supreme in every point of honour, promises a thing one day and refuses it the next ? Mr. Speaker, it may be all very well for the right hon. gentleman, with a powerful party behind him, to think that he can stand up in this House and say to the people : I will give you what I please ; I will not fulfil my word ; I will not carry out my promises. I refuse to keep my word with your representatives. But I tell the right hon. gentleman that every Government has its day of reckoning, and that that day will come to this Government as sure as the sun rises and sets.

There is no hon. gentleman, no matter what position he occupies, who can soar so high that he cannot be brought down ; and the higher he soars, the worse is his fall when he comes to earth, as he is certain to do. The right hon. gentleman has received indications of his loss of strength. He knows it. He knows that to-day one arm is paralyzed and withered—and it is the right arm. I do not know whether the right hon. leader of the Government is left-handed or right-handed, but if he is right-handed, my advice to him is to begin to practice with the left.

Now, Sir, this country has a direct interest in the hon. gentleman answering that question. If the people have no interest

in this matter, why does the right hon. gentleman give the message that was received and refuse to give that to which it is a reply. The Prime Minister promised us this information; and I say again no matter what honours he may have won recently, no matter how lofty the position he occupied while on the other side of the water as the representative of Canada, no matter what medals may have been given him there, when he comes back here he is a Canadian, nothing more and nothing less; he is one of us, and, being one of us, he cannot shield himself behind the declaration he has made: My honour is my own. I have nothing to say as to his private honour or as to his private affairs. But when he rises in Parliament and promises to furnish us with a certain document, and then, when we ask for it it is not forthcoming, the hon. gentleman does not occupy a pleasant position in this House and before the people. He might as well know that first as last. In my opinion, this is a serious matter. If it had been the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who acted in this way, none of us would have thought anything about it. We would not have asked many questions, for none of us would care much. We would care a great deal if the case were that of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). This side of the House have a special interest in that gentleman. He is our representative in that Cabinet. He has been specially selected by the First Minister as a proper sample of what we are who sit on this side. So, if he were to refuse us, we should feel it most keenly. It would be crushing, heart-rending, to be refused by the hon. Minister of Public Works. But it is serious when it comes to the chief factor—except the boss of the whole circus—among these artists, these scientists, who can polish everything off by refusing to give us information. It must be remembered that it was the personality of the right hon. gentleman, it was his word, it was his promises, made upon a hundred platforms—but broken, every one of them, in this House—that brought the hon. gentleman into power and gave him the place he occupies. And so we attach more weight and more importance to his utterances than we should otherwise do. Of course, Sir, we would expect an evasive answer from the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He has practiced that for years and has become an artist in that sort of thing. But we should expect that hon. gentleman not to get into such a position. He would never have landed with both feet in the pot as the Premier did. His knowledge of the wily gentlemen on this side of the House would have advised him the moment the question was asked as thoroughly and faithfully and well as he advised the Prime Minister to-day not to present the telegram. But the First Minister, not having the saga-

city of his faithful colleague, and I presume, that hon. gentleman being out of the House so that the Premier could not consult him, the Premier answered: Certainly, with all pleasure and delight I will lay the telegram on the Table, and then the people will know whether this contract is bona fide or not. It is important, it is absolutely essential, that we should know whether this contract is bona fide or not, and to that end, all the information should be laid upon the Table. I do not know this man Smith personally; I am not tied to his apron-strings; I am prepared to express a straightforward, independent opinion on this question; and if he is not a bona fide man, if he has not the capital to build the road as cheaply and well as the gentlemen to whom the contract is left, we will drop him and proceed to remodel the present contract. For hon. gentlemen opposite must know without our telling them that this contract must be remodelled before it can pass both branches of this Parliament. That has to be done, and we might as well proceed with these changes at once. We have a right to know, and it is important to us that we should know, whether this is a bona fide proposition or not. Therefore, I say that the right hon. Premier is not doing justice to the people or credit to himself in promising information yesterday and refusing it to-day.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CLANCY. Hon. gentlemen opposite are evidently very much disturbed in mind. I cannot allow this occasion to pass without calling attention to one or two points with respect to the very difficult question which now engages the attention of the House. In the few moments that I shall claim your attention, I shall not discuss the merits, either real or supposed, of the two contracts. I merely wish to call the attention of the House to the position taken by the right hon. Prime Minister and to a statement that was subsequently made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). The country will naturally inquire: What was the object of the Prime Minister in sending the message which has been a number of times referred to? I am sure the House is puzzled up to this time to know why he should send such a message, unless he should attach some importance to an offer formally made by Mr. Hamilton Smith. Otherwise, I should like the hon. gentleman to tell us why he should have sent such a message of inquiry. Why should he inquire whether Mr. Smith was representing the Rothschilds or somebody else? The House ought to be in possession of the information, particularly since the hon. gentleman has deemed it best to withhold it.

Now, as the right hon. gentleman has used that for public purposes, the House

and the country demand to know what that cablegram contains. I say, it is manifestly unfair to the House to withhold it. Let me show how the hon. gentlemen have attempted to build up their argument. In the first place, the Prime Minister says this is a private telegram. The very pertinent answer will be made: Why did you send that telegram? Next, the hon. gentleman says it is private, but it was sent on public business of a most serious character to the country; therefore, I say, the country has a right to it. Now, if there was no proposition, then there was no necessity for the right hon. gentleman sending a cablegram. It is stoutly denied by the Minister of the Interior that any proposition, in any shape or form, was ever made by Mr. Hamilton Smith on behalf of any person. The hon. gentleman has made that statement as broadly as it can be made. Now, I leave it with the First Minister and the Minister of the Interior to settle that difference between them. In face of no proposition ever having been made, the First Minister is driven to sending that cablegram to Lord Strathcona to inquire whether Mr. Hamilton Smith was acting on behalf of the Rothschilds. It does seem to me that the House has a right to know something more about this matter. Now, it is perfectly clear that Sir William Van Horne did wait upon the Minister of the Interior and discussed the matter, so far as has been disclosed by the Minister of the Interior, with that gentleman, on behalf of Mr. Hamilton Smith. Now, if that occurred, Mr. Smith was not wrong, when he said that he, at least through a mutual friend, approached the Government. Whether Sir William Van Horne discussed in detail the character of that proposition, is information that the House has been denied this afternoon. But I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior this question, if he will be kind enough to answer me: Whether upon that occasion the Teslin route or any other route was discussed between him and Sir William Van Horne?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. To the best of my recollection, when Sir William Van Horne said Mr. Hamilton Smith was likely to, or would, call upon me to discuss the question of a railway to the Yukon, he said by the Chilkat route—to the best of my recollection.

Mr. CLANCY. I am very glad that we have an answer, because I see, in the letter quoted by the First Minister for the purposes of this debate, that Mr. Hamilton Smith is said to have stated:

The answer I received was that the Government might prefer the Stikine-Teslin route.

Now, let us trace this up. Sir William Van Horne did wait upon the Minister of the Interior; the hon. gentleman admits the question was discussed as between the two

Mr. CLANCY.

routes. Then he comes back and says the answer was, that they must go by the Teslin route, or not at all, and therefore Mr. Smith made no offer. Now, there can be nothing plainer than that Mr. Hamilton Smith was shut out, to use a vulgar phrase—in other words, there was no use in him waiting upon the Government to discuss the proposition, because they had settled upon the Teslin route. Now, I do not think it was fair, on the part of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, this afternoon, to try to discredit the veracity of Mr. Hamilton Smith. It does seem to me that the Government ought to be able to rest their case upon better grounds. Let any one scrutinize the correspondence, as it now appears. There is absolutely no variance at all, in so far as stated in Sir William Van Horne's letter quoted by the First Minister—there is absolutely no variance at all between that statement and Mr. Smith's letter. The only question is, whether Sir William Van Horne at the time he discussed the matter with the Minister of the Interior, was told: Well, we cannot consider any other route but the one. The offer was to be based upon only that route, and, therefore, Mr. Hamilton Smith's further propositions, through a mutual friend or otherwise, could no longer be discussed. If he did not wait upon the Government afterwards, it was simply because, as he says, he had his answer, namely, that the Teslin route had been chosen, and it was not at all likely the Government would consider the other. Now, I did not rise for the purpose of discussing this matter at length. I only repeat that this House should be in possession of that cablegram. It has been used for public purposes, and it does seem to me that the First Minister should at least disclose the reasons that induced him to send that message, in face of the statement made upon that side of the House, that no proposition was made.

Mr. QUINN. It was not my intention to say anything on this question this evening. I expected to hear some explanation from the members of the Government, or their supporters, after recess, but, unfortunately, they have not seen fit to make any. We are left with simply three propositions before us. The first is presented by the Prime Minister, who discovers, between last night and this morning, that the message which he promised to bring down, is a private message and cannot be brought before this House. Of course, we mention, in parenthesis, that Lord Strathcona's answer to this private message might also be considered a private communication; but it does not seem to be necessary to preserve the inviolability of his answer. The next is the explanation given by the Minister of the Interior, who says that, if Mr. Hamilton Smith were a business man, he would not rest satisfied with any verbal explanation

or conversation that Sir William Van Horne had with him—the Minister—but he would make a business proposition in writing. Of course, we have not before this House any documents to show that there was a proposition in writing from Mann & Mackenzie. It is quite true, we have the result of several verbal interviews between those gentlemen and the Minister of the Interior, but there is no document before this House, so far as I can see, which can be called a proposition on the part of Mann & Mackenzie, other than the contract which is produced before us; so that, if any business proposition was made, we have the right to assume that it was made by the Government, and not by Mann & Mackenzie. And we have the right to assume that, if the Government wished to act fairly, honestly and in a straightforward way in this matter, they would have made these business propositions to more than one individual, or to more than one firm. Now, we have another explanation from the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson)—who I see standing beside the Speaker's chair, and I am very glad that he is present. He says that we are very much worried over this, because we are probably sorry that we do not have any interest in the proposed contract that Mr. Hamilton Smith was to get for 1,000,000 acres of land. Now, I think this is the key to the whole situation, so far as the power behind the throne is concerned. The whole situation is this: Hon. gentlemen opposite, by the mouthpiece of the hon. member for Lincoln, say here, that the Opposition are sorry because they could not get an interest in that 1,000,000 acres of land. We cannot afford to say, is the hon. gentleman's implication, what has brought about this contract, carrying with it 4,000,000 acres of land, but we will have the 4,000,000. The pot with 1,000,000 acres was big enough for the Opposition but was not big enough for the Government supporters. Now, I am afraid that the country will take that view of it. In fact, I agree with my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope), who says that a large portion of the country has already taken that view of it, and have sounded their disapproval of it in no uncertain way yesterday. I do not quite agree with my hon. friend from Compton, when he says that it was the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce who dictated this course to the Prime Minister.

I think the gentleman who dictated his course probably sits directly behind the right hon. Prime Minister, and occupies that seat at the moment, because we have a precedent for his conduct as regards that letter. We remember that a certain public or rather private letter was going to be exposed in the press, if a certain hon. gentleman would consent. That letter had been stolen, and it was intended that it should be published in the newspapers. The Minister said, when he found at one mo-

ment that it was impossible to trace the letter because it had been stolen, the office burglarized and the safe opened and this letter taken away, and it had gone into a hundred different hands, that he had not the slightest objection to the letter being published. But when it came to be known that the letter was still in existence, and not in the hands probably of the Minister, he then said: Oh, no; if I should allow this letter to be published I would be simply encouraging the theft of private documents. This is, no doubt, the Minister who dictated to the Prime Minister the way in which he could get out of publishing this private document. However, I do not think we should hammer on this question very long. I sympathize indeed very much with the position of the right hon. Prime Minister; I feel sorry that the Premier of Canada should be found in this position, and for the credit of the right hon. gentleman and for the credit of this country we should drop the matter as soon as possible. I see hon. gentlemen opposite are heartily ashamed of the Ministers, and I can assure them that every hon. member on this side of the House is equally heartily ashamed of the position which they occupy.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

UNSETTLED CLAIM OF MANITOBA.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Government to a motion made by me last session, in accordance with which the following return was ordered:—

Copies of all memorials, statements and other documents from the Government of the province of Manitoba in relation to an unsettled claim resulting from that province being charged with the cost of the erection of public buildings; with copies of all correspondence in connection therewith.

I desire to know why the return has not been brought down, and whether it is the intention of the Government to place this information before the House?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I will communicate with the Department of the Interior or the Department of the Secretary of State and inquiry will immediately be made in respect to the matter.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Blair for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) an Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Mr. Speaker, when I was relieved yesterday afternoon at six

o'clock from continuing my remarks on this subject, I assumed that the adjournment was taken not to accommodate myself, but to allow hon. members an opportunity of inspecting the bulletins exhibited on the streets last evening. It was an interesting night to gentlemen on both sides of the House, and the adjournment afforded members an opportunity of seeing in what respect the bulletins indicated the results of the engagement in which the people of Ontario participated yesterday.

Before proceeding with my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention and the attention of the House to the fact that some of the newspapers at least which made reference to the few remarks I addressed to the House yesterday, misrepresented me. They misrepresented me in this respect. My calculations of the quantity of freight and number of passengers that could possibly be carried under ordinary circumstances by means of steam communication on Teslin Lake down to Dawson City, were made on the basis of 100 passengers per day and 100 tons of freight, or 250 tons of freight or 250 passengers for each steamer. That was my calculation of the capability of any means of communication that would be possible for this company or any other company to place on Teslin Lake and Hootalinqua River down to Dawson. I took that as the limit of traffic that could possibly be carried over that route, and be continued during a season of five months' open navigation. My calculations were also based on the carriage of that number of passengers and that quantity of freight over the wagon road from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake. I figured that as the quantity which could be carried during those five months, because it was as much as, in my judgment, could be moved by any means of transportation that the company could place from Teslin Lake to Dawson City. Instead of the newspapers representing my remarks in this way—and I beg to refer hon. members to the report of my remarks in "Hansard," the unrevised edition of which is in my hands and where my remarks will be found just as they were stated, and just as I have now stated them—some of the newspapers represented me as making this calculation of the carriage of freight and passengers from Teslin Lake to Dawson City from 1st September, the date for the completion of the railway, up to the close of navigation, which would be, according to calculations that have been presented to the House, and which I accept, as between one month and six weeks. I thought it proper to make this explanation to the House in regard to the manner in which I was misrepresented by the press in respect to this matter.

I have referred to the reasons which led to the adjournment of the House last night at six o'clock. They were very important to hon. members on both sides of the House,

Mr. McDOUGALL.

important particularly to hon. gentlemen on the Government benches; and whatever feelings hon. members on this side of the House may entertain with respect to the result, I am informed that the effect on the hon. members of the Government and their supporters has been such as to cause alarm to some people in this city. I have been informed, that so chagrined were these hon. gentlemen on seeing the bulletins of the results of the elections last night; their faces grew so long this morning that you could not find a barber in the city who would shave a Liberal without charging double price. I am not surprised at that. for only a few nights ago I heard the right hon. the First Minister making an appeal to the electorate of the city of Ottawa and of the province of Ontario, to stand by the Hardy Government which was the right arm of the Government on the hill. The hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said: If you want to stand by my Government you will stand by Mr. Hardy, and you will not allow the right hand of the Federal Government to be cut off on election day. Well, Mr. Speaker, the right hand of the hon. gentleman's Government may not have been cut off yesterday, but it was at least broken and mangled and it is hanging in a sling to-day. But that is not all. The night before election day, at the late hour of 12 o'clock, we witnessed an unusual scene in this city, which was doubtless enacted with a view of saving the right arm of the Federal Government. We witnessed at the hour of midnight, men employed with horses and sleighs under the protection of the left hand of the Government, carting snow off the walks around the Parliament Buildings. That was an effort on the part of this Government to save its right arm. But, Sir, these kind of efforts availed not, and the people of Ontario did as they thought proper in the interest of their country, and so the right arm of the Government is now paralyzed.

In my remarks yesterday I referred to the exorbitant concessions that the Government are giving under this Bill to Mackenzie & Mann for the construction of 150 miles of railroad, and I shall now draw the attention of the House to the importance and value of these mineral lands which are included in that grant. We are given to understand by the Ministers that the location of the lots selected by Mackenzie & Mann is to be such as to conserve to the Government the adjoining locations with a view of selling them to miners and prospectors generally. Now, according to the Government mining regulations at present in force, I understand there is a charge of \$15 each for these locations, to persons who choose to engage in mining enterprises there. The Government also charge \$15 a year for the holding of each of these locations, and in order to hold it for a year, the ordinary owner of a claim is obliged to work it whether he

gets any gold or not. There are 3,700,000 acres given to Mann & Mackenzie for the construction of these 150 miles of road, and if the Government alternate sections adjoining the land of Mann & Mackenzie were sold out to free miners and prospectors, the Government would receive from each miner a sum of \$30, and \$30 on each of the 3,700,000 acres would amount to 111,000,000. In other words the equivalent of what the Government proposes to give and which the contract actually does give to Mann & Mackenzie, would bring in revenue to the public treasury the sum of \$111,000,000, if the same quantity of mineral lands were given to individual miners and the same rates charged for them as are charged today. But that is not all. Besides the Government realizing that vast amount on the sale of these locations and on their holding for 12 months, free miners outside of these favourite contractors are obliged to pay 10 per cent on every dollar's worth of gold they extract from these claims. There is a reservation on \$2,500 to begin with, but after that amount is taken out, the miner has got to pay a royalty of 10 per cent on every dollar's worth of gold secured. Let me show what that means. Suppose we take \$100 as an average, a very small one indeed, to be extracted from each location of the 3,700,000, then 10 per cent on that would realize to the Government \$37,000,000. That is what we would expect to accrue to the revenues of the country under the regulations which miners and prospectors are now subject to, and adding that to the \$111,000,000 which I have already calculated, we therefore find that we are giving to Mackenzie & Mann the equivalent of \$148,000,000 for constructing this narrow gauge line. I speak subject to correction, but if there is any hon. member opposite who can point out that I am making a mistake in calculating \$15 as the price of the location in the first instance, another \$15 as the price for holding the location, and 10 per cent royalty on the gold extracted, then, Sir, I shall be glad to hear that hon. gentleman make the correction. Now, what are Mackenzie & Mann getting? In the face of the fact that the Government is bound to go to enormous expense to protect Mackenzie & Mann's property and their enterprise, yet all that the Government can expect to realize from Mackenzie & Mann, is only 1 per cent on the product of their lands, which on the same basis of calculation would amount to only \$3,700,000, while the ordinary miners and prospectors, and everybody else who chooses to engage in the enterprise there, must pay \$148,000,000 on the equivalent of what Mackenzie & Mann get. In my opinion the franchises given to Mackenzie & Mann, outside of the mineral lands to the extent of 3,700,000 acres, should alone be sufficient inducement for them to undertake the work. Any enterprising company,

with a full knowledge of the facts now before the country with regard to the mineral wealth of the Yukon region and with regard to the prospects of a large number of people going in there, should be willing to undertake the construction of that road for the usual grant given in aid of the construction of railways in other parts of Canada, namely, from \$3,000 to \$6,000 a mile. In my humble judgment, the monopoly which Mackenzie & Mann are getting, by the prevention of other people getting Government aid for the building of any other line of railway into that country for the next ten years, is in itself a great franchise. In my judgment, the consideration that is given by the Government to these gentlemen ought to secure for us a continuous all-rail line from Edmonton, Prince Albert, Calgary, or any other important point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, into the Yukon district; and if the Yukon district is going to prove the great country it is now represented to be, and that the evidences given to the House by the Government indicate it to be, that is the route by which a railway must be built in order to satisfy the people of Canada; and how are we going to build it if we are to give away 3,700,000 acres of the best gold land in the country to Mackenzie & Mann for the building of 150 miles of road?

To show the dangers of the route selected, let me quote from Mr. Jennings's report:

In reporting the result of my observations for a railway route between Stikine River and Teslin Lake, B.C., I would, however, first refer to the means of communication between the sea and a suggested point of debarkation on the river, by mentioning that the Stikine has been navigated by steamers to Glenora and Telegraph Creek, a distance of from 140 to 150 miles from the sea, since the early seventies, when the Dease Lake and Cassiar mining excitement was at its height, but while so navigated during the open season, usually between 1st May and 20th October, the journey has almost invariably been considered slow, tedious and not without danger, partly owing to the inferior class of steamers used and partly to the fluctuating state of the water. At times the river is too low for speed with a reasonable cargo, or, the stream may be very high and the riffles difficult to make headway against, with the additional danger of drift trees or snags getting foul of the steering gear or wheel. The latter danger is most to be feared where the channel is contracted, such as in Little and Klotchman's cañons, where, if any mishap occurred to the vessel's machinery, she would at once be carried against the rugged rock walls by the swift swirling, disturbed waters, and sunk by having her planking either torn out or stove in. The distance of 96 miles between Wrangel and Little Cañon can be made by a powerful steamer in one day, whereas by reason of the swift and difficult water above it takes two days more to reach Telegraph Creek, a further distance of only 54 miles, or 150 miles from the sea, therefore, with these facts before one, it seems reasonable that on a route where safe and speedy transit is contemplated, it is advisable to commence the railway section well down the valley at a point to be determined on

below the Little Cañon and on the left bank of the river, 96 miles from the river.

This is evidence that ought to be accepted by this House with regard to the dangers attending the navigation of the Stikine River; and this must have an important effect on the number of people who will be willing to subject themselves to the dangers that must meet them in going up that channel. Other parts of the same report refer to the Hootalinqua River and the Lewes River, and the difficulties attending the navigation of those streams, on account of shoals, bars, snags, land-slides, and so forth. We have five or six hundred miles at least of that navigation beyond the point to which this railway is to be built. In view of these facts, and the further fact that we are not getting a satisfactory route after all, notwithstanding the enormous franchises and concessions in land and in other respects that are being given to the company, I feel that to support any such measure as this, this House would be making a terrible mistake in the best interests of the country. It is not possible, I take it, for the Government to make anything approaching a definite statement as to what the value of the concessions they are giving to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann is. It may be \$3,700,000, it may be \$10,000,000, it may be \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000, or it may be \$500,000,000; and the Government are not in a position to dispute any figure I have named from any data or any proof they are in a position to show to this House.

I made reference yesterday, in my remarks, to the position taken by the right hon. First Minister in respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway contract when it was before this House in the session of 1880-81. On that occasion I find that the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) gave expression to his views, and among his remarks I find the following:—

The Minister of Railways tells us it is the best contract Parliament could possibly make. How does he know that? How does the House know it? Did he give the country an opportunity of judging whether it is or not? Did he give the contractors an opportunity of tendering for the work, or of coming to the Government and saying: We will undertake its performance; let us know your propositions, your concessions? Not at all. Secretly, behind the back of Parliament, and without the knowledge of the people's representatives, the hon. gentleman signs this contract and affixes his official seal, without the authority or sanction of Parliament. He contents himself by telling us it is the best contract ever submitted to Parliament, and the best the Government could do. How do we know that? The Government has refused the people's representatives in Parliament, and the people themselves, an opportunity of pronouncing upon the character of the other proposals and schemes. * * * The Government refused to submit it to the people. They refused to submit the scheme to public competition. They did not tell the people, as they ought to have told the public: "We want to build this railway; these are our grants; here are our concessions; give us a

Mr. McDougall.

tender for this contract. No, the hon. gentleman enters into a secret contract with this company, and then boldly asks Parliament to ratify his action, &c., &c., &c.

Now, this was the language addressed to the House by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) on that occasion, and, having those remarks in my mind, I felt curious to hear from him some statement with respect to this deal, some explanation why he was prepared to justify the present Government in signing a secret contract with Mackenzie & Mann for a piece of work the construction of which Parliament never authorized, in aid of which Parliament never made any grant, and for the building of which the Government never called for any tenders. Those are explanations that I would like to have from the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), particularly in view of his criticisms on the Pacific Railway contract, passed by the Government of the late Sir John Macdonald, for a work fully authorized by Parliament. Why, Sir, by an Act of Parliament passed seven years previously and put on our statutes by the same party who now occupy the Treasury benches, full power was given to the Government to proceed with the building of that railway. When the second reading of the Bill embodying that contract was moved by the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), an hon. gentleman who does not now occupy a seat in the House, Mr. Robertson, of Shelburne, N.S., thus addressed the House:

For days past Parliament has been engaged in the discussion of this contract. The announcement was made in the House this afternoon that the Government have received a proposal from other gentlemen for the construction of the Pacific Railway. We have no information as to the terms of that proposal. We simply depend on the rumours. We have no information as to the terms of that proposal. * * * I think it would be unfair to ask Parliament to proceed with the discussion of this question until we know the terms of the offer. Whether they are more favourable to the country than those of the contract. Holding that view, which I believe to be entertained by this House, I beg to move:

That, in view of the fact that another offer for the construction and working of the Pacific Railway has been received by the Government, this debate be adjourned in order that the Government may lay the said offer on the Table of the House.

These remarks and that motion of Mr. Robertson were followed by an address from Mr. Blake, who, in the course of his speech, used this language:

Now, the Government having before them another proposal for the construction of this railway, a copy of which is placed in my hands, and is signed by, I do not hesitate to say, the strongest combination of Canadian capitalists ever witnessed in combination at all, in terms which I am not now about to describe, but which are infinitely better than the terms of this contract, removing many of the objections which have been taken to it, it is not right that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches should

propose to their supporters that they should concur in this resolution, &c., &c.

That was the argument used by Mr. Blake, after it was known that a second offer had been made to the Government, and after that offer had been laid on the Table. The ground was then taken by hon. gentlemen who to-day occupy the Treasury benches, that the contract which was signed with the Canadian Pacific Railway, should be put aside, and that the contract which, in their judgment, was a better one, should be accepted. They argued strenuously that it was perfectly honourable for Parliament to reject the contract then before the House and accept the tender that was submitted by the other parties. Mr. Blake followed up his argument by moving an amendment to the motion for the second reading. Which amendment was as follows:—

That the late Government invited tenders for the construction and working of the Canadian Pacific Railway under the Act of 1874.

That no tenders were received in answer to those invitations.

There we have Mr. Blake's admission that the Government of Sir John Macdonald did ask for tenders but got none, and in that respect the contract now before the House stands in a very different position compared with that which was submitted to the House in 1891.

That the policy of the present Government, approved by this House in the session of 1879, was to obtain Imperial aid towards the work.

That the policy of the present Government, approved by this House in the session of 1880, was to construct the railway as a Government work.

That it appears that during the recess the Government determined to make a contract for the construction and working of the railway on wholly new conditions.

That the Government did not invite tenders on the basis of the said new conditions at all.

That such new conditions were not made known by the Government at any time prior to the making of the contract or until the night of the 10th December last, when the contract was laid on the Table.

That the said new conditions, not authorized or contemplated by the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, are of the most vital importance, and amongst the same are the following:—

By the contract the contractors are given large powers of selection of the land.

By the contract the power to select two-thirds of the land by the Government is taken away.

Under the contract property and capital stock of the company is perpetually exempted from taxation by Dominion, new provinces, or municipalities therein.

By the contract the power of the Government to reduce an established tariff is limited to the case in which the company is making a net revenue not exceeding 10 per cent on the capital invested in the construction of the railway.

By the contract no power given to the Government to prescribe from time to time the accommodation and the trains to be provided by the company.

By the contract no power given to the Government to acquire the road.

That Parliament is free to reject such a Bill.

That it is now proposed that Parliament shall legalize the contract.

That the House is under no obligation to do so, and it is its duty to refuse to do so, unless satisfied that the public interest requires such a step.

That the conditions of the contract are extremely onerous and disadvantageous to the country.

That it now appears that terms much more favourable to the country can be obtained.

That on the 14th day of January instant, only five weeks afterwards, the said new conditions were made public, an offer which is now on the Table was made to the Government by Canadian capitalists of high standing and ample means, credit and business ability, to complete those parts of the railway to be built by the contract, and to equip and maintain and work the whole railway from Nipissing to the Pacific Ocean, and to perform all the obligations undertaken by the contractors, on terms far less onerous to the country, in the following respects, &c., &c.

Now, these were the points on which the Opposition of that day undertook to criticise the measure that was then before Parliament, and advised the Government and the House as to what should be done as between these two contracts. In this resolution Mr. Blake declares that the contractors received large powers. Well, what powers did they receive? I will explain that more fully later on by quoting from hon. gentlemen who occupied the Treasury benches then, and who were responsible for the contract. But I would say now that the powers given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were powers that the Government had been vested with by Parliament to give for the construction of the road. The contract had this force, in addition, that the Government not only had the power to let the contract according to the tenders that they called for by their advertisement, but they were subsequently empowered by Parliament to proceed with the building of the railway as a Government work. That was tried, but it was not found practicable; it was not found to be as advantageous to the interests of the country, and therefore the Government adopted the plan of inducing contractors to accept a contract under somewhat changed conditions which it was decided to offer. Mr. Blake, in his resolution, complains of the exemption from taxation which is given to the company. Why, the bargain now made with Mackenzie & Mann provides for the exemption of their property from Dominion taxes, provincial taxes and municipal taxes, except in the case of incorporated towns or cities that may be built up in that country. Suppose that a poor miner or prospector goes into that country and takes up a claim, at which he works hard in order to extract the wealth which it contains. He must incur considerable expense in getting into the country, and he must pay for his claim. He is subject to taxation—Dominion, provincial, municipal and incorporated town or city taxes. But these contractors are exempt from nearly all these taxes. Mr. Blake took

exception to the contract of that day also because it did not provide safeguards with regard to the tariff of charges of the company. The tariff of charges for that railway may, in some sections of the country, be complained of, but people who are familiar with the working of that railway, the business that is being done upon it and the expenses incurred in its operation, cannot find very much fault with the tariff that has been in existence practically ever since the building of the road. But what powers are given to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann under this contract? They are given almost absolute power in the establishment of a tariff. I admit that it is subject to the approval of the Government in the first instance. But, in view of the great difficulties, as we are informed, that exist, and must exist, in the way of those who undertake to build and run this line, Mackenzie, no doubt, will make a very high tariff. And what then, Sir, and that we have a right to expect from the favouritism already shown the contractors? After that tariff is established, the Government has not the power to interfere with it for four years. The Government are not allowed to put that road under the ordinary Railway Act, with regard to rates, even then. They are allowed to reduce the tariff 25 per cent, but that must stand for three years further, and, until the tenth year, the Government is not given power to interfere with the tariff of rates on the basis of the provisions of the general Railway Act. That is an immense advantage to the contractors, in view of the calculations that have already been entered into with regard to the number of people that are expected to go over this road and the freight that will have to be carried. Why, Sir, you have only to refer to the figures quoted in my calculations as to what business could be done over a common wagon road. As I was able to show, a tariff of \$20 a ton on freight carried 150 miles by a team, and \$10 for every passenger on the road, would amount, allowing at the rate of one hundred passengers and one hundred tons of freight per day for five months, to nearly half a million dollars' revenue for that length of time.

Now, with the facilities that the Government promise us, Mann & Mackenzie are going to put on this route, both on the Stikine River and Teslin Lake, what may we expect this traffic is going to amount to? What revenue is likely to flow from it? But here, Sir, the Government's hands are tied. No matter how much money Mackenzie & Mann make out of their undertaking, no matter if they realize out of the lands the Government are giving them, the enormous amount of money that is being calculated by hon. gentlemen in this House and by people outside, though they may make these enormous profits out of these lands, and these enormous profits from the operation of the road, the Gov-

Mr. McDUGALL.

ernment's hands are tied by this contract from interfering with the rates to any extent; for ten years they must leave them almost undisturbed so far as the General Railway Act is concerned. Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Blake, in his resolutions, referred to the fault of the Government in not prescribing the extent of accommodation to be provided on the Canadian Pacific Railway with regard to the train service, and so on. Well, what is there in this contract to compel Mackenzie & Mann to put even one train a day on that road? I cannot see anything to compel them even to operate that road. When they have completed their road and have reported that fact to the Government, and the Government have sent their engineers to examine it, and have found it in accordance with the terms of the contract, then the contractors can get their land grant, they can get the whole of their land grant if they choose, and the Government have no power under the present contract to claim a forfeiture of any part of that land concession, or any other concession, on account of the company failing to operate the road, or failing to put ten trains or any number of trains, or even one train a day, upon that road. There is no guarantee whatever in this contract that there will be a certain number of trains put on that road, or any particular class of trains. We do not know what kind of train service may be put upon this railway, or this tramway. Now, Mr. Blake also complained that there was no power given to the Government to acquire the road. Well, I am inclined to think that that would not be a good idea. It seems to me it would not be a property that the Government could handle easily. But I find that in the contract before the House there is no power given to the Government to acquire at any time that 150 miles of road, if they chose to do so, in order to connect it with another road or extend it. There is no power, there is nothing in this contract to prevent Mackenzie & Mann from handing over that railway when it is completed to anybody they like, whether he be an American or any other foreigner. Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the offer of Mr. Hamilton Smith which occupied so much of the time of the House this afternoon, I am not going to weary the House by any further reference to it than to say, that from what we learn already of the position which Mr. Smith must necessarily occupy financially from his connections with such people as have been named, and whose credentials were given to the House this afternoon, I do not think there can be any doubt whatever in the minds of the people of Canada of the ability of Mr. Hamilton Smith to carry out any work that he might undertake to perform in Canada under any reasonable contract with the Government. Let us remember also that the hon. gentlemen now occupying the Treasury benches took

the position, when they were in Opposition in 1881, that there was nothing in the contract entered into between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government that would prevent the Government from accepting the subsequent tender that was made after the signing of the contract. They took that position then, and why don't they take it to-day? The grounds for taking that position to-day, as I have intimated already, are very much stronger in relation to the present contract. The present contract was entered into without any previous knowledge on the part of the people of Canada. The people were not made aware that it was the intention of the Government to enter into a contract, they were not made aware that the Government intended to make any contract of that kind. The Government kept their intentions to themselves, they took very good care not to invite anybody in this country or out of this country to tender for the performance of that work until they had signed this secret contract, behind closed doors, with Mackenzie & Mann. Now, Sir, under these circumstances, and since the Government had no authority from the people, or from Parliament, to justify them in making a contract of this kind, especially within eight days of the assembling of Parliament, I say it is the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite to retreat from their position, and to give the consideration that is due to the offer of Mr. Hamilton Smith. If they fail to do so, they will work a great detriment to this country, they will violate a principle that is dear to the people of this country and which they consider very important in their own interests. In pointing out the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1881, I beg the House to bear with me while I read some extracts from the speeches delivered by members of the Government of that day in defence of the conditions under which they entered into the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Before proceeding to read those extracts in defence of the action taken by members of the then Government, I should like to quote from the speech delivered at that time by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I regret the hon. gentleman is not at present in his seat. The hon. gentleman made use of the following language in the course of his speech:—

Well, all the plausibility, if there was any in it, that the excuse may have had, has gone. Now, we find that capitalists of equal standing, of equal wealth and experience, come forward and say: We will do this work for you, and on terms which, I do not hesitate to say, if you put the just value on the exemptions, and if you put a very moderate value indeed on the enormous privileges of the monopoly that is granted them, is \$40,000,000 at least better than the offer contained in the contract heretofore laid on the Table. Sir, there are four courses open, as I

think, and fairly and favourably open to these hon. gentlemen. They might with good reason have withdrawn the original contract altogether, and if they had seen fit, gone on as they proposed to us nine months ago, and constructed this road as a Government work; or they might have accepted this new offer, also a perfectly legitimate, a perfectly reasonable thing to do; or they might have said: Under these circumstances we feel it our duty in the interest of the people, whose guardians we are—

I wonder who are the guardians of the people to-day.

—to see if we cannot get better terms than either; or they might have left the whole matter to the people, the true and proper arbiters,—

Who are the true and proper arbiters to-day?

—and let them say whether they would retain these gentlemen and their contract, \$40,000,000 worse than the offer now made, or be ruled by that "aristocratic demagogue," my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake). These hon. gentlemen talked of sacrificing something for their honour. Millions must, if need be, be given up to their honour. It reminds one of the words of the poet (not the hon. member for Niagara):

Their honour rooted in dishonour stood,

And faith unfaithful taught them falsely true.

What is the true position of this House? Are these gentlemen the despots of Canada? As I understand the case, the members of this House are the agents of the people of Canada, and these hon. gentlemen are the agents of the agents of the people of Canada. I can well understand gentlemen in the awkward position in which these hon. gentlemen now find themselves, saying, and feeling too, that it was their duty to submit to considerable sacrifices for the purpose of carrying out a contract to which they had agreed; and, Sir, if it was their land they proposed to sacrifice,—

Whose land are hon. gentlemen sacrificing to-day?

—if it was their money they proposed to give away, if the price of those exemptions were to come out of their pockets, if those monopolies were to hurt them and them alone, then I could understand their telling us that their honour forbade the sacrifice. But are they going to lose one cent by forcing the original contract? Are they going to suffer in any way? The parties who are going to suffer are the people of Canada. It is the birthright of the people of Canada which you propose to give away; it is the money of the people of Canada you propose to sacrifice; it is out of the pockets of the people of Canada that all these exemptions and charges are to be defrayed; it is the people of Canada and their children and grandchildren who are to suffer if you create these extortionate and exorbitant monopolies. The duty of an agent in such a case differs from the duty of the principal. His duty is not to sacrifice his principles, money and rights, but if the agent has fatally compromised himself, the least the agent can do, if he be an honourable man, is to refer the matter to the principal and abide by the principal's decision.

Who are the principals in this matter to-day? They are the very same as were the principals in the case of that contract

—the people of Canada. Is the Minister of Trade and Commerce willing to agree to the argument he laid down in respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on that occasion, he having before him a tender to perform the work for one-quarter of the amount which the Government propose to give Mackenzie & Mann?

If these hon. gentlemen desire to maintain the name of honourable men, that is what they should be prepared to do, and not talk to us honour in carrying out a contract which they rashly pledged themselves to.

A contract to which they rashly pledged themselves. What could be more rash than the action of the Government in pledging themselves and entering on an engagement such as the one represented by the measure before the House, an undertaking involving an almost unlimited amount of money, and an almost unlimited portion of the best of the public domain. I have stated 3,700,000 acres as the consideration to be given by the terms of this contract; but there is nothing in it to prevent Mackenzie & Mann claiming 5,000,000 acres instead of 3,750,000. They have only to start on the ground and make excuses suitable to themselves for carrying the road 200 miles, and we have evidence before the House that probably it will be necessary to construct the road 208 miles instead of 150 miles. That being the case, if Parliament sanctions this measure, Mackenzie & Mann will practically be given more than 5,000,000 acres; and so we are giving almost unlimited concessions to Mackenzie & Mann in this respect also.

Proceeding, the Minister of Trade and Commerce said:

I say, if ever there was a government on the face of the earth who were bound so to conduct their negotiations as to give no legitimate cause for suspicion, it was the majority of the members of the present Cabinet. Now, Sir, what have these hon. gentlemen done? Knowing that they stood suspected, knowing that their past record would not bear investigation, even if they did not care for their own honour and reputation, they should consider the effect of their conduct on their followers behind them; and yet they must needs carry on their negotiations in secret.

Where did Mackenzie & Mann and the present Government carry on their negotiations? In secret, with closed doors.

They must needs refuse information which this House and the country had a right to have.

What position did the First Minister occupy this afternoon? Important information was asked yesterday, that information was promised to be laid on the Table, and to-day that hon. gentleman has refused to give that important information.

They must needs keep these terms so studiously concealed that until I read that contract, I had not the faintest idea that, reckless as they are, they would commit so ridiculous and foolish an act as to set their hands to such a bargain as that, knowing all that, what did they do when

Mr. McDOUGALL.

the contract came down? We find them in the most desperate hurry to get rid of the discussion, in most desperate haste, that within ten days a matter which they themselves admit to be the most important with which the Parliament of Canada has ever had to deal should be carried through without the slightest chance or possibility of appealing to the country or obtaining from other parties any offer which might replace the one now before us. And when this new offer comes here, made by men of the very highest standing—an offer which they have shown by the very best possible tests is a bona fide offer—how are these men met? With vituperation and abuse of the very grossest kind.

What treatment did the offer of Mr. Hamilton Smith meet with this very afternoon in this House, Mr. Speaker? What did that offer meet with from the Treasury benches this afternoon? Why, Sir, it met with the most unjust treatment that could be directed towards the proposition of any man, private or public, in any country. Then the hon. Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) went on to say:

Not only by the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite, but men in this House also. What do these gentlemen propose to do? They propose to save the people of Canada many millions of dollars in money and land, and to remove these monopolies which hon. gentlemen wish to create. Is that a crime? Is it to be held a crime in this country if several Canadian capitalists come forward to say: You have made a bad bargain, we will undertake to construct this road at a less cost than proposed in the contract brought down; we will free you from a number of these embarrassing clauses and restrictions which you have unfortunately placed in your original bargain. The hon. gentleman dared to hint that this bargain was a fraudulent one—that it contained the elements of deceit, the elements of hypocrisy, the elements of a political dodge. All I can say is this: that when we come to consider these two offers, when we consider how the original negotiations were conducted, when we regard the extraordinary secrecy with which this whole matter, from first to last, has been negotiated, we must say that if everything was honest and above board, with respect to the original contract, the whole circumstances attendant upon its introduction have been most fortunate.

With every feature of a knave complete,
If it be honest 'tis a devilish cheat.

What is the conduct of hon. gentlemen towards their supporters in this matter? I do not believe a party was ever so dragooned as those hon. gentlemen have been upon this occasion.

I would like to know what means has been resorted to by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to dragoon their followers into supporting this measure. It would be curious for anybody to become possessed of the facts with regard to the means which have been used for the purpose of getting hon. gentlemen behind the Ministers to give their support to this measure which we are now considering.

All discussion has been shut off, all remonstrance forbidden. They have recourse, with their majority 70 strong, to the last and ugly argument which a Ministry driven into a corner has recourse to. They have told their supporters

that if they dared to listen to better terms or to sanction them when offered, they will have to choose between seeing them out of office or probably dissolution.

If we are to believe the rumours that are floating around the corridors of this House and throughout the constituencies, there is something of this very kind going on now. On behalf of the Government, Liberal members are being approached and told: If you do not support the Government and if the Government is defeated it means that they will appeal to the country, and you will have to stand an election, but if you do support the Government the general elections are three years off yet and the people will forget your vote before that time. These are the arguments that are presented to some hon. gentlemen who are expected to feel a delicacy in supporting this monstrous measure. Sir Richard Cartwright continued:

I do not remember a single hon. gentleman opposite, even among the Ministers themselves, who has ventured to say that this contract is just the contract he would like to see.

I am quite satisfied that there are very few hon. gentlemen outside of those on the Treasury benches who would say that this is the kind of contract they would like to be asked to support in this House.

Do these hon. gentlemen mean to tell us that a monopoly is a good thing, that exemptions are good things, that it is a good thing in itself to deprive the Governor in Council of the right of reducing tolls?

And in this particular instance in respect to this contract, this Government deprived themselves of the privileges of touching these tolls for four years, and then only to the extent of 25 per cent, and they are not allowed by the contract to place the operation of this road under the General Railway Act for ten years. What I have quoted is an extract from the speech delivered in this House on the 18th January, 1881, by the hon. the present Minister of Trade and Commerce.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** (Sir Louis Davies). That is a long time ago.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is a long time ago, but it is a time we should not forget, because during the intervening 17 years we have had an opportunity of seeing to what extent the predictions of the then Liberal leaders have been verified. What has this country suffered because of the very exorbitant—according to the Liberal way of putting it—concessions given to the Canadian Pacific Railway then? I do not see that this country suffered anything, but I do see that since the prompt opening of that road, Canada has progressed and attained a position that it would not have attained had that road not been constructed. When we had the rebellion in the North-

west, what would we have been without the Canadian Pacific Railway? How could our people get to the Stikine River now without the Canadian Pacific Railway? Without the Canadian Pacific Railway how could the people east of Manitoba and the Territories, and east of the Rocky Mountains, and all the way to Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island; how could they get to the Yukon to-day? They would be compelled to travel through American territory out to California, and then find their way back to Canada. Without the Canadian Pacific Railway how could the people of the province of Ontario send their flour and their farm products to the Pacific Coast, and from the coast to the Yukon district? Why, Sir, the carrying out and the completion of that railroad by the Conservative Government places Canada to-day in the proudest position that any country can occupy. In order to meet some of the arguments presented by the Liberals on that occasion, the present hon. leader of the Opposition addressed the House, and I propose to quote from him and from some others who replied to criticisms then made from the Liberal benches. I believe that in quoting these extracts it will serve all the purposes that are necessary, to enable the people to compare the circumstances connected with that transaction with the circumstances in connection with the transaction which we are now discussing. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in reply to Sir Albert Smith, said, and other members of the Liberal party:

What did the hon. gentleman do? When he found himself in the Cabinet, arrived at the goal of his ambition, he came down as a member of the Government, and put on the Statute-book an Act which stands there with all the authority of law to-day. He wants to know where we got the authority to make this contract. Let him look at the Act to which he was a party. Let him look at the Act of 1874, and he will find that his hon. leader, true to the opinion he had held for years, and which he did not hesitate to express that \$30,000,000 in money and 50,000,000 acres of land was utterly inadequate to secure the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he asked his friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to come to his aid in getting an Act put on the Statute-book authorizing any Government while the statute remained law to secure the construction of the Canadian Pacific by a subsidy of \$10,000 a mile in money and 20,000 acres of land a mile. If you count the number of miles of the road, including the branches, you have over 56,000,000 acres of land. The hon. gentleman voted for that when he was sitting on the Treasury benches, and yet, in the year 1881, relegated back by the people of this country to the Opposition benches, the hon. gentleman discovers that this was a frightful undertaking, and that there was no authority for it. Why, what does that Act provide? It provides that any Government while it remains law may contract with any person or co-partnership or company incorporated or hereinafter to be incorporated for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway—that Act authorizes the Government of the day, whoever

they may be, while that Act stands as it is to-day, to spend \$10,000 cash per mile, 20,000 acres of land per mile and such further sum in addition as the lowest tenderer might ask in accordance with the other provisions of the Act. The hon. gentleman may find it convenient to forget all this; his hon. leader may find it convenient to forget all this; but with that law standing on the Statute-book of the country he will not make the people of this country believe this Government had not authority to make the contract. But what did hon. gentlemen do at a time when the revenue of the country was altogether inadequate to meet the expenditure, at a time when the Finance Minister of that Government was coming down session after session and asking for \$3,000,000 additional taxation of which he himself stated \$2,000,000 was for the purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific. Those hon. gentlemen came down to the House the same session and put this Act on the Statute-book. When they came back a little more than a year afterwards they said: We have not enough with the \$3,000,000 we asked for last session, we must have half a million a year more! Did hon. gentlemen draw back and say we must stop the contract for the Canadian Pacific Railway? No; they went on and the Finance Minister met the House session after session with deficits until the amount of the deficiency between revenue and expenditure was over \$7,000,000 during four years, and with that condition of things—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; had not the hon. gentleman been dismissed by an intelligent public from the position he held he would have found himself on the 1st of July, 1879, with a deficiency of over \$3,000,000. And in that position of things, with a deficiency rolling up year by year between revenue and expenditure, what did they do? Instead of saying, stop, do not let any more contracts, they went on session after session, taking power to let new contracts down to the last hour. The hon. leader of the Government declared it was their intention to build the Canadian Pacific from the shores of Lake Superior to the shores of the Pacific. What more did the Government, of which the hon. member for Westmoreland was a member, under the authority of this Act, and in the face of these enormous and annual deficits? They advertised to the world asking on what terms parties could be found who would come forward and construct the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have heard something about the cost of advertising in my department since. I do not think they can find any occasion in which we spent over \$10,000 in those matters in my department. I think we will all come to the conclusion that no better result having followed that expenditure, it would have been just as well to have diverted the money to some other purpose. At all events, the fact remains that, down to the end of 1878, hon. gentlemen advertised publicly to know on what terms parties would come forward and construct the whole of this road from the shores of Lake Superior to the shores of the Pacific. Now, I challenge any gentleman to say, which the hon. leader of the Opposition has not ventured to say, that we have exceeded the powers Parliament has authorized for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. On the contrary, the hon. gentleman says things have all changed and declares that the 25,000,000 acres of land is worth \$3.18.

This is the statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition on that occasion, and

Mr. McDOUGALL.

I think it is a very complete answer to the position taken by those who criticised the Government with regard to the merits of that contract. I do not wish to weary the House, but I will quote a short extract from the speech of the late Hon. Sir Leonard Tilley on that occasion. Sir Leonard Tilley said:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see where we stand at this period in the proceedings. Here an opportunity was open to those hon. gentlemen when the Government was formed, of which the present leader of the Opposition was a member. They went to the country and declared distinctly that this policy would be carried out. They brought down a Bill and placed it upon the Statute-book giving 54,000,000 acres of land and \$27,000,000 for the completion of that road. They provided for \$1,400,000 to be paid in addition to that, and they practically provided for \$13,000,000 to be paid in addition, which, if you add the whole together is \$41,500,000 and 54,000,000 acres of land. They undertook to build a telegraph line in addition to that at a cost of another million dollars, making the whole expenditure under the Bill of 1874, and under the contracts they entered into subsequently \$96,000,000—making it infinitely more expensive than the proposition of 1873 and more expensive by \$20,000,000 than the proposition now on the Table of the House.

That was the statement of Sir Leonard Tilley, in reply to the criticisms made by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and other gentlemen who attacked the policy of the Government in respect to that question. Now, we had, as I said before, the predictions of those hon. gentlemen on that occasion, and we have had an opportunity of knowing to what extent those predictions were verified. It is enough for us to point to the fact that the people of this country, on the first opportunity, returned that Government to power, and on the next opportunity returned them to power, and continued them in power for eighteen years subsequent to the passing of that measure by Parliament. A better vindication of the position taken by the Government of that day could not have been expected.

Now, I do not wish to delay the House very much longer, but I was amused to hear the argument made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) a few days ago. That hon. gentleman came to the rescue of his colleagues in the Government who were more actively engaged in connection with this contract; and I do not know that I would be infringing on any right if I were to quote from a paper well known to hon. gentlemen, an independent paper published in the city of Montreal, the Montreal "Star," its view of the statement made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture on that occasion. But before proceeding to read from that paper, I must confess that I was rather amused, coming as I do from a constituency on the Atlantic Coast and thereby having some knowledge of the difficulties that attend navigation, to hear the proposition made by the hon. Minister with respect to

means of navigation from Victoria, or Vancouver, or Port Simpson to Fort Wrangel. The hon. gentleman proposed that it was quite expedient to build barges and sail them from Vancouver to Fort Wrangel, whence they could go up to the railway terminus on the Stikine River at Glenora or Telegraph Creek. The hon. gentleman contended that they could be of such dimensions and construction as would enable them to be towed from Victoria or Vancouver all the way up to Fort Wrangel, and thence to Telegraph Creek in order to do away with the necessity for transshipment. Now, we have heard in this House already reference made to the danger of navigating those waters between Vancouver to Fort Wrangel. We also have heard about the difficulties of navigating the Stikine River up to Telegraph Creek. We are told that the water in the Stikine is very low at the very time when this traffic must necessarily be done. During the autumn months, I learn from the information before the House, the water is at times as low as 26 inches in one or more places. Now, anybody that knows anything about crafts that have to be towed or propelled, or have to go under sail on such waters as the Dixon Strait, knows that it would be impossible to have a barge so constructed and of such a size as to be of any use whatever, so far as carrying freight is concerned, in such shallow water as in the Stikine River. It is questionable whether it is possible to have a barge or steamer constructed that can go to Telegraph Creek, where it is proposed this railway must start. I could not help thinking, when the hon. gentleman made the suggestion that barges could be towed from Vancouver to Telegraph Creek, of the peculiar position occupied by him, and could only come to the conclusion, that he was at a loss to find use for his cream pans. As we all know, we had an experience of tuberculosis on the Experimental Farm some months ago, in consequence of which my hon. friend's cream pans are becoming rutsy, and I suppose his proposition was to put them on the route between Victoria and Telegraph Creek for carrying supplies to the Yukon. The "Star" thus comments on the hon. Minister's proposition:

VERY LIKE A WHALE.

Mr. Fisher's proposition to extend the all-Canadian route to Canada by means of a line of whale-back barges between Wrangel and Victoria or Vancouver is calculated to strike dismay into the hearts of the Washington tail-twisters. For originality and audacity there has been nothing to equal it since that remarkable voyage of the Wise Men of Gotham. The only thing that approached it was Dobell's fast line of bottle-necked steamers, with all the modern inconveniences, that was going to paralyse the trade of the United States at the rate of twenty knots an hour. It was a beautiful dream, but where is the bottle-necked fleet? Stranded on the reefs of a brutal and unsympathetic money

market; striving ever in vain to beat around Cape Despair; or wandering ever in search of that fabled haven known to the ancients as Tarte's new harbour. We may never see our Carcassonne, we may never see Tarte's harbour, or Dobell's bottle-necked Argosies, but we shall never see any empty bottle without thinking of Dobell.

Oh! Andrew Blair, Andrew Blair! If we could only look into your heart of hearts and find out what the Minister of Canals thinks about that whale-backed extension of a pan-American abortion known as the all-Canadian route!

Far be it from us to say that a whale-back barge might not with favourable weather and the luck that favours fools, be towed in safety from Victoria to Fort Wrangel; but having escaped the perils of the sea, how is it going to avoid the breakers of the United States customs? Senator Frye's amendment requires all ships from Canadian ports to the Stikine to report to the United States collector of customs and submit to the regulations dictated from time to time from Washington. That the whale-back would not require to tranship its cargo is true, but the Government which assumes to control the transshipment of cargoes in the Stikine will probably "from time to time" discover new methods of hindering cargoes that are not transhipped. Of what use for Fisher's whale-backs to escape the giant waves of the Pacific and the sharp rocks of the Alaska coast, only to be harpooned in the Stikine River by a Yankee collector of customs!

But our Government is an Administration of infinite resources, and there are quite a lot of Ministers to hear from. Who knows what plan the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may have to propose for the perfecting of the whale-back system? How would it do to have a line of balloons from some point in the Pacific Ocean, just outside the American three-mile limit, where the whale-backs could make close connection with the bottle-necked air ships flying to Glenora direct?

For picturesque variety the all-Canadian route promises to take the cake. The scheme is developing remarkably as it progresses through the House. Each Minister as he speaks seems to have something to add or something to subtract. By the time they were all spoken the route will no doubt include transportation by railway, by whale-back, by river steamer, by tramway, by sledges, by toboggan slide, by water chute, by Shanks's mare, and possibly by balloon, not forgetting a United States passport. Although, it promises to be the most characteristic product of our whale-backed, bottle-necked Administration.

I think that is a very proper view of the position occupied by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches with regard to this claim.

In concluding my remarks, I wish to refer to an instance in respect to the position of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in relation to this measure. I could not help thinking, when I learned of the enormous concessions and franchises given to Mackenzie & Mann by this contract, that the Finance Minister must have had a hand in moulding this scheme. He was Prime Minister of a government in Nova Scotia at whose instance legislation was passed only a few years ago, handing over to a large foreign monopoly the management, control and ownership of vast coal-bearing properties in that province. I need not go into

particulars of that great scheme. It is enough for me to refer to the fact that, only a few weeks ago, the Minister of Finance had to leave his place here in Ottawa and join the present Prime Minister of Nova Scotia on a mission out of Canada altogether, a mission to Boston, in the United States, to interview this monopoly and induce them to recede from a position that they had taken under the authority of legislation passed at the instance of the government when the Finance Minister was Premier. That which led up to this mission was the fact that some of the best coal mines in the constituency I have the honour to represent, were closed by this monopoly that had been brought into existence by the so-called Fielding-Murray government. Under the powers given to the Dominion Coal Company by that measure, that company closed down two of the most important collieries under their control, one colliery known as the Victoria Mine, and the other known as the Gower Mine, throwing out of employment thereby people upon whom there depended for the necessaries of life about three thousand souls. In addition to that, a large number of the people who were labouring in these mines had invested their earnings, over and above what was necessary to maintain them from day to day, in homes which they expected to enjoy for the balance of their lives. The closing down of the mines threw them out of employment, and thus they could not occupy the houses that they had worked so hard to make their own, nor could they dispose of them in any way. It was not until all this came about, that the Finance Minister realized the nature of the injury he had inflicted upon the people by this improvident legislation. He went to Boston, and when he got to Boston reports reached these people of offers being made unfair to the people.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not wish to interfere with the hon. gentleman's argument, but I have been trying for some time to see how this argument affected the debate on the second reading of the Yukon Bill. If the hon. gentleman brings it as an illustration in support of his contention, I shall be glad to have him show how it applies.

Mr. McDOUGALL. My purpose is to give to this House and to the country an illustration of the future effects of this monstrous measure that we have now before us. We have had experience in Nova Scotia of this reckless method of placing at the disposal of monopolies the interest and property of people. This is a perfect illustration of the result of the contract now before the House, if carried into effect. These great collieries were brought into existence by the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of capital, some of it invested by our own people and some by English capitalists. The result is that to-day these pro-

Mr. McDOUGALL.

erties are valueless to the people of this country, and property which was always recognized as the heritage of the people, the coal in these lands, that existed previous to the coming into existence of this monopoly, is now locked up. Under these laws, these properties could only be held by people under lease extending over twenty years, and under these leases the properties had to be worked under penalty of forfeiture. Their working was in the interest of the country. But, under the legislation passed at the instance of the Finance Minister—whom I am now glad to see in his seat—a monopoly was created and power was put in the hands of these people to hold these properties without conditions of forfeiture for a term of ninety-nine years—not twenty years, as under the old laws. The humble, hard-working prospector or miner of the Yukon will occupy in the future the same relation to Mackenzie & Mann, in the development of the gold areas, as do the miners in my county to this great monopoly. Under this contract, Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann have power to hold these properties, to work them or not work them. Do the Government give the same privilege to the honest free miner or prospector, to the poor man who goes there to make money or earn a bare living? Such a man must forfeit his locations unless he pays a certain consideration each year, and also does a certain amount of work, whether he takes mineral out of the property or not. Is not this precisely the same position as that occupied by the poor miners down in Cape Breton, who are to-day rendered homeless, scattered through the country, here and there, among friends, and some without friends or means, their property rendered valueless, and all through this legislation passed by the legislature of Nova Scotia? Under the old law of the province, these mines could not close down. Those who held them had to work them or surrender them to the Crown, when they could be handed over to somebody who would work them. We are in no such position with regard to the monopoly existing to-day.

Therefore it is that I found myself compelled in the present instance, in order to give hon. gentlemen in this House my experience and the experience of my people in these large monopolies, and in order to give my constituents an opportunity of understanding more thoroughly the effect of this measure upon their interests, to bring forward this case as an illustration, and a fitting illustration, of the contract that is now before the House; and I take it that when you consider these circumstances you cannot object to my doing so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not object to the hon. gentleman bringing up the illustration, but what I objected to was his wandering into a great deal of extraneous matter. Of course, the illustration is very apt.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Sir, I look upon this deal as an improvident deal. I look upon it as a sporting deal, because the Government has not invited proper competition for building the road, and has no authority for making such a bargain. I look upon it as a gambling deal, because the Government are unable to tell us to-day whether they are giving a consideration worth five millions, or fifty millions, or 500 millions, for the performance of this work. They are unable to fix any figure, although we have before the House the information of competent engineers as to what that work should cost. The hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Dobell), when speaking yesterday made some allusion to the alleged fact that the Government were unable to ascertain what this road would cost. Why, Mr. Speaker, the Government had the same means of ascertaining approximately the cost of building this road that they have of ascertaining the cost of building any other road in any other part of the country. No Government can be positive as to the actual cost of building a work of that kind in any part of the country otherwise than by the estimate given them by competent engineers, which they have in this case. I look upon it as a reckless deal, because it is absolutely without guarantee for the operation of the road in the public interest. I look upon it as a monstrous deal, because the Government are giving such immense franchises, franchises of which they cannot tell themselves the value. I look upon it as an outrageous deal, because it takes from the people of Canada from four to five million acres of the best gold-bearing lands in the Yukon district, on which the eyes of the people, not only of all Canada are fixed to-day and have been for months past, but the eyes of the whole world, I may say, are fixed upon the gold-bearing lands of our Pacific Coast regions, I look upon it as an unwarranted deal, because this Bill has for its object the placing at the disposal of the people who want to enter into that country the means by which they may do so in providing them a railway only 150 miles in length. As I explained yesterday, a man coming from my part of Canada would take about twenty-two days to reach the Klondike district, and all this great undertaking on the part of the Government, for which they are bartering away the most valuable gold-bearing locations in that country, will afford to that man is, according to the estimate of the Minister of the Interior, a ride of five hours. Now, I am willing to take my own estimate of about fifteen hours, and even then all the conveniences that are to be provided by this monstrous proposition will be only fifteen hours out of twenty-two days. In view of these circumstances, I feel that I would be failing in my duties to my constituents, and to the people of this country, if I did not raise my voice

against this contract. As I said yesterday, if it were my own business, I would proceed with the building of a wagon road for present purposes, because, even if this road is built by the 1st of September next, we will only get four or five weeks of benefit from it during the next sixteen or seventeen months. In view of these circumstances, I would look at it from a business standpoint, and adopt the plan for the present of building a good wagon road thereby giving the country five months connection, and by the time the season would be near its close, then there would be ample time for the Government to proceed with some better means of communication if they thought necessary to do so. From the time of the close of navigation, which takes place in October, until some time in the following May, or perhaps the 1st of June, no communication can be had beyond this 150 miles of railway, for people who are going into or coming out of that country. If they attempt to get from Dawson City by any means to the end of this road at Teslin Lake, or if they reach the Stikine River at Telegraph Creek, they may come at a time when there is too much ice to permit any kind of craft coming down that river. The route is subject to all these disadvantages and inconveniences, and consequently from the close of navigation next fall until the opening of navigation in 1899, we cannot expect any benefit from this railway. Even if the Government were willing to abandon this contract and to proceed in some other way, I would not be ready to support even the proposition of Mr. Hamilton Smith of giving such a large concession as he asks for performing the same work; that is, I would not be willing to go so far as to say, even with the information now before us as to the benefits that are to accrue from the completion of this work, that I would sanction a contract with Hamilton Smith for the performance of the work for one-quarter the amount that is to be given under this contract to Mackenzie & Mann. I believe that the best way of giving proper communication between the most important sections of Canada and this great Yukon district is an all-rail route from some point in the Northwest Territories, a route that can be used every day in the year.

I am willing to go as far as any hon. member on this side of the House in aiding the construction of an all-rail line to that country, and I would go so far as to say that I would be willing to support such a measure undertaken by the Government, and would be willing to vote the money required for the building of the road. Why? Because it would give us every-day communication with that country; it would afford the people of every part of the world the means of getting there, and because, and this is a reason of still greater importance,

our people engaged in the industry of farming and producing food products, of which very large quantities will be required in that mining country, would be able to send produce there. A large quantity is required there now. Where did it come from and under what circumstances do they get it, will they get it by the Stikine River? It will be subject to four or five different modes of transit, thereby increasing the freight rates and enhancing the cost of food supplies, and even after this railway is built as proposed under this contract food will be very little cheaper in that region than it is to-day. I consider it is the duty of hon. members of this House to look at this question from a business standpoint, to look at it from the standpoint from which they would view it if considering it in their individual and business interests. Looking at it from that standpoint, hon. members having the interests of all the different classes to consider, the interest of the farmers, the interest of our manufacturers, the interest of our producers generally, and remembering there is nothing to be obtained in that country that is needed for consumption except what is brought in, hon. members should seek to secure that market for our own people who produce the articles that are there required. With that object in view it is the duty of hon. members to devise the best means by which our people and our producers can get into that country, and at the same time reduce the cost of food products there, the high prices of which take away largely from the profits of the people who go there to seek their fortunes. Under these circumstances I cannot do anything else than vote against the measure before the House or any measure of the kind introduced by the Government, and in doing so I feel I shall be discharging my duty not only to my constituents but also to the people of Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has been trying to come to a conclusion for the last hour and a half, and I have now much pleasure in congratulating him on having arrived there, and no doubt you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members on both sides of the House are equally pleased. I like to see a man industrious. I like him to spend his industry when there are products to be expected, but not to use his industry in turning the grindstone long after the grindstone is worn out.

I rise to speak briefly on the Yukon question, and particularly on the Yukon Railway question. You understand, Mr. Speaker, that it was late in the summer that the boom took place; it was not till late in July we heard much about the Yukon. True, we knew that gold had been discovered in that region since 1880, but it was not till about July, 1897, that the boom commenced, and consequently the Govern-

Mr. McDOUGALL.

ment had not very much time to make arrangements until well on in the season. I am sure that the country will congratulate the Government upon the energy, push and despatch with which they entered on the duties lying before them.

The first step they took was to pass a mining law applicable to that country. It was necessary to make suitable regulations, and the Government made a wise provision whereby the country would realize a certain amount of profits that were to be obtained from that section. This they did by securing to the country every alternate claim, and in that way, wherever a rich find is made, the Government will expect to be recouped in a large degree. The next step they took was to provide protection for property, limb, life and freedom in that country, and they sent Major Walsh and a posse of police for the purpose of maintaining law and order in that section. The next step taken was when the Minister of the Interior crossed the continent and went to see for himself the actual condition of the country, where the rush was going on, and he proceeded to the neighbourhood of Dyea and Skagway and different points. He went there for the purpose of understanding and knowing the necessities of the case. He not only went to those points, but I understand he ascended the Stikine River to examine for himself, so far as time permitted, the navigability of that stream; and so soon as it was determined to prepare for the general rush, the fall was nearly over. The Government after arriving at the conclusion that a railway was necessary, acted with the greatest despatch and energy that could reasonably be expected from any body of men.

There are several questions on which I think both sides of the House are tolerably well agreed. We are largely agreed in respect to the necessity of building a railway. I suppose three-fourths of hon. gentlemen opposite believe it is necessary to build this railway in order to secure the trade of that region to the Canadian people, and to provide some way by which people can pass with greater facility than they are passing now into that far country. The present leader of the Opposition stated, when he had a free hand, when he was out in the western country, when he was not controlled by parish politics, when he stood on a higher platform than he occupies to-day, when he viewed matters from a Canadian standpoint, from the standpoint of the interests of the Canadian people—the hon. gentleman at that time expressed himself in these words in regard to the necessity for building the railroad: "It is of vital importance." "It is absolutely essential to the best interests of the country." Then, when he was not controlled by parties here on account of the contest which was going on in Ontario, the hon. gentleman so expressed himself. I understand that he (Sir Charles Tupper)

waited upon the Minister of the Interior and pressed upon him the necessity of taking immediate action to secure the trade of the Yukon for Canadian merchants before that trade should be diverted into other channels. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) told the Minister of the Interior also, that, if he took immediate action, not only the Conservative party, but the country, would support him. Now, when the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) came back east, and before meeting these parish politicians, as I have called them, he expressed himself in the city of Montreal, from the exalted position he occupied, from the position of a statesman, from the position of a Canadian, and from his position as a leader—he expressed himself in favour of this road and in favour of the Government taking immediate action to construct it. It was not until after the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) came into this House, that a cosmopolitan—or will I say, a man of the “World”—drew him across the coals for acting in such a way. And do you know, Mr. Speaker, the reason that cosmopolitan gave for condemning the then leader of the Opposition? It was solely on the ground of parish politics, as I shall prove from quoting a paragraph or two from his speech made on that occasion. After telling his leader that he had done wrong, and that he should have consulted the party—his leader before that thought the party was able to rise with him, but, of course, the leader was astray in that opinion—this so-called man of the “World” made this reference—and you will see from it that he did not act in the interests of the Dominion as a whole, nor in the interests of those struggling over the mountain passes to reach that distant country, but that he had in his mind’s eye the interests of the Conservative party in the province of Ontario.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear. Forty-seven to forty-six.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman acknowledges himself that he was a parish politician, and that, instead of having the interests of the Dominion at heart, he came here to carry out the agreement that was made in the city of Toronto, a few months ago, when this Conservative Union was formed, and when Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Whitney agreed one to scratch the back of the other, and when the Conservatives were perfectly willing to sacrifice the interests of the whole country in order that the Conservative party here should work in the interests of the Conservative party there. This is what the man of the “World” said, and you will see what object he had in view:

If there is one thing which struck the Conservatives of Ontario more than another, it was the indecent way in which at the close of the last session of the Ontario legislature two subsidies were rushed through which we have now found

out were for the benefit of the same people who controlled the Yukon Railway. The Conservatives of Ontario are discouraged.

I may just interpolate here, that they are more discouraged to-day than they were then.

They saw some connection between the subsidies voted at Toronto and the Yukon deal at Ottawa, and looking forward to the elections about to come off in our province they (the Conservatives) expected the Opposition at Ottawa to expose the iniquity of all these deals. Instead of that, however, they found the Conservative leader of the Opposition rushing forward in the most anxious way to approve of the policy of his opponents.

Now, Sir, if this man of the “World” had the interests of the Dominion at heart, he would have sought to show that the policy of his opponents was wrong, and that the leader of the Opposition was wrong in supporting a wrong policy. He did not attempt to show that for one moment, but he endeavoured to show that the leader of the Opposition should not have taken the course he did because the Ontario elections were about to come off, and, by his supporting the policy of the Liberal Government, it might give discouragement to his friends in Toronto. This is the cosmopolitan or the man of the “World” who cannot rise above the world. He does not go high enough to be a statesman; he is working in the interests of a certain section of the country, and he brought his worthy leader—worthy on this occasion—to task for looking at the country’s interests instead of at the interests of the Conservative party in the province of Ontario. Just here I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals in the province of Ontario are returned to-day with a majority over all about equal to the majority they had four years ago.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The Ontario Liberals came into power four years ago with a majority of only four over all, and they come into power to-day with a majority of more than four over all.

Mr. MACLEAN. Oh, no.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). And in less than two months they will have a majority of ten over all.

Mr. MACLEAN. “We will whack Whitney.”

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another point in the discussion of this Bill upon which we are all agreed, and that is, that this route, as far as possible, should be a Canadian route. That is not quite possible, perhaps, according to the present route selected; but here is what the leader of the Opposition said, when he had a free hand, when he was not bound down by the persons who gathered

around him and gave him bad, instead of good, counsel.

There was one route and one route alone and that was the route on the Stikine River and thence from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake.

Now, a number of persons have deviated from that opinion in saying that probably another route was better, and I think the last speaker (Mr. McDougall) has gone so far as to say that the navigability of the Stikine River was of a very doubtful character. I do not know personally, and I must take the opinion of parties who have gone over that route, and those who have written the history of the navigation of the Stikine, tell us that it has been navigable for a great number of years. We know that when the gold find was made in the Dease country, which is some miles out of Telegraph Creek, vessels of large tonnage went up and down that river several times during the year. We are told by Mr. Jennings that it is navigable for large steamers for a large portion of the year, and that, with the expenditure of very little money on one or two places, it is quite practicable for navigation for river steamers built for that purpose and built stronger than those which previously operated on that route.

We are told by some that we will be controlled, to a very large extent, by the United States, because part of that river passes through the disputed territory, or territory now in possession of the United States. If we are to be controlled at all in that respect, Mr. Speaker, it is owing to the blunders of the leader of the Conservative party, who should have given proper information to the commissioners at Washington in 1871, and so prevented the Stikine River from being placed in the position it was then placed in. Whether that will alter the powers we before had on the Stikine, it is a matter for the lawyers to decide, but, in the reading of the two treaties, I have come to the conclusion that the Americans have more control over us since the Treaty of Washington than they had before. Now, let me read the section of the Anglo-Russian Treaty which refers to this subject. It is as follows:—

It is understood that the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, from whatever quarter they may arrive, whether from the ocean or the interior of the continent, shall for ever enjoy the right of navigating freely and without any hindrance whatever, all the rivers and streams which in their course towards the Pacific Ocean may cross the line of demarcation upon the line of the coast described in article 3 of the present convention.

By this provision we had propriety rights; we had all the rights that a proprietor of any of these rivers had. There was to be no hindrance whatever; we were to be under no regulations whatever: we had as much power as if the rivers were completely in our hands. But that was changed in 1871, so as to take the propriety rights

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

from us and to give us back only commercial rights, which, in my opinion, are quite different. The Washington Treaty, article 26, provides:

The navigation of the rivers Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine, ascending and descending from, to and into the sea, shall for ever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty and to the citizens of the United States, subject to any regulations of either country within its own territory, and not inconsistent with such privileges of free navigation.

Sir John Macdonald was our representative on that occasion. He was the man who should have given information to that commission in regard to the treaty already existing and the propriety rights it gave us. If the Stikine River had been left out of the Washington Treaty altogether, we would have more power of navigating it to-day than we have. If to-day there are any difficulties, the responsibility does not rest on the Liberal Government, but on the Conservative party, who failed to do their duty on that occasion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another phase of the question upon which we are very nearly agreed is that the construction of this railway will benefit Canadian trade. Every person here to-night will acknowledge that if we are to derive any benefit whatever from the proceeds of the Yukon country, we must seek to get into that country, and carry into it the products of the Canadian manufacturer and the Canadian farmer; otherwise these advantages will go to the United States and other countries. Therefore, one of the objects to be aimed at is to build that railway as quickly as possible, and thus to establish an all-Canadian route, which will secure for the Canadian people the trade of that country. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in his free moments, expressed a very sound and logical opinion in regard to this matter. He said:

I felt it my duty as a public man to take the position I did, because there are some questions that are higher than party.

According to the opinion of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) there is nothing higher than party. The hon. leader of the Opposition continues thus:

When it is a question as to whether Seattle or other United States points or Victoria or Vancouver are to be the base of supply, party should be subservient to public interest.

Now, that is sound doctrine; that is the position which every statesman should take; that is the position which every man who is sent here as a representative of the whole country should take. But I am sorry to say that when the hon. leader of the Opposition was soaring so high in the principles of statesmanship, he was dragged down to the level of those who could not follow him; and when they had the caucus and drilled him in, the poor old man had

to come to book, and be led by the man of the "World."

Now, we are told that the contract for this railway should have been let by tender. Well, it was well known throughout the country—it was well known to myself, and I am not in the contracting business—that the Government intended, during the coming season, to construct a railway into that country; and surely any contractor who had that information would have interviewed the Government in regard to it. Every contractor in this country knew just as well as those who got the contract that such a road was to be constructed. Mr. Hamilton Smith, who was said to have represented the Rothschilds of England, who was said to-day to be backed by eminent men whose united capital exceeded £20,000,000 sterling, knew that a contract was to be given. He was in the city of Montreal; and I understand also in the city of Ottawa; and do you suppose that if he was in earnest and desired to get this contract, he would not have put himself in communication with the Government, either by letter or personally? Supposing any person was in the position of Mr. Hamilton Smith and wanted to get the contract, would he not have interviewed the Government, submitted his terms to a certain extent, and announced, either by letter or personally, that he was prepared to undertake the work and had the financial backing to enable him to carry it out. The thing is so preposterous that no person can reasonably suppose that he was in earnest or that his proposition was a bona fide one at all.

It is said that the rates of transportation should be stated in the contract. Has there ever been a subsidy given to a railway where the transportation rates were stated? I challenge any member on the opposite side of the House to point out any single one. We were told to-day that a provision as to rates was put in the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, and the Conservative party should be ashamed of it to-day, because it enables that company to make charges to-day which they would not be otherwise enabled to make. That provision is that until they earn 10 per cent on their invested capital, the Governor in Council cannot interfere with their rates. I am sure the man of the "World" will acknowledge that that was a great mistake committed by his party at that time. Now, it is said that the rates should be inserted in this agreement; but have not the Government these rates in their own hands? After making a reasonable calculation and knowing the bulk of travel through that country and the difficulties and the expense of working that road, will they not know pretty closely the tolls that should be charged in order to give a reasonable return upon the capital invested. I think we can trust to the Governor in Council

not to allow that company to charge unreasonable rates. It is said that they will make extraordinary profits. I think it was the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) who made a calculation, a few days ago, so wide and extensive that really it would take almost all the figures in the arithmetic to work it out. It is said that figures never lie, but we are told that those who do the figuring very frequently do lie. You can make figures tell anything, and unless you have a sound basis to work upon, your calculations are merely guess work. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), instead of saying that 200,000 people would go into that country, said that this railway could only carry 20,000 or 30,000 people during the season. But if the calculation of the hon. member for West York be right, that of my hon. friend from Cape Breton must be wholly wrong, and these gentlemen may take whichever horn of the dilemma it is most pleasant for them to sit upon. Then there is the objection brought against this contract that we are giving the contractors too much land. Every speaker on the opposite side said that we are giving away half the country. But did any one of them say what amount of land they would give for constructing this road? Would they give one-half or three-quarters the quantity? It is impossible to set a value on this land. It may be of great value and it may not be of any value at all. If you take the gold-bearing lands in any country—California, Australia, British Columbia or anywhere else—you will find that those rich gold-bearing spots are only in pockets here and there, and that after a time the pockets become exhausted and the balance of the country is not worth developing at all. A large proportion, therefore, of this 3,750,000 acres is likely to be just in the same position as the land in the other mining districts in British Columbia.

Again we are told that the Government have not adopted the proper way of selecting those lands. But did a single one of these hon. gentlemen show what system they would adopt or suggest a better system? The system we have adopted is of two kinds. A base line can be drawn along the course of a river and location made along that line, three miles on either side, and three sections of three miles square on either side of that. And the Government are to have every alternate section. Is it not then just as likely that the Government will have rich lands as that the company will. Nobody would want the company to have lands without any gold at all, and therefore the selection along the general route of rivers is just as fair to the one as to the other, and that is the way we wished to divide those lands. The second is by taking a point at any place and running a line due north or south or east or west. It was said the other night that such a base

line would take in the whole tract of the river or creek along which most of the gold is found. Now, do you suppose that Providence has come to the aid of Mackenzie & Mann and made the creeks run directly north or south or east or west? I have always understood that the creeks and rivers in mountainous countries are as tortuous as a snake when crawling on the ground. Therefore, one of these points is just as likely to come within the land selected by the Government as by the parties to the contract. Therefore, I see no force whatever in this argument, nor do hon. gentlemen opposite point out a better way of selection, if selection is to be made at all. We know that the company must have large profits in order to reap a reasonable return upon their investment. I think it is stated by Mr. Jennings that the railway will cost nearly \$4,000,000. But although I do not wish to place my opinion in opposition to his, I am inclined to think that when we estimate the cost of labour, the cost of getting materials to the ground, and the kind of weather which prevails in that section, the cost will be found to far exceed that estimated by Mr. Jennings in his report. Time, of course, will tell, but in addition to the cost of the railway we must bear in mind that there is the cost of placing steamboats on the Teslin Lake and Hootalinqua and Lewes River all the way down to Dawson City, so that in addition to the \$4,000,000 for the construction of the railway, we may add \$2,000,000 for steamboats, so that \$6,000,000 is likely to be the amount of the investment. Another fact which we must bear in mind is this, that these \$6,000,000 will be lying idle about six months in the year, and that the earning power only lasts during five months, so that the income during these five months must be considered as equivalent to the interest on an investment for a year.

Then again, we must come to the conclusion that this boom is not going to last for ever. The history of the country will no doubt not be an exception to that of other gold countries. We have heard a great deal during the last few months with regard to the immense quantities of gold found in the Klondike, Eldorado and Bonanza Creeks. We have heard such stories before and have read such stories, but we know very well that in 1858, when the gold boom broke out in British Columbia, and when gold was found on the Fraser, Thompson and Columbia Rivers, people flocked there from almost every country. Not less than 30,000 found their way there in one summer from California, and Vancouver was built up in a few days. A large number came from the coast, sufficient to constitute the main land into a colony almost in a day. Those people went up the rivers to seek gold, but during three years only \$3,000,000 in gold was found. The result was that during the last twenty or thirty years very little gold has been found, certainly not in

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

paying quantities, in that neighbourhood. That may be the story which will be told of the Yukon in a very few years. Again, take the excitement we had over the Cariboo country in 1861, when hundreds of thousands came from all parts of the world and flocked into the Cariboo district. We had creeks there which were just as valuable in gold as the creeks in the Yukon to-day. In the Lightning Creek and Williams Creek, there was as much gold as has been found in the Yukon up to the present, and there were other rich creeks as well. But what has become of the Cariboo gold district? Why, it has petered out. There are only a few miners there now, and had we built a railway into that country, it would not be to-day worth the old rails on it. Take again the Dease country which goes very near the present Yukon, which is at the head of the Stikine River, further up the country. In 1872, we had another boom in that section, and the people used the Stikine River to bring up supplies. They did get a great deal of gold from there—about \$6,000,000. The Cassiar country, further up, was about in the same position. \$4,000,000 worth of gold came from the Cassiar, and the excitement passed away. The boom has subsided, people are not rushing in. And how do we know but that the Yukon country will be in the same position? I am almost as sure as I can be of anything that in less than ten years, yes, in less than five years, this whole boom will have the bottom knocked out of it, and, instead of having thousands and tens of thousands going into the Yukon district, there will only be a few hundreds there seeking gold as there are now in the Cariboo. Taking all the gold that has come out of all the mines of British Columbia for the last thirty-eight years, we find that it is \$57,500,000, or only about \$1,500,000 of gold for every year. That has been the result of the work of the thousands of people who went to that country. Bear in mind that that will be the history of the country we are speaking of. In boom times we generally speak in boom style. We are apt to multiply actual amounts by tens and twenties. We have found the same thing with respect to Winnipeg real estate a few years ago. Properties were sold for \$20,000 or \$30,000 that could have been purchased since for one-tenth of that sum. In Montreal or Toronto there were somewhat similar experiences. In that same way this Yukon country is boomed beyond any value that it possesses in itself. After 18 years since the discovery of gold in the Yukon we have taken out of that country only \$4,100,000 worth of gold. This year, I suppose, has produced more than any other, and it may bring out probably as much as British Columbia, but I very much doubt that it will exceed it.

There is another point we must bear in mind, that if we do give Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie a large area of land the gold

does not come into their possession until they develop their claims; and we find that on the average it costs \$1.25 to develop \$1 worth of gold. They may have large finds in some places, but they will have no finds in others, and the average find will be of a very reasonable character, so it is unreasonable to expect that they will realize such large sums as some hon. gentlemen opposite say they will. My own impression is that you will hear the last of the Yukon country within the next fifteen years, and therefore the railway communications that will now be provided at the expense of these parties will be of no further value, the railway iron will be taken up, and people will cease to go there by rail; but probably a few of them will find their way, as in the case of the Cariboo to-day, on foot over the mountains and through the valleys. We are anxious to get that railway in immediately, before the boom is over, so as to catch the large number of passengers that are going in and have the opportunity of carrying their outfits and provisions. Therefore, I contend, the Government could not afford to wait even until the House should meet, because it would have put off this contract and would have made it impossible to construct the road this season. Thus one whole season would be lost, the transportation of passengers and supplies would be carried on through United States channels, and probably by next season, the American route would have been established and it would be impossible to turn the tide of trade towards channels and Canadian business centres. Though we give the contractors this quantity of land, we throw no burden upon the people. We believe, as has been said, that the Yukon should pay for the Yukon, the taxpayers of this country should not be burdened to pay the costs of that railway. Though there are hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of us who will never pick up an ounce of gold in distant parts of the country, we can yet do something to so direct trade as to make a profit even for many who do not go there. There will be a profit for our manufacturers if we can take active steps to accomplish the ends we have in view. Our manufacturers to-day are preparing for that, as a matter of fact. They are ready to supply the outfits required in that country and all the supplies called for by that market. Our railway companies will be benefited, for a considerable portion of the freight that goes into that country will be carried over our Canadian roads. But not a moment is to be lost if that trade is to be secured for Canada. If we delay but a few weeks it means that we lose that trade for a whole year.

This road will result in a great saving. I have made a brief memorandum giving an estimate of what I think it will be agreed is much below what the actual results will be. I have drawn up the figures to show the extraordinary saving that it will be to

our people to have these facilities provided. Suppose that 20,000 people are carried by this line. Each person will save at least \$100 as compared with what it would have cost him had he been compelled to go by the route over the mountains. It is said that from 150,000 to 250,000 people will go into that country this year. Taking it at only 20,000, this will be a saving of \$2,000,000 to those who go there to seek their fortunes. Then there will be a saving of \$250,000 on the transportation of their supplies. I believe that that is a low estimate. Then those people will reach the Yukon country in thirty days less time than it now takes them to reach it. Time is money, and if you count this time at only \$1.50 a day, that will amount to \$900,000. This saving of time as compared with what would be necessary to go in by Dyea or Skagway will represent money actually left in the hands of the people.

Then, take the cost of living for these thirty days, while going over the passes, that will at least be \$3 a day. Now, \$3 a day for thirty days for 20,000 people will amount to \$1,800,000 that will be saved by establishing this route immediately. The whole thing will come to \$4,900,000. Now, there is not a single person in the House who can take these figures without concluding that they are very low, that the estimate placed upon the number is very low; therefore, I think, that they can be safely taken as an extraordinary saving to the people who go out there. When we cavil over a few acres of land, a few acres that they say will all turn out to be Eldorados or Klondikes, and when we dispute here, while knowing that this may be saved for the people who go out there, I think we are losing time at the expense of the country. Now, I want just to say a few words of regret. I regret that we cannot save more of that country's wealth to ourselves. That wealth belongs to the Canadian people just as much as the timber limits over which my hon. friend opposite made such an ado a few days ago, only it is of a different character. The timber grows upon the land, the gold is found under the soil. Is there any way by which we could save that to ourselves, instead of giving it to every tramp that may come from China, from Italy, from the United States, from Germany, and from every other foreign land—coming in with empty bags upon their shoulders, picking up our wealth and putting it into their bags, and walking out without saying, Thank you? Can we devise any plan by which some, at least, of that money will go into the exchequer of the Dominion of Canada? If we can, we should adopt it. True, the Government has taken one line of action, and a very wise one, I think, although I fear it will not be successful. They propose to charge a royalty upon the finds of the miners. If a miner finds \$500 a week, he has to pay 10 per cent

upon it; and, I think, 20 per cent on anything over that sum. But I can see that there must be very great difficulty in collecting that royalty, and, even if we collect it, it would not be uniform. Hundreds go in there, not with a pick and shovel, but for the purpose of obtaining the gold that has been found by the miners; they go in there for the purpose of selling whisky, of keeping dance-houses and gambling-houses; and the poor miner, who works hard all day in a temperature, perhaps 40 degrees below zero, his money goes largely into the hands of people who pay no royalty at all. Now, is there any other plan? A plan suggests itself. We might make every person take the oath of allegiance, when he goes in there; we might say that no person can hold a miner's claim unless he is a Canadian. You know well, Mr. Speaker, that a large number of those who cross the mountains and endure all the hardships to dig gold, will not hesitate to swallow an oath, and the whole Bible, if necessary, to become a citizen of Canada, when they are there. They may take the oath of allegiance and promise that they will shoot the President, and, after they have filled their bag and after they have gone across the mountains and reached the United States, they will take the oath that they will shoot the Queen. Now, how are we to manage that? Well, I have a suggestion. I do not know whether there is anything in it. I hold that we should charge a poll-tax on every man, or woman who enters that country. We might meet them at the boundary and say to them: We have provided you protection; we have sent in Major Walsh with a posse of police for the purpose of giving you all the protection that is necessary in that country; we have built a railway which has cost us millions of dollars, and we have furnished you with these facilities. Now, if you think it worth while, if you think your fortune is in that country, it is not too much for you to pay for all we have given you, say \$25. Let us collect that tax from every person who goes in there in search of a fortune, whether it be a hotel-keeper, or a gambler, or even a dancing girl, or any other person who goes there to seek a fortune. This \$25 a head would bring us in a large sum of money every year. Suppose it was collected on 20,000 people, it would bring us in just half a million dollars. Why should we not adopt that plan? In British Columbia they have a poll-tax on medical men and on lawyers going in there. A medical man cannot go into the province of British Columbia to practise his profession without paying \$100, and many professional men go there and pay the \$100 so that they may make a living. What is the difference in principle between that and paying a tax for going into a country to pick up loose gold that is found almost on the surface of the ground? It is a suggestion that I think should be con-

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

sidered. In any case, I deeply regret that of all the gold that is found in that country Canada should get so small a portion, and that the larger portion should go into the United States, into Italy, into all the other countries from which these parties come. I understood the other day from the papers, that a large number of people are coming from even China, sent out by their bosses, who use them as slaves, sent into our gold districts to make wealth for their masters. Therefore, I think it would be wise if some such plan were adopted by which we may secure a portion of that wealth for the people of this country. As it is now getting so late, I propose to draw my remarks to a conclusion. I will not make five attempts to close, as my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) did, but I will immediately take my seat.

Mr. MOORE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 3rd March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Ottawa Montreal and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Fraser.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)

THE QUEEN vs. COULOMBE AND OTHERS.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked,

1. Are the Government aware that the defendants in the case of The Queen vs. Coulombe and others for smuggling whisky, have appealed from the conviction pronounced against them by Mr. Justice Chauveau?

2. Are the Government aware that the hearing of the appeal before the Court of Queen's Bench has been postponed until the October term?

3. Why was such postponement asked for and granted?

4. Were counsel for the Crown authorized to consent to such postponement?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows: 1. Yes. 2. Yes. 3. Postponement granted because of the absence of counsel on both sides from Ottawa in attendance on their parliamentary duties. 4. Yes.

POSTMASTER AT LOWER L'ARDOISE.

The following questions being called, (Mr. Gillies):—

1. Who is the postmaster at Lower L'Ardoise, County of Richmond, at the present time?
2. When was the present incumbent appointed?
3. Who was his predecessor in office?
4. Why and when was he removed?
5. At whose request?
6. Were any complaints in writing against the late postmaster filed with the Government or the Post Office Department?
7. What was the nature of these complaints, and by whom were they furnished?
8. Was an investigation afforded the late postmaster before removing him from office? If so, by whom was the inquiry held?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). I would ask that that question be allowed to stand.

Mr. **GILLIES**. Will the hon. Postmaster General tell me when it will be convenient for him to answer this question. It has been on the Order paper for about ten days, and I would really like to have an answer.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I will endeavour to give the hon. gentleman the answer to-morrow.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY

Mr. **CHAUVIN** (by Mr. Casgrain) asked,

1. Have there been acts of mutiny and revolt committed by the convicts of St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary lately, and what measures have been taken by the Government to establish order there?
2. What is the name of the officer or employee in charge of the administration of the said penitentiary at the present time?
 - (a.) When does the Government intend to appoint a warden?
 - (b.) Does it intend to appoint a warden, or a warden and deputy?
 - (c.) What are the names of those persons who have asked for this place?
3. When will the Government publish the report of the three commissioners appointed to inquire into the administration of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, and on what date was the said report delivered to the Government?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1. In September last, there were two or three nights in which some disturbance occurred, but order was restored without serious difficulty. Since that time, on three or four occasions, a very few of the more incorrigible convicts have tried to renew the disturbance, but without success. Nearly all the sensational reports which have appeared in the press regarding al-

leged disturbances at the prison were without any foundation whatever. The measures taken to preserve order were the strengthening of the staff, temporarily, by Dominion Police, and the transfer of experienced police officers from other prisons. 2. George L. Foster. (a) At an early date. (b) Whatever offices are vacant will be filled. (c) We do not believe it is in the interests of justice to answer this question at present. 3. The publication of the report is now under consideration. It was received on February 5th, 1898.

KENNETH MCKAY, LOCKMAN.

Mr. **GILLIES** asked,

1. When was Kenneth McKay appointed lockman upon the St. Peter's Canal?
2. When were his services terminated?
3. Was Mr. McKay dismissed?
4. If so, why and at whose request?
5. Were any complaints lodged against him? If so, what were the complaints and by whom laid?
6. Was an investigation held, and if so, when and before whom?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). 1. Kenneth McKay was first employed upon the St. Peter's Canal in April, 1892. 2. He was dropped at the close of the season of navigation in 1896, and on the opening of navigation in 1897 he was not re-employed. 3 and 4. He was not dismissed, but such of the men who were not needed during the winter season were dropped, and among them was Mr. McKay, who was not re-employed in the spring. 5. There were no complaints lodged against him. 6. No investigation was held.

RAILWAY RATES TO STIKINE RIVER.

Mr. **MACLEAN** asked,

1. Has the Government any reliable information showing the feasibility of any route or routes for railway purposes from any port on the coast of British Columbia to Glenora, Telegraph Creek or other point on the Stikine River, within Canadian territory?
2. If so, which, in the opinion of the Government, is the best route to be chosen for such a railway, and what (approximately) would be the average cost per mile?
3. If the Government has no reliable information regarding a railway route from the British Columbia seaboard to Glenora or Telegraph Creek, is it proposed to take steps to acquire it, and what (if any) surveyors have been commissioned to undertake the work?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). The Government has no reliable information as regards a route from a port of British Columbia to Glenora, &c., within Canadian territory. It is not possible, therefore, to state positively that a feasible route for a railway can be found, or if there be one, what would be its cost per mile; but it has been determined to ask Parliament for an appropriation for the bar-

ometrical exploration of a railway route within Canadian territory between the Stikine River terminus of the Teslin-Stikine Railway and a suitable ocean port in British Columbia.

BANKS IN THE YUKON DISTRICT.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

Has the Government made any arrangement with the Bank of Commerce for establishing a branch of that bank in the Yukon district? If so, what is the arrangement made? Has any other bank made proposals to the Government looking towards establishing branches in the Yukon district?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). There has been some correspondence between the Government and the Canadian Bank of Commerce with reference to opening an agency of that bank in the Yukon district. The correspondence at this moment is unfinished, and I would prefer, if the hon. gentleman will permit me, to let it stand in that position for a day or two. With regard to the second part of the question, no proposal has been submitted to the Government by any other bank, although I am aware, from general conversation, that other banks are talking of the probability of their going in; but we have no proposal from any other bank.

Mr. FOSTER. That part of the question stands, then, for a day or two.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, if the hon. gentleman prefers.

THE ONTARIO COURT OF APPEAL.

Mr. MACLEAN asked,

Whether it is the case, that by reason of the fact that a fifth judge has not yet been appointed to the Ontario Court of Appeal, the appeal to that court in a habeas corpus matter by a prisoner confined (as it is alleged unjustly) in the Kingston Penitentiary cannot be heard? Is it the case that there are ten important appeals standing for hearing by the Court of Appeal, some of which were set down for hearing in May, 1896, that cannot be heard because of the fact that the fifth judge has not been appointed? Does the Government intend to appoint a fifth judge, and, if so, when?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). As regards the first part of the question, I have to say, that the Government has no information on the particular points raised therein. As regards the appointment of a judge, no provision was made during last session for the payment of the salary of a judge; but provision will be put into the Estimates this year for that purpose.

SHIPPING MASTER OF BEAR RIVER.

Mr. MILLS asked,

1. Has Mr. Thomas H. Miller been dismissed from the office of shipping master of the port of Bear River, Nova Scotia?

Mr. BLAIR.

2. If so, why was he dismissed?
3. Has Albert Harris been appointed in his place?
4. If so, how old is Albert Harris?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Yes, by Order in Council, 13th January, 1898. 2. As it was satisfactorily established, by an official investigation under oath, that Mr. Miller was an active and strong partisan both before and at the time of the late general election of 1896. 3. Yes, by Order in Council, 13th January, 1898. 4. Sixty-eight. Mr. Harris is a retired merchant, and is represented to be "a good, reliable and respectable man," and that he would make a good official. The duties at Bear River are comparatively light, and the shipping fees received by the former shipping master for the year 1896 amounted only to \$84.60.

POSTMASTER AT STE. ANNE DE BEAUPRE.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked,

1. Was Albert Godbout, postmaster of St. Anne de Beaupré, dismissed?
2. If so, was an investigation held into his conduct before he was dismissed?
3. Did the officer investigating the charges made against him report that such charges were proved?
4. What is the reason of said Godbout's dismissal?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). 1. Mr. Albert Godbout, postmaster at Ste. Anne de Beaupré, has been dismissed. 2. An investigation was held before dismissal. 3. The officer who investigated the charges against the postmaster, confined himself to forwarding the evidence taken on oath. 4. The postmaster was dismissed for having taken an unduly active part in elections, as shown by the evidence.

BRITISH VESSELS SEIZED BY RUSSIA.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

What is the present position of the claims on behalf of British vessels seized by Russian authorities in Behring Sea?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. The validity of the claims in respect of the schooners "Ariel" and "Willie McGowan," seized in the North Pacific Ocean in 1892, has been recognized by the Russian Government, and a sum of \$40,078.75 has been paid over by that government to satisfy them. The respective amounts payable to these vessels will be available so soon as necessary preliminaries are arranged, and the name of a responsible person entitled to receive the same, on behalf of each vessel, has been ascertained and satisfactorily established. 2. The validity of claims in respect of the seizure of the schooners "Maria," "Carmolite," "Rosie Olsen" and "Vancou-

ver Belle" and the warning of the schooners "C. H. Tupper" and "W. P. Hall" has not yet been admitted by the Russian Government; but diplomatic correspondence has been renewed between Her Majesty's Government and that of Russia, in connection with such claims, since Russia's settlement of the "Ariel" and "Willie McGowan" cases, and it is hoped the arbitrator may shortly be appointed.

GRANTS TO CHEVALIER DROLET.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

What is the extent of the mining concessions granted to Chevalier Drolet?

How much has been paid, and how much is still payable thereon?

What are the conditions of tenure and operation?

Has he the right to lease or sell these concessions?

Has the Government any knowledge as to whether he has, in fact, disposed of the whole or a part of them for a large sum of money?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Thirty miles of the submerged bed or bars of the North Saskatchewan River. 2. No payment has yet been made, as the first yearly rental is not payable until the 1st July next. 3. The conditions of tenure and operation are contained in an Order in Council issued in the matter, which will be laid on the Table of the House if moved for in the usual way. 4. Yes. 5. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman lay the Order in Council on the Table?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If you move for it, I will do so.

Mr. FOSTER. Without moving for it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

Who is now the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories?

Has Mr. Mackintosh tendered any resignation of that position to the Government, and, if so, what was the date thereof?

Has the position been offered to any person, and, if so, to whom, and with what results?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Mackintosh is at this moment Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories. He tendered his resignation, to take effect on the 1st of January last, but it has not yet been accepted. Pending the acceptance of his resignation, I am not in a position to give any more information on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. The question I asked was what was the date of his resignation, not the date at which it would take place.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot give the hon. gentleman precise information as to that; I understood he wished to know when it would take effect. My impression is that the resignation was handed in in December or November.

GOLD DREDGING LEASES.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

What is the total length of the river gold dredging leases granted to date in the North-west and the Yukon; on what rivers or streams, and to whom?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The information asked for is properly the subject of a return, and will be brought down in that form, when an order is obtained in the usual way.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

Have any leases for dredging for gold on the rivers or streams in the Yukon or North-west Territories been granted to John Connor, of St. John, N.B., and, if so, to what extent, where, and for what consideration?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No lease has been granted to John Connor.

RED POINT WHARF, P.E.I.

Mr. MARTIN asked,

1. On what date did the Government assume control of Red Point Wharf, Lot 48, in Prince Edward Island?

2. Is the Government aware that its bad condition for some time back, has seriously interfered with shipping?

3. Has the Government engineer reported to the Government as to the condition of this work or the sum required for repairs?

4. Has the Government decided that repairs shall be made on this wharf in order to have it ready for spring shipping?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. The Order in Council accepting the transfer from the government of Prince Edward Island of Red Point wharf is dated 20th October, 1897. 2 and 3. It has been reported to the Government that a sum of \$1,000 will be required to effect the needed repairs to that wharf. 4. The information will be given when the Estimates are laid before the House.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER—TENDERS.

Mr. MARTIN asked,

1. How many tenders were received by the Government for the construction of the work on the breakwater at Tignish, in Prince Edward Island, in the year 1897? What are the names of the parties tendering, and the amount of each respectively?

2. Was the contract awarded the lowest tenderer, to whom, and the amount obtained?

3. Has the department appointed an inspector of the work? If so, what is his name?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). 1. Ten. The tenders are as follows:—

John Burns, Ottawa.....	\$ 6,770
Félix Sauvageau, Montreal.....	7,320
J. H. Myrick & Co., Tignish, P. E. I.....	8,725
Hugh McDonald and C. W. Mof- fatt, Sydney, C.B.....	9,750
A. J. McFadyen, Tignish, P.E.I..	10,450
John P. Brennan and Richard Keeffe, Alberton, P.E.I.....	11,775
John Heney and Henry Smith, Ottawa, Ont.....	12,061
J. B. McManus, Memramcook, N.B.....	12,500
J. E. Simmons and D. C. Bur- pee, Gibson, N.B.....	12,940
R. Fennell, Ch. H. Chandler and Michael Eagen, Charlottetown, P.E.I.....	17,445

2. Yes, to Mr. John Burns, of Ottawa, for \$6,770. Mr. Burns has asked the department to accept the assignment which he has made of his contract to Messrs. James H. Myrick & Co., and by Order in Council, dated 14th February last, the assignment in question has been accepted. 3. No Inspector appointed as yet.

**AGENT OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
AT CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.**

Mr. MARTIN asked,

1. Who was the agent for the Department of Justice at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, during the year ending 31st December, 1897?

2. Was he paid a salary or did he collect his fees?

3. What amount did he receive for his services during the said year as salary or fees, or both?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1. A. P. Walker. 2. Paid by fees and received no salary. 3. The fees during the previous year amounted to \$247.78.

WEST POINT PIER, P.E.I.—TENDERS.

Mr. MARTIN asked,

1. Has the contract for the construction of West Point Pier, in Prince Edward Island, been let, and to whom?

2. How many tenders were received for the work, and what are the names of the parties tendering, and the amount of each tender?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes, to Messrs. McDonald & Moffatt. 2. The following tenders were received:—

Hugh McDonald and C. W. W. Moffatt, Sydney, C.B.....	\$ 9,500
Félix Sauvageau, Montreal.....	9,717
John Burns, Ottawa.....	9,770
Angus McKinnon, Coleman, P.E.I.....	11,450
J. E. Simmons and D. C. Burpee, Gibson, N.B.....	11,750
Heney & Smith, Ottawa.....	11,901
J. P. Brennan and B. H. Ram- say, Alberton, P.E.I.....	13,891
J. B. McManus, Memramcook..	14,372

Mr. MARTIN.

**BOUNDARY BETWEEN CANADA AND
UNITED STATES.**

Mr. McINNES asked,

1. What steps have been taken to determine the boundary line between Canada and that portion of Alaska contiguous to British Columbia?

2. Has the Government protested against the United States occupying and assuming control of Dyea, Skagway and other portions of Alaska alleged to be Canadian territory?

3. What action is now being taken, or is contemplated, by the Government to bring about a settlement of the Alaska boundary question?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). 1. Under the first article of the convention entered into at Washington in 1892, Messrs. T. C. Mendenhall and W. F. King were appointed commissioners on behalf of the United States and Her Majesty respectively to make a coincident or joint survey of the territory adjacent to the boundary line in question, "with a view to ascertainment of the facts and data necessary to the permanent delimitation of said boundary line in accordance with the spirit and intent of the existing treaties in regard to it between Great Britain and Russia, and between the United States and Russia." Surveys were accordingly made between latitude 54 degrees and 40 minutes and the 141st degree of longitude, in the years 1893, 1894 and 1895, and on the 31st December, 1895, a joint report was signed by Mr. W. W. Duffield, who had replaced Mr. T. C. Mendenhall as United States commissioner, and Mr. King. This report, with accompanying maps, was laid before Parliament in 1896. No determination of the position of any part of the line was made by these commissioners, their duties being confined by the convention to the ascertainment of facts and data. 2 and 3. The matters referred to in the 2nd and 3rd questions are now receiving the attention of the Government, but it is not deemed to be in the public interest to make any statement in regard to them at the present time.

JUDGE PRENDERGAST.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

Has the Government considered the necessity for a commission of inquiry in the case of Judge Prendergast, of the County Court, in the province of Manitoba? Is it proposed to issue a commission of inquiry into this case?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Government have considered this subject and come to the conclusion that there is nothing to inquire into.

MERCHANDISE IN AMERICAN VESSELS

Mr. KAULBACH. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, and with your permission, I desire to call the atten-

tion of the right hon. the leader of the Government to a matter, appearing in the Toronto "World" of yesterday, of vital importance to the province to which I belong, and to Canada as a whole. We having four members from the maritime provinces representing our interests in the Cabinet of this Dominion causes me to doubt the correctness of the statement. But, if true, it would be a death-blow to the greatest industry in Canada, as it is her great source of wealth. I refer to our deep-sea fisheries, and I would ask as the most provident thing to recall such a deal at once. The announcement is as follows:—

Washington, D.C., March 1.—The Secretary of the Treasury has received through the British ambassador, information that the Canadian Government would hereafter allow American vessels to carry merchandise from one port in Canada to another.

I would ask the right hon. the leader if this statement has any foundation.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am happy to relieve the feelings of the hon. gentleman by telling him that the statement made in the Toronto "World" is absolutely incorrect and untrue.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon gentleman who read the paragraph should have stated that it came as one of the ordinary press despatches from Washington.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry to learn that the hon. gentleman takes his inspiration from Washington.

TREASURY BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Government to the fact that a motion was carried in this House last session, as follows:—

Resolved,—That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before this House a copy of schedule B, showing recommendations of the Treasury Board, as submitted by report of Council to His Excellency the Governor General on the 6th and 7th July, 1896, and intended to be approved by him, laid upon the Table of the House last session, with a statement of the action taken by the Government on each of these appointments as made by the said Order in Council approved by His Excellency, or where no action has been taken, the reason for such a course.

This is a motion carried during the last session of the House, and I understand that it has not been complied with. I wish to ask my right hon. friend whether it will be necessary for me to put another motion upon the paper, or whether this motion of last session will be complied with and the papers brought down?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am somewhat surprised to hear that the motion has not been complied with. If the hon. gentleman will send me the volume referring to it, I will have it attended to.

MR. OGILVIE'S KLONDIKE REPORT—FRENCH TRANSLATION.

Mr. MONK. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to a matter which has already been referred to by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte). It is in regard to the French version of Mr. Ogilvie's report. I am receiving letters quite frequently from my French constituents in reference to Klondike, and I would like to ask the Government what progress had been made in the translation of that report, and how soon we may expect to have the French version. It is a pity there has been so much delay in the French translation.

The PRIME MINISTER. There has been no delay whatever. The matter has been attended to and is being pushed forward with all speed possible. We realize fully the great importance of having this valuable report circulated amongst the French population.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask whether Mr. Rose or the Government is to bear the cost of that translation?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The firm of Hunter, Rose & Co. bear the cost of the translation.

Mr. FOSTER. They certainly should.

MR. HAMILTON SMITH'S OFFER.

Mr. IVES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say that many, in fact all of the most sensible men in the world, never come to an absolute decision without sleeping the night over it. The right hon. gentleman has had a night's sleep since his refusal yesterday to lay on the Table the cablegram to Lord Strathcona, and I would like to know to-day if he still absolutely refuses to lay that message before Parliament?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Orders of the Day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was waiting for my right hon. friend to reply to the inquiry from this side of the House, but as he does not seem disposed to answer, I want to draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the fact, that an omission—whether by accident or design I am not able to say—has evidently taken place in the contract that is now before the House. The Minister of the Interior gave to the public the Klondike Official Guide by Mr. Ogilvie,

and it is dated the 27th January, two days after the contract was made with Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie. I find it stated officially in this work, officially given to the public by the Minister of the Interior that :

River steamers will ply all summer from the mouth of the Stikine to Telegraph Creek. A wagon road with abundance of transportation facilities will be available from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake, and steamers will be plying on this lake and on the Hootalinqua, Lewes and the Yukon rivers.

As there is no mention made in the contract of the wagon road which the Minister of the Interior has informed the public would be immediately available upon the disappearance of the snow, and as it is a very important matter, I thought it was possible that that clause which the contract must have contained when this official document was prepared, had by some inadvertence been unfortunately omitted. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior to that omission.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think there has been any inadvertent omission in the contract, and I think the statement contained in the Official Guide will be found to be correct.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Minister of the Interior omitted one important particular in his answer, and that was whether this road was to be constructed at the expense of the Government or at the expense of the contractors.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Official Guide simply stated what accommodation will be furnished to the people there. There was no statement in the Official Guide that the Government would construct it or that the contractors would construct it.

WEST PRINCE, P.E.I.—NOTICE OF VACANCY.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that a vacancy has occurred in the riding of West Prince in the province of Prince Edward Island in this House, by the death of our late colleague, Stanislaus F. Perry, and I trust that a writ may forthwith issue in order that the said riding may be represented in Parliament at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is the first formal intimation the Chair has had of the vacancy caused by the death of the late hon. member for that riding. Notice will be taken of this information now, and it will be entered on the Minutes, and the Speaker's Warrant will at once issue for a new election.

Sr CHARLES TUPPER.

YUKON ADMINISTRATOR WALSH.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the fact, that some fifteen days ago the right hon. the leader of the House was asked as to whether he would lay on the Table the instructions and commission to Administrator Walsh. The right hon. gentleman promised to lay these papers on the Table, and I draw his attention to the matter again as it is important we should have them.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Blair for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) an Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, representing as I do an important, an intelligent and a wealthy rural constituency which is deeply interested in the discussion now going on in this House upon a most important question, I do not feel that I would do justice to the position which I hold ; I do not feel that I would be doing my duty to my constituents, to myself, and to this country if I did not give expression to my sentiments on this question. I do not expect that I will bring to light any new argument upon this important subject ; I say important subject, because I believe that in the political history of this Dominion none more important has ever been brought before the Parliament of Canada. I have not the assurance to think that I can throw any great light upon or add any new interest to this question, which has been discussed so fully, so freely, and so ably by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. My expectation is not to make an oratorical display, but merely to have a business talk upon a business question with business men and in a business way. The announcement that rich finds of gold had been made in the Yukon district ran like an electric shock throughout this country, throughout this whole continent, and I may say throughout the whole world ; and the eyes of people of various countries, and not only their eyes, but their feet, have been directed to that field of operations, in which they expect—and I hope their expectation will be realized—to reap a bountiful harvest. It is therefore a matter of necessity, which I think will be conceded by gentlemen on both sides of the House, that some means of transportation should be provided of a more rapid and cheap nature than now exists, to enable the miners and their supplies to be landed in that country. We do not disagree in regard to the importance of having a railroad. It is the manner of building that road that

causes the contention in this House and throughout the country.

I had the pleasure last evening of listening to a very able speech by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Macdonald), who made statements and gave us figures in regard to the benefits to be derived from the construction of the Yukon Railway, with the most of which I can agree. I can agree with him that it is an important matter to have a railway constructed into that country. I may agree with him that 20,000 people or more will find their way thither. I may agree with him also that a railway would save millions of money to the poor miners who are struggling to find their way into the gold regions of that desolate country. But, Sir, I do not think that the conclusions to which the hon. gentleman came are logical or correct. While it may be true that 20,000 people may find their way in, and that millions of money may be saved to them, I do not think it follows that we should ratify a contract made by this Government in secret a few days before the meeting of this Parliament, by which a large portion of the domain of the Dominion of Canada is given away and a great deal more than would have been necessary if competition had been invited, and other men had had an opportunity to make offers. The hon. gentleman further stated that it would cost \$1.25 to get \$1 worth of gold out of that country. He further stated that in the course of ten years he believed that country would be worthless, and would be deserted by the miners. But, Sir, none of these statements or prophecies of the hon. gentleman can be considered as a justification of the Government for making a very unfair, unjust, and unbusiness-like contract with these contractors. The hon. gentleman told us that the rush was so great that there was no time to be lost—there was no time to advertise for tenders or to invite competition. But, Sir, I think I am speaking to intelligent men, who are reading men; and if you go back for nine months in the history of this country, you will find scarcely a newspaper published in Canada during that time which omitted to mention the Klondike region, the great excitement that was occasioned throughout the world by the gold discoveries there, and the great ingresses of people who were expected to go into that country in the coming spring. The people of Canada, the United States and all over the world have been discussing this matter for the last nine months; and it strikes me that since the last meeting of Parliament the Government have had ample time to consider this matter, and have had ample evidence that there would be a great rush of people into that country. Yet we have the strange spectacle of a Government, a few days before the meeting of Parliament, making a secret contract with contractors to give them 25,000 acres a mile, or about 4,000,000 acres, of rich gold-bearing lands for

the construction of a temporary railroad. There may be some doubts in regard to the feasibility of the route which has been selected. It is not for me to discuss the legal aspect of the question, as affected by the Washington and Russian treaties. But I notice that some hon. gentlemen have gone out of their way to disparage the name of one of the greatest of Canada's late statesmen, the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and tried to prove that he had injured the interests of this country in helping to carry through the Treaty of Washington. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that in all the transactions we have had with the United States, in all the treaties that have been made between England and the United States in which Canada has been interested, Canada's interests and England's interests have been sacrificed and the United States have come out the gainer, until Sir John Macdonald met them and secured from them the Washington Treaty, which gave to us \$5,000,000, and which was a just and honorable treaty, and so recognized by the people of this country. Though these hon. gentlemen do not feel or judge as we do in political questions, yet I think it is wrong on their part to follow the great statesmen of this country to their graves and disparage their memories. Why, Sir, they cannot hurt the name of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. His work stands to-day as a glorious monument to his patriotism and his loyalty to Canada and Canadian institutions, and his name will be handed down to posterity with esteem and honour and will be remembered long after those who disparage it are unremembered and fill unhonoured graves. I regretted also to hear the hon. gentleman speak so disparagingly of that country. It was but a prophecy he made, but I trust that it is one which will not prove true. I trust that the prophecy he made, based upon his experience of other countries and other portions of this country, will not prove correct. I, for one, have great hopes for the future of the country in which I live, and I do not like to think that an important part of it, which we have every reason to believe is richly stored with gold, shall in a few years be abandoned as worthless.

I remember, not many years ago, hearing hon. gentlemen opposite condemn the then Government of this country for having purchased the great North-west for \$1,500,000. That country they characterized as a "sea of mountains" which it would not pay to own and govern, and condemned the building of a railway from ocean to ocean to open up to colonization and settlement the vast areas which we purchased for so small a sum, they denounced as a most unprofitable transaction. Yet I have been told that one mine in British Columbia has produced \$4,000,000 in gold, almost three times as much as the great North-west cost us, and I shall not undertake to speak of the great returns of

farm produce from Manitoba or of minerals from the mines of British Columbia. These have been immense, and the returns we may expect also from the great Yukon district will add greatly to the material prosperity, wealth and population of this country. If, Sir, as the member for West Huron asserts, it takes \$1.25 to get \$1 of gold, why all this wrangling in this House about so worthless a country? If in ten years time that country will be desolate, surely it cannot be worth our while to undertake to get into it and send our forces in there to maintain law and order, which cannot be done except at great cost. I trust, however, that prophecy of the hon. gentleman will prove false and that this distant region will prove a very important part of this Dominion in the future.

There are other uncertainties with regard to this Teslin Lake route which I shall not discuss, as legal minds are better capable of placing them before the House, but there seems, from the discussion which we have listened to, doubts as to the right of Canada to navigate the Stikine River without coming under the customs regulations and coasting laws of the United States. There is also a doubt with regard to the feasibility of navigating those rivers to and from the Teslin Lake. I am told that in certain seasons the water in them falls so low as to render navigation impossible. I am told also that the Five Finger Rapids are dangerous to navigate, so that taking all things into consideration, there are considerable doubts and uncertainties with regard to this route. But there is no doubt regarding what Canada has to give. We are to give 25,000 acres of land for the construction of a temporary road, of the standard of the Kaslo and Slocan Railway. When you examine the report, you find that this Kaslo and Slocan Railway has grades upon it of 171 feet to the mile and curvatures between 29 and 30 degrees. This, therefore, is to be a narrow gauge road, with rails of only 45 pounds to the yard, and you may guess what kind of temporary affair will be the railway which these people are going to furnish under this contract. We may have some conception of this when we understand that the late Government required all the contractors of the Canadian Pacific Railway on that section between Montreal and the Atlantic seaboard to build the road with a maximum grade of 52 feet to the mile and with maximum curves of six degrees. But if we are paying 25,000 acres of land to the mile, with all the franchises and privileges and the monopolies which are attached to the contract, for a road which the right hon. leader of the Government said was but for a temporary purpose, let me ask the question how much would this economical Government be prepared to pay for a safe, first-class railway into that portion of the country?

Mr. MOORE.

The next consideration I wish to place before this House is the privileges which are given these contractors compared with the mining regulations to which the miners in that country are subjected. I have said that we are giving about 4,000,000 acres of land, or about 6,000 square miles, and when I tell you that 6,000 square miles is as large as six states like Rhode Island in the American Union and as large as Delaware and Connecticut together, the extent of that territory which we are giving for this narrow gauge temporary railway will be better appreciated. Then with regard to the privileges which are given these contractors compared with those given to the miners, we find that while a miner has to take out a certificate for which he has to pay \$10 a year and forfeits all right to any claim he may strike unless he has this certificate, the contractors pay nothing. The poor miner has also to register his claim and pay \$15 a year to the Government for registration fee, while these rich contractors pay nothing. Then the poor miner is made to pay a royalty of \$10 on every \$100 he produces in gold, while the rich contractors only pay \$1. A company of several miners will pay a fee of \$50 where the nominal capital is less than \$100,000, and \$100 where the nominal capital is \$100,000 or more, but these rich, highly-favoured contractors pay nothing. Nor can a mining company hire a miner who has not taken out a certificate and paid his \$10 fee, under the penalty of having their mining claims forfeited, whereas these contractors are free to hire whom they choose without any conditions. And while a miner who leaves his claim 72 hours is considered as having abandoned it and it may be cancelled, these contractors are subject to no such disability. These important privileges which are given to the contractors and are withheld from the miners may have serious consequences. When men go in there and find that the contractors are placed in this favourable position, there will be great danger of contention and strife arising. Those men are hardy and brave, they take their lives in their hands, they go out there to make their fortune and they are not going to be deprived of their rights, and if they are interfered with there will be trouble, and I would not be much surprised if blood should be shed and the Government compelled to increase its forces very largely in order to maintain law and order in that distant country. With regard to the monopoly which they are giving in addition to the land, I will point out that, according to section 4 it is provided as follows:—

4. For five years from the first of September, 1898, no line of railway shall be authorized by Parliament to be constructed from Lynn Canal or thereabouts or from any point at or near the international boundary between Canada or Alaska into the Yukon district, and for five years from said date no aid in land or money shall be granted to any person or company other than the con-

tractors and the contractors' company to assist in building any such railway.

Section 5 confers upon them further privileges as follows:—

5. The contractors and the contractors' company shall be entitled to receive in preference to any other person or company during ten years from the said first of September, 1898, such aid or assistance in land or money as the Government may be authorized and may see fit to grant in aid of a line of railway from the Stikine River to an ocean port in British Columbia, provided that the contractors or contractors' company are willing to undertake the construction of the same at once and completion thereof within a reasonable time upon receiving notice thereof from the Government.

Another very important concession granted to this company is that they are to pay only 1 per cent royalty, while the poor miner must pay 10 per cent. What is there in the law or in the mining regulations to prevent these contractors from saying to the miner who goes into that country: Prospect upon our lands instead of the Government lands, and if you find a claim you may work it for 5 per cent royalty, while if you find a claim upon Government land you must pay 10 per cent? In this way, paying only 1 per cent to the Government, these contractors would receive 4 per cent net from the miners, I cannot see any reason why they could not compete with the Government in this way greatly to the loss of the country. And when we consider that these contractors are to select from the country the best portion of the mining land, it must be apparent that the belief will spread abroad throughout the world that the best lands will be in the hands of these contractors and that the contractors can offer better inducements than can the Government. Consequently we are placed in the position not only of turning over these great franchises and benefits and this great area of land but of enabling these contractors to compete with the Government, to the great loss and detriment of the country.

We have heard in this House some very strong remarks regarding the leader of the Opposition. An hon. gentleman said not very long ago that the majority of the people of Canada required that this contract should be ratified by this Government and he sounded a note of warning that should it not be done, the people, when they had an opportunity to pass upon the question would be found strongly in favour of ratifying the contract which has been signed and laid before us by the Government. Well, Sir, I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but when I hear these accusations that are being hurled across the floor with regard to the hon. gentleman whom we have selected as our leader, I feel this—that should the Government succeed in putting this measure through Parliament, then, when the time comes for the great tribunal of this country, the people, to pass upon this question, the

leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition will be able to lead his followers to one of the grandest, to him, one of the most agreeable victories he has ever achieved in his long and useful career.

Mr. CRAIG. I had no idea, Mr. Speaker, of addressing the House on this question at the present moment. But, as I think it necessary that this matter should be fully ventilated, I shall make a few remarks. We all admit, I think, the great importance of this question. It has been charged that the Opposition are obstructing this measure, that they do not realize the importance of the railroad which is the subject of this contract. Sir, we on this side realize as much as do hon. members of the Government side of the House the importance of measures to secure the Yukon trade for this country. It has been said that the objects of this railway and of an all-Canadian route are, first, that supplies may be got into that country for the people who will be there, so that suffering next winter may be prevented, and also to secure the trade for Canada. I make the declaration here that we are just as anxious to secure the trade for Canada as are hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. In fact, taking the previous record of the two parties, there should be no occasion for me to make any such declaration; for we have found in the past that gentlemen on the other side have advocated the extension of trade with the United States, in fact have advocated doing away with the limitations to that trade, whereas we have always advocated the securing of the trade of this country for the people of this country.

For my part, I have been prepared from the first to give fair consideration to the contract submitted to us. But, Sir, from the way it has been brought to the attention of this House, from the way in which this bargain was made before Parliament met at all, from the fact that the contract has already been signed and the work is actually going on, I fear that we cannot expect gentlemen on the other side of the House to give this matter fair consideration. They are really bound to back up the Government in this case. I believe that if the matter were left to them, clear of considerations of party, a great many of them would take the same view of this question that we do. I have no doubt in my own mind that there are hon. gentlemen on the other side who, while they will vote to put this contract through in order that the Government may be sustained, yet, if they were free to vote according to their own judgment, we should find them opposed to this contract entirely. In order to back up what I say about members on the other side not being free to give this subject fair and independent consideration, I shall read a short selection from a paper which has been in the past, and, I believe, is to-day, friendly to

gentlemen on the other side of the House, a paper which has a high standing in the mercantile community of the province of Ontario—I refer to the "Monetary Times," published in Toronto. I notice in last week's paper the following :—

The urgency of the Klondike case will be admitted by all reasonable people. It was necessary to provide some speedy and expeditious mode of getting to that gold region.

There is ground for complaint that decisive steps were not taken sooner to meet this necessity, but the business having been delayed till within a week of the meeting of Parliament, the reason for acting without the authorization of that body could no longer be pleaded. Parliament would, in six days, meet to express its own will, and it was scarcely worth while to anticipate its action at this late stage by an act of executive volition, when nothing was to be gained, in point of time, by the unauthorized contract. If such action could ever be justified, it would have been when the meeting of Parliament was unavoidably far off, and a great gain in time and construction would be made by immediate action. Parliament, under the circumstances, can scarcely consider the contract on its merits ; practically its only function is to assent to a bargain already made. Meanwhile the contractors have no guarantee that the contract will be condoned by Parliament, and the delay must paralyze their efforts both in floating the scheme and in construction.

I think that bears out what I said. I may say that is from an independent source, a paper that looks at the matter from a non-party point of view, it is a paper which, as I said, has in almost every case been favourable to hon. gentlemen opposite ; so I offer my sympathy to many gentlemen on the other side of the House who, I have no doubt, will vote to sustain this contract, but yet in their own minds think, as the majority of the people of this country think, that this is not a good bargain for the country, and ought to be condemned. Now, Sir, I propose, in the short time which I shall address the House, to state some of the objections that I have to this bargain. These objections have been stated by members before, but I think it is important that they should be stated over and over again. We want the people of the country to understand what this bargain was, we want them to know that it is not a good bargain for the country. Of course, hon. gentlemen opposite and their organs throughout the country state their side of the case many times over, and sometimes their organs throughout the country misrepresent what has been said by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in order to make a point. But I intend to state three or four objections which I consider strong ones, to this bargain and to the way it has been made. In the first place, I object to the way in which this matter was arranged, in that no tenders were asked for. Now, it has been admitted, it was admitted by the Minister of Railways in introducing this Bill.

Mr. CRAIG.

that generally it is a good thing, and it is only right that tenders should be asked for in matters of this kind. He made that statement ; but he said it was impossible to ask for tenders for this contract, for this great work, because the matter was so urgent. His argument was urgency, and that is about the only argument that he offered. He said the urgency was so great that there was no time to advertise for tenders and receive and consider them. Now, we say that this urgency was caused by the Government's own delay. We maintain that if there was urgency, if there was great urgency, it was caused by the Government's own lack of prompt action. The Minister of Railways, in introducing this Bill, used this language :

Hon. members of this House will recollect quite clearly, that before the close of last session evidence was pouring in upon us of the immense discoveries of gold that were taking place in the Yukon district, and returning parties were bringing the most fabulous accounts of its mineral deposits.

Now, that is the statement of the Minister of Railways, made in introducing this Bill. He says that before the close of last session evidence was pouring in upon us of the immense discoveries of gold in that district, and that returning parties were bringing fabulous accounts of the discoveries of mineral deposits. Now, I hold that if that was the case, if these accounts were coming to the Government before the close of last session, then there was no excuse for them in delaying the matter at all. They should have considered the matter then, they should not have put it off all summer, and then at the last minute find that they were in such a hurry to have this road built that there was no time to advertise for tenders. They have no excuse for delaying this matter at all. While this plea of urgency may satisfy their own followers in the House, and their supporters in the country, I am sure it will not satisfy the people of independent minds who look at this matter without any party prejudice at all. Now, Sir, did the Government act at once when they heard of these reports ? Not at all. They did nothing, they let the matter pass from month to month. I do not know what they were doing, but they were travelling all over the country, and had not time to look into this matter until it got so late that they could not do it properly. So, Sir, while the plea of urgency is given by the Minister of Railways, I do not think that is the real reason, or the only reason, for not asking for tenders. I intend to quote a few more words from the speech of the Minister of Railways, which will bear me out in making that assertion. He said this :

This is not a class of undertaking in which you would propose to advertise for tenders. We have never done so. It was not done by our prede-

cessors, and I presume it never will be done by any responsible Government.

Then he says again :

It would not be an effective way under any circumstances.

And further on :

How could we ask for tenders when no cash was to be given ?

Sir, the only conclusion I can arrive at from all these remarks of the Minister of Railways is that they had no idea at all of asking for tenders. Even if they had had plenty of time, if there had been no urgency in the matter, they would not have asked for tenders. I think there was another reason, and what was that reason ? I believe that reason was this : that they had arrived at the conclusion to give this contract to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. I think the Government did not want anybody else to come in and tender, they did not want tenders at all, and naturally would not advertise for them. While that plea of urgency may avail with some people who do not understand all the circumstances I am satisfied it will not be accepted by the country at large, because, even if they had but a short time, a short time would have sufficed to ask for tenders. It would not take long to invite particular contractors to tender for this work, and to ascertain what they would do it for, and we might have got it done, and no doubt would have got it done, for a much less price than we are asked to pay for it to-day. It is said that Mackenzie & Mann are reliable and responsible men. Well, there is no need of saying that, because nobody disputes that fact. But we maintain that there are other contractors in this country who are capable and responsible men, and we maintain they should have had a chance as well. Now, Sir, had they a chance at all ? Had any other contractors any chance to tender for this work at all ? We have heard one gentleman mentioned in connection with this work, Mr. Hamilton Smith. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have tried to ridicule this gentleman, have tried to insinuate that his offer is a bogus offer, have tried to prove that he has been guilty of—well, I was going to say lying; I suppose that was what was meant, although that is rather a plain word to be used in this House. Well, Sir, how was Mr. Hamilton Smith treated ? We are told that a mutual friend of his informed the Minister of the Interior that he was prepared to call upon the Minister and talk over the building of this railway. Well, now, the Minister of the Interior says he never called on him. We say that the Minister of the Interior should have asked him to call, when he was told that he was ready to call to see him and to talk over this matter. But it is said in reply that the Minister of the Interior had no right to

run round after him. Well, I would like to know what Ministers are for. Are they to sit in their offices and wait till people come to them and bow before them ? I hold that they ought to act in these matters as any other business man would act. If I wanted to get some work done, and I heard that some gentleman was willing to do it for a certain price, and was willing to see me about it, I would write him a note and would ask him to call, especially if I was told by a gentleman of such high standing in this community as Sir William Van Horne. We asked the Minister of the Interior if he had made any inquiries about the standing of Mr. Smith, and he says that he made no inquiries about him at all. If he had made inquiries, what would he have found ? Not that Mr. Hamilton Smith was a man of no standing, not that he was a man to be treated with ridicule, not that he was a man who would make offers that did not amount to anything. He would have found that he was a man having a substantial backing, that the man himself was of the highest standing, and those who were associated with him were men able to carry out anything they undertook to carry out. I say the people of this country will hold the Government responsible for not paying a little more attention to Mr. Hamilton Smith when he was willing to call and talk over this matter with the Minister of the Interior. I think it is about time the Ministers learned that the country will not excuse them for neglecting to call on a man respecting a matter of such importance. If a Minister is able to save two million or three million acres of land by going to see Mr. Hamilton Smith, or taking the trouble of asking him to call at the department, the people will not accept the excuse that Mr. Hamilton Smith did not call on him, especially when he is aware that Sir William Van Horne had stated that Mr. Smith was willing to call and talk over the matter of building this railway. The country will not acquit the hon. gentleman of blame in this matter. I notice that the Minister of Railways, in introducing this Bill, talked about other men who would have been glad to build this road. The hon. gentleman said :

I know there were others. I know there were others who felt that they represented large amounts of capital and had untold means behind them, and were willing to enter upon the construction of this road.

As I read those remarks I thought perhaps the hon. gentleman referred to Mr. Hamilton Smith, because he said he was prepared to talk railway with the Minister of the Interior. But the Minister of Railways proceeded to say :

None of those large capitalists materialized, and I did not get my eye on any credentials which went to show that they were prepared and capable of carrying out the undertaking.

I do not wonder that the Minister did not get his eye on others; I do not think he wanted to get his eye on others, for he would not take the trouble to ask to see them. They did not wish to see Mr. Hamilton Smith, who offered to come and talk over the subject, a gentleman with large capital behind him, and it is apparent the Minister of the Interior did not want to get his eye on that gentleman. But, as the Minister of Railways said, they did not see their credentials. The Government did not want to obtain them. They had fixed their eye on two other men to whom they wished and intended to give this contract, and to whom they did give it. The Minister of Railways also said:

They (Mackenzie & Mann) were the only two men we knew who were willing and capable of carrying the work out.

No doubt they were the only men they knew of, because the Ministers would not know any other men. Sir William Van Horne told them about Mr. Hamilton Smith, and the Minister of Railways himself stated in the House that there were others who were willing to undertake the work: he did not say there was only one man but there were others; yet the hon. gentleman said that Mackenzie & Mann were the only men he knew of who were willing and capable of doing the work. I am satisfied from reading the speeches and from statements made by Ministers that the Government were determined to give the contract to these men, and they did not want to know any other contractors. That is one of the objections I take to the contract, and I have endeavoured to make it plain that the Government should have advertised for tenders, but they failed to do so; they declaring that this was on account of urgency, but in my opinion it was because they were determined to give the work to Mackenzie & Mann.

Another objection to the contract is the character of the road to be constructed. It has been described as a tramway, as a narrow gauge road, and at all events it is a road that will not be able to carry a large amount of traffic. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite read the Montreal "Witness," which is one of their staunch supporters, but the "Witness" in discussing the matter, after it had found out something about the contract, expressed its surprise at the character of the road to be built for the price to be paid, and stated that in view of the high cost a substantial and first-class road should be built, not a tramway or a road supposed to be of a temporary character. The Minister of Railways showed the House in the course of his speech that it was calculated that about 50,000 passengers and 50,000 tons of freight would require to be rapidly carried into that country. I am afraid that a road running only during five months will find it very difficult to

Mr. CRAIG.

carry those people and supplies into that country. I maintain that when the country is building a road to the Yukon it should be a first-class road and not a temporary one such as that proposed under the contract, which will be a tramway, will be constructed with light rails, and will be totally unequal to carrying large numbers of people in and out, together with supplies.

The greatest objection to the contract is, however, the price which the Dominion is going to pay for it. It has been heralded all over the country by supporters of hon. gentlemen and by hon. gentlemen themselves that we are not going to pay any cash, and that there never was a road built without money. That is a very poor argument to use. We may sometimes give what is even more valuable than cash, and we are doing so in this case. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, say: We are only giving some acres of barren land, in a country where there are no people, and we might as well give away the land. Those men further say that they would not accept the land as a free gift, that the country is practically getting the road built for nothing, and that is indeed what they seek to make the people believe.

What is the price we are paying for this road—what is it the country is called upon to pay under the contract now before the House? We are going to hand over mineral lands, not lands worth nothing, but lands of great value in the money markets of the world to-day. How many acres will the contractors receive? Twenty-five thousand acres a mile, equal to about 4,000,000 acres, or the equivalent of 5,800 square miles. It is pretty difficult to grasp that idea. They are receiving a whole province carved out of the Yukon country. More than that. The Government is not selecting the lands and assigning them to the company, but they are allowing the company to select the land where they please. Again, they have a long time in which to make selection, three years for the first half and six years for the balance. The contractors may have to-day prospectors going all over the country finding out the gold deposits and marking them out. One of the Ministers when speaking on this subject, said the contractors could not commence to make a selection of lands until the 15th June, by which time thousands of miners would be scattered all over the country. I am told that very few men will be able to get over into the country before the middle of May, and no doubt the contractors, who are men of large means, will have hundreds of prospectors picking out the best places, and so soon as the time arrives for taking up the land they will be able to go to the very spots previously selected and take the pick of the land. If we consider the extent of this gold country it is evident that the contractors will practically secure the greater part of the gold-

bearing lands of the Yukon district, and the balance left for other people will not possess great value. But I am not surprised that the contractors receive 25,000 acres of land per mile, or 4,000,000 acres in all, the selection being made by themselves, because they have made their own price. Is that denied? The Minister of Railways made that statement to the House himself. The hon. gentleman said: It may be asked why did we agree to give 25,000 acres per mile. The answer is a very simple one, and it is because the contractors would not take less. So we find the Ministers themselves at first appeared to think that they should get the contractors to accept less. They seemed to think it was too much, although hon. gentlemen opposite now say the lands are not worth anything. The truth is that they could not get the contractors to accept less than 25,000 acres per mile, and they had to give it to them. The Ministers were entirely in the hands of the contractors. It is a serious confession for the Government to be obliged to make before the country. Here are two contractors ready to build this road, this tramway, narrow gauge road and temporary road, and when they talk the matter over with the Government they want a certain price, and say they will accept 25,000 acres per mile. The Government say: We think that too much. Mackenzie & Maun reply: We will not take less. The Government are bound to give these men the contract; and so they say: We will give it. That is a strange way to make a bargain for the people of this country, and it is about time the Government stepped out and allowed other men to form a Government who would be able to make a bargain more in the public interest. What would we think of a business man who wants to buy something, but who picks out one man with whom to do business. This man wants a certain price, and the other starts out to beat him down, but the man says: I must have that price, and so the other gives him the price, although he might have obtained it for less money from another person. We believe that the Government might have got that road built by other contractors at a great deal less cost, and we hold the Government responsible that they did not do it. It is said by persons competent to judge, that the road could be built for one-fourth of what the Government undertakes to pay, but take it that it could be built for one-half of that amount, and even then I hold that the Government have shown themselves to be incompetent in making this bargain. They are proven to be incompetent by their own confession. It was a humiliating confession for the Minister of Railways to make in this House when he said: We wanted the contractors to take less, and we tried to cut them down; and when he is asked, why he did not do it, he has to confess that the contractors would not come down in their price, and so the

Government had to deal with them on their own terms. There is another strange thing in the remarks of the Minister of Railways about this transaction. He tells us, that the Government wanted the contractors to take less land, and then he winds up by saying: Well, we do not know whether these lands are worth anything or not. He tells us that, after all, perhaps the contractors are getting nothing, because the Government did not know whether the lands are worth anything or not. Sir, it is a humiliating spectacle to hear a Minister of the Crown make such a statement to Parliament, in face of what Mr. Ogilvie says at page 92 of his report. I will read Mr. Ogilvie's statement in this regard for the benefit of the House, for perhaps some members on the other side have not read it, and perhaps, when they hear it, they may vote against this contract because I am sure they cannot endorse the statement of the Minister of Railways, that the Government did not know whether these lands were worth anything or not. Mr. Ogilvie says:

At many of the points mentioned it will pay well for working even under present conditions, and at many others it will pay well when we have such facilities as we expect to have during the next year for entering and developing that region. Attention may be directed to the fact that the whole of that vast district owes its now world-wide reputation to the richness of 140 claims in the Klondike division. One hundred of these are on Bonanza Creek, and about 40 on Eldorado. To use a mining term, many of these claims are "world-beaters," and if the indications now known are worth anything at all, they are worth from sixty to seventy millions of dollars in those two creeks.

Taking this division as a whole, including the three creeks named, affluent to Indian Creek, a district some 35 miles in length and 25 or more miles in width, if the indications can be relied on, there are one hundred million dollars in sight in that area.

And yet we are told by the Minister of Railways that these lands may not be worth anything at all. Mr. Ogilvie's report continued:

No one can guarantee this amount, but the prospects so far developed point to that sum pretty conclusively. This district is exceptionally rich. Nothing has ever been found like it heretofore in that country, in fact, in very few countries has anything been found like it, and while we cannot confidently assert that other finds as valuable as it will be made, it is altogether improbable that gold is scattered over such a vast extent and only rich at a point which is less than the 140th part of the total area. If we add to this part of the northern area of British Columbia, we increase it nearly two-fold, and the comparative area of the Klondike district is much lessened.

Well, Sir, that ought to be conclusive as to whether these lands are worth anything or not. It is a pity that the Minister of Railways and the Government did not read that before they made this bargain, and anyway, it is rather strange that they should make a

bargain about a thing they did not know anything about, and did not know whether it was valuable or not.

The Minister of Railways also told us that he did not know whether Mann & Mackenzie had a good bargain or not, but he hoped they had, and I will quote his words, because they are very remarkable, and, I have no doubt, represent the views of the Government on this question.

Whether we have given them in one of those acres a Bonanza or second Eldorado we do not know; we may have done so, but we may not.

It may be, and it looks as if the Minister of Railways did not know anything about what he was doing, but I think Mann & Mackenzie knew something about it. I am strongly of opinion that they knew something about it and that they were not in so much doubt as the Minister of Railways in regard to the value of these lands. Mann & Mackenzie are not the men who would undertake this on spec, and I am quite sure that they had some idea that they had got a Bonanza or second Eldorado. The Minister of Railways again says:

That is all a chance, but it is one of those chances in which, happily for the Government and the country, the risk is all carried and borne by other parties to the contract. We do not assume any risk; they do.

Well, what an absurd statement for a man to make when he is parting with lands which may turn out, as he said himself, to be a Bonanza or second Eldorado. He tells us that the Government may have given Mann & Mackenzie a Bonanza or second Eldorado, and yet he says, in the same breath, that the Government are taking no chances at all, and that Mann & Mackenzie are taking all the chances. How absurd that is. If these lands turn out to be Bonanzas and Eldorados, as the Minister of Railways thinks they may, what will the country think of this bargain then? There is very little doubt that Mann & Mackenzie will select the very best lands in that country, and there is very little doubt that these lands will turn out well. Then, if what Mr. Ogilvie talks about come true, and the lands yield \$100,000,000 to the contractors, does any sane person think that the country will hold that the Government was justified in making any such bargain as this? Does the Minister of Railways think that the people of Canada will believe with him, that Mann & Mackenzie took all the chances?

Now, Sir, I will quote from the "Monetary Times" again, and I would impress upon hon. gentlemen on the other side, that this is a commercial and not a political paper. This is what the "Monetary Times" says about the statement of the Minister of Railways, that perhaps these lands are worth nothing at all:

No impartial person can view the continued depreciation of the Klondike gold lands, for which the railway company has bargained, with-

Mr. CRAIG.

out amazement, the more especially as it is chiefly indulged in by official personages, whose object it is to defend the bargain. Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann are represented as little better than ninnyes for having entered into what is described as the wildest of wild speculations.

We all agree with that, and I think the country agrees with that, too.

Undoubtedly, there's a large speculative element in the deal; but what are we to think of making a bargain of this kind, toward which, when it has been made, one of the parties thereto acts as if it desired to defeat the scheme? Admitting, as we have done from the first, the large speculative element in the deal, we think the odds in the gamble, as it is called, are against the Government, decidedly, not to say largely.

Well, Sir, instead of the contractors taking all the chances, it is quite plain that the contractors are taking no chances at all. The Government must know that, if this contract is ratified by Parliament, the contractors can sell out these lands for far more money than the railway is ever going to cost them, and they can pocket millions of dollars besides. That statement cannot be disputed. What I have said has been borne out completely by this article in the "Monetary Times." The contractors are taking no chances, but the country is taking great chances, and throughout Canada to-day the Government are being condemned for parting with such a valuable domain of the people. If there is any gamble at all in it, the Government must be condemned for being on the wrong side of the gamble.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Railways said: "I believe this Bill will stand close examination." Well, we are trying to give it close examination; that is what we want to do. I do not know that gentlemen on the other side of the House are examining this Bill very closely. We have not heard very many of them giving their views to the public upon it. The arguments used to defend this Bill are not arguments which I think will avail with the public; they have not been very strong or very forcible. The Minister of Railways also said: "All we desire is that the Bill shall be fairly examined, and that it shall be well understood." Does he mean that the Government supporters can judge of this bargain without reference to party? I am afraid not. The Opposition are trying to let the country know what this bargain is. A few days ago I was talking to a gentleman in Port Hope, a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, about this Yukon Railway Bill. I said to him, "This is a pretty bad bargain." He had the idea that the lands to be given to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann were all in British Columbia. When I told him that that was not the case, but that they were all in the Yukon region, he expressed great surprise; and, although he was careful not to say too much in condemnation of the Government, he agreed with me that they were giving too much for what they got.

Now, we want the country to understand this question, and if we can do it we are determined that they shall understand it. In the first place, we want them to know whether they are getting an all-Canadian route. That is a question on which there is a good deal of doubt at the present time. That is the only plea urged for the building of this road; but I am not satisfied in my own mind that we shall have an all-Canadian route when this road is built. In fact, the probabilities look the other way. One probability is that at Wrangel we shall be in the hands of the United States, as we are in other ports in Alaska. The Government should have settled this question before introducing the Bill, so that there would be no doubt about it. I suppose urgency was their excuse for that. But we may go ahead and build this road, and give away all this land, and not have an all-Canadian route after all. What defence will the Government then have before the country?

Then, we want to know the kind of road we are to get for the great price we are paying for it. We are not going to get a first-class road; I think that is evident. We are getting a narrow gauge road built with comparatively light rails. It may do the work for a little while. In fact, we are getting a temporary road. I am satisfied the people of this country do not understand this; they think we are getting a first-class road. They must think so when they see the great price we are paying for it. Therefore we want them to know we want the country to know what price we are paying for this road. People have asked me whether the House of Commons would pass this Bill. I have said that I had very little doubt the House of Commons would pass it. The members on the other side of the House would feel bound to support the Bill, because if the Bill did not pass the House of Commons, the Government would be defeated. But whether or not the Bill will pass the two Houses, I cannot tell. I hope, for the good of the country, that it will not, because I consider the contract a bad contract in every way. We want the country to know the price we are paying for this road. The price is, first, selected gold lands in the Yukon district to the amount of 5,800 square miles. Next, there is the small royalty of one per cent which these contractors have to pay, while all other men in the country have to pay ten per cent. Then, they are to have a monopoly for years; no one else is to be allowed to build a railway into that country. When speaking on this question before, I said that that monopoly was itself almost a sufficient price to pay for the building of that road. Nobody else can compete against them. All the passengers and goods going into the country must go by their road. Nobody else can build another railway or get assistance to build a railway. More than that, if these contractors were building a road into a country

where there was no traffic, where there were no people or very few going in—if they were going to build a road into a country where, as a gentleman of their party once said of another road, they could not earn enough to pay for the grease on the axles—we might give them a large price. But they are building this road where there is a large business waiting for it. A large quantity of freight is there, and the people are ready to buy their tickets and step on the train. Therefore I consider that the price these men are getting for this railway is an exorbitant price, entirely out of proportion to what the country is getting—far more than we would have had to pay if tenders had been asked for, or if the Ministers had taken the trouble to ask Mr. Hamilton Smith or some other men to call upon them. But they did not know any other men; they did not want to know them. They shut themselves up to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and these gentlemen made their own price; and if this Bill passes the two Houses of Parliament, the result will be that the country will have to pay a far greater price than it ought to pay. While I want to see a road built, I do not want to see one built under a contract in which the country takes all the chances and the contractors get a second Bonanza and Eldorado. I believe that the more the people know of this contract the more they will condemn it, and that is the only excuse I have to offer for adding to the debate on this question.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up the time of the House to any great extent in discussing this matter; but I will take the liberty to discuss it from the point of view of the constituents whom I represent rather than as a matter of general policy. I do this principally for the reason that the constituency which I represent, owing to its geographical position and the nature of its productions, has a particular interest in the development of the Yukon district, just as it has a particular interest in the development of the Kootenay country. The agricultural region which lies immediately to the east of the Rocky Mountains, necessarily, in the nature of things, has the most intimate interest in the development of the mineral region lying immediately to the west of those mountains, whether that region be north or south. The success of the agriculturist depends not only on the favourable conditions of the locality in which he lives, but equally upon the nature of the market that he secures for his products. Our situation in the far west is unfavourable to some extent for the marketing of our products in the east; but it is proportionately favourable for the marketing of our products in the west. Lacking, then, to a great extent the markets in the east, we look to the development of the country west of the mountains as that

which will most certainly tend to the development of our country east of the mountains. Therefore, I repeat, we have the most intimate interest in the mining development of any country west of the mountains. And inasmuch as the Yukon excitement is the greatest excitement, we have the greatest interest in the development of that region, owing to our being its nearest agricultural neighbour in the Dominion.

While I might claim the right to take up the time of the House discussing this matter from a local point of view, and while I do take my stand, to a certain extent, on that somewhat narrow ground, I wish to point out that, although the point of view in which I regard the question is of great local interest to us, nevertheless, it is one which is likewise of considerable interest to the whole Dominion. It is on the general prosperity and progress of the agricultural regions of central Canada that the prosperity and progress of the whole of Canada must depend. Eastern Canada cannot hope for any considerable further expansion, except through the further development and expansion of western Canada, so that anything which tends to the development of the west, anything which can promote the development of our western agricultural regions, must tend directly and intimately to the progress, and development, and prosperity of eastern Canada. So that, if I take this opportunity of discussing this Yukon Railway scheme from the standpoint of the agriculturists of the west, I do not think I am open to the charge of wasting the time of the House or the time of those members who represent the eastern portion of the Dominion, because they, too, have a direct and intimate interest in the prosperity of that part of the country of which I have the honour to be one of the representatives.

I propose to discuss this Yukon bargain from the point of view in which it has been laid before the public. The claims made on its behalf are, first, that it is intended to secure to Canada the trade of the Yukon, which otherwise would fall into the hands of the Americans. Second, that it will secure the development of the Yukon, and third, that it will prevent the otherwise certain starvation which, without it, is bound to occur. These are the three points that are claimed in favour of the contract, and I propose to discuss them from the point of view of the locality I represent.

As to the construction of this road preserving to Canada the trade of the Yukon, I can only say that, so far as we can see in our part of the country, and so far as our interests are concerned, it does not appear to us as calculated to attain that object. The trade of the Yukon country is very largely one in food products, and it is that part of the trade in which we in the North-west are particularly interested. If the construction of this railway will give us that trade, then certainly we are bound to support it; but

Mr. OLIVER.

if, on the other hand, it fails in that object, then there is no inducement, to us at any rate, to give it our support. As a matter of fact, the possibility of supplying agricultural or any other products to any market depends, in the first place, upon the cost of production, and in the next place, on the cost of reaching that market. If we, the agriculturists of the west, can reach the Yukon market over the railway about to be constructed, so as to be in a position to compete successfully with our rivals from other countries, then that railway, no matter where located, will be of great advantage to us. But if the circumstances are such that we shall not be able to compete over that railway with our rivals to the south of the line, then, so far as we are concerned, and to that extent, it is of no use at all to us.

The geographical position is this. The nearest point of production of surplus food products in the Dominion to the Yukon is that part of the country in which I live—the country immediately surrounding Edmonton—and the next nearest point is the country immediately surrounding Regina and extending eastward to Winnipeg. If the food products, therefore, which are consumed in the Yukon cannot be drawn from those localities, they cannot be drawn from any other part of Canada, but must be obtained from some other and foreign country. The distance by rail from Edmonton to the coast at Vancouver is a matter of 800 miles, and from Regina to the coast by rail it is 1,000 miles; and if you go further east towards Winnipeg, the distance is 1,200 to 1,400 miles. In that distance the Rocky and Selkirk ranges have to be crossed, and the haul is proportionately expensive. Any point on the Pacific Coast is a common point for the Yukon trade over the proposed railway. Our competitors for the furnishing of the food products to that country are the States of Washington, Oregon and California. These States are the producers of surplus food—the very articles required by a mining community, and the same articles that we produce. They are, and have always been, our competitors in the markets of British Columbia. The agricultural regions of Washington, Oregon and California are situated at distances by rail from the coast running from scarcely any distance at all up to 300 miles. That is to say, our competitors have the advantage of a haul of from nothing to 300 miles, against a haul by rail of 800 or 1,000 miles. Under the circumstances, it is not necessary to argue for an instant, that if the agricultural products of our country have to reach the Yukon region over the Teslin Lake Railway, they will not be used in the Yukon at all in competition with those of Oregon, Washington and California. I am not speaking for the rest of the country, I am not arguing on principles or politics, but merely placing an undoubted fact before this House, so that the position taken will be thoroughly understood, and

why it is being taken. If we, the agriculturists of the west, cannot compete with our rivals across the line for the trade of the Yukon in food products, which is by far the greater part of that trade, then it is for us to look for some other means whereby we can hope to obtain that trade.

The position of eastern Canada, as I understand it, is this. If we can sell to the Yukon the food the people there require, at advantageous prices, then the manufacturers and merchants of eastern Canada will be in a position to do greater business with us; for every dollar that we get means, we will say, fifty cents to the manufacturer or merchant of eastern Canada. But the supplies which the agriculturists of Washington, Oregon or California sell to the Yukon mean nothing to the merchant or manufacturers of eastern Canada. If I have proved that we, the agriculturists of the west are not able to enter that country with our products in competition with our competitors, I have proved not only to ourselves but to eastern Canadians as well that their interests are not being served fairly and fully by the construction of the Teslin Lake Railway.

I said that a second claim made on behalf of this bargain was that it was a proposition whereby the Yukon country would be developed. I am prepared to admit that to a certain extent. But I wish to draw the attention of the House to the difference in the interest which this country has as between the development of the Yukon and securing of the trade of the Yukon resulting from that development. The development of the Yukon means nothing to this country if that development does not mean increase of trade for this country. Little as I would wish to oppose the development of any part of the country by any reasonable means, it is a very grave question whether we are justified in taking measures to develop a certain section of our country when we are not going to get the benefit resulting from that development; when we are only helping our opponents, our rivals—if you like to say our commercial enemies—to reap the harvest from its development. I am not what is called a National Policy man, in so far as the National Policy means a high tariff. But I should like to be understood as being a thoroughly National Policy man when I hold the ground that whatever is done within the limits of the Dominion of Canada should be done for Canada; and if we cannot do it for Canada, we can afford not to do it at all.

However, that is not the point I wish to speak of particularly. I wish to discuss for a few moments, with your leave, Mr. Speaker, a certain feature of this proposition—the granting of a certain area of mineral lands to this company. I take the liberty of discussing this side of the question because it seems to me it is one on

which the members who have already spoken are not, perhaps, informed from the same point of view as I happen to be, owing to circumstances. According to the knowledge which I have acquired from practical miners, the proposition to hand over a certain area of gold-bearing land of the Yukon under the system proposed—that is to say, giving the right of selection of eighty different parcels throughout that country—is not a proposition tending, in itself, to the development of the Yukon, or, I would add the development of the trade of the Yukon. The reason is this. We must depend for the development of the Yukon and the value of the trade resulting from that development upon the number of men who are employed by others or who employ themselves in searching for or digging gold in that country, and any action which restricts in any way the energy or the ambition, or, if you like to call it so—since the word has been used here—the gambling propensity of the prospector, is so much hindrance to the country, so much hindrance to the trade of that country, which trade we wish to do. I am not finding fault with the area of the grant which is made, because the difference between three million acres and ten million acres in that country means nothing—absolutely nothing. It is not the area, but the right of selection. Or I will turn it the other way and say that a grant of one hundred thousand acres in that country with the right of prior selection is a better thing for the party to whom it is granted than ten millions of acres to be taken arbitrarily without selection. The case of mining lands is different from that of agricultural lands. The gold of the Cariboo—some thirty or forty millions of dollars—was taken out of an area less, I believe, than one of the blocks that are to be granted to Mackenzie & Mann. Now, if one block of three miles by six miles, or of six miles by twenty-four miles, is likely to contain, or may possibly contain thirty millions of dollars which can be mined at a profit, it is clear that no company or organization requires a very large number of such areas in order to satisfy even the most rapacious in the matter of this world's wealth. The question is not as to the number of acres you give, but as to giving the right of selection; and when you give a railway company the absolute right of prior selection of eighty blocks of land, speaking generally and roughly of six miles by twenty-four miles, you practically, in my humble estimation, hand over to them the total gold-bearing area of that country, unless the Yukon far transcends any gold-bearing country that exists on earth or ever existed. Take the province of British Columbia, which is much larger than what we call the Yukon district. It has been mined and prospected for thirty or forty years, and there is not a man here but knows, if he knows anything of British Columbia, that to

give to any concern the right of selection of eighty blocks of land of the size proposed to be given to Mackenzie & Mann, would enable that corporation to cover every mine in British Columbia that ever did pay, that is now paying or that, in all human probability, ever will pay. When you give that privilege to any organization of men you certainly put the prospector and miner at a corresponding disadvantage; and, as I maintain that it is upon the energy of the prospector that the development and the trade of the country depends. In so far as you hamper the prospector you injure the country.

I have heard it said repeatedly in the House that these men, having received an immense grant of land, will employ men to prospect, and having prospected it and found rich mines, they will work them to their own advantage, and that, therefore, instead of this land grant meaning less development, it means more development. That is a point I would like to discuss for a moment. In the first place Mackenzie & Mann do not need to send one prospector into that country. There are a hundred thousand men in the Yukon or on the way to the Yukon, or preparing to start to the Yukon, and every one of those men, under the terms of this agreement is a prospector of Mackenzie & Mann. If any man of that hundred thousand strikes a good claim anywhere in that Yukon country within the next nine years, Mackenzie & Mann, under this agreement, will get the advantage of that discovery. There is no question about that. They do not take the claim he has located, but after he has located a claim, they can "blanket" the surrounding country. Therefore, I say they do not need to employ a single individual, for every man who goes into that country is a prospector for them, and their expenditure on account of prospecting, as an addition to the trade of the country, may, therefore, be wiped off the slate.

Now, then, we will suppose that they have taken up their grant of land, or their half of six by twenty-four miles; and supposing for the sake of argument it is situated on the Klondike,—there is room in that area probably for 15,000 or 20,000 miners if it were all good ground to work on ordinarily sized claims, including their helpers and so on. If Mackenzie & Mann, being business men, take up one of these grants and they find good pay upon it, they will work that good pay, but they will not work what is not good pay. That is the difference between Mackenzie & Mann having the land and it being thrown open to the ordinary prospectors. Let the ordinary prospector strike a claim, and forthwith hundreds of others will flock in and take their chances of developing the surrounding country. But under this agreement, if a miner strikes a claim and Mackenzie & Mann hold the surrounding block of coun-

try, they put on their prospectors, and if they strike something particularly rich, they employ ten or twenty men in working that particular rich area; but they do not employ the hundreds of men, the thousands of men, who would flock into that area and work it on the chance of making something, if it had been left open for them to do so. This country is out the difference between the trade that will be done by the ten or twenty men working for Mackenzie & Mann, and the trade that would be done by the thousands of free prospectors. But it may be said that it is not right to give people the privilege of going in and working in a case like this. If they are not going to make money, it is far better they should be kept out. Suppose the whole of the area is gold-bearing and that every foot of it will yield to the miner at the rate of \$5 or \$10 a day. The ordinary miner will work that for the wages he makes out of it and do well. But if one particular section of that country is good for a million or two and the rest is only good for \$10 a day, Mackenzie & Mann will work the deposit that is good for a million or two, but the \$10 a day area will lie dormant and we will be out the difference in the amount of trade just the same. I lay particular stress upon this question, because I do not think the members of the House are posted upon the effect which the restrictions upon the energy of the prospector will necessarily have upon the actual development of the Yukon country. To throw the choice of the whole of all the land of that country into the hands of one company will be, I say, a greater hindrance to its development than the building of the railway can possibly be a help to it.

Another thing I wish to point out is that the grant of land to Mackenzie & Mann extends not only throughout the Yukon territory, but it extends outside and over to the Mackenzie River. On behalf of the country east of the mountains, I claim that is essentially unfair. It is only the country west of the mountains that can possibly be advantaged by the development that will result from the building of this railway. The country east of the mountains lying between the Mackenzie River and the Rocky Mountains, must necessarily in the nature of things, depend for its development upon whatever communication there may be entirely on the east side, whether by water or by railway; and I say it is essentially unfair that for the building of a railroad west of the mountains that can only benefit the country west of the mountains, these people should be given the right of selection east of the mountains as well.

The third point alleged in favour of this contract is, I believe, the necessity on philanthropic grounds of establishing communication at an early date. It is held that if such communication is not provided at an

early date whereby people can go into and come out of that Yukon country, there will be starvation there next winter, and there will be a terrible condition of affairs, for which this country would be responsible. Let us look at that for one moment. Remember, Sir, that if there is danger, or if there were likely to be danger of starvation in any part of the Dominion of Canada, it is the duty of this Government to take such measures as may be necessary to prevent that starvation, whether the people concerned are citizens of our own country or not. But it seems to me that the idea that there will necessarily be starvation in the Yukon country next year is rather far-fetched. There was a rush to the Yukon last year, a rush that was entirely unexpected, a rush for which we were largely unprepared, and we have every assurance that there will be no starvation there this year—for the reason that those who were in danger of starvation simply got up and walked out, a very natural proceeding on their part, and one that I think any one would expect them to take. Now, if these people got up and walked out last winter, I suppose that if the people there next winter should find circumstances unfavourable for remaining there, they will get up and walk also. Even if there was no prospect of the construction of a railway, or no prospect of improved communication into that country during the coming summer, there is no reasonable probability that people would go into that country without taking with them sufficient provisions to carry them through the winter. The experience of this winter would induce them to do that. So I say there is no danger in the nature of things, if matters were left alone, of starvation occurring there next winter, especially when we know that it has not occurred this winter. But there is this further consideration. When it has been advertised far and wide throughout the world that the Canadian Government is taking means to prevent starvation by building a railway, people will thereby be encouraged to go in without making sufficient provision for themselves, and perhaps if the railway should fail to connect, if there should come an early fall, then there might be starvation as the result of the promises that were made; or else the people will do as they have already done, they will get up and walk out. So I say that whatever reasons may be urged in favour of this railway—and I do not wish to traverse them or discuss them—I do not want to traverse or discuss the objections that are raised against it—I say that on these three points I see no reason for supporting this contract, namely—on the ground that it is going to secure the trade for Canada; on the ground that it is going to develop the country; and on the ground that it is necessary as a humanitarian proposition.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I will say this in addition to what I said a few minutes ago in regard to the national development of this country. If there is gold in the Yukon district, it is our gold; if it is there to-day, it will be there to-morrow, it will be there ten years from now if it is not taken out. It is money in the bank for this Canadian nation. I will take the liberty of saying that I do not believe the Canadian nation should go into mining speculation. I do not believe that as a nation we should try to make money out of the Yukon in that way; but I say that the Canadian nation, as a nation, has a right to-day, and it is a duty as well as a right and privilege, to take all reasonable means to secure whatever benefit may naturally accrue from the development of the Yukon to Canada through the ordinary course of trade. I have no hesitation in taking the ground that if circumstances are such that to-day Canada can reap a benefit from the development of the Yukon, it is our duty to see that she does so, as representing the business interests of the country. In the first place to take measures for securing that trade, rather than for the purpose of merely securing the development of that country. I think that in this case the cart is being put before the horse; that our first step should be to secure the trade of the Yukon and then provide for the further development of the Yukon. But if I understand the matter aright, we are providing for the development of the Yukon, and our rivals, our opponents, our enemies to a great extent, are to reap the benefit of that development, pending action to be taken by us in the future, more or less distant, to secure a share of that trade. It does not appear to me to be a business-like proposition that we should develop our country for the benefit of our rivals. I believe in development, but I believe in development for our own benefit. On the ground that it is our first duty to take such measures as will conserve to Canada and to Canadians the trade of the Yukon rather than to secure the development of that country for the benefit of the trade of our rivals—on that ground, if on no other, I have no hesitation in registering my vote against the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. ROCHE. Mr. Speaker, while not at all desirous of engaging the attention of this House for any great length of time, first, because from the very full discussion that has already taken place on this question, I cannot possibly hope to add anything new or original to the debate, and secondly, were I even in a position to do so, I recognize it would not at all result in effecting any change in the Government's decision in respect to the same; still, I feel that I would not be discharging my full duty to my constituents or to the people of my adopted

province, were I to content myself by giving a silent vote on a question of such vital importance, not only to the people of western Canada, but to the people of Canada as a whole.

When, during the last session of Parliament, a contract for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass line was being railroaded through this House during the dying days of the session, a contract which involved the expenditure, or rather the giving away of millions of acres of our best coal lands in the province of British Columbia, a contract which a great section of our people considered to be a very extravagant one and one which, under the circumstances, the Government would have been perfectly justified in constructing as a Government line; still, in view of that plea of urgency which seems to be a very favourite one to use on behalf of the Government in getting through any contract, in view of the apparent and seeming necessity to that part of the country for this line, in order to retain the trade of that mining country in Canadian channels, the people were not disposed to be hypercritical, and submitted themselves to the inevitable, although not without many protests on their part. Encouraged by their success in the past, the Government are again about to try the patience of a long-suffering people by foisting on Parliament and this country a contract which, for recklessness and utter disregard of the resources of this country, surpasses anything of a similar character hitherto launched by any body of public men ever having charge of the public affairs of Canada. Some of the Government members, in discussing this question, have done so in a spirit that would seem to imply, in their devotion to that galaxy of intellect that now adorns the Treasury benches, that they have a monopoly of all the wisdom of Parliament, and that, in fact, we, on this side of the House, do not know what we are talking about. Allowing, for the sake of argument, that this is the case, they have now arrived at that stage where, to use a scriptural phrase, "Too much wisdom hath made them mad," and some of the most severe condemnations and some of the strongest utterances heard in condemnation of this deal I have heard come from the political supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite who reside in the province where I have the honour to live, gentlemen who declared that they could not understand how any body of public men, and especially the members of the present Government, in view of their past professions, could come to Parliament and ask the representatives assembled to acquiesce in any such deal. So frequently have Government professions been departed from since hon. gentlemen opposite have assumed the reins of office, that they now require a very slim excuse indeed to attempt to justify their actions, and the people have already given up any hope that they will im-

Mr. ROCHE

plement their promises by legislation, except in so far as it may suit political exigencies. Urgency, inadvisability, force of public opinion, and numerous other excuses have been advanced to explain the discrepancy between past professions and present performances, and it ill becomes any Minister or any hon. member opposite constituting that combination of political weathercocks—if I may be allowed to use the term—to accuse any hon. gentleman on this side of the House with having changed his mind on any public question, when they themselves have shown themselves so expert as political acrobats as not only to have astounded their political foes, but their political friends as well. Who does not remember the principle enunciated by the Liberals when they were in the wilderness, and were most profuse in their promises, if they were permitted to enter the promised land, on this very question, that all public contracts would be let by public tender. How eloquent in denunciations were they, if they thought the late Government were about to engage in any public work without throwing it open to public competition. How have they put this principle into practice? Have they carried it out? Decidedly, no. Why? They fall back on their old excuse, the plea of urgency. I think, if the Government had not sufficient time at their disposal to have advertised for tenders in the ordinary way for the construction of this line by asking public competition, the least they should have done, under the circumstances, was to have notified all the gentlemen who had been in the habit of carrying out railway construction in Canada, either by a circular or otherwise, and thus place all the contractors of Canada on an equal footing with Mackenzie & Mann. By doing so very little time would have been lost, the public would have reaped the benefit, the Government would have made the best possible bargain under the circumstances, for I consider that one of the best arguments that even the Ministers themselves considered that the terms of this contract were extravagant in character, was the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals, who declared that the Government tried their best to beat down the contractors' terms, but without success. If the Ministers did not hold that opinion that the contract was extravagant in its nature, why should they have tried to induce the contractors to take it for a less subsidy, for something less than it was worth? The logic of hon. gentlemen opposite is rather contradictory in its character.

Mr. Speaker, this contract puts me in mind of another famous contract made in Manitoba, a few years ago, the one entered into for the construction of a road, the parties being the Northern Pacific Railway Company and the Greenway Government. So favourable was that contract—I mean, favourable to the railway company—that one of the Northern Pacific Railway magnates

made use at that time of a notable phrase which will go down to posterity in the history of that province, because of its truthfulness—"that the government was their meat." So it is in this case. Mackenzie & Mann, knowing a good thing when they saw it, being able and competent men in their own line, and shrewd, practical men, as is evidenced by the terms of this contract—they knowing the position the Government were in as regards the plea of urgency, also knowing that they alone of all the contractors in Canada were selected to tender for the construction of this road, took advantage of this state of affairs to name their own price, which we, on this side of the House, claim to be most exorbitant; and the Government tamely submitted, or in other words the Government became their meat.

But is the claim of urgency a valid reason for engaging in this contract in this peculiar manner? We say, no. The report of Mr. Ogilvie, as has been pointed out, was in the hands of the Government last July—indeed it has transpired during the debate that it has been in the hands of the Government since last March. Here I take issue with the hon. Minister of the Interior, who asked the question, would any sane man on the strength of that report ever dream that any great number of people would flock into that country. Well, I think the mental equilibrium of the gentlemen on this side of the House is equally as good as his own, and I unhesitatingly say, yes, the report of Mr. Ogilvie in reference to those large gold finds and to the probable mineral resources of that country was of itself sufficient to ensure a large influx of people, in the words of the report itself. The hon. gentleman knows that there is nothing so infectious as the gold fever; what is there in this universe that will more quickly draw people from the four corners of the globe than reputed finds of gold? The hon. Minister (Mr. Sifton) depends largely on his emigration literature depicting in glowing terms the agricultural resources of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, to draw population to those fertile plains. How much greater effect will a report of an engineer of the high standing of Mr. Ogilvie, in which he lays bare to the public the knowledge of the vast mineral wealth of the Yukon region, in bringing in, not as the Minister of the Interior said, two or three hundred miners, which was his rather peculiar and pessimistic interpretation of the word "influx," but thousands of souls—miners, speculators, capitalists, business and professional men and almost every class of people under the sun. So that I think the Government cannot hold themselves guiltless in not having taken steps earlier in order to ensure the opening up of a highway into that remote region. Instead of which they dilly-dallied and now make the excuse that the reports as to the navigability of some of those rivers were not received until very recently, but the

trouble is they did not make a commencement soon enough or this information would have been at hand in plenty of time to have asked for tenders. Why, the very paragraph quoted by the Minister himself on page 92 of the report, which says that in a district some 35 miles in length and 25 miles in width, it is estimated that there are \$100,000,000 in sight, is sufficient to indicate the wealth of that country and to induce thousands of people throughout the world to flock into that district.

It evidently seems to be the object of the members of the Government and their followers to talk all around this question, to touch upon the fringe of it, and not to get at the question itself. That long speech delivered by the Minister of the Interior the other day—a speech which I am willing, as a western man, to give him all credit for—was the best presentation of the case from the Government side that could possibly be made. No wonder, because this Yukon child is the Minister of the Interior's own first-born, and like most other fond fathers, he is very proud of it. He can see qualities in it that no person else can, and he has therefore dressed it out and made it as presentable and respectable as he possibly could. When I said this Yukon child was the first-born of the Minister of the Interior, I meant, since his promotion to the Dominion Cabinet. It is true that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has had some previous experience in the letting of railway contracts. It is true that the hon. gentleman has before now, on the part of the Greenway Government, entered into a railway contract with these very same contractors. It may be only a coincidence but it is a peculiar coincidence. Possibly their relations in the past have been so very harmonious and mutually advantageous that of necessity the Minister (Mr. Sifton) could not pass them over and so he gave them a preference over any other contractor in Canada for the construction of this road.

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

After Recess.

Mr. ROCHE. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was pointing out that this was the first venture of the hon. Minister of the Interior in any transaction of such large dimensions since his accession to the present Government, because his time has been principally occupied in wielding the tomahawk and decapitating a number of Conservative officials on that very convenient plea that they were offensive partisans; and therefore he probably had not much time at his disposal to engage in any huge deals such as this. But I was also saying that he is by no means as green at the business as his youthful appearance would seem to indicate, but that he has had a little ex-

perience in the past, and, strange to say, with the very same contractors, in putting through a contract for the construction of what is commonly called the Lake Dauphin Railway, in the province of Manitoba, more properly speaking, the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company. This was a line which the members of this House will remember was subsidized to the extent of 6,400 acres a mile, and also by a cash bonus to the extent of \$40,000 per annum for twenty years, or, in all, \$800,000. This alone was sufficient to have enabled the contractors to have raised what money they required for the construction of that road, to equip it, and run it at a very fair profit. But not content with this, the hon. Minister of the Interior, when Attorney General of Manitoba, undertook to give some other valuable aid from the provincial treasury to these contractors. He therefore put through a deal which practically made a present of \$8,000 per mile for 100 miles to these contractors, by guaranteeing the principal and the interest on the bonds to the total amount of \$800,000. On the strength of the Dominion subsidy, there would have been ample, in the opinion of the best railway experts, to have built, equipped and run this road at a very fair profit. Therefore, it was entirely unnecessary for the provincial government to have come to the relief of these contractors and practically to have made a present to them of \$8,000 per mile, without even taking a mortgage on their land grant as security—the only security being a lien on the road, subject to the Dominion subsidy, which comes first. So, I say, it seems very strange indeed that the relations of the hon. Minister of the Interior with these contractors, Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie, should have been of that character as to have caused a renewal of those relations in negotiating this Yukon deal. While not at all charging corruption against either the Greenway Government or this Government in connection with these contractors—because I would be very foolish to do so without being able to prove it, and, not being behind the scenes, I am not able to prove it—still, to use the expression of my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), it has a very piscatorial effluvia about it. I merely state the facts and leave the members to draw their own conclusions. It has been further stated that, in addition to these business relations between the hon. Minister of the Interior and Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie, there is also a family relationship. I do not know whether that is the case or not. I am merely stating it as a reputed fact, which possibly the hon. Minister of the Interior may be in a position to deny or may take occasion to deny.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. gentleman, as a personal favour, to repeat the remark he made about the family connection?

Mr. ROCHE.

Mr. BENNETT. See "Hansard."

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I am asking it as a favour.

Mr. ROCHE. I presume, the hon. gentleman is asking the question in order that he may have an opportunity to deny the statement. The statement may be wrong, and if so, I am sure the members of this House will prefer not to take the denial at second-hand. I think the hon. Minister of the Interior is quite able to take care of himself, and he will, no doubt, be able to refute this statement, if untrue. I am not giving it as a fact; I am merely giving it as current report. I was about to say that I have it, on the opinion of a railway expert whose name, if I were to take the liberty to divulge it, would be accepted by every hon. member on either side of this House as a high authority on the subject, that this railway could be built for \$6,586 a mile, which is less than the amount of the grant made by the provincial government of Manitoba; and with the terminal facilities and the rolling stock, the total cost would have amounted to some \$750,000, or less than the amount voted by this Dominion Parliament. These figures are really higher than the work could be done for at that time, but they are put at the outside limit. Therefore, hon. gentlemen can draw their own conclusions as to the contract entered into with these same gentlemen.

Now, I was speaking of the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of the Interior of nearly five hours' duration. That speech was largely directed to his own political followers, because if we could judge by the number of times we saw the hon. gentleman's back, he seemed to be more anxious to keep his own followers in line than to convince members on this side of the House; for there were rumours of dissensions and of certain members kicking over the traces. His speech consisted also of large quotations from the reports of Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Jennings, which has been placed upon our desks a week previously, and which members of this House were no doubt cognizant of; and also clippings from American newspapers, which were, no doubt, manufactured in Ottawa by some of the emissaries of the Government, and sent out to do duty in their behalf. He also read a description of the country and its water stretches, gave his own version of the Russian and Washington treaties, and spoke of how the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald had sacrificed the rights of Canada in the navigation of those north-western waters. But I venture to say, that I am well within the mark when I state that, in that long speech of five hours' duration, not forty minutes were devoted to a discussion of the contract itself. Possibly, the hon. Minister considered that discretion was the better part of valour, and therefore avoided that as much as possible. As a sop to the members from the North-west, who

came to this House vowing vengeance on the Government because of this contract, in which country public opinion, irrespective of party, is opposed to this deal, and to obtain their support, he hints that at some future time, in the sweet by and by, the Edmonton route—a route which the people of that country are all desirous of seeing opened—may be built through the Peace River country to connect with this Teslin Lake Railway, so that some of our towns and cities, like Edmonton, Prince Albert, Calgary, Regina, Brandon and Winnipeg, may obtain a slice of that Yukon trade, which is now going to the American republic. But I very much fear that, with our heritage being given away, as this contract gives away millions of the best gold-bearing lands in the world, if we can believe Mr. Ogilvie's report, we shall stand a very poor chance of obtaining the construction of this other road which we are anxious to see built, and which would be in all respects an all-Canadian route, free without doubt from any of those obnoxious and harassing customs regulations, bonding privileges and the many other objections common to those coast routes. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem anxious to get away from the main question as far as they can, and to talk all around it. No defence has been offered by the Government whatever for granting a land monopoly of 3,750,000 acres of mineral land to those contractors, further than a retort—a most puerile one from men claiming to be statesmen—to the effect that Conservatives should be the last people to talk about a land monopoly, because their party had given a land monopoly to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of that railway. This was a policy condemned by our Liberal friends for the last fifteen years, and surely they do not now argue that two blacks make a white. Everything good in their policy has been stolen from the Conservative party, and surely they do not want also to steal the vicious features. We expected something different from our Liberal friends, especially in view of their past professions. It is true, the Conservative Government did grant a monopoly of virgin soil for the construction of a transcontinental highway, 3,000 miles in length, to bind the provinces of this Dominion together, and to keep faith with the people of British Columbia. But in this deal our Liberal friends have gone them one better, and are giving away millions of acres of some of the richest gold-bearing lands in the world, if we are to believe the report of Mr. Ogilvie. We have given all this land for the construction of not 3,000 miles of railway, but for 150 miles of road which the right hon. First Minister himself declares is going to be but a temporary one—a road, in other words, properly described as a three-foot tramway.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) declared that the Yukon country must pay for the Yukon Railway, that the

down-trodden taxpayers of eastern Canada were sufficiently taxed, and objected to our national debt being increased for the construction of this line. But the hon. gentleman was not always so solicitous and sensitive concerning the increase of our national debt. He was not so solicitous for the welfare of the poor down-trodden taxpayers of eastern Canada when, as a member of the Government, he supported the proposition of the Government to burden them to the extent of \$7,000,000 for the construction of the Drummond County Railway. So that it is rather late in the day for the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to become so very sensitive with reference to the poor taxpayers of eastern Canada, after being so very anxious and willing to see the country taxed for the construction of a railway largely intended to assist his own political friends and more particularly that very dear friend of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), who, that hon. gentleman declared, had stuck to him in the dark days of the past, and who now, like Dickens's "Mrs. Macawber," he would never desert, especially when he had the opportunity of returning one good deed by another.

If the Stikine Railway were to be constructed on business principles and the gold lands retained for the benefit of the people, if the Government had taken time by the forelock and, after getting all necessary information, had thrown the contract open to public competition, not only would the Yukon country be able to pay for the railway, but the development of the wonderful mineral resources of the country would add to the credit of Canada to such an extent that we would be able also to pay for the Drummond County Railway.

Neither have the Government attempted to defend that portion of the contract with reference to the royalty imposed on individual miners as contrasted with that imposed on the wealthy contractors. Ten per cent is charged on the production of the individual miner, while but 1 per cent is charged to the wealthy contractors. We can on this side retort on the Liberals the old cry which they again and again have used against the Conservative party. By this contract the poor man is made poorer and the rich richer. The old battle-cry of the Liberals is entirely set at naught in their own house by their own political leaders.

No defence either has been offered to the monopoly created by tying up this country and binding it to give a preference to those contractors in the event of the construction of this road further south, or of the monopoly they now enjoy for the next five years during which no other line will be permitted to be constructed from the coast.

And above all, the Government have given no defence for practically allowing the con-

tractors to charge whatever tolls they please. If there is one thing about which the Government should have been more particular than another, it is this question of tolls, because they have had the object lesson before them of the pernicious effect of the high rates under which the people of the North-west have been labouring for years. It is well known that the people in the North-west would have prospered much more were it not for the fact that they have to pay excessive charges on incoming and outgoing freight, and therefore, having such an example before them, the Government should have had particular regard for the interests of the people in this respect. It is true that the tolls are subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council, but that practically means nothing with the present Government in power; it practically means that the contractors may charge what they like. It is true that the tolls must be reduced 25 per cent at the end of four years and 25 per cent at the end of three years more, but at the end of the seven years, after this 50 per cent reduction takes place, no reasonable man can doubt that the freight rates even then will be higher than the average freight rates on the western roads; and during this interval, the contractors will have been able to make sufficient on transportation alone to pay for the road twice over.

The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), strong man as he is physically, was, I thought, specially weak, even for him, in the argument that he addressed to the House the other day. He used some illustrations, one in particular, that went directly against his own contention. Why, he said, in discussing the offer of Mr. Smith, why did not these gentlemen come forward with their offer before the contract was signed? My answer is simply because they had not the opportunity. The hon. gentleman said it is all very well for these men to come on after the contract is signed and completed and offer a better bargain. But, he said, I have attended sales before now, and have seen articles knocked down to the highest bidder, and afterwards other gentlemen coming forward saying they were willing to pay better prices. What does the hon. gentleman's argument amount to? It amounts to no more than this, that the purchaser had such a snap that there were plenty others willing to give higher prices for the articles knocked down to him. But they had nothing to complain of for the opportunity was given them to bid. In this case, however, the contract was not put up for public competition, so that there is no parallel whatever between the two. What we object to is that the public did not have an opportunity of tendering, and that it was only those favoured contractors, Mann & Mackenzie, who were given a chance to bid at all.

Mr. ROCHE.

For these and numerous other arguments, which I might adduce as opposed to this contract, but which have already been advanced by hon. gentlemen on this side and which it is unnecessary for me to repeat, I have made up my mind that it is my duty to oppose this contract by my voice and vote, and I feel confident that in so doing I shall be giving expression to the sentiments not only of the majority of my constituents, but of the people of the province where I have the honour to reside.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I have listened, Mr. Speaker, to the remarks of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) with somewhat mixed feelings. That hon. gentleman is my near neighbour in Manitoba, and he is a gentleman for whom I have a great deal of personal regard, and in that respect, I may say, I do not stand alone in the province of Manitoba. It was, therefore, with mixed feelings that I heard my hon. friend somewhat demean himself, in my estimation and that of the majority of the members of this honourable House, by some of the remarks which he thought fit to make in connection with the subject before us. Of course, his attacks on hon. Ministers are not perhaps so much a matter of surprise as they might be. In fact, criticism and attacks on hon. Ministers, coming from any quarter on the other side of the House, are perhaps not a matter for surprise when we bear in mind the somewhat painful scene which was enacted here not long ago, when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) attacked the leader of the Opposition, and also made an accusation against the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), which, I may say, I would have been very glad if that gentleman had seen fit or had been able to refute. When you find such a state of unfriendliness and want of respect for their leaders among members of the Opposition, it cannot be a matter of surprise that they should criticise and attack the leaders on this side; and perhaps we ought to be glad that they do so, because it shows that they make no invidious distinctions between their own leaders and ours. I do not know that I have very much to say in regard to the Yukon contract.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I have no doubt that that would exactly suit hon. gentlemen opposite. What I have to say, I am going to say, with their permission, and I hope that when I get through, they will be none the worse for what I have said. The subject of this railway has been threshed out pretty fully. We have had it discussed from every imaginable point, and have had some of the most remarkable criticisms upon it that it has ever been my lot to hear upon anything. It is not necessary for me to go

into details. I find that all the other speakers make that remark, and I like to be in the fashion. The speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite have been remarkable for a peculiarity characteristic of them all, that, while they have poured out their criticisms upon the present contract, none of them have suggested anything better. Now, the Government was face to face with a very complex problem. There was a country which was just being opened up, and about which no one knew anything until a very short time ago. That is putting it very broadly, but, as a matter of fact, that was the case. I am inclined to agree with the speaker whom I heard address an audience down town, a few days ago. He said that a beneficent Providence had kept the gold in the Yukon covered under 20 feet of earth until such time as there was an honest Government on Parliament Hill. I believe that speaker took an inspired view of the whole case, and I think we could have no better proof of this beneficent Providence than the contract laid before this House.

Now, before going on to deal with the contract, I desire to take up one or two questions which were dragged into this debate by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche). That hon. gentleman alluded to the career in the province of Manitoba of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). Now, Sir, I have watched that career with considerable interest, and I know that the hon. member for Marquette and others of his political stripe have also watched that career with great interest. I understood the hon. member for Marquette accused the Minister of the Interior of having been connected with the bringing of the Northern Pacific Railway system into the province of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman's memory must be rather short in that case, because the hon. Minister of the Interior was not at that time a member of the Government of Manitoba and did not have anything to do with the bringing in of the Northern Pacific Railway. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of the Interior was not one of those directly instrumental in bringing in the Northern Pacific Railway, because the coming in of that system has been a great boon to the people of that province. Previous to that time, we were, as all know, completely under the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I would like to ask, if the abolition of that monopoly and the bringing in of the Northern Pacific Railway was not a benefit to the people of Manitoba, why did the friends of the hon. member for Marquette, then in power in the Dominion, pay such a large sum to the Canadian Pacific? What are the facts in regard to this case? The Northern Pacific was brought into the province by receiving a grant—cash; there was no land grant—of \$1,750 per mile for the greater part of the road, and \$1,500 on the Portage branch, a total of \$532,000—say, half a million dollars. There was never any

railway constructed in any section of Canada for such a small cash subsidy. The land grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway branch lines which parallel the branch lines of the Northern Pacific, in many cases, realized \$14,000 per mile. The coming in of the Northern Pacific had the effect of reducing rates throughout the province 3 cents per hundred within the first month, soon followed by other reductions, thus saving millions and millions of dollars to the people of the province. The increase in the value of farming lands on the little Portage branch of 54 miles is alone sufficient to pay every dollar that the Northern Pacific cost the people of Manitoba.

Then, we come to the Dauphin Railway. The hon. member for Marquette waxes eloquent about that road. He dare not go into his own constituency and criticise that Dauphin Railway as he did here to-night. I am glad, for one reason, that he did it. I have a strong personal liking for the hon. gentleman, but I do not love him politically. I shall take good care that his constituents in the northern part of his riding shall have the full benefit of that speech. No step has ever been taken by the Government of Manitoba which has received more hearty and more universal commendation than the bargain they made with Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie to build that railway. What are the facts? I do not like to accuse the hon. gentleman of misrepresentation or perversion of the facts, but I must say that, though he is a very good doctor, he would have made, perhaps, a better lawyer. He has a wonderful way of bringing out the strong points for his own side of the case and leaving out of sight the points on the side of his opponent. A mail subsidy was granted by the late Government to any railway that might be built from the Manitoba and North-western Railway or from Portage la Prairie, for the first hundred miles, \$40,000 per annum, and for the second hundred miles leading up to the Saskatchewan, an additional \$40,000 per annum. Those who followed the campaign of hon. gentlemen opposite in the last election, know that the present leader of the Opposition came to Winnipeg and promised that this railway should be completed through to the Saskatchewan before the end of 1898. A land grant was made of 6,400 acres a mile, besides the mail subsidy. The legislature of Manitoba in 1893 passed an Act by which they agreed to guarantee the interest on the bonds of the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company up to \$9,000 per mile, at 5 per cent for thirty years, and also gave the company power to issue bonds unguaranteed to the extent of \$7,000 per mile, thus allowing them to assume a bonded debt of \$16,000 per mile.

For that privilege they took a mortgage on the land grant. Now, what happened? The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who were, I have heard it stated, somewhat friendly to the late Administration,

immediately upon this Act being passed by the Manitoba legislature, surveyed a line, a paper line, an air line, from Selkirk across the Narrows of Lake Manitoba, and partly through the Dauphin country, and they appropriated the land grant of the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company, and proceeded to sell it, and did sell a great many parcels of that land. They had no authority for taking that land except the authority of the late Government. As a matter of fact, to-day the Canadian Pacific Railway Company owns, or pretends to own, and sells and disposes of the lands which really are the land grants of the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company. Now, a great many people, I do not know whether our hon. friend from Marquette was among the number, criticised that bargain, and said it was an infamous bargain. They said, like Col. Sellers, that there were "millions in it." But it lay on the Statute-book for over three years, and nobody ever came to make the millions, nobody would touch the road, nobody would build it, and the great Dauphin district, the last great reserve of good arable land which the people of that province possessed, was being deserted. People went up there and homesteaded, they lived there for three, four or five or six years, and then they got disheartened and discouraged; hope deferred made the heart sick. They kept asking for a railway, but they got nothing but promises. They got promises from the Hudson Bay Railway Company, they got the promise of the Winnipeg and Great Northern Railway Company. And talking about railway legislation in the province of Manitoba, does my hon. friend the member for Marquette remember the streak of rust which now runs from the city of Winnipeg?—a disgrace to the late Government and a disgrace to the Hudson Bay Railway Company. Why, that railway cost the province of Manitoba \$256,000 in bonds, which have been bearing interest ever since. That was under the regime of the late Mr. Norquay, and there has never been a train run over it. The ties have been taken up and burned by the farmers, the rails are being used as head beams in the cow stables throughout the country, and trees are growing on that track twenty feet high. That railroad cost the province of Manitoba \$250,000, and still this hon. gentleman talks about the Dauphin Railway and the Northern Pacific. Now, Sir, in regard to this Dauphin Railway, what happened? Their whole land grant was 6,400 acres per mile, but a large portion of that land grant had been hypothecated by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and as a consequence the Dauphin Railway Company, or the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company, would have been driven to go away west to other regions in search of land.

Mr. MILLS. What about the Yukon road?

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I did not introduce the Dauphin Railway into this debate. If hon. gentlemen do not like the arguments which I am making, I am very sorry, but I am not responsible for the introduction of that railway into this debate. Now, in regard to this matter, the land grant, as I say, lay there, the mail subsidy lay there, and nobody would touch the road. The hon. gentleman said those were quite enough to induce anybody to build that road. He knows better, he knows that nobody would build that road, and nobody did build the road, that it lay there and lay there, and nobody would touch it. The people of Dauphin came to us, men who were in his own constituency, came to the Manitoba Government and asked that they should have a railway. And what did the Manitoba Government do? What is this wonderful bargain that he talks about? The Manitoba Government said, we will give you a guarantee of the principal and interest on \$8,000 per mile for 100 or 125 miles of that railway, as the case may be. They got 100 miles of that railway, which cost, as he says, a guarantee of \$800,000, with interest at 4 per cent. Then they built twenty-five miles more, for which they also received that guarantee. Now, what are the facts? It was a guarantee of interest and principal, and as security they took a first mortgage on the railway itself. The track itself, I may say, is one of the very best tracks in Canada, they took a mortgage on the track, on the terminals, on the station-houses, telegraph lines, cars, rolling stock of all kinds and descriptions; they took that as a guarantee on their security for \$8,000 per mile. Now, any hon. gentleman who knows anything about railway construction will admit at once that that was quite a sufficient guarantee for the province of Manitoba in regard to that railway. But this railway, which is a new railway, and which we never expected to pay interest for at least three or four years, has been in operation only a little over a year, and, Sir, it has paid interest on its bonds, and it has not cost the government or the people of Manitoba one cent, and it never will. I say a railway like that is a credit to any government, and if it was engineered through by the Minister of the Interior, I say all credit to him. It ill becomes the hon. member for Marquette, in whose riding these poor settlers lingered and lay for so many years without a railway, to get up on the floor of this House and criticise the action of the Manitoba Government. Now, I understand that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) attacked the contract this afternoon. Well, I want this House to deal leniently with the hon. member for Alberta in that matter. This House should take into consideration the fact that that hon. gentleman lives at Edmonton, and he would like very well, as most of us would,

to have a railway from Edmonton to the Yukon. But the hon. member has allowed his predilections, to some extent, to blind his judgment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. It is only my opinion, you know. The hon. gentleman has not realized that time is the whole essence of this contract, that it is absolutely necessary for the Government of Canada to get means of communication into that country just as soon as possible. This matter has been fully explained to this House by far abler men than myself, it is a matter in which I am sure I have the hearty and unqualified support of the hon. leader of the Opposition, although some of the small fry of the party may not agree with him. The leader of the Opposition has also stated that the route which has been selected by the Government is infinitely the best that could be selected under the circumstances. Now, I do not wish to be hard on any man because he belongs to the Opposition. I believe in giving credit where it is due, and when I find a display of intellect, a display of statesmanship and a knowledge of the subject far above the petty party spirit which characterizes the remarks of most hon. gentlemen on the other side, I wish to give credit for it. That being the case, I am sure these hon. gentlemen will admit that the opinion of the leader of the Opposition is entitled to some consideration at least, and when we have his support of this route, it is not necessary for me to dilate upon it. But that route is certainly not going to give the people of Canada the whole trade of the Yukon country, no route could do that. You cannot change the location of the west coast of Alaska. You cannot prevent the American people taking supplies into that country, they are going to take them in anyhow. But by this route we are going to receive a very much larger share of the trade of the Yukon country than we could possibly receive by any other route, not excepting the route via Edmonton—and I will tell you why, in my opinion. I have been through booms, and I do not believe that this Yukon craze is going to last any time. I believe myself that over 200,000 people are going to try and force their way into that country this summer; but we will make the most moderate, the most conservative estimate of the number of men that will go in there, and we will say that 50,000 men will go into that country this year. Forty-nine thousand of those men, at the very least calculation, are going to come out of that country next fall, broken, dispirited and discouraged, and they will spread all over the country, and the result will be that only the most determined and the most hardy and adventurous of men will return to that country. That being the case, we want to get all the trade possible this sum-

mer, and we must have it. As a matter of fact, hon. gentlemen do not know what they are talking about when they speak about going into the country by way of Edmonton. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) talked about exemption from taxation. What does he think that country consists of? Has he the idea that anybody is going to live there permanently? Such will not be the case by any means. It is a barren country, and although in the Klondike and the creeks running into it wonderful discoveries of gold have been made during the past season, it is not to be imagined that the whole region is going to be covered with Klondikes. Prospectors have been there sixteen years, and they are not "tenderfeet," but they know their business and they have been going through that country carefully prospecting, and they have found only one Klondike, one Eldorado. As a matter of fact, although a man may obtain gold equal to \$8, \$10 or \$12 a day in the beds of rivers and streams, he would be better off working in Ottawa or Hull for \$1.25 a day and he would save more money. It will cost him a great deal more than average prices to live and get out gold in that northern country.

The leader of the Opposition has stated that it takes \$1 to get out \$1 of gold. That calculation is based on ordinary conditions; but in that country—and I know a little about the country, for I live much nearer to it than hon. gentlemen opposite, and I have been far north on the barren lands—it is going to cost \$3 for every dollar's worth of gold taken out. If the people can get in there and we can get their trade, which we will eventually do, the country will become developed in course of time; but the only people who will remain to develop that country will be men like Mackenzie & Mann and other capitalists who have money to spend. If we can get the trade of the country, we are going to secure for the Dominion two or three dollars for every dollar's worth of gold taken out; and under these circumstances I say that the contract made is a very good bargain for the people of Canada. I hope I have made my views plain on this last point.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I am sorry for the sake of hon. gentlemen opposite, and perhaps I had better enter into more lengthy explanations. I will give my opinion honestly and fairly, and it may be taken for what it is worth. Of course it does not compare with the opinion of the hon. member for Kent, particularly as regards the timber limits of that country. It does not compare with the opinion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) as regards the value of the land grant, which I think he placed at \$18,000,000,000. I wish to repeat that the people who go to that country and remain there will have money, and every

dollar's worth of gold they take out will be the means of putting at least \$3 into the pockets of the people of this country. The man who gets \$1 worth of gold may not spend \$3 in obtaining it, but the disappointed man will spend a great deal; and this development will largely benefit the country as regards trade. When the country settles down into a regular rut—if it ever does—and at all events if it should ever settle down into an ordinary mining country, where capital will be invested for its development, the people of Canada may look for a large share of its trade. So soon as that occurs, it will be time enough to enter into business arrangements for the construction of a railway from Edmonton into the Yukon. As a settler of many years' standing on the plains of Manitoba, I am very much in favour of an interior route, when it can be built; but when we have to face the fact that it is necessary to construct a railway in order to obtain immediate communication with that country, to take in people and supplies, and prevent the region falling into a state of anarchy endangering human life, I am, while anxious and willing to have a railway by an interior route, still more anxious to secure communication at the present time. It is claimed by some hon. gentlemen that our western produce will not obtain entrance into that market. For several years past Manitoba and the North-west have supplied the Vancouver and Victoria markets with butter, cheese, pork and food products of every kind. A large number of cattle have been shipped from the plains to the coast. Just before I left, the Lake of the Woods Milling Co. at Portage la Prairie, was making a large shipment of flour, putting it in double sacks, to the Klondike. The rate on flour from Portage la Prairie to Vancouver is heavy; but representations made by the Winnipeg Board of Trade on their visit east to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have resulted in such a reduction in the freight rate on flour to the coast that no doubt the Lake of the Woods Milling Co. and Ogilvie & Co. and various other millers throughout our wheat-growing section will be able to compete with the millers of Oregon, California and Washington. Wheat, of course, is up in price just now in any case, but pork, butter, cheese, eggs and articles of that kind have risen in price very rapidly and are still rising on account of the demand from Vancouver and Victoria to supply the Klondike country. We will secure not the whole of that trade, but a fair share of it; and hon. members are aware that the passes at Dyea and Skagway are already blocked, and that the only available route which can be used with any hope of success is via the Stikine River and Teslin Lake. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Roche) discussed the value of the land grant and talked very wildly and very lengthily about its value. What does that hon. gentleman

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

know about the value of that land? When he began his speech and he commenced to enter into details, I thought that at last we were going to obtain some definite information as to its value; but he twisted and turned and squirmed and could not give the House any definite idea as to what was the value of that grant. Now, no hon. gentleman in this House nor anywhere else can give the faintest approach to an appraisal of the value of that land. It is a barren mountainous country; there are certain beds of creeks and streams which are gold-bearing, and these, according to Mr. Ogilvie who knows more than anybody else about the country, average 300 feet in width. Mann & Mackenzie cannot take up a single piece of land which is not at least six miles wide and in these six miles wide there are over 31,000 feet. Therefore, even if there is a little streak of pay dirt which may be richer or poorer like the rest of us, as the case may be, running through the middle of that 31,000 feet 300 feet in width, you can see the enormous amount of territory which these men will have to take and which in 99 cases out of 100 will be absolutely valueless.

Again we are told, that this contract is going to make the poor man poorer and the rich man richer. I do not want to bring up old stories, but we are all aware of a political party in this country that succeeded exceedingly well in doing that for seventeen years, and at the end of that period the poor man was poorer and the rich man infinitely richer. We do not believe for a moment that the implementing of this contract is going to have any such effect at all. Hundreds of poor men have gone into that country last fall taking with them every cent they could save; hundreds of men crazed with the excitement over gold mortgaged their farms and houses and with the money landed at Dyea and Skagway trying to force their way over the White and Chilkoot passes, but they failed miserably. I know many of these men who came back with nothing but their lives, having lost every cent they had without ever reaching the gold-bearing country at all. That state of affairs is going to be infinitely worse this year. At the present time at Skagway there is hardly standing room on the beach, and as we see from the newspapers anarchy and disorder of every kind reign. What would be the effect on the minds of the people of the whole world, if Canadians allowed such a state of affairs as that to exist on Canadian soil? It has been our boast hitherto that we have maintained law and order in the Dominion of Canada, and how could we possibly continue to maintain law and order, unless in the first place we build a railway to give these men fair and reasonable transportation, and in the second place to enable the Canadian authorities to send a sufficient military or police force to uphold the law in

that country. Whatever may be said by hon. gentlemen on the other side, the present proposition is infinitely cheaper and more satisfactory than anything they could think of to attain that end.

My hon. friend (Mr. Roche) dilated on the poor taxpayers of eastern Canada. When he comes down east he develops a wonderful interest and friendly regard for the taxpayers of eastern Canada, but when he is up west he does not tell us very much about them. He does not talk about the taxpayers of eastern Canada to his constituents, but he keeps that for his speeches down here. It sounded a little strange to me that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) should criticise the Dauphin Railway and the Northern Pacific Railway, which are admitted to have been of the greatest possible benefit to the people of Manitoba, and which have been approved by the people of Manitoba to such an extent that the Greenway Government which promulgated and perfected that railway policy, has been time and time again successfully returned to power, and at the present time, the Opposition in the legislature is so small that it almost takes a microscope to see it at all. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) also criticised to-night the Crow's Nest Railway contract which passed this House last session. Well, that railway is going to be the means of saving to the people of his province of Manitoba, at the very least calculation, \$750,000 every year. The downtrodden taxpayers of eastern Canada did not object very seriously to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and it comes with a very ill grace from the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) that he should criticise that railway which is undoubtedly of immense benefit to his province. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House is tired of the subject of the Yukon Railway. Every available argument has been discussed in connection with that road, and I trust that hon. gentlemen will not be too hard on me, if I do not prolong the debate to any very inordinate length.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Yes, I will go on until I finish. I must say that I regret very deeply that hon. gentlemen opposite, with the exception of their leader, have shown such a lamentable lack of patriotism in this matter. I regret very much that they have delayed the letting of this contract to such an extent. Perhaps they had a reason for it, but it appears to us on this side of the House as if the greater portion of their speeches were simply made for the purpose of factious opposition. These gentlemen of the Opposition feel as we feel, that the contract is a good contract.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, they do not.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Well, I never make an assertion which I cannot prove. These

gentlemen opposite feel that the contract is a good contract; they know that it is a good contract, and they tacitly admit that it is the best contract which could possibly be promulgated in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Yes, they admit it because they have not produced a better, nor have they made any suggestion which would lead to the introduction of a better contract than the one now before the House.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I have listened to all that has been said in defence of this contract by the Minister of the Interior and by other hon. gentlemen in this House. I have also listened with a great deal of pleasure to the address of the hon. member from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), a gentleman whose opinion on railroad corporations and monopolies is always admired and respected in Ontario. The more this agreement or contract is discussed, the more dissatisfied am I with its terms. We are told that it has been modified in two or three important particulars, but I do not think that such a bargain as this could be modified with so delicate an instrument as a pen; I would like to see it modified out of existence with an axe, and I hope there are hands either in this House or elsewhere that will do that work.

I appreciate all that has been said by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) about the duty of saying nothing which would embitter the pleasant relations heretofore existing between the United States and Canada; I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that Parliament stood at all in need of a lecture on this point from the hon. Minister. I agree with him, that the duty of saying nothing to embitter these pleasant relations is binding on both parties in this House. I wish I could only persuade him that the Government should be just as truly bound by the duty of doing nothing to embitter these relations. I believe the Government is doing a great deal to embitter these relations where it gives away a large slice of the Yukon territory to provide a tramway to be used during the pleasure of the United States. The Government is giving away resources far more than sufficient to build an all-Canadian route from Teslin Lake down to Port Simpson; and all the country gets is a tramway which may be useless whenever the commercial interests of the State of Washington or the State of Oregon are able to call our treaty rights in question. If the Government were really what it pretends to be, the friend of peace and good-will, it would seek to avoid all international complications by making Canadians independent of any treaty rights which may be regarded as favours by our American friends. The Government cannot ensure harmony by ignoring the possibility that

difficulties may be raised at Fort Wrangel. The Government could have avoided all cause for misunderstanding by dropping Fort Wrangel and the Washington Treaty out of the question, and by establishing a route which would have secured the entire trade of the Yukon to Canadian citizens without reference to any possible difficulty at Fort Wrangel or elsewhere. It has been suggested that there are grave international reasons why this bargain should be promptly ratified. It would not be right to ask the Government to trumpet those reasons from the housetops. I for one am quite content that the Government should keep a tight grip on its state secrets. I only wish I could persuade it to keep an equally tight grip on the country's resources.

My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser)—I read his speech in "Hansard" the other day—likened this bid to the bid of a man who would like to put in his bid after the article he wanted had been knocked down to some one else. He seemed to look upon the hon. Minister of the Interior as a sort of auctioneer in the matter. I confess I cannot see any evidence of a sale. I believe that if the goods had been put up, there would have been not only this bid, but many others even better. It seems to me, from all the evidence before the House so far, that the hon. Minister of the Interior acted as if he had a good deal rather make a bargain with Mackenzie & Mann than give the people a chance to make better bids. In regard to this Hamilton Smith matter, which has caused so much talk, it strikes me that the circumstances surrounding that case will require a good deal of explanation from the friends of Sir William Van Horne. I believe that the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway realized the danger of allowing Mr. Hamilton Smith to get in between Mackenzie & Mann and the Minister of the Interior. I believe that Mackenzie & Mann represented the Canadian Pacific Railway interests, and I am therefore inclined to think that Sir William Van Horne undertook to amuse Mr. Hamilton Smith until Mackenzie & Mann had completed the deal with the Minister of the Interior. In other words, the friends of Sir William Van Horne had better hurry up and get their explanation in quick, or the country will be at liberty to conclude that the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway simply confided this man Hamilton Smith out of a chance to get in an offer that would have effectually spoiled the Mackenzie & Mann deal. I have never seen Mr. Hamilton Smith or Sir William Van Horne in my life, and I have no personal knowledge that would enable me to put a value on their words: but the circumstances surrounding the case strongly suggest to me that Mr. Hamilton Smith is telling the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

I would like to refer again with becoming reserve to the difficulties created by the

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.

policy of the United States towards Canada. I believe that if the Government had anticipated any trouble that may come from the south like patriots, they would have had the whole country behind them, even to the extent of building an all-Canadian route from Lake Teslin to Port Simpson. The country will not begrudge the few millions in dollars needed to build a railway in defence of Canadian trade; but the country will begrudge the millions in gold claims which are given in tribute to Mackenzie & Mann. I am ready to believe, Mr. Speaker, that there are grave international reasons why this tramroad should be built; but I do not believe there are any international reasons why this bargain should be made or ratified. There is surely a difference between building a railroad or a tramroad for the benefit of the country and making a bargain for the benefit of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. The Government appeals at once to our patriotism and our parsimony. They talk like patriots; they tell us that this tramroad is a good thing for the country, and that it has to be built, no matter at what expense; and then they come to us like pawn-brokers and tell us that they have to save the money of the country, and that they are giving us the accommodation required, and it is not costing the country a cent. I confess that I am not persuaded by the Government's double-barrelled argument. I say that if this tramroad had to be built to meet a grave national emergency, the Government should have risen to the occasion like patriots. They could have done as the American Government did in the case of the Union Pacific Railroad—advance the money required to build the road and take a mortgage on it. If they had done that, I believe the country would be paid back every cent, just as the United States have been paid back the \$45,000,000 they advanced to the Union Pacific Railroad. But hon. gentlemen say that the country must not take any chances. Since when, pray, Mr. Speaker, did this country cease to take chances when there is a railroad to be built? When there are any chances to be taken, the country has to take them, for there is no one else to take them. The country had to take the chances a year ago, or rather the Canadian Pacific Railway Company took \$3,000,000 out of the country's strong box for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and the friends of the Government got 300,000 acres of British Columbia coal lands. There was no desire then that the country should not take any chances. There would be no desire now that the country should not take any chances if the risks were at all great. I would sooner see the country take the chances than Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann take everything in sight. Some hon. gentleman has suggested that this Yukon business is a huge gamble, and that the country should keep

out of it. I do not know whether this hon. gentleman thinks that it would be immoral for the country to rush into such a gamble, I cannot quite see the morality of his idea that the Yukon is a gamble and that the country should keep out of it. The country might better risk its own money than enfranchise Mackenzie & Mann to risk other people's money. I remember that the hon. Minister of Railways, on the afternoon on which he introduced this railway Bill, said that these gentlemen were going to put their hands into their own pockets. These gentlemen will not do anything of the kind so long as the good old British public has got a pocket in its clothes. These contractors are not going into this gamble with their own money. They will use the country's resources to get the money they need. If the enterprise is successful, they win, and if it fails the British public lose and the country's credit is injured. If this scheme should prove unprofitable, Mann & Mackenzie will certainly lose the prospective profits, but the real loss will fall on the innocent investor who has advanced his money. Then the promoters of future enterprises, who will cross the sea in these magnificent ships, a model of which is in the lobby of the House, when they want money from England, will find, as they walk around Lombard and Threadneedle streets, that they will not be able to secure any, because the British investor has been already bitten in this gamble which this Government is going to keep out of. I do not think that there will be any loss. If there were any risk of loss in this transaction, Mackenzie & Mann would not be found within gunshot of this contract.

William Mackenzie, of Toronto, and Daniel Mann, of Montreal, are no fools.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON—William Mackenzie, of Toronto, and Daniel Mann, of Montreal, are not exactly children in arms, although one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House seems to think that their parents or guardians should have taken hold of them and prevented them from signing away all their worldly possessions in this contract.

There has been an effort on the other side of the House to put the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) before the country as a sort of young David who goes after these Philistines and bowls them over. But these Goliaths of the contracting world are not new at the business of making bargains. I understand from my hon. friend the member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) this afternoon, that this Yukon Railway contract is not the first which Mackenzie & Mann have made with the hon. Minister of the Interior who represented the Dominion in these negotiations. It is perfectly wonderful—I have been making some inquiries—

the mine of information that one may find on inquiring into this railway deal. I think, if I mistake not, that the hon. Minister of the Interior, in his former capacity as the Attorney General of Manitoba, was entrusted with the interests of that province in a bargain which immediately preceded the construction of the Lake Dauphin Railway referred to by my hon. friend. I think, too, that Mackenzie & Mann looked after their own interests in that transaction. When the Minister of the Interior was doing the personally conducted Klondike tour business, the other night, before adjournment, it is a pity he did not produce a map showing a diagram of what the Lake Dauphin Railway cost Mann & Mackenzie and what Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann received from the sale of the bonds guaranteed by the Manitoba Government. Then he might have given us a map of the land grant, neatly blocked out, showing how much land Mackenzie & Mann got. I am told that, as the result of that bargain, they got a good paying railway which did not cost them a cent. They had a few hundred thousand dollars, after cleaning up, the difference between the proceeds of the bonds and the cost of the railway, and the returns of the land grant are not all in yet. If I am mistaken, I can only blame the hon. Minister of the Interior. He should have produced a map and diagram showing the enormous losses in land & Mann lost in land and money because they could not hold up their end in a bargain with the Manitoba Government, when the present Minister of the Interior was Attorney General of that province.

I wish I was as sure of this Government's ability to take care of the country as I am of the ability of Mackenzie & Mann to take care of themselves. The House need not offer these contractors any sympathy. They can worry along first rate, considering that under this contract they have got pretty much everything in the Yukon. As to the value of the lands which these gentlemen are to receive. I have been very much struck with the marked difference between the Liberals at Ottawa and the Liberals at Toronto in their estimation of the value of mineral lands. I wish the Liberals at Ottawa would place as high a value on the best lands in the Yukon as the Liberals at Toronto place on the worst mining land in that province. Here are the prices :

(1) The price per acre of all Crown lands to be sold as mining lands or locations in the districts of Algoma, Thunder Bay, Rainy River and that part of the district of Nipissing which lies north of the French River, Lake Nipissing and the River Mattawa shall be :

- | | |
|--|--------|
| (a) If in a surveyed township and within six miles of any railway..... | \$3 00 |
| (b) If elsewhere in surveyed territory.. | 2 50 |
| (c) If within six miles of any railway, but in unsurveyed territory..... | 2 50 |
| (d) If situate elsewhere in unsurveyed territory | 2 00 |

(2) The price per acre of all other Crown lands sold as mining lands or locations, and lying south of the aforesaid lake and rivers shall be :

- (e) If in a surveyed township and within six miles of any railway..... \$2 00
 (f) If situate elsewhere..... 1 50
 57 V., c. 16, s. 4, part.

(3) The price per acre for a patent of mining rights shall be half of the above rates. (Order in Council dated 21st May, 1897.)

These Yukon lands are surely not less valuable than the lands in the unproved districts of Ontario. I believe that north-western Ontario, is a great mining region, but proud as I am of my province, I cannot blind myself to the fact that the Yukon has produced more gold than Ontario, and that it is to the Yukon, and not to north-western Ontario that people are flocking from all parts of the world. If the lands included in this grant had belonged to the Ontario Government, the price would have been for the 3,750,000 acres \$3 an acre. In Ontario there is no reduction on account of the quantity taken. Even the noted Engeldue syndicate had to pay the regular rate on every acre surveyed in their concession. But my hon. friends opposite do not even place the value of \$1 per acre on the 3,750,000 acres in a mining region supposed to be the best in the world. No, Mr. Speaker, instead of doing that, they give the land to encourage two gentlemen to build a narrow gauge road, which will pay immense dividends, if they succeed, and will be a total loss to the British investors if they fail; and on this very road I am informed this evening that the rails to be laid were first laid down on the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway thirty-two years ago.

Another point to my mind, which has not been sufficiently cleared up, is that the country loses the chance of getting \$15 a year on every claim worked in these 3,750,000 acres. As I read the regulations, the country get \$15 per year on every claim registered, and \$15 every year so long as that claim is worked. The chances are there will be a great many claims staked out on this territory, which is dedicated to the profit of Mackenzie & Mann, and the country loses the possible annual revenue on such claims.

I grant you, as an hon. gentleman said a moment ago, that the one per cent is a charge on the gold yielded by the Mackenzie & Mann properties, but the other miners in the district have to pay a royalty of 10 per cent. The annual tax of \$15 a year would probably pay the expense of maintaining law and order in the district; and as I read the agreement, the country must protect the Mackenzie & Mann properties either at the expense of the eastern taxpayers or the other miners in the Yukon district.

I believe that the presence in the district of a private corporation, endowed with vast territorial powers, will be a cause of endless wrangling and trouble. The cost of

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.

settling disputes between the individual miners and the agents of these contractors will be large. More money and men will be needed to protect the alleged rights of Mann & Mackenzie than the rights and property of all the other interests in the Yukon. I believe, as a matter of dollars and cents, it will be a bad business, this enfranchising of individuals with territorial rights which should be exclusively administered by the Government. This thrusting in of an incorporated middle man between the state which should control all the territory and the miners who are seeking to stake out claims, will inevitably lead to trouble.

I am satisfied that it will be cheaper to pay the interest on the cost of this investment than to maintain the extra police and courts that will be required owing to the excessive privileges which this bargain confers upon two individuals. I do not say that the Conservatives, when they were in power, did not put through some transactions that were, possibly, a little off colour; but I hardly think, I do not believe, I am dead certain, they never would have been equal to the iniquity of such a transaction as this. But if the Conservatives had brought down such a bargain to Parliament, they would not have made any offensive display of righteousness. They would have thanked heaven if they could have got it through before the police interfered. When this Government does anything it wants the entire country to admire it, even when it is scattering the country's money right and left. When the Tories did wrong, they tried to plan so as to get away before the police got word of it. The Liberals want to do wrong to an accompaniment of brass bands and bouquets. I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that this Yukon Railway bargain cost their friends many a vote in the province of Ontario last Tuesday. I believe that if the Conservative Opposition had been in a position to show its enmity to the influences which profit by this bargain, the Conservative Opposition would have swept the province from end to end. If the Ontario Government has escaped defeat, its leaders must know that the dissatisfaction which this bargain has aroused in Ontario has brought them to the very verge of death after twenty-five years of supremacy. That is all I've got to say.

Mr. GANONG. I had not the pleasure of being present when the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) introduced this Bill. But when I arrived, the following day, I could not but be struck with the dejected air of the hon. Minister of Railways, and of hon. members on the other side, except, possibly, the Ministers who were in what would be called, probably, the ring. It was a manifestation of that psychological power which, when a man gets extremely angry, drives the blood to his face, and which, when

he is extremely frightened, will upset his equilibrium, the forces flying wild, striking at the pit of his stomach, as it did in the case of many members opposite, paralysing their extremities and even raising the hair on their heads. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) once stated in this House that he was not endeavouring to fire over the heads of members of the Government, he was endeavouring to strike them in the heart. For a time it was not possible to get any words from the hon. gentlemen on the other side, only by aiming at their diaphragm. They worked very much on the principle of the famous Edison doll. When the diaphragm is pressed, it cries "Ma, ma!" With hon. gentlemen opposite it was, "Mann, Mann!" The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) used the phrase—and I presume he used it advisedly—"the wild and woolly west." I should not have applied that phrase myself; but since I have the authority of the Minister of the Interior, I can only suppose that he knew what he was talking about. It is quite evident that he used this as applied to some of his own supporters, because he has succeeded well in pulling the wool over their eyes; and if evidence of wildness is required, I think we can furnish that as well. As to the pulling the wool over their eyes, he referred to certain grants that were to be had, provided this deal went through, and, for some hon. gentlemen who do not live so far in the west, there was another inducement held out—steamboats, steamboats galore to be built, though this was made possible only by the retention of the National Policy. We had from the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) the statement that he was in this line, and that he favoured this contract. Why should he not? He has every interest in favouring it. Hon. gentlemen on this side may say that it is a grand and glorious thing to have built up a country; but the hon. member for Centre Toronto, according to his own words, has been the saviour of the country. If so, he has been its saviour from his friends only. The hon. gentleman's resonant tones had hardly died away in the words, "Elect me. I did it," in the Toronto campaign, when he received what might have been called a Chilcootian blast from the west. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), who is, I believe, the owner of the Winnipeg "Tribune," took occasion to state that "Mr. Bertram's platform, it is satisfactory to learn from an unquestionable source, is not the platform of the Liberal party." I would like to ask the hon. member for Lisgar what that "unquestionable source" is. Two Ministers, representing, we presume, the intelligence of the Liberal party, took occasion to go on the stump in Centre Toronto, and they undoubtedly backed this policy. If the Bertram policy is not the policy of the Liberal party to-day, what policy have they? It is the policy they proposed and carried through this House. So,

I say, it is an evidence of the wildness referred to by the hon. Minister of the Interior, to make a statement in this House, or out of it, in the newspapers or otherwise, that this Bertram policy is not the policy of the Liberal party.

The purpose of this Bill is to confirm a contract made between this Government and Mackenzie & Mann for the building of a railroad, or more correctly speaking and taking the words of the right hon. First Minister, a temporary tramway, from some point on the navigable part of the Stikine River to some navigable point on Lake Teslin, the standard of which shall be equal to that of the Kaslo and Slocan Railway.

Now, Sir, the very fact of the Government placing this matter on the bill of fare for this session, if they are sensible business men, which I think this country has very good reason to question—if, I say, they are sensible business men, the Bill pre-supposes that they had a full knowledge of the requirements and of the resources of that country, and not only so, but that they had a full belief themselves in the possibilities of this great northern country, this country which is to be reached through the construction of—what? The construction of a road, but also the construction of a road, be it remembered, that is adapted to the requirements. It is essential to remember that the road should be adapted to the requirements, and also that the road should be on a proper route. It should be remembered that up to this time this golden harvest consisted chiefly, if not wholly, in placer mines, consisted of that class of mining in which the working classes of this country were particularly interested, a class of mining that does not require large capital, but that simply requires the strength and sturdiness of the men, with a few inexpensive implements with which to dig the wealth out of the soil. I say that the Government believed in this, and as a proof of it, what have they done? They have advertised in the Klondike Official Guide, made it an official advertisement, and have done this in a manner that is not at all creditable to the Government. They have taken an official guide that costs less than 10 cents, and put it on the market, and in order to put money into the pockets of some of their political friends, they have authorized the sale of this book at 50 cents, the difference between this and the cost going into the pockets of their friends, when this book should have been spread broadcast over this country without the charge of a cent to anybody. They have not only done this, but they have sent the author of this book, who is admitted to be the best authority on the Yukon district we have, out to lecture under the auspices of His Excellency the Governor General and under the auspices of the First Minister of the Crown. In doing this they have given the best possible proof that they believe in the great wealth of

this country. If they do not, they are no better than banditti, luring men to hardships and death that they know are before them. Now, Sir, throughout this matter I cannot help but commiserate the Minister of Railways. I know something of the Minister of Railways; I know some of the difficulties he had to get into this House. When he got in here the first thing he had to do was to father a job that had been put up before he ever came here. He did it with an ill grace, he did not do it with the old accustomed fervor that we had seen in the local legislature. But he had scarcely got through with that before he attempted to fly a kite of his own in the Canada Eastern railroad. Well, that kite is still in the air, it still lacks the wind, and it is liable not to land where the hon. gentleman wishes. He scarcely got through with that, before this hair-lifting scheme was thrown in. He happened to be in a position where he had to accept it or get out. He was told so very plainly, if reports be true. He brought it in here with an apology, too great an apology for a man of his ability. But I would warn hon. gentlemen to look out. Evil days seem to have fallen upon the Minister of Railways. He seems to be sowing wheat for other reapers, with the possibility of gleaming a little for himself. Keep your eye out that he does not glean most of that golden harvest for himself. The Minister of Railways told us that he knew a good deal about this matter in some places, and in others he absolutely denied knowing much if anything. It is quite evident, however, that at least a year ago—for I believe a question brought out the fact, that on the 15th of March, 1897, every one of Mr. Ogilvie's reports were in the hands of the present Government—they evidently had this matter well in hand, had they chosen to have taken it up. No doubt the reports were accurate enough to have been acted upon. Now we find the hon. Minister of Railways said this, in his speech the other day:

Hon. members of this House will recollect quite clearly, that before the close of last session, evidence was pouring in upon us of the immense discoveries of gold that were taking place in the Yukon district, and returning parties were bringing the most fabulous accounts of its mineral deposits.

Now, it was on the strength of just such information as this, supplemented by such outside information as was available, that the Minister of the Interior went off on that junketing trip out to the western coast. Does any one imagine that the Minister of the Interior went for his health? If they do, they do not know the Minister of the Interior. He did not go out for the purpose of examining placer mines, he had some other object in view. He did not go to determine if a certain railway were warranted, or if the railway was warranted

by a certain route. He had determined on that before he went, without any question. But he did not take the country into his confidence. He went out there simply as a part of the grand play that was to come off in this House at the ensuing session. The Minister of the Interior went out there, and he did go up some of these passes. He no doubt put on some of these remarkable looking suits, and tramped over the passes just to see how it would feel to be a Klondike miner. The Minister of Railways has stated, also, that in their opinion the Chilkat Pass was the proper pass through which to build, as a business enterprise. Well, it is not at all surprising that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann wanted to build by that pass. They had good reason to wish to build by that pass, for according to the statement of the Government engineer—and by the way whatever may be said in connection with this, it must be remembered that he at least has a reputation to maintain—the engineer states that the route will be 245 miles long from Lynn Inlet to a point on the Yukon five miles below Five Finger Rapids. He states that that route will cost \$5,635,000 to build. According to the present contract now before the House that route would give Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann 6,125,000 acres of land. It is quite evident why they wished to build through Chilkat Pass. They were not looking so much for a good railway as for good land. The words of the Minister of Railways on this subject were these:—

The Chilkat route would cost a great deal of money; probably, among all these four the Chilkat route is, although the longest, the most favourable from a business point of view, and one which, were it not for the national considerations, might be very favourably regarded.

If the contention of the Government supporters is correct, that this is a hard contract, why do not the contractors give it up? Hon. gentlemen seem to be very sympathetic in behalf of these poor contractors. On the contrary, additional concessions have already been made. They have conceded points not only in respect to the directors, but in other respects, and around these corridors we have seen the principal mover in this great deal ready to make concessions. These facts prove that the contractors are after a land grab. What does this little tramway, wending its way up to Teslin Lake, represent? It represents the tail of a rat that will eat the life out of that country. Hon. members need not ask the contractors why they preferred to build by Chilkat Pass. They are sufficiently well up in natural science to know that the longer the tail the rat has the greater will be the capacity for devouring this the most palatable meal ever set before a gourmand; hence they would sooner build through Chilkat Pass and get the larger land grant for the railway and the auriferous deposits of that country.

The Minister of the Interior did not go into that country for his health; he went there professedly to determine on the route. He is no novice at spectacular performance. He concluded to build—but without doubt he had arrived at that opinion before he went west. Not only so, but he knew enough to bring all the forces possible to back this scheme. What did he do? The first thing was to ring in the loyalty cry. He felt, however, he could not carry the Chilcat Pass route simply because one of the termini would be in a foreign country, in a country that commercially is antagonistic to Canada; but he felt that if he could raise the cry of an all-Canadian route he would be able to carry it, because the people would pick up the cry from one end of the country to the other. This, of course, was a surprise to the people, because it was not according to the traditions of the party he represented. I do not want to be understood as opposing an all-Canadian route; on the contrary, I will oppose in every way possible a railroad by any other route. But I do want a route, if we have one, that will possess some practical value to the people of Canada, who are most interested in having the best possible route adopted.

As the hon. gentleman had determined on building a railway, why did he not take the people at large into his confidence? It was not necessary to determine the possibility of this route chosen. He had the report of 1896-97 in his hands. Not only so, but he had the report of Dr. Dawson in 1887, in which he said:

Communication may easily be established by railway from the mouth of the Stikine to the centre of the Cassiar district and beyond.

Mark the word easily. Nor did the hon. gentleman make this trip to determine the necessity of that route, because the Minister of the Interior, no doubt, put it into the mouth of the Minister of Railways to say:

It became clear to us that we should immediately address our attention to dealing with these problems.

Further on he said:

With such a probability staring us in the face, could we afford to allow any time to be wasted; could we allow months or even weeks to go by which must be used if we were to meet the demand that transportation facilities should be provided at once.

Then, why the necessity of this secret contract? This is a question which is being asked all over the country, from Victoria to Cape Breton and from our southern boundary to the Arctic Sea. It was asked, and asked very loudly on the 1st of March. This visit to the west made by the Minister of the Interior was but part of the farce to draw the attention of the public while plans were being prepared, and these plans took time to prepare. They have been

pretty thoroughly sifted, but they will stand more sifting yet. They were made, not by a novice, but by one who was a master hand. The Government have either wilfully allowed provisions to be incorporated into the contract, or they have been incorporated so skilfully that the Government could not detect their nature, that they convey untold wealth belonging to the working people of this country into the hands of a monopoly. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that no hon. member on this side would wish to have it thought that the Minister of the Interior made a confidant of one party. It is true we have had some evidences during the life of this Parliament to raise suspicion that the Ministers have made confidants of the public contrary to usage. We have evidence of it in the case of the Minister of Finance, when he wished to influence the Nova Scotia elections. We had some little evidence also when the Minister of Railways wished to give Kingston the contracts for locomotive engines. But surely the Minister of the Interior would not attempt to give information to one party and keep it from another. Surely no man would have any intimation that the Stikine route would be selected, because it carried with it the biggest pull on the public domain; that it would stand best with the people because the cry of an all-Canadian route would blanket everything else. But if the Minister did not do this, it was to say the least a remarkable demonstration of that wonderful condition of the mind known as telepathy. If it were admitted that the Minister is not connected by blood with Mr. Mann it would only be greater evidence that this science of telepathy is not dependent on consanguinity. Hon. members cannot believe that in this country Mr. Mann and his partner are the only men among 5,000,000 Canadians who would be able to carry out this work, but there are beside about one hundred millions of Anglo-Saxons, some of whom I presume have some little ability in the line of carrying on such extensive public works, still, Sir, these were the only men apparently who could be trusted with so much of this auriferous surface, sub-soil and bed-rock. And as an evidence that telepathy or something of that character had something to do with that contract, Mr. Mackenzie has himself become a little confidential, for he is reported as having stated in Winnipeg as follows:—

We spent a great deal of money before—

Before what—

—before we took up the scheme. We spent a good deal of money before we took up the scheme.—

This scheme was not sprung on Mackenzie & Mann inside of fifteen minutes—

—and every fair-minded man will support me when I say that it would have been folly to let every person know what we were doing.

How does it chance that Mackenzie & Mann knew so much of this road, knew so well just where to go and make their survey, knew how many miles of road they could get, and how big a pull they could make on the public domain. It is quite evident that some one had given them information, and we have the confirmation of that from the spokesman himself of the contracting parties. They went and looked over the promised land in order to find out just how much land this Government should promise them. Now, Sir, if more were needed we have further evidence from the statement of the Minister of Railways. He says :

And people ignorant of the difficulty surrounding the situation, and without knowing the character of the undertaking, would not have offered to have entered into the contract.

How did the Minister of Railways chance to know that these good people, these friends of the Government, had been all over this country. He tells us as plainly as can be, that they must have known, for he refers to every one else as being ignorant. What will be the impression that will go throughout this country? The impression will be that there are only two people in this matter and they are Mann & Mackenzie; they were in it from the first and have been in it ever since. When the thinking people of this country have had time to read and digest the remarkable diplomacy in the speech of the Minister of Railways in which he tried to impress upon us the stupendous difficulties under which these contractors will have to labour; the thinking people will be very much surprised indeed. Let me read a little of his (Mr. Blair's) statements further. He says :

I presume we may be asked—

He was very weak kneed when he started out; he knew very well that the sober thought of the people of this country would call the Government to account for this conduct of theirs. He says :

I presume we may be asked, why did we give so many acres as 25,000? Why did you not give the contractors less? Well, I may frankly acknowledge that the reason was because they would not take less. We could not force them to take less. We bartered and negotiated it with them. Members of the Government, sub-committees of the Government—sub-committees constituting pretty nearly the whole numerical strength of the Government—urged on Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann every conceivable argument in order to get them to reduce their terms, and we did get them down very much below, I can assure you, the demands they made; but we could not get them below 25,000 acres per mile; therefore did not.

Well, that is a very nice kind of argument for a Minister of the Crown to make. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to this House to have a map displayed here showing how much Mackenzie & Mann asked in the first place, so that it might be learned what brazen effrontery these con-

Mr. GANONG.

tractors did have. I am not much of a lawyer, but I believe there is such a thing as contributory evidence, and if there was ever a case under heaven of contributory negligence there is a case to-day before this Parliament against this Government, for holding the report of the engineer for one year and not allowing the country to know what they proposed to do about this contract. They come before this House and they cry that they had not time, but the question of contributory negligence meets them in the face every time. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly wonderful; these Ministers had fairly to pray with these contractors—and some of the Ministers have had experience in praying within the last year. The Minister of Finance with his deputy the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia got a chance of praying down at Boston; praying over a contract that they themselves brought into existence, and the Minister (Mr. Fielding) has scarcely got the dust off his knees yet. What was he praying for? He was praying to keep two towns alive in his own native province, one of 2,000, another of 3,000 population, that were about to be depopulated through the very franchise that he himself granted when First Minister of Nova Scotia. Why, the Minister of Finance might have furnished the rails for this Yukon railroad, and got them from Mr. Whitney, of Boston, probably at a cheaper rate than these 36 or 40-year old rails they propose to put on it. If this contract is an evidence of the ability of thirteen Ministers of the Crown, two ministers of the Gospel, and all the laymen sitting on that side of the House, to reduce the claims of Mann & Mackenzie to build this railroad, then they had better throw up the job and let the Conservatives treat with the contractors.

Why, Sir, when the country gets a chance to grasp the true inwardness of this matter they will be struck with amazement. It is a perfect wonder to most people that Mackenzie & Mann did not ask for a cinch on what daylight they have in that Yukon country; certainly they must have asked for the whole aurora to make a halo for themselves. Why, Sir, if this scheme materializes the man in the moon won't be in it with this Mann, for the man in the moon shines with a borrowed light, while this Mann of the Yukon will shine resplendent in the glories of his own possessions; although none the less robbed from the honest working men of this country, and that by a Government elected to protect them. Now, Sir, again referring to the speech of the Minister of Railways when he introduced this Bill. He said :

The Government knew, or at all events we thought we knew, what was wanted in this direction.

A good many people now think they did not know.

First came the question as to how we can get what we want,—

Please note the reading of this :

—and upon what terms can we get what we want.

Now, Sir, up to yesterday that read very smoothly and nicely, but after the First Minister refused to give a telegram to this House on which hinged, not this contract, but the possibilities of another and more favourable contract it will leave the whole country, from the east to the west, to question as to whether the Government have not themselves had some hand in this deal. It would perhaps be more appropriate to read it in this form :

Then came the question as to how can "we" get what "we" want, and upon what terms can "we" get what "we" want.

The Minister, continuing, says :

How could we invite tenders on these conditions ?

Well, he had better have done it and taken the chances, or else have prayed longer and more earnestly, and reduced the amount of the subsidy. He says further :

We did not propose to give any money to the enterprise, we proposed that the territory should pay for the railway which was necessary for its future. How could we tell the value of the land ; how could we tell in advance the value of a land subsidy ?

They had better to have asked Mackenzie & Mann, who are well up in such things. Besides that, they might also ask some of the members who sit on the back benches. For instance, they might have consulted the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), who, last session, so strongly impeached certain supporters of the Administration for grabbing coal lands in British Columbia. I wonder if that hon. gentleman's statesmanship is too narrow to oppose a worse deal than that. Shall we hear the voice that downed the oracle of Liberalism, the Toronto "Globe," in defence of his native province, score as strongly against an outrage that affects the whole of this country ? I hope we may ; the time will be opportune for it. Now, I wish to call attention to a few figures that have been given by the engineer of the Government in connection with these contracts. He states that 245 miles of railway over the Dalton trail could be built at a cost of \$5,635,000. He states that 208 miles on the Stikine Valley route (not including the sleigh or wagon roadways in either case), could be built at a cost of \$3,957,000. That is a difference between the cost of these two roads of \$1,678,000. But if they would carry the same acreage per mile, there would be a difference in the land grant of 925,000 acres. Well, if this 925,000 acres is worth \$1,678, it is worth just 1.814 cents an acre. At the same rate, the 5,200,000 acres for the 208 miles on the Stikine Valley would be worth \$9,432,800. These are rather startling figures to be presented to the country, and they are made

upon a very conservative basis. What do they show ? They show, based upon the report of the Government engineers and upon the offers of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann for building this road, that this country is being asked to present to these contractors, or their assigns, 208 miles of railway, with terminal facilities and many franchises hitched on, and above these, a land grant of the value of nearly \$5,500,000—and what for, Mr. Speaker ? This is all, Sir—for the very questionable possibility of being able, according to Mr. Jennings, to work 12,000 people and their supplies through to the gold fields next fall. Mr. Jennings knew, when he was making that statement, the number of trips that could be made on the Stikine River, and, as his reputation depended upon it, he did not make an over-estimate, but made a fairly conservative estimate, knowing the conditions and the navigability of the river. In regard to the value of these lands, we have also corroborative evidence from the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) ; and, if there is any one who knows their value, his paper indicates that he does. He said also, on the floor of this House, in defending this contract, that it would be almost impossible for Mackenzie & Mann to get men to work on this road—why ? Because they could go into this rich country and shovel gold. No one will dispute the hon. member's statement, for he is in a position to know about it better than most of the gentlemen on either side of the House. I do not oppose the road to that country. I advocate it. I advocate its being built by the Government. It cannot surely be possible that the Government are short of funds, with all the potentiality of Governor General's warrants unsigned behind them. Surely there must be funds somewhere to build this small road. No, Sir ; but this was not part of the play. Everything before this had been pantomime to the public, but a farce to the members of the Government. What did the Ministers do to meet the exigencies which they knew were upon them—and brought on, too, by their own negligence ? Why, Sir, they did not require to do anything. The farce was over, and the people, instead of paying for the pantomime at the beginning, as is usual, are asked to pay for it at the end, and at what a price ! Why, Sir, it was not even as in the old Scotch song, "Whistle, and I will come to you, my laddie," but the laddie was right on the ground, ready to whistle himself, and whistle he did ; and, according to the hon. Minister of Railways, he whistled both long and loud, and the least price at which this country can get just such a whistle is 5,200,000 acres of land, worth \$9,432,800. Mr. Speaker, what do you think of such a tune ? What will this country think of such a tune ? Why, Sir, up to a few days since, everything had been running as placidly as a summer sea. We had Jubilee festivities and jollifications of every sort,

with possibly a few jamborees thrown in, when lo! this telepathic scheme, which had been maturing for about twelve months, dazzled the whole country with its brilliancy. And, Sir, it evidently is pretty brilliant. It outshines even the Rothschilds, who are presumed to have a fair share of this world's goods. But, Sir, up turns Mr. Mann, the man who, figuratively speaking, has been in the Government woodpile for a year; and what does he say? He says: Don't you worry; this railroad shall not cost you one coined dollar of the realm. Besides that, as stated by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), he had enjoyed the advantage of some little contracts before. He had a little surplus, and he told the hon. gentlemen who are engineering this deal, that he was willing to let them have \$250,000 to keep the grease running on the Government wheels until this contract was put through. Not for money will he build this road. Oh, no—the Government do not want him to build it for money, but just simply for love of Canada. For love of how much of it, do you think? We shall never know, probably, on this side how much Mackenzie & Mann wanted in the original draft, but we know to-day, from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), that they loved the 3,750,000 acres of Canada sufficiently well to build a railway in return for it.

The hon. Minister of the Interior says that the contractors' total grant is 3,750,000 acres, but according to the engineer, the amount is 5,200,000 acres of auriferous land, located according to this certain plan which they have. But the engineers say: do not lose sight of one thing—it is an all-Canadian route. The Ministers hark back to these followers: Do not lose sight of the fact that it is an all-Canadian route; that is the only thing which is going to save us in the eyes of the country. Well, Sir, the contractors did not only wish for this little piece of Canada—this 3,750,000 acres that they loved so well—but they asked for a few extras. I am not going to enumerate all they get, but there was one condition in particular that they insisted upon, and that was: you must prevent Uncle Sam or any other bad boy from coming in at the work to compete with us. Notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) that this is a glorious and great contract, that it is a Bill that could not be improved upon. Why, Sir, it has, since its first reading in this House, changed shape very materially and more particularly in its land grabbing propensity. Possibly the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) may have had something to do with it. He may have assisted, remembering the difficulties he got into himself in his own native province. I do not presume in taking this matter up to assume the position of an exponent of international law or of one qualified to determine the scope of international treaties or rights, but I do state, and the statement

Mr. GANONG.

is borne out by the facts patent to every hon. gentleman who reads that with an anti-British feeling as rampant as it is in the United States to-day, so rampant indeed that last year a treaty of arbitration sent over by Great Britain was rejected by the United States. I say with this feeling as it is, and more particularly with the feeling from the western or silver states as it is to-day against Great Britain on account of her refusal to accept a silver standard, and also the direct interest of the western states, in this matter of supplying the trade of the Yukon country, so far as we are concerned in Canada, we need look only for the closest interpretation of the words of the treaty, or in the words of a Liberal—I cannot say statesman—but politician, we need only look for cold justice. Why, what would you think of a United States customs collector collecting duty on fresh fish when he knew there was no duty on them in the tariff and was well aware that the entry would be returned to be amended? Would you not think that such a proceeding was an outrage? I have no doubt of the opinion of hon. members, but, Sir, such a proceeding was carried on in the city of Eastport, and it was carried on at the instigation of the Liberal party in the county of Charlotte. During the election of 1887, in order to frighten the fishermen along the coast into the belief that they must vote for the Liberal party or a duty would be imposed on fish, a leading Liberal of Charlotte put up a job with the customs collector, and the customs collector imposed a duty on fresh fish only for a day or two, just long enough to serve their purpose. Only for that, a Conservative would have been elected for that county in 1887, and would have sat in this House from 1887 to the present day.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to ask the hon. Minister of Customs a question. Presuming it may be an advantage to the shippers in Seattle to make it interesting enough for the collector of Fort Wrangel to refuse to allow goods to be transhipped there in bond, in what position would he be? It would take weeks to negotiate with Washington, and by the time you had the matter settled, the question of navigating the Stikine for this year would have gone by. I do not wish to intimate that this will be done, but if it should be done it will simply be a little retributive justice on the Liberal party for their action in the county of Charlotte. It seems to have been taken for granted by a great many members of this House that everybody is in favour of this Stikine valley route. I want it understood that I, for one, am not in favour of that route. I want it to be understood that there will have to be a good deal more information produced before I will vote for any subsidy, either of lands or moneys, to build this temporary flimsy tramway over the mountains. I will concede that possibly a

good wagon road could be built, but that could be built at an expense of \$210,000, it being only 150 miles long according to Mr. Jennings's reports.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. GANONG. If you do not like your medicine come to the purer atmosphere over here where people keep to their principles. I wish to refer to some statements of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) regarding the possibilities of transport over this tramway. He says that "it has been estimated—and the estimate does not seem to be an extravagant one—that from \$50,000,000 to \$75,000,000 will be spent on transportation and supplies of these people. It does not require any lengthy argument on my part to show that the volume of trade is a thing to which this country should devote a large amount of attention, when there is a possibility of securing it for Canadian workmen and manufacturers." Take the estimate of Mr. Jennings, that it takes \$400 worth of goods to supply any miner going to that country. According to the Minister's estimate, 125,000 persons will go into this country over this Yukon valley route.

Now, the hon. Minister of the Interior says of his knowledge that the Skagway and Dyea passes are closed up, that there are more people there at present or arriving than can possibly get through those routes. So he must expect that they are all going over the Stikine valley route, at least he is giving the public that impression, with the hope that it may help to carry this scheme through. It is a most ridiculous statement to put before intelligent men, that, looking over this route, it will be possible to carry over it 125,000 able-bodied men and the stuff they will need to take with them, which will be equivalent to virtually 125,000 tons. But take the figures of the hon. Minister of the Interior at a later period in his speech, when he had sobered down. He said that this road would have the effect of bringing to Canada within six months trade to the extent of perhaps twenty or twenty-five millions of dollars. That means, on the basis of the calculation of the Government engineer, that 50,000 men and 50,000 tons of supplies would be carried in over this route. That is all done to influence the public in favour of this scheme. The route cannot do this work this year. Do you presume, Sir, that the hon. Minister of the Interior fancies that it can? He had not the most remote idea, nor has any other hon. gentleman on that side of the House any idea, that it can be done. Why, his wagon road, in the unfinished state it will be in the spring, cannot be made use of until late; and then you have the June rains on it, so that it would be almost impossible to carry in goods by the wagon road. The tramway will not be finished until the 1st September, and after that there

will be six weeks to carry that immense traffic into this country.

To get any correct idea of the possibilities of this route, one must take fully into account the conditions of the Stikine River. I am going to ask your indulgence while I read a synopsis of the report on this river, because on the navigability of this river depends the whole value of this route.

The width from Telegraph Creek to Klootchman's Cañon, a distance of 44 miles, average 500 feet. In this stretch occurs the Grand Rapids, a particularly swift section of the river. At Klootchman's Cañon the river runs between rugged rock walls, and contracts to 300 to 500 feet in width for one-third of a mile, and at Little Cañon, ten miles further down, contracts to 100 or 150 for three-fifths of a mile. Below Little Cañon the river widens, but makes many bends and swings, and the bottom lands are frequently divided by channels cut during freshet season through the silt and loose formation.

According to Dawson :

The extensive flats near the mouth of the river render it necessary to enter it about high tide.

He reports also :

Mr. Hunter ascertained that the channel across these flats has from one to two feet only of water at ebb tide.

Such, Sir, is the description given. Such is the description given by the Government engineers of the water-way by which it is proposed to carry 50,000 men and 50,000 tons of freight between the 1st of May and 1st October this year. It is nothing more than a canoe stream. One of the engineers remarks in his report that the Indians of this river are remarkable adepts in poling a canoe. The rapids are so swift that they cannot paddle against them, and must resort to poling.

There are some other matters to be considered in this connection. Dawson reports that the highest water occurs in June and July. That is undoubtedly after the spring rains have started the snow in the mountains. He also states two other facts that must be taken into account in connection with the river. The precipitation at Fort Wrangel is sixty inches. As soon as you get inside the mountain ranges the precipitation is so little that it is absolutely necessary to irrigate the land in order to cause it to produce anything. These things have a material bearing on the navigability of this river. Besides, he states that the country has been largely bared by fires, and no doubt as it begins to be settled, the timber will be cut off. Any one who knows anything about timber land knows that it is absolutely essential, in order to reserve a supply of water, that you should have timber lands at the beginning of these rivers. Let us also look at other and no less discouraging conditions. First, note that the streams which join to form the river are streams starting in the mountains, mere mountain torrents. They, as well as the main river, run in

contracted valleys in which rivers from the very nature of the country are subject to sudden rises. The only conclusion is that when a sudden shower comes (which, according to Professor Dawson, is very rare) inside of these mountain ranges, from the configuration of the country, the water runs rapidly off into the stream, accounting for the sudden rise and fall of these streams. At one time you may have one or two feet of water at a given point, and within an hour, fifteen feet of water at the same location. He says:

At times the river is too low for speed with a reasonable cargo, or, the stream may be very high and the riffles difficult to make headway against, with the additional danger of drift trees or snags getting foul of the steering gear or wheel. The latter danger is most to be feared where the channel is contracted, such as in Little and Klootchman's cañons. If any mishap occurred to the vessel's machinery, she would at once be carried against the rugged rock walls by the swift swirling, disturbed waters and sunk by having her planking either torn out or stove in.

That is Mr. Jennings's report, and truly it opens up a beautiful prospect for the transport of human beings and of valuable property. Again, he states that the level is sometimes fully fifteen feet below the lowest water mark at high water period, and also that it is with considerable risk that the passage through these contracted reaches are made, and delays are common, as driftwood is liable to become foul of the rudders or wheel. At Little and Klootchman's Cañons there is a current of about eight miles. I fancy from the light way in which a good many members on the other side talk with regard to this question of currents that they have not a very clear idea what an eight-mile-an-hour current means. If they wish a clear illustration of it let them go down to Sparks street and stand before an electric car going at eight miles an hour. When they have picked themselves up, shaken the dust off their feet and regained their composure they will have some idea of the impact of a vessel in an eight-mile current. Why, Sir, I am not giving the best points in this river. That is not what we must consider. What you need to do as sensible business men, is to look at the difficult points of this navigation. Even the Minister of Railways damns it with faint praise, for he says, in reply to the ex-Minister of Finance, I believe, in regard to shipping goods by steamer up this river.

Certainly not, unless it is a very shallow craft. And further on

Ocean transit will terminate at or in the immediate neighbourhood of Fort Wrangel, near the mouth of the Stikine River.

That hon. gentleman recognizes that it will be utterly impossible for vessels of any size to navigate this river. Now as this is an important point. I shall refer to some of the

Mr. GANONG.

past experiences on this river. The Minister of the Interior himself, in trying to show the expense of transportation, gave a strong argument against that river. He read, I believe, from the Victoria "Colonist," and I will only quote what refers to this point:

Everything used in constructing the railway except the right of way and the ballast, must be taken up the Stikine River. This is what will make the undertaking exceptionally difficult.

Mark the words "exceptionally difficult." The Victoria "Colonist" people who are virtually on the ground, state plainly, and their statement is repeated by the Minister of the Interior, that this will make it exceptionally difficult.

Mr. Dawson states that it is navigable for stern-wheel steamers of light draught and good power, to Glenora, 126 miles from Rothesay Point, at its mouth, and under favourable circumstances to Telegraph Creek, 12 miles further.

He also states:

It is generally necessary to carry a line ashore at a few places.

It is true, Mr. Ogilvie has stated that the Hudson Bay Co.'s steamer made but two trips from Port Simpson to the Stikine River and up as far as Telegraph Creek, in 1896, and two in 1897. But it is rather unfortunate that the Minister of the Interior did not succeed in getting the logs of these two steamers. We might then have known how long they were waiting at the mouth of the river in order to get over the bar: we might have known at what season of the year it was, whether it was after the spring freshets when they were able to navigate this river with craft drawing four feet of water, or whether it was at a later season. The fact that this is not produced to us, is an evidence that the Government have not taken proper precautions in looking up the navigability of this river. Mr. Ogilvie states further:

Sudden rises in the river also bring down lots of drift wood, which compel tying up until it abates.

Now, Sir, I would like in this connection to make a little reference to Port Simpson. Mr. Ogilvie states:

If we have to make our way entirely in British vessels, we can take a river steamer at Port Simpson, and watching for a favourable opportunity to cross Dixon entrance (some 60 miles across), 170 miles brings us to the mouth of the Stikine River.

But that is just where the difficulty begins, from the mouth of the river to Telegraph Creek. Then the Minister of the Interior states positively that the Stikine is a navigable river. I should not like to take the judgment of the hon. gentleman. He says later:

I do not think anybody ever supposed that it was navigable for ocean steamers.

Mr. Jennings, his own engineer, turns round and says :

The Stikine River is usually navigable for powerful steamboats of suitable design, to Glenora.

It may be possible that the Minister of the Interior cannot distinguish the difference between a river that is absolutely navigable, and one that is usually navigable. This river cannot possibly be open more than five or six months in the year, and if this word "usually" can be applied here, the probabilities are that not for one-half of that time will it be possible for any vessel of respectable size to navigate that river. Next, we have the authority of the Minister of Agriculture. I do not know what the great rivers are that run through his country. I do not know what the great waters are. Possibly he may have an unusually large lake area in his county. But he seems to speak with great authority, for he says :

We have a few miles south of Fort Wrangel, Port Simpson, where, if necessary, we can tranship into lighters, and tow those lighters from Port Simpson up the Stikine River ; and I believe there is another possible proposition, which is, that such lighters should be constructed somewhat after the form of whale-back vessels, which are used on the great lakes, so that a string of these lighters could be towed from Victoria, or Vancouver, all the way up the inside channels without any transshipment or stoppage, or anything more than entering the first American port they will come to, Fort Wrangel. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, and says it is impossible. But that is a proposition which I have discussed with some practical men.

Why did not the hon. gentleman advise us who these practical men were ? Certainly to men who know anything about shipping, it would have been interesting to know the names of the practical men who had made such an absurd proposition.

They say it is perfectly feasible, and I would not be at all surprised—

Well, any shipping man who knows anything about his business, would be surprised.

—to find that before this railway is far proceeded with, the materials for its construction will be carried up to Glenora in the way I have pointed out.

Well, Sir, if they do carry this up to Glenora it will be by putting wheels on their keels. The projection of such a scheme is a symptom of a disease not uncommon on the other side of the House, known as having wheels in the head. To back up this, we have also the statement of the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram). It is not surprising to hear the hon. gentleman talk like this, for he says he is building steamers himself, and this is necessary talk for him until his steamers shall have been delivered :

The Minister of Agriculture stated that he had been looking into the matter and discussing it with other people, and he was inclined to think that barges could be towed from Victoria and

Vancouver via Wrangel and the Stikine River to Telegraph Creek. From what I know, because I have given great attention to the subject, and I happen to be building boats for the Stikine, I am very much inclined to think it can be done, while I am not absolutely certain. Then, of course, it would be a more available route than ever for the purpose of enabling people to send goods without breaking bulk from Victoria or Vancouver, to the head of Telegraph Creek.

Well, the party who are now in power in this country some years ago, had a friend about the time they were endeavouring to carry out their commercial union plan. It is true they dropped him when he got into a little difficulty. But you will remember that that hon. gentleman is still alive, he is over in London, and they might work him in now. His pet scheme is, I believe, to put a trolley wire over the Erie Canal. Now if you can get the hon. member for Centre Toronto to build these boats with wheels on them, and get Mr. Erastus Wiman to string along his trolley wire, you may succeed in running a steamer up to Telegraph Creek. It will not be long, however, before we shall hear from the senior member for Halifax and also from the members of the city and county of St. John, that they propose that a whaleback shall start from some of our eastern ports to make the north-east passage and go around and up to Telegraph Creek. It would be about as reasonable as the talk we have heard in this House on the subject, and which is not much to the credit of the hon. members who are trying so hard to bolster up this scheme. What have we here after all ? We have 150 miles of circuitous river navigation, dependent on mountain torrents, with either too much or too little water, liable to sudden rises, and an eight-mile current, which will require warping. Yet we are asked to accept this as navigable waters for the transfer of \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000 worth of freight during the season of four months. This is called a great National waterway. When hon. gentlemen take into account all the data, they will have ascertained the extreme risk taken as regards navigation at these points. It will be very difficult to obtain insurance, and I question very much whether it will be possible to obtain any insurance at all. We have here a report from the Pacific Coast, under date of February 23rd, as follows :

Most of the marine insurance companies have advanced the rates for Alaskan trade. The freight rate on steamers of the approved class has been made 1 per cent, below deck, and 3 per cent above, in place of 1 per cent below and 2 per cent above. Freight on barges or dismantled ships advanced from 4 per cent to 5 per cent below deck and 7 per cent above. The new rate on hulls and equipment of barges is from 5 to 6 per cent, an advance about equal to that made on freight.

The advance on approved steamers is understood to be about 15 per cent, and to range on other steamers and other classes of barges

from 30 to 50 per cent. The advance has been made because the business is undesirable. Risks in southern Alaskan waters being rendered exceptionally hazardous by the dangers demonstrated in the wrecking of the steamers "Wilapa," "Corona," "Mexico," "Clara," "Nevada." The loss to insurance companies on the hulls and equipment alone of these vessels it is said was: "Wilapa," \$20,000; "Mexico," \$80,000; "Corona," \$120,000 "Clara Nevada," \$20,000.

This is the route over which the Minister of Agriculture expects to be able to run whale-back vessels. The fact of the matter is, that these difficulties are not brought to light, but this contract is being foisted on the country under the guise of ultra loyalty, calling it an all-Canadian route, although it is simply to assist a monstrous combination in getting an immense land grant.

I would be the last to oppose any practical route. I believe the only practical route is through the centre of this country via Edmonton. I hold that the capabilities dispose of the plea that the road is being built on the ground of urgency, and the Edmonton route is the only one that should be thought of in connection with granting a large subsidy by the Government. That is a route which would open up at least some country for settlement. In what position will the farmers of the North-west be placed in connection with the present route? When they come to add the expense of transportation to the coast to the cost of their goods, and then send them north, they will find it will be possible for the farmers of the State of Washington, and of the states further to the south to pay the duty, and still send their goods into the Yukon country in competition with those of Canadian farmers. Our farmers, by the Edmonton route, would be able to send beef and breadstuffs to that country, and if hon. members will take the list of necessary supplies set out by Mr. Jennings, they will find that the quantity furnished by the farmers, out of a total value of \$400, would possibly be \$200, outside of what might come indirectly. It is in the interest of our western farmers that the route via Edmonton should be adopted and the railway built by no other route. The protection of the western farmer was reduced under the present tariff. Even protection on flour, which might possibly have gone from our western country, was reduced, perhaps in the interest of the State of Washington, which can furnish food supplies for this great Canadian country. Let hon. members note how deftly the Minister of the Interior threw out his catchy side-show to obtain the votes of some of our good western farmers. What did the hon. gentleman say? He told the House plainly that he was making a bid for these western votes, and he made the statement in plain English language.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. GANONG. Let hon. members listen, and they will understand. He said:

Mr. GANONG.

It is contemplated to extend it down from Telegraph Creek down to Alice Inlet, at the extension of Observatory Inlet, which will be seen marked on the map. The distance is about 200 miles; and although we have no engineer's report on that territory, we have made pretty careful inquiries from Hudson Bay officers and others who have special knowledge regarding it, and we are assured that no doubt it is a practicable route for a road between those two points.

Now we come to the point:

I have adverted to this point in connection with the enterprise in order that members of the House, from the west particularly, may see that in considering this matter we have not lost sight of their interests.

This is making a bid for the western support:

Members from Manitoba and the North-west know very well and thoroughly understand that in any project of this kind I at least will be most sedulous in looking after the interests of Manitoba and the North-west, the fertile districts of which I hope to see settled by a very much larger population than is there at the present time and affording a very much larger and profitable market for the merchants and manufacturers of the east.

He bases an argument as follows:—

This, therefore, is the scheme we have laid before the House for its approval.

This is the scheme by which the hon. gentleman sought to hoodwink the western vote.

If the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) is as solid on railway building as on tariff building, he must favour the Edmonton route, which I have been advocating. It is nice to see one hon. member look pleasant, and that hon. gentleman should certainly look pleasant, with the possibility in view of securing large dividends from steamboat building. That hon. gentleman said:

But when the Government built a railway through permanent agricultural lands, while they were making a permanent debt they were also securing a permanent asset, and such an expenditure was justifiable.

So far as regards the position of the east, I may say that the people of the eastern provinces have paid pretty well towards western government investments. I do not think it can be thrown up against them that the eastern members have particularly objected to doing so. We have made large investments in the west to open up the country by railways and canals, while in the east we have not received adequate assistance. The eastern people are willing at any time to pay their fair share towards the development of this country, but they do not want any kiting scheme brought into Parliament for making large grants to speculators. They do not want the wealth of the country that belongs to the workingmen to be swallowed up by pet contractors.

I do not propose touching very much on the provisions of the contract—it is too

vicious to touch. There are some points upon which I do not believe the members who are shouting so loudly on the other side of the House know very much. We endeavoured to get some information from the Minister of the Interior and some from the Minister of Railways, but these gentlemen begged the question as far as possible. We must presume that the estimates of the engineer are made from Glenora, for that is the only point on the Stikine River he mentions. He says that a wagon road will be only 150 miles on account of the grade, he makes an electric road on account of the lesser grade, 165 miles, and he estimates a tramway or railway with a less grade, 208 miles. You will note that there are no positive points claimed for the termini of this road, but they are presumed to be the same in each case. The cost of these 298 miles of railway is given at \$3,957,000, including docks, sidings, telegraphs lines and contingencies. You will note that section 1 of this contract reads :

Distance of about 150 miles more or less.

And the last paragraph of this section reads :

Provided also that the location of the said railway between the points mentioned shall be such as the contractors may decide upon without filing plans thereof prior to completion, provided that the grant of land thereby contracted for shall not be made upon a larger mileage than the Minister of Railways considers reasonably necessary for traversing the distance between the terminal points.

It would be well for the Minister of the Interior and some more of these gentlemen opposite who are endorsing this patent job, to note particularly the reading of that. That clause is very likely to carry with it the Canada Eastern Railway, for does it not provide that it shall not be made upon a larger mileage than the Minister of Railways deems proper. The Minister of Railways holds the Government right in the grip of his hands and he holds the contractors in the same position. It is not at all likely that there will be any less mileage than is estimated by the Government engineer, and as they have a perfect right to build the road to Clearwater, it will represent 22 miles more making according to his estimate, 230 miles. Not only that, but there will be a bigger surprise when this matter comes before the House and the country later, for without a doubt, when the railroad gets around these little curves that are so handy to follow you will find that instead of it being 150 miles, as is stated broadcast over the country to delude the people, this road will be 240 miles long and will carry with it a grant of 6,000,000 acres of this rich alluvial land of the Yukon district. This based on the estimate of \$1.81 cents per acre gives a value of \$10,884,000. The Minister of the Interior positively stated that the total grant is 3,750,000 acres, and I now ask the Min-

ister is it a fact that that is the only amount this railway is to receive? Why are all these misleading statements put before the House and before the country; why do they not face the music like men and tell the people truly what it is proposed to give the contractors. I again ask the Government: are 3,750,000 acres of land all these contractors are to obtain? It seems but a small difference to some hon. gentlemen yonder, this little trifle of 2,225,000 acres of the richest alluvial soil under Heaven to be thrown away.

Let us take up clause 2 of the contract and perhaps we will get a little more information. It says :

They shall also have a line of railway from the waters of Lynn Canal to Port Selkirk, or thereabouts, by way of the Chilkat Pass.

That means that this contract gives them a virtual charter to build another road via the Chilkat Pass, the very pass that according to the Minister of Railways they wished to build through in the first place. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that while the Government would not allow the contractors to build through the Chilkat Pass, they did, however, allow them to tie up the route there so that no one else could do so. Just wait, Sir, until this new cloak of loyalty lately adopted by the Liberal party in this country has been worn out; wait until it has served its purpose to contribute 6,000,000 acres of this land to this monopoly, and you will see the tail of that larger rat crawling down through that pass. If you wanted anything else to show that an adept framed this scheme, you will see it in the provision that the Government grant a charter to this country to build a road through the Chilkat Pass, and you will see it in the manner in which they sandwich in another lot of stuff here that should be in an entirely different section. Section 3 is thrown in here on an entirely different matter with the hope of throwing the people off the scent, but directly they come back to the old ground they started on, and section 4 says :

For five years from the first of September, 1898, no line of railway shall be authorized by Parliament to be constructed from Lynn Canal or thereabouts, nor from any point at or near the international boundary between Canada and Alaska into the Yukon district, and for five years from the said date—

This is the part that is interesting :

—and for five years from said date no aid in land or money shall be granted to any person or company other than the contractors and the contractors' company to assist in building any such railway.

What was the object of putting that in the contract at all? If it was put in carelessly it is rather odd that it should have been so. Nay, Sir, it was put in with the utmost care. The contractors wanted to use that very clause when they were going

on the markets of the world, to point out that this very clause was one that provides for much of the good things in store for the future.

Now, Sir, if this patriotic seed, stolen from Conservative granaries, has found sufficient soil to take root in Liberal principles, let them make this contract read a little differently. If they have improved in their morals, they would make this section read thus: "And for ninety-nine years no aid in land or money shall be granted to this or any other company to assist in building any such railway." And if they will not incorporate that, Sir, in the clause, it was put in solely for the purpose of making another land-grab in the future. From the wording of section 5, which I will not pay any particular attention to, it will be found a much more troublesome section under which to call for tenders than was the original condition as to the tenders for the Stikine Valley road. Passing on over the question of tolls and exemption from taxation, and the contractors' obligations, or rather lack of obligations, to provide transport northerly, which were so admirably shown up by the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. McInerney); also the deposit, which, I believe, it has been stated is already in the hands of the Government, we strike what may be termed the bonanza clause of the whole thing, section 11. I shall not take the time of the House to read it; but, Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the time should ever have come when such a clause should have been placed before the backbone, the workmen, of this country. I have already proved conclusively, Sir, that to the contractors, as an investment to speculate on, this grant is worth \$10,884,000. To back up this idea of immense value, what did the contractors do? They offered \$25,000 a year to one man to go in and look over the country and locate claims. Could any better evidence be found of the estimate these contractors place upon the value of this immense territory that has been given to them for building this little tramway? Section 12 relates to locating the lands. A glance over it will show the consummate skill with which it was prepared. But, Sir, be it said to the credit of the hon. gentleman who leads Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, that he squeezed the rat so hard on this vital point that he had to agree to drop half of the three-square-mile lots from his capacious maw; and who knows but that another such pounding and squeezing would cause the Minister of the Interior to change the reading of the Bill so as to make it tally with the extract which he read from the New York "Commercial Advertiser." Why, Sir, I never, in my experience, have seen an hon. gentleman who could assume the courage to stand in the House before intelligent men, and read such a clause as he did from that paper. This is the clause I refer to:

But Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues stood firm, and all that the contractors receive
Mr. GANONG.

from the Government is a land grant along the route. The bargain is pronounced to be the best one which Canada ever drove in a railway negotiation.

So it would be, if there was a vestige of truth in this, but it is a lie; and, Sir, this is from a paper which is not considered by the Government worthy of a place on the files of the Library or Reading Room here. The next article the hon. Minister of the Interior will be quoting from as to the doings of his Government, is quite likely to be from the "Police Gazette;" and from what we hear, there have been some actions in caucus which would warrant their actions being reported in the "Police Gazette." The Minister of Customs might object to that paper being brought into the country, but a few copies might be allowed in just for the edification of some of these hon. gentlemen on the other side. On the contrary, these contractors will not take one acre of land grant along the line of the railway except such as may be required for terminal facilities, which they will get in addition. Why, Sir, they have a sort of go-as-you-please license along the rivers, streams and gulches of that northern country. Besides, they are allowed to box the whole compass to find a starting point. They are allowed to go north, south, east or west, just as they choose, for a location. Besides that, read the last clause, subsection 2 of section 12, and what does it say in regard to the distribution of this land grant:

Provided that if, in the selection of lands along any base line, the courses thereof prevent rectangular blocks being laid out, such blocks shall be adjusted to the required angles.

What required angles? This will give these contractors a chance to steal more gold lands. It would not require a John Gilpin to ride his horse over paying ground with such a license as that. It only requires one of these expert engineers who framed this contract. The last clause in this section is one that was strangled by the hon. leader of the Opposition. Number 16 looks on the face of it as a fair clause, but, with the telephone and the telegraph and all other conveniences in the hands of this monopoly, I fear that the chance of the poor miner ten miles away from a recording office will be very poor. He will find that this swivel base line will surround him before he gets a chance to record his claim; and, even if he does, they will scoop up everything around him. Number 17 suggests an examination of present regulations, as this Bill, if passed, will override all regulations. If it were not a serious thing, it would be laughable to put it before the country. On opening the regulations, we find the very first words printed in the interpretation are the "free miner." What a farce, Mr. Speaker! What a misnomer; what a play upon words! In the vocabulary of the Liberal party you have the two expressions, free miner and free trader.

They are on a par, you take your choice, and you pay for both. Who is this free miner? He is a man who dare not place his foot on an acre of Government land without first planting down \$10. He is a man who if, by mischance, should lose his license to go and search for claims, will have to pay \$2 for a renewal of it. He is a man who, after he has found gold, is asked for what? If he prospects for three, four or five years, he has to pay in \$10 every year; and if he should find gold, what is he asked for? Is he a free miner? Yes, Mr. Speaker, he is a liberal free miner. He pays \$15 more for the right to mine. They say there is something free in that country—the fishing is free. The Almighty, in His wisdom, has put thousands of fish into those waters, and the Government have not thought fit to charge any impost on fish so far. Section 8 of the rules and regulations provides:

Every free miner shall, during the continuance of his certificate, but not longer, have the right to enter, locate, prospect and mine for gold and other minerals upon any lands in the Yukon district, whether vested in the Crown or otherwise, except upon Government reservations for town sites, land which is occupied by any building, and any land falling within the curtilage of any dwelling house, and any land lawfully occupied for placer mining purposes, and also Indian reservations.

Why, Sir, this section 17 of this contract is this curtailment of the miners' rights provided for in these regulations? It prevents six million acres of the very best lands, now Government land, from the possibility of being located by miners. Six million acres of land belonging to the labourers of the country are thus totally debarred from location. Then if this liberal free miner has not quite enough ground and wants a little bench claim, as they call it, he can, within sixty days, if he applies, obtain a little enlargement of his claim. But is this free? Oh, yes; if he will pay \$100. That brings up the charge on the free miners to \$125 for mining under these liberal rules and regulations. Then, section 39 is worth reading:

A claim shall be deemed to be abandoned and open to occupation and entry by any person when the same shall have remained unworked on working days, excepting during the close season, by the grantee thereof or by some person on his behalf, for the space of seventy-two hours, unless sickness or other reasonable cause be shown to the satisfaction of the mining recorder, or unless the grantee is absent on leave given by the mining recorder, and the mining recorder, upon obtaining evidence satisfactory to himself that this provision is not being complied with, may annul the entry given for a claim.

This man, who has paid \$10 from year to year, in order to be able to locate a claim and who has found sufficient value, in his opinion, to locate a claim, who has paid \$125 for the sake of being called a free miner, can, if he absents himself seventy-two hours, be fired right out of his posses-

sion. That is a monstrous regulation, and right beside him there is a monopoly to which will be given six million acres of the choicest claims they can select alienated for ever from the rightful owners—the hardy sons of toil in Canada—to be worked?—no, not to be worked, but tied up for speculation, and only subject to a royalty of 1 per cent. This free miner, after years of work, has to pay his \$125 annually and his royalty of 10 per cent, and dare not cease work under penalty of forfeiture. If he ceases for seventy-two hours, he can be fired out; and just to show the great love they have for him, the Government charges him 10 per cent royalty. That aptly illustrates the regard which the Liberal Government have for the workingman, compared with their love for the monopolists. Their love is represented in the ratio of 1 to 10.

Never in the history of this country has so great a stride been made towards that most lamentable stage that we find now to a considerable extent prevailing on the south of the line—the stage of socialism. There in that great northern country, watched over only by the eternal stars, have been lying for ages untold millions. Hardy prospectors have at last succeeded in unlocking enough of it to satisfy the world there is more, and this good news has been heralded from one end of Canada to the other and all over the world. The news that rich placer mines, requiring only the labour of her stalwart sons with simple and inexpensive tools to extract riches before undreamed of, has stirred the ambition of men who in other lines of work could scarcely hope to attain more than a livelihood. Sons of hardy fishermen, men inured to the hardships of lumbering, solid sturdy sons of farming communities, all comparatively young men—these, Sir, the best stock of the country are all moving toward this land of promise to claim their share in their birthright, only to be met in the teeth by this monster monopoly with its tentacles directly or indirectly on every available acre of placer mining property that can be found in the country. It is such monopolies as this that directly robs the labouring classes, that gives rise to the discontent that breeds socialism. Yes, even anarchism. It is to this class of people who are more directly affected that this Government will have to give an accounting. The first notice of demand for such accounting was given March 1st, 1898, in Ontario.

These contractors are not new men at the business. When this contract was made, giving such an immense amount of land to these men, why were they not subjected to some restriction? Why did not the Government apply to these men some of the restrictions that the city of Toronto applied to Mr. Mackenzie with regard to the street railway. As soon as the re-

ceipts from that railway amount to one million dollars, its owners have to pay 8 per cent of the gross receipts to the city, and when they amount to \$1,500,000 they have to pay the city 10 per cent on the excess over \$1,000,000, and on all excess over \$1,500,000 of gross receipts, 15 per cent. If hon. gentlemen sitting opposite had the interests of this country at heart, if they had endeavoured to preserve the best interests of the workmen and the citizens at large, they would have inserted some such restrictions in this contract.

I shall advert for a few minutes again to the contract. Section 18 gives some remarkable privileges to the contractors and I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of the Interior, but as he is not in his seat perhaps the right hon. First Minister will answer me. We are going to get information if we can—that is if the Government has it. Will the contractors be allowed to equip this road for the first year with the 28-pound rails that have been referred to?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You were told that they would.

Mr. GANONG. We will accept that, even from a layman. If it is thus equipped will the company be allowed, after ten miles has been laid and accepted by the Government engineer, to select 92,160 acres of land. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not want to answer that question. If they do locate 92,160 acres of land, will they be allowed to mine upon any or all of this before the completion of this road and its acceptance by the Government? Will the prospectors for this company going upon this ground be required to pay the official fee of \$10 the same as does the free miner? Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be struck dumb. If this road should be fully equipped by September 1st with 28-pound rails, will the land be transferred in fee simple to this company? I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is very hard to get any information out of them. The process is slow, either because of their culpable ignorance or their no less culpable indisposition to state facts, or both, the country, I have no doubt, will be able fairly to decide this question. Every new fact that has been brought out emphasizes the necessity there was for having an open contract for having this work open to tender, so that every man interested might have a chance at least to put a value of his own upon the construction of this road. Why, this urgency scare is just about exploded. The United States Government have found that it was a fad run by the Government here to scare people into accepting this outrageous contract.

They have found out what it means, and they do not propose to send any supplies there, having found that it is unnecessary. Why, Sir, I have no doubt that, with a reasonable notice such as might have been possible for the Government to give with the report of 1897 in their hands, there might

Mr. GANONG.

have been a tender from the miners in that district. It may be that some of the hon. gentlemen opposite will smile. Some of them smile one way and some another. I have no doubt they will laugh at the idea that the men who, after years of toil, have succeeded in unearthing this gold should have some little right to tender, should have some little right to say which is the best route to go into that country, what is the best way for them to get their supplies in there. Laugh? Yes, Sir, laugh at giving the workmen a chance, but hobnobbing in secret with these contractors who are scooping in the best of the country; laugh as their party has always laughed at and gayed and hoodwinked the workmen of this country; laugh as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) then Minister of Finance, laughed at the workmen when, in 1878, they came to him and asked him for something to do, and he told them in substance if not in so many words that the only consolation he had to give them was that they must work more and eat less, while the Conservative party, ever true to its traditions, has been the friend of the working classes, protecting their labour, protecting their rights, and ever will. Mr. Speaker, I would oppose this Bill for three reasons: first, because the making of this secret contract, involving so large interest in the public domain, is contrary to representative parliamentary principle. Second, because it will, at the sacrifice of very large and very valuable land grants, subsidize a route, that cannot provide facilities at all commensurate with the cost to the country; or to put it differently, because the advantage to our country from what is conceded to be a temporary tramway, dependent on the uncertain navigation of the Stikine River, will not warrant the country being forced into so outrageous a secret contract. Third, because the question of urgency being very largely eliminated by its lack of capacity for carrying supplies for this year, there is no warrant in giving assistance of such magnitude to other than a permanent route, and one that will open up a large tract of country for permanent settlement, such as the Edmonton route. That the country will stand no trifling on this question was evidenced by the paralysis of the right arm of the right hon. the First Minister on March 1st. Years ago, through a settlement that was made of disputed territory on this continent, we lost Michigan. Later on, in 1842, by the wanton stupidity of some people who did not understand this country, through the Ashburton Treaty, the province of New Brunswick lost the best agricultural portion of the state of Maine, making it necessary for the Canadian Pacific Railway through it to go through a foreign country which would not have been necessary but for that. But, here, Sir, here to-day, in this House, elected to pro-

tect the rights and interests of our citizens at large, is projected a Bill by this Government which, in its vicious principles and provisions will be far more disastrous to Canada, if carried, than was the loss at that time of the territory in Maine. Mr. Speaker, I should be untrue to the great guild of workmen to which I claim to belong if I did not in every possible way oppose such a monstrous Bill as the Government is now attempting to force upon the country.

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words with regard to this contract; I think it is my duty to say my say like the others. I have seen enough and read enough to know that all countries need railroads, that all countries that have railroads are progressive countries, that all countries that are without railroads are unprogressive countries, always in financial misery and have always been exposed to be conquered and swallowed up by others. For this reason I am greatly in favour of this Government building a railroad in British Columbia, not merely of 150 miles, but of as many miles as the Government may desire, and not only in British Columbia but anywhere else. I desire to explain my standing in this House. I was selected by the people of the county of Dorchester to come to this House not as a politician but as a representative. My understanding with them was that I was not to come here and be in opposition for the sake of being in opposition, and for the sake of objecting to any measures that the Government might bring before the House.

I was elected on the condition that I would do the best I could for the country, whether for the Government or against the Government. It was on that condition that I was sent here by the people of the county of Dorchester, and I could do nothing else than be true to that mandate. I do not propose to be a politician, but I propose to be independent. I did not come here to please or displease others, but I came here to suit myself, in acting for the interest of the country. I am here to support measures because they are in the interests of the country in general, and not because they are brought forward in the interests of certain politicians. I am here to work, not for politicians nor for myself, but for the country in general. We are all paid to do that. Well, Sir, I may say to you that I am in favour of a railway through the province of British Columbia into the country known as the Yukon district, but while I am strongly in favour of that railway, I am strongly opposed to the method the Government have chosen to secure its construction. I think that this district and the Pacific Coast deserve a road, and should have a road; but my hon. friends opposite should not bankrupt this country for the sake of building that road. I think the Government have been too hasty in making the contract to

build this road. Why have they been so hasty? If I tell what I think the reason is, I presume the Speaker may stop me, but I will go on until he does so. I believe in speaking plainly and without ambiguity. We know that at one time our Divine Lord said to his Apostles: I will leave this earth, and I will send you the Comforter. Well, I believe that when Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann signed that railway contract, they promised my hon. friends opposite to send them the comforter—not exactly the divine apostle, but a comforter in the shape of checks. That, I think, is the reason why the Government have been so hasty in desiring to build that road. With them it is a matter of "business." Now, I am as old as any of them, and I have done probably a great deal more business than any of them. I have dealt with all kinds of people, and I have seen what people on the other side of the line call "the elephant." Hon. gentlemen seem to be amused. I do not know whether they understand in plain English what the elephant means. Well, on the other side of the line where I have resided for thirty-five years, when people speak of having an elephant, they mean a piece of rascality. Now as soon as the hon. gentlemen opposite heard about the Klondike region, they jumped at the opportunity and immediately went to work to get a railroad built, but they kept it in the dark until the 25th day of January, and then they let out the elephant for public gaze. Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say that that seems to be the habit of the Prime Minister, that seems to be his way of doing business, but it is what I call a queer way of doing business. I know what business is as well as he does, for I have done, without any doubt, more than he has, but not that kind of business. You may remember that in 1896, Parliament was called together on the 19th of August, and on the 18th of August, one day before Parliament met, the Government of the right hon. gentleman secured Governor General's warrants to the extent of \$2,300,000; and the very next day Parliament met. Well, if he was going to run the machine without the members of this House, what was the use of calling us here? The Government have made this contract with Mackenzie & Mann in precisely the same way. After they sign the contract and bind the country to this "business is business," then they call the House together. Why, Sir, the right hon. gentleman acts in the same way as an old woman down in my county. After her daughter was married she went and invited the people to the wedding. Now, I want to know why the Government are afraid to take Parliament into their secrets. What is the peculiar business that they have on hand; what is the secret of this contract? I have done business in my lifetime to the amount of millions of dollars, but I was never caught in a thing of that kind yet. The Prime Minister pro-

bably knows very well that his doings are far from being according to the laws of the country ; if he does not know it, I do. The Minister of Railways introduced the Bill under pressure from his colleagues, as was very evident from his speech and then he seemed to wash his hands of the whole matter. It reminds me of the conduct of Pontius Pilate who was pushed on to do what he did not approve. The hon. gentleman came here, played his part for a moment, then slipped quietly out and repudiated the business or the "business is business." He does not seem to have had as much grace as Judas Iscariot, because after he had betrayed Our Saviour he went and hung himself.

Where the hon. gentleman has gone, I do not know, but it is not my fault he is not present, and I therefore must proceed. The hon. gentleman stated, when in his place, that we must build this railway for Japanese, Chinese, Hungarians, Russians and Italians, who are coming in here with their knives, and it was necessary to have the scoups and their picks, their shovels and their road built. What do we owe the Chinese, Japanese, or other peoples ? Are we compelled to build a road for them, to bankrupt our country to construct a railway to carry them into the country and enable them to fill their pockets and then steal away ? The Government should consider the matter seriously and not jump at opportunity to build a railway for other people. The Government has sufficient to do to provide work for our own citizens, we have enough to do without assisting others. No one works for us ; we take care of ourselves. Let the Japs, Chinamen and the Yankees take care of themselves ; we owe them nothing. Gold in considerable quantities was discovered in the Yukon only last year, but immediately the Government turned around and made a secret bargain with Mackenzie & Mann, a bargain the particulars of which they never dared to let the country know. They had been working at it for months, but have kept it secret, and it is a secret bargain to-day. The Government have tried to make the House believe they have acted in good faith ; but, although they may try to make me believe it, I am unable to believe a word of it. They have given the contractors a land grant of 25,000 acres a mile, and they now represent that it is only worth \$25,000. There is not a man in this House, the country or the world who knows just the value of this grant. Do hon. gentlemen opposite know what they are giving away ? They are giving away great mines of wealth which are the property of the country ; they are giving away what does not belong to them. Members of this House are paid \$1,000 per session, and Ministers receive \$7,000 and expenses ; for what ? To conserve the interests of the country, not to squander or give away that which does not belong to them. They are

Mr. MORIN.

not working for themselves ; they are nothing but the agents of the people. They are on the same footing as men who take their scythes and go into the fields and cut grass ; if such men faithfully and honourably do their work, they are to be praised for performing their duty. The Ministers are in the same position, and if they step beyond the limits placed on them by the constitution and squander the property placed in their hands, they are not doing their duty. If the property belonged to them individually, they would be saving with it and not give it away. Let them follow the advice, "Do to others as you would wish to be done by." You would not give your own property away.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman's interesting speech, but it is not quite regular to address the members ; the hon. gentleman should address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MORIN. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your advice, and I will try and do a little better. This is the first time I have addressed this House, and I am not acquainted with its rules. Hon. gentlemen opposite and one hon. member on this side of the House have great sympathy for Mackenzie & Mann. Let Mackenzie & Mann take care of themselves ; and, if it is our duty to take care of our own country, let us do it. We are not sworn to take care of Mackenzie & Mann, who can take care of themselves, and who can also take care of their own. We have a right to take care of what belongs to the country. That is my policy ; I do not know whether you call it Conservative or Liberal, but I call it an honest policy. It has been said that the Americans are coming by thousands into this gold district. Let them come and let them go, but what business have we to make such great sacrifices to build a road for them when they do not build a road for themselves. Do not the Americans own that country from Behring Straits and from the Pacific Coast to the Arctic Ocean ; do they not claim to own part of our own coast in British Columbia. Have they not as much land as we have and have they not as much gold as we have, and why should we build a railroad for them ? In fact American example is against our building this road even for ourselves. In 1847 they found gold in California which belonged to Mexico at the time, and in 1848 they fought Mexico and conquered and became owners of California, but they never built a railroad until 1867. For twenty years they went around by the Isthmus of Panama ; they had a railroad in California but they had none across the mountains. In 1867 the Americans built the Union Pacific Railway, and I paid taxes to help to build it. They bought Alaska from Russia in 1867, they have no railroad anywhere in that country yet, and is it anything like common sense that we

should build one for them. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) showed us a little black map the other day about an inch wide; I call it a nigger map, and he told us what a little, small bit of our country we were giving to Mackenzie & Mann. It was just a little black spot on that map. Now we will make a calculation on that, and see what it really is. This Government is offering to Mackenzie & Mann 3,750,000 acres of choice land. That will make 5,846 square miles and a fraction over, and if you extract the square root it will give you almost 77 miles square; a great deal larger than the State of Rhode Island, a great deal larger than the State of Connecticut, almost the size of the State of New Hampshire, and almost three times larger than the province of Prince Edward Island. Deny one word of that, any of you. This is not politics; it is common sense. Remember that the province of British Columbia has an area of 407,000 square miles with a population of 80,000 people, and remember that you give three provinces like Prince Edward Island to Mackenzie & Mann to start with. What kind of a railway are you getting in return? It is a tram road. I have seen tram roads in Pennsylvania which we used for mules to draw logs on, but that mule tramway had 28-pound steel rails. If the Government knew as much as I do about narrow gauge roads and tramways, they would give this business up at once. I have seen the Pennsylvania Central Railway Company trying to use all kinds of rails, 42-pound rails, 50-pound rails, 76-pound rails, and 95-pound rails, and do you think that you are going to have any kind of a railway from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake with 28-pound rails on a narrow gauge? Why, you dare not put an engine on that road weighing more than ten tons. I am not a politician but I know from practice that business is business as well as any of you. I borrowed \$20 and left home at the age of 15 years, and I travelled the States and Territories over and over. I have walked from Wisconsin to the Red River of the north, before Minnesota was a State, and I drove logs on the Mississippi from Lake Itasca to New Orleans. I have done business with men worth millions of dollars, and if any of you gentlemen can teach me politics you cannot teach me a word about business. I say here in this House, as well as any place else, that politicians are no use when they come in contact with business men. We do not need men to make fancy speeches to please the galleries. No, Sir; we need work right on the ground; that is what counts. Why, a poor man will starve with politics; a beggar will die with politics. Now, don't you forget what I am going to tell you. Who built the city of Buffalo, New York? Who built the city of Detroit, Michigan? The province of Ontario built them. Whoever was at the

head of the Government, it was bad management. I do not care whether he was a Liberal or a Conservative; it makes no difference to me at all. At that time there was no system in the way business was conducted, and every line of railroad ran to Buffalo or Detroit, and these cities just swallowed the juice and the sap out of the province of Ontario. What happened once may happen again, with that snowshoe road that you are talking about building—I do not care whether a Liberal Government or a Conservative Government is building it. I may call it a snowshoe road and nothing else. It is of no use to any one only to those who want to swindle the Government. They put before this House that they will build a road, but who will operate that road? They cannot do it. Remember, I am going to give you truth, right and left; I have got the medicine right here. Very well, they are going to build a road. After that road is built, what will they do with it? They will just say, "To hell with the road!"

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not consider that the language which the hon. gentleman made use of last is quite parliamentary.

Mr. MORIN. I will withdraw it at once and apologize. What will they do with that road? Why, they will give a man five cents to take that road off their hands. The gold is what they are after—nothing else. Some men here say they are very tender-hearted about Mackenzie & Mann. Now, take the sensible, business view of this. Supposing that road was built. We have rights up and down the Stikine River by water; but we have no right on the land, and how are we going to build a railroad from Telegraph Creek to Fort Wrangel? Our friends the Yankees are just waiting until we do our work, and they will do their work afterwards. We can make use of the river, but we cannot make use of the land. The moment we try to make use of the land, they will stop us. Well, suppose the whole thing is a success. Where will the supplies for the Yukon Valley come from? Some will come from the province of Manitoba—from Edmonton, Regina and Calgary. Very well; how will you get them? You will have to ship produce to Vancouver by car twice—four or five or six hundred miles; unload it from the cars and place it on the steamers; then ship to Fort Wrangel; unload and reload on lighters; then take it up the Stikine River, with twenty-six inches of water. I never measured the water, but that is what the Minister of the Interior said. After you get to Telegraph Creek, you have to unload from your light boats and load on the cars. Then you ship to Teslin Lake, and then unload and load again. What will the transportation and frequent tran-

shipments of that produce cost, from Manitoba until it gets to Dawson City, or to any other place on the Yukon River? What will our friends on the other side of the boundary line do? We all know; if you do not, I do from experience. I have been in every state and territory in the United States. I know a great deal more about that country than I do about my own country; and there is no better state in the Union than the state of Oregon, as far as agriculture is concerned. So far as minerals are concerned, the state of Pennsylvania is ahead of the Union. Illinois comes next in agriculture, but only for corn; but Oregon comes in for apples, pumpkins, oats, barley, corn, wheat, and all kinds of fruit and all kinds of meat. They are shipping from Oregon to Chicago, and what will be the result when that road is built? The people of Oregon will load their vessels at Portland, Oregon, and will ship to Fort Wrangel, 600 or 700 miles, while our people will have to ship from Manitoba 1,400 or 1,500 miles by rail. The Americans will ship by water, which we all know is cheaper than by rail, and will undermine us, and undersell us, and control our trade and commerce. Why should they not? My hon. friends on the other side passed a law last year to allow corn to come into Canada free of duty. Can they deny that? Well, we all know that Oregon is a productive agricultural state, and we all know that corn is preferable to oats as food for cattle and horses both. Any man who can do so should use corn in preference to oats. If hon. gentlemen do not know this, I do, for I have fed from forty to sixty horses for twenty-two years, and have had to pay for learning. When my friends on the other side of the boundary line can ship corn to this side without paying duty, they would be very foolish to ship oats and pay duty. We all know that a bushel of corn, as a rule, is worth two of oats. If you want to fatten hogs or feed cattle or horses, corn is what you need. The Americans will ship corn to our country, and they will stock the province of British Columbia and the Yukon Valley with corn, grain and meat.

If you want to build a railway and have a Canadian route which will give you no trouble, you should build your railway from Edmonton. There you will be at home for ever and for ever. You will have a road through our Canadian country, and you will go across the Saskatchewan River and the Athabasca River, and the Lelard River, and then strike the Yukon River, and go down as far as you please. You then will have a central road, and, from my own personal knowledge—not from what I heard from Tom, Dick or Harry—when you strike the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, you are bound to strike stone coal. I say that, because I have owned thousands of acres at different places, and I know by the strata of

Mr. MORIN.

the land whether there is stone coal or not. When I strike a stratum of what they call a free-course vein, I know that stone coal is there. When you build your road from Edmonton, you open up the Yukon Valley and the Mackenzie River Valley; but, if you build your railway where Mackenzie & Mann want it, where will you be, and how will you be? I should like to know. Now, remember this: Our people are all thinking about gold. I myself am no gold man; I am a timber man, and I say this to you—members, Ministers, and all—when you strike a tract of timber land, it is not worth a dime so long as there is no railway, but the moment you build a railway, that timber land is worth \$2 and \$3 per thousand feet, board measure. On the Yukon River, or any place else, supposing they cut 1,000 feet, board measure, per acre; that is almost nothing. But when you strike that, you strike enough to pay for the whole road without the gold. When you strike a tract of land of 40,000 or 50,000 acres, that gives 10,000 feet, board measure, per acre, that is very little; 15,000 feet per acre is called pretty good; 20,000 feet, board measure, per acre is called fair; 25,000 feet, board measure, per acre is called good; 30,000 feet, board measure, per acre is called very good, and 50,000 feet is called extra good. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying this because I heard Tom, Dick or Harry say so; but I know from experience, and I have paid for my experience. I have bought the stuff from year to year. I have contracted for 600,000,000 feet that I have paid for myself, and know something about it. I have no doubt, although I never saw the land, that Mackenzie & Mann can realize a dollar per acre from every acre we give them by the sale of the timber growing on it, and then they will have a railway and the land besides; and, if my hon. friends on the other side are willing to give them a clear title to the railroad and the immense tracts of gold and timber lands this contract provides, why let them go ahead and do so. I cannot prevent them, but I can fight them. I ask your pardon, Mr. Speaker, for mistakes I have made, and will not detain you further.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. MORIN. Just wait, and I will go back again to the Drummond County Railway. This is the first time I have risen in this House, so that you cannot say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been troublesome. This is the first time, but I hope it will not be the last. I may say to you plainly, that I will rise again, and that, if my friend Pontius Pilate is not out of the place, I will scratch his back for him. Pontius Pilate is the Minister of Railways. I will go for him, and it will be plain talk, open and above board, so that you can hear it clear, for my information is written down in black and white.

Before resuming my seat, Mr. Speaker, I wish to crave your pardon for any departure from the rules of this House on my part, as this is the first time I rise to address the House, and if I happened to say anything that might have displeased you, I hope you will accept the apology I make for the same.

Mr. BELL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on, go on.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my right hon. friend the leader of the House is not going to object to the adjournment of the debate. I must ask him the question.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfred Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will agree with me that we have not been at all exacting, but that we have given every facility to the Opposition to carry on this debate; and if we wish to come to a conclusion I think that we should go on a little longer. We have not made much progress this evening.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to one or two points. He understands as well as any one in this House the immense importance of the question that is being discussed. I do not think he expected or any one else in this House expected that the debate would not last a considerable length of time. There are a large number of members on this side representing important constituencies and it is not fair—

An hon. MEMBER. Speak now.

Mr. FOSTER. We have rights in this House, every member of us; we have one right which, I think, every person will acknowledge—that is we must have due and reasonable time to debate important questions. And it is not right on sanitary or moral or on any other grounds that we should be driven, in the small hours of the morning, to discuss an important question like this. I submit that to the common sense of all. I say further that it will not lead to an earlier closure of this debate if severe measures of this kind are taken. I myself propose to speak, and I propose to speak at some length. I am not physically able to speak at length to-night.

An hon. MEMBER. Let some one else speak.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an hon. gentleman who sits on the opposite side whose constituency I do not know. He has never signaled his constituency by rising to speak, but he has signaled himself by interruptions and remarks which I do not characterize. I was not addressing myself to the hon. gentleman, but to a more important personage, the leader of the Government, and I am trying to make plain to him, with all frankness and all earnest-

ness, that it will not conduce to the discussion of this subject to make unreasonable demands upon us. I have one more remark to make. A little more than a week ago the leader of the Government did not think it so urgent a matter, did not think it so much a part of the contract to hasten forward the debate but that he could propose to adjourn this House for a whole week. I think it is not right for him to endeavour to make up for that eight or ten days of adjournment by pushing gentlemen on this side of the House beyond their physical strength and endeavour to make them debate this question at this unseemly hour. I state for myself and for a great many more hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that we propose to speak in the interest of the country and of our constituents. The hon. gentleman has force on his side, and he can make an exhibition of that force upon the House if he wishes. We shall submit if it is necessary, but we will not submit with good grace, and we will discuss the question, even if we have to do it against great difficulties and under adverse circumstances. I hope we shall not be driven to that extreme, and I hope my right hon. friend, now that he has had a moment to think it over, will allow those much-talked-of sunny ways of his to lead him and permit us to discuss this question in proper hours.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would be the last man in this House to endeavour to abuse the power we have on this side; and I do not believe that I can be fairly challenged on that ground. I do not believe the Government now in office can be charged with having on any occasion abused the power of the majority that supports it. I do not answer the threat the hon. gentleman has made. I leave that aside, and I think that when he considers it he will think that it would have been as well for him to leave it aside also. But up to this moment the hon. gentleman has not shown such a desire to hasten the discussion or to reach a conclusion as to entitle him to say that we should not take a little more time to make up for what might have been more profitably used this evening. I do not know that the debate has been enlightened or anybody instructed this evening.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a matter of opinion.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is my opinion; I do not seek to express the opinion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). But, for the reasons I have given, I think we might go on for an hour more, or half an hour more, at all events, before we adjourn.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman has imputed to us a desire to waste the time of the House. I repudiate that most

earnestly and most emphatically. No man has spoken on this side of the House who did not speak because he felt it his duty to speak, or who did not speak in the way he was impelled to speak by a sense of duty. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morin) who has just taken his seat, in his quaint and witty way said many things that caused amusement. There was not a single sentence he pointed that was not an expression of the strong common sense characteristic of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) should not make two speeches.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to make only a short plea—I know the Speaker is insistent—I will not take much time.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman not to make two speeches.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) certainly took no more time than was necessary.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the motion is put. I hope the right hon. Premier, seeing that it is one o'clock in the morning, will yield to the very modest request made on this side and allow members to go home and get some rest. I have heard it intimated in the lobbies that we were to stay here all night. I could not believe it. After the appeal made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) who is leading the Opposition, I hope that the right hon. gentleman will not force the hon. member (Mr. Bell) who has moved the adjournment, to go on. Thirty minutes, the time mentioned by the Premier, will not allow the hon. gentleman to make the speech he proposes to deliver.

This gentleman was here from one of the provinces paying his expenses for a week. Not only members representing maritime province constituencies, but all others outside of Ontario have been compelled by the Prime Minister to stay in Ottawa doing nothing and paying their expenses, when they might have been making their speeches. I gave to the chief Whip of the Government the names of several gentlemen who would have occupied all the sittings of this House in delivering their speeches during the entire week the Ontario elections were going on; but the Prime Minister wanted to allow his supporters to deluge the country, to help his right arm to carry the province, and so he adjourned the House for a week. It is unreasonable at this hour of the morning to ask us to continue this debate; the motion that is now before the Chair will occupy the half hour that he wanted to take out of the speech of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell). This is one of the most important questions that will come before the House this session, and the constituents of hon. members will expect them to signify their protest, not only by their votes but

Mr. FOSTER.

by their voices. These gentlemen from a distance particularly have a strong claim on the right hon. gentleman to permit them now, at this hour of the morning, to retire.

The PRIME MINISTER. I rise to a personal explanation, as I have no right to speak again. The hon. gentleman says that I agreed to this adjournment which took place during which members from the maritime provinces were kept here doing nothing. The hon. gentleman is aware that if I agreed to the adjournment, it was after consultation with the leader of the Opposition, and with his consent. I may say that I had understood from the leader of the Opposition that the debate would close to-night. The leader of the Opposition did not understand it exactly as I did. That was my understanding, at all events, and I told him I expected the debate would be closed this evening.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to make a personal explanation on my own behalf, and on behalf of the leader of the Opposition who is not in his place. The chief Government Whip came to me some time yesterday and stated that he understood the debate was to close to-day. He remained here while I went over and consulted with the leader of the Opposition, whom I asked if he had made an arrangement that the debate should close to-day. He said, by no means. Then I came back and told the chief Whip of the Government the message from the leader of the Opposition. Afterwards I went over to consult with my leader and to find out how this understanding could have arisen. He told me that the Premier had asked him when he thought the debate would close, and he said in reply that he thought the members had pretty well spoken on this side. The Prime Minister said: Do you think we can get through on Thursday? The leader of the Opposition said: It is possible that we might. That was all the bargain there was.

The PRIME MINISTER. That was not my understanding.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was no bargain arrived at, as I was informed. In reference to the statement of the Premier that the leader of the Opposition had agreed with him to adjourn for a week, I understood from the leader of the Opposition that the Prime Minister came to him and suggested that the House should adjourn for a week, and the leader of the Opposition yielded to his invitation, thinking that it was the desire of the Prime Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. One word of personal explanation, because, before the leader of the Opposition went out, I had a conversation with him. He certainly did not understand that we were to close to-night, in fact he told me it was impossible to close to-night. It is perfectly impossible to close this week.

If the hon. gentleman gets this vote by the middle of next week he will get the vote, I think, as soon as he can possibly expect it in view of the discussion on this subject which we propose to make on this side of the House. Now, I make another appeal to my hon. friend not to drive matters to an extremity, but to allow us to close the sitting now.

Mr. McINERNEY. I would make one suggestion to the right hon. leader of the Government. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), who has moved the adjournment, has been lately a very sick man. He was confined to his room for over a week, and he expected at least, so I understand, that the Government would consent to the adjournment of the debate to-night. This is a circumstance that I wish to bring to the attention of the right hon. gentleman, hoping that he will accede to that proposition.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a new feature altogether. If my hon. friend from Pictou is in ill-health, I certainly would not compel him to speak at this hour of the night. Under these circumstances, I will yield to the motion to adjourn the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 o'clock a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 4th March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that my attention having been called by the Honourable Member for King's, P.E.I., in his place, to the fact of the demise of Stanislas Francis Perry, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Prince West, P.E.I., I have, in accordance with section eight of chapter thirteen of the Revised Statutes of Canada, issued my Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to make out a new Writ of election for the said electoral district.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 52) respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Mr. BAIN moved :

That the first report of the Select Committee of Agriculture and Colonization be concurred in. He said : I may explain to the House that this is simply the ordinary motion asking for power to employ a shorthand writer.

Motion agreed to.

COMMISSION TO MAJOR WALSH.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) laid upon the Table of the House the commission to Major Walsh.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask if the instructions issued to Major Walsh are included ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I have only the commission, not the instructions.

Mr. FOSTER. When may we expect the instructions ?

The PRIME MINISTER. As the Minister of the Interior is not in his seat to-day, I cannot say when, probably at an early day.

PERSONAL—LIQUOR PERMITS IN THE YUKON.

Mr. DAVIS. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the House to an article that has appeared in the Saskatchewan "Times," a Conservative newspaper published in Prince Albert, in the district of Saskatchewan, which article is copied from the Winnipeg "North-Westerner." The article reads as follows :—

The falsehood put in circulation by some unscrupulous partisan that Sir Charles Tupper had secured a permit to take 50,000 gallons of whisky into the Yukon has been promptly and emphatically contradicted. Sir Charles is not in the whisky-peddling business, nor would he be likely to get favours from the Government in that connection if he were. The Government is reserving favours of that description for its supporters. The only whisky-peddling monopoly is that, so far, in which Mr. T. O. Davis, the Grit M.P. for Saskatchewan, is interested.

Now, I may say that so far as I am concerned I have never applied to any member of the Government for a permit to take liquor into the Yukon or into any other place ; nor am I connected with any institution which has applied for such permit. I am not directly or indirectly interested in the Yukon, either one way or the other ; and I wish to deny this slanderous accusation.

THE RAILWAY RATE WAR.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a matter which, to my mind, is of considerable importance, and to put myself in order, I intend to move the formal adjournment of the House. It is known to most people, especially in the province of Ontario to-day, that a somewhat unseemly wrangle is going on between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. The intercourse which has hertofore existed between them, and the traffic arrangements for carrying on the business of the country between Toronto and North Bay, and vice versa, have been practically stopped. The travelling public who use the Canadian Pacific Railway for going to the North-west or coming from the North-west to centre, western or south-western Ontario, are very much inconvenienced in consequence of it. There appears to be no possibility, so far as we can judge from what has taken place already, that the two companies will reach an understanding by which the ordinary traffic arrangements which existed heretofore are to be renewed; and therefore the public are to remain under this inconvenience. According to my remembrance of what took place in this House, the original charter granted to that portion of the road between Gravenhurst and North Bay and the amendments to the charter afterwards had but one special object in view, and that was that the portion of the road between Gravenhurst and Callander—because Callander was then supposed to be the objective point—was practically to be an independent road, which all roads from western Canada could use for traffic purposes to reach the Canadian Pacific Railway, and where the trade of the west, of London, Hamilton and Toronto and the country of south-western Ontario, would be carried so as to reach Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia. And to show that this was the case, I may mention that at the time there was strong objection taken to the proposed grant by the Government to the building of the road. I remember distinctly, because I went with one or two deputations to the Government to object to a large grant being given the company unless that portion of the line should be kept as an independent line available for all roads that would reach it at either end. The first grant made was one of \$6,000 per mile, and certain provisions were inserted in the charter to secure the use of this portion of the road by all railways for all time. It was afterwards found that the road could not be built as rapidly as was expected at the time, and a few years afterwards an additional grant was given of \$6,000 per mile, and provisions were inserted in

Mr. DAVIS.

the Act to safeguard what were considered the rights of western Ontario.

The first charter was 44 Vic., chap. 45, an Act to incorporate the Northern, North-western and Sault Ste. Marie Railway. The incorporators included a large number of men, among these being Barnhart, Morris, McCarthy, Cumberland, Stuart, Wood, Turner, Gurney and others. In that Act provisions were inserted that the company should build the road, and to insure its being used for the purpose it was intended clauses were inserted in the Act as follows: After providing that the company may receive aid from the municipalities, or from the Government or from certain sources, the Act says:

The company may receive from the Government of Canada or from the Government of any of the provinces, or from private individuals, or municipal or other corporations, who may have power to make or grant the same, money or securities for money in aid of the construction, equipment and maintenance of the said railway and bridge, and the same may be received by way of bonus or gift, or by the way of loan. And in like manner and for the same purpose the company may receive, take and hold grants of lands from either or any of the said governments or from private individuals, municipal or other corporations, who may have power to grant the same, and upon accepting such aid from either or any of the governments aforesaid, may agree to give such running powers to, or to make such traffic arrangements with any other railway company or companies as the said government may require to be made or given as a condition of such grant; but nothing herein contained shall render it lawful for the company to make any arrangement whereby one company may obtain advantages over any other company.

In section 32 it is provided:

The company shall make running arrangements with, and give running powers to any railway company or companies in the Dominion of Canada (whether incorporated by the Dominion or any of the provincial legislatures) which are now or may hereinafter be situate on the line or lines hereby authorized, or which touch or cross the same, or any line or lines which connect with any of such lines, upon terms to be agreed upon; and such running powers shall include all proper and necessary facilities and sidings for obtaining fuel and water, and generally for the passing and working of the trains of the company or companies exercising the same; and the facilities so to be given shall be equal to all companies exercising such powers, so that no unfair advantage shall be given to any one company over another in the use of the said lines; and all the powers mentioned in this Act shall be so given upon the payment of a reasonable compensation therefor; and any railway company or companies, as aforesaid, which may claim and use the running powers and facilities over the line or lines of the company, as hereby authorized, shall grant similar running arrangements and powers over any line or lines of railway which such company may own or control, and which may now or may hereafter be situate on, or many touch or cross the same, or any line or lines which connect with any of such

lines, and all such powers shall be so given and exercised upon the payment of a reasonable compensation therefor.

The next provision applicable is clause 34, as follows:—

In order to afford reasonable facilities to all the companies whose lines of railway may, at any point or points, be connected, mediately or immediately, with the railway of the company hereby incorporated for the receiving, forwarding, delivering, interchange and working of traffic upon and by way of the several railways belonging to or worked by such companies respectively, the company hereby incorporated shall, for the purposes of all traffic whatsoever, whether passengers and their baggage, including the usual accommodation for express matter, or freight of any description, including live stock and minerals, and whether such traffic shall originate or terminate upon the railway systems of such companies or either of them, or come from or be destined to some other railway or railways, or other carriers connecting mediately or immediately with them, at all times receive, ticket, bill, invoice and forward the traffic upon and over its railway from such connecting point to or towards its destination, and deliver any and all such traffic as consigned either in final delivery upon or from its own railway, or to some other carrier for further transmission to its destination according to the ticket, bill or invoice; and in like manner shall receive, ticket, bill, invoice and forward the traffic destined to or by way of such connecting railway and duly deliver the same at such connecting point to such connecting railway. And the company hereby incorporated shall afford to all other companies having connecting railways, as aforesaid, all needful accommodation, facility and convenience at the stations and by their trains and otherwise by through rating, billing and ticketing for the promotion of their business and the interchange of such traffic.

2. And the company hereby incorporated shall not give or allow directly or indirectly any preference or advantage to, or to the traffic by, any other railway or portion of a railway or other carrier's line forming part of a continuous route, whether owned or operated by or in interest directly or indirectly with the company hereby incorporated or otherwise, over any such connecting railway or the traffic thereby; and it shall be unlawful for the company hereby incorporated to make, and it shall not make any greater or higher charge for the carriage of traffic or any service connected with the traffic passing through or from any such connecting railway than the lowest charge it shall make for a like and similar service over any part of its own railway, or which shall be made over any part of a railway worked by or in interest with it, nor make or allow any discrimination, preference or advantage as between any such connecting railways.

Clause 35 provides:

In case the said companies shall fail to agree upon the extent or manner of working or carrying into effect any of the provisions contained in sections 32 and 34, such matters in difference shall be settled by three arbitrators, appointed from time to time, one to be appointed by each of the said railway companies, parties to such difference, and the third by one of the judges of one of the superior courts of Ontario, and in the event of either of the said companies refusing or neglecting to appoint such arbitrator for

the space of ten days after being requested or notified so to do by the other company, then the said judge shall appoint such arbitrator for the company so neglecting or refusing; and the decision and award of the said arbitrators, or a majority of them, shall be final and binding on the said companies, and may be enforced in any court of law or equity having jurisdiction in the premises.

Then the schedule which follows lays down the conditions:

And whereas, in the course of the debate upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, certain questions arose which the contractors present at Ottawa deemed it expedient to meet, by agreeing that this company would enter into certain undertakings with the Government of Canada so soon as it should be organized, and it is expedient to provide for entering into such arrangements:

Therefore, it is unanimously resolved that this company is prepared to enter into an agreement with the Dominion Government to the effect following, that is to say: If any company other than the Canada Central Railway Company build a line from any point on the Canadian Pacific Railway at or about the Wharnapit River to any point on Lake Huron or Lake Superior, or on the River Ste. Marie, such company shall have running powers over the Canadian Pacific Railway from the point of junction to Callander Station, on condition that such company shall grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway similar and reciprocal running powers over its railway west of such point of junction. In the event of the company purchasing, acquiring, amalgamating with, leasing or holding and operating the Canada Central Railway the said Callander Station shall continue to be a neutral or receiving and distributing point common to the Canada Central Railway and any railway in the province of Ontario running southward from said Callander Station; and, in that case, all traffic to or from any point in the west or north-west coming from or destined for any such Ontario railway shall be carried to or from Callander Station at the same mileage rate as similar traffic to or from such point coming from or destined for the said Canada Central Railway, and such mileage rate shall not be greater than the average rate per mile charged for similar traffic from the point of shipment on the Canadian Pacific Railway to the point of destination on the Canada Central Railway or from the point of shipment on the said Canada Central Railway to the point of destination on the said Canadian Pacific Railway, as the case may be. And for the purposes of this section the word "traffic" includes not only passengers and their baggage, goods, animals and things conveyed by railway, but also cars, trucks and vehicles of any description adapted for running over any railway, if offered for carriage as freight. But this agreement shall not be construed as consenting to any running powers by any railway over the Canadian Pacific Railway. This agreement to be subject to the conditions as to special rates for purchasers of land, or for emigrants, or intending emigrants, which are contained in the 24th section of the charter of this company. If at any time the Canada Central Railway should be purchased, acquired, leased in perpetuity by, or amalgamated with this company, such amalgamation, acquisition, purchase or lease shall be made subject to the existing legal obligations of that company created by this charter, or any amendment thereof in respect of running powers

or traffic arrangements, as well as in respect of the matters and things referred to in the letters patent incorporating this company.

That was the original Act. Afterwards when that incorporated company got power to build the railway and received a subsidy from the Dominion Government, clauses 32 and 34 were incorporated in it for the purpose of continuing those rights and powers. Now, then, clause 3 in the next Act which we have, namely, the Act to amend the Act incorporating the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway, which name it went by then; clause 3 provides:

Whereas, by the contract between Her Majesty the Queen and the company set forth in schedule "B" hereto, it is agreed that in the event therein stated the Parliament may cancel the lease therein mentioned and take over the portion of the said railway between Gravenhurst and Callander free from encumbrance—

That portion of the railway between Gravenhurst and North Bay, because it finally reached North Bay instead of Callander:

—upon the assumption of the bond or debenture debt of the company to the amount of eight thousand dollars per mile of that section of the railway, and upon payment of any further sum of money beyond the bond or debenture debt of eight thousand dollars per mile and the subsidy paid to the said company, as the said railway may then be worth—the value to be ascertained in manner therein provided.

It will be understood here that they were to pay the bonded debt of \$8,000 per mile, and whatever additional cost it was to the company to build that railway outside the subsidy which the Government gave them. They finally gave them a subsidy of \$12,000 per mile, and that with the bonded debt of \$8,000 per mile was supposed to cover the cost then; but if there were any additional cost beyond that, the Government was to take it over and pay them back the difference between the \$20,000 a mile and what the road actually cost. They were to take over that road at a value to be ascertained in the manner provided, namely, by arbitration. For that purpose this contract was entered into. Now, the lease that was entered into in connection with that is set forth in schedule "B." This was the agreement entered into between the Government and the railway company which then controlled the road:

Whereas, by an Act passed in the forty-fifth year of Her Majesty's reign, chapter fourteen, it was made lawful for the Governor in Council to grant a subsidy not exceeding six thousand dollars per mile, nor exceeding in the whole six hundred and sixty thousand dollars, towards the construction of a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, both in the province of Ontario, such subsidy to be granted to such company as should be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction its ability to complete the said railway within a reasonable time, to be fixed by Order in Council, and according to descriptions and specifications

Mr. SPROULE.

to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made by the company with the Government, to be payable out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada, as in the said Act particularly mentioned:

And whereas, by another Act passed in the forty-sixth year of Her Majesty's reign, chapter twenty-five, it was made lawful for the Governor in Council to grant a further additional subsidy not exceeding six thousand dollars per mile, nor exceeding in the whole six hundred and sixty thousand dollars, towards the construction of the same railway, to be granted to such company as should be approved as aforesaid and also to be payable out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada, as in the said last mentioned particularly mentioned.

And whereas, pursuant to the above cited Acts of Parliament, the Governor in Council hath granted to the Northern and Pacific Junction and sixty thousand dollars, towards the construction of the railway aforesaid, the full subsidies authorized by the said Acts, amounting in the whole to twelve thousand dollars per mile of the railway, but not exceeding in the whole one million three hundred and twenty thousand dollars.

Now, therefore, the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company do covenant and agree with Her Majesty the Queen, in consideration of the subsidies granted as hereinbefore and hereinafter mentioned.

I may say that was done for this reason. The question was raised in Parliament, how will you keep this an independent road? It is only 130 miles long, and it was intended to be a connecting link between southern and south-western Ontario and the Canadian Pacific Railway, whereby the commerce of that section of country could be carried on without interruption or unfair traffic arrangements. It was said that this road was too short to be carried on by a separate company, and the question was, what company would control it? It would have to be either the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or the company which controlled the railway at the other end. The two roads running from the south to Gravenhurst were the Hamilton and North-western and the Northern. These two railways were running under one agreement, and it was decided to put this link into the hands of the company controlling them. They were to maintain this road and run it, and give facilities to the roads that reached it at either end to carry on their traffic without any interruption or interference, for the purpose of securing in perpetuity the right of the railways of western Ontario to carry on their traffic with Manitoba and the North-west, and vice versa. This agreement went on to provide for the carrying out of the conditions set forth in the three clauses which I have read. It said:

4. The said lease shall contain a provision requiring the observance by the lessees of the said railway of the several provisions contained in the 32nd, 34th and 35th sections of the special Act in-

corporating the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company, under the name of the Northern, North-western and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.

5. That through rates and fares shall be agreed upon and made between the lessees and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from time to time, for traffic to and from all points on the Canadian Pacific Railway west of the point of junction with the said projected railway, and all points of the railways of the lessees, and such rates and fares shall be divided (cartage and including in the rate to be first allowed to the company performing it) on the basis of mileage, except where such division would act unfairly by the reason of the one line of railway having a largely preponderating mileage, in which case the division of rates and fares shall be settled on a fair and equitable basis by mutual agreement, and in the default of agreement, by arbitration. If the parties can agree upon a single arbitrator there shall be but one arbitrator, otherwise each party shall appoint one arbitrator, and the two so appointed shall appoint a third, and the award of the majority shall be binding; failing agreement as the third arbitrator, he shall be appointed by one of the judges of the High Court of Justice of the province of Ontario. Provided, that this clause shall have no effect unless the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall, within six months from this date enter into a contract with the lessees, agreeing on its part to the terms of this clause;

Which they afterwards did do—

—and the said agreement shall provide that the through freight business shall be conducted in through freight cars without transshipment in the manner and on the terms usual among connecting railways; and for the purpose of facilitating and developing the business of both parties, it shall also provide for the making, from time to time, by mutual arrangement, of close and suitable train connections at the point of junction for through passenger business—

Which they have not done, and which they do not do—

—having regard to the connections of both companies' railways with their connecting lines, and also for the running of through sleeping cars, in such business, and that such connecting trains shall be run by the lessees upon their own railways, and on the said leased railway, and by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on their railway, with due and reasonable expedition, and that each company shall give to the freight traffic interchange between them the despatch usually given to through freight by connecting lines of railways.

6. For the purpose of insuring the free interchange of traffic coming to or going from the railway so to be constructed between the lessees' railways and the railways connecting therewith, so far as such interchange shall be under the control of the lessees, the said lease shall also contain a provision that in the event of the Parliament of Canada being at any time hereafter of opinion that the traffic of the railway system of the lessees coming from or going to the projected railway and interchanged with lines connecting with the lessees' system of railways is not so interchanged without preference or prejudice as between such connections, then being of such opinion the Parliament of Canada may, if it see fit, cancel the said lease and take over the said railway free from encumbrance upon assumption of the bond and debenture debts of the lessor

company to the amount of eight thousand dollars per mile of the railway and upon the payment of such further sum of money beyond the said bond debts of eight thousand dollars per mile and the said subsidy, as the said railway may then be worth,—

That is, they were to count out the \$8,000 of bonded debt and the \$12,000 of subsidy per mile, and what the railway was worth above that, they were to pay—

—the value thereof to be ascertained, in case the Government and the company cannot agree, by arbitration; the arbitrators to be appointed, one by the Government and the other by the company, and the third by the two so appointed; failing agreement as to such third arbitrator, then by one of the chief justices of the High Court of Ontario, under the provisions of the Ontario Judicature Act in that behalf, and the award of the majority shall be binding.

7. In consideration of the premises and upon the terms and the conditions hereinbefore mentioned, Her Majesty agrees to grant and does hereby grant to the Northern and Pacific Railway Company a subsidy of \$12,000 per mile of the said railway so to be constructed, but not exceeding in the whole one million three hundred and twenty thousand dollars, payable out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

This is signed by Adam Brown on behalf of the Hamilton and North-western Railway Company; Charles Tupper, Minister of Railways, on behalf of the Government of Canada, and A. P. Bradley, secretary. That was the agreement then entered into for the purpose I have mentioned—to keep this line always an independent link, whereby the railways of central and western and south-western Canada could carry on their trade with Manitoba and the North-west over the Canadian Pacific Railway. But as it is at the present time, these two railway companies have disagreed, and the Canadian Pacific Railway is carrying its traffic over its own lines, carrying passengers, freight and baggage from Toronto to Carleton Place, a distance of 228 miles, and then back to North Bay, a distance of 216 miles. Passengers and freight are taken over 444 miles, whereas, if they went by that connecting link, as it was intended they should, they would only have to travel 232 miles. The public are subjected to these inconveniences by virtue of the quarrel between these two companies, and they will not come to terms. Neither of them have appointed an arbitrator, nor made any reasonable attempt, so far as I can learn, to adjust their differences. It, therefore, seems to me a matter of sufficient importance to justify the Government in quiring into it, with a view of seeing whether they should not take action under the powers contained in this Act which I have read, and take over that portion of railway between Gravenhurst and Callander or North Bay, so that new arrangements might be made, then if another link from Toronto to Gravenhurst was built, a distance of only 111 miles, the trade of the

great cities of Toronto, Hamilton and London could be carried without interruption and without the inconveniences to which it is now subject by the disagreements of these companies. I contend that no railway company has a right to hamper the traffic of the public by reason of its little quarrels, so as to compel the public to travel an extra distance of 212 miles for no purpose in the world. We gave that railway \$12,000 a mile, because \$6,000 a mile was not sufficient, and because it was intended that that road should be kept in perpetuity, available for all other roads which might reach it at either end.

Now that has been virtually destroyed and there must be something done. I notice that in a letter from the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the other day, to the Board of Trade in Toronto, he intimated that the only remedy was the construction of another line from Toronto to North Bay or Sudbury. There is no need for that if the Government does its duty, because the Government has the right to take over that line from Gravenhurst to North Bay, and then at furthest a connecting link could be built from Toronto to Gravenhurst, and the link would be complete, and the trade of the great city of Toronto, in which we are so much interested, would not be crippled by the preference given to Montreal and the other eastern cities in business with Manitoba and the North-west, as it is now.

I draw the attention of the Government to this matter in the hope that they will look into it, and either compel these companies to have recourse to arbitration for an adjustment of the difference, so that the Ontario trade may enjoy the advantage of the shorter distance which it was intended we should have when the Dominion Government gave the large sum of \$12,000 per mile to build that road, or else consider whether, under the circumstances, it is not advisable to take over the road and run it as an independent railway, and make such arrangements as the Government may see fit, in the interests of the travelling public and the trade of Ontario.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I endeavoured to follow the statement which the hon. member has just made as closely and carefully as I possibly could, and I was able to catch the conclusion he led up to and the suggestions he made regarding governmental action. But I must confess that the subject being new to me, I was not able to pursue the various clauses in the statute which he read, and which, in his opinion, would justify action on the part of the Government in the direction he has indicated. I am, therefore, not free at the moment to intimate what my view may be, after having had the opportunity of looking into the matter, or what action the Government

Mr. SPROULE.

might feel called upon to take, upon a thorough understanding of all the circumstances. But I would suggest to the hon. member—and I make the suggestion with every desire to facilitate any proper action—that if he would kindly call upon me, I would be very glad to go over with him in detail the various matters he has referred to, and discuss the question with him in all its bearings.

WAGON ROAD TO THE YUKON.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders are called, Mr. Speaker, I desire to put a question to the Government. I regret that the Treasury benches are practically empty, but I am glad to see now my right hon. friend the Prime Minister taking his seat, because it is extremely inconvenient to have the members of the Government absent when the House is sitting. I have two matters of pressing importance to which I desire to draw the attention of the Government. One is in the Department of the Interior and the other is in the Department of Customs, and neither the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) nor the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is in his place. I do not think that this is calculated to promote public interest.

My right hon. friend will remember that I drew the attention of the Government yesterday to a matter of very great and pressing importance. That was the question of the construction of the wagon road which was announced by the Department of the Interior and published over Mr. Ogilvie's signature on the 27th January last. That announcement was:

River steamers will ply all summer from the mouth of the Stikine to Telegraph Creek. A wagon road, with abundance of transportation facilities, will be available from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake, and steamers will be plying on this lake and the Hootalinqua, Lewes and Yukon rivers.

That is a matter of very great importance. I thought perhaps that this clause had escaped the observation of the Government in the drafting of the Bill now before the House, and I, therefore, drew the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to it. What was the answer I got? I got this answer from the Minister of the Interior:

I do not think there has been any inadvertence or omission in the contract, and the statement contained in the Official Guide will be found to be correct.

Is that any answer for the Minister of the Crown to give Parliament, when his attention is drawn to a fact in which thousands of people are deeply interested? Look at the disgrace that attended the Skagway and Dyea route last year—four thousand horses lying dead in those passes and no end of suffering and loss of pro-

perty, simply because there was no proper means of travel, and both passengers and animals had to wade into the mire. The public has been officially informed by the Department of the Interior that there is to be a wagon road constructed from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake, and that question was treated, not with the attention and the courtesy which the Government are bound to give every member of this House when he approaches them in a respectful manner with regard to public business, but in the most cavalier manner as will be seen by reference to yesterday's proceedings. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), after the Minister of the Interior had replied to my question, said :

I think the Minister of Interior omitted one important particular in his answer, and that was whether this road was to be constructed at the expense of the Government or at the expense of the contractors.

It certainly is very important to know how this work, which is bound to cost a very large sum of money, is to be constructed, and whether any measures have been taken for its proper construction as soon as the snow disappears and a sleigh road is perfectly useless.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must call my hon. friend to order. I have no objection to any questions that may be put, but at this stage he cannot enter into a debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was not entering into a debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman was making a speech. I hope he will be good enough to confine himself to putting a question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was impossible for me to put the gravity of this matter before my right hon. friend at less length. I do not want to detain the proceedings for a moment, but simply, on a matter of the greatest importance, I wish the Government to condescend to give Parliament the information, whether they have made any provision for the construction of this road, whether it is to be practically taken up, or whether it is to be again in the deplorable condition in which it was before the winter set in, until the 1st of September, when the proposed railway is expected to be available. Are the people who rely upon the statement of the Government that there is to be a wagon road there, to be in the position of those who undertook to go through these passes last year? This is a matter of grave importance in which thousands are deeply interested, and it is entitled to the respect and consideration of the Government.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** I am delighted to hear that the hon. gentleman wants to expedite the business of this House. I

have not seen any evidence of it up to this moment. With regard to the question he has put, I am sorry to say that my hon. colleague, the Minister of the Interior, is inevitably absent from his seat to-day, but I shall call his attention to this matter, and if the hon. gentleman will kindly repeat his question to-morrow, I am sure he will have his answer.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS REGULATIONS AT FORT WRANGEL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, and not with the view of doing anything to impede public business, I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Customs, whom, I am glad to see in his place, to a very important statement contained in the "Daily Witness," of Montreal, under the heading of "News From Vancouver." This statement is dated Toronto, March 2nd, and is as follows :—

G. F. Beard, of this city, who is organizing a party of Klondikers, wrote to the Customs Department recently with reference to the customs situation at Fort Wrangel. He has received a reply from Mr. John McDougald, Commissioner of Customs, who says he understands that the United States customs do not yet permit Canadian goods for the Stikine to be transhipped at Wrangel without paying duty.

If this statement is correct, that on the second day of March these duties were being collected on Canadian goods, it is a matter that demands the immediate attention of the Minister of Customs.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). I will attend to the matter. The letter is signed by Mr. McDougald, as I understand the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It says so.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** I will make inquiry into the matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will send this paper over to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson).

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENTS TO OFFICE.

Mr. GILLIES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister to a telegram I find in the columns of a very influential, and widely circulated, and fairly accurate newspaper. I refer to the Montreal "Star," and the statement to which I wish to draw attention is worded as follows :—

Quebec, March 3.—Rumours are current in Liberal circles, and apparently well founded, to the following effect: Immediately after the session, Mr. Choquette, M.P., is to be named judge at Arthabaska; Judge Lemieux will be transferred to Sherbrooke, and Mr. Carroll, M.P., will be appointed to the judgeship vacated by the death of Judge de Billy.

In this connection, as a statement has gained considerable currency in connection with the hon. member for Guysborough, who, it is said, has been knocking at the door of the Cabinet for some time past—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) must not take advantage of my leniency to transgress the rules of the House. Of course, newspaper articles, if they relate to any public matter, are often of great advantage to the House; but I am doubtful if quotations about the positions of individual members can be quoted by a member of the House unless he vouches for their accuracy. As to that part of the hon. gentleman's statement, then, I do not think that it is quite in order. As to his going on to refer to some other hon. member, I am afraid he is out of order, unless he has some simple, plain question to ask about the business of the House.

Mr. GILLIES. I have a question to ask the right hon. Prime Minister. I wish to ask what truth there is in the statement I have read to the effect that two hon. members are to be appointed to judgeships.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If I had any information on this subject, I should not feel called upon to give it to my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies). I must tell the hon. gentleman, that, so far as these newspaper reports are concerned, for my part, I attach very little importance to them. Generally, the newspapers are better informed on the business of the Government—if they are to be credited—than I am myself. They publish many a thing as being done by the Government, or contemplated, that are not done and are not contemplated. I am not aware, for instance, that Judge de Billy is dead—

Mr. GILLIES. I did not ask that.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman asked me if it were true that Mr. Carroll was to be appointed in place of Judge de Billy. Well, he ought to wait until Judge de Billy is in his grave before he asks us to discuss his successor.

THE STIKINE-TESLIN WINTER ROAD.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I have a question to ask which is of importance. A party of Klondikers, popularly so called, passed through here yesterday, amongst them being a large number from the city and county I represent. Having read over the terms of the contract, and taking the speeches of the members of the Government, they are bound for the Stikine River, under the impression that when they get there—by the 8th or 9th of March—they will have a completed road over the pass, with shelters provided. They have pinned their faith to that statement.

Mr. GILLIES.

It will be a tremendous disappointment to them—but for these statements they would have gone by Edmonton—if, when they reach there, they find that the road is not completed. I have promised to telegraph them the information, and I would ask my right hon. friend if he will give me the information, as to whether that road will be completed within the contract time, and whether the shelters and provision houses will be made, as provided in the contract.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have every reason to believe, in fact I am aware, that every effort is being made by the contractors to have this winter road ready by the 8th March. It is quite possible, owing to the tactics of the Opposition and the difficulties placed in their way, that they may not be able to complete the work within the prescribed time. That is all I have to say.

WHISKY FOR THE KLONDIKE.

Mr. GUILLET. I wish to call the attention of the Government to an associated press despatch from Liverpool to the effect that a large party of Klondikers have embarked for the gold fields on a vessel named the "Manaunse," the vessel having a cargo of 150 tons of whisky. I shall not read the article, but I would like to know if the Government will allow this whisky to be admitted.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That is another newspaper report, which may have little foundation in fact. If it is true that these gentlemen are bringing with them so much whisky, it seems to me they have taken extra precautions. We will wait until the whisky is here, and then we shall know what to do.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Blair for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) an Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, the debate which has continued now for some time, and which, apparently, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister thinks is being prolonged unnecessarily, has developed some features which are of a gratifying character to the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I was exceedingly pleased, yesterday, and on some other occasions in the debate, to hear hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House speaking of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) in kind terms such as they have not always used. It is quite true that some of the gentlemen who have indulged in these complimentary

remarks, have rather expressed themselves to the disadvantage of the followers of the hon. gentleman and have complimented him in a measure by contrasting him with his followers, greatly to their disadvantage. But, with all that, we are delighted to discover that the Government supporters are now recognizing that in the leader of the Opposition we have a statesman, a great statesman.

Mr. GIBSON. The best man of the lot.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I hear an hon. gentleman say, "the best man of the lot." I am pleased to hear him say so, because, on some occasions, I think, I have heard him make some remarks of a different tenor, of a rather uncomplimentary character. And, as I cannot think that the leader of the Opposition has improved so much in the short time in question, I am glad to be able to compliment that hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) on coming to a better sense of the character and eminence of the leader of this side.

The question of providing railway accommodation for the Yukon is very largely discussed in this House in connection with one or two impressions that are held. The justification which the Government assumed, or seeks to assume, for itself for the contract and for the route which it has selected largely turns upon one or two questions, or, perhaps, I might more properly say, on one or two impressions which we might call popular impressions.

The propriety of the action of the Government, the wisdom of the selection of the route they have made, largely depend, in their estimation, upon the extent of the influx of people into the Yukon which they might reasonably anticipate; and furthermore, the time when they might expect that influx to take place, and the time when they first learned it was likely to take place. The birth of this Yukon question, the beginning of interest in the Yukon, can be pretty exactly fixed. I think it was on the 15th or the 16th of July, 1897, that the people of Canada first began to hear the word Yukon popularly used; they certainly did then for the first time hear the name Klondike. About the 15th or 16th of July, at Victoria, I happened by accident to meet those returning miners who had formed the first party coming back from that Yukon district and bringing with them stories of the wonderful richness of the gold deposits of that country. Now the Government claimed that they could not know at an early date the facts of these rich finds; they have contended that they were not thoroughly informed of the probability of a large influx of people into the Yukon; but certainly on the 15th or 16th of July last, the world was beginning to hear of the Yukon, and on the 18th or 19th an officer of the Government, Inspector Strickland, was on his way to Ottawa, and probably reached Ottawa about

the 22nd of July, bringing with him in his pocket very interesting specimens of the nuggets to be found in the Yukon district, and bringing precise details of the richness and extent of the finds of gold that had there been made. Now, immediately that those discoveries were made known, they were of such a startling character that the news was telegraphed to every part of the world, and certainly by the 18th or the 19th of July, in every part of the world to which the telegraph carries information, people were discussing the Yukon or talking about the Klondike, and were beginning to form parties to go to that country. As early as the 17th of July it was stated, and I think stated correctly, that the whole population of Seattle was in a state of excitement over the matter of going to the Yukon; and on the 17th of July, which I think was a Sabbath, a steamer actually sailed from Seattle loaded to the water's edge with gold miners going to the Yukon to seek their fortune. Now the question that is now so interesting to this country—because it is the question that is to settle whether the Government in this matter are taking the right course or not—the question that first had to be decided was, Where is the Yukon gold field? The next question, was, How can we get there? These are the two questions that have been considered by the Government when they decided on their route into that country. The Yukon gold field lies, as probably almost every person now knows, near the international boundary, about the 64th parallel north latitude, and the deposits of gold extend, so far as we can tell, in a southerly direction down to somewhere in the vicinity of Lake Teslin, or about the 56th parallel north latitude. This auriferous region stretches along parallel with the coast of the Pacific Ocean, and at a distance from that coast varying from 100 to 200 miles. The particular feature of the locality that has made it a puzzling question to the country, is how to reach that region; and a difficulty for the Government, perhaps, in deciding on the best route by which to build their railway, lies in the fact that the frontier, the shore of the Pacific Ocean, through nearly the whole of that distance, is not British territory, but is United States territory. But when people began to say to themselves, How can we get to the Yukon? we began to hear the names of St. Michaels, Juneau, Dyea, Skagway, names now familiar the world over, but not before then heard of outside of their neighbourhood. It was at once discovered by those who thought of going to the Yukon country that there were two classes of routes, or rather there was one route which stood by itself entirely, the route via St. Michaels at the mouth of the Yukon River, using steam ocean navigation to the mouth of that river, and then ascending that river for some 2,000 miles until you come to Canadian territory, that is a voyage of some 4,000 miles or thereabouts.

The other alternate routes are those via Dyea and Skagway, or by Juneau, by the Taku Inlet, and by the Stikine River. Now, these are all precisely similar in their character. In every one of them the first part of the journey is made from Victoria or Vancouver, or from such American port as may be selected. Then a voyage by pack trail, or on foot, has to be made over that mountain range which lies along the coast, and after crossing that, all the early adventurers proceeded by using a system of water communication which runs generally in a north or north-easterly direction from Teslin Lake until it crosses the international boundary in the Yukon district. Now the Government have introduced a Bill to provide a railway, and they have introduced it in a very peculiar manner. They have made what we on this side of the House regard as an improvident bargain, they have made it in violation of some principles which, it has been usually held, ought to apply to all bargains made by the Government, that is to say, they have failed to secure the advantages they would enjoy by calling for tenders, or by bringing as many contractors and parties ready to engage in such a work, as they possibly could into competition, in order to secure a low price. They have decided in this case not to do that; and they have urged quite a variety of reasons, not very numerous, but which we must consider in detail, in considering this bargain. The first reason they give is that of urgency. The Government's justification for making this contract with Mackenzie & Mann, was that there was great urgency, they were pressed, and so pressed for time that they were not at liberty to take those steps that an ordinary business man would take, and were driven by stress and pressure to make a hurried bargain. I have read with care the two speeches made from the Government side of the House which throw light upon this question. I refer to the speeches made by the hon. the Minister of Railways, and by the hon. the Minister of the Interior. The Minister of Railways apparently expected a good deal of opposition to the Yukon Bill; by the manner in which he introduced it he was apparently under the impression that he was not speaking to a friendly audience. His whole speech apparently was a reply to anticipated criticisms. The reasons given by him to induce the House to accept the Yukon Bill were, in the first place, this same argument of urgency; in the second place, that by building the railway by the route which the Government had selected, they had secured an all-Canadian route. Subsequently the Minister of the Interior followed and discussed this measure at very great length. To a large extent his speech was taken up, not with careful criticism of the measure, or in advancing reasons why it should be supported, but you will find that he also relied in the arguments he presented

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

to the House, on the fact that urgency obliged the Government to depart from the ordinary custom of taking tenders for this work; and furthermore, that this was an all-Canadian route. Practically the arguments advanced by hon. members on the other side of the House, including members of the Government, in favour of the Bill, are two: first, great urgency, that the matter must be disposed of very hurriedly; and, second, that the route selected is an all-Canadian route.

First, to deal with the question of urgency. The Minister of the Interior did not give the House the impression that he thought there was very great urgency, in so far as it was necessary to provide for the accommodation of a very large number of passengers, because he said from his place, speaking of what he termed the probable influx of people into that country, all he intended by the expression "influx" was a few hundred people. If that was the view which the Minister took as late as the time when Mr. Ogilvie's report was made public, it was an extraordinary view for the hon. gentleman to hold, because as early as 20th or 22nd July, certainly as early as the last days of July, he must have known that all the world over interest was taken in this region, and every one moving about in Canada was aware that in almost every town and village parties were being formed to go to the Yukon. From the very moment when it became known that these marvellous discoveries of gold had been made in the Yukon, or in the neighbourhood of the Yukon, and when the people began to recognize that they were the greatest gold discoveries ever made, they said: Let us go there; and necessarily the people of Canada and the United States everywhere discussed the question of the best route to the Yukon. The very question which the Government of Canada had to decide when they came to select the route was one which the people of Canada and the United States, and the business men, to whom it was a live issue, had decided for themselves, namely, what was the best route to the Yukon.

Now, what is the best route? Let us appeal to the decision of public opinion. Unquestionably it has been decided to be the route not by the Stikine, but by Dyea. In 1887, when the Government sent Mr. Dawson to visit that country and report on it, he went by Dyea. When Lieut. Schwatka visited the Yukon he went by Dyea. When Mr. Ogilvie was sent by the Government, he went by Dyea; and Mr. Ogilvie, in his report, states that at this day practically all miners entering the Yukon go there via Dyea or by Lynn Inlet. So that the question was decided by the parties who were most interested, the men who wanted to get there quickly, those who were resolved to go there to seek their fortune, the men who wanted to get there

cheaply, safely and rapidly—all those men who resolved to go to the Yukon, and all miners who are going there at the present moment, have decided by their action that the best route is by Lynn Inlet and Dyea Pass. That being the case, why did the Government decide to take another route; and in doing so it may be asked have they decided so correctly or wrongly? It must be admitted by Government supporters that if it can be shown that the route selected is not a good one and is not in fact a suitable route, a tremendously strong argument is advanced why this Bill should be defeated. The only reasons apparently given why we should adopt this route via the Stikine are the two to which I have referred: first, that the Minister of Railways states that urgency compels the adoption of this route, as it is the only route which can be built over this year; and in the second place, that he and the Minister of the Interior declared that this is the only all-Canadian route. These are fortunately very explicit statements. Are they correct? It surely should not be difficult for hon. members composing this House to come to a satisfactory determination on these two questions, whether or not the route via Stikine is the only route that can be built over in 1898, and whether it is the only all-Canadian route. But these propositions, I contend, are totally unfounded; neither can be proved and both can be disproved.

The route via the Stikine is, according to the report of Mr. Jennings, the Government engineer, only twenty-seven miles shorter than the route via Lynn Inlet. He states that the route via Pyramid Harbour to Fort Selkirk is 235 miles, and the other is 208, one being twenty-seven miles longer than the other. Is the Minister of Railways prepared to come before the people of Canada and seek to induce them to believe that a route which is only twenty-seven miles longer than the route he has selected, could not be built over during the season of 1898, when he maintains that a railway by the Stikine route could be built? Moreover, the evidence of Mr. Hamilton Smith and the report of Mr. Jennings show that the route via Lynn Inlet, although longer, is an easier route over which to construct a road. Mr. Smith, in his letter, states, and it has not been contradicted, that on the Dalton route there is no grade exceeding 2 per cent, which, considering it goes over a mountain pass, is a very easy grade. Mr. Jennings, on the other hand, in his report, shows that on the route by the Stikine there are grades up to 4 per cent. Under the terms of the contract there are to be grades up to 171 feet to the mile, which is equal to 3½ per cent. Another fact indicating, that the proposition that the only route over which a railway could be built in 1898 was via the Stikine is unsound, is that Mr. Hamilton Smith in his letter to

the Government offers to build a road via Lynn Inlet in 1898; and the Government could have justified themselves as to the financial ability and standing of himself and the interest he represents, and no doubt he would have been willing to have made a deposit of a quarter of a million dollars, or any other sum, to guarantee the construction by that route in 1898. These reasons seem to me conclusive that this question cannot be decided in favour of the Government on the argument of urgency advanced by the Minister of Railways and the Minister of the Interior. I think a fair consideration of the facts and arguments advanced on both sides will show there is no cogency whatever in that argument, and that if it applies at all, it applies in favour of the route via Pyramid Harbour and Chilkat Pass. Let us consider the question of the all-Canadian feature of this proposal. The one route would terminate at Pyramid Harbour at the sea, and below the Rink Rapids on the River Yukon, inland. There is no question as to what would constitute an all-Canadian route—that question does not admit of argument. We all admit that an all-Canadian route is one that would have both termini, and the whole length of the line in Canadian territory; and when the Government come to this House and propose to adopt a route as an all-Canadian route, they are bound to show that these conditions, that both termini and the whole extent of the line lie in Canadian territory, are fulfilled.

Let us contrast these lines: that by Chilkat Pass, suggested by Mr. Hamilton Smith, and that by the Stikine, advocated by the Government. We know that the terminus at the northern end of both these roads is unquestionably in British territory, but how about the terminus at the southern end? We all know that the terminus of the Stikine Railway is practically at Wrangel, and Wrangel is unquestionably in American territory. But as to the terminus of the Chilkat Pass route which is at Pyramid Harbour, that is an open question, and one which I hope to see decided in favour of the British contentions. I believe that when the boundary line there is delimited it will be found that Pyramid Harbour is in British territory; that is only a reasonable construction of the treaty. In that case the Chilkat Pass route would be an all-Canadian route and the Stikine route—the navigation of the Stikine River being necessarily a part of it—cannot be an all-Canadian route, for the reason that we must tranship our goods at Wrangel and come under the control of the United States Government regulations. But there are other reasons which ought to be considered by the people of Canada and by this Parliament in deciding which of these two routes should be taken, if we admit at all

that the Government are bound to build a road from the Pacific Coast into the Yukon country.

Another reason advanced by the Government and their supporters in favour of the contention that it was necessary to provide railway communication to that country is that it would prevent a varied series of shocking disasters, of riot, of bloodshed, of starvation. I was glad to listen to my friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) deal very effectively with that contention. So far as the question of riot and bloodshed is concerned, we may look to the past history of the development of mining interests in the Canadian North-west and British Columbia with a great deal of satisfaction as a people. In no part of Canada has law and order been more effectively preserved than in the mining districts of British Columbia. In Rossland, a town grown up in a few days and containing a large number of the wilder spirits of the border coming not alone from Canada, but from many parts of the United States, there has been no disorder. There has been everywhere under the British flag evidence that one official or two, backed by the strength of the Canadian Government were sufficient to maintain order even among a very lawless population.

A great deal has been said from the Government benches of the urgent necessity of building this road, and the people of Canada are called upon to construct it at great expense, because it is said that if it is not built there is danger of the people starving in that country. That is a very extraordinary proposition to make, and I thought it was most satisfactorily answered by two speakers on the Government side of the House, the hon. members from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford). The hon. member from Alberta suggested that very naturally if people after going into the Yukon found they were not going to have enough to eat they would walk out as they walked in; and the other hon. gentleman (Mr. Rutherford), who seemed to be very well satisfied with his own opinion, told us that if 50,000 people went into the Yukon this summer, 49,000 would come out this fall. That certainly disposes in a most satisfactory manner of any danger of the glutting of that country with people, and any danger of starvation or misery. I think, Mr. Speaker, we might safely enough leave it to the common sense of those who are going into the Yukon to provide for themselves. We have in the city of Montreal some 300,000 people who are fed every day without the intervention of any Government machinery. They are supplied with everything they require, because there are business people only too anxious to supply them, and we may safely leave it to the traders of British Columbia, or even to the traders of the extreme north, to see that every man

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

who has money to pay for food will be supplied with it. There are, and have been for years, two very extensive corporations doing business in the Yukon, namely, the Alaskan and the North American Transportation and Trading Companies, and these concerns are perfectly competent to supply goods to all who have the means to pay. Very early in the history of this gold discovery the question of food supply came up, and some said that there was danger of starvation. Last year I had the opportunity of speaking to the commissioner of the Hudson Bay Company at Winnipeg, and I asked him if there was any danger of starvation or hunger in the Yukon. That gentleman laughed at the idea, and said that his company had very great facilities for doing business and were perfectly able to supply the wants of everybody there.

Having now disposed of these questions of urgency, of the danger of hunger, and of the all-Canadian route, let us consider whether or not the Government have selected what is probably the best route to the Yukon. The route from Victoria via the Stikine to Dawson is 1,770 miles long, so far as we can trust to the figures that are published, and of that 770 miles, or about 45 per cent. is made up of sea voyage. The route via Pyramid Harbour is 1,370 miles, and of that 900 miles, or about 70 per cent. is sea voyage. Now, I would like to know if any person were proposing to go or to send freight into the Yukon, whether he would prefer to take a route 1,770 miles long, of which only 770 was by sea voyage, 1,000 miles was by tramway and river voyage (and an exceedingly narrow and ill-equipped tramway at that), or whether he would prefer to take a route 900 miles of which was by sea and only 470 of which was by rail and river navigation. Which would he select? If he would go as the travelling public does everywhere, he would unquestionably select the route via the Chilkat Pass. In the latter case he would have the comfort and ease and security and cheapness of travelling on a well-equipped steamer by sea.

If the plan offered to the Government by Mr. Hamilton Smith were carried out, he would have, not a tramway, but a first-class road, extending 288 miles to a point where it would connect with river navigation for boats drawing at least five feet of water. At Pyramid Harbour, the ocean terminus of the Chilkat Pass, there is deep water, with landing facilities that would enable large steamers to draw up beside the wharf from which the train would start, so that there would be no more difficulty in passing from one to the other than there is at any of the ocean ports of Canada, and less difficulty than there is at New York. And at the other terminus of the railway, at the river landing, where there is five feet of water, the same course could be followed. The river boat could be drawn up beside the

wharf at which the train would land the passengers and freight, and they would be carried with the greatest possible facility and cheapness on their way. Let us consider whether there was not sound sense in the proposition laid down by Mr. Hamilton Smith, that no capitalist who expected to get any return from his investment would consider for a moment the route by the Stikine River, as compared with the route via Pyramid Harbour and the Chilkat Pass. If these routes were competing, as they necessarily would, for the traffic and trade of all those people from the United States and Canada and other parts of the world, going to the Yukon country, what chance would there be for this route via the Stikine? They would be compelled necessarily to carry passengers and freight at the same rates; and how could this road possibly live or be a paying business venture, if it were compelled to carry passengers and freight at the same rates over a route 400 miles longer and involving five transshipments as against four transshipments by the other route? That question of transshipment adds very largely to the expense. It is necessarily a very interesting question to the people of eastern Canada. A man anywhere from eastern Canada who wishes to reach the Yukon country, must first of all load himself or his freight on a transcontinental railway, then tranship at Vancouver or Victoria to an ocean steamer, again tranship at Wrangel, if he goes that way, to a river boat, then again to the light railway running to Teslin Lake, and then again to another river boat; and after that he has the chance of having to make one or more portages in making his way down the Hootalinqua River. He has at least five transshipments to make as compared with four by the other route, and there is no possibility of his having by the latter to make any portage to avoid difficulties of river navigation.

This being the case, why should the people of Canada be asked to build this railway via the Stikine at all? It is not called for by any urgency. We know now, from the contract laid on the Table of the House, that that road cannot be ready to do any business before September of this year. Urgency means the pressure of business that has to be dealt with at the moment. There is no urgency to deal with the business of 1899. The plea of urgency would apply, if we had to attend to the business of 1898, which, we are informed, cannot be dealt with by this road. Why, then, should choice be made of the worst route? Has the Minister of Railways or the Minister of the Interior given any reason why the people of Canada should be asked to pay what is admitted on all hands to be a liberal price for the worst route? And, finally, have hon. gentlemen given any satisfactory reason why they should try, using the power given by the monopoly clause, to compel the people of the

United States and the people of Canada who are going to the Yukon country, to go via the most expensive, the most dangerous, and in every way the worst route? Have they made any case at all on these points? I maintain they have not.

There is another reason which perhaps requires some consideration, and that is probably the least tenable of all, when it comes to be looked into. That reason is, that the Government are acting in this matter because they wish to keep the trade of the Yukon for Canada. How are they going to keep the trade of the Yukon for Canada? By compelling that trade, as far as it is in their power, to go by the Stikine, the slowest, the most perilous, and the most expensive route. It is always known that the flow of trade is very nicely paralleled by the flow of water. You can no more make business run in an unprofitable channel than you can make water run up hill. Business naturally and inevitably follows the most convenient channel. The more easy of access you make your business, the more people will come to you to do business. The more convenient you make it for people to come to you, the more people will come to you. Then, how are the Government of Canada going to keep the trade of the Yukon for Canada by compelling it to follow a route 400 miles longer, at least twice as costly, and, as the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) points out, one that is open only five months in the year, as against a shorter and more convenient route which is open twelve months in the year? That is a conundrum, and I would like some member of the Government to try to answer it. If, instead of the worst route, we had the shortest, most convenient and in every way the best, and if it were the property, not of a company, but of the Government of Canada, how would even that keep the trade of the Yukon for Canada? The Government have not explained that, and I think the people of Canada would be very glad if they would attempt to explain it. There is no doubt that we are enjoying a great many courtesies at the hands of the United States, and they are enjoying a great many courtesies at our hands. The bonding privilege is extended by each country to the other to facilitate business, and in many other ways we are enjoying friendly relations with the United States. We are acting kindly towards them, and I think they are acting kindly towards us. We see sometimes alarming and sensational reports in their papers, and we sometimes see similar reports here; but to my mind there is nothing to warrant the feelings which inspire those reports, and no danger that these friendly relations will be interrupted. Now, if we had the best possible route to the Yukon, how could we keep the people of the United States from using it?

Who are the people that are competing with Canadians to-day for the trade of the Yu-

kon? Are they not the people of the northern and north-western states? They are in such a position that they can come to us and say: We want to pass our goods in bond over the Stikine route. Let us assume that that is the best route, and that we must allow them to pass their goods over it, they will enjoy every facility and advantage which the Government of Canada has created at the expense of our people, because we cannot refuse them equal participation in those rights. How then can it be seriously contended that the main purpose of building this railway by the Stikine route is to preserve the trade of the Yukon for the people of Canada and give the people of Canada an advantage over their competitors in the United States? That is an utterly irrational and indefensible proposition.

The fact of the matter is that with the duties adjusted as they now are, the people of the north-western states will be able to take the trade of the Yukon in a great many lines, from the people of Canada. Take food stuffs, and particularly feed for animals, bulky food products, in which there will be a very large trade, how will we stand compared with our American rivals? The supplies we furnish must come from this side of the Rockies. We shall have to haul those supplies over the Rockies, probably six hundred to eight hundred miles, to the coast, then tranship to Fort Wrangel, and there tranship again up the difficult Stikine River, and again tranship over the road to Lake Teslin, and perhaps have to portage before reaching Dawson City—how can we expect to bring those bulky produces all that distance, with all these disadvantages, and compete with people who can ship directly from the Pacific Coast?

Will the duties imposed last session enable us to keep that trade? I do not think so. The duty on flour is 60 cents per barrel of 200 pounds. Mr. Jennings estimated the cost of handling flour or anything else across the proposed Yukon route to Lake Teslin at 9 cents a pound or \$18 a barrel, and the duty is 60 cents. On beans the duty is 15 cents a bushel, or a quarter of a cent a pound. These are articles that will be largely used by the Yukon miners, and the duty will not count at all compared with heavy freight rates. Corn pays no duty at all, and instead of the people of Edmonton having an opportunity of sending their coarse grains into this country, they will find they are hopelessly beaten. There is no chance whatever for them to compete. Hay pays a duty of \$2 a ton, or one-tenth of a cent per pound. What protection will the duty of one-tenth of a cent per pound afford on an article which has to be conveyed over a route where you pay many cents a pound for freight? None whatever. It would be cheaper for the people of that Yukon country to go to the United States and buy there and pay the duties than to take the goods

which can be supplied from Canada and which must be hauled across the Rockies to the coast of British Columbia—because that province does not supply enough for its own population—and then be transhipped and sent on to the Yukon. Therefore it is absolutely foolish to talk of this proposed route capturing the trade for the people of Canada. I would be delighted if it would have that result, but there is no reason to believe that it will, but every reason, on the contrary, to conclude that this argument, like other arguments on the other side, is absolutely baseless and untruthful and of no effect whatever.

A great deal has been said in the course of this discussion—because I do not suppose that many discussions have ever wandered much more widely—concerning the various treaties, and a great deal of blame has been heaped, in connection with these treaties, upon a very eminent Canadian statesman, now deceased unfortunately. These treaties have been ransacked, a good deal of legal ability has been directed towards them, hours have been occupied in discussing them, and with what result? I think that to the mind of the ordinary citizen of Canada the conclusion is inevitable that these treaties do not count for anything in connection with this question. No matter from what source we derive our rights, they are indisputable. We have the right of navigation of the Yukon and the Stikine rivers. It has been suggested that difficulties might be raised in connection with the question of transshipment at the Stikine River under the treaty. I do not see how that is possible. We have exactly the same state of affairs existing at the Yukon. We hold our right to navigate the waters of the Yukon on precisely the same treaty conditions as our right to navigate the Stikine. On the Yukon, the Government of the United States has designated St. Michael a port for transshipment, transshipments are made there regularly and continually, and there is no suggestion that that right is to be interfered with. And just as we enjoy the right of transshipment at St. Michael's, so we will have it, with equal freedom from embarrassment or disturbance, at Fort Wrangel. At this moment we have at Dyea and Skagway the same privilege as at Boston and Portland of shipping goods in bond. The fact of the matter is, that under our treaty rights, we enjoy the same free passage, at these western ports as at Atlantic ports, for our goods over the United States territory as the United States enjoy over Canadian territory; and all the time that has been devoted to discussing the disabilities that might be thrown in our way in this matter of transshipment has been wasted. So far as I can discover, our rights are not questioned at all but are perfectly defined. We have never been interfered with yet in the enjoyment of them, and it is not at all likely that we shall be.

Now, as bearing to some extent on this question of an all-Canadian route, on which so much stress has been laid by members of the Government who have chosen to speak in defence of the Bill, let us consider a little more at length this matter of the privileges we are enjoying in the transportation of property across United States territory. If there is any point in our having an all-Canadian route, if it is profitable for the people of Canada to give a large land grant or money grant or to make any other sacrifice in order to have an all-Canadian railway route, it must be surely competent for someone on the Government side to show where that advantage is going to arise. In respect of what point, is an advantage to us to have an all-Canadian route?

Mr. PRIOR. To the coast.

Mr. BELL. I shall prefer to have an answer from the other side of the House. The hon. gentleman may speak on this question and perhaps I may be able to gather from him where the advantage lies, but I must confess it is now perfectly obscure. At present I do not see that it is any advantage whatever for the people of Canada to go to any extravagant expenditure for the construction of a railway in order to have an all-Canadian route. We have an all-Canadian route by the Intercolonial to Halifax, but that hauls very little freight. It is put where it is for military reasons, and it is of no advantage to the eastern coast, whatever advantage to the coast on which my hon. friend resides, an all-Canadian route on the Pacific might be. There is no doubt that the Intercolonial Railway would be a more profitable road commercially, if it were not an all-Canadian road. It would then be in a position to compete with the Canadian Pacific, to do business with the Atlantic coast cities, and to handle freights from the west. Because it is an all-Canadian road, it is an unprofitable road. It is a most necessary route, one for which Canada has paid a fair price, and without which Canada could not exist; but, as a commercial route, it is a failure. So it seems to me it is an utterly exploded humbug, this idea that the country ought to pay an extravagant price for a road because it is an all-Canadian route.

Mr. DAVIN. Particularly, when you do not get an all-Canadian route.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). And, as my hon. friend from West Assiniboia says, this is not an all-Canadian route. Now, let us consider what advantage the building of this road will confer upon us. We have the right now to enter Lynn Inlet, because it is tidewater, but we cannot go up the Stikine, because it is a river. We can go to the ports at the head of the inlet, because we reach them by sea navigation. But there we touch the American territory. What have we to do, then? All that is necessary for a person

who wishes to transport goods, is to pay to the collector the amount of the United States duty and take his receipt. Then, on making his way across to Canadian territory until he reaches the Canadian customs office at the summit of land, his money is refunded to him by the Canadian Government. No difficulty is thrown in his way; he has every facility given him for doing his business; he can do it that way more cheaply and better, because it is a better route to take. So that, so far as that all-Canadian feature of the route is concerned, to my mind, there is no reason why we should put ourselves out of the way, merely considering this as a matter affecting the pockets of the people of Canada.

Now, another question which, perhaps, some may think I should not touch upon, but which, perhaps, it is fair enough for me to advert to, is one that affects an enormous proportion of the people who sit in this House. It was dealt with by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). I was delighted to hear him come out so plainly. Of what value is this route going to be to any persons east of British Columbia? It may be that, as the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) contends, it will be of some advantage to British Columbia, but of what advantage is it to the rest of the country? For instance, what good is it to the constituents of my hon. friend from Alberta? That hon. gentleman lives within six or seven hundred miles of the coast. But as you go east from British Columbia, toward the portion of the country in which most of us live, the advantage to be gained grows less until, so far as the eastern provinces are concerned, it becomes infinitesimal, microscopic and utterly invisible. Then, this is the position,—the Government of Canada is building a railroad over the most expensive route and over a route where it can never, according to my opinion, benefit the trade of the coast even of British Columbia, because they have to come into competition with the people of the United States, who are their natural competitors, and where it is of no earthly good to any other part of Canada. Why, then, should the Government be prepared to pay for the building of that road what is admitted to be an enormous price? Why should we be asked to vote away 3,750,000 acres of land in what is said to be the most valuable mineral country in the world, for the construction of a road which is of no good to anybody, and which is in the wrong place? What reason does the Government give for asking their supporters to vote for such a proposition? There is a route which could be used, if it were absolutely necessary to make a way to get into the Yukon. I do not think that that necessity is proven, for, if the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) is right, the people are going to get there faster than is good for them; he says that of 50,000 who go in this summer, 49,000 will be glad to get back next fall.

We are told, that in that country their lives will be in danger, and there is a possibility, which I do not admit, but it is said to exist, that bloodshed, riot and wrong-doing will take place. I do not admit these things, but if they are to be guarded against, why not build the road in the place where, some day, a road must be built, and where it will develop Canada, promote settlement and run through good land to the Yukon? Reaching it in that way, it will make it among the possibilities for the people of the older part of Canada to secure the trade of that country. What route is there that does that? There is a route, and that is the Edmonton route. It can be built now, and so anticipate expenditure that must be made by Canada at an early day. In travelling through the north-west of British Columbia, you realize in a very short time that the artery that makes settlement possible is the railway connection. At this moment they have the Canadian Pacific Railway, a great line, crossing that country, and it has had the effect of settling up the country for a distance of eight or ten miles on either side. In order to settle the northern part of that country, you must build branch or parallel roads. In that fine country in which Edmonton lies, in which, farther east, Prince Albert lies, which extends to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, there is an abundance of good grazing land and farming land. That country will have to be opened up with railways sometime, if it is to be filled with workers, with taxpayers, who will help to bear the burdens of Canada. Why not undertake it now? If it is necessary to give \$3,750,000—which, at \$2 per acre, amounts to \$7,500,000—to build a road to connect the coast of British Columbia with the lands of the Yukon by a route where it can only serve a tithe of the people of Canada, why not build it from Edmonton or Prince Albert over a route where it could be used by all the people, where everything that passes over from the east would pass over at an advantage? But, even if it were not feasible, at this moment, to build a road there, why not build a wagon road of such a character that it could be used afterwards for building the railway? This could be done at comparatively small expense, and it would serve the double purpose of reaching the Yukon and bringing about the settlement of the district beyond Edmonton. If I am not mistaken, to reach the navigable waters of the Pelly River, that route would not exceed 900 miles in length. I am not so familiar with that country that I can be sure of the figures, but I think I am nearly right. According to the estimate of the Government engineer, this would cost \$1,400 a mile, or a total of \$1,260,000.

A road of that character, I believe, would be of great value. It could be built so that a large number of people could pass over it, even in some part of this season. It would open up the Yukon country, and

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

more than that, it would open up and develop the fine farming country about Edmonton; and unquestionably it would bring to that country, which is treeless, or comparatively so, in which lumber is expensive, and it would bring into the markets of the world, the large lots of timber land which lie north-west of Edmonton as you approach the mountains. If you were to go to the people of Canada and ask them for authority to build this route by Edmonton, which would cost one million dollars, it would be a feasible and rational proposition, and I maintain that a proposition to build at a cost of some \$7,500,000 a small, poorly built, inefficient tramway, in a wrong place, is not a reasonable proposition. Now I do not think it is advisable to spend much time in considering the different features of the contract. Those are matters of detail, and I have endeavoured so far in my argument to deal with the essence of the question, with the large considerations that ought properly to be considered when we are discussing the second reading of the Bill. I do not think it is well to spend much time now in doing work which will have to be done, if it is done at all, and which can only be done, in committee of the whole House, that is, discussing the details of the measure. The flaws and defects which the Opposition can point out in the various sections of the contract, can probably be more satisfactorily and usefully dealt with in committee. However, I would simply make one observation here. Admitting that it was the purpose of the Government to restrict very considerably the power of the contractors to select large portions of the valuable mineral lands in the North-west, the provision compelling them to select 72 square miles in each block, is not sufficiently stringent to be of much value. It gives to the contractors power to select some 81 blocks. In 81 localities, they can select valuable mineral properties. Now, are there 81 valuable mineral centres in the North-west, or in the Yukon? Would not this power of selecting 81 blocks give to the contractors every recognized valuable mineralized centre that lies in the North-west and the Yukon district to-day? Would it not in addition give them probably every recognized mineralized centre of value in British Columbia as well? One such block, three miles by six, would take in all the valuable mineral lodes known in Rossland. If I am not mistaken, every portion of the mineralized belt at Rossland which has been proven yet to be of value could be included in one single block, three miles by six. The whole of those creeks that lie on the Yukon, the Klondike, the Eldorado and others that are of recognized value, could be taken up in one or two. The fact that the Government has restricted the contractors to only 81 points of selection in the North-west, does not, to my mind, restrict them sufficiently to compel them

to give to the rest of the people who are going into that country looking for wealth, an equal chance. There is another reason which I think ought to weigh very strongly with the electors of the country in deciding whether this is a good measure or not, and it is a matter that was dealt with fully last night by my hon. friend for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) in which he contrasted the stringency of the regulations of the Government in dealing with individual miners, and the great laxity and excessive liberality of the Government in dealing with the contractors. The fact that an individual miner must pay \$25 a year in order to have a property out of which he can dig any gold at all, and then be compelled to pay 10 per cent royalty on what gold he does take out in excess of \$2,500, seems to me a most unjust, unfair and unreasonable discrimination against the individual miner. The further fact that the contractors may let these mineral lands lie undeveloped as long as they like, is not right. On the other hand, the individual miner, if he does not work it, is compelled to forfeit his property in 72 hours, a property upon which he may have spent a good deal of time, which he probably looked for a long time before he found it. There is to my mind another exceedingly grotesque feature in this contract. If there was one thing about which our friends on the Government side of the House dealt with more unction, with more impressiveness, with greater pertinacity than anything else, it was the charge continually made against the Conservative party that they were the friends of combines and monopolies. They coined a word at the last election to express the contempt with which they looked upon the Conservative party who had, as they said, allied themselves with these people; the word "combinester" was created by the Liberal party, but it was to be used in that contest only, as they did not require it afterwards. The only men in Canada who could be relied upon at all times to treat fairly the workingmen, were the Liberal politicians and Liberal Governments. The only men who could be relied upon on all occasions to create a combine, to create a monopoly, to favour monopolists, to help millionaires, to make the rich man richer, and the poor man poorer, were the Conservatives. On the other hand, when the Liberals came into power the sun of prosperity would rise upon the workingman, and his healing beams which were to bless the workingman, would at the same time bring destruction and annihilation to all those creatures of an unhealthy atmosphere, to all the combinesters and their fine-spun schemes. Well, we find this Government that is made up of those gentlemen who went about the country declaiming so eloquently about the combinester, who professed themselves so warmly to be the friends of the workingmen and the enemies

of monopolists, are here engaged in this very Bill in creating what is probably the greatest monopoly that Canada has ever seen. They are taking probably one-half, almost certainly one-half, of the richest lands in what is admitted to be the richest gold field in the world, and are giving them to two individuals, giving them under such conditions as are glaring when contrasted with the conditions upon which the ordinary citizen, the ordinary workingman, is permitted to take up a claim. That is a feature of this contract which, while the Government may have made up their minds to swallow it, can scarcely satisfy many hon. gentlemen opposite who probably are opposed to combines sincerely, are opposed to monopolies, are opposed to special privileges to any person. How can these gentlemen, these doubtless honest members of the Liberal party, who sincerely believe that monopolies and combines are wrong, and should not be created, and that every man in this country should have a free and equal chance—how can these hon. gentlemen vote for a Bill containing such clauses? They may do it, if they do, it will show to the people of Canada that there is no more sincerity in the rank and file of the Liberal party in dealing with these matters than there is in their leaders, and that is absolutely none whatever. Now, perhaps one of the most interesting considerations in connection with this whole matter, one that has been dealt with by many speakers, and one to which I will refer to but for a few minutes, is the value of the concession that has been made to the company. We have it pointed out pretty clearly that the Government is not getting very much in return. If we were to consider nothing else but the railroad that they are getting in return, regarding it as a railroad, and knowing, as we now do, that it is a narrow gauge road, a tramway, with very light rails, and necessarily with very light equipment, with sharp curves, with very heavy gradients, a road 150 miles long, a road about as long as the Government road in the little province of Prince Edward Island, when we realize that for that road the Government of Canada are giving away four times the area of Prince Edward Island, what would be thought of this Government if they went down to eastern Canada and proposed to build a railroad in Prince Edward Island and give to the people who built the road not only Prince Edward Island, but three times as much territory more which they could select from the best lands they could find in Nova Scotia as well?

That is an illustration applicable to this case. What is the value of these 3,750,000 acres? It has been fairly argued that they are worth at least \$7,500,000; and it must be recollected that 3,750,000 acres is the minimum quantity. If we select the other figures which have been given by Engineer Jennings, and take the road as of the length

of 165 miles, we have 4,425,000 acres; if we take the line as 208 miles, the quantity exceeds 5,000,000 acres; and consequently, if we estimate these lands to be worth—and this is a very moderate estimate—\$2 per acre, they would reach the figures I have given. How easy it would be for a company to go on the money market and sell the privilege of occupying an acre of these lands for \$2. So we are about to pay from \$7,500,000 to \$10,000,000 for a poor piece of railway construction. But these lands, it may be argued, and argued fairly, are not of any very definite value to the Government of Canada at the present time. They lie there, however, possessing very great indirect value. They are bringing people into Canada. The simple fact that they are lying there open has had probably the effect of inducing more immigration than have all the efforts of the immigration department for many years past. Will the fact that this land, to the extent of at least 3,750,000 acres, has been transferred to a company stimulate immigration? No. If it were arranged that those contractors should sell the lands on the same terms as the Government extended to free miners and accepted in return \$2 per acre, if indeed the Government entered into a supplementary contract, whereby individual miners could obtain these lands from the contractors at \$2 per acre, or even \$3 or \$4 per acre, on conditions imposed by the Government, then possibly those lands might possess the power to attract, as they possess to-day. Would it not be wise to endeavour to enter into such a bargain with the contractors, that so soon as these lands were leased by the company to individual miners, the company should receive from the Government \$2 per acre, or even a higher sum? Would that not be a good bargain for Canada to make? The land has now passed entirely out of the hands of the Government, or it will do so if we do not succeed in defeating this Bill which is now before the Parliament, and which stands without any justification whatever.

One great objection to the Bill—but I do not deem it necessary to deal with it at length, because it has already been fully argued—is, that the Government lies under grave suspicion in connection with this transaction. They have sprung upon the people of Canada the announcement that they have entered into this contract. How many people knew that the Government were negotiating with these contractors before the negotiations were completed?

An hon. MEMBER. Four.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). About four. Capitalists interested in the matter, anxious to tender for the construction of such a railway as is proposed, were not able to reach the ear of the Government, and could not make an offer; and, under these circumstances, the Government of Canada lie under grave suspicion, because they have chosen to con-

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

duct their operations in secrecy, when secrecy did them no good. What purpose, in the interest of Canada, was served by the Government maintaining secrecy in respect to this transaction? If we can believe the hon. Minister of Railways, he did his very best to make a good bargain for Canada; he exercised every effort and used every influence to secure a good bargain for the Dominion. If he were really anxious, however, to secure such a result, why did he deprive himself entirely of the greatest advantage belonging to a person entering into a bargain, and that is, inviting competition? Why did he, if he desired to make a bargain, shut out all competition? Have the Government, or any hon. gentleman opposite, given justification of the conduct of the Government in keeping the bargain secret? The fact of the matter is, that the Government have shown a great deal of folly in conducting the negotiations secretly, but they have shown a great deal of wisdom in holding their tongues since the contract came before the House. Some of their supporters have talked round the question, but no one speaking with authority has made a satisfactory defence of the manner in which the Government conducted the negotiations, and the Opposition, in arraigning the Government before the people of Canada as having been unwise, if not worse, in this transaction, are acting perfectly within their rights. If any transaction ever came before Parliament deserving of condemnation at the hands of this House and condemnation at the hands of the people of this country, I think it is that embodied in the Bill submitted, for the second reading of which we are now asked to vote.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) It was not my intention to intervene in the discussion at this stage, as there are no available papers in French on the matter under discussion, and I could not find any such detailed information on the subject-matter of this debate. I found it impossible to procure such information, for several reasons. In the first place, the other day I asked the right hon. Prime Minister whether he intended having the official guide prepared and published by Mr. Ogilvie on Canada's great gold field, the Yukon district, translated into the French language, so as to enable the French-speaking members of this House to study with more profit its contents. The right hon. gentleman promised to see to it that this translation should be placed at our disposal at the earliest possible moment: now, although I elicited that promise from the Prime Minister over ten days ago, we have not yet had that translation, or at least it has not yet reached us. But, Sir, it is not so much in my own personal name that I bring this matter before the House as for the sake of our own fellow-countrymen who are leaving their homes and are already wending their way into the Yukon region. A great many

French Canadians are likely to seek their fortunes there this year, and they have not the necessary information to guide them.

I enter my protest against such a state of things, as it is likely to deprive those intending gold-seekers, on the eve of their departure for the Yukon, of the necessary and detailed information on that district, about which the great majority of them know absolutely nothing. I also tried to procure some information from the debates of the House, but here again I found that the French "Hansard" did not go any further than the 14th of February. I draw the attention of the House to that fact, as showing how the French language is overlooked. I hope that with a French Canadian Prime Minister at the head of the Administration, these details will be better attended to in the future. Mr. Ogilvie's report is of greater importance to the French-speaking people than is generally believed; therefore, it should be translated at the earliest possible moment, and it should have been done before now.

I shall not dwell at any great length on the subject now before us, as it has been fully threshed out by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. A great deal of light has been thrown on the subject by the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House, and I hesitate not to say that the comments we have heard are quite sufficient to fully elucidate the matter, so as to show the hon. gentlemen opposite how the best interests of the country may be safeguarded. This is an important issue, as it interests not only those who intend seeking the Yukon gold fields, but also, in the highest degree, the country at large. The Government have taken some steps to have railway communication into that gold-bearing region, and to secure the building of a railway, by giving the contract to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. In my opinion, that contract contains many objectionable features. The worst feature of all is that private interests are surrendered, by that contract, as well as the rights of the country at large and, besides, the powers of Parliament are nullified. There can be no manner of doubt about private interests being surrendered by that contract. Private interests, in many cases, are going to be jeopardized, owing to this contract having been given to Mackenzie & Mann, without public tenders being called to carry out such work. There is no doubt that several solid and responsible companies would have tendered for this work, and in so doing, not only would they have benefited by it, but larger benefits would have accrued to the country at large. We can see plainly to-day that those companies have not been fairly dealt with in this connection, by the Government, from the standpoint of the general interests of the country, and did not receive at the hands of the Administration the protection they were entitled to. Private interests were also undoubtedly entitled to the pro-

tection of the Government, under the circumstances. In a case like this, the influence of those companies should have been allowed to prevail, as public interests would have benefited by it. In my opinion, those companies will no doubt call the Government to a bitter account for not having been called to tender for this work. I utterly fail to see on what grounds the Government can justify their action in not calling for public tenders. The action of the Government could be justified but on the most serious grounds, because this system of public tenders is the best safeguard possible to the public funds and to private interests as well. By inviting tenders, the action of the Government would have been unobjectionable, and the public treasury would also have benefited by the competition of the several tenderers. I believe that the Government must have been actuated by very weighty reasons in not inviting public tenders for a work of such importance. And yet, strange to say, they have not deemed it fit to act in the open light of day and to make known to this House the motives that prompted them to take such a line of action. Sir, what was the consequence of the action of the Government in this case? The result was that they were called upon to give away 3,750,000 acres of gold-bearing lands, the value of which cannot be exactly estimated. Such a result speaks by itself and this is the reason why they did not put up that great contract to tender.

When was that contract let? It was entered into within ten days of the opening of Parliament. Now, Sir, I make bold to say that the powers of Parliament have been ignored by the Government, when, within a few days of the opening of Parliament, they undertook to give away such a large portion of our public domain, and of our national inheritance. What, I ask, prompted them to take such a step? The only plausible explanation of the step taken in this instance by the Government was that they were sure of having their action endorsed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, who would merely register their votes in favour of that grant, irrespective of the consequences that might follow therefrom.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) The is right.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) With such a system, involving, as it does, a new and deplorable departure from the principle which underlies free parliamentary institutions, I believe that the freedom of hon. members is hampered, and their hands are tied by such a procedure. When the hon. members opposite are brought face to face with a measure of that description, giving away, without tenders, a portion of the public domain, the value of which cannot be estimated, they will not hesitate, when they know that an adverse vote of theirs would sweep the Government from power, to support such a measure, and I doubt not but

that they will register their votes in favour of it. But, I ask, what about the duty of the hon. gentlemen to their province and to the country at large? I have no hesitation in saying that they will be false to their duty and endorse a measure which should, undoubtedly, be defeated. Under such circumstances, Sir, the role which the hon. members are called upon to play in Parliament is or may be nullified if not detrimental to our interests.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) That applies to the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Let the hon. gentleman who has just interrupted me allow me to remind him that, if he wants to get promotion, he will have to register his vote in favour of the measure of the Government, were it even ten times worse than it really is. The hon. gentleman and his friends are bound to support this measure, for their hands are tied, this contract having been entered into within ten days of the opening of Parliament. Fortunately, on this side of the House, we enjoy the privilege of criticising this contract, and although we are the minority in this House, still we have it in our power to take the necessary means to have it amended, should we fail in having it voted down by the House.

I hold, Sir, that it is surrendering the interests of the country at large to grant 3,750,000 acres of land to those gentlemen, the value of which is unknown or at least can be but imperfectly estimated from Mr. Ogilvie's report. But if we are to believe implicitly what that gentleman says in his report, I think we are making a pretty liberal grant to Mackenzie & Mann, and no wonder these gentlemen are afraid to lose their contract, should it be blocked somewhere.

I stated, a little while ago, that the Government were also surrendering, by this contract, the interests of the country at large. It has been shown here the other day, by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) that such an action, involving, as it does, the locking up of an immense tract of land, had never been done by any Government on the face of the globe. Such a fact, I believe, is well worth considering. Further, I may say that never was anybody known to have handed over to somebody else a property the value of which he could not estimate. Now, from what we know of the value of those lands, as stated in the report of Mr. Ogilvie, we may safely say that we are putting in the hands of two men the highly auriferous deposits of the richest gold country in the world. In my opinion, it would have been by far preferable for the Government to have taken action and undertaken themselves the building of this road, rather than entering into such a contract with private contractors, under such provisions as those now submitted to our consideration. Such an action on the part of the Govern-

Mr. MARCOTTE.

ment could only be justified on the strongest grounds. The Government have at their disposal all the necessary machinery; with competent public officers, with civil engineers and all the means in their possession, they could easily have undertaken to build a road into that country, connecting the Stikine River with Teslin Lake. The cost of a Government railway would probably be greater than if left to private enterprise, but, in addition to our securing a national road, we would have retained the gold lands of the country for the people of this country. But not only are these men given the gold lands of the country, but they will also have a preference which places at their disposal the means of acquiring untold wealth. They are given exclusively the right to build branch lines, to construct, acquire and operate during ten years lines of telegraph and telephone, thus creating a monopoly in their favour. If we are to believe what Mr. Ogilvie states in his report, these gentlemen, owing to that huge monopoly, will before long acquire greater wealth and revenues than the Government itself will have. Let me now deal with another objectionable feature of this contract. It is surely a crying injustice against which I enter my most solemn protest, that the Government should impose on the company a royalty of only one per cent on the gold extracted from their lands, while the free-miner, the poor man who goes into the Yukon, to make a living for himself, and who, at the risk of his life, has prospected that country as far back as 1885, should be compelled to pay on his gold a royalty of 10 per cent. I say again it is a crying injustice and a course of action altogether unwarrantable. Sir, what fair-play is that? In my opinion, it is the contractors who should be compelled to pay a royalty of 10 per cent, while the Canadian free-miner who goes into the country to make a living for himself and for his family, at the risk of his life, should pay but 1 per cent on his gold, or even no royalty at all. I had to-day the opportunity of meeting a man who has just returned from the Klondike, and he told me that the royalty of 10 per cent imposed on the miners was an intolerable hardship. The Government, I hope, will take into consideration the position and the interests of the free-miners and will make a great reduction on this heavy charge. There is another very important feature of this Bill to be considered, that relating to the selection of the best route to the Yukon district. The route which they have chosen is not altogether a desirable one, as a certain portion of the territory which the Stikine River runs through is claimed by the United States. Moreover, owing to the railway facilities in the State of Washington, travellers going to the Yukon already largely buy their supplies and outfits in the United States. The gold-seekers wishing to reach the Klondike will travel as usual via

the Grand Trunk Railway, and will stop at Seattle, for the purpose of buying their supplies and outfits previous to taking the Canadian route. This will take place, with the proposed route, as it will offer them the advantage of reaching United States territory, before taking our Canadian route, and they will thus have only one customs duty to pay, which, in this case, will be paid to the Canadian authorities. The reason why this route was chosen, in preference to all others, was the securing of the enormous trade of that country to Canada. Now, this end will be defeated, because, instead of taking that route, the intending Klondikers will buy their outfits and supplies at Seattle. Thus, that great trade, instead of accruing to the benefit of Canada, will, in a large measure, benefit the United States of America to which the hon. gentlemen opposite have always shown such deference. In fact, there has been, ever since the outset, a most determined effort on the part of the United States to divert that trade from Canada, and to grasp and turn it to their own advantage.

There is, Mr. Speaker, an all-Canadian route, through Edmonton. We would secure by that route the whole volume of the trade of that district. This route offers several advantages, as it would greatly assist the opening up of the valleys of the Peace River, of the Nelson, Liard and Pelly Rivers, before striking the Yukon district. In my opinion, Sir, this route should not be lost sight of by the Government, and I was happy to read in the papers a few days ago that a delegation had interviewed the Prime Minister asking him to provide for railway communication in that direction. This route, I trust, will soon be opened, and I believe that it will greatly benefit the country at large. At an earlier stage of this debate, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) made a remark which I cannot let pass unchallenged. He said that the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would be ashamed of the opposition they are offering to this measure, as they are ashamed to-day of the position they took upon the Remedial Bill.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Hear, hear.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) We are by no means ashamed of the position we took formerly in regard to the Remedial Bill, because our course was grounded on the constitution, and we were simply upholding the constitution. When the Conservative Government brought up the Remedial Bill, they acted in conformity with the decision of the Privy Council, the highest tribunal in the Empire. We have always redeemed our pledges, on this side of the House. It is the hon. gentlemen opposite who ought to be anxious to bury all recollection of their opposition to that Bill; they are the very men who ought to be ashamed of having opposed a measure which was quite adequate, as it secured to a French Catholic

minority their rights to separate schools. Mr. Speaker, before resuming my seat, I wish to tender the House my thanks for having so patiently heard me throughout. And, while I am on my feet, I wish to give expression to the hope that many hon. gentlemen will oppose this Yukon deal, as I am myself in duty bound to do; and were I to follow a different course, I would be negligent of the interests and incur the displeasure of the electors of the county of Champlain who, at the last election, have rendered such a conscientious verdict on the school question by voting down the Laurier-Greenway settlement, which, as we all know, has been condemned by the highest religious authority on earth; and, as the hon. gentlemen can see, this was a very sensible verdict, and one that has been confirmed by later events.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Pacific and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Dominion Building and Loan Association.—(Mr. Clarke.)

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Canadian Railway Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto.—(Mr. Osler.)

Bill (No. 44) to confirm an agreement between the St. Stephen and Milltown Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

Bill (No. 45) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Brandon and South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Cowichan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. McInnes.)

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Ottawa, Montreal and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)

CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from the North-west and representing a great constituency there, I do not think it would be a fit thing for me to allow this debate to close without expressing what I believe to be the opinions not only of my constituents, but the opinions of the people

of the entire Territories. There are other reasons why I am constrained to speak, for did not my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) express a fervent wish that I would not allow the debate to close without taking part in it, and regarding the wish of such a high dignitary as a command I am here to obey.

Mr. McDOUGALL. He is not here.

Mr. DAVIN. I regret the Minister is not here. I regret it because it will be impossible that I should not refer to his speech. Mr. Speaker, every thing connected with this Klondike business is extraordinary. You have secret negotiations by the Government to spend millions, and you have secret telegrams promised by the Prime Minister and then not produced. The whole thing, therefore, has a suspicious look, and we have to give our constituents and to give the country such ideas as occur to us should be expressed in regard to this matchless deal, this Yukon grant to two happy men, whom I do not blame at all because it is their business. I do not blame Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie if Pactolus is made to flow into their lap by the Government, but the rest of the country may be expected to have a different opinion upon that matter. Sir, the speech of the Minister of the Interior is one that I should like to praise if I could. It is practically the first speech he has made in the House, and he is a North-west man and he showed fight, and if I could I would praise his speech. I can give it this praise: that it excited hon. gentlemen opposite and gave heart and voice to benches that had been silent up to that time. In his absence I will apologize to the Minister of Railways for having done him wrong. It was a very extraordinary spectacle we had from that hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), because he is one of the parties to this contract, which reads:

Whereas, it is necessary in the public interest of Canada that railway and steamboat communication with the Yukon district should be established without delay; and whereas, subject to the approval of Parliament, Her Majesty, therein represented by the Minister of Railways and Canals,—

Well, it was a very extraordinary thing that, though Her Majesty had been represented by the Minister of Railways and Canals, that hon. gentleman knew so little about the Bill which he had introduced, or knowing much about it, said so little in explanation of it. In fact the contract was signed by another in his name. We had two speeches from the Minister of Railways and they fell flat. There was discomfiture and dismay in the ranks of the Government, and there well might be. Then came the Minister of the Interior, who is the real author of the Bill, and what kind of a speech did he make to us? Did he give such an explanation of this Bill as a Minister moving the second reading of a great Bill ought to give? Did he show that it was justifiable on economic

grounds, that it would tend to the development and enrichment of the country, that the bargain was an economical one? Not at all. He said very little about the Bill, but he took five hours of two sittings to abuse the Opposition. You, Sir, like him, are a lawyer, and you know that proverb, "If you have no case, abuse the other side." He had no case. I have no doubt that with a good case in court, he would prove a good advocate; but with a bad case in this high court of Parliament, he proved a bad advocate; and I will show that his speech utterly failed to justify this Yukon deal to the Parliament or the people of Canada.

Now, Sir, what is the first question that ought to be decided? The first question, it seems to me, that ought to be decided is this: is it justifiable on economic grounds for a Government to build a railway for the development of a mining country? Many great thinkers doubt whether it is justifiable for a Government to build railways at all. I think there can be no doubt that the argument for building railways to develop a farming country is a good one; but the argument for building a mining railway rests on a wholly different footing; and we should have had from the Government benches the question debated from a politico-economic standpoint, and we should have heard some justification for the course taken. But if you are going to build a railway into a mining country, there is no use of doing it on most extravagant terms. The Minister of the Interior based his chief argument on the ground of haste; and if he fails to justify his statement that it was necessary to be hasty in the building of this railway, he fails utterly. Sir, you know, and I hope the members of the Government know, that because of hasty action in regard to lands which were little known in parts of this continent that formely belonged to Canada, this country lost millions and millions of acres which are now some of the fairest states in the country below the line. British power would now predominate on this continent in a manner almost inconceivable if what was given away by a foolish man named Onslow, whom Franklin laughed at as a good-natured man who always sought to do good, and what was subsequently given away by Lord Ashburton, had been retained for Canada. Therefore, I say we have historical example against the argument that has been put forward here by men who have said in perfect ignorance of the land, that it is of no value. Here are hon. gentlemen who tell us, in the same breath almost, that they know nothing about the country, and then that the land is perfectly valueless; the Minister of the Interior taking the extraordinary course of trying to demonstrate that he had made a very shrewd deal with Mann & Mackenzie, and one of his supporters telling us that the country is a wholly worth-

Mr. DAVIN.

less one, and that of every fifty people who would go in probably forty-nine would return the next year. We have had to-day from one of the members from the maritime provinces a weighty argument showing that there was no need for haste. If so, the case the Minister of the Interior tried to make out falls utterly to the ground.

Now, taking up the contract, the first thing I object to in it is this, that Parliament is flouted. Here we are told that this contract is made subject to the approval of Parliament, and what is the attitude of the Ministers in regard to the majority whom they probably think subservient? What is their attitude in regard to this House, and what is their attitude in regard to another House? Why, Sir, that if Parliament dares to have anything to say to this project, if Parliament, thinking the contract is subject to its approval, dares to set it aside, Parliament will behave so badly that one of the Houses of Parliament is threatened by one of the Ministers. My hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) shakes his head. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will not use that hackneyed joke of O'Connell's, and say that if he shakes his head there is nothing in it, but I will say that he is greatly mistaken, for we all remember how, at the close of his speech, the Minister of the Interior said that the people of Canada would hold the other House to a bitter account unless they passed this Bill.

Mr. DOBELL. He did not say so.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend again shakes his head. I will prove shortly that he did say that; and taken in connection with much of the hon. gentleman's speech, it was characteristic. With regard to that speech, I do not want to say anything harsher than this, that most of it was irrelevant, and a good deal of it was indecorous, in the way it referred to eminent men living, and to eminent men whose memory lives in this House. There are some words which I might use if the hon. gentleman himself were present; but there is a certain restraint placed upon me by the fact that he is not. If I wished to be harsh and extreme in my expressions, the hon. Minister gave me an example when he referred to the treaty made by Sir John Macdonald and other plenipotentiaries—the Treaty of Washington. What did he do? He flouted the memory of the greatest man that Canada has produced—a man who was a great constitutional lawyer as well as a great statesman, and he declared that Sir John Macdonald had never read the Treaty of St. Petersburg. Such a statement would be a piece of presumption coming from almost any one, but particularly coming from a young man and a still younger Minister, and from a man who is a lawyer by profession. His statement amounted to this, that Sir John Macdonald could not have read the Russian Treaty, or

le would not have consented to the conditions of the Treaty of Washington. My legal friends who have spoken from this side pointed out what is perfectly true, that, we have by the Treaty of Washington pretty well all the advantages which we had under the Russian Treaty. My hon. friend showed, not only ignorance as a lawyer, but a marked disrespect for a great man, very unbecoming in a gentleman of his years and capacity.

The speech of the hon. gentleman, however, produced considerable effect on the other side, but, Mr. Speaker, the effect produced was due altogether to contrast. It came as a revelation to our hon. friends opposite on the back benches, who were dumb, discouraged and dismayed, that any Minister should have the courage to defend this extraordinary measure. But when we read and study the Bill, we are not astonished that the hon. Minister, who is the author of it and who made the contract, and who was like a hen defending her chickens against the opposition hawk, which was pouncing upon them, should have been roused to spread his wings and fight for his progeny as best he might. Sir, the criticisms of the Opposition not only impressed hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, but powerfully impressed the country. The criticisms of this Bill have powerfully impressed all Canada, as we know who have just come back from that province, where, with ten-fold odds against it, the Conservative party has gained a towering moral victory and probably a political victory as well. One of the things that contributed most to that victory was the strong impression made upon the public mind by our criticisms of this unfortunate Bill. And I am speaking what I feel, Sir, when I say that I would have been glad if my right hon. friend the First Minister—who had nothing, I am sure, originally to do with this contract—had, when its true character was exposed to him, withdrawn it.

My hon. friend questioned my accuracy when I referred to what the hon. Minister of the Interior said, and I shall quote from "Hansard" the exact words:

It will remove the danger of the country being, not in the hands of our officers, but in the hands of an alien population who will contemn the authority of this Government. These things I look upon as important. Let my hon. friends opposite understand that if this railway project is obstructed—

Mark you this, here is the extraordinary spectacle of a man moving the second reading of a Bill, assuming a bellicosity seldom seen on such an occasion, and then concluding with such a threat as this:

—if this railway project is obstructed, if it is stopped here or elsewhere, and if that territory passes from the control of Canada by reason of there being no railway communication, the people of Canada will hold them to bitter account. Is that not a threat? My hon. friend shakes his head. Then he does not attach the

same meaning to words that I do, because I consider it a very pointed threat indeed.

What was it that gave heart to hon. gentlemen on that side in the speech of the hon. Minister of the Interior. It was simply this. Instead of saying that this Bill was good, he put his arms akimbo, "a la fille de Madame Angot," and said: You are just as bad.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I heard my hon. friend who smiles cheer that at the time, and we heard all the members of the Government cheer, but will that justify the conduct of the hon. Minister to the people of Canada? In the North-west, and I believe all over the country, the Government will be held to a strict account with regard to the professions they made in Opposition. That speech of the hon. gentleman was what used to be called in old legal pleading "a confession and an avoidance." In reply to the charges made against him, he said: You are as bad, and produced a map—a deceptive map, as I have shown; a map that did not give a true account of affairs. The whole thing was a piece of parliamentary melodrama—was not very dignified in a Minister of the Crown.

The hon. gentleman lectured us on parliamentary demeanour, and he favoured me with a lecture on my style of expression. He spoke of the tail wagging the dog. Well, the hon. gentleman was quite competent to speak of a proceeding of that kind, because there are two notable instances of the tail wagging the dog, neither of which is creditable to the Liberal party. There was the tail that wagged the dog up in Manitoba and made the dog turn aside from the pledges on the strength of which the Government had won an election. And there was the tail that wagged the dog in this Dominion, and made a great Minister turn aside from views that must have been cherished by him and to which he had pledged himself publicly and solemnly. The hon. gentleman was therefore in a good position to lecture us about the tail wagging the dog, for he knew all about it.

The first thing which the hon. gentleman dealt with, when he did come to discuss the subject proper, was the cost of building this railway; and he did exactly what the Minister of Railways did—he began at once to depreciate Mr. Jennings. I propose to dissect this speech and show that it is steeped in want of candour, and that in it the hon. gentleman contradicts himself. He depreciated Mr. Jennings's ability in this manner. Mr. Jennings calculates that this line could be built for \$3,485,000, or \$24,034 per mile, but the hon. Minister says that is quite a mistake. Why? Because anybody who knows as much as he and some others, including the leader of the Opposition, would not believe that that calculation was correct.

Although my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) was for a

Mr. DAVIN.

long time Minister of Railways, I do not think that he would hurriedly say that a calculation made by Mr. Jennings on such a subject as that was incorrect. And I will tell you why. I happened to be connected with a great railway inquiry into all the facts relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway. We had to examine the work done by Mr. Jennings and to examine Mr. Jennings himself. We found that he was not only considered one of the first of railway engineers, but a man of impregnable morality as well. We found that he had resisted the strongest temptations held out to him by contractors to represent one kind of work as another kind of work. A more capable engineer than Mr. Jennings does not exist. Yet the Minister of the Interior says that nobody would accept his calculation of what the railway would cost. Then, he depreciated the land that was to be given for this railway. He told us that Ogilvie told him that only about 300 feet width in a stream bore gold. But it was shown by the leader of the Opposition that, under the wording of the contract, the contractors could lay their base line in such a way that they could cover all the gold. And what is the result? We have heard one Minister declare that, in consequence of the criticisms of the leader of the Opposition, they have changed their Bill in what must be regarded as a pretty vital point. In connection with this, I will say something that I would prefer saying with the Minister of the Interior present. He said that I spoke of the Conservatives having the instinct of government, and he added, "whatever that may mean." Well, if he does not know what that means, then, at any time, without fee or reward, I will give him a private audience and explain it to him. If he does not know what it means, he is what I certainly do not take him for, a man of imperfect education. The change that was made because of the criticism of the leader of the Opposition, shows that there was an instinct of government on this side which was not that side. Through the whole speech of the Minister of the Interior we find a bowing to this superior instinct of government, for the only attempt he makes to justify what the Government has done is to say: You did the same thing. But he cannot get off with that. I am going to give you chapter and verse from men who are his leaders in the Government, showing that the principles on which he has acted in regard to this contract are contrary to Liberal principles as surely as they are unsound from a Conservative standpoint to-day.

He vaunts that there is no money paid. There was no necessity to pay money when you were giving away land in such quantities. Besides the land, these contractors are given a monopoly. I will read subsection 4 on page 7 of this Bill, and I intend merely to read it, and I will leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this country, whether, if it were

parliamentary for me to say that the Minister was guilty of effrontery in characterizing that clause as he has done, it would not be an appropriate thing to say. He said that there was no monopoly, and insisted on it again and again. This is what the clause says :

For five years from the first of September, 1898, no line of railway shall be authorized by Parliament to be constructed from Lynn Canal or thereabouts, or from any point at or near the international boundary between Canada and Alaska into the Yukon district, and for five years from said date no aid in land or money shall be granted to any person or company other than the contractors and the contractors' company to assist in building any such railway.

Now, there is no language that I can use to characterize the boldness of a man who will say that does not give a monopoly.

Then, what does he say about rates? He became very melodramatic. In his accession to our ranks we gain a good actor. He threw his hands about and then put his arms akimbo and said: Rates? You say we do not fix rates. I throw out a challenge to you. I defy you to show a single instance in which you, when in power, fixed rates for a railway that was being incorporated. Is that the way to judge it? Is it not of a piece with the exhibition of mountebanks for a member of the Liberal Government to speak in this way? I read here the doctrine laid down by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. I quote from "Hansard," December 17th, 1880, page 143:

They evade altogether the most important question of rates, to which my hon. friend most properly calls attention.

His hon. friend was Hon. Edward Blake. What had he done? He had laid down a principle, that you should fix the rate of tolls in such a Bill. He laid it down as a plank of the Liberal platform. The Liberals have been educated in that throughout the entire country, and it is a fair supposition that in the last election many voted for them in consequence of such sentiments. Yet, the moment we ask them to fix rates—which, I think, was the best thing to do even in our time, but surely we have made some progress—he turns around and says: Show us a case where you fixed rates. No, I cannot show such a case, but I show where you professed that rates should be fixed. Again, on page 146 of the same volume, is the following (Sir Richard Cartwright):—

Fifthly, Sir, I take issue entirely with their omitting to fix such rates as would prevent the future population of the North-west from being put under the power of these grinding and terrible monopoly tolls, which have proved such a tremendous detriment to the progress of the country on the other side of the border.

And I call your especial attention to this:

Now, Sir, these hon. gentlemen tell us that this need not, in the slightest degree, disturb us, because, say they, the Government can fix the

rates. Well, as my hon. friend pointed out, the Government can fix the rates. The Government must fix the rates in the early periods of the railroad, and at a very high point. I think every reasonable man will admit that. But, Sir, by the provisions of this contract, you take away from the Government, for ever, the power.

And so on. With such principles as that laid down by one of the leaders of the present Government, have not the people of Canada the right to ask of them to carry out their principles, and if they do not do so, have we not the right to regard them as political humbugs? Here is what you professed, and when you get into power, you will not carry out your professions.

Now, I revert to the land grant and the hon. Minister of the Interior's calculations. He calculated that there would be only 37,500 acres of the 3,750,000 that would prove to be gold-bearing. Well, a claim is about an acre, and one claim has often produced thirty million dollars. If you have 37,000 mining claims productive, supposing each one yields \$10,000 or \$30,000, you see how it runs up. But I have an authority here that I am very glad to be able to use. Last night we had a speech from my hon. friend the member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), in which he condemned the Minister and the Government in language as strong as we ever used from this side. I call attention to what he said, not because he spoke against the Government, but because it is the language of a practical miner. He has lived among placer mines, he is a practical miner, and here is what my hon. friend for Alberta said:

I have heard it said repeatedly in the House that these men, having received an immense grant of land, will employ men to prospect, and having prospected it and got rich mines, they will work them to their own advantage, and that, therefore, instead of this land grant meaning less development, it means more development. That is a point I would like to discuss for a moment. In the first place, Mackenzie & Mann do not need to send one prospector into that country. There are a hundred thousand men in the Yukon or on the way to the Yukon, or preparing to start to the Yukon, and every one of those men, under the terms of this agreement, is a prospector for Mackenzie & Mann.

We have been sneered at for making the same statement by men who know nothing about placer mining. The hon. member for Toronto West (Mr. Osler) made the same statement, and hon. gentlemen on the Government benches were ready to sneer at it. But here is a practical man, a placer miner himself, a man who has lived most of his life amongst placer miners, and this is what the hon. member for Alberta further says:

If any man of that hundred thousand strikes a good claim anywhere in that Yukon country within the next nine years, Mackenzie & Mann, under this agreement, will get the advantage of that discovery. There is no question about that. They do not take the claim he has located,

but after he has located a claim, they can "blanket" the surrounding country. Therefore, I say they do not need to employ a single individual, for every man who goes into that country is a prospector for them, and their expenditure on account of prospecting, as an addition to the trade of the country, may, therefore, be wiped off the slate.

Now, I want to give you another quotation, because I am sure it will be listened to with pleasure and with deference from the Government benches, because there is no man on the Government benches who knows as much about placer mining as the hon. member for Alberta. This is what a strong Liberal is forced to say, out of his knowledge of placer mining, about your precious contract :

It is not the area, but the right of selection. Or I will turn it the other way, and say that a grant of one hundred thousand acres in that country with the right of prior selection is a better thing for the party to whom it is granted than ten millions of acres to be taken arbitrarily without selection. The case of mining lands is different from that of agricultural lands. The gold of the Cariboo—some thirty or forty millions of dollars—was taken out of an area less, I believe, than one of the blocks that are to be granted to Mackenzie & Mann.

"Less than one of the blocks." Now make your calculation, and you will see that it rises up to millions. But what are millions? These gentlemen, like Onslow, like Ashburton, say: These lands we know nothing whatever about, they are worthless, we are not giving Mackenzie & Mann anything. They try in that way to throw dust in the eyes of their supporters, but let me say they are not throwing dust in the eyes of the country.

Now, if one block of three miles by six miles, or of six miles by twenty-four miles, is likely to contain, or may possibly contain, thirty millions of dollars which can be mined at a profit, it is clear that no company or organization requires a very large number of such areas in order to satisfy even the most rapacious in the matter of this world's wealth.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say that the Minister of the Interior himself confesses incompetence. He declared to begin with: We all know exactly what we knew last session about the Yukon country, there is no dispute about it. If I recollect aright, the printed report was not brought down before the House prorogued; but he says it came down afterwards. But he says there was nothing in that report to give people an idea that so many persons would go into the Klondike. Now, Sir, what is the fact? He twitted the Minister of Railways with not having read the reports of his department. Now I have to twit him with one of two things, either with not having read the report, or with conveniently forgetting it. I have here the report of Mr. Ogilvie of November 6, 1896:

From all this we may, I think, infer that we have here a district which will give 1,000 claims
Mr. DAVIN.

of 500 feet in length each. Now, 1,000 such claims will require at least 3,000 men to work them properly, and as wages for working in the mines are from \$8 to \$10 per day without board, we have every reason to assume that this part of our territory will in a year or two contain 10,000 souls at least. For the news has gone out to the coast, and an unprecedented influx is expected next spring.

That was in his hands in November, 1896, and yet he tells us there was nothing in Mr. Ogilvie's reports that would justify him in expecting that large numbers were to flow in. Then he half remembers that there must be something like that, and he says that even if Mr. Ogilvie, who was there and who knew what the country was, did say that an unprecedented number would go in, would a Minister be justified in acting on that? Why not, Sir? Would not a competent Minister be justified in acting on it? If Mr. Ogilvie could say that, then with our knowledge of California, with our knowledge of Australia, is it not palpable to any sensible man that tens of thousands would be going into this Golconda? He says it is necessary to build that railway in a hurry because so many people are going in. He had to hurry up so much that he would not look out for better offers: the hurry was so great that he had to do this thing secretly. Now, if he was capable, if he was fit for his office he would have acted earlier. He had the evidence before him as far back as November, 1896, that that place would be inundated with people, that an unprecedented number would crowd there, yet he did not act. What reason does he give for not acting? He says:

Nobody dreamed of such a thing—

That such a lot of people would go in. And yet you have abundant evidence that they dreamed of it in the United States as far back as the beginning of 1897.

This is his language:

It is easy to be wise after the event.

It is surely not to hear such language that we pay a Minister of the Crown an annual salary of \$7,000. A man who so describes himself here can be got for \$700 a year.

And if the hon. gentleman can prove events backwards, and hold people responsible for not knowing what is going to happen in the future, then he can hold his political opponents responsible for a great deal, and it would be a very convenient matter of political argument. But I assert, Mr. Speaker, that there has not been one moment of delay in connection with any of the work devolving upon the Government of this country by the development of the Yukon district. I assert that the hon. gentleman can take the record of his party, he can look back over the history of the development of the great west, and he can find time after time when prompt action was required and no action was taken by that Government.

And so on. This argument is made simply to show that when the Conservative party

were in office, they were as bad as hon. gentlemen opposite. Is that any justification? The hon. gentleman reveals himself in the language he thus uses and proves that he is not a competent man.

I want to deal with a very delicate matter. The hon. Minister devoted a lot of time to my friend Major Walsh. So good an appointment did I think that of Major Walsh that when he was appointed I wrote and congratulated him. I said that probably this was the only act the Minister would do which would please me, but I knew well he had selected a good man. The hon. gentleman has devoted much time to Major Walsh. But what did he do? He said—and it was not at all necessary to do it, and it is evidence of the want of candour which characterizes this whole scheme—that not only was Major Walsh eminently fitted for the position, which I entirely endorse, but he said and the hon. gentleman must have known the facts, because I am aware that he is very intimate with Major Walsh, that the Major made a great sacrifice by accepting \$5,000 a year to go to the Yukon. I say here, without fear of being contradicted, that not only is that incorrect, but it is almost impossible that the hon. Minister did not know it to be incorrect. This is all I will say about the matter—it is part of the want of frankness which characterized his whole speech.

I put a question on the paper in the early part of the session in respect to the Edmonton route and the Prince Albert route, and I received an answer which was not very satisfactory. But I was very much disconcerted by the wave of the hand, the contemptuous wave with which the Minister treated the Edmonton route. This is what he said about it:

We can get across by way of Edmonton. I started a party of police that way before I went west myself, and they just got across the summit of the mountains the other day.

The true route is that by way of Prince Albert and Edmonton, because in that way the Government can build a railway which they can justify before the country, and at the same time they can develop the magnificent country along the Peace River. What time would it take to build a railway through from Edmonton? When I refer to the Prince Albert route, I may say that there is a point where the line from Prince Albert would join that from Edmonton, and thence the line would go forward by Peace River to the Yukon; thus when I mention the Prince Albert route I mean the Edmonton route as well. The true all-Canadian route, which would have retained the trade of the country to our own people and within our own borders, as my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) mentioned last night, is that route. I suppose it could not have been built so rapidly as this rag-tag tramway. But where would the difficulty have

arisen? We are told there might be starvation in the Yukon. The hon. member for Alberta, who knows something of the western country—and I know something of the country also—says that is perfect nonsense. If there was the least danger of starvation the people would walk out of the country, just as some of them walked out during the present year. There is no foundation for that statement, or in fact for seven-eighths of the statements put forward for the purpose of justifying hon. members opposite in voting for this extraordinary and reckless contract. We could keep all the trade in Canada, and the money that would be spent by the miners would go into Canadian pockets, and the North-west would thereby be developed, Manitoba would likewise be developed, and Winnipeg, the great centre of Manitoba, and the gateway to the North-west, would be still further developed. Winnipeg instead of having a population of 30,000 would have 60,000 in a short time. I see the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) in his seat, and the hon. member when he came here from the west was very zealous in regard to this question, and I hope the blandishments of Ottawa have not changed him. I hope he has not been hypnotized by the blandishments of the capital, and that he still keeps the Winnipeg virtue which he brought with him a distance of 1,500 miles. If it has suffered deterioration it has occurred here, and I have seen in the past what the blandishments of Ottawa could do. I am proud, however, of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who has shown that he is made of sterner stuff, and that the blandishments of this city have not changed his opinion. I have here a sketch of the route to which I have referred, and I would be very glad to place it in the hands of hon. members; but I do not think it is necessary to refer to it further than to say this, that men who have gone over both routes declare that for a part water route you cannot have a better route than that by Prince Albert. There is also a water route from Edmonton to the point where it meets with the Prince Albert route. Along both routes not merely is there a ranching country but there is a gold producing country as well, and the construction of a railway would develop a farming and a gold-producing country. The line would pay well from the larger traffic over it, and by developing our North-west Territories we should secure for our merchants money which will otherwise be distributed among merchants over the line.

The route adopted by the Government, called an all-Canadian route, we have shown is not an all-Canadian route, and we have shown that this claim, like almost every other claim put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite, has no foundation. No doubt this railway will put some money into our mer-

chants's pockets, but can it be supposed for a moment that the miners of Colorado and Oregon and those who arrive from Seattle and other American ports will buy their outfits in Canadian cities? No. They will buy them at the point of departure. There are companies in Chicago, Seattle, and in nearly every large city in the United States for supplying miners' outfit and sending men equipped to the Klondike, and the men are buying their outfits there. The bulk of produce will be brought in from Oregon and other States. I do not know how to characterize—a poppycock argument, a poor, petty contention, something contemptible for a Minister to use, that unless this line was built during the present year, the Yukon would probably pass out of the hands of the Government. Why should that occur? If they are going to the country without a railway, cannot they come out without railway facilities? This road is to be finished on 1st September. But it can only be run, according to the reports of Mr. Ogilvie and others, for one month after that time, because the river closes the 1st of October. In order to build this line, which can only be run for one month, we are to rush into millions of extravagance and into a reckless bargain that nothing could justify. Mark what I say. It will stamp this Liberal Administration with indelible disgrace, and it will stamp the Liberals in this House who vote for it with a disgrace that will bring punishment on them when they go back to their constituents. Sir, if the Liberals in this House have become dead to Liberalism and become the mummies of Liberalism, the Liberals of this country, outside of the walls of Parliament, are yet alive and understand what Liberal principles are.

The argument of the Minister of the Interior is: We are to build this line, and we are to spend 3,750,000 gold areas for the building of the line. Why are we to do this? It is, he tells us, so as to be able to bring provisions to men who go into that country. He says we may lose control over the Yukon, for there will be an alien population there, and so, according to his own hypothesis, in order to accommodate an alien population, who will carry away with them the vast wealth of the Klondike, we are to spend this money and to do this wrong act. Mr. Speaker, the whole contract is steeped in folly; the whole contract shows the greatest incapacity. It not only shows incapacity, but it shows governmental insincerity and indecision combined, and, if the contract be carried out, instead of our having in the Canadian treasury millions and millions from that Yukon country that would almost pay off our public debt if properly managed, there will be a further serious addition to the liabilities of our people. With the ridiculous and petty statesmanship into the hands of which Canada has fallen, we have lost a great opportunity for adding to our national wealth. There is

Mr. DAVIN.

nothing to be apprehended from our going on quietly in this matter. Let me for a moment, in connection with that insincerity which I have spoken of, point out where my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) was unjust to the engineer, Mr. Jennings. He spoke thus in misrepresentation of Mr. Jennings:

I need not say to the House that Mr. Jennings did not make what could be called a survey of a railway route, for he had no time to do anything of the kind.

Look at Mr. Jennings's report, and the first thing he tells you is this; he is addressing the very Minister who makes that statement, and he says:

Sir, in accordance with your desire for an interim report covering the examination of the country made by me for a highway or railway route between the Stikine River and Teslin Lake, I have the honour to report, &c., &c.

Mr. Jennings tells us that he made a railway survey, so that here you have the statement of the Minister discrediting his own engineer, actually falsified by what this engineer says in the first words of his report. That is a most serious thing, and I do not know, if such an exhibition of insincerity and incompetence has been seen before. I accuse the Minister (Mr. Sifton), first, of incompetence, because I will not accuse him of worse. If it is not incompetence, it is worse, and I accuse the Government of incompetence in condoning his offence, and if not incompetence, it is worse. The more you examine into this railway deal, the more objectionable it is. Look at the contract; look at all that surrounds it; look at the way all negotiations were avoided that might have saved us from this reckless bargain, and look at the way the Government conducts this debate. They are afraid to defend it; they make a spurt now and again, and then lose all heart. When crushing arguments are made from this side of the House, one Government supporter starts out and makes a fight, and then they get afraid. It is something like what used to occur, in the old days, before the walls of Troy. Timid warriors there shrank before the swift-footed Achilles, as timid warriors on the Government benches now shrink before the aged hero of debate on this side. It is now in this House as it was before Troy, one of the besieged starts out and then takes to his heels, once he sees the broad buckler and sword of his over-whelming opponent.

The present political situation reminds me of this. Some centuries ago, pirates swept every sea, and the great terror of them was, first, Spain, and afterwards, England. There was this peculiarity about the pirate ship, that the captain was not absolutely master. He had not, for instance, the authority over his crew that the captain of a man-of-war would have, because sometimes he would get a late captain more audacious than himself that would serve under him as a mate. Generally

speaking, the captain understood how to sail the pirate ship, but sometimes he had men on board who thought themselves better seamen than he, or thought themselves vested with more force of character. There was no bond of law and authority, only that of plunder. Looking across the House, it seems to me that there is there something like what used to be witnessed on board the pirate ship. You have the first mate from Quebec, and the second mate from Manitoba, and now they have hoisted the black flag. I think that originally the captain had better intentions because I can never believe that the captain of that ship yonder would have originally allowed his men to bear down upon this magnificent galleon; no galleon that ever went out of Cadiz could compare with it in wealth.

What I would like to see, Sir, and what I hope to see is enough of public spirit in this country to send out a frigate or ship of war, like the rescuer of other days, floating an English flag, which will bear down upon the pirate ship, take her and her prize, and lead both safely to English justice, so that the pirates may be sent where they ought to be, which certainly would not be a place from which they could rule a country.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, at this late stage of the debate, I do not rise to participate at any great length in the discussion of the important measure placed before Parliament, and which has been so thoroughly threshed out on the floor of this House; but, as one of the representatives of one of the great eastern provinces, I feel it my duty, under the circumstances, when the best interests of the country are at stake, to give expression to my views, with no faltering voice. And at the very outset, Sir, I may say that if there is a fact upon which there exists a perfect consensus of opinion in this House, it is the absolute necessity of providing the earliest possible means of railway communication with the extensive gold fields of the Yukon region; and on that policy, Sir, I do not think there is a single dissentient voice in this House. I am free to say here that it would be a suicidal policy to neglect adopting every measure necessary not only to facilitate the access of the Canadian territory to those who are going to the Yukon, but also to put down in a prompt and efficacious manner the troubles and disorders which are of so frequent occurrence in mining districts. Should we not be lacking in public spirit ourselves were we to surrender with wantonness, by a policy of inaction, and allow to be diverted from us the immense trade to which the discovery of these gold fields will undoubtedly give a fresh impetus? Within a few days of the opening of Parliament it was stated in the public prints by pessimists that Parliament had been dethroned and had abdicated its powers, or rather that the Government had trampled

under foot the franchises and privileges of Parliament, and why? Because the Mann-Mackenzie contract had been signed without our being consulted on the matter. Sir, if I read aright what is stated on the matter by writers on parliamentary government, I hold that the Government is simply a committee of this House, to which we delegate our powers. Now, the Government have thought it fit to agree to the proposals made to them by Mann & Mackenzie, on grounds to which I shall refer later on. Who can blame them for that? To believe that men of such high standing as the members of the Cabinet would deliberately sanction a corrupt bargain, is the height of absurdity. That the Government, consisting of honest men, should have considered it their duty, and a matter of urgency to agree to the proposals made to them, is no such extraordinary departure. Under such circumstances, when thousands of gold-seekers are preparing to wend their way into the Yukon region, what useful purpose, I ask, would an executive council serve, did they hesitate to assume the responsibility of a similar action, and prepare a measure like the Bill under discussion? But, Sir, at all events, the contract entered into by the Government, must be sanctioned by this House. The charges levelled against the Government, before the opening of the session, are now out of place. The people of this country now know that their representatives are free either to endorse or to reject this measure, according as they deem it favourable or contrary to the best interests of the country.

Previous to entering into the discussion of the contract on its merits, allow me, Sir, to offer a view of the matter which is quite personal. It is an opinion which may be disputed, but, I am sure it will command the respect even of those hon. gentlemen who do not subscribe to it. Upon an occasion like this, I cannot forget that the very men who opened up those immense territories of the North-west to civilization, were fellow-countrymen of mine from the province of Quebec. It was from the province of Quebec that went forth the missionaries, the trappers of the Hudson Bay Company, the chief factors of the North-west Company, and the voyageurs of old who were the first to venture across the prairies and to pitch their tents on the coast of the Pacific Ocean. Later on, among the hardy adventurers and explorers who wended their way into the Yukon region, are to be found again compatriots of mine, and if you look over the map of that country, you will find many French names of places such as Juneau, Labarge, Mercier, Ladue, which bear testimony to this fact. The measure now before the House, although it assumes a purely commercial form, aiming at connecting those northern territories with the rest of the country, is also, in my opinion, an official consecration of the pluck and heroism dis-

played by those pioneers of the great west. As the building of that railway was a matter of absolute necessity and urgency, it was necessary for the Government to make the best possible bargain with the contractors. Now, Sir, if we review the different provisions of this Bill, we will easily satisfy ourselves that it will greatly benefit the country.

In the first place, Sir, we are not called upon to vote a single cent of the people's money for the building of that railway. Now, on that ground alone, and let me add that it is an unprecedented fact in our political record that a railway was built without involving us in debt—on that ground alone, I say, irrespective of all other considerations, I feel warranted in supporting this measure. I stand here to say, Sir, that it would be most unfair to impose any more taxes on the rate-payers of the Dominion, and specially on the taxpayers of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, for the building of this Yukon railway, for I think, Sir, you will agree with me in saying that we have dealt most liberally by the North-west, within these twenty-five years past. Not only have we made large outlays for the purpose of developing those provinces, but we even went to the length of depriving ourselves, for their benefit, of many public improvements of an urgent character. I speak with knowledge, for the county of Gaspé, which I have the honour of representing in this House, with a population of twenty-five thousand inhabitants, is still without any railway communication; and I may further say, that the south shore of the St. Lawrence, with its great agricultural possibilities, and where are to be found some of the oldest and most prosperous settlements of Canada, is also deprived of railway facilities. As I said, it would be most unfair to add to our public debt, even for the purpose of building a railway into the Klondike, after we have made so great outlays for the development of the North-west, to the prejudice of the other provinces. Therefore, I congratulate the Government for their having solved this problem without committing the credit of the country to the expenditure of a single dollar. In my opinion, the Klondike ought to pay for the Klondike.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentlemen opposite and the Conservative press have been loud in their denunciations of the Government for having granted to Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie those gold-bearing lands. I take it for granted that the people of the older provinces of the Dominion would have condemned any action of the Government, involving the increase of the public debt and charges for the building of this railway; and I take it also for granted, in view of our past record in connection with all the great public works carried on under the various Administrations that have succeeded each other—

Mr. LEMIEUX.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). (Translation.) Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) I take it for granted, I say, that had the Government recklessly undertaken to build this railway, their action would have involved an expenditure of at least seven or eight million dollars of the people's money. Under the circumstances, Sir, I hold that it was the bounden duty of the Government to indemnify the contractors by means of a land subsidy. The hon. gentlemen opposite have vied with each other in giving exaggerated estimates of the value of the gold-bearing lands granted to Mackenzie & Mann, but I must confess that some Conservative papers have capped the climax in their fanciful valuation of those auriferous lands. I happened to hear, the other day, my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) indulging in similar fantastical estimates with regard to this land subsidy. The facility with which the hon. gentleman launches out into the most extravagant statements is no longer a matter of surprise to me. The hon. gentleman is a brilliant scholar, and, owing to his alertness of mind, he readily assimilates the literary food with which he regales himself. He has, no doubt, read Alphonse Daudet's famous novel, "Tartarin de Tarascon," a masterpiece of French literature, which brought a fortune to its author, and has been translated into several languages. The hero of this novel is a typical good-natured child of the south of France, with his fancy and brain overheated by a burning sun. My hon. friend, in my opinion, is very nearly related to Daudet's hero. He is the north-western Tartarin, and if his extravagant estimate of the land subsidy granted to Mackenzie & Mann cannot be accounted for by the influence of the sun over his overheated fancy, I will venture to ascribe it to the golden rays of the Klondike. Here is an extract from "La Presse":

THE YUKON AND ITS MINERAL WEALTH—
MR. OGILVIE'S REPORT.

"If the indications now known are worth anything at all, they are worth from sixty to seventy millions of dollars in those two creeks (Eldorado and Bonanza). Taking this division as a whole, including the three creeks named, affluent to Indian Creek, a district some thirty-five miles in length and twenty-five or more miles in width, if the indications can be relied on, there are one hundred million dollars in sight in this area."

What is given to Mackenzie & Mann is the pick of nearly four million acres of lands, or seven times more than the area which, judging from the indications, is likely to yield one hundred million dollars.

Therefore, according to the estimate of "La Presse," the gift made by the Government to Mackenzie & Mann amounts to seven hundred million dollars. I must honestly confess to my astonishment at these fantastical figures. But what "La Presse" refrains from saying, the better to arouse

popular prejudices against the Government, is that Mr. Ogilvie's approximate valuation applies but to one particular district, and that the gold-bearing claims of that area are already located by the thousands of miners who have invaded it. Mann & Mackenzie will therefore find themselves on a footing of equality with free miners, and will have to run as much risk as the others do. For my part, I hope that the brilliant vistas which are keeping the eyes of the whole world riveted on the Klondike, will materialize; but, on the other hand, there is not a man in his senses who will not agree that in the discoveries of all those wonderful Eldorados, one must make a pretty large allowance for the figments of fancy. At all events, it ill becomes the Conservative party to find fault with the Government of the day for parting with their lands in favour of Mackenzie & Mann, especially in view of their past action in committing the credit of the country to an enormous expenditure for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway across the continent. And how many million acres of land did not the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) ask the House to vote in 1881 in favour of that ogre, the Canadian Pacific Railway? I make bold to tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that by their action in so liberally subsidizing that company, they have created, not only a huge monopoly, but a vast landed aristocracy, which brings us back to the palmy days of feudalism, and to which the North-west farmers are bound to pay homage and fealty. The lands granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway are daily increasing in value, and constitute for the future an abundant source of income to their owners, while the Yukon lands, on the contrary, can only be said to offer indications of gold. But when the gold has been extracted from these lands, or rather from those glaciers, the resources of that country will have been exhausted.

Mackenzie & Mann, we are told, are going to make a good speculation, being on the point of selling their grant on the English market. Should they do so, what of it? Should the contract prove less beneficial to the country for all that? Whether this rumour is well grounded or not I do not know, but one thing I know, from my past experience of the English people, and my daily intercourse with them, from the knowledge I have of their history and literature—for I am a regular reader of the English newspapers, I am free to say that there is not on the face of the earth a more conservative, a more practical and prudent class of people, from a business standpoint, and as they know how to give and take, I doubt whether Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann will find in England any capitalists ready to buy their lands, when they have read the onerous conditions contained in the contract; for it is expressly stipulated that it is only upon the completion of any ten miles of their railway,

and after it is in running order, that they will have the right to select their lands; then only will they be allowed to select a certain number of claims. Besides, the contractors will become entitled to their lands but on the first of September, provided their road is completed and inspected and approved by the Government. Sir, I believe I am but voicing the feelings of my hon. colleagues from the province of Quebec, when I say that I approve, conjointly with them, this contract, as it stands, because it secures to the country an all-Canadian route. We are thus creating a national route, making of Canada the base of supplies for the intending miners, and enabling our manufacturers, our workmen and our merchants to secure the immense traffic to which a fresh impetus will be given for several years to come by the enormous tide of population flowing into that region. For it may be stated, without any exaggeration, that at least 100,000 miners will be wending their way into the Klondike within a year, and it is easy to see how this exodus towards the gold fields of the Klondike will swell the volume of our trade.

It has been stated across the floor of this House that the Government of the United States were going to create difficulties of every description in order to prevent us from navigating that portion of the Stikine River which flows through their territory. I do not think those fears are well founded. Were those predictions to materialize, who ought to be held responsible for that state of things? Ought not the blame for such action on the part of the United States authorities to be laid on the hon. gentlemen opposite who, within the last fifteen years, have been so loud-mouthed in their professions of loyalty before the people of this country? Should we not, on good grounds, call to a bitter account the hon. gentlemen for the line of action adopted by their leaders? Should we not be warranted in stigmatizing the blamable indifference shown by Sir John Macdonald and the other British plenipotentiaries in neglecting to revive in the Washington Treaty certain clauses of the Anglo-Russian Treaty of 1825? Let us hope, however, that the fears entertained by the hon. gentlemen will prove groundless, and let me offer to the House the reasons on which I ground my opinion. According to all the authorities on international law, the right of navigating rivers and water-courses as a means of communication and commerce is grounded upon natural law itself; and further, nothing that so far has transpired in our intercourse with the neighbouring republic goes to show that they are willing to strain our mutual relations of good fellowship. But, Sir, if we took stock in the rumours that have been afloat in the air, from the very outset of this debate, it was rather from within Parliament instead of from the outside, that we were to look for the enemy, in connection with this Yukon

railway. The Senate, we are told, is going to block the Bill which will undoubtedly be put through this House, by taking upon themselves the responsibility of preventing Canada from getting the earliest possible means of railway communication with the Klondike. Should the Senate decline to ratify this measure, our manufacturers and our business men will see the immense traffic of the Yukon district diverted from us, to the enrichment of the people of the United States. And were the majority in the Senate, by an abuse of their power, to go against the will of the people, I say, without hesitation, that they would defeat the policy of the fathers of confederation, thus setting up an absolute and tyrannical power, and their usefulness would soon have ceased. I think, Sir, this debate should now come to a close, as the agitation created around this issue ought to be given its quietus, now that the provincial elections in Ontario are over. For it is a well-known fact that if this agitation has been kept up so long by the hon. gentlemen opposite, it was only for the purpose of inflaming public opinion against the Hardy Cabinet. But now that the struggle is over, I fail to understand why they keep it up. The attitude adopted by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) bears a striking resemblance to the position assumed by another leader of the Opposition in the British House of Commons, who lived at the time when Palmerston was Prime Minister of England. When asked by his followers what charge they should level at the Ministry, he invariably answered, "Gentlemen, the time has come when we must advertise for a grievance." Now, the hon. leader of the Opposition has also advertised for a grievance. It cannot be said that he had advertised for it at the beginning of the session, as he did formally and strongly approve of the action taken by the Government. But his followers have since reminded him, in the words of the old leader of the Opposition in the British House of Commons, that the time had come for him to advertise for a grievance. The hon. gentleman has since advertised for a grievance, but the grievance he has formulated is an offspring of his fancy, prompted by disappointment, and it is not likely to find an echo in the country.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from a rural district in the province of Ontario, I can say that the feeling of the people on questions of this kind is so strong in the older parts of that province against the granting of bonuses, that the local candidate in the Liberal interest recently found it necessary to put in his address the statement that he would oppose any bonus proposed for a railway, no matter what effect it would have upon the Government of the day. I do not take quite so strong ground as that against bonuses, because I quite understand that there may be times and

Mr. LEMIEUX.

places where railways ought to be built for the purpose of developing the country, and to which it would be right and proper to give a bonus; but, Sir, I do not think it is right and proper to give a whole country almost, or a very large section of country, for the building of 150 miles of railway. I happened to be in the House when the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) introduced this Bill, and I was very greatly surprised at the position he took on that occasion. He admitted that he had information even before Parliament rose last session that large finds of gold had been made in the Yukon district; and it has come out since that there was information in the Department of the Interior as long ago as the 16th of March, 1897, that there had been a great discovery of gold in that district. Now, Sir, it seems to me very strange that the Government, being in possession of these facts, took no notice of them. After the close of the session the Prime Minister went to England. That was right, because he went there as our representative at the Jubilee of Her Majesty the Queen. But I believe three other Ministers went to England during the recess. We had the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who had to go there to make a loan. Then we had the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), who had to go there to try to convince the people of England that the preferential clauses of the tariff applied only to the people of England; but he came back having fully convinced the people of England that the preferential clauses of our tariff applied to all the world except the United States and a very few other nations. Then, the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) had occasion to go to England, it is said, to get rid of office-hunters. He was so harassed and embarrassed by those people that he found it necessary to leave the country.

The most astonishing thing about this Bill, to my mind, is that when the Government found that they wanted to build a railroad in that country, they took no precautions to get the necessary information. In my judgment, as soon as this great discovery became known to them, it was their duty to send their engineers to that country to get an estimate of what a railway would cost, to ascertain where it should be built, and as far as possible to get an estimate of the value of the land in the country. I think it would have been well for them also to have made their information public, so that other gentlemen who are in the habit of contracting for the building of railways would also have sent out their engineers so as to be in a position to make offers to the Government. But, Sir, it appears that only one firm got the hint. How they got it I do not know. But Mr. Mackenzie, in an interview which he gave to the press in the city of Winnipeg, said that they had information about that country, that it had cost them a great

deal of money to get it, and that he did not think any man would blame him or his partner for not giving it to the world. I think he was right; but I think the Government were very wrong in not obtaining that information and in not putting this work up to tender, so that there would be competition, and there would be a fair chance of getting several offers. If they had done that, they would have had some reason on which to justify themselves before the people; because if there was anything on which hon. gentlemen prided themselves and as to which they found fault with their opponents when they were in Opposition, it was that everything should be done by open tender. I think that is a good principle. I think every public work should, as far as possible, be let by tender. But the Minister of Railways ridiculed this idea. "Is it not idle," he said, "under such circumstances, to talk about inviting public tenders to carry on such a work?" That is astonishing to me. I do not think anybody would be astonished at the Government asking contractors to tender to build a railway or any other public work. Then he gives the reason. He says: "Why, we did not know what to offer. If we offered 5,000 acres per mile, that would be perhaps too little, and if we offered 50,000 acres per mile, that would be too much; and we really did not know what to do." Now, it really does seem to me to be a matter of common sense, that any man might have written an advertisement stating that the Government were prepared to receive offers for the building of a railway, and that they would give a bonus in land for that purpose. If they had done this I am satisfied they would have got plenty of tenders. If the hon. Minister of Railways was not able to ask for tenders of that kind because he did not know what quantity of land to offer, what position was he in to make a bargain with the contractors when they came to him? He pretended that he had no knowledge of the value of the land, and consequently he was at the mercy of the gentlemen with whom he dealt privately; and that is one of the worst features of the case. He simply says: "Yes, it is absolutely a gamble, nothing more and nothing less." That is, to my mind, a very strange statement for any Minister of the Crown to make. I do not think the people of this country want their business done in that way. I think we want straight business. We do not want Ministers of the Crown to gamble in our property. We are willing to pay a fair price for what we want done; but we want to be in a position to know what is a fair price before we give the job; and it seems to me that the Government, with the facilities they have at their disposal, might easily know. The Minister of Railways also said that there had come no estimate under his eye as to what a railway would cost in that country;

yet he comes down to this House with a Bill that proposes to give away 25,000 acres per mile to build a railway. He says: "I do not know whether that is too much or too little; it is purely a gamble, and that is the way we are doing the business of this country." Well, Sir, I do not approve of that at all, and I do not believe my constituents would approve of it. Then, Sir, when we come to the contract, if there is one thing the Liberal party fought in this House, it was the monopoly that was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway in the North-west; but what do they do here? They give Mackenzie & Mann a monopoly of this railway for five years, during which time no other person will be allowed to build a railway into that country. Besides that, they fix the rates for ten years. There shall be no alteration in the rates for the first four years; then there shall be a drop of 25 per cent; then they will run for three years more, and then there will be another drop of 25 per cent. At the end of seven years they will be carrying freight for half the price they got at the beginning. That seems to me a very extraordinary thing. It seems to indicate that they must be getting at the start about double what they ought to get, or else they will not be able at the end of seven years to carry freight over that road at half the price. Then, it is pointed out on all sides that at the beginning they will have more work than they can do. There is another difficulty. What is to hinder Mackenzie & Mann saying "We made a contract to carry freight beyond our capacity." They may say, we may just as well make \$100 a ton on the freight as carry it for \$25 or \$50. What is to hinder them? There is to be no competition, the Government will not allow anybody else to build a railway there, and the whole public will be at the mercy of this monopoly. Now, I am entirely opposed to a monopoly. Of course, I know my Liberal friends opposite will say that is very curious for a National Policy man, but it is the fact none the less. I find that there are as many National Policy men on the other side of the House as on this, because they have apparently changed their tactics entirely, but those hon. gentlemen who were in the House at the time knew full well what an agitation there was in the North-west against the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we know how time and again the late Sir John Macdonald was put in a very embarrassing position because he was not able to do away with that monopoly. And how did we get rid of it? By the Government of the Dominion guaranteeing the interest on the bonds of the Canadian Pacific Railway for \$15,000,000, and I think it was fortunate we got out so easy, because, so far as I know, we have not been called upon to pay a dollar. But that was due entirely to the good management and tact of the leader

of the Government, Sir John Macdonald, who watched his opportunity and took advantage of the signs of the times.

Then these contractors will have the right to select whatever lands they see fit in that country. Now, I think that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) made the other day a very forcible speech and put the matter about right when he said that Mackenzie & Mann will, under this contract, have all the gold mines worth having in that country. He said more than that, and I think he said so truthfully, that they would not only have all the gold mines worth having, but would not have to spend a dollar in sending out prospectors, because if there is to be 100,000 men going into that country this year, as hon. gentlemen opposite say there will, these people will all be prospectors. or the great bulk of them at any rate will be looking for mines, and just as soon as one of them makes a discovery, Mackenzie & Mann will have an agent on the spot to gobble it up. Is that in the interests of the poor miners who are working for their living and who go out there in the hope of making a strike?

Nor is that all. The first thing that a poor miner has to do is to pay \$10 for a license. That is the first thing he has to do in order to be able to prospect. If anything should happen that license, if he should happen to lose it, he has to pay \$2 for a duplicate, which makes \$12 for the first license. In addition he has to pay an annual rental of \$15 before he can work his claim. That makes \$25, and then he has to pay a royalty of 10 per cent on all the gold he takes out. How does he stand in comparison with Mackenzie & Mann? These gentlemen get this large amount of land and do not have to pay any rental or any miner's fee, or any license fee, nor have they to pay any 10 per cent on what they find. They simply have to pay a royalty of one per cent. I recollect the time when these hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches and the gentlemen behind them pretended to be great friends of the workingman. How many times did they shed tears over the hard lot of the workingman and lead us to believe that if only they reached the Treasury benches, the public would see what they would do for the working classes. They would have no more monopolies, they would not help the rich to grind the poor, they would not give the rich any special rights or advantages. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see that in this, as in most other of their promises, they have entirely failed to practice what they preach.

The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), whom I do not see in his place, seems to have had more to do with framing the policy of this Government than anybody else. It is said that he framed the tariff, and if that be the case, he did pretty well because he kept the Government pretty close to National Policy lines. That

Mr. WILSON.

hon. gentleman says it is against the policy of the Government to give land grants in agricultural sections for building railways. I fail to see any difference myself in the principle, and I should say that mineral lands are much more valuable than agricultural lands, especially if they are nearly so rich as those are reported to be. But these gentlemen do not always stick to giving lands—sometimes they give money. We all recollect how last session the Crow's Nest Pass Railway scheme was put through the House in the dying days of the session. We also know how these gentlemen, when in Opposition, used to deplore the unfairness of bringing down in the dying days of the session great railway bonuses, but it seems that in this they have followed the example of their predecessors, and in the dying hours of last session they brought down a bonus of \$3,630,000 for the Crow's Nest Pass and forced it through the House.

There is one great virtue which they claim for this particular route, namely, that it is a purely Canadian route. If it were, I would feel much better towards it than I do, but if it be an all-Canadian route why all this worry about the unloading at Fort Wrangel and putting the goods into river boats. I think that that is the best evidence this is not an all-Canadian route, and if we are to believe what we read in the papers, the Government are going to have a good deal of trouble in getting their goods from Fort Wrangel up to the Stikine River. I would much prefer, as far as I am concerned—I do not know if the party on this side would agree with me—seeing the railway built through the North-west from Edmonton, and I will tell you the reason. A good many people will go to that country, if we are to believe hon. gentlemen opposite, who will not make a success of mining, who will lose what money they took with them, and not be able to remain in that country, because it is not a farming country. But if they went in through our own North-west, those people might locate on our lands or settle in our towns and villages and work, for other people, and in that way we would be able to keep them in our own country and the expenditure would not be in vain. I am strongly of opinion that this route is not in the best interests of this country, especially if it is to be, as represented by the Government, simply a temporary railway with a three-foot gauge. Somebody said that the rails are to be old rails that were in use thirty years ago and were laid away to rust. I hope that this is not true, and that if we are to have a railway it will be a better one than that.

The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) wonders how the Government made so good a bargain. He said he was astonished at the contractors signing the contract without having been given the right to select the lands before they did anything towards building the railway, because people will go

in and gobble up the best land and these contractors will only have to take what is left. I should have been sorry had that happened, because I think it is enough to pay a man after he has earned the money, instead of paying him in advance. Besides, it is so different from anything the Liberal party has ever advocated. The Minister of the Interior displayed a map showing how much land had been granted to railways, and declared that this policy had kept settlers away, and had been a great disadvantage to the North-west. That was one of the stock arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, when in Opposition. Now they are pursuing the very course which they then condemned. We are told that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann cannot get this land until the railway has been completed and accepted by the Government. But, as soon as they build ten miles of the railway, over 92,000 acres is set apart for them, and as each additional ten miles are finished they get another 92,000 acres. They do not get a deed of it, but what is the difference? Nobody else has the right to go upon it, to lay out claims upon it, or take possession of it in any way. Then, hon. gentlemen opposite, to make this contract seem more reasonable, belittle that country. But Mr. Dawson tells us that last year two and a half million dollars in gold was taken out of these mines. Then, I wish to refer to a few items from Mr. Ogilvie's report, just to show that this contract is not the matter of pure speculation it is represented to be by hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Ogilvie says that we have 1,400 miles of streams in our part of the system, upon all of which gold can be found. Fourteen hundred miles of gold-bearing lands on the creeks, and yet they say this is a matter of simple speculation. Again, Mr. Ogilvie tells us of meeting a man who had been a miner for twenty-five years in California and British Columbia, and who said he had never seen a country so rich in gold. Not only that, but the statement has been quoted in this House, that there was \$100,000,000 of gold in sight in a certain district of 35 miles square or thereabouts. Still, these hon. gentlemen are willing to give 25,000 acres a mile for building this railway, which will be a very ordinary work and, we are told, will be only a temporary railway. They say that this work will cost a total of 3,750,000 acres. But they cannot speak with certainty of that, because they do not know the length of the railway. It is reported that it will be 208 miles, instead of 150 miles. For my part, I am decidedly opposed to doing business in this way. The duty of the Government, before they let a contract like this before us, was to make themselves fully acquainted with the facts of the case. They should have known what the railway would cost. They should have taken time by the forelock, and made these investigations, instead of going off holidaying, as they did

last summer. They should have had engineers report the state of the country and give estimates of the cost. Had this been done, they would not have been at the mercy of one or two men and reduced to saying that they could not find any others. It was a state secret that they were looking for offers, I believe, until this contract was signed. It was, as far as I am concerned. The first intimation I had of it was when I saw the "Globe," with a whole side filled with the report that a great contract had been signed to build a railway into that country without costing the people a cent, the contractors taking land that was comparatively worthless, land that nobody else wanted. But the Government think so much of this land that they will not allow anybody to go there unless he pays \$10 for a license: they will not let him work unless he pays \$15 rent, and that he has to pay every year, and besides all that, he must pay 10 per cent of what he makes. And this is the land that they say is no good. Even if my party were in power and made such a bargain as this, with this immense grant of land and these monopoly clauses, with all this—I will not say, trickery; I do not mean to be offensive—but all this want of care for the public interest, I would not support it. I say it is a shame, and I hope there will be enough members on the other side who will feel that country must be placed above party, to prevent this measure going through. Just as in the case of the National Policy, hon. gentlemen opposite thought of the country and were willing that the people should blame them for not keeping their promises, than to give the country the free trade they had promised, I hope it will be the same in this case, and that the feeling among those behind the Government will compel them to greatly change this measure.

Mr. SEMPLE. I should hardly have said a word on this occasion, were it not that a statement had been industriously circulated that the Liberal party lost votes in the last election in Ontario because of the measure that is now before this House, and therefore the local Government is not responsible. I think that, as the returns come in, it will be found that the Reform party has as many supporters in the present House as they had in the last one. I was in Wellington for three or four days during the campaign. In the south riding of Wellington, at the Dominion election, a Conservative was returned by over 100 majority; now a Liberal has a majority of nearly four hundred. In the other Wellingtons there were larger majorities than before. During the campaign, I never heard the question of this Bill mentioned. I will say to the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson), that if it was discussed in Lennox, it was not to the advantage of the Conservative party.

Mr. WILSON. May I put the hon. gentleman right? What I said was, that the can-

didate in the Liberal interest had to say in his address that he was opposed to bonuses, before he could stand any chance of being elected, and he did it.

Mr. SEMPLE. I had not reference to the speech of the hon. member from Lennox, but to those of other hon. gentlemen.

Mr. WILSON. You mentioned my name.

Mr. SEMPLE. Some are apt to look at matters in a visionary way; they seem to have two kinds of spectacles, one to magnify and the other to make smaller what they see. It is through these spectacles that hon. gentlemen opposite seem to regard the different phases of this question. For instance, the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. McInerney) computed the value of the timber on lands granted to the company at \$400,000,000. I find that the agricultural lands in the whole province of Ontario are valued, in round numbers, at \$572,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the Klondike, and millions, and hundreds of millions as if they were talking of so many units. When a man is going to exaggerate, he might as well do it on a generous scale.

Now, with regard to the construction of the Glenora and Teslin Lake Railway, many reasons lead me to believe it will cost a large amount of money. For instance, I see that an English company, of which the leader of the Opposition is the chief manager in this country, advertised to take passengers from Vancouver or Victoria, with 400 pounds of luggage, for \$500, and I see at the present time contractors are engaging labourers for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway at \$1.75 per day, taking them to that section of the country and bringing them back. I have heard from very good authority, from men who have been out in the Klondike, that the wages of labourers working in the mines run as high as \$10 a day, and I have even heard it stated that sometimes \$15 a day are paid. So, if this company are going to reap a rich harvest, they will still have to pay for the construction of the railway an enormous amount of money in wages. Suppose, for instance, that the cost of constructing that road is \$3,750,000, that is just equivalent to selling all that land at \$1 per acre. If it costs to build the road \$7,500,000, it will be \$2 an acre; if it costs, as it is reasonable to believe, \$10,000,000, it will be nearly \$3 an acre for the land. I think that from \$1 to \$3 per acre would be a very good price for that land of gold and eternal frost. We learn from the official reports that there are 125,000 square miles, or eighty million acres of land, of which the contractors are to receive for building the railway about one-twentieth, or 5 per cent. They will have one part, and the Dominion of Canada will have 19 parts, and they will

have the railway to develop 95 per cent of the lands which the contractors cannot claim. Now, Sir, it is a known fact that the United States purchased the adjoining territory of Alaska, that is rich in gold, rich in timber, rich in harbours, for \$7,200,000, or about 2 1-10 cents per acre. Mr. Ogilvie, in his report, informs us that the number of miners who go out to the Klondike know best where to find gold, and the many thousands that locate claims cannot be disturbed or the contractors claim any land until ten miles of the road is built. Whenever the company do make a location, the Government have the alternate section. Therefore if it is good for the contractors, it will also be good for the country. The more trade there is, the more duty will be paid into the treasury. Indeed the country is already beginning to derive a benefit from that region, because I see that on the Pacific Coast business is brisk, large returns are coming in, and everything points in the direction that if the road is built, it will certainly help the trade of this country. Any person who has read about placer mining knows that in no place has it lasted for any great length of time. I remember hearing about the California gold fields, the Australia gold fields, the Cariboo gold fields, the West Africa gold fields, the Rainy River gold fields. Who did not hear about a year ago of the enormous riches there were in Rossland? How many thousands of dollars have been invested there which are lost, for which there will never be any return? Gold is something that seems to attract individuals, people have gone crazy looking after the yellow metal. It is indeed doubtful whether many will make their fortunes in the Yukon district; that is something that remains to be seen. The contractors, Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, have to take great risk. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) was honest enough, when speaking last evening, to say that the investors might be at a loss, but he supposed the company would be secure. I may say that during the recess I had considerable conversation with intelligent and thoughtful people, and they were very much gratified that there was to be no increase of the public debt. We know that during the last session a large amount was voted for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, a large amount was also voted for the Rainy River district. With the rich timber and the rich mines in those places, there was something to justify those votes, because we knew that the mineral industry in British Columbia was increasing, that miners had set their faces towards British Columbia, and it was necessary that a road should be built in that region in order to have the minerals smelted at a cheaper rate, and encourage the increase of population which is desired by all parties. Although the Government gave a large amount, provi-

Mr. SEMPLE.

sion was made that the coal in that section of the country should be relieved from the grasp of those likely to form monopolies; there was an agreement that only a certain amount should be charged for coal. I think it is really refreshing to hear some hon. gentlemen talk about the great monopoly to be enjoyed by Mackenzie & Mann in their contract with the Government. We are told these contractors are relieved from the competition of any road from American territory to tap the traffic that they will enjoy on their road. Why, Sir, these hon. gentlemen who are speaking against monopolies have been castigating their own predecessors. Who does not remember the gigantic monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a monopoly that was granted for twenty years, and no change can be made in the tolls on that road? It is true, a change can be made if their earnings amount to 10 per cent, but the company will manage things in such a way that they can never be touched by the Government. It is refreshing to hear those hon. gentlemen speak of a monopoly, who have been for many long years endorsing such a monopoly as the Canadian Pacific Railway, endorsing the cotton monopoly, the sugar monopoly, and a great many others too numerous to mention, besides granting over 39,000,000 acres of land for to encourage railway construction. It is also worth noting, that when the leader of the Opposition was interviewed by a representative of the press, he clearly expressed himself as in favour of the action of the Government in the present bargain; but when he comes among the politicians they say that won't do, that he must oppose the contract, and he has yielded. It often happens that the leader of a great party leads that party, but in this case it is the party that leads the leader. But with all his ability, he now finds himself in a very awkward position. Whatever he may think on his own account, he is told that he must carry out the wishes of his friends as expressed in the caucus.

In the future, when the leader of the Opposition makes a statement on any question, it may be asked whether there is not danger that a certain amount of discount must be taken from the expression of opinion given. I believe if hon. gentlemen opposite had not had a bad case they would not have talked so long; they have dealt with so many subjects that their wanderings have been similar to the wanderings of the streams in the Yukon or of the Trent Valley Canal. Of course, if they had had a good case, they would have delivered shorter speeches, but during this debate they have dealt with many topics foreign from the subject of debate. It has been said that hon. members on this side of the House cannot defend the present contract. I hope I shall never be in a position when I cannot defend such a contract as this, and I cer-

tainly can defend the action of the Government in securing the building of a railway and giving one-twentieth of the territory benefited by it for the purpose of paying the cost of its construction and at the same time developing the country. The whole discussion has been conducted by hon. gentlemen opposite in the dark, and no doubt if they had possessed more information their speeches would not have been so long, but they will have no effect in the country which they seem to confidently expect; they think they will be heard for their much speaking. I am glad that the Government have taken this step to develop the Yukon country out of its own resources, and not add one cent to the already heavy taxes borne by the ratepayers of the Dominion.

Mr. CAMPBELL. At this time of the evening, I do not intend to occupy more than a few minutes of the time of the House. The subject under discussion has been so fully ventilated that nothing new can be said about it; but as it is a very important one, I do not feel like allowing the opportunity to pass without giving expression to the views I hold in regard to it. For let me say, that I have been struck with the extraordinary statements made by previous speakers and to the extravagant language used in describing the proposed Yukon Railway. It has been described as a monstrous bargain, unparalleled in the history of this or any other country, that the transaction is unequalled in the history of any country, that the subsidy given is greater than that ever before allotted. One hon. member went on to say that the duty of the Government was not to build the road as proposed, but the Government should itself build it; that they should have given liberally and handsomely and enormously from the resources of the country to construct the railway. Then the debate is peculiar in another way, as to the subjects that have been dragged into it. We have had the Drummond Counties Railway, the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, the Dawson Railway, and we have even had the Manitoba school question brought up in this discussion, as well as the Ontario elections. All these things are foreign to the subject under consideration, and certainly have very little to do with it. But the Government deserves credit for the manner in which they have conducted the affairs of this country, I say, and I do so without fear of contradiction, that never was there a Government in this or any other country that has made such a grand record since it assumed office. It has been a bold and progressive Government, a Government capable of managing the affairs of this Dominion. The very moment the Ministers came into office they had to face a question that had engaged the attention of the

House for a whole week, and that wrecked the former Government. They took hold of it in a businesslike and statesmanlike way and settled the question to the satisfaction of all men in this country, and there is not a man on the Opposition side of the House who dare rise in his place and move a motion of censure for the manner in which they have settled it. They brought up a question that should have been settled ten years ago, and that was the extension of the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal. There never was a measure brought before Parliament that should have received the commendation of every practical man more heartily than the proposed extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. If the late Government had the proper instincts of a government they would never have allowed that great railway, which cost the people of the Dominion \$50,000,000, and which has ran behind from \$300,000 to \$500,000 annually for a number of years, to stop where it did, with the great metropolis of Montreal within a short distance; and this Government, recognizing the requirements of the country, recognizing the duty devolving on them, saw that the only method of wiping out the deficit on the Intercolonial was to do that which any railway company would have done ten years ago, secure an extension to Montreal; and accordingly they made a bargain which I hold should receive the commendation of the whole people of Canada. Hon. gentlemen may compare the transaction with what other railways do, and they will find in every case that the bargain made by the Government to secure the extension of the Intercolonial was a wise and prudent one, and was for the general interest of Canada. Take the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That company wanted to extend their line from Toronto to Buffalo. They gave the Grand Trunk Railway \$40,000 a year to run over thirty-nine miles to Hamilton. Take the Wabash system. It sought an extension from Detroit to Suspension Bridge. Its line ended at Detroit, and the company wanted the privilege of running to Buffalo by way of Suspension Bridge. Of course, they could have built an independent line; but for power to run over 229 miles they have paid the Grand Trunk Company \$229,000 each year. More than that: they give the Grand Trunk Railway 75 per cent of all the local freight on their road. That is what other railway companies have done. By the agreement submitted to the House last session the Government acquired equal rights to run into Montreal and use the terminal facilities of the Grand Trunk Railway, and acquired the Drummond County road, all for the sum of \$210,000. There never was a bargain brought forward in this country or in any other, that should more heartily receive the commendation than the proposed Intercolonial extension to Montreal. Before the

Mr. CAMPBELL.

road had ran into Montreal for a period of five years the profits from the extension would pay off the \$210,000, and probably leave a balance of \$300,000 or \$400,000. This subject has been brought up during the present discussion, and the measure was opposed last session for a great many days. Hon. members will remember the hue and cry that was raised by the Opposition because this bargain was made. The phrase was hurled across the House and it seemed to roll under the tongue of the ex-Finance Minister that we had by one fell stroke increased the public debt by \$7,000,000. We had agreed to pay \$210,000 a year for running over 176 miles of railway. This extension, however, would not only pay for itself, but yield a profit, I believe, of \$300,000 or \$400,000—yet hon. gentlemen opposite told the House and the country that this Government had increased the public debt by \$7,000,000.

Then when this Government saw the great possibilities of the Kootenay country, they seized the situation, built the Crow's Nest Pass Railway with energy and diverted to Canadian channels the trade of that great district which otherwise would have gone to the Americans south of the line. Like statesmen and business men the Government provided for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and vast benefits will accrue to Canada from that undertaking.

Another new phase of development took place this year in the Yukon region, and the Government was again prompt to formulate a progressive policy. If the Government had not taken prompt measures to secure railway communication to the Yukon, disastrous consequences would have occurred next year, and the Government would have been charged, and I believe rightly charged, with dereliction of their duty. I need hardly discuss that phase of the question because the leader of the Opposition has admitted the necessity for prompt measures being taken to secure transportation facilities there; and the hon. gentleman has also agreed that the route selected by the Government is the best route available at the present time, so that these two questions may be dismissed from our considerations. There consequently remains only the question: Is the bargain a good one? Admitting that the road was necessary, and admitting that the route selected was the best available, then what should the Government have done? Should the Government have built that road themselves, or should they have made a contract such as they did make? Sir, if this Government had taken five millions, or six millions, or ten millions of dollars out of the public chest to build the Yukon Railway, I can imagine how the leader of the Opposition and his friends would have held up their hands in horror at such a course. They would have told us that we were going to swamp the Dominion by enormous increases of the public debt,

and they would have told us also that the Yukon country itself should have paid for the boom of a railway. And, Sir, the Opposition would have been right in taking that ground. I hold that the Government, in providing that the Yukon country shall itself pay for this railway, have acted wisely in the interests of our people. After the prorogation of last session of Parliament rumours reached here of the rich discoveries in the Klondike, and as these reports became confirmed we saw from all countries in this wide Dominion, young men and able-bodied men, the brightest and best in the land wending their way to these arctic gold fields. It was absolutely necessary that measures should be taken to get supplies in there, and the Government acting promptly and wisely, at once made provision for the development of that country. Mr. Jennings, one of the most competent engineers, was sent to try and find a route into that country and the Minister of the Interior lost no time in going over that difficult Pass so as to possess himself personally of all the facts. All this took time, and then the urgency arose. The Government were compelled to act promptly, and they did act promptly and they have made a bargain which I believe the people of Canada will commend, and which will undoubtedly meet with the approval of all honest men in this Dominion. The Government has provided that the older sections of Canada which have already contributed millions towards the bonusing of railways shall not be called upon for one dollar in connection with this work, while at some time these older parts of Canada will derive enormous benefits from the building of the road. These gentlemen of the Opposition tell us: but you have given away 3,750,000 acres of the very richest land that the sun ever shone upon, and you have provided that these contractors can select it where they please. Why, one would never think that the gentlemen over there, for years and years backed up a Government that had given away no less than 68,000,000 acres of the very best land in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and locked it up for all time to come in the possession of a railway company. Yet, Sir, they talk about this Government granting 3,750,000 acres in a rocky region, as a huge crime and as something unprecedented in the history of any country. What insincerity are not those gentlemen opposite guilty of? What are the facts? The Government have taken every precaution to preserve the interests of the people of Canada in this matter. We all know that Mackenzie & Mann are taking great risks; I hope they will make money out of this transaction, I hope they will make millions out of it, because the more they make the more all the people of Canada will make. We have in that region from 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 acres of land, and I venture to say that millions of acres of that land is not worth 10

cents a square mile. There may be some of the land rich in minerals, but the Government have provided that each alternate section shall be held for the benefit of all the people of Canada, and if the company finds a rich mine on their block, which I hope they will, then the Government will own the adjoining block, and the people of Canada will share in its wealth.

Now as to the question of a monopoly being given. Why, there is no monopoly worth speaking of at all, and whatever monopoly is given to this company is a monopoly that ought to have been given, and which if the Government did not give they would have been derelict to their duty in withholding. We do not want an American road from Dyea and Skagway in there next year; an American road which would monopolize the commerce of that region for the American people. We want to retain that trade for Canadians, and the course taken by the Government will retain it for Canadians. Sir, the monopoly only exists so that no railway from the American border will be bonused by this Government. There are already two charters granted last year to enter that country from the coast, and from Edmonton or from any point on the Canadian Pacific Railway you can get as many charters as you like. I hold that this monopoly is one which is in the interests of the people of Canada, and which the Government were wise in giving.

Again, Sir, this is an all-Canadian route so far as we know. We have the same rights to navigate the Stikine River as the Americans have to navigate the St. Lawrence, and then when we get to the head of the Stikine we have an all-Canadian route through a fine Canadian waterway down to Dawson City. If there is any trouble, which I may say I do not anticipate, we can easily extend our line to Port Simpson, and then we will have a through Canadian road right from the ocean to the heart of the Klondike. I trust, Sir, that if that country proves as wealthy as it is reported to be, there will be many railroads in there. I hope to see a railway from Edmonton, but as the great object was to get a railway communication at once, the Edmonton route was impossible this year. A railway must be constructed by the 1st of September so that supplies can be got in there next summer before navigation closes, and while I am in favour of the Edmonton route, yet we must remember that it is a thousand or fourteen hundred miles and it was impossible to build a line there this year. I have no doubt, Sir, that the people of this Canada of ours will approve of the businesslike and statesmanlike course that has been pursued by this Government.

The great thing which we who are sitting behind the Government can point to with pride and admiration is that, unlike the days of the old Government, when such things stunk with corruption, robbery and

boodling, not one dollar of money has been stolen in any of these transactions. That is to the honour and credit of the Government, and I say that the Liberals of this House will approve of and stand by the Government in the wise and statesmanlike course they have pursued in the last 18 months, and I am sure they will go on as they have begun, and will make a record such as has never been made by any previous Government in this country. I tell the Opposition, that the Government of this country, composed as it is of business men, honest men, straightforward men, and men of ability, has a long future before it, and I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will long live to fill the position they are now filling so well.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no possible hope of closing the debate to-night, and under the circumstances I think it would be hardly worth while for us to proceed any longer at this late hour of the night. If it were possible to reach a conclusion to-night, it would be different, but there is no hope of that. Under the circumstances I hope the right hon. First Minister will allow the debate to be adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is certainly no hope of getting through to-night; I do not know whether there is any hope of getting through at all. I had hoped that we would close this debate yesterday. I had some conversation with my hon. friend on this subject, and my understanding was that the debate would be closed yesterday. I believe, however, that such was not the understanding of my hon. friend. But no intimation has been given to me that this debate, which has gone on for three weeks, will be concluded, and, therefore, it is certainly not fair that we should adjourn to-night at eleven o'clock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I found a large number of gentlemen anxious to continue the debate, which is one of grave importance, and I am sure that my hon. friend who is leading the House will see that no person can apply a great deal of pressure on gentlemen who wish to express themselves on the subject. I do not think any time has been lost so far, and on Monday or Tuesday at the latest I expect we shall be able to bring the debate to a conclusion; and I think that object will be attained quite as readily by adjourning now.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the hon. gentleman will tell me that we shall take a vote on Tuesday, I will agree at once to the adjournment of the debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will assure my hon. friend that I will do everything in

Mr. CAMPBELL.

my power to bring that about. He knows that there is a limit to either his power or mine in a question of that kind; but I think we shall be able to take the vote on Tuesday, and I will give my hon. friend all the assistance I can in that direction.

The PRIME MINISTER. In years past, when I sat on the other side of the House, there has never been any difficulty in coming to such an understanding after a debate has reached a certain stage. If my hon. friend will say that we shall take the division on Tuesday, I will agree very readily to the motion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will do everything in my power—

The PRIME MINISTER. That is hardly satisfactory.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I have no hesitation in saying that I believe it would be quite practicable to take a vote on Tuesday.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the hon. gentleman will say so, and he has control of his party, I will agree very readily to an adjournment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will use all the power I have.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think that under such circumstances the hon. gentleman should have no hesitation in coming to an understanding, such as has been done on several occasions in my experience, and in his experience, that a certain day should be fixed for the taking of the vote, and if my hon. friend will agree that we shall take a vote on Tuesday, I will agree to an adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to have to address the House this evening; but, as hon. gentlemen opposite are desirous of expediting this debate, I am obliged to proceed with the few remarks which I intend to address to the House on this question. It seems a little strange that the anxiety of hon. gentlemen opposite to expedite the debate, which is evident by their refusal to allow an adjournment to-night, had not been manifest to some extent when they ventured to adjourn this House for a week during the time the Ontario elections were in progress.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to interrupt my hon. friend for one moment. I am anxious that there should be no misunderstanding. If my hon. friend is obliged, under the circumstances and after what I have said, to continue the debate to-night, I wish the hon. leader of the House to understand that I give no engagement to promote, as I was ready to do to the utmost of my power, the taking of the vote on Tuesday. I do not think the progress of the debate will be promoted by an unreasonable demand.

The PRIME MINISTER. Let me say this to my hon. friend. This is the first time in my experience that we have not been able to come to an understanding. This debate has lasted three weeks, and here we are taunted by an hon. gentleman on the other side with having adjourned the debate for the Ontario elections, when he knows as well as I know that this was done with the consent of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am very glad the hon. gentleman has made that remark. Is the House to understand that the hon. gentleman, being the leader of this Government, and being responsible for the business of this House, is to consent to everything which hon. gentlemen on this side consent to? Does he propose to deal with this measure in the way that hon. gentlemen on this side think it should be dealt with? If so, this debate need not continue much longer, because we can bring it to an end in five minutes. The hon. gentleman is responsible for the adjournments of this House; he has the majority in this House; and when he undertook to adjourn the House for the Ontario elections, he took upon himself the responsibility of saying that the matter which was so urgent that a contract had to be signed eight days before the meeting of Parliament, had ceased to be urgent and thus that this House might adjourn in idleness for a week. I and other gentlemen from the maritime provinces and other distant parts of the country had to remain here for a week, while hon. gentlemen were stumping in the province of Ontario. That is the position of affairs so far as that is concerned. However, as hon. gentlemen opposite desire to proceed with this debate to-night, we will endeavour to proceed with it, and perhaps public business may not be so much expedited after all. I do not say that in any sense of using a threat, because this matter has been dealt with so thoroughly by hon. gentlemen on both sides that I for one shall endeavour to put in the most concise form possible everything I have to say with regard to it.

I cannot very well follow in detail the remarks which fell from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who immediately preceded me. My hon. friend from Gaspé spoke in his own beautiful tongue, and with his own beautiful voice, but unfortunately for me I was not able to always follow what doubtless were the very eloquent and able remarks which he made. I always listen to the hon. gentleman with pleasure, even if I cannot follow him very well, on account of his eloquent manner of speaking, his magnificent voice and the ease and grace with which he addresses the House.

I do not propose to attempt to deal at any length with the question which was spoken to by the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Sempie), as to the effect

of this measure on the Ontario elections, because that is a matter I do not know very much about; and so far as the remaining remarks of the hon. gentleman are concerned, I think they were fully covered by those of the hon. Minister of the Interior and other gentlemen, to whose speeches I do intend to devote a little attention.

So far as my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) is concerned, I was a little surprised to find, after his telling us that the Manitoba school question and the Drummond Railway and various other matters were not at all relevant to this debate, and after his complaining that these matters had been introduced by hon. gentlemen on this side, that he took up a considerable portion of his speech in dealing with them himself, and gave us some very comprehensive statements as to the general excellence of this Government. He informed us that it was more excellent than any Government which had performed similar work in this or any other country at any time. I do not claim the all-embracing and all-comprehensive knowledge of all the Governments of the world which the hon. gentleman seems to possess, and therefore I shall not venture to contradict his proposition on that point, so far as other countries are concerned; but so far as our own country is concerned, I would not be quite disposed to acquiesce in everything he said. However, that is more or less aside from the main question, and I shall not pause further to deal with it.

Speaking from this side, I have, in the first place, to say that I recognize the importance of developing, so far as we are able and so far as it is at all consistent with the public interests, the resources of Canada, not only in the Yukon, but in every other district of Canada; and I for one am prepared to give a fair and cordial support to any fair and reasonable measures looking to that development. And so far as this scheme is concerned, I do not at all seek to criticise the Government for taking measures to develop the interests and resources of this country in the Yukon district. If they have been active in that respect, they are entitled to our praise and support. But any proposal from the Government looking to the development of the Yukon district must be examined upon its merits. What do we find in the proposal which this Government make with regard to this project? In the first place, the project of the Government, as I understand it to have been outlined at the commencement of this session is:

To construct a road for immediate communication with the Yukon district, in order to provide food and supplies next winter for the thousands of men who will be in that region. That is the object and the only object the Government have in view. It was not to establish a perpetual permanent route; for a communication

which might be more in accord with the interests of the country, that has to come later.

In other words, what the Government have brought down is a temporary measure for communication with the Yukon district. What, then, is the purport of that measure? In the first place, it is that there shall be established an all-Canadian route. That all-Canadian route is to be what is called the Stikine River and Teslin Lake route. The contractors are to build this road. They are to own it after it is built. It is to be presumed that they are to operate it, but there is no clause in the agreement or the Bill, as I understand it, which obliges them to operate it. If I am wrong in that respect, I shall be very glad to be corrected, because I have examined the Bill and the contract, and I have examined the Railway Act; and unless I am mistaken, I cannot find in any of these three documents any provision which obliges this company to operate the road after it is constructed.

What is it that we propose to give to these gentlemen for constructing this road? We propose to give them the right of selecting, in any part of that district they may see fit, over 6,000 square miles of territory, comprising the richest mineral-bearing lands in the world, if we are to believe the official report which the Government are scattering all over the world for the purpose of inducing people to go there. This has been elaborated by hon. gentlemen on this side over and over again, and I do not need to repeat it. If the official guide which the Government are sending out as the official guide with regard to this country, is to be believed, if the statements of Mr. Ogilvie, who made a personal visit to this country and who remained there for over two years, are to be believed, then in that region there are mineral lands of such enormous value that one small district, a district which might be occupied a thousand times over by one-tenth of this grant, will probably yield not less than from \$60,000,000 to \$100,000,000.

The able and convincing argument which was addressed to this House yesterday by the hon. gentleman from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) must, it seems to me, convince any hon. gentleman in this House that the right of selection will give to these contractors the power to secure to themselves every rich portion of gold-bearing area in that district. But suppose that that is not the case, suppose they are able to secure only one—and certainly, with 6,000 square miles, which is one-third the area of Nova Scotia, if there is a district there nearly equal to that described by Mr. Ogilvie, they will be sure to have one—what will be the result? The first result will be, as has been pointed out by hon. gentlemen on both sides, that ordinary miners will be excluded from that land. In the second place, either the development of the district will be checked, or, if the company proceed to develop and work, as no doubt they will, then, the Government gives away

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

to the contractors 9 per cent of all the gold extracted. If it were a district like the one referred to by Mr. Ogilvie, the Government's own expert sent there to learn the facts, and if it realized sixty, or seventy, or a hundred millions, the Government will lose 9 per cent of the total amount, and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann will have at least that advantage, so far as they are in competition with other miners of the country. I think that a contract of that kind should be supported by very extraordinary reasons before this House should be called upon to adopt it. What is the justification for this measure as presented by the Government? The first plea is urgency. That has been dealt with by hon. gentlemen on this side, and it has been shown, over and over again, that this matter was brought to the attention of the Government before the close of last session. It has been shown that months elapsed before they took any active measure. And it has also been shown, out of the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite, that, if this urgency did exist, it would have been easy for the Government to call Parliament together a week or two, or three weeks or a month earlier, so that the contract could have been submitted to Parliament in the ordinary way. They have not done that. They have violated one of the very first principles of governmental dealing with contracts in this country by failing to advertise for tenders and by making this contract without any communication with the country at large, and by secretly dealing with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. The next justification we have is, that this whole transaction is, as two Ministers of the Crown have said, a huge gamble. That was the expression used by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) in justification of this measure, and also by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). Now, I am not aware that the Government have any mandate from this country to gamble with the public resources or the public domain of Canada. Hon. gentlemen may say that his is not a gamble on the part of the Government, but that it is a gamble on the part of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. It seems to me that, if it is a gamble on one side, it must be a gamble on the other. These gentlemen, it is said, do not know the value of the lands they are getting. Still, it does not seem to be very much of a gamble on their part, because they have, at least, the assurance of the official expert of the Government that these are the richest mineral lands in the world. If it is a gamble on the part of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann on the ground that they may get much or may get little, it is equally a gamble on the part of the Government, because, for the same reason, the Government cannot know whether they are giving much or little. The people do not expect the Government to deal with public questions in this way, but to know what they are doing. When the Govern-

ment frankly say that they do not know what they are getting, that they do not know the value of the work to be done by these contractors, or the value of what they are giving, how then can they justify themselves for bringing such a proposition down to the House?

The principal defence that was made in regard to this Bill was the very exhaustive and very lengthy address that was made by the Minister of the Interior in support of the motion for the second reading of this Bill. The hon. gentleman, it seems to me, went very far afield with many matters that were not directly connected with this Bill. And, though I give the hon. gentleman credit for the ability he displayed in his speech, it seems to me that he was at least as much disposed to make political capital out of the remarks he addressed to the House as to afford information to the House on the subject he was discussing. There are one or two remarks made by the hon. gentleman which, though not very relevant to the question under discussion, I think deserve some attention from this side of the House, coming as they do from an hon. Minister who was making such an important speech in support of the second reading of this Bill. The hon. gentleman attempted to deal very severely with the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), and told us that that hon. gentleman had used very extraordinary language with regard to our relations with the United States. He stated that the language of the hon. leader of the Opposition was like a stump speech addressed to a backwoods audience, or some words of that kind. There were portions of the hon. gentleman's own remarks which did not seem to me to be of a very high order, or to be in any way what we might properly expect from a member of the Cabinet addressing the House on so important a question as this. But I desire to call the attention of the House to what the leader of the Opposition did say with regard to that:

Sir, the time has come, I do not hesitate to say, when, if Canadian rights are to be maintained in Canada, we have got, as a Parliament and Government, to show that great republic that while we are ready to do everything men can do to maintain the most friendly and harmonious commercial and every other kind of relations with that great country, we are not prepared to sacrifice the indefeasible rights of Canadians at their bidding.

Now, Sir, I for one subscribe to every word of that, and I think that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, at least most of them, will be willing to subscribe to every word of that, and I am sure there are few Canadians in this country who will not be willing to subscribe to every word of that. I would deprecate as much as any hon. gentleman in this House, any attempt to assume an aggressive attitude towards the United States, or towards any other country, but that is entirely different

to the position laid down by the leader of the Opposition, that we have a certain independence and certain rights of our own, and that so far as we are concerned, we shall always be ready and willing to defend those rights. Now I would call the attention of the Minister of the Interior, if he were in his place, to the fact that on the very day on which he delivered his speech, the great organ of the Liberal party in this country used language with regard to this very matter which went far beyond what the leader of the Opposition said. I refer to the Toronto "Globe" of the 15th of February last, in which this language was used:

The despatches from Ottawa show that certain influences at Washington are determined to capture the first year's Yukon trade, no matter how treaties may be broken or the national faith compromised by the process.

Did the leader of the Opposition use any language which went nearly as far as that? I read a little further on:

Any regulation which practically prohibits the enjoyment of this right, solemnly given by treaties, will be a breach of faith, and will do infinitely more injury to the people on behalf of whom it is done than to us.

And further on:

The objections arise almost wholly from the Pacific Coast cities of the United States, which propose to abolish everything that stands in the way of their securing the whole of the Yukon outfitting trade, and they are determined that Congress and the officials at Washington shall do everything to neutralize the advantages of the Canadian position. They propose to employ the circumstance that a strip of American territory intervenes between the ocean and the Canadian Yukon, to embarrass the free access to our own lands, but they are woefully shortsighted if they think Canada can be held up in this questionable way. Canada cannot be closed out of her own territory. We believe we speak the mind of every section of the country when we express the determination not to be tricked or intimidated out of our natural rights in that region. If the United States Congress thinks proper to break a treaty in order to back up the game of Tacoma and Seattle, our Government will have to proceed forthwith to meet the situation.

Now, I think the Minister of the Interior, so far as any criticism of the leader of the Opposition is concerned on that point, is very well answered out of the mouth of his own organ which stated even more emphatically than the leader of the Opposition, matters as to which most, if not all, Canadians are thoroughly in accord. Now, Sir, the Minister of the Interior was disposed to be critical if not captious in other respects, and he undertook to read to this House from the Montreal "Daily Witness," and to show that the leader of the Opposition had stopped short at a certain place in the article which he was reading from that paper, for the purpose of misrepresenting that article to this House. Sir, the

hon. gentleman himself did exactly that of which he wrongfully accused the hon. leader of the Opposition. He was asked to read on, and he failed to read on, and I venture to read on to the House as a criticism upon some of the terms of this bargain, what the hon. gentleman declined to read on that occasion :

There would seem, at all events, to be every probability that if there is really any great wealth in the country the syndicate will have no difficulty in reaping the first-fruits of it. It looks as though they would be likely to acquire for themselves or to make a profit on almost all the gold lands discovered up to the amount of their available grant. With the power of laying down a base line as may best suit their own advantage, and with the power of securing an uninterrupted territory of twenty-four miles long by three miles in breadth, it looks as though the syndicate could secure the best of the land without sharing on equal terms with the Government.

It is true that since the hon. gentleman made his speech on that occasion we have been told by the Minister of Agriculture that that provision is to be modified, although we are not yet informed as to the exact terms of the modification, and I, for one shall await with some interest a statement of what the exact terms will be. But when the hon. gentleman undertook to leave this portion of this newspaper article out, that fact had not been stated to this House, and we do not know whether at that time the Government had made up their minds to take that course. Then the article proceeds :

Their interests and privileges are so large as compared with those of individual prospectors and miners that the latter will find it always to their own interest to form a sort of partnership with the syndicate, or at least to "stand in" with it against the interests of the Government, and even with those of other miners, friends or partners. Prospectors who discover a rich stream or a rich lode will stake out their own particular claim so as to secure it and also to guard themselves against the power of the syndicate. And that done, it will be to their interest to notify the syndicate of their discovery and enter into negotiations with it for their mutual interests. The syndicate, with the power of securing a whole stream bed, if it is not more than twenty-four miles long and three miles broad, or a plexus of streams at intervals from one another, by skilful laying down of their base lines, can well afford to make it worth the while of any individual prospector, or even any company, to join it in securing the locality. The syndicate, which will own its property in fee simple, can convey to any miner or prospector or company that "stands in" with it much larger areas of the rich locality than could be secured by such prospectors or company under claim from the Government.

It would be to the advantage of the prospector to deal with this company rather than to deal with the Government for this very obvious reason. If the prospector takes his land from the Government he gets only a lease, he has to pay \$15 a year, he has to pay a free miner's certificate, and

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

he has to pay 10 per cent royalty. If he takes it from the contractor, or the company, he may, with great advantage to them and also with great advantage to himself, get his land in fee simple, if you will, or he gets his land for a longer term and at a lower rental if you like, and he pays royalty at a less percentage ; therefore it will be to the interest of the prospector to stand in with the syndicate and not to stand in with the Government.

By getting their land through the syndicate, too, the miners, prospectors or private companies would only have to pay a royalty of one per cent—

That is what I have just mentioned.

—instead of ten per cent. In most cases, however, probably the successful prospectors would prefer to sell outright to the syndicate or to some capitalist company working in with it, and thus leave themselves free to prospect for further discoveries of rich districts. Thus, the Yukon must soon be full of prospectors who will be little other than agents of the syndicate. By this process the land grants will become rapidly available, to the discouragement and hindrance of independent development, and to the injury of the revenue interests of the Government.

Now, I do not know how you could put in a few words a much more cogent criticism of the terms upon which these contractors are to get these lands than the statement of them contained in that article which the Minister of the Interior did not see fit to read to this House, after he had criticised the leader of the Opposition for omitting some portion, and I have not heard in this House any answer to the arguments briefly and pithily put in that article. It is true there is one thing now eliminated that I mentioned a moment ago, and that is the right to secure 24 miles by adding blocks at either end. But if we are to place any reliance on the argument, and it seems to be a fair and reasonable argument, of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), that is not going to make very much difference with regard to the ability of the contractors to secure all available gold mining areas in this district.

The Minister of the Interior also dealt at some considerable length with a question which is not very relevant to the subject before this House, and he dealt with it solely and obviously for the purpose of making political capital. The question was, whether or not the rights of Great Britain and of Canada under the Treaty of St. Petersburg had been diminished by the Treaty of Washington ; and I regretted that an hon. gentleman standing in his place in this House as a Minister of the Crown did not see fit to take the position which was very properly taken by my hon. colleague for Halifax (Mr. Russell) with respect to it. I think it is a pity that any Minister of the Crown in this House should see fit to state that the rights acquired by Great Britain under the Treaty of St. Petersburg had been reduced

by the Treaty of Washington. It would have been better to have made the most of the rights of Canada under one treaty or the other ; but I must admit that I was unable to follow the arguments of the Minister of the Interior with respect to this subject. I desire briefly to refer to the language which he used. The hon. gentleman said, in the first place, that we had what he called a proprietary right under the Treaty of St. Petersburg in the Yukon, Stikine, Porcupine and other rivers running into the Pacific Ocean, an absolute proprietary right ; and he stated that this proprietary right had been lost in some way so far as the Stikine River was concerned by the Treaty of Washington. I did not understand, and I hope some hon. gentleman will explain to me, what proprietary right was possessed in the Stikine River by Canada under the Treaty of St. Petersburg which we do not possess under the Treaty of Washington ; or how we possessed a proprietary right under the one treaty and did not possess the same proprietary right under the other. I am not forgetting what has been suggested by my hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Russell), that perhaps our rights were not restricted to commerce under the Treaty of St. Petersburg, as undoubtedly they are restricted under the Treaty of Washington ; but you cannot say that in the one case there was a proprietary right and in the other there was not a proprietary right ; and I would have expected the hon. gentleman, a member of my own profession, in dealing with this great question as a constitutional lawyer, to have been somewhat more exact in his language in respect to it. But after proceeding at great length to show that our rights were lost, that we were very much injured by the substitution—if it was a substitution—of the Treaty of Washington for the Treaty of St. Petersburg, we find the hon. gentleman saying that we occupy an absolutely impregnable position under the Treaty of Washington—I am quoting his own language. So we have lost a large portion of our rights, according to the hon. gentleman, by the substitution of the Treaty of Washington for the Treaty of St. Petersburg, and yet we occupy an absolutely impregnable position on this point under the Treaty of Washington. I do not see how that can be ; and to use an elegant simile, which was introduced by the hon. Minister, perhaps we had Phillip drunk at one page in "Hansard," and a dozen pages further on we had Phillip sober. That was a simile which the hon. Minister thought fit to apply to the leader of the Opposition. I think the hon. gentleman might well have considered his own language before he undertook to apply such a simile to my hon. friend. So far as the Treaty of Washington and the Treaty of St. Petersburg are concerned, I do not think we have lost anything at all. It is perfectly obvious, as was stated very frank-

ly to me by my colleague from Halifax in answer to a question I put to him, that so far as the use of the Stikine for purposes of commerce is concerned, we stand exactly under the Treaty of Washington as we did under the Treaty of St. Petersburg ; and no hon. gentleman has advanced any argument to convince me to the contrary. There may be some later argument that will convince me, because I am perfectly open to conviction. I desire, however, to point out to the hon. gentleman this : that so far as the regulations are concerned, it is perfectly clear, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that our rights under Article 6 of the Treaty of St. Petersburg were subject to regulations—that the right of free navigation of those rivers by British subjects would necessarily be subject to some regulations, even although there is no expressed statement to that effect in the treaty. It has been suggested, and I will not say it is not an arguable point, that we had other than commercial rights under Article 6 of the Treaty of St. Petersburg, but I venture to suggest that it is at least doubtful, and I desire to point out the distinction between Article 6 as compared with Article 7. Article 6 of the Treaty of St. Petersburg provides :

That the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, from whatever quarter they may arrive, whether from the ocean or from the interior of the continent, shall for ever enjoy the right of navigating freely and without any hindrance whatever, all the rivers and streams which, in their course towards the Pacific Ocean may cross the line of demarcation upon the line of coast described in article 3 of the present convention.

Article 7 of the Treaty of St. Petersburg provides :

That for the space of ten years from the signature of the present convention the vessels of the two powers, or those belonging to their respective subjects, shall mutually be at liberty to frequent, without any hindrance whatever, all the inland seas, the gulfs, havens and creeks on the coast mentioned in article 3 for the purposes of fishing and of trading with the natives.

In the one case you have a provision applying solely to subjects ; in the other case you have a provision applying not only to ships of the subjects but to the ships of the two powers. It is open to doubt whether in the case of Martin, referred to by my hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Russell), we would not have had exactly the same difficulty under the Treaty of St. Petersburg as we had under the Treaty of Washington, because it is needless to remind members of the legal profession that there is a marked distinction between the ships of the power concerned and the ships of the subjects concerned. The ships of the power have extra territoriality ; the ships of the subjects are in all cases subject to local laws and to municipal regulations. In order to show that I am not alone in holding this view, I venture to bring

to the attention of the House what was said by Mr. Laflamme, when Minister of Justice in 1877, in quoting from the despatch of the law officers of the Crown. He said :

Even if the rights of free navigation under the Convention of 1825 still existed, it would be a matter of doubt whether the conveying of a prisoner through American waters would be within the terms of the Convention.

He is quoting in that statement the language of the law officers of the Crown, and therefore it is at least a matter of doubt whether the construction which I have ventured to suggest with regard to the 6th and 7th articles of the Treaty of St. Petersburg, is not the correct construction. So much for the rights of Canada under these respective treaties. One further remark, and it is this: When the Treaty of Washington was made, we must bear in mind that the United States had taken the position that Russia had ceded to the United States, free from every restriction, and free from every encumbrance, the entire territory of Alaska and of the rivers in it, that therefore the question of the old treaty was entirely a question between Great Britain and Russia, that the United States were not bound by it, and that the United States were entitled to hold Alaska free from any restriction placed upon it by the Treaty of St. Petersburg. It is stated by the law officers of the Crown, in the same despatch to which I have referred:

That in regard to the rights of Great Britain to the navigation of the Stikine, Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that by clause 6 of the Treaty of the 30th March, 1867, between Russia and the United States, which declared the cession of the territory and dominion to be free and unencumbered by any reservation, &c., Russia did virtually revoke the permission she had granted to Great Britain by the Convention of 1825, in regard to the free and unrestricted navigation of the rivers flowing through that territory to the sea; and although Russia could not voluntarily and without the consent of Great Britain withdraw the right conferred by that Convention, that right, whatever may have been the nature of it, has been lost by the negotiations which led to the Treaty of Washington and by that treaty itself.

Quite so, but what I desire to point out to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House is, that at this very time, before the Treaty of Washington was made, the United States were taking the position that they had that country ceded to them free and unrestricted, that they were not bound by the Treaty of St. Petersburg, and, as my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Russell) has very well pointed out, when you come to deal with international law, you are practically bound by the view which the opposite party takes, and as the United States, the opposite party, were taking this view at that time, what other conceivable thing could we have done than to deal with these rivers on the Pacific Coast exactly in the same way in which we dealt with the St. Lawrence?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Mr. RUSSELL. My hon. friend surely does not understand me to have said that we were bound by the view taken by the opposite party.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will read to my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) what he did say. I have it here :

On the question of international law, a private opinion is quite unimportant. The question is, what is the opinion and the conviction of those with whom you are dealing. International law is not law, it is only international morality. There is no sanction for it, as has been stated over and over again, by authorities on the subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. I trust my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) does not believe that the passages he has read support his statement, that I said we were bound by the view taken by the opposite party.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If we pursue the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) to its legitimate conclusion, what is our position? Our position is this, that the United States claimed they had this territory unrestricted by the Treaty of St. Petersburg or any other treaty, and they were actually at the time so insisting, and instructing their officers to act accordingly, that we had no right to navigate these rivers. That is plain from the debates which took place in 1872. If you pursue the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) to its legitimate conclusion, then you are forced to accept the opinion and conviction of the opposite party with whom you are dealing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, if my hon. friend's language does not mean that, I do not know what it means. If it does not mean that, I do not think it means anything at all. Now, with regard to our rights under the Treaty of Washington; and I am as anxious, I hope, as any man in Canada to maintain them to the utmost possible extent. We have the right of free navigation of a portion of the Stikine River, which runs through the territory of the United States, for the purpose of commerce, subject to regulation, and they have the same right with respect to the portion of the river which runs through our territory. Then, so far as this being an all-Canadian route is concerned, it never can be called an all-Canadian route, in the proper sense of the word, until you have once determined what these regulations are to be. These regulations cannot be determined solely by us. The United States certainly have a voice in them, and I suppose the United States would claim they have the sole voice. If that is so, and if the United States do see fit to make regulations which, in our opinion, interfere with the navigation of that river, I do not know exactly what remedy we would have, except by recourse to arbitration or by entering into negotiations with them for a settlement.

Until that is done, it does not seem to me that, in any proper sense of the word, we have an all-Canadian route via the Stikine River.

Coming a little more particularly to the direct question before the House, I desire to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to some of the provisions of this contract and of this Bill. The hon. the leader of the Opposition has already called the attention of the Government to one provision in the contract, which the Government have declared they will modify, with the consent of the contractors, and no gentleman on either side of the House can deny that this is so important and so great a modification that it is well worth ten times the debate which we have expended upon this Bill so far. I again call the attention of the Government to the fact that there is no provision in this Bill, or in this contract, or in the Railway Act, so far as I am aware—and I say this subject to correction—by reason of which the contractors will be obliged to operate the road. I cannot find any such provision, but if I am in error in regard to that, I will be glad to be corrected now. That is one provision which may be amended when we get the Bill in committee, and, if it is not amended, it will be a great defect. It will be a defect in the Bill for this reason: If the road is a road which the contractors can operate profitably, at such a profit as will reimburse them for their outlay, then there is no reason whatever for giving them the enormous land grants we are giving. If, on the other hand, this is a road which cannot be operated by the contractors profitably, and which we must insist upon their operating for the purpose of developing the country, then, surely, we ought to have some provision in the Bill by which the country would be safeguarded against the contractors failing to operate that road. I do not think any hon. gentleman opposite would deny that for a moment.

The second criticism I have to make on this contract is that although this matter is stated to be a matter of the utmost urgency, a matter which required this contract to be entered into eight days before this Parliament assembled, we do not find anywhere in this contract, so far as I am aware, the very ordinary provision that time shall be of the essence of the contract—a provision so ordinary that it is contained in the printed forms of contract used in the Department of Railways and Canals; a provision which was inserted last year in the contract with regard to the Fast line. It may be suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite that there is some implication in the terms of this contract, that time shall be of the essence of the contract. That may be discussed in the Committee. I do not agree with that view, and at the proper time I shall be prepared to state my reasons. But the provision I have suggested would seem to be the first thing a lawyer would have

inserted in this contract, when the very essence of the scheme is that the road shall be constructed in the present season, and shall be ready for operation by the 1st of September next. With regard to the deposit which was made under the contract for the Fast Line last year, I find in clause 13 this provision:

The contractors shall supply the steamers in accordance with the terms of this agreement, and within the time or times hereby contracted therefor, for which purpose it is agreed that time is to be of the essence of this contract.

I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite, and I ask them in all seriousness, why, if a provision of that kind was necessary in regard to the Fast Line scheme, it was not inserted in this, which, according to hon. gentlemen opposite was of a very much more urgent character? I know the ability and the capacity of the legal gentlemen who are members of the present Government, and I cannot bring myself to believe that they overlooked the importance of such a provision as that; and at the same time I find it hard to understand why it has been omitted unless the intention was not to insist upon the completion of the road on the 1st of September, 1898. Then, we are told that we have security for the completion of this road on the 1st of September, 1898, by the deposit of \$250,000. I would have expected to find in this contract the same provision that was inserted in the Fast Line contract with regard to the deposit; but I do not find it. According to section 14 of the Fast Line contract:

It is agreed and understood that in the event of the contractors making default in having two of the steamers ready by the time hereinbefore named in that behalf, then the said deposit of ten thousand pounds is to be forfeited to Her Majesty as agreed upon, and as liquidated damages for such default.

Why do you not find in this contract a provision that the sum of \$250,000 is to be forfeited to Her Majesty, in case this road is not completed according to the terms of the contract on the 1st of September, 1898? If this contract is drawn in the interests of the contractors, I can understand the omission; but if it is drawn in the interests of the country, I am bound to say I cannot understand it. Hon. gentlemen will argue that the language of this contract may point to a conclusion different from that which I have suggested. I will examine the 10th clause, which deals with this matter:

The contractors shall, within ten days after the execution hereof, deposit with the Government, in cash or approved cash security, the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars as security that the railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake, hereby contracted for, will be completed and equipped in accordance with the terms hereof, and on such railway being completed and equipped and accepted as hereinbefore specified,

the said sum or security shall be returned to the contractors, or to whom they may appoint.

Now, what will take place if this road is completed on the 1st day of September, 1899, instead of on the 1st of September, 1898? The Government either will or will not accept the road. If they do not accept that road, will any gentleman on the other side of the House pretend that the company are bound to operate it? I think not. If they do accept it, will any gentleman on the other side of the House venture to say that this sum of \$250,000 is forfeited and will not be returned to the contractors? It would be perfectly plain if there were such a provision in this contract as there is in the Fast Line contract, that if the road is not completed on the 1st of September, 1898, the deposit shall be forfeited. But no such provision is to be found in this contract from first to last. Therefore, I venture to submit that hon. gentleman opposite have no security for the completion or operation of the road. But, oh, says the hon. Minister of the Interior, we will recover damages. The hon. gentleman was asked by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), "On what principle will you recover damages from these contractors?" The hon. gentleman gave no real answer to that question. He gave the answer that any layman could give just as well—that they would be recovered in the ordinary way. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, what damages could the Government of this country recover for one year's delay in the completion of that road? What would be the measure of the damages? Does any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House venture to say that the Government could recover the damages which would be sustained by any individual in this country who failed to get into the Yukon? Why, any infant in the law knows that the Government could not recover damages in any such right. Could the Government recover damages by reason of loss to the revenue?

I think no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House would deny that these damages would be too uncertain and too remote. Therefore, when the Minister of the Interior endeavours to convince this House that the Government can recover any substantial damages from these contractors through their failure to build the road in time, I think he takes a position which he will find it very difficult to maintain. There is another very strange omission in this contract. It is a very ordinary provision in regard to railways, that if the contractor does not proceed with the work with such expedition as will convince the Government that he will complete it within the time specified, the Government shall have the right to take it out of his hands and complete it themselves. No such provision is to be found in this contract. The contractors can go on and put the Govern-

ment at defiance, working or not as they see fit. Hon. gentlemen will no doubt say that they will not get the land grant unless they do complete it; but if the Government are not in a position to forfeit this deposit or to recover damages against them, the Government have one alternative or the other, so far as I understand. Either when the road is completed, say in one year from the 1st of September, 1898, they must accept that road and allow it to be operated, in which case the company will certainly be entitled to their land grant as I understand the contract—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may be wrong in that view, as I see my learned friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) smile, and perhaps he will set me right.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). No, I was smiling at the endorsation which came from the hon. leader of the Opposition. He had no doubt about it. You have, but he has not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand, I repeat, that if this company completes this road on the 1st September, 1899, the Government will either accept it or not. If they do not, they are in exactly the same position as now, because the company are not obliged to operate it. If they do accept it, the company are entitled to the land. That is my view of the contract, and if it be wrong, I should like to be corrected. There is another view of this contract, and one in which I shall differ—of course in a kindly way—from my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), because I notice he has smiled at the suggestions which have been made with regard to it by hon. members on this side. I refer to clause 9:

The contractors or contractors' company shall provide, or arrange with others to provide, steamboat transport of freight and passengers between the terminus of said railway on Teslin Lake, or other terminus northerly thereof, and Dawson City to and fro.

The objection I have to that provision is this. In the first place, there is no time mentioned within which the contractors shall provide this steamboat transport. The obvious answer to that by hon. gentlemen opposite would be that they may be obliged to provide it in a reasonable time. Well, that may or may not be, but I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite how long are the company obliged to provide it. Suppose they provide it during six months and then stop, what are the Government going to do? Are they going to bring an action for damages against the company or what will they do? I do not know what remedy the Government has and should like to be informed of it by hon. gentlemen opposite. There is

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

another curious thing in connection with the question of damages, and I desire the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) to this. The contractors, once the Government accept this road, are absolutely free from any personal responsibility. Now suppose the Government do accept the road and the company fail to operate it and fail to provide this steamboat accommodation, or having provided it, fail to continue it, whom are the Government to sue? I suppose it will be the company, because the company in that case will have assumed the liabilities of the contractors. But this company may have covered every available bit of property they have in that country by a mortgage for every dollar it is worth, and the liability of the company to the Government for these supposed damages may not be worth a snap of the finger. In what position will the Government then be? And I suppose that the Government, in dealing with an urgent matter like this, are bound to provide against every possible danger to the public interest. I do not think they have done so.

Now, I have detained the House at greater length than I really intended and I shall endeavour to make my remaining remarks as brief as possible. The Government, in making this contract with Mackenzie & Mann have violated the principle of dealing with contracts by tender. The question is, are there such circumstances existing as will justify the Government in having departed from that salutary rule? We have the statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior that between his return from the west and the 20th of December, 1897, he was informed by Sir William Van Horne that Mr. Hamilton Smith was prepared to make an offer for the construction of this railway. I think I am stating the fact fairly when I state that. We also know that Mr. Hamilton Smith had communicated with Sir William Van Horne, and that Sir William Van Horne, in so far as he said anything, spoke by Mr. Hamilton Smith's authority. We also know—at least I think we know—that Mr. Hamilton Smith has at his back men who are capable of doing the work which Mackenzie & Mann propose to do. Well, we are told by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) that the negotiations between the Government and Mackenzie & Mann extended over a great many days. There was a great deal of bartering. They wanted more land at first and the Government beat them down, and all these negotiations took a long time, so that the contract was not finally signed until the 25th of January, 1898. Even if the Government had the right to depart from the ordinary principle of dealing with these matters by public tender and contract, even if they were justified—as I think they were not—in excluding other Canadian contractors from this work, why, for the purpose of making better terms

with Mackenzie & Mann, did they fail, during all these weeks to call in Mr. Hamilton Smith and procure from him the offer which he has made since. I have not heard any satisfactory explanation of their failure to do that, and I do not think any can be given. During these weeks, when the Government were trying to make the best bargain they could with Mackenzie & Mann, the Minister of the Interior had it within his knowledge that Mr. Hamilton Smith, supported by capitalists of sufficient capacity—some of the greatest capitalists in the world—was anxious to enter into negotiations for constructing this road. Why was not this gentleman called in? Why were not circular letters sent around to contractors throughout Canada who would have been willing to make an offer to build the road? Why was it the Government saw fit, during all this period, to deal with one firm only? What is the reason? I am not able to understand any reason advanced so far, and I think there are some other gentlemen in this House who do not appreciate any reason given, and I think the country will want a better reason than any given by hon. gentlemen opposite up to this time.

Mr. McCLURE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Can he give an instance in this country in which a contract of this kind was let by tender?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman tell me when there was a contract of this kind in the history of the country?

Mr. McCLURE. Then I put the question this way: Can the hon. gentleman tell me of a case in the history of this country of a railway contract let by tender by the Government?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, I must say, I have not under my hand a list of the contracts, but if he will seek the sources of information readily available to his hand in the Library, he will find dozens of such cases. And, so far as that is concerned, I may answer the hon. gentleman in the way in which he answered a question, when he said that if his questioner wanted information, he had better look it up.

Mr. McCLURE. I did look for it, but could not find it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). However, I think I have sufficiently answered the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, in conclusion, I venture to submit to this House that all the considerations that have been put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the offer of Mr. Hamilton Smith, are beside the question. The hon. Minister of Customs spoke in such a way as to lead one to suppose that he believed that any offer made now was not an honourable offer. I do not so understand it. I understand that this contract has been made subject to the approval of Parliament.

I take it that that means something. I understand that if it is made subject to the approval of Parliament, then it depends on whether Parliament approves it, whether it shall be put through; and if, during the discussion of the contract, another offer is brought to the attention of this House to do the same work upon the same terms for one-quarter of the land grant which this Government proposes to give to this company, I, for one, see no reason why Parliament should not vote to accept that offer rather than the offer which the Government had made behind the back of Parliament, behind the back of the country, and behind the backs of the practical men in this line of business. And I do not propose, so long as the information before this House with regard to the offer of Mr. Hamilton Smith is in the condition in which it is at present, to support any proposition which gives to Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie four times the quantity of gold-bearing land in the Yukon district that this road can be built for by Mr. Hamilton Smith and his associates; and I think that any hon. gentleman who votes to give almost four million acres of gold-bearing land in this district to Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie, without being thoroughly convinced that there is not a bona fide offer to build the road for one million acres, and without further information from the Government on that point than has been afforded to this House, will find it hard to justify his action to his constituents. So far as I am concerned, I protest against the Government dealing with a matter of this kind in a gambling spirit. I have not used the word "gambling"; they have used it themselves. They are self-styled gamblers; and gambling in the public domain of Canada is not a thing that the people of this country will endure. It may be said that there has been gambling in this country with regard to political principles. We have had unrestricted reciprocity, free trade, commercial union, and various matters of that kind; but I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite should proceed beyond that and deal in a gambling spirit with the public resources of the country. They should know what they are getting and what they are giving. At all events, I feel sure that the country will not endorse a Government which sees fit, in the face of an offer such as has been laid on the Table of this House, to confirm this contract with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. I therefore beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Powell:

That all the words after "That" to the end of the question be left out and the following words be added instead thereof:—"the Bill No. 6, an Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company, be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved, that this House, while recognizing the necessity of providing adequate facilities for transportation into the Canadian Yukon gold fields, regards as indefensible the terms and conditions of the proposed con-

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax),

tract, but will cordially support the grant of substantial assistance in aid of the immediate construction of a railway on the best available route under such conditions and safeguards as will prevent the creation of any railway or mining monopoly."

Mr. MORRISON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.36 o'clock a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 7th March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY INQUIRY.

Mr. LISTER (by Mr. Morrison) presented the first report of the Committee appointed to investigate re the Drummond County Railway.

Mr. MORRISON moved:

That leave be granted to the special committee re Drummond County Railway to employ shorthand writers to take such evidence as the committee may deem necessary, in accordance with the recommendation of said committee contained in their first report.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MORRISON moved:

That the special committee re Drummond County Railway be empowered to print all evidence taken before said committee, and all proceedings, from day to day, and that the rule of the House in regard thereto be suspended as recommended in the first report of said committee.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 53) to incorporate the Prudential Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Bain.)

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES— THE ATLANTIC FISHERIES.

Mr. RUSSELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to ask a question. A Bill has been introduced in the United States Senate, according to a despatch published

in the Ottawa "Citizen" of Saturday, extending the homestead laws and providing for right of way for railroads in the district of Alaska. I notice, from the despatch, that there was comparatively little discussion until section 13 was reached, providing for certain bonding concessions to Canada in lieu of privileges to be extended by the Government of this country to the United States. The report proceeds to say :

Mr. Turner (Washington) moved to strike out that part of the section which related to the entering of Canadian ports by American fishermen. He did not, he said, make the motion because he was hostile to New England fisheries, but because he deemed it unfair to burden this measure with a demand upon the Dominion that it yield a contention it has made for one hundred years.

Mr. Hale (Maine) inquired if Mr. Turner did not think it would be of advantage to the United States to obtain the fishing concessions from Canada.

Mr. Turner replied that it would be of advantage if we could obtain it, but he did not think it could be obtained.

Mr. Hansbrough (N.D.) said that the Committee on Public Lands was in possession of information that Canada would accept the conditions imposed by the section. He was firmly of the opinion that the Dominion Government would yield on the fisheries question in view of the concession made to it by the Bill.

What I wish to ask, Mr. Speaker, is, whether there have been any negotiations of such a nature as would warrant the statement that is reported to have been made by Mr. Hansbrough ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My attention and the attention of my colleagues was called to the debate in the American Senate to which my hon. friend has just alluded. The statement made by Mr. Hansbrough was, that the Committee on Public Lands was in possession of information to the effect that the Canadian Government would agree to the withdrawal of the privileges which belonged to Canada by the convention of 1818, to which the hon. gentleman has specially directed our attention. Of course, it is difficult to judge of the remarks which may be made in any legislature, upon a summary report of that character ; but assuming that the report of the language attributed to Mr. Hansbrough is correct, all I have to say is, that there is a very serious misapprehension on the part of Mr. Hansbrough. There have been no negotiations of any kind, official or unofficial, between the Government and the authorities at Washington, except such negotiations as took place when I and my colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, proceeded to Washington in November last. These negotiations have already been communicated to the public, but in order to make the thing still more certain, I beg to lay on the Table of the House the whole correspondence which took place. It consists, first, of a letter addressed

to myself by Sir Julian Pauncefote, on the 26th November last, including a statement of certain propositions made by Mr. Foster, with the consent of the President of the United States ; and my reply to Mr. Foster's statement and his rejoinders.

I beg to move for leave to lay said correspondence on the Table of this House.

I should say that in the correspondence which I have just laid on the Table, there is nothing whatever of any kind (as a perusal of the correspondence will show) to warrant the statement made by Mr. Hansbrough.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Might I ask my right hon. friend if these papers contain all the negotiations which have taken place between the Canadian Government and the Government of the United States of America ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Absolutely everything.

Motion agreed to.

THE YUKON RAILWAY—THE ACTION OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I draw the attention of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the statement which has just been made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell). I wish to ask my right hon. friend if he is aware of the action which the Senate of the United States have taken in the most formal and unmistakable manner, and whether in view of it he proposes to proceed with the Bill now before the House. My right hon. friend will remember that when this action of the United States was first proposed, I drew his attention to it, and his reply to me was : that it was impossible to suppose that the legislature of any country like the United States of America could possibly adopt a measure of that kind. The right hon. gentleman therefore declined at the time to consider seriously a proposition of such an extravagant character. We are now brought face to face with the fact that the Senate of the United States, so far from treating that as a violation of treaties and a thing that it was impossible that any Government could entertain, have by a majority of 34 to 16 declared their determination to render impracticable this proposed Yukon Railway by the Stikine River.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is proceeding further than merely to ask a question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will conclude with a motion, Mr. Speaker, because this is a matter of the very greatest importance, and one that I am sure has obtained the careful consideration of the Government. The question has now assumed such a phase

that the Government must regard it as of the most serious character. My right hon. friend will remember, that the hopes he entertained some time ago that no proposal of such a character, which would strike at the very basis of the treaty arrangements between Great Britain and the United States, could possibly be entertained by the American Senate; have been disappointed. We have reached a point at which the Senate of the United States—a part of the Government of the United States and a most important part of the Government of that great country, as my hon. friend is quite aware—have by a majority of 34 to 16 pledged themselves to, in fact, destroy the object which this Government aims at in providing an all-Canadian route. The Senate has shown that it is determined not only to prevent this being an all-Canadian route, but also to render any expenditure this Parliament may make in connection with it, absolutely nugatory, unless several demands of a most extraordinary character are complied with by the Government and Parliament of this country. They require that this Bill shall be changed in all its essential particulars, they declare that the bonding privilege shall be withheld unless the same privileges are accorded to American fishermen; a request contrary to the Treaty of 1818, a matter that I drew the attention of the House to a short time ago, as one that has practically been set at rest by the negotiations that have taken place, and the legislation continued from 1888 down to the present time by the Canadian Parliament.

In addition to that, the American Senate dictate that this Government shall issue miner's licenses, as they now do, upon equal terms to American citizens and British subjects, and further, that this Government shall issue these licenses when and where the Government of the United States dictate. I have no hesitation in declaring, that no member of this House will do more than I to promote the most cordial and friendly relations between the Republic of the United States and Canada. It is our interest in every way that the most harmonious relations should exist between the two Governments and the two countries. I yield to no person in my desire to see those friendly relations continued. I need not remind my right hon. friend that again and again the Liberal party in this House have denounced the action of the Conservative Government and the representatives of the Conservative Government, for having basely sacrificed the best interests of this country at the shrine of the interests of the United States of America. The Liberal party again and again used their power in this House to defeat treaties made between Great Britain and the United States of America, in regard to matters affecting Canada, on the ground that the representatives of the Conservative party had basely surrendered the best inter-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

ests of Canada at the dictation of the United States

In view of that action of the Liberal party in days past, I am here to say now, that the position of the great Liberal-Conservative party is what it always has been. Our policy is a desire to do everything that possibly can be done, consistent with the honour and interests of Canada, to promote the best possible relations between the United States and ourselves.

But, Sir, there is a limit to human endurance, and I feel that there is a limit which I am quite sure no Government, either in this House or in this country will ever be sustained in going beyond in their efforts to promote these cordial relations.

I feel sure that we can look to this Government, as we can to any Government that enjoys the confidence of the Parliament and people of Canada, for the maintenance, not only of that which is the indefeasible right of Canada, but the preservation of a position which will show to that great Republic—great and powerful as it is—that the Dominion of Canada will never submit to have terms dictated to it which strike at the very root of the independence of the Government and of the Parliament of this country.

The time has arrived when it becomes a most serious question for the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues to consider, whether under these circumstances he proposes to press this Bill upon the further consideration of this House, when it is proved beyond the possibility of a doubt that it is to end in an utterly futile arrangement so far as the object contemplated by the Bill is concerned. I am quite certain that my right hon. friend and his colleagues will receive the hearty support of both sides of this House in taking that manly and independent course which is absolutely due to the character and position of this country, and in devising such measures as will effectually prevent our being subjected to the base humiliation we will be subject to, if we were to submit to such terms as the Senate of the United States propose to dictate to the Government and Parliament of Canada.

I beg, Mr. Speaker, to move the adjournment of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I agree very sincerely with the sentiments which have been uttered this moment by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) I agree very sincerely with everything that he has said in regard to the maintenance of the dignity of this young nation. We are only a small nation yet. We are willing to be on the most friendly terms with the powerful nation to the south of us, but I agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition that nothing should be given away of our national dignity. Though I agree with the sentiments which he has expressed

in this regard, I am sorry that I cannot at all agree with him in the conclusions which he has based upon these sentiments. And I venture to believe and hope that when he has reflected upon this subject, he will come back to the opinion he himself expressed at one time outside of this House, and has since repeated in this House, that the only route we could have taken to have access to the Yukon country was that by the Stikine River, if we wanted to have the advantage given to us by treaty and to avoid the possible hostility of our American neighbours in regard to trade arrangements. When we had to determine upon the policy we would adopt and upon the route we would select, in order to afford to Canadian trade and to the Canadian people access to that part of their own territory which lies in the region of the Yukon River, it was apparent that there was only one of two routes to be chosen. We had either to take the route by the Lynn Canal and Dyea, or the route by the Stikine River. The advantages of the one had to be set against the disadvantages of the other, and vice versa. The advantages of the route by the Lynn Canal were that it was shorter and more direct than the route by the Stikine River. But if we had adopted the route by the Lynn Canal, that is to say, had chosen to build a railway from Dyea by the Chilkat Pass up to the waters of the Yukon, we would have had to place the ocean terminus of the railway upon what is now American territory. I agree with the statement which has been made on the floor of this House on more than one occasion that Dyea, if the treaty is correctly interpreted, is in Canadian territory. It ought to be; but the fact is, as my hon. friends know very well, even those who do not belong to the legal profession, that possession is nine points of the law; and even though by the letter of the treaty, Dyea is in Canadian territory, the fact remains that from time immemorial Dyea was in possession of the Russians, and in 1867 it passed into the hands of the Americans, and it has been held in their hands ever since. Now, I will not recriminate here; this is not the time nor the occasion for doing so; but so far as I am aware no protest has ever been entered against the occupation of Dyea by the American authorities; and when the American authorities are in possession of that strip of territory on the sea which has Dyea as its harbour, succeeding the possession by the Russians from time immemorial, it becomes manifest to everybody that at this moment we cannot dispute their possession, and that before their possession can be disputed, the question must be determined by a settlement of the questions involved in the treaty. Under such circumstances, Dyea was practically in American territory—at all events, in possession of the Americans; and, therefore, if we had undertaken to build a railway from Dyea

to the Yukon country, we would have been placed at the mercy of the American authorities with regard to the bonding privilege. We would have been in this position, that though we had built a railway, the ocean terminus of that railway was not in our own country, and we could not send a ton or a pound of goods over that railway unless we had the permission of the American authorities. On the other hand, if we were to build a railway by the Stikine River, there, Sir, we had a highway—because a river is a highway; we had a highway arising in our own territory and flowing through the territory of another country to the sea, and over that highway we had, not only by the common law of nations, but by a special treaty, signed by both British and American plenipotentiaries, the right of navigation. Now, that right of using the Stikine River as a highway, means something or it means nothing. I am sorry to say that I cannot agree with my hon. friend's interpretation, when he says that this right of navigation which we have by the Treaty of Washington means nothing at all. I assert, on the contrary, that by the terms of the Treaty of Washington the Stikine River is a highway which we have the right to use for commercial purposes—for the carrying of goods over it, without having to pay duty at the American frontier. There is the difference, which my hon. friend has overlooked, between the Stikine route and the Dyea route. If we had built the railway by Dyea, when we came to Dyea we would have come to an American port, and according to the law of nations we could not have entered a ton of merchandise or a pound of food without subjecting ourselves to the necessity of paying duty, if the Americans refused to bond the goods. But, Sir, we have by treaty the right to use the Stikine River as a highway. If we have not the right to send goods over that river, I want to ask any sensible man, what was the use of having secured the right of navigation on that river by treaty? It would not be worth the paper on which it was written. But while this is our position, while we have a right to use the river as a highway in carrying merchandise from the sea to our own country, it is not in the power of the American authorities to demand the payment of duty when we reach the Stikine River. I admit, as every one will grant, that the Americans have a right, not to impose duties there but to make municipal regulations for their own protection—to prevent smuggling, and so on. But I maintain that if the Americans in establishing municipal regulations for their own protection, were to go the length of defeating the rights which belong to us by treaty, such regulations would be null and void, and would be so pronounced even by American courts. A treaty to which any nation has assented is part and parcel of its laws, and cannot

be defeated by any law passed by the legislative authority of that nation. Therefore, as the Treaty of Washington is part and parcel of the laws of the United States, as it is part and parcel of the laws of Canada, it is not in the power of the American people or of the Canadian people to do anything which will make nugatory the rights secured by that treaty.

I regret exceedingly the legislation which has been introduced in the American Senate, by which we are refused the bonding privilege; and I may say in passing that perhaps that Bill has been agreed to by the American Senate under a misapprehension, because the statement made by Mr. Hansbrough that Canada was prepared to surrender some of the privileges we have on the Atlantic side of the continent seems to have had some effect. But even if the Bill should become law, if it should receive the sanction of the President, though it may refuse us the bonding privilege on the Stikine River at Fort Wrangel, it does not affect our rights in the least; and if regulations should be made which would prevent our benefiting by the rights that are ours by treaty, of course we would have to exact our privileges and appeal to the American authorities that their legislation is null and void as being contrary to treaty. My hon. colleague the Minister of the Interior, a few days ago, in the speech he delivered upon this question, stated—and properly stated—that upon this question our position is impregnable. We claim, as a right beyond dispute, that the power which we have of navigating the Stikine River is a power which gives us the right to use it as a highway—that is with the power of transshipment and mooring as well—that is to say, that right carries with it, as necessary incidents, all the powers necessary to make it available. That is the position upon which and to which we hold, and therefore there is no occasion whatever for even discussing the suggestions made by my hon. friend. I fully recognize and stand upon this position, that we have rights by treaty which cannot be defeated.

I am aware, however, that though we have these rights by treaty, and though we cannot be defeated except by another treaty negotiated in the same manner, we may be harassed in the exercise of those rights. Well, we have thought of that in the measure which is now before Parliament and to which we ask the sanction of Parliament. We have taken the precaution, in the view of the possibility of our being harassed in this direction, to extend the line down to the waters which are Canadian and in British territory, and we intend at the earliest moment to ask an appropriation from Parliament in order to carry out this view so as to have that line extended at the earliest date—that is part of the contract—to those waters.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

But what would hon. gentlemen opposite have us do? A moment ago my hon. friend asked: Are you going to proceed with this Bill? Sir, I ask the question: If we do not, what will arise? If we do not proceed with this Bill, then there is only one thing to do, and that is to build a line to Dyea on the Lynn Canal. But would that remedy the evil? On the contrary, it would make it ten times worse. There is no possibility of remedy at the Lynn Canal, because there we are altogether dependent on the goodwill of the American authorities. We have no treaty rights there, whereas upon the Stikine River we have. And if these prove insufficient, there is only one alternative for the Canadian Parliament, and that is, at the very earliest possible moment, without the loss of a single day, to have the line extended south where it will reach Canadian waters. I quite agree with my hon. friend in everything he has said as to the character of the Bill introduced in the American Senate, and I hope that the position there taken will be reconsidered. I hope that the American senators and legislators will reconsider their position before proceeding further with this Bill. Though it cannot affect us, though it cannot defeat our rights, still I hope that before they determine that they shall not give us the bonding privilege, unless we do certain things, unless we are compelled to eat humble pie, unless we are compelled, for instance, to revise our own domestic legislation, they will reconsider their action.

There is no other intention on the part of this Government and the Canadian people than to have the most friendly relations with our American neighbours. But I do not admit at all that they have the right to dictate to us what shall be our domestic policy or whether we shall exercise or not the rights which belong to us by treaty. I do not admit at all that the Atlantic fisheries can come into consideration as regards what is to be the policy of the two nations on the Pacific Coast. I understand that our American friends complain that we do not bond their fish upon the Intercolonial when it is landed at Halifax for Boston. But the statement is not accurate. We do not refuse to bond their fish, because there is nothing to bond there. The position is simply this, that the American fishermen, under the Treaty of 1818, have not the power to land their fish at Halifax. Now, if that be, in their eyes, a grievance the fault is not ours, but it is simply the result of the stipulations of the treaty signed by themselves. If at the present time they are not allowed to land their fish at Halifax and are not allowed certain privileges, I must give my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) the credit of having done his best to negotiate a new treaty; and in that treaty which he in conjunction with Mr. Chamberlain sought to negotiate in

1888, those restrictions against the American fishermen were withdrawn. If therefore that withdrawal was not made part and parcel of a treaty between two nations, it is not the fault of my hon. friend, because he was ready to make away with those restrictions, but it was the fault of the American Senate who chose to reject that treaty and reaffirmed therefore the treaty of 1818, thus maintaining the restrictions imposed upon their own fishermen. Under such circumstances, the Americans have no fault to lay at our door. If those restrictions are to be complained of, there was a very simple way of making away with them. That was to confirm the treaty which was negotiated by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and Mr. Chamberlain; and I will say further, to the credit of those gentlemen, that in order to facilitate matters and have more friendly relations between the two countries, they agreed to a *modus vivendi* which has been continued ever since, and under which, on the payment of a small license fee, American fishermen can enjoy the rights denied them by the Treaty of 1818. At present all American fishermen who choose to take advantage of the present license system can land their fish and enjoy all the privileges denied them under the treaty.

This is the position we hold. Therefore I repeat what I said a moment ago, that the Bill to which my hon. friend alluded, which has passed the American Senate, does not and cannot affect our treaty rights. No regulation made by the American authorities, not even an Act which has the sanction of the President I submit to you, Sir, can avail against our treaty rights, confirmed by the plenipotentiaries and bearing the signatures of all the proper authorities. Under such circumstances, I have no hesitation in saying that, apart from all diplomatic remedy, any regulations or other Acts affecting our rights would be, by an American tribunal, decided to be *ultra vires* and null and void.

Now, my hon. friend asked a moment ago: Are you going to proceed with this Bill? I ask him: Have you anything to offer other than this Bill?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. Even if the action of the United States Senate were to have the effect alleged—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, what will it be?

Mr. SPROULE. Build from Edmonton.

The PRIME MINISTER. The distance from Edmonton is about 1,500 miles, over a country that has never been surveyed, and the route which must cross three or four ranges of mountains. I had the opportunity to state on another occasion, and I here repeat, that the line which we pro-

pose to build, and will build, to the waters of the Stikine River is not a line which ultimately, in our minds or in the minds of those who know the situation will be regarded as a competitor with the line by way of Edmonton. I agree that there is strong reason, and urgent reason, perhaps, why a line from the interior should be built. But I do not regard this line from the interior as antagonistic to the line which we propose to build immediately. What we must have is immediate access to that country, a line to be in operation by the 1st of September. This is the object we have in view, and the fact that we have arranged to have access to the waters of the Yukon River by the 1st of September next and not later, is our justification for what we propose. Has the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) any substitute to offer us?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. A line by Dyea, I suppose.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; if the hon. gentleman will give me an opportunity, I will make a suggestion now.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will say this to the hon. gentleman, and I think that what I say will commit itself to the judgment of every reasonable man—

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) will not make a speech now, I have the floor.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My suggestion is this: The only basis for the monstrous payment which it is proposed to this House to pay under this contract is that it is designed to secure the construction of a line immediately, a line to be in operation on the 1st of September, by which line we would get communication with that country. That is gone.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentlemen permit me, as this is a very important point. If my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will allow me, I will state very frankly what I believe to be the position.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would rather the hon. gentleman would give me his alternative.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am going to give the hon. gentleman the alternative. I remind him of the fact that the Minister of the Interior himself stated in the course of his speech that it would probably take six years to negotiate the Stikine question with the Government of the United States. Now, inasmuch as the Senate of the United States has taken a position that makes it absolutely impossible to attain the object

which it is proposed by means of this Bill to attain, I ask my right hon. friend to consider the whole question de novo. Before any large expenditure of public money has been made, I ask him to take up the question of an ocean port in British Columbia; and I will undertake, Sir, if the right hon. gentleman will do that—as the urgency has passed by, from the absolute impossibility of accomplishing what the Bill proposed to accomplish—that for far less than he is going to give for the construction of this 150 miles of road, he can have constructed, by contractors of the highest standing and character, the entire line, from either Alice Arm or Kithmast Arm, or whatever may be the best available port, to Teslin Lake.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am delighted that the hon. gentleman has made this statement. I put the question very pointedly whether he had any substitute to offer. He has no substitute, but simply proposes to do the very thing which we have said we intend to do. We have made this contract for the construction of a road to the Stikine River in the hope that the Americans would abide by their treaty obligation. But, even in case they might refuse, we contemplated in this very contract that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann shall have the option—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The PRIME MINISTER—to carry the line down to a Canadian port.

Mr. FOSTER. In ten years.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, but we can call upon them at any time within ten years; and if they do not undertake it next summer, others will. So the position of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) simply confirms and is the best justification of our course in this matter. He has just declared that the best policy would be to build a line to a British Columbia port. That is the very thing we have done under this contract. We anticipated that, possibly, we should have some trouble with the Americans—though our rights are secured by treaty and cannot be denied—that something might be done such as has been done. Let me recall the attention of hon. members to what I said a moment ago. Does my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) pretend that the refusal of the bonding privilege on the Stikine River is to affect the rights secured to us by the Treaty of Washington? If he maintains that contention, what, then, is the cause of having attained by treaty the right to navigate the Stikine River? Is that right worth something, or is it worth nothing? If it is worth anything, it is worth this—that we have the right to use the Stikine River as a highway, and, in doing so, certainly no impediment can be placed in our way.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Whether impediments should or should not be placed in our way is not the question, but whether they will be placed in our way.

The PRIME MINISTER. The question is simply this: Does this right exist, or does it not? I know very well that even where a right exists, it is sometimes difficult to exercise it; but the fact that a right is difficult to exercise does not at all affect the fact that the right exists. If it be found that this right of ours could be exercised only with too great difficulty, then, here is the provision made in the contract:

The Government shall submit to Parliament at its next ensuing session a measure for the necessary Act confirming this agreement and authorizing the Government and the contractors to perform and carry out the same, also incorporating the contractors and such others as may become shareholders into a company under the name of the Canadian Yukon Railway Company or other name approved by the contractors (hereinafter referred to as the contractors' company), with power to acquire and perform and carry out this agreement, and with all necessary provisions in that behalf, and with all necessary powers to build and operate a railway above mentioned and an extension thereof northward to Dawson City or thereabouts and an extension southward to a point in British Columbia to be designated by the Government and capable of being made an ocean port.

And, in view of the possible difficulties that may be placed in the way of the exercise of our rights, it is the intention of the Government, at the earliest moment, to ask from Parliament for an appropriation so that we may have the surveys made at once, so as to free us from all possible interference in this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two considerations on account of which I am glad that this matter has been brought up, and these two considerations especially affect the position of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who has just taken his seat. The bringing up of this matter has given my right hon. friend an opportunity to set himself right before this Parliament and before the country in an important particular in respect of which, for the last six or seven years, he has been diligently setting himself wrong. It has enabled him to dispel, at this late date, if such a thing be possible, some of the illusions which his conduct and speeches for eight or ten years have tended to fix as settled ideas in the minds of senators and representatives at Washington. If you read over the newspaper reports of the discussion which took place upon one of the clauses of the Bill which has just been passed by the Senate, you will find that not one but several senators made a remark—in answer to the objection of some senators that they did not think it would be germane to interject the

provision with reference to the north Atlantic fisheries into a measure which seemingly had nothing to do with them—that they had good reason to believe that in influential quarters in Canada there was a disposition to grant these concessions, and that, consequently, they might just as well be attached to this Bill, and might even better be attached to this Bill than not.

Now, I presume that no one doubts that. Where in the world did these senators get that impression which has settled and become almost a fixed idea in their minds? They got it, Sir, from the speeches and from the conduct of my right hon. friend who to-day sits opposite to me in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. No! Have the hon. gentlemen on the other side lost their memories as well as lost their convictions and their devotion to their former political principles? We know, and every member who will allow his mind to go back four or five years, knows, that at the city of St. Thomas, not many years ago, when the Liberal-Conservative Government was attempting to enforce the rights of Canadian fishermen, according to the Treaty of 1818, that hon. gentleman, as the leader of his party, attacked the Liberal-Conservative Government for trying to resuscitate a barbarism and to bring back the provisions of an old treaty of 1818 into this nineteenth century of light, and freedom, and commercial and other intercourse between civilized nations. My hon. friend remembers it perfectly. That went from one end of this country to the other, and that was not all the mischief of it; it went from one end of the United States to the other, and made senators like Mr. Hansbrough firmly convinced that once he and his party came into power, there would no longer be an insistence upon treaty rights in this country as regards the United States of America. My hon. friend has given other good reasons why Senator Hansbrough and others like him have come to that conclusion. For, Sir, when he and his colleagues were in Washington, before they went and after they came back, did we not have this statement from his own lips in an interview, that what he proposed to do was, to take up all these vexed questions and settle them in a lump? The Behring Sea question was not, I suppose, a question of the first national importance, which stood upon its own firm right, upon which we not only have the right of the treaty, but the right of international law, but had the right which was vindicated for us by the mother country in years of diplomacy, and a right which was afterwards affirmed to us by the tribunal in Paris. Our rights under the Treaty of 1818 are as clear and as undoubted as the sunlight, yet my hon. friend proposed to throw in all this before he

would settle the Behring Sea question, to throw in with this all the little vexed questions that were brought up between the two countries, this one amongst the others. When the American people heard him state that, they rightly came to the conclusion that he placed no very great store by these great rights, and that he was quite willing, for the sake of peace and amity, to wipe off the whole score, taking little and big together. There is another reason why they have come to that conclusion. Possibly they read the Chicago "Record," and they read the hon. gentleman's fresh interview shortly after he came back from the elections of 1896, which showed on some points an entire ignorance of the relations between these two countries, the rights of Canada with reference to them, and showed in the whole of that interview a disposition to think lightly of, and to stand lightly by, the rights which Canada possessed, if only good-will and amity could be brought about, in his language, between the United States and this country. There are the reasons. My hon. friend need not assume surprise and feign to be astonished when he hears that Senator Hansbrough and others are looking to him, from his former walk and conversation, for no very sturdy defence of the rights of this country. Well, I said I was glad this matter had come up, because the hon. gentleman has been forced to take this position before the House and the country, now that he does not propose to consider even the old obsolete rights of 1818 as of no force and of no validity in this country, that he proposes to stand by them. And so will he have to. Irresponsible as one in opposition may be, when he is in a position to talk as he will, to promise as he will, when he comes to be Premier of this country, the dignity and rights of this Canadian people are in his hands, and neither he nor any other leader can afford to go one single step behind that dignity and those rights. That is one reason why I am glad this has come up, and Senator Hansbrough now can read the statements which have been made by the leaders on both sides of this House, and can value at their true worth these ante-Premierial declarations of my hon. friend. But, Sir, there is another point. We have been debating a great question in this House for ten, twelve or fifteen days, and we have not been able to draw the right hon. gentleman from covert yet. To-day he has taken one stand. I was going to say, his one stand; but he has taken half a dozen stands upon the question of the Yukon deal. I have heard that it is possible for some philosophers to extract sun-rays from a cucumber, but I never met with a more signal illustration of the power to draw from every defeat some sunny rays of victory than is embalmed in my right hon. friend who sits opposite to me. We have heard the utterances of his own Ministers, three of whom have been declaring in this House, ten days ago, and eight days

ago, that they had not the least doubt that the United States Government and people, having treated them most courteously, would continue to treat them most courteously to the end; and they laughed to scorn, and flagellated with whips—and scorpions, if they could have been put upon the thongs of those whips, would have been placed there by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior—they laughed to scorn my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition because he ventured to make a proposition here, that the sentiment in the United States Senate was not friendly to the realization of those optimistic opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite. The Minister of the Interior made the statement, the Minister of Agriculture made the statement, the Minister of Railways and Canals made the statement, that they had no doubt at all that the greatest peace and good will, with reference to this matter on the Pacific Coast, would be found to exist, and the greatest courtesy would be shown them by the Government of the United States True, when he had to take a somewhat different line of defence, the Minister of the Interior made the statement that, of course, we had our rights, and, of course, the United States had always treated us with courtesy and always would, but still he asked were we to stop building this road and wait three, or four, or five, or six years, while trying by negotiations to settle definitely that Stikine matter? The hon. gentleman is on the same ground as the right hon. gentleman: both of them stand on the ground that there is a treaty right, but both of them are bound to come down to the bald fact, that, treaty right or not, the question now is: Will the United States admit the treaty right and allow the operation of trade under it? We said to the Minister of the Interior: Leave off this road until you find out whether they will or not. What was his answer to-day? Ask us to wait five or six years to find out! What does that mean, translated into English? That, though he may be sure of the right, he is not sure that the right will be allowed, and that the operation of trade will take place under that right. My right hon. friend is not any more certain of it. My right hon. friend now comes to the conclusion that there is a strong possibility that we will not be allowed the exercise of that right, and, consequently, that he may yet have to call into operation that preference clause of a ten years' duration which is attached to this contract, but which is not a part of the contract in any obligatory sense.

But the hon. gentleman is bound not to let Mann & Mackenzie go. He is going to hold to them, and together they are going to hold to the ripe plums, to the contract which places a blanket over the best gold lands of the Yukon territory. What for? In order to secure 150 miles of tramway, which if built by 1st of September we could not carry a pound of Canadian produce

Mr. FOSTER.

over it without the permission of the United States authorities at Wrangel. The hon. Minister of the Interior has told the House that it might take four or five or six years to complete the negotiations. What is the use of the leader of the Government saying that a treaty is superior to law, and that we have rights under the treaty which are undoubted. There is the challenge from the Senate of the United States, which proposed to attach an impossible condition to that treaty right, by a vote of 34 to 16. Suppose this Bill passes through the lower House and President McKinley signs it. Go and put your rights before the United States, and alongside of it they will place the provisors under that law. What will happen? Are you going to say that you will use the road on the 1st September? No, but you will have to avail yourselves of the future time of years mentioned by the Minister of the Interior before you will find whether you can put a pound of freight through there by transshipment and under treaty rights.

What does the hon. leader of the Government propose to do? He comes down to the House and practically admits that this Teslin Railway of 150 miles, even if built by 1st September, will be practically useless if the United States maintain their contention.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. And yet the hon. gentleman asks the country to proceed with this unparalleled and extravagant piece of business of building 150 miles of useless road and allow it to lie, year after year, unused until they have made certain investigations and arrived at a conclusion and resolved to build to some port on the Pacific Coast. What this Parliament wants is this—the whole scheme of the Government; and it wants it now. It does not want to build 150 miles for a most extravagant sum and for the Government then to bring down another piece of road for construction, and ask permission to build that link and pay for it out of the country's treasury. What we demand as members of Parliament is, that if this scheme is now abortive, let hon. gentlemen opposite bring in their full-fledged scheme and allow hon. members to discuss it, without tying them up hand and foot in party shackles and threatening Parliament by placing before it a contract for its authorization without permission to dot an "i" or cross a "t" in it. That is what we complain of.

I am glad this subject has been brought up. The leader of the Government is now face to face with a crisis in respect to passing the proposed legislation. He has come to the Rubicon and has found that it is not crossable. On the ground of abstract right, it is, on the ground of the Senate's action and possible complications, it is not. Let us know what we have to do and let us

face the Government's scheme as a whole, and not be called upon to consider a small portion of what is possibly to be a railroad into the Yukon. Let us know what the whole scheme is from the beginning to the end, and let the Government take Parliament into its confidence in discussing it; for to-day's proceedings have made it certain that we may push Mackenzie & Mann, and they may push the Government and this road may be built by 1st September, but it will be perfectly useless for any service during the present year. If that be so, let hon. gentlemen opposite bring their whole scheme to Parliament, and we will take it up, and if the Government scheme is a good one, we will support it; for I, as well as my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) and every member in the Liberal-Conservative party, whilst we do not defy or threaten in the least, feel just as firm and just as strong in not abnegating one single right of this country even to the great power to the south, as are hon. gentlemen opposite.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Personally I feel I am in unison with most of those hon. gentlemen among whom I sit when I deplore the bitter temper, tone and substance of the speeches which have fallen from the two leaders of the Conservative party.

Mr. **LANDERKIN**. Paid agents of the American Government.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. The point of order is this: no sooner had I taken my seat and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has risen than an hon. gentleman who occupies a seat as a representative on that side of the House accused us on this side of being paid agents of the American Government? Is that language, Mr. Speaker, which should be used in this House?

Mr. **SPEAKER**. If any hon. member used that language it is irregular and improper.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The hon. member for Grey used it.

Mr. **LANDERKIN**. I will retract. I do not think they would do so much without pay.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I contend that is not a withdrawal.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. The hon. gentleman must withdraw the remark.

Mr. **LANDERKIN**. Under the circumstances, I withdraw it.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Where do you put it?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I opened my remarks by regretting the substance and tone of the speeches delivered by the hon. gentlemen who were leading the Opposition. I did so because we are not now debating a purely

internal political matter. When we are discussing Canadian politics of an internal character alone and affecting the political rights of either party or those of Canadians, I can understand that parties may differ in the extreme and that violent language may be used. But when the Canadian Government is engaged in the great task of upholding and maintaining the rights of the Canadian people against a foreign power, Sir, I have been taught in my reading of British history that on those occasions the voice of faction should be hushed. No sooner have we the least breath in the Senate of the United States which—accepting for the moment the construction hon. gentlemen opposite put on it—which threatens the treaty rights of Canada, than we hear a craven cry raised by the leader of the Opposition, a craven cry raised by hon. gentlemen opposite that we should surrender, that we should not attempt, either diplomatically or otherwise, to maintain the great vested rights which the Canadian people possess. They are at this moment endeavouring to raise the cry that we should withdraw a Bill, which the hon. leader of the Opposition himself put his imprimatur upon not many days ago, which he said he would be proud to recommend Parliament to pass, which he declared vested in two men, Mackenzie & Mann, probably the only two men in Canada capable of carrying it out, the construction of that road, and to which he pledged the party he led and declared they would give a patriotic support. Why did he do so? Because, as he alleged, it is an all-Canadian route, because it is to build up Canadian interests as against those interests which are competing with us on the Pacific slope, and he sank for the moment his political proclivities and desired to unite with the Government in this great patriotic Canadian work of preserving and conserving for Canada the trade of that great country which the Americans are seeking to take from us. The hon. gentleman has, however, forgotten his patriotism. He has forgotten to assist the Government; he has broken his pledge, and at the first note which comes to us from the American Senate of danger and of the possibility that they may throw obstructions in our way, we have him and his lieutenant who sits alongside of him, rising in their places, forgetting their patriotism, and in the hope of gaining a temporary and paltry advantage calling on us to surrender the rights of the Canadian people.

I beg to tell the hon. gentleman that the present Government of this Dominion are not composed of that kind of stuff, and I beg to tell them also—and I say it with every humility—that it would be well for them before they cry out and call upon the Government of Canada and the people of Canada to surrender; it would be well for them to ascertain if there is any danger whatever. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles

Tupper) has talked about the Bill introduced in the American Senate, and has assumed that that Bill aims at the destruction of certain treaty rights which we possess. I challenge him to point to a line or a sentence in that Bill which directly or indirectly affects the treaty rights we possess of the free, open navigation of the Stikine. The hon. gentleman knows very well that we possess a bonding privilege by treaty so far as two or three points in the United States are concerned. He knows that we do not possess any treaty right to the bonding privilege at the town of Wrangel, and he knows that it is specially with reference to the bonding privilege at Wrangel that this Bill is aimed and that the whole question refers to.

Mr. DAVIN. Is not that what makes it so dangerous?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. For the benefit of the close consideration which I am sure the whole House is giving this subject, I wish to ask a question. I understood the Prime Minister to-day to say, and I believe myself there was ground for it, that he claimed that under the Treaty of Washington we had the right not only of navigation on the Stikine, but in connection with that right the right of transshipment. Am I right in understanding the Minister of Marine now to say, that we have not the right to tranship?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On the contrary, my hon. friend must understand me to mean just what the Prime Minister advised as the construction of that treaty, and he must understand me to mean further, that the granting or withholding of the bonding privilege at Wrangel does not necessarily imply the modification or retraction of the free right of transportation.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have jumped before they came to the stile. Supposing the Bill passes to-morrow; supposing section 13 passes through the American Senate and afterwards through the House of Representatives and is signed by the President and becomes the law of the land, would that detract from our treaty right to free and open navigation of the Stikine? Not at all. Would that take from us the right of transshipment which is necessarily incidental to that free right of navigation? Not at all. I say, therefore, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), in calling upon us to yield at the very first threat on the part of some American representatives has—I won't say deliberately, because I have to much respect for him to think that—but in his haste to rise a little party capital for the moment, he has forgotten even to read the section of the Bill he has commented upon. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) talks here as if this threatened

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

action on the part of the Senate was brought about by some remarks of my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) some years ago, which led the American people to believe that the Liberal party were willing to surrender Canadian rights and Canadian privileges. Sir, does he (Mr. Foster) remember the occasion when the Washington Treaty was negotiated? Does he remember the occasion when Sir Charles Tupper came back and moved in this House the Bill to endorse and approve of that treaty? Does he (Mr. Foster) remember that previously to that time he had occupied the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, charged with the administration of the fishery laws, and does he remember that he received a lecture from Sir Charles Tupper on that occasion, the like of which I never knew or heard of a young member of the Government getting from a senior Minister. Sir Charles Tupper did not tell him (Mr. Foster) that it was the language of Sir Wilfrid Laurier that brought about the strained relations which unfortunately existed between Great Britain and the United States, but Sir Charles Tupper told him (Mr. Foster) that it was due to the unfortunate manner in which he carried out the fishery regulations.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think I am quoting the exact words when I say—

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my hon. friend—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) has made a statement which is either correct or not correct. He has appealed to the "Hansard"; will he read the "Hansard"?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I can recollect the words very well.

Mr. FOSTER. Why does not the hon. gentleman read from the speech?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) said that he would be sorry to take responsibility for the manner in which these regulations had been enforced during the past few years.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you quoting from "Hansard"?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am quoting from the hon. gentleman's speech; I think I have it correctly.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had to take his whipping

on that occasion. By the manner in which he (Mr. Foster) enforced the regulations, he had brought about what the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) who moved the treaty, declared to be a state of commercial war, and Sir Charles Tupper added: It is well known that the distance between commercial war and real war is only imaginary. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was directly charged, because of the manner in which he had administered the regulations, with having brought the two countries to the verge of actual war.

I propose now to revert to the rights which we have guaranteed to us by the Treaty of Washington. Can there be any doubt as to what these treaty rights are?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not the question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will find out what the question is in a moment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a question of how far they can be enforced and at what time?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will show the hon. gentleman there is no danger. I tell the hon. gentleman that he wants to surrender before there is danger, and I tell him too, that it is time enough to surrender our rights when they are threatened and when we cannot maintain them. We on this side of the House say, in the first place, that we can maintain our rights, and we say in the second place that the Opposition are seeking to surrender Canadian rights before even they are threatened. Now, let us see what the section of the treaty says:

The navigation of the rivers Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine, ascending and descending to and from the sea, shall for ever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty and to the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of either country within its own territory not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

Therefore, we have guaranteed us by treaty—the highest form of national compact I know of—the free and open navigation of that river, subject only to such municipal regulations as either country may see fit to adopt for the protection of its revenue. Does the hon. gentleman want to know what construction the United States places upon treaties of that kind? If he does, let him look at the controversy which took place between Mr. Evarts, the Secretary of State for the United States of America, and the British Government a few years ago with reference to the treaty giving the Americans the right of fishing on the shores of Newfoundland. The Americans had the right to enter, in common with

British subjects, on the shores in the Bay of Fortune, Newfoundland; and when they went there to fish they found themselves met with municipal regulations, declaring that they should not fish on Sundays, that they should not fish with meshes of a certain kind, and other such provisions. What stand did the United States take upon that? They said: We cannot acknowledge that any municipal regulations can limit, much less destroy the rights which are guaranteed us by treaty; we have the right to fish here by treaty, and you cannot take away that right from us by saying we shall not fish on Sundays. The United States contended: we have the right here to fish and you cannot minimize that right by declaring that we can only fish in a certain way. And, submitting their proposition and enforcing it with very powerful arguments, they induced the English Government to accept the stand they took. Both Governments are therefore upon record as declaring that defined treaty rights cannot be minimized or detracted from by any municipal regulations.

No one denies, Mr. Speaker, that the principal right which is attempted to be conceded by this article is the right of free navigation of the Stikine and other named rivers for commercial purposes. Well, Sir, what do we find? The treaty must be construed in the light of the subject matter with which it deals. Here is a river which is said to have about four feet of water in depth. We find that provision is made for ocean-borne freight to be carried to the mouth of that river, and to go up it. Does not common sense suggest to you that ocean ships drawing thirteen or fourteen feet of water cannot go up a river with only four feet of water? As a necessary incident, therefore, to navigation, the right of transshipment exists. Now, nobody denies that the subsidiary right follows the major or principal right; and that right being guaranteed to us by treaty, it can never be taken away from us nor minimized by municipal regulations. I have tried to explain to the hon. gentleman that in his unpatriotic course he has misread and misunderstood the 13th section of the American Bill. That section makes no reference whatever to transshipment or free navigation. It makes no attack whatever on the treaty rights which we have there, but the hon. gentleman is so anxious to surrender our rights that he cries out to the Government to surrender those rights before they are attacked.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, but to render ourselves independent of American action.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is giving aid and comfort to the enemy at a most critical time in his country's history.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why did the hon. gentleman's leader say that he agreed with me in almost every word I said?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman misunderstood my leader very much, just as he misunderstands the text of section 13 of the American Bill. The hon. gentleman knows that a commercial contest is going on between the cities on the western coast of the United States, and the cities on the western coast of Canada, the result of which may be of vital importance to the future of Canada. The question is whether Tacoma, Seattle and San Francisco shall be built up by the Yukon trade, or whether the cities of Vancouver and Victoria shall be built up, as well as Montreal and Toronto. That is a contest for the millions upon millions of dollars of trade which will be the result of the opening up of the Yukon country. Both countries are contending for it. We have built an all-Canadian line, because we believe the trade belongs to us, and because we believe that by reason of that all-Canadian line it can be preserved to us, and the hon. gentleman stands to-day in the unpatriotic and undignified position of trying to destroy the policy of the Government—of playing into the hands of the American people, and of endeavouring to induce us to adopt a policy which would certainly result in handing over this trade to the cities of Seattle, Tacoma and San Francisco.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The very reverse.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Sir, I leave the hon. gentleman in the humiliating position he occupies to-day. I use the word humiliating more especially with reference to the pledges he made when Parliament met, that this Bill would not only receive his own hearty and cordial assent, because it was a Bill to develop Canadian interests, but that it would receive the cordial and patriotic support of the party which he led; and, having made this statement on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, he comes now and asks the Government to withdraw the Bill in order that American interests may be promoted which is a humiliating position for the hon. gentleman to occupy.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I hear a cry of "oh," across the House. I wonder if that is the singing of the Klondike nightingale. Mr. Speaker, a few evenings ago I called attention to the string of absurdities that was given to this House by the hon. gentleman who occupies the high position of Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton); and what has occurred in the American Senate has illustrated the character of that speech. Now, Sir, in the light

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

of what we have heard, I want to call attention to one of the florileges of that speech. We have the hon. gentleman asserting that it is impossible to suppose that the United States could do anything so absurd as we have evidence this morning that it has done. The hon. gentleman had the confidence, which was not the confidence of debate but the confidence of defiance, almost aggressive defiance to this side of the House; and, as he did with regard to other matters, he changed his tone, and here is what he said:

The only question of importance is the question of transshipment.

Well, I understood the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Louis Davies) to say that there is no such question in it now at all, although, if I understood him at the beginning of his extraordinary harangue—because I cannot characterize it in any other way—he said that there was a question of transshipment. However, the Minister of the Interior goes on:

That is a question upon which we can give no positive statement, because, although the matter has been brought to the attention of the United States Government, they have not yet expressed an opinion on the subject. It is a question which, if disputed, must be decided either by negotiation or by reference to a competent tribunal.

Which might take six years; but even the Minister of the Interior does not dare to say that the question would be settled in six years.

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. DAVIN. I am trying to imitate the stentorian tones of the Minister of the Interior and of the Minister who has just sat down, and I may quote the lines:

Once upon Afric's sultry shore,
An angry lion gave a dreadful roar;
Another lion made another roar,
And the first lion thought the last a bore.

Sir, I am not going to roar so loud as the Minister of the Interior or the hon. Minister who has just taken his seat; but before I sit down I am going to do what no Minister on the Treasury benches has dared to do—deal with this question in a very few words and in a practical manner. The Minister of the Interior went on:

But it must be evident that it is utterly out of the question for the Government of Canada, under the extraordinary circumstances in which we are placed, to think of opening up diplomatic negotiation and waiting until we got a question of that kind settled, before we proceeded to deal with the building of the railway.

Well, Sir, in the name of all that is rational, would it not be the very thing you would do when you are building on the possibility of being able to tranship? "It would be a ridiculous proposition," said the

hon. gentleman, and then, further on, he said :

They might possibly say that we were entitled to the privilege of transshipment ; but, under the extraordinary circumstances, it would probably take us some time to get them to say so. Under the circumstances, the negotiations might be prolonged for several years.

If the negotiations were to be prolonged for several years, in the mind of the Minister of the Interior, and that was in no way to destroy the usefulness of his 150 mile-route. How comes it that the Prime Minister tells us to-day that it is part of his policy in this Bill not to depend upon Wrangel, but to build down to a Canadian port ? Then, the hon. Minister of the Interior goes on to say, and really that is a specimen of the florilege of the learned gentleman :

And the miners, the poor men, for whom hon. gentlemen opposite expressed such sympathy, if they were waiting for something to eat until we made a treaty with the United States, might be sad and hungry before that treaty was signed.

But, Sir, after what has taken place in the American Senate, even if we pass this measure, these men admitting the urgency, which I do not, may stay hungry for a long time.

Just one word, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the question as to whether there is any alternative line. My right hon. friend the First Minister, like his colleague, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), doubted the idea of the Edmonton route and cast contempt upon the route via Prince Albert. I will at a later period, go into this question, but at the moment allow me to say that a more practical route for reaching the Klondike than the one through the Peace River country and having its termini at Prince Albert and Edmonton does not exist in Canada. That has too the advantage of being an all-Canadian route. After all the talk and worry that we have had about the all-Canadian route, which, it was said, this Bill would give us, where is that route to-day ? In order to turn aside public attention from the position in which the Government is—beaten to its knees—the hon. Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies) took the course he has often taken in court when he has had a bad case. He went howling to the jury, and talked of everything else but the question at issue. He ventured to cast a slur on men who wear on their bosoms the honours given them by Her Majesty for services rendered in building up the Empire ; he ventured to make a charge against men who, unlike himself and those associated with him, who have been for twenty-five years deceiving the people and the Senate of the United States by their misleading eloquence, have a life long record of loyalty—he ventured to say that a veteran hero, like the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) wanted to surrender, when all that he

wanted to do was to save the name and the honour and dignity of the Canadian people. I would ask the right hon. the First Minister and his subordinate—

An hon. MEMBER. Steady.

Mr. DAVIN. I thought at first that I heard the Klondike eagle, but it is the Yukon bray. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who spoke with some force in support of this Bill, had the effrontery to tell this House that it was a proposition to build a railway which would not cost the people a cent. That was one of the beautiful features of the Bill. But the first words that fell from the right hon. First Minister to-day, when he rose to reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition, were to the effect that it was part of the policy of the Government to ask without delay for an appropriation to continue the line right down to a Canadian port. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is evidently part and parcel of the policy of the Government to take up again and again a position and then surrender it ; and as my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) says, when they do surrender it, they get up and boast that they have accomplished some great achievement. The practical position to-day forces us to put the question : What is the use of passing a Bill that will give 3,700,000 acres of gold land to Mann & Mackenzie for building 150 miles of railway, when that Bill contemplates, according to the statement of the First Minister, an extension of 300 miles of railway, which no doubt he will have to bonus Mann & Mackenzie for building. Mr. Jennings calculates that \$23,000 a mile is what the Stikine road will cost ? Are the Government going to bonus this additional extension at the rate of \$23,000 a mile, in spite of the declaration still ringing in our ears that not one cent was to be taken out of the pockets of the Canadian people to build railways to the Klondike ? Evidently they are, because we have the right hon. First Minister declaring that, in spite of this declaration, it has been the policy of the Government all along to build this extension. We shall appeal to you, he exclaims, for an appropriation to extend this line 300 miles, you will then have a Canadian terminus, and we make this appeal because we are a patriotic party. For twenty months these hon. gentlemen have been a patriotic party and have forgotten the cries of twenty years. Out upon such statesmanship, and let me say to the hon. Minister of the Interior he has now a practical exposition of the embodiment of what is and what is not the instinct of government.

Mr. McINERNEY. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a somewhat critical moment in the history of Canada, and that it is our duty, as it is the duty of every patriotic citizen in this country, to advise the Government at this critical time in the sober, solemn and conscientious language of

truth. It is no time, Sir, for faltering. It is time we should tell this Government exactly what its duty is towards this country, and having found what the duty of this Administration is towards the country, to help it in the fulfilment and performance of that duty. That is the position which I for one intend to take, and it is the purpose of expressing my views in that way that I now take my feet. It is plain to anybody that the balloon sent up a few days ago, inflated by the gas of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), has fallen into a sea of trouble, and that the different members of the Administration, after looking around in vain for life buoys and preservers to save themselves, have at last appealed to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) to get up enough wind to blow the wrecked balloon ashore. I was delighted with the position taken to-day by the right hon. leader of the Government when he said, in no mistaken tones, that he believed we have the full and complete right of navigation, carrying with it the incidental right of transshipment at the mouth of the Stikine River at Fort Wrangel. I was glad to see him take that position even though it was not an entirely logical one for him to take. I believe that that was a patriotic stand for the right hon. gentleman to take at this time, but I was ashamed to see him desert it at the very next moment. If we have the right to navigate the Stikine River and transship at Wrangel, why not continue with this Bill and build the road down to that place or as near it as possible? But in the very next breath the hon. gentleman forsook that position because he next proposed to build the road down to Port Simpson. The two positions are inconsistent. If he believed we had the right to navigate the Stikine and transship there, why not stand by that position? Why desert it immediately afterwards and declare that he will build 300 miles further down to Port Simpson.

Then immediately afterwards, discussing the Edmonton route, he asked: How can we possibly build the Edmonton route—1,500 miles of railway from Edmonton to Dawson City? But, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary, in order to have the Edmonton route, to build 1,500 miles of railway. Four hundred miles from Edmonton will carry us to the Liard River and give navigation over the Liard down to Dawson City, and will open up an agricultural country before which there is a great future.

But what I rose particularly to do was to point out the difference between the position taken to-day by the right hon. First Minister, for which I commend him, and that taken a few days ago by his colleague the hon. Minister of Interior (Mr. Sifton) and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell). The Minister of the Interior, in his speech on the second reading said, most distinctly, in answer to the question of the

Mr. McINERNEY.

hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that our rights to the Stikine River had been seriously curtailed by the Treaty of 1871. Is that true or is it not? At page 662 of "Hansard" in his speech, the Minister of the Interior said:

We are indebted to the sublime statesmanship of our friends on the other side for the curtailment, to a very great extent, of the privileges which we did enjoy on the Stikine River.

And, further on, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked him this question:

I rise merely for information, and would ask the hon. gentleman if I am right in understanding him to argue that our rights under the treaty between Russia and Great Britain were curtailed by this provision of the Washington Treaty?

To which the Minister of the Interior replied:

I should say yes. If the hon. gentleman desires to dispute it, I think I will be able to satisfy him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not wish to argue it, but wish to have the hon. gentleman's statement.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. (Reading.) "The navigation of the rivers Yukon and Porcupine and Stikine, ascending and descending from, to and into the sea." Every word of this clause is important. That is, we have the right to get in and out by the sea, not simply from the mouth of the river—because a point might arise there—but we have the right to go to the sea wherever it shall be.

The hon. gentleman sets up a doubt in that sentence, as to whether we have a right to go into the Stikine River from its mouth. Against that position we have the position taken by the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) took up, almost to the same extent, the position assumed by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). I ventured to assert at the time, when I followed him, that no other member of this Administration, no other gentleman on that side of the House, from that time forward would venture to assume any such position in this House. I ventured to point out what the patriotic duty of the Government was, and I am glad to see that the right hon. leader of the House has at last come to a full sense of his duty. The right hon. gentleman, however, was very illogical. He said: We preferred the Stikine River route because it was the only one on which we had navigation rights; it was the only all-Canadian route. The right hon. gentleman must have read the Treaty of 1871; he must have read the provisions of the treaty, the finishing clause of section 26 of which reads:

That the navigation rights shall be subject to any law and regulation of either country within its own territory not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

Now, he must have known, when he chose

the Stikine River route, that navigation of the river was subject to the laws and regulations of the United States. I am here to take the position boldly, that this treaty is no curtailment of the rights we gained under the Treaty of 1825; for under the Treaty of 1825 we had only commercial rights; we had not the right to take an armed force, or even a police force, up the Stikine River. Our rights were simply the rights of commercial navigation, and these same rights guaranteed by the Treaty of 1825 were maintained under the Treaty of 1871. But, in the next breath, the right hon. gentleman stated that we owned Dyea. If Dyea is our property, if he believes it to be our property, why not build the road to Dyea, for there then would be less difficulty about the Dyea route into the Yukon than there is about the Stikine route. But the hon. gentleman comes down and, though he does not make the formal proposition, we can infer from what he says that he is prepared to saddle the country with the additional expense of building 200 miles further to Port Simpson, and this only as the tail end of a proposition by which he gives Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann no less than four million acres of the rich mining land of that region for the building of 150 miles of road. After they had given a price which would build the line by the Edmonton route, he proposes a further subsidy to build this 200 miles south to Port Simpson. What we have protested against, do protest against, and will continue to protest against, is this tremendous grant of public lands to this company for the building of a bit of road that is of no practical value.

But I rose particularly to make the protest which I now proceed to make. As a member coming from the maritime provinces, I hold dear the interests of the fishermen down by the sea. I wish to warn this Government, to advise this Government, to admonish this Government, that they shall not, in making any arrangement with the United States authorities, barter away, exchange or sacrifice in any manner the rights and privileges that our fishermen enjoy at the present time. What are these rights? Everybody who knows anything of that part of the country knows that the fishermen from Cape Ann and Gloucester come up to the Gulf of St. Lawrence every year. They must bring with them stores for a season's fishing and bait for a season's fishing, or pay the tax of \$1.25 per ton. Their vessels are from 100 to 150 tons. They would feel such a tax, and they do not pay it. Our fishermen go out into the same waters and enter into competition with them. They catch the same description of fish, they take the same riches from the storehouse of the sea. And, when it comes to marketing their catch, they find that their great markets are in the United States. But, when they enter into competition with the American fishermen in that market, they

find a duty of from 1 cent to 1½ cents per pound against them on the whole catch. What I protest against is the idea that, while Americans put upon our fishermen a handicap of from 1 cent to 1½ cents per pound on our fish, American fishermen shall be allowed the same rights and privileges on our Atlantic waters as our fishermen enjoy. I ask this Government to be true to the interests of the country, and particularly to the rights of the hardy men down by the sea, the fishermen of the maritime provinces—to be true to them and for no consideration to barter away their heritage for any concession that the American Government may seek to extract from us. I endeavoured to say a short time ago, that, looking at the route which the Government has chosen, looking at the tremendous gift we are making for the building of this road, looking at the temper of the American people at that time, we might expect that they would endeavour, from the vantage ground on which they stand, to wrench from the Government concessions and conditions prejudicial to the people of Canada. I hope—and this is the advice I have to give the Government—that, as patriotic men, they will not sacrifice the interests of any part of Canada or any portion of its people.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I wondered why it was that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInerney) who has just taken his seat, was so anxious to give us his views upon this question; but the mystery has been explained by the strong "piscatorial effluvium" which appeared towards the end of his remarks.

Mr. McINERNEY. It was not a horse-stable effluvium.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The hon. gentleman is a very eloquent and pleasing speaker, and shows evidence of having careful training in his youth, however much he may have departed from the way in which he should go. He displays great commiseration for the poor fishermen, and says he would not under any circumstance barter away their rights. But he forgets, perhaps, that his views have undergone a change since 1888, when the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), who was not then his leader, I believe, in that memorable Treaty of 1888, was prepared to give away the very rights for which the hon. gentleman so stoutly contends to-day. The hon. gentleman, though perhaps somewhat thrasonical in his speech, is a very worthy and respected member of this House, and his remarks on the Yukon Railway and the Yukon contract will be entitled to a great deal more attention after he has mastered the geography of that northern country.

I am very certain that no member who has spoken on this subject hitherto in this House has displayed the same amount of crude and crass ignorance in regard to the north-western part of the Dominion of Canada, as has the hon. gentleman who has just

taken his seat, and I am sure those gentlemen who know that country, and who understand to some extent at least the geography of that country, will have that opinion very much strengthened by his remarks in regard to the Edmonton route this afternoon, when he speaks about building to the Liard River. He speaks as did the hon. gentleman who preceded him, he drags in again the tremendous amount of land, and the value of the land which is being given to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann on account of the construction of this railway. That land appears to be a nightmare on that hon. gentleman's brain. Now I would like to make a proposition, I am not making this proposition officially, but I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they think it would be possible at the present time to get a syndicate in Canada which would take up 3,750,000 acres of that land at \$1 an acre, that land to be selected on the same terms as this proposed to be transferred to Mackenzie & Mann, and the money to be paid before the goods are delivered?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Well, now, let us look at that matter in a business-like way. I do not believe that any such syndicate could be formed in Canada to-day; and I would like for my part to have some guarantee of the bona fides of those hon. gentlemen who say, yes. Now this road is going to be, as we all know, a very expensive road to build, and \$1 an acre, which would only be \$3,750,000, or \$25,000 per mile, is a small estimate for what that road is going to cost. A great deal has been said about the value of the land, that I do not think is of very much importance. I think I have answered fairly well all the remarks of the last speaker, and I will now deal with a much more congenial subject. We all like to hear the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) speak. When the hon. member for West Assiniboia rises to speak the House at once assumes an attitude of expectation. It always reminds me of a story of a little boy whose mamma got a stammering station agent to tell her a dozen times what time the 12 o'clock train would pass the station. The station agent finally wanted an explanation why the lady asked him so often the same question. Oh, she says, it doesn't matter to me, I know perfectly well what you said, but my little boy likes to see your mouth work. Now that is about the explanation of the popularity of the hon. member for West Assiniboia in this House, this House likes to see the hon. member's mouth work. The hon. member talks very loudly and very eloquently; in fact, as he describes it himself, he roars, and he roared at a great rate about this all-Canadian route, and about the difficulties of transshipment, and the difficulties that were going to be thrown in our way by the United States Senate. Now, it is a well

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

understood fact that we do not need to tranship at Wrangel at all. We have heard a great many arguments in this House based on the ground that transshipment at Wrangel is going to be prevented, but that is not necessary at all. The Hudson Bay Company navigate the Stikine River from Port Simpson, during the season of navigation, with flat-bottomed boats. Gentlemen who are familiar with the case know perfectly well that navigation on the inland waters of that coast is perfectly safe, with the exception of crossing the mouth of Dixon's entrance, and that is dangerous to vessels of any kind when the wind is high. So there is no very great difficulty. We have an all-Canadian route without any doubt. Again and again we have asked hon. gentlemen opposite if they have any thing better to propose, but there is nothing better they can propose. But the hon. member for West Assiniboia dilated very largely upon this. The hon. gentleman talks a great deal in this House, and perhaps it would be as well for him to understand a little more about some of the things he talks on before he takes up so much of the time of this House in regard to them. Now I want just to say a word or two in regard to another matter which has been brought up several times in this House.

Mr. DAVIN. Would my hon. friend answer me a question?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. If I can.

Mr. DAVIN. Would you like my knowledge to be as profound and correct as that of your leader the Minister of the Interior?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Well, now, on that ground I would not feel quite so safe when the hon. gentleman rose to speak. I am very glad indeed that that hon. gentleman is not gifted as highly as my hon. leader, the Minister of the Interior. He sits on the wrong side of the House, but if the hon. gentleman were to mend his ways and come over here, then I think perhaps he would increase his knowledge on a great many subjects. The hon. gentleman is a very fine speaker, it is his principal avocation. As I understand, he has done little or nothing else in all his life, and consequently he is very good at it. But he goes far afield some times for his similes. I heard him during this session compare my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to the devil.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Of course he took a very polite devil. He went to Milton and brought Beelzebub, and he compared the hon. Premier to Beelzebub. And just to show how consistent these hon. gentlemen are on the opposite side, I think it was only the day before that the ex-Minister of Finance compared him to Marguerite. Now you know it is pretty hard for a man to maintain his composure when he is com-

pared by one hon. gentleman to Marguerite and by another to Beelzebub. The hon. member for West Assiniboia appears to have gone deeply into diabolical literature, he seems to have studied the devil to a great extent, to have followed out his whole life, and, I have no doubt, not only his life but his works. His works have received considerable attention at the hands of the member for West Assiniboia. But I would like to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to another poetical devil who has appeared of late years, and that is the devil created by the famous author of *Our Lady of the Snows*. If the hon. gentleman will consult the works of that author, he will find that in addition to Milton and other poets whom he consulted in his researches after a devil, that distinguished author has also created a devil. In one of his poems on the devil he has, I think, given the most apt description of the speeches of the hon. member for Assiniboia that I have ever heard, and I am sure this House will realize the similarity as soon as they hear the quotation. The devil sent out his imps to search a poor unfortunate who had arrived at his gates, and they came back with this report—and I am sure hon. gentlemen will recognize the likeness after hearing one of the hon. gentleman's speeches—the report was this :

We have threshed a stook of print and book,
And winnowed a chattering wind ;
And many a soul from whom he stole,
But his we cannot find.

Now, Sir, I am sure that that is a very apt description of the hon. gentleman. I have risen from my seat this afternoon, not so much to discuss this important question that has come before us to-day, as to call attention to the readiness of the hon. member for West Assiniboia to take up the time of this House. I trust that we will hear no more of this nonsense in this debate. We have gone on now for three weeks wasting valuable time, not only of this House but of this country, and we are tired of it, and I am sure the people of this country are tired of it. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been asked, time and again, to suggest anything better than this contract which has been laid before the House, and I hope they will do it or let us come to a vote in a short time, because we are all tired of this chattering wind of talk, and I hope we will hear no more of it. I apologize humbly for taking up the time of the House, but at the same time I could not help bringing in that exceedingly apt description of the hon. member for West Assiniboia.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has treated us to somewhat of a confidential lecture as to the manner in which we should conduct ourselves in debate in this House. He has referred to the sublime ignorance of my able hon. friend from Kent, N.B. (Mr. McInerney) and to my able hon. friend from West Assini-

boia (Mr. Davin), as frittering away the time; and he then continued his speech by contributing to this discussion a profound knowledge of the Yukon Railway deal, and has continued to consume the time of the House by giving us good solid information which we all value, and which we all received with gratitude. I do not rise for the purpose of discussing any point which the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) referred to, because of points there were none; but I rise for the purpose of saying a word or so germane to the subject under discussion this afternoon, and perhaps incidentally to the larger question which has been dragged into the debate by members, especially on the Government side, as a defence of the propositions which have been made to the House. I am sure this House was delighted this afternoon at the calm and judicial manner in which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries discussed this great international question. For my part, I felt when I listened to his calm and judicious speech, that it was a time when all party feelings should disappear, that we should unite around that common, unbiassed and non-partisan standard he raised and support him in almost everything he proposed, so loud was his loyalty and so at variance were his statements with the facts he presented.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries told the House this afternoon that his youthful training led him at all times to appear as a friend of this country, and never to interject at a critical moment a word which might discredit this country or weaken its case abroad. I can only say that the hon. Minister for fifteen or sixteen years cast to the winds his youthful training, and on every possible occasion in this House at most critical times in the history of this country, the hon. gentleman was found not following out his youthful training, but discrediting the Government, weakening the Canadian case and in every possible way, as the evidence in "Hansard" will show to a conclusion, strengthening the case of his American friends on this continent, as he dealt with trade matters, with fishery matters and with international disputes generally. And the very same fervour he displayed this afternoon was used hundreds of times from the desk in front of me when he fought against the late Government, which, whatever its mistakes, did its best to maintain British connection and to fight for British rights and privileges on the continent of America.

And what else did the hon. gentleman do? He attempted in the remarks he addressed to the House to discredit a British statesman, the leader of the Opposition in this House. Well, Sir, this House does not need a certificate of character for the leader of the Opposition from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. For forty years my hon. friend has been in public life in this

country and has been in the forefront of the battle, and I challenge the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to place his finger on a single line in all that forty years' record to show that the leader of the Opposition has not fought for the maintenance of British and Canadian rights on this continent. There is little reward for patriotism in Canadian politics if a mere tyro, and I say it advisedly, such as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is able to rise and attack the record of a man who, with his faults—and we all have our faults—was never yet charged, either in British or American circles, with having deserted the fight for British and Canadian rights on this continent. Not only did the Minister of Marine make this attack, but the hon. gentleman was not sure of his facts.

What is the point before the House this afternoon. If I have grasped it, it is this: The question has been raised as to interference by the American people with certain rights and privileges, which under the Treaty of Washington we believe and assert we hold with regard to the navigation of the Stikine and other rivers. The question has arisen as to why an anti-Canadian feeling has been created among the people of the United States, and why they seek to interfere with what are our undoubted rights and privileges in connection with that treaty. It has been asserted on this side of the House, and asserted with faith in the truth of that statement, that the anti-Canadian feeling, or if you like to put it, the anti-Conservative feeling, the feeling of the United States people against the Conservative Administration, was created, inflamed and excited by hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches at the present time. I am open to correction when I say that at this moment the anti-Canadian feeling, the feeling that we were dependent on the pleasure of the United States, which exists there, would not exist at the present time to one-thousandth part of its present dimensions had it not been for the speeches delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and by the right hon. Premier, who though now he holds a place in the Privy Council of Great Britain, was at that time, not the paid advocate, but certainly the advocate of the American contention on the questions of international law. On the other side we have the statement of the Minister of Marine that that feeling has been caused by the arbitrary and very severe conduct of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in connection with the Treaty of 1818. That is, as I understand it, and the hon. Minister can deny what I say if that was not his contention in this House.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I did not say it was caused by that. But I said the hon. member for

Mr. MONTAGUE.

York (Mr. Foster) was very severely reprimanded by the hon. leader of the Opposition when he introduced a Bill to approve the Washington Treaty, and the hon. gentleman stated he would be sorry to take the responsibility of endorsing that regulation, for it had brought the country to the verge of war.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am pleased the hon. gentleman has made his statement, because the subject is now fresh within the memory of the House. The hon. gentleman will perhaps permit me to go over it. The hon. gentleman has said practically this, that when the present leader of the Opposition came back to this country as one of the plenipotentiaries who negotiated the Treaty of 1888 with the Americans as regards the fisheries, he found it necessary to severely reprimand his present colleague the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), who was then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for having conducted his department so as to cause a very strong feeling or irritation among the people of the United States, and he so stated in his speech in the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us ascertain how much truth there is in this statement. The hon. gentleman can send, if he wishes, for the "Hansard" of 1888, volume I., and in order that the hon. gentleman may not trouble himself to find the page, I will state that Sir Charles Tupper's speech appears on page 673.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I have got it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am glad he has. The hon. gentleman never read it, or he misstated it with a knowledge of the facts. If the hon. gentleman had it, I say, he either did not read it or has stated what is incorrect, or he stated what was incorrect after he read it. As I stated this afternoon, I challenge the hon. gentleman to point to one single act, during the forty years of his public life, which would show that the leader of the Opposition had deserted the fight for British and Canadian rights upon this continent of America. I challenge him (Sir Louis Davies) as a member of the Government, after having made that deliberate statement in this House—I challenge him to read line after line of that speech, and to find a single utterance which would bear out the statement he made this afternoon. Now, Sir, I shall read to the House the reference of the present leader of the Opposition to the administration of the Department of Fisheries, and I shall read it for the benefit of the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) and allow him to draw his own conclusions. Here it is ("Hansard," p. 676, second column), and the then plenipotentiary, Sir Charles Tupper, declared as follows:—

When my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was compelled to adopt the same

policy that had been adopted by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who organized that department with great ability, and who filled the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries with equally great ability during a considerable time—I say when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries fell back upon the same policy his predecessor had adopted under like circumstances and took such measures as were absolutely necessary and indispensable for the protection of the rights and interests of the fishermen of Canada, the United States complained bitterly.

Is there any condemnation there? Is it not a declaration that the steps taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were absolutely necessary and indispensable for the protection of Canadian rights and interests? A few lines further down, Sir Charles Tupper says:

The result was that, as before, collisions occurred. Those parties brought themselves under the operation of the law, and it was absolutely necessary, as I have said, in the defence of the rights of Canadian fishermen, to make examples of those parties who showed that disregard for law. The result was, an entirely erroneous impression grew up through the United States.

Is there any condemnation there? Not a single word, not a single line. Then, go to page 677 of "Hansard":

Although we were not giving an ungenerous or an extreme interpretation to the treaty at all,—

Mark you these words:

—but were simply doing that, which my hon. friend opposite found it necessary to do, as did his successor, that is, to defend the just rights of the fishermen of Canada—and no Government would be worthy of the name who would shrink for a single moment from that duty—the result was that because we took this action the sentiment of public men in the United States became inflamed, and instead of thinking of anything like increased freedom of commercial intercourse or of anything that was calculated to be of advantage or benefit to the two countries, they had recourse to the passage of what was called a retaliatory Act.

Now, I want to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, where he finds his condemnation in that? Sir Charles Tupper declares here that the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Foster) was carrying out the provisions of a treaty that was absolutely necessary for the protection of the rights of Canadian fishermen, and he further declares: No Government could exist in Canada, or would be worthy of the name of a Government, that did not carry out the same policy which the late Minister of Finance, then the Minister of Fisheries, had carried out on behalf of Canada. You will find that in every line of his that refers to the action of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as regards this dispute in connection with the rights of the Canadian and American fishermen, the administration of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) of the Fisheries Department is backed up and defended by

the gentleman who made the Treaty of 1888 with the United States. In the face of these facts, what did the old country say, what did the Government of Great Britain say?

Sir, we are all aware that the Government of Great Britain is anxious for the most amicable feeling to exist between herself and her great daughter upon this side of the Atlantic. She takes the greatest possible pains that that amicable feeling should exist, and if the Government of Canada had acted in an arbitrary and mean and contemptible spirit, we should not have had merely the reprimand of Sir Charles Tupper, who was the plenipotentiary to the United States, but we should have had the reprimand of the Government of Great Britain herself. Instead of the reprimand of the Government of Great Britain, the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) ought to know, as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the Government of Canada then received the commendation of the Home Government for the careful, and painstaking, and just manner in which we had dealt with this question as between the United States and Canada, or, if you like, as between the United States and Great Britain. So I say, that the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies), this afternoon, and made for the purpose of showing the country, or attempting to show the country, that it was the Conservative party that created this ill-feeling in the United States towards Canada—that statement is absolutely false and unfounded. I have shown, Sir, that in the speech which the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) referred to as his foundation for that statement, there is not one jot or tittle of justification for any such statement.

But to speak of the treaty matter a little further. Where does the right hon. the present Prime Minister stand? As you are well aware, all the parties to that Treaty of 1888 confirmed it with the exception of the Senate of the United States. You remember that the Senate of the United States rejected that treaty, and, Sir, while the action of the Senate was yet alive in regard to it, the right hon. the present Prime Minister of this country stood up in St. Thomas and declared that the United States Senate were correct, that we had been wrong, and that our treatment of the people of the United States had been mean and contemptible. I ask, then, in regard to this treaty matter, who it was that created this feeling against the people of Canada in the minds of statesmen, as well as of ordinary citizens in the United States? Who was it but the Prime Minister of this Dominion? Who was it but the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who, not satisfied with talking this rot, and trash, and rubbish to Canadian audiences, went abroad, to the United States, and there deliberately offered our commercial freedom as a price to the United States. Sir, I have heard a good many queer things in this Parliament, but I never

expected to hear hon. gentlemen opposite charge that it was gentlemen upon this side of the House, members of the Conservative party, who had created a feeling of irritation in the minds of the people of the United States in regard to the people of Canada.

Now, Sir, just one word and I have done, and that word is this: I was in this House when the first reading of this Yukon Railway Bill was moved by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), and I want to ask the Government now, whether or not the difficulty which has cropped up at this stage, and which is a very serious difficulty indeed, was not fully pointed out at the time this Bill was introduced. We asked the question of the gentleman who introduced the Bill: Before you come to a conclusion to construct the railway which you refer to in this contract, have you found out whether it is likely that there will be any international difficulties as regards the all-Canadian nature of that route? And, Sir, we had the Minister of Railways compelled to confess to this House, that he had made no inquiries, that the subject had not received consideration.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I beg your pardon. That is not correct, you know.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, it may be a little incorrect as regards the words; I am speaking, of course, entirely from memory; but I will tell him this: That the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) said he was not aware that any inquiries had been made about the matter. What a position the hon. gentleman is in—a leading member of the Government, a Minister of Railways and Canals, speaking for the Government of Canada, dealing with a matter involving the handing over of 3,750,000 acres of territory to contractors, and saying this afternoon that he did not even take the pains to inquire whether a great question involved in it had been touched upon, or whether inquiries had been made in regard to it. That was not the object. The object was to rush through the Bill, it did not make any difference whether international complications would arise or not. We had an inkling, just a little inkling, in the speech of the hon. Prime Minister in an early part of the debate, of what might happen. He said that this road was only a temporary expedient, or something to that effect. A temporary expedient, surely, because we had the admission from him this afternoon that this Parliament is only on the threshold of Yukon deals—only on the stepping-stone of the great staircase that leads up to Yukon deals. We are giving away 3,750,000 acres of mineral lands in the Yukon for 150 miles of railway; and then we have to build, I think he said, 250 miles more before we have an all-Canadian route. In other words, he is giving away surely all that this country can afford to give of the golden Yukon,

Mr. MONTAGUE.

and he has not got a railway at all. To my mind, no more extraordinary position was ever taken by a Government in this country. It seems that the whole thing was rushed and bungled from the beginning. It seems that there was no inquiry as to the cost of the railway, no inquiry as to these international questions, no real inquiry as to any of the great factors involved in the construction of this railway, but that the deal had to be consummated in a very few days, and this country must suffer by reason of the neglect of hon. gentlemen in these respects. I have risen, however, specially for the purpose of pointing out the weakness in the statement of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I shall be glad now to conclude in order that that hon. gentleman may be able to give his evidence to the House that Sir Charles Tupper, if I may be excused for naming him, castigated the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries for his unkind treatment of the United States in connection with the fisheries question.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Mr. Speaker, I notice that the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, put the question as he considered it to be before the House this afternoon, but during the whole of his remarks carefully avoided dealing with that question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Will my hon. friend allow me a moment? The hon. gentleman asks me for the reference I made in Sir Charles Tupper's speech. I made reference to two statements. The one was where he declared that the two countries had been brought to the verge of commercial war, and the other was that there was a very thin and narrow partition between that state of things and an actual war. The language, on page 690, is this:

Now, having referred to the various provisions of the treaties, I am happy to say that I shall have to detain the House but a few minutes longer; but I would like to draw the attention of the House to what has been accomplished by this treaty. I have told you what position Canada stood in with regard to the United States of America, before the initiation of these proceedings. I have told that we stood face to face with an enactment which had been put on the statute-book by a unanimous vote of Congress, ratified by the President, providing for non-intercourse between the United States and Canada. I need not tell you that the Bill meant commercial war, that it meant not only the suspension of friendly feeling and intercourse between two countries, but that it involved much more than that. If that Bill had been brought into operation by the proclamation of the President of the United States, I have no hesitation in saying that we stood in the relation to that great country of commercial war, and the line is very narrow which separates a commercial war between two countries from an actual war.

So far with regard to the actual state of matters which the hon. gentleman was

describing when he went to Washington to negotiate a treaty; the countries had been brought to the verge of commercial war, and there was little difference between that and actual war.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not by Canada. You are referring to the Bill signed by the United States President.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am referring to the conditions which the hon. gentleman found existing when he went to negotiate a treaty. On a previous page, 687, where the hon. gentleman was leading up to this declaration, where he was referring to the gentleman who brought about on the part of Canada these conditions—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What else was he referring to? The hon. gentleman said:

I need not inform the House that in diplomatic intercourse it is customary, it is right, for the representatives of a government to state the strongest and most advanced ground that they possibly can sustain in relation to any question, and I would not like, I confess, to be tried before the House by the ground taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Could anything be stronger than that?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are the words, "Minister of Marine and Fisheries" there?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend has raised some doubt as to whether I have read correctly from the record. Considering the long number of years that I have been in this House—

Mr. MONTAGUE. I accept your statement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I hope the hon. gentleman would not insinuate that in reading a passage from "Hansard," I would be low or mean enough to read what is not there.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend think that is a sufficient apology for his misrepresentation?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I not only think it was a pretty good castigation, but I remember when it was given how mean the hon. gentleman looked under it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries rose to prove the allegation he had made in a previous portion of this debate—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. Minister of Agriculture pardon me for a moment, while I take away even the ground which the hon. gentleman has built up for himself. It is true, the language quoted by the hon.

Minister of Marine and Fisheries was used by Sir Charles Tupper. When he discussed this matter, he said:

I need not inform the House that in diplomatic intercourse it is customary, it is right, for the representatives of a government to state the strongest and most advanced ground that they possibly can sustain in relation to any question, and I would not like, I confess, to be tried before the House by the ground taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The ground they took was quite right.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is what I call a castigation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman seems to think that in reading that, he has proved conclusively that the present leader of the Opposition did not castigate his present colleague (Mr. Foster) who sits behind him. But if this ground was rightly taken, if the Ministers of that day had right and justice on their side, why was it that the then plenipotentiary came back from Washington and informed this House that he was not prepared to be tried on that ground. We all know full well that the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) came back from Washington, having found that the Government of that day in Ottawa had brought this country to the verge of commercial war, which was only a short step from actual war, and took the then Government by the throat and forced them to change their policy and take other ground. He knew, from his position in Washington as plenipotentiary, that the Imperial authorities were not prepared to back up this country in the position which the Canadian Government had taken. He knew full well that the Government at Ottawa had taken a position which was untenable in the face of that taken by the Washington authorities, and forced the Canadian Government to turn right-about face.

The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) took a long time to discuss what had been quoted and said by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) and some little time to discuss the details of this contract, but did not really touch the question which has arisen here this afternoon at all. He spoke of the interference by the Bill which has just passed the United States Senate with our treaty rights on the Stikine River. Sir, we contend that that Bill, including its clause 13, does not interfere with and does not militate against our treaty rights on the Stikine River. It does not interfere with those rights, because by the treaty we have the right, apart from the bonding privilege, of navigating for commercial purposes the Stikine River. We contend that the privilege of using that highway for commercial purposes entitles us to use it without bonding the goods which may pass up and down it. We contend that we have the

privilege of transshipping goods, if necessary to carry on the ordinary and commercial use of the Stikine River as an international highway, and that we have the right of mooring in the river and doing all that may be necessary to our enjoyment of our treaty rights and privileges.

But hon. gentlemen opposite evidently suppose that if our goods are billed from Klondike to any point in Canada up the Stikine River, they must necessarily be bonded at Wrangel. There is no need for taking that position, and in doing so these hon. gentlemen are putting a weapon into the hands of our adversaries at Washington and trying to enable them to interfere with our acknowledged treaty rights.

One hon. gentleman opposite—I think it was the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster)—said that Mr. Hansbrough had obtained information from Canada which made him believe that the Canadian Government were prepared to agree to the stipulations of clause 13 in the American Senate Bill, and intimated that the information must have come from our party or Government. Sir, is it at all likely, if such information has been conveyed to Hansbrough or anybody else in Washington, it would have come from the party and the Government who are to-day trying to put through this contract, which hon. gentlemen opposite say is contingent upon these provisions not existing. On the contrary, if there is any suspicion as to where that information may have come from in Canada, the suspicion would naturally fasten on hon. gentlemen opposite who are to-day obstructing the passages of this Bill for an all-Canadian route and the free navigation of the Stikine. If there are any people in Canada interested in obstruction to our free navigation of the Stikine, it is hon. gentlemen opposite who have been contending for a long time that this is not an all-Canadian route. Before this debate began, the hon. leader of the Opposition approved of this route and contract on the ground that it was an all-Canadian route, yet to-day he tells the country and our enemies in the United States that he favours the withdrawal of the Bill because the American Senate have declared that bonding privileges at Wrangel may be dependent on our giving the Americans bonding privileges on fish on the Atlantic coast. Not because the free navigation of the Stikine is to be interfered with or the commercial use of that highway, but simply because a question as to bonding privileges has arisen in the Congress at Washington, he urges the Government of Canada to withdraw this Bill which is not at all dependent upon such a privilege, and is not interfered with by the Bill at Washington.

The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) said, a few moments ago, that my right hon. friend, the leader of the Government, had gone down to Washington with the proposition that all these questions of dif-

Mr. FISHER.

ference between us and the United States should be settled in a lump, and he implied therefrom that the right hon. leader of the Government was prepared to accept this partial proposition contained in this clause 13 of the Senate Bill. But surely the fact that my right hon. friend proposed to the United States a commission to adjust all the difficulties between the two countries in one lump, must make it evident that he would not accept for one moment this partial proposition with regard to the special privilege of bonding at Wrangel and on the Atlantic Coast. The course of the right hon. First Minister shows evidently that it is quite impossible he should have undertaken to accept for a moment clause 13 of this Senate Bill; and the hon. gentleman's fears in this regard should have been set at rest by the specific statement which the leader of the Government made this afternoon. But the hon. gentleman went on to say that we ought to leave off the construction of this road until we found out about the right of navigating the Stikine. He wants us to indefinitely postpone its construction. It means that the hon. gentleman is prepared to postpone indefinitely the completing of any railway into the Yukon territory, at least so far as this year is concerned. It means that the hon. gentleman is willing to run the risk of starvation in the Yukon country this year, that the hon. gentleman is prepared not to provide the facilities necessary for the entry of these thousands of people who, we know, are rushing into that country, and whom we wish to see enter that country to develop it and help to assume part of the public obligations of Canada and develop trade and business throughout the country.

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

After Recess.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at eight o'clock.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I had pointed out that the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) had not really touched upon the main issue before the House, that is to say, the issue raised by the leader of the Opposition, who moved the adjournment of the House in order to declare that in consequence of the passage of a certain Bill by the American Senate, a Bill which touches upon the question of bonding at Wrangel, we should therefore withdraw the Bill now before the House to ratify the contract between the Government and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and should immediately make arrangements for an entirely different route into the Yukon. This is the real question, and I wish to point out most distinctly, that the Government do not consider that the question of bonding at

Wrangel has any relation whatever to the free navigation for commercial purposes of the Stikine River, that this Bill passed by the Senate, even if it were to become law, would not interfere with the description of the Stikine-Teslin route as an all-Canadian route, because we believe and contend that under the Washington Treaty Canadian subjects may ship goods up the Stikine River without bonding at Wrangel, and therefore without being in any way interfered with. Believing this, I am surprised that the hon. leader of the Opposition should have taken the step he has taken. I wish to refer to another remark of the hon. member for Haldimand—I think it was he—who said that before we made such a contract as this, we ought to have taken steps to find out whether the American Government would allow the free navigation of the Stikine River, or would be disposed to put obstacles in our way in the enjoyment of that navigation and of the perfect freedom of this Stikine-Teslin route. I am surprised to find any hon. gentleman on the other side, or any citizen of this country anywhere, suggesting that before we introduce legislation into the Parliament of Canada, we should go on our bended knees to the American Senate, or the American Congress, and ask them whether they are going to carry out their treaty stipulations and their treaty obligations. That is not of a piece with the conduct of Canadian affairs in the past. I must give credit to the hon. gentleman himself and most of his colleagues, by saying that it is not of a piece with their usual practice or with the practice of any Canadian statesman or any public men, that before we undertake legislation in the Parliament of Canada, we should go to the American authorities practically to ask their permission. I do not think that the suggestion was made with any thought or forethought. And I am sure that the hon. gentleman and those alongside of him will try to remove the impression from the people of this country that they would assume such a position for a moment. But, Sir, the hon. leader of the Opposition to-day made a statement as to what he would do, as an alternate proposition. He said to me, that he would at once take steps to build a road on to Alice Arm or the Portland Channel, to continue the road down to a seaport which is open all the year around and undoubtedly in Canadian territory. Sir, that is one of the schemes that is under consideration at the present moment, a part of the scheme the Government has actually laid before the House. The road to be built between the Stikine River and Teslin Lake is but one portion of the scheme which, if it is found necessary in the future, the Government of Canada is prepared to carry out. But the hon. gentleman would have us go on with this at once before an opportunity is given the United States authorities to put obstacles in our way of the full enjoyment of our treaty rights. I am surprised at the

hon. gentleman bringing forward this scheme to-day, because it was only last Friday that the hon. gentleman was applauding and endorsing an amendment to a Bill that was before the House of an entirely different character, an amendment moved by his lieutenant from the city of Halifax (Mr. Borden), which does not outline in any way, or in any sense, what the hon. gentleman has proposed this afternoon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It does, exactly.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. An amendment that is drawn in such a way is of such a milk-and-water character that it is impossible to say what it means, an amendment which does not commit the hon. gentleman or any of his followers to any route, which does not commit them in any way to any means of securing the building of the road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It says, "by the best available route."

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Which may be any route. We have had some of the hon. gentleman's supporters, this afternoon, declaring that the best route was the Edmonton route; we have had the hon. gentleman's supporter, the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), declaring that the best route was the Dyea route; we have had the hon. gentleman himself declaring that the Teslin Lake-Stikine route was the best and only available route. What, then, does it mean? The hon. gentleman says this amendment means the best available route, and the object of the amendment which he was applauding on Friday, and to-day he tells us that the route which must be chosen is the Stikine-Teslin route, extended to Alice Arm—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Or Kitinat Arm.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Or some other Canadian port. I am surprised to find this, though perhaps I should not be surprised when I find the hon. gentleman change his mind so completely upon this question already this session. But I confess I am much surprised that the hon. gentleman should have taken the stand that he has taken this afternoon, in so completely giving away, so far as he can do it, the treaty rights of the Canadian people and the Canadian Government. I will do him the justice to say that in this he does not live up to the reputation for courage which he has always enjoyed. He has generally been able vigorously to uphold the rights of Canada. He has generally been in a position where he has been able to lead. But now I find him following some of his followers—or shall I call them his leaders?—just as, a few days ago, after he had declared himself in favour of this proposal, he followed his followers, and declared himself against the Bill. For the last few days of the debate on this contract, the course of gentlemen on

the other side has led up to this situation. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been declaring that this Stikine-Teslin route was not an all-Canadian route. but because the American Government might put an obstacle in our way and interfere with our free navigation of the Stikine River at Fort Wrangel, the hon. gentleman to-day, following his supporters, comes forward and tells us that the Canadian Government must withdraw their Bill because of this law which he says has been passed in the American Congress. I am surprised that an hon. gentleman, with the force of character, with the reputation for courage, and with the reputation for insistence in asserting his opinion, should have fallen so far away from his former position and reputation, and that to-day, the moment he sees a shadow of legislation in Washington which he thinks may hurt our route, he is prepared at any cost, in order to defeat a Government Bill, to come here and ask that the whole contention and position of Canada on this treaty right which we have in regard to the Stikine River, should be given up and acknowledged to be without force and effect. I do not expect it from the hon. leader of the Opposition, I regret to see that he has taken this position, and that in doing so he seems to be committing his party, so far as he is able to do so, to the unpatriotic and pusillanimous position that the Canadian Government should withdraw their legislation simply because a Bill has been introduced into the United States Senate to interfere with our bonding privileges, especially as this bonding privilege is not necessary to the full enjoyment of our treaty rights, and to the full enjoyment of the commercial navigation of the Stikine River.

Mr. POPE. This has certainly been an afternoon of humiliation for hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I fancy such a spectacle has never been witnessed before in this or in any other Parliament, and it has put the hon. gentlemen to the test in a work in which they have had considerable experience, that is, in turning right angles in their political way of getting forward. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat did not rise because he knew anything in particular about this contract, outside of the reservation of the arable lands around the North Pole, and outside of what he might be able to judge of this motion as a milk-and-water proposition. As Minister of Agriculture we would expect him to be able to express an opinion upon the proportion of milk and water that are contained in the amendment of the Opposition, but beyond that we had no right to expect much from the hon. gentleman. But every Minister who has spoken upon the other side must speak again, they must put themselves right. They have taken one position in

Mr. FISHER.

this House, and to-day they must taken another; and every Minister of the Crown is bound, as opportunity presents itself, to rise in this House and state his new position to the people of this country. They have been discussing the question of loyalty. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said in his remarks, which were somewhat cool and collected, that he had a right to charge us upon this side of the House with being disloyal. Mr. Speaker, I have not been many many years a member of this House, consequently it cannot be so many years ago since I remember the hon. gentleman who is now Postmaster General proposing a resolution of loyalty in this House, after a certain general election in which the Liberal party had taken part in a manner which you never hear them refer to now, in which they had been condemned as a disloyal people for having fraternized with the people on the other side of the line, for having courted their assistance in every possible way, a time when Mr. Wiman's name was a household word in this country, and they could not make a forward movement in their political programme without consulting him. Well, Sir, at that time I, for one, as a member of this House, took part in that whitewashing arrangement—not that we needed it, no man inside this House or outside of it, thought that the Conservative party needed to pass a loyalty resolution; but in order that those hon. gentlemen might present a decent and respectable appearance before the people of Canada, I consented to apply the whitewash brush, and I rose in my seat and voted for that resolution, in order that those hon. gentlemen might be made presentable before the people of Canada. Now, Sir, after having taken part in that work, I think it is extremely unfair for an hon. gentleman who has just been across the water and received special honours from Her Majesty, to come back and, forgetting our kindness upon that occasion when they were in a minority, to use the language that he has used to-night. Now, Sir, the Minister of Agriculture, in his speech which he delivered a few days ago, made use of the following language:

In the first place, the Government look to making an all-Canadian route. We took that as the principle which we thought necessary to maintain and make the essence of the contract. We have succeeded in doing that, and hon. gentlemen opposite, however they may have talked around it indirectly, have not dared yet to say that their party, or they themselves as a body, are against that particular feature of the contract. The next proposition adopted and laid down as a principle and made the essence of the contract, is that the Klondike shall pay for the railway; that the people of eastern Canada, the workingmen, and the shopkeepers and the other classes, should not have placed on their shoulders an additional burden or debt in consequence of the building of the railway and development of the Klondike.

Does the hon. Minister say to-day that they are able to carry out that contract without imposing an extra burden? Did not the First Minister say that one of his first duties, at the earliest opportunity, would be to ask this House to grant a vote of substantial aid and assistance towards the extension of that route down to the sea?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. POPE. Yes, he said that in his speech this afternoon.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. POPE. Certainly the right hon. leader of the Government made that statement in this House, and so it will appear in the "Hansard." Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman takes that position, and at the same time he says this is an all-Canadian route. Well, I am not a lawyer; but when I look over at the Government benches, when I see the Minister of the Interior, who is a lawyer, the Minister of Railways, who is a lawyer, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is a lawyer, the First Minister, who is a lawyer, and the Minister of Justice, who, I presume, is a lawyer, the Postmaster General, who is a lawyer, and the Solicitor General, who is a lawyer, and the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), who is a lawyer—when I find the Government composed of all that legal ability, and who yet are not better able to translate treaties than those hon. gentlemen have been since they came into power, from the treaties affecting Great Britain, including the Postal Treaty, down to the treaties with the United States, I thank heaven that I am not a lawyer, and that I have been permitted to apply a little common sense to the interpretation of those treaties. Now, Sir, it has been laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite that a treaty made between the United States and Great Britain is of stronger force and character than the common law of the country. Now, a treaty with the United States, before it becomes law, has to be ratified by the Senate, and signed by the President of the United States. The law that is being enacted at this moment, that has passed the Senate of the United States, if it is also sanctioned by the President, and if there arises a question between Canada and the United States, in which case the courts of the United States will be called upon to pass judgment, their decision will be according to the common law of that country. I say that when those judges appointed for the purpose of carrying out the common law of the country, when they have rendered their decision, it will have precedence over the treaty, let the consequences be what they may.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. POPE. I quite understand the hon. gentleman saying "hear, hear." But after listening to the legal talent of the hon. gentleman, the exclamation of the hon. Minister who says "hear, hear," has just about as much effect as if he said "yes, yes." If the whole legal talent of hon. gentlemen sitting on the front Government benches were to acquiesce in my position, I would not feel any more certain in the position I have taken than I do because the hon. member says "hear, hear." I believe that interpretation will hold. The judges of the United States are appointed to interpret the law of the land, and in the event of the violation of treaties it is a question of settlement between the two nations, and you may either go to war or take your medicine. That is about the position of the question. When appealed to, the judges of that country will properly interpret the questions submitted to them. If that be true, then, by the admission of hon. gentlemen opposite—because they have admitted enough by the very fact that on a question like this such a gigantic intellect as is possessed by the Minister of Agriculture should have to work twice on one and the same problem—they are standing in a very different position from that occupied a few days ago when this contract was explained by the hon. gentleman in the speech he delivered on that occasion. Hon. gentlemen opposite indeed find themselves in a difficult position. They find themselves facing a difficulty they have brought on themselves, and they are obliged to admit to-day that the only plan by which they can get out of the difficulty is by extending this proposed road from Telegraph Creek or Glenora down to the sea at or near Port Simpson. If that proposition be correct, and the hon. First Minister said that at all times he had contemplated this outlet, that from the first they had prepared means to escape any difficulty by carrying the extension down to the sea—I want to know why in arranging this contract originally, there was no provision made with Mann & Mackenzie for some basis of contract in this regard and for some definite prices for work connected with the extension. If, as the First Minister acknowledged to-day, hon. gentlemen opposite had already taken this extension into consideration before this Bill came before the House for discussion—if within the ten days which have elapsed the First Minister has intimated to the people that at the earliest opportunity he is going to ask Parliament for money for extension southward, what may not be expected after further discussion? The hon. gentleman is frank at last. He has told the House that the whole of the scheme has been provided for and that a further extension will take place in the direction of Dawson City. Taking the whole scheme, I ask why do not hon. gentlemen enter into it in a business-like manner? Why do they not cancel this semi-arrange-

ment with Mackenzie & Mann, pay them the damages, whatever they may be, pay them a reasonable sum and act with them honourably and straightforwardly; and if they are going to build a road from the sea, begin the construction down by the sea, not in a frozen country where it will cost thousands of dollars to get stores on the ground before the line is commenced. I saw a statement by Mr. Mann in the newspapers, which I presume is correct, that it would cost him \$8,000 to place supplies and material in the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Eight thousand dollars a mile.

Mr. POPE. Yes, \$8,000 a mile for 150 miles. Common sense would lead the Government to commence construction down by the sea where when a mile was completed they could use the rails and push forward material and supplies along the route. Instead of so acting we find the Government prepared a contract which they themselves admit could not be carried out, but they included in it a provision which afforded a loophole by which they could escape. Hon. gentlemen opposite now say they contemplated all these arrangements, and yet they entered into a contract for building this road to Glenora and Teslin Lake. The Government are giving away—what? No man can state what they are giving away; no hon. member opposite could place a value on what the Government are handing over to the contractors. No hon. member can say that the Government are not giving away a hundred million dollars. Suppose they had been building the Crow's Nest Pass Railway three years ago instead of this year, before Rossland or Boundary Creek or any of the mining camps of to-day were in existence, they would be doing the same as they are doing to-day, giving away most valuable mineral lands. Hon. gentlemen opposite had an opportunity of making comparison with the extraordinary value now possessed by lands in the vicinity of Rossland as compared with their value two or three years ago. This comparison would apply to lands in the Yukon region, they being both in the western part of Canada, and I am astonished under these circumstances, that hon. gentlemen opposite should give away vast tracts of rich mineral deposits, which extend through Oregon, Washington, British Columbia, and enter the Klondike. Throughout the whole distance there are these rich mineral deposits, and wherever tapped in Canadian territory they have proved richer than in any portion of the United States, where the development has proceeded to the same extent. Under these circumstances I venture to say there never was a wilder proposition submitted to Parliament than hon. gentlemen opposite have submitted on this occasion. Do hon. gentlemen opposite tell me they could not have sold these 4,000,000 acres of land to the people of this country

Mr. POPE.

by issuing scrip and receiving in return \$40,000,000? They know as well as I do that this could have been done. At the present time the Government charge a miner \$10 for his annual license to mine on ground which only covers about an acre, and they obtain 10 per cent of the gold produced. Would not the people prefer to take from the Government scrip covering one acre in fee simple to be taken anywhere in the Klondike during the next five years, and pay therefor \$10? This payment would take the place of \$10 license and 10 per cent royalty. The whole thing is as clear as the nose on a man's face.

There is, however, another point. I should like to see the date of the issue of the writs of Ontario and the date on which this contract was signed, and see how nearly they ran together. Hon. members would find these transactions trotting along in the same class, with perhaps the contract a little ahead, and ending in a dead heat, although they started even at the ringing of the same bell.

It is not my intention to go deeply into the Bill until I have had an opportunity of further considering the measure itself. I was very fortunate, I presume, but I was not entrapped by the hon. gentlemen for I did not take them to be in dead earnest when they brought this Bill down to the House. I then told the First Minister that before the Bill passed this House, and before it passed the Parliament of Canada, it would be materially changed. Sir, it has been materially changed already, and we are not done reforming it yet. There are some changes yet to be brought about, and until the Government lay down their policy, and until they say, Amen, we will go on changing it. I think the Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) might be trusted to say, Amen. From what we know of him in our province, I think that if the Government would entrust him to lay before the House the last change which is going to be made in that contract, we would accept his word for it. As acting Minister of Railways, he put his name to that peculiar document, that contract between Her Majesty and Mackenzie & Mann, but that he really knew its contents, or for one moment understood them, it is hard to believe. That that hon. gentleman (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière), pleasant as he is at all times, and agreeable in every kind of climate, realized the fearful document to which he was appending his signature as acting Minister of Railways, no man can make me believe. After having heard this discussion to-night, after having seen the changeability of the Government of which he, unfortunately, happens to be a member, I am sure that his eyes are beginning to open to the iniquity of the contract, and I believe that the hon. gentleman will not now say, Amen, to this Bill. We can hardly blame the Minister of Railways for it, because he was not present, nor was he around the Council Board when that

document was signed. He was asked to father it in this House, and, in the execution of his baptismal performance, we discovered before he had been very long on his feet, that, though he might possibly have heard of the Yukon, he had never before heard of the contract between Mackenzie & Mann and this Government. If report be true, and we have the very best reason to believe it, later on, when he met his party in caucus, the Minister of Railways discovered that his followers thought he had not done his duty. For a few days afterwards the Minister of Railways was not present in the House, and he did not return as a solid soldier of the party and as an obedient member of the Government until Mr. Mackenzie passed through this city on the Monday following the Liberal caucus. What mesmerism is there in the possession of this man Mackenzie? What spell does he throw over hon. gentlemen opposite? He makes them do what the people do not want them to do, and he compels them to sign a contract some of the provisions of which they are bound to deny before a few hours pass over their heads. The political faith of that hon. gentleman was once in unison with ours, but, when he served in our ranks, we never were susceptible to this mesmeric influence. There is an unsolved mystery about this matter which causes the Government to give away millions and millions of the money of the people for a tramway between two icicles. To solve that mystery is beyond my power. I can guess at it, and if I had not used up my imagination the other evening in cabling to England, I might draw on my imagination to discover the reason why Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, over and above anybody else, were preferred as contractors for the construction of this road. Can it be possible that they have become the bosom friends of gentlemen on the other side of the House? I know these hon. gentlemen, and in one of them, at least, I have not noticed any change. He looks a little worried, he looks like a gentleman who got into bad company, but, outside of that, he is very much the same as he used to be. He talks the same Tory principles, but has succeeded in charming beyond measure the First Minister, his colleagues and their followers. This Cabinet was said to be full of business principles, and to be composed of men who were going to administer the affairs of this country as they never were administered before—I am bound to say, that is perfectly true, for there never has been such an exhibition of wild business administration in this country as we have exemplified in the contract now before the House.

Now, Sir, fancy a Government giving away millions of acres of rich mineralized lands. Could you do it in Australia?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. POPE. You bet, you could not. Could you do it in South Africa?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. POPE. No, you could not. In no British colony in the world could you give away millions of mineralized acres of the people's heritage for the construction of a tramway between two icicles. Sir, it would be absolutely impossible to do such a thing elsewhere than in Canada. But more than that, this business Government is going to give railway communication to a country that is frozen up for eight months, aye, nearly nine months in the year, and where fuel is just as much an essential of life as is bread and meat. Who will own the wood and coal in that territory the moment the contract is signed? Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann will. They own the fuel in the country, they own the gold in the ground, and they own the railroad that is supposed to take the people there. Why, Sir, Boss Kruger, President of the Transvaal, in his wildest mood, could never dream of granting such a monopoly or of giving away to his friends millions of dollars worth of property belonging to the community.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). For sole answer to the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Pope), as to the extreme impolicy of the Government's action in adopting the Stikine and Teslin route, I refer him to the repeated declarations of his own leader (Sir Charles Tupper). It has been said by some parties not particularly friendly to the present Government, that the true reason of their success at the late general elections was to be found in the utter incapacity of their opponents, and I am bound to say, the exhibition this afternoon and evening goes very far to lend colour to that statement. Sir, I doubt whether, ever since this Parliament was a Parliament, we have had an exhibition of so much cowardice, so much want of statesmanship, so much want of common, ordinary policy as these hon. gentlemen opposite have displayed in the last few hours.

If ever there was a question which above all others called for the exercise of calm and cool judgment on the part, not merely of the Government, but of the Parliament of Canada and of the responsible leaders of Her Majesty's Opposition, it was the question which, by a deliberate prostitution of the rules of this House, has been hurled at our heads this afternoon. The hon. gentlemen over there want us, forsooth, to cringe to the United States at the very first crack of the whip, on the very first occasion that a single branch of the American legislature chooses to pass a particular Bill. Why, Sir, that is not the law of the United States; that has to pass through the House of Representatives, and it has to obtain the support of the Government of the United States as evidenced by the sanction of the President. Under these circumstances, knowing that this is in every possible sense and shape a matter sub judice before that legislature, we have these patriotic and hon. gentlemen

rising up here to strengthen to the uttermost the hands and the forces of the enemies of our country. What right, Sir, has the leader of the Opposition, what right have his followers, to dare to come here under present circumstances and tell us that the Government of the United States have deliberately determined to violate their solemn treaty obligations? What right have they to suppose that the Supreme Court of the United States, an honourable tribunal, would uphold such legislation, if by any chance it should be passed? I say, Sir, that they are deliberately inviting the Congress to make this Bill a part of their statute-book. Every argument, every statement they have made—not this afternoon only, but for the last two or three weeks—almost everything which they have advanced, has been of a character calculated to provoke just such action on the part of the United States. Now, Sir, I do not say—because it would not be parliamentary—that this was their design and purpose; but I do say that if this had been their design and purpose, that is the very way they would have taken to attain such an end. Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman, as I believe he has been told before from these benches, that the plain duty of the Government of Canada under these circumstances is to proceed as they have begun, and to pay no attention whatever to any such Bills as are now before the Senate of the United States. If the Government or the people of the United States should attempt to violate a solemn treaty, should attempt to deprive us of our rights solemnly guaranteed to us, then, Sir, it would become the duty not merely of the Government of Canada, but the duty of the Imperial Government, to take such action as should be found requisite to obtain for the people of Canada the rights that properly belong to them, or due indemnification for any violation of those rights. But, Sir, it shows how little hon. gentlemen opposite have risen to the position which Canada now holds, it shows how little they understand the fact that the position of Canada has improved enormously in the last eighteen months, it shows how little they understand that we are legislating here, not merely for the people of Canada, but with an eye to the advantage and profit of the whole Empire of which we are a part, that they have taken the course they have done to-day. If that fact had been properly before their minds, the very last thing they would have done would have been, under these circumstances and at this time, to raise this most idle, useless and mischievous discussion. Now, Sir, it is perfectly idle to go into the question whether the bonding privilege—which is the only thing, as I understand, affected by the Bill in question—is essential to our maintaining the right of free navigation. The cases that have been cited, in which the United States have granted us bonding privileges

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

through their territory, where we possessed no rights, guaranteed by treaty, are utterly different from the case in hand. I do not think any lawyer in this House would say that if the United States were to refuse the bonding privilege it by any means follows that they could by that Act deny us the right to the free navigation of the Stikine River. Sir, I will tell my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) that our motto, on this occasion at any rate, is "No Surrender." Sir, I am known, and I hope I shall always continue to be known, as one who desires by all and every honourable means in my power to promote friendship and alliance between the English-speaking nations of the earth, and notably between the people of the Empire of Great Britain and the people of the United States. But were I ten times as desirous as I am of that consummation, under no conceivable circumstances would I as a Canadian representative submit for one moment that any foreign power should dictate to us where we should build railways or where we should not build railways. Still less, Sir, would I consent that any foreign power should presume to tell us what quantity of baggage miners should import free to any particular country under our control, or where those miners should obtain their licenses. Sir, I say that the Senate of the United States, or the authors of this Bill, have utterly and entirely mistaken their position. They have gone utterly and entirely outside of any rights which can possibly accrue to them; and the Government of Canada are not going to be dragooned, either by hon. gentlemen opposite or by the United States Senate or the United States Congress into surrendering any of the rights of the people of Canada. I repeat, Sir, that I regret exceedingly that the hon. leader of the Opposition, who knows better, whatever some of his followers may do, who has shown on other occasions that he could rise superior to the mistakes and blunders which had been committed by some of his former associates—I say I regret exceedingly that he should have precipitated this debate. I tell him that this is a matter that should not be made a subject of angry controversy between one side of the House and the other. This is a matter that should be considered calmly and coolly by the Government, and then considered calmly and coolly by the Parliament. The hon. gentleman was perfectly within his right, I grant, in calling the attention of the Government and the House to the measure which has passed the United States Senate. I do not complain of that; but there he should have stayed. He should not have plunged, while this matter was undecided, into a debate which could not, under any conceivable circumstances, do any good to Canada, and which might do a great deal of harm.

Mr. DAVIN. Does the hon. gentleman know who introduced the debate?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I know that it has been introduced and has been maintained and kept up, to the great injury of the public affairs of Canada, by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure my hon. friend will be greatly indebted to me if I tell him that his absence from the House to-day has led him to make a very serious blunder. The attention of the Government was called in a very serious manner to this question by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell).

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I am aware also that the hon. member for Halifax, as I conceive his duty was, accepted the answer that was given him, and proceeded no further. Where angels fear to tread, other kind of people rush in. A very impolitic and a very unnecessary debate has been initiated. Now, Sir, I understand that the hon. gentleman has been good enough to give his advice to the Government as to what they should do. I believe he was good enough to advise us to withdraw the Bill. I will take upon myself to tell him that the Bill shall not be withdrawn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me to say that I gave no unsolicited advice. I was asked by the Prime Minister to say what I would propose—what I would do to meet this emergency.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Then all I can say is that if the hon. gentleman, taking into consideration all the surrounding circumstances, would advise the withdrawal of the Bill, it is Heaven's mercy that he long since ceased to be the adviser of His Excellency. Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman wishes to draw a lesson from this, I grant that there are two important lessons to be drawn. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition is perfectly aware, and if you refer to his own speech, you will see he was perfectly aware, that by the capitulation of the Treaty of Washington, we greatly departed from the rights which Canada had under the former treaty. Does the hon. gentleman who sits behind the leader of the Opposition contradict his venerable sire?

Sir CHARLES HIEBERT TUPPER. I was simply remarking to my hon. friend beside me that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was contradicting his juvenile colleagues who spoke on that question and took a different view of it.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I was calling attention to the fact that the hon. leader of the Opposition on more occasions than one—and it is to his credit, because he understood what he was talking about—over and over again—shall I recall the page in "Hansard" or does my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition deny

it?—pointed out that we had lost heavily in the Treaty of Washington by the substitution of the clause under which we claim the present navigation of the Stikine for the clause which was embodied in the Treaty of 1825, and afterwards confirmed by the Treaty of St. Petersburg. And the hon. gentleman will recollect very well his reference to a certain famous Latin proverb on that occasion.

Now, I do not want to unnecessarily prolong this discussion, nor unnecessarily to stir up bad passions among the members of this House. But I would tell the hon. gentleman this, that they would do wisely and well to abstain until people's memories have grown a good deal shorter from any reference to the superabundant loyalty of gentlemen on that side of the House. I recollect their colleagues and their past intimately. I have had occasion to allude to this before, and shall not do so now, but with respect to the present question, that is to what is due the temper that has been manifested in certain sections of the United States, I have to tell these hon. gentlemen that that is largely due to their own action in the eighteen years that elapsed between 1878 and 1896. There again I shall call the hon. leader of the Opposition to witness that when the Mackenzie Administration went out of office our relations with the United States were in a most harmonious condition. It is true we had obtained very great advantage from them in the Halifax award, and that occasion, I have more than once reminded hon. gentlemen, is the only one on which Canada distinctly came out a gainer in a transaction with the United States; but ten years later in what kind of position did we find ourselves? Did we not hear my hon. friend, from the place now occupied by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), tell this House—and it is on record in "Hansard"—that the impolicy of his own colleagues—because it amounted to that, although he was very careful in his way of putting it—had brought us to the verge of commercial war, which, he truly said, was very close indeed to actual war. The hon. gentleman, for once in his life, stated the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in that speech of his in 1888, which I cherish and preserve as perhaps the only evidence he has given us that he really did possess some statesman-like qualities.

Mr. BERGERON. That has all been heard this afternoon.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. It is a thing that cannot be put forward too often, because it is so much to the hon. gentleman's credit, and we want to give him all the credit we can, particularly to strengthen his hands against some malcontents in his own party. The hon. gentleman wants to know what we

consider is the proper line to be taken. I will tell him. I consider that the proper line to be taken now is not lightly or rashly to assume that a friendly Government will violate their treaty obligations, but to insist, and to cause the British Government to insist with us, on the observance of treaty rights which have been solemnly guaranteed to us. For the rest, we distinctly refuse to be flurried or hurried. We are charged—whether we are fit for the position or not—with the task of governing Canada for the time being; and if we find that this unhappy course is taken and persisted in, and we can obtain redress in no other way, we will know how to protect and preserve the rights of the people entrusted to us. Sir, we will examine and then decide, and I think that even if the Opposition choose to exhaust themselves in idle and fruitless attacks upon this policy, which, I repeat, the hon. leader of the Opposition, in a lucid interval, approved most heartily—if they choose to aid the enemies of our country for the purpose of bringing about a state of things from which injury and loss may result to a portion of our people, it will not alter our determination one hair's breadth, and that determination is that we will secure a route through Canadian territory and take care to control our own trade for the benefit of the people of Canada.

Mr. QUINN. It is altogether probable that if the hon. Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies) had not done me the honour of referring to me personally this afternoon, I would have continued to enjoy in silence the very interesting debate that has been carried on since three o'clock; but since he has done so, perhaps it would be well to refresh your memory. Sir, as to the circumstances which brought forth the remark from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. You will remember, Sir, that he was reading a contradiction of a statement supposed to have been made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, when he was questioned by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). Finding himself in what was characterized as a very deep hole, an hon. gentleman on this side said: You can wriggle pretty well, but you cannot get out of that hole. The hon. Minister, perhaps a little flurried, said: Well, I am trying pretty hard to wriggle out if you will only give me a chance. I was unfortunate enough to laugh at this sally and thereby attracted the hon. gentleman's attention. I must say I have always followed with a good deal of pleasure any debate in which the hon. gentleman has taken part. I always try to follow him through all the sinuosities of his language and argument. Sometimes I fail, but I have always admired the great talent which he displays in reply. In fact, on this occasion, he brought to my mind—and it was that which

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

caused me to laugh—the words of the old poet:

He wriggled so long and he wriggled so fast,
That he wriggled himself to the dickens at last.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) has evidently been studying Voltaire, only he has improved somewhat on the original. Voltaire said that a lie that lives six days is as good as the truth. But the hon. Minister thought that one which would last the afternoon would be equally good. Unfortunately for him, no sooner had he resumed his seat, after a most convincing argument to prove that the leader of the Opposition had at one time slated the then Minister of Marine for something he had done, than my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) stood up and quoted from "Hansard" the very words of the hon. leader of the Opposition which proved that he never used the language attributed to him at all. Therefore, I think I am right in saying that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tried to improve on Voltaire by some five days and three-quarters.

We have also had the extraordinary exhibition this afternoon of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, the able lieutenant of the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, administering to the hon. member who brought about this debate a spanking, metaphorically speaking, for having had the audacity to bring up such a question. This afternoon when we heard the same speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) we thought it real thunder; but now that we have heard it from the Minister of Trade and Commerce we know that it is only stage thunder—a mere farce. I will not say that the whole plan of the play had been drafted by the Ministers in their Cabinet council before they came here, but I will say that it looks like it. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) taking time by the forelock rises, on the Orders of the Day being called, and reads the telegram announcing the passage of this Bill through the Senate of the United States. He is at once answered by the right hon. Prime Minister who, with all that eloquence which distinguishes him as a parliamentary orator, gives a most beautiful answer to the hon. member for Halifax. Of course we see now that this was done merely for the purpose of spiking the guns of the Opposition upon this question. But that sturdy warrior, the leader of the Opposition was not to be put aside by the fine words of the leader of the Government. The plan which has been shown here this afternoon was all prepared before hand, but then the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) happened to be the lieutenant of the leader of the House instead of the Minister of Trade and Commerce who has just gone out. He therefore was obliged to take the place of the Minister of

Trade and Commerce and fire off the guns which had been left to the care of that hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright). Now, what is the position of the Government? I have listened with a great deal of attention, with much interest and with sealed lips during this debate to find out if I could, what the Government intended or if it were in earnest for one hour on any question connected with this contract. I have listened to this debate for two weeks. I have heard the Ministers at one time declaring one thing, and a few days later taking back everything they had said. In the words of my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope), it appears as if every member who has spoken in this debate concerning the contract and charter now before us was obliged to stand up to-day and read the recantation of everything he had said in favour of the Bill, on account of the action of the Senate of the United States. We have heard most extraordinary propositions made upon this question. We have heard the Prime Minister of Canada, aided and endorsed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, declaring as lawyers and as members of this Government that the treaty of the United States with Canada carried with it the free use for the purposes of commerce of the Stikine River, and not that alone but carried with it the right to unload at Wrangel, the right to tranship at Wrangel. And in the next breath we have heard these hon. gentlemen say that even if it does not carry with it the right to unload and tranship, we can get over the difficulty by building down as far as Port Simpson. The leader of the Government reminded me to-day of that play called the "Mighty Dollar." One of the leading characters is a United States Senator, and one of the expressions he uses is: "I will vote for anything as long as it carries with it another appropriation." The Government say: We are prepared to support the Stikine route, to vote 3,750,000 acres of land; and then, after we get that through, if it will not work, let us have another road and another appropriation. So that, by the time the scheme of the hon. gentleman is put through the House, not merely the four millions of acres already proposed will have been voted, but eight or possibly ten millions of acres of mineral lands will have been given to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Four million acres will account for all the mineral lands there.

Mr. QUINN. The Government would have us in the position of the client of a certain lawyer who resembled very much the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. This lawyer was consulted by his client who said that a man had written him a letter and threatened to arrest him on a *capias* and put him in jail. After the lawyer had heard the case, he said: They cannot send you to jail for that; go home; you are all right.

An hour afterwards the client came back and said to the lawyer: My friend, I am not only threatened by letter, but this man has been down to see me and he says if I do not pay him he will *capias* me. The lawyer said: They cannot put you in jail for that. So the client went away comforted. And so it went on until the client, in spite of what his lawyer had told him, found himself coolly in jail. He sent for the lawyer. The lawyer came, and the first thing he said was "My dear fellow, they cannot send you to jail for this." "But," said the client, "I am here." So, the Ministers have been protesting that the Americans cannot prevent us from transshipping or unloading at Fort Wrangel; they cannot prevent our goods going in. But the United States Senate have said, and the Opposition here have said to the Government: You are there, and you cannot get out of it. The hon. leader of the Opposition is not displaying a "craven spirit" as has been said, very irregularly by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. We have been warning the Government not only to-day but ever since this debate began that some day they might find themselves in the position in which they now find themselves. This warning has gone on day after day, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce himself has said, and after they have answered that it is impossible for the United States to act in this way, we have positive proof that the Government of the United States is going to do what the Opposition feared they would. And the Government have only awakened to that fact sufficiently to try to explain it away by saying that the Opposition has made them do this or led them to do it, or aided and abetted them in putting the Government in this position.

It was not my intention to speak at all on this subject. But I do look upon it as a most serious position for the Government to be placed in, still to persist in proposing the building of a line notwithstanding that the declaration of the United States Senate shows that it will be absolutely valueless, for the United States will make it valueless by the impositions which they will make through their Congress.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 52) respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

POSTMASTER AT LOWER L'ARDOISE.

Mr. GILLIES (by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked,

1. Who is the postmaster at Lower L'Ardoise, county of Richmond, at the present time?
2. When was the present incumbent appointed?

3. Who was his predecessor in office ?
4. Why and when was he removed ?
5. At whose request ?
6. Were any complaints in writing against the late postmaster filed with the Government or the Post Office Department ?
7. What was the nature of these complaints, and by whom were they furnished ?
8. Was an investigation afforded the late postmaster before removing him from office ? If so, by whom was the inquiry held ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). The present postmaster, Daniel C. Mathieson, was appointed on the 30th September, 1897. His predecessor in office was Roderick Ferguson. Certain complaints having been made against him, they were communicated to him in order to afford him an opportunity of replying thereto, which he did, pleading guilty to all of said complaints excepting one—an immaterial one—it was not thought necessary to hold an inquiry.

LOCOMOTIVE DEVICE—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER** asked.

1. Upon what terms, if any, were Messrs. Cleveland and Petersen, or either of them, allowed to fit up an engine or engines in the Intercolonial shops at Moncton ?
2. What amount of work (and of what value), if any, has been done on these engines or either of them by the employees in the Government service ?
3. What amount of materials (and of what value), if any, has been used in this connection ?
4. What amount, if any, has been paid to the Government by Messrs. Cleveland and Petersen ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). Messrs. Cleveland & Petersen are the owners of a patent locomotive cylinder, which they were desirous of having fitted upon one of the locomotives of the Intercolonial Railway. The department had reason to believe that there was merit in this invention, as it had been applied to a stationary engine and had been found to work successfully. In accordance with the custom of the railway to occasionally try new inventions which impress the department favourably, the trial of this device was authorized on one of the Intercolonial Railway locomotives, but upon the distinct agreement that the owners of the patent should pay to the railway the entire cost of the work. In accordance with this arrangement and upon those terms, the device is being fitted upon one of the locomotives of the Intercolonial Railway in the shops at Moncton, and is now in progress and nearing completion. Work has been done thereon to the amount of \$1,724.99, and material furnished to the amount of \$1,056.28. The parties, who are responsible people, have already made a payment of \$250 on account, and as soon as the work is completed will be called upon for the payment of the balance of the whole cost of the work and material furnished.

Mr. **GILLIES**.

THE UNITED STATES STEAMER "YANTIC."

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER** asked,

How or in what character was the United States steamship "Yantic" entered and cleared, if at all, at any port on the St. Lawrence on her passage through that river in 1897 ?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). The collector of customs at Montreal reports, that this vessel was not reported inwards formally, but a record was made of her coming in, and no clearance was made. She arrived at Montreal from Boston. On November 4th, the vessel was taken to Cantin's dockyard and there cut apart and placed upon pontoons to enable her to be taken through the smaller St. Lawrence Canals. I have no information that the vessel entered or cleared at any other port on the St. Lawrence.

TELEGRAPH LINE—NORTH SHORE OF THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. **CASGRAIN** (by Mr. Dugas) asked.

1. Is the telegraph line on the north shore of the St. Lawrence being constructed by days' labour or by contract ?
2. Who are the superintendent or contractors ?
3. What are the prices paid to day labourers ?
4. Are they paid in money or in goods ?
5. Have the Government sent on a person to examine the work and see that all is properly done ?
6. What sums have been paid on this work since May, 1896, and to whom and for what service ?
7. How many miles of telegraph wire have been laid on this line since 1896, and in what places ?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). 1. By contract. 2. The contractor is Mr. L. P. de Courval. 3 and 4. The department is not aware of the manner in which contractor pays his men. It only knows that up to the present no claim or complaint has been lodged with the department. 5. Yes, a careful examination has been made. 6. Statement of expenditure since May, 1896, to date :

Ahearn & Soper, telegraph instruments and battery supplies.....	\$	86	73
Firstbrook Bros., side-blocks.....		137	80
Lewis Bros. & Co, wire and insulators		2,208	56
Samson & Fillion, spikes.....		39	43
L. P. DeCourval, contractor.....		9,003	75
Labour inspecting line—			
Frs. Cormier.....	\$	13	00
Fidele Desjardins.....		13	00
Israel Cormier.....		33	10
Nap. A. Cormeau.....		277	63
			<hr/>
			336 73
			<hr/>
			\$11,813 00

7. The line on the North Shore, St. Lawrence, completed to Point Esquimaux in 1889, was in the season of 1897 further extended beyond that place for 43 miles to

Piastre Bay, and a further 43 miles to a point 6 miles beyond Aguanus, 86 miles in all.

BRIDGE AT BEAR RIVER, N.S.

Mr. RUSSELL (by Mr. Flint) asked,

Was the question of the removal of the remains of the old bridge in Bear River, between Arnapolis and Digby counties, ever considered by the Minister of Public Works in the late Administration? Was any communication made to such Minister by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in that Administration? If so, what was its purport?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Communications were had between the Department of Public Works, under the late Administration. The then Minister of Public Works received a letter from the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, of which the following is a quotation:

I am in receipt of a letter from the Hon. Mr. Dickey, written, I presume, under the impression that the matter was under the charge of this department, in which he states that he is informed, though he has no personal knowledge of it, that the expenditure would be of no great service to the public, and he knows of no special reason why it should be made, and he adds that he states this in order that the question of recommending the expenditure may be very carefully considered.

In the years 1894-95-96 applications were made to the Privy Council for a vote of \$1,000, but they were not granted.

W. E. PHIN—TORONTO HARBOUR.

Mr. CLANCY asked,

1. What amount of money was paid one W. E. Phin, or any partner of his, between the dates of 1st January, 1897, and 1st January, 1898? Are there any amounts still owing for the work done or material supplied in connection with the improvement of Toronto harbour?

2. Were such moneys paid according to written contract? If so, would the Government give copy of contract? If no written contract, would the Government give all information and correspondence in connection therewith?

3. When, where and by whom was Mr. W. E. Phin instructed to proceed with the work, and upon what terms did he proceed?

4. Was the said work advertised, and tenders asked for?

5. How many tenders were received?

6. If no other tenders were received, who recommended Mr. Phin to the department?

7. Before being given the work, was he ever known by the department to have done any dredging or to have owned any dredging plant?

8. For what period of time does Mr. Phin's contract extend?

9. Is it the intention of the department to advertise and call for tenders for any work to be done in connection with Toronto harbour improvements for the year 1898?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. The amount of money paid Mr. W. E. Phin for dredging in Toronto Harbour, between 1st January, 1897, and

1st January, 1898, was \$5,310.26. There is no balance due. 2. A written agreement was entered into with Mr. Phin on the 19th July, 1897. No objection to produce the agreement in question, when a return is moved for. 3. Mr. W. E. Phin was instructed to proceed to work at Toronto by Mr. E. B. Temple, engineer in charge of the Toronto Harbour, under his agreement of the 19th July, the price agreed upon being that usually paid by the department, viz., \$8 per hour of actual work. 4, 5 and 6. No tenders were asked for, as it is not customary for this class of work. Mr. Phin was recommended to the department by reliable parties. 7. It is not the practice of the department to make such inquiry. All it concerns itself with is that the plant offered is good and reliable, and that the price asked is reasonable. The dredging, as it proceeds, is closely superintended by the officer in charge. 8. The agreement closed with the end of the season of 1897. 9. That will depend upon the nature of the improvements to be performed.

HOMESTEAD LANDS.

Mr. BERGERON asked,

Does the homestead law on Government lands apply to the Yukon territory?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). No.

NEWS STAND AT LEVIS STATION.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked,

1. Who is the lessee at the news stand at the Intercolonial Railway station at Lévis at the present time?

2. When did his lease begin, and when will it terminate?

3. Was said lease given out after tenders had been called for?

4. If not, why not?

5. What is the annual price or consideration of said lease?

6. Who was the lessee who preceded the present lessee?

7. What was the nominal price or consideration paid by said former lessee?

8. If said price or consideration, mentioned in the last question, has been reduced, at whose instance was it so reduced?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Mr. Pichette is the lessee of the news stand at the Intercolonial Railway Station at Lévis at the present time. 2. His lease commenced on 31st December, 1896, it will terminate on the 31st December, 1898, unless extended for another year. 3. Said lease was given out after tenders had been called for. 4. 5. The annual price or consideration is \$520. 6. C. A. Demers was the lessee who preceded Mr. Pichette. 7. The nominal as well as actual price paid up to December, 1896, was \$160 per annum, but since that date and at the present time the annual price is \$520. 8. It has not been reduced.

SICK SEAMEN.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

1. What amount has been paid for medical attendance upon sick seamen at the outports of L'Ardoise, St. Peter's and River Bourgeois since January, 1897, and to whom paid?

2. What are the names of the sick seamen that received medical attendance at each or any of these ports, and the amount paid and to whom on account of medical attendance upon each sick seaman during the period mentioned?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I shall be very glad to give the hon. gentleman who asked this question all the information; but the answer covers four or five closely written pages of foolscap, and it should be moved for in the shape of a return and not given in the shape of answer to a question. The papers are under my hand, and are at the disposal of the hon. gentleman, but it is useless to fill up "Hansard" by printing them as an answer to a question.

ST. PETER'S CANAL.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

1. Is it the intention of the Government to have a sufficient amount provided either in the main or supplementary estimates during the present session to have necessary repairs made to the entrance of the St. Peter's Canal upon the Bras d'Or end, and also to the east wall?

2. What amount do the Government intend asking Parliament for during the present session to have these necessary repairs made?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). The matter of repairs upon Bras d'Or end of St. Peter's Canal and also upon the east wall has not escaped my attention. Departmentally a decision has been arrived at on the subject of these repairs, but I doubt the expediency, if the hon. member will pardon me, of making any more explicit statement before the Estimates are brought down.

WEST INDIA TRADE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked,

1. Is it the intention of the Government to take any steps for the purpose of extending and increasing trade between Canada and the West Indies (including Bermuda)?

2. What steps does the Government intend to take for that purpose?

3. How long has the Government had this matter under consideration, and is it probable that any conclusion will be speedily arrived at?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). The Government have this matter under consideration. They are fully alive to the importance of the West India trade, which has been urged on them very strongly by the hon. member for Halifax who sits on this side of the House.

Mr. BLAIR.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. JAMESON asked,

1. Does the clause in the statute incorporating the Canadian Pacific Railway Company providing that the lands of that company shall be free from taxation for twenty years from the grant thereof from the Crown, mean that the lands of that company shall be exempt from taxation for twenty years from the time of their selection of said lands and the approval of such selection by the Government, or for twenty years from the actual issue of the patent?

2. Is it usual to allow any long interval to elapse between the selection of the lands by the said company as part of their land grant and the issue of the patent to said lands?

3. Has any effort been made by this or any former Government to ascertain the amount of capital actually expended in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

4. Does the clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter exempting that railway company from control of its rates until ten per cent per annum profit on the capital actually expended in the construction of the railway is produced, mean that exemption shall exist until ten per cent per annum is produced on the capital actually expended in the construction of the railway, both by the Government and by the railway company, or is the calculation to be based only on the capital actually expended by the railway company on such portions of the railway as were constructed by the railway company?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). 1. The view taken by the Government is that the exemption dates from the issue of the patent. 2. It has been usual to allow long intervals to elapse between the selection of lands and the issue of patent. 3. No such effort has been made so far as the Government is aware. 4. The question is one which involves the interpretation of a statute by legal authority. When any practical necessity arises for determining the question it will be referred to the law officer of the Government, but up to the present time such reference has not been made.

LOBSTER PACKING.

Mr. BETHUNE asked,

Will the Government, because of the peculiar climatic conditions existing to the north-east of the Island of Cape Breton, allow the lobster packers and fishermen of that section of the country, particularly those of Victoria county, to catch lobsters regardless of size limit, from 1st May to 31st of July in each year?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I have not been able to see my way clear to answer the question in the affirmative. It seems to me and to the department that it would be destructive of the lobster interest to make the concession asked.

PROPOSED MINT.

Mr. BERGERON asked,

Is it the intention of the Government to establish a mint in this country? If so, when?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). The matter referred to in the hon. gentleman's question has not been considered.

EDMONTON BRIDGE.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

To whom was the contract for the construction of the Edmonton bridge let? Were tenders called for? Who were the tenderers, and what were the figures of each tenderer for which the tenderer would construct the work? Have the specifications been modified as the work has gone forward? Was the time when the work would be completed one of the essential features of the contract? Has the time limit been live*i* up to? If not, were there forfeitures in case of default as to time? If so, have these forfeitures been enforced?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). No sufficient answer can be made except by the hon. member moving for a return.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Railways and Canals.—(Mr. Blair.)

INSTRUCTION TO ADMINISTRATOR WALSH.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton) laid on the Table Order in Council covering instructions given to Major Walsh, administrator of the Yukon district. He said: There were no written instructions outside of the contents of the Order in Council given to Major Walsh.

PROPOSED WAGON ROAD IN YUKON.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to state to the Minister of the Interior that the First Minister promised in his absence that when the Minister of the Interior would be in his place he would inform the House what measures were proposed to be taken to ensure the construction of the wagon road, as stated in the report which the hon. gentleman has laid on the Table of the House.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). It is not the intention of the Government to ensure the construction of that road. The statement referred to was made because the Government were satisfied that the operations in connection with this contract for the construction of a railway would necessitate the construction of a wagon road, and no doubt if hon. gentlemen will allow the Bill to pass in any reasonable time, that result will be brought about.

QUARTZ MINING IN YUKON.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Might I ask the Minister of the Interior whether he has issued

regulations under which quartz mining can be carried on in the Yukon?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). The regulations have been under consideration and some amendments are being considered, and on that account they have not been printed and issued with the others. But I expect they will be printed within a few days and sent to members of the House.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Blair for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) an Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Mr. Speaker, since the opening of this debate we have witnessed many curious scenes, and I think I may safely say we have heard many very curious and contradictory statements. At the time of the debate on the Address the leader of the Opposition made use of these words, after explaining that he had called on the Minister of the Interior:

I told that hon. gentleman the conclusion at which I had arrived. I told him that from the best information I could get from well qualified sources, I had come to the conclusion that there was one route, and one route alone, which in the first instance it was absolutely essential should be taken up by the Government and developed, and that was the route on the Stikine River, going from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake and thence down by the waters. I pressed that upon him very strongly, with a view of getting the earliest possible means of communication with Dawson City, because I had a discussion on the matter with Major Walsh, a very able officer in the service of the Government, as to the probability of his getting in, and knowing the difficulties he had to encounter, I believe it would take him a very long time. I told the Minister of the Interior that I believed it would be found practicable to send an ocean steamer to the mouth of the Stikine River when the ice had formed, and with horses and sleds and provisions and equipments of every kind, to go up on the ice to Glenora or some portion of the upper part of the Stikine River, and by a sled trail go down on the ice to Teslin Lake long before navigation would open at all. I pressed on that hon. gentleman in the strongest and most emphatic manner I could his duty as Minister of the Crown to spare no effort to endeavour to accomplish a connection in that way. I told him I had interviewed the Government of British Columbia, and they had assured me they were prepared to co-operate with the Government of the Dominion in opening, in the first instance, in the absence of the railway, a sled trail, to be made into a trail as soon as the snow went off. I went further; I said to the Minister of the Interior: You heard me make a very strong speech last

session on the floor of the Commons in opposition to Government aid to railways. I said: I am prepared to take it all back so far as this road is concerned. I said: I am so convinced of the vital importance to Canada of at once establishing a railway connection between the Stikine River and Teslin Lake that I feel that the Parliament of Canada, so far as I am able to judge—if you will take that scheme up vigorously and put it through at once as a Government work—I believe you will have the hearty support of the people of Canada—the Parliament of Canada and the people of Canada as well. I believe now that the importance of that work cannot be over-rated, and I will tell you why.

And he proceeds to tell us why. Scarcely a month has elapsed since the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) pronounced these words in this Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A good deal has happened since.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The terms of the Washington Treaty have not been changed since.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Hamilton Smith has come here since.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yet, in face of those statements we to-day find the hon. leader of the Opposition rising in his place in this House and asking us to abandon that route altogether and to proceed by some other way in order to reach the Yukon. What vision has he had in the interval? What change has come over the spirit of his dreams? Is it the "World" and my friend from York (Mr. Maclean) that has brought about this extraordinary change in his judgment with regard to this Yukon route. But, Sir, that is not all. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, like the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) have stated that it is idle for us to pretend to have an all-Canadian route, and he sees no reason why we should sacrifice the resources of Canada to obtain access to the Yukon country, because, as he tells us, there is a better route by way of Dyea and Skagway and over the White and Chilkoot Passes. These gentlemen opposite are divided, some of them want an all-Canadian route and some an American route. From the very outset of this debate we find them in revolt against the inspiration of the leader of the Opposition, and refusing to obey that generous impulse of his, which at the beginning prompted him as a patriotic citizen to admit that the route selected by the Government was the best under the circumstances. From the very outset these gentlemen opposite have joined to decry the patriotic effort made by this Government to secure the trade of that country for the Canadian people, and they have united in the unpatriotic endeavour to ensure that the American Government should put

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

obstacles in our way. To-day we find that these gentlemen have to some extent accomplished their design, and have succeeded in inducing the American Senate to give them that measure of comfort which they have so eagerly sought. They have succeeded in obtaining from the American Senate an attempt to interfere with our all-Canadian route, and with those privileges which we enjoy under the terms of the Washington Treaty. These gentlemen are to-day jubilant and in high glee, but although they may find comfort in that from the narrow standpoint of party advantage yet from the higher plane of patriotism, they will one day have reason to deplore this action of the United States Senate, which, I charge, has been brought about by their instigation.

Let me turn aside from this unfortunate phase of the question to deal for a while with the conditions which brought about the contract now before the House. I take it that both parties in this House are agreed that the Klondike is a country rich in mineral lands, but at the same time a bleak and inhospitable region which required to call upon the resources of other parts of Canada and other parts of the world for its development. We know that not only was it necessary to import capital into that country, but in addition to that it was necessary to import labour and machinery, and also to supply means whereby food and clothing and the necessaries of life should be provided for the workmen who went there. I believe, Sir, that no party in this country has a monopoly of patriotism, and believing that, I feel that I give expression to the sentiments of gentlemen on both sides when I say that that labour which we wanted to develop the resources of the Yukon, should be Canadian; that the machinery which is required for that development, the clothing, the food and the light necessary for this new population, should be of Canadian production.

Now, Sir, how was that desire to be accomplished? It was only possible to secure that end by giving an all-Canadian route; an all-Canadian route in fact as well as in name; a route that would start from one part of Canadian territory and reach the Yukon without for a moment leaving the shadow and protection of the Canadian flag. That was our ideal, and let me ask have we accomplished it? I am willing to confess that we have not perhaps accomplished in the letter the ideal that I have just set forth, but I claim that we have got as close to it as the circumstances and as the conditions with which we had to cope would permit. Let me remind hon. gentlemen that we had to consider this question, not only from what I might call the commercial point of view, but we had also to deal with it from the standpoint of the political necessities of

this country, and from that standpoint it was necessary that we should get access to the Yukon and access at the earliest possible moment by an all-Canadian route. We find to-day a deplorable condition of things existing at Dyea and Skagway, and it is a condition which would exist in ten-fold intensity in the Canadian Klondike had we not taken action in this matter. The Ottawa "Citizen" of the 3rd of March contains the following news item :

The steamer "Oregon" arrived yesterday from Skagway and Dyea, Alaska. She had a number of passengers who are returning home disgusted with Alaska. Before the "Oregon" left Skagway, seventeen deaths from cerebro-spinal meningitis were reported in twenty-four hours.

That is the condition of things now existing at these places on the Pacific Coast which are comparatively accessible ; and if these are the conditions existing at such places at the present time, what must be the conditions existing at Dawson City ? What will be the conditions existing there one year hence if we allow 50,000 people to go in there without providing any means of ingress and egress ?

Dealing with this question of access to the country, I take it that we may eliminate at once and for ever the question of American routes to the Yukon territory—that by way of Dyea, that by way of Skagway, and that by way of Taku Inlet. Nothing can be added, it seems to me, to what has fallen from the lips of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to show the inconveniences that would result if we adopted any one of these routes. It is not necessary for me to show the inconveniences, from a political standpoint, that must necessarily result if we were to start from any point on the American coast to reach our own country in the interior. Let us for a moment turn our eyes towards Washington, and see what is taking place there to-day. If, in violation of the most sacred treaties, an attempt is made by the Senate at Washington to prevent our gaining access to that country by the Stikine River, what would be the case if they had the semblance of a right on their side through our attempting to get access by way of those American points ? I say it is absolutely impossible to consider these points, from a political standpoint. But more than that, let us consider them from the standpoint of their physical conditions. The physical condition existing at the present time, in regard to the crossing of the White Pass and the Chilcoot Pass, from the most recent information we have at our disposal, are such that it is absolutely out of the question to think of getting access to the Yukon country through these passes within any reasonable time next season. I said a moment ago that the ideal route would of necessity be an all-Canadian route: and the all-Canadian routes to which reference has been made in the course of this debate are the Edmonton route, the Ash-

croft route, and the route by way of Alice Arm. These routes wholly on Canadian soil would be the ideal routes. But let us realize what the construction of any one of these routes, outside of the route by Alice Arm, would be. Take, for instance, the Edmonton route. It would necessitate an expenditure for the construction of at least 800 miles of railway to reach that point on the Stikine River or on Telegraph Creek from which the proposed railway will begin. The Ashcroft route would necessitate the construction of 775 miles of railway, speaking approximately, to reach the same point on Telegraph Creek. I have heard it stated, for instance that the construction of the Edmonton route would cost from \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000. If such be the case, I put it to the members of this House, I put it to the people of Canada, to that wider constituency beyond these walls, whether or not under existing conditions this Parliament would be justified in going to such an expenditure as that to enable us to get access to the Yukon country. Let us realize what it means. We would be spending that enormous amount of money to get into a country, the resources and the future possibilities of which are up to the present time practically unknown. But, let me draw the attention of hon. members of this House, to this fact, that when we had built that road to Telegraph Creek, it would be then necessary to build the road from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake. In the construction of a railway by any of these routes, the line from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake is an important link, which must of necessity be accomplished. No route to Dawson City could be established without this particular link having first been built. Now, how far would the people of this country be justified in incurring this extraordinary outlay of \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 at the present time ? I am of opinion that no outlay we can possibly make for the purpose of constructing railroads which may serve to develop the resources of this country is too great, provided it brings about that development which we have a reasonable right to expect. But I say it would be a matter of criminal neglect on the part of the Government of Canada at the present time, with the limited knowledge we possess of the Yukon country and its resources, to incur this enormous expenditure in addition to the enormous expenditure which we have already incurred for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railways in different portions of Canada. We cannot do it, and until we know more of the resources and capabilities and future possibilities of the Yukon country, I say we have gone as far as we can legitimately go in burdening the people of Canada with additional expenditure.

I heard the other night my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) discuss the Edmonton route, and I must confess that in a

great deal of what he said at that time I very heartily concurred; because I believe the Edmonton district is an important district. It is a district which has a future before it; it is the district through which probably the Canadian Pacific Railway should have been built, and which would have benefited to a much greater extent by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway than the more arid region to the south through which it went. But, as I said a moment ago, a glance at the map will satisfy the most casual observer that even in the construction of the Edmonton route to the Yukon, the point which that route would reach after having left Edmonton would be Telegraph Creek; and when Telegraph Creek was reached, it would be necessary to prolong the route so as to reach Dawson City. Therefore, if the Edmonton route is ever constructed, that necessary link will be there and in operation when the time arrives for its construction. But I was surprised to hear my hon. friend talk of the necessity of building the Edmonton route, for what purpose? Because he said that if the Edmonton route were constructed, the breadstuffs of the Edmonton district would reach the Yukon country directly instead of going around by the Pacific Coast. It seems to me that it really would be rather an extraordinary demand to make upon the resources of Canada to pledge ourselves to build a road of 900 odd miles into Telegraph Creek simply to allow the Edmonton district the use of the Yukon country as a market for its breadstuffs. I do not think that my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver)—who, I know, is too good a free trader to believe in any such parish politics as that—really intended to press that idea very strongly on the House.

If we have it taken for granted that an all-Canadian route by Telegraph Creek and Teslin Lake is necessary, and that, with the meagre information we possess, we would not be justified in going to the heavy expenditure necessary to build a road from Edmonton and Ashcroft to Telegraph Creek at present, and if we have it admitted that it is urgent, for political and other purposes, to reach that country at the earliest possible time, the only question to be considered is, whether or not, under all the circumstances, we have adopted the best and most economic route, that which is the best in the interests of Canada as well as the Yukon country. We have now reached the crucial point. By reason of the construction of the Telegraph Creek and Teslin Lake route and by the utilization of the Stikine River, we can, according to the estimate given us by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) reach Dawson City in something like thirteen days. If we take the Island of Vancouver as a point of departure, a vessel leaving Vancouver goes along the British Columbia Coast, following British territory the whole length of that coast until she

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

reaches what is now supposed to be American territory, at the southern point of Prince of Wales Island. Leaving the Prince of Wales Island, she comes to Fort Wrangel, at the mouth of the Stikine River. Until she reaches that point, there can be no dispute whatever as to our right of free navigation, because up to that point it is ocean and coast navigation. But when we reach Fort Wrangel, we have reached the mouth of the Stikine River, and the question arises: What are our rights in that river from its mouth up to Telegraph Creek? In so far as those rights are concerned, we have to depend entirely upon the terms of the 26th article of the Treaty of Washington. That article reads as follows:—

The navigation of the rivers Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine, ascending and descending from, to and into the sea shall for ever remain open for the purposes of commerce to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty and the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

The question, then, to be considered is, what is the true construction to be put upon the terms of the Treaty of Washington. In order to resolve that question, it is necessary to consider, in the first place, what would be our rights upon the Stikine River in the absence of a treaty? Second, what were the rights which we enjoyed at the time that treaty was made, in 1871? My contention is, that we, being the owners of the sources of the Stikine River, being the proprietors of the Stikine River in the interior, having many thousands of miles of territory watered by it and its tributaries, and the Americans having simply a strip of land at its mouth on the shore of the ocean—my contention is, that the *de jure naturæ*, by law, independent of any treaty whatever, we have the right of free access to and ingress from the ocean over that river. That is the common law, that is the principle of Roman jurisprudence, and a principle which you will find consecrated by all the authorities on international law—by Grotius, Puffendorf, Vattel. It is the principle for which the United States have always contended, for which they contended in the case of the Mississippi River, and more than that, it is the principle which has been since consecrated by the treaties of Vienna and Berlin, and is generally adopted on the continent of Europe.

Not for the purpose of making any cheap display of knowledge, but simply for the purpose of giving what I consider to be the legal position of this Government on this question, I would ask hon. gentlemen to give me their attention while I refer them to a few authorities on this subject. I refer them, in the first place, to "Wheaton on International Law." Wheaton says:

When a river rises within the bounds of one state and empties into the sea in another, in-

ternational law allows to the inhabitants of the upper waters only a moral claim or imperfect right to its navigation. We see in this a decision based on strict views of territorial right, which does not take into account the necessities of mankind and their destination to hold intercourse with one another. When a river affords to the inland state—

This is our case.

When a river affords to the inland state the only convenient means of access to the ocean and to the rest of mankind, its right becomes so strong that according to natural justice, possession of territory ought to be regarded as a far inferior ground of right.

Then, let me quote Phillimore. And here let me say that Phillimore is the greatest authority on international law who has written in the English language. I do not claim that he is an authority at all equal to the continental authorities, such as those I mentioned a moment ago. Grotius, Puffendorf and Vattel, although years have elapsed since they wrote their books, stand even to-day without rivals in that particular branch of law. Here is what Phillimore says :

It has been contended that the principle of this law has been engrafted upon international law, and that it is a maxim of that law that the ocean is free to all mankind, and rivers to all riparian inhabitants. So that the nation which possessed both banks of a river where it disembogued itself into the sea, was not at liberty to refuse the nation or nations which possessed the banks of the river higher up, from the use of the water for the passage of vessels to the sea, and from the incidental use of the banks for the purposes mentioned above. (d) The opinion of Grotius (e) seems to be in favour of this position.

I could also quote upon the same point Wheaton, Vattel, Puffendorf and Grotius. But I have here an authority greater by far, than any of these I have just referred to, and which I say is applicable to the case in point, an opinion which reads almost as if it were prepared to meet with the very difficulty with which we are called upon to deal to-day. I said a moment ago that we were called upon to deal with this question as if no treaty had existed. I have referred you to the opinion of the highest legal authorities in the United States ; I will now refer you to the opinion of one of their most eminent statesmen and publicists. I spoke a moment ago of the case of the Mississippi. You will remember that for some time after the United States came into existence, while the sources of the Mississippi were within the limits of American territory, the river discharged into the Gulf of Mexico through territory that belonged to Spain. It became unnecessary, therefore, for the Americans at the source to get down to the Gulf of Mexico to the sea and back from the sea up the river to their own territories. It became an important matter to them to know how they could get through the territory of Spain, because Spain wanted to do just what some

members of the Opposition are now hoping the Americans will seek to do—to prevent those at the sources of the river from reaching its mouth. What do we find said at that time by one of the most eminent men the United States ever produced—Thomas Jefferson. I will refer to the instructions that he gave to the United States Commissioners at that time. Speaking of the law of nature and of nations, he says :

If we appeal to this, as we feel it written in the heart of man, what sentiment is written in deeper characters than that the ocean is free to all men, and the rivers to all their inhabitants ? Is there a man, savage or civilized, unblinded by habit, who does not feel and attest this truth ? Accordingly, in all tracts of country united under the same political society, we find this natural right universally acknowledged and protected by laying the navigable rivers open to all their inhabitants. When their rivers enter the limits of another society, if the right of the upper inhabitants to descend the stream is in any way obstructed, it is an act of force by a stronger society against a weaker, condemned by the judgment of mankind.

That is the opinion of Thomas Jefferson. Writing on a case absolutely analogous to this.

But, more than that, the question has arisen here as to the nature and extent of the right so enjoyed by the inhabitants of the Interior of reaching the ocean. The question has arisen what were the rights incidental to this right of navigation. On this point, assuming that we wish to go up the river to reach the Yukon country or from the Yukon country down the river, we carry our merchandise up to the mouth of the Stikine River by ocean navigation and we can tranship there so as to put our goods on board the river boats and take them to Telegraph Creek. That is, the right to tranship is incidental to the right to navigate. Let me point out what is said, not by continental authorities, dealing with an abstract question, but an American authority, an authority they cannot deny, they cannot gainsay, and dealing with the identical issues that exist here. Here is what Jefferson said :

Among incidental rights—

—rights incidental to the right of navigation—

—are those of having pilots, buoys, beacons, landmarks, lighthouses, &c., to guide the navigators. The establishment of these at the joint expense, and under joint regulations, may be the subject of a future convention. In the meantime both should be free to have their own, and refuse those of the other both to use and expense.

Does it not seem as though Jefferson were writing of the very case that we have now in hand ?

Very peculiar circumstances attending the River Mississippi require that the incidental right of accommodation on the shore, which needs only occasional exercise, on other rivers,

should be habitual and constant on this. Sea vessels cannot navigate that river, nor the river vessels go to sea.

Exactly our case.

The navigation would be useless, then, without an entrepôt where these vessels might safely deposit their cargoes and take those left by others, and where warehouses and keepers might be constantly established for the safeguard of the cargoes.

That is what Jefferson said when he contended for rights on the Mississippi exactly the same as we contend for on the Stikine. That is what Jefferson said of rights existing even in the absence of a treaty.

I now come to consider what were the rights which we enjoyed in 1871 when the Treaty of Washington was made. At that time we enjoyed the rights given us by the Russian Treaty, as follows:—

VI. It is understood that the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, from whatever quarter they may arrive, whether from the ocean or from the interior of the continent, shall for ever enjoy the right of navigating freely, and without any hindrance whatever, all the rivers and streams which, in their course towards the Pacific Ocean, may cross the line of demarcation upon the line of coast described in article 3 of the present convention.

I say that under that treaty we had an absolute right to navigate the rivers mentioned in that treaty. What were the rivers mentioned in the treaty? A controversy has arisen as to whether the Yukon River would be included in it. The controversy arose for the first time before the Paris Tribunal, when the question was raised by Sir Charles Russell and Sir Richard Webster as to whether or not, in view of the terms of this treaty the Yukon River would be included in it. You must bear in mind that this treaty was originally drafted in the French language, and in French it reads in this way. The subjects of his Britannic Majesty have the right to navigate the rivers:

Qui dans leurs cours vers l'océan Pacifique traversent la ligne de démarcation sur la lisière de la côte.

That is to say, at the time of the Paris award it was contended that under this original treaty the only rivers we had the right to navigate were those which flow down towards the Pacific Ocean and south of Mount St. Elias. I say the question as to the Yukon was raised for the first time at the Paris Tribunal. It is a matter which may interest some people and they make a point out of the argument, that by the terms of the Washington Treaty the scope of our rights was somewhat enlarged, because we got the right to navigate the Yukon. But, so far as I am concerned, I can only say that if it is a good point, we have to thank the gentlemen who raised it before the Paris Tribunal. It was never dreamed of when negotiating the

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Treaty of Washington in 1871. That question arises, however, under this Washington Treaty, and I think it is well perhaps to say that so far as this Washington Treaty is concerned, I for my part contend—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the hon. gentleman leaves that Russian Treaty—am I right in understanding him that he agrees that the contention at Paris was correct, that is to say, that the Russian Treaty did not cover the Yukon?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I say that for practical purposes we are not concerned at present as to whether that contention was right or wrong.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And the hon. gentleman does not express an opinion.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is a matter of no interest, but as the question has been discussed, I thought it well to refer to it. But it has no point at all. We are dealing with the rights we have got under the treaty. I will say this, however, that at the time the Washington Treaty was negotiated that question was never dreamt of; in fact it would appear to me from the documents I have in my possession that those who negotiated the Treaty of Washington appeared to be in ignorance of the Russian Treaty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They included the Yukon portion.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. According to the negotiators of the Washington Treaty, they thought the Yukon was covered by the Russian Treaty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That would not follow.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am simply telling you what their opinion seemed to have been. We are not concerned with that. Here is what Sir John A. Macdonald said on the 27th of April, 1871, in a letter which he wrote to Dr. Tupper, now Sir Charles Tupper:

Then it happened that Donald A. Smith mentioned to Sir Stafford Northcote and myself that it was of great importance to the North-west to secure the free navigation of the three rivers mentioned in item 8. He says that the use of the Yukon is absolutely indispensable. That already American vessels from San Francisco carry goods via the Yukon into our country at rates much cheaper than they can be conveyed by any other route. The Stikine River, he says, goes through a gold country, and its navigation is also of importance. The Porcupine is a branch of the Yukon. As the Americans contended for the general principle, they were obliged to consent with respect to these three rivers.

That is all that is said about this matter. He does not appear to have had the faintest idea that the Russian Treaty was in existence, that under that Russian Treaty we were in possession, at all events, of the

right to navigate all the rivers with the exception of the Yukon. If there is any doubt about the Yukon, that doubt, as I said a moment ago, was never dreamed of, was never suggested, until the time these gentleman met in Paris a few years ago, and that point was raised by Sir Charles Russell and Sir Richard Webster. But more than that. When the question of this treaty was discussed in the House of Commons, after the negotiations were complete and the treaty was entered into, here is what Sir John said on the subject :

I know, Sir, that there has been in some of the newspapers a sneer because upon the latter paragraph of that article which gives the United States the free use of the St. Lawrence. I refer to the navigation of the rivers Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine.

I may tell my hon. friend (Hon. Alexander Mackenzie) that the navigation of the River Yukon is a great trade, and that the Americans are now sending vessels and are fitting out others for the navigation of the Yukon. I will tell my hon. friend that at this moment United States vessels are going up that river and are underselling the Hudson's Bay people in their own country (hear, hear), and it is a matter of the very greatest importance to the western country that the navigation of these rivers should be open to the commerce of British subjects and that access should be had by means of these rivers, so that there is no necessity at all for the ironical cheer of my hon. friend. Sir, I am not unaware that under an old treaty entered into between Russia and England that the former granted to the latter the free navigation of these streams and the free navigation of all the streams in Alaska.

That looks to me as if it covered the Yukon. That was the view of Sir John A. Macdonald who acted for us at that time. Then Dr. Tupper says :

Mr. McINERNEY. Will the hon. gentleman please continue that quotation ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL—

But that was a treaty between Russia and England, and it may be argued and would be argued by England that when the United States took that country from Russia it took with it all its obligations, but, Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to this question. The United States, I venture to say, would hang an argument upon it, and I can only tell my hon. friend that the officers of the United States have exercised authority in the way of prohibition, and have offered the pretext that that was a matter which had been settled between Russia and England ; that the United States now had that country and would deal with it as they choose, and therefore, as this was a treaty to lay all questions and not to raise new ones, it was well that the question should be settled at once as between England and the United States, as before it was between England and Russia.

Where is the point ? I would like to draw my hon. friend's attention to this fact, that at that time the law officers of the Crown had expressed the opinion, that by the treaty of 1867 under which Alaska passed from the dominion of Russia to that of the United

States, these rights still continued to exist. Therefore I see no point in the observation.

Mr. McINERNEY. The United States made the opposite contention.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I admit that. There is no point in that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) says there is a great deal in the point that the United States contended the opposite.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Well, there is this point in it, that the United States expressed one opinion, and the law officers of the Crown in England expressed another, and our object ought to have been to maintain the stronger opinion, that is, the one adopted by the law officers in England. Now, I think I have shown that in the absence of any treaty we would have the right of free egress from the sources of the Stikine to the ocean, and also ingress from the ocean to the sources of the Stikine River. I think I have also shown that under the Russian Treaty we would have had that right of free access, egress and ingress. Now, will it be contended by my hon. friends opposite that the intention was to restrict the rights to that we possessed according to international law and according to treaty ? I notice that in his speech the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) made it a matter of reproach to the Minister of the Interior that he had contended that by the Washington Treaty the powers we enjoyed under the Russian Treaty were restricted and limited ; he made it a matter of reproach to the Minister of the Interior that he should have contended for one moment that by the terms of the Washington Treaty our rights were sacrificed. Now it does appear to me that the senior member for Halifax was unwittingly severe, not upon my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, but upon his own leader, when he made use of that remark. I think he was unnecessarily severe upon the leader of the Opposition when he criticised the Minister of the Interior for having said that our rights were restricted and limited by the Treaty of Washington. Here again I have to call the leader of the Opposition as a witness against one of his own supporters. He said, in speaking upon this question :

Unfortunately, by an oversight, that treaty was renewed with the United States of America, who knew that the people of Canada and every British subject in the Empire possessed an indefeasible right to go in and out of the River Stikine without let or hindrance of any kind whatever, provided that we had the free right of free navigation of the Stikine River, subject to such regulations as might be found necessary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who was to blame for that ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, Sir, I will not go into that. There is an old classic adage which my hon. friend will understand without my calling it to his attention, that prevents a

single word. But we were taken advantage of by the United States of America in the construction of the present treaty, and they are in a position to give us hindrance; and, therefore, I say this Government, before they gave away this gigantic territory of Canada to two contractors, were bound to ascertain whether we could use the road profitably after it was constructed. That is the position I take, and I think it is incontrovertible.

That is what the hon. gentleman said himself about this treaty. Why should this be made a matter of reproach to the Minister of the Interior? The old adage to which the hon. leader of the Opposition no doubt referred was "De mortuis nil nisi bonum," referring to the hon. gentleman whose colleague the leader of the Opposition was for a whole lifetime. It appears to me there was no necessity for making this attack on the Minister of the Interior for the language he used. And in any event, I consider this: that in so far as we are concerned, we the Parliament of Canada, dealing now with the rights of Canada, we should take this position—assert to the extreme limit the rights which Canada can possibly possess under this treaty. And here is the position I think the Government should take, that the American sovereignty, as regards the waters of the Stikine River is limited in its scope by the engagements of the Treaty of Washington, which cannot be modified or affected by any municipal legislation. I say that the sovereign power over those waters is vested in the United States, but that the sovereign power which is vested in the United States is restricted in its scope by the terms of the Treaty of Washington, and that those terms cannot be modified, cannot be restricted in any way by any legislation of the United States. That is the principle for which I contend. That was the opinion expressed by Mr. Jefferson, to which I made reference a moment ago.

I will now proceed to show that that is the opinion of the most eminent jurists in the United States. It was also the opinion of Caleb Cushing, who wrote an admirable treatise on the Washington Treaty, and whose opinion was quoted a few days ago by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell). But I would go one step further, and claim that this principle for which I am contending is the principle that was asserted by the United States in 1883, it is the principle that was asserted against England by the United States in that year, and it was then adopted by England. Further, it is the principle asserted in the terms of the Washington Treaty by the United States and admitted by England in the terms of the same treaty, that is the treaty under which we hold our right of navigation on the Stikine. If therefore that principle was asserted by the United States and admitted by England, the high contracting parties, in the construction of the same treaty as that we now have under consider-

ation, that principle must of necessity be made to apply to the present case.

Let me point to the case in which the principle was applied. It was the case of Fortune Bay, Newfoundland. In that case, under the Washington Treaty, paragraph 18:—

It is agreed by the high contracting parties that in addition to the liberties secured to the United States fishermen by the convention between the United States and Great Britain, signed at London on the 20th day of October, 1818, of taking, curing, and drying fish on certain coasts of the British North American colonies therein defined, the inhabitants of the United States shall have, in common with the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, the liberty, for the term of years mentioned in article 33 of this treaty, to take fish of every kind, except shell fish, on the sea coasts and shores, and in the bays, harbours and creeks of the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and the colony of Prince Edward Island.

Therefore, they had the right to fish on the coast, harbour and creeks. They had the right, incident to that right, to fish, the right to go on shore for the purpose of taking, curing and drying fish. They also had the right to go on shore for the purpose of getting wood, and also for the purpose of getting water. Therefore, by the treaty itself they had the right to fish in the waters of Newfoundland; by the treaty they had the right of access to the shore for certain specific purposes defined in the treaty. The colony of Newfoundland, in the exercise of the rights it undoubtedly possessed, had passed a law under which no fishing should be done on Sunday, under which it was provided that no fishing should be carried on during certain months of the year, and providing further that seines should not be used, all of which provisions were applicable to the inhabitants of Newfoundland, these regulations being adopted because they believed them to be necessary for the preservation of the fisheries in which they had at least as great a right as the people of the United States. What followed? The people of the United States went to the shores of Newfoundland, and in violation of the law passed by Newfoundland prohibiting fishing on Sunday, prohibiting fishing during certain months in the year and prohibiting the use of seines by the people of Newfoundland—in violation of that law which the people of Newfoundland were obliged to respect, Americans landed on the shores of Newfoundland, fished on Sunday, fished during prohibited months, and used seines against the law; and the people of Newfoundland drove them out? What then occurred? The people of the United States made a claim on England, asserting the principle I contended for a moment ago, that is to say, asserting the principle that although the British Empire had the right of sovereignty over these waters, coast and fisheries, that right of sovereignty was limited to this ex-

tent, that even although laws might be passed applicable to the people of Newfoundland, they could not be made applicable to the people of the United States, that although the laws were applicable to the people of Newfoundland, citizens of the United States had the right, in violation of the law of Newfoundland, to go there and do practically what they pleased. The United States Government asserted that right. That right was accepted by England, because, they said: you, the people of the United States are a sovereign people within the terms of the Washington Treaty. And as a result England paid, through Newfoundland, £14,000 as damages.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What were the damages sustained?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Driving out the Americans who were fishing on Sunday.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Destroying nets and fish. The action was that of a British mob.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The Americans arrived there in the month of December and waited until January for a school of fish. They were driven off. It is true that the people cut the nets of the Americans. Some of the visitors returned home taking a cargo and proceeding to the state of Maine. But the claim as made was for damages suffered by reason of their not being able to take fish during that season.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was not due to the action of the local government or any government, but the action of a mob.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It may take some time to submit the particulars to the House, but I will read them in full. The principle contended for was this, and it was the principle admitted and agreed to in the settlement:

Her Majesty's Government will readily admit what is, indeed, self-evident, that British sovereignty as regards those waters, is limited in its scope by the engagements of the Treaty of Washington, which cannot be modified or affected by any municipal legislation.

That is the principle asserted by Lord Salisbury and accepted by Everts, Secretary of State for the United States, and it is the principle upon which the whole settlement proceeded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is made matter of reproach to this Government, that they assumed that they would have the right to use the Stikine River for the purpose of navigation and to get access to Telegraph Creek, without having made preliminary inquiry at Washington as to what were the rights we enjoyed there. Sir, we have it from the most eminent authorities, authori-

ties that cannot be controverted, we have it on the authority of Wheaton, we have it on the authority of Wharton, we have it on the authority of Woolsey, and we have it on the best authority of them all, the authority of the most eminent statesman that America has produced in the last century, we have it on the authority of Thomas Jefferson, that, even in the absence of treaty, we would have the right to navigate that river so as to get access to the ocean, and from the ocean we have the right to navigate it so as to get access to the interior. We have it on the authority of all these eminent statesmen and publicists, that we not only have the right to navigate the river, but that we have the right to use the shores and to tranship at any point necessary so as to change from ocean-going into river vessels.

Not only had we these authorities as to our rights, but we had, in addition, the principle conceded and admitted in the Fortune Bay cases. I have used the terms in relation to these cases from manuscript because I have taken them from the correspondence, and I ask my hon. friends on the other side to deny them, if they can. We have before us the principle contended for in the United States in the Fortune Bay cases, and admitted by England. That principle applied to the present case is, that the sovereignty of the United States over the river is limited by the treaty, and that no municipal regulations can be made by the United States which would in any way affect our rights to navigation for the purpose of commerce over that river. Now, Sir, being, as we were, in possession of the opinions of these eminent publicists and jurists, being in possession of the principle which was put forth by the United States in the Fortune Bay cases and admitted by England, what were we to be expected to do? Is it to be thought that we should have gone down to Washington and asked the United States authorities, whether or not they were going to observe their treaties, and whether, in violation of the terms of the treaty and in violation of the principles they themselves contended for, they were going to obstruct us in the navigation of the Stikine River? I maintain, Sir, that to do such a thing would be an insult to our own intelligence and an insult to the good faith of the American people. We have no right to assume that the Americans would not observe their treaties, and I maintain, Sir, that, in spite of what has taken place in the United States Senate, we still have the right to assume, and it is our duty to assume, that the United States will adhere loyally to their treaties, that they will keep these treaties inviolate, and that, in the words of the ever-sacred Book, the authorities of that great republic will remember:

Ye, who believe, must observe your covenants.

I hold, Sir, that we cannot for one moment admit that there could be any doubt on the

subject. If, after having on the faith of that treaty, as interpreted by the authors, as interpreted by the people of the United States themselves—if after having on the faith of that treaty entered into negotiations for the construction of this road, and assuming that, under the treaty, we were now to withdraw, this Government would be guilty of an act of cowardice that the people of Canada would never forgive us, an act of cowardice that we could never explain. I say, Sir, that we, the Canadian people, are on this continent the advance guard of the British Empire.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I say, Sir, that we hold, not only the territory that is confided to our care, as a sacred trust, but that we also hold, in addition, the treaty rights that were guaranteed to us, and we would be remiss in our duty to the Empire and to ourselves, if we did not consecrate the principle, that where the British flag once floats, there that flag remains, and that, in the matter of treaty rights once guaranteed to England, the power of England is sufficient to maintain these rights inviolate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the principle of the Bill, the details of which will be discussed hereafter in committee. There are some changes proposed to be introduced into the Bill, as announced by some members of the Government during the course of this debate, changes as to the board of directors, as to a provision for the operation of the road, and as to the mode of selecting the land.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have not heard of any change in regard to the provision for the operation of the road. Could the hon. gentleman state what that change will be?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Possibly, the change will be in the direction of introducing a clause similar to that in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's Bill. Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have charged that this is an improvident bargain, that tenders should be called for, and, in a word, they say that we have paid too much for our whistle. Now, what are we getting in return for the concessions that we are to make? We are getting a sleigh road from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is a one-horse sleigh.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not know if it is a one-horse or a two-horse sleigh, but I think it may be good enough

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

for us, because it had the approval of the leader of the Opposition.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was not known then, but it is announced now to be a one-horse sleigh.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I suppose we are not very proud, and if we get there even with a one-horse sleigh, it will be all right. We are to have a sleigh road from the mouth of the Stikine River to Teslin Lake, with suitable shelters or stopping-places for travellers at intervals of not more than 25 miles along such road; we are to have a line of railway, with proper terminal facilities, from the navigable waters of the Stikine River to Teslin Lake, and we are to have steamboat transportation from Teslin to Dawson City.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am asking the hon. gentleman who is speaking, and, of course, he can refuse, if he wishes. I trust it will not interrupt the hon. gentleman to ask him, whether he has any information that the provision of the contract with reference to the sleigh road will be complied with? The time expires to-morrow.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am under the impression that these questions will be more properly in order when we come to discuss the details in committee. In aid of the construction of this road we are to give 25,000 acres of land per mile, or on the whole, 3,750,000 acres. That is to say, in this practically unknown region, in this region of perpetual frost, we give 3,750,000 acres of land to men who, before they can call a single acre of that land their own, will be called upon to spend something in the vicinity of \$5,000,000.

Now, to a large extent this controversy has turned on the question, whether or not this contract is going to be a good thing for Mackenzie & Mann. I have heard very little from the other side, at all events, on the question whether or not this contract is going to be a good thing for the country, I, for my part, express the hope and the desire that Mackenzie & Mann may make something out of it. I hope they may make not only something, but a great deal out of it; because they deserve it, in view of the enterprise and the spirit they have shown in taking hold of this work. Now, what have we really done? What is our real object? The real object, in the first instance, must be to bring about the development of that country—to find out if there really is anything in it; and, as a secondary consideration in connection with that development, to see as the development goes on that the interests of those who are

brought into the country for the purposes of developing it are properly safeguarded. To bring about the development of the country what have we done? We have induced these people to build that railway from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake. The building of that road, no one can deny, is of itself an advantage to the country. To build that road, these men will be called upon to expend \$5,000,000. They must put that much out of pocket, in the creation of something which is going to be useful to the country. When we have reached that point, we have got to this position—that they have built a road which is useful to us, and have put into the construction of that road \$5,000,000, which must be taken out of the Yukon country. To get that sum of money out of the Yukon country, they must develop its resources. That is to say, they must bring about that condition of things which we are interested in bringing about. In the construction of that road, and in the development of that country, they are the partners of the people of Canada. In order to develop the country they must bring labour into it, they must provide machinery, they must feed and clothe the men they bring in. I understand that the country itself produces nothing of food or clothing, or even of light. Therefore, to get their \$5,000,000 back, they must help to develop the country; and, as was said by the leader of the Opposition in this debate, they must spend dollar for dollar to get it out; so that they must not only spend the \$5,000,000 in constructing the railway, but they must spend a great deal more in developing the country, in feeding the men whom they employ with Canadian products and clothing them with Canadian goods, in order to get back their money. Thus we have not only secured the construction of the road, but we have interested these men in the development of the country to the extent I have indicated. One would imagine, to hear hon. gentlemen opposite talk about these gold lands, that all these men would have to do would be to go into the country and pick up the gold. But they have to dig and delve and work before they can get it. All that is going to develop the country and benefit Canada at large. But more than that, for every valuable claim they find, they will find another for the Dominion of Canada, which is the large landed proprietor out there, much larger than the contractors; for every dollar of value they give to the land they possess, a dollar of value is given to the land beside it which belongs to us. I have heard a great deal of talk about these gentlemen going into the country and putting their blanket over it. They cannot put their blanket over that country without putting holes in it, or giving us blanket for blanket. Therefore, every dollar they put into the country must go for the food and the clothing of the labourers they employ, and, in addition, for every dollar of value

they give to their lands, a dollar of value is added to the adjoining lands owned by the people of Canada.

We have also to bear in mind that there have been mining booms in other countries. This is not the first time that gold has been discovered. We know that distance lends enchantment to the view, and the mystery that surrounds the Yukon district has given value to the land. But what has been the history of the mining booms in California and Australia? We know that these mining districts have been exhausted. In the very richest districts in California, the mining boom never lasted longer than three years, and there never has been a year in which the best parts of that country have produced more than \$75,000,000. Then, in California, where the conditions were such that men could live almost the whole year round without shelter, and where they had comparatively easy access for their supplies, we know the miseries and hardships they had to endure, and how soon the mining boom came to an end. We have, however, some information of a positive character about the Yukon country. But a few days ago there was a meeting of mining engineers at Montreal, at which two mining engineers from the Yukon country were present, and gave their experience of the country and their opinion of its resources. Let me read what these gentlemen said—this is from the Montreal "Gazette":

Some interesting things about the Klondike were heard at last night's meeting. Mr. C. J. Christie and Mr. Fred. Hyde, two practical miners, who have spent considerable time in the Yukon gold regions, were introduced to the meeting in the belief that their remarks would prove specially interesting at a time when so much is being said about these regions.

The opinions expressed by these experienced miners, in regard to the genuine inducements which the Klondike offers, were not just in harmony with much that has been said of them, not only through press reports, but through sources supposed to be reliable.

Mr. Christie, for instance, after referring generally to the state of things existing in the Klondike regions, said that under present conditions there were too many people in the district now, and those who were physically and intellectually unfitted to cope with the hardships of pioneer life should not venture their chances in the western scramble. Mr. Christie spoke of his own experiences at Dawson, and through the gold regions, and gave it as his opinion, based on personal observation, that many of the glowing reports which reached civilization in regard to the finds of gold there were largely exaggerated.

Now, there are two sides to the question of the value of the lands. There are the fabulous stories told by the people who have been working in the Yukon country and the truth of which we have never been able to test; and there are the reports given by these reliable men who have just come from there and who tell us that these stories are greatly exaggerated.

Mr. MILLS. Read the balance of what he says.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He says he made his way to that country by the Skagway trail. That is the trail these hon. gentlemen opposite want us to take. And he goes on to say :

There were some difficulties, there were some crevices and holes in it in which the pack horses got stuck, and he had seen them go down out of sight, packs and all, in the mud. He knew of something like 3,000 horses having been lost there, and had himself contributed 30 of that number.

Mr. MILLS. Does he not say that he believes it to be the storehouse of the world ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, but he says they have the liecrobe up in that country and you cannot believe a word they tell you. According to him there are two sides to the story, so that when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, during the debate on the Address, that this was a huge gamble, he said what was the case in so far as Mackenzie & Mann are concerned. They are building this road and taking all the risks. In order to get their money back—and remember they will have to sink some four or five million dollars in it—they must get it out of the gold lands, if the gold is there. If it is not, they will not get it back.

The next matter of reproach is that we did not call for tenders. I have no doubt that I will be followed by a gentleman who has had a much longer experience in Parliament than I and who knows all about contracts and tenders, but let me put to him this question: Where in this country has a construction of a railway ever been let by tender? That question was asked a day or two ago by one of my hon. friends behind me, and I have yet heard no answer. Let me give my hon. friend this bit of information. In the Public Works Act it is provided that the public works of Canada shall be let by public tender, but it is also provided that in case of emergency, when it is important to proceed rapidly, tenders may be dispensed with. So that even under this Act, which is the only one that stipulates that tenders must be called for, there are cases in which that preliminary may be dispensed with. What is the practice followed with regard to railway construction? Our practice is to incorporate railway companies, giving them a charter under which they have the right to construct their lines from one point to another, and to give each company a certain aid in lands and in money almost invariably. In this case, what did we do? We incorporate this company to build this railway, and to aid them in its construction we give them so many acres of land. In the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway,

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

hon. gentlemen proceeded exactly as this Government has done. They made a contract in exactly the same way, and after that contract was made without tender, just as in the case of this contract, they brought down a Bill, exactly as we are doing, to organize a company and enable them to build the railway and take over the contract. But if you call for tenders for the construction of a public work, what are you obliged to do? In order that you may deal intelligently with those who tender and enable them to deal intelligently with you, it is necessary that you should give them some information as to the nature of the work. What information could be given in this instance which would be of any value? They would require to know what we were prepared to give; and when told that we were prepared to give land, they would require information as to whether these lands had been surveyed or developed, and what information we had as to their worth, and we could only reply that we were not in possession of any information and could tell them nothing. These hon. gentlemen have been for weeks declaiming to the whole country about the extravagance of this bargain, and inducing their friends right and left to rise and protest against it, and no doubt they have called on those to whom they have access—and certainly, so far as the contractors are concerned, their experience enables them to have access without difficulty to most of them—and sought to obtain some offer to build the road, but so far have failed to obtain one. We have heard about Mr. Hamilton Smith. His name has been mentioned here repeatedly and I just wish to say a word or two about his offer. It seems to me its value has been very much over-rated, and one fact in particular has been overlooked to which I think it well to recall to the attention of the House. In his offer of the 14th February, 1898, Mr. Hamilton Smith, speaking about the negotiations, said :

The answer I received was that the Government preferred the Stikine-Teslin route. To this I replied that, in my judgment, which I felt sure from my familiarity with the country was correct, the Stikine-Teslin line had practically no value as a commercial route, and that no sane capitalist would invest a penny in it, but, of course, if the Government would give the right assistance, we would build the line, while disclaiming any responsibility for its value when constructed.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have reproached this Government for not having given Mr. Smith the right to construct this Teslin-Stikine route road, although Mr. Smith said it was of no value and that no sane capitalists would put a dollar in it. If that was Mr. Smith's opinion about the road, I say that no sane Government would have anything to do with him. If he was satisfied that no man would put any money

in it, and if the Government wanted the road, the Government should build the road itself, we could very well dispense with his services in its construction. Mr. Smith told us that this road was such that no sane capitalists would put a dollar in it, but that if we insisted on having it, we might have it at his price. That is to say, he would build the road for us and then abandon it, and we might do what we liked with it. That is to say: You build it yourselves, and when you build it, you can do what you like with it. But you have heard of the immense fortune which, it is said, these gentlemen are going to make, not only out of the lands they are getting, but also out of the working of the road. That is what gentlemen opposite tell you, and they tell you also that Mr. Hamilton Smith is a man whom the Government ought to have been glad to deal with, that the Ministers ought to have run after Mr. Hamilton Smith and asked him to do Canada the honour of constructing this road. Mr. Hamilton Smith must be an eminent capitalist, and, no doubt, knows all about that country and its resources. What does he say about this railroad, when it is built? He says: I will build the road for you at my own price.

But I disclaim any responsibility for its value when constructed.

That does not square with the information of hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Hamilton Smith says the road is of no value; they say that it is a gold mine. They had better square accounts with Mr. Hamilton Smith before telling us anything more about him.

As I said a moment ago, I will not say a word more about the contract, because we shall be called to deal with that in committee. But I would like to call attention to Mr. Ogilvie's report made in 1887, which states, that at that time the Alaska Commercial Company was trading up the Yukon. At that time the Alaska Commercial Company had driven the Hudson's Bay Company out of that market. Mr. Ogilvie tells us in 1891, that the American Transportation Company, with headquarters at Chicago and its distributing centre at Fort Cudahy, had monopolized the trade of that country—another American company. Hon. gentlemen opposite were in power in 1887, they knew that these American companies had got possession and control of the trade of that country, that they were bringing in American supplies to the exclusion of Canadian goods. But they never interfered for the purpose of developing the resources of the country and drawing the supplies from Canada. They never did anything except in 1894, when they received from that country \$3,000 in customs duties. But, after having allowed seven years to go by from the time of Mr. Ogilvie's report, they tell us still that we ought not to do anything, but await Mr. Hamilton Smith's convenience to build the road. I say, that this ought not to be al-

lowed to go further. The time has arrived when we ought to stop it, when something is required to be done. We have done that something to stop the Americans going in and monopolizing the trade of that country. We have done that something which will enable us to ascertain what there is in that country and what its resources are. We have done that something which will ensure to the people of Canada a share in the development of the country, because they will be able to furnish the supplies and other things necessary to enable the people there to carry on their operations.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to hear the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to-night. I waited patiently to have my curiosity gratified on this question. I desire to know, if possible, whether the Solicitor General of Canada ever had anything to do with the contract that is now before this Parliament for its approval. I was satisfied, from the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), that he, to some extent, had exonerated his department from the responsibility of ever having been consulted with regard to a clause or a line of that contract; and I waited, with some interest, to know whether the Department of Justice had ever been referred to in connection with this astounding document—for never from the hands of any government in any province of Canada, or of Canada itself, or of the government of any country with the history of which I am familiar, has there come such a miserable, lame, halting, humiliating document as this Mann & Mackenzie contract, so far as the responsibility of the Government introducing it is concerned. Interesting as was the speech of the Solicitor General, I cannot, I am sure, be considered as taking extreme ground when I say that that hon. gentleman gave less attention to the contract and the terms of the contract than he did to the very interesting historical and diplomatic matters which only bear incidentally upon this question. Upon the international law that the hon. gentleman laid down, various positions may be taken. But, when we come to the very important question to the people of Canada as to the terms of this contract, he felt that he was skating on thin ice. I will do him the justice to say that he felt the awkwardness of his position, and so sheltered himself by saying—and saying very quickly—that the details of the contract are to be discussed hereafter. I venture to reply to him, to-night, that, in the opinion of most of the business men of Canada, it would have been better if the details of the contract had been considered before; it would have been better had the Government had the advice of the paid, and well paid, advisers of the Government in connection with the contract. Let us consider that question, for it is a practical one, and it meets us at the outset. I have said to-night

that it is a guess, but, I think, a reasonable guess, that the Minister of Railways and his department knew nothing of this contract at all until the position of the Government was taken with regard to it. I shall be contradicted, of course, by the Minister of Railways, who is present, if I am wrong, when I state, subject to his correction, that there is not in the Railway Department, nor was there obtained from it, a report or advice as to the terms or drafting of these different clauses, or of any clause, in the Mann & Mackenzie contract. And we pay an engineering expert \$6,000 a year, or thereabouts, to advise the Minister of Railways of the day on this and all similar questions. I venture to say, in the presence of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), and subject to correction, that, while we have in his department highly-paid officials—for instance, Mr. Dawson, who is known all over this country, and known among the scientists of the British Empire—we had not the benefit of the opinion of any of those experts in mining matters as to a single clause of the contract or of the contract as a whole. And to-night it is clear, it does not require argument, after the speech of the Solicitor General, that, not only was the Department of the Minister of Justice passed over in the arrangement of the terms of this contract, but the Solicitor General himself was so ignored that he is unable to deal with that contract or to defend it, or take up the different points in debate, but has sought to shelter the Government and himself by putting off the evil day until we reach another stage, and go into committee.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL. Allow me to ask the hon. gentleman whether the position I have taken is not correct, that on the second reading of the Bill the principle of the Bill alone is to be discussed?

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Quite so. I wish to deal candidly with the hon. gentleman. That is the rule, but the principle of the Bill is the all-Canadian route, the principle of this Bill concerns the operation of a railway, the principle of this Bill, if it has any principle, deals with the selection of the lands belonging to the people of Canada; and in regard to all these principles the hon. gentleman says: The Government will give you information as to the legislation they propose in this House after you have voted blindfolded for the second reading. They have studiously refrained from giving us the draft of any of the amendments that we have forced them to tell us they will make on these very vital phases of the Bill. Day after day when they have found the weakness of their position was so apparent that it were monstrous to attempt to hold to it, they have told us; We will alter all that if you will only let it go past the second reading. They will come down, as some hon. gentleman says. But

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

here in connection with these vital features of the Bill, comes the confession of the Solicitor General, and he was wise to make it, that knowing so little about it, never having been consulted about it, he is unable to deal with the terms of these clauses, until they have been put before the House. Then what have we here except a statement that Mackenzie & Mann are going to run tremendous risks, risks that no other people, apparently, in the world would think of running, and that we are giving them a vast amount of property, it may be worth hundreds of millions, it may be worth not a song; and the terms and conditions have been so hastily considered that the people of Canada, and the Parliament of Canada, let alone being advised after Parliament was assembled, will know nothing definitely until Parliament votes that they will transfer to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann this large amount of gold-bearing territory in Canada if they will build this railroad, the conditions of the whole thing to be considered and to be discussed hereafter. There never was such a proposition as that made in this House, certainly since I have been in it, and I have yet to hear of any proposition concerning the construction of any railway that was ever introduced with such a limited apology. Now, Mr. Speaker, I followed the hon. gentleman's speech, and I must say that it is an alarming condition of affairs that any number of gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches should assume that they command sufficient confidence in this House of Commons that they can come down with such a proposition as is now before us, involving technical questions, involving most difficult legal problems, involving great legal questions in international law, and yet have to say that into those questions as a whole they have not looked, into those questions they hold their individual opinions, and as I shall show, the members on the Treasury benches are contradicting each other as fast as they speak, and although, it is true, they have not spoken so very frequently on this subject. That they should come down and tell us, that in regard to this momentous subject they cannot give us that which surely we are entitled to, even if they did not require the opinions of these different experts in the service of the Government. I say it is extraordinary; and when you add to that the secrecy of the whole thing, add to that the temper of these gentlemen, the violence of these gentlemen, when Mr. Hamilton Smith's name is mentioned, or the name of any man who would like to give Canada more for the money and upset this secret bargain, this bargain made in the dark, this bargain made without the benefit of legal advice, or engineering advice, or the advice of mining experts—I say the position is bewildering. At a previous occasion this session I opened my observations, and I take back none of them, by saying that I was going to make no charges against this Ad-

ministration, nor will I do so, of corruption, or of nefarious conduct, on mere suspicion, and that I would wait for evidence. Well, I may not have evidence upon which to make a certain and direct charge of corruption, but I am bound to say here, speaking emphatically, that I see no other alternative except to indict the Government for the most monstrous ignorance, and a recklessness that is tantamount to criminal. If they have not been corrupt, intentionally corrupt, if they have not been perpetrators of a huge job, if they are not attempting to perpetrate it now, their ignorance is such that it is almost criminal; and I hope before I get through my observations to be able to show that I have some ground for impaling these hon. gentlemen on either horn of the dilemma, and they can choose upon which to remain. The Solicitor General, to whom I must first pay some attention, ventured to taunt the leader of the Opposition with a change of base, a change of opinion. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when in a difficult position of this kind, have been eager to refer to the endorsement which they claim the leader of the Opposition at one time gave to this scheme. Well, coming from the Solicitor General I suppose he is an authority on a change of base. I suppose there is no man in this House who ever pledged himself to a certain course and then took a more opposite course than the Solicitor General.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I challenge that statement, let us set that at rest now. Last session when that statement was made, I said in the House that the gentleman to whom I gave that pledge was the best judge as to whether I had fulfilled it. I made that statement publicly, and I challenge hon. gentlemen on the other side to show that it has never been carried out or fulfilled.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman would go further and state what the pledge was, and then what he did, it would be unnecessary for me to say any more. I do not wish to misrepresent the hon. gentleman.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You are doing it now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But I am basing my criticisms upon the remarks the hon. gentleman made, and if he will tell us what the pledge was and what he did, I will not add another word. But let us see whether he is fair. In the first place when the leader of the Opposition gave an opinion upon that subject, he had not this contract before him any more than the Solicitor General had; he, no more than the Solicitor General, ever dreamed that the colleagues of the Solicitor General would go about so serious a matter as this without any understanding, or any reliable arrangement with the people who had it in their

power to thwart and destroy the whole scheme, whether right or wrong. Many things have occurred and have been explained to this House, which would enable gentlemen who had formed an opinion at the outset, to change it and to deserve commendation for the change. If I recollect aright the leader of the Opposition at the time to which the Solicitor General referred, laid great stress on this work being vigorously pressed forward as a Government work; but surely no man who heard the leader of the Opposition dissect the terms of that contract, and no gentlemen in this House, the Solicitor General himself included would be so mad as to contend that, having the information he had when he made his speech, he could have possibly entertained the opinion for a single moment to which the hon. gentleman referred. That information was such as to lead him, and to lead a great many gentlemen on this side of the House, and outside of the House altogether, to only one opinion, and that was in condemnation of this extraordinary proposition. Then the hon. gentleman refers to the action of the United States Senate as having been brought about at the instigation of the Opposition.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It was the Opposition of a few years ago, and the hon. gentleman who said "hear, hear," knows it was correct. The Opposition for many years in this House and out of it took such a course, as has already been explained, so as to lead any man who follows Canadian affairs to believe that the moment those hon. gentlemen occupied the Treasury benches, then every desire that had been nursed in the breast of many American citizens to get advantages at the cost of Canada out of Canada would be granted. Those hon. gentlemen were willing to compromise us or to grant concessions at our expense time and again. The St. Thomas speech and the Chicago interview mentioned this afternoon should have prevented the Solicitor General making so reckless a statement, unless when he referred to the Opposition, he meant the Liberal Opposition of a few years ago.

I have some reason, however, to quarrel with the Solicitor General for the manner in which he has dealt with a subject which in his hands I think he ought to have exercised more candour about than he did. The hon. gentleman was hard driven when speaking for the Government of Canada he gave such a representation of the authorities on international law as he did when discussing the Treaty of 1871, and the rights of upper proprietors of a river in regard to navigation over the river below when it went through another country to that to which the upper part of the river belonged. The hon. gentleman referred to Wheaton. Wheaton, of course, was an American au-

thority. He referred also to Phillimore, and I am bound to suppose that he seemed to me to make a most unfair statement of Phillimore's opinion, because in that statement—and he would not otherwise have referred to it—he made it appear that Phillimore and Wheaton agreed, and every one knows that Phillimore was a great authority on international law. Let us see exactly what the passage to which the hon. gentleman referred was, and then we will understand to what desperate straits the hon. gentleman is driven. He quoted from chapter 5, paragraph 107, and he made this citation in connection with Wheaton, where he explains the well known view of writers on international law in the United States, and a few authorities on the continent.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Was Phillimore an American?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I said that this view was peculiar to United States writers and to some writers on the continent who agreed with them but that it was opposed totally and absolutely to the views of English writers on international law.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. With one exception, and that is Hall.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman did not refer to Hall, but I will do so. Hall is an undoubted authority on international law, and he is quoted at all great meetings of international lawyers. This was the section to which the hon. gentleman referred, but he did not read it, and that circumstance makes it necessary for me to read it, not the whole of it, but the conclusion. The hon. gentleman referred to the contention, not to Phillimore's opinion:

It has been contended that the principle of this law has been engrafted upon international law, and that it is a maxim of that law that the ocean is free to all mankind, and rivers to all riparian inhabitants.

After stating that that was the contention, at the end of the very paragraph to which the hon. gentleman alluded, this is what Phillimore tells us:

For the reason of the thing, and the opinion of other jurists, speaking generally, seem to agree in holding that the right can only be what is called (however improperly) by Vattel and other writers imperfect, and that the state through whose domain the passage is to be made must be the sole judge as to whether it be innocent or injurious in its character.

Between Vattel, Phillimore and Hall and the advisers of the Crown in England there is no dispute whatever in regard to that proposition. Would it be believed that the Government have got in this position, that the ablest man among them, their representative on legal questions, had to quote or deemed it necessary to quote from

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

that paragraph of Phillimore to support the American doctrine that Wheaton lays down, when Phillimore's opinion is as different from that of Wheaton as are the poles asunder. Referring to Hall, it is not necessary for me to speak of his standing as a writer or the position given to him at different times by the Imperial Government. Dealing with the contention—the very contention of Wheaton—in respect to the River St. Lawrence and the contention of the Americans with respect to that river and the Mississippi, which subjects are considered by Hall, at the end of a long review, he says:

England, again, has always steadily refused to concede the navigation of the St. Lawrence to the United States as of right, and a controversy, which existed for many years upon the subject, was only put an end to in 1854 by a treaty which granted its navigation as a revokable privilege, and as part of a bargain in which other things were given and obtained on the two sides.

Let me give a little more from Hall, and I am not reading right along, as I wish to save time. At page 139 he says:

And it may be said without hesitation that so far as international law is concerned, a state may close or open its rivers at will, that it may tax or regulate transit over them as it chooses, and that though it would be as wrong in a moral sense as it would generally be foolish to use these powers needlessly or in an arbitrary manner, it is morally as well as legally permissible to retain them, so as to be able, when necessary, to exercise pressure by their means or so as to have something to exchange against concessions by another power.

That is not the exact reference I wish to make to Hall; but I say this, having some familiarity with Hall's views, there is no advantage to be gained to Canada by taking a position which no English Crown officer or authority has taken. Hall agrees to this doctrine as a matter of strict right, that without the Russian Treaty of 1825 or the Treaty of 1871 we could not use the Yukon or Stikine Rivers. That is a position unassailable and one that is not gainsaid in England to-day.

The difficulty in this way is this, that when we say: You are bound by such and such an American authority, they answer back: You are bound by such and such an English authority. The difficulty there is apparent, but at all events, it is more important for us to know what the Senate of the United States think in 1898 than what Jefferson thought many years ago. It is with the United States Senate of to-day that we have to deal rather than with Jefferson of long ago. Where, let me ask, did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) obtain the view that there was something new developed at Paris when Sir Charles Russell for the first time explained, as I understood the Solicitor General to say, that there was a distinction between the margin of land in Alaska, and

the boundary running to the Arctic Ocean on the north-west coast. I might tell the hon. gentleman, for I imagine he has not looked closely into it, that so far as this question is concerned, England represented by Sir Charles Russell and Sir Richard Webster, the Attorney General and the ex-Attorney General, all agree that the Treaty of 1825 so far as it gave us rights of navigation to the rivers running through the Lisière or margin gave us no other rights of navigation whatever. It referred to the rivers below the Aleutian Peninsula and below the Behring Sea covering that part running south of Mt. St. Elias. There was no question between the two great powers in the construction they gave to the treaties then and there; that we got under Treaty of 1825 any rights whatever through the rivers above this Lisière or above Mt. St. Elias. There was a very good reason for that, because I think I am safe in saying that the Yukon River was not discovered until ten years after the Treaty of 1825.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Oh, no.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I may be wrong, but I believe that is correct.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There was a plan of the river in existence in 1815.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I can say that Campbell, one of the Hudson's Bay men, claim to have been the first explorer or discoverer of the Yukon River some years (I think it was ten years) after the Treaty of 1825. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will at any rate understand that in those early years that land was generally speaking a terra incognita. The right hon. the Prime Minister made a rather serious statement this afternoon, and as I think he spoke on the spur of the moment, I trust he will retract it, so that it may not go as an authoritative statement on the record. The right hon. gentleman said that Dyea had been in possession of the Russian authorities from time immemorial, and that since 1867 it had been in possession of the American authorities. I have looked into that question, not so much in regard to the Alaskan boundary as in regard to the boundaries between England and Russia, and I know that though both nations had by discoverers and adventurers and hunters visited different parts of that enormous territory casually, up to 1825, I am safe in saying that it would be ridiculous to pretend that there had been an occupation by Russia of such a place as Dyea, or that Dyea was a place of any name or notoriety whatever. Then, again, when the right hon. gentleman speaks of it having been occupied at the time of the cession to the United States, I feel that he spoke hastily and I would ask him to qualify that statement, or at any rate not to repeat it in this House without having some definite authority. There will be no dispute on either side of the House

that there could be nothing more useful to the United States, than the admission of the Prime Minister of Canada that there had been this immemorial possession by either Russia or the United States in the country that we claim. The Minister of the Interior told us the other day that when these negotiations took place at Washington he was careful to arrange that the negotiations should proceed without prejudice to our claims to Dyea or Skagway, and what an idle precaution that would have been, if these places had been in possession of either of these countries from time immemorial.

The hon. the Solicitor General referred to the Fortune Bay cases, but I do not think he will find much comfort in that reference. Let me refer to Hall again, for this authority has gone over a good deal of these interesting questions and his deduction from this case is not exactly the same as that of the Solicitor General. Hall deals with that extraordinary claim that was put forward by the United States, that was resisted for a long time by the British Government, and which ended in a payment. Hall, after reviewing the claim and knowing of the payment, as a writer on International Law, higher than even Lord Salisbury himself—as I am sure the Solicitor General will admit—says:

There can be no question that no more could be demanded than that American citizens should not be subject to laws or regulations, either affecting them alone, or enacted for the purpose of putting them at a disadvantage.

He precedes that by saying:

That the American Government should have put the claim is scarcely intelligible.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. But it was paid.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Loyal as I am to the British Crown, I would be sorry to admit that every time England has conceded a point that has been demanded from her, the concession was based upon principles of international law. In support of that opinion, I can call to my aid the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the Hon. Edward Blake who have on more than one occasion stated that England had conceded even to the United States what the United States was not entitled to demand, and that these concessions had been made at the cost of Canada on one or two memorable occasions. The hon. the Solicitor General will see that the Fortune Bay decision settles nothing, because the facts, that instead of England acting in the assertion of these municipal regulations—for they were municipal regulations that were violated by the American fishermen—England was dealing with a claim made on account of great violence done to American fishermen in Fortune Bay, by subjects of England. The hon. the Solicitor General shakes his head.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, I have the text here.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I know the text. I have been over that case time and again, and I can tell the Solicitor General that the damages paid were for the fish that had been lost, the fish that would have been caught were it not for the violence of the mob which cut the nets and freed the fish that were caught by the Americans while exercising as they claimed their right under the treaty. There is no doubt that the damages were paid, but they were paid for the acts of the mob and not for the acts of the officers.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understand my hon. friend to say, that the claim was one for violence. The complaints were of two classes. First, it is alleged that violence was used. The other complaint did not charge violence, but charged simply that American fishermen, having treaty authority, were forbidden to fish in certain localities.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The danger in this case is for the Solicitor General to read only a scrap of the correspondence; but I again tell the Solicitor General, that if he will take that correspondence as a whole, he will find, as I have told him, that the damage was done by this mob, and by no officer of the law or of the British Government, cutting nets, letting fish loose, and so on. I am satisfied, that if he takes the papers and reads them through, he will come to the conclusion that Hall came to, that it was an unintelligible thing, even under those circumstances, that the Americans should make the claim which England paid. But at that time the Americans were feeling sore for the payment of \$5,000,000 to Canada and Newfoundland, and there was, perhaps, a question of expediency underlying all this, that a certain amount of money ought to go back or remain in the United States Treasury.

Then, I propose to deal, a little later on, with another position which, I think, the hon. Solicitor General was entirely unwarranted in taking—that we are bound to assume that the United States will observe treaties as construed by us or by England. They will observe the treaties as they construe them, or as they think they ought to be construed. That we all know; but no one knows better than the Solicitor General that here is the greatest difficulty to get minds to agree upon the construction of a treaty, and there is no greater difficulty anywhere in this respect than with the United States of America. While we may join in expressing the belief, as a matter of politeness, that the Americans will observe treaties, it is another question whether we should risk money or a great deal of money on that belief. We have the very best evidence—none could be stronger to put us on our guard in reference to the observance of

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

treaties—in regard to the manner in which the United States will attempt to gain an advantage over Canada, whenever she can possibly do it. I think I shall be able to show you, Mr. Speaker, that she began some months ago, in regard to this very Pacific Coast, to tie up by the hands and the heels, so far as she could, and to give advantages to her own citizens over the citizens of Canada in the competition for the trade of the Yukon. A man would be blind, if he could not see the purpose; and, admitting that that purpose exists, I will show, without being disloyal to Canada's interests, and without making any admission, so far as I am in a position to make any, against our rights, that she never had a better opportunity than she has to-day to embarrass, harass and annoy us, just as she has done to a large extent and for years to gain her object—not by overriding treaties, but by violating the clearest principles of law ever written or enunciated, and without rhyme or reason doing millions of dollars damage to Canadian citizens and British subjects—damages which have not been paid. With these facts before us, it is, in my opinion, the height of madness to arrange for the expenditure of a large amount of Canadian money which, peradventure, by the temporary action, if you like, the caprice of the moment, or the feeling in the United States, may be rendered entirely useless or inoperative. I say that it becomes us now more than ever to arrange all our great national schemes of development on such a basis that the United States can in no way, directly or indirectly, interfere to hamper or embarrass us except by war; and I am sanguine, Mr. Speaker, that that is the feeling that pervades the breasts, not merely of the majority of Canadians outside of this House, but, if men would speak it, of those on both sides of this Chamber. We have endeavoured to be friendly in every way with the United States for many and many a year. Both parties in this House professed, at any rate, that it was their desire to extend the most friendly relations to the United States; and it would be improper for us now to add to the danger or the excitement of the moment that would keep them further apart. But surely self-respect and our rights as British subjects demand that we who speak on this subject, shall on all occasions, and never more than now, proclaim our entire independence of the United States, their threats or their actions. It seems to me idle, in connection with what is going on, unfortunate as these actions are, that we should be deliberating for a moment about a plan in regard to which the United States have it in their power to hinder us or bother us in the slightest degree.

The hon. gentleman also referred to the contract; and that, which is the very subject under consideration, received, after all, scant treatment at his hands. There may be, for instance, a reason why the experts in

the Geological Survey were not referred to, why we have not their reports before us to guide us ; because the hon. gentleman does not himself think very much of Mr. Ogilvie. This land, which our Government has advertised to the world as one of the greatest gold-fields ever known, is described by the Solicitor General as a region of perpetual frost, and really an unknown region ; and in that region of perpetual frost, which is unknown, we have granted 3,750,000 acres of land to two poor individuals, Mackenzie & Mann, who take all the risk. Then, the hon. gentleman referred to the cases of public works which were let without tender. He was endeavouring to make a case for the Minister of the Interior or the Minister of Railways, whoever is responsible for this contract—and which is it ? They are both here. I do not think the Minister of Railways would like to assume the responsibility for this contract ; but the Solicitor General was ready to make him responsible ; and what do you suppose was his argument to justify him in passing over this technical necessity of advertising for tenders, or even shutting the door in the face of Mr. Hamilton Smith, one of the wealthiest men whose names have been mentioned in Parliament ? He says, the Minister of Public Works may do it in some cases ; and, I suppose, there is something in that argument. If it is safe to allow the Minister of Public Works to make secret bargains and to pass over these public advertisements, the Minister of Railways would be even a different man from what we suppose him to be, if it were not just as safe to trust him with that power. The hon. gentleman travelled very far when he resorted to this argument to defend the policy of the Government in ignoring the necessity of calling for tenders. He referred to section 13 of the Public Works Act, which allows the Minister of Public Works—not the Minister of the Interior or the Minister of Railways—to dispense with tenders in certain cases. That section provides :

The Minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all work, except in cases of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest.

But section 10 provides :

Nothing in this Act shall authorize a Minister to cause expenditure, unless previously sanctioned by Parliament, except for such repairs and alterations as the necessities of the public service demand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There is the same provision in the Railway Act.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But I am dealing with the Solicitor-General—one at a time. I say that the Solicitor-General had so little information on the subject, I say that the Department of Justice had been overlooked by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to such an extent,

that when the Solicitor-General was dragged into this debate and told to defend the contract and do the very best he could, he was not instructed on all the laws in force, for the Minister of Railways was ready to instruct him that there was another law on the statutes besides the one he quoted, but was told to quote an Act which, properly considered, is absolutely against this assumption of authority by the Minister of Railways or the Interior. Mr. Hamilton Smith is not a persona grata with the hon. gentlemen opposite because he—poor or rich man, whatever he may be—was willing to do this work for less than Mann & Mackenzie's offer. That is the only offence he committed. He has been slugged in the most violent manner simply because he is prepared to do the work on much more favourable terms. How much was he willing to put in of his own money ? asks the Solicitor-General. How much have Mackenzie & Mann put in ? My hon. friend the Solicitor-General knows as well as I do that no matter what may happen, no matter whether this contract be ratified or not, Mackenzie & Mann will never risk a sixpence of their money. The risk, if risk there be, will be the enormous money which, under the powers of this Bill, they may borrow ; and the gamble and the risk, instead of being Mackenzie & Mann's, will be the widows and the orphans who invest their money in this scheme, whether in England or elsewhere. Then the hon. gentleman, by way of harking back, blamed the Conservative party for having done nothing since 1887 to develop the country. He said we ought to be glad now to have a Government which, instead of merely sending men up to report, is ready to act.

The hon. gentleman again was not sufficiently instructed or he would not have made such an extraordinary argument in this House. The real work, the work which those who have gone into that country, have taken the benefit of, was done long ago. It was done under the auspices of the Liberal-Conservative Government. Mr. Ogilvie himself was sent up to that country, under the instructions of the Liberal-Conservative Government, and a greater than Mr. Ogilvie, Dr. Dawson, under a Liberal-Conservative Government, has, in my opinion, the greatest claim on our admiration and gratitude for the very valuable work he has done, not only in the Yukon and British Columbia, but in the Atlantic provinces, and in fact the whole of Canada. It is only because these hon. gentlemen had in their hands early in 1897, if not in the latter part of 1896, information that should have led to earlier action, that the question has come up as to whether they acted promptly or not. I think it has been sufficiently shown that instead of attending to the interests of the country, instead of taking advantage of the information which these reports of the officers sent out

by the predecessors of this Government had put them in possession of, they went to England and all parts of the world, and the hon. Minister of the Interior—some think wisely but I do not—got out of the way among these passes, in a direction where he does not propose to build or does not approve of. In fact, we had no Government here for months.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I suppose you mean between the 1st of January and the 20th of January, 1896.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman likes to go back to the older days when he was made a great deal more of than now. If he had the power in his party to-day that he had in that period to which he refers, I verily believe, to do him justice, that he would have been strong enough to prevent such a scheme as this ever coming before Parliament. The hon. gentleman is in a pitiable position. He must feel that he is. He has been ignored in everything. He cannot advise his colleagues much less lead them, and he is compelled at this time of life—and I regret it—to follow them in this matter much against his will, wholly against his better judgment, if we are to believe him to have been sincere in the principles he advocated in the past.

I propose to begin some observations that it will take me some time to get through. If hon. gentlemen will tolerate me, I shall do what I can to finish, but it would be a favour to them and certainly it would to me if I would be allowed to divide my observations by moving the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 8th March, 1898.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 54) respecting the Edmonton District Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 55) respecting the Atlas Loan Company.—(Mr. Casey, by Mr. Scriver.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Montreal and Province Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Penny.)

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Manufacturers' Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to the Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Clarke, by Mr. Monk.)

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Queenston Heights Bridge Company.—(Mr. Clarke, by Mr. Monk.)

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Victoria Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Quinn.)

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT—STANDARD FOR POTATOES.

Mr. **FORTIN** moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 60) to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

Some hon. **MEMBERS.** Explain.

Mr. **FORTIN.** The provisions of this Bill are very simple, but I believe the Bill will be found a most useful one if passed into law. It is to fix a standard for the weight of potatoes when they are sold or offered for sale by the bag.

The Weights and Measures Act fixes various standards. Section 16 fixes a standard bushel for various kinds of produce, such as wheat, barley, rye, corn, potatoes, turnips, and so forth. That standard is sixty pounds to the bushel. Other sections fix the standard for other kinds of produce, such as hay and straw. Section 18 fixes the standard of apples, when apples are sold by the barrel. But there is no standard fixed by law to determine the weight or quantity of a bag of potatoes. Now, it is a very general usage to sell potatoes by the bag. You have only to look at the market quotations in the daily newspapers to see how universal is that practice among farmers. I have before me the quotations of the markets at Toronto, Hamilton, London, Ottawa and Montreal; and in all these quotations the price of potatoes is stated at so much per bag. In the absence of any legal standard, the farmers who sell potatoes by the bag are subjected to a great deal of vexation and annoyance. Certain municipalities have thought proper to enact by-laws on this subject, although it is questionable whether such by-laws are intra vires of the powers of such municipalities. I find in the Montreal "Witness" of March 3rd instant, an item which relates to what has unfortunately taken place several times upon the market of the city of Montreal. I may perhaps be allowed to read this, as it states, in better language than I can use, as I am not speaking my own language, the kind of grievances the farmers complain of:

A number of farmers who habitually come to our different city markets have instructed a firm

of local lawyers to lay their grievances before the Market Committee in connection with the application of the by-law which provides that bags of oats, potatoes, &c., shall be of a certain weight. These farmers allege that, in certain cases, the bags and their contents are confiscated without any reason, and their contention is that while goods to be sold by the bag must show a certain weight, the city has no right to confiscate bags not having the regulation weight if the owner thereof intends to sell the contents by the measure. They claim that some of the confiscations have taken place under the last mentioned circumstance, and they want the committee to remove the grievance for the future.

These seizures are made in the city of Montreal by virtue of a by-law passed by that municipality in 1897. By section 2 of this by-law it is enacted that whoever sells or offers for sale any produce mentioned in the section, including oats, potatoes, and so forth, must give ninety pounds per bag. Another section of the by-law provides that if potatoes are offered for sale in bags containing less than ninety pounds, the same will be confiscated. As I have said, numerous cases of confiscation have taken place on the market of the city of Montreal by virtue of this by-law. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the Bill I propose that the standard of a bag of potatoes shall be eighty pounds. When the by-law I refer to was passed in the city of Montreal it was assumed that a bag of potatoes would contain a bushel and a half; and formerly each bag of potatoes did contain a bushel and a half, though it must be remembered that this was not in compliance with the measure of sixty pounds to the bushel adopted by the Weights and Measures Act now in force. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a good many farmers and representatives of farmers' constituencies in this House, and I think they will bear out what I say. It is alleged that the bags very generally used by farmers do not contain and cannot be made to contain ninety pounds of potatoes. The bags used by farmers are mostly empty flour bags. It is an economy for them to use these bags, and they are not bound to have bags prepared specially for potatoes. These bags do contain ninety pounds of potatoes in the fall, when the potatoes are still damp and heavy; but they cannot be made to contain that quantity in the spring, when the potatoes have become dry after having been kept all winter. The result is that this by-law is a great source of anxiety and uncertainty, and it bears very heavily on the farmers in the neighbourhood of the large cities, particularly around the city of Montreal. I have seen numerous farmers, who are not wealthy by any means, coming to market with loads of potatoes in bags, and the whole load has been confiscated. A case might be made to test the legality of such a by-law; but the idea of any farmer entering into a lawsuit against such a wealthy corporation as the city of Montreal is out of the

question. Now as there is no standard of measurement by law, and as I think a standard should be fixed, we should adopt the standard prevailing generally throughout the country. In doing this we shall not interfere with any interest, and it will be perfectly known to any purchaser of potatoes by the bag that he shall receive eighty pounds and no more. It will also be known to those who sell potatoes by the bag that they shall be required to deliver only eighty pounds. Now, since no harm can be done to any interest by such a provision, I think it is only fair that the farmers, especially that class of farmers who cultivate and sell this kind of produce, should be relieved from the grievance they complain of. This measure, as you see, Mr. Speaker, is far from being a party one. It is designed to grant relief to farmers who deal in that class of produce, and I hope that both sides of the House will see their way to support it. I venture still further to hope that the Government will see its way to adopt this Bill as a Government measure, so that it will be enacted in the present session of Parliament, and it will do away with all those vexatious proceedings that have taken place on the market of the metropolis of Canada.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I do not rise to participate, at any length, in the debate that is now in progress, but, as the representative of the most essentially agricultural constituency, not only of the province of Quebec but, I believe, of the whole Dominion, I deem it my duty to offer a few remarks on the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin). This Bill, as the hon. gentleman has just stated, is in no sense a party measure. It is a measure which, I hope, will meet with the general support of the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. As to the policy of this legislation, it is framed with a view to the protection of agricultural interests in general, and more particularly to the effect of remedying the grievances and difficulties experienced by farmers when offering their potatoes for sale on the markets. Under the Act now in force, there is no specific weight provided for the sale of potatoes by the bag, and, as the hon. gentlemen know, potatoes are now generally sold by the bag, on the markets of our principal cities. Now, if we refer to the Act mentioned by the hon. member for Laval, we will find that section 16 contains the following provision:—

In contracts for the sale and delivery of any of the undermentioned articles, the bushel shall be determined by weighing, unless a bushel by measure is specially agreed upon—the weight equivalent to a bushel being as follows:—

Wheat, 60 pounds; Indian corn, 56 pounds; rye, 56 pounds; peas, 60 pounds; barley, 48 pounds; oats, 34 pounds.

Then follows a long list of articles generally offered for sale on our markets, and now we

come to one of the last articles mentioned in the list :

Potatoes, turnips, carrots, &c., 60 pounds.

Potatoes, as stated by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) are generally put on the market and offered for sale in bags. It is quite a prevailing custom with farmers and tradespeople, and it is generally understood that a bag of potatoes must contain a bushel and a half. I understand quite well that, under the former Act a bag could hold a bushel and a half ; and then the farmers never experienced any trouble on that score. Then, ordinary bags, used by the farmers could be made to contain ninety pounds of potatoes, or a bushel and a half. But it is no longer so, under the new Act. It is this provision of the Act now in force that we wish to have amended as, under the practice now in vogue, the bags generally used cannot be made to contain a bushel and a half of potatoes. Farmers would, then, have to use empty rice or salt bags, which alone could be made to hold ninety pounds of potatoes. Now, the bags used by farmers for carrying their produce to the city markets are generally empty flour or oat bags. The Bill introduced by my hon. friend from Laval to amend the Weights and Measures Act in connection with the sale of potatoes, provides that the standard of a bag of potatoes shall be eighty pounds. In that way, the farmer would no longer be subjected to the hardship of having the fruits of their labour confiscated, just because there is a difference of seven, eight or ten pounds by bag of potatoes.

My hon. friend refers to the fact that the farmers are subjected, on account of that state of things, to a great deal of vexation and annoyance. And in this connection let me give an instance of what happened lately to a farmer in my own constituency. That farmer informed me, the other day, that he had gone to Montreal with a load of products containing ten bags of potatoes, which were all confiscated because they weighed ten or twelve pounds less than the standard weight. This is surely a very sad state of things which should be remedied at the earliest possible moment, in the interest of the farming community. The Bill now before this House will do away with all such grievances, and I hope that both sides of the House will see their way to support it. Such a Bill, in fact, should be supported, not only by the followers of the Government but also by all the hon. gentlemen opposite, as it is a measure, before all, calculated to bring relief to the farmers who constitute the revenue-producing class of this country. Our farming community is certainly entitled to the protection provided for by this Bill. While I am on my feet, let me give expression to the hope that, owing to the advanced stage of the session, the Government will take charge of this Bill, as a Government measure, for, otherwise, we could hardly

Mr. ETHIER.

hope to see the present amendment pass into law, at this session. I heartily approve of the position taken by my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin), and let me say that the Government ought to take charge of this Bill and introduce it as a measure of public policy, so that it might come into force at the earliest possible moment. I may, perhaps, be told that this Bill is an exceptional Bill and that, if it were carried, it would create an objectionable precedent. We already have a similar precedent, and one which was adopted for the purpose of determining the standard weight of a produce which is in great use, namely, salt. That Act, which was introduced by the former Government, in 1888, reads as follows :—

Every barrel of salt packed in bulk, sold or offered for sale, shall contain two hundred and eighty pounds of salt, and every such barrel of salt, sold or offered for sale, shall have the correct gross and net weight thereof marked upon it in permanent manner.

The policy of the Bill now before the House is similar to that of the Bill of 1888, in so far as it applies to potatoes, an article as necessary and as largely used as salt is. I therefore venture to hope that this Bill will secure the support, not only of the Government, but also of all the members of this House.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). A number of representations have been made to the Government in connection with the very subject dealt with by my hon. friend from Laval in this Bill, and it is my intention to introduce a Bill dealing with this and other questions. The sooner we adopt a unit of measure and measure everything, as much as possible, by weight, the sooner we will be able to give satisfaction and do justice to everybody. My hon. friend may rely on the subject-matter of his Bill receiving due consideration.

Mr. PENNY. I did not intend saying anything on this matter, but since the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue intends introducing a Bill dealing with weights and measures, I wish to point out to him that this by-law, of which my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin) complains, was passed by the Montreal City Council at the request of the retail and wholesale merchants in Montreal ; and before the hon. Minister introduces his Bill, I would ask him to communicate with the City Council of Montreal and obtain the views of the members of that body on the subject.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) The hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier), in winding up his remarks, a little while ago, ventured to express the hope that the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would support the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin).

As a voter of the county of Laval, though not as an elector of the hon. member for Laval, I am free to tell him that, if the farmers of the county of Laval and of the counties in the neighbourhood of Montreal are in favour of this Bill, I shall be most happy to lend him a hand to have it carried; but I am not ready to give an opinion on the policy of the Bill which is not yet in our hands. Possibly, some amendments may be offered concerning the weight and the measure. At all events, I may tell my hon. friend that I quite agree with him that this Bill and all similar measures in the interest of the farming community should be considered without any party spirit, and let him rest assured that, on this side of the House, we will give our best attention to his Bill, which greatly interests the farming community.

At all events, should I commit a mistake in supporting the measure introduced by my hon. friend from Laval, I may find a solace to my grief in the thought that I blundered in company with the hon. member for Laval, and with the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WALLACE. I am very glad to hear that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue intends to bring in a measure this session which will remove some of the difficulties now complained of. For my part, I think that a bushel and a half, or 90 pounds of potatoes, will be more convenient for this reason, that it is more easily measured as well as weighed, being three half bushels. In addition to that all the bags—for instance a bag that holds two bushels of wheat or oats and barley—will hold one and a half bushels of potatoes, so that in that way the same bags may be used, and it will be a convenience all round.

There is another matter to which I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister as of great importance to some constituencies, particularly East and West York. There ought to be some manner of regulating the size of milk cans. There is a very large business done in the suburbs of our cities in the milk business, and that business is rapidly increasing. There is a great deal of complaint among the farmers with regard to the size of the milk cans. In our district, I believe the milk cans are supposed to contain eight gallons, but it has been found that they hold eight gallons and a half and some eight and three-quarters, and the vendors only get paid for the eight gallons. This is a very substantial ground of complaint by the milk producers, and I think the hon. Minister should remove this by some enactment. I am well aware that in other places—perhaps in Ottawa—there are cans of different sizes, but I think the difficulty can be met in this way. Let the hon. Minister authorize his officers to stamp the cans to a certain number of even gallons where they reach over three or four gallons

—say five or six or eight gallons, as the case may be. I think that in Ottawa they have two and two and a half gallon cans. In the case of smaller quantities, it may be necessary and convenient to mark the half gallon, but I think if the department would have the regulations under which the cans would be stamped an even number of gallons in the cases I have mentioned, that would remove a great grievance felt by the farmers in both ridings of York, and I am sure in the neighbourhood of other cities. The farmers have met many times and brought this grievance before the attention of Parliament, but no law has yet been enacted which would enable them to deal with it; and as the hon. Minister has now told us of his intention to introduce legislation this session, I hope he will take this matter into consideration and confer thereby a great boon upon our farmers. I know that the records are in his department, from which he can get all the information he requires in detail, and he will receive the thanks of the farming community for adjusting this matter, which at present does very great injustice.

Mr. MONK. I merely wish to state that we on this side are extremely pleased to hear that the Government intend taking up this question. The grievance complained of by the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) probably exists to a larger extent in my county than in any other of the neighbouring counties around Montreal. I think that the limitation placed by the city of Montreal upon the weight of a bag of potatoes was an unjust assumption of authority, and I would venture to suggest to the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue that he should fix the weight at 70 pounds. That is a weight which would suit the farmers best of all, at least in my locality, and I do not see that anybody could suffer if it were fixed at that rate.

Mr. SPROULE. In our part of the country the farmers would not like that at all—70 pounds to the bag. They always consider that a two-bushel bag would hold a bushel and a half of potatoes. If the standard weight is 60 pounds to the bushel, that would be 90 pounds, or one and a half bushels for a two-bushel bag. It is on that basis that potatoes are usually sold now, but they are sometimes short in weight and sometimes over, and it would be much better to have a standard weight of one and a half bushels or 90 pounds for a bag of potatoes.

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) As I represent in this House an agricultural constituency, I may tell my hon. friend from Laval that he would much better compass the object he has in view, if instead of suggesting a reduction in the weight of potatoes sold by the bag, he would propose that the standard weight of a bag of

potatoes, which is now fixed at 60 pounds, should be reduced to 56 pounds.

For several years past, I have sold hundreds of bushels of potatoes, and I very seldom found the regulation weight of 60 pounds a bushel. I think my hon. friend would better attain the object of this Bill by reducing to 56 pounds the standard weight of the bushel, which is now 60 pounds.

All those who are selling potatoes on the market will agree with me that it is almost impossible to find a bushel of potatoes having the regulation weight of 60 pounds, and that the difficulties experienced by the farmers are not due to the fact that the bags used by them are not large enough, but rather because every bushel of potatoes does not come up to the standard weight now in force.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 61) in further amendment of the Trade Mark and Design Act.—(Mr. Bertram.)

INSTRUCTIONS TO MAJOR WALSH.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to address myself once more to the First Minister, or the Minister of the Interior, or both, and make a fifth or sixth request for the instructions which were issued to Major Walsh. I see no reason in the world why these cannot be brought down; they certainly involve no trouble in preparation; they are there, and have been there for several weeks, and it seems very odd indeed that the House cannot get that little bit of information from the Minister of the Interior.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The reason why the instructions were not brought down was, that everything has been brought down already. A few days ago, I laid on the Table of the House the commission of Major Walsh. I made inquiries in the Department of the Interior and received information that no additional instructions had been issued to Major Walsh beyond those in the commission.

Mr. FOSTER. We are to understand, then, that Major Walsh is operating without any instructions from the Department of the Interior?

The PRIME MINISTER. All the powers that he exercises are exercised under the commission, which has not been supplemented by other instructions.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). On this subject, I may say, that Major Walsh has some general instructions from the Post Office Department, of which,

Mr. TALBOT.

I suppose, the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior were not aware. These instructions relate to postal matters.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Blair for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) an Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before leaving the consideration of the speech delivered by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) last evening, I desire to show the gravity of an observation made by that hon. gentleman respecting the intention of the Government to urge upon the House the further consideration of this Bill. Those who had charge of the Bill, it will be recollected, called our attention to the peculiarities of this contract, that it differed from other contracts in that it contained covenants on the part of the contractors. I would draw the attention of the House again, not only to the title of the Bill, which is "An Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company," but to certain of its clauses. Clause 1 of the Bill says:

1. The contract, a copy of which is set out in the schedule to this Act, is hereby approved and confirmed and declared to be binding upon the parties thereto, and Her Majesty and the contractors therein named are hereby respectively authorized and empowered to perform and carry it out according to the true intent and meaning thereof.

The usual and ordinary clause to make effective and binding this contract between the Government and these contractors. In addition to that, clause 2 of the contract which we are asked to approve and confirm by the second reading of this Bill, provides:

The Government shall submit to Parliament at its next ensuing session a measure for the necessary Act confirming this agreement.

And so on. Clause 11 of this agreement makes it obligatory upon the contractors, in order to earn their reward, only to construct a railway, but not to operate it. The last part of this clause 11 reads:

Such land to be and become vested in the contractors upon the said railway being completed and accepted as complete by the Government and upon the said land being selected as hereinafter set forth.

Clause 12 of the contract which we are asked to make binding upon the parties, provides, in its last paragraph, as follows:—

The contractors may also at their option select additional blocks lying on either end of any odd-numbered block along a base line, but such additional blocks must be three miles square each

and they shall not exceed three in number on each end of each such odd-numbered block.

Clause S provides that, by the 8th of this month, that is by to-day, there shall be constructed a certain sleigh road, which is described in that clause. It is particularly agreed that, in any event, this road shall be constructed not later than six weeks from the execution of this agreement, that is, to-day.

Now, we were told that this contract which we are asked to approve, and which is appended to the Bill, is not to be approved in the form in which we have it, but that already it has been changed in marked particulars, and that it is not proposed by the Government, outside of the very letter of this Bill, to ask this House to ratify and confirm any such document as is appended to the Bill. We were told that there would be alterations made, not only in the Bill, but in the contract as well. These alterations were serious and important, even those we had heard of up to last night, but one of the most important alterations in that agreement is that proposed by the Solicitor General and promised on behalf of the Government, when he told us that as soon as we reach the committee stage, there will be put upon the contractors an additional and very serious obligation, an amendment whereby the contractors will covenant and agree to operate the road which, according to this agreement, they were only to build. Now, it might be said: But we will produce in committee a supplementary agreement; we will show that the contractors have agreed to these grave alterations, and therefore there is no necessity for any delay. But, whether this procedure would be, under the circumstances, in accordance with the practice of the rules of this House, we are face to face with the fact that, after the criticism that has been offered, the Government have receded from the proposition which they made to the House on introducing this Bill, and do not intend to ask that the House shall approve of the terms of the agreement which they entered into with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann on the 25th of January, 1898; but they intend to produce a contract signed and agreed to on some other day.

How ridiculous is the position which some have taken in this House that the Opposition, by discussion, by criticism and by the consideration they have given to the contract as it was originally proposed, have delayed or taken up unnecessarily the time of the House, when the result of that consideration and delay has been to obtain all these radical and important changes. Even last night, the night before one of the undertakings was to be completed, the Solicitor General announces a further and not the least important change which it is proposed to make. I do not believe that it is in accordance either with precedents or in accordance with common sense for the Government to presume so far upon their sup-

porters in this House as to ask them to vote for a contract which they themselves condemn in all these important particulars, and which in no event, whether we agree to confirm that contract or not, will ever be the contract between the Government and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. Then, if I caught aright an observation made by the Solicitor General, he referred to a Mr. Christie as having said something not altogether favourable to this territory which is to be handed over, under the proposal before us, to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. An hon. friend has put into my hands an edition of the New York "World" containing a contribution from, I believe, the same gentleman, Mr. Jas. Christie, in which he says:

I do not wish to convey the idea that the country is not rich; it is so rich, in fact, that it is not necessary to lie about it.

I find in the same edition of the "World" this contribution from Director Walcott, of the United States Geological Survey:

The gold resources of Alaska appear to be practically inexhaustible. The miners who are attacking the placers in the Yukon Valley are gathering the gold sorted out of the debris washing down from the mountains during many centuries. In that region there is a belt of rich gold-bearing rocks 500 miles long, not touched as yet by pick or blast. Geologists who have examined the deposits are of the opinion that they may surpass the wonderful gold mines of South Africa in productiveness.

Again, referring to the extraordinary impatience of the Government, all the more extraordinary for the observation of the Solicitor General in announcing at this late date a further change, one cannot help recurring to a humorous illustration put by my hon. friend from one of the counties in Quebec, the other evening. In regard to this formal consultation on the part of the Treasury benches of the Parliament of Canada, concerning the contract which they have entered into, I would remind hon. gentlemen of an illustration which became noticeable during revolutionary times in France, when parliamentary government was threatened, and when Parliament was regarded merely as a body for the registration of the decrees of a certain collection of men. A rustic had called all the fowls of the barn-yard together, and having convened them, asked what sauce they would like to be dressed with. The cock replied: But we do not want to be eaten; when the rustic answered: You wander from the point. Here the Treasury benches bring down this contract which they themselves are now half ashamed of, and accuse members of this House, and of the Opposition, of wandering continually from the point, because they give ample and sufficient reasons to show that no such contract ought ever to be entered into. When a proposition is made to create the greatest mining monopoly on the face of the earth, I think it is well, even if it were not for the reasons

with which we have justified our course, that the Opposition should dwell upon the enormity of this transaction, so that every man in the country who has its welfare at heart should have an opportunity to bring such influences as he can control upon representatives in this Chamber. All the efforts of hon. gentlemen so far to make what certainly is an ugly deal, look fair, have been singularly unfortunate. Fancy, Mr. Speaker, the manner in which intelligent men were talked to by the Minister of Railways. In this private conference, in the secret negotiations, the Minister of Railways tells us that the contractors were very reasonable. It would be more satisfactory, I submit, if he could show, what he has not yet attempted to do on the floor of this House, that the contractors were very reasonable. But upon what information is it possible that the Minister of Railways would be able to contend that they found, as he says, men willing to negotiate on a reasonable basis. Take his own language. Let us see the helpless condition in which he confesses he found himself, when dealing with these able, astute and successful men. In that very same speech he said :

I presume we may be asked : Why did you give so many acres as 25,000 ?

He meant, of course, per mile.

Why did you not give the contractors less ?

Now let us see the information and the knowledge of the hon. gentleman who tells us that these contractors were very reasonable.

Well, I may frankly acknowledge that the reason was because they would not take less. We could not force them to take less. We bargained and negotiated with them. Members of the Government and sub-committees of the Government—sub-committees constituting pretty nearly the whole numerical strength of the Government—urged on Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann every conceivable argument in order to get them to reduce their terms. And we did get them down very much below, I can assure you, the demands they made, but we could not get them below 25,000 acres per mile, and therefore, did not.

What were these first demands ? It would have been open and manly to have informed this House just the amount that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann thought that they could collar out of these lands in the Yukon at the hands of these hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. What were the different propositions and the different terms ? But let us see the humiliating position in which these hon. gentlemen found themselves when they undertook to hand over this huge monopoly to these contractors. The hon. gentleman goes on to say :

When you come to think about it, what is there in the question of 1,000, or 5,000, or 10,000 acres of the millions we have up there, and which we don't know whether they are worth anything or not ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

And again :

I do not know, for my part, whether the company of Mackenzie & Mann has made a big contract or not ; I do not know whether they are going to make a great lot of money out of this thing or not.

In other words and more briefly expressed, do I press the point unfairly when I say that this gentleman representing the Government practically tells us : We knew nothing whatever about the line ; we knew nothing whatever about this part of Canada, but we wanted to build the railway ; we put ourselves at the mercy of Mackenzie & Mann, and we asked them on what terms they would build it. Those are the only terms we could get from them ; we looked nowhere else ; and here we are. The Government, said the hon. gentleman, knew not whether there would be money in the enterprise or not ; but there were others. I must say, who could have advised the Government that there was a vast amount of money in it. But the Minister of Railways told the House that these gentlemen were "reasonable" in their terms and that when the Government made the bargain they did not know anything about the value of the land or any of these other very important considerations. Again, in the same speech, the hon. gentleman said :

I could not tell what value to place on the land, and no body of men, I do not care whether they possess the wisdom of Solomon, could decide what would be a fair and reasonable estimate to put on the land ; and yet we found them willing to negotiate on a reasonable basis.

Will the Government, that has given us so little information in respect to this contract, tell the House who drew the contract, as a matter of fact ; who drew the contract that is to be amended ; who drew the contract of which hon. gentlemen opposite are already ashamed ? Who drew this contract that is so incomplete that these important amendments are to be made ? Did the solicitor of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann draw the contract after those gentlemen had dictated to the Government what the Government were to give ? What officer of the Government drew the contract, and who gave the instructions to the officer of the Government ? I think we should have that information before we pass the second reading of the Bill, and that this question is a pertinent one.

You, Mr. Speaker, cannot have forgotten that when there was a Prime Minister of a Liberal Administration charged with the management of a large railway scheme, knowing as well as he did that in a position of that kind with such a large trust to execute it was necessary at all times that the Government, if possible, in dealing with that transaction should be above suspicion—what was the defence of the late Mr. Mackenzie when serious things were brought up in connection with the handling of the

Canadian Pacific Railway contract in those days? Mr. Mackenzie on two occasions—on a great many more, but on two occasions which I have a note of—used this defence. On the first occasion, at Unionville, he said: "We acted on the advice of the chief engineer." Again, at Fergus, he said: "I have invariably in all matters requiring a scientific or a professional knowledge acted upon the opinion of my chief engineer of the department." We have a chief engineer to-day, as I have already reminded the House, who is paid as an expert officer; and yet asking the Government as I did last night whether that officer had ever made a report, my question was received in such a manner that I have no doubt that he knew nothing whatever of this matter until it was "un fait accompli." Why should there be, as I believe there is, a feeling of alarm, not to mention interest, widespread in the country in respect to this proposition? It is not merely a proposition that involves a huge mining monopoly, but it is a proposition having to do with our mineral resources, so reckless in its terms that there is not a case in the world's history like it, unless you go back to the old days of Spain, when huge grants in the gold regions that Spain had discovered and appropriated, were made, and it was found that these grants which had been made, without conditions as to working, to favourites, retarded the development of those gold regions. Away back in the sixteenth century Spain thought better of pursuing such a course and policy, and from that day down to this I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to show that any civilized country has adopted such a policy as is embodied in this Bill. The Government have ignored, for instance, what the mining laws of the United States, what the mining laws of Spain and of the different colonies have all regarded as important. They have ignored the discoverer's right, they have ignored the condition of working in order to hold title; they have discriminated against the free miner in favour of monopoly, and they have, in my opinion, not only sown the seeds of rebellion amongst that hardy and strong population which will be attracted by lust of gold to those fields, but they have laid a huge financial responsibility on this country, the like of which it is hard indeed to imagine, limit or describe. They have ignored, as I have said, the very important policy of preserving the mineral resources free for exploration, free for discovery, and those features, if hon. members will look into the laws of the United States and into the experience of mining countries, they will find have been considered essential for the full and successful development of such resources. Take the legislation of the United States, and their experience has been great and their experience has been wonderful. In the old times what did Congress do? Con-

gress from the first until to-day has recognized these principles that commend themselves, not to mining corporations, not to huge collections of wealthy men, but which recommend themselves from the experience and fair-play involved in them to the actual miners on the ground. Hon. members will find this principle embodied in different sections of several statutes of the United States. It will be found in section 2319, and it has been continued from 1866 when the United States Congress began to organize a system for the development of their mineral resources. The section to which I refer, reads as follows:—

All available mineral deposits in lands belonging to the United States, both surveyed and unsurveyed, are hereby declared free and open to the exploration and purchase by citizens of the United States and those who have declared their intention to become such, under regulations prescribed by law and according to the local customs or rules of mining districts, so far as the same are applicable and not inconsistent with the laws of the United States.

It will be found even in recent cases in the Supreme Court of the United States that the judges refer to this policy of their country in dealing with rich corporations and monopolies, and point out that Congress has adhered to the policy which prevents railways obtaining, in aid of construction or otherwise, mineral lands, which were reserved for the people; and Mr. Justice Miller, in a very interesting case decided recently, traced the history of that legislation and pointed out how necessary it was to distinguish between ordinary public lands and mineral lands.

But we have some other very serious cases to guide us in these matters. We have the experience of Australia. Many hon. members may remember the Ballarat riots in Victoria, and they may know what led to those riots among the miners; and I propose to make a passing reference to those landmarks in the history of mining countries, as well as the general course pursued by the British Government when the great excitement broke out in the Fraser River district in British Columbia. From what happened in these cases and from the opinion of the experts who looked into the matter, we can well take warning on the present occasion. In the case of the Ballarat riots, the commissioners who were appointed to consider the grievances of the miners which gave rise to these riots, reported against giving absolute grants of mineral lands to any one, and they said:

The new auriferous land prospected by the applicants should be liberally dealt out, but the leases in no event should exceed 80 acres.

The commissioners argued, that lengthened terms were detrimental to the public interest, and that no lease should be given for a term longer than fifteen years, and at no rent under £5 a acre. They suggested, as I

have said, that 80 acres was a large grant for auriferous land, and then they have this sentence in this report to which I wish to call particular attention :

Countless treasures may possibly be passed from the public possession within such an area.

And remember, Mr. Speaker, that they are speaking of the comparatively trifling area of 80 acres. Again, the commissioners refer to the hostile feeling on the part of the miners being due to the natural fear that the wealth and influence of co-partners would gradually lead to the monopoly of auriferous land, and would be very unfair to the individual miner as well as detrimental to his interest. The commissioners argue that every care should be taken to guard against this.

In connection with the Fraser River excitement of 1858 there were some most carefully considered despatches of the late Bulwer Lytton, who was Colonial Secretary, and they form most interesting reading and contain valuable instruction. Douglas was then Governor of British Columbia, and people were pouring into the Fraser River district attracted by the great finds of gold. Every despatch of his shows, that notwithstanding that the responsible power lay with the English authorities, the Colonial Secretary took care to impress upon the Governor of British Columbia, that all the regulations should be such as would rally to their support every individual miner and make him believe that in supporting those regulations he was supporting his own title and his own property. Lord Bulwer Lytton sets out, that the greatest pains should be taken not to allow it to be supposed for a moment, that the Hudson Bay Company, a gigantic corporation in that province, could obtain a solitary favour at the expense of the miners from the Governor or from those administering the Government of that province. Governor Douglas wrote to Lord Stanley in 1858, referring to the importance of avoiding a cause for grievance, and for providing that there be no generally felt grievance to unite the miners in one common cause. Lord Lytton writing to Governor Douglas upon the question of the suspicion of favouritism to the Hudson Bay Company, adds :

This suspicion would be eminently prejudicial to the establishment of a civil government in the country lying near the Fraser River, and would multiply existing difficulties and dangers.

Again, Lord Lytton says :

I approve of you continuing to levy license fees for mining purposes, requesting you to adapt the scale of those fees to the general acquiescence of adventurers.

And, Sir, in the case we are now considering, it is extraordinary that this Government, going against such examples, and going against such wholesome doctrine, propose that they should attempt to collect ten

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

per cent on the operations of the individual free miners, while the charge is only to be one per cent to these favoured monopolists. Again, Lord Lytton writing to the Governor of British Columbia points out:

In a colony like British Columbia, in which it is reasonable to assume that the first immigrants would be men accustomed to danger, not to be daunted by the means of force, but too eager for gold not to respect the means by which gold when obtained is secure to its owners, soldiers will be popular in proportion as the strength which they afford to law is tacitly felt rather than obtrusively paraded.

What, Sir, will be the well-founded grievances in these Yukon gold fields, should the proposition now before the House become law? Let us remember that we are dealing in relation to the free miner, with placer mines only. So far as it is proposed to deal with this monopoly, we are handing them over the placer rights, and we are handing them over the quartz mining in that absolute grant of that huge part of the country. The Government have only had time, so far as the individual miner is concerned, to deal with these placer rights; and before I point out the discrimination made between the free miners and this monopoly I would ask the Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies) if he was serious, when I understood him on a recent occasion, to question the criticism made from this side of the House, that these regulations for the free miner, adopted about two days before the contract was signed, did not apply in any shape or form to these contractors when they obtain that absolute grant. I say without any doubt whatever that these regulations which apply to the free miner are in no sense applicable in terms or by the separate regulations to these contractors, Mackenzie & Mann, or to their assignees or to the people who obtain in future title from them. The subject has been partially dealt with, but let us consider again the respective positions of the free miner in that country, and the favoured monopoly.

In the first place the free miner can only get a grant for a year, and by working and paying and continuing to work and pay he may go on from year to year; while in the case of the favoured monopoly he obtains his grant for ever. In the case of the free miner, there is a certificate to be paid for at the rate of \$10 a year, and in the case of a company—not this favoured monopoly—\$100 a year, if it has a capital of \$100,000 or over. There is no such provision in the case of these contractors who can place their employees all over the land, and yet there is a regulation which makes it necessary for any other company, or any other free miner, not merely to pay for his own free miner's certificate, but to see at the peril of his property and the risk of his all, that every person in the company's employ shall hold an existing free miner's certificate payable for at the rate of \$10 a year.

Otherwise there is forfeiture for the other company or individual, while there is no forfeiture, no risk, and no trouble of any kind on the part of the favoured monopoly. It costs a free miner \$15 to enter a mineral claim, but there is no fee whatever charged for this huge gift to this monopoly when they earn from time to time the different portions of their 3,750,000 acres. There is a registry fee to be paid by the free miner every time a transfer occurs of his mineral claim, but there is no fee whatever charged for this favoured monopoly. When the entry fee of \$15 has been paid by the free miner, there is a further fee of \$15 a year payable by him, but there is no trouble or bother whatever on that score so far as this favoured monopoly is concerned. A royalty of 10 per cent payable by the free miner, or forfeiture of the title absolutely and at once, the very default creating the forfeiture—no trouble on the part of the Government. But in the case of these favoured contractors, forsooth, not only do we propose to let them off at 1 per cent, but should they be in default for one year or ten years or twenty years, there is no question of forfeiture; the land is theirs, the title remains theirs, and no action of the Government can take it from them for any default on their part. In the case of the free miner, let us see how careful the Government has been that no individual Canadian and no company of Canadians may do anything which would lock up several acres of these placer grounds. In the case of creek, gulch, river and hill claims, it is laid down, following good and wholesome practices in other countries, that they cannot exceed 250 feet in length and 1,000 feet in width in the case of creek or gulch claims, on each side of the centre of the creek or gulch, or 1,000 feet in width in the case of the river or hill claims. In the case of the individual, see how necessary it has been considered that everything he owns shall be held not only subject to tribute at the risk of forfeiture, but that as between free miner and free miner there shall be as little confusion as possible; so that he who runs may read, as far as the free miners' property and actions are concerned. There shall be first a well-located claim, and then a properly marked claim, so that it shall be easily identified. All this is for the purpose of order, to avoid confusion, for the development of the country, and based upon the experience of all countries that have been fortunate enough to own gold fields of this character. Now, turning to clauses 15 and 27 of the regulations, I find that clause 15 provides:

Every placer claim shall be as nearly as possible rectangular in form, and marked by two legal posts firmly fixed in the ground, in the manner shown in diagram No. 4. The line between the two posts shall be well cut out so that one post may, if the nature of the surface will permit, be seen from the other. The flatted

side of each post shall face the claim, and on each post shall be written on the side facing the claim a legible notice stating the name or number of the claim, or both if possible, its length in feet, the date when staked, and the full Christian and surname of the locator.

The 27th regulation says:

Entry shall not be granted for a claim which has not been staked by the applicant in person in the manner specified in these regulations. An affidavit that the claim was staked out by the applicant shall be embodied in form "H" in the schedule hereto.

If these are reasonable regulations, and I believe they are, why in the name of common sense or fair-play, should you allow what would otherwise be orderly and regular to be plunged into indescribable confusion, by these mineral land-grabbers being allowed to claim by the mere fact of having run their base line in a certain direction, and then to run off, as the clause to which I shall refer shows, without marking, without staking, without notifying anyone in that whole field of what they have done? What would otherwise be order and regularity, becomes, by the interposition of this monopoly, without these checks and regulations being made applicable to them, endless confusion and a source of endless trouble and disaster to the free miners; and the man is, in my opinion, absurd who will say that any body of free miners in the Yukon or in any other part of the globe, would stand such a discrimination as that for a moment, or remain a law-abiding people. There are no clauses in the contract to compare with the regulations I have mentioned, because they are not applicable; but clauses 11 and 12 enable these parties to take up that huge amount of land, and you may read the contract from beginning to end, and you will see that they are required neither to pay a fee in the way of entry, nor to put up posts or notices in any shape or form. A reference to Mr. Jennings's report will show that there is a possibility of this mineral land coming to 6,250,000 acres instead of the 4,000,000 acres spoken of in the House, by the adoption of line 2, the length of which is 250 miles. Section 18 of the contract, at any rate, permits these monopolists to take 92,160 acres, or to have this quantity of land reserved to them, on the completion of each ten miles of their road; and they are permitted to make their selection at leisure. They may make their selection of the lands, one-half in three years and one-half in six years. Now, permit me to draw attention to some of the reasons for some of the regulations from which these contractors have been exempted, and the wisdom that has made them applicable elsewhere to miners and mining companies. For instance, Barringer and Adams, discussing similar regulations to those applying to the free miner here, say:

The location must be distinctly marked on the ground, so that its boundaries can be readily traced.

The test is that any one visiting the ground may be able to trace and identify the location. Again, these writers say :

The failure, however, to mark the location as required is absolutely fatal to its validity.

Speaking again of the validity of the location, they say :

This process seems to be the usual mode recognized among miners, to indicate the taking up of a claim of this sort, as in fact an appropriation or proof of appropriation of the claim.

And, as answering the question as to why these claims should be limited in extent, these authors say :

The claim, unless the regulations otherwise provide, is invalid if unreasonable in extent, as creating a monopoly.

To refer again to the limited extent in locating a placer, they refer to the fact that :

The regulations limit the extent of a placer location to twenty acres, a lode claim to 1,500 feet in the direction of the lode or vein, and 300 feet wide.

Then, on the question of limited claims, and the reason for them, they say :

It is a recognition of such local district regulations, and is admirably adapted to promote the development of our mineral resources, as well as to prevent any monopoly of mining ground, the requirement serving to prevent the location of land as mining claims, unless the locator has sufficient faith in the character thereof to justify expenditure in its location.

Touching the condition of working, they say :

These mineral lands being thus open to the occupation of all discoverers, one of the first necessities of a mining neighbourhood was to make rules by which this right of occupation should be governed as among themselves, and it was soon discovered that the same person could mark out many claims of discovery and then leave them for an indefinite length of time without further development, and without actual possession, and seek in this manner to exclude others from availing themselves of the abandoned mine. To remedy this evil a mining regulation was adopted that some work should be done on each claim in every year, or it would be treated as abandoned.

That gives one an idea of the radical discrimination which has been made between the free miner and this company, and for that discrimination there is no precedent—none has been given to this House, and I know of none—to be found in the world's history of the successful administration of any gold fields.

The right hon. leader of the Government told us, that he desires to have the road in operation by the first of September, and we are promised some amendment in committee by which the contract will be made to have

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

that effect, but it is significant of the hasty and crude preparation of this contract that the agreement which the right hon. First Minister desired is not the one which is before the House.

As regards the clause touching the forfeiture of the deposit, I would like to call attention to the statement of the Minister of the Interior, as a sample of the confusion which prevails in the minds of the hon. gentlemen who have charge of this Bill. In his speech, the hon. Minister of the Interior told us, that the \$250,000 deposit had reference only to the construction of the railway, and did not apply to the construction of the sleigh road. That is fortunate for Mackenzie & Mann, who are apparently defaulters in this respect. But he added : "We have the covenant with the contractors, which is just as good as a deposit." Would the hon. gentleman tell me whether, default having been made, he proposes to take any action against Mackenzie & Mann upon their covenant, which, he says, is just as good as the \$250,000 deposit ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). When default is made, the Government will consider very carefully what they will do. But the hon. gentleman is making an entirely gratuitous statement when he says that default is made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I accept the statement of the Minister of the Crown, but am entitled to ask the question: Has the sleigh road been built ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is aware that there is no telegraph line between that point and this.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And the hon. gentleman is aware that Mr. Mann is in Ottawa. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman saw Mr. Mann. It is only reasonable that he should see him, if he takes any interest in the expediting of this work. Has the hon. gentleman the slightest supposition, from his conversation with any of these contractors, that one single mile of that road has been built ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that at the Rideau Club, this afternoon, I casually met Mr. Mann, and asked him if the sleigh road was completed, and he assured me that it was.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman was not as frank with me as I thought he would be, when this conversation began.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I told the hon. gentleman, that he made a statement he had no foundation for making, and that should have satisfied him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was asking a question, and would now, with

the hon. gentleman's permission, ask him another. If Mr. Mann's statement be not correct, will the Government take action on the covenant?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I think the hon. gentleman had better proceed with his speech.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. No doubt, the hon. Minister would prefer that I should take that course. He referred, however, in his speech, to this forfeiture again. He said:

There is a forfeiture of \$250,000 now in the hands of the First Minister, and there is the personal responsibility of Mackenzie & Mann, under a signed contract which renders them liable to the full extent of their means, whatever these may be.

Would the hon. gentleman tell me who drafted that security clause? I do not suppose he will, but I desire to show him the difference between it and the security clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter. I feel very positive that the clause in this contract was not drawn by any law adviser of the Government. Take the clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter, chapter 1 of the Statutes of 1881, paragraph 2, and compare it with this boasted security clause in this contract. The clause in this contract, which is clause 10, reads as follows:—

The contractors shall within ten days after the execution hereof deposit with the Government in cash or approved cash security, the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars as security that the railway from Stikine to Teslin Lake hereby contracted for will be completed and equipped in accordance with the terms hereof, and on such railway being completed and equipped and accepted as hereinbefore specified the said sum or security shall be returned to the contractors or to whom they may appoint, and if the same be deposited in cash, interest at the rate of three per cent per annum thereon shall be paid for the time such cash has been deposited.

Compare that with the clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter, section 2 of chapter 1 of the Statutes of 1881:

The contractors, immediately after the organization of the said company, shall deposit with the Government \$1,000,000 in cash or approved securities, as security for the construction of the railway hereby contracted for. The Government shall pay the company interest on the cash deposited at the rate of four per cent per annum, half yearly, and shall pay over to the company the interest received upon securities deposited—the whole until default in the performance of the conditions thereof or until the repayment of the deposit, and shall return the deposit to the company on the completion of the railway according to the terms hereof, with any interest accrued thereon.

In the one case the interest stops on default, but in the other it does not. I submit this to the consideration of the Government, that when they reach—if they ever do—the committee stage on this Bill, they should take

some pains to redraft that clause, so as to provide that, in case of default, the Government may lay their hands upon every dollar of the deposit. At present, the only risk which Mackenzie & Mann seem to run is this, that if they make default, instead of their getting their money back, it shall be held in the safe-keeping of the Government, for ever, if they like, and the company will draw the interest at 3 per cent per annum—not a very bad arrangement for Mackenzie & Mann.

As to the risk, let us consider that carefully in the light of some pretty good advice. Mackenzie & Mann, according to the Government, run the risk of losing \$250,000 and of being made liable for damages, according to what rule, the Minister of the Interior did not know, and the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) took very good care not to enter into that very abstruse and difficult question. I should like indeed to be informed by some of the legal luminaries on the Treasury benches what the nature of the claim for damages would be, on default, outside of this penalty or liquidated damage—whichever it may be—embraced in that clause.

But, leaving these technical questions, let us come down to something which every one can understand.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Hear, hear.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Let us come down, for instance, to the understanding of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I ask him what is the risk which Mackenzie & Mann run with regard to this deposit. I am going to submit a brief quotation, for it is a shorter way than to give them the history of these different contracts, for the building of railways within a certain time. This is not the first we have had; we have had them by the score, even cases in which the contract said—as this contract does not say—that time was to be the very essence of the bargain, that the contractors should not be entitled to a single farthing unless a certain thing were done by a certain day. And yet, on the failure of the contractors to carry out their agreement, Acts have been passed by this Parliament extending the time or declaring the forfeit off and handing back the money. If hon. gentlemen opposite have forgotten the history of the indulgence of the Parliament of Canada in connection with the contractors who made bona fide attempts to build a railway within a certain time and failed, I call their attention to Mr. Mackenzie's utterances at Kingston in 1878 on this very subject. We have here a case exactly in point. Let every one understand from this just how much security we have and how much risk Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann ran when they made their bargain under these pleasant circumstances, for them, in connection with the

building of this Yukon road. The late Alexander Mackenzie was defending his Government against a charge of having on such a contract, handed back the deposit and relieved the contractors. He said :

The Canada Central Company gave their contract to Mr. Foster, who, as I have stated, had the contract from us for the 85 miles which we were to build. The country proved to be much more difficult in way of railway construction than Mr. Foster had anticipated at the time he took the contract, and he asked for a revision of the terms of the contract, which the Government were unwilling to grant.

But when we found that he was not likely to proceed with the work as expeditiously as we could desire, we determined to cancel the contract, and pay back the money deposited, paying him such an amount for the work he performed as might be certified by the engineer as earned in the prosecution of surveys as far as they could be made available by the Government in finishing the surveys. This is what is characterized as a gross wrong. What is there wrong about it? The contract was fairly awarded.

A little different from this case, I submit.

It was fairly annulled, and we undoubtedly had the power to annul it; and, for that matter, our predecessors annulled many a contract. We just as certainly had the power to pay back the money and release the security, and we did so believing that it was in the public interest to do it. The previous Government did the very same thing, not in paying back \$85,000, as we did, but over \$1,000,000 to Sir Hugh Allan when they annulled his contract. If it was wrong for us to annul one contract and pay back the security, how much greater a wrong were they guilty of when they repaid back about twelve times as much as we did? We believed we were doing it in the public interest. It has been frequently done in the past, and no doubt will have to be done by every Government. There is nothing in the matter bearing the faintest shade of corruption.

Accepting his own version of that part of the great railway system of this country, are we to suppose, have we any reason to believe that, should default be made in connection with any of the terms of this contract, this Government will be more harsh than Alexander Mackenzie was or than has been our experience in these matters as between Governments and the contractors who undertake such huge contracts at great risk. Well, then, we have Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann able in this case not merely to quote the practice of Government in connection with these contracts as stated by the late Alexander Mackenzie, but, forsooth, to plead an excuse already provided for them by the Prime Minister of this country because he has already told us that, owing to the course of the Opposition in this very debate, they may be embarrassed and may be prevented from carrying out this contract to the letter.

In regard to monopoly, the Minister of the Interior affected to be indignant at the very suggestion of such a thing, so far as the power to build railways was concerned. During his speech, the hon. gentleman said :

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

They are mere charters for the construction of a line of railway, which any company might get upon application to Parliament in the usual way.

And again :

Now the reading of that clause will at once dissipate the idea that there has ever been any monopoly granted to this company. There is no monopoly whatever. There is nothing in this clause which, by any strength of imagination, can be called a monopoly.

Now, let us see how far apart these advisers of His Excellency are at times. Who was the authority for the statement, the frank, fair statement, of the meaning of this clause regarding railway construction? The first authority in this House on that subject was the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), and this is what he says in regard to monopolies :

Well, then, they said, somebody else will build that line if we go on and build this route, which is, from a business point of view, the most favourable. We said : We will not allow it for a term of years, at all events.

And again :

The contract could not have been entered into unless we were prepared to give them some protection against the destructive competition which would arise if this other route were built, destructive not only—

On that very important feature of the contract, you have these two gentlemen, one of whom is really in charge of the Bill, differing in the construction of the clause and the intention of the Government in introducing it.

Some hon. gentlemen have pretended that comfort could be got for those who support this contract by saying that if tenders were not asked for, there was the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a precedent. I wish to point out that there were features of that case which do not at all exist in the case under consideration. In the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway the subject had been threshed out and debated time and time again in this House. There was an obligation upon the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada to build that road. Parliament had approved of the system of building it by means of land grants and cash subsidies, and the Government had been empowered to carry out that policy; but there had been a complete failure so far as the implementing of that proposal was concerned. There were surveys and there were estimates; there was every guide necessary to enable the Government to reach an intelligent conclusion. And, under these circumstances, the Government submitted an offer which commended itself to this House and to this country, an offer which could be discussed in this House with the reports and estimates and surveys before hon. members. And in the preamble of that very Act we see the distinction between that case and the present all the more clearly. I again refer to chap. 1 of the Acts of

1881, relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in the second clause of the preamble we find the following:—

And whereas the Parliament of Canada has repeatedly declared a preference for the construction and operation of such railway by means of an incorporated company aided by grants of money and land, rather than by the Government, and certain statutes have been passed to enable that course to be followed, but the enactments therein contained have not been effectual for that purpose—

Therefore, the Act goes on to provide for the ratification of the contract which would carry out that object. Then, the Minister of the Interior was courteous enough to comply with a request of mine, when asked to be shown what I called a general form of contract, and he sent me copies of several Orders in Council prescribing the terms upon which contracts were to be drawn, where the Government was aiding the construction of a railway by a land grant. I call attention to the provisions of these Orders in Council, that they have been wholly ignored in the present instance. I will omit reference to those clauses which provide for, not merely the construction, but the operation of the road that is to receive the land grant. This is the clause that you find in nearly every one of these Orders in Council relating to these contracts:—

Tenth. That time shall be held to be the essence of the contract, and that unless the railway be completed, adequately equipped, and running for the whole distance from Winnipeg to the neighbourhood of Whitewater Lake, a distance of not less than 152 miles, by the said first day of October, 1885, the company's claim to land, under any and all Orders in Council relating to them and to the railway, including the present Order in Council, shall be absolutely null and void.

That was made the condition, and if the hon. gentleman meant to hold Mackenzie & Mann to that heavy undertaking, as they profess, this clause would have been found in this contract, and its absence, I say, is significant when we find it in similar contracts made between the Government and other companies in times past. Some hon. gentlemen have discussed this extraordinary statement of the Minister of Railways that this was a "gamble." There is no doubt that the hon. gentleman approached it with that view, that the Government had entered into a huge gamble, and I have an excuse for the Minister of Railways for not having resorted to anything like an advertisement asking for public tenders. If his statement be correct that this was a gamble, and if the manner in which he put the contract before the House was accurate, he would have become liable to indictment had he advertised for any public tenders. Under the Criminal Code, paragraph 205, he would have been liable to two years' imprison-

ment and a fine of \$2,000 for advertising any scheme—this is the language of the statute:

Any scheme or plan for disposing of any property by any mode of chance whatsoever.

So if the Minister of Railways knows nothing about railway contracts and gold fields, he does understand the provisions of the Criminal Code. Then the Minister of the Interior took a long time to explain the ignorance of the Government in regard to the subject matter of this contract. I wish, however, to deal with the Minister of the Interior as opposed to the Minister of Railways on this subject, and then to deal with the Minister of Railways as opposed to himself, in order to show the confusion with which this proposition has been covered when introduced for the consideration of the House. Take, for instance, the speech of the Minister of Railways. He told us in the first place:

Hon. members of this House will recollect quite clearly that before the close of last session, evidence was pouring in upon us of the immense discoveries of gold that were taking place in the Yukon district, and returning parties from that remote region were bringing us the most fabulous accounts of its mineral deposits.

Then, again, he refers to the great gold discoveries coming under the consideration of the Government, and adds:

It became clear to us that we should immediately address our attention to dealing with these problems in a manner that would be most efficient.

And so on. Now let us take the Minister of the Interior. In a speech that was remarkable for the strength of the assertions which, on examination, became questionable, if we are to take the statements of the Minister of Railways as accurate, the Minister of the Interior said:

We all know exactly what we knew last session about the Yukon country; there is no dispute about it. If I recollect aright, the printed report was not brought down before the House prorogued.

He had the information of Mr. Ogilvie's report, in which he said there had been some extraordinary rich finds of gold made. He goes on to say, however, that it was an almost unknown district, a district that had attracted no attention whatever, a district that had not attracted the attention of the late Government. Then he refers to the mining in the Stewart River, and continues:

But will anybody in his sane senses undertake to say that when this Parliament prorogued we had any information whatever which led to the supposition that tens of thousands of people were going to the Klondike district last fall and the coming year? Why, nobody dreamed of such a thing.

The Minister of Railways dreamed of it. The Minister of Railways, with these re-

ports coming in, not only from officials, but from returning parties, telling of the vast gold discoveries, says that in his opinion it became the duty of the Government immediately to consider what was to be done with this subject. I say the Minister of Railways speaks in such a way as to make the statement of the Minister of the Interior all the more remarkable and astounding. Let me show the evidence the Minister of Railways had under his hands at the end of last session, when, as a member of that Government, he was in charge of the information from 1896 down to the end of the session of 1897. Take, for instance, the report of Mr. Ogilvie, Sessional Papers, volume 30, No. 13. Writing on November 6th, 1896, he speaks of rich placer mines of gold discovered on the Klondike and branches, and gives the result of workings. I speak subject to correction, but I think the Minister of the Interior stated that that report of November, 1896, was in possession of the Government in 1896. Mr. Ogilvie goes on to say :

For the news has gone out to the coast, and an unprecedented influx is expected next spring (1897). And this is not all, for a large creek called Indian Creek joins the Yukon about midway between the Klondike and Stewart rivers, and all along this creek good pay has been found. * * * Now gold has been found in several of the streams joining Pelly River, and also along the Hootalinqua. In the line of these finds farthest south are the Cassiar gold fields in British Columbia ; so the presumption is that we have in our territory along the easterly watershed of the Yukon a gold-bearing belt of indefinite width, and upwards of 300 miles long, exclusive of the British Columbia part of it. :

Later on, he says :

I think this is enough to show that we may look forward with confidence to a fairly bright future for this part of our territory.

Then, referring to Bonanza Creek, he says :

From \$1 to the pan of dirt up to \$12 are reported, and no bed rock found yet. This means from \$1,000 to \$12,000 per day per man sluicing.

And again :

Enough prospecting has been done to show that there are at least fifteen miles of this extraordinary richness, and the indications are that we will have three or four times that extent, if not all equal to the above, at least very rich.

In January, 1897, he reports :

The reports from the Klondike region are still very encouraging.

Later on :

One thing is certain, we have one of the richest mining areas ever found, with a fair prospect that we have not yet discovered its limits.

On January 22nd, 1897, he reports :

I am confident from the nature of the gold found in creeks that many more of them, and rich too, will be found.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Then, on January 23rd, 1897 :

Placer prospects continue more and more encouraging and extraordinary.

Then, Mr. Speaker, how in the name of reason could the Minister of the Interior talk in that light way in regard to what had so much impressed the Minister of Railways when he issued the pamphlet published in August, 1897, that must have been prepared a long time prior to that, and informed the world, informed all for whom it was intended, that they were invited to come to our shores and to enjoy the conditions that obtained in Canada. He published this as early as August, 1897 :

The discoveries of gold near the southern boundary of British Columbia have recently been followed by still further discoveries on the Yukon River and its tributaries in the extreme north, and at numerous points between the two gold and silver have been found in such quantities as to create the belief that throughout the several ranges of the Rocky Mountains from the 49th parallel to the Arctic Ocean, additional fields for mining enterprise will annually be found for many years to come, and that as transport is afforded mining towns will arise from north to south of British Columbia. In no part of the world can capital be more profitably employed.

Then coming particularly to the Yukon, there is an article headed "The Yukon Gold Fields," which is published by that hon. gentleman in August, 1897. It says :

The greatest gold discovery of recent years has been made in the North-west Territories of Canada. No sooner had the great wealth of the gold and silver quartz mountains of British Columbia become known to the world than tidings were received of fabulously rich gold diggings on the Yukon and its tributary streams, particularly on the Thronduick, or as it is more generally called, the Klondike, as well as on the Bonanza, the Eldorado and other creeks.

And later on :

But of its richness in that respect there is no doubt, and it is impossible at present to limit the locality from which gold will be taken.

Further on in the same article there is the following :—

But the enormous quantity of gold brought out by a few prospectors resulted in a rush such as has not been seen for many years, and it became necessary to provide more amply for the future.

That was the statement made by the hon. Minister in August, 1897.

Let us now go a step further and see what information had been obtained by our neighbours to the south. The Minister of the Interior of the United States, in his annual report for the year ending June 30th, 1897, publishes some valuable information, and the United States Government had no officer more reliable or more deserving of praise than their representative in this regard. Speaking of Alaska, the Hon. Secretary of the Interior said :

The population of the district, according to the census of 1890, was 32,052, which has been greatly augmented since, notably so during the last two years when discoveries of valuable gold mines in Alaska, and particularly in the Klondike region, has caused a large influx of white people from all grades of society.

In the appendix to this report the Secretary adds some interesting information :

Near by is the mouth of the Koyukuk River (the Klondike), a tributary to the Yukon from the north. This river has been ascended 600 miles by steamer, and with its various tributaries is known to be rich in gold.

Again :

When the tidings came of the rich finds on the Klondike last spring, the entire population forsok the place. Circle City, and hastened to Klondike, and hundreds of good, comfortable log cabins were emptied.

Again :

The summer has been a memorable one because of the excitement created by the rich gold discoveries of last winter on the Klondike. I was at St. Michael the 1st of July, when the returning miners, with their valuable packages of gold dust, reached that port en route to the States, and later in the fall when thousands of miners reached St. Michael from the States en route to the Klondike mines.

Again :

My observations at the various mining camps along the river, and my conversations with miners that had been from one to several years in the country, and a personal inspection of gold dust brought out by various persons, have led me to feel that the public statements of the richness of the mines clustered around the Klondike have not been exaggerated.

Again, this officer reporting, who is the general agent of education for Alaska, Mr. Sheldon Jackson, says :

Wherever a prospector has experimented on the streams and creeks, not only in the Yukon valley, but also on the streams north of the Arctic circle running into the Arctic Ocean, as well as a number of the great streams running into the Pacific Ocean, evidences of gold deposits have been found, making Alaska probably the largest fields of gold deposits in the world.

Then we have another source of information in a lecture delivered by Mr. Ogilvie in Victoria, and a reference to this will strengthen the position I took at the beginning of my observations, that we are handing over not only a rich gold possession to these contractors, the extent of which the Minister of Railways confessed he could not even guess, but we are handing over what acknowledged authorities say is the largest tract of rich gold deposits the world has ever known. Mr. Ogilvie, in his lecture, at page 16 of the report, says :

We must have from 90,000 to 100,000 square miles, which, with proper care, judicious handling and improved facilities for the transportation of food and utensils, will be the largest, as it is probably the richest gold field the world has ever known.

Again, he says :

There are men in that country who are poor and who will remain so. It has not been their luck, as they call it, to strike it rich, but I may say that that country offers to men of great fortitude, steadiness and some intelligence an opportunity to make more money in a given time than they could possibly make anywhere else.

Again:

In conclusion let me say that we have in the far north land a vast region comprising from 90,000 to 100,000 square miles of untold possibilities. Rich deposits we know exist in it, and for aught we know many more equally rich may yet be found. We know now that there is sufficient to supply a population of 100,000 people, and I look forward to seeing that number of people in that country within the next ten years.

Hon. gentlemen may consider that in bringing to the attention of the House, not for the first time, testimony as to the mineral wealth of their country, there is not altogether a proper appreciation of the time of the House ; but it is a remarkable fact that testimony to the value of that country now comes from this side of the House and from hon. members opposed to this Bill, while hon. gentlemen who are seeking to minimize the mineral wealth of the Yukon are those who are seeking to put through this gift to Mackenzie & Mann.

But there is another matter which troubles hon. gentlemen opposite, I think. There has been confusion among members on the Treasury benches as to what they really intended to give these contractors, and as to what the conditions of the contract are. What have we to say in view of the conflict between the Minister of the Interior and the officer who was sent to that country with the most extraordinary instructions, or at all events clothed with very wide authority indeed ? The Minister of the Interior said :

Somebody the other night—I think it was the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace)—in a sarcastic tone, wanted to know why Major Walsh was camped far from Dawson City. In the name of common sense, what would he be doing at Dawson City ? We have forty mounted police and a sufficient staff of officers there to do the work.

Where are these instructions ? The Prime Minister, as I understood him, said that there was not a line to that effect in the instructions. We were told :

Major Walsh is at the place he was told to stay, attending to the business he was sent to attend to.

But Major Walsh has been heard from, and Major Walsh was asked :

“ Well, Major, were you disappointed at being held up here by the ice ?

“ Yes, I was much disappointed, I was very anxious to get to Selkirk at least, with all my party and with it to Dawson City.”

There is, not merely a contradiction between colleagues, but there is a very serious contradiction between the Commissioner and

the Minister of the Interior in regard to a matter not wholly unimportant in this connection.

There is confusion as to the facts, but, what is even a more serious thing, there is a bewildering confusion amongst Ministers on the Treasury benches as to the rights of this country in our relations with the United States. Yesterday, the Prime Minister, in urging this Parliament not to pay any heed to what the United States authorities might do, in connection with the transshipment of goods on the Stikine River, told us, that if the United States attempted to contravene a solemn treaty, there was a remedy easily at hand. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, the Government are relying upon this, that if we in Canada are interfered with by the United States customs authorities on the Stikine River, and if that interference is against the letter or spirit of the treaty, we have our remedy, and that remedy is that we can go to a United States court, and in the face of a United States statute obtain a vindication of our rights under the treaty, because, as the Prime Minister says—and it is upon this supposition the Government are going—a treaty is paramount to a statute in the United States. I listened in vain for the opinion of the Solicitor General on that subject, and I say here and now, that neither the Minister of Justice nor the Solicitor General of Canada will endorse that opinion of the Prime Minister. Sir, what a plight are we not in, when, in pushing this enterprise on the assurances that are given to us against these threats, or supposed threats, from the south, are of that nature.

Let us see exactly what the law is in the United States; it was settled long ago. The law is, that a treaty which is ratified by their Congress—and, if it be not so ratified, it is not a treaty at all—is a part of the law of the land. It obtains its effect and vitality from the action of their Congress, just as a statute does, and it is paramount to all the statutes that contravene it which have been passed anterior to the sanction of that treaty. But, Sir, there is not a jurist in the United States who pretends that the body that brought that treaty into life cannot undo it and every line and every letter in it, the very next day or the very next moment. The responsibility is not between the law courts and the Government; the responsibility is between either party to the treaty. Their rights are not in the courts of the United States; their rights are in the diplomatic chamber; their rights have to be settled as they are generally settled, between independent governments. There is not a pretense of authority in the United States to support the proposition laid down by the Prime Minister of Canada yesterday. Whether clause 13 is contrary to the spirit or provisions of that treaty, or whether any Act is passed in the Congress of the United States, contrary to the provisions of the treaty, we have not the slightest ground to

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

go upon to cause us to believe that we can obtain relief in any court of the United States. Our only remedy for the violation of that treaty would be in the usual way, namely, through the British Government. The Minister of Public Works does not seem to accept the law as I lay it down, but he will find it is said in Wharton:

A treaty may supersede a prior Act of Parliament, and an Act of Congress may supersede a prior treaty.

That is the law, and authorities are cited for it. But let me give the opinion of an Attorney General of the United States, long ago; for there has not been an occasion in recent years for an Attorney General of the United States to instruct any one either at home or abroad on such a condition of affairs in connection with the administration of their laws. Crittenden says:

I am not insensible to the sanctity of treaties, and appreciate the public importance of their faithful observance. But their moral effect and their obligation under the laws of nations is not now the subject of consideration. The question before us involves the legal effect of treaties under our constitution, and the political powers of this Government in respect to them. To say that a treaty annuls every Act of Congress that comes in conflict with it, is to place the whole political power of the Government in perpetual subjection to it. The supreme political and legislative power of this country is placed in the hands of the Government of the United States, under the constitution, and its Acts are uncontrollable, except only by that constitution; and that constitution does not say that Congress shall pass no law inconsistent with a treaty; and it would have been a strange anomaly if it had imposed any such prohibition. There may be cases of treaties so injurious, or which may become so by changed circumstances, that it would be the right and duty of the Government to renounce or disregard them. Every Government must judge and determine for itself the proper occasion for the exercise of such power, and such a power I suppose, is impliedly reserved by every party to a treaty, and I hope and believe belongs inalienably to the Government of the United States. It is true that such a power may be abused; so may the treaty-making power of all other powers, but for our security against such abuse we may and must rely on the integrity, wisdom and good faith of our Government.

These are authorities which it would not have been necessary for me to refer to, were it not for the extraordinary proposition solemnly laid down on a great and exciting occasion by the Prime Minister of this country, when he, yesterday, endeavoured to give comfort by telling us, that a treaty in the United States was paramount to a law that Congress made itself. I have just given the authority to show that no such idea obtains, and that that theory of the Prime Minister can afford no comfort or relief to any hon. gentleman who desires to support this Bill. It is bad enough to suppose that Ministers are proceeding in such ignorance of the conditions that surround them, and on this subject of treaties I may call your attention to

the startling contradiction between the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). The Minister of Railways rushed to this House with this contract that had been arranged in haste, and with regard to the Stikine River he told us: We are not subject to any conditions. Then, the Minister of the Interior, finding that a very weak case had been made in support of the Bill, in a speech delivered loud enough for us to hear—whether we could understand it or not, is another question—told us, that our rights were curtailed under the Treaty of Washington, and later on, that same gentleman, forgetful of this difficult question and of these difficulties between his colleagues and himself, said:

So that we consider ourselves in a perfectly impregnable position in regard to the navigation of the Stikine River.

In one portion of his speech, when he was endeavouring to prove that Sir John Macdonald had lost us our right to the navigation of these rivers, we were always in danger, according to him; but later on, when speaking of that treaty, and when he had no point to make against the late Conservative chief, he assured us that our position under the treaty was unassailable. Later on, with no other treaty, no other understanding, we were assured that our position was sound and unassailable; and ten minutes afterwards, this same gentleman, hurrying over important subjects like these, so that he could not remember the positions he had taken up in the very same debate before, said, as to our right to tranship on the Stikine River:

That is a question upon which we can give no positive statement.

We who stand in an impregnable position, we who are subject to no conditions whatever on the Stikine—when you ask us how about our rights of transshipment, have to tell you that that is a question upon which we can give no positive statement. The Prime Minister, if I recollect aright, did attempt yesterday to give us a positive statement. We would like to back him up; we would like to back the Government up in the most extreme position, which it would be necessary for us to take, as to those treaty rights; but it certainly looks as if this weak and halting suggestion of the Minister of the Interior were what Congress is now acting upon. The Solicitor General insinuated that it was the observations made on this side of the House that suggested to Congress that they should embarrass us, that they should deal with this question of transshipment so as to render this scheme abortive; but the direct and positive evidence that gives force to the suggestion that the idea came from hon. gentlemen opposite I hold under my hand, in the fact that a Minister of the Crown in Canada told the United States several weeks

ago, before these Bills dealing with transshipment or bonding were introduced into Congress, that this question of transshipment was one on which we could give no positive statement. Then later on, the Minister of the Interior said:

It is a question—

A question, mark you—our right under the treaty, a matter so plain that the Prime Minister would not consider for a moment the possibility of Congress doing anything to interfere with it—

It is a question which, if disputed, must be decided either by negotiation or by reference to a competent tribunal.

And what are we to do in the meantime? We have had negotiations with the United States. We have had negotiations this year, and most extraordinary things happened. The negotiators could not understand each other. We sent the Minister of the Interior to Washington, or at any rate he went there to advise, and he came back thinking he had made a bargain of a certain character; but it took him six weeks to find out that the other party to the bargain had never heard of it at all, and did not agree to it.

Now, let us see what is happening in Congress, and how much hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House know of it, from anything we have heard from them. There is the Prime Minister in his seat, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the Minister of Inland Revenue, and the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister of Customs, and the Postmaster General, and the Solicitor General—a very fair representation of the Cabinet; and I would ask them now, for the purposes of my argument, whether they are aware of any other measure than the Bill containing the clause 13 mentioned yesterday, which deals with the subject of transshipment, now before Congress. I ask that, for this reason. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took the position that it is arguable whether clause 13 deals with transshipment at all. Am I not fair in saying that those hon. gentlemen endeavoured to allay alarm and excitement in this country over clause 13 by saying that it related to the bonding of goods, and not to the transshipment of goods? For that reason, I ask the Prime Minister, who is in charge of our interests at a most critical time—I ask him in good faith—is he aware of any other measure dealing with the subject of transshipment before Congress?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There may be, but I am not aware of any.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this Bill had better be withdrawn. I think that, not merely for the reasons which I gave at the commencement of my speech, but I think it

had better be withdrawn until we have the Government advised of a Bill which is now passing through Congress dealing directly with the subject of transshipment. I have under my hand, not merely the Bill dealing with the subject of transshipment, but a report of the Secretary of the Treasury recommending that Bill to Congress; and we are chided with taking up time discussing a Bill concerning transshipment on the Stikine when to-day members on the Treasury benches do not know of the legislation before Congress dealing directly with that subject. Were the Government ever in a more humiliating position? Is it possible for us to imagine a more humiliating position for them to be in—that in regard to transshipment, on which they say there is a question, they do not know that the Government of the United States are asking power at the hands of Congress to make any regulation they please concerning our privilege of transshipment on the Stikine River; and the legislation is of such a general character, that we are not to know what the regulations are until the Secretary of the Treasury has considered and made them—that he will be given such wide discretionary power that, after that Bill goes through Congress, at his own sweet will and in his own time—

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman cannot afford to sneer at my observation, for he has not read the Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. Pardon me. If the hon. gentleman refers to the Bill which he has in his mind, I have read every line of it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I acted upon the hon. gentleman's statement that he knew of no other Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. I know what Bill the hon. gentleman refers to. I am not aware that it affects this question. The hon. gentleman refers to a Bill whereby the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make regulations with regard to transshipment—a Bill which is perfectly consistent with the powers of the United States. I stated yesterday that the executive authority of the United States has the right to make regulations for their own protection, but not to defeat our right.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am willing to take this answer of the Prime Minister, that he did know of a Bill dealing with transshipment other than that containing clause 13.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman cannot find a clause in that Bill affecting this question. It is only for the making of regulations.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Excuse me; I have the floor. The hon. gentle-

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

man knew of the Bill after I explained it. Before I explained it, the hon. gentleman told me that he did not know of any other Bill than that containing clause 13.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is an insinuation that is hardly worthy of the hon. gentleman; but, Mr. Speaker, let the hon. gentleman read his Bill, and he will find that there is nothing at all in it but power given to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the other proper officers to make regulations.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is what I stated. The hon. gentleman surely does me an injustice when, after I stated what the Bill contained, he informed me that he did know of it. Of course, the hon. gentleman withdraws what he said before, when he told me, as distinctly as anyone could, and as "Hansard" will show, that he did not know. The hon. gentleman evidently had forgotten, and I think he will find that this Bill is not the insignificant Bill which he supposes it is.

I shall, if the House will permit me, take time to show that this is part, and a part and parcel, of a systematic plan attempted by the United States on the western coast of the Dominion, for the purpose of capturing and securing trade at the expense of Canadian enterprise; and it is a dangerous thing for the First Minister of this country to regard so lightly a provision which he says he understands.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Legislation promoted by Mr. Hamilton Smith.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is making an extraordinary statement. Does he make it seriously or in chaff?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I believe it is true—Mr. Hamilton Smith and his associates.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says, that Mr. Smith is promoting a Bill which the First Minister declares is a harmless and a very ordinary Bill regarding the subject of transshipment; and so we are somewhat bewildered. I venture to say, that the right hon. the First Minister, at any rate, does not share the supposition that Mr. Hamilton Smith is the suggestor and prompter of these Bills for the creation of difficulties by means of vexatious bond and transshipment regulations of the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is what he and his associates are doing, and you are giving them the time to do it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Let me point out, that on the 15th of January Congress was informed, not only of the Bill having to do with this transshipment, but of a report from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Lyman J. Gage, who, to my knowledge, has been in communication, not with Mr.

Hamilton Smith, but with parties out on the Pacific Coast whom he was assisting—and he was right from his own point of view—and co-operating with, and who are competing with Canadians for the Yukon trade. This report of Secretary Gage is a very important document, and had considerable weight in the discussion of the Bill by Congress. It is dated the 9th February, and, in referring to the subject under discussion from different points of view, he says :

In order to cover more explicitly the situation, sea-going vessels can proceed to St. Michael, near the mouth of the Yukon. The Yukon is very shallow, in some places only four feet deep. Transfers of cargo and passengers from deep-draught sea-going vessels to river vessels drawing little water are therefore necessary at St. Michael ; substantially the same as is true of the Stikine River, and Wrangel, near its mouth.

Then other clauses of the Bill—for the Bill deals with other subjects as well—come in ; and, after referring to these provisions, touching particularly the coasting trade, Secretary Gage goes on to say :

Section 3 is designed to give the Secretary of the Treasury full powers to regulate the transfer of cargoes and passengers from deep-sea vessels to shallow vessels bound up the Yukon and the Stikine. The conditions under which such transfers will occur cannot now be fully foreseen, so the bestowal of discretionary power in the Secretary of the Treasury seems the only way to meet the situation.

Hon. gentlemen opposite can only comfort themselves by assuming that the Secretary of the Treasury will make those regulations in conformity with treaty rights and obligations. But the trouble is, that he is vested by that Bill with wide and ample power to ruinously embarrass and impede our trade and shipping up the Stikine River. That Bill was under consideration on February 15th in Congress, and that report was read in conjunction with it, and this explanation was given why this discretionary power is vested in the Secretary of the Treasury :

This is made to apply to the new station in Alaska in the navigation of the Yukon and Stikine rivers. The Secretary says it is impossible to frame a statute which might not do great injustice, and so it is left in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury to make such laws and regulations as the commerce on this river requires.

That Bill is Bill No. 17808, and is the one referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The Secretary explained that the Bill covers the Yukon and Stikine rivers, so that, until the Secretary of the Treasury makes the regulations or has come to a conclusion, we are left absolutely in the dark as to whether we are to be bothered unfairly, or as to what the nature of these regulations will be at all.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). Is the hon. gentleman aware whether any regulations have already been made with reference to the Yukon ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, the hon. gentleman told us so.

The **FIRST MINISTER**. Not under this Bill.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, it is not law, and whatever regulations are made, the hon. gentleman will understand, can be very easily unmade by a party that has these wide discretionary powers, and Mr. Gage states particularly that he is desirous of getting into his hands this power, so as to make regulations that may fit the circumstances. All the regulations that are now existing will, of course, stand in the way very little time, should the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States consider it necessary to replace them by others.

But let us take section 13 of another Bill, a Bill with a title not exactly generic to this question. It is an Act extending the homestead laws and providing for right of way for railroads in the district of Alaska. I have it as it was introduced, and I have it as it passed, according to the newspapers. Section 13 of this Bill provides :

That under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the privilege of entering goods in warehouses and merchandise in bond, or of placing them in bonded warehouses at the port of Wrangel, district of Alaska, and of withdrawing the same for exportation to any place in British Columbia or the North-west Territories without payment of duty, is hereby granted to the Government of the Dominion of Canada and its citizens, or citizens of the United States, whenever, and so long as it shall appear to the satisfaction of the President of the United States, who shall ascertain and declare the fact by proclamation, that no exclusive privilege of transporting through British Columbia or the North-west Territories, goods or passengers arriving from or destined for other ports in Alaska, is granted to any persons or corporations by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, and that the privilege has been duly accorded to responsible persons operating transportation lines in British Columbia or the North-west Territories of making direct communication with transportation lines in Alaska, and that the Government of the Dominion has consented to, and is allowing on behalf of the citizens of the United States the entry free of duty of all miners' outfits and a supply of provisions and clothing, the whole not exceeding in quantity one thousand pounds for each citizen of the United States proposing to engage in mining in British Columbia or the North-west Territories, and that the Government of the Dominion of Canada has removed all unequal restrictions to the issue of miners' licenses to all citizens of the United States operating or intending to operate in British Columbia or the North-west Territories.

And then it provides that we shall grant American fishermen privileges denied them by treaty.

There is, therefore, the embarrassment to be considered. Business men know better than I, that, owing to the condition of the sea. It may be impossible, when a ship reaches Wrangel, to unload from the vessel into lighters, and it may be necessary to

land and warehouse the goods for a longer or shorter time, according to the circumstances. The embarrassment that may be caused under that clause will not be minimized by one who looks at these matters in the light of the ordinary principles of carrying on business.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sorry that, on continuing my observations I have only the pleasure of seeing the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) in their places. However, I take it that the absence of other hon. Ministers may be simply a reflection upon myself. I hope that, so far as they are concerned, it is not an indication of any diminishing interest in this interesting question. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), I see, has arrived—and it is only fair to say that since my observation was made the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has been good enough to enter an appearance, and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) is also ready for the fray.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will only have patience for a little, he will have a distinguished audience.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It could not be more distinguished, now that the hon. Minister of the Interior is here. The hon. gentleman, speaking some time ago, but speaking in this debate, said among many other extraordinary things, that, forsooth, we had no cause of complaint against the United States. Let me not misrepresent the statement of the hon. gentleman. Let me read the very language he used:

We have had no cause of complaint against the United States Government because of their dealings with us upon this question.

And again:

When I was there—

Speaking of his visit to Washington and of a member of the United States Government, who is called here the Secretary of the Navy, but really, I suppose the Secretary of the Treasury—I do not suppose that "Hansard" is correct in that.

—he said that he would have them issued in such a way as to facilitate our trade in any reasonable way that we had any right to expect, and that he would be able to get them out in a short time.

And again:

The Secretary of the Treasury did assure that he would at once—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

I call your attention to this, Mr. Speaker,— "that he would at once"

—issue regulations which would have the effect of doing away with the necessity of paying these fees, and I so telegraphed to the Board of Trade of Victoria, and, I think, that of Vancouver.

The regulations were to have been drafted and issued at once. So that then, we had this state of facts admitted by the Minister of the Interior of the Dominion of Canada to exist—that long ago he went to Washington and reached an agreement with the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States in regard to regulations concerning the customs upon goods passing from Canada through United States territory into the Yukon country. And, after many weeks, after extraordinary and unexplained delays on the part of the United States, costing the people of this country, east and west, many thousands of dollars, embarrassing the business of Canada, I venture to say, to an extraordinary degree, there came regulations which dealt wholly with Dyea and Skagway and ignored the Stikine River altogether.

All this was the result of the visit of a member of the Canadian Government to the city of Washington, and he had no cause of complaint against the Government of the United States. Must we eat humble pie all the time, Mr. Speaker? Must we go hat in hand to the governors of the United States, and be thankful that they courteously receive us? Must we not complain if an understanding is not complied with? Either the Minister of the Interior is exceedingly deceived or his statement is incredible, that he had no cause of complaint. Well, let us see. I have given you what he stated to this House, and I will sow you from other statements he has made, how our Minister of the Interior was dealt with by these gentlemen in charge of the public affairs of the United States. It appears that he had made all the concessions that the United States desired he should make. He was frank and explicit, let us give him credit for that, as to how far Canada would go in regard to the concessions that they desired, and those were made in no doubtful manner. He received from them promises, and though the promises stood for weeks without any performance, and though definite regulations issuing out of those negotiations from the United States wholly ignored this route that is so indispensable now in the eyes of the Government, and so necessary for our purposes, the hon. gentleman chided in advance any one who would dare to rise in his place in this House and find fault with the manner in which the United States Government had dealt with him. Dealt with him! Why, they played with him, Mr. Speaker; they played with him as they would play with a child; and the extraordinary thing is

that the child, after being played with, did not understand the game they were at. Now, let me see what he told the business people of the coast he had accomplished on this mission. On the 3rd of January, 1898, he wired to the Board of Trade of Victoria as follows:—

Have just returned from Washington where I have—

Got a promise? No, Mr. Speaker:

—where I have completed arrangements ensuring passage of Canadian goods by way of Dyea and Skagway sub-ports without charge for inspection referred to in your telegram and correspondence. Treasury Department will make arrangements to facilitate business.

Has the hon. gentleman no cause for complaint against the United States? or does he consider our position in Canada so humble and so contemptible that he dare not make complaints if the very best faith is not kept with him? If that statement is correct, and I believe when the hon. gentleman sent that telegram he believed it was correct, I know of no language sufficient to characterize the treatment that was accorded to him by the United States authorities, no language sufficient to deplore and to decry the spirit that prompted them so to delude, and so to deceive, the Minister of the Interior. He had completed arrangements on the 3rd of January which ensured this passage of goods forthwith, by a route which is now a secondary affair, not to be mentioned even in connection with the Stikine River; and perhaps the Minister of the Interior will confess that on that occasion he had no arrangement whatever in regard to the Stikine River, and no understanding with the United States Government. From what has occurred in Congress, from the action of the Secretary of the Treasury since, I take it there can be no question whatever that the Minister of the Interior entirely overlooked the necessity of coming to any arrangement with them in regard to this essential portion of the Government programme that is now submitted to us. However, on January 4th, the people of the Pacific Coast, relying on the acuteness of the Minister of the Interior, supposing that he was equal to the occasion, supposing that he understood what had happened at Washington, congratulated him in this manner:

Your telegram has created better feeling amongst merchants here. Most important Washington authorities wire proper instructions, Skagway and Dyea; any delay will greatly prejudice Canadian trade. North bound steamers with full Seattle passenger lists leaving frequently.

But little did the people of the Pacific Coast understand the administrative capacity of the Minister of the Interior and his instinct for government, upon which he dwelt to the immense amusement of this House a

short time ago, when he having botched and bungled the whole of this business from beginning to end, dared to rise in his place and sneer at the instinct of government possessed by Sir John A. Macdonald. When I heard that hon. gentleman, when I saw his scorn, feigned or unfeigned, in regard to the career of that great statesman, when I heard him discuss and criticise the statesmanship of Sir John A. Macdonald, I remembered the old adage that a live dog was better than a dead lion. On no other principle that I can conceive would the Minister of the Interior be warranted in the sneers and scoffs that he threw against that great name. Well, the people of Victoria soon learned to measure the value of our new plenipotentiary at Washington, soon understood how much the telegram of January meant. Remonstrances came from the coast fifteen days afterwards, he informed the people of that coast:

Saturday regulations being issued immediately.

But still no cause of complaint, not a ground of complaint from the Minister of the Interior, we are to assume, had occurred. Remonstrances came from the coast having regard to this positive and unqualified statement, this unqualified assurance from a responsible Minister fresh from the negotiations at Washington, after business transactions had been based upon his assurance, remonstrances followed and followed quickly and daily. On the 20th January, this telegram went from the Minister of the Interior to the Board of Trade:

It was arranged that there should be no regulations at Stikine that would harass our trade, but not specifically provided that same regulations adopted at Dyea and Skagway should apply to Stikine.

Still no regulations; still the officers of the United States at the Sound, up on the Stikine, at Dyea and Skagway, everywhere that they could be found on that coast, were embarrassing every Canadian steamship company, stating that there were no instructions received from Washington. Still, of course, those who had an abiding faith in the Minister of the Interior, and there were some even then on the coast, excused the Minister by stating that the instructions no doubt had been settled, but there had not been time to communicate them to these outposts. In the meanwhile, our rivals in the United States ports, at Seattle and other ports on the Pacific, were clutching, and grasping, and controlling trade in connection with our own Yukon country. That was on the 20th. But again on the same day another telegram came from the Minister of the Interior:

Am advised this morning by the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury that the collector of customs for Alaska would be in Washington in two or three days, and that regulations are held pending conference with him.

This shows the manner in which the Government acted, against which there is no cause of complaint! The hon. gentleman, acting as the representative of the British Crown, had exhibited the very best of faith. Everything he had assured the people at Washington would be done he had implemented to the very letter, which it was his bounden duty to do; and I can understand him resenting, even if he thought it was not politic to express it, the action of those authorities, but I cannot understand him under the circumstances endeavouring to excuse this extraordinary conduct on the part of the United States Government, unless he was wholly erroneous, wholly inaccurate in regard to that telegram of January 3rd in which he stated that the arrangements and regulations had actually been completed. It was not necessary to bring from Alaska the collector of customs to discuss regulations that had been arranged and agreed to, according to the telegram of the Minister.

Again, we had another version from the Minister as to what happened. On 22nd January, he telegraphed to Captain Irvine in Victoria:

Arrangement was that instructions should be given which would do away with customs charges and inspection fees. Treasury Department has not yet issued instructions. Have been wiring them constantly. Last telegraph says they expect to close in a day or two. Have done everything possible; do not see what more I can do. Expect it is only a matter of a few days.

I am in the hearing of the hon. Minister of the Interior, and he knows he was grievously disappointed; that though he sent this telegram on 22nd January, it was not a matter of a few days but of weeks, and the matter was not settled until after 22nd January, when the Minister of Customs had to come down to the House first with regulations and instructions that concerned the Dyea and Skagway only, and afterwards he supplemented the statement by saying the Government would obtain further information and advice applicable to the case of the Stikine River. I therefore, join issue with the hon. Minister of the Interior, and I say we are doing our duty here in expressing our resentment against the treatment shown to a Minister of the Crown who went to Washington, and in good faith conducted these negotiations with the authorities of the United States, and was treated in the contemptible manner in which the Minister of the Interior was treated, and he had not the spirit to resent that treatment though it has cost the people of this country many and many a dollar. I come again, then, to make good my position in regard to the absolute futility of relying on the good will of the United States or upon the United States view of international law as heretofore expressed in connection with any scheme or proposition that aims at the development of the Dominion of Canada. I

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

have just as high an opinion of individuals in the United States as any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House, and when I charge against that government hostility to this country, when I charge against that country every ungenerous effort that can be made to thwart us in advancing Dominion interests, I refer to their pernicious system of politics, deplorable and humiliating, and I believe many thousands of Americans are as much disgusted with their system of government as are our own people so far as relations with Canada are concerned. I am against voting a single dollar or a single acre of land in Canada, mineral or otherwise, to any project that depends on the good will of the United States for the successful carrying out of that scheme for which the land is appropriated. We may have done so before, if you like; but having had experience of the United States, we should look at the facts, and look the position in the face, and place our lines and arrangements and our plans, as we can do and as this country is rich enough to do and willing enough to do, wholly apart from them and wholly irrespective of what they wish or seek. I say we cannot rely on those people showing towards us the slightest measure of fair-play. Some hon. gentlemen seem to speak with bated breath when referring to the conduct of the United States; it is an awful thing to say anything respecting even a United States citizen in this House of Commons, as I have heard during this debate. If there is any British subject afraid of saying what he thinks, I have under my hand the authority of those who advise directly Her Majesty the Queen to show that they are not built of that stuff. I have under my hand the language of those advising the Queen now that points out directly, emphatically and in the strongest language possible not only how those people to the south of us, represented by their Government, will not only twist and vary treaties and will twist and torture principles of law, but will scheme and arrange so as to grasp every advantage possible, regardless of any consequences whatever. Let me give the House an example. For instance, there has been a difference of opinion in this House as to whether the Treaty of 1825 gave the people of this country the right to navigate the Yukon. Mr. Blake, no mean authority, was of the opinion, contrary as I have endeavoured to show, to the opinion prevailing in England, that we had under that treaty, notwithstanding the purchase of the country by the United States, the absolute right to navigate the Yukon. No one will doubt we got the right, whatever the other question may be, under the Treaty of Washington, and we got the right to navigate the Stikine under that treaty, if we did not enjoy it in 1871 under the Treaty of 1825. Yet there is the best authority to show that after that Treaty of 1871 and for several years thereafter no

British bottoms could go up the Stikine River. There was the treaty. Hon. gentlemen opposite are willing to risk the resources of this country on the assumption that the United States will understand and carry out a treaty as we read it; and yet with the Treaty of 1871 it is a fact that in 1873 the customs officers of the United States Government on the Stikine prevented and were instructed to prevent any British bottom ascending the waters of that river. We have the authority of Sir Donald Smith, the present Lord Strathcona, who in this House stated, notwithstanding the contention of Mr. Blake, notwithstanding the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, who even now think that under the Treaty of 1825 we have a right to navigate the Yukon. British bottoms were not allowed to navigate that river. Let me give the House the language of Sir Donald Smith during the discussion on the Treaty of Washington, as reported in the "Globe." He said:

As to the assumption that free navigation of the Yukon in the North-west was of no practical use to Canada, he thought it was otherwise. That river goes into British territory for a distance somewhere of 300 or 400 miles, and while it now takes the Hudson Bay Company several years to get their goods from England to points on that river, they will, if the treaty is ratified, be able to get their goods to their destination in eighteen months.

The hon. gentleman read a letter from the Secretary of State of the United States to prove that no vessels other than those of United States citizens can go up that river. As to the Stikine River, the fact is, that, notwithstanding the Treaty of 1871, as late as 1873 the British vessels were not given their rights under the terms of that treaty, and for confirmation of that I refer hon. gentlemen to the correspondence in the Sessional Papers, vol. 11, for the year 1878. These are facts pertinent to the very case in point, and let us see whether that excuse cannot be given again by the Americans in connection with the proposition now under consideration. They can say: Oh, yes, the treaty did arrange that you should navigate the Stikine, but the regulations concerning the treaty and the instructions have not been sent forward to the officers on the Stikine River, but they will be sent forward. In the meantime, notwithstanding the treaty, years elapse before the officers of the United States have instructions to obey it; on the contrary in the case mentioned up to that time they had instructions which prevented that treaty being operated. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, and I have the authority of the Minister of Trade and Commerce for saying it, although he is not a lawyer, there never was a more monstrous assertion of an untenable right on the part of any country than there was by the United States of America in connection with the Behring Sea fisheries. They had not a single shadow of excuse for the action they took, and which they took for

the purpose of breaking up a great Canadian industry and paralyzing a large portion of our mercantile marine on the Pacific Coast. Without any foundation in international law, against all the traditions of their country, against all their previous interpretations of international law, they simply instructed their revenue cutters to seize right and left on the high seas, fifty, sixty and seventy miles from land, any ship floating the British flag that dared pursue an industry which they desired should be locked up in the hands of a monopoly of their own citizens. Eleven years have we been discussing this, but yet, with decisions of a most unmistakable character against them, and vacillating from position to position, the Americans have fought us during the whole period. Some of the men that they ruined have died, many of the ships that were concerned have disappeared, and we are still waiting for one dollar of indemnity in compensation for that gross violation of international law and comity of nations—a violation that was perpetrated by the United States simply to break down, as they almost succeeded in breaking down, by virtue of the power they were allowed to exercise regardless of principle—the Canadian sealing industry. Hall, referring to this action of the United States, says:

With flagrant inconsistencies, the United States, when acquiring possession of Alaska, have claimed as attendant upon by virtue of cession from Russia about two-thirds of Behring Sea—a space of 1,500 miles long and 600 miles wide—and upon the ground of this claim have seized British vessels engaged in seal fishing.

Let me pass from this subject to another phase of the question. The Minister of Customs smilingly attempted to answer the expression of my fear that injustice might be done us under the Act by which the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States will be permitted to make regulations concerning the transshipment of British goods at Wrangel; but let me give him some of our experience with the United States authorities on the subject of regulations. Having whipped them from pillar to post on the questions I have referred to, having obtained the judgment of an international tribunal that they they had no case at all, regulations were prescribed under which the seal-hunters in Pacific waters were to be guided and governed. The Colonial Office, after some experience of these gentlemen in their administration of international regulations which had their birth in the treaty and the judgment under the treaty, speaks of the treatment Canadians received at the hands of these people, concerning whom the Minister of the Interior says we have no cause of complaint whatever. Mr. Chamberlain's department, addressing the Foreign Office and discussing that United States despatch, vulgarly known as the "Shirt Sleeves Despatch," of General Sherman, thus wrote only in September last:

The extent to which British sealing vessels have been unnecessarily harassed by the United States patrol vessels during 1895 and 1896 may be judged from the fact that in 1894, when the British sealing fleet numbered only 22 vessels, 36 boarding operations were performed, an average of one and a half per vessel, while in 1895, when a fleet of 40 British vessels were engaged, the number of boardings rose to 183, an average of four and a half per vessel, and in 1896 the British fleet of 57 vessels was subjected in Behring Sea alone to 171 boardings by the United States patrol, an average of three times per vessel. It is interesting to note that in 1895, 76 United States vessels were subjected to only 156 boarding operations.

If the direct adviser of Her Majesty the Queen is not afraid to call a spade a spade, when dealing with the United States, any member of this House may without fear warn the Government of Canada that they are relying upon a broken reed when they rely upon the good faith of the United States in maintaining inviolable the spirit and letter of the different treaties. Lest any one should be timid in this House at the utterance of such language, let me refer again to the language of the Colonial Office in that same despatch, and let us see how they understand the position of the United States touching obligations of any kind. In the despatch I find the following:—

The nation which is now so zealous for prohibiting the killing of seals on the high seas was, in 1832, with equal zeal asserting a claim of rights for its citizens, not only to kill seals on the high seas, but to land and slaughter them on the shores of a friendly nation. The power which now reproaches Her Majesty's Government with "unneighbourly" conduct because they decline to abolish an industry, the lawfulness of which has never been questioned except by the United States, and has, only four years since, been vindicated by the highest international tribunal, did not shrink, in 1832, when the United States sealing vessel "Harriet" had been seized for violating the territory of the republic of Buenos Ayres in the pursuit of fur seals, from landing an armed party at Soledad and carrying off the crew and cargo of the vessel, and from declaring that the seal fishery on those coasts was in future to be free to all Americans, and that the capture of any vessel of the United States would be regarded as an act of piracy.

They, notwithstanding their action in 1832, notwithstanding their views that certain things would be an act of piracy, did not hesitate to commit against British subjects in 1886 and afterwards, the very self-same acts of piracy, and worse than that, attempted to justify them. Again, this despatch, coming from the office of the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, says:

They (British subjects) have performed with the utmost rigour all the requirements of the award, but they have had to make continual and unavailing protests against the attempts of the United States to hamper and embarrass the operations of British subjects pursuing their lawful vocation.

Out on these very waters, on the very coast now under our consideration. You have

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

the evidence from the British Government, new and fresh, you have the opinion of the authorities of the Crown in England, that, in spite of international law, in spite of the judgments of tribunals, in spite of the regulations under treaties, the United States pursue and are pursuing their fell purpose of embarrassing and harassing in every possible way, manner and form a British industry in that vicinity. And can you doubt, Sir, can any man doubt, that whatever the result of a collision on these questions may be—I mean a collision of opinion, a difference in regard to the interpretation of the treaties that have been discussed—that the spirit that induced them to hamper us as they have hampered us on the deeper waters, will prevail when thousands and hundreds of thousands of their citizens on their Pacific Coast are bringing all the pressure they can bring to bear on the Washington authorities, to give them every conceivable advantage in this Yukon country, and in the trade connected with it. I have no manner of doubt whatever, Mr. Speaker, that not only is that their purpose, but from the legislation now before Congress there is cause for any reasonable man to assume that, so far as they can go, short of actual offensive and warlike demonstrations and action against us, the people of the United States will compel the Administration of the day to go. If you do not agree with me, if this is perhaps an extreme position, at any rate it seems to me there is just cause and just reason for the caution that I have endeavoured to inculcate in my speech, that is, that we should have no plan and no proposition for the expenditure of money, or involving financial responsibility for Canada in regard to the development of this country, where it is possible that people who have taken the action they have taken, who are considering the measures they are considering, can by any manner of means come in and even for the time thwart us and embarrass us.

I am, therefore, in the strongest manner against, and will vote against any proposition for the expenditure of a dollar, or the assumption of responsibility for any action, which is dependent upon United States good-will at the present time for its successful accomplishment. I am as anxious as any man in this House or out of it can possibly be for all fair and legitimate aid being accorded for the development of this, the richest gold field, as I believe it to be, in the world, for the benefit of Canadians and Canadian trade. Indeed, I go further than hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), reverting to the old spirit that pervaded the Liberal party, that fear of the future, that fear to risk a dollar to gain anything for the people of this country, spoke of this proposition as worthy of commendation because there

was not any money of the people of the east to be risked in it, and because after all we were only risking the gold field itself, and what it might produce. I go further than that, and I say that I believe the bulk of the people of Canada to-day, with our credit as it is, with the confidence that pervades the Canadian breast, in our own strength and in our financial independence of any other country, would rally round a Government, Grit or Conservative, that would have the pluck and courage to risk the dollars of the Canadian people, not merely to manage and control in a wholly independent manner the trade of that part of Canada, so rich as it undoubtedly is, but to enable the Government, by a wise and statesmanlike policy, to rely upon the possibility, the human probability, too, of being recouped tenfold by wise and reasonable regulations in the administration of that country, for every dollar expended in order to hold and keep it in our hands. I believe the gentlemen on your left, Sir, are ready to support this Government in an active and energetic policy that will pledge the resources of this country, wholly apart from any surrender of our mineral lands, wholly apart from any gambling or speculation in them; so that we could say to the world: "We told you, and we meant it when we told you, that we had a rich and vast heritage in the Yukon country, and when we asked you to come and risk your resources and your lives in the pursuit of wealth in that part of the world, we believed every word we published; and if it will pay you to venture everything you have, you see that we believe it will pay us and the people of Canada to risk some of our credit to enable you to go to that country by an all-Canadian route, and to come out of it when you desire." I believe that a speedy and successful route into that country can be found, and can be constructed within a reasonable time, from a port on the British Columbia coast. Though I do not profess to be thoroughly proficient as to the merits of the different routes, I believe, from what I have heard in that province from gentlemen who are familiar with the country in general, that a route from a British Columbia port into the Yukon can be built, which would be partially, if not wholly, adapted to the other different routes—at any rate, to the Edmonton route and the Ashcroft route, with very slight deviation later on. At present I believe it is our bounden duty to push on at any reasonable cost, but with the honest, bona fide risk of the money of the people of this country, in the construction of such a road. But under no circumstances, I say again, will I vote for a national gamble in this case or in any other case. With the general purport of the amendment, I am in full and hearty accord. The only qualification I would make in it is that

I have no hesitation in being a little more definite than that; and instead of saying, "the best available route, judging from all we have heard," I would vote for a route which begins in the province of British Columbia, and went to the points that have been mentioned; as our practical friend, a gentleman of great experience, the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), has said, not to begin up in the ice region to build a railway between different icicles, but to build on the coast and push our way in—building a cheaper road; cheaper to the men who would undertake the contract, and cheaper in the end to the Dominion of Canada.

Those are my principles, Mr. Speaker, and of those principles I am in no sense ashamed. If the country is not with us to-day in our resistance to this monstrous proposition, this wild speculation, this unholy gamble, it will not be long before the people throughout Canada will give no uncertain sound as to their condemnation of the vilest and worst scheme that was ever submitted to an independent Parliament.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The question under debate, Mr. Speaker, has assumed quite a new aspect during the past two or three days. The eminent baronet who leads the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) moved yesterday the adjournment of the House in order that he might offer his views to the Government as to the policy which this country ought to follow in view of the action taken by the United States Senate. He gave us the benefit of his advice, and that advice was that, owing to the action taken by the American Senate, the Government of this country should cancel the arrangement we have made with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. To-day the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) followed in the same line. He deliberately tried to impress upon this House the conviction that the action taken by thirty-four American senators is of such a nature that we ought not to hesitate a moment in stopping the national work in which we are now engaged. Sir, on behalf of this Government, on behalf of the loyal representatives of the people who sit on those Ministerial benches, on behalf of our young and proud Canadian nation, I beg to take issue with the hon. gentleman on that ground. Their policy is that we ought not to go on with the Stikine road. Well, Mr. Speaker, the policy of this Government is what it was and what it will be—to push on this enterprise with more vigour and more determination if possible. I hold in my hand the book published by Mr. Pope on the life of Sir John Macdonald. In that book, I find the following letter written by Sir John to Mr. Bridges in 1870, and which I commend to the attention of the eminent baronet who leads the Opposition:—

Many thanks for your letter of the 26th giving me an account of your conversation with ———. It is quite evident to me, not only from this conversation but from advices from Washington, that the United States Government are resolved to do all they can, short of war, to get possession of our western territory, and we must take immediate and vigorous steps to counteract them. One of the first things to be done is to show unmistakably our resolve to build the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir, those words seem to have been written for the present emergency. History seems to repeat itself, and although I must at once protest against the idea put forth by my hon. friends opposite that these thirty-four senators who have voted for the Bill alluded to, represent the American nation, we must not forget that the American Senate has taken the position they have, and that that position is worthy of our earnest consideration. The veteran knight who leads the Opposition is, in this House, the last representative of the Macdonald-Cartier regime and the Macdonald-Cartier school, and the language he used when the policy of this Government was first made known to the Canadian public was that of a true Canadian and I must say a true Liberal-Conservative. It was the language to which I listened so many times, in my younger days, in the press gallery, in the mouth of the then leader of the House. But you will permit me to say, Sir, that I am sorry he has been obliged to adopt another language and another attitude; and I beg leave to appeal from the present position he has taken and the language he has used, to all true Liberal-Conservatives of the old Macdonald-Cartier school, and to every patriotic Canadian who feels in his heart that Providence has sown in the fertile soil of this fair Dominion the seed of a free nation. Sir, the hon. gentleman has been overpowered by smaller men than he, for I say it—and I say it in all truth—he is not a small man by any means, and I am sorry that in his declining years he has been obliged to go back from the high position he occupied in the past.

What is the position in which we are placed to-day? The American Senate, by a vote of 34 to 16 has told us that if we do not give the Americans permission to build railways where they like on our own territory, if we do not allow their miners to enjoy the same customs privileges as our own, if we do not allow their fishermen on the Atlantic Coast privileges to which they are not entitled by the Washington Treaty—if we do not do all these things and many others, they may violate treaties to which they have assented. This is the position that the American Senate has taken, in which they are helped by hon. gentlemen opposite. The eminent baronet has been quoted very often in this debate. I would ask permission to quote him once more. On the 15th February he used the following language:—

Mr. TARTE.

I said that although difficulties have presented themselves, difficulties that ought not to have presented themselves in connection with this Stikine route recently, notwithstanding these I do not hesitate to say that I infinitely prefer the route now under consideration to any route that crosses a foot of territory claimed by the United States, and all the other routes to which I have referred are open to that objection. From Pyramid Harbour down to Dyea and Skagway and Taku Inlet—not so much Taku Inlet but all the others; the Taku Inlet route is placed beyond consideration by the fact that glaciers render it absolutely dangerous for vessels to attempt to reach the waters of that lake—but all the other routes from the Pacific Coast are, in my judgment, infinitely more objectionable than the route now under consideration. There are other routes all-Canadian routes. There is the projected route from Ashcroft by the old Telegraph trail away through to Telegraph Creek. There is the route through Edmonton, and also the route from Prince Albert, whose greater length would perhaps render it more objectionable. These are all-Canadian routes, but not routes that can be made valuable to-day for the purpose of facilitating ingress into that country. It is on that ground that while I feel that the Edmonton, and the Prince Albert, and the Ashcroft routes will all furnish valuable trails, their long distance from the sea is against their practicability from a commercial and national point of view, as compared with the route chosen. They will be used for the important purpose of carrying cattle and supplies out of the great North-west and the Peace River to this great Canadian Yukon gold field, and to a certain extent by persons proceeding from the eastern portion of Canada, but it is impossible—

I call particular attention to these words:

—to expect that they could be used for the purpose of rivalling the modes of ingress that now not only cross territory claimed by the United States but have had the effect of absolutely making Seattle and San Francisco the basis of supplies for the whole of that great Canadian Yukon.

Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman states there, in the most positive manner, that the route chosen by the Government is the only route which will put Canadian producers, Canadian merchants, Canadian cities, in a position to compete successfully with their American rivals. And yet, in the face of that statement, which cannot be disputed, which has not been disputed, the Opposition moves an amendment condemning the route, and the leader of the Opposition moved the adjournment of the House in order to ask us to abandon that route. In the statement I have read, the hon. gentleman recognized that there were difficulties. He realized that, perhaps, our American friends would throw obstacles in our way. But, in spite of all that, he had then fully made up his mind that we should go on with this work. On the 15th February, he stated, in so many words, that our rights on the Stikine River, which are to-day disputed, were indefeasible rights. In the very same speech as I have already quoted, he said:

The next day, Mr. Fry, a senator of the United States, introduced a Bill into the United States

Senate to adopt a policy by which if a Canadian vessel, in the enjoyment of her indefeasible right of navigation from the mouth of the Stikine River, should neglect at Fort Wrangel to pay a certain deference and respect to the United States authorities, what happens? Is she fined? No, but confiscated.

On the 15th February, the hon. gentleman recognized the fact that our rights on the Stikine River were indefeasible, but now, those rights, which were so clear, so unquestionable, it would seem do not exist at all to-day—we have no rights, and we must give up our trade, our commerce and our national dignity. Sir, what is this trade going to be? The hon. leader of the Opposition has given us a description of it. I shall not read what he says, but he tells us that it is impossible to estimate the importance of that trade. That trade means commerce, not only for Victoria and Vancouver, but for Quebec and Montreal, for Toronto and Hamilton—trade to keep our mills working, our industries busy. Are we paying too much for that trade? Hon. gentlemen on the other side have given us brilliant descriptions of the immense wealth in that Yukon district. They have reproached us with having thrown away great public properties. I think they have minimized the question, that once more they have failed to understand the feeling of this Canadian people. Have we given away too many acres of land to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann? I am sure we have not done so; the people of this country are sure we have not done so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let hon. members wait until the next by-election, and then they will see whether I am right or wrong. But suppose—I do not admit that it is so, but let us for the sake of argument suppose—that we have given a few thousand acres more than we should have given. What is the position to-day? The hon. leader of the Opposition will not contradict me, I am sure, when I say that the trade of the Yukon to-day amounts to \$10,000,000. And, Sir, what will that trade be if in a few months we have in the Klondike district 50,000 or 100,000. Suppose, I say it again, that we have given a little too much. Would it be a wise policy to abandon that work? The question brings its own answer. If we abandon the construction of the Stikine Railway we would lose all that trade. Let it once be known that the Canadian Government does not go on with that road, and what will happen? Seattle, San Francisco, and other American cities on the Pacific Coast, will then be, in the words of my hon. friend, the basis of supplies for the Canadian Yukon. But we might lose more than our trade. May we not suppose that we might lose the Klondike itself? Suppose that next year there are 50,000 foreign miners in that district, if we have not direct communication with that

far off region, who can say that we would be able to maintain the authority of Canada there? But we have been accused of building up a huge monopoly. Well, I was very much surprised to hear language of that kind coming from the lips of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I remembered when I was in the press gallery years ago, and heard speeches that he then delivered in this Parliament. I remembered hearing a speech that he made in 1879 in introducing a measure for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. One of a series of resolutions upon that subject, reads as follows:—

That it is further expedient to provide that one hundred million acres of land, and all the minerals they contain, be appropriated for the purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway.

One hundred millions of acres of land with all the minerals they contain. My hon. friend went on to say this:

But we are not only prepared to give the sound, untarnished credit of Canada in support of any aid or assistance we might ask, but we are prepared to place at the bottom of that national credit of Canada one hundred millions of acres of the most fertile land in the world. Exception may be taken to the appropriation of such a large extent of land for the building of this road, as exception was taken by hon. gentlemen opposite to the appropriation of fifty million acres of land to be under the control of a company. We do not propose here to put the land under the control of a company, although I confess, so far as I am concerned, I would be glad, did the condition of things permit of it, if a company liberally aided could be found to take this work up, and at their own responsibility and risk, carry it to completion. But, in the absence of that means of attaining our object, we believe we are right in placing in the hands of a commission, on which the Imperial Government should be with us jointly represented, a hundred million acres of land for the construction of this work.

Now listen to this:

Why, if we gave the whole of the land in the North-west Territories for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it would be better than to leave those immense fertile districts untrudden, for, I may say, an age to come, neither contributing to the benefit of the world nor the consolidation of British power and the extension of British interests on this continent.

Sir, the hon. gentleman was prepared to give, as he said, the whole of the North-west Territories to a private company to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. Still, they speak of a monopoly when, out of eighty million acres of land, we give less than four million acres of that land. There is no monopoly in this scheme; there is a wise arrangement by which, if the Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann find gold, the Canadian people will have their share alongside of it. But I think that objection has been sufficiently answered. The main point to which hon. gentlemen have addressed themselves is that the route chosen by us will be use-

less if the American Government make up their minds to refuse us the rights to which we are fully entitled by the Washington Treaty. Again, I take this opportunity of saying that the Canadian Government have no ground of complaint to make against the American Government. We have been treated so far by them in a friendly spirit, and we do not hesitate to believe that we will be treated in the same friendly manner in the future, in spite of the dangerous and unwise language which has been used in the House by hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, Sir, the language of the learned baronet has been quoted in the American Senate against this country; the speech that he made at the beginning of the session in which he appealed to passion against the American Government, was used by Colonel Lewis a few days ago against this country in support of the Bill which has been so often mentioned here. The same violent and unwise language has been used to-day by my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). Those hon. gentlemen have been Ministers of the Crown, they are experienced men, they are Privy Counsellors, and I ask them whether, in the present emergency, they think they are doing their duty to this nation and to the British Crown. I say they are trying to create complications between two nations that I hope will live in peace and harmony for all time to come. I have just said a word of the Washington Treaty. I was much astonished when I heard the other day the eminent baronet criticising the conduct of Sir John A. Macdonald in the negotiations at Washington in 1871. My hon. friend the Solicitor General, in his able speech, called the attention of the House to a letter that was written on the 27th April, 1871, by Sir John A. Macdonald to Sir Charles Tupper, who was then leading in Ottawa, when Sir George Cartier was sick. The letter which Sir John Macdonald wrote to Sir Charles Tupper deserves to be quoted again:

Then it happened that Donald A. Smith mentioned to Sir Stafford Northcote and myself that it was of great importance to the North-west to secure the free navigation of the three rivers mentioned in item 8. He says that the use of the Yukon is absolutely indispensable. That already American vessels from San Francisco carry goods via the Yukon into our country at rates much cheaper than they can be conveyed by any other route. The Stikine River, he says, goes through a gold country, and its navigation is also of importance. The Porcupine is a branch of the Yukon. As the Americans contended for the general principle, they were obliged to consent with respect to these three rivers.

Sir John Macdonald wrote those words to Sir Charles Tupper, and the eminent baronet, the other day, found fault with the manner in which Sir John conducted the negotiations. He added: Let us say nothing about it, for Sir John Macdonald is dead. But the eminent baronet who leads the Opposition is not dead, and it was to

Mr. TARTE.

him that Sir John Macdonald, on 27th April, 1871, wrote those words. The Treaty of Washington was signed on 8th May. Sir John Macdonald was deeply engaged in conducting these negotiations; he had to make a very hard struggle against the Americans, and I may also say, against the English negotiators, and he was asking the advice of his Cabinet. The eminent baronet was his adviser here, with his other colleagues, and it appears that they never read the Treaty of 1825. If there was any blame attachable to any one for the sacrifice of our interests then made in Washington, the blame and responsibility must rest on the Government of that day. The question, however, is as to whether we possess the free navigation of the Stikine River. The English language is a very clear one, and the Treaty of Washington is couched in very clear and unmistakable terms. It gives Canada the free navigation of the Stikine, subject to the regulations of the United States Government. Free navigation, if it means anything, means what was described yesterday by the right hon. Prime Minister—the right of transshipment. On this point I do not believe there can be any doubt or dispute whatever. But even if the Washington Treaty did not give us the right of transshipment at Fort Wrangel, we would still occupy a good position. When the Minister of Agriculture stated in the House his opinion, that boats could be constructed that could carry passengers and freight from Victoria to Glenora, he was ridiculed and told that he did not know what he was saying. The fact that at this very moment there are three boats under construction at Toronto for the purpose of carrying passengers and freight from Victoria or Port Simpson into the Stikine River, is the best evidence of its feasibility. That river can give passage to boats drawing between three and four feet at low water mark, and I repeat, that the best argument in favour of the practicability of this scheme is the fact that these boats are being built. But I do not think our American friends will deny us the right of transshipment at Fort Wrangel. It is situated seven miles from the mouth of the Stikine River, and is undoubtedly the best place for transshipment. But suppose we had some difficulty with our American friends and we could not agree with their regulations, we would then fall back on Port Simpson, where we could transship to advantage. As a matter of fact, the Hudson's Bay Company's boats have been transshipping for years at Port Simpson for navigating into the Stikine River.

Mr. WALLACE. Have they carried passengers?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly; there was no reason why they should not. At this moment the officers of my department are organizing an expedition which will go by boat from Port Simp-

son, the boat drawing over three feet of water. It will start from Victoria and go right up the Stikine River. I have in my desk a report from one of my officers to that effect. There is no doubt that vessels drawing three or four feet of water can carry passengers.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. gentleman mean, when crossing the ocean ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman must not forget that from Port Simpson to the mouth of the Stikine there are only 40 or 50 miles of open sea.

Mr. WALLACE. Sixty miles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let us say 60 miles. I grant that, in a big storm, a vessel drawing three or four feet would not be as safe as a vessel drawing 20 feet. But for all practical purposes, if we are denied our rights to tranship at Fort Wrangel, Port Simpson will still remain as a good place for transhipment.

A great deal has been said during this debate about an offer made on 14th February by a gentleman called Mr. Hamilton Smith. I happened to meet that gentleman, and in my presence, and in the presence of several of my colleagues, he stated that, before coming to Ottawa, he had had several interviews with Ministers at Washington, and especially with Mr. Gage. He came here from Washington and spent a few days in Ottawa, and during those days he made the offer we know of, after having communicated it to the hon. gentlemen opposite. That offer was made in co-operation with hon. gentlemen opposite. It was communicated to them ; it was communicated at the same time, it is quite evident, to the American Senate. He and his associates deliberately played the game of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I am sorry to say that hon. gentlemen opposite have to-day deliberately played the game of Mr. Hamilton Smith and thirty-four American senators who sympathize with him. These gentlemen opposite have now been obstructing this measure for two weeks, and yesterday our hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope) told us they were only beginning to discuss it. Well, let these hon. gentlemen understand once for all, that we can stand that kind of business just as well as they can. Let these hon. gentlemen discuss it to suit themselves and prolong the discussion as they like ; we will stand the racket. Sir, this scheme will go through, and it will go through because the Canadian people will insist on it. It is a national scheme ; it is essentially a Canadian scheme ; a Canadian scheme against the efforts of our friends in the United States to capture the Yukon trade from us. The position is very clear. On one side the Canadian people are anxious to get the millions and millions of dollars the trade of that vast district will bring

them, and on the other side are the Americans also anxious for that trade. After all, we cannot find so much fault with the American people, for if they can get the Yukon trade by legitimate means it is their right to do so ; but what is to be said and thought of hon. gentlemen opposite who are deliberately helping our American rivals to take away that commerce from us. The hon. the leader of the Opposition, when introducing the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill in 1880, uttered words to which I then listened, and which came to my mind when I heard his speech the other day. He then said :

Under the circumstances, hon. gentlemen opposite are unwise and unpatriotic in making this a battle ground of party. There was no necessity for it. I recognize, to the fullest extent, the advantage of having two great political parties grappling with each other, not on the low ground of personal or party ambition, but on a great national question on which a broad line of demarcation can be made between them, and regarding which they can do battle for great principles on which they differ. We have such a question in the National Policy, without dragging in the Pacific Railway. If we are defeated on that issue, hon. gentlemen opposite will take our places irrespective of the policy of the Pacific Railway. Having that line of demarcation between us, let us, on the great national question of the Canadian Pacific Railway, unite as a band of brothers, irrespective of old parties, show not that we are Liberals or Conservatives, but that we are Canadians, and that in every word that is uttered, whether we sit on the Treasury benches or on the Opposition side of the House, we feel we owe it to Canada, to ourselves and to our children, to do all that men can do to strengthen the hands of those who are engaged in a great national enterprise, upon the success of which the rapid progress and prosperity of our common country depends.

I ask my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) why does he not follow the advice that he gave the Opposition of that day. The construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was of great importance indeed, but in view of what is taking place now on the other side of the line, I ask that hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) if the construction of a line of communication between the Yukon and the rest of the Dominion is not of more importance. Yet, in the hope of gaining a party advantage, hon. gentlemen opposite are opposing a policy in which in the bottom of their hearts they believe. I cannot make up my mind that the hon. the leader of the Opposition especially is in earnest in the position he is taking. He has been forced to take the role he is playing to-day, and without intending to be offensive to him, I say that perhaps he is more to be pitied than blamed. When this Bill was first talked of in this House, he took a stand as a Canadian statesman, but he has been obliged to abandon it because of party exigencies. There was a time when the Conservative party claimed, nay, proudly boasted, that they were essentially the party

of progress, the party of devotion to Canadian industries, the party of devotion to Canadian commerce, and the party of devotion to British rule on this continent. It was on this ground that for over twenty-five years they appealed to the electorate—I may say “we” appealed, because I was then with them—for their support and their suffrages. They succeeded in creating on the public mind of Canada the impression that the Liberal party was composed of timid men, of unprogressive men, of men incapable of grappling with great and broad questions. In his last appeal to the Canadian people in 1891, Sir John Macdonald propounded this very idea, that the Liberal party had never been able to grapple with big questions. To-day, I ask the country to judge the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite in the light of the teachings of Sir John A. Macdonald. The leader of the Conservative party, in the statement I read a moment ago, set forth that in a great emergency it was necessary to build the Canadian Pacific Railway in order to secure to the British Crown and to Canada the vast territories of the west. The position is the same to-day. We have to keep secure for the Canadian people that vast district of the Yukon, and our friends on the other side of the House, instead of assisting us, instead of uniting like a band of brothers, to use the words of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), these hon. gentlemen opposite are simply engaged in the unpatriotic work of helping our opponents and our rivals. It is no use detaining the House very much longer on this question, but I may be permitted to say a word or two in answer to a few points raised by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). He has accused my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior with having been simply rolled over by the American statesmen, with having been deceived all along, and he cited in support of what he said the fact that my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) had gone to Washington and made customs arrangements. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said: How is it you telegraphed at such a date that arrangements were made, when those arrangements were not carried out until some time after.

A man who has been a Minister, who has occupied a responsible position, knows right well that in dealings between nations some little difficulty may arise without anybody being chargeable with bad faith. Those arrangements which the hon. Minister of the Interior concluded have been carried out since, and they are working very well indeed. Then, Sir, he asked, over and over again, by whom the contract was drawn? Had the contract been drawn by such and such gentlemen? Well, the Government of this country is to-day in the hands of Ministers who are trying to do their work themselves, as much as they can.

Mr. TARTE.

That contract has been drawn by this Government, and every member of this Government is responsible for it. My hon. friend has called attention, over and over again, to the fact that the contract was not signed by the Minister of Railways and Canals. The arrangement had been concluded, the whole thing was over, when the Minister of Railways and Canals was obliged to absent himself, and the day that contract had to be signed he was not here. That is all there is in that. As I said, there is not much more to be said. This scheme will be carried through; let my hon. friends make up their minds to that; they may speak just as long as they please. My hon. friend from Pictou in his speech described the anxiety of a poor fellow of a cock that was afraid to be eaten. Well, I can assure him that the Government cock is all right; it will not be eaten up. Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for the kind attention it has given me.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) rose to answer the very able argument of my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), I thought that after having listened for two days to the arguments of two very able lawyers, the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and the hon. member for Pictou, we might learn something more in the line of practical men from the Minister of Public Works. I must say, with all deference to the hon. gentleman—and I hope he will take it in good part—that I was disappointed. He has not convinced myself, nor will he convince the people outside of this House, who are, I am sure, just as much interested in this discussion as we are, when they read his speech. The hon. gentleman commenced by expressing his surprise that the chief of the Opposition in this House and those who surround him should have asked the Government, especially since we have heard from Washington, to abandon the scheme which is now before Parliament. Mr. Speaker, it would not be something extraordinary for the Government to abandon this scheme if they were convinced that in abandoning it they would be serving the best interests of this country. It would not be surprising, because they have already commenced by abandoning some very important parts of the scheme. They have, by the mouths of three of their Ministers, very materially altered some of its provisions. For instance, they have abandoned the system of laying out the blocks of land which the measure contained at the commencement; later on they declared that the directors of the company would be all British subjects, a provision that was not in the Bill as brought down; and last night the hon. Solicitor General declared that the company would be bound to operate the railway after it was built. These are three very important alterations; and most of

them were made before the action taken by the American Senate, which, to my mind, as has been contended on this side of the House—and the contention has not been answered on the other side—is a reason for abandoning the whole project. The hon. Minister of Public Works read something from the book written by Mr. Pope on Sir John A. Macdonald about the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the hon. gentleman, who was at that time a very good Conservative, declared that the scheme which is now before Parliament is similar to the Canadian Pacific Railway contract of 1881. Why, Sir, it is not similar; very far from it. The Canadian Pacific Railway scheme had been before the people of Canada for many years. It had been tried by the Conservative Government before 1872; it had been tried by Mr. Mackenzie during all the time he was in power, by means of the water stretches and by other experiments which failed; and when the people of this country placed their destinies in the hands of Sir John Macdonald in 1878, one of the first things he had to do was to provide for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in order to keep faith with British Columbia. But what we have before us to-day is not like that. A year ago who heard of the Yukon or the Klondike with all its riches? What we complain of to-day is that the Government have done a thing which, if it had been done by a Conservative Government, would have kept hon. gentlemen here talking for six months; that is, they have given one of the hugest contracts ever given in this country, about ten days before the opening of Parliament, and without calling for tenders; and the reason they give for this, which might be accepted outside of this House, is that it was necessary that the railway should be built as soon as possible. Will it be built soon? And just here let me say—and I call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this—if the Ministers who are sitting to-day on the Government benches, instead of promenading last summer, as most of them did, everywhere about this country and some of them in Europe, had sat down at their tables and examined the reports of Mr. Ogilvie and prepared to ask for tenders for the building of a railway to the Yukon, the people of this country would be in a position to examine in a more cognizant way the scheme that has been put before this House. The Government have also sent broadcast throughout Canada the statement that they were building a railway entirely on Canadian territory. Do we find that to-day? No; and this is one of the reasons why we say this scheme should be abandoned, and abandoned as soon as possible. As the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) said, and as the amendment of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) declares, we are ready to aid in every possible way, so long as it will be

for the best interests of this country, in the building of a railway for the development of the Yukon country; but when the hon. Minister of Public Works compares this scheme to that for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, he forgets one thing.

The men whom he supported at that time have not changed, but he has changed; and I wish to remind him that the gentlemen who are sitting around him to-day had not, in those days, the opinion of his former leaders which the hon. gentleman has expressed to-night. They opposed in every possible way the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Just let me quote a few words then said by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the House, and in whom my hon. friends has now so much confidence. The right hon. gentleman, who has been styled the silver-tongued orator, has had his speeches published in a book. This is the due of great speakers, and it is sometimes dangerous to them afterwards, but of course those who enjoy the glory must stand the consequences. The question was the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway along the north shore of Lake Superior, and this was the language used by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the House, with regard to the enterprise which my hon. friend still believes, despite his present associates, was a patriotic work, and the work of patriotic men:

Would it not be better, under those circumstances, to bring the road immediately to Sault Ste. Marie, tap the American system of railways, and secure not merely the trade of our own North-west, but a large share of the traffic from those states. This is so evident from a geographical point of view, that I will not stay to discuss it. There are two policies before the House at the present moment. The policy of the Government is: That the road should be constructed at once to the north shore of Lake Superior. What would be the consequences of carrying out that policy? There would be no communication with that road with the eastern railways for ten years to come; and although we may secure the incipient trade of our own territories we would lose the traffic from the north-western states of the Union. The other policy would be to bring the line at once to Sault Ste. Marie, thus securing us immediate connection, not only with the North-west, but with the American railways.

The right hon. gentleman always had a great inclination for American railways and American connections.

Can any one hesitate for a moment in the presence of that policy? What reason can be urged for the adoption of the route along the north shore of Lake Superior?

At that time the hon. Minister of Public Works did not credit the right hon. First Minister with the broad ideas for which he commends him now.

Though the question has thus far been discussed entirely in an unsectional spirit, I think I might well inquire which of these two policies

will be of most benefit to my own province? The immediate connection of the road to Sault Ste. Marie would at once carry over the railway system of Quebec the trade of our own North-west and of the American north-western states as well—a state of things which would prove of immense and obvious benefit to the cities of Montreal and Quebec.

Those were the broad ideas which the Prime Minister then held. To-day, the Government, by the scheme before us, are squandering away most important parts of our mineral territory and giving to monopolists what properly belongs to the poor man, the placer miner, but let us see how the right hon. gentleman wanted to build the Canadian Pacific Railway at that time :

Without venturing any expression of positive opinion, it may be a question whether, if the road, instead of being built, as it is now contended it must be built, had been gradually and step by step constructed, as the necessities of the country might require, it might not have been a consideration whether it should be built by a subsidy of lands and money, or whether the Government of Canada should proclaim to the world that the needy and poor of the whole world could find free lands and free soils throughout the whole of the North-west, and that they should be enabled to obtain the best market prices for their products. Perhaps, if that system had been followed, there might in a few years have been a few less millionaires in this country, but there would have been a much greater number of happy and contented homes. But another system has been followed. Twenty-five million acres of land are to be given to this company, and are to be locked up at the option of the company. The result of that policy must be the same in the North-west as it has been in every place where we have had land companies.

And so on. I read this to show my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, that the broad ideas which he finds in the Government of to-day were probably brought in by himself when he joined that Government, and are due to his long previous connection with the old Conservative party.

I heard my hon. friend say something which really surprised me, and, I am sure, everybody else who heard him. He purely and simply accused the hon. leader of the Opposition of being the cause of all that turmoil in the American Senate to-day. He said that the speech of the leader of the Opposition—of course, he was careful not to quote any of them—had been used in the Senate by one of the senators who supported that famous Bill. Well, I have had the honour of sitting with the hon. leader of the Opposition in Parliament for many years, and I do not know of any man who has been more abused, but this is the first time I have ever heard him accused of speaking against the interest of Canada. He has often been accused of the reverse; he has frequently been charged with standing up so much for Canada against the United States that he aroused the ire of the Americans. This accusation of my hon. friend falls very flat indeed. The present leader of the Op-

Mr. BERGERON.

position has been too long in public life for any one to believe that anything he ever said, in any circumstance, was not always in the best interests of his country.

My hon. friend spoke of the Treaty of Washington, but passed over that subject very rapidly. Of course, he had the excuse of not being a lawyer, but simply a man possessed of a great deal of common sense, and he limited himself to declaring that the Treaty of Washington granted free navigation, and that free navigation means, without doubt, the right of transshipment. Will the hon. gentleman say whether the Americans believe also that it involves transshipment. Let me remind him that, not only do we require transshipment, but we require also the right to land and warehouse our goods. If the hon. gentleman will read the "Globe" of to-day, he will find that the men who went from Vancouver to Fort Wrangel for Mackenzie & Mann, had a most terrible trip, although they sailed in an ocean vessel; and, when he speaks of small vessels of 300 or 400 tons in which men are going to sail from Vancouver to Wrangel, I hope that he will take the precaution of insuring their lives before they start. The hon. gentleman will find that it is absolutely necessary to use ocean vessels on that part of the coast. Take a vessel with a tonnage of 6,000 tons, which is about as small a tonnage as any of them will be, when you come to tranship from such a vessel into other vessels of 200 or 300 tons, you will find that more than the right of transshipment is required. You will find that we shall require the right of warehousing. But will the hon. gentleman have that right? How does he know the Americans will grant it? He says he stands on the faith of treaties. Treaties, Mr. Speaker, have been broken before now, and very often. We have had experience already with the United States, and our experience has been that, so long as it serves the interest of Americans, they will stand by a treaty, but when it does not, they will take every possible means to avoid it. England has a treaty to-day with the United States. In considering our position, we have to take everything into account, and I ask the hon. gentleman, if the Americans refuse to grant us what we are entitled to by treaty, what he is going to do? Will he apply to the mother country? The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) exclaimed, the other day, with a great deal of thunder, that the Government policy was: No surrender.

If you cannot get the Americans to stand by that treaty, what will you do? Apply to the mother country—you cannot do otherwise. Do you believe that, at this moment, England will go into war with the United States for a few acres of land, as they would call it, in the northern part of America? No, Sir. Treaties are written, but they can be broken, as other things can. Let me remind the Prime Minister that the

constitution of this country is a written constitution, but it can be broken. I hope you will not prevent me, Mr. Speaker, reading one section; I read it to prove my point.

Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union, or is thereafter established by the legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor in Council—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. Some people laugh now, but they will not laugh when they get before their electors—

—from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

At this very moment, while the Prime Minister is enjoying his position and the Minister of Public Works also enjoys his, there is an aggrieved minority in this country. Suppose that the Bill passed by the United States Senate should be adopted by Congress and signed by President McKinley, where will you be? For these reasons, it was eminently proper that the hon. leader of the Opposition and gentlemen on this side should earnestly—not for party purposes, but in the interest of the country—ask the Government to drop the scheme before the House and bring down a measure which, if it is in the interest of the country, this side will heartily support. Before leaving this subject, I may say that one of the things about the speech of the hon. Minister of Public Works that first struck me was the surprise he manifested that we should ask the Government to abandon this scheme. He wound up by a very strong declaration that this measure would carry. The hon. gentleman has read the contract, in fact, I think I recognize his hand in the drafting of it. Clause 25 says: "this contract shall be subject to the approval of Parliament." What is the meaning of that? Does the hon. Minister of Public Works think that every member of this House came for the purpose simply of hearing the speech of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair)—who did not seem to understand the subject very well—and the speech of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), and say "amen" to them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) himself was a fighter in Opposition; he did not come here simply to endorse everything that the Government might bring down. It was puerile on his part to be surprised that we should want the Government to abandon this scheme. Now, why do we want the Government to abandon this scheme? I speak simply as an elector of this country.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. The Prime Minister says "hear, hear." I think that is the way we should all speak here, because we represent the people who are outside. Sup-

pose one of the electors of the county were here and this scheme were submitted to him. Looking at the map he would see that the distance from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake, between which points this road is to be built, is not very great. He would naturally ask: What length of time will this save a man who is on his way to the gold fields from Halifax or Montreal, and he would be told that it would save five hours. He would read the contract and would find that you are giving everything to Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie. You give them 3,750,000 acres of land. You are giving them really more than that; the contract provides that you are to give them 25,000 acres per mile, and Mr. Jennings, one of the Government engineers, says that there will be 165 miles of railway, so that this land grant would amount to about 4,125,000 acres of mineral land of the Yukon. When it was known that there was gold in the north-west the Government very properly issued rules and regulations. I do not intend to discuss them, for I am not sufficiently posted on mining laws and the ways of miners. Taking them as they are, they are very severe. The miner will get a claim of 250 feet of land, or about one and one-fifth acres. He will pay \$10 for a certificate; he will pay \$15 annually to be allowed to work the claim. He has to select his claim within ten days after location. He has to work his claim, and if he does not work it for a period of seventy-two hours, he loses his claim and all the money he has paid. Then he must pay a royalty of 10 per cent on all the gold he gets. That explains why we have heard hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, men who know about these matters, stating that it costs a dollar to take a dollar's worth of gold out of the earth. Now, the elector whom I supposed to be here would see that it is proposed to give Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann over four millions of acres of mineral lands to be held in fee simple, in return for the building of 150 miles of railway.

They have not got to pay \$10 or \$15, and you are only charging them 1 per cent royalty when you are charging the poor man 10 per cent. You are giving them all that land, and you give them three years in which to choose half of it, and three years more in which to choose the other half—six years in which to go through what we expect will prove to be the best mining district in the world. Now if there is any clash between the agents of Mann & Mackenzie and some of the bona fide settlers on that land, who will be the loser? The poor man. Mann & Mackenzie, by their contract, can never lose. Do you suppose, Sir, that the people of this country would be willing to sanction such a bargain as that? Why, let any member of this House go out amongst his constituents and he will come back loaded

with opinions gathered right and left, that this is the most nefarious scheme that was ever brought before Parliament. There is no doubt that the discovery of this gold district is the greatest opportunity that was ever afforded to Canadians, but I am afraid we are going to lose the opportunity. Since this discussion commenced we have learned from the newspapers that our own Yukon district is at present merely an outlet for California and the other Pacific states, and that three-fourths of its wealth will go to those states. At present there are three Americans on the way to the Klondike to one Canadian, and they know their business better than our own people do, because they have been accustomed to it. In fact, we may say that the rich mines of the Klondike are to-day in the hands of the Americans, and as good as lost to Canada. But I may be asked, Why do you object to the construction of a railway? Sir, I do not object to the construction of this railway, but I object to the way in which this contract is awarded, I object to a grant of such immense value as we are giving to these contractors, I object to the monopoly which we are putting into their hands to the detriment of the poor miners of this country. What does history teach us in regard to mining in California? In the Fifties there was a mining tax in California of \$3 per month, and some times \$5 per month, imposed upon every foreigner who mined in the gold districts of California. The Americans can not pay that tax, there was that advantage given in favour of the Americans against any foreigner who chose to go there to mine for gold. Why should not the Government of this country in like manner impose a tax upon foreigners? Let me mention, also, in connection with the California mining history, that when the Panama Railway was built in the fifties, it was constructed for a purpose similar to that for which we are constructing our road. It was constructed in a rush, and it was much harder to build that railway than it is to build the railway which we are now discussing; and it was built by a private company without a dollar of assistance from any Federal or State Government. After it had been in operation for six years, the stock of that company was from 600 to 800 above par. All this enormous profit had been paid by the people who had travelled over that railway to reach the California gold mines. Now, Sir, I have risen on this occasion solely for the purpose of entering my protest against this project. I think that a scheme like the present one was never before put before the people of this country, and I urge once more upon the Government to refrain from pushing it forward. It is their own business I know, but it is my duty to oppose it, and to urge upon the Government to abandon it. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, in his speech the other day, which I listened to with great

Mr. BERGERON.

pleasure, because he always says something which I consider interesting, declared that the construction of this railway was absolutely necessary. Well, I would put that declaration alongside what fell from the lips of the right hon. Premier yesterday, in regard to the difficulties that might arise in consequence of action by the United States Government. The Premier said yesterday, that we could always rely upon another road from Telegraph Creek down to Port Simpson, and he said it was the intention of the Government to come before Parliament and ask for an appropriation for that purpose. Now, Sir, I ask whether it would not be better for the Government to break this bargain with Mann & Mackenzie at once, before going any further, to withdraw from this contract made before the opening of Parliament, a contract made against all the professions of the Liberal party when they were in Opposition, made without tenders, made without giving anybody a chance to build a road cheaper than Mann & Mackenzie are doing. I ask the Government, Would it not be better to tear that contract to pieces and ask for tenders to build a railway at once from Teslin Lake down to Fort Simpson? I am sure that if the Government would call for tenders for that purpose, and if there is the amount of gold in that country that we are told there is, there will be not less than one hundred contractors glad to come forward with offers to build that railway. If the Government choose to do that, I can say with my hon. chief the leader of the Opposition, that I would be ready to assist them in making a grant of land or of money for the construction of such railway. Then, Sir, we will have an all-Canadian route, we will be on Canadian territory, we will not be obliged to negotiate with our neighbours for the right to navigate the Stikine, nor be dependent upon their will and consent to reach our own territory. I think I have answered all the points that were made by the Minister of Public Works. We have heard all the legal points discussed thoroughly, and it is not necessary to go over them again. I thought it well to answer the hon. Minister of Public Works on account of the position he holds, although I am bound to say that he has not brought forward any new arguments in favour of this contract. It is my intention to support the amendment of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden).

Mr. MORRISON. I do not rise for the purpose of replying to the last speaker, for the simple reason that there is nothing to which to reply; nor shall I attempt to reply to any extent to any of the hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken. My hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), spoke at great length, and I think the most effective part of his speech related to the legal aspect of this question. For my part

I am perfectly willing to place against his arguments the opinions and the arguments which we have heard from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, notably from the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell). Now, I think I am correct in saying that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and the hon. member for Halifax, both eminent legal gentlemen, agree in the main on the question, and no successful attempt has been made by any hon. gentleman to controvert their contention. So that as regards these salient points there is no issue as between the Opposition and the Government, and I think any hon. member on the other side who shall attempt to deal with that question will not succeed in displacing these contentions, which have been advanced and supported by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I consider, therefore, it would be presumption on my part to take up the time of the House in talking upon the treaty rights of Canada and Great Britain as against the contention of the United States, and I will not detain the House by dwelling on that point. I am quite satisfied with the conclusion at which I have arrived, after reading all that is available here on the question and after having heard what has been stated, namely, that the free navigation of the Stikine is open to the subjects of Great Britain, and we all know what the free navigation of a river or water means. I contend that any further time taken up in discussing this point would be wasted so far as this House is concerned.

I am very sorry that hon. gentlemen opposite have studiously avoided the main points of this controversy. I regret exceedingly that on such a broad national question as this, hon. gentlemen opposite have not been more charitable, and instead of forgetting the fact that they are not here for the purpose of defeating measures but for the purpose of assisting the Government in carrying on the affairs of the country, they have seen fit to occupy much time and thrown many obstacles in the way of the Government, who, I am confident, are actuated by the best of motives and by a desire to advance the best interests of the country. It would be very much more to the purpose and much more likely to meet with public approval if hon. gentlemen opposite advanced some weighty reasons why this agreement should not be approved and this Bill passed; but if they are not satisfied with the line of action taken by the Government, why do they not submit some alternative scheme whereby the Government could conserve the interests of the people, which they allege, and wrongly of course, are being neglected by the present Administration. I am very sorry hon. gentlemen opposite are so uncharitable as not to offer some advice, to suggest some method by which the difficulties can be overcome. They forget the position in which

the Government found itself at the inception of this undertaking. I regret that they forget that the Government was confronted by an entirely new condition. The condition which met the Government was, I repeat, an entirely new one, and being so it is not, I think, a matter for criticism on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite that the Government should have adopted, to say the least, a unique line of action to meet that new condition. Hon. gentlemen opposite contend that this was a novel and entirely unusual treatment. The fact that the condition was new would justify new treatment. At the outset of the debate one of the main grounds taken against the Government was that they had been a little lax in grasping the situation. We were told that the state of affairs existing in the Yukon had been known to the Government for some weeks or some months; and the Opposition tried to make a point out of that fact and contended that the Government did not display sufficient activity. They must have forgotten that the Government knew, as hon. gentlemen opposite themselves knew, that for many years gold had been discovered in the Yukon. The Government knew it from various reports made to the Department of the Interior, which department had been under the control of hon. gentlemen opposite for eighteen years, and gold to a more or less extent had been discovered in the Yukon as far back as 1825. The Government knew, and hon. gentlemen opposite knew as well, that fact from the very full reports, no doubt authentic reports, in the public archives. These reports were at the disposal of hon. gentlemen opposite during all those years, and they have been at the disposal of the present Government for a few months. From those reports the Government knew that the Yukon district was the same as that portion of British Columbia lying south of the 60th parallel, geologically speaking; and they knew in addition, that not being different geologically from the southern portion of British Columbia, the Yukon had disadvantages, arising from having an arctic climate and being icebound, and having all the elements of inaccessibility and remoteness that always militate against the development and government of any section. They knew, and hon. gentlemen opposite knew, those facts for many years. They knew further that that portion of Canada had been traversed by trappers and adventurers for many years, but only the very hardiest and venturesome people could travel or subsist there. They knew the history of placer mining in Canada, Australia, South Africa, South America and other parts of the civilized world. They knew from the experience of British Columbia and from the experience of Cariboo, in which district something like \$50,000,000 had been taken out, William's Creek alone furnishing about \$20,000,000, that these placer finds be-

gan abruptly and ended equally abrupt. They knew that since that time prospectors have been travelling over the country signing option after option and throwing them up because they found that the history of William Creek and Lightning Creek would probably not be repeated. The Government had those facts and those reports before them. They had the report of Mr. McConnell, an accredited officer of the Government, and I refer hon. gentlemen to that document, for they do not appear to have consulted the material lying at their hands, furnished by the Government at very great expense.

If hon. gentlemen consulted that pamphlet of Dr. Dawson, dated 1887, and revised in 1898, they would find passages in it describing the sensitiveness of miners to placer excitements. At page 232, there is a statement from Mr. McConnell as to how little it takes to cause a stampede into a country where there is supposed to be placer mining, and what we are having in the Yukon country to-day is nothing more nor less than a stampede. Mr. McConnell, in referring to Forty-Mile Creek, one of the very places about which the excitement now exists, relates the following incident, which occurred in the year 1887 :—

A few days before my arrival a stampede had been made for Beaver River, a northern tributary of the Yukon, which is stated to enter the latter about 120 miles below the mouth of the Porcupine, but with somewhat disastrous results. The amount of information required to stampede a mining camp is very small, and in the present case was almost ridiculous. A report was brought up by the men on the steamer that a man had boarded the boat at the mouth of Beaver River, and after talking in a hurried manner to the captain, had suddenly departed, and in his haste had left his purse behind him. The miners reasoned that nothing but a rich find would cause such an excitement, and 150 men immediately loaded their boats and started on a wild goose chase down the river, only to meet with disappointment at the end of their journey. A few received a passage up again on the steamer, but the greater number drifted on towards St. Michael's and left the mining country altogether.

There is a sample of what little will cause a mining stampede. The Government had no reason to believe but that in the beginning this stampede towards the Yukon was caused by equally trifling circumstances, and let me ask, would any sane man blame the Government for taking precautions against swallowing wholesale excitable despatches coming through the medium of the American Press Association. Mr. McConnell, in his report, also shows how speedily these placer claims are worked out, and that opinion of his is supported by the experience under similar circumstances all over the known world. At page 233 of this report, Mr. McConnell enumerates some of the difficulties of prospecting in the Yukon region, and he says :

Mr. MORRISON.

Added to this is the shortness of the period available for work, which under the most favourable circumstances never exceeds three months, and in seasons of exceptional high water, such as the present, is very much less. In view of these drawbacks, prospecting must proceed slowly, and up to the present has been confined almost entirely to the larger and more accessible streams.

* * * * *

The present season has proved much less remunerative, partly owing to the unfavourable state of the water and partly to the fact that the rich claims first discovered have been worked out, the auriferous gravels being of little depth and easily exhausted.

That was true in the year 1887 of Forty-Mile Creek and the vicinity of the Klondike, and there is no reason for us to assume that it is not true to-day. The Government knew that, and, as sensible men, they were justified in discounting these very coloured reports which reached them from doubtful sources. This, in my opinion, is sufficient grounds for the precautionary steps taken by the Government before rushing headlong into an expensive railway enterprise. During those few months they had no accredited reports from their agents, but the excitement was all the time accumulating. For a number of years the northern Pacific Coast has been quite a resort for tourists. Hundreds of people from the United States and further afield have gone there during the hot summer months, and the glaciers near Dyea and Skagway had become the objective attraction of these tourists. When these people returned, they made that Yukon district a theme for magazine articles, newspaper writings, and even poems. There had been quite a number of miners in there, and wishing to dispose of their claims, they came to San Francisco and Seattle, telling extraordinary stories of the amount of gold to be found, and for the obvious reason of booming their own enterprises. In the spring of 1896, when this part of Canada had been made so well known to the outer world, the conditions were such that, owing to the disturbances in South Africa, the attention of miners was diverted from that part of the world. Australia, as a gold field, had apparently been set aside, and we heard nothing of the mining excitement in the United States, or in South America, or in Mexico. The Jubilee celebration came along, and Canada, as never before, became prominent before the people of the old country. Just at that time the newspapers commenced to publish despatches, almost incredible, as to the inconceivable wealth of the Yukon. Money was going a-begging in London, and was it any wonder that the attention of the English-speaking people was directed to the Yukon as a field for investment? Then the prospectors came out from the Yukon, alleging they had made their pile, and you could not go along the streets of the Pacific Coast cities without seeing a heap of what was said to be gold taken from such and

such a creek. The people became intoxicated, as it were, but should the Government, as a sober and sensible aggregation of men, swallow all the stories that were told, and propose to spend millions of dollars to construct a railway on the basis of such rumours? Later in the year came Mr. Ogilvie's report. A great deal has been said of this report, and I do not propose to minimize its importance, but, on my own responsibility, I do say, that it was a great misfortune that Mr. Ogilvie's report was written as it has been, because I maintain confidently that any report based very largely on hearsay evidence is dangerous and apt to be misleading. The great bulk of the information therein contained, as well as in Dr. Dawson's report of 1887, as to gold production, is hearsay. Those of the legal profession will understand the value of hearsay evidence and the weight attached to such evidence in a court of law, is certainly a good criterion for us to follow. I venture to say, that up to the present time the chief evidence before us as to the gold in the Klondike is largely hearsay. Take Mr. Ogilvie's estimate of the richest claims, and you will find him guarding himself by saying: If reports can be believed, such a river is worth a million dollars, or, if what Tom Jones told John Smith about Fakir Creek is true, the finds there are of marvellous value.

So far as his reference to the gold fields in the Yukon country is concerned, with all due deference to Mr. Ogilvie—and I do not want to be understood as criticising him adversely—that is all that it amounts to. Now, do the Opposition want the country to believe that this Government, or any Government, would for a moment expend and dissipate the money of the people of this country upon the strength of such reports as that in regard to the mineral value of the country? Mr. Ogilvie is a first-class surveyor; but I venture to say that there is not a capitalist in this country who would wish to invest \$100,000 upon the strength of Mr. Ogilvie's or Dr. Dawson's report on a gold mine. We know that in the Kootenay district there have been dozens of claims reported upon by expert mining engineers as worthy of being invested in; and capitalists invested their money in them only to find, on attempting to develop them, that they were valueless, and they had to be abandoned. How many abandoned mines are there to-day in the Kootenay district, admittedly the richest gold-bearing country in the world, which had been taken up on the reports of expert mining engineers? If the reports of expert mining engineers are so unreliable, what reliance can be placed upon the report, not of a geologist or a mining expert, but of a Dominion land surveyor. Mr. Ogilvie does not hold himself out as a mining engineer or a geologist; and no one can say that his opinion is that of an expert mining engineer. Nor can it be said that Mr.

Ogilvie represents the claims to be as rich as hon. gentlemen opposite say they are. I am trying to make the point that these hon. gentlemen are greatly exaggerating the known value of these lands, which are agreed to be given to Mackenzie & Mann in this contract. I say that there is no evidence that the lands in the Yukon district are as rich as hon. gentlemen opposite try to make them out; and until there is some tangible evidence before the Government in regard to their value, the Government are perfectly justified in taking the course they are taking, and in not expending money at the present time. Knowing that there was a tremendous influx of people into a region without any adequate means of communication, the Government were perfectly justified in giving some inducement to reliable contractors, and in giving that inducement in the shape of this land acreage; and I venture to say that two years hence, if we are living then, hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that the position which the Government have taken, and which I am now supporting, is correct. The Government, I say, had no more information before them than those reports, and the experience of British Columbia and other placer mining countries. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), as we all know, went up there. It is needless for me to recite what he accomplished or tried to accomplish. He went as far as he could go to the locus in quo; and although he saw, and had from officers and men there substantially what he had read in the reports published, there was nothing that he saw or heard that would justify him in concluding the mineral wealth of that country was of any permanence. But he had ample and conclusive evidence that a tremendous and unprecedented influx of people was imminent, and he would have been recreant to his duty as a Minister of the Crown, and the Government would have been recreant to their duty as sworn trustees of the people, anticipating, as they must have done, that the crime of the century would have been perpetrated, had they not taken steps to provide facilities for the transportation of people and goods into that country. I say they would have been recreant to their duty if they had not been willing to take very extraordinary steps to prevent suffering among those people, and to take those steps promptly. The steps they have taken are not, however, extraordinary. They have simply taken the steps that would have been taken by any level-headed body of men who had a proper conception of their duty in the circumstances. The Minister of the Interior no doubt also saw, what people here knew from the reports that were current, that the people on the Pacific Coast of the United States were moving heaven and earth in their efforts to corral the trade of the tremend-

ous number of people who were going into the Yukon country. Those people from Seattle down to San Francisco, spent hundreds of thousands of dollars, sat up nights, lied, and resorted to every artifice to secure that trade for themselves. They misrepresented in print and on the platform. They even misrepresented the printed customs regulations of this country, and adopted every ingenious means known to Americans to circulate those misrepresentations. They even hired column after column of such well-known papers as the "New York Journal" for the purpose of falsifying such well-known matters as the customs regulations, the coasting laws and the mining regulations applied to that part of Canada. The trades people on the Pacific Coast of the United States have a population of some 50,000,000 or 60,000,000 people to draw upon, and the surplus population of that great nation would be likely to resort to the Pacific Coast. They tried in every possible way to get these people to go by Seattle. They were not satisfied to confine their efforts to the United States, but they came across to Canada, and unfortunately succeeded in inveigling a great many people to the United States to purchase their supplies and equipment, who ought to have gone to Canadian ports. In these ways they diverted a great deal of trade, and it is needless for me to say that when a trade is diverted, it is very difficult to get a restitution of that trade. It no doubt impressed itself on the Minister of the Interior, as it did on the minds of the Government, that the tremendous efforts made by the people of the United States Pacific Coast to capture that trade would have to be met, and the only way in which they could be met was by the Government taking prompt and active steps to get an all-Canadian route which would secure, if not the whole of that trade, at any rate, a large measure of it, for Canada. I contend that the Government have succeeded in doing that, and what they have done will result in drawing to this country three-fourths, if not the whole of that trade. The most relentless and ungenerous opponents of this road, are the people of Seattle and of other United States cities on the Pacific Coast.

They are hardly second to hon. gentlemen opposite in their attacks upon this route. Why do the people of Seattle attack the Stikine and Teslin Lake route? I would be very sorry indeed to find myself in the same boat on a question of this kind with the people of Seattle and the United States. If hon. gentlemen opposite would only reflect a moment and realize that they are in the same boat with those on the Pacific Coast of the United States and other parts of the American Union in this matter, they would be reluctant indeed to follow out the course they are pursuing so thoughtlessly and for party purposes. The Government,

Mr. MORRISON.

having all those circumstances before them, set about considering what they had better do, and of course their first consideration was to decide what route should be selected in order that we might capture the trade then just beginning. Glancing along the coast, it was evident that the first means of ingress was by the Yukon River, but of course that was entirely out of the question. In the few remarks I made on the first reading of the Bill I attempted to show—and my argument has not been controverted—that 10,000 people were within the passes of the Yukon, and that estimating twenty-five steamers as the largest number which could navigate that river during the short season when it is navigable, all that these boats could carry would be about 2,650 tons of provisions, which would be quite insufficient to feed 10,000 people, let alone 50,000, which is a very low estimate of the number which will be there ere long. To keep 50,000 people, you will require 25,000 tons of provision. This shows the total inadequacy of the Yukon as a means of furnishing supplies.

That road, therefore, had to be abandoned, and the only feasible route was the Stikine. It was not a new route to the Government and it could not have been a new route to the Opposition, because we all know that in 1799 it was well known to the Russians, and afterwards to the Hudson Bay people and North Pacific traders. Wrangel was a trading post a hundred years ago, but known by a different name. Fifty years ago it was quite a trading post, and up to the Stikine River and along that telegraph trail was a well beaten path. The route was not a novel one to the Government or the Opposition. The Government passed by the Taku route and the Lynn Canal route for the very good reason that by those routes we would have to go over American territory; and there is not a gentleman here disinterested who will say for a moment that the Government would have been justified in building a railway, one of the termini of which would be in the United States. The Teslin-Stikine route, therefore, was the only apparently available.

The debate, since the second reading, has been almost entirely confined to an attack on the Stikine route as not being an all-Canadian route, and from that aspect of the case arose these discussions on the treaty rights of Great Britain and the United States. I shall not dwell on that question. I am satisfied with the statement given on this side that we are entitled to the free navigation of the Stikine River with all that such a right implies; and I do not know that the country desires anything more.

The right of free navigation being settled, the next position to consider is whether the river is navigable. We have been told by the other side that it is not. Well, these hon. gentlemen had information at their hands, if they chose to avail themselves of

it. We find in the report of Dr. Dawson—and there is not a gentleman on the other side who will attempt to controvert what he says, the following on page 6:—

In addition to this we now have instrumental surveys of the Stikine from its mouth up to the head of navigation (Telegraph Creek).

What does navigation mean? The Government were quite satisfied to assume that the Stikine was navigable to Telegraph Creek, the head of navigation, in the same way that they are satisfied that the Fraser River is navigable to Yale, the head of navigation. Further on, at page 15, Dr. Dawson says:

The Stikine is navigable by stern-wheel steamers for a distance of 138 miles, as more fully stated in a subsequent part of this report, where also details respecting the connecting trail to Dease Lake are given. This constitutes the travelled route to the Cassiar mining district.

The Government took the ground, and they were perfectly right in doing so, that it would be a work of supererogation on their part, having an official report in their hands certifying that that river is navigable, to go to the expense of sending out a man to test its navigability. Had they done so, they would have been attacked right and left by hon. gentlemen opposite for going to an unnecessary expenditure for the purpose of ascertaining information which we had before us. At page 44, we find something more about the Skagway and Stikine rivers. Hon. gentlemen opposite, and particularly the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), attempted to minimize the importance of the navigability of the Stikine River. They tried to make out it was an unknown route, concerning the feasibility of which the Government should have satisfied themselves before coming to a decision. We find that Dr. Dawson, at page 44, said:

Like the Fraser, the Skeena, the Nass and several other smaller streams, it rises to the east of the broad belt of mountains which constitutes the Coast ranges, and cuts completely through this belt with a nearly uniform gradient. In size and general character the Stikine closely resembles the Skeena, which reaches the coast 200 miles further south.

And the Skeena River is one of the most important of the Dominion. Referring still to the Stikine:

It is navigable for stern-wheel steamers of light draught and good power to Glenora, 126 miles from Rothsay Point, at its mouth, and under favourable circumstances to Telegraph Creek, twelve miles farther.

Further on, Dr. Dawson says:

This route has long been known to the Indians, the Stikine having been to them from time immemorial an important avenue of trade, by which, as by the Skeena, the coast trade penetrated a considerable distance inland.

Again, on page 45, as to the depth of this river, Dr. Dawson says:

The current of the navigable portion of the Stikine is swift throughout, but there are no rapids properly so called, though the Little Cañon (53 miles above the great bend) forms a serious impediment to navigation when the river is at its highest stage, in June or July, in consequence of the great velocity of the current in this narrow and rocky though deep gorge.

Near the mouth of the river the current scarcely surpasses two miles an hour, but it increases as the river is ascended, till it attains a rate of six to seven miles in many places between the Great Bend and Telegraph Creek, the swifter water being chiefly met with above the Little Cañon. The average rate of flow of the navigable portion of the river must be about five miles an hour.

Gentlemen who are not familiar with river navigation may think that a current of five miles an hour is an impediment to navigation. But, on the Fraser River, opposite New Westminster, the water is quite navigable and is resorted to by shipping from the old country, Australia, Hong Kong and all over the world. And the current in May goes up to eight miles an hour, and, even then, it is not the slightest impediment to navigation, being navigated by crafts of all draughts. The width of the Stikine River opposite Telegraph Creek on May 29th was 489 feet, but it is reported as being deep—Dr. Dawson's Report. The current ran at 6.08 miles an hour as decided by several observations. The river rose later in the season, and the current was swifter. So we see that at the terminus of this road, Dr. Dawson in 1887 states that the water is deep, and in June and July it was rising rapidly owing to the melting of the snow on the mountains. The Government would not have been justified at all in assuming that there would not be enough water in the river or that it was other than navigable for crafts of light draught. Crafts that may sail from Victoria, Vancouver, New Westminster and other places to Port Simpson can go on up to Glenora. I see it stated in the Victoria "Colonist," which paper supports hon. gentlemen opposite—but which, by the way, is vigorously supporting the Government in this measure—that the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company, a local company and entirely distinct from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, is taking the boats "Yosemite" and "R. P. Rithet," which are trading now from Victoria and Vancouver and Westminster from that route and putting them on the route between Port Simpson and Glenora. They are boats that can cross the Gulf of Georgia, which has often been compared to the English Channel, and is a rough piece of water. They have been navigating up the Fraser River and to Vancouver. They are stern wheel boats. The fact that they are being taken off their present route and sent on the route from Port Simpson to Glenora, furnishes an answer to the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite that you cannot tranship or lighter at Port Simpson with safety and carry the goods up to Glenora.

So, even if hon. gentlemen opposite are right and the United States Senate could interfere with us at Wrangel, we are independent of that. But I do not admit for a moment that there is any difficulty in the transshipment question at Wrangel or at any other point on the Stikine. But, assuming that there is any difficulty, we can transship at Port Simpson to boats that will navigate the Dixon channel and run up to Glenora. The "Yosemite" has been in service for years. She is an old boat and was taken off the Sacramento River. If she can navigate the Gulf of Georgia, it is mere nonsense for gentlemen opposite to say that it is not safe for her to trade between Port Simpson and Glenora on the coast waters of British Columbia.

So much for the navigability of the route. On this ground, as we have seen, the Government had every reason for selecting this route by the Stikine River. They also had the report of Dr. Dawson that the Stikine River is open for a longer period during the year than is the River St. Lawrence. At page 58, he states the following concerning the time the river opened :

According to Mr. J. C. Callbreath, of Telegraph Creek—

—a gentleman well known in British Columbia, and a high authority on the Yukon,—

—the Stikine generally opens for navigation between April 20 and May 1. Ice or "sludge" usually begins to run in the river about the first of November.

That is to say, the river is open from the middle of April to the end of November, a greater period than that during which the St. Lawrence is open. So hon. gentlemen can find little relief in saying that the Stikine, besides the international objections against it, has little water in it. And they are equally without support when they say that it is open for only a few months in the year. So, in the first place, we have our rights guaranteed by treaty. In the second place, we have a sufficient depth of water. And, in the third place, we have a river free from ice for a sufficient time during the year to justify the Government in adopting it as a means of reaching the Yukon country. On all these points, the Government's action is completely justified.

But, coming to the contract, were the Government justified in granting the concessions that they have granted to Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie? Were they justified in assuming that there was so much gold in that country as hon. gentlemen opposite would have us suppose there is? Were they justified in assuming that all these millions of acres of land were mineral land? They are often spoken of as such. I say that there is no sufficient evidence that even a large part, or even any considerable part of them is mineral land. I say that the Government are perfectly justified in assuming that these lands were not mineral lands to the

Mr. MORRISON.

extent that hon. gentlemen opposite tried to make out they were. Neither Mr. Ogilvie, nor Mr. McConnel, nor Dr. Dawson, nor any of the men who went up there and gave reports of that country stated that they discovered gold, or even that they knew of any great quantity. Trappers had gone over that territory, tourists and hunters, like Mr. Warburton Pyke and Lord Lonsdale, after big game, have traversed the country and found no gold. Mr. Ogilvie and Dr. Dawson walked over the Klondike in 1887 and found no gold, or, at least, did not report it. Who did find the gold? A few miners went in there and we have their report. Did hon. gentlemen opposite ever hear of such a thing as "salting" a mine? Take some of these prospectors who talk of immensely rich claims there, some of the people you meet about hotel corridors in this city or in Seattle or Vancouver, who say they have made tremendously rich strikes. Are hon. gentlemen opposite prepared to take every statement of these as to the tremendous riches of that country as exactly true?

I, for one, would be loath to take their statements, and in saying this, I do not wish to reflect upon some of those gentlemen who say they have made good discoveries. But as regards the great bulk of these people, I would not take their word in matters of less importance than mining, and I certainly would not take their unsupported statement as to the tremendous possibilities of the gold-bearing districts in that country. The Government, no doubt, in considering the reports of these miners, had in their minds Mark Twain's definition of a mine—a hole in the ground, the owner being a liar. I think it would be safe to take that definition as regards most of these people. Now, I have heard an argument used that these placer deposits are glacial deposits, that they are deposited there by glaciers from the north. If we ask, where did these glaciers come from, the obvious superficial answer would be, that they came from the Arctic Ocean. I would not be at all surprised to hear from hon. gentlemen opposite, in view of their extraordinary contentions on other points, get up and say that the glaciers naturally would come down from the Arctic regions. But anybody who has read anything of the theory of the glacial period knows that such is not the case. There are people who contend that the glaciers come from the equator. We know that at present they are found almost entirely in the temperate zone. During the glacial period the climate surrounding the poles was highly temperate. We have evidence of this in the fossil finds in the Tertiary beds at Greenland for instance, in the northern parts of British America and Russia, and the land surrounding the Arctic Ocean. These placer deposits are more apt to be found further south; and if there is such a

thing as a mother lode, from which these placer deposits have come, that mother lode is more probably in Mexico or Honduras than in the Yukon. So that, even going on the theory that these placer finds are glacial deposits, I think the hon. gentlemen will find very little consolation in that contention. Now, no doubt the Government considered all the other possible routes into that territory, and I have no doubt there are hon. gentlemen on the other side who would get up and argue against every one of them far more cogently than they can argue against this route. But I think that every other possible route or mode of getting into that country is far more open to attack than the one that has been chosen. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to take up any other possible route into that country, and we can advance stronger objections against it than can be advanced against this route adopted by the Government. Now, I wish to make some reference to the speech made the other day by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). I was very sorry to hear that hon. gentleman adopt so narrow a course, to use a mild term, as he did on that occasion. He took an extremely narrow view of the whole question, and I was surprised to hear a gentleman of his ability and of his general information standing up here and making use of the arguments that he did against his own party on such a very important matter as this. He argued, not from the standpoint of a resident of the North-west Territories, as a whole, but from the standpoint of a resident of the immediate vicinity of Edmonton. He went on to say, that as the building of this road would not inure to the advantages of the town of Edmonton and that part of country immediately surrounding Edmonton, therefore he would not support it, and he solicited the aid of hon. gentlemen opposite in his opposition to this route. I must say, Sir, that I think the action of the hon. gentleman on that occasion was most discredit-able: it was discredit-able in this way, that he was driven into the necessity of taking an individual position, and in arguing against one section of our country in order to benefit his own particular locality. I wish to avoid that in any remarks that I may make. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the Edmonton route is not a good route, and that a line from Edmonton should not be built into the Yukon country. But I will repeat what has already been said, that there is nothing necessarily antagonistic between the Stikine route and the Edmonton route. The Edmonton route at the proper time is all right, but it is irrelevant in the consideration of the route that is now before the House. He went on to argue that, inasmuch as the country immediately surrounding Edmonton was the only base of production in that portion of the Dominion, therefore this road would be under the disadvantage of being far away

from the base of production, and consequently the people east of Edmonton would derive no benefit from this Stikine route, that British Columbia would reap but a small benefit from it, while the bulk of the food would be furnished by the United States. He made that bald statement without any foundation. Now, I wish to take issue with the hon. gentleman on that point. He thus refers to the geographical position:

The nearest points of production of surplus food products in the Dominion to the Yukon is that part of the country in which I live—the country immediately surrounding Edmonton—and the next nearest point is the country immediately surrounding Regina and extending eastward to Winnipeg. If the food products, therefore, which are consumed in the Yukon cannot be drawn from those localities they cannot be drawn from any other part of Canada, but must be obtained from some other and foreign country.

Meaning, of course, from the United States. Now, I say, that the hon. member, in making that statement from his seat in the House, having the reputation which he enjoys for intelligence and the possession of information on general topics, took advantage of his position, either intentionally or otherwise, to mislead this House and the country into discrediting the action of the Government in building this urgency route from the Stikine River into Teslin Lake. Now, he does not give any reason in support of his statement that the vicinity of Edmonton is the nearest base of production. Let me tell the hon. gentleman, that the country immediately in the vicinity of Edmonton is not the nearest point of production to the Yukon. The province of British Columbia, in which this railway is being built, is the nearest point of production, if there is any point in that. It is not only the nearest point, but I argue confidently that, perhaps, it is the greatest point of production in the Dominion of Canada. In saying that, I do not deprecate the other portions of the Dominion which are capable of producing more than enough to supply, not only the Yukon and the Dominion of Canada, but the world at large.

Mr. COCHRANE. Does British Columbia produce enough to feed itself?

Mr. MORRISON. I happen to belong to British Columbia, and I have been sustained up to this time.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the hon. member had to depend on British Columbia alone, he would not be here.

Mr. MORRISON. If the hon. gentleman will take a trip there, perhaps he will be better sustained. I desire now to say a few words with respect to the products of British Columbia. I am not going to say that British Columbia is the only province in the Dominion of Canada, but I think it is right that the hon. member for Alberta

should be enlightened as to its resources, and I am glad the hon. member is in his seat. The hon. gentleman should not confine himself to gaining information with respect to his own bailiwick, but should ascertain what is being produced and exported by other provinces, including British Columbia. The hon. gentleman has evidently not availed himself of the facilities offered hon. members to post himself as to the resources of that great province. Even if I were not a resident, I would feel it incumbent on me to secure information in regard to British Columbia. I now refer the hon. gentleman to the official Hand-book published by authority of the Government of the province.

Mr. OLIVER. I should like to ask the hon. member a question before he goes further. I think he has misquoted me. I said that British Columbia was not a point of food production.

Mr. MORRISON. I will read from "Hansard" what the hon. gentleman said:

The nearest point of production of surplus food products in the Dominion to the Yukon is that part of the country in which I live—the country immediately surrounding Edmonton—and the next nearest point is the country immediately surrounding Regina and extending eastward to Winnipeg. If the food products, therefore, which are consumed in the Yukon cannot be drawn from those localities, they cannot be drawn from any other part of Canada, but must be obtained from some other and foreign country.

It is a categorical statement. I am now about to show that the town of Edmonton and the country around is not the nearest point of surplus food production in Canada for the Yukon. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to read the Hand-book, and he must have received one, he will find that British Columbia is the largest producer in the world per head except Holland. That should stimulate the hon. gentleman to find out why such is the fact.

Mr. OLIVER. This appears to be a question of veracity between the hon. gentleman and myself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman has charged me with speaking without knowledge, either intentionally or unintentionally. I wish to repeat the point I made. It was, that British Columbia is not an exporter of food products. I beg to repeat that statement, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to deny it and to prove his denial.

Mr. MORRISON. Whether British Columbia is an exporter of food products would involve a discussion of what the hon. gentleman means by food products.

Mr. OLIVER. Agricultural products.

Mr. MORRISON. That is the point to which I was coming. If the hon. gentle-

Mr. MORRISON.

man will abide his time I will show conclusively that British Columbia is a very considerable exporter. At all events it is confining the discussion to a very narrow local argument, to compare Edmonton and the country around it with any part of the Dominion as a producer of food for the Yukon.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure I do not challenge or question the fact that British Columbia furnishes food products, but I deny the assertion that British Columbia exports agricultural food products.

Mr. MORRISON. I am denying the statement made by the hon. gentleman, his categorical statement that Edmonton and the surrounding country constitute the nearest point for export of food products to the Yukon. The hon. gentleman has made that categorical statement, and a proper inference is that British Columbia is not a point of food production for the Yukon country. I leave other hon. gentlemen to deal with the point so far as the other provinces are concerned.

I lay down this proposition, that the value of any country to its inhabitants depends on four conditions. One is its supporting capacity. This may be by agriculture, ranching or stock producing. Coming down to the very narrow comparison to be made as between British Columbia and that part of the North-west Territories represented by the hon. gentleman, we find that in the district of Kootenay there are 16,500,000 acres, in the district of Yale, 13,000,000 acres, in Lillooet 12,500,000, in New Westminster 36,000,000 acres, Cariboo, 59,250,000 acres. Cassiar district comprises the whole western portion of British Columbia from 23 degrees of longitude, all these districts together comprising an area of 383,000 square miles, and there are 640 acres to the square mile, and I allow the hon. gentleman to make the calculation as to how many millions of acres there are in British Columbia. Statisticians tell us that an individual can sustain life on something like 3 acres of land, without the proverbial cow. I am not extravagant when I say that out of 300,000,000 acres in British Columbia a very modest calculation would be 10,000,000 as arable and food producing land. Therefore, assuming that three acres will sustain an individual, there is a supporting capacity for two, three or four millions of people in that province.

Another condition is the exporting capacity of a country. Looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns, with which the hon. gentleman from Edmonton must be familiar, we find at page 27 that the total value of exports of products exported from British Columbia in 1897 was \$14,017,678, and for the whole of the North-west Territories in the same year, exports were of the value of \$166,000.

Mr. DAVIN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) what is the exporting port of the North-west Territories?

Mr. MORRISON. The reference to that will come in in another branch of my argument.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the port from which the products of the North-west Territories are sent?

Mr. MORRISON. I do not quite understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIN. May I explain? These figures that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) is putting before the House are utterly misleading, because the exports of the North-west Territories are not tabulated in that book, and there is no means of getting at what the North-west Territories export for the purposes of that book that is published there.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not presume for a moment that the North-west Territories export anything for the purposes of this book, but I apprehend that the Trade and Navigation Returns of Canada are reliable.

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) finds that the \$14,000,000 of exports from British Columbia is composed of agricultural products, or what proportion of it?

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 9th March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Lake Tamagamingue Railway Company.—(Mr. McHugh.)

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—
REPLY TO ADDRESS TO HER
MAJESTY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, a copy of a despatch dated 22nd July, 1897, from the Right Honourable Joseph Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, relative to the Joint Address to the Queen from the Senate and House of Commons, tendering their congratulations on the happy occasion of the completion of the sixtieth year of Her Majesty's reign.

A copy of the gracious reply of Her Majesty, as referred to in the despatch, is also herewith transmitted.

Government House,

Ottawa, 9th March, 1898.

(Mr. Chamberlain to Lord Aberdeen.)

Canada.

No. 263.

Downing Street, 22nd July, 1897.

My Lord,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch No. 159 of the 10th June, covering a Joint Address to the Queen from the Senate and the House of Commons of Canada, tendering their congratulations on the happy occasion of the completion of the sixtieth year of Her Majesty's reign.

This Address was presented to Her Majesty in person by the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to whom the Queen was pleased to hand a gracious reply.

I have, &c.,

(Sgd.) J. CHAMBERLAIN.

Governor General,

&c., &c., &c.

Copy of Her Majesty's reply to the Joint Address from the Senate and House of Commons, presented by the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

"I thank the Canadian Parliament for their loyal and dutiful Address. I am deeply touched and gratified by this manifestation of the loyalty and affection which they bear to my Throne and Person.

"I request you to convey my sincere thanks to the Canadian Parliament for their Address, and for the beautiful casket in which it is inclosed."

ALIENS AND MINING INTERESTS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 63) to amend the law relating to aliens. He said: The Bill provides that any person who desires to own or occupy or become a director of any mining company or mining interest in Canada, must be a resident of Her Majesty's realm for at least twelve months prior to so doing, or of a country in which there is no alien labour law in opposition to Her Majesty's subjects.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BANK OF COMMERCE—BRANCH IN THE YUKON.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

Has the Government made any arrangement with the Bank of Commerce for establishing a branch of that bank in the Yukon district? If so, what is the arrangement made? Has any other bank made proposals to the Government looking towards establishing branches in the Yukon district?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). In reply to the first question, I beg to say, yes. In reply to the second, I beg to say: Under the arrangement made, the Canadian Bank of Commerce is to establish an agency at Dawson City and to be employed by the Government to do the Government's general banking business in the district, including the collection of royalties. The bank is to be allowed the privilege of erecting a building within the police enclosures. This arrangement is temporary, and the compensation to be allowed for the bank's services is to be fixed hereafter at the discretion of the Minister of Finance. Except as to the business and privilege above mentioned, the bank will stand in the same position as any other bank that may be established in the district, and any other privilege or protection that may be given the Canadian Bank of Commerce, under the arrangement with that bank, will be given to any other bank that may be established in the district. The correspondence on the subject will be laid on the Table to-morrow. In reply to the third question, I beg to say that it is already answered in the above.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I understood the hon. Minister of Finance to say that the Bank of Commerce would collect the royalties. That does not mean, I suppose, that they become the collectors outside, but simply that they receive the royalties on deposit.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They will receive the royalties in whatever form they may be collected. Under the regulations issued by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), it is provided that the royalties may be paid to the banking agent of the Government, or to any one of certain Government officials. In any case, however, the bank will become the receiver of the royalties on behalf of the Government.

BADDECK DRILL SHED.

Mr. BETHUNE asked,

Is the Government aware that the title of a piece of land at Baddeck, Cape Breton, has been made to Her Majesty for the purpose of having a drill shed erected thereon? Has the Government taken into consideration the necessity there exists of having a drill shed erected at regimental headquarters, Baddeck? If so, will the drill shed be built at an early date?

Mr. McMULLEN.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1. There is no record in the department to show that a piece of land at Baddeck, C.B., has been deeded to Her Majesty for the purpose of having a drill shed erected thereon. 2. It is highly desirable that there should exist at the headquarters of the 94th Battalion a headquarters drill shed, wherein all the arms and accoutrements of the battalion should be stored. 3. The D.O.C. at Halifax has been asked for a report. No decision can be reached until the report is received.

WHARF AT RIVIERE A LA PIPE.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Dugas) asked,

Have the Government sent instructions to any person at Rivière à la Pipe, in the county of Chicoutimi, as to the preparation of timber required for the building of a wharf at that place, and, if so, to whom; what are the prices paid, and what quantity has been allotted to each person?

Are the Government aware that this timber has been allotted to certain store-keepers in large parcels; that the said store-keepers refuse to give anything but store pay in return for the work of the settlers and that many of the latter have thus been deprived of the advantage of making timber at the price fixed by the department?

Have the Government instructed any person at Rivière à la Pipe or elsewhere to haul stone to the site of the proposed wharf; if so, who are the persons, and what are the prices offered?

Are the Government aware that several of the settlers are now hauling the said stone, without supervision, without any fixed price, and calculating on working by the day?

Who set the said persons to work? Is the departmental engineer on the spot, in order to set the work in operation and fix the prices?

How much have the Government paid for the special journey made by the engineer in order to locate the wharf, for travelling and living expenses and cost of survey?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: No work has yet been done on the wharf at Rivière à la Pipe. An engineer has been detailed to that point, and left about two weeks ago in order to procure the necessary materials required for the construction and see to the price thereof. No allotment of timber nor of the stone has yet been made or reported to the department. The engineer is now on the spot in order to set the work in operation. The site of the proposed work was selected after a survey made a few years ago by one of the engineers of the department not now in its employ—Mr. Guay—and, while in the Chicoutimi district, superintending some other works during last season, the engineer in charge—Mr. Blais—went to Rivière à la Pipe to examine the site and give any further information to the department that might be required. His expenses from Chicoutimi to Rivière à la Pipe and return were the following:—Transportation, \$18; board, \$2.50.

CUSTOM-HOUSE AT CHAMBORD, CHICOUTIMI.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Dugas) asked,

1. Is it true that the Government have established a custom-house at Chambord, in the county of Chicoutimi, and if so, at whose request?
2. Do the Government pay to P. C. Dupuis, or to any other person, any sum of money, by way of rent, or for other considerations, in connection with the use of the buildings wherein the said customs office is located, and if so, what sum?
3. What is the amount of duties paid at the said office, since its establishment, and on what articles have duties been collected?
4. What is the amount of the outlay incurred for the maintenance of this branch, since its establishment, including cost of installation?
5. What is the salary of the officer in charge of the office, and his name and residence?
6. What amount has been paid him, up to date, for salary, travelling expenses and other considerations?
7. Are the Government aware that that officer lives six miles away from Chambord?
8. For what reasons did the Government establish the said office?
9. What are the goods which have been entered at the said office, and the names of the persons who entered and passed the same?
10. Do the Government intend to maintain the said office?
11. Is it true that the late Government refused to open the said office, and that it was in view of a promise made prior to the Dominion elections that the said P. C. Dupuis opposed the Conservative candidate and supported the Liberal candidate?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1. Chambord Junction was established as an outport of customs under the survey of the port of Quebec, by Order in Council to take effect from the 1st May, 1897. Attention was called by Dupuis, Demers & Co. to the necessity for customs facilities for the Lake St. John district. 2. The Government do not pay any sum of money to P. C. Dupuis, or any one else, at Chambord Junction, for rent or use of buildings for customs purposes. 3. The duties paid at said outport from its establishment up to the 28th February, 1898, amounted to \$589.65. It would be necessary to have a special return from the port under which Chambord Junction is before an answer could be given to the inquiry as to the articles upon which duties have been collected. 4. The salary of the officer, from the 19th June, 1897, to 1st March, 1898, was \$210. Cost of installation about \$22; total, \$232. 5. Auguste Gagné is sub-collector of customs at Chambord Junction at a salary of \$300 per annum, and his place of residence at the time of his appointment is stated as at St. Jerome (Lake St. John). 6. The amount of his salary to 1st March, 1898, is \$210. He has not been paid any sum whatever for travelling expenses or other considerations. 7. The Government are not aware how far

away from Chambord Junction the officer lives at present. 8. The outport was established in order to accommodate the customs business of the Lake St. John district and vicinity. 9. It is not usual to publish the details of individual importations made through custom-houses. Moreover, the information required under this inquiry could not be furnished without special returns from the port of Quebec. 10. It is the intention of the Government at present to keep the office open. 11. The Government is not aware of the late Government's refusal to open the office, or of any promise made prior to the Dominion elections with regard thereto.

POSTMASTER AT ASHCROFT, B.C.

Mr. PRIOR (by Mr. Earle) asked,

1. Who is the present postmaster at Ashcroft, British Columbia, and where did he reside previous to his appointment?
2. By whom was he recommended for the position?
3. How many applicants were there for the position, and what were their names?
4. What were their post office addresses, and by whom were they recommended?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1. The present postmaster of Ashcroft, British Columbia, is Mrs. Mary J. Cornwall. She has been postmaster since 6th October, 1892. She resided at Ashcroft previous to her appointment. 2. She was recommended for the position by Clement J. Cornwall, county court judge, at the request of J. A. Mara, Esq., M.P. 3 and 4. There were no other applicants for the position. I fancy that my hon. friend intended to ask concerning the postmaster at Ashcroft Station, and if so, my answer will not meet his requirements; but I can only give the answer as I have it now, and which refers to the post office known as Ashcroft.

Mr. EARLE. I think the post office intended to be referred to must be Ashcroft Station.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will put his question again on the paper, I will obtain the answer.

MILITARY HARNESS AND SADDLERY CONTRACT.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. What contracts for military harness or saddlery have been given by the Government of Canada since the 1st of September, 1896?
2. By whom, and where were said contracts executed?
3. What is the amount fixed for the execution of said contracts, and have the amounts been paid?
4. Were tenders for the execution of said contracts publicly called for, and was the contract in each case awarded to the lowest tenderer?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA** (Mr. Borden). I must ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) to be kind enough to move for a return in the regular way. The same observation will apply to his two succeeding questions respecting military clothing and repairs and additions to Montreal drill shed, respectively.

BRITISH JOINT STOCK COMPANIES AND THE YUKON.

Mr. **DOMVILLE** asked,

In regard to regulations governing placer mining in the provisional district of Yukon, Northwest Territories: Interpretation, "joint stock company shall mean any company incorporated for mining purposes under a Canadian charter or licensed by the Government of Canada." Section 2. "A free miner's certificate may be granted for one year, to run from the date thereof or from the expiration of the applicant's then existing certificate, upon the payment of the sum of \$10, unless the certificate is issued in favour of a joint stock company, in which case the fee shall be \$50 for a company having a capital of \$100,000 or less, and for a company having a nominal capital exceeding \$100,000 the fee shall be \$100. Only one person or joint stock shall be named in a certificate." Reading the interpretation and section 2 together, is it the intention to prevent companies chartered in Great Britain under the English Joint Stock Companies doing business in the Yukon district; or is the intention of the Government to permit such companies to registration in Canada, and thus bring them under the same terms and conditions that relate to Canadian companies? If it is the intention, has any action been taken by the Government to facilitate registration, and on what terms, conditions and registration fees?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). I beg to say that it is the intention to permit these companies to register, and legislation will be introduced at the present session of Parliament for the purpose of providing a system of registration.

POST OFFICE OF ST. MICHEL DE NAPIERVILLE.

Mr. **BERGERON** asked,

1. Who instructed Mr. Bain to write the following letter:—

Office of the Post Office Inspector,
Montreal, 17th February, 1898.

Sir,—It is my duty to inform you that I am instructed by the Postmaster General to take the requisite steps to transfer the post office of St. Michel de Napierville to the charge of Mr. F. X. Paradis.

I cannot state the precise date on which the transfer will be made, but it will be done as soon as possible.

Yours, &c.,
(Sgd.) J. W. BAIN,
Post Office Inspector.

Mr. A. Laberge,
Postmaster,
St. Michel de Napierville.

2. On what grounds did the Postmaster General cause the dismissal of Mr. Laberge?

3. Was an inquiry held?

Mr. **MONK**.

4. Is the Minister aware that the present post office is not inhabited at night?

5. Has the Postmaster General received a petition signed by a large number of the parishioners of St. Michel, asking that the post office be allowed to remain under the control of Mr. Laberge?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). The Postmaster General's instructions were conveyed to Mr. Bain, the post office inspector, through the secretary of the department. 2. The last postmaster of St. Michel de Napierville, Mr. A. Laberge, was dismissed for undue partisanship in the general election of June, 1896. 3. He was dismissed on the representations of Mr. D. Monet, M.P., and in view of the terms in which Mr. Monet's representations were made an inquiry was not considered necessary. 4. The department is not aware that such is the case. 5. A petition has been received purporting to be signed by a large number of the residents of St. Michel de Napierville, asking that no change should be made in the postmastership of the office.

RAILWAY COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

Mr. **JAMESON** (by Mr. Richardson) asked,

1. Who are the members of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council?

2. How many meetings of that committee were held during the year 1897?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). The members of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council are:—Hon. A. G. Blair, Minister of Railways and Canals, chairman; Hon. David Mills, Minister of Justice; Hon. J. Israel Tarte, Minister of Public Works; Hon. William Mulock, Postmaster General; Hon. Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière, Minister of Inland Revenue; Hon. R. R. Dobell, P.C. Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, is the secretary. There were thirteen meetings held during the calendar year of 1897.

SALE OF LIQUOR IN THE YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. **RICHARDSON** asked,

Has the Government under consideration the desirability of refusing to grant licenses or permits for the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Yukon territory?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). The answer to the hon. gentleman is: Yes.

TELEGRAPH CONNECTION WITH YUKON MINES.

Mr. **McINNES** asked,

What steps have been taken to establish telegraph communication with the Yukon mining districts?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). This whole question is now under the consideration of the Government.

LAVALTRIE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DUGAS asked,

1. When was the contract awarded for carrying the mail from the Canadian Pacific Railway depot to the village of Lavaltrie and vice versa ?
2. To whom ?
3. How many tenders were there, what was the amount in each case, and for what time was the contract awarded ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). 1. The contract for the mail service between Lavaltrie and railway station was awarded on the 18th August, 1897. 2. It was awarded to Joseph Grenier. 3. There were five tenders, as follows :—Joseph Grenier, \$195 ; Auguste Perreault, \$195 ; Clement Laporte, \$195 ; Jean Laplume, \$199 ; Felix Hetu, \$240. The contract is for four years from the 1st October, 1897.

REPORTS.

Department of Indian Affairs for the year ending 30th June, 1897.—(Mr. Sifton).

Department of Agriculture.—(Mr. Fisher).

RAILWAY RATE WAR AND MANITOBA SETTLERS.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to direct the attention of the Government, and especially of the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) to a statement in the Toronto "Globe" of yesterday under the heading of "A hurtful rate war." With the permission of the House I will read it :

One result of the present rate war which is going on between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway is that intending settlers in Manitoba are being seriously inconvenienced. There is not now, nor can there be while this war continues, any adequate through service over either line to points in Manitoba for all settlers from Ontario who desire to take their families and effects with them. There is considerable complaint on the part of intending settlers, and it is understood that a report has gone forward to the Manitoba Government describing the position of affairs in Ontario.

A great deal of Manitoba business, in fact the larger proportion, comes from points on the Grand Trunk Railway not touched by the Canadian Pacific at all. In the case of a settler desiring to go to Manitoba from any Grand Trunk point with his family and effects, he is placed in a decidedly unpleasant position. He cannot ticket himself and family over the Grand Trunk to North Bay, there to connect with the Canadian Pacific, and the latter road will not accept exchange tickets from the Grand Trunk at North Bay, and if the settler went that way he would

simply have to pay the Canadian Pacific the local rate from North Bay to the point in Manitoba where he is going. He therefore has to send his family over the Canadian Pacific by way of Smith's Falls. But he cannot take his stock and effects round that way, because the Grand Trunk will not accept the freight unless it goes by way of North Bay, to be handed over there to the Canadian Pacific. Neither can the Grand Trunk take the effects into local points in Manitoba, for it has no entrance, except at Winnipeg. Therefore, the settler has to send his family over the Canadian Pacific via Smith's Falls, and he accompanies his effects to North Bay, where, of course, he has to wait until the Canadian Pacific express comes along. Even then, he is not sure of making a connection with the train in which his family is going through. After being put to all this trouble and inconvenience, he has not the satisfaction of getting even cut rates, for the Canadian Pacific, knowing that it controls the business in Manitoba, and must, in the nature of things, continue to control it, has not thought it necessary to give intending settlers in Manitoba the cheap rates it has made to other points. The question of settlement in Manitoba, in fact, does not enter into the present controversy at all. If it did, the Canadian Pacific would before this have cut rates into the prairie province, for the other lines are meeting the Canadian Pacific's rates to Winnipeg.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if necessary, I shall make a motion in order to bring this matter before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Unless the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) is going to confine himself to the asking of a question, he must make a motion.

Mr. MACLEAN. I intend to make a motion, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct the attention of the House to the inconvenience now suffered by the people of Ontario through this rate war and the failure of the two great railways to effect some kind of running arrangement between Toronto and North Bay. We know that up to a very few weeks ago there was a reasonable arrangement between the two roads and they did interchange traffic and so accommodate the public. For some reason best known to the management of these two roads, they have seen fit to end that agreement. The attention of the House was called to this matter the other day by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Here we have a statement in a leading public journal showing that the inconvenience still continues. It is a very serious inconvenience and demands the attention of Parliament. It involves questions even more important than does the Yukon proposition now occupying our attention. How is this service given? It is given, first of all, by the old Northern Railway, which received large public grants. In the next place by the Ontario Pacific Junction Railway, which was almost created by the grant given by this Parliament—these roads are controlled by the Grand Trunk Railway Co., which received large sums in the old days from the old

Parliament of Canada—and by the Canadian Pacific Railway which also has received large sums of money and large grants of land from the Parliament of Canada.

These railroads, for some reason best known to themselves, and in spite of the large grants they have received from the people of Canada, choose to play ducks and drakes with the interests of the people of this country; and it is time for this Government to undertake to discipline these railways and compel them to treat the public fairly, and to give a decent service in going to and coming from Manitoba. It may be said that this Parliament has no power legally to control these roads. I think the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) pointed out the other day that under the charter creating these roads, they were bound to consult the public interests, they were bound to give running rights to each other, and they were bound to give reasonable treatment to the people. I believe that the Minister of Railways, or the Railway Committee, has power to send an order out to these railways to-day and to say to them: You must accommodate the public; you must quit this rate war; you must amend your ways. If the hon. gentleman says that he has no power, he and this Parliament have power in another way. To-day both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway receive large annual grants from us in the way of postal subsidies, and we can cut off these postal subsidies if they do not see fit to serve the public in a proper way. There is another thing that we can do. They are here every day for legislation: the Canadian Pacific Railway was to-day represented in the Railway Committee, and the Grand Trunk Railway will be there to-morrow. The Government have it in their power to say to these gentlemen, and this House has it in its power to say to these gentlemen: Not one Bill, not one concession, will be granted to you by the Railway Committee or by Parliament, until you adjust your quarrels with each other, and give the public the services they had up to six weeks ago. It is with that object in view that I call the attention of the Government to this matter, and I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WALLACE. I think if the Government have not power to apply the remedy suggested by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), there is a desire that Parliament should have such power. Parliament is in session now, and can legislate so as to compel these roads to give an efficient and proper service to the public. Another grievance that I think the Government should consider, is the fact that the Parry Sound Railway and this road running from Toronto to North Bay, do not furnish convenience to the public. I am told that the Parry Sound road passes through Scotia

Mr. MACLEAN.

Junction at an hour before the other train reaches there, so that a passenger going up to that country west of North Bay, has to remain about 22 or 23 hours at Scotia Junction before he can go on. The mails are put under the same ban, and I apprehend that the Postmaster General could apply a remedy there speedily and effectually. As has been pointed out, this Parliament has paid large sums of money to these railways, some persons think exorbitant sums, for the carriage of the mails; and I think we can fairly and reasonably demand that the railroads arrange their business matters so that the mails and public may be carried promptly instead of remaining there, as passengers have to remain at Scotia Junction for 22 or 23 hours before they are sent forward to their destination. This is a state of affairs that should not continue, and I think that the Government should act in the first instance, and if the Government has not sufficient power, then Parliament should step in right now and give the Government sufficient power to deal with these roads promptly and effectually.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I can assure the House that I am fully sensible of the gravity of the situation which has been referred to by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and that the subject is at this moment engaging my serious and closest attention. I had the pleasure of meeting the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and having a discussion with him upon this subject, going over the legislation which has been passed in relation to it, and examining with him the question in all its bearings. He understands very fully the nature of the complicated questions which arise in connection with the legislation. I pointed out to him the views that I entertained upon the subject, and I have concluded upon a course of action, not by any means as drastic as the hon. member has pointed out, not by any means as broad, but a course of action which I hope will be attended with beneficial results. These matters are not, I may say, as easily disposed of as hon. gentlemen might think off-hand. But I trust we will be able to make an impression upon these differing corporations. As the law now stands, the jurisdiction which has been vested in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council can only be exercised practically at the instance of one or other of the railway corporations involved; and if, as seems to be the present condition of affairs, neither of the railway companies are prepared to move, or desire to take advantage of the powers which have been conferred by legislation upon the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or desire to set in motion the machinery of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, then a difficulty presents itself upon the very threshold. I do not think any good

purpose could be served by dwelling at this moment, at all events, upon the various phases of the question that have presented themselves to my mind, or the difficulties that arise. I am in hopes that the line of procedure that I have marked out for myself, and which the hon. member for East Grey has concurred in as being desirable, may be productive of some results.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman kindly indicate what that line of action is?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection to do so. It is to communicate with the two companies concerned, pointing out to them what I think we might, in the public interest, fairly demand at their hands, and asking them to present their views upon the question, and the reasons why neither of them, have evinced any disposition to avail themselves of the provisions of the existing law, also asking them to communicate with me at once so that I may know the attitude they take upon the matter. Then, having a statement from them as to their views, we will be in a position, I think, the better to take any action that may be open to us, and which will be proper for us to take in the public interest. I think the matter may be permitted to rest there for the present. I can assure the House that I will not lose sight of it in any way.

Mr. DAVIN. There is no part of the country so interested in this question as the part of the North-west from which I come. I think this general proposition may be laid down, that in regard to corporations that are creations of Parliament, Parliament should be supreme. It is for the hon. gentlemen who occupy those Olympian heights—to use a figure that was frequently used by my right hon. friend when he was in the cold shades of Opposition—it is for the hon. gentlemen who occupy those Olympian heights on the Treasury benches, to find a solution for difficulties of this kind. But I think the general proposition is unassailable that in regard to corporations which are the creations of Parliament, Parliament should be supreme.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may perhaps be permitted to supplement the remarks made a few moments ago by the Minister of Railways. Whatever power there may be in the existing law of Parliament over this question, I think we are all agreed that the present law is insufficient and ought to be supplemented by other legislation. The time has come when the attention of Parliament will be invited to it. The question has been lying dormant, and has not pressed before the present time in active form. The Government have had the subject

under discussion. Whether or not it will be advisable to introduce legislation during this session, will largely depend on the length of the session; but the Government are fully aware that something has to be done with respect to giving power to the Government and to the authorities to deal with this question which is now engaging public attention.

Mr. SPROULE. I was induced to bring this question to the notice of the House at first from seeing in the press of Toronto the urgent necessity of the interchange of traffic between these two roads. It had grown to such an extent that a conference had taken place between the mayor and city council and the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), who expressed very freely before the elections his opinion that it was most desirable a new road should be built to the west because traffic was very much interrupted. Since that time a special committee has been appointed for the purpose of devising ways and means to secure connection between Toronto and the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that the trade of Toronto, Hamilton and London and the south-western part of Ontario should be carried over it. I very well remember that at the time the Northern Pacific Junction and Sault Ste. Marie road was incorporated, the people of western Canada, feeling the urgent need of obtaining some connection between the western system of railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway, pressed on the attention of the Government that some independent line should be built, and that the Government should assist that company by a grant sufficiently large to prevent its absorption by any company, so that it might be made an independent line. At that time several deputations interviewed the Government. We said that we felt when the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed that our western country would be largely side-tracked, because trade would be more direct between Montreal and Manitoba and the North-west than it could possibly be between Toronto, Manitoba and the North-west, and unless we secured some independent connecting link to join our western system with the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a gross injustice would be done to our part of the country. The Government acquiesced in this view, and gave assistance to this road. For that purpose they first assisted the road to the extent of \$6,000 per mile. But the company found they could not finance the undertaking with that amount and keep the road an independent one, although they could do so if they came under the control of another road. In the following year the company asked a further grant, and the Government gave an additional \$6,000 per mile, with the distinct understand-

ing that there should be an interchange of traffic between this and other connecting roads, and surrounded by every safeguard to ensure for all time a connecting link between the south-western portion of Ontario and the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. At that time every condition was inserted in the Act that was thought desirable to secure that result. Afterwards it appears that there was some defect, and at my interview with the Minister of Railways, upon close examination of the Act and lease, it appears there is a loop-hole by which the companies can practically avoid carrying out what was the well-understood intention of Parliament and the country at that time; and I am glad to say on behalf of the Minister of Railways that he showed every possible desire to remove this difficulty. He desired to avail himself of the law, and he is prepared to use it as far as possible; but I agree that on examining the law it appears to be defective, although the defect was certainly not intentional. When the Act was passed it provided:

For the purpose of ensuring free interchange of traffic coming to or going from the railway so to be constructed between the lessees' railways and the railways connecting therewith, so far as such interchange shall be under the control of the lessees, the said lease shall also contain a provision that in the event of the Parliament of Canada being at any time hereafter of opinion that the traffic of the railway system of the lessees coming from or going to the projected railway, and interchanged with lines connecting with the lessees' system of railways is not so interchanged without preference or prejudice as between such connections, then being of such opinion the Parliament of Canada may, if it see fit, cancel the said lease and take over the said railway.

We thought that was a guarantee. There was a provision in the other Act that if this road was leased to any other company there must be a provision inserted in the lease:

Provided further that the company who may become lessees thereof and the railway leased shall be subject to all obligations hereby imposed on the company hereby incorporated.

And those were the obligations imposed on the railway company. Whether there is power under the Act to take possession of that road or not, and to compel the railway company to do what is in the interest of the country, it was intended at that time that such powers should be therein contained, and that in the event of the railway companies refusing to interchange traffic, Parliament should act; and it is on this ground that I am urging action on Parliament to-day. On the other hand, I thought it very strange that the city of Toronto found it necessary to appoint a special committee on the subject, and that the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Bertram) should desire additional connection between Toronto and the main line going to Manitoba and the North-west, when there

Mr. SPROULE.

is on the Statute-book a law that gave the right to enforce the maintenance of railway connection, if it were called into operation, and the only party that I knew which had power to call it into operation was the Government. Remembering this fact and the object we had in view when these provisions were inserted in the Act in order to ensure the interchange of traffic between the south-western lines connecting at Toronto and the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I brought the subject to the attention of the Government and urged that the Government should take action. I was somewhat surprised to see that the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) sat silent in his seat during the discussion, in view of the fact that during the election he declared he regarded this as one of the most urgent necessities of the city.

Mr. BERTRAM. I desire to say a word or two in regard to this subject which has been brought up by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). It seems to me that at the present time this is simply a quarrel between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and of course it is very difficult when railways quarrel to arrive at a satisfactory solution. If there is any remedy that can be applied by the Government in some way, it should be applied, because it is very injurious to the interests of Toronto and western Canada that these two great corporations should be quarrelling as they are doing. I have always held that Toronto and western Ontario, owing to their very imperfect connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the western trade occupy an unfortunate position, and on that account I have always supported, in the interest of Toronto and the province of Ontario that an independent line should be built to give us better connection. In the meantime we have the connection by way of North Bay, and it is unreasonable and unjust that passengers by the Canadian Pacific Railway should be obliged to come around by way of Smith's Falls, and thus waste much valuable time. I hope the Government will look carefully into the matter and give it their best consideration and remedy this disgraceful condition of affairs that exists at the present moment. I believe the Government have been giving the matter consideration for the past few days, and therefore I was willing to leave it in their hands. I heartily endorse what has been said regarding the condition of things which exists at the present moment, and I believe there should be some pressure brought to bear upon these railways to compel them to act more in accordance with the public interest.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

VACANCY IN PRINCE, P. E. I.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister, if a returning officer has been appointed for the election in the vacant constituency of Prince, P.E.I., with regard to which Mr. Speaker announced a few days ago that he had issued his warrant?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). A writ has not yet been issued. We received news only to-day of the funeral of the late Mr. Perry, and we thought it advisable to allow a few days at least to elapse before the writ was issued.

RAILWAY RATE WAR—THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask the Minister of Railways whether there is any truth in the rumour which has been current in the newspapers for some time, as to the Intercolonial Railway taking part in the present rate war involving a lowering of the schedule rates on the Government railways?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think there is no truth in the report. There is no cut rate at all on the Intercolonial Railway, as far as I am aware.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Blair for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) an Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last night I was drawing attention to the statements made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), which were in substance: that the nearest point of production for supplies for the Yukon was the country immediately surrounding Edmonton, and, that if the food products which are consumed in the Yukon did not come from that circumscribed territory, then the necessaries of life for that mining population would be drawn from a foreign country. I based my objections to such a contention upon this: That the value of any country to its inhabitants depends mainly upon four conditions, one of these being the supporting capacity of that country, and I proceeded to show, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) was astray in his argument, because the province of British Columbia, which is immediately south of the Yukon territory has a supporting and productive capacity more than sufficient to furnish all the food products necessary for

consumption in the Yukon. I did not mean when I said that, nor do I mean now to say, that the district of Alberta is not also capable of furnishing these food supplies. The area of the province of British Columbia is some 300,000,000 acres, and I pointed out last night that it was a very small estimate that 10,000,000 acres of that was highly fertile and capable of producing for millions of people. It might surprise the hon. member for Alberta to know, that in one of the districts of that great province of British Columbia—and it is a fact which he should be as proud of as I am—the producing capacity of one acre of wheat land is something greater than in Manitoba. At page 99 of the hand-book issued by the Department of the Interior, I find the following in reference to the district of New Westminster:—

The soil is rich and strong, the climate mild, resembling that of England, with more marked seasons of rainy and dry weather, and heavy yields are obtained without much labour. Very large returns of wheat have been got from land in this locality, as much as sixty-two bushels from the measured acre of wheat, ninety bushels of oats per acre, and hay that yielded three and a half to five tons to the acre, and frequently two crops, totalling six tons. Experiments have also been made in fruit-growing, with the most satisfactory results.

Now, there is evidence of the producing capacity of a large section of the province of British Columbia, and in the face of that, the member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver)—no doubt unintentionally—was certainly misleading the House and the country, when he made such a categorical statement as he did in his speech. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) went further, and to show the recklessness with which he was giving what he said were facts against this Bill and against the policy of the Government, I have simply to point out his observation: That he was not speaking of the rest of the country. Well, Sir, I am speaking of the rest of the country, and I hold that every hon. gentleman in this House ought to speak of the rest of the country, and ought to bear the rest of the country in mind and not only his own particular district or constituency, when he is discussing such a question as this. This is a matter of national import. It is not a matter that affects British Columbia alone, and even if it did, it should be of great concern to the rest of Canada considering the tremendous resources of that province, and considering the fact that the destinies of this Dominion rest upon the progress and prosperity of British Columbia. The fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) was not speaking of the rest of the country may account for a great many of the fallacies he gave expression to. He told us:

I am not arguing on principle or politics—
—and he might have gone further and said: Nor on common sense. He says:

I am not arguing on principle or politics, but merely placing an undoubted fact before this House, so that the position we take will be understood, and why we are taking it.

Now, one of the undoubted facts which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) placed before this House was :

In my humble opinion you hand over to Mackenzie & Mann the total gold-bearing area of that country.

That is to say the least of it a most unwarranted and extravagant statement, and one which I challenge the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) or his friends on the opposite side of the House to prove. Then he goes on :

I say it is essentially unfair that for the building of a railroad west of the mountains that can only benefit the country west of the mountains, these people should be given the right of selection east of the mountains as well.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) cannot support his statement, that this railroad built west of the mountains is of benefit only to the country west of the mountains. I deny that statement, and I shall not reflect upon the intelligence of this House to take up a moment's time in controverting it. I merely point it out to show the extravagant and unwarranted statements made by the hon. member (Mr. Oliver). Then he states :

There was a rush to the Yukon last year, a rush that was entirely unexpected, a rush for which we are largely unprepared, and we have every assurance that there will be no starvation there this year for the reason that those who were in danger of starvation simply got up and walked out, a very natural proceeding on their part.

The hon. member tells this House, and tries to score a point against the Government by saying, that the reason there will be no starvation in the Yukon this year is because those who were in danger of starvation last year got up and walked out. I cannot see the philosophy or the sense of a statement of that kind ; because we have it on reliable authority that before the first of January of this year there were 10,000 people within the passes to the Yukon ; and the people who came out were sturdy men, who were supplied with every facility that money could afford, who had strong constitutions, who took the precaution, no doubt, to take sufficient supplies in to bring them back. These were the people who came out, and not by any means people on the verge of starvation. And even some of them were fed on the way out with provisions furnished by the Government whom the hon. gentleman is attacking for their policy ; and those who had not means were assisted by the Mounted Police. Now, I say that there is every danger of starvation if the tremendous number of people who are now converging to that country go in there, and if such facilities as are proposed by the Government are not afforded.

Mr. MORRISON.

The hon. gentleman went on to indulge in a number of platitudes. I agree with a great deal of what he said, for instance :

If there is gold in the Yukon district, it is our gold.

Nobody disputes that.

If it is there to-day, it will be there to-morrow.

I could hardly, perhaps, go that far, because that depends on circumstances.

It will be there ten years from now if it is not taken out.

I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in that ; we will be here for a hundred years, if we do not die.

It is money in the bank for this Canadian nation. I will take the liberty of saying that I do not believe the Canadian nation should go into mining speculation.

I agree with the hon. gentleman, and I think they should not go into railway speculation either ; and the fact that the Government do not wish to go into mining speculation is the very reason why they propose to give to these contractors this large acreage of 3,750,000 acres, or whatever it is. I quite agree that the Government ought not to go into mining speculation ; and especially they should not go into railway speculation, such as the hon. gentleman is advocating so strenuously at the present juncture.

There is no rational member of this House who will for one moment entertain the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Alberta as against those advanced by the hon. Minister of the Interior. I contend that this Government have the interest of the Yukon country as much at heart, and have as much at stake there, as the hon. member for Alberta. They are as much interested in the welfare of the Edmonton district as he is. The mere fact that he resides there does not make him any more interested in that part of the Dominion than I am or than any member of the Government is. But because he cannot see the advantage that will accrue to himself or his district from the proposed line of railway, therefore he must oppose it. Let him follow that line of action to its logical conclusion in every day life, and where will it land him ? If we were to pursue the narrow, shortsighted course which the hon. member for Alberta pursues in opposing this Bill, in what position would we find ourselves ?

The remarks which I have just made have reference to the first condition on which I said the advantage of a country to its population depended. The other was its exporting capacity, and in referring to that I referred to the Trade and Navigation Returns. The hon. member for Alberta and his friend the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) took issue with me in that regard, and stated that the figures I gave were misleading, and that the arguments based on those

figures were fallacious. I am perhaps as well aware as are these hon. gentlemen that the Trade and Navigation Returns do not show all the products of the respective provinces which go out of the provinces. They only pretend to show the exports, and it was the word "exports" I used. I may have been misunderstood. I said that the second advantage on which the people of a country depended was its exporting capacity. If I sent a case of canned salmon from British Columbia to Edmonton, I would not find anything about that in the items I spoke of last night. I am endeavouring to show that the province of British Columbia exported a great deal more in value than the North-west Territories, and à fortiori more than the district of Alberta. I stated that the value of the exports from British Columbia was \$14,000,000. There is no doubt that that \$14,000,000 might include some flour shipped by Mr. Ogilvie, the milling man of Manitoba, to Australia; but the amount that should be subtracted from the total on that account is very small, because the total exports of the mine from British Columbia alone in 1897 was \$8,903,904, by all odds the very largest export of the product of the mines from any province in Canada. The export of fish from the province of British Columbia in the same year was \$3,400,645, the largest in value of any province in the Dominion except Nova Scotia, which is very little more. So that, even if you allowed for all the articles credited to British Columbia that ought to be credited to Manitoba and the North-west Territories, you would still have very much more to the credit of British Columbia than you would have to the credit of the North-west Territories. I am not referring to those outside of Alberta, but apparently they are not separated; so I am taking the whole of the North-west Territories together. What I am referring to particularly is the district of Alberta, and I say confidently that the district of Alberta is not an exporting district, but rather an importing district. I do not know what its imports and exports for the present year are, but I venture to say that up to a year ago the district of Alberta did not produce enough provisions to supply its own inhabitants. If I am wrong in that, I shall be pleased to have the hon. member for Alberta correct me; I want his figures. I say that the province of British Columbia, which is nearer the Yukon than the district of Alberta, has not only as great a supporting capacity as that district to-day, but a greater exporting capacity, and as such is of more value to the Dominion of Canada than the district of Alberta. Therefore the argument advanced by the hon. gentleman that inasmuch as this road benefited British Columbia, he would not be justified in supporting it, is an argument on a false basis; because if this road does benefit the province of British Columbia, it at the same time benefits the whole Dominion, and

that would be no reason why he should refuse to support the Bill, or why he should attack the policy of the Government in that respect.

The third condition of advantage to the inhabitants of a country is its position as regards foreign commerce. I am very sorry to have to come down to the very narrow and miserable line of argument of comparing one province against another, because all the provinces are our heritage, and though we may live in different parts of the Dominion, we ought each to defend and promote the interests of every other part. (That is what we are here for; we are not sent here as parish politicians, but to advance and promote the interest of every section, even the most extreme or most obscure. But I feel bound to make this comparison in order to show how unwarranted were the statements of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), and because of the great stress which hon. gentlemen opposite are laying on these statements. To show the extent to which the commerce of British Columbia has gone, let me refer to the Trade and Navigation reports. According to these reports British Columbia sends her exports to Great Britain, the United States, Australia, British Africa, Central America, the Argentine Republic, Italy, China, Japan, France, the French colonial possessions, Hawaii, Switzerland, the United States of Columbia. As against that vast range, I find that the district of Alberta only exports to Great Britain and the United States alone, according to the latest returns, those of the year 1897. I also find that the customs duties collected in the town of Edmonton, which is the largest centre of population in northern Alberta, amounted in 1897 to \$3,246, whereas in the town of Rossland, B.C., which was not known five or six years ago, the duties collected in 1897 amounted to \$122,646. And at Fort Steele, which is in a remote part of the province of British Columbia, I find that the customs duties collected inside of seven months amounted to \$17,000. In the province of British Columbia as a whole, the total duties collected amounted to \$1,555,589. How much were collected in the North-west Territories? \$52,000. There is therefore no comparison to be made between the two. If the hon. gentleman can show me that the Trade and Navigation Returns are misleading, and do not render justice to his section of the Dominion, I shall be the first to congratulate him and express my pleasure at his disclosing facts which give a different showing. I invite my hon. friend to take up these reports, to look through the general statement of imports and exports, and examine into the different items of goods exported by the different provinces. He will find at page 386, under the heading of "wheat," that the number of bushels of wheat exported from British Columbia in 1887 was 63,-

471, and from the North-west Territories 820. He may say, but I do not think he can prove his statement that that amount of 63,471 bushels was not grown in British Columbia, but still he cannot deny that the export largely exceeded that from his district. In every item, I find that British Columbia, as regards foreign commerce, gives an infinitely better showing than the district of Alberta. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I am not pretending for a moment that if the district of Alberta were populated and cultivated, it would not furnish a tremendous return. I do not deny that it would not then grow sufficient to furnish food supplies for the Yukon, but that is not the point I am discussing. Even admitting, for the sake of argument, that British Columbia does not export any food or agricultural products, that does not do away with the indisputable fact that she is capable of producing a tremendous return in these products if she were accorded markets and trading facilities. She has the requisite soil and climate to perfection. In Alberta there is the requisite soil, but the climate is very capricious. However, I shall not undertake to dwell on the disadvantages of any particular section of Canada, as we are interested in them all, but regarding the climate of British Columbia, let me refer to the Dominion hand-book, and then the hon. gentleman may draw a comparison, if he likes, between our province and his own part of the Dominion. At page 114, I find it is said :

There are several climates in British Columbia. In the southern portion, both of the mainland and of Vancouver Island, the climate is superior to that of southern England or central France. In this section of the province, snow seldom falls, and then lies but a few hours or days. Vegetation remains green, and the flowers are bright throughout the greater part of the winter, while in the spring and summer excessively heavy rains and long-continued fogs are unknown.

The hon. gentleman may compare that condition with the climatic conditions in Alberta. Having those conditions I have mentioned, having in the province of British Columbia extensive arable, fertile and cultivatable lands, where crops can be successfully harvested—having all the elements necessary for the raising of products to support life, I ask the hon. gentleman to draw a comparison with his own province, and then ask him if he can have the assurance to stand up in this House and declare that the district of Alberta is the nearest and only food-producing section of the Dominion to the Yukon.

I regret very much the necessity that impels me to make this reference to the speech of my hon. friend, and I trust he will take in good part anything I have said. I have endeavoured to reply in as dispassionate a manner as possible, but

Mr. MORRISON.

I did not think, in justice to my own constituency or province, nor the Dominion at large, that I could allow the statement to go forth uncontradicted that the comparatively isolated and circumscribed district of Alberta is the only possible centre of food production in the Dominion for the Yukon, and that if railway facilities are not furnished at once to get products into the Yukon from that district, then the people of Canada will be compelled to go down to the United States for their supplies. What is the natural inference that must be drawn from such a statement by people who are now preparing to go to the Yukon. If I were a stranger in Ottawa and read the hon. gentleman's speech, I would conclude that unless I got my supplies and went by the Edmonton route to the Yukon, I would have to go to Seattle or San Francisco and give the province of British Columbia the go-by, because in that province I could not obtain the supplies I required. The whole thing is preposterous, and I trust the hon. gentleman will take the first occasion to withdraw what he said, or, at any rate, fully explain what he meant.

I wish just to say a few words as to the amendment of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). That amendment reads as follows :—

That all the words after "That" to the end of the question be left out and the following words be added instead thereof: the Bill No. 6, an Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and Donald A. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company, be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved, that this House, while recognizing the necessity of providing adequate facilities for transportation into the Canadian Yukon gold fields, regards as indefensible the terms and conditions of the proposed contract.

I draw particular attention to the wording of the amendment. Now, what are the terms and conditions of the proposed contract? I will not detain the House to go over the whole contract, but there are one or two of its terms which, I venture to say, are not understood by hon. gentlemen opposite, and perhaps not by many of this side of the House. Take section 10 of the Bill. I cannot see, for the life of me, why a lawyer, and particularly a lawyer of the eminent standing of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) should say that he regards that term of the contract to be indefensible. It deals with the powers of the company, and provides :

And upon the said contract being assigned by the contractors to the company, and upon the company covenanting with Her Majesty to carry it out, and upon the railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake mentioned in the said contract being completed and accepted as therein provided, the contractors shall be relieved from personal responsibility under the said contract and the company shall be thereafter deemed to be the parties of the second part thereto in lieu of the

contractors and shall be bound as such and be entitled to their rights thereunder.

That is, it is a condition precedent to acquiring rights under this contract that all these things should be done. The words are used conjunctively, and it will not do for the company to do only one or other of them; it must do them all, or its rights do not come into force under the contract and cannot be enforced by them. Then I take up section 21. The intervening sections are simply the usual sections, and I take it that the amendment does not refer to them. This section deals with the question of tolls. What was the objections made by hon. gentlemen opposite to that? The tolls are to be imposed only on the line of railway, and not upon the roadway or the right of way. Therefore, this road now being built by the company can be traversed by anybody and no tolls can be exacted. What is the objection on the score of rates? I cannot see. I should like to hear some particularity in the objections to the contract. As to the limit of exemptions from taxation, which has been criticised, I think it is most satisfactory, and I cannot see how it can be successfully attacked. Coming to section 23, which, in my opinion, is the most important section in the Bill as distinguished from the contract, we find that it reads as follows:—

The lands referred to in the contract out of which selection may be made shall be such lands only as are at the disposal of the Government at the time of selection.

Now, I would ask the particular attention of gentlemen on both sides of the House to this. Under this section, if Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie postpone selection of these lands for six years or three years, then any person who may have applied for or staked out claims on this land will have a prior right to these contractors. Unless Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie, immediately on building the road and complying with the terms of their contract, make selection of their land, the Government may in the meantime dispose of the land in any manner, just as they could have done five years ago. If hon. gentlemen would bear that section of the contract in mind, I think it would give a different colour entirely to the conditions of this agreement. Coming to the contract which is incorporated in the Bill, we find that the usual stringent expressions are inserted. I cannot, for the life of me, see why any hon. gentleman should contend that the terms of the first section are indefensible. It will not do for hon. gentlemen simply to say that these terms are indefensible; we want something more definite than that. The latter part of the section says:

Provided also, that the location of said railway between the points mentioned shall be such as the contractors may decide upon without filing plans thereof prior to completion, provided that

the grant of land hereby contracted for shall not be made upon a larger mileage than the Minister of Railways considers reasonably necessary for traversing the distance between the terminal points.

The point is being raised that, inasmuch as Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie are to get 25,000 acres a mile, they may build in a circuitous way and so increase the mileage. But this section provides safeguards in the interest of the country. The Government have taken every precaution. It is said that the Government were at the mercy of the solicitor of Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie. Were he never so virtuous, the solicitor of Mann & Mackenzie would hardly insert such a section as this in the contract. Section 2, which seems to me important next to section 23 of the Bill, was read by the right hon. the leader of the House. But I wish to emphasize a section which must be read with this, and that is section 5 of the contract. I would direct the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, who have the contract before them, particularly to this clause. Section 2 provides that the agreement shall be submitted to Parliament, and also provides for an extension northward to Dawson City, and for an extension southward to a point in British Columbia to be designated by the Government, and capable of being made an ocean port. Read with that section 5 of the contract, which states:

5. The contractors and the contractors' company shall be entitled to receive in preference to any other person or company during ten years from the said 1st of September, 1898, such aid or assistance in land or money as the Government may be authorized and may see fit to grant in aid of a line of railway from the Stikine River to an ocean port in British Columbia, provided that the contractors or contractors' company are willing to undertake the construction of the same at once and completion thereof within a reasonable time upon receiving notice thereof from the Government.

That is, for ten years the Government has the privilege of granting a subsidy to Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie for the construction of a road or the extension of this road down to an ocean port in the province of British Columbia. But I would call your attention to the fact that, in order to be entitled to the subsidy, they must begin the construction of the road at once, and complete it within a reasonable time. So, as I understand the contract, if the Government were now to instruct Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie to extend that road to Port Simpson, they would be obliged to do so, or if they did not do so, it would be a violation of the terms of the contract, and there would be no obligation on the part of the Government to give them the subsidy.

Now, I ask the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), what he finds in that important section of the contract that is indefensible. Under that section Messrs. Mac-

kenzie & Mann have no privilege to extend the time. In order to have the preferential concession as to that subsidy, they must begin the construction of that line at once upon the Government asking them to do so. On this point, I think, some hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have been labouring under a mistake. Now, in section 8 it is provided that contractors shall immediately construct a practicable sleigh road upon which no tolls are to be collected. I cannot see anything indefensible in that section.

The contractors or the contractors' company shall provide, or arrange with others to provide, steamboat transport of freight and passengers between the terminus of said railway on Teslin Lake, or other terminus northerly thereof, and Dawson City to and fro.

I cannot see anything indefensible in that section. Then, coming down to section 3, as to the land :

Upon the incorporation of such company and upon the assignment by the contractors to such company of this agreement, and upon the said company covenanting with the Government to carry out the same, and upon the said railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake being completed and accepted as aforesaid, the contractors should then and not before be relieved from personal responsibility hereunder, and the company should be thereafter deemed to be the parties of the second part hereto in lieu of the contractors, and shall be bound as such, and be entitled to their rights hereunder.

So that, unless all these conjunctive things are done and done together, the company are not in a position to ask the Government to perform its part of the contract, and the company will have violated and committed a breach of the contract unless they do all these things. As I said before, they are conjunctive, and they are conditions precedent to the acquirement of these lands. Now the company are not to get one acre of the land grant unless they comply with all these provisions. Section 11 deals with the conditions which must be complied with before the company can get a grant of this land. I would like hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to remember that not one foot of this vast acreage is to be vested in the company unless the railroad has been fully completed and accepted, and unless, in addition, the company have gone to work and selected their lands. They must complete the road, that road must be accepted, and they must select their lands before they can get possession of one acre; so that the Government has taken every precaution possible, and I really cannot see that there is anything indefensible in that section of the contract. Then, section 13 provides :

The contractors should make selection of one-half of the lands to which they become entitled under this contract, within three years from the 1st day of September, 1898, and of the remainder within six years of that date.

Mr. MORRISON.

And by the next section free navigation, and the rights of traffic along those navigable streams are retained. Now, until Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie will have completed all these terms, which may cover a number of years, the Government are permitted by this contract to dispose of these lands to whomsoever they please; and if the great influx of people which is imminent, takes place, and if these people take up claims, as they have a right to do, up to the 1st of September—and nobody can stop them—where does the tremendous advantage which hon. gentlemen opposite have been declaiming about, accrue to Mann & Mackenzie? That is a question that surprises me. Thousands of people will go in there, all of whom will stake out claims, and those claims will have a prior right to the claims of Mann & Mackenzie, who cannot, at any rate conveniently, before July, start in to acquire one foot of that land, and so shut out other people. Then, take section 18. In this section the word "reserve" is used, which must be distinguished from "being granted."

So soon as any ten continuous miles of said railway between Stikine River and Teslin Lake have been completed and in running order and certified so to be by an officer named by the Minister of Railways in that behalf, the contractors may select—

They cannot buy, but they may select.

—ninety-two thousand one hundred and sixty acres, or two blocks of land hereunder, and thereupon such blocks shall be reserved by the Government—

Not granted by the Government, not disposed of by the Government, but reserved. After the full completion of the contract by Mann & Mackenzie, the land grant shall be reserved from sale or location, and upon the completion from time to time of ten miles of railway, the contractors shall have a similar right to select 92,160 acres, or two blocks, which shall thereupon be similarly reserved, not granted.

And upon the completion of the said railway and acceptance thereof, by the Government as completed, the blocks so reserved shall be granted to the contractors.

All these conditions precedent must be complied with by Mackenzie & Mann before one foot of land is alienated by the Government of Canada, and the Government will see, and we shall all see, that the contractors do comply with the requirements of this contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood the hon. gentleman to refer to a number of clauses of this contract, and to say that the land grant was conditional upon the performance by the contractors of all these provisions. Am I correct in understanding the hon. gentleman to say that the obtaining of this land grant is conditional upon the performance of the provisions of section 5,

or of section 6, or of section 8, or of section 9, of the contract ?

Mr. MORRISON. I mean to say that this contract is not divisible ; I mean to say that, having in view section 3, which states :

Upon the incorporation of said company and upon the assignment by the contractors to such company of this agreement, and upon the said company covenanting with the Government to carry out the same—

What does the word "same" mean ?

—--and upon the said railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake being completed and accepted as aforesaid the contractors shall then, but not before, be relieved from personal responsibility hereunder, and the company shall be thereafter deemed to be the party of the second part hereto in lieu of the contractors and shall be bound as such, and be entitled to their rights hereunder.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, I do not desire to argue with the hon. gentleman ; I merely want to understand what he means. I think one paragraph of the contract provides that they shall build a sleigh road, that is in clause 8 ; they shall immediately construct a practicable sleigh road. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to argue, that if they do not construct that sleigh road, but perform every other part of the work, they forfeit the land grant ?

Mr. MORRISON. No ; I do not think the hon. gentleman can put any such construction as that upon my contention, because that is not the section that goes to the root of the contract. The subject matter of this contract is a railway, and not a sleigh road ; the work for which they are to receive this 25,000 acres of land per mile is the railway, and these other sections I mentioned refer to the railway.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Permit me to ask—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, I cannot ask the question unless I have the hon. gentleman's permission.

Mr. MORRISON. You have my entire permission.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With regard to clause 9 of the contract, which says that the contractors shall provide or arrange with others to provide steamboat transport of freight and passengers ?

Mr. MORRISON. I have precisely the same answer to make to that clause ; it is one that does not go to the root of the matter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, will the hon. gentleman state which of the clauses of the contract are of the character that he mentioned a moment ago ?

Mr. MORRISON. I read the clauses of the contract which are the backbone and substance of the contract, which go to the root

of the matter, and a breach of which would be a breach of the contract. I refer the hon. gentleman to these, as I do not wish to go over them and repeat them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not wish the hon. gentleman to go over them, would he merely name them by number ?

Mr. MORRISON. I have mentioned them one after another. I could not repeat them in the order in which I gave them before. There is no hon. gentleman in the House whom I would more willingly oblige than the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, but I think he is asking me too much when he asks me to go over the arguments and repeat what I have said in his hearing. If I was not speaking in a manner audible to him, I cannot help it. I decline to repeat, word for word, what I have just completed saying. The hon. gentleman has the right of reply, and I invite his criticism of my arguments. If there is any particular point which he did not understand, I shall be pleased to go over that point again.

But I do not intend to go again over every section which I have already discussed. I have endeavoured as explicitly as possible to explain the principal sections of the contract and to show that they are by no means indefensible, and those which are not salient sections I have not read, but they likewise are not open to objection. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman has interrupted me as he has done. I was going on to say that the road must be completed and that the conditions precedent must be complied with before one acre of land is alienated. That was the point with which I was dealing when I was interrupted by the hon. member for Halifax. I drew attention to that section—that these conditions precedent must be complied with before an acre of land is alienated ; and it is that point which is disturbing hon. gentlemen opposite. Unless these conditions are complied with and sections are taken up by Mackenzie & Mann, those sections may be taken up by miners in advance. Again, there is a section providing for the reservation of arable lands. There are arable lands within the Yukon district, and it is a very wise provision for the Government to reserve them. Then there is section 24 in regard to water rights—and every one acquainted with a mining country knows the extreme value of such a right—as follows :—

Water available for hydraulic or placer mining on the contractors' lands, or on Government lands, shall be used by those mining on such lands under such regulations as may be established by or under the authority of the Governor in Council for the purpose of securing an equitable and fair division and use thereof.

This affords additional evidence that the Government throughout the whole contract have taken every precaution to protect the public and particularly the miners' interests in the Yukon. I thank hon. gentlemen

opposite and the leader for their kind indulgence in consenting to the adjournment of the debate last night, and also for the indulgence shown by both sides of the House during my remarks this afternoon.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very much obliged to the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Morrison) for the attention he has paid me in discussing the merits of the arguments that I have placed before the House, but I apologize sincerely to the House for having been the occasion of so much waste of time. However, I hope the House will consider that I at least was innocent in the matter. I shall not follow the example of the hon. gentleman and traverse the statements made or alleged arguments put forward. I made certain statements to this House as matters of fact, as information for the House, without regard to politics or principles, but simply as conveying information which was within my knowledge. In so far only as the hon. gentleman's contradiction of my statement of facts is concerned, will I trouble the House to follow his argument. I stated, and the whole weight of my opposition to the present contract rests on this point, that owing to geographical considerations the Dominion of Canada is not in a position to benefit from the demand for food products that would arise in the Yukon, if the only means of communication with the Yukon was by the route from the Pacific Coast. That statement is either correct or incorrect; it can be proved or disproved, and upon the truth of that statement I rest my case. The hon. gentleman only controverts my statement on the ground that British Columbia is a reasonable source of food supply for the Yukon. He does not contradict the statement as regards any other part of Canada, that Manitoba and the North-west are necessarily the only sources of food supply. He says that British Columbia is a possible and probable source of food supply for the Yukon, and the hon. gentleman quoted from the Trade and Navigation Returns in proof of this assertion. If British Columbia does not at present produce enough to support its population, it has no food products to export to the Yukon, and if it does produce more than is sufficient for the population of the province, its being on the sea-coast, the Trade and Navigation Returns must necessarily show the facts. I have examined the Trade and Navigation Returns and this is what I find in the returns for 1897. The total imports of British Columbia for that year entered for home consumption, were of the value of \$6,926,000. Of this amount I find that products to the value of \$4,117,373 came from the United States, which I hold proves my point, namely, that the food products used in British Columbia itself to a large extent come from the United States, and British Columbia, therefore, has no food products to export to the Yukon. As a matter of fact in the settled parts of British Colum-

Mr. MORRISON.

bia the United States is the competitor of the North-west in supplying that country with food; and if the United States can compete with the North-west in supplying the settled portion of the province, certainly it will compete under much favourable circumstances over the proposed route to the Yukon. As to the trade in food products to the Yukon, it may be worth while to say a word. Take the population to be in the Yukon at 50,000. Those people will use 1,000 pounds of food per man per year, and that food at the point of production would be worth anywhere from \$100 to \$200. In other words, taking the lowest estimate as to the population of the Yukon, the trade in food products will be worth \$10,000,000 yearly, and the question before the House is whether that \$10,000,000 of trade shall be done by the United States or by our North-west.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) raised the issue that I was speaking from a local standpoint and counselled me that I should have spoken from a national standpoint. In that regard I am prepared to stand comparison with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) himself. There are three constituencies on the Pacific Coast, one of them represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison,) which are directly interested in the Yukon trade by way of the proposed coast route. It is a matter of fact and it is acknowledged on all hands, that every other constituency in the Dominion of Canada is more interested in an interior route. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) feels that he is justified in supporting the case of three constituencies on the Pacific Coast, as against the rest of the Dominion, and if he thinks that that is not local politics, then, Mr. Speaker, I hope I am justified in supporting the wants and needs of the rest of the Dominion on the ground that neither is that merely local politics.

Let me say this in regard to the attacks that have been made on my position as to the merits of the bargain itself, by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) and the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Fitzpatrick). In the remarks which I made the other day, I did not speak of the Edmonton route, nor did I suggest a route from the eastern side of the Rocky Mountains to the Yukon. I did not mention it for the reason that I did not think it was necessary to my argument, but seeing that these two gentlemen have mentioned it, and seeing that they have taken up the time of the House about it, which I was too modest to do, I think I may be justified in following their example and so I shall refer to it now. I have just a few words to say to correct some slight misapprehensions which seem to have arisen in regard to this route, and as to the position taken by myself and others towards it. In the first place, it has been taken for granted that we east of the mountains are demanding that the

Dominion of Canada should build a railroad from Edmonton to Dawson City, a distance of 1,500 miles. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that neither I nor any one else whom I know has made any such demand upon the Government of the day.

We are willing to recognize the limitations of the resources of the Dominion; we are willing to recognize the possibility of mining in the Yukon not being permanent, and we are willing to recognize the desirability of a road being built in from the Pacific Coast. I entirely disclaim the position in which the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Morrison) seeks to put me when he says I am against the coast route and that the people in favour of the eastern route are necessarily against the western. What we do ask, Mr. Speaker, is that when the resources of this country are being pledged for the purpose of inducing trade from the United States into the Yukon, the trade of our own country should have equal facilities or equal consideration at least. We do not ask the Government of the day to build a railroad to Dawson City. The very modest request was made that the Government should open up a pack trail, or possibly a wagon road from Edmonton to Pelly River, which stands to this route in the same position as Teslin Lake does to the coast route. That was the sole demand that has been made on the Government in behalf of the eastern route, and if that demand should be granted the House and the country can rest assured that there never was an expenditure made by the Dominion of Canada that gave such a good return to the treasury of the country, and to the trade and manufactures of the country, as will that comparatively trifling expenditure.

The hon. Solicitor General estimated that the cost of a railroad over the Edmonton route would be something like \$30,000,000. Let me correct him. The broad gauge, substantially built railroad that runs from Calgary north to Edmonton cost \$12,000 per mile, according to the statement of the construction company. If that railroad had been built on the principle and standard of the proposed Teslin Lake road, I suppose it could have been built for \$8,000 a mile, so that the distance of 1,000 miles from Edmonton to the navigable waters of Pelly River would cost \$8,000 multiplied by 1,000 miles; or in all \$8,000,000 would build a railroad from Edmonton to the navigable waters of Pelly River which would give the food trade of that country to eastern Canada, and would give our eastern railroad system direct communication with the Yukon. I maintain, Sir, that such a railroad would secure to the Dominion of Canada practically every dollar's worth of the trade of that country. It would make Canada mistress in her own house, so that we would have no questions to ask a foreign country as to bonding privileges, or as to the con-

trol of a foreign country over our actions. If there are any international complications likely to arise, the remedy for these international complications is to build a road over what is unquestionably our own territory for the benefit of our own trade.

Since I last spoke on this question, Mr. Speaker, the Teslin Lake project has taken on a new phase. At that time, it was expected that there would only be the construction of 150 miles of railway. That was all that was asked for and the resources of the Dominion were pledged to that. Since then, however, it has transpired that such is not the project, but that the project is now to extend the line on the Pacific Coast to Alice Arm, a distance as the crow flies of 350 miles from Teslin Lake, and considering that there are one or two mountain ranges to cross, and considering that the country has never yet been even explored much less surveyed, there is every probability that a proper railroad cannot be built between those two points in a less distance than 450 miles. Now then, Sir, I leave it to this House to judge, if it is not cheaper, if it will not in the very nature of things cost this country less money—suppose we should look at it from the point of view of the cost alone—to build a railroad from Edmonton to Pelly River than to build from Alice Arm to Teslin Lake. The present estimate of the cost of the Stikine Railway is \$25,000 per mile. Figure out 450 miles at \$25,000 a mile, and 1,000 miles from Edmonton at \$8,000 a mile, and you will find that it takes less to build the 1,000 miles than the 450 miles. Remember that the building of the 1,000 miles of road from the interior would give the entire trade of the Yukon to Canada, and would make Canada supreme politically in that country. Sir, if two weeks ago there was a reason for supporting the interior route (the Edmonton route if you like to call it), that reason is ten times stronger to-day in view of the further light we have received on this question.

A word as to the practicability of the Edmonton route. It has been said that there is necessity for further exploration there and that the country is not known. Let me tell this honourable House that every foot of the country from Edmonton to the navigable waters of the Pelly River has been traversed, has been surveyed, has been mapped, has been reported upon by officials of this country; and those maps and reports are still extant, and the men who made them are still in the employ of this country. In view of this fact, it is unreasonable to say that the country is not known or that this Parliament cannot have any idea of what the construction of a pack trail, a wagon road or a railroad from Edmonton to the navigable waters of the Pelly River would cost. I understand that before this Parliament rises, and before there is any possibility of having the route explored or surveyed, a sum of money is likely to be

voted for a railway from Alice Arm to Telegraph Creek. At the present time there is no exploration, there is no survey of that country, there is practically no official knowledge of it. That, Mr. Speaker, is all I have to say about the Edmonton route. It is not I who have intruded it upon this House or the country; but I think it is only reasonable, when such vast interests are involved, that I should say that much in reply to the arguments of the hon. member for New Westminster.

Another point I would refer to is this. The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) said that, in any scheme for the construction of a railway to the Yukon, the proposed line from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake would be a necessary part. I regret to have to differ from the hon. gentleman. I say that a road from Edmonton to the navigable waters of the Yukon River would not go to Teslin Lake or Telegraph Creek, unless it went 250 miles out of its way. A wagon road could reach the navigable waters of the Pelly River, which is the main branch of the Yukon River, by a shorter distance from Edmonton than it could reach Teslin Lake if it went by Telegraph Creek.

In regard to my assurance in taking up the time of the House upon a local question, upon a question which the hon. gentleman says affects only the district which I represent, I would like to ask: Since when has it become a cause of offence in this House that a member should speak on behalf of the constituency he represents? If I understand the duty of a representative in this House, Mr. Speaker, it is to represent the interests of the constituency which has elected him; and I hope that duty does not rest more lightly on me because of the fact that the constituency which I have the honour to represent contains such a very large proportion of the total area of this great Dominion, and such a very large proportion of the valuable agricultural and pastoral lands of this Dominion. But, let me say, I am not speaking only for the district of Alberta, and I was careful in all that I said to show that I was not so speaking. What is the interest of Alberta in this matter is the interest of Manitoba, Assiniboia and Saskatchewan. It is the interest of the whole of that central Canada which extends from Rat Portage to the Rocky Mountains—that agricultural area upon whose development the progress of the Dominion depends. Every point in that area—Winnipeg, Brandon, Regina, Prince Albert, Edmonton—is affected by this question of getting a market in the Yukon country for the products of the North-west. It is a question, Mr. Speaker, of a home market for that country. You know how the farmers of eastern Canada have been persuaded to vote for certain measures in the hope of getting a home market for their products. No doubt they thought it was of value to them, and no doubt it was. I am not going to say it

Mr. OLIVER.

was not; but I say it is as important to the farmers of the North-west that they should get the home market which the trade of the Yukon country will afford to them, as it was for the farmers of eastern Canada to get their home market. That is what we say. We want the benefit of the natural home market for the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. If that is parish politics, it is big enough politics for me, as long as I am a member of this House. If it is possible to secure to the Dominion of Canada the trade in food products of the Yukon, if it is possible to obtain for the farmers of the North-west Territories \$10,000,000 of extra trade, \$10,000,000 of a home market for their products, this year or next year, I ask, am I not justified in coming before this House and discussing that proposition? Am I speaking locally or discussing parish politics, when I do so? What have we heard in this House since the North-west Territories were first brought into the Dominion? What did we hear when the Canadian Pacific Railway was being built? When any great project is brought before this House, the main argument put forward in its favour is, that it will help to develop and fill up the North-west, because everybody recognizes that the filling up of the North-west means prosperity to the whole Dominion. So I say, here is an opportunity to secure a home market for the farmers of the North-west and thus to add to the prosperity of the whole Dominion that is not offered by any other project known to this country at the present time. There is no other project before the Dominion at the present time that will add so much to the prosperity of the Dominion as the opening up of the Yukon country by an eastern trade route. Let me here read an extract stating a fact which some hon. members of this House ought to know something about. This is a telegram from Victoria, B.C., dated March 3rd:

In supporting a resolution moved by the president of the Victoria Board of Trade, that the Canadian Government build a line from some British Columbia port to connect with the Stikine-Teslin Railway, Mr. R. Stein, secretary of the Vancouver Board of Trade, said he had calculated that at the rate of trade now being done, \$24,000,000 was being lost to British Columbia yearly.

This is surely a trade worth having, and worth incurring some slight expenditure to secure. This is not a trade with regard to which the members of this House will be justified in taking the position of agnostics, of know-nothings; from which they do not know whether there is any money to be made or not, or whether they will be justified in expending any portion of the resources of this country to secure. If it is parish politics to endeavour to secure a trade of \$24,000,000 a year, then, Mr. Speaker, this is parish politics.

In regard to the point made by the hon. member for New Westminster, that I was arguing unduly against the interests of the Pacific Coast, when I objected to the gold lands east of the mountains being taken for a road that could only benefit the country west of the mountains, I might turn the argument another way, and say that, for the sake of securing the outfitting trade to the Yukon for two western cities, the hon. gentleman demands that the gold lands east of the mountains shall be hypothecated, as well as those of the west. It seems to me that it is not we who are making an unreasonable demand, if I may go so far, it is they who are doing so. We do not oppose the granting of assistance by this country to the opening up of a road to the coast. We do not begrudge Victoria or Vancouver their share of the outfitting trade, but in face of the fact declared by a Victoria merchant, that we are losing \$24,000,000 a year in trade, which should be ours, and which is being done by the Americans, I should think that the people of British Columbia would be perfectly willing to allow an effort to be made to secure for the people of the eastern provinces a share, at any rate, of that trade which at present we have lost. If \$24,000,000 of trade is to be fought for, surely we and they may each fight our own battles, and there is plenty room for both of us, especially if, after doing the best we can, the United States are going to get the greater share. At any rate, despite all the hon. gentleman has said, there is no cause of complaint on the part of the people of the Pacific Coast against the Edmonton route, or against any means whereby the producers of Canada in the interior can secure the market of the Yukon.

Let me put our case briefly again. Our objection is not to a route from the coast, but to the coast route being used as a means of locking up the resources of the country, and we object to its being used to prevent another and better route from being opened. We are willing to support the coast route, but we ask the people of the Pacific Coast to support us. We ask them to support any reasonable efforts made to secure to the eastern part of Canada a fair share of that \$24,000,000 of trade which to-day they are not getting, but which the Americans are getting, and which—if I have made a correct statement—we cannot get over the Stikine Railway. We must have other means of access to the Yukon district if we want to capture that trade, and unless we have this other means of access, that trade will remain with the United States. I believe that my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) is the only public man in British Columbia who would take the position he has taken in this House. I do not believe there is another one. I have not seen any such position taken by any of the newspapers of

his province. Everybody in that province, on the contrary, wishes well to the Edmonton route, believing that there is sufficient trade in the Yukon district for all parts of the Dominion.

Mr. MORRISON. I trust the hon. gentleman will pardon me if I interrupt. I do not think the interpretation he has given my remarks can be borne out by anything I have said. I did not oppose the Edmonton route, but studiously avoided doing so, and I hope the hon. gentleman will do me the justice of not misconstruing or misinterpreting what I said.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not quote the hon. gentleman, but merely stated the impression which his remarks made on my mind, and that certainly is the impression which they did make. I have no desire to go into figures to any great extent, but since the hon. gentleman challenged the correctness of the statement I made with regard to British Columbia not being an exporter of food products, let me give a few of the returns that I glean from the Trade and Navigation Report. I find that in the year ending June, 1897, the export of barley from British Columbia was 31 bushels; oatmeal, 1 barrel; hay, 4 tons; oats, 71 bushels.

Mr. MORRISON. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give me the page of the Trade and Navigation Returns from which he quoted.

Mr. OLIVER. They are the pages preceding and following that from which he took his return, showing that British Columbia exported 63,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. MORRISON. How much was exported from Alberta in the same time? Will the hon. gentleman read that?

Mr. OLIVER. It is not a question of Alberta, but of the products of the agricultural region extending from Rat Portage to the Rocky Mountains. But for the hon. gentleman's further information, I find that British Columbia exported four tons of hay, ten horses, one head of cattle; swine, none; sheep, none; poultry, 130. At the same time, let me tell him that my hon. friend from Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) informs me that the export of wheat from his riding last season was 3,000,000 bushels.

I have taken up the time of the House longer than I intended. The case I put, is that the people of the Dominion want the benefits of the trade of the Yukon in agricultural products, directly and indirectly, and that that trade, which will amount to anything from ten million dollars to twenty-four million dollars, we cannot get by any proposition giving a line of communication only to the coast; that for Canada to get her share of that trade there must be some line of communication from the interior. That is my whole case

and position, and I submit it without prejudice to the Government or the action of the Government in the matter. I put it before the House as strongly as I can, in the belief that the Government have not considered the question in that light, and since it has been put before them and has the approval of the House, to a very large extent. I hope the Government will consider that it is necessary and desirable to take the only means whereby that trade in food products for the Yukon can be secured to Canada.

Mr. QUINN. If any excuse, Mr. Speaker, were required—which I do not admit—for the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. and senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), it would be found in the speech which has just been made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). He, like myself, joined issue with the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), who seems to have the misfortune of running foul of nearly every member who has ventured to speak on any subject to which my hon. friend addresses himself. The hon. gentleman was not happy in his remarks, particularly in his opening remarks. For example, last night he, a mere tyro in politics—sitting here for the first, second, or possibly, as myself, the third session—began his address by stating that he would not attempt to answer what had been said by the hon. member who preceded him—a member of twenty years' experience in this House—because what that hon. member said was not worthy of a reply.

Mr. MORRISON. I wish at this juncture—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. QUINN. We can understand that such language coming from one whose leader—

Mr. MORRISON. I wish to state—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MORRISON. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is attributing to me a remark which I did not make, and I think that, in justice to myself, he ought to give me the opportunity of setting him right, and not persist in attributing to me words I did not use.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not a point of order.

Mr. MORRISON. It was merely a personal explanation which I desire to make.

Mr. QUINN. I do not pretend that I have used the exact language used by the hon. member. It is not such language as would fasten itself in my mind, as it is language altogether foreign to my nature and to the nature of hon. members who carry on debate in this House. But for the

Mr. OLIVER.

benefit of the hon. gentleman—not for the enlightenment of the House or for the elevation of debate—I will read exactly what he said :

I do not rise for the purpose of replying to the last speaker, for the simple reason that there is nothing to reply to.

These were his opening words. I say I do not wonder at such language coming from a gentleman who follows a leader who boasts that in that part of the country from which he comes, "the wild and woolly west," as he calls it, certain proceedings are followed which are not recognized in the effete east.

But I think that the hon. member, and even his hon. leader might with satisfaction benefit themselves, and certainly do credit to the House, by sitting in silence for a while and taking some lessons from this effete east in the proper methods of debating subjects in the Canadian Parliament. This is all the attention I intend to give to the hon. member or his remarks, except to point out that he was equally unfortunate with the hon. member who has just sat down. Whatever may have been his intentions in the opening remarks I have quoted as to the Edmonton route, there is no doubt that he was very unhappy in his expressions, because the hon. member who has just sat down understood him to say that he was opposed to the Edmonton route. It may be that the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) is not accustomed to speak in the House of Commons. Though a practising barrister, I understand he is only accustomed to speak in certain courts where the audience is usually not such as is to be found in the House of Commons or in the higher courts. He may in that way become master of a certain style of expression which does not either adequately reflect his ideas or impress his hearers.

Before speaking on the merits of this question, I should like to refer to some of the incidents of the debate. What I call incidents of the debate are subjects which have been dragged into this discussion, so to speak, by different members of the Government, for one purpose or another; probably, as I think, for the purpose of misleading the House and the country as to the real question before us, to lead the public on a false track, and to defend themselves before the people by pretending that the Conservative party have not been actuated by good motives in opposing the scheme which is now being agitated. The first of these incidents—and there are only three that I can remember at the present time—I would call the treaty incident, the second I would call the Hamilton Smith incident, and the third, an important incident indeed, the great solicitude that appears in the speech of nearly every Minister who has spoken as to the welfare of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, the deep and warm sym-

pathy for them in this contract, and the earnest hope that seems to fill their hearts that these gentlemen shall make a great deal of money out of it. Beginning with the last, I will say this. There has been some fault found in this House, which I have never heard denied by any hon. member of the Government, as to relations, more than business-like relations, existing between a certain member of this company and an hon. member of the Government. Besides this, the air is charged with rumours concerning this great contract. Hon. Ministers can hardly deny that they have not heard these rumours. One need only move about the streets of Ottawa to hear the question discussed and to learn that speculation is rife as to what are the interests of the different individuals connected with this affair. The reason that will certainly be ascribed by the ordinary voter of this country for this great solicitude on the part of so many members of the Government is that there is really more behind the Mackenzie & Mann contract than mere consideration for the personal interest of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, something akin to personal interest on the part of hon. gentlemen who feel this solicitude.

Mr. BRITTON. I rise to a point of order. I am not very familiar with the rules of debate in this House, but I should like to know if it is in order for an hon. member to insinuate corruption, for that is what the hon. member (Mr. Quinn) means—he must mean that if he means anything—against members of the Government in their dealings with public contractors.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I was just going to draw the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Quinn) to the fact that such charges should not be made, if made at all in the form in which he puts them. I do not think the hon. member should make insinuations without making direct charges concerning which proof can be offered.

Mr. QUINN. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that I have committed the fault of making insinuations. It is certainly not my nature to make insinuations and not make direct charges. I simply wished to put the members of the Government in possession of the rumours that are flying about. I say that the members of the Government surely cannot be blind or deaf to the these things; and I say that if these rumours remain uncontradicted until this debate closes, in all probability they will reach the electorate and be believed by them. I do not say that there is anything in them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) would be justified in making insinuations of corruption against members of the Government, basing those insinuations upon rumours.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I am not making any insinuations, I simply made a

statement of fact that these rumours are prevalent, that they exist, and I wish to put the Government in possession of the fact, if they do not know it already. Now, Sir, the next point to which I would refer is the treaty question. It has been stated more than once here by hon. members on the other side of the House that the Opposition have been traitors to this country because they have given reason to the United States to interfere with the rights of Canada at Port Wrangel and on the Stikine. It has even been said that the leader of the Opposition has shown himself a craven by wishing to strike his colours at the very first blow that has been made at Canada by the United States Senate. It has also been said by hon. gentlemen opposite that this question of the treaty was introduced by members on this side of the House for the purpose of leading the House astray, and of leading the country astray, as to the position which Canada occupied in regard to this matter. Now, I wish to show that any question that arose in this House as to the rights of Canada at Fort Wrangel under the treaty, came up for the first time when the Minister of Railways and Canals introduced this Bill and asked for its first reading. In doing so I do not think it necessary for me to preface my remarks by saying that the Minister of Railways and Canals at that moment spoke for the Government of this country. He did not speak, I presume, in his individual capacity but spoke for the Government; and if it were necessary for me to cite authority for that, I would simply cite the hon. Minister himself when, in answer to the ex-Minister of Finance, and in speaking on this very question, he stated that the Government did or did not know such and such things about it. I would therefore refer first, to pages 201, 202 and 203 of the "Hansard," where hon. gentlemen will find the position that the Government took upon this question on February 8, 1898. The information of the Government at that time, I take it, ought to have been perfect, when they undertook to put before this House a proposition, and ask the assent of this House to a proposition, involving the first reading of a Bill containing the contract between the Government and Mackenzie & Mann, and the charter to incorporate a company of which they were to be the head. At that time, on the 8th February, 1898, the Minister of Railways and Canals said:

In order to utilize that route, vessels will reach the ocean port in closest proximity to it at Fort Wrangel, a distance probably of not more than 150 miles from Telegraph Creek to Glenora.

Mr. FOSTER. In what territory is Fort Wrangel?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is probably in United States territory; at all events, they claim it, and they are in possession of it, and have a customs port at Fort

Wrangel. But the Stikine River, whose waters we propose to use, is a river that, under treaty with that country, we are entitled to use without being subject to any conditions. Navigation upon it is open to us as it is open to them.

So that if hon. members will look over their "Hansards" they will find that at that moment, for the first time, the question of the treaty between the two countries was introduced and brought into this debate. Therefore the Opposition is not responsible for having dragged the treaty question into this debate; but the Minister of Railways and Canals, and through him the Government, has dragged in the question of the treaty, and made it a point which ought to be discussed in the consideration of this contract before the House. More light is thrown upon the question by reading a little further in that same speech of the Minister of Railways and Canals. We find him expressing himself so clearly and so forcibly that Canada cannot be interfered with in the slightest degree at Fort Wrangel; so confident is he, that he says the Government did not think it necessary even to consult the Minister of Justice on the question. He says he does not know that the Minister of Justice was consulted. But if he does not know, who should know? Surely it was within the power, and moreover within the duty, of the Minister of Railways and Canals who was obliged to father the Bill, to consult the Minister of Justice. If the hon. gentleman should say: I am not the father of the Bill, I am simply its godfather, still he cannot escape the responsibility, because, so far as this House is concerned, he must assume the paternity of the Bill. He is Minister of Railways and Canals, and as this Bill deals with a railway, he is consequently responsible for it. Up to this time we find that the Minister, and consequently the Government, did not think it necessary to consult the Department of Justice or any other legal authority as to the rights of Canada at Fort Wrangel and upon the Stikine River. But after the Minister of Railways had made this extraordinary statement, the ex-Minister of Finance asked him:

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask another question for information? A vessel starting from Victoria, bound with freight and passengers for Glenora, will it be able to go to Glenora, and be able to land its goods on the wharf there for the railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly not, unless it is a very shallow craft.

Mr. FOSTER. Where will it have to unship?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The ocean transit will terminate at or in the immediate neighbourhood of Fort Wrangel, near the mouth of the Stikine River.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the hon. gentleman, for the sake of clearness: Does he mean to say that such goods starting from Victoria and reshipping at Fort Wrangel, a port in United States territory, and going up to Glenora, even though we have free navigation of the Stikine

Mr. QUINN.

River, will not be subject to the United States customs?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I am quite justified in going that far, and in saying that a ship which is freighted from Victoria or Vancouver, the object of which is to effect a transshipment at or near Fort Wrangel, may do so without encountering any obstacles from customs authorities—I think so. I will show the House why I think so. I presume that if an ocean steamer proposed to land at Fort Wrangel and tie up at the wharf there and unload goods at that port, they would be subject to the customs authorities; but I know no reason myself why a craft such as is used, or any other small craft available for the transshipment of this freight by the Stikine River, should not lie alongside a steamer which carries freight from our own ports to Fort Wrangel, or to that locality, and transfer the freight from the larger to the smaller vessel, and the latter might then pass on its way. However, whether I am right or not in this, that is the condition that exists.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the House will see at once that the Minister of Railways, in making that broad statement, opened up the whole question before this House, opened up the whole question of the rights of Canada on the Stikine River and at Fort Wrangel. There was no possibility of the House escaping a discussion of this question, because it had been forced upon us by the statement of the Minister of Railways. If the statement had gone uncontradicted, why it would be said, as the members of the Government say to-day, that the Opposition in this House were responsible for all the consequences that might follow, and it would have put the Conservative party in a false position. Therefore I say that this question was dragged into this debate by the Minister of Railways and Canals, dragged in in such a way that it would be impossible for the Opposition to remain silent or to refrain from discussing it, if they wished to do justice to the question which is under discussion.

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

After Recess.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I was about finishing my illustration that this question of treaties had been dragged into the debate before the House by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and I think by continuing with one or two other extracts from the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman on February 8th, I will conclude this portion of my argument.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order. There is not a quorum of members present.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman press the point?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not press it.

Mr. QUINN. Immediately following the extract of the speech which I read before the House rose at six, comes this question :

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend will not think I am interrupting him, for this matter is, by his own admission, one of very great moment. As those four routes were thrown aside by the Government because of that consideration, has the Government taken the precaution of getting an authoritative statement from the law officer of the Crown on that point ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not, Mr. Speaker, obtained any opinion from the law officer of the Crown on that subject.

Mr. FOSTER. Or has my hon. friend, or any member from the Government, got from the United States Government their contention and claim as to what would be their rights under such circumstances ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot inform the hon. gentleman what information any other member of the Government may have received upon this subject.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me a moment. We will go on with private bills.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 53) to incorporate the Prudential Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Bain.)

Bill (No. 54) respecting the Edmonton District Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 55) respecting the Atlas Loan Company.—(Mr. Casey.)

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Montreal and Province Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Penny.)

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Manufacturers' Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to "The Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company."—(Mr. Clarke.)

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Queenston Heights Bridge Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Victoria Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Quinn.)

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. QUINN. I was about to conclude the answer of the Minister of Railways to the question put by the ex-Minister of Finance, in which the hon. gentleman said :

I am stating the case as it appears from my own knowledge and my own information with regard to it.

From these extracts which I have read it will be plain to any one that at the time the Minister of Railways and Canals introduced this Bill in this House, the Government, from his own language here, was not in a position to state that it had considered the rights of Canada at Fort Wran-

gel or on the Stikine River, or what interference might have been made by the Government of the United States to Canada at either of those points ; and I would remark, in parenthesis, that this was fourteen days after the contract had been signed between Mackenzie & Mann and the Government of this country. Some seven days afterwards the Minister of Railways moved the second reading of the Bill ; but in the meantime his statement on this question had caused considerable discussion not only in this House, but throughout the country. Newspapers from one end of the Dominion to the other were filled with comments on the conduct of the Government in endeavouring to enter into such a serious contract without having first provided for the transshipment, storage or handling of goods at Fort Wrangel, so that no interference on the part of the United States Government could there occur. Not only were the newspapers full of this subject, but questions were asked across the floor of the right hon. Prime Minister and other members of the Government who happened to lead at that particular moment, as to whether any arrangement had been made with the United States, or whether this question had been discussed, or whether any understanding had been arrived at between the two Governments. Consequently, when the Minister of Railways and Canals came down eight days afterwards to discuss this subject, he was thoroughly informed as to the importance of this particular point. What did he then declare ? He declared :

It may possibly be, as I have said, that the customs officers at Fort Wrangel may claim, under the regulations of the United States Government, that our transshipments should take place under their eyes. But supposing they should, what great hardship would there be in that ? What great wrong would be done to us ? That would be only fair and reasonable exercise of precautions by the United States Government, that before foreign ships should be allowed to take advantage of the right to navigate the Stikine River, which they have under treaty, the United States authorities should, in order to protect themselves against smuggling or any other frauds that might be committed by persons using that river, exercise this power of overseeing transshipment.

That was the position then taken by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), and it showed that the question had not been understood by the Government of this country, either at the time the contract was signed, or even when he addressed this House. It was only when the leader of the Opposition referred, in the most scathing terms, to the conduct of the Government, that their attention was really brought to the point, and that they realized the importance of the proposition that was set out by the hon. the leader of the Opposition. The language used by the leader of the Opposition that day was sufficiently pointed to

draw the attention of even the most obtuse member of the Government to this important issue. He said :

We all recognize the ability and talent of hon. gentlemen opposite, and we know that whenever they have a semblance of a case, they will put it with all the force and all the tact in their power ; but it is only when they are brought face to face with a condition of facts for which they have no answer, that they are compelled to fall back on a policy of silence, in the hope that that will protect them. Was it or was it not right, I ask, that the people of Canada should expect this Government, before signing a contract by which they were giving 3,750,000 acres of rich gold lands to a company of contractors, to have made known to themselves what our rights at Wrangel were ? The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that distinguished know-nothing, who has signalized himself by the introduction of this Bill, and who has again signalized himself to-day by, if possible, greater ignorance of the measure he undertook to introduce to this House, can perhaps answer. Tell me, I ask the hon. gentleman, in the presence of this House, how you dared to put your signature—he did not put his signature, he got some one else to do it—to that contract without first knowing what the rights of the people of Canada were at Fort Wrangel ? You admitted, in your speech on the introduction of the Bill, that you did not know anything about it.

The attention of the Government was drawn to the point in the most forcible language, and the Minister of the Interior did not attempt to answer the argument or attempt to explain the position of the Government, but he did attempt to draw a herring across the track by raising a discussion as to whether the Conservative or the Liberal party passed the Treaty of 1871. That question has been debated, almost to the utter exclusion of the real question as to what our rights were at Fort Wrangel and on the Stikine River. This is how the Minister of the Interior dealt with the subject (Unrevised "Hansard," February 16th, page 662) :

These hon. gentlemen are getting very restless. They know what is coming, and they do not like it. Now, will the House take cognizance of the fact that the subjects of His Britannic Majesty possessed, under this treaty with Russia, a proprietary right, for all purposes whatever, in the Stikine River until that right was interfered with by the statesmanship of our friends on the other side. These gentlemen apparently had never read this treaty. They did not know what it contained, they had not the remotest conception of what they were doing when they put this clause in the Washington Treaty, which they have been boasting about ever since the question of the Stikine River came up.

Again, he said :

We are indebted to the sublime statesmanship of our friends on the other side for the curtailing, to a very great extent, of the privileges which we did enjoy on the Stikine River. Instead of this article, which gave us an unrestricted proprietary right in the Stikine River, we have now the following :—

I assert, Sir, that at the time the contract was entered into with Mackenzie & Mann,

Mr. QUINN.

on the 25th January, 1898, we were perfectly justified in assuming, from the language of the Minister of Railways, that the Government had not considered the question, had not taken counsel with the law officers of the Crown here, nor had they consulted or arranged with the United States Government as to the rights of Canada at Fort Wrangel and on the Stikine River. And when the attention of the Government was forcibly drawn to the fact that this was a question which deserved their attention even before they attempted to enter into this contract, the Minister of the Interior attempted to distract the attention of the House from the consideration of that very serious matter by raising a discussion as to who was responsible for the passage of the Treaty of 1871.

I shall not stop here to criticise the conduct of the Minister of the Interior, that hero of the bloodless battle of the Separate schools of Manitoba, nor shall I put him in contrast with that great statesman whose name will live in the history of Canada so long as the name of Canada is known to the world. I will not criticise the Minister of the Interior as the critic of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, whose memory will be cherished by every Canadian who has a spark of patriotism in his bosom, so long as Canada lasts. I leave it, not only to the judgment of this House, but I leave it to the judgment of our country, to watch the career of the Minister of the Interior and see, not if now in his youth, but if at any time in his life hereafter, he shall attain a position which will even be in touching distance of the heel of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald.

Now, Sir, I shall pass to another question incident to this debate, a question which, as another spectre or bogey, has been raised by the Government for the purpose of distracting the attention of the people of Canada from the proper consideration of the merits of this contract. I refer to the Hamilton Smith incident. Every member of this House will recollect how the name of Mr. Hamilton Smith came up for discussion at all. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) was making a speech on this Bill, and that day an article appeared in the Montreal "Star," saying that Mr. Hamilton Smith and Mr. Bratnober had made a proposition to the Government for the building of a line into the Yukon, which proposition had been refused. In the course of his speech, the hon. member (Mr. Clarke) asked the Minister who was leading the House, if such were true. That was the first time that the name of Mr. Hamilton Smith had been mentioned in the debate ; and I do not know that it was even mentioned at that time in the "Star," that Mr. Hamilton Smith represented the Rothschilds ; I do not think it was. At any rate, the answer was then given by the Minister, that there had been no negotiations with Mr. Hamilton Smith in

connection with a railway into the Yukon. After a while it was proven here that the proposition had been made within a short time—either before or after the introduction of this Bill—by Mr. Hamilton Smith for the building of a road—this very road, I think. There was no question at that time that Mr. Hamilton Smith or his associates represented the Rothschilds, and it did not enter into the merits of his proposition whether he represented Lord Rothschild or Lord anybody else.

It was simply a proposition made to the Government by a man professing to have sufficient financial standing to carry out a large undertaking like this, offering to build this railroad for a very much smaller figure than that which had been offered by the contract to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. There was no question about whom he represented. It was not the interest of any one to know whom he represented, so long as it could be established that he was a responsible individual. The question for the Government to consider at that time was not whether Mr. Smith represented Mr. Jones or Mr. Robinson or anybody else, but to consider whether he was a responsible man. Yet, from the conduct of the right hon. Prime Minister in this case, it appeared that the question was to get a denial from the representative of Canada in London, of a statement that was never made by Mr. Hamilton Smith, that is, that he was the representative of the Rothschilds. Not only this, but the right hon. Prime Minister, after he had promised to bring before this House the telegram which called forth the answer from Lord Strathcona which has been read to this House, backed down from the position he had taken and said: "It is a private telegram, and I cannot produce it." If the telegram that was sent to Lord Strathcona was a private telegram, the answer to that telegram was a private telegram. You cannot say that a telegram sent to a man is private, and that the answer to that telegram is a public document. No one can tell what importance to attach to the answer without seeing the telegram which drew forth that answer. It matters not who the gentleman may be whose name is signed at the bottom of the telegram which has been read in this House, what guarantee have we, what guarantee has the Prime Minister that this message was signed by Lord Strathcona? The right hon. gentleman certainly has not given any guarantee to this House, because he refuses to produce the telegram that would give it authenticity and make it pass current here, that is, the document to which it was an answer. But, as I said before, the question before us was not whether Mr. Smith represented Lord Rothschild or not. The question was whether Mr. Smith was a man of sufficient financial importance to carry out the undertaking. The Government could have found that out very easily. A private member of

this House, within twenty-four hours of the receipt of the answer from Lord Strathcona, produced before this House ample proof of the financial responsibility of Mr. Hamilton Smith. I have no hesitation in saying that that hon. gentleman had that information in his possession some days before he gave it to this House. Now, if a private member of this House could obtain that information regarding Mr. Hamilton Smith, how much more easily could the Government of this country have obtained it, just in the way they obtained a denial of a statement that was never made by Mr. Smith? I quote now from "Hansard," at page 1047, from the remarks of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). He said:

I found that Mr. Hamilton Smith is a gentleman who is entrusted in England with a contract amounting in value to £4,000,000 sterling—that is about \$20,000,000, or about six times what it is calculated by the Government will be sufficient to build this Yukon Railway. He has associated with him in this offer a gentleman by the name of Harry Mosenthal. That gentleman, I find, on application to the banking community, is the head of the large firm of Mosenthal Bros., and is reputed to be worth, in his own name, no less a sum than \$5,000,000, or £1,000,000 sterling. I also find that he has associated with him in this offer a gentleman—and he is not a New York man either—by the name of J. H. Lukach, who signs on behalf of an exploration company which has a paid-up capital of £1,100,000 sterling, and whose assets are estimated at no less a sum than £2,000,000 sterling. In addition to these, I find, among the applicants for this contract, Mr. Herbert Gibbs, who, I am informed, is a member of the firm of Anthony Gibbs & Sons. Their exact rating I was not able to obtain, but I found that they are one of the most reliable and richest houses in London. Then I come to Mr. Lionel Phillipps, another of the applicants, who is a member of the firm of Wernhor, Beid & Company, who are rated as the very richest financial firm in the whole city of London. The next gentleman I find on the list of Mr. Smith's associates is Lord Farquhar. It may be that the hon. gentleman from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) looks upon him as an American, but he was the late head of the firm of Sir Samuel Scott & Company, and was a partner in that firm with the Duke of Fife. He is, I understand, one of the rich men of England.

There is information which would be of inestimable value to the Government if they had any intention of obtaining the construction of the road which we are discussing for the least possible money. There is the information obtained by a private member of this House within a few days of the first time the name of Mr. Hamilton Smith was mentioned; and I say that when a private member of this House could obtain that information so readily, how much more readily could the Government of this country, by communication with its representative in London, have obtained the information—not that this man did not represent Lord Rothschild, whom he never pretended to represent, but that he was a man able to carry out not only this contract,

but any other contract in connection with this railroad that the Government might think proper to place in his hands.

But there is no question of doubt, Mr. Speaker, this is another case of an attempt to draw a herring across the trail. This is another attempt on the part of the Government to mislead the people, to distract their attention from the consideration of the contract, to make it appear before this country that an enormous crime has been committed by Mr. Hamilton Smith, that is, that he told a lie, that he made a false representation about Lord Rothschild. The people of this country will not think whether Mr. Smith made any such representation or not. They are too intelligent to be led astray on that point. They can read the statement in the letter sent by Mr. Smith, that he never pretended to represent Lord Rothschild, and they can see that this is—I will not say a subterfuge on the part of the Government, but I cannot find another word in the English language to characterize such conduct, and I leave it to the imagination of hon. members to say what it is. It certainly is not a straight and fair way of putting a question before this House. I cannot but regret that the right hon. Prime Minister, when asked to lay on the Table of this House the original telegram which he sent to Lord Strathcona, which brought forth the answer which was read to this House, and when told that he was bound in honour to produce it, said that he would be the guardian of his own honour, that he was responsible to the world for his own honour. But, Sir, the honour of the Prime Minister of Canada, if you will allow me to say so, is not in his own personal keeping. The honour of the Prime Minister of Canada is as dear to every Canadian as it is to the individual himself. It is not his property. It is my property; it is the property of every hon. gentleman on this side of the House, because we have a proper feeling in this regard. It is the property of every gentleman on this side of the House, and in public matters every hon. member on this side will guard it just as jealously as he would his own. I regretted to hear the right hon. gentleman say that he alone was the guardian of his honour. No, Sir, the First Minister of Canada is the property of every citizen in this country. To every citizen in Canada he is responsible, and he should rather remember the words of the poet:

Honour and fame from no condition rise,
Act well thy part, there all true honour lies.

Having, therefore, proven that the attempts which were made to distract the attention of the country from the consideration of this most unfortunate contract, did not come from the Opposition, I shall now, as briefly as possible, review some of the objections made to the Bill and some of the arguments by members of the Government in its favour.

Mr. QUINN.

our, more particularly by their supporters within the last few days.

Addressing myself first to the argument of the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who, I am sorry, is not in his place this afternoon, with regard to the treaty question, I have only a word to say. I would not like to believe that an hon. gentleman occupying the position of Solicitor General of Canada would misquote a legal authority. I hold the hon. gentleman in too high esteem personally to believe that he would do so knowingly, but I fear he has fallen into the very same error that his colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) did, when he attempted to quote from the speech of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart). The hon. Solicitor General, no doubt, spoke from a prepared brief. No doubt, he had put into his hands a list of authorities and certain extracts from these authorities, and did not take the trouble of comparing these extracts with the authorities themselves, and therefore gave us a construction which was not really the opinion of the authorities quoted. He mentioned the names of Wharton, Phillimore, Grotius, Puffendorf and Vattel as authorities holding a certain opinion which he enunciated to this House. I have not had the opportunity of examining all these authorities, but I remembered having read in my early youth one of them, Phillimore, and my understanding of the position taken by him was in direct contradiction to that attributed to him by my hon. friend the Solicitor General. I was very much astonished to hear the Solicitor General make such a quotation, and took the trouble of verifying it. I say that the Solicitor General was misled—to put the most charitable construction on the matter—by the quotation put into his hands from that author. The hon. gentleman read the and other like purposes. Then Phillimore work:

It has been contended that the principle of this law has been engrafted upon international law, and that it is a maxim of that law that the ocean is free to all mankind, and rivers to all riparian inhabitants. So that the nation which possessed both banks of the river, where it disembogued itself into the sea, was not at liberty to refuse the nation or nations which possessed the banks of the river higher up, from the use of the water for the passage of vessels to the sea, and from the incidental use of the banks for the purposes mentioned above.

These are for loading and unloading cargoes, and other like purposes. Then Phillimore goes on:

The opinion of Grotius seems to be in favour of this position.

My hon. friend stopped there. He failed to read the rest of this paragraph; but anybody who reads thus far will see that Phillimore was simply stating a contention by certain authors in international law, and had not yet given his opinion. The Solicitor

General concluded from this that Phillimore's opinion was in favour of that contention, but further down we find Phillimore thus stating his own conclusion :

For, the reason of the thing and the opinion of other jurists, speaking generally, seem to agree in holding that the right can only be what is called (however improperly) by Vattel and other writers imperfect, and that the state through whose domain the passage is to be made must be the sole judge as to whether it be innocent or injurious in its character.

We therefore see that if the hon. Solicitor General had taken care to verify his authorities, he would have never laid down the proposition he did as coming from Phillimore, but he would have laid down directly the opposite. I did not take the trouble to examine the other authors quoted, but I assume—and am justified in assuming—from this quotation, that my hon. friend was not any more careful with his other authorities than he was with Phillimore. I do not know that I shall refer to anything more in the address of the Solicitor General except to punctuate that point and to ask you, Sir, to consider fully all the authorities which he cited, in the light thrown upon them by the citation from Phillimore.

The hon. Minister of Public Works said :

Hamilton Smith is playing the game of the thirty-four senators in Washington, and so are his hon. friends in the Opposition.

If the hon. Minister of Public Works is anything at all, he is an enthusiast. This is the first time I ever heard him address this House or any other assembly without arousing the enthusiasm of his hearers and firing their hearts with zeal; but the other night he laboured for three-quarters of an hour, and even when he brought out, in his ringing tones, this statement that Mr. Smith was playing the game of the thirty-four senators in Washington and that the Opposition here were playing the same game, it fell as flat as ditch-water upon his supporters behind him. And why? Because nobody believed it. Everybody in this House had, from the very beginning of this debate, heard the leader of the Government catechised as to a certain action taken very early last month by the Senate of the United States with regard to the bonding privilege and transshipping of goods at Fort Wrangel. That was before there was any question of the Senate Bill at all.

Nobody in this House was moved by the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works that the Opposition in this House had attempted in any way to stir up the United States against the Government of this country. If there is any charge which cannot be made against the Conservative party, without causing the people to feel the statement to be an insult to their intelligence—and I care not to what constituency you go—it is the charge that the Conservative party have not always held clearly be-

fore them the idea of serving the best interests of the country and assisting its progress. The names of the leaders of the Conservative party are household words throughout this country, and will be so long as this country has a history.

The hon. gentleman made a very amusing remark—that the charge had always been made by the Conservative party that the Liberal party was composed of timid men. If that threat is considered an insult by the hon. Minister of Public Works or any other member of that exceedingly clever Government, I do not think it will ever be made again. Nobody who has read the terms of the proposition we have now before the House would so misapply the word "timid" as to use it as describing the men who have laid it before the House. Timid men! Why, the wonder is that they should dare to come before this House with a proposition of this kind. Timid! Why, "boldness" does not express their quality in this matter. It would be impossible, I think, to find a word in the English language, the antithesis of "timid" which would express what they are when they attempt to force this project through the House. It may be that they have got this boldness through the introduction of the Conservative representative into the Cabinet. Is that the idea the hon. Minister of Public Works wishes to convey? Perhaps it is. Certainly, there never was in any Conservative Government a man so bold as to introduce a measure of this kind, a man so utterly regardless of public sentiment as to put a measure before the House, a measure which had been so little considered by the Government as is this, or on which the members of the Government would show themselves so utterly ignorant.

The hon. Minister of Public Works said also that the Government dog is all right. I do not know what the Government dog is, I do not know to which member of the Government he applied this term; but, whoever it was, I think he ought to horsewhip the hon. Minister of Public Works. The Minister assures us that the Government dog will not be eaten up. Well, there has been considerable doubt about the question whether, not the Government dog, but rather the property of the country would not be eaten up by a certain firm of contractors. I think Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann are not the kind of men to eat dogs. They prefer gold lands. I do not know what the hon. Minister meant when he said that the Government dog would not be eaten up.

Now, I have very little to say as to this contract. It is so objectionable in almost every feature that I can say almost all I have to say against it by voting "nay" on the second reading. But I cannot conclude without calling attention to one or two of what I call salient features. Take, first, the effect of giving such an enormous terr-

tory to any private contractors—our heritage and the heritage of our children. An hon. member on this side has said—I do not say that he was exactly correct, but I think the statement is substantially accurate—that these contractors are being given a tract of land three times the size of the province of Prince Edward Island. And what for? Is it to build a road that will be the property of this country after it has been built? No. Is it in order that the people of this country may have privileges in going over that road? By no means, for those going over or sending goods over it will have to pay not merely ordinary passenger fare and freight rates, but most exorbitant figures for both. Therefore, I say the Government of this country is attempting to give to a firm of contractors a piece of territory three times the size of Prince Edward Island and has obtained absolutely nothing in return for it.

Now, the Minister of Railways and Canals, gives as a reason for paying such a large amount of money—because after all, the land that is to be given is worth so much money—to this company, that the road must be built within a very short time, must be finished on the 1st of September next. He says it will be utterly impossible to get this road built under ordinary conditions or at the ordinary price. The Minister of the Interior, in speaking on that question said that the Government was in this position, that it would have to provide for the going into that country of possibly 50,000 or 100,000 or even 200,000 people within the next few months. He said also that the condition of things presented itself to the Government only a short time ago, and that, using the greatest diligence, they sent out engineers to examine the country and to decide upon the proper route for a railway. But, the hon. gentleman forgot that a few pages before he had made this explanation. Speaking on the 15th of February, as reported at 602 of the unrevised "Hansard," he said:

But we did not realize, and I do not think the House will blame us for not realizing, until the summer had nearly passed there was going to be anything like the rush to that country which materialized last fall.

So we have the statement from the Minister of the Interior that at any rate before the summer had completely passed the Government did realize that there was going to be a large rush of people to the Klondike last fall, which would be continued next spring. Now, the charge has been made by the leader of the Opposition and by other members of the Opposition, that the Government remained quiet, that the Government did nothing between the time they first realized, as the Minister said, that there was going to be a rush to that country, and the time that he sent out engineers to survey and to examine the

country. Sir, there has not been any answer from the Government benches showing that the Government did anything between those dates. Here we have the statement of the Minister of the Interior that before the summer had passed the Government knew there would be a rush to that country, and the first thing the Government did was to send out its engineers some time in September for the purpose of examining the country before laying out a railroad to get in there. What other proof have we? We have the proof that on the 15th August—and of course they did not do it in a day—arrangements had been made with Major Walsh to go to that country as administrator; we have the proof that his assent was obtained, and the assent of Judge McGuire to accompany him, on the 15th August; so that prior to the 15th August, allowing sufficient time to bring Major Walsh and Judge McGuire to Ottawa, if they came here, allowing sufficient time to communicate with them, we are justified in saying that the Government knew about the latter end of July that it was necessary to provide for the administration of justice in that country. Why? On account of the great rush of people that would go in there owing to the excitement that had been caused by the large discoveries of gold. So that we have, at any rate, proven by the acts of the Government themselves that as early as the latter part of July there was something before them to show that they were justified in going to the expense of \$200,000 in sending out Major Walsh and his party to administer justice in that country. Now, that forces us to the natural conclusion, not only that the Government expected a large rush of people into that country as early as last July, but that the Government had private information and knew that they were justified in making this expenditure, because they were sending these men to the largest and richest gold country that the world had ever heard of; otherwise they would not have been justified in making this expenditure. Now, I think that point is proven beyond any question of doubt. Hon. members of the Government have not given any answer; and as one of the hon. members here has said, they have been beaten to their knees on the question, and it is impossible for them to give anything like a lucid or proper explanation in answer to that charge. So that if it is proven, as it is amply proven, that the Government of this country knew as early as July that there was going to be a rush of people to that country, that it was the richest gold country that had ever been discovered in this world, why, we are then forced to the conclusion that this Government was asleep from the middle of July till the middle of October, aye, until the 25th January, when they signed the contract with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann;

or else, if they had not been asleep, they would at once have set about providing some means for people to get into that country, providing means for the transportation of supplies to that country, providing means of communication not only between the North-west Territories and that country, but between the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, with that country, before the 25th January, 1898. What might they not have done? I have no doubt that if we could get the real facts of the case here, we would find that they were in possession of this information not only as I have proven here, by the middle of July, but that they were actually in possession of this information before this House rose on the 28th June last. I think if we had this information it would be proven beyond any doubt that such was the case. What, then, was the duty of the Government, if such were the case? It was the duty of the Government then and there to have apprised this House of that fact, to have allowed the representatives of the people of this country in Parliament assembled to know that such a country existed, to know that this rich country was right at our doors, to know that thousands of people were trying to enter that country in order to extract from the unwilling bowels of the earth the gold which they contained, to know that not only these people were going in, but that there would be a large influx of people within the next six months; and to call upon these representatives of the people to give them then and there power to build a railroad, or to take any other means that would to them appear sufficient in order to afford communication with that vastly rich country. But they did not do so. They rested, they remained quiet, they did nothing until late in the winter, until, we may say, the 25th January, or until a few days before the 25th January, when, with all the hurry, with all the haste, with all the speed possible, they entered into a contract with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann to build this route. Now, Sir, I do not propose to discuss the question of this particular route. I remember the castigation, I will not call it a merited castigation, which one hon. gentleman who took the liberty of addressing this House a second time when he had no right to do so, I refer to the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison); I say I remember the castigation which he attempted to give to a gentleman who did not merit it, when he said that the crude and crass ignorance of the geography of the country displayed by the hon. gentleman was really marvellous. It is quite true that we are not very well posted on the geography of that country, but it is not our fault. If the Government had taken proper steps when they first knew of the existence of that gold country, when

they first knew of its importance, when they first knew that the interest of this House would be centered upon that region to-day, they would have provided every member of this House with a map which would have given him distinctly and clearly to understand what the geography of the country was. We do not all enjoy the privilege of living at New Westminster, or of living in the province of British Columbia; we do not all even enjoy the privilege of having travelled that far. But we know as much about that country as the information which has been given us by the Government, who were bound to give us all the information possible, will allow us to know. So I say we have only to take the speeches of hon. gentlemen who, like the member for New Westminster, do know something about it, and from them extract what information we can. Now, what did the hon. member for New Westminster say on this question of the knowledge that was possessed by the Government about the condition of that country. The hon. gentleman was very anxious and very zealous in support of the Minister of Railways on the 8th February, and wishing to impart to this House as he had a perfect right to do, all the information which he possessed upon it, and not thinking that his own words would be brought up in judgment against him some day, delivered himself of the following:—

As I said, there will be 10,000 people in there soon after navigation opens. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken thought a conservative estimate would place at 50,000 the additional number of people who will go in there by some means or other. Now it is a matter of calculation that it will take 25,000 tons of provisions to feed 50,000 people.

And he goes on then to estimate how many people will go in there:

The 50,000 people will not go in by the Yukon River, they must go over those passes, that is, if they can get over them, and what does that mean? Of food, baggage, machinery and tools, all of which are absolutely necessary to every man who goes in there, about two tons will be required to every man.

Then he makes use of this extraordinary language:

Any person who has been at Vancouver, Victoria, New Westminster, Seattle, or Tacoma, during the past six months, must be specially blind if he could not see that at least 100,000 people would be in the Yukon country this season, and may have gone there since I left the coast.

So that the hon. member for New Westminster says that anybody who was at either of these places mentioned at any time within the last six months, that is, since 1st July last, must have been blind, if he did not see that 100,000 people would go in there within the six months which are just ending and the opening of the spring. Accordingly, by his own words he convicts the Government of either having known six months ago that 100,000 people would go in,

or blindness on their part. I leave the hon. gentleman and the hon. Minister of the Interior to settle between them whether they were blind or stupid. But it is abundantly proven that the Government were in possession of this information, and that consequently the excuse of haste does not hold under the circumstances. It is quite true, that hon. gentlemen opposite have sheltered themselves behind the fact that no person in this country would have been able to build this railway except Mackenzie & Mann. I am not going to express any opinion, as all the Ministers have found it necessary to do—probably because they want to keep friends with these very wealthy contractors, and they know they are going to be very wealthy—as to whether these contractors will make any money out of the contract or not. I have nothing to say against Mackenzie & Mann. I know both of those gentlemen, one of whom I have known only a short time, but the other during some years, and I have no reason to wish them any harm, and, in common with all my fellowmen, I wish them well; but I do not think that if I were a member of a government, I would consider it necessary because I had friendly feelings towards those gentlemen, to go out of my way to give them a contract for which they will receive payment in the shape of 2,750,000 acres of gold-bearing lands for building a road which will prove eminently remunerative to them. What have all hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the Government side of the House on this question proved? At one time they say this railway will never pay. But they are confronted with the argument that if it is not going to pay, where is the necessity for it? Next, they say there will be 100,000 people going into that country by that railway within the next six months. Then, they are met with the statement that if 100,000 people go in within the next six months, they will require 50,000 tons of freight in the shape of supplies and food products; so that a moderate estimate of the receipts of the railway would be \$1,500,000 for the first six months. Hon. gentlemen must take one or the other proposition; they cannot shift about, as they have done, from one side to the other every few minutes; they must pin their fate to something. It is not for the Opposition to put before them any scheme to carry through; they are responsible for the scheme, they must carry it through and pin their faith to it. So they must either show that this railway will pay and that it will be used for the accommodation of the public, or they must admit there was no necessity for haste in building. If there was no necessity for haste, we may not consider the other question, whether this is the most advantageous route or not, because if there was no necessity for haste in building the road, I, in common with every hon. member, I think, will say that this road should have been built in all-Canadian ter-

Mr. QUINN.

ritory, and we should not have run any risk of being interfered with in any way by the United States Government.

The hon. gentleman has made a great point of the assertion, that one of the advantages of this road and the reason why it should be built is, that it is going to be constructed in all-Canadian territory. I fail to see the advantage of that, since we are brought face to face with the fact, now apparent, that the United States Government is going to use all its power to prevent us from getting at the terminus of that road nearest the ocean. What matters it to this country that 150 miles of railway should be built to some point in the Yukon district and carry the traveller 150 miles on his journey of 1,600 miles, and that this road should be built all in Canadian territory, if before he can reach that point, there are 150 miles between that railway and the steamer which has brought him to the mainland of that country? What difference if this road should be built all in Canadian territory, if between that road and him intervenes a foreign government, which will have the right to tax his food products, every article of raiment, every piece of machinery he brings into that country? What matters it that this road should be built in Canadian territory, if between him and that road is a piece of foreign territory to the government of which he may have to pay tax before he can set his foot there? What advantage to this country would it be to build an all-Canadian route all through Canadian territory under such circumstances? Would it not be a greater boom to this country to wait until a road could be built, not over 150 miles, but over 300 or 400 miles, if necessary, so that, not only would it be an all-Canadian route, but its approach and its outlet would be in Canadian territory. This is a point that I think has been lost sight of by the Government, and it is a point on which the leader of the Opposition was perfectly justified in saying that the Government should withdraw the Bill now under the consideration of the House.

But I think the most monstrous proposition in all this contract is, that Mackenzie & Mann should have the right to obtain of the territory of this country such an enormous portion as is provided by this contract. Sir, this land is the heritage of the people of this country; it is the heritage of the children of this country; it is the heritage not only of us who live here now, but of our children and our children's children. It may be valueless to-day, but may in the future contain such wealth as would make every citizen of Canada enormously rich. It has been said that this is a gambling transaction. If that be so, then I say, if the Government are prepared to sanction a gambling transaction, then let every man, woman and child in Canada have the right to gamble in the Yukon, too.

If the Government insist upon forcing this contract through the House, and insist on chartering a company to carry out the work, I would like to see that charter prepared in such a way that it would give every individual in this country a share in the enormous wealth of that gold region. I would like to see the Government insert in that contract, a clause compelling Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann to organize a company of \$10,000,000 capital with shares at \$1 each, so that every man, woman and child in Canada might have a chance to invest in it. I would like to see the number of shares in that company held by any one person, limited to 1,000 so that individual capitalists would not have the power to get more than a fair proportion. I would like to see the Government insert an advertisement in the papers of Canada inviting our citizens to subscribe to that capital stock, and I prophesy that if that be done, long before the first of September, even long before the first of May the \$10,000,000 of capital stock will be taken up by our citizens who are anxious and willing to take a gamble in the Yukon. By so doing, provision could be made to meet even the most urgent demands of the Ministers who are so solicitous for the welfare of Mackenzie & Mann. I would be disposed to deal liberally with those gentlemen, but I would compel them to accept out of the \$10,000,000 capital, 25 per cent, 35 per cent or 40 per cent profit on the actual cost of the railroad which would be ascertained by Government engineers; I would compel them to accept a percentage of profit and take that in full payment of their investment. We would then have a road owned by the people of Canada; we would then have a road really controlled by the populace; we would then have in this country a large tract of mineral land owned by the people. I would further have inserted in the contract a clause providing that if the total capital should not be subscribed before the 1st of September, the balance unsubscribed would be owned by Mackenzie & Mann if they so wished, or be open to public subscription. If this were done, that immense tract of country would not be appropriated to making multi-millionaires of two men, but it would give every citizen in Canada an opportunity of having something substantial to his credit in this golden heritage which Providence has placed within our control. If the Government do that, they will have achieved something that will make their names favourably remembered, longer even than the Yukon district will be remembered in the history of Canada.

Now, Sir, I do not know that I have very much more to say on this question, but I urgently press upon the Government this proposition which I have outlined. I do not put it before the House as an idea that has originated with myself alone, because I know that many others have looked upon

this as a proper way in which to administer this very rich territory. I do not take to myself the credit of originating the idea as I have said, but I do urge it with all the earnestness in my power on the consideration of the Government. If these gentlemen opposite insist upon the Bill now before the House, and do not withdraw it, I commend my suggestions as a proper means of enabling the people of Canada to share in the wealth of this region. Many people will say that there is no guarantee that the millions of acres given to Mackenzie & Mann contain large quantities of gold, but, Sir, gold is not the only thing valuable in that country. It has been repeated over and over again by members on this side of the House, although members on the other side seem to forget it, that gold is not the only thing that is of value in the Yukon district. The people of that country cannot eat gold, the people of that country cannot warm themselves with gold, the people of that country cannot clothe themselves with gold, the people of that country cannot build houses out of gold nor can they construct furniture out of gold, and one of the strongest objections to that contract is that Mackenzie & Mann have it within their power, not only to take a very large proportion of the mineral bearing lands but to monopolize almost all the timber in that country. Owning the railway which carries food and supplies to the Yukon, they can prevent the importation of any wood except such as is cut on their own reserves. They can charge almost any price they like for transportation, and even if there were not an ounce of gold in the region, they can make millions of dollars out of the timber which must be found on this vast land grant.

From what I have already said I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I need add, that it is my intention to vote against the second reading of the Bill. I shall take this course, not because I have any ill-will to the Government, not because I come here to create a factious opposition to measures of the Government, not because I have any ill-will towards the men who have been given this contract, not because I am not willing that they should make all the money they possibly can in the conduct of their business, but because I feel as a representative of the people, that it is my duty to consider well every point of connection with this contract before I vote upon it.

In coming to this conclusion I have put myself in the position, in my own mind, of one who had it in his power to decide whether this railroad should be built or not. I have taken into consideration whether I would run the risk of having a number of people suffer a great deal in that country rather than that Canada should be robbed of this large amount of territory for the purpose of building that road. But it is because I do not fear that people will suffer as much as has been said through the fault

of this Parliament, because I do not fear that this country will lose any great amount of trade by preventing the building of this road in the immediate future, because I think that this country is paying too high a price for the contract which has been entered into by the Government, and because I think it is criminal or almost criminal on the part of the Parliament of this country to vote away, to individuals, such a large territory, the heritage of the children of this country, that I have determined to give my vote against the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. MAXWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we have all listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent words of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn). I am sure that it rejoices all our hearts to know that he has given this subject such mature consideration, and I am sure that we on this side deeply regret that he has come to the decision which he has made known before sitting down. I am almost afraid, Mr. Speaker, to venture into this debate, owing to the very severe castigation which a third-session member of this House has already received; but as I listened to the hon. member, especially in the covert insinuation which he made by introducing the rumours of the street into this House, I felt that even a third-session member would hardly be so indiscreet as to commit such a blunder as that. What is rumour but gossip, and what is gossip but slander? and it seems to me very unwise for a wise man like the hon. member for Montreal Centre to bring in the slanders of the street for the purpose of insidiously blackening the characters of men whom we all know and respect. The hon. member complained, in his opening remarks, that the Government had not taken into consideration our rights at Wrangel. That seemed to me a very foolish question to raise, because I cannot imagine that the Government would be so lax in their duty in that regard. But what need had they to inquire into our rights particularly? Those rights are well defined, and they are well known; and I was glad, and I am sure the country rejoices, at the position which the Prime Minister took when he said that he would stand firmly and unflinchingly by the rights which the Washington Treaty gives to Canada. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to try to understand the position of the Government with regard to this railway contract. Of course, our view of the contract will depend greatly on our view of the circumstances in which the Government were placed. We on the Pacific Coast have perhaps had a better idea than most hon. members of this House of the position the Government occupied. One of the fiercest struggles or battles for trade was being fought out there that perhaps had ever been fought, not only in this country, but in almost any other country in the world. On the one hand, we had the

Mr. QUINN.

Americans, who were alive to the discovery which had been made on the Klondike, and the trade and traffic which that discovery would create.

They had the men, they had the ships,
They had the money too.

We on our side, realizing that that country belonged to Canada, were determined that as far as possible that trade should be done by the merchants of Canada and also by the farmers of Canada. Now, out of that situation there arose one of the greatest emergencies which could possibly confront a Government or a people. There were some people in the east who had no idea that such an emergency existed. One wise luminary in the Conservative party, or one that seeks to help the Conservative party in the city of Ottawa, the Ottawa "Citizen," in an article said that this railway was not necessitated by the emergency of the moment. We have a far wiser Conservative light on the Pacific Coast; I refer to the Victoria "Colonist," a paper which I think every Conservative member of this House will recognize as a very valuable aid and a very valuable friend in all their struggles. In reply to this article of the Ottawa "Citizen" the Victoria "Colonist" published a special article dealing with the question, in which, among other things, it said:

We tell the "Citizen" that an emergency exists, and one of the gravest character. The Yukon needs a railway. The exploitation of its enormous wealth will be impossible without a railway. Unless a line is built this year there will certainly be a great deal of distress among the miners next winter, and what perhaps is of even greater importance, the development of the wealth of the region will be seriously retarded.

The case is one in which it was necessary for the Government to come to the assistance of the business men by adopting a policy that will secure the early construction of the railway. The coast cities of Canada were handicapped in the struggle by the fact that all the trans-continental railway lines in the United States, all the newspapers, and many commercial organizations were fighting them. Capital in large amounts and prejudice in immeasurable quantity were massed against them. They realized that there was only one way in which to keep what is theirs by right, and that was to secure the construction of a line of railway from the Stikine to Lake Teslin, which line can be reached in summer by steamers carrying the flag of Canada, and can later be extended to an open port in British Columbia, thereby securing for all time to come Canadian supremacy in Canadian territory.

That is the expression of Conservative sentiment on the Pacific Coast with regard to this emergency; and I challenge contradiction of that statement from hon. gentlemen opposite. Shakspeare reminds us that—

There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which taken at the flood leads on to fortune.

I believe that the Government of this country, realizing the tide which was about to flow over our land in the shape of commercial prosperity, took advantage of it, and that, in this contract, which we are considering, and upon which I hope we shall soon be called upon to vote, we have that which will lead on the people of Canada to great commercial prosperity as well as great happiness. So far as the Pacific Coast is concerned, I know that we were full of zeal and earnestness and enthusiasm for this railway, and I believe Conservatives and Liberals alike exerted the greatest pressure possible upon the Government to do something in order to secure the trade of this region for the people of Canada. As I glance over the various steps which the Government has taken, I cannot but see in them indications that the Government was alive to the occasion. We had, for example, the sending out of the North-west mounted police, and here let me say that the men who were sent out were about the finest specimens physically that a country could possibly boast of possessing, and I consider it my duty to say that, so far as I have met them and heard of them in that distant country, they are a credit to Canada and Canada ought to feel proud of them. Again the wisdom of the Government in sending out these men has been more than evidenced by the fact that they have not only preserved law and order in that country, but have been helpful in many other ways, not only in feeding those who might have perished from hunger, but in saving others who had almost lain down by the wayside, and who, but for timely assistance, would have perished from the cold. The humanitarian deeds which the police have performed in that country have earned for them among the people of Skagway and Dyea and all those who pass through those districts, everlasting gratitude and admiration. Then we had the appointment of Major Walsh as administrator. I need hardly refer to the chorus of praise which came from every part of Canada for the wisdom shown by the Government in selecting this gentleman, and as I had the honour of travelling with him through Skagway and Dyea, I am in a position to bear evidence to his wonderful nerve and ability and fitness in every respect for the work to which he has been assigned, and I look forward to his administration of that country with great confidence and hope. We had also the appointment of Judge Maguire, and those who know that amiable gentleman have perfect confidence in his ability to wisely and impartially administer justice in that country. But perhaps the thing which most revealed the earnestness of the Government and their desire to do the best they could for this distant country, and likewise to obtain for the people of the other portions of Canada the prosperity which the development of that country must na-

turally create, was the determination of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to go out himself, that he might examine the different routes, come in contact with the different classes of people in the different sections, and on the information thus obtained frame a policy which would be of national benefit. I take pride in saying that no man has ever tried to serve his country better than did my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, that no man has ever been more faithful or alert in the prosecution of his duties, and I say that there is no man in this House who can come near the hon. Minister as regards an intimate and accurate knowledge of the position. The decision of the hon. Minister in this matter was based upon the best information obtainable and the most complete knowledge which was possible for any individual man or Minister to acquire. All these things together, weighed seriously and earnestly, justify to my mind at least, the completeness and comprehensiveness the grasp which the Government has for the needs of the Yukon country.

The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) criticised, as in duty bound, the policy of the Government in this and other respects. There is no one in this House who listens to him with more pleasure than I do. I consider that he is a Canadian wonder, a man of wonderful vitality and earnestness, and of whom we may all be proud, but criticism may, like ambition, over-leap itself. Wise criticism has a salutary effect, but as reckless criticism misses the mark. I think I never heard the hon. gentleman speak so ineffectively, because I never heard him speak so recklessly as when criticising this policy of the Government. He told us that the Government had gone to sleep. "Do nothingness" was also one of the classical terms which he applied to the Administration, and then, with that vim which he possesses so abundantly, he told us that the Government had shamefully neglected its duties. These words seem to me like tinkling brass and sounding cymbals. There was no reason for the noise he made or for this particular criticism, and I believe that I am voicing the sentiment of the people when I say that such criticisms are perfectly unjustifiable and of no particular effect. They resemble rockets rising, one by one, into the air and making a noise as they go up, but ending in smoke and eternal blackness. Of course I know that a leader of an Opposition has to say something, and I know that something must have in it that which will rouse the drooping courage and the fainting hearts of his followers, as he leads them on to what they know is a hopeless battle. But all the same I rejoice to know that there are those on the Conservative side of this House who can rise superior to the inglorious exigencies of party, and who prefer to stick to the truth than to

what is best but a dream of fiction. I believe that the Government did all that a wise and up to date Government could possibly do; I believe that they acted wisely and well; I believe that every movement they made, every appointment they made, every decision arrived at, were all so many evidences that they are men who counted the cost, and had complete knowledge of what they ought to do and hence acted intelligently and wisely, I believe further that whatever errors the Government may have committed, we cannot consistently lay this charge of "do nothingness" or masterly inactivity at their doors. I might say further that if that had only been my opinion or the opinion of those who sit on this side, or those who are friendly to the Government outside of the House, it might not carry much weight, but I call to my assistance leading exponents of the Conservative party on the Pacific Coast. In one of the articles of the Conservative organs, we read that if ever there was a time for action it was this one, if ever there was an emergency, one existed in this matter, that the Government have dealt with it promptly, and their promptness has evoked an expression of congratulation on all sides. Now, I am glad to know that there are some wise men on the Conservative side as well as on this side. There are no newspapers in Canada that have better knowledge of the circumstances and the facts than the coast papers of British Columbia.

But we are told, on one hand, that the Government acted slowly; that they went to sleep. And then we are told, on the other hand, that the Government acted with undue haste. Of course, I am not attempting to reconcile these opinions. One of the chief objections that has been made by hon. gentlemen opposite was, that the Government acted with undue haste, that they ought to have waited until Parliament met, that they should not have made an arrangement with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann until we assembled, and so on. Now, I could understand this objection, if it came from men who only made the objection of undue haste; but when it comes from those who state that the Government have gone to sleep and done nothing and shamefully neglected their duties, I cannot understand the force of it. We can hardly expect, if the Government had acted slowly, that they could also act quickly; and, if they had acted quickly, how can it be charged that they have gone too slowly, and thus shamefully neglected their duties? Is this the kind of criticism that the people of this country expect? I believe the people are willing to profit by honest and fair criticism; but, when, on one hand, we have one kind of criticism, and on the other another kind which contradicts the first, I think the people will come to the conclusion that there is a lack of genuine conviction about a great deal of the criticism which is passed by hon. gen-

Mr. MAXWELL.

tlemen opposite. I am rejoiced further to say that another Conservative member comes to my support on this point. I take a clipping from a newspaper to this effect:

The member for South Norfolk, another member of the late Conservative Administration who happened to be in Montreal, was also interviewed. He said: "It was necessary to place the work in the hands of reliable and energetic men, and the Government has certainly succeeded in doing this. In the matter of time he thinks the Government was fully justified in acting promptly and in not waiting for Parliament to meet. Delay was to have been avoided at all hazards."

So, on the question of promptness and on the question of making the contract before the House met, we have the testimony of Conservatives in different parts of the country, justifying the action of the Government.

As I have hinted, I went with the Minister of the Interior, last fall, on his trip, to see for myself about the country and to get all the information I could possibly obtain with regard to these routes. When you come to consider the question of a route, I think the Victoria "Colonist," which is the leading Conservative newspaper on the coast, speaks to the point when it says:

This railway must be built to a point in Canada or to one in the United States. If it is to be one in the United States, a great city will grow up at its southern terminus, and the trade of the country will pass into the hands of Americans. If the terminus of the road is in Canada the freight will be controlled by Canadians.

I think that is a very fair statement of the case. When we look at Skagway, for example, one is at once convinced that for us to start a railway there is certainly to build up the town of Skagway at the expense of Canada. This is even more true with regard to Dyea, because you not only help to build up a town at Dyea, but also one about 12 miles inland, before the most difficult ascent begins. The same is true in connection with the Chilkat Pass and also with the Taku Inlet. The only available route in that section of the country, the only one which presents itself to any one seeking information, as one likely to benefit the people of Canada, is the route by the Stikine River. I do not say that that is the best route; I would not be so selfish as to say that, though it runs in connection with my own constituency. But it was the only route, I think, speaking in all fairness, it was the one most available, the one that could be best used, the one that could be brought into such a state that most of the goods that would have to be taken into that country could most easily be taken by that particular way. Now, by adopting this route, what are we doing? We are building up the town of Glenora. So many people have settled there that I have received an application for a post office. We are building a town also at

Telegraph Creek. The people are beginning to congregate there, so I had to make application that a postmaster be appointed there also. So that, in spite of all complications that may arise at Wrangel, the policy of the Government is building up towns on the Canadian side and holding a trade that will be of service commercially and otherwise to the whole people of Canada. With regard to the question of shipping, I do not intend to enter into that, because I think it has been very freely discussed. I cannot help saying that a great deal more has been said about this than is necessary. I do not know that it was wise of us to discuss these questions at the present moment in Parliament. Further, it seems to me—I hope I am mistaken—as if at least some hon. gentlemen on the opposite side would be very glad, it would be a matter of great rejoicing to them, one of the sweetest things that ever entered into their lives, if the Americans should in any way block the policy of the Government by putting obstructions in their way at the mouth of the Stikine River. I hold that there are times in our lives when we ought to rise superior to mere party instincts or desires. There are times when our country ought to be dearer to us than mere party success. And, if ever there was a time in the history of Canada when we ought to act as one, one in sentiment and one in aim, it is the present moment. We should show the American people that, while we may fight and wrangle over our own home affairs, when it comes to the question of Canada's honour, we are willing to bury these differences and join as one man in support of our country.

I was amused with the speech of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). It has already been referred to, but I think I ought to say a word or two with regard to it. I did not like the speech at all, because I thought it was so unlike the hon. gentleman, who generally takes a very broad view of any question he discusses. This evening, he again commenced to discuss this Stikine route. Evidently, he does not like it, because one of his first statements was that the Dominion of Canada would not benefit in the trade for food products by this route as it would if some other route had been adopted, but particularly one near his own section of country.

Then he said there are ten million dollars worth of trade to be done by the United States or by Canada, and he asked who was going to do that trade. He said further that there were only three constituencies in British Columbia who were interested in the Stikine route, and that all the other constituencies represented in this House were interested in some route near to Edmonton. Now, I say that is neither a fair nor a true statement of the case at all. I say with all due respect to the hon. member for Alberta, that the people of Canada will be as much benefited

by the Stikine route as by any other route which might have been adopted by the Government. Of course, I cannot agree with the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) when he said that we could at the present moment supply the food for the people who are passing into the Yukon. We do not produce enough to supply our own wants at the present time. But where do we get it from? The hon. member for Alberta referred to the fact that we imported somewhere about four million dollars worth from the United States. But then what is that composed of, and at what particular places in British Columbia does this trade take place? Most hon. members know that in the Rossland district, especially at the beginning, almost the whole of that section fell into the hands of Americans on account of the proximity of the place to Spokane. Even at the present moment a great many merchants do business there. Then again we have to import a great deal of fruit into British Columbia from California. We have had to import likewise a great deal of machinery for our mines in British Columbia, because the people of eastern Canada were not prepared to supply it, and there are a great many other things necessary to our mining development which they are not yet prepared to supply. So that when you come down to actual food supplies imported from California or other states, they dwindle almost into insignificance. But what benefit will this Stikine route be to eastern people? Now I am glad I do not need to say very much so far as that is concerned; but I will quote you the testimony of one of the leading merchants of Montreal, who said:

Our manufacturers are working day and night, some of them in the endeavour to overtake orders which they have for supplies. Grocers, clothiers, rubber manufacturers, boot and shoe people, are all blessing their good fortune; and the completion of the railway will bring much more of the Yukon gold down here in payment for food and clothing.

Now, it seems to me all nonsense for any one to talk about this Stikine route being opposed to the interests of the people of eastern Canada. I say that almost every particle of stuff that we are selling in Vancouver, in Victoria and in New Westminster to-day, in connection with this trade we are bringing from Alberta, and from Manitoba, Ontario and Québec. Every business in every district in Canada to-day is being benefited in equal measure by the extraordinary prosperity which this Yukon development and the policy of the Government are bringing about at the present time. Now, another objection has been brought against the Government because they did not call for tenders. The question each one has to decide for himself is, Was the Government justified in acting as they did? Considering the cir-

cumstances of the case—and we all believe that circumstances alter cases—it seems to me that, owing to the emergent nature of the case, the Government were perfectly justified in acting as they have done. There are times in every individual life, there are times in the life of a business man, there are times even in the history of a nation, when delay means defeat and disaster all round. I say that delay in connection with this case was what the people of Canada did not want, as it would have retarded the commercial prosperity of the country, and would have been playing into the hands of Americans and benefiting them commercially. So I say again that the Government were perfectly justified in acting thus, because at the very moment when that position was made known to the country a complete change took place in the direction taken by people going to the coast, and from that day began the great prosperity which we are enjoying at the present time. Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite have been making a great fuss about a gentleman called Hamilton Smith. I do not know anything about the gentleman, I do not want to say anything disrespectful about him, but we know in British Columbia a great deal about these men who represent great capital, and in nine cases out of ten these very men cannot pay their board bills.

Mr. MILLS. Is that the case with Hamilton Smith?

Mr. MAXWELL. I do not know anything about him.

Mr. MILLS. No, nor do you want to know.

Mr. MAXWELL. I say I do not wish to say anything disrespectful about him; but out in British Columbia our experience with men coming out from different countries and pretending to represent great capital, has been that in nine cases out of ten they cannot pay their board bills. We are sick of those men altogether. We talk about the Canadian people, we boast on this and that platform about our growing Canadian life, and our national sentiment. Well, here we have two Canadians in Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, men who have been born in the country, men against whom not one single word has been said on either side of the House, men in whom we seem to have perfect confidence, men who are able and willing to do this work; why, then, in the name of common sense, is it that these hon. gentlemen have so much love for a man about whom they know very little, a stranger to the country, and yet will not support men of their own blood, of their own country? Now, with regard to the land subsidy, I may say that I am strongly opposed to giving away our land. We have suffered very severely in British Columbia by a policy which I think has been a fail-

Mr. MAXWELL.

ure on the part of our government out there, in giving away the land of the people to this and that railway company, to this and that individual. Perhaps there is no part of the Dominion at the present time affording a better object lesson of the evils of giving away land than in British Columbia. But in my opinion, there is all the difference in the world between agricultural land and supposed mineralized land. Is there any consistency, for example, in the policy of the Opposition in this respect? I could appreciate the force of their objections if their own policy had been in any wise different. When they were in power they gave away the best land of the North-west, the land that was their heritage and the heritage of their children and of their children's children. But not a word of complaint, not a murmur did we hear from them against that wholesale slaughter of this invaluable heritage. And yet here is land about which we know little or nothing as to what may be in it, and oh, what horror, what dreadful compunction of soul, seizes upon these hon. gentlemen at the thought of giving away some of this land. We have no particular knowledge as to whether there is any value in it, but so far as agricultural land is concerned, we know there is a value in that. You can always compute the number of dollars that will be taken out of agricultural land, that is always a valuable asset, and always will be of importance to a people, and to those who own it. So far as that land in the Yukon is concerned, there seems to be a small section of it that may be valuable, so far as we know, but so far as the great bulk of it is concerned, we do not know that it ever will be worth a single cent to any individual or to the contractors to whom it may be given when the time comes. Sir, we see at the present time in hon. gentlemen opposite a wonderful exhibition of the working of the imagination. Sometimes individuals and parties develop one bump and afterwards develop another bump. The Opposition are at the present time developing the imaginative faculty. Of course the poet is the man to whom this faculty is supposed to belong; but I do not know whether hon. gentlemen opposite want to treat the subject in a poetical manner or not, although they are giving great scope to this particular faculty. But we know that some people have diseased imaginations and it almost seems to me as if the Opposition were giving evidence that their imaginations were diseased at the present time. What is the simple statement of the case? The Government want a railway built. The Government take the position that it is for Canadian interests that a railway should be built in to the Yukon. They offer so many acres of land, about which they know nothing. The contractors after consideration, and possibly giving a little rein to their im-

aginative faculty, decide to accept the conditions of the Government. The Opposition of the present moment with the aid of this wonderful organ seems to think that Mr. Mackenzie is a sort of modern Aladdin with the wonderful lamp of the Yukon in his hand and with unimaginable riches in his possession. Any one who has read Disraeli's works will know about the gambler. We can imagine the gambler sitting down with money in his hand, imagining to himself that if he makes his risk a fortune will pass into his pocket. He takes the risk; but he may lose or he may win. As regards this contract, I will not call it a gamble, but it is a matter into which the contractors have gone with their eyes open, determined to build the road and make the best of the bargain entered into with the Government; and I think, considering all the circumstances, the best wishes of this House ought to follow these men in the heroic endeavours they are about to make for the opening up of this portion of the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that this contract is in favour of the contractors. There are some men, however, who take a correct view of this bargain, and I have pleasure in calling as a witness a Conservative, a man who is regarded as a staunch Conservative and one of the pillars of the party—I refer to Mr. Edward Gurney, President of the Board of Trade of Toronto. He said:

I think that if the Canadian Government had advertised for tenders upon the basis of 3,700,000 acres of land with the other conditions that attach to this contract, and had called upon people to bid in the usual way, providing a cash payment for any increase in the terms of the offer, the whole thing would have any time within the past year been taken as a piece of humour, and the people who are howling most loudly now would have been the loudest laughers at the absurd proposition. It is the old Toronto complaint of not valuing things till some one gets his hands on them; then comes the rub. I believe the Government has done a good thing. I cannot conceive how it is possible for Mr. Mackenzie to carry out the stipulated conditions. I suppose, however, he has given the matter thought before putting his name to paper.

That is the testimony of a man, who if he has not the instincts of government, has at least the instincts of business, and that is the instinct which is most necessary when discussing a business transaction.

Again, with respect to this proposed gamble, we have other Conservative testimony which I may read for the benefit of the Conservative party—I refer to the *Victoria "Colonist."* That journal says:

As we have already said, the contractors have taken a great risk, and the compensation allowed them therefor may or may not be excessive. Under the best system of calculating that can be devised this must remain an open question. We repeat that the people here on the coast, who know the situation and who understand what a loss to the whole country delay will mean, are not disposed to listen with much patience to quibbling over details.

These men know the situation and are alive to its importance, and I only hope the wisdom of that paper will be inculcated into members of the Conservative party to such an amount as may yet result in a unanimous vote being given in favour of the contract now before the House.

I need not refer to the charge made that this road will not be a railway. I merely wish to say on that point that any man who goes over the Slocan and Kaslo Railway or who knows anything about it will never say that the railway from Glenora to Teslin Lake, which is to be built in the same fashion, is not a railway. It is true the Slocan and Kaslo is a narrow-gauge road, but in every other respect it is one of the most perfect railways we have in the whole Dominion.

Again, it is charged that the contractors will make large sums out of this contract. I merely wish to say that the rush which is on at the present time may be the only rush in connection with the Yukon country. That rush will be over in September, before the railway can be opened. So far as my knowledge of the condition of affairs goes and from my reading of reports, I must say that it is not certain there will be sufficient traffic over the road after September to pay the company. The only possible way in which I can see that the railway may pay will be on account of the freight that must be carried in order to provide for the wants of the people who may go into the country; so that if the contractors don't make money out of the land, I do not expect they will make very much money out of the railway after it is built.

In conclusion, I support this contract because I think it is a contract which the people desired the Government to make. I support it because it is one which seems to rise to the occasion and meet the wants of the people at the present moment. I support it because its terms are fair alike to the people and to the contractors, and more especially fair to the people. I support it because of the action of the Government in reserving alternate claims in the lands. I support it further because every miner who is now in the country will have a sufficient opportunity to select his claim before these contractors have an opportunity of taking up lands, and so thousands of claims will be located by the miners in the Yukon. I believe also that after the contractors have taken their chance, miners will make discoveries and through those discoveries other miners will be attracted, and thus a large number of claims will be taken up before Mackenzie & Mann even hear of those discoveries.

So, take it altogether, while there may be some things that may be objectionable, some things, perhaps, that you would like taken out, and other things you would like to put in; yet, take it all in all, considering how the Government were pressed and hurried, con-

sidering the clamour for some way into and some way out of the Yukon country, considering that this is building up Canadian trade and commerce and Canadian towns and villages, and considering what will likely flow to the people of Canada from this project, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that I shall vote heartily for the second reading of this Bill.

To me, this amendment is a mere skeleton; there is no life in it; it is a mere clap trap; it is a trap, for example, to try and catch my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver); but I hope that he may be wise enough to see through the machinations of the evil party on the opposite side. The amendment says that the scheme is indefensible. Why, Sir, this amendment itself is absolutely indefensible. There is nothing to defend in it. What I have seen take place in this House to-day was to me one of the greatest wonders, because, when the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) was speaking, and when he was talking about the Edmonton route, whenever he said a word against the Stikine route, we had "Hear, hears" and applause from hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, in the days when the solid six came from British Columbia, these were the days when the Conservative party thought wonders of British Columbia. But that is all changed. When we have to tell the people out there that anything that is being done by this Government to build up British Columbia is jeered at by the Conservative side of the House, the people of British Columbia will have their eyes open to the character of the Conservative party; and I believe their confidence and support will go out more fully to this Liberal Government, which is trying to do something, not merely for British Columbia, but for the whole people of Canada. I say, in conclusion, that in accordance with the sentiment which I have always expressed, the question which is before us is one which ought to rise above partisanship. The most bigoted political partisan must recognize that Canada is waking from the dead; it is rising up to a new life. There are signs of commercial prosperity through all and over all the provinces. I make no claim as to who brings that prosperity, but it is evident to all that there is prosperity in the country, that our people are busy and more than busy. Why, most business places in Vancouver have had to double their accommodation and to double their stores. The iron works have had to be extended; they are importing men from the east; we have our shipbuilding yards making boats for the Stikine and Teslin Lake and other places. Never the like business activity has been seen in the history of British Columbia as we witness at the present time. Gentlemen, are you going to block this; are you going to play into the hands of the enemy? I do not care what the Americans may do; to me it is not of the slightest interest what

Mr. MAXWELL.

the American Senate may do, but I say this, that the members of this House ought to feel so well disposed to their rights, to their privileges, to their opportunities upon the highway which treaty has given them that if the American people should attempt to block us, so far as the Stikine River is concerned, we ought to be as one in our determination that if we cannot get the all-Canadian route that way, we shall have it another way, so that the whole trade of this country may be preserved for the Canadian people.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, Walter Savage Landor tells us, in one of his imaginary conversations between Pitt and Canning, that when Pitt thinks he is about to hand over his illustrious successor the reins of government, he attempts to inculcate into him the mysteries of political administration. There are a few words that particularly apply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell) who has just taken his seat. "My dear Canning," said he, "when the clouds gather around you, when you find yourself in a difficult position, above all things, Canning, be patriotic, be patriotic. Swear to the Gods that you only remain in power to serve the interests of your country, and that you are unwilling in this great crisis in your country's history to hand over her destinies to be the prey of cruel demagogues. Canning, as a last resort, be pious; the people believe in religion, and the people believe in piety."

My friend the illustrious representative from Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) has played both roles to-night: he commenced by being patriotic; he wound up by being pious. Just what particular bump in his cranium had been disturbed, or what particular ganglion in his cerebral make up has been affected, I do not know. There has been some change in his life by which the preaching of religion has been given up for the practice of it in politics—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. POWELL. Hon. gentlemen opposite must see that I was paying the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell) a great compliment. I said he gave up the preaching of religion and now attended to the practice of it. Hon. gentlemen opposite were hasty in their cries of dissent.

Mr. FOSTER. They did not believe you.

Mr. POWELL. If that does not suit, to use the expression of my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Monk), we might reverse the laugh, and I think the contrary would meet with more condemnation probably than the correct understanding of what I have said. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell) has referred to the action of the Government as not being hasty. Whether it be hasty or not hasty, I am not going this evening to discuss, but there is one thing I shall say. The action of the Government

is submitted to Parliament for its approval or for its disapproval, and this scheme comes before the House to-night as if it were a scheme coming for the opinion of the House in the first instance. And, Sir, when we are weighing the arguments advanced, we must weigh them free entirely from any consideration as to what the results to the Government may be, for in the terms of the contract itself, it must be approved by the Parliament of Canada before it can be operative, and unless a statute of ratification is passed, the contract simply falls to the ground.

The Solicitor General, the other evening, expressed great surprise, and he told us that the discussion had been a series of surprises. I can assure him, this discussion has been a series of surprises to gentlemen on this side of the House. It was a great surprise, when a gentleman of the ability of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) came before the House with one of the most important measures that had ever been submitted to Parliament—and I shall justify my assertion in a few moments by showing how it is one of the most important measures that has been submitted to this Parliament—it was a great surprise that that hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) should come before this House and glory in his enormous wealth of ignorance concerning this contract; and it was a great surprise that the only thing he could advance to this House as a ground on which we could endorse and ratify the action of the Government, was, because it was a subject on which the Government knew nothing and the transaction with Mann & Mackenzie was a huge gamble.

That, Sir, was a great surprise. It was greater surprise that a gentleman of his ability, upon a great question like this, upon which he should have risen to the dignity of statesmanship, should have side-tracked the discussion to a spirited, able and decent discussion of the manners of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) when he was a boy. It was also, Sir, a great surprise to this House to find the Solicitor General of Canada (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who from his position is entitled to have his words treated as being at least the genuine expression of his heart and mind, resorting to what, if it were not unparliamentary, I would say, was the trick of a pettifogger in giving to the House the view of Mr. Phillimore by reading from a text-book one-half of a passage, and suppressing the other which contained the author's disapproval of the first half which has merely a recital of opinions he condemned. It was a surprise to this House that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) a young man—whatever may be his ability I care not—that one of his short existence in the House should have directed to a gentleman of the age and experience and reputation of the hon. leader of the Opposition, language and demeanour which would lead us to suppose that during his stay in the

wild and woolly west he had acquired some possessions coarser than fine gold. It was also a surprise to this House that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), a gentleman whose long parliamentary record is an honourable one, should have treated the question in the manner he did. Whatever suspicions we may have of other men on that side of the House, I would pay him the compliment of saying that the members of the Opposition in this House, and the country generally, have never supposed his course to be directed by mercenary considerations, nor by other than fairly high political principles. It was a surprise, I say, that a man of his ability, when this great question of national importance was before us, had nothing more to offer to this House and the country than a complicated mosaic of stale witticisms of most antique pattern.

It is necessary for us, Mr. Speaker, in discussing this matter, to look fairly and squarely in the face the issue as submitted to Parliament. What is submitted to Parliament? A scheme to construct a railway across the coast range of mountains. The great object these gentlemen have in view is to open up communication with the great northern country known as the Yukon district. That is their great object; and for their alleged haste they put upon record this justification. They say that the road is demanded in the interests of trade and good government and that it was necessary under the circumstances to violate that sacred political principle that every scheme involving a disposition of the public funds of this country, should in the first place receive the assent of Parliament. They say that their justification for the course they have taken was the emergency of the situation, and that emergency imperatively demanded immediate action.

Gentlemen on this side of the House are as anxious that a highway should be opened to the Yukon country as gentlemen on that side of the House. If it is essential that that means of ingress into and egress from the district should be opened up immediately, we are as willing to open it up as they are. If this scheme is a good one and to carry it out involves a tax upon the public treasury of this country, is the record of the Liberal-Conservative party such that they are afraid to spend public money for the necessary opening up and development of any section of this country? Hon. gentlemen talk about extravagant land grants made by the Conservative party when in power in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I myself might declare that I am in favour of no monopoly of any kind; and at the time that monopoly in land was foisted upon this country, the reason it was done was because of the clamour of the

Liberal party in this Parliament, the Opposition of the day, who protested against taking from the public treasury a dollar for opening up a country which they claimed was destined for ages and ages to be the home of the wolf and the bear. But, Sir, when the country rose to a just appreciation of the magnitude of that country, and realized how wise and patriotic was the principle that directed the party led by Sir John Macdonald, and when the Government of the day, feeling that the monopoly of land was too large, proposed to take 10,000,000 acres of that land back, who raised the howl but hon. gentlemen opposite.

They say that they wish to get a means of communication to the Yukon country during the present autumn—for what purpose? In order that famine and disease shall not be rampant in that lone land. I can assure them that we on this side of the House have as much sympathy for our fellow-men as they have. We are willing to go to any reasonable expense to help out those adventurous men of our own nationality who have gone to be the pioneers in that land; but I for one, object to the expenditure of one cent to aid any alien proletariat who go into that country, not for the purpose of building up Canada, but for the purpose of filching our riches and carrying them off to a foreign country.

Now, Sir, this scheme which is submitted to the House opens up four considerations. In the first place, is it necessary to have means of communication into that country at all? In the second place, is it necessary to have means of communication into that country opened up before the 1st of September, 1898? In the third place, so far as a railway forms a link in the chain of proposed communication, is it necessary to select the Stikine route? And, lastly, is it advisable to give this enormous land grant which the Government propose to give to this company? To the consideration of these four matters I shall now address myself for a few moments.

With the object of opening up to the outside world this great country, we on this side are in most hearty sympathy; I regard this, as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat regards it, as one of the great epochs or turning points in the history of this country. In the history of every country in which large quantities of gold have been discovered—in Australia, California, New Zealand—the opening up of large and rich tracts of gold-bearing lands has been ever the cause of stupendous development of the country. Victoria was simply a colony of convicts until the discovery of gold, after which her population leaped up in one decade from about 75,000 to about 541,000 souls. The population of California, the year before the discovery of gold, was about 100,000, and four years afterwards it had increased to about 225,000. The only reason why the discovery of gold

in British Columbia did not give the same great impetus to the development of that country, was that geographical conditions were against it. California and Australia had great stretches of arable land fit for cultivation, and the settlement of those lands followed the discovery of gold. There is a lesson for the Government to ponder over and profit by.

Let us look for one moment at the geographical condition of the Yukon. That district lies, severed from Eastern Canada by a long untraversed stretch of country. It is in close proximity to the Pacific Ocean. Lay out a map before you and the great fact will strike you immediately, that to make a entrepot for the district on the Pacific slope is to rob us of the great advantages that are now opening up before us. There can be no question but that the development of the Yukon must increase trade enormously. In all probability the increase in the next ten years in the trade in agricultural and manufactured products will range between \$10,000,000 and \$20,000,000 annually. The province of British Columbia, despite the eloquent arguments made by my hon. friend from that province (Mr. Morrison), last evening and this afternoon is not an agricultural country. It is absurd to talk about it as such. Almost the entire agricultural products consumed in that province either come from the Canadian North-west or from the Pacific States in the great Republic to the south. So far as agricultural products are concerned, what countries are going to compete for the trade of the whole, and what is likely to be the amount of that trade? If you will take the estimate of the requirements of the British army, making allowance for horses and cattle which will be taken into the country, you will find that a population of 100,000 and there will probably be that many the next year or the year after in that region—means a trade in agricultural products of about \$5,000,000 per annum. Who is going to get that trade is the question for this Government to solve in the interests of our people. \$5,000,000 annually! Is it going to flow into the pockets of the farmers of Canada or shall it go into the pockets of the farmers of Oregon and Washington Territory and California, who are our great competitors for that trade? How do we stand as respecting our facilities to capture this trade? Against the Americans are the customs duties of Canada; but against the Canadian North-west is a long stretch of transportation with a series of transshipments. Circumstances are overwhelmingly in favour of the Americans, and I have no hesitation in saying that, so far as the trade in agricultural products is concerned, the Americans have even now stolen that away from us, if this iniquitous contract is proceeded with. The Government have committed themselves to a policy which, if carried out, would be most detrimental to the interests of the

farmers of Canada. They lack foresight and are unequal to the occasion.

Then the other branch of trade is that in manufactured articles. In the lighter lines, there is no question but a large amount of that trade will go to Canada. But in the heavier and bulkier articles, it is as certain as that the sun will rise to-morrow, that the geographical conditions of the country will force that trade to states of the great Republic lying on the Pacific slope, unless British Columbia rises up and becomes a great manufacturing country—which it cannot become simply because it has not constituency enough for trade. The plea of these hon. gentlemen opposite is that they are opening up this country and building this railway—for what? To give Canada the trade? Why, does not the force of the absurdity of such a plea dawn upon you? If the natural circumstances in favour of the United States are such that without any railway that trade is going to be filched away from us by the republic, will not the increased facilities which we are opening to the United States as well as ourselves to get into that country make it still easier for them to capture that trade? That plea, Sir, is false and hollow. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has been referred to by the correspondent of the Montreal "Witness" as a perfect Napoleon in commercial strategy. Well, Mr. Speaker, if he were a perfect Napoleon in commercial strategy, he would never have undertaken the scheme he is endeavouring to thrust upon this country. He is the Napoleon of Leipzig and Waterloo. The rule in military, and it applies in commercial matters as well, is to get your base of supplies as close to the field of action as possible. Start your road, as my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has said, start your means of communication, say at Edmonton, push it up directly to the Pelly River, and then have steamboat navigation to the gold fields of the Yukon. By doing that, you will ensure for all time the trade of that country in agricultural products to the people of the North-west, and the member of the North-west who votes for this contract is untrue to his constituents, and, in the language of John Quincy Adams, "will go down to posterity but damned to eternal fame." The moment hon. gentlemen reflect that the agricultural products of Canada, to compete with the products of the United States, have to cross and recross the Rockies, subject to transshipment and whatever bothersome regulations the United States may make as regards the navigation of the Stikine, that moment you recognize our weakness in successful competition, in agricultural products by way of any Pacific Coast line.

I return to the trade in manufactured articles. So far as that is concerned, build your road from Edmonton, and its strategic importance is such that Canada, as long as

she is a manufacturing country, will have the trade in manufactured products and the United States cannot compete with her. As a matter of strategy, the interest of this country would be served by preventing any access whatever from the Pacific Ocean for agricultural and manufactured products, by allowing nothing further than means of access simply for the men who choose to go in and out of the country. That barrier of the rocky mountain Providence has put there. Construct a railway and you open for the American Cyrus a path through the impregnable walls that guard this Babylon. The moment that is done you guarantee the loss to Canada of one-half if not nine-tenths of the Yukon trade.

The second point is: I will discuss the desirability to have that road constructed by the 1st of September? What is the plea of the Government? It is that the rush of adventurous spirits into that country will be such that during the present winter famine will stare them in the face. All I have to say about it, that if it is necessary to have that road constructed and an avenue opened up for trade before the 1st of September, for this reason, then these gentlemen on the Treasury benches have created the necessity. Did not every man who went in there last year take sufficient provisions to last him throughout the winter? The people of the world knew the requirements, and those who went in went prepared to meet the difficulties of the case. But if men going in this year are not prepared, it is because those gentlemen opposite have given out to the world that by the 1st of September there will be abundant facilities for taking in supplies and all fear of famine might be scattered to the winds. It is not necessary for me to discuss at any length the question whether it is necessary by the 1st of September to complete this road. I ask you, what reason exists for opening up that country during the present year at all. The one great object of getting into that country is to get the gold. That cannot rot; it must remain there, secure in its casement of frost. It will not run away; it will not be stolen; men must go there to take it out, and if men do not go there to take it out it will remain, and whether it is taken out this year or next year is perfectly immaterial, so long as we are guaranteed the trade when it is taken out.

I hear a remark from the hon. member from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), but I do not catch exactly what he says. The hon. member has such a euphonic voice that I always like to hear him. Will he please repeat this observation?

An hon. MEMBER. He settled the question.

Mr. POWELL. It was a very effectual settlement of one question when he, one of the great leaders of the Liberal party who had shared in the battle was neglected

in the division of the spoil. I think it will take a little of the gold of the Yukon to smooth over the difficulties in his case.

Now, let us pass on to the Stikine route. We must bear in mind that the railway is only one of three stages of communication. First, there is the navigation of the Stikine River to Glenora; second, there is the railway across from the Stikine to the head of Teslin Lake, and, in the third place, there is the navigation of the chain of lakes and rivers down to Dawson City. Take these three stages by themselves. First, the portion from the mouth of the Stikine to the head of navigation on it. Remember that all the material for the construction of the railway has to be taken up the Stikine River, and has to be there for the 1st of September. Hon. gentlemen if they reflect one moment, will see clearly that all the boats that these gentlemen, Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie, are preparing to put on that route will not of themselves be equal to the task of the carriage of the railway material. What do these little steamboats that are to be put upon this route amount to? It is said that large boats can be towed up the river. I do not intend to quibble about the size of the boats; but I say that any man who has had any experience of nautical affairs at all who will propound to this House as a practical proposition that steamboats can go up an eight-mile current in a crooked river and tow barges, is either a knave or a fool. In the first place, think what an enormous current an eight-mile current is. It must be an eight-mile freight boat that holds her own against it. And if she has to tow a barge, and if the barge is as large as herself, it would take a most powerful and fast boat to make her way up that river, if it were possible against the current. The engine power of such a boat would be enormous, and there is not the depth of water to float her. I claim in respect to this matter, to have considerable practical knowledge and I venture the assertion that no steamboat can go up that stream against an eight-knot current herself unless assisted by warps around the turns. This is borne out by the reports submitted by the Government. The moment she puts her bow past a point where there is a sharp turn in the river, and is struck on the bow by the current, she is swung around as quick as lightning and, with the speed she has got on she must be dashed on the rocks opposite the point. Anybody who knows anything about vessels will appreciate the almost impossible difficulties to contend against. The Minister of Public Works may talk about this as though it were an easy matter. Mr. Ogilvie in his report mentions the fact that a boat going up the river was obliged to use warps to get around the turn. They were not obliged to use warps to overcome the current, but to keep the vessel in the

channel. A warp attached to the bow of the boat is made fast to the shore and as she strikes the current coming around a bend in the river her bow is held, and instead of being driven over to the opposite shore, she is gradually turned in line with the rushing current, and when she is turned she can steam up on again. It is easy to see how impracticable it would be with a barge in tow to get around these turns.

Again, these gentlemen furnish information so contradictory that it is difficult to know what to rely upon and what to reject. I take it that the reliable information as to the Stikine River is not the report of Mr. Jennings or the report of Mr. Ogilvie, but the report of Mr. St. Cyr, who was selected by Mr. Jennings to make the report on this river, and is the only man who has made anything like an exhaustive survey of the river. What does he say? First, as respects the steamboat route, he tells you plainly that it takes one whole day to go up to the foot of Little Cañon, about ninety miles from the sea. The balance of the distance is fifty miles, and it takes two whole days to cover it. When a steamboat, and a powerful steamboat, requires three days to go up the river, what would a steamboat require with barges in tow? It would take a day to unload at Glenora at the head of navigation, a day to load at Wrangel. You can safely calculate on it requiring not less than six or seven days for a round trip for any of these steamboats now being constructed. These men have thirty days in which to work after the 1st of September, when the road is supposed to be completed. All the goods have to be got to the head waters of Teslin Lake before the last of September, otherwise they cannot be got down to Dawson City on account of the closing of ice of the Hootalinqua River in the first days of October. One steamboat, then, will be able to make at the outside, five trips, and that only in the best of weather. The hon. Minister of Marine is the Neptune of Canada; and his colleague the forcastle member of the Government (Mr. Dobell) seems to be the Æolus. Which of them controls the winds and waves and locks them up in a dark cavern? I do not know; at any rate, I think his jurisdiction does not extend to the Dixon Inlet. Remember, the last half of the month of September is generally very stormy. The equinoxials are on about the 21st. Every one who has had any experience of the sea knows what weather is then to be expected. I candidly admit that there are times when one could venture on the bosom of the Atlantic in a birch bark canoe. And in the same way, there are times when these scows or barges could be brought across from Wrangel to the Stikine in safety and their steamers must cross that portion of open sea. But there are other times, especially from the 15th to the

end of September when it would be impossible to get these light draft steamers and barges away from Wrangel at all. But suppose we assume, all things considered, that a steamboat makes five trips a month. What is to be taken up? Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that 50,000 tons of freight will be required to meet the wants of the people who will be there next winter.

Why, these river boats would not take more than 150 tons at the best. That means five trips apiece, it requires fifty steamboats, and I understand they are only preparing three. Now as far as the railway is concerned, what do we find? We find an attempt to deceive this House, the same as I charge the Solicitor General with attempting to deceive this House respecting international law, and as I charge the Minister of the Interior with deliberately attempting to deceive this House and trifle with its intelligence when he attempted to palm off the encomiums of a United States paper on this contract, when the terms upon which the encomiums were based were entirely different from the terms of the contract itself. This policy of hoodwinking, this policy of deceiving, is carried even into the agreement between Mann & Mackenzie and the Government. If this scheme has merits, this scheme that they talk about as the salvation of Canada, if it is going to subserve the interests of Canada to the unparalleled extent claimed, why is it necessary to indulge in falsehood and deception about it? Give us the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. I have the dimensions of these boats now building for the Stikine River. They will carry less than 150 tons each. These people in the Yukon will require 100,000 barrels of flour for the closed season of '98-'99. They will require also 13,000,000 pounds of meat. These two articles of food alone amount to 16,750 tons. To carry them up the Stikine will require 35 steamboats of the capacity of these steamboats making five trips each. Instead of 35 steamboats the contractors have not five. This steamship line has not one-seventh of the capacity necessary to take food enough up the river to keep the miners in the country.

Now in this contract there is written in as the length of the road 150 miles. Turn to Mr. St. Cyr's report, he was the engineer who made the report on the route, (Mr. Jennings was simply the pilot who went ahead of him). Mr. St. Cyr says that it is possible, from Glenora to the head waters of the Teslin Lake, to construct a road, a trail 175 miles long that will cost from \$100 to \$200 per mile, according to its completeness and capacity to stand wear and tear. Now, if that trail is to be 175 miles long, what is the length of the railroad going to be? This railroad will not probably be less than 200 miles long. I have not the slightest doubt from the information I have but it will. When they make their calculation of

3,750,000 acres of land to be given to Mann & Mackenzie, they are astray according to the report of their own engineer whom they are bound to trust, and upon whose survey of the country they have entered into this contract and have submitted it to Parliament. According to his report of the probable length of that railway, at the very least the Government will be bound to give no less a quantity than 4,375,000 acres, that is, if I am right in assuming that to build a railway would require as long a route as to build a trail. We all know how much shorter a trail would ordinarily be made than a railway—and if I am right in assuming it is going to be 260 miles long, then it is not only 3,700,000 acres of land, but 5,000,000 acres the Government will have to give, or 4,000,000 more than Mr. Hamilton Smith is willing to construct the road for. But I will discuss this matter later. What is the carrying capacity of this railway? In the first place it is going to have a 28-pound rail. Any gentleman in this House who knows anything about railroads will acknowledge that it is utterly absurd to talk about 10-ton cars on such a rail. The grade is such, the rails will require so light an engine, that it will be impossible to put cars on that road carrying more than seven tons. On the Intercolonial Railway in its early days, coal was carried in 7-ton cars, which were enlarged to 10 and 15 tons capacity as the rails were made heavier. Allow 12 cars of 7 tons carrying capacity each as a fair train and this is too liberal an allowance, and you will find that in order to get 50,000 tons of freight through from the first day of September up to the first day of October, when navigation closes, exclusive of passenger trains, it will require no less than 20 trains per day going and 20 trains per day coming, or forty trains per day on the road at one time to carry this amount of freight. Have the Government looked these facts in the face? I do not believe they have. They are rushing madly into this scheme, and are trying to hoodwink this House and to deceive the people of Canada in reference to it. Mann & Mackenzie, and they understand each other, know exactly the position they are in, because as the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) pointed it out to the House, there does not rest on the contractors the slightest obligation in the world to provide, for the coming autumn, more than one engine and one car. There is no provision in that contract as to what equipment should be deemed sufficient. Indeed this contract is the greatest curiosity that I ever saw. I would be sorry to suppose that the Minister of Railways and Canals had anything to do with drawing up such a contract. The name of the Minister of Railways and Canals is signed to it, signed by an acting Minister, but he

never had anything to do with that contract. I know him too well; I have spent too many days, too many weeks, and too many months associated with him as counsel in legal cases, to believe that he ever was the father of "such a howling slip of wilderness" as this. Suppose that the insuperable difficulties of the Stikine and the railway are past, and the 50,000 tons of freight is landed at the head of the Teslin Lake, it has to be taken down the river before the 1st day of October as I have said. The round trip is 1,300 miles and one of the members of the Government stated that the boats were supposed to carry 70 tons apiece. How many boats then will it take to do the business? It will take 700 round trips. It will take 25 days to make a round trip, and a steamer can only make one round trip in the month of September, she cannot venture on a second because the river is frozen up in the early part of October. To get these provisions and supplies down the river in order to prevent this population from starving, in order to clothe and house them for the winter, it will require 700 steamboats upon the river and upon Teslin Lake. The company cannot have more than 6 at the outside. Now, when this contract was up for discussion it was mentioned by some hon. gentlemen opposite with a great flourish of trumpets that \$250,000 had been put up as security by these contractors. Just how that \$250,000 remains with the Government I do not know, I defy any hon. gentleman in this House to decide the status of that \$250,000. It is there as a security. If we give a security for the performance of any promise that security is simply liable for the damages that accrue on account of its non-performance; and if this contract is not carried out, then the \$250,000 of a security can only be liable to the extent that the Government has suffered. Now, I ask the Ministers: What damages can the Government suffer? The possible damages are so remote, that the Government can in any case receive only nominal damages for a breach of the contract. But supposing they are right, and that the \$250,000 remains with them to be forfeited in case of non-fulfilment of this contract, it remains as a guarantee for only one-third of the contract, that is, only for the construction of the railway. The other two stages of this great transportation scheme remain without the guarantee of a solitary dollar or even the personal responsibility of the contractors for their being completed this year. This is the way that the Government have looked after the interests of Canada. This shows what is worse, the duplicity and deception that are attempted to be practised upon the country. The next feature to which I direct my attention is the land grant. A great boast is made by the Government and their friends that they are getting this railway construct-

ed without the expenditure of a single dollar from the public treasury. Why, Sir, these gentlemen are Liberals, these are men who have outgrown the swaddling clothes of the early monopolists and protectionists of the country; yet these same men go back into medieval days when the bullion theory was all in all, and the only wealth was gold. If the country has immense wealth in the Yukon itself, what difference does it make whether we draw on the public treasury to construct this railway, or whether we use up that which is as good as if it were in the public treasury? But it makes a great deal of difference to the country if land that we could turn into cash is given to the extent of ten or twenty times the value of the cash required to build it.

But to proceed. These contractors are to receive 4,650,000 or 5,000,000 acres—which? What does that mean? Hon. gentlemen opposite say that this is only a drop in the bucket, and that the lands are worth nothing. Why, Mr. Speaker, is not this whole scheme based on the supposition that the lands are not only worth something, but that their value is enormous? What does the scheme amount to, if these lands do not possess some value? It is idle to talk about it. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not fit to occupy their present position, unless the lands possess some value, because this Government should not do what they themselves surely regard, and what their predecessors in our Parliaments have regarded, as an act hostile to the interests of this country, and as immoral, and have placed laws on the Statute-book to suppress—and that is the act of gambling. Their course would be censurable on another ground. The Government should never give undue impetus to the adventurous spirit of those who are simply going to squander their means and obtain nothing in return.

But are these lands worth nothing? What do we know? Simply what we get from the report of officers who are in the employ of hon. gentlemen opposite themselves, not his fame as a scientist gone, not only as being high officials, but as bearing world-wide reputations. Take Dr. Dawson. Has not his fame as a scientist gone, not only through this land and the whole of America, but over Europe? Sir, he has secured world-wide fame. Take the other gentlemen associated with him. It is true their fame is not so widespread, but they are most highly-respected and competent scientists. And what do they say? We heard Mr. Ogilvie in the opera house. The Government kindly adjourned the House so that members might listen to his lecture, and what did he tell his audience, which included hon. gentlemen who are now occupying the Treasury benches? He said that in the Yukon there is gold enough in sight to occupy the energies of all the people that can get into the country for the next ten years. He declared that this was one of the richest gold

fields the world possessed. He told of a man who had four claims and had reaped such a golden harvest from them that a San Francisco syndicate had given him \$2,000,000 for them, nearly two-thirds of the total cost of this proposed railway. He told us that there was a mountain that was all gold-bearing rock, worth from \$6 to \$12 per ton, awaiting the advent of machinery to work it. Any one who knows anything about gold is aware that unless it is very peculiar rock, it must pay such high returns so soon as a stamp mill is taken in there, that the owner will become a Croesus. Is the land worth nothing? Take up the first newspaper at hand, and hon. gentlemen will find reports of men who returned with \$175,000 or \$150,000 and down to \$30,000, as the result of last winter's operations. Is the land worth nothing? It is said by the Government that the gold-bearing lands are so extensive that these contractors will only receive one-twentieth of the whole. That is another attempt to hoodwink the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to assume that there is not sufficient intelligence among hon. members to discriminate between gold measures and the localities where gold is actually found. For illustration, take the maritime provinces. One-half of New Brunswick lies in the carboniferous area, but in the most of the area there is not enough coal found to fill a man's eye. Take the actual gold-bearing portion of Nova Scotia, and you could count it by the tens of acres, and yet there are almost a million of acres of auriferous formation in that province. I am sorry the hon. member for Guysborough is not here. He would object to the Government's method of gauging values by bulk as not having been pursued in his case.

An hon. MEMBER. He is on strike.

Mr. POWELL. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) prepared an elaborate plan according to scale, which he exhibited in the House, and pointed out how small was the square painted black, I think—it should have been green. This square was for the purpose of comparing the lands granted with the total area of the whole gold-bearing tract. The adoption of the means of comparison is too absurd to attack. The point is, how much of actual gold-producing land this area will cover. From 7,000 to 8,000 square miles are given to Mann & Mackenzie. There is a width of 300 feet allowed on the river as a claim for placer mining. They can start a base line where they please. That will give them six miles to start with and the privilege of extending 9 miles on each side, giving a total stretch of 24 miles. They can run a base line in two ways: either according to the cardinal points of the compass, or according to the direction of the stream. If they adopt the former, they get 6 miles in length, the first

block taking in the stream, and the Government gets alternate sections of the balance—along the base line—the contractors can extend the first block 9 miles up and 9 miles down stream. As the great majority of the rivers where gold is found run east and west, the man is a mere tyro in surveying who could not place the base line so as to take 24 miles of the stream, and if the contract is ratified, as it stands, they could take in 1,200 miles of stream, or at all events, 1,000 of the 1,400 miles of placer bed in the whole Yukon district. After they got this haul there would be a million or two acres with which to scoop in the gold mountain, coal beds, timber lands and every thing in sight. The Minister of Railways told the House that the contractors take all the chances. We might add the definition some time given of a Scotchman. He keeps Sunday and everything else he can put his hands on. These contractors not only take the chances, but they take the country and everything as well. Take the amount of the grant at 4,375,000, as if the railway will only be 175 miles long. What does it mean? It has been shown that one of the placer claims is 250 feet wide. This grant of 6,000 miles would give five belts right around the whole globe, each 250 feet wide. Imagine a belt one-quarter of a mile wide around the world, of the richest bearing gold land. I was astonished at the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture. He said the land was not of much value. The top dressing for this grant in this province would cost twenty times what he values the richest gold-bearing area in the world. A change, I understand, is going to be made in the matter of the selection of these blocks. Let us see what that change means. It is in respect to the extension of the three blocks of three miles square each on each side of the contractors' blocks along the base line. The intimation given was simply that these will alternate between the Government and the country. What does that involve? That this company can take the first block of 3 miles contiguous to the six they have in any block on the base line, and the Government will take the next. The contractors then have twelve continuous miles and will not be obliged to go further; and then they can run out another base line, get another continuous 12 miles, and it does not require many blocks of 12 miles to constitute a Vanderbilt.

As was pointed out by the hon. gentleman from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), one of the great evils in this contract is not so much the vast extent of territory it gives as the power of selection with which it invests these contractors. The Government engineer, as I have said, mentions 175 miles as the very shortest distance the railway can be, and the sinuosities of the route will doubtless increase it twenty-five miles more, so that the contractors have 111 selections; an enormous privilege. This country may

not meet expectations, it may not pan out well, it may simply be a temporary excitement that is running over the world in respect to it. But what the Government has done is to place in the hands of Mann & Mackenzie the power to take advantage of this excitement and make millions out of it. The Minister of the Interior knows how the applications are pouring into his department day after day by the hundreds from England and elsewhere to secure these lands, and I have no hesitation in saying that in view of this gold excitement, Mann & Mackenzie can go on the English market and float this charter at \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000. Supposing the land be not worth so much as the scientific men say, yet the evil is that the Government are bartering away a magnificent chance, and absolutely handing all its possibilities over to these men. I shall not go into details of the defects of this agreement. The agreement itself, Mr. Speaker, is so monstrous, it so does violence to every principle of wholesome economy, it is drafted so loosely, slovenly and inartificially, it gives such enormous rights, privileges, franchises and monopolies, that to use the language of Dean Swift: I do not think the Government could have done worse if they had gone to Hades for their principles and to Bedlam for their discretion.

The magnificent possibilities of this country should be for the young men of Canada. If trade is increasing at the present moment, it is due to the thrill of national inspiration that is the resultant of the discovery of these gold fields. If these mining regulations be continued as they are, handing our minerals over to aliens, tying up the whole country in the hands of this monopoly, the result will be discouragement and dissatisfaction among Canadians. I can assure the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches that if they seek to maintain order and good government in that country with this iniquitous grant and its unjust provisions in force, it will tax the resources of the militia of this country to its fullest extent. We know what restive people these miners are. We know what will be their discontent when, working on a claim adjoining that of Mann & Mackenzie, they will have to pay 10 per cent royalty while Mann & Mackenzie only pay 1 per cent. We know that these miners will endeavour to get even with the Government and with Mann & Mackenzie in some way. But, Sir, not only does the gold go to Mann & Mackenzie, but the valuable forests on the land which is given to them also, and which means untold wealth in themselves. In addition, they can scoop out the coal mines of the country, and these coal mines as incidental to mining operations in such a remote territory are almost as valuable as the gold itself.

I have spoken to gentlemen who are familiar with that country on the subject, and

Mr. POWELL.

their testimony and the reports of Dr. Dawson and of Mr. McConnell and of others bear me out in the statement that it is a very easy thing indeed to build a road from Edmonton to the Pelley River. The right hon. First Minister told us yesterday that the road from Edmonton would have to go over the range of the Rocky Mountains. I beg to inform the right hon. gentleman that the Liard River, where it strikes the course of the Rocky Mountains, reach a fault and the Rockies at this point actually leap forty-two miles to the eastward, and the river goes through by a gap not over 2,500 feet above the level of the sea, and the route as easy as over a prairie, so far as railway construction is concerned. Not only that, but along this route on the Liard River and the had water of St. Francis Lake, and the lower reaches of the Pelly, there are magnificent forests. They tell us in the reports that there are thousands and thousands of acres, yes, thousands of miles, of spruce. And if a road taps these forests, there would immediately be opened up a great trade in lumber for the North-west. Vast gold fields exist along this route also. The moment the Edmonton Railway would be opened up, there would be the great advantage and inducement to the settler that he would have an immediate market which the pioneer in the North-west had not. Every settler means a purchaser for the eastern manufacturer. And the eastern provinces of the Dominion share in the great benefits of the boom and in the greater resulting permanent benefits. The people who are going in and coming out of the country have no inducement to settle if the railway went by the Pacific slope. By the Edmonton route settlers have the virgin lands of the Peace River district, extending 400 miles from Edmonton, one of the richest and most fertile pastoral regions, they say, on the whole face of the globe, with the splendid market in the Yukon for their agricultural products. From my conversation with those people who know whereof they affirm and from the reports of Dr. Dawson, Mr. McConnell and others, I have no hesitation in saying that contractors could be found who would be content to build the railway from Edmonton to the Pelly River for less than the grant of gold lands given these favoured contractors for the construction of this tramway. If the Government adopt the policy suggested from this side of the House the young men of this country would have great hope in the future, but if this deal is consummated, our rising generation will find themselves on going out there simply "the sport and prey of a racking" monopoly.

My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney), in his eloquent address, during the course of this debate, associated these contractors, by way of illustration, with Jason and his company who sailed after the Golden

Fleece. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McInerney) owes an apology to Jason. The idea of comparing Jason and his band of heroes to this piratical crew that are to take possession of the Yukon and squeeze it to its death. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) waxed warm when addressing the House yesterday. It was a perfect melodrama not to be exceeded by anything from Shakspeare, not even by the wrath which Macbeth conjures up when he discants on the horrors of the murder of poor Duncan. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was going to force this deal through. The Government, he told us have taken it in hand, and the old war-horse when he scented the battle from afar pawed in the valley and the glory of his snorting was terrible. Is the hon. gentleman in this Macbethian frenzy to appease the inward monitor? The Government is going to put this contract through. Yes, Sir, they are, heedless of all the warnings that are given, they pay no respect to the criticisms of the press of the country; they have made up their minds to rush madly on. Why, Sir, he suggested to me the captain of the vessel in "Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea," who rushed on and on and on and finally landed his vessel and crew in the maelstrom. Sir, the maelstrom of public discontent and public disapproval is ahead of these gentlemen on the Treasury benches, unless they abandon their proposal. The contract is here to be dealt with as in the first instance. If members of this House believe that a better bargain could be made, they are in honour bound to vote for it, because the contract is subject to the approval of Parliament. We have a better offer, an offer by which the road can be built for one-fourth of the quantity of gold lands offered to these people—an offer from the strongest syndicate of capitalists that can be got together.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the House for the kind and considerate attention you have given me. I deprecate ratifying this contract, with all its enormities, with all the franchises and monopolies which it hands over to these people. It suggests the Laocoon, Canada and Canada's two children, the Yukon district and the Mackenzie district, will writhe in the coils of this python monopoly for generations, and one of the not less horrible features about it is that we, law-abiding citizens of Canada are bound at our own expense to throw around these people the ægis of the law, to protect them in their extortion, to secure them in their plunder.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Fowell), being a legal gentleman, has discussed the other side of this subject fairly well. As a rule, Mr. Speaker, legal gentlemen can speak equally well on either side of a question; but, if the hon. gentleman

had been arguing the question from this side of the House, he could have made a much better speech than the one he has just made. Now, I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman through the whole course of his speech. All I intend to do on this occasion is to give my opinion of this contract from a purely business standpoint. The hon. gentleman advocates the Edmonton route. I also, Mr. Speaker, would advocate the Edmonton route if conditions permitted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would be very glad if the circumstances were such that the railroad to be built to the Klondike would go through our agricultural country, and thereby hold a large population in the country who might perhaps be disappointed in the production of gold. I would be very glad if that could be done; but are the circumstances at present such as to permit of that being done? I do not think they are, for the reason that the building of a railroad by the Edmonton route would under present conditions take far too long a time. The hon. gentleman condemns the contract under all circumstances. He apparently would not have it at all. He would not have Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann build the railroad, but he would have Mr. Hamilton Smith build it on the same route for a less grant of ground. There is that one inconsistency, at any rate, in his remarks. Furthermore, according to him the building of the road by the Stikine and Teslin Lake route, by the more rapid route, is going to lose to Canada a tremendously large traffic, and is going to divert it to the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. Hon. gentlemen say, "hear, hear." I do not think the business men of this country will say "hear, hear." I do not think one sound business man in this country will say "hear, hear."

An hon. MEMBER. Prove it.

Mr. EDWARDS. The building of this road as it is now being done is just what is going to give Canada a large amount of business which would have gone to the United States if we had waited to build by the Edmonton route.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. Hon. gentlemen may go on with their interruptions, but I intend to make my speech. It will not be a very long speech. I am not in the habit of making long speeches. Another remark made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat was that this railway is being built in the interests of people who are going to filch our wealth from us; and later on he said that he hoped that that country would be preserved to the youth of Canada. Mr. Speaker, as a business man, my position is that I hope that not one of the agriculturists of Canada will go to the Klondike,

but I hope that the rest of the world will go to the Klondike and engage in the production of gold. What is the profit we are to get out of the Klondike? Is it in the immediate production of the gold itself? Not at all. The advantage to Canada is in the business to be developed in the production of the gold, not in the immediate production of the gold itself. What is the history of the production of gold? Has the gold of the world been produced at a profit? The gold of the world up to date has been produced at a loss, and is the experience of the Klondike going to be different from that of all the other gold fields of the world? I hope it will be. I hope that a turn will be taken, and that gold will be produced in that country at a profit. But I do not think it will. A few men will make fortunes, but the great body of the men engaged in the production of gold will produce it at a loss; and I will be very glad indeed if those who the hon. gentleman terms as those who are going to filch our wealth and the class who will go there are not the agriculturists of Canada. The great question before the Canadian people, in my judgment, is this: is it desirable that communication should be established with that country by railroad and by navigation? I believe it should be established, and in the quickest possible way. I believe it should be established in the interest of the people of Canada, and my judgment is that the very best route has been chosen under the circumstances. The next question is: is the bargain a good one or a bad one? My opinion is that the bargain is a good one. I believe it is a good one, for the reason that the road we are to have is a certainty.

An hon. MEMBER. A tramway.

Mr. EDWARDS. A tramway, the hon. gentleman says. But it is a great question whether the men who are building the road will ever get anything for it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. Hon. gentlemen say, "hear, hear." Is there one single gentleman sitting on the opposite side of the House who would take the position of the contractors?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is there one single gentleman on the other side of the House who is possessed of a million dollars who would stake his million dollars and take their position?

An hon. MEMBER. Scores of them.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is not a single one of them who would stake a million dollars and take their position.

An hon. MEMBER. Would you take it?

Mr. EDWARDS. I would not take \$2,000,000 in gold and take their position.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the tenders?

Mr. EDWARDS. We will come to the question of tenders a little later. I make that statement as a business man, and I am not a very timid business man either, but there are those who are more speculative than I, and have greater confidence in the results of gold mining. My opinion is, that the Government are getting this railway built for nothing. That is my opinion, but I sincerely hope that the gentlemen who have undertaken the contract will make money out of it. Will it hurt Canada if they do make a large amount of money out of it? Not at all. What is going to become of that great area? Is it not going to be given away to miners? Will not each individual who goes out there and takes up a mining claim, get his claim and be permitted to go on and mine? Certainly he will. Supposing that gold is found on the grant given to Mackenzie & Mann, and found in great value, the same advantage will accrue to Canada from the mining of it as from the mining in the rest of the world.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. EDWARDS. Precisely the same. Who are to be benefited, apart from the business men of Canada, by the construction of this road? It is the men who are going in there as miners to develop the country. Its total area is, I understand, about 175,000 square miles, equal to 112,000,000 acres, and the gold-bearing district covers an area of 125,000 square miles, equal to 80,000,000 acres. Out of this, a small piece of 3,750,000 acres is given for the construction of the railway and for the benefit of all the remaining portion of that country. I do not think that that is any disadvantage at all to those who will go in there as miners, or to the people of Canada.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are very much exercised over this. They are pleading, or pretend they are, for Canada, but my opinion is that they are simply offering opposition without any good basis of argument at all. They are acting on the general principle of opposing the Government, and that is all there is to it. It would appear, judging by the declamations of these hon. gentlemen, that this is the first instance in Canada where public lands were given for the construction of a railway. But to show the contrary we need only go back to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when the public Treasury was taxed, perhaps for all time, by a money grant, as well as a large land grant. Previous to and since that time, land grants have been given for the construction of railways. In this very district of Ottawa, 4,000,000 acres of land were voted for the construction of a railway, and there is no comparison as regards valuation between that grant and the one given to Mackenzie & Mann. Was there any such tremendous howl made in Canada

then as is made to-day? By no means; and yet those 4,000,000 acres were worth ten times, perhaps one hundred times, as much as the whole of the Klondike region. There is no parallel whatever between giving lands from an agricultural district of great wealth bearing great areas of timber, and giving away land in a territory whose value is purely speculative. No one knows anything about the value of these lands at all. But we have the certainty that the railway will be built, and equipped, and run, in the interest of the people, whereas the contractors take their chances as to what return they are to get.

Mr. SPROULE. What part of the contract secures the running and equipment?

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not think it has ever yet been the case, in the history of Canada, that a railway has been taken over by the Government unless inspected and all the requirements complied with, and the railway found suited for the work it has to perform. I think the same course will be followed in this instance, and I have not the slightest fear that Mackenzie & Mann are such fools as to build a railway and not equip it for the business it is to perform. If 25,000 acres of land per mile were given for the construction of a railway in a timber district, no fault would be found, judging by our past history. We know that, in the province of Quebec, large areas were given away formerly, and even in recent years, and there was no howl made about it. The eyes of the whole people of Canada to-day are upon the Klondike; they think it possesses the wealth of Canada; but, Mr. Speaker, it possesses only a trifling portion of our wealth. Our agricultural lands are our greatest wealth, and next to them are our timber lands, and if I were offered one-eighth of the spruce timber of Quebec for ten Klondikes, I would take the one-eighth of the spruce lands, and in saying this, I have no desire to detract in the slightest from the value of the Klondike. I sincerely hope that every man who goes in there will make money, but there is a very great difference between what we see and know and what we know not of.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. Hon. gentlemen say, "Hear, hear." Well, we know the value of our agriculture and timber lands, but the value of these mineral lands will have to be determined in future years by developing them.

The first notice I saw of this contract was at some distance from here. At first sight, it appeared to me that a large grant was being given for the construction of the railway, but in thinking over the matter by myself, regardless of any remarks made here, I arrived at the conclusion that the contract is in the interests of the people and of the miners who are going to develop that

country. In my judgment, it is the best bargain I have ever known to be made between individuals, and certainly the best made between a government and individuals. The Bill has my hearty support, and the amendment before the House, I am of opinion, ought to be rejected.

Mr. CLANCY. As the hour is very late, I hope the right hon. the First Minister will consent to the adjournment of the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I hope that my hon. friend will be ready to go on with his speech, which we are anxious to hear. We must reach the conclusion of this debate some time, and, surely, after three or four weeks devoted to it, we should look to make rapid progress to that end.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. More amendments.

The PRIME MINISTER. All the more reason to go on, even until six o'clock in the morning.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I promise you that I shall not detain the House at great length. I probably might be excused, as I think any hon. member of this House might be excused, for occupying a short time upon a question of such magnitude and importance as this. I think that every hon. member will be justified in rising and entering his protest against this, the most extraordinary scheme that has ever been presented to the Canadian Parliament. We have had some lectures as to the attitude of the Opposition in discussing this question. We have been told that it involves a cold business transaction, and so we should discuss it in that light and discuss it dispassionately. I agree that that is the way to approach a question, and I venture to say that the Opposition have maintained that course throughout. If hon. gentlemen on this side have been forced to use what, under other circumstances might appear rather strong language, they have not in no case used the language of raillery, but have discussed the question upon fair grounds and have made no attack that was not warranted by the facts. We had a moment ago a speech on this subject, from a business man. Of course we always receive with great deference any opinion of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards).

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On lumber.

Mr. CLANCY. Exactly, on lumber. He has been a most successful man in this province. If we were to judge of the contract before we heard the hon. gentleman's speech we might have wondered how he arrived at his rather enviable position for a business man. He has stated in positive terms that he comes to a conclusion favourable to this contract on one ground and that ground is that the contractors have made

a bad bargain. Of all the arguments given in its favour, this is the most extraordinary one. I wonder if Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann were in the gallery. Had they been, I wonder what they would think of hon. gentlemen opposite rising one after another to throw their doubts upon this contract from the contractors point of view by saying that it is worthless. We need nothing more than that a statement of this kind should go before the country; that hon. gentlemen opposite, having entered upon a contract involving four millions acres of land to build a railway into the Yukon can find only one defence, and that is that the contractors have been unwise to accept the contract. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) states that he believed the price to be excessive until when? Until he became convinced that this land was worth nothing. He asks: How then are we to derive a profit from it? And his answer is: Simply from the traffic that will arise. I ask him if it is likely that traffic will arise if this is a bad bargain and the land is worth nothing? How is he going to reconcile the two statements? If we get the return he looks for, then, these gentlemen will run no risks. It is because we believe that there is something in that country, that we believe that these contractors have made a good bargain for them. We have the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) talking in much the same way, and what was his idea? His idea was that we were to place no confidence whatever in the report of Mr. Ogilvie in regard to that country. He said he took upon himself to make that statement. I do not know whether he was put up to make that statement or not. But I ask hon. gentlemen on that side who have sent out these reports from one end of Canada to another, from one end of the world to another, with the purpose of inducing men to go into that country, why they should rise in their places and declare that these reports must be taken with a discount. The hon. member for New Westminster says that this is a matter of mere hearsay so far as Mr. Ogilvie is concerned, and so his report in this respect is not to be relied on. Are hon. gentlemen opposite to talk in one way to induce members in this House to take a certain course upon this Bill, and in another way to induce men to go into that country? Are they to issue these reports to show that this country has attractions and, in this House to say that there is no gold in that country, that the reports are perfectly unreliable and that members of the House are not to pay the slightest attention to that. I ask the reading people of this country, what can they think of such statements as that coming from hon. gentlemen opposite. I ask these hon. gentlemen opposite who have launched this scheme and launched it hurriedly and apparently, without due thought, what must be thought

Mr. CLANCY.

of them when they begin discrediting their own engineer and other officers and who may have spoken favourably of that country, hoping by this means to place themselves in a favourable position. It seems to me one of the most extraordinary positions I ever knew a Government to take.

Before entering upon the merits of the case, I desire to refer for a moment to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). That gentleman made what he wished the House to understand to be a very patriotic speech. He made reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway and to the conduct of the great leader of that time, Sir John Macdonald, and to the speech that was made by the present hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) pointing out to hon. members opposite, who were then sitting on this side, their duties with regard to this great work. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) seemed quite unconscious that he was administering a very severe rebuke to his own friends. Where were they upon that occasion? Why, Sir, they were decrying that great scheme. That scheme was not one parallel with this in any sense. But it seemed that the Minister of Public Works forgot for the time that he breathed a different atmosphere in those times from that he breathes to-day.

He had forgotten that he belonged to a party which, as Sir John A. Macdonald said, must always remain in Opposition because they had never been equal to the task imposed upon them. That is as true to-day as it was then, as is shown by the weakness they have displayed in the scheme now before the House. But that hon. gentleman made the extraordinary statement that this Bill was going through in spite of opposition. Why, Sir, I wonder if hon. gentlemen have given up their rights as members of this House. I wonder if we have come to a day in the Parliament of Canada when hon. gentlemen will rise in this House and declare that any Bill will go through. If we have reached that state of things, we might as well prorogue the House and go home, and leave the Government to conduct the business without the aid of Parliament. Now the one strong ground urged in favour of this scheme is that of urgency, that it was important to construct that road as speedily as possible in order to have some means of getting into that country. One would suppose that if it were necessary to send a military expedition into that country there could not be greater urgency than is now urged for the construction of this road. But here we are not providing for any absolute or immediate need. There is no condition of affairs in the country now existing that would prevent the Government from taking a reasonable time to consider this scheme which they are now asking the House to sanction. If there is a sane man in this House I am sure he will say that the Government would be justified in taking a

month, in taking two months, in taking six months, nay more, in taking a year rather than entering upon such a transaction as the one we are now asked to sanction. If we had not a penny in the treasury, if Canada were bankrupt, and we had nothing else but lands to offer, why then it might be pleaded that we were forced by the circumstances of the case to give these lands because we had nothing else to give. If there could be a strong condemnation from start to finish of this transaction, it is that hon. gentlemen have stated that they knew nothing about what they were entering upon. Well, Sir, this country demands that these hon. gentlemen, no matter what the urgency may be, should know something of a scheme of this magnitude before they entered upon it. The building of the railway that is now in question, is only the commencement, if this country turns out to be anything like what we hope and expect, of a much larger system of communication. The construction of this railway is not to serve only a present need or the exigencies of a single year, but it will have a broader and wider significance. You would think to hear some hon. gentlemen talk that this was going to be only a temporary arrangement, temporary in the light of serving a purpose of a momentary character. The First Minister told us that this road is to be merely a road to last possibly for a single year. But when they found later on that some unpleasant complications were threatened between Canada and the United States with regard to bonding and other privileges, these gentlemen have all of a sudden discovered that they must widen their scheme, that they would not be warranted in adhering to the statement of the First Minister that this road was only to serve a temporary purpose. I repeat that there is no question of urgency in that country to-day that can justify the course the Government have taken. One of the reasons urged in favour of this scheme was that in regard to supplies. I watched my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) and I had hoped that he, as a business man, would be able to find some defence for this contract. It has been repeated frequently on this side of the House that so far as the question of supplies is concerned, there is no immediate demand in that country. The men who have gone into that country are fully equipped, it would be impossible for any one to attempt to cope with all the difficulties incident to a new country like that, if he were not fully equipped with food and clothing, and all other things requisite under the circumstances. Why, then, this hurry about the contract? Why this most indecent haste to meet a need that does not exist at this hour? Where is the demand for rushing this contract through? Have the Government to send a relief expedition up there? The hon. Minister of the Interior made a trip to that country, he

looked into the promised land without entering it. I did not hear the hon. gentleman's speech, but I read it with great care, because I was told that he had made an able plea in defence of the Bill, and had answered all the attacks made from this side. I searched that speech in vain to find that the hon. gentleman had met one single argument advanced from this side of the House. He put up men of straw and he knocked them down. He prepared questions himself in order that he might answer them as he liked. We had made the most complete arraignments against the Bill on this side of the House which the hon. gentleman did not attempt to meet. The strongest argument that has been advanced against this contract is that there is no immediate demand made upon the Government for entering into it. They were not taken by surprise by any circumstances that have occurred. They were not taken by surprise because a rebellion had broken out in that country. No such reason could be urged for entering upon that contract so hastily. The Minister of the Interior showed great fear lest the authority of this Government should be overthrown in the Yukon district. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what particular warning he had of that. That is a question that has not yet arisen in that country. I can tell him that if his contract should receive the assent of the House and this Bill should become law, he has already laid the foundation of a rebellion in that country. A cheaper means to avoid rebellion is by laying down a more reasonable and equitable set of rules for the government of the men that are likely to go in there. If the authority of this country is ever in danger of being overthrown, it will be because the men working there will feel that they are treated unjustly, it will be because they endure hardships as a result of this contract. The trouble can only come from a few men who have come from other countries and not from men who have always been a law unto themselves in every mining country in the world. If rebellion should arise in that country the hon. gentleman himself has invited that rebellion, and has laid the foundation for it by placing over the heads of these men laws under which they will chafe, and if rebellion should follow, it is only what might reasonably be expected.

I will not detain the House by discussing at any length the provisions of this contract. They have been discussed very fully by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and I regret no answer has been given to the very grave objections made to the contract. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) and the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) presented the strongest objections possible to this contract. It was stated that it was drawn in the most slipshod manner, and it does not require a legal training to arrive at the conclu-

sion that the contract was purposely left loose or drawn by the solicitor for the contractors; and it is not necessary to read between the lines themselves to observe that it is drawn in the interest of the contractors entirely, and that the interest of the people must suffer. No hon. gentleman opposite has dared to rise and controvert any of these charges. The House heard the hon. Solicitor General last evening. Hon. members waited with baited breath, anxious to hear his answer to these charges. The hon. gentleman discussed the question for a very considerable time, but he made no attempt to answer the arguments presented by the two hon. gentlemen to whom I have referred. Hon. gentlemen opposite fancy, I think, that it will be very much easier to allow these arguments to go unanswered than undertake to answer them, but any layman can see that these defects in the contract are sufficient to justify its rejection by the House, if there were not other grounds. Hon. gentlemen opposite declare that they were unable to get any other contractors but Mackenzie & Mann to take this contract. A more childish declaration, one that places the Government in a more unenviable position or tends more to show the weakness of the Government can scarcely be imagined, than to see the Government hold up their hands in despair and declare that these were the only men who could undertake the work.

If that be true, who brought that situation about? Has it been brought about by special circumstances, independent of hon. gentlemen opposite, or by some cause over which they have no control. The truth is that the Government placed a time limit so that it was utterly futile to suppose that contractors could fulfil such a contract. When those hon. gentlemen laid down at the last moment, as the Minister of the Interior declared he did, that the Government had only ten or twelve days to consider the contract, that he received the report of the engineer on 13th December and let the contract on the 25th January, I ask what was the impelling power that compelled the hon. gentleman to let the contract on that date, instead of on 25th February, by which date he could have obtained offers from other quarters? The country will come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman fixed a time limit, not because there was a question of urgency, but for purposes that are apparent on the face of the contract—I will not charge hon. gentlemen opposite with corruption, but the contract bears all the evidences of bad faith. Mr. Kersey was, in fact, forced within a single day to make an offer, and he was compelled to return and say that there was not time to make an offer, and therefore he was compelled to withdraw any proposals he had made in the past. Why could not the hon. gentleman have extended the time? I ask the Minister of the In-

Mr. CLANCY.

terior now, what was the pressing reason which impelled him to close the contract on the 25th of January? I hope the hon. gentleman will do me the honour of replying to my question.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Will the hon. gentleman repeat the question?

Mr. CLANCY. I shall be glad to repeat the question, and I regret that the hon. gentleman takes so little interest in the affairs of the country that he asks me to repeat a question that has been asked in this House so often. I now ask the hon. gentleman what was the reason that induced the hon. gentleman to let that contract on 25th January rather than have waited for some reasonable time, some days, if not weeks or a month, to get further propositions or offers to construct the road?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the hon. gentleman is not doing very much credit to his intelligence. The object of letting the contract was to get the road built.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has not done much credit to his intelligence and hon. members will not do much credit to themselves if they accept the hon. gentleman's answer. The object, the hon. gentleman says, was to have the railway built. It is the most extraordinary answer I ever heard, and it does not do credit to hon. gentlemen opposite if they are unable to offer a better answer. Let the hon. gentleman's answer go to the country, and we are willing to go to the country upon it, if hon. gentlemen opposite have no better answer to furnish. Any little boy in the street could have given a better answer, if he could not give a better answer, he should be chastised. But after all, is not this part of the general scheme? This answer is as good an answer as hon. gentlemen opposite have been accustomed to give, and as good as we have been accustomed to expect. It suits the purposes of hon. gentlemen opposite to offer no reason for entering into this contract, and the hon. Minister has declared, after having had plenty of time to consider the matter, that this contract was let so suddenly to secure the building of the railway. The country will expect a very much better answer from the hon. gentleman, and, whatever he may be able to do with his own friends, and however much the threat of the Minister of Public Works will have effect upon them, I say that the people of this country will not take his view of it, when they get a chance to express their opinion at the polls. I hold that the time limit fixed for receiving the proposals made it absolutely impossible for the Government to have guarded the public interest. If the Government had all the information necessary to enable them to

enter upon a business transaction of this kind, there might be some excuse for having rushed through the contract in such haste, but we have the extraordinary spectacle exhibited in Parliament to-day—for the first time, I believe, in the history of Canada—of members of the Government coming before the representatives of the people and telling them that the ground on which they rushed the contract through was, because they knew nothing whatever about it. One Minister, indeed, told us that the contract was all right, because both parties to it knew nothing at all about it. If that is the principle which is to guide us in the transaction of public business in Canada, then, let the Government take the responsibility of telling the people that such is their policy, and gentlemen on this side of the House may be perfectly content to leave them in the hands of the electors. The Ministers tell us that they knew nothing about this contract. Well, if there is one reason stronger than another why they should not have signed it, it is that they should wait until they did know something about it: and wait until they knew whether or not they were engaging in a proper transaction. If there was this great urgency, I myself would not be disposed to censure the Government if even prior to obtaining the sanction of Parliament, they paid some money to place them in possession of all the facts concerning this territory which they were giving away. The Government knew nothing about it, and so the contractors could make their own terms with the Government. These contractors are not such great fools as the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) takes them to be, and when the members of the Government told them that they knew nothing at all about the business, these gentlemen were wise enough to insist upon their own terms. If there was any figuring down or figuring up, the Government had to do the figuring with their eyes shut. How absurd it is for these gentlemen on the Treasury benches to tell us, in one breath, that they knew nothing at all about this matter, and, in the next, that they tried to cut down the original demands of the contractors. How did they know whether ten millions of acres or three millions of acres was a sufficient grant, when, as they say, they knew nothing at all about it? Again, we are told by gentlemen opposite that the contractors took all the risk and that the Government—or rather, the people, because it is the people who will have to suffer in the last instance—took no risk. But did the contractors take no risk? Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that there will be an influx of from fifty to two hundred and fifty thousand people go into that country this year, and that because of this the railway was a pressing want. Now, even from that statement, we can see that, whether or not that country turns out to be a disappointment to the gold

seekers, the people will have to go into that country and come out again, and the railway company will have all the advantages. Each man who goes there must pay tolls to the railway to go in, and pay tolls to the railway to come out, and so the contractors will be indemnified to the full extent of their outlay by the receipts from the traffic on that road, even if they reap no advantage from the land grant. Hon. gentlemen opposite, to be consistent, must admit that, if the urgency of the road was on account of the vast influx of people into that country, then, that immense passenger traffic and the transportation of the supplies necessary for these people, was full security to the contractors for the outlay they make.

There is another feature in this matter which is of some importance. The Government of Canada will have to provide for the maintenance of law and order in that country, and for the new state of things which will obtain there. We cannot expect to reap direct benefits from the gold mining in that country, but we may naturally expect to reap indirect benefits, and we will have to pay all the expenses in connection with that. I venture to predict that, when the Estimates are brought down, we will find large sums of money appropriated for the government of that country. After all, do not the people of Canada take all the risks, and is it not a fact that the contractors take none? I believe there will be large indirect benefits; and I am prepared to vote any reasonable sum of money to provide a proper means of communication with that country. But I am not prepared to vote for an irrational scheme, one that has been ill-considered, that has not been carefully thought out. The right hon. First Minister himself was forced to declare in his place only a day or so ago that if we were threatened with difficulties and harassments from the United States, he would, not in the future, but at once, be prepared to ask this Parliament for a grant for the purpose of going on and constructing an extension of this railway that would make it entirely a Canadian route. What do the people of this country expect of a Government, charged with the conduct of the affairs of this country, at a critical moment like this? I say that no Government can utterly disregard the state of things that has arisen within a few days. We should have no cheese-paring policy at such a time. The Government are bound to come down with a scheme that will not place us for a single hour in the power of a nation that has been hostile to us. What has the hon. gentleman told us? "This is a case of the greatest emergency; we were forced to enter into this contract without taking time to consider it; the case was so urgent that we had to get the railway built at once." I ask the hon. gentleman what would become of that great scheme if the railway were interrupted for

an hour—if it were tied up by hostile regulations of the American Government, such as we are now threatened with? We cannot close our eyes to the state of affairs that exists, and it becomes this Parliament and the people of this country to consider the situation. If there is to be a difficulty in the future, let us provide for it now. It is perfectly idle for any member of this House to say that the members on the Opposition side have receded at the first shriek of the American eagle. It is unworthy of hon. gentlemen to put forth such an argument. We have not receded, and it would be silly and cowardly for any hon. member on either side of the House to take such a position. We gave these gentlemen warning, and we hoped that they had taken the warning to themselves. It seems that the right hon. First Minister has not taken it, but that he is proceeding on the lines on which he has probably proceeded all his life, from the day his responsibilities began, to provide for the single day, and no more—never to provide for the time to come. The hon. gentleman expects this House to assent to a proposition that we are to vote for a railway which is only a half measure; and when this is concluded, we are to go on further. I ask him where he is going to get the money to build the others. He has dried up every possibility and all the means in the construction of the 150 miles. When he wants to build any more, he must tax the people for them. He is building the smallest portion of the railway with the greatest portion of our capital for the building of railways. After he has given practically the whole of the gold lands in the country for the building of a portion of railway that may be closed up in a single day by the hostile action of our neighbours, and we are obliged to enter on the larger and safer scheme, where are we to get the means of doing it? I have waited to hear some hon. gentleman explain that, and up to the present hour I have not heard a single solution of the question. Parliament may be asked to vote the money; but I say that Parliament will not be justified in voting one dollar under the circumstances as they exist, for the building of a railway to Port Simpson or elsewhere, having no more lands for the purpose. The Government are proposing to give away a sum in gold lands that ought to have built a dozen railways of that kind.

I do not wish to detain the House at any great length. It would probably be waste of time for any member on this side of the House to attempt to urge, after all that has been said, anything that would appeal to the hon. Minister of the Interior. He set about letting a contract, and he made it impossible for any other person than Mackenzie & Mann to get it. He is bound now to carry it through, and he has the assurance of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) that it will be carried through. The

Mr. CLANCY.

First Minister was not in his place when that statement was made, and I wonder whether he endorses it. The hon. Minister of Public Works said to us: "That contract will be carried through; you may say what you like; you may urge what reasons you may; you may have common sense and good judgment and force on your side; it makes no difference, we are going to carry the contract through, because we have the greater number on our side of the House, and we rely on that fact, and that alone."

Now, we have come to what seems to me to be a very serious state of affairs in this country. We are entering upon the construction of a railway that may mean what? If we may judge from what has fallen from the right hon. First Minister it may mean in the near future the construction of a railway through by way of Edmonton. The hon. Minister of the Interior suggested that this was only the beginning of a great scheme. Then, should there be commercial hostilities between Canada and the United States in connection with the railway under consideration, we are told that we may have another to Port Simpson. With the possibility of these great expenditures staring Canada in the face, we have these gentlemen taking all the resources in sight for the construction of this railway. Taking the words of the hon. gentlemen themselves, they say: "That country is of no use without the construction of this railway, and we are bound to make that country pay for its own railways." I ask them how they propose to make it pay for the balance of the railways they propose, including the railway from Edmonton and the railway from Port Simpson. I venture to say they have no answer to that.

We have come to a stage when the Government can afford to retrace their steps. What defence have they made of this scheme? One defence is that the leader of the Opposition declared himself in favour of it. But on that occasion the hon. gentleman took it for granted that the Government had a well-considered scheme, that they were entering upon a defensible transaction. He found himself afterwards in the unpleasant position, in which we all found ourselves, of having been deceived. The whole country were deceived by the language of hon. gentlemen opposite into believing that the scheme was one which could be defended, and we were all anxious to have as soon as possible a railway into that country. Hardly an hon. gentleman opposite who has risen to defend this measure has failed to quote that interview in which the leader of the Opposition expressed himself in favour of building a railway into that country, and it is rather strange to find these hon. gentlemen coming to the leader of the Opposition for a certificate after the abuse they have been heaping upon him for years. I trust that the right hon. First Minister will see fit to retrace

his steps. It takes some little courage for any gentleman, even in private life, to admit that he has been wrong, but it is always better to admit a wrong than to defend it. The opportunity has come for the right hon. gentleman to take the right course. He declared only a day ago, that we might be confronted with a state of circumstances which would entirely alter the scheme, and I ask him therefore to withdraw it now and submit a comprehensive scheme which will be capable of being defended. It is idle to discuss what treaty rights we have when these rights are set at naught. It is not a question now of discussing what treaty rights we have, but of preparing for a condition of things that may be precipitated on us at any moment. The Government have now the opportunity of retreating, and I would say honourably retreating, and I appeal to the right hon. First Minister to make a record, which will be in contradiction with his past, by withdrawing this Bill and submitting one that will be worthy of approval.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 10th March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. McInnes.)

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. DAVIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 65) further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892. He said: Clauses 736, 738, 739, 740 and 741 of the Criminal Code make the Lieutenant-Governor of a province responsible for the disposition of the criminal, or the accused persons who are innocent. My belief is this has arisen from a mistake in drafting, and is not the intention of Parliament. Therefore, I propose to substitute for the Lieutenant-Governor the Governor General and restore the criminal law in this matter to what it originally was. The next

clause provides for the repeal of the section of the criminal law—I think it is section 748—which enables the Minister of Justice to grant a new trial. I have never heard a jurist of any standing who did not think that it was a mistake to introduce that clause into the Criminal Act, and therefore I propose that it shall be repealed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MOUNTED POLICE AND EDMONTON ROUTE TO KLONDIKE.

Mr. DAVIS asked,

Was there a detachment of North-west Mounted Police sent by the Government over the Edmonton route to the Yukon? When did the detachment start? Has it arrived at Dawson City yet? If not, at what time do the Government expect it to reach there?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). A detachment of police, composed of one officer and five men left Edmonton via the overland route on the 4th September last. When last heard from they were some miles west of St. John on the Peace River. It is hoped that they will reach the Yukon next month.

GOVERNMENT CATTLE, BATTLEFORD AGENCY.

Mr. DAVIS asked,

What number of Government cattle died on the different reserves in the Battleford agency during the winter of 1895 and 1896? What was the cause?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The number of Government cattle that died on the several reserves is as follows:—On Stony reserve, 7; on Red Pheasant's reserve, 6; on Sweet Grass reserve, 4; on Moosomin's reserve, 4; on Thunderchild's reserve, 6; on Little Pine's reserve, 6; on Poundmaker's reserve, 7. The cause of death of these cattle is not known to the department with certainty, but is believed to be lack of sufficient provender being provided under the direction of the agent.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL AT BATTLEFORD.

Mr. DAVIS asked,

1. What was the cost of maintenance of the industrial school at Battleford, North-west Territories, during the last fiscal year?
2. How many pupils are in the school?
3. What is the cost to the Government per capita per annum?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows:—1. The cost of maintenance of the Battleford Industrial School for the last fiscal year was \$16,472.37. 2. The report for the last De-

ember quarter gives the number of pupils as 107. 3. The per capita per annum cost to the Government is \$161.49.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER AT KILDARE.

Mr. DUGAS asked,

1. Who is at present postmaster of St. Ambroise de Kildare, county of Iberville ?

2. When was he appointed ?

3. Who was his predecessor ?

4. Why and when was the latter discharged ?

5. At whose request ?

6. Were complaints in writing, against the former postmaster, laid before the Government or the Post Office Department ?

7. What is the nature of the said complaints, and who made them ?

8. Was an inquiry granted to the former postmaster, prior to his discharge ; if so, by whom was it held ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows:—1. There is no post office named St. Ambroise de Kildare. If Kildare post office, county of Joliette, should be the post office referred to, the present postmaster is J. A. Riberdy, M.D. 2. He was appointed on the 10th November, 1897. 3. His predecessor was Oliver Vigneault. 4 and 5. He was dismissed on the 19th June, 1897, for offensive partisanship in the general election of June, 1896, on representations of Mr. Charles Bazinet, M.P. 6. The charges against the late postmaster were made in writing. 7. This is covered by answers already given. 8. An inquiry was not considered necessary, in view of the terms of the charges made by Mr. Bazinet.

MAILS FOR POINTS EAST OF TRURO. N.S.

Mr. McDUGALL asked,

1. By what lines of railways are the mails destined for points east of Truro, Nova Scotia, forwarded from Ottawa, and what is the distance by such route between Ottawa and Truro ?

2. By what railway lines are mails from points east of Truro, Nova Scotia, and destined for Ottawa received, and what is the distance over such route ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows:—1. By Canadian Pacific and Intercolonial Railway, distance 814 miles. By Canadian Pacific, Grand Trunk and Intercolonial Railways, distance 905 miles. 2. By Intercolonial and Canadian Pacific Railways, distance 814 miles. By Intercolonial, Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railways, distance 905 miles.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS AND MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LEMIEUX (by Mr. Choquette) asked,

1. Has application been made to the Post Office Department for a mail service between the Mag-

Mr. SIFTON.

dalene Islands and the mainland during the winter season ?

2. Has the application been granted ?

3. By whom was the application made ?

4. Why has there been no winter service ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would say that this question concerns the Department of Trade and Commerce, as well as the Post Office Department. Replying for the Post Office Department, I may say that the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) made application for the establishment of a mail service between the mainland and the Magdalene Islands. The Post Office Department looked into the matter, and found that it fell within the purview of the Department of Trade and Commerce. Accordingly, a conference was held between the Ministers of Trade and Commerce, Marine and Fisheries and Post Office and, after giving the best consideration to the matter, the conclusion was arrived at that the dangers of the voyage and the expense were such that it was not possible to comply with the hon. gentleman's request. The officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries said that they did not consider it would be safe to trust human life with undertaking the voyage as asked for.

TRANSLATION OF MR. OGILVIE'S REPORT AND OF "HANSARD."

Mr. CASGRAIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that we have not yet got Mr. Ogilvie's report in French. I do not wish to make any complaints at all, because I understand that, being technical matter, it is very difficult to translate, and it is also long. I receive letters almost every day asking for it ; people who want to go to the Klondike from the province of Quebec are asking for it from all quarters. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman could hurry up the translation. He would not only be conferring a great favour upon the members of this House who speak and read French better than they do English, but also upon a large class of the electors of the province of Quebec. I think the right hon. gentleman himself will recognize the justice of my request. While I am on my feet I would like also to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the French translation of the "Hansard" is far in arrear, and has only been done up to the 18th February. This is the 10th March, so that the work is far behind. It is not fair for the French members of the House who understand French and read French better than English, that there should be so much delay in the translation of Mr. Ogilvie's work and also of the "Hansard."

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have some reason to believe that

at this moment the translation of Mr. Ogilvie's report is concluded and in the hands of the printers. About a week ago, I took trouble to inquire about it, and the translation was then three-quarters finished. I think, by this time, it is probably in the hands of the printers. At all events, I am quite sure it very soon will be. I have seen the translation so far as it had been done at the time. With regard to the translation of the "Hansard," if it is to-day only one month behind, it is quite a progress on preceding years. It has always been behind time. The only thing I can do is to call the attention of the committee to the subject.

Mr. BERGERON. So far as the "Hansard" is concerned, I myself asked the chief translator the reason of the delay, and he told me that the French "Hansard" was following the English "Hansard" as closely as possible, but that the delay came from the printing office. I think the attention of the Debates Committee should be called to the matter.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. At the last meeting of the committee, we had a report from the printers of the French translation, who said that they were only six days behind.

Mr. BERGERON. The "Hansard" at present is twenty days behind.

TROOPS FOR THE YUKON.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask a question—I see the Minister of Militia is not present, but perhaps the First Minister, or the Minister of the Interior, could give the information. It is as to the rumour which seems to be pretty well assured, that a detachment of the militia or of the permanent force of Canada is to be sent to the Yukon to supplement the Mounted Police force there. Is that rumour true, and have matters progressed so far that the route is determined which this military force is to take?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is truth in the rumour to which my hon. friend alludes. In view of the very large influx of people who are expected to crowd into the Yukon, it has been thought advisable to have a sufficient force there to maintain law and order. This could not be done unless the Mounted Police, which is practically a military body, were largely increased. But we thought it well to follow the practice that has obtained in other countries, and since we have a small permanent force, to employ it in that country, where the need has recently arisen. Therefore, a small corps is being prepared at the present time to be sent out at the earliest moment to the Yukon. As to what progress has been made and whether a route has been determined upon, I am not in a position to inform my hon. friend to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Militia and Defence, who has come in, might be able to tell us how many men are to be sent in, and by what route.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The number determined upon is 200 or thereabouts. The route has not been absolutely determined upon, but Colonel Lake is making the necessary inquiries now which will enable us to come to a conclusion.

CHEESE FACTORIES IN THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, Sir, I would like to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to an article published in a Quebec newspaper "L'Avant-Garde," in connection with the cheese factories in the province of Quebec. I believe I could not do better justice to the grievance I wish to point out to the House, than by giving the most important paragraphs of that article, under the heading: "The cheese factories in the province of Quebec, a grievance that should be remedied." Here it is:

The sale of our cheese takes place in most cases through an exchange of cablegrams between the shipper in Canada and the buyer on the continent. The price is fixed according to the place of origin.

Now, cheese from Ontario is as a rule, classed beforehand as superior to the Quebec cheese, notwithstanding the fact that the latter is equal to the former in quality. Therefore, shippers cannot give to the Quebec cheese-makers the same price they give the Ontario cheese-makers, for the same quality of cheese. Should they pay for the Quebec cheese what it is really worth, they would have to ship it under the description of Ontario cheese in order to safeguard their profits.

On the other hand, it is obviously in the interest of shippers to substitute Quebec cheese for Ontario cheese of the same quality, as they are thus enabled to market it at the same price as the latter, while paying less for it, and to realize larger profits without any trouble. As a matter of fact, cases of substitution have come to the knowledge of the public.

Those shipments under a false designation are enormously detrimental to our farmers as they have for effect to keep up instead of breaking down the prejudices which exist on the English market against Quebec cheese. Therefore, as a matter of urgency, steps should be taken to break down those prejudices and of doing away with the causes calculated to strengthen them.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the committee on agriculture have decided, by a majority of its members, that there should be a special stamp or mark on every box and package of cheese, showing the place of origin and also, I think, the month and year of its manufacture.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may ask his question, but he cannot go any further.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I intend to conclude by a motion of adjournment of the House. I should like to know whether the Government intend remedying such a state of affairs, which is most detrimental to the farming class of the province of Quebec. The Quebec cheese-makers are very seriously handicapped, as the cheese buyers abroad are under the impression that the article produced and sold in Quebec is not as fine as that coming from the province of Ontario. Owing to that serious drawback, the Quebec cheese-makers cannot successfully compete with those of Ontario.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman has a question to put founded upon that article, he can ask the question, but he must stop there.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I would like to know whether the Government intend taking steps to remove the grievance complained of?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). (Translation.) In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would say that we have, last session, passed an Act to that effect. That Act secures to everybody the advantage of registering their cheese factories and creameries. Such was the purport of the legislation passed by Parliament at its last session. If the cheese-makers of the province of Quebec wish to avail themselves of the provisions of that Act they may do so, and they will not suffer from the prejudices mentioned by the hon. gentleman. That is what I have never ceased pressing upon my hearers, in the many localities in which I had the opportunity of addressing meetings throughout the province of Quebec in presence of representative farmers. I have always endeavoured to explain to the farmers and cheese-makers and to all those interested in the development and progress of the dairying industry, the various provisions of the Act passed last year.

The cheese and butter-makers and the owners of cheese factories and creameries in the province of Quebec may therefore avail themselves of the steps taken under this legislation, I trust, therefore, that the interested parties will be enabled thereby to avoid the danger pointed out by the hon. gentleman.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Blair for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) an Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. MARCOTTE.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with feelings of timidity and hesitation that I approach the discussion of this question this afternoon, after the implied rebuke administered to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and, perhaps, by implication, to many on the other side of the House, by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) last evening. I still remember the fine scorn with which he alluded to my unfortunate friend, a lawyer who represents the county of Westmoreland in this House (Mr. Powell), for having ventured to approach this question from a standpoint of incomplete information and inexperience, and I equally well remember the self-satisfied air with which the hon. gentleman drew himself up as much as to say, Now, you are going to hear from a business man. Well, Sir, I listened with both ears, as I think did every hon. gentleman present on this side of the House, for the utterances of this business man on the Yukon scheme; and I am free to say that if a lawyer from the county of Westmoreland could not make a better business plea than did this business man who represents the county of Russell, I would be ashamed of him. For when it was all boiled down, what did the hon. gentleman from Russell say? Naively enough he confessed that at first blush he did not like this scheme at all; but after the party whip had been cracked and party discipline brought into play, he began to find it not so objectionable as it had first seemed to him. When the hon. gentleman came to give the reasons why he proposed to vote for that contract, and why he proposed to give his adhesion to the scheme, I was lost in admiration. He gave it as his opinion as a business man that the contract was a good one, and there he stopped. Now, an opinion like that is quite sufficient for the man who holds it, if he holds it strongly but an opinion which is not backed up by reasons good and sufficient, is of no earthly use to men who do not wish simply to be led by the opinion of a man but by the well-based and reasonable opinion of a man. When he had occasion to speak of the business part of the arrangement, the contract with Mackenzie & Mann for instance, he made the extraordinary proposition that he was in favour of it because it was a bad thing for Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, that there was nothing in it for them; and ten minutes afterwards he declared that that contract ought to be carried through and he gave it his support because in that way this country would conserve to itself \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000 worth of trade that would otherwise be lost to Canada in respect to the Yukon country. It would seem to me, though I am not a business man in this sense, that if the contract is carried out with Mackenzie & Mann and they come by that into possession of a transport franchise, and that by reason of the opening up of the country in which that franchise is situated there arises trade to

the extent of \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000 per year, two things follow as a necessary consequence: first, it must be a rich country in order to call for that trade; and second, that the traffic and transportation over the railway will be as regards Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann very profitable and remunerative. So much, then, with respect to the business view of it; and I mention it simply to show that the monopoly of knowledge and of argument and reason with respect to this which, after all, is a very common-sense proposition, is not the property of any one member in this House, even though that member be the boasted business man from the county of Russell.

Now, would it not be well, Mr. Speaker, for a moment to ask ourselves what is not the question to be debated on this the second reading of the Yukon Bill, because I think an attempt has been made on the opposite side of the House to introduce issues which do not fairly belong to this question? In the first place, I wish to state that we are not discussing a question of patriotism, either absolute or relative; that in approaching this subject and in discussing and deciding this we can do it from a point of view which does not raise the question of the relative or absolute patriotic standing of either party in this matter. But it is significant and somewhat amusing to see hon. gentlemen climbing into these new clothes of theirs labelled "patriotic" all over the back, front and sides, after they have been trying to cover themselves for fifteen years with the tattered rags of every policy in the world. Sir, the Liberal-Conservative party does not need to spend one minute to convince itself or the country of its patriotism, its desire for the prosperity and benefit of Canada or its adhesion to the principles of the union of Canada and every other part of the British Empire. It is not a question either of maintaining the rights of this country as compared with the United States. We can approach this question and discuss it and settle it and both sides be just as strongly in favour of maintaining whatever the rights of Canada may be in the premises. But it is a little significant that hon. gentlemen opposite are to-day in their position of responsibility as the executive rulers of the country brought up by a pretty sharp turn in face of some of their expressions, for the last ten, twelve or fifteen years with respect to this very question. What I mean to say is this: that the Conservative side of the House is in favour of the maintenance of every just right that Canada possesses, on sea-coast or frontîer, and will not yield one single one of those rights so far as it is concerned to the United States when they attempt to force concessions from us, to press for something which they wish to secure along the Atlantic Coast or in connection with the Yukon trade. It is not either a question of the absolute opening up of a route into the Yukon. Both sides of the House may be equally in

favour of opening up that country; and yet there may be an honest difference of opinion as to what is the best route and what is the best method of securing that route.

Let us, if we can, then, for a moment brush away these extraneous considerations as not being vital to the matter in hand, and let us see what the question under discussion really is. It is simply a business question. It is a question as to what is the best route for Canada to adopt in order to get into that Yukon country, not what is the best route temporarily, not what is the best route for a particular section, but what, taken as a whole, looking at the interest of Canada on the one hand as a whole and the possibilities of that new country on the other, what is the best route for us to adopt. We have to take the best route, considered also in two other respects, first, and in the least important respect, as to the adventurous spirits that are proposing to go into that country; secondly, and in a much more vital respect, as to the source of supply and its disposition geographically with reference to the Yukon country. This is a grave question. Associated with that is the question: How may we best obtain this road into the Yukon, when once we decide as to what is the best route? If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that in my humble opinion there has been quite too much of the rush and the stampede in this matter as it has been placed before us by the Government. What I mean to say is, that we to-day are preparing legislation which will vitally affect this country for years and years to come, and it is worth while taking sufficient time and gathering sufficient information before we plunge into the heavy expense of opening up what is to be the route, and the best route, into the Yukon country. And, Sir, if there is any plan by which the necessary exigencies of this present year—and perhaps part of the next year—can be met by a moderate expense, let us meet it in that way and reserve for the time when greater knowledge will be at our disposal the more important and far more expensive proposition of opening up a permanent route into this region.

Another question which allies itself with this is: What is the reasonable cost which this country can afford to pay, and in what is it best that that cost should be payable, money or lands, or partly in each? It is a plain fact that too much may be asked for opening up any route into that country, when we come to compare it with what may be got as compensation in return. The question may very well arise, and indeed has arisen now, and a grave question it is: whether it is economy and in the best interests of the country to pay in cash or to pay by alienating the prospective wealth of the country; and, Sir, statesmen may awake to find that what they supposed was good economy in alienating the prospective wealth of the country in order to avoid a present

drain upon our finances, may turn out to be a most extravagant method and one which in the end will inure, not to the greatest benefit of Canada financially, but just the opposite. We must be careful that, to avoid the criticism of the man who does not want an extra few cents of taxation to-day, we shall not take the other alternative which may rob that very man and every citizen of this country of \$100 for every cent of present taxation, by this transfer of future prospective wealth.

It is a simple question: What is the best route, how may we best attain it, and in what should we pay the cost? That is a business question which any man on either side of the House can approach with the hope of coming to some fair solution of it. Before entering into that question, however, I desire to say this: that certain incidental circumstances have prejudiced my mind, and I will venture to say have prejudiced the minds of every cool observer of events in this country during the last three months. Let us contemplate the various side-lights thrown on this question. Sir, one of these side lights is the utter contempt for parliamentary precedents which has been shown by the Government in most important particulars in the way it has been proposed to make this bargain and to impose it upon this House and upon the country. I ask any man sitting opposite me to-day, partisan though he be, is he prepared to stand on his feet in this House and before this constitutionally governed country, and affirm this proposition: that we no longer have any use in this country for that old parliamentary and constitutional principle, that the franchises of Canada are the property of its Parliament and ought not to be given away by its executive. There is no man, not even the most utter partisan on the Government benches, who would dare in the white light of public opinion to contradict that principle. Let me ask you a question: Has not that principle been utterly and openly violated in this case? No man can answer that it has not, and the only question that remains for every honest man to ask himself is: Was there any reasonable reason why that principle should be thus utterly violated in this case, and his answer must be to his conscience.

Sir, the principle which from the reign of King John down to the time of the Georges was the central principle around which waged the war for parliamentary and political freedom in Great Britain is not of so little importance that at this time in the parliamentary history of Canada a man can afford to give the lie to it without having a very urgent and sufficient reason to justify his political conscience, to justify himself to his constituents, in setting at naught the principles of parliamentary freedom which govern in a country like this. Is there a man sitting on the opposite side of the

Mr. FOSTER.

House to-day who will affirm in this Parliament that it is not for the best government of the Dominion that when any great public franchise is to be given it ought to be open to public competition by tender and sealed by contract? Let any man dare contradict this and he pleads for the worst forms of corruption that could be brought into the government of any country. No man on that side of the House will affirm that the principle which I have enunciated is not correct, and yet, Sir, every man sitting behind the Government knows that this principle has been contemptuously and determinedly violated in this very case. Was there any great national exigency involving the public weal which made it absolutely necessary that time should not be taken for that open competition and call for tenders? That is the question which every man has to answer to his own conscience and to his constituents.

Now, Sir, that is one of the things which predisposes me, and predisposes the majority of people in this country—and I will go further and say, predisposes the majority of men sitting on the opposite side of the House—to feel dissatisfied with this arrangement when it first came to their notice; and many of them to feel dissatisfied with it up to this very date, though they may be whipped into line and made to vote for the contract. I know whereof I am speaking, and I know that is true.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Our friends seem to have made you their father-confessor.

Mr. FOSTER. I would be sorry, Sir, to be the hon. gentleman's confessor; I fear I should have to listen to more black malice than any parishoner ever poured into the ear of a parish priest, though, for some time it has appeared as if the good things of office which the hon. gentleman had taken into his system has made him almost an apostle of sweetness and light, and that the old malice had almost entirely left his system. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on the change; but should he go out of office again, should he get back to the old condition, I beg to be excused from being his father confessor.

There is another side-light which disposes me against this scheme, and which I believe disposes the large majority of the people of this country against it. What is that? It is the duplicity—and I use the word advisedly—that has characterized these transactions from the first that we knew of them, and I do not know how long before, up to the present time; and I will endeavour to prove that. What reason was there, Sir, why the Government, in December or January last, in the discussion and deliberation upon the opening up of the resources of so great and promising a section of country as the Yukon district—what

reason of state or of public utility was there, why they should have barred the door, and locked themselves within the Council Chamber, and let practically no one know of the plans which they were discussing or the propositions which they wished to bring to fulfilment, until they had made the final contract, and had practically in black and white their ultimatum to present to Parliament and the people? The answer has not been given to that question; the answer cannot be given to it. And yet, Sir, although newspaper reporters are fairly enterprising, and the people of this country are intelligent and wide awake, there was scarcely a breath of suspicion in the public mind of this country that anything like a measure to build a railway and form a system of transport and communication with the Yukon was even in the wind, until we received the notice in the "Globe" when the contract had practically been signed. Unless some reason of public utility is given, there can be no other motive for this concealment than this, that there is a reason behind which has not yet come out; and it is for the Government themselves to take away the suspicion of a baser and less worthy reason by stating to this country, in terms unequivocal and easily to be understood, why secrecy and duplicity surrounded that transaction from last July up to the 26th day of January, 1898. Sir, when they had hatched the whole scheme, and not only hatched it, but handed it over to its sponsors, Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie, they sent for a trusted newspaper friend of the Government, and put their case into the hands of the "Globe" editor or correspondent, to give to the public of Canada the first and formal intimation, not of what they proposed to do, but of what they had done. I have no hesitation in saying, Sir, that that information, as it was arranged and put out, was meant to have, as it actually had, the effect of catching a public approval which the scheme itself did not warrant—catching it by two methods; by skilful concealment of terms in the bargain which would prove disagreeable; and by, if not wilful, yet on the face of it, when you come to understand the bargain, patent misrepresentation of the facts of the case. What was the first impression that was conveyed to the people? That, in the first place, the Government had been immensely careful—that in giving this franchise and in opening up the country, they had conserved the farmer's interest, to wit, in that they had withdrawn all arable lands from the operation of this contract. My hon. friends laugh. Well, they may. They know that no man who has the run of this House, and who understands that country, would be misled by that observation, which entitled the Government, in the mind of the man who gave it forth, to very great praise and very great honour. They know that that would be laughed at by members of

the House; but they know also that nine-tenths of the people of this country have not the least idea as to whether there is arable land in the Yukon country or not; and from that great mass of intelligent men, but who are on this point ignorant, simply because they have no means of being informed, they snatched a favourable opinion for themselves by representing that they had withdrawn all arable lands from the operation of this contract. What more? The first idea that was put out by that official communication, by the gentleman who had the particulars of the contract put into his hands by Ministers of the Crown, regarding the cost of building the railway, was that it would have cost the Government \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000, but that by this arrangement they would get it built without costing the country one cent. There were two misrepresentations in that. At the very moment the Ministers authorized that information to be spread before the public, they had under their hand the testimony and report of their own engineer that the whole road could be built for \$3,200,000, on the mileage which has been taken by themselves in this contract. And yet, Sir, they put forth, to snatch a snap verdict from the great public of this country, that they had saved immensely, because they had not plunged the people into an expenditure of \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000; and it was days before I knew myself—and I follow these things pretty well—that the contract was not for a good, broad gauge, solid road, but simply a tramway, with an indifferent track and an indifferent weight of rails.

What happened next, Sir? There immediately commenced in the press of hon. gentlemen opposite—and it was followed up in this House—an attempt to minimize the value of the lands in the Yukon. A crusade has been set on foot by hon. gentlemen opposite to minimize the value of the lands in the Yukon district. Why? Because, forsooth, if they could only persuade the people that these lands are not worth much, they would thereby minimize the value of the tremendously heavy subsidy which they have granted to Mackenzie & Mann. Without a thought of consistency, Minister after Minister, and speaker after speaker, in this House and through the columns of the country press and the city press which reported them, began a crusade for minimizing the value of those lands. Are those gentlemen in a confidence game? And if so, who are they attempting to confidence? Why, before any Minister opened his mouth, before any member sitting behind the Ministers opened his mouth to minimize and detract from the value of those lands, the Government itself authorized the publication of a Klondike official guide. That guide was published under the authority of the Department of the Interior, and sent broadcast throughout this and every country in the world. As I

am informed, more than half a million copies are already upon the market, and every line and every page of that work extols and magnifies the value and the richness of those lands in the Yukon. Is that work, published under the Government imprimatur, true or is it false in its facts? If it is true, these Ministers and their supporters who now seek to deprecate the value of these lands, are guilty of basely denying their own official information. For what purpose? In order to confidence this House, or that side of it at least, into supporting this measure on the ground that the lands are worth very little or nothing. Or are they confiding the great public and the world, to whom they have sent broadcast this official guide, vouched for by the Minister of the Interior, written, as Mr. Ogilvie says, under the express authority of that hon. Minister. Which are they trying to do—gull the world and the adventurous seekers of riches by false information, or endeavouring to get this contract through this House by a persistent attempt to make it appear to the conscience and minds of the members of this House, or as many as they can influence, that, after all, if you give away 4,000,000 acres of picked gold land, it amounts to nothing because nobody knows whether it is worth anything or not?

I find another instance of this duplicity in the fact that they have warped the official and engineering mileage of this road in the contract they have presented to this House. We have had no explanation of that. The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) ought to be here to explain it now, and I ask the right hon. First Minister at this juncture of the debate—and I have a right to an answer: When Mr. Jennings reports to you that it will take 200 and odd miles of railway to reach from a certain point to another point, by what authority or on what information have you reduced that 200 miles to 150 miles in the contract you have presented to us? For any other purpose than to apparently diminish the area of the land grant by the amount that it would have been augmented, if you were to multiply the difference in mileage by 25,000 acres per mile? Has the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), has the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), has any of the Ministers any satisfactory explanation to give why they ask subsidy for 150 miles of road, more or less, when there is not a line in the official report—and they cannot get any better information than that at this moment—which warrants them in asking less than for 175 to 200 miles, more or less? Why this duplicity? Why cannot the Ministers be honest and above-board? Unless they have reasons to give for cutting down the mileage, why do they not, like men, say that it is 200 or 175 miles and not 150, and honestly face the larger land grant?

Again, we have been told that this measure should be put through because of three

great considerations, namely, impending starvation, possible rebellion, and a contingent loss of the territory to Canada forever. In this House, and in another House, all those have been urged—the last one most strongly in the other House—by a member of this Government; and I well remember how this Napoleonic Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) became inflated in size and elevated in power of voice, as he declared that he was not above going down to Washington and seeing Mr. Alger, if thereby he could be a saviour of the poor starving wretches in the Yukon country, and a minister of mercy to those who wanted bread. And he went down and saw the humane Mr. Alger, and prevailed upon him to consider him as the saviour of the poor starving unfortunates in that country. Reindeers were purchased, stores were obtained, but when Mr. Alger at last woke up to proper reports and information, he countermanded the whole thing. He sold his reindeers and sold or gave away his supplies, and came to the conclusion that the "tale of woe" of the Minister of the Interior was an imaginary one. Why, the Minister of the Interior himself contradicted it, when he boasted that on our side of the line, from before Christmas to the present, not one man had gone hungry, so well had he posted his men and his Commissioner Walsh. The cry of preventing starvation had some effect at first but the strength has gone from it, and every one to-day sees that it is as hollow as some of the other pretensions of the hon. gentleman why this measure should be put through.

Then he raised the bogey of rebellion—there was to be rebellion. But how, or when, was that rebellion to come? At the best, on the calculation of hon. gentlemen themselves, this road cannot be completed before the first of September. I am not much of a prophet, but I venture to say, that if they do get this Bill through Parliament, there will be no ingress or egress by that road on the first of September or October either. There are some things that man cannot fight against, and I am inclined to think that hon. gentlemen opposite have run up against one of these things. Rebellion? I think I questioned the hon. gentleman as to how many mounted police he had up there. He told me that he had 270 there and on the way thither. To-day we have been told that 200 men of the permanent force are to be sent in addition. Is not this force sufficient? What right has he to say that he expected there would be rebellion? Law and order has always been the grace and pride of this Dominion. Take the southern British Columbia region, overrun by miners of every nationality in the world—men who, before they came there, carried their pistols in their hip-pockets, and knives in their belts and shot and stabbed at sight—when they came over to this coun-

try, they simply laid them aside on the shelves and became law-abiding citizens. Throughout the whole of the British Columbia mining region law and order have been as well maintained as on the streets of Ottawa—even if I might not say better. Was there any ground for supposing that under honest and just conditions law and order would not be maintained in the Yukon district? Disorder and anarchy take place in a mining region, in ninety cases out of a hundred, only when rank injustice is done to the miners and not without that. There is no body of men, fishermen, artisans, farmers—no body of men anywhere, who are so vitally interested in justice being done as a body of miners in a mining country, because their wealth, their whole stake depends upon it.

But there was something more frightful still—that we might lose that country. I have not heard that scare of late. When the Minister in another place was pressed to tell what were his reasons for fearing this, he would not give them; they were safely folded within his bosom; they involved such a state secret that he could not impart it to them; but if they knew what he knew, there would be nothing but the most patriotic clamour for that Teslin Lake Railway to be built and built at once. The First Minister has not brought that machine into operation in this House. I do not think he will do so, because it proved so little effective in the other House, and has now the reputation of being an altogether out-of-date instrument of war.

More than that, if there was not a deliberate attempt, there was an effectually successful attempt to prevent every contractor, every financial concern in the world, from getting any chance to make a fair, open tender for the work of constructing the Teslin Lake Railway. Whether it was deliberate, determined upon in the sanctum of the Minister of the Interior months before the contract was signed, or whether it was not, makes no difference in the ultimate outcome or in the turpitude with which the affair might be branded. The outcome was this—that capitalists in Canada and throughout the world had no chance whatever to put in their propositions and compete for the building of this road. Why not? Is there any answer to that? What is a Minister if he is not a trustee for the people? What business has he to be a Minister if his object is not to get the best for the least for the country. And I have the evidence of my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who sits before me that he is not going to resort to the miserable technicality that because the offer was not in at a certain time, though it proved to be a better offer, it ought not to be accepted in the interest of the country. I have him down in black and white on that subject. And yet he has stood up once or twice in this House and come very close to the assertion that it is

all very well for men to put in their propositions after the contract is signed, but they should not be accepted. He might speak in this way of those who had had an opportunity openly to put in their tenders and had failed to do so. But when my hon. friend asks for no tender, locks the door against tenders and then makes a contract, if, after the contract is made, it is found that capitalists are ready to build for less than the contract price, my right hon. friend is estopped, if he has any regard for consistency and his knightly word, from raising a single objection. Well, Sir, what happened? Mr. Hamilton Smith came forward. Mr. Hamilton Smith, of whom hon. gentlemen opposite speak as “one Hamilton Smith” and as “Smith” and as “that prevaricator” and as “a busted bubble,” to use the elegant language of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), or, to use the fine insinuation, the fine, I had almost said religious insinuation of the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) that man Smith, who might not be able to pay his board bill—as if such a man should be shown any consideration. Sir, I venture to say that the First Minister had only to cable to proper sources of information to find that Mr. Hamilton Smith and the men behind him were men in every way capable of undertaking such a contract as this and carrying it out to successful completion. But, Sir, probably Mr. Hamilton Smith did not have before the knowledge that he has now of the ways in which a Liberal Canadian Government carry on these things. I suppose he thought that when capitalists were eager to compete for a public work, the Government would be eager to have them compete; and when he once intimated that he was in a position to compete, he supposed he would be given an opportunity to compete. That was a rather old-fashioned idea of Mr. Hamilton Smith; but still, he held it, and he pays the penalty so far as the Ministry sitting opposite is concerned. But, Sir, I beg again to disagree with the First Minister with regard to that Hamilton Smith episode in two particulars. One is that the right hon. gentleman himself, though having definite information under his hand and over Mr. Hamilton Smith's own signature that he had never made or been authorized to make a proposition on behalf of the Rothschilds, sent some sort of telegram to Lord Strathcona to put himself in direct communication with the Rothschilds and get a repudiation of Mr. Hamilton Smith's alleged representation of that great firm. Now, what did the First Minister want to get, if he was honest in his request for information? He wanted to meet an assertion made in this House and in the country, that Mr. Hamilton Smith had offered to build the road and that the Rothschilds were backing him. Was not that it? If that was the information he wanted, that information had been given to him by Mr.

Hamilton Smith over his own signature in these words: I have never been authorized to make any proposition on behalf of N. M. Rothschild & Co. And, if he were honest and wished nothing more than to meet that alleged statement on the part of the members of this House, the press and the country, all he had to do was to rise in this House, take Mr. Hamilton Smith's letter and read that gentleman's own statement that he had never made a proposition on behalf of the Rothschilds and had never been authorized to do so. That would have met the allegation and would have set right the distorted view of the press and the public. Why did not the right hon. gentleman do that? He was after something else which would act as a repudiation of Mr. Hamilton Smith and so lower him in the estimation of hon. members and in the mind of any one who was following this question. Now, Sir, I would put it to the right hon. the First Minister—who took occasion to leave this House the moment I broached this question—whether he did an honourable thing from one gentleman to another when, having Mr. Hamilton Smith's disavowal, he went behind the gentleman's back and sent the secret telegram to Lord Strathcona.

The word of one gentleman is as good as the word of another; and all that the Prime Minister could have needed in his most exigent mood, was to ask Mr. Hamilton Smith whether he did really represent the Rothschilds or not. When he was told that he did not, he had all that was required, and he had simply to use that information that he got at first hand. But instead of doing that he telegraphed to Lord Strathcona to put himself in communication with the Rothschilds. What more? We do not know; we want to know, the House has a right to know, Mr. Hamilton Smith has a right to know, the public of this country has a right to know. A telegram received in reply to that private telegram is heralded in the press of this country, given to the reporters and sent everywhere, and newspaper head-lines come out, "Hamilton Smith repudiated by the Rothschilds." That was an answer to a telegram. When we asked the First Minister for the telegram he said, I will bring it down to-morrow. But when the morrow came he said, I cannot bring it down, it is a private telegram. In the first place, there can be no such thing as a private telegram on public business where you give the resulting answer to the public and then refuse to give the question put on behalf of the public. In the second place, I say to the Prime Minister that when he refuses to read that telegram the only conclusion you can draw from it is that the question was improperly worded, that he either made a statement in the telegram that Hamilton Smith represented himself as an agent of the Rothschilds, which was false, or some other thing was put into the ques-

tion which the First Minister found was incorrect and would not, if published, inure to his political advantage, and he took the alternative of pocketing his honour rather than suffering politically. I am, says the hon. gentleman, the keeper of my own honour. Then, for God's sake, let him keep all such honour; no one else wants it.

Then, Sir, there was the Van Horne episode. Mr. Hamilton Smith put himself in communication with Sir William Van Horne. Sir William Van Horne put himself in communication with the Minister of the Interior. Is there any denial to that? There cannot be, the Minister himself has acknowledged it. Of the language of the conversation that took place between Sir William Van Horne and the Minister of the Interior, we know absolutely nothing. It was "casual," as the Minister of the Interior says. So the information about the sleigh road is "casual," according to the Minister of the Interior. The first pert and boyish answer, when asked the grave question across the floor of this House, was: Well, I have no telegraph line to Wrangel. Of course not. Then when he became a little ashamed of that pert answer, he led us to suppose that having had a "casual conversation," the sleigh road was completed. I ask the Minister now, as responsible in part for that legislation, as responsible for that clause which is an essential part of it, if he is in a position to inform this House to-day that 300 miles of practicable sleigh road has been built, with shelters at every twenty-five miles, and is now in operation for travellers across that country and pass to-day? The Minister has no answer, he cannot give an answer and save himself. He is wiser than he was the other day, and simply takes refuge in silence. The "casual conversation" has perhaps developed into a little more stated interview. Anyway, if the Minister can make that affirmation he ought to make it, for several reasons, and I will tell him why. The Minister may feel his responsibility or he may not. He may think that he is simply plain Mr. Sifton, of Brandon, but the facts are that, to whatever it is due, he has been translated out of that sphere, and is to-day one of Her Majesty's Ministers in this House. As Her Majesty's Minister in this House and representative of the Government, he has caused it to be heralded broadcast as an important and essential part of a contract made, that by the 10th day of March all intending adventurers seeking the gold fields of the Yukon can use a practicable sleigh road, with shelters at every twenty-five miles for 300 miles, from the mouth of the Stikine to the head of Teslin Lake; and hundreds and thousands of young men in this country, from all its provinces, are to-day either on the route, or they are preparing to go there, or are already there, under the impression that the Minister's word was to be relied on,

and that they would find there what has been stated in this Parliament would be found. They go, Sir, to the mouth of the Stikine, they are camping there to-day by the thousands. The least casual conversation with Mr. Mann will give the Minister that information. They are camped there without a shadow of a chance to get further, it may be, for two or three months, brought there and put in that position by a statement of one of Her Majesty's Ministers, on a provision placed in a contract, and with a tremendous deposit to be forfeited if the contract is not carried out that the road will be ready. Is it or is it not? Let him reckon with that public opinion outraged in that way, with practical men taking it for granted that it is true, and having their hopes disappointed, their health and their prospects interfered with because it is not as it ought to be. Yes, and let him reckon with his own conscience.

But to return, Sir. The Minister of the Interior knew from Sir William Van Horne that Mr. Hamilton Smith, backed by a syndicate of capitalists, wanted to tender for the building of that road. He does not deny it, he cannot deny it. He knew that before the 25th December, he does not deny it, he cannot deny it. If he had looked upon himself as a trustee of the people would he not have grasped at the information that a body of capitalists headed by Mr. Hamilton Smith, wished to have an opportunity to tender or to bargain for the building of that road? Why, what were the anxious days and nights of the Ministers? You heard it graphically described by that master of language, of much language and little knowledge, the Minister of Railways and Canals. A man can always describe his experience more graphically than something that is at a distance and that he does not know well. We heard him attempting to describe the route, to describe the gold fields, to describe even the terms of the contract, where the Minister was a know-nothing. But when he came to describe in pathetic words how he and his colleagues, and a committee of his colleagues, and in fact all his colleagues together, went down on bended knees and pleaded with Mann & Mackenzie, saying: O, Mann & Mackenzie, make it a little less than 25,000 acres of land, behold, these stern and hardened wretches, without any bowels of compassion or mercy, looked all the Ministers in the face and said: No, gentlemen, we are not fresh enough for that, it is 25,000 or it is nothing—how graphically that was described. But how easily my hon. friend could have been taken out of his misery by a simple expedient, just to have said to Mann & Mackenzie, these hard and obdurate wretches: Well, if you don't do it for less than 25,000 acres, we will just call

in Hamilton Smith or some other man who will do it for less. Sir, Mann & Mackenzie would have been brought to their marrow-bones inside of an hour, and my hon. friend's genuflexions, and the piteous and tearful pleadings of this aggregated ministerial phalanx, with one after another marching up to plead with Mann & Mackenzie, would all have been spared. Now, Sir, the question arises here, was the Minister of the Interior the trustee for the people? Was it his bounden duty to get that road built for the least amount possible? Who doubts it? No one. Did he know that Mr. Hamilton Smith and a body of capitalists wanted to talk over the matter with a view to building the road? He knew it. On what ground did he refuse to send for them and talk the matter over and give them a chance to tender for it? As matters turn out, they were prepared to build this and another road for less than one-half of the subsidy granted to Mackenzie & Mann. Did the Minister of the Interior treasure that information simply in his own breast, or did he, as he ought to have done, go immediately to his Prime Minister and say: I am told that Mr. Hamilton Smith and a syndicate of English capitalists want to bid for this road. Evidently he did not go to his chief, for his chief was a very much surprised man when he found that Mr. Hamilton Smith had ever spoken of a proposition to build the road. Then, Sir, I charge the Minister of the Interior with one of two things: either with being lax in his position and guilty in his position as a trustee of the people's franchise in that he did not take up that clue and communicate with those capitalists; or, what may be worse, that for other reason best known to himself, he did not apprise his colleagues in the Cabinet that such a proposition had been made to him and take conference with those colleagues on the matter. Anyway it is plain enough that Sir William Van Horne knew it and that Sir William gave his information to the Minister of the Interior; that the Minister of the Interior knew, and the Minister of the Interior deliberately kept his knowledge to himself and signed the Mackenzie & Mann contract, and refused to let other parties have a chance of offering to build the railway.

The Minister of the Interior has something else for which to answer. He has officially issued "The Klondike Official Guide" in French and English, the publishing being given to Dan Rose & Company, Toronto, for a consideration, and the hon. gentleman has published editions of 500,000 copies and scattered them over every quarter of the globe. There is in that guide book a statement made by the Minister himself under his authority, and it is thus the statement of the Interior Department and of the Government. What does the hon. gentleman say?

Since the following pages were written the Canadian Government has completed arrangements which will, during the coming season,—

What do people understand by the words "coming season?" That season of the year when people go into the Klondike for prospecting and for work, and the months in which they have to work.

—remove the great difficulties which have heretofore stood in the way of travel and transport to the Yukon district. The route to be opened is by steamer from Victoria or Vancouver to Wrangell, thence by the Stikine River to Telegraph Creek, thence overland 150 miles to Teslin Lake, thence down Teslin Lake, the Hootalinqua, Lewes and Yukon rivers to Dawson City. Large steamers run the year round to the mouth of the Stikine River.

Suppose they did. Suppose they ran there in November, December, January, February, March and April, what use was that except as a lure to the foreign travelling public? The vessel might go to the Stikine, and the searcher after wealth might leave the vessel there, but he could not in the face of natural obstacles enter the Yukon by that route during seven months in the year.

From that point a sleigh road to Teslin Lake will be open for travel, with stopping places every twenty-five miles, on the 10th of March.

That is the contract with the travelling public of the world bound for the Yukon.

Persons going in can thus reach Teslin Lake and make their preparations to go down from that point by water when the ice goes out, which is usually about May 15. While those who wish to prospect in the south-eastern part of the Yukon district may find it to their advantage to go by one of the overland routes, the great bulk of the travel to Dawson City and its neighbourhood will find an easy route by way of the Stikine and Teslin Lake.

River steamers will ply all summer from the mouth of the Stikine to Telegraph Creek. A wagon road with abundance of transportation facilities will be available from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Creek, and steamers will be plying on this lake to the Hootalinqua, Lewes and Yukon rivers. On the first day of September a railway will be in operation from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake.

That is the point I desire to come to. The hon. Minister of the Interior has advertised to the world that a wagon road will be available from the mouth of the Stikine to Teslin Lake. When first asked about it he gave the impression to the House that the wagon road would be completed and the Government would see it was completed. When he was told that it did not appear in the contract and was questioned a little more closely, the hon. gentleman stated the other day to the House that the Government were not responsible for that wagon road and did not propose to build it. What right have the Government of Canada to publish to the world, as one part of a contract to the travelling public, that there would be a wagon road there, unless either

Mr. FOSTER.

by their own appropriation or work, or by contract with some responsible party they made certain their word would be implemented by deeds? They have not done so. The Minister of the Interior confessed they had not made any preparations, and asserted that the Government were not responsible for building the road. If the Government were not responsible, this announcement should not have been made in the official guide book. There is not a member in this House who will contravene that statement.

Then there is the sidelight of misrepresentation. That is a strong word to use, but it is true. Hon. gentlemen, warned by their bitter experience of 1891, earlier and later, wanted to catch on to a cry which they thought would be popular, and which they had reason to think would be popular in this country, and therefore they advertised these 150 miles of tramway as the all-Canadian route. Europeans read this official guide book and said: Ho! for the Klondike: there is an all-Canadian route, which will be ready on 1st September, a wagon road and sleigh road supplying the facilities up to that time. Men in England and in different parts of the world, men in Australia and mining countries, read this announcement and said: Why, there is to be an all-Canadian route to the Klondike. Now, what does this Canadian route consist of? It consists of 150 miles of poor tramway, commencing somewhere in the mountains and ending nowhere. But when you approach these wily men they say: Well, this statement is true; the first of the 150 miles commences in Canadian territory and the last of the 150 miles ends in Canadian territory, and therefore it is an all-Canadian route. You might as well go up to the confluence of the Lewes with the Pelly River and build a road from Rink Rapids on to Dawson City and put that down as an all-Canadian route, all through Canadian territory. This all-Canadian route covered by the contract now before the House covers simply 150 miles of tramway out of a total distance of 1,500 miles from Vancouver to Dawson City; yet up to this day hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to secure support for this contract by appealing to the sympathies and susceptibilities of the people in favour of an all-Canadian route.

Hon. gentlemen opposite also published to the world the statement that this was the route, and the only route, that could be chosen. Why? Because, they said, it was free from all international complications and difficulties. The Minister of Railways and the Minister of the Interior made that the chief point in their advocacy of the scheme. They told us: We take this route, not Pyramid Harbour, not the Chilkoot Pass, not the White Pass, but we take this route simply because there are no international complications. And yet, what has happened? In the course of a few days' debate, not only

have they themselves gone back on that position, but the Prime Minister had to rise in this House and acknowledge, that there were grave international complications. And what was the statement of the right hon. the leader of the Government? "Yes," he said, "there is legislation threatened by the American Senate, but there is a treaty, and the treaty gives us the right of free navigation. Go on, vote the land, vote the contract, build the 150 miles of railroad, set your great all-Canadian route into operation, and, if they interfere with us at Wrangel, we have a supreme and instant remedy." And what was his remedy? To appeal to the courts of the United States to quash an enactment of their own Congress. That is the learned, that is the invaluable, that is the wise remedy proposed by our right hon. Premier. Was ever such a humiliating position taken by any man in the Government of Canada as is taken by the right hon. gentleman? Now, Mr. Speaker, these side-lights thrown upon the operations antecedent to the giving of this contract, and thrown upon this contract, and upon the methods of the Government, are what predispose me, and every cool and careful man in this country, against this contract and against this scheme. Let us go now to the discussion of the scheme itself. This Yukon policy is only one more blunder added to successive blunders of the Government and of the party which supports the Government. I wish I could say it was the last blunder of the Government. It is the latest blunder, but I cannot hope that it is the last blunder that this party and Government will make. It is only in the line of sequence. These hon. gentlemen blundered, when, as a party, they were in Opposition long years before they came into power. On the trade question they blundered. In 1878, as a party, they took strong and radical ground against protection; they fought the principle of protection up until 1896, and then, Sir, they proved their own blunder by adopting the principle of protection and putting it upon the statute-books of this country. They, as a party, fought the Canadian Pacific Railway, tooth and nail; they have ended by embracing the Canadian Pacific Railway, by gobbling up as many of its fat positions as they possibly could, and by affirming day and night, in their action and in their statements, that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway is the very basis of the present prosperity and the future progress of this great north-western country of ours. They blundered for years, and they acknowledge the blunder now by the changed aspect in which they view the Canadian Pacific Railway. The right hon. the leader himself made the same trouble upon the fisheries question, when in 1886 and 1888, and along in that period, we were endeavouring to stand by the fishery rights of this country in respect to the Treaty of 1818. What was the position of the leader of the Liberal

party then? It was one of carping criticism, one of fault-finding at the severity and barbarity, as he called it, of the execution of the laws and the maintenance of the rights of Canada. The statement that he then made at St. Thomas was so bald and so pointed, that his own party paper, the Toronto "Globe," was obliged, on the 29th August, 1888, to call him to task in these words:

How far is it possible to go in conciliation? The mere continuance of privileges granted to American fishermen by the *modus vivendi* will not satisfy the Washington claim that the privilege of transhipment in bond should be freely accorded to American fish cargoes. We fail to see how that privilege can be permanently accorded gratis by Canada. To yield it and what would logically and inevitably have to be given with it would be to make waste paper of the convention of 1818, and practically to surrender our inshore fisheries for nothing at all. Till Mr. Laurier disposes of the argument by which we yesterday maintained this opinion we must with all deference and good will to him maintain that the fisheries policy of Canada has not been unfriendly to the States.

Could there be any exigency greater than to call forth from a faithful party paper this rebuke to the chief of the party because of his unpatriotic stand in reference to the Treaty of 1818? What applies to the right hon. gentleman, applies as well to the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries; the one quotation points the argument against them all. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made a mistake, when he made Boston the centre of his political warfare, and when, on one memorable occasion, he stood before the inhabitants of a hostile country in many respects, and said, that Great Britain had been inhuman and severe in the way in which she treated her American cousins during the civil war; declaring before all of them in Boston, that Great Britain had made a mistake; declaring before the face of a hostile country in many respects, that he must say, a Canadian before everything else, that if it came to be the best for Canada that the ways should part between Canada and Great Britain, he would stand by Canada, that he preferred at any time to take, as he expressed it, the Yankee dollar to the English shilling. These mistakes culminated after 1896, in that famous interview in the Chicago "Record," where he threw the Treaty of 1818—established as firm as the granite rock of the mountains is established—when he threw the fishery dispute in Behring Sea—in which we were as clearly within our rights as could possibly be demonstrated—when he threw them both in with a lot of other trifling questions, and declared to the United States, that he was quite willing, for the sake of peace and amity, to wipe off the whole slate, bonding privileges included.

Sir, it is these blunders that hon. gentlemen made when they were in Opposition and since they have got into power, which

are but followed now by these later administrative blunders, the latest and worst of which is this one of the Mann-Mackenzie deal. As we expected, so it has turned out.

Now, what was there in this question to face? Simply as to what was the best commercial route. I take leave to reiterate to a certain extent, and maybe to amplify in some particulars, the excellent argument made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) in his speech in this House four or five days ago—the only speech on that side of the House which has been addressed to the business aspect of the question, and which has not been answered or attempted to be answered by any gentleman on that side, but has been persistently evaded. I say that in looking into this question of opening up the Yukon country, the question was simply one of providing transport facilities, so that the greatest trade for Canada could be secured; and the placing of the line of transport as far removed from international complications as possible. These were the essence of what was to be considered, and with reference to which a conclusion was to be reached.

In the first place, was the question rightly approached by the Ministry? They have made the plea of urgency; they have made the plea of haste—for what they themselves have acknowledged to be undue haste in this matter. I disagree in toto with the argument attempted to be made by the Minister of the Interior. I say that neither he nor any other hon. gentleman on that side of the House has made out a sufficient plea of urgency in this matter, or has been able to defend the Government from the charge of negligence in the early part of these transactions. I am not going into the details; they have been gone into by other hon. gentlemen, who have successfully proved where this negligence took place. The plea of the hon. Minister of the Interior was that he had no knowledge. That plea cannot stand before the facts of the case. That hon. gentleman was obliged to answer a question which was put to him a little later, as to when Mr. Ogilvie's reports came into the possession of his department. First, he declared that they had no knowledge, and afterwards he admitted that one or two of these reports had been given out to one or two members about July. Where were those reports, Sir? The first report of Mr. Ogilvie, of September 6th, 1896, came to his department on October 19th, 1896; the second, of August 18th, 1896, reached his department on October 22nd, 1896; the third, of November 6th, 1896, arrived on February 16th, 1897; the next, of December 9th, 1897, was received on February 27th, 1897; the next, of January 11th, 1897, on March 16th, 1897; and the last one, of January 23rd, 1897, on the same day, March 16th, 1897. On the 16th day of March, 1897, then the hon. gen-

Mr. FOSTER.

tleman had under his hands the whole of the information which his own officer had transmitted to him by report, and the essence of that information was that large and rich and repeated gold finds were being brought to light in that country, that there was intense excitement there, and that there was no doubt that there would be a great influx of people into the country the moment the news reached the outside world. Now, every man knows what mining fevers are. Any man who is conversant with the mining history of the world knows that the very announcement of rich gold finds in any quarter of the globe will bring a rushing troop of adventurous seekers for riches from every part of the globe—and now more than ever, when the means of transportation and the means of telegraphic communication spread the news and bring the seekers for wealth from every portion of the globe in an astonishingly short space of time.

What more? In the October session of 1896, the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) passed through this House an appropriation of \$6,000, on the request of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior), for the exploration and investigation of the Stikine River and the Taku Inlet routes leading over the mountains to the water basins on the other side. That appropriation was got by this Government in October, 1896, and a discussion upon it took place in this House; yet, so far as I know, not one single move was made with that money in hand to carry out the object for which it was appropriated—to get the information which the House at that time wanted it to get. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) himself as has been already pointed out, said that before the House rose last year the Ministers had this question forced upon their attention. Why, Sir, before we left this House last year the papers were bringing news of tremendous finds in the Yukon country; and the first of that band of adventurers who had spent the winter of 1896 in those regions were coming out and spreading over the whole world the news of the rich finds which they had made.

With all this information, the fact that the Minister of the Interior, specially charged with that subject, should sit down and practically do nothing until the 25th day of September, 1897, shows negligence of the grossest and most culpable kind. What length of time did it take for the Government's engineer to make his investigations? Do not let us run away with the idea that all this time was consumed by the engineer. Mr. Jennings started on the ground on the 25th of September. He finished his exploration on the 25th day of October. Of all the time he took simply one month to do the engineering investigation. Mr. St. Cyr, who was ordered to explore the Hootalinqua River and Teslin

Lake, got on the ground on the 14th of October, and in thirteen days, or on the 27th of October, he had finished his survey. What does that mean? It means that it took these engineers less than a month to gather all the information which the Government needed both as to the railway and as to the rivers at both ends of the railway. Why were they not sent out in July? Why were they not sent out in August? If it took them but a month, one of them, and but thirteen days, the other, what reason in the wide world was there why a Government, with all the necessary means and information at its disposal, should not have had these engineers out there in July, and had their information back here in August? There is no reason in the world. Nay, more, if Mr. St. Cyr finished his work on the 27th October, as he did, who is to blame if that report did not get into the Minister's hands until the 6th January, 1897? Was there any reason why that report—not an abstruse or voluminous one—should not have been in the Minister's hands within three weeks, at least, after it was completed, which would have been the middle or latter part of November. There is no reason; it was simply stupid negligence—negligence which cannot be condoned. That negligence was shown, in the first place, by the Government not sending engineers out long before they did, and in the next place by their not obtaining a report before the 6th of January, when the work of the engineers was finished on the 27th of October. Therefore the charge of gross and inexcusable negligence lies at the door of hon. gentlemen opposite. They had July and August for making preparations and for gathering information, they had then September and October for deliberating and coming to a conclusion, and then they had November and December and part of January to ask for and obtain tenders, and then they could have met Parliament very shortly after the 1st of January, and not a single fundamental principle of constitutional and parliamentary government would have been contravened. That they did not do this shows negligence in the first place, which they attempted to cover by haste in the second place, and for both they are responsible.

I have spoken about the methods of this contract as being indefensible, and shall not amplify that point. The very fact that the negotiations were conducted in secret condemns it. But these hon. gentlemen say: How could we have made our intentions known? I ask how did you make the contract known? You made it known in a moment, when you wished to, by publishing it in the press, and it went all over the country and the world. What was there to prevent the Government stating, through their organs, or in any other authoritative way, that they were proposing to build a railway

line into the Yukon by Teslin Lake or any other route, and letting the public know that they were willing to meet capitalists and give them an opportunity to tender for the work. Why, the simplest announcement would have carried the news broadcast, and we would have had the benefit of competition almost world-wide, and the benefit of having this line built at a very much decreased cost than now proposed.

One of my greatest objections, the thing I quarrel with the Government most about, is that indefensible blanket which they give Mackenzie & Mann over the gold lands of the Yukon. What incited these hon. gentlemen to do that? They have confessed their own cowardice from their own mouths. They were afraid, after their long years in Opposition of protesting economy—they were afraid after their experience in trying to pass through the Drummond deal, which has a capitalization of \$7,000,000, they were afraid after they had passed through the Crow's Nest transaction which cost us \$2,000,000 more than was necessary, they were afraid, after having made the largest expenditure on current account ever made in this country—and so their courage suddenly oozed out, and they themselves alleged that they did not dare ask the people for one million or two million dollars to open up the great Yukon. So they adopted a subterfuge, as unworthy as it has proved costly, and proposed to deceive the people with the statement that this was not going to cost them anything, and at the same time give away nine-tenths of the eligible gold lands in the Yukon. Sir, this country has never yet proved itself indisposed to bear public burdens for a great public good, when once it has been placed fairly and well before it. The history of the last twenty years bears that out. To open up the Yukon country to the men of Canada as well as the people of other countries, this country would not have found fault with the Government for promising a vote of \$2,000,000 or even more, and have thus kept our heritage. I want to make this statement just as strongly as I can make it, that this plan of handing over the placer and gold mining regions of the country to a perpetual monopoly is a thing unheard of in the annals of Anglo-Saxon government. Basing their first action upon the history of the mining world, these gentlemen, on the 18th January, promulgated their latest regulations, which affirmed that the placer mining of that country should be kept for the individual miner, that every man with a mining license had a right to enter and prospect and take up land wherever he found it, to a certain extent, with the exceptions of town sites. Yet seven days afterwards, they went back on the salutary history of all mining countries, they went back upon their own reasoned-out judgment, as embodied in their regulations, and made a blanket of 3,750,000 acres of picked gold placer mining country, and gave

it to a monopoly in perpetuity, from which they get nothing in return, except a trifling fee in the shape of one per cent royalty.

I want to call the attention of this country to the statement made by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), and made also by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair). What matters it, said the hon. member for Russell, anyway, about two million or three million acres of land? What is the difference whether Mackenzie & Mann get it or whether it becomes the property of many individuals? If individual miners get it, they will strip the wealth out of it and put it in their own pockets. If Mackenzie & Mann get it, they cannot do anything more than that. Then what are you making this bother about? Well, Mr. Speaker, if that be good reasoning, carry it out to its logical conclusion, and just give the whole of the gold lands of this country to one single firm. They will only take the gold out—that is all. But has it come to this, that the trustees of the wealth of the country are going to give that wealth into one hand and rob the multitude of their patrimony—rob them of possessions which for centuries have been the acknowledged right of the individual miner and prospector in all Anglo-Saxon countries where mining has been carried on. Carry that argument a little further. The extremely foolish stand was taken by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) of holding up a map and showing a little black spot on that map, and saying: You are making a terrible time about the amount of land given to Mackenzie & Mann, look at this wide map and that little spot on it, that is all that Mackenzie & Mann get out of it. The Minister of the Interior, refining a little more, said: There is a lot of waste land about mining, just as there is waste cloth in cutting out a garment. All you can get there is a three-hundred-foot pay streak and when you calculate the quantity of land in this three-hundred-foot pay-streak throughout this 3,750,000 acres, you find it amounts to only a few acres of land—so, what have these men got? Exactly, but go to the Le Roi mine, measure the acreage of land, and measure the width of pay-streak, and you will see that the owners though rich now would be illimitably richer if they had a pay-streak three hundred feet wide. Why, every mining country in the world has to take its waste lands along with its pay-streak, either in lode or alluvial mining; and a mine is valuable only according to the extent of pay-streak or payable lode that is in it. But the point about that dot on the map was that to be accurate the whole country should have been reduced in the same proportion which the three-hundred-foot pay-streak in the country bore to the quantity of the pay-streak that Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie are to get. If the map had been constructed on that principle you would have found

Mr. FOSTER.

that Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie's pay-streak would take about nine-tenths of the valuable placer mining pay-streak in the Yukon. I have no hesitation, then, in saying that, with the machinery they have, with the time at their disposal and the opportunity which they will make the most of in that great country, they will get the major part by far of all the paying alluvial placer mining lands in the Yukon. Now, what does this mean? Take this official Klondike guide. I do not want to read what has already been read, but if you take the summing up by Mr. Ogilvie you will see what this means. I will read just one sentence:

Taking this division—

That is only one division—

—as a whole, including the three creeks named, confluent to Indian Creek, a distance of some thirty-five miles in length and twenty-five or more in width, if the indications can be relied on, there are one hundred millions of dollars in sight in that area.

Suppose that Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie get but one such property in their whole one hundred blocks of 72 square miles each, suppose that in the location and search and pick of these lands they get simply one stretch of country equivalent to this, we have given them a bonanza. Suppose that, in every block they only get one good find, they will have one hundred finds, which may average them, for each, \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000. The fact is that the knowledge upon this point is so indefinite, the prospect is so rich as shown by the reports of the officers of the Government, that it is the height of folly and extravagance to give one single foot of picked gold lands for the building of this road. It ought to be the policy of this Government and of this country to save these lands for the people of the country, and to pay what cash may be necessary in order to secure the building of the road.

The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) said that he hoped no Canadians would go into that territory, that he did not want the young and sturdy sons of farmers to go there. I cannot help what he wants; I know that they are going there and will go there in increasing numbers; and I, for my part, bid them God-speed in their search for independence and a fortune in that great country that is to be exploited for Canada. I tell you plainly, I would not vote a penny for opening up the Yukon if I did not think our own people would have an opportunity to get there. If only foreigners are to go there and to take the gold from the country, so far as we are concerned let them get in and out the best way they can, let them provide their own means of transport, and pay for it. No consideration of mere trade would cause me to favour the spending of a single dollar of public money for

transport facilities. The great point with me is that in the opening up of that country we are giving our own young men an opportunity to go there and seek their fortunes, as many will, though no doubt many will be disappointed. The question has been suggested, what will be the spirit of the miners going into that country when they find that monopolists have the choice of the rich ground and are working at an advantage as compared with themselves? The miners' sense of justice is keen, and that sense of justice must be reckoned with by every Government that has a mining country to develop. Besides the alien miners who will go there, there will be the young men out of our own country who will go there this year and next year and future years. Retribution will begin to overtake hon. gentlemen opposite, when, in two or three years from now if they are successful in putting this deal through and blanketing that country, our young men from every quarter of Canada go up there with their brawny arms and their small capital to prospect the country in the hope of finding fortunes, only to find that they have been preceded by monopolists, and that a country which ought to be their birthright has been given away. Then, Sir, the people of this country will have an accounting with hon. gentlemen opposite. From a mere party point of view I might be willing, so far as I am concerned to let them put through this scheme and take the onus of it, because I would be sure of the retribution which would follow. But there is one consideration which makes any such thought impossible, and that is that once done this is irrevocable; once that land is given into the hands of monopolists it is perpetually alienated from the people, and, so far as I am concerned, and, I believe, so far as this side of the House is concerned, we propose to use our best efforts to defeat such a proposal.

Then, what follows? The inevitable muddle. International complication may arise elsewhere, therefore choose all-Canadian route, and build the 150 miles of tramway to Glenora, and then you can go up the Stikine River, says the Government. And yet, before a single stroke has been done on this road, hon. gentlemen opposite are face to face with international complications which they can no longer ignore or deny. And they have largely brought it on themselves. If, last July and August and September, instead of taking their comfort and enjoying themselves, in different parts of this country they had been diligently making way with the Government at Washington and had been putting into shape a fair system of bonding on the Pacific Coast, I believe they could have had arrangements completed before this contract was given so that courteous and amicable treatment on both sides would have been assured on the Pacific Coast. But, instead of taking a single,

step in that direction, they dilly-dallied, they made no overtures, they made no arrangements. The first thing they did was to throw defiance to the people of the United States by saying: We will prevent roads built across your territory from connecting with the Yukon, we will build by the route that we choose, and we will prevent the United States trade from going into that country.

It is right that any Government should seek to take the most of the trade and keep it for our people. But they were unfortunate in not making their arrangement with the United States Government before they threw out that challenge, when, as I verily believe, they could have had this arranged in an amicable and friendly way, and without any trouble on this score. But, Sir, here we are, and we have now to look at this scheme just as it is, threatened with international complications greater there than at any other point on the Pacific Coast, with our right to navigate undoubted, a right which, I am glad to know, the right hon. gentleman proposes to maintain, as we on this side of the House propose to help him to maintain, but a right which, at the same time, is surrounded by certain complications for which my hon. friend himself can only find a remedy in the tedious and futile process of an appeal to a court of the United States, and the Minister of the Interior in a five or six years' course of negotiations and arbitration with the United States. What, then, is the position we are forced to? We are forced to this position, that, according to the statement of the First Minister himself, we are asked to-day to decide upon an incomplete proposition, which they admit is incomplete—they propose to add something to it, and they do not tell us what they propose to add; and so they ask us to vote a partial scheme through at immense expense instead of bringing down their whole proposition as a remedy under the present set of circumstances, and placing it in its entirety before this House.

What do we get now? We get, after all said and done, simply 150 miles of tramway, commencing 150 miles from the coast at Wrangel, ending some 600 or 700 miles this side of Dawson, which, for seven months in the year, is perfectly useless, and for five months in the year has tedious and expensive navigation on each side of it, with the inevitable shifts, and transfers, and changes in whatever you carry into or out of that country. You have that, Sir, and, in addition, the complications that are threatened by actual and impending legislation in the United States Congress, and which, however we may hope for the better, we yet fear will be put through. This tramway, by the calculation of Mr. Jennings himself, will cost about three million dollars. That is what we get. Now, what do we give? I think the House has, to a cer-

tain extent lost sight of one of the franchises that we give to those contractors, that is, the profits on the operation of the road itself. I propose to make a calculation, which I will present to this House and invite criticism upon it. We have been unable to get the Government to say what are the maximum tolls they are going to allow on that road for passengers and freight; but we have this statement of the Minister of the Interior, that they will be high, very much higher than on any railroads which are known in this country at the present time. Now, I say it is necessary, to a proper judgment upon this question, that we should have the maximum of the toll and of the freights. Then, you take power to make two reductions of 25 per cent each in seven years, and when ten years have passed, you are to bring them under the operation of the general railway law. That carries out the proposition that they are to be high, very much higher than any railroad tolls and freights that are known. Now, if these tolls are to be at a certain amount, and the travel is to be what hon. gentlemen have estimated, the franchise of that road is a most valuable consideration in itself. Let me ask the attention of the House for a moment. I have taken the tolls at the rate of 10 cents per mile for a passenger, that is, \$15 over the 150 miles. I have taken the calculation made by the Minister himself as to the cost of the tonnage of freight, at \$50 per ton. Now, how does that work out? For 150 miles of road, taking their own calculation and Mr. Jennings's calculation of the cost, the contractors will expend \$2,700,000 of capital to build it. On the basis that 20,000 passengers and 20,000 tons of freight go into that country in a season, that is, going in and coming out, on that calculation, the earnings of the road, after you have taken out \$60,000 as the estimated cost of working, will give a profit of \$700,000. Now, is that to be laughed at?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). How many trains do you allow a day?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going into the details.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How can you tell what it will cost to run, unless you do that?

Mr. FOSTER. I take the engineer's estimate, and I add \$10,000 to it; and I have not heard from the Minister of Railways, and he has no report of an engineer to show that it will cost more than that to run it for five months in the year; and, until he makes a statement, either on his own authority or of that of his engineers, I will have to take the authority of the only engineer whose report we have before us, and I have been generous in adding to his estimate. Now, I say, that on that basis, which is below the lowest estimate of the Minister of

Railways himself, it will make a profit of \$700,000 over the cost of operating.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I made no estimate of the number of people that would travel over the road.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend says he made no estimate of the number of people who would travel over the road. Why, Sir, his own language is before you, in the "Hansard."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You had better point it out.

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell my hon. friend what it is, without pointing it out. He went over the different estimates, and showed that some people had estimated that 250,000 would go in, others had estimated that 200,000 would go in, others that 100,000 would go in, and he brought it down and based his estimate upon 50,000 going in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is quite true I did state that the lowest estimate that has been made of the number of people who would go into that country in one year, was about 50,000; but I did not say, nor did I suggest, that that number of people would use this railway, because, I said, they were already commencing to go into the country, and would continue to do so long before the railway was built.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend thinks he can get out of it that way for the Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am stating what I said.

Mr. FOSTER. I will just bring this to his attention. For what purpose is the Government building the railroad?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Chiefly to get tonnage in; the people can get in there, but the tonnage cannot.

Mr. FOSTER. The *raison d'être* of the building of the railway, according to the argument of every hon. gentleman opposite, is that if the Government build this road they do so to make sure the Canadian trade will go in by that route. Canadian freight cannot go in unless passengers go in. The whole argument adduced by hon. members opposite is that: You have to build the road so that when it is constructed you will divert the trade into Canadian channels, and if you do not direct the trade and the passenger traffic there, no argument is presented for building the road at all. But I am safe even in that presentation of the case, when the hon. gentleman stated that 50,000 people would go into that district, and that 20,000 would come out. Will the hon. Minister deny that such was his proposition?

Mr. FOSTER.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I did not give any estimate of the number of people who will use that railway.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Hon. members know that the hon. Minister did not seem to be very well informed or very accurate. On the assumption that 50,000 people will go in and out, that is 25,000 in and 25,000 out, and the hon. gentleman mentioned that no one had made a lower estimate of the number than 50,000, certain calculations may be made. Those are the hon. gentleman's figures as reported in "Hansard." Assuming 50,000 people will go in and out and 50,000 tons of freight will go in and out—and the hon. gentleman has admitted that the tonnage must go that way—what profits would accrue from that traffic, after taking out the running expenses? There would remain \$3,190,000 as net profit. If 100,000 people go in and out, 50,000 each way, or 75,000 in and 25,000 out, and you calculate one ton of freight for each person, and that is a small allowance, for the quantity will be found to be nearer three tons than one ton for each person—

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Suppose you take one ton of freight for each person and estimate that 100,000 persons go in, the profits, after taking out the working expenses, would show \$6,000,000 in a single season.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. What percentage of the receipts is the hon. gentleman taking out for working expense?

Mr. **FOSTER**. \$500,000.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. How do you get at that sum?

Mr. **FOSTER**. Will the hon. Minister of Railways say that a railway operated for five months and carrying 100,000 people and freight, will cost more than half a million dollars to operate during that time?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I never ran a railway up there.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I want the hon. gentleman, from a business point of view, to take up that calculation and tell me wherein it is extravagant. Are hon. gentlemen going to place an average rate for carrying passengers per mile at 10 cents and freight at 2½ cents per pound? If they are going to adopt such rates, then my estimates, taking the passengers and freight as named, give the result I have stated. So in three years of successful operation these gentlemen will pay for the whole of the railway and lay up \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000, undoubtedly, of profits.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Oh, oh.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Hon. gentlemen opposite may smile or laugh at these figures as they please, but let them tell the House the tolls they are going to charge.

Mr. **DOMVILLE**. They are charging \$500 now as tolls at Stikine, and the man walks.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Let the Government inform the House as to what tolls they are going to charge on passengers and freight. If the rate is to be 10 cents or 8 cents or 5 cents, let us know it. Let them state what freight tolls they are going to allow Mackenzie & Mann to charge. We are handicapped for lack of this knowledge; but if the tolls are to be anything like those I have named, the contractors will, in three years, be able to repay every dollar expended out of the profits of the road, and have millions of surplus for themselves. But we give them even more than what I have stated.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). Why not incorporate that mine of wealth?

Mr. **FOSTER**. The hon. gentleman is always inclined to take a thrifty view.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Are these Mr. Hamilton Smith's figures?

Mr. **FOSTER**. No doubt he would endorse them. I am not, however, in the habit of submitting figures handed to me by some other person, though the hon. gentleman may be in the habit of doing so. These contractors also obtain bonding powers, and they are empowered to issue mortgages, debentures or stock on all their properties and undertakings. The Government give the contractors a five-year monopoly of the road to the north, with the opportunity of building by the route over the Chilkat Pass if they wish, and they give the contractors a preference clause as regards the southern extension, which means that if such an extension is built Government aid will be given, and Government aid must be given to that portion of the road. In addition, they give the contractors a grant which will actually cover over 4,000,000 acres of the mineral lands in the Yukon. It is an immense franchise which these contractors are given—and for what? For simply building 150 miles of tramway, beginning 150 miles from the ocean and ending 650 miles from Dawson City.

The Minister of the Interior alleged that the country would obtain some other benefits from the road. He contends that the building of this road is necessary for the preservation of law and order. However, I find I am entering on a new and what will be the last phase of my subject, and

I will be pleased if Mr. Speaker will now call it six o'clock.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was going on to state, what it was that the Government got out of this arrangement, how much it would cost in the way of outlay of capital to the contractors, the franchises and subsidies which the contractors were to get from the Government, and I think the contrast is a sufficiently striking and significant one. We get 150 miles of mountain tramway, beginning somewhere in the hills 150 miles or so from the mouth of the Stikine River at a point which is totally inaccessible during the winter season, and which is accessible only by difficult and tedious navigation for five or five and a half months in the year. This railway ends 150 miles further on, somewhere near the head of Teslin Lake which is 600 or 700 miles away from Dawson City or the centre of the Yukon country, and which distance has to be traversed in small boats by a tortuous line of navigation involving possible portages and transshipments, and certainly taking up a great length of time in the round trip on account of the speed and strength of the currents by which those boats will be met on the return. This tramway is practically all that the contractors give to the Government. Under Mr. Jennings's report and his statement as to the cost of the road, the outlay of capital necessary to build that tramway is in the neighbourhood of three million dollars, in round figures. I was going on to state that we give the company the road and its possible profits, and I took the statements which were made by the Ministers, and took what I considered a fair good average, on the information given by the Minister of the Interior as to the rates of tolls and carriage of freight, and I calculated the profits on the incoming and outgoing, first, of twenty thousand people and their freight, second, of fifty thousand people and their freight, and third, of one hundred thousand people and their freight. I submit these calculations to both sides of the House and to the intelligent public, as it is impossible for us to get from the Government the knowledge which is absolutely necessary to this Parliament before it can come to any fair conclusion as to whether the grant we are giving is an inordinate and unreasonable one or is not. As the Government refuses to give us that information, I have assumed these railway rates, and I have made my calculation upon them. I state without fear of contradiction, that you can make a very large reduction on these rates, and even on that basis you must come to the conclusion, that if this road is patronized at all as the promoters, and

Mr. FOSTER.

the Government suppose it will be, then the company stands to make in two or three years of its operation, not only the original cost of the road, but all its charges of operation as well as a very handsome return of millions of dollars on their investment. I was also stating, Sir, that the contractors are not called upon to put their hands in their pockets to build that road; the Government has looked after that. On all this wide basis of a rich franchise, they have given the contractors the power of raising as much money as they wish: yes, Sir, many times as much money as is needed, by bonds and mortgages which they can put upon their property and which they can raise upon the mileage of this road. And, Sir, with that franchise, with the reports that have gone broadcast as regards the richness of that territory, with the inevitable and openly patent spirit of speculation which is showing itself in all parts of the world in regard to this gold country, and the rush (as the records of the Department of the Interior will show) for mining franchises; I assert that that franchise alone placed upon the London market, or any other great money market, will give, in a small moiety of it, more than sufficient returns for these men to pay for all their outlay and leave them a large surplus of funds for future operations or for division amongst themselves. I added, that beside that, they had a monopoly which renders these territories tolerably safe and certain to them, a monopoly of five years on the north, or what is equally as good an option to build a road from Pyramid Harbour on to Rink Rapids towards Dawson City, giving them what is the real commercial route, and a ten years' preference of building a railway on the southern extension, with the inevitable Government aid which the right hon. gentleman who leads the House has declared Parliament would be asked for, if this road be extended. That is what the company gets. It gets besides this, charter powers of a very wide extent and of very great importance, viz., the power to build branch lines from all its possessions to the principal railways, the power to do almost all businesses under the sun, and what is of no slight account in a country where timber will be almost next in value to gold—the timber can be used and is to be used for nothing else, comparatively speaking, than for the operations and needs of the miners themselves—these contractors get the best timbered lands in that district, which timber they can sell out to the miners at very profitable rates. Although the miner may have the opportunity of going on Government lands and taking from them such timber as he chooses for his operations, yet he cannot touch a stick of timber on the lands of Mann & Mackenzie; that timber belongs to these gentlemen and they will keep it as a source of profit, as they are perfectly entitled to do.

Now I am aware that the Ministers said, we get more than that. What is it? The Ministers have declared to the country and to the House, that we get what is absolutely necessary to guarantee law and order in that community. I take absolute exception to that statement. I ask my hon. friends opposite what they expect in the way of difficulties in keeping law and order in the Yukon district. Into that district will pour a large number of people from the settled portions of Canada, law-abiding and orderly people every one of them, who will be, next to the mounted policemen so far as keeping law and order is concerned, the right arm of everything that is right and proper to be carried out. There are going into that country hundreds and thousands of young Englishmen of character and of force, and every Englishman who goes there is an upholder of English law and order by nature, and by custom, and by practice, and by his own self interest as well. From the Australian colonies are coming adventurers trained in mining who understand what law and order means to themselves in Australia, and who will carry the same respect for law and order into the Yukon territory. And of those who come from the United States—more in this than perhaps in any previous great excitement—a better class of men are forming themselves into syndicates of ten, and twenty, and thirty to go to that country. Are they going to fight law and order and the representatives of that justice which alone can give them security in their possessions?

I questioned the Ministry not long ago, and they said that in that country or on the way to it there were 270 mounted policemen. I asked the Government to-day how many of the militia or the permanent force they are going to send in there, and I had the answer, 200 men. What in the name of heaven do we need with four or five hundred mounted police and military to keep order among the people going into that country? I ask the right hon. gentleman one question. He has been urging us to vote this measure through for the sake of keeping law and order in the Yukon country. I ask him, is one of those 270 mounted policemen going to stay out of that country until Mann & Mackenzie's road is completed; or are they going in now, and will they continue to go in so as to get there on the first of July, or as soon thereafter as possible? I ask the right hon. gentleman if one of those 200 men of the permanent force, which he is going to send in as a right arm to the mounted police is going to wait until Mann & Mackenzie get the road completed, and go in after the first of September? He would not dare to take the risk of such a contingency. No; those men are to be sent in at once, and before Mann & Mackenzie strike one blow on that road the 270 mounted policemen and the 200 of the permanent force will be in the Yukon,

or far on their way thither, and they will be quite sufficient to keep law and order in that country. It is a false pretense to put before this country that we must go it blind and put this work through during the coming summer for the purpose of keeping law and order in the Yukon district. Now, when do you want to keep law and order in the Yukon district? In the summer season? Measurably so. In the winter season? Measurably so. Let us be sensible. In the summer season where are the 50,000 men who are in the country? Scattered over the country, in twos or threes or fives or sixes. These people will keep their own law and order. They are there not to fight against the civil power; they are there to search out the riches of the country for themselves, and they know that their best protection is that they shall be the observers of the law. In the winter season what are you going to do? Are the 50,000 people who are going in next summer going to camp there next winter; to live in that delightfully torrid season in the northern part of the Yukon district, for the simple pleasure of living? There will be two classes among that 50,000; the class of prospectors who this year will have struck something and will have something to work upon—they will be working on their claims next winter; and the class who will have struck nothing, and who either do not have to work or do not want to work on their claims, and will not care to have the pleasure of remaining in the Yukon country during the winter. He will find that next fall these will be on their way out to civilization on the coast. And in the winter season where will be the men who remain in the country? How many points have you there in which the men can congregate? I believe one or two, or three points at the most. Do you mean to say that four hundred mounted police and militia are not sufficient to keep law and order at Dawson City and the one or two other places in the country? It is a pretense that is blown away at the very first attempt you make to analyse it, that we perforce are to vote this thing, or law or order will be placed in jeopardy. Again, I ask the right hon. gentleman, is he going to wait until we get that road built on the first of September next before he sends in the police and his permanent force of infantry? If not, he does not want the road for that purpose. I will put another question. Is he going to send in with the men themselves, or by other means, the supplies they will require next winter, or is he going to keep them back until Mann & Mackenzie get the road completed? He does not dare to say that he will leave the men who will go there as guardians of the peace, dependent for their food and supplies for next winter upon the contingency that Mann & Mackenzie will get that road built by the first of September, or in sufficient time thereafter to send the food and supplies over it. No, Sir; the men

will take their food and supplies in themselves, or have them sent in by the routes that will be available during the coming summer. They will not depend upon the contingency of this road being completed in time. If they did, they might find themselves in a bad box if Mann & Mackenzie failed to finish the road in time.

Then, we were appealed to on humanitarian grounds. Our susceptibilities as to suffering were harrowed up, and we were told that it was absolutely necessary to carry through this secret contract and get it into operation—to do what? To save people from the pangs of starvation in the Yukon country. Starvation during what period of the year? Starvation this spring, next summer or next fall? No, because by this road not a pound of food will go in under the best of circumstances before the 1st of September; and up to that time, whatever food is necessary will be taken in by other and well-known routes. So that, so far as staving off starvation during this summer season is concerned, that road is of no more use than would be a road in the north of Siberia. Have the Government undertaken to keep people from starvation in that country from next autumn on? If so, they have undertaken a contract which they had no business to undertake, which this country never authorized, and I think will not authorize them to undertake. By what right have this Parliament, as the representatives of the taxpayers of this country, to say to the world, to adventurers and aliens from every clime: "Rush in; never mind your provisions; we will see that you shall not starve when you get there." Lay that down as an axiom in the conduct of the Government of this country, and where would you be? No Government dare lay down such a policy. These hon. gentlemen have gone far towards laying down that policy in this case; and if next winter men are found in that country with insufficient supplies, the guilt will lie at the doors of hon. gentlemen opposite, who advertised in their queer way to the world at large that they would build a line of railway into that country to prevent starvation next winter. But I take the more common-sense view, and I hazard the assertion that you may go to Dyea or to the Stikine or to the wharfs of Victoria and Vancouver, and you will find that nineteen out of every twenty of the men who are going into that country are going there with the determination either to come out next autumn, or, if not, with a sufficient supply of provisions in their possession for one and a half or two years. The tales of starvation and the dangers of starvation which have been heralded through the press of this country, and the press of every other country, have awakened every adventurer who turns his face towards that northern clime, to the fact that he must insure himself against the danger of starvation. The re-

Mr. FOSTER.

sult is that nineteen out of every twenty men who are going in, with these examples before their eyes, with the constant admonition to take in plenty of supplies, with the admonition of Commissioner Walsh that they must have at least a year's provisions with them, will go in well supplied with provisions; and what they lack the trading and supply companies which are operating in the country by the dozen, will see that they have provisions to sell when the starving time comes and the people have to buy. Now, I think I have thoroughly exploded the idea that owing to the fear of starvation we have to put our hands into the treasure-house of this country and denude it of its greatest value for the purpose of keeping the people in that country from starvation. But they say: Oh, we want to save the trade for Canada. Let us examine that from a common-sense point of view. There are two things the Government are trading on. They are, first, trading on the cry of "An all-Canadian route," which is a pure pretense so far as this contract is concerned, and are trying to get the country to stand by them on this pretext. An ostrich may stick its head in a heap of sand and think it will thereby escape the attacks of its enemies, but so long as its huge posterior bulk is found to obtrude, its enemies are sure to find it out. This ostrich Government sticks its head in a mass of moss and snow, 150 miles from the mouth of the Stikine River, and cries out that this railway of 150 miles, on a route which is more than 1,500 miles in total extent, is an all-Canadian route. This is an ostrich policy, which the criticism of its opponents will soon make very short work of. Save the trade for Canada? I have said there are two things which these hon. gentlemen are trading on. One is the all-Canadian cry, and the other is that they are patriotically determined to preserve the trade of Canada for Canadians. Let us examine their scheme and bring to bear on it a little common sense. I ask this question of the right hon. leader of the Government; Will the building or not building of the Teslin Lake Railway, 150 miles in length, save one ounce or vary one pound of the Yukon trade for this year? Every man who proposes to go there this season, has either started on his way or has made all the preparations to get there. He has purchased his supplies, whether he has purchased them here or in any other country. And, so far as the 20,000 or 30,000 or 50,000 people who are going into that country to prospect for minerals this year is concerned, not one pound of the supplies they will take will be in the least degree influenced by the building of that 150 miles of road during this summer. Well, if the building of that road will not vary the trade of the Klondike one ounce, or a pound, this season, let us go beyond that into the wider question and test what this Yukon Railway scheme, as propounded by this

Government—for we must take it exactly as it is before us to-day—amounts to. There may be prophecies and promises as to something else that is to come, but we know nothing about that. This Parliament is dealing now with the simple Teslin Lake route and the contract which we are asked to pass upon. Let us ask what its effect will be on trade. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not a whit more eager that Canada shall have all the trade possible in opening that country than we are. But hon. gentlemen on this side, or the other side, might just as well come down to plain matters of fact and look into the question outside of anything else but the hard facts of the case. I propose to discuss briefly this question of the Canadian trade, and I make bold to say, this,—and I say it before I bring my proof, in order that it may catch the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite who may think that I am extravagant in my statement—that if hon. gentlemen opposite had searched the whole line of coast to the interior, they could not have selected a more disadvantageous route for the carrying of heavy provisions than this half-and-half scheme of the Teslin Lake 150-mile tramway business, with its attendant water stretches on either side.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As the hon. gentleman's leader says so well.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has given utterance to one of his wise remarks. He will now, as in the past, find that my hon. leader is quite able to take care of himself and the Minister of Trade and Commerce to boot. He will also find, if he wishes to look into the matter, that there is not very much difference between my opinion and the opinion of my hon. friend who sits beside me.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. And if there be a difference, it is that difference of opinion which every man on this side claims a right to have in looking at these questions from his point of view.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There are no misgivings.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend had to apologize the other night, and he will find that quietness is the best policy for some people, under certain circumstances. What I want to state is this, and I state it again, because the facetious remark of my hon. friend quite overcame me for the time being. I was looking into the matter of the trade of Canada to be obtained by the opening up of the Yukon district, and I said that hon. gentlemen opposite would find it difficult to discover a line of transport which would labour under greater disabilities in the carrying of heavy freight than this scheme which is submitted to us.

My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) discussed this question of supplying the great bulk of products which will go into the Yukon district, from an intensely practical point of view, and much better than I can state it; but I propose to make another statement of fact, in order that it may be taken into consideration, if possible, even with greater attention by hon. gentlemen on the other side. When you speak of the Yukon district and of diverting the trade of Canada into that district, against competition from other quarters, there are three things to take into account. In the first place, you have to distinguish between what you may call the simple distribution of supplies what you may call the production of these supplies. It is a good thing, if the distributors or handlers of goods can get out of the Yukon trade a profit that comes to them as the medium of transmission, whether these goods are the products of their own country or simply handled in transshipment from another country. Every distributor being a medium for the passage of these products from the source of production to the place of consumption gets his profit upon it, and these profits are distributed to a large extent in the cities and towns in which these distributors live. So that, if nothing of this were produced in Canada, if a large proportion of it were handled by distributors in Victoria, Vancouver and other towns, the trade would be worth looking after, and could be profitably done in this country. But every hon. gentleman knows that that is not the important point. When we talk of having the trade of the Yukon for Canada, we mean that we want to have the productions of Canada consumed in the Yukon. We want our own men to handle the goods also. Then we have the double advantage of profits on production and handling as well. But every business man knows that as between the two, the profit that comes to Canada from sending in products of our own country are far greater than those which we get from the distribution of a similar quantity of products of other countries. When you come down to that point, you have three things to think of—first, the cost of production; second, the cost of transport, and, third, the incidence of customs duties. I think I am right when I say, as I think the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) was right when he said that the greater part of what will be taken into the country as it fills up will be provisions of different kinds. A mining camp is proverbially lavish and almost wasteful. Man for man, the workers in a mining camp will consume two or three times as much as labourers in other classes of labour. So that a great feature in the supply of a mining camp is in provisions. These you may divide into two classes, those that are, so to speak, dead and those that are taken in on foot. Now, as to the cost of pro-

duction. I take it that I am not uttering a hearsay when I state that in Washington, Oregon, on the Pacific Coast of the United States you can produce these staple provisions at as little cost as you can produce them in Manitoba or the North-west. I am not going into a laboured argument on that point. I will simply take it for granted that the cost of production of meats of all kinds and provisions of all kinds is as great on the plains near Calgary or further east, as on the fertile stretches of Washington and Oregon. Let us see, then, how we stand for the securing of this trade by the Stikine route in competition with the producers in Oregon and Washington. Call it unpatriotic if you like; say that we are not sounding the praises of our own country, but business, as an eminent authority on the other side says, is business, and we have to look at facts as well as to study sentiment. Taking the cost of production as equal in our North-west on one side and in Washington and Oregon on the other, what are the difficulties, if any, in the way of our competing with them? You have to take your provisions and cattle from the North-west on this side of the Rocky Mountains, and transport them for six hundred to a thousand miles down to the sea-board. You have to take them up by a vessel to the mouth of the Stikine River; you have to transfer them there to smaller vessels and take them up the Stikine River. And then you transfer to the tramway and take them over that road a distance of 150 miles. You must here make another change and take them by boat down Teslin Lake and Hootalinqua River until you get them to Dawson City. Count up the cost of that method of transport. Then take the cities of Oregon and Washington, where production is equally cheap and there you have a route less in mileage and less expensive, because it is by water entirely, until you reach the port where you leave them to be re-embarked for inland transportation. Will anybody tell me that you are going to give the producers of meats and provisions in Canada a fair chance to secure that trade of the Yukon under these circumstances? I do not believe you are. The question has come up whether British Columbia is a producer of surplus agricultural products. Everybody knows that she is not. I hope the time will come when she will be. She has rich lands and a very good selection of them, but we are dealing with facts as they are, and the facts that British Columbia has to import a large proportion of her food products, and she imports them from the United States and from the western part of the North-west Territories. If this supply of food for the Yukon is to come from Canada, then it must come from this side of the Rocky Mountains. That brings up the question whether it is possible for competition to take place

Mr. FOSTER.

with regard to these things, competition which will bring a large quantity of Canadian products into the Yukon district for consumption there. Then, take the next large item of trade in the Yukon. A great deal of machinery and tools will be needed, also furniture and that sort of thing. Now, machinery is heavy and furniture is fairly bulky. Applying the same line of argument, and you can easily see that it is a question whether you would be able to compete with the United States in these articles, and whether things of that bulky kind will go over that road along the Teslin Lake and over this railway, or seek some way where there are not so many transshipments or where the cost will not be so great.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) says "hear, hear." I am glad the argument is sinking into his mind. I thought that after much reiteration I should bring my hon. friend to say "hear, hear."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It sounds like an argument from a Tacoma paper.

Mr. FOSTER. I could not ask for anything more apt to illustrate my argument than this ejaculation of my hon. friend. Defeated in argument, with the facts of the case against him, his last resource is simply to ring the patriotic bell, to declare: Why this man who is talking to you reflects the ideas of a Tacoma newspaper. My hon. friend is welcome to that trick; he has used it before and he can use it again. It will never stop an argument, from a business point of view, so far as I am concerned. Besides the articles I have named, you have clothing and the like of that. It may be possible for eastern Canada to compete, even by the coast route, in this line of goods. That is a question which I will not take up. I deal simply with the principal items, provisions and machinery, tools, furniture and such like. So I say one of the most important things that this Government and Parliament has to take into consideration before they put any permanent route into operation is what route will really give to Canada the business of producing the goods that will be needed in the Yukon trade.

Is it this? If it is, let us put it through; if it is not, don't let us put it through. Let us make whatever transport is necessary on the Pacific slope to-day, temporary, but sufficient for the time being. Let us wait for time and knowledge until we gather what is sufficient, and are able to come to a permanent conclusion, for the best interests of Canada are involved in this. Will hon. gentlemen think of one thing? Have you heard of any

quarrel between Canadians and outside suppliers with relation to these people and parties that are going in by the Edmonton route? Where do these men outfit for their provisions? Nine-tenths of it is done in Canadian territory. The route settles the question. Where else would they get their provisions and their meats? They pass right through the source of supply, and they take their line for the Yukon out of the very centre of the source of supply. The question solves itself, and that adds additional interest to this discussion as to where shall be the route into which Canada shall put its hard earned money, but its well spent money if the result of spending it is to be a permanent arrangement towards increasing the markets of this country. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that they have no greater opportunity to provide a market for the agriculturists of this country and the North-west in particular, than is opened up to them to-day in the Yukon district. If it is a country of the rich promise that their officials say it is, if it bears out one-tenth of the promise which to-day it holds forth to the public of Canada and to the world, there will be a centre of consumption which will be better for that great North-west in the supply of provisions than any foreign market that you can go into by preferential trade or reciprocity which discriminates, or any other plan that you might wish to propose. It is the very market that the people need, the very market which Providence seems to be opening up at the very doors of the district of Alberta and that section of country, far removed from the seaboard to the east, and far removed from the seaboard to the west, and consequently under the disadvantage of long hauls and expensive freight charges. I earnestly ask hon. members on both sides of the House not to be stampeded by a flurry, and not to put the inestimable wealth of Canada into the building of a 150-mile tramway until we are certain from investigation, and calm discussion and deliberation, that we are getting a route which will do for the productions of Canada that which we all wish to have done. Now, Canada has one great advantage. What is it? She has the advantage of the impost of the duties. That is an advantage which will counteract to a certain extent the cost of transport and distance from the field. But you can count upon that only to a very small extent if you bring into the route such costliness of transport as tends to more than compensate the advantage that is given to you by the impost of the duties upon the articles that go in.

Now let me go on to another point. According to the Ministers themselves there will either be no difficulty practically with the United States of America on the coast, or there will be difficulty. I take this broad ground, that if there is to be difficulty at Wrangel, there will be difficulty at Dyea,

and Pyramid Harbour, and on the Yukon River just the same. There will be no difficulty at Wrangel, if the good will of the United States is secured and manifested to us: and if she is disposed to manifest good will to us there, she is equally disposed to manifest it to us on the Yukon River, and at Dyea, at other ports along that coast. There cannot be any doubt as to the soundness of that position. What say hon. gentlemen opposite? They say that they have had unfailing courtesy shown them at Washington, and good relations with the Government of the United States heretofore, and they expect that these will continue. Is the Minister of Customs here to-night? I ask him a question. To-day, in your arrangements with the United States, have you a basis of satisfactory operations on the Yukon River, and at Dyea, and at Skagway? What is the answer of the Minister of Customs? The answer that he gave us a month ago, that there is now in operation, and so far as we know will continue in operation, an arrangement at these two mentioned ports and on the river, which allows the free interchange and passage of goods under a customs arrangement which is not burdensome, and which is mutually satisfactory. Now, what I say is this: If the United States proposes to squeeze Canada at Wrangel, she will squeeze Canada on general principles at Dyea, and on the Yukon River as well. If she does not do it on these, she will not do it at Wrangel; and despite all that has been said in the United States Senate and elsewhere, I am not yet going to lose hope that the United States, in its executive government, will so model and carry out things that in the end, although it may take some little time, we will have a modus vivendi which will be agreeable to both countries. Why not, Sir? The United States of America on that Yukon stretch has more to gain than to lose by having these amicable arrangements. Take the 141st meridian and run north. When you get a little north of Dawson City you have the United States territory of the Yukon. Will any one say that it is not liable to be as rich in gold as the Canadian side? It is just as liable, and if finds of gold are made in that United States portion of the Yukon along the 141st meridian, the United States would be just as glad as we would be to have an arrangement by which they could take their goods in bond across the intervening territory, and take them by rail way at all seasons of the year, and so deliver them to the centres of consumption in that country. Now, I believe this general proposition to be true; if the United States proposes to squeeze Canada they will do it in these other portions just the same as at Wrangel. If it gives facilities at Wrangel, it will give facilities elsewhere just the same. Under these circumstances let us look at this route as compared with other routes. Suppose that

the United States gives us facilities all along that coast. Now, take your Stikine route, with this hybrid arrangement that you have, and compare it with the road which might be built from Pyramid Harbour along the Dalton trail down to the Rink Rapids, and so get into deep water communication for the summer, with Dawson City, and the not difficult communication in winter, some 225 miles. Place your merchant on the wharf at Vancouver and give him a choice of routes. He has piled around him everything that he wishes to export, flour, beef, pork and all kinds of provisions, heavy machinery, light machinery, tools, mechanical appliances, bedding, furniture and all that like. Ask him which route he will take—take the route via the Stikine, the Teslin Lake, the Hootalinqua, and the Lewes River down to Dawson, with its mixed navigation and land carriage, with its costly system of transport, a transport made costly by transshipments necessitated by the small size of the vessels which must inevitably do the transportation on the river stretches, both in the Stikine and in Teslin Lake and in the Hootalinqua; ask him whether he will send by that route, or whether he would send by a route, if it were open, by which he could take his goods up the Lynn Canal, hand them over to a railway at Pyramid Harbour, put them through on the railway to Rink Rapids in a day, get them from within 225 miles of Dawson City by an uninterrupted line of good water communication in the summer, and by fair stretches of snow road, or by railroad, in the winter. Should there be one moment's hesitation as to what route should be taken—the one an expensive route, a tedious route, involving both time and delay and great expense; and the other a speedy route, involving the least charge for transshipment and for loading and unloading, and open every day in the year, while the other will be shut up for seven months in the year? That is a business proposition. Let us ask ourselves, which route should be adopted. If the Minister of Railways were here, if the Minister of the Interior were here, I would ask the hon. gentleman whether it was true or was not true, that Mackenzie & Mann themselves wanted, as a commercial project, to build the railway by the Chilkat Pass, and were wedded to that route. If the Minister were here, he would be obliged, if he answered, to say that was true; the Ministers know it is true. Mackenzie & Mann had been over that route—it was their pet route. There they saw the most speedy means of communication, there they saw the least interruption and change, there they saw the best methods of transportation both for the carrier and for the person whose goods were transported. As a commercial route, that was the line they favoured. As a commercial line, it was the route which every business man would adopt, one open the whole year round, and consequently giving

Mr. FOSTER.

communication between the sources of supply and communication every day in the year, and not shut up for seven months, during which people could not enter the country with supplies of any heavy kind or in large quantity.

Suppose the United States acts fairly or does not act fairly by us—let them take whichever course they please—the same obstructions would be met at Wrangel as at Lynn Canal and on the Yukon River, no more and no less, for we would be dependent ultimately on the good will of the United States as to arrangements they would make with us. Stand by your treaty rights as firmly as you please, say that the treaty means untrammelled freedom so far as we are concerned, the United States is at liberty to say that the treaty means something else so far as they are concerned; and there is no way of coming to a conclusion except by long diplomatic correspondence and probably the decision of a tribunal in the end. When the matter was settled and the United States came to the conclusion to treat us on a fair and amicable basis, there would be no obstacle in either case. On either of the assumptions, the Stikine River route so far as I am able to look into it, will not commercially compare with other routes which may be opened up ultimately from other ports on the coast. I am not going to elaborate this point; I have laid down the outlines, and every business man in this House can work out the calculations and details for himself. Hon. gentlemen opposite state that this is an all-Canadian route. I dealt with that before the dinner hour, and I do not propose to say anything more particularly in relation to it, only I again desire to bring to the attention of the House and the country, that the Canadian route passes through a strip of United States territory. On the Lynn Canal route, you come to territory which is indisputably ours, by the terms of the treaty, as we interpret them, but which the United States may claim, as they interpret the treaty. But the chances there are in our favour. The chances respecting the Stikine route are not in our favour and, inevitably, there is United States territory which we shall have to pass through. The territorial line has to be passed, and a length of 150 miles of tedious and somewhat intricate navigation in summer has to be passed, and in winter a chaos of snow and ice, impassible for the passage of man, let alone of freight, whether heavy or light.

Sir, I am told that we are estopped from asking the Government to consider the propositions which have since been made, even though they save the country one-half of the cost this secret bargain entails on it. Will the leader of the Government take that position, or will he say here to-night, that under the circumstances we are stewards and trustees for the people, and if we can get this route, or as good route, or two routes, built for one-half the cost to the coun-

try this bargain will entail on it, that for the sake of the country Parliament, which has the undoubted right to pass in freedom on this subject, may reject or modify this contract as it pleases, has nothing else to do than save the country's resources and secure the building of the proposed railway for a smaller sum of money? Will the hon. gentleman controvert that proposition? My right hon. friend is estopped from controverting it. My right hon. friend spoke with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, and in his speech he made a statement which I think it worth while to place on the "Hansard" of this House. It was as follows:—

It is stated that the offer is not seriously made, that it is a political dodge got up by the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition have organized this scheme they will have still another claim to the gratitude of the country, for whatever may have been the motives that induced these capitalists to make the Government this new offer, these motives are of little consequence, provided that we obtain the result, and the result is that the new company now offers more advantageous terms than those we have now before us.

It is stated that the offer is not serious. But there is a very simple means of ascertaining the fact, and that is to put these capitalists to the test. They are ready to deposit the money and give all the security the Government may require.

I fling the words of the right hon. gentleman before him to-night. I tell him he has an offer under his hands from capitalists of undoubted ability, to build this road for 1,000,000 acres, instead of 4,000,000 acres and over, and to build this road and the Pyramid Harbour route and Dalton trail route, to boot, both of them, for little less than one-half of the land subsidy to be given to Mackenzie & Mann for building 150 miles of tramway. Will the hon. gentleman try to crawl out of accepting that offer because "it is a political dodge got up by the Opposition?" Let him take his own words, which I quote to him, where he says, "If the Opposition have organized this scheme, they will have still another claim to the gratitude of the country, because they will have got the work carried out at a saving of cost to the country." Does the right hon. gentleman take the ground, that Mr. Hamilton Smith and his associates are not responsible men and able to build the road? I quote his words to him: "Put these capitalists to the test." That is what he said before; but put them to the test, not by a private telegram, the answer to which the right hon. gentleman made public, by a telegram which he himself promised to lay before the House, when he knew as well as he knows to-night the nature of the telegram, for he himself sent it, and which, the next day, he refused to give to the House, thereby doing gross injustice to a gentleman whom he should have treated as a gentleman, and degrading the dignity and

standing of a Minister of the Crown in this Parliament. Let the hon. gentleman, instead of sending winding and tortuous telegrams that he dare not produce to the House, let him put the matter to the test and telegraph London to know whether Hamilton Smith and his associates are men of means and men of worth, able to put this contract through, and I vouch he will get an answer that will set that matter at rest. What will the Prime Minister do? Will he eat his words as he has eaten them time after time; eat his words until his bad faith is becoming a byword in this country? What pledge of public policy has he made that he has not gone back on? And even a pledge that he makes across the floor of this House, knowing well every condition of it, when he wakes up the next day he comes in and repudiates and says, that though he breaks his word he will keep his honour in his own charge.

Sir, I have one word more to say and though I may reiterate something I have said before, I shall put on record once more my protest against alienating the rich alluvial placer grounds of the Yukon to any two men, or to any monopoly of men in this country. I want to affirm that, that is the heritage of the common people of this country and should be kept for the common people. By the common people I mean the people of worth and substance in the rural districts, our artisans in the towns, all that class of men who though they have not large capital have the hearts and the brawn which makes Canada strong and gives her a guarantee of the future. I put on record my protest against this departure from the settled principle of every Anglo-Saxon mining country in the world, as well as an outrage upon the rights of this country. If these gentlemen opposite succeed in putting this through and setting their monopolists at work, the harvest that will be reaped will be a harvest full of sorrow and of retribution to them.

Mr. GIBSON. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentlemen laugh; irresponsible men are noted for laughing, irresponsible men have nothing but a sneer or a laugh, but the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government does not laugh just now. On his shoulders rest two weights. One is the dignity and interests of the country which he sometimes forgets, but which we call to his mind, and the other is that long stream of pap-hunters and patronage-seekers in his own party which renders every hour of his life a bitterness and which is ageing him fast as he sits in this House. I leave the hon. member for Lincoln to put himself in whichever of these classes he pleases; but the man who sneers and laughs when his country's best and richest portion is given away to contractors, is a man who can feel very little of the responsibilities of the situation.

I repeat, that we should not give away this heritage to monopolists. Do these gentlemen opposite think it is profitable for the country? Take your official guide book of the Klondike, discount the promises revealed in that by 50 per cent, give this monopoly to Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie, let them blanket four million acres of picked gold fields, and see how that is going to work out from the financial point of view. Suppose that in the next three or four years, out of that four million acres of picked land Mann & Mackenzie work 5,000 claims, and suppose that if it had not been given to Mann & Mackenzie five thousand prospectors would have taken these claims and worked them. How does that stand with reference to the revenues of this country? Mann & Mackenzie will work these 5,000 claims, we will say, for the sake of argument, five men to the claim. They will work them every year with these 25,000 men, and not a man of these pays his \$10 a year for a miner's license, or his \$15 fee for the entry of his claim. If these claims were worked by 25,000 free miners, they would pay a fee of \$10 each per year, making \$250,000, and all that is lost to the country by reason of this monopoly. They would pay \$15 entrance fee for each claim, making \$75,000 to be added to the loss. Suppose they worked out \$5,000,000 of gold, they would pay 10 per cent of a royalty, but Mann & Mackenzie only nine-tenths of that sum, and so you have to add another \$450,000 as a loss because of this monopoly. That makes \$775,000 loss to the revenues of the country on these five thousand claims that would be worked by Mann & Mackenzie. The Minister of Trade and Commerce laughs. He no doubt thinks that this is imaginary, but I have based it on the published statements of his Government and I take it they are worthy of credence. I look upon that as a promising land, and I say that out of 4,000,000 acres of picked gold fields, it is not extravagant to say that in a few years Mann & Mackenzie will have 5,000 claims working, and they are very great fools if they do not have four times five thousand. That is how this huge grant works with regard to the revenues of this country, and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) showed how it works as regards the trade of the country. Look at it in whatever light you please, it is an extravagant arrangement, and we are doing our duty in protesting against it so long as we have the power. Though the mechanical majority may be whipped into line and may vote for it; numbers of them not wishing to do so, numbers of them praying that they might be relieved from doing so; the time will come when in the country hon. gentlemen opposite will meet with the judgment of that tribunal, before which we as members of Parliament have each to go and before which we have to give an account of our trust.

Mr. FOSTER.

Now, Sir, I have finished what I have to say. If I may be allowed to offer a bit of advice, I would say that the Ministry had better now stop for a moment, take stock of the situation, and see what is the best thing to do under the circumstances. My own opinion is, that something like this would be best: go to work under the present conditions now that the urgency is past for the present year, use your means of having investigation as to all the different routes possible into that country, go slowly, go only to the extent of putting what is necessary as a wagon road, across that Stikine passage if you please, and a wagon road from Edmonton north, and leave in abeyance that weightier question on the conclusion of which the future of Canada so greatly depends. Leave it to a time when you can have sufficient information gathered, and when you can come to a fair conclusion as to where the permanent roadway should be; and then place Canada's contribution towards opening up that country for Canadian people and Canadian trade cheerfully on that roadway, and keep for Canada the great benefits that are likely to accrue from the rich blessings in the shape of gold lands that Providence has given us in the great north.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, this House is engaged at the present time in the consideration of a problem of the same character as other problems that have previously called for our attention, and of the same character as problems that will undoubtedly hereafter call for our action. The matter now pending before this Parliament is one of first-class importance. It is a question that has to do with the future welfare of this Dominion. It is a question that ought to be approached in a judicial spirit, and not in a mere partisan spirit. It is a question that has to do with the future development of this country—a vast area, with changing conditions, where we are now laying the foundations of a future nation—a country with enormous resources, the extent of which increase in our estimation, year by year, as we become better acquainted with them; a country capable of supporting 75,000,000 inhabitants from food raised on its own soil. It is a grave problem—a problem that should call for our most careful, most candid and most honest consideration; and I propose, Mr. Speaker, so far as my judgment will enable me to do so, to approach the consideration of the problem in that spirit.

We have had, as I said a moment ago, other great problems of a similar character to deal with. In 1881 we had before us the question of building a railway across this continent. I believe, Sir, that the conception of that work was a statesmanlike one. I believe that the building of that road was a beneficial step in the history of Canada. Whatever we may say with regard to the details of its construction, and

the expenses that were incurred, which received criticism at the time, and which are liable to criticism to-day, the step itself, primarily considered, was a statesmanlike one. We are dealing with a question of a similar character now, and we shall be called upon to deal with similar questions in the future.

Now, what is the character of this question that demands our attention? We are suddenly confronted with the question of how we may best develop resources that were hitherto undreamed of in this country. We know, of course, that we had a vast auriferous area extending from the United States boundary line along each side of the Rocky Mountains to an indefinite distance northward. We knew that we had resources of the utmost importance in the minerals of this Dominion, but late last summer the world was startled by the fabulous discoveries of wealth in the Klondike; and this revelation of mineral wealth seemed to have awakened that spirit of adventure which is characteristic not only of the Anglo-Saxon, but of almost all races, and promised to throw upon that country a great tide of immigration in the near future. Here was a question that suddenly confronted the Government—a question that required prompt and immediate action, a question differing in its character from any question that had ever before confronted the Government of this country; and what we have to consider is, what has been the character of the Government's conduct and policy in reference to this matter? Have they dealt with it with that degree of promptitude and vigour which the importance and sudden appearance of the question demanded?

Now, in dealing with a question of this kind, the Government would be necessarily placed in a certain sense at a disadvantage. They would be unable to consider at their leisure, or after the lapse of months, the proper course to pursue, for the simple reason that instant action was demanded by the circumstances of the case, and the Government did act instantly, did act promptly, did act vigorously and courageously; and I believe, Sir, that the outcome of their action will be in the interest of this country and will redound to their own credit. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) says that if they had not been loafing around last July and August, they might have made satisfactory and amicable arrangements with the American Government—that had they been attending to their duty, all the difficulties that have now arisen with regard to the bonding privileges and the free navigation of the Stikine, &c., could have been avoided. Why, Sir, the condition of things was scarcely known in July last. The first mutterings of the news that spread over the world with regard to the riches of the Klondike was just being received at that time. The Government had not had time

to act; they had not been placed in possession of the facts in relation to the matter. But, Sir, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), a young man, a vigorous man, a courageous man, a western man, familiar with that country, with its wants, with the character of its population, with its geography, and with its physical resources, did not remain here in his office at Ottawa to inform himself by hearsay and by report as to the character of the country and its requirements in this new emergency, but he at once departed to the scene of operations.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When?

Mr. CHARLTON. He left here in September, shortly after the news had come of the gold discoveries in the Klondike. He acted promptly in the matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the Minister of the Interior was in Winnipeg on his way to the west on the 27th day of September.

Mr. CHARLTON. I said he left here in September. Early in October the Minister of the Interior was investigating the character of the routes from Dyea and Skagway. In October he ascended the Stikine River. In October he sent Mr. Jennings to report on the balance of the route which he had not visited himself. He acquired by personal observation at the earliest possible moment a knowledge of the facts to enable him to judge intelligently as to the best steps to be taken to meet this problem. He came to Ottawa and entered into communication with his colleagues. This question received immediate and due attention at the hands of the Ministry; and after considering it fully, definitely and carefully, the Ministry set about providing for means of ingress and egress to and from that region. So rapidly did they proceed with the consideration of the question that an arrangement was made, and the contract was ready to be entered into on the 25th day of January. Now, Sir, I claim that the Government cannot be accused of dilatory conduct, or of having failed to realize the sudden emergency that had confronted them, or of having failed to the best of their ability to meet that emergency.

My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) almost succeeded in persuading himself that we did not need a railway at all. He told us that no miner would go into that country without ample provisions to last him until the fall, if he intended to come out then, or to last him a year and a half if he did not; and that to talk about the emergency that confronted the Government and the necessity for the immediate construction of that road was sheer nonsense. Then he said that the Government did not need to send in troops, because we have already 150 mounted police in that country, and will soon have 400 police and militia. But suppose an emergency arose that required,

not 150 men, but three or four battalions in that country, with all the paraphernalia necessary for a large military force, would there not then be a necessity for the railway? And is it not a part of prudence, that in a country which is likely to be filled up with a population of a character difficult to control, the Government should be prepared for any emergency that may arise?

My hon. friend went on to state the superior advantages of the Edmonton route. From what he said, I must infer that he is not in favour of a railway running into the Yukon from an ocean port on the Pacific, that he believes it is unpatriotic to build such a road, and that he would prefer a road from Edmonton, which would cost at least \$25,000,000 and would not be in operation for two or three years. He, in fact, asked the Government to adopt a policy which would leave the gold fields of the Yukon without railway communication or any means, except those furnished by nature, of getting in supplies. I have no faith in any such scheme.

He said also that if the United States squeezes us at Wrangel, we are just as badly off going by the Stikine route as we would be if we went through Dyea, Skagway, or any of the other proposed routes from the coast. Well, Mr. Speaker, in my estimation, the great point in favour of the route adopted is that it is part of a route on Canadian territory, from a Canadian seaport on the Pacific Coast to the navigable waters of the Yukon. That is what the project has in its favour. If the Americans allow us transshipment without interruption at Fort Wrangel, and if we can make use of the Stikine River to the road from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake we shall enjoy the facilities we desire. But if we are denied access to the Stikine River, if the American regulations are such that we are deprived of our treaty rights, we are building a road which simply requires an extension of 180 or 200 miles southward and then we shall have a complete railway line, starting from our own seaport, and running through our own territory, to the waters of the Yukon. When these gentlemen talk about the superior commercial advantages of a line starting from Dyea or Skagway or Taku, or any other point, the one thing that renders the construction of any such line impolitic and improper is the fact that it would have to cross American territory and have its ocean terminus upon American soil. We are therefore bound by the necessity of building a road upon the line proposed in this contract in order that we may have it upon our own territory. The Government carefully considered these points and circumstances, they entered coolly, carefully and dispassionately into the calculation as to what is the better course to pursue, and they concluded naturally that

Mr. CHARLTON.

this movement to the Yukon may be ephemeral in its nature, that these rich placers may be confined to one or two streams, and that the thousands who flock into that country may be disappointed, as thousands of gold-seekers have been before. They realized that there may be a necessity for the railway or that possibly no such necessity may continue. They realized that any investment in a railway line to that country might prove to be a dead loss, and therefore adopted a scheme whereby communication is secured without the expenditure of a dollar of public money. That is a strong point in favour of this scheme. Under all the circumstances, considering the uncertain character of the business the road is to develop, considering its doubtful permanency, the Government, by securing the construction of a road without the investment of a dollar of public money, have made, in my estimation, an exceedingly good bargain. The risk is great to the parties who have undertaken to build the road, and the Government have given them a speculative chance to make something. It is merely speculative, there is no certainty about it, and later on I think I will be able to show that the extravagant statements made on the other side regarding bonanzas and the enormous amount of wealth which will accrue to this company from these placer lands are purely visionary.

My hon. friend opposite makes a strong point against the Government for having violated that principle which we on this side recognize as the proper one to observe, namely, that Parliament ought to be consulted and tenders asked for in all cases when contracts are let. He contends that until the initiatory steps were taken by Parliament and tenders received, the Government should not have proceeded with this scheme. He said that the franchises of this country belong to Parliament and the people, that they are a sacred trust, and that the Government have violated this trust. He charges the Government with having set aside parliamentary precedents, and I could not help asking myself what parliamentary precedents the hon. gentleman was alluding to—whether he might not have been alluding to some of those which he himself helped to make and which are quite consonant with any action by the Government in proceeding to make contracts or anything else without advertising for tenders or without reference to the people's representatives. The hon. gentleman's remarks recalled to my mind some circumstances in connection with his own parliamentary career. He inquired whether a greater outrage than this had ever been perpetrated in the history of any Anglo-Saxon commonwealth, and I was about to ask him what he thought of the granting of timber limits some years ago without advertisement or tenders,

what he thought of the granting of pasture lands without calling for tenders, what he thought of the letting of contracts on Sheik's Dam in the same manner, and what he thought of the inception of that great enterprise, the construction of a railway across this continent, without advertising for tenders. Were these the parliamentary precedents the hon. gentleman alluded to in the remarks which he made? I presume they were not. Perhaps the hon. gentleman was oblivious to these circumstances. I have here, in the "Hansard," of 1886, page 1035, if the hon. gentleman wishes to look at it, the record of land grants made when my hon. friend was a supporter of the Government, grants of timber limits that were made without advertising for tenders, and on application merely. These grants were made secretly in the line of backstair influence, through the supporters of the Government coming in and quietly presenting their claims and getting their demands, a condition of things that led to the granting of 25,000 square miles of the territory of this Dominion in timber lands. I have a list of eighteen members of this House, all Conservatives who have received timber limits. I have a list of some 50 or 60 timber limits obtained upon the application by members of Parliament for friends. I have a list here of some applications that were made by members for limits that were granted to others, and consequently could not be granted to them. Among those who made application I find the name of G. E. Foster, M.P. This gentleman applies on the 18th April, 1883, for a timber limit for himself. Some other good boy had got it, and so he could not get it. He applied on the 25th April, 1886, for a timber limit for John Saddler, I do not know who that may be. He also applied for a timber limit for Henry Muirhead. Here are three timber limits applied for by my hon. friend who warmed my heart by his fierce denunciation of the corruption and violation of parliamentary precedent—not this kind of precedent—of which this Government was guilty when it proposed to provide for the construction of 150 miles of railway without advertising for tenders. I have in this list the name of another gentleman who sits in the House, Mr. John Haggart. There are also applications by other members, which include Sir Adolphe Caron, M.P. I do not see the names of any others who were members of the House then, and are members now, because the personnel of the House has changed very rapidly. But I mention this to temper somewhat the indignation of my hon. friend from York as to the conduct of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Mine was a very modest one.

Mr. CHARLTON. It was a small affair, of course, only 50 square miles, and if my

hon. friend had had his application granted to be got for nothing, except the payment of \$5 per square mile annually for ground rent.

Mr. FOSTER. Not half as much as Mercier got under the dredging arrangement.

Mr. CHARLTON. On the subject of the Government entering upon large undertakings without advertising for tenders, I call the attention of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) to a case that arose before the hon. member for York was a member of the House, and perhaps it is a piece of history with which that hon. gentleman is not acquainted. In 1880 the Government entered into a contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a work of vast magnitude, an undertaking to give a subsidy of \$25,000,000; to build about 630 miles of the road and to give a land grant of 25,000,000 acres. This was an undertaking of sufficient magnitude to warrant the Government in taking the precaution of advertising for tenders. Yet they failed to do so. They were guilty not only of breach of the general and sound principle of advertising for tenders, but were actually guilty of a violation of the law of the land. The Canadian Pacific Railway Act provided—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is outlawed.

Mr. CHARLTON. It will be well for the good name of the country when it is forgotten. The Canadian Pacific Railway Act provided that work undertaken on any section of subsection of the railway should not be given out to any contractors without advertising for tenders. The Opposition took exception to the conduct of the Government, and Mr. Blake moved a resolution to condemn the Government for having violated the law as well as disregarded the salutary principle of advertising for tenders.

Mr. MILLS. Does that wrong make this right?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am talking about the consistency of my hon. friends. That is something we have a right to speak about. If these hon. gentlemen denounce in unmeasured terms a small transaction after having been guilty of a much larger one, we are naturally disposed to question the patriotic motives that actuate them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think my hon. friends on this side are hardly treating the hon. gentlemen opposite fairly, and I think that I must interpose on their behalf. Hon. gentlemen opposite have one solitary support on this matter, and that is the opinion of my humble self, and it is too bad for any one to interrupt any hon. gentleman when he is adducing the only justification they can possibly have for this proposal.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have in the House at this moment nine gentlemen on the Government side who then were in Opposition, and who voted for this motion of Mr. Blake to condemn the Government. Nine are all that are left out of the fifty-one members who voted for that proposition. But Providence has been kinder to this small band than to the other, for retribution appears to have overtaken a larger number. Of 140 members who voted that this wrong was right, only eight remain. These include Mr. Wallace, Sir Charles Tupper, Mr. Domville—who has seen the error of his ways and will not do it again—Mr. Costigan, Mr. Haggart and Mr. Bergeron.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell how many now there are in the House who supported Mr. Blake.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is a piece of information the hon. gentleman is entitled to and I shall be very glad to give it. The names are, Bain, Borden, Cameron (Huron), Cartwright, Casey, Charlton, Laurier, Paterson and Scriver. These are the men who stood then for this salutary principle, and, speaking for myself, I say as a matter of principle that if I cannot give a satisfactory reason for adopting the course I do, I will vote against this Bill.

We have not on this occasion the condition of things that existed in 1881. We had then a Bill proposed to Parliament that allowed ten years time to carry the project into effect. The Government were not pressed by being confronted by a great and overmastering necessity, but could proceed at their leisure and carry out a project which had been discussed for years, ever since the annexation of the North-west.

They adopted a measure that gave ten years' time to consummate the thing, and there was not the shadow of necessity for failing to advertise for tenders in this case, because no reasons could be assigned then, such as can be assigned to-day, in the shape of urgency for immediate action, that prevented adherence to the ordinary practice of advertising for tenders. Now, I am free to say, that my first impression as to this measure now before the House, was an unfavourable one. I felt that the position I had taken in 1881 was hardly consonant with the support of this measure. I felt that it would be necessary, if I did support this measure, to find reasons that would justify me in doing so; and I proceeded to examine the case with the view of ascertaining whether I could conscientiously support the Government in this matter, or whether I should be compelled to withhold my support. I presume, there are a large number of Liberals in the Dominion of Canada, and more especially in the province of Ontario, who look at this matter as I did; and I dare say, the process of reasoning by which I have arrived at a conclusion will

Mr. CHARLTON.

be one, perhaps, satisfactory to them, as well as to myself. If I did not satisfy myself, if I did not satisfy my reason, if I did not satisfy my conscience, then I could not support this measure. Now, Sir, I repeat, that the principle of advertising for tenders is a salutary principle; but I assert that there may be circumstances, emergencies that will render a temporary failure to adopt that principle not only justifiable, but possibly in the highest degree necessary. There may be emergencies confronting the Government that render compliance with this principle not only inconvenient, but impossible, without sacrificing the public interests. The Government itself must be the judge as to whether such an emergency exists. They will act upon their judgment, they are at the mercy of Parliament as to whether that arrangement should be confirmed and their action approved. They take their lives in their hands when they do it, and if Parliament does not agree with them, that the exigencies of the public service justified their action, why, it is the duty of Parliament to withhold its sanction. That is the case here, and it will be the case under similar circumstances at all times. Now, the reason, if any reason existed, for justification in this case was, that it was necessary to secure communication with that country promptly; that time was the essence of the contract; that the Government had not time to comply with the usual dilatory movements in connection with the advertisement for and the consideration of tenders, thus spending the time necessary to consummate arrangements under such conditions, and that it had to move more rapidly than circumstances would permit had it adopted that course. The Government evidently entertained that view of the case in this matter. The question for me to decide, in casting my vote upon this Bill, is whether the judgment of the Government in this respect was correct. If it was not, why, I am bound to say that they are not entitled to my support; if it was correct, I am bound to say that I shall support them. I have arrived at the conclusion that their judgment was correct. So far as exigency was concerned, so far as the necessity for action was concerned, so far as the necessity of securing the construction of the road at the speediest moment was concerned, I have arrived at the conclusion that their judgment was correct. Now, if they were correct in taking that line, the next thing I have to decide is, whether the means they have adopted for securing the end they sought for are such as should receive popular approval or not, and I shall discuss at some little length that phase of the question.

Before proceeding, however, to discuss that, I wish to say a few more words about the antecedents of the gentlemen who are criticising so severely the conduct of the Government in this matter. I referred, a few moments ago, to the fact that we had,

in 1881, a public work of great magnitude and great importance, of greater magnitude and importance than any other ever constructed in Canada, and we had that work entered into without tenders being asked. Parliament was called together on the 9th of December, 1880, called together to consider a contract entered into by the Government with the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate. When we met here at Ottawa, we found that a scheme had been arranged for proceeding with the construction of a railroad from Callander to Port Moody, 2,530 miles in length; that of this 2,530 miles, the Government was to construct a portion, from Fort William to Selkirk, and a portion in British Columbia, making in all 635 miles, leaving 1,895 miles to be constructed by the syndicate with whom the Government had made a contract without advertising for tenders. We found by the terms of that contract, laid before the House in this manner, that ten years were granted to these men to perform the work and carry out their contract; that the syndicate was to receive for the portion of the road it was to build, 13,000 acres of selected land per mile, or 25,000,000 acres for the 1,895 miles; they were to receive, in addition, \$13,000 in cash per mile, and they had certain additional advantages of a very important character. For instance, the road and its equipment were to be free from taxation perpetually; the land grant of the road was to be free from taxation for twenty years after the issuing of the patents; the company were to have a transportation monopoly of the whole of that vast Canadian North-west, a monopoly worth millions upon millions of dollars, a monopoly that it required a very serious and costly effort to get the company to relinquish. It was found that they were to have the free importation of material, and, by the construction of the law, it has been held that the renewal of the road after it was built, that the bridge material for renewals could be imported free of duty also. It was found that, under the conditions of this contract thus entered into surreptitiously, they were free from Government supervision as to tolls until they were earning a net dividend of 10 per cent, a condition of things impossible for a road of that character to reach, a condition of things, at all events, that rendered it impossible for the Government to make any effectual arrangement in the public interest. We found also that the standard of this road was to be the low standard of the Union Pacific as first constructed. This was the contract that confronted us when we assembled on the 9th December, 1880, a contract sanctioned by the gentlemen who are to-night, and have been throughout this debate, condemning the Government for having, under the pressure of a paramount necessity, entered into arrangements for meeting an emergency without wasting the time that would have been required, had they advertised for tenders. We

had on that occasion also an instructive experience in the line of a better offer. We have had Hamilton Smith's offer under consideration to-night; we had a better offer then. When that contract was laid before the people of Canada, we had, on the 17th January following the 9th December when this contract was made public—we had an offer made to construct that road for 3,000,000 acres less land, for \$3,000,000 less money, without the monopoly privilege, without exemption from taxation perpetually of the roadbed and rolling stock, without exemption from land taxation for twenty years after the issuing of the patents of the land granted, without free importation of material, leaving the Government to regulate the tolls of the road, and offering to adopt the then standard of the Union Pacific road, and not the standard of that road when first constructed. This was the better offer. The first syndicate had been required, by the terms of the contract, to deposit a million dollars. The second syndicate, which made the better offer, voluntarily deposited \$1,395,000 as an earnest of good faith. Who were the gentlemen that made the second offer? Not an obscure Hamilton Smith, of whom we do not know anything more to-day than we did when he made the offer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You do not want to know.

Mr. CHARLTON. One who got into collision with a Minister of the Crown as to a question of veracity, and referred to a high official of a railway as witness that he had made an offer, and whose statement was formally denied by that official. I have here a list of the names of those who made the better offer, and it includes Senator McPherson, Senator McMaster, Wm. Hendry, J. Stuart, present president of the Bank of Hamilton, A. T. Wood, A. W. Ross, Geo. A. Cox, president of the Bank of Commerce, P. Howland, P. Larkin, Allen Gillmore, James McLaren, Alexander Gibson and others. These men had almost enough private means themselves to build the road. This syndicate made their offer shortly after the proposition of the first syndicate had been made public, and put up \$395,000 in excess of the deposit required. What did the present leader of the Opposition say? Why, he said this was merely a political dodge. But why did he not take the men at their word and thus scoop in \$1,395,000? This deposit was put up subject to the call of the Government. Where was it put up? There were \$500,000 at the Bank of Commerce, \$100,000 in the Bank of Ontario at Woodstock, \$100,000 in the Federal Bank of Canada, \$100,000 in the Bank of Ottawa, \$500,000 in the Bank of British North America, and a large sum in the Quebec Bank, all these amounts being subject to the call of the Government and although this offer would have saved millions of dol-

lars, directly and indirectly, to the country, it was rejected. Those are the hon. gentlemen who come here with Hamilton Smith's offer to build a line we do not want, with its termination in the United States, and they tell us about his respectable connections, and on testing his responsibility it appears that he prevaricated with a gentleman whom he asserted acted as a go-between on behalf of himself with the Minister of the Interior, but the gentleman who was alleged to have so acted explicitly denied he did anything of the kind. Could the Government trust this man? Why did he not put up \$250,000? The other syndicate that made the offer to build the Canadian Pacific Railway put up the required deposit of \$1,000,000 and another extra amount of \$395,000. If Hamilton Smith had put \$225,000 we might have imagined he was not engaged in making a bluff. But would any business man, any prudent, sagacious man with a knowledge of the world, put an end to or suspend most important negotiations then in progress on receiving an offer such as that made by Hamilton Smith, who represented he was somebody, but gave no proof, and cast discredit on himself by a circumstance which came out in connection with this matter, that when he came into collision on a question of veracity with a Minister of the Crown he was repudiated by the president of the greatest railway corporation on the continent of North America.

When we found, Mr. Speaker, that this second offer to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, made in the interest of the country—of course it would have meant fortunes for the men who made it, because the old syndicate contract has established a plutocracy in Canada—was not accepted; when we found the Government would not retrace their steps and would not accept this second and more favourable offer, we proceeded to attempt to minimize some of the obnoxious features of the contract. Sir Richard Cartwright moved an amendment against the contract on the ground that the grant was excessive, that the Government had an offer of 3,000,000 acres better as regards land and \$3,000,000 as regards money, with incidental advantages as regards taxation and monopoly, which were worth millions more. This amendment was defeated on a strict party vote, the present leader of the Opposition voting against it. Mr. Mills moved an amendment against the monopoly clause. This amendment we defeated likewise on a strict party vote, the present leader of the Opposition, the ex-Minister of Railways and every Conservative in the House at that time voting against it. I moved an amendment against exemptions of the property of the company from taxation. That was also defeated. Mr. Ross, the present Minister of Education of Ontario, moved against the clause preventing the Government interfering with the tolls until the road had made a net re-

Mr. CHARLTON.

turn of 10 per cent. That amendment was also defeated. Mr. Casey moved a provision in favour of giving power to the Government to acquire the road, which the second syndicate was willing to accept as they were ready at any time to agree to the Government taking the road on paying the company 10 per cent more than the actual cost. All these amendments were defeated. Here are the gentlemen who entered on that great contract without advertising for tenders, who gave away 25,000 square miles of timber lands without advertising for tenders, who disposed of millions of acres of lands including mineral lands, without advertising for tenders, who allowed these outrageous provisions to go into effect and refused to entertain the offer of the second syndicate though it was backed up by a deposit of \$395,000 more than was demanded—these men rise in this house and make all this row about this little line of 150 miles, to be built from pressure of necessity to meet an immediate want with respect to the Yukon territory. This record is not a good guarantee as to the patriotic motives of hon. gentlemen opposite who are taking the Government to task to-day in connection with this Bill we have under discussion. The member for York says that the Government throughout all the transactions in connection with this scheme have been guilty of secrecy and duplicity, which has characterized every action since last July. Was there secrecy or duplicity in the journey of the Minister of the Interior to the very spot where action was rendered necessary, in order that he might obtain practical knowledge—that kind of knowledge which is so much superior to theoretical knowledge—whose impressions were derived from actual inspection of the country, visiting the different ports which might be made the terminus of the railway, examining the Stikine River, and calculating by actual observation what steps were necessary to be taken, and what the character of the exigency that confronted the Government was? Was there any duplicity or secrecy about this most necessary and commendable action on the part of the Minister of the Interior in gaining upon the ground information upon which we can rest implicitly in dealing with this question? No, Sir; on the contrary, he deserves commendation, and the Government of which he is a member deserves nothing but commendation and praise for the promptitude and efficiency of the measures they adopted. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was very facetious about the humbug of starvation in that country. He told us that the American Government had sold their reindeer, that the Minister of the Interior had gone to unnecessary trouble to rescue starving men, and again he charged the Minister (Mr. Sifton) with duplicity and secrecy for being guilty of the humane motives that prompted him to save

these miners from the lingering and painful death of starvation in that inhospitable region. I do not see anything to be facetious about in the action taken by the American and Canadian Governments, even though it happily proved to be unnecessary. It was a wise precaution. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) tells us, that it is all nonsense about fearing a rebellion out there. He believes that you can pour in 50,000 or 100,000 such characters as congregate in mining camps, men who have vigilance committees, and make and execute their own laws, men who might take a notion to establish a government of their own in that country, men who might defy constituted law and authority; he tells us that there is no danger from the congregation of these men in a remote territory of our country. Well, it ill-becomes my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) to belittle the apprehensions of the Government as to the danger that might arise from such a population, and it ill-becomes him to sneer at the desire of Ministers to preserve law and order, and so retain in our possession the great heritage that belongs to the people of Canada. He tells us that it is all humbug about any fear of filibustering, but I tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that there was danger, and I tell him that it was prudent and proper and necessary that the Government should take precautionary measures and should place themselves in a position, by constructing this railway, to send troops into that country if it ever became necessary to assert our sovereignty and to hold that country under the British flag.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) threw discredit upon the Government because of the character of the road. He told us that it was 150 miles long, commencing nowhere and ending nowhere; it is a cry in the wilderness, he said, a voice that will be lost in the great wilds of that country. He believed it was a piece of fatuity on the part of the Government to invest in any such undertaking, but let us see about that. As I have said, in providing for the urgency that confronted the Government, time was the essence of the contract, days were important. If communication with the Yukon was to be secured before the frosts of next winter set in, there was not a day to be lost. The Government realized the paramount necessity that rested upon it of prompt and vigorous and decisive action. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) have built a road from Edmonton, which about four years from now would have answered the purpose in view? Would he have gone from Pyramid Harbour to Rink Rapids and built a road that terminated in American territory and placed us in a position in which the United States could have taken us by the throat and throttled us as regards our commerce? Perhaps he might, but the Government concluded that none

of these routes would answer, and for the simple reason that the terminus was in American territory. We once built a railroad on this side of the continent to reach the sea-coast through our own territory. It was a longer road, and it was not the best commercial route to reach the sea, for we could have accomplished that end more easily and cheaply by going to Portland or Boston or New York. Indeed, we need not have invested a dollar in such an enterprise, because there were already railroads reaching these points and anxious for our trade. But we built the Intercolonial Railway at a cost of \$50,000,000, and why? It was because we wanted to reach the ocean upon our own territory. Sir, the conditions that governed us in that case are precisely the conditions that actuated this Government to decide upon the route to the Yukon which they have selected. If we could not avail of the railroads to Portland and Boston and New York to reach the ocean, the same reasons apply to Dyea, Pyramid Harbour, Skagway or to any other point upon the Pacific Coast that is in American territory. If this Government acted consistently, if they followed precedent, if they acted in consonance with the traditional policy of this country, they were bound to select the route which could be made independent of foreign interference. I say they did right in carrying out this policy. We presumed upon our treaty rights being accorded us, and on our being able to navigate the Stikine, but in the event of our being disappointed we are still building a road upon the proper line, and one which may simply be extended 180 miles or 200 miles further to the sea, and then we have got a line of our own in our own territory. The Government did exactly what they ought to do, and they would have deserved censure if they had failed to do it. All this talk about shorter routes, about better commercial routes, or about routes across the White Pass, or any other pass which terminates in that strip of territory which unfortunately the Americans own extending from Mount St. Elias, down, as they claim, to the Portland Canal; all this talk is misleading. Nobody denies that these routes are the best commercial routes, but what we assert is, that national considerations compelled the Government to disregard the natural advantages of these routes and to build a line on Canadian territory which will enable us to be independent of foreign control or foreign interference, and after all, this understanding is not a very serious one. Of course, we are in some degree ignorant of the character of the route from the southern terminus of the Teslin Lake line to Portland Canal or Observatory Inlet, but we have reason to believe it is inside of 200 miles, and we know we can get across the first chain of mountains by going down the Cañon of the Stikine.

Men who have traversed western railways, running through the Cañon of the Arkansas, the Cañon of the Gunnison, the Cañon of the Sacramento, or any of those western roads which have had to overcome great engineering difficulties, are surprised at the comparative ease with which a railway could be constructed where nature has made an opening and where the grades are light. We can cross the range of mountains at any rate by the Cañon of the Stikine, and we have every reason to believe that we can get a favourable route thence to Portland Canal. We have also reason to believe that the interests of British Columbia, in having a road located through her territory to a port on her coast, will prompt her to relieve Canada largely from expense in carrying out the extension of this line.

My hon. friend from York, in the course of his remarks, dwelt upon the ease with which we might have secured favourable arrangements with the United States last July. One would infer, from what he said, that the Government had lost a golden opportunity—that there would not have been the slightest difficulty about their securing those rights if they had only attended to the matter in proper season. Well, Sir, I fear that the hon. gentleman comes into collision with another very prominent member of his party. His assertion that the Government were loafing around last July and August and were missing a golden opportunity, will scarcely agree with statements made by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) the other night with regard to the conduct and characteristics of the American Government in its dealings with Canada. That hon. gentleman said :

I say we cannot rely on those people showing towards us the slightest measure of fair-play.

Again, he says :

How those people to the south of us, represented by their government, will twist and vary treaties, and will twist and torture principles of law, but will scheme and arrange so as to grasp every advantage possible, regardless of any consequences whatever.

And then he proceeds to say :

When dealing with the United States, any member of this House may without fear warn the Government of Canada that they are relying upon a broken reed when they rely upon the good faith of the United States.

Further on, he says :

Their citizens on the Pacific Coast are bringing all the pressure they can bring to bear on the Washington authorities, to give them every conceivable advantage in this Yukon country, and in the trade connected with it. I have no manner of doubt whatever, Mr. Speaker, that not only is that their purpose, but from the legislation now before Congress there is cause for any reasonable man to assume that, so far as they can go, short of actual offensive and warlike demonstrations and action against us, the people of the United States will compel the Administration of the day will go.

Mr. CHARLTON.

And again, he says :

I am, therefore, in the strongest manner against, and will vote against any proposition for the expenditure of a dollar, or the assumption of responsibility for any action, which is dependent upon United States good-will at the present time for its successful accomplishment.

That was rather inconsistent with the declaration made by the hon. member for York—and I take occasion here to lament the intemperate language indulged in by the hon. member whose words I have quoted. At the present time sentiments of that kind expressed here are not only unfair to the country against which they are expressed, but they are mischievous in their tendency to produce strained and unfriendly relations between the two countries, and are calculated to embarrass the Government here in the attempt which they will necessarily and properly, to the best of their ability make to smooth out the difficulties between the two countries, and to promote Canadian interests by striving to bring about friendly relations between them. As that kind of language is calculated to thwart such efforts, I must condemn the use of it by any member of this House.

Then the hon. member for York proceeds to say that we have insulted the United States. We have insulted them in what way? Why, he says we have insulted them in not professing to care about getting a road across their territory. We have insulted them by wanting to have a line of our own in our own country, where it will be independent of any interference which the United States will be able to make, if that country should assume an unfriendly attitude. I do not think that they will feel that we have insulted them because we wished to have an independent railway in our own country, and be in a position to control the trade of our own country.

My hon. friend made some remarks about the course of duplicity followed by the Government in exempting from the grant to this railway company the arable lands of the Yukon district, where there were no arable lands. I do not know that that was a very proper foundation for an unfavourable criticism. The hon. gentleman may not be aware of it, but there are arable lands north of parallel 60—lands capable of producing barley, potatoes, roots, grass—large pasture areas—lands that will be valuable for agricultural purposes; and the Government, in taking the course which my hon. friend ridicules, simply showed that they were possessed of more accurate information than my hon. friend himself evidently is. These arable lands, whatever may be their extent or value, are under the terms of this contract exempt from appropriation by this railway company; and in making that arrangement, the Government have acted in the public interest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having dealt with the reasons that may be urged as good and

sufficient ones for the selection of the route which the Government have selected, and for the course that has been adopted by them—the pressure of necessity, the urgency of the case, that did not admit of waiting for weeks and months if we were to provide an outlet and inlet for that country in the season of 1898; having dealt with the offer of Mr. Hamilton Smith, with no tangible proof of any financial ability to supplement his proposal; having contrasted the assumed principles of hon. gentlemen opposite with their conduct when in power, and the outrageous violation, year after year, of the principles which they are sticklers for to-day; let us examine for a few moments the question of the probable cost of this road. We are told that it is a poor, miserable tramway, which will be thrown together in the utmost haste. We might almost suppose, from the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, that it would be almost as easy to build this road as to make a sleigh road for a logging camp. This road of 150 miles, we must remember, will be a road in the wilderness, a long distance from the base of supplies. The contractors will have to transport every ounce of material, all the food, implements, rolling stock, rails and everything, first, to the Pacific Coast, then up the coast, and up the Stikine River to Glenora, 150 miles, and thence along the line through an unbroken solid wilderness for 150 miles. They have to build that road and put it into operation by the first of September next. That may seem a rather trivial task to my hon. friend—the task of making the surveys, preparing the road beds, laying the rails, getting in the rolling stock, etc. Why, I venture to say that the company could lay down a narrow-gauge railway from Montreal to Toronto by the first of September next and do it cheaper than they can build this 150 miles from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake, through that howling wilderness. I think it can be demonstrated that that road, 330 miles long, from Montreal to Toronto, could be built quicker and cheaper than this road from Telegraph Creek to Lake Teslin.

Mr. BERGERON. How much would that cost?

Mr. CHARLTON. A narrow-gauge road from Montreal to Toronto, built in that way, with great haste, would cost \$4,500,000. Of course it could be built cheaper, if they had ten years to do it in, as our friends on the Canadian Pacific had.

My hon. friend from York gave us a calculation of the earnings of this road, and he complained that the Government had neglected to retain the power to regulate the tolls. If that be his belief, he is mistaken, for under section 21 the Government can regulate the tolls. Later on he asked what the tolls were to be. He wants to know, before a mile of the track is laid, before the conditions are understood, before the cost

of the road is known, before the difficulties are over, what the tolls will be. The Government will naturally wait until the road is ready to carry something before deciding what tolls shall be. Then my hon. friend made some estimates as to the probable earnings, and in these he demonstrated that he is one of the greatest railway authorities of this century. He ought to be made Minister of Railways without delay, and I have no doubt that under his supervision the Intercolonial would be made to pay.

Mr. FOSTER. I would give the hon. gentleman a pass the first thing.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think I would have earned it after this recommendation of the qualities and abilities of my hon. friend. He assumes that the fares on this road for passengers will be \$15 for 150 miles, or ten cents a mile. I do not know that that assumption is unreasonable. The company will have to fix the fares at a rate at which a man can not afford to walk the distance. But assuming that the passenger rate will be \$15 for 150 miles, the hon. gentleman assumes that the freight rate will be \$50 per ton. Here the brilliancy of his calculation comes into play. \$15 per passenger and \$50 per ton of freight or \$2.50 per one hundred weight. Why, on the trunk lines between Chicago and New York it costs \$2.50 to \$3 and in some cases \$4 per ton of freight, according to the season of the year, and \$20 for a first-class passage. My hon. friend has made the cost of a ton of freight three and a half times higher than the cost of a passage, when the usual ratio for freight of trunk lines is one-third or one-quarter the cost of a passenger. Corn can be sent from Chicago to New York at 18 cents per cwt., or \$3.60 per ton, while the fare for a passenger is many times more. At a way station in western Ontario—I speak from knowledge because I recently imported a car load of corn—it cost 13½ cents per hundred weight, or \$2.70 a ton, for freight from Chicago to that way station, in the middle of Ontario, near the Niagara frontier, where we had to pay local rates. You can send it down to New York for very little more, and yet my hon. friend talks about \$50 per ton or \$2.50 per hundredweight for the transportation of freight 150 miles. The statement is preposterous.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it?

Mr. CHARLTON. It is. The carriage of freight, by ordinary rules, will not be one-half the cost of a first-class passenger fare. Then the hon. gentleman calculated that if there were 20,000 passengers and 20,000 tons of freight, that would give a net revenue of \$700,000. He was careful, however, not to say what the running expenses would be. He said that 50,000 passengers and 50,000 tons of freight would give a net earning of \$3,250,000, and one hundred thousand passengers and 100,000 tons of freight would

yield the snug sum of \$6,000,000 net earnings. Even Baron Munchausen could not get up such a railway statement as that. He had not the imagination. He could easily, however, have made a statement, in the wildest efforts of his fancy, that would be more reliable than this.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend aware that the Government engineer who was sent out there to report, both as to the cost of building the railway and the cost of transportation to the lake, estimated it at \$50 per ton?

Mr. CHARLTON. I was not aware of it, and if he did, he knew as little about it as my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister of Railways took that as his basis of calculation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (Mr. Blair). I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have heard a good deal of the character of the road. The cost of building it will be enormous beyond doubt. The men whom these contractors will employ will be right on the way to the Yuokn gold fields, where men are receiving perhaps a dollar an hour, and navvies cannot be kept on the road for less than \$5 or \$6 a day. The cost of labour in constructing that road will be five times greater than it would be in a settled country. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not stop to consider the enormous disadvantages under which these contractors will labour in the construction of that road. Then, as to the character of the road, there is a great deal of fun made about this narrow-gauge, but railway men know that a narrow-gauge road is considered the most economical for the performance of business of any road at all. The proportion of dead weight to live weight or paying freight is less on a narrow-gauge road than on a wider one. The proportion of freight to dead weight on a four foot eight inch gauge is very much less than on a three-foot gauge; and the reason for the universal adoption of the four-foot eight-inch gauge is because uniformity of gauge is necessary in order to avoid breaking freight. You can imagine the advantage, in sending freight from Chicago, in running the same car through to Portland or New Orleans, whereas, if you had two or three different gauges, you must have two or three transshipments. We started in this country with a five foot six inch gauge. We had a gauge of four feet eight inches prevalent in the northern States, and a gauge of five feet in the Southern States. There were some very important narrow-gauge roads. For instance, there was the Denver and Rio Grande Road, which had a gauge of three

Mr. CHARLTON.

feet six inches, and an admirable road it was. The gauge was changed, because its connection east and west were the standard gauge, and not because it was not an economical or efficient road. This line, of which so much fun is made, is almost identical in character with the entire railway system of South Africa, from Cape Town up through the Orange Free State, the Transvaal, Mashonaland, Mataberland, Bechuanaland, and reaching out to the Zambesi, a great stretch of two or three thousand miles of line, including the lateral lines to the ocean at different points. That whole system is a narrow-gauge system. And yet we are told that this narrow-gauge road is not going to be able to do the business between Telegraph Creek and Teslin Lake. Another advantage in favour of the narrow-gauge is that you can surmount heavier grades and go around sharper curves. You can lay down a more efficient road through a difficult country at a small cost and overcome engineering difficulties more easily than with a road of a broader gauge. So far as any disability arising from gauge is concerned, there is no reason why this road should not be an efficient and economical one.

Mr. DAVIN. Before my hon. friend leaves that point, with his permission, I would ask him a question. Is a narrow-gauge road as suitable as a broad-gauge road for a country having a great deal of snow?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think there is a great difference. A heavy fall of snow is very awkward in any case, whether on a broad or narrow-gauge road. I think I may claim to have a little knowledge of these narrow-gauge roads. Some years ago, I carried on a large lumber operation, transporting long timber and masts on a road having a gauge of three feet two inches in a country where the snowfall was heavy. We had an iron rail of 22 pounds to the yard. We loaded on truck loads of masts that would weigh 25 or 30 tons, and hauled them down to the lake. We had no difficulty with the snow more than we should have had with a standard gauge road. I do not think that there is any difference. You have to clear off the snow, and it is at least as easy to clear the snow off a narrow road as to clear it off a broad one.

Mr. FOSTER. How did you get the long timbers around the curves?

Mr. CHARLTON. We had a pretty straight line. We are not calculating to draw masts on this Teslin Lake road.

Now, as regards the value of the land grant. As my hon. friend is aware, this grant does not cover arable lands. Messrs Mann & Mackenzie must take rock and mountain,

that class of land which is useless for any purpose but minerals, and what little scraggy timber may be growing, which would be useless except for mining purposes. This is a large land grant, nominally. The Canadian Pacific got 13,000 acres a mile of arable land for the portion of the main line constructed by the syndicate; this company gets 25,000 acres a mile of non-arable land, worthless except for minerals. My hon. friend talks as though the whole of the land grant would be placer diggings or quartz leads. With this grant of lands laid out on base lines, with three-mile blocks on each side, or six miles wide on the line of a stream, there would be a mile of stream to 3,840 acres of land. Assuming that the placer diggings on streams large and small are three chains wide, and that is wider than the average will be, out of 3,840 acres of land, there are 24 acres for placer diggings. On the entire land grant, laid out in blocks three miles wide on each side of streams, there will be 1,000 miles of stream beds. But we may assume that there will be lateral branches coming in, perhaps a rod wide or so, which will add a thousand miles more to the length of the streams that will be given in this grant of four million acres of land. Let us assume that there are three chains wide of placer diggings on each stream, and that is a liberal estimate, because some will be smaller, and because this is wider than the small California streams. Having three chains of twelve rods in width in each, there will be a total of 48,000 acres of placer diggings on 2,000 miles of stream bed, out of the whole land grant. Yet my hon. friend gets up and talks about four millions of acres of gold lands. But when you simmer down to 48,000 acres of placer diggings, you can realize the exaggeration that is indulged in in criticizing this scheme. Moreover, it costs gold to get gold. My hon. friend, in his ideas of the richness of this country, is like the Irishman who landed in America with exaggerated notions of the chance he would have with getting on in the world. He chanced to see a dollar lying in the street, but he passed it by. When asked by a friend why he did not pick up that dollar, he answered: "I am going where they grow on the bushes." My hon. friend seems to think that gold grows on the bushes in the Yukon district. I can tell him that the price of getting gold must be special effort, hard work and much uncertainty. It must not be forgotten that the conditions of life in the Yukon region are infinitely more onerous than in the placer diggings of California. The hon. gentleman must not forget that the frost is never out of the ground in that country. In the summer the sun thaws out the ground for from one to three feet, but underneath is eternal frost, extending to the bed-rock. The placer miner carries on his work by building a fire to thaw out the ground and start a hole, then throws

the thawed earth aside, then makes another fire to thaw out more of the earth, and so on down to the gravel on the bed-rock, and then must tunnel under by means of fires, throwing out the dirt and leaving it on the surface until the summer sun thaws it out and it can be panned out.

There is no certainty in the results. One man may strike it rich, when fifty will be beggared by their operations in placer diggings. All this talk about the wonderful returns to be held in the placer diggings of the Yukon are misleading, whether intended so or not, like all the information given us by hon. gentlemen who indulge in these criticisms. I do not know whether my hon. friend has followed closely the methods of taking out gold in the various parts of the world. California was probably the richest gold field ever discovered. I have gone through this, over the old placer diggings, where the whole country was torn to pieces, the miners having gone down to bed-rock, having taken out hundreds of millions of dollars. I have investigated the average character of the result on the part of those hardy miners, and the result in that country, with all the advantages that it possesses, with the richness of its placer diggings, was that not more than one man in fifty made a fortune, and that the majority of the men failed to make wages. That is the character of the placer diggings in California. They have there the mother lode, as they term it, and many rich quartz leads are being worked, and in all cases these quartz leads are more or less uncertain. They may, as the miners term it, pinch out, they may grow lean, they may peter out as they go down into the earth. Experience shows that the business of quartz mining in California, in Colorado, in Idaho, in Montana, and in all the mining districts of the United States, is hazardous, uncertain, and that on the average it costs a dollar to get a dollar in gold. There are no prizes even in that favoured country such as my hon. friend imagines. Then if he goes to other countries he will find substantially the same condition of things. There is just one gold field in the world, the Witwatersrand in the Transvaal, where there is some degree of regularity and certainty as to the yield of the mines. The blanket or conglomerate carrying gold there, has a uniform quality and yields gold in paying quantities. The miners there sink their shafts and reach the blanket or conglomerate, and they can figure pretty accurately what the returns will be. But even there it costs 80 to 90 per cent of the value of the gold to extract it. Go north to Mataberland and Mashonaland where it is supposed there are great gold deposits, and where evidences of former gold mining operations are abundant on every side, and the whole question as to whether it will pay to extract gold is purely problematical to-day. So it is the

world over ; and I repeat there is just one locality, the Witwatersrand (white water ridge) in the Transvaal, where there is any degree of certainty as to what returns will be secured from gold mining operations. All this talk about the fabulous wealth of Alaska, about the heritage of the people, and about the enormous returns that will be secured in working these frozen placers, frozen down to bed-rock, is pure moonshine and nonsense. To extract the gold in Alaska, if the company that has this contract proceeded afterwards to the work of mining, they have got to hire labour, they have got to employ men, they have got to develop the country by spending money, and it is a problem of the most doubtful character whether they will get back the money they put in. They get at best 4,000,000 acres out of 80,000,000, about one-twentieth of the placer area and the general area of that country. When I was studying this matter over and deciding for myself, whether I could reasonably and honestly satisfy myself that these men were not getting more than they ought to, I asked myself this question : Would you invest money in that enterprise? And I said no, I would not put in a dollar, and I would not ; and you won't find one business man in fifty in this House or in this country, who will give to that question the attention that a man will naturally give to something where he is going to bank his money, and who will venture to put money in that enterprise. These men are entitled to the chance to make something ; they have bravely taken a great chance to lose something ; and the only parties in this matter who are perfectly free from danger of loss, and who have a sure thing, is the Government.

Now, my hon. friend says, this Government is a cowardly Government, it does not dare to make any investment in money, it is afraid to put a dollar into this road, it sneaks out of the obligation that rests upon it as the custodian of the public interests, and it goes and barter away this vast heritage of the people, rather than place a tax upon them to build a road, the necessity for the construction of which is a pure problem. Now we do not know what the character of these placers will be, we do not know whether the men that will go into the Yukon district this spring will come out in the fall, every man of them cursing the country and will never go back, or whether some will stay there, whether there will be continued development or a complete and disastrous collapse of a boom that may dissipate into thin air like the South Sea bubble. The recklessness and risk is on the side of the men who are taking the contract, it is the Government who are in a perfectly safe and sure position. It gets the road built without money, it gives to the company a grant, that, if it proves to be worth anything, the company has got to develop, has got to pay

Mr. CHARLTON.

money to develop, and it has got to develop for the Government just as much placer diggings as it develops for itself. The Government ascertains through the expenditure of this company, through the hard money it invests in developing these placer diggings, the Government ascertains without the expenditure of a cent, whether it has got any value in the alternate blocks. The whole matter when we come to look it over, is one that gives satisfactory proof of the judiciousness of the Government in taking the course that it has taken in this matter.

Now, when we talk about the fabulous richness of these placer diggings, the wonderful reserve of gold in this country, what foundation have we for arriving at the conclusion that hon. gentlemen opposite have arrived at? This country, Mr. Speaker, has been prospected for ten years, there have been thousands of miners in this country roaming over it from end to end, on the American side and on the Canada side, year after year. There has been a settlement below Circle City of American miners who have wintered there year after year, grubbing along, some making enough to pay expenses, some making a little more, some making a little less ; and these hardy adventurous men have gone down the streams on the Canadian side and on the American side, making investigation far and wide, and the result of ten years of exploration, ten years of investigation, is to find one Klondike. And yet these hon. gentlemen would have us suppose that every valley, every gulch, every gully, in the Yukon Valley is glittering with gold. Why, I hardly think my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), has yet recovered from the influence of the nursery story where he learned to believe that by following a rainbow he could find a pot of gold at the further end.

We have travelled far afield in the discussion of this question. We have had a good deal said about treaty rights, about international obligations, and international good faith, and international regulations. We have had from one set of gentlemen on the other side praises for the United States, for its kindness, its generosity, its fairness in dealing with us, and lamentations that we did not avail ourselves of the chance last summer to get arrangements that we might have got so easily. And we have on the part of other hon. gentlemen the assertion that they are grasping, and guilty of bad faith, that they would not invest a dollar upon their good faith and upon their word. I do not know on which side to believe, are the sentiments that our hon. friends opposite entertain. Now, with regard to treaty obligations, the Stikine is a free river, and if we are deprived of the free navigation of that stream, it will be truly an outrageous over-riding of our treaty rights. We have no business to assume that will be the case, I do not believe it will be the case. I do not

believe the United States Government would deprive us of a right assured to us by solemn treaty ; I do not believe there is a disposition to do it. But as I said before, even if the policy that the United States Government has deliberately decided to follow will lead them to shut us out of the Stikine, the same policy will make it in the highest degree impolitic for us to build a road upon their territory at any point on the Pacific Coast. I repeat what I said before, that even in that eventuality we are working on the right line, for we are building 150 miles of road which, by building 180 or 200 miles more, will lead us to a port of our own and make us independent of interference of any kind. That is the only safe course to take. If the Government were putting a road to Dyea or Skagway, they would be voluntarily incurring risks as to interruption of communication that they would not be justified in incurring. They are doing exactly what they ought to do, exactly what meets my approval in this matter ; and in the haste with which they have acted in this matter, temporarily overriding a principle which in itself is a good one, but like all other principles must be set aside in great emergencies. I say they have acted in my belief properly, because it was necessary to take time by the forelock, and to make instant provision to secure what they desired to obtain.

It follows from what I have said that we must have our own road as a matter of prudence. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) made a most unwarranted attack on the Premier of this Dominion—he made several attacks, in fact, but I will allude to one only. He made an attack on my right hon. friend because of language attributed to him in an address delivered at Boston. The right hon. First Minister has time and again told the House that the report was one never submitted to him. He cannot be bound by a report of a speech he did not sanction. I know how liable a speaker is to have his language misconstrued and misstatements made through ignorance and not through a desire to misrepresent, and especially is this the case with reporters who may be desirous of construing language used by speakers so as to convey an impression which the language was not calculated to convey. All I have to say about the right hon. Premier is that he may now be judged by his acts, by his record. Hon. gentlemen opposite were in power eighteen years, and during the whole of that term they failed to secure from the inhabitants of the motherland that warm and effusive response to the action of this Government evoked when we granted the mother country preferential treatment in our markets. The British people recognized the right hon. Premier and the Ministers of this Dominion as their friends. They have a warmer

place in their hearts for these men than they ever had for public officials of Canada before, and I repeat that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues may be judged by their record, that is all they need point to, and the carping, barking criticism on the part of men who would deny to these high-minded, statesman-like officials the meed of praise due them, will pass for what they are worth, and that is infinitely less than little.

With respect to the statement made by my hon. friend that the golden opportunity had been missed of securing better relations with the United States, all I have to say to that is, that in my belief the present Government has lost no opportunity and has never failed to use its utmost efforts to secure better, broader and more friendly relations with the United States ; that this Government realizes fully and to the utmost extent the importance of such relations ; that it realizes its importance as regards ourselves, that it realizes its importance in a high degree as relates to the promotion of friendly feelings between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon family ; that this Government is wide-awake to its duty, and will never fail to seize any opportunity that presents itself to secure broader, freer, friendlier social and business relations with the great republic to the south of us.

But we must maintain our self-respect ; we cannot surrender our rights, that is a thing this Government will not do. A few months ago the right hon. Premier and the Minister of Marine were in Washington, and they were asked by an American diplomat, the official in charge of the negotiations, to surrender what we might term our trump card and then wait until the United States were ready to treat in regard to other matters. We were asked to put an end to pelagic sealing, which the Americans are anxious we should do, and they would be ready in due time to take up other questions. The right hon. Premier very properly and astutely said : We are ready on the instant, without a moment's delay, to enter into the consideration of the whole broad question of pelagic sealing and all other questions, and we are anxious to get these questions out of the way as speedily as possible ; but a partial settlement, especially of the kind proposed, would not be calculated to promote freer trade relations between the two countries. So my right hon. friend declined the offer, and this was evidence of his ability, and he thus indicated the proper course for the Canadian Government to pursue.

While we have an anxiety to secure such relations as will ensure freedom of commercial intercourse and friendly relations which will serve to promote union between all the Anglo-Saxon commonwealths of the world in the interest of humanity, while

this Government will go as fast and as far as possible in that direction, this Government will still maintain its self-respect. If its offers are rejected and its advances met with rebuff, what can we do? We can simply wait our time. And we are now doing tolerably well. It was thought some years ago, I thought so myself, that admission of our agricultural produce to the American market was essential, that we must obtain it or we could not prosper. I do not think so to-day; it would be highly advantageous and most desirable, but it is not absolutely essential. We are getting along, and I am happy to say we are getting along famously. We have the goodwill of England, thanks to the conduct of this Liberal Government. Other things being equal, we will now get preference in that market; they will take us by the hand and say: Good boys, if you do anywhere near what is right you are pretty sure of our market. In the province of Ontario we have received \$1 per 100 pounds for live hogs through the past season in excess of the price in Buffalo or Chicago, and this has been obtained at our country stations. We are exporting increased quantities of bacon and ham to England; but we will not realize the extent of our increased exports until next year's Trade and Navigation Returns are brought down. We are exporting to England two or three times as much cheese as do the United States. Our farmers in Ontario were in a better position last season than farmers in the United States. They only suffered in one respect: a combination of wheat buyers gave our farmers 5 to 10 cents per bushel less than they should have obtained. But as regards pork, cheese and beef, we have had splendid prices and an unlimited market, and the result is great prosperity; and if we cannot gain access to the markets of the United States, which are essential in some lines, the farmers can simply change their mode of farming, and instead of raising poultry, barley, vegetables and hay for the American market, can turn their attention to pork and cheese, thus changing the character of the output, and our exports on these lines have been for the last year or two increasing rapidly.

Mr. CLANCY. It took you a long time to see it.

Mr. CHARLTON. It takes a man a long time to see a thing that has not come yet. There was once a Dutchman who said that if his foresight had been as good as his hindsight, he would have avoided many difficulties. I saw it as soon as it arrived.

Mr. FOSTER. He would have been a sight better off.

Mr. CHARLTON. I shall not follow the example of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) and make a four hours' speech. A few

Mr. CHARLTON.

words more and I shall conclude. This Government that I am a supporter of will, in my honest belief, do everything to secure a fair settlement of outstanding questions with the United States, and towards that end will make every effort that can in reason be demanded of them. If their efforts are met in the same spirit as they are made, then these questions will soon be settled. This Government hails with joy the sweeping away, or the opportunity to sweep away social prejudices, business prejudices, trade repression, and all things and everything that stands in the way of a close connection and a responsive feeling between the two great Anglo-Saxon commonwealths upon this continent. We will bear with fortitude our position whatever it may be; we have a grand future before us, we have a great country abounding with resources, resources the character and extent of which have been undreamed of heretofore by ourselves, and which we fail even yet to realize a tithe of. We have a country extending from ocean to ocean; a country inhabited by a hardy and an enterprising race. I believe, Sir, the very fact that we have two nationalities in this Dominion will ultimately result in increasing the vigour and the enterprise of our people. I listened to a speech to-day in another part in this building by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) a speech every word of which I endorse, a speech in which that hon. gentleman contemplated the possibility of our having scope for all our resources and all our population in Canada. That day is coming, Sir, when our young men will cease to drift away to the United States, and it is coming more rapidly in consequence of the existence of a Liberal Government in this country. The day is coming, the day is near at hand, when this will be a great and prosperous and powerful state, founded upon British precedents and upon British institutions, avoiding the mistakes that exist on the other side of the line, a nation that will be a model I trust to all nationalities now in existence or which may hereafter come into existence upon the face of the globe. Sir, the efforts of this Government are in the direction of bringing about such a happy condition in our Dominion. The efforts of this Government, even in the matter under consideration are in that direction. They seek to afford to that great Yukon region an immediate outlet and inlet for travel, for trade, for export and import.

Mr. MILLS. Where is the machine politician now?

Mr. CHARLTON. The machine politician is on that side of the House; he always has been enrolled under the banners of the Conservative party.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the efforts of this Government are in that direction, and I am sorry to say that the efforts of the Conser-

vative Opposition are in a contrary direction. Whether consciously or unconsciously, whether with intent or without intent, these gentlemen are pursuing a policy which is calculated to injure Canada, and they are questioning the propriety of a policy which is calculated to benefit Canada. They are playing into the hands and exciting the animosities and the prejudices of a party on the other side of the line, and their efforts are calculated to militate against our interests in any future negotiations that may be undertaken with that country.

I have to say, Sir, in conclusion, that I have gone over this question—candidly admitting as I do that at the outset that I looked upon the matter with some disfavour, because of the apparent violation of a cardinal principle in the policy of the Liberal policy, that no contract should be entered into without tender; a principle arrived at in consequence of the abuse of the contract system by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House in 1881, and subsequently to that time. I say that in consequence of that fact I looked with some disfavour on this measure at first. I felt it my duty to examine this measure candidly and carefully—of course I would not arrive at a conclusion hastily that was opposed to the interests of my friends, for I would do them justice if I could—and I am happy to say that I am able to endorse fully, for the reasons I have stated, the action of the Government in this matter. I endorse this Bill, not that I can foresee the outcome, not that the Government professes to be able to see the outcome; I cannot tell whether Mann & Mackenzie may become bankrupt in consequence of undertaking this hazardous enterprise, nor can I tell on the contrary whether they may make large profits out of it; but I do know one thing, and that is: that Mann & Mackenzie take all the risks, that they are entitled to any profit they can get, and that the Government sits quietly by and gets the railroad built without investing a dollar. I believe, Sir, that this policy of the Government is a very good one.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat refreshing even at this late stage of the debate, and after the many days of discussion upon this important question, to listen to the speech which we have thus heard from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). We of the Conservative party have sometimes said during the last couple of years, that it was worth while getting these gentlemen on the Treasury benches, because when we got them there we made patriotic men out of those who were unpatriotic before, we made lovers of Canada out of those who were lovers of the United States, and we made those men opposite feel that they had an interest in Canada, and that they had a country which was worth speaking for and fighting for. We have had no better illustration of that, either in the present session

or any previous one of this Parliament, than the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) to-night. Sir, I have been a member of this House for 20 years; I have listened to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) during that long time, and for 17 years out of these 20 he invariably ran down his own country and stood up for the United States. To-night he has taken a different course. Formerly he could see no good in Canada, nothing to admire in the statesmanship of her people, nothing worth living for here. He believed in former days that everything that was done by the Government was calculated to exasperate the people of the United States. To-day his friends are in power, and though they are pursuing the very same policy as was pursued by Conservatives in the past, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) believes that everything is all right and nothing wrong. The very same thing which was wrong in his political opponents is the very best of policy in his political friends.

Now in reference to this question before the House, and on which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has given such valuable information, according to rumour it was said, that from the date of the meeting of Parliament up to the present, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) was opposed to the Yukon contract, and that he was one of the members supporting the Government who was likely to get up at any time and condemn the scheme in toto. I believe there was some justification for that rumour, but strange to say at the very last moment the hon. gentleman has found new light, and through some peculiar change he becomes an enthusiastic supporter of this Yukon tramway. When the scales fell from off his eyes, we do not know—whether it was on his way to Damascus, or to Room 16, or to some private closet where he communed with his heart and conscience, or with the leader of the Government. What was the balm of Gilead which caused him to change his mind and to display this sturdy manhood which he has displayed to-night—we must leave the future to bring us the information; we cannot know it to-night. But it is sufficient to know, that within the last few days the hon. gentleman was opposed to this scheme, that he saw no virtue in it, whereas to-night he speaks as if he had examined it carefully and found it to be worthy of every commendation.

Now, I wish to refer for a short time to a few remarks made by the hon. gentleman with reference to the hopeful outlook of this country for the future. He says this country is great because it is inhabited by two races. I was just wondering how that remark accorded with the sentiment of a letter which the hon. gentleman wrote to his friends a few years ago, when, referring to the present leader of the Government, he said: "With a French Roman Catholic for a

leader, and machine politicians to back him up. I can see no hope for the future of the country." To-day, there is a virtue in two races, but then it was a vice. To-day, there is a bright outlook for the future, but then he could entertain no hope for the future while we had machine politicians. He says, the leader of the Government should be judged by his acts, and not by his past record. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite would gladly have their past record blotted out; and no one among them I am sure, would be more pleased to have his past record blotted out than the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, for no man has been more influenced by party exigencies than the hon. gentleman. What has his record been? In the early seventies he was a protectionist; after that he was a free trader except in everything that concerned himself. When his friends were out of power, he was a free trader; but as soon as they get back to power, he becomes a protectionist again, and their protectionist policy, when they passed their last Customs Bill, was, according to the hon. gentleman, everything to be desired. We required it in the defence of Canadian interests, whereas a few years ago it was opposed to the best interests of Canada. At one time the hon. gentleman was himself opposed to this deal, and was expected to make a very strong attack upon it; but now the attack of the Opposition upon it is unwarranted. It was necessary, he says, for the Government to be prepared to throw troops and munitions of war into that country at a moment's notice—why? Because there was danger of a rebellion, or an invasion, or something of the kind, occurring in that country. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, what value would this railway be to throw troops into that country when they would have to cross American territory? What power would the Treaty of Washington give us to throw troops into that country if that privilege were refused to us by the United States, as they refused to allow Canadian troops to go by way of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal when we were sending troops to Manitoba and the North-west? What value would this road be, if they undertook to do that? It would be of no value at all. The hon. gentleman said that the Conservative Government did not advertise for tenders for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and therefore this Government was justified in not advertising for tenders in this instance. The whole gist of his argument appeared to me to be this. Every argument advanced on this side against the letting of that contract and against the principle on which it was let, was answered by saying: You are just as bad; you did the same thing when in power. But that hon. gentleman forgot that, for eighteen years, he condemned the principle on which the Canadian Pacific Railway was built—the principle of giving away mining lands, grazing leases, timber lands. He

Mr. SPROULE.

condemned the principle of monopoly as strongly as any man in this House; but, to-night, he has nothing to say against it, but every word he utters in defence of it. Is it possible that what was wrong for eighteen years in his opponents must be a right in his friends to-day? Is it possible that two wrongs can make a right? What is wrong when done by his opponents, must surely be wrong when it is done by his friends. The hon. gentleman has always been voluminous in his arguments, and he is very logical, I must say; and he has advanced strong arguments in the past against the principle of monopoly, involved in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and against the large grants of land made for that work; but if he succeeded in advancing strong arguments against the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, there is not one of those arguments that does not apply with stronger force against the course followed by his friends to-day, in locking up 4,000,000 acres of land in the Yukon country for the building of 150 miles of railway.

The hon. gentleman gave, as a strong reason for supporting the present Bill, that the railway was secured without the expenditure of a dollar. I thought of what I saw in a paper a few days ago, about a farmer who went and traded off his land and nearly everything he had, to buy a fine piano and a horse and carriage. Showing them to his wife, he said, "What a beautiful piano and horse and carriage I have got, and the best of it is, I did not pay a dollar of cash for them." His wife said, "You old fool, you have traded off the whole farm for them." We have traded off the whole country in the Yukon district for the purpose of getting a railway built to enable the owners of it to develop their own lands and take out the gold. The great argument which the hon. gentleman advanced in favour of this road was its great urgency. He said the Minister of the Interior had left for the scene of action as soon as it became known that gold existed there in fabulous quantities. When did he leave? He left in September of last year. When did he get the first information in relation to the gold discoveries? In December, 1896, and again in January, 1897; and nine months after that he left to make this inquiry on the scene of action. I would like to ask the hon. member for North Norfolk, if the Government did not know anything about the gold discoveries, last fall, when the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) brought the matter to their attention, that there was an item in the Estimates of \$6,000 to defray the expenses of exploring and surveying the country lying between the Stikine River and the sources of the Yukon. Mr. Prior asked:

Has anything been done yet on this work?

Mr. DOBELL. No, nothing has been done.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to draw the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that there is

another route besides the one from the Stikine River to the Yukon. The other route is from the head of Lynn Canal over the White Pass to Teslin Lake, and thence to the Yukon River. There is no proper road now for miners to come in by, and it is very hard for them to get their goods in in any quantity. At present nearly all the goods going to the Yukon country are coming around by the mouth of the Yukon. They have to go up by St. Michael's, and they are American goods that are mostly coming in. If we could get a good road through the Lynn Canal into the Teslin Lake and so on to the Yukon, that would be much shorter. If that cannot be found, I take it that the Stikine is the best. The Government should put on two surveyors.

Mr. DOBELL. It is the intention to survey all possible routes to open up that country, and not to spare any expense in having the routes properly surveyed.

Mr. PRIOR. I should like to see it done as soon as possible. Better spend \$15,000 in one year than five or six thousand dollars per year in three years.

Mr. DOBELL. It will be gone on with early next spring.

Now, the whole gist of that conversation goes to show that in October, 1896, the Government were aware of the urgency and were providing for it. The hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Dobell) said they were prepared to survey every part of the route, and yet it was nearly a year later before the Minister of the Interior went into that country to examine it. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that as soon as ever it was known that gold existed there in large quantities, the Minister of the Interior went to the scene himself and endured all those hardships which that hon. gentleman described for the purpose of acquiring information and providing for the carrying through of the road at the earliest possible moment. How does that agree with the fact of which there can be no doubt, that the reports of the hon. Minister's own engineers lay in his office nine months before he ever moved a hand or foot, during which time he and his colleagues were travelling all over the country, junketing and banqueting, going everywhere except to that part of the country where they should have gone to get information. Then they got into a terrible hurry at the last moment, and decided to give the contract so as to have the work done by the 1st of September.

The hon. member for Norfolk said that we did not ask for tenders for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He forgets, or if he did not forget, he should have told the House that there was an offer on the records of this Parliament for two or three years, announcing that the Government was prepared to give a large amount of lands and money to any company which would build that Canadian Pacific Railway, and his own leader, Mr. Mackenzie, sent Mr. Sandford Fleming to England to try and induce capitalists to

undertake this great work. Mr. Mackenzie spent a great deal of time advertising tenders all over the world, but did not succeed in getting an offer. Then, when he was defeated and the Conservatives took office, they renewed the offer, and it stood upon "Hansard" up to the time that the bargain was entered into by them with the men who built the road. Unless the hon. gentleman's memory is very defective, he must remember that circumstance, and he cannot pretend that the Conservative party, in giving that great contract for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway did anything which warrants the course taken by the Government at present.

I would have contented myself with giving a silent vote, were it not for the fact that my silence might be construed into the belief that I did not think that this is one of the worst schemes ever submitted to Parliament during my time in this House. I am opposed to this scheme on account of the route chosen. I am opposed to the route chosen for commercial reasons. I believe it to be the very worst possible that could have been selected. Why? Because it is more calculated to give advantage to the people of the United States than to the people of Canada? Why do I say so? Because the Americans have free navigation from Seattle, Puget Sound, Washington Territory, Tacoma, or up in San Francisco, and can send their goods over this road right into the Yukon district. I opposed it because I believe that the large body of miners who will go in there during the next three or four years ought to be supplied with produce raised on Canadian farms and goods manufactured in Canadian factories. I oppose it because it is a route calculated to serve the interests and requirements of Americans rather than Canadians. My principle is Canada for the Canadians—not a portion of Canada, but all Canada for all the Canadians. My principle is Canada for all the Canadians, and not for a few to make millionaires of them. My principle is the expenditure of the people's money so as to benefit the great mass of the people of Canada rather than the people of the United States. I do not wonder that the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) advocates this Bill, because he was always an advocate for the United States against Canada. The whole history of his career, in and out of Parliament, has been on the same line—everything for his friends in the United States and nothing for our own people. He has been feeding labour in the United States for twenty-five years by the saw-logs taken out of Canada that should have been manufactured in Canada. He has been fighting year after year against the imposition of an export duty on logs to keep Canadian logs in Canada. He has been fighting against the making of regulations that

would compel the manufacture in Canada of Canadian logs? Why? Because the mills at Tonawanda, where his interests lie, and where his brother is employed, have been kept going by sawing Canadian logs. Every effort we made to bring about a change was fought in the most strenuous way by the hon. gentleman. To my mind, this is the very worst road we could possibly have for commercial purposes. Let us compare for a few moments what the results would be to the Canadian people if we had that road through Edmonton. Eastern Canada and the North-west Territories would be the country of supply for the people going into the Yukon. We would have an all-rail route right through for the transport of the manufactured goods of this country and the products of the farm to supply the hundred thousand people who are estimated to go in there. The Americans would not be able to compete, because after bringing their goods to Vancouver, they would have to send them across the Rockies in order to make connection with the Canadian road. The long haulage they would have to pay and the customs duty would make competition on their part impossible. And had we chosen the road to Edmonton we would also open up the great arable district in the Peace River country, to open up which we must build a railway some time, and if we build it to-day, the expense would not have to be incurred again. That railway would be the natural outlet for the products of the farms of the North-west, Manitoba and the eastern provinces. It would be an outlet for the manufacturers of mining machinery to supply the people in that country. Where are they supplied from to-day? We are told that last year about \$20,000,000 worth of products were brought into British Columbia for home consumption and for the people in the Yukon. What was that composed of? It was principally food products to supply the people going to those mines. British Columbia is not raising those products. If you had this road from Edmonton, the North-west Territories, Manitoba and Ontario would supply these products, and they would not be brought in from Montana, Dakota and San Francisco. \$10,000,000 worth of food products was brought in last year, when there was not half the number there that there will be this year. I favour the route by Edmonton because all the miners would go over that route when they go to these gold fields, many of these will become discouraged and return, but in the meantime they will have visited the rich agricultural country of the Peace River and when they leave the Yukon district they go over the arable land again. What will be the result? Probably 75 per cent of them will stay there and become permanent settlers to the benefit of this coun-

Mr. SPROULE.

try at large and the settlement of that region. This would be a great colonization railway besides opening up the route to the gold fields. When I asked why not build by the Edmonton route, the right hon. Premier answered that it would be a line of 1,500 miles long. I am told that it would be only about 1,000 miles to reach the navigable waters of the Pelly.

Mr. DAVIN. Nine hundred miles.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) who ought to be an authority on this subject that it would only be 900 miles. I believe we could build this road for less money than we could build the 450 miles for that we shall have to build before we can be sure of gaining uninterrupted access to that country by this coast route. And when disappointed gold seekers come out by that road they will disappear to every quarter of the world. Not ten per cent of them will remain in Canada to settle. For these reasons I say it is a mistake to build that road by the route chosen. The Government will build it there in the interest of United States rather than of Canada. It is a mistake also from a military point of view. The Government are to-day sending a military expedition through to the gold fields. How do they know that that expedition will be allowed to go up the Stikine River? In fact, they have the strongest reason in the world for believing that it will not do so. And if they are obliged to send this expedition through by way of Edmonton, this should prove to them unmistakably that the route that they have chosen is the worst route for military purposes. If they apprehend danger in the Yukon country, the route furthest from the frontier is the route they should have chosen.

I oppose this scheme because it costs too much. What is the length of the route? We are told that it is 150 miles; but the engineer says it is 208 miles, and I take it that the engineer who examined it ought to know better than those who have not been over the ground. The Government have contracted to give 25,000 acres of land, including mineral rights, per mile. For 208 miles this would mean over four million acres.

My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Robertson) gave what to my mind, was a very fair estimate of the value of the gold-bearing lands. He said that in Ontario where the Government is selling mineral bearing lands, which are not supposed to be worth one-tenth as much as these, the price is \$2 per acre. At that price, this subsidy would represent \$8,000,000, for the building of about 200 miles of tramway. If the road proves to be longer, we are going to pay more than that. At the lowest price at which you can at all fairly estimate the land, we are paying

too much. But, besides the land, we are giving great privileges which, if they were given to independent miners would bring millions into the treasury of this country. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) gave a calculation which I have made in another way. I think he was very modest and that the calculation I have made is more likely to prove correct. Suppose the amount of land given to this company for building the road were given to free miners, what would it bring to the treasury? In the first place, we will suppose that 500,000 free miners went into that country and located the various claims comprised in these 4,000,000 acres. Two years would be a very moderate estimate of the time required for this. Now, 500,000 miners, at \$10 apiece—what they want for a free miner's license—would be \$5,000,000 for the right to go there and begin prospecting. This same amount would have had to be paid the following year. In order to take up this amount of land each miner must locate eight claims, making four million claims. At \$15 each for locating claims this would be \$60,000,000. If they continued to work these claims the second year they would pay \$60,000,000 more. If they took an average of \$100 of gold out of each claim—and that is moderate when you consider that men have claims that they can sell for \$2,000,000, the royalty as compared to what Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie would pay would amount to \$9,000,000. This makes a total of \$139,000,000, which would be paid by poor men going into that country. Suppose that twenty men form this Mann & Mackenzie company. We make a multimillionaire of each of them. I contend that a Government charged with the duty of looking after land has no right to give away that domain.

Compare the situation of the poor man with the situation in which the Government places this company. He goes in and pays \$10 for the right to hunt for gold, and when he takes up a claim he pays \$15 for it, and every year he continues to work that claim, he pays \$15. If he takes out any gold he pays 10 per cent royalty. When the company go in there they pay nothing at all for the right to examine the country, nothing for the claims, and they pay only one per cent royalty. They put the poor man down in a hole, and he has got to pay 10 per cent of all the gold he takes out to satisfy the voracious appetite of the Government for a royalty, while at the same time they allow the millionaire to dig his gold, and he only pays one per cent to the Government of what he takes out. How is that for the labouring man? How can they square themselves with the poor men of this country when they handicap them in this manner in the race of life, while at the same time they give away the rich domain of the people with other great franchises to these contractors. They impover-

ish the poor man and put him down almost as low as a slave for the rest of his life, for the purpose of making millionaires of a few capitalists in this country. They cannot justify such action when they go before the people of this country. But what more do they do? They are locking up this vast territory where no man will want to dig as a free miner. This company takes possession of all that large gold-bearing territory that is open for free mining, and the Government have taken the alternate blocks. How will the free miner know in that country where to go and locate his claim? How will he know where to hunt for gold? There are no stakes to tell him the portions of land that are exempt from those that are not exempt, the portions that belong to the Government from those that do not belong to the Government. I say that the monopoly thus established will render it impossible for the free miner to work successfully in that country. Three-fourths of his time will be wasted in endeavouring to find gold in some portion of country that is not taken up by the monopolists. Then I say there will be confusion for the free miner, he will be handicapped, he will be prevented from carrying on operations in that country as he ought to have a right to do. But there is another question in regard to which I would like to have some information. I see by the regulations here that the Government reserves for themselves every alternate ten claims. They are taking every alternate ten claims of that region; do they reserve that from the free miner, or what do they do with it? There is nothing to show whether they reserve it or not. But if the company takes ten claims and the Government takes ten claims, then it is all reserved. Where is the free miner to come in? How is the Government to sell their ten claims or to get value out of them? The company take their ten claims and work them on one per cent royalty, and without any other charges that are made upon the free miner, and which will assuredly prevent him from succeeding in the race of life the same as others succeed. I oppose this contract for the reason that, in my judgment, it is too high, it costs too much, they get too much land. Again I say we not only give this company that large territory, but we have got to protect their rights. How are we going to protect their rights? Did the Government ever take into consideration what it would cost to protect their rights, to keep others from trespassing on their property? How many policemen will they require to do it? How many military expeditions will they require up there for that purpose? I say if we could only count that up, and calculate it by any right principle of reasoning, we would come to the conclusion that the Government have made a very bad bargain and one which this House should not sanction. I say it will be practically impossible

to protect their rights there. No number of men, whether policemen or military, will be able to do it. But we not only give them the gold, we give them the silver, the lead, the copper, the timber, the iron, and the coal, in that country. I saw an article the other day showing that lumber was worth \$250 a thousand feet, and there is a lot of fine timber in that country. When these men go up there, and lumber is needed for their purposes, they will start out wherever they can find a good timber limit and take possession of it. If they strike a coal mine, they will do the same; if they strike an iron mine they will do the same. We give them the great value that is in the timber there, the immense value, a value that we do not know how to appreciate here, because timber there is worth so much while here it is worth so little, they will take the coal mines as well in that country. But we have made it possible for this company to take nearly all the valuable timber of that country and no doubt they will do it. It will be one of their great sources of wealth when they take possession of their territory. But they will not only take the timber, they will take the coal mines that are found. Coal is one of the essentials for successful mining. They will take the gold mines, they will take the lead mines, they will take the iron mines, or any other class of mines because this property is given to them in fee simple, and they have it exempt from taxation for at least ten years. Now I oppose this contract because it was let in a wrong way. It was let in private, it was let without public competition, it was let without any notice to the world that the Government required this work to be done. If a man wants to do any important work, the first thing he does is to put a notice in the papers, asking capitalists to compete for the work. But the Government did not think it was necessary to do that? they bargained with their friends to do it at a price agreed upon between them, without any outsiders knowing that this work was to be done. Therefore, I say, the contract is a very bad one. Now, there are no men in this country who condemned that principle of letting contracts in private more strongly and more vehemently than the hon. member for North Norfolk, the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, and the men who are surrounding him. For the last 18 years they have been strongly condemning the principle of letting contracts without tender, but as soon as they came into power they violate their past record, they violate every principle they defended before. The hon. member for North Norfolk asked us not to judge them by their past records, but to judge them by their present acts. We are judging them by their present acts, and when we find that their present acts do not accord with their past record, we are justified in concluding either that they were

Mr. SPROULE.

dishonest before, or that they are unfair now. We had information given us that Mr. Hamilton Smith was willing to build this road for one-fourth of the money. The Minister of the Interior was told that he was prepared to make an offer. But did he invite tenders from him? Did he ask him to come and have a consultation with him? Not at all. They endeavoured to keep Mr. Hamilton Smith and his friends as much as possible in the dark, so that it was impossible for them to tender, or to know what was going on until the contract was let. We are told that this contract cannot be changed in any particular. It is before Parliament, and I sometimes ask myself what is the right, what is the duty of Parliament? It either has a right to refuse to ratify this contract, or it has no rights at all. This contract is made subject to the approval of Parliament; but we are told to-day that the contract is already given, that the men are going on and doing the work, that they have incurred large expense, and that consequently Parliament should ratify it. These hon. gentlemen go on the assumption that Parliament, that the representatives of the people, have a right to ratify it but not to reject it. Again I oppose this contract because it is a bad principle to make large allotments of the property of the state to a few individuals to make millionaires of them. If there is one thing more than another that tends to start a revolution, to create anarchy and socialism in a country, it is when a Government apports out the domain of the state to a few people, to make them immensely wealthy while by so doing they impoverish the great masses of the people. There is nothing calculated to breed contempt for government and for the authorities of a country than that very principle. If you are forcing the majority of the people down to poverty and degradation, while making millionaires of the few, the large number cannot respect the men or the principles of the men who do it. The history of Canada offers ample illustration of the baneful effects of this principle. We have had examples from the very time the seigneurs of the province of Quebec acquired large tracts of land. The Government had to settle the seigniorial tenure and take over the lands. We had the clergy reserves in Upper Canada, whereby large areas became the property of a few people, and the Government were obliged to buy those rights back. We had an example when we gave the Canadian Pacific Railway 25,000,000 acres of land for the building of that railway, a grant which we have regretted many times, and the Government have been obliged to buy back the monopoly privileges granted to that company by virtue of the contract. In the face of all this experience, we have learnt nothing. We are like the Bourbons; if we

forget nothing, we never learn anything. Experience is said to be the school for fools; but we are worse than fools, if we learn nothing by the history of the past, and do the same thing which has proved to be so baneful in principle as regards this country. When we give away the public domain to a few and make them immensely wealthy, while we reduce others to poverty and degradation, we are doing an act which tends to breed contempt and anarchy and socialism; and yet we are doing it by this very transaction, and for that reason I oppose it in the strongest manner possible.

I oppose it because it is against the interest of the poor miner, who will find the condition of affairs confusing when he goes into that country; he will find it confusing by not knowing where he may prospect, locate and stake his claim. He will go into a wilderness, and will be in doubt as to where to locate, because he will be ignorant of the fact that these contractors have taken up so much of the country. Thus, the miner will find himself handicapped, especially when he finds he occupies a different position from that of the rich corporation that will own such large areas of the gold-bearing lands there.

I oppose it because it contains a monopoly clause, which is one of the great acts of injustice that we should have avoided. I referred to this matter, when I spoke incidentally on this question before, and the Minister of Marine then contradicted me and said there was no monopoly in the contract. The Minister of the Interior referred to the member for East Grey, who said there was a monopoly, and that Minister said there was no monopoly whatever. Now, I ask what does section 4 mean, which says:

4. For five years from the 1st September, 1898, no line of railway shall be authorized by Parliament to be constructed from Lynn Canal or thereabouts, or from any point at or near the international boundary between Canada and Alaska into the Yukon district, and for five years from said date no aid in land or money shall be granted to any person or company other than the contractors and the contractors' company to assist in building any such railway.

Is not that a monopoly? If it is not, then I do not understand what a monopoly is, and I would like to ask why the Government put it there, if it was not intended to operate as a monopoly in the interest of the company. I find, by another clause, that a monopoly is intended, because it is provided:

5. The contractors and the contractors' company shall be entitled to receive in preference to any other person or company during ten years from the said 1st of September, 1898, such aid or assistance in land or money as the Government may be authorized and may see fit to grant in aid of a line of railway from the Stikine River to an ocean port in British Columbia, provided that the contractors or contractors' company are willing to undertake the construction of the same at once and completion thereof within a reasonable time upon receiving notice thereof from the Government.

This company will get the first offer, and the assistance of the Government. Yet it is declared that there is no monopoly. If so, I do not understand plain English, and I do not understand the meaning of the contract, if it does not contain two monopoly clauses which will prove very injurious in the interest of the country, but very beneficial to the company.

I oppose it because it is not an all-Canadian route, and we can be handicapped any day in carrying on trade through that country by customs regulations imposed by the United States. We have had several gentlemen visit Washington to endeavour to conciliate the Americans and secure the privileges we require. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) proceeded there, and he was thought to be specially useful for that purpose. But with all the sunny ways of the right hon. the Premier and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who instructed the Americans how to squeeze us in our lumbering operations, they were unable to do anything in our interest. It is not an all-Canadian route, and at any time we are likely to be hampered by customs regulations if we adopt this route. The Government are in favour of Canada for the Americans. It was their rule in the past to endeavour to benefit the people of the United States against the people of Canada. This railway will prove to be carried over a route very favourable and especially useful to them, and especially disadvantageous to us. The policy of the Reform party for the last twenty years has been pursued largely on the same lines. It has been so in respect to our timber policy. Over and over again, the hon. member for North Norfolk has brought in some proposition in favour of the Americans as against the Canadians. So has it been with respect to our mines. We allow Americans to come here and usurp our mining privileges, and we give them the same advantages as Canadians, while Canadians cannot go into the United States and locate and own mines unless they become American citizens. I therefore say that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has been one in favour of the United States rather than in favour of the labourers and artisans of Canada.

I oppose it because it is in favour of the labourer of the United States as against the labourer of Canada. A labourer from the United States can come here and get all the benefit of work in our mines and can take away our gold and nickel, while such privileges are not accorded to the Canadian labourer; and hence I feel that this is an American rather than a Canadian policy. I am in favour of a Canadian policy, that is, keeping Canada not for a few Canadians, but for all Canadians, for the Canadian labourer, manufacturer, artisan and for the Canadian in whatever capacity in life he may be engaged, rather than for the people

of the United States. I repeat, that hon. gentlemen opposite have adopted a policy founded on the very opposite principles, because everything they are doing is not in the interest of Canada, but in the interest of the people of the United States.

I have already pointed out the advantages of the Edmonton route; I think they are important, and I have set them forth at sufficient length. I said it was the route for commercial purposes above all others, that it was the route for the benefit of the Canadian manufacturers and farmers and people living between the east and Edmonton. It would be a railroad that once built would be built for all time to come and would not require to incur the expense of building this Teslin Lake Railway, as we propose to do at the present moment. If Parliament is assembled here only for the purpose of giving our nominal assent to a contract when it has been already executed and the parties to it are carrying it out, then I say that such a thing is only making out of Parliament a farce, rather than a representative institution. The functions of Parliament are to oversee these things, and to revise them if, in its judgment, they should be revised. It is the duty of the representatives of the people to pass their judgment on such contracts as this before they take effect, and it is not according to well-founded constitutional principles of government, that after they are brought into operation Parliament should be called merely to assent to them. In view of all these things I am opposed to this Bill, and I am in favour of the amendment. We on the Conservative side are just as anxious as gentlemen opposite and as the members of the Government, to open up a route to the Yukon at the earliest possible moment. We are willing to give substantial assistance to such a project, but we are not willing to give away these valuable domains to such a vast extent for the purpose of securing a road which is neither the most advantageous nor the cheapest for the Canadian people. We are not willing to give away 4,000,000 acres of our heritage of gold lands for that road, especially with the prospect of being called upon afterwards to grant twice as much more to extend that line to Port Simpson, so that we may have an all-Canadian route. I say that if we had a road to Port Simpson at the present time, it would not be the best road for the Canadian farmer in Manitoba or the North-west, or for the Canadian manufacturers in the eastern provinces. I repeat that I am in favour of opening up a route to the Yukon as rapidly as possible. I say that we should have built a wagon road from Edmonton. We are sending cattle over that route now, prospectors are going over it, goods are being taken over it, and if we had started to build a wagon road ten months ago when we had this

Mr. SPROULE.

information, that road would have been completed to-day. We would have all the advantages from it that we expect to have when this railroad is built next fall, and when it will be too late to get any benefit from it this season. If, as the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Dobell) promised in October, 1896, the Government had sent their surveyors to ascertain the best, and quickest, and cheapest route to the Yukon, there would be no necessity for undue haste now. If the Government had acted then we would have all the information that was necessary, and a road would be built into that country at the present time, a road from which the people of Canada rather than the people of the United States would derive benefit.

I regard this as one of the most injurious monopolies that was ever proposed to a Canadian Parliament to be established. I regard it as one of the worst contracts that was ever made by a Canadian Government. We have heard threats of what will be done if this contract is thrown out by the Senate. Sir, if the Senate throw out this contract they will give the best possible reason in the world for their existence as a branch of the Parliament of Canada. My sincere hope is that the Senate will reject this Bill. They have nothing to fear from the people if they do, for the idle threats now made from the Liberal side of the House will have no effect on intelligent electors of Canada. The people of Canada will endorse the Senate in rejecting this measure. If there is one reason greater than another to justify the existence of the Upper Chamber, it is their patriotism in throwing out the Drummond County Railway, the Teslin Lake Railway, and such nefarious contracts as have been submitted to this House by the Government during the past two sessions of Parliament. Mr. Speaker, I will oppose this Bill at every stage, and I will support the amendment that has been offered to this House.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am aware that I may not be able to throw any more light on this subject, but I have one or two ideas which I would like to give to the House. I can remember the time when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, and I can remember the promises then made that we were going to get 70,000,000 bushels of wheat out of that country before 1890, and that \$53,000,000 would be returned to the treasury out of the proceeds of the sales of mineral lands, wheat lands and timber lands of the North-west. Sir, have these promises been fulfilled to the people of Canada. Has the treasury ever benefited one cent because of the vast tract of land (some people say the most valuable land in Canada) that was given to that railway company. I am astonished at some of the statements made by some of

the gentlemen opposite, and I am particularly astonished at the statements of the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) with respect to the timber limits in the Klondike regions. They told us that there were valuable timber limits there in addition to the mineral lands, and that the contractors would secure all this timber. Now, what does the official guide to the Klondike say in respect to the timber in that country. It says:

It may be said that the country might furnish much timber, which, though not fit to be classed as merchandis, would meet many of the requirements of the only industry the country is ever likely to have, viz., mining.

It is not likely that any one will take up timber limits in that country except for the purpose of carrying on their own occupation. When hon. gentlemen opposite speak against this route, I would refer them to the statement of their own leader (Sir Charles Tupper), who told the House that this was the only available route that could be built into that country. In order to demonstrate that, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) gave the following reasons:

I am in opposition to Government aid to railways. I said: I am prepared to take all back so far as this road is concerned. I said: I am convinced of the vital importance to Canada of at once establishing a railway connection between the Stikine River and Teslin Lake that I feel that the Parliament of Canada, so far as I am able to judge—if you will take that scheme up vigorously and put it through at once as a Government work—I believe you will have the hearty support of the people of Canada, the Parliament of Canada and the people of Canada as well.

There is the statement of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). There is not the least doubt that he was in earnest when he made it and he made it in the true interests of Canada, and would have stuck to it only he was disciplined by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). There is not a doubt that he was disciplined by other members of the party, as he was also by an anonymous writer who wrote under the cognomen of "Onlooker." I think the hon. leader of the Opposition took a statesmanlike view of that question; he took the view the Government did; and down to the time he went before the caucus of his own followers he did everything in his power to advance that view. We were asked on the other side of the House if we were going to vote as we were instructed in room number 16. I would like to know who instructs the Opposition how they are going to vote; because they have so many leaders that we do not know who their leader is to-day. I have been astonished at the number of statements they have made. The leader of the Opposition said:

I came to the conclusion that the route by the Stikine River and Teslin Lake was, not only the best route, but the only available route for the construction of a railway during the present

season. Having arrived at that conclusion, I felt it my duty, as the question was one far above and beyond party, to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who had been giving it his personal attention, to the subject in an interview I had with him in Victoria; and I ventured to suggest to him, that if the Government of Canada would grapple with that question vigorously, and would undertake to secure the prompt construction of a railway from Stikine River to Lake Teslin, I believed they would receive the hearty support of the Parliament of Canada. I have seen no reason to change that opinion.

There is not the least doubt that the hon. gentleman spoke in sincerity. He said further:

I infinitely prefer the route now under consideration to any route that crosses a foot of territory claimed by the United States, and all the other routes to which I have referred are open to that objection. From Pyramid Harbour down to Dyea and Skagway and Taku Inlet—not so much Taku Inlet, but all the others; the Taku Inlet route is placed beyond consideration by the fact that glaciers render it absolutely dangerous for vessels to attempt to reach the waters of that lake—but all the other routes from the Pacific Coast are, in my judgment, infinitely more objectionable than the route now under consideration.

Now, I leave it to the hon. leader of the Opposition and his followers whether or not that is the best route. The hon. leader of the Opposition is a gentleman of large experience. At the time the contract was entered into he was in British Columbia and received the best information he could get. With respect to the Government having information about the discoveries of gold, I have been astonished at the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Picton stated that we had only begun to hear of the gold being found in large quantities in the Klondike in July, 1897. Another hon. gentleman stated that we had been in possession of that information for six months before. The whip of the Opposition party stated that the Government had been two years before in possession of all the information they are yet in possession of; but the hon. gentleman forgot that the party of which he is the whip was in possession of the Treasury benches at that time; so that if that information was available, they are certainly worthy of the condemnation of this House for not taking action on the information which their whip states they were in possession of before they were turned out on the 23rd of June, 1896. The hon. leader of the Opposition also made this statement:

I asked my right hon. friend to lay on the Table of the House, if he could, a carefully prepared estimate from the best sources in his power of the amount of gold taken out of the Canadian Yukon gold fields, and by whom taken out. Let him lay such a statement on the Table, and I undertake to show that for every dollar a poor Canadian has got, an American has got \$500. Is there a man in this country who will

say that that is right, considering the laws that the Americans enforce against us, and the manner in which our people are treated when they go into the United States on a similar errand.

If this is correct, that \$500 is taken by every American, what is the reason why, when the leader of the Opposition was in power, this was permitted to go on. It is well known that large amounts of gold have been taken out of the Yukon country during the last fifteen or sixteen years. Three or four hundred miners were there in 1888 or 1889. What is the reason the Government of that day did not take steps to protect the gold fields for our own people instead of letting Americans go in there? The hon. gentleman goes on:

Imitation is the sincerest flattery, and I would flatter them in that way. I would copy, line for line and word for word, their laws in relation to tariff as far as I could. When they were putting up the McKinley and Dingley tariffs, I would not have taken off the duty of corn and let it free into this country to impoverish our farmers.

A greater falsity was never uttered than the statement that the removal of the duty from American corn was injuring our farmers. If you look at the quotations to-day, you will find that oats are selling in Toronto at 35 or 36 cents a bushel and that you can purchase corn for 31, 32 or 33 cents. It is ruining our farmers, indeed, that they can get 56 pounds of corn for the same price at which they can sell 34 pounds of oats. A greater benefit was never conferred on the farmers of this country than the taking the duty off corn at a time when it was an absolute necessity to our farmers for feeding purposes.

A good many gentlemen on the other side of the House have spoken of the peculiar circumstances under which this contract has been let. I was very glad that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) did not repeat one of the objections he made when he spoke on that question before; that was, that it would be found in the time to come that a part of the money that carried the elections in the province of Ontario came from this secret deal.

Mr. SPROULE. I believe it still.

Mr. McMILLAN. These hon. gentlemen have spoken about the Drummond Railway deal. Do they remember that in the session of 1891 large bonuses were granted to railways, that on the 2nd of February the House adjourned, and on the 7th of February \$11,000 of the bonus granted during that session was paid to the Drummond County Railway? Do they remember that three or four days afterwards \$71,000 was paid to the Drummond County Railway? That was a deal, but the hon. gentleman forgot all about that. He should remember, too, that back in the session of 1896 there was an attempt made on the Treasury of this country, in my opinion for funds to assist in carrying the elections—I mean the

Mr. McMILLAN.

attempt made to get \$210,000 of extras for Mr. Goodwin, a contractor upon the Soul-anges Canal. That was one of the gravest attempts ever made on the Treasury of this country, when an ex-Minister of Justice, went to the office of the Minister of Justice, and wrote a letter and sent it to the Minister of Railways asking him to send the claim to the Auditor General so that the \$210,000 should be paid. Thanks to the vigilance of the Auditor General, that deal was stopped and the money was not paid. And though there has been a case before the courts and Mr. Goodwin has succeeded in getting \$73,000 out of \$210,000, \$130,000 was saved which was to have gone for election purposes. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they talk about the Drummond Railway and other things, should look back first and see whether or not their own skirts are clean.

With respect to giving large sums for the building of a railway, I have been over a good part of Ontario this fall, and I have never heard the action of this Government condemned, but have heard their conduct approved in letting this contract. I have yet to find an individual in the rural districts who is not well satisfied with its policy, and who does not believe that it is an absolute necessity to have a road built into that country. They are all satisfied that the Government has done the best it possibly could in giving this grant of land to build the road. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said that when the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be built, an offer was published two long years before any one came forward to accept it. Could this Government have afforded to allow the Klondike districts without some means of egress and ingress for the remainder of the two years? The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) himself gave the answer to this question when he said it was of the utmost importance that this road should be built at the earliest day and commended the Government for its prompt action, because every day that we lost, he said, was to the advantage of the Americans. But to-day these hon. gentlemen would like the project to be given up altogether, and one of the strong reasons they advance is because the Americans are likely to impede the working of the road as regards freight. Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, I am a Canadian first, and after that I am a subject of the British Empire. If there is one thing more than another that I esteem, it is the rights and privileges of this country, and I would be prepared to vote the necessary money for the Government to build from the end of this railway down to the Pacific Coast rather than sacrifice any of our rights. There is not a man with the instincts of a man and of a true Briton who would give up the building of this road simply because the Americans have threatened us. I do not believe that

the legislation complained of will ever be put in force, but one thing more than another that would induce them to enforce it would be if Canadians were cowardly enough to withdraw their contract from Mackenzie & Mann because of this legislation. We would then be doing the very thing the Americans want, and would throw the whole trade of the Klondike into their hands for years to come. That country is a benefit at present to almost every manufacturing industry in Ontario. All our woollen mills, which have been running short time and many of them standing idle for years, are working now on full time to fill orders from the North-west. It is a benefit to our manufacturers and merchants and workmen and the whole of the Dominion generally; and the Opposition are committing a very grave mistake in opposing this measure, as they will find out whenever they have to go before the electors. I commend the hon. Minister of the Interior for his prompt action and for the course he took in going into that country himself in order to spy out the land and become thoroughly conversant with all its circumstances; and from the information before us, I find that the moment he had the reports of the engineers in his possession, he took immediate action. It may be argued that this contract was made privately, but if the Government had advertised for offers to build the road for a land grant alone, without any money subsidy, they would not have been able to effect so favourable a bargain as the present one. There is not an hon. member on the Opposition benches who can point to a road ever built into a country similar to this, where there is a large population and no land fit for agricultural purposes. These hon. gentlemen talk about \$2 an acre, but where is the individual who would purchase a large tract in that country and give \$2 an acre for it. The reports show that all the gold that has been taken out has been taken from 100 lots on one creek and 40 lots on another, covering in all 165 acres; and these have all been taken up long ago. Our hon. friends opposite seem to forget that there is a large number of miners up there at present, and that large companies from England have sent out prospectors. I have read in an English paper that an English company has taken up a large claim of placer mining and that another company has taken up a claim of quartz mining, and that they are working during the winter. The writer in that newspaper says: We were under the impression that prospecting could not be followed during the winter, but it seems that prospecting can be carried on during the winter just as well as in the summer. Therefore, the very richest portions of that territory will have been explored and taken up before the month of June, when Mackenzie & Mann will have built ten miles of road and be in a position to take up a claim.

I was astonished to hear the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) ask what will be done with each alternate claim and declare that the poor miner would not have an opportunity to locate any of these claims. Why, if I understand the contract, these alternate locations, are to be for the benefit of the free miner, who will thus be benefited by the fact that this rich company has explored its claims so that he may take up the adjoining claim. Every miner sent in to explore by the company is increasing the value of each alternate claim which the Government reserve, and is doing for the miner what the miner would have to do for himself—explore the country and see what it is capable of producing.

My hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig) sympathized very strongly with hon. members on this side. He said we could not have examined this scheme very carefully, or in voting for it we would have to vote contrary to our own convictions. The hon. gentleman in that well described his own position when he supported the late Government. He was always very independent until the whip was cracked, and then he always voted straight when called upon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have reason to believe that the House is very impatient to reach the vote, but I think, under the circumstance, I will be indulged with the opportunity of making a few observations, especially in view of the frequent allusions that have been made to myself by hon. gentlemen opposite. I confess that if I were not a very modest man I should be in danger of having my head turned a little by the immense importance which I find hon. gentlemen on the other side attaching to my opinions. Nothing can be more flattering than the fact that every one of these hon. gentlemen on the other side, who has had a word to say in favour of this measure, has rested his case mainly upon the opinions that I have expressed in relation to it. Now, Sir, as I said before, I cannot accept that in any other light than as extremely complimentary, and I thank hon. gentlemen opposite for that compliment. But is there any gentleman among them, is there any gentleman in this House who will say that, when additional light is thrown upon a great public question, one is not only justified, but is in honour bound by his duty to the people to look at the question in the light of that increased information? Debate would become a farce, if it were assumed that opinions formed at one stage of the discussion and in the absence of complete information, were not to be qualified. Turn to the great mother of parliaments, the British House of Commons, and you will find that on the greatest measures Imperial statesmen have changed and modified their opinions, and Parliament has, in the face of public opinion, in the face of public discus-

sion, actually reversed its decision. Take the question of foreign policy, and you will find that the opinions of the greatest statesmen have been changed in many cases, and completely reversed, because of light thrown on the subject by further discussion.

I must say, I was not a little surprised at the tone adopted by the hon. gentleman who is mainly responsible for this Bill, the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). That hon. gentleman assumed the position of a teacher of parliamentary deportment. He is the last man in this House, I think, to whom gentlemen on either side would look as a teacher in that regard. The hon. gentleman owes his position on the Treasury benches to one of the most scandalous compromises of principle that ever disgraced a Government or a Minister. The opinions that that hon. gentleman had propounded to the people of Manitoba, and by which he obtained their support in the first instance, were sacrificed as the price of obtaining a seat on the Treasury benches of this Dominion, a course as dishonourable to the Government as to the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that to apply the word "dishonourable" to any member, is not a parliamentary form of expression.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no wish for a single moment to transgress the rules, and if any person can suggest to me an expression—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I bow, Sir, with the most perfect deference to you on any question of that kind.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has made a personal reference to me. Will he allow me a word?

Mr. SPEAKER. I would suggest that it would be better to settle this point of order first.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say, that if I have transgressed the rules of the House, no person can regret it more than I do. I place myself in your hands, Mr. Speaker, and am ready to comply with what you say. After the course that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton), in the discussion of this Bill, after he and his colleagues had made it their main argument in favour of the measure, that I had expressed an opinion favourable to it, I should fail in my duty, if I did not call attention to the unwarranted liberty which hon. gentlemen took on that occasion.

I shall have had the honour, if I live to the 22nd May next, of taking an important part in the public life of this country for forty-three years. I am in the judgment of the House, when I say, that during that period of forty-three years, on every ques-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

tion, I have regarded the interest of my country as supreme. Again and again, I have proved to the people that I regarded personal considerations as utterly insignificant compared with the interests of the country. If there is a man in public life who has invariably shown that he regarded the public interest as greater than personal or party interest, that man is myself. Moreover, I say, that there is no man in public life who more than I has had the courage of his convictions on every subject, even when they brought him in conflict with the views of a great body of his own supporters. I never hesitated to do what I considered in the best interest of Canada.

The hon. gentleman who is in charge of this Bill, was good enough to read me a lecture on the question of leadership. There is not a position of this country that I consider so high or so honourable as that of leader of this great party. I regard the position of my hon. friend opposite (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as utterly insignificant as compared with the leadership of—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, utterly insignificant, when compared with the leadership of the great party that has made Canada what is to-day, that has lifted Canada from the deplorable position in to which it had sunk during the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite.

It is a party that has enabled Canada to attract the admiration of the world, it is a party that has enabled us to obtain the commendation of the most illustrious statesmen that are living to-day for what we have accomplished. Yet under these circumstances I am to be lectured on the subject of the leadership of the party. Sir, there is no position in the world of which I could be so proud as the position I occupy as the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party; but there is not an intelligent man in that great party who does not know that I accepted the position at the greatest personal sacrifice that any man could be called upon to make. There is no man in that great party who does not know that nothing could confer so great pleasure upon me personally as to be at once relieved of the responsibilities and duties that this high position imposes. But, I am to be told that I changed my opinion on a great public question for the purpose of retaining that position. Sir, it would be as degrading to the party as it would be to myself if I were capable of doing such a thing. The hon. gentleman based his statement upon an interview which I gave to the Toronto "Mail." That interview was not taken down by the interviewer. He had a conversation with me, but he did not make a single note, and he went away and reduced it to writing, and he made some mistakes in regard to it, as the House will at once perceive. The hon. gentleman who sup-

ported and expounded this Bill, read to the House that interview, and then he exclaimed: There is Phillip sober, not Phillip drunk. Sir, I can tell him that Phillip is sober still. I can tell him that I can read that interview line for line and justify every word of it. What did I say? I am reading from the "Hansard" what was read by the hon. gentleman:

I stated that the route chosen is the best that could have been selected.

In the light of the information that I had then, and in the light of the information that I have now, and regarding the position in which I believed the question to be, it is an opinion that I entertained then, and that I would entertain now if circumstances were not changed. I will show the hon. gentleman the ground upon which I make that statement. The interview continues:

When I was in the west I made inquiries, and I reached the conclusion that Canada ought at the earliest possible moment to have communication with the Yukon.

Quite true, I say it now.

And I impressed upon the British Columbia Government that it should co-operate with the Dominion Government to ensure the construction of a link between the Stikine River and Teslin Lake.

Quite true, and as that question then stood I am in the same position now, I would say the same thing to-day. The next statement is inaccurate:

At Winnipeg I declared that the undertaking was a necessity, and when I returned to Ottawa I went immediately to Mr. Sifton—

That is entirely inaccurate. It was not at Ottawa that I saw Mr. Sifton; it was in the city of Victoria on or about the 1st November, when he returned from his visit to the Stikine. Therefore, the House will at once see that the reporter misunderstood me in regard to that matter, and locating that interview at Ottawa instead of Victoria.

—and I impressed upon him the absolute necessity of opening up a route to secure Canadian trade. I said to him: You heard my arguments against the Government construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. I am willing to withdraw all that if you will go ahead and give that country a railroad. As a matter of principle I am opposed to Government construction, but here is a case in which I might concede that the country ought to be prepared, if necessary, to build a road in order to secure an all-Canadian route and to secure the trade of the Yukon for Canada.

Every word of that is correct. Sir, I ask any hon. gentleman in this House: Is that the language of a man who is mainly interested in maintaining his own personal and political position? Or is it the language of a man who, deeply impressed with the importance of the question, after the most careful and close examination he

could give to the subject regarding it as above party considerations? If the hon. gentleman had adopted the suggestion that I made, I repeat that I believe he would have had the support of every member of the House of Commons in taking up that work as I urged him to do, promptly, and constructing it as a Government work. It would have relieved it from all the difficulties and embarrassments that have since surrounded it. I can tell him, therefore, that Phillip is still sober, and adheres to the accuracy of every line of that statement so far as it has not been entirely changed by circumstances that were known neither to the Minister of the Interior nor to myself at that time.

As to the arrangements made with Mackenzie & Mann, Sir Charles Tupper said they were men who had the capital, the resources, and energy to carry it out. They were probably the only men in Canada who could put the undertaking through in the time that was specified.

I adhere to that. Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, although there are many other contractors of equal ability and probably of equal resources in Canada, were men of high character as contractors, they were known to be men of great financial strength and resources, and I repeat now that in my judgment they were the only men that were in a position to build this railroad from the date that the contract was made on the 25th January, and also to open a sleigh road in six weeks with shelters built every twenty-five miles from the mouth of the Stikine River to Teslin Lake, and to have that railroad ready for operation by the 1st day of September. I repeat now that, in my judgment, they were the only men, and for this reason, that they had a large amount of plant, horses, sleds, men, everything of their organization close to the spot, or comparatively near it, and that they could transport all that plant, and all their men and all their organization to the city of Victoria before any other contractors, who had not their attention drawn to the subject, could organize for the work. They were engaged in the construction of works on the Crow's Nest Pass and they had advantages that no other contractors had. Therefore, I said then what I repeat now, that as that question stood then, they were the only men who could do it. But I say now, and I believe I am stating the truth, that they have found themselves utterly incapable of carrying out the contract which they have made. I do not credit the statement made by the Minister of the Interior that that sleigh road is completed for 250 miles from the mouth of the Stikine River.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I did not make that statement. I was asked if I had seen Mr. Mann, and if so, what he had said, and I repeated what he said. The

hon. gentleman cannot put words in my mouth that I had not uttered.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very good. However, though I have great confidence in the energy and in the financial strength of Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie, I do not believe, with the information that I have as to the date when they were able to put their plant at the mouth of the Stikine River, I believe it to be absolutely impossible that they can have done what the contract required them to do by the 8th day of March. I do not believe that from the mouth of the Stikine River, a sleigh road capable of being operated as a sleigh road for 250 miles through a trail from that point to Teslin Lake, has been built, and I will not believe it until I have better evidence than that which has been offered.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I should like to ask the hon. member a question. I ask him if his company did not offer to take passengers through for \$500 each only two months ago over that very same route?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid it will not do for me to be diverted into a discussion altogether aside from the question; but I can tell the hon. gentleman who asked me the question, that the company of which I am a member had reason to believe on 1st November, when I had that interview with the Minister of the Interior and after my interview with the Government of British Columbia, that that work would be promptly taken up and have been in a different position from what it is to-day. That is the answer I give to the hon. gentleman. I proceed:

Sir Charles says that much valuable time has been lost, and if his suggestions had been adopted, operations would have been in a much more forward state than they were now.

Phillip was sober when he made that statement and is sober now and I adhere to every word of it. That the Government lost most valuable time, no person can entertain a doubt who has listened to the debate that has taken place on the floor of this House on this subject:

The fact that a trail was to be put through in six weeks, so that the distance between the Stikine River and Teslin Lake may be covered in three days, is in his judgment of great importance.

It was of great importance in my judgment then, and it is of great importance in my judgment now, and I have nothing to retract as regards anything I have said:

The completion of the road by September is slower work than might have been done had the question been grappled with earlier. Still, it will be of the utmost importance to Canadian interests.

I adhere to that statement now:

Sir Charles gives the Government credit for acting with such vigour as it has shown, and
Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

asserts that the opening of the Canadian route was strongly urged by him upon both Governments interested as the proper course to pursue. He does not anticipate any trouble with the United States in transferring cargoes from the ocean boats to river boats at Wrangel.

I did so in the light of the information I possessed, and I will show hon. gentlemen opposite the ground on which I made that statement and the reason I had to believe in the soundness and accuracy of that opinion:

If, however, such should happen, Canada has Port Simpson to fall back upon, which will be equally serviceable.

I did not say it would be equally serviceable, because I know it would not be equally serviceable. I knew it was a long distance from the mouth of the Stikine River; but on the authority of Mr. Ogilvie, who is a Government officer and supposed to be thoroughly acquainted with this question, I stated not that it would be equally serviceable but that it would answer for the purpose. I made that statement in the hope that the United States, if they had any doubts about giving every possible facility to Canadians in these waters, which by the treaty we have the right to enjoy, they would be less inclined to do so if they knew we had a Canadian port that would answer our purpose. There is the whole statement on which the hon. gentleman relies to convict me of failure to maintain the position I took before the country when I made those public statements, and because I am not able to support this contract.

I will give now as briefly as I can the ground that compelled me to take a contrary position to my own wishes and desires when I was compelled to adopt the policy of opposing this contract as to which I had expressed my earnest desire that it should be carried out. If the question stood to-day in the position it did when I made that statement, I would repeat it here and adhere to it, let the consequences to myself be what they might; because while every hon. gentleman must recognize the necessity of fealty to the party to which he belongs, whenever the question becomes one on which a public man has to choose between fealty to his party and failure to serve the best interests of his country, he has no choice but one, if he wishes to preserve that honourable and independent course which is absolutely necessary to the success of a public man.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It throws us back on the coffin.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman, who is such a stickler for accuracy, was guilty in the course of that speech of one of the most palpable acts of deception ever attempted to be practised on any Parliament or body of people.

Som hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give you, Mr. Speaker, the evidence, and I will leave it to you and hon. gentlemen opposite whether I have maintained my statement or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should qualify that statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In what way, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sure on consideration the hon. gentleman will agree that to accuse a member of a palpable act of deception is beyond the limit of the rules.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, I will withdraw the words "palpable act of deception," and I will read to the House what was done and allow the hon. members to put their own construction on it. The hon. gentleman was quoting or pretending to quote a statement in one of the papers, supporting this Administration, the "Daily Witness" of Montreal. I read it in justification of my changed attitude on this question, showing that the light in which I spoke on this question at the outset was entirely and completely changed when the contract came to be published. My statement was made before the publication of the contract, and I gave in support of the position I took and my right to maintain that position, the statement of the "Daily Witness" pointing out half a dozen important matters in which that journal stated the information which had first been obtained and furnished the country by the newspapers had been entirely and completely changed by the publication of the contract. That was a legitimate thing to do. What did the hon. gentleman undertake to do? He undertook to quote that article from the "Witness," and he quoted a certain portion of it as follows:—

The details of the bargain of the Mackenzie-Mann syndicate reveal objectionable features that do not appear in the information which came to light before the presentation of the contract to Parliament. It was not then known that the railway was to be a very narrow gauge one. It was not then realized, as it seems to be admitted, that the Stikine is not navigable for sea craft, and that bulk must be broken in American waters, and there are, as we have pointed out, possibilities connected with the parcelling of the land grant which are interesting to contemplate.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) was asked to read on. What did he say? He said: "Will we read the balance of it," but did he read the balance of it? He knows he did not. He knows that instead of keeping his word which he had just given to this House, he left out a most important clause in which the "Witness" pointed out that the mode in which these lands were parcelled out would enable these contractors to seize upon comparatively the whole of the gold areas there.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman but—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had better let me make my statement.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I wish to say this—

Some hon. **MEMBERS.** Order.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Mr. Speaker, I am quite in order. When the leader of the Opposition says that in quoting a certain article I left out a part of it, I have a right to ask the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) if he accuses me of leaving out a part and passing on in such a way as to misquote the article. I state most emphatically that I did nothing of the kind. I did not read the whole article. I was asked by the hon. member for West Assiniboia to read on, and I said to the hon. member (Mr. Davin), that when he came to speak on the question he could read the rest of the article. I quoted from that article what I believed was sufficient for my argument.

Some hon. **MEMBERS.** Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen opposite are too easily satisfied. They are more easily satisfied than the intelligent people of this country will be when they see the narrow and unsubstantial grounds on which the hon. gentleman endeavours to protect himself from the charge I have made, of his having misled this House and attempted to mislead this country. Mark you, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) was asked to read on, and his answer to that was: "Well, we will read the balance of it." Did he read the balance of it, or did he not read something altogether different away down at the bottom of the column, which had no reference to the quotation I gave. If the hon. gentleman had kept his word to the House and read on, and given the balance of it as he said he would, he would have read this:

There would seem, at all events, to be every probability that if there is really any great wealth in the country the syndicate will have no difficulty in reaping the first fruits of it. It looks as though they would be likely to acquire for themselves or to make a profit on almost all the gold lands discovered up to the amount of their available grant. With the power of laying down a base line as may best suit their own advantage, and with the power of securing an uninterrupted territory of twenty-four miles long by three miles in breadth, it looks as though the syndicate could secure the best of the land without sharing on equal terms with the Government. * * * By getting their land through the syndicate, too, the miners, prospectors, or private companies would only have to pay a royalty of one per cent instead of one of ten per cent.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) left out that portion which he knew was the whole question upon which my argument rested,

and upon which I had given conclusive evidence that one of the ablest journals supporting hon. gentlemen opposite had been compelled to admit, it was misled when at first blush it saw the statement which was carefully prepared by the Government and which gave to the public a mistaken view of the whole question. The "Witness" pointed out how it had been misled, and that when it came to see the contract, it found it was filled with these most objectionable features. Let me give to the House the conclusion of the evidence as to what dependence hereafter, hon. gentlemen in this House can place upon the word of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton). Here is what he read as the balance :

We doubt, however, if a business man acting in his own interest would, even with all considerations fully before him, recall the bargain as a whole, if he could, much as he might wish he could, alter many of its details. We doubt if any of the Government's critics would, were the case their own, recall the bargain.

Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) read on the balance when he left out the portion I have read and which he omitted? No, he did not. The hon. gentleman knows that I never pretended that the "Daily Witness" could be induced by anything to stand by its criticisms in opposition to this Government, when the Government had determined on its course. I have never said so, but I gave conclusive evidence that one of the strongest newspaper supporters of the Government was compelled to put before the country the fact that it had been altogether misled.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not "altogether."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, "altogether." I have read the evidence to the House and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) must not tell me no.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not "altogether."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do you want me to read again the statement from the "Daily Witness" that it was misled by the information sent out by the Government, and that when the contract came to be tabled, it found there were six at least most important matters that had been altogether concealed and were unknown to them when they published the first article. Now, Sir, I felt it necessary to draw the attention of the House to that, because I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton), and I speak in the light of long continued parliamentary experience; I may tell him that if he wants to obtain that standing and character in this House that will be useful to him as a public man and a credit to his country, he will find that it is not to be attained by trifling with the credulity of members, and endeavouring to take advantage of it on the floor of this House or anywhere else.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

I now come to the question of transhipment, which is a most important consideration in connection with this matter. I do not hesitate to say that I regard the immediate obtaining of an all-Canadian route as of vital importance to Canada. I believe, Sir, that the trade of Canada which would otherwise go to the United States is dependent upon that, and under those circumstances I was prepared to go to any reasonable length, as I am prepared now, to accomplish such an object. Irrespective of any consideration in the world I was prepared to go to any length to support hon. gentlemen opposite in carrying out a policy upon which I believed the best interests of this country depends.

Well, Sir, what did the hon. gentleman say in reference to transhipment? There is no hon. gentleman in this House who will not say that when you are considering the question of an all-Canadian route, it is vital that we should have the advantages which I assumed we would have under the treaty, of free ingress and egress on the Stikine River. Every person knows that an all-Canadian route would be a farce if we could be obstructed on that river. With reference to Port Simpson, I will say that the commissioner of the Hudson Bay Company, Mr. Chipman, who has been for the last two years sending a steamer from Port Simpson up the Stikine River to Telegraph Creek, was here a few days ago, and I asked him the question, "Is the route from Port Simpson practicable for vessels that can go up the Stikine River?" He said, "No, unfortunately, it is not. We have been running a steamer, but we have been sadly hindered because there is an open water, the Dixon Entrance, which is so often hazardous as to be most embarrassing to our trade; and the only way that difficulty can be got over is to have a powerful stern wheel steamer to run from Port Simpson through American territory and tranship again in Canadian territory." This information is conclusive that Port Simpson does not afford the necessary facilities, but that there are days and sometimes weeks together when no communication could be made by a steamer that could go up the river. That information I obtained since I had the opinion that Port Simpson could be relied upon, and I formed that opinion on the statement of a Government officer, Mr. Ogilvie, who I suppose was not as familiar with that branch of the subject as he might have been. What was the position that question of transhipment was in? Let me draw attention for a single moment to a statement made by the Minister of Railways and Canals; and we had a right to assume that that hon. gentleman had given this important subject the attention he was bound to give it. I could not suppose that this Government would undertake to deal with an enormous question of this character without having ascertained that there was no difficulty in regard to the ques-

tion of transshipment, which lay at the foundation of this line being an all-Canadian route: so that they would know we would be able to enjoy those advantages without let or hindrance. But what did the Minister of Railways and Canals tell us? Mr. Foster asked:

In what territory is Fort Wrangel?

Well, the hon. Minister of Railways, true to that wonderful know-nothingism that characterized his speech on that occasion, said:

I think it is probably in the United States territory.

The hon. gentleman who was introducing this Bill to this House, absolutely did not know that Fort Wrangel was in the United States at all, or in territory claimed by the United States.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Do you know for certain that it is, when the boundary is not settled?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know that for all practical purposes, for the purposes of this Government and this Parliament it is in American territory, because it has been for a long time in the possession of the United States, who compelled the removal of a Canadian post there, and pushed their boundary farther up the river. Therefore, I am in a position to tell the hon. gentleman what he apparently did not know, that Fort Wrangel is in United States territory.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. If you will read on, you will see whether I knew or not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I will read on, and the further the hon. gentleman went the deeper he got in the mire. He said:

I think it is probably in the United States territory; at all events, they claim it, and they are in possession of it, and have a customs port at Fort Wrangel. But the Stikine River, whose waters we propose to use, is a river that, under treaty with that country, we are entitled to use without being subject to any conditions. Navigation upon it is open to us as it is open to them.

Now, Sir, I ask the hon. gentleman whether we stand in the position in which we stood when the Minister of Railways and Canals, introducing this measure to the House, stated that we could use that navigation without let or hindrance.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I will answer the hon. gentleman. I will say, so far as my opinion is concerned, whether it is worth much or little, and in view of all the discussion that has taken place both in the press and in this Parliament, that I could not say anything more, and I would not say anything less than I said when I introduced the Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, it is very difficult to teach the hon. gentleman anything. If he has not learned a good deal on

this subject within the last fortnight, I think he will learn something before I sit down.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not profess to be omniscient or infallible.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman said:

I think I am quite justified in going that far, and in saying that a ship which is freighted from Victoria or Vancouver, the object of which is to effect a transshipment at or near Fort Wrangel, may do so without encountering any obstacles from customs authorities—I think so.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. How much greater knowledge has the hon. gentleman now to furnish this House than I furnished the House at that time?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman, I hope, is not so obtuse as he appears. What I am saying to the House is this, that from all the information I could get—and I am not overburdened with confidence in this Government, as a good many people know—I had the fullest confidence that they would not be guilty of so mad, so rash an act as to precipitate this country into a contract of such enormous proportions without seeing that the railway would be of some use to the country after it was completed. What is the position to-day, Sir? Let me read for the information of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals what Mr. Hansbrough said a few days ago. It will be found at page 2771 of the "Congressional Record."

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Is he an authority on international law?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman ought to know me too well to suppose that any of these puerile and childish interruptions are going to turn me aside. Mr. Hansbrough said:

The section proposes to extend the bonding privilege to the port of Wrangel, in Alaska. The Dominion Government claim that they now have, under the treaty of Washington, the right to transport goods, wares and merchandise on that stream to their own territory. That contention by the Dominion Government is disputed by the Treasury officials in this city. The Treasury holds that we are entitled to collect duty on all goods, wares and merchandise which pass up the Stikine, Yukon and Porcupine rivers, the three streams which are mentioned in article 26 of the treaty.

The Dominion Government holds that "free navigation"—the words appearing in that treaty—means that they are entitled to transport merchandise free of duty.

Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that if we cannot transport merchandise free of duty, that is an all-Canadian route?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do I understand the right hon. gentleman to scoff at the idea that it is not. Will not this completely paralyse the Stikine River as an all-Canadian route. That is a new phase we have to deal with. The right hon. gentleman has reached such a state of enlightenment that he has discovered that though blocked by customs-houses at Fort Wrangel and made to pay duties on everything that goes in and comes out of that country, the Stikine will still be an all-Canadian route? If he can induce any intelligent gentleman sitting behind him to support a route which involves the payment of customs duties to the United States on everything Canadian that goes into the Yukon over it, as an all-Canadian route, he has reached a stage that would warrant us in yoking him up along the side of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who is the gentleman who has revised this treaty?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Has not the hon. gentleman learned since he has been listening to gentlemen on this side sufficient to know that the best authorities on international law have been quoted to prove that the First Minister is entirely wrong in his assumption that a treaty overrides the common law of a country, and that the idea which the right hon. gentleman had of appealing to the Supreme Court of the United States in case the treaty is violated is contradicted by every writer on international law. The highest authorities are quoted, text-books given, and yet the Minister of Railways has not found that out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I admit that I have not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will you allow me to make a suggestion to hon. gentlemen on the Government benches, that we would get along faster and more pleasantly if there were no interruptions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not often charge you, Mr. Speaker, with partiality, but I cannot help saying that you have given a very valuable suggestion to my hon. friends opposite. Let me proceed with my quotation:

Mr. President,—the Dominion Government have entered into the contract with a firm of railroad builders—I think the name of the firm is Mackenzie & Mann—for the construction of a line of road from Glenora to a point on the Stikine River in British Columbia; and from there they propose to transport merchandise on the waters of Lake Teslin and down the Hootalinqua River and the Yukon River to Dawson; but before they can make this monopoly a success—

Mark that, Mr. Speaker.

—they must have an uninterrupted egress on the Stikine River. They are not sure that they have that right at this time. We propose to

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

give it to them when they will consent to the construction of competing railroad lines in British Columbia and the North-west Territories. I am informed by persons in a position to know that the Canadian Government is strongly inclined at the present moment to yield that condition, as well as the other conditions I have referred to.

Where did they learn that? We were told that they had assurances—and some gentlemen had the audacity on the other side to insinuate that they had received advice from this side. Let me say to these gentlemen that they will search in vain in the history of the Liberal-Conservative party in this country to find that ever on any occasion we gave the slightest aid or comfort to the enemy. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if the Liberal-Conservatives in this country are characterized by anything especially it is for a loyal devotion to British interests and the maintenance of the best relations between the Government of the United States and the Dominion. Why is it that the whole press of the United States was daily praying for the success of hon. gentlemen opposite? Every one knows that, from week to week and from day to day, the press of the United States were using all the means they could, of every kind and description, to bring hon. gentlemen opposite into power. Why? Because during long years these hon. gentlemen were denouncing the Government of Canada as being unjust in its treatment of that great republic and declaring that when they obtained power all these difficulties with the United States would be set at rest. That was the position and attitude which these hon. gentlemen took. Not only that, but the right hon. gentleman was hardly warm in his seat as Prime Minister when he committed the unpardonable folly of unburdening himself to the reporter of the Chicago "Record"—and we listened with amazement to his admission on the floor of this House, when the question was put to him, that, according to his recollection the report was correct—he told the reporter that his predecessors in office, the Conservative party, had been acting oppressively, unfairly and unjustly to the United States, and that he was prepared to take up this question of the bonding privilege, forsooth, and to barter away our inestimable priceless fisheries for the admission of free fish into the markets of the United States.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." He has forgotten that the tribunal under which the Washington Treaty which he endeavoured to prevent coming into operation, which he did all in his power to destroy and break down, declared after receiving sworn evidence from the United States and Canada, that in addition to the right of free fish, free fishing in Canada could only be mea-

sured by \$5,500,000 cash paid into the treasury of Canada as equivalent for the benefits that that treaty gave over and above the value of free fish for twelve years. I am doing the hon. gentleman no injustice when I say that he not only committed an unpardonable act of folly on a question of the most delicate diplomacy by unburdening himself in this way, but he had the extreme folly to talk of questions he did not understand, and to pledge himself in advance to barter away the inestimable fisheries of Canada for a mess of pottage.

But that is not all. We now have the fact that this Mr. Edward Farrer was closely identified with hon. gentlemen opposite, engaged in 1891 in a grand conspiracy with Mr. Erastus Wiman and the leaders of the Liberal party of this country to break down what Mr. Blake called the British nationality of Canada is again at work. This Edward Farrer himself in a published pamphlet advised the United States how to bring Canada to her knees. He was associated with the leaders of the Liberal party in the struggle of 1891. He it was who advised the imposition of high duties by the United States and generally the policy that Americans have since carried out to bring Canada to her knees and secure everything that the United States might desire. Is it any wonder that the Americans assumed from a long course of fulsome eulogium of everything American, from the Opposition benches that when the gentlemen got into power they would be able to dictate their own terms. Why, the right hon. gentleman himself told the people that if he were returned to power all these questions with the United States would be amicably and pleasantly settled. Are they settled? Where is the alien labour law? Where is the Dingley Bill? Where are the other measures that the United States have adopted and that are now followed by their declaration, not by an irresponsible man, but backed by an overwhelming majority of the Senate of the United States, which is the most powerful section of the Government in the United States that you must get upon your knees, you must give them whatever they please to ask for or they will shut you out of the Stikine River, treaty or no treaty, and will not allow a pound of Canadian goods to go up or down without the payment of duty. When I spoke upon this subject how could I think that these hon. gentlemen would commit the unpardonable folly of entering into a contract involving the giving away of millions of Canadian treasure for the construction of 150 miles of railway to establish an all-Canadian route without having taken the trouble to learn—because they knew nothing about it—that it might be so effected that it would not be an all-Canadian route at all. Having, under these circumstances, expressed myself in favour of what I was prepared to make any personal sacrifice or even party sacrifice to have ac-

complished, when I learned that this so-called all-Canadian route was one upon which Canadians and Canadian trade were to be barred, will anybody say that I was not in duty bound to revise my opinion.

What does the hon. Minister of the Interior say on this question? It is very interesting. We have the opinion of the Minister of Railways that all is plain sailing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I still adhere to that position.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman still adheres to that position and is ready to pay 60 per cent duty on this trade and consider it all right. What does the Minister of the Interior say:

The only question of importance is the question of transshipment, and it is a question on which he can give no positive statement.

Why could he not give a positive statement? He says he was invited by Mr. Alger to go down and confer with him at Washington in regard to matters in which the United States took a deep interest, and he took that opportunity of laying before the Government of the United States the great importance of having facilities at Dyea and Skagway. He says that it is a question which, if disputed, must be decided either by negotiation or by reference to a competent tribunal, but it must be evident that it is utterly out of the question for the Government of Canada in the extraordinary circumstances in which we were placed to open up diplomatic negotiations, and waiting until we got a question of that kind settled before we proceeded to deal with the building of the railway. That is to say, the house must be built first, and then we must ascertain whether we can get a right of way into it. I am not a lawyer, but I think there is not a pettyfogging attorney even in a village in the North-west that such a proposition would commend itself to. He says further:

It would be a ridiculous proposition to go to the government of the country which is now getting the largest portion of the trade which we seek to take away by constructing a railway, and, before starting to construct a railway, to try to get them to agree to something which would have the effect of taking the trade away from them.

Where is the hon. gentleman now, does he still hold the opinion that it was supreme folly for him to raise this question with the United States because it was an effort to take from them trade which they monopolized?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How would you raise it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why, when Mr. Alger invited the Minister of the Interior to go down and discuss this question, had I been in the Minister of the Interior's place, I would have told Mr. Alger the Americans were in the enjoyment of inestimable

advantages from Canada, that though they shut Canadians out from owning or working the mines, or working as free miners in the United States, thousands of American citizens were entering the richest gold country in the world and carrying the gold away. No Government ever had such a magnificent opportunity to secure the settlement of the questions on just and fair terms. Why, suppose that the Minister of the Interior had said: You must repeal your alien law. They have not repealed it to this day and why? Because of the cowardice of hon. gentlemen opposite. The First Minister, when he found that at Windsor in the county of Essex, I had declared that if my Government was sustained we would have enacted line for line, word for word, the same alien labour law as the United States, unless they repealed these unjust laws the hon. gentleman in this as in other things, outbid me, and going there, pledged himself up to the hilt that if returned to power, unless the Americans repealed these unjust and cruel alien laws with which they were persecuting Canadian subjects, he would have a similar Act passed and put into operation.

What has he done, Sir? Why, in a partial completion of his pledge, he handed this bantling of his over to the tender mercies of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who announced his utter hostility to any thing of the kind such as his leader had pledged himself to; and that emasculated Bill was not allowed to go into operation until a proclamation by the Governor General in Council was made. The result is that, instead of it doing any good, it has inflicted a deep injury upon Canada. They found that although they could boast of what they could do they were afraid of that great Republic, and although they had pledged themselves to do it, they were afraid to put their Bill into operation. They had given the United States Government evidence that their friends were on the Treasury benches in this country, and they might safely rely upon their never doing anything or taking any action that, however, deeply the interests of Canada were involved, would be in the slightest degree unpleasant or objectionable to them.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is the reason that you advise us to withdraw this Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will read the remaining sentences of the Minister of the Interior, and let him give you the answer. He says:

They might possibly say that we were entitled to the privilege of transshipment, but under the extraordinary circumstances it would probably take us some time to get them to say so. Under the circumstances, negotiations might be prolonged for several years.

Now, I ask the First Minister if he is prepared to say that it was an act of wisdom to engage in the construction, at such an enormous cost, of a railway of 150 miles that would be rendered practically useless

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

and abortive as an all-Canadian route unless we could get these privileges? I ask whether Mr. Alger—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon gentleman—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will be still more uneasy before I sit down. I know the hon. gentleman winces under every touch of the knife, and it is as painful to me to perform the operation as it is for him to suffer. But, Sir, I have a duty to discharge in this Parliament, a duty to the Canadian people, and I intend to discharge it even if my hon. friend should be a little bruised when I get through. The hon. gentleman told us that he had made arrangements for Dyea or Skagway. Why Dyea and Skagway, I want to know, if we were going to have an all-Canadian route? Were Dyea and Skagway more important than the Stikine? He gives his reasons why he did not venture to hint a word of the Stikine to Mr. Alger or to any official of the United States, because, he says, he knew it would take several years, they would find that we were going to take away their trade, and they would get their backs up, and it would be several years before we could get a settlement of the question. So he said, We will build the house first, and then we will see whether we can get a right of way into the front door.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And yet you advised that the road should be built there?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did advise it, but surely the hon. gentleman has heard what I said a few moments ago. I believed that it was impossible to find a set of men so obtuse upon the subject they undertook to deal with as to be guilty of making such a proposition, to give an enormous contract for the construction of a road without finding whether they could get access to it. I hope the hon. gentleman understands that now. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but there is nothing in it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a single question. Does he feel that it would accord with the dignity of this Government, or with the dignity of the United States Government, that we should ask the United States Government to give us a pledge that they were going to observe a solemn treaty obligation into which they had entered?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, does not the hon. gentleman know that the Minister of the Interior went down to Washington to discuss these very questions with Mr. Alger? Does the hon. gentleman himself not know that the Minister of the Interior obtained from the United States a change in their arrangements with reference to this customs duty at Skagway and

Dyea? The hon. gentleman has a power in his hands such as no government ever had before of being able to say to that great Republic, in face of their determination to capture the rich prizes of our Canadian gold fields, with the power in his hands to shut them out, as they ought to be shut out to-morrow, by the passage of a law precisely word for word like their own mining laws—I say that if any person supposes that by fawning or cringing on the part of the Government of Canada, they are going to succeed in obtaining this arrangement from the United States they sadly deceive themselves. The United States of America, Sir, intend to advance ‘per fas aut nefas’ the interests of their people, and to obtain every advantage for them they can, will go just as far as they think they can venture to go with impunity. Just as you recede they will encroach, until a point is reached when it is impossible to recede further, and when you have lost the ground that otherwise you could have stood firmly upon. Therefore, I say, it is madness for the hon. gentleman to barter away 3 or 4 million acres of the richest gold fields of the world for 150 miles of tramway without being able to use it after it is built. Does he think the United States will think more highly of him because he will proceed in an act of such incomprehensible folly? I say they will not. I say they will come to the conclusion that they can do with the hon. gentleman just what they please, and that they can encroach upon the rights of Canada just as they please, and that it will be tamely submitted to by the hon. gentleman. Does any hon. gentleman suppose that when I expressed myself in favour of the measure at first proposed, that I dreamed for one moment that they were making a contract which could be handed over to the United States to-morrow? After the dissection that this contract has undergone in this House the hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to say like the coon—Don’t shoot, we will come down. Now, they say, We will change all that. It is true they have made a contract with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and have given them a charter which they could sell to-morrow and relieve themselves of all responsibility, they could sell it in the city of New York to American capitalists and thus make this all-Canadian route instead an all-American route. This is the position. And yet these hon. gentlemen pretend that because I ventured to express a favourable opinion of the contract as it was first published, believing it would secure an all-Canadian route, I am now inconsistent in opposing it in the light of subsequent information. I ask whether the most prejudiced man on the opposite side is in a position to say that if he had committed himself in some way to a favourable expression of opinion of a proposal he would not be justified in receding from that ex-

pression when he found that the contract was wholly unlike that which he had supposed it to be when it was announced in the press. I do not reflect in that statement of the Minister of Railways because I know he has some legal talent; but I believe he was as ignorant as I was of the terms of the contract until he found his name signed to it by the Minister of Inland Revenue. I believe it was a little thing the Minister of the Interior was manipulating on his own account, and he was not only doing so, but he was determined to keep secret what he was doing, even from his own colleagues. When the First Minister had his interview, when he received from Mr. Hamilton Smith his proposal, he was amazed to find he had never heard anything about it. Why did not the Minister of the Interior tell him? He has since confessed that Sir William Van Horne stated that this gentleman, Mr. Hamilton Smith, was anxious to discuss this question with him. He knew it, yet it was concealed. Why was it concealed, and why was the transaction carried out in secrecy? I have shown already that the plea of urgency has fallen to the ground. I have shown the pretense that he knew nothing at all about what was going on in relation to the conditions of that country, that he had not even read Mr. Ogilvie’s report. And I ask the hon. gentleman now if he does not feel he made a fatal mistake, as head of the department, when, for the purpose of putting his own creatures into office, he drove out of the public service and bowed down and humiliated one of the best men in it and drove others out for the purpose of surrounding himself with other men. Does the hon. gentleman not want any one to know what is going on in his department? It looks like it. When an hon. gentleman adopts, in regard to such a question, secrecy, it engenders suspicion. I will not say more; but the whole of this transaction is one that will cloud the reputation of the hon. gentleman and will seriously affect the character of his colleagues until we know more about it than we know to-day. I ask the hon. gentleman if he was the only person who did not know the fabulous wealth of this region. The Minister of Railways knew it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know the wealth of that country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman did not know it, I wonder how he dare make this statement to the House:

Hon. members of this House will recollect quite clearly that before the close of last session, evidence was pouring in upon us of the immense discoveries of gold that were taking place in the Yukon district, and returning parties from that remote region were bringing us the most fabulous accounts of its mineral deposits. No one who is at all interested in public affairs could fail to realize that very important questions were likely to arise in that country in connection with its great gold discoveries.

Did the hon. gentleman tell the truth when he made that statement to the House?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am usually in the habit of doing so.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Why does the hon. gentleman attempt to deny it?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I will read it again.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I really did not understand the question the hon. gentleman addressed to me. I will state the matter in three words. I thought the hon. gentleman was saying that I knew the value of the gold fields. I do not know the value of the gold fields or the value of the land.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I am afraid it is after dinner with the hon. gentleman. I am getting hopeless. When a statement is plainly made and the hon. gentleman is incapable of appreciating it, something is surely wrong. I cannot understand how any intelligent man could fail to see the form of my statement. Although the Minister of Railways stated before the House that accounts were coming in showing a state of intense excitement respecting the gold discoveries, the only man who knew nothing about it was the Minister of the Interior, to whose department the information was supplied. What did the hon. gentleman say.

But will anybody in his senses undertake to say that when this Parliament prorogued we had any information whatever.

What do those hon. gentlemen say to each other? One of them stated to Parliament that there was a condition of intense excitement.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I beg your pardon.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Well, I will read it again. The hon. gentleman's colleague, the Minister of the Interior said he had no information of it whatever. How could the hon. gentleman make that statement? Did he not know that at that moment when he said he had no information whatever, the whole press of the United Kingdom was ringing with accounts of these marvellous discoveries and there was the wildest excitement in connection with them? I hold in my hand extracts from the London "Times," dated 12th July, 1897. The Ottawa correspondent in a letter dated the 11th, writes, referring to the wonderful gold discoveries in the Yukon River and tributaries. He says:

The latest report to the Government—

That is of the Minister of the Interior, who said he had no information whatever.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**.

The latest report to the Government confirm the previous intelligence of the extraordinary results obtained in placer mining.

References were also made by the following newspapers:—

The Times, Financial News, Financial Times, Daily Mail, The Daily Telegraph, Daily Chronicle, Westminster Gazette, Morning Post, Standard, St. James's Gazette, Evening News, The Sun, The Echo, Pall Mall Gazette, The Morning, Evening Standard, Birmingham Argus, Bristol Times, Sussex Daily News, Manchester Evening News, Liverpool Mercury, Leeds Mercury, Sheffield Telegraph, Liverpool Courier, York Examiner, South Wales Daily News, Leeds Express, North British Daily Mail, Christian World, The Speaker, Baptist, Church Family Newspaper, The Saturday Review, European Mail, Money, Financial Chronicle, and Bristol Mercury.

Here are all the United Kingdom papers ringing with wild excitement over this information; and yet the Minister of the Interior rises in this House and tells us he had no information whatever.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Will the hon. gentleman read what I said?

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I will.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Well, read it.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. The hon. gentleman said:

But will anybody in his senses undertake to say that when this Parliament prorogued we had any information whatever which led to the supposition that tens of thousands of people were going to the Klondike district last fall and the coming year?

Has the hon. gentleman been dreaming? I told the hon. gentleman that he had been asleep, that he was a Rip Van Winkle, and that while all the world was in excitement on this subject he was the only man who did not know. So wild was the excitement in the old country that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took occasion at a public meeting to implore people neither to go into the Klondike nor to put any money in any company to develop it. Does the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) shake his head; then I will give him the evidence.

Sir Louis Davies, at Tenbigh, in Wales, said: * * * Later in the day Sir Louis Davies attended a luncheon—

That may account for it.

—given in his honour, and replying to the toast of his health gave an interesting account of the various provinces of Canada, and the immense and unlimited resources of Canada. With reference to the newly discovered Klondike gold fields, he said he had been asked by many men if he could advise them to send their sons out to the fields, and he had answered emphatically, "No"; and when asked if it would be wise to invest money in companies for developing the fields, he replied doubly emphatically, "No."

He was resisting this wild excitement then.

And as a member of the Canadian Government he knew what he was talking about. They were

doing their best to establish a provisional government in that region, but they advised that every one who could possibly wait should delay going to the Klondike fields for the present, and he hoped that his words would go further than the room in which he was speaking.

Mr. BERGERON. He did not think it was going to reach here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He said :

Statements have been made regarding the richness of the mines, but he would ask them to bear in mind the words of the American humorist : " A mine is a hole in the ground, and the owner is a liar."

I ask the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) was he or was he not guilty on that occasion of what I regard as a great crime against the interests of Canada. I say that every honest and intelligent Canadian ought be most anxious to bring British capital into Canada for the development of our enormous resources ; and yet when there was a proposition, as the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) knew, before the financial and commercial men of England, inviting capital, and that by myself, when the hon. gentlemen, as I presume, knew that—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not know it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He told them : As a Minister of the Crown, if you ask me whether you wish to put your money into the development of gold mines in Canada, I say " doubly emphatically, no."

Mr. LISTER. In a few years some of the stockholders may find they had better have kept their money out of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then it becomes the more important, when men holding responsible positions undertake to invite capitalists to put their money into the development of Canadian resources, that they should be sustained by the Government of Canada instead of decried. I did not intend to refer to this matter until the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) questioned the accuracy of my statement, but what did he do. Who will believe it? When he made that statement he had actually put his name to a letter to be published in the prospectus of his friend, Col. Domville, inviting people to invest their money in Klondike gold mines. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) again dissents. Well, I will read him his letter. Although this letter to Col. Domville did not appear until a few days after the hole in the ground and the liar story, strange to say, it was written before :

London, 30th July, 1897.

I have received your note of to-day's date telling me that a syndicate is being organized to open up and develop the Klondike Yukon country. I have no hesitation in saying that the policy of the Government is and will be to assist in the opening up and development of that rich country, and I need not say to you that we shall be glad to look favourably upon every bona fide

company which has that for its object. Your personal connection with such a company would be an additional guarantee of its bona fides, and I will be glad to hear that it has been successfully launched.

(Sgd.) L. H. DAVIES.

Mr. FOSTER. To whom did he send that letter?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. To Col. Domville.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I would ask the hon. gentleman for one moment—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Surely you are not all so prejudiced that you will not hear a word from me. I speak most emphatically on that subject and I say, that when Sir Louis Davies wrote that letter, he had no idea that I was going to transport whisky into the Yukon country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) mean to say that he intended to keep it all for home consumption.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I have a right to answer that question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to keep order.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I shall answer that question and I have a right to.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order ; sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. The disorder seems to come from both sides of the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) can only ask a question with the leave of the hon. gentleman who is addressing the House.

Mr. DOMVILLE. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) does not want me to answer I do not wish to, but if he does wish me to answer, I shall.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, it is rather too late in the evening to allow the hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) to interrupt me.

Mr. DOMVILLE. That is an old answer from an old man.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The statement that I have applied for a permit, has been emphatically denied by me, as the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The hon. gentleman did not apply for a permit, but in British Columbia—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out to the House that the moment this road was constructed, this charter could be transferred to capitalists of the United States of America, and thus this would be made an American road. I have shown that so far as the transshipment was concerned, the Minister of the Interior himself admitted that it was unwise to raise the question of transshipment at Wrangel, because he expected it would take half a dozen years to get a favourable answer, if ever, from the Government of the United States. I have given, I think, two pretty strong grounds for a change of opinion in regard to this contract, when its misleading character came to be displayed. I will now turn the attention of the House to a still more important phase of it, and I am glad to be able in this case to quote one of the ablest and most independent men sitting on that side of the House in support of my statement. I drew the attention of the House to the fact, which was received with great derision, and I presented a diagram which showed that by the plan provided for in this contract for the appropriation of the lands by the company, they could lock up all the gold lands in the Yukon territory. Under the mode of laying out their lands, establishing the base line where they pleased, and taking a solid block of twenty-four miles, I showed that the country had been completely deceived as to the character of the measure. I will draw the attention of the House to the evidence of the Toronto "Globe" on that subject, when that paper put before the public all the beauties of this beautiful contract, in order to prepare the public mind before it should be shocked by the introduction of the monster itself. The "Globe" said :

Should the company make rich discoveries, the people of Canada, for whom the alternate blocks are reserved on any of the water courses on which these discoveries may be made, will profit by them to an equal extent with the contractors, who must, at their own expense, do all the work of prospecting.

Well, Sir, I presented that diagram to the House, and I showed that the power to cover 3,750,000 acres, which we all now know will be greatly exceeded, and will be more like 4,000,000 acres, on account of the engineer's statement of the length of the line would enable the company to cover all the gold in the Yukon. Is that an extravagant statement? The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) showed that these gold deposits in the Yukon are not extended all over the country, but that they are placer deposits along the streams; and the width of the placer mining in these streams is only about 330 feet. Well, I want to know where the gold would remain under that plan of laying out the lands. My statement was met with derision, but two days afterwards the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) was put up to relieve the startled feelings of gentlemen on that side of the House, who

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

no doubt rose in revolt at such a proceeding, to state that the contractors had agreed to change all that, and to accept alternate blocks in these twenty-four miles. That gave some relief, but it was not unattended by some disadvantage. The block, instead of being twenty-four miles, is extended to forty-two miles by the arrangement for putting in alternate blocks for the Government. I want to know, without these contractors being compelled to register these base lines, what chance has a poor miner in that country after he has spent his toil and labour and perhaps his last dollar in exploring, and gets what he thinks is a mine, and then discovers that it is within forty-two miles of a base line—and a base line it is indeed. There is another reason that would warn any man who had formed a favourable opinion of this contract, to promptly change his opinion. The hon. member for Alberta, having examined the gold and silver and copper mines as I have done, said, and he said truly, that that contract, if it applied to British Columbia, would cover every mine known that has ever paid or that has any prospect of paying in the whole province. Now, is that hon. gentleman's statement to be relied upon? Is it true? It is as true as the gospel. Every man in this House knows that it is true; and I say that in view of that statement and these facts, he is a bold man who will venture to support this contract, and expect to receive the support of intelligent electors in this country afterwards.

The Minister of Railways and Canals gave us another interesting statement and what was it? I am going to read it and ask him if it is true. He said :

Now, Sir, I have endeavoured briefly, and I am quite conscious that I have done it very feebly,—

We all agree to that.

—to state the situation as the Government found in that country; and I might say that immediately after the last session of Parliament, feeling that all the information that it would be possible for us to procure ought to be procured, and that the information should be accurate and reliable, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) himself proceeded to the Pacific Coast.

The hon. gentleman knows that that is not true. The hon. gentleman knows that instead of the Minister of the Interior proceeding to the Pacific Coast immediately after the House rose, I was in Winnipeg when the hon. gentleman was on his way to the Pacific Coast, and that was on the 27th of September. That was the way the Minister of the Interior, who was the only person in Canada who did not know of any gold in that country, and who only gave to his friends advance copies of Mr. Ogilvie's report, dealt with this question. If he had done what the Minister of Railways said he did, and what he did not do, if he had dealt with it the moment the House rose, there would have been no necessity for a secret contract—not only no necessity, but no ex-

cuse for a secret contract. That is the position, and the hon. gentleman knows it right well. He let the summer go by, and on the first of November when I met him in Victoria, he had all the information which Mr. Jennings had, because they came down together to Victoria, and even then there was abundant time for him to have said to the contractors of this country: We have not a vast deal of information, but all that we have is at your service. And if he had called on ten or twenty able contractors of this country to tender for the work, instead of dealing with it in secret, he would have been in a different and much more defensible position to-day. The hon. gentleman ventured to say that Mr. Hamilton Smith and the story of his communication with him was a figment of the imagination.

Sir, one of the most discreditable acts that this Government will have to answer for is their treatment of a gentleman of the highest character and standing. I say here, and I stake my position in public life on the statement, that it is within my knowledge that Mr. Hamilton Smith is associated with and has at his back, as an applicant for a charter from this Parliament, half a dozen of the most independent, wealthy and powerful financial firms of the city of London. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) talked to us of the second offer that was made to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why, there was one man in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate who, every hon. gentleman opposite knows, could buy up every one of those men who made the second offer, and that without inconvenience. There was one man on this syndicate who could buy up the whole of them and not be particularly disturbed in his financial position after he had done it. But here was a man, Mr. Hamilton Smith, connected with the most powerful and wealthy firms in the city of London, himself a man of immense wealth, connected with great enterprises, a man who, in the United States and the city of London, stands at the very top of his profession as a mining engineer, whose success is such as to give him the confidence and support and command of all the capital he can desire, for any enterprise whatever.

Mr. DOMVILLE. What has that to do with the Stikine route?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman sitting along side the hon. member (Mr. Sifton) feels that it has something to do with it, when he turned his back upon a man of that standing and character and pushed this secret contract through to a conclusion before the Prime Minister knew he had even been approached by Mr. Hamilton Smith. The taunt was thrown across the House by the First Minister that Mr. Smith had communicated with me. What was he to do after the treatment he received, after

he had been here looking in vain for an opportunity to tender for a great public work—and no man was better able to carry it to a successful conclusion—what was he to do but put himself in communication with public men and ask what means he could adopt? I did advise him, when he showed me a letter which puts me in a position to say here to-night he has at his back half a dozen of the most powerful and wealthy firms of England, since he could not reach the Minister of the Interior to send a letter to the First Minister, and that I thought it would receive attention. It did receive attention, but I think the right hon. First Minister was hardly prepared, after all that theatrical display of reading this correspondence, for the statement that Sir William Van Horne had approached the Minister of the Interior with regard to Mr. Smith. I do not intend to go into that matter further than to say that a greater indignity by a member of a Government never was perpetrated than when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) denounced a gentleman of the highest standing and character in the United States and England, where he has been for the last fifteen years, as a prevaricator. It was an act of indignity such as no gentleman has ever been subjected to by any member of a Government who had any respect for the Government or himself.

The whole of Canada was startled. No contractor, no public man outside of the Government knew anything about this negotiation with Mackenzie & Mann until they woke up and found that the whole deal was perpetrated and that it was too late to make any alteration. Let me read, before I pass away from the conduct of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the language of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, which applies exactly to the conduct of the hon. gentleman. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, when Mr. Blake moved a resolution asking this House to take up a proposal to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, sent in five weeks after the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway was laid upon the Table, said, speaking of the criticisms to which the parties were subjected under the offer:

We have heard the minions of the hon. gentleman—

I ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give his attention to the name which the Minister of Trade and Commerce gives to the gentlemen who did what he did.

We have heard the minions of the hon. gentleman—set up to do the dirty work which even the hon. Minister of Railways did not choose to do—set up to state that this new contract was a mean, miserable, political dodge, set up to decry the repute and the character of men as honourable as Canada can show.

There is not a word of that but applies to

the hon. Minister of Marine. The cases were parallel in this regard and completely analagous. Five weeks after the contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway had been laid on the Table, these gentlemen opposite got up this new syndicate, made a new offer, sent it to me, it was called for and laid upon the Table. What ground did they take? Did they say it was too late? Let me give the answer from a greater man than sits on the Treasury benches to-day, and that is the Hon. Mr. Blake. He moved:

That the contract now on the Table does not come within the provisions of the said Act, and is of no force unless legalized by Parliament.

It was precisely in the position that this contract is, subject to the approval of Parliament and laid upon the Table for that purpose.

That the said contract expressly provides that the same shall be binding only in the event of an Act of incorporation being granted to the projected company, as set in schedule "A" to the contract.

That Parliament is free to reject such a Bill.

How does that sound? These hon. gentlemen voted for it, their names are here on the journal declaring the fact that the contract was made and laid on the Table subject to the approval of the House, and that this Parliament was free to reject the one and accept the other. What more did Mr. Blake say? He said it was now proposed that Parliament should legalize the contract, that this House was under no obligation to do so, and that it was its duty to refuse to do so unless satisfied that the public interest required such a step, that the conditions of the contract were extremely onerous and disadvantageous to the country, and that it now appeared that terms much more favourable to the country could be obtained. There is precisely the case of Mr. Hamilton Smith, with this difference, that in his case, he will have a syndicate of infinitely stronger, more powerful and wealthy, and with greater resources than the parties who have signed the agreement. These parties, though eminently respectable and able, yet, without impugning their means, are utterly insignificant, as regards resources, compared with Mr. Hamilton Smith and his associates. And so I say they are bound by their declaration.

I will not detain the House at this hour to read, as I could read, utterances in point from every one of them who is now in the House who took part in that debate, denunciations of the contract and demand that the offer made five weeks afterwards should be accepted instead of it. When a man of the financial resources of Mr. Hamilton Smith offered to do for one million acres that for which they have agreed to give four million acres, these gentlemen, confronted with their declaration of what Parliament ought to do in a similar case, are left with-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

out a shadow of pretext for the position they take to-day. I do not intend to detain the House much longer. I want to refer to a statement of the Minister of the Interior in which he finds himself contradicted point blank. The hon. Minister went into elaborate adulation of Major Walsh. What for? Had anybody attacked or disparaged him? All that I said about Major Walsh was that he was an able man and that I regretted that he had not been charged with his important duties long before he was. The hon. gentleman told us that when Major Walsh was offered the appointment he could not take it up for a month. Was there no other man in the country? I know that Major Walsh was a great favourite of the hon. gentleman and had been closely associated with him. But that is no reason for sacrificing the public interest and the public money. Major Walsh was so late in starting for the seat of his labour that in spite of all his energy he has been unable to get through. In a desperate effort to get forward, he lost an enormous quantity of the provisions that were almost worth their weight in gold, you might say, and a valuable life lost as well. But in spite of all, he finds himself stranded at Salmon River. The Minister of the Interior is a resourceful man to say the least. He was no sooner confronted with this than he stood up and told us that Major Walsh was in the very place he sent him to, and ridiculed the idea of Major Walsh going to Dawson City. Here was the administrator of the country stranded at a place where there was no population, and where he could not possibly perform the important duties with which he had been charged. The hon. gentleman was in the position of the man who was boasting about his dog and its wonderful sagacity and obedience. A friend asked him for a specimen of what the dog could do. So the owner of the dog said, "Rover, go out of doors," and Rover put his tail between his legs and went under the table, whereupon his owner turned and said, "or under the table, which ever you please." So, Major Walsh got his instructions to go to Dawson City, the only place where a reasonable man would expect him to go and when he cannot get any further than Salmon River, the Minister says, That is exactly the place I told him to go. But Major Walsh does not say so.

"Well, Major, were you disappointed at being held up by the ice?"

That is at Salmon River.

"Indeed I was. I was anxious to get on to Selkirk, at least, with the whole of my outfit, and part of it to Dawson City.

There is a point blank contradiction. If the hon. gentleman expects people to give weight to his utterances, he will have to be more careful than he has been in the past. Now, the hon. gentleman made a statement in this House of far greater importance than any-

thing to which I have referred. He went out of his way to state that Canada was utterly dependent upon the United States as to access to that country, that we could not get a man into it except by their permission. He said it would not be at all unlikely that we should find ourselves in a position where we did not own the country at all. In fact, he intimated that if a certain number of lawless men chose to go into that country they could take possession of it and we should lose it. A more discreditable position for a Minister of the Crown to take could hardly be imagined. To say, under any circumstances, that one foot of the soil of Canada could be taken possession of by any power in the world is to make a statement of a most humiliating and degrading character, and one in violation of everything that the honour and integrity and independence of Canada requires. The hon. gentleman attacked me for speaking with such freedom as I did with regard to the United States. I repeat that I will go as far as any man can be required to go in an effort to preserve the most friendly and kindly social and commercial relations with the United States. But, having had a long experience of public life, and having had an opportunity to study that country, I know that the only way that Canada can have her rights respected is to show that we are determined not to yield one jot or tittle of our right at the impudent dictation of the United States. Let me read what the organ of the Government said and see if I was justified in the position I assumed. I hold in my hand the Toronto "Globe," of February 15th. I will not read the whole article, though every line confirms the position I have taken :

It is immaterial to him where he purchases his supplies. The objections arise almost wholly from Pacific Coast cities of the United States, which propose to abolish everything that stands in the way of their securing the whole of the Yukon outfitting trade and they are determined that Congress and officials at Washington shall do everything to neutralize the advantages of the Canadian position.

Can hon. gentlemen read that, can they see what is taking place in Congress, read the statements made by members of Congress, and endorsed by the majority of the Senate, and say that our true course was not to have advanced by securing the modification of these injurious Acts that are calculated to paralyze Canadian trade and hand over the whole Yukon country rather than to go on with the senseless construction of a work that, after it is built, we can have no means of using. They say :

We believe we speak the mind of every section of the country—

And so they do.

—when we express the determination not to be tricked—

--Mark this : I want the Minister of the In-

terior to mark what his own organ says to the people of this country.

We believe we speak the mind of every section of the country when we express the determination not to be tricked or intimidated out of our natural rights in that region. If the United States Congress thinks proper to break a treaty in order to back up the game of Tacoma and Seattle, our Government will have to proceed forthwith to meet the situation.

For to meet the situation? To use the power you have in your hands, to say to the Government of the United States: We want to have the most friendly commercial relations with you, but if you meet us with alien bills, you force us to meet you with similar bills. If you will not allow Canadians to have mining licenses in the United States, we must deny them to your people. We must pay you the compliment of copying your own legislation in protection of the rights of Canadian citizens. Do you think the United States, if they did not believe they could mould this Government to their own will, would set up such wild and insane pretensions, and undertake to dictate to the Government of Canada that they should revise all their laws at the dictation of the United States of America. The "Globe" goes on :

It will necessitate more extensive railway building than was at first contemplated, but we have entered on the contest, and our American friends can be assured that we will not be balked in our resolution to obtain free and unhampered communication with our possessions in that distant part of the Dominion. If the most absolute guarantees are not obtained on this point, no time should be lost.

And so I say to the hon. gentlemen opposite. Let them first discipline their own press before they undertake to call in question anything I say in regard to this matter. I say, Sir, that you will search the civilized world in vain to find such a proposal as you have in this Bill, alienating four million acres of the richest gold land in the world, allowing two men to absorb all the mining wealth of that country. I say no country would tolerate such a course for a moment; I say it will fail disastrously, and if you wanted to excite rebellion in that country you could take no better means of doing it. You will make every miner who goes into that country the deadly enemy of this Government, you will induce a combination among them, because they will feel that they are suffering the rankest injustice at the hands of the Government that was ever practised upon honest men who wished to obtain a honest livelihood, when you undertake to charge individual miners no less than 10 per cent on what they take out. We heard the hon. member for North Norfolk say that under ordinary circumstances it costs to the miner 80 or 90 per cent to get out a dollars worth of gold, and after you have charged him the 10 per cent royalty, what will he have left? I say if you want

a rebellion in that country you will get it, and you will be responsible for having provoked it by laws so unjust that every man will have the sympathy of the outside world instead of having its hostility in the course that is pursued. Sir, there was one answer given to the appeal and misericordium of the Minister of the Interior about these starving thousands of people who would be up there next winter. If there is going to be 50,000 people there, it has been demonstrated that this railway is going to be utterly incapable of furnishing the supplies that would be necessary to prevent destitution. There has been no starvation up to the present time, because every man who went in there felt that he must take a year's provisions with him. Now, you have advertised to the world that you are building a railway because there will be 100,000 starving people in there next winter, and you intend to supply them with food. What will be the result? These people, depending upon the declaration of the Government, and their determination to afford means of taking food to them to prevent starvation, will thereby be induced to make no provision for themselves. The course of the Government is clear. Major Walsh is an energetic man; there are only a few avenues of access to that country, and you have only to give him orders that no man should be admitted to that country unless he goes provided with a year's supply of food, and there will be no starvation. Sir, I should not have risen to speak upon this occasion were it not that constant references had been made by hon. gentlemen to myself and to the course which I have pursued. I think I have given the House reasons that should be satisfactory to any unprejudiced man, that after the light and the information that this contract threw upon this dark transaction, devised in secrecy, and with every means taken by the Government to place unreserved power in the hands of the contractors, I should have been unworthy of a seat in this House had I not adopted the only course that remained to me and explained my position, as I have just done. I cannot believe that this measure will become law, but if it does become law, the result will be to cover this Government with confusion and to expose their utter incapacity to administer the great interests that have been confided to their charge. Before I sit down I wish to say what course I think the Government should adopt. Since the contract was made with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann a complete change has taken place in the situation. The Government are now in a position to say to them, under the circumstances: The objects and aims we had it is impossible to realize, and under these circumstances, if you go on, whatever work you do, we will be prepared to pay you handsomely for, but anything you do must be done for the Government, and not under this contract. Then let the Government take prompt measures

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

to examine this route from Port Simpson from Hastings Arm, or from Alice Arm, in the Portland Channel; examine these routes and I believe that you will find that you can obtain a British Canadian port free from all obstruction, where ocean steamers can go to railway communication, and it will be at no very remote distance from Glenora, where it will make connection with the proposed railway between Teslin Lake and Stikine River.

That is not all. You have in addition the fact that the old telegraph trail running on from Ashcroft, B.C., which was constructed by the Russians many years ago, before the cable was laid, and where there are many miles of wire yet strung, runs, I believe, within ten miles of where the line would extend from Telegraph Creek and by a slight divergence, according to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) who understands this subject better than I do, the line from Edmonton could join, and both that line and the line from Ashcroft connect with the railway. I believe this House will be prepared, after the able statement made by that hon. member, who has mastered this subject in all its details, to sanction the prompt construction by the Government of a wagon road from Edmonton, opening up the Peace River Valley and giving access to the great food-producing districts in the North-west Territories and in the province of Manitoba, and thus accomplish a work that would be alike creditable to the country, develop its resources and escape the evils of this contract, which has been so rigidly criticised and thoroughly exposed to the view of hon. members of this House so as, I believe, to lead every member of the Government to the conclusion that a more unwise act could not be done on their part than to press this unfortunate measure to a conclusion.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, when, two hours and a half ago, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) was good enough to tell us that he desired to address a few words to this House, knowing his habit, I did not venture to hope that his words would be few, but I did venture to hope that he would disperse a few arguments among them. Unhappily, the length has been in inverse proportion to the quality. The hon. gentleman has traversed every single individual fact or act of his long career, in order to show that in the person of the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party we have the most modest man that ever occupied a similar position; and there is no doubt about it, because he has told it himself, and he ought to know. Sir, I am told that the leadership of the Liberal-Conservative party is the highest position to which mortal man can aspire. It is well known to hon. members that I have always entertained a very high regard for Tories of all description; I

have extended that appreciation to the Conservatives also; but I must admit that in so far as regards the Liberal-Conservatives, I have found it utterly impossible to place them in the same category. It may be truly said of those political mulattoes that they have inherited the vices of both parents and the virtues of neither; and while I profess the utmost regard for all true Conservatives, I say regarding these men, whose very name is a sham and a contradiction, who are no more entitled to call themselves Conservative than Liberal, who belong to neither party, that the leadership of these men may possibly be fitly held by the hon. gentleman opposite. Sir, I desire to call the attention of the House, in the first place, to the most remarkable concurrence and accordance between, what shall I call him—the king de jure or the king de facto of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FOSTER. Of the mulattoes.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The ex-Minister of Finance was good enough to denounce with all his heart and soul, and in words almost as verbose and as tedious as those of the hon. gentleman beside him, the Stikine-Teslin route as the most absurd that the mind of man could conceive and grasp. The hon. gentleman who has taken his seat, and whom my hon. friend calls his leader, has told us that he adheres to every word he previously stated, that not only was the Stikine-Teslin the best route, but it was the only route worthy of consideration, under the circumstances. Sir, every word with respect to the various routes said by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) was in direct and absolute contradiction to every word used by his leader. Why, Sir, the hon. leader of the Opposition still admits that he agrees with the policy of the hon. Minister of the Interior on all points practically but one, that one point being that he says now, although he did not say it a few weeks ago, that he has been misled and deceived on the one point of transshipment, as to which I shall say something by and by, although the hon. gentleman, in a speech, which he did not deny, pointed out that if there were any difficulty in respect to transshipment, it might be avoided by going to Port Simpson. But the hon. gentleman quarrels with us on one point alone. He admits the urgency, he admits that the route was the best, he admits that the contractors chosen were not only the best, but the only men in Canada who, by reason of their financial standing, organization and experience—and, bear in mind, that it requires much more than money to enable contractors to perform such a work—had the least chance of constructing the road within the time given by the hon. Minister. But, Sir, after making a careful examination of the question, whether or not we would be allowed certain privileges of transshipment or bonding at Wrangel, what is the remedy that the lead-

er of the Liberal-Conservative party suggests? Why, that we should go to Washington and ask whether the American Government mean to violate their treaty obligations before we proceed to carry out this project on the faith, which I think we are justified in holding in spite of what has transpired in the United States Senate, that on calm consideration the United States Senate and the people of that country will fulfil their treaty obligations. We ask no more, we want no more than our rights. The hon. gentleman has been on the Pacific Coast and he has had conferences with Hudson's Bay Company's officials, who have made trips for years on the Stikine River. I want to ask the hon. gentleman whether the men connected with that company told him, or whether the hon. gentleman is able to state from his knowledge, that up to the present moment any Canadian goods going up the Stikine have been compelled to pay duty?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not aware of any.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman is not aware of one case, and more or less, for probably more than twenty years, the Hudson Bay Company's officers have used that route, I understand not constantly, but occasionally, for their vessels and it has been used by Canadian vessels. If these goods have not been compelled to pay duty—that being the case, and I believe the hon. gentleman does not deny it—and our people have been allowed to use this route under such conditions, why should we now suppose that a new and altered condition of affairs will take place. The hon. gentleman in the course of his somewhat rambling oration was good enough to call the attention of the House to the Halifax award. I wondered at the hon. gentleman doing so, because I have here as one of my colleagues, a gentleman whose exertions contributed largely to the successful result that Canada obtained on that occasion, and I think I am correct in saying that one of the stumbling blocks that lay in his way and one of the authorities most frequently appealed to in support of the American contention and claim were certain speeches delivered by the hon. gentleman opposite, which were quoted before the American commission in support of their contention that we were asking far too heavy claims for indemnity on account of these same fisheries. I have many reasons for knowing that—perhaps not the hon. gentleman, but certainly his colleagues—were prepared to have gladly accepted a very much smaller sum than we subsequently obtained by way of compensation.

The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) also was good enough to call our attention to the fact, that some minions of his, I suppose I may say, were concerned in a very disreputable transaction which resulted in the stealing of certain private papers belonging,

I believe to Mr. Goldwin Smith, or perhaps to Mr. Edward Farrer, upon which a most preposterous and absurd charge of conspiracy and treason was formulated by himself and some of his late colleagues. It may perhaps interest some of these gentlemen to know, because they probably are not as well posted in Mr. Edward Farrer's antecedents as others are, that Mr. Farrer was a long time editor of the "Mail" newspaper, and was the writer of at least one, and probably more, Tory campaign sheets. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) makes merry at the idea expressed by one of my hon. friends here that, if 100,000 men, not in the habit of rendering always the most implicit obedience to laws of any kind, were collected together at a point almost inaccessible, there might be some difficulty in maintaining law and order. He makes very light of a possible rebellion in our territory. Sir, I can understand these hon. gentlemen opposite making light of rebellions, for their misconduct was the cause of two, and one at least was provoked by the most scandalous neglect and mismanagement on the part of the hon. gentleman's colleagues. Whether or not he was in the Government during the entire time that the seeds of that rebellion were being sown I do not recollect at this moment, but I do recollect, that if ever it was proved that the mismanagement and the gross and scandalous and shameful neglect of their duty to our distant fellow subjects in the Northwest—I will not say justified but excused a rebellion—it was proven in the case of the conduct of that hon. gentleman's colleagues.

Sir, I have not time at this hour to make more than the briefest allusion to the hypocritical criticism against a grant of three or four million acres of rocks under the Arctic circle preferred by these hon. gentlemen, who to our knowledge gave way fifty millions of acres of the most fertile land in the world, and who were prepared to give away a hundred million acres, as the record shows to this hour. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) was good enough to tell us, that not a single pound of trade was likely to accrue from the opening of this road. Unless I am most grievously misinformed—probably my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior or my hon. friend the Minister of Customs can correct me—unless I am most grievously misinformed the moment the contract was signed with Mackenzie & Mann, that moment an instant and great revival took place in the trade of Vancouver and the cities on the coast. And, were we to accept the suggestion of these hon. gentlemen, if we were to stop this contract, if we were to withdraw the men who are now engaged in carrying it out, I venture to say the effect would be felt in all these cities, and the trade which has grown up so quickly would disappear as quickly.

The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

tells us, as an excuse for his change of face, that there has been a complete change since this debate began. Yes, there has been a complete change. That was justifiable before, simply on its merits and as being as the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) truly said, the best and only route available to us if it was to go through Canadian territory, has now become, in the very highest degree and sense, a matter of national honour, which we cannot possibly abandon, unless we are prepared to make manifest to the world that the American Congress can dictate to us where our railways should go and under what condition. And, if the hon. gentleman and his friends possessed one spark of real genuine patriotism; if they possessed one particle of the loyalty which they most impudently arrogate to themselves; if they possessed one atom of real regard for the interests of this country, the very moment that Bill was known to pass the American Senate, that moment they would not have asked us to withdraw the Bill, but they would have withdrawn their own opposition to it. I certainly do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to imitate my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) at this hour, and in the very few remarks I now propose to make, I apologize to the House, because it is utterly impossible to deal with this question at this time without some repetition more or less.

With respect to the position occupied by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) himself, I have this to say: It is a fine sight no doubt to see Cæsar disciplining his mutinous troops, but to see the mutinous knaves disciplining Cæsar and reducing him to the position which he now occupies is a spectacle which should give pain to all rightly constituted minds. What has the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) proved? Why, he has proved two things, which we have always admitted from the first. He has proved, I will grant, that if circumstances permitted, it is always wise and right and proper to advertise for tenders for a public work. Who denied it? No one on this side of the House that I have ever heard. He has proved also, that it is right in all such cases to consult the House. Nobody denied it, and this contract is made, as he truly said, subject to the consent of the House. But, the hon. gentleman has not considered the fact, that we were fettered on all points by conditions which he himself has admitted. He has not attempted to disprove—although some of his comrades may have done so—that this was a case of urgency in the highest degree. On the contrary, he admitted this once and again. He has not attempted to disprove that this road lies through our own territory. That, he has had the good sense to abstain from denying, although he does contend that if the navigation of the Stikine is interfered with, it will not be in all respects as useful to us as we hoped it would be. But, sup-

pose the Stikine navigation is interfered with, all the same this piece of railway from the Stikine to the Teslin, is, by his own showing—and out of his own lips I establish it—a most necessary and indispensable link to any action we may take, whether in the extension of the road southward to a port in British Columbia, or for an extension eastward to give connection with Edmonton. It is an indispensable link either way, and if interference is made in the trade, it will be a most valuable means of communication with the Yukon country, and anyhow supplies, in case of need, can be passed through. The Government laid down, and we are accomplishing it in spite of what hon. gentlemen opposite may say, these conditions: That the road should not cost the people of Canada anything, that it should not cost the people of Canada—who have in one way or other expended something like \$200,000,000 public and private money in the attempt to open up and colonize the Northwest—that it should not cost them any more of their hard-earned money, but that the Yukon should be opened by means of a reasonable contribution from the resources of the country itself. We also lay down the condition that we should preserve a fair share of any possible profits to the people of Canada; and every man who looks at the contract knows that that is done in the fullest and most complete degree.

Now, I have looked at the amendment which these hon. gentlemen have introduced. What practical alternative have they to propose? Why, they cannot agree among themselves. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) had one scheme. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) recommends, I believe, a wagon road. That is the highest point his broad-minded vision will enable him to aspire to. The leader of the Opposition did, in the first instance, like a sensible man, recommend the route my hon. friend has taken, and he has only partially withdrawn from that position. All through his better sense and judgment was quarrelling with the position he was forced to assume by those malcontent followers of his.

We do not mean to say that it would not have been better to ask for tenders; but in this case we had no time. It is utterly impossible for my hon. friend or for any man in his position to have done more than he did; and in the weighty and unanswerable speech, in which he explained his course, a speech which does him honour, and which will live long in Canadian annals, he showed to the satisfaction of every reasonable man in Canada why it was that he was not able to act earlier than he did. Every man of any practical experience in affairs knows well that had my hon. friend asked for tenders, it would have been utterly impossible for us to have obtained any road this year; and the whole reason why we dispensed with tenders and desired to push this road through was because there

was, as any man can see for himself, urgent necessity that we should have communication established this year if by any means it can be established.

As to the large land grant, my hon. friend himself has stated, and others have stated, that there is not the slightest doubt that Mackenzie & Mann, in the first instance, did not want to take this land grant and build this road. They would have preferred another road—they made no secret of it—as being easier for commercial purposes. But when the hon. leader of the Opposition talks about our giving away the whole of this valuable gold field by a grant of 4,000,000 acres, or about 6,000 square miles, made under the conditions with which this House is familiar, the hon. gentleman will excuse me for saying that I think a man of his experience should have talked less nonsense. Why it is apparent to him and to everybody that the whole of that country will be flooded, not with thousands, but with tens of thousands of explorers before Mackenzie & Mann can locate a single, solitary acre. In all human probability, every stream on which there is any show of gold, will be taken up before these gentlemen are allowed to select more than the veriest fragment of the land assigned to them. I have not the slightest doubt that Mackenzie & Mann would be very ready to exchange for a very moderate subsidy in hard cash their large land grant: in fact, we have excellent reason to know that they would. Just take the case of any man with an undeveloped property supposed to contain valuable minerals which are not located. Is there any man who would not be willing to have men of capital explore it on condition of his receiving one-half the product? And, remember, we are giving not more than 5 per cent of the lands, because we have eighty or a hundred million acres there out of which we are giving 4,000,000 acres.

Sir, let us apply a little common sense to this matter. Who can tell to-day whether we have struck half a dozen gigantic pockets or whether there is a new California there? The hon. gentleman talks as if we were going to exhaust all the gold-bearing streams of this country. At the outside, all that the company possibly get possession of, under the conditions laid down by the Minister of the Interior, would be 1,000 or 1,500 miles of river bed. Does the hon. gentleman know how many thousand miles of river bed or streamlet bed equally likely to contain gold there are in that country? I have made some attempt, in conjunction with my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, to estimate it, and I think I am safe in saying that there are from 20,000 to 30,000 miles of river bed in that country, which is a mountainous country, abounding in mountain torrents or mountain streams, any single one of which is just as likely to produce gold as any other. Consider under

what circumstances these mines are going to be worked. Consider that the expense of working them must be enormous. These miners go to a country to which every pound of supplies must be brought thousands of miles, in an Arctic region, where wages must be five or six times as great as in older Canada, in order to induce men to work at all.

The hon. gentleman made a great deal of an expression used by myself or by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, I forget which, when we said that Mackenzie & Mann had undertaken to make a huge gamble. Quite true, but we never said that Canada had undertaken to make a huge gamble. What Canada has done is what all prudent men would do. Canada has hedged in this matter. Canada, having an enormous area of land, has given a small portion of it, probably not more than 5 per cent, for the purpose of developing and making valuable the rest. The calculation submitted by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and his leader, and by other gentlemen, are certainly of the most astounding proportions. As became him, the hon. leader of the Opposition maintained his ancient renown. The hon. member for York demonstrated to his own satisfaction, if not to the satisfaction of the House, that this land grant would be worth some \$700,000 or \$800,000 a year. But this estimate dwarfed into insignificance beside that of his hon. leader, who promised us that Mackenzie & Mann would earn \$37,000,000 from converting their land grant into mining licenses. Then, one of our hon. friends from Toronto was good enough to inform us that these 4,000,000 acres were worth \$50,000,000. Now, I speak without authority, but I think I can pledge the Government that if the hon. gentleman will take other four million acres and sell them for fifty million dollars, he can have, if he wishes, 20 per cent on the transaction. We are also to have \$400,000,000 for the timber. What an Eldorado it all is. If the hon. member for Toronto be correct, we might extinguish the national debt four times over by the sale of our lands in the Yukon. If the leader of the Opposition is correct, we might pension all Canada.

At this hour of the night I do not want to enter into a discussion of the exact position we occupy under the Washington Treaty. But one thing the hon. gentleman said, which I may as well call attention to, because several of his friends behind him chose to take a totally different view of it. He pointed out that a most grave error had been committed in the framing of the Washington Treaty by the substitution of the clause as it now stands, for the clause under which we enjoyed further privileges of navigation on the Stikine River, under the Treaty of 1825, and the subsequent Treaty of St. Petersburg. He pointed that out, while some of his friends, not having duly listened to his words, informed us that, after all

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

is said and done, we were just as well off as we were before. There is no doubt whatever that all the British Commissioners who were present at Washington on that occasion were responsible. They ought to have known all about the treaty which gave us the navigation of the Yukon and Stikine and Porcupine, and it is very little to the credit of any of them that that matter was only discovered after the treaty was signed. I do not pretend to say we are not grievously hampered in our dealings with the United States by the folly of our predecessors. No man who has watched the conduct of public affairs in Canada for the last fifteen years, but is aware of the truth of my statement, made calmly and deliberately and under a sense of responsibility, that the relations between Canada and the United States were never one half so good or friendly as during the period when that honest, sagacious statesman, Alexander Mackenzie, presided over the affairs of this country. But just so soon as the hon. gentleman and his brother jingoes got into office, everything was reversed. His own common sense did at last wake him up to the folly of the career they were running, and his remarks have been quoted over and over again, from these benches, I shall not repeat them. But he pointed out, some nine years after he left office, to what a dangerous position the folly, ignorance and incapacity of some of his brother colleagues had brought the affairs of Canada, until it became necessary for the British Government to send out Mr. Chamberlain, the present Secretary of State, to take these men by the collar and shake them to some sense of their duty. As to the subsequent proceedings at Washington, aye, and as to the hon. gentleman's proceedings at Washington, I will say no more than this, that neither was that famous visit, which began at half past ten and terminated at a quarter to eleven, nor the submission which the hon. gentleman himself was compelled to make to the late Mr. Blaine, things which any Canadian is likely to recall with pleasure or which reflect any credit on our Administration.

It is perfectly true that the extravagant expenditures which these hon. gentlemen have committed the country to have laid a burden upon us which makes it very difficult for us to deal with those other questions as we would like. One of the reasons why we give lands in preference to money for the building of this railway is because our national debt and expenditure are very much greater than a proper administration of the affairs of Canada warranted.

More than that, this question of the Alaska boundary, that is now giving us so much trouble, and which will probably invoke tedious and complicated negotiations—who is to blame if it was not properly settled? These gentlemen were in power from 1878 to 1896—eighteen long years—and

they gave themselves very little trouble about this matter, which, if they had been the statesmen they pretend to be, they would not have allowed to remain in abeyance all this time.

The hon. gentleman, in one breath, complains that we allow American miners to operate in the Klondike, and in the next breath he complains that we are taxing these poor fellows for the privileges of doing so. It is a new departure, I grant, and one which does honour and credit to my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton). It is time that the people of Canada, as a whole, should extract some profit, in one way or another, from the enormous resources that providence has showered upon them; and if it be a new departure, it is a wise one. We have spent a couple of hundred million in opening up that region, and if we can extract one or two millions a year from it, that is our legitimate and fair profit, and it is our duty to do it.

One of the reasons, and a very good reason, for selecting Mackenzie & Mann was this obvious one, that in a matter of urgency, a matter in which the very essence of the thing was that this railway should be constructed, if at all possible, in time to provide means of communication before the close of the current year, it was necessary to have contractors who had something more than money at their backs—contractors, like Mackenzie & Mann, of great experience, with a ready organized plant, ready to go into the work at once. In my opinion, very much more money will be spent getting into the country than will be taken out of it, for a considerable time to come, and that is another reason why we should, by all possible means, make easy transport there. If the goods come from Canada, so much the better; but if they come from the United States, Canada will not lose her share, so long as she has experienced officers and proper authorities to support them.

In conclusion, let me say this. Everybody who has paid any attention to this particular class of mining knows perfectly well the truth of the statement made by many of my hon. friends beside me, that we cannot possibly depend or rely on placer mining continuing for more than a very short time. If there are rich quartz mines in the country, they may prove a permanent source of wealth, but all the evidence and experience we have from California, British Columbia, or any other country of the kind, goes to show that it is quite possible that the whole of these great finds of placer mining may be exhausted within two or three years. I do not say that they will, but it is quite possible; and under these circumstances, I put it to the common sense of hon. gentlemen if we would not be censurable if we allowed the public credit to be pledged and the money of the people to be used to any larger extent than is possible to avoid, for the purpose of obtaining access to a country

where we cannot tell that we will find 5,000 miners, let alone 50,000, at the expiration of three years from this time. What is the use of proposing plans, if you have any to propose, which it will take three or four years to carry out, under such conditions. I repeat that there is no doubt whatever that if, under existing circumstances, threatened by the American Senate, threatened by some parties in the United States, threatened with condign punishment, forsooth, if we presume to go on opening up our own country in the way we think best—if, under those circumstances, we withdraw our Bill, we would desire to be branded as the most incompetent cowards whoever held the reins of Government.

Mr. McINNES. I do not intend at this late hour to prolong the discussion of the subject before the House. This debate has now lasted nearly a month, and I am sure hon. members are thoroughly acquainted with all the details connected with the bargain which can be of any assistance in aiding them in coming to a conclusion. But inasmuch as this question is of vital importance to the whole country, and I find that the views which I hold on it are unfortunately at variance with those of the majority of the members on this side, and also—which I very much regret—at variance with those of some of the hon. members from British Columbia, I shall briefly give an explanation of the position I take, and the vote I intend to give.

As to the resolution proposed by the Government to ratify this contract, I cannot justify myself in supporting it. I give the Government credit for the desire they have manifested in this contract or otherwise, to secure the construction of a road or some other facilities for communication with the Klondike country. I give them all praise for every legitimate effort they have put forward to secure the trade of that new market for Canada and Canadians. So far as the route they have selected is concerned, I endorse it as good so far as it goes, but I think that the opinion will ultimately prevail that it does not go far enough to serve the purpose we all desire to have served by opening up communication with that country.

But I apprehend that the question is not whether it is desirable to have an all-Canadian route to that country or whether this route is superior to all others. There is very little difference of opinion so far as I have followed the debate, and so far as I have followed opinion in the country on these two points. The question before the House and the country is whether the contract for the construction of what is presumably an all-Canadian route is a good and provident one. Upon that question, I regret to say, I cannot see eye to eye with the Government.

There are several features of the contract which I consider unfortunate. I do not in-

tend to amplify the discussion of them, but shall confine myself to a mere statement of opinion. I believe strongly that a contract of this magnitude should not have been entered into without an opportunity for public competition. I believe, furthermore, that the Government has agreed to give far too much for what they are to get. I believe, moreover, that the kind of assistance they propose to give the contractors for building the road is one that cannot be defended either on principle or in the light of past experience. I think that we should cease to legislate into existence these large corporations with monopolistic rights with regard to transportation and land and mineral wealth. The time has surely come at last for a different policy to be pursued with regard to the construction of railways. So I cannot justify myself in supporting the propositions of the Government.

With regard to the amendment, I think it has been very well described by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell). It is a mere skeleton; there is no life to it, there is no substance in it; it is indefinite; it lacks decision; it embodies no business principle, and, so far as I can pass judgment upon it, it seems to me to be devised more to gather in all the dissentients under it than to supply a definite line of action in case the proposition submitted by the Government should be defeated. No doubt there are other members of the House similarly dissatisfied with both proposals submitted. I do not know whether the views I express and the course I intend to take will satisfy those hon. members, but I feel it would not be doing myself justice to remain silent and record two negative votes which, by themselves, would not be very intelligible. I have prepared an amendment to the amendment which, perhaps, will meet the views of hon. gentlemen who find themselves in the same position as myself:—

That all the words after the word "but" in the eighth line of the amendment be struck out and the following words be added instead thereof:—

That it is expedient to provide transportation facilities with the least possible delay by an all-Canadian route to the mining districts of the Yukon.

That the recent action of the United States Senate gives reason to fear that every possible obstacle will be placed in the way of traffic by the proposed Stikine route, and justifies the reconsideration of the present contract with a view to secure a deep water terminus in Canadian territory.

That the route via Observatory Inlet and Teslin Lake is the only all-Canadian route free from the possibility of international complications immediately available or suitable for railway construction at a comparatively moderate cost.

Therefore, be it resolved, that the Government of Canada call for tenders at the earliest date consistent with public competition, for the construction of a narrow gauge railway from Observatory Inlet to Teslin Lake on either of the following plans:—First, as a Government work; second, on the basis of a cash subsidy to a com-

pany constructing the railway and operating it under strict governmental control; provided, that in either case the portion from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake should be completed by 1st October 1898, and the whole railway by 1st September, 1899; and that the Government be authorized to enter into a contract for the construction of such railway with the party submitting the lowest tender, accompanied by satisfactory securities for the completion of the work, on either of the above plans.

I do not think it necessary to add anything at length in the way of explanation of this amendment to the amendment. It declares that in all probability there will be trouble in connection with this route if the lower terminus is at Telegraph Creek, and is not pushed down to Observatory Inlet. I believe it is not a question whether we have rights by treaty which will give us the navigation for commercial purposes of the Stikine River. There is no doubt but there will be differences in the interpretation of the treaty, and there can be no doubt that it will take a long time for the interpretation of our treaty rights to be settled. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has declared as much. I have every confidence in the ingenuity of the Americans; and I have seen enough of their contemptible tactics on the Pacific Coast, to know that they are sufficiently unneighbourly to resort to almost any trick to prevent the use of this river for the purpose of connecting with this road and so securing the trade for Canada. It also declares that this route is the only available route for present purposes which can be built over all Canadian territory at moderate cost. I think those who are acquainted with all the routes will come to this conclusion, and I do not wish to say anything which will cause any rivalry between that and other routes. My resolution also declares that cash assistance alone should be given towards the construction of that railway, or that it should be undertaken as a Government work. I prefer the latter course, decidedly; but if hon. gentlemen see fit to endorse the other alternative, I shall not complain. As I said, I do not intend to take up the time of the House at this late hour, but I move this amendment to the amendment in accordance with the views I hold upon the question, and I think it also expresses the feeling of other members of the House on this matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am not sure that I have correctly followed the phraseology of the resolution, or fully understand its purport; but if I have, and if I correctly apprehend its meaning, it appears to me not to be a motion which it is competent for the hon. gentleman to move. I think that it infringes upon the prerogative of the Crown, that it is not a motion which can be moved by a private member without the usual governmental recommendation. At all events, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call your attention to the resolution, and to raise the point of

order as to whether it is one which the hon. member may properly move.

Mr. SPEAKER. While it is competent for a private individual, without the recommendation of the Crown, to propose an abstract resolution with reference to grants of money, I think this is not an abstract, but a very concrete resolution, providing, directing and authorizing the Government to incur a specific expenditure. For that reason, I do not think the resolution is in order.

Mr. CASEY. I regret that the motion proposed by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) has been found to be out of order. But, at all events, even as it stands, it serves to express the views which he and I, at any rate, entertain upon this subject, and as you, Sir, have said, to put our views in a simple and concrete form. It is with the deepest regret, and with something more than regret, that, for the first time in my rather long parliamentary career, I have had to differ from any important proposal made by the leaders of the Liberal party, and I should not do so now did I consider that the present proposal was in harmony with my understanding of the principles and past career of that party. I know what is due to party allegiance, perhaps, as well as any other man in this House, and am prepared to yield all that is due to that great principle. While I am prepared to yield on all points merely of judgment or of expediency, I cannot avoid expressing, in this case, where I think there is a difference in principle, the dissent which I really feel. I am sure the Government have the less reason to complain of such an expression of opinion on the part of their followers, because there was no opportunity given for such an expression of opinion before the Government committed themselves and the party to the particular course in question. I am aware of what is due as, I said, to party allegiance, and I am also aware of the sufferings and tribulations of those who are commonly called kickers. I have been one of those who denounced kickers, and have pointed out how much more comfortable, and easy, and defensible it was as an almost invariable rule, to vote with your party through thick and thin, and I admit still that it is the easiest course to maintain, and the easiest course to defend. But, perhaps, Sir, it is in the interests of the party and in the interests of the country that notwithstanding all this, some should kick and some should suffer for their kicking. As my hon. friend from Vancouver has remarked, this is a time for stating conclusions and not arguments, and I will try and follow his example in stating my conclusions. I have deferred speaking on this question until the very end of the debate in the hope that I might find means of avoiding what I had to say. But I am compelled now, as at first, to say that I object to the manner of making this bargain and to the matter of the bargain. The

manner of the bargain seemed to me, and still seems to me, to have been characterized by undue and improper haste, and I must add, recklessness in its dealing with the public domain. The matter of the bargain is objectionable for several reasons. I may say that I agree with my hon. friend, the mover of this abortive resolution, in believing that a cash subsidy is the proper method of aiding a railway to develop Government property. Such has always been the policy of the Liberal party for many years, such was the policy of the Liberal Parliament and Liberal Government during the late session, and the session before that. I do not understand the sudden revulsion from that policy, the sudden feeling that seems to have come over the Government that they must give no more cash subsidies, and that they must revert to the principle which we have denounced as vicious on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, the principle of giving away large land grants of unknown value to secure the construction of railways. I was the colleague of those, not a great many, who now sit on the Treasury benches, who opposed the Canadian Pacific Railway contract in 1881 on the very grounds on which I am opposing this to-day. I stand where I then stood, and I see no reason to review my opinion. The Government say it is proper that the territory in the Yukon district should pay for its own development. I quite agree with them, but a Government possessing such talent as they possess, should be able to raise out of the territory funds to build the railway without giving a grant of land which seems to me to be improvident. The Minister of Railways and the Minister of the Interior also have admitted that this was a gamble. I do not think that is the proper method of dealing with an emergency of this kind. Even in an emergency requiring hasty treatment, I do not think that method should be resorted to. The adventurous spirit of the gambler is sometimes exceedingly necessary to a politician or business man. A distinguished railway man once spoke to me of the great difficulties he had sometimes to meet, and he said: Thank heaven, I have been a poker player from my early boyhood, and it is quite an assistance to a man on a pinch. I do not think the Minister of the Interior, from my knowledge of his associations, received that early training, and I do not think he can thank heaven for having been a poker player from his boyhood up. I am afraid, moreover, that he has not shown full knowledge of the game into which he entered, full knowledge of the speculation, to use a milder term than he used. I do not want to urge any of these points too strongly against the Government, but I felt it due to myself to state thus briefly a few of the reasons why I feel compelled to disapprove of this contract. One point only, in addition. The Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke of this great country as so

many million acres of rock under the Arctic circle. In all seriousness, that is not the way to speak of a country proved to contain immense riches. No one can say that it contains immense riches everywhere; but until we know what it does contain, the only safe and proper course to obtain railway facilities for it is to give a cash subsidy for its construction, and, if you must gamble, gamble on the chance of getting paid out of that territory.

Again, we are told that Mr. Hamilton Smith's proposition came too late to receive attention. I say it should not have come too late. There is no use denying that that proposal may have emanated from people perfectly able to carry it out. I do not know whether the Government have satisfied themselves on that point or have taken the trouble to do so, considering the proposition came too late. But opportunity for such offers should have been given before the Government tied themselves up to consider this question with respect to one form of contract only, with one set of contractors only, and on one plan only. Although I have spoken of my preference for a cash subsidy scheme, I would not have greatly objected or have been compelled to speak about it, if an opportunity for tendering had been given. If offers to take a subsidy, either in cash or lands, had been invited, I would not have felt called upon to object publicly to the scheme. In saying I object to this scheme and declaring that I would have voted for my hon. friend's resolution and would have seconded it if it had been in order, I do not mean to declare any want of confidence in the Government. I have personally, and as regards their general policy, the utmost confidence in them. I supported their railway policy last year and the year before, voting for the aid to the Crow's Nest Pass line and in favour of the Drummond County road, and I am still prepared to defend those schemes as wise, statesmanlike and in the public interest; but the fact that I voted for them does not compel me to express approval of this contract. I beg leave to say in respect to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), that I agree with the opinion of my hon. friend who moved this resolution, which has been declared out of order, but I cannot support a mere hollow amendment to this scheme. I proposed to second the proposition of my hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. McInnes), because it was a serious and complete proposition, which I thought was right; but I cannot vote for the vague amendment proposed from the other side of the House.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). I ask hon. members to bear with me for a moment while I advert to a personal matter which arose in connection with the hon. leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman made a distinct and positive statement that I had been guilty of an at-

Mr. CASEY.

tempt to mislead the House in quoting the Montreal "Witness," and that in doing so I quoted part of the article, and when asked to read the balance said I would read the balance and I proceeded to read a portion of the article further down on the page. The evident intention of the hon. gentleman was to convey the impression to the House that I had read a portion of the article and then skipped a portion for the purpose of misleading the House by omitting a portion of the article that did not bear out my argument. I have taken the trouble to obtain the newspaper from which I made the quotation. I need not delay the House by reading it at the present moment; but I desire to say, what I said when I interrupted the hon. gentleman, that I made the quotation with absolute accuracy, line for line and letter for letter. If the hon. gentleman intended that I misquoted or attempted to mislead the House there is not a particle of foundation for the statement. I give the House the date of the paper in which the article appeared which I quoted, the Montreal "Witness," of February 11th, and the article is on the editorial page. In column 598 of the "Hansard," members of the House will read the quotation, and in a moment they will see that I began at the beginning of the article and went down and read as much as I wished to quote. The hon. member for West Assinibolia asked me to continue reading the article, and I said:

I trust that the hon. member for Assinibolia (Mr. Davin) will allow this debate to terminate without addressing the House on the subject, and he will have an opportunity of reading the article himself when he comes to speak.

So every hon. member must have known that I had not read the whole article, but I read from the first word continuously, line for line and letter for letter until I had read that portion I intended to quote. So there is not the slightest foundation for the hon. gentleman's statement. As a matter of fact, this hon. gentleman who has been so long in public life, in making his quotations in his original speech did the very identical thing he accused me of doing. He read the first portion of this very article; he then skipped a portion of the article and went on to another part, having left out the part that did not bear favourably on his contention. Hon. gentlemen will find that to be the case by looking at pages 565 and 568 of the "Hansard." They will find that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) quoted there as a continuous article, only a portion of this article, and left out that portion which I quoted afterwards and which bore unfavourably on the contention he was making. The hon. gentleman stands in the position of having accused me of an attempt to mislead the House by misquot'ng, when, as a matter of fact, I did nothing of the kind, and when he originally did the very thing he accused me of in the same article.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend at this late hour of the

night, or rather at this early hour of the morning, to occupy the time of the House for more than five minutes, but as I come from a western constituency and one deeply interested in this question, it is only right that I should give vent briefly to my views. I shall commence by saying that I intend to support the Bill before the House, and I shall support it for the good reason that I consider it is in the interest of the constituency I represent and in the interests of the Dominion as a whole. I do not agree with my colleague from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) when he says, that all the trade of the Yukon will be lost to the North-west Territories, because this railway runs from the coast. As a matter of fact, I know that at the present time we have a large coast trade in flour in the county I represent, and I believe there is a larger similar trade done by the constituency of Alberta. It is a well known fact that the duty on flour—that is the principal thing we export from our district—of 30 cents a sack will prohibit the American flour from going in there. We have good reason to suppose also, that if the American flour or produce comes in, the Canadian Pacific Railway will protect their own trade, and they would reduce their freight rates to such an extent as to enable us to retain the trade of that country. We have a precedent for this, because we know that the Canadian Pacific Railway reduced the freight rates into the Kootenay in order to enable Canadians to do that trade.

Let me say a word about the overland route mentioned as running from Edmonton to the Yukon. While I quite agree with the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) that there should be an inland road built in the near future—I would not say from Edmonton, but from some point in the North-west Territories—I think he will agree with me that such a road could not be built in less than three years. In the meantime, if we had to wait for three years to get an opening into that country, the trade in the interval would go to the United States, and it is a well known fact that, when trade once gets into a certain channel, it is a most difficult thing to divert it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver), basing his calculation on the cost of the Calgary and Edmonton road, told us that this road could be built from Edmonton to the Yukon for \$8,000 a mile. Now, Sir, it is a well known fact that the Calgary and Edmonton Railway runs through a prairie country which is as level as a plank, and where a road can be constructed cheaply. But, when you go north of Edmonton and into the Yukon district, the conditions change completely, and in place of that railway costing \$8,000 a mile, I am satisfied that it would cost not less than \$30,000 a mile. When we take into consideration that the Intercolonial Railway cost \$32,000 a mile, my estimate is not far out, that the road from Edmonton would cost the amount of money I have said. As I un-

derstand the position of the Opposition, it shows that they have gone back on their former policy of giving lands to subsidize railways, and so that we must take it for granted that they intend that this road from the interior should be built by a cash subsidy. A conservative estimate of the cost of that road would be \$30,000,000, and I wonder if hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to mortgage the finances of this country to such an extent. I am opposed, and always have been, to giving our lands away to subsidize railways of any kind. However, my judgment always was that that rule should apply only to agricultural lands. The Opposition object to the Government giving 25,000 acres a mile of these Klondike lands to subsidize the Teslin Lake road. Now, Sir, it is a well known fact that this road will cost not less than \$25,000 a mile, so that an estimated value of the land grant would be about \$1 an acre. The policy of the Conservative party has been heretofore to give 6,200 acres of agricultural lands per mile, to subsidize railways in the Territories, which railways only cost \$8,000 per mile to construct. When they did this, they were not giving away lands without any known value as the Government is doing today, but they were giving away the choicest agricultural lands in the North-west Territories and Manitoba; lands that we know are valuable and that are going to be valuable as long as this world lasts. The Yukon lands are of no value whatever, except that minerals may be found on them, and even that is very doubtful. I venture to say that these lands given the contractors in the present case, are such that gold will not be found on more than one acre out of ten thousand acres. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) claimed that the Government were giving away half of the whole Yukon territory to the contractors, and he held that if a free miner went into that country and made a strike and found gold, Mackenzie & Mann would go to work and blanket all the lands in that locality. If the estimate be correct, that from 100,000 to 200,000 free miners will go into that country this summer, and they are going in now in large numbers, we may take it for granted that many of them will find their way to the Yukon before the first of June.

The contractors will not be able to get an acre of their land grant until the middle of the summer; so that, if there are 100,000 free miners roaming over the country, they will blanket nearly all the creeks before Mackenzie & Mann get there at all. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they want a wagon road from Edmonton to the Yukon. I fancy I know something about this matter, because I have lived in the North-west a good many years, and I claim that a wagon road which people could travel on could not be built. You would have to build a wagon road 1,200 miles long, and it would take parties at least four months to go from Ed-

monton to the Yukon by such a road. Besides, over 600 miles of that country has not been explored, and we do not know whether there would be fodder for animals or not, and it would not be possible to haul enough fodder to feed the animals that would be required for packing. Nature has provided good highways in that country in the waterways. We have the Athabasca River running into Lake Athabasca, then the Slave River running into Great Slave Lake, and then the Mackenzie River, by which over a small portage you can reach the Porcupine River, which takes you into the Yukon. There are only three portages in the whole distance. If a small amount of money were spent on these, you would have a waterway all the distance from the town of Prince Albert to the Yukon and, as it is all down stream, it would be a very cheap and easy way of getting into the country. I want to read a short extract from a statement by Mr. Moberly, a chief factor of the Hudson Bay Company who has spent forty years of his life in the northern country, who was in charge of all the posts between Fort McMurray and Fort Yukon, and who knows whereof he speaks:

A direct overland route from Edmonton to Peace River in summer is almost impossible on account of swamps. It must run up close to the foothills of the Rocky Mountains, where they will have to cross deep ravines and through large timber, making the expense of opening a wagon road enormous.

A letter appeared in the Ottawa "Free Press" of to-day that was sent by a couple of young men who left here some time ago and went over the Edmonton overland route. They lost their horses, and they are now going by the waterways which I speak of. Now, I believe the Government have done right in this matter. If we are going to have 200,000 people in that country during the coming summer, it is a matter of necessity that we must provide some means of communication into the country before next winter. We can estimate what it would take to provide 200,000 people with food and clothing during the winter, and how long a time it would take to haul that over a wagon road such as the leader of the Opposition advocated.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Borden (Halifax).

That the Bill No. 6, an Act to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company, be not now read a second time, but that it be Resolved, That this House while recognizing the necessity of providing adequate facilities for transportation into the Canadian Yukon gold fields, regards as indefensible the terms and conditions of the proposed contract, but will cordially support the grant of substantial assistance in aid of the immediate construction of a railway on the best available route, under such conditions and safeguards as will prevent the creation of any railway or mining monopoly.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Beattie,	Maclean,
Bell (Addington),	McAlister,
Bell (Pictou),	McCleary,
Bennett,	McCormick,
Bergeron,	McDougall,
Borden (Halifax),	McInerney,
Broder,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Cargill,	McNeill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Marcotte,
Carscallen,	Martin,
Chauvin,	Mills,
Clancy,	Monk,
Clarke,	Montague,
Cochrane,	Moore,
Craig,	Morin,
Davin,	Osler,
Dugas,	Pope,
Earle,	Powell,
Ferguson,	Quinn,
Foster,	Reid,
Ganong,	Robertson,
Gillies,	Robinson,
Gillet,	Roche,
Haggart,	Rosamond,
Hodgins,	Sproule,
Ingram,	Taylor,
Ives,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Kaulbach,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Klock,	Hibbert),
Kloepfer,	Tyrwhitt,
LaRivière,	Wallace,
Macdonald (King's),	Wilson, and
MacLaren,	Wood (Brockville).—65.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bain,	Jameson,
Bazinet,	Joly de Lotbinière
Beausoleil,	(Sir Henri),
Beith,	Landerkin,
Belcourt,	Lang,
Bernier,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bertram,	Legris,
Bethune,	Lemieux,
Blair,	Lewis,
Blanchard,	Lister,
Borden (King's),	Livingston,
Bostock,	Logan,
Bourassa,	Macdonald (Huron),
Britton,	Macdonell (Selkirk),
Brodeur,	Mackie,
Brown,	MacPherson,
Burnett,	McGregor,
Calvert,	McGugan,
Cameron,	McHugh,
Carroll,	McInnes,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McIsaac,
Casey,	McLennan (Ivernass),
Champagne,	McMillan,
Choquette,	McMullen,
Christie,	Malouin,
Copp,	Maxwell,
Costigan,	Meigs,
Cowan,	Migneault,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Monet,
Davis,	Morrison,
Dechêne,	Mulock,
Domville,	Oliver,
Douglas,	Parmalee,
Dupré,	Paterson,
Dyment,	Penny,
Edwards,	Pettet,
Ellis,	Préfontaine,
Erb,	Proulx,

Ethier,
Featherston,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Fortin,
Frost,
Gauthier,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Godbout,
Graham,
Guay,
Guité,
Hale,
Haley,
Harwood,
Heyd,
Hughes,
Hurley,
Hutchison,

Ratz,
Richardson,
Rinfret,
Rogers,
Ross,
Russell,
Rutherford,
Savard,
Scriver,
Semple,
Sifton,
Snetsinger,
Somerville,
Stenson,
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Tarte,
Tolmie,
Tucker,
Turcot, and
Yeo.—119.

Amendment negatived.

House divided on motion of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) for the second reading of the Bill.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bain,
Bazinet,
Beausoleil,
Beith,
Belcourt,
Bernier,
Bertram,
Bethune,
Blair,
Borden (King's),
Bostock,
Bourassa,
Britton,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Burnett,
Calvert,
Cameron,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Champagne,
Choquette,
Christie,
Copp,
Cowan,
Davies (Sir Louis),
Davis,
Dechêne,
Domville,
Douglas,
Dupré,
Dyment,
Edwards,
Ellis,
Ethier,
Featherston,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Fortin,
Frost,
Gauthier,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,

Joly de Lotbinière
(Sir Henri),
Landerkin,
Lang,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Legris,
Logan,
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Lister,
Livingston,
Logan,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonell (Selkirk),
Mackie,
MacPherson,
McGregor,
McGugan,
McHugh,
McIsaac,
McLennan (Inverness),
McMillan,
McMullen,
Malouin,
Maxwell,
Meigs,
Migneault,
Monet,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Parmalee,
Paterson,
Penny,
Pettet,
Préfontaine,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Richardson,
Rinfret,
Ross,
Russell,
Rutherford,
Savard,
Scriver,
Semple,

Godbout,
Graham,
Guay,
Guité,
Haley,
Harwood,
Heyd,
Hughes,
Hurley,
Hutchison,
Jameson,

Sifton,
Snetsinger,
Somerville,
Stenson,
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Tarte,
Tolmie,
Tucker,
Turcot, and
Yeo.—111.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Beattie,
Bell (Addington),
Bell (Pictou),
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blanchard,
Borden (Halifax),
Broder,
Cargill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carscallen,
Chauvin,
Clancy,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Costigan,
Craig,
Davin,
Dugas,
Earle,
Erb,
Ferguson,
Foster,
Ganong,
Gillies,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hale,
Hodgins,
Ingram,
Ives,
Kaulbach,
Klock,
Kloepfer,
LaRivière,
Macdonald (King's),
MacLaren,

Maclean,
McAlister,
McCleary,
McCormick,
McDougall,
McInerney,
McInnes,
McLennan (Glengarry),
McNeill,
Marcotte,
Martin,
Mills,
Monk,
Montague,
Moore,
Morin,
Oliver,
Osler,
Pope,
Powell,
Quinn,
Reid,
Robertson,
Robinson,
Roche,
Rogers,
Rosamond,
Sproule,
Taylor,
Tupper (Sir Charles),
Tupper (Sir Charles
Hibbert),
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Wilson, and
Wood (Brockville).—72.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.

Opposition.

Messieurs

Angers,
Campbell,
Wood (Hamilton),
Gibson,
Madore,
Charlton,
Lavergne,
Fraser (Guysborough),
Fraser (Lambton),
McClure,
Desmarais,

Casgrain,
Kendry,
Gilmour,
Corby,
Poupore,
Roddick,
Prior,
Seagram,
Tisdale,
Henderson,
Dupont,

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would suggest to my hon. friend that we proceed from day to day with the committee stage of the Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I will have to ask my hon. friend to proceed in

the usual way in this case. There has been no opportunity, as he knows for dealing with any private business, and I think he should place his motion on the Notice paper in the ordinary way.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. That will only give Monday, because I think it is only fair that we should take this up Tuesday and proceed with it from day to day.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I should like to call the attention of my hon. friend to a telegram which appeared in the New York press as coming from Ottawa

New York, March 10.—The "Press" has the following from Ottawa:—"Sir Julian Pauncefote has informed the Canadian Ministry officially that he has arranged a convention with the United States, whereby the Alaskan boundary dispute has been settled. Under the terms of the convention the British Government has conceded the claim of the United States that the three marine leagues should be measured from the shore of the mainland, and should proceed along the shores of the inlets, which are thus recognized as arms of the ocean, and not as rivers. The contention of the British and of the Canadian Governments was that the three-league limit should begin on the oceanward side of the island, and that the delimitating line should be run across the inlets and not follow their shores. These inlets are numerous, and extend into the mainland a great distance, and the decision, therefore, is of much importance to the United States. The United States has agreed to the British retaining the boundary on the limit of Chilkoot Pass and the White Pass, because in the Russo-British agreement of 1825 the line of demarcation was fixed as one running along the tops of mountains. The decision, while not entirely unexpected by the Cabinet, is regarded with disfavour. It was understood that the British Government was irritated at the forwardness of the Canadian Ministry, but it was not thought that the surrender would be so sweeping as it is.

I read this to my hon. friend, as it has been put in my hands, and as it appears to have been forwarded from Ottawa to New York press. I do not, for a moment, suppose it possible that it contains the truth, but I draw the attention of my hon. friend to it. In this connection, some measures ought to be taken to prevent, if possible, communications of this kind being sent to the United States press by the Ottawa press. Certainly, so far as this House has any jurisdiction over the parties connected with it.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I need not tell my hon. friend that there is not a word of truth in all that.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I did not expect there was.

Motion agreed to, and the House, adjourned at 5.15 a.m. (Friday).

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 11th March, 1898.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 66) respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Rutherford, by Mr. Flint.)

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the London and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Lister, by Mr. Flint.)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Montfort Colonization Railway Company, and to change its name to the Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Bourassa.)

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Britton.)

RESTRICTION ON JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. **McINNES** moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 70) to amend the Chinese Immigration Act so as to extend its application to Japanese—and to provide for a more equitable distribution of the revenue derived therefrom. He said: In briefly explaining the provisions of the Bill I may say that it contemplates extending the restrictions which are now placed upon Chinese immigration, to the immigration of Japanese. You are aware that we now impose a tax of \$50 per head upon Chinese immigrants. My hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Maxwell), has introduced a Bill this session to increase that restriction to \$500 per head. The Bill I introduced to-day contemplates a similar increase on the immigration of Japanese. When this Bill comes up for the second reading I will be prepared to go over the reasons why a similar restriction should be placed upon the people of that nationality. There is a common idea that there exists a material distinction between the character of the Japanese and the Chinese, in consequence of which some people may be disposed to place a restriction upon the immigration of Chinese while they are not prepared to place a restriction upon the immigration of Japanese. I may say, however, Mr. Speaker, in reference to that view that the only class of Chinese that are aimed at under the present Act are the lowest class, and the only class of Japanese that it is contemplated to exclude by this Bill, are the lowest class, the class that come to our country as labourers of the most degraded and menial sort, who are practically slaves, and against whom it is absolutely impossible

for white labourers to successfully compete. Another feature of this Bill deals with the distribution of the revenue which is derived under the Chinese Act. As you are aware, the province in which the revenue is collected is entitled under the present Act to one-quarter of the revenue. Now, it has been found by experience that, by reason of the large number of Chinese in British Columbia, the expenses of maintaining jails, asylums, hospitals, and for the administration of justice, are very materially increased. In addition, the people of that province are also put to the expense of maintaining a station for Chinese lepers exclusively, because there are no others. Now, it is felt out there that if we are compelled to have this wretched class of humanity among us, we should not at least be placed in any position of pecuniary disadvantage on account of their presence. I do not think it can be contended for a moment that this is a kind of tax from which the Dominion should seek to raise a revenue further than may be required to defray the expenses of the working of the Act. Any revenue over and above that may fairly be handed over to the province which has to make so large an increased expenditure on account of the presence of the Chinese. With these explanations I move the first reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 71) further to amend the Weights and Measures Act. He said: I would like to draw the attention of the House to some provisions in this Bill. Two or three days ago the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), introduced a Bill which he asked me afterwards to incorporate in this Bill; therefore, I think it might be well to give some explanations to those hon. members who may take an interest in the changes that I propose to make.

The second section of the Bill fixes the weights per bushel of various grains and produce raised by our farmers. When we go into Committee of the Whole I may take occasion to compare these weights with the weights prevailing up to this time, and hon. members will then be able to appreciate the nature of the changes proposed. I may mention one among them, one which we are requested to make by the farmers of the North-west, where, it is known, they raise a great quantity of flaxseed. Up to this time, and according to the weight of law which I am now seeking to amend, a bushel of flaxseed was fixed at 60 pounds. Now, it happens that in England and in the States, and wherever flaxseed is raised, a bushel is only taken to weigh 56 pounds; while here

according to the present law, our farmers are obliged, if they sell by the bushel, to deliver 60 pounds. It has been thought advisable, among other changes, to recommend that change, and to put the bushel at the same weight as that which is allowed for a bushel in other countries. There are several other questions that are likely to arise. For instance, the hon. member for Laval has introduced a Bill for altering the legal weight of a bushel of potatoes. According to the law as it stands to-day a bushel of potatoes ought to weigh 60 pounds. Hon. members read quotations from the "Witness" and other Montreal papers, and drew attention to the fact that this weight of 60 pounds is only reached when the potatoes come out of the ground and are in a more or less damp condition and there are particles of soil attached to them. When they have been kept a few months their weight is considerably reduced. As it happens that in nearly all the large cities municipal by-laws provide for the confiscation of goods sold on the market when they do not come up to the weight prescribed by law, it becomes necessary to reduce the standard weight to suit the average size of bags. A number of cases were quoted by the hon. member for Laval in which potatoes were confiscated because the bags were short by two pounds.

There is another question, and it is a very complicated one in regard to hardship endured by farmers in connection with the sale of milk to dealers. It was brought before the House on two different occasions, in 1892 and 1893. In 1893, as I see by "Hansard," there was a very full discussion of the subject. Milk forwarded to cities is sent in cans on the morning trains, these cans being supplied by the dealers, and the milk is afterwards emptied into smaller cans and delivered to customers. At one time it was agreed that these cans should represent 8 gallons; but lately when the dealers have supplied the cans it has been found that many of them hold 9 or 9½ gallons, and this is the ground of complaint by the farmers. Of course the cans must be filled, otherwise the milk will suffer while in transit in the cars, and it can easily be understood that when a farmer supplies ten or twenty cans a day and he finds each can contains 9 or 9½ gallons and is only paid for 8 gallons, he has a ground for serious complaint, and this complaint is very general, especially by farmers in the neighbourhood of Toronto. During the discussion in 1893 the hon. member for Stanstead stated that the department had attempted to grapple with the question, but it had proved one of the greatest difficulty. The officers could not be expected to remain on the market so as to ascertain what use was made of measures or scales, and it is easy to see how difficult it would be for any department to carry out such an inspection. It was proposed

at one time to adopt the standard which we are trying to introduce all round, namely, sale by weight. This system does not appear to be practicable in the case of milk on account of confusion that would arise on the arrival of milk trains containing a large number of cans. When the House is in committee on this Bill I trust hon. members will endeavour to aid in arriving at some adequate system to remove the existing hardship, for it is evidently our duty to try and introduce some remedy.

The third clause provides for the more frequent verification of scales and weights. By the present law there is only one inspection made in two years for which the department, has a right to charge, and even then the expenses are so great that there is a deficiency every year of about \$40,000. There are two classes of inspection, compulsory and non-compulsory. What may be called non-compulsory may include bakers, grocers, confectioners and others of that class. The people can protect themselves if there is fraud in the use of scales used by these classes of traders. If a man goes to a grocery and buys five pounds of sugar, either he or his wife will soon find out if the weight is light, and the purchaser can then go to another grocer or baker and is not obliged to trade with the man who has cheated him. So the Government does not propose to ask for any change of the law in regard to these classes, because the public can protect themselves. But there are other cases which come under the compulsory class that it is important should be dealt with, I refer to grain elevators, coal scales and scales at railway stations. If a farmer takes to an elevator two or three loads of wheat he has to accept the weight given, for he cannot go elsewhere on account of the question of travelling, as the nearest elevator may be 50 or 60 miles away.

In the coal mines of Cape Breton the coal miners are paid by the ton. As hon. gentlemen know, the coal is dumped down on the scales sometimes from a great height, and it will be understood how impossible it is for these scales to stand the wear and tear of that system for two years, receiving as they do so many tons of coal per day. The workmen in the coal mines must be excused if, as is the case more or less with uneducated men, they mistrust the dealings of those for whom they work and so they have sent several protests against the present system and demand that the scales should be inspected more frequently than at present. If we want to make the miners feel that they receive justice, it is evident that our inspection will only be a farce if it is made only once in two years. We therefore propose under this Bill to place at the disposal of the mine-owners a certain number of our fifty-pound and other weights, and to try to induce the employers to agree with their workmen to test the scales as frequently as it is felt

there is ground for complaint. It is thought that in each mine an intelligent workman would be found who had the confidence of his fellow-workmen, and whom they would select to represent them at the inspection of the scales. There would be a representative of the mine-owners on the other side, and thus it would be insured without any additional expense that the scales were correct. By this proposal we would also accomplish the very desirable result of establishing mutual confidence between the mine-owners and their workmen.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says he has provided for the verification of the scales in the case of coal mines. Does the Bill apply to other large operations in business, where there is a great deal bought and sold and weighed over the same scale?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It would be well to apply that verification of scales to other industries as well as to coal mines, but there are certain difficulties in the way. It is very easy to select a man to represent the workmen in a coal mine where there is a large staff of miners gathered together, but in the case of wheat elevators, for instance, this would be difficult, as the farmers who are interested in the latter are scattered all over the country. If it would be possible to find a man residing near an elevator who would have the confidence of the farmers, and who would assume the responsibilities, I would be only too glad to meet this case and to send a set of these fifty or twenty-five pound weights to the elevators. I attach great importance to the fostering of confidence between the two parties interested, namely, the farmer or miner on one side, and the owner of the elevator or mine on the other. It will be seen at once that this change will entail no extra expenditure. What makes the expense at the present with our Weights and Measures Act is that inspectors have to travel miles over the country with a load of weights in order to test these heavy scales. By this system we can save the time and expense of sending an inspector. There is another matter which this Bill is intended to provide for. It is a singular fact that while in England and the United States—I do not know as to other mercantile countries—spring scales are admitted to inspection, they have never been so admitted in Canada. We have had voluminous requests from dealers all over the Dominion asking that we should inspect spring scales, but the department has had a natural reluctance to grant the request, for the reason that in an ordinary beam scale everything is open to the naked eye and any person can see that it is correct, while in the case of the spring scale the mechanism is completely out of sight, and one can readily understand that if the spring is not of the best quality it may get rusty or strained, and then it becomes

inaccurate. I believe, however, that the time has come when we should give our retail traders the advantages of the inspection of these spring scales.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question with regard to the official who is supposed to look after the scales at the mines, particularly at the mines of Cape Breton. Does the hon. gentleman mean that this Bill is only to apply to the mines at Cape Breton?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Oh, no. It is to be general. I only mentioned the mines of Cape Breton as an example. Last year we decided to have a special inspection made for these mines, at the request of the parties interested. As the hon. gentleman knows, there are a large number of mines there in a small compass.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). While economy in various directions is very commendable, yet I think the public is quite willing that a certain expenditure should be made in order that the public interest in this, as in other matters, should be protected. In the Island of Cape Breton, in a comparatively small area there is a population of 100,000 people. That island, I may say in passing, was for thirty-six years a province of itself, with all the paraphernalia appertaining to a government. For years past there was an inspector of weights and measures in that island; but with a view to economy, as the hon. Minister has stated in a letter to myself, that office has been wiped out. Whether an unpaid official such as that honest man he referred to, can be picked up at every mine, and whether such a man would be in a position to perform his duty so as to give satisfaction to the mine-owners and the miners, remains to be seen. This is a new measure, and one we are quite unacquainted with in that part of the country. At first blush, it appears to me, that it would be a case of what is everybody's business is nobody's business, and when there is no regular and permanent official to see that justice is done. I fear that the business of looking after the weights and measures will be neglected. When this Bill is up for its second reading, I will be prepared to go into the question as to whether the law proposed to be introduced by this Bill can with advantage be applied to the Island of Cape Breton.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When we provide for calling both parties, the owner of the mine and the workmen together, it is not for the regular inspection, and we provide for an appeal to the inspector.

Mr. McDougall. I am very glad to know that it is the intention of the hon. Minister to provide for more frequent inspection of the scales and measures used in connection with the development of our coal

mines. I had the honour, a few days ago, to present several petitions from the miners of Cape Breton, asking for a more frequent inspection of the scales used in the weighing of coal at the mines. Those petitions set forth that, for various reasons, the scales are not considered to be properly or sufficiently inspected, and they ask for a monthly inspection. I understand, from the explanation given by the hon. Minister, that he proposes to amend the Act so as to give power to the miners to have a local inspection, so to speak, by a person in the immediate vicinity of the coal mines, who will be available at any time in case of difference between themselves and the proprietors of the mines in respect to the scales. In that connection, I would like to understand from the hon. Minister, whether the intention is to have that inspector appointed by the Government, or whether he will consent to give the miners, so long as, I understand, there is no salary attached to the position, the option of selecting from among themselves a suitable man at each coal mine for this purpose—a man who would also have the confidence of the coal mine proprietors or act in conference with their representatives. I would further recommend, that in case of a dispute, it should be in the power of the aggrieved party to call to their assistance the services of the general inspector of the district. As I understand, at present, in the Island of Cape Breton, there is no inspector. The late inspector having died about two years ago, his position has not been filled, and the inspection is not attended to. Understanding that it is the intention to appoint one, I would like the hon. Minister to keep in view the necessity of having this paid official of the department within as near reach as possible of the great centres of those coal mines where the greatest and most important business is being done. Moreover, in case of calling upon the chief inspector, which is frequently likely to occur, the expenses to the department would be much less by having him within as convenient reach as possible. These are points which I would like the hon. Minister to understand as important to the people of my constituency and the public generally, particularly to those who are interested in this matter, and who have petitioned for this amendment to the Inspection Act.

Mr. Maclean. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, if it is his intention to introduce legislation providing for a standard milk can?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. A moment ago, I explained to the House the difficulty that exists of providing for that, and I referred to what took place in 1892 and 1893. If my hon. friend likes, I will be very glad to go with him over the discussion which took place at that time, as reported in "Hansard," and from which he will see the difficulty that exists. When we are in

the Committee of the Whole, it will be the time to consider these details.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADULTERATION ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 72) to amend the Adulteration Act. He said: Considerable expenditure is undertaken by the Dominion Government in efforts to prevent the adulteration of food and fertilizers, a very important work in the interest of the public. We have found it difficult under the existing Act, however, to reach the parties who are really guilty of offences against the law. Our officers, for instance, go to a town or city and collect from dealers samples of food offered for sale—mustard, honey, coffee, and so on. The samples thus collected are submitted to the analyst. But, even where adulteration is proven, very often the dealer from whom the sample has been got is not the party morally guilty of adulteration. As we feel sure that these parties are not guilty, in many cases we do not sue them, and in that case, the \$10 or \$12 paid to the analyst, as well as the expense of collecting the samples is so much lost. We wish to provide means to reach the really guilty party, who, in many cases, is the manufacturer who put up the goods which are offered for sale by the retailer. It is provided in the Bill that if the dealer in whose hands the adulterated articles are found testifies, giving the name of the manufacturer from whom he bought the goods, the manufacturer will be prosecuted and the retailer called as a witness. In one word the object of the Bill is to provide an easier and cheaper mode of reaching parties who are guilty of adulteration. My hon. friend Mr. Wood (Brockville) will know from his experience, how difficult it has been to carry out the law in this respect.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not desire to discuss the Bill at this stage. But I may say that I sympathize with the hon. gentleman's efforts to improve the law respecting adulteration. I would ask the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue if any steps have been taken, based upon the British law, to make standards of pure food?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When my hon. friend reads the Bill he will see that a good many of these matters have been dealt with. I cannot say that we have met every case, but I may mention that attempt is made to distinguish between adulteration with articles that are of an noxious character and adulteration with harmless substances.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

GAS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 73) to amend the Gas Inspection Act. He said: This is a Bill of only two or three lines. Hitherto the classification of gas companies for the collection of the yearly fees has been based on the number of customers. But in many cases one customer has several meters. The object of the Bill is to base the classification upon the number of meters and not upon the number of customers.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PETROLEUM INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 74) to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act. He said: This is a Bill of only two sections. Under the present law petroleum in unmarked packages must not be kept or offered for sale. It is difficult, however, in many cases to prove that the oil has been kept or offered for sale. Of course as my hon. friend knows, a great deal of petroleum is smuggled. The object of this Bill is to provide that even the having in possession of petroleum in unmarked packages shall be an infringement of the law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INLAND REVENUE ACT.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 75) further to amend the Inland Revenue Act. He said: I need not take up the time of the House in explaining at this stage the different clauses of the Bill. I may, however, mention one point. I was much astonished when, some time ago, I found that the courts had dismissed one of the cases brought by the department for illicit distillation. The still was found in the defendant's possession, but as it was not found on his premises nor in the house he occupied, the law as it now stands, would not cover the case.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 76) to provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and for the retirement of members of the civil service. He said: This is in the exact language of the Bill which I had the honour to introduce

last session, and provides for the abolition of the present Civil Service Superannuation Act and the substitution therefor of an Act for the retirement of civil servants, the two Bills being radically different. I need not point out the features of the present law, as they are familiar to all hon. gentlemen. The present Bill provides for the creation of a retirement fund by deductions from the salaries of officials, and by these deductions being funded and placed to the credit of the officials, and interest computed thereon every half year at the rate of 5 per cent. The fund so created will belong to the officer or his legal representatives whenever the officer ceases to be in the service. In this respect it differs materially from the present law, which only contemplates a retiring fund for the benefit of the officer himself during his lifetime, making no provision whatever for his family. To-day if a civil servant dies in harness, his family gets nothing, his contributions go to the survivors on a sort of tontine principle, so it works hardly on the families of those who die in the service. This Bill provides, as I have intimated, for a fund that should belong to the officer himself or his family in case of death; but it is not within the reach of creditors, or assignable during his period of office. It will be a fund that will enable an officer to withdraw from the service if his interests suggests it. At present when a man enters the civil service his whole interest under the Act is to continue in it during his life. That state of affairs is perhaps not desirable, as it keeps the officers almost in a position of bondage to the Crown, for they cannot retire except under certain conditions set forth in the Act and have any advantage. Therefore they linger in the service when perhaps their own interest and the interest of the public would be served if they withdrew from it. Under the proposed substituted Bill they will always have this fund within their grasp in case they desire to separate themselves from the service. Many other reasons may suggest themselves for the Bill, but without mentioning them, I move for leave to introduce it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not rise for the purpose of offering any remarks upon the explanation of the Postmaster General with regard to this Bill, but I desire to ask him, in anticipation of a motion on the paper which may not be reached for some time, to lay upon the Table of the House the information asked for with reference to the superannuations that have already taken place. I think it is desirable that we should have that information before we come to a second reading of this Bill. I allude to the information that was asked for connected with the superannuations that have taken place within a comparatively recent period.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. An order of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The notice has been given, but as I say, it may not be reached for some time.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We will reach it on Monday.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That will probably answer the purpose.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no doubt that when the House makes the order it will be complied with promptly. At the same time I do not see that the Bill in question is in any way connected with the matters to which my hon. friend refers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If we had these facts before us, it would assist hon. gentlemen a good deal by showing the absolute necessity of taking the powers of superannuation now existing out of the hands of the Government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We propose to take the exercise of superannuation out of the hands of the Government altogether by this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

POSTAL FACILITIES IN THE KOOTENAY DISTRICT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of Day are called, I want to call the attention of the Postmaster General, and of the Minister of Customs, to a matter of a very urgent character. I will read a telegram which I received early this morning: From Sand Point, B.C.

The arrangements made by the Government for postal facilities, customs accommodations and other improvements necessary to develop the resources of the Kootenay district in conjunction with the construction of the Crow's Nest Railway, are seriously obstructed and the contractors harassed beyond conception by the apathy of postal department and cast-iron rules of the customs. A certified cheque for \$200 was posted by the manager Union Bank, Macleod, on 1st March to customs, Crow's Nest Landing, B.C., to pay duties. The bank wired to that effect, but the orders are "hard cash" or "hold up." This part of British Columbia produces nothing but mountain and refractory ore, so we have to get our forage and other produce from Montana, forty-five miles south of the railway line. There are no facilities for storage, and our oats and hay are piled out in the open, subject to pilferage and other discrepancies till our bank cheque arrives. next Wednesday, 16th instant, or the time it would take me to go half around the world. Kindly help me out and hand this to Press Gallery.

I thought the better course to adopt was to bring this despatch under the immediate notice of the Post Office Department and the Department of Customs.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Can the hon. gentleman say who signs the telegram?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is signed by R. B. Dixon, purchasing agent for Egan & Co. I do not know the parties. The telegram explains fully the matter; that the Customs Department, although they had information from the manager of the bank that there was a cheque for the purpose, refuse to take an accepted cheque, given under authority of the manager of the bank, and therefore all the goods have been left in the open until postal facilities enable this company to be able to comply with the demand. There must be something radically wrong in the administration of the department to permit such a monstrous inconvenience to parties to whom this may be a matter of the very gravest consequence.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Pater-son). All I can say is, that so far as I am personally aware, what the hon. gentleman has read is news to me. Whether there is any correspondence in the department or anything of that kind I will at once take steps to ascertain. The writer of the telegram does not state that he has had any communication with the department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He states what the action of the department was.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is giving prominence to a complaint which may not be well founded.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He takes the responsibility of making the complaint.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). So far as my knowledge goes, this is the first time I am made aware of anything wrong in the postal facilities at Sand Point, Kootenay, to serve a moving body of contractors who are constructing several miles of railway per day. It occurs to me that the proper course of procedure in regard to departmental matter is not to publish telegrams in the press, but to apply to the proper department to deal with the matter, and if thereafter the case is not dealt with, it then may become a grievance and ground for complaint. If the hon. gentleman had in advance furnished me with the information I would now have been in a position to state whether the matter had ever been before the department. I observe from the telegram that these contractors are exceedingly anxious to purchase agricultural supplies at Montana in the United States. That may be a very necessary step and it may not; and I should like to know the necessities of the case before, for my part, I am prepared to lend assistance in purchasing supplies in the United States, if they can be purchased in Canada.

MUNICIPAL REGULATIONS IN THE YUKON.

Mr. DAVIN. I desire to ask the Minister of the Interior this question: Pending

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the introduction of the legislation promised in the Speech from the Throne respecting the Yukon district, what modus vivendi has been established between the Department of the Interior and the Government of the North-west Territories as regards the municipal government of the Yukon? Take, for instance, one detail. As regards liquor permits, a number of my constituents are anxious to get information, which I am not in a position to give them, as to whether the permission to allow liquor to enter the Yukon is at the present moment under the control of the local government or under the control of the Government at Ottawa. I do not wish to raise a question of law as to the party in whom the authority inheres—I have an opinion on that question myself—but I apprehend that some arrangement has been come to between the department and the North-west Government; and what I want to know is, under whose authority issuance of permits in the Yukon rests, if any.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I desire to say in reply to the hon. gentleman that in so far as municipal law and regulations are concerned, the Yukon district is in the same position as any unorganized portions of the North-west Territories, and is administered in the same way. No change has been made, and it is not necessary to anticipate the introduction of the legislation which will be brought down during the present session of Parliament. So far as liquor permits are concerned, the matter is in abeyance, as I stated in the House some time ago in answer to a question respecting the Yukon. The Government of the North-west Territories claim that permits should be issued by the Lieutenant-Governor, with the advice of his Executive Council. That is not the interpretation placed on the statute by the Government here; but there is no real dispute between the two Governments.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. Minister state what is the interpretation put on the statute by the Government here.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Government consider that the changes that took place in the constitution of the North-west Territory have not altered the position so far as issuing permits are concerned, but the matter has been held in abeyance and no permits are being issued either by the Governor of the North-west Territories or by this Government, and will not be issued until the matter has been finally settled. Correspondence has taken place, and it has been suggested by myself that one of the members of the North-west Territorial Government should come to Ottawa for the purpose of discussing the matter with the members of the Government here. That is the way the matter stands at the present time—nothing is being done.

THE TRANSPORTATION QUESTION.

Mr. MAOLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw the attention of the House to a very important matter in regard to the transportation question, and in order to put myself in order I intend to conclude my remarks with a motion. We have heard a good deal in this House with respect to the Yukon Railway proposition, that it was one which was urgent. There is another and a still greater proposition before this country, which was outlined in yesterday's "Globe," in which there is no such urgency as is put forward in behalf of the Yukon proposition, and it is in order to bring this question before the House and give the Government an opportunity to institute some new departure in regard to the railway question that I now bring this matter up. The article in question appears on the first page of yesterday's "Globe," and is headed "The Railway Situation," and there is a second heading, "Great Projects Now Before Parliament for the Development of the Country." The article, after the introduction, goes on to say:

Not since the completion of the main line of the C.P.R. have so many great railway enterprises been before the public. The C.P.R. is pushing through the Crow's Nest Pass into southern British Columbia to tap the rich fields of the Kootenay and ultimately to reach the coast.

It then proceeds to give further details in respect to the Crow's Nest Pass line, and continues:

MANITOBA'S NEW OUTLET.

But while the Canadian Pacific has secured for itself this profitable field, its grasp of another important portion of its traffic is unquestionably loosening. There has long been a feeling in the province of Manitoba against the Canadian Pacific Railway because of alleged excessive rates charged for carrying grain to the east, and especially to Fort William during the season of navigation. An attempt was made some years ago to secure railway competition by subsidizing the Northern Pacific Railway to extend its lines from the American border northward into Manitoba; that extension failed of its purpose, although not altogether useless. Mr. Greenway and his associates cast about for another means of securing cheaper freights to Lake Superior, and for some time negotiations were conducted with a view to securing a railway from Winnipeg to Duluth. Not a little opposition was aroused in eastern Canada to this proposal as one little calculated to bind the provinces closer together. Mr. Greenway was urged to secure his competing line through Canada instead of diverting trade to the ports of the United States. The belief is that arrangements have been practically completed compassing this end. The Ontario and Rainy River Railway, the charter of which is controlled by Mr. William Mackenzie, of Toronto, is projected to run from a point on the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western (a short line running out of Port Arthur) through the gold fields of the Lake of the Woods region to a point on the boundary of Manitoba. It will be met there by the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway, the

charter of which is also controlled by Mr. Mackenzie, and which, if built, will earn a Dominion land grant. These two lines will give a new grain route from Manitoba to Lake Superior.

A Strong Combination.

It may be asked what advantage it will be for Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Greenway to arrange for a line to Lake Superior from Winnipeg so long as the C.P.R. holds the interior lines from which the grain must come to Winnipeg. The position is really simple. Between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie there is a line called the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway, the charter of which contains a clause reserving to the Manitoba Government the right to grant running powers. From Portage la Prairie to Gladstone by the Manitoba North-western Railway a similar arrangement can be made. At Gladstone, the Dauphin Railway, built and controlled by Mr. Mackenzie, is reached, and it runs to Lake Winnipegosis. With the co-operation of the Manitoba Government, therefore, and the granting of the necessary running powers over the links mentioned, Mr. Mackenzie can secure a continuous line from Port Arthur to Lake Winnipegosis. This, however, is not all, for he is understood to have a considerable interest in the Hudson's Bay Railway, which would really be an extension of the Dauphin Railway, the construction of the latter road being the first stage of a road from Manitoba to the Bay. These railway-building projects are set forth here to show that the C.P.R.'s hold of Manitoba will be greatly lessened by the construction of the Ontario and Rainy River and the Manitoba South-eastern by Mr. Mackenzie and his associates.

Ontario and Rainy River Railway.

The time for commencing the Ontario and Rainy River Railway was extended to-day by the Railway Committee of the House of Commons, and in the course of the debate it was asserted that the Ontario and Rainy River charter had fallen into the hands of the C.P.R. This, of course, if true, would mean that the road, while it would still be of advantage to the Ontario gold fields, would be useless as a factor in the proposed scheme. Your correspondent is in a position to state that this assertion is absolutely untrue, and that it is the intention of the holders of the Ontario and Rainy River charter to build and operate in competition with the C.P.R. This notwithstanding the cordial relations existing between Mr. Mackenzie and the management of the C.P.R. It is indeed probable that the actual work of construction will be commenced this year on that part of the railway from Winnipeg to the Lake of the Woods. Here, therefore, we have a railway system in embryo involving the construction of 350 miles of road between Lake Superior and Winnipeg, and the establishment of lake connections with ports on Lakes Erie and Huron. Developments may be looked for during the session of the Manitoba Legislature, which begins to-day.

Then there is the third project and the writer goes on to explain something in connection with the Hudson Bay Railway, which I do not consider pertinent to the subject of my remarks. The writer goes on to say:

These projects total up to 2,200 miles, or over an eighth of the mileage of the existing railways of Canada. There is not one of them that a careful student of the development of the Domin-

ion would put a veto upon as of no value to the country at large. They are grouped here, that the reader may see at a glance the chief projects now under way for the development of the transportation system of Canada.

I consider that we have reached the crucial point in the transportation problem of this country. An effort has been made to solve that problem in the interests of the people and particularly of the interests of the people of the North-west. It is the duty of the Government to see that whatever legislation comes before this House, security ought to be provided that this competition will take place. A private Bill will come before this House—the one referred to in this article and which has been reported by the committee to the House—for the granting of an extension of time for the beginning of the construction of the Rainy River Railway. It is the duty of the Government, before allowing this Bill to go through, to have a clause inserted which will secure to the people the great objects outlined in the article of the "Globe."

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is transgressing the rules if he takes advantage of a motion to adjourn to discuss any order on the paper.

Mr. MACLEAN. I only wish to draw the attention of the Government to this question of railway competition. My position is this, that this Rainy River Railway Bill which is now before the House must be so amended—

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Order.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then I shall say that my position is that the Government should take care that running rights are given to other railways over any new road running from Port Arthur to Winnipeg. I want the Canadian Pacific Railway to have running rights over this Rainy River Railway or any other road between Port Arthur and Winnipeg. I believe that most of all the Grand Trunk Railway ought to have running rights over any railway from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, which is in the receipt of Government subsidy. This railway is in receipt of a subsidy—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot mention a private company, but must confine his remarks to the general subject.

Mr. MACLEAN. What I wish to impress upon the Government is that provision ought to be made for the protection of the public by allowing all railways running rights over any new lines. The Grand Trunk Railway in particular should have running rights over any new railway chartered to reach the province of Manitoba. So should the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if this be done the public will be protected. Further, there ought to be complete control taken by the Government over the question

Mr. MACLEAN.

of rates on any railway receiving a charter from this out. It will not do to put in a general clause, such as what is called the model clause, which is inserted in some Bills, but there should be a specific clause giving full protection to the people and full running powers to any railway in the country that may desire to obtain them. The country lying between Winnipeg and Port Arthur is the key to the whole transportation problem. It is like a funnel through which all traffic between east and west must pass, and the Government have the opportunity to-day to protect the public interests in a way they never had before. I trust that when any Bill comes before this House the Government will see that it provides sufficient protection to the public. Hon. members who come from the North-west, and who have in previous sessions complained of the tyranny of the Canadian Pacific Railway have now an opportunity to protect the interest of the country from which they come, and it rests upon them more than upon those of us who come from the east to see that that opportunity is not lost and protect the interests of not only Manitoba and the Territories but of British Columbia as well. Urgency is pleaded in connection with the Yukon Railway for the creation of a monopoly and the concession of a large land grant to the contractors and for the establishment in this country of a false measure of value, when acres of land are made the measure of value in connection with a railway proposition. Land is not the measure of value in this country; money is. Still it was said there was urgency, and we had to give lands and we had to give a monopoly. There is no reason for that to-day. The North-west is claiming consideration, the province of Manitoba is considering it, the province of Ontario is giving a large grant to it, and care must be taken now that the public interest should be protected. It is for this reason I call the attention of the Government to this article, and I trust the Government will make an explanation of what they intend to do and as to what protection they intend to afford the public treasury by allowing no private Bills to go through this House, which when once passed enables these corporations to take it in their hands to regulate and control the transportation question in this country. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Minister announces his policy on this question, I wish to add a few words to what has already been said. No public man in Canada to-day will deny that there is a strong and growing sentiment in favour of greater parliamentary control over railways. That sentiment is pressed upon our attention all over the country, and everywhere we see the evil effects of the loose system which now obtains, through the absence of control on behalf of the public, either by a

railway commission or by Parliament itself. We, as representatives of the people, are induced to turn our attention to some means by which that evil can be remedied. It is held that while we subsidize railways liberally from the treasury of the country or bonus them by land or other grants and give them wide power in their franchises, it is also our duty to exercise control over them in the interests of the people whose property we give away. Year after year railway companies come to this Parliament for charters to build lines competing with those already established, and which existing lines perhaps may have been subsidized by both the Dominion and provincial Parliaments. The desire for railway competition is so strong that public sentiment supports the representatives of the people in incorporating these new companies, and also in giving subsidies to them. This action is taken for the purpose of securing better transportation facilities, and in order to guarantee railway competition. But no sooner is the competing line in operation than a secret agreement is reached putting the two roads under the one management, or the stock of both companies is bought up by one, and consequently the public receive no benefit whatever from the grants which they have made. The serious question then presents itself to us as to what we can do to gain that control over railways which up to the present we have failed to secure. These corporations are the creatures of this Parliament, but the creatures appear to be greater than their creators, and the public ask if it is not possible that some remedy be found for the existing state of affairs. If we subsidize two railways to get competition, and if our object in this direction is frustrated, why should Parliament not hold the control so that the public may get what they are entitled to on account of what they have paid. The great question is, how this end can be accomplished without our going too far. Some contend that Parliament should hold control over the roads even to the extent of determining what the freight rates should be, but I confess that I have never yet been able to see clearly the justice of our going that far, at all events, to the extent of Parliament saying just exactly what the freight rates should be. It appears to me that we could not be in possession of the data that would enable us accurately to calculate what would be a fair or unfair freight rate in every part of the country, for it must be remembered that we are not experts and have not devoted our time and attention to that business. But over and above what may take place under ordinary circumstances, there are extraordinary conditions arising out of the transportation question which Parliament ought to direct its attention to. If we do not think it wise to control the rates, we might go so far perhaps as to compel the great rail-

way corporations to give other companies running powers over their lines, and in this way we might secure competition without building two railroads where one only is necessary to do the work and without involving the country in great additional expense. In the interests of the people of this country, and in order to settle this vexed question of the transportation of our products, Parliament should not only recognize that it has this right and power, but it should exercise that power over these corporations which we have created. We give them liberal subsidies, we give them extensive franchises, we put in their hands instruments by which they can coin money faster than can any other enterprises, by watering their stock and by manipulating their charters one way and another; and yet we leave them supreme to treat the public just as they please. The day is coming and coming soon, when Parliament cannot refrain from taking action in this matter, and when, if Parliament does refrain, then the electorate will send other representatives here to carry out their wishes. Those who are observant of public matters know that this sentiment is growing rapidly, becoming stronger every day, and that we cannot shut our eyes to it much longer. It is the duty of the Government to outline its policy with regard to these great questions. The sooner that is done the better, because it will quiet the feeling of resentment in the country to-day; a feeling which may grow to such proportions as to reach beyond our control. It is sometimes said that a railway commission will accomplish this, but to my mind the experience of the world so far has been that railway commissions, though undoubtedly they have done much good, have not been equal to the occasion. It is also said that parliamentary control, so far as it has been exercised in the past, has signally failed to secure to the people the advantages from the competition of railways to which they are entitled by reason of the large subsidies and grants they have given, but, though railway commissions have failed in the past, and though Parliament has hitherto failed to exercise this beneficial influence on railway corporations, that is no reason why we should become supine or refrain from attempting any other remedy. It is a strong reason why we should grapple with this great problem, and the earlier the better; and if the means at our disposal prove to be insufficient, we should devise others that will meet the case. I apprehend that we can at least go so far as to tack on to every railway charter which we grant the condition that every railway shall have the right to run over the road and carry the trade of the country over it, rather than subsidize another road for the purpose of giving competition, which the experience of the past has proven to us most conclusively it rarely gives. Parliament can-

go that far, at least, and if the law is not sufficient to meet the case, we can amend it from time to time. But some people will say, you cannot run the traffic of two or three railways successfully over one line. We have illustrations to the contrary both in Canada and in the United States. I have here a clipping of a paper, which gives one or two illustrations of this, and I will read them for the benefit of those who think that cannot be done :

The track between Newark and Columbus, Ohio, thirty-three miles, was operated in common by the Baltimore and Ohio and the Pittsburg, Cincinnati and St. Louis railways for at least twenty-one years prior to 1887 ; also, the Cleveland and Toledo (afterwards the Lake Shore) and the Cleveland, Columbus and Cincinnati railroads made use of the track from Grafton, Ohio to Cleveland, a distance of twenty-four miles, for about twelve years prior to the same date above named.

Besides this, I need only mention the road from Toronto to Hamilton, one of the busiest roads in Canada. A portion of the New York Central road is also operated, and successfully operated, conjointly by two railways. By this means, we have the advantage of two railways with the cost of one. We have as much competition as we have in those cases where Parliament has subsidized two railways for the purpose of providing competition. There is no reason why what has been done in the cases I have cited cannot be done in others, and Parliament is justified in exercising that power whenever it is needed in the interest of the country. Take the road from Toronto to Gravenhurst. See how the trade of that section of country and of the great city of Toronto is hampered by the quarrels of two railway companies. Parliament subsidized, and subsidized liberally, one line, which is sufficient to carry all the trade, with the intention that it should be used by both railways. That could be done, if it were done agreeably by these two companies. But they have not done it, for reasons best known to themselves, but which are not known by this Parliament. Parliament designed that this should be done when it subsidized this line, in order that the benefit of competition should be secured over it ; but it is not secured and are we to sit idly by when the efforts we have made have proved abortive ? Rather this condition of things should stimulate us to use greater exertions to grapple with this growing and gigantic evil, and remedy it. It is for the purpose of putting myself on record with regard to this matter that I speak at the present time, for the purpose of letting the Government know what I regard as public opinion upon it, and for the purpose of getting some intimation from them at an early day as to what means they propose to Parliament to remedy this great evil which the public service are suffering and groaning under at the present time.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. JAMESON. Mr. Speaker, as I know a good deal about this proposed line, the opportunities of which have been referred to by the hon. member who alluded to it first, I would like to say a few words on the subject. It looks to me like a case of the most sudden conversion on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite that they should take the stand they have been taking, both in the late debate, and at present on the subject of railway monopoly. It is to the legislation of hon. gentlemen opposite that we owe all the difficulties under which the North-west is labouring to-day in the matter of railways. We are tied up in such a way that it becomes a very serious problem for the Government how they can relieve the people of the west from the situation in which they have been placed. We know that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was given certain great privileges such as have never been given to any other railway company in the world. It was given a transportation monopoly which caused almost a rebellion in the North-west, and which was bought off at a great cost to the people of this country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What the hon. gentleman says was bought off at a great cost to the people of Canada, I am in a position to tell him has never cost Canada one dollar and never will. The concessions made by the railway company are advantages to us, by which, instead of paying money, we are receiving it.

Mr. JAMESON. The people of Canada had to pay a large sum of money to get that privilege. It may be that owing to the settlement of that country it has not cost the people of Canada anything in money ; but I can tell the hon. gentleman that it cost the people of Canada a great deal in the loss of immigration it caused. There is no doubt that immigration has been greatly hindered by the existence of that monopoly. I have lived in that country for seventeen years, and I know whereof I am speaking. There is also an exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway from control of their rates for ever, or at any rate until ten per cent is paid on the cost of the railway. That of itself constitutes a monopoly which it is very difficult to deal with. And yet, in the face of all these difficulties, which have been caused by the vicious legislation of hon. gentlemen opposite in the course of eighteen years, they come here and pose as champions of the North-west, and as its saviours from this Government. However, Christianity teaches us that, while we should suspect, we should not despise sudden conversions, for we have all read the story of the penitent thief ; and therefore I am glad to welcome this sudden conversion of hon. gentlemen opposite, and to say that I am altogether in sympathy with the principles that have been enunciated. I think the time has come when we

should take up this railway problem and try to bring it to a successful issue. There is no doubt in the world that both in Ontario and in Manitoba the people believed that competition in railways was the solution of the difficulty. We have found out our mistake. We know how the people in Ontario voted bonuses to railways, and how the railway system of that province has now been absorbed into two great railway systems, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk. We have had the same difficulties in Manitoba. We gave the Northern Pacific a large bonus, and although we did receive a great benefit from the introduction of that railway, there is still a certain amount of monopoly, and we have found there as we have done in Ontario, that the railways do not compete. Consequently we have only one of two things to do. Government ownership of railways being apparently out of the question, what we ought to see is that the Government should exercise that control over railway rates which the Railway Act gives them, except in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We should further provide, as I believe the Manitoba Government intend to do, that wherever aid is given, a certain scale of maximum rates should be fixed.

Mr. MACLEAN. What about running rights?

Mr. JAMESON. I do not quite agree in what the hon. gentleman says. I think that when running powers are given, the railways to which they are given may be hampered in such a way that the privilege would not be effective. I believe, however, that in the Railway Act there is ample power given for the proper exercise by the Government of a control of rates. I understand that railway companies have to submit their schedules of rates to the Governor in Council, and if the Government is independent of the railway—which unfortunately has not always been the case in Canada—there is nothing to prevent the Government effectively exercising the control given them by the Railway Act. I am very glad to welcome the building of the railway outlined by the "Globe." It will be a very great benefit to my constituency and the people of Manitoba and the North-west generally. It will pass through an agricultural region and through the Rainy River district, where mines are constantly being opened up, and I have no doubt that the volume of grain taken out of the country is so large as to afford ample business for two lines of railways. I am very glad this matter has come up, and am entirely in sympathy with the idea of taking up this railway question and introducing legislation which will give the Government more effective control of railways than they have at present.

Mr. DAVIN. The Toronto "Globe" is exceedingly happy at present in having at its head a gentleman, with whom I have the honour of a slight acquaintance, of great journalistic ability, and under whose management the paper, in its literary make up, and also as a news gatherer has very much improved and ranks very high. I will say also that its correspondent in Ottawa—although I believe he is no friend of mine—for indefatigable industry and ability as a writer is deserving of all praise, but this has to be said about the editor and his staff, that while they have the ability to bring out a first-class paper at present, and for many moons back, nobody can read it without seeing that its main motive is not the enlightenment of the public but something behind. Take the article just quoted, any one reading it will see why it was written. It is a double leaded correspondence from Ottawa, and its object apparently is to give to the public of Canada information of what is being done at the capital in railway matters. The real object, however, is to call the attention of the people of Manitoba to a scheme that, I believe, will prove utterly delusive, and in regard to which the people of Manitoba will find themselves as completely duped and tricked as the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) knows they were some years ago with regard to another matter. Any one reading that article carefully will see that the suspicion creeps over the minds of the correspondents that in putting forward this railway of Mr. Greenway as a means of competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, people will see through the object Mr. Greenway has in view, because the correspondent says that although Mr. Mackenzie is a strong friend of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there cannot be the least doubt that this will give competition. We have all seen a gentleman here—I saw him on the right of the Chair—who used to be a member of this House, and is a member of the Manitoba Government—Mr. Bob Watson—and another gentleman I have seen about the corridors, who is one of the dark men working in the interests of the Manitoba Government, and we know there is an election pending in Manitoba, and that at this moment the Liberal party, if they went to the polls, could not come back with a baker's dozen.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIN. I know what I am talking about. The Liberal party is beaten in Manitoba, and one of the dodges to help Mr. Greenway to win the impending election that is certain to come after next session—

Mr. MCGREGOR. There will be no election in Manitoba for two years.

Mr. DAVIN. If the hon. gentleman wants to reply to me subsequently, he will have

every opportunity to do so. I would be glad if every hon. gentleman over there would treat me as I prefer to treat them. I would like to feel that I am addressing a number of British gentlemen meeting together to discuss questions, and it is no pleasure, but positive pain, to me when I have to waste time by taking one member after another, who interrupts me, and silencing him. If I were teaching school, it would not give me the least pleasure to have to take one of my little boys occasionally and give him a squeeze on the ear when he did not behave himself. Hon. gentlemen opposite have never had any cause to complain of me, and it would be better for the management of the business of this House if they would allow the business to proceed without these useless interruptions, because they must know by this that if they could multiply their number by 44 and their power of interruption by 54 they could not prevent me by going on with what I have to say.

I say that my hon. friend, Hugh J. Macdonald, has gone through Manitoba and with his eloquence, charm of manner and political power has swept that province, and Mr. Greenway knows he is beaten. This scheme, outlined in the "Globe," is merely a dodge, such as was practised on the people of Manitoba in the case of the Northern Pacific; and when the election is over and Mr. Greenway once more in power, he will do as he did in the past—fing his election promises to the winds, enjoy his cigar and attend to his farm until another election is impending, and once more it is necessary to invent a new dodge. There is nobody in this House more earnest than I to help the Government, if the Government has any desire to do it, in bringing about railway competition in the North-west Territories. The hon. member for Winnipeg talked about the dreadful oppression that was introduced into the Territories and Manitoba by the Conservative Government, and declared that disallowance nearly brought about a rebellion, and he had to be corrected by my hon. friend who leads the Opposition when he said that it cost this country a large sum to get rid of that disallowance. But will the hon. member tell this House what the people of Manitoba and the North-west have gained by the means that Mr. Greenway took to bring about competition there? The hon. gentleman knows very well, that perfectly fictitious competition was brought in there by Mr. Joe Martin and Mr. Greenway. They went into it in an extravagant manner for the province, and the very minute that the means of competition were provided, everything was arranged in such a way that the Northern Pacific was in a position to arrange as to rates with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the competition turned out to be perfectly fallacious.

Mr. JAMESON. But the rates went down.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. DAVIN. Why, from time to time, the Canadian Pacific Railway has lowered its rates without competition at all. Let me say here what I know will be a very unpopular thing. I hear this talk—it is a cheap, hustings talk, mind you—about the oppression in Manitoba and the North-west at the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I say, that there has never been oppression in Manitoba and the North-west at the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. On general principles, I object to a monopoly; but I believe the man who is at the head of that great Canadian Pacific Railway corporation, Sir William Van Horne, takes a very enlightened view of this railway's interest—I am not now giving him credit for anything except a desire to advance the progress and prosperity of his railway—and he knows that if the rates are such as to crush the life out of the country, the prosperity of the Canadian Pacific Railway would not be what it is to-day. As a consequence, there has never been a monopoly handled with so much restraint as that monopoly. We have had good crops and good prices in the North-west, and if the subject of railway rates were brought up at a meeting of farmers now, hardly a man would spontaneously make loud complaint of the Canadian Pacific Railway rates. I say that in passing. My main object in rising is to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to some views that I would humbly submit to his judgment with regard to railway matters in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

If any new railway project should present itself to the Ministry, affecting the whole country, but especially I speak for the country whence I come—Manitoba and the North-west Territories—I hold that he is bound to see that, if it takes the colour of being the medium of producing competition, the whole power of his majority is used to make that competition a genuine, and not a fallacious one; above all, that the competition shall not be of such a character that, one element of it removed, the whole thing will go to pieces. I think we ought to take a new step with regard to bonusing railways. Henceforward, when we bonus a railway, mindful of what has taken place in Canada and on the other side of the line also, we should see to it that the public interest is conserved. On the other side of the line, you will find one State after another receiving large incomes from railways they have bonused. In the charter of any railway that we bonus hereafter, we should have a clause, not merely giving us a firm grip on the rates from the first, but maintaining an effective control of the company. I agree with my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson), that in this Canadian Pacific Act there is an element of efficient control. I say, that the Minister of Railways, if he wishes to use the means placed in his hands, has the power of efficient control of that road. But here is the danger we are in in this

free country. It would never have occurred to any one, that such a state of things could take place. Here we have five millions of free people, a free Parliament modelled on the august mother of free parliaments; we have come from where we were oppressed by dukes, and earls, and landlords, and our dream was to have a free yeomanry, to hold our property clear of the power of a dominant and oppressive aristocracy. But what do we do? We make corporations that enable men to make money so quickly that the common citizen of to-day is immensely rich to-morrow. From plain Mr. he becomes first a Sir, and afterwards is almost begged to enter the painted chamber. Take such projects as that we have been discussing. Why, Sir, coronets rain on that page. You will have the Duke of Yukon and the Earl of Klondike; and in that region, where they say that the smallest berry will not grow, the strawberry leaves of English aristocracy will flourish. That is the reason why I oppose the legislation that we have now before us, and that is the reason why I offer my suggestion to the Minister of Railways. I know his difficulty and the difficulty that will meet every Minister of Railways. I heard a Minister of the Crown in England say to another, who was about to become a Minister of the Crown: Wait until you have been three years in office, and you will find that it is one of the most difficult things in the world for a Minister of the Crown to do the good he would like to do. I have no doubt that there is one Minister sitting on that bench who has already, in less than two years, found it true, as the Apostle Paul puts it, in that great moral paradox, "For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do." Or, to put it in the words of Tennyson:

His honour rooted in dishonour stands,
And faith, unfaithful, keeps him falsely true.

The difficulty arises from a want of genuine patriotism, a want of far-reaching, historical patriotism. The mere sense of duty will not keep any Minister of the Crown, whether Liberal or Conservative, up to the standard at which he ought to live, because the temptations offered him are so terrible that, unless he has the historical, far-reaching conscience that will enable him to live up to a higher ideal, he will not be able to resist. From the moment he gets into power he is assailed. We know that it is often said, that as soon as a government is born, it begins to die. That is true of all organic things. The Government must fight for its life. There is nothing so nervous as a government in a constitutionally governed country. It is as nervous as a snail—for, though a snail has not a highly-organized nervous system, you have only to touch its horns to see how quick is its sense of apprehension. You find great corporations that want their help, and there is a terrible temp-

tation to allow their judgment to be biased. They are tempted to consider these corporations just as members of Parliament are tempted to consider them. I am a rash person myself, and I do not consider these things.

But we find that members of Parliament do consider them, and we find more than that, that Governments consider them, and what happens is this: that here in this Chamber we are creating corporations that spread out in wealth far overshadowing, for instance, the salary of a Prime Minister, paltry and utterly inadequate as it is for any man fit to hold that high position. Why, it is the salary of a first-class insurance agent in England, or the manager of an insurance company. What signifies the salary of a Minister of the Crown to the splendid income of a railway magnate, whose growth in opulence is phenomenal. The chrysalis of a few years past becomes gorgeous and powerful, and rises from comparatively moderate means to be as rich as Cræsus. We might almost quote the language of the hymn:

One moment here, so mean so low,
The next—beyond the stars.

Well, that is giving a rather spiritual aspect, I admit, to what is a very mundane existence. Now, Sir, although I am sorry to have to say that this Government has not lived up to its professions in the past, has not availed itself of its opportunities, there are yet at least three years of 'locus penitentiæ' left to it; and I would like to see the Prime Minister and his colleagues go into retreat and examine their consciences as to their political sins for the last twenty months, and try to redress the dreadful backslidings that I have witnessed with so much pain. That is what I want them to do in regard to this railway matter. All you have to do is to fall back on your professions, live up to the professions of the Liberal party, live up to the professions of Alexander Mackenzie and George Brown, and then you will be, I won't say ideal statesmen, but you will go as high as will satisfy my humble confidence either in your desire or in your capacity to go. Now in regard to existing railways, I think the Government have control of them if they would only use it. I went once before a Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I remember the ex-Minister was there, and after a time he and his colleagues took what seemed to me to be a very sensible view of the question that had been discussed before them, and they declared that in regard to certain things, for instance the discrimination between points on a railway in regard to rates, they had power to deal with that. I do not know whether they dealt with that point or not, but anyway it was stated that they could deal with it. But what is done is past. It is in regard to future railways that I wish the public of

Canada and the Parliament of Canada should be on their guard, and we can easily frame a clause which would enable us to keep our hands on the well-being of the railway that no watering stock can take place without our cognizance. The people of Canada who bonus a line, should have a permanent interest in that line, and after the railway has had a certain percentage on its cost, then a certain percentage should go into the coffers of the Government, and after a certain number of years we would find ourselves in the position of one of the states below the line the other day, which received a large sum in consequence of this claim upon the earnings of the road. We might frame a clause so as to keep a hold upon the rates, we might frame a clause that would make the process of affecting the tolls more simple, a clause that would act automatically, and so relieve the Minister from the odious position of appearing to go against a powerful corporation or a powerful friend—because in popular government we have to keep that constantly before us. The only reason why it is not better for a government to build and run railways is this: That the pressure placed upon the administration of such a line is such that corruption is inevitable. Supporters go to the Minister and press upon him to take men on to the line when they are not needed, and the same thing will take place in regard to the line, as has taken place again and again in Canada, and the Minister would do what Ministers on both sides have done from time to time, he would say: Oh, take him on. That is one of the reasons why the Government cannot run a railway as successfully as a private corporation. My hon. friend, speaking in connection with the railway, referred to the case of the penitent pig. Well, Sir, I come from a land where the pig is supposed to be a classical entity, but about that particular pig I do not know exactly what he did. But I am glad to see my hon. friend, the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) take the part he does to-day. I was not so well pleased with him last evening. I rather thought he went back on himself—and it will help him with his friends—he sacrificed his past self. I know my hon. friend too well to say that he would sacrifice his convictions. I do not think that he would do that—but he sacrificed his past, he sacrificed his constituents to please his friends; but many a man has done that before him. Now, I wish to warn the people of Manitoba that this is the first move in a scheme to throw dust in their eyes, as dust was thrown in their eyes last election, and on the eve of the election before that, and they will find, I am afraid, that the scheme that Mr. Greenway is about to place in that local legislature is nothing but a straw for a drowning man to catch at; because I may tell you he is a beaten man. I warn the people of Mani-

Mr. DAVIN.

toba that this is simply a dodge to try and get them to forego the position they have taken up, that they are ready to act on, and that if they trust him the same thing will take place that took place a few years ago when they were filled with strong hopes only to be succeeded by bitter disappointment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have no doubt the hon. gentleman who introduced this subject this afternoon had a very sincere desire that the evils complained of should be remedied, and in that sentiment the Government very strongly agree. But I must say that I think it open to much question whether any material advantage is to be gained, and whether very much disadvantage may not result from the continued resort to a motion that the House adjourn before the Orders of the Day are taken up, for the purpose of opening up a discussion of this character.

I am sure that a moment's reflection will satisfy hon. gentlemen that unless the case is one of some considerable urgency, unless the particular facts to which they desire to draw attention require in the public interest prompt action, nothing whatever is to be gained by simply repeating what we all know, and in repeating which we do not make any practical business suggestion which the House could consider. We have no motion to which our minds could be addressed. Neither of hon. gentlemen has made a suggestion in any concrete form. They have simply told the House that transportation difficulties exist. We know that these exist all over Canada, and it is known they prevail over the wide world, and there is no country in which these same problems are not arising. No legislation, it appears to me, has ever been framed by which an ideal result has been attained. These questions will continue to arise from time to time, and I venture to suggest that unless hon. gentlemen opposite, who have apparently given some study to the question but without much result, are in a position to present some formal proposition, they should avoid raising a discussion which is likely to result in nothing but inconvenience and disorganization of the public business.

Mr. DAVIN. Let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to what the present Premier was in the habit of saying when he sat on this side of the House: Call me in, and I will make the proposal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I venture to make this remark in all good feeling, and I have not the slightest doubt as to the bona fides of the hon. gentlemen. I say, and it is a fair claim to put forward on the part of the Government, that until those hon. gentlemen are able to suggest some specific legislation which will provide a remedy, or which at all

events in their judgment will provide a remedy, and until they are able to inform the House in what direction it should be framed, hon. gentlemen, in my opinion, should not move a motion of this kind when the House is on the eve of taking up important business.

Mr. DAVIN. May I ask a question? Surely the Minister of Railways is not going to lay down this proposition, that it is a proper thing for a mere independent member to make substantial proposals. I thought the view of Parliament was, that independent members should state grievances and express public opinion, and the doctors who sit on the Treasury benches should prescribe.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman had better look at the Order paper.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would be very sorry to concur in the idea that private members are not entirely free and that it is not part of their duty, if they have thought out any subject, to submit their opinion in order that legislation may be proposed which would prove useful, and at all events that they should retain the privilege of making suggestions to Parliament.

Mr. DAVIN. I must interrupt the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not do so disrespectfully. Last night the Prime Minister ruled out one of his supporters, an independent supporter, who made a substantive proposal, on the ground that it was definite.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do not let hon. members suppose that a motion to adjourn the House might not be made in an emergency. I do not at all wish hon. gentlemen should feel that—so far as I am entitled to speak the sentiments of the Government on this question—any such privilege or right should be curtailed; but I say our actions in this particular should always be governed by those considerations which spring from public convenience and the promotion of the public business. I am satisfied that members of the House who have followed this discussion will find it quite impossible to lay their fingers on suggestions of any value made by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken to this motion.

I have stated, and I repeat the statement, what the position of the Government is with respect to this great question. I have stated that the Government is of opinion that the existing law, which confers on the Railway Committee of the Privy Council power to deal with emergencies as they arise, is not by any means perfect; that it

does not cover all the ground which might advantageously be covered; and I think I stated last year that the Government had reached the conclusion that an experiment might usefully be made in the direction of creating a railway commission, upon which commission even larger powers should be conferred than those now vested in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I stated that we hoped during the recess to obtain sufficient information to enable the Government to submit a proposal, in concrete form, to Parliament at the present session, and I have already stated—certainly I so stated before the Railway Committee—that it was found quite impossible during the recess to get the matter into such form that we could present it to Parliament during this session. The question is undoubtedly a very complex one. It is a question that requires to be thought out with very much care; it is a question that involves many intricacies, and the Government would not be doing its duty either to itself or to the people if it presented to Parliament a measure for such a purpose which it had not thought out in the most thoroughly careful manner. I do not feel that the evils under which we have been living in the past are of a very grave character, or of so grave a character as compared with other important subjects that it is essential that this subject be taken up with undue haste. I repeat that it is our purpose at the earliest possible moment, when we can get a measure in such shape as will give us confidence as regards its usefulness and utility, to submit such a proposal to Parliament.

Let me say one or two words in regard to the views put forward by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who followed him. I think the hon. member for East Grey said that the present law conferred on the Railway Committee of the Privy Council ample powers if they were only exercised.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not put forward such a contention. I said that when the clause was put in the statute, we thought it was ample; but finding it is not ample, we think it desirable to supplement it with something else.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then I was under a misapprehension as to the hon. gentleman's view. I think that view has been expressed by many hon. members, more particularly with respect to the regulations of rates on railways. I hold that the power which has been conferred by statute on the Governor in Council is ample, and the defects which exist arise in regard to the exercise of that power, as regards its efficient and successful exercise, from the difficulty which must surround all Governments and the departments of Government in working up to the powers

which the statute confers. Necessarily there must be want of completeness in the exercise of the powers which are conferred on the Railway Committee of the Privy Council with respect to the question of rates.

We cannot take up in detail and minutely, the conditions which may govern the various localities and sections in the Dominion. It would be impossible for the Government, with all the other duties which devolve upon it, to deal in any sort of thorough or effective way with these constantly altering conditions. I think that perhaps a commission might be able to do so. I may say, that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council never could be so constituted, nor could the Railway Department ever be so regulated as to work out such powers in an efficient manner. And further let me say, the fact that in times past, Ministers of Railways and Railway Committees, ever since that body was constituted, have found that the farthest they could possibly go was to fix a maximum rate beyond which none of the railway companies could go, is some evidence as to the views which have been continually entertained by the hon. members of that committee and by the various Ministers of Railways as to the measure of their powers. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has suggested, that if there were powers given to the Railway Committee or some other sufficient tribunal to control the running rights by one railway over the other, you would make a large advance in remedying these evils. I can assure the hon. gentleman, that would not be the conclusion which he would arrive at if he had given as careful study to this question as it would be proper to give it. You cannot work out any such system, unless you have a railway company which desires to have the privilege of using the track of another railway. The public may desire it, they may be intensely anxious that this one line of railway should be utilized by two or three different lines, but unless you have another railway company connecting with it which is prepared to set the machinery of the law in motion, you are utterly powerless.

That is the situation with regard to the line between Toronto and North Bay, or the two or three lines which continuously traverse that distance. The Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway have fallen out. They did agree at one time and as a result of their agreement the Canadian Pacific Railway utilized that portion of the line from Gravenhurst to North Bay under arrangements which had been voluntarily entered into between them. The time came when one or the other of them felt that these arrangements were not just to the company complaining, and they withdrew. What is the situation to-day? The situation to-day is, that notwithstanding the agreement which has been entered into and which is made part of the law of the

Mr. BLAIR.

land governing the railway which was added from Gravenhurst to North Bay; notwithstanding that this railway company is subject to the franchise, or easement, or privilege, or whatever you may call it that has been exercised heretofore by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and notwithstanding that it is in the power of any railway company that may be connected with it to exercise that privilege if it desires there has been no railway company coming forward asking for such authority. The Canadian Pacific Railway has not said to us: We desire to use the authority which results from this agreement and compel the Grand Trunk Railway to submit to the use of this line; and in the absence of action on their part I say that the Government is entirely helpless. I fear very much, from what study I have been able to give this question, that it will not be practicable for Parliament by any legislation which it is possible to frame, to provide an adequate remedy for the existing state of things. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has pointed out that there are two or three railways in the United States which have been using each other's lines with great advantage. If my information is correct, the only instance in which one railway company is exercising running powers over another railway, is in the case where they have come to a friendly understanding between themselves and is not the result of the exercise of any superior controlling power. The question is one which is surrounded on all hands with difficulty, and therefore I think it would be unwise on the part of my hon. friends opposite to assume, that any amount of astuteness which might be applied to the framing of a measure constituting a railway commission, or any other tribunal with these large powers, could be depended upon as furnishing an ideal remedy for these difficulties. They have occurred in the past; they will continue to occur in the future, notwithstanding all the laws Parliament may choose to enact in the matter. There is no manner of doubt as to the power of Parliament. It does not help us, to assert that Parliament ought to have the power because Parliament has the power, except so far as it has limited its exercise by an enactment of a contractual nature. The difficulty that surrounds us all is, not to reach that primary conclusion, but to make up our minds as wise legislators, as men who are not willing to disturb the great transportation arrangements of the country, and who are not willing to disturb the existing sound business conditions; the great difficulty with us is to determine just what shall be the precise nature of the legislation which we will pass.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of Railways finds fault with members of this House for bringing up these questions at the time they are now brought forward;

but he must bear in mind that though we have been in session more than five weeks, one urgent question has occupied almost the whole time of the House, and other questions of importance as they arise in the country have had to be deferred, so that this is the only possible manner in which they can be brought to the attention of the House. The hon. Minister of Railways has acknowledged that there are very great grievances, but he complains that no member of the House has brought down a concrete settlement of them. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that is hardly the duty of private members of this House. I think it is sufficient for them to call these grievances to the attention of those whose duty it is largely to initiate legislation. The history of this House is, that the efforts of private members to engraft legislation upon the Statute-book has not been very successful, because the Government, with their majority, will usually prevent the passage of the measures proposed. With regard to the Rainy River Railway, the question is—and I would ask the Government to consider it—whether the Grand Trunk shall have running powers over it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I should say so, if it wants them—certainly.

Mr. WALLACE. I am very glad to hear that statement, and I am sure that it will be satisfactory to the people.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I would do anything I could do to secure for it any such right, if it wanted to exercise it, or were willing to exercise it.

Mr. WALLACE. I am glad to hear the declaration of the hon. Minister to that effect, because I think this is a very important proposition, and one that will largely solve these North-west questions of transportation that have created so much discussion. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) has told us the reason why the settlement of the North-west has not been more successful than it has been. In this connection, I regret to see that, when this important matter is under discussion in the House, the hon. member for Winnipeg is the only hon. member on that side of the House from Manitoba and the North-west who is here to discuss it, though we all know how in the past, during their election campaigns, they have been making Manitoba and the North-west ring with their denunciations of their political opponents because of these transportation grievances. But to-day, when these questions are being discussed and the attention of the Government may very properly be called to them, there is only one member on that side of the House from the province of Manitoba, or the province of British Columbia, who is prepared—

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I beg to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact, that there are two. I have been listening to this discussion with a great deal of interest.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not mean to say that they are not here. I suppose they are all here, but they are all like the hon. member who has just notified us that he is here—they are dumb, they have nothing to say. I hope this gentle reminder will have the effect of causing our friend from Manitoba to get up and give his views on this important matter.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to say just one word on this subject. I had no idea that the question was coming up for discussion to-day. I want, in the first instance, to call the attention of my hon. friend, if he will allow me to designate him as such, from Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) to the very grave misapprehension he entertains with regard to the position that has been taken by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in this House, and also with regard to the position taken by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean). Both these gentlemen have been for a long time past moving in the direction in which they have been moving to-day. Fourteen or fifteen years ago, I heard my hon. friend from East Grey discussing a question of this kind, and taking exactly the same position that he has taken to-day, except in one particular. At that time, he seemed to be more strongly in favour of the constitution of a railway commission than he seems to be to-day.

Mr. JAMESON. Did he vote that way?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. JAMESON. Against disallowance?

Mr. SPROULE. In favour of a railway commission.

Mr. McNEILL. The question that was up had reference to the grievances of the public in connection with these great railway corporations. The fact that these great corporations, which hold in their hands almost the whole carrying trade of the country, could do with the public very much as they pleased, was the subject under discussion at that time. We were considering the possibility of finding a remedy, and my hon. friend from East Grey did not at all hesitate to differ with some of the leaders of his own party on the question. Therefore, I am sure that my hon. friend from Winnipeg will gladly withdraw the imputation he has cast upon my hon. friend in this regard, for he has really done him a great injustice. So far as the main question is concerned, I think the attention of the House could scarcely be directed to anything more important; and, if the Minister of Railways will forgive my saying so, I think his own speech has been a very good answer to the

charge that he brought against my hon. friends, of improperly bringing up this question. He spoke as though he thought they were practically wasting the time of the House. In my judgment, however, the speech that has been elicited from the hon. Minister of Railways himself, is an ample justification of the action of my hon. friend from East York. I, for one, am delighted to find that the Government still have it in their minds to address themselves seriously to the remedying of this great grievance, which undoubtedly does exist in the country. There is no doubt that the public feel that the railway companies have too much uncontrolled power; and, for my part, I am quite satisfied that so long as human nature is as it is,—so long as political human nature is as it is, no Railway Committee of the Privy Council can ever deal successfully with these grievances. These great and influential corporations possess enormous political power, and when they choose to exercise it, they are always able to bring enormous pressure to bear upon the members of a Government. So that, when the members of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council come to deal with questions in which these corporations are deeply interested, it is scarcely to be expected that they can deal with them with open minds. It seems to me that we are driven to the conclusion that we must find some remedy outside the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and the constitution of some independent body to deal with such matters seems the obvious and logical solution.

For my part, so far as I have been able to discover, I have not learned that the railway commission in England has been a failure by any means. On the contrary, after having tried that commission for several years in a tentative manner, they constituted it on much stronger, broader and more permanent lines, and I think that while, as the hon. Minister has said, it certainly does not prove itself a perfect remedy for the evils complained of, it has dealt with them more successfully than they have ever been dealt with by any political body. I am only too glad to find that the action taken by my hon. friend has had the effect of eliciting from the hon. Minister of Railways so satisfactory a statement.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). As we had a very long sitting last night, I would propose to my hon. friend that we do not sit after six o'clock, and I hope that will meet his convenience. I would ask, however, that he would agree that we should take up the second order and proceed with it a stage before adjourning.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no objection.

Mr. McNEILL.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to grant and appropriate twenty-five thousand acres of land in the Northwest Territories for each mile of a railway from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake, according to the terms of the contract relating to the said railway, copy of which contract has been laid before this House.

Resolution reported.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 14th March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVILEGE—EXPLANATION BY MR. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before calling the Orders of the Day, I would like to mention to the House a matter which is of the nature of privilege, and which I see has been connected by the press with the seat of an hon. member—the member for Richelieu. It is stated that I have received his resignation. If I had received his resignation, I should have issued my warrant for a new election before now. The only occasion when I have had any communication from or with Mr. Bruneau this session was on Friday morning. I had just come into my office when Mr. Bruneau came in. He asked me if I had received a letter from him. I told him I had not. He said that he had called to get a letter back which he had written to me. I told him to wait and I would look among my mail, for I had not yet opened any letters. I turned the unopened letters over in his presence, and he pointed to one with his frank upon it. I asked him if it was his writing on the address and frank. He assured me it was. He told me nothing of its contents, and I asked him nothing, but handed him the

letter unopened, and he took it away with him. So far as I know, it had come to my office through the post office, for I had not seen it before. I mention this to avoid any mistake as to facts as far as I am concerned.

THE LATE MR. DUPONT, M.P.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, it becomes my melancholy duty to remind the House of the untimely death of one of our most valued and respected members, Mr. Dupont, the member for Bagot. We have already been called upon to suffer the loss of valued members of this House during the present session, but I am sure that every member on both sides of this House will agree that in his untimely death owing to a railway accident, we have been deprived of the services of one of the most able, one of the most esteemed, and one of the most conscientious members that has ever sat on the floor of this House; and I am sure that we shall all join in the expression of our deep sympathy with the friends and with the family of the deceased. Particularly the great agricultural class which he represented in this House with such ability, will everywhere feel that they have sustained a very great loss. I think we will all be ready to recognize that no member of this House, during the period that that hon. gentleman was a member, ever discharged his duties with a more conscientious regard to what he believed to be right, and in the best interests of the country. While his loss will be deplored by every member of this House, it will be especially deplored by those on this side who regarded him as one of their ablest and one of their most valued colleagues and supporters.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is to me, Mr. Speaker, a melancholy satisfaction under the circumstances to join my tribute to the eloquent tribute which has just been paid by my hon. friend opposite to the memory of our departed colleague, taken away from us under such peculiarly sad and painful circumstances. Sir, some of us perhaps will be prepared to make the admission that in the heat of political conflict, we are not as fair nor as generous to each other as we ought to be; yet we may congratulate ourselves that there is a better side to our nature, in obedience to which, silently and unconsciously, a sentiment of mutual respect grows up in the heart, and must find expression upon such a solemn occasion as this. For my part, I say very frankly that having been associated with Mr. Dupont in this House, having met him in debate, and very often on the public platform in election campaigns throughout our native province, I had formed the highest estimate

of his personal character. No one could know him without admiring his strong yet at the same time genial qualities. He was a strong party man; but his ideas were his own, they were not borrowed from anybody, and he defended them, I am sure, feeling that they were absolutely true. His death is all the more to be deplored inasmuch as he was in the prime of life and vigour, and had before him the prospect of many more years of usefulness. That his death under such circumstances should be mourned by those who were his political friends is but natural, and I may say that those regrets will be shared by all those who, on this side of the House, were his friends likewise, and along with those of our hon. friends opposite will follow him to his premature grave.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. To one coming from the province to which our late colleague belonged, it is more than a painful duty to rise and to join my tribute to those which have been so eloquently expressed by the leader of the Government and by the leader of the Opposition. Sir, Mr. Dupont, during the many years that he sat in this House, commanded universal respect from both sides of it. His views, strong as they were on all questions by reason of the strength of his convictions, were always expressed in a manner which appealed to hon. members on both sides, to those who acted with him and to those who did not view political matters from the same standpoint that he did—to his friends as being the expression of strong convictions, and to his opponents as being submitted to the House in a manner always acceptable. Sir, few men have sat in this Parliament who will leave behind them a more blameless record than the late hon. member for Bagot. There are few members who have sat in this House who had before them a more brilliant future than the hon. member whose loss we deplore. His death is a loss not only to this Parliament, but, I think, a loss to the whole country. He was conscientious, he was able. His convictions were strong, and on all occasions when called upon to take part in debate or in elections, he did so in a manner to convince the people that he was acting, according to his views, in the very best interests of the country.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved that the order for the consideration in committee of Bill (No. 32) an Act respecting the Ontario and

Rainy River Railway Company, be discharged, and the Bill be recommitted to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. MACLEAN. Explain.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Bill was amended in the committee in such a way as to affect large interests that were not represented before the committee. The opinions of the members seemed to be that the time should not be extended for the commencement of the work. The Bill as originally presented to the committee did not ask for an extension of the time for the commencement of the work; but some hon. gentlemen, who perhaps had not read the Bill, secured its amendment so as to extend the time, and parties interested in legal agreements thought their rights had been affected; and by consent of the solicitors on both sides it was agreed that the Bill be referred back to the committee.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Tamagamingue Railway Company.—(Mr. McHugh.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Maxwell.)

Bill (No. 66) respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Jameson.)

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the London and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Lister.)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Montfort Colonization Railway Company, and to change its name to the Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Bourassa.)

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Britton.)

THE JUDICIARY IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIS asked,

Is it the intention of the Government to appoint an additional judge for the North-west Territories? If so, when will such appointment be made?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Judge McGuire is now in the Yukon, but the Government is not in a position to state whether he intends to remain there permanently or not.

OYSTER FISHERIES, P.E.I.

Mr. YEO asked,

1. Have any leases or grants been given by the Department of Marine and Fisheries of live
Mr. SUTHERLAND.

cyster beds in Malpeque or Richmond Bay, in Prince Edward Island?

2. If so, did the expert, Kemp, recommend such grants or leases being given on the ground that such oyster beds were unproductive, and was it afterwards shown, on investigation held by the inspector of fisheries and from the testimony of oyster fishermen, that the report of Mr. Kemp was not in accordance with the facts?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to allow the oyster beds in Malpeque or Richmond Bay to become depleted by allowing parties engaged in oyster culture to stock their oyster areas from said beds during the close season?

4. What is Mr. Kemp's salary? What are his duties? Has he succeeded, in Bedeque Bay or elsewhere, in rendering any oyster beds productive which would not naturally have become so by having the fishing of oysters in that locality prohibited for a time?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. One lease in Shemody Creek has been granted to Mr. T. H. E. Inman. Mr. Kemp after examining the bed leased did not consider it a live bed as it was shallow and cut to pieces by mud diggers and he recommended the granting of the lease. 2. As yet the department have received no report from the inspector of fisheries on this bed or the granting of this lease. 3. No. The small oysters obtained in Richmond Bay are generally picked from very shallow water and sometimes where the tide leaves them. These cysters would never mature as they would be killed by the ice and frost during the winter months. Permission is only granted to take these small oysters during the regular fishing season. 4. Mr. Kemp's salary is \$1,500 per annum. His duties are to examine oyster areas and report on condition of same to department and to clean and plant oyster areas under instructions from department. 5. Yes, at Shediac and Tracadie, N.S.

POSTMASTER AT LOCH LEVEN, C.B.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

1. Did the Honourable the Postmaster General direct that the following letter be sent to Mr. John A. McLellan, postmaster, Loch Leven, Inverness county, Nova Scotia:—

Post Office Department, Canada,
Ottawa, 29th January, 1898.

Sir,—Referring to your communication of the 21st instant, inquiring why you have been removed from the postmastership of Loch Leven, county of Inverness, I am directed to inform you that it is not considered compatible with the proper discharge of the duties of a postmaster that he should take any unduly active part in political elections, and that it having been represented that at a political meeting held in Port Hood prior to the Dominion election of June, 1896, you and others endeavoured to prevent the present member for Inverness from being heard in reply to a speech made by Sir Charles Tupper on that occasion, the Postmaster General has decided to make another appointment to the office in question.

I am to add that it is further stated that on election day you were an active worker in the interests of Dr. Cameron, one of the candidates in the above mentioned election.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) W. D. LeSUEUR,
Secretary.

2. If so, who made the representations referred to in the said letter ?

3. Did Mr. McLellan inform the Post Office Department by letter that he was prepared to contradict the statements and representations contained in the said letter on oath ?

4. Was an inquiry or formal investigation made into the truth of the statements and representations referred to in said letter ?

5. Has Mr. McLellan been dismissed from the postmastership of Loch Leven, and, if so, why ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. No. The letter mentioned in the question was sent in the ordinary course of business by the secretary of the department in reply to a letter of inquiry from the ex-postmaster, without previous instructions from the Postmaster General, but the Postmaster General assumes full responsibility therefor. 2. Dr. A. McLennan, M.P. 3. Yes. 4. No. 5. Yes, for the reasons mentioned in Dr. McLennan's communication to the department.

MAJOR WALSH'S COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

Is the commission to Mr. Walsh, as embodied in the Order in Council of 17th August, 1897, the only documentary authority under which Mr. Walsh is now acting, or has the Minister of the Interior supplemented this by any instructions and directions of any kind, special or general ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The commission of Major Walsh is issued under the authority of the said Order in Council. He also holds commissions which constitute him senior officer of the North-west Mounted Police, and a police magistrate. Instructions given in addition to the commissions were verbal, and general in their character.

SLEIGH ROAD ON THE YUKON ROUTE.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

Have Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie constructed and finished a practical sleigh road from the mouth of the Stikine River to Teslin Lake ? If so, when was it completed, and what is its length ? Have they provided suitable shelters for travellers at intervals of twenty-five miles along this route, and is this road and are these shelters now available for travellers ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I would ask the hon. gentleman to let that question stand until to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. It is past the 12th of March, you know.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question stands.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND MAINLAND—WINTER COMMUNICATION.

Mr. MARTIN asked,

1. Does the Government propose to take any steps to improve the winter communication between the province of Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Canada ?

2. If so, what are those improvements, and if the Government intend, without further delay, to place a second steamer on the Georgetown-Pictou winter route ?

3. Has any contract been given, or does the Government intend to ask for tenders, for the building of a suitable winter boat, and when ?

4. Has the Government, after their experience with the steamship "Petrel," in the winter of 1896-97, abandoned the scheme of placing a steamer on the Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine ice route ?

5. If so, has the observations made by the officers of the steamship "Petrel," referred to in page 21 of last year's report of the Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, been of such a definite character as to lead them to that conclusion ?

6. Has the Government considered the present oppressive rate of 3c. per pound for baggage (in excess of thirty pounds) over the Cape Traverse winter route ?

7. If so, do they propose to decrease that exorbitant rate in the public interest ?

8. Is the Government aware that passengers are required to pay a minimum of \$2 over that short distance of nine miles, besides being compelled to perform the arduous labour of pulling the Government boats containing Her Majesty's mails over ice and lolly ?

9. Does the Government propose to remedy this grievance ?

10. Has the Government had under consideration the terms of union between Prince Edward Island and Canada, that provides that the province of Prince Edward Island shall be connected with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion, and that the rate for passengers between the province and the mainland of Canada should not exceed the rate per mile on the Intercolonial or the railway system of Canada ?

11. If so, does the Government intend to take steps to reduce the rate for passengers on the steamship "Stanley" to the same mileage rate as prevails on the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I desire to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, and the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) to the fact that the form of this question very flagrantly transgresses the rules of the House. It is argumentative and states facts, instead of asking for information.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you not like facts ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When one is asked to answer a question he does not like to have certain things set out as "outrageous," and all that sort of thing.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not say outrageous ; I said excessive.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I shall answer the hon. gentleman's question as best I can.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before the Minister answers the question, I wish to say that it occurred to me that the words "oppressive and exorbitant rates," characterizing certain matters about which information is sought, are not quite in order. Hon. gentlemen will remember that in asking a question, they cannot use any argumentative language, nor can they even attack the Government in putting such a question, no matter how strongly they may feel on the subject.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do not object to answer the question, but I merely wish to call attention to the irregularity of it. Winter communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland is at present maintained by the ice-boat service at the Capes and the SS. "Stanley" between Georgetown and Pictou. The Government are now considering representations made to them by the member for East Prince and by the Charlottetown Board of Trade and a deputation from Summerside as to the necessity for a second winter boat. The particular route which a second steamer should be placed on in case the Government decides to obtain such steamer has not been determined, but no decision adverse to the Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine route has been reached. No representations have been made to the present Government that the existing baggage rates over Cape Traverse winter route are excessive. The Government is aware of the minimum rate paid by passengers over the route. It is the same rate which has existed for years past. The Government is not aware that the terms of union between Prince Edward Island and Canada provide for the rate to be charged for passengers. The rate was reduced last winter by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the amount charged by the summer boats between Charlottetown and Pictou.

IMMIGRATION AGENT, L. RANKIN.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Has L. Rankin, of the Dominion Lands office, Regina, been immigration agent in Kansas? What were his instructions? Was he instructed to ignore the Territories and describe himself as of Manitoba?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). Mr. L. Rankin has been employed as an immigration agent in Kansas during the winter months. His instructions were to work in conjunction with the agent permanently in charge of our immigration interests in that state. He was not instructed to ignore the Territories and describe himself as of Manitoba.

Mr. MARTIN.

CLAIM OF MISS FLORA CUMMINGS.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether it has been decided to place a sum in the territorial exhibition indebtedness estimates to pay the claim of twenty-five dollars (\$25) of Miss Flora Cummings, of Portage la Prairie, Manitoba, and with whom the department has corresponded?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). It has not been decided to place a sum in the territorial exhibition indebtedness estimates to pay the claim of \$25 to Miss Flora Cummings, of Portage la Prairie, Man. This claim was referred to the accountant of the exhibition at Regina, whose answer was to the effect that he knew nothing of the loss of this exhibit. Miss Cummings's claim was to cover a lost exhibit.

GRAIN STANDARDS.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

What course has the Honourable the Minister of Inland Revenue determined to take respecting grain standards? Does the hon. Minister contemplate any revision of the present inspection system?

The **MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE** (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). The matter is under consideration.

CONVICTIONS FOR PERJURY AT BATTLEFORD.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether at the close of last year J. N. Skelton and T. Dewan, were, in the Supreme Court at Battleford, convicted of perjury? Whether the Court of Appeal at Regina upheld the conviction? Whether at the time of the trial at Battleford, in the case of C. M. Daunais, the jury disagreed? Whether Daunais still stands to be tried under the original indictment and is on bail? Whether he occupies a position in the public service, and if so, what that position is?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). J. N. Skelton and T. Dewan were convicted of perjury. The Court of Appeal at Regina upheld the convictions. At the time of Daunais's trial the jury disagreed and Daunais now stands for trial at the session of the court to be held in May. I am not in a position to answer the last portion of the question as it is not in the knowledge of the Department of Justice whether or not Daunais occupied a position in the public service.

Mr. DAVIN. Probably the Minister of the Interior can answer that. I may point out that the question is asked of the Government, and not of my hon. and learned friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) particularly.

Mr. SPEAKER. These questions are usually asked of the Government, and not of a particular Minister.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The attention of the Minister of

the Interior has not been called to that. It will be answered to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER. The latter part of the question will stand, then.

YUKON TERRITORY—WHISKY PERMITS.

Mr. CRAIG asked,

1. How many, if any, and when, have permits or licenses been granted allowing whisky to be taken into the Yukon territory for consumption or sale?

2. If any granted, what are the names of the grantees, and the quantity covered by the permits or licenses, respectively?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). If the hon. gentleman will send me a note saying within what period he wishes this information given, or for which period he wishes it to apply, I will give him the information to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question stands.

PREVENTIVE OFFICER AT GRAND NARROWS.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked,

1. What are the duties performed by the preventive officer at Grand Narrows, Cape Breton?

2. Are such duties performed the same as that, and all, performed by his predecessor?

3. What is the salary?

4. Is it the same as that paid his predecessor?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1 and 2. The duties of the preventive officer at Grand Narrows, C.B., are entering and clearing of vessels, the collection of duties and the prevention of smuggling. So far as the department is aware such duties are the same as, and all that, were performed by said officer's predecessor. 3. \$200 per annum. 4. Yes.

QUARANTINE PHYSICIAN AT SYDNEY AND NORTH SYDNEY, C.B.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked,

1. Who is quarantine physician at Sydney and North Sydney, Cape Breton?

2. When was he appointed?

3. Whom did he succeed?

4. How many changes have taken place in that office since June, 1896?

5. What were these changes, and reasons for the same?

6. What is the salary of the present officer?

7. What was the salary of his predecessors?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). 1. Dr. Horace Rindress. 2. 1st October, 1897. 3. Dr. W. McK. McLeod. 4 and 5. On 1st July, 1897, the office of assistant quarantine officer at North Sydney was abolished, and the services of Dr. Lewis W. Johnstone dispensed with. On the same date the salary of Dr. W. McK. McLeod was increased from \$1,000 to \$1,200 per annum, he assuming the duties of quarantine officer for

the whole harbour of Sydney. On the resignation of Dr. McLeod, on 1st October, 1897, Dr. Rindress was appointed at a salary of \$1,200. The reason for the abolition of the office of an assistant quarantine officer was, that it was thought that the work could be performed by one officer, if he resided at North Sydney. The increase in salary of Dr. McLeod was for increased duties. Dr. Rindress was appointed owing to resignation of Dr. McLeod. 6. \$1,200. 7. Dr. McLeod received \$1,000 a year. The salary of the last incumbent was \$1,200 at the time of his resignation.

MILITIA GENERAL ORDERS.

Mr. MONK asked,

Are all Militia General Orders approved by Order in Council before their promulgation in the "Canada Gazette"?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). No. General Orders are orders issued to the militia in general by the General Officer Commanding in virtue of his commission, which empowers him to issue orders and commands to all officers or other persons under his command.

INSTRUCTIONS TO LIEUT. SUTTON.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. What instructions were issued to Lieut. F. H. C. Sutton, Royal Canadian Dragoons, on proceeding to England for a course?

2. What examinations did he go up for?

3. What examinations did he fail in?

4. Did Major General Gascoigne recommend his being sent to England?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The instructions, which were not in any way unusual, cover five or six pages of typewritten foolscap, I am told by the officers of my department, and I think it would be more convenient if the hon. gentleman would move for them in the ordinary way. With regard to question 2, the examinations were in cavalry training and musketry. He passed the cavalry examination and failed in the musketry examination. I am informed, that the Major General was not consulted.

Mr. MONK. I would ask the hon. Minister if, to save me trouble, he would let me have the communication, as an answer to the first part of the question, instead of necessitating my moving for a return.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The instructions were the ordinary instructions given under such circumstances. They were not special.

INSPECTION OF THE PERMANENT MILITIA FORCE.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. On what dates has Major General Gascoigne inspected each unit of the permanent militia force?

2. Did he make a written report of each inspection, and, if so, will it be laid on the Table of the House ?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). 1. There is no record of such dates in the department, and, as the General Officer Commanding is absent in New York, the information cannot be obtained. 2. It is not customary for the General Officer Commanding to make written reports of such inspections, and, in the event of his doing so, they would not be laid on the Table of the House.

THE WALKS AROUND THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. **DAVIN** asked,

Who was the contractor for laying the asphalt walks around the Parliament Buildings last year ? Has the contract been finished and paid for ? Were there extras ? If so, how much did they amount to ? How much was paid under the contract, and how much for extras ?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). The Sicily Asphaltum Paving Company, Limited, of Montreal, which was the lowest tenderer. The contract is finished, but there is a balance due on work performed. There were no extras to the sidewalk contract. The sidewalk contract was for \$2.19 per yard, and no extra or additional payment thereto was made. There were no extras in connection with the sidewalks. There was additional work in making scoria block watercourses and crossings and entrances at Main and East Block gateways. The contract price for the scoria block was \$3.50 per yard, and amounted, in all, to \$3,570. This work was not considered as an extra, being apart altogether from the contract for the sidewalk.

ST. JACQUES L'ACHIGAN POSTMASTER.

Mr. **DUGAS** (by Mr. Chauvin) asked,

1. Who is at present the postmaster of St. Jacques L'Achigan, county of Montcalm ?

2. On what recommendation was he appointed, and by whom was the recommendation made ?

3. Did the Postmaster General receive various petitions asking for the appointment of a postmaster for St. Jacques L'Achigan, county of Montcalm ?

4. What are the names of the several applicants, and the number of signatures attached to the petition in each case ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). 1. Mr. Solomon Venne is at present postmaster of St. Jacques, county of Montcalm. There is no post office named St. Jacques L'Achigan. 2. He was appointed on recommendation of Hon. J. I. Tarte, and of Mr. Chas. Bazinet, M.P. 3. No petition was received asking for the appointment of a postmaster at St. Jacques L'Achigan, and one petition only was received ask-

Mr. **MONK**.

ing for the appointment of a postmaster at St. Jacques, county of Montcalm. It asked for the appointment of the present postmaster. 4. There was but one applicant, the present postmaster. The petition in his favour which was received contained five signatures.

TIMBER IN THE YUKON DISTRICT.

Mr. **DOMVILLE** (by Mr. Penny) asked,

Have the Government authorized Major Walsh to employ any one to dispose of timber in the Yukon district ? If so, who has Major Walsh employed for that purpose, and what instructions has he given him ? Tenders were called for and timber berths sold to the highest tenderer. Is it a fact that having sold timber berths, the Government or their employees are permitting people to go in for mere stumpage and cut timber when the department have already charged a large sum to others ? Is it true that parties are being permitted to cut timber off the limits sold at the foot of Laberge, and has the Government given instructions to the mounted police to protect the timber limits from being plundered ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). No special instructions were given to Major Walsh in regard to the disposal of timber ; but he has reported that he deemed it necessary to take steps to protect the timber. On the 23rd ultimo, two officers left Vancouver for the Yukon district for the purpose of taking charge of the timber business in the district, and Major Walsh was advised by letter of the action of the department. It is not, so far as the department is aware, true that any persons are being authorized to cut timber off limits sold at the foot of Lake Laberge.

THE YUKON TERRITORY—HOMESTEAD PRIVILEGES.

Mr. **BERGERON** (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

Whether it is the intention of the Government to extend the homestead privileges to the Yukon territory ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). No.

A RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. **McMILLAN** asked,

Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint a railway commission ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). The Government have it in contemplation to take up the subject of a railway commission and deal with it at an early date. I may say that it is not found practicable, owing to the condition of public business and for other reasons, to submit a measure with that object in view during the present session ; but I am in hopes that we may be able to do it next session.

RIVIERE STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Chauvin) asked,

1. Whether the Department of Public Works have expended on repairs to works on Rivière Ste. Anne de la Pérade, the sum of \$5,000 voted for that purpose on 20th May, 1897? 2. If not, is it the intention to do so this year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say:—1. No. 2. Matter under consideration.

• BELLE RIVER, P.E.I., BREAKWATER.

Mr. MARTIN (by Mr. Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.) asked,

1. Does the Government intend to assume control of the breakwater at Belle River, in Prince Edward Island?

2. Has a Government engineer reported as to the importance of this work?

3. If so, what is the nature of the report, and does it refer to the condition of the breakwater or the amount required for its existence?

4. Does the Government intend to extend and improve it, and if so, when?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say:—1. No, not a present. 2. Yes. The late chief engineer, Mr. H. F. Perley, made a report on the 15th February, 1889. 3. Yes. The report states that the works are in a bad condition and estimates the cost of the repairs and extension required at \$7,500. 4. Mr. Martin was informed in August, 1896, and April, 1897, in reply to questions asked by him in the House that the breakwater in Belle River was not one of the works that had been assumed by the Federal Government.

COLONIAL PREMIERS, LONDON CONFERENCE.

Mr. FOSTER moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the British Government and the Government of Canada, in reference to the conference of Colonial Premiers held in London in June, 1897, in accordance with Mr. Chamberlain's invitation of January 28th preceding, with the report of the proceedings of the same.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no objection to the motion being granted, but I do not believe there is at present anything to be brought down which has not been made public. The conference which took place between the First Minister and Mr. Chamberlain is still confidential.

Mr. FOSTER. Whatever can be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

BONDING AND TRANSIT ARRANGEMENTS, &c., ON PACIFIC COAST WITH UNITED STATES.

Mr. FOSTER moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada, or any member thereof, and the United States Government, either directly or through the British Government or its representative at Washington, in reference to bonding or transit arrangements on the Pacific Coast, and to the relief of destitute persons in the Yukon or Alaska districts. Also, any reports of Ministers to the Government on these matters.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no objection, but my hon. friend must understand that there are negotiations now going on which cannot be brought down until concluded.

Mr. FOSTER. That is always understood.

Motion agreed to.

VICTOR J. A. VENNER.

Mr. McALISTER. There is a motion in my name for information regarding the suspension from office of Victor J. A. Venner as Indian agent for the Restigouche band of Indians. At the time I gave this notice Mr. Venner was simply suspended from office, but since then, I have been informed, he has been dismissed, and I would ask leave to add after the word "suspension" the words "or dismissal."

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Stand.

Mr. FOSTER. This is simply an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. If there is any objection, of course the motion cannot be moved.

Motion allowed to stand.

SUPPLIES, MILITARY CAMP AT ALDERSHOT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for:

Return showing the names of all parties furnishing supplies for the military camp at Aldershot, King's county, Nova Scotia, since July, 1896, the rate of allowance or payment of each class of articles supplied, the names of the tenderers, the amount asked by each tenderer, and the amount allowed.

Also, a schedule of prices paid for each class of supplies for the camp at Aldershot, in 1895, 1896, 1897, and the names of the parties supplying each class of articles.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I beg to ask if the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) would object to having the words "from 1888 to 1897, inclusive," inserted in place of the words "in 1895, 1896, 1897," in the last

line of the motion? There was really no camp in 1895, and I suppose the hon. gentleman wants to make a comparison.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then the motion will be amended in the way I suggest?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Very well.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER AT AGNES.

Mr. POPE moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, inspectors' reports, and all documents respecting the dismissal of the postmaster at Agnes and the removal of the office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). I wish to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Pope), as he has included inspectors' reports in this motion, that it has been customary to treat inspectors' reports as private. I do not know whether there is anything confidential in the report in this case. I have no objection to the motion, but I wish to say to my hon. friend that, if the report is of a confidential nature, it cannot be produced.

BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. JAMESON moved :

That the public interest demands that the railway companies of Canada should at the earliest possible moment be brought under the control of a Board of Railway Commissioners, clothed with full power to enforce the provisions of the Railway Act and to prescribe and enforce the observance of such regulations as may be necessary in the public interest.

He said: This notice, which stands in my name, was put on the Order paper some time ago. The matter has since been discussed to some extent, but I think that, in view of the importance which is attached to it in the North-west, it will do no harm to obtain an expression of opinion from members of the House on the subject of a railway commission, even although the Government have promised us to bring down a measure of this kind. The word "commission" is one of doubtful meaning. I wish to state briefly to the House the reasons why I think a measure of this kind is necessary, and why I believe it will be approved by the House and by the people of the country at large. While the question of railway transportation is one of interest to all in Canada, it is one of very special interest in western Canada, where I reside. Our situation is a peculiar one. We have to contend with geographical difficulties which other countries with which we have to compete in

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

agricultural products, do not have to contend. In western Canada we have to compete, for instance, with such countries as India, such countries as the Argentine Republic, such countries as Russia, which have much readier access to the markets of the world than we have. Our position in the centre of the continent of America causes us to be geographically handicapped in our competition with other countries. Consequently the railway question is one which has always been considered of great moment to the people of western Canada. With all those disadvantages under which we have to contend the late Government placed legislation on the Statute-book that accentuated our difficulties and made our position far more onerous than it was before, which handicapped and intensified the extreme difficulties with which we have to contend. In Winnipeg, where I live, we are situated 1,500 miles from the Atlantic Coast and 1,500 miles from the Pacific Coast, and portions of the country are at far greater distances than those figures indicate. In addition, we have to contend against the fact that there is no proper tribunal capable of enforcing the provisions of the Railway Act. I contend the railway laws of Canada are not observed by the Canadian Pacific Railway and there is no tribunal sufficiently strong and experienced to force an observance of those laws. Contrast our position with that of the various countries with which we have to compete in the matter of immigration. If an intending emigrant in England wishes to decide as to the country in which he should settle, and considers the railway laws of the different countries, what will he find? He will find that if he goes to New Zealand and Australia there the Government own and control the railways. If he goes to the United States, where they have progressed far beyond Canada in the matter of railway legislation, he will learn that during the last eighteen years, while our Government has been placing a monopoly on the people of western Canada, the United States Government have been obtaining greater control over their railway system. Legislation has been introduced not only into the Federal Congress, but in the various State legislatures, which has given the people more control over the railways within the jurisdiction of the different legislatures. So we find Manitoba in this position, that whereas on one side of the line, that is to say in the State of Minnesota, there is a railway tribunal established—the establishment of which has been attacked as unconstitutional but whose authority has been maintained by the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota—under the regulations laid down by that commission in the State of Minnesota, which is only separated from Manitoba by a line of iron posts, the rates are determined by the commission, which is composed of

three commissioners elected by the people. In our province, on the other hand, the railway rates are established by a railway boss in Montreal. Thus a sharp contrast is presented between the railway laws of western Canada and those of the adjoining states of the republic. This difference greatly handicaps our efforts in the matter of immigration. The intelligent immigrant considers these points. He ascertains that the railway rates in the United States are controlled by the people, and that when he goes under the British flag, as he does when he enters western Canada, these railway rates are controlled by a railway boss in Montreal. Statistics show that this railway discrimination has been very detrimental to the cause of immigration. If we look at the census of 1896, the census of the province of Manitoba, we find that the population increased between 1891 and 1896 from 150,000 to 200,000 people; that is to say, with all our undoubtedly fertile land and with all the advantages we possess, our population increased in those five years only from 150,000 to 200,000 people. The natural increase of that country is at least 5,000 people a year, and therefore during those five years the only real increase has been 25,000, and I contend that that condition of affairs is vastly due to the fact that the railway laws and regulations are inferior to those in other countries with which we have to compete for immigration. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) stated the other day that the Canadian Pacific Railway did not exercise any great tyranny over the people in the west; he said that their rates were not excessive.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not say that.

Mr. JAMESON. I am glad the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) admits they are excessive. Suppose they were not excessive, I object nevertheless. I contend that we should be placed in as fair a position as other countries, such as the United States and countries under the British flag. It is said that in our railway management there is no despotism. It may be that the despotism of Van Horne and O'Shaughnessy may be a benevolent despotism, which they contend it is; but what I contend is that there should not be any discrimination, and that so little control should be exercised by the Government over the rates charged by the railways in Canada. It is not altogether a question of rates, but it is largely one of discrimination. If the railway company had not control of the rates, but the Government and the people exercised such control, as is the case practically to-day in the United States, the condition would be different from what it is to-day. If the companies choose to give special rates and rebates as they are doing to certain firms and corporations, they can make certain firms and corporations very remunerative and destroy others. If

they favour particular towns, as they have done; if they discriminate against Winnipeg, as they have done, against my constituents, then there exists a despotism which does not prevail in other countries to which immigrants are invited. Even supposing those railway companies could show that their rates were not excessive, still the present condition should not be allowed to continue. We cannot hope, with that clause of the Canadian Pacific Railway against us, to secure relief; although I will make this suggestion, that an inquiry should be made by the Government as to what the clause means. The clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act to which I refer is that, providing that the Government shall have no control over the rates until 10 per cent is paid on the capital actually expended on the construction of the railway. I asked the other day whether this meant the capital actually expended by the railway company and by the Government, or only by the railway company. If it means the capital expended by the railway company, then I believe that point has been reached. I understand the company are paying 4 per cent dividend. Some of the shares were bought at 25 per cent on the dollar; consequently those shareholders are receiving 16 per cent dividend on their investment. This is a point which should be inquired into, whether the Canadian Pacific Railway are not to-day earning 10 per cent on the capital actually expended; and if such should be found to be the case, the Government would have control over the rates and would be in a position to remove special difficulties existing in western Canada which do not prevail in eastern Canada.

I am not going to occupy the time of the House by going into the question of grievances. We have grievances as to rates and as to discrimination, and I could occupy the time of the House two or three hours in enumerating them. I do not, however, base my case on that ground, and probably some other members from the North-west may bring forward instances of that kind. The tribunal which is supposed to control the railway is the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I contend that the railways of Canada have altogether outgrown any possibility of control by such a body. This tribunal is composed of the Minister of Railways, the Minister of Justice and other members of the Privy Council of Canada. It consists therefore of men who are in charge of large departments of Government, whose time is fully occupied with the administration of the affairs of their departments, and who are consequently unable to give to the duties which devolve upon the Railway Committee, the time, and consideration, and attention that a due performance of these duties demand. In the consideration of even such minor matters as railway crossings, great delays and inconvenience result on account

of the infrequent meeting of the committee; besides, no complainant can lay his grievance before this body without the aid of a lawyer. The majority of the members of that committee are not intimately acquainted with railway matters and are therefore at a still further disadvantage in that respect. Now, Sir, that is the great difficulty of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have contended that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is a sufficiently strong authority to deal with the railways, but as I have already contended, the Railway Committee of Canada have reached that stage that they have outgrown any possibility of control of that committee. Considering the matters of detail with which these gentlemen have to deal, it seems to me impossible that they should be able to give time to properly administer such affairs, and to keep the railways in check. I have here the Railway Act of Canada which defines some of the duties of these gentlemen of the Railway Committee, and you can see from that the enormous number of details which devolve upon them, and how impossible it is for them to give their time fully, and with advantage to the public, to the performance of these duties. They have to deal, for instance, with the location of tracks, the maintenance of highways, the cost of fencing, adjustment of tolls, running powers, traffic arrangement, and transshipment or interchange of freight. This latter point is one with reference to which we have difficulties in the North-west. The railways in interchanging freight do as they like. They seem to be under no control. The Northern Pacific and the Canadian Pacific Railway in Manitoba do not seem to have any care for the public, they seem to do as they please, and they do not in that case at any rate, obey the provisions of the Railway Act at all. It is true that we cannot obtain the same perfect control over transportation in western Canada that has been obtained in some of the States of the Union, because we are tied up by this 10 per cent clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter. However, we can claim far greater control than we have at present. One of the most valuable rights obtained under such a State commission as that of Minnesota, is the right of the State to protect the individual in a far cheaper and more expeditious manner than is at all possible under our laws. If the rights of the individual are detrimentally affected, he has the privilege of appealing to the courts, but in practice this right of appeal gives no protection to the individual. If the ordinary citizen of small means finds his rights invaded by a railway company, he would prefer to suffer loss rather than to bring a lawsuit against a wealthy corporation which could ruin him financially by appealing from court to court. The people in some of the neighbouring

Mr. JAMESON.

States have recognized this; they have recognized the fact that a private individual, a small farmer in the west, for instance, is not in a position to press a lawsuit against a railway company. The rich corporation can fight him, whether he has right on his side or not, and in view of this some of the States have adopted in their railway commissions a principle which I think should be adopted in any commission which may be established in Canada. That principle is: that if the individual can show a prima facie case, and the railway company refuses to remedy his grievance, then the State will take up the case of the individual against the railway company. That is provided in the Minnesota Act, which I think is about the best of all the Acts in reference to these railway matters. I have studied the Minnesota Act and the Iowa Act, and I have come to the conclusion that the Minnesota Act is on the whole the most perfect legislation in this regard. There is a provision in the law of the State of Minnesota by which the commissioners are constituted as it were, a Board of Arbitration between the public and the railway company. If a man has a grievance in connection with any matter which comes under the Railway Act, he either telegraphs or writes to the commissioners and they investigate it; not on the strict rules of evidence, but just as a minister or board of inquiry would investigate it. If they think that the complainant has just cause of grievance, they notify the railway company to remedy the grievance, and if the railway company does not remedy the grievance, then they have the power to put in motion machinery backed up with all the power of the State in order to ensure that the rights of the individual are protected. This is section 13 of the Minnesota Act to which I refer:

Any person, firm, corporation or association, or any mercantile, agricultural or manufacturing society, or any body politic or municipal organization complaining of anything done or omitting to be done by any common carrier in contravention of the provisions hereto, may apply to said commission by petition, which shall briefly state the facts.

The petition is frequently simply a telegram, as I can show from several Iowa cases which I have reported here. The clause goes on to say:

Whereupon the statement of the charges so made shall be forwarded by the commission to such common carrier, who shall be called upon to satisfy the complaint or to answer the same in writing within a reasonable time to be specified by the commission, and to serve a copy of such answer to the complainant. If such common carrier shall not satisfy the complaint within the time specified, and it shall appear to the commission that there is reasonable ground for investigating the matter set out in said complaint, the commission shall name a time and place when and where a hearing will be had before the commission, in the matter complained of.

It goes on to say as to what the findings of the commission shall be, and at the end :

If said common carrier shall neglect or refuse, within the time specified, to desist from such violation of the law, and make a reparation for the injury done, in compliance with the report and notice of the commission as aforesaid, it shall be the duty of the commission to forthwith certify the fact of such neglect or refusal, and forward a copy of its report with such certificate to the Attorney General for the State, for redress and punishment as hereinafter provided.

That is the procedure in the State of Minnesota. There are two valuable principles in the Minnesota Railway Commission Law, and in my humble opinion it is the best Act in reference to these matters, and a law which we could easily imitate here. In the first place, the rates are controlled by the commission, and in the second place, the commissioners are a board of arbitration between the public and the railway companies for the redress of the grievances of the individual. I have in my hand the report of the railway commissioners of the State of Iowa which shows the procedures in the various cases and which is a very valuable book, and may, I suppose, be obtained by any member of Parliament. I obtained this book by writing to the Secretary of State, and I suppose anybody can get a copy of it. I will just read the headings of a number of the cases which were settled by correspondence. They were on these various matters: Overflow of lands, dangerous and dark street crossings, overcharge on buggy, failure to furnish cars, highway crossing, shortage of cars, failure to furnish cars again, books lost in transit, inquiry as to transit privileges, insufficient train service, station facilities, goods damaged in transit, inadequate freight train service, insufficient accommodation for passengers in cabooses, overcharge on young bulls, perishable freight—facilities for storing and shipping, farm crossing, discrimination in passenger fares, site for elevator, discrimination against short haul, discrimination in furnishing cars, refusal to furnish cars, discrimination in furnishing cars again, loading cars from wagons, discrimination in favour of Omaha. All these cases were settled by correspondence, and any cases which it was necessary should go before the courts, went to the courts. I have here a book for 1896, showing the numberless cases which were taken up by this commission and settled by telegram. For instance, a man would send a telegram complaining of not being furnished with cars or of being overcharged, and the commissioners would decide the case and tell the railway company to do justice. After these cases have been fought in the courts for years, matters have come to this point, that all the commissioners have to do is to instruct the railway companies to do justice, and they do justice without taking any chances by going before the courts. The hon. Minister

of Railways seemed to think that it would be a stupendous task to legislate in the direction of the appointment of a railway commission in Canada; but I think it would be a great deal easier to do it in Canada than in the United States, for this reason. In the United States the Federal Government has jurisdiction over railways, and each State Government also has absolute jurisdiction over the railways within the limits of the state; but in Canada, it is otherwise. By declaring railways existing under provincial charters to be railways for the general advantage of Canada, we have practically transferred all jurisdiction over railways in Canada to the Federal Government; and therefore it would be necessary to have only one commission to control all the railways in Canada. I suppose we have about 5,000,000 people in Canada. In the agricultural State of Minnesota there are about 2,000,000 people, and if we were to follow their legislation, I think we would not be making a mistake. Fortunately, their legislation has been tested by scores of decisions in their courts. The Act appointing the Minnesota commission is a very short and simple Act, and I do not know that there is anything in it that we could not adopt in Canada, with certain modifications in names. What I would suggest, in conclusion, is that a railway commission should be created, and vested with all the powers of the present Railway Committee, and with further powers similar to those vested in the railway commissioners in Iowa and Minnesota, that is to say, powers sufficient to enable them to see that the provisions of the Railway Act, and all the amendments thereto, are carried out, and also powers to act as a board of arbitration between the public and the railway companies. I believe this is a matter of vital necessity to Canada in general, but especially so to western Canada. If we are to compete successfully for immigration, we must bring our railway laws up to date, and make them as nearly as possible equal to the laws of the countries with which we have to compete for immigration.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, I am in complete sympathy with the motion that has been moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson), for the appointment of a railway commission, for the very good reason that we in the west have had a certain number of grievances against the railway corporations for a number of years, and although we have been bringing them before this House and the country, through our representatives and our press, we have not up to the present got any relief. If we can secure a railway commission such as the hon. member proposes, I am sure it will be a boon to the people of the west. We know that existing freight rates are too high; but although they have been often enough brought to the attention of this House and the country, they have

not as yet received attention. As the hon. member for Winnipeg says, we cannot interfere with the rates on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But there are a great many branch lines in the Territories, and a railway commission might do something to bring some relief to the people in the rates charged on these lines. I do not think the people are suffering as much from the rates on the main line as they are from those on some of these branch lines. In the district where I live, the people are paying enormous freight rates. The Saskatchewan and Long Lake Railway charges a freight rate of about 90 cents per hundred pounds, and a passenger rate of four cents a mile. When we take into consideration the vast amount of public land given for the construction of that road, and also the fact that it gets a cash subsidy in addition of \$80,000 a year for twenty years, I think it will be conceded that the people in my section of country have a right to expect that they will be put in a position to have their produce hauled to market at a lower rate than they are obliged to pay at present. As the hon. member for Winnipeg has truly said, these high rates charged by the railway companies in the west have a great deal to do with preventing people going into the west to settle. We may appoint all the immigration agents and scatter all the immigration literature we please, but as long as the railway rates are kept at the present high figure, we are not going to get that measure of immigration that we have a right to expect. When the railway companies are able to take half the produce for currency charges, people feel, and feel rightly, that they cannot farm at a profit. Another thing which a railway commission would be able to do would be to take up and settle the small disputes constantly arising between farmers and merchants and the railway corporations. In cases of this kind, the settler would rather lose a few dollars than go to the expense of a lawsuit with a large railway corporation. I do not think I need say any more on this question. I hope the hon. member for Winnipeg will be successful in inducing the Government to see eye to eye with him in the matter, and that they will appoint a railway commission. I think it is time such a step should be taken in this country, as has been done by our neighbours on the other side of the line.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. In seconding the motion of my hon. friend, I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, what he has said, and to address to the House a few other arguments in support of the case he has laid before you. It is certainly very necessary that some action should be taken to control our railway system throughout Canada. As matters now stand, the system, or rather want of system, which characterizes the management of our railways, imposes a very heavy burden upon the people, and it is only right

Mr. DAVIS.

that a Liberal Government, which is supposed to be a Government for the people, should take up this great question and deal with it in a manner satisfactory to all concerned. The question is one which should have been taken up years ago. Of late years there has been a great awakening in the public mind throughout the world on the question of railway legislation and railway matters generally, and, as my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) so ably pointed out, we are behind a great many other civilized countries in this respect. It is not so very long since heavy tolls were charged on a great many of the public highways throughout the civilized world, and we know that a wave of public indignation swept away a great many of these old-time barriers to traffic and transportation. But in Canada we are still in very much the same position with regard to railways as we were when the old toll-roads charged excessive rates. No doubt, transportation could be very much more easily and cheaply performed than at present, if our railways were owned by the Government. We have in this country created a great railway monopoly, one which bids fair to control the country, instead of the country controlling it, and it is now almost too late for us to speak about Government ownership of railway. That is an ideal condition to which we ought all to strive to attain, but, under present circumstances, the question of Government ownership of railways, however desirable or correct theoretically it may be, is hardly within the range of practical politics. The mistake was made years ago, when our railway system was first inaugurated. There is no doubt the building, management and control of railways would have been much more cheaply and efficiently carried out, if the people had taken hold of the question in a proper spirit at the start. The arguments adduced by many people against Government ownership and control of railways are fallacious. We have good evidence of that in the history of other countries, and also in the history of our own country, with regard to various public works which are carried on by the Government. The Post Office Department, in Canada and in other countries, is managed and controlled by the Government. In the old country, the telegraph and telephone lines are all conducted by the Government, and conducted most efficiently, satisfactorily and economically, and there is no reason why our railway system should not be carried on in the same way. Because the Intercolonial and other Government railways in Canada have, in the past, been used as political machines, is no reason why we should to-day take that view of the case and stand by it. If a commission were appointed, composed of men selected as our judges are, not so much for their political services as for their integrity and understanding and ability, if politics were excluded entirely from the personnel of the commission, no

doubt our railways would be conducted in a business-like way and in the interests of the people of Canada. There are a number of evils in our present system, and one of the principal, perhaps the greatest, is the heavy bonding of roads in the course of construction. Railway companies are chartered and allowed to bond their roads as they are built, at sums very much larger than their cost. In this way, the roads are put in debt to an enormous extent, and, in order to pay the interest, very much heavier freight charges have to be imposed on the people than would otherwise be necessary. This has been the case with regard to the construction of many railways throughout the Dominion. This system is entirely wrong. No railway company should be allowed to issue bonds for more than the actual cost of the road as constructed. The railway which was referred to here the other night by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), the Lake Dauphin Railway, is one which was constructed on the latter principle. No unnecessary bonds were issued, and there is no debt on the road except for the actual cost of construction. Consequently, that road does not require to earn money over and above the interest on its actual cost; and, as a proof of the wisdom of that policy, that company has, during the first year of its existence managed to pay its interest in full. If the construction of every other railway in Canada were managed in the same way, we would have little or no trouble with high freight rates, provided the roads were conducted honestly, as they should be. This is a very serious matter, as my hon. friend from Winnipeg has said, in Manitoba and the North-west, where we are under the control of a monopoly. In this part of the country you do not feel it to the same extent, because wherever two railways exist, no matter whether they may charge or pretend to charge the same rates, we all know that competition creates a great deal of accommodation which one railway does not give. My hon. friend alluded to the Northern Pacific. Now, the Northern Pacific charges the same rates as the Canadian Pacific Railway—or at least professes to charge the same—but the competition of the two roads makes a vast amount of difference to the people who live at those points in Manitoba which are served both by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Northern Pacific. It makes so much difference that the lumber dealers at Rat Portage and Keewatin have a special schedule, issued only at points which are touched by both railways. At points touched only by the Canadian Pacific Railway, there is a different schedule, because the rates are so much lower at the other points that two schedules have to be printed; and the merchants of Portage la Prairie and Brandon pay considerably less for their lumber than other towns, on account of the Northern Pacific bringing in Minnesota lumber to

compete with Canadian lumber. In many others ways also we get accommodation. Those who lived in Portage la Prairie before the advent of the Northern Pacific are well aware of the great benefit which the Northern Pacific gives us by competition, and there is no doubt that the benefit which competing roads give would be very largely augmented, if they were brought under Government control.

The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) mentioned the fact that the roads in our country would not interchange freight. That is the fact as regards the Canadian Pacific Railway and the North-Western, and one or two others there, but it is not a fact as regards the Northern Pacific Railway. That railway is willing and anxious to interchange freight with any other roads, but its advances are invariably rejected. I wish to quote a few figures to show the difficulty under which people labour in Manitoba on account of the refusal of these railways to exchange freight. In quoting these figures, I shall point out the discrimination practised, showing the difference between the local freight rates, which were alluded to by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) on the spur lines, and those charged on the main lines.

In speaking of the price of lumber at the town of Neepawa, let me quote the following figures:—

Were it not for the railway discrimination, the lumber combine could not control the market as it does. By referring to freight bills, it will be seen that the rate from Little Falls to Portage la Prairie over the N.P.R., a distance of 433 miles, is 16c, and the rate from Portage la Prairie to Neepawa, over the M. & N.W., 61 miles, is 10½c.; from Keewatin to Neepawa, over the C.P.R. and M. & N.W. lines, a distance of 254 miles, the rate is 15c., the C.P.R. share for the 193 miles to Portage la Prairie being 9½c., the M. & N.W. share for the 61 miles from Portage la Prairie to Neepawa 5½c. Thus, you will see the M. & N.W. discriminates against the N.P. in favour of the C.P.R. to the extent of almost double rates on inward freights.

I have a still more striking instance in regard to this same particular locality. The freight rate from Portage la Prairie to Port Arthur or Fort William is 18 cents per hundred pounds. The rate by the Northern Pacific from Portage la Prairie to Duluth is 18 cents also. The freight rate from Neepawa to Fort William over the Manitoba and North-Western and the Canadian Pacific is 19 cents. The rate from Neepawa over the Manitoba North-Western and Northern Pacific to Duluth is 30 cents, a difference of 11 cents. The reason for this is that the Manitoba North-Western, being largely under control of the Canadian Pacific Railway, refuses to transfer freight to the Northern Pacific and charges the full local rate of 12 cents per hundred pounds for the 61 miles from Neepawa to Portage la Prairie. Now, that is practically a prohibitory rate,

and, as a consequence, there is no freight shipped from Neepawa by the Northern Pacific to Duluth, but what wheat is shipped is sent via Fort William; for no man can afford to pay 30 cents per hundred for shipping wheat when he can get it shipped for 19 cents. The Northern Pacific have, over and over again, offered to pay the Manitoba North-Western the same differential rate as is paid them by the Canadian Pacific, but their offers have invariably been rejected. Consequently, at any point in Manitoba, except at the points where these two main railways meet, there is no competition.

Now, there is another very serious matter which ought to be taken up by a railway commission, and which a railway commission could very properly handle, and that is a question which, during the past year, has been agitating the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west to a very great extent—the question of the elevator monopoly. We have had a good year in Manitoba and the North-west. While our crop was not a very large one, the price has been very good. The consequence is that the farmers have been fairly prosperous. But, in spite of that prosperity, what do we find? We find farmers all over the country holding meetings and discussing the grievance which they feel is inflicted upon them by the existence of this elevator monopoly? What is this elevator monopoly? With your permission, I will read from a resolution which was passed by the Farmer's Institute of Portage la Prairie, and which was forwarded to me. It goes on to say:

Whereas the railway companies of Manitoba, except the Manitoba North-western Railway,—
—and I think the Dauphin Railway should be excepted—

refuse to allow farmers to load grain on cars without passing through the elevators;

Whereas the said railway companies will not allow farmers to build or operate elevators or warehouses unless they are of a stipulated capacity and have cleaning and other extensive machinery there;

Whereas the said railway companies do allow milling and elevator companies to load grain through warehouses or uncleaning elevators, even at points where cleaning elevators exist;

Whereas many farmers who have been compelled to ship through these elevators claim to have lost both in grade and price, as the elevator operators will not bind themselves to give out the farmer's own identical grain or any guaranteed grade of the same;

Whereas the granting of this privilege has undoubtedly led to the formation of the combination of elevator and other interests, and this combination, coupled with the machinations practised in our present grading system, has and is seriously interfering with the farmer's rights by controlling largely the price paid for his produce:

Therefore, it is resolved, on behalf of the farmers of Manitoba, that this Institute would emphatically protest against such treatment, and call upon the Federal Government to abrogate the unjust privileges granted to the said railway

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

companies, and request the Government to exercise its power, and, if necessary, compel the railway companies to do justice by accepting grain for transportation from farmers direct from their flat warehouses. And, further, that the Provincial Government be, and is hereby requested to co-operate with the farmers in this matter, and, if necessary, to make a test case in the courts on their behalf.

Now, Sir, this is a matter which agitated the farmers of Minnesota, as has been stated by my hon. friend from Winnipeg, and which agitated the farmers of Dakota also. A few years ago, the legislatures in those States, in order to deal thoroughly with the question established a State railway and warehouse commission—that is, a joint commission. The elevators were made public elevators, and the railways were compelled to accept grain from the farmers' wagons without putting it through elevators. Long platforms were erected at the stations, and the farmers of Minnesota and Dakota enjoy the privilege which is denied our farmers, of loading grain from wagons. The same privilege also exists in Iowa, as I shall show you in a few moments.

Now, the matter on our side, if I understand it properly, stands in this position—there is an agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the owners of the elevators whereby, on condition of the elevators erected being of a certain price and up to a certain standard, the railway company refuse to accept grain from farmers' wagons or through flat warehouses or in any other way. Now, the object of the farmers in obtaining the privilege of loading from wagons or from flat warehouses, is this—that, while we have no doubt that a large majority of the owners and operators of elevators throughout Manitoba and the North-west are men of the highest character, men who would not, under any circumstances, do any thing wrong, still, there is a possibility, that, here and there throughout the country, men may be in charge of elevators whose morals are not up to the required standard. Men in these positions have very large control over farmers in the neighbourhood. The man in charge of the elevator takes in the wheat, but does not guarantee to give the farmer back his own identical wheat—that of course, would be practically impossible in many cases—but he does not even agree to give him wheat of a similar grade. Consequently, the farmers are at the mercy of the elevator man, and many instances are on record where the farmers' confidence has been abused. The farmer regards this as a grievance and claims the right to load his own wheat from his own wagon into the cars, ship it to the commission merchant or anybody he chooses, and thus be able to live independent of the grain men whether in the combine or otherwise. I wish to call your attention to the report of the Iowa state railway commission covering a similar case. I trust the House will

not weary if I take a little time in reading the report of this case. It is not long :

J. H. Strong & Co., Luton, vs. Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company.
Filed Oct. 9, 1896.

The complainants in substance protested against an alleged order of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company, barring them from track shipping on and after Oct. 9, 1896, stating that this would work a hardship upon them in favour of the elevator men, and asking early attention.

The case was at once taken up with Mr. A. C. Bird, general traffic manager of the respondent company, who answered on Oct. 17, as follows :—

Chicago, Oct. 17, 1896.

Mr. W. W. Ainsworth, Secretary, Railroad Commissioners, Des Moines, Iowa :

Dear Sir,—I have yours of the 13th inst., in which you forward copy of letter from C. J. Milligan and J. H. Strong & Son, protesting against an order issued by our company, which company prevents complainants from track shipping on and after the date named.

In reply I beg to say that it is with the utmost difficulty we can supply our patrons with the necessary means of transportation. The demand for cars at the present time is greater than is our ability to supply, and we are, therefore, obliged to refuse cars to any one who is not able or willing to load them in the usual time.

The shippers referred to are "track buyers," and none of them have warehouses to store grain in, and are thus compelled to load cars from the wagons as the grain is brought in in varying quantities by the farmers. Several cars have been thus delayed from three to ten days. If the gentlemen who complain will load their cars within the regular time limit which is required of every one, they will receive their quota of cars. We cannot fill all orders, but will, as far as possible, give each shipper and each station, for that matter, a pro rata of cars at our disposal.

Yours truly,

A. C. BIRD,
General Traffic Manager.

Copy of the foregoing was sent the complainants on Oct. 22, 1896, calling their special attention to the statement of Mr. Bird, that "if the gentlemen who complain will load their cars within the regular time limit which is required of every one, they will receive their quota of cars."

Nothing further being heard from Mr. Milligan, the case is closed.

Now, Sir, what would have been the result in that case if there had been no railway commission in the state of Iowa? These men might have asked for cars until doomsday, and the chances would have been very much against their getting them; but the State Railway Commission stepped in and ordered the company to supply those men with cars, and they were supplied. We know in many similar grievances throughout the country the farmer is helpless, the merchant is helpless, the ordinary citizen is helpless, because, as was stated by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson), it is out of the question for an ordinary individual to cross swords with a large railway corporation. He may obtain a verdict

before a jury, but he is invariably met with an appeal, and appeal follows appeal, until finally he is glad to give up, he is glad to do anything, glad to settle at any price, in order to get out of the enormous expense of litigation to which he has been put. Now, my hon. friend from Winnipeg read the headings of a number of cases which had been settled by correspondence alone. Among these there is a very interesting one he mentions, namely, the site for an elevator. Now, here is a most interesting case. We find that a railway in the west refuses to allow elevators to be built at a certain point where they say there are enough elevators now, and that it is not advisable to have another elevator erected there. We find that the railway companies up there have the right to decide as to the size and capacity and price and standard of the elevator which is to be erected at these stations. Now, here is a case in point also settled in a very satisfactory way by the Iowa State Commission :

Primghar Grain Company, Williams Bros. et al., Primghar, vs. Illinois Central Railroad Company.

Petition filed July 5, 1896.

On July 5 the following petition was filed in the office of the Railroad Commissioners :—

In the matter of the application of the Primghar Grain Company, for an order compelling the Illinois Central Railroad Company to permit an elevator to be erected on the right of way at Primghar, Iowa.

To the Honourable Board of Railroad Commissioners, Iowa :

Gentlemen,—We the undersigned named citizens of O'Brien county, Iowa, who reside in the vicinity of the town of Primghar, and who make said town their trading point and market to sell grain, respectfully petition and ask that an order be made and entered against the Illinois Central Railroad Company, compelling them to allow the Primghar Grain Company, composed of Williams Bros. and others, to erect and operate an elevator on said railroad company's right of way at Primghar, Iowa, and as grounds therefore state the said commissioners the following reasons :—

1st. That the Primghar Grain Company petitioned the Illinois Central Railroad Company for a place to put in an elevator at Primghar and were refused, as shown by letter of C. K. Dixon, superintendent of railroad companies, hereto attached.

2nd. That there are only two elevators at Primghar; one is owned by C. E. Achorn, of Sutherland, and the other by the Chicago and O'Neill Grain Company, of Chicago, and to the best of our knowledge and belief, said two elevators have combined together and have an understanding and agreement about the prices of grain, so there is no competition—

It seems that the grain dealers are very much alike in Iowa and Manitoba. They have an understanding or agreement about the price of grains, so there is no competition.

—and they do not pay the average market price, or as much as is offered for grain at other towns in the county, thereby causing the farm-

ers to haul their grain to Sanborn, Sutherland and Paullina, in order to get the average market price for said grain, greatly to the disadvantage of both the farmers and business men of the town and city of Primghar.

3rd. That the farmers selling grain have frequently been able to get from two to three cents per bushel more for the same grades of grain at the Achorn elevator at Sutherland than they could at the Achorn elevator at Primghar, and the same condition exists at Sanborn and Paullina over Primghar.

Mr. Speaker, I could fancy I was reading about Manitoba, only the names are different, the names of the people and the little towns are different, but we have exactly the same condition of affairs existing up there.

For the reasons above set forth, and in justice to the farmers and business men of Primghar, we, the undersigned petitioners, ask that an order be entered requiring the Illinois Central Railroad Company to grant and furnish for the Primghar Grain Company proper room and space on the right of way of said company at Primghar, suitable for the erection and maintaining of a grain elevator, and to make such other and further orders as by law required in such cases.

Then follow the signatures of the petitioners.

The letter of Mr. C. K. Dixon, superintendent, referred to in the petition, was as follows:—

Cherokee, Iowa, July 8, 1896.

Messrs. Williams Bros., Primghar, Iowa:

Gentlemen,—I inclose herewith copy of a letter written by my superior officer, declining to give you lease of ground for elevator purposes at Primghar. I also inclose copy of your application for the ground, as per your request of the 20th ultimo.

Yours truly,
C. K. DIXON,
Superintendent.

Copy of Inclosure.

Dear Sir,—Referring to your letter of May 7, and returning papers in relation to application of the Primghar Grain Company and Messrs. Henderson and Ingold for lease of the same piece of ground at Primghar, Iowa, for an elevator, which would necessitate the construction of a spur track at an estimated cost of \$375:

As there are already two elevators at this point, it does not seem advisable to spend this amount of money for additional tracks, and the application is denied for this reason.

Yours truly,
J. G. HARTIGAN,
Assistant General Superintendent.

On July 15, 1896, copy of the petition was forwarded Mr. J. T. Harahan, second vice-president Illinois Railroad Company, for attention and answer. Under date of July 20, Mr. Harahan wrote the board stating that he would "have this matter looked into at once." Mr. T. F. Ward, attorney for petitioners, was so advised.

On July 1, 1896, the following was received from Mr. H. L. Williams for petitioners:—

Primghar, Iowa, July 30, 1896.

W. W. Ainsworth, Esq., Secretary, etc., Des Moines, Iowa:

Dear Sir,—In reference to the application of the Primghar Grain Company for grounds to
Mr. RUTHERFORD.

erect grain elevators on right of way of Illinois Central Railroad grounds at Primghar, Iowa, would say that unless action is taken at once it will be too late to do anything this year. We trust you will compel—

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to that word "compel."

—that you will compel the railroad company to make a showing at once, that we may know what to do.

Yours truly,
H. L. WILLIAMS.

Fancy a merchant or a farmer in Manitoba telling anybody to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to do anything.

Copy of the foregoing was immediately forwarded to Mr. Harahan, and he was asked whether his investigations had been completed, and, if so, what position his company took in the matter.

In answer thereto, Mr. Harahan wrote the board, under date of August 11, 1896, saying, among other things:

He does not quote the "other things."

I have had this matter carefully looked into, and the information I have now received would tend to show that there is a necessity for another elevator at that point. I have, therefore, instructed that a location be given the Primghar Grain Company, which, I understand, is composed of Williams Bros. and others, on which to erect an elevator.

If a similar request were sent to the Canadian Pacific Railway, no doubt they would say a great "many other things." The reply would be full of "other things"; but we would not get any such concession.

Under date of August 13, the foregoing statement was communicated to Messrs. Williams Bros. for petitioners, who, in a letter received by the board, August 18, 1896, say:

Yours of August 13 received and noted, and we relieve you from further notice, and the case may now be closed as to location for elevator at Primghar, Iowa.

WILLIAMS BROS.

The case is closed.

I apologize for taking up the time of the House by reading this case, but I could not in one hour have more accurately described the difference in the condition of affairs existing in Manitoba from that in Iowa under the railway commission, and I could not have adduced a better argument in support of the creation of a railway commission to control our Canadian railways. Grievances of all kinds would then be looked after by a properly constituted authority. I regretted to hear the hon. Minister of Railways state that it would be impossible to bring in a Bill this session, because we from the North-west, and I am sure a large number of other members from various parts of Canada are anxious to see this question satisfactorily settled as soon as possible. I trust there will be no delay. I trust that even if we cannot have the whole question satisfactorily settled, the hon. Minister will do what

he can to remove the grievance inflicted on the farmers in the North-west by the existence of the elevator monopoly. From the answer given to my question the other day by the hon. gentleman it would appear that the Government have the power to deal with that matter under subsection 2 of section 246 of the General Railway Act. If the Government did so this year, the farmers of western Canada would feel deeply and heartily thankful. A commission composed of three gentlemen selected for their ability and integrity, men above suspicion, well trained with no pronounced political proclivities, and sufficiently paid to enable them to put aside all political proclivities and act as do our judges on the bench, solely in the best interest of the people without fear or favour, would be able to do much more and their actions would be infinitely more satisfactory than the present Railway Committee of the Privy Council. No one doubts the ability of the present committee, but it is impossible for men whose time is so fully occupied as is the time of those gentlemen to devote the same attention to questions of rates and similar matters as a railway commission specially constituted for that purpose.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I very much regret the absence of so many members to-day when so important a question is brought before the House. I also regret the absence of so many Ministers when this question is up, and I regret especially that the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) is not in his place, because when he occupied a seat on the Opposition benches, he had a forward policy on this transportation question, but now we do not hear his voice. But as one who does believe in railway reform, as one of those forward Conservatives who intend to make this railway question a prominent one at the next elections, and who intends from this day forth to keep it before the people of Canada, I rise to state my views on this great question. I believe it is the greatest issue we have before us in this country to-day.

We can deal with this question in a great many ways. It has been suggested that we should have a railway commission appointed; that we should go in for the nationalization of railways; that we should extend our present state railways; and there is another and immediate course to adopt, and it is to this I will first address myself, and that is that this House can now with the power at present in the hands of the Government, decide, if it sees fit, to take steps to ameliorate the existing state of affairs. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when this question is brought up, are in the habit of saying: you are proposing something radical. Even if it should be something radical, I contend that we should at least endeavour to do something to ameliorate the railway situation and I now propose

to suggest the method. In the first place, this Parliament ought to exercise a greater and stronger check on every railway Bill presented to this House. The Government should insist that there should not be unnecessary duplication of roads. That is the curse of the system to-day. Competition does not always bring about reduction in rates. If the number of roads is increased unnecessarily, we at the same time increase the burdens on the freights to be carried from different points. We must, therefore, stop unnecessary duplication and unnecessary stocking and bonding of railways, and in that way we can reduce the burdens which the traffic has to bear. It devolves on the Government to regulate and carefully guard every railway Bill that passes through Parliament. They should first insist on the 2 cents passenger rate. That would be a great reform and relief to the people. But the members of the Government are in the habit of saying that we must make this a sweeping measure. No; let hon. gentlemen embody this change in the first Bill coming before this House; and I will test the opinion of the House at the first opportunity. Another question has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Railways, and it is one in regard to which something should be done now, and that is in respect to the clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act providing that the Government shall not interfere with the tolls until the road has earned 10 per cent on the capital of the company. I asked last session whether the Minister intended to take steps to ascertain the capital actually invested in the railway, and the hon. gentleman replied that he did not intend to take any such steps. I contend that it is the duty of the hon. gentleman to ascertain the amount the Canadian Pacific has actually cost, and also to ascertain, what has been suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson), whether 10 per cent earnings applies to the amount spent by the company or the amount spent both by the company and the country. That is a duty that should be discharged at once, and I call on the hon. Minister to inform the House why it has not been discharged, and whether he intends to discharge it or not, and I now draw the attention of the hon. gentleman's colleagues to their duty in that respect. Another way in which to regulate the railways and to ameliorate the grievances is to give the companies no further concessions until they remedy the grievances complained of. We have grievances in Ontario with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. The hon. Minister of Railways is not satisfied that the law is sufficient to regulate them. But these companies are here every day of the session to secure additional favours and concessions, and we should say to them that the Government will grant no favours or concessions until existing grievances are re-

medied. That would be following the practice in England, where Parliament refuses to grant favours unless grievances are remedied. These grievances exist to-day, and as the representatives of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway are constantly here let the Government announce that no more concessions will be made and no more subsidies granted or favours conferred until they remove the railway grievances prevailing in Ontario. The members of the West, who are in the main supporters of the Government can in this way get a remedy to-morrow almost, for the transportation grievances in their country. They can have the remedy right here in Parliament by insisting on the Government extending our present national railway system to the city of Winnipeg. They have extended the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal. They are committed to the principle, they can go further and take running rights over the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Ottawa and Parry Sound road; they can then get steamer connection to Port Arthur, and now while the Rainy River Railway is in their hands, they have an opportunity to protect the public as to that line. They have an opportunity to put in the Rainy River Railway Bill a provision insuring that the national railway system of Canada shall be extended to Winnipeg. There is a check on the Canadian Pacific Railway for you; there is where hon. gentlemen who call themselves Liberals and who come from the North-west; there is where they can, if they wish to protect their country, take a stand now and call upon the Government to do this. The Government having extended the national railway from Quebec to Montreal, let them take the running rights to Parry Sound, thence by steamer to Port Arthur, and after that, running powers over the Rainy River Railway. That is the most important issue in this country to-day. That is where this House can do something; that is where this Government can do something, and most of all, that is where the members who come from Manitoba, from the Territories, and from British Columbia, can do something to ameliorate these railway grievances of which they complain. If you put the Intercolonial Railway into Winnipeg it is easy to get from Winnipeg across the plains where you make connection with the Crow's Nest road, and running powers have been retained to the state over that road. In that way you will have a transcontinental line controlled and regulated by the state. If we are to secure that, it must be done now, and the Government must have the courage, and the members from the western provinces must have the courage to insist upon its being done.

Another thing the Government can do, is to abolish the pass abuse that exists in this country. The leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the Postmaster General

Mr MACLEAN.

(Mr. Mulock), the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), are on record in this Parliament as saying that the pass abuse must be regulated, but they have not attempted it yet. When do they propose to take action? Until that pass abuse is abolished and until Parliament compels railways either to carry members of Parliament free, or gives members of Parliament money to pay for their railway transportation, there will be no headway in railway legislation in this country. I may tell hon. gentlemen that the people of Canada are satisfied to-day that there is something wrong in this House, that there is some reason why railway reform does not come, and within my knowledge a great many think it is because this pass abuse exists. We have a Government in power now that claims to be progressive, and it is their duty to do something at once in regard to this matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have given a number of instances to show wherein this Government and this Parliament can do a great deal to remedy the evils of the transportation system. I have shown that they can exercise a check on new legislation; that they can insert more stringent clauses in every railway Bill going through this House; that they can give us a 2 cent transportation rate for passengers in every new railway Bill; that they can compel the big corporations to remedy existing grievances by refusing them any further concessions until they remove these grievances; that they can abolish the pass abuse, and that they can extend the national railway to Winnipeg. Sir John A. Macdonald was able to regulate the railways in a way, by withholding legislation, and I direct the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to that. There was what is called the monopoly clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter, and when the Canadian Pacific Railway came to the Government for further aid, Sir John Macdonald said: We will give you that further aid provided you remove that monopoly. That was the way to do it, and the same method is open now to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Why did they give them a monopoly in the first place?

Mr. MACLEAN. Why are you giving them a monopoly now in the Yukon country; I will put you a question, if you are in that humour. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make a party issue of this; I deprecate the idea of bringing party into a question of this kind. I am glad to see that this question has been raised by a Liberal member from Manitoba, and, Sir, I will support any Liberal in any progressive measure of railway reform. Any criticism I am offering here on this matter is not of a partisan character; I am ready to give the Government credit where credit is due. I give

them credit for bringing the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, although I am not able to approve of the method by which they did that. I give them credit for retaining a certain control in the Crow's Nest Pass Railway; I think they should have retained more. In every way in which the present Government endeavour to solve this transportation problem, I as a Conservative will be only too glad to give them support, and I do not wish in any way to mix up politics with the issue.

But there are other things that can be done. There can be a railway commission established as is now proposed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jameson). That railway commission could accomplish a great deal, and I regret that the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) told us the other day, that he did not see that we could establish it this session. Why not this session? Is there any question more important to the country? Surely the Government are not holding back the establishment of this railway commission until such time as that monster monopoly the Canadian Pacific Railway has grabbed everything in sight, and until nearly everything will be gone in the way of railway extension. Now is the time to do it, and the Government can do a great deal if they wish to. A first-class railway commission can do a great deal of good, and a comparatively trivial Act of Parliament can begin it this very session. First of all, that commission could take over the jurisdiction of the present Railway Committee of the Privy Council; it could be given additional powers and those powers could be gradually extended. If the Government be in earnest about the matter, that commission could be established this session by simply transferring the powers of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to this railway commission, and gradually extending and expanding these powers at subsequent sessions of Parliament. I admit that you cannot make all these sweeping reforms at present, but you can begin action, and it is to begin action that I am urging on the Government to-day. That commission will not cost this country a great deal, although I may say I believe in paying these men well. If you have three men whom you expect to give their entire service to Canada in this respect, they ought have \$10,000 or \$15,000 a year. You should get the very best men in the country and they ought to be free of Government influence or party influence or influence of any kind. They ought to consecrate their efforts to acting as judges between the people and the railway companies, and they ought to be placed in a position to hold court in any part of the country. It is a great inconvenience to people to attend the meetings of the Railway Committee in Ottawa, it is hard to bring the witnesses and get at the facts here; but if we had a commission with power to go to any part of Canada where an issue

had arisen it would be a great convenience. They could settle the issues between a farmer and a railway company, between a municipality and railway company, and between railway companies one with the other. That commission would be essentially in the interests of the people; and it would cost comparatively a small sum of money, and it could be instituted this session if the Government were in earnest. I regret that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) who brought up this question quite a number of years ago, is not here to-day to tell the people where he stands on this question. He raised false hopes in their hearts years ago; he said he staked his future on the establishment of a railway commission in Canada, but for a number of years of late, his voice has been silent. I believe that hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) will return to Canada shortly, and I hope he will find occasion to tell the people of Canada what his position is now in regard to the establishment of a railway commission.

Another thing we can do in regard to railway transportation is to lay down the principle, that Canada is to take a stand for the nationalization of her railways. That may be a hopeless programme to some of you, but I know of no idea in the higher field of politics that is growing with more force than the idea of nationalization of railways, all the world over. In Australia they have nationalized their railways and it has proven a great success; in several of the countries of Europe they have nationalized their railways and always with beneficial results. The people have better transportation, they have cheaper transportation, and the countries that adopted the policy of the nationalization of railways are continuing that policy and extending its scope. Only the other day, the people of Switzerland voted in favour of the nationalization of the railways in that country. In the United States, where there are enormous railway grievances, and where it is much more difficult, owing to the constitution of the country, to regulate the railways, there is an agitation for the nationalization of the railways. I know of no means of realizing that fact so easily as by reading an article on the subject in the February number of the "North American Review." The writer of that article shows that the whole issue with regard to railways settles down to this, that there are four or five great countries in the world which are seeking to supply food products to Europe—North America, South America, principally Argentina, Australia and Russia—and he holds that that country which has the cheapest and best transportation will win in the fight. So convinced is he of that, that he holds that the only way the United States can hold its own in the coming competition with Russia, Canada, South America and Australia is, by the nationalization of the Pacific railways west

of the Missouri. He says, that he would not take the responsibility of suggesting the nationalization of the railways east of the Mississippi, which is almost too enormous a task; but he shows clearly how it would pay the United States, even at this late date, to nationalize the great continental roads west of the Missouri River. All over the world this movement for the nationalization of railways is in progress, and it is a growing movement. It is a movement with which Liberals ought to identify themselves; but very few of them have yet dared to say, as I have said, that I am in favour of the nationalization of the railways. I do not wish hon. gentlemen to say that I am asking too much, and therefore nothing can be done. A great deal can be done, and done this session, by the Government with the powers they now possess. All they want is the courage and energy to do what can be done; and those Liberals who have railway grievances should insist on the Government doing something in that direction. If we are a people who believe in our representative institutions, these Liberals must join hands with us who claim to be progressives, in seeking to put down monopolies in this country. If there is any force that is threatening our representative institutions, it is these enormous monopolies which we have created. The Canadian Pacific Railway is a dangerous monopoly. It has too much power at this moment. In this connection, I would point out to my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) in what way he could do something to trim the wings of the Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly, that is, in regard to their telegraph monopoly. I believe the time has come when the telegraph lines of this country should be taken over by the state, and administered as a portion of the Post Office Department. As a newspaper man, I can say this further—and Mr. Hays, of the Grand Trunk Railway, pointed it out the other day—that, in the present dispute between the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway had the enormous advantage of controlling the news service supplied to the newspapers of this country. It is high time that that should come to an end, and one way by which it can be brought to an end is, by the Government taking over the telegraph service of this country. To show the House that the people of this country are in earnest in demanding railway reform in the direction of the nationalization of monopolies, I wish to read an account given in the Hamilton "Herald" of a meeting held in that city the other night:

The seating capacity of the Bricklayers' Hall was hardly sufficient to accommodate the attendance of social reformers—

I am a social reformer, Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen like to call me that.

—at the meeting called by the Trades and Labour Council last evening to complete the organization

Mr. MACLEAN.

of a general social reform society. Representatives of the East and West End Workingmen's Clubs, Single Tax Society, Socialists, Co-operative Commonwealth, Co-operative Trade Company, Industrial Brotherhood, and others interested in the movement were present. The discussion of the various clauses of the platform occupied the attention of the meeting until a late hour, and resulted in the adoption of the following basis of organization:—

I will only read two or three of those:

4. The operation of all natural monopolies by the Dominion and Provincial Governments, in the interest of the whole people.

5. The operation of all municipal franchises by the municipalities.

The same feeling which pervaded this crowded meeting pervades the people of Toronto. They are in favour of the nationalization of monopolies. It is the question before the people of this country; it is the question before the people of most countries. It is making great strides in most countries where it comes up, and this Parliament, if it wishes to be alive and up to date, must take up these questions and deal with them on the lines of nationalization. At the present time, especially, it must deal with them on the lines of national control. It is a great satisfaction to me to be able to stand up here to-day and say that I am in favour of these reforms. I believe that something should be done to promote them. I hope the Minister, when he makes his statement to-day, will state when he will introduce this proposed railway legislation. I hope he will introduce it this session, notwithstanding what he has said to-day, and I hope he and the First Minister will pay some heed to the things I have said as to what the Government can do at the present moment for the amelioration of the transportation problem of this country. Especially do I ask the members from the Northwest, who are in a position to press upon the Government to do something in the direction of removing the grievances of which they complain.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to speak at any length on this subject, nor would I have spoken at all, had it not been for the importation into the discussion of the question of the elevator monopoly by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford). That question, as most of the members who read the press of the Northwest, and as most of the people of Canada know, is a burning one in that country. It may not be within the knowledge of the members of this House, but it is a fact, nevertheless, that the general impression throughout that country is, that, owing to the elevator monopoly, the farmers of Manitoba and of the North-west Territories suffered a loss in connection with the marketing of their wheat during the past year of \$1,000,000. That, Mr. Speaker, is a remarkable statement, but I believe that later on this session I shall be able to prove its ac-

curacy to the House. During the past few months, I have been collecting data with regard to this subject, and I hope, at a later stage, to be able to lay before the House information which, if it does not entirely prove, will go in the direction of proving, the absolute accuracy of that statement. I have introduced a Bill, in the form of an amendment to the general Railway Act, which, if it passes, will compel the railway companies to carry wheat for farmers which may be loaded at the railway stations, not necessarily from the elevators, which is at present compulsory, but from flat warehouses or from farmers' vehicles. These elevators are controlled generally, if not entirely, by grain dealers. In that country, in the last year, there was formed what is known as a syndicate of syndicates. This syndicate of syndicates controls practically all the elevators in that country, with the exception, I believe, of such as are in the hands of the Ogilvies, and consequently all the farmers are obliged to store their grain in these elevators and pay a cent and a half per bushel for that privilege. In the second place, the owners of these elevators whom the syndicate of syndicates control, by mixing the grades, as they seem to be able to do, are able to practically steal from the farmers from one to three cents a bushel. Thus the farmers suffer grievous wrong through this elevator monopoly.

I had hoped that the Government would have been prepared this session to deal with the question of a railway commission. If it were to appoint such a commission as would deal effectively with these questions, it would not be necessary for myself and my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), who has also introduced a Bill dealing with the same matter, to press our measures to a conclusion. I am quite sure that members from the west who have been studying this question, and who have been pressed by their constituents, from time to time, to bring it before Parliament, will never, until successful, cease in their advocacy of some measure which will effectively kill this elevator monopoly in the North-west. If the Government does not provide for the appointment of a railway commission this session, I shall certainly do my best and I am sure the other members from the west will do the same, to prevail upon the Government to allow this Bill of the hon. member for Assiniboia, or the Bill I have myself introduced to become law. I am sure that the Government and the members of this House, when they see the facts that we shall be able to bring before them will support such a measure. As I have already pointed out, the farmers of our western country suffered to the extent of nearly a million dollars during the past season in the handling of their grain. Hon. members know well how the people of the North-west have struggled to hold their own, and I would appeal to them to stand

by those who are preparing to press for legislation to relieve our farmers in this connection. With regard to the point made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) that the west would be assured in the control of rates on the Rainy River Railway, the construction of which is now proposed by virtue of the aid already voted by this House and voted by the Ontario Legislature, and which, it is reported, will be proposed this session by the Manitoba Legislature, I am heartily in accord with his suggestion. I may say that if the Greenway Government had been able to assure absolute control of rates upon the road recently proposed to Duluth, it is my belief that that road would be under construction at present, to connect the wheat fields of Manitoba with Duluth. If it is correct, as reported, that Mr. Greenway is now preparing to secure much needed competition by way of the Rainy River road, then every one will trust that such precautions will be taken as may insure the absolute independence of that road and the control of its rates by the Manitoba Government.

In the States of Minnesota and the Dakotas, the settlers suffered as they do in Manitoba and the North-west by reason of an elevator monopoly, but railway commissions were appointed and that question was so thoroughly dealt with that the farmers of these states have no longer any ground of complaint in that regard. The farmers are enabled to load their grain directly from their vehicles or flat warehouses on to cars at the various stations. I hope to be able to lay before the House the facts in this connection which will be perfectly satisfactory, and I trust will influence members of this House to support the measure I shall submit to them later on.

Mr. SPROULE. As one who has always advocated the appointment of a railway commission, I wish to say a few words. I have never seen occasion to change my mind from the first time the proposition was submitted, and that was many years ago. It was introduced originally in this House, I think, by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), it was advocated for several years, and finally an agreement was reached between the Government and him—upon what ground, whether the sunny ways of conciliation or the influence of the railway companies, I do not know that he should abandon his Bill and that instead a Railway Committee of the Privy Council would be appointed. That was expected to do the same work and just as effectively as any railway commission. The railway Committee of the Privy Council has been in operation many years, and public opinion is to the effect that it has not been instrumental in doing the work expected. It would be interesting to-day to have a report of the classes of complaints submitted to that tri-

bunal for adjudication, because I am sure it would be found that a great many of the cases which it was expected would come before that body never reached it at all. After the trial of a few cases, it was found that the tribunal was one which ordinary individuals could not approach with any hope of getting the consideration they were entitled to. What benefit has resulted from the formation of that Railway Committee of the Privy Council? Largely, I think, it has been instrumental in settling disputes between railway companies themselves with regard to crossings and like matters, or with regard to the right of the public to have highways over railways or to have certain places in cities, where railways pass, protected. These are the cases that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has dealt with more than any other. But a railway commission would settle a great many other cases which are not taken before the railway committee at all. The moral power behind that commission would help them to settle a great many such cases. What powers should such a commission have? In my opinion, they should have both executive powers and the powers of a court of inquiry. A commission could act more readily here than in the United States. It has been said that the commissions in the United States are not effective, but there is a great obstacle in their way, namely, that they are State commissions. The American railways commissioner is under state laws, whereas here they are under federal laws. A state can only control a railway so far as the powers of the state go, but here the federal power controls the railways all over the country. A railway commission would have a strong moral force. It would not be subject to the political influences to which the Government is subjected, and it would therefore act more independently. Such commission should be composed of at least three members—first, a railway expert; second, a legal expert; and third, a man of good intelligent, common sense.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Sometimes these professional men and experts are not possessed of this qualification as men are outside of the professions. What have other governments done in this matter? It has been said that in England, where they have had the same trouble to contend with a great many years, their railway commission has not been a success. But I find that, as far back as 1840, the House of Commons referred the subject of a commission to a special committee of the House. It was referred again in 1844 and again in 1865, and the result of the report that was made by these various committees was that in 1872 a railway commission was appointed. After that commission had been in operation for some time a report was made by a select committee showing some of the things that had been accomplished.

Mr. SPROULE.

The committee reported that it was necessary to maintain some special tribunal to which could be referred questions arising as to the rights and duties of railway companies in relation to the trade and traffic of the country; that the operation of such tribunal should be cheap and expeditious; that this tribunal should have jurisdiction to enforce the provision of special acts of railway companies in any case of illegal charges; and that a 'locus standi' should be given to it in branches of the chamber of commerce and other similar associations of trade and agriculture. That a railway commission could and would do good work on these lines there is no doubt. And the result was, I am told, that the railway commission has been operated in many respects satisfactorily ever since.

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

After Recess.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I observe that the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution is not present. Had he been here, I would have made a suggestion to him, which would, I think, have met with his approval. It would, if approved, have the effect of affording the hon. gentleman, if he desires it, a later opportunity for the resumption of this discussion. I have no wish that the opportunity should be withheld from any hon. member who might have views on this question which he desires to express. With a few observations preceding the motion, I shall move the adjournment of this debate. I observe that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has assumed that necessarily I would wish to make some statement on this subject, and I infer that if I abstain altogether from speaking on the question, he might think that I was wanting in courtesy, perhaps, or that I failed to appreciate the magnitude and importance of the subject to which hon. members have been addressing themselves this afternoon.

I do not at all underrate its importance. I feel as strongly as any member of this House that the transportation question is one of the largest questions with which the Parliament of Canada can have to deal. I am not maturing my views upon the question to-day, by any means. I have felt strongly upon it, and have held these views for many years. I would hail with delight the adoption of any scheme of legislation which would, in any substantial degree, redress the grievances of which the people of Canada have to complain; but, Sir, I would not think I was doing my duty, if I allowed the impression to be generally entertained, that I thought, and that the Government thought, so far as I can express its views,

that this matter is one susceptible of easy treatment, or that a complete, or even a large, remedy is capable of being applied. I cannot shut my eyes to the adverse facts, when hon. members tell us that a railway commission, if one were created, would remedy these evils, because I know that in those countries where railway commissions have been established, these evils have not been in any considerable degree removed. If we carry our recollections back to the year 1873, when there was a great outcry in the United Kingdom which led to the creation of a railway commission, and if we follow the history of that legislation and of the operation of that commission, we will find that the result was not what the people were led to expect would follow the creation and operation of a railway commission in England, as no considerable measure of relief was afforded to the traders and to the people interested in the great transportation question in that country. It is a fact, that at this very day the people are almost despairing of obtaining any adequate remedy. Now, knowing that, I feel it my duty to disabuse the hon. gentlemen of the impression, which some might perhaps entertain, that the moment we set a railway commission on its feet, that moment we will see a vastly improved condition in these regards. I am in the fullest sympathy with anything which will afford a substantial measure of relief, but I am not sanguine, sympathetic as I am—quite as sympathetic as the hon. gentlemen opposite, and as ready to go as far as my judgment will bear me out to provide this relief—that the consequences will be as complete and as successful as hon. gentlemen believe. Now, the hon. member has said, that all we would have to do to afford substantial relief to the people of this country, would be to constitute a railway commission, and to confer upon it the same powers which are now vested in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Now, I know the hon. gentleman has stated that opinion very strongly, and I am quite sure that was his conviction; but, Mr. Speaker, with all deference, I must say that I do not agree with him. My view is, that as regards providing a remedy for the more serious grievances, you would absolutely fail, if you simply invested a commission, no matter how able, with the powers which have been conferred by statute upon the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. My judgment is, whether it is of any value or not, but formed from a somewhat careful study of the provisions of that Act, that such a transfer would not be very effective. I believe that the statute to-day, so far as it provides or confers upon the Railway Committee machinery to meet these evils, is defective. I think it is very defective. Take, for instance, the suggestion to confer upon one railway company the right to use the rails of another company, or, in other words, to confer running rights. Why, Mr. Speaker, you might hand over the

whole machinery of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to a railway commission, and you would not get one step further. We have never had, so far as my information goes, but one or two minor and trifling applications since the Railway Committee has been constituted, from one railway company, asking to have running rights over another's tracks. I presume, the reason of that largely lies in the fact that those who have been advising the railway companies, the counsel of the railway companies, have been forced to the conclusion, from a study of the provisions of that Act, that it is inadequate for that purpose. I am not going to detain the House to-night by going over this field. It is a very large field; it is a subject which one could discuss at great length. There are many matters which suggest themselves to any one who has studied the provisions of the Railway Act relating to this one single branch of it. At all events, the result of that study has been to convince me that it is not sufficient or effective, and cannot be made so simply by transferring the jurisdiction which the Railway Committee now exercises to such a railway commission as would be constituted.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me—will he tell the House whether, in his opinion, he thinks some provision could not be made, for instance, whereby the Intercolonial Railway could be extended to Winnipeg, and the right obtained for that railway to run its cars to Winnipeg?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Sir, I do not wish at all to treat the hon. gentleman with any discourtesy; on the contrary, I wish to treat him with every consideration; but I am bound to tell him that he is roaming into a field which is very much larger than he has any conception of, when he talks about conferring upon any tribunal which we can constitute here, and which we have prescience enough to surround with proper safeguards, the power to use the various railroads of other companies which we would have to take in order to project the Intercolonial Railway into the centre of this continent. Sir, it is a vast subject, and what does it mean? It means that you have to sit down and make provision for using all these various lines of railways, for using the staff of these railways, for using the station-houses and terminals of these railways, and for getting these different railway corporations to come to some sort of understanding with you; and then, after you have done all that, where are you? As the result of the exercise of any power which Parliament could be led to confer upon a commission, you would not give them the right to obtain one dollar's worth of local traffic from one end of the connection to the other. The local traffic must belong, of necessity, to the railway company which owns the road. Just imagine me coming to Parliament on behalf of this

Government, and asking Parliament to make a grant of a sufficient sum of money to enable me to run the Intercolonial Railway from its present terminus at Montreal through to Winnipeg, and explaining to Parliament what my needs would be in that case, how much money I would want, and what such an arrangement would involve, say I could only hope to get what through traffic might offer to the railway at the terminals for transfer to Montreal. I could not pick up a ton of freight or a single passenger through hundreds of miles that railway would traverse. I am only just touching the threshold when I suggest this as one of the difficulties which surrounds this subject. I assure the hon. gentleman that when he tells the House that all the Government have to do is to cross a "t" and dot an "i" and the difficulty is settled, he does so from want of knowledge of the details connected with the subject. I sympathize with the hon. gentleman, I will not say in regard to the nationalization of railways, but in the view that we should have a national highway. I am as strongly of the opinion as is the hon. gentleman, that it was a radical error in the policy of the Government of that day—I do not reflect on them, because public opinion would not have sustained them in taking this further step—when they allowed the trans-continental railway to become the property of a private corporation. I feel as strongly as does any man that the true policy in the interest of Canada, the sound policy for its welfare was that at any cost the country should have owned that great highway. Then we could have afforded to treat the people liberally, even though it might involve cost, for the people benefited would have been those who went west to find homes and settle on its broad acres and turn them to profitable account; and people would have been induced to go there and stay there if Canada had owned one great trunk line—I am not going for any more than one, and I do not think more than one would have been necessary—constructed and operated by the Government. I sympathize entirely with the hon. gentleman in that phase of the question, and am heartily with him in that regard. So far as it is possible for me within my sphere in this Government to work out the problem in that direction, I shall be very glad to give it my closest study and very best attention. That is one question. The question of the nationalization of railways is, however, a very large one, one we cannot take up and usefully consider on short notice. It is a live question or becoming a live question in England, and it is likely to grow in intensity in that country; and it is a remarkable fact that there is not on the continent of Europe, with one or two minor exceptions, a country which does not own its railways, and the feeling is growing stronger there day by day and year by year in favour

Mr. BLAIR.

of adhering to the system of state railways. That is undoubtedly a great advantage to a country, and the traders of England now recognize that it would be in the true interests of the country if the Government owned the railways in the United Kingdom. There was a time when it was within the power of the British Parliament to have bought those railways, when it had the statutory authority to buy them, but it did not exercise the power, and the people of the United Kingdom are now face to face with this very great problem which has been settled throughout the continent of Europe by the nationalization of railways. My hon. friend has pointed out how easy, in his opinion, it would be for the Government to take the railway companies by the throat when they come to Parliament and ask for legislation, and compel them to yield to our wishes. We will assume that one company wishes to acquire running rights over the line of another company. Before we would be in a position to deal with the question we would require to have some other company desiring to have such a right conferred. If that were the situation and we had such an application before us it might be possible to exercise enough pressure, even enough moral influence possibly on what would be the subservient railway company to lead it to submit to the exercise of this privilege by another company. But that is a matter which would depend so much on circumstances and contingencies, I scarcely can agree with my hon. friend that it would be an easy thing to do, because we have not the conditions existing. If the hon. gentleman had all the power to-day he could not work out the remedy suggested; in the first place, not having a railway company coming here asking for a favour which could be withheld, and in the second place, not having another company coming here and asking for running rights over such road. Another suggestion my hon. friend made, and he said he intended to try it at the first opportunity when a railway company came here asking for a charter, and that was the introduction of a clause limiting the rate of passenger fares to 2 cents per mile. That would not carry my hon. friend very far, even if he tried and succeeded with his experiment. The hon. gentleman would find himself imposing a rate of 2 cents per mile on some company constructing a line in a new country, occupying a field which had never been covered before, perhaps running a railway under difficulties that would render a 2 cent rate utterly inadequate, and the hon. gentleman would at the same time fail to get at the companies he wants to reach. He would not reach either the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk, or any company by imposing a 2 cent rate other than the company seeking to be incorporated.

When he comes to make his motion he will find many hon. members who will sympathize with his object, but will regard it as unreasonable and impracticable to apply a 2 cent rate to a railway running in some remote section of the Dominion. I would suggest to my hon. friend that having had this somewhat full discussion on this motion, he should not press it to a vote to-night, or if the hon. gentleman desires that the debate should stand over, I would move the adjournment of the debate. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. MACLEAN. Before the motion is carried I wish to make one remark. The Minister of Railways has stated that it is almost impossible to make an experiment with a 2 cent passenger rate in respect to a new road. We will have an opportunity this session of applying the 2-cent passenger rate to a railway that controls the key of the situation, the road from Port Arthur to Winnipeg. The highest tariff rate prevails in that district to-day, it is a line that has large travel; it is a line which will be travelled a great deal more hereafter, and it is a line largely subsidized by this Government, by the Ontario Government and by the Manitoba Government. It is a good line on which to make an experiment. Mr. Bagehot, who is one of the greatest authorities in the British Empire on the constitution, lays it down that the great thing in regard to legislation is experiment. I ask the Government here to make the experiment. It is a hard thing to carry out a general principle, but make an experiment. Do not attempt to make a sweeping reform, but go in for an experiment of some kind. We have now an opportunity of making an experiment in regard to the adoption of a 2-cent passenger rate on this railway. It is a line which is generously subsidized by three Governments, a line that is largely travelled over now and likely to be much more largely travelled over, and if the experiment succeeds on it we can apply it all over. I throw out the suggestion, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) adopts some of these progressive ideas we have suggested to-day, a great deal will be done for the improvement of transportation in this country. It is possible to frame legislation to-day that will enable this country at a small expense to extend the national railway system clear to Winnipeg, as it has been extended from Quebec to Montreal, and in that way relief will be afforded to the people of the North-west. I know there are difficulties in the way, but difficulties have to be tackled, and we must begin in some way to try and overcome them. It is not to embarrass the Government, it is not in any way to advance the party on this side of the House, but it is in the interests of the country I throw out the suggestion, and I do hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair),

who has charge of the Railway Department, will find a means of making an experiment in regard to the transportation problem, on the line between Lake Superior and Winnipeg. When that Bill comes up, I will bring forward a proposition with that end in view.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not intend to discuss the main question, but speaking on the motion to adjourn, I would merely say that I was glad to hear the Minister of Railways tell us that he sympathized with the desire of those who wish to effect something in the way of reduction of freight rates. I remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) that his Government, through his right hon. leader, is pledged to give the North-west Territories relief in the matter of freight rates.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. So they have.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think they have in any marked way up to the present. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) refers to the Crow's Nest Pass arrangement, let me ask him: has that come into operation yet? The reduction of 8 cents that took place east of Port Arthur had no connection whatever with the Crow's Nest road, and would have taken place if that road never existed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The reduction between Port Arthur and the east.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, that reduction of 8 cents between Port Arthur and the east. The Minister of Railways is bound to find a solution of the question. I quite realize, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) does, the difficulties in the way, and it does not seem to me that it is all plain sailing in the matter of a railway commission. We know the history of the railway commission in England, and although my hon. and learned friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has stated that the railway commission in England was a success, so far as I remember the working of that commission it has not been a supreme success at all. The Minister of Railways has, I think, thought out the matter himself on the same lines as my own mind goes on. The moment this House gives a charter to a railway, it really parts with a certain amount of sovereign power, and the real solution I believe will be found to be the resumption of the railways by the state. Although in England the railway commission had all the powers of a court of record, nevertheless it was found that it could not enforce its decisions with the authority of a court of record, and one railway after the other presented a passivity in regard to its decrees that thwarted its usefulness. Nevertheless, it did some good. The subject is surrounded with difficulty, but difficulties are the opportunities of great men. In regard to the line to which my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has referred, and in

regard to any future railways chartered by this House, we might make a beginning, and although maxima were not very successful things in England, yet they were not wholly unsuccessful, and they effected good results for the people. In regard to these lines this House should say: We will not allow you to charge more for freight than a given sum—they may charge less if they like, but they must not charge more. In that way a certain measure of relief will be given and a commencement in the right direction made. I grant you that the whole question is a vast one, and I doubt if the people just now are prepared for it. The only way to prepare the people and to prepare Parliament for the question is by discussions such as we have had to-day in this House and by discussions in the press outside. The real solution, as the Minister of Railways said, is that the state should have control of the main continental line. It is a long way to look forward to that, but I do not see a plan that will offer a thoroughly successful solution short of it.

Mr. McMILLAN. As a farmer from Ontario, let me say that I have had conversations with a good many gentlemen just before the commencement of this Parliament, and business men and farmers alike are all strongly in favour of a railway commission. One of the reasons why that is so is that there is very great discrimination against both individuals and localities. In shipping apples to the old country we have found that wherever we have competition between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway we get a rate of 5 cents or 10 cents less per barrel than where there is no competition. If the reduction is 5 cents, it comes to \$9 per car, and if it is 10 cents it comes to \$18 per car. In one case in which I was interested a railway commission would certainly have interfered. We shipped three carloads of cattle from Prince Albert to Montreal and we paid \$190 per car. We sold a carload of apples to my friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), and we were obliged to pay for these apples going west \$518 per single car. That is a case a railway commission would take cognizance of. I know a farmer who shipped cattle to North Bay, a distance of 190 miles, and he paid \$90 a car, whereas for a carload of cattle shipped 100 miles west of Chicago, he only paid \$65 a car. Why should discriminations of this kind exist against the farmers of Canada? To-day we have free corn in this country, but in consequence of this discrimination on railways we can bring corn from Chicago into Toronto just about as cheaply as we can bring corn from the counties of Kent and Elgin into that city. There is this discrimination against both the farmer who wants to purchase corn, and the farmer in the western part of Ontario, who should get the full price for his

Mr. DAVIN.

corn. Another matter which a railway commission ought to deal with is one which the farmers in the western part of Ontario have felt very keenly, that is, drainage across railways. I have always felt that it would be useless for any farmer to bring his grievance before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council; for the railway companies send their well-trained solicitors there, and everything a farmer might place before them would be set aside at once. But if we had a railway commission, appointed by statute, in the same manner as our Auditor General is appointed, independent of the Government or any corporation, the farmers could go before such a body, and lay their case before it, with full confidence that it would receive attention and be dealt with in a satisfactory manner. When any matter relating to the farmers is brought before the Railway Committee, they are generally in the press of business, and have not time to attend to it properly; whereas if a railway commission were appointed, with ample power to deal with these questions, many of the grievances we suffer under at the present time could be remedied. For instance, at present we find that large corporations can get shipping privileges which the farmers cannot. They can get a cheap rate for taking a carload of cattle from any part of Ontario to Manitoba or the North-west. Why should not any breeder or farmer from the North-west who comes to Ontario to purchase cattle get the same rate as the Live Stock Association, without having to go through any formality, or asking any favour from a railway corporation? All these are questions which a railway commission could deal with, and I think it is important that the Government should take steps to appoint such a commission. Although it may be true that a railway commission could not compel a railway company to grant running powers to another company, yet they could prevent discrimination against individuals. For instance, a small shipper of cattle from western Ontario to Montreal, is led to believe that he can get as good a rate per car load as any one else; but a large shipper who sends eight or ten car loads, gets a rebate. This I hold is an unjust discrimination against the small shipper, and it has the effect of driving our young men out of the country. I hold that if a man takes a full car load of any stuff, he should get the same rate per car as a large corporation which ships a large quantity of stuff. Another thing the cattle shippers in western Ontario have to complain of is, that a shipper can go to Chicago and purchase his cattle there, and ship them to Montreal at as low a rate as can be got from western Ontario to Montreal.

Mr. MACLEAN. And over Canadian roads.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, and over Canadian roads. This is a great injustice to our far-

mers and cattle dealers. All these are questions which could be dealt with by a railway commission. I have spoken on this subject with many farmers and business men of the county of Huron, and almost every one was in favour of a railway commission, and I was urged to lift my voice in this House in favour of it; and that is the reason I have risen to speak after the adjournment of the debate has been moved. We believe that a good deal of benefit has been derived by the people of the United States from the railway commission there. I have in my hand the railway rates as settled by the railway experts. In the United States, they have six classes of freight, while in Canada we have ten classes, and I have placed them so as to make as fair a comparison as possible. The different rates per 100 pounds on similar classes of freight are as follows:—

United States Rates.		Canadian Rates.	
For 65 miles—			
1st class.....	22c.	1st class.	28c.
3rd class.....	15c.	5th class.....	14c.
8th class.....	8c.	9th class.....	11c.
For 115 miles—			
1st class.....	24c.	1st class.....	38c.
3rd class.....	19c.	5th class.....	19c.
8th class.....	8½c.	9th class.....	14c.
For 160 miles—			
1st class.....	28c.	1st class....	42c.
3rd class.....	20c.	5th class.....	21c.
8th class.....	10½c.	9th class.....	17c.

The lower rates in the United States may be due to competition, but I am inclined to believe that they are the result of the work of the railway commission; and I do not see why a railway commission in Canada would not be equally beneficial. If it did not generally reduce the rates, it could at least see that outlying districts got equal rates for equal distances with those districts which have the benefit of competition. I think it is the duty of the Government to take hold of this question and appoint a railway commission. I am convinced that there is a strong sentiment in favour of it, all over the province of Ontario at least.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to add one word to the few remarks I made when the debate commenced this afternoon. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) spoke of the possibility of securing railway competition for Manitoba and the North-west by the construction of the Rainy River Railway from Port Arthur to the west. I want to point out that, even with that road built, the advantage to Manitoba and the Territories would not be as great as anticipated by many people, in the present condition of affairs. The system of railroads now existing in Manitoba and the Territories is largely controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway. If, therefore, we have competition between Lake Superior and Manitoba, it will be

easily seen that if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company applies its local rate on its branch lines, then that local rate plus the through rate from Winnipeg to the head of navigation will be almost a prohibitory rate. The hon. member for East York suggests that we might extend the lines west of Winnipeg. True, I would expect that would be done, and I may say that we have in Manitoba at present the Manitoba and Northern Pacific system, as well as what is known as the Dauphin Railway; and inasmuch as the Manitoba Government has power under the contract with the Northern Pacific Railway to grant running powers over the lines of that railway in Manitoba, any competing railway that we bring into Manitoba now, can secure these running powers over that system; but it is not an adequate system. It only represents a small portion of the province, although it might be very good in this way, but the House will see that if we had a railway commission, it would regulate the local rates and compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to give a rate, say from Morden to Winnipeg, on an equality with the rate from Winnipeg to Lake Superior, and every good object would be attained. I can testify myself to the strong feeling that exists throughout Manitoba and the North-west Territories in favour of a railway commission. While the tariff is a very serious matter in that country, every one who lives there will bear me out in saying that the real grievance in Manitoba and the North-west Territories is that of freight rates. I thought from remarks that reached me when I came down here, that the Government would take up this question of a railway commission and push it through to a conclusion. A commission composed of men of probity, honour and ability would do a great deal to ameliorate the condition of the settlers. I should have been very much pleased to have had a definite statement from the Government that they intend to propose the creation of a railway commission and to press that measure to a conclusion at once.

While on my feet, I wish briefly to refer to another matter, which I presume would not come under the control of a railway commission, but which I take this opportunity of suggesting to the Government because it relates to railways. A large amount of time is lost in the Railway Committee, at every meeting, discussing the immense number of applications for railway charters. In my opinion, no railway charter ought to be given to any set of men unless the Government is thoroughly satisfied that these people intend to build the railway for which they ask the charter. The loss of time to Parliament and the committee is serious, and moreover, by giving these charters, a great many people become possessed of valuable franchises which they hawk about the country, and for which they obtain large sums of money at the expense of the coun-

try. I would press earnestly on the Government the desirability of taking steps to promptly nip that sort of speculation in the bud. The country has already lost sufficient money by these chartermongers obtaining charters to build roads in all possible directions—men who have not the slightest intention of spending a copper on these railways, and who secure the charters solely for the purpose of bartering them away in different markets to the highest bidder.

Mr. JAMESON. I would just like to say a word or two with regard to the remarks of the hon. member from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He referred to the great difficulty of handling a matter of this kind. I have said before that the commission in Iowa has been in existence seventeen years and given every satisfaction to the people. There are railway commissions in, I think, ten states and the people of those states—farmers like the people of western Canada—are satisfied, and believe that they owe their salvation to these commissions. I believe that this Government has sufficient capacity and ability to cope with a question which has been so successfully coped with by the farmers of Minnesota and Iowa.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THE QUEEN VS. CAMERON.

Mr. BOSTOCK moved for :

Copies of all depositions and papers in connection with the case of the Queen against H. B. Cameron for libel, either before the police magistrate or the Court of Queen's Bench at Montreal, including a copy of the judgment of Hon. Mr. Justice Wurtele upon the motion for the discharge of the bail bond.

He said: This matter, which I desire to bring before the House, has reference to the case which occurred in British Columbia some time ago. This motion was on the Order paper last session, but owing to the late time at which it appeared on the paper, I was not able to bring it up. The facts are as follows:—

In 1892, Dr. Cameron and R. Stevenson located a mining claim of 640 acres on the banks of the Granite Creek in British Columbia. They agreed that Cameron should stay on the claim and "shepherd it" while Stevenson should go to Victoria and Vancouver to look for capital to develop the property. Stevenson did not succeed for a while, but in 1894, met a Mr. W. L. Hogg, of Montreal, in Victoria, who was represented to be in touch with capitalists in the east. He accompanied Stevenson to Granite Creek and after some days an agreement was arrived at that a company should be formed with a capital of \$1,000,000 in 100,000 shares of \$100 each of which 10 per cent was to be paid up. The company was incorporated under the British Columbia laws as the Stevenson Gold and Platinum Hydraulic Mining Company. Shares were issued in this company and in 1895, Mr.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Hogg, having ascertained that shareholders who had acquired treasury stock at less than par would be liable for the balance in case that the company should be wound up. He then got the shareholders to agree to procure incorporation under the Canada Joint Stock Companies Act and in the month of January, 1896, a charter was issued to the Granite Creek Mining Company, Limited, for the purpose of acquiring the assets of the Stevenson Company, and to work the claims. Under the new scheme Dr. Cameron, who had been a director of the Stevenson Company was removed from the board and another party named in his place though his original associate was retained as president of the new company. Adjoining some of the lots of the Granite Creek Company, were two claims known as the Swan and Amberty claims, and it was extremely important that they be secured by the Granite Creek Company, and Dr. Cameron urged on both Mr. Stevenson, the president, and Mr. Hogg, the secretary-treasurer, that they acquire same, and they did so during 1895. In February, 1896, a meeting of the shareholders of the Granite Creek Company was called at Montreal, to take over these claims, and a resolution was passed to accept of them from Messrs. Stevenson & Hogg for \$25,000 paid up stock. Dr. Cameron was not present at this meeting and was not aware of the nature of the bargain until he came east some months afterwards. Dr. Cameron seeing the way in which the work was being conducted on the property thought it best to come east to consult with the directors and fellow-shareholders and then ascertained about the deal as to the Swan and Amberty claims. On the 10th July, 1896, an informal meeting of shareholders and some of the directors was held in Ottawa, and at it Dr. Cameron charged Messrs. Stevenson & Hogg with having bought the Swan and Amberty claims for the company at \$2,500 and then pretending that they were their own property sold them to the company for \$25,000, thus clearing \$22,500 at the expense of the company. The doctor also made other charges of culpability against the same parties. One of the directors of the company subsequently told the doctor that he was to be arrested for libel.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the statement which the hon. gentleman is now reading, his own statement, or whose is it?

Mr. BOSTOCK. It is a statement of the facts which I thought it better to put down in this condensed way rather than take up the time of the House by giving it more fully.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has moved for papers, is the statement he is making based on those papers?

Mr. BOSTOCK. No, I cannot say that I have seen the papers at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bostock) aware that he is not allowed to read his speech?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not my objection. What I desired to know was, whether the hon. gentleman was stating these facts as part of his speech and reducing them to writing for the sake of brevity, or whether they were facts gathered from the documents in the case.

Mr. BOSTOCK. I merely wish to draw the attention of the House to the way in which Dr. Cameron was brought from British Columbia to this end of the country at great expense to himself, and in a way that, I think, deserves the attention of the country.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman's statement of the facts, I suppose, is based upon the information supplied by Dr. Cameron?

Mr. BOSTOCK. Yes. Resuming, I may say, that Dr. Cameron was told that he was liable to be arrested for libel, and advised to leave the country, but knowing the statements he was making to be true, he declined to take the advice and told the party that he would be only too willing to meet the parties in court and have the whole matter gone into; and at the same time gave his address in Ottawa where he could be found. As no action was taken, Dr. Cameron returned to British Columbia. On the 2nd September, following, Mr. Hogg went before the police magistrate in Montreal and swore out an information against the Doctor for criminal libel, and a warrant was issued and placed in the hands of a detective in Montreal, who left for Granite Creek, and, on the morning of 16th September, having ascertained that the Doctor was at the Driard Hotel, at Nicola Lake, B.C., he woke the Doctor up out of his bed in the early morning and told him he would have to go with him down to the province of Quebec. At the time this man appeared in Dr. Cameron's room, it was 5.40 o'clock in the morning. The detective arrested him on the charge of criminal libel, and announced that he was well armed and would make the arrest at all hazards. He ordered the Doctor to dress himself and accompany him on the stage coach, which left in fifteen minutes; and, without any overcoat, he was forced to drive to Kamloops, although suffering from an aggravated cold. Though he asked to be allowed to remain one day and arrange his business affairs, this courtesy was denied him, and he was compelled to go on by the train which left Kamloops at midnight, and come right through to Montreal. When in Kamloops, the Doctor asked to be allowed to consult a solicitor, but this man who was sent down from the

east to take him in charge, refused to allow him to do anything of the kind, and he was unable to consult with any friends to find out what his position was. On his arrival he was placed in the police station, and the following morning he appeared before the police magistrate. As he was a stranger, and without friends in Montreal, he had to pay a detective to keep watch over him in a hotel until such time as he could communicate with friends in Ottawa to furnish bail. His preliminary investigation took place on the 8th October, 1896, when he was committed to stand his trial at the Court of Queen's Bench. In November, he attended the court and asked to be put on trial, but without success, as the private prosecutors did not place any bill of indictment before the grand jury. The next term came on, and, though the grand jury had two distinct sessions, no bill was laid before them. Although it was the duty of the private prosecutor, Mr. Hogg, to be on hand on the March term, to prefer the bill of indictment, he not only failed to appear, but actually left for British Columbia. Upon the facts being laid before Judge Wurtele on a motion to discharge the bail bond, he made the necessary order and declared that Dr. Cameron was discharged from all custody. However, there is now hanging over Dr. Cameron the commitment by the police magistrate, and, from the way in which this case has been handled, it would certainly appear that this action was taken against him for the purpose, if possible, of stopping him from saying anything more against the way the affairs of this company had been conducted and to prevent further comment or further statement being made against the way its affairs had been carried on. I desire to bring this matter before the attention of the House, because this gentleman was brought down here in a most disagreeable way, to say the least of it, being taken out of his bed in the early hours of the morning and brought down with this private detective, who, from accounts the Doctor has given of him—which I do not think it necessary to go into before this House—was certainly a most objectionable companion to be compelled to travel with for at least seven days. I think it is a serious matter that a gentleman should be subjected to such treatment, when he was doing what he considered his duty, in placing before the shareholders of this country, a large number of whom resided in Ottawa and the east, the serious condition of things in the management of the company. I would draw the attention of the Government to this matter, and suggest that something should be done, if possible, to prevent such cases in future.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I see the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in his place. I followed the observations of the hon. gentleman who has placed this motion in your hands, and I would hope that

some expression of a opinion might be obtained from the Treasury benches in the line of what I believe to be the practice that has generally obtained in past Parliaments of discouraging any attempts, wittingly or unwittingly, as in this case, to turn this Parliament into a court of appeal in criminal or other matters, which are better disposed of outside of this House, where forms of procedure obtain, so that both parties can have their differences fairly heard and fairly adjudicated.

I know nothing at all about the facts of this case, except that Dr. Cameron was, according to his version of the story, very unfairly and unjustly dealt with. But it seems significant that, with relief open to him in the courts, he apparently has stopped short of that avenue, and instead of following up his rights and of proceeding against those parties who, according to his ex parte statement, have been entirely governed by malice and improper feelings, have put him to a great deal of annoyance in attempting to use the criminal administration and criminal procedure for their own private and selfish purposes—instead, I say, of taking the course of pursuing these men in the courts, it occurs to me, from the statement of the hon. gentleman, that Dr. Cameron has preferred to put his case here ex parte without notice to any of the parties, and there leave the matter. If the hon. gentleman who has charge of the motion thinks that the criminal laws or any other laws of Canada or of any province are not sufficient to give redress to a man so shamefully used, it seems to me that there is a proper way of obtaining a remedy, and that is by suggesting a change in the law. But without knowing anything more than what the hon. gentleman has stated about this case, and in view of the statements that have been made to the hon. gentleman, I would hope that the Treasury benches would rather discourage than encourage any practice of this kind in the House in the future.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I agree with most that has fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman. While it seems to me that the administration of criminal justice should be very properly left in the hands of the local authorities and the local legislatures, at the same time one cannot possibly overlook the cruel abuse of legal process such as has taken place in this instance. While I cannot entirely agree with all that has fallen from the lips of my hon. and learned friend, I may agree with his conclusion, but while we agree upon the conclusion to which he has come, I think there may be some difference as to the process to adopt to bring about the end that he seems to suggest. My learned friend admits that if the facts are true, there has been an abuse of legal process in this case. Now, that abuse of legal

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

process may have been made possible not only because of the administration of criminal justice, which is entirely under the control of the local legislature, but it may also have become possible because of the defects in the law which is under our control, and which we may have a right to amend. If this abuse of a legal process has been the result of a law which is under our control, that is to say, of the law affecting libel, it seems to me that it is quite within the right of any one, and within the right of my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), and quite within his duty, to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that this injustice to this man had been made possible because of a defect in the law, for which we are responsible. If that be the case, it seems to me that he has taken a very proper course indeed in the circumstances. I was not in the House when my hon. and learned friend began his remarks, but from what I know of this matter it would appear that for some things that were written or said by Dr. Cameron, written from British Columbia to Montreal in connection with the mismanagement, as he pretends, of a company, a writ was issued in Montreal under which he was arrested in British Columbia, and forcibly taken to Montreal, a place where he was practically unknown, and without having an opportunity to give bail, he was brought to Montreal and kept there practically in custody until such time as he could communicate with friends in Ottawa, who could furnish bail. It does seem to me a most extraordinary case. If such a case as this is possible under the law of libel as it exists, there ought to be some remedy for it. I do not think it is quite fair that for an offence committed in British Columbia, he should be brought down to Montreal to be tried for it. I admit that it is an extraordinary proceeding that a man could be taken from British Columbia on this warrant without an opportunity being given to him to give bail there; but still, if such were the case, and if that fact of his being brought from British Columbia to Montreal was made possible under our law, I think it was quite proper for my hon. friend to draw the attention of this House to it, with a view to provide a remedy.

Motion agreed to.

STATION AGENT AT PORT MULGRAVE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for:

Copies of all papers, reports or correspondence referring to or connected with the dismissal of D. Bain, Esq., station agent at Port Mulgrave, Intercolonial Railway.

He said: It would be impossible in connection with this case, which is a very extraordinary case, so far as my information

goes, to discuss the dismissal of this officer on the Intercolonial Railway in the absence of the full record.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). Does the hon. gentleman wish to discuss them to-night on this motion?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, I said it would be impossible.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I would like to refresh my memory with regard to the facts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then I would not like to waste the time of the House, because I propose that when the House is in possession of the records, to discuss this question, and I would not desire now to put my views before the House, though they were only preliminary, seeing that the Minister of Railways and Canals has not got the facts fresh in his mind. But I will move for these papers so that we may obtain them preliminary to a full and final discussion, and I would press upon the hon. gentleman's attention the request to have the papers prepared as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF WILLIAM SUTHERLAND.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for :

Copies of all papers, reports or correspondence respecting the dismissal of Mr. William Sutherland, car inspector, Stellarton, Nova Scotia, and also all correspondence touching an inquiry into the facts of the case.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I do not suppose the hon. gentleman considers it desirable to have a prolonged discussion on this case to-night. If he will allow the motion to stand, we may have some consultation on the subject.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There will be some discussion.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I have no objection to the motion being carried.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to discuss it, because I desire to prove to the hon. gentleman, perhaps with more success than previously, that Mr. Sutherland is innocent of the very serious charge now hanging over his head, and that there is not a vestige of evidence in support of it. If the hon. gentleman prefers that the motion should stand, I will allow it to stand and bring it up when Notices of Motion are next called.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I would prefer that the motion should stand.

Motion allowed to stand.

DISMISSAL OF S. R. GRIFFIN.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for :

Return of all papers, correspondence and reports connected with the dismissal of S. R. Griffin, Isaac's Harbour, Nova Scotia, from his position of postmaster, including a petition signed by seven-eighths (more or less) of the electors of said district, in favour of the retention in the service of an officer who had served for twenty-two years and a half.

He said : The motion as it reads contains all the information I have in connection with the subject, but the postmaster himself is my informant. He is desirous, and I think the Postmaster General will concede that much to an old servant, of ascertaining why his services were dispensed with. He states that he held the office for twenty and a half years, and he was not at the time he put this information in my hands, July, 1897, in receipt of any information as to the reason for the course adopted. I hope that if the motion is carried he will ascertain the reason.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). There is no objection whatever to the motion being carried. I observe it alleges that there is a petition in the department. I cannot say from memory whether there is such a petition or not ; at all events, I have no objection to the petition being included in the papers. There is also a reference to a report, I suppose by the commissioner or inspector. I have no recollection whatever of the transaction, and I do not wish to strike out the word "report," but of course the hon. gentleman will not press for the report if it is of a private character. If it is of a private character, I will leave it to the hon. gentleman to say whether it should be produced or not.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF PETER S. ARCHIBALD.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) moved for :

Copies of Orders in Council, papers, depositions, reports, evidence, correspondence and documents in relation or reference to any charges made against Peter S. Archibald, lately chief engineer of the Intercolonial Railway, or to the dismissal of the said Peter S. Archibald from his position or office as such chief engineer, or the grounds or reasons for such dismissal, or in relation or reference to any claim of the said Peter S. Archibald for superannuation allowance or otherwise in relation or reference to the retirement or dismissal of the said Peter S. Archibald from the service of the Intercolonial Railway.

He said : It will probably be necessary to have some discussion on this matter after the papers have been brought down, and no doubt it will be more convenient to the Minister of Railways if the discussion took place when the papers are on the Table. I

will adopt whichever course the hon. gentleman prefers, and I am quite willing to discuss it now, with the materials at hand.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I have no objection to the adoption of the motion. I agree that it would be better to have any discussion which may be desired after the papers have been brought down.

Motion agreed to.

SURVEY OF TIDES AND CURRENTS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for :

Copies of all reports respecting the survey of tides and currents in Canada.

He said : I am prepared to go on with the discussion of this motion, which refers to a matter of very great importance, but I should have liked to have had the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In asking the right hon. First Minister to allow the motion to stand, I venture to express the hope that the right hon. gentleman will be good enough to bear the subject in mind. I want to complain somewhat that the importance of this has apparently been overlooked, and I hope that before the estimates are prepared this session it will be very fully considered in Council. If the expert navigators and the better class of merchant marine navigating the St. Lawrence are consulted, they will say there is no aid to navigation more important in connection with these deep draught vessels than the question of carrying on effectively the surveys of the tides and currents which were begun when I was head of the department. I trust the Government will consider that in a generous spirit before bringing the estimates down.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Will my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) particularize a little so that I can draw the attention of my colleague, the Minister of Marine, to particular facts ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Some years ago, we appropriated \$10,000 for a year, and appointed a very eminent man, the son of Principal Dawson of McGill University to the permanent staff of the Marine and Fisheries Department, and gave him a staff of officers for the special purpose of taking observations of the tides and currents. It required a good deal of scientific work, great exactness, and most competent men to handle it. After the observations had been taken with Imperial assistance at Halifax and on the Pacific, I think we gave Mr. Dawson the "Lansdowne" to continue the operations in the Straits of Belle Isle and off Cape Breton for one season. The work was making good progress, when for reasons not fully explained yet to the House, that

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

assistance was stopped and last session the necessary appropriation was not made for this work. In consequence there must now be some delay in obtaining all these mathematical data upon which calculations can be made, so that expert navigators may be able to know not merely the direction and force of the currents but the rise and fall of the tides as you come to the Atlantic and Pacific coasts or the Gulf of St. Lawrence. This information is now in the hands of these fast steamships as they approach the British Isles, and a great deal of this work has been done and well done in India, and in the waters approaching the leading United States harbours. The United States authorities have had the work done by their hydrographic survey staff, half military and half civil, I think. Among the better informed navigators there is a consensus of opinion upon this subject. The Prime Minister will remember when I mention it, that Prof. Johnston, of McGill, was put forward by a body of leading men in Montreal and afterwards by the Royal Society in Canada to press this subject upon the attention of the Government. When I was in the department he was very energetic in the matter, and I have no reason to believe that any of his energy has abated in the slightest degree since. I observed in the Montreal "Witness," a few days ago, a very interesting editorial again pressing the importance of this subject upon the Government. I urge upon the Government that if they are serious and desirous of pressing on the Fast Atlantic service and putting Canada abreast in maritime matters with the great nations of the globe, they will make a generous appropriation so as to continue the work effectively this season.

Motion agreed to

UNITED STATES STEAMSHIP "YANTIC."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for :

Copies of all entries and clearances of Canadian ports by United States steamship "Yantic" on her voyage up the River St. Lawrence in 1897 ; also a copy of any papers or correspondence respecting her passage through the said river or St. Lawrence canals.

He said :—This subject has been once or twice before the House and the Minister of Customs has answered a question in regard to it. I understood him to say in reply to me, that there was no entry made, but the first part of the question relates to entry and clearance. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) referred to some report, made by a collector of customs at one of the ports apparently in lieu of an entry. The second part of my motion is to settle the point as to whether as a matter of fact any permission was requested or obtained ; it is intended to make history in a sense.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return of the number of acres seeded, the nature of the seed sown, the amount of crops grown in each Indian reserve in the North-west Territories.—(Mr. Davin.)

Return showing the names of commissioners appointed by the Government to inquire into the conduct of Government employees in the province of New Brunswick since 1st July, 1896, the amounts paid to each as salary and travelling expenses, the names of the persons dealt with, whether in each case the report was favourable or not, and whether the person was dismissed or retained, and the cost to the Government in each case.—(Mr. Foster.)

Copies of all papers, reports and official correspondence in any way connected with the dismissal of David Ross, fishery officer for N. E. Margaree, in the Island of Cape Breton.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all papers and correspondence respecting a fire claim of D. Connors, Esq., Bayfield, Antigonish, between officers of the Department of Railways and Canals and other departments, as well as between the claimant and others in the department.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, Orders in Council and instructions in reference to the admission of foreign countries to commercial privileges under the so-called preferential clause of the tariff of 1897.—(Mr. Foster.)

Copies of all correspondence between the mayor and corporation of Gananoque, or any other person, with the Government in reference to the removal of the drill shed at Gananoque. Also, all correspondence in reference to the sale or purchase of a new site. Also, all offers made by the President of the Agricultural Society of Gananoque, or any other person, offering to rent or sell a suitable building in which to store the arms and clothing; and also, all other correspondence with the Government dealing with this question.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Copies of report made to the Government by Mr. Jean. B. B. Prévost, who was appointed to inquire into the conduct of Mr. D. Desroches, collector of revenue for the excise division of Terrebonne.—(Mr. Chauvin.)

Copies of the following documents and papers :
(a.) The commission issued to Mr. Rothwell, law clerk in the Department of the Interior, Ottawa, authorizing him to investigate the grievances of certain settlers residing within the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company's land belt on Vancouver Island.

(b.) All evidence taken under the said commission at Nanaimo, Victoria, or elsewhere.

(c.) All reports made by the said Mr. Rothwell on all matters inquired into by him under the said commission.—(Mr. McInnes.)

Return showing the number of acres reserved for settlement in the North-west Territories; the number thus reserved in Manitoba; the number of acres in the North-west Territories sold to railways; the number reserved for railways; the number reserved for the Government; the number of acres settled on; the number of acres in Manitoba sold to railways; the number reserved for railways in Manitoba; the number reserved for the Government in Manitoba, and the number of acres in Manitoba settled on.—(Mr. Davin.)

Copies of all correspondence, evidence taken by commissioners, reports, recommendations and

other papers relating to the dismissal of Joseph Steeves, late postmaster at Elgin, Albert county, New Brunswick, and to the appointment of his successor to that office.—(Mr. McInerney.)

Returns of the names of all persons discharged in the Department of Public Works, whether in the permanent or temporary service, since the 30th day of July, 1896, to the 17th day of February inst., and for what causes, also, the names of all persons taken into the service of the said department, either permanent or temporarily, and who remain on the pay-roll of said department, and in what branch of the service of the said department they are employed.

A return of the expenditure of the said department between such dates, on the various services of said department at Ottawa.

A return of expenditure so far made in connection with the reconstruction of the Western Block.

Of the names of persons discharged in the several departments and taken on temporarily or permanently, and their services.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all correspondence and papers touching the appointment of R. S. Thompson to the position of postmaster in the town of Oxford, Cumberland county, Nova Scotia, and the dismissal of Henry Smith from said office, the applications for the said position and correspondence respecting the same; also copies of all reports or charges, if any, made against R. S. Thompson for selling liquor contrary to the provisions of the Scott Act, and for smuggling or other charges; and all papers showing what, if any, action has been taken on these complaints.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of reports, correspondence and papers relating to the dismissal of Charles Hoar, an employee of the Intercolonial Railway at Pictou, Nova Scotia.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports of evidence, recommendations and other papers relating to the dismissal of Joshua L. Steeves, lately collector of customs at Hillsboro', Albert county, New Brunswick, and to the appointment of his successor.—(Mr. McInerney.)

Return showing in detail the extent of all gold dredging leases applied for, and granted in the North-west Territories and the Yukon, where situated, the names and post office addresses of the applicants, and amount paid therefor; also, all correspondence and Orders in Council in connection therewith.—(Mr. Foster.)

Return of copies of all papers connected with the letting of the contract for the construction of the railway bridge at Edmonton, including advertisements, specifications, the tenders, the contract; any subsequent modifications of the same; correspondence; and Return respecting forfeitures connected with the said contract and the action of the Government thereon, and a further Return stating the conditions of the work at present.—(Mr. Davin.)

Return showing: (a.) What works or repairs have been executed on the drill shed at Montreal since the 1st of September, 1896; (b.) The estimated cost of said works; (c.) The names of those who executed said works, and the amounts paid to each by the Government; (d.) The mode of calling for tenders in reference to the execution of said works.—(Mr. Monk.)

Return showing: (1.) All contracts for military clothing entered into by the Government of Canada since the 1st of September, 1896; (2.) The name of each contractor and the amount of his

contract ; (3.) The mode of calling for tenders in each case, and the names and amounts mentioned by each tenderer.—(Mr. Monk.)

Return showing : (a.) What contracts for military harness or saddlery have been given by the Government of Canada since the 1st of September, 1896 ; (b.) To whom such contracts were awarded and where they were executed ; (c.) What amounts were paid for the execution of such contracts ; (d.) For which of the said contracts tenders were called publicly, and the amount of tender in each case ; and all correspondence had by the Department of Militia in reference to the execution of said contracts.—(Mr. Monk.)

Copies of all letters, telegrams, papers, recommendations, correspondence, documents and papers relating to the appointment of Byron Nickerson as keeper of the Cape Negro Island light station, or to the application of any other person or persons for that office or position since the 1st day of August, 1896.—(Mr. Borden, Halifax.)

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 15th March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved :

That as the time for the presentation of private Bills will expire on Thursday next, 17th instant, the same be extended to Thursday, 24th instant, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the seventh report of the Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Toronto and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, by Mr. Maclean.)

Bill (No. 78) respecting St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.—(Mr. Ellis.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Guay.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That precedence be given on the Orders of each day after questions on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday, and after introduction of Bills on Tuesday and Friday to the Order for the reception of the report of the Committee of the Whole on the resolution granting twenty-five thousand acres of land for each mile of railway from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake, and also to the Order of the House to go into Committee on Bill (No. 6) to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company, and that a similar precedence be given to all subsequent stages of the said resolution and Bill until both are finally disposed of by the action of this House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of making any objection to this motion. The House has already had an opportunity of discussing these questions at very considerable length, and as the session is somewhat advanced, and considering what small progress has been made, I think it is the disposition of members on both sides of the House to do everything that is possible to facilitate business, and to avoid any unnecessary delay in reaching important public questions which have not yet received the consideration which this measure has.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO LUMBER CUT.

Mr. BRITTON. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the indulgence of the House for a minute or two, and I suppose I will have to make a motion to adjourn, although in doing that I am rather going against the advice of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair). It was my intention on Friday afternoon to have made a statement, but the preliminary proceedings were so lengthened that I was unable to do so. I am induced to take this course by reason of a paragraph which appeared in the Ottawa "Free Press" of the 11th inst. It is headed "Brisk Sawing Ahead," and it says :

The Georgian Bay Lumber Company are at present preparing plans for a new mill to be erected at Canoe Lake. This mill will be of large capacity and will be erected in the heart of a first-class limit. The mill at Georgian Bay will cut as much this year as ever. Only the smaller firms are negotiating with the Michigan people for the sale of their logs.

On the 21st of February the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) put a question to the Government which will be found

on pages 859 and 860 of "Hansard." It is as follows:—

Is the Government aware of the enormous output of logs cut in the Georgian Bay district the present season, to be sawed in Michigan mills, of which the following is a statement from Saginaw, Michigan, February 14th, 1898?

Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) appended a statement which appeared in many newspapers in Ontario purporting to be the amount of logs that were going to be cut during the present season, and all of which it was said would be sawed in Michigan. I was out of the House when the question was put and did not notice it until a day or two before Friday last. Had it been called to my attention sooner I would have drawn the attention of the House to it before. This statement put on the records of the House by the hon. member (Mr. Kaulbach), was a campaign document issued in connection with the Ontario elections, and it appeared in many of the Conservative newspapers with comments more or less unfavourable to the policy of the Ontario Government. That campaign document appeared first in a fly sheet, and as I, with a good many others, was interested in the question, I took the pains to make inquiry with regard to the truthfulness of it, and after the most careful investigation that could be made by a person competent to make it, I found that instead of that statement being true, these are the facts, which I will now give to the House:

The article quoted contains three sentences. One, that the Georgian Bay district will furnish the Michigan mills with a large quantity of logs the coming season.

Mr. KAULBACH. What paper is the hon. gentleman quoting from?

Mr. BRITTON. Do you mean the paper I have in my hand?

Mr. KAULBACH. Yes.

Mr. BRITTON. This paper I prepared myself from information obtained.

Mr. KAULBACH. Where did you get the information?

Mr. BRITTON. This information was got by an officer of the Crown Lands Department of the Ontario Government, and the information was obtained from persons whom I will now mention.

Mr. BENNETT. We did not catch the name or the date of the newspaper from which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) first quoted.

Mr. BRITTON. It appeared in a good many of the Conservative newspapers. The paper I saw it in myself was the Kingston "News" of the 17th of February, and also the London "Free Press" of about that date.

The second point in this statement is that a gentleman who has come from there states that

the loggers are experiencing trouble with the deep snow, it being three feet on the level, and slow progress is being made. The third point is that he furnishes the following approximate estimate of the quantity of logs being put in this winter by the several firms operating this winter in the Georgian Bay district.

Then follows the statement which appeared in the different newspapers and which also appeared in the question put by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) to the Government. It will be observed that the approximate estimate is not the quantity which will be exported to the Michigan mills, but of what will be put in by the firms operating on the Georgian Bay, part of which will be exported, of course, and part sawn in Ontario. Instead of the statement contained in these newspaper articles being correct, the following are the facts:— Many of the firms named have their mills in Ontario and never exported a log and are not likely to. The approximate estimate is 328 millions. Included in it are the following firms who will not export:—

	Feet.
Holland & Emery Lumber Co., who have just erected two large mills on the Maganetewan River, in order to saw their logs in Ontario.....	20,000,000
Ontario Lumber Company, mills at French River	8,000,000
Arthur Hill & Co., being under contract to saw at Midland.....	15,000,000
Tanner Bros., mills near Waubausheue	4,000,000
Cutler-Savidge Co., mills at Cutler, Ont.....	4,000,000
Victoria Harbour Lumber Company, mills at Victoria Harbour.....	15,000,000
Georgian Bay Lumber Company, mills at Waubausne	20,000,000
Total.....	86,000,000

The following firms named are not cutting any logs this winter:—

Pitts & Co.....	20,000,000
Total.....	106,000,000

The following are over-estimated:

Loveland, Roys & White will get out about 10,000,000, estimated at 16,000,000	6,000,000
Wm. Peters, going to saw in Ontario 8,000,000 out of 15,000,000.....	8,000,000
Hale & Booth expect to get out 20,000,000 instead of 30,000,000, over-estimated	10,000,000
Total	130,000,000

The following Canadian lumbermen have not yet decided whether they will saw here or sell for export:—

Conger Lumber Company..	20,000,000
Alex. Barnet.....	10,000,000
Carswell & Francis.....	4,000,000
Total.....	34,000,000

Grand total over-estimated.... 164,000,000

Total.....	328,000,000
Over-estimated.	164,000,000

164,000,000 ft. b.m. to be exported.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the statement which the hon. gentleman is reading the statement to which he refers as having been prepared by one of the Ontario Government officials, of the quantity of logs to be cut in Ontario this year ?

Mr. BRITTON. Yes. That is to say, the statement shows the quantity that is to be cut in Ontario, and the quantity over-estimated to be cut in Michigan. There is an over-estimate of 164,000,000 feet, board measure, of the quantity that will be cut in Michigan. In other words, the quantity given in the statement referred to in the question put by the hon. member for Lunenburg is exactly double the actual quantity. I ask permission to make this statement because "Hansard" descends to history, and history is made up from the statements that appear in "Hansard." The statement given by the hon. member for Lunenburg appears there, and if it were not contradicted in any way, it would go forth that this year there would be 328,000,000 feet, board measure, cut in Michigan from logs taken from the timber limits of Ontario. That is a wrong statement, and I consider it right to make this correction. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the estimate, according to the hon. gentleman's information, of the quantity to be taken out this winter ?

Mr. BRITTON. 164,000,000 feet, board measure.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, after the great anxiety of hon. gentlemen opposite, last week, to press the Yukon Bill to a rapid conclusion, one is rather amused at the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) dragging this question before the House to-day, because it cannot possibly have any effect on the Ontario elections, which the hon. gentleman was of course very solicitous about. However, I think the hon. gentleman has a motive in this, that he is gently and quietly breaking the ground for the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton); for I have no doubt that before the session closes hon. gentlemen opposite will be pressed, and pressed very hard, to give a yes or no answer to the question of the imposition of an export duty on logs. We all know how much the hon. member for North Norfolk is interested in that question; and his patient silence on the Yukon Bill for many days, and the longing looks that were cast in his direction by the First Minister and the other Ministers, betokened the fact that that hon. gentleman was loath to rise and make the speech he did in favour of the Bill, until he received, as I have no doubt he did receive, the assurance from hon. gentlemen opposite that there will be no export duty placed on logs this year—an assurance which will, I have no doubt, bring consolation and comfort to the hon. member for North Norfolk. Now, what is the complaint

Mr. BRITTON.

of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton)? He says in the outset, as I understand him, that a grave wrong and injustice was done the Ontario Government in this, that prior to the Ontario elections certain Liberal-Conservative papers had published a statement showing that during the coming summer there would be a large export of logs from Canada to the United States; and now at last he has received the assurance from some representative of the Ontario Government—one of their servants—that the statement was incorrect and that the quantity of logs to be sent to the United States during the coming summer will be much less. The hon. gentleman did not state who the representative of the Ontario Government was. I have no doubt, however, from the recklessness of the statement, that it was probably Mr. D. F. Macdonald, the gentleman who succeeded in assisting in swindling the Ontario Government out of \$15,000 of dues, and in perpetrating the infamous outrage of assenting to the statement that only 15,000,000 feet of logs had been cut by the Moore Lumber Company, when he well knew that 30,000,000 feet had been cut. That gentleman, by reason of his skill and cunning and connivance, and by reason of his assistance to the Moore Lumber Company, a friend of the Ontario Government, instead of being displaced from his position, was placed in a better position, where he may be better able to do the work of the party. The hon. gentleman has not stated who gave him the assurance as to the estimates for the coming year, and one can hardly realize who could have been so reckless as to have made such a statement. I am not sure whether the statement he gave refers to the quantity of logs that has been cut this season, or to the quantity that is to be cut in the mills during the coming season. If it refers to the quantity cut during the present winter, I can only say that it will be utterly impossible to arrive at a correct knowledge of that until the officers have first made their returns, as Mr. Macdonald did; and then, after a careful scrutiny, to see how much swindling has been perpetrated, we may ascertain the quantity that has been cut. But the hon. gentleman must remember that prior to the elections, the Ontario Government sent out a circular, asking all lumber concerns to be very careful to keep the estimate down, and if the statement which the hon. gentleman has quoted is the result of that effort of the Ontario Government to lessen the quantity that would be reported, no regard can be paid to it. If the statement of the hon. gentleman refers to the quantity to be sawn this year, then all I can say is that if all the statements in it are as true as some that I know of, the hon. gentleman should blush to give credence to them. He stated that Tanner Bros. were going to cut 4,000,000 feet of logs near Waubashene. All I can say is that the hon. gentleman may know more

about Tanner Bros.' business than Tanner Bros. do themselves. Mr. Tanner's statement to me was that his 4,000,000 feet of logs had been sold and were going to the other side. Then, the hon. gentleman says that the Peters people are going to cut 8,000,000 feet at the town of Parry Sound. I can only tell him that that will be a most joyful surprise to the people of Parry Sound, who have looked upon it as a certainty, that in the coming summer the mill of Peters & Co. would be shut down. The hon. gentleman ventured no statement as to what the hon. member for North Norfolk would do. I suppose he assumed that that hon. gentleman need not be quoted, as beyond any possibility of doubt, the hon. member for North Norfolk would be true to American interests, and would see that everything he owned and possessed would be shipped to Michigan for cutting. So far as Arthur Hill & Co. at Midland are concerned, they do not own a single log which is to be cut on the Georgian Bay this year, they having sold their cut. So that the hon. gentleman is utterly at sea as to his facts. He has been made the victim of some Ontario Government official and has been persuaded to make this statement in the House, just as the Minister of Customs (Mr. Pater-son) was put up in Toronto by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to announce his two-cent rate on letters. I think this confidence game is going too far. First, we have the confidence game played on the Minister of Customs. Then we have the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), steered, too, by a confidence man, reading this report in the House, and last, but not least, we have this Yukon business, steered by confidence men on the outside. The only reason the hon. gentleman can possibly have for bringing this statement before the House to-day must be that the Ministers want to mark time on the Yukon deal, and are not in a hurry to go on with the Bill. No doubt, they see breakers ahead. The statement, so industriously circulated through the Government press, that the Senate will, without a shadow of doubt, pass the Bill, evidently has not the truthfulness which they would desire it to have. Perhaps, too, it may be, that since the break the other night by some of the independent supporters of the Government, the Ministers fear that others may follow, and that, if the House goes into committee, there may be still more breakers ahead when amendments come to be proposed. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) should be the last man in this House to rise to mark time for the Government. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones, and be very careful about giving slavish support to the Government. It is now a notorious fact, that the hon. member for Kingston left a highly lucrative position to take his chances of becoming a member of this House, and the hon. gentleman must know that, in

legal circles in the city of Toronto his name is more closely associated with the vacancy in the Court of Appeals in Ontario than that of any other member of the Ontario bar. Not only is his name mentioned in connection with this vacancy, but with two or three other prospective vacancies on the bench, and I am surprised, therefore, that he should have lent himself to this scheme, which, on its very face, is nothing more than a device to kill time for the Government. Why did he not let some of his other colleagues, whose rewards are more distant, do this work? This is a matter which does not at all concern the constituency of Kingston, and there are other hon. gentlemen, prospective senators, waiting for vacancies—why did not some of these take their feet? The whole point is plain. My hon. friend from Kingston rose for one reason alone, and that was to endeavour to spring upon the House a discussion which the House does not at all desire at present. This question of the export duty on logs has not been discussed, in one form or another, so far this session. There were some other matters which the hon. gentleman might bring before the House with some shadow of excuse, but in this he stands before the people of Kingston to-day in—I will not say, discreditable—but rather a compromising position. If I mistake not, he was on the public platform in the recent local election campaign, when an effort was made to boom the Liberal candidate in Kingston by reading a telegram purporting to come—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is getting very far away from the subject.

Mr. BENNETT. I am endeavouring to justify the conduct of the hon. member for Kingston in bringing this matter before the House, and, moreover, to show why the House should adjourn. If the hon. member for Kingston had brought up the question of this telegram which purported to come from the Minister of Railways and Canals, and which assured the people of Kingston that two locomotives would be constructed, but which telegram the Minister of Railways and Canals afterwards declared to be untrue—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is really proceeding to discuss a matter which has no earthly connection, so far as I can see, with that before the House. I desire to say, further, that I do not think the House has any disposition to encourage continual motions to adjourn, and that being the case, I think that the members should confine themselves closely to the subjects brought before the House.

Mr. BENNETT. I quite agree with you, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that my hon. friend from Kingston, after your admonition, will not venture to transgress again. I trust that, when this question of the export duty of logs, in which my hon. friend from

Kingston takes so deep an interest, comes on, his loyal and patriotic voice will be heard, urging on the Government, of which he is so strong a supporter, the imposition of an export duty on logs.

Mr. SPROULE. I apprehend, that the object of the information given to the House is to influence the situation in the county of Russell, where an election is going on. I saw, in a western paper, an item said to be copied from the "Western Lumberman," stating that in order to supply twenty-five mills on the American side this year, American mill-owners have contracted to bring over from Canada to the United States over 300,000,000 feet of Canadian pine timber, board measure. I take it for granted, that that information, coming from that source, is in all probability likely to be correct, because it was obtained from American lumbermen who are interested in keeping their mills going, and who gave it to the press in that country. At that time it did not seem at all unreasonable to me that that quantity should be taken over, especially in view of the fact that a Bill had then been introduced and passed by the Ontario legislature to prevent the future export of these logs. That being the case, it was not at all unnatural to expect that the American owners of Canadian limits should try to get out as much as possible before the operation of that law began to take effect. About the same time, or a little earlier, the statement was made in the Ontario legislative assembly, by the Crown Lands Department, to the effect that there had been taken out in Canada, from 1880 to 1896, inclusive, no less a quantity than 768,000,000 feet of lumber in the logs to be sawn in the United States. If you look over that statement, you will find that, from year to year, the quantities increased, until the evil became so oppressive during the last few years that public indignation forced the Government to announce that business would be stopped. It was announced by one of the western papers that 328,000,000 feet would be taken out this year. And it was not unreasonable to expect that that amount would be taken out at present, in view of the Bill before the Ontario House.

I happen to have in my hand a letter sent me by a friend of mine who lives at Spanish River, and to whom I had written for correct information as to how much was taken out from this district in one month, so as to give us an idea of what has been done and the places to which this lumber is sent. He sent me the following figures, which are as follows:—

May 4th, 1894, by Hale & Booth to Bay City, Mich., 31,844 rough pine saw-logs, 3,500,000 feet.

May 9th, 1894, by Spanish River Lumber Company for Bay City, 30,000 rough pine saw-logs, 3,000,000 feet board measure.

May 9th, 1894, by Albert Pack for Alpena, 30,000 rough pine saw-logs, 3,000,000 feet board measure.

Mr. BENNETT.

May 15th, 1894, by Edmund Hall for Bay City, Mich., 47,000 rough pine saw-logs, 3,500,000 feet.

May 17th, 1894, by Hale & Booth for Bay City, 29,083 rough pine saw-logs, 3,635,000 feet.

May 19th, 1894, by Saginaw Lumber and Salt Company, Bay City, Mich., 38,000 rough pine saw-logs, 3,500,000 feet.

May 25th, 1894, by James T. Hurst, Bay City, 32,000 rough pine saw-logs, 3,000,000 feet.

June 1st, 1894, by Spanish River Lumber Company, 34,000 rough pine saw-logs, 3,313,240 feet.

June 2nd, 1894, by Edmond Hall for Bay City, 44,000 rough pine saw-logs, 3,000,000 feet.

June 6th, 1894, by Spanish River Lumber Company, 32,000 rough pine saw-logs, 3,200,000 feet.

June 7th, 1894, by Saginaw Lumber and Salt Company, Bay City, 36,000 rough pine saw-logs, 2,500,000 feet.

June 11th, 1894, by Alger, Smith & Co. for Cheboygan, 25,000 rough pine saw-logs, 2,500,000 feet.

June 12th, 1894, by Hale & Booth for Bay City, 23,241 rough pine saw-logs, 2,887,884 feet.

And in addition to that there is 10,000,000 feet more for the Spanish River Lumber Company, which will go this month to Bay City. So we see here that, for a little more than a month, a month and about fifteen days, I have given the names of the parties to whom the logs are sent, the number of logs and the quantity of lumber, and it totals 50,000,000 feet in that time. That was before there was any talk of a regulation by the Crown Lands Department of Ontario compelling the cutting of this lumber in the province. If this is an average of a fair winter's cut, it is reasonable to suppose that fully 300,000,000 feet will be taken out this winter. We are using this to-day and using it, I think, successfully, against the provincial government, because they did not do what in our judgment they ought to have done years ago in the interest of the people of Ontario. Look at the amount taken out up to 1891—678,000,000 feet, even according to their own statement—taken across the water in vast fields to a foreign country. Several sessions ago I gave a statement in this House on the basis of information furnished me by an Ottawa lumberman who has had thirty years experience in the business. I asked him what this export of logs would mean to the people of Ontario—what would it mean to the labouring people if these logs, instead of being shipped away, were brought to the mills on our own side, cut, sorted, carted to the yard, piled, measured and then taken out in boats or cars or in whatever way might be found best? According to his experience, he told me, it would mean about \$6.50 per thousand feet. If that be the case—and I assume that this gentleman knew what he was talking about—what number of men does this employ in the United States, with a similar number of men denied this means of work here? What would it mean in wages? It would mean \$4,992,000 spent in the United States largely in wages which ought to have been spent here in Ontario. And during all this time the Government had it in their power by passing an Order in Council at any time

to stop this loss of money to Canadians and secure this employment for the labourers of Ontario. Is that no consideration for the workingman here who has to support his family, who is not allowed to go across to the American side and even there get a share of this labour, because of their alien labour law, though he would only be following the raw material that was taken out of his own country? It is a shame and a disgrace, and discreditable to the Government that allowed it to be done, to the Government that could have stopped and did not. What would it mean further? This gentleman told me that every 100,000,000 feet taken out would employ in handling, cutting, carting, piling and shipping 2,000 men for six months in the year. If that be the case—and this gentleman was in a position to know, having been in the business for many years—we might have had employed in Canada 5,000 men for six months in the year for three years, or 1,000 men employed for six months in the year for fifteen years. Set down anywhere in Ontario 1,000 workmen, representing with their wives and families, a population of 5,000, and give them their cash once a month or oftener, and see what a difference their employment for six months will make to the surrounding country. See the demand it will create for farm products, the business it will bring to storekeepers in every line, the improvement it will mean to business generally. And yet the raw material which properly belongs to the labouring class of Ontario is taken away and the labouring people are deprived of the opportunity to work by reason of the insane policy carried out by the Ontario legislature since that system was commenced years ago. Is it to be wondered at that we tried to have a stop put to it? In view of the figures I have given, it is reasonable to say that at least 300,000,000 feet will be taken out this year across the Georgian Bay to give employment to United States labour.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him, since he has made this statement, to say that according to the official statement the quantity will be 186,000,000 feet, or 62,000,000 less than last year.

Mr. SPROULE. The returns are not all in yet, and it is utterly impossible for the hon. gentleman to know what is being got out. It is a mere guess on his part, if he relies upon official figures. It must not be forgotten that a large quantity of what goes out is jobbing stuff, and there is no report made to the Ontario Government where it is cut. My informant tells me that millions of feet are taken out that the Ontario Government knows nothing about. We know very well that the Moore Lumber Company actually took 15,000,000 feet that the Ontario Government did not know any-

thing about. I think the House does not need any further facts to convince it on that point. I am told by a gentleman whom I believe to be a reliable authority that no person can say what the amount is. I gave the figures for a little over a month. But the same thing goes on through the whole season, even when no embargo was threatened. Now that the embargo has been decided upon, it is reasonable to suppose that the amount that will go to the United States is a very serious matter for the people of Ontario.

If you take out 400 million feet this year, what would it employ? It would employ 8,000 men in Canada for six months. If you take out 300 million feet, which I think is below what will be taken out, it would employ 6,000 men in Canada for six months. Is that nothing to the Canadian labourer? I saw a short time ago that in the city of Toronto over 500 people surrounded the city hall and begged the mayor to give them some work so that they could earn money enough to keep their families from starvation. When that condition exists in the city of Toronto, and when we know that thousands of our own Canadians are out of employment, and that they are denied that remunerative employment which they could get by virtue of a changed policy, is it any wonder that we bring this matter to the attention of Parliament and of the country? We believe that the mismanagement of the property belonging to the whole people of Ontario is such that we are depriving the Canadian labourers in Ontario, 8,000 of them this coming year, of the employment that they ought to get at home for at least six months in the year, by virtue of that insane policy of letting this lumber go out to employ men in Michigan, to build up their towns and cities, while impoverishing ourselves to enrich them.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY.

The Resolution adopted in Committee of the Whole on Friday, the 11th March instant (p. 1772), respecting the granting of lands to a line of railway from the Stikine River to Teslin Lake, was reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved that the said resolution be referred to the committee on Bill (No. 6) to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). During the discussion which took place on the motion for the second reading of this Bill, two or three intimations were given that when the Bill reached committee amendments would be suggested to meet some criticisms that had been made upon the Bill, and some objections that had been taken to it in two or three particulars. The first clause now read is the substantial clause, and confirms the contract; and I might perhaps now with advantage explain to the committee the scope and character of the changes which have been made in these particulars. The first relates to the selection of blocks of land. It will be remembered that a great deal of stress was laid by hon. members who criticised this contract upon the fact that there was permission given by the contract to the contractors to select lots on either sides of the main blocks without being subject to the conditions which attach to the selection of other blocks, as to their being of alternate character, and as to the Government being entitled to each alternate area. That question seemed to be considered as one of great importance by some hon. gentlemen, and it was noted a good deal in the press. Some were under the impression that the effect of that clause would be to enable the contractors to possess themselves of unrestricted and unlimited areas of valuable placer lands or gold lands, and that it would, in consequence of the possibilities which were involved give to the contractors undue advantages that the Government ought not to give them. Now, Sir, I may say here that the Government did not attach the importance to this selection of blocks which was attached by hon. gentlemen opposite, nor, in point of fact, did the contractors themselves. I think it was mentioned in course of the discussion on the Bill that the reason why the Government consented to incorporate this in the contract, was that it seemed not to be unreasonable that if the contractors, in their search for quartz veins, should find that they were carried over mountains and over stretches of country that would not in themselves be productive all through their course, it would not be unreasonable to allow them to take lot after lot for a certain distance in order that they could get a reasonably sufficient amount of area, so that they could work their quartz mine to advantage. The clause I refer to is the last subsection of section 12 of the contract:

The contractors may also at their option select additional blocks lying on either end of any odd-numbered blocks along a base line, but any such additional blocks must be three miles square

Sir **LOUIS DAVIES**.

each, and they shall not exceed three in number on each end of each said odd-numbered block.

The Minister of Agriculture, in the course of his remarks on the second reading of the Bill, stated that there would be no objection to amending that clause. Neither the Government nor the contractors regarded that as very important; the contractors did not regard it at all as a vital feature of their contract, nor did the Government consider that there was any serious objection to it. But since it was objected to, on communication with the contractors and the matter being put before them, they consented to yield the point since the Minister stated that the clause would be amended. On consideration, the Government felt that it would be better to incorporate any amendment that might be made with respect to this into the original contract, or, what would amount to the same thing, in a supplemental contract; and a supplementary contract therefore, was agreed to by the contractors, this feature of it being omitted. I shall move this amendment as an addition to the schedule in the Bill, and I shall move a supplementary contract, after having read it, of course, to the committee, when we reach that portion of the Bill in due course. The clause which has been accepted in amendment to the latter clause of section 12 of the contract has been disposed of in this way. It has been settled that the right to make such optional selections of additional blocks shall be entirely abrogated, and under the altered or amended contract the contractors shall have no right to make a selection of land other than in the usual way, as prescribed by the contract. A clause has been incorporated in the supplementary contract, which I shall read in a few minutes, which provides that the option in the latter part of clause 12 of said contract, by which the contractor shall be able to select additional blocks on either end of the base line shall be entirely and utterly abrogated. Thus we will eliminate from the contract what some hon. gentlemen, without much reason, I think, considered to be a feature of very objectionable character. There is another clause in this amending contract.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. If the hon. gentleman is going to read a supplementary contract, I would ask him, if convenient, to lay it on the Table.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Unquestionably. I intend to move it, and if the leader of the Opposition wishes to look it over I will immediately place it in his hands. The supplemental contract is dated 28th February, 1898, and is made between the parties to the original contract. It provides first for the abrogation of clause 12, and it subsequently provides:

(1.) It is agreed that the option given by the latter part of clause 12 of said contract to the contractors to select additional blocks lying on either end of any odd-numbered block along a base line shall be and is hereby abrogated.

It further provides :

(2.) After the said railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake has been accepted by the Government as complete, it shall be and continue to be duly and reasonably maintained and operated for the conveyance of passengers and freight, and during five years from such completion the contractors shall not select more than four-fifths of the total quantity of land to be selected by them under said contract, the remaining one-fifth is to be held by the Government as security for the said maintenance and operation of such railway during such five years, provided that the Government may allow the contractors to substitute other approved security in lieu of said one-fifth.

At the end of the said five years, if no substantial default (avoidable by the company) in the said maintenance and operation during said period shall have occurred, the contractors may select and shall be entitled to grants of said remaining one-fifth ; but if such substantial default shall occur, the right of the selection of the one-fifth shall lapse, and shall cease and be forfeited, and in the event that any other security has been substituted in lieu of the said one-fifth, it shall become and be forfeited.

These are the two material clauses in the supplementary contract. There is another clause which the statute provides relating to the independence of Parliament, and it is embodied in all contracts, and appears here as section No. 3 :

(3.) No member of the House of Commons shall be admitted to any share or part of said contract, or any benefit to arise therefrom.

This clause is a similar one to that contained in the Bill, but as we were having a supplemental contract entered into, it was thought desirable that this clause should also be incorporated into it. The fourth clause provides :

(4.) The lands referred to in the said contract out of which selection may be made, shall be such lands only as are at the disposal of the Government at the time of selection.

The supplemental contract, in full, is as follows :—

Agreement made the 28th day of February, 1898, between Her Majesty the Queen, herein represented by the Honourable the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Honourable the Minister of the Interior, Canada, of the first part, and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, of the second part, supplementary to and as part of the contract between the said parties dated 25th January, A.D. 1898 :

(1.) It is agreed that the option given by the latter part of clause 12 of said contract to the contractors to select additional blocks lying on either end of any odd-numbered block along a base line shall be and is hereby abrogated.

(2.) After the said railway from Stikine River to Teslin Lake has been accepted by the Government as complete, it shall be and continue to be duly and reasonably maintained and

operated for the conveyance of passengers and freight, and during five years from such completion the contractors shall not select more than four-fifths of the total quantity of land to be selected by them under said contract, the remaining one-fifth is to be held by the Government as security for the said maintenance and operation of such railway during such five years, provided that the Government may allow the contractors to substitute other approved security in lieu of said one-fifth.

At the end of the said five years, if no substantial default (avoidable by the company) in the said maintenance and operation during said period shall have occurred, the contractors may select and shall be entitled to grants of said remaining one-fifth ; but if such substantial default shall occur, the right of selection of such one-fifth shall lapse, and the right of the contractors to receive grants of such one-fifth shall cease and be forfeited, and in case any other security has been substituted in lieu of said one-fifth, such substituted security shall become and be forfeited.

(3.) No member of the House of Commons of Canada shall be admitted to any share of or part of said contract, or to any benefit to arise therefrom.

(4.) The lands referred to in the said contract out of which selection may be made shall be such lands only as are at the disposal of the Government at the time of selection.

(5.) This agreement shall form part of and be read with the said contract of 25th January, 1898, as if the same had originally formed part thereof.

In witness whereof this agreement has been duly executed by the parties.

WM. MACKENZIE.

D. D. MANN.

AND. G. BLAIR,

Minister of Railways and Canals.

CLIFFORD SIFTON,

In the presence of Minister of the Interior.

Z. A. LASH.

JOHN J. MAGEE.

I move to amend clause 1 by inserting after the word "which" the following words :—"Comprising several agreements respectively, being dated 25th January, 1898, and 28th February, 1898."

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 5,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg to amend this section by adding the following :—

But the majority consisting of said board, of whom the president shall be one, shall be at all times British subjects.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 8,

Mr. QUINN. Before this clause is adopted, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to a scheme which I proposed, in my speech on the second reading of this Bill, relating to the issue of this stock to Canadians. I suggested that the capital should be \$10,000,000, but the shares, instead of being \$100 each, should be \$1 each, and should be issued for subscription to the

Canadian public first. If not all subscribed before the 1st of September, then, the balance of the stock might be taken by Mackenzie & Mann, but I think the opportunity ought to be given to the Canadian people to benefit by the construction of this road and by the existence of such a rich country in Canada. I, of course, do not wish to move an amendment here. I realize that the Government is sufficiently strong to carry the proposition which they have made, but I think the Government should hesitate before excluding the Canadian public generally from the benefits to be derived by this particular firm of contractors and company, and from the opening up of communication with this rich gold country which we have within the limits of our Dominion.

On section 15,

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose, it is intended that this clause with reference to the expropriation of land should apply solely to the railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not confined to that. Under this clause they might expropriate away down in Vancouver or Victoria.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it has been quite a customary thing to allow the same procedure to be adopted for this purpose.

Mr. HAGGART. The words "along the line of railway" are omitted here, and the omission makes quite a difference.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Better let the clause stand for the present.

On section 16,

Mr. HAGGART. Is the Minister aware of any grant in aid of this road from any Government or municipality besides that from this Government?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not aware of any.

On section 18,

Mr. HAGGART. Does the Minister think that this section gives the company power to borrow more than the \$10,000,000 which they are authorized to borrow under the Act?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the only limitation to which they would be subject would be the provisions of the Railway Act.

Mr. HAGGART. The Railway Act does not apply to this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Railway Act is generally applicable, except where it is inconsistent with the provisions of this Act. I do not think there would be any limitation to their

Mr. QUINN.

borrowing powers, except their ability to persuade people to let them have money.

On section 20,

Mr. HAGGART. What is section 57 of the Railway Act?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Section 57 relates to the qualifications of directors, I think. It was thought that if the 20th section were not introduced here, there might be a question as to whether Mann & Mackenzie could be directors of the company to be organized, they having a contract with the Crown.

Mr. BRITTON. Is it understood that under section 19 the company may raise as much money as they like over and above the \$25,000 per mile provided by section 17?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. Hon. members should bear in mind that this company is not simply a railway company; it is not simply a railway and mining company; but it is a railway company, a mining company, a shipping and transportation company, a company which could carry on a smelting business, and which would probably be able to engage in a variety of businesses, such as will be done by companies under charters which have already been granted. Section 17 of the Bill regulates and limits the amount of the debenture or bonded debt which can be incurred in respect of the railway; section 19 has reference to the bonded debt which can be incurred by the company by a mortgage on its mineral lands; section 18 authorizes it to contract debt in respect of its other undertakings, which we take it would be a very proper power to confer on the company. The three sections, 17, 18 and 19, would cover the three distinct classes of business, and the three distinct powers which are conferred upon the company.

On section 23,

Mr. HAGGART. Have the Government the power of scheduling lands, that is, withdrawing them from settlement or from mining entry, for the purpose of securing to these parties the lands to which they are entitled? My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior will know that a great many companies, especially in the North-west Territories and Manitoba, who have not earned their lands, have the lands what is called "scheduled" to them. They are withdrawn from settlement or occupation, and I should like to know whether the Government have the power to do that with reference to this company.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The contract provides that the selection may be made in a certain way. I suppose, that, under the Dominion Lands Act, the Government have the power to reserve lands for the company to make selec-

tion from later on, but I have no hesitation in saying, that the hon. gentleman must have gathered from the discussion which has taken place, that the Government have no intention of reserving lands for the company to make selection from until the time comes when, under the contract, they are permitted to make selection.

On section 25,

Mr. BENNETT. In the event of the contractors being unable to secure possession of any lands that they might desire, will an action lie against the Government on behalf of the contractors? If any person is in possession of any lands which the contractors may desire to secure, but which the possessor seeks, by force, to prevent their securing, will an action lie on the part of the contractors against the Dominion?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should have very little hesitation in saying, no.

Mr. BENNETT. If the Minister lays that down as law, then, there is an invitation extended to all parties to come in and take up land on this understanding, that the Government will not, by force of arms or otherwise, seek to dispossess these parties.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not a legitimate inference to be drawn from my answer.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand the hon. Minister to hold, that, if any persons should take possession, say, of an area half a mile in extent, and the contractors wish to displace them, and these persons resist, no action will lie against the Government on the part of the contractors?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My answer is, that no action will lie against the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the Government allow the internecine strife to continue?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is one thing for the Government to allow an improper interference or any disorder, and another thing to make the Government liable because somebody is creating a disorder.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is confusing the idea of the liability which would arise under the contract, and the liability which would arise by reason of the obligation of the Government to maintain order.

On section 15,

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister will see, that this is a company carrying on business all over the North-west Territories and British Columbia, and that they have the right to expropriate for anything in reference to their business in British Columbia and the North-west Territories.

Mr. BRITTON. It ought to be made plain. At the same time, there have been decisions on that point, and they are to the effect that a railway company must, bona fide, require the lands for its business, and not simply for the purpose of speculating.

Mr. HAGGART. But this is not a railway company. It is a private company for many purposes.

Mr. BRITTON. I agree that it is, but, at the same time, for this purpose it is a railway company.

On section 4,

Mr. HAGGART. Am I to understand then, that if this railroad is not worked continuously for five years, the only forfeiture is one-fifth of the land we are giving to this company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is all.

On section 15,

Mr. QUINN. Section 15 is carried, I understood you to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to see the Minister of Railways economical, but I think it would have been well, seeing it would not have cost much, to have had a few copies of these important amendments distributed among intelligent members of the committee who really wish to discuss them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I felt that it would be a little awkward to discriminate. I would move to insert the following words after the word "elevators," in the second line, "along the line of any of the railways hereby authorized to be constructed, or at any of the termini thereof." The section will then read:

Should the company require land for wharfs, docks or elevators along the line of any of the railways hereby authorized to be constructed, or at any of the termini thereof—

And so on.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask the hon. Minister of Railways what he proposes to elevate along this line of railway and in the Canadian Yukon?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume the hon. gentleman is aware that there will not be any elevating material, as we hope that there will be no whisky there.

Mr. FOSTER. That is provided by another company, the head or manager of which I do not see present. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) if he has taken due precautions in the interest of the farmers. He is giving these grasping monopolists the power to build elevators wherever elevators can be put down, or put up, whichever he prefers. In the interest of the farming community, he has retained wheat

lands, corn lands and barley lands in the interests of the agriculturists. Has he put a clause in to prevent these monopolists from overcharging the farmers, who are to take up these arable lands and raise quantities of grain, for the use of elevators? The hon. gentleman, above all, must be consistent. If he is going to be good to the farmers by keeping back these arable lands for them, he should see to it that they are not overcharged for elevators.

Mr. HAGGART. I notice that the hon. gentleman does not confine the power of expropriation to the railroad actually being constructed, but gives a company power to expropriate on any of the lines or at the termini of any of the lines authorized to be constructed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). That is the effect of the amendment.

Mr. HAGGART. This will give them nearly as large powers as they had before. I suggest that it be limited to the road actually being constructed.

Mr. DAVIN. Is the hon. Minister making provision that farmers or anybody else shall be allowed to load freight without passing it through the elevators? That is a controversy we have on now in the North-west Territories. This ought to be guarded so that if a farmer or anybody else brings freight which he wants to put on the car, the railway company shall not have the power to say: We will not take it unless it is passed through our elevators. Has the hon. Minister had regard to that question?

Mr. FOSTER. No, never thought of that.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall I report the Bill?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to add one clause providing that this work shall be a work for the general advantage of Canada. The section will be drafted in a moment.

Mr. POPE. I think that in view of the national importance of the by-election in Russell, the House had better adjourn, and give the Government an opportunity to draft this Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I ask the committee to add the following as part of section 26:

The railways hereby authorized to be constructed are declared to be works in the general advantage of Canada.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported, and amendments agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES OF SHIPS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved second reading of Bill (No. 37) further to amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is a very small change made in that clause. Under the Wrecks and Salvage Act the Governor in Council formerly authorized an investigation into wrecks. In 1893 that Act was amended, vesting in the Minister the power formerly exercised by the Governor in Council. But the amendment did not extend to the present Act, as it should have done, and the only alteration here is made to incorporate that amendment giving power to the Minister to order investigations, which is at present exercised by the Governor in Council.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think last year there was some collision, as I recollect from the newspapers, between the Board of Trade and the Minister in connection with the exercise of his jurisdiction in these matters. Is the hon. gentleman able to explain shortly what point was brought up?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As near as I can recollect, there was an investigation held into the wreck of a steamer at St. John, N.B. The investigation was held by Capt. Smith, assisted by two assessors whose names I forget at the moment. However, the point the hon. gentleman wishes to ascertain arose from the disagreement between Capt. Smith and the assessors. Capt. Smith thought that the officer in charge—I think it was the second officer—was not to blame for the collision. The assessors held to the contrary, they held that under the evidence this officer was to blame, and they recommended the suspension of his certificate for a limited time. I do not recollect all the facts, as I had not the slightest idea that the hon. gentleman would have sought information with regard to that circumstance.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It was only with regard to the supervision of the Board of Trade over the decision of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was leading up to that. When the matter came before me, I went thoroughly into the evidence taken before

the commissioner, and I sided with the assessors in holding that the officer was clearly to blame, and against Commissioner Smith, and I so ruled on the appeal. Then it went to the Board of Trade, and the Board of Trade held that there did not lie an appeal from the commissioner, that the Minister here had no power; but they went no further.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was under the impression that it was under some legislation of this character that the Board of Trade is seized with the matter at all. Is the Minister able, at the moment, to explain how they assumed or undertook to overrule the decision of the Minister of Marine in connection with an adjudication where he was acting under the authority of a statute of Canada, in connection with an accident that took place in Canadian waters?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The officers were officers holding certificates from the British Board of Trade. The order made by the assessors was that their certificate should be suspended, and I confirmed that. The Board of Trade said: You have no power to confirm, because the commissioner does not agree with them, you have no power to alter or to amend his findings.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Practically they denied the right of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, under our legislation, to deal with a certificate granted by the Board of Trade.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They did.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is to say, they eschewed our own statute.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This clause is introduced at the solicitation of a large number of owners of steamships and others who desired that young men should be enabled to acquire the service necessary to obtain a permanent certificate. It has been applied with reference to engineers under the other Act, and it is now desired to apply the same principle to masters and mates. It enables the Minister to grant a temporary certificate to men qualified to take charge of a steamboat of not more than ten tons gross tonnage. And that certificate may be issued for not more than one year, or it may be recalled.

Mr. CARSCALLEN. Is not the capacity of a 10-ton boat more than ten passengers?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was not considered desirable by the officers of the department that

we should grant a temporary certificate to captains of large steamers carrying many passengers. It was thought desirable to try the experiment with small boats, and perhaps subsequently continue it and extend to large boats. At the outset the experiment will be limited to boats of 10 tons and carrying not more than ten passengers.

Mr. CARSCALLEN. Why limit it to ten passengers?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the class of boats which is contemplated by the Bill, in regard to which these temporary certificates will be given.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Why limit it to ten passengers for a 10-ton boat?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I understand it, the Government propose to wreck ten passengers before they go into the business more extensively.

Mr. BENNETT. What length of service will an engineer require before he obtains his certificate to act on a vessel of that kind?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This Bill does not extend to engineers, but simply to masters and mates.

Mr. BENNETT. As regards masters, what length of service is required now?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This Bill is to enable me as Minister of Marine to grant a master's certificate to a man to take charge of one of these vessels for a year, although he may not be entitled to receive a permanent certificate.

Mr. BENNETT. How many years must a man have been employed on a vessel to enable him to receive a certificate?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He has to pass a regular examination and must have served a specific term.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it must be shown by a mate before he receives a certificate that he has served a certain period. How many years must a man have served to receive a certificate?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not recollect exactly the time.

Mr. BENNETT. This Bill will press rather harshly on men who have served a number of years, because the Minister of Marine may of his own will recommend certain persons for certificates, and they will compete with men who have been compelled to serve a number of years prior to receiving certificates. Political pressure will be brought to secure this advantage, and recommendations will rest with politi-

cal friends to receive this much desired compliment, because it will be a compliment, for certain men will receive these certificates and other men will be refused. The Bill does not provide any special time of service but it simply states that upon passing a certain examination a certificate will be granted.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. So far as I am aware, there never have been politics imported into this branch of the service, at all events. It is not upon the application of any politician that I could grant this certificate, but upon the report of a duly appointed officer.

Mr. **ELLIS**. The difficulty experienced has been to secure competent men with certificates to fill these subordinate positions, and the object of the hon. Minister is to fill these positions with men holding temporary certificates, provided their inspector reports in their favour.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT HARBOURS, PIERS AND BREAKWATERS.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies) moved second reading of Bill (No. 38) further to amend the Act respecting Government harbours, piers and breakwaters.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). The meaning of this Bill is simply, that the Auditor General has determined that the practice which has existed for many years whereby wharfingers pay themselves by deducting from the receipts the 25 per cent which the law authorizes them to get as salary, was not legal. He has decided that they should return the whole wharfage dues received into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and then that a special payment for their remuneration should be made back to them. This Bill is to enable us to continue the practice heretofore prevailing by which the wharfingers deduct their fees from the amount collected, and forward the balance. The addition to the Act is :

Such remuneration shall be retained from the tolls and dues collected.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I quite agree with the Minister of Marine as to the necessity for making this practice regular by legislation. The supervision of these wharfage dues is a matter that gives an immense amount of work to the staff of the hon. gentleman's department. He has been long enough at the head of the department to know that there is no toll which is

Mr. **BENNETT**.

more unfairly administered, in a sense, than these wharf dues. There are any number of public wharfs in the different provinces, and there is a tariff of tolls, and wharfingers are appointed, but, if any one takes the trouble to look through the returns, he will find that, in some localities—and they are very few indeed—a comparatively large amount is paid; whereas, in the great majority of cases, no tolls of this kind are paid at all. The public use the wharf in these places: Parliament votes the money to repair these wharfs, regardless of whether tolls are paid or not, and, in view of the fact that, after long experience, it has been found impossible to collect these tolls fairly and equitably, the wharfs ought to be made free all round. It is hardly fair that a few communities should be made to pay tolls, while the majority are allowed to go scot free. In some places, the people of a particular locality have defied the department to collect the wharfage tolls, and, after considerable trouble, it has been found that it was impossible to carry out the law. From 1867 down, the annals of the department will show, that the administration of this toll tariff, which applies all over Canada, is a nullity and a farce in most cases. In one locality the law is enforced, while in another the people have the benefit of paying no wharf tolls. It would be better to abolish the toll altogether.

Mr. **COCHRANE**. I cannot see why the law is enforced in some communities and not in others, and I, for one, would object to voting money to maintaining these wharfs where the people do not pay toll. I know that, in my section of the country, a very excellent wharf is owned by a private individual, and the people of that community have to pay wharfage. Why should not that be the case all round? It is the duty of the Minister of Marine to see that tolls are collected at the Government wharfs throughout Canada.

Mr. **GILLIES**. I fully endorse the statement of my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). It is to my personal knowledge, that many of the wharfs in the lower provinces do not pay a single cent into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, while others, within a few miles, are paying the tolls fixed by the department. The collection of these dues rests largely, if not entirely, upon the energy of the person in charge of the wharf, and, while in some cases communities pay no tolls, others are charged to the fullest extent. To secure uniformity of charges would require a staff of particularly vigilant officers, and would lead to a great deal of expense. I believe the best plan would be to make these wharfs entirely free. The revenue derived from this source last year has been very small, and what revenue there is has been taken from communities that can ill afford to pay. In my opinion, the Minister would

do a wise thing, if he made those wharfs free.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) This question has to be looked at from the point of view of the property of private individuals, as well as from the point of view of the property belonging to the Government. In many sections of the country the Government may own a wharf, and a private individual may own another wharf immediately alongside of it. If you make the Government wharf free of toll, you depreciate the property of the man who has a wharf adjoining, and in that case you will inflict a hardship upon him. The tax is not a very onerous one, the tolls are not very high, and, so far as I know, there is no one who has a serious objection to them, as they exist at the present time. If these tolls are properly looked after, as they are in my section of the country, they would turn in a substantial revenue which would help to maintain these Government wharfs.

Mr. McALISTER. I agree with the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) that these public wharfs should be made free. In the town of Campbellton, where I live, the shippers have to pay those wharfage tolls, and there is a great deal of complaint from time to time. The revenue derived from these wharfs in the different parts of the Dominion, after the expenses of collecting it are deducted, amounts to a very small sum, and I believe it would be wise to make the wharfs free of toll throughout Canada.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It would be a very popular thing, no doubt, in certain localities to abolish the wharfage on the Government wharfs, and make them what my hon. friend terms free; but if he stops to think for a moment, he will see that it is not so very easy, and would not be so very just. Last year, for instance, the net amount received, after paying all the wharfingers' fees, was about \$9,000. This amount goes very far towards keeping these wharfs in repair. Hon. gentlemen know that where wharfs are used, as ours are, for shipping and other purposes, it is necessary every year to lay out certain sums of money to keep them in decent repair.

Mr. McALISTER. This \$9,000 was paid by one or two districts.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think hon. gentlemen opposite are largely exaggerating the cases where wharfage is not paid. During the past two years the department has been looking very closely after this wharfage matter, and wherever information has been given to the officials that the wharfage tolls were being evaded, steps are being taken to bring them under the general rule. I know that an attempt has been made, by not appointing a wharfinger, or by appoint-

ing one who declines to act, to evade the tolls; but the department generally overcomes that attempt by appointing one of its own men, who will act and collect the tolls. The \$9,000 collected last year was, I think, pretty fairly divided over the Dominion. Besides this, an amount was collected sufficient to pay the salaries of all the wharfingers. Suppose you make the wharfs free—

Mr. GILLIES. You would not require a wharfinger.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman know what the effect would be? It would be that the big man of the town would take possession of the wharf, and put all his tar-bark or other materials there. The wharf would quickly become practically the property of the leading merchant of the locality, and other people would be deprived of its use. That has been the effect in many cases, and it would not be fair to the people who build wharfs at their own expense. Every session numerous applications are made by members for wharfs to be provided for their constituents at the public expense; but I do not think it would be fair or just that wharfs should be constructed to give accommodation to individuals in different localities, and impose no tolls upon them. The present system has worked pretty well, though it has defects which it is our duty to try to overcome, and which we have pretty fairly overcome wherever our attention has been called to them. We have endeavoured to see that the tolls were collected as the law provides.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There are four wharfs which pay the bulk of the revenues collected all over Canada. Of all the wharfs of Ontario, there are only eight which pay any tolls whatever, one of them paying \$1,439. In Nova Scotia there is a large number of wharfs along the coast, and not more than a couple of dozen of them return any tolls whatever. In Quebec, with its long stretch of river and gulf where wharfs are necessary and are supplied, a little over a dozen pay tolls. In New Brunswick only eight pay tolls. Of these one pays \$700 and another \$426, the others paying very little. I do not suppose that this is the time when this matter can be fully considered; but I feel positive that my statement did not exaggerate the case. Of the hundreds of wharfs built and maintained by the Government, and supposed to be in charge of officers, but a mere handful, comparatively, pay these exactions; and it is not fair, I submit, under these circumstances, that the few should be oppressed when the many escape altogether.

Mr. BRITTON. It will be seen that section 3 of the General Act is not touched or proposed to be touched by this Bill. Under that section the Minister of Marine and

Fisheries can, and I suppose ought to and does, deal with the ports according to circumstances. Some of them, it is reasonable to believe, he would not put tolls upon at all, or at all events, not to the same extent as upon others. He would be governed by the amount of competition, the demands of the port where the wharf is situated, and so on. The great majority of the wharfs in Ontario belong to private individuals, as the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) has said, and this Act does not apply to them at all. I quite agree with what has been said on the other side, that if there is any unfair discrimination against persons in reference to certain wharves, section 3 ought to be amended; but at present there is nothing before the House except simply the question of collecting tolls on wharfs, and allowing the wharfingers to deduct from the amount collected their remuneration according to what has been fixed.

Mr. FLINT. The argument of the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) seems to be to tend rather in the direction of increased energy on the part of the Minister and his officials in seeing that the dues are properly collected. We have the assurance of the Minister that the department is paying attention to that matter. There is one point which appears to have been overlooked in the discussion, that is, the importance of having a wharfinger to see that the property is looked after and does not fall into decay, and to notify the proper authorities as to the state of the property. The wharfinger also performs an important office in looking after the conflicting claims and rights of individuals using the property. This work of course has to be paid for. Were the wharfs made free, it would not, of course be possible to find gentlemen in the neighbourhood who would be willing to act as wharfingers without pay, and there would be a great deal of difficulty in keeping track of the condition of the property, and avoiding difficulties and squabbles between individuals in regard to their different rights in respect of the wharfs. In the province of Nova Scotia some of these properties pay very handsomely towards the interest of the fund for regulating them and keeping them in repair. I think the facts stated by my hon. friend from Pictou should, and no doubt do, incline the department to see that the tolls are most strictly collected. There are cases where no private wharfs exist, and yet where the tolls collected are practically insignificant. In the main, the position taken by the Minister of Marine ought to be upheld.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it intended that this Act shall apply to so-called harbour masters or officers at points where there are no Government docks at all? Take the town of Midland, where there is no Government

Mr. BRITTON.

dock, and yet where there is a Government official whose business it is to collect fees from vessels. He gets \$200 per year, and when he collects that amount all further interest in his work ceases. There is no return from him because he keeps the amount of \$200 that he collects, and has no interest in collecting any more. Is it intended that this Bill shall apply to such officials?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never heard of this before, and I thank the hon. gentleman for the information. I shall have the matter looked into. This Bill does not introduce any new principle, but simply authorizes the practice which always has prevailed, of allowing wharfingers appointed by the Government to retain out of the fees they receive the amount allowed them, instead of sending the whole sum to Ottawa and getting back what is due them.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this clause applicable to persons who collect fees and dues, as in the port of Midland?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If he is a wharfinger, it would apply.

Mr. BENNETT. There is no wharf there for him to be wharfinger of.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is harbour master and comes under another statute altogether.

Mr. BRITTON. Section 1 of the Act now proposed to be amended defines distinctly to what this applies. It applies simply to Government harbours, piers, wharfs and breakwaters, constructed or completed at the expense of Canada.

Mr. GILLIES. I think that the fee demanded by the department is very reasonable, but the hon. Minister should adopt some system of seeing that it is universally imposed. In some cases, the fees are collected, and in others, within a few miles, they are not. In some cases, the person in charge of the public wharf belongs to the community, the people doing business on the public wharf are his neighbours, and he lets them go free; whereas in others, the collector is more exacting, and makes every one pay. One community suffers, therefore, while another goes entirely free.

I do not think there is anything in the point raised by the hon. member for King's, P.E.I., as regards public wharfs coming into competition with private wharfs, because the policy of the Government has always been to construct wharfs only in districts where there are no private wharfs, and where, owing to physical difficulties or other causes, the construction would be too great a burden on the community.

Mr. McALISTER. There is a great deal of force in the argument of the hon. Min-

ister of Marine and Fisheries that if wharfingers were dispensed with altogether, one or two persons would take possession of each wharf and monopolize its use. I would suggest that the wharfinger should have the power to collect the tolls, to be regulated by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, from all persons indiscriminately who make use of the wharf for business purposes, and that these tolls should be smaller than at present and should go entirely towards paying himself. Under present conditions, the irregularity in collecting is a great cause of complaint. In the town of Campbellton, where I live, the wharfage accommodation is very limited, and besides navigation is closed during four or five months of the year, and yet the returns from the wharf there amounts to over \$400, whereas the returns from the whole Dominion are only about \$9,000. That shows that the number of wharfs paying tolls is very small, and that if they are not made free, some provision should be made by which every wharf would be subjected to toll. That is to say, if I am right, the provision here simply affects the payment of remuneration, and would not cover anything like an allowance for expenses out of the tolls. That still remains as before.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved second reading of Bill (No. 39) respecting the inspection of steamboats and the examination and licensing of engineers employed thereon.

Motion agreed to. Bill read the second time and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is a rather bulky Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Rather bulky, but the amendments are few and almost altogether those recommended by the departmental officers. I do not think there will be any dispute as to the principle. I will explain each section as we go along.

On section 2—interpretation,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman will follow me, I will point out the changes that are made in this section. Subsection A remains as it was, except that the words, "and includes steam dredges and floating elevators," are added. These words were found necessary in order to bring steam dredges and floating elevators under the operation of the Act. In subsection C, it was found that the expression "yearly"

and "every year" were not definite enough, and we substitute for the previous clause the one in the Bill now before the committee:

(c.) For the purpose of collecting the yearly rate of duty hereinafter imposed, the expression "year" means the calendar year, commencing the first day of January and ending on the thirty-first day of December, and for the purpose of the inspection hereinafter rendered imperative the expression "year" means twelve calendar months from the date of the certificate of inspection.

In subsection B, we provide:

The expression "owner" means the registered owner only.

Under the old Act the term "owner" included also the lessee and charterer. That was found not to work well. In practice it was found that ten or more people could charter a tug and claim that they were privileged as owners, and so evaded the Act. To meet that palpable evasion, we limit the interpretation of "owner" to the registered owner. Subsections D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, are as they were before. The subsections from L to P, inclusive, are new, as follows:—

(l.) The expression "passenger steamboat" means any steamboat carrying any person other than the master and crew, the owner, his family and the servants connected with his household; except steam yachts used exclusively for pleasure or private use without hire of any kind;

(m.) The expression "minister" means the Minister of Marine and Fisheries;

(n.) The expression "vessel" means any barge, bateau, boat, scow or vessel carrying passengers, other than a steamboat;

(o.) The expression "voyage" includes "passage" or "trip," and the expression "remuneration" includes fuel and ship's stores of any kind or any other kind of payment or compensation;

(p.) The expression "tug-boat" means a steamboat used exclusively for towing purposes.

Mr. BRITTON. I must oppose as strongly as I can the inclusion of dredges and floating elevators under the provisions of this Act. The use of floating elevators has been going on for twenty-five or thirty years. They have been used very extensively, and, so far as I know, without any accident occurring and without injury to trade. There is no reason that I know of for having this Act made applicable to them. If any inspection of them is required, it seems to me it ought to be only such inspection as is made necessary in case of stationary engines. They are stationary engines to all intents and purposes. An engine is put upon a floating elevator instead of being put upon a dock, but it is used simply for hoisting. It floats alongside the dock and moves about nowhere except to adjust its position to the vessel that is being unloaded. Why a higher class of engineer should be required, or why a different inspection should be necessary than that which has existed for many years,

I cannot see. I speak only as the matter strikes me at first blush; I have not considered this Bill carefully. I did not know it was coming up this afternoon. But the Bill hits particularly the trade of Kingston and that of Montreal, so far as floating elevators are used in Montreal. It is a most important matter, and I should like to get some facts concerning it before this Bill is passed. It seems to me that if inspection is necessary, the inspection that is provided for stationary engines would be quite sufficient.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have nothing to do with stationary engines.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no very great principle involved; but I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) will see that it is for him to give reasons why steam dredges and floating elevators should not be included under this Act.

Mr. BRITTON. They have not been included hitherto.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But they ought to be. Why should they not be made liable to inspection the same as any other steamboats? What is the difference?

Mr. BRITTON. They are not steamboats in that sense.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But they have boilers which ought to be inspected.

Mr. BRITTON. So has a hoist on a wharf.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But a hoist on a wharf is not within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. But I may tell the hon. gentleman that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is flooded with petitions praying for legislation to have stationary boilers inspected. But we have no jurisdiction over them; the provincial legislatures must pass laws on that subject.

Mr. BRITTON. Then let the provincial legislatures look after these.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But they have no power to legislate with regard to steam dredges. That is within the jurisdiction of this province. But I do not wish to press the matter upon the hon. gentleman, seeing that he has not given it consideration. The officers of the department report in favour of having such a Bill as this. If any men work upon these dredges, and if they are to be deprived of the protection which Parliament thinks it desirable to throw around other steamboats. I should like to hear some reason given for it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is all for protection.

Mr. BRITTON.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All for the protection of life, and it is not an improper exaction upon shipping at all, it is a proper thing that the boilers of those dredges should be inspected from time to time in order that the employees may know that they are not going to be blown up.

On section 4,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We leave out of that section a provision under which the Governor in Council had power under the law as it stands to-day, to appoint at such places as he deems advisable in Canada, a skilled person competent to inspect boilers. Before we had to define in his appointment the district over which he would have jurisdiction, and we propose to leave out that limitation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They would all have jurisdiction over Canada.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I had special reference to British Columbia in proposing to leave out the limitation. Subsection two is a new clause. No inspector so appointed should be engaged in any business or act as valuator of any damage to the goods or cargo, and should not act in any other capacity than his official capacity as steamboat inspector. Complaints have been made that these men were sometimes mixed up in some business with which they ought to have nothing to do.

On section 5,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There has been a change proposed by the chairman, Mr. Adams, and by Mr. McGee, who has special charge of this business. Under the old Act any three practical shipbuilders formed a board. The new Act provides that the chairman and two hull inspectors shall form a board to examine applicants for the position of inspector. It was thought best that the chairman and two inspectors should constitute the commission.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What do you do in case of the sickness of the chairman?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no provision made for that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It seems to me that under the old system there will be no delay for the candidates. If you make the chairman an indispensable member, his absence through illness might mean serious delay. I do not understand why they wish to have the chairman on all occasions. It seems to me that as we have to look after the safety of life, we must take every precaution in this Act not to have machinery that will interfere with the busi-

ness of the commission. I do not see at the moment why the chairman should be required. It seems to me that three inspectors, as under the old system, would be quite sufficient.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Take the case of British Columbia to-day. I have sent the chairman out there because there will be a large amount of work there for the inspectors to do. Now, there are two inspectors in that province, and when he goes there he, with these two inspectors, will constitute a board, and they can examine, and perhaps it will be necessary for them to do so, those who come forward as candidates for the post of inspector.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. The hon. gentleman does not appreciate my point. Now that he is away you cannot arrange this board until he comes back; whereas, if the chairman were not always required, you have three inspectors, and you could get them together more easily than you could get the chairman with two inspectors. The case the hon. gentleman put seems to be an illustration of the inconvenience of this arrangement. The chairman can not be in British Columbia, for instance, and in Ontario at the same time.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The only difference between this provision and the old Act is that the latter provided that any three practical shipbuilders could form a board. That was found not to work well, because in many places they could not get three men competent to form a board of inspectors, and we think that a chairman and two hull inspectors will be an improvement.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I do not object to an improvement of the board, if it is to be such; but I think the hon. gentleman is making an unworkable arrangement by requiring that the chairman of the board of inspectors should always be one of the board.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I will consider that point.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Before Six o'clock is called, I would like to ask my right hon. friend what he proposes to take up this evening, after getting through with this Bill?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We will take up the Franchise Bill this evening.

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

After Recess

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The previous Act, to which

the hon. gentleman referred, might be rendered nugatory by the absence of the chairman, is the contention of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). I call attention to section 9 of the present Bill, referring to the Board of Steamboat Inspectors, and subsection 3, which provides that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may appoint one of the inspectors deputy chairman, to act in the absence of the chairman, and he shall have all the functions of the chairman.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I doubt whether the word "chairman," in section 5, even with this amendment, would include the deputy chairman. The clause says "chairman," and not acting chairman or deputy chairman.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I move to insert, after the word "chairman," the words "deputy chairman."

Amendment agreed to.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I should like a fuller explanation in regard to the change proposed. Under the present law there is a board for the examination of inspectors of hulls, and there is a handy provision under which, in some cases, no inspectors will be required. Practical shipbuilders are selected by the Minister, who shall constitute at any time or place the examining board, and, so far as my recollection goes, instead of any objection being taken to this arrangement, it is considered a convenient system. Inspectors themselves have been chosen from that class of men, and practical shipbuilders were able to examine the qualifications of a candidate, and, in any event, report the result of their examination, and the matter comes before the Minister before an appointment is made. While I have always been very much inclined to give great weight to the advice of the chairman and a board of this kind in regard to technical subjects, I should like to know, before this change is made, whether in the hon. gentleman's experience, there has been any difficulty whatever in the board of practical shipbuilders, as regards testing the qualifications of inspectors of hulls. The reason I press this matter upon the hon. gentleman is, that I can understand the necessity, in remote parts of Canada, of the speedy examination of an inspector of hulls, and, moreover, there is great expense involved in sending these particular men to any special part of the Dominion for the purpose. The Steamboat Inspection Act has been so administered that the dues collected paid for the expense of the inspection, so that, while the benefits to the public were many, in regard to the safety of lives in this connection, there was not felt, outside of the shipping interest, any expense of regulating these matters. If we are to depart from

a system that has worked well in connection with ascertaining the fitness of commissioners, and enabling the board of officers, consisting of no less than three, to visit different parts of Canada, it will take a very short time to run up the expenses pretty heavily, and it is also possible that this change will be attended by considerable inconvenience and great delay in remote sections, where new officers are required. On these grounds, I should like a fuller statement, in order to ascertain the necessity for making such a radical change. On the face of the Bill, it looks well. A trained officer, with two other regular officers, would, no doubt, secure greater regularity in the examinations, and greater satisfaction, possibly, in the result, and also in the body of men who became inspectors. While that is, on its face, a good result, there is, at the same time, a possibility of incurring expense, inconvenience and delay, and, therefore, a case ought to be made out, founded on experience, to show that the present system, cheaper, undoubtedly, and more expeditious, has not worked well in the public interest.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I admit this is a question on which there may fairly be a difference of opinion. I have been guided entirely by the officers of my department. The chairman believes that, in the public interest, he should be present at the examinations, because charges have been made that inspectors have been appointed who had not been competent to fulfil the duties of their office. My predecessor had issued a commission, and had incurred an enormous expense in examining charges made against an inspector in British Columbia, Mr. Collister. There was a great deal of contradictory evidence gathered; but I have never taken action, one way or the other. I thought the evidence was inconclusive against his ability to discharge his functions properly, and I let the matter go: but the chairman of the board is under the impression, that uniformity could be obtained, in a degree at least, under the present amendment, that had not obtained under the old Act. You might send down to Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia and obtain three shipwrights there whose opinion as to the competency of a man to be appointed inspector would be entirely different from that of three shipwrights in Quebec, and it was thought that, if the chairman were present at these examinations, there would be a guarantee to the public that a certain amount of uniformity and efficiency would be obtained, which otherwise would not be secured. I frankly admit that was the only ground on which the change was made, and it is made on the very urgent representation of the present chairman of the board who believes that his presence at the different examinations would ensure an efficiency and uniformity, which the present system does

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

not. The opinion of three shipwrights in the maritime provinces as to the ability of a man may be all right or all wrong, but it might not coincide with the opinion of three men in Ontario or Quebec or British Columbia. The chairman, Mr. Adams, thoroughly understands from long experience what the qualifications of an inspector should be, and his presence at an examination must have a good effect.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Suppose the office of inspector of hulls in British Columbia is vacant, where would the candidates be examined under this Bill?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Not necessarily in British Columbia.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not possibly in British Columbia, unless the Minister sends out there two inspectors of hulls and the chairman or acting chairman of the board. As I understand it, there is only one inspector there now for the inland waters and the salt waters of that vast province, and the hon. gentleman sees that his duties would take him great distances apart.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I think there are two inspectors of hulls there now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not of hulls.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Mr. Collister is inspector of hulls, and while Mr. Thompson is primarily inspector of boilers, he is also inspector of hulls on the inland waters. Mr. Adams has now gone out there, and the board would be properly constituted under this Act. I suppose there is no other part of the Dominion which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) can point to as a similar example. The increasing trade of that province, however, will necessitate the immediate appointment of an additional inspector.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Three practical shipbuilders could certify to the ability of a candidate much more cheaply and quickly than could the board constituted under this Bill. If a vacancy in the office occurs it would be necessary to send Mr. Adams or some other officer all the way from the east out there and that would entail considerable cost, if this amendment is adopted. You have two inspectors for the three maritime provinces, and even if they could leave their work you would have to convene them at a particular place and send one of your officers from another province to constitute this board. This suggestion has been made by the board from the very best motives no doubt, but they probably do not think as much as hon. gentlemen here have to think of the convenience of the public and the expense on the

treasury. While I would be the last man to treat their suggestions lightly, yet I would say, that unless the present more speedy and economical system has been found fault with—and there is no pretense of that—it would be much better to allow it to remain in force. Surely two inspectors of hulls cannot be any more competent to pronounce on a man's qualifications than are two practical shipbuilders.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I am disposed to pay great deference and respect to the opinion of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), for he was much longer in the department than I. Very strong objections have been taken to the fact that the three shipwrights appointed to examine a man, as it would be in their own interest, might select one whom they desired to appoint, but who might not otherwise be competent. My object was to divorce the public interest from the private interest, and that is why I yielded to the representations of my officers. It may be said: Here you have three shipwrights, they will appoint their foreman or some other friend, and he will do whatever they want him. There is that difficulty in the way. If my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) feels strongly upon the point, I will yield to him, because I recognize he has had large experience in the matter. I would make the clause to read:

Two inspectors of hulls—

And taking these words in the alternative:

—or two experienced shipwrights.

This would enable the Minister to appoint the chairman or deputy chairman and two inspectors in any particular case where it was thought necessary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The chairman or deputy chairman of the board would still have to travel about.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I think I should have at least one officer who has had experience, who knows what the qualifications of an inspector should be, and upon whose judgment I could rely.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The suggestion made by the hon. Minister is, I believe, an improvement.

Mr. HENDERSON. This clause states that no person shall be appointed an inspector of the hulls and equipment of such vessels unless he has passed a satisfactory examination as to his competency for the office. I would like to know if the Minister intends that the department should prescribe what competency shall consist of. A few years ago an examination took place in Toronto, and from my recollection, it turned chiefly upon the technical knowledge of the candidates, and not upon their practical knowledge of hulls; so that the man

who stood highest was a person who had rarely seen the hull of a vessel, while others who were thoroughly posted in ship-building and knew every part of a ship, were excluded because they were unable to solve problems in quadratic equations or demonstrate propositions in the sixth book of Euclid. It seems to me that what is really wanted is practical knowledge, and if so, there should be some better definition of competency by the department. I know that good men have been excluded because they had forgotten some of their early training at school, while younger men who knew very little practically about ship-building, were accepted. In that way, I do not think the most efficient officer was secured.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It is to overcome the difficulty my hon. friend suggests that I am adopting this new method. I want to get one experienced man on the board, so that the examinations throughout the Dominion shall be uniform, and shall be made on reasonable grounds. The same qualifications will be required from a candidate in British Columbia as from one in Nova Scotia. I do not want a hap-hazard examination, which would suit three ship-builders in Nova Scotia, while three in Ontario would require an altogether different examination; and I think I ensure that by requiring that the chairman of the board of inspectors shall be the chairman of the board of examiners; and, with the suggestion of my hon. friend from Pictou, which I accept, that it shall not be absolutely essential that the other two members of the board of examiners shall be inspectors, but that one or both may be practical ship-builders. I think the whole question will be solved.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is well as far as it goes, but I think the Minister should take care that in the instructions given to the chairman, the examination prescribed shall be of a practical character rather than simply of a technical character.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I think my hon. friend is right, and I am sure my hon. friend from Pictou will acknowledge that we have in the department, in the person of Mr. Adams, a very practical man—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. A man who has had a large experience, and whose whole soul is devoted to his business. I would, therefore, move that after the word "equipment," in the 5th clause, there be inserted the words, "or one or more experienced practical ship-builders."

Mr. BENNETT. How many inspectors are there now in Ontario?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Two hull inspectors and three boiler and engine inspectors.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Is it intended to increase the number in the province of Ontario?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. A question arises out of section 4, which I think has not been considered. It is a very good clause on the whole, except for a little exception:

And no inspector so appointed shall, except by permission of the Minister, be engaged in any business.

Will not that put the Minister in a very awkward position? The object of course is to get rid of persons who would be in the pay of some boiler-maker or drawing plans for him, and have thoroughly impartial officers; but while the principle is sound, this is a dangerous exception to it.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I am sure the committee will agree that a certain amount of discretion may fairly be left in the hands of the Minister. The case came before me, within the last few months, of a person perfectly competent to act, but who happened to be the mayor of some small town, and we had to give special permission to him to act. There was no reason why he should not fairly act as inspector, although mayor of a locality. It is just to meet similar contingencies that this discretion is left in the hands of the Minister.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. It seems to me that the Minister could go on doing as he did in the case mentioned, without this clause.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I could not. In that case we went against the law.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. The Minister could lay down a rule that no officer should be engaged in any business that would subject him to the slightest suspicion. By this exception, the hon. Minister will subject himself to tremendous pressure. The pressure from any particular locality will be such, where the applicant has local influence, that he would be more than human if, under some circumstances, he be able to hold out. In his own interest and that of the service he should drop that section, which destroys the whole clause, or else drop the clause and let the Minister himself be held responsible as now.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I would ask my hon. friend not to press his objection. Without this clause, it would not be open for the Minister to say to those who have the patronage

Mr. **BENNETT**.

of a district and are recommending a man for his position, that the man is unfit because he is engaged in business. But there will be cases constantly arising, where a man is engaged in some sort of business not at all connected with the inspection of steamboats, and unless there is some discretion vested in the Minister we would have to provide a salary for an inspector which would enable him to live without following any other business. The officers of the department concur in this exception, and my experience has been that such a discretion would be advisable, but that the main principle should be declared that engaging in business other than the one to which he is appointed would be disqualification.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I shall look into the subject before the Bill gets its third reading, but I would point out to the hon. gentleman that, under the general law, an officer in receipt of \$900 or upwards in the service of Canada is debarred from being employed in any outside business of any kind. I think that is the general law, under the Civil Service Act, not applicable merely to employees connected with the inner service, but the outer service as well. I think this is a departure in the wrong direction.

Mr. **WOOD** (Brockville). Is subsection 2 of section 4 new?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes, I was applied to a short time ago, by a gentleman, who had received an appointment, to know whether he could hold a certain office. It seemed to me rather inconsistent with his appointment, but there was no law against it. Now we have introduced a clause providing that he shall not engage in any other business unless with the consent of the Minister. It is the same principle that applies in the Inland Revenue and Customs Department.

Mr. **HUGHES**. Does that apply to civil servants, such as stenographers, accountants, &c.

The **MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE** (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). Any civil servant.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Passing to clause 5, the hon. Minister is carrying forward, with perhaps some little changes, an old clause relating to the inspectors of hulls and equipments and dispensing with them in certain parts of Canada. That clause, I think, was adopted in 1882, for the purpose of dealing with the then remote parts of Canada—Manitoba, British Columbia and the district of Keewatin. The hon. Minister will see that a clause which was good enough for those times, and which was out of harmony with the general inspection Act altogether and an exceptional piece of legislation, of necessity justifiable then, is wholly out of place now.

He will not say that we are not able to adjust these matters now on a general system for the whole of Canada, and there is no reason why that clause should be there at all. The clause is as follows :—

In the provinces of Manitoba, British Columbia and the North-west Territories and the district of Keewatin, the Minister may, when he sees fit, dispense with the appointment of an inspector of hulls and equipment; and in such case, or in a case of vacancy in the office of inspector in the said provinces, territories or district, the Minister may assign the duties of such inspector to the inspector of boilers and machinery, or such other person as he temporarily employs, who shall then, and so long as such order remains in force, have all the power and perform all the duties hereby assigned to the inspector of hulls and equipment, under the like obligations and like penalties in case of default, and such person shall be called an acting inspector of hulls and equipment.

That was necessary owing to the exigency of the time and the impossibility of anything like system that could be managed and controlled as in the older provinces. The railway facilities of British Columbia did not then exist. The steamers were limited in number. But now we have that province opening up and enormous shipping developing suddenly. And so, as strong a case as can be made out for any part of Canada for the system in its best possible form exists for it there; and that is what the people, I am sure, expect and what they ought to have. It means nothing extraordinary to provide an efficient staff to carry out there the law which is considered wholesome in the east. One of the best things about this law is that the administration of it is so far separated from the political department, so to speak. You have technical officers with large power, and you destroy, as far as public convenience will allow, the possibility of the improper exercise of discretion on the part of the political head of the department. Therefore, the law commends itself, as a whole, to the public in the eastern part of Canada. And it was a wholesome principle, though ignored in the clause which was brought into existence in 1882. But I suggest to the hon. Minister that now is the time to drop that and allow the general sections of the Act to apply, and I think it will be found sufficient.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says. But I would call his attention to the fact that the clause to which he refers merely provides that the inspector of boilers, in the discretion of the Minister, if circumstances demand its exercise, may be appointed inspector of hulls. Take the case of Mr. Thompson in British Columbia. He is inspector of boilers, and under this section he was appointed inspector of hulls for the new steamers to be built on the inland waters of British Columbia going down the Kootenay River. We could not well do otherwise. It was impossible

for Mr. Collister to go into the interior and inspect the hulls there. But the inspector of boilers, being on the spot, could make that inspection. It is found that in some cases this portion of the Act works well. In Manitoba a similar appointment is made. To do otherwise would duplicate appointments and expense to accomplish what, for the present at least, I think is better accomplished under this system. I would therefore ask that matters remain for a few years as they are. I am aware that we are emerging from the condition of affairs existing when this clause was introduced, but I think we have not got far enough yet to have qualified men to act, one as inspector of hulls and one as inspector of boilers. In many cases the same man can discharge both duties. I have given the hon. gentleman the instances, one in Manitoba and one in British Columbia, in both of which the Acts have worked well.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. Minister be correct—and I doubt it—and our officers can be interchanged to advantage, it must not be forgotten that that is not the principle of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, it is an exception.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The inspector of boilers may be quite unfit to undertake the inspection of hulls.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Quite true.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This law does not stop, as the hon. Minister seems to think, at the power of the Minister to allow the inspector of boilers to act temporarily as inspector of hulls, but allows him to choose any person, inspector or not inspector—"the Minister may assign the duties of such inspector to the inspector of boilers and machinery, or such other person as he temporarily employs."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That will relate to distant parts of the country.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It gives a wide and dangerous discretion. The Minister himself would admit that he should not take such powers for the older provinces; it would create alarm among those identified with the shipping interests. I venture to suggest—without desire to reiterate my views or take up time—that the position is a dangerous one for the province of British Columbia, because it means that, for the sake of convenience and to put off dealing with affairs as they are, they leave the province of British Columbia in the same position as they have been in since 1882. The hon. Minister has mentioned the subject of distances. When you have to take an inspector from the Island of Vancouver to send him into the great inland waters of British Columbia, it seems mani-

fest that the time has come when there should be two officers there, just as there are in Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island. Even in that territory two are required. But British Columbia is much larger in extent, more difficult of access. The argument of the Minister would be to postpone the proper administration there and the proper increase of the staff so as to gain inefficiency of administration. I do not put myself forward—I should not be warranted in doing so—as representing that part of the country, but speak simply from having held an official position that gives me grounds for believing, as I now argue, that the time for the cheap system in that district has passed. There is no reason why a province like British Columbia should be exempted from the general principle of the Bill and governed by rule of some or at the discretion of departmental officers wholly.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I have no desire to postpone the making of proper appointments in British Columbia, and the best instance I can give is that I have already sent out the chairman of the board to make a proper division. I hope to do that. But the hon. gentleman must remember that British Columbia is a very large territory. It is not confined simply to the Island of Vancouver and New Westminster, but extends from the Kootenay up past the Skeena River northward. It may be necessary for me to make a provisional appointment for Skeena River at the north of British Columbia. This is a discretion that it would be well to retain for a time at least. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press his suggestion at this time. My officers all agree that it is desirable. It is not intended to retain the section unduly longer, or to postpone the responsibility of making the necessary appointment in British Columbia.

On section 6,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There is no change made here, excepting in subsection 2, which provides that any rules and regulations made under either of these sections shall, after publication in the "Canada Gazette," have like force and effect as if herein enacted. No. 1A was passed in 1889; B in 1890; C in 1892; D in 1892, and E in 1890. The present law does not provide that they shall have any effect by publication in the "Gazette;" but hereafter they will have.

On section 9,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The main section is as it was in the old Act; but subsection 3 has been added. The Minister may appoint one of the inspectors deputy chairman to act in the absence of the chairman, and such deputy shall exercise all the functions of the chairman.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How often is this board convened?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There are no regular times for convening it, but Mr. Adams is trying to bring about some uniformity. It meets wherever the chairman calls it. For instance, he has gone to British Columbia now and he will have a meeting there. When he comes back, he may be sent to the maritime provinces and have a meeting there.

On section 10,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The following clause, that was in the old Act, has been left out:—

The chairman of the board of steamboat inspection, who shall also be the supervising inspector.

We did not know what that meant, and so we leave it out.

On section 11,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There is only one change made here. Under the old Act, the penalty was arbitrarily fixed at \$400. Every hon. gentleman knows that the degree of guilt attached to a breach of the law is variable. Sometimes a man is, perhaps, not absolutely innocent, but he commits a breach of the law which is not very serious. At other times, he acts in direct, and wilful, and wicked violation of the Act; the same penalty ought not to be attached to the different offences. Instead of fixing the penalty arbitrarily at \$400 in every case of breach of the law, I propose to ask the committee to agree to a sliding scale, not exceeding \$500, and not less than \$100, depending upon the gravity of the offence. The whole object of the alteration is to give a discretion to the court in the matter of a penalty, making the minimum \$100 and the maximum \$500.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not altogether agree with the wisdom of that change. It is a difficult thing to obtain the penalty above the minimum in these cases, at the hands of the court. There is not a very general appreciation, over the country of the necessity of a severe administration of that section. I venture to believe, the result of this change will be, that the minimum penalty will be imposed, and then the same pressure and the same appeals that have heretofore been made in these cases, will continue to be made. If my recollection serves me right, where the Minister entertains a view that there should be a remission, it has been found necessary to come to this House and obtain a vote for the remission of the fine.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No, the Governor in Council has power.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Under the general Act.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** It is being constantly exercised, very unfortunately; a constant pressure is being brought upon the Minister every month of his life to reduce a penalty, on grounds which commend themselves to his good sense. The magistrate says: I am sorry; I would not have inflicted \$400; I do not think the case justifies \$400. But the man broke the law, and I think perhaps he ought to pay \$100, but \$400 is too much. So I have to go to the Council with a report to get the penalty reduced from \$400 to \$100. I think some discretion ought to be left to the court, and I submit that, between \$100 and \$500 is giving a fair discretion for the court to exercise. Then, the Minister will be relieved from the necessity of hearing constant appeals to exercise his own discretion for a reduction of the fine.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, clause 78. That would not apply, as the hon. gentleman will see on reading it. I do not recollect the provision under which the Governor in Council could remit these penalties, certainly not under that as I read it.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I may say to my hon. friend, that it is not under that statute. A case came up, the Anglin case, and it was referred to the Department of Justice—I do not know who was Minister at the time—and they gave a written and reasoned opinion, that the Governor in Council had power to remit these penalties.

Mr. POWELL. As to this discretion of which the Minister speaks, it seems to me, that a tribunal of two justices of the peace is a very imperfect tribunal to hold such discretionary power as it is proposed to clothe it with under this section. There will be no uniformity. Two justices in one court would be guided by considerations that would not weigh with justices in another court, and this action would simply bring the law into disrepute.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. My recollection is that these prosecutions could not be heard before two justices of the peace.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I will look into the matter. I have not had a case before me adjudicated upon by two justices of the peace.

Mr. MILLS. Why should it be made compulsory to have the certificate on board the vessel?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** It is necessary. Every steamboat carries her certificate; it is framed and hung up.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the Act, of 1886, this certificate was to be delivered to the chief officer of customs at the port where such inspection was made. Why have the words "at the port where such inspection was made" been dropped? I can understand cases arising where parties might want to take action respecting the vessel and it might be important to know where to find the certificate.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I am informed that this clause was amended with a view to simplify the matter. Instead of making it compulsory that the certificate should be delivered to the chief officer of customs at the port where the inspection was made, it has been amended so as to read that the certificate may be delivered to any chief officer of customs.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Anywhere.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not a wise change to make. Under the old law there was something definite and certain. If you believed the vessel was violating the law, you could look for her certificate at the port where the inspection was made. Under the law as amended the officers would not have the support of the community in enforcing the law, because it would not follow that the certificate was filed in that port but at any customs port. Who is a chief officer of customs?

Mr. POWELL. A chief officer of customs at a port we all understand to be the collector. The chief officer for the Dominion, however, is, I suppose, the Minister. The language of the amended clause as proposed is very indefinite. Why not provide that the certificate should be filed where the vessel was registered, so that any one could find it in case of action being taken concerning a ship. Under the proposed clause it would be necessary, in order to institute proceedings, to search every custom-house in the Dominion. The amendment is perfectly absurd, trifling and picayune.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** The idea was to make it more general.

Mr. POWELL. You are trifling with purely technical ritual which is absolutely unnecessary and will interfere with shipping. If the hon. gentleman departs from the practice that the certificate should be filed in the port of registry, he is making a regulation that will serve no purpose and will put people to considerable trouble, if it is of any significance at all.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** The deliverance of the certificate is not the main thing. The inspection of the ship is the main object.

Mr. POWELL. It is a useless change.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The great object is to have the inspection made and to have the certificate filed in some official way. But there is no necessity to have it filed in any special place. Very frequently inspections are made on Saturday afternoon after the office of the port where the vessel was inspected had closed. If it was necessary to file the certificate in that port, the vessel would have to remain over until Monday. The great thing is to have the inspection made and to have the certificate given. The filing of it is merely an official act which is not of one-fiftieth part the importance of the main act itself. Mr. Magee tells me that every month cases come up where vessels are inspected on the afternoon of Saturday and the papers cannot be filed unless the vessel waits over Sunday and until Monday morning.

Mr. POWELL. I agree that the main thing is the inspection, and so far as the certificate is concerned, the only object in filing it is to place it somewhere where people can see it. Why not have it filed in some convenient place?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If it is filed in the office of the chief inspector of customs it is proper.

Mr. POWELL. The owner or captain of the vessel is directly interested, and outside of him the public generally. So far as the owner and master of the vessel is concerned the copy in the possession of one of them is ample. But so far as the public is concerned they want to know where to get the certificate or otherwise they may go hunting all over Canada. What sense is there in filing it when people cannot know where it is. Under this Bill they might file it in British Columbia.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. After all, the old Act was well considered and it met the objections which seem to occur to both hon. gentlemen who have last spoken. Under the old Act, if a person wanted to know whether the vessel was inspected or not, all he had to do was to find the officer, and if the vessel was inspected on Saturday night there was nothing requiring the inspector to go back to the office. As long as you had the officer you had the information as to whether the vessel was inspected or not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Curiously enough my attention had not been called to this change and that is the reason why I did not mention it to the committee. If my hon. friend thinks it better I have no objection to maintain the law as at present in that regard.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It tends to certainty anyway.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Very well, I will move to amend the section so that the law shall remain as it was before on this point.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the old Act, the words were inserted "and such people shall be liable for the same and chargeable therewith." Would it not be as well to retain those words as I see they are omitted in the Bill?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I myself went through the Act very carefully and I found about twenty places in which a similar phrase was used. I introduced one general section to cover that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Very well.

On section 11, subsection 2,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In that case, I think there ought to be something more than the language of the draft. The party offending ought to have something more than the mere visit of an officer. I think the direction ought to be in writing—something in the nature of a warrant.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course, the Minister would not direct personally. He would naturally direct in writing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Exactly; and to avoid any uncertainty, and let masters understand what the authority of the officer is, I think the words "in writing" should be inserted. I think it is dangerous to leave the matter in this form, and I know of no case like it where the same thing is done.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no objection to inserting the words "in writing," only it looks curious that the collector of customs may make the seizure without a certificate, while the Minister must do it in writing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I assure the hon. gentleman, that I do not make the suggestion merely for the sake of suggesting. I know of no case in which a Government officer, or any other person, can act without having to show some written authority from a Minister or a court. The officer ought to have something to show before he makes a seizure or stops the running of a boat. If not from the Minister, let it be from the Deputy Minister.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If a steamboat is running in violation of the law, any chief officer of customs may go on board and seize it without a certificate. If there is no chief officer at the place, the Minister may direct any other person to make the seizure. If the hon. gentleman makes a point of it, that that direction should be in writing, I have no objec-

tion. I move that after the word "Minister," the words "in writing" be inserted.

Mr. POWELL. I would suggest the use of the term "collector of customs," instead of "chief officer of customs."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The term "chief officer" is used all through the Act.

Mr. POWELL. I do not think it is recognized as a legal term. If it is used, had you not better have a definition of the term?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I thank the hon. gentleman for his suggestion, and I will consider it.

On subsection 3,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is new, and it is caused by the fact, that excuses are constantly made by the owners of steamboats that their boats are not ready, and the inspectors have to go back and forwards, time and again, to inspect them, at a very heavy cost to the department. We do not know how to meet such cases otherwise than in the way suggested here.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I sympathize with what the hon. gentleman has stated, in one sense, and I do not wish to change the position which I occupied departmentally in that regard. I know the inconvenience of it, and the expense that fell upon the general fund by very careless conduct on the part of some steamship owners. But here is a case where, perhaps, the language goes a little too far in attempting a remedy. It seems to me, that some notice should be given to the owner before he is to be fined—for practically this is a fine. If the inspector happens to be about, and drops in upon the steamship owner, and he is not ready for the inspector, the inspector may go away until some other time that suits him, and the expense is levied on the steamship owner. I do not know how far it would be possible for the inspector to have some system in connection with his perigrations, or whether a steamboat owner could not fairly claim notice of the fixing of a certain time in which he must submit his boat to inspection. A steamboat owner may have complied with the law and have his boat ready for inspection, and yet there is no certainty that the inspector may not come when the owner is absent and every one away. It seems to me a great hardship that in such a case the owner should be punished.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The clause is arbitrary but I see no escape. It should be read in view of the facts known to exist. The inspectors always agree with the owner to proceed with the inspection at a certain time, but when they get to the place, it frequently happens that the owner has an excuse for

not being ready, and the inspector has to kick his heels about a week or two at the hotel or travel back some hundreds of miles and return again, and he may have to do this two or three times. It is a choice between a little arbitrary section and a laxity which gives the steamboat owners power to evade inspection altogether. I frankly confess that I am guided in this matter by the advice of my permanent officials. If the hon. gentleman objects very much, I shall let the clause stand, but cannot consent to strike it out in the face of the strong representations made to me by the officers of the department.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Better let it stand. There seems cause for strong complaint, and the innocent are apt to be punished.

On section 12,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The old Act was very rigorous. It proved that in case of an omission to give the notice required, the owner of the steamboat would incur a penalty of \$200 per day. That was considered very outrageous, and I substituted this provision that the penalty shall not exceed \$500 and be not less than \$50.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where the master, owner or engineer of a steamboat neglects to give at the earliest opportunity a report of the occurrences of any event whereby the hull or machinery or other portion of the vessel is materially injured or weakened, the old penalty was not too high.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The owner might be ruined by the engineer's neglect, and we have to consider what is a reasonable penalty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the case of a passenger boat, it was not a bit too high.

Mr. QUINN. No doubt the intention in making a maximum and minimum penalty is to levy it according to circumstances. In the case of a passenger boat, the minimum penalty would be imposed but not in the case of a trade boat.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly

On section 14,

Mr. QUINN. According to this section the owner of a steamboat must produce the certificate of the master, mate or engineer before his boat can be inspected. But he may not have appointed a master or mate at the time. Is not that a little hard?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There must be the certificate of the master, mate or engineer to suit the requirements of the law.

Mr. QUINN. That is the certificate of registry of the steamboats, but not the certificate of the master, or the certificate of the mate or the certificate of the engineer. The master, the mate and the engineer, as I understand, must each have a certificate in order to run the steamboat.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. QUINN. But that is not the certificate required to be produced here.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. QUINN. Then this section is rather arbitrary. These inspections are very often made in the early spring before the master has been employed, or before the mate is employed, and sometimes even before the engineer is employed. Yet you require the owner of the steamboat to produce the certificate of his master or his mate, or if he cannot do so he cannot have his steamboat inspected.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He certainly cannot have it inspected if he has not a certified master and engineer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. Minister quite sure of that? There are some steamers, I think, that do not require to have a certified master or engineer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They would not be required to produce certificates.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Let us see how far we are going. This section provides that the inspector shall demand a certificate of registry and may demand these others. There seems danger that you will go further than you desire. Under this section it would be no excuse to say the steamboat to be inspected was one that did not require these certificates. The Act demands that the inspector may demand them, and if they are not produced, then the penalty follows.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The first part is imperative he "shall" demand the certificate of registry. But, as to the production of the other certificates he "may" demand them. Surely you must leave some discretion with the officer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would not assume that. I do not think that is a right spirit in which to legislate in dealing with penalties. This is a case in which a man may be put to any amount of trouble regarding a matter that he cannot control. The hon. Minister says that part of this is permissive. The officer may demand the certificate, but when he does demand them they must be produced, or

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

the party is liable to a penalty. The hon. Minister said that they would not be asked for in the case of a steamboat in which they were not required. But I submit that this is a dangerous way to legislate.

Mr. QUINN. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the penalty, which is not exceeding \$100 and not less than \$50, "and any chief officer of customs or any inspector may detain any steamboat in respect of which the provisions of this Act (or any Order in Council made under it) have not been fully complied with." I think the object of the hon. Minister would be obtained by holding back the certificate from the steamer until the certificate of the master or mate or engineer has been filed in the department. To deprive him of the use of his steamboat, to put it in the power of the inspector to retain the steamboat altogether is a very severe penalty.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman, I think, does not understand the object of the section. It makes a very slight change in the law as it exists. When the inspector goes to make the inspection of the steamboat, he calls first upon the certificate of register.

Mr. QUINN. No objection to that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the owner wants to go to sea, the inspector asks him for the certificate of the captain, and mate and engineer. He may require the production of these. If the owner does not produce the certificates, he does not get the certificate of inspection.

Mr. QUINN. It is not only when the owner wishes the steamer to go to sea. It is clear that at the time of the inspection the inspector may demand the certificate of master, mate and engineer. This must be for a purpose.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no penalty if these are not produced.

Mr. QUINN. Yes, there is. Section 50 covers the penalty.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly, no man expects to get a certificate unless he complies with the demands of the inspector. They are not liable to penalty, but unless the certificates are produced, you cannot get your certificate or go to sea.

Mr. POWELL. One criticism I have to make. I have had a good deal of experience in shipping, and it is the first time I ever heard it suggested that the master is the custodian of the certificate of either mate or engineer. I think the Minister will travel over the world a great deal before he finds that a master has his engineer's certificate, or his mate's certificate; these certificates are in the keeping of the officers themselves, and to call upon the master to produce these

certificates would be an absurdity. I would suggest that only the master, the mate or the engineer shall produce or exhibit the certificates to the inspector. Here the master is held responsible in a very large penalty if his engineer, over whom he has no control, does not do a certain thing which he has no power to compel him to do.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend has misconceived the object of the section altogether.

Mr. POWELL. But I do not misconceive the result.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no penalty attached to it. The inspector must deal with the steamboat. He must not go running around for the mate, the cook, the engineer and all the others; he goes to the master and he says: You want an inspector's certificate? Yes. Have you got your certificate of register? Yes. Produce it. He produces it.

Mr. POWELL. That is not exactly what it says.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is only an authority given to the inspector to demand these things. If they are not given, there is no penalty, only the inspector does not grant the certificate until they are produced. He must not grant the certificate until he sees that they have a certificated engineer on board.

Mr. POWELL. I call the Minister's attention to section 50:

Except when otherwise specially provided, the owner or master of any steamboat in Canada shall, for any violation in respect of such steamboat, on any one voyage or trip thereof, of any of the provisions of this Act, or of any Order in Council made under it, be liable to a penalty.

Now you require that the master shall produce that certificate. The master cannot produce it because it is not under his control.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I want to give the inspector power to require the production of the certificate of the engineer, the certificate of the master, and the certificate of the mate before he grants his final certificate to that boat.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where is the provision that if a refusal takes place, the certificate of inspection shall not be given?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The law says that he may require it. Every inspector shall demand the production of the certificate of registry of the owner or master of every steamboat. Now, if the owner does not produce that, he cannot get a certificate.

Mr. QUINN. I think the Minister ought to add, "on default of the owner or master to produce such certificate, the certificate of inspection shall not be granted."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend will see that that is clearly implied. We have had the first part of the section there for 20 years. If he does not produce his certificate of registry he will not get his certificate of inspection. Then we add that if he does not produce the certificates of the master, the mate, and the engineer, as being duly qualified, he shall not get his certificate of inspection.

Mr. QUINN. I fear that under section 50 the owner will be liable to a penalty, and his vessel will be detained.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am quite clear about that, the section does not apply to it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The old section was a little different.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, that read: "Every inspector of steamboats shall demand that the owner—"

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, "may demand of the owner or master of any steamboat which he is inspecting, the production of the certificate of registry of such steamboat." The hon. gentleman stops there, but the old Act says "such owner and master shall thereupon produce and exhibit the same to such inspector."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not so much to exact a penalty, it is to give a right to the inspector to have these necessary documents produced to him before he grants the certificate to enable that boat to go on her voyage. I think every one will agree that she must have her proper certificate of registry, and she must satisfy the inspector that she has a certificated captain, a certificated mate, and a certificated engineer.

Mr. QUINN. Quite right, but I think the penalty comes under section 50.

Mr. POWELL. Any one who has practical knowledge of the working of the law, knows that all these details were covered by the law. The officer would not grant the vessel her discharge and would not give her a clearance.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What, then, is the harm of putting this in?

Mr. POWELL. Suppose you call for a mate's certificate to-day, and to-morrow a new mate comes on. Then you have a useless provision calling for a mate's certificate for one day, and no provision for having a duly certificated mate for the next

12 months, unless she has to apply for inspection again. Why not leave the matter as it was? When a master wanted to clear his steamer, if he did not comply with the law, he could not get his clearance. Whether a man has a duly authenticated engineer, or mate, or boatswain—what has that to do with the machinery and hull of a steamer? We can see no good reason for calling for the certificate of registry, these are things that the collector of customs has to attend to before he grants a clearance. But you are introducing here foreign matters that have nothing to do with steamboat inspection, matters of detail that are worked out on each individual trip.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. My hon. friend does not understand the working of the Act, although I admit he has had great experience. But there are many steamboats that do not clear at all, as ferry boats running from one point to another. The inspector goes to inspect one, and the owner says to him: I want to get an inspector's certificate for 12 months. Very well, where is your certificate of registry? Produce it. Have you got a certificated captain? Yes. Produce it. Have you got a certificated mate? Yes. Produce it. Have you got a certificated engineer? Yes. Produce it. Unless these requirements are complied with, he gets no certificate. Now, no man would wish that the inspector should be compelled to give that certificate unless all these necessary requirements have been complied with, and this is merely power given to the inspector to demand them so that there shall be no question raised. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) raised the point that failure to comply would mean a penalty. It is only if the owner sails without these certificates that he incurs the penalty.

Mr. **QUINN**. I am sorry I cannot agree with the Minister on that point. Section 50 clearly says: "Any chief officer of customs or any inspector may detain any steamboat in respect of which the provisions of this Act have not been fully complied with." When that provision has not been complied with, the steamboat can be detained.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Is not that right?

Mr. **QUINN**. But he is furthermore liable to penalty for a mere temporary loss or absence of the certificate. The mate, engineer and master of the steamboat may be certificated men, but the certificate may not be in the hands of the owner at the moment his steamboat is being inspected. Now, if the Minister will put here that the penalty incurred by the neglect to produce these certificates at that time, will be that the certificate of inspection shall not be granted to the owner, then I think there is some reason in it; but if he leaves it open in this way, there must be some penalty for not

Mr. **POWELL**.

complying with the law, and it only can fall under the penalty described in section 50.

Mr. **POWELL**. Take the case of a ferry-boat running from St. John to Carleton. If there is no duly certificated engineer on that boat, all they have to do is to hire one for one day, because he is not an articulated seaman at all; he is not an articulated officer of the boat. The owner can put any person on there one day, and turn him out the following day. That is a very laudable end to be accomplished, and the proper way to do it is by some other Act for the protection of passengers, where it provides a penalty in case the boat is without a proper certificate, but it does not come within the purview of a Bill for the inspection of hulls and machinery, and is entirely foreign to such a Bill.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I cannot do more than repeat the arguments I have already advanced. This section is to enable the inspector, before he gives the certificate, to see that the vessel is seaworthy within the meaning of this Act; that the boat has a certificate of registry, that the captain and the mate have certificates.

Mr. **POWELL**. A certificated captain is not necessary.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes, by the Act. If the vessel sails the next day and discharges her certificated officer and takes on board one not certificated, she thereby incurs another penalty under the Act. The object of this section is, however, to enable the inspector to see that the vessel is seaworthy.

Mr. **POWELL**. That is once in twelve months.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Section 50 only provides for a violation of the law, such as inability to produce a mate's certificate, which would simply prevent the owner or master from getting a proper certificate of inspection.

Mr. **QUINN**. The terms of the Act are very broad, and it provides that any steamer may be detained in case the provisions of this Act shall not have been complied with.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The collector of customs may detain a vessel.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. The Minister may have no doubt that these parties would go scot free in the event of being sued for penalties, but the courts may take a different view. It is proposed to have some one named to prosecute for these penalties; informers are contemplated, who will be allowed a share of the penalties. The Bill contains a provision that the officers of the vessel shall produce certain certificates.

But the Minister says that, in certain cases, they would not have those certificates, and yet there would be no liability. The Bill says that, when a provision of this Act is violated, a penalty shall attach. Another provision contemplates the putting of the Bill into force by officers or others authorized by the Minister. It would be desirable, as the Minister does not desire to have these men placed in that position, to amend this section. I cannot understand why these additional provisions are required in connection with the administration of an Act in relation to the inspection of hulls, boilers and machinery, when we have another measure in regard to the safety of passenger boats, and another requiring that boats shall have certain certificates.

Mr. POWELL. I call the attention of the Minister, as a lawyer, to section 50. No doubt, the idea was, that the penalty in this particular case should not be a money penalty, but that the steamboat should be placed in such a condition that it could not obtain the certificate necessary to clear. I will concede, that that is the object of the Bill, and I call attention to the fact that this section does not carry out that idea. If this particular infringement of the section does not come within the first part, namely, that he shall not be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$200, it does not come within the section that the steamboats shall not have the certificate. The same conditions are necessary to bring the vessel within the first clause as within the second; so the inspector cannot refuse the certificate. This is a serious matter. The hon. gentleman will see that, when the Bill deals with the matter in regard to which there is a former statute, and attempts to make new regulations, these are substitutionary, and directly or impliedly repeal the old Act. Our statute-book contains a number of regulations safeguarding steamboats. If this section has the significance which the Minister says it possesses, it is a direct or indirect repeal of the old provisions, and these new provisions are substitutionary, and the result may be more far-reaching than the hon. gentleman imagines. The latter part of the section has no right there, and it does not belong to the subject matter, and could only tend to secure bad results to our shipping law.

Mr. QUINN. In the division I represent, there are 500 or 600 steamers, all of which might be tied up under this Act. This is a serious matter, and I am not convinced by what the hon. Minister has said, that the owners of the steamers would not be liable to penalties. The nature of the Act would not be changed, but the objects sought to be attained by the Minister might be secured, if he added the words "until a certificate has been produced, such certificate shall not be granted to the steamboat."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had better let that clause stand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not think I have been arbitrary in the matter, and I have tried to meet the views of hon. gentlemen. I have no objection to let it stand.

On section 17, subsection 3,

Mr. POWELL. I have a little quarrel with this section which relates back to subsection 1. Under the old Act of which this is simply a transcript, there was some inconvenience. I was interested in a small steamboat myself, and we were detained three weeks in getting a certificate, owing to the fact that the Department of Marine would not grant the certificate we required.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When was that?

Mr. POWELL. That was under the regime of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). It was not in your time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am glad of that.

Mr. POWELL. I know we lost several hundred dollars on account of it. If you look at the form of certificate you will see that it says:

I further certify that the said steamboat is permitted to run on the waters from..... to.....from this day.....to..... day of....., and that she is adapted and fit to carry passengers, &c.

The Department of Marine at that time put this construction upon these words: That they could only grant a certificate from special ports to special ports and that they could not grant a roving certificate wherever a vessel wanted to go, and which is the kind of certificate we needed. A British steamer can come across to Canada with a British certificate and go wherever she pleases, but if one of our steamers is going on a special voyage she has to get a special certificate. That certainly requires amendment so that the inspector can grant a Canadian steamer a roving certificate to go wherever she pleases. Our shipping should not be under more severe restrictions than British and American shipping. In the case I refer to I saw that the department officials were bound by the form of the certificate, but I had to come to Ottawa and I succeeded in getting them to do something approximating common sense. This question will arise particularly when we come to the schedule; but in the meantime I would call the attention of the Minister to the fact that there should be no such restrictions on a steamer, except in the case of passenger line steamers that are on a special route. In respect to our freight boats they should be allowed

to travel the world over without limitation whatever wherever trade calls them. This should be amended so as to put Canadian steamers on a par with British and American steamers.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. This will come up particularly on the schedule later on, and in the meantime I will consult with the officers of the department to see what amendment can be made in the line of the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell).

On section 17, subsection 5,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. This subsection was framed to meet cases where captains lent their equipment to other captains to evade the law.

Mr. **QUINN**. I think it is too broad, in speaking of equipment alone. I think it ought to say the material portion of the equipment.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The penalty is variable from \$50.

Mr. **QUINN**. But it is a severe penalty for the loan of a spike, or something of that kind.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Suppose a man lends some life preservers?

On section 20,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The change made here, at the instigation of the inspector, is to provide that when the engine of any steamboat is stopped for any purpose for five minutes, the safety valve should be opened.

Mr. **QUINN**. That would only apply to cases where the steam went up to or above the inspection point. For instance, suppose a steamer is inspected up to 150 pounds pressure, and is running with only 90 or 100 pounds, would it be necessary, if it stopped for five minutes, to open the safety valve and blow off steam, probably reducing the pressure down to eighty pounds?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Certainly not. As long as it is below the point of inspection, it is all right.

On section 27,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. This clause provides a protection which the department think desirable. In the old Act the words "some incombustible material" are open to difficulty, and the chief inspector suggested that the description should be made more definite by using the words: "tin be nailed on it in such a manner as approved by the inspector." These words were thought necessary

Mr. **POWELL**.

to effectually protect wood work exposed to ignition on board steamboats.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. How far will this interfere with the arrangements which ship owners make at present?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The chief inspector did not make any of these arrangements without full consultation. Many of these technical matters I have no personal knowledge of, but I have gone over the Bill carefully with Mr. Magee and Mr. Adams, the chairman of the board, and this change was recommended unanimously by the entire board of inspectors.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. That is very good technical advice, but the question is how far is it going to be practicable?

Mr. **QUINN**. The objection I see is necessitating a space of four inches between the wood and the funnel. That may cause large expense to vessel owners, as it will necessitate the opening up of larger spaces around these funnels. I do not think it is necessary in all cases as the funnel is not a very dangerous spot.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Four inches is not much.

Mr. **QUINN**. That is not allowed at present. If you make it four inches by law you will necessitate enlargement of the space and inflict expense on the steamboat owners. That fact that this is recommended by Mr. Adams would be almost sufficient guarantee to me to let it pass without reserve, but as it may involve a radical change in the expenditure of a large amount by steamboat men, I would take it as a favour if the hon. Minister would allow it to stand until I can communicate with some people, and if there is no objection, the matter will then pass.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I have no objection at all to allowing the clause to stand.

Section allowed to stand.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. This is the same as the old Act of 1886?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Is there any reason for the change?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. All the boards recommend it.

On section 32,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. This is new.

Mr. **QUINN**. I would like to ask if this is supported by the whole board.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes, I am informed by the officer that this is according to the unanimous report of the board.

Mr. **QUINN**. I need not draw attention to the fact that it is a very radical change. Fancy the enormous expense of the signaling and repeating apparatus.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) regards this as a radical change, I am willing to allow it to stand.

Mr. **QUINN**. I would like it.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 33,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The latter part of this, from the word "qualified" in line 39 is new, in the sense of being an amendment to the old Act, but it was passed in 1890. There is no change in the subsection.

On section 35,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Subsection 2 is new, as follows:—

2. Any person keeping watch or in charge of the engine-room of any steamboat mentioned in this section shall be deemed to be serving and employed as engineer while keeping such watch, or while so in charge.

That was found necessary, after a good deal of consideration, to prevent the law being evaded. They used to put an uncertificated man in charge, but, if their action was questioned, they would say he was not the engineer.

Mr. **QUINN**. This applies only while the steamer is running.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It is to meet the case I have suggested.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) suggests a good idea. This is intended to cover the case of a steamer running and not one at the dock.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. This has reference to another section concerning persons in charge of steamboats that are running. They are not required to have a certificated engineer when not running.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. But suppose a man did part of his watch duty at the dock and afterwards put in some service at sea as watchman, he would not be allowed, even when at the dock, to keep watch in the engine-room.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I think there is no chance of any such construction.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I think it goes further than the hon. Minister intends.

Mr. **QUINN**. The objection I take to it is this: that under this section a man could not employ an uncertificated man as watchman even when the steamer is at the dock.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. This does not compel them to keep certificated men, but simply provides that persons employed and in charge of the engine-room shall be certificated engineers.

Mr. **QUINN**. Suppose a boat is at the dock and the engineer wants to leave, he would naturally leave his fireman in charge. But, under this clause, the fireman could not legally take charge.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. What do you suggest?

Mr. **QUINN**. I suggest these words, "or any steamboat while in motion."

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I accept that.

On section 39, subsection 3,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. That is the old law, taken from half a dozen different sections, and consolidated into one.

Mr. **QUINN**. I must raise my voice against the imposition of all these penalties. I would like to say to the Minister, that, unless the reports of his department show that such a law is absolutely necessary, it is too bad that it should appear on the Statute-book. We have what I consider a perfect iniquity on the statutes, in the customs law. Why should we be obliged to introduce here such severe penalties as are introduced in the customs law, when we are dealing with the leading business men of the country? It seems extraordinary that we should do so. I think it is an awful reflection upon the honesty of our people, if such laws are necessary. I would ask the Minister, unless there is some pressure brought to bear by the officers of his department, not to put such a law as this upon the Statute-book. The idea of a law imposing a penalty of not less than \$50 or not more than \$500, or imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, upon any person who prevents or interferes with any officer of the customs or an inspector in the performance of any duty under any of the provisions of this Act, is certainly an extraordinary provision. I speak from my experience of the customs law, when I say that the effect is to make our officers in the different departments purely and simply Jacks-in-office, who, clothed with the authority which this Act gives them, become insulting, offensive, intolerable characters in

society, in many instances. I do not wish this to be construed as a reflection, at all, upon the chief officers of the different departments; but I do say, that is the case in the administration of the customs law, and I fear it will be so in the administration of this law. We are simply creating a number of Jacks-in-office, who will make the existence of the people with whom they come in contact, unbearable, and who will ride rough-shod over the merchants and people occupying respectable positions in society. I say that, unless it is called for by the officers of his department, I do not like to see a penalty of this kind on the Statute-book.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There is nothing new in this at all. We are conforming to the law which has been in force, and which has been found to be necessary for many years past.

Mr. **QUINN**. If it is necessary, why, all right.

On section 48,

Mr. **BRITTON**. There is no protection to the owner of a boat who has chartered it to a lessee. The proceedings appear to be rather severe and no redress is provided.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. We must be able to take proceedings in rem against the boat. If the owner can lease his boat to the cabin boy and so escape payment and confiscation, there will be no protection whatever.

Mr. **BRITTON**. The Minister will see there is no protection whatever to the mortgagee in case of a mortgage and no protection given to the owner.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. The same course is followed in customs cases. The Government look to the ship.

Mr. **QUINN**. I agree with the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) that some protection should be afforded to the mortgagee of a vessel. I could imagine a case where a vessel might be chartered for a very short voyage, and by collusion between the charterer and an officer of the customs, she might be sold without the knowledge of the owner or the mortgagee, and the charterer and the officer divide the profits.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No. Before such proceeding could take place, there must have been a proper prosecution and conviction obtained. This could not be done in a week or a month. This Bill does not change the severity of the old law, which provided that the vessel should be sold and confiscated. I have suggested a certain mode of making the confiscation and forfeiture practicable, by selling the vessel.

Mr. **QUINN**.

Mr. **QUINN**. The term confiscated and forfeited is a very uncertain one. In this case the machinery appears so well oiled and greased that these people might be able to take advantage of it to the injury of the mortgagee.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). This provision is simply following the principle adopted in all proceedings in rem.

Mr. **QUINN**. No doubt the vessel would be in the same position as if she was seized for smuggling; but in such a case there would be long proceedings necessary to libel her.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. In all these cases proceedings are taken in rem without any reference whatever to the owner. This section is simply applying the principle which applies in all such cases.

On section 58,

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Instead of bringing this Act into force in the middle of the shipping season the hon. gentleman might consider the advisability of bringing it into force at the end of the year.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I will let the clause stand and consider that.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 16th March, 1898.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE SAN JOSE SCALE.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. S2) to protect Canada against the introduction of the insect pest known as the San José scale.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Explain.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. I propose to ask Parliament to adopt a somewhat unusual course in connection with this Bill, and I therefore feel that I should explain the nature of the measure. To those who have followed the agricultural litera-

ture of Canada during the last two or three years, and the agricultural literature of the United States for the last eight or ten years, the name of this insect pest, the San José scale, is well known, and the great ravages it has made amongst fruit of all deciduous trees wherever it has been introduced, is thoroughly understood. It may however be that some hon. members have not made themselves familiar with it, and therefore I feel that I must give an explanation of the course I propose to take. During the closing days of last session, I had a very earnest request made me that I should then immediately introduce legislation to prohibit the importation of all nursery stock from the United States, on the ground that the San José scale is now thoroughly established in most parts of the union and that consequently the introduction of nursery stock from these states would be most dangerous to our Canadian orchards. With the information that was then at my command, and knowing, as I did, that in the United States they were preparing legislation of the most drastic kind to protect themselves against this insect, I did not feel justified to introduce such a measure in the last hours of the session. Since that time I have been obtaining all the information possible. I have been examining the legislation which has been passed by the various provinces of Canada to protect themselves (as far as the provinces within their provincial rights are able to protect themselves), and I have come to the conclusion that it is absolutely necessary in the interests of our fruit-growers, in the interests of our forest trees, and in the interests generally of all deciduous vegetation that Canada should be protected against this dangerous pest. The San José scale is a very small insect which reproduces itself with marvellous rapidity; to such an extent indeed that if all the young insects which are produced by a single scale in the course of a season were to live, they would reach the number of several hundred of millions. The spread of the San José scale has been extremely rapid in the United States. It is believed that originally it came from Japan or the East into California, and about twelve years ago it was first noticed and its ravages first understood in the state of California. Since that time it has spread over the whole union and it is stated by entomologists that probably the state of Maine and vicinity is the only state in which this insect does not exist. The United States Congress at the present time is considering a Bill for the rigid inspection of nursery stock and rigid regulations as to the passage of nursery stock from one state to the other. Unfortunately, this Bill does not come into effect until late in the season, the 1st of July next; and unfortunately it has been found, and those who are the most expert in the matter themselves declare, even in the United States that any system of in-

spection must necessarily be defective, and that it is impossible by inspection to detect the insect. We know also that any system of inspection of nursery stock at the frontier would be practically inoperative. The nursery stock which is sent by mail or by express is very tender and requires expeditious transportation, so that it would be practically fatal to it to have it stopped at the frontier, the packages opened and separated, and the delay incurred which a proper inspection would necessitate. Such delay would cause a great deal of nursery stock to die, and were the Government to undertake such inspection as has been suggested, the blame of all this destruction and loss of nursery stock would be laid at our doors, and we would be held responsible for it. I may say, further, that the entomologists who understand this insect, inform me that it is very difficult of detection, being so minute that a magnifying glass is necessary to see it, and being in appearance very like other insects which are neither dangerous nor widespread. Therefore, if we were to adopt any system of inspection, it would be necessary for us to have experts to carry it out, and it would be an expensive and difficult proceeding, which I do not feel justified in asking the Government or Parliament to undertake.

The Bill proposes a distinct and clear prohibition of all nursery stock coming into this country from any country in which this insect has obtained a large foothold. At the present moment the United States is the most largely affected of any country I know; Japan and the Island of Hawaii and Australia are also somewhat affected; and if this Bill passes, I propose to ask that an Order in Council be passed declaring these four countries to be those to which the prohibition shall be first applied. The Bill, as hon. gentlemen will see from the copies of it placed on their desks, provides simply for the prohibition of importation. The other clauses simply provide the machinery for bringing this prohibition into force. I ask that the Government may be authorized by Order in Council to say from what countries this stock should be prohibited. That class of plants which entomologists and botanists tell us are not liable to attacks from this insect, are to be allowed to come in notwithstanding anything in this Bill; and if at any time a country which is scheduled is declared to be free from the pest, then the Government may allow plants to come in from that country. There is also a clause allowing plants for scientific purposes to be brought in by special Order in Council. The Bill is very simple. I think it will serve the purpose in view, and I think it is necessary in the interest of our orchardists that it should pass. In support of that contention I will only say that I have received representations from the fruit-growers of the country in favour of legislation

of this kind. The fruit-growers' associations of the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and British Columbia have all memorialized me, asking for prohibition; and I have had letters from a large number of the fruit-growers best known in the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia and Quebec. One large fruit-grower from the province of Quebec told me the other day, on the occasion of a personal visit to me on this question, that for years he has been in the habit of importing from the United States the stock on which he makes his grafts for the purpose of producing nursery stock, to the extent of several thousand stocks a year, but that last year and this year he has felt the dangers from the introduction of this insect to be so great that he has decided not to import any at all from the United States, even though he did not then know or expect that I was going to introduce this Bill. The fruit interests urged the measure so strongly upon me during the whole of last season, that I felt it to be my duty to inquire most carefully into the matter, with the view of ascertaining what had best be done; and this Bill is the result of that investigation. I think that those who have turned their attention at all to this question will agree with me as to the importance of this legislation; and therefore, after having placed the matter thus shortly before the House, I propose to ask that the rules be suspended so that the Bill may pass without delay.

Mr. SPROULE. This is as bad as the Yukon Bill.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I ask this simply on behalf of the interests I desire to protect. My hon. friends can understand that once it is known in the country that a Bill of this kind is likely to pass through the Parliament of Canada, a large number of those nurserymen in the United States, who have been in the habit of sending in large quantities of nursery stock into Canada, will immediately ship their goods into this country, to evade the provisions of this Bill; and if it were delayed for two or three weeks, as it would likely be if it were subject to the ordinary course of procedure in the House, the object of the Bill would be defeated; because the present or within the next two or three weeks is the time when the importations of nursery stock from the United States usually take place. They would be able to send in carload after carload, and we might feel assured that in that stock there would be a large quantity of this scale insect introduced into this country. The only way by which, so far as I can see, we may be able to prevent that procedure, is to pass this Bill as quickly as possible.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did you not introduce the Bill a month ago, if there was that urgency, before there was any importation of stock?

Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If I had introduced the Bill a month ago, the same thing would have occurred then that I am pointing out as likely to occur now. The nurserymen would have been rushing in their stock the moment it became known that Parliament was considering the advisability of passing a Bill of this nature.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The only way in which I can see it possible to accomplish the object we have in view, of protecting our fruit-growers, our tree-growers and our nurserymen is by being in a position to carry the law into effect the moment the announcement is made that we are going to protect ourselves in this way. If the notification to our customs officials that they are not to receive entries of stock from the United States, were delayed for two or three weeks, there would undoubtedly be a number of carloads of nursery stock sent into this country; and I have no hesitation in saying that in it there would be a large quantity of this San José scale introduced into Canada. I have therefore determined to ask this indulgence of the House. I may say that I spoke yesterday to the hon. leader of the Opposition, showing him the danger that existed; and, with that spirit and that grasp of public questions for which he is well known, the hon. gentleman said that he would be glad to facilitate the passage of this Bill when I introduced it. I have not had an opportunity of speaking to other members of the Opposition, although I may say to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who has just asked a question, that I tried yesterday twice to find him, for the purpose of explaining this measure to him as an old chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and knowing the interest he takes in such matters. Had I been able to find him, he would have understood the situation before I explained it on the floor of this House. I do not know that I can give any further explanation of the actual facts; but if any hon. gentleman wishes to ask any further questions, I shall be only too glad to answer them to the best of my ability. In asking that the rule be suspended and that the Bill be passed through this House as quickly as possible, so as to accomplish the object aimed at, I trust that I shall receive the co-operation and support of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister how far he ascertained in his inquiry that the ravages of this insect have taken place in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN. I desire to compliment the Minister of Agriculture and his Government on the adoption of a national policy. It is true, they are adopting it in an indirect way. They are adopting the same kind of national policy which the mother country

has adopted in her quarantine regulations, and the same kind that Germany has adopted. But it is an effective way of carrying out a national policy. We have nurseries in Canada able to supply all the stock required in the country, and I can only say that so far as I am concerned I will be pleased to assist the hon. gentleman in carrying the Bill into effect. But I would also like to know whether he intends to end here, or whether he relies altogether on the acts of the provincial government for the stamping out of this pest in these districts where it has invaded our country. I believe it has broken out in the Niagara peninsula, and that we need not only to prohibit the importation of stock but to take measures to stamp the disease out in our own country. If it does exist in the Niagara peninsula, I hope the hon. Minister will take some further steps in the direction of wiping it out altogether.

Mr. CHARLTON. Although I sympathize very fully with the motives of the hon. Minister of Agriculture in desiring to protect the fruit-growing interest of Canada, it seems to me that this Bill is one of a very drastic character. It prohibits the importation of nursery stock from all parts of the United States. From what knowledge I have, and I have made some inquiries, the sources in the United States from which our nursery stocks are supplied chiefly are those in the neighbourhood of Rochester, and they are exempt from this pest, and the most careful measures are taken to prevent its introduction into these localities. I doubt whether the necessity exists for the absolute prohibition of the importation of nursery stock from all parts of the United States. From the best information I can obtain, the only locality where the San José scale has obtained a footing and where the nursery stocks are affected in this locality, is the Niagara peninsula of the province of Ontario; and if this policy of the total prohibition of American nursery stock is adopted, without taking pains to ascertain whether the pest has obtained a footing in the localities in the United States from which we import nursery stock, grievous injustice will be done to parties in this country who desire to import fruit trees of various kinds. It would prevent the fulfilment of all contracts entered into this year, and I do not believe the measure is one called for in the public interest. Some measure, no doubt, is necessary for more careful supervision, but we should first ascertain whether the nursery stocks in the localities in the states from which we import are affected. I do not believe that absolute non-intercourse is a step rendered necessary by the exigencies of the case. I could understand quite well that the nursery men of this Dominion should be strongly in favour of the Bill. It would act very effectively in their interest, much more so than a high duty, because it would throw

the trade entirely into their own hands, but I doubt whether it would be in the interest of the fruit-growers of the country. If it passes, the logical sequence will be the prohibition of the importation of fruit from the United States altogether.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Of course my hon. friend would be in favour of that, but that would be another step which would be very arbitrary and sweeping in its character. That also would be beneficial to certain interests, but not to the great mass of the people; and I must confess that I look upon this measure with some apprehension as not in the public interest, if it be in the interest of a special class. I do not believe the necessity exists for it. The nurseries of the state of New York are as exempt from the pest as those of Ontario, and I fear my hon. friend has been misled by representations from interested parties who desire to monopolize the markets of this country. I should favour the Bill if I felt that the necessity for it existed, but I do not and therefore I deprecate the hasty movement proposed. There was force in what the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said, that this measure ought to have been introduced some time ago so as to give us some time to consider it. The hon. Minister of Agriculture said that in that case the result he fears now, would have followed, namely, a rush into this country of American nursery stock. Well, we are not in the habit of getting in nursery stock when there is frost on the ground. I do not believe there is necessity for this drastic measure of non-intercourse in nursery stock, which will be followed perhaps by non-intercourse in fruit. It is not called for, it will produce irritation and bad results, and I think my hon. friend had better consider the measure a little more maturely before pressing it, and perhaps he will arrive at the conclusion that strict investigation as to the sources from which nursery stock comes will answer the object. I was visited by a representative of one of the largest nurseries in the United States—the New England nurseries—last autumn. He said he was anxious that a most searching investigation should be made, and that such an investigation would show that all the nurseries in Rochester were free of this pest. The nurserymen there were alive to its danger, and had taken most careful measures to prevent its introduction, and the result was that their stock was free of all taint, as they could prove to the satisfaction of any investigator. He therefore deprecated the destruction of their business through a mere suspicion which could be set aside.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite concur in the statement which has just fallen from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that this is a very drastic mea-

sure, but I believe that this is an occasion requiring a very drastic measure if the object of the Bill is to be attained. The hon. Minister of Agriculture was good enough to communicate with me upon this subject, and he satisfied me certainly that the interest of Canada demanded that not only that this Bill should pass, but that the ordinary rules of this House should be suspended so as to enable it to pass without any delay. I am quite certain that my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture did not decide on this measure until he had availed himself of all the information that the very able department over which he presides is able to furnish, and that it was with the greatest reluctance he arrived at the conclusion that the interests of fruit-growers in the Dominion made it absolutely indispensable, not only that this measure should pass, but that it should pass without such delay as would practically defeat its operation. The parties interested will certainly avail themselves of any delay in passing this Bill to rush in their nursery stocks before the Bill becomes law. I trust that my hon. friend from North Norfolk and every other hon. gentleman in this House will feel that this measure having come from the Minister of Agriculture after the most careful consideration of the subject, we may confidently rely upon his opinion and give him that support which the exigency of the case requires. It may be quite true that portions of the United States may be free from this unfortunate pest, but as the hon. Minister of Agriculture has pointed out, it would be practically impossible to discriminate. Even if you were to adopt all the means in your power of careful investigation and inspection, you could not effectively guard this country against the introduction of this pest which is calculated to have a most injurious effect on our fruit-growing industry. I hope that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) will therefore, under the circumstances, not interpose any objection which would prevent the suspension of the rules of the House and the passage of this measure with the promptness which is shown to be absolutely necessary in order to make it effective. The care that has been given to the consideration of this subject warrants us in believing that if any less drastic measure could accomplish the object, the hon. Minister of Agriculture would have been only too glad to have availed himself of it, but my hon. friend knows perfectly well that if there are certain sections in the United States free from this pest, there would be no difficulty in any quantity of nursery stock being sent from other portions of the United States which are infected to the uninfected districts, and it would be actually impossible for the Department of Agriculture to effectively keep the diseased stock out of the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. CHARLTON. Can my hon. friend designate the localities in the United States where the San José scale is prevalent among nursery stock?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that it is the duty of the Minister of Agriculture to consider that matter. He satisfied me he had given the subject most careful consideration, and had caused the most scientific men in his department to examine into it most critically, and, as a result, he had arrived at the conclusion that this pest existed in the United States, and that this measure and this measure alone, would effectually protect the country.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not rise to oppose the Bill, for I am strongly in favour of it and always was. I think there is a very urgent need for it. But I asked what was to my mind a pertinent question, and that is why this Bill was not introduced a month ago, before the sending in of the nursery stock for the spring had begun. Had this Bill been introduced a month ago and passed under suspension of the rules of the House, it would have prevented the importation of any stock this year. To-day a good deal of it has already crossed the line. In our county notice has been given that the stock will be distributed in a few days, and that means that it must now be in the country or expected in immediately. I asked the Minister if he had any knowledge as to the localities in which this pest existed in Canada already. I knew that inquiries had been made by parties interested. But the hon. Minister did not answer. With regard to the other statement of the Minister that he has introduced this Bill without giving any previous intimation of his intentions, I can only say that his intention to introduce it was announced in the press three months ago. I read the statement myself. I said then that it was the right thing to do, and I say so still. It is the only protection we can offer which will prevent serious loss to our fruit-growing industry. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that the only place where this pest exists is in the Niagara peninsula. It is to the Niagara peninsula that stock is brought from Rochester, just across the line. I have been in their nurseries and have been told that it is from Rochester they bring stock when necessary. The fact that the pest is in the Niagara peninsula is the very strongest proof that the necessity exists for this Bill to prevent the pest being brought into other parts of the country. If the hon. gentleman's argument is right in saying that the Minister ought to be clothed with power which would enable him to prevent stock being brought from any particular locality, it is most urgent against the locality to which he refers. I am strongly in favour of the Bill, and I will give the Minister

all the support I can in pressing it through the various stages.

Mr. HENDERSON. Like other hon. members, I express myself as very much pleased indeed that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has introduced this Bill. The hon. Minister spoke of it as a drastic measure, but it does not appear to me to be drastic enough. I think it ought to go further and apply not only to nursery stock, but to fruit as well. I believe the scale will be brought in on the apple, pear, peach, and possibly other fruits. This would make it advisable that the Minister should take power to include fruit as well as nursery stock within the operation of the Bill.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not know where my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) got his information as to the designs of the Minister of Agriculture to bring down this Bill six months ago. I had several communications from fruit-growers in the county of Lincoln complaining against the importation of nursery stock from the other side of the line. I waited on the Minister of Agriculture and he intimated to me then that in the course of a very few days, his intention was to bring in a measure such as he proposed this afternoon. His idea, as I got it from him, was that secrecy should be observed in this matter. I was not even left at liberty by him to reply to my constituents further than to say that the Government had this matter in hand and the Minister of Agriculture would deal with it. The Minister was satisfied that the announcement of this Bill would have the effect of increasing the importations from the United States before the Bill became law. If the members of this House have the interest of the fruit-growers at heart, as I believe they have, this Bill will receive unanimous consent of Parliament and will be sent through Parliament as speedily as possible in order to prevent the importation of diseased fruit from the other side of the line. The Minister of Agriculture has taken a step in the right direction in preventing the importation of diseased nursery stock.

Mr. McCLEARY. I am sorry the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has seen fit to oppose this Bill. Somehow or other, his inclination seems to be in the direction of protecting the Americans rather than our fruit-growers in their industry. It should be within the recollection of the Minister of Agriculture, as of the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Bain), the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), that before this House rose last session, we had telegrams from fruit-growers in our district asking us to have the Minister of Agriculture inquire into the subject of this pest coming into Canada. Of

course, it was only a minor evil at that time, and very little was known of it. But in the Niagara district it has since become a great pest. Whatever may be said in reference to other parts of Canada not having it, we know that the fruit trees in our district have it, to the great loss of the fruit-growers. The hon. member for North Norfolk says that some system of inspection might be sufficient. I am satisfied that no system of inspection would adequately meet this case. The insect is so minute that it would be impossible to exclude it by a system of inspection, except one that would be immensely costly. It is only a drastic measure of this kind that can possibly do what our fruit-growers require. I sincerely hope the Bill will pass at once. It matters not if a few Americans who have made contracts in this country to sell their fruit trees are prevented from making their sales this year, if we can avoid loss to our fruit-growers of thousands upon thousands of dollars. Our duty, in my opinion, is to protect the interest of the fruit-growers and farmers of our own country rather than of the outsiders who are trying to make a living out of us.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I think that it is unfortunate that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) should have intimated that the object of this Bill was the protection of the growers of nursery stock. My understanding of the object of the Bill is to protect the fruit-growers of Canada against the attacks of a microscopic enemy that is destroying the trees in the nurseries and orchards to the south. That is the object that my hon. friend had in view, and that alone. If, incidentally, the Bill has the effect of doing any immediate good to the growers of nursery stock in Canada, I am sure no one will object. And I am sure we are all very glad to know that, in this respect, we in Canada are now practically independent of our neighbours to the south of us, and that, even though we exclude nursery stock from the provinces, we are able to find in Canada sufficient nursery stock to answer the demands within our own country. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) found fault with the Minister because he did not introduce this measure a month ago. Now, I think it is scarcely fair to do that. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture felt that it was such an important step that he should not take it until after he had satisfied himself by every possible means that it was absolutely necessary to do so. There is plenty of opportunity yet to bring about what he desires, if this House takes the advice which he has given it, supported by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and passes this measure at once. With reference to the remarks of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I would say, in addition to what I have already said, that I can

assure him, as coming from a large fruit-growing district in Nova Scotia, that the fruit-growers want this Bill passed, that the fruit-growers of that section of the country, I think absolutely without exception, as voiced by a resolution passed by the Fruit-growers' Association in Nova Scotia, one of the oldest and most important associations of that kind in Canada, have asked this Parliament to interfere in behalf of that industry. I had the honour, three or four years ago, when the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) occupied the position of Minister of Agriculture, to bring this matter up in this House. I was urged to do so then by a resolution of the fruit-growers of the province of Nova Scotia, and I called that hon. gentleman's attention, by a question, to the fact that this pest was now to be found in the state of New York, and he answered that the Government were then carefully considering the question. It seems to me, therefore, that there cannot be any doubt at all that this law is urgently necessary, and I trust that the proposal which is made by the Minister will be agreed to, and that the Bill will be expedited in its passage through the House.

Mr. McMILLAN. Coming from a large fruit-growing district in western Ontario, I may say, that the fruit-growers of that section have been watching very carefully the action of the Government with respect to prohibiting, or at least keeping down, the spread of the San José scale. Large sums of money have been spent in that section of the country lately by farmers in enlarging their orchards and in planting new orchards; and in their interests it is of the utmost necessity that some steps should be taken to stop the spread of this insidious insect. We hardly yet know, in the province of Ontario, how far it has spread, we hardly know what localities are entirely free from it and what localities are affected, notwithstanding all the vigilance of both the Ontario and the Dominion Governments. I, therefore, hold that it is of the utmost importance that the rules of the House should be suspended, and that this Bill should be put through as rapidly as possible, in order to protect our fruit trees from the ravages of this insect, and in order that the disease may not be any further spread. As a farmer, I hope that there will be no opposition to this Bill in its passage through the House. I must say, that I was very much pleased that the leader of the Opposition gave his entire consent to the suspension of the rules in order that we might pass this Bill through the House as rapidly as possible.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) The object of the Bill now under consideration is to protect the farming community, and I may say I am in favour of every measure the object of which is to protect the agricultural interests in general, and particularly those of the province of Quebec.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

If the ravages of this pest are as widespread as has been pointed out by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), then I hold that this is a case of urgency, and the House ought to give the Minister free scope, in order to have his measure carried through the House without any delay. *Salus populi, suprema lex esto.* As the interests of an important class of our community are at stake, the House ought to adopt this Bill.

As I am counsel for a fruit growers' company, the Trappist Order of Notre Dame, of the Lake of Two Mountains, in the county bordering on the constituency I represent in this House, I deem it my duty to support the motion made by the Minister of Agriculture. In order that the operation of this Bill be not defeated, it should be passed into law without any delay, so as to protect the particular interests of my clients and those of the fruit-growers of the province of Quebec in general.

Let the hon. Minister allow me to remind him that, if the object of this Bill is to be attained, it ought to apply also to those localities, in Canada, where that pest is already thoroughly established. I think the words in the Bill, "country or place," ought to cover any locality, either in the United States or in Canada that has already been invaded by the San José Scale; and, under the circumstances, the Minister ought to be given full scope to prohibit the sale or even to order the destruction of the stock or fruit trees in Canada that are already contaminated. If such a provision is not contained in the Bill, I think the hon. Minister ought to insert it now.

Mr. HUGHES. There seems to be no provision in the Bill for protecting those districts in Canada where the pest has not yet made its appearance. I take the liberty of drawing the attention of the Minister to that phase of the Bill, hoping that it may be amended in that direction.

Mr. ERB. I fully agree with the spirit of this Bill that is now before the House. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, whether it is his intention to supplement this Bill with any legislation, or to take any steps to find out what localities in Canada have already been visited by this pest, and what localities are as yet exempt from it; and whether he proposes to take any steps to prevent infected stock from being taken from those localities in which it is found to exist, to those districts which are as yet exempt. Unless that is done, the desirable results that we wish to obtain from this Bill will, to some extent, I fear, not be realized.

Mr. BAIN. The members of the Agriculture Committee of last session will realize that a good many members of this House are not as familiar with this question as the members of the committee unfortunately

are. There was a strong pressure brought on the Government last season for the purpose of securing some such action as is now proposed by the Minister of Agriculture. I need not remind the House that, in the province of British Columbia, for four or five years, there has been legislation in existence so far as that province had power to pass it, to prevent the introduction of this pest, and members from Ontario will recollect that, after a discussion of the matter, last summer, by the officials both of the Dominion and of the province of Ontario, the Minister of Agriculture at Toronto introduced legislation to cover the very ground referred to by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), and by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. In several counties inspectors have been appointed and preparations made with the view to ascertaining how far it was distributed, and for the purpose of suppressing it locally. From my personal observation and contact with the fruit-growers in my county, I am bound to say, that it is somewhat more widely spread than I expected to find it. In common with some others, I had the impression that there was more cry made about it than was necessary on the part of some of those who brought the matter up a year ago. We were in hopes then that, as the scale was a pest that belonged to milder climates, we were situated in a region where it would not successfully multiply. But, unfortunately, our experience last year in the Niagara peninsula, and also in the Essex district, goes to show that the conditions there are perhaps more favourable than we were heretofore willing to admit, for its propagation and extension. I know, from contact with the fruit men in my county, that in some of the colder districts, north of the lake, it does not spread as freely as it does on the Niagara side of the lake, indicating that, in some places, there are conditions more favourable to it than exist in other quarters. I think, if my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had come in contact with the growers of many of the small fruits in this country, he would never have delivered the speech he has made in the House to-day. According to our observation, a good deal of nursery stock comes into Canada from points further south than New York. I think, if my hon. friend was to extend his observation, he would find that considerable stock, in bygone years, has found its way into Canada from New Jersey; he would also find that, in some of the nurseries of that state, this pest has caused a serious loss to the nurserymen where it had found its way into their nurseries. I am not in favour, as a rule, of the application of a drastic measure, such as we have before us to-day. But I am free to say, that if a measure, such as we have now, had been placed on the Statute-book two years ago, it would have been in many cases a serious inconvenience to our fruit-growers, who were then planting freely.

I must say this, that the reduced prices of the large output of fruit last year have gone a long way to check the planting that was going on so freely for the two previous years, and I feel that an Act of this kind brought into operation now would not be followed by the serious derangement of our commercial relations with the business men to the south of us that would have been produced two years ago. Further, I think there are some points in the details of the Bill that will commend themselves to the House, and one of these is the power that is left to exempt places and districts that may be found in the future to be exempt from the operation of this pest. It will enable the Minister of Agriculture and the customs authorities to withdraw from the operation of this Bill points on the American side as soon as satisfied that the danger is over. I do not sympathize with the view of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the passage of this Act would necessarily exclude American fruit. It is true that this scale is carried on the fruit, contrary to the habit of other scales with which we have been familiar on our fruit trees from time immemorial; but it is equally true that incidents of the distribution from the fruit are so much smaller than from the tree that I think the necessity of having to resort to such an extreme measure as that is exceedingly unlikely. Upon the whole, while the Minister of Agriculture has been naturally slow to ask the House to take this extreme step in prohibiting the introduction of fruit trees, it is to his credit that he only did so at the last moment, feeling that under the circumstances it was the only efficient mode of putting a stop to what is a serious danger to the fruit-growing district of this country; and that if the time should return—any time within two or three years—when we could safely dispense with the operations of the Act, I can safely promise for the Minister that no one will be found more ready than he to withdraw an Act that can by any means be considered as interfering with ordinary trade relations with our American cousins to the south of us or as disturbing those business relations that ought to exist between us on friendly terms; but I feel, and it has been urged upon me very strongly by the fruit-growers and not by the nurserymen of my own district, that this was a matter in which the fruit-growers were more deeply interested than the nurserymen.

Mr. BOSTOCK. The fruit-growers of British Columbia would have been only too glad to have seen an Act of this kind introduced into the House last year, if not previously. They had done as much as they could in the province to protect themselves from pests of this kind, and especially from this particular pest, as California is one of the states of the United States which has been most troubled with this particular pest. But of course a province has not very much

power in a matter of this kind. British Columbia passed an Act some years ago by which it was made compulsory to have all fruit and fruit trees coming into the province inspected before being distributed to the people to whom they were consigned, and to some extent we have been able to protect ourselves in that way; but the measure adopted has not been found so satisfactory as we could wish, and I think the fruit-growers all through the province of British Columbia are only too anxious to see a measure of this kind passed into law. I hope that everything will be done by this House to place this measure on the Statute-book as soon as possible.

Mr. ELLIS. No doubt this is an insidious insect, but it is not quite so insidious as the spirit of protection. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has truly indicated what underlies this action, although I do not consider that affected the mind of the Minister. We constantly hear of pests against which our farmers are fighting, and of the struggles which must necessarily be made in order to carry on their industry. This is a very extreme measure to adopt for the purpose of arresting the progress of one insect, when there are other insects, just as dangerous and difficult to overcome, against which our agriculturists must struggle. No doubt the fruit-growers are in favour of this measure, and I observe that almost all the hon. members who have spoken on the subject represent fruit-growing districts. The Minister of Militia has told the House that the fruit-growers of Nova Scotia are in favour of this measure. Of course they are, because they cannot ask for protection until the trees are first protected; but the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that the spirit of protection is in the fruit-growers of Nova Scotia and they are seeking to pave the way for the protection of their fruit against American fruit. I regret very much indeed that this measure is so drastic, that the Minister of Agriculture holds the opinion that it is desirable to put it through the House; and the hon. gentleman having made up his mind, no opportunity is to be given to other hon. gentlemen to ascertain whether it is necessary, or not. I agree further with my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Erb) that an enemy in the rear is just as dangerous as an enemy in front, and if it is necessary to pass such extreme legislation, we should take measures to close the Niagara district, in which this pest prevails, and prevent the fruit-growers sending trees to Nova Scotia and the other maritime provinces, which may suffer thereby just as much as other portions of the Dominion. I regret to be obliged to oppose the Bill, but I do so on the principles of free trade, which I am sent here to express.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It must be apparent to the House that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Ellis) has wandered

Mr. BOSTOCK.

somewhat from the subject when he suggested to the House that a measure such as this means the entry of the thin edge of protection for our fruit industry. The incidental measure of protection which may be given, if we accept the phrase of the Minister of Militia, might be so regarded if it applied to the nurserymen, but not to fruit-growers. There is no measure of protection in this Bill to secure our home market against American fruit.

Mr. ELLIS. Why?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Because it does not deal with the importation of fruit.

Mr. ELLIS. I did not say that. I said it was an advance movement in that direction; but I did not mean to say that this measure affected fruit at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will suggest to my hon. friend that in regard to the question of free trade he might find weaker points in the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite than that covered by this small Bill for the banishment of the San José scale. I shall not pursue that subject with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ellis), but he will find a very great field in which his arduous and sincere labours may result better to the theory of free trade, than his opposition to this measure on that score; because I cannot think that even the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ellis) from down by the sea regards this Government as free trade Government in everything except the San José scale.

But, Sir, leaving that subject, it appears to me that this measure should be passed through the House with the very greatest speed. The subject was brought to the attention of the Department of Agriculture two or three years ago, but the department then hesitated, in view of the little knowledge that was in our possession in regard to the subject, to take hold of the matter and pass such a drastic measure as is now considered necessary. Looking at it now as the facts are before the public, there is no question about it that the Minister of Agriculture has pursued the proper course, and I, for one, though opposed to the general policy of the Government will give this a very hearty support. The idea has been suggested that this is largely for the protection of the Niagara peninsula, and the hon. gentleman who recently spoke said that attention should be turned to the clearing of that peninsula from the pest rather than to the introduction of this general Bill. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) had answered that in advance when he declared, that steps had been taken in the province of Ontario to rid the districts of that pest where it now existed. But, Sir, the chief feature in attempting to keep a country free from a pest like this is to prevent its introduction into an unaffected district and even into districts which are now

infested with it, and the hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. Ellis) knows perfectly well that the provincial governments have no power to prevent the importation of diseased nursery stock.

And, Sir, if it were only to protect the Niagara district, the hon. gentleman should know that the Niagara district is a most important district; that thousands upon thousands of dollars worth of fruit are annually exported from there; and that from that district and other districts such as are represented by my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), has gone forth and extended knowledge of fruit raising which has made that industry of very great importance for the whole Dominion. Why is it said that this measure is drastic? To my mind there is nothing drastic in it at all. We say to the people of a country: If you have an infected plant you cannot send that plant to us and up to the time when you rid yourself of that plant disease, we will not allow the importation of nursery stock from your country, or from any district in which this disease exists. If they have a feeling of what is just and right there would be no desire on the part of any nurseryman in the United States to send diseased stock to Canada, and if there is such a desire on their part it is the duty of this Parliament to look after the interests of our own people, whether or not it suits the tastes and the business interests of the nurserymen of the United States. I did not hear the argument of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), but I trust that after the expression of the very nearly unanimous feeling that has been given voice to from both sides of the House, no technicality will be resorted to to prevent the passage of this Bill and to the making of it into law at the very earliest possible moment.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I wish to draw attention to one or two points which have come up in this discussion. In the first place I beg to thank members on both sides of the House who have accepted the principle of this Bill in such a friendly manner. I have been asked why it was necessary to prohibit, because measures less drastic in their nature might accomplish the end in view. There are two reasons for the prohibition, each of which I think is quite sufficient. One is: That it seems to me to be the only effective way to shut this pest out, and any measure of examination or inspection would be so ineffective that I consider it would be waste of time and of energy to undertake it. I do not say this on my own authority, but I say it after having carefully consulted those entomologists and botanists who have studied this matter for years and who are competent to speak on such a question. In the next place, any measure of examination or investigation or detention of the importations for the purpose of seeing that they

were not affected, would be extremely unsatisfactory, and as a matter of fact almost impossible to carry out in this country so as to be of any use. Under these circumstances, and appreciating and knowing the danger which exists from the introduction of this pest, I felt it was necessary to adopt even such a drastic measure as this might be characterized. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) has complimented me on the protective character of the Bill. My own well-known views as to protection and as to free trade, perhaps may be sufficient to defend me from any such accusation; but I want to tell the hon. member and to tell everybody else, that while I do not believe in unnecessary and interested restrictions being put upon trade, yet, when it is necessary for the proper protection of industries in this country from outside, I am quite ready to adopt protective measures.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. You are converted, too.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Quite ready to adopt protective measures with the explanation which I have given.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Try and convert the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis).

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) when he has studied this measure as much as I have will perhaps appreciate what I have done. I wish to cast no reflection upon the hon. member for St. John, for I quite understand what he has expressed. I may say frankly that when this measure was first drawn to my attention last year it seemed to savour of a certain kind of interested protection to a certain class of people in this country, which is the kind of protection I object to and which I will not in any way endorse. But, when I found as I did, that the demand for this law was supported not by the nurserymen who possibly may be able to profit a little from this Bill—I think it is likely they will to a certain extent profit, but I cannot help that even if I wished to—when I found that this Bill was supported not by the nurserymen but by the very men who were obliged to buy that stock, the men who are the consumers and not the producers of that stock, when I found that these men passed resolutions unanimously, not only in the province of Ontario where the first demand came from, but also in the province of Quebec and in the province of Nova Scotia asking that this law should be passed, I felt I was quite safe in introducing it. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) asks, why I did not introduce this Bill a month ago. I may tell him that it is only a few weeks since I received the resolutions from the horticulturists of Nova Scotia and Quebec. Since that time, this House has been occupied *de die in diem* with a particular measure, and had it not been so engrossed

in that measure I would have introduced this Bill two weeks ago at latest. But I could not interrupt the course of the work of the House, and I therefore had to put it off until that measure was disposed of. As a matter of fact, the present time is quite soon enough, because up to the present no stock has been or would be likely to be imported from the United States.

The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has said that there are large sections of the United States which are not affected by this scale. I have under my hand a memorandum from Mr. Fletcher, the entomologist and botanist of the Experimental Farm, who went to Washington a little while ago at my request, to attend a meeting of the entomologists and botanists of the United States who were then appearing before Congress asking for legislation. On his return, Mr. Fletcher reported to me in these words :

It has been in the eastern states for ten years, and has already caused thousands of dollars of injury in those states. All the fruit-growing states of the Union to the south of Canada, with perhaps the exception of Maine, are infested with this pest.

The hon. gentleman said that around Rochester there was not much of this scale. I am not prepared to say how much there is, but I would like to tell him and this House that the few cases of this pest which have been found in Canada have nearly all been traced directly to a nursery in the neighbourhood of Rochester. I want to put the House in possession of as much information on this matter as I have myself. At present the existence of this pest in Canada is very limited. I do not wish to alarm anybody, and I can say that as a matter of fact there are only, as far as known, a few instances of it in Canada—one or two in the Niagara peninsula, one or two in the country to the north of Lake Erie, and two or three in the province of British Columbia; and those who have studied the question, and who are to-day engaged in the suppression of this pest in Canada assure me that if we can prevent its further introduction, we can in a short space of time absolutely free our country from the danger. I therefore think it is well worth our while to pass such a drastic measure as this for such an enormous gain.

I may say that a week or two ago I received a message from Lord Strathcona, our High Commissioner in London, asking me if Canada was taking any steps in this direction. I have since found out that that message was prompted by the inquiry in Great Britain as to the introduction of this pest from abroad, and that it was suggested to the High Commissioner that if the people of England could be satisfied that Canada had none of this pest within its boundaries, it would be a great advantage to the seller of our fruits in Great

Mr. FISHER.

Britain. I may say that Lord Strathcona has just gone to Berlin to see what can be done in the way of developing trade between Canada and Germany, and I have information in my office to-day that there is abundant opportunity for the creation of a large fruit trade with Germany which would be entirely prevented if this insect were to become general in Canada.

I have been asked to explain why I did not provide against the spread of this scale in Canada. That work is being, and I think effectually, provided for by the local legislatures. Several years ago the legislature of British Columbia passed an Act providing for the appointment of inspectors to examine all fruit trees and nursery stock which were sent from one point to another in the province, or which came from outside of the province. That Act has worked under some difficulties, but has perhaps done some good. In the province of Ontario, as has been explained by my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Bain), the legislature, at its last session, passed a very complete Act providing for the efficient inspection of nurseries and orchards, and for the destruction of trees found affected by this pest. The legislature of Nova Scotia passed a similar Act the other day; and I have reason to believe that the legislature of Quebec, at its next session, will also pass an Act dealing with this subject in a local way. It seems to me well that the Parliament of Canada should deal with the importation of the stock from abroad and that we can safely and properly leave the local work to the legislatures and executives of the provinces. It is not necessary, even if it were advisable or possible, for us to prohibit the passage of nursery stock from one part of the Dominion to another.

I did not decide upon this legislation until I found that it was the fruit-growers, and not simply the producers of nursery stock, who were asking for it; and it was because I wished to assure myself of this, and that this was not simply an agitation got up by certain interested parties, that I did not last session yield to the demand that was made, but took the interval between then and now to inquire into the subject. I am satisfied that to-day, with the exception perhaps of two or three agents of American nursery houses, whose business will no doubt be somewhat interfered with in Canada if this Bill passes, the whole community is at the back of this legislation, and will feel relieved and satisfied if the House adopts the measure as laid before it. I therefore ask that the Bill be read a first time, and that the House accede to my request, to enable me to put it through at one sitting, suspending the rules for that purpose.

Mr. McNEILL. I only wish to say that I am delighted to find that my hon. friend has introduced a measure of this kind; and I think that any hon. member of this

House who attempts to stand between the fruit-growers who are really the farmers of this country, and the protection which is being extended to them by the measure which the hon. Minister has introduced, is doing something which he will not be much thanked for by those people in this country who are interested in the growth of fruit. I want to ask my hon. friend whether this measure goes as far as he thinks he can safely go in this direction. It only covers fruit trees. Is the information which my hon. friend has from the experts whom he has consulted such as would lead him to believe that there is little or no danger from the importation of the fruit itself? Because I take it that it is almost impossible to have any inspection of the fruit that would be in the least degree a safeguard from this pest; and if there be any real reason to fear that the importation of the fruit itself will be likely to conduce to the spread of this most dangerous disease, it might perhaps be well for my hon. friend to go a little further even than he has done.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have examined that point very thoroughly. This insect is one which can travel only a very slight distance, not more than a few inches. It is not a flying insect, but a scale insect, which cannot pass from one part to another.

Mr. MILLS. Does it travel on Sundays?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It travels all the year round, except in climates where the frost stops it. It is spread largely by being attached to the feet of birds and flying insects, which light on trees or twigs affected by it, and carry it to other trees. The insect does appear on the skins of apples and other fruits. It cannot, however, live more than a few minutes after the part of the tree or fruit on which it is ceases to be alive. It can only live while the bark of the tree or the skin of the fruit is succulent and juicy. It is possible, no doubt, for such a combination of circumstances to arise that, when the insect is attached to the skin of an apple, or a peach, or pear, the fruit might be put into such a place that the insect would attach itself afterwards to the twig of a tree. It cannot multiply on the fruit, but it can exist there; but those who have studied the matter inform me, that such a combination of circumstances is so unlikely to occur, under which it would be possible for the insect to spread in that way, that it is not necessary to provide against the importation of fruit, and I need not point out that the prohibition of the importation of fruit would be a very much more drastic measure and would create a very extraordinary and, I believe, unnecessary interference with our ordinary trade. My information leads me to believe that there is no necessity to do this.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Although this is irregular, I would ask permission to put the question to the hon. Minister, whether he has taken any steps to give instruction or encouragement to tobacco-growers in Canada. There is the opening of a large industry in this plant, and I should like to know whether, by experts or pamphlets, he proposes to give instruction to farmers in the various sections of the country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Although that question is not germane to the subject of this Bill, I have no hesitation in replying and in informing my hon. friend that I have not done any more than continue the experiments in the culture and curing of tobacco on the experimental farm which were in operation when my hon. friend was Minister of Agriculture. I propose to try and issue a special bulletin on the subject for next season before operations begin.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would suggest to my hon. friend, that he should not only include the result of the experiments on the farm in his pamphlet, but get an article from the pen of some expert and publish it at the same time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE moved the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not rise to offer further opposition to this Bill, because the sentiment expressed by the House is very unmistakable. Of course, my own opinion remains, that it is unnecessary, and that we could reach the object aimed at to better advantage in some other way. As a fruit-grower, I do not consider the measure in my interest, and I would sooner to-day buy nursery stock in nurseries in Rochester, which I know to be free of the pest, than in the Niagara district. But I do not wish to press that now. What I rise to suggest is, whether, under all the circumstances, it is advisable to rush the Bill through all its stages to-day. I shall not avail myself of the privilege of objecting, but I would suggest that it would be proper, perhaps, to allow the House to sleep on the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not considering the necessity for the Bill itself, for the House has formed its opinion upon that point, but I would ask the House to consider what may possibly be the consequences which may grow out of this action. There is the possibility of restriction in other matters beside the San José scale, and we may have some action on the other side that may lead us to regret that we did not approach this matter in some other way. I would suggest that we take time to deal with this matter in a broad and prudent manner, with the necessary delay for consideration. I do not

think it is necessary to put this Bill through all its stages to-day. No nursery stock will be imported the next two weeks at least, and by laying the Bill over a day, we will show a little less precipitancy, a little more dignity, and will attain the same object, if the House does not arrive at another conclusion with regard to the matter.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The allusions which my hon. friend from North Norfolk has made are sufficiently clear for every one of us to understand; but everybody realizes here—and I hope it is well understood by every one on both sides—that this is not a measure of hostility to the United States. We are desirous of preserving the most friendly intercourse with our neighbours; and, if the conditions were reversed, if it so happened that this pest were within our borders, none of us would find fault if our American neighbours took precautions to protect themselves against the possible invasion of their territory by that pest. The Americans are aware of this, and therefore they cannot construe this action of ours as in any sense implying, as was suggested by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), a moment ago, anything in the way of protection. That is not our intention, and I would not have this Bill, for my part, if it were. It is purely a matter of the health of the fruit trees of this country, and it is simply in this view that it is to be considered. The House should therefore not hesitate to carry out the advice expressed by my hon. colleague the Minister of Agriculture, and shared by everybody, that immediate steps should be taken in order to prevent the possibility of the introduction of this pest among us.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. In addition to what has fallen from the lips of my right hon. leader, let me say, that in the United States Congress to-day there is a Bill for the protection of the various states of the union against each other, exactly as we are proceeding to protect ourselves against them. I would have been disposed to consider, perhaps, the provisions of that Bill almost sufficient to protect us, but, unfortunately, it does not come into force until the first of July, and between now and then the whole injury this season could be done. Therefore, I feel it necessary to proceed thus with the despatch. The hon. gentleman need be in no fear that the Americans will consider this in any sense hostile legislation. I certainly would be very averse to introducing any such legislation.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to be understood as not objecting to the Bill, in the face of the strong opinion expressed by the House, but as urging that we should not press it through with this haste.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the majority of the House is of the opinion that this is a case

Mr. CHARLTON.

of urgency, we can carry the Bill through all its stages to-day. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion for the second reading of the Bill?

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time, and passed.

SLEIGH ROAD, STIKINE RIVER TO TESLIN LAKE.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

Have Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie constructed and finished a practical sleigh road from the mouth of the Stikine River to Teslin Lake? If so, when was it completed and what is its length? Have they provided suitable shelters for travellers at intervals of twenty-five miles along this route, and is this road and are these shelters now available for travellers?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that the Government have no official report on the subject referred to in the question. Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie have been applied to for information, and they say they believe that they sent forward a sufficient outfit of men and material and plenty of time to carry out the provisions of the contract in reference to the construction of the sleigh road and the erection of shelters. They have no doubt that the work was done. But they report that, owing to the great storm that took place a short time ago, the first fifteen or twenty miles of the road was obstructed. They have a large force of men working, and they hope in a short time that the road will be open for use.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure that I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton). Did he say that Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie had had the road constructed, but that since then it had probably filled up?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The storm had obstructed the first fifteen or twenty miles.

Mr. FOSTER. But it had been completed through the 200 miles?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. That is what they report to me.

C. M. DAUNAIS.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether C. M. Daunais occupies a position in the public service, and if so, what that position is?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that there is in the service of the Department of Indian Affairs, as

Indian agent at Battleford, a man named C. M. Daunais.

BYRON NICKERSON.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked,

1. When was Byron Nickerson appointed keeper of the Cape Negro Island light station?
2. Was he appointed upon the recommendation of any and what persons resident in the county of Shelburne?
3. What steps did the Government take to ascertain his fitness for the position?
4. What information has the Government as to his fitness for the position?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Byron Nickerson was appointed keeper of Cape Negro Island light station on the 26th July, 1897. He was recommended by a number of the residents of the county by a petition received through the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). No special inquiries were made, as the representative of the county was deemed sufficient. The department has no reason to believe that Mr. Nickerson is unfit for the position; from letters received from him, he appears to be performing his duties satisfactorily.

THE LIGHT AT KING'S HEAD.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

1. Did the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries receive a petition from the pilots of the port of Pictou and the resident captains asking to have the light at King's Head turned on?
2. If so, when was it received?
3. What action, if any, will be taken upon this petition?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows:—1. Yes. 2. 11th September, 1897. 3. It is not proposed to take any action at present.

DIVERSION OF INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY THROUGH SPRING HILL.

Mr. POWELL asked,

1. Did the Department of Railways and Canals employ C. E. Croasdale, C.E., to make a report on a proposed diversion from its present route to a route leading through the town of Spring Hill, Nova Scotia, of a portion of the Intercolonial Railway lying between Athol, Nova Scotia, and River Philip, Nova Scotia, and if Mr. Croasdale was so employed, has he made any report on the proposed diversion?
2. If Mr. Croasdale has made any such report, has the Government had the report under consideration?
3. Has the Government had under consideration the advisability of making such diversion in the route of the Intercolonial Railway?
4. Does the Government intend to make the above mentioned diversion in the location of the line of the Intercolonial Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows:—1. Mr. Croasdale, C.E., was employed to make a survey of a proposed diversion from its present route to one leading through the town of Spring Hill of a portion of the Intercolonial Railway lying between Athol, N.S., and Salt Springs, N.S. Mr. Croasdale found that on account of the severe grades the road could not be built from Spring Hill to Salt Springs without exceeding the maximum allowable on the Intercolonial Railway. After consultation with Mr. Logan, M.P., Mr. Croasdale was instructed to proceed with surveys to such point on the Intercolonial as could be reached without exceeding the maximum grade. He surveyed to River Philip. Mr. Croasdale then made his report accordingly. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4. The fact that the road could not be built from Athol via Spring Hill to Salt Springs has increased the difficulties of the proposed diversion very much, and to build to River Philip would lengthen the main line, according to Mr. Croasdale's report, about three miles. It would also necessitate the building of heavy trestle and other expensive construction work, entailing a much larger expenditure than was in contemplation when Mr. Croasdale was instructed to make his survey. In view of the fact that a proper line could not be found to Salt Springs and an extension to River Philip would materially lengthen the line and greatly increase the cost, I have been unable favourably to recommend the project to my colleagues.

GRAIN LIENS IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether it was the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill dealing with seed grain liens in the North-west Territories and Manitoba?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman's question, I beg to say that I have no present intention of recommending the introduction of such legislation as that referred to.

DEAF MUTES, NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether the Minister of the Interior is taking steps to enable the North-west Government to make provision for caring for the deaf mutes of the Territories?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that the question of making provision for caring for the deaf mutes of the Territories has received some considera-

tion, but up to the present time, I have not been able to make any recommendation to my colleagues in connection with the matter.

REGISTRY AND LANDS OFFICE, REGINA.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether the Minister of the Interior is providing for the erection of a building on the site of the old court house, Regina, to afford suitable accommodation for the Registry Office and the Dominion Lands Office?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that the matter referred to is now under consideration, but the Government is not in a position to make a positive statement at present as to what will be done.

PROVISIONS FOR GOVERNMENT YUKON PARTY.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Who were the persons who during December, 1897, superintended the buying of provisions for the mounted police and Government parties bound for the Yukon?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The persons who, during December, 1897, superintended the buying of provisions for the mounted police and Government parties bound for the Yukon were the Comptroller at Ottawa, the Commissioner in the Territories and British Columbia, and Inspector Wood at Skagway, Alaska.

WILLIAM McNAUGHTON.

Mr. McLNERNEY asked,

Is there a detective or officer of the Inland Revenue Department by the name of William McNaughton in Nova Scotia? Has a man of that name been in the employ of such department? Is he so employed now?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that William McNaughton has never been in the employ of the Inland Revenue Department.

DOUBLE HILL POST OFFICE.

Mr. MARTIN asked,

1. Has the Double Hill post office, in the province of Prince Edward Island, been closed?

2. If so, when, and for what reason?

3. Is it intended to reopen it, or open any other post office in the neighbourhood of Double Hill?

4. What was the amount of salary paid to the postmaster at Double Hill, and to what extent, if any, has his salary been increased, and if increased, when, and for what reason?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). The replies to the hon. gentleman's Mr. SIFTON.

questions are as follows:—1. Yes. 2. It was closed on the 1st of March, 1898, because, in the opinion of the inspector, it was not considered necessary. 3. It is not at present in contemplation to reopen it or to establish another office in the neighbourhood. 4. The salary was \$10 a year up to the 1st July, 1897, and was from that date increased to \$12 a year because of a slight increase in the business of the office.

THE LIGHT AT KING'S HEAD.

On the question by Mr. Bell,

1. Has a petition from the pilots and seafaring men of Pictou, Nova Scotia, and vicinity, asking that the light at King's Head, Nova Scotia, be turned on again, reached the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

2. What action has been taken in the matter?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Similar questions were put by the hon. senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and I have just answered them.

LIGHTHOUSE ON THESSALON POINT.

Mr. McDOUGALL (for Mr. Sproule) asked,

What was the total cost of the lighthouse on Thessalon Point, erected in 1897? Specifying, 1st, cost of timber and lumber; 2nd, other material.

From whom were these purchased? Was the work done by tender? If not, why not? By whom was the work done, and under whose supervision?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The total cost of the lighthouse on Thessalon Point, erected in 1897, was \$1,219.36. The cost of timber and lumber was \$309.60, and the cost of other material \$209.41. The material was purchased from the following:—Lumber from J. T. Wallace, Thessalon; hardware from F. R. Bennett, Thessalon; plate glass from A. McPherson & Son, Montreal; lime and cement from F. Leighfield, Thessalon; iron work from J. C. McKay, Thessalon; tinsmithing from James McAlpine & Company, Thessalon; blacksmithing from J. V. Matson, Thessalon. The work was not done by tender. It was considered by the engineers of the department that a better building could be put up by day's labour than by contract. The work was done by local labourers, under the supervision of Mr. Joseph Magee, of Ottawa, who had previously superintended work for the department satisfactorily.

DISMISSAL OF A. POWLIE.

Mr. POWELL asked,

1. Has A. Powlie, within the last six months, been dismissed from the position of car inspector on the Intercolonial Railway at Spring Hill, Nova Scotia? If so, why was he dismissed?

2. Has any person been appointed to fill the said position of car inspector since the dismissal of Powlie? If any person has been so appointed, what was the occupation of such person previous to such appointment?

3. Was said Powlie employed at the time of his dismissal by the day or on a salary?

4. How long had Powlie, previous to his dismissal, been in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway, and had he not during the course of his employment with the Intercolonial Railway, been a faithful and efficient servant? Had any charges been preferred against him on which he was dismissed? If so, what were they, and by whom were they made? Were the said charges, if any, investigated, and if so, by whom, and had Powlie any notice of such investigation or opportunity to make any defence thereat?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). 1. The services of A. Powlie, car inspector at Springhill Junction, were dispensed with in October, 1897. His services were dispensed with on the ground of political partisanship. 2. No person has been appointed to fill the said position of car inspector since the services of Mr. Powlie were dispensed with, but Moses Legère is acting as car inspector. Moses Legère was employed as assistant to the car inspector at Spring Hill Junction before that time. 3. Powlie was employed at a monthly salary previous to his dismissal. 4. Powlie had been in the employ of the railway since 1873. He was a satisfactory employee. He was dismissed for political partisanship on the representations of Mr. Logan, M.P. There was no investigation.

DISMISSAL OF A. STEWART.

Mr. POWELL asked,

1. Was A. Stewart dismissed from the position of tankman on the Intercolonial Railway at Spring Hill, Nova Scotia? If so, why was he dismissed, and who made the charges, if any, against him?

2. How long had Stewart been in the service of the Intercolonial Railway previous to his dismissal? Who has been appointed to fill the position of tankman at Spring Hill in the room of Stewart?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). 1. The services of A. Stewart, tankman on the Intercolonial Railway at Spring Hill Junction, N.S., were dispensed with. They were dispensed with because he was an offensive partisan in the last Dominion election. 2. Mr. Stewart had been in the service of the Intercolonial Railway twenty-four years and upwards. Mr. H. A. McKenzie was appointed in his place, but I understand has resigned.

Mr. POWELL. Who made the charges?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The information is not furnished me; I suppose it was not noticed in the preparation of the answer. I will answer the question to-morrow.

COMMANDER WAKEHAM'S REPORT.

Mr. DAVIS (by Mr. McMillan), asked,

Is it the intention of the Government to furnish the members of this House with copies of Commander Wakeham's report on the navigability of Hudson Straits?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Such is the intention of the Government just as soon as the Printing Bureau have the report printed. It has been in their hands for some time past, but delay has been caused, partially by the fact that a large number of photographs taken by the officers at the time, are to be incorporated in the report.

THE MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIS (by Mr. McMillan) asked,

How many miles of the Manitoba and North-western Railway have been constructed? How many miles, per annum, is the company supposed to construct under the terms of their charter? How many miles have they constructed in the years 1894, 1895, 1896 and 1897? Have the Government received any memorials from the Government of the North-west Territories respecting this road? If so, has any action been taken on the same?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). Two hundred and thirty-four and a half miles of the Manitoba and North-western Railway have been constructed up to the 30th June, 1897. The company is supposed to complete not less than 20 miles of their railway, as defined by their Act of incorporation, each calendar year. There has not been any mileage constructed during the years 1894, 1895, 1896 and 1897. Yes, the Government have received a certified copy of a resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the North-west Territories, praying that the charter of the above railway be amended and that cash assistance be granted towards extension of its line into Prince Albert. No action has yet been taken in the matter, but it is under consideration.

LEASES FOR DREDGING.

Mr. MAXWELL (by Mr. Gibson) asked,

How many miles of river has been leased for dredging purposes to J. A. Mercier?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). Twenty-five miles have been leased to J. A. Mercier for dredging purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. If I wish for information with respect to leases given to individuals in this same way, and if I put a question on the paper, will I be given the answer, or be asked to put it in the form of a motion for a return?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Certainly the hon. gentleman will be answered if he puts a simple question that can be answered in this way. I presume the hon. gentleman is referring to the fact that when he asked a question before, it involved practically my reading a departmental return. I do not want to delay the hon. gentleman at all. If he will simply say what he wants and specify the particulars, I will bring down the return without a motion.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I will ask twenty questions instead of putting it all in one.

ESTIMATES AND BUDGET SPEECH

Mr. **FOSTER**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance when we may expect the Estimates and the Budget speech?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). The Estimates are in a very advanced state, and will be brought down at an early day. I am unable to make any more definite statement, but they will not be delayed many days. The Budget speech usually follows in due course. I hope my hon. friend will not ask me to depart from the custom and fix a day at present.

DUTY ON SPADES AND SHOVELS.

Mr. **RICHARDSON**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to bring to the notice of the Government a question which I consider of grave importance, and I will conclude with a motion. In the Tariff Bill introduced last session occurs the following clause:—

Whenever the Governor in Council has reason to believe that with regard to any article of commerce there exists any trust, combination, association or agreement of any kind among manufacturers of such articles or dealers therein, to unduly enhance the price of such article, or in any other way to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may commission or empower any judge of the Supreme Court or Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any superior court of any province in Canada, to inquire in a summary way into and report to the Governor in Council whether such trust, combination, association or agreement exists.

The judge may compel the attendance of witnesses and examine them under oath, and require the production of books and of papers, and shall have such other necessary powers as are conferred upon him by the Governor in Council for the purposes of such inquiry.

If the judge reports that such trust, combination, association or agreement exists, and if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumers is facilitated by the duties of customs imposed on a like article, when imported, then the Governor in Council shall place such article on the free list, or so reduce the duty on it as to give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in such article.

Mr. **FOSTER**.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand four letters from prominent manufacturers of spades and shovels in the United States. I will read only one of these letters to the House, but I will be glad to show them all to any member of the House, or to any member of the Government who desires to see them. The letter I will read is from a prominent manufacturing firm in Pennsylvania, and is in response to an inquiry from a well known manufacturing firm in Canada asking for quotations for spades and shovels. This is the letter:

Gentlemen,—Yours of the 23rd instant at hand, and in reply we would say that according to our agreement with the Canadian shovel manufacturers, we are not in a position to quote you prices at present.

The other letters are practically of the same character, they decline to give any quotations of prices of shovels and spades. It is quite evident therefore that a combination has been formed in regard to these articles. The duty on spades and shovels is 35 per cent, a duty which, I think, is entirely too high; notwithstanding that fact, I have in my hand evidence that a combination exists, and that by virtue of this combination consumers are compelled to pay infinitely too much for these articles. The price of spades and shovels, in the States particularly, is very low and these manufacturers in the States accept the shilling from our Canadian manufacturers and keep out of the market. I desire to call the attention of the Government officially to this question with the view of having them suspend the duty on these articles as provided in the tariff clause which I have read, until such time as the combination is broken. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). I may state that certainly, so far as my own knowledge is concerned, and I think I am correct in stating the same for my colleagues, this is the first time this matter has been brought to our notice; therefore we are not in a position to take any action or even to consider the matter at all. I will not say that I have not heard something in relation to a combine in respect to this particular industry, for I recollect at an early stage of the investigation into the trade question representations were made to us—I cannot recollect the particular place—that gentlemen engaged in that line of industry had something in the nature of a combine, and something like the state of facts presented by the hon. gentleman to-day in support of his motion. However, since the passage of the clause in the Tariff Act to which the hon. gentleman has referred, it has never been brought to my attention, nor so far as I am aware to the notice of the Minister of Customs or any Minister whose department might be supposed to be partic-

ularly connected with that branch of administration. I call attention to the fact that when we presented to the House our original tariff the Government itself took power to deal with such cases; but on discussion it was suggested that it would be a very great and perhaps a very dangerous power to confer on a Ministry; and before the Act was carried through the House it will be remembered that we agreed that the Government would not on its own motion take this power to itself, but if called on to deal with the question of combines, the matter would be in the first instance presented to one of the judicial tribunals of the country. If therefore the hon. gentleman thinks he will be able, as perhaps he may be able—and we must look into that point—to establish the existence of a combine, the Government is not in a position to take action except to call the attention of the courts to the question in order to obtain a proper decision. Inasmuch as this subject is brought to our attention for the first time since the passage of the Act, I can only say that the Government will give the matter careful consideration.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

THE CANADIAN YUKON RAILWAY BILL.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton) moved third reading of Bill (No. 6) to confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, and to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.

Mr. KAULBACH. I cannot refrain from trespassing upon the indulgence of this House for a few moments, owing to the subject matter of this Bill being of such vital importance to the people of Canada. This proposed railway, to be known as the Canadian Yukon Railway, will be entailing such an immense expenditure for so small a return to Canada, and the legislation which we are called upon to enact so comparatively new, nothing having been mooted with regard to it, till within a few weeks ago, the engagement so great, the grant of lands so enormously large, to say nothing of its richness in mineral wealth and forest, that I feel it is really a duty I owe to the electorate of the county I represent, to give my views on the subject, and, were I to remain silent, I might be interpreted as simply following the dictates of party and indifferent to the essential element of honour and just principle, which should characterize every member of this House, be he Liberal or Conservative—hence my reason for claiming the indulgence of this House for a few moments. It was very amusing to listen to hon. members disputing on the merits of this Bill, the character of the work required of the contractors, Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, the consideration these two contrac-

tors are to receive for the performance of the work, and the beneficial results as a convenience accruing to Canada on its completion; but I must say that to all their utterances I take exception, as I cannot think they are sincere. At all events, it is not the opinion of hon. members on this side of the House, and I feel very certain it will not voice the sentiment of the great majority of the people of this country, when they understand it.

I must state, that I, as a member of this House, object to this Bill on the grounds, first, that it is not in the interest of Canada, inasmuch as it is not an all-Canadian route—that by the Stikine River international disputes, as well as dissatisfaction in the administration of the customs laws between the United States and Canada, at the mouth of the Stikine in Alaska, at Fort Wrangel, may arise, which may lead to serious complications and difficulties, which we now, having warning by the action taken in the American Congress, can avert; that the many transfers of passengers and freight—said to be seven—would be inconvenient, expensive, and dangerous to life and property; that a more convenient and all-Canadian route can be had from Fort Simpson and Portland Channel to Glenora or Telegraph Creek, and thus avoid the tortuous and dangerous waters of the Stikine; that any route from the Pacific Ocean available over Canadian territory to the Yukon, is better than the proposed one; that any route passing from the Pacific Ocean to the Yukon is an injury to Canadian merchants and traders, and building up the United States, to the injury of Canada, inasmuch as it would be giving a market for the agricultural and industrial products of Washington, Montana, Oregon, Idaho, Nevada and California, in the United States, they being in such close proximity as to be able to supply nine-tenths of everything required for the entire gold region lying between the Pacific and Arctic Ocean, cheaper even when paying the duty, than we of the North-west Territory or central Canada, owing to our long freight rates on the Canadian Pacific; that the water stretches between Vancouver and Morely Island, a distance of 160 miles, and Dixon Entrance between Prince of Wales Island and Graham Island, a distance of 60 miles, are dangerous to navigate, owing to strong winds and the roughness of the waters. Hence my reasons for objecting to this route, and I feel that it would be wisdom on the part of the Government to abandon the project altogether, thereby saving money, and allow adventurers, they being mainly foreigners, to find their way to the gold region in the Yukon as best they can. My advice, under the circumstances, is, to open up a good wagon road into this country, as was done some years ago, when the rich Caribou gold-bearing region was first discovered, which road has been used up to the present, and

nothing better has been asked for. But I believe a still better project can be advanced, at all events infinitely better than the extravagant deal provided by this Bill, that is, to start from Edmonton, in Alberta, via the Peace River, Halfway River, Black River and Francis River, till it strikes the Pelly River, and utilize the waters of the Pelly and Yukon rivers to Dawson. By this means you have an all-Canadian route; you open up that beautiful Peace River district, valuable for its climate and richness of soil; you offer advantages to settlers, with the certainty that the goods going into the Klondike region would all come from Canada, while the goods that would be going into the Yukon district by the proposed Stikine and Teslin Lake Railway, would be of American origin. This Edmonton route, I claim, is the shortest, safest and best for Canadians. It opens up a rich mining country, has no need of bonding goods, ex-warehouse, as is threatened at Fort Wrangel; neither is there any need of seven transfers, as is required on the route provided by this Bill.

Some would object to the Edmonton route via Peace River, owing to the distance being about 1,400 miles. As an answer, I would say, to build a permanent railway into the Peace River district, and from that a wagon road to the waters of the Pelly, utilizing the waters of the Pelly and Yukon, to get to the Klondike region.

By adopting this Edmonton route we avoid all complications with our neighbours to the south of us, as respects the bonding privileges at Fort Wrangel, who really want everything in sight and disposed to take steps to secure it. It is very humiliating to have Congress, by the 13th clause of the Bill as passed in the Senate at Washington, on the 5th instant, dictate terms to us, and ask, among other privileges:

That fishing vessels of the United States having authority under the laws of the United States to touch and trade at any port or ports, place or places in the British dominions of North America, shall have the privilege of entering such port or ports, place or places for the purposes of purchasing bait and all other supplies and outfits in the same manner, and under the same regulations as may exist therein applicable to trading vessels of the most-favoured nations and of transshipping their catch to be transported in bond through said Dominion without paying of duty, in the same manner as other merchandise destined for the United States may be there transported.

May I ask, what prompted this section of 13th clause, as referred to, to be embodied in that Bill? Is it not truthfully stated by Mr. Hansbrough (North Dakota), who said in debate in words like these:

That the Committee on Public Lands was in possession of information that Canada would accept the conditions imposed by the section. He was firmly of the opinion that the Dominion Government would yield to the fisheries question in view of the concessions made to it by the Bill.

Mr. KAULBACH.

I would here ask the right hon. the leader of the Government, if he would consider it fair and in the interest of the fishermen of the maritime provinces, with the knowledge of a high American tariff wall ruling against us, by which we are excluded from entering their markets, that we should allow them the like privileges with ourselves on our shores? It would be unreasonable to entertain such a thought for a single moment.

Let me inform the hon. gentleman, that we are suffering very greatly at present in the maritime provinces, owing to the bounty-fed French catch of fish being allowed to be sold in our markets, whilst our fish products are excluded from theirs, and coming into competition with our Canadian catch in foreign markets, thereby reducing the price of the article so greatly as to cripple our Canadian industry, and in some cases to drive parties out of the fish business entirely.

But to give this valuable concession, as referred to, to our American neighbours in barter for rights which we contend are our own fishermen's rights, and upon which rights there should be no infringement, in order to pass goods or get the bonding privilege, ex-warehouse, at Fort Wrangel, at the mouth of the Stikine River, and carry out the conditions of this doubtful Bill, for a paltry tramway, would be dealing a death-blow to our North Atlantic fisheries, and fishermen, who are struggling for an existence, and in many cases are in dire need of the necessaries of life, owing to the manner in which their interests have been handicapped and their appeals rejected. I am here as their friend and advocate to speak for their rights and to sound the note of warning, and, if hon. gentlemen opposite are indifferent to this reminder and regardless of results, they take the consequences.

Now, I desire to say a few words with regard to the contract given to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. This contract, be it remembered, was given to these contractors without tender and without consultation, with any other parties accustomed to take contracts, only about ten days before our assembling here in Parliament, which looks, to say the least of it, very suspicious, there being no urgent necessity for it, neither any haste, as no work could be proceeded with till the opening of spring, and to build a tramway commencing at a point inaccessible or that cannot be reached at all times, and ending nowhere, 160 miles, with 28-pound rails, narrow gauge, for the enormous consideration of 25,000 acres per mile, which gives the contractors the immense area of 4,000,000 of acres, or 6,250 square miles of country, equal to the acreage of all the arable land in Nova Scotia, and nearly three times the area of the island known as Prince Edward Island, so familiar to our fishermen visiting the Gulf of St. Lawrence, is monstrous, and will give an idea as to how our rights are being attempted to be barter-

tramway, which the Government's own engineer, Mr. Jennings, says, in his report, can be built for \$2,850,000, meaning by these figures the construction of a first-class road with proper rails.

Now let me place a moderate estimate on the value of each acre these contractors are to receive, taking the estimate from the report of the Government's own engineer, Mr. Jennings, where on page 2 he says as follows:—

From the Naplin River northward for forty-eight miles the general valley contracts from twenty to eight miles in width, and has in the central section a continuous stretch of rounded hills, all heavily timbered with spruce and pine, while on either side, in the low grounds, are many lakes and marshes, the valley to the eastward being the widest and best.

Say each acre has an average of twenty-five thousand feet of inch lumber, value each thousand at \$2—I am placing a very low estimate upon it when you consider the demand for the article for home consumption, house building, mineral uses, &c., and you have for each acre for timber purposes alone \$50—say we take only 1,000,000 acres as timber tract, and there are 3,000,000 acres left—we find as the value for the 1,000,000 acres for the timber alone \$50,000,000. But this is not the least part of the contract, as respects the lands to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, for both Mr. Jennings and Mr. Ogilvie, the Government's own engineers, in their official reports, refer to the valleys of the rivers as very rich in gold and other minerals, so you see the contractors have the crop of forest, and beneath in the soil, there is supposed to be in these valleys the rich deposits of gold—the value of which is beyond the estimate of man, but I will quote from Mr. Ogilvie's official report just issued to have you draw your own conclusions, in which he says:

A specimen of gold-bearing quartz was picked up some years ago high up on the side of the banks of the Yukon River, opposite the mouth of the White River. It was sent to San Francisco and assayed, showing the enormous value of \$20,000 to the ton.

On page 92 of the same report Mr. Ogilvie stated as follows:—

Attention may be directed to the fact that the whole of that vast district owes its now world-wide reputation to the richness of 140 claims in the Klondike division. One hundred of these are on Bonanza Creek, and about 40 on Eldorado. To use a mining term, many of these claims are "world-beaters," and if the indications now known are worth anything at all they are worth from sixty to seventy millions of dollars in these two creeks.

Taking this division as a whole, including the three creeks named, affluent to Indian Creek, a distance some thirty-five miles in length, and twenty-five or more miles in width, if the indications can be relied on, there are one hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) in sight in that area. No one can guarantee this amount, but the prospects so far developed point to that sum

pretty clearly or conclusively. This district is exceptionally rich. Nothing has ever been found like it heretofore in that country, in fact, in very few countries has anything been found like it, and while we cannot confidently assert that other finds as valuable as it will be made, it is altogether improbable that gold is scattered over such a vast extent, and only rich at a point which is less than the 140th part of the total area.

Now both these Government engineers report that there is to be found silver, copper and coal, which if taken with the richness of the gold as referred to will prove beyond anything that man can estimate, the wealth that is attempted to be bestowed upon these two contractors in consideration of their building 150 miles of a tramway, improperly called a railway, running from Glenora or Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake. These two contractors get a deed in fee simple, a perfect title of all these lands, 4,000,000 of acres, with all the minerals they contain, without tax, save one per cent royalty on gold. Is not this a monstrous piece of monopoly, brought about by those who only a short time ago were shouting, "down with combines and monopolies?" The poor miner has to pay to the Government a rental of \$15 per year, whilst these contractors pay nothing. The poor miner has to pay \$10 for a miner's license, while these contractors pay nothing. The poor miner has to pay a royalty of 10 per cent, while these contractors pay only 1 per cent. If the poor miner happens to lose his license, he has to pay \$2 additional to get a new one.

I hold that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann can select, as was truly said by the hon. member for Alberta, a supporter of the Government, the best of the gold claims of that country, and he can locate 92,160 acres as quickly as the first ten miles are completed, and a similar quantity for the next ten miles of the road, and so continue taking and selecting lands until the whole road is built. The contractors can, owing to the careless contract that was made by the Government with them, make a deal with the miner himself by offering him a less license fee, a less rental fee, and a less percentage as royalty than the Government would exact, thereby giving the miners an advantage, and placing themselves at an advantage over the Government and still further placing the revenue that should go to the Government in their own pockets and leaving the Government in the humiliating position to tax the people of this country for this extravagant "Mackenzie & Mann" deal, and the further expenses incurred in this Yukon region. Another objection I make to this deal is, that the contractors are not limited as to the rates or tolls they are to charge on this road, at least there is no provision in the Bill, but can charge what they please. We will say there are 50,000 people passing over this road this year—the hon. Minister of Railways says there probably will be 250,000—and say we place a profit on each passen-

ger at \$10—that will give \$500,000, and say there are 50,000 tons of freight, that will give \$500,000 more, or equal to \$1,000,000—nearly half the cost of the entire road. But the contractors will charge what they please in the way of tolls and in one year out of profits alone will in all probability pay for the entire road, and have from this single source, a fortune, besides all the rest of the values referred to. In addition to the profits and benefits to these contractors, as referred to, it is understood the British Columbia Government are to aid them with a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile.

In conclusion I would say that I sincerely trust the Government will see that this proposed road is an injury to Canada, is a serious expense to Canada without any return, as foreigners can land from all parts of the world from the waters of the Pacific, be fed and clothed by our American neighbours to the south of us, pocket all the gold they find, and laugh at this impolitic Government in giving them the conveniences of getting into this region, and getting out, without paying one cent as a return to the treasury—whereas by the Edmonton route they would get all their supplies as the product of Canada, leave a portion at least of their money in Canada, see a beautiful country as regards climate, and soil, and mining resources, and probably be induced to settle in the Peace River district.

It is anticipated that if Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann by this suspicious and extravagant contract receive only half the profits that I have estimated, they will have a colossal fortune, and be "monarchs of all they survey," but they can't say "their right there is none to dispute," for it has been disputed by us on this side the House most ably, and reasonably, on honest and logical grounds, as was pointed out without the shadow of a doubt by the speeches delivered and the proofs given, that had the work been submitted to tender, instead of granting this gigantic monopoly to these contractors, the work would have been accepted by other parties as contractors, Mr. Hamilton Smith having expressed himself ready to submit his offer, for one-fourth the present land grant, and the conditions carried out in a speedy and satisfactory manner.

I hope my friends will accord me the credit of showing no disposition throughout my remarks to misrepresent, but only to give facts and to offer just and fair criticism as respects this Bill, which I think I have done.

I may say in closing that there is one advantage the contractors have gained by this deal, which they will thank the Government for, and it is this, that they have by this contract learned from the Minister of Railways, as by magic, how to run a railway without a "tender."

Mr. QUINN. Although the Government has seen fit to adopt several suggestions

Mr. KAULBACH.

made by the Opposition as regards the operation of the road, the system of selecting lands, the securing of a British directorate, and to provide for the road being a work in the general interest of Canada, yet it has not seen fit to place this matter in such a way before the public that the people of the Dominion generally may benefit by the existence in Canada of such a rich region. In the course of my remarks on the second reading, I suggested that a company should be organized with a capital of \$10,000,000, to be divided into shares of \$1 each. I suggested the same thing in committee yesterday, but no notice was taken of the suggestion, and I consider it my imperative duty to move an amendment now to that effect, and to ask that it be incorporated in the Bill in the place of section 8. I beg, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to move :

The capital stock of the company shall be ten millions of dollars, divided into shares of one dollar each, the whole of which shall be first issued for subscription to the Canadian public and left open for subscription until the first day of September, 1898. On the first allotment of shares no individual shall be allotted more than one thousand shares, but should the whole sum of ten millions of dollars be not then subscribed any person who shall have applied for shares shall be allowed to take up any portion of the balance remaining unsubscribed. In the event of applications for stock in excess of the ten millions of dollars being received, shares shall be allotted pro rata to each subscriber. The ownership of the railway and the contractors' interest in their contract with the Government shall be acquired by the company by paying to the contractors, out of the capital stock of the company, the amount expended by such contractors for the construction of such railway, together with a profit of twenty-five per centum on the gross expenditure so made by them.

The object of my amendment is very easily understood. As I take it, the desire of the Government in granting 25,000 acres of land per mile for the construction of this railway was to secure the contractors against the possibility of loss. In the country generally, there is a difference of opinion as regards the possibility of loss by the contractors, and the opinion generally prevailing is not only that this railway is bound to be successful but that there will be millions of money in it for the persons who are fortunate enough to have the contract for building the road and to have shares in the company that may afterwards be organized to carry it on. In fact there seems to be no doubt, except in the minds of the Government and the Government supporters, at all as to the ultimate success of this undertaking. In view of these circumstances and knowing well, from my intercourse with the public, as every other hon. gentleman must know, that the poorer classes of the country are prepared to risk an investment in this scheme, my desire is to give every man, woman and child in Canada the opportunity of benefiting by the existence and development of such a rich region as

the Klondike. If my amendment be adopted and these shares be issued at a dollar each, I have no hesitation in saying that before the first of May, not only \$10,000,000 but possibly \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 will be subscribed. It will then be the duty of the directors, or the provisional directors, to allot proportionately the shares at their disposal up to \$10,000,000. Should there be any deficiency, should for example only five million or six million dollars be subscribed, then the contractors will have the advantage, if the subscribers are not willing to take the difference between what is subscribed and the \$10,000,000 capital, of taking up the balance of the capital themselves or of floating it in England or the United States or anywhere else they may see fit. I think that the first opportunity should be given the public in general of the Dominion to benefit by the advantages of this Yukon district, and that only can be done by issuing the stock at such a price that every one may be able to subscribe without any great strain on his finances.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time, on division.

DUTY ON PETROLEUM.

Mr. MOORE moved :

That in the opinion of the House it would be in the interests of the farmers, labourers and the country generally, to reduce the customs duty upon imported refined petroleum for illuminating purposes to three cents per Imperial gallon, and also to further extend the right of importing such oil in tank cars.

He said: I desire to call the attention of hon. members of this House to this motion, which is similar to one I submitted last session. I do not make it for the purpose of embarrassing the Government in any way or to injure an industry which is also of much importance in this country. My whole object has been and is to make the oil cheaper and of better quality. There are two ways, as I look at it, in which this may be done—first, by reducing the duty, and, second, by cheapening the transportation and handling of the oil in Canada. If the duty were reduced to three cents a gallon, I believe, and I have pretty good testimony on the part of members on the other side of the House to support me, that the protection would be ample for any industry. I do not wish to press unduly my own opinion with regard to the excessiveness of the duty, but I beg leave to offer the testimony of some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. In the first place, the present hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, speaking in 1894, said that in 1877 coal oil was worth 20 cents per gallon, that seven and one-fifth cents per gallon upon that was only 30 per cent ad valorem. Now the same quality is sold at 3½ cents—which is nearly 200 per cent ad valorem. He characterized the duty paid in his locality as atrociously

unjust, and an intolerable tax upon every poor family. There was no industry in this country, he said, which could possibly justify such an enormous robbery under the shape of protection. Further, that the oil (Canadian) was not fit to use. The oil offered for sale in the maritime provinces was of a very inferior quality. There are other gentlemen who have given their testimony in this House upon this same point. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), speaking in 1894, claimed that reduction to 6 cents per gallon was not sufficient, and that the protection was too high. He said that five gallons were imported into the maritime provinces from abroad upon which duty is paid to one gallon of Canadian. He said the fact that a large majority of the consuming population, who represent people of moderate means, deliberately used five times as much imported as they used of oil of home production was irrefutable proof that the imported oil was intrinsically the better for all illuminating purposes. I have also the testimony of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who said that the duty struck the poorer classes and the farming community particularly. There were 1,000,000 families in Canada who used about 20 gallons each. The consumption would thus be about 20,000,000 gallons, on which a duty of 7½ cents would amount to \$1,400,000. The duty collected was \$430,000, leaving a balance of \$989,494 that went into the pockets of and was divided amongst the refiners of coal oil, or very near \$1,000,000 paid by the people last year (1893) to refiners in Petrolia. We have now Casey at the bat. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) said the tax was outrageously high. If we take the price of oil at 6 cents per gallon, a duty of 2 cents would be equal to 33½ per cent protection which would be a fair duty on the same lines as those given to great manufacturing industries of this country. It was going too far to ask Parliament to give this industry special protection for the benefit of the oil refiners, or even for the benefit of those who produce the crude oil. I shall say no more with regard to the excessiveness of the duty. I think I have shown by the opinions expressed by the leading gentlemen on the other side of the House what their opinion was a few years ago. They may say that the duty has been somewhat reduced since that time. But if, as the present hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated, it was 200 per cent ad valorem, when the duty was seven and one-fifth cents per gallon, the reduction to 5 cents per gallon, would leave it to 149 per cent ad valorem at the present time. There is another point, the quality of the oil. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, speaking on this subject in 1894, said :

The hon. gentlemen, whose olfactory organs do not have to submit to the stench from this oil, gentlemen who can afford to use electric

lights or gas, are astonished that anybody should hesitate to burn stinking oil. I do not think the poor people should be insulted in this way. Their olfactories are as good as the hon. gentleman's, and while they have not the privilege of using gas and electric lights as he has, neither have they the fine salary which enables him to enjoy these luxuries. No man would buy it who can avoid it.

Those hon. gentlemen to-day are occupying the position that he mentioned in this respect, and the same objection may be now raised against them that they made at that time with regard to the use of poor oil. Now, since the responsibility rests upon them, what are they going to do about it? I need not read all the testimony I have in my possession, which is very voluminous. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House have stated that the oil is not what it should be. I have read the statement made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) and one or two others. I will now read the testimony of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor):

The Lord has evidently made a mistake in giving the people coal oil in Canada—because for twenty years we have been taxing it. Taxing oils is one of the worst ways in the world to raise a revenue. The hon. gentleman need not think that this duty will compel the people to use Canadian oil. I never had more than one or two gallons of it in my house, and it smelt so badly that I thought there must be a dozen polecats about my yard. I don't want any more of it.

All this is testimony that has been given in this House, and as some hon. gentlemen may say that there is not a word of truth in it, I will make this statement here without fear of successful refutation, that there has not been one gallon of Canadian oil, until very recently, ever used in this country that will compare with the oil of the United States. I state that without fear of contradiction, for I have dealt in oil myself for over twenty-five years, and I have never seen, until within a short time, any oil refined in this country that would compare in quality with the oil imported from the United States. But I am happy to say that within a few weeks I have seen some oil claimed to be made in refineries in Sarnia, which does come somewhere near the oil manufactured in the United States. If we are able to secure that quality of oil in Canada, I would not so strongly object to the duty being retained, seeing that good oil can be furnished to the consumers in Canada. Now, if the Government desire to retain the duty in order to produce a revenue, if they desire to retain the duty as it stands to-day in order to protect an industry which I believe deserves protection, to protect an industry in which is invested a large amount of money in this country, I can point out a way, a very easy way, by which the price of oil may be reduced to some extent, and at the same time be made to pro-

Mr. MOORE.

duce a revenue without taking protection away from the industry. We have only to follow the example of the people of the United States, who are transporting oil throughout the length and breadth of their country in tank cars, and from tank cars the oil is taken in tank wagons and other vehicles and distributed to the retail dealers and consumers. In this way they save the price of the barrel, the price of the inspection of the barrel, and the price of the duty on the barrel, all of which amounts to 3 cents per gallon. In that way, if the Government would make such regulations as would enable the oil to be transported from the refineries in Petrolea and Sarnia through this country in tank cars, and from them to be distributed in tank wagons to the dealers, we can save the cost of barrelling, and thus reduce the cost of the oil by 3 cents a gallon without injury to the revenue in any manner whatever, and without injuring the industry, but rather helping it. If you go to Montreal to the dealers in oil, you will find that they are prepared to-day to lay down oil in Montreal in tank cars at 3 cents a gallon less than in barrels. There is no difficulty that I can see why the Government should not make such regulations regarding the inspection of oil as will result in giving the people of this country oil 3 cents a gallon less than they are paying for it now, and without touching the revenue in any manner whatever. Therefore, I feel that the consumers in this country have a strong claim upon the Government in this respect. If they do not see fit to reduce the duty on account of the revenue or for fear of injuring the industry, they can help the industry and help the consumers to get good oil, and get it at 3 cents a gallon less than they are paying to-day. Now, having called the attention of the Government to this matter, I trust they will look into it and make such regulations as will enable this oil to be distributed throughout the country in tank wagons and in tank vehicles the same as it is in the United States, by which the people of that country get their oil 3 or 4 cents a gallon less than they would in the ordinary way. That is all I have to say upon this important question, which I now leave before the Government and before the House. As I said in first place, I have no desire to injure this industry nor to embarrass the Government, nor do I desire to appear inconsistent before this House, who well know my opinions in regard to the tariff and in regard to the principle of protection. I do not think that I am abandoning anything of my principles in regard to protection when I favour a reduction of the duty on an article which I think is excessive. I am in favour of placing a duty on everything that comes into this country to compete with the manufacturers of this country, in a way that will give

the control of our Canadian markets to the Canadian producers, and at the same time reduce the cost of the article to the consumer. I believe we can find that happy mean in regard to this matter by giving fair and reasonable protection to this industry and at the same time reducing the cost of the oil to the consumer, by making the regulations which I have suggested. I would like, however, to amend this motion by adding the words, "and distributing the oil in tank wagons and other vehicles."

Mr. BEATTIE. It is already distributed in tank cars.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to amend his own motion.

Mr. MOORE. In reply to the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie), I admit they have a right to distribute it in tank cars, but they cannot do it in tank wagons.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I think it is not desirable that the House should take up a separate and distinct item of the tariff in the manner proposed by the hon. gentleman. The tariff has to be considered in a general way, and to select a particular item and to challenge a vote upon it, I think is not expedient. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

MOTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I expected a debate to come on on agricultural implements, and was not in the House when the motions standing in my name were called. If the House does not object, I would like to make my motions now. They are motions upon which I am not going to speak, one refers to the Dominion Veterinary Inspector and the other to employees on the Welland Canal. They are motions for returns.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). They can be moved on Monday.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Toronto and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RAILWAY EXTENSION COMPANY.

Mr. ELLIS moved second reading of Bill (No. 78) respecting the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I observe the Bill is not printed in French, and I ask that it be allowed to stand, according to the rules of the House.

Mr. ELLIS. I trust no such objection will be taken by my hon. friend, because all the other private Bills on the Order paper occupy the same position. The hon. gentleman can understand it in English.

Mr. DOMVILLE. This Bill requires consideration, and I do not wish it to be proceeded with now. The hon. member for St. John has charge of it, and no doubt the Bill will recommend itself eventually to the favour of the House. Meanwhile, hon. members should have an opportunity to consider it. There are certain facts that, in my opinion, should be presented in connection with it.

Mr. SPROULE. The custom followed has been, that when private Bills are printed in English, they are allowed to receive their second readings, and are then sent to committee. It is very unfortunate that the hon. gentleman should raise this technical objection, when all he seeks can be accomplished in committee, and especially is it unfortunate when objection has not been taken by any hon. member who does not understand the language in which the Bill is printed.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I have raised the point, and I ask your ruling on it, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. ELLIS. I trust the hon. member will not press his objection. This is purely a formal stage, and the Bill can be discussed fully in committee.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I will withdraw my objection, in order to meet the desire of the hon. member for St. John.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

BETTER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest. He said: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, there are members in this House who would deem it proper for me to offer an apology for having so often taken up the time of the House in presenting this measure, and it will no doubt be made the sub-

ject of cheap witticisms, and the promoter will be treated with the usual characteristic terms, as a crank, a seeker after notoriety, and so forth. Those, however, who have followed the discussion of this Bill, and who are familiar with the treatment that it and kindred measures have received at the hands of this House, will hardly accuse the promoter of being a notoriety hunter or seeker after popularity; and I always feel, when rising to advocate this measure, that I am doing so under discouraging and depressing circumstances, and that I am presenting a measure to an unsympathetic House. I have continued to press the measure because I consider the presentation of this case and the urging of the propriety of the passage of this legislation as a public duty. In doing this, I always feel as did a certain teacher of old, when he was presenting a certain doctrine to which he was firmly attached and in which he firmly believed, that it is a "stumbling block to the Jews and foolishness to the Greeks." But nevertheless, I feel it my duty to continue to press this measure, believing no measure is brought before this House, no measure is seeking the consideration of the people, that is more important to the well-being of Canada than the measure I rise to advocate to-night; and I am glad I have not been deterred by the circumstances, which are so depressing and unfavourable, from continuing to discharge what I believe to be a duty.

The interest of this House would be easily aroused, Mr. Speaker, if we were considering a grant of a few thousand dollars, if we were considering the imposition of a tax of one or two cents on tea, or if we were considering an increased tax on petroleum, or some matter of that kind. The House would see that it was a question that deserved its consideration, and it would arouse on each side of the House warm discussion and elicit warm expressions of opinion as to the propriety of the proposed measure; but when we come to the discussion of a measure which involves the deepest of all moral influences, a measure which has to do with the future of this country, a measure which may to some extent, even to a large extent, shape the destinies of this country, not for the present alone, but for future generations, that measure, far-reaching in its scope, great in its influence, is a measure which has heretofore received scanty consideration at the hands of the Canadian House of Commons. We are building in this country a nation. We have vast resources; Providence has given us all natural resources necessary for a mighty power. We have a broad area of arable lands, great natural resources of all kinds, a vigorous people; we have a good constitution and good laws, and it certainly is a matter of great importance, what shape shall be given to the future of this young country which promises to be inhabited by a great people. It is in that view of the case that I present

Mr. CHARLTON.

this matter to-night. I present it asking: what the foundations of the future of this country shall be, asking whether we shall consider it worth our while to make provisions that shall secure the highest interests of the state; that shall give to us such a promise, as we alone can derive from respect of moral obligations and the better foundations of human life; whether we shall consider a question of that kind of sufficient importance to engage our attention, and whether we shall be able to dismiss this spirit of levity and this spirit of carping and caviling, and attributing to the promoters of such a measure the motives that are attributed to them in dealing with this great question.

The state, of course, has nothing to do with the establishment of religion; with regulations as to what form of religion the people shall observe, as to what religious opinion shall be, as to whether the people shall be religious or the reverse. That does not come within the scope of the functions of the state; nevertheless, those who are charged with the duty of framing the laws and administering the laws of the country cannot close their minds to the fact that the moral and religious character of the people has very much indeed to do with the interests of the state, and that whatever may indirectly, or directly for that matter, promote a high moral standard of respect for Christianity and respect for the truth, is something that is of importance in laying the foundation of the state, something that is of more importance than the ordinary political issues of the day. Irreligion, vice, disregard of moral obligations; all these are forces that militate directly and powerfully against the interests of the state; all these are influences that it is the duty of the Government to discountenance, that it is the duty of the Government to minimize the influence of so far as it may be possible for it to do so. The kind of a nation that we naturally desire to establish here on the northern half of the American continent, is a nation whose institutions shall be founded in truth and in justice; and a nation whose institutions shall be of a character that shall promise to be enduring. Such institutions can only be secured by attention to the immutable principles of truth, to the immutable principles of justice; such institutions can only be perpetuated, and conserved, and preserved by a citizenship that is not capable of being swayed by base and mercenary and corrupt motives. To perpetuate such institutions, if they are once established, requires a citizenship of a high order, a citizenship where the citizens respect their obligations and are virtuous, and such citizenship can be secured only by a proper attention to the influences that legislation may bring to bear upon the people of the country.

Now, in a general sense—although I am not dealing particularly to-night with this

question of Sunday rest—in a general sense, Sir, the Government is entitled to deal with the question of Sunday rest, not because it is a religious observance—although of course I would yield to no man in my devotion to a principle, because it was a religious principle—the Government is entitled to deal with it, I say, not because it is a religious observance or is inculcated by religious precepts, but because it is in the highest sense a civil right. The labourer is entitled to his weekly day of rest. I believe it is one of the highest of the privileges that devolve upon him, and it is his by natural and by Divine right; and any measure, any usage, any influence that is calculated to deprive the labourer of the exercise of this civil right is one which attacks the foundation of liberty in one sense, one which deprives a very large class of our population of the exercise of a right which in many cases can only be secured to them by the operation of civil law.

The Bill, Mr. Speaker, which I present tonight, contains one of the four clauses which was embodied in a similar Bill presented on previous occasions to the House of Commons. The Bill last session, and for two or three sessions previously, embodied four principles. First, it required the closing of the canals upon the Lord's Day; second, it prohibited the publication of Sunday newspapers; third, it sought so far as was practical to minimize the amount of railway traffic on that day, and fourth, it prohibited excursions by rail on Sunday. One of these clauses of the Bill was accepted by this House and passed on one occasion. It received the endorsement of the late Premier of the Dominion (Sir John Thompson); it received the endorsement of the present Premier of this Dominion (the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). And, Sir, in deciding what the character of the Bill should be which was to be presented this session, I arrived at the conclusion that it was better to take that portion of the Bill which was accepted and which would likely be accepted, than to fight the battle again with the doubtful prospect of securing the other objects of the measure. In regard to the closing of canals on the Lord's Day, I am happy to say that there is no room at present; there has been no room in the past for complaint on that score. The Government has voluntarily done what the Bill required, and perhaps it is unnecessary to ask for legal enactment upon a point where no present necessity exists for its operation. The third section is with regard to railway traffic—and perhaps that was a matter of less importance than the section under consideration, because I believe that the managers of our great railway corporations in Canada, so far as they are able to do, avoid Sunday labour. There is a class of traffic which they are incapable of controlling, a class of traffic which the previous Bill did not attempt to control; that is through traffic.

These companies receive freight traffic from the American lines and in order to compete with other American through lines they must do as other American through lines do. The same applies to through passenger traffic and the Bill did not propose, and it would not be practical to attempt to restrict these roads in their freight operations and their passenger operations that are made in connection with continental lines. **The Bill only proposed before to operate in the line of restricting local business, with the proviso that when the United States passed enactments with regard to their through business, our laws should be made to correspond with that legislation. This feature has been dropped, as well as the provision with regard to excursions by rail; and the Bill now contains just the one clause with regard to Sunday newspapers. This clause was re-cast last year by the Minister of Justice, and it received the sanction of the Solicitor General of this Dominion, and I believe, was satisfactory to the Premier. As it is brief, I shall read it; it is as follows:**

Every one is guilty of an offence and liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars and costs for the first offence, and not exceeding one hundred dollars and costs for each subsequent offence, and in default of payment to one month's imprisonment, who,—

(a.) Being the proprietor, publisher or manager of any newspaper, publishes or issues, or prepares for publication or issue, any copy or number of such newspaper for sale on Sunday, or with the intent that such copy or number shall be sold on Sunday; or

(b.) Sells or employs or procures any person to sell any newspaper on Sunday;

Provided that the publishing or issuing or preparing for publication or issue of any copy or number of a religious newspaper for distribution on Sunday, or with the intent that it shall be distributed on Sunday, shall not be an offence under this section.

2. The word "newspaper" in this section has the same meaning as it has under paragraph (p1) of section 3, in the sections relating to defamatory libel.

3. No prosecution for an offence against this section shall be commenced after the expiration of one month from the commission of such offence.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the provision that is submitted in this Bill to the consideration of this House—a provision against the publication of Sunday newspapers. Now, Sir, the Sunday newspaper so far as we have practical knowledge of it, is not a crying evil in Canada. Such Sunday newspapers as have been published in this country are not of an objectionable character, further than lies in the fact that they have been issued on Sunday. But the time was in the United States when the Sunday newspaper there, in the character of the paper itself, was as little liable to objection as it is in Canada, in the few instances in which we have Sunday papers published at the present time. But in the United States it has proved to be a growing evil, and it has become

after the lapse of a few years an evil of enormous magnitude. The Sunday newspaper in the United States furnishes us with a practical example of what it is likely to become here, and furnishes us, if we will examine into the question, with all the reasons we require for taking action against the establishment in Canada of this curse—for in the United States it has proved to be nothing less. The Sunday newspaper in the United States was at first a very decorous kind of journal. It gave one or two columns of religious homily and religious reading matter; but it gradually degenerated, it soon become most objectionable in its character, and it was very properly designated by Horace Greeley, the great American editor, as a social demon. To-day, after the evolution of this evil to its present dimensions, we find that there are nearly a thousand Sunday newspapers published in the United States, that perhaps ninety per cent of these papers are the reverse of respectable, that more than half of them are positively vile, that they exercise a most pernicious influence upon public taste and public morals, that they are the natural parent of that sensational "yellow journalism" which is the disgrace of that country, that they lead gradually to a depraved and vitiated taste on the part of the reading public—a trivial, immoral, superficial taste—and that they are sworn enemies and potent foes of solid literature as well as of religious truth. Their effect upon the public taste is most disastrous, and their effect upon the national life is to degrade it. The national life of the United States is being rapidly degraded. Those who are familiar with the condition of society in the United States to-day, and who contrast it with the condition of society in that country thirty years ago, must be struck, and painfully struck, with the lamentable change that has taken place in that country. The influences that are at work, largely attributable to the Sunday newspaper, are degrading and demoralizing that nation, and rapidly dragging it down. The character of the press is something which, in itself gives an unerring indication of the character of the public taste. Of the majority of American newspapers, no man would dream of asserting that they occupy a respectable standing or that they are respectable literary journals, and their effect upon literary taste is shown in the character of the literature of the country. The great authors of the United States have passed away with the introduction of the Sunday newspaper. We have no longer Longfellow, or Whittier, or Bryant, or Holland as poets; no longer historians of the rank of Motley, Bancroft or Prescott, no longer writers of the rank of Washington Irving. These were men who lived and wrote before the debasing and demoralizing influence of the Sunday newspaper curse had been introduced into the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Now, this is a question having a practical bearing upon the national life of a country. The Sunday newspaper curse in the United States is bearing most disastrous fruits, and scarcely the first crop has yet been reaped. It is a curse which degrades even the religious life of a country. Those who are familiar with the operations of this evil, who are familiar with the character of this literature, must necessarily take the most pessimistic view of the future of that country; and, Sir, if we wish to build up in Canada a great healthy, virile, virtuous state, there is no precaution that can be taken, that is so urgently demanded by the danger that threatens, as the necessary precaution of prohibiting the introduction of this literary and moral curse into this country.

This matter, Mr. Speaker, is a proper subject for adverse legislation, because the Sunday newspaper is the foe of all religious restraint. The Sunday newspaper is itself a violation of God's law, an impious defiance of God's law; and a newspaper with such an inspiration, must necessarily, and does, denounce and defame everything that has a divine nature or a divine sanction. It belittles it; it casts ridicule upon it; it opposes every influence in the country that is of a religious character, or that calls for religious restraint, and any law that tends to promote moral objects and secure the observance of moral obligations. It is, I repeat, the foe of religious restraint. It weakens and destroys in a great measure moral purpose on the part of those who are the habitual readers of the objectionable kinds of Sunday newspapers. It is an attack upon the moral law comprehended in the Ten Commandments, one of which is, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." The Sunday newspaper is an attack upon the moral law from beginning to end—a direct attack upon the Fourth Commandment, and an inferential attack upon all the others. It lowers the status of religious life in the nation; it begets disregard of all moral principle and obligation; and it flouts its influence in the face of divine restraint and the divine commands. It poisons the literature of the nation. Not only does it degrade the character of the newspaper press, not only is its legitimate child the yellow journal, but it degrades the literary taste of the nation from top to bottom, from the spring to the mouth of the stream. As I said a few moments ago, the day of great authors in the United States seems to be passed. The day of poets, historians and writers who gave character to American literature has waned, and in their place has come the Sunday newspaper and the yellow journal and sensational literature, and everything calculated to debase the taste of the people and make them frivolous, immoral, sensational and superficial in the tastes they possess and the pursuits they follow. It begets contempt for the re-

quirements of the higher law, and any nation the mass of whose people pay no attention to the higher law, who disregard and belittle its requirements, is a nation which stands in danger of meeting with serious disasters and of entering upon its decadence. This influence that leads directly and naturally to contempt for moral restraint, that laughs to scorn the precept that righteousness exalts a nation, that tramples upon everything which is true and religious and elevating in the national life, is certainly an influence that we do not, if we know our interests, wish to introduce into this country. For all these reasons, entertaining, as I do, the belief that if we are to establish in Canada a healthy, sound, progressive nationality, if we are to create and foster sentiments and habits of thought and moral action that will make this a great and vigorous and flourishing people, we must avoid the mistakes that are occurring under our eyes, we must realize the enormous injury that has been inflicted upon the United States by the Sunday newspaper curse; and if we are wise we will in good time, now and at once, apply the ounce of prevention, knowing very well that it will be impossible, in our case, as it is in theirs to-day, to apply the pound of cure. The best minds in the United States lament the existence of the Sunday newspaper, recognize fully the evils it has brought to pass, and express the desire to be rid of it, but the question is how. With the depraved tastes engendered by the publication of these newspapers, with the influence exerted by this Satanic press, with the downfall of moral sentiment, with the gradual breaking down of the national and moral perceptions of the country, the evil is one which cannot be grappled with; and if we wish to avoid falling ourselves into the same condition that exists in the United States to-day, now is the time to put on our Statute-book a law which shall prohibit the introduction of this curse into the country. I know there are newspaper men who do not take the view of the matter that I do, who may think that this will be a law calculated to injure their business, which will interfere with what is, in their assumption, their just rights, but if there are such—and my words can reach such gentlemen—I ask them to look at the question from a patriotic standpoint, to dismiss for the time being individual and personal interest, and to realize that the publishing of the Sunday newspaper is an influence the effect of which will be disastrous to the country. And acting from patriotic impulse, with the desire to secure the future good of Canada and avoid what will inevitably prove, to a greater or less extent, damaging to the country, I ask them to withdraw their opposition to this Bill, and ask the House to give its support to this Bill, which, I believe, is conceived in the best interests of Canada.

Mr. CRAIG. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is hardly just to this House in the remarks he made at the opening, when he talked about introducing this measure or bringing it to the attention of a non-sympathetic House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope so.

Mr. CRAIG. And that he is looked on as a crank for bringing this matter up over and over again, and that the circumstances are very depressing when he does bring it to the notice of the House, and that the Bill has received scant consideration. I wish to say that if the hon. gentleman is considered by any members of this House or people in this country as a crank for bringing this measure before the House, it is not on account of the measure itself, but it might be on account of the manner in which he introduces it, because I think sometimes that the speeches which the hon. gentleman has made in support of his Bill were not calculated to promote it as much as a very simple statement would be. No doubt, a great many speeches are made in this House for the benefit of the country; and as I listened to the hon. gentleman to-night and on previous occasions in introducing this Bill, I thought he was not talking to the members at all, but to the country.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I have never been so fortunate as to get a good report for the presenting of my remarks to the country.

Mr. CRAIG. I may say that while apparently a Bill of this nature does not excite the interest that a debate on such a measure as the Yukon Railway would, it is not because the members of this House, on either side, do not take an interest in this question. I would not do any member of this House the injustice of saying that he has not as much interest in the observance of the Sabbath as I have. As regards the hon. gentleman's complaint of scant consideration, over and over again a great deal of time has been spent in considering, not this Bill, but a longer Bill brought to the attention of the House, and I have always found, as no doubt we will now, that the great trouble about a Bill of this kind is to make it workable. It is more easy to have a desire that the Lord's Day shall be observed by everybody as a day of rest than to devise a law which shall apply to every part of this Dominion, without doing some injustice to some one. I agree with the hon. gentleman that this is an important question, though I cannot say that I concur in what he has said about the present condition of literature—that all the great poets have departed and none are living to-day, and that we shall have no more historians because of the Sunday newspapers. As the hon. gentleman was talking about poets, I was congr-

tulating myself that in this country at least we have a poet in the person of the Hon. George W. Ross, who has made himself illustrious by some poems, and I hope the Sunday newspaper will not come into this country and have the effect of depriving us of some of his outpourings.

I have talked with some authorities in this House on this question, and have been told that this is a matter especially for the provincial parliaments, and I was thinking it might not be out of the way for the hon. member for North Norfolk to have an interview with the Premier of Ontario (Mr. Hardy), and try his persuasive powers on that gentleman.

We remember that not long ago Mr. Hardy introduced a Bill in the provincial legislature at the request of those who, like the hon. member for North Norfolk himself, are strongly in favour of Sunday observance; but for some reason, on account of some pressure, this Bill was withdrawn at the last moment. I think if the hon. member for North Norfolk would stop talking to the country or to the members of this House and would just go to Toronto and talk with Mr. Hardy and use his influence with that gentleman, he would do more good than he is doing here. I believe from what I have learned that this matter is entirely a matter for the provincial legislatures. I do not pretend to be an authority on constitutional law, but I am sure if I gave my authority the hon. gentleman himself would say it was a good one. A gentleman who stands very high in the country, who used to be a member of this House, but is now a member of the Senate, told me on one occasion when I asked his opinion on these Bills, that they were matters for the provincial legislatures and not for this Parliament. I have noticed in the discussions on this Bill on previous sessions that while we may make a Bill that would work well in Ontario, it seemed to be impossible to make one that would work in Ontario and in British Columbia and in Quebec as well. If that is the case, why should we in this House not leave these matters to the provincial parliaments? They are representatives of the people quite as much as we are, and the matter is one that concerns them more directly than it concerns us, and is within their jurisdiction. If we find it so difficult to make a law here, I think the hon. gentleman should resign the position he has taken upon himself of advocating this measure every session and bring the matter before the attention of his friends in the Ontario legislature, and as to the other provinces, leave it to the governments of those several provinces. Before I sit down, I wish to remark upon one peculiar thing in this Bill. I notice that beginning at line 18, it says:

Provided that the publishing or issuing or preparing for publication or issue of any copy or number of a religious newspaper for distribution on Sunday, or with the intent that it shall be

Mr. CRAIG.

distributed on Sunday, shall not be an offence under this section.

I would not be in favour of making an exception of parties who prepare for publication or issue a religious newspaper on Sunday. I do not think that would be promoting Sabbath observance. I am opposed to printing newspapers on the Sabbath, whether religious or not, or whether to be given away or not. It might be an easy matter to make a newspaper a religious paper within the meaning of this section by printing a sermon of Talmage, which we find in many papers, and as to giving away papers, that can easily be done, where the receipts from advertising are sufficient. That clause, to my mind, is a very imperfect clause. I believe in the principle of this Bill; I believe Sunday newspapers are unnecessary; and if a workable Bill can be framed here and if we have the jurisdiction, I would be in favour of the measure. But I wish to say again that the hon. member for North Norfolk does great injustice to the entire membership of this House by trying to give the impression to the country that he, almost alone, stands in this House advocating Sunday observance measures, while all the other members are opposed to such measures or have no interest in the observance of the Lord's Day. While a great many members of this House say nothing on the question, I believe they take as much interest in it as the hon. member for North Norfolk. I am satisfied that if we have jurisdiction and if a workable Bill can be framed, hon. members will support it. I know that the hon. member for North Norfolk has sometimes been laughed at on account of the kind of speeches he has made, as they add little relevancy to the measure. They were essays on Sabbath observance and morals, but did not particularly relate to the subject before the House. I myself can bear testimony to the fact that any measure of this kind or any measure which is in the interest of the people always receives the attention, and the sympathetic attention, not of one or two members only but of all the members of the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must say I have been disappointed at the introductory remarks of the hon. member (Mr. Craig) who has just resumed his seat. I do not think he has shown the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the courtesy he has deserved at the hands of every well meaning man in the House who desires to see brought about reforms that we know are necessary, who desires to see the sacredness of the Lord's Day observed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) I have been informed, occupies now and then, a sacred desk, and lectures the people on their way of living; and yet, instead of encouraging the hon. member for North Norfolk in the course he has taken, for purely party purposes and to meet party

exigencies, he rises and tells the hon. member—

Mr. CRAIG. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether it is right for the hon. member to impute motives to me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid that the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) is going a little too far.

Mr. CRAIG. I just want to say that I have no thought of party in the matter—not the least.

Mr. McMULLEN. Though I felt justified by the course the hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) has taken in making the remark I did, as it is not in accordance with parliamentary rule, I shall not persist along this line.

Mr. CRAIG. Judge not.

Mr. McMULLEN. No ; I think the hon. member (Mr. Craig) would have gained the respect of the people outside the House—and that is what he says the hon. member for North Norfolk is seeking—had he not attempted to belittle the praiseworthy efforts the hon. member for North Norfolk has made, session after session, in this House on behalf of this Bill. We all know that we are living alongside a populous nation that is unquestionably suffering because of the open desecration of the Lord's Day. And as the hon. member for North Norfolk has said the condition of things in the United States grows worse rather than better. Sunday newspapers are sold at the church doors giving a record of the transactions of the week, the markets, sports, amusements of all kinds, causing great demoralization throughout the country. I do think that it is our duty to benefit from the lesson that their experience teaches ; and I give the hon. member for North Norfolk praise for the noble efforts he has made, session after session, to preserve this country from the same influences that are causing so much injury in the neighbouring nation. Now my hon. friend (Mr. Craig) says that he thinks the local legislature is the proper place to introduce a Bill of this kind. It may be. I do not know whether the jurisdiction of two parliaments has been so clearly and well defined as to show whether a Bill of this kind comes within the duty of the local legislature or within the duty of this Parliament. Certainly the power must rest somewhere, and if this House can legislate, it is quite right that it should be called upon to do so, and the hon. member for North Norfolk is quite in his place in introducing this Bill and pressing it upon the consideration of the House from session to session. When we approach the consideration of a great moral question of this kind, I did hope to see on both sides of the House a spirit of true patriotism and an honest desire to safeguard and improve the morals and the general condition and Christian standing of our

people. I think we should not permit ourselves to get into a petty spirit of partyism in discussing these questions ; we should do it on broad lines and in the best interests of the people. I did not intend to say anything on this question ; I have spoken on it before. I want simply to say now that I am in hearty accord with the hon. member for North Norfolk in the course he has taken, and I was exceedingly sorry to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman who last took his seat. I thought, indeed, they were in very bad taste on his part.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think I can say that I am as much in favour of the moral code as the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill. I think I am as much in favour of upholding the teachings of Christianity generally as the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill ; but, Mr. Speaker, I think we can enforce those principles much better than by using the Criminal Code to enforce them in this country. You do not promote Christianity, you do not promote morality, by putting in the Criminal Code any trifling violation of the moral law. My hon. friend ought rather to adopt sunny methods, if he wishes to promote things of that kind. But simply to cover them with the Criminal Code, and to bring every one within the scope of that code, is, to my mind, the least effectual way of promoting the morals of the people. The hon. gentleman's speech has been—why ? Nothing but a mass of false reasons. He has mixed up his major and minor premises, and in every case his conclusion was wrong. He says, that the production of a Sunday newspaper is an evil, and he proposes to interfere with the production of Sunday newspapers and to make that a crime. Sir, to my mind, it is the reading of Sunday newspapers that is a crime, if anything in that connection is a crime. It is the people who read the Sunday newspapers and who are becoming demoralized by that reading, who ought to be corrected and who ought to be brought within the scope of the Criminal Code. If it is bad to read a newspaper on Sunday, or a newspaper produced on Sunday, a fortiori, it is bad to read these newspapers produced through six days of the week. Surely, if a newspaper is bad one day, it must be bad all days. When the Sunday car battle was fought out in Toronto, the argument finally resolved itself into that shape. A man who denied people their Sunday cars, who said it was immoral, that it led people to beer gardens and all that kind of thing, when he was asked to prove it, could not prove it, because, if its true of the Sunday car or the Sunday newspaper, it is also true of the week-day car and of the week-day newspaper. The newspapers are the production of the people. The press does not make the people, but I contend that the people make the press ; and if the people of the United States are demoralized to-day, it is not because of their newspapers, but

the newspapers are demoralized by the people who read them. Now, I am not going to question the good faith of the hon. gentleman in this matter, but it is a very peculiar thing that he is constantly championing American institutions and of people who have American interests of one kind or another. I can appeal to the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary), I can appeal to all the hon. gentlemen who represent constituencies anywhere between the Niagara frontiers and Detroit, and the city of Toronto, if it is not a fact that there is a growing increase in the circulation of American Sunday papers in all Ontario, west of Toronto. They come in there on Sunday by the Sunday trains, and they are distributed at all the stations, and the people are reading them. I do not wish to misconstrue the hon. gentleman's intention in this matter, but judging by his past, I believe that this is an argument of his to advance the sale of American Sunday newspapers in the province of Ontario.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would not this law put an end to that evil?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, law will not reach that evil, and I do not see how he can frame any law that will reach the evil. Now, speaking of law, what are the facts? I believe the Minister of Justice, in the other House, will tell the hon. gentleman, he will tell the Senate, if it ever reaches that body, that this Parliament is not the place to deal with this question, but that the provincial legislatures are the proper places to deal with this question. But the provincial legislatures have found that they have gone too far on this Sunday question. Even in Puritan Ontario, if I must so characterize my native province, they have found they have gone too far. When Mr. Hardy attempted to make a more stringent Sunday law, some months ago, he was waited upon by the most representative delegation that ever came to the parliament building at Toronto, to protest against a too stringent Sunday law. I can appeal to my hon. friends who come from the province of Quebec, to say whether they want this legislature to dictate to them what should be their Sabbath observance in that province. I believe the members from Quebec, and the people of Quebec, think that they are in every sense competent to deal with this question in their own province. I can also appeal to my hon. friends from British Columbia, if it is not a fact that they would prefer to deal with this question in that province themselves. Now, in British Columbia they do have Sunday newspapers, they have papers there printed on Sunday morning to avoid printing them on Monday morning, and I give the people of that province credit for really observing the moral law in that respect; because it is the Monday paper that violates the Sunday law. A Sunday paper is produced on Saturday by Saturday night work, the only Sun-

Mr. MACLEAN.

day connection with it is the distribution on Sunday morning, and if there is any evil in connection with it, it is in reading the paper during Sunday. It is the people that the hon. gentleman ought to try and reach, and not the party who distributes the paper. But the Monday morning paper is produced by Sunday labour, by the labour of writers, by the labour of reporters, by the labour of printers and pressmen, on Sunday; and if you really wish to uphold the moral law, if you really wish to give every man his Sunday day of rest, you ought to prohibit the publication of Monday morning papers. In that way alone can you reach the object the hon. gentleman has in view. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to say much more on this subject. It is rather painful to have to stand up here and to vindicate the civil rights and civil liberties of the people of this country, because my action in this matter may be entirely misconstrued. The hon. gentleman says he is trying to protect the civil rights of the people. I say I am standing up for the civil liberties of the people of this country in resisting the endeavour of the hon. gentleman. I give the hon. gentleman credit for being honest in the desire to bring the people of this country within the scope of the Criminal Code, but I say he is going about it in the wrong way. If he really desires to effect a reform in this way, if he desires to respect the constitution of this country, if he desires to respect the opinion of the people in their capacity as citizens of a province, he will not attempt to override what are really their constitutional privileges, but he will go to the province of Ontario, for instance, where he can succeed, if anywhere. But I tell him, that the attempt was made a few weeks ago to introduce an over-stringent law in the province of Ontario, and it failed ignominiously. I shall have no hesitation in voting against the Bill of the hon. gentleman, because I believe it is wrong in principle, it is a violation of our constitutional privileges, and it will not effect any good purpose, by reason of the fact that it makes something a crime which ought never to be constituted a crime.

The PRIME MINISTER. Whatever may be the merit of the Bill, my hon. friend who introduced it will be the first to admit that it has certainly not the merit of novelty. My hon. friend has been most persistent during the last ten years or so in bringing a similar measure to the attention of the House session after session. The Bill has been constantly amended from year to year, and now it is very different from what it was when the hon. gentleman first introduced it. My hon. friend has been charged not exactly with playing to the gallery, but with speaking to the country. I do not know that this is a crime on the floor of Parliament; and perhaps if I were to put a question to the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) himself, I would ask

him if he would be the first man to cast the stone at my hon. friend for speaking to the country. I presume he will admit he would not be the only hon. member, for I suppose we all would admit that when we rise in this House we are, more or less, talking to the country, and when the benches are empty, as they are at the present time, if we did not talk to the country it would be scarcely worth while talking at all. My hon. friend will admit, I am sure, that the Bill, such as it is now, is one which is not all devoid of merit, let whatever may be the views hon. gentlemen hold, whether peculiar views or not, as to Sunday observance. The Bill is restricted to a single feature, and one alone, and it is, as now presented to the House, simply to prevent the selling of newspapers on the Lord's day—that is to say, to prevent little boys going about the streets of a city and peddling their newspapers as they do on week days. That is the only question now dealt with by the hon. gentleman in introducing this Bill. It is not a question whether Sunday newspapers are good or bad. If I were to speak my own mind I would say there are newspapers that are not good to read on week days, not to speak of Sunday—and I do not mean to be personal in making that statement; but every day of my life I read newspapers which I think I would have been just as well off not to have read, nevertheless it is part of my business to read them. The question is not whether or not the papers issued on Sunday are of the class styled "yellow papers" or not. The question is simply whether the sale of newspapers on Sunday should be allowed any more than the sale of anything else on Sunday. According to the laws which prevail in all Christian nations, and among others in this nation, the sale of anything is prohibited on the Lord's Day. The same feature is introduced into this Bill, and the sale of newspapers is made an offence the same as the sale of anything else on the Lord's Day. It may be said, and said with some truth, that this is hardly a question which comes within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. For my part I think there is great force in this contention, and if I were to express my own personal view I would not hesitate to say that this is a question that had better be relegated to the provinces, there to be dealt with. But a year or so ago this question was brought before the House. Since I have taken the position I now occupy, I have thought it advisable on a question of this kind to follow the precedent laid down by Sir John Thompson. Sir John Thompson was an eminent authority, as eminent an authority as we ever had on these matters, and he thought it advisable when a similar measure was introduced to adopt the principle of the Bill; and he adopted the principle, that the criminal code could be amended so as to bring the selling of newspapers on Sunday within the provisions

of the criminal law. I thought the House should act on the doctrine laid down by this eminent authority, and that is the reason why I am prepared to adopt this measure, otherwise not. But the House having decided three or four years ago, on the suggestion of Sir John Thompson, to adopt the principle of the Bill, I do not see why we should go back on the record we have established in regard to this Bill. That is the only reason why I support it. I wish to call the attention of the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) to the fact that he objects to the very provision which I think makes this Bill acceptable. My hon. friend, if I understood him correctly, took objection to this provision:

Provided that the publishing or issuing or preparing for publication, or issue of any copy or number of a religious newspaper for distribution on Sunday, or with the intent that it shall be distributed on Sunday, shall not be an offence under this section.

I think this provision should be in any such legislation as is proposed, because we know, whatever may be the views we entertain in regard to the observance of the Lord's Day, that in our age and under the conditions of our present civilization, every one expects to have his newspaper on his breakfast table on Monday morning, and he cannot have his newspaper on Monday morning unless work is done some time during the Sabbath. All newspapers published in the civilized world are obliged to open their doors some time during the evening of the Lord's Day; and this provision is introduced to protect them and to prevent this act being made an offence.

Mr. HUGHES. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. If not framed in this way, the section ought to be so framed. I do not conceive that this Bill is to restrict the sale of the Sunday newspaper, I do not know any definition of the Sunday newspaper; but I would take out the word "Sunday," and make it applicable to all newspapers sold on Sunday. Surely the hon. gentleman does not pretend that the fact that the newspaper publisher is obliged to open his workshop on Sunday evening in order to issue his paper on Monday, should constitute an offence.

Mr. HUGHES. I believe in the greatest freedom in this matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. For my part I agree with the principle of the Bill, that freedom should not involve the sale of newspapers on Sunday. I think the sale should be restricted as is provided in the Bill, but the preparation of the newspaper for Monday morning should not be prohibited. This is the view I take of this legislation, and if it is not so, the Bill should be amended in committee so as to make it possible that newspapers could be issued on Monday, but prohibit the sale of newspapers

on Sunday. If the Bill goes into committee, I hold it should be amended in that way. This is a measure on which the Government have no opinion, and I simply express my own view of the matter.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). I do not desire to present anything in the nature of an argument in favour of the Bill, but I rise simply for the purpose of stating that I am entirely in accord with my hon. friend who has presented this measure to the House. The arguments in its favour I apprehend have been fully and ably presented by my hon. friend. The question of what may or may not be done on Sunday, such as the running of street cars and similar occurrences, has given rise in the Dominion and elsewhere to very lengthy discussions, and having followed these discussions pretty carefully from time to time, whatever arguments may have been presented in favour of other things. I have never seen any reasonable argument advanced in favour of the publishing of Sunday newspapers; and because I think the press of Canada at the present time, with all its faults, is a press of which Canadians have reason to be proud. I hold we should do whatever is possible to preserve and improve its high status, I have much pleasure in giving my support to the Bill. So far as regards the legal aspect, I have no doubt the provisions of the Bill are substantially within the power of Parliament to pass. Whether we should exercise the power is entirely a different question from the question whether we possess the power. No doubt we possess the power in this Parliament to declare that the publishing of Sunday newspapers shall be considered an offence against the criminal code. For my part I am in favour of that declaration being made. I therefore have very much pleasure in expressing my support of the Bill.

Mr. **WOOD** (Brockville). I am not quite as confident as is my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) in regard to the existence of a law which justifies the sale of newspapers on Sunday. If, as a matter of fact, it is a violation of the law to sell any of the articles mentioned by the First Minister—and undoubtedly it is a violation of the law to do that—then it is a violation of the law to sell a newspaper. Does any member of this House, whether he be a lawyer or a layman pretend, that you cannot sell a bushel of potatoes or a bushel of corn on Sunday, but you can sell any number of newspapers. Why amend the law at all and why not leave the vendor of newspapers in the same category as others who violate the Lord's Day. I am not justifying any one who undertakes to sell newspapers on Sunday, but on the contrary I say that the vendor of newspapers on Sunday should be punished just as well as the vendor of any other commodity. I do not see why newspaper publishers or newspaper vendors should have the right

Sir **WILFRID LAURIER**.

to violate the Lord's Day Act any more than any other class of people.

Mr. **MACLEAN**. They are always fined in Ontario if they violate the law. In that province we have a sufficient law to cover the case, and they have never violated the Lord's Day Act by selling newspapers on Sunday without their being punished for it. They were punished and they gave it up.

Mr. **WOOD** (Brockville). The First Minister is quite right when he says there should be no difference made between the preparation for the issue of the Sunday secular newspaper and any other newspaper. There is no definition in the law which would point out a distinction between a religious newspaper and a secular newspaper. To my mind this whole legislation is unnecessary. I believe the law as it is now provides amply for every remedy that is required in every possible respect, and with regard to the question of jurisdiction, I am not so confident as the Minister of the Interior, as to the jurisdiction of this Parliament to go one step in this direction. We have the right to declare here what shall be a crime; we have the right to say that something heretofore considered not a crime shall be considered as a crime for the future; but I say that this legislation is not necessary, because the object of the promoter of the Bill has in view, viz., to punish vendors of newspapers, is now an offence. Hence it is that whilst I have no objection whatever to any amendment of the law which would make that position any clearer, I really do not see where the necessity for any legislation comes in upon this subject.

Mr. **HUGHES**. I was not in the House when the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) moved the first reading of this Bill, but I have heard his speech on other occasions and I presume his arguments to-night were nearly the same. I have failed to hear from him, and I have failed to hear from the lips of any one in the Dominion of Canada, that there is any demand for such a law as this. I have travelled over this country a great deal on Sundays, and I presume that newspapers and books will always be sold in book stalls and hotels just the same as chewing gum and candies. No law which the hon. gentleman may enact will prevent that going on. As the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) has pointed out, there has been no violation of this law proved to the House. In every city in the Dominion of Canada, fruit and cigar stores are open on Sundays and there is no attempt to punish these people because it is looked upon as an ordinary custom and as something that is not immoral. In many places even provision stores are open, and yet my worthy friend (Mr. Charlton) does not seek to enforce the law which I presume is on the Statute-book against the selling of candies and groceries

on Sunday. The sale of newspapers on Sunday is amply covered by the provincial laws as they stand at the present time. The hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) pointed out one most important matter, and that is, that under the Bill as it now stands, the sale of Yankee newspapers on the railways and in hotels is not proscribed. It reaches only Canadian newspapers. There is another respect in which I consider the Bill is misleading. If it is wrong to set type for the Toronto "World," or the "Globe," or the "Mail" on Sunday, it is equally wrong to set type for the "Christian Guardian." It does not make one particle of difference to the man who sets the type whether it is a religious newspaper or not, and if it is an immoral act in one instance it is equally an immoral act in the other. This Bill is an attempt to legislate people into being moral, and the history of the world has shown that that is an absolute impossibility.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is no law at present which accomplishes the object of this Bill, I cannot see any reason in the world why we should not put one on the Statute-book. It has been said over and over again in this House that the law already reaches the offence of selling newspapers on Sunday and provides a punishment therefor, and if that be the case I can see no necessity for duplicating the enactment because that only results in confusion. If it be not the case, then so far as my judgment goes this Bill is unobjectionable. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has introduced his measure for a great many years, and he has narrowed it down from year to year until it is confined solely to one subject to-day. It is very plain and very simple. It may be that some other law specifies penalties for the same offence, and if it does so conflict there is no object in the Bill, but if there is no other law for this purpose then there can be no objection to its passing. I thought last year and the year before, that since we were honoured by the presence of two reverend gentlemen in this House we would have some expression of opinion from them on this subject. I have patiently waited to hear their views but up to the present time they have not given us an opportunity of listening to them. We ought to hear from these reverend members, because if there is one subject more than another upon which they ought to speak with some degree of responsibility and authority it would be upon a moral question of this nature. We would like to know where these reverend gentlemen stand upon this question, and I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the public would like to know what are their opinions. We would like to know whether their introduction into the political arena has been sufficient to silence them on the great and highly moral questions which arise in this country.

Mr. RICHARDSON. As the seconder of this Bill, I would like to say a word with regard to it. It seems to me that the argument of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) is not absolutely sound. If there is any doubt with regard to the law on this subject, then I think the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is an eminently proper one. The law should be clearly defined. With respect to the sale of American Sunday newspapers throughout Canada, I think such legislation as is here proposed would be right in line. If the prohibition of the sale of these newspapers throughout the Dominion could be secured, I think it would be an excellent thing, because hon. gentlemen who read these papers know they are very sensational indeed, and not such literature as should be distributed among the people generally. In the Canadian Saturday papers care is taken by the publishers to insert a quantity of matter fit for Sunday reading, so that those who choose to purchase these papers can have their Sunday reading. But Sunday newspapers should not be allowed to be sold by boys running about the streets and calling out their sale. With regard to manual labour on the Sabbath, apart from moral grounds, I think it is an excellent thing physically that every man should rest one day out of seven; and in the name of those compositors and others who make the newspapers, I would enter a plea that they should receive at least one day's rest in seven. It is on these grounds briefly stated, that I second the motion for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. BRITTON. I give credit to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), not only for his perseverance in presenting this Bill or a similar Bill to the House, but also for the able manner in which he has presented it. I am as much opposed as any man in the House to the selling of Sunday newspapers; but I must confess that being now somewhat advanced, at all events in years, and having had considerable to do with trying to interpret the statutes during a large part of my life, I do not feel as clear as some hon. gentlemen do on this question of jurisdiction. It has been already settled by the highest court of the realm that the Dominion Parliament may exercise jurisdiction over certain subjects over which there is perhaps jurisdiction on the part of provincial legislatures, in cases in which the provinces have not exercised that jurisdiction. It may be that this is one of those cases as to some of the provinces and that it is quite within the province of the Dominion Parliament to amend the Criminal Code and make it applicable. But I have found it difficult to know what is the law which only one Parliament has attempted to deal with; and if the two Parliaments, both the provincial and the Dominion, propose to legislate on the same lines, the difficulty will

be doubly increased. In the province of Ontario—and I suppose that if that province has the right to legislate in such matters the other provinces have the same right—we have the Act, chapter 203 of the Revised Statutes, which seems to me to apply to this case. A very clever lawyer might possibly find some difficulty in applying the first section of that Act to the publication of a Sunday newspaper. Still, it comes within the meaning of the words of that section, and also of a subsequent section. Section 1 provides :

It is not lawful for any merchant, tradesman, artificer, mechanic, workman, labourer, or other person whatsoever on the Lord's Day, to sell, or publicly show forth, or expose, or offer for sale, or to purchase, any goods, chattels, or other personal property.

The first point in the interpretation of this section that has arisen refers to the class of persons who are offering things for sale. It has been decided that as only certain trades or classes of persons have been mentioned, therefore the words, "or other person" whatsoever applies only to persons of the same character. The rule of *ejusdem generis* is claimed to be applicable to such cases, and it may be difficult to apply this section to the sale of newspapers on Sunday. However, it is because of the assumed jurisdiction of the province to deal with this subject that it seems to me objectionable on the part of the Dominion to attempt to do so also; because if any difficulty has arisen from what I have mentioned, the way to correct that difficulty is to amend the statute. The province, having dealt with the subject in so far as it has by the words I have read, can deal with it in the larger way to cover a case of the kind in question. If the courts have acted, as the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has said—if they have dealt with cases involving the sale of newspapers on Sunday, there is the more point to what I have said with regard to the interpretation of section 1. As I have said before, I am in sympathy with the purpose of the hon. mover of this Bill; but my difficulty as to whether this is the right way of accomplishing it makes me hesitate about supporting the Bill. There will certainly be a difficulty in enforcing this Bill. There is a great deal of force in what hon. members who have preceded me have said with reference to work on Sunday. The provincial statute is very clear in prohibiting any person from engaging in his ordinary work on that day. With regard to the work that is engaged in every Sunday in the preparation of the papers for Monday, suppose this Bill passes, does it after all meet the difficulty, except in the narrowest sense of prohibiting the sale on the streets, in hotels, at railway stations or in the cars? Will it stop the reading of newspapers on Sunday? Will it stop the reading of newspapers prepared on Saturday specially for

Mr. BRITTON.

Sunday reading? That cannot be prevented, and if not, we are going to have the evil without the remedy. Again, the Bill makes an exception of religious newspapers. I think there ought to be an interpretation clause defining what religious newspapers are. I could understand that denominational papers, which are presumed to be religious, might be excepted; but any paper might, in the view of the person who issued it, and in the view of many other persons, be called a religious newspaper for the purpose of evading this law. I do not know who would interpret that term, to say whether a person was guilty of a criminal offence or not. To summarize my objections, if we pass this law to amend the Criminal Code, we place it side by side with the Ontario statute dealing with similar offences, and we have a possible conflict of two statutes in regard to one particular thing.

That is a difficulty that we ought not, with our eyes open at all events, to get into. We ought to hesitate before passing a law the enforcement of which will be so full of difficulty. I say this without any fear of being challenged as to the honest desire, not only of myself, but, I believe, of the gentlemen who have spoken on the other side, and of a great many people in the community who have expressed their opinions on this subject.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I thoroughly endorse the principle that we should have in this country one day of rest in the week, and there is no doubt that the publishing of Sunday newspapers interferes considerably with the enjoyment of that day of rest. For this reason I am quite disposed to support the provisions of this Bill, but there are one or two points in which I would like to see it changed somewhat before it becomes law. In the first place, I do not think that this Bill is necessary in the province of Quebec. It may be necessary in Ontario, the province from which my hon. friend comes, it may be that that province is not so Sabbath-keeping as the province of Quebec; but in the province of Quebec we have a law in our revised statutes which absolutely prohibits any storekeeper, hawker, or anybody else, from selling any goods, wares or merchandise on the Sunday under a penalty not exceeding \$20 for the first offence, and not less than \$20 or more than \$40 for each subsequent offence. Therefore, I don't think that my hon. friend's Bill is necessary, so far as the province of Quebec is concerned. But if it be necessary for any other parts of the Dominion, I shall be very glad to see that the law of Sabbath observance is rendered as strict as possible. But I would point out that paragraph A of the Bill, which reads as follows:—

Being the proprietor, publisher or manager of any newspaper, publishes or issues, or prepares

for publication or issue, any copy or number of such newspaper for sale on Sunday, or with the intent that such copy or number shall be sold on Sunday, or sells or employs or procures any person to sell any newspaper on Sunday—

does not prohibit the sale in Canada of Sunday newspapers published elsewhere on Sunday. I listened with great attention to the graphic description of the hon. member for North Norfolk—the correctness of which description I can fully endorse—of the low and debasing character of the Sunday newspapers published in the United States; and if any law is to be passed dealing with this matter, I would like to see incorporated in it a provision to prohibit the sale of such newspapers here. By that means we would protect our people from many of the evils my hon. friend so graphically depicts.

I would further point out that the provision exempting religious newspapers from the operation of this Act will interfere with the observance of the Sunday as a day of rest. Certainly, if we are to have a day of rest for those employed in the publishing of newspapers, it ought to apply to all newspapers, both of religious and secular character, and I cannot, therefore, endorse this section. The chief object to be attained is the prevention of any public disturbance of the Sabbath as a day of rest, and that is done by preventing the publishing and selling of newspapers on that day. We also want to obtain twenty-four hours' rest in the week for every employee and labourer. It is true, that a paper issued on Monday morning requires a certain amount of work to be done between midnight on Saturday and midnight on Sunday, and to that extent infringes on the Sabbath Day. But you must remember that if those employees have to work on Sunday evening for a few hours, preparing their Monday morning issue, they are not employed on Saturday in preparing for a Sunday morning issue; and consequently, if they do not have all the Sunday, they have their full twenty-four hours of rest in the course of the week. The contention that a Monday morning paper really involves as much Sunday work as a Sunday morning issue, or more, is not pertinent to the question. Although it is true, that during a few hours of the Sabbath the men employed on a newspaper are at work, they have a compensating rest on the Saturday evening, and their labour of the Sunday is not public and does not in any way interfere with the strict observance of the Sabbath Day by the public generally. I think therefore, it is not necessary that we should discuss the publishing of a newspaper on a Monday morning. With the two changes I have pointed out, I fairly endorse the principle of the Bill.

Mr. CLANCY. Before we legislate in this House, there ought to be some great public need for legislation. I had not the pleasure of listening to the hon. gentleman who intro-

duced the Bill, but I have learned since that he did not point out that immoral literature was being sold and published in the Dominion, and therefore I am at a loss to understand the object of his measure. Unless some object of that kind is to be attained, will it not be idle to load up our statutes with legislation which properly comes under the jurisdiction of the provinces? We had rather a strange spectacle, a moment ago, when we had the First Minister saying he had no opinion on the subject, and then the Minister of Agriculture stated that such a Bill was not required for the province of Quebec, though it might be for the province of Ontario. But in Ontario we are fully empowered to deal with matters of this kind, and therefore I see no reason why they should be dragged into this House simply to give an hon. gentleman a cheap advertisement from one end of the country to the other. I am not going to charge the hon. gentleman with being unduly anxious to appear before the public as an apostle of light, but I do object to his taking charge of the morals of the House and assuming the attitude that he alone is anxious to purify and protect the morals of the people. The role has been played with much less success than the hon. gentleman's efforts deserve, but unless he is prepared to show that the province of Ontario has not the authority to deal with such matters, or that that province has overlooked, by design or otherwise, this great public want, I do not see how he can ask us, even admitting we have concurrent powers, to place such legislation on our statutes. I do not agree with the right hon. First Minister, that because a very eminent authority in this House, a few years ago, was prepared to admit the principle of such legislation, we are bound to pass it when there is no necessity. Suppose we should place an Act on the statutes which the hon. gentleman desires, if it were a question affecting the rights of the provinces, we would at once find them disputing our right to pass such legislation; and since it is a kind of legislation which neither the Dominion nor any province may be disposed to urge very strongly, it does seem to me that we ought not to pass it. We will simply be creating a crime where none exists. There are many crimes that are only such because created by statute, and if we load our statutes with crimes that are in themselves not moral offences, we are simply making laws which the people will not observe.

People may be very much better employed than in reading newspapers on Sunday; but I would ask the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill if he would go so far as to prohibit the people from reading anything but religious newspapers on Sunday. I venture to say that for such a law as this you must wait for the advance of public opinion; and if you put upon the Statute-book legislation that is not sanctioned by that advance in public opinion, you

have no means of enforcing such law. Legislation of that kind, I contend is most harmful. Unless the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) is prepared to point out that there is a public demand for this law and that there is a class of newspapers being distributed that should not be distributed Sunday or Monday, that would justify the restraint on the part of the province—a power that has been used in Ontario, as pointed out by the hon. member for Kingston—this Bill should not receive the sanction of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. If I may be permitted, I should like to say a few words before the House is called upon to act upon this measure. With regard to the objections raised by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), I freely concede the force of those objections, providing that the Bill is as the hon. gentleman supposes. I think, however, that so far as concerns the sale of public newspapers in Canada on Sunday, the Bill would prevent that. Sub-section B makes liable any person who :

(b.) Sells or employs or procures any person to sell any newspaper on Sunday.

This section is universal and applies to foreign newspapers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It prohibits the sale on Sunday, but not the sale of newspapers published elsewhere on Sunday.

Mr. CHARLTON. But it prevents the sale of these newspapers anywhere in Canada on Sunday.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Does not the present law meet that case ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Not all over the Dominion. With regard to the circulation of religious newspapers, the objection was raised on one occasion when this Bill was under discussion that in Sunday schools and churches, Sunday journals and religious reading for children were distributed gratuitously, and the Bill as it previously stood which would render that contrary to the provisions of the law. This Bill, when it is referred to committee, if it reaches that stage, can be amended, and defects of that kind, if any are found can be treated by the House in the proper way, and the Bill put in proper shape if it is found not to be so. With regard to the questions of jurisdiction, that matter has been discussed frequently on the floor of the House. As the right hon. the Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stated, one of the highest judicial authorities in Canada, the late Sir John Thompson, pronounced this Bill *intra vires*, and also pronounced it a proper Bill to pass—gave it his sanction and support—on the ground that, although there might be enactments in some of the provinces that would partially or wholly deal with the evil, it was a measure of a character that made it desir-

Mr. CLANCY.

able to have it universal in its application in the Dominion. The Dominion Government has jurisdiction in the matter of the importation of literature in the matter of copyright, in the matter of the transmission of literature through the mails; and for various reasons it was felt to be a proper exercise of what was unquestionably constitutional power, to deal with this matter in this House. Of course it is a matter for the judgment of the House whether it is proper to exercise that power or not, but the existence of the power is beyond question. The highest judicial authorities in the Dominion have declared this House quite competent to pronounce any act whatever a criminal act and make a criminal act of it. While I am on my feet, I wish to say a word with regard to a remark made by the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig). I certainly was not desirous of doing or conscious of having done injustice to any of my fellow members. Nothing was further from my intention. If I have been guilty of anything that was not perfectly fair and proper in the statements I have made with regard to the attitude of the House toward this measure as manifested at various times, I regret it. There have been occasions when this Bill was slaughtered without any record of votes, and afterwards restored to the Order paper when a record of the votes were kept. I suppose these things have unconsciously to myself left an impression on my mind that the actual bottom attitude of the House with regard to this measure was not one of unqualified approbation. I am willing to believe that the great majority of this House—for this is a new House—are favourable to the Bill; and I am willing, if the result of the vote on this measure shows that my hon. friend (Mr. Craig) is correct, to concede that I was wrong and make all proper acknowledgments. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) talks of this matter as a trivial offence. It would be beneath the dignity of this House to make a great deal of trouble over a trivial offence. But that which saps the foundation of a country's virtue, demoralizes its populations, debases its literature and brings about a condition of things such as we see in the United States to-day is not a trivial offence, but a gigantic crime against the present and against the future. My anxiety with regard to this thing was not to inflict some injury upon some gentlemen who wanted to publish a Sunday newspaper, nor to seek notoriety by warring against some trivial offence, but to avert from this country an impending calamity, which, if it does fall upon the country, will produce consequences of the most serious character. I hold that in this matter it is not only proper but it is in the highest degree desirable that we should have a uniform rule of practice and a uniform law throughout the Dominion. We have to-day no law on our Statute-book as a Dominion

Parliament with reference to this question of the sanctity of the Sabbath. In passing this law we will give our sanction to the propriety of this class of legislation and will proceed to deal as a whole country with a question that affects the whole country, and we shall have a uniform system of procedure and usage with regard to this trouble the introduction of which into this country we seek to avert. I have listened very carefully to the questions raised on the account of jurisdiction. They have been raised before and have been set aside by the highest authorities. Beyond all question the power to deal with this matter is vested in this Parliament, and it is merely a question of expediency and propriety that we have to deal with and we need not trouble ourselves as to the questions of authority.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). I move that after paragraph b, there shall be inserted a new heading as paragraph c, with these words: "sells, or employs or procures any person to sell any newspaper issued or published on Sunday."

Mr. **WOOD** (Brockville). Would that imply that it was an offence to sell a newspaper that was published on Sunday?

Mr. **CHARLTON**. No.

Mr. **WOOD** (Brockville). That is the plain English of it.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. The intention is to provide against the sale of a paper which is published on Sunday.

Mr. **WOOD** (Brockville). The inference is that a paper that was published on any other day than Sunday might be sold on Sunday.

Mr. **CHARLTON**. It cannot be sold on Sunday, and a paper published on Sunday cannot be sold on Monday.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Section b, which I do not interfere with, provides that any person who sells a paper on Sunday is subject to this Act. Then I propose to go on and say that any person who on Sunday sells a newspaper which is published on Sunday, our object being to prevent the issue of a newspaper on Sunday.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. It seems to me that possibly the Minister is going a little further than he intends. It strikes me that would prohibit the sale of the "Globe" or "Mall" in Toronto, or the Montreal papers, as a part of these papers are made up on Sunday.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. That is not the intent.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. I may say with regard to the provisions of the Bill as a whole, that I am in sympathy with it. I desire to say this in answer to some remarks thrown across the House some time ago. It seemed that when an hon. member on this side of the House rose to say anything at all on this Bill, it was almost inferred that he was offering opposition to it.

Mr. **CHARLTON**. No, no.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. I think it is scarcely a fair inference. I am quite in sympathy with the provisions of the Bill so long as they are workable, and I intend to support it, whether it comes within the scope of this House to pass this legislation or not. I understand that the Minister of Justice in another House, whilst occupying a seat in this Chamber, said that this House had not jurisdiction to deal with a matter of this kind. As the matter will come before him, no doubt he will give his judgment, and the Senate will be guided by what he says in the matter, and if we are going wrong by passing legislation here which we ought not to pass, no doubt he will stop it in that Chamber, so that there can be no harm on our part in passing the Bill. I intended on the second reading of the Bill to refer to one or two remarks made by the hon. member for North Wellington with regard to some previous remarks of my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig). I scarcely thought the remarks of the hon. member for North Wellington were called for. I listened carefully to the speech of my hon. friend from East Durham and I am sure he did not throw into the discussion anything of a partisan character. I think it was scarcely fair, in a question of this kind, to attribute to my hon. friend for East Durham a desire to mix up with this question any party spirit. If we are to pass legislation in the matter of morals I think it should be done as much as possible with the sympathy of the whole House, and that nothing should be thrown into the discussion that would tend to alienate support from the measure in any way. I certainly thought that the strictures applied to the hon. member for East Durham were entirely uncalled for. Now, coming back to the amendment of the Minister of Agriculture, I think when he looks carefully at those words, he will discover that he is going so far as to prohibit the sale of a newspaper on any day that is published on Sunday. Perhaps I do not attach the same meaning that he does to the publication of a newspaper on Sunday, but I take it for granted that if a portion of the work, the type setting or any other part of the work of a Monday morning paper is done on Sunday, that may be called publishing the paper.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.**
No.

Mr. **HENDERSON.** Well, what do you mean by publishing a paper?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.**
Issuing it.

Mr. **HENDERSON.** Well, suppose the press starts at half past eleven o'clock. The boy who sells the newspapers does not know what time the press starts, and the result would be that he might be liable to a penalty because he had sold a newspaper, a portion of which was issued or published on Sunday. We should guard those who are handling the paper who might be taken advantage of innocently, we should be very particular in the legislation we pass that no one should become subject to a penalty innocently.

Mr. **MACLEAN.** I wish again to raise the constitutional issue. I say this House has no jurisdiction in this matter. Furthermore, we have here a Solicitor General who ought to advise us in these things. We have a Solicitor General who comes from the province of Quebec, and I hope he will be able to tell this House, not only as Solicitor General, but as a citizen of Quebec, whether he thinks the law is necessary, and whether there is such a crime existing in that province which ought to be put down—this crime that exists only in the imagination of the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill. The Minister of Agriculture says it does not exist in the province of Quebec, because they have a law there which punishes the offence if it does exist. In the province of Ontario we already have a law sufficient for the offence. I believe that the offence does not exist in any province in this Dominion, if it exists at all it is only in connection with two newspapers in the province of British Columbia. If that is the case, British Columbia will cure that offence by a law that is suited to the crime, namely, a provincial law.

Mr. **CAMPBELL.** What about the Sunday "World"?

Mr. **MACLEAN.** The "Sunday World" does not violate the law of the province of Ontario. I again urge the constitutional issue. I do not believe, as suggested just now, that we should first pass a law and then find out if it is constitutional. Let the Solicitor General demonstrate his usefulness to this country, let him show some value for the large salary he draws, by advising this House, and let us not have to go to the Senate for advice.

An hon. **MEMBER.** Are you opposed to the Bill?

Mr. **MACLEAN.** I am opposed to the Bill because it is unconstitutional. I hope we shall have the question settled, and I trust members from the different pro-

Mr. **HENDERSON.**

vinces will express their views; and I challenge the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill to say whether this offence exists which he wishes to put down. If it does not exist, if the present laws are sufficient to meet the offence, why waste the time of the House when there are much more important measures to occupy its attention. If he wishes to confer some benefits on the people, to improve their status and morality, let him take up some question such as the housing of the poor or the promotion of hygiene, and he will then advance morality and do public good. But at the present time the hon. gentleman is running a tilt against a windmill, and the windmill is of very little importance to the people. There is no such crime existing to-day as the publication of Sunday newspapers, none such as the sale of Sunday newspapers, and therefore hon. members are wasting the time of the people in considering this measure, and I suspect somebody is taking up our attention in order to keep his name before the public as the guardian of the morals of the people of Canada.

Mr. **HUGHES.** I beg to move:

That all the words after "who" in the 10th line be struck out to "defamatory libel," line 25, and the following be substituted:—"Sells or employs or procures any person to sell any article or commodity on Sunday."

Mr. **CHRISTIE.** I desire in a word or two to express my hearty approval of the principle of the Bill before the House. I should have been very glad if it had gone very much further, and dealt with the Sabbath desecration that we see existing in other parts of the public service. It is true this evil is not very widespread. I think it has been stated that it has not obtained a foothold; it has obtained a foothold, for even in my own province Sunday newspapers are sold every Lord's Day. Prevention is better than cure, and I hold this Bill is a step in the right direction, and we should endeavour to prevent the spread of this evil. We are all aware that this practice has exercised most baneful and deleterious influence in the United States. The very best minds of the people there have attempted to root out that evil, but have so far failed. I have great sympathy with the Bill, and the only trouble in regard to it is that it does not go far enough; but inasmuch as it is a step in the right direction, I have pleasure in casting my vote for it.

Mr. **BEATTIE.** While I do not desire the sale of any newspaper published on Sunday, I do not see any reason to prevent the sale of Sunday newspapers on Monday.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.**
New York papers published on Sunday are sold here on Monday.

Mr. BEATTIE. In the section in which I live we are very much troubled with the sale of American newspapers. They come in over the different lines of railways and are sold in very large quantities on the station platforms at London. That is a practice I should like to stop. The sale of these newspapers is not creating a healthy Canadian feeling, but the reverse.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That evil will be stopped by the Bill. My object in moving the amendment was to stop the sale of newspapers which are issued on Sunday, but which do not come into this country until Monday and are then sold. These papers are of such a character that all hon. members appear to agree that we should prohibit their sale here.

Mr. MACLEAN. Would the hon. gentleman stop the New York "Tribune," published on Sunday from being sold here on Monday.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think I would.

Mr. MACLEAN. Would the hon. gentleman prevent the sale of respectable English or French newspapers that might be published on Sunday?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No doubt there are some respectable newspapers published in the United States or in France, but as the object of this Bill is to prevent the sale of newspapers published on Sunday in this country, it should prevent newspapers containing these objectionable features being introduced in our country from abroad.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would not like to go as far as the Minister of Agriculture, and prevent the sale on Monday of all newspapers printed on Sunday. That would be a very serious matter, and it would lead to enormous difficulties.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I referred to newspapers published on Sunday.

Mr. RICHARDSON. A newspaper might be published in England on Sunday and reach here one or two weeks after, and according to the amendment proposed, a dealer selling such a newspaper would be guilty of an offence. I look at the question in this way. I conceive that the Bill is introduced to prevent the issue and sale in Canada of newspapers published on Sunday, or American newspapers published on Sunday and brought in and sold here on the Sabbath. We do not want to have the sale of newspapers on the Sabbath in this Dominion. There need not be any difficulty in arriving at what a Sunday newspaper is. The Sunday "World," of Toronto, or the Sunday "Sun," of Montreal, in my opinion, would come under the category, and their sale should be stopped.

The paper itself states in its heading whether it is a Sunday paper or not.

Mr. MACLEAN. What about the religious weekly called the "Sunday Observer"?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would not allow the sale of any religious or secular paper on the Sabbath. I understood the object was to prevent the publishing of newspapers on Sunday, so as to ensure to every workman connected with a newspaper one day of rest in seven.

Mr. HUGHES. In speaking to the amendment, the Minister of Agriculture omitted to recognize the fact that there are very many Sunday newspapers in the United States that are essentially first-class newspapers of high moral standing and are even catering to the fantastic tastes in this matter of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I should be very sorry to see those papers shut out on Sunday as well as on Monday. The public should have an opportunity of purchasing on Sunday or Monday such newspapers if they come here and are permitted for sale. The point I wish the committee to consider is this: do we want to sell articles on Sunday? It is not a question of printing a newspaper and selling it, no matter whether it is published on Saturday or Sunday, or whether it is religious or so-called irreligious paper, as some political newspapers are supposed to be, but it is a question as to whether newspapers should be sold here on Sunday.

I would go further. If there is a law on the Statute-book at the present time which prohibits the sale of a bushel of potatoes on Sunday and does not prohibit the sale of a newspaper on Sunday, then the law should be amended so as to prohibit the sale of a newspaper, as well as the bushel of potatoes.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have no law of the kind at all.

Mr. HUGHES. Do you say, we have no law of that kind in Ontario?

Mr. CHARLTON. Not in the Dominion.

Mr. HUGHES. There is such a law in Ontario.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have such a law in the province of Quebec.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not in the Dominion.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Ontario law is against Sunday vending.

Mr. HUGHES. I move the amendment, because I do not wish to see a poor little boy who is trying to earn 5 cents on the streets in catering to the public demands, arrested and punished for selling a newspaper on Sunday, when some gentleman, around the corner, is selling cigars and making his dollars. If it is wrong for the little boy, it is wrong for the cigar-seller and for the seller of everything else.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear. Railway companies the same.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, just the same with railway companies. If a newspaper cannot be sold on Sunday, it will not be published on Sunday. A traveller coming to Windsor or Sarnia on Sunday from the United States, buys the Toronto papers of Saturday, and whether that paper be published on Saturday or Sunday, if there is any crime at all in the matter, the crime lies in its being sold on Sunday. The Saturday Toronto paper should be prevented being sold on Sunday, just the same as if it were a Sunday paper sold at Sarnia or Windsor. If it is wrong to sell a newspaper on Sunday, it is wrong to sell any other article, and, as my amendment provides against the selling of any article on Sunday, I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) will agree to it.

Mr. FLINT. It seems to me that the promoter of the Bill, as well as other members of the committee, are trying to kill two birds with the one stone in a way that is not very easy to accomplish. There are two objects mixed up in the efforts of the committee to reach a reasonable conclusion. One object, with which I heartily sympathize, is to prevent business transactions with newspapers on the Sabbath Day, and I think the general sense of the committee is in favour of any legislation which will prevent the sale of any journal on Sunday. Another object of the committee, which appears to be generally favoured, with certain exceptions, is, to legislate, if possible, to prevent any work being done upon newspapers on Sunday. With regard to these two objects, the sense of the committee appears to be favourable. It has been pointed out that, on the majority of Monday newspapers, some of the work has to be done late on Sunday night, and with a proviso that such work should not be carried on to too great an extent, it appears to be the general feeling that legislation going that far would be desirable.

My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has introduced an entirely new question, and one with which I think the committee will feel it difficult to sympathize; because, no matter what may be the denunciation of the hon. member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as regards Sunday newspapers in general, yet we must discriminate. There are Sunday newspapers so-called which are bad as literature, and which it might possibly be desirable to discourage by legislation; yet, on the other hand, there are papers issued as Sunday newspapers in the neighbouring republic which are not at all open to that line of criticism. I would be sorry to have the community in which I live deprived of the privilege of buying on Tuesday the editions of the Boston Sunday "Herald" and Boston Sunday "Globe," papers of high literary merit, papers containing articles of the most distinguished writers in the world, and

Mr. HUGHES.

papers to which no objection can be taken because of their moral or literary tone.

Mr. CRAIG. Are they published on Sunday?

Mr. FLINT. They are published in the United States on Sunday, but the probability is, that the work is done on Saturday, because they are issued in the city of publication at a very early hour on Sunday morning or late hour on Saturday night. I would not go as far as my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher), and prohibit the sale of papers of this kind on Tuesday, or any week day, throughout the Dominion of Canada. If we do that, we are opening the door to what I believe the people of this country will not submit to, namely, constituting some official censor to prescribe what the people shall read and purchase on week days. I will support, and I think the committee will support, any legislation which will prevent the publication and sale of newspapers in this country on the Sabbath Day.

Mr. MACLEAN. You can see now, Mr. Chairman, that we are getting into a labyrinth of difficulties, and we are still waiting for information from the Solicitor General. If we cannot get him to speak, I will have to appeal to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) as to whether it is a fact, that such a crime exists in the province of Quebec, and as to whether it is a fact, that they have a law there which prohibits the vending of anything on Sunday. We have this law against vending on Sundays in all the provinces, and if this Parliament are going to make the vending of Sunday newspapers criminal, then let us apply the rule to everything else. As the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) pointed out, we should apply this law to the running of trains on Sunday, and keeping pharmacies open on Sundays, and a hundred different things. When you come to that, you disturb the whole social condition of this country. As a Canadian who happens to live in a city, I object to those who live in rural communities trying to regulate our social life in the cities. We are able to do that for ourselves. Especially do I resent that members from the wild and woolly west, like the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Richardson), who come here with all these professions of interest for the public morals, should try to regulate the social life of the large cities of Canada. The people of the cities resent this rural interference. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) and those who support him are really in earnest, let them put it in the Criminal Code that it is a crime to read a paper on Sunday. If they apply such an amendment as that equally to all the people, then I will support it.

Mr. HUGHES. No, you won't.

Mr. MACLEAN. If they who call themselves Liberals, say it is a crime to read a

newspaper on Sunday, if they who say they are the friends of the people, declare that, then they are at least logical, but in their present position they are both illogical and illegal, and I want the Solicitor General to give his opinion as to whether this law is constitutional, and as to whether there is not a sufficient law in the province of Quebec at the present time.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite prepared to endorse the proposition made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I admit that there are some papers published in the United States that do not come within the category of those that should be rejected; but while there are a few of those, there are hundreds that are decidedly objectionable. I know myself of papers which are simply a review of the horse-racing, sports and amusements of the previous week, and these papers are brought into Canada and sold here. For my part, I am quite willing to take the course suggested by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, to shut out all these papers in order to shut out the undesirable ones. With regard to my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), I would like to see collected together in one city or community all those who are disposed to advocate the same principles of a free and open and unrestricted Sunday. I would be quite willing to legislate that they should have a little Utah of their own in order to see how it would be conducted. I fancy that it would be a pretty rum city.

Mr. MACLEAN. There would be no hypocrites in it.

Mr. McMULLEN. We would then see what use they would make of the command, which says: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy."

Mr. MACLEAN. And do not charge more than 6 per cent.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this House is perfectly justified in legislating to prevent the publishing of Sunday newspapers, if it is possible to do it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would like to draw the attention of the Solicitor General, who has not been here during the greater part of this discussion, to what appears to be a matter of some doubt with regard to the question of jurisdiction on this subject. It has been pointed out by myself and by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) that there already exists in the statutes of Ontario a complete law prohibiting the selling of any articles on Sunday, and that there is no distinction between a newspaper and any other chattel or article which is there prohibited from sale. The simple question at issue is whether we should encumber our statutes with a law exactly similar to a law that exists in the province of Ontario and also similar to a law which I am informed by the Minister

of Agriculture exists in the province of Quebec. Would it not be more proper to amend the Act of the province of Ontario, if it is imperfect, which I think it is not. The rule of "jus generis" referred to by the hon. member for Kingston, does not apply to it at all. I would like to point out to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the question of jurisdiction cannot be decided unless a test question is made of it; and I think that if I were as zealous as he is for this legislation, which he has brought before this House for several years, I, or the association with which he is acting, would endeavour to see that some test case was made so as to ascertain whether the provincial statute was sufficient, or whether the provincial Parliament had jurisdiction or not. If the provinces have jurisdiction in a local matter of this kind, then this Parliament ought not to interfere. In saying that, I am expressing the Liberal doctrine which has been enunciated by hon. gentlemen opposite ever since I have been in this House—that in matters of local concern this Parliament should not interfere if the local legislature has jurisdiction. I am not certain that the eminent authority who has been referred to to-night by two or three gentlemen had any such simple clause as this in his mind when he said that this Parliament had jurisdiction. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk will bear me out that at the time Sir John Thompson expressed his opinion on his measure, it contained many clauses which are not found in this Bill, such as those relating to the running of cars and steamboats, the keeping of canals open on Sunday, and so on. If the Bill had been whittled down to a simple provision to prohibit Sunday newspapers—to amend the Lord's Day Act of the provinces—I think he would have said that the provinces had jurisdiction, and that we should not meddle in the matter.

Mr. McCLURE. I heartily agree with the sentiment expressed by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), but I have very great doubts whether any such legislation is necessary.

Mr. HUGHES. I agree with that, too.

Mr. McCLURE. I think the law of the province of Nova Scotia prohibits the selling of anything on Sunday, and applies to newspapers as well as to anything else. There may be doubts as to the constitutionality of that law; but I think that question should be settled before we legislate here. As to the amendment moved by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, it is calculated to do great injustice. You allow people to sell newspapers ostensibly published on Monday, the greater part of the work on which is done on Sunday; but the hon. Minister's amendment proposes not to allow newspapers to be ostensibly published on Sunday all the work of which is done on Saturday.

Mr. HUGHES. Before the hon. member for North Norfolk speaks again, I have strong hopes that he will accept my amendment. He will notice that an additional amendment is moved to this, so that it reads as follows :—

Sells or employs or procures any person to sell any article or commodity on Sundays, except drugs or medicines or articles for surgical and medical use.

I am sure my hon. friend will accept this.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). One does not like to express opinions off-hand on great constitutional questions. The present question is one of great importance, and I think it gathers importance from the fact that eminent authorities have expressed opinions upon it. If I ventured to give an opinion, it would be, that this is merely a matter of municipal and local regulation entirely. However, I am indebted to the right hon. First Minister for the opinion expressed by the late Sir John Thompson on this subject; and in view of that opinion, I feel a very great deal of hesitation in upholding the one I expressed a moment ago, and which I personally entertain. Sir John Thompson said :

The hon. member for North Norfolk is quite right in saying that I expressed the opinion that this Parliament has jurisdiction to enact the provisions which are found here. Although the opinion is not entertained by some members of the House of eminence in their profession, I have no doubt that we have the power to deal so amply with all matters relating to the criminal law, that when we undertake to make a thing criminal we have jurisdiction to do so.

That is where we differ. I do not think we have the right to declare anything a crime. That is out of the question.

When the House was considering the matter last year, the first clause of the Bill, relating to the publication of Sunday newspapers, was one which we might, with great propriety and safety, we thought, leave to the local legislatures to adopt if they saw fit.

Then he went on to say :

It is a matter relating particularly to the convenience of the inhabitants of the provinces themselves, and the legislatures, no doubt, will adopt restrictive laws whenever they think the time has arrived for doing so.

That was the view which was entertained by Sir John Thompson, when this Bill was introduced in 1892. In so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, as my hon. colleague the Minister of Agriculture said a moment ago, we have legislation there on this subject, and it is legislation of a character to prevent the abuse which the hon. member for North Norfolk points out. It will be found in article 3498 of our revised statutes of the province of Quebec, which prohibits the barter and sale of anything whatever on a Sunday. That section is quite sufficient to prevent the doing of that which,

Mr. McCLURE.

to some extent, in our province is a scandal. For instance, to my knowledge, papers published on Saturday are peddled about through the streets in Quebec and sold at the church doors on Sunday morning, contrary to statute; but there is the remedy I have pointed out, and I think we ought to apply that remedy and as far as possible avoid encroaching on the attributes of the local legislatures, especially with regard to anything which may come within the regulations of local municipalities.

The Bill before us does not reach its object, as far as I can see, looking over it very cursorily. The object, I apprehend, is to prohibit the sale of Sunday newspapers, that is to say, those newspapers that are published on Sunday and distributed through the streets. But that is not what you are going to accomplish. The section reads :

Any one who, being the proprietor, publisher or manager of any newspaper, publishes, or issues or prepares for publication or issue any copy or number of such newspaper for sale on Sunday, or with the intent that such copy or number shall be sold on Sunday.

That is to say, if the newspaper is published on a Saturday, as is the case now, and is sold on a Sunday at any of those depots or places where newspapers are put on Saturday night, quite harmlessly, the publisher would be liable to be fined. The consequences of this Bill are much more serious than they appear in the minds of those who drew it up. After all, we have got to understand the meaning of terms. If any one issues his paper on a Saturday, and it is sold on the Sunday afterwards, he is to be called to account under this Act.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will that reach the Saturday Toronto "Globe" ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It would require a very ordinary construction of this statute to reach it, if that paper is sold on Sunday.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Or even subscribed for or received on Sunday.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would not go so far as to say that, but that might be the case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In Vancouver and Victoria, B.C., no paper is distributed on Monday at all, and consequently no Sunday work is done on any newspaper. That, I presume, is a condition of things which the hon. gentleman who moves this Bill desires to encourage. There is a Sunday newspaper published there, but the work is done before Sunday begins, and yet under this Bill the publishers of these papers will come within the meaning of this clause and be liable to punishment. I should think that they should rather be entitled to commendation for taking a course that does away with the necessity for any Sunday work; but nevertheless, those people would

come under this Bill and be considered criminal. I think that this legislation is a great deal in advance of the time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I should like to quote the opinion of an hon. gentleman whose opinion, by reason of his eminence in Parliament and his official position at present, ought to have a great deal of weight. I refer to the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills), who was formerly member for Bothwell in this House. Having in view the fact that he is now Minister of Justice and responsible for the legislation which goes through this, as well as the other House, his opinion on legal and constitutional questions should, so far as the members of the Government are concerned, be conclusive. In the session of 1892 he spoke as follows ("Hansard," page 394):

I think the question is one of civil rights, regulated by the provincial law, and I do not think that by simply declaring it a misdemeanour, and thus trying to bring it within the purview of a department of law in which it has not been previously placed, you can prevent its being a matter of civil rights.

Then, he threw out a word of warning, at the conclusion of his speech, which I think the House might well accept at present:

I think there are matters here that ought to be seriously considered by us, and we ought to meet the public wishes and expectations as far as we can; but with regard to those matters that are in other hands, surely we ought to let them alone, and let them remain in the hands in which the constitution has placed them.

That is the very strong opinion of the Minister of Justice, who is responsible for the constitutional action of the Government. He also took the ground to discuss the question, that in Ontario the case had been provided for, and the legislation proposed seemed to be altogether unnecessary.

Mr. CHARLTON. In reply to the statement made by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) as to the attitude of Sir John Thompson on this Bill, that hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) tells us that Sir John Thompson did not give his sanction to this particular section of the Bill, but to the general principle and to the Bill as a whole. Now the truth is that Sir John Thompson gave his sanction to this particular section of the Bill, singled it out from others, and decided, that while he could not see the propriety at that moment of legislation with regard to railway traffic or railway excursions, he did see the propriety of legislation with regard to the Sunday newspaper evil to prevent that evil in this country. It was to that feature of the Bill he distinctly gave endorsement, and it was in consequence largely of that support that the first two sections, one relating to the closing of the canals on the Lord's Day and the other with regard to the publishing of newspapers passed this House. But for the action of Sir John Thompson that favourable action

on the part of the House could not have been secured. He took the ground that, although this matter might be dealt with by the provincial legislatures although it was competent for the province to make laws with regard to it, the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament was paramount to that of the provincial legislatures and it was desirable to secure uniformity of the law with regard to this matter. He thought it desirable to have uniformity because of the extreme importance of taking precautionary measures to prevent the introduction of this great evil into the Dominion. He based his approval of the measure upon this provision alone, and this provision has been selected from the others and placed before the House because of Sir John Thompson's approval and because it had passed the House and been accepted by the present Premier. The history of the Bill, to which my hon. friend from Brockville alluded is this: The Bill as first introduced covered a large number of infractions of Sabbath observance. It went over nearly the whole field. That Bill on the motion of Sir John Thompson was referred to a special committee composed of thirteen members. It was considered by that committee and every portion of it upon which it could be held that the provincial legislature had exclusive jurisdiction was eliminated from the Bill. It was held that the provincial legislatures had nothing to do with the opening of the canals on Sunday, these being Dominion works; or with the traffic of our railroads that had been declared works for the general advantage of Canada; and it was held that the publication of Sunday newspapers was a national matter, a question of national importance, and that, as the Dominion Parliament controlled the copyright law, the transmission of literature through the mails, the libel law and the matter of prohibiting the importation of obscene or objectionable literature, this matter could best be dealt with by the Dominion Parliament. It was also felt that there should be a general law on the subject for the Dominion, rather than to have one law in one province, a different law in another province and no law at all in another, as is at present the case. The question of the jurisdiction of this Parliament is raised. This Parliament has jurisdiction on all matters of criminal law. This Parliament can declare criminal any act which it believes to be contrary to the general interest and the welfare of the country. It has been objected that the evil has not been developed here. But it exists here in an incipient state. There is one newspaper published in Toronto and sold on Sunday, and one in Montreal. This gigantic evil in the United States had its inception in much the same way. One or two of the leading newspapers in New York commenced issuing Sunday editions during the War of the Rebellion. From this small beginning, the evil has acquired such magnitude

and power that no newspaper can exist that seeks to stand against it. Every newspaper is forced into an infraction of the Divine law, and to assisting in the demoralization of the country. This evil is sapping the religious and moral life of the country. If there is anything calculated to bring the United States down to the dust to subvert and upset its institutions, it is the Sunday newspaper. This national evil should be dealt with in a national way by this national legislature, an evil that would affect this whole Dominion and that can be effectively handled and dealt with only by the Parliament sitting at Ottawa. Sometimes I lament most deeply those gentlemen who talk about their sympathy with the Bill, their desire to see the evil suppressed, of the sorrow it gives them to see this evil going on, carping at this and that feature of the Bill, the practical result of their criticism being hostility to the Bill, and to stifle and defeat it. I say: gentlemen, if you believe this Sunday newspaper growth to be an evil, why object to grapple with that evil by the supreme legislative authority of this country? Why do you wish to refer it to be dealt with by municipal and city councils, making it a mere municipal matter? This is a national matter. There is nothing that confronts us that is fraught with greater consequences for the future of the country than the evil I ask this House to deal with by applying the ounce of prevention, when we know very well that we can never effectively apply the pound of cure.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the difference between a bad paper published on Sunday and a bad paper published on Monday?

Mr. CHARLTON. There is no material difference. I was coming to that. Great stress is laid upon the publication of the paper on Saturday, of there being a certain amount of work to be done on Sunday in order to be ready for publication on Monday. The evil of the Sunday newspaper is not decided by the question whether the newspaper is published on Saturday or Sunday, but by the fact that the Sabbath is secularized by the crying of newsboys in the streets and by the running of special trains and special messengers. Each of the larger newspapers in New York sends a lightning express train to Buffalo on Sunday with its pernicious freight to debase and demoralize the people.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that the case in Canada?

Mr. CHARLTON. No, but it is the case in the United States, and I do not want to have it in Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite often accuse me of sympathizing with everything American. I denounce this evil that has grown up in the United States; I oppose everything that is calculated to sap

Mr. CHARLTON.

moral character and moral life. The matter is important enough to warrant truthful, candid treatment, the kind of treatment it has not been receiving to-night, I fear, I am obliged to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, candid treatment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Unless the hon. gentleman refers to himself, he is out of order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will allow the hon. gentleman to say who I refer to. But I say that the attitude of certain members of this House with regard to this Bill, is thoroughly disingenuous. Now, the matter we have got to decide upon is not whether it is sinful to publish a newspaper on Saturday that may be sold on Sunday, there is nothing in this Bill that will bear that application. The Bill says: "The proprietor, publisher or manager are liable to penalties." My hon. friend from Victoria talked about the hardship of fining a little newsboy. The penalties of this Bill are applicable to those persons named, the proprietor, publisher or manager of a newspaper, who

publishes or issues, or prepares for publication or issue, any copy or number of such newspaper for sale on Sunday, or with the intent that such copy or number should be sold on Sunday.

These are the men who are liable:

Or sells, or employs, or procures any person to sell any newspaper on Sunday.

Mr. HUGHES. Does that not cover a newsboy?

Mr. CHARLTON. No, it is intended to cover the person who procures the services of a newsboy to sell the paper that he has published or issued.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman does not read the clause correctly. He says it does not apply to a newsboy who sells, but the Bill does say that anybody who sells a newspaper on Sunday, or who employs anybody, or procures anybody to sell a newspaper on Sunday, is liable.

Mr. CHARLTON. The word "or" connects clause "a" with clause "b" and carries on to "b" the penalties that apply to individuals referred to in clause "a," that is to say, the proprietor or publisher or manager of a newspaper.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. member for North Norfolk is right.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I say any newsboy who sells that paper is a publisher within the meaning of subsection "a."

Mr. CHARLTON. The intention of this Bill is to make liable to its penalties the proprietor, publisher or manager, who is primarily responsible for the infraction of

the law. Now, it is said that the publisher of a paper published on Saturday may be liable to the penalties. Sir, in this age papers published on Saturday are not liable to be sold very extensively on Sunday, they are not issued with the intent of being sold on Sunday. Saturday editions of Canadian papers are sold on Saturday, they are issued to be sold on Saturday, they are not reserved for sale on Sunday. It is not the purpose of the publisher of that paper that it should be distributed on Sunday or sold on Sunday. But the object of this Bill is to reach that evil which exists in the publication and hawking about of a paper, sending it by express wagons throughout the city, the selling by newsboys of a paper on Sunday. The criticisms here with regard to the want of jurisdiction fail utterly. We are possessed of jurisdiction, there is no question about it. The question of the evil almost every body who has spoken admits, the desirability of avoiding that evil there can be no question about. The proper method of coping with this evil efficiently there can be no question about. You do not cope with it by employing subordinate powers, but by employing the paramount powers existing in this central body. It is a proper exercise of the legislative prerogative for the Dominion Parliament to deal with this question, it is the most effective way of dealing with it, and if we are governed by our desire to promote the interest of the country, to avoid the introduction into this country of an evil which will speedily grow beyond our power to check it, we want to take the very course I am asking the committee to take to-night. I do not know that I would insist upon the amendment of the Minister of Agriculture. That, perhaps, is unnecessary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman want to stop the distribution of a paper that is made up on Saturday night? Does he want to prevent the distribution of that paper on the Lord's Day?

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly, that is the very evil I want to stop. I daresay that nine-tenths of the Sunday newspapers in America are largely made up on Saturday night and published at three or four o'clock on Sunday morning. But the evil is that these papers are hawked about and sold on Sunday. They are got up for the class of readers that read them on Sunday, they furnish a quality of reading matter that is deleterious to public interests, that debases the morals of the people, and they are just as worthy of suppression as a brothel or a gambling den.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman wish to stop the reading on the Sabbath of a paper published on Wednesday, for instance?

Mr. CHARLTON. That question does not enter into the consideration of this measure at all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman wants to stop the distribution of a paper on the Lord's Day that is made up on Saturday, he is bound to go so far as to object to the distribution on the Sabbath of a paper published on Wednesday. The real harm is the reading of it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The paper made up on Saturday is read on Sunday, it is made up for the purpose of being read on Sunday, it is not designed for circulation except on Sunday, it is to all intents and purposes a Sunday paper. The mere incident of the small amount of labour employed on Saturday in preparing that paper for Sunday circulation has nothing to do with the question. The evil complained of is the character of the paper and its influence upon the moral status of the community, the influence of that paper in dragging down the moral life of the nation.

Mr. HUGHES. Would the hon. gentleman object to the sale, for instance, on Sunday of the "Mail and Empire" and the "Globe," published on Saturday?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not dealing with that question at all. I would object to the sale of them on Sunday, as I would object to the sale of any other commodity. These are not properly Sunday papers, they were not issued with the design of being circulated on Sunday, they are Saturday papers. But we are dealing with the question of Sunday newspapers, the Sunday newspaper evil that is the curse of the United States, that is one that we want to avoid having introduced into this country; and all this cavilling and carping of hon. gentlemen opposite is begging the question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman says that his intention is to prohibit altogether the distribution and sale of Sunday newspapers. Now, the hon. gentleman has stated that there are two Sunday newspapers in Canada, and this Act, if it goes into force will prevent the issuing of only these two Sunday newspapers. Now, I happen to live near the border, as the hon. member for North Norfolk knows. We are not bothered with any Sunday newspapers that are published in Canada, but we are bothered with Sunday newspapers which are published in the United States, and very pernicious newspapers they are. They come over on Saturday night and they are sold on Saturday night to the people of the towns and villages adjoining—a class of reading that ought not to go into any home, Christian or otherwise, in the Dominion of Canada. Now, these newspapers are a thousand times more pernicious than any newspaper, Sunday or otherwise, that the

hon. gentleman or myself will ever live to see published in Canada.

Under this Bill the hon. gentleman says that the boy is not punishable if he sells the newspaper on Sunday. If you cannot get at the boy whom can you get at, because the hon. gentleman will agree that there is no power in this Parliament to punish the publisher of a newspaper residing in New York, Buffalo and Utica and who sends over newspapers to be distributed in Canada on Sunday. The real evil in Canada to-day is the distribution and sale of pernicious newspapers published in the United States, some of which I am very glad have been shut out by the Minister of Agriculture. That is an evil which Parliament should grapple with.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is the object of my amendment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not hear the hon. gentleman's amendment; but the Bill as submitted is very lame and halting.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman has unconsciously given an argument in favour of the amendment offered to the committee.

Mr. MACLEAN. No; the amendment is quite the opposite. The papers referred to are printed during the week and sent in here on Saturday night.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not referring to the date of publication, but to the contents.

Mr. CHARLTON. It does not militate against the propriety of seeking to prevent one evil by presenting another evil to the attention of the committee; and if the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has any grievance to place before the House or desires legislation to remove an evil, let him offer an amendment. This Bill has reference to Sunday newspapers. The hon. gentleman has been talking about Friday newspapers.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No; I rise to a question of personal explanation. What I said was that there were papers published as Sunday newspapers that are not printed on Sunday. They are dated on Sunday. They are sent out probably on Friday or Saturday, and I sometimes buy them on the train Friday or Saturday.

Mr. CHARLTON. You should not buy them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Some of these newspapers are of a very good class. For example the 'Buffalo Express' is a very high class paper, and contains very useful matter. Although printed on Thursday and Friday these are often called Sunday papers.

Mr. CHARLTON. They are not the Sunday newspapers we are talking about.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is a Sunday newspaper?

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is one published on Sunday and sold on Sunday. We are dealing in this Bill with Sunday newspapers—not with papers published on Friday or Saturday and called Sunday newspapers and which may be sold before that date. That may be an evil—it would depend on the character of the newspaper. There is, however, a law that will meet the case of papers of an obscene and an objectionable character, and if such newspapers are published in Canada there is a remedy provided to-day. The hon. gentleman is importing into this discussion a question foreign to the case under consideration, and his course is calculated to draw the attention of the House from the consideration of the question with which we are dealing.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman say what newspapers he is now really aiming at?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am aiming at newspapers published and sold on Sunday.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have in the course of my remarks pointed out the character of the evil prevailing in the United States and have stated that there are a thousand Sunday newspapers there. This evil has grown up and has been allowed to acquire such magnitude and influence as to place it beyond the reach of Christian sentiment and the abolition of the nuisance by law. That is an evil I explicitly stated I had in view in preparing this Bill; that it was the object of the Bill to prevent this evil being introduced into this country, and that the Bill was designed not as a corrector of an evil existing, but, on the principle of using an ounce of cure, to prevent an evil that was sure to come. I ask from the House fair treatment of this measure. I deprecate drawing a red herring across the track, as has been done by the hon. member for Haldimand; I object to hon. members raising side issues, and questioning the jurisdiction of this Parliament when the point has been decided and there is not the slightest doubt in regard to it. The question before the House is this: is the Sunday newspaper an evil; is it desirable to prevent the introduction into Canada of this evil; have we the power to do it? These are the questions the House has to decide. If hon. members believe that it is not an evil to introduce these Sunday newspapers from the United States into Canada let them vote against the Bill. If they believe that this Parliament has the power to make criminal an act which will be in the highest degree detrimental to our people, if they believe that this great evil should be suppressed, that this House has power in the premises to deal with the question, that it is desirable it should be dealt with, they will support the Bill. Let us deal with this question in an honest way, and let

hon. members vote one way or the other without raising pettifogging objections, or drawing herrings across the track, or raising side issues, perplexing and bewildering the House by the tactics that have been resorted to.

Mr. MONTAGUE. To my mind the hon. gentleman's argument altogether depends upon the character of the paper exposed for sale or distributed on Sunday. When I spoke of American newspapers, the hon. gentleman said the matter depended entirely on the character of the paper. I submit that the Bill will have a very serious effect in some directions in which this Parliament does not desire any restriction to be imposed. Supposing a publication is started in Toronto or Montreal the object of which is to the promotion of home culture and the extension of knowledge among the masses, and suppose that this paper is dated on Sunday and delivered on that day, would there be found in this Parliament members prepared to fine the publisher or the boys distributing these papers. Yet in no sense could this be called a religious newspaper. But what is a religious newspaper? To one man a religious newspaper would mean one thing and to another a publication entirely different. So it comes back to the nature of the newspaper, and unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to draw up a schedule and make a list of the various classes of newspapers, he should not ask this House to pass the Bill, for he has already admitted that the present law adequately provides as regards the sale of obscene papers. And if the law does not apply against all papers in which stuff is published which is obscene and immoral and impure, then the law can be invoked now just as well as under the Bill of the hon. member. If the law can be invoked against the immoral and the bad and the impure, then the hon. gentleman's Bill is only giving authority to those who have that power, to invoke the law against that which is not bad and not immoral and not impure. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is entirely illogical. So far as his insinuation goes, that we are not sincere and honest, I may tell him that there are those of us who have not his pretensions in this regard, but who believe we are just as honest, when we express our opinions in this House, as is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) or anybody else. Surely, in this Parliament we can differ on these questions as we can differ on political questions, without being told we are trifling, without being told we are raising side issues, without being told we are drawing a red herring across the scent, by the hon. member for North Norfolk. The fact is, this Bill has been before this Parliament ever since I have been a member. It has been riddled from stem to stern in every direction, and I am bound to say, out of credit for the hon.

gentleman (Mr. Charlton), that nothing but the perseverance of a saint would have brought him through all these trials and tribulations to revive his Bill during each session of this legislature and ask us to adopt it. I tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), that he is making a mountain out of a mole-hill. The sentiment in the country on this Bill, so far as present necessity goes, hardly stirs a ripple in public opinion in the province from which I come, and I believe I speak for just as good a class of the community as does my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton). It is true, that agitation here at this meeting, and agitation there at that meeting, may excite a passing interest, but I challenge members on the other side of the House who are supporting the Bill, and I challenge members on this side who are supporting it, to state whether or not I am correct, when I said, that there is no rousing public sentiment on that question, that there is no agitation as regards the introduction or carrying of this Bill, and that if my hon. friend dropped it in this House, we would fail to hear from it again, unless indeed a condition of affairs should arise in the future which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) pictures in his imagination is likely to arise, and for the termination of which he is trying to carry this Bill. I am strongly in favour of the observance of the Sabbath as a day of rest and Christian worship, but I do not see that this Bill will make it more so in this country.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Montague) has just paid a highly deserving compliment to my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), when he said that nothing but the perseverance of a saint would induce him to persevere in this Bill from year to year. But we are not all so constituted as is my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton), and after four hours of discussion, might I not suggest, that if we have not made up our minds on this Bill, we will not make up our minds by further discussion. Mr. Chairman, I would call question.

Mr. CRAIG. I think, Mr. Chairman, I should make a few remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not intend to detain the House, but it is due to myself, because, as I happened to speak first after the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), I have no doubt that probably he included me when he spoke about persons who sympathized with the Bill, but who are, nevertheless, trying to kill it. The hon. member for North Norfolk talks about not receiving sympathy. Well, I do not wonder at that, because he abuses his own friends. He talks about the Bill not receiving candid treatment, but as for myself I might say that I am perfectly candid and perfectly sincere in everything I say, and while I have no doubt that the hon. member for North Norfolk is quite sincere

and candid, yet I must admit that a great many people outside of the House do not think he is. I have no sympathy at all with remarks of that kind made concerning members of this House. I am not called to defend my hon. friends, but I do say that we have a right to differ on these matters without being called pettifoggers and told we are trifling. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), that I take as strong a stand on the observance of the Lord's Day as any member in this House, not excepting the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton.) I express my candid opinions in this House. If I were not candid, I might pretend to something I did not believe, and I might try to gain some outside applause or sympathy from a certain class of the people. We are here to-night considering a Bill presented by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), and, as the Solicitor General has pointed out, the consequences of this Bill may be more far-reaching than we think. I said nothing that could be construed to be offensive in any way; and what I did say has been amply justified by this debate. I said I was in favour of the principle of the Bill, but I objected to it for two reasons, the first of which is the question of jurisdiction. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says there is no doubt we have jurisdiction; but we have heard quoted against that the opinion of the present Minister of Justice when he was a member of this House, and he (Mr. Mills) told us that there was grave doubt about our jurisdiction, and that in his opinion this question belongs to the provinces. The Solicitor General expresses to-night the same opinion, and I am therefore perfectly justified in taking the ground that the question of jurisdiction should be settled before we legislate in this direction. I have objected to this Bill because I believe it would be found impossible to make a workable law out of it. I have listened to this discussion year after year, I have seconded this Bill more than once, and I would be quite willing to second it to-night if we could make out of it a law which would accomplish what we desire. The Solicitor General tells us now that this Bill will not accomplish the end we seek, and on the legal point I am disposed to be guided by his opinion more than by that of the hon. member for North Norfolk.

After all, the question comes to this: Have we confidence in the provincial legislatures. All of us admit—I do not know that the hon. member for North Norfolk does—that this is a question for the provincial parliaments. The hon. member for North Norfolk states, that he has no confidence in the provincial parliaments doing their duty, and so he says: I will insure here that they shall do their duty, and I am going to ridicule almost any man who does not support me in this measure, and I am going to contend that he is opposed to Sunday observance. Well, Sir, I have confi-

Mr. CRAIG.

dence in the provincial legislatures in this matter. They are in some ways nearer to the people than we are, and this is a matter that comes directly within their powers. If they do not attend to this matter let the hon. member for North Norfolk agitate so that the Government of Ontario will be bound to attend to it, and there are members from the other provinces who are sincere on the question of Sabbath observance who will agitate in their own sphere. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has been asked to point out one case in Canada which called for the intervention of this law, and I heard him say that there was one case in Toronto. I am prepared to state that there is no case of a Sunday newspaper published and sold in Toronto. There is a paper called the "Sunday World," but that paper is printed on Saturday night and sold on Saturday night. Will the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) contradict that?

Mr. CHARLTON. I referred to a paper in Montreal.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not know anything about Montreal, but you referred to Toronto, and I know there is no such case in Toronto. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) tells us that he was moved to introduce this Bill because of the great evil in the United States, and as a preventive measure he wants to have this law in Canada. It will be well to wait until that evil arises here, and until the people of this country ask for this measure, which they do not at the present time. In order not to be misrepresented, I wish to say that I am strongly in favour of a measure to prevent Sunday newspapers, if we have jurisdiction in the matter, and if a workable Bill can be framed and presented to this House.

Mr. MACLEAN. In order that we may get a workable Bill, I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

QUARTZ MINING IN THE YUKON.

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

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the House adjourns, I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of the Interior whether the regulations governing quartz mining in the Yukon are issued yet?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I cannot tell the hon. gentleman. I will let him know to-morrow.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I can tell the hon. Minister that there is just as much need for them as there is for the railway in the Yukon country.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 17th March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SPECULATION IN BUTTER AND CHEESE.

Mr. PARMALEE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 83) to prohibit improper speculation in the sale of butter and cheese. He said: Mr. Speaker, in brief explanation of this Bill, I may say that it proposes to deal not with an imaginary evil, but with an actual evil which has grown up of late years in connection with the produce export trade—a trade which amounts altogether to about \$20,000,000 a year. As everybody knows, that trade is in a few hands, giving a few men an opportunity of controlling the trade, and doing with it pretty much as they please. Within the last three or four years the practice has grown up of selling butter and cheese in England long in advance of their being made in this country. This is an evil which is deprecated not only by the legitimate traders, but by the dairymen themselves. In support of this statement I need only quote from a report of the annual meeting, held in Montreal, of the Butter and Cheese Association, the members of which do nine-tenths of the export trade in butter and cheese of this country. At that meeting this evil was discussed, and in reporting it, the Montreal "Trade Bulletin," an authority on the produce trade, said:

The short selling of cheese was also discussed, and it was stated that over 50 per cent of the business during the past season was done on this basis. This, if correct, shows that the speculative spirit in the cheese trade has increased enormously, and the opinion prevails among a large section of the trade that some measures should be adopted to check it. But it is difficult to see how this can be done, as long as parties on the other side are prepared to buy and take their chances on the future of the market. The buying and selling of goods ahead before they are made is a practice that should be deprecated, but how can it be stopped if buyers and sellers choose to agree on terms we cannot say, unless a Government measure is passed prohibiting such trading.

The object of this Bill is to prohibit that sort of trading. This Bill, which I introduced last session, was discussed more or less during the recess in the press of the country, and during last fall and winter was discussed before the different dairy conventions; and the dairymen are almost unanimous in support of the passage of some such legislation as this.

So far as this quotation which I have read shows that a large portion of the trade is in favour of legislation of this nature. It may

be urged that this Bill will interfere with trade. I want to remove the impression that there is any intention to interfere by this Bill with legitimate trade and legitimate speculation. There is a vast difference between legitimate speculation and the gambling of the sort we propose to prohibit, namely, offering to sell something which does not exist, in the hope that at the time of delivery prices will go down. In the case of such transactions, there is not only the evil of selling in advance and thus creating an influence calculated to depress the market on this side, but there is this other evil. Take, for instance, a Montreal man who wishes to speculate in this way. He cables over to fifteen or twenty houses in Great Britain, offering them large blocks of cheese—offering in June to sell August cheese at, say, 8 cents per pound, which is below the market value. He does not make these offers always with the expectation that any of them, or any considerable number of them, will be accepted, but in order to make importers timid, in order to put the English market in a waiting condition, in order to do all he possibly can to create stagnation in it, and thus be enabled to purchase butter and cheese on this side at prices below the market value. By this Bill I propose to prohibit, not only the selling of futures, but the offering to sell them.

Professor Robertson, speaking at the Western Dairymen's Association, a few weeks ago, gave his cordial support to this Bill, and discussed the question very fully before the large number of dairymen at that meeting. He drew a sharp distinction between legitimate speculation and the gambling which it is the object of this measure to prohibit; and I do not think I can better inform the House than by reading an extract from Professor Robertson's remarks on that occasion:

Speculation is a legitimate and necessary part of commerce. When a man buys cheese in June and does not intend to sell it until September, he buys it in the hope of a rise in the market; he is speculating, that is, hoping for a profit. That is legitimate speculating, wholesome business. Such a buyer gets possession of something, and every pound of butter or cheese which he owns as a speculation makes him so much the more a factor, doing all he can to keep the price up. Cheese may be selling at 9 cents, or any other figure per pound at that time. A man may not buy any cheese in June at all, but he may say to himself: "I see a good chance to make some money without doing anything, a chance of getting something for nothing. I will offer to sell August cheese for delivery in September at 8½ cents." Forthwith he makes an offer to sell August cheese for delivery for 8½ cents, and telegraphs that offer to a score of houses in Great Britain. He has not put a cent of money into cheese; he does not own a box of cheese; he does not render an iota of service in the development of the cheese trade. He has merely offered to sell August cheese for delivery in September at ½ cent under the current price. It may be that nobody in England accepts his

offer; but the firms to whom he cables will be led to say: "We have bought June cheese at 9 cents, and here we are offered August cheese at 8½ cents. Humph! we will not buy any more cheese just now." When anybody sends a cablegram or any other communication offering to sell "futures," or to sell "options," if they are accepted, his whole power and influence are used to weaken the market. He is merely betting that the price will be lower, and then he uses every means, fair and unfair, to make it lower. He is not a necessary middleman in commerce any more than the highwayman is in travel, and civilized nations having abolished the one are now confronted with the duty of preventing the other.

That puts the case very clearly, and removes any objection that might be raised on the ground of interference in any way with legitimate trade. I know how sensitive this House is with regard to any proposal which appears in the slightest degree to affect the perfect liberty of bargain-making by our people, but I contend that this Bill, if passed, will not in the slightest degree interfere with, but on the contrary will promote, legitimate trade. I submit that the interests of a few private individuals should not prevail against those of 200,000 or 300,000 dairymen in this country. I also submit that an industry like the dairy industry in this country—the largest single industry, perhaps, which we have—should not be jeopardized by allowing the continued existence of an evil of this kind. I have the authority of the trade for saying that legitimate traders themselves are in favour of our passing legislation of the kind I propose. I think I am warranted in saying that legislation of this kind will also be welcomed by the British boards of trade, as calculated to put the trade between this country and England upon a steadier and more straightforward basis. Taking all these things into consideration, I think that the Bill I have introduced is well worthy of the careful and serious consideration of this House.

My intention, in speaking on the first reading, was to remove the impression that this Bill is calculated, or intended, in any way to interfere with legitimate trade and commerce. Its intention is to put down a practice which does injury to legitimate trade and commerce, and, more than that, causes very distinct injury to the dairy producers of this country. I hold that this Bill, if it becomes law, will not in any way injuriously affect trade, but on the contrary will help it; but if this Bill should be opposed by a section of the trade—by, perhaps, the parties guilty of the practices I desire to prohibit—then we shall have to make our choice between half a dozen speculators in Montreal and 200,000 or 300,000 dairymen, who are the backbone of the country, and, for my part, I have no hesitation in doing so.

I think that the House will find that this Bill proposes to do something quite in our power to accomplish; and, under the cir-

Mr. PARMALEE.

cumstances, considering the extent of the evil and the reasons for removing it, I hope that we will find it our duty to support and pass the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSOLVENCY.

Mr. FORTIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 84) respecting insolvency. He said: I may say, at the outset, that I would have preferred that a measure of this importance had been confided to a more experienced member of this Parliament. I have for a certain time entertained the hope that possibly a measure of this kind would be presented to this House by a member of the Government. Some few days before Parliament met, a delegation of the Montreal Board of Trade, which I had the honour to accompany, waited upon the members of the Government, and urged upon them the necessity of introducing an Insolvency Bill during the present session. After having had a very cordial and sympathetic reception, we were assured that the question would receive the careful consideration of the members of the Government. Most of us were non-politicians, and consequently, were not very familiar with the exact meaning of "careful consideration." So, we went away with the idea that possibly we might see at the opening of Parliament a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne announcing to Parliament and the country that an insolvency Bill would be introduced by the Government. But alas, there was no such thing in the Speech. This was naturally a matter of great regret to us. At best a mention in the speech from His Excellency would perhaps not have been a very reliable assurance, for on two former occasions we have known the Speech from the Throne to say explicitly that insolvency legislation would be introduced and passed, while, as a matter of fact, though introduced it was never passed. As it was not in the Speech from the Throne this session, and as we have not heard anything since about the decision of the Government upon this subject, I am unfortunately in this position to-day—that at the request of very important commercial bodies, such as the Montreal Board of Trade, for instance, I have to present to this House a Bill entitled "An Act respecting insolvency."

I feel that in doing this I am acting in the best interests of the commercial community. I feel that the Bill now proposed is one the want of which has long been felt in the country, the want of which is more imperative to-day than it has ever been. Immediately after the repeal of the insolvent law of 1875, the boards of trade of the country began to agitate and urge upon the Government the necessity of adopting

a new insolvency law. In 1883 a Bill was submitted to this House by one of the members of that time, Mr. Beatty. In 1884 a Bill was presented to this House by the then member for Montreal Centre, now one of the eminent judges of the Superior Court of Quebec—Mr. Curran. Neither of these Bills was a complete insolvency law. They provided for the equitable distribution of the assets of the insolvent, but contained no clause by which insolvent debtors could be discharged and allowed to start in business again. In 1885, Mr. Curran re-introduced his Bill, and Mr. Beatty also introduced his. After that year, I find that a committee of the House, which received the support of the Montreal and other boards of trade, prepared a Bill, which was introduced in 1892, but which did not pass. Another Bill was prepared by the Toronto, Hamilton and Montreal boards of trade, and this measure was urged upon the Government. In 1893 these efforts were renewed, and in 1894, the Bill was introduced in the Senate by the then Minister of Trade and Commerce, Sir Mackenzie Bowell. That Bill was fully discussed before a committee of the Senate and was afterwards passed in that Chamber. The Bill reached this House at the end of the session, but unfortunately it did not get beyond its first reading. In 1895 the same Bill was again introduced in the Senate, it having been announced that year, as in 1894, in the Speech from the Throne. But the Bill died after passing its second reading in the Senate, and never reached this House. Another Bill was introduced in this House in February, 1896, by the then hon. member for Winnipeg, Mr. Martin, but, as every one knows, no legislation was passed in that session, the time being wholly occupied with one very important measure, which also did not pass.

Now, with this very sad history of attempts to pass insolvency legislation before me, I must say that I do not feel much encouraged. But, if I feel that something might be done in this way, it is on account of the very important fact that there was such a day as the 23rd June, 1896, on which this Parliament was renewed to the extent of nearly one-half, and on which also a new Government came into power. I am fully aware that among the members of this Parliament there are still members of former Parliaments who have expressed their views upon Bills of this kind. I know that some of these hon. members may feel bound by past utterances upon the subject. But when I reflect that there are now possibly half the members of this House who have had no previous experience in Parliament and no past utterances upon the subject of insolvency legislation, I feel that my task may be successfully accomplished, although attempted, as I have already said, by a member of the House

who has very limited means of convincing his fellow-members.

The necessity for such legislation as this, is sufficiently proved, I think, by the repeated declaration of former Governments upon the subject, and by the persistent demands from the trade. This necessity has not disappeared by any means. I believe, on the contrary, it is to-day more necessary to have a good insolvency law applicable to the whole Dominion than it ever was before. It is well-known that business is improving in all directions. Signs of prosperity are visible on every side, and the increase of business is wonderful. The moment the business dealings between traders increase, the moment the volume of our commerce grows greater, the need for a good, equitable and generally applied insolvent law begins to grow more urgent.

It may be said that some of the provinces have adopted measures which render such a Bill as this almost unnecessary. I know that in most provinces laws providing for the equitable distribution of the assets of insolvents have been passed. The first province to adopt such enactments was the province of Quebec. In that province the common law contained the germ at least of a law of this kind. There was in the code of civil procedure provisions for the abandonment of property, but it was limited to the case of *capias* and the case of an unpaid judgment founded upon a debt of a commercial nature exceeding \$80, after all the apparent property of the debtor had been discussed. An Act was passed in 1885 in that province to extend as much as possible the code of civil procedure so as to make it applicable to traders becoming insolvent. An Act was passed during the same year in Ontario providing as far as possible for the equitable distribution of the assets of insolvents. An Act was passed in 1888 in British Columbia not dealing expressly with the subject involved in this Bill, but entitled, "The Trustees and Executors Act." In that Act a section is found by which the property of a man who made an assignment is divided for the benefit of the creditors, and it also provides for the proper distribution of the assets realized. In 1896 a statute was passed in New Brunswick generally on the lines of the Ontario statute. I may also mention that in 1886 a statute was passed in Manitoba much resembling that of the province of Ontario. Now, Sir, allow me to state that although there exist provincial laws on the subject, those laws do not cover all the ground that an insolvency law ought to cover. No blame can be attached, however, to the provincial law-makers, because it is well known that the question of bankruptcy and insolvency is especially allotted by the constitution to the Parliament of the Dominion. Consequently all those laws which have been

passed in the various provinces can only make provisions for the distribution of assets. Many doubts have been expressed as to whether any compulsory provisions in those provincial laws would be valid, and the point has been raised, although I believe it has not yet been decided by the courts.

Now I hold that an insolvency law properly so-called, while protecting the creditors must, at the same time, assist the debtor to a certain extent, when no fraud or bad faith can be proved against him. Any law concerning the distribution of assets which takes no account of the debtor cannot strictly be called an insolvency law.

Moreover, even if the provinces had passed legislation dealing with the whole subject of insolvency, I submit that even then a general Act by the Dominion Parliament would be necessary, for the reason that no one can suppose, in view of the diversity of conditions existing in the various provinces, that an insolvency law could be the same in all those provinces. Although I am not in a general way in favour of a uniform law when there is no uniformity of conditions, I hold that upon a question of this kind there ought to be a uniform law applicable to all the provinces. It seems to me that a merchant who sells his goods in Montreal, in his own office, to a merchant living in Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Halifax or Pictou, ought to be able to know under what law he will be able to get redress in case the purchaser of his goods becomes insolvent. If there is any one subject, I repeat, upon which uniformity of legislation is necessary, it is the subject of insolvency.

Now, Sir, there are provinces where there is no law, or practically no law, dealing with the distribution of assets, and even in those provinces where there are such laws, they have been found to be totally inadequate to cope with this difficulty. I may be allowed to quote from the interview which some members of the board of trade had with the Government, in which occurs some instances showing how the law works in the different provinces. I take this from what Mr. E. B. Greenshields, one of the eminent members of the Montreal Board of Trade said on that occasion :

As an instance of the laws of Nova Scotia, I have with me the notice of assignment of R. A. Logan & Co., of Bridgewater. The firm assigns and instructs the assignee to pay first the attached list of preferred creditors, which takes all the assets. This is a type of nearly all the assignments in this province.

In Ontario, the commonest forms are by giving transfers of book debts, and by sales en bloc of the stocks in trade. The former is a simple document that may remain in a creditor's possession for years. When the debtor assigns it becomes a preference on all the book debts made before and after the transfer was given.

In this interview Mr. Greenshields mentioned the following case :—

Mr. FORTIN.

As an instance of the latter, I might mention the case of C. S. Herbert, of Toronto. He started a large business there, and after a short time sold his stock for cash, paid one or two local creditors and went to the United States. The other creditors got nothing. Another plan was adopted by Thorne & Co., of Hamilton. They dissolved the partnership and borrowed money on a chattel mortgage to pay out one of the partners. He left the country and the other partner assigned. The assets of the estate were used first to pay off the mortgage. Thus, one partner in a firm in difficulties got paid a large sum which belongs to his creditors.

Similar instances might be multiplied. Now let me give an interesting case which I find in the "Shareholder," of the 25th of February last. It is the dividend sheet of the proceeds of the assets of A. C. Baillie, of Pictou, N.S. The assets realized \$14,480. Of this sum, \$10,873 was swallowed up by preferred creditors, and \$2,897 by the expenses, leaving only the sum of \$909, out of nearly \$15,000, to go to the ordinary creditors. All the rest was swallowed up by the expenses of liquidation and by the payment of preferred creditors. Now, this case shows better than anything else that can be said, the actual necessity of an insolvent law of the kind I now introduce into this House. Let me remark that, although, as I have said, in introducing this Bill, I am acting at the request of the Montreal Board of Trades, at the same time there is nothing in it contrary to my own convictions. I have had some experience in dealing with insolvency matters, and this Bill is entirely in accord with my convictions upon the necessity of such a law. I might be allowed to read a letter which I have just received from Mr. George Hadrill, the well-known secretary of the Montreal Board of Trade upon this subject, expressing the views of that very important commercial body. The letter is dated Montreal, March 15th, 1898, and reads as follows :—

Dear Sir,—I am directed by the council of this board to express most emphatically its satisfaction that you have, as requested by the council's Insolvency Committee, prepared a Bill respecting insolvency, and that you are about to introduce that Bill into the House of Commons.

The council, like all bodies in close touch with the business interests of the Dominion, is convinced of the urgent need for legislation whereunder the assets of insolvent debtors shall be equitably divided; a need emphasized by the fact that the system of preferential assignments prevalent in some provinces has rendered England and other European countries unwilling to give credit to Canadian houses.

While slight differences of opinion may arise in discussing the details of your Bill, you may rest assured that not only the Montreal Board of Trade, but all other influential boards of trade throughout the country will support you in this effort to provide for the equitable distribution of insolvent estates, and I am further to say that the council of this board is anxious to assist you in any way that you may suggest towards procuring the adoption of insolvency legislation at this session of Parliament.

I have received a similar letter from "La Chambre de Commerce," which is well known to be the French Board of Trade of Montreal. It is dated March 16th, and is written in French. It says :

La Chambre de Commerce attend avec une certaine anxiété la faveur promise d'une copie imprimée de votre projet de loi de liquidation de faillites.

Son but est de vous appuyer dans la mesure de ses forces.

S. COTE,
Secrétaire.

I am told by one of the members of the board of trade, Mr. A. W. Stevenson, that all the boards of trade of the Dominion, numbering sixty-nine, are a unit in favour of the desirability and necessity of enacting an insolvency law. Mr. Stevenson writes to me under date 15th March, and says :

You need not hesitate to say that every board of trade in the Dominion, some sixty-nine in number, endorse your action.

It may now be asked, what is the Bill I propose to this House under the title of an Act respecting insolvency? I may say before entering into the details, that the Bill has been prepared under the direction of the Montreal Board of Trade, and with the assistance of perhaps the most able men connected with this matter, at all events the most eminent men in Montreal, Mr. A. L. Kent, and A. W. Stevenson, both accountants of wide experience and knowledge and who have no superiors in Montreal. The Bill is very largely the one which was introduced by Sir Mackenzie Bowell in the Senate and passed by that Chamber in 1894, and re-introduced in 1895. Several changes have been made, which I shall enumerate and notice as I explain the provisions of the Bill. As far as I am concerned I have endeavoured to apply the following principle with respect to this Bill. A well-known author, Mr. Robson, on bankruptcy laws, says :

The law of bankruptcy is founded on the principle that when a man becomes insolvent, the property then remaining to him rightfully belongs to his creditors and ought to be distributed rateably amongst them towards satisfaction of their claims, the debtor himself being released from future liability in respect of his debts, upon giving all the aid in his power towards the realization and distribution of his estate for the benefit of his creditors, and fulfilling the other conditions prescribed by the law for his discharge.

I think it will be found that in the provisions of the Bill, especially in the new provisions, this principle has not been departed from.

The Bill I propose contains a preliminary title declaratory of the most important terms used in it, and it is afterwards divided into seven parts with several subdivisions.

Part 1 determines the application of the Act. I may say that the Act is intended to

apply only to those who make trade their main occupation. In former Acts, especially in the Act of 1864, this was not the case. In that Act, in the province of Quebec, then Lower Canada, traders only come under this law; while in Ontario, then Upper Canada, the Insolvency Act applied to every person who might become insolvent. This general application of the Insolvency Act was limited to traders in the Act of 1869. As it is well known, the Act of 1864 was adopted before confederation. After confederation two more provinces formed part of the country, and it was then found necessary to re-enact the Act of 1864. I am aware that some hon. members and some business men and others would prefer to see such a law apply to all sorts of people, to farmers and non-traders, mechanics, and so forth. For my part I am not in favour of such a measure. I think an insolvency law should be considered, as an exceptional law, for the benefit of traders. The farmers and professional men run no risk, take no chances such as is necessary with business men, and only traders assume large risks from day to day. There is an express provision that the Act should only apply to those persons who as a means of livelihood, "manufacture, buy or otherwise acquire, goods, wares, merchandise or commodities, ordinarily the subject of trade and commerce, and sell or otherwise dispose of the same to others, including commission merchants, whether they sell by auction or otherwise."

This Bill differs, as already said, on many important points from the one introduced by Sir Mackenzie Bowell. The former Act was made applicable to all joint stock companies which now come under the provisions of the Winding-up Act. We have omitted all those provisions from the present Bill. The Winding-up Act has been in operation since 1882. It has worked in a very satisfactory manner and I never heard of any fault being found with its application, and it seems useless to re-enact its provisions and introduce them into a new law, the discussion or passage of which might occupy considerable time. No useful purpose would have been served in re-enacting the Winding-up Act, which applies to joint stock, insurance and finance companies. Hence these changes in the Bill from the measure passed by the Senate in 1894.

Part 2 of the Act deals with "Proceedings from act of insolvency to discharge of debtor."

Section 4 defines what is an act of insolvency, the most common of which acts, it is very well known, is the ceasing on the part of the debtor to meet his liabilities generally. Section 5 commences another sub-title, under the heading of "Receiving order." This requires some explanation. In former Acts there was a voluntary assignment and a compulsory assignment. I

have omitted in this Bill, as was also the case with Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Bill, the provisions concerning a voluntary assignment. It has been found by experience that that feature of an insolvency law was very objectionable to the merchants throughout the country; and those who remember the operation of former insolvency Acts are most decidedly opposed to any such thing as a voluntary assignment. Therefore the main feature of this Bill is that all assignments are compulsory. In the case of compulsory assignment under former insolvency Acts the procedure was somewhat different from that proposed under this Act. Under the Act of 1875, for instance, there was a demand of assignment and there was also a writ of attachment, which would issue without any previous demand of assignment. These have been omitted from this Bill and the procedure now proposed is as follows:—

The moment a trader has committed an act of insolvency, a creditor to the minimum amount of \$200 applies to the court by petition and obtains a receiving order. That receiving order is addressed to the sheriff of the district or county, and upon the receipt of it the sheriff either by himself or by his officers, proceeds to take possession of all the property of the insolvent. The order may be had with or without notice. It is optional. If it is obtained after notice, of course the parties may be heard on the application and then the court would determine whether or not the order should be granted. If it is obtained without notice, immediately after the order is granted it must be served upon the debtor with copy of the affidavits in support of it, and the debtor has three days within which he may apply to a judge to have this receiving order cancelled. In the meanwhile there is nothing done until such time as it is adjudicated by the court whether or not the receiving order is to hold or be cancelled. I may say, that in most cases the receiving order will always be issued after previous notice of the application upon the debtor, because generally, although there is no voluntary assignment, yet when the debtor finds himself insolvent he is willing that his creditors should take possession of his assets.

There is also in connection with this subject a very important difference between this Bill and the Bill introduced by Sir Mackenzie Bowell. As is well known, in the Bankruptcy Acts of 1864, 1869 and 1875, there was a class of persons known under the name of official assignees. By the Acts of 1864 and 1869, those official assignees were appointed by the boards of trade of the different cities throughout the Dominion, but by the Act of 1875 the law was changed and the official assignees were appointed by the Governor in Council.

Now, I know of no institution that brought more discredit upon the insolvency law of 1875 than the official assignee. It created a

class of persons whose sole object was to obtain by all means the assignment of persons in trade or otherwise. I remember perfectly well when I began the practice of law, a case where a man, worth several thousand dollars consisting of real estate, and happening to owe a very small sum of money, was persuaded by an official assignee to make an abandonment of his property. The next thing that occurred was an application to the court, to send that man to jail, and it cost him many hundreds of dollars to resume possession of his estate and to escape imprisonment. I do not say that all these official assignees were to be complained of, because some of them were very respectable men, but as a rule the institution of official assignees proved to be most disastrous, and there is probably nothing that brought so much discredit upon the law and which contributed so largely to the repeal of the Act of 1875, as this institution. After all, if we eliminate some of the details of the Act of 1875, it would be found to be good law.

In the Act introduced by Sir Mackenzie Bowell there is no mention of the official assignee, but another class of officials was proposed to be created under the name of "official receivers." I know that the official receiver is known to the English bankruptcy law, and its origin is probably to be found in that law. The official receiver under the Bill of Sir Mackenzie Bowell was nothing but a guardian and his duties were very limited. He was merely to receive the assignment; he had no right to vote; and he had no right to be appointed subsequently as assignee to liquidate the affairs of the insolvent. But we know, and experience proves, that when the thin end of the wedge is introduced, it is always difficult to prevent it going further than was anticipated. We fear that this official receiver—under the amendments to the Act which may be made at every session of Parliament—would turn out to be nothing else than an official assignee under another name. Therefore that provision has been left out of this Bill, and it is replaced by a clause whereby the receiving order is addressed to the sheriff, and executed by him or his officers, and he becomes a mere guardian of the estate, without making an inventory and without incurring any expense save those that might be strictly necessary in order to conserve the property of the debtor. There is no danger in addressing this order to the sheriff, for the reason that the sheriff is an official who lives by his official position as a rule. Some of the sheriffs occupy very high positions. It is well known that the sheriff of the city of Montreal is also an hon. member of the Senate of Canada, and it is well known, too, that the sheriff of the city of Quebec is an ex-Minister of the Crown in that province. I may say, that the gentlemen appointed to that position are educated and honourable

men, who have the means of living well ; so that they have not, as a rule, any interest in increasing their fees or revenue. Moreover, the duty imposed on them is so limited that they would have no interest to act otherwise than in a perfectly fair manner, since they are only called upon to take possession of the assets of the debtor and to act as guardian of the estate until the appointment of a liquidator. Besides, it is proposed that, whenever the court is satisfied by affidavit or otherwise that the majority in value of the creditors approve of a person to be appointed liquidator, then, such person may be appointed guardian of the estate, and will thereupon take possession of the assets, even from the sheriff's hands. But such person only acts as guardian until the liquidator has been appointed in the ordinary way by the creditors.

Another sub-title of the Bill deals with the proceedings consequent upon the receiving order. The first thing to be done after the receiving order has been executed, and possession has been taken by the sheriff of the assets of the insolvent, is to call a meeting of the creditors, to be held either at the sheriff's office or at any other convenient place. The sheriff is bound, of course, to give notice to all the creditors ; and at such meeting of the creditors a liquidator is appointed. At the same time, one or more inspectors may also be appointed. The duties of inspectors are to control and superintend the administration of the liquidator, and to see that the affairs of the estate are generally managed in the best interest of the creditors. The inspectors are not to be paid, unless at a general meeting of the creditors, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, the creditors should decide otherwise.

Another sub-title of this part of the Bill is under the heading, "Control of the person and property of the insolvent." Under this sub-title will be found provisions by which the insolvent is bound to give all possible information and assistance to the liquidator. Provisions will also be found here concerning the examination of the insolvent, with the view of ascertaining the way in which he managed his affairs. There are also provisions concerning the arrest of the insolvent, whenever that becomes necessary—for instance, in case he is about to abscond.

Another sub-title is under the heading, "Discharge of the insolvent." The only discharge which is provided for by the Bill is a discharge with the consent of a majority in number, and three-fourths in value, of all the creditors. There is no provision for a discharge being obtained against the will of the creditors. There is no provision, such as existed in former Acts, by which, after a certain lapse of time, the debtor could apply, ex parte to the court and obtain his discharge. When the express consent of a majority in number, and three-fourth in value, of the creditors is obtained,

a deed of composition is made and deposited in the hands of the liquidator, who thereupon calls a meeting of the creditors, and subsequently, if nothing is shown which would be sufficient to prevent the insolvent getting his discharge, the deed of composition is agreed to by resolution; and with that deed of composition the debtor may go before the court and obtain his discharge. There are provisions to the effect that no deed of composition can be obtained, or shall be valid, unless, in the first place, all the costs of the liquidation are paid in cash into the hands of the liquidator, and unless all the privileged claims are also paid into the hands of the liquidator, and unless at least one-half of the amount of the composition shall be payable within twelve months after the granting of such discharge. This discharge being confirmed by the court, the liquidator reconveys to the debtor all his estate ; but should the insolvent fail to carry out the conditions of the deed of composition, the liquidator is entitled to resume possession of all the assets of the debtor, with due regard, of course, to the rights of new creditors, which may have arisen in the interval.

Then we come to the effect of the discharge. On this subject, there is something new in this Bill. In former Acts, and in former Bills on insolvency, the discharge had the effect of liberating the debtor from all his debts existing at the time of the insolvency. I know that this has always been a very objectionable feature of any insolvency law. I remember very well how the farmers complained, that insolvency laws were a kind of class legislation in favour of merchants. The farmers who used to sell their produce to merchants, complained that these traders had the opportunity of going into insolvency, paying a small dividend, and obtaining their discharge, when the producers had not the same opportunity. In order to meet these objections, we have introduced a provision in this Bill declaring that the discharge shall not apply, without the express consent of the creditor, to any claim of a non-commercial nature due to a non-trader. This is intended to restrict, as much as possible, the effect of the discharge of an insolvent trader to his fellow traders.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Would he be entitled to any portion of the distribution ?

Mr. FORTIN. He would, but the giving of the discharge would not affect him. He can take his dividend as an ordinary creditor, but then his claim will not be affected by the discharge. He will keep his claim for the balance, and unless it be prescribed, he will be entitled to claim from the debtor, notwithstanding any discharge. This is a very commendable feature of an insolvency Act, especially in a country like ours. It will remove, it seems to me, in the minds

of those opposed to insolvency legislation, the very serious and important objection that was made to any insolvency law before this was presented.

There are also other claims not affected by the discharge. Those are for damages for seduction, libel, slander, malicious arrest, also for the maintenance of parent, wife or child, or penalties for any offence, or debts due by the insolvent as assignee, curator, executor, administrator, &c. All these different claims have always been exempted in all the insolvent Acts I have seen, from the operation of the discharge.

The Bill also determines the effect of the discharge with regard to persons secondarily liable, such as endorsers upon negotiable instruments. Those are not discharged. There was also in Mackenzie Bowell's Bill transitory provisions making it applicable with regard to the discharge to all those who have become insolvent since the repeal of the Insolvent Act of 1875. We have left out those provisions as likely to be the subject of much discussion and criticism, but there would be, in my opinion, no objection, if it were thought advisable to insert a clause of that kind, which would be available to all the honest traders who have become insolvent since the repeal of the Insolvent Act of 1875.

The subject next dealt with is the administration of the property of the insolvent. A sub-title deals with debts provable against the estate. The principle laid down is, of course, that all claims, direct or indirect, contingent or conditional, are provable against the estate. We know that limitations, however, are necessary, and these are made with regard to some debts. For instance, no costs of suits made subsequently to the issuing of the receiving order can rank against the estate. This is intended to prevent useless legal expenses after the receiving order is issued.

In the second place, the privilege of the unpaid vendor in the province of Quebec, when the goods are delivered in the store of the insolvent, is done away with. As the law now stands in the province of Quebec, an unpaid vendor can revendicate his goods within 30 days from the date of the delivery. This has been found to lead to abuse. There arises disputes of all kinds, the date of delivery is sometimes very difficult to establish, and in order to put an end to those difficulties, it is provided that the privilege will only last so long as the goods are not found in the store of the insolvent.

I may say that this is in accord with article 577 of the Code of Commerce in France, which also limits the privilege of revendication to goods which may be found in transit and before delivery into the store of the insolvent.

There are also changes in the law of privileges. Those who have furnished provisions to the insolvent, have, under our law

in the province of Quebec, a privileged claim, but under this Bill they will be treated as ordinary creditors.

There is also a limitation in the privilege of the employees of an insolvent. They will only be allowed arrears of wages not exceeding three months, and for any balance that may be due they will rank as ordinary creditors.

There is also a limitation to the privilege of the landlord. His privilege for rent is limited to six months' arrears and three months in advance, if the liquidator should give notice to put an end to the lease, and there is a provision by which the liquidator may be authorized to sell the lease for the unexpired term. It is found, in some cases, that the right to the lease is a most valuable asset of the debtor. Take, for instance, the case of hotelkeepers. They have usually long leases, covering sometimes five to ten years, and these leases are sometimes the most valuable part of their property. In such cases, the liquidator may be authorized to sell the right to such lease for the benefit of the creditors.

There are provisions regarding the manner of proving claims. The Bill provides that they are proved by affidavit, accompanied with vouchers when there are any.

There are also provisions with respect to the liquidation of the private property of the individual partners, when the partners have individual creditors of their own. The principle laid down in article 1899 of the Civil Code of Quebec, is incorporated in this Bill, namely, that the creditors of the partnership are to be preferred upon the assets of the partnership for what is due to them, to the individual creditors of the partners; and the individual creditors of the partners are given a like preference on the private estates of the partners, over the creditors of the partnership.

There are also special provisions regarding secured creditors. These will be bound to value their security. The liquidator then will have the right to take up the security by paying a sum of money corresponding to the value put upon it by the creditor; or if he does not choose to do so, the amount of the value of the security is deducted from the total amount of the claim, and the creditor is allowed to rank for the balance. Conditional and contingent claims are also to be valued, and in case of difference, the dispute is to be settled by the court.

Then the Bill deals with the effect of insolvency on antecedent transactions.

In the first place, the guardian or the liquidator is entitled to take possession of all the property of the debtor, whether it be found in the hands of the bailiff, the sheriff or any other officer of the court. After notice, they can take possession of these assets for the benefit of the creditors. Then provisions follow by which fraud and

fraudulent preferences which may have been made by the debtor before insolvency, are declared null and voidable. In the first place, as regards gratuitous contracts, it is provided that these contracts are to be deemed fraudulent and the result of fraud, if made within three months of the insolvency. Onerous contracts or contracts for a consideration made within thirty days are voidable if it is proved that they were made to prevent and avoid the payment of debtors or to give preference to any creditor of the insolvent.

Then follow provisions for the realization of the property. It is provided that the property may be sold in any manner which may be advised by the creditors or the inspectors. As regards the sale of real estate, there are special provisions applicable to the province of Quebec. It is provided that immovables are to be sold by public auction, and the proceeds of the sale are to be distributed by the liquidator in the usual way. Now, there is a provision under which sales made by the liquidator shall have the effect of sales by the sheriff. This was found necessary under the Winding-up Act, and so it was introduced here. It was found necessary to have a special statute passed in Quebec by which all the effects of the sheriff's sale were given to sales made by the liquidator under the Winding-up Act.

This provision has been found useful, and therefore it has been introduced here. With regard to sales in other provinces, they are made according to the manner decided by the creditors or inspectors. In Quebec the sales may be made subject to any charge that may be imposed upon the property when sold by the sheriff. This is to provide for cases where the immovables are leased or affected by other charges. It has been held, for instance, that a lease of an immovable constitutes a charge which is not annulled by the sheriff's sale. It is provided also for the case of immovables on which there are charges of life rents annuities, and so on. In all these cases, upon the demand of the creditor, the immovables may be sold subject to such charges.

There is a special section in connection with this subject. By section 64, upon the demand of a privileged or hypothecary creditor, the liquidator may be ordered by the court to sell the immovables without delay. This is to obviate the delays that may otherwise take place in the liquidation of that part of the estate.

Another sub-title deals with the distribution of the property. This is made in the ordinary way by dividend sheets, after due notice to all parties interested. Provisions are enacted for the contestation of the different claims. In connection with this part of the subject, there is a very important difference as compared with the former Insolvency Acts. These provisions are taken altogether from Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Bill. As is well known in insolvency mat-

ters, there are often found a certain number of persons who file bogus claims, claims that have no existence in law, and that are generally filed by persons having no means whatever. It becomes the duty of the liquidator to contest these claims; and more than once it has proved that the contestation of these claims was more costly than profitable to the creditors. To prevent these things, the provisions under this Bill are these: Whenever a claim is to be contested, the liquidator serves notice upon the claimant setting forth all the grounds of contestation. From that moment the claim is deemed to be contested, and is not to be put upon any list or dividend sheets that may be prepared. It is then open to the claimant, within a certain time, to serve a writ upon the liquidator to establish his claim. In ordinary cases, where the claim is a bona fide one, it is not imposing too much upon the creditor to make it necessary for him to establish it in this way. I dare say these provisions will do away with the necessity of wasting a good part of the assets of the debtor in contesting bogus claims made by insolvent parties.

Claims may also be contested either by the insolvent or by creditors. It is sufficient for the insolvent or the creditor to serve notice upon the liquidator with an order from the court, allowing the contestation, and from that moment the issue is joined, by the service of the answers and replications in the ordinary way and then the record is transmitted to the court by the liquidator and the parties are heard upon the merits of the claim.

There are provisions concerning unpaid dividends. These are to be paid over to the Minister of Finance, and whenever claimed by the parties entitled to them they are supposed to be paid to them. I do not think that this provision will have any practical results. It is so probable that all dividends allowed will be claimed that this section will not often be called into use. Provision is made for the ordinary 1 per cent duty upon the sales of immovables in Quebec for the building and jury fund.

Another section deals with benefit of proceedings. This provision is similar to that of the Act of 1875, whereby when the liquidator does not choose to act himself, a creditor may obtain an order by which he is allowed to use the name of the liquidator in suing for the recovery of any property belonging to the debtor. The benefit of such suit belongs to the party suing.

Another section deals with small estates. Whenever the proceeds from an estate do not exceed \$5,000, then the estate can be dealt with by the liquidator in a much more simple and summary way. I need not dilate upon this feature, for it will be fully discussed when the details of the Bill come up for consideration.

Part 5 deals generally with the liquidators and the duties imposed upon them. A

R

subsection determines the remuneration to be allowed to the liquidator. This point is left entirely to the creditors or the inspectors. When the creditors do not act, the inspectors are at liberty to fix the remuneration of the liquidator. There is an appeal to the court upon this point.

Part 6 deals with the ordinary offences and penalties, as when the debtor has been guilty of fraud, or refuses to give information to the liquidator, absconds or conceals his property.

Part 7 deals with procedure generally: how the meetings of creditors are to be called, who is to act as chairman, how resolutions are to be made binding upon creditors, &c. A subsection deals with the jurisdiction of the court.

The last section is one of considerable importance. It has been placed last because it was only proposed after the other parts of the Bill had been prepared. It refers to banks. As is well known, the bankers have sent a deputation to the Government, requesting that, in any legislation which might be introduced, their rights and privileges should be properly safeguarded. This section enacts that nothing in the provisions of this Act shall interfere with, or restrict, the rights and privileges conferred upon banks and banking corporations by the Bank Act.

Such are the main features of the Bill I have the honour to introduce. I do not contend that this measure is a perfect one; a perfect law is something rarely seen. In a country like this, of such great extent, and where conditions are so different in various portions, it cannot be expected that an insolvency law can be made so perfect as to give universal satisfaction; although it might be made nearly perfect when applicable to a more limited extent of territory, or to a population more homogeneous. Doubtless, many features of the Bill will provoke discussion, and will be liable to be changed. There are many details which, no doubt, after full consideration, will be found faulty, and these can be replaced by others. But I submit that the Bill, as a whole, is one that will commend itself to all the members of this House. The fact that it has been indorsed by all the boards of trade of the Dominion is sufficient to entitle it to our most serious consideration, and, indeed, to our support and adoption. The passage of the Bill, in my opinion, will prevent designing and fraudulent debtors from imposing upon legitimate business firms. I think it will protect honest merchants, and will promote honesty in business transactions. The passage of this Bill will also, in my opinion, be in the interests of both creditors and debtors; it would benefit the buyer, as well as the seller. Let me also add, that the passage of this Bill, in my opinion, would greatly promote our credit in foreign countries; it would largely contribute to the growth of confidence on

Mr. FORTIN.

the part of those from whom we might desire to ask credit. In a word, it will protect the honest as against the dishonest. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will only say, in conclusion, that any legislation that promotes credit and confidence, cannot fail to promote industrial and national prosperity. We are all proud to be able to say, since a recent period, that Canada has become a nation. We find expressions of that sort in speeches of many of our most eminent public men. Now, if Canada has become a nation—as I am quite ready to acknowledge—it seems to me, she should act as a nation, and a civilized nation, at this time of the nineteenth century, ought to have a law of this kind on its Statute-book. There is no European nation which has not in its legislation provisions of the kind I am now advocating. In France, they have a Code of Commerce, enacted in 1808, and which has remained in force ever since. In England, they have also legislation of a similar character. Among our neighbours to the south, on the 19th February last, an insolvency law was passed through Congress at Washington very much on the same lines as this one. I feel sure, that the adoption of this law, or an insolvency law on similar lines, will greatly contribute to our commercial prosperity. I am not so wedded to this Bill that I would not be willing to withdraw it at once, if I were assured by the Government, or by some members better qualified than myself, that another Bill, more perfect, would be introduced at this session. If a better Bill is introduced, or if this Bill is so modified and amended as to make it more nearly perfect, I shall not be sorry. My sole desire is, that we should now, or as soon as possible, adopt a sound and equitable insolvency law applicable to the whole Dominion.

Mr. BOURASSA. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to participate at any great length in the debate now going on in connection with the Bill before the House, as I shall not be able to add very much to the exceedingly able and exhaustive effort which the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) has just delivered. But I thought it my duty to rise on this occasion and voice the general opinion prevailing among business men, and those who are in close touch with the wants of the mercantile community, concerning the urgent and imperative necessity of having an insolvency law carried through Parliament at the earliest possible moment. I know that the old Bankruptcy Act did not meet with general favour in the country, and the reason of its being so very unpopular was the way it was applied, even without taking into account the undesirable provisions of that law. But from the fact that a law contains objectionable features or that it is not enforced in a satisfactory manner, it does not follow that

it should not be replaced by another one, dealing with the same subject.

One of the difficulties incident to our social condition in Canada, and which is not met with in other countries, is that when an insolvency Act is enacted for the benefit of the trade and other interests of the country, such legislation, coming within the purview of the local legislatures which have within their own jurisdiction all that concerns civil rights, it is enforced in a different way throughout the different parts of Canada. Such is the reason why I am led to believe that a good, equitable Dominion insolvent law could be enacted by this Parliament, as would greatly benefit the trade interests of the country at large.

It is not my intention to enter into any exhaustive review of this matter in all its details as, before going through this House, this Bill must be thoroughly considered and debated, at its various stages; but all I wish to do is to review it, from the standpoint of the best interests of the country at large, and of our trade relations with foreign countries. As I do not wish to make any lengthened remarks on this question, let me say, Sir, that if we want to develop our trade intercourse with foreign nations, it is absolutely necessary for this House to enact such legislation as may provide for the general interests that are affected. We have a general law on the Customs duties, we have an Act concerning insurance matters; we have also an Act respecting banks and banking; we further have an Act concerning steamboat and railway companies. Now, these several Acts are administered by the Dominion Parliament, and offer a uniformity which, unfortunately, does not exist in the case of our insolvency laws. From the standpoint of foreign trade, our actual position is still more objectionable. The outside trader who deals in Canada finds himself face to face with a uniform Customs legislation. There is not a different law for the province of Quebec, another for the province of Ontario, and another for British Columbia. No, the tariff is the same everywhere, and is applied throughout the whole Dominion in the same way and by the same Government. So it is also with our railway and steamboat companies, and should he find himself obliged to resort to law, the foreign dealer finds a uniform law applicable to the whole country. The legislation is everywhere the same, and the courts to which he appeals are clothed with the same jurisdiction and follow the same jurisprudence. But in the matter of trade relations, our position is altogether anomalous. Traders from Great Britain, from France, from Belgium and Germany, representing individually, with the exception of Belgium, a population of about forty million people, find themselves face to face with insolvent laws enacted by the various provinces of the Dominion which do not possess that uniformity

which is so desirable in such matters. It is of the utmost importance that we should have a uniform legislation applicable to the whole Dominion, in order that outside traders in their dealings with us may not find themselves face to face with a country of four million inhabitants, divided, from a legislative standpoint, into four or five provinces, in matters of such considerable importance. I would urge the Government to take this measure under their special protection, and to place upon the Statute-book a legislation on the lines of the Bill now before the House, presenting such uniformity as a law of that kind should possess, in trade matters.

I do not intend to deal at considerable length with this subject, as other hon. gentlemen who will participate in the debate will no doubt be able to throw much more light on it than I can, but let me say this, that it is in the general interests of the country to enact such a law as is calculated to remedy the grievances and remove the difficulties now prevailing. In my judgment, Parliament ought to adopt an insolvency law making provision for a simple and inexpensive machinery, a law the provisions of which in regard to creditors and debtors could be easily interpreted; in short, a general and uniform law such as we have in our Statute-book relating to railway and steamboat companies and to the customs. The Bill introduced this afternoon by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) who has treated the subject-matter of it in such an able and exhaustive manner, includes some enactments which, while securing this much-desired uniformity, also command my approval on other grounds. I refer to that portion of the Bill which makes provision for the protection of the interests of the farming community; and let me say here, Sir, that such an equitable and just provision cannot fail to commend itself to the approval of the people of this country. The Bill provides that when a trader is compelled to make an assignment of his property for the benefit of his creditors, and when there is apparently no intention to defraud his creditors on the part of the insolvent, he may obtain a general discharge from his creditors; but that discharge is not to apply under this provision to the debts he may owe to non-traders, that is to say, those creditors who have not run the common risks of trade. Under that section the unhappy but honest trader is free to resume his operations; but the provision is inserted that the debts of farmers who do not run the risks of trade, are not to be affected by this Bill. This provision of the Bill is a very fair and equitable one, and I have no doubt such as will be eagerly endorsed by all the hon. gentlemen who represent rural constituencies in this House. Under that provision of this Bill, those farmers who have sold their produce to traders

will not be called upon to grant a discharge to the insolvent, because, as they have not had the chance of realizing any benefit from the trade, it is but fair that they should not be called upon to share the risks of the same.

The interests of the country at large, as also those of private citizens will therefore find ample protection under this legislation, and I trust it will go through its different stages and be placed on the Statute-book before this session is over. This Bill is well calculated to foster the general interests of trade, and to further develop our trade relations with foreign countries, a policy which was auspiciously inaugurated by the present Government from the very moment they came into power.

Mr. MONK. As one of the representatives of the district of Montreal I deem it my duty to say a few words on this Bill in order to show the urgent necessity that exists for the passage of a law on insolvency. The commercial community of the city of Montreal has taken up the subject and expressed its opinion on the same. In fact, having in view the fate which has been meted out in past years to measures of this kind, I had myself, before the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) gave notice of this Bill, given notice of a motion to the effect that it was desirable that legislation of this kind should be passed by the Dominion Parliament. At the request of the right hon. First Minister I suspended action on that motion. The reason why I proceeded in this way was, that I was desirous of testing the opinion of the House first of all, and had the opinion of the House been favourable to the passage of such a measure, then it would have seemed to me to have constituted an urgent intimation to the Government that the Government should take charge of legislation of this kind.

Sir, I have listened with a great deal of attention and pleasure to the explanations given by the hon. member for Laval of the principal parts of the Bill, which I have not yet been able to read, and I am aware that many of the provisions he has pointed out are calculated to remove some of the difficulties which existed in the working of previous insolvency laws. But I think in a matter of this kind it is impossible for any lawyer in any of the provinces, unassisted or even assisted as my hon. friend has been, to prepare a measure which will meet with the approval of every province of the Dominion; and I believe that the task being insuperable, it devolves on the Government to take charge of such a measure. However satisfactory the law which my hon. friend has prepared may be to hon. members who will be brought in the way of carrying out its provisions daily in Montreal, it is almost safe to say that some of those provisions will not meet the wants of other provinces. It seems to me, therefore, that the task

Mr. BOURASSA.

which my hon. friend has taken upon himself is one in which at all events he should be assisted by the Government; and the reason for that is obvious. The Government is better able in every respect to give a finished measure which would inspire confidence and satisfy the wants of every part of this Dominion, in which there are so many provinces having different systems of law. The Government is in a position to weigh the representations which for a certain time past have been made from all sources setting forth the grievances of all classes, commercial and others; and the Government also possesses the facilities for obtaining reliable information from all the provinces, through commercial bodies, judges, lawyers, bankers and accountants, and is in that way able to prepare legislation which will meet the requirements of every province and not clash in any way with the systems of legislation so diverse one from the other which exist in the different provinces.

At the time of confederation the underlying principle actuating the framers of our constitution was that all matters of general interest should be confided to our legislative power here, and surely there is no matter of such general interest as the subject of legislation in respect to insolvency. Year after year our interprovincial commerce is increasing in a remarkable degree, and there is an obvious necessity in consequence of that for obtaining a uniform law throughout the Dominion on the subject of insolvency. It is also equally essential, as was pointed out by the last speaker, that parties from outside dealing commercially with the Dominion should not find themselves face to face with a varied system of legislation in regard to a matter of this kind, but they should find a general system of law equally applicable throughout the entire Dominion. In my own province we have not been able to deal with the subject of insolvency, but we have a law, as I think was pointed out by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), in regard to the abandonment of property, which possesses many good features. It provides for the punishment of frauds and fraudulent debtors, it provides for the distribution equitably of all assets of traders who are unable to meet their liabilities as they fall due. There is, as I have said, many good features in that law. It is simple in its operation, and provides for an even distribution, subject, of course, to privileged claims, which exist under the civil law, largely French in its origin. But it is not properly an insolvent law, and there is not that particularity in its operation which would be so valuable if we had a Dominion insolvent law whose operation would be controlled by the Dominion authorities. Moreover, many of the privileges existing under the law in regard to the abandonment of property are open to objection, and have been severely criticised by our

commercial community. There is also another very serious defect to which my hon. friend has adverted in the course of his remarks, and that is the lack of provision for the discharge of honest debtors. The result of these defects is, that there have been numberless complaints from bankers and the commercial community generally, and there is a manifest desire throughout our province, at least in the large cities, for the passage of an insolvency law. To give an instance of the anomaly which the administration of our law of abandonment sometimes presents, I may read to the House a statement which appeared in one of the Montreal newspapers, the "Star," a short time ago. The writer, who is a member of the bar, says :

The interest you take in the question of an insolvency law induces me to ask you to place before your readers the official report of the curator in the case of a man who, a very short time before his failure showed considerable surplus. The figures are remarkable. The man also is not "contraignable par corps," as he was doing business in his wife's name. He could only be reached through his wife, and in our time nobody would think of imprisoning a woman in a matter of this kind when her name is in most cases made use of without her knowledge. The names, for obvious reasons, are suppressed.

Trustees' statement of affairs in re X— & Co., after liquidation :

28th August, 1897.

LIABILITIES.

Privileged creditors paid, viz.—		
Rent, taxes, &c.....	\$1,013	29
Privileged creditors not paid—		
“Wages”.....	2,708	38
Ordinary creditors.....	4,126	19
		<u>\$7,847 81</u>

ASSETS.

Stock on hand—		
Furniture	\$ 465	97
Fixtures	46	54
Horse	36	00
Express wagon, sleigh, &c.	136	00
Book debts	305	64
Rent, &c., due.....	91	50
		<u>1,081 65</u>
		6,768 15
This estate paid to ordinary creditors		
1 cent per dollar.....	68	36
		<u>\$6,697 80</u>

Statement furnished the Quebec Bank by X—, the insolvent, on 20th June, 1896 :

ASSETS.

Stock on hand—		
Furniture	\$3,575	70
Book debts	3,235	20
Cash on hand.....	78	70
		<u>\$6,889 60</u>

LIABILITIES.

Bills payable and open ac-		
counts	4,261	60
Surplus....		<u>2,628 00</u>
		<u>\$9,325 80</u>

Showing a deficiency of \$9,325.80 in the short space of seven months.

This possibly occurred because of the absence of that provision which would have permitted the insolvent to obtain a discharge under favourable circumstances and continue business in his own name. It is therefore, so far as we in the province of Quebec are concerned, and more particularly in the city of Montreal, and I believe the same condition of things exists throughout all the commercial centres of the Dominion, most important that we should have an insolvency law. I hope the Government, if I may use the expression, will not shirk its responsibility in regard to the satisfying of that want, but will take this measure under its protection so that before the end of this session we shall have an insolvency law which will as far as possible meet the requirements of our commercial community.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, the able speech of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) in introducing this Bill, as well as the able speeches made by the other hon. gentlemen (Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Monk) leaves very little for me to say on this important question. It has been clearly demonstrated, Sir, by these hon. gentlemen, that it is imperative we should have a uniform insolvency law for the whole Dominion of Canada. I may say that I came to Ottawa to interview the Government on the same deputation from the Montreal Board of Trade as did the hon. member for Laval, and we then put our case strongly before the Government. I am more convinced to-day than ever, that we should have a Dominion Bankruptcy Act, because I am certain that the merchants of Canada are suffering from the want of one, and more particularly do the merchants of Montreal experience great hardship because of the existing state of things. The merchants of the province of Québec, especially of Montreal, have found that in dealing with other provinces they have been at a great disadvantage, and I sincerely hope that the Government will take this insolvency measure under their special protection, and will assist in its passage during this session of Parliament.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to participate at any length in the debate that is now in progress in connection with the Bill just introduced by my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin). For my part, I must confess that I would have liked the Government to have made it a ministerial measure. The importance of this Bill is such, and the influence of the Government is so great that if they were to use it to push this Bill through, it would undoubtedly be adopted by both branches of Parliament. Since the insolvency law of 1875 was repealed, several attempts have been made in this House to pass new insolvent laws. For some reason or other,

these attempts at legislation all proved abortive, either on account of the deficiencies incident to the Bills introduced in Parliament, or because the House was not favourably disposed towards enacting legislation of this kind, after the law of 1875 had been repealed in 1880. But unless the Bill is taken charge of by the Government and made a ministerial measure, I am afraid it will meet the fate which has been meted out in past years to previous insolvency Bills. The necessity for such legislation as this is admittedly more imperative to-day than it has ever been. The experience of the country, since the repeal of the law in 1880, has satisfied everybody that there is an urgent necessity for an insolvency legislation. If the Insolvent Act of 1875 became unpopular it was not, as stated by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), owing to the fact that the official assignees who were appointed and acted under this Act, abused their position, but because the law was held responsible for the commercial depression which prevailed throughout the country, from 1875 to 1880. But it is a well-known fact that all the disasters experienced by the trade of the country, for which that Act was held responsible, resulted neither from the law itself nor from its general application, but from the sad condition of affairs which was the outcome of the commercial crisis which took place in the United States in 1876, the injurious effects of which were felt all over Canada.

In 1880 the Government, in order to make political capital, deemed it proper to repeal the Act of 1875. But, I ask, have failures since then been less numerous? Have frauds been curtailed? Did trade benefit by the repeal of that law? Decidedly no, and no better evidence could be adduced than the fact that, since the bankruptcy law was repealed, four or five attempts at reviving it have been made in this House. Still, the country is more prosperous than ever, business is improving in all directions, and in spite of all that, the trade of the country demands the protection of an insolvency law. In order to be operative, that law should be made uniform and applicable to the whole Dominion.

As stated a little while ago, in an eloquent manner, by an hon. gentleman, tradesmen in England and on the continent have asked for the passage of such a law, as the goods shipped into this country come under as many different laws as there are different provinces, and they are at a loss whether the goods shipped by them will not be assigned to other creditors, under the form of chattel mortgage, or whether they will remain in the possession of those to whom they are sold. But, Sir, foreigners and merchants in England and other European countries are not the only ones who clamour for an Insolvency Act; our wholesale merchants are not less pressing in their de-

mand, as their trade relations extend over the whole Dominion, and as the difficulties experienced by French and English exporters are intensified in the case of our wholesale merchants who carry on dealings with a larger number of traders scattered all over the Dominion. As to the retail trade, it also needs the protection of such a legislation. It often happens that an honest but unfortunate trader, who has lost his fortune and all his capital, needs the protection of the law in order to be enabled to obtain his discharge, after his estate has been wound up for the benefit of his creditors. Therefore, all the different classes of the community need the protection of an insolvent law, and it would be an egregious mistake to believe that a well-devised law could prove detrimental to any class of the community.

It is not my intention now to criticise the statement made by the hon. member for Laval, in introducing his Bill, only let me tell him this, that notwithstanding his strictures on the operation of the law of 1875, his Bill is about a copy of the same Act. But, if the gentleman has introduced but few new features into his Bill I must say that he has imported into it some fresh complications. For instance, under the hon. gentleman's Bill the receiving order is to be addressed to the sheriff, and that officer is only called upon to take possession of the assets of the insolvent and to act as guardian of the estate, without his having to make an inventory of the estate. That officer, therefore, under this Bill, is only a man having an order of the court to take possession of the assets of the insolvent. My hon. friend wants also the majority in value of the creditors to appoint a guardian, who will be appointed by the court upon a petition to that effect. That guardian may make an inventory, call a new meeting of the creditors, and the latter may then appoint a liquidator who will take possession of the estate and wind up the same for their benefit. Well, Sir, under the operation of the Act of 1875, matters were less complicated. Under that Act, the winding-up order was to be sent to an official assignee, who forthwith took possession of the insolvent's estate, made the inventory and called a meeting of the creditors. Why should the sheriff and the guardian interfere here? If the sheriff is only appointed in order to take possession of the insolvent's estate, he does not require two officers nor a meeting of the creditors to ascertain the opinion of the majority, as to who ought to be appointed guardian. Why not give to one single officer the power to attend to those proceedings? The operation of the law of 1875 was much less complicated and its machinery much less expensive than that provided by the present Bill. Under the plea that the Act of 1875 was unsatisfactory, it was deemed necessary to modify its provisions; but in-

stead of innovating in the right direction, you are only providing a much more complicated and expensive machinery.

These are, in a nut-shell, all the provisions of the Bill now under consideration, concerning the appointment of a liquidator. But with respect to the discharge of the insolvent, I did not quite understand whether the hon. gentleman meant to make provision purely and simply for a discharge or for a composition and discharge. I know that under the operation of the law of 1875, it often occurred that, after the insolvent's estate had been wound up and the dividends paid, when the debtor could not secure the consent of his creditors, he applied to the court to obtain his discharge. Is this case covered by the hon. gentleman's Bill? From what he told us, there is provision made for a composition; but, I ask him, how can the debtor obtain his discharge from his creditors, once the estate has been wound up? If such a provision is not included in the Bill, it ought to be inserted.

This is the policy of an insolvency law: To provide the creditors with an expeditious and economical means of placing the insolvent's estate at their disposal. Such a law ought, therefore, to provide for an easy means of realizing the assets, and also of punishing any fraud whatsoever, and further to protect the honest debtor who is a victim to unfortunate circumstances, instead of delivering him over to the tender mercies of his creditors. What should happen, were the Bill not to make such a provision in order to protect the debtor? Small creditors would take advantage of circumstances to prevent an unfortunate debtor from obtaining his discharge, from becoming a free man and being set on his feet again. That unfortunate trader would, perhaps, be compelled to expatriate himself, owing to certain creditors refusing to give him his discharge. The court should, therefore, be empowered to protect unfortunate debtors from the ill-will of certain creditors. I am glad to say that in the outline of the Bill presented by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), there are many provisions which undoubtedly reach the object which a legislation of this kind ought to aim at.

I trust that the Government, should they take this Bill under their charge, or should they deem it proper to introduce another one, will see to it that such provisions are inserted as are calculated to render the operation of the law as efficacious and fair as possible.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sure the House fully appreciates the able and exhaustive manner in which my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin) has treated the important question which he has brought to the attention of Parliament, and in so far as I have been able to follow the outline he has given of the provisions of this Bill, I think we may

all agree, that if we are to have an insolvency law it would be difficult to prepare a better measure than the one which my hon. friend (Mr. Fortin) submitted to the House. Of course, it may not be absolutely perfect in all its details. I cannot for my part, reluctantly as I have to say it, accept the compliment which was paid us a moment ago by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), when he said that the Government would be better able to devise a law of this nature than would a private member. Much as I value such a compliment coming from an hon. gentleman who as a rule is not overburdened with confidence in the Government, still I cannot accept it altogether. I must say with all due humiliation that I do not think the Government could have devised any such Bill better than the hon. member (Mr. Fortin) or better than could the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) himself. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has stated, and the same remark has been made by other members, that this is a measure which should have been introduced by the Government. The Government have had this subject under their consideration for some months. Indeed it is not new, for the late Government considered it also and prepared a measure on this subject. In so far as the present Government is concerned, we have been reluctant to make this a Government measure, for the reason that it is to be apprehended that the moment the Government did so, it might be treated as a political measure, and above all things such a Bill should be treated not as a political one, but simply from a commercial point of view, and from no other. I would recall to the memory of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and to other members who expressed the same opinion, that our most important insolvency law, that of 1864 which lasted from that year down to 1875 and was then reconstructed upon the same lines; I would recall to their memory that that law was introduced and carried through the House, not by the Government of Sir John Macdonald then in power, but by Sir John Abbott, who at that time was a prominent supporter of the Administration but was not in the Cabinet. That measure introduced by Sir John Abbott, was carried through as we know with the assistance of the Government, but not as a ministerial measure. In consequence the party contests which perhaps might have assailed that Bill did not arise; the Bill was treated simply as a commercial one, and I believe the country did not suffer from such a proceeding. In 1875 the Government of Mr. Mackenzie undertook to recast that law and they proposed the new Bill as a ministerial measure. From that moment, as we well remember—without looking into the motives which dictated what took place—from that moment the insolvency law of Mr. Mackenzie was treated as a political

question, and it was made one of the grounds of attack against the Administration in the elections of 1878. I therefore think it is far preferable that this question should be approached as it has been approached now, and the Bill introduced by a private member so that members on both sides of the House may approach it with a view of obtaining the very best results possible.

There is a division of opinion as to whether or not there should be an insolvency law applying to the whole of Canada. One strong reason why a general insolvency law has been formerly attacked, is to some extent obviated by this Bill. What must be a prominent feature in every insolvency Act, namely, the discharge of the debtor from his liability, is of course included in this Bill, but the provision is inserted that the debts of non-traders—that is to say of farmers and mechanics, and so on, are not to be affected by this law. If as a result of the insolvency law, a trader can obtain a discharge from his liability, that discharge is not to apply under this Bill to the debts he may owe to non-traders such as farmers, mechanics and professional men. Perhaps this will remove a feature from the insolvency law which up to this time to my certain knowledge has been held to be an almost insuperable difficulty in passing such a measure. It may perhaps be held by many that such a law ought to come within the purview of the local legislatures which have within their own jurisdiction all that concerns civil rights. It is always an invidious thing to deprive any man of his assets, or what ought to be his assets. The laws of the province of Quebec in that respect are, I believe, superior to the laws of any other province; and if the principles that prevail in that province were accepted by all the other provinces, there would perhaps be the less necessity for such a measure as this. Under the provisions of the French civil law everything that pertains to a debtor is pledged to his creditors, and he cannot divest himself of it. If he is, I will not say in an actual state of insolvency, but in such a state that his assets are not sufficient to meet his liabilities, he cannot make any contract whereby he would deprive any one of his creditors of the right of sharing in his estate, share and share alike, with all the other creditors. That is the main reason why an insolvency law is so much desired in some quarters, that is to say, among the merchants. As the law is at present in some of the other provinces, a man can make an assignment and give a preference to some of his creditors whom he chooses to favour, or he may make contracts which will practically make him insolvent, which will deprive him of all the assets that he has, and leave nothing to the other creditors, who are not on the premises, or who are not so fortunate as to have his favour. This is what makes the

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

desire for an insolvency law so universal as it is at the present time. The principles of the French civil law which prevail in the province of Quebec have been gradually extended to other provinces; and I am informed that at this moment there is before the legislature of Nova Scotia a Bill which provides for the distribution of the assets among the creditors. How far it goes I do not know at the present time? If it be the wish of Parliament to approach this subject, the Government will be only too willing to give every possible assistance, so as to carry out the absolute desire and opinion of the members on both sides of the House. For my part, I would deprecate such a measure as this being made a party measure. If it be possible to approach the question simply in a commercial spirit, with a view to devising the best possible law for the trade of the country, the Government will be glad to assist my hon. friend in carrying his measure; but before the Government undertakes to facilitate the passage of the measure, I think we have a right to have an expression of opinion on both sides of the House on the question, whether such a law is desirable or is not desirable.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have but a few words to add to the able and eloquent statements made by the hon. gentlemen who have taken part in the discussion now going on on the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin). I may say that an insolvency law is an absolute necessity. It is an uncontroverted fact about which we are all agreed. I am aware, however, that the passage of such a law is attended with considerable difficulty. But, from the fact that a remedy is not administered without difficulty, it does not follow that those who are called upon to administer it, in order to root out a disease, ought to shrink from applying it when necessary.

Our home trade, as well as our foreign trade, which are improving in all directions, demand that Canada, like all other countries, should have an insolvency law. Now, if it is imperative that we should have such a law, let us enact it and make it as efficient as possible. There are several reasons why the adoption of an insolvent law has been adjourned from year to year, since the repeal of the Act of 1875; and, I may mention among other causes, the abuses which had crept in under the previous acts, and several other causes, foreign to these Acts, which made them less efficient. It is not my intention now to lay the blame or the responsibility for such a state of things on anybody. I am aware that the previous Acts were not as perfect as could be; and I know also that some official assignees did abuse their position and bring discredit upon the law itself. If there were assignees to be complained of, there were also found respectable men among them. In my

opinion, it would be a wise course, when enacting a law of this kind, to so frame it as not to place the responsible officers in such a position as to give them an option between their duty and their personal interests. I believe that even an honest assignee is always human and that it is always dangerous to give a man such powers as would put him in the situation of having to choose between his duty and his interests. I do not wish to enter into a detailed review of the Bill under consideration. For my part, I think the Bill in its main lines is equitable and well devised. The outline given of it by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) was clear and forcible, and, as everybody could see, it produced a marked impression upon the House. This Bill, to my mind, includes provisions which are a decided improvement over the previous laws and which will prove most beneficial in practice.

I was happy to hear the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) state that, far from treating this Bill with indifference, the Government would be glad to facilitate its passage. I also heard with pleasure the hon. Prime Minister deprecating such measure being made a party measure, and expressing the wish that both sides of the House would see their way to assist in having inscribed upon the Statute-book as perfect a law as possible. As we are threatened with a long session, there will be plenty of time for this Bill being put through. I make bold to say, Sir, that before this session is brought to a close, a notable portion of our sittings will be taken up in debating more or less idle questions. If, when the session is over, all the hon. gentlemen could call each other to witness that they have striven, to the utmost of their power, to secure the passage of such an insolvency law as would meet the wants of the country, it would prove most consoling to those who are liable to trespass upon the forbearance of the House, while, at the same time, it would be a compensation for those who had to listen to their utterances.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the remarks of the Premier will not be very acceptable to the mercantile community of Canada, or to the mercantile community of Great Britain. We have been told that one result of the preferential tariff is that the trade of Great Britain has largely increased and will continue largely to increase. There is no doubt that the merchants of Great Britain are very anxious that an efficient insolvent Act should be passed by this Parliament; but I have myself very little hope that such an Act will be passed unless the Government assume responsibility for it. If any measure is important, this is most important; and if the Government should frame other important measures, I see no reason why they should seek to escape responsibility for

a measure of this kind. I think there is no reason to fear, as the Premier intimated there might be, that the Opposition would indulge in any factious opposition to a measure of this kind. It is not a measure which ought to be made a party question. I am not advocating that at all. I think it is a measure which should receive fair and full consideration by the members of this House without reference to party. It is purely a business measure. At the same time, I agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that it is a measure of such importance that it should be taken charge of by the Government, and they should see that it is made as good as it can possibly be made. While I have the greatest respect for the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), still I think one man cannot frame as good a measure as the Government, who have a great many resources at their command which no individual has. Another reason why the Government should take charge of this Bill is this, that if they did take charge of it, they would urge it on and see that it was pushed through this House. But if it is left in the hands of a private member, I am afraid there will be very little possibility of its going through the House this session. We have not heard the opinion of the Government at all on this measure. I do not know whether the Government have an opinion upon it. The Prime Minister did not say whether the Government were in favour of an insolvent Bill of any kind. He did say that if Parliament showed itself favourable to a measure such as has been introduced by the hon. member for Laval, the Government would facilitate its passage. That is not expressing any opinion of the Government on the subject at all. I think the House and the country are entitled to know whether the Government are or are not in favour of an insolvent Bill. I think the country is waiting to know that. There is no doubt that some people have great objections to an insolvent Act. Under the former insolvent Act there were a great many abuses, and in the minds of many people there is a great prejudice against any such law. At the same time, there is no doubt that the merchants of our large cities who are dealing all over the Dominion, feel that a Dominion insolvent law is an absolute necessity. While the laws of Ontario and Quebec on this subject may be satisfactory, the laws in the other provinces, so I am informed, are not satisfactory. What is wanted is a Dominion insolvent Act. I only rose to say that I think the Government should let us know whether or not they are in favour of an insolvent Bill—I do not say this Bill which has been introduced, because they may give us a better one. We want a Bill which is simple and inexpensive, and which will yet provide for the winding-up of an estate expeditiously. One objection to the previous insolvent Act was that it was too expen-

sive. Under it we found the assignees getting rich, while the creditors did not get much out of the estate. That was my experience—I was in business then—and that was one reason why it was repealed. But that defect can no doubt be remedied; it should be remedied. I would urge the Government to let us know now whether they are in favour of an insolvent law for the whole Dominion or are opposed to such a law. If they are in favour of one, then we will know what we may expect. If they are opposed to it, we may as well know that we shall have no insolvent law at all. Unless the Government take charge of this Bill and make it a Government measure, I am afraid we shall have no insolvent Act passed this session, and if not there will be great disappointment among the mercantile community both of Great Britain and of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, there is to-day an urgent necessity for an insolvent law. I do not know what the provisions of this law are, but some of them, it appears to me, are such as the commercial community require, and as would also suit non-traders. I agree with the right hon. leader of the Government, that one of the strong objections to the old law was, that non-traders were brought under the operations of that law to the extent that they were deprived of what was coming to them when an insolvency took place, while at the same time they were compelled to pay all that they owed to an insolvent. I understood the right hon. First Minister to say, that in this proposed law there is a provision which prevents that injustice. That, I think, will be in the right direction, and will be accepted by the great farming community as satisfactory. I only regret that the Government has not seen fit to introduce the Bill. They should take the responsibility of it, and then it would be more likely to get through. The commercial community have been asking for an insolvency law for a long time, and it is time that Parliament woke up and gave them what they desire.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. PENNY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 85) to amend chapter 99 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, being the General Inspection Act. He said: The only explanation I have to give is, that the grocers of Montreal have asked me to introduce this Bill, which is intended to remedy a grievance from which they suffer at present. At present, a great deal of the fruit brought to Montreal arrives in an unsalable condition,

Mr. CRAIG.

and the trade desire the appointment of an inspector.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BREAKWATER AT BELLE RIVER, P.E.I.

Mr. MARTIN asked,

1. Does the Government intend to assume control of the breakwater at Belle River, in Prince Edward Island?

2. Has the Government engineer reported as to the importance of this work?

3. If so, what is the nature of the report, and does it refer to the condition of the breakwater or the amount required for its extension?

4. Does the Government intend to extend and improve it, and if so, when?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I have already answered these questions.

CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY AGREEMENT.

Mr. McINNES asked,

Has the Government received the grant of 50,000 acres of coal-bearing lands from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or any other company, as contemplated by section "I" of the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway? If so, from what company, and when? If not, what steps are being taken to select the said 50,000 acres, and to secure the performance by the company of its obligations as specified in the said section?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Government has not yet received the grant of 50,000 acres, or any other number of acres of coal-bearing lands, as contemplated by section I. of the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The lands cannot be conveyed by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Government until they are earned from the British Columbia Government by the construction of that portion of the railway to which the British Columbia land subsidy applies. I understand, the lands have not yet been earned or received from the British Columbia Government.

YUKON MINING REGULATIONS.

Mr. DOMVILLE (by Mr. Ellis) asked.

If under the mining regulations in the Yukon district the words "The certificate shall also grant to the holder thereof, &c., also the privilege of cutting timber: for actual necessities, for building houses, boats, and for general mining operations," apply to timber leases granted by the Government, or is it to be construed to apply to ungranted timber districts?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: The mining regulations further provide, that the privilege referred to "shall not extend to timber which may

have been heretofore, or which may hereafter be granted to other persons or corporations."

The words quoted by the hon. gentleman do not, therefore, apply to timber licenses granted by the Government, and they are to be construed to apply to territory not covered by timber licenses.

THE YUKON RAILWAY LAND GRANT.

Mr. DAVIN (by Mr. Monk) asked,

What ground had the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce for saying: "I have not the slightest doubt that Mackenzie & Mann would be very ready to exchange, for a very moderate subsidy in hard cash, their large land grant; in fact, we have excellent reason to know that they would"?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I beg to state, that the words used here are not quite correctly reported. What I did say was, that I had not the slightest doubt Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann would have been very ready to have exchanged a large portion of their land grant for a very moderate subsidy in hard cash, for which statement I have quite sufficient reason.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to raise a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I am credibly informed, and believe I can establish, that Arthur Aimé Bruneau, Esquire, then member for the electoral district of Richelieu in this House did, during the present session of Parliament declare, according to the form of statute in such case made and provided, his intention to resign his seat;

That Joseph Godbout, Esquire, the member for the electoral district of Beauce, and John McMillan, Esquire, the member for the electoral district of the South Riding of Huron, were witnesses to the said declaration;

That the said declaration is, as I believe can be established, the document referred to in the following statement of His Honour the Speaker of the House of Commons, addressed to the House of Commons, on March 14th, 1898.

I move as follows:—

François Arthur Marcotte, member of the House of Commons for the county of Champlain, having stated in his place that he was credibly informed and believed he could establish that Arthur Aimé Bruneau, Esquire, then member for the Electoral District of Richelieu in this House, did during the present session of Parliament declare, according to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, his intention to resign his seat.

That Joseph Godbout, Esquire, the member for the Electoral District of Beauce, and John

McMillan, Esquire, the member for the Electoral District of the South Riding of Huron, were witnesses to the said declaration.

That the said declaration is, he believed he could establish, the document referred to in the following statement of His Honour the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed to the House of Commons on March 14th, 1898:

"Before calling the Orders of the Day I would like to mention to the House a matter which is of the nature of privilege, and which I see has been connected by the press with the seat of an honourable member—the member for Richelieu. It is stated that I have received his resignation. If I had received his resignation I should have issued my warrant for a new election before now. The only occasion when I have had any communication from or with Mr. Bruneau this session was on Friday morning. I had just come into my office when Mr. Bruneau came in. He asked me if I had received a letter from him. I told him I had not. He said he had called to get a letter back which he had written to me. I told him to wait and I would look among my mail, for I had not yet opened any letters. I turned the unopened letters over in his presence and he pointed to one with his frank upon it. I asked him if it was his writing on the address and frank. He assured me it was. He told me nothing of its contents and I asked him nothing, but handed him the letter unopened and he took it away with him. So far as I know it had come to my office through the post office, for I had not seen it before. I mention this to avoid any mistake as to facts as far as I am concerned."

That this declaration was tendered within the meaning of subsection 3 of section 5 of Chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, and yet the said Arthur Aimé Bruneau, Esquire, continues to sit in the House of Commons.

Resolved, That this statement, including the statement of the Honourable the Speaker be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Election to inquire into the facts, to examine into the legal questions arising in the case, and to search for Parliamentary precedents applicable thereto, and to report to this House the result of their inquiry and whether any and if so what further proceedings should be taken by this House in the premises.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I must express my regret that my hon. friend did not deem it advisable to give any notice of this motion. As he has not done so, I would ask that this matter be deferred until to-morrow. We will take it up to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER. The paper read by the hon. member is partly in English and partly in French. I suppose we will take it to be read.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not all in French, Mr. Speaker; the resolution is in French and the statement is in English. I should like to say in justice for the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) that he told him that he informed the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) that he would mention this matter to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER. It stands as a notice, then?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.
Yes, the first thing to-morrow.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to put myself straight before the country. I have here an extract from the "Gazette," of Montreal, which places me in a very false position. It is probably based on a mistake in "Hansard" which I should have corrected if I had seen it, but did not know of it until my attention was called to it.

It came out in debate in the House of Commons on Thursday night that Mr. Domville, M.P., was financially interested in the shipment of whisky into the far North-west. Mr. Domville is a Liberal supporter of the Laurier Government. It would take a good many—

—I am looking at my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) now—

—a good many W.C.T.U.—

—whatever that may mean—

—delegations to offset his pull and prevent the issue of permits for the transport of stuff parliamentarians may make money out of.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I beg to state here that I am not interested, directly or indirectly, in any liquor going into the North-west Territories, nor in any permits. I think, perhaps, our company may have been mixed up with some companies that are shipping whisky in. I wish to have corrected now in the "Hansard" the following few lines:—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Surely you are not all so prejudiced that you will not hear a word from me. I speak most emphatically on that subject, and I say that when Sir Louis Davies wrote that letter, he had no idea—

Now it goes on to say:

—that I was going to transport whisky into the Yukon country.

That is what I said. There was much disturbance made on the other side of the House. I do not know why they should do it. But I see at times, in the evening especially, they make quite a little disturbance. What I said was this: in writing his letter Sir Louis Davies would feel satisfied from those surrounding me that we were not going to trade in liquor in that country—not that we were going to trade. The House was discussing the Stikine-Teslin Railway, and I threw the remark across the floor that it must be a good road to get \$500 per man from their passengers and they walk part of the way, or something of that kind. It had been said that was what each man would pay. Further I said it was a good road without whisky. I should like to have that set right in "Hansard." Whatever other companies may be doing—

Mr. SPEAKER.

a company has a right to trade as it likes—I disclaim most emphatically for myself and for the company that we are connected with or have anything to do with the liquor traffic in that country.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sure that the member of "Hansard" now at the table will take down accurately what the hon. member (Mr. Domville) has said.

BREAKWATER AT BELLE RIVER.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to call the attention of the House to the question to which I have already referred. I have turned up the "Hansard" for last Monday, and I fail to find any reply by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) to the question. If my memory serves me well, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was not in his place when the question was called. I think also that the hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) asked that the question be allowed to stand. At any rate, I have here the "Hansard" of last Monday and I do not see that the question was replied to. I would like to get an answer to the question and not be put off any longer. I want a straight answer, yes or no.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I am sure I answered the question. If my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) will look at page 1838 of the "Hansard," he will find the question asked and answered.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the hon. member was out of the House at the time the question was called, it was asked for him by another hon. member.

Mr. MARTIN. I beg to withdraw what I said. But I may explain that the question on the Order paper was just before one standing in the name of the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Yeo), and it does not appear in the same order in "Hansard."

THE VACANCY IN WEST PRINCE.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask whether the returning officer for West Prince has been named for the election to be held?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The returning officer has not yet been appointed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. To-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Or afterwards.

BETTER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest.

(In the Committee.)

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

After Recess.

Committee resumed consideration of Bill No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day.

On section 1,

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thought there was an amendment to that clause moved by the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A sub-amendment has been moved to that clause which I will read :

That all the words in the Bill after the word "who" in the 10th line, down to the words "defamatory libel" in the 25th line, be struck out, and that the following be substituted therefor :—"Sells, or employs, or procures any person to sell any article or commodity on Sunday, except drugs or medicines, or articles for surgical and medical use."

Mr. McCLEARY. Will that meet the case of prohibiting the sale of American newspapers? because if the interpretation that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) put upon subsection "b" last night, is correct, it certainly does not meet the needs of the case, because if there is anything we have to complain of at all in this country, it is the selling of American newspapers on Sunday.

Mr. CHARLTON. Subsection "b" meets the case of selling American newspapers on Sunday in Canada.

Mr. McCLEARY. I think the hon. member took the ground last night that it referred to publishers and proprietors only.

Mr. CHARLTON. It prohibits the selling, and in the absence of the publisher or proprietor or manager, the person responsible for having the paper sold would be liable to action.

Sub-amendment negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is now on the amendment to add, after subsection "b," these words : "sells, or employs, or procures any person to sell any newspaper issued or published on Sunday."

Mr. McCLEARY. I am satisfied that the interpretation put upon this section last night by the hon. member for North Norfolk and by the Solicitor General that these

words "sells or employs," particularly the first one, would not prohibit the newsboys selling American newspapers in Canada on Sunday, but that it only bears upon the proprietor and publisher. I say if that is the case, we cannot get at the publishers or proprietors of American newspapers.

Mr. CHARLTON. When this Bill was first introduced last session, the provision relating to the matter we now have under consideration was as follows :—

Whoever shall, upon the Lord's Day, in the capacity of a proprietor, publisher or manager, engage in the publication and issuing of any newspaper, journal or periodical, for the purpose of sale, either by carrier or newsboy, at any news stand or store upon that day, and whosoever shall engage in the sale of any newspaper on that day, shall be deemed guilty of an indictable offence; but nothing in this section shall be held to prevent the gratuitous distribution of religious publications upon the Lord's Day.

This Bill was referred to the then Minister of Justice, Sir Oliver Mowat, and he suggested a change in the phraseology of this section, and drafted one. That draft which emanated from the Minister of Justice, was considered and reported by the Committee of the Whole House as it is introduced to-day, considered by the Solicitor General, and he preferred it to the original draft, and it was therefore adopted. The House has already acted on the very section we are considering to-night, and it acted favourably; but the Bill did not receive its final action last session, owing to the fact that the leader of the Government was called to England to attend the Jubilee proceedings there, and in consequence of his departure, all private legislation was dropped, this Bill among others. But this Bill received the sanction of the House last year in Committee, for which the Minister of Justice last year was responsible; this section he drafted, and I believe it merits all the requirements of the case. Let us go briefly over the Bill. The first section states :

(a.) Being the proprietor, publisher or manager of any newspaper, publishes or issues, or prepares for publication or issue, any copy or number of such newspaper for sale on Sunday, or with the intent that such copy or number shall be sold on Sunday; or

(b.) Sells or employs or procures any person to sell any newspaper on Sunday.

As a matter of course, if the newspaper was a foreign paper, and was brought here and sold by newsboys, the publisher, manager or proprietor by whom the paper was issued might not be within the reach of the law here; but these papers are sent here to agents, and I hold that, under this clause, in the absence of the publisher or manager, the agents, as the representatives, would be amenable to the penalties of the law. I think that is a sound position, and I give it as my opinion, that this would be the case. If not, and this law went into operation, we

would soon have demonstration as to whether this was the fact or not. If the law proved to be defective on this point, it could be remedied. The next provision is as follows :—

Provided that the publishing or issuing, or preparing for publication or issue of any copy or number of a religious newspaper for distribution on Sunday, or with the intent that it shall be distributed on Sunday, shall not be an offence under this section.

I believe the Bill fully covers the ground, and that we cannot improve it. I ask my hon. friends to accept the Bill, which has received the careful consideration of the highest legal authorities, of Sir Oliver Mowat and of the Solicitor General, and has received full and due consideration from the friends of the Bill, who desire to secure efficient legislation against Sunday newspapers. Let us allow the Bill to pass, and if it goes into operation, I think it will prove to be a law that will be found efficient for the purpose intended; and if it does not meet the purpose, the House can subsequently remedy any defect ascertained during its actual working. We are liable, by submitting hastily considered amendments and sub-amendments, to practically destroy the Bill, so far as efficiency is concerned, and I ask my fellow-members, as this is a matter to which I have given great attention, and I am exceedingly anxious to secure a proper Bill, to allow the Bill to be reported by the committee.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has made the statement, that the Bill is supported by the highest legal authorities. I submit, that the Minister of Justice is the highest legal authority.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of Justice at the time this Bill was drafted was the authority to whom I referred.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of Justice in the present Cabinet, as I showed, by a quotation from the record, last night, declared that this Bill, while within our power, trespassed on ground which the constitution gave to the provinces, and not only so, but that this was a Bill which might cause trouble.

Mr. CHARLTON. I call attention to the fact, that the present Minister of Justice has never had this Bill under consideration, that he has never made any remarks on this Bill, that his remarks were offered on the general principle as to the matter of jurisdiction; that is, not something which pertains to the character of the Bill in detail, but to the general principle of the Bill.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is quite true. The hon. gentleman says, that the Bill, in its present form, was not before the present Minister of Justice when he made the speech which I quoted last night, and, as the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) reminds

Mr. CHARLTON.

me, neither was the Bill in its present shape before Sir John Thompson when he gave his opinion; and, therefore, one counterbalances the other. I submit, that if the hon. member who introduced this Bill will read the argument of the Hon. Mr. Mills, then member for Bothwell, and the present Minister of Justice, he will find that the hon. gentleman declared there were certain clauses in that Bill which properly came within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. No doubt, he referred to the clauses relating to the running of trains and steamboats on the Sabbath. He will also find the hon. gentleman stated, that, as regards certain other provisions of the Bill, those covered by the present Bill, were matters relating to civil rights and municipal control, with which the provinces have a right to deal, and which he properly and correctly declared the province of Ontario had already dealt with. While I have no personal interest in the matter, I think the committee ought to have the opinion of the Government on the Bill, more particularly as their own Minister of Justice declared, that the Bill is not a proper Bill to pass in this Parliament. It is useless to pass a Bill that is superfluous and meddling, as the present Minister of Justice declared this portion of the Bill to be, while he was a member of this House. The opinion then held by the present Minister of Justice, I have no hesitation in saying, he holds still; and for this House to pass a Bill which the Minister of Justice must criticise adversely in the other Chamber, speaking as the representative of the Government, would be an act of folly.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does the hon. gentleman think it could not be passed over his opinion in the other Chamber?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I think the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) was not in the House when the Prime Minister gave his opinion in respect to this Bill, and, although he did not give it as the opinion of the Government, he gave it as the expression of his opinion as the leader of the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was not present.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Therefore, the contention put forward by the hon. gentleman falls to the ground. I rise to say, that the amendment which I moved in committee last night, believing that it was carrying out the principle to its legitimate conclusion, was one which I considered would be a necessary corollary to the Bill. At the same time, I feel that the promoter of this Bill has made an appeal to members of the House not to load the Bill with any extraneous matter which might give rise to difficulty, or might endanger in any way or sense the passage of the Bill through the House. While I considered the amendment to be quite in line with the Bill, and would be a necessary corollary to the Bill. How-

ever, if the Bill passed into law, some such amendment could easily be enacted in the future, if the necessity should occur. I, therefore, at the request of my hon. friend, ask leave to withdraw the amendment and not press it to a vote.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. MACLEAN. Last night the committee reached a conclusion with regard to this Bill; and it is only through an omission of mine in making the motion that we are troubled with it again to-night. Last night the majority of members in the House expressed the opinion that this was a crude measure, an unnecessary measure and an unconstitutional measure, and therefore that we required more time and information to get an effective law. I am sure that is the sense of the House to-night, and I therefore beg to move that this committee rise.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you call for a standing vote on that question, Mr. Chairman, I beg to say that this Bill will be by no means shunted or got rid of by a resort to this expedient, for I shall move for it to be put on the Order paper again, and I shall only fight it the harder and more persistently if this mode of assassination is resorted to.

Committee divided : Yeas, 23 ; nays, 25.

Motion (Mr. Maclean) that Committee rise, negatived.

Mr. McCLEARY. Before I vote for this Bill, I would like to be satisfied that it meets the necessities of the case. The only thing we have to legislate against in the province of Ontario, anyway, is the sale of American newspapers, which I believe are detrimental to the best interest and well-being and morals of our people. These American newspapers of a certain class ought to be excluded. I am as much in sympathy with this Bill as the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) who introduced it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why did you oppose it ?

Mr. McCLEARY. Excuse me, I did not vote against it. I want to have this Bill put in such condition that it will be of some use to us when it is passed into law. We cannot get at the publisher or the agent even of an American paper, because they throw them off the trains to the boys when they cross the line. How can we exclude them then ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Will my hon. friend suggest what he thinks is necessary ? I believe the Bill is quite sufficient as it stands.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that the Bill as it stands meets the point the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary)

desires it should meet. The difficulty is that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) puts a different interpretation upon the words to that which I and a good many other hon. members believe they will bear. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) insists that the words "being the proprietor, publisher or manager of any newspaper" should also be read in before the letter "b" in the second subsection. I fail to see that that construction can be put upon the words. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) would allow it to be understood that the Bill just expresses what the words here imply I think the case is met. But owing to the fact that he put a different construction upon these words he is certainly misleading the House, and driving us to a conclusion as to the effect of a Bill which I do not think will be borne out.

Mr. CHARLTON. Since last night I have carefully considered this matter, and I believe that subsection "b" will meet the case in the sense my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) desires. If these Sunday newspapers are sold and the proprietor could be reached, it would be proper to proceed against him ; but whoever is guilty of the offence of selling these newspapers, if they are foreign newspapers, is in my mind amenable to subsection "b."

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I do not think we want this Bill in Quebec, and therefore I move, seconded by Mr. Rinfret, the following amendment to subsection "b."

The provisions of this Act shall not apply to the province of Quebec.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why, it is the province of Quebec this Bill is intended for.

Mr. MONK. I hope the committee will give its support to that amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Choquette). I do not know that there are any Sunday papers published elsewhere in the Dominion than in the city of Montreal, and we have there two papers, one in the English language and one in the French language. They are good papers, and for my part I buy them and have no scruple about it whatever. I know there is a very large section of the population of Montreal who also buy these papers. I consider it an undue interference with the rights of conscience to endeavour to apply this law to the province of Quebec. I respect the convictions of the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) who introduced this Bill ; I believe he is sincere, and he may be endeavouring to remedy an evil state of things that exists elsewhere, but in the province of Quebec the manner in which we observe the Sunday is, I think, a good one, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) wishes us to be sincere, I can tell him that our population in Quebec will compare favourably with the population of

any other province. I hope this amendment will carry.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry to hear from my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that he buys newspapers on Sunday, for if he does he violates the laws of the province of Quebec and subjects himself to a penalty of \$20 every time he does it.

Mr. MONK. There are many other good citizens who do the same thing.

Mr. MACLEAN. I propose as an amendment to the amendment that the words be added

And also the province of Ontario.

Mr. POWELL. I would ask the mover of the amendment to please incorporate the words :

And also the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. FOSTER. As the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not present, and as I have such an interest in his province, I would like to see Prince Edward Island added.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I wish to see Nova Scotia added.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I would like to see the North-west Territories included in that amendment.

Mr. CHARLTON. We are reaching the 'reductio ad absurdum.' We see what the meaning of any attempt to weaken this law by the exemption of a province amounts to. I do not suppose that the rights of conscience in Quebec differ materially from the rights of conscience in Ontario, or Patagonia for that matter. The necessity of this law rests upon the broad ground of national good and national interest. The presentation of the arguments in favour of this Bill last night showed up very fully the consequences of the introduction and the maintenance of this Sunday newspaper evil in the neighbouring country. That country was cited as an example of the evil consequences that would follow the introduction of what at the present time is a very small evil in Canada. The Bill aims to prevent a national evil and demoralization through an agency which has produced the most lamentable results in the United States, and is gradually destroying the moral and Christian tone of that country. If members cannot realize the broad grounds on which this Bill rests, if they cannot realize that this country has a future, and that that future is largely placed in our hands, and that upon us rests the duty of shaping the destinies of half of this continent—if they cannot realize that this Bill has something more in it than the petty features they allude to, we may as well drop the Bill, and let it be lost. I would rather submit to the loss of the Bill than have it mutilated by having its application

Mr. MONK.

limited to any part of this Dominion. The object of the Bill is to have a national regulation in regard to this matter—to lay the foundations of this country broadly and firmly on principles of justice and truth. The Bill is not an attempt to interfere with the rights of any man's conscience or to force any religious observance upon any man. Its purpose is to shut out of this country a great evil that exists in the neighbouring country and the consequence of which we are fully aware of. If we cannot treat the matter from that standpoint, we are not approaching this Bill in a proper spirit, and I hope it will be either rejected in its entirety, or passed without reference to the province of Quebec, the province of New Brunswick, the province of Prince Edward Island or any other separate province or collection of provinces in this Dominion.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman says he is looking for something on behalf of the nation. I say that of more importance than that is that this Parliament should respect the rights of the provinces. That should be especially the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite, who have, for many years, made a stand for provincial rights, and claimed that the jurisdiction of the provinces should be maintained. The Solicitor General has told us, the opinion of the present Minister of Justice has been quoted, and the opinion of all the legal gentlemen in this House is, that this Bill is an interference with the rights of the provinces ; that in each province there is at present a Sunday law and that the sin the hon. gentleman refers to is only imaginary ; and if all these things are true, what is the use of our trifling any further with the Bill. Let us vote as we think, and vote against it.

Mr. CLARKE. If the object of the Bill is to keep out of this country the Sunday newspapers printed in the United States, I think it is a most commendable and worthy object, and I shall most gladly support it. But there is at present no newspaper printed in the province of Ontario that comes under the operation of this Bill ; and so far as I am advised, the law at present on the provincial Statute-book covers all possible cases. I do not know how far this Bill would militate against any of the papers which are called Sunday newspapers in this province, but which are printed on Saturday. If it would interfere with those papers, I think it would go too far. So far as it aims at keeping out of Canada those yellow journals which are degrading the morals of the people of the United States, I think it is a movement in the right direction, and I shall most gladly support it ; but the regulation of the publication of newspapers in our own country might reasonably and fairly be left to the provincial authorities.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may say in one word that the object of the Bill is not only to keep

out the yellow journals of the United States, but to prevent the growth of the same brood of vipers in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN. As an evidence of the efficacy of the Ontario law, there is in today's "Globe," on the seventh page, the decision of the magistrate at Merritton in the case against the Carbide Company for operating on Sunday, after a fourteen days' trial in which the best counsel of the province have been engaged. The magistrate upholds the Sunday law and vindicates the position of the hon. member for North Norfolk; so that we in Ontario require no other law than we have already on the Statute-book.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It appears to me that this Bill meets what is not wanted, and does not meet what is wanted. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) said he had bought newspapers on Sunday in Montreal, and the Prime Minister immediately said that that was illegal in the province of Quebec.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If it is illegal to buy a newspaper in the province of Quebec on Sunday, it is illegal to sell one on Sunday, and therefore in so far as Quebec is concerned, this Bill is absolutely unnecessary and uncalled for. We have also the most undoubted evidence that it is unnecessary and uncalled for in the province of Ontario; and I have no doubt that the same is the case with respect to the other provinces. As for this Bill meeting the case suggested by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), the hon. member for North Norfolk cannot think, I am sure, that it does meet that case.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, it does.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The case put by the hon. member for West Toronto was this, that pernicious literature was coming in from the United States in the shape of Sunday newspapers, which were sold, not on Sunday, but on Friday or Saturday, by irresponsible boys, who, as the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) says, receive them at the hands of brakemen on the various trains. Does the hon. member for North Norfolk mean to tell me that this Bill would prevent the sale of those papers on Friday or Saturday?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not at all. There is not a man in this House believes it can. I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture withdrew his amendment. I will very heartily support this Bill if it will do that.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am quite willing to accept an amendment that will cover the ground.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then let the hon. Minister of Agriculture leave his amendment in place. I have no hesitation in saying, so far as this side of the House is concerned, that we will carry the Bill if the hon. member will leave that in. The Bill is not only no good without it, but it is pernicious. If that amendment is made in the Bill, I will very heartily support it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very good, I move that the committee reconsider its action on the amendment moved by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There are two amendments which must be disposed of first.

Mr. MACLEAN. I wish to say that there is a law now which enables the Postmaster General to keep the papers which have been referred to out of the country.

Sub-amendment negatived: Yeas, 21; nays, 29.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 15; nays, 35.

Mr. CHARLTON. To suit the scruples of the hon. member for Haldimand and other hon. members opposite, I am free to express my perfect approval of the motion offered yesterday by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and my views will be fully met by having that motion incorporated in the Bill; and as we have the promise of the support of the hon. member for Haldimand and others to this motion, I move that it be incorporated in the Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is this to be considered a defeat of the Government? The Minister of Agriculture withdrew his motion, and now the hon. gentleman moves that it be restored.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman willing to add that amendment himself? What is it he is against? Is it the mere fact that a certain transaction takes place on a Sunday, or that a bad thing is being sold? If he is merely against the first—that is if he does not want a newspaper on Sunday, irrespective of the kind of literature it contains—he gets it by this Bill; but if he wants to keep out that kind of literature as being bad, he ought to make the selling of a Sunday newspaper on any day of the week against the law. It is simply the doing of a thing on a certain day which the hon. gentleman meets, but all the filth and vileness and everything else objectionable in this yellow journalism, which is published somewhere on Sunday, may be distributed elsewhere on any other day, and his Bill will not prevent its being sold on any other day.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend, I presume, was not in the House last night when I dealt with this question. I consider the

class of newspaper literature to which he alludes, the natural progeny of the Sunday newspaper. Those who look over the history of the Sunday newspaper in the United States, are aware that when Sunday journals first issued they did not have the distinctive characteristics they now possess, but the process of deterioration and debasement was rapid, and the Sunday editions cater now to the most degraded tastes of the nation. The vitiated public taste that has been engendered by the Sunday newspaper curse, is the taste that calls for yellow journalism on the week day. While we cannot have a censorship of the press, while we cannot decide what newspaper is worthy of being circulated and what can be suppressed, yet if we cannot cut off the source of this demoralization or prevent its introduction by prohibiting the publishing of Sunday newspapers, all that which has been so fatal in the United States will extend to Canada. It is for that reason the case is partially met by the prohibition of the publication and sale of Sunday newspaper editions on a Sunday. It is that which secularizes the day in the United States, it is that which menaces and warps all religious influences in that country, and leads to the most shocking and glaring demoralization and profanation of the day. If we adopt the law in this country, with our eyes open to the consequences of the evil in that country, we adopt it for the purpose of preventing the introduction and growth of the evil of the Sunday newspaper and its circulation on Sunday. We cannot deal with the characters of the papers published on other days, but we know that the taste created by the Sunday newspaper in the United States is that which demands that sort of pabulum on week days. This Bill goes as far as possible to prevent the introduction of the evil into this country. It is not practical to go further than to prevent the introduction of the Sunday newspaper, a thousand different editions of which are published in the United States every Sunday, and fall like autumn leaves over the country, carrying their demoralizing influence from Portland to San Francisco, and from Lake Erie to the Gulf of Mexico. My object in urging this Bill is because I conscientiously believe that there is no measure that can be adopted by this House which will have more far-reaching influence in giving us sound, healthy, national life than this very provision I am urging on the House to-day. I ask the House to accept this Bill, which was drawn by the Minister of Justice last session, which was approved by this committee last session, and reported just as it is submitted now, and give it a fair trial. It is my belief it will produce the effects that hon. members say they desire. If it fails in any particular, it can be easily amended. It can be put to the test of experience, and my belief is that

Mr. CHARLTON.

that test will show the Bill is what we desire, and if not, it can be amended.

Mr. MACLEAN. If the right hon. leader of the Government is the Liberal he professes to be, if he has any regard for freedom of opinion and the freedom of the press in this country, if, as he says, he takes Cobden and Bright for his model, he will stand up and repudiate the attack made by a bogus libel on the freedom of the press and on free thought in this country. I have never heard a Liberal go so far back on the traditions of his party. I do hope the right hon. gentleman will repudiate it, and stand up for Liberalism, and not leave it to us who are Conservative, whom he calls reactionaries, to put in a word for the freedom of the press, freedom of opinion and religious liberty. There is such a thing as liberty, and it is a sad thing to see men who call themselves Liberals, remain silent while one who claims to be of their number, attacks a free speech and a free press.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to ask the hon. member (Mr. Charlton), what he means by "religious newspaper." The word is very ambiguous. Take any religious newspaper, the "Churchman," the "Evangelical Churchman," the "Wesleyan," published in the maritime provinces, or the "Christian Guardian," published in Ontario. I have seen copies of the last-named of these newspapers, containing most violent political articles. They are scarcely to be called religious reading. What proportion of religious reading makes a paper a religious paper? If there is any reading not of a religious character, does that make the paper containing it a secular journal? I might almost challenge the hon. gentleman to produce a so-called religious newspaper in which are not to be found columns devoted to secular topics. Would that prevent the reading of these newspapers on Sunday? If this country is going to be destroyed by the dissemination of knowledge among the people, whether on Sunday or any other day, it speaks very ill indeed for civilization. Now, as to liberty of opinion, so far as the Roman Catholic branch of the Church is concerned, there is the greatest freedom on the question of the Sabbath. I do not think the leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would be representing fairly the great historic church, were he to attempt to curtail religious liberty in this respect. As to the Protestant branch of the Church, there is no early father of Protestantism but expressly repudiated this narrow view of the Sabbath that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is attempting to foist upon the people. Take a theologian for whom, I am sure, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has a great deal of respect—Calvin. Now, Calvin, in his "Commentary on Hebrews," speaks of the

observance of Sunday as one of the errors of false teachers, and, in the French version he goes so far as to say, it is one of the lies of false teachers. Take Tyndall, also. He expressly stated—it is some time since I read these matters, and I may be in error in some minor particulars, but I think my recollection is fairly accurate—We are lords of the Sabbath; we can have none, or we can have one in six days, or one in ten days, as we please. And Milton actually wrote a book, directed to the Protestant world, against the curtailing of human liberty in this respect. I am with the hon. gentleman so far as substantial observance of the Sabbath is concerned, apart altogether from any idea that there is any sanctity attaching to the day itself, an idea which I expressly repudiate. I recognize that its observance does lie at the base of social, and political, and religious, and moral advancement in this world. But I do not think that this Bill goes far enough to do much good. If the hon. gentleman is going to grapple with a great evil, let him grapple with those things that constitute the evil: but let him allow people to get information from any source they can, whether on Sunday or week day. The individual conscience must be the test in respect to what is fit reading for Sunday or any other day.

The PRIME MINISTER. As my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) appealed to me, a moment ago, to rebuke my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I cannot allow his appeal to pass without a word of answer from me. The only fault that can be found with me, I think, is that, for once in my life, I accepted Conservative doctrine in the case of this Bill. I had occasion to say, yesterday, that if I assented to this Bill, it was because, on a former occasion, the very proposal which is involved in this Bill, had received the sanction and authority of the late Sir John Thompson. Sir John Thompson, on two or three occasions, supported the Bill of my hon. friend from North Norfolk, and gave it the benefit of his influence. When we came into office, the same question was presented to us. We thought it was not proper to depart from what had been accepted on this question—I may say, by both sides of the House. After all, the question is not a very large one, for there are other modes of attaining the end that my hon. friend has in view. But, as Sir John Thompson had taken a certain position in the matter, I thought I would abide by it. Otherwise, I should have said to my hon. friend, that his Bill was absolutely useless, because there is in the Statute-book of every province ample means to deal with the evil that the hon. gentleman seeks to meet. But Sir John Thompson thought that, although there was provincial legislation on this subject, there might also be federal legislation. I would appeal to those hon. gentlemen who

are his followers to accept his views on this question, on which we have already spent so much time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I hope my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will accept the dictum of Sir John Thompson on many other things—

The PRIME MINISTER. I am afraid I have made a mistake in doing it once.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was going to say, that there are matters of much greater importance on which he might accept the opinion of Sir John Thompson than on this Bill. He will make no mistake of accepting Sir John Thompson's view with regard to those. I desire to propose the following amendment in the form of subsection "c," making parties therein indicated liable to the penalties proposed:—

Sells or employs or procures any person to sell upon any day of the week any paper, whether published in Canada or elsewhere, issued or purporting to be issued on Sunday.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). This, practically, is the amendment I proposed, but which I withdrew because it seemed as if to insist upon it, would be to hamper the passing of the Bill, which I desired to avoid. I need scarcely say, that I am in favour of the amendment, and will support it, and will support the Bill, if it is added.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am pleased to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague).

Mr. MACLEAN. It was pointed out, that if such a clause were carried, it would keep out papers like the New York "Tribune," the Sunday "Herald," many prominent papers in the old country, papers from France that are now on our files, important Boston publications, as pointed out by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), and so on. I do not believe the people of Canada wish such literature to be kept out.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported.

SAFETY OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND PASSENGERS.

Mr. CASEY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 4) further to secure the safety of railway employees and passengers. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I have merely to say that the Bill as it stands is the outcome of the fullest consideration before a committee of the House last session, which committee not only took the evidence of railway employers and employees, but examined the Act of the Imperial Parliament passed during the last session of Parliament in regard to the compensation of workmen in hazardous employments, and they made this Bill conform very largely to the provisions of that Imperial Act. Under these circumstances I have no hesitation in asking the House to

read this Bill a second time. It provides, briefly, for one or two improvements in the fitting up of cars, and for the compensation of workmen injured while in the performance of their duties on railways. I do not think any further explanation is required.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. MONTAGUE. Of course, we consider that the Minister of Railways and Canals is, to a very large extent, the leader of the House in regard to these Bills affecting the railway interests of the country. I do not myself understand the details of the Bill, but I take it for granted that as the House is allowing it to go through without discussion, the Minister of Railways and Canals, and through him the Government, quite concur in the nature of the legislation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I must say that there is some misapprehension on the part of my hon. friend the mover of the Bill. We had an understanding to the effect that there was no objection to the Bill going to a second reading, but I ask him if he would defer reference to the Committee of the Whole until I had had an opportunity of going into it.

Mr. CASEY. Quite so. I did not wish to urge it, but when the question was put from the Chair, as the Minister of Railways and Canals did not object, I thought perhaps he had reconsidered his suggestion. Under the circumstances, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. CASEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 5) respecting drainage on and across the lands of railway companies. He said: This is the Bill I introduced last year, and which got as far as the Railway Committee and was allowed to rest there, for the purpose of allowing the Cabinet and the House to get better acquainted with it. I now propose to ask the House to read it a second time and to refer it to a select committee, to which I hope another Bill, to be subsequently moved, will be referred, in order that the whole question of municipal and private drainage across railways may be fully considered, and a consolidated Bill reported to this House which will meet with the approval of the Government and the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member has suggested a special committee, I think it has always gone to the Railway Committee, which has taken these matters up very fully.

Mr. CASEY.

I do not see any reason why we should depart from that practice.

Mr. CASEY. I beg leave to urge, in support of the reference which I intend to move to a select committee, that the Railway Committee, as my hon. friend knows, is amply occupied by private Bills, and it is quite impossible to have that Bill considered clause by clause in a large and busy committee such as that is. The best they could do would be to appoint a sub-committee to consider this Bill and report to them, as was done last year, such committee having never reported. Everything the Railway Committee can do could be done by the select committee, before which parties opposed to the Bill and in favour of it could be heard.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that this Bill is one of all others that should go to the Railway Committee. It proposes a radical and fundamental change in the legislation with respect to railways, and that being the case, it appears to me that it is necessary this Bill should be considered in the fullest and most complete manner by that committee. The hon. gentleman will see that if he is able to satisfy the Railway Committee, which is a small parliament of itself, that this is a wise and judicious Bill and should be passed, it will save an immense amount of the time of the House, whereas if the hon. gentleman sends it to a special committee and gets it reported, the fact will amount to very little. I trust the hon. gentleman, under the circumstances, will feel that this Bill is especially one that should be considered by the Railway Committee, and it would be a mistake, from his own point of view, and cause a great loss of time to the House, if it were sent to a special committee, and it would have to run the gauntlet to a far greater degree afterwards than if it had been referred to the Railway Committee. On consideration, I hope the hon. gentleman will adopt this course.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. CASEY. I beg to move:

That Bill (No. 4) be referred to a select committee composed of Messrs. Baine, Campbell, Casey, Fortin, Henderson, Monk, McGregor and Tolmie, with power to send for persons and papers and report from time to time.

While giving all possible weight to the considerations urged by the leader of the Opposition, I am sure his experience, as well as mine, will bear out the statement that a small body really supervises the railway legislation, and they are especially capable of judging, but the Railway Committee as a whole is the last body which is in a position to give special attention to a Bill, if it should involve new principles of legislation. This Bill does not involve any-

thing new or radical in legislation, but it proposes to refer to arbitration claims for damages of those who assert the right of drainage across railway lines and substitute arbitration in the place of appeal to the Privy Council. That is the drift of the Bill. I am sure that such a Bill can be much better considered before a special committee than before the Railway Committee. We have had proof of that fact in the case of the railway employees Bill, which has just received its second reading. Before the special committee appointed to consider that Bill counsel appeared for the railway companies and for the employees; the subject was given full consideration, evidence was taken and comparisons made with other legislation of a similar kind, and I am satisfied the railway companies could not have arrived at so mature and full a consideration of the case as did that special committee. In this case there is another Bill on a similar subject, which might properly go to the same committee, and the two Bills must be considered together and consolidated into one. All the Railway Committee could do would be to appoint a sub-committee to consider the present Bill, and it would occupy some hours during several sittings in arriving at a conclusion. The full committee could not take evidence, as might be done by this special committee, which could proceed with the consideration of this Bill while the Railway Committee continued to transact its legitimate work.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the Bill now under discussion is of special concern to the lawyers of the province of Quebec, as it conflicts with the provisions of our municipal code. This Bill will affect the rural properties, in the province of Quebec, crossed by railways.

Under articles 21 and 22 of our municipal code, it is provided that the road inspector is to supervise the works in connection with ditches on the property of a railway company. The Bill now under consideration proposes to set aside the road inspector and to replace him by an engineer appointed by the railway companies. Let me remind the House that, in such matters, it is but fair that the members of the Bar of the different provinces, who sit in this House, should be members of the committee. I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that there is but one lawyer from the province of Quebec on that committee, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

As to the legislation, it particularly concerns the province of Quebec in so far as it effects its municipal code. I would suggest to add the names of Mr. Fortin and Mr. Casgrain to the committee to which this Bill is referred.

Mr. LISTER. I ask that the name of Mr. Cowan be added.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 11) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to cruelty to animals.—(Mr. Penny.)

Bill (No. 14) respecting the attachment of salaries out of moneys in the hands of the Government of the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Richardson.)

MOUNTED POLICE PENSION ACT.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan) moved second reading of Bill (No. 13) to amend the Mounted Police Pension Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. POWELL. Please explain what this Bill is.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The object of this Bill is to allow the members of the Mounted Police Force to be pensioned after twenty years' service, instead of after twenty-five years, as at present.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 18) further to amend the Railway Act. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill I wish to say a word or two as to its nature. This Bill provides against three things which have been found to be very injurious to the interests of the people in the western part of the province of Ontario especially. The first clause provides for regulating railways, and says that they will not permit the running on any of their railway tracks of any locomotive or engine in emitting sparks; and a subsequent clause provides that in case they do allow these engines to be run and a fire occurs in any farm buildings along the line of railway, then, if the fire is discovered within a certain time and no other cause can be assigned for it, it is to be taken for granted that the fire was caused by the railway engines.

The next clause amends the Railway Act, chapter 25, section 91, and a reference to that Act will show that this section has been drawn very much against the interests of the people. The fourth clause is in reference to the use of farm crossings. The Railway Act compels the railway company to put up farm crossings for the conven-

ence of the people through whose lands it runs, but the section in the Act is very indefinite. This Bill provides that the gates shall be provided by the railway company as under the Railway Act, namely, swing gates. It further provides that if the gates are left open, not through the negligence of the person for whose benefit they were put up, or if from any unknown cause the gates are open and cattle lawfully pasturing on the lands along the line of railway, get on the tracks and are killed; then, unless it can be shown that the farmer was negligent in leaving the gates open, the damage shall be borne equally by the railway company and the person who owned the cattle. I think it is a very proper and wise provision and without going into any further details, I would move the second reading of the Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is no objection to the second reading of the Bill, if my hon. friend will agree to refer it to the committee to which was referred Bill No. 4.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Very well.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved that Bill (No. 18) further to amend the Railway Act be referred to the same special committee to which was referred Bill No. 4.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSIT OF GRAIN IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST TERRI- TORIES.

Mr. DOUGLAS moved second reading of Bill (No. 19) to regulate the transit of grain in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I desire to make some explanation to the House. The importance of the subject may be realized by the members of this House from eastern Canada, when they remember that Manitoba and the Territories is from year to year making progress and increasing as a great producing country. Certain difficulties have arisen during the last grain season that have called forth a great deal of criticism in the country, a great deal of writing in the newspapers, and a great deal of discussion generally. The producers have met together and have passed resolutions condemning the state of things that exists in Manitoba and the Territories in connection with the transshipment of grain. It should be understood that from the time of the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway certain privileges have been enjoyed by grain dealers. Prior to the time when elevators were built men engaged in the purchasing and shipping of grain through flat warehouses; but there are now in the country a number of elevators in

Mr. CAMPBELL.

full operation, and an understanding has been reached between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the elevator syndicate that all such flat warehouses must pass out of existence; so that in the province of Manitoba and a portion of the North-west Territories, the business has been wholly absorbed by the elevator syndicate, and men who have been engaged for years in purchasing grain and shipping it through flat warehouses have been obliged to go out of business. This is felt to be a hardship, not only on the part of these men, but on the part of the producers themselves. The importance of the question will be seen by the fact that the Premier of Manitoba has estimated that the loss to the province from this arrangement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the elevator syndicate amounts to no less than about \$1,000,000 for the past season; and I could very easily show that in the riding which I have the honour to represent, which produced last year 3,000,000 bushels of first quality grain for export, the loss in this respect could not have been less than from \$50,000 to \$60,000. This indicates the importance of the Bill for which I ask the consideration of the House. In the first place; it only asks for the continuation of the privileges which have been enjoyed by the producers since the opening of the railway. The railway companies are forced, in places where there are no elevators, to continue the use of the flat warehouses, and to allow the farmers to load the cars from their vehicles. This is felt to be a privilege that we ought to protect on behalf of the people. They claim it as their right, as British subjects and as true Canadians, that when they go to the railway company with their produce, the railway company should receive that produce and carry it forward when they are willing to pay the usual rates required by the company. The reason alleged against these flat warehouses is that frequently a glut occurs in the market, in which case time is required to clear away the grain, and the railway companies hold that they can clear away the grain from the elevators in less time and with less rolling stock than they can from flat warehouses. The men who have been engaged in the flat warehouse business, however, are prepared to give evidence to show that they can load a car with horse-power in one hour; and the usual time given to any one shipping goods is twenty-four hours. The farmers do not ask for any extension of that time. If they cannot load on the cars within the time required by the Railway Act, they are disposed to abide by the consequences. All that the Bill contemplates is a continuation of the privileges which the farmers have enjoyed for the past fourteen years. It is only during the past season that this arrangement has been made between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the owners of the elevators. I do not wish to speak

against the elevator system. I do not think any of the farmers would speak against that system as such. On the contrary, where there are five, they would like to see ten. We have no desire to overthrow that system or cripple it in any way. We believe that if the Bill passes every honest dealer in grain will be able, through the elevators, to do an honest business. But we desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that under this agreement the producer is absolutely in the hands of this combine which is known to exist. It is, I may say, a syndicate of syndicates which has formed an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The agreement, so far as I can learn, appears to be this, that where an individual proposes to put his capital into the building of an elevator at any shipping point, the Canadian Pacific Railway will protect that capital from being affected by the building of another warehouse at that particular point. We claim that while it may be the duty of the railway company to protect the capital of the elevator, it is equally their duty as a common carrier, having been endowed by public funds, to protect the capital of the producer, which is infinitely larger than the capital of the elevator. So that there is no force in that argument. Further, I hold that this agreement is a direct violation of the Railway Act as expressed in subsection 1 of section 246 of the Revised Statutes of 1888. Then, there are other objections to be urged against the elevator system. I speak now from the experience of my own constituency. We have at one point, Fleming, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, three men engaged in buying from the farmers and shipping through flat warehouses. They were engaged in the business for years, but last year they were told distinctly that they could do no more business on these lines, that they must either build an elevator up to the normal standard and ship from the elevator, or go out of business. This has entailed a personal loss to these parties to the value of the building they were using in their business. This is a wrong inflicted on these men. Further west, at Wappella, the very same thing occurred, and further west again at other points. These points were regarded by our farmers as their best market, and to show the House the importance of this, I will call attention to this fact, that the business men of towns where there were no flat warehouses found they were losing their business, they found that the wheat was being carried to those points where there were flat warehouses, and that the prices at these points were higher than elsewhere. These facts forced themselves so much on the attention of the business men of certain towns, for example, Moosomin, that the town council and board of trade of Moosomin examined a large number of farmers under oath as to the difference in price

between the points where there were flat warehouses and those where there were elevators. It was shown under oath by a number of individuals that the prices ranged from 3 to 15 cents a bushel in favour of a flat warehouse and against the elevator system. This meant a serious loss, not simply to the farmers, but to the business men at points where the elevator system is followed.

Then there are still further difficulties connected with the elevator system. This year there has been very little difficulty because the grain has nearly all been No. 1 hard, and when put into the elevators, it was not subject to the same amount of mixing as in other years. But the farmers complain on another ground, that the elevator men will not guarantee the grade of grain deposited in the elevators. Suppose a farmer deposits a certain number of bushels of No. 1 hard, it goes into the bin and may be mixed with the wheat of half a dozen other men, so that when it reaches its destination, he does not realize the wheat he put in, but a mixture of grain, and has often to suffer loss on that account.

Then, another complaint is that the elevator system shuts down about the end of March. There are men in that country in easy circumstances who perhaps may hold back 2,000 to 5,000 bushels of wheat in the expectation of a rise in the market, but when the elevator system closes down, there is no market for them until the coming season.

There is an additional evil which I may point out to this House. In certain seasons, when the grain is struck by frost, there is a great variety in the grades. It is well known that our milling companies want our best grain and have little use for frosted grain, so that they do not call for it in the market and the sale of that grain has been largely done in years past from the flat warehouses. Hon. gentlemen know that a large amount found its way into Ontario for feeding purposes. Should the combine between the elevator companies and the railways be allowed to continue, there will be no market or very little market, for these frosted varieties of wheat that may be produced in some seasons. This is a further reason why the market should remain open. We should hold to it, as a principle, that every Canadian producer has the right to approach the market in his own way and sell his own products, and we ought to see that our people enjoy that right in every province. This is one point that is contended for. The farmers object also to the method of weighing the grain in the elevators. When the grain is put in a flat warehouse, it is weighed in the presence of the seller, so that he has an opportunity of seeing whether he gets just weight or not. But when he brings it to an elevator, it is all emptied

into the hopper and then lowered to a lower storey and weighed. The owner of the grain is not present to see it weighed, and perhaps could not understand the weighing if he were. The consequence is he gets a certificate for so many bushels without having any guarantee of its correctness. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction on that account, and I would also take this opportunity of informing the Government that the weights are only examined once in two years. We believe that in consequence there is a great deal of fraud practiced in the country through false weights or perhaps arising out of this state of things I have indicated. It may be well that the House should see that a more thorough and more frequent inspection is made of these weights, and it might be well for the Government to appoint an inspector, who would move about during the season and examine these scales and weights.

I have outlined the chief difficulties which beset the farmer on account of the combinations between the railway companies and the elevator owners. But there is a further difficulty that reveals itself, and concerning which the Millers' Association of Toronto sent a deputation to Ottawa, which was here yesterday and to-day, to confer with the authorities. What they complain of is that if they want grain as it is grown by the farmers in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, they cannot at present, under this arrangement, secure it. They can only get it from the elevator system. One of the members of this delegation told me yesterday that he desired to get three carloads of grain for seeding in Ontario. He communicated with people in Manitoba, but he found out in every case that the chief difficulty was his agents could not get cars to ship the grain to him in Ontario. He consequently had to give up the idea, and had to purchase the mixed grain from the elevators, and must sow that for seed instead of the quality he desired. This again is another and very serious difficulty. Farmers in Ontario would be glad to get pure Red Fife hard wheat, which is to be had in Manitoba and the Territories, but owing to this combine between the railway company and the elevators they are unable to do so.

I do not know that I need occupy the time of the House very much further. We hold, in the first place, that this combination for the purpose of preventing the shipping of grain from flat elevators in Manitoba and a portion of the Territories is a violation of the Railway Act as it now stands. We hold further that it is doing away with the rights and liberties we ought to enjoy and which this Government ought to secure to every producer in the Dominion. We desire by this Bill to secure for our people an open market. We are not opposing the elevator system, but we want this privilege, so that our farmers may

Mr. DOUGLAS.

be able to present their own grain at the railway station and there ship it directly into the cars or sell it to some one who is engaged in shipping through flat warehouses, so that our farmers may present their own grain on the eastern markets and test its weight and qualities and price. You will observe that, so far as shipping from flat warehouses and from platforms is concerned, the Bill provided also for the same. In regard to supply of cars, when a glut occurs in the market, under the existing system, it is within the power of the railway company to cause the men who own the elevators to hold the market. In this case the price is put down, and the purchasers remain at home, thus the railway companies get time to clear the elevators and so overtake the work with less rolling stock. Thus they play into the hands of the elevator owners and the elevator owners play into the hands of the company for these reasons. This Act provides for the distribution of cars. It also provides that certificates be given for the receipt of grain. It has sometimes occurred that papers could not be obtained, because the company did not wish to ship for individuals. Provision is made for the enforcement of the Act. There is a departure in this Bill from what has been usual in cases where difficulties have sprung up in the past between producers and the railway company. It is a hopeless task for any producer to enter on a process of litigation against the company. Hence we have thrown the responsibility upon the Dominion. We ask that all cases of prosecution under this Act should be carried on in the name of Her Majesty and under the direction of the Attorney General of Canada. At a future stage of the Bill, I shall move that the first and second clauses be amalgamated, opening the alternative for the railway companies either to provide the facilities for handling the grain, or to allow others to build flat warehouses on their lines and switches, to meet the necessities of the case. Further, I propose to make the penalty attached to the Bill cover No. 1. On the whole, the sections of the Bill will be increased in number by one.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I greatly regret, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a larger attendance of members to-night to listen to what the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) has said, and to what I am about to say—not because we are the speakers, but because the subject is one of very great importance indeed to the people of the portion of the country we represent. I have a Bill before the House designed to cover much the same ground as the Bill the hon. member has just moved. It has occurred to me, that probably my hon. friend from East Assiniboia would accept a suggestion, that his Bill and mine be referred to a special committee, to be composed of himself, myself, and a few others, to go over the two

Bills and amalgamate them, and present to the House a Bill that will cover the ground most completely.

On the main question, I wish to go over the ground in some little detail, giving the facts. In the province of Manitoba and the North-west, we have not had such serious trouble in years gone by in handling our grain as we have had the past season, because we have had competition at nearly all the important market points, active competition, there being from one to five or six buyers at these various points. But a new condition of things has arisen. The elevator system has been enlarged, and to-day is a fairly complete system throughout Manitoba and the North-west Territories. These elevators are controlled largely by syndicates—the Northern Elevator Company, the Manitoba Elevator Company, and others. In addition to these, there are the elevators owned by the Ogilvie Milling Company and the Lake of the Woods Milling Company. So long as there was no combination, there was real competition in the buying of wheat. But these various syndicates put their heads together last season, and, seeing that the price of wheat has considerably advanced, they decided to corral a larger share of the profit than was their legitimate due. So they formed what is popularly known in that country as a “syndicate of syndicates.” Instead of each syndicate sending out a bulletin to their buyers at the various points throughout the province and the territories, stating the price at which they wanted them to buy, the “syndicate of syndicates” meets in its little room in Winnipeg, each morning, and decides what price they propose, in their majesty, to allow the farmer for his wheat. Instead of various telegrams being sent out, the “syndicate of syndicates” sends out one telegram to each important point, and the buyer who receives it goes to the others, and the result is, that no one buyer at any station will pay more than the price which has been decided upon by this clique in Winnipeg.

Now, it is this state of affairs that we seek to remedy, and I feel that we have such a strong case that it is not necessary to go further than to place the facts before the House to secure unanimous endorsement for this Bill. It might be asked: Why does not the Canadian Pacific Railway, which, after all, is the great railway corporation in that country, check this “syndicate of syndicates?” It would be supposed that the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be the interest of the settler in that country. The answer is, that while, doubtless, the Canadian Pacific Railway desires to see the farmers of that country succeed, like most other corporations, it is selfish and desires to secure for its own benefit the entire trade of that country and at the same time prevent any agitation being raised regarding its arrangement with the “syndicate of syndicates.” When there is a glut

of wheat, and the railway company is unable to carry all that is offered with due expedition, the railway company will arrange with the “syndicate of syndicates” to stop buying at the various points until the overplus is relieved and carried out of the country.

In that way the Canadian Pacific Railway secures the entire carrying trade. But the farmers, what of them, Mr. Speaker? They are absolutely unable to sell a bushel of wheat at certain periods of the year, they must forsooth wait upon the good pleasure of the “syndicate of syndicates” and the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is the one point that we should remedy.

Now, like my hon. friend from East Assiniboia, I am not here to decry the elevator system; the elevator system is an excellent thing in its way, but I am here to ask this legislature to put it in the power of the farmer to sell his wheat direct from his vehicles or direct from the flat warehouse, or load his wheat direct from the flat warehouse and from his vehicles into the cars there. The result of that will not be, I apprehend, to destroy the elevator system, but the menace to the farmers will be removed. If that is done you will find that these elevator owners will be quite ready, indeed quite anxious, to accommodate the farmers all along the line, and to assist them in handling their grain; and it will also ensure to the farmers competition at the various points. Now, as my hon. friend has said, the farmers suffered to the extent, I think I am within the mark in saying, of a million dollars in the crop of 1897; and I think I will be able to submit figures to the House which will satisfy hon. members that that is a moderate statement. The Hon. Mr. Greenway, who is a man very moderate in his estimates, and a man very conservative in his views, has declared that at least a million dollars has been lost to the farmers of Manitoba on this account. But when we remember that in addition to this, the farmers of the West have to pay some 17½ cents a hundred pounds to take their wheat from Winnipeg to Lake Superior, you will see that when wheat is worth, as it used to be in some years prior to the last, only about 43 cents a bushel, and when they have to pay such an enormous toll as that, it is essential that we should protect their interests in connection with the handling of their grain. Now, we may not be able to regulate combinesters, but this House is able to regulate the railway companies, and while it is contended by some that under the General Railway Act the railway companies could be forced to provide cars as common carriers at various points, still there is some doubt on the question, and up to the present time they do not do it. The Act which I introduced is an amendment to the General Railway Act, which would compel the companies to provide cars at the various points. It might be contended by

some that this would be a very inconvenient system, and that there would be great delay in loading these cars. But I may point out to the House that it will be provided in this legislation that any detention of cars will be paid for in the ordinary way, so that the risk will be with the farmer and not with the company. An important point to bear in mind is the fact that no farmer in that country—a great many farmers there raise sometimes as high as 4,000 or 5,000 bushels of wheat—and no farmer under the present system is able to ship his wheat direct, or sell his wheat to dealers outside of this grain combine. So that if a miller in the East, or any dealer who desires wheat, wants to purchase from any particular farmer, say for seeding purposes, and wants to get a special grade of wheat, he is absolutely unable to procure it, because the farmer cannot sell unless the wheat goes through an elevator. In going through an elevator it sometimes gets mixed with impure wheat, sometimes with smutted wheat, and there are various disabilities which prevent dealers from securing the class of wheat that they want. That we desire to remedy. Now, let us assume that the crop of wheat in the North-west will amount to twenty million bushels per year, and I think my hon. friend will agree with me that this is a moderate estimate. The elevator charge on that wheat is a cent and a half a bushel.

An hon. MEMBER. A cent and three-quarters.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is probably in the Territories. My information is that in Manitoba it is a cent and a half. There will also be an insurance on that of a cent and a half. Now, if the farmer was permitted to load direct from his vehicle, or direct from a flat warehouse, and thereby save a cent and a half a bushel elevator charges, there would be saved to the farmer enough money in actual cash to build 100 elevators a year with a capacity of 4,000 bushels; and in three years alone we would have in Manitoba and the Territories 300 elevators, giving sufficient accommodation for the entire country. I think that is a statement which will appeal to every member of the House. In addition to the elevator charges, the dealers in that country have had the habit of so mixing the grades as to steal from the farmer, on an average, two or three, and sometimes four cents a bushel. I will explain to the House how that is done. There is not after all such a great difference between No. 1 hard and No. 2 hard. There may be a difference of two or three pounds in the weight and probably a slight difference in the shading or the colour. Dealers have been in the habit of purchasing three, four or five cars of No. 2 hard wheat, which they secure at a price of two, three and four cents below that of No. 1; they take a carload of No. 1 hard,

Mr. RICHARDSON.

and by skilfully mixing it in the elevators, they are able to raise the grade of these four or five cars of No. 2 hard, up to No. 1 hard, and so secure an immense profit in that way. If we allow the farmer to load his wheat directly into the cars from his vehicle or from his flat warehouse, we enable him to sell to any dealer on sample, and he secures the benefit of his own work. I would like to ask the members of this House if it is not their desire to place the farmer, who earns his bread with such hard toll in that country—if it is not their desire to protect him in preference to protecting this ring, this combine in Winnipeg, which is able to make its hundreds of thousands of dollars at the expense of the hard working farmers of that country.

Now, in this connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to say one word in vindication of the Ogilvie Milling Company in its operations in that country during the past season. At first the company was criticised, but I am rather disposed to think that it was unfairly criticised. When it was established that this combine existed, the Ogilvie Milling Company went into the market actively and raised the price of wheat all along the line, paying 3, 4 and 5 cents a bushel more than was being offered by this "syndicate of syndicates," the result of which was that the farmers were saved an enormous amount of money in that manner. With the permission of the House, I will read a brief interview had with the manager of the Ogilvie Milling Company in the city of Winnipeg, on 27th November, 1897, and I do so in order to emphasize my vindication:

Mr. F. W. Thompson, manager of the Ogilvie Milling Company, was seen by a reporter of the "Tribune" on the relation of the company to the elevator monopoly. It was pointed out to Mr. Thompson that in spite of the published denial of Mr. Ogilvie, statements are being made that the Ogilvie Milling Company are connected with the combine.

"I wish," said Mr. Thompson, "to state most emphatically that we are not, either directly or indirectly, connected with any combine and will prosecute any person associating or connecting our name with any such organization."

"Are you in favour of the continuance of the elevator monopoly?"

"Our position on that question has been clearly defined. We exact no special favours. A farmer is privileged to load on cars at any point where we have an elevator. The so-called elevator monopoly has no meaning to us whatever."

I mention this in order to do justice to the company. Before I pass from this point, I should like to say that it is desirable, in view of the fact that there is a considerable duty remaining on agricultural implements in Canada, to place the farmers here on as good a footing as possible. It has been intimated to me, within the last two or three days, that Russia and Argentina, which are our great competitors for supplying wheat to the world, are now admitting agricultural

implements free of duty ; so that this fact will strengthen my argument that the Government should deal as liberally as possible with our farmers, in protecting them in the sale of their wheat, to make up for the disability under which they labour by virtue of the agricultural implement duty.

I desire to offer a little evidence with respect to the loss sustained by the farmers. I have stated that, according to my view, our farmers have lost \$1,000,000 at least through this grain combine or elevator monopoly. In the Brandon "Sun," of October 14, appeared a statement that the farmers there up to that date, which was not very late in the season, had lost \$3,400, and if the operations were continued, and they were continued, the farmers would lose \$5,000 more as the result of this combine. I will read an interview which was published in the Winnipeg "Tribune" with Dr. McCoanell, of Morden, a man very well known in southern Manitoba, a shrewd man and one who raises a large quantity of wheat himself and is well qualified to speak on this question. This interview took place on 3rd November, 1897, and is reported as follows :—

To a "Tribune" reporter the doctor said that Morden's wheat situation was not what it should be. It is owned almost exclusively by the combine. There is only one outside buyer against fourteen or fifteen combine men. At the present time prices are not bad, but it is only because two large milling firms are badly in need of wheat, and have forced the price up. While the quotations are high, though only one firm in the combine is staying with the milling companies and paying their prices. The others buy an occasional load, but that is all. It looks as though there was an arrangement between the firms composing the combine to let only one of their number buck the milling companies. But even at the present prices in Morden they do not represent the value of the wheat. Yesterday the street price was 79 cents, while at Pilot Mound it was 85 cents, a difference of 6 cents between the two places.

Let hon. members mark these figures, because Pilot Mound is a station away beyond Morden, and the wheat rate to the head waters of Lake Superior would be higher.

It is not only in the prices that Morden has a kick, though. The dockage claimed is excessive. One firm will charge a man three pounds a bushel for dirt, and he will be told by another buyer that only one and a half pounds should be taken. He disposes of the next load to this buyer, and true enough, only the one and a half pounds are docked, but the load following is docked five or six pounds to balance matters. It is almost impossible also for a farmer to secure a one hard grade for his wheat in Morden, and the consequence is that a large number of farmers instead of drawing their wheat to Morden, prefer to travel farther and go to Rosebank, Winkler, or Thornhill, chiefly the two former places, however, where they can obtain the grade the quality of their wheat is entitled to—one hard. Thus trade is being lost to Morden daily.

Mr. McConnell quoted the instance of a farmer who stored 1,000 bushels in a combine company's

elevator before the grades were issued, and received a ticket from the elevator man grading the wheat as one hard ; underneath the one hard, however, in very small print, which, unless a man looked carefully at it, he would not notice, were the words "not official" in brackets. When the farmer in question went to the elevator to sell his wheat, what was he offered ? The market quotation for No. 2. And so, while farmers cannot get one hard for their wheat in Morden, buyers saying it is not entitled to that grade, the same wheat can be taken to either Rosebank or Winkler, and at those places it will grade one hard.

Morden people generally were greatly surprised at the motion of Mr. McLennon, who proposed at a recent meeting of the Grain Exchange, that farmers be allowed to load on cars at elevator points, being voted down. It showed very clearly the hand of the combine. "This elevator monopoly has got to be broken, however," said the doctor, "and farmers must be allowed to load on cars if they desire to do so. If the C. P. R. will not allow it, then the Government should step in, and they cannot do so too quickly. The combine in force this year has meant a loss of \$750,000 to the farmers of the province."

If the elevator monopoly were of no value to the grain dealers in Winnipeg, it would be natural to assume that they would offer no opposition to its abolition ; and in order to demonstrate their opposition and to show the milk in the cocoon in connection with their action, I will read a resolution offered to the Grain Exchange of Winnipeg. On the 20th October last, at a special general meeting held to consider the question, it was moved :

That whereas, an impression obtains in certain quarters, that an elevator monopoly and grain combine exists in North-western Canada, to the prejudice of the best interests of the people at large, the same having recently been the subject of considerable newspaper controversy here and in eastern Canada ; we, the members of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, having the well-being of our city and province at heart, and feeling the importance of taking prompt action in connection with this vital question, in order to indicate to the farmers, upon whose efforts largely depends the general prosperity of our country, the fact that our organization, as a body, is opposed to monopoly and combines in any form ; therefore, we hereby request, as a simple and effective solution of the whole difficulty, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company abrogate forthwith their present regulations, which prohibit farmers and others loading direct on cars at elevator points ; and that the secretary of the exchange be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to W. Whyte, Esq., manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to the boards of trade at Hamilton, Toronto and Montreal, and to the various city papers for publication.

That motion was defeated by a vote of 30 to 9, so that hon. members will see the exact position of the grain combine of Winnipeg on this question. It seems to me that it proves to a demonstration that these grain dealers want this monopoly continued, and if so, it must be of some benefit to them. I have had information laid before me during the last few days that the grain combine

proposes to send a deputation here to intimidate the Government and lobby members with the object of defeating the Bill which I have introduced to protect the farmer. I hope the Government will give them the cold shoulder, and that every hon. member who is applied to by any member of that deputation will reject their overtures and give a vote substantially in the interests of the farmer who deserves every cent that is in it for him after his hard toil.

I want to present a few facts with regard to the price obtained for wheat and as to how it was manipulated by the combine, in order to prove to some extent at least that the estimate I gave of the loss to the farmers by virtue of the operation of this combine, was correct. Let us take a sample case. On Wednesday, 22nd September, 1897, Carberry and Douglas, two points on the Canadian Pacific Railway west of Winnipeg, were receiving 78 cents for No. 1 hard, while Austin and Sydney, points much nearer to Fort William on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, were receiving 75 cents. When I said much nearer to Fort William, I will qualify that by saying that although these places are nearer, the same freight to Fort William would rule, namely, 19 cents per 100. The difference of 3 cents in the price between the points named is accounted for by the fact that there was competition at Carberry and Douglas, one of the milling companies at least having a buyer in the field.

Here is a stronger case. On the same date, 22nd September, 1897, at Morris and Rosenfeld, in Southern Manitoba, about sixty or seventy to eighty miles southwest of Winnipeg, they received 76 cents for No. 1 hard on an 18-cent freight rate basis—18 cents from the point named to Fort William; while at Boissevain, nearly 150 miles further away with a 20 cents per 100 freight rate basis, they were getting 80 cents for the same grade. This will demonstrate how the operations of the combine affected the farmer. There was a difference of 4 cents a bushel, although it would even appear worse than that, because one is on an 18-cent rate and the other a 20-cent rate and that would make a difference of 6 cents, which is accounted for by the fact that there was competition at one place and not at the other. The average price on the 22nd of September, in Manitoba, on Brandon rates which are 19 cents per hundred to Fort William, was 75 cents, adding elevator charges 1½ cents, freight to and elevator charges at Fort William 12½ cents a bushel therefore at Fort William the wheat cost the buyer 89 cents. On that day the grain firms not in the syndicate—that would probably be the Ogilvie's and possibly the Lake of the Woods, and probably one or two small buyers—were paying 92½ cents a bushel afloat at Fort William, which would give a clear gain of 3½ cents a bushel, notwithstanding that there is a further good profit in selling

Mr. RICHARDSON.

the same in New York. In order to demonstrate this better, I will ask the House to give me its attention while I buy a bushel of wheat at certain points and follow it to its destination, to see what it cost, at say, Buffalo, that being the point at which most sales are made. If hon. gentlemen give me their attention they will see the enormous profits made. I have selected at random for this comparison three different average points in Manitoba. I take Griswold, first: On the 30th October last, the combines price at that point was 77 cents for No. 1 hard; add 1½ cents elevator charges and 13½ cents freight to Fort William and elevator charges there, and you have a total cost of 92 cents a bushel. The average freight charged in bottoms from Fort William to Buffalo, according to the best available information at my disposal, was 2 cents a bushel. This makes the cost to the combine 94 cents at Buffalo. Now, I have in my possession here a telegram showing that the price offered at Buffalo on that date was 98 cents a bushel. That would be a very handsome profit as you will see for the combine, and as I have already informed the House, it has been their practice usually to steal a grade on much of this wheat. Let us take the town of Treherne on the Glenboro' branch. The price paid on the date I have mentioned was 79 cents. Add freight to Fort William and elevator charges there 14 cents a bushel, which would give a total of 93 cents. Add 2 cents freight to Buffalo, and remembering that the price offered in Buffalo that date was 98 cents, you have a profit left to the combine of 3 cents, and you must recollect that they probably stole a grade in connection with most of that wheat. Hon. gentlemen will see the enormous profit they must make on these large quantities at 3 cents per bushel. I am informed that if wheat dealers make a quarter or half cent a bushel they do very well, but here I have demonstrated that they make 3 and 4 cents a bushel straight, to say nothing of what they make by stealing a grade. Let us take Manitou, a market point in my own constituency. The price paid by the combine on the day above mentioned was 78 cents at Manitou; add elevator charges and freight to Fort William 14 cents, and you have 92 cents; add 2 cents to Buffalo which would make 94 cents, and then they had a profit of 4 cents a bushel with possibly a grade stolen. Let us take the same three points on another date and I have selected the 22nd of September, because I hold in my hand telegrams from large firms in Buffalo offering the price named for the wheat delivered there that day. At Griswold the combine paid 74 cents for No. 1 hard that day; add to this 1½ cents elevator, 13½ cents freight to Fort William and elevator there, making 15 cents in all, and you have 89 cents. Add 2 cents for bottoms to Buffalo and you have 91 cents.

The quotation that day at Buffalo was 97 cents, and this leaves the combine a clear profit of 6 cents a bushel with possibly a stolen grade. At Treherne, on that date the combine price was 77 cents; add 14 cents elevator charges and freight to Fort William and 2 cents to Buffalo, and you have 93 cents a bushel laid down at Buffalo. The price paid at Buffalo on that day was 97 cents, which gives the combine a clear profit of 4 cents a bushel. At Manitou the price of the combine on the date mentioned was 75 cents a bushel for No. 1 hard; add 14 cents elevator and freight charges and 2 cents to Buffalo, and that makes 91 cents a bushel in Buffalo, giving a profit to the combine of 3 cents per bushel. I think the House will agree with my statement that a quarter or half a cent a bushel would be a very good profit, and yet they are enabled to make these enormous profits which I have pointed out.

Now, I want to say a word or two with regard to the grading at Fort William. My hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) dealt with that subject and I want to emphasize the point he made. I very greatly regret that the Minister of Inland Revenue is not present to hear what I have got to say on this question. I want to see the grading of wheat conducted in such a manner at Fort William that there will be no mixing of grades, and that there will be no stealing of grades from the farmers. We want the inspector to be a man, not paid by fees as he is at present, but paid a salary so that he will be in the position of a judge and be able to give an impartial judgment on the grading of wheat. If the mixing of wheat were stopped at Port Arthur and stopped at the elevators throughout the country, the great advantage would accrue that we would secure a better sample of wheat and a better character for our wheat. The reputation of our wheat would rise rapidly if the present system were stopped. I believe I am within the mark in saying that the wheat grown in Manitoba and the North-west Territories is the best wheat produced in the world, but owing to the system by which it is graded and the practice of mixing wheat at these elevators, the result is that the people of England and other foreign countries who buy our wheat do not secure the best samples and labour under a delusion with regard to its quality. By mixing good wheat with poor wheat, thriftless farmers receive just as much advantage as thrifty farmers, the grade of the entire lot being lowered.

I want to submit to the House a few figures in connection with the grading of wheat, and I would bespeak the earnest attention of the members who are present to these figures, which I think are rather startling. One of the first things I did after reaching Ottawa was to place a motion on the Order paper for a return showing the number of bushels of wheat graded into the elevators at Fort William from the 15th September,

1897, to the 15th January, 1898, and the grades of the same, and the number of bushels graded out at the same place during the same period. My object in seeking for that information was this. For years it has been charged that although large quantities of wheat were sent into these elevators which graded No. 2 hard and No. 3 hard, and even lower grades, yet by skilfully mixing the wheat in these elevators, and sometimes putting in scoured wheat, a great deal of this wheat was raised to a higher grade; and what I was anxious to get at was how much was graded in, and the grades, and how much was graded out and the grades in order to show that the prevailing belief that grades were raised, was correct. I have before me the figures, which I was able to procure to-day from the Department of Inland Revenue. There was inspected in during the period above mentioned of Extra wheat 19,800 bushels. That Extra would be a grade much higher than No. 1 hard—the very cream of the wheat of the North-west. Although that quantity was graded into the elevator, I find that not a single bushel was graded out. That proves to a demonstration, I think, my contention that these high grades of wheat are used to raise the grades of the lower classes. If not used for this purpose what became of it? Of No. 1 hard there was graded in 7,816,200 bushels, and graded out 8,059,248 bushels; showing that there was 243,048 bushels more of No. 1 hard graded out than was graded in. It is quite evident, therefore, that the grades of wheat were raised by mixing. Of No. 2 hard there was graded in within the same period 1,682,100 bushels, and graded out only 130,153 bushels showing that 1,551,947 bushels of No. 2 hard has to be accounted for. This, I take it, proves to a demonstration that this was raised and graded out as No. 1 hard. Of No. 3 hard 41,300 bushels was graded in and 53,649 bushels graded out, a difference of 12,349 bushels. Of No. 1 Northern there was graded in 13,300 bushels, and graded out 19,206 bushels, a difference of 5,906 bushels. Of No. 2 Northern, there was graded in 23,800 bushels, and graded out nil. Of No. 1 White Fife, there was graded in 10,500 bushels, and graded out nil. Of No Grade there was graded in 7,000 bushels and graded out nil. Of Condemned, there was graded in 4,200 bushels and graded out nil. Of Rejected, there was graded in 347,900 bushels, and graded out nil. Of No 2 frosted, there was graded in 1,200 bushels, and graded out 14,666 bushels. Of No. 2 frosted, there was graded in 4,200 bushels, and graded out nil. Now what became of all these low grade wheats? Where have they gone?

It occurred to me that there was a discrepancy in these figures, and that there

must have been a larger amount in the elevator than appears. So I induced Mr. Watts, the secretary, I think, of the Grain Exchange of Toronto, to telegraph his people in Toronto for the official return to the Board of Trade of wheat at Fort William the dates above mentioned, and I will lay the result before the House. The stock of wheat at Port Arthur, per official returns to the Toronto Board of Trade on September 15th, 1897, was 1,474,000 bushels. The statement from the inspector, which I have just read, shows that from September 15th, 1897, to January 15th, 1898, he inspected in 9,972,200 bushels. So that at the latter date there should be in the elevator a total of 11,446,200 bushels. During the same period, according to the statement of the inspector which I have read, there was inspected out 8,538,951 bushels, leaving apparently on January 15th, 1898, 2,907,249 bushels; whereas the returns from the official report to the Toronto Board of Trade show that there was on hand at that date only 44,000 bushels; so that we have 2,163,249 bushels to be accounted for. I would like to know where that wheat is. The inference would be that a larger quantity was graded out than would appear from the report of the inspector at Fort William is not correct, but designed to mislead. During the period from September 15th, 1897, to January 15th, 1898, the inspector's return shows less out than in of 1,433,249 bushels. The Board of Trade returns show a reduction in stocks during the same period of 730,000 bushels, leaving 2,163,249 bushels. The inspector reports: Extra wheat graded in, 19,800 bushels; graded out, nil; No. 1 hard wheat, 243,000 bushels more graded out than graded in; and No. 2 hard, more inspected in than out by 1,551,974 bushels.

Now, it might be fair to ask me what is done in the United States with regard to this question? It is important that we should take a leaf out of the book of our neighbours on this question, because we find that the Americans, no matter what our opinion of them may be politically, are a progressive people, who succeed in doing business on business lines. They used to have an elevator monopoly in the United States, and I am told that it was a serious injury to the country; but, like a business people, they dealt with the question in a business way. They appointed a railway commission, and the result has been that they have been able to get rid of the elevator monopoly and to see that the grain is handled in the interest of the farmers. A few days ago, when the question of establishing a railway commission for Canada was discussed here, I took the opportunity of saying a few words upon it.

It was not officially intimated, although it seemed to be understood that the Government, while considering the question, was not prepared to announce its policy, so that

Mr. RICHARDSON.

we may take it for granted that we shall not have a railway commission appointed this session. If we do not have a railway commission appointed which would regulate this question of the elevator monopoly, so much the more desirable is it that my Bill should become law.

In order to place before the House the best information procurable, I wrote to the Secretaries of State of the Dakotas and Minnesota, and received in reply many books showing what the laws of these several states are in this connection. In these states the farmers have the privilege of shipping their grain directly from flat warehouses or their own vehicles. Let me read briefly from the warehouse and grain laws of the state of Minnesota:

Sec. 35. In case any owner or consignee of grain shall be dissatisfied with the inspection of any lot of grain, or shall from any cause, desire to receive his property without its passing into store, he shall be at liberty to have the same withheld from going into any public warehouse (whether the property may have previously been consigned to such warehouse or not) by giving notice to the person or corporation in whose possession it may be at the time of giving such notice; and such grain shall be withheld from going into store, and delivered to him, subject only to such proper charges as may be a lien upon it prior to such notice—the grain, in railroad cars, to be removed therefrom by such owner or consignee within twenty-four (24) hours after such notice has been given to the railroad company having it in possession; provided, such railroad company place the same in a proper and convenient place for unloading; and any person or corporation refusing to allow such owner or consignee to receive his grain shall be deemed guilty of conversion, and shall be liable to pay such owner or consignee double the value of the property so converted. Notice that such grain is not to be delivered into store may also be given to the proprietor or manager of any warehouse into which it would otherwise have been delivered; and if, after such notice, it be taken into store in such warehouse, the proprietor or manager of such warehouse shall be liable to the owner of such grain for double its market value.

I do not want to detain the House too long on this point. I could quote at length from the laws of Minnesota and these regulations which have been sent me, but in order to present to the House, in a concrete form, the exact position of affairs with regard to the grading of wheat in that country, let me read a couple of letters which I received from the department of railroad and warehouse commissioners of Minnesota. It will be found that they cover the ground very accurately:

St. Paul, Minn., 26th Jan., 1898.

R. L. Richardson, Esq.,
Editor "Tribune," Winnipeg, Man.

Dear Sir,—Replying to your favour of 23rd inst., will say that chap. 144, General Laws of 1835, was the first legislation enacted in this state looking toward a remedy for alleged evils in the business of grain buying and handling. Previous to this, the inspection of grain was in the control of the Chambers of Commerce of

Minneapolis and Duluth, and the standards fixed by them was the basis for grades given at country points to farmers. The system was unsatisfactory to the producer, he regarding the grades as arbitrary, unjust and wholly in the interest of the large elevator companies and the millers of Minneapolis, of which two elements of the trade the membership of the Chambers of Commerce was then largely composed.

Placing the control of grain inspection in the hands of state officers was regarded as likely to result in more uniform grading and in disinterested and impartial work.

This law applied only to the inspection at terminal points, and as but few of the farmers were able to load their own wheat into cars and secure the advantage of terminal inspection, the elevator companies operating in the country continued to exact rigid grades as before. This called for supplementary legislation, which was secured in the passage of chap. 64, G. L. 1893.

Let me read that section. It is a short one and will be interesting :

Sec. 1. Any person, firm, or corporation desirous of erecting and operating at or contiguous to any railway station or siding a warehouse or elevator for the purchase, sale, shipment or storage of grain for the public for hire, may make application in writing containing a description of that portion of the right of way of said railroad on which said person, firm or corporation desires to erect a warehouse or elevator, and the size and capacity of the warehouse or elevator proposed to be erected, and the time for which it is desired to maintain said warehouse or elevator to the person, firm or corporation owning, leasing or operating the railway at such station or siding for the right, privilege and easement of erecting and maintaining for the time stated in such application and for the reasonable compensation such warehouse or elevator as aforesaid upon the right of way appertaining to such railway at such siding or station, and within and between the outside switches of the yard of such railway station or siding, and upon paying or securing in the manner hereinafter prescribed reasonable compensation for the right, privilege and easement aforesaid shall absolutely and unconditionally be entitled to the same.

The letter then proceeds :

—providing a means whereby farmers, either individually or collectively, could erect their own warehouses on the right of way of railroad companies in the state, and thus be enabled to ship their wheat to terminal points and secure full grades and prices. In case there is lack of room at any station for elevator sites when demanded, parties can secure sites, by purchase, on lands adjacent to railroad right of way and are assured of rail connection under provisions of chap. 65, G. L. 1893.

Let me read that passage :

Sec. 1. The owner or owners of any elevator, warehouse or mill of not less than five thousand bushels capacity, located on lands adjacent to the right of way of any railroad company in this state, at or in the immediate vicinity of any regular way station of any railroad, shall have the right to demand of such railroad company the construction of a side track over its right of way from such elevator, warehouse, mill or manufactory, which side track shall connect with a switch with the main or other side track of such railroad, at a point within a reasonable distance from such way station, and the railroad com-

pany shall build such side track and make such connection at its own expense. And in case no suitable place for the erection of such elevator, warehouse and mill can be had, for any cause, within the distance occupied by the switches, then the railroad and warehouse commission shall have the right upon application of either party in interest, to designate a place for the erection of the same, not more than one-quarter of a mile beyond the end of such switch ; provided, however, that no such owner or owners shall have the right to demand, nor shall any railroad company be required to construct any such side track under the provisions of this Act which shall connect with the main track of such railroad outside of the outside switches of the yard of such station or siding as the same, may be established at the date of such demand.

Then the letter proceeds :

These three measures have resulted in opening up the interior markets to competition, where previously they were practically monopolized by half a dozen large companies. In addition to this, the railroad companies have shown a disposition in the past three or four years to furnish cars to individuals who desired to load their own grain on side tracks, and thus avoid the cost of having it handled through the local elevators.

While the line elevator companies still operate at nearly every station in the state, it is rare to find a station where there are not from one to three or four small houses operated by private individuals, or farmers' co-operative associations. This, taken in connection with the privilege of shipping from side track, gives the farmer practically everything he has contended for, as it enables him to reach the large markets, when grades or prices are not upon a just basis at the local point. There is no dissatisfaction with present conditions in this state.

You will observe that under chap. 148, G. L. 1895, all elevators and warehouses on railroad right of way are required to procure a license and are operated under the supervision of the Railroad and Warehouse Commissioners. There is a marked improvement in the character of the grading at country elevators under the operation of this law, and a general disposition shown to conform to terminal standards. The sharp competition now existing compels interior buyers to give the farmer "all there is in it," to use a common expression, as he knows to a moral certainty that the farmer will send his grain to the larger markets unless proper treatment is accorded.

If the farmers of Minnesota and Dakota are receiving "all there is in it," I think I am safe in appealing to this House to see that the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west are also placed in a position to receive "all there is in it."

I wrote the gentlemen who sent me the above letter, to ascertain if elevator owners dealt in wheat, and to see if any difficulty was experienced by farmers in procuring cars, and received the following reply :—

St. Paul, Minn., 1st Feb., 1898.

R. L. Richardson,
Editor "Tribune" Winnipeg.

Sir,—In reply to yours of 27th ult., with farther reference to the subject of grain handling at country points in Minnesota under existing laws and conditions, will state that the large

line companies do not look for profit to accrue in these times from the mere handling and shipping of wheat, but rather from the "storage" feature of the business.

Formerly, when these companies operated and exclusively controlled the country warehouse business, the charge for handling and shipping with other incidental charges amounted to three and one-half cents per bushel. As they were doing all the business and transferring large quantities this charge yielded a handsome revenue. The advent of competition in the field has resulted not only in a division of the business but in a very material reduction of charges, the present rate for handling being but two cents per bushel. This charge, in view of largely reduced receipts, yields only sufficient revenue to the larger houses to meet the expenses of operating. The profit now is made by filling up their houses in the fall and selling the May option against these purchases; under normal market conditions there is generally a premium of 4½ to 5 cents per bushel for May over October and November. When May arrives, they ship in the grain to fill in the contracts. This has hardly held good during the present crop year, owing to the relatively higher price for cash wheat as against the futures. The elevator companies are complaining of the unprofitable business the present year, but under ordinary conditions the business is, as far as I know, profitable and satisfactory.

Under existing conditions, with the increased number of warehouses and storage capacity, grain is handled more expeditiously than ever before, and it is rare to have a blockade even in the busiest portion of the year, where formerly it was a matter of daily occurrence.

I regret having been obliged to detain the House at such length. My only excuse is, that this is a question of the very deepest importance to the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. The settlers there have had a long and a hard struggle. People who live east in their comfortable homes, with abundance of fuel, have little idea of the hardships to which these people are subjected. The fuel is scarce, and often the farmer is obliged to drive 15 or 20 miles in the severe cold to procure a very small load of very poor wood. There are also other disabilities under which they labour. I think I shall not appeal in vain, when I ask hon. members of this House to join with the hon. member for East Assinibola and myself in pressing this Bill to a conclusion. I appeal to the members of this House to render justice to their fellow-men in the west, to support the representatives of the west in their effort to so amend the law that a ring or combine in Winnipeg shall not be able to fitch from the hard-working settlers of that country a clear million of dollars in the handling of the season's crop.

Mr. DAVIN. The subject of this Bill is one of the most important, as affecting the North-west Territories, that can occupy the attention of the House. On previous occasions, I have brought before the House the necessity, in the interests of justice to the farmers, of dealing with the question of grading wheat. The facts that have been

Mr. RICHARDSON.

placed before us to-night, illustrates the propositions I laid down at previous sessions, as to the injury done the farmers in the mixing of wheat, and of the whole system of buying grain. This Bill, however, deals with a matter that has come up within a twelvemonth. Up to last year, at various points, like Moose Jaw, Lumsden and other places, we had not only elevators, but warehouses whence the railway took the grain of the farmer. However, the combine of which we have not heard too much or too strongly this evening, was formed last year. There was a feeling that men were about to reap a great harvest at the expense of the farmers. We found that at places where men had been accustomed to ship their grain, from warehouses with perfect efficiency and satisfaction to everybody, these warehouses had to disappear, and these men who, from one end of the country to the other, were putting up elevators, looked as though they felt themselves masters of the situation. I believe that if the farmers had not readily assumed that this was the case, things would not have been carried with a high hand. I knew nothing of the matter in my own constituency until they told me they had to take away the warehouses, that an elevator was being erected. If they had asked my advice before, I certainly would have advised them that the warehouse need not be taken away. It is my opinion, that, under the law as it stands, no common carrier can refuse to take the grain of the farmer, if he presents it in portable fashion. But if there be any doubt about it, it is not desirable that the farmer should have the responsibility thrown upon him of initiating litigation. I think that nothing is more desirable than that we should have a Bill such as that introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Douglas). I shall not at this late hour occupy the time of this House by going further into this matter. Without committing myself in matters of detail, I concur in most of what has been said. This Bill shall have for its second reading and its subsequent stages my entire support.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I would suggest to my hon. friend in charge of this Bill (Mr. Douglas) that, as it is an important Bill, and some of its provisions require a good deal of consideration, the best course would be to read the Bill a second time and refer it to the Committee on Railways and Canals, where it can be thoroughly discussed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What about my suggestion with regard to the Bill which I have on the Order Paper one or two lines down, and which is designed to cover much the same ground? I suggest that both be referred to a special committee and amalgamated.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I think these are Bills of such importance that they require to be considered by the Railway Committee. My hon. friend when his Bill comes up, might refer that to the Railway Committee too. But I do not think it is a case for a special committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have prepared the two Bills carefully, and really the Bill which we are now discussing covers the whole ground, the first clause in the Bill covers the ground that is proposed in the Bill of the hon. member for Lisgar. Though I have no objection that the two Bills should go before the committee and should be amalgamated, but I would prefer that my Bill should stand upon its own merits.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The hon. gentleman had better send it to the Railway Committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS moved that the said Bill be referred to the Railway Committee.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. After the very able manner in which this Bill has been introduced, and its various points brought before the House, it would be entirely out of place for me to take up any time in further discussing it this evening. I will not therefore trespass upon the time of the House further than to say that the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who have discussed this Bill meet with my hearty approval and endorsement. There is no doubt whatever that a very grave and serious grievance exists in the whole grain business of the North-west. As the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has said, from the time the grain leaves the farmer's hands, the business is badly conducted. I believe, however, that the establishment of a railway commission, which would deal with these matters, would remove this grievance almost entirely, and I regretted to hear the other day from the Minister of Railways that there was not much probability of a railway commission being appointed this session. However, it gives me very great pleasure to endorse, as a meantime expedient, the principle of this Bill. I may say that while the elevator owners throughout Manitoba and the North-west are making some outcry in regard to this matter, I for one do not think that any honest elevator owner or manager has anything to fear. On the Manitoba and the North-Western Railway, and on the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company's Road, no elevator monopoly exists. The farmers there can load their cars from wagons or in any other way that suits them best. The elevator owners on these roads have no trouble, and no honest man need be at all afraid of allowing the farmers the privilege of loading their own cars. Of course, the dishonest elevator owner and the

unprincipled elevator manager will object; but people who are anxious to do business in an honest and straightforward way, have nothing whatever to fear in the passage of legislation such as this. There is no doubt that it is the duty of this House to protect the farmer. The grain man, as far as my experience goes, and I fancy that is the experience of every other hon. gentleman in this House, is quite able to look after his own interests and to protect himself; but in the case of the farmer it is our duty to pass such legislation as will guard his interests, and protect him from the rapacity of his fellow men.

Mr. DAVIS. I merely wish to say a few words on this question, and to express my hearty sympathy with the Bill moved by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). I think it is a step in the right direction. We know that the farmers in the West have been labouring under great difficulties for several years, and this is one of them. Now, I consider that this elevator combine is a dangerous institution for the reason that it does away with competition, and competition is a thing that is good for the farmers, it is the only way they can get a fair price for their grain. Several companies of this kind form a combine, and they have the power of fixing the price in their own hands, so that the farmer has no chance at all, and has to give them the grain for whatever they may offer for it. Another matter which was alluded to by the hon. gentleman, the manner in which the grain is weighed, I do not consider is fair at all. This grain is poured into the hopper, it disappears from the view of the farmer, in fact he never sees the grain, and he has got to take whatever weight is given to him by the man who has charge of the elevator, and he has nothing more to say. Now, with reference to there being a combine, some persons might say there is no combine, but I have taken the trouble to find out, and I know there is. All the elevator companies in the North-west Territories have one agent in the city of Toronto, that agent does business for all the elevator companies in the North-west Territories and Manitoba. So I think that goes to prove that there is a combine. Another grievance is that not only can these grain men fix the price of grain for the farmers, because there is no competition, but it appears to me they can also force the millers to pay very nearly what they please for the grain, that is to say, they can force them to pay at least 8 to 10 cents a bushel more than it is actually worth. They do that in this way: They have 15 cents a bushel protection, and they are thus enabled to raise the prices. They get it into the elevator and hold it, and as I was informed by a miller to-day, they are asking them now \$1.12½ a bushel for that wheat. Another thing is that it does away with the en-

couragement the farmers have had heretofore to raise good wheat, because no matter how good the quality of the wheat the farmer raises, after it passes through this elevator and is mixed, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), the farmer does not get credit for the actual quality of his wheat. I do not think I need to say anything more on this question. I think the hon. member for Assiniboia deserves a great deal of credit in bringing this matter before the House, and I intend to vote for his Bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As this Bill has now passed the second reading, personally I would very much prefer, as it is a public matter, that the Government should take charge of it and make it a Government measure.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I do not think that the Government can take charge of the hon. gentleman's measure, it must go before the Railway Committee on its merits and be discussed there. The Government are not in the habit of taking charge of measures unless they have introduced them and considered them themselves.

Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to the Committee on Railways, &c.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 18th March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RESIGNATION OF MR. BRUNEAU.

Mr. MARCOTTE rose to move the motion of which he gave notice yesterday.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I suppose my hon. friend is rising to bring up again the question of privilege of which he gave notice yesterday. I would ask him to allow the motion to stand over until Monday. We have consulted the law officers of the Crown, but have not received their report, and are not in a position to

Mr. DAVIS.

advise the House what will be the decision of the Government on the question.

Motion allowed to stand.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Brockville and St. Lawrence Bridge Company.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville).

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 39) respecting the inspection of steamboats and the examination and licensing of engineers employed thereon.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). When we were in committee on this Bill before we passed most of the sections, but some were reserved. My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) desired to have the line in the second section which brings steam dredges and floating elevators within the operation of the Bill, reserved. Though this section was not formally reserved, I told my hon. friend from Kingston that it would be considered reserved in order that further opportunity for discussion might be afforded. I would suggest that it be taken up now.

Mr. BRITTON. Since the matter was before the committee on the last occasion, I have made inquiry and have found that there is strong objection on the part of the owners of these floating elevators to have them brought within the scope of this Bill. These are not, in any sense, steamboats. They are not propelled by steam power, but are simply barges with an engine upon them. There is no more reason why the engine and boiler on one of these should be inspected than there is why the engine and boiler on a wharf should be inspected; and I certainly take objection to the jurisdiction of this House to deal with it unless they also intend to claim jurisdiction in reference to stationary engines. Though they have been in use a long time, no accident has happened. I am aware that that is not an argument that has very great force, but it is to some extent a reason why these floating elevators should not be brought within the operation of the Act. There is no demand for such a law. The Bill, I fancy, has been prepared at the instance of the Minister, by the men in his office, and they have thought to get hold of anything that had a steam engine upon it and that was afloat. This law is designed to apply to steamboats, to vessels that are propelled by steam. It is not, it seems to me, intended to apply, nor ought it to apply to a case where, instead of having a floating dock—for we have such, docks that rise and fall with the tide, with an engine upon it—the engine is upon a barge or floater which lies beside the dock. I withdraw the objec-

tion that I had to dredges being included under the Bill, because these are moved about from place to place in the harbour and even from harbour to harbour. But it is not the case with floating elevators; they are simply an adjunct of the dock and not a vessel, except in the very narrowest sense—that they are afloat.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I submit to my hon. friend (Mr. Britton) that his arguments are not by any means conclusive. We claim to exercise authority over all steamboats and vessels which are within our jurisdiction; but, with regard to stationary engines, there is a very grave question whether we have any jurisdiction over them. My own personal opinion is that we have not. But we have jurisdiction over steam barges and floating elevators. I understand my hon. friend to waive his objections to the inclusion of steam barges and so the committee is confined to the request made by him that floating elevators shall not be included. But there are already a large number of men employed upon these floating elevators, and it is reasonable to suppose, with the increasing trade anticipated after the canals are dredged that there will be a large number of these floating elevators at Montreal, at Kingston, and at other places along the St. Lawrence. The proposition is that the boilers upon this class of vessels, upon which there must, from time to time, be a large number of men employed, shall be absolutely exempt from inspection. No Minister could justify the application of the Act to steam barges and steamboats, and yet say: Here is a class of vessels that we will leave out of consideration altogether, and leave the workmen upon them at the mercy of the owners.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). They have a number of floating elevators in Montreal now.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes; and what would the workmen of this country say to me if I calmly consented to withdraw the operation of this class of vessels from the Act? I should feel that I had been faithless in the matter. Unless the committee, by a very strong vote overpower me, I shall have to ask that this clause be passed as it is.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I quite agree with the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries upon this question. What has been said on the other side involves an attack upon the system of inspection generally. It has taken a long time to induce the shipping community to accept any of the other features of the law. A great many owners of this kind of property prefer to manage their property as they think best, and much dislike that interference which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) refers to

in connection with cover floating elevators. But to any person who supports the general principle of the Bill, I think the position taken by the hon. Minister of Marine must seem unassailable. To exempt these floating elevators because the owners prefer to be left alone, would weaken the hon. Minister's position with regard to all the other shipping interests. This Bill is for the protection of life. The mere fact that there are no passengers on these floating elevators does not affect the case, for the Bill applies to a number of kinds of craft on which no passengers are carried. The object is not merely to protect the lives of a certain class of individuals, but to protect life generally. I hope the hon. member for Kingston will take a broader view, and will endeavour to reconcile the opinions of those who are behind him with advanced opinion upon this question. The shipping community themselves stand in a very different attitude towards the general principle of the Bill from that they occupied when it was first introduced. I think that, as a whole, they favour these precautions which are thrown around the lives of our citizens.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whether it is intended that the Bill shall apply to stationary engines that are used in the loading of vessels—for instance, a hoisting engine used for hoisting cargoes.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I should be very glad, indeed, if I thought the constitution permitted, to add to the Bill so as to include the stationary engines to which the hon. gentleman refers. But I cannot see under what possible clause of the constitution this Parliament has power to legislate with regard to stationary engines on the land.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. There is great pressure for some such legislation. Of course, I do not know if this Parliament has power to pass it or not. If it is possible to see any way to include these engines and boilers within the operation of the present measure, I think it would be a very proper amendment.

Mr. **WOOD** (Brockville). With regard to what has been said by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), I am sure there is a very strong feeling among the members of the Association of Stationary Engineers that some action should be taken by this Parliament to give them a proper status and place them on the same footing as engineers who are required to pass examination.

I myself have been approached by a deputation from the district in which I live, asking me to urge upon the Government to take steps in that direction. I notice on the Order paper that the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has a

Bill aiming at that object. I asked him some days ago whether he was going to proceed with his Bill this session, and he said then that the Government had some doubt as to the jurisdiction of this Parliament to legislate in that direction. Now, I would ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in view of the very widespread feeling among that class of engineers who wish to be placed upon a status equal in importance to that of the marine engineers, whether he has fully satisfied himself that this Parliament has jurisdiction in that matter. I deem it my duty to make this request on behalf of those who are deeply interested in this matter. I shall be satisfied with his assurance upon that subject.

Mr. BRITTON. I do not want to be misunderstood, and I see that I have been by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). I do not object to inspection for stationary engines, and I should be very glad if the Bill of the hon. member for North Oxford should become law, or some similar Bill. But my objection is that a steam elevator, a floating elevator, is called a steamboat, and by the interpretation clause of this Bill, all the clauses of this Bill that are applicable to steamboats, except in so far as they refer to passenger steamboats, are made applicable to the floating elevator. That is not a steamboat in the proper sense of the term. What we understand by steamboat is a boat that is propelled by steam and goes from place to place. In this case it is nothing more or less than an engine placed upon a floater in a harbour, such as the hon. member for Cape Breton refers to as an engine on a dock to assist in loading and in unloading cargoes. If the hon. Minister will make inspection necessary for floating elevators, I have no objection to that; but I do object to calling them steamboats, and wherever any one of the many clauses in this long Bill refers to a steamboat, to make them apply to a floating elevator. That is my objection. It is not against inspection, not against having every safeguard possible thrown around those who work upon floating elevators. But I say that when you call a floating elevator a steamboat, it is a misnomer: they are not steamboats at all. To say that a floating elevator is a steamboat, and to make these clauses applicable to it, is legislating entirely in the wrong direction, I submit. Of course if the committee is against me, and if the hon. Minister is not willing to modify the Bill, I can only protest and sit down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In answer to my hon. friend from Brockville, I say that I had considered that question, and have come to the conclusion that this Parliament had no jurisdiction to legislate in respect to stationary engines.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville).

On section 11,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is to provide for cases where a steamboat inspector is called from time to time to inspect a steamboat, and the master or owner suddenly says to him, Oh, I am not ready, and the man has to go back home. As the section is drawn, it is a little arbitrary, but I did not know how to reach the point otherwise. They ought only to be punished when they are in actual default, and I would suggest to the committee that after the word "boat" in the 30th line, these words should be inserted: "If the Minister determines that such expenses were incurred through the fault or default of the owner or manager of such steamboat." Then the Minister may be relied upon in these cases to give fair consideration to the facts, and if he determines that it was the fault or default of the owner or manager of the boat, then he should pay the expenses, and only then.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BRITTON. How will that agree with section 4?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend thinks that the words "without such permission" should be repeated, so as to cover the 1st clause, which he thought might be read as disqualifying any man from holding any civil office, whether he had permission or not. I do not agree with him in his construction, but to meet the matter and put it beyond doubt, we will insert these words.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am opposed to that clause altogether. I do not wish to say any more, however, than I said on the last occasion. I think the inspector in this position ought not to be allowed to engage in any business of any kind whatsoever outside the business of the department. Officers in the service who receive salaries and those men who hold positions like theirs, are not allowed to engage in outside business, it makes them open to suspicion. Take the case of the mayor that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave us the other night, a case which he thought would be an extreme one; if the rule were applied and the inspector was not permitted to hold this office, I think it puts the inspector in a very awkward position, and the department also. The mayor, as we know in that district, has to compete for public favour, and has his supporters, and this must be considered in connection with this business. How can he hold to a rigid observance of the law those steamboat owners on whom, perhaps, his very election depends, and to whom he must come under obligations? Other officers in the Customs Department, the Inland Revenue service, and all other departments, are debarred from holding these positions. I do not think there is an officer receiving \$1,000 a year in the

Inland Revenue or the Customs allowed to hold office outside of the department. If there be so, the reason for applying the law is stronger as regards an ordinary Customs or Inland Revenue officer, because he occupies a impartial position, and if he does not occupy such a position his office is of no use whatever. The feeling has been constantly aroused in regard to our officers that we should prohibit them engaging in other business. The Minister of Marine spoke of a case that had occurred within his time. I remember a case within my time where an inspector was complained of because he had drawn plans for engines and boilers of certain firms. It is admitted that these officers should be entirely above suspicion, and we should recognize the importance of that point. This is a most dangerous clause, because it gives direct authority to the Minister of Marine to permit these men to hold offices which the public will feel are inconsistent with the position of inspector of steamboats.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** The Bill only enables the Minister to carry out effectively that which is done now ineffectively. If an inspector of steamboats is engaged in a business that I think incompatible with his position, I would ask him to resign the office at once, or I would take the responsibility of advising his resignation. He would then say that the law did not prohibit what was complained of and the Minister had no right to act in such a cruel and arbitrary way. I am trying to introduce the principle into the law that they should not be permitted to hold office outside, but inasmuch as it is necessary to appoint men in the North-west Territories at very small salaries, it was suggested, and I agreed with the suggestion, that the power to permit or prevent the supplementary employment should be conferred on the Minister.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILL.

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

Mr. Speaker,

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

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

And having returned,

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

An Act to protect Canada against the introduction of the insect pest known as the San José Scale.

The House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 39).

(In the Committee.)

Mr. **FOSTER.** If my recommendation would be of any avail in this matter so far as the Minister's own comfort is concerned, I would advise him most strongly not to put this invitation into the statute. That is a minor matter, however, because a Minister is paid his salary and is supposed to do the work, and if he is pestered he has to take the amount of pestering given to him. It will not add to his comfort a great deal to have his petition put on the Statute-book, and the invitation for pressure from all over the country wherever these officers are distributed, and pressure which will be necessarily partisan in its nature, and where the power cannot help but be administered in a partisan manner. I know the hon. gentleman strives to the best of his ability to be non-partisan and perfectly unprejudiced; but I know too that he has a large lump of human nature in him and that, strive as he may, he even now finds it very difficult not to get off the straight line once in a while. That, however, I say is a matter of minor importance, and relates to the Minister's personal comfort, and he must take it into consideration. Outside of that point there are many objections to this clause. It opens a door to pressure from outside, which will be exercised in party interests, given in some cases and withheld in others and which will not work for the benefit of the public service. It is a true principle to lay down that Government gives a salary to a man to do certain work, and his time should be devoted to that work. That is the general rule which governs civil servants who do not perform other than the statutory work, so to speak, for which they are paid their salary. It does happen that we have a class of officers who are allowed to occupy two or three offices instead of one office. The collectors of customs occasionally are allowed to act as collectors of inland revenue as well, but these cases are exceptions to the rule, but I recollect very distinctly that from year to year the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) attacked the Government for even allowing such officers to do extra outside work, even although it was shown that it resulted in convenience and economy. With respect to the inspectors of steamboats, I think it is an office which should be outside of this partisan influence. Suppose, for instance, an inspector occupied another office. It may be that the office was one in the gift of the municipality or city. If he obtained it, he did so as a result of a party canvass, he having been named by the party and elected by the party. Great pressure is brought to bear and sufficient reasons are advanced upon which the Minister acts. The moment that is done, you have a partisan inspector. Suppose there

is a case in which one of the parties is a friend and the other an opponent, there is ground for suspicion as to the independent action of the officer, and suspicion that actually injustice has been done. The Minister had of the two evils better choose the least. The Government should pay the inspectors a sufficient sum of money to give them a proper salary, and if in one or two cases they paid a little more than they would otherwise have had to pay, there would be the great advantage of having an officer free entirely from partisan pressure. I speak on this subject without any feeling. This is a direct invitation to bring in politics, of which we have enough, and this will at the same time mean the use of political pressure. I advise that the statute be left as at present. If overwhelming reasons are given why a different course should be taken towards the officers, then they can be treated as before, or if the Minister of his knowledge is able to state that in the North-west or some other portions of the Dominion it is found impossible to get men and pay them a sufficient salary for the small amount of work required, then an exception might be made in certain cases, although even in regard to them I would take the ground that it is better to pay a little more and leave the statute free from the objection.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I appreciate that my hon. friend has no feeling whatever in this matter except to get the legislation in as perfect shape as possible. I am leaving the law as it has been departmentally administered.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. No, pardon me ; not as to permission.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. As it has been departmentally administered ; there has not been a prohibition against these officers.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. There has been a departmental prohibition.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. That is in the discretion of the Minister. There is no law prohibiting these men from engaging in other business. I am trying to prohibit them by law, but I say that under peculiar circumstances the discretion might be invested with the Minister. It has never been used by a Minister for political purposes ; I have never had a hint of such a thing, and I am quite sure from what I know of the working of the department, there never will be, for those things go on in a mechanical way. The inspectors remain there until they are worn out in the service or until they resign. I have never changed any inspector of boilers nor of hulls ; I kept on the same men that were there before, and I propose to keep

Mr. **FOSTER**.

them on so far as I know, unless they are inefficient or unfit for the office.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Or partisans.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. If they are "O.P.'s" I suppose they would share the fate which usually follows that class of people. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will see that I for the first time introduce a prohibition against their holding other offices, and I include a proviso in that prohibition that in certain cases the Minister may, if he thinks fit, give that permission. I do so, not from my own suggestion, but by the suggestion of the officers.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Very naturally.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I mean the suggestion of the officers of the department here, not of the inspectors.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Oh.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes ; Mr. Magee and Mr. Adams suggested this, because they say that in certain outlying localities you cannot pay a man sufficient to give his whole time to the work, as there is not enough work to justify it.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Where is the case of the man who is a mayor ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I think it was at Kingston.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. That surely was a case where there was no ground for it at all.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. He applied to me to know if he could become mayor or alderman, I forget which.

Mr. **BRITTON**. Alderman ; he is going to run for mayor next year.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. If you allow an inspector to be mayor of Kingston, surely you will allow an inspector to run for mayor or alderman in any other city.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The law did not prohibit him ; it was just a departmental order.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. That is a very strong case against this. I believe it is against the efficiency of this Act to allow an inspector of steamboats to be mayor of a city like Kingston. I thought it was some small place where there were some exceptional reasons for it. A man like that cannot be regarded as absolutely independent, having regard to the duties of his office, when he has such ambitions to gratify and serve. When I was in the

department the rule was that no officer of this kind should engage in outside work, and the question came before me when an officer was attacked upon the ground of impartiality, it being said that he could not be independent when he was working for people whose work he afterwards inspected. The rule was made general then, and I do not know a case where the rule should be more strictly adhered to than that of a steamboat inspector.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I would not ask this at all if I had not pointed out the exceptional position of inspectors in the outlying districts.

Mr. McMULLEN. The ex-Minister of Finance made some reference to my taking exception in past years to more than their ordinary salaries being paid to civil servants. That course was introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite when in power, and over a million of the money of the people of this country has been given to civil servants over and above their ordinary salaries.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Do not let us get into that question.

Mr. McMULLEN. I simply wish to say that in order to carry out the principle which I have advocated in the past, I have a Bill now on the Order paper which if I receive the support of hon. gentlemen opposite, will put a stop to that kind of thing.

Mr. BRITTON. The objection I raised at first was that the clause as it is drafted in the Bill made it prohibitory as to holding any civil office whatever, while it made it permissive so far as the engaging in other business like the valuing of damaged goods. The Minister has now made the permission applicable to clause 2. That removes the objection I had, but I certainly think there is a great deal of force in what has been said by the opposite side about making it prohibitory that they should engage in any outside work or hold any civil office. I know that steamboat inspectors have been permitted to do a good deal of outside work in reference to valuing for insurance companies and for steamboat owners, and for which they have been paid. I suppose so long as that does not interfere with their business there is no objection to it. I also know that some of these inspectors do hold a civil office, and I do know that it is objectionable in some cases, and objection has been raised to it. The answer was: There is no prohibition in the statute, and why should persons raise the objection so long as the holding of this civil office does not interfere with their business. As to my objection, I am quite willing to make it prohibitory.

Mr. FOSTER. It is quite fair to say: Why should not they do this so long as it does not interfere with their duty, but everybody knows that where you allow a man to take outside work and get paid for it, he wants to get as much of that outside work as possible, and the tendency will always be for him to infringe upon his other duties. The other objection is the natural desire that comes to any man who holds an office in the gift of the voters to be friendly to those men who are friendly to him, and that introduces a sort of an inclination to favour one side and not favour the other, with the certainty of a chance for a grievance anyway. Why should we be more lenient to this class of officers than is the Postmaster General to his officers? I know a particular instance in which the Postmaster General is acting very stringently with reference to a postmaster who, before he took office, was a lawyer, and had certain cases on hand and certain business to finish. The strings were drawn there very tightly, even as to the finishing up of a little estate business and the like of that. The order is now peremptory, you have your duties, attend to these and attend to nothing else. I am not disposed to quarrel with that, as a public officer who gets a fair salary should make it his first and chief and only duty to attend to the requirements of the office during office hours. If my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) passes this law, I believe he will be holding out a statutory invitation to everybody to press for this favour.

Mr. DAVIN. Are there any Government inspectors of boilers or steamboats in the North-west Territories?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister what is the smallest salary given to any of these men?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There is no statutory salary. The chief inspectors, such as the man at St. John, get \$1,000 a year each. The smaller ones, such as those in the North-west, do not get that or anything like it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With regard to the officers receiving that amount of compensation, does the hon. Minister propose to apply this provision?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes, certainly. The hon. gentleman perhaps did not hear my explanation. I am only seeking the authority by statute to do what we do every day, departmentally.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It seems to me that there is a difference between a statutory enactment giving the Minister power to do that, and a departmental practice. Suppose the hon. Minister asked to be given

authority to allow any officer in his employ to run for a public position. I do not suppose the House would grant that.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No, but there are some officials at outlying places who receive only small salaries, and it would be improper to require these men not to engage in any other business, as the salaries they receive are not enough to enable them to live.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think it is well enough to take authority to prohibit them from engaging in any other business, but I think that proviso, "except by the permission of the Minister," should be dropped out. If you cannot give these officers enough to keep them free from suspicion, the whole thing is a farce, and most unfair to the shipping community. All these officers get what are considered fair salaries, good enough at any rate to secure for the department the advice of a splendid lot of men. In British Columbia, on the Atlantic coast and in Ontario, the minimum salary is \$1,000, running up to something like \$1,800; so that there is no reason for doing in this case what is not done in any other branch of the service. If the Minister will drop this exception, the clause is a first-rate, healthy clause, simply embodying what I think has been for some time the rule in the department—to give these officers to understand that it is against discipline and against the rules of the service for them to sell their time to any one whatsoever, because that cannot be done without raising a suspicion against them.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has found in the administration of his department that the present system has worked badly. I understand that he bases his case on the fact that he is now doing what he seeks authority from the House to do. If these inspectors have acted without permission, under the law as it now stands, I would like to ask him if he has found any harm coming to the service from that action, and wishes to restrain it. If no harm has arisen, it seems to me hardly worth while to place any man, even one with a small salary, at the mercy of the Minister. I do not mean to say that he would deal with them harshly or unfairly, but it is unfair to put them in that position, unless it can be shown that the service is injured by the present state of things; but so far I have not heard that the hon. gentleman makes any complaint of that kind. I am sure my hon. friend can see the difference between these officers being in some cases permitted to act on their own motion, without the authority of the Minister, and, on the other hand, limiting their action by the will of the Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. There is just one additional remark I would like to make. Although I think the whole clause is bad, I

Mr. WOOD (Brockville).

think the last few words are simply abominable; that is, the permission which may be given to an inspector to hold any civil office whatever. Take the city of St. John, the city of Halifax, or any other city, what may very easily take place is this. The men who are most active and most successful in ward politics are the men who are looking for the rewards of office from the Government in power. It might easily occur that one of your ward politicians, who is successful as such, because he commands the votes of the ward, and is able to hold them, wants to get a party reward in the shape of an appointment as inspector of steamboats. I ask the hon. gentleman to put the question to himself, what would be the administration of the office in the hands of such a man? Would it be the best kind of administration? This man who has handled the majority of his ward, and who holds them by whatever arts he can command, who has to give favours as well as accept favours, when he comes to perform his duty, is at the mercy of the political element, and not always the best element of the ward. When he comes to conduct the inspection, he is a fair shot for all the influences that can be brought to bear on him in the spirit of: "Don't hurt our party." That is an extreme case, but it is a case that might occur. Although there might not be so much objection to such a man acting as valuator of a vessel in case of damage, this last paragraph which would admit of his holding office as inspector is bad and worse than bad, and I hope my hon. friend will leave that part out.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. This is a just punishment upon me for my sins. I had the Bill at first all right, but my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) asked me to amend it so as to qualify the latter part and give me this permission. I did so, and then my hon. friend turns round and joins the opposition, and says I should not do it. In the older parts of Canada, I would make the rule an arbitrary one that no inspector should hold any other office, but my officers tell me, and I know from my own knowledge that I shall have to appoint a number of inspectors in outlying parts of the Dominion—in the Yukon district and in different parts of British Columbia and the Northwest—at small salaries.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Because I cannot afford to give a salary of \$1,000 to inspect these steamboats.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What would be the good of the inspection?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. It will be all right. They will only have to inspect two

or three boats. I am merely asking to be allowed to appoint inspectors at outside places at small salaries, and permit them to engage in other business as well. I am not introducing any new practice. There is no law prohibiting these men from engaging in business now, and I am seeking to introduce a law that will prohibit them, unless they get special permission from the Minister. No Minister would think of granting such permission to inspectors in the older localities, because they get sufficient to devote their whole time to the business; but in an outlying section it is reasonable that the Minister should have discretion to allow them to do other work as well.

Mr. ELLIS. The objection appears to be this, that members representing these districts will be called on to ask the Minister to grant such permission in places where it is not granted now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the law now.

Mr. ELLIS. Yes, but the permission does not appear in print now. It is an order of the Minister. There is a great sensitiveness among the people everywhere against the employment of these persons in other offices. I agree with the hon. Minister in the general principle he lays down, but whether it is wise for him to take the exception, I do not know. I do not think it is. I would prefer to see a cast-iron rule, so that no pressure could be brought on him by members or by anybody else.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not have so much objection, so long as my hon. friend is Minister, because he is so notably non-partisan; but I am afraid that, some day or other, the present Minister of Public Works may become Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and in the city of Montreal "business would be business." you know.

Mr. BRITTON. I want to put myself right. If the hon. gentlemen will look at subsection 2, they will see that I was of opinion that the permission did not apply to the last clause of that subsection, and so I thought it was an unfair discrimination to legislate against the officers of the Marine Department, when there was no such legislation against the officers of any other department. I know, as a fact, that some steamboat inspectors do other work to-day, and, I believe, have permission to do it, and as this legislation was to allow the Minister to give such permission, I thought it would be unfair discrimination to say that, in no case, should the inspector hold any civil office. But I would prefer to have it prohibitive, rather than permissive, because I can see the difficulties that have been suggested.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment, namely, to add after the word "or." in the last line of the sec-

tion, the words "without such permission." The clause will then read:

And no inspector so appointed shall, except by permission of the Minister, be engaged in any business, or act as valuator of any damaged goods or cargo, or inspect or survey any machinery, steamboat, barge or vessel of any kind in any capacity, other than in his official capacity as steamboat inspector, or without such permission hold any civil office whatsoever.

Mr. FOSTER. The amendment is not necessary.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not think it was, but I consented to it so as to leave the question beyond doubt and meet the view of the hon. member for Kingston.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is now on the section, as amended.

Mr. FOSTER. I move an amendment, to strike out the words in the 38th line, "except by permission of the Minister."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would rather drop the clause altogether. That would put the Minister in this awkward position, that he could not appoint a man to inspect a steamboat in any part of the Dominion at \$100 salary, without requiring him to abstain from doing any other business. That is carrying the thing to extremes.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I agree with the hon. Minister. In the North-west Territories, where I live, we have five steamers on the river. No one would think it right to employ an inspector by the year and pay him a salary. A man can be employed at \$100, and less, for the year, and I think the clause should stand as it is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suggest to the hon. Minister, that the discretion should be made to apply only in the cases of those having less than a certain salary. That would be quite in accord with what the hon. Minister says.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will carry that out in the sense the hon. gentleman mentions, but it would be foolish to fix an arbitrary salary, and make a hard and fast line. Allow me the discretion, and see how it works for a year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Minister brings forward the case of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Why not make an exception in favour of these sections of country?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows very well that there are some parts of British Columbia to which this must apply, just as much as the North-west Territories.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be some parts of Quebec, too.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The plan the hon. gentleman suggests, of engaging \$100 men, has never been adopted in British Columbia. We have ample officers there to do the work, and when new officers are required, they are engaged at a good salary. A proper officer for that work cannot be got at \$100 or anything like it. He has to be paid a regular salary to keep him independent, and the minimum is \$1,000. Take the class of engineers; an engineer may be willing to go into the Government service at nearly that at which he can earn outside the Government. I do not believe in the plan of employing men at hap-hazard. When the Minister is confronted by some new development, he does what has always been done, he increases the regular staff, because the district requires it, and those appointed do not come on for this temporary purpose, but as regular officers, and are given permanent appointment at a fair salary. In outlying districts, if you had that class of men, who are not regular inspectors, you would have any amount of trouble, and the community would not have any satisfaction. It is not to be presumed that you can take a man out of the steamboat business, and yet have him administer the law with absolute impartiality, in connection with interests out of which he is, at the same time, earning a living himself. It is not to be presumed that you could take a man actually engaged in the steamboat business and get him to administer fairly and with absolute impartiality the law in connection with interests out of which he is getting a living. But the hon. gentleman will see that he must be partial, when he comes in collision with interests which give him his livelihood, I think the Minister would be wise if he made this rule obligatory. It is obligatory in practice. The cases the hon. Minister referred to were cases that involved abuses; and, when these were brought to the attention of the department, the officer was, very properly, told that if he wished to remain in the service, he had to attend to the business of the department, and no other person's business. I mentioned that the general law provided that any officer in the receipt of \$900, or over, shall not be employed in outside work. I think, perhaps, I was wrong, so far as the statute is concerned, for I cannot find the section; but I still think it is the rule, that probably there is an Order in Council to that effect. The ex-Minister of Customs (Mr. Wallace) tells me that that is his recollection of the law, as it now stands. So this is really a departure from the existing law, if that is correct.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). In the section I come from, a man can be had, a competent man, to inspect all the steamers we have there for less than \$100 a year. If

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

you have a permanent official go there from Winnipeg, the travelling expenses alone will be twice that amount.

Amendment (Mr. Foster) negatived.

On section 14,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know why that stood over. The latter part of it is new, but I think everybody agreed with it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I thought the hon. Minister was to reconsider and redraft the section, dropping out some words in the last part.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Objection was raised; but I cannot see anything in the objection. This section provides:

Every inspector of steamboats shall demand of the owner or master of every steamboat which he inspects the production of the certificate of registry of such steamboat,—

That is the old law. Then it proceeds:

—and may require the production of the certificate of the master, mate or engineer, as the case may be, and such owner or master shall thereupon produce and exhibit the same to such inspector.

It is quite clear that the inspector ought to have power to require a production of these certificates.

Mr. BRITTON. I hope that this section does not mean that a floating elevator is to have a certificated master.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The law does not require that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the demand is made for the certificates, and they are not produced, there is a violation of the Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Besides, it seems to me a monstrous thing to require the master, or owner, to produce documents which they have not in their possession, which they are not allowed to have—as, for instance, the engineer's certificate. The engineer and mate keep their own certificates. But if this demand is made on the owner, or master, they are required to produce documents that are under the sole control of these other officers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The law does not require the owner of a steam dredge to have a certificated captain or a certificated mate, and there can be no obligation to produce certificates that the law does not require them to have. This relates only to such vessels as are required under the law to have certificated officers of the classes named.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but this is an extraordinary provision, that, while the law does not require them to have it, if the inspector demands their production and they are not produced, then the person upon whom the demand is made violates the law.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It does not say so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am arguing, that they do violate the law.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The law says, the inspector "may" require the production of these documents. I ask my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), as a lawyer, to say where he must, or whether he may, require it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am speaking as a lawyer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. May he require it in the case of a vessel that is not required to have certificated officers?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes. I say that as a lawyer. It is a most absurd provision. The Minister seems to think it would be absurd to have it, and I say it is there, and just as absurd as the Minister seems to think it would be. Suppose the inspector is dealing with the case of a ship in which inspection is required, but certificated officers are not required. The committee is asked to make this provision: First, that the inspectors shall demand the production of the said certificate of registry—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the law now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but see the reason of it. Every vessel has to have this certificate of registry under the law; and that being the case, it is reasonable to ask the production of it. But now the section goes on: "and may require the production of the certificates of the master, mate or engineer," and so on, and this although, as the Minister himself says, many of these vessels, though having certificates of registry, are not required to have certificated masters or certificated mates. But in another respect the language of this draft is most extraordinary. I do not think the Minister could have heard me, or he would not have asked me the question. After having made it necessary, on demand, to produce the certificate of the master, or mate or engineer, we are face to face with the fact that these documents belong to the individuals named, and they have the exclusive right to hold them. And if these certificates are not produced, who violates the law? Not the men themselves, who have the right to hold these documents, but the owner or master. Even if there is on a ship in whose case such is necessary, a

certificated mate and a certificated engineer, the master and the owner have not the slightest control over the certificates of those officers—they belong to the individuals named. Here would be a violation of the section, whatever may be the consequence. We have already discussed that question of penalties. Hon. gentlemen who criticised the Bill said that the violation of the section would subject those violating it to the provisions of the general penalty clause. The hon. Minister said this was not the case, and so there was a difference of opinion. But it is quite clear that these few lines were hastily drafted; and the object of holding it over the other night, as I recollect it, was to give the hon. Minister an opportunity to look into it, and even if he proposes to add to the law as it was, to change the language which imposes upon the owner, or the master, the duty and responsibility of producing the mate's or the engineer's certificate.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) sees that there is a broad distinction between the first part of the section and the second part. The first imposes a peremptory duty upon the inspector—he "shall" demand the certificate of registry. The second part of the section says that he may demand a certificate of the master. Surely that applies to those steamboats that the law says shall have a master; it cannot apply by any legal construction or ingenuity to steamboats that are not required to have a master, and do not have a master, and there is no penalty in the section. Any hon. gentleman who has ever been engaged in the administration of this law knows that it is more necessary for the inspector to require a certificate of the master, and a certificate of the mate, and a certificate of the engineer, than it is to have a certificate of the registry itself. The certificate of the Inspector is posted up and can be seen by almost anybody. But the great evil which arises is that they will try to evade the law by putting uncertificated masters, and uncertificated mates and engineers on board these vessels, and it is to prohibit and prevent, so far as we can, that evasion of the law, that we are giving power to the inspector to ask that these officials shall produce their certificates. If the vessel is not required to have a captain, these officers are not required to produce their certificates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not yet quite understand why you should require the owner or master to produce the certificates of the master, mate or engineer. Why does not the hon. gentleman, in the latter part of the clause, provide that the inspector "may" require the production of the certificates, and such master, mate or engineer shall thereupon produce the certificates to such inspector?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That would not do at all. That would enable them to evade the law, as they do now. I want to make it compulsory on the owner of the vessel to get his certificate from the inspector. If the inspector says to him, I want the certificate of your captain to satisfy me that you have a certificated captain, I want you to satisfy me that you have a certificated engineer, and I ask you to produce your certificate—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Suppose they cannot.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then he cannot get his certificate to run his steamer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then an inspector animated by ill-will can run him out of the business.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He gets his certificate the moment he has a certificated engineer. Do you want him to run his vessel without a certificated engineer? The whole object of the law is to prevent that being done.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You make the certificate of inspection dependent upon the act, not of the owner, but of the employee of the owner, who may be on bad terms with him.

Mr. MCGREGOR. If the owner and captain disagree, then the owner must get another captain.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Take the case of an engineer for instance, who has his own certificate, and who has control of it when this inspector comes. We are told that the inspectors are not everywhere, and when he comes the owner may not have full control of the engineer at the time. The hon. gentleman talks about getting another engineer, as if that was a very easy matter. It is a most difficult matter during the busy season. You are putting it in the power of these men who have a right to the documents and to the exclusive control of them, apart from the owner, to embarrass, if not to injure financially, the owners of the vessel. We are dealing with the inspection of the steamer, not with the conditions under which she is going to sea, so far as the certificates of the master, mate and engineer are concerned. In this Bill we are dealing with another subject altogether. In this respect I say this is an inconvenient and awkward clause, and tends to embarrass every steamboat owner in Canada. I say that worked out, and in the hands of any inspector, you are going to bring into collision these officers and the owners of steamboats in a manner that can only be attended with great injury and inconvenience to the owner.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any penalty under this Act, or any Act, where

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

the owner employs persons who do not hold the necessary certificate?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. If they sail a vessel with an uncertificated engineer, there is a penalty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And this is a provision to prevent the violation of that Act?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would it not be better to provide, in case a certificate might be lost, that the owner or master should then satisfy the inspector that these persons have the necessary certificate.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, because if the certificate is lost, he can in five minutes get a telegram from the head office satisfying him whether the man has got it or not.

Mr. McNEILL. Is it not a fact that some of these officers are not obliged to have these certificates?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. McNEILL. Some of them, I believe, are not obliged to have any.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. State any such case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Barges and steamers under certain colours.

Mr. McNEILL. Suppose a case where they are not obliged to have certificates and this inspector may call for them. I do not say he shall call for them, but he may call for them, and if he does, he may put the master of the vessel to any amount of inconvenience. It is all very well to say that the master may not be liable legally to any penalty, but all the same, he may have his vessel tied up and not be able to get to sea.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am afraid the inspector would have a bad time, if it came to the notice of the Minister.

Mr. CLANCY. I sympathize with the position taken by the Minister that all these men should have certificates; but I think the hon. gentleman should see that he is not proceeding in the safest way to obtain his end. If the position of one of these officers of the vessel depends solely upon his having a certificate, then why not make him produce that certificate himself rather than call upon the owner to do so. The Minister will see that he places the owner at the mercy of those men who may wish to exact greater salaries, or for any other reason. If he makes these men directly responsible, he will have attained the object he is now aiming at. I fully sympathize with the views

he has stated, but I see where he shifts the burden upon a person who cannot carry it out rather than upon the person who should be demanded to produce the certificates. If he will compel these officers to produce the certificates when they are demanded, he may not imperil the rights of the owners or put him to inconvenience.

Section agreed to.

On section 32,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. member for Montreal asked that this section be allowed to stand until he had consulted some authorities in Montreal. No representation has, however, been made to me by the hon. gentleman. There is nothing in the old Act requiring wire tiller ropes.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Why is this provision put in the present Bill?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. On the recommendation of Mr. Adams and the unanimous report of the steamboat inspectors.

On section 58,

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. The changes in this Act, although not very serious, are very numerous, and I would suggest to the hon. Minister that, under the circumstances, it should come into force on the first of next year instead of on August 1st, as provided in the Bill. It would be inconvenient to introduce it in the middle of the season when the vessels are already equipped, and they should be allowed to run the balance of the year under the present law.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There is a good deal of force in the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman. I therefore propose to insert January 1st, 1899, instead of August 1st, 1898.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. **POWELL**. I call the attention of the committee to the schedules, and I contend that a steamboat should be able to obtain a certificate enabling it to sail all over the world, if the vessel is fit for the service.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The certificate entitles a steamboat to run, but only in certain waters. In Ontario a vessel might be fitted for running on a river and not on a lake.

Mr. **POWELL**. Owing to officialism in this regard I have myself suffered financial loss. In the particular case to which I refer, we wished the steamboat to run anywhere. A British vessel comes into our harbours and has that privilege, while our vessels perhaps are restricted to running between certain points on the St. Lawrence. The words should be sufficiently

broad to give a roaming commission to a vessel to go all over the world, if it is fit, as an ocean-going vessel. Why should all the trade be placed in the hands of the English and Yankees, and Canadians not allowed to have roving commissions for their vessels. Owing to the formality observed by the late Deputy Minister of Marine the steamer in which I was interested was tied up during four weeks, and in order to get a certificate I had to come to Ottawa, and it was only by the action of the former Minister of Marine, who took the bull by the horns, and really acted against the law, that the vessel was given a roving commission.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I see no objection to allowing the section to stand as it is now, and at the same time giving the inspector alternative powers to give a certificate to a vessel to run in any of the waters of Canada.

Mr. **POWELL**. That is my objection.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. We cannot give a certificate to go outside of Canada.

Mr. **POWELL**. Why should our steamboats be restricted from going all over the world?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. We cannot legislate to go over the world.

Mr. **POWELL**. That is humbug. Take an English steamer; it has a certificate to go anywhere.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It is perfect nonsense.

Mr. **POWELL**. I know what I am talking about.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I did not make any remark to the hon. member or about him. He proposes to give certificates to vessels to sail beyond the waters of Canada, and that is a proposition to which I do not accede.

Mr. **POWELL**. I say we have the right to give certificates to go anywhere, and in doing so we are not extending our parliamentary jurisdiction beyond the domain of Canada. All we are doing is simply placing our ship-owners on the same basis as the ship-owners of other countries. We give a ship-master a certificate to enable him to sail over the world, and if such certificate is good, why is not a certificate to the boat which he will sail good. German, English and French vessels sail everywhere, but Canadian steamboats have this restriction placed upon them, that they are confined to the interior waters of Canada.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. What distinction would the hon. Minister draw in connection with this subject be-

tween the master obtaining a sea-going certificate and an unlimited certificate under the Inspection Act being given to a vessel?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do not understand that the certificate is unlimited. I have always understood, and I never knew any legal gentleman here to take exception to this view, that our legislation applied within Canadian territorial jurisdiction. We do not profess to go outside of that, and all our legislation must be along those lines. I should not like to introduce a Bill in this Parliament giving an inspector power to give a certificate to run a steamer all over the world, because we have not authority to do it. If the English or American Governments choose to recognize our certificates, that is their business; if we choose to recognize the American certificate, that is our business. But our powers are limited by our territorial jurisdiction, and I do not think we could give certificates to go beyond that. This Parliament has no right to extend its jurisdiction all over the world. We simply give a certificate of character to the vessel that she is sufficient to sail wherever there is an ocean, but we do not give her a right to go into foreign ports. It is just exactly the same as when we certify that a master is possessed of sufficient knowledge to enable him to navigate around the globe. The certificate does not enable the steamboat to go anywhere, but it merely says the steamboat is qualified to go. It is a certificate of the ship's competency as to her seaworthiness in respect of machinery and hull.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). For example, a ship is built in Halifax and she is capable of going anywhere in the world. As to her capability she must get a certificate from some Government. I do not understand where she would get that certificate if not from the proper officers in this country, unless we are restricted in some way by Imperial legislation which I am not aware of. I can see, of course, that if there is Imperial legislation it might override our powers in that respect.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Which there is clearly.

Mr. **POWELL**. Oh, no; there is not.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) is speaking without knowledge.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). If there is any such Imperial law I should like to know what it is. Outside of that we have just as much right to send a ship all over the world as the Government of Great Britain or the United States or France or any other country.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No one doubts our right to do that, but when a ship comes into British
 Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**.

territorial waters she will be governed by the regulations of the British Board of Trade, and if she goes into American waters she will be governed by the regulations of the United States. We have no power to give her a certificate which would overrule these regulations. The objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) was that the form of certificate which has been in force for the past twenty years was not broad enough, and he held that it should not be made more elastic and that it should not necessarily be confined to giving a certificate to a vessel to sail between any certain specified ports. I say now by this amendment, that I will accept that, and will give a certificate to a steamboat to run in any of the waters of Canada. I conceded, as I thought, all the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) asked, but he will not accept it. He wants us to give her a certificate to run all over the world, and I say we have not the power to do that.

Mr. **BRITTON**. It seems to me we are all agreed as to what is desirable in this matter.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. You saw my amendment; it says: "Or in the alternative to run in any of the waters of Canada." There is no limitation in that at all.

Mr. **BRITTON**. If you turn to section 17 which provides for the granting of this certificate we will see how we stand, and we will see if there is not something further required in the certificate than merely to say: "in any of the waters of Canada."

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I propose we shall give a certificate for all the waters we have power to give a certificate over, viz., within the limits of Canada.

Mr. **BRITTON**. The question is: If a vessel makes a voyage beyond the limits of Canada, how can she do so?

Mr. **POWELL**. Hear, hear; that is the question.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I can easily understand that some steamboats might not be fit for ocean voyages, and it might be well to restrict them; but surely in the case of a vessel capable of going around the world it would be a very improper thing to give a certificate that would limit her in any way. Why not have two forms of certificate, one for the seaworthiness of a boat that can go anywhere, and then let foreign parties raise the question as to whether or not she has the right to do so.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). I did not hear from the Minister the character of the Imperial legislation which I understood him to refer to.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No steamboat can sail in

British waters unless she conforms to the requirements and regulations of the British Board of Trade, and no certificate we can give her can alter that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is equally true of France and the United States, but there is no Imperial legislation, I presume, in the sense I refer to. For example, there is a company in the city of Halifax which operates steamers between Halifax and England. They must have a certificate for running these boats, but under this law they apparently cannot get it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They do not require a certificate on the ocean.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If we have ocean steamers owned by persons in Canada, why should we not control the certificates of these steamers?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not altered the law in that regard.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It might be desirable to alter it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman can show any one case since this Act came into operation in which a steamboat was ever prevented travelling between this country and a foreign country, I would be willing to amend the Act to any extent we can. But this is all imaginative.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) has mentioned one case, and there may be others.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) mentioned a case in which the form of the certificate as it then existed, and as it would exist now unless amended by me, limited the inspector to certify between two specified ports. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) wanted a broader certificate. I propose to give the certificate as broad as we can within our territorial waters, and beyond that he can roam the sea wherever he likes.

Mr. POWELL. The case I mentioned was this. A steamboat was under charter to go to a port in the United States, and she was going to take a load from there to the West Indies. It was not known what particular port she was going to, and we wanted this roving commission which we could not get at once as we should have got, and which we did not get for three or four weeks after great delay and expense. I ask the Minister: How can the law giving a steamboat a certificate of character be unconstitutional when the law giving seamen a certificate of character is perfectly constitutional? Both are perfectly the same in principle and there is nothing extra territorial in one that is not in the

other. This Parliament has the power, because so far as Canada is concerned, it is not necessary to have steamboat inspection at all; you could wipe the statute off our books and then the steamboats would go as they pleased. The Act is not an enabling but a restrictive Act. But we know that the Steamboat Inspection Act is not confined to the inland waters of Canada; and under that form, if a vessel wanted to go to England, and then to the Mediterranean, and then to South America, she would have to obtain from the inspector before she left Canada a certificate mentioning all these ports; and when she got to the other side she would not be able to take advantage of any good freight that offered for any other ports. I make this suggestion as a result of practical knowledge of shipping matters, and I regret that the Minister has not a practical knowledge of shipping matters. If he had a practical knowledge of shipping he would not suggest that the certificate of register should be posted on the ship. A sailor would laugh at a suggestion of that kind.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I referred to the certificate of inspection, which is always posted up.

Mr. POWELL. The shipping industry in the maritime provinces is a great industry. The sailing vessels are gradually being discarded, and steamboats taking their place; and if we are going to retain that industry, we must make such provisions as will promote instead of preventing the extension of that industry, by giving the inspectors power where necessary to grant these roving commissions.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Minister has one of his expert officers in attendance, and I would like to be corrected if I am wrong; but my recollection is that the practice has been entirely different from what the hon. gentleman's argument would lead us to suppose. For instance, there are vessels going from Halifax to Boston, others from Yarmouth to Boston, and others from different ports in Nova Scotia to Newfoundland, and in the certificate of inspection granted to any of these vessels, the particular route she takes is mentioned. There is not much dispute on either side of the House as to where our jurisdiction begins and ends; but I do not see that there can be the slightest objection, technical or otherwise, to acting upon the suggestion of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), not to limit to certain prescribed waters the vessels which are competing with foreign vessels, or even with English vessels, all over the world.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend from Westmoreland thinks that because he lives in Westmoreland he has a great deal of practical knowledge of shipping. I think I pro-

bably know as much about shipping as he does, and have more money invested in it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think that is the way to answer the important question raised by my hon. friend from Westmoreland. I understood that his suggestion was met by the hon. Minister saying that there were difficulties in regard to jurisdiction, and that we must be careful not to go beyond our jurisdiction. But I think that we have a right to start our ship on her voyage properly certificated, just as much as England. Our certificates are recognized in the United States the same as American certificates are recognized in Canada, the fact being that we require American vessels coming to our ports to submit to a certain inspection, and to come up to a certain standard, and they do the same. We are just as able to start our ships fairly on ventures over the world as any other country; and we come down to this question, whether there is any objection to giving the certificates the scope suggested by the hon. member for Westmoreland; and I point out that in the certificates granted to the vessels sailing to Boston from Yarmouth or Halifax it is expressly stated that the vessel is a safe vessel to ply on that route.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If that is the case, there ought to be no difficulty at all, because you can grant such a certificate to-day; but it is not one that can have any legal effect outside of the waters of Canada. A certificate to run between Halifax and Boston can be granted by the form you have now. I do not propose to limit that or take it away. You ask me to give you greater powers within Canada. I say, all right, take the amplest power; give the vessel the right to ply in any of the waters of Canada. I thought that in doing that I had met every possible objection. I do not think we have power to legislate outside the waters of Canada. We all agree as to that. The penalties which we impose can only be recovered when the vessel does some act contrary to our legislation in the waters of Canada. If she does it outside of the waters of Canada, we have no right to punish her.

Mr. POWELL. I think British law would follow her.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. British law would follow her, of course—the Merchants' Shipping Act; and it is not shown how far we have to follow that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Let me put this case. A ship-owner of Nova Scotia purchases in the United States a steamer which is to be used as a tramp freight steamer. She does not run between any two points in particular, but secures freight all over the world. She has not been subjected to

inspection by the Board of Trade of England, but was purchased in the United States. What I desire the hon. gentleman to do is to take the power, if he has not got it now, to license that steamship to carry freight anywhere in the world, because she is not designed to run on any particular route. I think the hon. gentleman would be perfectly right in taking that power. I am trying to extend his power.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I should not think that was necessary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It may be. A good many ship-building firms in Nova Scotia at present are going into the building of steamships as freight carriers, and they may require a license of this kind. That business is very likely to increase, and it is in all seriousness I make the suggestion that the schedule or any other portion of the Act should be so extended as to deal with these steamers. If the hon. gentleman does not deal with this suggestion now, I venture to suggest that he should take it into consideration in order to deal with it at this session or some future session.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. Minister of Marine has come to take the ground I stated in the first place. My point was that under the form of licenses issued by the inspector, a freight vessel is tied to a particular route. That is all right enough, so long as her owners intend to keep her on that route, so long as she carries freight between a particular point in Nova Scotia, for instance, and another in the United States, but only a few steamers are liners, the great bulk are not liners at all, but are known as "tramps." These tramps would require, wherever they freight anew, a new certificate for the particular voyage. Say a Nova Scotia tramp or a New Brunswick tramp—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is the case of a New Brunswick tramp.

Mr. POWELL. Say a New Brunswick tramp reaches the other side. Let us suppose she is freighted to Bordeaux, and at Bordeaux she gets freight back to the United States. Unless she has this general roaming commission as a seaworthy vessel, her owners have to bring her back to Canada and have a special examination and inspection, in order to get a certificate to go from Bordeaux to a point in the United States. That is all right enough in the case of liners, but not in the case of tramps, who are not on any specific route but take freight wherever they can get it. You are going to destroy the shipping industry so far as that class of vessel is concerned. All that is required is to carry out the principle which the hon. Minister of Marine has now recognized, and which does not extend our territorial jurisdiction but simply means giving a certificate of the competency and sea-

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

worthiness of a vessel. The inspectors certify that she is seaworthy so far as any ocean is concerned, and not merely as respects any particular route. I appeal to the Minister in this matter, because I am interested, and I would ask him, if he is not satisfied to adopt it now, to consider my suggestion, because I have had the case practically arise and we were delayed four or five weeks before we could get a certificate. Finally I induced the then Minister of Marine (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to give me the certificate and grant that roving commission, so far as that steamboat was concerned, but in so doing he went beyond the terms of the statute. This tramp freight business is a very large business. And why should we prevent our shipping men from engaging in it? While English and German steamboats all have roving certificates, it is criminally stupid for Parliament not to give ours an equal privilege.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do not want to restrict their engaging in it.

Mr. **POWELL**. That form of certificate will.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. They have never been restrained before. I am part owner of a steamer which has been running for years back in all parts of the world.

Mr. **POWELL**. Where does she register?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Here.

Mr. **POWELL**. If the hon. gentleman is right in respect of the steamer he has mentioned, he is giving away his whole case. She has been running contrary to the terms of the statute. If that is the case, why not let all ship-owners violate the law?

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Where did she get that roaming certificate?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. She did not get any other certificate than the one the law requires.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported as amended.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT.

Bill (No. 71) further to amend the Weights and Measures Act was read the second time, the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 6,

Mr. **MONK**. I desire to move an amendment, or add a proviso to this section. It is to meet the difficulty which was mentioned

the other day in connection with the sale of potatoes in the city of Montreal. As the House is aware, there is a by-law of the corporation to the effect that when potatoes are offered for sale by the bag in the city, the bag must contain ninety pounds of potatoes. This is extremely detrimental to the farmers who do business on the markets of the city, and involves injustice to them. A farmer violating this by-law is liable to have his bags of potatoes confiscated. They are not in a position, before they leave their homes to weigh the potatoes; and when they arrive in the city, as everybody knows who lives there, the marketplaces are so crowded that it is difficult for them to move about, and so they cannot weigh their bags. As a rule, they use for the conveyance of their potatoes old flour bags; and it is difficult to place in these bags, as I am informed, ninety pounds of potatoes. The other day we were invited by the Minister of Inland Revenue to follow some interesting experiments that were made in his department with regard to weighing potatoes; and, as a result, I have arrived at the conclusion that it would be proper to define in this statute, if the hon. Minister thinks it could be done, the weight of a bag of potatoes. I question very much whether the corporation of the city of Montreal can, without proceeding ultra vires, define what shall be the weight of a bag of potatoes as they have assumed to do. The by-law does not state that potatoes shall be offered for sale in the city of Montreal only in bags equivalent to a bushel and a half standard weight, but it says, if I mistake not, that the weight of a bag of potatoes shall be ninety pounds. I think that wording of the by-law is unconstitutional, or at least open to grave doubt as to its constitutionality. The other day a farmer from the county of my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin)—and that hon. member I think feels as I do upon this subject—saw his bags of potatoes confiscated. I have read the report of the judgment rendered by the Recorder of the city of Montreal in which he states that this by-law is open to the reproach of being full of confusion in its wording. I believe that the aldermen of the city of Montreal would be only too pleased to see this grievance remedied by the Parliament of the Dominion. Therefore I desire to propose an amendment. I limit it to the province of Quebec, in case the amendment should not be acceptable to the other provinces. I move:

That the section be amended by adding these words: "Provided that in the province of Quebec, whenever potatoes are offered for sale not by the measure or by the weight, but by the bag, said bag must contain at least one bushel and one-sixth of potatoes according to the standard weight decided by this Act."

That would be seventy pounds. I do not wish to take up further time. This has been spoken of as a potato debate, but I

can assure hon. members that this grievance is a very serious one for our farmers. And I believe, as I have said, that the city of Montreal would be only too pleased to be relieved of the responsibility by this short amendment. I trust the hon. Minister will allow the amendment to go through.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) a couple of days ago introduced a Bill very much to the same purpose as the amendment now submitted, except that in the Bill the weight of a bag of potatoes was fixed at eighty pounds. The difference between eighty pounds and ninety pounds which is now the measure fixed by the by-law of the city of Montreal is not so great, but to change it to seventy pounds would make a very considerable difference. I believe it would be better to leave it as proposed by so many of the hon. gentlemen who took part in the debate when the Bill was discussed the other day. If the committee decides to make that amendment, it would be well to come as near as possible to the present practice and leave it at eighty pounds instead of seventy pounds, which I think is too little. I fear this would not be in conformity with the purpose of the law of weights and measures. It is evident that the tendency in that law is to uniformity and simplification, in the direction of measuring everything by weight instead of by measure.

One can readily understand how difficult it is suddenly to change the habits of people, practiced for so many years. There are so many things in our present law of weights and measures that will have to be remodelled before we can consider it satisfactory in every respect, and before the principle of uniformity is secured, that for my part I would not stand in the way of an amendment limiting it to the province of Quebec—if it is found that it will be a real relief to the farmers. My hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin) read the other day an article from the Montreal "Witness," which forcibly brought out the inconvenience and loss suffered by the farmers from a rigid execution of the Montreal by-law, the officials going in some cases so far as to confiscate whole loads of potatoes. Under the circumstances, I will not oppose the amendment, although I do not admit that it is a step in the right direction. But in order to avoid this inconvenience from which the farmers suffer so much in Montreal, and because there are so many other things that will have to be remodelled in order to reach that unity of weight until we are ready to carry that out. I will not object to the amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be much better for the corporation of the city of Montreal to change their by-law and let us have uniformity all over? Because peo-

Mr. MONK.

ple readily move from one province to another, and when they find one law applying to one province and another to another, they become confused. There is no reason why the corporation of Montreal should not change their by-law, if the farmers trading in that city are suffering so much hardship from it. It seems to me entirely out of place for us to destroy uniformity in our law here simply for the purpose of meeting the requirements of one city. Winnipeg might put up another request, Toronto another, and Vancouver another, and it would be absurd for us to attempt to satisfy each one of them.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman is not aware how difficult it is for us to get the city of Montreal to do any act of wisdom. When we have endeavoured to get the city of Montreal to change one of their by-laws in this respect, the answer we have received is: Get your law in respect to weights and measures amended, and we will be only too glad. Now, there is no other city where such a by-law as this exists, and therefore the farmers in that locality are the only ones who suffer. There is one disposition in this by-law which I will quote to the committee, referred to by His Honour the Recorder of Montreal, in rendering judgment in this case referred to a moment ago:

In rendering judgment this morning, the Recorder stated that it had been proved that the potatoes had been offered for sale by the bag, and that the bag did not weigh the amount required by the city by-laws. Under sections 5, 22 and 23 of by-law 223 the farmers had the right of selling goods by weight or by measure, but section 23 also provided that if the produce was offered for sale in bags, each bag had to weigh 90 pounds. The by-law, added the Recorder, was in this respect according to Federal law, which placed the weight of a bushel at 60 pounds. If potatoes were sold by the measure in bags, each bag had to contain a bushel and a half, or 90 pounds. The defendant had failed to comply with the terms of the by-law, but as there was a certain amount of confusion in it, he (the Recorder) would suspend sentence in the present case.

Now, there is only the city of Montreal in the whole Dominion which has such a by-law, and that is made to suit a certain class of purchasers who, as the committee will readily imagine, do not want to take the trouble to conform to the ordinary rule, 'caveat emptor,' to take the ordinary precautions when buying. There is only the city of Montreal which has seen fit to pass this by-law, the constitutionality of which is very questionable. I think this is a case where, for the reasons stated by the Minister of Inland Revenue, we ought to get at least temporary relief, and I hope the Minister will see fit to allow that amendment to be added to the Bill. I believe that eighty pounds would be satisfactory—I mentioned seventy, but from what fell from the lips of the hon. member for Laval

(Mr. Fortin) and the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier), I understand that eighty pounds would place the farmer out of the way of these continuous vexations and annoyances caused by the city of Montreal.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I put this question to my hon. friend: Would the passing of this amendment relieve the people of Montreal, on whose behalf he complains? It is very questionable whether that by-law is constitutional. But if you pass this amendment, you will have two laws in the city of Montreal instead of one; you will have the by-law of the city, and you will have this amendment which will permit a man to sell a bag of potatoes containing seventy pounds, while the city by-law prohibits him from selling a bag of potatoes containing less than ninety pounds. If a farmer goes on to the market with a bag of potatoes containing less than ninety pounds, his potatoes will be seized by the officials of Montreal. We shall only add to the confusion until it has been determined whether the by-law of the city of Montreal is legal and constitutional. If the city is acting within its rights, then they have a right to pass that by-law, and they will seize a bag of potatoes which contains only seventy pounds or less than ninety. It seems to me questionable whether this amendment will afford any remedy. I think it will simply add to the confusion.

Mr. MONK. Since the right hon. member asks my opinion, I think the remedy will prove effective. It seems to me the subject of weights and measures is one exclusively assigned to the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and I think the city of Montreal has gone beyond its rights in defining what shall be the weight of a bag of potatoes. I think an amendment in this Bill, stating that in the province of Quebec the weight of a bag of potatoes need not exceed eighty pounds, will enable the farmer to set at defiance this disposition contained in the by-law of Montreal. I believe the sentiment of the council—I am not a member of the council—but I believe that some intimation has been given here that the council would be prepared to abide by legislation of that kind. Under these circumstances, and for the reasons I have just stated, I reiterate my request that for the present, at least, this amendment should be added to the Bill.

Mr. WILSON. I do not see why we should have this applied to the province of Quebec alone. If we are making a standard for a bag of potatoes, why should it not be applied to the whole Dominion? If a farmer sells a bag of potatoes weighing only eighty pounds, he will only be paid for eighty pounds. I think legisla-

tion of this kind is out of place. We should make one law for the whole country instead of making a different law for each province.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not see how you can regulate by law the standard weight of a bag of potatoes. Every one who is accustomed to handling potatoes knows very well that when they are taken off the ground in the fall they will weigh much more than they do when taken out of a cellar in the summer or spring; so that to make a standard by weight, in my opinion, is impossible, that is, to do it equitably. For instance, potatoes that are in a pit all winter will weigh much more than potatoes that are in a cellar. Now, to compel a man that has kept his potatoes well in the cellar to give ninety pounds weight, while another man who has kept them in a pit where they will weigh much more, is compelled to give only the same weight, is hardly fair to the man who has kept his potatoes in the cellar. If we are regulating the standard by measure, I could understand that. Potatoes will measure less in the spring than in the fall, and they will not weigh the same. If we are to regulate the standard of potatoes at all, I think to do it equitably so that all parties will be treated the same, you had better do it by measure instead of by weight.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It seems to me that you cannot separate the two principles of weight and measure. The law declares now that a bushel of potatoes shall weigh sixty pounds, and I think you are right in that. The reason why this legislation is desired is that the farmers find that they cannot put in the ordinary sacks a bushel and a half, which, according to the standard should weigh ninety pounds. Perhaps the standard of the measured bushel, 60 pounds, is too high; then it should be made lower. If the standard is sixty pounds to the bushel, and a bushel and a half would weigh 90 pounds, an argument that a bag ordinarily called a two-bushel oat sack, for example, would not contain a bushel and a half, is not a very strong argument, because, from practical knowledge, I think I can prove that a flour bag or oat sack that contains 2 bushels of measured oats will contain a bushel and a half of potatoes. Therefore, if you declare to-day, as I think it is proposed to do, that a bag of potatoes, so considered to be a bushel and a half, need only weigh 80 pounds, you are going to put the farmers to more inconvenience, unless the House agrees to ignore the standard weight of the bushel and sell by the bag. At present, when farmers prepare bags of potatoes for the market, I suppose, not one-tenth of them weigh the potatoes; they put a bushel and a half into a bag, and they know that that bushel and a half by measure will equal in weight 90 pounds. If you reduce the bag which has always been

accepted as containing a bushel and a half, you must reduce the standard fixing 60 pounds to the bushel. You must establish that fact first, and if you do so, you have a perfect right to reduce the bushel to 45 or 50 pounds, and if you reduce it to 50 pounds, then, consistently, you must reduce the weight of the bag to 75 pounds, for you must maintain the relations between the weight of the bag and the measure of the bushel. With respect to the other point discussed, that a bushel of potatoes in the fall is not the same weight as a bushel in the spring, because the bushel, when taken from the ground fresh, has a certain amount of moisture in the potatoes which evaporates before the spring, when kept in the cellar. In my opinion it is true that the moisture evaporates from the potatoes, but I am not sure there is any difference in a bushel of potatoes. I think it is admitted there is less moisture in the potatoes in the spring than when harvested in the fall, but if that moisture has escaped, the potatoes have shrunk in size, you must put more potatoes in the bushel. The hon. Minister shakes his head; but the fact remains that the bushel of potatoes in the fall contains more moisture than the same bushel if kept by itself until the spring; but if you take the same bushel which weighs 60 pounds in the fall, it will not give that weight in the spring—but you will have to fill up the bushel. So there is not, after all, so much difference between potatoes in the fall and in the spring. The principal point, however, I wish to make is, that, first, in order to show the necessity of the Bill, the fact must be established that 60 pounds per bushel is not the proper weight. If so, then reduce the standard of the bushel and reduce the bags sold on the market in proportion.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman's contention is, that a two-bushel bag will hold a bushel and a half of potatoes, it will hold a bushel and a half when they are taken up in the fall. But if you fill the bag out of the cellar, where they have been lying for five or six months, you cannot put a bushel and a half in the bag. It is impossible to establish a standard bushel of potatoes that will deal equitably at all seasons. We can establish a standard by measure, but not by weight. My hon. friend says potatoes will shrink. I was rather surprised at the statement, as I think he should know what a potato is, for he is from the Green Isle, as I am, where potatoes form the staple article of food. But the hon. gentleman never saw a shrunken potato that was a sound one. Potatoes do not shrink in size, but they shrink in weight; and they will fill the same measure six months afterwards as they did when taken out of the ground. If the House wishes to establish a standard for potatoes that will do justice to buyer and seller at all seasons of the

Mr. COSTIGAN.

year, we must do it by measure, for we cannot do it by weight.

Mr. HAGGART. The important question at issue is, where does the jurisdiction lie? If the municipality of Montreal can pass a by-law declaring that a bag of potatoes shall not weigh less than 90 pounds, I do not see what is the use of this Parliament passing legislation fixing the weight of a bushel of potatoes. The simple question is, whether the municipality possesses that power or not. If it can pass a by-law declaring that no potatoes shall be sold unless the bag contains 90 pounds, what effect legislation here could have, if, for example, we declare that a bag shall not weigh less than 80 pounds, I do not understand.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not agree with my hon. friend, the hon. member for Lanark, that the law of this Parliament would have no effect in such a case. It would have the effect of making valid a penalty imposed on a man for offering for sale a bag of potatoes of less weight than 90 pounds. It would have effect as regards the collection of the penalty, for the law of this Parliament could not be overridden by a by-law passed by the city of Montreal. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has contended that the shrinkage in the weight of potatoes would interfere with the standard of weight. That argument may also be used as to hay and grain of all kinds, but I cannot see the force of it in this case. If it is contended that the bags available to the farmers for sending potatoes to market are generally the bags used for a half barrel of meal and flour, why not change the bushel and a half to the bag and make the standard 75 pounds, instead of 90 pounds?

Mr. McNEILL. The argument that we cannot pass this law because potatoes shrink in weight will not hold. Wheat will shrink in weight and oats will shrink in weight very much indeed, and if you cannot deal with this matter because potatoes will shrink in weight, neither can you deal with it in regard to grain. My hon. friend (Mr. Costigan) has put the thing on a logical basis, namely, that you have to adhere to your principle of measurement, and you have to deal with a standard of measure, and if the standard of measure be by the bushel you have to assign what the weight of the bushel shall be. Then, when you define the weight of the bushel, you will find what the weight of a bushel and a half will be. This Parliament has always assumed that it had the right to deal with this matter, and I think it has. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) thinks the city of Montreal would have the right through a by-law to override the law we lay down here. I fail to follow that argument, for it seems to me that if we legislate here that a bushel of potatoes shall weigh a certain

amount, that law will hold in spite of any by-law the city of Montreal may pass.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) has misunderstood me. I said that this House has the power to fix the weight of the bushel, but I also said that it is purely a municipal regulation in the city of Montreal as to what quantity ought to be sold there, and the city may say that no potatoes shall be sold in Montreal unless in bags containing ninety pounds. Can any regulation of this Parliament fixing the weight of the measure of a bushel affect that power which the city of Montreal has?

Mr. McNEILL. Any law passed by this House declaring that a bag of potatoes shall weigh a certain amount, cannot be set aside by the city of Montreal, and any man bringing into the city a bag of potatoes weighing that amount has a right to sell that bag. Any attempt of the municipal authorities of Montreal to override the decision of this House in that respect would be ultra vires.

Mr. TALBOT. From what I have heard of this discussion to-day, as well as the discussion which took place a few days ago, I think it is altogether a mistake for this House to give to a bag of potatoes a standard weight of any kind. If to-day it is provided that a bag of potatoes shall weigh ninety pounds, it is because it is supposed to contain a bushel and a half. I contend that the error is in the bushel measure itself, which does not weigh sixty pounds. I have handled a good many bushels of potatoes, both in selling and buying, and unless the potatoes were particularly chosen and selected, and placed in the measure in such a way that there would be no waste space, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred I did not find a bushel of potatoes to weigh over 56 pounds. It is my opinion that if the bushel was altered to 56 pounds, it would meet any city by-law to that effect. If a by-law of the city of Montreal requires a farmer to put 90 pounds of potatoes in his bag, it is because it is supposed to contain a bushel and a half. I maintain that any ordinary grain bag holding two bushels of grain will hold a bushel and a half of potatoes, but at the same time it will not hold 90 pounds, for the very good reason that a bushel does not weigh 60 pounds. It is because of that that the Montreal by-law says that a bag shall weigh 90 pounds. Even if Parliament here passes a law stipulating that a bag of potatoes shall weigh only 80 pounds, there is no security that the farmer will not come to the market with a bag containing less weight. He may choose the smallest bags in his possession and put only 65 pounds or 70 pounds or 75 pounds in them. I hold that our experience in the past shows that if the weight of the bushel is brought down from 60 pounds to 56 pounds, it will

meet the requirements of the farmers, and be satisfactory in commercial transactions.

Mr. MONK. This matter is of so much importance to the farmers in the neighbourhood of Montreal that I must insist a little. The right hon. the Premier has called my attention to the constitutional question. Now what are the facts? I have not here the charter of the city of Montreal, but there is no doubt that the Quebec legislature, in that charter has authorized the city of Montreal to make regulations to govern its own markets. What did the city of Montreal do? Acting upon that authorization, it passed a by-law which states that potatoes may be offered for sale by the measure, or by the weight, and then it goes on to decree—according to me—contrary to the constitution—that bags of potatoes brought into the city of Montreal for sale will have to contain 90 pounds. If the city of Montreal can decree that, the city of Montreal can decree equally well that bags of wheat shall contain 50 pounds, 60 pounds or 70 pounds; in other words, the city of Montreal could act entirely at variance with subsection 2, and entirely at variance with what is now about to be passed into law by the Dominion Parliament. Under these circumstances it seems to me that the municipal authorities of Montreal have gone beyond the limits of the power given them by the local legislature, and it is for us to come to the relief of these people and to enact directly contrary legislation, and say, that a bag of potatoes shall not contain more than such a quantity. I believe we have jurisdiction. I believe the city of Montreal has no jurisdiction, and if we have jurisdiction it is not only our right but our duty to remedy this grievance of the farmers.

The PRIME MINISTER. Therefore, if the city of Montreal has no jurisdiction the parties sued under the by-law should not pay the fine. †

Mr. MONK. They should not, but if the farmer defends himself he will have to undertake lawsuits with the city of Montreal which a farmer is not prepared to do with such a wealthy corporation. It is our right to come to the relief of these farmers here.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) to amend the charter of the Union Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto.—(Mr. Osler.)

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RAILWAY.

On the Order,

House in committee on Bill (No. 32) an Act respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale).

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I understood that by an arrangement of the promoters of this Bill with the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), it was to stand over until Monday.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the hon. member for East York had arranged with the hon. Minister of Railways that this Bill should stand till Monday, because he had notice of an amendment to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr Blair). As far as we could affect the disposition of the Bill, that is a correct statement of the understanding.

Order allowed to stand.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 71) to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I think it would be desirable not to spend the whole night among the potatoes. I have been thinking of the remarks that have been made by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and the question really presents more difficulties than one would at first think. In Ontario people sell by weight, and I think they are perfectly right, for that is the only way to reach a fair conclusion.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to say to the hon. Minister that in my section of country potatoes are generally sold by the bag.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. What is the weight of the bag?

Mr. WILSON. According to law it is 90 pounds. In my town the people are not so particular; but in Kingston, I have heard of people being fined for selling potatoes by the bag that weighed less than 90 pounds. I presume that they have a by-law there the same as that in Montreal.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There is really a difficulty in establishing what the weight of a bushel of potatoes is. The law as it now stands provides that 60 pounds shall be the weight of a bushel. There is no doubt that when a potato comes out of the ground damp and covered with more or less soil, it may weigh 60 pounds to the bushel; but only two days ago

Mr. MONK.

I took the opportunity, with some members of this House, of making experiments with two different kinds of potatoes. After the most careful measuring, and heaping the measure, as is usually done, the result was that the Early Rose weighed 55½ pounds, and the Dominion Pride, which appears to be the standard potato in Ottawa, weighed 56½ pounds. In both of these cases the potatoes were pretty far from the standard of 60 pounds. Some hon. members propose to change the weight of a bushel of potatoes; but that might still give rise to great inconvenience, as I am told that in many cases in Ontario, especially in those counties which have daily communication with our neighbours on the other side of the line, potatoes are always sold at 60 pounds to the bushel. Under these circumstances, I think the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) might perhaps be adopted as an amendment, instead of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). His amendment is to this effect, that if potatoes are sold or offered for sale by the bag, each bag shall contain at least 80 pounds. That does not do away with the principle that everything ought to be weighed, which is the most preferable of dealing with that commodity. We have a precedent in the matter of salt. The law provides that a barrel of salt shall contain 280 pounds. I do not see why we should not follow that precedent, and provide that each bag of potatoes shall contain at least 80 pounds. That would relieve a large proportion of the farmers of the province of Quebec from the difficulty under which they labour. We have, however, first to dispose of the amendment offered by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who wants to fix the weight of the bag at 70 pounds, which is, I think, less than what it ought to be.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) As this is a matter that concerns the people of my province very much, I am much pleased to see that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has no idea of changing the number of pounds that constitute a bushel of potatoes. I think that so long as he leaves the bushel at 60 pounds, as it is in every section of the country, it makes very little difference to any particular portion what other changes he makes. As long as 60 pounds is the standard bushel, it is a matter of very little difference whether he makes a bag of potatoes any other capacity. In our province, we utilize a measure containing two and a half bushels, at 60 pounds to the bushel. That is found useful to the trade in handling potatoes, much more than would be the purchase or sale by bags. In fact we could not begin to handle our large stocks of potatoes in bags. Farmers bring them in from the fields, as they dig them out in the fall of the year, and you will find a dozen or so of ships or schooners, from

1,500 to 4,000 or 5,000 bushels capacity, loading at the same time. Hundreds of carts come in with the potatoes in bulk, and they are measured out very readily in those cylindrical measures, each containing two and half bushels. I would strongly recommend the hon. Minister not to change the number of pounds to the bushel.

Mr. HEYD. It strikes me that there has not been sufficient reason advanced for making a change of such great importance as is involved in this Bill. Customs that have obtained for the last forty years cannot be changed so readily as proposed through the medium of that Bill. There must be other reasons than those assigned before we ought to change a custom that extends from the east to the west, and has existed for this long period of time. One of the principal reasons why a bag contains 90 pounds is that it holds a bushel and a half, and a bushel by law is 60 pounds. It may be asked: Why not sell at 70 or 80 pounds, and call that a bag? That may be true, but in that case, better make it 100 pounds at once. The moment you establish 80 pounds as the weight of a bag, you establish a new trade regulation, and you will disturb our trade with the United States. We, in Ontario, are in the habit of buying by the bag, and each bag must weigh 90 pounds or a bushel and a half. Take a bag of 70 pounds, and a person without much education will not be able to go readily through the mental process of calculation to find out what he is paying by the bushel. The only reason assigned for the change is that the people in Montreal can buy cheap bags and these bags will not hold 90 pounds. For that reason they want the weight of the bag reduced to 70 pounds, but that is no reason. In Ontario we use the ordinary two-bushel bag, and that holds a bushel and a half. The hon. Minister said that he has weighed potatoes which only gave 50 to 54 pounds to the bushel, but he must remember that these potatoes had been stored away for eight months, and during that long period the process of evaporation was going on, the juices in them were evaporating and the potatoes constantly getting less in weight. But for a month or so after they were dug out of ordinary soil, the bushel will weigh 60 pounds, and a bag containing a bushel and a half will weigh 90 pounds. It is much easier to figure out the cost at this rate, and if a change is made it will interfere with the trade regulations of the country. The argument advanced that because the bags in Montreal are small is no reason for doing away with customs that have established and entrenched themselves in the trade during the experience of forty years.

Mr. MONK. I do not know what the hon. member means by customs of forty years extending from ocean to ocean. In the counties around Montreal, which are claiming a remedy, the custom is quite different,

and existed more than forty years, and until this by-law was passed by the city of Montreal, we never heard that it was necessary that a bag of potatoes, in order to be offered for sale legally, should weigh 90 pounds.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I hope my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier understands that my intention is not to interfere in any way with the weight of the bushel, though I really think that 60 pounds is more than the average weight of a bushel, especially if you keep them a few months.

I do not propose to interfere with the weight of the bushel; in fact, when this Bill was presented, there was no idea that this question would arise. But the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) introduced the subject, and gave such good arguments to show why, if possible, relief should be given to the very considerable population about Montreal, that I promised, as was my duty, to give him an opportunity to bring this question before the committee.

Mr. MONK. If the hon. Minister will pardon me, I may remind him that, when the hon. member for Laval introduced this Bill, the hon. Minister, if I understood him, promised to provide a remedy for this grievance in his own Bill. Otherwise, I should not have proposed this amendment.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That is what we are doing now. The hon. member for Laval asked if we would bring the matter before the House, and I promised him I would; and I am bringing it before the House, and in the same line as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) desires, except that I ask him to change one word in his amendment, to change it to 80 pounds, instead of 70 pounds—that is, to make it a bushel and a quarter.

Mr. MONK. I believe that would meet the difficulty.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Does the hon. member (Mr. Monk) propose, with the consent of the committee, to insert "eighty pounds" instead of "seventy pounds" in his amendment?

Mr. MONK. I would be satisfied with that.

Mr. SEMPLE. I can see no good reason why the change should be made. Sixty pounds is the recognized weight of a bushel of potatoes. I think that would be about the weight of potatoes that are middling fresh, with the measure heaped up with as many potatoes as would lie on it. It has been the custom of the country for a very long time to have 60 pounds the weight of a bushel of potatoes. Of course, if a person sells 70 pounds, or 80 pounds, as a bag of potatoes, instead of 90 pounds, he will not expect so much for it. A bag of 90 pounds is a bushel and a half, which is easily calculated, and, taking the ordinary two-bushel

grain bag, I think it holds a bushel and a half of potatoes very nicely. We have been accustomed to selling in this way in Ontario, and so it makes little difference whether we sell by the bushel or by the bag. It might appear, at first sight, as though there would be a little advantage to the seller in having 70 or 80 pounds fixed as the weight of a bag of potatoes. But, when it becomes known, there will be a corresponding reduction in price. Supposing an individual in Montreal went to purchase a load of potatoes in the bag, and was told: You can take these potatoes at so much per bag, just as they are, without weight, would that stand law or not? That is a question for the lawyers.

Mr. MONK. But the moment a bag of potatoes is brought into Montreal for sale, it is liable to be confiscated, unless it weighs 90 pounds. Farmers have no way of weighing them before they leave home, and the moment they enter the gates they are liable to confiscation.

Mr. CLARKE. Have petitions been received from chambers of commerce and boards of trade, or from people who deal largely in potatoes, for this legislation?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is a question for farmers, and I am not aware that there have been any petitions from the boards of trade.

Mr. CLARKE. Has there been request from the Ontario farmers for this legislation?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The Ontario farmers sell by weight, and I acknowledge that they are perfectly right in so doing. But in the province of Quebec it appears customary to sell by the bag, and, as that is an optional matter, I do not see that relations of buyer and seller are affected. We do not change the weight of the bushel, and I do not see why we should not recognize a bushel and a quarter, as well as a bushel and a half. We do not infringe at all on the constitutional habits of the people in any part of the Dominion. We do not say, that a bag must be just 80 pounds, and not more, but that where potatoes are offered for sale by the bag, each bag must contain "at least" 80 pounds. Wherever it is customary to have the weight 80 pounds, it is allowed to remain at 80 pounds, but this will not interfere with those who count a bushel and a half as a bag. Hon. members must have heard the complaints by so many hon. members who have spoken, of the difficulties under which farmers in the great district of Montreal are placed by having to deliver 90 pounds for a bag of potatoes. The proposed weight may not be a very logical one, but there is something greater than logic—facts. We must meet the facts, and, if possible, grant

Mr. SEMPLE.

relief to these people, particularly when we can do it without affecting others.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think we should remember that Montreal, though a large city, does not constitute the whole Dominion, and that it would be more proper to bring Montreal into conformity with the Dominion as a whole than to change the rest of the Dominion to bring it into conformity with Montreal. If this amendment were passed, it might easily cause difficulties between buyer and seller by changing the old standard of 60 pounds for a bushel of potatoes. Suppose a Montreal buyer were going through the province of Ontario to buy potatoes for shipment to Montreal, which would not be a very unlikely thing, he might show quotations in the Montreal papers, that potatoes are sold at a certain price per bag. The farmer might easily not be aware that a bag of potatoes in Montreal was 80 pounds, instead of 90 pounds, and so might sell for less than he was fairly entitled to. These established customs should not be interfered with, if it can fairly be avoided. Farmers are not lawyers, and have not access to the statutes at all times. I think it would be better to leave this matter as it is.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sorry to say, I cannot agree with the proposal made by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. I am quite sure that he will take note of what the members for Ontario and other provinces have said, and that he will not proceed too hastily in this matter. Here is a custom that has prevailed throughout the country, with, perhaps, one slight exception, ever since long before confederation; and the Minister of Inland Revenue proposed to alter it without a petition from a single board of trade, without a petition, as I understand it, from a single farmers' institute or a gathering of farmers in this country. Am I not right in that?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. Not a single delegation in this Dominion has asked that this change be made. It will upset the whole basis of the trade, as the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) have pointed out. The Minister tells us that in the city of Montreal they have established there that the bags of potatoes shall weigh 90 pounds, but previous to that they were using a smaller bag. The business men of Montreal, recognizing the fact that Montreal is becoming a great centre for the potato trade, and in order to have business done properly, their bag of potatoes should be the same as in all the other large towns in this Dominion.

The Minister of Inland Revenue tells us that this is a convenient measure, because it is a bushel and a quarter. In that he has made a mistake. It is a bushel and one-third, for which there is no measure to

correspond. To fill a bag of potatoes, you take a half bushel measure and fill it with three half bushels to make the bag. But how are you going to do it with this bushel and one-third?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I made a mistake when I said a bushel and a quarter.

Mr. WALLACE. Every bushel of wheat does not weigh sixty pounds. Sometimes a bushel will weigh sixty-two or sixty-three pounds; it has weighed as high as sixty-five. The weight this year is not so heavy, it has been from fifty-seven to sixty pounds. The whole argument of the Minister of Inland Revenue was in favour of changing the bushel of potatoes and not the bag.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not want to change the weight. I want to say that wherever potatoes are sold by the bag, they can be sold for no less than eighty pounds. But I did not even mention the word bushel.

Mr. WALLACE. That is what I said, that the whole statement of facts made by the hon. gentleman was in favour of changing the bushel, but he says he does not propose to change the weight of the bushel at all. But his argument was in favour of changing the bushel, because he said he went down to-day and measured some half bushels of potatoes, one weighed fifty pounds, the Early Rose, and the other fifty-six pounds, the White potatoes. The hon. gentleman tells us that he did not just make it level, but that he put it a little over level. But that is not the way to do it. The way is to heap it up. I venture to say he had not the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple) with him when he made that measurement, or the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), or any other farmer in this House, who know that the rule is to heap it up and pile on as many as the half bushel will hold. If he had done that, I venture to say he would have had sixty full pounds to the bushel. But then he says this bag cannot weigh less than eighty pounds, he says it may be more, it may be ninety or 100. Why, that would demoralize the whole business of the country. If you fix anything, you must fix a definite amount. Custom, which is stronger than any law, has fixed a bushel and a half at ninety pounds almost universally throughout this Dominion. The city of Montreal have passed a by-law requiring the weight to be ninety pounds. They recognize the justice of that measure, and the necessity of adopting business methods. The board of trade or whatever authority was instrumental in fixing that standard, did not do it without reason. They recognized the fact that this was the rule. When potatoes are sold by measurement, men experienced in measur-

ing potatoes know that they can be put ninety pounds into every two-bushel grain bag. That is the custom from the Atlantic to the Pacific to-day, almost without exception. Yet the Minister of Inland Revenue proposes, without a petition from a board of trade, or from a commercial body, or from a farmers' organization anywhere in this country, to upset this whole arrangement. It gives them no warning. If this is passed into law the farmer goes to bed to-night, and to-morrow morning he finds that his business has been disarranged. It will lead to confusion without a particle of benefit to anybody. The statement was made that they have got a small bag in Montreal that won't hold a bushel and a half. I do not know where they get the bags. If they get the bags made specially for potatoes, they can get it made two inches longer or wider, and it will hold a bushel and a half without costing half a cent more. It has been stated in this House over and over again that a two-bushel grain bag, a bag that will hold two bushels of oats, will hold a bushel and a half of potatoes weighing ninety pounds. That has been proved by experience, and every farmer, every dealer, knows that to be a fact. These men say they can buy a smaller bag, but a bag that is universally used for all other farming purposes will hold ninety pounds. Then why confine it to eighty pounds? That is the objectionable feature. He does not say it shall be eighty pounds, but it must be not less than eighty pounds. In the United States the rule is ninety pounds, our own rule is ninety pounds. You break up all the business arrangements, you disturb trade, you disturb the farmers' convenience, as I contend, for no purpose. Therefore, I would ask the Minister of Inland Revenue to proceed no further, but to let this stand so as to obtain the opinion of the people, of the farmers' institutes, and other organizations. Let them examine this proposal, and leave this over until later in the session, or until next session. No interest will suffer. If the farmers want it they will make their wishes known, but I am sure he will find a string of protests against this proposal. I am anxious to have a measure that will meet with the approval of the business community and of the farming community, and that can only be done by leaving this matter as it is. An hon. member from Prince Edward Island said they did not care so long as it did not touch the bushel. But he also stated that they do not use a bag there at all, therefore, it is of no interest to them. They put their potatoes in barrels holding two and a half bushels, so it is of no interest to them what quantity the bag may contain. But in Ontario, and in all the other provinces where the rule is to sell by the bag of ninety pounds, this would be a great inconvenience. The present custom suits

every purpose of the farmers and of the dealers; therefore, I strongly urge upon the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue to let this stand for the present.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I see no objection to letting this stand, the more so as the hon. member who introduced a Bill that I promised to incorporate in this Bill of mine, and which I never saw until it was placed in my hands. He would like to have been here to discuss this matter, as he has some ideas on this subject, as well as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I see no objection to letting this amendment stand until the hon. member who introduced that Bill and some others who have taken an interest in it, are present. But as for the measurement of the potatoes that we made as an experiment, I must say that I had with me such practical and experienced farmers as the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary), and several other members who were kind enough to examine the measure, and I was glad to see them undertake the task. I think they did it very fairly.

Mr. McMILLAN. I was present and saw these potatoes measured and weighed. They were potatoes that had been for some time out of the ground, or out of a damp cellar, because they were very dry, and when potatoes get dry they get a little soft. I am under the impression myself that a bushel of potatoes taken fresh from out of the ground will weigh sixty pounds. It will depend a good deal upon the quality of the soil. If you take a bushel of potatoes from a black, mucky land, they will not weigh as much as if taken from heavy clay land. But I am under the impression that if you take a bushel of potatoes from good, heavy clay, or clay loam, it will weigh sixty pounds. I am also under the impression that the weight of the bushel should remain at that, for more reasons than one. In western Ontario we have been selling large quantities of potatoes for some years to the Americans. Their bushel is sixty pounds, and this proposal would disarrange the trade between the two countries. Living alongside of our neighbours, our weights and measures should correspond with theirs just as nearly as we can possibly make them. If the bushel was changed, it would disarrange the whole trade of the country, it would disarrange the trade of the west so far as selling in bags is concerned. However, my experience is that our bags up west will all hold more than a bushel and a half. The farmers use grain bags. I went to the market in Ottawa the other day and took two bags and had them weighed. These two bags weighed 95 and 96 pounds respectively. No change should be made either in

Mr. WALLACE.

the weight of the bag or in the bushel. It would prove a very disturbing Act all over the country, and as has been suggested by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), we should not change the whole trade for the sake of the city of Montreal; let that city's arrangements come into conformity with those of the rest of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. There is not a province that has not trade with the United States, and we should not disarrange not only our local trade but trade with our neighbours; and no change should be made unless urgency could be shown, and no urgency had been shown in the present case.

Mr. WILSON. I desire to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the weight of a bushel of onions. The old law provided that they must weigh 60 pounds. This Bill reduces the weight to 50 pounds. It should be reduced to 45 pounds, but the average weight does not come up to that standard. I saw bushels of choice onions recently that weighed 46 pounds. I hope the hon. Minister will take this matter into consideration and will reduce the standard still further. The bushel by weight and measure should be as nearly as possible, the same.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to intimate to the hon. Minister that when this clause comes up again, I shall move an amendment providing that 70 pounds be the standard for a bushel of lime, which is not fixed at the present time. I trust that in the meantime the hon. gentleman will make inquiries and satisfy himself that this is a proper weight for a bushel of lime.

Mr. McMILLAN. There is another change which I shall propose when the measure is again considered, and it is a matter of great importance as it relates to the sale of eggs. The proper system in selling eggs is by weight. I went on the street the other day and got seven fair sized eggs and had them put in the scales, and they weighed one pound less one ounce. I got a dozen on the market and they weighed a pound and a half and one ounce. I afterwards got a dozen small eggs, which look like chicken's eggs, and put them in the scale and the dozen weighed 1½ pounds. In England eggs are largely sold by weight and a dozen should weigh 1½ pounds. I would not make the rule so strict that a farmer's wife or daughter could not come into town and sell eggs by the dozen, if the parties agreed; but we should have a standard, particularly at the present time when eggs are classified as Nos. 1, 2 and 3, and all No. 1 should go over 1½ pounds to the dozen, and No. 2 nearly 1½ pounds. We can thus improve our eggs and raise their character in the English market. I wrote to one of the large egg dealers on this subject to ascertain what change should be made, and when the Bill comes up again I shall move an amendment that eggs be sold by the weight and

that a standard be fixed establishing that a dozen eggs shall weigh $1\frac{1}{2}$ pounds.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This section is to abolish section No. 44 of the Weights and Measures Act, which makes it incumbent on the inspector to notify beforehand the people whose weights and scales he is going to inspect, of the date when he will make the inspection. We think it was a great mistake to notify them beforehand, and it would be much better for the inspector to call when he is least expected.

On section 4,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This section is to provide for the more frequent inspection of scales that have to bear very heavy weights, such as scales at collieries, elevators and railway scales. It is easy to understand that an interval of two years is too long a period to elapse between such inspections. It is also proposed to ask the owners of these large establishments to provide proper shelter for the weights required to be taken to make the inspection. The importance of this amendment becomes clear when it is considered that 80 weights of 50 pounds each are required to test a 2-ton scale, and great expense is incurred for the carriage of the weights. Spring balances and scales are admitted into use in the United States and England, but their use has been hitherto refused in this country. The advantages of the employment of these scales are great, and we have decided to recommend their inspection on conditions which will afford security to the public. It can readily be understood that spring scales, in which the springs are hidden, are much less reliable than the ordinary beam scales that we can easily watch. It is provided that before recommending the spring scale it shall be subject to a most severe trial by the officers of the department. We believe this inspection will be in the interests of the retail dealers.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am very glad to know that the Minister is making provision for a more frequent inspection of scales in connection with the development of the coal industry. Some weeks ago I presented a number of petitions from the miners in my constituency, asking for this change in the law, and I would like to know a little more with regard to the intention of the Minister as to the departmental regulations under which he proposes to hold this more frequent inspection of scales. I would like to suggest to the Minister, as I have already done when this Bill was introduced, that he should give the use of these weights to the miners themselves. As I understand,

it is not the intention of the Minister to provide a salaried official at the mines for this inspection, and in that case I would like the Minister to give the miners power to select a man to represent them at any time there was a dispute between them and the mine owners as to the condition of the scales, and which representative of the workmen would act in concert with the mine manager in testing the scales. This would be a great convenience. In case of a difference of opinion between the mine owner and the miners, I would like the Minister to provide authority for the nearest paid official to go to the mines and adjudicate. That is a privilege which I think the miners should have. It would be impossible for them to get the satisfaction they desire if they are obliged to appeal to an official who may be located at a distance from them, or who in a large district like Cape Breton may be a hundred miles away attending to his duties when this difference arises. It is therefore important, more convenient and inexpensive to have a local official to attend to the inspection for the time being. The hon. Minister may not be aware of the custom of weighing in coal mines. The coal as it is produced by the coal cutters is weighed in order to arrive at the amount of pay to which the miner is entitled, and a further weighing takes place when the coal is being shipped at the wharf into the vessel. The weight on which the miner is paid is the weight that the measure contains under ground or at the mouth of the pit, and consequently the miner is specially interested in having proper weights at the time the product of his day's work is being weighed. Under the present system the scales are only tested once in two years, and we all know they are liable to get out of order in a much shorter time than that.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Of course regulations will have to be made to carry out the provisions of this Bill. It will be seen at once that when we provide each mine and each elevator with the number of weights required to make the test, we can economize a considerable expenditure by not having to carry these heavy weights around from one place to another. As I explained the other day, I hope we will find it to be the case that the mine owner on the one hand and the miners on the other, can agree at any time they think necessary to have the scales tested. I expect that the miners can choose amongst themselves a workman to represent them on the one hand, while the mine owner will be represented on the other. In case they should not agree our inspector of weights will be called upon to decide between the two. I hope that by this arrangement you will foster a good feeling between the mine owners and the workmen by creating mutual confidence between them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.
Hear, hear.

Section agreed to.

On section 5,

Mr. WALLACE. When this Bill was up on a previous occasion, the member for East York (Mr. Maclean), the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), as well as myself, called the attention of the Minister to the necessity for having milk cans measured and having their capacity stamped upon them. The Minister promised that he would consider that matter carefully and that he would see if something could not be done in this direction when the Bill came again before the House.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We will come to that question later on. This clause refers specially to the owners of second-hand stores who have in their possession scales which are absolutely worthless, and which no amount of adjustment can render perfect. It is only for the purpose of reaching that class of men that we have introduced this clause. Up to this time these scales have been used in junk shops, and they are so completely worthless that they can never be adjusted so as to be accurate. This section is not connected in any way with the question to which my hon. friend has referred.

On section 6,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is to meet an abuse that happens very often. When a scale is inspected, it is guaranteed for a certain weight, and in order to give satisfaction, it must not be used for a greater weight than the weight for which it has been inspected and proved. But persons who buy scales guaranteed for two tons, will sometimes try to load them with three or four tons, when they will cease to weigh accurately. This clause is to meet cases of that kind.

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to a device which is now used for the purpose of weighing grain, that it, to determine the test weight of grain. It is in a sense a false measure, for the reason that it substitutes an ounce for a pound in the scale.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Will my hon. friend excuse me if I interrupt him for one moment. If my hon. friend will allow this clause and the next clause to pass, what he refers to will more properly come up afterwards.

Mr. CLANCY. I will of course be glad to accede to the request of the hon. gentleman, and I will send over for his consideration a subsection which I propose to move later on.

Mr. WALLACE. I think this is an arbitrary section, and that it will fail of its pur-

Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

pose. I quite recognize the evil of using a scale to weigh three tons when it is only guaranteed to weigh two tons. That should be made a punishable offence in some way; but suppose a dealer has a scale to weigh two tons with four weights of one thousand pounds each, and he loses one, and then gets another, and afterwards finds the one that was lost, the mere fact of his having the extra weight in his possession would subject him to a penalty of \$10.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Taking the same example which the hon. gentleman has cited, it is not likely that a man would lose a weight so heavy. By this clause we only want to reach him in case he abuses the strength allowed to his scale by adding that additional weight, thereby straining the scale and making it untrue. We do not mean to prevent his substituting one weight for another, provided both have the same weight.

Mr. WALLACE. Take the scales used all over the country for weighing wagon loads of various kinds. A man comes along with a load, and drives on to the scale. Neither the man with the scale nor the man with the load knows how much it weighs, but it happens to go one hundred pounds or two hundred pounds over the guaranteed capacity of the scale. If the owner of the scale should use an additional weight to ascertain the weight of the load, he is liable to a penalty of \$10. That is, I think, a little too arbitrary.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Our object is to protect the public by trying to keep as long as possible those scales in a satisfactory condition, so as to render justice to all parties.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman will recognize the fact that the owner of scales is not anxious to destroy them and render them useless by overloading them, any more than a man who owns a wagon is anxious to break it down by putting on too heavy a load. People can be trusted to the instinct of self-preservation in that regard. But a man may unwittingly put a load on his scales which will be a few pounds or 100 pounds more than their capacity, and in that case he is liable to a penalty of \$10.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Men are apt to overload—even the owner of a buggy or a wagon is apt to overload it. Men in every walk of life overtax their strength for the purpose of gain. If the scales were not inspected and inspectors not answerable to anybody, we might say: If you want to break your scales, do so. But without breaking the scale, they can weaken it by overloading, and it will be impossible for that scale to continue true as long as it should.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before leaving this Bill, I would like to draw the attention of

the hon. Minister to a matter that came up in discussing a Bill of a similar character a year or two ago. I refer to the change that is usually made by the inspector for the conveyance of the standards required to inspect the scales. There is a good deal of opposition in the country at times to this inspection, but I am quite sure that much of the friction would be removed if this charge were done away with. It seems to me a rather unfair charge in many instances.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This can be regulated by Order in Council. I have received communications on the subject, and all I can do for the present is to promise to investigate it. I may say that we are very strict about the charges made for the transportation of those weights of scales, and that the officer who makes the charge is obliged to account for every cent. I shall look into the matter.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. WALLACE. Might I ask the hon. Minister if he proposes to do anything with regard to the matter I brought to his attention the other day—the advisability of having milk cans measured and their capacity stamped upon them?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I shall be very glad to confer with my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) before this matter comes up for further consideration. I have the "Hansard" of 1893, in which a long discussion is reported on the subject of milk cans and of dealers substituting cans of nine and nine and a half gallons for cans containing eight gallons. I have read the discussion with attention, but I have not found that any practical remedy is proposed. I shall carefully consider what should be done, and, in the meantime, if my hon. friend can suggest anything, I shall receive it very gratefully.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD.

On the order for Bill (No. 72) to amend the Adulteration Act,

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has several other Bills on the Order paper. As the former Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Wood) is absent, and as he is very anxious to be here when this Bill is discussed, I would ask the hon. Minister, if it would not inconvenience him, to let this stand over.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). Very well.

GAS INSPECTION.

Bill (No. 73) to amend the Gas Inspection Act was read the second time and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I desire to explain the purport of these amendments. The classification and grading of the gas companies has heretofore been based on the number of purchasers or customers. It is desired to base it on the number of metres, because in many cases customers have more than one metre, especially in the case of incorporated companies. The classification is necessary in order to determine the proportionate fee each company should contribute in respect of the periodical test for purity and candle power of gas supplied. The fee for the inspection is the same to all companies, of whatever grade they may be.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

PETROLEUM INSPECTION.

Bill (No. 74) to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act was read the second time and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, not in connection with this Bill alone, whether he has considered the advisability of adopting a different style of drafting. For instance, in the Marine and Fisheries Bills and some others, instead of this style of changing one word in a certain line and substituting another, which makes it necessary to refer back to the existing statutes, the whole section to be amended is repealed and re-enacted as amended. This method is more convenient to all concerned.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I must admit that it is more convenient and we have followed that method in the Bill to amend the Adulteration Act. But the meaning in the case before us is so clear—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Of course, I am not objecting to the Bill.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Quite so. I admit that it is more desirable generally to draft Bills in the form the hon. gentleman suggests. But I can explain in a few words the meaning of this amendment. The law as it now stands provides penalties for keeping or offering for sale for use in Canada petroleum in unmarked packages. The committee will understand that the only security we have against the use of dangerous oil, oils that would explode at a lower degree than 85, which is the degree fixed upon, is that under the law it must be taken out of a barrel which bears the mark of inspection. Otherwise, one can understand

that there would be danger, especially in some parts of the country where there is so much smuggling from the other side.

If the department's officers cannot prove that it is actually kept or offered for sale, we cannot make out a case, although satisfied that the petroleum has been smuggled. By adding the words "or has in his possession," the simple fact of finding it in unmarked packages or not in conformity with the law, makes our case clear. It is difficult to show what the intention of the person is, when you speak of offering it for sale, it leaves the question open. As in the case of illicit distillation, where we punish the person in whose possession the illicit still is found, we are not obliged to go into the motives which have prompted him to place himself in possession of that still.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENTS.

Bill (No. 75) further to amend the Inland Revenue Act, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is a new clause, and it is simply a definition of the words "beer," "wash" or "wort," as applied to distilleries. The definition of these terms is necessary in the interests of the revenue, and in order that there may be no doubt as to what constitutes beer, wash, or wort.

Mr. FOSTER. What will the whole clause be now, as amended? We want to get the sense of it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is merely to make clear the exact meaning of beer, wash and wort. The expression "beer, wash or wort," as applied to distilleries, means and includes all liquor, fermented or unfermented, made in whole or in part from grain, malt or any saccharine matter.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is merely to remove the inconvenience of having to handle barrels of 25 gallons, which is the minimum content now required by law. It is merely to facilitate transactions by making the package smaller and reducing it to 10 gallons.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have found that the sense of the law, the spirit of the law, is perfectly clear, but the way in which it is drawn up is defect-

Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

ive. We have met with several failures in suits instituted in enforcement of the law, and have found that it is defective in several points, which we now try to amend by meeting the legal objections that have been raised. The purpose is to secure an easier enforcement of the law. In subsection "e." my hon. friend will see in the first line, "has in his possession in any place, any such still." We had a suit dismissed because the law, as it now stands, stated that any person who was found in possession of an illicit still, on his premises or on his land—I do not remember the exact words—was punishable. But the case was dismissed because the illicit still was found on a neighbour's land; and, therefore, we add the words, "in any place." I have inserted the words "suffers to be concealed" in section 30. When we find an illicit still in a man's cellar and seek to secure his punishment, he pleads that the liquor was put there by some one whom he did not know, or that a man rented the cellar from him. By this section we endeavour to compel him to answer the charge and bring the guilty party to justice.

Section 4 is framed to meet the change in the tariff when the extra charge of 10 cents was placed on all tobacco. Dealers in tobacco who sell packages containing one-tenth of a pound put a stamp on it representing the value of the duty. When the extra tax was imposed they asked the Government to be allowed to change the packages and denominations, because for convenience they have been in the habit of selling by multiples of 5 cents, and hon. members can easily understand how awkward it would be to sell packages formerly 10 cents now for 11 cents.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been done in the meantime?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have been obliged to strike new stamps in the meantime to meet the requirements.

Mr. FOSTER. But you have no authority.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am afraid to a certain degree we have been guilty of using a few of those stamps without having been authorized to do so. We were obliged, of course, to meet the requirements of the trade. The trade was taken by surprise by the changes in the tariff made last session; in fact, the manufacturers imported several millions of pounds of tobacco with the idea that the increase in the tariff would not be applied as it was applied. Of course they appealed to the department for relief, and we felt it to be our duty as much as possible to relieve them. We thought we were not doing wrong under the circumstances under which the change was made in changing the denominations of the stamps in order to prevent great difficulty.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman may not have been doing anything very wrong, but he has clearly been doing something illegal. The hon. gentleman is coming to Parliament now a year after the fair, asking it to pass law, and naively confessing a violation of the existing law. The hon. gentleman is a year behind the Finance Minister, and he should have been able to have kept pace with that hon. gentleman. I am afraid the condition of things cannot be condoned by Parliament.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. All I can do is to throw myself on the mercy of the court, and I hope the hon. gentleman will never be able to reproach me with anything of a more serious character.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman acts so gracefully that I withdraw my protest. He never seems to have thought of the poor chewers and smokers, but he only wanted to place the monopolists, so to speak, in a good position.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the order for second reading of Bill (No. 76) to provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act and for the retirement of members of the civil service.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the right hon. Prime Minister will not go on with this Bill at this hour of the night. It is a very important measure.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We have not done very much to-day. We have not made any great advancement so far, and I do not see any sign of prorogation.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the House is ready really; I am serious in that. If there is any other Bill not involving so serious a matter; the Franchise Act, for instance.

The PRIME MINISTER. I understand that my hon. friends opposite are not ready to take the Franchise Act either. I agree that the House shall adjourn now but it must be understood that we shall sit late next week.

Mr. FOSTER. We must not sit too late; it is bad for our health.

VACANCY IN WEST PRINCE, (P.E.I.).

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend might take up a moment or two before the House adjourns, by informing us whether the returning office for Prince, P.E.I., has yet been appointed.

The PRIME MINISTER. That can be answered in a moment; he is not yet appointed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You only have up to 12 o'clock to-night to do it.

The PRIME MINISTER. How is that?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You said yesterday you would do it to-morrow.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, I think not; to-morrow, or afterwards.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10 o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 21st March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ALASKA AND NORTH-WEST RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BELCOURT moved:

That the petition of James A. Gillies and others, presented this day, praying to be permitted to present their petition praying for the incorporation of a company under the name of the Alaska and North-west Railway Company, notwithstanding the expiry of the time for receiving petitions for private Bills, be read and received forthwith, and be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, I think this is very irregular. I do not want to make any objection, of course; but as this is the second motion of this kind we have had to-day, I desire to say that it is evident we are establishing a very bad precedent in allowing companies to come before us in this way, notwithstanding that the rules of the House are known or ought to be known.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is not a precedent; it is a practice.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a very bad practice; it is an abuse.

PRIVILEGE—THE QUESTION OF MR. BRUNEAU'S RESIGNATION.

Mr. MARCOTTE moved the following resolution:—

François Arthur Marcotte, member of the House of Commons for the county of Champlain,

having stated in his place that he was credibly informed and believed he could establish that Arthur Aimé Bruneau, Esquire, then member for the electoral district of Richelieu, in this House, did during the present session of Parliament declare, according to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, his intention to resign his seat.

That Joseph Godbout, Esquire, the member for the electoral district of Beauce, and John Mc-Millan, Esquire, the member for the electoral district of the South Riding of Huron, were witnesses to the said declaration.

That the said declaration is, he believed he could establish, the document referred to in the following statement of His Honour the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed to the House of Commons on 14th March, 1898 :—

“Before calling the Orders of the Day, I would like to mention to the House a matter which is of the nature of privilege, and which I see has been connected by the press with the seat of an hon. member—the member for Richelieu. It is stated that I have received his resignation. If I had received his resignation I should have issued my warrant for a new election before now. The only occasion when I have had any communication from or with Mr. Bruneau this session was on Friday morning. I had just come into my office when Mr. Bruneau came in. He asked me if I had received a letter from him. I told him I had not. He said he had called to get a letter back which he had written to me. I told him to wait and I would look among my mail, for I had not yet opened any letters. I turned the unopened letters over in his presence, and he pointed to one with his frank upon it. I asked him if it was his writing on the address and frank. He assured me it was. He told me nothing of its contents and I asked him nothing, but handed him the letter unopened and he took it away with him. So far as I know, it had come to my office through the post office, for I had not seen it before. I mention this to avoid any mistake as to facts as far as I am concerned.”

That this declaration was tendered within the meaning of subsection 3 of section 5 of chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, and yet the said Arthur Aimé Bruneau, Esquire, continues to sit in the House of Commons.

Resolved, That this statement, including the statement of the Honourable the Speaker, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to inquire into the facts, to examine into the legal questions arising in the case, and to search for parliamentary precedents applicable thereto, and to report to this House the result of their inquiry and whether any and if so what further proceedings should be taken by this House in the premises.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. May I ask if my name may be substituted for that of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) as seconder of this motion?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood that Mr. Wallace seconded the motion.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) is particularly anxious for the honour of having his name associated with this motion, I see no objection why it should be denied him. The object of this motion is to refer this statement

Mr. MARCOTTE

which has been made by the hon. gentleman from Champlain (Mr. Marcotte), and the declaration he has made to-day with that which he made previously, to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to inquire into the facts, to examine into the legal questions arising in the case, to search for parliamentary precedents applicable thereto, and to report to this House the result of their inquiry, and whether any and if so what further proceedings should be taken by this House in the premises. The only object of an inquiry by the Committee of Privileges and Elections into the law, and into the facts as disclosed by the declaration of the hon. gentleman, could be to determine whether, upon the facts so disclosed, the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) has resigned his seat, or whether he is still a member of this House. Before proceeding any further, it may be advisable, at this early moment, to look at the law in the matter, and to see in what form a member of the House can resign his seat. The law is found in chapter 13 Consolidated Statutes of Canada, section 5, and subsection 2. Section 5 begins by reciting that a member of the House can resign his seat from his place in the House. Then subsection 2 points out another mode by which a member may resign his seat :

Such member may address and cause to be delivered to the Speaker a declaration of his intention to resign his seat, made in writing under his hand and seal before two witnesses, which declaration may be so made and delivered either during a session of Parliament, or in the interval between two sessions ; and the Speaker shall, upon receiving such declaration, forthwith address his warrant, under his hand and seal, to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, for the issue of a writ for the election of a new member in the place of the member so resigning, and a writ shall issue accordingly ; and an entry of the declaration so delivered to the Speaker shall be thereafter made in the Journals of the House.

The question to which I first desire to call the attention of the House, is whether the facts as here set forth, supposing them to be all absolutely true and substantiated by evidence, would constitute a resignation of his seat by the hon. member for Richelieu ; or, in other words, whether he has not only signified his intention of resigning his seat, but also has caused his intention, so declared, to be delivered to the Speaker of the House. If these two facts clearly appear from the declaration made here, there may be cause for a further inquiry. But if it be apparent from the facts here declared that the hon. gentleman has not conformed to the two conditions which are here set out, that is to say, if he has not both declared his intention of resigning his seat, and caused his intentions so declared to be delivered to Mr. Speaker, I submit under such condition of things no case for inquiry exists. It is manifest by the declaration here made that if the hon. member for

Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) had any intention at any time of resigning his seat, he did not cause his intention, so declared, to be delivered to Mr. Speaker. Let me make this clear, I again call the attention of the House to the facts in the declaration by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Marcotte). He said :

That he was credibly informed and believed he could establish that Arthur Aimé Bruneau, Esquire, then member for the electoral district of Richelieu in this House, did during the present session of Parliament declare, according to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, his intention to resign his seat.

That Joseph Godbout, Esquire, the member for the electoral district of Beauce, and John McMillan, Esquire, the member for the electoral district of the South Riding of Huron, were witnesses to the said declaration.

That the said declaration is, he believed he could establish, the document referred to in the following statement of His Honour the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed to the House of Commons on 14th March, 1898 :—

"Before calling the Orders of the Day, I would like to mention to the House a matter which is of the nature of privilege, and which I see has been connected by the press with the seat of an hon. member—the member for Richelieu. It is stated that I have received his resignation. If I had received his resignation I should have issued my warrant for a new election before now. The only occasion when I have had any communication from or with Mr. Bruneau this session was on Friday morning. I had just come into my office when Mr. Bruneau came in. He asked me if I had received a letter from him. I told him I had not. He said he had called to get a letter back which he had written to me. I told him to wait and I would look among my mail, for I had not opened any letters. I turned the unopened letters over in his presence, and he pointed to the one with his frank upon it. I asked him if it was his writing upon the address and frank. He assured me it was. He told me nothing of its contents and I asked him nothing, but handed him the letter unopened and he took it away with him. So far as I know it had come to my office through the post office, for I had not seen it before. I mention this to avoid any mistake as to facts as far as I am concerned."

In the declaration of the hon. gentleman both facts are alleged. I assume everything therein contained is literally true without requiring investigation, and I assume these facts are as much proved as they would be before a committee. Four allegations are made : first, that the hon. member for Richelieu wrote his resignation as a member of this House ; second, that he so wrote it before two members of this House, the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Godbout) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) ; third, that after he wrote his intention to resign his seat and it was witnessed by two members of Parliament, he put the document in an envelope and mailed it to Mr. Speaker ; four, that the member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) called at the office of Mr. Speaker and asked that his letter be returned and it was returned to him without

having been opened. Under such circumstances this fact would be proved, that Mr. Bruneau had not the intention of resigning his seat, that having declared his intention according to statute he had the document witnessed by two of his colleagues, that he caused the letter then to be mailed to Mr. Speaker, but he himself prevented its delivery to Mr. Speaker. So that the last requirement of the law, which would make the resignation complete, did not take place, namely, his written intention of resigning his seat was never delivered to Mr. Speaker according to the term of the law. The law says a member may resign :

By addressing and delivering to the Speaker a declaration of his intention made under his hand and seal before two witnesses, either during the session or in the interval between two sessions.

The facts shows that whatever may have been the intention of Mr. Bruneau he changed his mind subsequently and caused the letter which he had written expressing his intention of resigning not to be delivered to Mr. Speaker, but actually prevented it being delivered to Mr. Speaker. Under such circumstances the declaration of the hon. member never came into the hands of Mr. Speaker. It may be said, and no doubt it will be said, that Mr. Bruneau had no right to recall his letter. I do not admit that proposition. Until Mr. Speaker was in possession of his written communication to resign his seat it was open to the hon. member to change his mind, and recall his act, so long as it was not complete. It is to be noticed that the letter of resignation never came into the possession of Mr. Speaker, so that Mr. Speaker could take any action on it. Let me again call the attention of the House to the last paragraph of the section I have just read :

Which declaration must also be duly entered on the Journals.

It is quite manifest that an entry in the Journals could not have been made because the letter of resignation never was in the hands of Mr. Speaker. Suppose Mr. Bruneau, instead of sending his resignation by mail, had taken upon himself to deliver it to Mr. Speaker with his own hands, as he might have done, and he delivered it and at the very moment the letter was in the hands of Mr. Speaker, the hon. member changed his mind and wanted to recall it, he was within his right and power to do so. Under these circumstances it would be taking the most narrow, the most unjudicial of all constructions to pretend that before Mr. Speaker had power to act on this resignation, the member who sent it had not the power to recall it. This resignation in order to be complete must follow the chain of operations set out in the law, and so long as the last link in the chain of these operations is wanting, then the member who in-

tended to resign might change his mind. I submit that when a member has placed himself beyond the possibility of recalling his resignation he can no longer hold it; but until Mr. Speaker can testify that he has received the letter of resignation, the member can recall his resignation, and so I fail to see there is anything to investigate in this matter. We assume all the facts here stated to have taken place just as they are set out: that Mr. Bruneau intended to resign, that he drew up his resignation in writing, that he had it witnessed by two members of the House, that afterwards he mailed it to Mr. Speaker, and that after it had been mailed, and before Mr. Speaker could act he asked for the letter to be delivered to him, which letter had not been opened and on which Mr. Speaker had not taken any action; and under such circumstances the hon. member did not complete his intention of resigning his seat and he is still a member of this House. This is a matter which in my estimation should be construed not in a narrow, carping spirit, but in a broad spirit; and if a member of the House claims to be still a member, until it is apparent and manifest that he is no longer a member of the House, his intention should be respected. His intention, whatever it may have been at the time, had been changed before Mr. Speaker could take any action to report to the House, or make an entry in the Journals. Mr. Bruneau went and recalled the document, thereby fairly showing his intention of not resigning but of continuing to hold his seat in the House. Under these circumstances I contend there is nothing to investigate, and that it would lead to no good whatever to have any further proceedings taken in this matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I venture to think that the statement of the Prime Minister cannot be considered as wholly satisfactory to the House, and certainly not to those members who are inclined to reserve thoroughly impartial minds for their ultimate conclusion, as to what the facts submitted to you, Sir, really involve in connection with the construction of this statute. As a reason for my not thinking the statement of the Prime Minister to be entirely satisfactory, I venture to call to the attention of the House the almost invariable practice of this Parliament, and the Parliament of the mother country, which is to refer—what I was going to call the simplest kind of statement in regard to the right of any hon. gentleman to occupy a seat in the House—to the proper committee for inquiry. That is based on the well-understood principle that a representative of the people in a Parliament constituted as ours is, must be at all times ready to answer any challenge as to his right to occupy his seat. Indeed, Sir, I have in my mind a case (which I shall

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

later on submit to the consideration of this House) where in connection with facts challenging the right of a Speaker of this House to occupy his seat, the Liberal party took the strongest ground, and without inquiry, voted down the arguments and the resolutions which involved the denial of the right of that gentleman to sit in this House; and yet, after these gentlemen had taken in debate the strongest possible ground and used language even more emphatic than the Prime Minister used to-day, the present hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) rose in his place, though on the Liberal side of the House, and he moved for a reference of that very case to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. That is to say: the Liberal party at that time referred facts, which they voted did not constitute a case against the Speaker, to the Committee on Privileges and Elections in order that all the circumstances surrounding the case should be thoroughly investigated and ventilated, and that there should not be an idea prevailing that Mr. Speaker or any member of the House was holding his seat under any circumstances which might be considered as rendering that seat void. That is an illustration of how easy it is, if one likes to put it that way, to make a prima facie case in a matter of this kind. But, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in his argument to-day has overlooked entirely one of the strongest paragraphs of the resolution which has been put in your hands, Sir. The right hon. gentleman discussed the paragraphs of the resolution of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte), but he wholly omitted any reference to or any discussion of the clause which contains the prima facie case and which if true, renders, without any act on the part of the Speaker, without the necessity of any entry in the Journal, without any action whatever being taken, which renders, as I say, the seat of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) absolutely void. The right hon. gentleman made no reference to this paragraph in the motion, which a look at the statute will show was of the greater importance:

That this declaration was tendered within the meaning of subsection 3 of section 5 of chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, and yet the said Arthur Aimé Bruneau, Esquire, continues to sit in the House.

Let me show the House what that means. The statute which the right hon. gentleman quoted says:

The member so tendering his resignation shall be held to have vacated his seat, and shall cease to be a member of the House.

The right hon. gentleman in dealing with that section, dealt wholly with the statement of Mr. Speaker, and with all respect to you, Sir, and without harbouring the slightest desire to insinuate anything against

the character and honour and integrity of the Speaker, I have to point out that this reference to the statement of Mr. Speaker made from the Chair, cannot have the slightest possible weight in regard to the settling of facts which it is desired to send to the committee. There is no question that that committee, on a reference of this matter, would not be bound by that statement, but would be bound to discuss with Mr. Speaker the very statement of his which is there recited, and which the Prime Minister now quotes, to bar and prevent any further inquiry. The object of a reference to the committee is to ascertain, what perhaps, Mr. Speaker, with the best possible intention considered of no importance, but which coming from the Speaker's own mouth before that committee might put an entirely different phase upon that construction of the statute. Therefore, without saying anything that is not necessary—nor do I know of any reason for insinuating anything against the Speaker—no one knows better than Mr. Speaker himself that that statement recited in the resolution is only a ground for further inquiry into the very facts that Mr. Speaker himself mentions, and can in no sense preclude or embarrass the hon. member who has moved this motion from bringing evidence to prove that this declaration was tendered within the meaning of subsection 3 of section 5 of chapter 13. If that be so, there is in my opinion no doubt whatever that the committee would report, and that this House would consider that the law required a declaration from the House that the seat of the hon. member for Richelieu was absolutely void. The right hon. gentleman having discussed, therefore, only part of the motion of the hon. member (Mr. Marcotte), went on to say that your statement, Mr. Speaker, finally disposes of the facts, that there was nothing further to contend for, and that no prima facie case had been made out. He does not deny that this resignation was made out in proper form as stated; but the right hon. gentleman went on to contend that the declaration that was made out to be delivered to the Speaker did not take effect according to the statute. Whatever our ultimate decision may be, I think the law advisers of the Government, as well as those hon. gentlemen who approach this matter with a full understanding of this word "delivery," will not say—even though the right hon. gentleman should be found in the end to be correct—that it is absolutely clear that these facts as stated by Mr. Speaker, do not constitute a complete "delivery" within the meaning of that section. At least (not to put the case in an extreme manner), I think it will be admitted by fair-minded men, looking into that question, that there is a great deal to show that there has been, even on the statement of Mr. Speaker, a "delivery" within the meaning of the statute. I think

I will be able to show before I sit down that there is a very strong argument in favour of that contention. But before dealing with that, I would like the House, or those hon. gentlemen who care to follow my argument, to understand that I am just now only attempting to meet the argument of the right hon. gentleman as based upon a portion of the resolution, and in view of his omitting wholly any reference to that distinct clause which says that this declaration of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bruneau) was tendered within the meaning of the Act. Putting that aside, and pointing out that a declaration had been properly made before two witnesses, who were members of the House of Commons; that that declaration was signed and sealed by the hon. member for Richelieu; that the statement of the Speaker, coupled with the statement of the hon. member for Richelieu, has reference to that very document, and is to the effect that the resignation of the hon. member was posted by him and reached the hands of the Speaker and was in the possession and under the control of the Speaker, and that it became necessary for the hon. member for Richelieu not to demand, but to request as a favour, which was granted to him, the return of that letter, which was at the time under the absolute and exclusive control of the Speaker—I submit that there is ground for showing that an extremely strong case is made out. So far as I can gather from the authorities and from a careful reading of this section, if these facts are not qualified by explanation or further evidence before the Privileges and Elections Committee, it would become the duty of that committee to report in favour of the conclusion which runs through this resolution, that is, that the seat of the hon. gentleman had become void by his declaration being tendered, or being delivered within the meaning of the statute. Before coming to the points which I wish to submit in order, in connection with that clause, I wish to join issue with the right hon. gentleman in the view he takes of the spirit of that clause. Mr. Speaker, it would place you, or any member occupying your high position, in a most difficult and embarrassing situation, if the right hon. gentleman's construction of that section be correct. If, for instance, there remains, after these solemn acts take place, a locus penitentiæ, so to speak, or if, by the good-will of the Speaker, any arrangement should be made to which a Speaker might be a party—for all sorts of things would be possible, if the right hon. gentleman's construction be correct—any gentleman in your position would be placed in a most awkward and unenviable position. When any member of this House desires to resign, unlike the difficulties that would meet him in England, the minute he takes these formal steps, as I believe Parliament intended, that minute he ceases to be a member and it is not in

the power of the Speaker, nor is it possible for influence to be used on the Speaker or on others, to prevent the intention of Parliament being carried out. I need not pursue that further than to show the great amount of suspicion that might surround all parties concerned, if, after these solemn steps had been taken, and after the document had passed from the possession of the member into the possession of the Speaker, it was possible for any plan to prevent the consequences which Parliament seems to have indicated, by such means as the right hon. gentleman has himself suggested. In other words, as I understand the right hon. gentleman, though all these steps may have been taken, though the resignation may have gone from the hands of the member into the hands of the Speaker, until the Speaker is fully seized of the facts, until his mind is made aware that there has been something done, this paper is a mere paper, and nothing else—not a resignation, and not acted upon. It seems to me, on the contrary, even judging from the case in England, where, by the device of accepting the Chiltern Hundreds, a member may give up his seat and leave Parliament, the law does not regard the Speaker's knowledge as of the slightest importance. So here, I contend, for the safety of the Speaker, for his being able to preserve a position of strict impartiality, his knowledge of any of these steps amounts to nothing. The question is, did that resignation reach the Speaker? Did it leave the possession of the member, and go into the possession of the Speaker? Instead of the knowledge of the Speaker being necessary, look again at the last clause of the section to which the hon. gentleman referred. "The member so tendering his resignation"—no suggestion as to what the Speaker shall do with the paper—whether he shall look at it, whether he shall treat it with contempt, or whether he shall take any action on it. The mere tender of the resignation shall be held to vacate the seat, and the person so tendering shall cease to be a member of the House, irrespective wholly of the Speaker's knowledge, or interference, or neglect to interfere. Now, let us see what these words mean. First of all, I think, I may refer to the altogether irregular course that is being pursued in this case. I do not say, that the right hon. gentleman is responsible for it at all; but it was laid down with great care, in one of the cases with which the right hon. gentleman acted, the case of the member for Two Mountains in 1876, that the gentleman whose seat was involved, after the resolution was read, rose in his place, and made a statement, and retired. In this case, it will be observed, though ample notice was given to the hon. member for Richelieu, last week, that the matter was to come up on Friday, and, after a postponement, that it was to come up to-day, yet, on both these occasions, both on Friday last and to-day, it is note-

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

worthy that the hon. member for Richelieu has not been in his seat. So that we have not even the benefit which, according to the rules of the House, the House ordinarily has, of a statement from the party affected being made at the beginning of the debate. Now, let us see how these matters are considered. What is fit for a reference to the committee? It is quite clear that a complete case has not to be made out. It is, on the face of the resolution, a matter simply for inquiry. But the authorities show that very little is sufficient to put the machinery in motion for the purpose of an inquiry into the facts; and no stronger case could be put, I submit, for an inquiry into the precedents as they exist, or into the authorities on the construction of a statute, which so far as I know, has never been construed in this Parliament, and which is peculiar to this Parliament. There is no such practice, of course, in England. This is our own particular; and it seems to me that it would be an interesting matter, not only as regards the hon. member for Richelieu, but as regards the seats of all hon. members in this House, that the practice under that statute should receive a prompt and speedy construction at the hands of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any other committee of the House to which we might see fit to refer the matter. In the case of the Speaker of a former Parliament—the Speaker in 1877—after the House had voted down a resolution declaring his seat void, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), who had voted against the resolution, afterwards rose to a question of privilege, and moved:

That the attention of this House having been called to the reports, returns and vouchers laid upon the Table, touching the payment of public moneys to the Hon. T. W. Anglin, member for the electoral district of Gloucester, for printing and stationery for the Post Office Department, the said papers be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and they be directed to inquire into the facts, to search for precedents, and to report the result of their inquiries, and whether the said Hon. T. W. Anglin has vacated his seat.

In his argument on that motion, the hon. gentleman very properly referred to cases concerning which the English House of Commons had found it necessary to institute inquiries. He mentioned the case of one of the Rothschilds, who continued to sit in that House after he had become connected, in some way, with a Government contract. I forget the exact facts, but they are not important, but through his firm, ignorantly I believe, he had been brought into connection with one of the Government departments; and although in that case there was no expression of opinion as to what position the hon. gentleman was in, the case went to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The hon. gentleman cited this case to show on what slender material a reference to committee would be made, and he did this after argu-

ing that no case had been made out against Mr. Anglin, on the presentation of the resolution declaring his seat void. Let me refer again to the speech of the hon. member for West Elgin on that occasion. That hon. gentleman said :

He wished merely to state that he felt convinced that this case was a proper one to be investigated by a committee of this House, because, according to May, any case in which there was a matter of doubt, should be referred to a committee.

I shall quote from our own authority, Dr. Bourinot, to show that we have been governed by the precedents which the hon. member for West Elgin cited at the time, and that a case need not be an exceedingly strong one in order that it may be referred to a committee of inquiry. On page 199 of Bourinot, I find the following :—

In the Canadian, as in the English House of Commons, whenever any question is raised affecting the seat of a member, and involving matters of doubt, either in law or fact, it is customary to refer it to the consideration of the committee.

I venture to say that the hon. member who drew up the resolution before us—and I make the statement from the language of the resolution—never pretended to suggest to this House that in the Speaker's statement we have a narrative in detail of every particular incident that occurred in the Speaker's presence, and I venture to say that no one better than Mr. Speaker himself knows that he would not say that every fact had been mentioned of which he was aware. All he would say is that all the facts which, in his opinion, were material, had been fully stated to the House of Commons, but facts which he may not have considered material and may not have stated, may have a very material bearing on the question. Bourinot proceeds to say

For example. In the case of Mr. Perry, referred to in a previous page, of Mr. J. S. Macdonald and Mr. C. Dunkin, whose seats were questioned on account of their holding offices in the Executive Councils of Ontario and Quebec ; of Mr. R. B. Cutler, who had been paymaster of a Government railway at the time of his reelection ; of Mr. DeLorme, who was charged with complicity in the Red River rebellion ; of Mr. Anglin and others, alleged to have violated the Independence of Parliament Act. In the case of Mr. Daoust, 1876, the matter was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which reported in his favour.

The case of Mr. Daoust was one in which the right hon. gentleman took a conspicuous part. In it charges were dug up, if I remember aright, from years back, with regard to proceedings that had been taken, of a criminal nature, in connection with Mr. Daoust. Unless I am entirely wrong—and it is not long ago I read the report of the right hon. gentleman's speech—he by no means took the ground that Mr.

Daoust was guilty of all that was laid to his charge, but he took very good care to keep to the line that there was matter for inquiry, that if, by any possibility, things had been done which rendered the hon. member for Two Mountains an unfit and improper person to sit in Parliament, Parliament should know it and know it quickly. This case was referred to a committee itself hostile politically to Mr. Daoust, but which reported in his favour, and the matter was set at rest. I proceed to quote from Bourinot :

But in 1880 the House refused to refer a petition making certain charges against Mr. Hooper to the same committee. In 1890, the conduct of Mr. Rykert, in connection with certain timber limits, was referred to the Committee of Privileges. In other cases, where there is evidence of crime, or of the person accused being a fugitive from justice, it has been considered sufficient to lay the papers formally before the House ;—

After two or three lines, which the right hon. gentleman will see are not important, Dr. Bourinot goes on to say :

—but whenever the seat or character of a member is affected, the House will invariably proceed with due caution and deliberation.

That is perfectly right, but Parliament is aware that all kinds of rumours are in circulation with regard to this case, the importance of which is shown by the solemn statement made to the House by you, Mr. Speaker. The leading papers in the country are giving an entirely different version of the facts ; for the sake of the Speaker, who is not in a position to take part in a debate of this kind and urge on the House any particular contention, I venture to say that the right hon. gentleman should—if he appreciated as he ought the position of the Speaker in the Chair, if he appreciated the fact that the Speaker's version is not supported by a great many people in the province of Quebec, where the county in question is situated—support this reference to a committee, so that the facts may be put before the House and the country and the position of the Speaker himself indicated in the strongest possible way.

Dr. Bourinot says further :

A reference to a committee is no doubt the proper procedure in all cases in which there are reasonable doubts as to the facts or the course that should be pursued, especially when it is necessary to examine precedents.

We have had no case like that in this House, but there are authorities—I have seen a few—that could be quoted to show the construction which a court would give to the language used in this statute and particularly the word "delivery." I may mention that in this connection I am omitting any reference to that cause, but propose to deal with it later on.

But take what the right hon. gentleman has referred to—the other paragraphs of the

resolution—I submit that the authorities I have laid before the House are such that it will be well worth the committee's while to consider them in order that a proper construction may be put by this Parliament upon the statute. In 1876, for instance, I find the right hon. gentleman giving us one reason why the case of Mr. Daoust should be referred to a committee, that while there was a technicality involved, it was quite clear the circumstances should be referred to a committee.

I shall not take up the time of the House by referring further to what has happened but come down at once to discuss the construction of this statute, and I think that at least it will appear from my argument that there is a question for consideration. Now, take the primary meaning of the word "deliver," take Webster and Bouvier—Webster on the definition of the word, and Bouvier, a well-known authority, on the construction to be put upon these words in a court of law. Webster says:

Deliver—to put in another's power, to pass from one to another.

Bouvier, perhaps more technical, but giving an interpretation from the legal point of view:

An action by which all present and future dominion over the thing delivered passes from the person making the delivery.

And there is an interesting authority on this point. I have not the name of the case, but it is found in 5 Hurlston & Coltman's Reports, 518, where it was held that a notice to quit, mailed on a certain day, but not reaching the possession of the tenant until some time afterwards, was to be considered as delivered on the day of the posting; because it was notice to be sent to the person under the terms of the lease, and that notice, having been proved to have been posted, was considered to have reached the possession and control of the tenant. But let me, without going too exhaustively into the case, take such an authority as Leake on Contracts with regard to the delivery of deeds, where you have the point of knowledge dealt with. It must not be forgotten that this declaration on the part of the hon. member for Richelieu is a deed, it is a declaration, as the statute says, to be witnessed, to be signed, and to be sealed. And we know that, as to delivery, the very question has come up which the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) mentioned to-day in this connection—the importance of Mr. Speaker's knowledge in the matter. It had been argued that a deed to a grantee could not take effect without the grantee's knowledge. But this point, reaching the House of Lords, after being fully argued—and that within recent years—has been decided according to the view contrary to that which the right hon. gentleman has suggested. And, in a leading case, well known to the lawyers in the House, it has

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

been decided that a deed of land may be effective and considered as delivered to the grantee, without the grantee having any knowledge of the existence of the deed or of the intention of the grantor to transfer any property to him. Leake, in the edition of 1892, page 114, says:

Delivery is necessary to render a deed operative. Delivery may be made by giving possession of the deed to the other party, or by authorizing the other party to take possession. A deed proved to have been signed and sealed by the one party, appearing in the possession of the other party, is presumed to have been duly delivered.

Delivery may also be made by giving possession of a deed to a stranger for the use and benefit of the other party, the intention being sufficiently expressed; a delivery to a stranger without any explanation of intention would be insufficient. Delivery may also be affected by a mere declaration thereof, though the party retains the deed in his own possession, or in the possession of his solicitor or agent, without communication to the other party. Where a policy of insurance purporting to be signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of a witness by the directors of an insurance company, was left in the company's office to be sent for by the insured, according to the usual practice, it was held to be a valid policy and binding upon the company, though they cancelled it whilst it remained in their possession. An acknowledgment by the party whose deed it is that it is valid and operative is sufficient evidence of delivery. The execution and delivery of a deed may be attested by a witness, who signs a formal statement appended to the deed to the effect that it was signed, sealed and delivered in his presence.

I have read nearly the whole of the paragraph, in order to put it as fully as possible. So, in connection with the delivery of deeds, we have, I think, good cases to govern our judgment in regard to the meaning of the word "deliver" here. It is shown to mean some act by which this declaration should pass out of the control, out of the possession, of the member signing the declaration, and into the possession and under the control of the Speaker of this House. And I submit that the facts stated by the hon. member, and not disputed, leave the House in the position that they can say nothing else than that this paper, this declaration, reached the Speaker's control, and was only got out of the Speaker's possession by Mr. Speaker's consent, and as the result of an action on his part. I need not go into the point regarding the posting of letters, that a letter, the moment it is put in the care of the Post Office Department, passes at once from the control of the person sending it, to that of the person to whom it is addressed. So, Mr. Speaker, I say again that there are any number of authorities which could well be examined by this committee, to show that delivery, under the circumstances given, was complete and effective in the case of resignation of Mr. Brunneau. I would like to know—and I hope we shall hear in the course of the debate—how this other clause of the statute is to be met.

I submit again that, instead of the case being presented, as the right hon. gentleman has suggested, containing three statements, which he read, and which are found in the paragraph before the one I shall now refer to, there are two statements here submitted for the consideration of the House, and the right hon. gentleman has dealt with only one of them. He has dealt with the effect produced by supposing the facts to be exactly as Your Honour has presented them to this House. Without further inquiry, and without intimation of the history of the case, he has dealt with your statement, Mr. Speaker, as though that statement covered everything. I have endeavoured to deal—though hurriedly, it is true—with that statement. But the right hon. gentleman has wholly overlooked this subsequent statement, which is complete in itself, which has no reference whatever to your statement, Mr. Speaker, or to any other statement in the resolution, but which is the statement of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte), and that is, that this declaration which was signed, and sealed, and properly executed, by the hon. member for Richelieu, was, as a matter of fact, tendered within the meaning of subsection 3 of section 5 of chapter 15 of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada. The right hon. gentleman says: No, and would argue that it was nothing of the kind, that the hon. member is all wrong, because, when we find what the facts are, there is no argument that there was a tender of the resignation. But where are the facts to support that contention? I would ask: Is the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) bound by the statement of Mr. Speaker? No one would argue so. It is only by reading the Speaker's statement and founding an argument on the Speaker's statement, that that charge of the hon. member for Champlain could be made. It seems idle, at any rate unfair and unreasonable, to contend that there is not a prima facie case, when a member rises in his place and says there is a tender of a resignation properly executed by a member of this House, when the law declares that, if a member tenders his resignation, he shall be held to have vacated his seat and to be no longer a member of the House.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) who has just taken his seat has referred to what we may speak of as the Anglin case, as reference to that case, and the facts of it serves to emphasize most strongly the difference between the action taken then and the action which he wishes the House to take now.

I think that it may be taken for granted that we should not rashly refer everything to the Committee on Privileges and Elections that any person chooses to suggest. I think any old parliamentarian will admit that there must be a prima facie case, such

a case as a grand jury would send for trial to a petty jury, such a statement of facts as raises at least a doubt as to what the action of the House should be in the matter, and as to whether an hon. member has vacated his seat. Now in the Anglin case, in which I was responsible for the action finally taken, that prima facie case existed beyond the shadow of a doubt. The hon. member who brought it up, the Hon. Mr. Bowell, now Sir Mackenzie Bowell, had taken means to bring before the House the proof that Mr. Anglin had received money in payment for printing from a department of the Government. On the face of it that payment appeared to vacate his seat. It was urged on the other hand that as Mr. Anglin had not received this money under contract, he was not therefore within the words of the statute which referred to money received then existing under contract. Now Sir, that was the point of dispute, whether a payment not made under contract to the hon. member vacated his seat. There was a doubt whether it did or not, and that doubt constituted certainly a ground for reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections prior to this House taking any action in the matter.

But what was the thing that we voted down? My hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says that I was one of those who argued that there was no case against Mr. Anglin. I never argued anything of the kind, Mr. Speaker: I only argued that the question which was brought before the House, and which was an amendment to going into Committee of Supply, and which was a declaration that Mr. Anglin's seat was vacant—I argued that that motion should not be carried by this House until an inquiry had taken place before the Committee on Privileges and Elections to ascertain whether this doubt operated in Mr. Anglin's favour or not. There was then a prima facie case, there was a motion to deprive a member of his seat, and that motion being voted down, as a matter of fairness and equity, I made a motion to have the matter considered by the committee. The case was as different as possible from the present one. If the hon. member who makes the present motion had moved that the member for Richelieu had vacated his seat on account of what has taken place, instead of asking that the matter should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the parallel in that case would be complete. But the House can see how different the case is at the present time.

I consider that my action in moving the reference to the committee in the former case, is perfectly consistent with the opinion I now hold that there is nothing in the case to refer to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The whole question turns on whether there is a prima

facie case. Now, though my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) wishes to have the Committee on Privileges and Elections inquire into the precedents in this matter, he has admitted in his speech that there are no precedents. We are therefore thrown back upon our own common sense and knowledge of parliamentary law and procedure, in which a great many of us have had quite as long an experience as the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, I ask the common sense of this House whether any common sense parliamentary interpretation of the statute that has been read in your presence, would not take it for granted that the resignation had not been completed until the fact of that resignation being written and signed had come to the knowledge of the Speaker. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has quoted a lot of legal authorities in regard to matters of trade, matters of land, and questions of common law and chancery. I do not see that they have the slightest application to a question of parliamentary law like this. It has been laid down by the leader of this side of the House, and I think with the utmost propriety, that several things are necessary to a resignation—first, that the member should have the intention to resign; secondly, that he should put that on paper before witnesses; and thirdly, that it should come to the knowledge of the Speaker. I say that until it has come to the knowledge of the Speaker, whether his knowledge of it has been delayed by accident, or by the intentional abstraction of the document in his possession, or by his voluntarily handing it back unseen to the gentleman who had sent it in, there is no completion of the resignation; and until the Speaker is aware of the fact that this resignation has been signed in the presence of two witnesses, the resignation is not complete. I do not think any parliamentarian of any experience in this House will take a different stand on that point from the stand I take. I say therefore that if all the allegations in this motion be facts, without any equivocation or quibble at all, still there is nothing like a prima facie case to go to the committee, for it is not stated in fact, in any part of that resolution, that the Speaker ever knew of Mr. Bruneau's intention to resign, or ever saw the resignation which it is alleged Mr. Bruneau signed. There is no allegation to that effect in the whole resolution; therefore there is nothing on which to base any attack on the seat of the hon. member for Richelieu, or to call upon the Committee on Privileges and Elections to inquire into the case. I do not think that Lake on Contracts has anything to do with the matter. I do not see that any legal presumption of delivery, on account of a letter having been mailed and registered, has anything to do with the interpretation of a parliamentary practice of this kind. If there is no allegation, therefore, that the Speaker saw

Mr. CASEY.

the contents of that letter and that it was officially brought to his knowledge as Speaker, there is nothing for the committee to inquire into. The hon. member refers to the case of the acceptance of the Chiltern Hundreds in England. He said no knowledge by the Speaker was necessary there. Certainly it is not. There is no similar statute to ours governing the resignation of a member of the British House of Commons, there is no means, in fact, by which a member of the British House of Commons can resign. The only way in which his seat can be vacated is by his acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, and this office of Keeper of the Chiltern Hundreds is used traditionally for that purpose, and for that purpose alone. There can be no analogy drawn, and therefore no precedents, from the practice of the British House of Commons to help us in interpreting our own statutes. We must fall back upon first principles and upon our own parliamentary knowledge. I think the hon. member will find that the cases cited by myself in moving the Anglin reference, were all cases where a prima facie charge against the seat of the member in question had been made out, and that no case, either in the British House of Commons or here, has ever been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections where there was not an allegation of something either affecting the member's character or affecting his technical right to hold his seat in this House. Now, Sir, I contend that in the present case there is no allegation at all which, on a common sense interpretation of the law, affects the seat of the hon. member for Richelieu, and that therefore there is nothing to refer to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, last week treated the House to an exhibition of freedom from party thralldom, and on the present occasion I had hoped that the hon. gentleman would have continued the same freedom of last week. However, we must assume that the hon. gentleman has seen the error of his ways, for apparently it is an error to show a spirit of independence without recanting. That was the case with respect to the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau), who manifested a spirit of independence, but that spirit of independence, if hon. gentlemen opposite could have their own way, would apparently be very short-lived. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Casey) referred to a debate a number of years ago on what was known as the Anglin case, and the hon. gentleman on that occasion blew very hot and very cold at well regulated periods. The first proposition made set out that in the interest of the country and of this House it was improper and wrong for that hon. gentleman, Mr. Anglin, to have had dealings with the Government of

the day, he then not only being a member of the House, but also the Speaker. On that occasion the hon. gentleman, together with the Administration, voted down that resolution of principle; but subsequently, seeing the mishap that occurred and the feeling aroused against the party in the country, introduced a motion to have the case presented before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I cannot do better than quote the words of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) on that occasion. After stating the position of the matter, he said:

He considered that the committee would do Mr. Speaker justice, notwithstanding the gentlemen opposite had tried to prevent it being done.

And further:

I do say it distinctly. The committee would also afford the country an opportunity of having the matter cleared up.

I submit that from the statement submitted to-day to the House by you, Mr. Speaker, hon. members cannot help but see, by a close reading of it, that it is a most carefully and particularly worded statement. And not only so, but it is controverted and contradicted by statements made from day to day in the public press; and surely the House is not going to decide on the ex-parte statement presented by you, Mr. Speaker, that there shall not be any investigation in this matter. There is something at stake here. We are told in this country, and we are led to believe, and I think the precedents of the past have established that when once Mr. Speaker accepts the position, he is above and beyond party politics. If that is not so, then it must cause throughout the country a feeling of distrust in our governmental institutions, especially when Mr. Speaker is alleged by newspapers to have done what was incompatible with the statement made by himself. In support of my statement let me read from the Montreal "Star." There are newspapers to which little attention is paid, but in western Ontario there is no newspaper more generally read for its independent leanings than the Montreal "Star."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. Some hon. gentlemen opposite laugh. I tell them that such is the case, and that that newspaper is having its weight and effect felt in Ontario.

Mr. DAVIN. It is the same with regard to the North-west Territories.

Mr. BENNETT. Under date of 14th March, 1898, appears the following editorial entitled: "The Speaker and his Spectacles":—

The latest version of the Bruneau resignation episode, is that the said resignation was written, duly witnessed, and handed to "Mr. Speaker" in a sealed envelope; that Mr. Speaker, being informed what the fateful envelope

contained, did not open it, but kept it until he was asked to hand it back; and that then he did so without ever having been cognizant officially of its contents.

This theory is a trifle gauzy. It is hardly to be presumed that the Speaker will officially put forth so disingenuous an explanation of the affair. Either the resignation was handed to him, or it was not. If it was—and this has not yet been denied—then Richelieu is vacant. The law does not declare that the Speaker must read the resignation—he might have mislaid his spectacles; and surely the patriotic desire of a member to relieve the country of his presence in Parliament should not be balked by so trivial a cause. It only declares that the resignation shall be "delivered to the Speaker."

This appears to have been done in the Bruneau case. More than that, it is said that the Speaker was made aware of the contents of the document delivered to him. What does it matter whether it was done by reading the document to him, or letting him read it himself, or telling him what it contained? Or could the member be made to suffer if the Speaker never opened it? Can the Speaker keep a man in his seat against his will by simply neglecting to read his written resignation? He would have as much right to be deaf when his attention was called to the matter in the House.

The whole affair is decidedly diaphanous. Mr. Edgar will not gain sufficient repute as the non-inquisitive man to make up to him for his loss in other directions. Politicians may fall into the deposit of depositing secret letters with him for safe-keeping, knowing that he will never read them; but even this will be a doubtful advantage. The glory of our Speakership is its non-partisan character; but that glory will not be increased by transactions of this description. The Speaker's office should receive the resignation of a member like an automatic machine, and run it through the ritual prescribed without reference to race, party colour, or any previous condition of party servitude.

That editorial appeared, as I have stated, on 14th March, and I have not heard of any action for libel being brought against the "Star" newspaper by you, Mr. Speaker, or anybody else. Moreover, I have never seen in the "Star" any explanation of those statements which are certainly made against the honour of this House, statements which should be thoroughly ventilated and inquired into. Not only did the "Star" take up this question, but it is also dealt with by other newspapers. I read now from the Toronto "Evening News."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. Hon. members may say "hear, hear," over and over again, and I am glad they recognize a good newspaper and have the sense to show their recognition of it. In its issue of 15th March, it said as follows:—

Bruneau saw Blair again. He reminded that practical politician that, in the first session of the present Parliament, he, Blair, had announced that, on requisition of any Liberal member, or defeated Liberal candidate, civil servants residing in their districts would be discharged without delay. Blair told the House of his determinations eighteen months ago. The Tories

protested, but what Blair said went, and the Tory office-holders went too, to the number of two thousand and more. Bruneau did not see why the Minister should make an exception in his case. Blair, who is not the most *saucy* man on earth, declined to listen to argument, and told Bruneau so. Thereafter, to wit, at four o'clock on Friday morning last, Bruneau told some of his friends that he would resign. The House was half asleep upstairs, and gentlemen who did not want to slumber sought the cellar, there to have something to eat and drink. Bruneau had both. He carried out his fell threat, and wrote a letter to the Speaker. He posted it, and boasted that he had showed the trebly-blinded Blair that he couldn't run him, the upright and incorruptible Bruneau. Next day was the day after. As sometimes happens on such occasions, Bruneau "was sorry for it." He remembered to have written a letter.

Yesterday, Speaker Edgar told his part of the story. Before the House had been in session ten minutes, the Honourable J. D. arose and informed the House that he had something to say to it. Sproule, who had intended to bring the Bruneau question up, looked fiercely at the First Commoner, who was cutting from under his feet the ground for an effectual attack on the Government. Edgar held in his hand a type-written page, whose lines may have been dictated by any one of several persons. He read his statement, in which he said that Mr. Bruneau had come to him on Friday morning, before he had opened his daily mail, and had asked for the return of a letter which he had posted to the Speaker some hours before. Thereupon, Mr. Edgar, the most obliging of men, went over the pile of letters that lay on his table and picked out one which Bruneau identified as bearing his writing and his frank. "I returned the letter unopened," concluded Mr. Edgar, "and did not question Mr. Bruneau as to, nor did he tell me the contents of the letter."

Foster's sarcastic smile was four feet broad when the Speaker sat down. From neither side of the House came any expression of anger or satisfaction. The Conservatives, who discussed the matter in the corridor, made no bones about their sincere conviction as to the inside history of the episode. They blamed Sir Wilfrid for having put Bruneau up to this dodge, whereby he recovered the letter in which, everybody guesses, his resignation was tendered to the Speaker. On Saturday morning Bruneau went through the corridors telling everybody that he had never resigned. Whether he did or not, none of us will ever know. His word must be accepted; at least no man is entitled openly to dispute it. It is true that Mr. Edgar said that Mr. Bruneau interviewed him on Friday morning, and it is equally true that the member for Richelieu was not feeling well on the same morning, and did not leave his room until after two o'clock. But this proves nothing. It was after six o'clock when the members and pressmen got to bed on that morning. It would be the most natural thing in the world for Mr. Edgar, who did not rise until after luncheon time, to confuse morning and afternoon. The main thing is that Bruneau is member for Richelieu, and that his would-be lock-tenders are still without the pale of Her Majesty's Service in Canada. Bruneau may consider himself in luck, for, of course, the story, as related by Mr. Edgar, is absolutely in accordance with the facts. Had Mr. Speaker opened the letter—as, of course, he did not—he must have laid the matter before the House. It is manifestly preposterous for any-

Mr. BENNETT.

body to hint that Mr. Edgar knew the contents of the letter. A gentleman of his high character would have said so in making his statement yesterday afternoon. Nobody but a partisan would have helped Mr. Bruneau to jerk back his resignation, and everybody who lays claim to possessing a brain knows that Mr. Edgar is far from being a partisan. He has said so himself, and he ought to know. It may be pardonable here to express a doubt that Honourable Peter White, the former Speaker, would have taken the course selected by Mr. Edgar. When Bob White, then member for Cardwell, wrote out his resignation under peculiar circumstances, and forwarded it to the Hon. Peter, Sir Mackenzie Bowell had an interview with the Speaker. The then Premier wanted Mr. White to permit his namesake to withdraw his resignation. It was far from convenient to the Conservatives to have any of their supporters leave Parliament at that juncture, and Sir Mackenzie used his best efforts to induce the Speaker to accord with his desire. Mr. Peter White declined to argue the question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we find from these two journals? We find that statements are going broadcast through the country, that the declaration as made by you, Mr. Speaker, in the House, is, to speak charitably, not a full and complete statement of every fact in relation to this matter. I have heard the matter discussed by gentlemen, not members of this House, who overheard Mr. Bruneau on the morning that the vote was taken on the Yukon Bill, and when one takes the coincidence of time and circumstance they all go to point to the fact that Mr. Bruneau certainly did place his resignation in the hands of the Speaker. It is not denied that Mr. Bruneau was about the House that morning, and it is equally plain as the division list shows, that Mr. Bruneau never recorded his vote. Now, it is within the knowledge of witnesses who can be produced before the committee, that a certain gentleman who sits on the opposite side and occupies a prominent position in this House, saw Mr. Bruneau that morning and in the presence of witnesses, expressed his opinion of what Mr. Bruneau had done and told him in plain English, that he made as ass of himself; and, that Mr. Bruneau and this party thereupon and at once commenced to discuss as to how the resignation was to be got back.

There must be one of two things in this case. There must be honesty of purpose, or there must be the treatment of the whole matter as a farce, and I say this House for its dignity cannot afford to treat the whole matter as farce. It is due to you, Mr. Speaker, as the first commoner, to insist that there should be a thorough and full inquiry so that you may be cleared fully and effectually from these statements—they are not insinuations but they are real statements—that are made in the public press. Sir, the allegations are there clearly and concisely: That you knew the contents of that letter just as well as if you had opened it yourself; and under these facts and under

these allegations, it is a duty the House owes its Speaker, and owes to the position of Speaker in this country, that there should be a thorough and full inquiry into this matter. To say that there is no prima facie case made out; why, there is the admission that the resignation was written out. The two hon. gentlemen who witnessed it are both members of this House, and neither one of the two has risen in his place to deny that they saw the resignation, and that they were witnesses to it. Until they do that the House will believe and the country will believe, that the resignation did exist. No one will believe, after the statements made in the public prints, that the First Minister was not aware of the existence of that resignation. Aye, and moreover, that he himself knew, Mr. Speaker, before it parted company with your possession as handed to Mr. Bruneau, that that resignation was in your possession and had been transmitted to you either by mail or by messenger. Take your own statement, Mr. Speaker, and I do submit that to a man who is at all of an inquisitive mind there are strange coincidences and circumstances to point to this fact: that that communication or statement made by you has been made most carefully, aye, I will go further and say, most cunningly devised as a reading of the lines will show. It goes on to say first and foremost:

It is stated that I have received his resignation. If I had received his resignation I should have issued my warrant for a new election before now.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there was a time and there was a place to have given an explicit and flat denial to the receipt of the resignation by you, and yet there is no denial at all. The statement is simply made:

If I had received his resignation, then I would have issued my warrant.

But, in the statement of the Speaker before the House there is no denial at all that the resignation was by him received. Further on it says: That this communication was franked to the Speaker. Surely no man who knows the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau); who knows him and has known him as many of us have known him not only as a member of this Parliament but as a member of the last Parliament; surely none of us are going to believe the childish statement that he franked a letter to the Speaker. Surely the hon. gentleman—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I cannot allow an absolute license to the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) to personally contradict the statement of the Speaker of this House. I shall permit no member of this House to do that. I have submitted to a great deal so far, but when it comes to contradicting absolutely the statement of myself from this Chair, I cannot permit that.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I must submit, as I have by my argument,

and by arguments contradicted what certainly is a statement of fact; because the statement of fact appears that the letter was franked. Mr. Speaker, it all points more and more strongly to what I have been urging, namely, the necessity for a thorough and close investigation of the matter in order that justice may be done to you and to the position you hold. Then, Sir, there comes this coincidence, and it is a suspicious coincidence, and it would be treated so in any case:

I had just come into my office when Mr. Bruneau came in.

Well, Sir, that suggests a pre-arrangement to my mind and it is a matter certainly which should place the House, and which should place some committee of inquiry in possession of the whole facts, and of all the statements in the case.

Now, Sir, I do not propose to deal with the legal aspect of the case; that has been gone into fully by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). But I do say this: taking the two high grounds (and they are high grounds), that this House owes a duty to itself in seeing that acts of this kind are thoroughly and fully ventilated, and I do maintain in view of that fact, that it is such a case as should go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. You, Mr. Speaker, and the House have everything to gain and nothing to lose; nothing to lose if the statements are true, and they are accepted by the House as true. But if a denial is made of an inquiry into this subject, then I can only say that the country will look with suspicion on the whole transaction, and it will demean and it will dishonour the proceedings of this Parliament not only on this occasion, but other times, as from one action all will be judged. I ask the First Minister to contrast the position taken by him to-day with the position taken by Sir John Thompson in the Turcotte case. On that occasion there was no hesitation; there was no question as to the propriety of an investigation; and it is a strange coincidence that the charge in that case was preferred by the hon. member for Richelieu against Mr. Turcotte, then the member for Montmorency. I say, as Sir John Thompson on that occasion said fairly and frankly by his action. "The position of a member should be above party politics; it should be taken out of that arena; respect should be had for the position; and I will endeavour to give it that respect by giving a full and frank and fair inquiry." Notwithstanding the statement of the First Minister that he will not permit any inquiry to be made into this case, I trust that he will even yet recall his decision, and have a full, fair and impartial investigation before the committee. The committee is the hon. gentleman's own committee. He has a majority on that committee; they can admit what evidence they like; they can

suppress what evidence they like in that committee just as well as they can by a vote in this House. But if an inquiry is had, I hope the hon. gentleman will not do as was done in the Anglin case. In that case, when the report was brought down to the House, and the House was ready for the question of its adoption, the Usher of the Black Rod was announced, and the report was suppressed. It would have been far better for the Government to-day to have laid on the Table of this House the resignation of the hon. member for Richelieu, and have thrown the constituency open; for hon. gentlemen opposite must remember, as the province of Ontario lately showed, that they have no guarantee that the country is theirs. A day of reckoning must come, and they must be amenable to public opinion. These hon. gentlemen have set up for themselves a high standard of morality. They have professed to be the teachers of men, and they must support that profession a little with their actions, if they wish to become entitled to the support of moderate-minded men. I am glad to say that they learned to their cost, in the late provincial elections of Ontario, that they had not succeeded in defying public opinion in that province; and by a continuance of actions of this kind, they will find when the day of reckoning comes, that public opinion will assert itself.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not suppose, Mr. Speaker, that there is any frenzied desire on the part of any member of this House, without fair and just cause, to have any hon. member's seat declared vacant. For my own part, I would disavow any such desire or intention. Nor am I here to champion the cause of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) or to show that he took the proper course to vacate his seat. I think it is:

"Better like Hector in the field to die,
Than like the perfumed Paris turn and fly."

I do not think that the hon. member for Richelieu, on any question of patronage, as was rumoured in the press, had any justification for the resignation which we are told he handed in. Now, there are two ways in which under the statute a member may vacate his seat by his own free will. The first way is by an open declaration in the House, and the other is the way to which our attention has been called by the hon. First Minister. In order to fulfil the conditions of this latter mode, the member must in the first place signify his intention to resign in writing; that intention so signified must be witnessed by two members of the House; and so signed, sealed and witnessed, it must be delivered to the Speaker of the House, when, the Act says, the resignation is complete, the seat is void, and the Speaker shall forthwith issue his warrant for a new election. What have we in this case to fulfil these conditions?

Mr. BENNETT.

We have it admitted. I take for granted, that the hon. member for Richelieu did write out his resignation, did have it witnessed by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Godbout) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), and did send it to the Speaker. I want to admit frankly to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House that, at the beginning, in the private discussion that has taken place in this matter, the stand I took was that I did not believe it was sufficient for the Speaker to have simply the actual delivery of the document, but that I thought the Speaker should have a scienter of what that document contained—that the fact of the resignation should come to the knowledge of the Speaker. That was my first judgment upon the question. My mind has since gone one step further, and it is lodged here at the present time; that a scienter is not absolutely necessary, but that if the facts of the case were sufficient to lead the Speaker, as a fair and reasonable man, to believe that the document or the envelope contained a resignation, then I do not think he should have handed it back to the hon. gentleman, for in that case the resignation would be complete. Have we any knowledge of the facts in connection with that, or as to the conclusion which you had in your mind as to that? I hold that we have not. I have read very carefully the declaration which you, Mr. Speaker, made on the 14th of March, and I wish to be within the lines of order in any remarks I make upon that declaration. Far be it from me to utter any word of disrespect to you, Mr. Speaker, in the position you hold in this House as between the two parties here, as our spokesman, and as the guardian of the rights and privileges of the members of this House on both sides of it. But, Sir, your declaration of the 14th of March does not state that you did not know that Mr. Bruneau had put his resignation in that envelope. Your statement does not go that length.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Nor does he say that he had not reason to know.

Mr. McINERNEY. No; I will read the statement:

Before calling the Orders of the Day, I would like to mention to the House a matter which is of the nature of privilege, and which I see has been connected by the press with the seat of an hon. member—the member for Richelieu. It is stated that I have received his resignation. If I had received his resignation, I should have issued my warrant for a new election before now. The only occasion when I have had any communication from or with Mr. Bruneau this session was on Friday morning. I had just come into my office when Mr. Bruneau came in. He asked me if I had received a letter from him. I told him I had not. He said that he had called to get a letter back which he had written to me. I told him to wait and I would look among my mail, for I had not yet opened any letters. I turned the unopened letters over in

his presence, and he pointed to one with his frank upon it. I asked him if it was his writing on the address and frank. He assured me it was. He told me nothing of its contents, and I asked him nothing, but handed him the letter unopened, and he took it away with him. So far as I know, it had come to my office through the post office, for I had not seen it before. I mention this to avoid any mistake as to facts as far as I am concerned.

In that statement of yours, Mr. Speaker, there is not one word to the effect that you did not know that Mr. Bruneau had sent in his resignation. There is the statement that he did not tell you that he had sent in a resignation, that you did not know, perhaps, what that particular letter contained, but there is no statement—and, in justice to you, Sir, it is just as well this should be pointed out—that you did not know that Mr. Bruneau had sent in a resignation to you. You, Mr. Speaker, have not, up to this date, made that declaration. I claim that this House has the right to know—and, I think, if the opportunity be given, you, Mr. Speaker, will be only too anxious to tell the House, or any committee of this House—whether you had any such knowledge or not. My contention is, that if the Speaker had knowledge that that envelope contained the resignation of the hon. member for Richelieu, then he should not have handed him back the letter. I go one step further, and say that if the Speaker had reasonable grounds for believing that that letter contained the resignation, then he should not have handed back the letter. The only place where we can get at the facts to establish whether the Speaker had the knowledge, or should have had it, is the Committee on Privileges and Elections. There is a lot of rumour throughout the country, there are lots of statements on all hands about this resignation—as to the Speaker's knowledge, and all that sort of thing; and I, for one, as a member of this House, want to be put in a position to know, and to know absolutely, whether you, Mr. Speaker, had such knowledge at the time, or whether the facts you had before you and in your mind were such as to justify your coming to the conclusion, as a fair and reasonable man, that that envelope contained the resignation. I simply rose to call attention to the fact that the Speaker makes no declaration that he did not know the envelope contained the resignation, and to make the further point that, unless it were made plain to me, as a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, that the Speaker either had the knowledge that the envelope contained the resignation, or should have had such knowledge from the facts going the round of the House and the country, I would not vote to vacate the seat of the hon. member for Richelieu. But if it be shown that he had, or should have had, that knowledge—and I hold we should have an opportunity of finding out whether he had or not—I think I would be bound, under the

law, to report in favour of declaring vacant the seat for Richelieu. I again wish to urge that, in my opinion, the dignity of this House, the privileges of the members of this House, the reputation of the Speaker himself—all these call upon this House to refer this matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I cannot see why this motion should be opposed; I cannot see why anybody should want to hide anything in connection with this matter. Why should there be suspicion spread throughout this country on this question? Why should the newspapers be allowed to circulate rumours concerning the Speaker of this House, whose honour is dear to every member of this House and every Canadian, whose position should be above suspicion and above reproach, and whose conduct, so far as I have been able to see—and I am anxious to bear the willing testimony—has been above suspicion and reproach?

But I claim that the press and the people of this country should not be in a position to cast imputations on the honour of the Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada; and the only way by which I can see that the ground can be taken away for any such imputations is, to have this matter thoroughly investigated and reported on by the only committee that can investigate and report upon it.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). No fault can be found with the manner in which my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Herbert Tupper) and my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) have addressed themselves to the discussion of this question. I am sure it would have been acceptable to the House at large, if the question had been discussed from all standpoints on the same line, but I regret, for one—and I take this opportunity of saying so—that an attempt should have been made by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to make a personal and bitter attack on you, Mr. Speaker, under and behind the shield of some anonymous correspondents in some one or two newspapers.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. Let some of those on the back benches whose eloquence never gets beyond the cry of "Order," hold their souls in patience for a while. The hon. gentleman says that I quoted from anonymous correspondents. I did not. What I quoted was what might be called editorial matter, for which the Montreal "Star" is responsible, and not any anonymous correspondence.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do not see that the hon. gentleman has bettered his position at all.

If he entertained the belief that the Speaker of this House was an untruthful and dishonourable man, he should have had the manliness and courage to say so himself, and not take the unmanly course of shielding himself behind anonymous correspondence or articles in newspapers. I shall not further discuss that view of the case, but I would venture to say—and I think in that I would have the almost unanimous vote of this House—that the dignified and severely impartial manner in which you, Mr. Speaker, have discharged the duties this House has entrusted to you, has been in accordance with the best traditions of the Chair you occupy.

Let me say a word or two on the legal point my hon. friends have suggested. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) felt himself in a dilemma. He could not accept, as a lawyer, the argument of his confrère from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and was obliged to import into it a third statement. I acknowledge, he said, as a lawyer, that, in addition to the fact of the posting of the letter, and in addition to the fact of the receipt of the envelope containing it, there must be the actual knowledge brought home to the Speaker.

Mr. McINERNEY. Or a reasonable ground for the Speaker having that knowledge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It must be brought home to the Speaker. In other words, the hon. gentleman acknowledges that the position taken by my hon. friend from Pictou is in itself untenable. There must be something else in addition. Now, I want to call his attention, as a lawyer, to the fact that this House, in deciding upon the resolution submitted to it, are bound, as the right hon. First Minister said, to assume the correctness of all the facts stated in the resolution, but are neither bound nor justified in importing into that resolution a fact not stated. And if there is an essential fact omitted in the resolution—a fact necessary to state in order to justify us in referring the matter to a committee—then, there is no ground for the reference at all.

We are here construing a statute. The statute does not say that on knowledge, however obtained, the Speaker shall act—it does not say that on knowledge gained by casual conversation in the lobbies or through letters or articles in the newspaper press, the Speaker can act. The Speaker would have no power to act upon knowledge so conveyed to him. He has the power to act upon knowledge if that knowledge is conveyed to him in a special way, which is pointed out by the statute. It says :

Such member may address and cause to be delivered to the Speaker a declaration of his intention to resign his seat, made in writing under his hand and seal, before two witnesses * * * and the Speaker shall, upon receiving such declaration, forthwith address his warrant—

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

And so on. Now, it is not a question whether A, B or C has gone to the Speaker and said : I believe that a letter has been sent to you by Mr. So and So declaring his intention to resign. He must act strictly in accordance to the law, and the law provides he shall only act as and when he receives a declaration signed by the member. To my mind, as I respectfully submit, my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) has answered the point entirely. My hon. friend the Prime Minister has stated, and I think very correctly stated—every lawyer who has spoken on either side has agreed with him—that those who wish to refuse sending a matter of this kind to the committee must take the responsibility of assuming the correctness of every fact in the statement made. On this basis, assuming that every statement of fact be correct, I venture to submit that there is not sufficient to justify reference to the committee, because there has not been a legal resignation. The hon. gentleman for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) argues that delivery, in the legal technical sense only is necessary, and he supports and buttresses his argument by reference to the law books. He quotes a case from Leake on Contracts. But the hon. gentleman knows, as every lawyer knows, that delivery in such cases as he has referred to is a technical legal act. He knows that it is not necessary that a deed should pass out of the possession of the grantor to be legally delivered. I could declare a deed to be my act and deed and put it in my pocket, but, if my intention in the matter is established, the delivery is legally complete. But the hon. gentleman could not argue, he has estopped himself from arguing that the writing of a resignation by a member and putting it in his pocket is a delivery within the meaning of the Act. And yet, unless he adopts that, there is no point whatever to his quotation of "Leake on Contracts." But, arguing the case simply as a lawyer, the hon. gentleman has said: Look at the case of a notice to quit—I have forgotten where he quoted that case from. The lessor sent the notice to quit through the post, and it was held that this was sufficient. But why? Not because the posting was delivery, but because the terms of the lease under which the notice was sent provided not that the notice should be delivered, but that it should be sent by the lessor, and it was shown to have been posted by him. Now, let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact which to some extent he failed to deal with—that when the hon. member for Champlain imported into the declaration he made in this House the 'ipsisima verba' of the statement made by the Speaker, he made that statement his own. That statement of Mr. Speaker is part of the declaration on which we are asked to refer this matter to the committee. Then, every statement made by Mr. Speaker must

he assumed to be true—you cannot go back of it, it being a part of the hon. member's own statement upon which we are asked to act. If the hon. member for Champlain had, as was entirely within his right, said that he believed and had reason to believe that a resignation had been properly drawn and sent and received by the Speaker and had stopped there, he would have made out a prima facie case which would justify this House in referring the case for examination to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. But he did not do that. He merely took Mr. Speaker's statement, and upon that statement he argued, as a matter of law, that the resignation was delivered and was received. My hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) saw the force of that argument when presented by the Prime Minister; he saw that there was no answering it. And how does he seek to escape from it? He says that the Prime Minister forgot to refer to a paragraph that fills up that hiatus and completes the argument, the third paragraph of the charge. But does it fill that hiatus? What is the third statement of the charge? I appeal to the hon. gentleman himself to say whether there is an allegation of fact in that paragraph at all? Or was there intended to be one? Not at all. It is simply the conclusion on the point of law which the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) draws from the facts which he had set out in the paragraphs covering the Speaker's statement.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman appeals to me. I suppose he would like a decision?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would appeal to the hon. gentleman, and, if I could divorce him from his politics, would not be at all adverse to accepting his decision. I would call his attention to this third statement:

That this declaration was tendered within the meaning of subsection 3 of section 5 of chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

That is the conclusion that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcotte) arrived at on the point of law; the facts upon which he bases it are all set out in the previous statements. And so I say that the hiatus which the Prime Minister pointed out is there still. The reception by the Speaker, on which alone he could inform himself of the contents of the document is absent. Therefore, the Speaker cannot issue his warrant. The position I take is this: There is not only no allegation of knowledge given to the Speaker, but the existence of such knowledge is disproven on the face of the charge itself. I put that to my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney). He says the knowledge must be brought home to the Speaker; now, Sir, I say that no such knowledge is alleged. The hon. member for Champlain and other members are bound by the terms of the resolution. It

simply incorporates Mr. Speaker's statement—

It is said that I have received his resignation. If I had received his resignation, I should have issued my warrant for a new election before now. The legal inference from that is irresistible. There was no knowledge on the part of the Speaker and could not be. Mr. Speaker goes further and says:

The only occasion when I have had any communication from or with Mr. Bruneau this session was on Friday morning.

Now, I press my argument that he could not receive information from a third person on which he could act.

Mr. BERGERON. Why not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because the statute distinctly declares that a member may send to the Speaker a declaration of his intention to resign and that upon receipt of this declaration, the Speaker may act. That is why not. The Speaker says, with regard to Mr. Bruneau, the only person from whom he could receive the communication:

The only occasion when I have had any communication from or with Mr. Bruneau this session was on Friday morning. I had just come into my office, when Mr. Bruneau came in. He asked me if I had received a letter from him. I told him I had not. He said he had called to get a letter back which he had written to me. I told him to wait and I would look among my mail, for I had not yet opened any letters. I turned the unopened letters over in his presence, and he pointed to one with his frank upon it. I asked him if it was his writing on the address and frank. He assured me it was. He told me nothing of its contents, and I asked him nothing.

Mr. BERGERON. Will my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) allow me to ask him a question?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes; but let me finish my argument. If I am correct in saying that the information on which Mr. Speaker is to act must come from the resigning members themselves, and if, as the resolution before us expressly states, the Speaker handed back the letter unopened, the argument seems irresistible that the Speaker had not and could not have had knowledge on which to act. Now, let us look at the section of the statute for a moment.

Mr. BERGERON. Do you want me to put that question now?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not want you to; but I am perfectly willing that you should.

Mr. BERGERON. I thought the hon. gentleman wished me to wait until he had finished his sentence. Does the hon. gentleman contend that if the Speaker knew from any member of the House, whether the Premier, or the Minister of Public Works,

or the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), that the member for Richelieu had sent in his resignation, and that it was in his mail—does the hon. gentleman contend that when the Speaker upon opening his mail, found that letter there, and when the hon. member for Richelieu asked for that letter, even if he did not speak about the resignation, that the Speaker would be justified in giving back that letter containing the resignation?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Does not the hon. gentleman think it is quite enough for us now to discuss the practical questions before us, without introducing a theoretical question?

Mr. **BERGERON**. No, that is why we want an investigation.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I will give the hon. gentleman what, I think, is a complete answer, when I say that no such charge as that the Speaker was so informed by the Minister of Public Works, or by anybody else, is contained in this resolution.

Mr. **BERGERON**. That makes no difference.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There is no such allegation made. The hon. gentleman is indulging in a fanciful complaint, he has nothing to base it on at all. Now, this is what I want to lead up to for one moment, before I close the argument that I was presenting to the House. We are bound to assume—

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Where do I come in? The hon. gentleman appealed to me a moment ago in regard to that last clause.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. You do not come in at all.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I would like to give my view, because he does not understand it, and it is a reflection on myself. I wish to answer a question that he was putting as if to myself, to show that he has misunderstood it. For instance, that resolution which the hon. gentleman says is not a statement of facts, is exactly covered by this subsection. Take the first part and the first paragraph, which charges that that resignation was made out in regular form, that certain witnesses saw it made, and their names are given. Now, then, take the statement of the Speaker that this declaration was tendered within the meaning of subsection 3, and you have the exact statement that that resignation, made out before witnesses in regular form, was delivered to the Speaker, and his tender within the meaning of subsection 3, is a delivery in the meaning of the whole section.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I thought I had made that
Mr. **BERGERON**.

point before, but at the risk of wearying the House, I will repeat myself. I stated before that if the hon. member for Champlain had stated that he had good reason to believe, and did believe, that Mr. Brunneau's resignation, as declared in the first paragraph, to have been written out, was delivered by him to the Speaker, and had stopped there, he would have made out a prima facie case. But I said that inasmuch as the hon. gentleman did not make that statement, there was a hiatus. He took the other course. I won't take the responsibility, he says, of making a statement that that resolution was tendered or delivered; I will recite certain facts declared to this House by the Speaker, and I will follow this up by a declaration of my legal opinion that this is a tender within the meaning of the Act. That is where the hon. gentleman stands to-day, and that is where the House stands. If he had taken the responsibility of stating: I have reason to believe, and do believe, that that resignation was written, and signed, and delivered to, and received by, the Speaker, then we would be bound to investigate. But he did not do so; therefore, that necessary ingredient is missing. Now, I will call the attention of the House to the importance I attach to that point, by reading the second section, which says:

Such member may address and cause to be delivered to the Speaker, a declaration of his intention to resign his seat, made in writing under his hand and seal, before two witnesses.

Now, it is quite evident that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney), in reading that section, saw that that must be, not a technical delivery, not a technical delivery in the post office, because, as his argument went, although he did not state it in so many words, it irresistibly pointed out that if that letter had been burnt in the post office, or otherwise interrupted on its way, and never reached the Speaker, the Speaker could not have issued his warrant. It must have been an actual delivery which brought a knowledge of its contents to the Speaker's mind. Why do I say that? I say that because the latter part of the section puts it beyond any doubt. The first part says that he must "address and cause to be delivered"; and then it says that action shall be taken by the Speaker upon receiving such declaration. "The Speaker shall, upon receiving such declaration, forthwith address his warrant." The Speaker cannot forthwith address his warrant until he receives a declaration within the meaning of the Act, that is, he reads the declaration, informs his mind of its contents, and having the knowledge brought home to his mind of the intention of the member to resign his seat, the Speaker then issues his writ. I believe that position will be accepted by every one. So, there must be not only a technical delivery within the meaning of the Act, but there

must be an actual receipt by the Speaker, imparting knowledge of the fact, and bringing to his mind a knowledge of the contents of the document itself. When these two things concur, the Speaker is fully informed of the facts. Then, I say, it would be too late for the Speaker to hand back the resignation or anything else of a like nature. So I say that until the Speaker has so received the resignation, it does not appear to me that his conduct is open to any animadversion or criticism for having delivered back to the member the letter which had been sent to him by the member, when the Speaker solemnly declares that he did not know the contents of it, and had no conversation with Mr. Bruneau about it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What reference does the hon. gentleman make to those words: "And an entry of the declaration so delivered to the Speaker shall be thereafter made in the Journals of the House"?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not refer to it myself, but I will. I say the latter part of the section refers to the action which the Speaker is to take when the letter has been delivered to him. I say that action which the Speaker has to take plainly imports what the law meant by the word "delivered." It is not a technical delivery, it is such a delivery as enables him to do the act which the section points out. Now, the act which the section points out the Speaker is to do is to issue his warrant for a new writ, and the Speaker evidently could not issue his warrant for a new writ unless he had been informed that the member had resigned. So I say the conclusion is irresistible that there must be the delivery of a document to the hands of the Speaker, and a conveyance to his mind of the contents of the document, of the fact that the member has resigned, so that he may issue a new writ.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman goes this far—that if the envelope had remained on the Speaker's desk and the Speaker, for any improper reasons—putting the case outside of this case altogether—had simply declined to open that envelope, then the member could not resign.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not quite follow the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I understood the hon. gentleman he goes this far: What if this document, having reached the Speaker's room, by the design or neglect of the Speaker, had remained on his desk, then the member who had executed the declaration and sent it in through the mail to the Speaker's room, would re-

main a member, and his seat would not be voided.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman himself—Does he think any good can follow from imagining cases of malfeasance on the part of a high officer, and drawing conclusions from them? I ask him this further question: Should we not be better engaged in discussing actual facts before us, than in discussing imaginary facts of what might happen under supposed circumstances? The facts of this case are that the letter was not allowed to remain for a week or a day, there was no malfeasance, there was no wrong-doing. The Speaker, before he opened his mail, was asked to deliver back to the gentleman the letter which he had sent to the Speaker, and he delivered it back. Therefore, the contents of the letter never came to the Speaker's mind, therefore he could not issue his warrant, and therefore, in my opinion, there is no vacancy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems, so far as the most of the facts in this case are concerned, or rather so far as the inference from the statement of the facts put before the House, are concerned, that there is not much difference of opinion. In this case the statement made by the hon. member who has moved this resolution, declares that a resignation, duly executed within the terms of the statute, was sent by mail to the Speaker, and was received by the Speaker. There is no dispute about that, so far as I understand. If I gathered rightly what has fallen from the right hon. Prime Minister and from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the argument which is put forward to justify the denial of this committee is the fact which, it is said, can be gathered from the statement of the Speaker, that he had no knowledge of the contents of the document. I have not heard from any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House any argument other than that. I venture to suggest that the matter from that standpoint is not so plain as hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House would have us believe. I presume that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would not say, if a resignation properly executed and sent through the post, were received by the Speaker, and were accidentally dropped in the fire or otherwise destroyed before the Speaker had knowledge of its contents, that that would not be a good resignation. I do not suppose any hon. gentleman would controvert that proposition, or would contend that if a notice of resignation had been received by the Speaker, and had been abstracted from his possession before it was convenient for him to examine it, the seat of the member who so tendered his resignation would not become vacant. It is one question, it seems to me, as to whether an hon. member who

sends in his resignation in the manner indicated has vacated his seat; it is another question altogether as to whether Mr. Speaker has received such a knowledge of that resignation as to justify him in deciding that a warrant shall be issued for a new election. In the case I have suggested it would be proper, if there were any discrepancy as to the facts, that the matter should be referred, as the hon. member now desires this case shall be referred, to the Committee on Privileges and Elections in order that it may be inquired into, and so I say, Mr. Speaker, that as all the evidence in this case is not before the House, the case should be inquired into by the committee. When under the provisions of this statute a resignation has been only executed, the statute does not provide any particular form in which it should be directed to you, Mr. Speaker, and it does not seem to indicate that the hon. Minister shall deliver the resignation himself to Mr. Speaker. The words of the statute are: "He shall cause to be delivered." This may be done either by post or by messenger; but when once a resignation is in the possession of Mr. Speaker, the case differs to some extent from the analogy that might be drawn from the case of an ordinary deed. A person to whom an ordinary deed is to be delivered may refuse acceptance. Mr. Speaker has no right to refuse the resignation of any hon. member; the member has the absolute right to resign and to tender his resignation. When once tendered, the knowledge of Mr. Speaker as to the contents of that resignation so tendered is immaterial; it is immaterial upon the question as to whether the member so resigning has vacated his seat. At all events, I would not suppose any hon. gentlemen opposite would venture to say that in a matter of that kind there was not a doubt sufficiently grave to justify the case being sent to the committee for inquiry. In this case it is admitted by the statement of the Speaker, coupled with the statement of the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution, that the resignation did come within the possession and control of Mr. Speaker. If Mr. Speaker were aware of the contents of that letter, he had no right to hand it back. The question is not affected by the fact that he handed it back, when he did not possess any such knowledge. It is to be presumed from the terms of his statement, although not so expressly stated, that Mr. Speaker knew nothing of the contents of the letter when he returned it. He merely says that he knew nothing of those contents from the hon. gentleman himself. Under these circumstances I think it is due not only to the House, but to you, Mr. Speaker, and also to the hon. member who sent in that resignation, that there should be an inquiry instituted before the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. QUINN. It is very much to be regretted that the right hon. Prime Minister
Mr. BORDEN (Halifax),

has seen fit to avoid the investigation which the country expected and which the circumstances of the case called for. Hon. gentlemen have twitted the Opposition with splitting hairs on the question of the receipt of this document by Mr. Speaker; but I think if there is any hair-splitting at all, it has been done by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries based his whole argument, so far as I could understand it, and I should like the hon. gentleman to correct me if I have taken a wrong view of it, on his opinion that section 3 is a legal conclusion which my hon. friend has drawn from the statement of facts. Section 3 says:

That this declaration was tendered within the meaning of subsection 3 of section 5 of chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, and yet the said Arthur Aimé Bruneau, Esquire, continues to sit in the House of Commons.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries declared this was a legal conclusion which my hon. friend had reached from the consideration of the statement made by you, Mr. Speaker. If, however, this is not a legal conclusion drawn by my hon. friend, but a statement of facts, then the declaration of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries falls to the ground. I draw the attention of the House to the first part of the resolution, which reads as follows:—

François Arthur Marcotte, member of the House of Commons for the county of Champlain, having stated in his place that he was credibly informed and believed he could establish that Arthur Aimé Bruneau, Esquire, then member for the electoral district of Richelieu, in this House, did during the present session of Parliament declare, according to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, his intention to resign his seat.

I stop there for a moment. Any member of the House has a right to resign his seat by giving in his place notice of his intention to resign. Let us suppose that my hon. friend who declared in this House that he desires to resign his seat is not heard by the Clerk of the House or by Mr. Speaker. Section 5 provides that a member may resign of giving notice of his intention to resign, and the entry thereof by the Clerk of the House. So it will be argued by my hon. friend that if Mr. Speaker did not hear the hon. gentleman make the declaration, he did not resign his seat, and no hon. member of the House had the right to ask that the question be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Such things might occur with respect to the Clerk of the House. I do not mean to suggest any dereliction of duty on his part, but he must sometimes feel bored and be wearied by the eloquence of hon. gentlemen, and especially of hon. gentlemen opposite, and while the Clerk was dreaming of pleasant things, an hon. member might tender his resignation, which might not be heard by

the Clerk. Some days afterwards when reading the report of the proceedings of the House we might find that the official resignation of a member had been tendered, but not duly recorded on the Journals; and an hon. member would then rise and declare, as the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) has declared, that the hon. member did tender his resignation. The Clerk of the House may make the statement; I did not hear him; but the hon. gentleman declaring would go further, and say: I heard that statement made. And I ask if the denial of the Clerk of the House, as to whether he heard this or not, is a fact, or whether the statement I have made is a fact. That is exactly a similar case as to what occurred here. The statement of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) is plain and clear: That the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) did tender his resignation under subsection 3 of section 5 of the Act, and the only question that comes up for consideration by the Committee on Privileges and Elections is: Was that paper which the Speaker of this House handed back to the hon. member for Richelieu, that particular morning, the resignation of the hon. member, or was it not. If that were his resignation, surely no one will argue for one moment that, when it was in the hands of the Speaker, even though unopened, it had not been received by him. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) says, that it would be necessary that Mr. Speaker should have a knowledge of what that document contained, or that he must be in a position to have reasonable grounds to know what it contained. I do not go that far.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It does not suit you.

Mr. QUINN. I do not believe it is at all necessary to go that far. I am sorry to disagree with my hon. friend (Mr. McInerney), but I do not believe it is necessary, under the meaning of the Act, that the Speaker should have a knowledge of what that document contained. Let us suppose a case of this kind. A member is travelling in Europe, and he sends his resignation to the Speaker. In the course of his travels, he meets one of the members of the Government who tells him: My dear sir, you are imperilling the fate of our Government by sending your resignation. That document has reached the chamber of Mr. Speaker here, and it is waiting some months for him; but in the meantime, some months after the resignation has been sent to the Speaker, this hon. gentleman cables to the Speaker: I wish you not to open the letter which is in my handwriting, and which comes from such and such a particular place, but return it to me. Would any reasonable person argue that that document was not in the possession of the Speaker at the moment when he readdressed it to this member who asked him to return it? The actual delivery was the receiving of it by Mr. Speaker.

Whether it came to him by post or by messenger, the mere fact of the Speaker having that document in his hands is the receiving of that document. The fact that he returned it to the member who addressed it to him, or to any one else, does not change the nature of the document, and does not change the nature of the transaction as regards the receiving of the document. It does not make the slightest difference, whether Mr. Speaker had this document in his possession for a month, a week, or a day, or an hour; the act of receiving it was completed at the very moment Mr. Speaker took that document in his hand. The Act does not say that he must have it in his possession an hour, or a day, or any length of time, but the mere delivery of that document by the member who wishes to resign, and the mere receipt of it by the Speaker, is sufficient, under the statute, to constitute a resignation on the part of the member so tendering his resignation.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Without the Speaker reading it?

Mr. QUINN. Certainly, without the Speaker reading it. Hon. gentlemen opposite argue this question as if it were a matter of contract between the Speaker of this House and the supporters of the Government, as to whether they should remain as members of this House, and that, in order to complete the resignation, the mind of the Speaker and the mind of the person who wished to resign, must act in unison. I hold that no such thing is necessary. Mr. Speaker is no party to a contract between himself and a member who wishes to resign. Mr. Speaker occupies the position of being totally disinterested; he acts as holding the scales evenly between the two political parties, and as representing the country here, and the moment a member tenders his resignation and sends that in proper form to Mr. Speaker, then the Speaker is bound to accept it and bound to receive it, no matter in what form it may come. It is not a question of Mr. Speaker's knowledge, at all; the question to be submitted to the Committee on Privileges and Elections is this: Did the hon. member for Richelieu write out his resignation; was it witnessed by two hon. members of this House; did it actually get into the hands and was it received by the Speaker of this House? These are the questions.

It is said by the hon. Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies), that the hon. mover of the resolution (Mr. Marcotte) is bound by the statement of Mr. Speaker, and is bound to assume that every statement therein is correct, as regards the third declaration in this motion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said that the hon. gentleman is bound by the statement, in so far as he imported it into this resolution.

Mr. QUINN. I quite agree with the hon. Minister in that ; but here is what the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) said as regards Mr. Speaker :

That the said declaration is, he believed he could establish, the document referred to in the following statement of His Honour the Speaker of the House of Commons on 14th March, 1898.

That is all he (Mr. Marcotte) says. He simply refers to the statement of Mr. Speaker in order to identify the document therein mentioned, as the document to which he has referred in his motion previously. It is not done for the purpose of basing any charge against the hon. member for Richelieu on the statement of Mr. Speaker, but it is merely for the purpose of identifying the document to which Mr. Speaker has referred in his statement, with the document to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcotte) referred in his two previous declarations. Then the hon. gentleman goes on to say :

That this declaration—

That is, the declaration referred to in the section of the resolution immediately preceding the statement of Mr. Speaker.

That this declaration was tendered within the meaning of subsection 3 of section 5 of chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, and yet the said Arthur Aimé Bruneau, Esquire, continues to sit in the House of Commons.

It was also stated by the Minister of Marine that it was absolutely necessary that Mr. Speaker must know what this document contained, or else it could not be charged that it had been received by him. I look upon it quite differently. I take it, that the fact of Mr. Speaker not having acted upon any resignation that might have been supposed to have been sent to him, established a fair subject of inquiry in this House, so that Mr. Speaker might explain that he had not received that document.

Mr. Speaker might explain to the House that he had not received the document, owing to absence from the city or some other cause. He might give that as a reason why he had not carried out the law—why he had not reported, according to subsection 2 of section 5, which declares that “the Speaker shall, upon receiving such declaration, forthwith address his warrant, under his hand and seal, to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, for the issue of a writ for the election of a new member in the place of the member so resigning, and a writ shall issue accordingly.” So that if the Speaker had failed to issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, it might be inquired here why he had so failed, if it had been known to any hon. member that a resignation had been sent ; and then it would be the right of the Speaker to inform this House either that he had not received the document or that it had been withdrawn from him, as in this particular case. I take it that the explanation made to this House,

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

by you, Sir, on the 14th of this month, is a perfectly reasonable, natural, and just explanation of the circumstances of the case as they occurred. But it is not of interest to this House to know whether you returned a letter to Mr. Bruneau on the morning of the 11th or any other morning. It is, however, of great interest to this House to know whether that document which you returned to him was his resignation of the seat he occupies in this House. It is of interest to this House to know whether or not it is within the power of the Speaker or of the Government to elect a man to represent a constituency in this House after he has resigned that position. That is the situation, fairly and plainly stated. It is of interest to this country, and is certainly of interest to this House, to know whether the paper which you returned on that morning was the resignation of the hon. member for Richelieu. If it was, then it will be for the Committee on Privileges and Elections to say whether the member is entitled to occupy a seat here after he has resigned that seat. I think, Sir, it would be a very severe comment on the proceedings of this House, on the dignity of this House, and on the fairness of the occupant of your Chair, if the people of this country were allowed to remain for one moment under the impression that a document had been returned to Mr. Bruneau which afterwards turned out to be the resignation of his seat in this House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to approach this question animated by no other desire than to see that justice be done, not only to the hon. gentleman who presides over this House, but also to the hon. gentleman who represents the county of Richelieu. We are all interested in this matter, the country is interested in it, and it is a matter which does not call for any political animus or any political bias, but which calls for the best elements of right and justice in the heart and mind of every individual member of this House. I do not think that any one should advance technical reasons why this resolution should not carry. Why is it that hon. gentlemen are afraid of an investigation ? The very fact that an investigation is opposed, that hon. gentlemen are seemingly afraid to go into an investigation of this matter, arouses a suspicion, not only in the minds of hon. gentlemen here, but also, I venture to say, in the minds of the entire country. The entire country is anxious to know why this inquiry is being shut off. As has been stated, there are two ways by which a member of Parliament can resign his position : by announcing viva voce in the House his intention to resign, and thus bringing the fact to the eyes and ears of the Speaker, or by causing his declaration to be signed and sealed in the presence of two witnesses, and causing that to be delivered to the Speaker. I hold that the very moment a member of Parliament does that,

and causes the document to be delivered to the Speaker, he has resigned. Then it is for the Speaker to issue his writ. That has to come to the knowledge of the Speaker before he can issue his writ; that goes without saying; but the fact of a resignation has become completed just as soon as the declaration signifying a member's intention to resign, has been signed and witnessed, and has been delivered to the Speaker. Now, what this resolution seeks to know is whether or not Mr. Bruneau's resignation was in that letter which was in the hands of the Speaker. If that resignation was in that letter, then I contend that the Speaker has a right to demand that resignation back again. That resignation, after it left the hands of the hon. member for Richelieu, was no longer his property. It belonged to the people of Canada; it belonged to the Speaker as the official representative of the people of Canada; it was in his possession, and it could not be delivered to anybody else. Suppose it is now brought to the Speaker's knowledge that that letter which he says he delivered back to the hon. member for Richelieu conveyed the resignation of that hon. member, then I contend that the Speaker has a right to demand that resignation back. That is one of the reasons why we want this committee. We want this committee in order to investigate whether that letter which was so handed back by the Speaker to the hon. member did or did not contain that resignation. I do not desire in the least to cast any reflections on your honour or your probity, Mr. Speaker; nor do I desire in the least to be bloodthirsty after the seat of the hon. member for Richelieu; but I contend that we have a right in this House to know what is right and what is wrong, and that the people of this country have a right to know what is right and what is wrong, in these matters.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MILLS. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock, I was endeavouring to impress upon the House the fact that the public sentiment of the country would require this matter to be looked into regardless of any technical objection that may be raised to the motion itself. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) argued that a case was not put, because the motion did not contain the statement that the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) had resigned his seat or an expression of the belief that he had resigned his seat. If you can make anything less than that out of the resolution, Sir, I cannot. The resolution reads in part, as follows:—

François Arthur Marcotte, member of the House of Commons for the county of Cham-

plain, having stated in his place that he was credibly informed and believed he could establish that Arthur Aimé Bruneau, Esquire, then member for the electoral district of Richelieu in this House, did during the present session of Parliament declare, according to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, his intention to resign his seat.

That is a specific declaration by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte):

That Joseph Godbout, Esquire, the member for the electoral district of Beauce, and John McMillan, Esquire, the member for the electoral district of the South Riding of Huron, were witnesses to the said declaration.

That the said declaration is, he believed he could establish, the document referred to in the following statement of His Honour the Speaker of the House of Commons, addressed to the House of Commons on 14th March, 1898.

Then he gives the specific statement of the Speaker, and ends up by saying:

That this declaration was tendered within the meaning of subsection 3 of section 5 of chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, and yet the said Arthur Aimé Bruneau, Esquire, continues to sit in the House of Commons.

That is a specific, detailed statement of the case, as my hon. friend from Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) believes it to be, and it is beyond doubt a prima facie case. You cannot make anything else out of it. The hon. member was not required to swear to it, but he rose in his place and made that statement respecting another hon. member, and that constitutes a prima facie case, which makes it the bounden duty of this House to inquire into the facts.

I hardly consider it necessary to argue what is essential for a resignation. Yet if it were necessary, at this stage of the case, to make an argument of that sort, we could by the facts before us, which facts are admitted by the right hon. leader of the House, show clearly a resignation by the hon. member for Richelieu. All that is required by the statute, in order that a resignation may be complete, is simply this:

Such member may address and cause to be delivered to the Speaker a declaration of his intention to resign his seat, made in writing under his hand and seal before two witnesses.

What have we here? We have the declaration of the hon. member for Richelieu of his intention to resign his seat, made in writing, under his hand and seal, and signed by himself before two witnesses—all of which facts are admitted. The statute provides that he may address and cause to be delivered such resignation to the Speaker. How did he cause that resignation to be delivered to the Speaker? He, as the Speaker has told us, addressed a letter to the Speaker, and it came through the ordinary course of mail. At least the frank of the hon. gentleman being upon the letter, it is to be presumed that the letter came from the post office, and having come from the post office, the hon. gentleman had made his

final plunge beyond retraction. When he posted that letter, he resigned beyond retraction. That letter, once it was mailed, became, not the property of the Speaker, but of the people of Canada. The Speaker is a mere machine; the letter itself belonged to the people of Canada, it belonged to this House, and it had the frank of the hon. gentleman upon it. He made out his resignation, he addressed it to the Speaker, he put it in the post office, and thereby caused it to be delivered. Then what took place? I do not care anything about the knowledge of the Speaker at all. That knowledge comes in when he issues his writ. The member who has tendered his resignation, and has addressed it to the Speaker, and caused it to be so delivered, must be held to have vacated his seat. The statute says:

The member so tendering his resignation—

That is addressing it to the Speaker and causing it to be so delivered—

—shall be held to have vacated his seat, and shall cease to be a member of this House.

The knowledge of the Speaker has nothing whatever to do with it, so far as regards the final plunge of the hon. member when making his resignation as a member of this House. I take it that the Speaker is supposed to know what acts he is called upon to perform. In other words, he is supposed to know the law. Even common laymen, in the eyes of the law, are supposed to know the law, and the Speaker is supposed to know all the acts he is called upon to perform. He must of necessity know that there may be a dozen members—we have heard rumours of any number contemplating resigning their seats—who may want to resign; and how does he know that his box may not be flooded with letters of resignation, so that when a letter comes to him addressed in that way, I take it that it is his duty, before handing it back, to inquire of the hon. member: Is not this your resignation? Because we know there have been rumours in the newspapers for months that members intend resigning, until at last the thing came to a point, and one gentleman made the final plunge—and was caught. I would not advise a Conservative member to attempt any such thing. I would not advise a Conservative member to do precisely the same thing as the hon. member for Richelieu did, and run the chance of getting that letter back. But aside from all that, I may say here, in passing, that the Speaker in his statement, referred to the fact of newspapers making one report and another, and to a certain extent he gave as a reason for his statement the newspaper comments on this matter. Well, I wish to caution Mr. Speaker and this House that the newspapers will say a great deal more with reference to this matter, if this committee is not given. The newspapers will

Mr. MILLS.

say it, and the people will think it and will say it, and will understand it too.

Then there is another thing. I wish to remind the right hon. leader of the House and also the hon. member for Richelieu, this is not the only place where this matter can be brought up. So, though, by their majority, they vote down this motion, that does not, necessarily, put an end to this transaction. What is the law with reference to that? Section 4 of this very chapter says:

If any person who is by this Act declared ineligible as a member of the House of Commons, or is declared incapable of sitting or voting therein, nevertheless sits or votes, he shall forfeit the sum of two thousand dollars for every day he sits or votes; and such sum may be recovered from him by any person who sues for the same, by action in any form allowed by law in the province in which the action is brought, and in any court having jurisdiction.

Well, it is a known fact that since this resignation was put in in the manner in which the hon. member for Champlain believes, the hon. member for Richelieu has sat in this House.

Mr. BERGERON. Not long.

Mr. MILLS. But he was here.

Mr. BERGERON. About half an hour.

Mr. MILLS. He was here, at all events, and, consequently, by voting down this resolution, hon. gentlemen must not think that they are voting this case entirely beyond the jurisdiction of courts other than the court of Parliament. Now, I rather think that, for the honour and decency of this House, and for the establishment of good precedents and for the elevating of that moral standard that the Liberals of this country all said that they were going to elevate and keep elevated, hon. members should do as the hon. member for Champlain has asked them and refer this matter so that further investigation can be had before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. A great many things could be said with reference to these resignations, but there is only one point to be considered here on this motion. Is there a prima facie case made out? Is it a proper case to go before the Committee on Privileges and Elections? If so, it is the duty of this House to send it there. I think, and a great many other hon. members think with me, that a prima facie case has been out, and that it is right and proper that this matter should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BERGERON. Last Friday when this question came before the House, the right hon. the Premier said that the matter had been laid before the law officers of the Government, so I expected when the matter came up to-day that the right hon. gentleman would give us the report of those officers. I do not know whether he would allow me to ask him now whether he got a

report, and, if so, whether it was a written or a verbal report.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have stated everything that I have to say in this matter.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Then we are at liberty to suppose that the law officers may have made a report, but that it has been filed along with that telegram to Lord Strathcona. It may have been against the Government contention. I am not surprised at the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, for I have heard them upon similar questions when not in office and, of course, as in all other cases, their speeches of to-day are far different from those they delivered then. The right hon. Premier threw some aspersions upon the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), because he seconded the motion of the hon. member for Champlain. When the motion was handed to you, Mr. Speaker, you looked for a seconder and, as is often done, you gave the name of the member who happened to catch your eye, in this case, the hon. member for West York.

Mr. **LANDERKIN**. Why not take him ?

Mr. **BERGERON**. That is not the question. I know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) means, and that is the reason I speak of it. We have seen it in the papers before. I say it was not the intention to ask the hon. member for West York to second the motion. There was no reason, as there was somebody to second it. Unfortunately, the seconder's name was not on the motion as written. I beg your attention to this question, Mr. Speaker, because I know it will come up later on. I did not see why the leader of the House should throw aspersions upon the hon. member for Three Rivers when that hon. gentleman seconded the motion. Years ago, Mr. Speaker, when you sat on this side of the House, you presented a motion like the one now before the Chair, directed against the hon. member for Three Rivers, and the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) of that day, threw no aspersions on you or upon those who supported your views. It seems to me that what the House and the country are interested in here is to find out the whole truth about the resignation of the hon. member for Richelieu. As has been said before—and I only mention en passant—it is important to us all, from the Speaker to the humblest member of the House, to know how we stand upon this question. As my hon. friend has just said, I would not advise any one on this side of the House to send in a resignation in that way.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Hear, hear.

Mr. **BERGERON**. The right hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," and why should we give this advice ? The Speaker of the House is supposed to be entirely without feeling as

between two parties, and I am sure that that is the case with you, Mr. Speaker. That is why I insist upon this point. I do not want it to go to the House or to the country that anybody here could be favoured by the Speaker ; and that is why I am convinced that a body like the Committee on Privileges and Elections—where hon. gentlemen opposite have a majority—would be the proper place to find out all the facts of this transaction. Of course, if the right hon. gentleman does not allow such a reference, it will not be made. But, if there is no investigation, what will remain in the public mind ? That we cannot prevent it. Why, it has been rumoured here already, and when I was in Montreal last Saturday I heard it there, that the hon. member for Richelieu twice or three times or oftener has sent his resignation to the Premier, and that he sent this one to the Speaker for the same reason that moved him in communicating with the Premier. He has told everybody what his reasons were, not confining his confidence to members of his own party. It was a question of patronage of course—we could never expect to find it a question of principle—a question of patronage at Sorel. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), who is smiling at me now, knows it well. If public rumour is true appointments were made there. People were appointed through the influence of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine), and there was a row. The hon. member for Richelieu, to use a vulgar word which I trust you will pardon me for using, Mr. Speaker, considering that it has been much used in political discussions of late—the hon. member kicked, and on the eve of an important vote, he sent in his resignation.

He sends his resignation to the right hon. the Premier, that is to say, he writes a letter to him, and begins by paying him a great many compliments—just as the Liberal clubs in Montreal always do when they want to secure expulsions from the Liberal party. He writes a letter to the Premier and says : It is impossible for me to support the party any longer, my conscience forbids me from remaining here. Why, Sir, the right hon. gentleman has received resignations like that very often, not only from the member for Richelieu, but from other members too. The right hon. gentleman, knowing the meaning of these resignations, sent him from January to December, takes no account of them, but when he sees that the member says : At the same time I am sending in my resignation to the Speaker—then the right hon. gentleman begins to think there may be something in it. Now, if rumour is true, it would seem as if the right hon. gentleman had shown the letter to somebody else, and had asked somebody else to see how far the resignation had gone. Now, we all know that what the Speaker says is perfectly correct. No one here would even

doubt a word of his statement, but the Speaker does not say that he had not heard of the resignation of Mr. Bruneau. He says very truly that the member for Richelieu did not tell him what was in that letter. I believe that. The hon. member for Richelieu, I think, had been well prepared for the mission he was to accomplish when he went to the Speaker. He had been told not to be too talkative with the Speaker, and he was too intelligent to ask or to put questions. But we want to know more than what is contained in the Speaker's statement. We want to go before the committee so that we may be in a position to prove that the right hon. gentleman knew it, that the Minister of Public Works knew it, that the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) knew it, and that through these, in an unofficial way, the Speaker became acquainted with it, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said this afternoon. Why, he says whether the Speaker did know it or not, whether the Speaker had learned it from the mouth of these gentlemen, or had read it in the newspapers, it was all unofficial, but still in an unofficial way he knew that the member for Richelieu had offered his resignation. Well, if we could go before the committee we would be able to find out whether these things are true. Now, I think it is very important that we should do so. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to attach much importance to this, but my right hon. friend later on would thank us for what we are doing, because he will have some more resignations. I have no doubt—of course, not in the same way, they will know better. The hon. member for Richelieu, at least, will not again send his resignation to the Speaker in this way. But the right hon. gentleman will have more resignations, they are hanging over his head, because I am convinced that it is impossible to grant what the member for Richelieu wants now, for instance; what the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) wants, for instance; and what the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine) wants, for instance. I know that, and so he may expect some other resignations. Therefore, he should grant us a committee of investigation, so that everything which will come out before that committee may be a lesson to other members who may wish to send in their resignations later on, that they may not be caught in the same way as the member for Richelieu was caught. Now, what will the people think of this? The law has been read, the right hon. gentleman has read it three or four times, others have read it. The resignation was written, there is no doubt about that. My hon. friend opposite said there was no *prima facie* case. But the resignation was written according to the statute which regulates the manner in which a member shall resign his seat. It was written in the

Mr. BERGERON.

presence of two members of this House, according to the law, and it was mailed, and the Speaker, in his declaration, says that he received it. He says: "So far as I knew, it had come to my office through the post office." The Speaker received it, and so everything is perfectly regular, all through it is perfectly regular. Now, under ordinary circumstances, that resignation was in the hands of the Speaker. So far as ordinary correspondence goes, that letter was in the hands of the Speaker. We all know that the moment we deposit a letter in the post office, we cannot get it back under any circumstances. I have seen people posting a letter and forgetting to put on a stamp, and though they did everything in their power to get it back, going into the post office and begging to have the letter returned that they might put a stamp on it and prevent it going to the dead letter office, still they were refused, they were told that the letter now belonged to the party to whom it was addressed. How much more so in the case of a document of this importance. I am, Sir, much surprised with the right hon. gentleman and his followers at taking this position. As has been suggested here, suppose that letter had been left under some papers in the Speaker's office for a week or ten days, would anybody then pretend that according to law the member for Richelieu had not resigned? Supposing the letter had been lost, dropped in the passage by the messenger who carried it to the Speaker's room, still, as a question of law, would not the resignation of the hon. member for Richelieu have been properly transmitted, even though it had not reached the Speaker? But more than this, the Speaker actually had it in his possession and gave it back. I understand very well, I have no doubt at all, that the Speaker attached no importance to that letter, that he did not know what it was, never having asked Mr. Bruneau what was in it, and Mr. Bruneau not having told him. Consequently, he attached no importance to the letter and gave it back. But he had the resignation in his hands, all the same. Now, any one can ask imaginary questions, says the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The right hon. gentleman would have prevented all this play of the imagination if he had granted us a committee of investigation. Then we would have gone before that committee with the facts, but now we are left to suppositions, as somebody has said. We are all human, but we know how these things are done, at least we can guess. Suppose somebody had said to the Speaker: Mr. Speaker, I wish you would not open your mail to-night, wait until to-morrow afternoon. That might have been done, and would that have been regular? Would that not be something that should not have been done? Let us have a committee of investigation in order that all these things may be either proved or dis-

proved. If they are not proved, so much the better for hon. gentlemen opposite and the hon. member for Richelieu. Now, we heard the speech of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and while he made it, he could not help laughing. I do not believe there has ever come before Parliament a case so plain and clear as this one. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a great lawyer, and he makes great arguments; still, I saw him splitting hairs here to-day, and he could not help laughing. There was nothing at all in his arguments except that he paid some compliments to you, Mr. Speaker. I will be very glad to second anything the hon. gentleman has said in that regard, but let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not like to hear hon. members getting up and paying compliments to the Speaker. I have not seen it done before during many years, and I do not like it. I have seen four Speakers occupying that Chair before yourself, and I never before heard any one paying them compliments. I am sure, Mr. Speaker himself would prefer not to see that done. Therefore, putting aside these compliments to the Speaker, there was nothing at all in the arguments of the hon. Minister to show why a committee should not be granted. I ask the right hon. gentleman once more to give us the committee. Surely he can change his mind, he has done it before. There is no harm in that, when it is done for a good purpose. Let us have the committee of investigation, for it is a question of honour to the House and to Parliament. It is an important question for the Speaker, and it is a very important question to every one of us. There is no danger. The Government have a majority on that committee, and if we are not able to prove things that we believe are true, so much the better for the hon. gentlemen opposite and for the hon. member for Richelieu.

Mr. FLINT. The question before the House is not precisely as to whether the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau), as a matter of fact, has resigned his seat in this House, but as to whether there is contained in this statement submitted by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte), sufficient reason for referring the matter of the alleged resignation of the hon. member to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. We must take this statement as a whole, and must conclude that the whole case rests on this statement presented to the House; and we must ask whether, in that statement, there is sufficient case to go before a committee for investigation.

It is true, there are other courts having jurisdiction over this matter, and if any person sees fit to invoke the jurisdiction of another tribunal, of course that is a matter for the person himself to consider, and the matter will then be discussed from a strictly

judicial standpoint. Now we are discussing the matter from a parliamentary standpoint, and I see no reason why, as a Parliament, and as members of Parliament, discussing the rights and privileges of fellow-members and of our constituents, our interpretation of the statute and the circumstances and merits of this case should not be what we call a liberal interpretation, in the direction of carrying out the intention, as indicated by the hon. member's conduct which has been called in question. As we are here without any direct precedents to guide us, we must be guided by reason and analogy. The terms of the statute refer to an intention on the part of the member to resign his seat. There is, first, the wish and intention to resign his seat, and that intention and wish must remain unchanged until by the operation of the law the seat becomes vacant. We must follow the wish and intention up to the point of controversy. It is true, we assume, for the sake of argument, that the statement of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) is true, that the resignation was written out, and there was an express wish and intention of the hon. member at that time to resign; that the letter was deposited in the post, and in due course of time was received, not by Mr. Speaker, not by the person to whom it was to be delivered, but at the office of Mr. Speaker, at a certain place within which it could have been delivered to Mr. Speaker. It was not delivered to Mr. Speaker, but the intention expressed was revoked by the action of the hon. member, the intention to resign his seat. The facts, as stated by Mr. Speaker—and it must be assumed that these are the facts on which the application is based—show that this was the case. His Honour stated that, before he had received this letter into his hands, before it had been delivered by any operation into the hands of Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked him if he had received a letter. Mr. Speaker replied: I have not received any letter from you. He was then informed that he wished to get from Mr. Speaker a letter which he had written to him. At that moment the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) revoked the wish and intention to resign, and from that moment it was impossible that the law vacating the seat could come into operation. It seems to me, as we are tracing the matter step by step, that this is the point in the controversy, and where hon. gentlemen opposite must meet the hon. member for Richelieu, if they wish to deprive him of his seat in this House. I contend that there is substantial ground on which the House can give a liberal interpretation to the action of the hon. member in wishing at that time to resign a position which he had received at the hands of the electors. The interpretation should be liberal on behalf of the constituents whom he was then representing, and is now representing, in this House, if my interpretation of the differ-

ent stages of this proceeding is correct, a policy leading in the direction of liberality towards those whom the hon. gentleman represented, and as the representative of whom, in a moment of anger or passion, or from some other motive, he desired to withdraw. The hon. gentleman who last spoke referred to the position of the post office in the matter, and declared that, when the letter was delivered into the post, it was, by operation of law, delivered to Mr. Speaker. This contention cannot seriously prevail, because, although postal law constitutes a binding obligation on the postal authorities as between these two parties, that law does not change the property in the envelope and as regards its contents. So that, while, as between the Postmaster General and the hon. member for Richelieu, the hon. member could not reclaim that letter from the Postmaster General, he had the right and privilege of resuming property in the letter with the consent of the person to whom it was addressed, when it left the control of the Post Office Department. So there is nothing left in the complaint itself on which a committee of investigation could operate. The House is bound by the statement of this complaint, and the complaint, or so far as the only substantial part of it is concerned, and the statement of Mr. Speaker shows that the intention and wish of the hon. member for Richelieu had been fully and amply revoked before the document itself had been delivered to Mr. Speaker.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The right hon. leader of the Government twitted me, in his opening remarks, with having attempted to secure the honour of seconding this motion. My right hon. friend knows that, as a rule, I generally do not attempt to secure honours of this kind; but if I did interfere it was because I had been asked to second the motion, and you, Mr. Speaker—and I am not accusing Mr. Speaker of doing anything he should not have done—inserted the name of my hon. friend sitting to my right. I do not wish, at this stage of the discussion, to offer more than a few remarks on points that may probably not have been touched or noticed during the debate. I consider this a very important question. It is important, not because it is the case of the hon. gentleman who is sitting on the Government benches, and whom we are opposing, but because I consider the laws of this country have not been respected. I wish to discuss this subject without any party feeling, and merely from the standpoint of the existing law.

No man in this Parliament or outside of it will contend that the writer of a letter, the moment he puts it into the post office, has any control over it. We know well that it is the recipient of the letter who has all to do with it the moment it reaches him through the mail. If that were not so, what would be the use of Parliament pass-

Mr. FLINT.

ing stringent laws for the protection of letters in transit through the post office. The hon. the Speaker of the House has admitted that a letter was placed upon his desk, and he says in effect: in looking over my correspondence at the time when I generally open my letters, the hon. member for Richelieu came into my office and stated that he had written a letter which he wanted back. We have now before the House the declaration of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) that that very letter contained the resignation of the hon. gentleman from Richelieu, duly signed before two members of this House. Sir, let me draw your attention to this point. Acting in your capacity as Speaker of the House of Commons, acting in your capacity as the first commoner in the land, a letter addressed to the Speaker of this House is no longer his private property but becomes the property of the House of Commons and of the people of Canada. Let us suppose a case. Take the case of the Postmaster General of this country, a position occupied by an hon. gentleman who is absent from his seat to-night, and a position which I had the honour to occupy; and supposing a letter were addressed to the Postmaster General containing tenders for mail service; will you tell me, Mr. Speaker, that the Postmaster would not be liable to an action in damages if he returned a letter containing the lowest tender to the writer of that letter who asked him for it? Would he not be liable to an action for damages if he did not open that letter? I contend, Sir, that in his official capacity the Postmaster General had no right and no power not to open that letter, and I believe that the case is exactly the same under the present circumstances. If the Speaker of this House had opened that letter and taken communication of it, he could not have returned it to the hon. member (Mr. Bruneau), and does this Parliament think that the constituents of Richelieu can still recognize the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bruneau) as representing their views and their ideas, when he committed the formal act of calling two of his colleagues to witness his resignation and sending it to the Speaker. Will not the people of Richelieu and the people of the country believe, that all the circumstances should be sifted that led up to the tendering of this resignation. I claim that that letter was not addressed to the Speaker in his personal capacity, but was addressed to him as the presiding officer of this House, as the first commoner in the land, as the representative of this Parliament and as the guardian of our parliamentary usages. Under those circumstances, I hold that it was impossible for the Speaker to have returned that letter. You, Mr. Speaker, are responsible to Parliament, and it was to Parliament that you should have returned the letter, or made its contents known. The law of the land says that you, Mr. Speaker, should have taken this course.

Now, Sir, what is going to be the result of the refusal of the right hon. the leader of the Government to refer this matter to the proper committee. What is going to prevent any man in Canada who stands up for the rights of our parliamentary institutions, taking out an action against the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) and claiming the severe damages which are inflicted upon a gentleman who sits in Parliament and is not a properly qualified member. Sir, everything that the right hon. gentleman wishes not to be disclosed before a parliamentary committee will be disclosed before a court of justice. You, Mr. Speaker, can be called as a witness before a court of justice—you have been so-called once before—and Mr. Speaker, the two hon. gentlemen who witnessed the resignation of the hon. member for Richelieu will be brought up as witnesses. The points that a committee could investigate will be investigated before a court of justice in Canada, and what shall be gained except the knowledge that parliamentary institutions have been violated. I would advise the right hon. the leader of the House—I am very much afraid he will not accept my advice though—to let this matter go before a parliamentary committee rather than leave it to be argued before a court of justice. Sir, under the law which regulates the transmission of letters through the post office, that letter was no longer within the jurisdiction of Mr. Speaker to return to the hon. member for Richelieu, who after getting two of his confreres to witness his resignation came to the Speaker and said: I made a mistake, and I am sorry for that mistake, and I want you to return the letter which I have written in a moment of haste. I do not at all accuse the Speaker of anything more than the fact that that letter was addressed to him as Speaker of the House of Commons. At that point I stand, and I say that unless we stand at that point it will be almost impossible ever to control the relations which exist between the Speaker of the House, not personally, but as representing the Commons, and the members who have dealings with him.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to add to what has been said that I think this is a question which might properly be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I listened attentively to the speech of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), and it seemed to me to be directed largely to an exoneration of your own conduct, Sir. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we should emphasize the fact that nothing in this motion has the effect of calling your conduct in question in the slightest degree. But if we adopt the suggestion of the right hon. Prime Minister, it seems to me that we consecrate the principle that a member of this House desiring to place his resignation on record is dependent to a certain extent on the

action which the Speaker himself may take upon that resignation—that the power to resign depends upon your action, Mr. Speaker; and I do not think that is at all the intention of the law. Again, if we adopt the suggestion of the right hon. Prime Minister, we consecrate the principle that a member having fulfilled all the requirements of the statute, has still the power to withdraw, unless you, Sir, have yourself taken some action upon his resignation; and I think that is a very false and a very dangerous principle for us to consecrate. Furthermore, it seems to me, we are consecrating the principle, and a very dangerous one, I submit, it is, that a member may put into operation the machinery indicated by the statute, in order to bring to bear upon the Government pressure for the satisfaction of his own personal desires. There is no doubt, Sir, that a case is very easily supposable of a member sending in his resignation in the same manner in which it was done in this case to you, Mr. Speaker, then letting it be known that he has taken that very important step, and then proceeding to exercise a pressure upon the Government in order to obtain that which may be unfair; thus placing the Government in the position of being obliged to meet the desires of an hon. member when under ordinary circumstances they would not do so; and, Sir, that is what to a very considerable extent, according to general rumour, has occurred in this instance. It was known throughout the House here on the evening on which the hon. member sent in his resignation, that he had done so; and the next day it was known, and was stated in the press all over the country, that he had done so, not because he desired to withdraw on account of ill-health or some similar motive, but because he was dissatisfied with the Government, because there were questions on which he did not agree with the Government, because the Government had failed to satisfy some of his legitimate desires. Well, Sir, it seems to me that if we pass over this circumstance, we are consecrating a very dangerous principle indeed—a principle which seems to me not only to have been provided against by the very terms of the statute, but to be against the very fundamental principles of free parliamentary government. There is a saying in my province that lawyers invariably disagree because they are always reading out of different kinds of books; but in this instance, we have the spectacle of lawyers disagreeing when reading out of the same book; and the laws contained in that book seem to me to be very clear. They seem to me to place the power of resigning entirely in the hands of the member himself without any co-operation of any kind on the part of the Speaker. I do not wish to go over the legal arguments which have already been made; but what seems to me to be required of a member desiring to re-

sign is that he should put his resignation in writing, that he should give it authenticity by having it witnessed by two members, and that he should cause it to be delivered to the Speaker. I cannot say that I agree with the argument that it is necessary for the Speaker to take even the slight action, on the delivery of the document, of taking some cognizance of it, because that would require his co-operation; and it seems to me that the law has been in contemplation that a member should have the power to resign without any action whatever on the part of the Speaker. There is no doubt whatever that that delivery has taken place, and these things having occurred, what does the statute say? It says:

The member so tendering his resignation shall be held to have vacated his seat, and shall cease to be a member of this House.

Under these circumstances, it seems to me that it is competent for an hon. member who has caused his resignation to be made in the proper form and to be delivered to the Speaker, to accept at once, without any action on the part of the Speaker, any situation incompatible with his holding a seat in this House—for instance, to enter into a contract with the Government, which he would be forbidden to do as a member of this House; and, as has been already pointed out, if the Speaker mislays a document or if that document is not taken into communication by him at once, it makes no difference whatever; the seat becomes vacant by its very delivery. The subject, at any rate, it seems to me, from what has been said in this debate, is one that may fairly be discussed, and I think it is a subject on which we should have a report from the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I would have refrained from even expressing these views had it not been that my hon. friend the member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) has been made an object of very unfair attack in respect to the action he has thought fit to take in this matter. It was stated in the organ of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) that that hon. gentleman had acted in this matter not of his own free will, but under the absolute control of a set of members alleged to be on this side of the House—and their names are given in this article—whose main object in life is the humiliation of the French-Canadian race; and remarks of a most insulting character, and most untrue, ridiculous and grotesque, are addressed to the hon. member.

Well, Sir, we who sit on this side as well as members on the other side have duties to perform. We act, and we speak in the fierce light of publicity, and must be prepared to accept a certain amount of criticism and even at times to be charged with being animated with party motives. But when it comes to an accusation of this gravity, when it comes to charging an hon. member with the low design of betraying

Mr. MONK.

his own nationality in a matter of this kind. I think we are really entitled to the protection of this House. At any rate that is my excuse for rising, namely, that I think the position taken by the hon. member for Champlain, as to whose patriotism nobody has any doubt whatever, is a fair and logical position, and one that commends itself to the attention of this House and country.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the questions we are bound to approach in rather a judicial than in a partisan spirit; and it seems to me that a good deal of what has been said on the other side has not been addressed to us in a judicial spirit at all or with the view of throwing light on the real question. In fact, there was an alarming vista disclosed to us of the hideous things which this committee would bring to light if this question were referred to it. For my part I would be very much more inclined to refer this matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, if the question were simply whether an hon. member had actually tendered his resignation and was or was not a member of the House, than I would be if this reference were to be the means of bringing to light all the secrets of the Liberal party which these hon. gentlemen tells us are so hideous and so revolting. And what would make me still more disinclined for a reference to the committee would be the misgiving that inquiries of that sort, set on foot for that particular purpose, are very apt to prove boomerangs and reveal instead the inner history of the machinations of the Liberal-Conservative party, as illustrated by the committee of inquiry now being held and concerning which our hon. friends opposite are not so keen as they were some time ago.

But speaking seriously, it seems to me that the preliminary question we have to consider is whether there are any facts which could be brought out by this committee that we do not know already—whether there is any essential question of fact as to which this House is in the dark, and to which it is necessary this House should have an answer before it can come to a conclusion. It seems to me that the matters of fact have been exhaustively stated in the recital of the resolution before the House and the statement made by the Speaker the other day. If that statement imports verity, and I think it should to this House—I for one should be sorry, indeed, by any vote or course of mine, to suggest that any statement, deliberately and seriously made by his honour the Speaker, presiding over this House, can import anything but absolute veracity—if we are justified in accepting the statement of the Speaker as declaring the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and in assuming that he was not committing any *supressio veri*, there is no fact necessary to be ascertained by us in order to enable us to come to a conclusion on the question before us.

That being the case, what is it that is asked for? If I understand the suggestions from the other side, this committee is asked for the very ungracious purpose of cross-examining the Speaker on the statement he has submitted. I for one am not prepared, by any vote I may give in this House, to suggest for a moment to the people of this Dominion that the Speaker is capable of making any statement which can be improved by cross-examination. The facts being admitted, the only questions remaining are legal ones which no committee can assist us in discussing. We have the same opportunity of ascertaining the law and applying it to questions of fact as any committee can possibly have. And as far as the question of law at issue is concerned, although I cannot say it is such an absolutely simple matter as one would like a matter of this sort to be, I am prepared, giving it the calmest judgment I can, to vote that there was not a complete resignation of the member for Richelieu, even admitting that he was willing and desirous, at one stage, of expressing his intention of resigning his seat in this House. The fair way to test that question is this. Let us suppose that this statute, instead of saying that a member could resign his seat by delivering a written declaration, signed by two witnesses, to his honour the Speaker, provided that a member of this House could resign his seat by going personally to the chambers of the Speaker and declaring to the Speaker his intention to resign. Suppose then that the member had gone to his honour the Speaker, and had declared to him his intention and desire to resign, and suppose that his honour had been unable to hear the declaration and had not heard it, but had known that some declaration was made, and had asked the hon. member to repeat it. And suppose that before the hon. member had the opportunity of repeating it, he had been taken kindly by the arm by one of his friends and persuaded not to do so but to revoke it as far as he was able; and suppose that, under such circumstance, instead of repeating the declaration he had made, he had told the Speaker that although he had come there with the intention of resigning his seat, circumstances had arisen which made him change his mind, and that he had no longer such intention. Could any one say that the seat was resigned, under the imaginary conditions I am putting and the law I have stated hypothetically as bearing on the question. No one would suggest for a moment that under such circumstances the resignation was complete. If that be correct, what more is a written declaration that the conveyance to a party of the substance of a verbal declaration. What is a written declaration? "It is," as has been well expressed by a distinguished writer on jurisprudence, "nothing but the dumb agent by which a verbal declaration

is conveyed." This matter is not a new matter. It has perhaps being argued over in the courts almost more than any other subject of equal apparent simplicity. It is a matter which came before a very distinguished French tribunal in the old country, and I take from a very authoritative work on the subject of communications by letter, these words:

Bartolus, whom all authors have copied in this regard, has established upon law 4 'de donationibus,' a principle which puts this in the clearest light. A letter says he is for the absent to whom it is written what words are addressed to a person present, and he who sends a letter to another is considered as speaking to him as if he was present.

Then he quotes some Latin, which I will not stop to read, because I am afraid I might be asked to translate it. He proceeds:

Now it is certain that words addressed to a person present can only bind him who uttered them, so far as the person to whom they were addressed heard them before they were retracted. It is, therefore, the same of a letter written to an absent person. This letter, therefore, can only oblige its author so far as the absent person to whom it is written receives and reads it, things being still entire.

This is the necessary consequence of the very definition which the demandant gives of a letter missive. A letter missive is only a series of words fixed upon paper; but these words are addressed to an absent person. It is necessary, therefore, in order that they should have their effect, that the absent person to whom they are addressed should understand them. They are, therefore, without effect, so far as he to whom they were addressed has not understood them, as they would be without effect if being addressed to a person present that person was from a physical cause not in a condition to understand them. Now, how can an absent person understand the words that are addressed to him? Certainly he can only understand them by reading the letter which contains them.

Well, now, the logic, the moral, the common sense of that is, that until these words communicated through the post office, or by special messenger, reach the party to whom they are addressed—not merely until the physical material upon which they are written, had been received, but until the sense or import of the words has reached the mind—there has been no effective communication. Therefore, the person who makes such a communication is in exactly the same position, in point of common sense, as if he, being present and attempting to make the verbal communication, had not succeeded in doing so, and, before he had succeeded in doing, had retracted the message he had intended and endeavoured to deliver. I think that is a fair and reasonable statement and the essence of this whole case.

But then the suggestion is made: Surely, you are not going to leave the member dependent upon the contingency of whether the Speaker will or will not read the letters addressed to him. No, I am not. I think we may be materially assisted at this point by

the law on an analogous case. Of course, it is impossible to state any theory upon this subject to which persons—I will not designate the character of such persons—may not raise objections, or concerning which they may not ask foolish questions. The question is: What if the Speaker refuses to read the letter? Can he thus prevent an effective communication? I think we shall be materially assisted by considering the well-known principles of English law with reference to offers and acceptances. It seems to me, that a person who tenders his resignation is much in the position of a person who undertakes to accept, through the mail, an offer that has been made to him. If my hon. friend on the other side, who knows all about horses, makes an offer to sell me a horse, and I post a letter accepting that offer, it is good English law—though I am told by those who know, that it is not good French law—that the moment I put my letter in the post office accepting the offer that has been made through the post office, that moment I have a complete contract to which I can hold the other party who has made the offer. That is, of course, supposing he had not withdrawn the offer in the meantime and before my offer was posted. I may have received his letter making the offer and may have decided to accept it, but, if I do not signify that acceptance, my having made up my mind on the subject is not sufficient. It seems to me, that a person in such a case as the present delivering his resignation, is in the same position as a person accepting an offer. One has a legal right to accept the offer, the other has a legal right to tender his resignation. I cannot see that they are not in practically the same position. One is a right which is given by statute, and the other is a right given by the offer of the party and the law of the land applicable to it. Having posted my letter of acceptance of the offer, the other party is bound. I believe it has been decided in the English courts of law, that, even if he never receives it, even if the letter altogether goes astray, the contract is still complete as against the other party.

But does that say that the person who sends a letter of acceptance cannot retract it, if he succeeds in getting retraction to the other party before he knows about the acceptance, and before communication of it has been perfectly made? Surely, it would not be good common sense to say otherwise. I know that some writers have said otherwise. I know that when Mr. Benjamin was dying of heart trouble, somewhere in the old country, some foolish editors did strive to show that that was the law; but no one thinks that that is the law to-day. Why cannot we accept this analogy, which seems to be a perfect one, and regard the resignation as binding upon the Speaker, upon the House and the country, that when the party who tenders his resignation tenders it in the way provided in the statute, he

Mr. RUSSELL.

can insist upon it as his right and that his right to resign in this way is not dependent on the mere judgment or discretion, or mere dilatoriness of the Speaker. But, at the same time, if he changes his mind and chooses to retract, why is he not in a position exactly analogous to that of a person who accepts an offer made to him?

Now, it seems to me, further, that hon. gentlemen opposite have been confusing two distinct matters. The hon. members opposite have confused two different questions in this discussion. We are not concerned with the question who has the property in this letter. The property of that letter may have been the property of the Speaker or of this House, or it may be the property of this country, but it makes not the slightest difference whose property it is. We are not discussing the right of property at all, but we are asking: What is the effect of this attempted tender of resignation, of this attempt to make a communication which in point of fact never was made. That I submit is an entirely different question from any question relating to property which I suppose is settled, although I do not know that it is absolutely settled by the Post Office Act which, for certain purposes at all events makes a letter which is once mailed the property of the person to whom it is addressed. I will give the House authority for making a distinction of that sort, although it is a matter which is so obvious that it should not call for any authority. The same writer, to whom I have already referred, says:

Grant that you are the owner of the material of my letter from the moment when I committed it either to your carrier or to a public carrier who is the carrier of everybody, at the proper hour. That does not deprive my letter of the character of a dumb agent; it does not consequently prevent me from recalling it before you have received it.

He was only discussing the question of a case where it was not received. Had it been received and not read, the result would be the same as shown in another part of the judgment which I have already quoted.

Now, the other portions of that statute were so acutely commented upon that I do not feel disposed to make any further comment. "The member so tendering his resignation should be held to have vacated his seat." Reading these words literally you can make an apparently strong superficial argument like the argument in favour of the case put forward from the other side. But the moment you apply legal principles and the principles of jurisprudence to the interpretation of that statute the contention of the other side dissolves into thin air. Suppose the hon. gentleman who it is said tendered his resignation had in the same way tendered his quarter's rent, that it had gone sealed up in an envelope,—suppose he had sent that to the Speaker sealed up in an envelope, but before the Speaker had taken

it into his possession, when it was lying on his table, suppose the sender had come to get back his letter, that he had got it and gone away with it, would anybody then say that he had tendered his rent, and that he was no longer indebted for the rent he had been owing? That is the kind of analogy by which great jurists like Lord Bramwell answered just such a question as we are wrestling with to-night. Now, I think we have also some help from the analogy of English legal cases. I have cited a French case on this question because of the fact that as everybody knows that the English courts have run a little off the track of strict logic and have delivered judgments on this subject which are not philosophical, although I do not admit that they afford any consolation to our friends opposite. I will cite an authority on the question of service through the post office of what is called mesue process. I do not know that it is a controlling authority on this question, but I think it has a close analogy to the kind of question the House is dealing with to-night. There it was decided in one case where a party with whom there had been a previous correspondence, was supposed to have received by mail mesue process addressed to him through the post office, and had been evidently evading the process of the court and was by that act committing contempt of court, that he must be held to have received service of the document so sent. When a similar case came before the court again, the court did not act upon the law that was decided in that case. As a matter of fact they did not adopt the law that was laid down in that case, but they said, when the case I have just mentioned was cited that a service by mail was insufficient, although the defendant was wilfully evading service and proposed to persevere in evading it and when the letter was offered to her by the postmaster refused to receive it.

I do not know any distinction between refusing to receive a letter and receiving it through the post office and immediately handing it back, and I do not think that any rational distinction can be made. I will read only one further authority:

Delivery of process sealed up in a letter, in the absence of the person to whom it is addressed, is no service, but from the time when the letter is opened.

I think the attempted tender of this resignation, sealed up in a letter, delivered to the Speaker, not read by the Speaker, of the purport of which the Speaker did not have knowledge, which was retracted before ever communication of its contents was made to the Speaker, was not an effective resignation of the seat of that hon. member.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it is a little rash for a layman to meddle with this debate, which has belonged mostly to the lawyers. But when some of the lawyers talk such nonsense as some of them have talked on

this, it gives a layman who lays claim to a little common sense, a chance to edge in. There have been several things which have been noteworthy, somewhat peculiar, in the attitude which the Government has assumed on this question. When this debate was put off from last Friday until to-day on the grounds that the Government wished to inform itself by getting an opinion from the law officers of the Crown, and after all the trouble had been taken, as of course we suppose it was taken, to get this opinion of the law officers of the Crown, the House has been looking with a good deal of anxiety to have that opinion given to it, so that it might have the benefit of the legal wisdom and lore possessed by the Government in the person of its law officers as well as of themselves. According to their own argument our minds on this side of the House need informing almost as much as they do on the other side. But not only have we not had any information of what the decision of the law officers of the Crown has been with reference to this question, but we have not had the law officers of the Crown in this House doing us the courtesy of giving us an opinion, and so helping to form our minds upon this largely legal question. Why is it that the only representative of the law department of the Government, who sits in this House and gets his salary from this country, is not here when a debate like this is going on, ready and prepared to give the House the benefit of his search and investigation, and his conclusions with reference to this matter? I do not think it is treating the House right, I do not think the Government is doing itself justice, I am quite sure that the Solicitor General is not at all doing himself and this House the justice which he should do both to himself and to the House. It may be said that the Ajax of the Government side, in point of law, has raised his spear and brandished it in front of the House. He does that often. But it does not have very much effect on this side of the House. His brandishments so far have been only brandishments, and his opinions have not gone far on this side of the water and have not gone very far on the other side of the water. While we have been glad to receive the crumbs that have fallen from the Government table, we should have liked to have had the benefit of the full table of the law officers of the Crown. And why should we not have had it?

Where has the hon. member for Richelieu been all this time? I should like a question of this kind to come up with respect to my own seat when I would not be in my place, doing my duty in the premises. Where is the hon. member for Richelieu? We have had many cases somewhat similar to this in the House affecting the seats of members of Parliament, and this is the first time I have ever known a member's seat attacked and the hon. gentleman to

be outside of the House when he might just as well be inside the Chamber, at a time when his colleagues equally with himself were anxious that his name and his place should be kept, if he has a legal right to keep it, and when the House could have had the benefit of his statement, because he is the prime actor and prime mover and must have known and must know yet something about this question. Then we have not heard from those godfathers of the hon. member for Richelieu, the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Godbout), who sits opposite, and his Gaelic godfather, whom I do not see, but who is very likely present in the House. Did they sign the resignation of the hon. member for Richelieu, or did they not? They have not denied it, and I do not think they will deny it. But the point I wish to make is this: why is it that in a case of this kind, when an hon. member's seat is attacked, we have neither his facial presence nor his word of mouth, nor any sign or any intimation from him as to the facts of the case. There is another thing which is peculiar about this case. Can any one give any good reason why the Government should be averse to letting this matter, which even so partisan a partisan as the hon. member who has just taken his seat, lawyer though he be, has declared is not entirely void of doubt, go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which is the highest and most non-partisan committee we have struck from the members of the House, and whose judgment will be taken as a fair indication of the legal rights in the case. What has the Government to lose from allowing this matter to be discussed before the Committee on Privileges and Elections? If it had been reported that the seat of the hon. member for Richelieu was rightly held, that he properly occupied the seat, that would have been a triumph for the Government and a discomfiture for their opponents. If he had not the right to his seat, had the right hon. gentleman so far fallen from those high ideals he held up at the time he was leading Her Majesty's Opposition, that he wished to keep a man as a member who is not a member of this House. One of the two positions is correct. Either we are wrong and the seat is all right—that would have to be decided by the committee; or we are right and the member is wrong, and the hon. member for Richelieu has no right to his seat; in which case we would all be glad that justice was done, even though it came to a friend of our own.

There is another thing somewhat peculiar, and it is this. There is an attempt made to discredit the effort of my hon. friend who made this motion and the hon. member who seconded it, on two grounds, both of them unworthy, and equally unworthy, in my opinion. One is to turn the point of the attack by accusing hon.

Mr. FOSTER.

members on this side of doubting the word of Mr. Speaker, or wishing to get Mr. Speaker in the witness-box so that we could cross-examine him. It is an unworthy attempt, and it is the reason, I believe, which is mainly responsible for the fact that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) stated when he rose to speak that at first he did not think he would have much objection to this case going to the committee, but when he began to think of the evil deeds with which the Government might be charged, he changed his ground; his broad judicial intellect warped like a pea on a hot griddle, for he thought it might cause a state of things that would be detrimental to the party, and so he was prepared to vote against the reference and depart from the path of right, the road of justice in this matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the hon. member really think he is presenting what I said, or anything like it?

Mr. FOSTER. I well know the hon. gentleman's speech was a revised one, and I taxed my mental concentration to get the kernel of it, but I find it very difficult to do so, and I am giving just a running comment on what I understood the hon. gentleman to intimate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I noticed the hon. gentleman was suffering.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman must rest in peace until he gets another opportunity. So far as I am concerned, I am bound to admit, and I do it cheerfully, that you, Mr. Speaker, stated nothing which you did not believe to be the truth in your statement made before the House the other day. I do not understand that any hon. member on this side of the House says anything differently; but I have just as good a right to analyse the statement of Mr. Speaker as I have the statement of any hon. member; we are all representatives of the people, and with all deference due to the high and official position, we must stand on the common ground of criticism. But if that was an unworthy motive, what can be said of that one which emanated from the hon. Minister of Public Works, who issues that paper, that costly, that precious paper—which he inherits from whom we know not—but for whom we know—who issues that paper to throw obliquely if possible, on the hon. member who made the motion, by trying to make it appear that it was an attack on a French member, forsooth. What is a French member, an Irish member, or an English member? They stand here because of certain rights under the law; and if they do not possess those rights, it makes no difference whether they are English, Scotch, Irish or French, their position should be inquired into and the rights of the case ought to be arrived at. I am not a lawyer,

but I can consider what this matter means according to common sense.

What was the object Parliament had in view when it enacted that law? The object was evidently to give a means by which a member might hand in his resignation and cease to be a member. This under discussion is one of the ways by which he could do so; write his resignation, have it properly attested and deliver it or send it to Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that that is one action and is in itself complete. But the whole action is not complete until the constituency is placed in the position where it can replace the member who has resigned. What is the machinery by which that can be carried out? Under the law the machinery is Mr. Speaker. The member himself is competent to hand in his resignation without any co-operation of Mr. Speaker, and he does so. The Speaker himself, however, is the only machinery by which it is possible for the constituency to obtain the power to fill the vacancy and place a member in the position of the member who went out. Is it not a matter of plain common sense that what was intended was this, that when the hon. member for Richelieu wanted to resign he should be able to resign without any complication or embarrassment from his own side of the House, or from the leader. And so his resignation was complete the moment he had written his intention, had it witnessed as the law declared it should be witnessed, and sent it on its way to the Speaker; he had nothing more to do, and his seat became vacant when that was done. But before the constituency could be apprised of that, or given an opportunity to replace this man who went out, Mr. Speaker has to take cognizance of that, to issue his warrant and to make it possible for the election to be held. It seems to me, that each action is complete in itself, and that each action is entirely independent of the other, in so far as affecting each particular part of the act which is to be completed. Now, Sir, if that be true, let us ask what the converse would be, and if the hon. member for Richelieu could not resign until he has had a consultation with the Speaker. Why, that would not be admitted for a single moment. The Speaker and he had nothing in common, the Speaker and he are to have no co-operation, the Speaker and he are distinct, as they ought to be for the sake of the independence of Parliament; and, when the member resigning does his part, it is for the Speaker to do his part, and allow the constituency to send back their man. I am not a lawyer, but that is the common-sense view I take, and I believe that is the view that the country will take.

My hon. friend (Mr. Russell) who made that astonishing argument from a legal point of view, went on to say, that a letter was nothing more nor less than a person

speaking to a friend in dumb language, so to say. Well, we knew that; I suppose the most of us knew that some time ago. I sit down and write a letter; I imagine my friend before me—or my enemy before me, it may be—and I just allow my thoughts to run through the point of the pen. There is this difference, Sir, between the tongue and the pen, that, when the pen has taken my thoughts and carried them away from me, they are set and fixed, and they cannot be unset and unfixed; the tongue, as it speaks, with a face before it, may make as many turns as it pleases, and may change the thoughts that may be expressed, as it pleases. But, Sir, it was never apprehended by the law, that a member who wished to resign had to go and talk to the Speaker, where he would have a chance to canvas things, and talk things over, and think things over; but the machinery was laid down by the law that he should write his resignation, and write the thought he had then—whatever thought he might have five minutes afterwards. Suppose we examine the case in the light of the contention of my hon. friend (Mr. Russell). Suppose the member penned that letter, and the moment it came to Mr. Speaker's hands, was just a verbal communication put through the dumb language of a letter, but the interpretation that that pen gave when the thought was in the mind of the member for Richelieu was the idea that was carried to the Speaker's mind; and, by the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite, if the Speaker had just happened to have opened that letter and to have read the contents, even though only one minute after it was penned, then, if the member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) came into the Speaker's office, he could not possibly undo the thing which he had done. The expression of opinion at the time is what carries in the letter, and the expression of the resignation given at the moment, duly attested, remains fixed, and after it was despatched to the Speaker there was no possibility of it being recalled.

Now, Sir, I take another point. It was not simply J. D. Edgar who was acting in his office that morning, when these letters were there and were being turned over. It was the Speaker of the House of Commons who was there, and I say that, if the Speaker of the House of Commons had, knowing that that was a letter bearing the resignation of the hon. member for Richelieu, had given it back to him five thousand times without having read it, and without having had any communication of it to his mind, that would not alter the case one iota, and the plight of the member for Richelieu would be no better than if the Speaker had issued his warrant. His (Mr. Bruneau's) case would not be a bit better, I say, because it is laid down in the law that a certain process makes the resignation complete, and the other process, which is carried on by

the Speaker, is what makes it effective so far as the constituency is concerned. The Speaker was not acting personally; his party views had no business to come in, as he declares they did not come in, and as I believe they did not come in. Had Mr. Speaker loved the member for Richelieu ever so much; had he been his own brother; had he loved his party ever so much more than a brother—his personal views and party predilections were all to be placed under foot: Mr. Speaker was then the trustee for Richelieu county and for the people of this country. And, as the trustee for that county and for the people of Canada, that resignation, once conveyed to Mr. Speaker's possession, robbed the member for Richelieu of any chance of ever getting it legally back, and should have made the Speaker, as I believe—and it is only my opinion—at this date, yes, even at this hour, it should have made him to think and to say: If I can find out that that letter which Mr. Bruneau took away from me, was his resignation, and that it was laid on my desk in my office, his resignation is complete. And so I believe it is, Mr. Speaker. It would be well, therefore, for the committee to take this matter up and to examine it, for there are several things that are not well known. Now, the weakest part of the case stated by my right hon. friend, and by his Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is this evident attempt to say that such a thing is so which is not so, on the face of it. They declared that they would not accept this motion. Why? Because the principal allegation of fact has been set at rest by the Speaker's own assertion. Will hon. gentlemen pause a moment while I read this declaration upon which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcotte) bases his motion? First:

François Arthur Marcotte, member of the House of Commons for the county of Champlain, having stated in his place that he was credibly informed and believed he could establish that Arthur Aimé Bruneau, Esquire, then member for the electoral district of Richelieu in this House, did during the present session of Parliament declare, according to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, his intention to resign his seat.

That is his first statement, and what does he say in it? He says, he believes he could establish that Arthur Aimé Bruneau had handed in his resignation. My right hon. friend the leader of the House refuses to give him a chance to establish that. The hon. member (Mr. Marcotte) says, he is credibly informed that the hon. gentleman from Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) has placed his resignation in the Speaker's hands, and that he could establish it. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), with that sense of justice which may be apparent to him, but is not to us, on this side of the House, and will not be, I think, to the people of the country, refuses to give him (Mr. Marcotte)

Mr. FOSTER.

a chance to make that allegation good. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcotte) further says:

That Joseph Godbout, Esquire, the member for the electoral district of Beauce, and John McMillan, Esquire, the member for the electoral district of the South Riding of Huron, were witnesses to the said declaration.

That needs no proof; that is generally accepted as being the case. Now, then, this is where Mr. Speaker's declaration comes in, and the Speaker's words are simply surplusage put into this resolution, and the resolution would be just as strong if they were not inserted at all. What are they put in for? Merely to say, that in this declaration of the Speaker a document is mentioned which he believes is the resignation of the member for Richelieu:

That the said declaration is, he believes he can establish, the document referred to in the following statement of His Honour the Speaker of the House of Commons.

That would have been just as strong as it is now if he had said: "That the said declaration is, he believes he can establish, the document referred to in a statement made by His Honour the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed to the House of Commons on March 14, 1898." What follows? That the words of the Speaker are not material to this resolution at all. The only thing affirmed is that the document which the Speaker mentioned to the members of the House of Commons is the document in question, the declaration of the hon. member for Richelieu. What is the next affirmation of the motion? That this declaration was tendered within the meaning of the Act; and then there is the resolution that this statement, including the statement of the Speaker, be sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Now, Sir, I think I have said enough to show that if hon. gentlemen opposite refuse this committee on the ground that that is the principal allegation—in fact, as they have stated, the only allegation—they are taking a very flimsy ground, and ground which will not commend itself to the good sense of this House or of the country. But let us go further. It is said that the Speaker declared that no resignation was in his hands from the member for Richelieu, so far as he knew. The Speaker said:

If I had received his resignation, I would have issued my warrant for a new election before now.

Granted that that is true; the whole point is as to what the Speaker would mean by the reception of a resignation from a member of this House. The Speaker may have taken the same view that hon. gentlemen on that side have taken, that he could not be said to have received a resignation until it had been communicated to his mind through his eyes from the writing on the paper on which it was placed. Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken that ground.

The Speaker himself might have taken that ground. Taking that ground he would be perfectly right in stating that he had not received a resignation in that sense. So that the statement of the Speaker proves nothing against the resignation being in the Speaker's hands until you know what the Speaker's view is of what a proper reception of a member's resignation is. So much with reference to that.

Now, Sir, I am not going to spend more time upon the question. I rose simply to give my own view, and that is a layman's view, of how this matter strikes me. It is a matter in which the whole House is interested. It is not a partisan matter. Nobody believes that it is peculiarly gratifying to a member of this House to rise and attack the seat of another member. It is not, and we on this side of the House would be very glad indeed to know that the hon. member for Richelieu had not sent in any resignation, and that consequently he now held his seat rightly and properly under the law of the land. But this is a duty which devolves upon a member of the Opposition, because no member on the Government side will ever be found attacking the seat of a brother member supporting the Government. It is the duty of the Opposition to watch these things, and it is the duty of the Opposition to see that these things are kept in proper legal position. Now, we on this side feel that the hon. member for Richelieu, having sent in his resignation, is no longer a member of this House, and we ask for a chance to have that question adjudicated upon by the Privileges and Elections Committee, which is the highest and best legal committee we can get in this House. Why should it not be done? There is no difficulty about the partisan business which my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Russell) spoke about, because hon. gentlemen opposite control the committee, so far as party votes go, if there are any party votes in that committee, by having a majority upon it. There is therefore no liability of any harm coming to their party or to the men concerned, because of the introduction of partisan topics. When a request like this is preferred, when ground like this is taken, when there is a grave doubt, even amongst the best of them on that side of the House, as to whether or not this has been a valid resignation, why is it that we cannot have a chance to settle the point? For it is of great moment that it should be settled. That question has been raised, and from this time out there will be two opinions in this House and throughout the country as to what makes a proper resignation, and it is better for the political life of this country in every respect that that point should be settled, and settled as quickly as possible. It is better for the political life of the country in another sense; for, if it becomes possible for members supporting a Government

to kick and ask for concessions, and when they do not get them to kick again and again, to the length of putting their letter of resignation into the post office directed to the Speaker, and then in forming the leader of the party that if those concessions do not come the letter will be allowed to take its course, with the idea floating in their minds that if the right hon. leader of a Government caves in in time, that letter will be again fished out of the office of the Speaker, I want to know what will be the political life of this country, if that becomes a dominant idea, and if it becomes a fact carried out in practice. Surely it will not be for the better political life of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh and gibe at this position; but there is another tribunal outside, and that is the great electorate, who watch these things, and who will ask two questions. The first question will be, did the member for Richelieu actually resign his seat? That is, did he conceive the idea and carry it out to the point that he thought he had resigned? All the great electorate will have to do will be to ask the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) whether the hon. member for Richelieu thought he had resigned or not. All they will have to do will be to ask that question of the hon. gentlemen who were his sponsors, and who knew and witnessed the resignation. All they will have to do will be to ask the question, and there is not a man on that side of the House or on any side of the House, but will say: "Mr. Bruneau did hand in his resignation, and came to the conclusion that he was no longer a member of this House." Common sense people outside, knowing that to be one view, will say, what right has he, then, to re-elect himself without going to his constituency? Is the machinery in Parliament between Speaker and members so loose that a man can get into a pet and resign, and boast about the corridors that he has resigned, and then fish out his resignation, take it back, and re-elect himself?

The common-sense people of this country will answer that question in a simple way. They will say: Yes, the fact is undoubted that the hon. member for Richelieu resigned and is no longer a member of this House. Then the question will be asked as to what kind of hocus pocus it is by which a member can re-elect himself—by which he can resign twenty times in a season, if he pleases, and twenty times plump himself right back into his seat again? And when the people get these two questions in their minds and can answer them, the personnel, the dignity and the honour of a representative institution like this is not helped, but is most liable to be greatly injured by the result which will take place. Hon. gentlemen have a duty to perform to the hon. member for Richelieu. The hon. member for Richelieu will, I suppose, come and sit in this House; but if he does, with the

doubt over his power to sit here that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) has placed upon it to-night, he will sit here with the fear and the consciousness that he may be all the time rendering himself liable to the penalties which come upon a man for sitting unauthorized in this House. And if in the after event, it should happen that by process of law the penalties be exacted from the hon. member for Richelieu, what would be the responsibility of my right hon. friend and the party behind him? Is it not far better on all counts that the matter should be sifted by the Privileges and Elections Committee, so that if Mr. Bruneau is reported as being safe in his seat by that committee, then the House will have its answer and the country its answer from a high, dignified source. Otherwise you will have doubt and suspicion, and what is worse a feeling that things are not what they ought to be in the Parliament of Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The question before the Chair turns so largely upon the construction of a statute, it is very natural that the gentlemen of the legal profession should give it particular attention, and perhaps there is good reason why lay members should refrain from saying very much about it. But when my hon. friend who has just preceded me (Mr. Foster) arose and expressed the desire to get away from the legal aspect of the question and approach it from the standpoint of common sense, I fully sympathized with him, although I regret to say that my view of the common-sense question does not exactly harmonize with his. I do think that on a question like this we may well ask: What will the great electorate think of it? And while it may be answered that in matters of this kind we are usually guided by parliamentary rule and precedent and statute, after all the great electorate are in the habit of getting away from these things and taking a broader view, which possibly may not always rest on statutory law or precedent; and in this case, seeing the wide divergence of opinion among legal gentlemen, the great electorate may be pardoned if they apply a little common sense to the question. My hon. friend who preceded me said he desired only to discuss the common-sense aspect of the matter, but proceeded nevertheless to discuss at some length its legal aspect. I do not desire to follow him in that line, because I am sure every point he made has already been dealt with, but let us simply take the facts of the case as they will present themselves to the great electorate—not merely the facts as developed before the House but the broadest view of the so-called facts set forth in the columns of newspapers which were read here to-day. Taking the facts as they are alleged—I do not state anything of my own knowledge but from what I have learned during this debate—we find that an hon. member of this House, being somewhat dissatisfied, makes

Mr. FOSTER.

up his mind to resign. He acts hastily, in a moment of excitement—I had almost said in a moment of weakness, but that would hardly suit the position. On the following morning he makes up his mind that he acted hastily and desires not to act on the intention of the preceding night. Surely that hon. member has the right to ask himself the question whether he has given effect to the intention that was in his mind last night, but is not in it any longer this morning. He is aware that by doing certain things that intention may be carried out beyond his reach; but that if not, it is within his power to retract or withdraw. If that be not so, then gentlemen will contend that if I were to sit down in my room and pen my resignation and lay it on the table, the mere penning of it and the witnessing of it by two witnesses, would constitute a resignation by me of my seat, even if I tore it up immediately. No such preposterous contention will commend itself to the common sense of the great electorate. They would never conclude that the intention was carried out.

Mr. SPROULE. But it reached the Speaker.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman will find no authority for saying that it is enough if the envelope reached the Speaker. It seems to me that the Speaker must receive the resignation not merely into his hands but into his mind. He must have such a knowledge of it as would enable him to do something based on that knowledge, as would enable him to make a record of it—such a record as the Speaker would require when the intention of a member sitting in the House was so stated that it might be recorded by the Clerk of the House—and in the absence of any intention so expressed as to reach the Speaker's mind and enable him to make record of it, or base some action on it, there can be no complete resignation. I do not wish to be drawn into a discussion of the legal aspect of the case, but to confine myself to what my hon. friend referred to as the common-sense view of the great electorate. I am disposed to go a little further than my hon. friends behind me on that point. It has been held that if the member had mailed that letter to the Speaker and if the Speaker had some reason to suspect what it contained, he would have done a great wrong in allowing the member to withdraw it. I am not prepared to adopt that view. I am not prepared to adopt the view that the Speaker in this House, in dealing with his brother members, should strain the law against them. If the case were one in which there is doubt, the Speaker has no right to put a forced construction upon the law for the purpose of turning out a member of Parliament. If there is a precedent, it is his duty to follow it, but there is none in this case. If the statute law is clear, it

is equally his duty to apply it, but the statute law is not clear in this matter, as is evident by the debate. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not even agreed among themselves, and their contentions have been denied by hon. gentlemen on this side. Even though the Speaker had received the resignation, that is not enough. He must have the knowledge of it and not the knowledge that he might get it second-hand. Not the knowledge that might be conveyed to him by a third party, or that he might have picked by rumour, but only the knowledge that could be conveyed to him by the reading of the paper itself.

In the absence of a knowledge of the law by the great electorate—and I am sorry to say that the absence of knowledge is likely to continue, in view of the great difference of opinion we have had expressed on this question—I think the question which would present itself to the great electorate, would be: What would happen between private gentlemen in a case of this kind? We have been told that once a letter is posted, it goes beyond the control of the writer and becomes the property of the person to whom it is directed. We admit that it has passed beyond the control of the writer, and I grant you the writer could not go to the post office and get the letter, but that is not the case here. It has passed through the post office, it has passed beyond the control of the post office, and is in the hands of the person to whom it is addressed, but who has not yet taken communication of it. I submit that he has an undoubted right to give back the letter, if he wishes, to the person who wrote it. Therefore the right that does not exist between the person who wrote the letter and the officer of the postal department, may exist as between the person who wrote the letter and the person to whom it is addressed, but who has not received it in the legal sense of the word. Now, if I should have a difference with my hon. friend from York and should tonight write him a letter which, in the morning, I regretted, I should call upon my hon. friend in the morning and say: I wrote a letter to you last night, have you received it? No. Have you read your morning letters? No. I was wrong in writing the letter I did, and would rather have it back. I think that, in all probability, he would give me back the letter. I believe he would think that if there was anything in the letter that I did not, upon reflection, wish him to read, he would think it best to give me back the letter unopened.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) say that that would be a parallel case to a letter given to the Speaker of the House of Commons?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) dealt with that phase of the question and advanced the view that every letter

addressed to the Speaker belongs to this House. We have no evidence at present to show whether that letter was addressed to the Hon. J. D. Edgar personally, or to the Speaker of the House of Commons officially.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is what we want a committee to find out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But in either case it would make no difference in my view. I am answering the point as it is raised. No doubt, Mr. Speaker receives a great many letters, but with every desire to defer to the wish of the House, I think he would hesitate to accept the rule that every letter that reaches him with his name on the back is the property of the House of Commons. He could not discover until he had opened it and found out whether it related to a private transaction or to a matter coming before him in his official capacity. And so, the whole thing turns upon the opening of the letter and the knowledge of its contents. Therefore the contention that the letter belongs of necessity to the House of Commons is one that I think will not bear examination. Going back to the point, and the only point that I desire to make, it seems to me that, where there are no precedents, as seems to be the case here, where there is no statute law that is clear and beyond discussion, the electorate will apply the same rules as they would apply between man and man. If a man writes a letter at night and desires to recall it before the person to whom it is addressed receives and takes communication of it, between gentlemen the letter would be returned unopened. That is what has happened in this case. That is common sense, and it ought to be sound law. It is what would take place between two private gentlemen, and in the absence of any clear law or established precedent to the contrary the same rule should apply in this case.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I think it well to dwell for a few moments upon the peculiar grounds of defence adopted by the Government and its supporters. The right hon. the First Minister dealt with this matter, in a way very different from that adopted by the last speaker (Mr. Fielding). The right hon. the First Minister argued that there was no grounds upon which the House might satisfactorily refer this matter to the committee, that there was nothing to settle, there was no question of fact or law that could be profitably referred. That contention has been answered very satisfactorily on this side, notably by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). But it has been most satisfactorily answered from the other side of the House. I am sure that if anything were wanted to remove the last shadow of foundation which the Government might claim as support for their contention, that has been supplied by the hon. Finance Minister. He has given

abundant matter, in the statements he has made—which may be accepted on his own side but cannot be accepted with authority here—upon which the committee might come to a determination. Therefore I say, that from his own side of the House, not only by the Finance Minister, but by the member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) in the course of his arguments, the argument of the First Minister has been completely knocked down and does not need any more attention. But I think some little attention might be paid to the argument of the hon. the First Minister, that in dealing with resignations of its members, the House is entirely limited in its action by the degree to which Mr. Speaker might get a knowledge of the contents or resignation placed in his hands. I maintain that this is a contention which neither this or any other Opposition can for a moment admit. What is the purpose of this strictly defined and limited mode of resignation set forth in our statutes? It is evident that it is to allow a member of this House to divest himself of his position, to relieve himself from the responsibility of being the trustee and representative of a constituency. It puts it absolutely in his power; and it is important, it is absolutely essential to any Opposition that is going to carry on the business of Opposition in this Parliament with a reasonable degree of efficiency that it should not be wholly in the power of the Government to do as they please in regard to resignations that come from their own side, while those from the other side are dealt with strictly on the line of the statutes. Now take this instance. It was well known that the hon. member for Richelieu had resigned the night before the division on the Yukon Bill. This was the common report and it is absolutely incredible that it should not have come to the knowledge of the Government; that the Ministers did not know that the hon. member for Richelieu had vacated his seat and acting on that belief had abstained from voting. Therefore I maintain that in the eyes of the country and of this House the fact that that gentleman could go to the office of Mr. Speaker and secure from him the return of the envelope which, unquestionably, contained his resignation, is a most suspicious circumstance and suggests wrong-doing; at any rate we have a combination of circumstance that the Opposition cannot afford to overlook. Not only for the good of the Opposition themselves, but for the good of Parliament generally the Opposition is bound to insist upon the prevention of such occurrences in the future. How can they prevent them? The only course is to insist upon sending this matter to the proper committee. And for what purpose? Why, to inquire into every circumstances in connection with the matter, to learn how far the Speaker has gone with propriety in this matter. We do not presume to question the word of Mr. Speaker, but we do

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

question his conduct. It is our privilege, it is our right, it is our duty under certain circumstances, to canvass the Speaker's conduct, and under some circumstances even to condemn it. Does any one contend that Mr. Speaker cannot commit an error of judgment in discharge of the duties of his office? And we accuse him of nothing more. And is it in the interest of Parliament, if he has made an error that it should not be condemned?

There is another question of principle. This resignation was written and signed in the presence of witnesses and placed in the hands of the Speaker. There is no doubt that the envelope handed by the Speaker to the member for Richelieu was the precise envelope containing the resignation.

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

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to my argument. Take the statement of Mr. Speaker. By whom were these letters turned over? By whom were they handled in the office of Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker states:

I turned the unopened letters over in his presence, and he pointed to one with his frank upon it.

Mr. Speaker was then in possession of that letter, it was in his hands, not in the hands of the member for Richelieu. Furthermore, it is plain, although not specifically stated by the Speaker, that that was the only letter of the member for Richelieu that was in his mail.

An hon. MEMBER. He does not say that.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). He does not say that, but it is so plainly implied that there is no doubt about it. The Speaker states there was one letter, he does not speak of more, with the superscription and frank of the member for Richelieu upon it, that letter was claimed by the member for Richelieu and was returned to him by the Speaker unopened, and most unquestionably that was the letter which contained the resignation. There can be no question that that was the only letter from the hon. member for Richelieu, the letter about which he was so solicitous that he went to the office of the Speaker and recovered possession of it. Therefore, the whole case is completely made out, and fulfils every condition of the statute. The member for Richelieu had made out his resignation in proper form, and placed it in possession of the Speaker, and the Speaker returned it to him unopened upon the request of the member for Richelieu. Now, from the standpoint of the country, to say nothing of the standpoint of hon. gentlemen opposite, would any reasonable man doubt for a moment that the members of the Government knew that the member for Richelieu had resigned, that his resignation in written form had passed

into the hands of the Speaker, and that when the member for Richelieu went to the Speaker to recover possession of his letter, he did it with the full knowledge of the Government? It is incredible to think for instance, that Mr. Speaker would so far stretch the act that might be required of him by courtesy as to allow a member of this House to recover possession of such an important letter without some indication, no matter from what quarter derived, that it was most important that that letter should be returned to the member for Richelieu? We do not wish to find any fault with Mr. Speaker, as I said, we do not wish to condemn him at all; we simply wish to have this point settled, whether or not, in acting as he did in this matter, he has committed an error of judgment, whether he has done something which a Speaker should not do, either now or at any time in the future. Then, there is another point, the most material of all. This question affects the privileges of this Parliament, and the right of this House to say who shall sit within its walls. Let us assume that by sending this matter before the Committee on Privileges and Elections it can be proved, as I have no doubt it can be proved, conclusively on the evidence of this gentleman who wrote this resignation, and signed it, and who recovered possession of it from the Speaker, that the resignation was made out in every respect complying with the conditions of the statutes, was placed in the possession of Mr. Speaker, and was then recovered from him under these circumstances—I maintain, in that case, that the seat of the member for Richelieu is vacated, and that he can no longer legally sit in this House. That is an important question for the member for Richelieu and for this House; but it is even more important that this question should be settled for the future. It seems to me important that we should settle these two points: Whether the member for Richelieu did comply with all the requirements of the statute, and has consequently vacated his seat; and in the next place, whether the Speaker committed an error of judgment in allowing the member for Richelieu to do what he did. These are two points that it is important should be settled by the committee appointed for that purpose. Now, I will deal for a moment with the contention of the Finance Minister, who argued that this case is parallel with the case of private individuals writing letters to one another and recovering possession of them through common courtesy. I can very well understand that if some one had written me a letter in which he had used some uncomplimentary expression, and if I were in a benevolent mood, as would be very likely to be in the morning, I would rather return him his letter unopened than to come to an open rupture with one who may have been

a friend. But this is entirely different. In this matter the correspondence comes to Mr. Speaker in his official capacity. It is not his property, it is the property of the House of Commons, there can be no question whatever about that. In this matter that gentleman was not dealing with his own private property, but was dealing with the property of this House, as a trustee for this House. Now, if the Finance Minister had advertised for tenders for some matters in connection with the Finance Department, if these tenders had been addressed to his deputy, would the Finance Minister justify his deputy if, after these tenders had been received in his office within a certain fixed time, he had returned a tender to one of the contractors unopened, and without a knowledge of its contents? Would the Finance Minister justify his deputy in such a case? Would he not feel—at any rate, if the deputy were one of those unfortunate men who are on the wrong side of politics—would he not feel very much like dismissing his deputy who had been capable of such conduct? I believe he would be a gone deputy in a very short time. The business of no department could be conducted in that manner with any satisfaction to the country. Now, it strikes me that such fine cobweb spinning as we have had from the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) in connection with this legal question, while it may be agreeable to listen to, because it is ingenious and very pleasant in a way, still I do not think it will help the people of the country to come to a rational conclusion as to the rights or wrongs of the subject. It seems to me that the parallel cases cited by the hon. member are all open to this same objection, that they deal with ordinary transactions between private parties, and not, as in this case, between a citizen on the one hand, and an officer of the House, a trustee representing the Parliament of Canada, on the other hand. There is always that difference; these cases are not on all fours at all. That horse transaction the hon. member for Halifax referred to, could not have occurred in these circumstances. Here the hon. member for Richelieu proposed to sell to Mr. Speaker the horse known as the municipality of Richelieu; he thought he was disposing of what was his own property in that matter, but it is a case in which a third party, the House of Commons has something to say. When these hon. gentlemen argue so strongly that this question is not one that is decided by the technical delivery into the hands of the Speaker of a missive, a dumb agent, as mentioned by the hon. member for Halifax, but by the degree of knowledge which the Speaker gets of the contents of that missive, then I maintain that these gentlemen have advanced arguments in favour of a committee so powerful that they do not require to be sus-

tained from this side of the House. We have here a question that should properly be submitted to a committee, and I believe that I am not going beyond the facts, or the evidence, or the substance of the debate that has taken place, when I say that a case has been made out by these gentlemen who have spoken for the Government to-night why a committee should be struck, and why a full inquiry should be made, and why we should have a decision given on these two points, namely, as to how far the Speaker has acted within his right, or committed an error of judgment in taking the course he did, and how far it can be proven that the letter which passed into the hands of the Speaker and was returned to him, was really the precise missive containing the resignation of the member for Richelieu, and whether in that case the seat of the member for Richelieu is not now vacant. These are two important questions, and upon them this House differs very widely. Both these opinions are supported with great force, and there exists therefore abundant material for controversy, and upon which the committee could come to a decision.

Mr. SPROULE. I should like to say a few words before the vote is taken, because this question is very far reaching in its nature, concerning the important functions of Parliament and rights of members of this House elected by the people. The law, which is directory, is clear enough as to how a member may resign. There are two ways in which he may resign. The first is by making an announcement publicly in the House, and the resignation will be taken notice of by Mr. Speaker, and the fact will be entered in the Votes and Proceedings. The second way is by the member preparing a declaration in writing of his intention to resign, having it signed by two witnesses, and handed to Mr. Speaker. When the resignation is so made, signed and delivered, then I take it, that the member has discharged his full duty to Parliament and the country to relieve himself of the responsibility of sitting longer as a member of this House. The only question that would follow, would be as to the mode of delivery. There may be two modes of delivery: first, by messenger; second, through the mails. There is no question here as to the letter of resignation being delivered by a messenger. If there had been, there would have been an eye-witness, and the facts could have been arrived at by taking evidence under oath. The other method is by delivery through the mails. A letter, to be sent through the mail during the session and by a member of Parliament only requires to be franked by the member, and it appears in this case to have been done, because, Mr. Speaker, says:

I turned the unopened letters over in his presence, and he pointed to one with his frank upon

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

it. I asked him if it was his writing on the address and frank. He assured me it was.

There was evidence that must have proved satisfactory. This letter was sent through the official channel to Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker was then acting in his representative capacity, as discharging the duties of Parliament, and not as a representative of his views and desires. I take it, that there is no question of delivery, because the letter of resignation came through the mails, and because it came through the mails, there was no justification for its return. If Mr. Speaker had been aware that this letter related to his own private affairs, then action would have rested with himself, because the letter would have been his own property; but, as he only received it in the interest of Parliament, and as he was only the medium through which the functions of Parliament could be discharged, then he had no right to exercise a private judgment with respect to it, but he was called upon to discharge the functions of Parliament, as Mr. Speaker, and especially in view of the fact that the communication was sent through the official channel, namely, through the mail. Mr. Speaker said that he did not receive the letter:

I told him to wait, and I would look among my mail, for I had not yet opened my letters.

The Speaker said that he took up his mail. Therefore, his mail was delivered by a person who brought it to his office, this letter was franked by the member, and Mr. Speaker admits that he received it, whatever information it may have contained. The only question is, whether Mr. Speaker knew the contents of the letter or not. I do not attempt to argue that he knew them. Mr. Speaker himself, however, said:

He told me nothing of the contents and I asked him nothing, but handed him the letter unopened and he took it away with him.

Mr. Speaker did not, however, say that the information might not have been furnished him through another channel. When Mr. Speaker recognized the handwriting and the frank, and the letter was brought to him from the post office, he subsequently handed it back to the hon. member. I submit, that Mr. Speaker had no right to hand it back to the hon. gentleman, as he was only the medium through which the functions of Parliament were performed.

Mr. LISTER. Whose frank was on the letter?

Mr. SPROULE. The member's frank—Mr. Bruneau's frank. Mr. Speaker said, that Mr. Bruneau called and asked for the letter. We have, therefore, the evidence of Mr. Speaker, that this letter was sent through the ordinary channel and that it was not his private property. I again submit, that Mr. Speaker had no right to hand back the letter, because it was the property of Par-

liament, and did not belong to Mr. Speaker's own private business; that he had no right to deal privately with communications sent through him, when the member was addressing Parliament through the Chair. Thus, Mr. Speaker was only the medium through which the functions of Parliament could be discharged, and he had no right to exercise his own private opinion regarding a letter of resignation sent to him. He had no rights, other than those pertaining to the discharge of the constitutional duties of his office. As to the contents, it is admitted that, if Mr. Speaker were acquainted with the contents, the letter of resignation would have appeared in the Votes and Proceedings, and a warrant would have been issued for a new election. The hon. member refrained from voting on a question arising a few days subsequently, knowing that he had resigned, and that this resignation had been witnessed by two members, according to law, and that he would afterwards be amenable to the law, whatever the nature of the penalty might be, in view of his resignation addressed to the Speaker through the regular channel. Taking that view of the question, it is incumbent on this House to inquire further into this case in order that the committee may satisfy itself. We have instances of resignations and of members coming back afterwards and taking their seats in the House. In the local legislature of Ontario, the member for Algoma, Mr. Conmee, resigned; and placed his resignation in the hands of a certain party to hand to Mr. Speaker. The ground was taken that Mr. Speaker declared that the resignation had never been handed to him, and the party entrusted with the duty admitted that he had forgotten to hand it in. But the member had practically resigned; he subsequently ran at an election and was defeated, and afterwards came back to the legislature and took his seat. I do not think that should have been allowed; but, whatever justification there might be for his conduct, there is no ground that would justify this House in approving of the conduct of the hon. member who resigned in this case, and who subsequently returned and took his seat. Whatever object Mr. Speaker may have had in view when he did this, whether he did it unwittingly, innocently, or otherwise, I consider, for my part, that he did a great wrong to Parliament, and that he did not faithfully carry out the functions which Parliament expected him to discharge as Speaker of this House, when he did not present this communication to the representatives of the people here. The law provides that, when this letter was delivered to him—and I respectfully submit that there is no question but that it was delivered to him—the law provides that the inevitable result should follow, and that is a vacancy in this House, where a new member should be elected.

Mr. CLANCY. I recognize the difficulty of discussing a question of this kind without

probably being somewhat misunderstood, but I deem it of such importance that no member need offer an apology for stating his views. I was much surprised to hear the contrary arguments addressed to the House by members of the Government. The Minister of Marine told us that there was no case made, that there was nothing to consider, and, therefore, this matter should not be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Now, it seems to me to be perfectly plain and beyond all doubt, that the member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) addressed an unconditional resignation to the Speaker, not an intention to resign, but an absolute resignation; and it is also practically admitted, that that resignation reached the hands of the Speaker. No one will contend that, if the resignation, duly attested, reached the hands of the Speaker, the member for Richelieu had any right to recall it, nor will it be contended that Mr. Speaker had the right, under any circumstances, to give that document back. I do not pretend, nor is it in my mind, to, in the slightest sense, impute motives to Mr. Speaker in regard to his action; but supposing, from the purest motives, he handed back that resignation, the fact still remains that he was the custodian of that document, not for the purpose of accommodating the member who resigned, nor for the purpose of yielding to any question of courtesy, nor, as the Minister of Finance suggested, for the purpose of treating it as a private matter between gentlemen; but Mr. Speaker was the custodian of that resignation for the purpose of protecting the rights and privileges of this House. It does not make any difference that Mr. Speaker refused to act on it, that he had lost it, that it had been abstracted from his office, or that he had given it back. The mere fact of the Speaker receiving it, put it beyond all doubt that the seat for Richelieu became vacant. The only remaining question was the envelope delivered to the Speaker and asked for by the hon. member (Mr. Bruneau), the document containing the resignation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bruneau) declared that it was his letter, and if the matter goes to the committee, we can trace out that the resignation came into the hands of Mr. Speaker and that Mr. Speaker returned it. The fact that the Speaker returned it does not alter the case, because, the moment the Speaker got it, no action on the part of the member for Richelieu could recall it or alter that fact. The Government cannot better the case by refusing to allow such an investigation. I am not anxious to hear any scandals that may be unpleasant to hon. gentlemen opposite, if any such exist; I know nothing about that, and I care very much less, but I do know, that, as members of this House, we are bound to vindicate the rights of Parliament, and we are justified in demanding that our rights and privileges shall be maintained. If we were to

adopt the doctrine laid down by the Minister of Finance, what would follow as a consequence? He declares, without the slightest reservation, that if any member, from whatever reason, thinks proper to place his resignation in the hands of the Speaker, and notwithstanding that Mr. Speaker was informed that a letter containing the resignation was in his hands, it would be a right and proper thing for the member to ask Mr. Speaker to return that document to him, and that Mr. Speaker should not stand upon any technical grounds in refusing to give it back. If that doctrine were adopted, Mr. Speaker could no longer be looked upon as the guardian of the rights of this House. If that doctrine were adopted, an hon. member would tender his resignation half a dozen times during a session, and recall it as many times, because the Minister of Finance declares, that it is a case resting upon the code of honour between two private gentlemen. Such a thing would be impossible. I do not believe any hon. member on the other side of the House will advocate, that it was ever the intention of the statute that a member, having once tendered his resignation, had a right to recall it. I venture to say, that no such idea was present in the minds of those who framed the statute, and I venture to say, that no legal gentleman will pretend that Mr. Speaker, once being in possession of such a document, and having knowledge of its contents, would have any right to return it. If Mr. Speaker had no right to return a communication of which he knew the contents, so far as he was the guardian of the rights of the House. Then he would be equally in the same position if he did not know the contents, because any communication of the kind addressed to the Speaker of the House of Commons is not the private property of Mr. Speaker, but the property of the House of Commons and of the people of Canada. I do not intend to impute to Mr. Speaker any but the purest motives in what took place. But I submit it was returned without any authority whatever. It was demanded without any authority, and to have acceded to that demand under any circumstances was to have put it beyond all question that the whole thing was irregular and should be inquired into. Now, if by a majority of votes, this House will now declare that this has been a regular transaction, then I say we have put to an end all means of determining our rights in this House. There are two matters which we must not confuse. The one is that the statute lays down clearly the means by which an hon. member may resign his seat. Then there is the rule which we follow, which has become law by usage, for enforcing matters of this kind. We have no statute directing what this House should do in such a matter. The statute directs what course should be taken by a member, and it clearly indicates the course to be taken by Mr. Speaker; but we

Mr. CLANCY.

have no statute to guide the conduct of this House. Therefore we must be guided by the usage of Parliament, and if we depart from that, it will simply mean that no direction by a statute will have any force, because it will be disregarded by this House. I think nothing can be lost by hon. gentlemen opposite sending this matter to the committee; but I think much will be gained, because by that course you will remove any possibility of coming to a conclusion which must always remain a matter of suspicion. To have refused so reasonable a request seems to me to indicate that there is some reason behind the refusal which we have not yet heard. Hon. gentlemen have not given any reason so far, and the matter must go to the country and be viewed in that light, by every intelligent newspaper reader from one end of the country to the other. Is it possible that the reason was hinted at by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell)? I do not say that it was, but the suspicion will always be entertained in the minds of the people that some grave reason involving the state of affairs among hon. gentlemen opposite is behind all this, and that suspicion can only be removed by sending the matter to the committee, where all persons resting under suspicion will be cleared, as they have a right to be cleared.

Mr. McNEILL. It is not my intention to take part in this discussion. Some incidents of it I very much regret. But as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has told the House that it was his intention and the intention of the Government to obtain an opinion from the law officers of the Crown, I think it would be only fair to this House, in order that we might get further information before we proceed to vote on this question, that we should learn from my right hon. friend what the opinion of the law officers on this subject is.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection, but have great pleasure in telling my hon. friend that the opinion of the Minister of Justice is that there is no case whatever—that there is nothing to refer to the committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Speaker, I well know that the patience of the House must be pretty well exhausted by this long discussion; but I am going to intrude for a few moments on the further indulgence of the House while I point to one or two considerations, which it appears to me have not yet been strongly emphasized. I admit at once that the question is an important one—important to the hon. member for Richelieu, and that its determination, if it could be determined here once and for all, would be very much in his interest. But I do not admit that the question is of great importance either in a parliamentary sense or so far as it effects the general public in-

terest. I think it is more important from the personal and individual standpoint of the hon. member whose seat is in question. It appears to me, Sir, that if it were possible, by sending this matter to the committee, to elicit any further material facts which would enable us to reach a more correct conclusion upon it, there would be a great deal of force in the appeal which hon. gentlemen opposite make for such a reference. But I apprehend that the House is in full possession of every material fact. There is no question but that the hon. member for Richelieu put his name to a declaration of intention to resign his seat as a member of this Parliament; there is no doubt, we will assume, that he caused that resignation or declaration, duly witnessed by the proper persons, under the statute, to be forwarded to the Speaker. I am willing to concede that that declaration reached the office of the Speaker, and that it might have been possible for the Speaker to have opened that declaration and to have read it. I admit all that, and when we admit and establish that, we admit and establish every solid and material fact that could be adduced if you referred this matter to a committee ten thousands times over. Now, I would like some hon. gentleman to tell me, on what ground is it alleged that a committee, a portion of this House, is more competent to pass a legal judgment upon the law and the facts, when the facts are all conceded and in full possession of the House. I have listened to the arguments addressed to the House by the gentlemen of the legal profession in the Opposition, and I have heard the arguments addressed to it by the legal gentlemen on this side. They have not agreed. Do I understand that these gentlemen have not had ample opportunity to express their views? They have not hesitated to declare them positively on both sides, and with all confidence as to their accuracy, and they have disagreed. They would also disagree in the committee. They are not going to agree in their legal views, because eight or ten of those who have spoken here to-day are constituted a committee, any more than they have agreed here, and they have declared themselves with full confidence one side against the other. Now, my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) has appealed to this House in that manner which is so common to him: "Why don't you sift this matter to the very bottom? Why don't you get this committee, which is the highest and the most free from partisanship of any committee of this House, to sift it to the bottom?" And my hon. friend turned it over and viewed it on both sides in such a way that you would infer that the moment a majority of that committee declared their view, he would accept it as a declaration of unquestioned law, and it would be accepted at large by the country, and even the courts would bow down to it.

Why, the thing would be just where it is to-day after your committee had sat upon it. The gentlemen on that committee who do not agree with the view which the First Minister has presented would so declare and so report, and I presume from the expressions of opinion which have been given on this question, the majority of that committee would sustain the view which the leader of the Government has propounded to the House. Does my hon. friend from the county of York (Mr. Foster) assume—with that plausibility which distinguishes him when he throws himself into his most convincing attitude and, after the manner of a man turning pancakes, lays down proposition on proposition—that he or any of the gentlemen who are associated with him are going to bow down in most humble submission to the report which the majority of that committee may render? We would not be a step in advance of where we are now after we had referred this to a committee; and since we can get no more facts, since, in all frankness and candour, we admit everything against the hon. member for Richelieu, why cannot this Parliament now dispose of the question just as well as if it had been referred to a committee and the committee had reported, and thus spare us a useless wrangle and controversy upon the report of that committee? My hon. friends opposite talk about the effect the report of this committee would have on the community at large? It would have no greater effect on the community than it would have upon the judgment of the House.

My hon. friend from York was not wise enough to adhere to the declaration with which he started out, when he said that he would not touch the law points because he was not a lawyer. He would have done well to adhere to that intention, because when he departed from it, he floundered and lost his footing and became utterly confused. What did he tell us? He pointed out the terrible position which the hon. member for Richelieu was in by having his seat threatened and a possible action at law, and subjection to penalty. And what remedy was he going to apply to relieve the hon. member from these terrible consequences? Why, he was going to get a report of this committee. That was going to relieve the hon. member for Richelieu from the dire consequences of his act in attempting to retain his seat. It is apparent the hon. gentleman does not know anything of law—and it was not expected that he would—when he proposed that remedy, yet he undertook to give an opinion *ex cathedra* on a question with which he apparently is not very well acquainted. If there is any doubt on the legal question—and there is none on the facts because they are admitted—the report would not help the hon. member for Richelieu a particle. He would stand, after this committee had incubated its report, in no better position than he is in to-day. The same ac-

tion would lie against him as now. The decision of this committee and the House would not relieve him or put in any better legal status than he would be otherwise; the only difference between us is that we say it is not necessary to go to the committee because we know the facts, and what we want is the judgment of Parliament on the facts in its possession.

Let me say a word further on a point which I am presumptuous enough to think has not been touched upon in this discussion. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and those who followed him on that side seemed, in my opinion, to view this question altogether from an erroneous standpoint. They all seemed to regard this statute as though it were a disqualifying or disabling statute, a statute which imposes penalties and presented their arguments as if they were dealing rather with the case in which a man had been violating the Independence of Parliament Act or had been guilty of some misconduct which affected his integrity as a member of Parliament or in some other way had sinned against the public weal. But I beg leave to submit that these hon. gentlemen have altogether misapprehended the case and approached it from an erroneous standpoint. The standpoint from which it ought to be presented is this, that the statute we are discussing is an enabling and not a disabling one. It enables a man to do what he otherwise would be unable to perform. It confers a privilege upon him and not upon Parliament; it operates for his benefit, and not for the benefit of the public; it operates for his protection, and not for the protection of Parliament; it is passed for the purpose of enabling a member of Parliament to do what he could not do if that statute were not in existence. How then are you going to interpret that statute? Are you going to interpret it at the mouth of the canon? Are you going to argue everything against the individual who is seeking the benefit of it? Not at all. That is not the way in which it ought to be interpreted. It ought to be interpreted from an entirely different standpoint. I therefore agree—and I would have stated the proposition if I had spoken earlier in the debate—in the view suggested by my hon. colleague the Finance Minister, who, although not a lawyer, struck the kernel of the whole question, when he said that you ought to give that statute the widest possible interpretation, in order to allow a member of Parliament, after he had taken a second thought with regard to his determination to resign, to recall that intention, and I claim that that statute can never be rightly interpreted or reasonably interpreted in the sense in which it is framed and to carry out the object for which it was enacted, unless you allow to a member of Parliament the very last possible moment of time to withdraw the resignation he has tendered. Re-

Mr. BLAIR.

member, that the hon. gentleman has violated no law, he has infringed upon no privilege of Parliament, he has not assailed or touched upon the Independence of Parliament Act in any way, he has done nothing wrong, he is not subject to any penalties—but perhaps in a moment of haste, in a rash moment, he concluded to sever his connection with Parliament and sought to avail himself of the privilege allowed him by this statute and make out his resignation. It would be an unseemly view of the duty of Parliament to strain the interpretation of that statute in such a way as to refuse to a member of Parliament the privilege of taking a second thought with regard to such hasty action. I put that view, and I say that when you talk about public opinion, these gentlemen do not apprehend how broad public opinion and sentiment is. They fail to realize how large it is and how far from the narrow view they put forward. The public sentiment will hold that Parliament has done wisely. Who wants to see elections multiplied upon us. Who wants to see members vacate their seats? It is the duty of members to remain in their seats as long as Parliament lasts, and if in a hasty moment a gentleman has been led to take an unwise step, one which is not in accord with the sentiment of the people, he should be allowed the opportunity of reconsidering that action in the light of reflection.

I have just another word to add and it is an answer to the line of argument which the hon. member for York presented on this question. He found fault with the hon. Minister of Finance for the interpretation he put on the resolution of the hon. member for Champlain. Now, he says that you might entirely eliminate the citation in the resolution from the statement of Mr. Speaker; and, if you did that you would rob the hon. ex-Finance Minister's argument of its strength. I do not care whether that citation is incorporated in this resolution or not. If it were not incorporated, it would still be properly the property of the House, having been formally entered upon the records of Parliament. Let them eliminate it from the resolution. In order that it might be clear that there was no necessity for a committee to thresh out something concerning which we are not in doubt, to find facts which are in our possession, we should simply move an amendment to the resolution incorporating the statement of the Speaker as the evidence of the facts therein stated. Would it not then be completely in our possession? Would not the House be justified? It is for the House to say whether they would accept the statement which the chief officer of this House has given. If the House chooses to accept the statement made in that solemn and authoritative manner, as to the circumstances in which this letter came into his hands and afterwards left his hands, if the House chooses to accept it as evi-

dence, we can without further evidence dispose of the question, and say that there is no good end to be served by referring to a committee a matter in which the facts are all known and determined and that can be dealt with by the whole House as it would have to be dealt with by the House in the last resort. Therefore, there is no reason why the motion of the hon. member (Mr. Marcotte) should pass.

Mr. POWELL. I do not intend to take up much time. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) and the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) seemed to have different methods of discussing this matter. The one pleaded for a judicial handling of the question, and the other exhibited the tactics of the advocate. My contentions are very simple. I may remind the Minister of Railways that he is treading on very dangerous ground indeed in criticising laymen and their powers of dealing with the matter of law. Why, that hon. gentleman, I remember, not very long ago was engaged in a very important case in the province of New Brunswick. The defence was taken by a layman who has never read a law book in his life. He was the editor of a newspaper. And he non-suited the hon. Minister and drove him out of court. The Minister then appealed to the court of appeal, and the doughty layman drove out of the court with costs also. Now, if the hon. Minister of Finance were as successful in his case before the House as that gentleman was in handling his case before the court, the Minister of Railways would be at a discount. With respect to the argument of the hon. member for Halifax, I have little to say. His whole argument proceeds upon a false assumption, upon a wrong view of the question before the House. He was discussing the case as it would be between private parties, and not as between a private party on the one hand and a public official on the other. Private parties can waive any rights that the law gives them—that is a well known principle of law; but a public man, standing in an official position and acting for the public is unable to waive any public rights as a private individual waive his rights. To my mind, the correct way of looking at this is to eliminate entirely the Speaker as a factor, so far as having power to act in the matter is concerned. The Speaker is entirely passive. When the hon. member for Halifax argues that the Speaker might return or retain this resignation, he is putting into the hands of Mr. Speaker a power which Parliament never for a moment intended to vest in him. If that were true, Mr. Speaker, by refusing to hand back a resignation when demanded, might deprive one member of his seat, while, in the case of another party, by handing it back, he would give him his seat. That is a state of affairs that the law does not contem-

plate. That is why I say that the law must be considered aside from the Speaker. His deafness, dumbness, blindness, idiocy or misconduct do not seem to me to be factors in the problem that can be considered. I quite believe that when a letter is delivered to Mr. Speaker that is the end of it. But the question with me is whether the law was complied with in this case with respect to delivery, by sending the letter through the post. I have some doubts upon that point, and I think it would be a proper matter to refer the matter to a special committee to search for precedents to guide us. There are features of this case which the Minister of Railways has not touched upon, one of these being the necessity of this search for precedents. I do not think that because an hon. gentleman is going to vote one way or another, his intellectual powers are obscured and he is unable to look into the precedents in the matter. Therefore, I would vote for a reference to a committee in order to get more light. One thing I am certain of, that if the law recognizes this way of placing a resignation in the hands of the Speaker, if the English language means anything, this resignation has been in the hands of the Speaker, and there has been delivery under the Act. But considering the authorities in relation to the serving of notices and the delivery of papers in elections, and in other public matters, there is doubt whether it can be said that the hon. member for Richelieu was following out the acts when he undertook to use the post office for the purpose of effecting delivery of his resignation. There is this doubt in my own mind. What would be the proper course would be to hand the document personally to the Speaker or have it handed by an agent. The doubt is whether the resignation having been sent as it was and the Speaker not having known the contents can be said to have had the resignation delivered to him. I am in doubt in the matter, and because I am in doubt, I would like to see the matter referred to a committee to search for precedents.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I rise with great reluctance to speak on this question. But the press of the country has made so much of this matter that I think it should be fully ventilated in this House. Not only the Conservative press but the independent press has gone into the question very fully and has in some cases said things about Mr. Speaker that this House should resent. If no other reason could be given why this matter should be referred to the committee than to prove that the accusation launched by the press against the First Commoner, the Speaker of this House were not true, I think this case should be referred to the committee.

The Committee on Privileges and Elections is instituted for the very purpose of going into questions of this kind, and I take

it, that when such questions are referred to this committee, which is composed almost exclusively of legal gentlemen, that these gentlemen, after hearing the arguments and the evidence, and after having gone fully into the precedents which can be cited on both sides—these gentlemen, I say, will not make a report to this House upon which they will stake their reputations as lawyers, without being fully convinced that it is founded upon reason and law. Now, I put this question to myself: Why is it that the Government refuse so persistently to send this matter to the committee? It cannot be because the Government has no confidence in the committee, because the Government have a majority of eight members upon this committee; so that, if there was any fear that the committee would not do justice in arriving at their conclusion, the Government is fully protected by its majority. Now, when this resignation was sent, and attested by two hon. gentlemen in this House, it is said—I do not mean to say for an instant that this imputation is true, but it is reported all through the country—that the Speaker knew that this letter which was to be sent to him, contained the resignation of the member for Richelieu. It is further said—though I do not believe it, but the imputation is thrown out, and it should be disproved, if not true—that the Speaker, willing as he was to render a service to the Government, brought a certain pressure to bear upon the member for Richelieu, and after this pressure was so brought to bear, the member for Richelieu went and withdrew this letter from the Speaker's hands. Now, these are things that I think it is due to the Speaker of this House, it is due to the First Commoner, that they should be fully gone into and disproved, for the honour of the House, for the honour of the Speaker. So this is not only a question of law, but also a question of fact, and I take it to be a question for the decision of this House. It is a question in which the honour of this House is involved. It is also a question of grave precedence. From the researches which we have made, I think I can state that this is the first occasion upon which anything of this kind has ever happened, either in the English House of Commons or in this House. The facts are such that no precedent or judgment has yet been given upon identical facts with those which are now before this House. But it seems to me that the reading of the statute makes the case quite clear, and if any hon. gentlemen have any doubt about it, the place to have these doubts elucidated is in the committee. Now, the Minister of Railways and Canals, in his vigorous speech, a minute ago, asked: What other facts will the committee discover than those which are brought out before this House? Everybody knows that the reason why committees are constituted is, because questions of fact and sometimes questions of law, can be much better elucidated in a com-

Mr. CASGRAIN.

mittee composed of a small number of members, than before a House composed of so large a number of members as this House. Not only that, but there is another most important matter which cannot be gone into before this House, and that is the matter of evidence. I repeat, that it is due to the Speaker that evidence should be taken upon the facts which I mentioned a moment ago. But the question of law seems to be this: A public officer, a member of Parliament—because I take it that a member of Parliament is a public officer, according to the sense in which that expression is used in the books—a public officer may resign in different ways. He may resign by expressing his intention verbally or in writing. The law sometimes states the manner in which he is to resign. He may resign simply by telling somebody that he resigns; and, more frequently, his resignation is not complete until it is accepted by the appointing body. Now, in this instance, we have a statute which is very plain. I think the point of difference between the two sides of the House is this: When was that resignation completed? Was it completed as soon as the member for Richelieu wrote out this document, had it attested before two witnesses, and delivered it to the Speaker? Or was it completed only upon the Speaker receiving the resignation, reading it, and, as it were, accepting it? I say that, according to the reading of the statute, it cannot be made clearer, it seems to me, that the moment the hon. gentleman wrote the resignation, had it attested before two witnesses, and delivered it by the only means through which it could be carried to the Speaker, from that very moment the document was no more his property, it did not belong to him, it became the property of the House of Commons, and nobody had a right to hand back that resignation. As soon as he parted with it, as soon as he delivered it to the mails of Her Majesty, or a messenger, to be delivered to Mr. Speaker, from that moment, I say, his resignation was complete. What does the statute say? After relating the manner in which the resignation is to be written and attested, subsection 3 says:

The member so tendering his resignation shall be held to have vacated his seat.

What does "tendering" mean, when it is employed in that way? Tendering his resignation means writing it, and signing it before two witnesses. As soon as that resignation is made before two witnesses, it is a tender of resignation, according to subsection 3 of section 5 of the statute, and from that moment the seat becomes vacant. I think that the hon. member for Halifax, when he quoted the French authority which he was kind enough to give us this afternoon, was quoting from an authority, not upon resignations of public officers, but upon contracts, if I understood him aright. I could not quite catch his words, because I

must say that I did not quite hear him. But from what I heard, the authority which he read applied only to contracts, and not at all to resignations by public officers. I hold in my hand a compendium of the law which is known to every lawyer in the House, the "American and English Encyclopædia of Law." It is an authority, so far as the dictum of the author is supported by precedents and by judicial decisions. This is what he says, under the title "Resignations":

Resignation is the act of an officer by which he declines his office and renounces the further right to use it. To constitute a complete operative resignation, there must be an intention to relinquish a portion of the term of the office, accompanied by the act of relinquishment.

Well, what was done here? There was certainly an intention to relinquish a portion of the term, as shown by writing the letter attested by two witnesses, and this was accompanied by the act of relinquishment, when the member sent this letter to the Speaker. But that is not all. At common law, the office only becomes vacant, according to general rules, when the resignation is accepted by competent authority, that is, by the appointing authority. But this author goes on to say:

In America the above English rule which, on principle, seems to be the better doctrine, has been followed in perhaps the majority of cases; but there is also authority for the opposite view, that a public officer may resign at pleasure, without the assent of the appointing power,—

Of course, here the appointing power is not the Speaker, and it will not be contended that the hon. gentleman had to go before his electors to ask their permission to resign.

—and that, in the absence of any statute to the contrary, an absolute and unconditional resignation vacates an office from the time the resignation reaches the proper authority, without any acceptance, express or implied, on the part of the latter.

What was the proper authority here? The proper authority, under the statute, was the Speaker, and as soon as the resignation reached the Speaker, that resignation was complete, according to this authority; and, as I said a moment ago, this book is only an authority in so far as it quotes precedents to support the view that the author takes. What I am reading now is supported by numerous authorities, to be found at the foot of the page. If this question was referred to the committee, we would have occasion to refer to these authorities and to see whether this doctrine, as propounded by this authority, is really a doctrine which should be followed in this House. The authority goes on to say:

A resignation which has been accepted cannot be withdrawn, nor can a resignation which is intended to take effect immediately, and which has been delivered for that purpose to the officer authorized to receive it.

There are numerous precedents to support the view that a resignation that has been accepted cannot be withdrawn, and there are more authorities in favour of the view that when a resignation has been delivered to the officer authorized to receive it, it cannot be withdrawn. Here is what was decided by the United States Supreme Court at Washington, in the case of *United States v. Wright*:

There can be no doubt that a civil officer has a right to resign his office at pleasure, and it is not within the power of the executive to compel him to remain in office.

I do not know whether the Minister of Railways wants to keep the hon. member for Richelieu in the House, and desires further trouble in respect to the canal on which the hon. member wishes some of his friends or relatives appointed. I fail to see why the Minister desires to compel that hon. member to remain in his seat in this House. The court further said:

It is only necessary that the resignation should be received, to take effect, and this does not depend on the acceptance or rejection of the resignation by the President.

If report is true, and I do not say it is, Mr. Speaker had received word that the letter contained the resignation. This House wants to know whether Mr. Speaker is to be a lever between hon. gentlemen opposite and the Government as to the distribution of patronage among the party. Is it true that the resignation was received, and that Mr. Speaker knew the letter contained the resignation of the hon. member for Richelieu? There is another authority, supported by five or six of the best English precedents, to this effect:

When an unconditional resignation is transmitted to the proper officer with the intention that it shall operate as such, it amounts to a complete resignation, taking effect from the date of the transmission.

This decision is supported by *Mechem's Public Officers*, 417, Reg. v. *Wigan*, 14 Q.B. D. 903; 54 L.J.Q.B. 338; 38 Eng. Rep. 68; *State v. Hause*, 43 Ind. 105; 13 Am. Rep. 384. Why do the Government refuse to this side of the House, and to the hon. member for Champlain the privilege of bringing this case before the Privileges and Elections Committee, so that we may have the opportunity of examining these precedents, which are worthy of examination, and when by arbitrarily declining to refer this case to the committee hon. gentlemen opposite are thereby creating a precedent, which may prove to be a very dangerous precedent and which may some day be used in a manner which will prove detrimental to the state.

Mr. SPEAKER. In view of the conversation which occurred in the House at the early part of this debate, I should like to ask the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) if he was present in his

place when the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) placed his motion in my hands?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Certainly; I was in my seat.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman did not express his wish to second the motion. I do not want any misunderstanding.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is no misunderstanding. I was in my seat. When the motion was put, you, Mr. Speaker, selected my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Wallace) as seconder.

Mr. SPEAKER. I called for a seconder.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I was in my seat, and I assumed that my name would appear as seconder.

Mr. SPEAKER. I called on the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and asked him if he seconded the motion. He did so by bowing his assent. I now wish to put the motion as it was understood.

Mr. WALLACE. I seconded the motion in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER. The journals, I believe, show that the motion was seconded by the member for West York. It is questionable whether I can change the journals, and I think the motion had better be allowed to remain as at present.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	LaRivière,
Bell (Pictou),	Macdonald (King's),
Bennett,	McCleary,
Bergeron,	McCormick,
Broder,	McDougall,
Cargill,	McInerney,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McNeill,
Casgrain,	Marcotte,
Chauvin,	Mills,
Clancy,	Monk,
Earle,	Morin,
Foster,	Powell,
Ganong,	Roche,
Gillies,	Sproule,
Guillet,	Taylor,
Hale,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Hodgins,	Hibbert),
Hughes,	Tyrwhitt,
Kaulbach,	Wallace, and
Kloepfer,	Wood (Brockville).—39.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Angers,	Landerkin,
Bazinet,	Lang,
Beith,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Belcourt,	Lavergne,
Bernier,	Leduc,
Blair,	Legris,
Borden (King's),	Lewis,
Bostock,	Lister,
Brodeur,	Logan,

Mr. SPEAKER.

Brown,
Burnett,
Calvert,
Carroll,
Casey,
Champagne,
Choquette,
Christie,
Copp,
Davies (Sir Louis),
Davis,
Dechêne,
Douglas,
Dyment,
Edwards,
Ellis,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Flint,
Fortin,
Gauvreau,
Godbout,
Guay,
Guité,
Haley,
Harwood,
Heyd,
Hurley,
Jameson,
Joly de Lotbinière
(Sir Henri).

Macdonald (Huron),
Mackie,
McClure,
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McLennan (Inverness),
McMillan,
McMullen,
Malouin,
Meigs,
Migneault,
Oliver,
Paterson,
Pettet,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Rinfret,
Rogers,
Ross,
Scriven,
Semple,
Sifton,
Snetsinger,
Somerville,
Stenson,
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Tarte,
Tolmie, and
Tucker.—79.

Motion negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) has not voted.

Mr. GILMOUR. I am paired with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) has not voted.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am paired with the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Kendry). I would have voted against the motion.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Canada Central Loan and Savings Company—(from the Senate)—(Mr. Casey.)

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Brockville and St. Lawrence Bridge Company.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House adjourns would my right hon. friend be able to tell me what business we will have tomorrow?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We will take the Franchise Act.

VACANCY IN PRINCE, P.E.I.

Mr. FOSTER. May I also ask my right hon. friend whether the writ has been issued for West Prince, and whether the returning officer has been appointed ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am very happy to gratify the curiosity of my hon. friend. The writ has been issued and the returning officer appointed. Mr. Gallant is the returning officer.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 22nd March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 90) respecting Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies.—(Mr. Sproule.)

SUPPRESSION OF COMBINES.

Mr. SPROULE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 89) to amend the Act for the prevention and suppression of combinations formed in restraint of trade. He said: In the old law before the Act could take effect, it had to be proven that trade was unduly restrained or unreasonably restrained. This amendment is for the purpose of striking out the words "unduly and unreasonably" in the old law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE SAN JOSE SCALE.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to allude briefly to a matter which is of sufficient importance to engage for a few moments the attention of the House and of the Government, and I shall conclude my remarks with a motion. I refer to the measure recently passed in this House prohibiting the importation of nursery stock. The stages of that Bill were all taken in one day, and in consequence of the haste in passing that measure, the objections which have since been raised to it were unheard, and I deem it proper that some of those objections should be placed before the Minister of Agriculture who had primarily charge of the Bill, and before the Government, as well as before the House. I deprecated at the time the haste used in

passing the Bill, and I think the outcome of the matter will convince the House that it would have been better to have given the matter more careful and extended consideration. It is found, upon examination into this matter and on receiving the representations presented here, that many of the nurserymen in Canada import very largely of American nursery stock; that those men have made their arrangements for the coming season of operations; that many of them have paid for that stock; that they were at the time the Bill passed within a few days of opening transactions connected with the importation of stock; and the Bill has disorganized business to a very large extent, and will inevitably inflict hardship and very large loss on men who have carried on business successfully for years, and who have been brought up by a round turn as regards the importation of nursery stock, and have not been given an opportunity to make different arrangements. It is found, on examination into this question of stock in New York and Michigan particularly, that it is sent out under the certificate of the state entomologist, that the stock is exempt from scale bug or other pest or enemy of fruit. I hold in my hand the form of a certificate issued in New York state, which is as follows:—

This is to certify that I have this 8th day of March examined the nursery stock of Hammond & Willard, grown at Geneva, county of Ontario, state of New York, and find no indication of the presence of San José scale, peach yellows, rosette, or other dangerous insects or plant diseases that might be transferred on nursery stock from the nursery to the orchard.

V. H. LOWE,
Entomologist.

New York Agr. Exp. Station,
Geneva, N.Y., 10th March, 1897.

It seems that the very greatest care, the utmost precaution is taken, under the laws of that state with respect to nursery stock, and we have no better law, and, in fact, we have not so good a system of inspection as prevails in that state in regard to this matter. I believe the law is substantially the same in Michigan as in New York. Our heavy nurserymen, I am led to suppose, those who asked that the Bill be passed, are themselves heavy importers of American nursery stock, and the majority of the nurserymen are represented as importing stock in the fall, keeping it in cold storage cellars, and at their leisure during the winter, when labour is cheap, putting it up ready for shipment. All this stock was brought in without the entomologist's certificate, and that safeguard, whatever it may be worth, is wanting in regard to the stock imported last fall. That is the information I have received. Stock is ready to be sent out to fill orders by the nurserymen, many of whom have asked for this new law. In one case, Brown Bros. brought in two car loads of American nurse-

ry stock on the eve of the passing of this new law, and afterwards they declared themselves in favour of the Bill prohibiting the importation of American nursery stock. The small nurserymen have agents engaged over the country soliciting orders during the season, and have secured those orders, and they have suddenly been brought up with a round turn by this Bill; and, unless there was great necessity for the passage of this measure, certainly a very great hardship has been inflicted on those dealers. The effect, it is natural to suppose, will be to boom nursery stock on hand, and thus furnish profit to the Canadian dealer; and those who have already imported American stock will be able to control the market, sell their stocks, culls and all, and inevitably will make a large profit. The effect on the planter, as regards the source of supply, will be, that the source will be more limited, and while the nurserymen will make increased profits, all the farmers and fruit planters will receive dearer and in many cases inferior stock or not obtain the stock they require. The Minister of Agriculture received an inquiry the other day, for I received a telegram to the same purport, from one of the large nurserymen, Chase Bros. Co., of Rochester. as follows:—

March 18th, 1898.

From Rochester, N.Y.

Can you secure postponement of action on San José Scale Bill and secure a hearing for us, looking to admission of nursery stock this spring which has been fumigated under direction of Canadian inspector, thereby making it absolutely safe. Wire answer.

CHASE BROS. CO.

What those gentlemen asked was simply an opportunity to place their representations before the Government to show the Government that the importation of their stock is perfectly safe and that the precautions taken rendered it entirely free from suspicion of having scale or other disease. I should imagine that the representations of these gentlemen should have been heard. In order to show the extent of this interest, as regards the Canadian nurseryman, I have here some telegrams and letters which present it. Mr. J. W. Johnston, of Campbellford, Ont., telegraphs:

The passage of San José Scale Bill will ruin Canadian nurserymen that import from States. My spring orders are paid for. Will they be allowed to come in?

I received a letter from G. H. Caughell, of Aylmer, as follows:—

I write you to congratulate you on your manliness in condemning that drastic and prohibitive Bill, and unjust especially at this time of the year. As both the American and Canadian nurserymen have paid their Canadian agents thousands of dollars in salaries and commission for the last year's canvassing, and now when we have our stock just bought and ready to ship, they who were elected on a free trade policy

Mr. CHARLTON.

pass in a day an Act that is the next thing to robbery, as we cannot get our stock here. And it not only affects the nurserymen, but hundreds of agents, as they cannot get their balance due if the stock is not delivered, according to our contracts. And there will be thousands disappointed in not getting their stock to set. I have my trees bought at Geneva, N.Y., and just ordered them shipped yesterday, and don't know just what to do, as our dailies do not give the Bill, only a statement that the San José Scale Bill passed, and that the American stock was barred out of Canada. Is the Bill without any provisions or concessions, or can stock that has been examined by a state entomologist and found free from all diseases, and his certificate accompanies the invoice and box, be got through, or is it a dead stop? I say right here that such men are not worthy of being called our representatives, and am glad there were two that had brains enough to raise a voice against even their own colleagues and do the right. If it is just as the papers state it, it is worse than that barbarous seal-skin Act of the wily Americans. Will you please give me the information you see I want by the above, as I am in a dilemma, and your advice will be greatly appreciated at as early a reply as convenient.

Then I have another letter from Mr. R. Dickinson, of the Strathroy Nursery Company (Limited). It is as follows:—

Strathroy, 13th March, 1898.

John Charlton, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I notice your effort on the floor of the House to grant justice to men who have acted in good faith in the purchase of American fruit trees.

Our case is this: Last fall we purchased and paid for 16,000 seedling fruit stock to be brought in from France through the firm of Grening Bros., of Monroe, Mich., also 500 fruit trees. These trees are now at Monroe, Mich., and unless we can get them in it means the loss of hundreds of dollars directly, and a much greater loss indirectly, as we cannot get these trees from France for another year. Had we received any notice of the intention of the Government, we would have made other provision, and brought them in directly from France.

We are asking for simple justice. Grening Bros. are willing to have the stock inspected. They hold a clear bill of health from the state inspector. We are not asking the Government to repeal the Act, but to honour contracts made in good faith, subject to inspection if need be.

Hoping you will not cease your efforts till justice is done to men who have confidence in the integrity of the Government thus far, I remain,

Your obedient servant,

R. DICKINSON,

Secretary,

The Strathroy Nursery Co. (Limited).

I also received a letter from M. E. Gregg, of the Harriston Nurseries, who says:

Harriston, 19th March, 1898.

John Charlton, M.P.,

Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I am sorry to hear that the Bill re nursery stock is about to be passed; and as I have been paying about twenty men their commissions all season, and have invested all my money in the business and spent my life in the work, I find that I am completely ruined. I also

inclose my order blank, showing that all my contracts read: "Supplying goods from Geneva, N.Y."

If the Bill was passed six months ago, it would have saved me as an importer a great amount; but, as it is, the Bill has been rushed through hardly two weeks before the delivery of stock, all contracts being made to a complete loss in this case.

I have also received certificates from Geneva, N.Y., certifying that the Government entomologist proves that no such thing as San José scale exists in the neighbourhood of Geneva, N.Y.

I am glad that you have taken the stand you have re this Bill.

Respectfully,

E. GRIGG.

I have also received a communication from Bowlby Bros. & Company, of Waterford, Ont. It is as follows:—

Waterford, Ont., 17th March, 1898.

My dear Mr. Charlton:

I noted your objections to the immediate passage of Mr. Fisher's San José Scale Bill. We are afraid the fruit-growers will raise the same objections to bringing in peaches, pears and plums. You know they have always done this, before any scale was ever heard of. What will they do now? There is one way, even if they prohibit, that canners might be allowed to import these fruits, and could be done without any danger of the scale spreading, even though there should be scale on the fruit, and that would be by selling no fruit, but canning the whole lot and burning the refuse. I wish you would find out whether the whole fruit trade will be stopped, and let us know.

Yours, &c.,

DR. ALFRED BOWLBY.

This gentleman is evidently afraid that the next move will be to deprive him of a supply of fruit. Mr. J. W. Johnston, of the Campbellford, Ontario, Nurseries, writes:

Campbellford, Ont.

Mr. Charlton, M.P.

Dear Sir,—My grievance re San José Scale Bill is, that I have purchased the nursery stock, for which I have paid, last February, and had it held in cold storage for me in Rochester and St. Louis, awaiting my order to ship it. It was paid for and shipped several days before San José Scale Bill was brought up. These two invoices of stock were packed and shipped to me at St. Louis and Rochester 15th February, 1898.

Yours truly,

J. W. JOHNSTON.

Then Mr. Johnston furnishes me with the following brief statement with which I will conclude the representations made, so far as they have passed through my hands in regard to this matter. He says:

I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that this San José Scale Bill has been brought up at this late date and rushed through in a hurry, ostensibly in the interests of Canadian fruit-growers, but really in the interests of two or three of the larger nursery firms in the western part of Canada, who raise more of some kinds of nursery stock than they find ready sale for, owing to the competition of the smaller local nurseries, who import much of the stock they sell, and are able to sell it at lower prices locally than the larger nurseries sell it

for through their agents. Notice should have been given to opponents of the Bill, so that the Government could have heard both sides of the question. Most of those who import had their orders placed some time ago, and in some cases paid for, and stock packed and shipped. Some, viz., those who can afford it, import in the fall, so that they can put up their orders during the winter in cellars, when help is cheap, and ship these orders to their customers early in the spring. These larger nurseries did their importing last fall (for they also import from the same nurseries that I and others do, as I have seen myself). Nursery stock imported last fall is no safer than stock imported this spring, and I contend not so safe. As all the leading United States nurseries have had their stock inspected and certified, certificates granted showing their stock to be free from scale since last fall. If there is any scale on the uninspected stock imported last fall, it is now distributed through the thousands of orders awaiting shipment from the cellars of the importers of last fall. I see it stated that American nurseries supply eighty per cent of all the nursery stock planted in Canada annually. Shut out this eighty per cent and these few larger nurseries will have a boom this spring that will clean out everything they have in the shape of a tree, regardless of quality or variety, and to the ultimate detriment of the planter, who, when his trees begin to bear, will find he has everything but the right sorts, because the demand for trees caused everything to be sold when none could be imported.

The operation of this Bill will ruin the smaller nurseries and dealers who import most of their stock, because, as above stated, their orders are already placed and paid for. Are we to be crushed out for the benefit of a few stronger rivals? The San José scale can easily and effectually be destroyed on nursery stock by immersing it completely in kerosene emulsion. Not one scale can survive this treatment (proof ready). The Government could employ a competent party at each port of entry to immerse all imported stock, even though it be done at the expense of the importer, and thus do an injury to no one. Less than three per cent of the duties collected on imported nursery stock would effectually destroy all scale and other injurious pests as well, taking my own importations as an average on which to base my assertion. The high prices of fruit since last fall has caused a great demand among the farmers for trees this spring, and the importations would be very large. But now they cannot get the trees they ordered for planting. The duties that would have been collected on all these importations will also be a serious loss to the revenue of the country. American nurserymen are alive to the importance of having no scale in their nurseries. It would ruin their reputation at once. They would be boycotted by all dealers in nursery stock, the same as the New Jersey nurseries are, which spread the scale through western Canada and other places two or three years ago. It was not a New York nursery that spread the scale through western Canada, as was stated in the House when this San José Scale Bill was brought up. Referring to the United States San José Scale Bill not coming in force until June, it is to place trees handled this spring on the same footing as those handled last fall, as they are all the production of 1897. But their Bill coming in force next June will reach everything after last year's crop of trees, &c.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen engaged in the nursery business who employ

a great number of agents and are largely interested in the industry, represent that this law would ruin them. These representations show that these men were suddenly jumped upon, that this Bill passed through the House without their being accorded an opportunity to present their objections to it, or to present arguments which might have been, probably would have been considered quite sufficient to have warranted the Government in adopting other measures than the total prohibition of this stock. I believe now as I did when the Bill was under consideration, that proper precautions as to importations would have served the purpose just as well as total prohibition. If this Bill is not modified in its operation by Order in Council, then these nurserymen have a fair and just claim for compensation, because this is an *ex post facto* law in effect, which comes down upon them when their arrangements have been made, when their business is just about culminated in the delivery of the goods they contracted for, when their payment has been made to the parties from whom they purchased; and at one fell swoop the Government propose to wipe their business out of existence. This is a very drastic measure, the propriety of which I very seriously doubt; and if in the opinion of the House it is deemed necessary to enforce it, I believe these men have a just claim for compensation. I have felt it my duty to lay these facts before the House. Naturally, in consequence of the position I took on the Bill, I have received communications from some of these nurserymen, and I am thoroughly convinced that the reasons I assigned for urging delay and a more thorough consideration of the question were sound reasons.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not refer to a past debate.

Mr. CHARLTON. I make these representations without reference to a past debate, although I have necessarily to refer to this Bill. I have placed them before the House, so that the House may be in possession of certain facts which it should have been in possession of before the Bill received the sanction of the House. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put, I want to say a word or two in reference to it. I sincerely hope the Minister of Agriculture will not listen to the voice of the charmer in the person of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Since the Bill has become law, I have spent two or three days in the garden of Canada, the Niagara district, and I will say that no more popular measure has ever passed this Parliament. Beneficial results have already come from it to the fruit-growers as well as to the nurserymen of Canada. On the train yesterday morn-

Mr. CHARLTON.

ing I met a gentleman who was going to Grimsby to leave his order for 3,000 peach trees, although he has always hitherto bought his stock from the Rochester nursery. The hon. member for North Norfolk has certainly shown that there are people in the country who are interested in his actions in this House, because he has read to us letters of recommendation of character from his friends who are doing business with American nurserymen; and it is but natural to expect that they would feel aggrieved at such legislation as this being passed by this Parliament. Of course, we expect that; but had the advice of the hon. member been taken by the Government the other day, and had they allowed this Bill to stand over for two or three weeks, because he said there would be no nursery product imported into this country for two or three weeks, this country would have been flooded with nursery stock, as witness the telegram received by the Minister of Customs the other day from the port of Niagara Falls, asking him to allow certain cars of nursery stock to cross the line. The hon. member has instanced the case of Brown Brothers. That firm, as he knows very well, is but a branch of the American firm of Brown Brothers of Rochester, with nurseries at Fonthill. The hon. gentleman does not say anything about the Canadian industry as represented by the Morris, Stone and Wellington nursery, one of the largest in Canada, which has to compete with the producers of the cheap grades of stock on the other side of the river. Leaving aside the question of protection, it is only right that our fruit-growers should be protected in the substantial manner in which this Bill provides. I do not know what course the hon. member thinks the Government should take in this matter; but certainly a step backward cannot be taken—at least, I hope not. The hon. member tells us that he has a certificate of inspection from the entomologist in Rochester that the stock of the nurseries there is absolutely free from the San José scale. The only place in Canada where we have it to any extent is the Niagara district, and it has been from these very American nurseries that the stock has been imported. That is *prima facie* evidence that if this Act did not apply to any other district in the United States, it certainly should apply to that district, and prevent any further importation of that nursery stock, which injures the fruit-growers of our country. I sincerely hope the Government will stand by their guns in this regard, and let our people see that not only as a matter of protection to our fruit-growers with respect to their toil and the money they have invested, but as an assurance to the people who are not fruit-growers that this House deems it wise in this way to meet the legislation of our neighbours on the other side of the river.

Mr. CASEY. I am sorry to hear from my hon. friend (Mr. McCleary) his opinion that this pest prevails to any extent on the Niagara peninsula; I had hoped that it had not yet gained a footing anywhere in Canada. But the question raised by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is no doubt a very serious one, although I did not agree with the stand he took at the time the Bill was before the House. The sole object of this measure is, of course, the protection of our fruit-trees and fruit-growers from the pest, and it cannot be treated as a protective measure in any other sense. When the hon. Minister of Agriculture took the responsibility of urging the course he did, I have no doubt he acted with a full sense of his responsibility, and under an overwhelming conviction that what he did was necessary; and with my limited knowledge of the question, I am quite prepared to take his statements on that point. But the fact remains that a great many people have made contracts, as my hon. friend from North Norfolk points out, and that a great many farmers and fruit-growers expected to get trees for this year's planting which they will not now be able to get. I think it is fair to ask the Minister if he has had full advice as to whether it is possible to disinfect trees that may be suspected of being infected with this pest, or what measure of relief could be given this year to those who have made contracts and who are now expecting trees, which contracts and expectations will no doubt be nullified by this Act. I am thoroughly with any measure to protect our fruit-growers from the foreign invasion of pests; but I hope the Minister will be able to give us some pointers as to whether any relief is practicable in the peculiar circumstances of the case, even if for this year only.

Mr. HUGHES. I am not going to take any part in this discussion. I heartily endorse the measure, but I have received letters from people in my constituency who ask whether the honey locust which is used for hedges comes under the operation of this Bill. It would be well that the Minister of Agriculture should let the country know his opinion on that point.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to add a word to what has been said on this question. I must express my sympathy for those of our people who have been accustomed from year to year to give orders for all kinds of fruit trees largely from the American side. Unquestionably they have been taken by surprise by the very sudden passage of this measure. I do not at all call in question the prudence of the action taken by the Minister of Agriculture. If it be possible to keep our country clear of a pest of this kind, any action tending in that direction is commendable; but on the other hand, there are a number

of men who have been engaged many years in the business and who suddenly, without the slightest indication on the part of Parliament or from the Executive, find an unexpected stop put to their business. A good many men will in consequence be called upon to bear very serious loss. We know that when certain diseases strike our cattle—when hog cholera, for instance, breaks out in any place—a very heavy slaughter is ordered, and those subjected to loss are allowed compensation. This is a case in which the Government have deemed it prudent to take decided action in order to protect the country against this pest. While I agree that it is wise to do everything possible in this regard, at the same time I think some consideration should be given to the men who have their all invested in this business, who have made contracts and who would be virtually ruined by this measure. I do not think the country will find fault if some measure of relief be given in order to compensate them in some way. Suppose they were granted a certain percentage of their loss—that is those who can show that they actually have taken bona fide orders and spent money in order to get these orders. I do not think that those who are anxious to protect Canada from the pest would be so harsh as to say that these men should be called on to lose every dollar they have invested, through our law to keep the pest out of the country. If the Government hold to the measure—and I do not for a moment say that it is not opportune for them to do so—I think some consideration should be given those men engaged in the business and some reasonable compensation provided, so that they will not be ruined by the passage of the Act.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to point out that these men are in business and have taken no more risk than business men do when the tariff is changed. If you once open this door to compensation, what will you be involved in?

Mr. CASEY. The tariff does not prohibit importation.

Mr. BERGERON. You all voted for it, and what is the use of talking now?

Mr. SEMPLE. I hardly understood the real effect of the measure to prohibit nursery stock coming into this country at the time, it was put through so rapidly, but after giving the matter some consideration, I have come to the conclusion that those who have been engaged in the business for a number of years are certainly deserving of sympathy. I have no doubt that if the Government could see their way clear to devising something that would remove the difficulty to a certain extent, they would be doing an act of justice to which no one would object. The Government have discretion under the Bill, and I think they might use that discretion to enforce a rigid inspection of the stock,

and there might then be a chance of allowing it to come across to fill orders taken, so that those who have their all invested in the business may be able to distribute their stock. I know very well the dealers who have been distributing stock for the last fifteen years in the county of Wellington. In fact in that county the trees from the Geneva nurseries are prized more than trees from the Canadian nurseries, they grow well, are true to name, and are nice trees, giving general satisfaction. These gentlemen have spent much money in paying agents going through different parts of the country, and cases of this kind are numerous throughout the country, so that I think if the Government would exercise discretion to see that this scale did not exist in the trees brought from the States, which have been ordered, it would be a very great benefit to a number of very deserving individuals.

Mr. McNEILL. I hope that, whatever the Government may do with regard to this matter, they will not decide to allow the stock to come into the country. I would very much prefer seeing the Government pay a hundred cents on the dollar on this prohibited stock than that they should permit it to come in under any inspection. We have heard already from the hon. Minister of Agriculture that the inspection of stock is, at the best, a very unsatisfactory protection to fruit-growers, and I hope that the Government will, on no consideration weaken on the policy they have adopted. I confess that the suggestion appealed very much to my own sense of justice, on the first blush of the matter that those who have been placed suddenly in this position should be compensated; but, on the other hand, when we remember how easy it is to introduce a principle of this kind, and how difficult it is to check the operation of it afterwards, it becomes a very serious question as to whether it might not open the door to a principle, the operation of which we would find it difficult afterwards to hold in proper subjection. I hope that the Government, at all events, whatever they do, will not dream of allowing the stock to come into this country. They have acted properly in keeping it out, and I give them every credit for their action.

Mr. SPROULE. It is quite clear from what has taken place that I was justified in inquiring of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, at the time, why this Bill had not been introduced earlier. It seems to me very strange that he should have delayed it until we had reached the season when fruit trees were being brought in instead of introducing it a month earlier. Had the Bill been introduced earlier in the session, no doubt it would have minimized the evil we hear these men complain of to-day. The law is in the right direction and should be sustained by Parliament, as I have no doubt

it will be. The hon. member for North Norfolk spoke several times of trees coming from the other side, bearing certificates by entomologists that they were not affected in this way. From my knowledge of certificates, I pay very little attention to them. It seems to be an easy matter to get a certificate of that kind when wanted; and if the Minister of Agriculture were innocent enough to accept them as a guarantee for the purity of the fruit, his measure would be of very little avail to the fruit-growers of this country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I can assure the hon. Minister of Agriculture that, from my experiences since this Bill was passed, he need not have the slightest fear of any popular feeling against it. So far as I have been able to learn, the people of the country are quite in sympathy with it. The only objection I heard was that fruits were not excluded as well, such as apples, pears and peaches.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I must necessarily refer to some of the remarks that have been made this afternoon with regard to this matter, for I appreciate very fully the importance of it and I also appreciate very much and feel very sorry for the loss which certain individuals will undoubtedly have to sustain in consequence of the passage of this Act. It is one of those unfortunate things we all regret that legislation of almost any kind, affecting a large country like ours, must necessarily tread upon the toes of some people. I realize, as I think I stated a few days ago, that when this Bill became law, no doubt some who have been acting in this country as agents for American houses and selling American stock would be hurt, and, perhaps, lose a little money. I believed then and believe still that in the interest of the country at large, even such a sacrifice as this to certain private interests had to be made. I have not learned from the country directly how the Bill has been received; I have not been away from Ottawa but have been immersed in the work of my office since the Bill became law. Therefore, I am glad to hear from hon. gentlemen who have been home since that time that the feeling in their respective neighbourhoods is as they have stated. It is the feeling I expected, as it is, in accordance with the feelings that were expressed in the large number of resolutions and letters, a number of which I have under my hand and some of which I will read before I sit down. It will be seen that these people impressed upon me the danger to our country's fruit-growing interests if a Bill of this kind was not passed. So I can understand the feeling of relief now that the Bill has been passed. I expressed on another occasion my belief that it was necessary that this Bill should be

Mr. SEMPLE.

passed promptly without warning, that time should not be given to those engaged in the trade to render futile the passing of the Act. What would be the use of our Parliament passing an Act and at the same time taking special pains to see that the Act was made useless. Had we given warning to the people who wanted to import this stock from the United States that in a few weeks time they would be prevented from doing so, we should be offering a premium to them to provide against the disability we proposed to put upon them. It seems to me that the outcry that has been raised and that has been voiced by my hon. friend from North Norfolk—an outcry which I venture to say was not very widespread—justifies the action of Parliament. I had an opportunity to read a communication sent to a member of the House in which the writer complained that warning had not been given him so that he might prepare himself against the provisions of the Act—in other words, he complained that we had not given him an opportunity to get his stock into the country before the law prohibited him from getting it in. I can understand his feeling, looking at the matter from his point of view, his business point of view. I do not blame him for it; it is only an exhibition of human nature. But the interests of the country would have been sacrificed had that feeling been allowed to sway the Government and Parliament in the passing of the Act. As to the dangers of the pest, I will take the opportunity of reading one or two resolutions that have been sent to me—and I take them up hap-hazard out of a very large number. Here is one passed on the 22nd November, 1897, by the fruit-growers of Pelham and Thorold townships, meeting at Fonthill:

That we appreciate the efforts of Hon. Sidney Fisher, Minister of Agriculture, to check the spread of the San José scale; but in view of the increasing number of localities in which it has been found and the source of infestation has been nursery stock from the United States;

We also call your attention to the fact that so serious has the matter become in the United States that nearly all have passed inter-state laws making it almost prohibitory to ship nursery stock from one state to another.

In view of the above facts, we humbly pray that the Dominion Government, with an Act of legislation, prohibit importation of fruit and nursery stock into Canada, believing that this is the only safe course to protect the interests of the fruit-growers of Ontario.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When did the hon. Minister (Mr. Fisher) receive that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell exactly, but it was some time in the early part of the winter. It was passed in a district which was and is occupied by the largest nurserymen in this country, the Niagara district. I have already explained, but I am glad of the opportunity afforded by the interruption to explain

again, that so long as it seemed possible that this agitation was being carried on by nurserymen alone or by men who might be supposed to be largely influenced by the nurserymen, so long as there was a possibility of this being an agitation whose motive was self-interest, I hesitated to ask for the passage of such a drastic measure. But when I found, as I did about a month or six weeks ago, resolutions coming from purely fruit-growing sections, passed by associations of fruit-growers and not of nurserymen, organizations whose interests so far as the mercantile consideration was concerned were against the passing of this Bill rather than in favour of it, then I decided that it was in the interest of the country that this law should be passed. The reason why I did not ask for it at the very earliest day of this session was because it has been since the opening of the session that I have received the representations of those purely fruit-growing associations and from those purely fruit-growing neighbourhoods—for instance, in Nova Scotia and in the province of Quebec, where there are not enough nurseries, perhaps, to supply the demands of the fruit-growers, but where they have to send for stock to the nurseries in the province of Ontario whose proprietors were urging the passing of this Act. I, therefore, felt that the influence of the self-interest of these nurserymen to obtain protection for mercantile purposes rather than against the scale insect was practically eliminated, and then I felt that I was on safe ground in asking for the prohibition of the importation of this stock. And only then. As long as it could possibly have been held to be an agitation got up by men interested in the commercial aspect of this prohibition, I felt that I must receive their representations with the proverbial grain of salt, and must be careful before acting, to be fortified by the representations of others, who on the commercial side of the question were opposed to them. I did find that, and then I felt myself justified in proceeding in the course which I have taken and which Parliament, I am glad to say, has endorsed. Now, I shall read one or two statements on this subject. In the first place I shall read a remark or two written to me by Hon. John Dryden, the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario, who, as no doubt is well known to the Ontario members of this House, at the last session of the Ontario legislature had an Act passed for the purpose of inspecting the orchards and nurseries of the province of Ontario and trying to stamp out the disease in those sections where it had made some slight appearance. Mr. Dryden says:

I note what you say as to state entomologists inspecting nurseries. I have made diligent inquiry as to how this is done, and have come to the conclusion that it is no protection whatever. It appears to be a pretty general practice that those dealing in fruit trees on the other side are quite willing to dump off on Canadian fruit-growers such trees as would not readily sell in

their own country. These sell at a lower rate, and I am told that parties have sent fruit trees into this country knowing them to be infested, taking advantage of our carelessness in allowing them to enter. It is impossible, in the course of a short letter, to say much about it; but I think when I say to you that, having studied its habits and effect, I have come to the conclusion that every precaution that it is possible to take must be taken immediately. I propose at once taking active measures towards uprooting all such trees as are infested at the present moment.

Our fruit men are becoming much excited over the difficulty, and in the House to-day statements were made that it was useless our dealing with it here, provided infested trees and fruit continue to be brought into the province.

That was the report made to me.

Mr. McCLEARY. Was that letter written before the passage of Mr. Dryden's Bill in the local legislature?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think, judging from the date, it was just after the passage and during the discussion of that Bill in the local legislature. The letter is dated December 30. He says, the statements were made in the House that day. I have here another letter of Mr. Dryden's, from which I will read. He says, after speaking about some other matters:

I do not know that you will agree with me, but my judgment is that it would pay, at least for a few years, to prohibit the importation of fruit and ornamental trees altogether from the United States, until we see where we stand. The situation is too serious to be trifled with.

This letter was dated on the 20th of December, previous to the other one. Now, here is a statement which was made to me by Professor Alwood, of Virginia, who is the chairman, or president, of the Entomological Society of the United States, which deals with what they call practical or economic entomology:

I apprehend that you notice there is a disposition on the part of some parties to minimize the danger from this pest, but from my experience I cannot share any such sentiments. We shall try to push the federal inspection Bill through at the earliest possible date, and I will inform you of our progress in this matter later.

That was last fall. Now, here is another statement, originally from Professor Alwood, but one which I did not obtain until some time last fall. It is the report of a statement of Professor Alwood at the meeting of the Association of American Nurserymen, held in June last, but I did not get it until some time last fall:

At the present time, from my own record, I know that nineteen states on the Atlantic and adjacent states inland are infested with the San José scale. How the scale came into the eastern part of the United States it is not necessary to go into now, except to say that it came on nursery stock from California, and for five or six years it was spreading upon the eastern half of this continent in the nurseries and orchards before we had the first inkling that there was a San José scale this side of California, except in

Mr. FISHER.

our cabinets. It is now four years since the first case was known, and it is only during the last eighteen months that we have begun fully to realize the extent of the dissemination of the San José scale in the east. I may say further that it is only within the last few weeks that we have had brought to our attention some of those alarming cases where the scale has existed right under the noses of specialists for years without having been detected. Now these cases, which I shall cite, are all arguments for the necessity of most thorough inspection laws, so that we shall be able, by the facts brought out by inspection, to provide such measures, whatever they may be, as will stop the further dissemination of this scale, as it has been heretofore widely disseminated.

The speaker stated that a law had been passed by the state of Virginia, provided for the appointment of inspectors and giving them almost absolute power in regard to treatment of infested premises, and stated that the first two days' work after his appointment as such inspector he had located ten cases where the scale had never been known before.

He went on to speak about inspection, and then he says:

I do not believe in treating nursery stock for the scale; I believe in burning it.

This was a direct condemnation of inspection, and against the possibility of any effectual inspection. Then he goes on further:

A case of scale was found to exist within a few steps of the door of the horticultural building of Cornell University—had been there for three years without having been detected, and was only found the other day by a man from the experiment station. The scale is adapting itself to different climatic conditions; it has been found in the mountainous regions of Virginia at a height of 2,000 feet; in western New York, and as far north as Canada. It infests all the deciduous fruit trees that belong to the rosaceæ; among trees it infests the black walnut, the American chestnut, the American and European lindens, the catalpa, cut-leaf birch, &c.

I will read that part of the report which speaks about fruit. Professor Alwood says, this:

There is at present no case on record where fruit has disseminated these scales, its spread generally taking place from branch to branch where the trees are planted closer together, and in one case at least the infection was carried from place to place by peach-gatherers, who had brushed up the scale with their garments.

This is pretty good proof as to the unlikelihood of the scale being introduced on fruit, and is one of the strong reasons why I was led to believe, in discussing the matter, that it was not necessary to exclude fruit to protect our orchards in this country. Now, I will give you a list of places where this insect has been found in the United States. I am reading from a list of states which include nearly all the states on our borders, and a great many others: Alabama, Connecticut, Georgia, Indiana, Maryland, Mississippi, New Jersey, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Washington, Arizona, Delaware,

Idaho, Kentucky, Michigan, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Ohio, South Carolina, Virginia, California, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, West Virginia. That was last year. It has been found in some more states since that time. The nurseries in the following states are reported as being badly infested:—Massachusetts, Georgia, Mississippi, New York, Florida, Louisiana, Alabama, Missouri.

You see, then, that the spread of that pest has been very great in the United States, and when I say that twelve years ago only was this scale discovered in the little far-off Valley of San José, in Southern California, and that last year it was found in most of the states of the union and a number of the Northern States, where a few years ago it was believed it could not possibly exist, and that it has been found in our own country in a few instances, you can understand the tremendous danger of its introduction into this country, necessitating our taking even drastic measures to protect ourselves. Now, I may say a word or two in regard to the objections that have been brought forward. I think I have fairly answered the question as to why I did not introduce this Bill earlier in the session. I would have introduced it two or three weeks ago, had it not been that the House was occupied with the Yukon Bill. I had no opportunity until that debate was over of introducing it, though I was prepared to introduce it over two weeks ago, and would have done so, had it not been for that Bill. The people who are complaining say that they have had no warning. Now, as a matter of fact, during this past winter and autumn, every horticultural meeting, and a large number of agricultural meetings, all over Canada, have been discussing this question. It has been brought up at every provincial fruit-growers' meeting in the land, where it has been discussed, and resolutions have been passed asking this Parliament to prohibit the introduction of the scale, asking this Parliament to pass just such a law as we have passed. At institute meetings, in the province of Ontario, there have been frequent discussions in regard to this pest. I have in my possession a number of resolutions passed at such meetings, asking me to prepare a Bill prohibiting the introduction of this pest into the country. In face of this, it seems idle to suppose that these people have not had fair warning, and have not had the likelihood before them that action of this kind would be taken. The question has been discussed for over a year. As I pointed out, the other day, at the end of the last session of Parliament representations were made to me by farmers and the fruit interests in the country, asking that the House then, in the last days of the session, should pass a prohibitory law; and the question has been discussed in both the agricultural press and in the ordinary press of the country.

The "Horticulturist," the organ of the Provincial Fruit-Growers' Association of Ontario, a publication which must be taken by all those gentlemen interested in nursery work, who, if they keep up with the times, must read about these matters and know the discussions that have occurred on this question, published an article and resolutions asking that this legislation should be passed. It seems, therefore, idle to suppose that those men had not as much warning as the ordinary warning given in regard to legislation that may affect any industry in the country. Sir, I have been asked to make allusion to the question of inspection, as to whether it would be possible that some slight modification of the Bill might be brought about as regards the importation of nursery stock by its inspection here. I have followed very closely the discussion and arguments that have taken place on this question in the United States and Canada. I have come deliberately to the conclusion that any inspection would be futile, that if we were to allow carloads of stock to be brought in and try to inspect it at the frontier, we would have no sort of assurance that it would be protected from disease.

Mr. FOSTER. What about fumigation and inspection?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am coming to that in a moment. On Tuesday, the very day the Bill was sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor General, two carloads of nursery stock were imported by Brown Bros. That stock arrived at the frontier and was entered on Friday, and consequently it was allowed to come in, orders going out from here on Friday night to have the Act put in force. Supposing the stock had to be inspected, supposing we undertook to inspect two carloads of nursery stock, it would be found that there were not less than 50,000, 60,000 or 100,000 plants. That is quite possible, for a great deal of the nursery stock is very small. Some years ago I imported a thousand trees, and they all went into a small box. A carload would take usually 100,000 individual plants of such stock, and very likely even more if small stock such as is imported for the purpose of grafting or budding. The inspector would have to be an expert if the inspection was to be any good. He would have to take up every individual plant and examine it with a magnifying glass. That would mean many days of work. The stock would have to be opened to the air, probably somewhat dried, then repacked and sent on to its destination; and I venture to say it would practically prohibit, if those regulations were carried out, just as much as the Bill passed the other day would prohibit. It would be practically impossible to carry out such inspection. Furthermore, in shipping nursery stock of this kind a large per-

centage is killed. Any one who has any knowledge of ordinary stock is aware that a pretty large percentage of the plants die. If the Government were to undertake to make any inspection, and any loss of that kind should occur, they would be held responsible, even though they carried out the system as well as possible.

Mr. McNEILL. What is the value of the stock ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could obtain an estimate for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McNEILL. Has the hon. gentleman considered the advisability of destroying the stock and paying for it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The value of a carload of stock would depend on the nature of the plants, for nursery stock is variable as regards quality and size. I am informed, through one of my officers, that a gentleman imported a lot of nursery stock from the United States, which was delivered at as low a rate as from 2 cents to 3 cents a plant. I am disposed to consider that this is the kind of stock that Mr. Dryden indicated should not be allowed to be imported. If a buyer can purchase stock in the United States at from 2 cents to 3 cents per plant, he is getting the refuse of the United States nurseries, which the proprietors cannot sell to their own people, and it will very probably be infected with scale or some other disease. If buyers are getting stock at such prices, knowing as we do the average prices of nursery stock in this country and the United States, it is most extraordinary that they can obtain nursery stock at such prices unless there is some disease affecting it.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. gentleman take into his consideration whether it is not desirable, in view of the great danger to the fruit-growing interest of the Dominion, to destroy any of that stock coming into the country, even though it may be necessary to compensate the parties who are paid for it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When I found those two carloads coming in, I telegraphed the Ontario Government to send an inspector there and let him do the best he could. I do not believe in the adequacy of inspection.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not believe in inspection.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not; but I telegraphed instructions that the inspector should do the best he could.

Mr. McNEILL. I would burn it all, and pay for it, if necessary.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Ontario Government has that power, Mr. FISHER.

but I am not aware that any Dominion law authorizes it. I am dealing with the importation of nursery stock in the way I have indicated. And as we were aware that the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia and British Columbia had already passed laws for that purpose, I therefore thought it was not necessary for this Parliament to interfere in that regard.

I was speaking about inspection, and stating the reason why I did not consider any system of inspection we could possibly adopt or carry out would be effective without spending an enormous sum. I venture to say to-day that if we had allowed this stock to come in and attempted to inspect it at all effectively, it would be difficult to find men in Canada qualified and willing to undertake the work, unless they were paid enormous remuneration; reasonable salaries would not suffice. For that reason, I tell the House frankly that the more drastic remedy was the better one and the only safe one, and that it was in the interest of the country that the law was passed.

The question of compensation has come up. I am not prepared to speak on that at the moment, for it is a very serious question. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) pointed out how easily an enormous sum could be spent to secure very doubtful results. I am quite prepared to consider any suggestion or any details that may be suggested. More than that I cannot presume at this moment, and at this stage of the question, to say. I must state, however, that any such claims for compensation would have to show with great clearness and remarkable force that they were founded on any necessity. One gentleman who said he was going to be ruined by this law told a friend of mine yesterday that he would lose \$62. I have no doubt that he is a comparatively poor man and that \$62 is an important sum to him, and I can appreciate the loss it would be, but still when I hear that a man is going to be ruined by the loss of \$62, I can hardly connect the two terms as being suitable in applying to the same case. When we come down to the investigation of the facts, I think we will find that the alarm raised as to the great pecuniary loss in consequence of this Bill is somewhat exaggerated, and that when the momentary excitement has calmed down it will be discovered that comparatively few people have been hurt, and very few, if any at all, seriously hurt, while I am satisfied that a great step has been taken in the necessary protection of a large industry in our country, and which step I believe Parliament was called upon to take.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not forget about the fumigation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There have been experiments tried in re-

gard to the fumigation of this nursery stock with hydrocyanic acid. These experiments have been made in California with a certain amount of success, and I believe if the nursery stock is very thoroughly fumigated so that every individual plant is reached by the fumes of the acid the effect is all right. It is a somewhat expensive, very difficult and somewhat dangerous proceeding to use hydrocyanic acid, because it is a very strong poison and those using it incur a considerable danger. I have discussed this matter with the fruit-growers and entomologists and they have recommended me not to take it into consideration in framing this law. It is possible that fumigating chambers might be erected in certain places and that the stock might be very thoroughly fumigated, but I do not think it would be practically possible to fumigate all stock coming into the country, and allow it to come in free. That is the conclusion I arrived at after investigating this question of fumigation.

Mr. CHARLTON. What about the kerosene emulsion?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Fletcher reports that it is very doubtful if kerosene emulsion is effectual in killing this scale.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Cornell experiments seem to show that it has been effective.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but there have been disputes and differences of experience in regard to that. Mr. Fletcher recommends that where the scale exists there should be a thorough spraying and drenching with a solution of whale oil soap. I understand that kerosene emulsion is not by any means effective, and while it may hurt the scale it cannot be counted upon as an absolutely effective remedy. I may say in reply to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), who spoke of the honey locust, that this pest infects all deciduous honey trees. The name of the honey locust is not included in the list I have, but it would come within the class of trees which I am told are infected with these scales. I may say that the Order in Council based upon this Act brings the Act into application as against the United States, Hawaii, Australia and Japan, those being the four places where we know at present of the existence of the San José scale. In accordance with the section of the Act which provides that certain classes of plants may be exempted, we passed an Order in Council exempting what are commonly known as greenhouse plants, and which with the exception of roses are apparently not affected by the scales. This exemption includes herbaceous perennials, not wood in their nature, all coniferous plants which are never attacked by the scale, and bulbs. I am advised by Professor Saunders and Pro-

fessor Fletcher that these plants are not open to the scale and accordingly we have exempted them. I think, Mr. Speaker, I have explained this matter in such a way, that I hope the House will be satisfied with the action which has been taken, and I trust that as time goes on we will find that the alarm about certain interests being seriously hurt will be found not to be nearly so serious as has been represented in the House of Commons.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the hon. Minister of Agriculture does not shut out every ray of hope that some relief will be afforded to those persons upon whom this law will press so very heavily. I have had communications from and personal interviews with men who will be very much affected indeed by its operations. With the efforts of the Government, and with the efforts of authority everywhere to suppress disease or prevent disaster, there must be a certain amount of sympathy, but the hon. Minister himself by his admission the other day in reference to this pest, shows us that there are difficulties to be overcome which cannot be coped with by any legislation. He pointed out the different ways in which this insect pest is spread by attaching itself to moving objects, such as the feet of birds, and by other means which pay no attention, either to the customs authorities or agricultural authorities or to boundary lines. The chief difficulty seems to be in regard to this insect, that it is so minute that it was not discovered until it had made considerable ravages, and now, as all men magnify their operations, the fruit-growers and the nurserymen to some extent have made the very most of this difficulty. I hope that the Minister will take into consideration, that by this action of the Department of Agriculture and of Parliament certain persons engaged in business in this country have been very seriously oppressed. The Minister now says that the expenditure will be so large that he cannot undertake to say that any redress will be given to those people, although he does not say that redress will not be given, and in that those who have suffered losses may find some hope. Take the case of men who having made all arrangements to carry on their business this year are now completely shut out by the operations of this Act. It must be taken into consideration that the documents issued by the Department of Agriculture and read by persons who are in this business, would naturally lead to the belief that there would be no active legislation against the San José scale this year, and so they were led to continue to place their orders in advance and to conduct their business in the usual way in which this business is conducted. Those persons have incurred large expenditure, and they must necessarily suffer great loss. I would call the attention of the House for a moment.

to the evidence given last year by Mr. James Fletcher before the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization over which the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) presides. Mr. Fletcher went before the committee, and referring to this pest, he said :

There is some agitation in the west to have prohibitive legislation by Parliament, to prevent nursery stock, through which this scale was introduced, from being brought into the country. After watching the matter carefully in the United States, and the way it is developing here, I have not seen my way to advise the Minister to recommend that legislation. All I can say is, I have watched it very carefully before I came here, and I think I know of the three instances in which it has been introduced into Canada, to find if possible a remedy without interfering with the fruit-growers and the nurserymen. If our fruit-growers and nurserymen could grow all their stock, and would grow it, then legislation of this kind might be considered more seriously. We know that our Canadian nurserymen have not got this insect, but we know that they cannot supply fruit to their customers. They have to get it from the United States nurseries, and if we enact prohibitive legislation before it is possible for them to do without the importations, we are going to interfere with both of these businesses at once, and I did not see my way to advise the Minister to propose this legislation.

The Minister read a list of the states in which this insect appears; but these are some of the finest fruit-growing states in the American union. After all, this is the old fight of the agriculturist against the insect which preys on his crop. I would like also to call the attention of the House to the evidence of Mr. Craig, the horticulturist of the farm, on this matter :

It seems to me that it would not be a difficult matter for us to arrange through our customs-house officers, to stop any package of fruit trees coming into this country unaccompanied by a certificate from the state entomologist, saying that the nursery from which these trees came was free from San José scale.

Here is an officer of the department who thinks the evil might be met, or at any rate restricted in that way. An hon. friend asks me what I am driving at. I am endeavouring to show to his broad intellect that the people engaged in the fruit-growing business might fairly infer from the reports of the department that there would be no restrictive legislation, and that in view of such legislation they are entitled to consideration at the hands of the Minister with reference to compensation. Then the Minister himself made a report to Parliament this year, in which he said :

Among the newly introduced insect pests, the San José scale has attracted a large amount of attention. This is probably one of the most injurious insects known on fruit trees. The scales are small and not easily detected, especially in their earlier stages, and it is a very difficult insect to destroy. Much timely information has been disseminated regarding this insect enemy, and fruit-growers everywhere have been warned of the danger of the careless importation from

Mr. ELLIS.

infested districts, of trees by which this formidable foe may be brought into their orchards. Several visits have been made, and meetings of fruit-growers attended, by the entomologist, in the districts where this insect has been discovered, and advice has been given as to the best methods for the destruction of the invader.

In view of these reports, I think that the persons who made arrangements to import their stock were justified in doing so, and that the country is to some extent responsible to them for the loss which this legislation will inflict upon them. It is well known that every enemy that infests plants and trees can be met and destroyed by some chemical means or some appliance; it is a mere question of taking it in time. I regret very much that the Minister seems to think that no effort could be made to disinfect and destroy these insects at the frontier. I think the opinion of the authority of Cornell University is worth something. If we are to carry on all our business by stopping at the frontier everything that may have some germ of disease in it, we may as well stop immigration and importation altogether; we may as well close up our whole business at once. The proper way to deal with these matters is to grapple with the difficulties as they present themselves, in the way that men have to grapple with them everywhere. However, I did not rise to discuss the question, but to impress on the Minister's mind that something is due to the people to whom I have referred, who have incurred large expenditures in their business this year.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think the Minister of Agriculture has acted fairly and well in this matter. I belong to the county of Essex, where we have five or six thousand acres in peaches, five or six thousand acres in grapes, and possibly twice as much in apples; and had the Minister of Agriculture not acted, and acted quickly, the damage in my county would have been great. But as he has acted so quickly, we are satisfied that the nurseries to the south of us will not send their trees to us, and our orchards will not be affected. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that the Minister might have given longer time or more notice; but there is a great difference between this year and last year in regard to this pest. Last year it was not known in our county, while this year it is known, and there is no telling what would be the result a few years hence if we allowed the nurseries south of the boundary to send in their stock. I feel satisfied that the southern portion of Canada is going to be a great fruit-growing district, and that the northern and north-western sections of Canada are going to be great consumers of that fruit; and I think it is the duty of the Minister of Agriculture to do everything in his power to save that fruit, and to allow the people of this country to make the most of it. I was present at the committee last year when Professor Fletcher gave his evidence. He said that but three

cases of the pest were known to the department—one in British Columbia, one in the county of Kent, and one in the Niagara district. He could now tell of a good many more. I am pleased that both the Government at Ottawa and the Ontario Government are doing everything in their power to stop this dreaded disease. It would be much better for us to pay for the shrubs and trees that have been imported and have them destroyed, than to allow them to be planted to the damage of the country. In my county we have orchards of forty, fifty and one hundred acres in peaches alone, and other large areas in grapes, and if the San José pest got into our orchards and vineyards, the loss to our people would be very great indeed, and we would feel that the Minister of Agriculture here and the Minister of Agriculture in Ontario had neglected their duty in allowing the pest to increase. I hope and trust that the Government will continue to act as positively as they are doing to-day, and I feel satisfied that the course they are taking will be of great benefit to this Canada of ours.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the circumstances have changed so rapidly with respect to this pest that any evidence which we had before us a year ago is almost unavailing to-day. Take the correspondence which the Minister of Agriculture has had laid before him since the last meeting of this Parliament, and since Messrs. Fletcher and Craig gave their evidence. We know three times as much about this pest to-day as we did then.

My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis) said that no pest ever came amongst our fruit without some means being found of dealing with it. Well, I may tell the hon. gentleman that a germ came among our plum and pear trees in the western parts of Ontario which caused the black knot, and that, in consequence of this disease, these fruits almost entirely disappeared, despite everything that could be done to check it, after once it had been allowed to spread. Whereas, if this germ had been destroyed in its infancy, when first introduced, we might have stopped its ravages. We waited, however, too long, and the only remedy now is to cut down the trees infected and burn them. I believe that the hon. Minister deserves credit for the care he has taken and the amount of time he must have given to the examination of this very important matter; and let me say, further, that I am under the impression that we do not know yet how far this pest has spread. It has been stated that the trees might be inspected. Why, it is a very difficult matter to inspect a tree infected by a great many of these small insects, which can only be detected through a lens. Means should be taken, if possible, to stop the spread of these two carloads of trees which have been imported. It would be much better to have them destroyed, and I would be willing to vote an amount of

money for that purpose rather than have them distributed throughout the country. The hon. Minister would have been derelict in his duty to the fruit-growers and farmers of Canada, if he had not taken the drastic measure he has. In my opinion, the loss that will be sustained by those who are dealing in this stock will be very small indeed, compared with the injury that would have been inflicted on the country if the large quantity of trees ordered had been allowed to come in and be distributed. This law will only have the effect of stimulating the nurserymen in Ontario and other provinces to supply the want that has been caused by the stoppage of these trees from other sources, and I believe that Canada is perfectly capable of supplying all the trees we require. I am of the opinion that every proper means should be taken to stop the influx of foreign products, the importation of which is calculated to injure our own stock through pests of any kind.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that we have had, in these last few minutes, sufficient satisfaction, on this side of the House, for our seventeen or eighteen years of propaganda in favour of the protection of our industries. I almost leaped from my seat, when I heard my hon. friend who has just spoken lay down the proposition, boldly and strongly, that, in this matter of nursery stock, he was in favour of keeping out the foreign trees—and even going further than nursery stock, and declaring that he would be in favour of keeping out all foreign products of a kind which we were able to raise ourselves. Why, Mr. Speaker, that is the rankest kind of protection.

Mr. McMILLAN. I did not say, all the foreign products, but only those that are going to injure the native products of this country.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all that the most ardent protectionists have been arguing for or want. Whatever Canada is able to produce for herself, let us keep the market for, by putting up a strong tariff against outside markets, and in this way you will develop the growth of supplies within our own territories. My hon. friend has reached the happy land at last. Here is my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who has been preaching free trade for eighteen years. His practice, fortunately, has disagreed with his precepts; and the result is, that this youthful member of his party has been won over and nurtured into stronger and stronger protectionist doctrine, until to-day he is a full-fledged protectionist. Now, I wonder what the hon. members for Manitoba and the North-west think about that next instalment, when one of their most forward members has to-day, by the statement he has made classed himself irrevocably in the ranks of the protectionists. One by one they are com-

ing over, but two are still left of the old guard, and of these one is doubtful. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the other night, betrayed a part of his old creed, his love for the American market, and thought we were getting on famously without it. One is left, and I believe will remain as long as life continues, an ardent free trader and a lover of the freest ingress of goods from the outside, especially when that outside source is the United States market.

Let me say, with reference to this matter, that the measure is a drastic one, and that, in my opinion, nothing else but a sudden and drastic measure would have at all coped with the evil. But there are some other considerations which, I think, my hon. friend ought to have taken into account. There is a wide divergence between this sudden prohibition, coming right in the midst of an active season, attacking the dealers after they had incurred all their initial expenses and had made their sales for the season in this country—taking them between the supply of our market and the getting of their goods from the other side—and a tariff revision. The position is a peculiar one, and it is established with regard to goods that have never been prohibited, and are considered useful articles of merchandise. Although a drastic measure had to be undertaken and the prohibition had to come suddenly, to be of effect at all, the question is, whether it is fair that the country should take the whole gain at the expense of some few individuals who make all the losses in the matter. That is a point my hon. friend should take into consideration. It is rather a dangerous thing to advocate compensation with regard to tariff changes which should be made, but there are tariff changes and tariff changes; and I think this is a case where the country might well ask itself whether all the benefit should come to the country at the expense, and the large expense, of a few individuals who are caught, as it were, between wind and water.

My hon. friend has also this to think of, that his measure, perhaps, will not be effective. This scale exists on the other side and has existed there, according to his contention, and there are in Canada to-day hundreds of thousands of American stock, which have been imported from the infected regions and are now stored up in the cellars and houses of the Canadian importers; and after this Bill has passed, that stock will be distributed throughout the country without inspection and with all its load of possible disease. So that my hon. friend has been able, by this measure of his, simply to stop the influx of a certain quantity of infected material, but has not been able to cover by a single article that larger amount of infected material which was successful in passing the customs before this law was passed, and which is stored up now in the warehouses and cellars of these distributors,

Mr. FOSTER.

and will be soon distributed all through the country. So that if there is any method by which, at a small cost, this distribution can be stopped, that method should be adopted. The cost is never excessive, because hundreds of thousands of these plants are bought at extremely low rates. My hon. friend thought that two or three cents a plant was an extremely low rate, but when he takes into consideration the immensely large scale on which the nurseries on the other side operate, and the consequent cheapness with which they can produce, he will see they may sell good stock at very low prices, and, consequently, two, or three, or four cents per plant is not indubitable proof that the plant is bad or the stock infected in any way. So that my hon. friend must, to be effective, follow this infected material which has come over the border during the last four or five weeks, and which is waiting distribution to the farmers and plant-growers of the country. I do not know that that can be done or not, but, if it can be done, now that he has started, he ought to make this law as effective as possible, and, if the distribution of the stock which has been brought over can be prevented, that should be done.

I wish to draw attention to another point. Here you have two men, both of whom have sent out their agents into the field. These agents have been at work six or eight weeks, and have made contracts for the sale of this nursery stock. These nurserymen in Canada have bought stock from the United States nurseries and paid for it. One of these nurserymen was successful in getting his stock across, and his business has not been interfered with. His sales have been implemented, and he reaps the profit. But the other man was too late; he did not get his stock across in time; he loses everything, and his whole season's business is gone.

The country has benefited, but why should the country take this benefit from an extraordinary Act passed for an extraordinary purpose and leave the individual who was unfortunate enough to be a few hours late to bear all the loss of it? I think that this is something my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) should look into with a view, in this especial case, to having justice done.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.
My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) would propose compensation, then?

Mr. FOSTER. I would propose a very careful consideration of this matter, not because I am in favour of the principle of compensation when tariff changes take place, but because of the peculiarity of the case. This is a case that might prove to be an exception and, at any rate, I think might well be earnestly considered. Another thing I think is apparent. Whilst all the good things that could be said of this legislation have been said—and none too

good—I think it is apparent that my hon. friend was late in his legislation. He should have known as a practical man of business, about the season when these men are sending out their agents—that is within the last four or five weeks. He was advertised, and fully advertised of the insidious nature of this pest and of the fact that it threatened this country. I think he has not been as early with his legislation as he should have been. This measure should have been prepared and put through Parliament in the very earliest days of the session. If that had been done, the hon. gentleman would have caught the agents before they went into the field, and he would have caught this infected stock before more than a very small quantity had come into this country to be distributed. I believe in the legislation, I believe that you cannot follow this insidious San José scale by any method of inspection, and I am not sure that you could do it even by disinfection and fumigation. Prohibition is the real remedy, but it is a harsh remedy when applied to useful articles of common consumption. There are other considerations which the Government could take into account as to the compensation of individuals who are hurt by it. After all, \$62 is not much to my hon. friend or to Klondike people, but to a poor man it is more than \$62,000 to a rich man, and may go far to ruin him.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

LIQUOR PERMITS FOR THE YUKON DISTRICT.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask a simple question. Mr. A. W. Owen, writing in the "Citizen," says :

The only things that are plentiful in Dawson are whisky and cigars, and there is an abundance of that. Along the main street of the town nine shanties out of every ten are saloons and gambling dens. Some of these have dance halls attached, and these are the places that do the rushing business. The town is full of women, and they make more money than is good for them out of the miners that are fools enough, or, shall I say, drunk enough, to spend it on them.

I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior what is being done about that? We have been asking questions about permits going into that country, and information has come to me from responsible men in the Northwest Territories who assure me that permits has been issued from Ottawa.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). When?

Mr. DAVIN. Very recently. I would like to know what is being done about it.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is not here, but I

am in a position to know that no permits have been issued recently. I do not believe that any permits have been issued, but I am sure that recently none have been issued.

THE CATTLE TRADE.

Mr. HUGHES. Among those who are familiar with the harbour of Montreal in the summer season, what I am about to say will not excite any surprise. But I am satisfied that the facts I am about to lay before the House will be news to a great many. Every day vessels laden with cattle and other merchandise from Canada sail from the port of Montreal for Liverpool, for Glasgow, for Bristol, Southampton, Aberdeen, and a number of other ports in Scotland and England. But though there are large vessels leaving Montreal weekly for Ireland, not one of these vessels is allowed to carry a single head of cattle.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I fail to see in what way the question the hon. gentleman is bringing up can be considered a question of privilege.

Mr. HUGHES. I am bringing it up before the Orders of the Day are called.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There has already been a motion to adjourn, and I do not think a similar motion can be made now, and it seems to me that the question is one that should not be raised without a motion.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) wishes to put a question—

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to read an extract from a letter and lay certain facts before the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. HUGHES. Very well; I will bring the matter up another day.

FRANCHISE ACT.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to repeal the Franchise Act of 1885 and to revert for the franchise for the polling divisions and also for the voters' lists to the condition of things existing previous to that time. The Bill is not a lengthy one. It provides in the first instance, for the repeal of the Franchise Act; then it provides that the franchise shall be in each province the franchise existing under the provincial law for the purposes of the provincial election—the words "provincial election" being defined in the Bill—

and then it provides that the list of voters shall be the same as that in existence in the province. We then go on to provide that the polling divisions or subdivisions are to be the same as those that exist in the province. These are in effect, the enacting clauses. There are some other clauses which have for their object to repeal or amend certain provisions of the Dominion Election Act so as to make the Act conform with the conditions under the new Bill.

It will not be necessary for me to refer to the condition of things existing in 1885; it will not be necessary for me to show that at that time a radical change took place, that we then made a departure from the franchise as we had had it not only from the time of confederation but from a time long previous to that. The change made in 1885 has certainly not been productive of good results, and the law then passed has not met with the approval of the people of Canada. The proof that the law has not met with the approval of the people of Canada will be found in the fact that in 1890 and in 1891 legislation was introduced in this House for the purpose of repealing the law, and that the objections to it grew to such an extent that in 1894 it was found necessary by the Government of that time, presided over by a gentleman belonging to the great political party that brought about the change of 1885, to introduce a Bill which had for its object to revert to the same conditions as existed previous to 1885. When that Bill was introduced, Sir John Thompson made use of these words:

We propose important changes in the Franchise Act, and without making a speech upon them or giving reasons, I would briefly state that we propose to adopt as the basis of the franchise, the franchise of the various provinces of Canada.

Then when the Bill came up for the second reading, Sir John Thompson made use of these words:

The change is also proposed in this Bill which I indicated a few days ago, that the questions upon which so much difference has arisen in the past, as to the basis of the franchise, shall be adjusted by adopting the franchises of the several provinces. While I admit that this is a new departure, I deny what has been so widely asserted, that it is in any important or practical degree a surrender of any principle that we have contended for in times past. The number of differences which exist between the provincial franchises and the Dominion franchise as established by our own Act, are so few as not to be worth the contest and the expense which are involved in keeping them up, and the adoption of a general system which will apply both to the local and Dominion legislatures, has recommendations, as regards simplicity and facilities for economy which cannot exist under a dual system, such as we have been keeping up for the past few years.

Therefore we find that within ten years after the Act had been introduced, after we

had had ten years' experience with the operation and the results produced by this Act, the leader of the Government at that time—I think he was then leader—found it necessary to say that the Act had been a failure, and that it was necessary to revert to the conditions existing previous to its introduction. Now, I have looked over the Act introduced by Sir John Thompson, and those who are curious enough to look into this matter will find that his Bill, No. 143 of 1894, shows clearly that the intention of the framer of the Bill when it was introduced, was to revert purely and simply to the provincial franchise, that is to say, to adopt the system of leaving its preparation to the people. But though that was clearly the intention of the framer of the Bill when it was introduced, we find that after he had adopted that principle, in obedience to some outside influence which it is impossible to gather at the present time, he grafted on to this principle the revising barrister. He adopts the principle of the provincial franchise, he says that for federal elections we shall use the voters' list of the several provinces, then he takes up the revising barrister and brings him into the Bill for the purpose of—what? It is impossible to say.

Mr. BERGERON. For the principle of uniformity.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The principle of uniformity—why it is impossible to imagine that the principle of uniformity can exist when you consider the variety of franchises in the provinces. The only possible intention must have been to provide that in case any province should disfranchise individuals for instance, the revising barrister should remedy such grievance, if any grievance really existed. It was to have some federal control over the franchise, not for the purpose of uniformity. Now that is what took place in 1894. The Bill was not passed, I believe it did not reach the committee stage. But in 1895 another Bill was introduced which was framed to some extent on the lines of that which is now submitted to the consideration of this House, that was the Bill introduced by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). That Bill met with considerable approval in the House, but at that time the hon. gentlemen who were then sitting on the Government side, were evidently more seriously engaged in other matters, and the conclusion to which they came was that in view of the then impending elections it was not wise to change the basis of the franchise. However, it seems to me that from 1894 the principle has been settled and established in this House that we should revert to the conditions existing previous to 1895 and adopt the principle of provincial franchises. Now, if we consider what has been the result to the country of the adoption of the Franchise Act in 1885, we find that from that date to

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

1895 during ten years, it cost this country \$1,154,000.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). For three revisions.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. For four revisions, but in any case, that was the cost to the country. Now, if we consider the cost to individuals, to the members, to those who take part in the administration of public affairs, I am safe in saying that we may place that at another half a million dollars. I think it is, at all events, a very safe estimate, and those who have had more experience than I have would consider probably that it is a very low estimate, to conclude, after adding these two amounts together, that the total expense during those ten years has been in the vicinity of \$1,500,000 at the very least. Now, under these circumstances we say that it is proper for us to revert to the conditions existing before 1885. We say that the Act of 1885 has not produced the results that were expected of it, and we say that the application of that Act has involved an expenditure out of all proportion to the benefits realized. We say furthermore, that the uniformity which it has been contended was secured by that Act, is not a principle which would justify us in setting aside that idea which we think ought to prevail, that we should put the franchise, not under the control of this House, but under the control of the electorate, under the control of the people who sent us here, put that as directly as possible under their control by placing it in the hands of the municipal councils. We say that uniformity is not desirable, because the conditions existing in this country are not the same throughout. So far as I am concerned as a citizen, speaking now as a member from the province of Quebec, I say it would be unfair to the people of that province, for instance, that we should endeavour to impose upon them universal suffrage. They are the best judges of what they require, they are the best judges of the conditions under which they wish their members to be chosen, they are the best judges of the principles which they wish to see applied, and also of the class of voters that are to select the men that are to come here to represent them. It may be that a desire exists in some provinces to extend the franchise so broadly that all men may have a right to participate in the elections; there may be a desire that all men, even those whose only asset in life is the vote they may dispose of as a marketable commodity in the elections, should occupy the same position as the man who has some stake in the country. I say that in the province of Quebec, at all events, our desire has been so far as our provincial franchise is concerned to have some regard to property, to the rights of education, to the rights of the artisan who contributes something to meet the public expenditures; and we can see no reason why those rights should be set at naught,

and that we should yield to the desire that appears to exist elsewhere to impose upon our province that which the province has never been willing to accept, universal suffrage. Under these circumstances I move the second reading of the Bill.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill has done so briefly, because I think it will be the less necessary that I should detain the House under the circumstances, for any considerable period. The hon. gentleman has based the introduction of this measure very largely upon the views of an hon. gentleman who held a very distinguished position in this House, Sir John Thompson; but I think he has entirely misapprehended the position that hon. gentleman took and the mature opinion at which he arrived. It is quite true that the Bill which was adopted by this House, giving us the franchise of 1885, admittedly proved to be a somewhat expensive measure; there can be no doubt it was found to be attended with a large amount of expense, so large an expense as to prevent the revision of the lists as frequently as it is desirable the lists should be revised. But the hon. gentleman could not say that the proposal was to revert to the system that was in operation before for many years, or in fact from confederation down to that period, because he knows that the policy of adopting the franchises of the provinces was absolutely necessary in the first instance. There were no means of creating a franchise until this Parliament had been elected and had assembled; and it was therefore essential to use the franchises of the various provinces. The policy was a matter of absolute necessity; it was not a matter of choice. But after mature consideration, and after the experience this House had of the franchise of the various provinces as the franchise of this Dominion Parliament, the House deliberately came to the conclusion that it was due to the character and independence of this Parliament that we should depart from this arrangement and have a franchise of our own. I need not at this moment go into the evidences that existed in regard to that point, further than to say that it was found that the right and power of the local legislatures to select a franchise, which was afterwards used by the Dominion, was in some cases certainly grossly abused; and so strongly was that abuse pursued, that in the province of Nova Scotia the legislature absolutely passed a franchise Act after the general election to have an effect upon the Dominion elections, although they never intended to use it and never did use it, for their own elections; and they repealed the Act before the local elections came on, showing they had absolutely the power to control the representation of this Parliament, by adopting

a policy which they did not exercise themselves and never intended to exercise. One such illustration is sufficient to prove the absolute necessity of this Parliament, if it was going to occupy an independent position in the estimation of the country and the world adopting a franchise of its own. That led to the passage of the Act of 1885, and the experience of that law was that it was attended with very considerable expense, and a desire arose, and naturally arose, and which no doubt exists generally in the minds of hon. members, to endeavour to modify that Act in such a way as to prevent the very large expenditure it necessarily involved, and which led to the still worse effect of precluding the prevention of frequent revision of the electoral lists as was desired. The hon. gentleman said that that system to which he proposed to revert was one long anterior to confederation. I do not understand what the hon. Solicitor General means, because anterior to confederation there could be no possible analogy between the adoption of the franchises of the provinces and the election of members to this Parliament, and the subject we have now under consideration.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. By the making of the lists by the municipalities.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That question does not necessarily arise. Does this Parliament intend to avail itself of the expenditure made by the municipalities and provinces and take their lists?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Certainly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then I think the hon. gentleman is enjoying the expenditure made by the provinces for provincial purposes to an extent which I do not think this Parliament would be justified in doing. But I find in this Bill the hon. gentleman provides, and I find he is obliged to provide, under certain circumstances which may arise for the independent creation of a franchise for the purposes of Dominion elections, such a measure of relief, and it is necessary because if he had not that power, he might be left in the position of having no franchise in a province when it is required, or of having a franchise so old as to make it very inadvisable that it should be used. The point I want to come to, therefore, is this: If this Parliament has the right, as this Bill assumes it has the right, to avail itself of the officials appointed by a province for the purpose of creating a franchise, if we have that right—and I will not for a moment dispute it except as a matter of common justice—then there is no reason why, without surrendering the position of being deprived of the power to pass that legislation upon which the representatives of this Parliament should be elected to sit here, we should not avail ourselves

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

of those officials and their lists. If that was the position, we would have the power, without necessarily reverting to the franchises of the provinces for Dominion purposes, of using their lists. I think, therefore, that what any hon. member would feel was desirable was that this Parliament should have the means of legislating, should have power and control in respect to the franchise upon which hon. members are elected to sit in this Parliament. If that were the case, we should endeavour to avoid the only objection that was raised against the Act of 1885, or at all events the main objection raised, and that was in regard to the expense involved; and according to the present Bill the difficulty can be avoided just as well without surrendering our independent control of the franchise under which members of this Parliament are elected. I think, therefore, the measure provides a means of meeting the only substantial difficulty ever presented in regard to the Act of 1885. Sir John Thompson, no doubt, gave this subject a good deal of consideration; but it is impossible when you take all his statements in this House into consideration, not to arrive at the conclusion that while his purpose was not to adopt the franchises of the various provinces as the franchise for the election of members of this House, but his proposal was that the franchises of the provinces should be adopted as a basis upon which the officers of this Parliament should prepare a franchise for Dominion purposes.

If the matter is carefully investigated, it will be found that it did not go any further than that. I have alluded to one of the strongest evidences of the humiliating position in which this Parliament is placed, if we divested ourselves of all control over the franchise under which members to this House are elected. When we were discussing this measure last session, we had placed before us an illustration of the wretched occurrences which took place in connection with the administration of the franchise law in the province of Manitoba. Will any one in this House deny the existence of the monstrous frauds under which the elections were carried on, and are carried on, in the province of Manitoba? We had it pointed out here, last session, that, under the officials appointed, and under the law of the province of Manitoba—a law that we are invited by this Government to make the law for the election of members from that province to the Federal Parliament—a most disgraceful state of things existed. What occurred then is likely to occur to-morrow, if an election should take place, and it will doubtless occur, unless that law is changed. The Manitoba law provided for the revision of the lists, and it was proved before the officials appointed by the Manitoba Government to revise the lists, that in constituencies where parties were evenly balanced, whole batches of names were placed upon

the lists—names of parties who had no existence, and who could not be found within the bounds of the province, nor anywhere else. The objectors to these names pointed out this clearly to these revising officers, who acted in the capacity of judges, and asked to have the names struck off the lists, but one of these officials said: No, I will not strike the names out, unless you have evidence that you have served each of those parties with a notice. Now, Sir, it was plain that these parties could not be served with notice, because they had no existence, and yet these spurious individuals were kept on the voters' lists so that on election day others could vote in their stead, and so change the result in these close constituencies. The evidence of that was placed before this House; the affidavits were read, and they could not be contradicted. Imagine, Sir, the humiliating position that every member of this House will occupy when such a thing as that is made possible in this Parliament. I have shown that, not only is it possible, but it has been done, and we have every reason to believe the same thing will be done to-morrow, if we adopt the franchise law of Manitoba—a law which we will adopt, if this Bill passes. Is there any man in this House who will not feel humiliated, when he finds he is sitting alongside a gentleman from that province who has been sent to this Parliament as a result of the most palpable and transparent fraud? This Parliament occupies a high position now, but it will occupy a low position, indeed, the moment the finger of scorn can be pointed at any of its members, and it can be established that he sits here as the result of such frauds as must bring to our minds the strongest possible feeling of repugnance.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) tells us he objects to uniformity, but why? He knows that, to-day, there is great uniformity in the franchises of the provinces of this Dominion. The province of British Columbia has universal suffrage; the North-west Territories have universal suffrage; the province of Manitoba has universal suffrage; the great province of Ontario has universal suffrage; the province of New Brunswick has universal suffrage, and the province of Prince Edward Island has universal suffrage. That narrows down the whole question of uniformity to the province of Quebec and the province of Nova Scotia. I do not intend at this moment to go into that question, further than to draw attention to the fact of how nearly we can approach to uniformity, if there is a disposition to do so, and how, under the proceedings contained in this Bill, we can obtain such lists by the municipal authorities in the various constituencies as to entirely avoid any very large expenditure. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has provided, in certain cases which he sees may arise, just such machinery as would give us

a franchise of our own, over which we would have control, and a franchise carried out under the authority of officers appointed by the Dominion Government. I am quite sure that no Government of this Dominion will ever, in the appointment of officials or in any other way, expose us to the humiliation of having these franchise matters dealt with as they have been dealt with by the government and legislature of the province of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) says that they will feel this a great hardship in the province of Quebec. I do not quite see why that should be. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), on a very recent occasion, paid that great province, which we all recognize as the most powerful portion of this Dominion, my right hon. friend paid that province—the province of Ontario, not the province of Quebec—the great compliment of saying that it was his right arm.

Mr. BERGERON. Which was paralyzed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I shall not go into the question of what the vigour of that right arm is now; but, as I say, we all recognize the position the province of Ontario occupies in this Dominion, and if that great province, after long experience, finds that manhood suffrage is a proper qualification for its voters, I do not think that either the province of Nova Scotia, where there is a low property qualification, or the province of Quebec, where, I believe, the qualification is still lower, would have any very great reason to regret its franchise being placed on the same basis as that of the province of Ontario. I trust therefore that my hon. friend will find some better reason than that for avoiding what I feel is a matter of great importance to this House—to its character, its standing, its estimation in the eyes of its own members and in the eyes of the world; that is, the control of its own franchise such as the great parliament of England possesses, as well as the parliaments of France, Germany and other great countries. I hope it is still not too late for the Government to reconsider this matter, in the light of the remarks that have fallen from the introducer of the Bill, and in the light of the remarks which I have made, with the view of doing that which we all wish to do—avoiding any great expense in connection with the franchise of the country. This Dominion is quite able to bear a certain amount of expenditure for so important a purpose, and a reconsideration of the question may enable us to reach a common ground where we may have due and suitable control over our franchise, adopting for its basis what may be found to be most wise and most judicious, and what will not leave us in the humiliating position of being elected to sit here under franchises which are liable to be changed from day to day by provincial legislatures—in some

cases very small legislatures—over which in that regard we exercise no control whatever. I will not detain the House further than to say that I hope still that it is not too late for the Government to reconsider the measure along that line, with a view of reaching a satisfactory solution of the question by the adoption of a policy that will commend itself not to one side of this House only, but to all of us sitting on either side, and enable us to preserve for the Parliament of Canada that independent position which I feel is absolutely necessary to command the respect either of our own country or of other countries that may be aware of the position we occupy.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, it is a mere truism to say that the question which has been introduced into the House by my hon. friend the Solicitor General in this Bill is one of the most important to which Parliament can give its attention. Of all the matters that can come before us, every one will acknowledge that this is the one which should command the most calm and judicial discussion on both sides of the House. It is at the very basis of our parliamentary institutions, these institutions of which we are legitimately proud; and I congratulate the House on the fact that the discussion has been commenced in so judicial and calm a temper, both by my hon. friend who introduced the Bill and by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. We are agreed on one fact—and I am glad to have it from the mouth of my hon. friend himself—that there should be a reform in the law which is now the Franchise Act of this Dominion. So far as my opinion goes, the only reform which ought to be satisfactory is to reform that Act absolutely out of existence. Those who were in this House in 1885, when the measure was introduced, will recollect quite well that it was supported by the Government of that day very reluctantly. Our experience is that it has been received less than cordially by the country. The record shows that it was never carried out in its entirety, either by the Government that introduced it or by the succeeding Governments. A fundamental principle of that Act is that there should be a revision of the lists every year. The reason of that is obvious. The lists ought always to be in such a condition that if the electorate is to be consulted, every man who by the law would be entitled to vote should be in a position to exercise that right. But what is the condition of things at the present time? There are by-elections coming off, and there are others that may come off at no distant date, and these elections have to take place on lists almost four years old. The Act has been in force since 1886, and under it we should have had twelve yearly revisions; but if my memory serves me, we have had only three, certainly not more than four. We had one in 1886, another in 1891, and

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

another in 1894. The Act is a perfect terror to members on both sides of the House; it is an incubus even to those members who are responsible for its existence. My hon. friend the Solicitor General has stated that the three revisions which we have had have cost the country a million and a quarter of dollars. I venture to say that every penny of a similar amount has been expended, not by the Government, but in addition to the expenditure of the country, by members and candidates. Now, we have all come to the conclusion that the present Act has to be reformed in some way. But there is more than that. I am glad to have the statement of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that he is not satisfied with that Act. In 1894 Sir John Thompson, who was at that time Prime Minister, himself introduced a Bill in this House, providing for another system. What the character of that measure was I will not say at present; I will revert to that later on. Let it be sufficient to have it admitted that the present law is unpopular with and unsatisfactory to both parties in this country, and that a reform has become absolutely necessary. Thus far we do not differ. As to what should be the character of that reform, what should be the nature of the franchise on which the members of this House should be elected, there we differ. There I take issue with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Our policy is that the franchise under which the members of this House should be elected is the franchise under which members of the local legislatures are elected. This is the position which we have taken from the beginning; this is the position we maintain at this moment. This policy my hon. friend controverts; but I think I shall be able to show that this is the only true policy for a system of government like ours. My hon. friend said a moment ago that this House should have the control of its franchise, such as the parliaments of Great Britain, France, and such other countries have. My hon. friend forgets that Great Britain is not a federated country; neither is France. I put the question to my hon. friend whether in a country like ours, a federated country, where there is a division of legislative powers between the federal authority and the provincial legislatures—whether or not the system we propose is not the very best that can be proposed. My hon. friend, however, opposes this policy, and his policy, if I understood him aright, is that we should have a franchise of our own, enacted by this Parliament. In support of that position, my hon. friend gave only one reason which in my judgment is at all worthy of attention. My hon. friend said a moment ago that Parliament should keep in its own hands the control of the franchise under which its members should be elected. This proposition I do not propose to controvert here and now, though it might be successfully controverted,

at least by the authority of precedent. Under the American constitution which, in so far as the federation principle is concerned, is largely a prototype of our own, the regulation of the franchise for the election of members for Congress is not under the control of Congress; but is embodied in the constitution itself and is a fixed enactment, beyond and above the legislative powers of Congress. The proposition which I lay down at this moment is that under our system of a federative government, it is quite in the fitness of things and of good government that there should be only one franchise. Before I proceed on this point, however, though I do not intend to controvert the principle that this Parliament should regulate its own franchise, though I agree that it is perhaps better that our constitution should be in this respect what it is rather than follow the American constitution, and agreeing that we should keep in our own hands the regulation and the control of our own franchise, I wish to say to my hon. friend that when this Parliament declares, in the sovereignty of its powers, that it shall adopt the franchise of the provinces, it controls its own franchises just as effectively as if it were enacting one of its own.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, just as effectively it exercises its sovereign power, Parliament can say, in the sovereignty of its power, that we shall have a franchise of our own, or in the sovereignty of its power it may decide that we shall take the franchises of the different provinces, and in either case Parliament exercises the sovereignty with which it is vested. Does my hon. friend pretend or will any hon. gentlemen on the other side pretend that in order to have the control of its own franchise, this Parliament is obliged to enact one for itself, even though it would be satisfied with the provincial franchise? Supposing that the franchises in the different provinces are satisfactory to the Dominion Parliament, if there is any logic in the contention we have heard this afternoon, although the provincial franchises should be absolutely as perfect and satisfactory as they could be, still we ought to adopt a different franchise simply to show that we have the control of what is our own. Sir, there is neither logic nor reason in that, and I am safe in saying, therefore, that this Parliament controls its own franchise just as effectively by adopting the provincial franchises as by making a franchise of its own. I now come to this proposition, which I lay down as a principle of good government, that under a federative government such as our own, it is better that there should be only one franchise as regards the provinces and the Dominion—the same franchise should serve to elect members of this House as to elect members of the local legislatures. The reason for

that is that our system is a system of divided legislative powers. I recall principles which are familiar to all, but I have to do it to draw the conclusion I propose to draw. Our system is a system of divided legislative powers—divided between the central Government and the provincial legislatures, but whether it be the federal House of Commons or a provincial legislature, it is the same people who are represented in each. It is the people of the province of Quebec who are represented here in the Dominion Parliament and the same people who are represented in the legislature sitting in Quebec. It is the people of the province of Ontario who are represented here in the Dominion Parliament and the same people who are represented in the legislature sitting in Toronto. And so it is in the case of every other province; but, as we know very well, the powers which are confided by the people to their mandataries whether their representatives sit at Toronto or Quebec or Ottawa, are different. The powers which they give their representatives at Ottawa are of one class. They embrace those subjects which pertain to the nation, as a whole, whereas the powers they confide to their representatives in the local legislatures are powers which are only of a local or purely domestic character. These principles are well known, but still if kept well in mind, they will afford a solution of the question before us. Such being the case, I venture to state another proposition, which is this—that the regulation of the franchise is, above all things, a domestic matter which concerns and ought to be regulated by the local legislatures and not by this Parliament. If it be true that all the provinces are here represented—if it be true that the same people are represented, whether in this Parliament of the local legislatures, I lay it down as a principle, not admitting of successful contradiction, that the regulation of the franchise is one of those questions which, though not nominally delegated to the representatives of the local legislatures, still, by the very essence of things, ought to be regulated by the local legislatures and not by the Dominion Parliament. What is the reason? The reason is that the experience of all countries, governed by parliamentary institutions such as our own, shows us that the extension or the restriction of all franchises is a question which depends largely upon the conditions of the different communities where the franchises apply. It is a question of education, of customs, of circumstances; and in no two cases hardly do you find the same franchise apply. This I think we can show both by the authority of reason and precedent. Take the very case of the Canadian confederation. We have seven provinces in the Canadian confederation, and in no two of them do the franchises perfectly agree. We find in all the same principle; we find that in all the principle of sovereignty is largely democra-

tic, it is almost universal manhood suffrage, still it is not universal. There are restrictions of education, of property qualification, of residence, payment of taxes, and so on. In the province of Ontario there is manhood suffrage and the qualification is a residence of nine months. In the province of British Columbia there is manhood suffrage and the qualification is a residence for twelve months. In the province of Quebec the principle is largely democratic as here in Ontario, but it is not yet absolute manhood suffrage. There are restrictions of property ownership. So it is in Nova Scotia and some other provinces. If we were to take—if the expression is pedantic, I do not intend to use it as such—the philosophic view of this question, I suppose all would admit that every one who contributes to the revenue, every one who pays his taxes, ought to have the right to vote. That I think is a sound principle, but it is not one which is acted upon even in the most democratic of all countries. For instance, in the American Republic if the principle that every one who is a taxpayer and pays his taxes ought to be a voter, the woman who earns her own bread, the spinster who toils, as many do, ought to be a voter. The young man not yet twenty-one years of age who goes into the bush and labours and toils for himself and therefore contributes to the revenue ought also to be a voter. Yet there is no country where a young man under twenty-one is a qualified voter. What does this prove? It proves what I have been contending for, namely, that the regulation of the franchise is largely a matter of custom or education or sentiment, if you please—even of prejudice—but after all it is a question, the determination of which had better be left to the different communities which are represented in the local legislatures. We have the authority of our own country in this respect. There is more. I quoted a moment ago the American constitution. There is a precedent there, an extreme one, I admit, but one which shows the truth of what I have been contending for. It is a matter of history that one of the questions debated with the greatest earnestness before the Continental Congress when they met to adopt the constitution of United States was this very question of the franchise—what should be the franchise adopted for members of Congress. After long and long debate, the question was decided in the way for which I have been contending, that is to say, it was decided that the suffrage by which members of the House of Representatives should be elected should be the same as for the state elections. Let me quote upon this subject from the letter of the constitution. Article 2 says:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several states; and the electors in each state shall have the qualification required—
Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

site for electors of the most numerous branch of the state legislature.

My hon. friend spoke of the humiliation of having members of this Parliament elected under a franchise over which they had no control. Why, Sir, if there be humiliation, it is a humiliation which has been on the statute-book of the United States from the very beginning of their government, and I am not aware that the principle has ever been controverted in the American union. On the contrary, I shall show presently that all the discussions that have taken place, all the trouble which has arisen regarding this matter have been due to the attempts which have been made at one time in order to get over this provision.

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

After Recess.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the question which is now engaging the attention of the House, I quoted the American constitution. I did not quote it as a precedent to be copied servilely, but as one worthy of close attention and examination. I stated that under the American constitution members of the House of Representatives are elected upon a franchise which is not regulated by themselves, which is not regulated by the American Congress, but is enacted by the state legislatures. This system has been in force for more than a hundred years. During that time, as we know, the American constitution has had to undergo many ordeals, but the system enacted under this section has been maintained with one exception, and that exception, as is well understood, is justified and explained if we reflect that it grew out of the circumstances following the civil war. After the close of the civil war, the leaders of the victorious party, the Republican party, thought that their work would not be complete unless that the African race, which had just been emancipated and brought to the plenitude of civil rights was also endowed with the plenitude of political rights, and to give expression to this thought, to give it absolute certainty, the 15th amendment of the American constitution was passed a few years after the close of the war. It read as follows:—

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of race, colour, or previous condition of servitude.

The object of this amendment was very plain indeed. It was passed only after prolonged discussion, and the object was to give to the coloured race, which had just been emancipated, the same rights of suffrage that belonged to the white race. The object was that in any state, especially in

the Southern States, where a white man had a right of suffrage a coloured man similarly situated should have the same privilege. Everybody will coincide that this was a noble thought, a most generous inspiration. But it is a matter of history, experience has shown, that though the thought was a noble one, though that inspiration was a generous one, still this amendment of the constitution, instead of producing the good results which were anticipated from it, has been productive of none but evil consequences.

They had taken that action, probably, in view of the fact that some members of the coloured race, or representatives of that race who had been emancipated, were equal in most respects to their white neighbours. We have a few coloured citizens in our country also. They are not many, but, wherever they are found, I think it may be truly said of them that they are equal in every particular to the other members of the community. But it was not so in the Southern States. Experience has shown that it was a mistake on the part of the white people to take millions of men out of the degradation of slavery and bondage and to give them an absolute right of citizenship. Experience has shown that the thousands whom it was the intention of Congress to bring to the polls, were not competent, after years of servitude, to exercise the great powers of the franchise with which they were clothed. They were driven to the polls by wicked, designing and corrupt men. They had no conception of the rights and prerogatives which had been placed in their hands. Many unhappy instances have been given, and many occurrences have taken place which showed their ignorance of their duty and their responsibility. We know that, under that law and under the amendment to that law, by reason of the privileges and prerogatives which were given to the emancipated race, the power of government passed into the hands of wicked and corrupt men, which brought the African population of the Southern States into the most lamentable condition. Under such circumstances, the white population of the Southern States, whether they belonged to the Democratic or Republican persuasion, found means and methods to take away from the African race the franchise which had been conferred upon them by Congress. In one state, for instance, they enacted a law, that no man should be an elector, unless he was a property owner; in another state they passed a law, that no man should be an elector, unless he had paid his taxes; in another state they passed a law, that no man should be an elector, unless he paid his taxes and brought his receipt to the poll; in another state they passed a law, that no man should be an elector, unless he could read and write. While in the terms of these enactments they applied to all races, in point of fact they applied particularly to

the African race, and practically they took away from that race the right of suffrage which had been given to them by Congress.

Now, what is the conclusion which should be derived from this state of things? Why do I bring these examples to the attention of Parliament? Simply to show what I have been contending all along, that the right of suffrage is, above all things, a domestic right, to be determined according to the conditions of education, and of the particular circumstances which are to be found in each community. This is the reason why I have brought up this argument. I say this is an additional reason—an extreme case, I admit, but a case which shows forcibly the truth of the position which we, as a party, have taken upon this question, that in a country like ours, under a federal system of government, the only proper solution of this question is to place the right of suffrage in the hands of the local legislature. Now, Sir, it is remarkable, that for the first nineteen years since confederation, from 1867 to 1886, during which that system prevailed, all the elections which took place in this country, took place, not under a Dominion franchise, but under a provincial franchise. This was the franchise under which the elections of 1867, 1872, 1874, 1878 and 1882 took place. Surely, judging from the result of those elections, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have no reason to complain of the franchise which then prevailed. Moreover, I am safe in asserting that, during the nineteen years this system prevailed, not a word of complaint was ever uttered against it. It gave universal satisfaction. But while it gave such universal satisfaction, it is also true that, during all those years, although, with the exception of five years, the Conservative party were in office all that time, the leaders of the Conservative party still harboured the thought of obtaining from this Parliament the enactment of a Dominion franchise. It is not known at the present time, because it has been forgotten, that the Franchise Act which was passed in 1885, had been introduced into this House by the Conservative party while they were in office, no less than seven times. It was introduced seven times, but it failed six times and was only carried on the seventh occasion, carried, as we know, after a tremendous struggle against it by the Liberal party; and we also know that it was carried with no cheerful disposition on the part of the Conservative party. The event has shown that, on that occasion, the good sense of the party was far better and far above the sense of the leaders of that party; events which have taken place during the last twelve years have shown that in the ranks and file of the Conservative party there was a better political intuition, more wisdom, than existed among the leaders of the party; and if the good sense of the rank and file of the party had prevailed, the Dominion Fran-

chise Act never would have been enacted. They were satisfied with the provincial franchise, and we propose to revert to the provincial franchise to-day.

Now, what is one of the strongest reasons why we should revert to the provincial franchise? I have given to the House what I conceive are the theoretical reasons; let me now give what are the practical reasons. Of all such reasons, the most practical, in the view of men on both sides of the House, is that the provincial franchise in its operation is absolutely simple and inexpensive. In the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and for that matter in most of the provinces, the lists are prepared by the municipal councils. It is so in the province of Ontario; it is so in the province of Quebec, and it is so, I believe, in the province of Nova Scotia. If there be a system which is absolutely fair and inexpensive, just and equitable, it is the system whereby the preparation of the voters' lists is placed in the hands of the local councils. The local councils represent small bodies—villages, parishes and townships. They are composed of six or seven men, as a rule. They know each other, both parties are represented at the board. Every member of the council is familiar with the circumstances of every family in his constituency. He knows the number of children in each family, and circumstances of the head of the family. He knows who are qualified in any family to be electors, how many sons each farmer has, and he knows the means of every family. He is, therefore, absolutely competent to know who should be, and who should not be, a qualified elector. So far as my experience goes in the province of Quebec—and I believe it is the same in the province of Ontario—very few complaints, indeed, are ever made against the decisions given by the municipal councils under such circumstances. Sir, we propose to revert to the former system. The leader of the Opposition—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. I notice the Opposition has a new leader, and I hope he will allow me to offer him my congratulations.

Mr. MORIN. Merci.

The PRIME MINISTER. The former leader of the Opposition, the leader this afternoon, stated in answer to my hon. friend the Solicitor General, that Sir John Thompson had not reverted to the provincial franchise. The Solicitor General took issue with him at the time, and the assertion of my hon. friend is more than borne out by the facts. I have here the Bill introduced by Sir John Thompson, shortly before his lamented death, in the session of 1894. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to section 4, and they will plainly see that the principle for which we have contended, for which we

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

contend now, is admitted, and explicitly admitted, and I shall show in a few minutes where the difference came. Here is the principle laid down in the 4th section:

Except as hereinafter otherwise provided, the qualification of voters at a Dominion election shall, in any province of Canada, be that established by the laws in force in such province on the first day of June in the year during which the lists for use at such election were prepared as the qualification of voters at a provincial election.

Nothing can be clearer than that. There was not by that system the uniformity for which the hon. gentlemen opposite contend. Later on Sir John Thompson introduced some modifications, some extensions, some restrictions of the qualification laid down in that section; but this is not material. The blemish in the Act introduced by Sir John Thompson, and it is to me an absolute and irredeemable blemish, was that while he adopted the provincial franchise, yet he retained the revising officer and the preparation of the list by the revising officer. I say this is the blemish in the Act. Here is section 5:

The Governor in Council may from time to time appoint a proper person to be called the revising officer.

Let me call attention to section 10, which says:

On, or as soon as possible after, the first day of June in each year, the revising officer shall obtain certified copies of the provincial voters' lists then in force and of the last assessment roll, and with all the information he can obtain from these sources and from the last list for a Dominion election, and from the municipal and other official list, records and proceedings, and from any other source which he has reason to believe reliable, and by means of solemn declarations made as hereinafter provided according to the Canada Evidence Act, 1893, shall prepare a list of voters.

These are the objections which we had at the time to the Bill of Sir John Thompson. It was far more logical according to our view, having adopted the principle of the provincial franchise, to also accept the voters' lists so prepared under the authority of the provincial legislature. On this side of the House we have an absolute hostility to the revising officer and the lists prepared by the revising officer. During the last twenty years we have suffered too much at the hands of revising officers, it has cost too much time and money to prepare lists, the system is indefensible and we propose to come back to the custom of former times and use lists prepared by the provincial councils in Ontario and Quebec. I place myself in the judgment of the House when I say that the lists so prepared in Ontario, with the exception of the lists in the cities, do not cost a cent to the provincial treasury; the lists in Quebec do not cost a cent to the provincial treasury; and those lists in Ontario and Quebec do not cost a cent to individual members. They are prepared by

the municipal councils without any expenditure. I propose that we shall revert to that system. If we apply the principle of the provincial franchise, why should we not take at the same time the means and methods by which the principle is applied? An objection, however, has been raised this afternoon by the leader of the Opposition which has some force in it. The hon. gentleman stated he could not accept the provincial lists because the provincial legislature may abuse their legislative power. He stated the case of Nova Scotia, in which he said the legislature had passed a most obnoxious law. In so far as Nova Scotia is concerned the argument did not go very far; indeed he refuted his own argument because he stated at a later period that the legislature of that province had repealed the obnoxious law. Then the hon. gentleman cited the case of Manitoba. I am not familiar with the system of the province of Manitoba. I have heard it attacked, but I am not sure the attacks were always well grounded. But let us assume for an instant that the system of the legislature of Manitoba was unfair, as was stated by the hon. gentleman this afternoon. If so, it can be remedied just as the unfair system, according to the hon. gentleman, which prevailed in Nova Scotia, was remedied. But there is force, I admit, in that argument. I know there is force in the argument that a legislature can abuse its powers. We the Liberal party have known to our cost that the majority can abuse their legislative powers. It was an outrage, it was a scandalous abuse of the legislative power that the infamous Gerrymander Act was carried, whereby Ontario was cut and carved so that by clever manipulation it gave to the party then in power a clear majority of 20 seats over their opponents. This very Franchise Act was an abuse of power, whereby the revision of the lists was placed in the hands of henchmen of the Administration. True, there was some retributive justice, because hon. gentlemen opposite overreached themselves, and in their effort to make it an effective measure to suit their own ends, they made it cumbrous and costly to their own friends. In the face of all these statements, in the face of the arguments adduced we all agree that we must have reform of the law now in operation, and the only reform for which I contend is a reform which will reform out of existence the infamous Act known as the Franchise Act. I appeal to members of this House to discard party passions and legislate out of existence an Act which in operation has proved to be cumbrous, expensive, unjust and unfair, and I ask them to give a trial to a system which was in force nineteen years, and which proved not only sound in reason but convenient and inexpensive in practice.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. At this stage of the debate I should like to say a word or

two. There should be no difference of opinion on a question like this. No party has anything to lose by a system which will give a vote to every man who should vote and keep every man who should not vote off the list. I hold very strong views in connection with the present Franchise Act, and I think the First Minister in describing it as a perfect terror conveyed the impression I had entertained all along of the old Act. I think the Conservatives of Toronto who have had to fight a by-election on a four-years old list, have come around to my way of thinking. It is surely in the interest of all parties, of both political parties, to provide machinery for the making of a modern list at the smallest possible expense. It is not in the interests of the country that the system of preparing voters' lists should be so expensive as to keep the poor man out of Parliament, or to force him to come here under obligations to his rich friends, who provide funds to protect his interest in the revision of the lists. I rise to suggest that it is a pity to make a partisan fight over this question, and in that I agree thoroughly with the words of the right hon. the First Minister. There is no substantial cause for difference between the Conservatives and the Liberals on this subject, and if there is any substantial cause, I do not think that the position is so wide apart that it cannot be reconciled. It is in the interests of the country, and of both political parties that the present Act should be repealed and that the revising officer should be got rid of. The right hon. gentleman, the First Minister, has no more abhorrence, and I am sure the hon. members on the other side of the House have no more abhorrence in connection with the work of the revising barrister than have many of my hon. friends on this side. It is too bad that Parliament should be kept here week after week to fight this Act out on party lines, when the leaders on the Government side and the leaders of the Opposition could get together and in half a day's conference agree upon a law that would do justice to all, including those of our fellow-subjects who are disfranchised in thousands in every constituency where a by-election has to be fought upon a voters' list four years old.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I have listened with that pleasure which I am sure every hon. gentleman on this side of the House always feels when the right hon. the Prime Minister addresses us upon a subject which in this case he has admitted to be of the very greatest importance to the Parliament and to the people of Canada. I feel like commending those who have taken part in the debate thus far for the moderate tone of the language they have used to express their views upon the question now before the House. Ordinarily, and in years past, the mention of the Dominion Franchise Act operated a good deal like the proverbial red

rag before the bull, but happily we are now approaching this subject in a different spirit, because as has been expressed on both sides of the House, the great object to be obtained by any legislation we may enact in this Parliament is the greatest good to the greatest number; and, Sir, that is to be found in providing a franchise Act which, while inexpensive, will be wide in its operation, and which shall furnish every facility for every honest voter to get his name upon the list.

If the House will permit me, I shall for a few moments refer to the history of this Franchise Act, and in doing so I may, in the first place, allude to the historical reference that has been made by the First Minister, in his comparison of the system in vogue in the United States with the system in this country. At the outset I may say that hon. gentlemen who make that comparison between the franchise of the two countries fundamentally make an error in forgetting that in the United States, especially during that period referred to by the right hon. gentleman, subsequent to the revolutionary war and down to the sitting of the constitutional convention in 1787—the state rights existing in that country were the subject of the most jealous solicitude on the part of the people. Consequently, in that constitutional convention of 1787, the outcome of which was the present constitution of the United States as modified by the amendments (and they have not been very many) which have taken place since that time, the franchise of the state, which it was there agreed upon should be the franchise for election to the House of Representatives, was to some extent the result of a compromise. The question that was debated there for weeks was, as to the particular mode of representation that should be permitted in the House of Representatives. It was contended by Pinkney and many other eminent members of that convention that the system of state delegation which now obtains in the United States Senate, and which then obtained in what was called the Continental Congress, should be the system of representation in the House of Representatives. That is, that each state should send a certain number to the federal house. A sort of a compromise, as nearly as I can read the proceedings of that convention, led to the adoption of the state franchise for the House of Representatives, and state delegations or state representatives for the Senate of that country.

Now, Sir, when the fathers of confederation were deliberating upon that written part of our constitution, they deliberately, and with the example of the United States before them, inserted in the 41st section of the British North America Act, the provision: that until the Parliament of Canada otherwise ordered, the provincial franchises

Mr. WOOD (Brockville).

then in force should be the franchises of this Dominion House. Why did they do that? The spirit that prompted the members of the United States constitutional convention to enact as they did regarding the franchise was to preserve at all hazards the state rights, which were then of the utmost concern, and the jealous manner in which they guarded them, led to a condition of things which, even in the opinion of very great thinkers in the United States was worse than that which existed before the revolutionary war. It was felt that owing to that spirit, and the tenacity which the people of the United States adhered to state rights, and the trouble that ensued—and which was never ended until the conclusion of the civil war—it was felt that in framing the British North America Act we should avoid the errors they fell into and that we should strengthen rather than weaken the central authority. And to that end, and with that object in view, the fathers of confederation deliberately inserted in the British North America Act a provision that this Parliament was to enact a franchise which was to be the national franchise of the Dominion of Canada. There can be no question about that. If you will allow me, Sir, to go back to that period referred to by the right hon. the First Minister, where he alluded to the fact that the Franchise Bill was re-introduced into this House for several years before it was finally submitted and passed, I think the language of the then First Minister (Sir John A. Macdonald) is very explicit, and from it we find that it was introduced on all these different occasions in order that the principle of the measure might be well known to the people of Canada—and it was well known to the people of Canada by the time we got through with the discussion of 1885.

Reference has also been made by the right hon. gentleman to the fact that Sir John Thompson, when Premier of the Dominion of Canada, introduced a franchise measure. Now, whatever may have been the strict reading of the 6th section, to which he has alluded, I submit with all deference, that the view of Sir John Thompson in introducing that legislation, was to maintain that principle, which before confederation it was contended we should adopt in this House, which Sir John Macdonald did adopt in his Franchise Act of 1885, and which in my humble judgment this Parliament will err if they depart from. Sir John Thompson, in the debate of 1894—in a very brief discussion, I may say, because the Bill never reached the second stage—said:

We uphold the feature which I regard as the principal feature of the Franchise Act of 1885, and that is that the revision shall take place by officers under the control of this Parliament and of the Federal Government. The great principle which underlay the Franchise Act of 1885 was the control by this Parliament over

matters connected with the franchise. It was contended that control should exist in two branches ; in the first place, as regards the laying down of the franchise itself, and, in the second place, as regards the administration of the law by which the franchise was carried out. We have arrived, after the experience of eight or nine years, at the conclusion which I have stated, that it is not worth the effort to keep up the divergencies that exist between the two sets of franchises.

I read the last sentence, lest I might be charged with not reading something that would bear against my argument. I do not consider it to be a matter of such very great importance, what particular difference there is between the franchises of the provinces and the franchise that now exists for this Parliament, because practically we have manhood suffrage existing all over Canada to-day. In the great province of Ontario, we have it. In the province of New Brunswick, I think, we almost have it. In the province of Nova Scotia we virtually have it, for the standard of property qualification there is so low that almost any person can get on the list. If he has not an income of \$300 or \$400, or does not possess property to the amount of \$150 or \$200, he is almost certain to rent a house at \$20 a year, and that gives him a vote. In Manitoba and in the North-west Territories we have manhood suffrage. In the province of Prince Edward Island we have a very strange franchise ; in fact, we have none for the lower house, because any person who takes the oath at the poll can vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Oh, no. The franchise is a very plain one. It is residential manhood suffrage on the ground of taxes.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Have you a list made up ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No list.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Then, I am correct ; any person who takes the oath at the poll can vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He must pay his taxes.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Now, I wish to refer again briefly to the franchise laws in the United States, because there has never been an argument in this House on the subject of the franchise in which a comparison has not been made with those laws ; and I do not wonder at it, because at first sight they furnish a fair basis of comparison. In almost every state there is manhood suffrage. There is an educational test in some states ; but so far as I can learn, there is not a property qualification in any state of the union. In Massachusetts, I think, if a person owns property for one year that is taken as a substitute for a residential qualification of two years. That is the nearest ap-

proach to property qualification, but it is not property qualification. Where the state franchises are uniform throughout the whole country, it is very much easier to adopt them as a national franchise than it would be to adopt the provincial franchises in a country where those franchises all differ. I know that there are some gentlemen on the other side of the House who are opposed to what is called cumulative voting. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), who always took a very deep interest in legislation appertaining to the franchise, spoke as follows when this Bill was introduced by the Solicitor General during the last session of this Parliament :

I have only glanced hastily over the Bill of my hon. friend, and I do not see in it any provision for one man one vote. If there is not such a provision in the Bill, the hon. gentleman ought to insert it. Let the man vote, and not the property he holds.

Now, I submit to that hon. gentleman and to other hon. gentlemen on that side, whose party in every province of this Dominion believe in the principle of one man one vote, in favour of which much can be said, that by this Bill you adopt cumulative voting in the great province of Quebec. For instance, in the city of Montreal, a man may have a vote in several constituencies. It used to be so in the city of Toronto that hundreds of men had votes in East York, North York, Peel and other surrounding constituencies. You cut off all these votes, so far as the representation of this House is concerned ; you cut off entirely the cumulative voting that existed in the city of Toronto, and you allow it in the province of Quebec and in any other province where cumulative voting exists. I do not say that by that you increase the representation of any province ; but I do mean to say that you increase the potentiality of the voter. You increase his influence in the particular district where he resides, and you multiply the voting power of any province where the real property qualification exists, against the province where the principle of one man one vote only exists. Another important fact, which has been alluded to by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and to which too much importance cannot be attached, is this. We have had experience of the provincial franchises for the representation of this Dominion in this House, and notwithstanding all that has been said in praise of them, I humbly submit that we have on record instances in which the hostility of legislatures to the party in power has not been such as to warrant us in divesting ourselves of the powers which Parliament has assumed. We know that in Nova Scotia one member of the provincial legislature was powerful enough to secure the passage of an Act in that legislature before a general election for the Dominion, by which a large number of voters who belonged to the Dominion service were disfranchised, and after the election they

were enfranchised again. We have the authority of an hon. member of this House for that. We have another illustration in another province. We know that the provincial government of Ontario, a few years ago, was strong enough, and strongly enough attached to its friends of the federal party, to secure the passage of an Act in that legislature limiting the population of counties, by which the Conservative Government of the day was restricted in its ability to appoint junior judges. We know that immediately on the accession to power of hon. gentlemen opposite, that same government, as almost their first act, repealed that law, so as to enable this Government to appoint junior judges at their own sweet will. I submit that these illustrations justify us in assuming that a legislature will be tempted so to trifle with the franchise as to manipulate it for the advantage of their friends or otherwise. It is just as objectionable for a legislature to legislate in a hostile way as to legislate in a too friendly way. From all these considerations I conclude that this Parliament, having assumed the power of framing a national franchise for itself, it would be manifestly unwise for us now to go back upon that record. We cannot go back upon that record and revert to the condition that existed prior to the Act when we had no franchise at all and had necessarily to take the franchises that were then in force in the provinces. I would impress upon the Government, in concluding these remarks the necessity of endeavouring by some means, to retain the franchise in our own hands, and at the same time work it in as inexpensive a way as possible. I admit that the expense of the Dominion Franchise Act was unquestionably objectionable, and I know that the late Government intended to so legislate as to reduce that expense. I know that the late Sir John Thompson, in introducing his Bill of 1894, contemplated doing that, and I submit if the Government have the power, which they have taken to themselves in this Bill, to impose duties on the municipal officers of this country, they have the power to impose additional duties on them and to order them to make up from the provincial lists such a list as will be national in its character and uniform throughout the Dominion. Surely this Government possesses sufficient resources in itself to bring about that result, so that this Parliament will not divest itself of the right to make legislative enactments here regarding a subject which it was always intended should be controlled by this Parliament. I know we are all approaching this subject in as calm and judicial a spirit as we can bring to bear upon it, and for that reason I submit these remarks, hoping they may possibly be of some little use and possibly assist the Government in altering this Bill when it comes to be discussed in committee.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville).

Mr. SPROULE. I will not say but very few words on this question before the second reading of the Bill takes place, if it ever takes place, and my remarks will be principally directed in the way of a reply to some of those made by the right hon. leader of the Government in his defence of this measure. I cordially agree in his statement that this is one of the most important measures that has engaged the attention of this House for a long time, and it is because of its importance and the far-reaching consequence it will have that we ought to consider it most calmly and carefully. It is a question that deals with the right of the people to send their representatives here, and we have always regarded it as a most proper thing that the representatives of the people sent to this Parliament from the various provinces should be elected under the same law and the same franchise and the same qualification for voters, whatever that qualification might be. The right hon. leader of the Government says that the fact that every province in the Dominion has a different franchise of its own is no objection to this Bill. I have always regarded that as a most serious objection, one of the strongest we could possibly bring against adopting the provincial franchises. The fathers of confederation never contemplated that the provincial lists should be used for any length of time for electing members to this House. In the British North America Act, they only provided that these franchises should be used until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provided that provision was inserted for the purpose of electing the first Parliament, so that when elected and Parliament organized, Parliament could then deal with the question as it saw fit and lay down a proper franchise law, under which members should be elected to this House. Clause 41 of the British North America Act, says :

Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces at the union relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely, the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected to or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the returning officers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the trial of controverted elections and proceedings incident thereto, the vacating of seats of members, and the execution of new writs, in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution, shall respectively apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons, for the same several provinces.

If you take the various subjects that are included in that clause, you will find that almost every one of them has been dealt with by the House of Commons after it was organized. On every one of these subjects we legislated, and the last one was the franchise law. We took that up be-

cause we believed that the principle intended to be embodied in the Confederation Act was that this Parliament should control its own franchise, and we dealt with that question as we did with the various other questions on which the provincial laws governed us until we legislated upon them.

The right hon. leader of the Government cited the different franchises in the different states of the American Union as an argument in favour of this Parliament adopting the franchise of our provinces. I thought that if there was one argument more than another that condemned the principle embodied in this Bill, it was the one the right hon. gentleman then applied. In some of the states, they use what I think the right hon. gentleman called "artificial franchises," which were devised for the purpose of depriving the poor negro of the right to vote; and if I understood anything from his explanation, it was that these did great injustice to one class of the people. If that be the case, was it not rather an argument that we should not follow the same course here. As a matter of fact we have something of the same kind taking place in our various provinces. We have found in the provinces fancy franchises, adopted by the provincial legislatures, to the detriment of certain classes in the community, who were as well entitled to vote in the election of members to this House as any other class. And it was just because we found that evil becoming so great that it could not be tolerated any longer, that we took up the question in the Dominion Parliament and legislated as we did in 1886. The cases which the right hon. gentleman cited afford the very strongest argument why there should be one franchise law to control the election of members to this House in every province or territory of the Dominion. From 1867 to 1886, the right hon. gentleman said elections took place under the provincial lists, and not a word of dissatisfaction was heard. If that were the case, it would be a strong argument, but surely the right hon. gentleman's memory cannot be so short that he forgets the very strong objections and arguments that were used against the system then existing. Surely he does not forget that we found abuses creeping in at one time in one province and at another time in another province. Surely he does not forget that large classes of the community were disfranchised by the provincial legislatures, in order to minimize the votes that could be polled for the friends of the other party in the Dominion. Why, for instance, were the poor labourers down on the Intercolonial disfranchised, if not because it was supposed they might be friendly to the Conservative party and Government then in power at Ottawa, and be likely to vote for it? Why was it that in Ontario large classes were disfranchised? For the same purpose. And we found the same thing taking

place in province after province, and so we were obliged to avail ourselves of the right given us by the British North America Act to adopt a franchise of our own and extend equal rights to all citizens in electing members to this House. So far from not hearing any expressions of dissatisfaction, we heard them from every quarter, from Ontario, from New Brunswick, from Nova Scotia—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No, no; not from New Brunswick.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair), that he is mistaken. It is on record, and if he will look up "Hansard," he will see that it was referred to again and again, and many cases cited. I know what I am talking about as well as the hon. Minister of Railways, for I was through that fight.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What was the objection?

Mr. SPROULE. It is so long since that I cannot state the specific objection off-hand, but I know that it was cited and is on record in "Hansard." I am as clear on that point as I am on anything I say to-night. We found the same objection in Ontario, not once, but several times. Therefore, there was an urgent necessity for this law. While we were working under the provincial law, from 1867 to 1885, these evils crept in, making it necessary to change the law. Had the hon. gentleman's friends, who controlled the provincial legislatures, done justice to the people, there would have been no necessity for this Franchise Act.

The hon. leader of the Government says, that the most practical reason for this Bill is, that the provincial lists are inexpensive—they do not cost the provincial treasury a cent. I admit that; it is not the provincial government that pays for them. But does the right hon. gentleman mean to imply that they do not cost anything? Following the hon. gentleman's argument to its logical conclusion, and it would seem that he was trying to make the impression on the public mind that we get something for nothing. But because the money is not taken out of the provincial treasury, is that proof that it does not come out of some one's pocket? It comes out of the treasuries of the various municipalities, that is, it is paid directly by the people, when the tax-gatherer goes around. It is as expensive to make the provincial lists, proportionately, as it is to make the Dominion lists. Because it is not paid out of the provincial treasury, is it to be said that it costs nothing?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not cost the country one-fifth as much as the Dominion lists.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman may speak with authority of affairs in his own

province, but I can assure him that I know more about this matter, so far as my own province is concerned, than he does. I have gone into the calculation, and I know I am justified in saying that the provincial lists—and I have one here before me—cost the people practically as much, if not more, than the Dominion lists for the same locality, and it comes out of their pockets by direct taxation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Will it cost them any less, if we have our own lists for the federal elections?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not saying that; I am replying to the argument of the leader of the Government, that because these lists cost nothing, we should adopt them. He says that nothing is taken out of the provincial treasury for these lists. But I say that the money is taken from the people directly. For the Dominion lists have to be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Funds, the greater part of which is made out of customs duties on imported goods and inland revenue taxes. Therefore, there is not the force in the hon. gentleman's reasons that he would lead the House to believe.

I admit that I am not enamoured with some features of the Dominion Franchise Act. No doubt it was troublesome. Still, there are many things that are troublesome and expensive, and yet we think it well to have them, and we may think it so in this case. If we cannot get the provincial governments, whether Conservative or Reform, to do the fair thing to all political parties, it becomes necessary for this Parliament to pass its own franchise law. The leader of the Government, in connection with this matter, spoke of the "infamous gerrymander Act" that was so repulsive to his friends. I thought: Surely, he has not lived in Ontario for any length of time. If ever there was a law, in the history of Canada, that was infamous and detestable, those terms might be applied to the two gerrymander Acts passed by the provincial legislature of Ontario. Go into my county, and you will find constituencies that were carved twice in order to defeat one man. Notwithstanding that the great majority of the people in the county are Conservatives, in the provincial election of 1894 they did not send a Conservative to the Parliament from the county. It is true, that the indignation against the provincial government was so great in the last general election that they sent three representatives on the Conservative side. The more honourable element of the Reform party know that their friends did not do right to the county in gerrymandering it twice to turn out one man, Mr. Creighton, who was one of the best representatives that our county ever had. They cut one constituency out in such shape that no per-

Mr. SPROULE.

son would recognize it who did not live in the county. It was changed twice in order to defeat the one man and to send two representatives out of three as Reformers, although the majority in the county were Conservatives. Hon. gentlemen opposite should not mention gerrymander without hanging their heads in shame, for we have had an experience in Ontario that is a discredit, a disgrace, to any political party. Under the Ontario gerrymander it was impossible to get a fair expression of the views of the people.

Now, I for one have always held the view that a redistribution Act should be made by judges, or by some other independent power than Parliament. I have never been enamoured of the Redistribution Act introduced by our own friends. I hold that we want to give fair-play to the people of the country and we want a fair distribution. I would be willing tomorrow to see all the constituencies of the Dominion arranged by the judges of the country, and it is my opinion that it would be done fairly. It should be done at least by some independent tribunal who are not at all influenced by party politics. It would probably be as well to adopt any franchise law and to keep it in perpetuity, that would give fair-play to all political parties, and would give no one party a chance over the other. I think that ought to be done. But I say that the history of the past justifies us in the contention that the provincial governments so far have not meted out fair-play to the two parties in the country. They have changed the franchise law from time to time expressly for the purpose of defeating the will of the majority of the people, there is no doubt of it whatever. Then, when it answered their purpose, they afterwards repealed their franchise law. When you look at the acts of the provincial government of Ontario before the Conservative party were defeated in the Dominion, what do we find with reference to judicial districts and the appointment of judges? They passed a law saying that no county that has not a population of over 80,000 shall have a junior judge. The administration of justice, they said, did not require it, and it is entailing an expense on the province, or on the country, that we can avoid. Now, some were uncharitable enough to say that it was because these judges were appointed from and by the other political party, that is to say, by the Conservative party, who were then in power. Then what did we see? After the Conservatives were defeated in the Dominion, at the very next session of the provincial legislature, they repealed that law, and again provided for the appointment of junior judges. I think no one will say that that was not an unfair thing. It was done for the purpose of defeating the

will of the people, of benefiting a political party. Now, when they would do such an unfair thing as that, we are justified in the assumption that they would go further, they would commit an injustice with regard to the franchise laws for the purpose of strengthening their own friends. Therefore, I say, that notwithstanding that the old franchise law is an expensive one, I hold that is not a sufficient reason for abandoning it altogether. It should rather be our aim to devise some other means of retaining the same principle, but making its operation less expensive, while still keeping the franchise under our own control.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I wish to express my opinion upon this matter once more. I have expressed my opinion two or three times upon this Franchise Act, which was passed here in 1885. I have always called it, and I still see no reason why I should not continue to call it, the most iniquitous act which was ever placed upon the Statute-book of Canada. I use the word "iniquitous" advisedly, because we have now had experience of it for ten or twelve years, and that experience justifies me in characterizing it in this manner. I am certain, so far as certainty can go in the absence of actual knowledge, that that Act was brought in and passed through Parliament in 1885, not because of any necessity for a Dominion Franchise Act, but because the astute leader of the Conservative party at that time saw a necessity of providing some means by which he could legislate into the halls of this Parliament a number of his followers in the ensuing election. I regret that the Liberal party on that occasion did not allow that Act to pass in the form in which it was brought in, for if they had done so, the Act would so have disgusted the people of this country that it would have been repealed from the Statute-book long ago. But our friends sought to make it as little harmful as possible, and they spent no less than six weeks here battling with the Government with regard to that Franchise Act; and at the end of six weeks they did succeed in making it a good deal better and more acceptable than it was when it was first brought into the House. Now, that Act, in my opinion, and I think I may say in the opinion of a large number of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, is one that is unjust, it is cumbrous, and it was never thoroughly understood, even by the revising barristers who had command of it for ten or twelve years. The method of preparing those lists was so costly as to entail an extraordinary expense not only upon the candidate and his friends, but upon the opposite party as well. I think, Mr. Speaker, if we could ascertain the real sentiments of hon. gentlemen opposite, they would agree with us in deploring the burden of the expense imposed upon them by

that Franchise Act. I know very well that in the first place we had to contend against the prejudices of the revising barristers, who in nineteen cases out of twenty were in friendly relations with the party in power and they sought in the performance of their functions to give the benefit of a doubt always to their own party. Now, the expense attendant upon the four revisions that have taken place was truly extraordinary, and I am prepared to give you the figures which will show you that it is high time that this Franchise Act should be repealed, and that the country should be relieved of the tremendous outlay necessitated by its working. The first revision under this Act took place in 1886, and it cost this country no less than \$416,000, all spent to enable the Conservative party in the ensuing election to send here members that never would have come if a true and a just list had been in existence. Then, in 1887, they sought to give us a revised list again, and they went to the length of spending \$2,000. But their better sense got the control of them, and the list was not prepared until 1889. We find that in 1889 the list cost no less than \$238,426, and that list was not required at that time at all. It was therefore an expenditure of money without any reasonable justification. No election was held upon that list, so that a quarter of a million of dollars was thrown away, as if money was as plentiful as water, for the purpose of getting up a list which was of no use whatever to the people of this country. Then the next revision was in 1891, and it cost this country no less than \$226,749, almost another quarter of a million. In 1891 we had an election on that list. Then we had the list prepared again in 1894-95, which cost no less than \$243,554, and that list was two years old when the election of 1896 was held upon it. It was so imperfect that hundreds and thousands of men who had no right to vote were upon the list, while hundreds and thousands of young men who were only eighteen years of age when the list was prepared and who would be twenty-one at the time the election came on, had no right to vote under this Franchise Act. Therefore a large number by that Act were actually disfranchised, and a large number voted who had no right to vote to return representatives to this Parliament. In the next place, \$30,000 in various small items may be charged against these four revisions, making a total expenditure of no less than \$1,156,000 for the four revisions. It would almost appear that we had so much money we did not know what to do with it, when we were willing to spend a million and a quarter of dollars for the purpose of making a list, and abandoning a list which had for seventeen or eighteen years given satisfaction, against which not a single petition had ever been presented from any part of the country setting forth that the list was

not perfectly satisfactory ; and the change in the Act was not asked by the country but was introduced for political purposes by hon. gentlemen opposite to secure the ends they had in view. These items make an average expenditure of \$285,000 for every revision. But that is only half the expense. Those members who have had experience can testify what the expense really is to the candidate or his friends. What is done ? The revising officer or his clerk proceeds to prepare what we call the primary list and he proceeds to examine the assessment roll and the last revised list, and his opponent has to appoint a representative, and the consequence is that the examination of these assessment rolls and gathering in the names and the making of declarations and so on costs at least \$10 for every subdivision. That amounts to about \$75,000. But that is not all. Now we have the primary list. The next step is to frame a final list. What are we to do ? We have to get printed declarations and subpoenas, we have to employ bailiffs to serve them, we have to send notices to parties, and pay postage and registration charges, all of which will amount to \$10 for every polling subdivision. This would make a further amount of \$75,000, and I think that estimate very low. But that is not all the expense. There are, in addition, the courts before which the final lists are brought. On an average there will be one court for every seven or eight subdivisions ; so 1,500 courts are held in Canada for the purpose of bringing these matters before the revising officers. The expense is extraordinary. First, we have to employ a lawyer to discuss the matter with the revising officer, because we find that he often arrives at a wrong construction of the Act, and we have to watch him and put him right in our interest. We have to subpoena the witnesses and pay their expenses at so much per day, we have to hire horses to bring the parties to court, and in this way each court costs no less than \$20. If that be so, there is a cost of \$30,000 more entailed. Putting these items together hon. gentlemen will find that it costs no less than \$180,000 for one party to see the lists through revision, and if we multiply that amount by two we will reach the sum of \$360,000 as the actual expense of putting the lists in proper shape. This expenditure for four revisions aggregates \$1,444,000 spent by the political parties and candidate principally by the candidates. In order to show that my estimate is much lower than what it should be, I may state that it cost me in 1894-95 \$13 to get one man's name off the list. He well knew he had no right to vote. He moved away from the section, and so I had to give him notice, subpoena him, pay his railway fare from his residence to the place where the court was held, and these items reached \$13, although he had no right or title to have his name on the list, and the revising

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

officer or his clerk should have known it. That is only a sample of the extraordinary expenses placed on candidates and their friends in connection with the preparation of the lists. We have been obliged to fight the lists all the way through. The friends of the late Government were manipulating the lists and obtaining the benefit of all doubts for their friends, and unless we had fought the lists from the beginning to the end, we would have had no representation in this House. When we add together these amounts of \$1,444,000 and \$1,156,000, we will find a total of \$2,600,000 in connection with the four revisions. There is another item to which I desire to call attention : it is in connection with the session of 1885 when the Franchise Act was introduced. That session extended from four to six weeks longer than was necessary on account of the discussion on this Act. What was the result ? I think a round robbin was signed, or some effort in that way was made so as to secure for each member an additional indemnity of \$500, which expenditure, when added to a like indemnity paid to the Senate, represents \$150,000 spent as a result of the introduction of that Act, and it must be charged against that Act. Thus there has been at least an expenditure of \$2,750,000 for four revisions, or an annual expenditure for all services by the Government, the candidates and their friends on both sides of no less than \$687,000 for every revision made. Surely in the face of these facts, and they are facts, there is not an individual member, however much opposed to me in political views he may be, who would for one moment deny that some change is necessary in the law. It is very easy for hon. gentlemen opposite to say that some plan should be adopted which would involve less expense. I think Sir John Thompson consulted his friends as to what was best to be done, and after consultation, he and his friends could not come to a conclusion that a reduction of the expenditure could be arrived at, and Sir John Thompson abandoned his efforts, with the intention probably of bringing the subject up again when his supporters had got more wisdom or light in respect to this question. The only way I can conceive to secure retrenchment is to revert to the system which worked well in the past and was satisfactory to all those who utilized the provincial lists before the introduction of the present Act. What benefits are we going to derive from the adoption of the franchises of the different provinces. First, this large expense to which I have alluded will be wiped out. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House said the expense of framing the local list was just as great as the list of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman knows better, for he is rather an intelligent man, and possesses a pretty good grasp of local, municipal and other affairs. He knows that the provincial system is comparatively

inexpensive. How are those lists framed? The clerk of the municipality goes over the assessment roll, and makes a list of those entitled to vote, and that list is printed. It is true it is printed at the expense of the municipality. The clerk, however, receives no additional pay for its preparation. In that way we get a list, the expense of which is simply the printing, and when we compare that expense with the expense to which I refer, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will see that he is mistaken in saying that the local lists are just as expensive as the Dominion lists.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman not count as one of the items of expense the work of the assessor who goes around and takes down all the names? That must be included if you make a fair estimate of the cost.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) knows that the local lists are gotten up for various purposes, and they must be prepared whether we accept them or not.

Mr. SPROULE. They cost all the same.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). But do you not see they do not cost any more by our accepting them.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say they did.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Therefore, the whole of this large expenditure is saved to the Dominion, without adding a single cent to the expenses of the municipalities. The hon. gentleman must know also, that we are more apt to get a pure list from the local authorities, because to a very large extent they are non-political. They are lists that are used for the election of municipal councillors, for the election of the municipal trustees, for the voting on money by-laws, for the voting on subsidies or bonuses to any industries in the town, and therefore the people are interested, irrespective of their political leanings, in having every person upon the list who is entitled to a vote. The court of revision which consists of about three out of the five members of the municipal council, is usually non-partisan. These gentlemen agree that every person in the municipality shall have an opportunity of expressing his views upon the different questions, and I hold that no particular partisanship attaches itself in any way to the compilation of these local lists.

Then we will have the great benefit of one man one vote, which in my opinion is the only true principle. Every hon. member in this House knows, that although perhaps it may not be according to law, one of the most costly things in our elections has been the paying of persons who come from outside to vote for us. We may represent to them that they should come to the constituency and vote in the interests of the country, and in the interests of the party; but for months

and for months after a member is elected, those persons who come from a distance to vote for him, send in accounts for their expenses. I am not going to give myself away, but I can appeal to any gentleman who has ever run an election in this country, if he has not found bills coming in, to pay the expenses of those who travelled a distance to cast their vote for him. Now, that expense is going to be saved to the members of this House. There is another advantage from the system of one man one vote, and I may couple with that, residential voting. In the past the railway companies have taken a stand either for one political party or the other. I remember that in the election of 1891, the Canadian Pacific Railway strongly favoured the late Government, while the Grand Trunk Railway on the other hand took a stand to a very large extent in favour of the Liberal party. I know to my certain knowledge that thirteen voters were taken from the city of Toronto, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the town in which I live, to vote against me. I know to my certain knowledge that all they had to do was to throw up their caps and shout out for the Conservative party and that was all the ticket required of them. I know to my own knowledge that young men who had gone to British Columbia, the Northwest Territories and Manitoba, took the idea about election time that they would like to come home and see their mothers, and while they were seeing their mothers they took time to vote against the Liberal candidates, and got their railway transportation free for so doing. Now, under this Bill we will have one man one vote and we will have residential voting, and in that way we will reap the great advantage that all these things will be done away with in the future. I am certain that in advocating this Bill I am expressing the sentiments of gentlemen opposite, who at one time thought that the Dominion Franchise Act was a model of perfection. From their past experience, and on the account of the expense it has cost them, these gentlemen are getting wisdom, and so they are not so rabid as they used to be, and they are agreed upon securing some better franchise system.

There is another great advantage which will derive from the repeal of this Act, and one on which I place a good deal of importance. The young men of the great province of Ontario, that progressive province containing two millions and a quarter of progressive people; the young men of that province will in future have a right to vote for members in this House. I believe that a man who has attained his majority should have the right to vote whether he has any property or not; I believe that it is the man who should vote and not the property. But, we are told that probably this will throw too much power into the hands of the rabble. Now, Mr. Speaker, in my experience of life, and it has been considerable, I have

found that the rabble is not always amongst the poor people. I have found as many of the rabble amongst the rich people; and I believe I can say I have found more of them amongst the rich than amongst the poor. A poor man has to work and earn his daily bread; he has to be up at seven o'clock in the morning, and consequently he has not so much time to spend in immoral conduct as a great many of the rich young men, who know not in the morning how to kill time during the day. Therefore in my opinion you will find a great deal more of the so-called rabble among those who possess property than among those who have to work for their living. Again, I hold that the young men should have the franchise because they pay largely towards the revenue of this country, and any person who pays tribute to our revenue should have a voice in saying how it should be expended. You know that many stylish young men probably purchase more imported and dutiable goods than any farmers and labourers, and others who have families around them, and consequently they pay more taxes. I believe that in consequence they should have a vote in sending a representative here to spend that money in the interests of the people. Then, I hold that young men are entitled to the franchise because of the rich inheritance we have in this country; and, Sir, it is a rich inheritance. We have vast timber limits and vast sources of wealth hidden below the ground; and all this wealth, in a sense, belongs more to the younger people of this country than to us older ones. We are stepping off the great platform of life, while they are just stepping on; and if you clothe them in the full habiliments of citizenship, national sentiments and aspirations will grow in their breasts, and they will take a greater interest in this country than they will if you keep from them the right of a voice in the affairs of the nation. Then, I believe that manhood suffrage would attract to this country a progressive class of people. In all countries there are two classes—a progressive class and a non-progressive class. The progressive class are those who look forward to taking an interest in the country; and, when they hear that Canada bestows the franchise on every young man who attains his majority, they are more likely to come to the country and assume the responsibilities of citizenship; and, when you place a responsibility on the shoulders of any man, his honour is at stake, and he exerts himself to discharge that responsibility to the best of his power. In view of all these things, I hail with pleasure the fact that we are going to return to the progressive Franchise Act which the local government has placed at the disposal of the people of Ontario. It is true, there are other parts of the Dominion where the people do not believe in manhood suffrage. By this Act they can go along upon their own lines, while we in

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

the province of Ontario, where the two political parties agree in favour of manhood suffrage, can discharge our duties of citizenship in this way without affecting the representation of other provinces in this House.

Then, again, it is said that, if we broaden the franchise too much, we are not so safe as we are under a narrow franchise. The history of the world teaches us differently. Any one who reads the history of Rome, the history of Greece, the history of England, the history of the United States, yea, and the history of Canada, will find that, the broader the franchise became, the greater security there was to property and life, and the greater was the progress of the country. In England, less than one hundred years ago, two-thirds of the House of Commons was appointed by the aristocracy; but no person would say for a moment that property or life was more secure or that the progress of England was greater at that time than to-day. Ninety years ago, three peers of England appointed no less than twenty-six members of the House of Commons; 300 members of the House of Commons were elected by an average vote of 160 electors. The county vote of Scotland at that time was just 2,000, while 100,000 inhabitants of Edinburgh were controlled by fifty electors. But, as the foundations of the franchise became broadened, the superstructure became more secure; and so it is with us in this country. If we trust the people, we will not be disappointed. If we extend the franchise, those to whom we extend it will respond in an intelligent way. The progressive element of any country is largely in proportion to the extension of her franchise. With the widening of the franchise in England, great reforms came. It was after the widening of the franchise there that the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1828 was passed; and, when the people were trusted and their power was extended, they saw that the disabilities placed on one section of the people were unjust, and they were more just in the nation's affairs than were the few in whose hands the power had rested before. It was from the enfranchised people of England that the great constitutional reform of 1832 came. England began to expand and become much more progressive with the extension of the franchise than she had ever been before. It was from an enfranchised people that the demand came for free bread; and in 1846 Sir Robert Peel, Tory as he was, had to listen to that demand, had to give up his Tory proclivities, and give to the people free corn. It was from the sense of justice of an enfranchised people that the demand came for the disestablishment of the Church of England in Ireland, where the people felt that it was unjust to be taxed for a church to which they did not belong, and in whose tenets they did not believe. Thus, we find that, as the franchise was extended and the people were trusted, these great reforms came

about. And who will fail to remember that, when the people demanded a still wider franchise, Mr. Disraeli, Tory of the Tories though he was, had to respond to that demand. The franchise had to be extended, and a larger amount of power placed in the hands of the people; so that, in 1885, he increased the electorate of the country by about 1,000,000 voters.

For these reasons, I think this Government are to be congratulated on having taken this early step to repeal the Dominion Franchise Act and to place on the Statute-book a method by which we can accomplish far more, with greater purity and less expense than before; and I hope that the members on the Opposition benches will assist us in carrying this measure through, and withdraw any partisan opposition to a measure which will be better adapted to promote the objects we have in view. For these reasons, it affords me much pleasure to support this measure in its different stages through the House.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the speech of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), I was reminded of Rip Van Winkle. The hon. gentleman commenced by giving us a history of the present Franchise Act and pointing out its great iniquities, and he continued by giving us a history of the extension of the franchise in England. Well, I do not think there was any necessity of doing either of these things. Nobody on this side of the House, so far, has undertaken to defend the present Franchise Act. On the contrary, those who have spoken hitherto have expressed a desire to have the Act remodelled or repealed, and a better Act put in its place. I was sorry to see that the hon. member could not help indulging in some partisan remarks, although he sympathizes with those of us on this side of the House who desire to treat this question from a non-partisan point of view.

I regret to say that he imputed motives to the revising barristers. The Conservatives, he said, always had the friendship of the revising barristers, and the Liberals had the prejudices and the political proclivities of these officials to contend against, so that they had a great deal harder work to do in order to get the lists properly made out than had the Conservatives. I am sure that no other hon. member on that side will take that ground. As far as I am concerned, the revising barrister in my constituency, although he was a Conservative before he was placed on the bench, gave no indication of it by his conduct as revising barrister. On the contrary, his sympathies all went the other way. He tried to be so impartial that he leaned a little to the Liberal side in almost every case. I do not blame him, in view of the remarks that have fallen from the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), because no

doubt he felt that even if he acted fairly, he would be charged with doing injustice unless he gave the Liberals the advantage.

The hon. member went on to say that he hailed this new Bill with great pleasure, and one of the reasons he gave was that the lists would be entirely non-partisan. I wish I could agree with him, but am unable to do so. From my little experience, I am not able to say that the lists, framed by municipal councils and assessors, are always non-partisan. On the contrary, we find that we have to look just as carefully after those lists as after the others. We find that not only have both parties to attend to the revision of these lists, but we have to watch very carefully to see that they are of a non-partisan character.

Another reason the hon. gentleman gave was that the young men would have the right to vote. Well, we on this side desire that they should, and I believe that the young men of Ontario owe to the Conservative party the fact that they have a vote to-day. Some years ago, the leader of the Opposition in the Ontario House made a motion to that effect, which was not carried at the time, but was opposed by the government, but what he then moved for has been given effect to since, just as that government has placed many things on the statutes which were proposed by the leader of the Opposition and resisted by them.

I am glad that in this question we agree with hon. gentlemen opposite on several points. On a great many questions we are not able to agree with these hon. gentlemen at all, but on this occasion we do agree with them on some points. We are, for instance, agreed that this is a most important question, and on this side we consider that it therefore ought to be very thoroughly discussed. I am not sure that hon. gentlemen opposite entertain the same opinion, because so far they have not acted up to it. In fact I was afraid a moment ago that they had entered into a conspiracy of silence, and concluded that probably the order had gone out that the question was not to be discussed. I am glad, however, that my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) has dissipated that idea by entering into the discussion. If this is an important measure, it certainly ought to be fairly discussed. It is all very well for these hon. gentlemen to come down and say: we have made up our minds and are going to submit to you a measure which is a perfect one, I believe that they will find it is not as perfect as it may be made by discussion, and I trust that hon. members on both sides will give it the benefit of a full discussion. For my part, I propose to discuss it entirely free from any party bias at all. I do not believe that there is any question that has ever come before this House at any session which is of more importance.

What is the object we should aim at accomplishing? It should be, in the first place, to make the Dominion Franchise Act so simple that it can be understood by everybody. I do not know whether it is because I am not a lawyer, but I have found that many Bills passed by this House are so complicated that not even the lawyers themselves can understand them. I know that I have often asked lawyers to give their opinion as to the meaning of clauses of Acts passed by this House, and they could not tell me what these clauses meant, and the House is aware that we often have to refer these matters to judges for interpretation, and the judges do not always agree. I hope that when endeavouring to pass a Franchise Act we shall try to make it so simple that everybody will know what it means. There are two essentials to a Franchise Act which we must all admit. These are that it should be simple and inexpensive. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) painted in graphic colours the large expense of the present Franchise Act. He talked about the hundreds of thousands of dollars, he even got into the millions, which this Act has cost the country and members of Parliament. No doubt it was expensive, and while I hold it is impossible to have any Act which will do away with all expense, because even the Act now proposed will not relieve members of Parliament from expense in looking after the revising of the lists and having the names of voters added and getting names struck off which have no right to be on, and so on, I want to see the Act as inexpensive as it possibly can be made and at the same time effective. But the most important thing is to have the Act effective—that is to have such an Act that every man who has a right to vote shall be on the list. That is a most difficult thing to accomplish, and I have no doubt that as we discuss the Bill, we will find there are a great many difficulties, but I hope that we shall be able to overcome them. It ought to be possible, if we approach this measure in a non-partisan spirit, for the Government and the Opposition to work out some sort of a Franchise Act which will have the qualities I have mentioned—which will be simple and inexpensive and above all be effective, so that every man who has the right to vote can easily have his name put on the lists.

I am now going to approach another part of the question, and that is the points on which we differ. Wherein do we differ? I hold that we differ on two points. The first is the control of the franchise. We find that the Government side of the House are willing to hand over the control of the lists to the provincial legislatures, or rather to the provincial governments, because it amounts to that practically. I was a little surprised to hear the right hon. First Minister say that when this Parliament adopts

Mr. CRAIG.

the provincial franchises it really controls its own franchise. He argued that by passing this Bill we would not surrender our control of the Dominion franchise, and in support of that argument he said that when this Parliament says it adopts a provincial franchise it controls that franchise. That is a very poor argument. I say that in adopting the provincial franchises, we surrender the control of our own. We do not retain the control, and I will show why. Suppose we hand the making of our franchise over to the different provinces, we do not retain our control, but lose it, and for this reason. Even if the franchises of the different provinces were acceptable to every member of this House, how long are these franchises going to remain as they are? Can we control them? No, the provinces may change their franchises every six months. A provincial government may bring down a new franchise and change the old one entirely, and in so doing it will be beyond our control, should we pass this Bill. By this Bill we do not say that we continue our control, but we say that our franchise must be those of the different provinces. It may be asked: Why do you object to giving up the control of our franchise? In a general way, I think it is objectionable to do so, because I think the Dominion Parliament should retain that control in its own hands. That is a principle which should be assented to by almost anybody who looked at this question from a non-partisan point of view. It appears very strange to me that any Parliament should be willing to hand over the control of its franchise to another set of parliaments altogether. The very statement of that proposition seems to me an argument against it. It looks to me like an absurdity, and for my part, I am opposed to doing that thing, and I hope that hon. members opposite, when they look at the matter impartially, will be opposed to it as well. There are reasons apart from the general principle why I am opposed to this. In the first place, we find that the provincial legislatures are sometimes very partisan. It is very difficult to find any government that do not look at their own interest and the interest of their party. And when parliaments in the different provinces are in sympathy with the party in power here, it need not surprise us if we find them trying to help their friends with their Franchise Acts. Or, if the party in power in the province were opposed to the Government here, a contrary course might be pursued. I think it unfortunate that the provincial legislatures should be put in that position of temptation, for I think it is a position of temptation. It may be said that that is a low view to take of it, and that there is no danger that any provincial parliament would descend so low as to use the franchise for partisan purposes. I should be glad to think so, but

I cannot. I understand that in Ontario, the local legislature disfranchised a good many Dominion officials so that they could not support the Conservative candidate in their constituencies. I have been told that in Nova Scotia men employed by the Government, working on the Intercolonial Railway were disfranchised for the same reason.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Craig) will permit me to interrupt him. I am sure he does not wish to misrepresent the situation. I must tell him that the statements made with regard to the disfranchising laws in Nova Scotia, as affecting the voting for the House of Commons are absolutely unfounded. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I knew he did not wish to misrepresent the matter.

Mr. **CRAIG**. I do not. I must leave to somebody else the task of answering the hon. Minister (Mr. Fielding). But I must say I have heard it stated, over and over again, in this House. I should be glad to know that it is not true. Still I hold that this temptation will exist for provincial legislatures to use the franchise for partisan purposes, and I do not wish to put them under that temptation. Another reason why I oppose this is because I want, and I think the Conservative party wants, a uniform franchise for the Dominion. What do we mean by that? We mean that electors for the Dominion Parliament wherever they may live throughout the Dominion shall stand on the same footing and have the same qualification. Now, the provincial franchises are not uniform. I was rather surprised at the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) saying that the reason he was in favour of this Bill was that it gave one man one vote. I suppose he did not know—perhaps he did know but overlooked the fact—that in the province of Quebec the law is not based on the principle of one man one vote.

Mr. **MACDONALD** (Huron). I was speaking with reference to my own province.

Mr. **CRAIG**. I am using this as an argument in favour of the uniform franchise. I have no objection to the principle one man one vote; in fact, I am in favour of it. But I am told that this principle is not recognized in Quebec or in New Brunswick. In Ontario a man has one vote, but in Quebec he may have three or four. I do not think the people of the country will be satisfied to have such a difference.

The right hon. Premier says that it is better to have the same franchise for members of provincial parliament and members of the Dominion Parliament. I would just ask this question: Would the provincial governments and parliaments allow the Dominion to make their franchise? I do not think they would. If they would, I

think it would be far better that we should make a franchise for the provincial parliaments than that we should allow the provincial parliaments to make a franchise for us. If the provincial parliament should say: No, we will not allow the Dominion to make our franchise. I think we have an equal right to refuse to allow them to make our franchise. I think all the members of this House should come here upon the same footing and to that end they should be elected on the same franchise. I am sure that hon. members opposite, if they express their views without reference to party, will agree that we ought to retain control of our franchise as a Dominion, and we ought to have that franchise uniform. If these two points are granted, I do not see much difference between the two sides of the House. We are quite willing to have a new franchise Bill; I am, for my part. I want a Bill that will be simple, inexpensive and efficient; I want a Bill to control our own franchise and to make a uniform franchise throughout the country. I think this could be done. Of course it cannot be done if the Government are going to adhere to this Bill and refuse to change or accept suggestions, leaving those who cannot support it simply to vote against it. I shall be bound to vote against it if they take that position.

I have not spoken from a party point of view. I have not consulted any one about the views I should express. I think my views are such as will commend themselves to thinking and reasonable men all over the country. I am in favour of one man one vote; but if we have that principle in Ontario, I want to have it in Quebec and New Brunswick as well. I hope that before we get through this discussion—which I trust will be thorough—we shall be able to frame a Bill which will be to the advantage of the people of the country generally.

Mr. **McMULLEN**. I desire to say a few words in reply to the address which has been delivered by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Craig). In the first place, he admits that the Act should either be revised or be repealed. He frankly confesses that the operation of the Act that has been in force in this Dominion for a number of years, is not by any means satisfactory, and he is willing to consent, either to repeal that Act or so to revise it as to bring it into a position where he thinks it would be satisfactory. Now, he says the revising barristers discharge their duties impartially. Well, I have heard of cases where the revising barristers did give the wink to their own men to hand in the names of all those that they desired to be put upon the list; and I know that in cases where the Reformers asked to be put on, they had to be very careful that the declarations were all drawn up in accordance with the provisions of the Act; but, when the Conserva-

tives started to put on their men, they did not require to make any declaration at all. I know one case where a revising barrister actually said to his own friends: Send me in any names you want added, just give me the list with the qualification, and I will put them on—and in every single case they were put on. The lists were loaded up in many cases. Young men were put on, seventeen, eighteen and nineteen years of age, and, in order to purge the list of such names, the Reform candidate had to spend a great deal of money; he had to pay a man to go around and serve subpoenas for witnesses to attend, and was put to enormous expense to try and wipe off the list names that never should have been put on, and that would not have been put on had the revising barrister discharged his duty faithfully, if he had treated both parties alike. Now, I am not complaining of that official in my own constituency; he has discharged his duties fairly well. But I do know that in some ridings they took the course that I have just outlined, very much to the inconvenience and expense of those who were compelled to take steps to get those names off the list. Now, my hon. friend says that the list will be a partisan list, and I was rather surprised to hear him say that the local government will make the lists. Surely, my hon. friend knows better than that. Had he thought for a moment, he would not have made that statement. The local government establish the standard of qualification merely, that is all they do. The municipal officers, including the reeve, appoint the assessor, the assessor goes through the municipality and makes out his assessment roll. After that is done, a revision is held, and held before the council, with the reeve and other members of the council present. Every elector in the township has a right to appear and to object to any names that are on the list, and to ask that any others be added to the list, so as to make it as perfect as possible. If the reeve and the council, however, should discharge their duties in a partisan way, if they leave off those that ought to be on, or put on those that should not be put on, there is an appeal to the county judge, just the same as there is at present to the revising barrister. The revising barrister takes the place of the county judge. There is an appeal now under the present law. I refer more particularly to Ontario, where there is an appeal to the county judge. The court of last appeal has been virtually the creation of hon. gentlemen opposite, they made the court of last appeal themselves, the judge who sits there was appointed by them; so that virtually the last tribunal before which they will have to go to perfect any municipal list, is a tribunal of their own making. I cannot see, therefore, how they can find any objection to that tribunal. From the way my hon. friend spoke, you would fancy that the Ontario Government

Mr. McMULLEN.

made the list, that it is prepared by their own officials, and that they have every opportunity of making a partisan list. Surely, the hon. gentleman did not intend to present the case with that face on it, because that is not at all the case. Then again, he said that the young men were indebted to the Conservative party for the right to vote in this country. Well, I challenge that statement. It was Sir Oliver Mowat, when he was leader of the Ontario Government, who introduced the Act that gave to the young men of this country of the age of twenty-one years the right to vote, and also gave the right to farmers' sons. If he consults the statutes, he will find that that is the case. Then, again, my hon. friend refers to the evidence of silence on this side of the House in the matter of discussing this Bill. Well, Sir, I sat in the House in 1885, when the Franchise Act we are now about to repeal was under consideration. I can well remember that at that time the word must have gone around that the hon. gentlemen who then sat on this side of the House, should keep silence; for, from Wednesday night we discussed that one provision of the Bill, all Wednesday night, all Thursday, all Thursday night, all Friday, all Friday night, and all Saturday up to 12 o'clock at night. The Speaker, or his substitute were continually in the Chair, and during all that time those who sat on the Opposition side continually spoke on one provision of the Bill, while the hon. gentlemen who were then sitting on the Government side, never broke silence in this Chamber. Now, what is the provision we wanted? The leader of the Government at that time demanded that the Government should reserve the right to appoint the revising officers. In England, the revising officers do the work, but under very different conditions. The courts in England appoint the revising officers, and not the Government at all. But the Government here wanted to retain the right to appoint the revising officers. We opposed that on the grounds that the judges should be, ex officio, the revising officers. The leader of the Government at that time positively refused to accept any such amendment to the Bill, and in order to secure that measure of justice that we felt would be secure if we got the last appeal before the county judge, and as we felt that that was the only hope we had of securing anything like fair-play, we fought it for three days and for three nights. The result was, that, on Monday, when we were fresh and ready to begin the fight the next week, the leader of the Government felt that Saturday night would be again reached without any progress being made with the Bill, and so he came down and agreed to accept county judges, where they were willing to act. But, notwithstanding that, I must admit that, to a certain extent, we did get fooled by the then leader of the Government, because the leader of the Government

immediately appointed a whole batch of barristers as junior judges, so that we were thrown back on the position we occupied before, but we got the opportunity of pleading before junior judges in place of revising barristers who were virtually appointed to do the work. Ever since the passage of this Act we have been under a franchise measure which has proved most harassing, annoying and expensive, particularly to the Reform party. We have had to fight to get our friends on the list and to get our opponents off at every revision, and I believe some hon. gentlemen opposite have had considerable inconvenience also. I dare say that hon. gentlemen opposite, when they found we were paying lawyers to go round and appear before the judges, for the purpose of getting the lists perfected, were called to contribute their share in a like way, and the result was expensive, and hon. gentlemen have session after session pressed on their own friends that they should amend this measure. Under the present system the preparation of the Ontario list could not be carried out in a more fair way than that adopted. The members of the council of a municipality are not all Tories or Grits. Conservatives are elected as reeves and deputy reeves even in Reform townships and the reverse, the reason being that those men had discharged their duties faithfully. The result is that when they come to revise the voters' lists their object is to have all their friends, whether Conservatives or Reformers, who are entitled to vote, placed on the list, and municipal councils take very little stock in the prospect of a Dominion or a local election. They look after themselves, and endeavour to see that every man entitled to vote is placed on the list. I should like to know any reason why the reeves and members of municipal councils are not in a better position to judge who should and who should not be on the revised list than any barrister or judge. There is no court you could devise that is more likely to adjust equitably and fairly the voters' lists of a municipality than the municipal council itself. They will adjust it fairly and carry out their duty in the interest of the municipality without regard to either Tories or Grits. In that respect they will be found to fairly discharge the duties devolving on them in almost every instance.

My hon. friends opposite have said that a uniform franchise is desirable and that it should prevail throughout the Dominion. If the hon. gentleman who made that contention had sat in the House when the Franchise Act, now about to be repealed, was introduced, he would remember that the leader of the House gave as a reason for the introduction of the Bill that he wanted to establish a uniform franchise; but after the discussion had continued during several days and we reached the clause regulating the qualification, he rose and moved that

Prince Edward Island and British Columbia should have manhood suffrage, a different franchise from that enjoyed by all the other provinces. The first impression was that the reason the Act should be uniform was that it should have general application, but when it reached the committee stage, as I have said, it was changed so as to give manhood suffrage to Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, leaving the rest of the provinces to continue under their old franchises. This law has been unquestionably an exceedingly costly one in its operation. I do not wish to go over the items mentioned by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) or to give a shower bath of figures to show the extravagant cost of the Act, but every hon. member who has taken an interest in the four revisions has come to the conclusion that the Act is an exceedingly costly one and that an effort should be made to reduce the expense. It has been stated, and I think it has been stated by the Solicitor General, that the Act had not accomplished the object in view. I think it accomplished the object sought to be obtained, to a considerable extent. In its action it certainly militated against the interest of the Reform party, and that was the primary motive in introducing the Bill and enacting it into law. In that sense it has accomplished a great deal; it put us to enormous inconvenience and cost and it kept off the voters' lists a great many names that would otherwise have appeared there. Another proposed amendment of the Act will be of decided advantage. Under the new Bill the Government are going to establish the same polling subdivisions as have been established under the local Act. I can well remember that in some townships people were in great doubt as to where they should vote. The municipal elections would be held in a certain division; the provincial election might involve a change, and when it came to a Dominion election other polling places might be decided on and the result has been that many people visited the wrong polls and sometimes they lost their votes. I have known cases of that kind. Under the present Bill there will be the same polling subdivisions for the Dominion elections as for the local. Men who went to the poll at the last election will know that their vote will be recorded at the same poll at the next election. My hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) made very much the same speech to-night as he delivered a year ago when a change was proposed in the Act. To-night he attempted to make a mountain out of a mole-hill. The hon. gentleman said that in the province of Quebec men might have more votes than one; that if a man lived in Montreal and owned property he might be able to vote in more than one place, and in Toronto a voter would only be able to record one vote. If that is the case it is a matter of little consequence to the people of Ontario, because the pro-

vince of Quebec can only have sixty-five representatives, and if the province chooses to give a man the right to vote in several places on the ground that he holds property there. It has a right to do so whether Ontario adopts that system or not. This Bill will not conflict with any of the provinces. I hope, however, that we shall always have the one man one vote principle, because in the past, as outlined by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), very great expense has been incurred in bringing in men from great distances for the purpose of making votes for both sides. Much has been said with respect to the action of Nova Scotia, and I am very glad the hon. Finance Minister corrected a false impression entertained by many members of the House with respect with what they were pleased to call the disfranchisement of the electors of that province.

Mr. MILLS. Notwithstanding the denial I say they were disfranchised.

Mr. McMULLEN. Under what Act—

Mr. MILLS. I say that the electors of Nova Scotia were disfranchised in batches from voting in the local elections.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) keep his seat. Although he ought to know the law of Nova Scotia, I will give him a little information and I will challenge him to say I am wrong. In the province of Nova Scotia no man was disfranchised by any provincial Act to vote at the Dominion elections. Is that right or is it not?

Mr. MILLS. No one ever said to the contrary.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are not dealing with the local franchise, we are dealing with the Dominion franchise.

Mr. MILLS. You are trying to make the local franchise the Dominion franchise now.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) thought I was not posted with regard to his province, but he would secure more credit by keeping his seat than by interrupting me, because I had the honour of setting him right. I say there is no law that has disfranchised any elector in the province of Nova Scotia from recording his vote in the Dominion election.

Mr. MILLS. It would though if this Bill passes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Now, Sir, there is no intention of parting with the power we in this House exercise over the franchise. We are merely in the meantime adopting the franchise of the provinces, and if at any time the provinces alter their franchises, or interfere with the rights of the people to vote in the election of members to this House, there is nothing at all to prevent us remedying any injustice in that respect. My

Mr. McMULLEN.

hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) could not help having a shot at the Ontario Government for gerrymandering, as he said the province of Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear, and I shall do it ever.

Mr. McMULLEN. If there is any man in this House who should feel grateful to the gerrymander, it is my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. SPROULE. In what way?

Mr. McMULLEN. He would not have a seat in this House were it not for the Dominion gerrymander.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) allow me to say—

Mr. McMULLEN. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will sit down I will explain it to him.

Mr. SPROULE. Will he allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. McMULLEN. In 1882—

Mr. SPROULE. He dare not let me ask him a question, because he knows—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) had better keep cool and I will explain the whole matter to him. In 1882 he so arranged his own riding that he would have a perpetual seat as long as he lived, and he threw out a township that would give a majority against him and made for himself a little hive. He is here to-day on that account, and he ought to be thankful to the gerrymander.

Mr. SPROULE. What township was it?

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say what they like about the Ontario Government, but they never broke county boundaries as did the Conservatives in the Dominion Parliament. I have the honour of representing a portion of three counties as the result of their gerrymander. I have part of Dufferin, a part of Wellington and part of Perth in my constituency, and although I never thought of demanding three indemnities I really think I have a good case for claiming it. Now, Sir, I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has made out of his fling at the Ontario Government.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) what township did they take out of my county? Did they take out a township that gave a majority against me or a majority for me?

Mr. McMULLEN. I have not in my recollection all the townships in the hon. member's riding, but I say there was a change made in the constituency that perpetuated his holding a seat in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. You did not answer the question.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is no doubt about it. South Grey was altered and there was a certain portion taken from his riding and put into South Grey which endangered the election of my hon. friend (Dr. Landerkin). The change was made to try and kill Dr. Landerkin, and another township that I have no doubt suited my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) was put into his riding. The doctor from South Grey was made to carry a load of Tories from the riding of the doctor from East Grey.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do not laugh until I get through. An addition of Tories was put in the constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) from the north part of the riding so as to make him safe.

Mr. SPROULE. There was nothing added to my riding at all, but there was one township taken out that gave me 190 majority, and therefore it could not make a safe riding for me. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) should get up and apologize.

Mr. McMULLEN. We will settle that question when we introduce a Bill to abolish the miserable Gerrymander Act. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will have to fight for his life when the Bill is brought in to abolish the gerrymander.

Mr. MILLS. Elevate the moral standard.

Mr. McMULLEN. I congratulate the House and the country upon the introduction of this Bill which will abolish the Dominion Franchise Act, that annoying and expensive measure which has disfranchised a great many of the electors of this country. I hope that the Bill now introduced will be fair and honest, and that it will give every man in this country an opportunity of recording his vote. I have no doubt that the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) will possibly try to find some objections to the measure, but he would not carry out his duty as a member in Opposition if he did not try to do that. It is about time that the Franchise Act should be abolished, and this Bill will do it.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) now give the name of that township?

Mr. BENNETT. A week or ten days ago when the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) broke silence and came out from his tent where he had been sulking for a considerable time, it was attributed to him that he was to be translated to the Lieutenant-Governorship of the North-west Territories. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has again not broken silence for some time, and now it must be clearly apparent to the House that in the dire extremity in which the Government are

in the Senate, it is within the range of possibility that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is to be elevated to that sphere where he has so long wished to go. The hon. gentleman owes a duty to that House, and that is to go over there and apologize for all the unkind things he has said of those who have the honour of being members of that House. I had the pleasure the other evening of attending a meeting in the county of Russell, which this same worthy and valiant gentleman attended. The meeting was held in the interest of the Conservative candidate, and I opened and discussed matters for upwards of an hour. The hon. gentleman was then afforded an opportunity of replying. He did so for an hour or three-quarters of an hour, and then excused himself to the audience on the ground that he had a pressing engagement elsewhere, and left. I can only say that his statements to-night with reference to the riding of East Grey were nothing compared with the Munchausen stories he indulged in on that occasion. The hon. gentleman can never have read sacred lore. He never could have heard of the fate of Ananias. I am sure; but I would commend to his perusal the chapter of Holy Writ which deals with Ananias and the horrible fate that overtook him, for he should feel that in these days the same fate might come to such high mortals as himself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question before the House to-night is whether or not we should interfere with the existing privileges which we have under the Franchise Act of this Dominion. I presume that we should view that question from three different points; first, on the question of principle; next, on the very high ground, to secure an honest and fair list; and, in the third place, the least of all, on the matter of expense and cost to the country.

On the question of principle, I contend that it is in the best interests of the Dominion as a whole that there should be a uniform franchise list, and that it should not be delegated to the different provinces from time to time and at all times to provide for those provinces such franchises and such lists as they might desire for the election of Dominion representatives. Take, in the first place, the case of Prince Edward Island. If there is a province in the whole Dominion where the Conservative party may expect the most unmanly and most dishonest treatment, it is the province of Prince Edward Island. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) yesterday assailed me on the ground that I had acted in an unmanly manner in this House. All I can say is that I hope and trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have nothing to do with the revision of the lists in Prince Edward Island, because I shudder to think what will be the fate of the Conservatives there

if he has. I have little doubt that his guiding hand was in the deal consummated there a little while ago.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I have not been in the legislature for fifteen years back.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Certainly not, but the hon. gentleman was in close touch with his companion in the toils there; I have no doubt of that.

Mr. **FOSTER**. He had a finger in the pie.

Mr. **BENNETT**. I have no doubt he had a whole hand in the pie. It was pretty small politics, and that is the reason why I think the hon. gentleman was mixed up in it. What did they do in the Island of Prince Edward? The legislature found a franchise law that had been in existence for years, and under that they disintituled all Government officials from voting in the province; but as soon as the Liberal party came into power, they gave Dominion officials the right to vote after having but a little time before prevented them. I think that must have been one of the crowning efforts of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and probably he feels very proud of it. Then, there is the province of Manitoba. Last session we heard of the irregularities and outrages practised there, and I will be bound to say that the representation from Manitoba in this House will be worthy of performing any iniquities quite on a par with some of the others. Why, Sir, it is simply disgraceful that the Dominion of Canada, in the election of its members to this House, should be placed under the thumb of these local legislatures. I am surprised to see the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) in their unctuous, pious manner, getting up and declaiming about gerrymanders in the province of Ontario. Take the case of the hon. member for East Huron. If there is a man in the House who should be ashamed to speak of a gerrymander, it is that hon. gentleman. He comes from a county where the Ontario Government tortured and twisted, not constituencies to give them a party advantage, but where they cut up the very townships and drove the voters this way and that way to gain a party advantage. But at last they have been overtaken in their iniquity, and we have the satisfaction of having redeemed from them two of the constituencies which they cut and carved in that way. The hon. member for North Wellington says that in this Franchise Bill we are going to have an honourable Bill; and before he sat down he told the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the day would come when he would see a gerrymander that would gerrymander him out of the House. I would be sorry to leave the

Mr. **BENNETT**.

honour of this House to the hon. member for North Wellington.

Mr. **McMULLEN**. The hon. gentleman is saying what is not true. I did not say so.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Order.

Mr. **DEPUTY SPEAKER**. I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw that statement.

Mr. **McMULLEN**. I withdraw the statement, but I simply say in explanation that the hon. gentleman, in supposing that I used those words, is stating what I did not say, and what is not true.

Mr. **BENNETT**. The hon. gentleman appeals to me to be the judge whether it is true or not. I can only tell him that he had better not appeal to me, for judgment will go against him on that score. However, actions speak louder than words, and if the hon. gentleman is not translated to the Senate by that time, we will expect him to give a fair Bill to this House, but I shall be doubtful of his actions. Then, we come to the other ground, that this Bill is going to afford to the people of this Dominion the privilege of one man one vote. That is utterly misleading and untrue, because it does nothing of the kind. In the Island of Prince Edward a man may have a vote in four or five different divisions, so that that principle will not be enforced in that province. So in the province of New Brunswick. But it is in that charming province of Nova Scotia that we may expect fair-play and the purest motives carried out on strictly impartial lines. The hon. Minister of Finance got indignant at the idea that there had ever been anything wrong there. The hon. gentleman knows that the local legislature of that province passed an Act which prevented any employee of the Dominion Government from voting in local elections. Is that not correct?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. That does not happen to be the point we are discussing. That is correct, but it is not the statement which has been repeatedly made in this House. The statement that has been made is that we prevented them voting in Dominion elections, and that is not true.

Mr. **BENNETT**. The hon. gentleman only meets the statement by saying that he cut the throats of his political enemies for the local house.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I do not suppose this House wants to be troubled with the local affairs of the province of Nova Scotia. If it were necessary, I could show that most of the statements made in that respect are entirely unwarranted.

Mr. BENNETT. Evidently the hon. gentleman is not proud of what he had the honour of doing down there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am proud of it.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, I can only say that if the hon. Minister is proud of the fact that he disfranchised hundreds of men, he and I have different opinions of what manliness and honour consist.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to state that I do not propose at any time to allow him to be the judge of what is manly or honourable?

Mr. BENNETT. What does the hon. gentleman propose under this Bill? He says that, having struck down hundreds of voters in the province of Nova Scotia, having prevented their voting in the local elections—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman assents to this, that hundreds of voters have been struck down in his province.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman says I struck them down. The thing occurred years before I was in politics, and some of the hon. gentlemen over there were parties to it.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, the hon. gentleman takes this ground, that he saw a wrong committed, as he claims, when he came into power, and he refused to right that wrong, but allowed it to be continued. I do not know whether the thief is worse than the receiver, but the hon. gentleman admits, not only that the wrong was done—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not said it was wrong. I have said it was right, and I can prove it was; and if it were necessary to go into the politics of Nova Scotia—I do not think it is—I can prove to most of the members of this House that it was right.

Mr. BENNETT. Do the hon. gentleman and those behind him applaud the sentiment of depriving men working on a railway from the right to vote because a number of them were employees on the Intercolonial?

Mr. CAMPBELL. What do the people of Nova Scotia think about it?

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the hon. gentleman from Kent one thing they thought: They thought the duty should be taken off flour, as was promised them by this Government—

Mr. MILLS. It was promised them at Annapolis by the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Annapolis has interrupted and stated in his interruption that I said at An-

napolis that this Government would take the duty off flour. I tell the hon. gentleman that he is mistaken. I made no such promise.

Mr. MILLS. I have the type-written stenographic report of the hon. gentleman's speech, and can produce it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can only say that the hon. gentleman will find no speech I ever made containing the statement, in any authorized report, that the duty would be taken off flour. I have condemned the duty on flour, as I have condemned the duty on other things, but I never said that we could take the duty off flour and leave it on other things in which our province is interested.

Mr. BENNETT. We can take this lesson from the statement of the hon. Minister, that the hon. member for Annapolis should have had a written promise from the Minister of Finance, such as was obtained from the right hon. leader of the Government by one of his prominent supporters. When the hon. member for Annapolis gets a promise of anything, he should get it in writing.

Mr. FOSTER. And then he will not get it fulfilled.

Mr. BENNETT. And then he will not get it fulfilled, unless the circumstance or exigencies require its fulfilment. But really, Mr. Speaker, I must ask your protection from these interruptions by the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You will get it by not making incorrect statements about the Minister of Finance.

Mr. BENNETT. Where did we find the hon. Minister? We found him at this point, that he told the House that, in the province of Nova Scotia, they have had the satisfaction of depriving hundreds of people from the right to vote because they are employees of the Dominion Government, and now the Minister of Finance is going to do—what? He is going to apply that provincial law to the Dominion elections.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Some of those back benchers say, "No, no." They rarely ever say anything more than that. Why, is not the provincial Act of Nova Scotia going to be a part of this Act? Certainly, it is.

Mr. McMULLEN. You do not understand it at all.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. member for North Wellington says I do not understand it. All I can say is this: That hon. gentleman spent half an hour telling the House that we were going to have the pure and salutary Act of the province of Ontario in force in the Dominion elections. If so, are we not also going to have the pure and salutary Franchise Act of Nova Scotia enforced,

too? Certainly, we are. And here we see at once that these hon. gentlemen rely on their being able, by this new Franchise Act, to cripple their opponents through the influence of the local legislatures. That is the object of the Bill before the House. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was always, in the last Parliament, wont to say, in reference to any Government measure: Never mind, the Bill will go through, thanks to the brute majority. I am not going to say that it is a brute majority which rules in this House, as the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce used to characterize the majority in the other House, but I say that this Bill will go through, and that when it does wherever these hon. gentlemen have a friendly local Cabinet, they will do everything in their power to make it as infamous in its operation as possible. What do we find to-day? We find that, in Nova Scotia, there is a Franchise Act that is grossly unfair. We find that in Manitoba there is a system of registration which no words of mine can condemn too strongly as being a disgrace and an outrage on public decency. We find in Prince Edward Island the principle of one man one vote entirely disregarded, and the same thing in New Brunswick.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is that about New Brunswick?

Mr. BENNETT. In New Brunswick, one man can vote in every county in which he has property, so that if he is the owner of property in three or four different counties, he has three or four different votes. These hon. gentlemen talk of uniformity—why, there is not a semblance of uniformity in these franchises.

To come down to some of the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite on the question of principle, they say that we are going to have lists which will be revised by fair-minded judges, and not by revising barristers. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) made a charge of outrageous conduct on the part of some revising barrister. But he did not dare to name the offending barrister, and, for fear that he might be accused of doing an injustice to the revising barrister in his own riding, he at once said that that gentleman was perfectly fair and impartial. And I venture to say, that if the hon. gentleman were brought to task, he could not name the revising barrister to whom he attributed wrong-doing. That is the kind of unmanly artifice to which the hon. gentleman resorted to discredit the Franchise Act. I give him the opportunity now, if he chooses to name the revising barrister who, he said, acted in an outrageous partisan manner. But the hon. gentleman will not venture to reply. The fact is, that the great bulk of the revising barristers in Ontario are county

Mr. BENNETT.

court judges. They are the very same men who will have to revise the lists under this Bill. And when hon. gentlemen opposite throw mud in this way at the revising barristers under the present law, they are only showing up their own lack of good faith, because the same men will be revising barristers, should the Bill now before the House become law.

Then, we are promised simplicity of lists, and there are to be no costs at all to the country. We are to have no costs, comparatively speaking, because we are going to take the provincial lists. I was amused at the figures in which the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) indulged, but I have heard that hon. gentleman romance so often about figures that I would have been disappointed if he had not made a mistake of some few millions, or hundreds of thousands of dollars. What is the fact with regard to the revision of the local lists? One would imagine, to hear these hon. gentlemen, that the revision of the local lists in the province of Ontario was one of the most honest performances ever heard of. In the innocence of their hearts, these hon. gentlemen tell us, the township council appoints an assessor, that assessor makes up the list: the clerk then posts it up, and that is accepted, with perhaps a few changes made by the judge. But what is the history of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario? What is their history in the county of Simcoe? Let me read an extract from a newspaper to show how these hon. gentlemen resorted to every disgraceful manoeuvre in order to stuff the voters' lists in that riding, and I am bound to say, from what I know of other parts of the province, that in these other parts things are not a bit better conducted:

Judge Ardagh found a pretty piece of work cut out for him when he came last Monday to hold the voters' lists court for the township of Orillia. The net results of His Honour's labours, assisted by the representatives of both political parties, is as follows: The Conservatives had fifty names put on and forty-one struck off.

On inquiry into the matter, it transpired that a number of these men whose names were struck off the list, never existed at all. They were simply names the assessor placed on the list. And I must tell the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that some near and dear relatives of his were mixed up in that affair. What was the result? We had to appeal to the judge, and this newspaper comment will show the effect of the judges' finding in the case:

Considering all the circumstances, Assessor Regan and his friends must feel that Judge Ardagh was more than moderate last Monday. The wholesale attempt to stuff the voters' lists was a most unblushing piece of villainy, deserving a severe punishment. Mr. Gunn's claim that there was no evidence of the rascality having been perpetrated in the interest of any particular party was a delicious piece of humour,

which readers unacquainted with the learned gentleman's propensity to joke, even on the most solemn occasions, might well fail to understand or to appreciate. That Regan was not alone in the systematic attempts to rob Conservatives of their votes and confer the franchise on unqualified Liberals, existant and non-existent, there is said to be ample evidence to prove, and in that case the matter should not be allowed to rest here. Honest Reformers will be as anxious to see justice done, and the sacredness of the ballot vindicated, as their political opponents. This would appear to be the more necessary, in view of the fact that Orillia township is not the only municipality in the riding where such work appears to have been attempted.

Why, Sir, we found wherever there was a Liberal assessor in the riding the same disgraceful tactics had been resorted to ; as a result, we had to go into the courts. Hon. gentlemen would have us believe that it is a matter of no trouble whatever, that the laws are so good and so well administered that one had no trouble to make the lists right. Let me read some clippings from the newspapers with regard to these appeals. The Penetanguishene "Herald," of the 23rd September, 1897, says :

When the judge comes here to hold the voters' list court of revision, he will find his work cut out for him and lots of it. The Liberals have about ninety appeals, and the Conservatives somewhere over one hundred.

The Orillia "Times" of September 9th, 1897, says :

There are over three hundred appeals against the voters' list in the township of Tay.

Then we come down to the Midland voters' list. The Orillia "Times" of 23rd September, says :

His Honour Judge Ardagh held his court of revision of the voters' list for Midland on Tuesday. The Liberals added forty names and struck off eleven. Conservative additions, sixty, and none struck off.

Then, coming down to the township of Orillia where this outrageous conduct has been carried on, on more than one occasion, I read :

The court of revision will have its hands full when it deals with the revision of the Orillia voters' lists before the county judge. There have been lodged 288 appeals for alleged wrongful omissions and insertions. Of these, 175 are against Conservatives, and 113 against Reformers.

Now Sir, I would be bound to say that if you go to other parts of the province and examine the preparation of the local lists, you will find what we found in East Simcoe. Instead of the lists being perfect, we had 1,400 appeals in that riding alone. It is absurd for hon. gentlemen opposite to talk of the simplicity of the local lists. Every man acquainted with the subject knows that the greatest frauds have been perpetrated in connection with them, and the reason is that the preparation of the list assists in

the carrying out of such frauds. The hon. gentleman says that there is no cost, and I understood the hon. the First Minister to say that no cost was borne by the province. I will give him credit for not being informed upon the subject, that he has been misled by the hon. member for North Wellington or somebody else. If you will consult the public accounts, you will see that hundreds of thousands of dollars are paid to the county judges in connection with the revision of the lists.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How much was paid ?

Mr. BENNETT. I will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) the benefit of the information. I have some little hope of his conversion some day or other. It may be far away. I remember that hon. gentleman declaimed vigorously against the grant to build a certain post office in the province of Quebec last session, but that this session millions and millions of acres of land in the North-west were voted away by him. I will be courteous to the hon. gentleman and give him the information he wants. He will find on page 427 of the Public Accounts of Ontario that the amount paid the county judges in respect of the revision of voters' lists was \$7,668. But the payment by the province directly to the judges is not the sole expense. I would refer the hon. gentleman to the Revised Statutes of Ontario. These hon. gentlemen would lead the House to believe there is an arrangement by which the clerk of the township does all this work for nothing. Either they must be grossly ignorant or they must be trying deliberately to mislead the House. I am inclined to the opinion that their difficulty is ignorance. If they will hunt up the Revised Statutes of Ontario they will find that there is provision made for the payment of the township clerks of a certain amount in respect of these appeals under the Franchise Act. There is not only the fee to the clerk of the court, but provision is made that all the notices—which, under the Dominion Act may be delivered cheaply by mail—must be served personally by a constable, and the township has to bear the cost. Before the hon. member for North Wellington leaves the Chamber. I hope he will allow me to tell him that the city of Stratford alone was put to an expense of \$600 for the revision of the voters' list for the last election. And what was our experience in our own riding ? With these monstrous appeals that we were forced to make against Grit assessors. Grit township councils and Grit clerks who refused to carry out the law loyally and properly, there was a charge of about \$50 to the ordinary municipality, while one was put to a cost of over \$100 to rectify the wrong-doing of these gentlemen. When they will deliberately stuff the voters' lists and put the municipalities to an immense cost to have these lists made correct, what

will they do in the bigger game when the Dominion issues are at stake? One shudders to think what, under their cunning hands, will be the result in the voters' list in every riding of this Dominion when it comes to a prospect of giving up the loaves and fishes at Ottawa. Take the ordinary riding and the cost of revising the voters' list under the Dominion Act will amount to about \$1,000. Take an average of \$50 for every municipality—and that is a small average—it will cost all the municipalities on the average riding \$600 to revise the provincial lists. Then there is the payment that the province has to make to the judge. Taking the two together, it will cost as much for the thorough revision of the local lists as to-day it costs for the revision of the Dominion lists. The only difference is that, instead of the Dominion bearing the cost as they do at present, the municipalities will have to bear it. Why, Sir, I see in a local print in Ottawa the statement that at a meeting of the city council objection was taken by the council to the large expense entailed upon the city for registration. Then the hon. gentlemen talk about a fresh list. Why, they know this very well, or else ignorance pervades their minds on this question, that there is no registration in the cities every year; and as a result, if an election comes on in a riding where there is a city, my hon. friend from East Toronto, for instance, would find that he would have a list a good deal staler than he has now under the Dominion list, because there would not have been a revision for local elections, consequently the list in the city might be three or four years old. Now we find that the principle of having the elections conducted on the same franchise all over the Dominion is utterly at variance with having these local franchises adopted. We find, too, that it is within the power of men in these local legislatures to devise any iniquity they may conceive in their minds, and in turn apply it here to the Dominion Act, and judging from what these hon. gentlemen have done in the past, and if the pardonable pride, as it is deemed by him to be, of the Finance Minister has been gratified here as it has been gratified in Nova Scotia, we must shudder to think of the kind of lists on which the next Dominion elections will take place if this Bill is carried into effect. But they say that we are going to have an honest list. Well, I will show you a sample of an honest list under the Ontario Act. I hold in my hand a local list in the riding of East Simcoe, and I call the attention of my hon. friend from East Toronto to this fact, that that local list has on one page 37 names written in, not printed at all, because under the local Act the list is first printed and afterwards it is revised by the judge, and after it is revised by the judge then these names are all written in the list, and the list is then left in the office of the

Mr. BENNETT.

clerk of the peace. What is the result? Exposed as the list is, changes are made there by persons, and we found in the riding of East Simcoe in the recent election and in North Simcoe—and I do not blame the clerk of the peace for doing so—we found there names that we never knew as having been placed on by the judge, and we found the names of substantial farmers through which a pen had been run. Are these the kind of lists we are to have for the next Dominion elections, lists printed and posted up in the office of the clerk of the peace, accessible to every person who goes in there, and when a man goes in and runs his pen through the name of a voter, that voter is disfranchised and dispossessed of the right of voting? The hon. gentleman cannot contradict it. That must be the result of the adoption of the voters' list in the province of Ontario. Now, I say that when a man goes up to poll his vote we should have a clean and clear printed list showing the names of all the parties entitled to vote, not a list malformed, a maimed list like this, with a host of names written in, with a stroke of the pen run through other names, and a man who has a right to vote prevented from voting simply because a pen has been run through his name. Yet that is the Bill that these hon. gentlemen are going to force upon the people, and they cannot force any other Bill upon them if they carry out the provisions of the list as they are applicable there to-day. Now, there is another and a very commendable phase in favour of the present Dominion voters' list. The Dominion list, when printed to-day, is a final and conclusive list. If a voter's name appears on the list he has a right to vote, there is no power to dispossess a person from voting. If your name is not on that list then you cannot vote. But the adoption of the local voters' list, or the adoption rather of this Bill, means this, that these hon. gentlemen are going to incorporate into this Act as appears by section 18, the form of oath that is provided in the local elections. Now there is a commendable feature about the Dominion Franchise Act, it is that any voter presenting himself to record his vote and who is entitled to vote, if objection is taken, there is a form of oath prescribed if he takes which he is permitted to vote, and all that is required in that oath is that he shall be 21 years of age and a British subject, and has not been bribed or bribed any person else. But if you take the form of oath that is provided for the local, it is altogether of a different nature, and the result is that under the form of oath that these gentlemen are introducing into this Bill—and when the Bill goes to committee, as I suppose it will, I trust that form of oath may be eliminated—but under that form of oath provided in the local election, the door is open for any kind of fraud

being perpetrated. But here is another thing strongly to be urged against these local lists. After these lists are corrected, after these 200 or 300 corrections are made in a township, as is often the case, after thousands of changes are made all over the different ridings, what have you then in your hands? You have been able to get only a few scanty voters' lists that are printed in the township, and you of necessity are forced to go or to send to the office of the clerk of the peace, and have your lists corrected. I fancy the demur that would be made by every hon. gentleman who wanted the voters' lists, if instead of having, as he has to-day, a perfectly clean and proper voters' list, he found himself obliged to go to the clerk of the township, and either pay him for doing the work of correcting the list, or do it himself. Under the present Dominion Act you can get any number of lists here at Ottawa, a certain number being first allowed by virtue of your being a member of the House, and afterwards upon payment. But with the local lists you can do nothing of the sort. A scanty number of lists is first prepared, and after those lists have been distributed according to the statute, you can only obtain a limited number. The result is that when you obtain a limited number, you have got to go to all this expense and all this trouble of preparing and correcting these lists. Now, Sir, I am in favour as much as any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House, of reducing the cost of the revision of the voters' lists; but I do contend that there should be some guarantee given to the people, first, that they are going to have an honest list, and that the electors of the Dominion as a whole shall not be at the caprice and will of designing local politicians spread through the different provinces, as they have been in the past, and whose only aim has been, in pursuance of the small parish politics in which they indulge, to secure a party advantage. In the next place we are entitled to have, when we come to an election, a properly prepared voters' list, and not a voters' list with numerous names written in as these lists have them written in, and with numerous names struck, under a system which affords every facility for manipulating and for tinkering with the voters' lists. Why, Sir, I knew in one township, in the riding of East Simcoe, in the local elections, a man who has voted for years, the owner of a splendid farm, who, when he went to the polling place, found that his name was struck off the voters' list, at least it did not appear upon the poll book where it should have been. There is a point to which I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentlemen, that when you go to vote under the local Franchise Act which these gentlemen propose to bring into force, there is no printed list displayed at all, the list there is not a list with the names written in,

written in by the clerk of the peace or by some clerk in his office, and what is the result? The printed list first in his hands runs all the chances of being tampered and tinkered with, and after it has been tampered and tinkered with, as we know that has been done, then this clerk, or whoever prepares it, may make a mistake by not copying correctly, and the result is a most mutilated list is presented. I have never seen a local election take place yet but that some man did not find on going to vote that his name was not on the list at all.

An hon. member informed me to-day of a case where, owing to an error on the part of the Clerk of the Peace a large number of names had been left off the list altogether, and the consequence was that these gentlemen were debarred from voting. Is the House going to adopt a franchise list such as that of Ontario—I am not acquainted with the lists in the other provinces—where there is a system as defective as a system can be made, a system which is open to the grossest outrage and has had the greatest outrages perpetrated under it; for if the House is going to adopt that system, those who may be candidates at the next general elections will have a very poor chance of fighting in a fair field, but they will certainly be playing against loaded dice, and a very bad kind at that. When this Bill reaches the committee stage, I trust the Government will not show a partisan spirit, but will be true to their declarations that they are going to eschew everything of that kind and place on the Statute-book an Act with honesty emblazoned on the face of it. If they do so, they will raise a monument a great deal more lasting than any monument they have hitherto erected. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I will appeal to them when the Bill is in committee, to endeavour to have this Act so amended that it will at least give resemblance of fair-play and not adopt an iniquitous, unfair list, the gross and outrageous list that prevails in Ontario to-day, and which has prevailed for a number of years.

Mr. FLINT. After the very extraordinary line of argument taken by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), I could scarcely be expected to follow in a discussion of the peculiar local conditions which he referred to. The principle of this measure alone should now be debated. If the representatives of each province entered into minute particulars in regard to local matters, and dwelt on personal matters, indulging in personal statements, which no one was in a position to question or dispute in regard to squabbles in certain small communities over the local lists, of course the debate would be so long and tedious that no sound conclusion could be reached as regards the principle of this Bill. Many of the points alluded to by

the hon. gentleman would more properly come up in committee, where questions of detail would be sifted. We have heard from this hon. gentleman and others who have attacked this Bill allusion to the operation of the Franchise Act in some of the provinces, and not only during this discussion, but in other discussions we have had Nova Scotia alluded to and a line of statement and argument adopted which very seriously misrepresented the condition of affairs in that province. The hon. gentleman spoke of electors being disqualified to vote in that province, and alluded in the most contemptuous and severe terms he could use to the crime, the unmanliness, the general wickedness of disqualifying any persons whatever in Nova Scotia or anywhere else. If any weight whatever is to be attached to that line of argument, it applies not only to Nova Scotia, but to all the provinces and to the Dominion itself, and to every country which has a franchise law and a voters' list, because there does not exist in the Dominion and never has existed in any country a voters' list where a large number of people who might fairly and reasonably be considered as suitable to hold the franchise, were not disqualified. Disqualification exists as to some persons as naturally and as reasonably as qualification exists as to other persons, and it is no argument for any hon. member to sneer at the legislature of his province or of the Dominion itself if, for reasons suitable to the legislature or the Dominion, it sees fit in endeavouring to protect its rights to disqualify a certain class of persons. The Dominion Act, which is belauded by hon. gentlemen opposite, has disqualified many persons who might be qualified to vote, but whom Parliament has seen fit to disqualify; and yet there is nothing wrong or unconstitutional in creating those disqualifications. Our own Franchise Act disfranchises the judges of every court and a large number of persons for reasons which at the time appeared to be sufficient. The Franchise Act of every province has disqualified a large number of persons for reasons that seemed to the various legislatures adequate. When hon. gentlemen from other provinces, inadequately informed as to the circumstances of the case and of the reasons that actuated the legislature of Nova Scotia in depriving certain persons of the right to vote in local elections, raised this issue, they were travelling beyond the record which should be followed in this discussion, and dealing with matters on which they are improperly informed. It is true that the province of Nova Scotia has for many years, I believe since confederation, or at all events since an early date, deprived of the right to vote at local elections quite a number of voters. I have always contended and I contend now, that the reasons which actuated that legislature were perfectly

Mr. FLINT.

sound and based on the principles of public policy, but it is not fit to import a discussion of these reasons into the debate here, because none of them apply to this Franchise Act. Whether it is right or wrong, prudent or imprudent, reasonable or unreasonable for Nova Scotia to act as it did, cannot possibly operate as regards any discussion of this measure in this Parliament, because no one proposes to disqualify this class from voting at Dominion elections. I may state in a general way that the Local Act of Nova Scotia disqualifies from voting employees of the customs service, post office, inland revenue, Government railways and works.

Mr. MILLS. In some counties about 250 persons.

Mr. FLINT. No matter how many are disqualified. The legislature of Nova Scotia to protect itself in provincial affairs, saw fit to so act, and it had good and substantial reasons for its action, to disqualify those persons from voting. I will not import those reasons into this discussion, but if this was the provincial legislature, I would be perfectly willing, as is any hon. member on this side of the House representing Nova Scotia, to enter the lists with the hon. gentleman and discuss the propriety of the action taken. The people of Nova Scotia at election after election, time and again have supported and consecrated the principle embodied in that legislation.

Mr. BERGERON. What are they going to do now?

Mr. FLINT. It is not contended that those disqualifications should apply to elections for the Dominion Parliament. The reasons why that should apply to the provincial legislatures will not operate as regards the Dominion Parliament, and if it is not already provided in the Bill that this particular disqualification should cease to exist, I for one would be perfectly willing, when the Bill is in committee, to remove these disqualifications for a Dominion election. But, Sir, I would not vote as a member of the local legislature or as a citizen of Nova Scotia to remove these disqualifications in the provincial franchise.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no more cause for this disqualification; the Liberals are in power here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Leave us in Nova Scotia to settle that matter.

Mr. FLINT. The argument of the hon. gentleman in reference to disqualifications in certain provinces need not apply to disqualifications under the Franchise Act, as it applies to the Dominion. Judging from the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, one would think that there is something essentially sacred, in regard to the franchise, that

it should be absolutely uniform. Of course, our present franchise is more uniform than the franchises of the various provinces would be, as compared with each other; but our Dominion franchise has never been absolutely uniform, because persons who might be qualified in one province might possibly not be qualified in another. This sacred principle of uniformity, now invoked by hon. gentlemen opposite, did not exist during the first nineteen years of confederation when the discrepancy in the franchises of the different provinces was much greater than at the present time. During these nineteen years, the larger portion of which the Conservatives held the reins of power, they never were tired of praising the magnitude and greatness of the country, the wisdom of the legislation adopted, and the high character of the Parliament which was elected under these various franchises. During these nineteen years, we heard very little complaint as to any evil which arose from a lack of uniformity. As has been pointed out, it was with a great deal of reluctance, and only after the strongest pressure on the part of political adherents that the gentlemen then governing the country brought into operation the existing Franchise Act. After all, so far as this discussion has gone, we have found but very few points of difference between the advocates of the present Bill and the leaders upon the opposite side of the House. We find that this Bill, in its main features, follows the lines of a Bill introduced by a former leader of a Conservative Government in Canada. We find also, that the leader of the Opposition has united with other gentlemen supporting him in condemning in strong terms the present Dominion Franchise Act. The points of agreement, in reference to this question, between the two sides, are numerous. It is admitted that the present Franchise Act has been unduly expensive, and although it may have secured a certain measure of uniformity, yet it has been an egregious failure all round. The expense of its administration has been so great that at least not half of the number of revisions which ought to take place, in a normal condition of things and under a reasonable Franchise Act, have been had. No Franchise Act should remain on the statutes of the Dominion which did not allow of a revision at frequent intervals, but on account of the expense to the Dominion Treasury and to individual candidates, the revision of the lists under the present Act has been postponed from time to time, until a great national scandal has arisen, by which almost every one of our important elections, where great issues were placed before the people, have had to be decided upon lists which did not represent the real voting elements of the community. This has been most unjust to that large class of ambitious voters who, although qualified according to law, were not entitled to vote,

because of the want of revision. The first revision of the Franchise Act cost \$493,644; the second revision cost \$235,000; the third revision cost \$225,000; the fourth revision cost \$240,000; in all, about \$1,200,000; and yet an election that is being held at the present time is actually held upon lists about four years old. In this very case, owing to deaths and removals from the county, as well as the large number of new voters who are qualified and are not upon the lists, not more than 60 or 70 per cent of the possible voters are able to exercise the franchise. It is admitted by all that the present Franchise Act must be repealed, if we are to have a Parliament representing the wishes and desires of the actual electors of the country. How is that to be accomplished? None of the hon. gentlemen opposite have yet pointed out a way out of the difficulty, other than that adopted by the Government, namely, to accept the lists prepared by the local authorities, and to make use of them for future elections to the Parliament of Canada. It has been pointed out, with good reason, that the local legislatures are more familiar with the domestic relations and concerns of the people than the Dominion Parliament can be. Here our members come from the various provinces, and it is very difficult, if not absolutely impossible, for the representatives from one province to understand the peculiar local circumstances of the people in another province; and, while the franchise may be technically and literally nearly uniform, yet, as a matter of fact, it may not operate in the same way in the different provinces. The advantage of accepting the local franchise is, in the first place, economy. No hon. gentleman has seriously ventured to attack that phase of the problem.

If we can save the Dominion of Canada on each revision of the voters' lists from \$200,000 to \$300,000, certainly it is worth making a vigorous attempt to accomplish, unless the results are shown in some way to be disastrous to the best interests of the country. I understood one hon. gentleman opposite to say that no economy is served by accepting the local lists. Of course, the hon. gentleman meant that no saving is caused to the various municipalities; but as regards the Dominion, no increased expenditure is created, and as regards the municipalities no increased expenditure is created either. We simply accept as the franchise for the Dominion Parliament the franchises of the various provinces as we had them nineteen years previous to 1885. The line of attack taken by some hon. gentlemen would necessarily if followed throughout this discussion, lead to violent arguments as to the local politics of the various provinces of the Dominion, because charges and counter-charges may be made as regards the conduct of the various local administrations, and the various local oppositions; and all the small politics of the provinces would be imported

into a discussion which ought to be entirely foreign to such subjects. We have already had imported into this discussion a vigorous debate as to the so-called gerrymander in the province of Ontario. Language of an extraordinarily violent character was used by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and by other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House on that subject. Certainly no hon. member can attempt to follow in that discussion without a great deal of research and inquiry that ought to be unnecessary. But I would call the attention of the House to one peculiar feature of this discussion. Although my hon. friends have discussed that matter with a great deal of warmth, we have just passed through a local Ontario election, in which a great many members of this House took part, and yet I failed to find, in all the discussions that took place in that election, any reference to the so-called gerrymander.

Mr. SPROULE. It is well seen that you had no part in the contest, or you would not say that.

Mr. FLINT. I have looked over the Conservative handbook of the campaign, and the subject of the gerrymander was scarcely alluded to in it, except in passing terms. At any rate, it is a subject which has two sides, and those who defended the re-arrangement of the boundaries had a good deal to say in defence of it. But what I deprecate is the bringing of that into this discussion.

Mr. SPROULE. It was your leader who introduced it.

Mr. FLINT. Because this Parliament is not the sphere, and has not the materials for its discussion, and nine-tenths of the members, apart from those from the province of Ontario, would not be able to understand it without a great deal of research which they ought not to be called upon to make. Another argument advanced by hon. gentlemen against the proposition to accept the provincial lists is that Parliament should not give up its control of the franchise. I do not understand that by adopting the provincial lists as the mode of electing representatives to this Parliament, this Parliament parts with one iota of its control of the franchise. In the main, as has been pointed out, and as a review of the statutes of the various provinces would show, the franchises of the provinces are not so far apart as we would be led to suppose from the remarks of some hon. gentlemen. For instance, the difference between the present Dominion franchise and the franchise of Nova Scotia is so slight as practically to amount to nothing; and the franchise in almost all the provinces, except Nova Scotia, are practically the same. But if, after the adoption of the provincial lists this Parliament should find that one of the provinces

Mr. FLINT.

had created machinery for a local list which was unsatisfactory to this Parliament, this Parliament would have complete control over the matter, and could rectify that by the passage of an amendment to the law, as easily as it can control its own franchise at the present time. Therefore, this bugbear disappears. We find, then, the matter reduced to a very simple proposition—as to whether the great economy, the great simplicity and the general benefit of the new Act are not far greater than the expense, the disadvantages and the uncertainties which were in the Act under which Parliament is at present existing. I think all the arguments point in the direction in which the hon. Solicitor General's Bill goes. But it has been argued that in the various provinces certain acts of impropriety have taken place. No doubt, under the operation of any law some acts of impropriety might take place. No doubt under the operation of the present franchise law many things have taken place in various sections of the country which a calm and unprejudiced observer could not approve of; and no doubt in the provinces, here and there, have taken place, if we could investigate them judicially, things which a person in a proper frame of mind would not approve of. No doubt attempts have been made to put persons on the lists who should not be there or to keep persons off the lists who should be there; but these things are failures which are common to any law, and common to human nature; and if when we get into committee on this Bill any gentleman can suggest a clause by which these things could be diminished or reduced to a minimum, no doubt the Government would be glad to receive any suggestions along that line. But we know that the local lists are made up by the appointees of the various municipal councils, who are not always men belonging to one party, but who are more varied in their political feelings than would be the appointees of the Administration here. The appointees of the Administration, unless some of them were judges, would naturally be individuals of one political stripe; but we know that the municipal lists are made up, not by gentlemen of one political stripe, but by gentlemen representing all shades of political opinion in the country. Where the municipal council is largely of one political faith, no doubt the revisors would be men of the same political faith; but these men are responsible to the community in which they live, they are men of character and standing in the community, they are acquainted with all the circumstances and they are amenable to the local public opinion of the community in which they reside. Viewing human nature as we know it, taking the average character of the yeoman and farmer and gentleman throughout the various provinces, who are selected to carry out this work, we have every reason to believe that they will act with all the impar-

tiality one can possibly expect of human nature. Therefore, I contend that, under the operation of this law, we will have lists which will represent fairly all the voting element of the community. The officials appointed to carry out the law will be in close touch with the community in which they live, and be particularly sensitive to the influence of public opinion, and thus more likely to act fairly in the public interest than those appointed under the present system. I think the Government has done wisely in bringing down this measure, and have no doubt that the Government and hon. members on this side will be most happy to receive suggestions from hon. gentlemen opposite in matters of detail, so as to make the Bill as workable and as fair and honest as possible. Once this Bill becomes law, the day of these extravagant costs heaped upon the Government and the candidates and members of Parliament will have passed away. These heavy costs are a barrier at present, which serves to keep out of Parliament men of worth but of modest means, who otherwise would present themselves for election, and it especially keeps back numbers of young and enthusiastic politicians throughout the country from coming forward in the public interest. I believe that this measure will tend to purify and clear the political atmosphere more than any other which has been brought forward since the present Franchise Act became law. It will put an end to the embarrassment now placed upon the Government, through its being compelled to select revising barristers from among its strongest partisans. I am not here to make any charge against the revising barristers throughout the country, but we know that charges have been made and have, in some instances, been supported by what appears to be very strong evidence of a partisan and tyrannical abuse of power. It is an unfortunate thing that any class of men appointed by the Government to discharge quasi judicial functions of the highest character should be open to the charge of partisanship and should be subjected to the suspicion on the part of the electorate that their appointment was simply the paying off of political obligations. We know what pressure must have been exercised on the Government who appoint these officers, and we know that no one could obtain the position of revising barrister who was not known to be a strong partisan. This, however, will be done away with. Every municipal council will appoint its local representatives in the smallest localities, who will be amenable to public criticism and opinion, and the result I believe will be a much healthier political atmosphere than we have enjoyed for a long time. I trust that this measure will speedily become law, and I venture to predict that it will be a long time before any hon. member will advocate its repeal and a return to the present

Franchise Act, which appears scarcely to have a friend on either side of the House.

Mr. MILLS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 23rd March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DISMISSAL ON INTERCOLONIAL—A. STEWART.

Mr. POWELL asked,

1. Was A. Stewart dismissed from the position of tankman on the Intercolonial Railway at Spring Hill, Nova Scotia? If so, why was he dismissed, and who made the charges (if any) against him?

2. How long had Stewart been in the service of the Intercolonial Railway previous to his dismissal? Who has been appointed to fill the position of tankman at Spring Hill in room of Stewart?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. A. Stewart was dismissed from the position of tankman on the Intercolonial Railway at Spring Hill Junction, N.S. He was dismissed upon the statement and representation of the member for Cumberland County for having taken an active and offensive part in the elections. He had been in the service of the Intercolonial Railway between twenty-four and twenty-five years. Mr. H. A. McKenzie has been appointed to fill the position of tankman at Spring Hill Junction, in place of Stewart.

INTERCOLONIAL STATION AT WESTVILLE, N.S.

Mr. BELL asked.

Has the Minister of Railways and Canals taken into consideration the matter of improving and extending the accommodation for the public at the Intercolonial station at Westville, Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The accommodation at the Westville station of the Intercolonial Railway has been considered, but so far it has not been found that further accom-

modation is absolutely necessary for the traffic at present.

REVISION OF STATUTES.

Mr. BRITTON asked,

1. Have persons been appointed for revision and consolidation of Dominion statutes ?
2. If so, who are they ?
3. If not, is it the intention of the Government, during the present session, to make provision for such revision and consolidation ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is a question which is now engaging the attention of the Government. I cannot tell the hon. member at present whether the Government will be able to make provision this session or not.

IMPORTATION OF HORSES FOR FEEDING.

Mr. McCLEARY asked,

1. Has the Government or the Department of Customs made regulation making it obligatory on the part of Canadian farmers who bring temporarily into this country horses for feeding purposes, to take out a license for which a tax is levied ?
2. If so, what is the tax or charge on each person who takes out such a license ?
3. What number of licenses have been taken out since the month of August, 1897, and the amount received for the same ?
4. If such regulation has been made, what was the object in making such ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. Horses brought into Canada for feeding, are subject to duty unless the premises of the importers have been approved as a "Bonded Warehouse" and security furnished, if required, for compliance with customs laws and regulations. 2. The warehouse fee for the premises of each applicant is \$10 for six months. 3. Ten applications have been received and approved for warehouses for feeding and pasturage since 1st August, 1897. 4. The object in making regulations for the warehousing of horses for feeding and pasturage (as established 24th June, 1897), was to authorize the entry of horses for this purpose under general rules, without payment of duty—general regulations not having been previously in force, permitting this to be done.

DISMISSAL OF FRANCOIS CORBEIL.

Mr. BERGERON asked,

1. Has François Corbeil, formerly wharfinger on the Lachine Canal, been dismissed ?
2. If so, when and why ?
3. Has an investigation been asked by Corbeil or anybody else
4. Was an investigation granted ? If not, why not ?
5. Was Corbeil replaced ?
6. How many applications has the Government received to replace Corbeil ?

Mr. BLAIR.

7. Who are the applicants, and by whom were they recommended ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Mr. François Corbeil, formerly wharfinger on the Lachine Canal, was dismissed. 2. He was dismissed by an Order in Council of the 19th of June, 1897, because he was addicted to the use of intoxicating liquors to excess. 3 and 4. No investigation was asked. 5. When Mr. Corbeil was dismissed, he was not replaced, as it was considered one wharfinger was all that was needed. 6 and 7. There was one application, which of course was not acted on as the position was not to be filled.

Mr. BERGERON. By whom was the recommendation made ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must decline to state the names of gentlemen who make recommendations in these cases.

INSPECTION OF STEAMBOATS—REMISSION OF PENALTIES.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

1. Has the opinion of the Minister of Justice been obtained respecting the right of the Crown to remit penalties imposed under the provisions of the Act relating to the inspection of steamboats ?
2. If so, what was the opinion and when was it given ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I am not aware that the opinion of the Minister of Justice has been formally asked by my department in reference to the commutation of fines imposed for infraction of the Steamboat Inspection Act ; but the question was raised by the Auditor General last November. I gather from the letter he wrote me that he took objection, and referred the matter to the Department of Justice, because he wrote "the whole question has been affected by a recent opinion given by the Department of Justice." According to this opinion, any offence against the sections of an Act under which penalties are incurred is subject to the exercise of the prerogative of mercy ; and a pardon by the Crown would carry with it a remission of the penalty. Mr. Lash with whom I consulted, concurs in this ruling. Under these circumstances the commutation or refund of a fine that is recommended by the Treasury Board and sanctioned and ordered by the Governor in Council will not in the future be questioned in this office on the point of authority."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman see any impropriety in putting the question formally to the Department of Justice and obtaining an opinion on it ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I see no objection whatever. I put it informally before, and I will put it formally now.

DREDGE "PRINCE EDWARD."

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) asked,

1. How many are employed on the dredge "Prince Edward," as caretakers or otherwise? What are their names, and amount of salary of each?

2. How many were employed during the winter of 1896-97?

3. If more are now employed, why?

4. Was John R. Macdonald relieved of his duties as captain in the fall of 1896 on the ground that only one person was required on board during the winter?

5. How many cubic yards were removed by dredge "Prince Edward" during the season of 1896 and 1897, respectively, and the cost per cubic yard each season?

6. The number of days the dredge "Prince Edward" was doing actual work in each month during the seasons of 1896 and 1897, respectively?

7. The cost of repairs for the dredge "Prince Edward" for the years ending 31st December, 1896 and 1897, respectively?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). I think the hon. gentleman should move for a return covering these questions, otherwise I shall not be able to bring down the information.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) asked,

Was the curve recently straightened at North Wiltshire, on the Prince Edward Island Railway, the sharpest curve on said road? What is the amount expended by the Government to date on the straightening of the curve at North Wiltshire, on Prince Edward Island Railway, and is further expenditure necessary in connection therewith?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). The curve recently straightened at North Wiltshire on the Prince Edward Island Railway, is the sharpest curve on the road between the two main centres, Charlottetown and Summerside, on which the largest traffic is carried. The amount expended up to the 21st March, 1898, on the straightening of the curve at North Wiltshire on the Prince Edward Island Railway is about \$8,000. Further expenditure is necessary in connection therewith.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EASTERN EXTENSION.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) asked,

Is it proposed by the Department of Railways to place a dining car on the eastern extension of the Intercolonial, between Truro and Mulgrave?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). It is not the intention.

DUCK LAKE INDIAN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan) asked,

What was the cost of the maintenance of the Indian Industrial School at Duck Lake, Saskatchewan, for the last fiscal year? How many pupils are there in the school? What is the cost to the Government, per capita, per annum?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The cost of maintenance of the Indian school at Duck Lake for the last fiscal year was \$4,030.80. According to the last reports there were seventy-two pupils in the school, but the average attendance for the last fiscal year was fifty-three. The per capita cost per annum for the last fiscal year was \$76.05.

MONCTON STATION—PLUMBING AND HEATING CONTRACT.

Mr. POWELL asked,

1. Was the plumbing and heating for the new Moncton station included in Messrs. Rhodes, Curry & Co.'s contract for building; and, if so, were the heating and plumbing withdrawn from the contract, and why? And what sum, if any, was deducted on account of such plumbing and heating being withdrawn from the amount to be paid to them?

2. If the said plumbing and heating were withdrawn from Messrs. Rhodes, Curry & Co.'s contract, were tenders afterwards called for the heating and plumbing of said station building? If so, who were asked to tender, and what were the different amounts of the tenders received?

3. Was T. H. Doody, of St. John's, one of the parties who tendered for the said plumbing and heating? If so, what was the amount of his tender, and was his tender accepted; and, if his tender was accepted, did he perform any part of the work tendered for, and what has been paid, or to be paid, to him for the work so done by him? Why was the work taken off Mr. Doody's hands?

4. After the work was taken off Mr. Doody's hands, were tenders for the said heating and plumbing again called for? If so, who was asked to tender, and what were the respective amounts of their tenders?

5. Did Messrs. Arnoldi & Ewart, of Ottawa, make a report on the plumbing and heating of the new Moncton station, as provided for in the original plans and specifications for the station? If so, what was the estimate of cost?

6. Were Messrs. Estano & Sons, of Moncton, asked to tender, or given an opportunity to tender for the plumbing and heating of the Moncton station; and if not, why not?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). 1. The plumbing and heating for the new Moncton station were included in Messrs. Rhodes, Curry & Company's contract, the sum of six thousand and seventy dollars (\$6,070) being included therein to cover that item. It was found that the specification was very defective, and the plumbing and heating work was therefore withdrawn from the contract, and an improved specification prepared, which increased the quantity and

quality of plumbing work and material generally and, also, included the heating and fire protection, as well as the gutters and down pipes and gas fittings, &c., for the entire building, which had been omitted from the previous specification. 2. Yes, tenders were afterwards called for upon the amended specification for the plumbing and heating and fire protection, gutters, down pipes and gas fittings, &c., of said station building. Messrs. Rhodes, Curry & Co., Amherst, Mr. James Doody, St. John, Longard Bros., Halifax, and Thomas Campbell, St. John, were asked to tender. The amounts of the tenders were :

Rhodes, Curry & Co., Amherst.....	\$11,516
James H. Doody, St. John.....	11,516
Longard Bros., Halifax.....	11,691
Thomas Campbell, St. John.....	11,375

3. Mr. James H. Doody, of St. John, was one of the persons who tendered for the said plumbing and heating. His tender amounted to \$11,516. His tender was accepted and he performed part of the work. He has been paid \$1,519.65. The work was taken off Mr. Doody's hands and contract rescinded as soon as it came to my knowledge that invitation for tenders had been limited to the persons above mentioned. 4. After the work was taken off Mr. Doody's hands, tenders were again called for. Messrs. Longard Bros., R. Longueil, J. B. Naylor & Son, A. E. Craig, Halifax, N.S., Messrs. John Ritchie & Co., Dartmouth, N.S., Messrs. J. H. Doody, O'Brien & Brown, Jas. Boyle, J. McManus, P. Campbell & Co., Frank McManus, W. Kiley, G. & E. Blake, J. E. Fitzgerald, Doyle & Lambert, St. John, N.B., Messrs. Lemerech & Co., Kitchen & Shea, Fredericton, N.B., C. O. Rowe and Wm. Watson, Moncton, N.B., were asked to tender. The respective amount of their tenders were :

Jas. H. Doody, St. John.....	\$ 9,550 00
Doyle & Lambert do	8,293 00
P. Campbell & Co. do	8,350 00
W. Kiley do	10,500 00
Frs. E. McManus do	8,277 00
Wm. Watson, Moncton.....	10,400 00
Kitchen & Shea, Fredericton.....	9,797 42
J. E. Fitzgerald, St. John.....	10,000 00

5. Messrs. Arnoldi & Ewart, of Ottawa, did make a report to the department on the plumbing and heating of the new Moncton station, as provided for in the original plans and specifications for the station. They estimated the cost with certain improvements at \$8,108. 6. Messrs. Estano & Sons, Moncton, were not asked to tender for the plumbing and heating of the Moncton station. I understand their names were not brought to the notice of the department.

FIRE AT WEST BLOCK.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

1. What was the date of the fire in the West Block by which a portion of the roof was destroyed and the building otherwise damaged ?

Mr. BLAIR.

2. What is the departmental estimate of the loss caused by fire and water ?

3. What work, if any has been done in the way of restoring the roof ?

4. Has any work been let by contract ? If so, will copies of the contract be laid before the House ?

5. When is it expected the new roof will be placed on the building ?

6. What work is still to be done before the building is fully restored ?

7. Is it true that the iron for the roof has been purchased in Belgium ? If so, did the Government permit this class of material to be entered without payment of duty ?

8. Has any material used in the restoration of the building been admitted duty free ? If so, what ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. The 11th February, 1897. 2. \$200,000. This covers the repairs to allow the departments to move back to the Buildings, the expenses in connection with the fire proper as well as the reconstruction of the roof and offices. 3. The whole of the ceilings in the basement, ground floor and first floor have been re-plastered on metallic lathing and the woodwork of these floors, damaged by fire and water, has been repaired and the walls of the offices, corridors, &c., have been re-painted and the whole of the offices have been occupied. A fire-proof floor has been constructed over the entire attic with steel joists and porous terra cotta. All the damage to the stone work and brick work of the towers, chimneys and walls have been taken down and new stones cut and put in place, with the exception of a few chimneys which it will take about from four or five weeks to complete. 4. The construction of the iron roof has been let by contract, the balance of the work has been and is being done by day labour under the direct supervision of the present chief architect. No objection to produce contract for iron roof. 5. Part of the new iron roof has been delivered and it is expected that the iron work will all be in position in two months. 6. The iron roof has to be placed in position, also the fire-proofing of iron roof, the covering of the roof with copper and the plastering, finishing of the offices. 7. We have not been informed as to the place where the iron has been purchased by the contractors. To the second part of the question the answer is "No." 8. Yes. The Ohio stone which was purchased direct by the department was admitted duty free. No other material had a free entry.

DRUG SUPPLY FOR MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Did W. J. Fleming & Co. tender last year for the supply of drugs to the North-west Mounted Police at Prince Albert and Battleford ? Was their tender from 100 to 200 per cent higher than their competitors ? Has the drug supply for the police at Prince Albert and Battleford

been given this year to W. J. Fleming & Co. without tender ?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. W. J. Fleming tendered, unsuccessfully, last year for the supply of drugs required by the North-west Mounted Police at Prince Albert, not Battleford. 2. His tender was not from 100 to 200 per cent higher than other competitors. 3. The drug supply for the police at Prince Albert and Battleford this year has not been given to W. J. Fleming without tender.

MOUNTED POLICE—DR. BAIN.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Did Hugh W. Bain, Esq., M.D., act for many years as surgeon to the North-west Mounted Police at Prince Albert? Has he been dismissed? If so, when and why? If dismissed, has a successor been appointed? If so, on whose recommendation?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Hugh M., not Hugh W. Bain, M.D., was employed professionally in connection with the North-west Mounted Police at Prince Albert from 1885 until the 31st January, 1898, when his services were discontinued, as being no longer required. A successor has been appointed, on the recommendation of the member representing the constituency in the House of Commons.

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE RAILWAY.

Mr. POUPORE (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

Does the Lake Temiscamingue Railway, which runs from Mattawa to Gordon Creek and Kipewa, come under the operation of the Railway Act with respect to the fixing of passenger and traffic rates?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). The railway mentioned does not come under the operation of the Railway Act.

ELECTION IN MACDONALD—COST OF PROSECUTIONS.

Mr. ROCHE asked,

What amount of costs or expenses, if any, have been paid or incurred by the Dominion Government in connection with the prosecutions arising out of the general elections of 1896, in the constituency of Macdonald?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is impossible to give the hon. gentleman the information which he asks. The expenditure in regard to these prosecutions was not divided between county and county.

HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION—MR. JAMES FISHER.

Mr. ROCHE asked,

What was the amount allowed by the Dominion Government to Mr. James Fisher, the repre-

sentative of the Manitoba Government, on the recent Hudson Bay expedition? When will his report be given to the public?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). The amount to be allowed Mr. Fisher has not yet been submitted to or approved of by Council. His report has not yet been received; I expect it very shortly.

PRINTING BUREAU—MR. H. T. SMITH.

Mr. COPP asked,

Is H. T. Smith an employee of the Printing Bureau? If so, when was he employed, what are his duties, and what is his salary?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). H. T. Smith is an employee of the Printing Bureau. He was appointed in 1889. He has charge of the franchise lists and assists Dr. Dawson, the Queen's Printer. His salary is \$1,100.

WOOD ISLAND (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER.

Mr. MARTIN asked,

1. Has the Government received any petition from the inhabitants of Wood Islands, in Prince Edward Island, or a copy of any resolution passed at a public meeting of the people of Wood Islands and neighbourhood, in the said province, asking for the dredging of the Wood Island harbour, and extending the western block of the breakwater at Wood Islands?

2. If so, what action, if any, does the Government intend to take in the premises?

3. Is the Government aware that the entrance to the breakwater at Wood Islands is being gradually filled in with sand, and that the extension of the western block is absolutely necessary?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes, a petition was received. 2. The matter is under consideration. 3. The department is informed that an extension of the breakwater is not advisable until the dredging of the approach to the western breakwater is done, and may not then be found necessary.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF THE BUTTER TRADE.

Mr. REID moved:

That the production of cheese in Canada has reached a very high and most satisfactory point, and any expenditure for the further development of this product alone might be detrimental to the best interests of our dairy industry as a whole.

That Great Britain imports immense quantities of fine butter from foreign countries, of which Canada as one of her most important colonies at present furnishes a very small portion.

That proper cold storage transportation facilities have been provided by our Government.

That the governments of other countries have expended large sums of money in fostering their butter industry by means of bonuses, &c., with the result that their butter industry has prospered and assumed large proportions, as is

shown by the official returns of butter imported by Great Britain.

That Canada is specially adapted for and has so many natural advantages for the finest butter.

That whereas a large export butter trade would benefit not only the farmers as a whole, but the millions of money it would yearly bring into the country would do incalculable good to the whole community.

That, in view of the foregoing facts, our Government should take immediate steps to do something more to assist in the development of our butter trade, and this House is of the opinion that the Government should place in the Estimates for the present session an amount to be paid to the farmers direct by way of a bonus of one cent per pound on a specified quantity of our finest fresh creamery butter to be exported to Great Britain while fresh and in condition to secure a reputation for itself and establish a lasting demand, and that this bonus be continued for three consecutive years. This bonus to be increased at the discretion of the Government on butter made during the winter months. All such butter to be subject to a rigid Government inspection.

That this bonus be paid to only those farmers who will furnish for export regular supplies.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the last session of this House I had on the Order paper the same motion that I am moving to-day; but at the request of the leader of the Government, it was allowed to stand over, and I was unable to obtain an expression of the opinion of the House upon the subject before the close of the session. I therefore wish to move it to-day, for the purpose of obtaining now an expression of the opinion of the House upon the subject. I wish to refer first to the growth of our cheese industry in Canada. A number of years ago the farmers of this country depended for their living entirely upon the hay, grain and other products of their farms; I refer more particularly to the farmers of the older provinces, that is, Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces. But owing to the opening up and development of Manitoba and the North-west, the farmers of those new provinces have been able to produce hay, grain and other products of the soil so much more cheaply, that they have taken away almost entirely the opportunities of the farmers of the older provinces of making a living from these sources; and the farmers of these older provinces have necessarily had to turn their attention to some other means of making a livelihood. The Government that was in power at that time sent men to the mother country to look into its cheese trade, for the mother country was importing very large quantities of cheese, and it appeared to the Government that no other country was better adapted to the production of cheese than Canada. The result was that that Government adopted the policy of assisting in every way possible the development of our cheese industry; and with their assistance, our cheese industry has developed to such an extent that I am proud to say that at the present time Canada supplies

Mr. REID.

at least 60 per cent of the total quantity of cheese imported into England. I claim that this is a wonderful advancement for our Canadian farmers, and I move this motion to-day with the view of making an effort also to obtain a portion of the great butter market that Great Britain affords. If we had a large butter industry in Canada, along with our cheese industry, I believe that we would be able to keep up our reputation for cheese, and also keep our farmers employed during the winter months. In advancing the cheese industry, I believe we lost sight altogether of the butter industry. At the present time the farmers make cheese during the summer months only. Their cows are allowed to dry up in the fall and remain so during the whole winter. I claim that if the farmers go into winter dairying, and the cheese factories are built in such a way that either butter or cheese can be manufactured in them, they will be able to make cheese in summer, if cheese will pay better than butter, and during the winter they will be able to make butter; or they will be able to make butter in the summer if they find that it pays better than cheese. Now, England imports annually 340,000,000 pounds of butter; and of this enormous quantity Canada supplies only 10,000,000 pounds. I will state the other countries from which this enormous quantity of butter is imported. The United States, which is not nearly so well adapted for the dairying industry as our own country, owing to its much milder climate, supplies 15,000,000 pounds. We should be able to take a large portion of that trade from that country. Denmark supplies the enormous quantity of 137,000,000 pounds. Holland 26,000,000 pounds. France 52,000,000 pounds. Germany 12,000,000 pounds. Sweden 36,000,000 pounds, the Australian colonies 30,000,000 pounds, and other countries, including Canada, 30,000,000 pounds. I believe that every member of this House will agree with me that not one of these countries is in any better position to manufacture or supply butter for the English market than Canada; and if they are able to supply such enormous quantities, why should not we in Canada be able to supply more than we are now doing? I can quote precedents in support of granting a bonus to the farmers. In the province of Quebec, the province from which the hon. Minister of Agriculture comes, the local government give a bonus to the farmers. The hon. Minister of Agriculture knows that that bonus was given, although I think he took the stand last session that it did not increase the quantity of butter made. Yet in 1890, at the time that bonus was commenced, there were only 111 creameries in that province, turning out 2,779,000 pounds of butter, and four years afterwards there were 400 creameries, which turned out 10,413,131 pounds. I do not see what better evi-

dence we want that that bonus was a great help to the farmers of the province of Quebec. No bonus was given in the province of Ontario, and that province last year exported only 587,000 pounds of butter, although it is the richest farming province in the Dominion. I claim that the farmers of the province of Ontario require some encouragement, and I am now making an earnest appeal on their behalf, as well as on behalf of the farmers of the whole Dominion. Last year the hon. Minister of Agriculture, in contending that a bonus was of no help to the farmers, read a resolution that was passed by the Board of Trade of Montreal. That resolution was as follows :—

Outside of one instance, there had not been a pound of butter manufactured in this province as a result of the bonus. It appeared that the persons here who manufactured butter from cream and milk sent from Ontario, got quite a goodly portion of the bonus, and by this means they had built quite a little business at, as he claimed, the expense of the legislature.

I should like to ask the hon. Minister, how many farmers were at that meeting of the board of trade. The hon. gentleman also gave, as another instance of the failure of the bonus to accomplish its purpose, a motion moved at the same meeting by Mr. Hodgson, a well-known butter and cheese buyer in Montreal :

That a committee be appointed to draft a resolution strongly advising the discontinuance of the system of granting bonuses to creameries, and also the advisability of applying whatever money has been voted for that purpose to the increasing and improving of refrigeration accommodation, both by water and land.

This Mr. Hodgson is not a farmer. He has not the interests of the farmers at heart, but is looking out for himself, and he knows well that, if this bonus were continued and the farmers were compelled to export directly, as they would be, he would lose his business. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that he should have moved this resolution. Then, there was another resolution in amendment, moved by Mr. Ayer :

That this association, having heard that the province of Quebec proposes the discontinuing the bonus to creameries, heartily concurs in the same, and recommends that any further grants be given towards the increasing of refrigeration accommodation.

Mr. Ayer is also an exporter. The hon. Minister of Agriculture did not give one instance of a single farmer who was opposed to the bonus system. It is true, that the province of Quebec discontinued the bonus to the butter business, but the evidence I have given of the growth of the industry shows that it was a great boon to the farmers of that province ; and if the hon. Minister of Agriculture would give a similar boon to the farmers of this Dominion for the same length of time, it is altogether likely that this Government would also be,

at the expiration of a similar period, in a position to discontinue it, because that industry would have grown in the interval to such an extent that it could afford to dispense with Government assistance.

To show, further, how this bonus system is of great benefit to the farmers, let me read a brief statement from the Minister of Agriculture, which he made last year, in his remarks on this question :

I wish to point out, in the first place, that one Australian colony, Victoria, for six years, did give a bonus for the export of butter. During that period the butter exports from Victoria very considerably increased, as I find from the figures under my hand. But immediately upon the cessation of the bounties, the export of butter from the colony to Great Britain dropped enormously, showing that the stimulus was not sufficient to encourage and to create a proper and legitimate trade.

In the first part of that statement, the hon. Minister of Agriculture admits that the bonus did make the butter industry in Victoria grow very enormously. If it should do that here for a number of years, would not that be of great importance to our farmers ? In the last part of his remarks, the hon. Minister says that the industry did not increase, but went back. True, it may have fallen off a little, but I think the hon. Minister will agree with me that it did not fall off to what it was when the bonus was first established. The hon. Minister takes credit for the establishment of the cold storage system to England, but, having done that, which, I believe, is of great help to the farmers, I hope he will also take into consideration this resolution, so that he may be able to obtain produce for shipment in this cold storage. I would also request that this bonus should be paid direct to the farmers, so that no middlemen may get it. For instance, when a creamery is started, the bonus should be paid directly to the farmers or the treasurer of that factory, and not to any middlemen, and in this way the farmers will get the full direct benefit. If there is anything in the world that would encourage the farmers, it would be a bonus of this kind, for the simple reason that they would then know, no matter what the price of their butter might be, that they would get probably sufficient to pay for the making of the butter, and thus be encouraged to take hold of that industry. For the last eighteen years, this Government has been promising to do the farmers some good. For the last eighteen years, before they obtained office, they were preaching that our farmers were in a state of poverty, and promising that, as soon as they attained power, they would do something for their benefit. But I have failed, since this Government came into power, to see that they have done anything for the improvement of the condition of the farmers, or that would be of any benefit to them. If I have overlooked anything that the Government have done in

that regard, I would like the hon. Minister to inform me of it. The Government, however, has not hesitated to make enormous expenditure on other matters. These hon. gentlemen blamed us for our large expenditure on railways, but I think the record of this Government, in its short term of office, surpasses in this regard that of any Government that has been in power since confederation. The right hon. leader of the Government, when in Montreal, in 1897, told a meeting of the farmers there that the hon. Minister of Agriculture was the best friend they had. I hope that, in this matter, the right hon. gentleman will use his influence on that hon. Minister to obtain this little favour from him which I am asking for the farming community. This is no party matter, but one that interests every farmer throughout the Dominion, and I hope that it will be considered apart from politics. It is in this spirit that I move this motion, and I trust that it will be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite in a similar spirit. I may add, that many members have said that they would like this resolution to apply also to dairy-made butter. If the Government had an inspector, so that no butter could pass except that equal to creamery-made, I would not object to include that in the resolution. But I earnestly urge the Government to place an amount, be it ever so small in the Estimates of the present session, so that this project may be given a fair trial, and the farmers given an opportunity to see how it would work.

Mr. MOORE. I shall detain the House only a few minutes in discussing the motion so ably presented by the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Reid). In concluding his remarks that hon. gentleman referred to what seems to me an important omission, to call attention to which was my main object when I decided to speak upon this subject. I think it would be very unfair for the Government to grant a bonus only to creamery-made butter and exclude the dairy-made, particularly when we consider that 80 per cent of the butter made in Canada is made in the dairy instead of being made by the creamery process. The bonus should not be confined to creamery butter at any rate until the farmers generally have an opportunity to send their milk to creameries. I am glad that the farmers have so able an advocate in the hon. gentleman from South Grenville. We must all agree as to the importance to the country of the agricultural interest. It is the most important industry in this country, and needs the greatest encouragement that it is possible for the Government to give. When we consider that one-third of the traffic upon our railways, one-third of the traffic upon our canals and one-third of the traffic by our ships is in carrying the produce of the farmers, we cannot close our eyes to their claims or feel that those

Mr. REID.

claims can be in any way slighted. I think that those who have followed the trend of events in this country in connection with this industry will find that the encouragement given to the farmer in the production of cheese has been the means of greatly increasing the production, and not only that, but of improving the quality of that which is now being produced in this country. It was said by an old Grecian philosopher that hope of reward is the main-spring of human action. I think that if anything in this country can be held to exemplify that saying it is to be found in results of the encouragement given to the manufacture of cheese. The returns show that in 1890 between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000 worth of cheese was exported from this country. But within the last two or three years this has increased to about \$15,000,000. I attribute the increase in the production of cheese in this country to the encouragement given by the various governments, Dominion and provincial, in prizes and in various other ways.

The resolution proposed suggests the importance of considering whether we have not gone as far as it is prudent to go in the manufacture of cheese. The United States people are turning their attention more to the manufacture of cheese, and now the market in England is being fully supplied. I think it would be imprudent for the agriculturists of this country to increase to any great extent the manufacture of cheese. They should rather turn their attention to the increase in the production of butter. The proposal now before the House that the matter should be taken up by the Government and a small bonus given to encourage the farmers in the manufacture of butter, in my opinion, is wise. We find that Australia sent to Great Britain in 1896 \$6,000,000 worth of butter, the United States \$612,000, Sweden \$6,680,000, Denmark \$28,000,000, Germany \$3,500,000, Holland \$4,045,000, France \$11,000,000, other countries \$3,000,000—in all \$65,000,000 worth of butter imported into Great Britain from other countries in a single year. We should have a larger share of this trade. We have a country well adapted to the manufacture of butter. We have as good cows, as good pastures, as good water, and, I think, as skilful people in this country as are to be found in any country of the world. All we have to do is to devote our energy and skill to the making of a first-class article, and there is a market open in England for all that it is possible for this country to send. I rose mainly to call attention to the omission in this resolution to which the hon. mover has referred. I should be very glad if the suggestion which I made to the hon. gentleman could be carried out, in which case the resolution would read:

That in view of the foregoing facts, our Government should take immediate steps to do some-

thing more to assist in the development of our butter trade, and this House is of the opinion that the Government should place in the Estimates for the present session an amount to be paid to the farmers direct by way of a bonus of one cent per pound on a specified quantity of our finest fresh creamery and dairy butter to be exported to Great Britain.

And so on. I cannot see any reason whatever why dairy butter that has passed a rigid inspection by the Government inspector, should be excluded from the benefit of this bonus. I think the manufacturers of dairy butter, who make 80 per cent of our entire butter product, would not appreciate the partiality of the Government if the Government were to confine its assistance entirely to creamery-made butter. I would suggest that this addition be made to the resolution, in which case I should be most happy to vote for it if it comes to a vote.

Mr. DAVIN. I consider the motion of my hon. friend is entirely on the lines of those countries on the continent of Europe who first made the export of butter a really scientific part of their trade policy. It was by encouragement on the part of the Government of Denmark that the butter exported from that country to Great Britain obtained such a vogue and proved so eminently successful. My hon. friend who introduced this motion has gone so fully into it and made a case so clear, that it is not necessary for me to say further than that I gladly support his motion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Before this motion is put, I would like to say a word or two. The hon. member who has introduced this motion has, as we are all aware, introduced an exactly similar motion last year; and the remarks he has made to-day follow very much the line of the remarks which he made last year. I do not know that I have much to add to-day to what I said when I answered him on that occasion. However, as he has gone over, to a certain extent, some of those points, I will just refer to them, so that the facts of the case may go on record in this session's "Hansard." In the first place, I would say that the experience of the province of Quebec, in regard to giving a bonus for the export butter trade, was not such as to encourage me to hope any great results from a similar policy on the part of the Dominion Government. In the province of Quebec, the local government, for one year, did this, and the result was, that certain shippers in the city of Montreal got practically the whole of the bonus. I never was able to discover, intimately acquainted as I am with the dairy trade in the province of Quebec, that the farmers who supplied that butter got any better price for it than they did for the butter which was not exported. So far as I could make out, from the provincial records, this money practically aided only a few shippers in the city of Montreal,

but did not in any way increase the amount of butter exported, and did not reach the pockets of the farmers who actually made the butter. Now, I know that the hon. gentleman has no desire to have such a thing occur as a consequence of this motion; but I can assure him that, according to my own judgment, the same results would probably occur, were any bonus arrangement to be made. I would point out to him that his statement of the exports of butter from the great province of Ontario is not quite fair to that province. The butter which is exported from the province of Ontario is credited to the port of Montreal in our export trade returns. There is a very much larger quantity of butter exported to Great Britain from the province of Ontario than appears in the figures the hon. gentleman read here this afternoon. As a matter of fact, the export butter trade of the province of Ontario, as the export butter trade of the whole Dominion, has been progressing in the most satisfactory manner. The increase this year, since the hon. gentleman made his motion last session, has been almost, if not quite, as satisfactory as the increases in the few years preceding to which I alluded in my remarks on this question last session. At that time I was able to say that our butter export had doubled each successive year for three years. It has not quite doubled during the last year, that is to say, the increase has not been quite as great as it was the year before, but we sent about two-thirds as much more out this year. I think, considering the enormously increased volume of trade, that such an increase as that was an actual increase on the year before, and a comparative increase not so very far short; and when you consider that the volume of trade was so much greater, I think the increase was equally satisfactory. I may point out to the hon. gentleman and to those who may, at first sight, be rather disposed to favour the course he suggests, that we are doing a great deal to encourage the export butter trade already. The cold storage system, which I have been able to put on a satisfactory basis, I think, during the last season, has contributed very much to the surety and to the advantage of the export butter trade. Our butter in England has, up to a recent period, been looked upon somewhat with suspicion, owing to the fact that it was a little off flavour by the time it reached Great Britain. I have in my department to-day letters from large importers in England, letters from a great number of people in that country engaged in the butter trade, and statements which have been made to me personally by my own officials who went over to England last summer, that the reputation of our butter in England has completely changed for the better. This last season, the butter which was sent forward from Canada to England in cold storage, arrived there in almost per-

fect condition, and those who handled it are full of praises of the quality, and fine texture, and fine flavour of Canadian butter. They say that, if we can send butter forward of that quality, so that it may arrive there in that condition, they would be able to give us an unlimited market, and all we have to do is to make the butter and send it forward. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that all our people have to do is, to provide machinery for manufacturing and exporting it, and they will have an abundant market there for all they can make. We do not need to do like the Australian colonies, who, a few years ago, paid a bonus for exporting butter to England at a time when their butter had no reputation in England, at a time when their butter was not known in England at all. We, to-day, have a sure position in the English market; we, to-day, have a very large and increasing butter trade with the English consumers, and, under these circumstances, without any further action on the part of the Government of Canada, we can simply go on increasing our export to the utmost capacity of the productive powers of this country at the present time. Allusion was made to the splendid position which our cheese holds to-day. I need not go over the familiar figures. Everybody in the country is aware of the fact that to-day Canada is pre-eminent in the cheese trade, that to-day there is one industry, at all events, in which Canada stands at the head of all the world, and that is the cheese trade. We make the best cheese that is produced in the world, and we send out the largest quantity of cheese that any country sends to Great Britain, so much so that we practically control the cheese market in that country. Now, Sir, that trade was created without any bonus, that trade was created by the good business methods of the men who were concerned in it. They were able, with great rapidity and with entire success, to accomplish a splendid result for this country. It was, perhaps, easier to accomplish that result in cheese than in butter, because cheese was not so likely to deteriorate rapidly in the transport between Canada and Great Britain, and therefore they could do that without the cold storage facilities and the transportation facilities which butter requires. These facilities are now at the command of the butter exporters, and I am satisfied, knowing as I do that in Canada we have every facility for making the best butter product in the whole world, that we have the pastures, the water, the herds and animals necessary, and, above all, the people required to make the best quality product that can be manufactured anywhere. I, therefore, feel assured that our people, having now the transportation facilities necessary, having secured an assured position and reputation in the English market, which they enjoy to-day, will be able to increase their output and sell their butter just as

Mr. FISHER.

rapidly as they can supply it for export. Under these circumstances I do not see it is necessary to give this artificial stimulus proposed—I can call it nothing else—at a time when after it has been given in other directions, it has not proved successful on the whole. The cheese trade has done without it, and our exports have increased, our exports of wheat and grain have done without it; our exports of butter are progressing splendidly and I do not think it would be wise policy, in the interest of the butter trade itself and of our farming population and in the interest of our dairymen, to undertake to give this artificial stimulant. Reference has been made to what Denmark has done for her butter trade in England. We all know that Denmark has leaped suddenly into the very first place among the exporters of butter to Great Britain. Denmark never gave a bonus of any kind whatever for the export of her butter to that market. She spent money in other ways, among others in providing facilities for exportation, in teaching her people at home how to make good butter—just as we have been doing—and providing officials in England to guard and watch the trade there. I think quite likely that we will have to do something of that kind, and to-day I have under consideration the advisability of more largely watching our trade there than I did last year in connection with my cold storage transportation work. I want it to be clearly understood that Denmark never gave any bonus for butter exportation to Great Britain. The countries which did so were the Australian colonies. They did it for a short time, found it did not work and then gave it up, and to-day I understand no colony in Australia is giving a bonus, and as a matter of fact, although for a year or so during which that bonus was being given by one of the colonies, the export was stimulated, the Government found that a lot of butter was sent forward that was not even produced there. They found the arrangement was not working satisfactorily, and they stopped giving the bonus. The butter export immediately dropped, showing that what had been an apparent success by reason of giving the bonus had been artificially stimulated and had not been profitable or successful. Under these circumstances and with this knowledge I do not feel it would be at all advisable to pass such a resolution as that now before the House. I think no one could pretend for a moment or would desire to pretend that, personally I have not had the greatest interest and desire to promote the dairy interest of the country and to increase the exportation of our dairy products. I am myself a dairyman; my own farming has always been on that line, and if there was any particular branch of agriculture in which I was more interested, it is the butter-making industry; but I am satisfied that we can increase and improve and stimulate our butter-making industry

by other methods, which are not of the hot-bed variety such as that of granting a bonus, and that we have not to-day the necessity of stimulating them because they are going ahead themselves in a most marvellous and successful manner, and the work we have done on other lines has been more successful than the artificial stimulus would have been, and therefore we had better go ahead on the line which we have followed so successfully and by which we have been able to accomplish such remarkable results. I would therefore suggest that this motion should not be passed, and that the Government should not be hampered by any desire expressed by the House to adopt this particular form of encouraging and helping the dairying industry.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I want to say only a word as to the motion placed on the Table by the hon. member for Grenville and a word or two in reply to, or perhaps in compliment to what has been stated by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I am sure the farmers of Canada owe their gratitude to the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) for bringing this subject before the House and presenting it in such an able manner as the hon. gentleman presented it this afternoon; and I am somewhat sorry that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has not turned a more sympathetic ear to the appeal of my hon. friend in behalf of the dairymen of Canada than his speech to the House this afternoon would indicate. The hon. gentleman declared that the bonus that had been granted by the province of Quebec had not been successful owing to the fact that a very small part of the money had gone to the farmers themselves in the form of increased prices. I take it that the object of my hon. friend in asking that this bonus be granted is not that the farmers may obtain a small increase in the price of their butter, but it is mainly that the reputation of our products should be established in England, that our markets should be wide and untrammelled, and by that means still greater encouragement given in the direction of creameries for winter butter-making and the use of them during the summer as cheese factories. The same explanation applies largely to the remarks the hon. Minister of Agriculture made in regard to Australia. But leaving these two points out of the question entirely, I think the Minister of Agriculture will not deny that to some extent at least, though the progress made was not all we could desire, the effort which was made a few years ago to encourage the shipment of creamery butter to Great Britain by aid from the public treasury was to a certain extent responsible for the increased demand for Canadian butter in Great Britain and of the enhanced reputation that butter enjoys at the present time. Whether the hon. gentleman yields to the request of the hon. member for Grenville or not, and I take it from the speech that the hon. gentleman

has no such intention, I trust the hon. gentleman will take the step which he has just broadly hinted at so as to secure a more careful inspection and regulation of our dairying trade in Great Britain itself. What I mean to say is this. At the present time there is a very large quantity of Canadian butter, and the same remarks applies to other products of Canada as well, perhaps excluding cheese, which at the present time is sold upon the markets of Great Britain without Canada receiving credit for it. We are all delighted to hear that, because we are all Canadians and we all thoroughly rejoice at the prosperity of our agriculturists even though we do not belong to that class ourselves. But I venture to say, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) if he had gone into the subject further, would have been compelled to admit that even these butter dealers from whom the compliments with regard to Canadian butter have come, have in many cases placed upon the British market Canadian butter without crediting Canada with its production; in other words, they are selling it in many cases under false pretenses and selling it as French or as Danish or as English butter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Might I remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) that last session we passed an Act requiring that all Canadian butter and cheese going forth to a foreign market would have marked on it the name "Canadian." Of course, when it is retailed and cut out of the tinnet we cannot enforce that, but when it is exported it is all marked "Canadian."

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am aware that it is all marked, and if honestly dealt with on the other side of the water, of course we are protected; but take the case of Canadian cheese. I know myself that Canadian cheese is exhibited in many of the grocery establishments of London but it is sold as British cheese, and the cheese-makers of Great Britain get credit for the splendid quality of cheese which is being produced by the Canadian factories. The same applies to butter, notwithstanding our Act of last session as regards the marking of it. The point I wish to come to is this, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) trod upon the threshold of it when he made the suggestion to the House, and which was merely a suggestion as he did not name any plan. My idea is, that this Government which is spending large sums of money in other directions; spending, I may say, much larger sums of money than we on this side ever expected they would spend; spending sums which announce to the country that they are an exceedingly generous Government; my idea is that a Government so generous; a Government which counts millions with very great ease and spends them with as much ease, could afford very well to spend a sum of money for the establishment of depots in

some of the leading cities of Great Britain where Canadian products would be placed upon sale as Canadian products. We should then, by reason of these depots not only secure an enhanced price for the products of Canadian farms and Canadian dairies, but we would in the very best and the most substantial manner possible secure a reputation for ourselves which would last so long as the quality of our products would last upon Canadian soil. I sincerely trust that my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) will look into the question of arranging some such system of selling Canadian products in Great Britain, a system which will without doubt have the effect of giving us the advertisement, as well as the increased price which the better condition of our products justifies at the present time.

Mr. McMULLEN. Although hon. gentlemen opposite occupied the Treasury benches for eighteen years, it is a singular thing that they never took such a lively interest in the farmer as they do now. I am prepared to offer any assistance possible to encourage the farmers of this Dominion, and to encourage any industry that may be for the well-being of the farming community. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) has just made the suggestion, that in view of the large amount of money spent by this Government, they ought to contribute towards an expenditure in the direction indicated by the resolution. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) was Minister of Agriculture for a considerable time, and yet the thought never struck him then, that it would be in the interest of the farmers to inaugurate a system of this kind. I would be glad to see the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) do everything he can to bring before the English consumers the butter and cheese of Canada, and I believe from the action he has already taken in securing cold storage, we have clear evidence of his desire to do everything in his power to secure better prices and better markets for the farm products of this country. It is rather amusing, that although hon. gentlemen opposite were in power for eighteen years the thought never struck them to establish agencies in England as has been suggested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague).

Mr. MONTAGUE. Oh, yes, we did.

Mr. McMULLEN. I acknowledge that on one occasion, just a very short time before a general election, it was thought it would be a good thing to act in that direction and that possibly it would secure the votes of the farmers of Canada. They bought a certain quantity of butter, they sent it home, the country contributed a considerable amount of money to handle it, but we have never learned down to the present day that any very great good resulted from that experiment.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

I am glad to know that the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who is himself a practical farmer and thoroughly acquainted with the dairying question, is doing everything he can to encourage the butter and cheese industry. I am proud to see that our cheese has attained such a distinguished place in the English market and I am glad also that our butter is fast gaining ground there. I quite concur in the statement of the resolution, that Canada is well adapted to the production of the best quality of butter. We have the climate, we have the grasses, we have the water and climate, we have all the conditions necessary to produce good butter and cheese, and I can quite see that the future prosperity—more particularly of the older provinces of this Dominion—depends very largely upon the farmers adopting the business of dairying rather than following the old lines. It is well that we should encourage our farmers in that direction, and in my opinion if the business of butter and cheese-producing is to continue to increase as it has since the present Government came into power, Canada will occupy a high position in the English market, and these two products, even without any subsidy, will take the first place. If I thought that such a bounty was necessary I would gladly support it. The interest of the farmers of Canada were neglected and badly neglected for eighteen years, but they are going to be attended to now. This Government will do everything they can to encourage the farmers of Canada. There is, however, one feature of this resolution that I cannot agree with. My hon. friend (Mr. Reid) proposes to confine it entirely to those who can supply butter all the year round. The bonus is not to be given to any factory that will not be able to furnish regular supplies for export. That cannot be done unless the factories can be carried on both winter and summer. In some sections of the country it might be possible to do that. I dare say that in the Morrisburg section, where my hon. friend lives, and where they have carried dairying to a high state of perfection, that could be done; but in other sections of the country it could not be done. If every factory that is producing butter were to be allowed to participate in the advantage offered to the extent to which it would be able to do so, and if the bonus were not to be confined to those factories which would be able to furnish a supply weekly or monthly the year round, I would have no objection to it. I have no objection to hon. gentlemen opposite urging on the Government the duty they owe to the farming community, and the efforts they should put forth in their interest. If the Government continue on the line they have commenced, by offering encouragement in the form of cold storage, both in refrigerator cars and in steamers; and if in addition to that they endeavour to place on the English market, under the eye of our own men, and in the most advantageous

way, the products of Canada in both butter, cheese and meat, I look forward hopefully to a very large développement of our trade in all these lines in the English market.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me to be rather unfortunate that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) cannot approach any subject in this House without introducing party. He says he is very much in favour of helping the farmers, but at the same time he is entirely opposed to the proposition before the House. He goes on to say that it is very amusing and a very singular thing that members on this side of the House should make any proposition looking in the direction of helping the farmers. Why, Sir, I would ask the hon. gentleman who it was that inaugurated the cold storage system for the benefit of the farmers of this country. I would ask him who it was employed a dairy commissioner to instruct the farmers, and to seek to have the cheese industry raised to its present proud condition. I might at the same time ask who it was encouraged the manufacture and exportation of butter. If we looked into this matter, we would find that these things were not done, or at any rate not begun, as the hon. gentleman insinuated was the case, by the Liberal party; but that they were begun and put on a sound footing by the Conservative party; and many of these propositions were ridiculed and opposed by the Liberal party. I would not have alluded to this at all had it not been for the remark of the hon. member for North Wellington; because, as the mover of this motion said, this matter should not be treated as a party question. It is a question that we should approach entirely in a non-partisan spirit; and I think that every member who has spoken on it has so treated it except the hon. member for North Wellington; and so far as I have done so, I have only done it in reply to what he said.

Now, we all agree that the farmers of this country should be encouraged in every way possible. I do not say that the Conservative party have a monopoly of that desire. I believe that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have the same desire; and I give them the credit of that. We are all, independent of party, proud of the position our cheese industry and export has attained; but there is no doubt that our butter industry has not attained to an equally proud position. If it is true that 340,000,000 pounds of butter are imported yearly by Great Britain, and that of that enormous quantity Canada sends only 10,000,000 pounds, I think there is great need for the matter being looked into and considered by the Government; and any means that will encourage the manufacture and export of good butter should receive their careful attention. I

am very glad that the statements made as an introduction to this resolution can be made in reference to Canada. We have a cold storage system, inaugurated as I said by the Conservative party. We have a country that is especially adapted, by the possession of many natural advantages to the production of the finest butter. I think it is well that this matter has been brought before the House and the country, and perhaps before Great Britain, at this time, in order that the fact may be made prominent that we have a country that can make as fine butter as any country in the world, not excepting Denmark itself, where very fine butter is produced. There is no doubt that the proposed bonus would necessitate an expenditure of public money; but I hold that this money would be repaid many times over. The money would not go to the farmers alone. They would receive it, but it would be expended in our own country. They would spend in Canada, not only the bonus, but the increased returns from the export of butter which this bonus would bring about. I believe it would result in many thousands of dollars extra being brought into this country, to the great advantage not only of the farmers, but of every part of the community; because I hold that if the farmers prosper, every class in the community will prosper as well. This bonus, at first, would not, I believe, be a very large sum after all, because the bonus of 1 cent a pound is not to be given indiscriminately, but is to be confined to a specified quantity of the finest fresh creamery butter manufactured. It is an open question whether dairy butter should not be included. I am not sufficiently familiar with the butter trade to pronounce an opinion upon that question. Even if a bonus were given on all the butter exported, it would amount to only \$100,000; but a large portion of the butter exported would not come up to the necessary standard, because the butter is to be subjected to a rigid inspection by a Government inspector.

I am a strong supporter of this measure, because I believe in its object, which is to raise the standard of quality of the butter made in this country. No object could be more important. A great deal of the butter manufactured in this country is of an inferior quality. What does that mean? It means a great loss not only to the farmers, but to the whole country. It means a great waste of good material and labour which could be as well turned into good butter as bad butter; and if, by giving this small bonus, we can induce our farmers to make butter of a better quality, I maintain that we would be justified in doing so. I do not know that any of the arguments offered by the Minister of Agriculture against this proposition are strong arguments. As the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) said, we are spending

large amounts of money—I am not saying they are too large—at the present time; but I think the country would justify us in granting a bonus of this kind if the result aimed at would be attained. The Minister of Agriculture does not seem to think it would, but we think it would. I would like to hear an expression of opinion from the practical men on the other side of the House, the men who make butter and know something of the business, whether they think this bonus of 1 cent a pound would result in raising the standard of butter made in the country. The Minister of Agriculture made a most important statement when he said that the market for first-class butter in Great Britain is practically unlimited; so that if our farmers can be induced to make a first-class quality of butter, they need not fear but that they will get a first-class market and a first class price. The great difficulty is the poor quality of butter which is sent to England. Not only does it not command as high a price as good butter, but it prevents the good butter sent over from commanding as high a price as it would if the standard were raised all over the country.

I do not need to say any more on this question, but it does seem to me one of the most important that could engage the attention of Parliament. Butter is an article of large consumption in England, as you can see by the fact that 340,000,000 pounds are imported by Great Britain per annum, of which only 10,000,000 pounds come from Canada. All the conditions are favourable for the expansion of our trade in that respect with the mother country. There is no doubt that in Great Britain there is a strong sentiment in favour of giving Canada, as the most important colony, every preference; and if our butter is equally as good, I am sure it will obtain the preference in that market.

Mr. SPROULE. I would be inclined to allow this motion to pass without saying anything, were it not for the remarks of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who, I regret to say, has exhibited to-day the same disposition which he invariably displayed, inside the House or outside, when any question is brought up by any member of the Conservative party in the interests of the agricultural community of this country. That hon. gentleman seems absolutely incapable of viewing anything except through his own political spectacles, and through those spectacles he can by no possibility see good in anything his opponents may do or propose to do, or anything wrong in whatever his own friends may propose or perform. Everything done by his friends is right and proper, and they alone can do anything good.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Hear, hear.

Mr. CRAIG.

Mr. SPROULE. I commend his faith and allegiance to the right hon. leader of his party. They are qualities required not only to make a good politician but a very loyal member of a party. He was not so loyal some time ago, but he seems to be coming back again to his natural element and disposition. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman if his memory is so short that he forgets what has been done by the Conservative party for our farmers. He says that the Conservative party was in power eighteen years, and during all that time never did anything for the benefit of the farming community. Will the hon. gentleman tell us who it was established the Experimental Farm? Was it the Reform party? I think not. If my memory is correct, it was established by the Conservative party and Conservative Government, and on that point by none was their conduct more severely criticised than by the hon. member for North Wellington. His plea then was that the agricultural farm was established for the purpose of making political capital with the farmers rather than of doing them any good. Will the hon. gentleman tell us who it was that started the dairy branch and appointed a dairy commissioner whose duty it was to devise ways and means by which our farmers could make more money out of their products than they had been doing previously? Who was it sent that commissioner to England and Germany and other countries to study the wants of these markets and find out how best we could supply them? It was the Conservative Government, but the hon. member for North Wellington seems to have forgotten that. He has a very short memory with regard to some things and a very long memory with regard to others. Who was it that first voted money for the introduction of the Canadian butter trade in England if it was not the Conservative party? Why, Mr. Speaker, only a few years ago the Conservative Government brought down a vote of \$20,000 for the purpose of introducing the butter trade into the old country, by indemnifying those who would supply that article regularly at stated periods during the season for shipment to England, so that the English consumer might be practically convinced that we do make an article here which is suited to his requirements and of which we can furnish an unlimited supply. Who did that? It was not the Reform party but the Conservative party. And when that very thing was being done, the hon. member for North Wellington condemned it most strongly as money wasted.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is getting excited. What is the mistake?

Mr. McMULLEN. That I opposed the proposition I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. SPROULE. I could not hear what the hon. gentleman said. Will he be good enough to repeat it? The hon. gentleman will not repeat it, and evidently does not want what he said to be heard. I have seen the hon. gentleman from time to time, when excited, making statements that are not justified by the facts. I gave an instance last night of a statement he made which had no foundation whatever but which is clearly contradicted by the records. I am justified therefore in saying that he very often does not confine himself strictly to the facts, and I cannot presume any reason except a desire to make political capital for his friends at the expense of his opponents and at the sacrifice of the truth. I repeat that the introduction of Canadian butter into the English market was accomplished by the Conservative party. That party voted \$20,000 for that purpose, and spent that money for that purpose, and it is because of the work done by them, that our butter stands to-day higher in the English market than it ever did before. We were the party which voted the first expenditure to establish that trade, and to us is due the credit for the success which has attended its establishment. Who was it that first provided cold storage? The hon. gentleman says that it was his friends who introduced it. But no one can successfully deny that the plan was arranged for and matured before the late Government left office, and the best compliment that can be paid to the present Government is that they carried out the arrangement which was made by the late Government just before leaving office. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, to whom I give credit for doing his best in the interests of the farmers, will admit that in this cold storage business, he simply carried out the programme outlined by his predecessors. But because that policy has resulted in great success, the hon. member for North Wellington wants to give the whole credit of it to his own friends. Who was it that first proposed the establishment of Canadian agencies in England, if not the Conservative party and Government. That policy was outlined by the Conservatives, and had the late Government remained in power much longer, the then Minister of Agriculture intended to establish these agencies in England for the purpose of advertising our goods and putting them before the English consumers in a healthy condition. Our intention was to have our goods brought over in good condition by means of the cold storage system, and then have our agencies established over there so that Canadian products would not be misrepresented or sold under some other name. Yet although these things were all done by the Conservative Government and party, the hon. gentleman has the assurance to state that they did nothing. He surely ought to have a sufficient sense of justice to give credit to his predecessors for the

establishment of a trade which has been so successful. We believe that there is room for continued development of that trade to a very considerable extent, and anything which the Minister of Agriculture can propose in that view we would be inclined to support in every possible way. Whether the means proposed by this resolution is the best or not, I am not prepared to say. There are some things about it I like and some I do not, but the farmers of Canada certainly should give credit to the hon. gentleman who has introduced this resolution for endeavouring to obtain something which will stimulate and develop trade in one of the most important lines of agricultural products. We have only a small portion of that trade yet and ought to assist its development in every possible way. While England imports 300,000,000 pounds of butter we do not send her one-thirtieth of that. We send her very much less than 10,000,000 pounds, and Germany sends her 137,000,000 pounds. There is nothing to prevent Canada supplying just as much as Germany. Our butter is every bit as good, and when the English people are educated to appreciate its quality, they will give us the preference, and we all know that there is a very strong sentiment in the mother country to give Canada every favour possible and every preference over Germany. Therefore if there is any way in which we can stimulate that trade, we ought to do so. I can only say that the aim of the Conservative party was to assist the farmers of this country in every way that lay in their power. Everything they did in relation to agriculture is an evidence of that. And what they did resulted in great good. But it was only a commencement of a work which would require years to bring to perfection. What they did has been of great advantage to the country already and will prove of even greater value in the future. So far as the present Government carries out the objects of their predecessors, I shall be glad to support them, and I am confident that, in saying this, I speak the sentiments of other hon. members on this side. At any rate, we shall not be like the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), but will give the Government credit for wisely directed efforts, instead of condemning them and saying that they did nothing.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I agree with a good deal that has been said on this question, but I cannot agree with the conclusion of the motion. I do not think that it is required that this Government should give a bonus for the exportation of butter. It is admitted and it is a fact, that Canada is especially adapted for the production of butter. It is also admitted that our butter trade with England is increasing by leaps and bounds, and that the dealers in England are loud in their praises of Canadian butter. In my opinion, the Government have taken wise

steps to encourage the extension of this trade, by improving the facilities of transportation. The cold storage system, in my opinion, has been of enormous advantage to the farmers of this country, by helping forward this trade. But in providing a system of shipment by means of which this butter can be delivered in the best possible condition, I think that the Government has done what it was called upon to do, and does not need to go very much further. It might be a wise step for the Government to employ some person in England to look after the butter sent to that market, and give the trade generally a little more attention than has been given to it in the past, but so far as commerce is concerned, I think the Government had better let business men manage their own affairs. Having the natural advantage that we have, and our butter having the reputation it has in England, the trade becomes a profitable one and can take care of itself without any artificial stimulus being given by this House to its extension. As the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has stated—a statement which has not been contradicted—only one country, the Australian colonies, ever adopted this system of bonusing the export of butter, and, after a few years of trial, they found that it was not a success, and have discontinued the system. As we have got along so well hitherto, as our butter trade is not languishing, but is going ahead rapidly, it seems to me that nothing further is required. If the Government is going into the bonusing business, there are a hundred industries in Canada that would be as much entitled to this assistance as the butter-making industry. We have in this country great facilities for the raising of cattle, of which an enormous number are exported to the old country. A bonus might be given with a view to having these cattle killed on this side, the meat canned here and exported in that form to the old country. This industry would give employment to an enormous number of men, and be of great benefit to the people generally. Then, there is the canning industry, which is of great importance to the people of Canada. You might as well ask that a bonus be given for the promotion and extension of that business. And so I might go through the list, naming a hundred different lines of manufacture which the Government would be as well entitled to bonus as the butter-making industry. Business men can be trusted to send their products to the best market. Therefore, I do not think that this motion should be adopted. But, as there would be no harm in looking further into the matter, and as, in that case, it would be well that further opportunity for discussion should be afforded, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. HENDERSON. I confess that I have been somewhat surprised at what hon. gen-

Mr. CAMPBELL.

tleman on the other side have said with respect to the resolution moved by my hon. friend from South Grenville (Mr. Reid). While I was surprised by the statement made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), I have been much more surprised by the statements made by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), gentlemen who represent rich agricultural districts in my own province, districts that are largely interested in this butter trade, and that would be much benefited by any measure that would promote the exportation of our butter to Great Britain. The hon. member for North Wellington has endeavoured to answer the arguments from this side by stating that, though in power for eighteen years, the late Government took no steps in this direction. The hon. member's sight seems to have been somewhat affected by his long sitting in the dark, cold shades of Opposition, so much so that he is unable to see where anything can be done to benefit the farmers whom he represents in this House. He told us that the late Government took no steps toward the establishment of a system of cold storage. His memory must have failed him for a moment, for I am sure that, on reflection, he will recollect that, as has been so well pointed out by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the very system of cold storage adopted by this Government received its inception at the hands of the former Government, being, in this respect, like the greater part of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, including the National Policy, which has been so largely adopted by these hon. gentlemen. We were also told, in answer to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), that no steps were taken by the former Government toward disposing of this article through depots established in Great Britain. Now, I remember quite well, that that was part of the policy of the hon. member for Haldimand when he was Minister of Agriculture. We have been told that other industries have been carried on without any stimulus from the Government—the cheese and cattle industries being especially mentioned.

Butter, possibly, of all the articles produced upon the farm, is one of the most sensitive, one of the most difficult to send to a foreign market without destroying its quality; consequently, there is greater need for assistance to those who undertake to export that article. It is very strange indeed that hon. members opposite, who seem to be a unit at this time in opposing a measure which is well calculated to benefit the agriculturists of the country, who have a policy on that question, even if they have no policy on any other question, seem to have taken up a position contrary to the interests of the farmers in this particular direction. They have been stimulating the iron industry by granting a bonus, they

have been stimulating the cotton industry by placing upon the Statute-book a very heavy tariff in favour of the cotton manufacturer, and also giving a large protection to the woollen manufacturer, and to many other industries. Therefore, it seems strange to me that out of the large expenditure which the Government have at their disposal, they are not disposed to grant the little assistance that is asked for to stimulate the export of butter from Canada. To my mind, one of the great advantages that will be derived from giving effect to the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) will be, in the first place, that it will stimulate the production of butter in this country. Now, that means a great deal. It not only means that a larger quantity of butter will be produced, but that the farmers' stock will be improved, and its quantity will be increased. Not only the quantity of his stock and the quality of his stock will be improved and increased, but the farm itself will be improved as a consequence of the larger number and better stock the farmer will keep upon his farm. The export trade will be encouraged, and that will be the means of bringing a greater revenue back to the farmer. His market will be enlarged and his revenue increased by stimulating this industry in the way proposed. But there is another benefit which, I think, will follow, and that is that the home market will be relieved. Now, those of us living in the smaller towns and villages, know something of the immense quantities of butter that are brought into the country stores and sold at a price too low to be profitable for the farmer, and bought by the merchant at a price too high to enable him to make any profit out of it. So I say that if we can by any means stimulate the export trade of butter to any other country, and thus relieve the home market of a large amount of butter that is thrown upon it at the present time, we would be doing a great deal not only to furnish a more profitable market for a great number of our farmers, but to relieve from loss many who are now handling butter in an imperfect way, in a way which neither brings returns to the producer nor to the man who handles it. I shall have much pleasure in supporting this resolution. I hope the Government will allow it to pass, and that an effort will be made along the lines pointed out by this resolution. I trust also that in this matter dairy butter will be included with creamery butter in receiving assistance from the Government.

Mr. FROST. Our friends on the opposite side appear to have taken a very sudden interest in the farming community, and particularly in the dairy industry in this country, and that at a time when the farming industries are more prosperous than they

have been for many years previous under a Conservative Administration. In looking over the production of cheese and butter, we find to-day, as my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) has stated, that the cheese industry has gone forward by leaps and bounds. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite what the condition of the butter industry was when they lost the reins of power, after the efforts which they claimed to have put forth in the way of cold storage, the appointment of a dairy commissioner, the establishment of experimental farms, and other things which they pretend to say were in the interest of the farmers. Now, it can easily be seen that if the butter industry is to be bonused at the rate of a cent a pound, there will be no end to the demands which will be made for like assistance to other products of the farm which we shall be asked to bonus in the same manner. Take the cold storage arrangement, take the transportation facilities which this Government have been establishing during the past year, these will do more for the butter industry, towards increasing the price of butter in England and putting that trade on a permanent basis than all the bonusing which this Government could possibly undertake for all time to come. This resolution asks us to place a bonus of 1 cent a pound upon butter exports for the purpose of encouraging that industry. This looks to me like a piece of folly, and therefore, so far as I am personally concerned, I cannot see my way clear to support it. I believe that the means which this Government are taking to increase our dairy products have produced excellent results throughout this country, and have already done a great deal to increase the prosperity of the farmer. If prices have been rising steadily for butter and for cheese, and for all products of the farms, I think these results must be attributed to the excellent policy which this Government has carried out in the way of increasing the transportation facilities and establishing a market in England, so that we have to-day one of the greatest markets there for our butter. Our butter is competing with Danish butter, with Australian butter, and with all butter coming from any other country into Great Britain. If we are to increase our export of butter we must increase it by increasing the number of cattle, we must increase it by augmenting our population, by enlarging our farming operations, and also by a decrease in the export of cheese, which to-day has become one of the most beneficial industries that we have in the Dominion of Canada. You cannot produce more butter than is being produced to-day, even if you bonus it to the extent of a cent a pound, for the simple reason that it can only be done by having more people, by raising more cattle, by having more farmers than we have now, and if we are really

producing all that can be produced with our present population, in what way can you increase the butter industry by a bonus? I say that already we are doing as large a trade in dairy products as any other country in the world according to population. Therefore, taking these things into consideration, there can be no possible utility in placing a bonus of 1 cent a pound upon butter. Now, the hon. gentleman says here that such butter should be subjected to a rigid Government inspection. The hon. gentleman must know that there is a rigid inspection at the present time of butter and cheese at all our ports. The Government are doing everything in their power to increase and to multiply this trade. The fact that cold storage depots have been established throughout the country, that bonuses have been granted for cold storage at all our creameries and all our cheese factories, are evidences that this Government are dealing with this matter in a very practicable way, that they are pushing it ahead, and that the farmers are to-day realizing a better price than they have done for many years before. Under these circumstances, to protect an industry of this kind, to protect the butter industry in the country, looks to me like folly, and therefore I do not feel inclined to support the motion of the hon. member for Grenville. After listening to the speeches on the other side, especially the speech of the ex-Minister of Agriculture, and knowing what he did during the term he occupied that position, I am satisfied he does not believe in this system, and therefore, for my part, I am opposed to this resolution, and when it comes up, I shall vote against it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I heartily approve of the motion made by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid). I have met with several surprises during the course of this debate. The first was when the Minister of Agriculture stated that the Government could not see their way clear to accept the motion, and therefore they would vote it down; although the hon. gentleman did not say so, he put up an hon. friend who moved the adjournment of the debate, which means the shelving of the resolution for this year. But I advise the hon. member for Grenville to vote on the question of the adjournment of the debate, to test the feeling of the House, because such amendment means the killing of the resolution. I was surprised at the action of the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville, a constituency which adjoins that which I have the honour to represent, and also with the position taken by my hon. friend representing a portion of the united counties of Leeds and Grenville, one of the largest agricultural counties in the province and one of the most important dairying counties. I think this Government, after having come in on the promises pledged up to the hilt to

Mr. FROST.

do everything for the farmers by giving them free agricultural implements and removing the duty on everything the farmers require, should have jumped at this opportunity to render some assistance to the farmers; because it is well known, and the farmers know it, that hon. gentlemen opposite may not remove the duties on any article to the consumer, and have absolutely reduced the duty on one of the articles they produced, namely, corn. They have taken the duty off corn in order to injure our farmers; and the Government should have been willing to give a bonus to the producers of butter to compensate them for the increased duty on tobacco, which our farmers use largely. The action of the Government in regard to the tobacco duties is about the only thing they have done in the way of changing the tariff. The hon. member for Leeds stated that the farmers are prosperous.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What about binding twine and barbed wire?

Mr. TAYLOR. The late Government practically reduced the duty on binding twine and barbed wire.

Mr. FROST. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for North Leeds says the farmers are more prosperous now, under the régime of the present Government of which he is a blind follower and supporter, than they were formerly. I ask the hon. gentleman why they are more prosperous. What has the Government done for them?

Mr. FROST. They have adopted a better policy; they favour transportation and cold storage, and they have generally a better policy for the farmers.

Mr. TAYLOR. What has the Government done in the way of transportation? Have they reduced the rates for the farmers?

Mr. FROST. Certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not in any particular. Have they reduced the rates on the Government railways; have they established a fast line of steamers? They simply took up the policy of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) when he was Minister of Agriculture; they found the whole scheme of cold storage prepared and in a pigeon-hole, and they adopted it because they were of the opinion that it was a better policy than they could submit. The Minister of Agriculture saw it was the right policy, and he adopted it in its entirety. What has this Government done, I ask, to benefit the farmers? Have they reduced the tariff upon agricultural implements, as they promised to do? Do they not tax everything used, both necessities and luxuries? They have adopted our policy which brought prosperity to our farmers, that is the National Policy; and that was the policy which, when dull times

struck almost every other country in the world, enabled Canadian farmers to maintain their position, because we were able to manufacture for ourselves. I have been making a comparison of the imports for home consumption during the last full year under the present Government with the imports during a similar period under the late Government, and I have found that the agricultural implements imported are about of the same value as formerly. We would have brought them in from abroad if the duty had been lower. Manufacturers of agricultural implements also obtained reduced duties on the raw products.

Mr. DAVIN. And they got the drawback.

Mr. TAYLOR. They got the drawback, of course. Were the farmers able to purchase agricultural implements cheaper last year than previously?

Mr. FROST. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know the prices paid by the farmers, but I do not know what prices the hon. gentleman gives his agents; but the prices for agricultural implements paid for by the farmers were the same this year, last year and the year preceding.

Mr. FROST. Have you bought any?

Mr. TAYLOR. I made inquiries from the farmers, and I found no reduction. I hope the hon. mover of this motion will divide the House on the motion to adjourn, because it is a simple trick to shelve the question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I think it is a trick.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. If it is out of order to say it is a trick, perhaps I may say it is a political trick.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is an expression which should not be used in Parliament.

Mr. TAYLOR. If you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, think it is an expression which should not be used, I cheerfully withdraw it. I strongly urge on my hon. friend to divide the House on the motion to adjourn the debate, because it will prove to the farmers who are in favour of giving them some relief from the excessive duties which hon. gentlemen have imposed on them, in contradiction to the promises and pledges made when they appealed to the country for support.

Mr. McMILLAN. I fail to see what the duty on agricultural implements has to do with the bounty proposed to be given to the butter-makers. I congratulate the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) in bringing the question before the House; I believe he has done it in a proper spirit and has not done it with any improper feeling. The cheese

industry has been referred to, in connection with the great improvements which have been made. The province of Ontario was first to properly manufacture cheese in Canada, and it established a standard in the English market. One of the means adopted by the Ontario Government was the employment of experts who went from factory to factory giving lessons in cheese-making, and from that day the cheese industry has gone ahead by leaps and bounds.

The Ontario Government sent Professor Arnold all over the province to instruct the farmers in this business, and the result was that within 12 months Canadian cheese took a higher standard than American cheese in the English market. We have three dairy schools in the province of Ontario in which our young men and our young women, our farmers' wives and farmers' daughters, and the farmers themselves if they wish, can get the best information possible with respect to the making of butter. They are not only shown how butter should be made, but they have got to roll up their sleeves and practice the whole process from the separating of the cream to the packing of the butter for the market, so that they are thoroughly instructed. Money spent in that direction is money well spent. The action of the Dominion Government in sending out dairy instructors is also in the right direction, but the late Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) had better have held his tongue when he spoke about the increased credit of our butter on the English market on account of the action taken by him two years ago. What are the facts with respect to that? That butter was purchased at 21 cents per pound, and let me ask whether the farmers who produced the butter or the dairies of the country reaped the benefit? No, Sir, they did not; it all went to the butter dealers. Not only that, but the inspection of the butter was so loosely carried on, that although it was in January the experiment was made, butter manufactured in the month of June and the month of July previously was sent over to England as fresh butter, and it only realized 14.38 cents when the market price in England for good butter at the time was 17, 18 and 19 cents. That experiment injured the character of our Canadian butter on the English market instead of benefiting it. To-day Canadian butter stands high on the English market. Canadian farmers are improving the quality of their butter rapidly, and nothing ever did more good in that direction than the system of cold storage inaugurated by the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). To-day many of our farmers are obtaining instruction from the Department of Agriculture as to the method of erecting cold storage in connection with their dairies at home. All these things are in the right direction. If anything further is necessary to be done, I believe it will be essential that the Min-

Minister of Agriculture should send an agent to the old country to see that our Canadian products are put upon the English market at as early a date as possible, and that they are sold as Canadian. Denmark never gave a bounty upon the butter exported from that country, but Denmark did send agents to Britain to see that all Danish products were sold under the Danish brand, and not palmed off as belonging to another country. I believe that our Minister (Mr. Fisher) should send one or two expert commissioners to England as did the authorities of Denmark, and that could be done at a comparatively small cost. Upon last year's export of butter from Canada it would take \$104,000 to pay one cent per pound, and if that export increases during the next three years as rapidly as it has increased, it would then take three or four hundred thousand dollars to pay this bonus. I hold that one-tenth of that money spent in sending expert commissioners to Britain, will be of greater benefit to the farmers than giving it as a bonus.

Perhaps the ex-Minister of Finance will tell me again that I am a protectionist. Well, I say that we farmers want protection, but the protection we want is that the Government shall ensure that our products shall be placed upon the British market as Canadian products and in good condition, and we want no protection in the shape of any bonus. I am opposed to bonuses almost of every kind except under very special circumstances, and the farmers of Canada to-day as a whole do not ask for bonuses; but I do ask that the Government shall take measures so that our products shall be sold as Canadian, and shall reach the English market in first-class condition. If the Government do this, I, as a farmer, have no fear of the result.

Mr. BRODER. If we are to judge from the discussion to-day, this question seems to have grown in importance in the estimation of the House since last session. My position is this: I hold that it is necessary to send our butter to the English market, fresh and continuously. The farmer is naturally a holder of his product just as a speculator is, and unless you can induce him to ship his butter fresh and continuously, Canadian butter will never take the first rank in England. I say that this Government has to do something to induce the farmer to sell his butter to the shipper while it is fresh, so that it may reach the point of consumption in good condition through the medium of the cold storage system. The attitude taken by hon. gentlemen opposite on this question is strange to me. They seem to suppose that anything you put into cold storage will be kept in good condition. Now, it is my experience, and I think it is the experience generally, that freezing anything will not make it good; the article must be fresh and then with the assistance of these facilities it can be made to reach

Mr. McMILLAN.

the market in proper condition. A great many hon. gentlemen have referred to the fact that our Canadian cheese has taken the most prominent place in the markets of Great Britain. That is very true, but any person looking into the matter as it stands to-day must admit, that the cheese industry of this country started out under very much more favourable auspices in finding a place in the English market, than our butter can possibly do now. The conditions are very different. We find that all the butter producing countries are shipping to the English market at the present time \$65,000,000 worth a year, and generally speaking that is butter of very good quality; so good that under present conditions it is impossible for Canadian butter, by reason of its quality alone, to displace that importation. Therefore you must do something to displace the butter of other countries in the English market in order to give Canadian butter a foothold. The time was, not many years ago, when you could send butter to London or to Liverpool or to Bristol, or to those large centres, under very different conditions from those which now exist. You could send butter which was very much more heavily salted and a good deal coarser in its texture to the Liverpool market, than you could to the London market, and we had to pay particular attention to the fact that in shipping to London it was necessary to send the freshest butter we had in Canada. The lines were so closely drawn that there were certain divisions in the city of London to which you could send comparatively coarser butter and find a market for it, but you could not cross that line and sell butter unless you had the very finest article. The English people are becoming more fastidious every day, and it is necessary to cater to their tastes if we are going to take first place in the market.

There is another important matter which has been overlooked in the discussion so far, and that is, that if you look closely into the cheese question you will find that we supply to a very great extent a very large percentage of all the cheese that is shipped to the English market to-day, and the question which now faces the cheese industry is, whether or not we have reached the paying limit of our cheese export to the English people. What I mean is this: That if we increase our product of cheese in Canada, the question is whether or not we will have to take a less price for it in order to dispose of it on the English market. It is important that we should keep these two industries more equally balanced in this country, in order to secure for the farmer a paying price in future in the English market. We ship now something like 10,000,000 pounds of butter to the English market. A cent a pound on that is \$100,000. Any person with any knowledge of the English market, or with any experience of the butter or cheese trade, particularly the but-

ter trade, knows that the question of quality has a great deal to do with the price—that you can perhaps get from 3 to 4 cents a pound more for a fine quality of butter than you can for a comparatively inferior quality. Therefore, if we can induce our people to ship a good quality of butter, fresh and in good condition, to the English market, and have it understood that it has to undergo a close Government inspection—if we can do all that at a cost of 1 cent a pound, and the butter realizes from 2 to 3 cents a pound more in the English market, then that is a paying speculation, and the cent a pound is a small consideration. This country has lost, not millions of dollars, but hundreds of millions of dollars, because the quality of the butter sent to the English market was not what it ought to be. We have not only lost money, but we have lost our foothold in that market, and it will be a difficult thing to displace the people who have that market to-day. The people of this country must wake up to the fact that, in order to maintain a hold on the English market, they must not only ship an article of finest quality, but they must ship continuously. A retail merchant in England, who goes to the large centres and buys his weekly supply, may find a good quality of Canadian butter this week. He puts it on his counter, and obtains customers for it. He goes back next week, and if he cannot find any Canadian butter up to the standard of what he got the week before, and has to go elsewhere to find what suits the tastes of his customers, the Canadian butter loses the trade. We have a law that our butter and cheese must be branded; but that law will be a dead letter and will have no effect, unless you have concurrent legislation in England requiring the retail dealer to place it as such on his counter. Unless that is done, the object of the law is lost, because the retail merchant in England, who finds that a certain article meets the tastes of his customers, will call the article on his counter by that name, and sell it to his customers as such. The Government have only gone part of the way in this matter. They should, if possible, bring about concurrent legislation in England to secure the recognition of our product as Canadian on the retailer's counter, as well as in the wholesaler's warehouse. Some people suggest that we should go to England and sell our own products on the market. If there is anything we ought to avoid doing, it is interfering with the business interests of that country in that respect; because the moment you go there as a retailer, every retailer in the country will do what he can to prevent you selling, and he will soon drive you out of the market altogether. What we want to do is to meet the conditions of the market which we find there. When this question is before the House, it ought to be dealt with, not in a party spirit, but in the spirit that seeks to promote this trade, and to do what is best

for the farmers of the country; and, when you do what is best for the farmers, you do what is in the interest of the country at large. The Minister of Agriculture raised the objection that it was not the farmer who benefited by the bonus given in the province of Quebec. I say it is possible, however, for the Government to so arrange the machinery for the payment of the bonus that it will reach the proper individual. My hon. friend from Huron said that it was the factory that would get the bonus; but he must not forget that the patrons of the factory get the proceeds of the sales, less the price of manufacturing, and in that way the benefit must ultimately reach the pocket of the farmer who sends his milk to the factory. This is worthy of a trial, at any rate, at the hands of this House, and especially at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, who professed such affection for the farmer during the last eighteen years. They are growing cold in their love for that gentleman now: he is no longer a factor in their political calculations; while the hard-hearted iron man gets a bonus on his iron he is not in favour of this bonus to the farmer. The hon. member from Huron is only in favour of a bonus under special circumstances, but those special circumstances are always those his friends wish voted in this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite ought to deal with this question on broad principles, as representing a large portion of the community, with the view of enhancing the value of the products of this country, and thus promoting the interests of the country generally.

Mr. BAIN. I cannot help thinking that the gentleman who framed this resolution must have felt the difficulties of his situation. It was patent that, when the old Government attempted to encourage the farmers by offering to purchase their butter and ship it to England, their project was a conspicuous failure. This document has a little clause appended to the end of it that indicates that the gentleman who framed it had thought the matter out very carefully, because, when hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the interest of the farmer of Canada, that little clause limits the bonus to those purely dairy districts which produce butter, and nothing else. Now, I do not want our hon. friends opposite to run away with the idea that to tax all the rest of the farmers of Canada for the benefit of those limited areas that make butter is a benefit to the farmers at large. I am with any system that will give Canadian butter a better standing on the English market; but, speaking for the general industry of butter and cheese-making and farming in Ontario, I have to say, that if this resolution were adopted and put into force, it would apply to a very limited section of that province. I do not want any one to run away with the idea that this resolution includes, in any broad sense, the term "farmer." What are

the facts in connection with the butter industry, which we have been trying to develop? So far as western Ontario goes, the facts are simply these, that our cheese industry succeeded and developed, to a large extent, because we put on the English market an article of uniformly good quality that suited the taste of the English consumer, and he bought that article. We want to do the same thing with our butter. But the trouble with the cheese industry was the tendency of the farmers to prolong the cheese-making season at both ends of the year, until a part of the time was devoted to producing cheese that did not grade No. 1. Here is where the development of the creamery industry in combination with the cheese factory business was likely to be a benefit to the people of Ontario, and here is just where the resolution proposed by my hon. friend, while it seems to do everything, really does nothing because it provides that it shall be a continuous supply. Now, to my mind what we want to develop, especially in a cheese district, is a continuation of the winter manufacture of butter in connection with the making of cheese; and I wish to point to this one fact, that one or two men in western Ontario to-day have, by their private energy, successfully accomplished that without any aid or support from this Government or any bonus from anybody else. They simply went on to the English market, and when their cheese season should stop, they stopped, and they went at the manufacture of butter and supplied a grade of butter that suited the particular locality in England to which they wanted to ship. It is for the development of our resources in those directions that attention should be devoted, and not to building up limits of sections of our people at the expense of the others, while we are calling it aid to the farmers at large. I think that every Minister of Agriculture, if he spoke his sentiments, that has tried to deal with this question, would admit at once that the difficulties were greater to overcome than the results were likely to justify, and while I am willing to give credit to my hon. friend for his zealous interests in the dairy districts where the object is butter making pure and simple, I do not want this House to run away with the idea that his resolution is one which will benefit the farmers of Canada at large. It is perfectly true that the dairy industry, in places where circumstances make it the exclusive business, is entitled to great consideration on the part of this Government, just as much as the coal, iron or any other industry that my hon. friend sneeringly remarked was being assisted by the Government of the day. That is not the way we should meet these questions. I think we can afford to deal with all these interests on their merits, without indulging in sneers as to what may or may not have been done, or imputing motives

Mr. BAIN.

as the reasons that may have led to the doing of certain things. But I do say that to ask this House to endorse this proposition on the idea that it is going to build up the farming industry of Canada, is to ask something that the position will not justify; and, therefore, while my hon. friend, who probably represents a purely dairy district, may have the right to look at the question from that standpoint, I think we ought to ask ourselves whether there is not a broader view to take of this question, and whether the efforts that the Government are making now—began by their predecessor, I say frankly and fairly—are not all we have the right to expect. Above all others, butter is an article that requires to be handled in the best possible condition and put on the market in the best possible condition, but the facilities we are offering now are, to my mind, all that this Government should be asked to provide at present, in order to secure for the butter of Canada the most favourable consideration that can be got for it in the English market. I agree with the hon. gentleman who last spoke, that just in proportion as you put a high grade article on that market in larger quantities, you will have to submit in time to the reduced prices. We may just as well realize that fact first as last, but it is equally true that it is utterly futile to put butter or fruit or cheese or any other article of Canadian produce on the English market, which is not a first-class article and is not in first-class condition. If I could impress on our people one thing above every other, it would be to try to produce a first-class article, and as regards butter, the Government are doing what they can to get that article on to the English market in first-class condition so that it may compete successfully and secure for itself an excellent place. I think that is as far as we can fairly ask the Government now to go.

Mr. POPE. This is a subject of great importance and one that should not be dealt with lightly, and I am rather sorry that the adjournment of the debate was moved. We can well afford to spend some considerable time in discussing one of the greatest sources of revenue to the greatest number of the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Bain) was frank enough—and I was glad to hear him say so—to acknowledge that the foundation of the advancement and progress which has been made in the dairy industry was laid by the Government that preceded the present one. The hon. gentleman said he was afraid that the encouragement by bonus of the manufacture and export of butter would limit itself to small districts. I do not think that any one who looks at the figures of the exports of cheese from this country and the figures of consumption in England will fail to realize that we are exporting to-day nearly all the cheese it is

possible for us to export to that country, and that the future increases of the dairy business of Canada must be in the direction of butter-making, so that any assistance given by this House to encourage the development of the butter-making industry is bound to prove an assistance to the cheese industry, furnishing, as it will, another avenue for the use of milk and thus relieve the congestion of the market which is bound to take place if we do not open other channels for the use of the increasing quantities of milk produced in Canada. It is evident that we have not yet reached the limit of increase in the production of milk, and the Minister of Agriculture is called upon to face the situation. It is acknowledged by hon. gentlemen opposite who have not spoken from political feeling, who have been earnest and sincere in dealing with the question, that the quality of the article we produce is a very important factor in the increase of trade. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat spoke of two instances in western Ontario that came under his notice, in which the owners of factories succeeded in establishing a remunerative trade in the export of butter to England. I admit that there are odd instances of that kind, but while two or three instances of that character may be quoted, any hon. gentleman in this House who is acquainted with any dairy section of Canada can give dozens of instances to the contrary. What you require in order to carry the dairy industry to a successful issue is to have a quantity of milk guaranteed for winter purposes, and to do that you require to have a large number of cows, controlled by a few farmers who will enter into the full spirit of the business. I know for myself that while we should manufacture butter at $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 cents at the outside per pound for the benefit of our patrons who bring the milk. I know that for a number of years in my district the manufacture of butter at my factory costs 5 and 6 cents, and then the quantity of milk was so small it ran up to 7 cents in order to establish a winter dairy in the section in which I live. You cannot get men to throw away two or three cents a pound on their butter, and you cannot establish winter dairies if the patron has to pay six or even five cents a pound for manufacturing the butter. That does not leave him a sufficient margin. In sections where the cattle are not gathered together in large stables the cost of manufacturing is too high, and I know of no other way than this by which the industry can be put on a proper footing in the more sparsely settled districts or among the smaller farmers where the manufacture of cheese has not been carried on for years and where large herds of cattle do not exist. The poorer farmers or those living in the newer districts though less fortunate than some others are as much entitled to the consideration of this Government as are more fortunate men. So

I feel that I am within my right and that I am performing my duty when I lay stress upon this point and ask the House and the Government to take into serious consideration the motion of my hon. friend from Grenville. In these districts which are less advanced in dairying, some sort of encouragement should be given to the people in starting. We are making now all the cheese we can export, and with an increasing quantity of milk year after year we must find some means of disposing of it in some part of the world: and, under existing conditions, I know of no better way than that proposed by my hon. friend. There are objectionable features in connection of the bonusing of any kind of business. But my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) acknowledged that there were certain circumstances under which such a course would be advisable, and I think we find those special conditions in this case. It might not apply to the hon. gentleman's district or even to the particular section in which I am living. But I know that there are parts of my constituency, and of every dairying constituency, where, if the increase of milk is to continue to the advantage of the farmer, you must encourage winter dairying: and I know of no better way to do it than through the granting of this bonus by the Government.

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

After Recess.

ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RAILWAY.

Mr. HENDERSON (for Mr. Tisdale) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 32) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.

Mr. MACLEAN. In connection with this Bill, I desire to move what I consider a very important amendment. This railway which it is proposed shall run from Port Arthur to Winnipeg is, to my mind, the most important railway under the consideration of the Canadian people to-day. It is intended that this road shall open up that portion of new Ontario which is known as the Rainy River district, which appears to be one of the richest mineral sections in the country. This is a section of country that it will pay to open up for the development of its mining resources, it is a section of country that will well pay to open up for the development of its agricultural resources. But above all it is important because it is a country which offers a new line of railway communication between the province of Ontario and the east and the province of Manitoba and the great west. So important does this railway appear in the eyes of the public that it has been very largely subsidized by various le-

gislatures in this country. At the present moment it has received for 205 miles a bonus from the province of Ontario of \$615,000. The first portion of the Port Arthur and Duluth Railway, which is to be used in connection with the Ontario and Rainy River Railway, has received a bonus from the province of Ontario of \$28,000. And, for the first eighty miles of this railway, this House has already voted a bonus of \$512,000. The road, therefore, has to-day bonuses to the total amount of \$1,155,000. It is to be further bonused by the province of Ontario, I have no doubt it will receive a much larger bonus from this Dominion, and we know that it is to receive a bonus from the government of the province of Manitoba. The mere fact that this railway is to receive all these bonuses from the Dominion and from the two provincial legislatures goes to show the importance with which it is regarded. It is regarded not only as important because of the agricultural and mineral resources of the country it will open up, but because of its superlative importance in the fact that it is a connecting link between the east and the west and will be a rival of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The Canadian Pacific Railway, as we all know now, is charged with being a monopoly, it is charged with imposing on the people of the west and of the east undue traffic rates. The cry has been for years and years, that we must have a line that is a rival of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Ontario and Rainy River Railway, if properly handled and controlled by this Parliament, will give that rival line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, will give the merchants and manufacturers of the east a cheap means of communication to the west, and, most of all, will give the farmers of Manitoba, and the prairies, and the province of British Columbia, an opportunity to relieve themselves from that monopoly which the Canadian Pacific Railway now imposes upon them. This portion of country lying between Port Arthur and Winnipeg is really the key to the whole transportation situation. The only railroad that is there now, the Canadian Pacific Railway, is overtaxed. It is hardly able to carry the produce of the west to the east, or from one point to another, and there is need for a rival road, not only to handle the business, but to give the people relief from the charges of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Unless we take steps now, when this Bill is going through the House, unless we take steps now, when the province of Manitoba proposes further to subsidize this railway, the opportunity will be lost, and what is likely to happen is this, that this railway, which is so largely subsidized by the Dominion and by the province, will pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, instead of being a rival of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it will strengthen that road in its monopoly. Therefore, it is incumbent upon this Parlia-

Mr. MACLEAN.

ment, and it is incumbent on the Government of the day, to see that such a provision is put into this Bill as will secure the public hereafter, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the main intention of the amendment which I propose to-night. I am not here in favour of any sweeping proposition looking to the nationalization of railways, although I believe that must eventually come, and I believe that is the opinion of a great many members of this House. The Minister of Railways and Canals actually expressed himself in this House, the other day, as in favour of the ultimate nationalization of the railways in this country; but I am not proposing anything so radical as that. All I say is, that, when the Dominion and the province are giving so much money to this railway as they are giving it to-day, the giving of the money and the granting of the legislation required by the railway ought to be contingent on the public being protected in regard to the rates charged on that railway, and in regard to running rights given over that railway to other lines. Now, I especially call the attention of my hon. friends who come from Manitoba and the North-west Territories to this fact, that the only relief that can come to them in regard to railway rates, as the only relief that can come to us of the east in regard to railway rates, is through both the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Government's system being brought into the province of Manitoba and, if necessary, extended still further west. To my mind, the only solution of these transportation problems lies somewhat in that direction. We must not only have running rates, but we must make provision for the Grand Trunk and Canadian Government railways getting into the North-west. Now, that is not a difficult thing to do. The Canadian Government railway system is to-day at Montreal. By obtaining running rights over the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Ottawa and Parry Sound roads, it can easily be brought to Parry Sound, and there it can have connection with lake steamers to Port Arthur, and then the Grand Trunk Railway or Canadian Government system can be brought on into Winnipeg. Now, to-day, when we are giving this legislation, when we are giving all this money, is not this the time to make provision in this Bill that the Canadian Government railway and the Grand Trunk Railway shall have running rights over this Ontario and Rainy River road? This road is being built almost exclusively by public money. So far as I can make out, if it is bonused throughout as it has been bonused, it will be to the extent of over \$9,000 a mile, and if the people have \$9,000 a mile in a railroad 425 miles long, surely they ought to dictate the terms on which that railway shall be administered, and dictate the terms as to what railways shall be allowed to run over it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is your amendment?

Mr. MACLEAN. My amendment, in substance, is, that the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Government system and the Canadian Pacific Railway shall have running rights over it; that the tariff charges shall come under the supervision of the Government; that a two-cent passenger rate shall obtain on it, and that provision shall be made for a fixed rate on a specified number of items mentioned in the amendment. I may say, that this amendment, in regard to running rights and in regard to Government supervision of rates, is taken from the provisions put by the Government in their Crow's Nest Pass Bill of last year. Another reason why I object to this Bill going through to-night without some declaration from the Government, and why I urge that the Bill ought to stand over, is this: That the province of Manitoba, as I mentioned before, proposes introducing legislation for granting aid to this railway, but granting aid to this railway on specified terms. I believe it is Mr. Greenway's intention to vote a subsidy to this railway, but in the Bill granting the subsidy, he is making provisions for a specified charge on a number of articles which he names. For instance, the great grievance in the North-west to-day, so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway and its outlet to Port Arthur are concerned, touches wheat. The rate to-day for wheat from Winnipeg to Port Arthur is 17½ cents; I believe it is Mr. Greenway's intention to make an agreement with the Rainy River Railway that the rate shall be 10 cents per 100 pounds. That is a great reduction, but if that reduction is to be secured, Mr. Greenway proposes to secure it by incorporating it in the Bill. If he can incorporate it in his Bill, why can we not incorporate it in our Bill here? I urge on this House to-day that we should not allow this Rainy River Bill to go through unless we get the same terms as the province of Manitoba is getting, and we ought to hesitate before we do anything until such time as we have their Bill before us. Now, to show still further the importance of this railway, I say it is an essential part of a transcontinental system. It is no great trouble now to secure another transcontinental system in this country that will be a rival to the Canadian Pacific Railway road, if we move at the right time to make provision in all the Bills that happen to be going through this House. We know that to-day the Government of this country control a railway that runs from Halifax to Montreal, we know that we can extend that railway to Parry Sound at very small cost, to the benefit of the people of this country. We know that, if we once get to Winnipeg, as we ought to by this Rainy River Railway, it is no trouble to have a connection between Winnipeg and Lethbridge, where the Crow's Nest Pass Railway begins. And we have received, by the legislation of last year, control over the Crow's Nest Pass Railway as regards run-

ning rights over that railway for other roads. If we to-day secure ourselves so far as the Rainy River Railway is concerned, the people will have in a very few years a transcontinental system a rival of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and by that way, if by no other, we will compel that great monopoly to reduce its rates.

I am not in favour of any further aggrandizement of the Canadian Pacific Railway, except on terms the most stringent and severe. I say now that I would have no objection to this railway, the Rainy River Railway, falling into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, if it fell into their hands on terms that would secure the people in regard to rates and running rights; but until that end is secured, I object to any further aggrandizement of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is at the present time too great, it is almost greater than the Parliament and people of Canada, and we should take some means to check it; we should take our stand and try to secure terms from it, or otherwise it will override everything in this Dominion.

If I may consider this proposition from an Ontario point of view, and if people ask me why is that province so greatly interested in that road, I simply reply that the manufacturers of Ontario have a deep interest in that road as regards getting their goods into the North-west at low freight rates. The farmers and fruit-growers of Ontario have a deep interest in securing lower rates to Manitoba. We have been told time and again that the people there would consume much larger quantities of Ontario fruit if they could get lower rates, and we know that to-day Chicago, St. Paul and all those cities west of the great lakes enjoy a large measure of that traffic of Manitoba and the western provinces simply because they enjoy better railway rates, and it is in the interest of the manufacturers, merchants and farmers of Ontario and Quebec that they should get lower rates to the province of Manitoba; and that it is possible to do so is proved by the fact that Mr. Greenway is stated to have made an agreement, and I believe he has done so, by which the freight rates will be cut down on wheat from 17½ cents to 10 cents. If he can get it, surely this Parliament can secure it, and now is the time to obtain it in connection with this Bill. Another change I propose in the Bill is to introduce into it the 2 cent rate per mile for passengers. This railway is 450 miles long and will receive \$5,000,000 of the public money, so that it will practically be almost entirely built from public money, and this fact gives Parliament the opportunity of imposing on that road the task of transporting passengers at the rate of 2 cents per mile. Railways all over are to-day carrying people for 1 cent per mile, and are making money. The companies never had their cars filled as they are to-day, and

there is some talk among the companies of continuing the present low rates because the receipts are so large. But at all events, in this particular instance, where this road has been built with public money, when we have other railways saying that they cannot afford to carry passengers at 2 cents per mile on account of the very heavy cost of constructing the roads, we have the right to say in this case at least: You shall not charge more than 2 cents per mile to passengers travelling over it. The traffic between Port Arthur and Winnipeg promises to increase. The great transcontinental passenger traffic must pass over one of those roads, and the Rainy River Company can well afford to make the experiment and give passenger transportation at 2 cents per mile. We have even been told that if we wish to bring about such a reform, it is necessary to introduce a general law so as to impose this rate not on one company only, but on all companies. That is not the way to accomplish it. We must make the experiment with one road, and afterwards all the others will come in, and this is instanced by the case of the New York Central and Hudson River Railway, one of the greatest railways in the United States. The maximum rate over the New York Central is 2 cents per mile. How was it attained? Not by any sweeping declaration on the part of the management, or by any law enacted by the state of New York; but at a certain period in the history of the New York Central the company desired to acquire a very short road, over which there was a passenger rate of 2 cents per mile, a road not exceeding fifty miles in length, and this great corporation was so anxious to get control of that piece of road that on receiving the consent of the legislature to acquire it, they agreed to a passenger rate of 2 cents per mile over their entire system. Some people will say that there is a large population in the state of New York, to which I reply that they have a larger number of competing roads, and the competition for passengers is quite as keen as it is here, and the number of passengers carried per mile does not exceed that in Canada. But the people of the state have secured this 2 cent rate, and we can secure to the people of Canada a 2 cent rate if we place such clause in all Bills coming before Parliament. And this is no imposition on the railway companies. Railway passenger transportation rates have not changed for the last twenty or thirty years. Freight rates are being constantly cut in two, and in some cases where formerly \$4 was charged, only 50 cents is now charged; these rates, I repeat, are cut time and again, and we should now do something to cut down the passenger rates and give our people relief from the excessive charges made by the railway corporations in that direction. The amendment which I propose to move in

Mr. MACLEAN.

committee, I desire to read, and to offer a few comments on it. The first two clauses in this amendment I have taken out of the Government Bill of last session in regard to Crow's Nest Pass Railway. If the Government saw fit to insert that amendment and make it applicable to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, which has been almost entirely built with Government money, it is the duty of the Government and this House to insert a like amendment in the Rainy River Railway Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, I understand, is not proposing this amendment at this stage, but is indicating the amendment that he will move in committee.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am explaining the amendment that I propose to move in committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. I presume the hon. gentleman will not at that time repeat his explanations.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will not go over my explanations again in the committee. The first clause of my amendment is as follows:—

3. That running powers over the said railway and all its branches and connections, or any portions thereof, and all lines of railway now or hereafter owned or leased by or operated on account of the company between Lake Superior and the city of Winnipeg, and the necessary use of its tracks, stations and station grounds are hereby expressly conferred on the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Government Railway system, the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other road designated by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or the Parliament of Canada, upon such terms as such committee or the Parliament of Canada may determine, and according to the provisions of the Railway Act, and of such other general Acts relating to railways as are from time to time passed by Parliament, but nothing herein shall be held to imply that such running powers might not be so granted without the special provisions herein contained.

I have put in the words "Parliament of Canada." The next portion of the amendment is as follows:—

That so soon as the said railway or any portion of it is opened for traffic, the rates and tolls on the railway, and on any other railway or steamers used in connection therewith and now or hereafter owned or leased by or operated on account of the company, shall be first approved by the Governor in Council, or by a railway commission, if and when such commission is established by law, and shall at all times thereafter and from time to time be subject to revision and control in the manner aforesaid.

Then there is the clause in regard to the 2 cent per mile passenger rate, and I also intend to specify the maximum freight to be charged on certain articles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Railways, representing the Government, has made several statements on different occa-

sions in this House. I believe he says that some kind of railway reform must come, and I believe he has already told us that in his opinion at least nationalization of the railways must come. But whenever we have had the practical issue before us, the Minister has contented himself by saying that hereafter he will establish a railway commission and make some provision for protecting the public against railway monopoly. Now is the time to do it, now is the time to lock the stable door before the steed is stolen. It is the duty of the Government to make this provision to-day for the protection of the public. I see my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) over there. He had a great fit of railway reform some time ago. I hope he has it yet, and that he presses it on his fellow Ministers. I must ask the Postmaster General now to assist me in having inserted in this Bill a provision somewhat similar to that which the Government inserted in the Crow's Nest Pass Railway Bill. The people of British Columbia, the people of the North-west and the people of Ontario are all in favour of some kind of railway reform. You cannot make a sweeping reform all at once, but you can make a start by tackling each railway company as it comes for favours to this Parliament. I agree that you must have a strong railway commission in this country, and I hope a Bill will be introduced next session to establish one, but in the meantime let us check these railway monopolists. Let us make an experiment in the interests of the people and if that experiment be successful then let us extend it. I urge upon this House and upon this Government, that under no consideration should this railway Bill be allowed to pass except on terms, and these terms should not be defined until such time as we have the proposed measure of the Manitoba legislature before us. I am led to believe that the railway rates will be regulated by the Manitoba legislature, and that the public will be protected, but, Sir, I propose to protect the public in two ways, and that is the difference between my amendment and what the Manitoba Government proposed, namely: I propose to specify the rates that shall be charged on this railway, and I propose also that this railway shall be compelled to give common trackage to all railways that desire to pass over it. I hope that this amendment will meet with the approval of the Government and the House, and I trust that hon. gentlemen will express their opinions on this effort of mine in the direction of railway reform and in the direction of giving to the people of Canada some returns for the immense sums of money which year after year in the past they have been called upon to vote to these railway companies without any return. We have bonused the duplication of many railway lines in this country for the sake of competition, but the result was that the big companies gobbled

them up and there was no competition and no good result. To-day, Canada has to bear the expense of maintaining thousands of miles of unnecessary railways and they have received no benefit in return for it. Let us teach the railway companies that they must give common running rights over their roads. In that respect, Sir, I believe the Grand Trunk Railway is more progressive than any other road in the country. It has given the Canadian Pacific Railway common rights from Hamilton to Toronto; it has given its Air Line over to the Wabash Railway, a great transcontinental system in the States, and the Wabash cars run over the Grand Trunk Railway to-day with the same facility as do its own cars. I believe, Sir, that the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Government railways should in the same way be given running privileges over the Rainy River road, so that the public may derive some substantial benefit from it. If you do not compel them to do it they will never do it.

Mr. CASEY. The Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway have to get to Port Arthur first.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Grand Trunk Railway to-day touches the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron, and they can put on a line of steamers to Port Arthur to-morrow if they wish. That being the case, the Grand Trunk Railway could have this right over the Ontario and Rainy River, and at the proper stage in the consideration of this Bill I shall make a motion embodying that principle.

Mr. CASEY. As my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) wishes to bring on a debate on this whole question, it would, I think, be advisable that this Bill should stand over for the present in view of the absence of the mover of the Bill and the Minister of Railways, so that they may have an opportunity of combatting the arguments presented to the House.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I agree with a great deal of what the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has said in reference to this matter. So far as the west is concerned, I believe this to be the most important railway legislation that has come before the House since I have had the honour to be a member. It is important for the reason that it refers to a road running from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, which is the keystone of the whole railway situation in the west. At the present time the Canadian Pacific Railway runs from the city of Winnipeg to Port Arthur and connects with the great lakes, and we know that therein lies the whole trouble in regard to freight rates. We are giving a charter to another company to build a road there, and no doubt they will ask for a large subsidy of \$6,400 per mile, so that the Government should do something to ensure, in the interests of the people not only of the west, but the people of

the east as well—that this company shall be compelled to grant us reasonable freight rates. It has been pointed out that we have built miles of railroads as competing lines, but that we have been disappointed in our desires, and if something is not done now while this Bill is before us we will meet with the same disappointment again. I believe that Parliament should force this company to guarantee us a fair rate on the grain and other produce we export out of the country, as well as on the goods which we import. The hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) has not mentioned the rates he should like to have inserted in this amendment, but I understand that the Greenway Government is making an arrangement for 10 cents a hundred on wheat. That is a fair price, and it can be carried for that rate, as has been shown by the reduction which the Canadian Pacific Railway made this year between Fort William and Montreal, where they now carry for less than 10 cents. We should insert in this Bill a schedule of rates for live stock and wheat which we export, as well as for the other commodities which we bring into the country. It costs a lot of money to build a railroad through that section of the country, and if we get this road built now we may not expect to get another in the near future, so that now is the time to safeguard the interests of the public. The cost of building railroads in the west is a very small matter. They can be built anywhere across the prairie for about \$8,000 a mile. We should take advantage of this opportunity and keep control of this road, otherwise, when we reach the city of Winnipeg we go as it were into a funnel, and the people who control these roads, unless regulated, will have us in their grasp. We expect that this road, if it is going to be built, will be a competing road; but we would like to be assured of that. Another matter I would like to say a few words on is the last portion of section 1 of this Bill, which reads as follows:—

And if the railway is not then completed, then the powers granted to the company shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the railway as then remains uncompleted.

I do not know what the meaning of that section is. When a railway company comes to this House and gets a charter to build a railway from one point to another, and gets a large subsidy of money to aid in the building of that road, there should be some means of forcing it to complete the railway. As I understand this section, a company may come here and get a charter to build a road from one point to another, and on the strength of that they obtain a subsidy, and when they build the road for half the distance, if they find that it does not pay them to go any further, they can stop there, and all the Government can do is to cancel their charter for the balance of the road. As an illustration of that, I may mention that the Manitoba and North-western Railway Com-

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan).

pany got a charter from this House to build a railway from Portage la Prairie to the north branch of the Saskatchewan River, and in aid of the building of that road they got a subsidy of 6,400 acres a mile of the choicest land in the North-west. This same clause is in their charter; but when they got to the boundary of the province of Manitoba, passing through a country which is thickly settled, and where the road is likely to pay, they stopped. They got their land grant as far as they went, but they went no further. The Government has power to cancel the charter for the remainder of the distance; but what good does that do the settlers? When a railway corporation enters into a contract with Parliament to build a railway to a certain point, and are granted public money for the building of that railway, some means should be taken to force them to carry out that contract. I would suggest that one good way of doing this would be for the Government to take a first mortgage on the railway as security to the people for their outlay. The Government would hold that mortgage, there would be no interest charged on it, and as soon as the railway company had fulfilled their contract and built the road, the mortgage would be released. That would be a safeguard to the people for the carrying out of the contract. Now, I consider the amendment that has been moved by the hon. member for East York a step in the right direction. The Government also took a step in the right direction when in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway they secured a great many concessions in freight rates over the Canadian Pacific Railway, for the people in the west and also for the people in the east, and also retained running powers over that road for I believe all railway companies, and also kept control of the tolls on the road. The same thing should be done in this case. In the first place, I think running powers should be granted, I am not going to say to the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway alone, but to any railway company that wants to run over this road. The Government should also keep control of the tolls and they should also, I think, keep control over the bonding power of the company. The worst feature of the whole railroad policy of the Government in the west has been the power that has been granted to the people who have built these railways to bond them for any amount they like. As an instance of this, I will mention the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway, which runs to the town of Prince Albert. That railway did not cost its promoters more than \$2,500,000 to build, but it has been bonded for \$3,800,000. There is a discrepancy of \$1,300,000, and we do not know what has been done with that money. I heard one hon. member say that it had been put

into electric railways in eastern parts of this country; but the settlers to-day have to pay interest on the whole \$3,800,000—not only on what the railway cost, but on the \$1,300,000 besides, which we do not know what has become of. I think that is something that should not be allowed to continue; it is something that the Government should grapple with at once, and put a stop to. These three suggestions should, I think, be carried out: keep running powers over the road, keep control of the tolls, and keep control of the bonding power of the company. If these things were done, I do not think we would have any more difficulty with the railway question.

Now, I am going to refer to some rates that are charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the west. The Canadian Pacific Railway carries coal oil from Petrolea to the city of Winnipeg for 64 cents per hundred pounds; that is a distance of close on 1,500 miles. They charge 65 cents per hundred pounds for carrying coal oil from the city of Winnipeg to the town of Prince Albert, where I live, a distance of 600 miles. So that they charge us in the west just double the rates they charge the people of the east. Another peculiar feature is this. Add the 64 cents which is charged between Petrolea and Winnipeg to the 65 cents that is charged between Winnipeg and Prince Albert, and you will get \$1.29 as the sum of the two local rates; but if I want to ship from Petrolea to Prince Albert and take a through rate they will charge \$1.37. I think it is time that steps were taken to stop this sort of thing. I am not going to take up the time of the House further than to say that I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment of the hon. member for East York.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, this appears to me to be a suitable time to make what remarks I intend to make on this amendment. In my judgment the time has come for a new departure from the principle heretofore followed in granting charters to railways. We have followed one principle for a long time in this Parliament, that is, granting charters with large powers, giving subsidies for the building of railways, and requiring very little in return from the railway companies, so far as Parliament could control them. While we have been doing that and expecting to realize certain advantages from the expenditure of the money belonging to all the people, our experience has proven that we do not receive those advantages which we expected when we granted that money and those powers. We did that sometimes for the purpose of getting a railway built through a section of country where there was not railway communication. That is all very well. It is essential that there should be railways in the west, and we have granted large bonuses for the building of those railways; but no sooner are they built than we find the com-

panies frequently charging exorbitant freight rates—rates that make it impossible for either the cultivator of the soil or the person who sends produce over those railways to get a fair return for his labour. In almost every instance the freight seems to be taxed for carriage to the utmost extent that it will bear, and we have such examples as that cited in a committee of this House a few years ago of a railway from Calgary to Edmonton, a distance of 75 miles, charging 75 cents a hundred for carrying freight that distance.

It was said that the gentleman who had this freight to forward went to the old Hudson Bay freighters—the half-breeds of that country—who had been carrying on the freighting business before the railway was built, and they agreed to carry the freight at 65 cents a hundred pounds. Look at the situation of the settler in that country. We had given a large bonus for the purpose of providing him with convenient and reasonably cheap transportation, but after railways were built aided by our bonuses, he was no better off than before, except that by the railway his freight would be carried a little quicker. That being the case, it suggests to us the advisability of obtaining some control over the railways which would prevent that experience from occurring in the future. We have been attempting to open up the country, in the first place, with railways, and when we found that the freight charges were so exorbitant that the people received very little return for the very heavy expenditure the country had made, we have been endeavouring to secure competition. This Parliament has often been called on to grant charters for other railways; perhaps over the same lines, and to give additional subsidies in order that competition might be created. But no sooner would another railway be built than it would be gobbled up by the first company, or both roads would be controlled by the one management, the freight rates would continue just as heavy, and the people be deprived of the benefits they expected to receive in return for the large expenditure which the country has made. We have had example after example of this kind of thing, and yet we continue to follow the same practice. We continue to subsidize other corporations to build railways over routes already occupied, in order to secure competition, and after the competing railway is built, we fail to achieve our object. That suggests to us the great necessity of taking some new departure; and the new departure we should take will be found in the amendment proposed to this railway Bill. By that amendment we say to the railway company which asks us for a charter: in return for our giving you that charter, in return for our giving you a large subsidy, in return for our giving you many privileges such as expropriating land and building your line

through a section already traversed by another railway, we insist on securing from you, for the benefit of the public, the obligation to allow any other company to run its trains over your line, on the payment to you of a fair compensation in return. This we insist upon in order to secure in the interests of the people, the competition which we desire to secure by giving you your charter, and in order to prevent you from following the dog-in-the-manger policy which other railways have adopted. I do not see why any railway company which obtains its charter from this Parliament, and has been subsidized by both this Government and the local governments, should object to a condition of this kind. We know that hitherto every effort of Parliament to secure from the railway companies the consideration which the public demand and are entitled to receive has proved of no avail, and therefore we ought to devise some new method of obtaining for the public that redress which they expect from Parliament. I do not see any means more likely to accomplish the object we have in view than the provision contained in the amendment proposed to this Bill. This amendment, if adopted, will prevent the necessity of our subsidizing some other railway through this section at some future time in order to get competition. But if we give a charter to this road, without attaching to it some provision to secure that competition which its construction is intended to give and which the public look to us to obtain, the same result will follow in this case that has followed in the others. The same result will follow as did the construction of the Northern Pacific, which was subsidized and chartered by the Manitoba Government in order to provide competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but which, instead of securing that competition, resulted in an arrangement between the two roads to work together and charge the same freight rates. It is true there has been some reduction, but there has not been the competition which the public looked for as the result of the great sacrifice of public money the province had made. It therefore, in view of these facts, becomes all the more urgent for us to try and make some new departure that will secure in perpetuity to the people this right beyond danger of disturbance. It appears to me specially important to do this in connection with this Rainy River Railway. This railway is intended to be a link connecting the great waterways of the eastern part of the Dominion with the great wheat fields of the west. For three or four hundred miles it will run through a country which will furnish very little local traffic, so that it will have to depend very largely on the through trade from east to west to give some return for the investment.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the

Mr. SPROULE

hour for the consideration of Private Bills has expired.

BETTER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON. I move, seconded by Mr. McMullen, the third reading of Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest.

Mr. MACLEAN. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. LaRivière :

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole with instructions to strike out subsection (c) of clause 1.

The object of my motion is to get the Bill once more in committee and improve in its details. This section that I propose to strike out was not in the original Bill. It strikes a blow at the freedom of the press, at personal liberty and at certain business interests in this country. I do not think that in this day, in the Dominion of Canada, we ought to establish a censorship of the press or interfere with personal liberty or the right of private opinion, as this Bill would do. I have received letters from prominent newsdealers in different parts of the country, who say that if this Bill is passed, it will prohibit them from selling over their counters the Sunday edition of the New York "Tribune," the New York "Herald," the Chicago "Record," the Chicago "Tribune," and all the other respectable Sunday papers printed in the United States. And not only that, but I believe that, if carried out strictly, it will stop the sale of the Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday editions of any paper in the United States or elsewhere that publishes a Sunday edition. As the measure is incomplete, and works great injustice, particularly so far as this clause is concerned. I move this resolution.

House divided :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Ives,
Beattie,	LaRivière,
Bell (Addington),	Lavergne,
Bell (Pictou),	Legris,
Bernier,	Lemieux,
Bertram,	Macdonell (Selkirk),
Eastock,	Maclean,
Broder,	McHugh,
Brodeur,	McInnes,
Bruneau,	McIsaac,
Cargill,	McLennan (Inverness),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Malouin,
Carroll,	Mignault,
Choquette,	Monk,
Clancy,	Morin,
Clarke,	Penny,
Corby,	Pope,
Costigan,	Préfontaine,

Davis,
Dechêne,
Dugas,
Dupré,
Earle,
Erb,
Ethier,
Fitzpatrick,
Fortin,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Guay,
Guité,
Haley,

Proulx,
Quinn,
Ratz,
Reid,
Rinfret,
Robertson,
Ross,
Savard,
Snetsinger,
Somerville,
Stenson,
Tarte,
Taylor, and
Wallace.—64.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bain,
Beith,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Borden (King's),
Britton,
Brown,
Burnett,
Calvert,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Charlton,
Christie,
Copp,
Craig,
Davies (Sir Louis),
Domville,
Douglas,
Edwards,
Fielding,
Flint,
Foster,
Frost,
Godbout,
Graham,
Guillet,
Henderson,
Heyd,
Hodgins,
Hurley,

Joly de Lotbinière
(Sir Henri),
Lang,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lister,
Logan,
Macdonald (Huron),
Mackie,
McGregor,
McGugan,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Meigs,
Montague,
Mulock,
Oliver,
Parmalee,
Pettet,
Richardson,
Roche,
Rogers,
Rutherford,
Semple,
Sifton,
Sproule,
Sutherland,
Tucker,
Wilson, and
Wood (Brockville).—58.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On subsection c, section 1,

Mr. MACLEAN. Now that the House has got back into committee, I hope it will recover its sense and deal with this question as it ought to deal with it. I stated, on a previous occasion, that we have already sufficient laws to deal with this question. In Ontario, we have a law to stop vending on Sunday, and that law is enforced. I directed the attention of the House to an elaborate judgment given by a magistrate at Meriton, where a carbide company had worked some of its men on Sunday. The case lasted ten or twelve days. The Sabbath Observance Society of Ontario sent their solicitor to the trial, and he succeeded in establishing the case and securing a conviction. And in the neighbourhood of the city of Toronto, yesterday, one of the magistrates tried a case involving a breach of the Sunday law,

and a conviction was secured. I believe that, if the members from Ontario were polled to-night, they would unanimously declare that the law in the province of Ontario is sufficient to stop vending of all kinds on the Sabbath day in that province. And we have had the testimony of members from the province of Quebec that they have in that province a law which has effectually stopped all kinds of vending on the Sabbath. We have had members from the maritime provinces declaring that there is a law to stop Sunday vending there. And in the province of British Columbia they respect the Sunday law, for their newspapers do not work on Sunday, but publish on Saturday and give Sunday to their employees. So the people, from ocean to ocean, do observe the laws of their respective provinces on this subject, and so there is no need for this law. I have been further told that the Minister of Justice holds that this law is unconstitutional. Above all, it is unnecessary, and the provinces can do, and, as a matter of fact, have done, all that is necessary in the matter. I do hope that the House will now see its way to deal with this question in the way that it ought to be dealt with. There is no need for the law, and, as has been pointed out, it is an attack upon the press of this country. Surely we are not going to put the power in the hands of a police magistrate to punish people for selling a Sunday newspaper. Such an enactment is unknown to British jurisprudence, and only in Canada has such a law been proposed. In order that we may deal with the question as it ought to be dealt with, I beg to move that the committee rise.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Before this motion is carried I wish to say a few words explaining my position in regard to the vote I have just given. I am in favour of the observance of the Lord's Day just as much as any other man who votes for this Bill, but I do not think it is necessary to exclude the sale of papers bearing the title of Sunday newspapers—and I speak now especially for the province of Ontario—in order to preserve the proper observance of the Lord's Day. I have had the pleasure of reading a great many Sunday papers published on the other side of the line, and some of the best literary, scientific and historical papers that are published in the city of New York and other cities of the United States, are Sunday newspapers. You cannot find any fault with them in any respect. They are not printed on Sundays, they are not sold on Sundays, they come into this country and are sold at the end of the week. Now if this Bill is passed, it will punish the person who sells these newspapers, which are printed on a week day and sent into this country and sold on a week day, and which contains some of the best literary matter that is to be found in any publication. I

do not think it is in the interest of the people of this country that this kind of literature should be kept out. Some of these papers contain a great deal of valuable instruction, and it ought to be no infraction of the law to buy them in the middle of the week and read them any day of the week, or on Sunday if people choose to do so. There is nothing in them that would debase any person who chooses to read them. Of course there are exceptions. There are some Sunday newspapers published on the other side the reading of which would not be conducive to the welfare of the people of this country, and I think the Postmaster General has power already to stop the circulation of that class of papers. I do not think this Bill meets the requirements of this country in any respect. In the province of British Columbia they respect the Sabbath Day, because they do not require printers to work on Sunday to produce a Monday newspaper; but this will prevent the people of British Columbia from getting out a paper on Saturday that is to be sold or read on Sunday. I think the Bill in its present shape will work an injury to the people of this country instead of a benefit, and therefore I oppose it. I am as willing as any other man to do anything I can to promote the observance of the Lord's Day, and I do not think any one has any reason to find fault with the manner in which the Lord's Day is kept in Ontario. There are in fact no Sunday newspapers of any kind sold on the streets of the cities and towns of this country on the Lord's Day. If any Sunday newspapers are sold, they are sold on Saturday or on Monday, so that there is actually no sale made on Sunday. Therefore, I see no necessity for this Bill. While I am, as I said, entirely in favour of the observance of the Lord's Day, I do not believe in this kind of humbug, and I, for one, am prepared to vote against it. I have voted for such things, but I am not going to do it any more.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to have some explanation from the author of this Bill as to what the facts really are. Most of the work done on the daily papers published on Monday morning is done by the employees on some portion of Sunday, principally Sunday night; and I want to know from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), whether he is aware of that fact. If he is, and if he is anxious to prevent work being done on Sunday, then I think he should direct his energies towards preventing newspaper offices from performing any kind of work on Sunday. The proposal he makes in this Bill does not, according to my mind, meet the case. Now, here is a newspaper published on Friday or on Saturday, it is sold on Saturday or on Friday, and the hon. member for North Norfolk proposes that that should be illegal. The only point I can see in it is that he is going to prevent people from reading this

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

newspaper on Sunday because it is called a Sunday newspaper, and people may be induced to read it on Sunday. Well, Sir, if the people choose to read any sort of book on Sunday, I do not think that the hon. member for Norfolk can introduce any law in this House that will prevent them from doing so, neither can he prevent them from reading any newspaper that they may choose to read. For my part I would prevent the importation of those Sunday newspapers from the United States, and a large proportion of the Monday newspapers also. When I was Controller of Customs I had occasion to exclude certain newspapers that were objectionable. I think we might fairly extend the powers of the officers of the Post Office Department, and of the Customs Department as well, so as to enable them to exclude some of those United States newspapers. I believe that those sensational papers, with blood-curdling pictures, and some of them perhaps immoral, should be prevented from coming into this country at all. But that is not the proposal made by the hon. member for North Norfolk. The effect of his Bill is, whether it is his proposal or not, that a newspaper having the word Sunday upon it, shall neither be printed in this country nor offered for sale on any day of the week when it is lawful to sell goods or newspapers. That in itself is an arbitrary interference. If the member for Norfolk finds that certain work is being performed on Sunday that should not be performed on that day, I would be willing to make a careful examination into any proposal to prevent, where it is possible without injuring public interests, such work being done on the Lord's Day. But I am not prepared to support a proposal that a newspaper published in Canada on a lawful day of the week, and sold in Canada on a lawful day of the week, merely because it has the name Sunday upon it, shall not be sold, and that the sale or the printing of it shall be an offence punishable by fines and penalties. It is for that reason that I voted that the House should now go into committee to consider this matter. If the member for North Norfolk has a reasonable proposition to substitute for that, I think this House will be disposed to give it a fair consideration; but this proposal is in itself objectionable, and should meet with the condemnation of the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), is actuated by the purest and most patriotic motives in trying to enact into law the Bill that is before the House. The evil that has crept into the United States and has been perpetuated there, was initiated at the time of the civil war. Up to that time there were no Sunday newspapers in the United States; but at the time of the civil war it was a common thing for the people to buy the Sunday issue of a newspaper when they were going into their church

door. During the war the people got accustomed to buying and reading the Sunday papers giving news of the war, and from that time down to the present the evil of Sunday papers has been perpetuated, and in fact is growing rather than diminishing. The religious denominations on the other side have expressed their views very clearly in regard to this matter, and most of the religious denominations on our side of the line have expressed in unmistakable terms their opposition to literature of this kind being brought into Canada and circulated in our homes.

I believe it is an evil, and I believe so conscientiously, and I hope to vote in accordance with my conscientious convictions. A paper printed as a Sunday issue carries with it a candid conviction to the home that as it is a paper printed on Sunday, it is a proper paper to be read on that day. I have seen papers published both in the United States and here as Sunday papers which, according to my conscientious convictions, did not contain proper reading matter either for the family or the home on Sunday, and I believe it is the desire of my esteemed friend the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to put a stop to issues of that kind. He may possibly be asking the House to adopt a law similar to an Act in force in some of the provinces at the present time, and I do not know as to that point; but it is a proper object on his part to try and carry out what he conscientiously believes to be right and which experience has shown to be in accordance with the feeling in Ontario. I entertain the same convictions, and I therefore support the Bill, and earnestly hope the committee will not consent to throw it out in the summary way proposed by the hon. member for East York. That hon. gentleman makes no pretensions with respect to the observance of Sunday. That hon. gentleman, as we all know, was one of the loudest advocates of Sunday cars, and one of the loudest advocates of Sunday newspapers. Next he will be one of the loudest advocates of baseball games on Sunday. No doubt if a Bill were introduced providing for baseball games or horse-racing on the Lord's Day, he would support it.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman know that money earns interest on Sunday?

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not find fault with the hon. gentleman. He has the right to hold those views, if he holds them conscientiously; but the fact shows that his religious teaching during his youth was sadly neglected.

Mr. BERTRAM. It was not my intention to have said one word on this question. I thought it better to allow every hon. member to vote on a question of this nature without any observation from my-

self; but I must say, on listening to the debate that has taken place for some considerable time in connection with this Bill, I almost felt as if I was listening to the debate on the Sunday car question in Toronto over again. I desire to say to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that no one is more anxious or desirous of having one day's rest in the week than I am, but I believe we cannot make men morally good or make them better citizens or raise people to a higher level by Act of Parliament. That must be done by education in its highest and best sense. There is one argument that does not commend itself to my judgment. We are told that if we do not adopt this Bill we shall have some such trouble on this question as they have in the United States. We heard the same prophecy in regard to the introduction of Sunday cars in Toronto. We were told that if there were Sunday cars we should have lawlessness and Sunday desecrations; these things however did not follow.

Mr. MACLEAN. Open beer gardens.

Mr. BERTRAM. Some of the best men in Toronto supported the running of street cars, not because they thought it would injure the city, but because they thought it would materially and morally benefit the city. I desire to say that so far as the Canadian people are concerned, they are capable of conducting themselves on Sunday or any other day without regard to the people of any other country, and I have no fear of the adoption here of any of the special vices said to prevail in the United States, because I have faith in the character of Canadian people as people knowing how to appreciate Sunday as a day of rest. This proposed law is entirely unnecessary. We have already in Ontario a Sunday law, and further restrictions of this kind, instead of making people better, have actually the opposite effect, and I do not believe in them. I shall always vote against restrictive legislation of this kind, which instead of making the people more moral, has the opposite tendency. I wish it, however, to be distinctly understood that in thus stating my position, I am at the same time not in favour of Sunday labour. I should be glad indeed that if there were only five working days in the week instead of six, and I believe it is necessary for the human frame and intellect as well as for man's moral nature that there should be complete cessation from labour on one day in the week. But some things are necessary under our present civilization. Hon. gentlemen might as well tell me that the waterworks in some cities should not be in operation on Sunday. Then everybody would have to secure their water supply by going to the lake or elsewhere with a pail; but men have to be employed at the waterworks for the purpose of meeting the wants and requirements

of the civilization we enjoy. Such legislation as is now proposed, is, therefore, injurious and not beneficial. I prefer to have faith in the people and trust to the people, and I am satisfied if we do that we shall find the people conducting themselves properly, and we should see that we do not apply fines and imprisonment to what is not a criminal offence. We should be very careful before we imprison any one for such an offence on Sunday, as this Bill provides for. I hope the committee will reject the Bill, simply on the ground that it is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There is no doubt the Bill before the House is contrary to the sentiment of the large majority of the people in the province of Quebec. We have our own way of keeping Sunday, and I think Sunday is kept in that province just as well as in any other part of the Dominion. We have a law against selling anything on Sunday, which is contained in the Consolidated Statutes of the province, and the article is as follows:—

Except the sale, at church doors of country parishes on Sunday, of the effects arising from public gatherings, for the benefit of churches, or those destined for pious purposes, no shop-keeper, pedlar, hawker, or other person shall sell or retail any goods, wares or merchandise during Sunday under a penalty not exceeding \$20 for the first offence, and not less than \$20 or more than \$40 for every subsequent offence.

We in the province of Quebec have always considered that law amply sufficient for securing the observance of Sunday. There is some doubt as to the constitutionality of the Bill now before the committee. I do not know whether I am quite right, but I take it that this matter falls within subparagraph 16 of paragraph 92 of the British North America Act, which leaves all matters of a merely local or private nature to the legislatures of the provinces. In Quebec we have legislated on the subject. The constitutionality of that Act has never been called in question, and I do not see why, by general legislation on a subject of this kind, the large majority of the people of the province should be subjected to a law of which they do not approve and which they have no wish to see adopted by this Parliament. I observe the Solicitor General in his seat, and perhaps he will enlighten the committee as to whether this subject comes within the sphere of legislation of the federal Parliament or not.

An hon. MEMBER. He did so before.

Mr. CLARKE. I desire to say two or three words on this question. I am strongly in favour of enacting a law for the purpose of keeping out of the country blackguard and loose newspapers printed on the other side or elsewhere, newspapers containing lewd pictures, which have a tendency to corrupt

Mr. BERTRAM.

the minds of the people and to degrade and weaken the moral fibre. I have examined the Bill of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and I cannot find one single line that will accomplish the object I have stated. If the Bill can be amended in that direction, I will give it my most hearty support. I am not in favour, however, of keeping out such eminently respectable journals as the London "Observer," "The News of the World" and the "Weekly Times." These are valuable papers from a literary standpoint; they are dated Sunday; they are read by hundreds of people in the Dominion of Canada, and if the Bill of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) becomes law, the sale of them would be prohibited and many of us would not have the advantage of reading them as we do now. There is only one secular paper I know of printed in the province of Ontario, dated Sunday, and it is due to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) who is a member of this House, and who is connected with the publication of that paper, to say—and I say it fearlessly and challenge contradiction—that that newspaper may be taken into any Canadian home and read with profit any day in the week. It is dated Sunday, but it is printed on Friday or on Saturday, so that there is no Sunday work done on it. Those who desire to get a summary of the news of the week can find it cleanly and well set out in that paper, and if they desire to get a summary of the religious news of the week they can find it well prepared in that paper always. If the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) would prepare a Bill to keep out the scores of yellow journals which are published in the United States, such a Bill would have my support. The Bill which we are asked to send for a third reading now, does not contain any provision of that kind, but on the contrary, it will militate against a class of journals which disseminate a vast amount of useful information in the country at the present time. For that reason I must vote that the committee rise, unless some assurance is given us that the legislation which I believe is necessary shall be proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

Mr. BOSTOCK. The intention of this Bill as I understand it is to prevent to some extent labour on Sunday. In the province of British Columbia whence I come we have newspapers issued on Sunday but not on Monday. The great part of the work on these Sunday newspapers is done on Saturday night and they are published late on Saturday night or the first thing on Sunday morning. If this Bill becomes law we shall be prevented from publishing these newspapers on Sunday, or else we can publish newspapers only on five days in the week, or, in the other alternative, we must publish on Monday morning and compel the editorial staff, the compositors, and the pressmen to work all Sunday evening, which they

do not do at present. In the province of British Columbia the result will be to make these people work on Sunday and deprive them of the Sabbath as a day of rest. This custom of issuing a paper on Sunday morning and no paper on Monday morning, is one which has been in vogue in our province for a long time, and it has been found most convenient by the people. We, in British Columbia are as law-abiding and respectable as are those in any other part of the Dominion of Canada and we are as anxious to have the Sabbath observed as are the people of any other province. We have found the system of publishing our newspapers suitable to our requirements, and it will be a great hardship to us if we are compelled by this law to forego it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As the mover of the amendment which is now under discussion I wish to say a word or two. When this Bill was up on various occasions in the House, I saw, as well as did gentlemen on both sides, that it contained a very great number of weaknesses. When it came before the House this session and was being considered in committee, I took occasion to point out to the promoter (Mr. Charlton) what I regarded as a very great defect in the Bill, and my opinion on that question was supported by no less an authority than the present Minister of Justice (the Hon. David Mills) who when he gave that opinion was a member for Bothwell. I urged upon the Government that they should give very serious consideration to the opinion of their own Minister of Justice as regards, not only the constitutionality of the Act, but also as regards the advisability of supporting a Bill which according to the opinion of the present Minister of Justice interfered in a matter into which this House had no right to go, it being purely a civil and municipal right. But, I was answered upon that question by the Prime Minister, who urged that Sir John Thompson, the late Minister of Justice, had supported the contention of the hon. member (Mr. Charlton), and the Premier urged that the opinion of Sir John Thompson was quite sufficient for him. So, for the time being the House was in the mood of throwing away altogether the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, or the fitness or unfitness of the Act, and it assented to the principle laid down by the Prime Minister according to the opinion of Sir John Thompson. Then I came to the discussion of the principle of the Bill itself, and it will be remembered that I pointed out as strongly as I could, that the Bill was ineffective in preventing the greater evil in connection with Sunday newspapers. I then said that in my opinion a respectable Sunday newspaper might be issued without injuring the morals of the people or destroying the moral sentiment of the country to any extent whatever. I pointed out upon the other hand, that the Bill of the hon. member (Mr.

Charlton) did not prevent the importation into Canada of the class of literature to which my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has alluded, namely, that class of journals purporting to be issued on Sunday, receiving, in the language of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), a sort of certificate of character by reason of the fact that Sunday was their day of publication, and sold broadcast through Canada as Sunday newspapers imported from the United States; papers, which I say in this House and am prepared to say out of this House, are not fit to enter into the home of any Canadian citizen. And, Sir, as the spirit of the House seemed to be that this Bill should be passed, I was anxious with others that if the Bill should pass and be operative at all, it should be operative against the greater nuisance; the importation of that class of immoral and unclean literature which is brought into Canada by the means I mentioned. And I have no hesitation in saying to-night, that it was to prevent that that I moved the resolution which was contained in that amendment, and which is now the subject of discussion. I hope I am too broad and have too much appreciation of the rights and liberties of the people of Canada, and too much appreciation, too, of their hard common sense, to say that the better class of newspapers which come in here should be excluded because they happen to be dated on the Sabbath Day. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has alluded to the London papers, and I mentioned one paper which is published near my own home. I stated that the Buffalo "Express" was a journal which was creditable to its publishers, which contained very excellent literary material, and which could do no harm in any Canadian home, so long as it did not endeavour to lead our people into republicanism, which we do not need to discuss in this House, since we well know the thorough founding of our people in British principles. It was not my intention to prevent newspapers of this kind coming into Canada; but I did try, and those who supported me tried, to get at the pernicious literature which has already been referred to, and which ought to be prevented from coming into this country. Now, Sir, we are at a pass in connection with this Bill at which, I think, the hon. member for North Norfolk should pause and very seriously consider his course. We have come to this, that, so far as the prevention of the real nuisance is concerned, his Bill, without this clause, is of no use at all, and with this clause his Bill is a sort of return to the blue laws which, I am free to confess, I do not believe would receive sympathy or support in the country. For instance, I do not think any man could be fined with the approval of the public for selling a copy of the London "Times" upon a week day in a city of Canada, because it happened to be printed on a Sabbath Day.

I conceive that to be an impossible condition of affairs in Canada. Such being the case, although I was the mover of that amendment, I am free to confess that there is a difficulty there which, in our haste the other night, we did not see, and which, it appears to me, would make this clause almost useless for the purpose for which it was intended; and I am one who, if I see that a clause which I asked to be added to a Bill is inoperative, will immediately retrace my steps. It is true, some little threat has been made in the papers, that, if I should happen to be a candidate in one of the cities of Canada, the gentlemen who are opposed to the operation of this law would knife me when the contest came on. Well, Sir, I throw that back as a dirty, base insinuation, and I say to the men who wrote it, and to the men who published it, that, when the time comes when I shall appeal to the people, either in my present constituency or in any other constituency in Canada, I shall be prepared, on every occasion, to defend my course in this House on its merits, appealing to no one class or another specially, and this much is certain: no miserable threat will compel me to take a course which I do not think is consistent or just as regards the interests of the people of Canada. I am anxious, I repeat, to see this class of pernicious literature shut out of the country. I believe now that the clause which I moved will go further than that, and will shut out a class of literature which I did not intend to shut out, which the hon. member for North Norfolk does not intend to shut out, which no man in this House would desire to shut out. Therefore, I think the hon. member for North Norfolk should pause and very seriously consider whether he should not remodel his Bill, possibly giving wider powers to the Postmaster General and the Minister of Customs, as regards excluding the class of literature which has been referred to. But this much is certain, that, without this clause, this Bill is no good at all, and with it, I am free to confess, after hearing the statements of members, after seeing the class of literature which is published on Sunday, in various parts of the world, that this amendment goes a good deal further than I ever intended it to go, and further, I believe, than the hon. member for North Norfolk himself intended it to go.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have listened carefully to the remarks that have been made by various speakers on the question now before the Chair. I have to say, at the outset, that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) attempts to place before this committee a motion which the House did not direct this committee to consider. The House directed the committee to consider the question of setting aside subsection "c." That action was taken on the motion of my hon. friend from East York, and directly on the House resolving itself into Committee of

Mr. MONTAGUE.

the Whole to consider that question, my hon. friend rises, without pausing to consider the question which the committee has the mandate of the House to consider, and asks for the assassination of the Bill by the rising of the committee. Now, I suppose that the speeches in this committee have been directed to the whole broad question, and not to the question that was properly and legitimately before the Chair, that is, the amendment of subsection "c"; and it may be necessary and proper for me at this moment to deal briefly with the arguments of various kinds that have been presented to-night with reference to the Sunday newspaper matter. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague), who moved the amendment the other night, gets up now and tells us, that he hardly comprehended the scope of that amendment, which he now finds goes further than he intended it should go, and, in fact, calls for action which he can scarcely approve of at the present moment. He tells us, moreover, that he has doubts to-night about the constitutionality of the Bill itself, or the constitutionality of action with regard to this matter by this House at all. Well, this question of constitutionality has been so often brought up in this House, and these objections have been so often set aside, the highest judicial authorities of Canada have so often pronounced that this question of constitutionality is one that need not be considered, because the constitutional power does rest in this Parliament to deal with this question, that it seems to me we waste our time in considering that point, and I can hardly comprehend how, in view of this well-known fact, hon. members will recur again and again to this phase of the question, unless their design be to waste time and befog the main question before the House by these side issues. The Bill is one of a broad and general character. It may be that we have laws in the various provinces that will meet, partially or entirely, the evil that this Bill proposes to remove. It is said that we have such a law in the province of Quebec, but evidently it does not meet the evil or is not applied, because in Montreal there is a regularly published Sunday newspaper, called the "Sunday Sun."

Mr. CASGRAIN. The paper is printed on Saturday, and all the work is done on Saturday.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not able to contradict the hon. gentleman, but it is ostensibly a Sunday paper, and so far as its moral influence is concerned, it is what it professes to be, a desecration of the Lord's Day. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) says that the Sunday newspapers of the United States are of most deleterious character, that their influence, which is wide reaching, is entirely unhealthy and demoralizing and lamentable in every respect. I agree with the hon. gentleman,

but he tells us that there are Sunday papers which are quite unobjectionable. He spoke of the London "Times." Well, if I am not misinformed there is no Sunday "Times," or other newspapers published in London on Sunday. I know that the New York "Herald" attempted to publish a Sunday edition in London, but the attempt ended in a disastrous failure. I speak under correction, but it is my belief that there is no such thing as a Sunday journal published in the city of London. There is no Sunday distribution of the mail in that city, and there is no city on the face of the globe where the Sabbath is so strictly observed, where there is such a total cessation of labour in the Post Office Department and in connection with literary pursuits, as in the commercial metropolis of the world. I ask this House to deal with this evil because it is one which is far-reaching in its consequence. The question of suppressing it is one that ought not to be beset, in its consideration, by the kind of tactics that characterizes the conduct of hon. members, who approach or pretend to approach the discussion of this Bill. Sir, the Bill before the House was called into existence by the fact that we have an object lesson in the nation right at our elbows, in a nation where those of us who have examined the circumstances know that the Sabbath was observed thirty-five years ago just as well as it is in Canada to-day. That nation permitted the introduction of the Sunday newspaper, the evil at first attracted little attention, these papers were just as respectable as that highly respectable sheet published by my hon. friend the member for East York (Mr. Maclean)—probably more so because they gave a little religious homily at first.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will let the hon. gentleman write a religious article for my Sunday newspaper, if he likes.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will put it in some other paper. The evil was at first one of moderate magnitude, but the time came when suddenly—almost in a year—every daily newspaper in the United States was obliged to bow the knee to this Baal and issue a Sunday edition. We may be just on the eve of a similar experience here because when a Sunday newspaper has established itself, it has certain advantages which may compel every other newspaper in the city to follow suit, and it is not impossible that such papers as the Toronto "Globe" and "Mail and Empire," and other highly respectable papers will be compelled to follow the example of the Toronto "World," if that paper should acquire a little more influence than it possesses at present and continue to issue what is ostensibly a Sunday edition. Looking at the demoralizing influences social, political, moral and religious, of the Sunday newspapers in the United States, looking at the fact that that influence has dragged

that nation down from a high moral and religious position, from the position of one of the most truly Sabbatarian nations in the world, from the position of a nation that refused to open its centennial exposition on Sunday in 1876, to the position in which it stands to-day—I say, looking at the gradual deterioration of religious and moral sentiment in that country, looking at the deterioration of literary taste in that country, looking at the fact that the yellow journal and the sensational press has largely usurped the place of good literature, and that the tastes of the people are becoming trivial and superficial, and immoral, and that the moral stamina, which is so desirable in the people, no longer exists among the masses—looking at all these facts, whoever will take into consideration the scope of these forces, the natural tendency of these forces, the ultimate result of these forces, must realize that we are called upon to meet in Canada an element of disintegration, an element that will drag down the people of this country if we do not grapple with it; and it is on the broad ground that for the good of the country, for the benefit of future generations, for the purpose of rendering more stable our institutions, religious and political, for the purpose of enabling this country to avoid the mistakes that have been made by the great nation to the south, for the purpose of making this a greater, nobler, more virtuous country, the inhabitants of which will possess more moral and physical and religious stamina—it is for these reasons that this Bill is urged.

Hon. members refused to look at it upon these broad grounds, and carp and cavil at little features here and there. It is unnecessary, they say, it is an interference with the liberty of the subject, it is an interference with the literary liberty of the country, men should be allowed to read what kind of literature they please. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are professedly a Christian nation, we recognize the obligatory character of the divine law. We profess to recognize that the Decalogue is binding upon this people—the Decalogue which prohibits murder, which prohibits unchastity, perjury, theft. All these are divine requirements, and the civil law supplements them and makes them crimes. That same Decalogue requires the observance of the Sabbath, and while it might not be proper for us to legislate on this as a religious matter, while we do not legislate on any of these through religious motives or avowedly for the purpose of compelling people to entertain religious views, yet we do these things as a state, as a legislature, as a people for the purpose of laying broad and securely the foundations of society. We punish the murderer, we punish the thief, we punish the seducer, we punish the perjurer. We do these things for the good of society, to establish society upon a sure and permanent basis. And this is the

reason that warrants this House in their taking action to cut off what promises to be an abuse, and is calculated to weaken the state, make life and property less secure, and make the future of the state darker and more uncertain. It is on this ground that this Bill asks that this great, this crying evil which exists in the nation to the south of us, be shut out of this country. There may be some good Sunday papers; there are certainly many bad ones. There are papers published on certain other days of the week that it is proper to keep out of the country; but these yellow journals, the sensational press, the whole brood of objectionable newspapers have been in the United States, and will be here, if we have them, the natural progeny of the Sunday newspaper. The Sunday newspaper is a violation of the Divine law; the man who publishes it knows it, if he has sense; and, if that newspaper is published in violation of that law, the publisher of that newspaper will be the natural enemy of every moral and religious restraint, he will be the enemy of Sunday observance; he will be the friend of Sunday cars, of Sunday saloons, and of every debasing influence that will stand as an ally to this Satanic press.

My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) says you cannot make people moral by legislation. No, but you can have salutary legislation, calculated to restrain immorality, and you can buttress and promote the moral sense of the country by laws. Though you cannot legislate that a man shall be a good man and make him so by that legislation, you can, by legislation, surround him with influences that are calculated to make him and his children better. If you remove those legislative influences, you leave him to drift aimlessly and helplessly down a course in which he might be arrested by wise laws. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto says that he has no fear of American vices being planted in the soil of Canada, that we are proof against these things. We were not born subject to original sin, I suppose; we have not the natural tendency that influences the depraved human heart; we are, fortunately, exempt from all the influences calculated to drag Yankees or other people down. American vices cannot find a foothold in Canada, even if the means by which those vices are propagated in the United States find a foothold here. I say, on the contrary, the influences that debase popular sentiment and national life in the United States will do the same thing here, and I assert that, having before our eyes in the United States an example of the influence of a degrading institution, whether the Sunday press or anything else, if we establish that institution here, the result will be the same. But my hon. friend (Mr. Bertram) congratulates himself that we are not likely to fall into temptation, that we are not amenable to the things that in-

Mr. CHARLTON.

fluence other people. Why, it is sheer nonsense. These things are the same in one country as in another, and if the Sunday press, which at first gave little indication of what it would grow to be, but which is condemned to-day, alike by Protestant and Catholic clergymen, has produced such effects as we know it has, how can we avoid the same results here, except by preventing the cause?

So, I stand by the principles of this Bill; I believe in them thoroughly; I have advocated them year after year. I do not advocate the adoption of this Bill for the purpose of curtailing conscientious or religious or literary liberty. It stands upon a higher and broader ground. Sunday newspapers are unnecessary. One day's rest in seven is necessary, and the Sunday newspaper keeps us rolling on the same secular rut. It is a means of secularizing the Sabbath. It prevents people from being drawn aside from the cares that are consuming their very life. We need rest in this busy age even more than did the people of three thousand years ago, more than the people of a thousand years ago. The very life we lead, the high pressure under which we live makes this one day's rest in seven an absolutely necessary and essential thing. The Sunday newspaper interferes with it, and it is a most important influence, calculated to degrade the national life and produce the whole brood of evils that we see exemplified in the experience of a nation that had not the wisdom to pass a law such as is here proposed. I sat in Chicago as one of two vice-presidents of the Sunday Rest Congress, Archbishop Ireland being the other. We had read before that congress a paper from Cardinal McCloskey, and had one of the most magnificent addresses on the subject of Sabbath observance from Archbishop Ireland that I ever heard. Both of these prelates were unsparing in their denunciation of the Sunday press of the United States, as an influence that is debasing, corrupt and weakening the life of the nation.

Now, Sir, I am prepared to stand by the judgment of this House upon this measure. But I must say that I felt pained to-night, when the vote was being taken, at the evidence of want of appreciation, to say the least, of the serious character of the question that was being decided. This is not a thing for jokes, for levity; it is a very serious question. And there is an element of the population of this country that will consider it a serious question. That element has not spoken very pronouncedly upon the matter, but it is a large element, and it does not want this American Anti-Christ introduced here. These people do not look with a great deal of favour upon the one or two publishers who want it brought in. The amendment to the Bill which you have just read, Mr. Chairman, was offered by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). It reads:

Sells or employs or procures any person to sell upon any day of the week any paper, whether published in Canada or elsewhere, issued or purporting to be issued on Sunday.

Now, so far as the actual issuing of a paper upon Sunday is concerned, the prohibition is all right. It might, perhaps, be claimed that a paper dated and nominally issued on Sunday, but really issued on some other day, ought not to come under that clause. But let the publisher issue his newspaper honestly. If it is published on Saturday, let him date it on Saturday, and if it is issued on Sunday, let him so state it.

We have on the border here, brought in from Detroit into Windsor and the towns along the line, brought in from Buffalo and sold all along the lines of railway, American Sunday newspapers, some of them fairly respectable and some of them not respectable. But all are undergoing the process of deterioration, the process of evolution will bring them down to the regular stamp of the yellow sensational journal. They are all going there, evolution will fetch them all there, the Toronto "World" and the rest. Now we want to guard against these things and this proposal is calculated to do it. If the committee choose to cut out this amendment, subsection "c," the Bill is still a good one. The Bill still provides, I think, an efficient and effectual remedy for the evils I am complaining of. It was drafted by the Minister of Justice last year and it was submitted to the Solicitor General of this House, and met with the approval of both those gentlemen. Talk about the Bill being insufficient and a weak Bill, is talk made for a purpose. The Bill is sufficient, in my opinion, the Bill is a strong Bill; and it does not matter so much to me whether subsection "c" is eliminated from the Bill or not. But at all events, I shall ask that the committee confine itself in its action now to the question whether it will eliminate section "c" and then if they do not do this, I shall ask power from the House to do something else.

Mr. MACLEAN. If the hon. gentleman has any necessity of being informed that we do not need a law to protect us against American institutions, he has had that in his own experience. He tried to politicalise this country on American lines, and failed. The good sense of the people saved this country, and it required no law for that purpose. If his Bill here to-night means anything it is a proposition to establish a censorship of the press of this country. He proposes to establish a censorship which is based on the date on which the paper is printed, and not on the contents of the paper. If he does intend to establish a censorship, let it be based on reasonable and sound lines, on lines that concern the contents of these papers, and not the date alone. It is an absurdity when you attempt to legislate in that direction. The hon. gentleman says that America is so and so because they

have Sunday papers; the moment before that he said England is so and so, and it has not Sunday papers. But England has no Sunday papers and it has no such law as he proposes to put on the Statute-book here—that answers the hon. gentleman. The Canadian people and the English people are different from the American people. They are protected in regard to their Sunday by substantial and sufficient Sunday laws; and I want none of this cant, none of this hypocrisy, and none of this attempt to govern the people of Canada by putting them all in the Criminal Code, as this man who professes to be a Liberal now proposes to do.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It appears to me that the promoter of this Bill loses sight of the fact that in the province of Ontario and in all the other provinces, we have already laws for the observance of the Sabbath; that being the case, I cannot see what good is to be obtained by having legislation here of a similar character. If it can be shown by the promoter of this Bill that the laws of the provinces are not sufficient to maintain the observance of the Sabbath, then I say it is right for this House to pass such by the promoter of this Bill that the laws there, which are strict and which are in force, as they are throughout the province of Ontario, so far as I know, I cannot see what is to be gained by the passage of this legislation here. Furthermore, the hon. gentleman is losing sight of the fact, as he did in a former session, although I voted for his Bill on that occasion, but more as a personal matter than anything else—he loses sight of the fact that he is not striking at the root of the evil at all. If he wants to prohibit labour being performed on Sunday he must stop the work of the printers, the writers, the reporters, the pressmen, and the whole staff of any newspaper office who are engaged in getting out a Monday newspaper. The Toronto "Globe," the Toronto "Mail," the Toronto "World," the Ottawa "Citizen," the Montreal "Gazette," and all these newspapers published on Monday morning, must have their whole staff at work on Sunday to get these newspapers out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). From 8 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Anyway, they have to work on Sunday. Now to be consistent, the promoter of this Bill, if he wants to stop labour and to preserve the Sabbath for the workingman, must enact a law that will prevent these men from working on Sunday to get out a Monday newspaper.

Mr. MACLEAN. And that must be a provincial law.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Just so; I contend that we have already sufficient laws in the province of Ontario to preserve the Sabbath, and I think they have in all the other provinces too. I do not see

the necessity for this legislation, as I said before. And I want to emphasize the fact, some of the best literary journals published in the United States are dated on Sunday. The Sunday New York "Tribune" and the Sunday New York "Sun" are printed on Saturday. These papers are all printed on Saturday, they are not printed on the Sabbath at all, they are not sold on the Sabbath at all, they are sold on the week days, so that there is no breaking of the Sabbath law at all by the publication, or circulation or sale of these Sunday papers in Canada or in the United States, so far as I know—at all events not in Canada. There are no Sunday newspapers sold in Canada on the Lord's Day. They are sold in the middle of the week or towards the end of the week, and they are printed in the middle of the week, and not on Sunday at all. This whole thing is merely sentiment, and I think a sentiment ought not to be put into law just for the sake of the sentiment itself, especially when it is not shown that it is going to accomplish any good purpose. I believe that in Ontario, and in every province of the Dominion we have good Sabbath observance laws that are maintained at the present time, and I do not think that anything is going to be accomplished by the passage of this Bill, unless the hon. gentleman inserts a clause to prevent printers from working on Sunday. It is the Monday newspaper that breaks the Sabbath, and not the Sunday newspaper.

Mr. OSLER. As an individual and as a member of this House, I object entirely to grandmotherly legislation of this kind. Surely, if the people of Canada need to be educated as to what they should read or what they should not read, they are not to be educated up to a high moral tone by being prevented from reading what is evil. I think the people of this country do not need to be educated as to what they should read and what they should not read. The newspapers printed on Sunday do not educate the people of this country, they do not educate the people of the United States. The people of the United States demand that newspapers shall be printed of a class that are printed on Sunday, and that is why they are printed. In Canada there is no such demand, and no such newspapers can be printed in Canada as are printed in the United States. We have a moral tone here which is far and away above the moral tone they have to the south of us, in my opinion. I do not believe that a newspaper printed on Sunday here in Canada, of a character such as those printed on the other side would pay the cost of wages for one week with its circulation for a year. I object entirely to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) coming here to lecture us as if he had a power of attorney from the Almighty to say how we shall observe the Sabbath. I think we are just as much en-

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

titled to judge how we shall keep the Sabbath as he is. I do not wish to be dictated to by any member of this House, or by anybody else, as to what I shall read or what I shall not read on Sunday. I want my children and those for whom I have any responsibility, to read what is useful and what is profitable for them, and I try to teach them to avoid what is unprofitable. I think that our moral teachers in Canada are quite able to set us the pace and to educate us as to what we should read. We are going back in any such legislation as this to the blue laws, and I consider that one of the causes of the low moral tone of the people to the south of us is the rebound from the blue laws under which they suffered so long. We have had no such laws in Canada. I think the child who has gone out into the world and met the evil fearlessly and has overcome it, will make a better and a stronger man than the child who has always been shut up away from the evil, so far as that could be done. Are we going to be told in this Parliament that we should not read certain newspapers because we are not able to stand their contents and because they will corrupt our morals? Our morals should be corrupted if we cannot stand any of these yellow newspapers. One reason I object to staying in New York over Sunday is that the whole of the hotels and streets, tramways and elevated railways seem to be loaded down with these Sunday newspapers. We have no such condition existing here; and if we had, we could not stop it by Act of Parliament. I take that position without any reserve. If you prohibit a thing you make a boy or a girl all the more anxious to get it, and by enacting a prohibitory law you will make the people more anxious to get these Sunday newspapers, and you will do more damage by your prohibition than if you let them in freely. I am against all attempts to establish morality by Act of Parliament, and I refuse to take any man's view as to what I shall do or shall not do as regards my mode of thought and mode of life.

Mr. ERB. I am as anxious as the hon. member for North Norfolk can be to have Sunday properly observed and our people not exposed to the immoral literature to which he has referred and which is published in the United States. But I think section 1 of chapter 246 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1897, covers the case fully with respect to selling or purchasing newspapers on Sunday in this province. Then, if our postal regulations and customs regulations are not ample and sufficient to prevent that immoral literature coming in from the United States, I think we had better amend our customs and postal laws in order to exclude that class of literature, whether published on Sunday or week day, or whe-

ther called Sunday newspapers or otherwise. These are the views I hold on this question, and I think the Bill entirely unnecessary.

Mr. CRAIG. The object of the Bill of the hon. member for North Norfolk, at least his object is to prevent Sunday newspapers being sold in this country, and by the term Sunday newspapers I think he means newspapers which purport to be published on Sunday, whether they are so published or not. That is, no doubt, the hon. gentleman's view, as in all he has stated on this question, the hon. gentleman has denounced papers called Sunday newspapers and published in the United States. On this point I have great sympathy with the hon. member for North Norfolk. I think it would be a good thing if we passed a law to prevent newspapers called Sunday papers from being sold in this country on Sunday or any other day. The amendment of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) is the only part of the Bill that reaches the object. The other part would not have the effect sought to be accomplished by the hon. member for North Norfolk, and which I will help him to accomplish, and that is to prevent papers calling themselves Sunday newspapers being sold in this country. It is true, no doubt, as the hon. member for North Brant has stated, that some of these papers published in the United States on Sunday are good papers; but we will all admit that most of the Sunday newspapers have not the best tendency, and a great many of them contain much matter which will tend to lower the moral standard. I have listened attentively to the remarks made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram). While there is some truth in the statement that you cannot make men moral by Act of Parliament, yet you can keep men moral by Act of Parliament in a great measure, and you can remove the temptation from young men and women by legislation. While we may say generally that you cannot make men moral by Act of Parliament, yet a great many laws tending to morality are passed for that purpose. I believe this Bill, if it should accomplish the object of preventing Sunday newspapers coming in from the United States and prevent newspapers calling themselves Sunday papers being published here, would have a good effect. I was rather surprised to hear the very broad sentiments expressed by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), when he said he does not believe in the prohibition of any newspaper. I do not believe any one will go so far as to say that if a man cannot stand the yellow papers, he has not much moral stamina. I do not agree with such a sentiment. It may be true as regards people of mature age; but when these newspapers fall into the hands of boys and girls they have a degrading influence on those who happen

to read them. I am not discussing such a paper as the London "Times," but the yellow papers coming here from the United States. It is very well to talk of the London "Times" and papers of that class, but we must take the general class. It may be there are some good papers, but it will be admitted by all hon. members that the great majority of the Sunday papers coming in from the United States are not papers of a very high moral tone, and for that reason I am prepared to support this Bill and am prepared to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Haldimand the other day, because I think it is an essential feature of the Bill. I am opposed to moving the House into committee for the purpose of immediately proposing a resolution that the committee rise, because as the hon. member for North Norfolk has said, we went into committee to consider certain matters.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). With a great deal of what has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) every one agrees. We are all extremely anxious to see the moral character of the people raised to a very high standard indeed, and I am also sure we all agree as to the necessity of keeping our homes sacred against the pernicious influence of improper literature. But with what are we called on to deal? Let us get down to the Bill. We are called on to declare the sale of newspapers on Sunday to be a crime. Why should it be a crime to sell a newspaper on Sunday if it is not a crime to sell any other article of commerce? If it be a crime to sell a newspaper on Sunday, why do you make a distinction between what we would call an ordinary, every day newspaper and a religious newspaper? What is the object of the sale? It is the newspaper. If the character of the newspaper can be weighed in the matter, if character is to be made an essential element, I say we have the right to deal with the matter now. If we want to prevent these imported newspapers reaching our homes and being circulated, we have the right to deal with the matter. We have the right now, and the law enables us to do it. All we have to do is to read the Criminal Code, and it will be found to meet the case that we have been talking about. All this desire to shut the door against the yellow newspapers will be found covered by hon. members if they read the Criminal Code, and the section applying to the subject. Section 179 says:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment, who knowingly, without lawful justification or excuse publicly sells or exposes for sale or to public view any obscene book or other printed or written matter, or any picture, photograph, model or other objects tending to corrupt morals.

What more do hon. members want? It seems to me we are encroaching—I say it with all deference and respect to the opinion of the late Sir John Thompson—upon the rights of the local legislatures, which alone have the right to deal with this question so far as the right of Sunday sales of newspapers or any other article of commerce is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Brodeur). The question is that I do now leave the Chair.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a question of order. That is not the question this House is considering.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Brodeur). Yes, the motion has been made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), that I do now leave the Chair.

Mr. CHARLTON. The House directed that we should go into committee on subsection 2.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Brodeur). That is perfectly true, but at the same time after we got into committee a motion was made that I do now leave the Chair, and I have put the question.

Mr. CHARLTON. I regret to say that I consider this irregular and a breach of the direction of the House. I shall feel myself called upon to move at the earliest possible date, if this motion is carried, that this Bill be restored to the Order paper. We shall fight this thing on a different basis from this mode of assassination.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). We should meet this question like men and let us meet it now. It is a subterfuge to move that the committee rise; the question will come before us again.

An hon. MEMBER. All right.

Mr. FRASER. The manly way is to vote for or against the Bill, and I am against this motion. I am not in sympathy with laws that attempt to make men moral.

Mr. MACLEAN. Oh.

Mr. FRASER. I believe that morality is never achieved by Act of Parliament, but you are not going to stop this Bill by simply moving that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. MACLEAN. There is no reporting progress about it.

Mr. FRASER. Neither is this Bill going to be killed by abusing the introducer. The question is the Bill and not the introducer, and nothing will be gained by abusing the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton). It is not a dignified way to meet a Bill like this by throwing taunts at the hon. gentleman. If hon. gentlemen in this House think that this legislation should not be passed let them have the courage to say so, but do not let

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

them try to remove it from the scene for the present as if it was a nightmare of some kind. I am ready to vote now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We all want to vote.

Mr. FRASER. I object to the motion to rise and report progress.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) is mistaken. There is no reporting progress at all in this motion.

Mr. FRASER. What is the motion?

Mr. MACLEAN. It is to rise and kill the Bill.

Mr. FRASER. That is still worse. If we want to kill the Bill let us kill by a straight vote.

Mr. MACLEAN. There are several ways of killing a cat.

Mr. FRASER. Whatever my views might be on the straight question, I shall certainly vote against this motion.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not wish the statement made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) to go uncontradicted; that any hon. member who has spoken on this Bill has taunted the hon. mover (Mr. Charlton).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not think that statement is correct. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) was not in the House; he came in late; he does not know what he is talking about.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There was no taunt thrown at the hon. member for North Norfolk.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, there was.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Well, I have been here all the time and I did not hear it, and so far as I am concerned I want it to be understood that I have the highest respect for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), but I think he is making a mistake in this legislation. If the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) would sit in his place in the House he would know what is going on.

Mr. FRASER. I suppose that if a member is not here all the time, when he is here he is capable of forming an opinion. The member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) did taunt the hon. member for North Norfolk, and if the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) is deaf and did not hear, I cannot help that. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) spoke of this legislation as grandmotherly legislation.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That was said on the other side.

Mr. FRASER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) mean to say that words said on that side of the House are not worth attention. If the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) did not hear he must have been sleeping as is his usual custom in the House. It is better not to be here at all than to be asleep. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) was to say the least of it rather profane when he spoke of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as being here with a brief from the Almighty. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) does not seem to have heard that.

Mr. McCLURE. I am inclined to agree largely with the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). I do not believe in Sunday newspapers and I do not believe in this Bill. The only thing I see in favour of the Bill is some of the opposition to it. Neither do I believe in assassination, and I believe that the members of this House who are opposed to this Bill should say so manfully.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is what we are doing now.

Mr. McCLURE. I am prepared when the question comes up to vote against the Bill, but I will not vote to assassinate it in this way.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Brodeur). The question is that I do now leave the Chair.

Committee divided : Yeas, 60 ; Nays, 43.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Militia and Defence.—(Mr. Borden.)

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

Motion agree to, and the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 24th March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Report of the Secretary of State of Canada, for the year ended 31st December, 1897.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

BETTER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker : As a continuation of the proceedings on Bill No. 2, I shall move to have that Bill reinstated upon the Order paper. I mentioned that intention last night, for the reason that an expression of this House on this Bill has not yet been taken in a due and proper manner. Had a vote of this House been recorded adverse to this Bill I should have bowed to the decision of my peers in Parliament, but such has not been the case. Last night a motion was made to go into committee to deal with a certain subsection of the Bill, and when that motion carried and the House went into committee, the mover of that motion, instead of proceeding to deal legitimately with the subject that the House delegated to the committee, moved that the committee rise, with the object of destroying the Bill. That motion was put to the vote and carried. There is no record of that vote. I repeat that I am quite willing to abide by the decision of this House, but I desire that the hon. gentlemen should come out of the woods and put their names on record, so that we might know who and where they are, and where they belong. This is not the first occasion that this sort of tactics has been resorted to. It is not the first occasion that I have had reason to complain of the assassination of a Bill, instead of meeting it openly and fairly, and either voting it down or carrying it by an open vote of the House. I prefer to attempt again to get an expression from this House, so that the country may know who favour the Bill by their votes and who not. I think I am entitled to that degree of fair-play, and I never shall surrender until I get it, if I live long enough to carry out my intention.

The Bill, of course, is one that I thoroughly believe is necessary for the good of this country. It is a Bill which many of my friends believe is not necessary. I have no quarrel with any member of this House, because he does not agree with me, but I have quarrel with any member of the House who has not the courage to go on record and let the country see where he stands. So long as the Bill is settled in the way it was last night, by a standing vote without a record, so long the country will be in ignorance of the character of the opposition to the Bill in this House, and the constituencies of the various members will be unable to relegate the responsibility where it belongs. I maintain that it is not a high-minded and honourable course to pursue with reference to any great public measure, and that is the chief reason I have for making the motion which I now present to the House, moved by myself and seconded by my esteemed friend (Mr. Scriver) :

That this House will, on Monday next, resolve itself again into a Committee of the Whole to

consider further the Bill (No. 2) entitled An Act to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest.

Mr. MACLEAN. I merely wish to say that it is one of the time-honoured rights of Parliament to deal with a Bill in the way in which this Bill was dealt with last night. Any number of Bills have been dealt with in this way by the British Parliament, by this Parliament and by every British legislature in the world. The hon. gentleman has attacked and called dishonourable this time-honoured right of Parliament; and if for no other reason I intend to vote in vindication of the rights of Parliament in this matter.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to say a word with regard to the proposal to reinstate this Bill. I voted against it last night in the House and in the committee. I did not then state all the reasons why I voted against it. We have the assurance of the Solicitor General, and we can see for ourselves, that the Dominion law, the Criminal Code, provides for the punishment of any infractions of the Lord's Day. We know that the statutes of the province of Ontario and of all the other provinces of the Dominion provide for the observance of the Lord's Day. We have the law in force now, not only in the Dominion but in all the provinces, to the same effect as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) wishes now to enact by this Bill. Now, I have been a member of this House for a good many years, and I have been for ten or twelve years supporting the hon. member for North Norfolk in his endeavour to promote this kind of legislation, and I find now that I cannot longer continue to do so, for various reasons. You know, the Liberal party is in power now. We made a great many pledges, not only in this House but in the country, that we were going to do a great many things when we got into power. One of the things we were chiefly interested in was economy; yet I find that for the last ten or twelve years we have been expending a large amount of money for this useless legislation, as I consider it, because we have devoted about two days every session during that time to its consideration. This useless legislation has cost this country about \$5,000 or \$6,000 every session, and I think it is time now that we should put a stop to it. I am not sure but we have spent enough in the last ten or twelve years on this Bill to pay the salary of the Governor General, \$50,000, for a whole year. We have spent enough in that time, Mr. Speaker, to pay your salary for twelve or fourteen years; and we can now see that there is no use of continuing to spend money in promoting legislation which is already of the Dominion Statute-book, and on the statute-books of the various provinces. This is the reason why I oppose the reinstating of this Bill on the Orders of the House. I think we have been fooling long enough

Mr. CHARLTON.

with this measure. It may be said by the promoter of this Bill that it is not a proper thing to defeat the Bill on a motion that the committee rise; but when legislation is proposed in the House that is useless and that incurs unnecessary expenditure, I think it is proper to stop it by any means within the scope of Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the vote is taken, I wish to state why I am going to vote against the motion. We have already, this session as in previous sessions, had this Bill before the House. It has had two or three days of legitimate discussion. There is other business to be done quite as important as this. The House has expressed its idea on the Bill, and I am of opinion that it should remain that way.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to say that I supported this Bill in all its previous stages during the present session, as well as a Bill of the same kind on former occasions. But to my mind the sentiment of this House was fully shown last night to be opposed to the Bill, and I, for one, am against taking up any more of the time of the House upon it during this session. I think the hon. gentleman who is promoting the Bill has had sufficient time allotted for its consideration, and whatever his purpose may be in bringing it forward, I realize that he has accomplished as much at any rate as he expected when he introduced it. For these reasons I will vote against the motion.

House divided on motion of Mr. Charlton :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bain,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Beith,	Lister,
Bethune,	Logan,
Blair,	Macdonald (Huron),
Britton,	Mackie,
Brown,	McCleary,
Calvert,	McClure,
Campbell,	McGugan,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McMillan,
Charlton,	McMullen,
Christie,	Meigs,
Copp,	Mulock,
Craig,	Oliver,
Davin,	Parmalee,
Douglas,	Pettet,
Dyment,	Richardson,
Featherston,	Roche,
Fisher,	Rogers,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Rutherford,
Ganong,	Scriver,
Gilmour,	Semple,
Graham,	Sifton,
Hale,	Tolmie,
Haley,	Wilson,
Hurley,	Wood (Brockville), and
Landerkin,	Wood (Hamilton).—52.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Hughes,
Beattie,	Joly de Lotbinière
Bell (Addington),	(Sir Henri),

Bell (Pictou),	Kloepfer,
Bennett,	Lang,
Bergeron,	LaRivière,
Bernier,	Lavergne,
Bertram,	Leduc,
Blanchard,	Legris,
Borden (Halifax),	Lemieux,
Borden (King's),	Lewis,
Postock,	Macdonald (King's),
Bourassa,	MacLaren,
Brodeur,	Maclean,
Burnett,	MacPherson,
Cameron,	McCormick,
Cargill,	McHugh,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McInnes,
Carroll,	McIcaac,
Carscallen,	McLennan (Inverness),
Casgrain,	McNeill,
Choquette,	Martin,
Clancy,	Mignault,
Clarke,	Mills,
Cochrane,	Monk,
Corby,	Montague,
Costigan,	Moore,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Morin,
Davis,	Osler,
Dechêne,	Penny,
Dugas,	Préfontaine,
Earie,	Proulx,
Ellis,	Quinn,
Erb,	Ratz,
Ethier,	Reid,
Fitzpatrick,	Rinfret,
Fortin,	Robertson,
Foster,	Rosamond,
Frost,	Savard,
Gauvreau,	Snetsinger,
Gibson,	Somerville,
Godbout,	Stenson,
Guay,	Tarte,
Guité,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Hardwood,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Henderson,	Hibbert), and
Feyd,	Wallace.—93.
Hodgins,	

Motion negatived.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) did not vote.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have a standing pair with the chief whip of the Government, who is not in his place.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is it premature to ask my right hon. friend what action the Government propose to take on this defeat?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I propose to leave the Sabbath to the laws of the provinces.

Mr. BERGERON. He did not vote that way.

The PRIME MINISTER. I bow to the will of the majority.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Klondike and Peace River Gold Mining, Land and Transportation Company (Limited).—(Mr. Davis, Saskatchewan.)

Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Canada Atlantic Transit Company.—(Mr. Choquette.)

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Logan.)

Bill (No. 94) to authorize the Canada Eastern Railway Company to convey its railway to the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)

Bill (No. 95) to authorize the Great Commonwealth Development and Mining Company (Limited Liability), and to change its name to the Alberta and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Nickel Steel Company of Canada.—(Mr. Wood, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the North Shore Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Edmonton and Peace Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the Montmorncy Cotton Mills Company.—(Mr. Penny.)

HARBOUR OF ST. JOHN.

Mr. ELLIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 101) respecting the harbour of St. John, N.B.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ellis) please explain the object of this Bill?

Mr. ELLIS. It is a private Bill, but I may say, that as a result of the amalgamation of the two cities, Portland and St. John, it has become necessary to bring the Portland portion of the harbour, Indian Town harbour, and the St. John harbour under one management.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MISSAQUASH COMMISSIONERS OF SEWERS.

Mr. LOGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 103) to confirm certain public Acts of the legislatures of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, so far as they relate to the Missaquash Commissioners of Sewers. He said: I may state that this Bill has reference to marsh lands which lie partly in the province of Nova Scotia and partly in the province of New Brunswick. By statute of Nova Scotia, chapter 42, power is given for the appointment of commissioners and, by chapter 115 of the Consolidated Statutes of the province of New Brunswick, similar power is given, and these commissioners are given power to reclaim lands. This Bill is designed to give power

to improve certain marshes and to confirm Acts of the two provinces with regard to marsh lands that lie partly in one province and partly in the other.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION—ACCOUNT OF P. LAMONT.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether the account of P. Lamont for \$93 is included in the Territorial Exhibition account and will be included in the Exhibition item in the Estimates? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Mr. P. Lamont's account amounted to \$93.70, and \$10 of it was paid, leaving a balance of \$83.70 still due. This amount is in the approved accounts and will be paid to Mr. Lamont when a revote is made, which, I hope, will be made this year.

THE PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. COPP asked,

Who is the superintendent of the Printing Bureau? When was he employed? What profession or calling did he follow previous to his appointment? Is he a practical printer? What are his duties? What is his salary? What were the total number of persons employed in the Printing Bureau, both inside and outside, on June 23rd, 1896? What changes, if any, have been made or taken place since said date? What was the total expenditure of said Printing Bureau for the years ending 30th June, 1895, 1896, 1897?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is no superintendent of the Printing Bureau. The superintendent of printing is Mr. William McMahon. He was first appointed on July 11, 1888, under the statute of first organization. He occupied for 17 years previous to his appointment a similar position to his present one with the contractors for Government printing. He was chief managing clerk with the contractors when the Bureau was organized. He is not a compositor but he has had the management of a printing office for 28 years, during which time he has been supervising the printing of the Canadian Government either under the contractors or at the Bureau. His duties are the management of the operatives and the superintendence of the manufacturing branch of the Bureau; including printing, stereotyping, binding, manufacture of blank books, and the manufacture of everything made in the building. The total number of persons employed in the Printing Bureau on June 23, 1896, was 416. The only changes made have been the usual suspensions of hands at the close of sessions of Parliament and their re-engagement when preparation is made for the assembling of Parliament. The number of hands varies in proportion to the work.

Mr. LOGAN.

Among the clerks one second-class clerk resigned last year. The post was abolished and his work was divided among others. Among the packers and carters four vacancies occurred by death or resignation. These were filled up and one new packer was added. The total expenditure of the Printing Bureau, including purchases of all kinds, for the years ending June 30th, in 1895, was \$675,607; in 1896, was \$612,415; in 1897, was \$618,070; of which the details are printed in the annual report of the department.

SCHOOL LANDS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked,

When have sales been held of school lands in the province of Manitoba? What acreage of lands sold, and the price per acre? What is the total amount realized? What interest has been allowed, or added to, the amount thus realized? What charges or expenses have been debited to the school lands account? What sums have been paid over to the Provincial Government of Manitoba from the school lands fund, with the dates of said payments?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Auction sales of school lands in Manitoba were held in 1882-83, 1883-84, 1886-87, 1887-88, 1888-89, 1891-92 and 1892-93. 2. 87,642.93 acres were disposed of at these sales; but, through cancellation of sales, 3,195.77 acres reverted, making an area of 84,451.16 acres actually disposed of, up to the 31st December last. The average price per acre was \$7.68. 3. \$650,960.71 is the amount for which the land actually disposed of was sold. The amount received up to the 31st December, 1897, was \$512,186.05. 4. Interest at 6 per cent, amounting to \$76,355.81, is included in this amount. 5. The School Lands Fund has been debited with a loan of \$30,000, made in 1879 and 1884 to the province of Manitoba, and with the expenses of management, consisting of inspection expenses, commission on sales, advertising, clerical assistance and printing and stationery, which amounted to \$28,940.73. 6. The following sums have been paid to the Provincial Government of Manitoba from the School Lands Fund, on account of interest:—

Dates.	Amount.
January 8, 1892.....	\$ 4,965 19
do	1,757 12
June 30, 1892.....	1,976 03
January 14, 1893.....	1,156 15
June 30, 1893.....	3,637 00
March 28, 1893.....	23 17
August 31, 1893.....	4,584 24
January 2, 1894.....	5,044 24
August 15, 1894.....	5,420 94
January 1, 1895.....	5,725 03
June 30, 1895.....	6,383 00
January 1, 1896.....	6,528 12
June 30, 1896.....	7,171 70
December 31, 1896.....	7,500 00
June 30, 1897.....	7,500 00
September 1, 1897.....	192 88
December 31, 1897.....	6,800 00

Making a total of..... \$76,364 84

Mr. SPEAKER. I would take advantage of the last two questions that have been asked, to suggest to hon. members that, when a question consists of a number of subsections, it would be much more convenient to number them, or to letter them, so that each subsection could be made to correspond with a similar designation in the answer.

MILITIA PROMOTIONS.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. How many field officers of the active militia have been promoted to the command of corps since 1st September, 1897, without their being in possession of equitation certificates? Were such promotions made in accordance with Militia General Orders?

2. How many officers have been promoted to field rank, and how many officers appointed adjutants of corps of the active militia since 1st September, 1897, without their being in possession of certificates of equitation? Were such promotions and appointments made in accordance with Militia General Orders?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I have received from Colonel Aylmer, the Adjutant General, on behalf of the General Officer Commanding, the following statement:—

1. Four. Two were made in accordance with Militia General Orders. The remaining two were, through inadvertence, passed during the first two weeks the new regulations were in force. These two officers have been called upon to obtain the necessary certificate. One has already done so; the other will without delay.

2. Six. Two were in accordance with Militia General Orders. In two cases officers were given their brevet majority, which they were entitled to and would have received before the regulations came into force, if they had made application. In another case, an officer was given brevet majority as a special case. The remaining case was owing to a clerical error. In all these cases steps have been taken to have the provisions of the General Order carried out.

LIQUOR PERMITS FOR THE KLONDIKE.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Has a permit, or have permits to take liquor into the Klondike district been given to William Chambers, clerk of the County Court, Oak Lake? If so, for what quantity?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). A permit to take 1,000 gallons of liquor into the Yukon district has been granted to William Chambers, of Oak Lake, Manitoba.

Mr. DAVIN. What date?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman did not ask the date; I have not got it.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Has a permit been given to one or more persons hitherto living in Brandon, to take liquor

into the Klondike district? If so, for what quantity?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No permits to take liquor into the Yukon district have been issued to any person, or persons, hitherto living in Brandon, Manitoba.

Mr. CRAIG. A few days ago, I asked a question about permits for taking whisky into the Yukon district. Is the hon. gentleman able to answer it to-day?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I have had prepared this return, showing the liquor permits granted by the Lieutenant-Governor of the Northwest Territories for the Yukon district, since January 1st, 1897:

Date of payment of fee.	Name of permittee.	Quantity and kind of liquor.	
1897.		Gallons.	
May 5..	Alaska Commercial Company	4,137	Whisky and otherspirits, ale & porter.
do 6..	Binet Bros.	2,000	
do 11..	T. M. O'Brien ..	600	Whisky.
do 12..	North-American Transportation & Trading Company.	2,000	do
June 12..	William Chambers ..	*	
Aug. 7..	Sullivan, McLeod & McPhee	1,000	do
do 20..	D. Menzies	500	do
do 30..		500	do
1898.			
Feb. 24.	Jas. H. Brown.....	15	do (for personal use)

* Quantity not reported by Lieutenant-Governor.

THE FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Before the Orders of the day are called, I would like to call the attention of my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to the fact that the French copy of the schedule of the Bill to amend the Franchise Act has not yet been printed and distributed. The English copy of that schedule, which is a very important paper, has already been distributed with the Bill. We wish to have it translated into French and printed. A great many hon. gentlemen want that paper very particularly. That schedule contains not only a list of some provincial statutes, but also a certain number of enactments in force in the various provinces of the Dominion. Now, it is desirable that that paper should be immediately translated into French, printed and distributed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick.) (Translation.) I cannot understand the reason why that schedule was not

translated into French and printed, as it is embodied in the Bill now before the House. Now, the Bill having been translated into French, the schedule should likewise have been translated.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) That matter should be attended to without delay.

CATTLE SHIPMENTS TO THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Mr. HUGHES. I take this opportunity, as it is the only one, perhaps, of which I shall be able to avail myself, to bring before the House the question which I intended to submit the other day, when I found myself out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman proposes to put himself in order, I suppose.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, I shall conclude my remarks with a motion. Under the British cattle regulations no cattle can be landed in Dublin, Belfast or Cork, in Ireland, and this restriction specially interferes with the cattle trade of Canada, and therefore I take the liberty of bringing it to the notice of the House. A number of vessels sail from Montreal every day in the week carrying cattle for ports in Scotland and England. Other large ones sail regularly from Montreal to Ireland, but those vessels are not allowed to carry cattle, and therefore we are handicapped as regards that trade. Our shippers also find during the shipping season a shortage of space, there is a lack of adequate storage accommodation in the summer particularly, and the cattle rates are thereby increased. If it could be brought about that our cattle could be taken to ports in Ireland, to Belfast, Dublin and Cork on these fine steamers, the same as they are carried to English and Scotch ports, I am satisfied it would make a very great difference in the rates our shippers are obliged to pay on cattle going across the ocean. I have a letter here to show the extent of the trade between Canadian ports and Irish ports, from which I shall read the following extract:—

In view of the traffic in Canadian cattle coming eventually to Ireland, we are at present negotiating for another very large steamer, which will carry over 9,000 tons, and if we could get permission to carry cattle she would be regularly employed in the Canadian trade.

For your information we inclose a comparative statements of the imports into Ireland by our lines during 1896-97. We are now running a regular winter line from St. John, under the subsidy arrangement, and are bringing forward immense quantities of Canadian products that never before came to Ireland. Five steamers have already been loaded and sailed this season, and we contemplate making a total of ten sailings before the end of April. Canadian flour is imported here now to a very large extent, while two years ago it was hardly known. Large quantities of rye and other grain are coming forward,

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

and whereas last year we had almost entirely to depend upon wood goods from St. John, this season we are almost independent of wood, and our boats are entirely filled with general cargo of Canadian produce.

The steamship line referred to is the Ulster Steamship Company, the vessels of which run from St. John in the winter and from Montreal in the summer. I am satisfied from the vast carrying capacity of those vessels that if they were allowed to carry cattle to Ireland, it would result in a great benefit to Dublin, Belfast and Cork, and would also benefit our Canadian farmers by leading to a reduction of freight rates across the Atlantic. I draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to this subject, and I make the ordinary motion that the House do now adjourn.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I desire to say a few words on this subject, not that I take any exception to the hon. gentleman's remarks, for they are such as will commend themselves to the House and the country. The condition of affairs, however, in regard to the question of landing our Canadian cattle at Belfast is one not so easy to overcome. We had considerable correspondence with the department in England, both before I came into office and since in reference to the establishment of abattoirs and cattle yards at Belfast for the landing of Canadian cattle. Representations were made to the Home Government, and they considered the question of the establishment of such yards, and referred the matter to the Government officials in Ireland, and they reported adversely. First, on the ground that there would be danger of the introduction of cattle disease into Ireland, Ireland at the present time being apparently more free from cattle disease than England or Scotland. Further, they pointed out that this was not a question as regards Canada alone, but by their regulations if cattle were allowed to come in from abroad, there would be no distinction made as between the cattle of one country and another, and if the Government established cattle yards for cattle brought in from abroad, they would be unable to discriminate and allow the cattle of one country to be there and not cattle of another country. So long as these countries are scheduled, our animals are prohibited altogether. At present in the whole country, speaking from memory, I think there are only four places where foreign cattle are allowed to be landed, namely, Deptford, for the London market; Bristol, Liverpool, Manchester and Glasgow; and the Imperial authorities seem to object to enlarging the number of those places, first, on general principles; second, on the ground that when you come to the particular case of Canadian cattle, if they allowed Canadian cattle to come in, they must also allow the cattle of foreign countries, and in the particular case referred to, the

matter was referred to the Imperial authorities in Ireland, and they reported against the proposal. The firm whose letter the hon. gentleman has just read have a line of steamers running from Montreal to Liverpool, and they made the generous offer to the Imperial authorities to provide the necessary accommodation and secure the perfect banishment of the cattle to such yards if they were established, and I am sure it is only because of the general policy of the Imperial Government that they are halting in meeting the views of those gentlemen. I will take occasion to again urge our High Commissioner in England, Lord Strathcona, to make representations to the Imperial Government, and I hope that, in view of certain events which have occurred recently, the Imperial Government will be more willing to extend a privilege which would be for the benefit of the Canadian trade; and knowing, as I do, the kind expressions uttered by the Ministers, especially the Secretary for the Colonies, I yet hope we may be able to secure the privilege which we were not able to procure when the correspondence under my hand originally took place.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The importance of this subject has been put before the House by the two hon. gentlemen who have spoken, and I shall not attempt to refer to it except to endorse the statement of the Minister as to the difficulty we have always found in securing the privilege to which my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) alluded. I rise for the purpose of asking the Minister of Agriculture: What efforts have been made during the past year to secure the repeal of the statute which prohibits Canadian stockers from the fields of Great Britain and Ireland? When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) announced to us that he had removed the quarantine restrictions as against the importation of American cattle, he was pleased to tell the House that he had not abandoned the hope of eventually securing the removal of the embargo against Canadian cattle in Great Britain. I hope the hon. gentleman has been endeavouring to bring to bear such influence as will finally succeed in that direction, and I should be glad if he will tell me, not only what efforts have been made but with what success his efforts have been met. There can be to my mind no more important question so far as the farming and stock-raising interests of Canada are concerned, and I sincerely hope that we have not a Government in power that will give up the agitation which was so long continued by their predecessors, which was so well fought by the present leader of the Opposition, and in which Canadians are so much interested. I sincerely hope we have not a Government in power that have given up that fight and have abandoned the hope of securing these advantages for us in the markets of Great Britain. I am sure the

hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) agrees with me, that the contention made by the British Board of Agriculture did not have a leg to stand on in regard to the unhealthy condition of Canadian herds, and if it had no foundation when the Conservative Government were fighting that point with the British Board of Agriculture, it certainly has less foundation now, since a couple of years have passed by and since the health of Canadian herds has continued to be successfully established and maintained in the meanwhile. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) is now in a rather better position than even we were to fight that point out with the British Board of Agriculture, and to win success for Canada.

I should like to ask him, too, whether the British Board of Agriculture has been advised that the ninety days quarantine against the importation of American cattle has been removed by this Government, and whether any opinion has been expressed by the British authorities on that point, and as regards its bearing on the contention Canada has been making for the removal of the embargo on our cattle.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). If I may claim the indulgence of the House I shall be glad to answer the questions of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague). In the first place I may say that the correspondence in regard to the Belfast Lairages shows that the contention of the British Government at the time when our cattle were scheduled, did have some influence with them in refusing to allow these cattle yards to be established in Belfast.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Quite so.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They did not put that forward as by any means the only reason, but the question of convenience and the question of foreign cattle being obliged to come in as well as Canadian, have been the chief ground of their objection. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) that I have not forgotten the position of affairs in regard to our cattle landing in England. Although I have not had any official correspondence with the Imperial authorities urging them to remove that embargo, I have had a good deal of conversation with Lord Strathcona, our High Commissioner, and he has informed me that he did not consider that last summer was a particularly favourable juncture for urging upon the Imperial authorities any action in this matter. I allowed myself to be largely guided by his opinion, because I thought that he was more familiar with political affairs in the old country, and more familiar with the personnel of the Government than I was; and not having had myself an opportunity of visiting England or discussing these matters with the authorities, I allowed myself to a great extent to be guided by his opinion. I think

the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) and the House will concur with me that the opinion of Lord Strathcona is one which may be fairly entitled to all respect. I may say further, that just recently the chief quarantine officer, Dr. McEachran, had to go to England on private business, and I asked him to inquire with regard to that matter. Dr. McEachran had several communications, which were entirely informal, with the veterinary authorities in England, and he also had communication with the Right Hon. Walter Long, President of the Board of Agriculture. That gentleman said that he thought it was quite impossible for us to hope for the removal of the embargo now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did he state his grounds?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No; he just said in a general way, that he thought it was an impossible thing at the present time. Dr. McEachran had conversations with gentlemen who are connected with the veterinary profession, amongst others. Professor Brown, one of the chief veterinarians, and Professor Brown said (I now quote from memory) that the veterinary profession in England had never really believed there was any disease in Canada, but that unfortunately we had got it from the United States and we had thereby forced them to pass this regrettable regulation scheduling our cattle. That of course was not an official declaration or communication in any way. I regret to say, I fear that at the present time, judging from what I have heard, there is not much prospect of our being able shortly to have the embargo done away with. I can appreciate the feelings of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague), I can assure him that I entertain the same, and I believe it would be very desirable if we could secure the removal of that embargo. We would then not only have the present advantages of having our cattle slaughtered at the port of landing, but where it is desirable we would be able to send them into the country, and export a class of stock which at the present time we cannot send to England.

By reason of the arrangement I was able to make last year we have got a market for that stock in the United States; a market which has proven itself to be so advantageous that—speaking again from memory, but sufficiently accurate for my purpose—that last October, when I was attending a meeting of agriculturists in the western part of Ontario, I was able to state to them, that while, during the years the quarantine existed against us in the United States less than 6,000 head of cattle had been sold into the United States; in the eight months since that quarantine had been taken off up to the date at which I was speaking, over 78,000 head of cattle had been sold to the United States from Canada. You can thus see what an enormous advantage that export

Mr. FISHER.

of stockers has been to our markets, not only because we have been able to sell these animals, but because in consequence of their sale the market here has been relieved of a surplus, by which relief the live stock which is held in Canada has appreciated considerably in value. I believe that was one of the chief reasons why during the past summer, Canadian beef cattle on the whole were at a fair price. But, Sir, I am still satisfied, that if we can get entry into the old country for our stockers we would have two strings to our bow, and be so much better off. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) that if there is anything in my power I can do I will be only too glad to do it to accomplish that end.

As to whether any remark was made by the English authorities upon the opening of our cattle market to the United States, and which would militate against our obtaining an entry into England, I may say that in the conversations which took place through Lord Strathcona and Dr. McEachran, they found that no such objection was raised, and the British authorities did not interpose that as any further reason why we should not be able to secure consideration.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture just another question, and I hope I am not intruding on your generosity, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. The generosity of the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The generosity of the House, which is expressed through you, Sir. I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture, whether or not, at the time the Prime Minister was in England, discussing with the Colonial Secretary the question of the preferential tariff, an opportunity was taken of trying to secure the removal of this obnoxious legislation. It appears to me that, instead of the time not being opportune, the time was most opportune; because, if I am correctly informed of the sentiment in Great Britain, from personal observation, as well as from the opinion of those in high places, I am quite convinced, as I believe this House is convinced, that the sentiment in Great Britain which goes to the support of the Act which prevents Canadian stockers going into Great Britain, is a sentiment of protection as regards the cattle industry, rather than one of consideration for the health of their herds; so that, I take it, the best opportunity that ever occurred for asking for its removal was at the time this Government was giving preferential tariff treatment to Great Britain.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If I may trespass on the forbearance of the House—

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will be very short, because this is out of order.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Certainly. In the first place, I may say that the communications and negotiations between the right hon. Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary were entirely confidential in their character, and, therefore, cannot be divulged. But I would further say to the hon. gentleman, that, as we gave the preferential tariff advantages to England without making any bargain, I do not think any bargaining of that kind would have been at all opportune.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Well, I can assure the hon. Minister that the people of the North-west Territories would have been well pleased, if the Prime Minister had bargained in order to get our cattle relieved of this embargo. I am very glad, however, to hear from the Minister that he does not intend to relax his efforts in trying to get rid of this objectionable legislation, and the people of the North-west will be very much obliged to my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) for bringing the matter to his attention in the manner he has done.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

THE PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE.

Mr. **CRAIG**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the Premier when the Bill providing for taking the plebiscite on the question of prohibition will be introduced.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). As soon as we have cleared the deck of the legislation which is now before the House, the Bill will be introduced forthwith.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I wish to mention a matter of great importance, of Imperial importance, of which I have given the Prime Minister notice. I have seen a letter from a high Japanese official, stating that a high Japanese diplomatic officer has telegraphed to his Government that the Government of Canada intends to pass a Bill imposing a tax of \$500 on each Japanese coming into this country. As things are at present, looking at the Imperial position and the advantage to England of friendship with the England of those eastern seas, inhabited by the Anglo-Saxons of the yellow races, I think it would be important that the Japanese Government should know what is the attitude of the Government of Canada in regard to the rumour which this official has set afloat.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may tell my hon. friend, that I have received a communication from the Japanese Consul at Vancouver, and I hope he will be satisfied with the answer which I have sent to him. I think the hon. gentleman can feel assured that the answer I gave was satisfactory. With regard to the other branch of his question, I can tell the hon.

gentleman, that the Government have no intention of introducing any such legislation at all.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—THE LUMBER SCHEDULE.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I would be very much obliged, if the colleagues of the Minister of Railways would suggest to him the propriety of bringing down and laying on the Table the last lumber schedule of the Intercolonial Railway. There have been several tariffs arranged. I understand, this year; and, as a great number of inquiries have been made with regard to it, it would be useful, if he would lay the last schedule on the Table at the next meeting of the House.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF THE BUTTER TRADE.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Reid in favour of granting a bonus for the encouragement of the export trade in butter.

Mr. **POPE**. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair, yesterday, for dinner, I was pointing out the importance of the question then under consideration. I fear that my appreciation of this question is not fully shared by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, for I fancy that, when the adjournment of the debate was moved, they did not then thoroughly understand the position the resolution would occupy on the Order paper to-day, or possibly it would not now occupy the favourable position it does. Those hon. gentlemen have expressed their deep interest in the agricultural portion of our population. The hon. member for North Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) delivered a speech yesterday in which he assured us that he was in every way very sympathetic with the interests of the farming community; but he did not think it was necessary that a bonus of a cent a pound, or any inducement, should be offered to the butter industry of this country. Well, I am sure that, when the members of this House know the very comfortable position which that hon. gentleman occupies, under the tariff of this country, when they realize that he is drawing, day by day, a revenue because those features of the tariff which affect his business as a manufacturer of agricultural implements have been left undisturbed, it will not lend special weight to the remarks made by that hon. gentleman. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were on this side of the House, claimed for years that they were the true friends of the farmers of this country. They advertised themselves as such by their speeches in this House and throughout the country, and they declared that, when they came into power, the great agricultural interests of the country would receive the consideration which they had never received

before ; that the duties on the articles which were so essential to the prosperity of the farmers of this country would be removed ; that they would no longer be weighed down by the oppression of a high tariff, that free trade throughout the length and breadth of the country would take the place of the sinful, wicked tariff of the Conservative party. Well, we have seen, I believe, the duties somewhat lowered upon wheat, we have seen the duties somewhat lowered upon flour, but when it comes to agricultural implements, the interests of which industry are buoyed up by my hon. friend from Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) we do not find any reduction. What special benefit or gain would come to the wheat and flour-producing people of Canada by the removal of the duties it is difficult, of course, for hon. gentlemen on this side to understand, but we are bound, I suppose, to accept it as a part of the wise policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. They have, however, the advantage over us of being able to argue that the statements they made during the last seventeen or eighteen years were then in the interests of the people of this country, but that since the change which has taken place by their crossing from this side of the House to the other—not more than twenty feet between the two sides, the chairs practically cushioned the same, but the salary attached to some of the front seats larger—these statements must be completely reversed. It must be the larger salary connected with the hon. gentlemen opposite who sit on the front benches and formulate a policy for their sheep-like following that makes the policy which for seventeen years they denounced in Opposition a perfectly sound policy when it comes to be handled by them in office.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture never was a warm friend of the butter-producing interests of this country. But I must do him the justice of saying that he was not hypocritical, he did not blind his constituents to the fact. In that particular, the hon. gentleman was always fair. We find in a speech delivered by him a few years ago, that he put himself on record on that question. He then assured the farmers and the people of Canada that he was not blinded to the greater interests of Canada, and was not going to do anything for the sake of fostering the dairy industry of any particular locality or of Canada as a whole. We find that in a debate which took place in this House he used those words :

But anxious as I am to see the agricultural interests, and especially the dairy interest, of the country carefully guarded—and I say this as representing one of the greatest dairy counties in this Dominion, a county according to the last census which made the second greatest amount of butter of any county in the Dominion—still I do not wish to see the dairy interest guarded at the expense of any other interest in the Dominion.

Mr. POPE.

There we find the hon. gentleman declaring frankly that, so far as he was concerned, the dairy interest of Canada need never look to him as a special friend.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.
Give the date of that.

Mr. POPE. The session of 1886, vol. 1, pages 549 and 550.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.
Hear, hear.

Mr. POPE. A little further on, at page 550, we find this warning recorded coming from the hon. gentleman :

I do not see why the production of these articles—that is, oleomargarine and butterine—should be forbidden in this country, and if it does work an inconvenience to the dairymen of the country, their true remedy would be to manufacture a still better article of butter.

The hon. gentleman went so far as to put himself on record in favour of substituting oleomargarine and butterine for butter in this country. We have therefore no right to expect from him, if he is still true to his policy on record, any great assistance in the development of the dairy interests of Canada. But perhaps the hon. gentleman has changed in that particular, as these hon. gentlemen have changed in every other particular, and possibly to-day he is prepared to reverse the policy he formerly advocated. But I thought, when I heard the hon. gentleman in his own constituency during the last election, that he was still of the same opinion. We were there discussing the question of cold storage and the fast line of steamers, and the hon. gentleman was arguing to his constituents against the introduction of cold storage and the establishment of the fast line. I notice that he looks somewhat astonished. Sir, whenever you call these hon. gentlemen back to any record of theirs, they always look astonished. That seems to be their only answer. In fact, the other night some of them objected because we were referring to the past, and voiced their objection by a chorus of "oh, ohs." That was their only answer when hon. gentlemen on this side dared, for the sake of comparison, ask them for a moment to consider seriously the policy they had formerly laid down on the floor of this House, and offered to the people for criticism and consideration. But despite their "oh, ohs," we propose to call these hon. gentlemen to account, by contrasting the pledges they made in the past with their conduct in the present. If they have not carried out these pledges, they have to take the consequences and receive the censure that is due to every political organization, no matter what its name may be, that stands up seriously before the electorate and makes solemn promises and pledges and then fails to carry them out when the people have given it the opportunity of doing so. We have the right

to call upon them to stand still and mark time until the people of Canada can give their record serious consideration.

The hon. gentleman has taken considerable credit to himself and has been given a good deal of credit by certain people for the establishment of the cold storage system in this country, so far as it has gone, but it is a matter of record, to be found in the Estimates and the reports of this country, that the establishment of cold storage is not due to these hon. gentlemen. I am bound to say that I feel ashamed of the little progress which has been made in that system under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. When I saw that he was to be Minister of Agriculture, and that the introduction of that system was therefore to be entrusted in his hands, I knew that we would have to wait for his conversion to the project, I knew we would have to give him some time to change the position which he then held on that question. What are the facts? Take any of the countries that export agricultural products to England, take Australia, New Zealand, South America, take any portion of the known globe, and you will find that we are the only country exporting to Great Britain which has not to-day a perfect system of cold storage. That we, who stand better in the financial market, who are the largest exporters of agricultural products of all kinds, and the greatest producers of certain classes of products that can only be forwarded safely and profitably under a system of cold storage, should be the only portion of the known globe which is in the condition I have stated, which has not a first-class, well-equipped cold storage system between this country and England, is a fact which reflects no credit on the hon. gentleman.

He has spent two years' time trying to bore a three-inch hole with a gimlet. The hon. Minister has been experimenting, with the result, as we find, that he has been trifling away the money of the country and accomplishing very little. If he wants to have a system of cold storage transportation between Canada and England, why does he not go to one of the well-established lines that are running now from the four corners of the globe to deliver goods in the British market, lines whose very crews understand the operation of the cold storage system, whose owners have studied the scientific as well as the practical side of the question? Why does he not get some of these vessels to ply between Canada and England? Give them sufficient encouragement, and let us have, not in some future year but this season, as we ought to have had last season, a well-equipped first-class line of steamers plying from the ports of Canada to the ports of Great Britain. Instead of this, we have a few cold-storage boxes. We are practising experiments in a thing that has grown gray-headed with

actual use in other parts of the world. But the hon. Minister says that it is progress, that it is advancement in keeping with the greatest colony of Great Britain with the greatest agricultural exporting portion of the globe—that we should be spending our time and money experimenting with ice-boxes when every portion of the colonies has a first-class line of steamers plying from its ports to Great Britain. This is the Minister's estimate of progress. Well, Sir, the hon. Minister has given us some other evidences that he is not thoroughly in sympathy with the dairy interests of this country. We used to have by the bagfull reports that we circulated among our farmers, educating them in the latest experimental knowledge upon agricultural affairs. But of late we have seen these reports only in very limited quantities, they are not obtainable by large quantities.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.
What is that?

Mr. POPE. The annual report, if that is what you call it—the experimental farm reports. You know where the experimental farm is, out here at the outskirts of the city. They publish a report for that farm, and we used to get those reports in large quantities so that we could distribute them to every farmer in our constituencies if we wished. Since the hon. gentleman became Minister of Agriculture, we find that the number of these valuable books of information that we receive is reduced to a very few, if, indeed, we get any beyond the supply for the members of Parliament themselves.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Rose prints them now.

Mr. POPE. I do not know whether her name is Rose or Dennis. But I am bound to say that these books were generally and closely read, and it is only right that the results of the work of these experimental farms which have been established throughout Canada should be made known to the agriculturists of the country. When we take into account the lack of agricultural education in our schools—though I am glad to see improvement in that respect by the provincial authorities—when we consider that a large portion of our farmers in every province are to-day tilling the soil and engaging in dairying and other agricultural pursuits without any special preparation for their business, the establishment of these experimental farms by the Government that preceded the present Government is seen to have been an exceedingly wise step. But, in order that the results of these experiments might be known to the people who could use this knowledge to their own benefit and to the benefit of the country, in order that we might get some good from the large amount of money expended year after year, the circulation of these reports throughout the length and breadth of

the land was necessary. So, I trust that when the hon. Minister wakens up to the fact that these reports are much appreciated and that they are of great benefit to the agriculturists of this country, the circulation of these reports in as large quantities as before will be resumed. I know that these reports are read. I know that the land is prepared according to the directions there given by hundreds and thousands of farmers throughout Canada. The hon. Minister should be alive to his opportunities in this respect. But if I remember well, when these farms were established the hon. gentleman expressed the opinion that to have experimental farms in the various provinces was unnecessary and that all the work should be done from one central point. I know that he has found that, in this particular, as in many other particulars, his judgment was not good, that he was not standing then upon solid ground. He has found that Canada is large, that it has not only great variety of soil but also great variety of climate and conditions that must be taken into consideration. So we find that when he is entrusted with the administration of the department that he was criticising the various experimental farms maintained in the different provinces, so far as I know, just as they were established by the Government that preceded this—proving conclusively that the hon. Minister, like many other hon. gentlemen, was mistaken in those early days and that to carry out these experiments effectively the special conditions of Manitoba and British Columbia and other parts of the country had to be considered. If the establishment of these farms is a good idea, it is better that the report giving the result of their experiments should be distributed throughout the length and breadth of the country to everybody who is interested in farming and who wishes that information. Now, I know that the hon. gentleman could not expect me to say less on that point than I have said. I would feel very reluctant to say anything that would in the slightest degree hurt the hon. gentleman's feelings. But as he is on record, by that record he must stand, and if the duty of pointing out the inconsistencies of the position occupied by the hon. gentleman falls upon me, I discharge that duty as a public man should, that the people may be in a position to judge of the inconsistent positions taken by hon. gentlemen opposite.

In regard to the question particularly under consideration, I know that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House hold views different from those expressed by myself. But I do feel, Sir, that the time has arrived when we have to take into serious consideration the disposition of the surplus milk of this country. It is no longer possible for us to blind our eyes to the fact that we are producing in this country all the cheese that anybody is ready to buy of us.

Mr. POPE.

We are also aware of the fact that the quantities of milk to be produced in Canada will be larger and larger every year, and it is essential to open our eyes to the fact that we have too much of one product in the world's market, and we should have some consideration for those people who are producing that article. Now, the Minister of Agriculture has an army of well-trained scientific and practical men at his service, and he is in a better position than any other hon. gentleman in this House to offer us a suggestion. But when he offers us nothing, when he says: I see no way clear to provide a market for the surplus milk of the farmers that is crowding into a market already glutted; I do not feel it my duty, as administrator of the Department of Agriculture, to step forward and offer any assistance to these farmers—then, I say, that we have to find some solution ourselves of these problems, and I think one solution is found in the resolution offered by my hon. friend on this occasion. I think the hon. Minister should offer us some substitute—not oleomargarine, or substitutes of that kind—but he should offer us some suggestion worthy of consideration, as to where he is going to place this surplus milk, what he is going to do for those settlements in Canada which are unlike the North-west, produce beef in quantities for exportation, like New Zealand and Australia, who bring their meat products into the market of Great Britain to drive ours out. Under these circumstances, I say, these people have no other alternative than to place themselves in the ranks of the dairymen. But they are inexperienced in that business; they are inexperienced in the production of milk, and they are not in a position of people in those parts of the country who have long been manufacturing butter and cheese. Therefore, I say, these people should have a right to the serious consideration of the hon. gentleman. I know of no other method but by a bonus of reaching these people, no way of inducing first-class men to go among them and introduce a new system, which will take three or four years to change the conditions, to change the practice of having cows calve in spring, and cause them to calve in the autumn, in order to bring about the best results of dairying. I say that, where all that has to be done, you have no right to expect a good butter-maker to go there, and establish a factory, and take the chances of success. It will take him at least three years to convert that community into a dairying community, and it will also entail a temporary loss upon those farmers. But it is necessary that these people should receive some consideration. I am bound to say that I fully appreciate the work of the department in sending lecturers to speak to these people, but still, these lecturers have established no factory, they have left behind them no plant in operation. Now, the hon.

gentleman has gone to the North-west, and he has put in some factories there; he has established factories throughout that section of the country for the making of butter and cheese. Does he not call that an essential operation? This proposition was objected to by some of his supporters, because it had a sectional character, and now we have the very Act of the hon. gentleman himself, which, of course, he knows is sectional. I do not object to the principle as being sectional, I do not object to the principle of his introducing dairying into that section of the country; but I say that there are parts of the province of Quebec, there are outlying portions of the province of Ontario, and there are many parts in the east, which have no future at all except in the dairy business, and these need that sectional consideration of the Government just as much as any portion of the North-west Territories. In that respect, I think the hon. gentleman might have expended some of that money in the east, in the good dairy sections, in sections which must be absolutely devoted to dairying, and which have no future outside of dairy farming. They can never produce wheat to compete with the wheat lands of the west, they can never produce beef to compete with the ranching sections of the North-west Territories, and, year after year, they find themselves compelled to abandon their former methods of farming and go to dairying. I say, those sections of the older provinces, those sections that are well populated, those sections where the people have been for generations trying to eke out a living from their farming operations, should have commended themselves, first of all, to the consideration of the hon. gentleman. The virgin soil of the west produces wheat and flour second to none in the world, and produces beef better and easier than it can be produced in any other portion of this Dominion, and I think they might well have been left for future consideration as respects encouragement given to dairying. So I think the hon. gentleman has laid himself open to criticism in that regard, and it is a question, to my mind, whether he has really done the people of the North-west a particular benefit, under all the circumstances.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Ask the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

Mr. POPE. The hon. member for Assiniboia paid the hon. gentleman a compliment, the other day, for having expended a great deal of money in his vicinity. I do not believe the hon. member for Assiniboia is above appreciating the expenditure of public money in his section of the country; I believe he is thoroughly practical in that respect. But I started out by saying, that I do not seriously object to it. At the same time, I think it is open to criticism, from the fact that the hon. Minister has passed by the older provinces of the Dominion, which are obliged to get their living out of

dairying alone; he passes by those sections, and offers them, not only a competition in the beef and in the wheat that they do produce, but, by the result of his action, he is going to offer them competition in dairying, as well. Now, I do not believe that many portions of the older provinces of Canada will appreciate the expenditure the hon. gentleman has made in the North-west, and the hon. gentleman will find that criticisms will be made upon his policy by others, as well as myself, criticisms more severe and more practical than any that I have made on this occasion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down, in one sentence of his remarks, said that I could not expect him to say less than a certain thing. I can assure the hon. gentleman that, knowing his manner of speech, both in the House of Commons and elsewhere—because I have known him ever since he made his political *début*, some eight or nine years ago—

Mr. FOSTER. Has not the hon. gentleman already spoken?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Excuse me, there is a new question before the House since I spoke.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Minister has already spoken on the motion, but since that time there has been a motion to adjourn moved. The hon. gentleman has a right to speak.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member need not think he can save himself from the remarks I shall make. The hon. gentleman is well known to me and his manner of speech, both in this House and elsewhere, is well known to me, and known to those who have followed his course in public life, that not only did I expect him to say what he said last, but I wondered that the hon. gentleman did not say more. The hon. gentleman's manner of speech and the substance of his speech are well known to me and known to all those who have been acquainted with him since he entered public life. The hon. gentleman came into the House to try and fill the shoes of his father, who was well known, and the present member for Compton could not fill those shoes as he thought he could. The hon. gentleman went back to the old stories, I will not call it the old history of 1888 when the subject of oleomargarine was up in this House, and he undertook to quote from a speech delivered by me on that occasion, a speech thoroughly threshed out in the county of Brome in 1889, when the hon. gentleman's myrmidons in all the eastern townships came into the county and tried to defeat me, after the assertion had been made by the hon. gentleman's father that I had made such statements on the floor of Parliament that I never would come back into the House.

In spite of the hon. gentleman's action and that of his party I came back to Parliament with a majority of 379, the largest majority secured by any member for Brome in any election. That question was threshed out, and the hon. gentleman knows and the country knows the stand I took on that and other questions since that time. Although the hon. member came into my county in 1896, what was the result? He held two meetings. I met him at each, and I gained the largest majority that I ever received in any election, except in 1887, and although he and all the strength of the Conservative party were thrown into the contest in an effort to defeat me, which they had only succeeded in doing in 1891, by what means I will not say, I was elected by a majority of 333 against the strongest man in the eastern townships who could contest the county of Brome. The hon. gentleman may try to throw accusations across the House, but I tell the hon. gentleman and the party with which he is associated that they cannot do away with my record before the House and the country and before my own county, and I am prepared not only in any county and in the country, but also on the floor of Parliament, to discuss with the hon. gentleman every utterance I have ever made on the floor of Parliament or elsewhere. The hon. gentleman after going over old stories, which, I repeat, I will not call history, because they are not history, began to say a few words on the question before the House, which he at last reached. The hon. gentleman did not endorse the proposition to give a bonus for butter-making just now. He did not go into the details, but wanted to know where would we find a market for our butter. Already there is a good market for milk prepared into the highest form of production into which it can be converted, namely, butter, in the English market, and it does not require artificial stimulus, in the shape of a bonus, to make a reputation for our butter on the English market, because that reputation is already made, and largely made by reason of the transportation facilities which my system of cold storage has established for the export trade. The hon. gentleman spoke about cold storage, and said I had adopted the principle of my predecessor in office. I grant that my predecessor made a small step in the direction of cold storage; that he adopted what was considered at that time an effective cold storage system. But the world moves, and we have progressed into something better and more efficient in respect to cold storage, in the form of mechanical cold storage, by which system we have been able to afford proper transportation for butter to England. The system of cold storage which my predecessor was trying was insulation by ice to keep the products perfectly cold. The system was not effective, it was not expected to be effective, it was only tentative. I have been able to accomplish much by the adoption of

Mr. FISHER.

mechanical cold storage, which is in existence, not, as the hon. gentleman said, in old boxes crossing the Atlantic, but in the best steamers leaving the ports of Canada. The hon. gentleman no doubt was making allusion to cold storage on the fast line, and he again referred to what I said in my campaign in regard to cold storage. He did not say, however, that I had opposed cold storage. I never opposed cold storage. I believe that what the late Minister of Agriculture was doing was a good thing. I knew what he was doing and I endorsed it, and I proposed to go further as soon as I came in to office. At the present time instead of cold storage by which to-day our goods have been carried to England in old boxes, we are carrying them in the largest vessels equipped with cold storage, the largest and best vessels of the Elder-Dempster Line, the largest and best of the Allan Line, the Dominion Line and the Reford Line, all of which are fitted up in consequence of our work done last year, and the inducements which Parliament enabled me to hold out to those companies. That is not the fast line, which I hope we yet will procure; but they are good freight boats, and they are doing splendid work, and we are improving the reputation of our butter in England to such an extent that any such proposition as the one now before the House is not needed to make a reputation for our product. The hon. gentleman has spoken in general terms of the dairying interest, and has referred to the North-west Territories and the work I have done there. The hon. gentleman himself has practically endorsed my work there. He is aware that the work was fully explained in this House. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues did not dare to raise their voices or say a word in opposition; they endorsed that work, although they had not the courage, when they were in office, to undertake it and carry it out. Now that it is completed, they are trying to take away from me the credit of having done it. The hon. gentleman says that the action of the Government will be criticised in the eastern part of the Dominion because, forsooth, it will compete with the dairying interest in the east. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. He has not found out, although the people of the country generally know, that the butter made in the North-west last summer almost all went to the west and did not come east, where our eastern butter is sold.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope), if he knows anything about farming and about the dairying industry, ought to know that if any poor butter is sent from Canada to England, it will injure the reputation of all Canadian butter. He knows that if we can establish the dairy industry in any corner of the Dominion of Canada, that will be of the greatest advantage to the dairy interests in every quarter of Canada. The hon. gentleman's friends have

boasted in Prince Edward Island of what they had done for the dairying interests in that province, but did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) go through the province of Quebec and tell the farmers that the late Government was hurting their dairying interests when they tried to establish dairying in Prince Edward Island? Not a bit of it. His political friends went to the province of Prince Edward Island and boasted of what they were doing, and on the floor of this House not a voice was raised against the work which Prof. Robertson had done so well in Prince Edward Island. The result of that work in the island province is that to-day the dairy industry there is able to stand on its own feet, and does not ask for or want help from the Dominion Government. It was because I believed that the work could be carried on in the North-west Territories, and that the same results could be accomplished as in Prince Edward Island, that I introduced a measure which has been endorsed by this House unanimously. I have no doubt whatever that there are parts of the older provinces where the dairy industry is not so far advanced as in other parts; but if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) knew what he was talking about he would know that in the older provinces the local governments are doing the teaching in dairy work. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) knew about the constitution of the country sufficiently, he would know that everything in connection with education is the special business of the local legislatures, and not of the Dominion Parliament; and while it is perfectly right for us here to encourage a new industry in any part of Canada, we would be stepping outside of our sphere if we undertook to conduct teaching in the different provinces of the Dominion. We in this Parliament, however, stand in the position towards the North-west Territories of a provincial legislature towards its province, and we have to do for the North-west Territories a good deal of what the different local legislatures do for themselves. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) branched off from the subject before the House to speak about the experimental farms, and here again I am rather surprised—I do not know that I ought to have been, because I know that the hon. gentleman often speaks without thinking and without going to the bottom of the subject he is addressing himself to—but still, I am surprised that he does not know that the reports of the farms are distributed straight from the farm, and that last year and the year before over 50,000 copies of the farm reports were sent to the farmers of this country.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Would the hon. gentleman state on what basis they are distributed and by whom?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall. There is a list made out at the

farm of all those whose names are sent in; that list is kept permanently, and all the publications of the farms are sent to these people.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman repeat that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a list kept on the farms, a permanent list, a mailing list, as it is called.

Mr. MONTAGUE. By whom is that supplied?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That has been gradually accumulating at the farm. It is supplied by the names of everybody who makes an application to the farm being put upon the list. It is made up by any one sending a name to the farm to have it put on the list.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Have the members of the House been asked to add to that list?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The members of the House can at any time send a name. They have been notified over and over again that there is that list, that they can send names to that list, and any persons who wish to have their names put on the list can do so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am quite aware of that, but I do not think, so far as I am concerned—I speak for myself and I fancy I speak for other members who represent farming constituencies—that we have been specifically told that we should be given a certain number of copies of the report, and instead of having copies of these reports distributed by ourselves that we should send to the officers of the department the names of those to whom we wish these reports sent.

Mr. McMULLEN. When I was in Opposition I received from Prof. Saunders an invitation to send the names of any persons I wished these reports sent to, and he would send them from the farm.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I never got any such invitation.

Mr. WALLACE. These names that Prof. Saunders asked the members to send in were the names of persons to receive the bulletins, and not the experimental farm reports at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Quite so.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) should know that the course I am outlining is the one that was carried on when the hon. gentleman and his predecessors were in office. I have made no change in it; I did not think that any change was necessary, and I did not think that that could be very much improved on. I know perfectly well that dozens, I may say hundreds of lists on different occasions and in different seasons have been received

by the officers of the farms from members of the House of Commons asking for certain literature to be sent to certain people. Invariably these requests have been acceded to, and whenever any such name is given to the farm, that name is put upon the list. The list has been accumulating for years. It has been accumulating to such an extent that this year I ordered it to be gone over so that the names of dead people, the names of those whose reports had been sent back, the names of people who apparently had paid no attention to the reports and bulletins they had received by acknowledging the receipt of them or asking for more, might be struck off.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to interrupt him for a moment, because I think this is a most important question.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Quite so, but it is entirely outside the question we are discussing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So far as the members of the House are concerned, what I understood is this: That the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) has stated that instead of the members being supplied with the copies of these reports to distribute to their constituents, the agriculturists of the various provinces, that these were now being supplied by the department itself through the officers of the farm; and then immediately succeeding that statement, if such statement was made—I confess I was not listening very carefully at the moment—

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then no such statement was made?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not in the sense you seem to have understood it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then what I want to inquire is this: The list of farmers, the hon. gentleman says, to whom these reports are now sent is the same list which was in existence when we were in power, but which, of course, has been added to from year to year. Now, then, I tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) that in addition to that list, thousands and thousands of those reports were scattered by the hands of the various members of this House—

Mr. TAYLOR. On both sides.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Upon both sides of the House. I want to say that if the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have received notice that instead of circulating these reports from the House by their own hands, they should send in a list of names of the farmers and have them distributed in that way, if that has been done

Mr. FISHER.

with regard to the hon. gentlemen opposite, it certainly had not been done in the case of hon. members on this side.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No such notice was received by us.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If that has been done with regard to hon. gentlemen opposite, it has not been done to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and if, as it appears, it has not been done to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, then no such information, I take it, has been given to the members of this House, and my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope) had a perfect right to find fault with the statement.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have made no change in the arrangement since I came into office with regard to the distribution of these reports and bulletins. I have been informed by Prof. Saunders that he has a list, which he told me last year numbered over 57,000 names.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What list is that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is the mailing list of the experimental farm. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) would be kind enough to sit down until I finish my statement he will understand.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What publications are sent?

Mr. CAMPBELL. If you sit down he will tell you.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman from Kent (Mr. Campbell) is not asked; he knows nothing about it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) will allow me to finish, he will understand; if he interrupts before I finish he cannot understand. To these names every publication of the farm is sent, except certain special publications, such as particular bulletins on particular subjects; for instance, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) asked me the other day to have something prepared about tobacco. I have taken steps to do so, but that document will not be sent to all the names on the list, and it will be sent only to those to whom we think it would be valuable. Special bulletins are sometimes made out with regard to particular fruit sections or particular fruit subjects, and these are not sent to the whole list; but the farm reports and all the farm bulletins are sent to these 50,000 odd names. These lists are not made up by me or by any official, but are the result of the accretions of names sent in for the farm literature. Everybody who makes application for that literature has his name placed on the list, and it is sent to him, whe-

ther his name is recommended by a member of Parliament or not; and any member of Parliament may send in as many names now as when the hon. gentleman was in office.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, I understand from what the hon. gentleman says that he proposes to confine the distribution to the names on this list, instead of making it through the members of the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. I have told the hon. gentleman that I have not made any change in the system that was in vogue when he was in office; that is to say, if a member of Parliament asked for any reports, he would receive what reports he asked for; but there was no system of sending so many hundreds or thousands of these reports to the member of the House for distribution. There never has been such a system. I would ask the ex-Minister of Agriculture if, during his term of office, he ordered a number of the reports to be sent to each member for distribution? I know that when I was a member of the House, I never received the farm reports in bundles by the hundred. That has never been the practice, so far as I am aware.

Mr. WILSON. I have sent out hundreds myself.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose you asked for them.

Mr. SCRIVER. A large number were voted by the Committee on Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Now we are coming to another point altogether. Sometimes the Committee on Agriculture of this House ordered a certain number of thousands of copies of the farm report for distribution. Hon. gentlemen opposite are perhaps confusing two things. There are the farm reports, and there is the evidence of the various officers of the farm given before the Committee on Agriculture, and that committee orders the report of that evidence to be printed and distributed to the members of the House. But I think hon. gentlemen opposite will find that they are mistaken in thinking that at any time a certain fixed number of the farm reports or farm bulletins have been sent to the members of the House for ordinary distribution. I speak subject to correction, for I never made special inquiry at the farm to find out.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. gentleman will find that a certain number of the bulletins, not a very large number, were sent to each member of the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If that is the hon. gentleman's remembrance of the practice during his tenure of office, I will look into the matter. But I want to reply to another matter which the hon. ex-

Minister of Agriculture has alluded to. I want to say this emphatically and clearly: I have made no difference whatever between the members on one side of the House and those on the other side. No member on this side has received any information or intimation, or has been consulted in any way, more than the members on the other side. The hon. ex-Minister of Agriculture will, I hope, understand this and listen to it and take it in.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am very obtuse, but I will try to take it in.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am very glad the hon. gentleman will; but he does not seem to be paying much attention when I am replying to him as politely as I can. The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), wandering away from the subject at issue, began to talk about the experimental farm, and among other things said that I had objected to something in connection with that farm. I am not going to rake over old records or old "Hansards"; but if he or any other hon. gentleman chooses to consult the "Hansard" of that date, he will find that I was a member of a committee appointed to inquire into the agricultural industry, the chairman of which was Mr. Gigault, and that I endorsed the report of that committee in favour of the establishment of these farms; and when Mr. Carling, then Minister of Agriculture, stated that he was going to establish these farms, I arose in my place in the House and endorsed the proposition, and from that day to this I have always taken a deep interest in the success of the farms, whether I have been in the House or out of the House. I believe these farms are doing a good work, and it is by reason of the distribution of the reports and bulletins that the farmers of this country are reaping the benefit of the good work they are doing. I have nothing further to say on the matter. I spoke on the main motion as fully and clearly as I could, and nothing that has been said leads me to change my view. I am satisfied that the butter industry of this country is advancing by leaps and bounds, and it is advancing in a sure and stable way, and that without resorting to any such method as is now proposed—a method which has been more or less discredited in other countries, and which was tried in the province of Quebec but without success. I think it would be unwise for the House to adopt this resolution, and unwise for the people of this country to pin their faith to any such artificial stimulus to the great industry of butter-making.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, on the present occasion we are discussing the advisability of granting a bonus for the manufacture of the finest fresh creamery butter. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, in the course of his remarks, said that the butter industry at the present time

was of such a good basis that it did not require any stimulus of that kind. I may say, in reply to that, that when the present Government is granting a bonus to the cheese industry of the North-west at the present time, notwithstanding the fact that the cheese industry of this country is in a very flourishing condition—

Mr. DAVIN. To butter, not to cheese.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) The fact that the late Government undertook to foster the cheese industry in the province to Prince Edward Island, has resulted in that province taking a foremost place in that industry. That province is making cheese which I think is second to none manufactured in Canada, and I think I am safe in saying that according to its area and population, it manufactures more than any other portion of Canada. That was brought about by the action of the late Government in coming to the assistance of the cheese industry. I believe that the same results could now be accomplished by the Government granting a bonus in accordance with the terms of this resolution to the butter industry, not only to the people of Prince Edward Island, but to the people of Canada generally. We know that the butter industry is away behind the cheese industry, which is now on its feet and can look after itself. The people of Prince Edward Island are now beginning to turn their attention to the making of butter, and I think that, if the Government were to promote that industry in a small way, by granting a bonus, such as is recommended in this resolution, it would go very far to give that industry the same start that was formerly given the cheese industry. Our people are also giving their attention to the hog-raising industry, which is, I believe, even greater than the cheese or butter industry, and the development of which will develop these latter industries.

But I got on my feet, Mr. Speaker, more particularly to refer to the distribution of the reports and bulletins from the experimental farm. I am informed from my province, that there are certain gentlemen down there who have taken to themselves the whole credit for the distribution of these reports. I have always understood, as the hon. Minister has just told us, that there was a permanent list at the experimental farm of names to whom these reports and bulletins should be sent. That used to be the case, and I am glad to see that the hon. Minister has continued that practice. The names on that list used to be furnished by members of Parliament, but any individual applying could also have his name inserted. The list was not confined to any particular party. At any rate, any names that were handed in by me were not restricted to either party. These reports were distributed for the general improvement of the people, and I am very glad, indeed, to hear that

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.)

the hon. Minister is continuing that very good system and keeping up the list.

There is another matter, in connection with the cheese and butter business, that is of as much importance, in my opinion, as a bonus, and that is the providing of cold storage facilities for shipment to the English market. I trust, that the Government will see their way clear to have some one of the various lines of steamers now plying between Canada and England, call at the province of Prince Edward Island, during the summer months at least, in order that the people of that province may have some small share of the benefits to be obtained from the cold storage system, which is so necessary to bring across the Atlantic our butter and cheese products. I hope that the Government will not overlook this very important matter to the people of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. McNEILL. Perhaps I may be allowed to say a word on this subject, because I think I was the first member of this House to bring up this question of the importance of obtaining a market for our butter in England. I remember very well, a good many years ago, bringing up this question, but my attempt at the time to attract the attention of the House was not very successful, for I was ruled out of order, and no more came of it at that time. I wish to say to my hon. friend opposite, that, for my part, I am quite satisfied that, since he has occupied the position of Minister of Agriculture, he has been doing all that he thought best to promote the dairy interest of this country. I think he has done a great deal in that direction, and I give him credit for what he has done. I regret, however, that on this occasion he is not prepared to go the length of this resolution. I think it is most important something should be done to direct the attention of our farmers in Canada to the fact that they ought now rather to turn their attention to the making of butter than to the making of cheese. I think we have got almost to the limit of our profitable production of cheese in this country, and there is only one way in which we can successfully secure the English market for our butter. We have got to compete with other great butter-producing countries, Denmark especially, and the only way we can do that successfully is, to follow a practice in the production of our butter similar to that which we pursued in the production of our cheese, namely, by producing our butter through creameries and in large quantities. The individual farmer can never expect to produce butter successfully to compete in the English market. I do not say, that there may not be exceptions to the rule, but, as a rule, we must expect that it will be creamery butter which will secure the English market for us, and in order to induce the production of creamery butter, I believe

it would be most beneficial to give some slight bonus, such as is proposed in this resolution. I do not know why it is my hon. friend is so much opposed to the principle of a bonus. Certainly it has proved most effectual in the case of these countries which have adopted it. It proved most effective in the case of Denmark.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Denmark never gave a bonus.

Mr. McNEILL. They gave a bonus, unless I am mistaken, when the industry was in its infancy, but they are not giving any now because it is not necessary.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They never gave a bonus.

Mr. McNEILL. I think my hon. friend is mistaken.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When this question came up last year, I asked Professor Robertson to give me a memo. of what the other countries had done, and he did so. In that memo. he gave what Denmark had done, and there was no mention of any bonus.

Mr. McNEILL. I think my hon. friend will find that, while Denmark does not give a bonus now, she did at the outset, and my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Haggart) supports me in this. Denmark did give a bonus in the beginning, but, having secured the market, there is no necessity for her giving one now. But even supposing Denmark did not give a bonus originally, Denmark had no such competitor in the English market, when she commenced her attack upon it, as we have now in the person of Denmark and other competitors who are filling the English market with foreign butter. So that, although a bonus might not have been necessary in the case of Denmark—although I maintain, she did adopt that means—it may be very necessary for us now. Anything the Government can do in the direction of encouraging the butter industry, ought to be done. It is most important for our farmers that we should secure the English market for our butter, and I believe that, by giving a slight bonus of this kind, a tremendous impetus will be given the butter interest of this country, and I would ask my hon. friend to reconsider his decision, and, if possible, to come to the conclusion suggested in the resolution.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I have sympathy with any movement for the betterment of the butter industry of this country, but I do not know that I am in sympathy with a proposal to grant bonuses to any particular branch of production; I think that that would probably be a move in the wrong direction. At the same time, I do not want to throw away any opportunities to help forward our dairying interests. I know that our cheese industry has developed very

greatly within recent years. It is true that this year the market was low. But what was the cause of that? It was that we had an over-production. We have had very heavy grass crops, and our cattle have had any amount of feed. Therefore they produced more milk last year than I have ever known in any one season since I first had anything to do with live stock business. This is the great reason, I am satisfied, why our cheese industry has fallen off as it has. When one industry experiences a falling off, we should all like to increase in some other line of production. If we can make our butter industry a paying industry in this country it would be very acceptable not only to the farmers and to those engaged in commerce, but also to our financial institutions, for nothing gives tone to the financial institutions like enhanced riches coming from increase of exportation of our own products. I do not wish to take up much time in discussing this matter now before the House. It has been stated here that the Quebec Government gave a bonus for the production of butter in that province. But I have been informed that the farmers did not get the benefit of that bonus, but that it went to the merchants of Montreal. I do not wish to support any proposal that will not yield benefits direct to the farmers. I do not think I can see my way clear to supporting such a motion as this, because I think this trade will regulate itself just as other agricultural interests do. I regard the dairy interest as one of the greatest value to the country, not only for the direct returns it brings to the country but because it encourages the people to go into the raising of pork. Any one engaged in the dairy industry can with the refuse of the dairy, raise a certain number of hogs that will give quite a return besides the direct return in manufacture of butter and cheese.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out the advantage of the dairying industry especially in the encouragement it gave to the pork trade. The pork trade has become one of the greatest industries we have. I am only sorry to say that the trade has suffered a little of late by reason of the action of the Opposition in the local legislature last session and also during the recent campaign. They talked a great deal about diseases amongst our swine, and all this was carried, no doubt, by our rivals in the United States to buyers in England and so we found the people there prejudiced to a certain extent against our pork. This resulted in a reduction in the price of our swine of from 50 cents to 75 cents per cwt. about the beginning of January. We usually expect an increase in prices, but on account of this

agitation, there has been a decrease. I am sorry that the Opposition was so short-sighted as to take up this as a part of their policy.

The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) stated that the Grits were great advocates of the agricultural industries and were much agitated over the interests of the farmers of this country. I agree with him; the present Government have shown themselves the friends of the agriculturists. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has been particularly active in advancing their interests. He went to Washington and was successful in securing the abrogation of the obnoxious quarantine regulations then existing between Canada and the United States. The result has been that we have had a large number of our cattle shipped through the United States. This trade has been on the boom ever since these quarantine regulations were removed. This season we shipped to Great Britain from the port of Montreal 106,000 head of fat cattle, and through American ports and markets about 100,000 head. Besides that we have shipped through the ports of St. John, Halifax, Portland and Boston, since the close of river navigation over 20,000 head of cattle. Thus we show a total export of about 226,000 head. I am satisfied that this is double the average of the exports of cattle from Canada to other countries for the last five years. The reason for the increase of our exports was that the prices have been better. And how were these prices increased? I will give you the quotations from the "Mail and Empire"—and I suppose that no person on the other side will doubt its accuracy—showing prices last year and this year. The prices were increased through the competition in this country caused by the opening of the American markets. Last summer I was buying stock in the west, and I was met in every section by American buyers, who could buy cattle for from $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound more than we could give shipping by Canadian ports. I found that this was due to the fact that cattle could be shipped cheaper by Boston. Then, as our cattle went into the market with American cattle the butchers in England were deceived in thinking that they were buying the best corn-fed American cattle, as our grass-fed cattle were inferior to theirs. Thus cattle sent by American ports realized from $\frac{1}{4}$ d. to $\frac{3}{4}$ d. more than we could get by Canadian ports. I have just said that I would quote figures from the "Mail and Empire." I give the figures showing the price of export cattle at Toronto, which is the Chicago of Canada in the cattle trade, more cattle being bought and sold in Toronto in one day, I suppose, than in all the rest of the markets of Canada in a week. On the 27th of January, 1897, the price of export cattle for Great Britain was from $3\frac{1}{4}$ to $3\frac{3}{4}$ cents per pound. On January

Mr. FEATHERSTON.

28th, in the corresponding week of this present year, the price was 4, $4\frac{1}{4}$ and $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. Now, the average weight of export cattle is a little over 1,300 pounds, that is under the average for this time of year, so that the advantage over last year's prices of, say, 75 cents per hundred, will amount in round figures to about \$10 per head more than the farmers have been getting for their cattle than they got a year ago. Now we will take butchers' cattle in the same market. On the 27th January, 1897, they brought $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 cents and $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. The "Mail and Empire's" report on that day, says that no loads brought more than $2\frac{3}{4}$ cents, that is $2\frac{3}{4}$ cents for full loads, extra cattle averaged $3\frac{1}{2}$. I remember selling cattle myself in January of last year for \$3.15 per hundred, which I call choice, first-class cattle for butchers' trade. A man this year was complaining that the Liberal Government had not brought about the good times that we had promised because he was only getting 4 cents for good choice heifers in the Toronto market on the first market week of January in this year. I asked him if he could get 4 cents, and he said: Yes, he could get 4 cents and that is all he could get. I told him that I sold just as good a year ago on the same market for \$3.15 per hundred. On January 28, 1898, butchers' cattle on the Toronto market sold for $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents to $3\frac{3}{4}$ cents per pound. Now, butchers' cattle will average about 1,050 pounds, that is a very fair average. Now, if we gain 75 cents per hundred pounds, that makes about \$7.50 to \$7.80 per head, which represents the net gain to the farmer for feeding what cattle have been sold this year, compared with what he sold last year. I have stated that the average gain on export cattle is about \$10 per head. We will take a lower average, say \$9 per head. Now, we exported from Montreal, St. John, Halifax and American ports and markets 226,000 head of cattle, at an average, say of \$9 per head. That is below the figures I quoted a while ago, and which I feel quit safe in quoting now. That will make a sum total of \$2,034,000, which represents the increased price the farmers have got for their cattle this year as compared with last year. Now let us see the increased gain in butchers' cattle which have been consumed in Canada. We consume in the different markets of Canada at least 250,000 head, to say nothing of the smaller numbers that are killed throughout the country for private purposes. Take the basis of \$7.50 per head on those 250,000 and we have \$1,875,000 of net gain to the farmer. Those two sums added together make a total, in round numbers, of over four million dollars which represents the benefit to the farmers of this country through the exertions of this Government in obtaining the removal of the quarantine regulations between Canada and the United

States, which removal has led to the prosperity we have been enjoying in the cattle trade. Now the motion introduced by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) is in the interests of the butter-makers, or men who are in the dairy business. We have that dairy business in the west, where we are interested in it to a considerable extent. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) mentioned here the other night that the milkmen of the country surrounding Toronto have had a grievance. They have had a grievance that has been existing for a good while. That grievance is that they are now supplying milk to the people in Toronto in cans supposed to be 8-gallon cans which really hold $8\frac{1}{2}$ to 9 gallons, and they have been asking for redress. The hon. member was very anxious that the Minister of Inland Revenue should take this question up. Last fall the farmers had a meeting in Toronto at which were present the hon. member for West York and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). They passed a motion requesting these two hon. gentlemen and myself to interview this Government, and ask that a regulation be made providing that milk cans should be supplied, measured and stamped, so as to hold about 8 gallons, or a little over, so that the buyer would not get less than his 8 gallons. They were quite willing to give a quart over, but they did not wish to be obliged to give $8\frac{1}{2}$ to 9 gallons for an 8-gallon sale. Well, I remember in the year 1892-93 when the farmers had a meeting there. They wanted this question taken up, and they wanted the Government to inspect these cans, to insist upon an 8-gallon can and no more, as that was the basis of the sales they were making to the milk dealers in the city of Toronto. In the year 1893 a delegation came down here to meet the then Controller of Inland Revenue, and he promised them redress, he promised that this thing would be attended to and that they would get what they were asking. They did not get it, and they have been complaining year after year. At last the then Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Wood) with the then Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), went to Toronto and had a meeting with these farmers. I do not know how they managed it, but somehow or other their friends let them out of the hole by accepting a proposition that every person should sell milk by weight at so much per pound. Now, I never heard since of any person selling a can of milk in that way, and this abuse has been going on ever since, to the detriment of the farmers in that locality. But I am now pleased to see that the Controller of Inland Revenue intends to deal with this question. I hope he will make the necessary regulations that these people are asking for, and that they will no longer be obliged to deliver $8\frac{1}{2}$ or 9 gallons of milk for the price of 8 gallons. By doing so I am satisfied he will confer a

great favour on the farmers in that part of the country. I am sure that the people to-day are satisfied with the action of the Government in respect to their treatment of the agricultural interests of this country.

Mr. STENSON. I have the honour to represent a constituency which is largely interested in the dairy industry, and I think it is my duty to give expression to my opinion with regard to the question that is now before the House. It matters little to me whether the mover of a resolution in this House belongs to the Opposition or is a supporter of the Government, so long as the object of that measure is to promote the welfare of the farming community, and particularly that portion of the farming community that are engaged in dairying. I will give credit to the mover of this resolution that we are now discussing, for sincerity. I have not the slightest doubt that his object is good, his intentions are of the very best. I will also give credit for sincerity to those who are of his opinion. I think they are acting in what they think is the best interests of the farming community, and particularly of those who are engaged in dairying. But on this important subject we are allowed to disagree, our opinions cannot be all the same, and on this resolution I must say that I cannot agree with the mover of it, that I do not think it will attain the object, namely, that of encouraging the dairying interest. Did I think so, I would give it my most hearty support; but I do not think so, and I will state a few of the reasons on which I base my opinion. Some reasons have been stated already, and I will not go over them again, but I will leave them altogether outside of the few remarks which I intend to make on this subject, and here I allude to those remarks which are more of a personal nature than of a public nature, and more of an attack on certain members of the Government and on certain members who do not agree with some hon. members on the Opposition side of the House.

To adopt this resolution would be to give certain advantages to but a very small portion of the farmers of this country, to but a very small portion of those interested in the dairying industry, and even those few whom we might suppose would profit, would not get the direct benefit of this vote. I am on principle opposed to bonuses of all kinds. It has been stated here that the cheese industry has now reached almost the utmost limit, and it would be unwise and perhaps dangerous for us in Canada to go increasing our products of cheese. We have so far succeeded in capturing the English market for cheese that we have now almost control of that market; at least we hold the best position on that market held by any exporter of cheese. But has this object been attained by bonuses? I do not believe anyone can say it was the bonusing system

which brought our cheese to the high position it holds in the English market to-day. Our cheese holds that position because the farmers went into the production of cheese and took means to produce the best cheese that can be made, that is the cheese that suits the English market.

Why does not our butter hold the same position in that market as our cheese occupies? I believe the principal reason is that our manufacturers have not proper facilities for transporting their butter to the English market in first-class condition. We had not cold storage and our farmers were not educated up to making first-class butter, although I contend that we are now making butter of a grade as good as any in the world, but when first-rate it declines in quality before it arrives on the market, for lack of proper transportation facilities. Again, the farmers were not educated up to taking care of the butter on its way from the factory to the cars. Further, when the butter was placed on the cars they were not provided with cold storage; on these cars the butter again suffered. When our butter was sent to England and cold storage was not afforded, the butter could not reach the English market in the same condition it left the factory. For that reason our butter did not sell in that market for the price it would have realized so as to encourage our butter industry. But this state of things is now going to disappear, thanks to the energy of the Minister of Agriculture. I do not want to detract from the credit due to the hon. gentleman's predecessors. I believe they did their utmost, so far as circumstances allowed, to encourage dairying; but that does not take away from the present Minister the merit due to him, and I was glad to hear some hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side give the credit due to him. He is doing his utmost, and is succeeding well; and it is painful to hear hon. members not only finding fault and criticise, but actually abuse the Minister, while he is doing his utmost, and succeeding, to promote the interests of the farmers. Were this money the House is asked to appropriate for bonusing likely to attain the object intended to be attained by the mover, I certainly would support the motion; but I have not only doubts, but I am perfectly satisfied that it would not attain that object, because the greater portion, not to say the whole, would go into the pockets of the speculators and not into the pockets of the farmers. On the other hand, let this amount be applied, not to granting bonuses, but to furnishing the necessary transportation facilities to place our butter on the English market in first-class condition, and then we will have done more to obtain a market for our butter and encourage our dairying industry than by the means offered in this resolution. More than that. In speaking to our farmers

Mr. STENSON.

during the past season I told them that it would be in their interest, as I thought, to have agents appointed in the English market to receive our dairy products and dispose of them there. I hold that if, instead of a grant being made in the direction suggested by the mover, the money was appropriated to provide proper facilities for transporting in first-class condition our butter to the English market, and employing qualified agents to receive and dispose of the butter, that would be spending the money to better advantage than by bonusing a portion of our butter production. When the English people get to know the quality of our butter when we deliver it to them in the perfect state as when produced here, then we will not require to bonus this butter to get the highest prices, and when our butter commands the highest prices in the English market our farmers will not want any bonus granted for the purpose. Our farmers are not looking for bonuses or for favours; they want fair-play, and the expenditure of money to place them in a position to enable them to compete with foreign producers and put them on a footing with foreign dairymen. We have to contend with other dairying countries towards which we stand at great disadvantage. One disadvantage is the distance which separates us from the English market. The Danes have an advantage in that respect. But the moment we have cold storage and can send our butter to the English market in good condition, that disadvantage will disappear and we will stand on an equal footing with the Danes. We may require a little schooling for our farmers to get them educated to manufacture a quality of butter even better than they produce at present. I admit that in many sections of the country, my own for example, which is a dairying county, our farmers have something to learn. But, Mr. Speaker, they are learning, and they are learning every year, and every month, and every day. They are improving in their methods; they are improving in the making of their butter; they are improving in the care of their stock, both summer and winter, and they are also taking more care in the transportation of their butter to the railway depots. When we provide cold storage cars, then we will be sure that this butter will get to the English market in good condition; the English people will soon find that Canadians can make as good butter as the Danes or any people in the world, and they will buy Canadian butter for the highest price. All this will entail the expenditure of money by the Government. The farmers cannot provide cold storage themselves, and, therefore, the Government is doing a wise thing in providing it for them. Let the Government add to this expense for cold storage the salaries of agents in the old country, men who will be well qualified to look after our agricultural products, men who will see that it gets on

the English market in proper form, and that the farmers will get a full price without having to sell it through the hands of middlemen. Our export of agricultural products has now become of sufficient importance for the Government to have agents in England to represent that industry, and I trust that the Government will see its way to appoint these agents in the near future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another way in which the expenditure of money by the Government can help our dairy interests, and in connection with which the vote for agricultural purposes can be more beneficially employed than by paying bonuses. It is my opinion, that we should look after the sanitary condition of our dairy herds, and if that is done, the farmers will reap a great benefit from it. Let the Government look after the health of our stock, let them attend to our dairying interests in a proper manner, let us have proper cold storage transportation, let us have men to look after our interests in England, and when we have all that, we want no bonuses. As I have already said, if the money which would be spent in bonuses, is applied in the directions I have intimated, it will redound much more to the benefit of Canadian agriculturists.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is not my intention to offer any harsh criticism on the Minister of Agriculture, or on the present policy of the Government, in regard to his department. It is more or less a policy of protection; it is more or less a policy of the encouragement of our native industries, especially of our agricultural products. In adopting this policy of protection, the Government think they are following a conservative policy, and so, in some way, they are ashamed of it, and hon. gentlemen like the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Stenson) get up and say that they do not believe in bonuses. But what is the providing of cold storage but the giving of Government aid to encourage a native industry; what is the appointment of agents in England but something in the same direction, and what would be Government oversight of our herds but encouragement and protection for the dairy industry? The competition in agricultural products is so keen to-day, that if we wish to be in the race, we must do what other people are doing. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Stenson) says that we now control the British market for our cheese; but he must know that the Americans, as well as the farming countries of Europe, are preparing to adopt such legislation as will compel us to share that market with them. They see that once you have the seed, every one can grow the plant, and so they intend to follow our example in giving Government encouragement to their cheese industry. The British West India Islands have been ruined by the bonuses given to sugar by European countries, and so the English Government, by some kind of protection or Government relief, are coming to the aid of the sugar-

growers of the British West India Islands, and in that way they are adopting the principle of protection. The bonus or bounty system is the most direct and, to my mind, the best system of protection; and, if we find that other countries are adopting it, we must follow suit, if we intend to hold the market. I have been struck with an article which I read the other day, in the "North American Review," and which was written by the Right Hon. Horace Plunkett, Chairman of the Recess Committee and President of the Royal Agricultural Society. That committee is one of the most important that has sat in England for many years. It was designed to investigate the lack of progress in Ireland, as compared with the other British Isles. It held a number of sessions, and the committee sent its representatives all over Europe to make inquiries and comparisons. One of its findings was this:

The Irish difficulty is well known to be rather economic than political, and it is more so to-day than ever.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the real trouble in Ireland; it is not a political, but an economic grievance. The agricultural industries in Ireland are seriously depressed, her manufacturing industries have been depressed, and they have now come to see that the grievances of Ireland are economical, and not political. The Right Hon. Mr. Plunkett says:

We instituted an inquiry into the means by which the Government could best promote the development of our agricultural and industrial resources.

They sent their commissioners to France, to Belgium, to Holland, to Denmark, to Wurttemberg, to Bavaria, to Austria, to Hungary and to Switzerland, and they found that the reason the farmers of all these countries could beat the British agriculturist out of his own market was because the governments of all these countries, by bonusing or some system of protection, had brought their farmers to such a condition that they could compete with the English and Irish farmers in their own markets. That was the finding of this important committee; that was the finding of these members of the British Parliament, who were committed to free trade. Here is a recommendation that was made by this committee. Mr. Plunkett says:

We recommend that a department of Government should be specially created with a Minister directly responsible to Parliament at its head; the department to be adequately endowed from the Imperial treasury, so as to administer state aid to agriculture and industries in Ireland, upon principles which were fully described. I need only say here that the scheme in its main features was taken from the institutions of the countries to which our investigations were extended, and modified to meet the requirements of our own case.

This committee waited on the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and here is an account of the interview:

The Chief Secretary, after describing the gathering as one of the most notable deputations which had ever come to lay its case before the Irish Government, and knowing the remarkable growth of public opinion in favour of the policy embodied in its Bill of last session, expressed his heartfelt sympathy with the case which was presented, and his earnest desire, which is well known, to proceed with a policy of agricultural and industrial development at the earliest possible moment.

There is an Irish Secretary of an English free trade Government admitting that the agricultural depression in Ireland and England was due to the competition of those countries, and stating his intention to set up in free-trade England a department for the encouragement of the agricultural interests of the country. If many English industries are being ruined by the competition of countries which have adopted the bonus system, we may have to adopt it here in order to keep our markets. We may have to go the pace which other countries are taking for the purpose of depriving us of the cheese market in England. We do not hold that market by any inherent quality of our cheese, but only because up to the present time we have been able to get there ahead of the others; but when they adopt our method, and follow our plan, they will be our equals, and they may dispossess us of the market. A thing has happened very recently with regard to agriculture to which I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Agriculture. That is with regard to the shipment of live stock from Canada to Great Britain. It is a fact that to-day the South American countries promise to beat us out of the live stock market which we now have in England. They can raise and finish their bullocks for less than we can, they can ship them to England at almost the same rates that we can, and I am told by large stock-dealers of Toronto that a large amount of capital is being transferred to South America to develop the export trade of cattle from Argentina. So that it becomes the duty of this Government, especially the duty of the Minister of Agriculture, if he finds that other countries are beating our country in the markets of Europe, to adopt some means for retaining those markets—to adopt, if necessary, a national policy. The National Policy has been denounced time after time as something not to be adopted by this country. But the mother country has adopted a national policy in some respects. What are the British quarantine regulations but a system of protection adopted to keep out our cattle and meats? The same thing has happened in Germany. Germany is one of the most progressive countries to-day, but it has a strong agrarian party, as it is called there, whose fundamental principle is the protection of native products against the food products of other countries. Now, if we find all other countries adopting such

Mr. MACLEAN.

a policy, we must adopt it in this country. Some hon. gentlemen who have spoken say that they do not believe in bonuses. I say that all these measures are bonuses, either directly or indirectly; and once you adopt the principle, you need have no hesitation in carrying it out in every direction. I am glad to see that hon. gentlemen opposite are coming more and more to this idea of protection. My hon. friend from Huron, when the other day made his new confession of faith, gave us a statement of the creed of protection which I must say I have never heard better stated; and the speech of the hon. gentleman who preceded me, if it means anything, means that in his opinion it is now time for the Liberal party of this country to adopt protection, if not by a bonus system, then by the adoption of cold storage, the appointment of agents in the old country, the inspection of our dairy herds, and I do not know what. But, Mr. Speaker, that is protection, and nothing but protection. That is a departure by these hon. gentlemen from their former creed, and the adoption of what has always been the policy of the Conservative party; and it would be far better for the Government candidly to admit this policy. They have adopted a great many planks of the policy of the Conservative party, and they should now adopt this one of agricultural protection. I am convinced that the Minister of Agriculture will be forced to adopt this very measure in regard to butter before long. I believe he is in a quandary to-night; I believe he does not like the division that is about to take place on this question; and I believe that our hon. friends opposite who represent agricultural constituencies do not like to have to vote against this resolution in favour of agricultural protection. I have no hesitation, Mr. Speaker, in voting for this measure of agricultural protection. I give the Minister of Agriculture credit for the steps he has taken already to encourage agriculture in this country; but I hope, now that he has made the break, that he will come out boldly and squarely in favour of what will keep the Government in the estimation of the people of Canada, that is, the writing on their party standard of every encouragement to the agricultural interests of this country.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, as I represent an agricultural constituency, and as the question before the House is one relating particularly to agriculture, I wish to say a word or two in regard to the resolution, which upon its face is strongly in favour of an important branch of agricultural industry. I am, Mr. Speaker, a national policy man; I am in favour of a national policy. But it does not necessarily follow that a national policy always means a policy of high tariff or a bonus. I am in favour of whatever will be found

for the good of the Canadian nation or any branch of that Canadian nation, whether it is one form or another—whether it is, if you like, in the form of a high tariff or a bonus. If I believe it is for the benefit of the Canadian nation, it will have my support, irrespective of what particular name you call it by. So that I have no prejudice whatever against the motion before the House. It is merely a question as to the best way in which the public funds of this country can be used to aid the dairy industry; and I will not spend time in arguing the point, more than to follow what was said by an hon. member on the other side of the House, who pointed out very clearly that the Government at present were using the public funds of this country in certain ways for the purpose of promoting the dairy industry, and who gave it as his opinion that those methods were more to the advantage of that industry and of the country at large than the method proposed in the resolution before the House. That is the ground I take, and upon that ground I shall vote against the resolution, believing that the public funds of this country can be used to better advantage along the lines which have been inaugurated by the present Minister of Agriculture than by adopting this new proposition. After a time, if it shall appear that the methods of the Minister of Agriculture have proven failures, and something new is needed, then I shall be prepared to support this or other measures that will appear likely to lead to success. But at the present stage, I am not prepared to condemn by my vote for this resolution the efforts that have been put forward in the last two years for the advancement of the dairy industry throughout the Dominion—efforts which, in my humble opinion, have been well directed, and which, as far as they have gone, have been highly successful.

I say this is in the hope and belief that the measure now in hand will be, as the circumstances require and admit, further expanded for the general benefit of the community.

I wish to say a word of explanation in reply to a charge which fell from the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope). That hon. gentleman declared that the Minister of Agriculture was open to severe criticism for having expended public money in advancing the dairy industry in the North-west in preference to the dairy industry in the eastern provinces. In the first place, if I am not mistaken, a very considerable portion of the public money of the Dominion was expended to advance the dairy industry in the eastern provinces, that is to say, in the old settled provinces, and particularly the province of Prince Edward Island, before any money was used for that purpose in the Territories. But in reply to the contention that inasmuch as there

is a larger and an older established population in the eastern provinces, therefore these provinces are entitled to greater consideration than the newly settled districts of the North-west, I would like to say that it is because the conditions are so different in the North-west as to render the ordinary co-operation, which is so essential, and which is practicable in the eastern provinces, almost impracticable in the west, the Government was justified in coming to the assistance of the western settler. All things being equal, I would certainly say that the eastern provinces have the prior claim, but what I want to point out is that the conditions here are not similar to what they are with us, and that it was to compensate for the lack of advantages in the Territories, which are not lacking in the eastern provinces, that the Government came to our assistance in this matter of creameries. Let me point out further that in the Territories, at any rate in the district I represent, the assistance of the Government was not directed to the establishment of new creameries. The Government did not spend the public money in that district to supply that which the inhabitants were lacking in enterprise to supply themselves. The people of the district which I represent had gone into the dairy industry, they had spent very large sums of their own money in trying to put that industry on its feet, they had struggled two, three or four years against disadvantageous conditions, due mainly to the scattered nature of the settlements, which again was caused by the land policy pursued in years past. By reason mainly of the scattered nature of the settlements, these enterprises were practically failures, so that in going into that country the Government did not undertake to supply new enterprises to the people but came in to protect the people against certain conditions which they did not calculate upon when they started these industries, and for which they were not responsible. I would say further that the action of the Government in that country has been, so far as the district I mention is concerned, fairly satisfactory; and putting it on no other grounds, as a means of bringing about contentment and prosperity to the settler and thereby inducing further settlement and development, it has been the most successful policy by far of the Dominion Government under the present administration. Had the conditions in the west been as they are in the east, where the settlements are close together, where capital is abundant, and had the people themselves lacked the enterprise to go into this industry, then the Government might not have been justified in going into the North-west, but the conditions were not favourable, the people out there had the enterprise, they had sunk their money, and the Government merely came in to supplement conditions for which the people were not responsible and against which it was

necessary to provide, in order that the industry might be a success. The action of the Government has been a success in that part of the country, and this part will reap its share of the profits.

Mr. SEMPLE. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to make a few remarks on this motion. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), gave the keynote when he said that a bonus was the best kind of protection. I must say that the local governments and the Dominion Governments have done all that could be reasonably expected. They have endeavoured to educate the farmers, so as to enable them to make the best kind of butter and cheese. This education has been carried on all over the Dominion. In the province of Ontario there are places of instruction where lessons in dairying are given, so that every one who wishes to avail himself of it, has the opportunity of being instructed in that industry without any cost. That, however, the Government did not consider sufficient, but they also sent travelling dairies to all the principal places in the different constituencies, in order to give object lessons, showing the best method of making butter. I consider that of late years, the Government has acted very generously towards the agricultural community. They have established the cold storage system so that butter and cheese may be placed on the British market to the best advantage, and, as has been stated by an hon. gentleman, this will be supplemented in due time by the appointment of agents at the distributing points in Great Britain, who will see that the produce of this country is put on the British market in the best condition and where it will command the best prices. Now, I shall read a part of the resolution of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) so that I may stick to my text. The part of the resolution that relates to butter, reads as follows:—

That whereas a large export butter trade would benefit not only the farmers as a whole, but the millions of money it would yearly bring into the country would do incalculable good to the whole community.

That, in view of the foregoing facts, our Government should take immediate steps to do something more to assist in the development of our butter trade, and this House is of the opinion that the Government should place in the Estimates for the present session an amount to be paid to the farmers direct by way of a bonus of one cent per pound on a specified quantity of our finest fresh creamery butter to be exported to Great Britain while fresh and in condition to secure a reputation for itself and establish a lasting demand, and that this bonus be continued for three consecutive years. This bonus to be increased at the discretion of the Government on butter made during the winter months. All such butter to be subject to a rigid Government inspection.

That this bonus be paid to only those farmers who will furnish for export regular supplies. So that you see, Mr. Speaker, this bonus is only to be given to a certain number. If

Mr. OLIVER.

one class of farmers make butter for export, another make butter for the local market, another raise cattle for export, another raise horses, another sheep and another hogs, I want to know what is the reason why any one of these others is not as much entitled to a bonus as those producing butter for export. I do not believe that, if this bonus were granted, farmers who are raising cattle for export would make a change and adopt the making of butter for the British market. Under this proposal, for a thousand pounds of butter exported, the bonus, at 1 cent a pound, would be \$10. Do you think, for that small amount, any farmer would change the kind of farming he has been engaged in and go into the production of butter for the British market? I certainly think not. And if the change were made, and no more money realized than there is at present, what would be the use of it? For my part, if bonuses are to be granted, I think it would be better to give a bonus to those who are raising excellent cattle for the British market, for we know that that is a much more important industry than butter. The income to the country from the cattle trade is about \$7,000,000 a year. It seems to me these bonuses are not needed at all. It reminds me of a cattle dealer I once knew, who used to say that he was always willing to spend 25 or 50 cents, if he could make \$4 or \$5 on a deal. There has been pretense, in years gone by, that the farmers were protected, but that was mainly as an excuse for the protection of other industries, and most of the money came out of the farmers' pockets.

Mr. COCHRANE. We have that all changed now, of course.

Mr. SEMPLE. Let me read, for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, showing that a very large amount of money was received for the sale of butter even before the National Policy came into existence. I find this table in the Year-book. It gives the receipts from the sale of butter from 1874 to 1896. In 1874 the amount realized by the sale of butter was \$2,620,305; in 1875, \$2,337,124; in 1876, \$2,540,894; in 1877, \$3,073,409; in 1878, \$2,382,237. I do not intend to go through this whole list; suffice it to say, that in 1896 the amount received for butter was \$1,052,089. In 1897 the income from this source was more than double that amount, being \$2,283,481. In 1891, the year in which the largest amount was received for the sale of butter, the receipts amounted to \$3,573,034. So, you see, butter is by no means an infant industry. It has flourished without any protection, and, with the advantage of the cold storage and of the methods of education that have been adopted, it will flourish in the future. The farmers, as a class, I think, are satisfied. The Government has really done them justice in the amount of money they have expended on the

dairies and creameries in the North-west and Manitoba, and other expenditures for the farmers. With wise use of the advantages that are afforded, I believe the farmers will make a better show in the future in the production of butter for the British market.

Now, I wish to say a word with regard to another question which has been brought up, and upon which, though a little aside from the subject before the House, I trust I may be permitted to speak for a moment. I refer to the reports issued by the Experimental Farm. There has been no change made since the present Minister of Agriculture assumed office. When questioned, today, he did not understand exactly the state of affairs. He had a vacation from this House for a few years and had not followed the working of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization. But that committee has been doing good work. Farmers of both political parties have met and studied diligently and earnestly what was for the best interests of the farmers. I can remember, on many occasions, when the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was chairman of the committee, when the committee recommended that a certain number of reports be procured, he wished the number to be cut down, because he thought the Government would not consent to print as many as the committee required. And so the matter was compromised, and as many as was considered absolutely necessary were supplied. I remember receiving a communication from the Experimental Farm, giving a list of those receiving farm reports and bulletins, and asking me to cut off the names of those who were no longer there and to add the names of those who should receive these papers. I did so, and sent back the list with about two hundred names.

Mr. WILSON. When did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Semple) receive that?

Mr. SEMPLE. That would be about four years ago. I must say, that, whether I was in Opposition or supporting the Government, as I am now, I was justly treated in the matter of these farm reports. The Government at no time, so far as I know, made any difference between parties in this respect.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are you getting reports now?

Mr. SEMPLE. I have not had any of late. We will have a meeting of the Agriculture Committee and learn exactly how things stand.

Mr. SNETSINGER. I have been glad to hear the discussion of this subject, particularly by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). I am inclined to think that this proposal is not so much to benefit the farmers as it is to catch votes. Though I come from an agricultural county, I have heard nothing of this proposal. There

is no feeling in the country in favour of this bonus business. I do not think the farmers require it. The fact is, we were manufacturing cheese, in our section, and we are now turning our attention, for the simple reason that cheese is very low and butter is very high. I have no doubt that the province of Ontario generally is going more into the manufacture of butter. As to the action of the Minister of Agriculture, I hope he will see his way clear to the establishment of more dairy schools, particularly in the province of Ontario. I think that, between Montreal and Kingston, on the St. Lawrence River, we ought to have one school. These schools are doing great service for the country.

Our people have not asked for this bonus, and I do not think they want it. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has spoken with regard to bonuses, he says that England is going to introduce the system of bonuses. Well, they have never had it yet. If he looks into the newspapers he will find that there was a meeting recently held in Belgium for the purpose of bringing together all countries that have been giving bonuses on sugar, with the object of doing away with that system altogether. There is no doubt in my mind that they will do away altogether with bonuses in regard to the sugar duties. It is too late for us to begin now to give a bonus on butter. I cannot see what good object the mover of this motion can have, unless he is seeking to make political capital out of it. There is no reason why we should give a bonus on butter at the present time. The county of Stormont, which I have the honour to represent, makes a great deal of butter, and I say now that our butter stands as high in the English market as any other butter in the world. No other country in the world can produce better butter than the clover leaf butter made in the county of Stormont. There is no trouble in making first-class butter in this country which will command the highest price in the English market. The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) says that because the farmers in the North-west can raise wheat to advantage, they have no need to go into butter making. There is no common sense in that. The fact is the North-west is a very good dairy country, and there is no reason why they should not go into the making of butter and cheese as well as raising wheat. I think the Minister of Agriculture has been wise in taking the course he did in establishing dairy schools in that section of the country. I was up there last summer, and I found them making magnificent cheese and magnificent butter, and I think it is in the interest of the whole Dominion that these factories should be established in that country. Although I come from an agricultural county, I have no desire that this bounty business should go on, nor do I think that my constituents have

any such desire. The people are not asking for it. I have no doubt that if this question were put to a vote to-morrow the farmers of Canada would be found opposed to it themselves. This question has been discussed over and over again in past years, and I think it is now brought up again simply to catch votes and not in the interest of the farmer.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to make a brief explanation with regard to the distribution of the report of the Agricultural Committee, and that of the Experimental Farm, as there seems to be some misunderstanding about it on both sides of the House. From year to year in the Agriculture Committee we usually made a recommendation to the House that a certain number of reports should be printed for distribution amongst the members, and also a number of reports of the Experimental Farm. One year we sent in a recommendation that the House should print 150,000 of the one report and 50,000 of the other. But we usually found considerable difficulty in getting the House to agree to so large an expenditure for that purpose. For several years we recommended a smaller number, and they were distributed to the members of both sides of the House to be sent to their constituents. But we found that there was going on at the same time a distribution from the Farm, we found that some of our constituents, when we sent them these reports, had been getting others from the Farm, in other words, they were getting duplicated reports. That was brought up in committee, and it was considered a waste of money that two reports of the same kind should be sent to the same party. I was instructed to make inquiry as to how the distribution was made at the Farm. I ascertained that some years ago when farmers' institutes were started in Ontario, an arrangement was entered into between the Agricultural Department here and the Ontario Government, that all members of the farmers' institutes should be supplied with the Farm Report and all the other bulletins that were issued from the farm. That was done for the purpose of inducing parties to join the farmers' institutes. The farmers' institutes sent the names in to the provincial government, and they were forwarded down here and put on our list. Of course it became a very extensive list, because, while additional names were going on every year, there were few being struck off. We found the distribution from the Farm was very large, especially of the Farm Report. Then the question was brought up in our committee as to how we could best distribute the report and avoid its being duplicated as had been the case. The sense of a large number of the members of that committee was that the distribution should be made by the members, but there were others who strongly opposed it, and who thought

Mr. SNETSINGER.

that it was imposing work upon them which might as well be done by the farm manager through his clerks. I was requested to furnish a list of the names that we were supplying, with a view of devising some means by which the distribution would be more evenly divided, and avoid the duplication which had been going on. It was finally decided that the superintendent of the Experimental Farm, Mr. Saunders, should send to each member a list of those in his own constituency who were being supplied from the Farm, so that he might revise it and strike off the names of those who were dead, of others who had moved away, and of others who had changed their occupation and therefore did not require the report. That was done, I think, three years ago, if my memory is correct. I know the superintendent sent me a list of the names to whom this report was sent, also the list for my constituency, and I revised the list and sent it back. I know a number of other members did the same. It was contemplated then that that should be repeated every two or three years, so that the list would be kept up to date, and that the farm manager should make the distribution from his office instead of it being made here. But it was still considered advisable that a number of the reports of the Agricultural Committee should be distributed amongst the members so that they could send them to others who applied for them. However, in 1896 our session was so disorganized that a report which was sent down by that committee was never adopted in this House. Therefore the report was not printed. Last year the committee did not send down a recommendation to this House to print any number, and therefore it was again overlooked or omitted, consequently we have had no distribution for the last two years. But I have no doubt the committee will take it up this year, and as usual send in their recommendation on that line. Now, this is the mode of distribution to-day, and these are the reasons why the members do not get the number of copies that they used to get a few years ago. I have always thought that it would be the better plan for the members to receive those copies, because they are in touch with the electorate themselves and let the members distribute them. But I know, as chairman of that committee, that many complaints were made to me that the reports were not distributed from the Farm, and that work was imposed upon the members that might as well be done by the clerks at the Farm. For that reason it was recommended that the distribution should be made from the Farm, except that of the extra copies which were recommended to be published by that committee and distributed to the members.

Mr. ROGERS. As we have heard speeches from a number of representatives of the two great political parties in this House on this subject, I think it right that the House

should also hear from the third great party. I am myself not only a representative of an agricultural county, but a representative of an organization that is supposed to be entirely agricultural. Now, Sir, I must say that all our meetings and gatherings, at no time has there been any mention made of the idea of bonusing any of our farm products. We are against the principle of Government paper or Government bonuses being given to any interest. Last year when this matter was brought before the House, I expressed my opposition to the principle, and I am of the same opinion still. We are opposed to bonuses of any kind, and to be consistent we must, of course, oppose a bonus of the kind asked for in the motion of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid). All the farmers want is a fair field and no favour. We do not ask that bonuses should be given to farmers, who pay nine-tenths of the taxes. The farmers do not seek special favours. They have in the past held their own with the agricultural class in any other land. This is shown by the standard attained by our wheat, cheese and dairying products; they have got to the top in competition with their rivals. It is an old story to speak about the success of our cheese in England. The manufacturers of that product did not obtain any Government paper or aid of any kind in bringing that product up to its present standard. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. McLaren), who largely aided to bring our cheese manufacture to such perfection, never received a bonus, and what he has accomplished surely can be reached by others. Our farmers are not lacking in intelligence; they are becoming more acquainted with the scientific methods of farming and dairying, and are adopting them. If a Government bonus is to be asked at all, it should cover all lines of our exports. Our poultry and egg industry requires aid more than our butter industry. There is great scope for our poultry industry in the English market, and if the Government wants to grant any concession, let them give a bonus on exports of poultry and eggs. The influence of such a bonus would be felt along every concession line; but let me repeat that the farmers do not believe in the bonus system. The last clause of this motion states that the bonus is to be paid only to farmers who furnished for export regular supplies. There is a very small percentage of the farmers who would be able to attempt to do this, and it would be hardly fair to have nine-tenths of the farmers taxed while only one in ten thousand of the farmers produced butter for export, and were able to receive any of this bonus. It would be something like robbing Peter to pay Paul. I repeat that farmers are opposed in principle to granting bonuses. They believe that every industry should stand on its own merits, as that of farming is prepared to do, and that no exception should be

made of any class of the people. In order to be consistent, I must vote against this resolution, which has within it the principle of granting bonuses.

Mr. CAMPBELL. When I moved the adjournment of this debate yesterday, I did so for the purpose of allowing some hon. members the opportunity of addressing the House. But the debate has now occupied the greater portion of to-day, and the subject has been so thoroughly discussed in all its phases that I do not see any necessity for further adjournment. I therefore ask permission of the House to withdraw my motion for the adjournment of the debate.

Motion to adjourn debate withdrawn.

Mr. REID. Before the resolution is put to the House, I should like to offer a few remarks in answer to statements made by some hon. gentlemen opposite. I am glad indeed that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) has seen his way clear to withdraw his motion for adjournment. I was anxious to have a vote taken on the main resolution, so that we could obtain an expression of opinion upon it from each hon. member. As to the statement made by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Snettinger), whom I do not see in his seat at the present moment, that I framed this resolution for the purpose of catching votes, I wish to tell that hon. gentleman that before I placed this resolution on the paper last year, I consulted some of the leading farmers in my constituency—in fact, they approached me and said something should be done on this line in the interest of the farmers. I consulted the leading farmers, both Liberals and Conservatives, in my constituency and in the constituency where I asked information from the farmers. I never met one, Liberal or Conservative, who told me that it was a wrong system to bonus the butter industry of the Dominion. Backed up by the farmers of my constituency, I felt it was my duty to place such a motion on the paper, and in doing so I plainly stated that I did not wish to make it a party question, and that I hoped no hon. member would treat it as such. I was very sorry indeed to see that the Minister of Agriculture made it a party question, and the Government are treating it as a Government question, and thus hon. members on the other side of the House, those whom I believe would have supported this resolution, are forced under the circumstances to oppose it. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), who is a leading farmer and in whose judgment I have the greatest confidence, was a little wrong in some of his statements. He told the House that the reason why our butter trade on the other side of the water was not a success was mainly on account of some fault on the part of the inspectors.

That, however, is not the main point I wish to bring up. If the hon. gentleman observes the dairy market prices, he will agree with me that dairy-made butter does not bring nearly as high a price in the cities of the Dominion as does creamery butter. I believe it will be the unanimous opinion of this House that creamery butter will always bring a high price, and therefore our farmers should engage in that industry at the very earliest possible moment and thus secure the highest price for their butter.

The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMullan) and the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), both of them leading farmers, tell us that they object to this resolution because they are opposed to the bonus system. That need not worry the hon. gentlemen because last session they both voted for a bonus on iron. They have a precedent for supporting this resolution, for they were not against giving a bonus to the iron industry last year. And if they were willing to give a bounty to the iron industry, why are they not willing to give a bonus or a bounty to their fellow-farmers who are striving to make a living. The hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple) gave a statement to show that the butter trade had increased, and I believe he told us that in the year 1874, the value of the butter exported to England was \$2,620,305, while in 1897 the value of the butter exported, according to his figures, was \$2,283,481. Now, according to the arithmetic I learned at school, I cannot see how there was any increase in that, for if it is properly figured out it will be seen that there was a decrease of \$400,000 in the 23 years. In 1874, as we know, there was but a small quantity of cheese exported, while our Trade and Navigation Returns show that last year we sent to England an enormous quantity. England does not import as great a number of pounds of cheese as it does of butter, and yet Canada has 60 per cent of the English cheese trade and less than one-fortieth of the butter trade. I find in the daily paper to-day, that last week the total exports of cheese from Montreal amounted to 19,867 boxes, while there were only 497 boxes of butter sent. Why, let me ask, should there not have been as many packages of butter as of cheese exported? I thought at first that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Featherston) would support this resolution because he told us that if he thought this money would go directly to the farmers he would favour it. Now, if the hon. gentleman read the resolution he would find that I have made that point very plain, and that the bonus should be paid directly to the farmer. If the Government were to place an amount in the Estimates for that purpose they could very easily arrange the details as to how it could be paid, and in consequence the hon. member (Mr. Featherston) had a very lame excuse for not supporting the motion. The hon. member for North Leeds and

Mr. REID.

Grenville (Mr. Frost) told us that the Government granted a bonus for cold storage depots at all our creameries and cheese factories, and if that be true, it is evident that the Government is dealing with this matter in a very practical way. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if that statement of the hon. gentleman is correct?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. According to the scheme I explained to the House last year, we are granting a small bonus to every creamery that establishes a proper refrigerator and which complies with the conditions which the department lays down. We are not granting that bonus to cheese factories, because they do not require refrigeration as do the butter factories.

Mr. REID. What is the bonus?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is a bonus of \$50 for the first year, when they have shown to the inspector that they have established a proper refrigerator, and \$25 for each of the two succeeding years, making in all \$100, provided they build and maintain the refrigerator for three years.

Mr. REID. I am very much obliged to the hon. Minister for the explanation, but I may point out that this amount is but a comparatively small item.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A refrigerator such as we expect, could be built for about \$400, and we give them \$100 towards the cost.

Mr. REID. Therefore, the Government have already adopted the system of bonus-ing, although it is on a very small scale. In my constituency the majority of my electors are farmers; they are the backbone of the constituency, and I feel that anything I can do in the interests of the farmers I am going to do it whether on this side of the House or whether I am on the other. Hon. gentlemen may remember that when I sat as a supporter of the Conservative Government I was the first to ask in this House that the Government should adopt some means of branding cheese. The Government took the matter in hand and they did adopt a plan. That idea originated with the farmers of my constituency who asked me to take that course in Parliament, and this resolution now before the House originated in a similar way. It is hardly fair, on account of my now being in Opposition, that the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Snettinger) should attribute to me a certain motive for placing this resolution on the Order paper. I can assure the hon. gentleman that if my party were in power to-day I would have put the same resolution on the Order paper as stands in my name to-night.

We have heard, from the hon. member from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), that he be-

longs to the third party. For my part, since the hon. gentleman has been a member of this House, I have failed to see where there has been any third party, so far as he is concerned. I have not seen where the hon. gentleman has recorded a single, solitary vote, other than with the Government, though he has been opposed to the tariff and to bonuses of every kind. When any question of this kind has come up, he has stood up, like a little man, and recorded his vote with the party in power. The hon. gentleman, in the last local election, if I remember rightly, supported the Liberal candidate. The gentleman who ran in Frontenac was previously a Patron, but in the last election he accepted the Liberal nomination and was the candidate of the Hon. Mr. Hardy; and the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) fought for that man and did all he could for his election. The hon. gentleman, therefore, cannot hold out to the country that there is any third party in this House. He will have to give some better evidence than he has given since he has been in this House, to make the country believe that he is independent of party. If I were in the hon. gentleman's position, I would stand up honestly and squarely before this House and show my colours, and not call myself a third-party man. Any man has a right to take what stand he likes, and I admire any man, even though he is a Liberal, who fights for his party. I am a Conservative, and I will stand up for my party. But I do not admire a man who professes to belong to a third party, but who always votes with the party in power.

With regard to the distribution of the Experimental Farm reports, which has been alluded to in this debate, I may say to the Minister of Agriculture, that I took great pleasure in distributing those reports and the report of the Minister of Agriculture. The members of this House always got a large number of those reports, and I made it a point, when distributing them, to send them to every farming elector in my county, so far as they would go, irrespective of party. If they are to be distributed in the way the Minister says, I can only get very few of them; at least, he would not take the list I would give him. It would require some 2,000 or 3,000 to supply the farmers of the constituency I represent, and it would be hardly fair to pick out one farmer here and one farmer there for the purpose. I may say, that every one of the farmers who received these reports was glad to receive them, whether Liberal or Conservative. I think the Government should try to give every member a sufficient number of these reports to enable him to supply every household farmer in the constituency he represents. I believe that nothing has done more good to the farmers than the reports of the Experimental Farm. I have heard farmers in my county express themselves to that effect; and I sincerely hope that the Mini-

ter will see his way clear to continue in the future the system which we had in the past.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, to have detained the House so long at this late hour; but I wish it to be thoroughly understood that, in bringing this matter up, I have not done it in any party spirit, and I am sorry that it will be treated as a party question. I brought it up, as I said before, at the request of both Liberals and Conservatives in my county, and, no matter what the consequences may be, I shall have done my duty in the matter.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend complains of the conduct of the Government, lectures the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) severely for his conduct, and generally seems to feel aggrieved at the action of the members of the House. I wish to say a few words with regard to the distribution of the reports, because my hon. friend must admit that he and other members who have discussed the matter, are altogether mistaken, in trying to blame the Minister of Agriculture, or the Government, for the way in which these reports have been distributed.

Mr. REID. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I have not blamed the Minister for the system of distribution. The hon. Minister explained to us, that the system of distributing them to every member had not been carried out, and I simply urged the Minister to see his way clear to give them to the members. I am not finding fault with him.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The whole gist of the discussion was, that the system of distributing the reports was changed, and insinuations were made that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) was mistaken, and that the statement of the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) was correct. As the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) pointed out, and as every member of this House ought to know, especially the members of the Committee on Agriculture, the reports distributed to the members were not at all under the control of the Government or the Department of Agriculture, or the Experimental Farm, but they were ordered by the House, on a resolution adopted by the committee and reported to and adopted by the House, and an appropriation was made to provide for the printing of a certain number of reports to be distributed to the members. Since 1890, I think, the Committee on Agriculture has taken no action in that respect; no reports have been printed for that purpose, and, therefore, none have been distributed in that way; and it is most unfair to try to create an impression in the country that the Minister or the Department of Agriculture had made a change or dealt unfairly in the matter. The explanation given by the Minister of Agriculture was correct, and the ex-Minister of

Agriculture was clearly mistaken or misinformed. My hon. friend from South Grenville (Mr. Reid) undertook to deliver a long and severe lecture to the hon. member for Frontenac, who represents the Patrons in this House, for the action he has taken on this question. I am sure, that the hon. member for Frontenac, and the farmers of the country, especially those who belong to the organization which he represents, will feel that he is more entitled, and more likely, to take his instructions from the farmers, and from that organization, than from my hon. friend; and he has frankly stated to the House, that, at no meeting in any section of Canada, did the Patron organization, or the farmers, adopt any resolution or even argue in favour of the principle expressed in this resolution.

I am sure that instead of being derelict to his duty as the representative of the farmers, he is quite the opposite in opposing the motion of my hon. friend. As he has pointed out, the farmers are opposed on principle to this system of bonusing private enterprises. Speaking for myself, I may say that I am in favour of any method that may be adopted which, I believe to be in the interest of the country. I do not believe in being wedded to any particular method or system, if by adopting some other method we will be acting more in the interest of the farmers of Canada, and I do not see why my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) should be at all blamed for the position he has taken on this question. On the contrary, he is representing the sentiment of the whole farming community; and one reason why I oppose this motion is that I do not believe the farmers of this country are in favour of it. They certainly have not expressed their opinion in any public way that I have heard of in favour of such a method being adopted. On the contrary, I believe with my hon. friend from Frontenac that our farmers have found that in the various lines they have taken up they have been able to hold their own without the aid of Government bounties. I must take particular exception to the statement made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), when he said that the position of the cheese trade in British America was due to the encouragement and assistance given it by the Government.

Mr. MACLEAN. I did not say so.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I looked at the "Hansard," and those were the words my hon. friend used.

Mr. MACLEAN. What I said was that we now have the British market, but that other countries, desirous of pushing their own goods there, would adopt the same system of Government encouragement, and in that way become our competitors and probably compel us to divide that market with them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I must accept the hon. gentleman's correction, but I thought I understood him thoroughly. If he will look up "Hansard," I think he will find that he is somewhat mistaken, but perhaps he did not intend to convey the impression which, it seems to me, his words did convey to the House. The hon. gentleman represents a constituency which might be called the banner cheese-producing county in Canada, and the farmers there have not asked at any time, nor do they ask the Government now, for any assistance such as is proposed here. With regard to this matter, I am of the opinion expressed by many other members, that the Government have been moving in the right direction. I believe that the Government and Parliament can do more to assist this industry by the educational system than by any other means. That is the system which has been adopted; and if the hon. member for Grenville had proposed some improvement in that direction, I believe he would have received the unanimous support of the House. I need not go into this question in detail, because every member of the House knows well what efforts have been made by the former Government, and especially the present Government, in that direction. If any money is to be expended specially to encourage the butter industry, I believe that it should be expended on an educational system such as we have at present and on improving our transportation facilities. The adoption of the cold storage system and the reduction of freights will do more to benefit the butter industry than any bonus we could grant. I agree also with my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) that if this bonus system be adopted, as proposed in this resolution, it would only be of benefit to a very few, and not to the great mass of the farmers, even among those who produce butter. For these reasons, I am opposed to this resolution, and without making any further remarks, I beg to move the following amendment:—

That all the words after "That" in the first line of the said motion be struck out, and the following added instead thereof:—

This House views with satisfaction the great progress which has been made in the butter-making branch of the dairy industry, as shown by the great and regular increase of our export trade in butter and the high reputation which the Canadian product has made, especially during last season, since the establishment of complete cold storage transportation, and believes that the course already pursued by the Government, if continued on the same lines, will result in still greater benefits to the farmers of our Dominion.

Mr. MARTIN. On this question, which is so important to a large class in this Dominion, I feel compelled to give expression to my views as representing a constituency in one of the most eastern provinces of the Dominion. It is a matter of sur-

prise that a country which occupies the very proud position we do as an exporter of cheese, should occupy such an obscure position in the export trade of butter. I therefore think that anything this Parliament can do to place Canada in a better position as regards the butter export trade cannot fail to be to great profit and advantage of our agricultural community. In taking this course, Canada would be but following the precedents set by other countries. Hon. members opposite object to a bonus, but I do not suppose that the bonus proposed in this resolution is at all intended to be a finality or to continue for any considerable length of time. Other countries, Denmark, for instance, have a strong foothold in the English market, and if Canada wishes to obtain a share of this market, we must do something, and I think we cannot do better than act on the lines of the legislation proposed by my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid). It seems to me that after Canada has gone to a large expense in establishing the cold storage system, and is prepared to incur heavy expenditure for the establishing of a fast steamship line, it is only logical that we should take one more step in order to obtain satisfactory results from our expenditure, and that is to develop our export trade in butter. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has perhaps very justly taken some credit to himself for what has already been done, but so far as I can see, he has done nothing so far except to carry out the programme of his predecessor, and if he wants to obtain credit for himself for initiating something, he had better introduce some measure that will entitle him to such credit on the lines of this resolution or in some other way. The hon. Minister referred to the expenditure that has been made in the province of Prince Edward Island in order to establish cheese factories there, and he also referred to the Experimental Farm.

In every other province, if I mistake not, experimental farms exist. But Prince Edward Island is an exception. However, the late Government, seeing that Prince Edward Island had not the same advantages in this respect as other provinces have by having an experimental farm, did something to assist the cheese factories in that province. I am sorry that the present Minister of Agriculture has deprived us of that advantage.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture has said that the cheese industry in Prince Edward Island is on a good footing. I say that the cheese industry there is only in its infancy and that the product could be doubled in a short time if proper encouragement were given. A serious blow was given to the industry by the present Minister of Agriculture when he withdrew the patronage which the late Government gave. Prince Edward Island suffers under still another

disadvantage. When cold storage was proposed, men who had an eye to the welfare of the province, subscribed money for cold storage in Charlottetown, the capital of the province, but the Minister of Agriculture withdrew what he was doing for the other provinces and nothing was done to provide Prince Edward Island with steamship facilities. I hope that this will be provided for this session. The sums subscribed by private individuals last year for the erection of cold storage warehouses for Charlottetown are likely to be withdrawn unless the Minister of Agriculture comes down with a scheme to have steamers call during the season. In that case Prince Edward Island will not get the advantages conferred on other parts of the Dominion either in the manufacture of cheese or in the manufacture of butter. I am not wedded to the bonus system, though I support this resolution. I do not suppose that the mover of it expects the system to continue for a long period of years, I think that the \$100,000 or \$200,000 that it would cost could be spent in this way to advantage. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that seven-tenths of the taxes come out of the farmers. I do not think that this bonus, which is for the benefit of the farmers will take a very large slice out of the farmers' contributions. I would prefer that, in place of this bonus of one cent per pound, the Government should open depots in the large centres of Great Britain where our butter could be sold as Canadian butter. But in the event of that alternative not being carried out, I cheerfully support this resolution, and if the result will be to place Canada in the same proud position in the British markets in regard to butter as it now holds with regard to cheese, no one who is at all interested in the welfare of Canada will begrudge the expenditure.

Mr. ERB. Coming, as I do, from a constituency largely engaged in the manufacture of butter and cheese, I desire to say a few words on the subject of this resolution. The riding of South Perth which I have the honour to represent has a large number of cheese factories many of which have been in operation for many years and have been a source of profit to the farmers in that locality. During the last few years many of these factories have been engaged during the winter months in the manufacture of butter, the summer being devoted to the manufacture of cheese. The dairymen who are engaged in this line of production are wideawake and enterprising business men. In many instances the farmers themselves have formed joint stock companies, have put up buildings, and engaged skilled cheese and butter makers—men who have spent years in acquiring all the knowledge obtainable with regard to their line of work—and have supplied these men with the most modern and improved appliances for the manufacture of cheese and butter. At least one man in our district has been in

the habit of going to England every year to study the requirements of the British market, and the farmers in our locality get the benefit of the information he gathers on his trips. I need hardly say that the gentleman to whom I refer is the Hon. Thomas Ballantyne, a man to whom, I think, the farmers of Ontario are very largely indebted for the present satisfactory state of the cheese industry in this country. The results from these factories have been so encouraging that during the past year there has been established at the town of St. Mary's a large butter-making factory, with a number of separating stations in the surrounding country. The farmers take their milk to these separating stations, and after the cream is separated, the milk is returned to their homes, while the cream is carried to the central station at St. Mary's, where it is ripened and churned into butter. The product of this factory, to a large extent, has been sent to the British market. So that the export trade in butter to Great Britain has already passed beyond the experimental stage, and I can see no reason why the Government should seek to encourage it further by means of a bonus. Particularly do I object to the resolution now before the House, because if this principle were carried into practice, very few of the farmers of Ontario would receive any benefit from this bonus. Hon. members will notice that the last clause of the resolution reads :

That this bonus be paid to only those farmers who will furnish for export regular supplies.

Now, any one who is acquainted with the production of butter or cheese knows that very few farmers are in a position to bind themselves during a whole year to furnish regular supplies. The production of milk depends upon a great many conditions which are altogether beyond the farmers' control. Consequently few farmers would be benefited because they could not furnish regular supplies. For this reason I am opposed to the resolution.

If this resolution were adopted, it would simply mean that a large portion of the population of Canada would be taxing themselves indirectly for the benefit of a very few, a principle which I cannot approve. For that reason I shall feel it my duty to oppose this resolution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not intend to say anything upon this subject which has been already so fully debated, but I think it would be wrong to allow the course which has been adopted by the hon. gentlemen opposite to pass unchallenged. My hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) has submitted a proposition to the House that asks the Government to take immediate steps to do something more to assist the development of the butter trade. He does not deny that something has been already done, but he proposes that something more should be done, and that he defines as a proposition—

Mr. ERB.

“ That the Government should place in the Estimates for the present session an amount to be paid to the farmers direct by way of a bonus of one cent per pound on a specified quantity of our finest fresh creamery butter to be exported to Great Britain while fresh and in condition to secure a reputation for itself and establish a lasting demand, and that this bonus be continued for three consecutive years. This bonus to be increased at the discretion of the Government on butter made during the winter months. All such butter to be subject to a rigid Government inspection.

That this bonus be paid only to those farmers who will furnish for export regular supplies.

Now, nothing could be more clear, nothing could be more plain than the statement proposed in this resolution. If hon. gentlemen opposite are opposed to that resolution, why should they be afraid to vote it down? Sir, the course that has been taken by hon. gentlemen opposite who are opposing this resolution, shows that they believe it will commend itself to the independent judgment of the great agricultural interests of this country. We all know what has been accomplished in this direction, we all know what the cheese industry has done for Canada. We all know that from feeble beginnings it has grown up until it has become one of the most important industries, one of the most important articles of trade of the Dominion of Canada. We know that our cheese has acquired a pre-eminent position in the markets of Great Britain. Now, why should we not in addition seek to place our butter in the same unrivalled position in the English market that our cheese now occupies? There is no country in the world that is in a position to compete with Canada in the production of the finest quality of butter, as it has been proved to a demonstration that there is no country in the world that is in a position successfully to compete with Canada in regard to cheese. We all know what an enormous industry this has become, and what its vast importance is to the great agricultural interests of the Dominion of Canada. Well, Sir, if that be the case in regard to cheese, why are these hon. gentlemen opposite afraid to take such measures as will put our butter industry on the same ground, and bring it to the same high position that the cheese industry now occupies? The very fact that Canada has been able to do what she has done in regard to cheese, shows that we have the climate, we have the soil, we have all the necessary conditions to enable us to acquire the same high position in regard to butter that our cheese now occupies, and that without losing a jot or tittle of the advantage which our cheese now holds. Is there any reason why, seeing we have accomplished so much in one branch of industry, we should not take measures to accomplish the same thing for another branch of industry, especially in view of the enormous capabilities that Canada possesses for producing the highest quality of butter? Although hon. gentlemen opposite are not willing to accept

this proposal of my hon. friend from Grenville, they know that he is voicing the sentiment of the great agricultural classes of this country. Although the Minister of Agriculture has done his best to prevent this resolution from receiving the support of this House, to prevent the butter industry of Canada from attaining the same pre-eminent position that the cheese industry now occupies, having determined that this resolution should not be adopted, he is still afraid of it. Why is he afraid of it? If he is right, if the butter industry does not require any support, if this resolution is uncalled for, if this is not a wise course to pursue why does not the hon. gentleman have the courage to ask those behind him to vote down this resolution proposed by my hon. friend? It is simply because that hon. gentleman knows, and those who sit behind him know that the sentiment propounded to this House by the hon. member for Grenville will be endorsed by the overwhelming majority of the great agricultural interests of Canada. Then what is done? Why, Sir, the miserable subterfuge is resorted to of attempting to get rid of this resolution by a side wind. Instead of meeting it in a manly fashion, by voting it down, they move the adjournment of the debate, well knowing that if they could put it at the bottom of the list they could prevent its being brought up again this session, and this House would have no opportunity to pass upon it at all. Well, Sir, that game has been checkmated and prevented. Then what do they do? Why they propose a resolution that every man on this side will vote for, they propose a resolution which, if offered to the House as a substantive proposition, would receive the support of every hon. gentleman on this side. There is not a man on this side of the House who is fighting in behalf of the great agricultural interests, as they have always fought for them, who would not be delighted, if the Government had proposed this as a substantive proposition, to vote for it. But what is the reason that this House is asked to give a negative to a proposition that every hon. gentleman on this side of the House is in favour of? Why, Sir, once more—I hope it is not unparliamentary for me to use the term—they have resorted to a miserable subterfuge to get rid of a resolution that they know will be sustained by the agricultural interests of Canada from one end of the country to the other. There is not a gentleman in this House who would not be delighted to vote for this resolution if put before us in any other light but as a means of preventing this additional aid and support being given to the butter industry. There is no hon. gentleman on either side of this House who is not willing to stand for that great interest in Canada that is of such vital importance to the progress and prosperity of the whole Dominion. There was not an hon. gentleman on either side of the House who should not be pre-

pared to vote for that motion and vote for it in connection with the resolution now proposed. Is there a word in this motion inconsistent with the resolution of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid)? Not a word. We all admit that both the past Government and the present Government have done a great deal for the butter industry. I am not going into that, as it has been reiterated again and again, and admitted on both sides of the House, that this industry has received a certain amount of attention; but, when we look at the utter insignificance of the success that has been achieved, compared with what we believe Canada can achieve in the butter industry every one must see that the amendment is one proposed for the purpose of killing the resolution, and has no other object, and that it affords a poor shield to protect hon. gentlemen opposite from the indignation which will be excited among agriculturists in Canada. Indignation will be felt by any intelligent farmer, I care not in what province he lives, because, knowing the capabilities of Canada to maintain an unrivalled butter industry, he cannot fail to see through this transparent gauze, and those who profess to endorse the measures taken, well and wisely, by the past Government and the present Government. I give them full credit for what they have done; I give the Minister of Agriculture full credit for having followed in the footsteps of his predecessors, for he has done so at considerable personal sacrifice on his own part, because, following so closely on the footsteps of his predecessor, he was obliged to run counter to the views expressed by himself in Opposition, and he became a humble follower of the Conservative party, which had taken up the butter industry. That fact has been established to-day beyond controversy. The hon. gentleman knows that one of the strong points in favour of a fast Atlantic service was, not only cold storage, but rapid means of transit, by which butter of the highest and finest grade could be delivered on the market of Great Britain. Yet the hon. gentleman did all he could to prevent that fast Atlantic project being carried out, one which is of so much importance to the agriculturists. He pledged himself, in the face of the people, against it; yet he is now supporting the fast Atlantic service and the cold storage system, and, in fact, he is wisely and judiciously availing himself of the services of a man placed in this department by the Conservative party, and whose guidance he recognizes. So I give the hon. gentleman full credit, and I say that, not only has he done what was his duty as a Minister, because in the past he committed himself to a different view, but in the face of that inconsistency, he has taken hold of those great questions and followed humbly and earnestly in the footsteps of his predecessors. Why cannot the hon. gentleman go a step further? Admitting, as he does, that

he owes so much to the Conservative party and to the policy they have propounded, and that he owes so much in respect to this butter industry and everything connected with his department, to the Conservatives, why is the hon. gentleman afraid to go a little further and adopt the wise measure propounded by the hon. member for Grenville, so as to meet the wishes of the great agricultural industry in this country? While admitting that a great deal has been done by the past and the present Government, I ask this Government, why such an insignificant appropriation of public money is made for the purpose of doing that for the butter industry which would be of enormous advantage, not to the agriculturists alone, but to every one interested in the progress and prosperity of Canada. This is an unworthy means to adopt. It shows that hon. gentlemen opposite are as unequal to meet this question in a fair and manly way, by the adoption of any parliamentary procedure, as they have been unable to maintain their position in the debate that has taken place. They have been left without a leg under them, and they know it. They know more than that. They know that, at this moment, they stand in dread of the indignation that will be felt by the agricultural population of this Dominion. How do they attempt to shield themselves? With this flimsy gauze, that every farmer, however humble his position may be, if he possesses a particle of intelligence, will see through; and they will denounce this motion as an altogether unworthy means of meeting a proposition that, after long debate, the House became satisfied should commend itself to the minds of the agriculturists, and their condemnation of the position of hostility taken by the Government to this measure will be justified.

Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the agricultural interests of this country. What have they done to promote those interests, except when necessity compelled them to walk in the footsteps of their predecessors? Did they remove the duty on flour in the interest of the agriculturists? Was the reduction of the duty on wheat in the interest of the agriculturist? Was there a farmer in Canada that wanted either one or the other? They know that these changes were made in antagonism to the farmers. Was the free importation of corn from the United States done for the benefit of the farmers, a change which led to an enormous quantity of corn coming into the country and striking down the farmers on poor lands who are raising coarse grains, and who are no longer in a position to compete with free corn? Hon. gentlemen opposite stand before the country, rightly and properly charged with having done nothing to promote the agricultural interest in any shape or form, except where the Minister of Agriculture humbly followed in the steps of his predecessor and availed himself of the great abilities of the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

gentleman brought into the public service by the preceding Government. I will not, at this late hour, exhausted as this subject has been by the discussion which has taken place, offer any further remarks, except to express the hope that every friend of the agriculturists will stand by the resolution, and vote against this flimsy pretext to cover the retreat of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Representing an agricultural county, which possesses dairying resources, I desire to offer a few observations. In view of the discussion that has taken place, and in view of the character of the resolution before the House, a silent vote on my part might be construed into an expression of sympathy with that resolution. The position taken by the supporters of this resolution seems to be, that there are shipped to the English market tons and tons of fresh Canadian creamery butter without a market, and ask the Government of Canada to come to the rescue of the manufacturer of this fine, fresh creamery butter, and ask that a bounty be given to the manufacturers in order to assist them to get the people of England to buy this "fine, fresh creamery butter." Coming, as I do, from a county that is not so favoured from a dairying point of view, as the counties of gentlemen who support this resolution, I feel that it is not to encourage the English people to buy fresh creamery butter that we should devote our money; but if the Government have money to devote to the advancement of this branch of agriculture, I would submit that they should supply it to the manufacture of creamery butter to suit the English market. In view of the fact that Great Britain imported 340,000,000 pounds of butter last year, and that the people of Canada only supplied 10,000,000 pounds of that amount, it is clear to me that the position taken by the supporters of this resolution is entirely erroneous. In my opinion the Government should devote this money to assisting scattered settlements throughout the Dominion to manufacture butter to suit the English market. I repeat, as has been already said, that when a proper quality of butter is manufactured for that market, the trade will take care of itself. The leader of the Opposition who has just spoken in favour of this resolution represents a neighbouring county to mine, and I hope to see him using his great abilities and his great influence in this House to secure for the people of Cape Breton assistance towards the manufacture of creamery butter. There are tons upon tons of ordinary dairy-made butter in the shops of the mining towns in the county which that hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) represents, and it is displaced by this very creamery butter which he so eloquently seeks help to market to-night. The miners look for this finer manufactured butter, and they are just as

fastidious in this respect as the other British consumers in the old land, so that the ordinary dairy-made butter of our farmers has no market. I therefore say that I shall have much pleasure in supporting the amendment, and I shall naturally expect the assistance of the leader of the Opposition to help his county and mine, neighbouring counties as they are, to claim from the Minister of Agriculture a certain appropriation to assist the people of Cape Breton to manufacture butter that will equal in quality this fine Ontario creamery butter that he is so much in sympathy with tonight.

Mr. DAVIN. That is the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Reid).

Mr. MACLENNAN (Inverness). It is evident that the old fashioned dairy system of making butter is a thing of the past. The same is true of the cheese industry, for who to-day would think of putting the old fashioned dairy-made cheese on the English market. Why, it would not be purchased at all, but our cheese manufactured in the systematic way and by the proper machinery has been brought to the highest standard of excellence, and is fit for any market in the world. Until such time as the farmers of Canada will be able to manufacture butter in the same systematic manner as they now manufacture cheese, dairying in Canada will be a failure. It is a very unfair condition of things that the people of the counties of the island of Cape Breton should be called upon to assist in paying millions for cold storage for the promotion of an industry in which they do not share. The same holds true as regards their proportion of the \$100,000 that went last year and previous years to assist dairying in the North-west Territories. We do not find fault with this, however, but we do expect that this system will be carried out from one locality to another throughout the whole Dominion until the manufacture of creamery butter will be a general industry in Canada. I may say that I look on the system of sending around lecturers both by the Dominion and local Governments as a rather useless expenditure of money to a very great degree, especially in cases where the conditions are unfavourable for demonstrating the process of manufacturing. The Ontario Government sends around what is called a traveling dairy, and this I look upon as a most useful institution, because a lecture can be demonstrated on the spot, and the farmers given practical lessons in the manufacture of creamery butter. But to send lecturers to farmers who never saw a creamery is a clear waste of time and money. But when the time comes when the Government will be in a position to extend their creamery system of manufacturing butter to that fine portion of the Dominion from which I come, and which the hon. leader of the Opposition represents in common with me, I hope that

I shall be able to claim his able assistance in urging the Government to make an appropriation to assist this very valuable industry.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I observe that hon. gentlemen opposite cheer that speech; but the concluding sentence would seem to indicate that if the hon. member is consistent, he is going to support the motion of my hon. friend from Grenville, for he wants an appropriation, and he calls on the leader of the Opposition to assist him in getting assistance for his farmers. What is that but the proposition of my hon. friend?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). It is to assist in manufacturing butter, not in selling it. The sale will take care of itself if it is properly manufactured.

Mr. DAVIN. That is a very fine distinction. If you assist people who make butter to sell it, it makes very little difference what you call it; you are assisting the man who makes the butter. I say that the leader of the Opposition has not characterized too strongly the amendment that has been moved. We heard a speech of great length from my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture in reply to the speech of the hon. gentleman who proposed the resolution, and what was the character of that speech? It was a carefully reasoned argument in direct opposition to the motion of the hon. member for Grenville. The hon. Minister pointed out that a bonus of this sort had been unsuccessful in Québec—that it had not gone to the men for whom it was intended, but had gone to the middlemen; and yet, although the Minister of Agriculture argued against the resolution, the Government are afraid to record their votes against it. This is an exhibition of cowardice such as we have never had before in a Government of Canada.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it out of order? I did not know it was unparliamentary. I will withdraw it, then, and will say an exhibition of timidity—an hon. friend says extreme timidity. I would say prudent timidity or calculated timidity; but whatever it is, it is too diaphanous altogether, and the farmers of Canada will so regard it. My hon. friend was on too high a wing of eloquence to allow me to interrupt him in order to ask a question; but I will ask him now, as he has not left the House. He said, in the course of his speech, that the dairy butter was displacing the farmers' butter made in his constituency.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). My argument is this, that creamery butter is now displacing ordinary dairy-made butter, and I contend that therefore creamery butter does not need a bonus for its sale.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, all I can say is that our experience in the North-west is this,

that the more we have developed creamery butter and dairy butter there, the better market we get for the farmers' own home-made butter. I do not understand how it is that the hon. gentleman makes out the displacement he speaks of.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Did you send any of the dairy-made butter to England?

Mr. DAVIN. Do you send any to England?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). No, for the simple reason that we have not got it. We do not send any dairy-made butter, and we are sorry that we have not got the creamery-made butter.

Mr. DAVIN. Still, I am in precisely the same position of not understanding the hon. gentleman's argument.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That is not his fault.

Mr. DAVIN. I dare say it is not. I dare say it is my obtuseness. But we find in the North-west that the more we have developed the creamery and dairy-made butter, the more we have developed skill in the manufacture of the butter for export, the better market we have for the farmers' home-made butter; and it must be the same thing elsewhere. If by means of creameries or dairies or anything else, you raise the skill of the farmers in making butter, you will not only get a better market for that butter away from the home market, but you will at the same time improve the market for the ordinary home-made butter produced by the farmer. But it was not for that I rose. I did not intend to speak on this motion, because before there was an amendment moved, I had expressed my adherence to the position of the hon. member for Grenville. But while I have been away from the House I understand that the motion proposed by the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Campbell) to adjourn the debate has been withdrawn, and why? Because the Government saw that they had put their foot in it. By moving that motion they had placed themselves in antagonism to the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Grenville, who in it represents the opinion of the farmers of Canada—not simply those of Ontario, but also those of Cape Breton. We had the Minister of Agriculture arguing against the position taken by the mover of that resolution, and we had his henchman behind him moving the adjournment of the debate in the hope that they would get rid of the resolution and prevent an expression of opinion on it by this House. I am sorry that the mover of the motion to adjourn was allowed to withdraw it, and that the Government were not forced to vote and show their real position on this question. No wonder the "Farmers' Sun," in Toronto, says that the

Mr. DAVIN.

farmers have been betrayed. No wonder it points to the broken promises of hon. gentlemen, and says: These are the men who put honeyed words and sunny ways before you, but now that they are in power, they forget their honeyed words and sunny ways, and the farmers of Canada are betrayed. The amendment that has been moved will not deceive them. I have no hesitation in voting against it. There is not a farmer in the country who does not know what that amendment means—that the Government that is so mean that it will not support the motion of the hon. member for Grenville is still meaner to try to hide the position it has taken. It will not deceive the farmers at all. It will only emphasize the position that is made clearer and clearer to the farmers of this country that in the men who are in power they have only hollow-professed friends, and the hearts of the people are not with them.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Representing as I do one of the best agricultural sections of Ontario, I wish to say that an injustice will be done to the farmers I represent if the resolution moved by the hon. member for Grenville is carried. The last clause of that resolution states:

That this bonus be paid to only those farmers who will furnish for export regular supplies.

I wish to say that in my constituency, there is a number of cheese factories which are now beginning to make butter for export in the fall of the year, after the cheese-making season is finished; and if this resolution should carry, the men who are making cheese during the cheese-making season and then turning their cheese factories into creameries in the winter season, would not benefit by this bonus at all. I have just read in the Brantford "Expositor" of March 23rd, a report of a meeting held by the farmers of the village of St. George, which is in the centre of my constituency, and where a large cheese industry is carried on. This cheese factory they have turned into a creamery during the winter season, and I wish to point out that injustice would be done to the farmers of my constituency if this motion should be carried.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Has my hon. friend not overlooked the fact that the bonus is to be increased at the discretion of the Government, on butter made during the winter months, so that it will suit his case exactly.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The last clause says:

This bonus to be paid only to those farmers who will furnish for export regular supplies.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. During the winter?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It does not say so. If this motion should carry, the cheese and butter factory at St. George, in my consti-

tuency, will not get a cent of benefit from this bonus, and therefore I am inclined to oppose the motion. There was a meeting held at St. George on the 23rd of March, which is thus reported in the Brantford "Expositor":

There was a largely attended meeting of the patrons of the cheese factory at the Public Library Hall on Friday forenoon, all anxious to learn the success of the year. The year has been one of gratifying success. At the close of the cheese season in the fall this was mentioned. The creamery which was then started was well patronized, and as the demand for butter at high price still keeps up it was decided to continue the manufacture of butter until about the first of May. It is found that making butter in this way puts more money into the farmers' pockets than the manufacture of cheese, hence the gratification at its continuance for a few weeks longer is general.

It must be perfectly evident that any hon. member who votes for this resolution, will not be voting in the interests of the farmers of this country, at least of the farmers who engage in the manufacture of cheese and butter. I know it will be an injury to the farmers in my constituency, and I am satisfied that there are many other constituencies in Ontario and the other provinces where cheese and butter-making is carried on in the same factories at different seasons of the year. It will be an injustice to these people, and this resolution is not in the interest of the farmers of my constituency, at all events.

Mr. McMILLAN. There are one or two statements made by the hon. leader of the Opposition which I cannot let pass. They show to what length men will go when they talk of questions concerning which they are perfectly ignorant. The hon. gentleman asked us if it was a benefit to the farmers to reduce the duty on wheat. Take the prices in wheat in Ontario this last winter. Every one who has examined them knows well that the price of wheat in Ontario is 10 or 12 cents a bushel lower than it is in the border towns of the United States. Take Detroit and Buffalo, and you will find that fall wheat is selling there 10 cents a bushel higher than it is in Toronto. Would it then injure our farmer to remove that duty and increase the prices? The hon. gentleman told us also that it as an injury to the farmers to allow corn to come in free. Why, in Toronto to-day you can sell oats at 34 cents to 35 cents a bushel, and purchase American corn at 32 cents. You can purchase 56 pounds of the best feed you can get for animals, with what you will get by selling 34 pounds of oats, and have a little residue left. If it is in this way that the farmers of the country are to be injured, I would like them to be injured in this way all the time.

I would say to the hon. gentleman who has introduced this resolution that he has not been paying strict attention to the farmers in his locality, or he would have told them that if they put up cold storage in their

creameries, the Minister of Agriculture has adopted a scheme whereby they are assisted in putting up these creameries. I am a shareholder in a creamery to-day that put up cold storage this last year, and the butter-maker tells me, and so does the salesman, that on account of that cold storage they were able to get one or two cents a pound more for their butter than they could without cold storage. If hon. gentlemen who are so anxious for the interest of the farmers had been paying that strict attention to their interests that they should, they would have paid attention to what has been done and have asked the farmers to avail themselves of these advantages which the Government has placed within their reach, and which will do more to give our butter a footing on the British market than anything that could possibly be done. A year ago butter was shipped from Indian Head, where they had no cold storage, and some was shipped also from Prince Albert where they had cold storage. Everything else was equal, but the butter from Prince Albert realized nine shillings to ten shillings per hundred more than the other, which shows that the Government has taken the best means possible to advance that industry. Let me give an example of what can be done in order to place our goods upon the English market. A gentleman of my acquaintance had tried, time and again, to get some of the larger distributing houses in London to accept Canadian eggs on trial, but without success. After thinking the matter over fairly, he had a nice little package of Canadian eggs put up, and went across to visit that firm again in London. He had arranged to have his little package of eggs arrive just as he reached the firm, and he made a present of the package to the head of the firm. The head of the firm was unwilling to accept but in the end took the gift, and a couple of days after my friend got a letter asking if these eggs were a fair sample of what he could put on the British market. We do not want to establish shops to sell our own goods, but we want agents who will persistently take them to the best distributing houses in Britain and if necessary make them occasionally a small present of a few pounds of butter to show what Canadian butter really is and thus have it introduced on the market. There has been nothing done which has been a greater benefit to the butter industry than the establishment of a cold storage system.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say that our cheese business has had no competition when it was established. That, Mr. Speaker, is a fallacy. The United States had control of the British market for cheese, they took the lead for years in that market against Canada, until we had a thorough educational system at work among our cheese-makers, which ended in our driving the Americans out of the British markets and in our getting a cent and a half to two cents

a pound more for our cheese. That was the result of the commission we sent over to England, but there was not one cent of a bonus paid to those who manufactured the cheese.

Let me tell the leader of the Opposition that I am acquainted with the great agricultural industry, of the province of Ontario at least, much better than he is. Within the last five years I have been over the whole province, except in Muskoka, amongst the farmers. This last winter I was out six weeks, and at every point this great dairying interest was discussed. Not one word did I hear about the farmers getting a bonus, but they were all hoping to have cold storage placed within their reach. Those hon. gentlemen who are very derelict in their duty who did not inform their constituents that the Government had provided a system of cold storage, and I think the Government will be very far wrong in going further than they have, until the farmers show that they are going to avail themselves of all the advantages placed within their reach, which they have not done up to the present.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I always listen with a great deal of interest to my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), because he is generally accurate in his figures and speaks with exact knowledge. But I find the figures he has given to-night are not in consonance with those given in to-day's "Mail and Empire." I understood him to say that there was a difference in red winter wheat of 12 cents between Toronto and Buffalo.

Mr. McMILLAN. I said there had been during the winter.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). There is no difference to-day; it is 83 cents in each place. I understood him to say that he could buy American corn at 32 cents in Toronto.

Mr. McMILLAN. Let me say that we ourselves have bought not less than four car loads of corn which we got at from 31½ cents to 32 cents. Just last week we got some of it.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). American corn is quoted to-day at 37 cents on track, by the car load. This is only 17 per cent of an error on the hon. gentleman's part. I observe that the prices can scarcely be attributed to the change of tariff, because this paper which may be in error, but is not likely to be so, quotes Canadian corn at Chatham at 31 cents and American corn at 37 cents.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What paper is that?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The "Mail and Empire."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I presume that the "Globe" quotations are the same. I would

Mr. McMILLAN.

be obliged if some hon. member opposite would look them up. As I have said, I always listen with great pleasure to my hon. friend from South Huron, because he always speaks from precise knowledge, and is usually very accurate. I am sorry to say that his remarks on this occasion are not quite so reliable as they usually are. I would like to say a few words upon the points touched upon by my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan). We are very much interested in the manufacture of butter in the lower provinces. The probability is that the larger part of the farmers of the lower provinces will, at an early day, devote themselves to dairy farming. We have a climate that is very well suited for that industry. We have good grass and pure water, the probability is that our farmers will devote themselves largely to dairy products, particularly the manufacture of butter. I was inclined to think that my hon. friend from Inverness was, perhaps, not giving the Opposition leader credit for as much assistance as he should in the course of his observations. As I understood my hon. friend, he was exceedingly anxious that the dairy butter in his county should be relieved from the competition of the creamery butter produced in Ontario. As nearly as I can understand the purport of this resolution, its object is to accomplish this very thing, that is, to take away creamery butter from Canada and find a market for it in Great Britain. If the hon. gentleman is really anxious to relieve the dairy-made butter from the present competition, I think he should join us in supporting the resolution of the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Reid).

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). My contention was that the market already exists in Great Britain for creamery butter without the assistance proposed in this resolution.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I presume that no one will dispute that. The market is there, but the difficulty is we are not enjoying that market. We are told, and I think that there can be no doubt about the fact, that 400,000,000 pounds of butter is imported into Great Britain, to which Canada sends 10,000,000 pounds. If we were able to supply that market, we should be in an enviable position. We produce a great deal of creamery butter that does not go to Great Britain. The object of the hon. member for Grenville is, as I understand, to raise the standard of butter throughout Canada, to place it in such advantageous terms of competition that it will capture the British market. That is a good work in which, as I cannot but think, my hon. friend from Inverness would be glad to join us. The hon. gentleman must know that we can capture that market only gradually. We sell only one-fortieth of the total quantity imported into Great Britain. The fact that we do even so well as that we owe, we can say

quite frankly, to the efforts of the present Government in establishing the cold storage system. This resolution does not deny the merits of the present Government; it only asks that they go further and that, in addition to giving the advantage of cold storage, they should grant a bonus of one cent a pound on butter exported to Great Britain and thus stimulate the production of high class butter and stimulate the efforts of those whose business it is to place it on the British market. There may be some better way of obtaining this object, but this is the best way that has occurred to the mover of the resolution. It seems to me that if the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) was really in earnest in wishing well to this resolution, he would not condemn it because it did not quite suit the locality in which his supporters are. I think it would have been more consistent in him and would have been better for his constituents if he had come with us, and while accepting the principles of the resolution tried to amend it so as to suit the people of his county. His idea was that this bonus of one cent per pound would go only to those who could guarantee a regular supply for a whole year. But this is not the way we understand it on this side. The farmer should guarantee a regular supply but there is not a word in the resolution to say that no arrangement would be made with any farmer or creamery that would not guarantee a regular supply for a year. The hon. member could have offered an amendment to the effect that one who would guarantee a regular supply for six months or for four months should be included. I think that we on this side could have accepted it, and the hon. gentleman would have been able to join with us in supporting this resolution. I have been anxious to see something of this kind done. I do not know that this is the best thing that could be done, but it is the best thing that has been suggested, and those who wish well to the dairying interests should join the hon. member for Grenville on the main question and then seek such changes in this resolution as would obviate any defects that may appear in it.

Dairying must necessarily be the great interest with the farmers in the lower provinces. There are a variety of reasons for this, but it is too late to enter into them to-night. I am sure, knowing the fine county represented by my hon. friend from Inverness, knowing its great fertility of soil, its fine grasses and excellent water supply, I am sure that it should be what it has been in the past, one of the greatest butter producing counties. The hon. member for Inverness would do a great deal to assist his friends in that county by helping them to produce better dairy butter, or to turn from that to the production of creamery butter. But by joining with the hon. member for Grenville he could probably procure

assistance to tide them over the difficulty that would attend the transitions from one mode of production to another. I am glad I have the opportunity to vote for this resolution. No objection can be raised to this manner of assisting this industry. It cannot be objectionable to the gentlemen on the other side, for they are all committed to the system of bounties. With sound common sense, as I believe, they heartily supported the bounties for the production of iron.

Well, in its own way, perhaps, iron is one of the most important products of this or any country, but in regard to the enormous extent to which the trade may be developed, and the amount of money which it will bring into the country, I do not think that it is at all more important than butter. But there is another most important point. Any person who is familiar with agricultural matters, who is familiar with the development of that industry that is taking place, is aware of the fact that, if you can induce the body of farmers of any county, or any country, to elevate their profession, and to pass from producing the coarser and cheaper products, or producing them in a slipshod way, to producing them of a higher quality and in a more economical way, you elevate thereby the whole mass of the farmers, you dignify their business, and you improve them in every respect. Whenever you induce a farmer to improve his methods and the quality of his products, you elevate that farmer, not only as a farmer, but as a citizen. Therefore, this is a most commendable object, and it is one in which the Government should join heartily. It is not, of course, for us on this side to dictate to the Government in what way they shall spend the revenue of the country, because they have to find the money for the appropriation, and they might fall back upon that plea, and refuse to be dictated to. But I do feel, with the leader of the Opposition, that, in endeavouring to side-track this resolution, as they did twice, first of all, by the amendment moved by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), and secondly, by the amendment moved by the Government Whip, the Government are endeavouring to avoid a direct vote upon an issue which can never be made anything else than a direct issue between the two parties in this House. Their object in doing that, I cannot conceive. One thing is clear, that their course will defeat itself. There is no question but that a vote in support of the amendment moved from the other side of the House must be regarded as a vote against this very laudable resolution moved by the hon. member for Grenville.

Mr. CLANCY. I would have been content to allow this vote to be taken without saying anything, if hon. gentlemen opposite had not given a distinct challenge to this side of the House. I am sorry to see that

the Minister of Agriculture and his friends do not feel themselves sufficiently strong in the position they took during the course of this debate, to have voted upon that question without resorting to what seems to me a very extraordinary and not at all a creditable amendment. I have never witnessed a more extraordinary spectacle in this House than the course of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell). I do not know whether he was the parent of the trick himself, or whether he was put up at the instance of some one else, but he has played a part that is not very creditable under the circumstances. The purpose for which the hon. gentleman moved the adjournment of the debate is now disclosed. The hon. gentleman rose afterwards, quite out of order, and asked that that motion might be withdrawn. Now, what was the palpable object of withdrawing that motion? Evidently, as this debate went on, and as hon. gentlemen felt themselves in a position where they could not defend their acts before the country, they wished to hide themselves behind what has been properly characterized, this evening, as a miserable subterfuge.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The expression that an hon. gentleman has been guilty of a subterfuge, is not in order. I find in Blackmore's "Speakers' Decisions," at page 132, that it has been decided by Speaker Brand, in England, that it is unparliamentary to say that a member has sheltered himself behind a miserable subterfuge. The expression is not in order.

Mr. CLANCY. I readily withdraw the expression, in accordance with your ruling. But I wish to say that I used no such expression. I did not charge the hon. gentlemen with resorting to a miserable subterfuge. I said the amendment was a subterfuge, and I said it had been characterized as such. So that my readiness to withdraw any unparliamentary expression in no sense involves a withdrawal by me of an expression that the amendment is a subterfuge.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You cannot withdraw the resolution.

Mr. CLANCY. No, I cannot withdraw the resolution; but I should judge that my hon. friend would like an opportunity of withdrawing what he said a few moments ago, to which I shall pay some attention. Now, the hon. gentlemen have succeeded in turning this into a party question. Without a single exception, they have risen in their places and discovered, all of a sudden, that no encouragement should be given to a particular class or interest in this country. We even see the representative of the Patrons joining in this crusade against the farmers. In the past, we have been accustomed to hear them declare that the farmers are a down-trodden set of people, and I am not sure but that the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) has shed bitter and

Mr. CLANCY.

salty tears, over the woes of the farmers. But now he says they only want a fair field and no favour. He has discovered suddenly that the farmers have become a very independent class. I fancy that, if the hon. gentleman were to use that kind of logic in his riding, we would not see anything more of him here.

Mr. COCHRANE. He won't come back again.

Mr. CLANCY. I think he is quite sure of that himself. Now, there was no need of making this a party question. The hon. member who moved this resolution did so in a most temperate speech; he said nothing of a character to provoke hon. gentlemen opposite to rise in defence of their past or present acts. It was a moderate speech of a business kind, and his resolution should have been allowed to go through without criticism. The Minister of Agriculture and his friends take the ground that only a few persons can profit by this proposition, and that, therefore, the masses of the people are opposed to it. Now, the object of giving encouragement to any industry to make it more prosperous, and the only ground of giving such encouragement is, that such industry is not keeping pace with others. Of the 400,000,000 pounds of butter imported into England, Canada only supplies 10,000,000 pounds. What does that mean? It means that the butter industry in Canada is not keeping abreast with the other industries, that it is not taking its place in the English market that it should take. It means that we must give some special encouragement, for a time at least, to that industry, until it can take the place which belongs to it in the English market. That has been the idea held in giving a bonus for the encouragement of any industry in this country. Why not follow it, although the mass of the people cannot be benefited? I should like to ask the hon. member for North Brant whether the masses benefit from the bonus given for the purpose of encouraging the iron industry? I should like to ask the hon. member why he presented this argument, which is the stock argument of hon. gentlemen opposite? It is utterly impossible to encourage any single industry when an argument might not be used quite as effectively as in the present case. Hon. gentlemen opposite felt the difficulty of their position, and have had to recede from it as indicated by the motion moved this evening. It is extraordinary that if hon. gentlemen have been sincere in their speeches, their declaration should not commend themselves to the people, and why should they be obliged to resort to this motion? We could have no better condemnation of their position than that to be found in the speech of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan). What did he say? He said it was an evil to encourage the manufacture of a

good article to take the place of a bad article, and yet he told the leader of the Opposition that it would be better if they had more encouragement given to the people of his province. For what purpose? In order to raise the standard of that article in Nova Scotia; in order to enable it to compete with the superior butter manufactured in other portions of the Dominion. Could any more absurd argument be offered to support hon. gentlemen opposite. Does not the hon. gentleman advocate, in the strongest terms, the principle that we should improve the quality of butter so as to be able to compete with the foreign trade. Hon. gentlemen opposite occupy an inconsistent position, of which there is no better evidence than the motion made in amendment.

I desire to say a word or two in reply to the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan). The hon. gentleman is always listened to with a good deal of interest. There is no doubt as to the hon. gentleman's honesty, but as regards his judgment and sincerity, I do not see where they lie. The hon. gentleman rose with apparently a good deal of knowledge and a great deal of assertion. The hon. gentleman stated that wheat was higher in Canada than in the United States and that it was in consequence of the duty having been lowered. No doubt the hon. gentleman travelled around his county during the last contest and declared that wheat was lower in Canada than in the United States when the late Government were in power, and it was in consequence of their policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite have constantly declared that wheat was higher on the other side of the line in consequence of the policy of the Liberal Government. The hon. gentleman was not satisfied with that statement, but he informed the House that the remission of duty on corn had been a great boon. He is, however, well aware that the importation of large quantities of corn in the province of Ontario has reduced the price of his own wheat. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) is a practical miller, and what has been his experience? They have thus reduced the value of the coarse grains, and have reduced the price of mill feed sent to Toronto and the maritime provinces, and the price has been lowered because it has been displaced by corn coming in from the United States. Nothing has had a greater tendency to lower the price of wheat than to bring in corn and other grains from the United States to come into competition with our coarse grains. Yet the hon. gentleman sought to show how little the leader of the Opposition knew about these matters and how much the hon. member himself knew. The hon. gentleman also spoke about oats. The hon. gentleman is perfectly well aware that the high price of oats was not owing to the local demand. He is too shrewd and keen a farmer to be imposed on

by such palpable nonsense. The high price is due to the export trade. If it were not for the export trade, oats would not be worth 20 cents a bushel. Does any one imagine that for the local demand in Canada oats would realize 31 cents or 33 cents, when independent of the export trade the price has been as low as 20 cents, and even 15 cents. That I know has been the case. The hon. gentleman should know that when the export trade in oats was dull last year the price fell to 15 cents throughout Ontario. Only white oats were sold, and for milling purposes, as I have said, the price was from 15 cents to 18 cents, and the result occurred not in consequence of the importation of American corn alone, but because of the low prices of other coarse grains, and in consequence of there being no export demand. I hope the hon. gentleman who poses as the friend of the farmers will consider these facts; but he does not speak for the farmers, because if he did, I would say God help the farmers. We have come to the rather strange condition of affairs that an hon. gentleman should rise in his place and declare opposite reasons have effected the market. We have a splendid exhibition to-night of the record of inconsistency on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. This is not the first time that hon. gentlemen opposite have been guilty of adopting such a course. We would only be guilty of a piece of acting if we were to pretend that we were at all shocked by the position taken by these hon. gentlemen. It is in keeping with their past record, and what we may expect for the future. But the hon. gentlemen cannot hope to escape the consequences of preparing and submitting such an amendment for the purpose of escaping from voting on the fair proposition contained in the motion submitted by the hon. member for Grenville. The farmers are not so dull as to be deceived by it; and if hon. gentlemen opposite feel inclined to vote for this palpable fraud, the people will understand and be able to judge of the action the hon. gentlemen have taken. We could have no better exhibition than we had in the speeches of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) and the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville). I have always listened to that gentleman (Mr. Somerville) with pleasure, as he is usually explicit and his arguments sound; but I cannot congratulate him on the position he takes to-night. He says that this motion would be an injury to the farmers in his county, and his reason is, that during certain months in the year the farmers are engaged entirely in the manufacture of cheese, and that in other seasons they turn their cheese factories into creameries for the manufacture of butter, which, no doubt, would be of high grade and come under the terms of this motion. If these farmers can successfully make cheese during a certain period, is it not a great boon to offer them a

cent a pound upon the high-grade butter produced in these same factories in the winter months for export? The statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) is not consistent with his record in this House. Indeed, the latter part of his argument was a complete answer to his own contention. We are now content to leave this matter, not in the hands of the House, because the amendment which is proposed, and will likely pass, is a sham; but I say we are willing to leave it to the people of this Dominion to judge of the arguments and the action of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. McMILLAN. I rise to substantiate what I stated about wheat. I went to the Reading Room, and I got to-day's "Globe," and it shows that white wheat in Toronto is from 77 to 83½ cents; red wheat, from 85 to 87 cents; while in Buffalo, red wheat No. 2 is 99 cents; No. 1 white, 93½ cents; No. 2 white, 95 cents; which shows conclusively that the statements I made are correct.

Mr. SPROULE and Mr. TAYLOR rose.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh.

Mr. SPROULE. I always hear the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) groan, whenever anything is said in this House in favour of the farmers; but if there is any man in Parliament who ought to be interested in that class of the community, it is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell), because he lives on their product from the beginning of the year to the end. No man is more ready than the hon. member (Mr. Campbell) to attempt to decry any member of this House when he has a word to say in favour of the farmers, and I think it comes with very bad grace from him. I wish to say a few words with regard to the conduct of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), and his political friends, in respect to this resolution. His first action was to move that this debate should be adjourned, in order to kill the motion for this session, and to prevent this House from saying:

That the Government should take steps to do something more to assist in the development of the butter trade.

That is the sum and substance of the motion. We all admit that the Government has made a reasonable effort to help the dairying interest, but was there anything wrong in saying that they should do something more? We on this side of the House believe that the industry is of such importance to Canada that the Government cannot afford to stand still, and we so believe that they should do something more to help it along. Gentlemen opposite did not seem

Mr. CLANCY.

to like that, and so the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) was put to move the adjournment of the debate, in order that no expression of opinion might be taken on the motion, and in order that the Government might be left to make no further effort to help our farmers. This resolution was either right or wrong in the opinion of hon. gentlemen supporting the Government. If it was right, why did they not let it pass, and if it was wrong, why had they not the courage to vote it down. They dare not vote it down, because they know that, in doing so, they would not be in harmony with the views of the farmers of this country. They dare not say that the motion was wrong, and so, in a roundabout way, they first tried to kill it by moving the adjournment of the debate so that it would be put down at the bottom of the Order paper and could not possibly be reached again this session; and, when we on this side of the House prevented them attaining that object, then they asked to have the motion to adjourn the debate withdrawn. That was unanimously consented to by gentlemen on this side, in the hopes that the Government had changed their mind and were willing to allow the motion to pass. However, their courage was not up to that point, and now we find that gentlemen opposite withdrew the motion to adjourn for the purpose of substituting an amendment which is intended to deceive the farmers of the country. That amendment expresses the conviction of hon. gentlemen opposite, that everything that was necessary to be done has been done by the Government, and that, in their honest judgment, nothing more should be done. Hon. gentlemen opposite moved in amendment, that these words of the original motion be struck out:

That our Government should take steps to do something to assist the development of the butter trade.

And they substitute the following words:—

This House views with satisfaction the great progress which has been made in the butter-making branch of the dairy industry, as shown in the great and regular increase of our export trade in butter and the high reputation which the Canadian product has made, especially during last season, since the establishment of complete cold storage transportation, and believes that the course already pursued by the Government, if continued on the same lines, will result in still greater benefits to the farmers of our Dominion.

Every farmer who reads that resolution will see that these hon. gentlemen opposite either do not believe that all has been done which could be done, or else that they are wanting in courage. If these hon. gentlemen are not in favour of doing more for the butter industry, then they should have manfully said so to the farmers, and justified their opinion by giving reasons. All the argu-

ments which they adduced to establish the correctness of their contention that everything was done that could be done, and that nothing more was necessary—all these arguments, they knew, will not be sufficient to satisfy the farmers of the country, and, therefore, they have resort to other means for preventing a straight vote on the motion before the House. Which horn of the dilemma are the hon. gentlemen willing to hang themselves on? For instance, the hon. gentleman from Kent (Mr. Campbell), who professes so much love for the farmers, what explanation can he give, when he goes back to the farmers of his county, for his two efforts in this House to prevent a fair expression of the views of Parliament on this question? An hon. gentleman behind me says, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) never expects to go back to his constituents. I can readily believe that, from his conduct here to-night, because, if he did expect to go back, he would not have taken this course. I believe that the farmers in his constituency are too intelligent not to see through his aim in making a motion to adjourn and afterwards withdrawing it—first, for the purpose of burking the expression of this House, and, second, for the purpose of evading it in another way that cannot be seen by the people of this country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.
Order.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the hon. gentleman calling order for?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.
Because the hon. gentleman speaks of burking the question.

Mr. SPROULE. I say deliberately burking the question, and so far as I understand rules of debate, I am quite in order. I say it is for that deliberate purpose, and hon. gentlemen know that it was for that purpose and no other. I want the farmers of the country to understand the means adopted by the Government for preventing the expression of this House that although the Government have done much—and we are willing to give them credit for what they have done—still this House thinks that they should do more to assist the development of the export butter trade. I want the farmers of this country to know that they are afraid to meet that question, and, therefore, they have resorted to this unfair means of preventing the expression of the House on this important question in which the great agricultural classes of this country are so much interested.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just a word in reference to a statement of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan). That hon. gentleman stated that oats could be sold in Toronto to-day at 34 cents a bushel of 34 pounds, and that corn could be purchased at 32 cents a bushel of 5⁹ pounds, and he

tried to show that that was a great benefit to the farmers of this country. It is perhaps a benefit to the hon. gentleman, who is a feeder and not a farmer. I find by the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce that in 1896 we imported into Canada 3,017,630 bushels of corn, and in 1897 we imported 4,163,069 bushels. Corn was put on the free list last session, which went into operation perhaps in March, and this report is made up to the 30th of June, so that practically in about three months of the year we increased our import of corn from the United States by 1,145,439 bushels. Perhaps when we get the returns for the whole year, the increase will amount to four or five million bushels. What does this mean? It means the displacement of over 2,000,000 bushels of Canadian grown oats by American corn. This year we had an export demand for oats; but we would have had two export demands had it not been for the importation of free American corn. Manitoba and the North-west had a failure in oats, and a demand sprang up there in the fall of the year for oats at 40 or 50 cents a bushel; but it was soon found that corn could be imported at much better advantage than oats could be brought from Ontario. Many of us in the grain business commenced shipping oats to Manitoba at the prices that were paid there at the outset, but the importation of corn stopped that trade. Had it not been for that the farmers of Ontario would have received two or three cents a bushel more for their oats. My hon. friend says that he purchased four car loads of American corn for feeding purposes. Had the corn not been free of duty, he would have had to go to his Canadian neighbours and purchase oats. I take it that the importation of American corn is a great injury, taking it year in and year out. This year we had a surplus of oats and a large foreign demand. Had it not been for that, they could not have paid this year in this country, taking into consideration the fact that we had free corn. My hon. friend also stated that he had travelled in every county of Ontario and had lectured to the farmers' institutes, and that he had not heard a single word in favour of a bonus on butter; the question had not been mooted. The Ontario Government profess to be great friends of the farmers, and they voted last year \$13,000 for farmers' institutes, but I find that in the disbursement of that sum \$11,000 went to gentlemen like the hon. member for South Huron who went around the country to instruct the farmers, and only \$2,000 went direct to the institutes. I presume that my hon. friend got a large portion of that \$11,000 for his expenses in travelling around and instructing the farmers of this country on the advantage of free corn.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will I inform the hon. gentleman what I got? \$2.50 a day is the fee you get.

Mr. TAYLOR. And your expenses ?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, and your expenses.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the farmers of this country got very little benefit from it. My hon. friend quoted the "Globe," of to-day as giving the figures of the Buffalo market. I have the "Globe" here, and I cannot find a quotation of the Buffalo market in it. The figures he quoted were those of the Detroit market.

Mr. McMILLAN. I quoted the figures of the Buffalo market, and they are in the "Globe."

Mr. TAYLOR. If my hon. friend had quoted the Toronto market, and not the farmers' market—

Mr. McMILLAN. I did quote the farmers' market.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman had quoted the Toronto market, he would have read these figures :

The market is steady at 84c. for red winter north and west ; Manitoba wheat is steady at \$1.10 for No. 1 hard, North Bay, and \$1.06 Midland.

These are the grains that compare with the same grains quoted at Buffalo, Chicago and Toledo.

Mr. McMILLAN. We do not raise any No. 1 hard in the province of Ontario. We only raise red and white winter wheat. No. 1 hard refers entirely to North-west wheat.

Mr. TAYLOR. North-west wheat is the wheat quoted in Buffalo and Chicago.

As Mr. Speaker was about to put the question—

Mr. SPROULE. I beg to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the second of this motion is not in the House.

The House divided on amendment of Mr. Sutherland to adjourn debate.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bain,	Lang,
Bazinet,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Beausoleil,	Lavergne,
Bernier,	Legris,
Bertram,	Lemieux,
Blair,	Lewis,
Bostock,	Lister,
Bourassa,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bourbonnais,	Mackie,
Britton,	McClure,
Brodeur,	McGugan,
Brown,	McHugh,
Bruneau,	McIsaac,
Calvert,	McLennan (Inverness),
Choquette,	McMillan,
Copp,	McMullen,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Madore,
Davis,	Malouin,
Dechène,	Mignault,
Domville,	Mulock,
Ellis,	Oliver,

Mr. McMILLAN.

Erb,
Featherston,
Fisher,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Frost,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Godbout,
Graham,
Guay,
Guité,
Haley,
Harwood,
Heyd,
Hurley,
Jameson,
Joly de Lotbinière
(Sir Henri),
Landerkin,

Parmalee,
Paterson,
Préfontaine,
Ratz,
Richardson,
Rinfret,
Rogers,
Ross,
Rutherford,
Savard,
Sriver,
Semple,
Sifton,
Snetsinger,
Scmerville,
Stenson,
Sutherland,
Tarte, and
Tolmie.—80.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Beattie,	McNeill,
Bell (Pictou),	Marcotte,
Bennett,	Martin,
Broder,	Mills,
Cargill,	Monk,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Montague,
Carscallen,	Morin,
Clancy,	Quinn,
Clarke,	Reid,
Cochrane,	Rosamond,
Dugas,	Sproule,
Guillet,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Hale,	Wallace,
Hodgins,	Wilson, and
LaRivière,	Wood (Brockville).—34.
McInerney,	
McLennan (Glengarry),	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.

Opposition.

Messieurs

Angers,	Casgrain,
Campbell,	Kendry,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Penny,	Ives,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Wood (Hamilton),	Gilmour,
Gibson,	Corby,
Talbot,	Poupore,
Cowan,	Pri-r,
Turcot,	McDougall,
Macdonell (Selkirk),	Roche,
McGregor,	Tyrwhitt,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Bergeron,
Christie,	Davin,
MacPherson,	Osler,
Cameron,	McAlister,
Fortin,	Chauvin,

Amendment agreed to, and motion as amended, agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. members for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), Terrebonne (Mr. Chauvin), Restigouche (Mr. McAlister), have not voted.

Mr. DAVIN. I am paired with the hon. member for Argenteull (Mr. Christie).

Mr. BERGERON. I am paired with the hon. member for Guysborough or I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. McALISTER. I am paired with the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), or I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. CHAUVIN. I am paired with the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin).

Mr. PENNY. I am paired with the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives), or I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am paired with the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), or I would have voted for the amendment.

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

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What business does the right hon. gentleman intend taking up to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER. One or two minor Bills and, at all events, the Franchise Bill.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 25th March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to ask the First Minister—unfortunately the Minister of Finance is not here—with reference to the Public Accounts Committee. I have had no notice of a meeting of that committee since the formal organization meeting, and I think it is very necessary that we should have a meeting at the earliest opportunity.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Certainly. The committee will be called, on the expression of the wish of my hon. friend, if he will let it be known what day would be convenient to him.

Mr. FOSTER. It will have to be a day on which there is no other important committee meeting.

PRINCE ALBERT MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I wish to call the attention of the Government and

of the House to a telegram which I have just received from the mayor of Prince Albert. It is as follows:

Only one mail in two weeks. Train in Regina. Insist on them moving. Weather fine.

T. C. BAKER.

This sort of thing has been going on in connection with the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway every winter for a long time. These people receive from the Government \$80,000 a year for carrying mails and supplies—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is making a speech, which he cannot do, unless he intends to make a motion.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I will conclude with a motion. I was saying that this thing is taking place every winter, and I think it is only just to the people of that district that the railway company should be compelled to fulfil their agreement with the Government. We do not object to a train being cancelled occasionally, but it has come to this, that when there is a very small storm these people cancel their trains, because they find it cheaper than to run them; they can save money. The people of my district do not intend to put up with this sort of treatment any longer. I brought the matter to the attention of this House last session, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's attention was also called to it, and they had all summer to put up snow fences. They have rotary snow-ploughs, and they can open that road if they like. It is not right to ask a town of 2,000 inhabitants and a large district with a population of about 15,000, to submit to the inconvenience of having only one train in two weeks. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DAVIN. With regard to this matter, of course it must be a great inconvenience to a town of the size of Prince Albert not to have postal communication or railway communication with the outside world, whenever it occurs; but I am under the impression—I may be wrong—that the grievance is not as great as my hon. friend states it to be, and I believe it is better not to overstate your case. I know that there are times when the Prince Albert train does not arrive in time, or has to be cancelled in consequence of a heavy snow blockade; but it is very seldom that this occurs. The statement of my hon. friend is very instructive, however, as bearing on a late burning subject of discussion, because this is a broad gauge railway, with an engine capable of running on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and going from one divisional point to another, yet when a heavy snow-storm occurs there is occasionally a blockade. What usually happens is that the train is late. If, as the telegram states, the weather is fine, I am perfectly certain that the Government

will not have to trouble themselves much about insisting on moving, because my experience is that when a train has been cancelled in this way, the very minute the weather permits, the Prince Albert train is set to work. It is right, however, that my hon. friend should insist on the Ministry attending at once to this, for if my impression is wrong and these things are of frequent occurrence, the Government should bring the company quickly to book especially in view of the fact that we are paying a large subsidy, but I say my impression is that it has not occurred as frequently as my hon. friend states. I am not, however, as much in the way of business as my hon. friend, and am not so much interested in the railways keeping time, and consequently I may be wrong.

Mr. GIBSON. I hardly expected the hon. gentleman would have become an apologist for the non-delivery of the mails by the Canadian Pacific Railway during eleven long days. He must be aware that the people of Prince Albert are living in a very important section of country, and the regular delivery of the mails is just as important to them as it is to the residents of Regina. I have been over that line, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway can keep their main line clear from the Atlantic to the Pacific from day to day, with the very few exceptions when storms occur that baffle the skill and ability of the railway companies with all the facilities at their hand, it cannot be because of the storms but because of the inattention of the Canadian Pacific Railway that the line is not kept regularly open between Prince Albert and Regina. If the Canadian Pacific Railway gave that line a quarter of the attention which they do their main line, we would not have this complaint brought forward to-day by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). I am glad the hon. Postmaster General is here because this is a matter in which every one of the Dominion is interested. It is not a local matter. No doubt the people of Prince Albert are in communication with every part of the world, and it is only proper that a question of this kind should be dealt with by Parliament, more especially as we give a large bonus to the road for carrying the mails. I am sure it would not be asking too much of the Canadian Pacific Railway or any railway company, that rather than delay Her Majesty's mails for eleven days, they should have them forwarded by a courier.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if when the Canadian Pacific Railway fail to give the mail service during eleven days which they are paid to supply, their pay was stopped? That is one way in which the company could be brought to time. If they do not perform the service deduct a suitable amount, or they should be put under bonds

Mr. DAVIN.

and have so much deducted from their grant if they do not perform the service.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the motion is disposed of, I should like to take the opportunity of calling the attention of the Government to a matter of very considerable importance to a portion of the constituency I have the honour to represent, and I do it now in order that the Minister of Railways and Canals may have the matter before him before the Estimates for his department for the coming year are being considered.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question before the House is the failure of the Canadian Pacific Railway to run their trains on this railway in the North-west, and I am afraid the hon. member cannot bring any other matter up on this motion. The discussion must be limited to the question raised by the member who moved the motion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I have heard for the first time, this moment, of the interruption of the mail service to Prince Albert. My hon. friend who made the motion informs me that he only a few moments ago learned by telegram himself of the failure of the service, owing, I understand, to the road being blocked by snow. I will exercise whatever power the department has to have the service re-established at the earliest possible moment. Regarding the inquiry of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) as to whether in the case of interruption of the mail service, there will be a deduction of the allowance, that would depend upon the nature of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway in regard to this particular service. As yet I have never had to deal with such a case as a railway failing to carry out its contract to carry the mails, but I admit that it would be only proper, in case of such failure, that the company should be docked a ratable proportion or even more. In fact I think it would be only wise that the contract, or the Order in Council regulating the contract, should provide for the imposition of a fine upon railways that neglect, without reason at least, to perform so necessary a branch of the public service. All I can say with regard to particular grievances is that they will receive as prompt and effective attention as I can give them.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say in reply to some remarks that fell from the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Gibson), in criticism of what was said by my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that the hon. member for Welland evidently misunderstood my hon. friend, because the hon. member for Assiniboia was not apologizing by any means for the Canadian Pacific Railway but only stating that, from his knowledge of the way they carried on

their operations, they would get their trains through at the earliest possible moment. He also said it was a serious thing that the mails should be detained so long and he regretted the delay just as much as did his hon. friend from Saskatchewan, and in no sense did he apologize for the conduct of the Canadian Pacific Railway or their management of the road.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I understood that this thing has gone on for years, so that there is no need for an apology. This is not the first time this is brought up in the House, and I am glad it is brought up now because I think railway companies should be dealt with seriously in cases of this kind. I know that an ordinary courier, who has to work his way through the snow-storms and carry a shovel with him, and sometimes bring along an extra man to help him through the snow banks, has to be on time, and if not he is quickly brought to book. If that be right in his case, as it is, there are ten reasons to every one why a railway company which receives a very large subsidy should be held just as strictly to its contract. What I understood my hon. friend from Saskatchewan wants (Mr. Davis) was that he had to bring this up again and again. No doubt it can be dealt with very quickly by the hon. Minister, and thus he will prevent such delay being a cause of complaint from year to year.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) says that this question is brought up before the House again and again, but the hon. Postmaster General told us that this was the first time he ever heard of such a case.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). This year.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. He did not say this year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said that this is the first time I ever heard of the failure of this particular service.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that from this day until the end of the session, Government orders have precedence on Thursdays after questions.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask the hon. gentleman when the Budget speech will take place?

The PRIME MINISTER. Without absolutely pledging my hon. colleague the Minister of Finance, I understand from him that he will be able to bring down the Estimates on Monday, and if this motion carries, his intention is to bring down the Budget on Thursday next. Of course, possibly the course of events may change his mind, but that is his present intention.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is rather early in the session to take so much of the time of the House from private members. There has been very little opportunity given private members so far in consequence of the motions previously carried to go on discussing certain questions de die in diem. I would suggest that it would be better to apply for the Thursday after next.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think I can accept the statement of my hon. friend that the private members have not had the opportunity of bringing up the different questions of which they have given notice. On Thursday last we went through the whole of the Order paper on public Bills and orders. We disposed of a few, I think, but most of the members were not ready. They had the opportunity to go on as the different orders were called. Now, with regard to the notices of motion, I think we have gone over the paper two or three times already, and it must be remembered that we still have Monday and also Wednesday afternoon for notices of motion until Wednesday is taken by the Government. Under these circumstances, I think I must insist upon the motion, and I hope I shall have the approval of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) in securing precedence of Government business on Thursday next. I would remind the hon. gentleman that this is the 25th of March and we have been sitting since the 3rd of February.

Mr. CASEY. What the right hon. leader of the House has said as to our having gone over the Public Bills and Orders the other day has a certain weight, but it must not be forgotten that some of the Public Bills and Orders are standing, not because the members who are promoting them are not ready to go on, but because the Government are not ready to have the Bills considered. That is the case with the first item on the list, a very important Bill, of which I have charge, in the interests of the railway employees, and which has been allowed to stand from time to time to suit the convenience of the hon. Minister of Railways. I am not complaining that he has not had time to consider it before now. I think his time has been fully taken up with other matters. But I do not think that this Bill or other Bills in the same position should suffer simply because the time of the House hitherto has been taken up with one great question. I would urge most strongly upon the Premier that he should accept the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition, that those in charge of Public Bills and Orders should have at least another Thursday. There is time enough to deal with notices of motions on Mondays and Wednesday afternoons, but the Public Bills and Orders will have only Wednesday evening, and I claim that that is not long enough to give to these measures, many of which are very important in the public interest. The discussion

of them may suffice to inform the Government as to what legislation should be introduced by them in the future, even if pending Bills do not carry. Their discussion is of the greatest public importance as a means of informing the Government as to public opinion on these subjects. I submit that to decide now that we should only have Wednesday evening for those items, is going rather too far. It means practically for the whole session that, with the exception of one Thursday, we shall have had no opportunity but on Wednesday evenings for this purpose, because, up to date, Thursdays have been taken up with the great subject that was before us; and Wednesday evening and a good part of Thursday thus far, has been taken up with a Bill introduced by one private member. So that, with the exception of one, private members will not have had a chance to discuss a Bill except on Wednesday night. I would urge very strongly, in the interest of the friends of the Government and others, that the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition should be acceded to.

Mr. MACLEAN. Before the right hon. the First Minister asked us to consent to this motion, he should tell the House whether he intends to take up, as a Government measure, a very important Bill now standing on the Public Bills and Orders—the Bill relating to insolvency. That question ought to be settled. The people are looking for some kind of legislation in regard to insolvency. I believe that, on the whole, the Bill that has been introduced is a fairly good measure and worthy the attention of the House. But if it is the intention of the Government not to bring up this question on their own account, but to leave it to the House to deal with, there would be no opportunity of reaching a conclusion with regard to it, or of having a Bill upon the subject passed this session, if the motion of the leader of the House is adopted.

Mr. McMULLEN. The leader of the Government stated that the Bills were gone over last Thursday. I must confess, that I was not here last Thursday, when these Bills were called, and I think a great many hon. gentlemen on both sides were absent. It was the day before the election in Russell county, and a very large number of members were absent. I had a kind of assurance that the Bills which stand in my name would not be up before half-past ten, but I found, when I got back, that they had been called. I have never had an opportunity to move the second reading of these Bills, and I hope the Government will consent to give reasonable opportunity for this purpose. A very large portion of the time has been taken up by the Yukon Bill—four weeks. I would suggest that, if the Government should decide to take Thursday, the right hon. leader of the House should consent to

Mr. CASEY.

a resolution, that the order for Wednesday be made the order for Thursday. That would give Wednesday for Public Bills and Orders.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my right hon. friend will not press this motion. I do not think that it is a reasonable one at this stage of the session, considering what has gone before, and considering the present state of the Order paper. We have given precedence to a Government measure, and it has had the boards for between two and three weeks of steady discussion, and has kept back Public Bills and Orders and notices of motion standing in the name of private members. We are within a few days, it seems, of entering upon the discussion upon the Budget. I have always contended that it was not a good plan to carry on the Budget debate in sections; and, though my hon. friend, then on this side of the House, on one or two occasions would not subscribe to that idea, I think it has been found the most convenient way to go on with the Budget debate from day to day until you finish it. That gives the Government control of the time during which discussion is carried on. Now, what time have we had, up to the present, for private measures, notices of motion, and so on? The right hon. gentleman says that we went through the notices of motion twice. But it will be in the recollection of my hon. friend, that all but a few were caused to stand, not at the instance of the Government very often, but at the instance of private members, whether they had the idea they wanted to block the getting of the information, or whether they really wanted to discuss the questions, I do not know. But, in any case, we could not get the information, of course, because the agreement was, that only motions not calling for debate, should be taken up. Some of them were allowed to stand at the instance of the Government. We have not overmuch insisted upon having returns and information during the three sessions of the House under hon. gentlemen opposite. But there is a great deal of information that we want this year, and my right hon. friend will find it to the advantage of the rapid progress of business to give us time for the presenting of these motions sooner, rather than later. For, if it is not given to us now, we must press for it later, and that might cause a grievance, as it would appear to cause a lengthening of the session.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am quite willing, Mr. Speaker, to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster). I will agree very willingly that we should not take Thursday, but the following Thursday, if the House will agree that, after entering on the Budget debate, we should proceed with it day by day until it is finished. If that be the sense of the House, I would be willing to agree to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand my hon. friend will leave next Thursday open on the understanding that we take the Budget.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will proceed with the Budget from day to day until completed.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend is not going to move that the Thursday after be taken? Then we will withdraw the motion and let it be for consultation.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection, because the next Thursday, I think, will be Holy Thursday. Practically that will mean that we take Thursday until Easter. But in the meantime we will have the Budget speech next Friday, and proceed with it from day to day until completed.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall be satisfied.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be hardly fair, because there are thirty-five items on the Order paper by private members already to be considered. During the early part of the session the time was entirely taken up by a Government measure, and private members have had no opportunity to deal with their measures. Now, we are going to have only one day to dispose of whatever Bills we can dispose of on this Order paper, including the Insolvency Bill. After that day is taken, then the Government want to take their business day in and day out until the end of the session. I do not think this is allowing private members any rights at all in this House in regard to private legislation.

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope I shall meet the desires of my hon. friend by withdrawing this motion, and it will be understood that when we take the Budget speech, we will proceed with it from day to day until it is completed.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

CLAIMS OF MANITOBA AGAINST THE DOMINION.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Government to a motion I made last session for a return, which motion was carried, but it has not been complied with. On the 2nd instant, I called the attention of the Government to this same subject, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce informed me that he was not aware that such a return had ever been brought in, and that he would look into the case. He took note of it. The return is for:

Copies of all memorials, statements and other documents from the Government of the province of Manitoba in relation to an unsettled claim resulting from that province being charged with the whole cost of the erection of public build-

ings, with copies of all correspondence in connection therewith.

This matter is now before the legislature of Manitoba, and I am informed that it will be the subject of an item in the Budget. Therefore, I think we ought to be put in possession of all the documents in connection therewith.

FLOODS ON THE GRAND RIVER.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I desire to call the attention of the Government to a certain matter, and I was proceeding to do so a little while ago when it was discovered that I was out of order. I do it, as I said then, in order that the matter may be before the Minister of Railways and Canals when his estimates are being prepared for the coming year.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order. If the hon. gentleman desires to get the information from the Minister of Railways and Canals by means of a question, he can do so. But I understand that the hon. gentleman wants to raise a debate.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was proceeding to explain my question, and to put myself in order it may be necessary to move the adjournment of the House, which my hon. friend knows I can do. The Minister of Railways and Canals has, no doubt, noticed in the public press accounts of the serious floods which have taken place at various points along the Grand River during the present spring. It is quite true that these floods during this spring have taken place at points where no Government works exist, and where, therefore, the assistance of the Railway Department could hardly be invoked for the purpose of prevention. But there is one point at which, considering the annually increasing volume of the spring freshets and the great danger which is likely to result, and to which the attention of the Minister ought to be called, in my judgment, at the earliest possible moment, and where I think it is absolutely necessary for him to take preventive measures. I refer to the point where the Grand River is dammed for the purpose of feeding the Welland Canal feeders. At this point, it is true, no flood took place during the present spring, but that is accounted for by the fact that the municipal council and private citizens, at considerable cost constructed a temporary embankment to hold the waters in, which otherwise would have flowed over the vicinity and done a great deal of damage. But even with this hard work being done night and day by the citizens and employees of the town, the vicinity was in imminent danger of a very serious flood. It is not for me to suggest what means should be taken by the Minister of Railways and Canals, because he has those officers in his department and in his employment who will be better able to do that than I can possibly do. Whether the bank should be heightened, or

whether the waste weir accommodation should be increased or both plans resorted to, this much is certain, that something should be done by the department to prevent the danger which has been very much increased during the past two or three seasons, as those who are residents along the course of that river will bear me out in saying. The hon. gentleman has in charge, immediately on the spot, a very competent, painstaking and intelligent man, Mr. Scott, who does his best to prevent damage being done. He has also his officers on the Welland Canal, to whom he might refer the matter. What I am very anxious for him to do is that he should secure a report upon the condition of affairs at that point, in such a way that he would be able to take it up and consider it, with the view of meeting any suggestion for prevention which these gentlemen might make, in the Estimates of the present session. The hon. gentleman is not acquainted with the district, but I may tell him that a few years ago a very serious flood took place, and great damage was done to private as well as to public property. The Government of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald found it necessary to pay large sums in indemnity for the losses which were then sustained. At that time preventive measures were taken, but these have now become entirely inadequate on account of the natural causes which I need not discuss, and which the hon. gentleman understands quite well. What I now urge him to do is to ask his officers to examine into this matter at once, to get a report upon it, and to act, as I believe he will act, in the interests not only of the vicinity, but in the interest of the Dominion treasury as well.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). As the hon. gentleman has thought upon the subject, may I ask him what he would suggest in a general way?

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Either the waste weir accommodation ought to be increased, because the damage is done by high water, which is caused by the dam, or the containing banks ought to be heightened. Perhaps both ought to be done, but certainly something ought to be done if damage is to be prevented.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I will communicate with the superintendent, Mr. Scott, at once on the matter.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

POSTMASTER GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. **GILLIES**. I wish to ask the Postmaster General when we may expect his report to be laid on the Table.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). It is in the hands of the printer. I think I will be able to lay it on the Table in a day or two.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that we have not had a meeting of that important committee called the Public Accounts Committee. I think that he, as Finance Minister, should advise the chairman of that committee to call a meeting at the earliest possible opportunity.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). Now that my hon. friend has called my attention to it, a meeting will be called at an early day.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. **McINNES**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the right hon. the Premier if he would be good enough, as soon as possible, to lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence between himself and the Japanese consul at Vancouver relative to Bill No. 70.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Certainly, that will be done.

EDMONTON BRIDGE.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), when the return I moved for in regard to the Edmonton bridge will be laid on the Table?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). I will be glad indeed to bring it down as soon as possible; in a day or two, I hope.

THE WEST BLOCK.

Mr. **FOSTER**. May I ask the Minister a question, too?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). Certainly.

Mr. **FOSTER**. In passing up and down by the West Block I notice a number of workmen taking off the face of the building and then building it up again. It is an important thing, to my mind, and I want to ask the Minister how far he proposes to go on with that, and why he is going on with it at all.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. There was a part of the wall which had been rebuilt a few years ago. The older members of the House will remember that about fifteen or twenty years ago there was a kind of second wall there, and that wall was removed and the removal caused the wall of the building itself to tumble. Upon

the report of my chief architect I was obliged to rebuild the part which is now being rebuilt. There is not much more than the space which is now uncovered to do.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to that, has the hon. gentleman a report from his engineer that he could lay on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection whatever, but I may say that I have no written report. The chief architect called on me and told me that he had discovered that part of that wall was in danger and that we had to rebuild it.

MR. OGILVIE'S REPORT—FRENCH TRANSLATION.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the right hon. the Premier when he expects that the report of Mr. Ogilvie on the Klondike will be translated into French. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) asked about it some time ago, but nothing has been done yet.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I stated at the time I was questioned by the hon. member (Mr. Casgrain) that the translation was very far advanced. The translation is made under the orders of Hunter, Rose & Co. I required to have the translation sent to me and to some others, to find out whether it was correct or not. We found it very correct. When the hon. member (Mr. Casgrain) questioned me, it was more than three-quarters done, and I presume at this time the report is in the hands of the printer and will be soon ready.

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I ask the right hon. gentleman, who is the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories at the present time?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Mackintosh.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would call the attention of the Government to a matter of public policy. I refer to the printing in the French language, of the Ordinances made by the Government of the North-west Territories. Under the constitution those ordinances should be promulgated in both languages. This is the state of things I wish to point out, as stated in an article of the newspaper "L'Ouest Canadien," published at Edmonton. It is taken from the issue of that paper of the 17th of March,

instant, and it was sent to me in order that I might bring before the House the grievance referred to. Here it is:

IS THE USE OF THE FRENCH LANGUAGE OFFICIAL IN THE TERRITORIES?

Whether the use of the French language ought to be absolutely struck out from our Statute-book is a question which is more important than ever, and ought to occupy a large share of the public attention. Since 1892, the government who are at the head of affairs in the Territories have deemed it fit to do away with the printing of the Ordinances of the legislature in the French language, in defiance of our rights.

Under the North-west Territories Act, 43 Vic., ch. 50, section 140, it is enacted that "Either the French or the English language may be used by any person in the debates of the Council or Legislative Assembly of the Territories, and in the proceedings before the courts; and both those languages shall be used in the records and journals of the said Council or Assembly; and all ordinances made under this Act shall be printed in both languages.

Under Act 54-55 Vic., ch. 22, section 110, of the North-west Territories Act, was repealed and replaced by the following:

"Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Legislative Assembly of the Territories, and in the proceedings before the courts; and both those languages shall be used in the records and journals of such Assembly; and all ordinances made under the Act shall be printed in both those languages: Provided, however, that after the next general election of the Legislative Assembly, such Assembly may by ordinance or otherwise, regulate its proceedings, and the manner of recording or publishing the same; and the regulations so made shall be embodied in a proclamation which shall be forthwith made and published by the Lieutenant-Governor in conformity with the law, and thereafter shall have full force and effect."

We therefore, have the imprescriptible and undeniable right of having those ordinances translated into our beautiful French language, the mother tongue of all those pioneers of the North-west, who first discovered the prairies of the far West, and have marked their passage by choosing the sites of mostly all the important cities of our country and of the neighbouring Republic. Those discoverers of the West were fellow-countrymen of ours; and it was our "coureurs de bois," our traders and our missionaries who first opened up to civilization those immense prairies till then unexplored, and who first called the attention of our country to the possibilities of those fertile plains which were to become the granary of Canada.

The article goes on the same strain, but I need not quote the whole article. Let it suffice to call the attention of the Government to the grievance complained of. I think it is the duty of the Government to tell us whether they are aware of the existence of that grievance and whether they propose to take any steps to remedy the same.

I do not think I need apologize for bringing up this matter before the House. But let me tell the House that the grievance complained of was brought to my attention by interested parties who live in

the Territories and are therefore entitled to the redress they ask for.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, as stated by the hon. gentleman himself, the grievance brought to the attention of the Government goes as far back as the year 1892, that is to say, the enactments relating to the French language, in the North-west, have not been in force during the years 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895 and 1896. I may tell the hon. gentleman that this is the first time this grievance is brought to the attention of the Government. As the hon. gentleman knows, the North-west Territories now enjoy responsible government, a government responsible to the people of the North-west Territories, and I do not know how far we have jurisdiction to remove any grievance complained of. It is a matter which I shall have to bring to the attention of the Minister of Justice.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

On the Order for third reading of Bill (No. 39) respecting the inspection of steamboats and the examination and licensing of engineers employed on them,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). My hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has given notice that on the third reading of this Bill he would move that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole to consider two amendments; one to strike out subsection 2 of section 4, and the other to amend clause 14, so as to make it read more in accordance with what he thinks is in accordance with the object of the section. I have no objection to either of the amendments and so far as the first is concerned, the House will remember it had reference to the clause prohibiting inspectors of boilers from engaging in any other business. That clause was qualified with the statement that they could not do so unless with the assent of the Minister. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) thinks that the clause had better be struck out altogether, and the law left as it stood before. I have no objection to that. The Bill is purely a departmental one and we ought have no difficulty in agreeing, so that if my hon. friend thinks it would work better as it was before, I am quite willing. The amendment he suggested in section 14 is of importance. I thought, and the law clerks thought, that it would meet the views of hon. gentlemen, but as it does not, I move:

That the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 39) be discharged, and that the House do resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on said Bill for the purpose of considering these two amendments.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into committee.

Mr. MONK.

(In the Committee.)

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I move that subsection 2 of section 4 be struck out of the Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. In clause 14 of the Bill, after the words "may be" in the fourteenth line, I move that the words be inserted "whenever the law requires these officers to possess certificates."

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. To make the amendment complete you will have to repeat the words "and such owner, master, mate or engineer, as the case may be."

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Very well.

Mr. **BRITTON**. May I ask the Minister if it is the intention to make any change in regard to the inspection of American steamboats? You will notice that the first part of section 37 refers to steamboats in Canada, and then the latter part of the section refers to every passenger steamboat. Is it the intention to make inspection compulsory on American steamboats carrying passengers in Canada?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. That is the intention.

Mr. **BRITTON**. The intention is to compel American steamboats to be inspected here too, and to pay the fee?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes.

Mr. **BRITTON**. Is it reciprocal legislation; is that the way they have it in the States?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes; the point was this: When our steamboats crossed the lakes and went to an American port, they did not accept our inspection and they insisted that our steamboats should be inspected in the United States. The practice has been for American steamboats to come over here with their own certificate of inspection and they did not get one from us. They would start out on excursions from Canadian lake towns carrying four or five hundred passengers, without any certificate from us. Our steamboat owners complained of it as an injustice to them, and I simply made the law reciprocal.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Hear, hear.

Bill reported, as amended, and read the third time, and passed.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fitzpatrick for second reading of Bill (No. 16) to repeal the

Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on the last day of the discussion on this Bill, a matter came up incidentally on which I desire to set myself right before the House and the country. It came up with reference to an interruption made while the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was speaking by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), and it was with regard to the duties on flour. The hon. member for Simcoe made the statement that the Government promised to relieve the country from the duty on flour.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman must have mistaken the item; we are on the item to resume the adjourned debate on the Franchise Bill.

Mr. MILLS. I have not mistaken the item, Mr. Speaker. I wish to set myself right on a matter that came up incidentally in the debate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.
On an interruption.

Mr. SPEAKER. It must have been very much out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. It was very likely made by the Finance Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). No doubt it came from the other side.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister of Finance upon my stating it was promised by him at Annapolis, rose and stated as follows:—

The hon. member for Annapolis has interrupted and stated in his interruption that I said at Annapolis that this Government would take the duty off flour. I tell the hon. gentleman that he is mistaken. I made no such promise.

I said: I have the type-written stenographic report of the hon. gentleman's speech, and can produce it.

I think it is only proper that I should put myself right with respect to this matter, and in explanation I desire to state that during the first session of Parliament in 1896, while I was attending to my duties here, the county of Annapolis was invaded, as it were, by the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, and by the Attorney General. The then Premier is now Minister of Finance in the Government here. A series of meetings was held in my county in the interest of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, who had decided to oppose me in the coming contest. As soon as I heard of this movement I was determined to learn what those people were saying behind my back, and so I sent a telegram to a gentleman, who is within the hearing of my voice at the present, to employ for me a shorthand reporter to follow those gentlemen over the county and take down everything they said. As a result of that telegram I have here the type-written report of their speeches

certified to by shorthand reporter Devine, of St. John, and signed by him. This is what the present Minister of Finance said with regard to flour at Bridgetown, in the county of Annapolis, on February 26, 1896:

Supposing I have two barrels of flour before me, one comes from Ontario and the other from the United States. The Conservatives would say, buy the Ontario flour. We say that too. We say, buy the Ontario flour if you want it, but what Conservatives say is, buy the Ontario flour whether you want it or not. We admit there should be restrictions in trade. If anything is made here reasonably good, we say buy it here. Do everything that will help your neighbours, but do it of your own free will, because you want to do it, and because you believe that you are getting a fair value for your money. But if an Act of Parliament is passed to make you do it, then I say you are strange persons if you do it at all. If a man has a hardware store, and he is selling powder, and he sees fit to put a barrel of it on the sidewalk, and a boy comes along with a cigarette and drops a spark in, probably there would not be any powder there long, so the law puts restrictions upon the sale of certain things—as, for instance, the sale of intoxicating liquors, because it is admitted that the free, unrestrained traffic of liquor is dangerous, and therefore the law says you shall only sell it under certain circumstances. All this is necessary for the good of society. They lay it down that you shall only interfere with a man's personal liberty when it is necessary for the good of society. Is it necessary for the good of society to interfere with your liberty with reference to the purchase of that Ontario flour? Surely you can be trusted to decide which of these two barrels of flour you want. Certainly, if the Ontario flour suits you you will buy it, and you do not need an Act of Parliament to make you, either.

We, the Liberal party, have confidence in you, and we say we think you have good enough judgment to know which barrel of flour you want, but they say you are not capable to judge for yourself, and so we will pass an Act of Parliament and fine you 75 cents if you do not buy that flour.

Free trade allows you to do that which you believe to be for your own interest in every matter which does not interfere with the liberty of your neighbour, and protection makes you buy something that you would not buy if you were left to your own free will.

That is what I call and what I ask this House to regard, and what the people did regard at the time as an implied promise on the part of the Premier of Nova Scotia and by Mr. Longley of their intention. They asserted time and time again in speeches I have here, to preach the good old free trade doctrine. The people so understood it and so regarded it, and in order to show that they so regarded it, I will simply state this: There was a little child at Annapolis, whose father sat on the platform at one of the meetings. That child was saying its prayers one day, and it said: "God bless papa, God bless mamma, and God bless Sir Wilfrid, and make him a good man, for he is not doing as well as papa thought he would."

With respect to the question before the House, the new Franchise Bill, which has

been introduced by the Solicitor General, he has given a few reasons why he introduced this Bill. The main reason was the fact that Sir John Thompson had introduced a somewhat similar Bill. The right hon. leader of the House advocates that every one should approach this question with calmness, with judiciousness, with an absence of anything like partisanship. When the leaders of the Liberal party ask us to approach matters which they are bringing before the people, in such a spirit as that, it always raises my suspicions. It always makes me think that it is something like the soft, velvety, caressing paw that hides the sharp and vicious claw; and I rather think that simile will apply to this Bill in this case. The present Dominion Franchise Act may have its imperfections, but it has good qualities as well.

An hon. MEMBER. Where?

Mr. MILLS. It has uniformity, for one thing; and, for another thing, under it we have had honesty and purity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS. We have had honesty of revision. The hon. leader of the House has said that that Act was a terror to his people, that it was hostile to his side of the House. The reason why it was such a terror to them was, that for the most part the revisions were carried on by judges, and judges are always a terror to that side of the House. There have been charges with reference to revising barristers and revising officers, but no one has dared to come on the floor of this House and name one revising barrister, or one revising officer, who did not do his duty. There was this great thing about the Franchise Act which I admired more than anything else in connection with it, that, when we went to the revision courts, we had justice done. Will the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), or the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Copp) tell me that justice was not done in the revision courts of those counties? They dare not do it. Even-handed justice was done there; and I thoroughly believe that even-handed justice was done in all the revision courts throughout Nova Scotia. That is one of the reasons why I admire the old Act—because of its uniformity and its purity. The hon. Solicitor General says that the Act of 1885 has not been productive of good results. That may be—not good results for them; not good results for the members of the present Government, because the revision was conducted squarely and fearlessly. It may have cost a considerable amount of money, and no doubt it did, and that is one of the chief objections I have to it. It was a new Act, and, therefore, it must, of necessity, cost a large amount of money to get it thoroughly before the people. But the people were commencing to understand the Act, the barristers were commencing to un-

Mr. MILLS.

derstand it, and the laymen were commencing to understand it; and it might have been amended so that the cost of its administration, particularly the cost of the revisers, could be reduced to a minimum. Objection has also been made to it because of the cost of working it to the political parties. We shall have precisely the same cost now, and more, if this Bill is put through. It will cost the political parties more to work under the Franchise Acts of the different provinces than it did to work under the Dominion Franchise Act.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It will not have to be done twice, though.

Mr. MILLS. It will have to be done thoroughly, and it cannot be done thoroughly unless it is done twice. The hon. Solicitor General also says that, since 1894, the principle has been settled and established in this House that we should revert to the conditions existing previous to 1885. I take exception to that entirely. It has not been settled and established in this House, nor anywhere else, that we should revert to the conditions as they existed before 1885. Sir John Thompson brought his Bill before the House, but it did not become law, and before it would have become law, he would have met with a great many objections, and there would have been a great many amendments to that Bill suggested. I believe, however, that in the main the ideas of Sir John Thompson were correct. His Bill was not to adopt the franchises of the different provinces; it was to have control of our own franchise, and to adopt the lists of the different provinces as a basis in making up our list. That was, in short, Sir John Thompson's Bill. This Bill is different from that altogether. Now, let us for a moment make a comparison between the Act of 1885 and the present Bill. As I have said, the principal item of cost in the revision under the Dominion Franchise Act was the cost of the revising barristers. There was also the cost to the different political parties; but the very same cost will have to be undergone now. So that need not be taken into consideration at all. The cost of the provincial lists is to be borne, in the first instance, by the different municipalities, but still that is a tax on this country. In answer to that, it is said that this cost has to be undergone now, so that it will not be any additional cost. There is some force in that answer. In the province of Nova Scotia we have certain revisers, who are appointed by the municipal council to revise the lists. These revisers are not the proper men to look after this matter. It is a most important matter, and it ought to be looked after judiciously and calmly, whether it is approached by this House in that spirit or not. But is the manner in which the lists are prepared in the province of Nova Scotia, a judicial and calm, a fair and square manner? I do not think so. I will give you

some idea of how it is done. For instance, in the county of Annapolis, there is quite a large majority of Liberals in the municipal council. They divided the electoral district of Annapolis into different revising districts. There are seven revising districts, and in each district there are three revisers. How are these three revisers appointed? Did they make a semblance of giving the Tories a chance? They appoint a good, square, honest man, a Tory, not a partisan, but a man who would give an advantage to no one—a thoroughly honest man. The other two are ward heelers. The consequence is—what? The Franchise Act to the letter for the Tories, and universal suffrage for the Grits. That is the way it is worked in Annapolis county. Take every one of these seven districts, I know the men well, and that will apply to nearly all of them, and some of their transactions are of the vilest kind of partisanship. Then there is an appeal. An appeal to whom? An appeal to the sheriff. Who is the sheriff? When the new law was enacted whereby the sheriff became responsible, not to the judges of the Supreme Court in Nova Scotia, but to the Government of Nova Scotia, the Attorney General of Nova Scotia said, in referring to these sheriffs: We will have eighteen good men and true. And they are, Mr. Speaker, eighteen good men and true partisans—good, honest men, some of them. Sheriff Gates is as honest a man as ever lived, but he is a political partisan—not a trained man, not acquainted with the niceties of the law, which the revising officer, under the Franchise Act, is required to know. He is not learned in the law, he is always in doubt; and being ignorant of the law and being always in doubt, he gives his party the benefit of the doubt always. Consequently, the Liberal party gets the advantage very largely and unfairly. I do not object to their getting an advantage squarely, but I object to their getting one unfairly, and these appeals, which are brought before these different sheriffs, are tried and adjudicated upon just in accordance with the dictates of the ward heelers. It is far different under the Dominion Franchise Act. But let me first refer to another point. The sheriff holds only one court in the county, and any appeal to him from the revisers has to come from every portion of the county to that court in the shire town, whereas the revising barrister or the revising judge, in the case of the county of Annapolis, held something like six or seven different courts. He went to the people, but in the case of the sheriffs' courts the people have to go to the sheriff, thereby making the expense of an appeal to him a very expensive affair. Then, there is the matter of purity with reference to these revision courts. In the case of a judge, even-handed justice is dealt out to all. No one dares say otherwise, whereas in the case of these revisers and in the case of the sheriff, to whom appeals are

made, it is not even-handed justice. I do not accuse some of these revisers of being men who are thoroughly dishonest, but men who are thoroughly honest in business are often thoroughly dishonest in politics. I will give you an instance of the absolute dishonesty of some of these revisers. It is a case which actually occurred in the county of Annapolis. I do not make charges here against men without proving what I say, and I would like the members of the Government and supporters of the Government to do the same. We have charges thrown out broadcast by hon. gentlemen opposite against the revising barristers; but not one revising barrister's name have I heard mentioned in this House. The case I refer to is one that occurred in the court of Judge Savary, and I will show you the connection in a few minutes between this and the revisers' court. This is the case:

FORM 5—SON OF PROPERTY OWNER (BY ELECTOR ON BEHALF OF ANOTHER PERSON).

DOMINION OF CANADA,
County of Annapolis:
To wit:

In the matter of Voters for Dominion Election purposes for the Electoral District of Annapolis, and in the matter of the "Electoral Franchise" Acts and amendments thereto:

I, E. H. Armstrong, of the polling district, No. 6, in the county of Annapolis, do solemnly declare that I am an elector in the electoral district of Annapolis, and that William Irvine, of the district, No. 6, of Granville, in the county of Annapolis, whose post office address is Granville Ferry, is of the full age of twenty-one years; and is not by said Acts nor by any law of the Dominion of Canada disqualified or prevented from voting at an election for a member to serve in the House of Commons of Canada; and that he is a British subject by birth, and I claim that the said William Irvine is entitled to have his name added to the voters' list for the municipality of Annapolis, in the said electoral district, under the Electoral Franchise Act and amendments thereto, and his qualification is:

That the said William Irvine, merchant, is the son of Hugh Irvine, of the district, No. 6, of Granville Ferry, in the county of Annapolis, who is the occupant and owner of house and land in the said electoral district, which is of the value of \$300, and he is and has been resident upon such property, in said electoral district, continuously.....with his father, being owner for one year next before the date of this declaration, except during.....months of said year in all.

The foregoing allegations of fact are true to my personal knowledge, and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.

E. H. ARMSTRONG,
(Signature of Elector.)

Declared before me at Granville, in the county of Annapolis, this 21st day of July, 1891.

D. J. RIORDAN,
(Justice of the Peace),
County of Annapolis.

To His Honour Judge Savary,
Revising Officer for the Electoral
District of Annapolis.

That was a solemn declaration and a specimen of several that were handed in to His Honour Judge Savary at the revisers' court of Granville in July, 1891. I do not know that I can explain the matter any better than by reading the editorial comments on it:

The above is a specimen of several of the "solemn declarations" by which His Honour Judge Savary was induced to put names on the preliminary lists for polling districts Nos. 6 and 7. If E. H. Armstrong really signed it and made a solemn declaration of its truth before a J. P., and any essential statement in it is untrue, as, for instance, that the proposed voter was twenty-one years old, then he is guilty of perjury, and liable under chapter 156, Revised Statutes of Canada, to fourteen years in the penitentiary. If, on the other hand, E. H. Armstrong never signed it and never made solemn declaration of its truth before a J. P., then the person who put his name to it, and wilfully used it as a means of getting a name on the list, is liable to one or the other of two penalties: 1st, by chapter 165, Revised Statutes of Canada, section 36, to seven years imprisonment for forging and uttering an "instrument made evidence by an Act of Parliament," or, 2nd, by section 39, same chapter, to three years' imprisonment for forging and uttering a "solemn declaration" made before a justice of the peace.

Endorsed on the above document is the following memo.:—"Admitted by D. J. Riordan to be a forgery by himself. (Sgd.) A. W. S." "A. W. S." being the initials of A. W. Savary.

It is also noticeable that the words: "or according to my information and belief the ground for which is as follows," are erased in the above document.

In other words, D. J. Riordan, the justice of the peace, a man that was appointed by this local government of Nova Scotia, one of the henchmen of the Attorney General, admitted, in cross-examination—

Mr. COPP. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills), what paper he was reading from.

Mr. MILLS. I am reading from the Annapolis "Spectator," which was published on October 30th, 1891. This Daniel J. Riordan—and he admitted to me, at the reviser's court, that the hon. the Attorney General of the province had employed him to look after the lists and get on as many names as he possibly could, and paid him so much a name for doing it. He also admitted, as this article states, under my cross-examination before the judge, that he had signed the name of E. H. Armstrong to that declaration. It was also admitted, that several of the men whose names were sought to be put on the list, were not twenty-one years of age. Therefore, he was not only forging a document, but was forging an untrue document.

These facts together with the fact that William Irvine, the citizen sought to be made a voter, is not yet 21 years of age, as stated by his father, Hugh M. Irvine, who was compelled to attend the court under a subpoena to give testimony on that point, clearly shows that this instrument, purporting on the face of it to be the solemn declara-

Mr. MILLS.

tion of E. H. Armstrong, was wilfully used as an instrument a means of getting on the voters' list William Irvine, who in law is still an infant and not entitled to vote. Do honest Liberals countenance such fraud? Three magistrates, D. J. Riordan, Esq., E. H. Armstrong, Esq.—
That is another magistrate.

—and Hugh M. Irvine, Esq., the "new creations" of the Attorney General, are more or less connected with the matter.

Is it true that D. J. Riordan committed a forgery? Or did E. H. Armstrong actually make a solemn declaration to what Hugh M. Irvine, going to the court under a subpoena, says is not the fact?

Armstrong has not been heard from at all. The Attorney General—

The Attorney General, by the way, was there.

—at the revision court asked judgment to be deferred, on one or two names as, he said, "he was expecting Esquire Armstrong."

But Esquire Armstrong never turned up.

Why was Esquire Armstrong so prominent by his absence? Surely the young and rising magistrate, so courteous, so brave, so impartial in his conduct whenever sitting in judgment as a local reviser of districts 6 and 7, did not know of any wrong being committed by his brother justice, D. J. Riordan, nor surely did he absent himself for fear of being asked a few questions, such as: Did you solemnly declare before Riordan, J.P., that William Irvine was 21 years old? And that Bernard Amberman is 21 years old? Your name is to both declarations; did you sign them or did you authorize Riordan to sign for you? If you authorized Riordan to sign for you, did you know, Esquire Armstrong, that you were authorizing your name to be subscribed to a lie? Surely this must be mere suspicion; but, if true, then "Esquire" Armstrong and "Esquire" Riordan are co-partners in the fraud, the penalties for which have been noted above.

Whoever wrote the name "Harvey W. Messenger" to the paper filed with the revising officer for the purpose of qualifying him as a voter on income wrote the name of "Robert Mills" to a paper purporting to be a solemn declaration of the young man declaring that "I am son of Robert Mills 1st, and that I am of the full age of 21 years." We are assured that Robert Mills second, is still under age.

Which was the fact, and his name was not allowed to go on the list.

The same pen and the same hand evidently, in our opinion, wrote the name of "Frank Armstrong" to a similar declaration. All these five declarations appear on the face of them to be declared before "D. J. Riordan, Justice of the Peace, county of Annapolis." At the reviser's court His Honour Judge Savary shared the same opinion, and as Riordan admitted the frauds in three cases, of Messenger, Irvine and Mills, His Honour cancelled all five applications, and his memo. appears on them endorsed as follows:—Entry on preliminary list cancelled. (Sd. A. W. S.)

Now, who is Esquire Armstrong, and who is Esquire Riordan? Will you be surprised to know that they were the local revisers, and are now. In sections in Annapolis county in the polling sections 6, 7 and 21, the revisers are Elwood H. Armstrong and Daniel J. Riordan.

Mr. Armstrong, I think, is a thoroughly good, honest business man, but, when it comes to politics, he will stoop to the lowest thing and then excuse himself on the ground that it is politics. James Reid is an honest man, and a good sound Tory, and always has been, and, I believe, always will be.

Mr. Riordan was brought before the grand jury of the county. One of the Attorney General's eighteen good men and true, the late Sheriff Morse, another political partisan of the Attorney General, was then sheriff. He used his influence with the grand jury, and the grand jury, notwithstanding that these facts were solidly proven, excused him, because anything is excusable in politics, and so they did not bring in a true Bill against Riordan. And so Riordan goes unwhipped of justice, and he and Armstrong are the revisers of the local list. That is a specimen of what this Bill asks this House to adopt. If this Act is passed, we shall be giving the control of our lists to just such men as these, just such men as Messrs. Armstrong and Riordan, instead of having them before men who are trained in legal points and who can understand legal points and give good decisions respecting the law. As I said before, when these appeals come before the sheriff, the sheriff, not being trained, not knowing anything about the law, cannot be expected to decide in accordance with the law.

He is always in doubt with reference to these matters, and in a great many of these instances where the franchise is intricate, you can easily raise doubts as to whether this man or that man should be placed upon the list; and the sheriff being always in doubt, always gives the benefit of the doubt to his own party. Therefore, I say, this is a most impure manner of revising the electoral lists for this Dominion. Annapolis County is not alone in that matter. What have we in the county of Pictou which has particular reference in this matter to the local contest? I will not make general charges, but I will give the names. I will read now from the "Colonial Standard," Pictou, N.S., Tuesday, May 11, 1897:

In the matter of the *Queen vs. Macdonald*.

Before Justice Roy, at New Glasgow, Tuesday, May 4th, 1897.

Mr. Justice Roy is a creation of the local government of Nova Scotia, a Grit partisan and a magistrate.

The following is a copy of the information:—

Canada,
Province of Nova Scotia,
County of Pictou.

The information and complaint of John McGillivray, of New Glasgow, in the county of Pictou, barrister; George Gray, of Stellarton, in the county of Pictou, accountant, taken this twenty-first day of April, A.D. 1897, before the undersigned James Roy, one of Her Majesty's Justices of the Peace in and for the county of

Pictou, who saith that Edward M. McDonald, of Pictou, in the county of Pictou, barrister, did, at Pictou, in the county of Pictou, on or about the 29th day of May, 1897, fraudulently alter an affidavit sworn to by George Gray, dated the 29th day of March, 1897, by inserting in said affidavit after it had been sworn to the words: "That due application to add their names to the list of electors of section No. 25, Stellarton, was made to the revisers thereof, and was duly heard and considered by said revisers thereof, and was refused by them," with intent to deceive the sheriff of Pictou County and induce him to add names to the electoral list whilst hearing and determining appeals from decisions of revisers under the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia, and the said Edward M. McDonald, did thereby commit forgery.

Taken and subscribed before me the day and year first above written, at New Glasgow, in the county of Pictou.

Signed, GEO. GRAY,
JOHN MCGILLIVRAY,
JAMES ROY, J.P.,
Pictou County.

The following is a copy of the affidavit as it left Mr. Gray's hands:—

I, George Gray, of Stellarton, in the county of Pictou, do swear:

1. That I have a personal knowledge of the facts herein deposed to.

2. That

JAMES BLAIR,
RICHARD DAVIS, Jr.,
REUBAN DUNBAR,
DAVID CONWAY,

of Stellarton, in the county of Pictou, are British subjects of the full age of twenty-one years.

8. That they are residents of polling section No. 25, town of Stellarton, in the county of Pictou. That they each derive an income of at least \$250 in money or money's worth or from some profession, calling, office or trade, or from some investment, and had so derived such income and had been such residents for at least one year next before the first day of January last past, except temporary absence not exceeding four months, and that I fully believe that they have a legal right under the laws respecting the election of members of the House of Assembly to have their names placed on the list of electors for polling district No. — town of Stellarton, in the county of Pictou, in virtue of such residence and income.

(Signed) DON. GRAY, J.P.

Sworn before me at Stellarton, in the county of Pictou, this twenty-ninth day of March, A.D. 1897.

(Signed) DON. GRAY, J.P.

The following is a copy of the same affidavit when it reached the sheriff:—

I, George Gray, of Stellarton, in the county of Pictou, do swear:

1. That I have a personal knowledge of the facts herein deposed to.

2. That

JAMES BLAIR,
RICHARD DAVIS, Jr.,
REUBAN DUNBAR,
DAVID CONWAY,

of Stellarton, in the county of Pictou, are British subjects of the full age of twenty-one years.

8. That they are residents of polling section No. 25, town of Stellarton, in the county of Pictou. That they each derive an income of at least \$250 in money or money's worth or from some profession, calling, office or trade, or from some investment, and had so derived such income and had been such residents for at least one year next

before the first day of January last past, except temporary absence not exceeding four months, and that I fully believe that they have a legal right under the laws respecting the election of members of the House of Assembly to have their names placed on the list of electors for polling district No. — town of Stellarton, in the county of Pictou, in virtue of such residence and income.

It is the very same that I have read with this addition :

That due application to add their names to the list of electors of section N. 25, Stellarton, was made to the revisers thereof, and was duly heard and considered by said revisers, and refused by them.

That was added to this declaration, a matter which made the declaration of some value, as it would not have been of any value if that had not been added. By that being added, the declaration was made to conform with the law, the law saying that these appeals can be taken to the sheriff when it has been shown that they have been before the revisers. Therefore, in order to make the sheriff take any cognizance whatever of these appeals, it was necessary that the section which was added to that affidavit should be placed in that declaration so that it could be a valuable declaration for the purpose.

J. Sim Harris, High Sheriff ; Donald Gray, J.P. ; George Gray and C. E. Tanner were called by the prosecution. Mr. McDonald gave evidence in his own behalf. The full evidence is as follows.

This is the evidence of Mr. McDonald, the accused, with reference to that, and in justice to him I think it will be necessary, although I do not relish the job, to read the whole of it, because I do not believe in reading a portion of anything and leaving out the rest, I do not believe in suppressing the truth in any way.

And this deponent, J. S. Harris, upon his oath, saith as follows :—

I am sheriff of the county of Pictou and was at my office in the month of March last for the purpose of hearing appeals from revisers, Franchise Act, Nova Scotia. I received affidavits made by Geo. Gray, of Stellarton (document produced). These names were added upon these affidavits. These affidavits are in same condition as when I received them. When brought to me by Mr. McKay's clerk in E. M. McDonald's office. His name is James McKay, I think, clerk in McDonald & Ives' office. Received affidavits about or very near 6 o'clock in the evening of 31st March. There were 20 or 30 others. I received them with a number of others, among the last. Sometime about 25th March was taking evidence,—sworn testimony of people coming before me, and it took quite a lot of time to get through with it that way, as there was quite a lot of names to be added to the list.

Mr. Tanner, who appeared for Conservatives, proposed, as he and Mr. McDonald had to go to the country to canvass, that I would receive affidavits. It was understood they were to be in accordance with law. Agreement was they would not object to affidavit from either side if regular. They were not coming back again. It was an agreement which suited me very well, as I was

Mr. MILLS.

busy conducting it. More or less of Mr. McDonald's handwriting goes through my hands. Admitted (by Mr. McDonald's counsel) that clause in each of affidavits is in handwriting of Mr. McDonald.

(Sgd.) J. SIM HARRIS.

And this deponent, Donald Gray, upon his oath, saith as follows :—

I reside in Stellarton,—J.P., Pictou—stipendiary town of Stellarton. Document sworn to before me by George Gray in the court-house at Stellarton. That clause was not in at the time they were sworn to. No other alteration made. Clause in handwriting of Mr. E. M. McDonald not in at time of being sworn to.

(Sgd.) DONALD GRAY.

There is the man before whom the declaration was signed testifying that this clause was not in the declaration when it was signed ; but when it came before him the clause which made it a valuable document appeared therein, and the handwriting of the clause was acknowledged to be the handwriting of Mr. McDonald :

And the deponent, George Gray, upon his oath, saith as follows :—

I am the George Gray who made the affidavit. (Letter produced.) I mailed that to Mr. McDonald. (Marked J. R., No. 4.) Produced under notice. (A marked J. R.) I received a reply, but have not got it. I cannot find it. I searched diligently but failed to find it. About the 23rd of March, two days after the close of revisers' court, a number of my friends in Stellarton interviewed me and expressed regret that they found their names were not on electoral roll. They informed me they had been told that by an application to the sheriff they could have their names added. None of them had applied to the revisers. I made inquiry as to whether this was correct or not,—not having applied to revisers,—of several parties whom I supposed would be likely to know. The opinion I got was,—no two agreed. Some thought they could, others not unless applied to revisers. In order to settle the matter, I said I would send their names to Mr. E. M. McDonald, which I did accordingly, expecting if they could be put on he would attend to it. I received a reply—I think the following mail—stating unless applied to revisers they could not be put on.

I then told these parties they were misinformed and could not have their names added. The impression on my mind was I had written to Mr. McDonald, but I failed to find any record that I had done so. I dropped the correspondence at that time, and on the 27th, Saturday, in conversation with Mr. McDonald by the telephone,—in reference to a private matter,—he said something about sending forms to me. On the following Monday, when I came to the office, I found there an envelope from Mr. McDonald's office containing blank forms. These affidavits are some of them. He said (blank forms marked F. R. No. 5) to get the parties to fill up the affidavits properly and return them to him by noon on Monday. I filled up these affidavits, as many of the parties lived a distance away. I could not write them all in time to return them, so I selected ten of whom I was sure, and returned them. I am accountant in Acadia office, and know of their affairs sufficiently well to make the declaration, and filled them up, as they were, with the exception of the clause in Mr. McDonald's handwriting. I did not authorize any one to insert it. On Sat-

urday night, 17th April, I first had knowledge this clause was inserted. The statement is not true, so far as I know. I appeared before revisers with other names, but these names were not among them. I am not aware those were before the reviser, although I heard repeatedly one had applied and been refused. On Saturday, 17th April, about 10 p.m., when I became aware that clause was in the affidavits, I immediately wrote to Mr. McDonald and the sheriff. In my letter to Mr. McDonald I stated the like was the case, that the clause was in the affidavit which was not there when I signed them. I mailed affidavits on 29th March, Monday. They would get the letter I wrote 17th of April on Monday, 19th of April. I should say about ten o'clock that morning of the 19th, Mr. McDonald called me up by telephone. He said he was much surprised to learn from Mr. Tanner there had been a mistake about adding these names, and he asked me if I would kindly see the parties, and have them not to go to the booth to vote, as they were not entitled to it. This I done. He seemed to be very much exercised and surprised about it. He said the clause was entirely a mistake. He assumed the responsibility. He said, "You have nothing to do with it," or words to that effect.

Cross-examined.—I have added hundreds of names for both parties. I remember two particular occasions in which I added names when the Dominion Franchise Act first came into force. (Objected to by Mr. McGillivray.) I, in company with another official of our office, made application for hundreds of names, irrespective of party. I also added a number when the local franchise was extended to house and income. I notified these men not to vote. I think I can safely say they did not. My reason is, I was presiding officer where five of the men should vote, and they did not vote, and the presiding officer where the others should vote told me they did not vote.

To Mr. McGillivray,—I was informed by John McQuarrie and W. G. Miller, on the 17th April, they—produced a copy of the affidavits—this was the time I discovered this clause. That is what induced me to write Mr. McDonald and the sheriff. After that Mr. McDonald requested me to get the men not to vote. Sheriff did not request me to get the men not to vote.

(Sgd.) GEO. GRAY.

And this deponent, Angus McKay, upon his oath, saith as follows:—

I live at Stellarton. I was one of the revisers last year for section 25. Joseph Clish and Duncan H. Gillis were the others. Admitted none of these parties named in affidavit, had applied to revisers or had these cases considered,—witness—say this is correct.

(Sgd.) ANGUS MCKAY.

And this deponent, Edward M. McDonald, upon his oath, saith as follows:—

I had very little to do with the revision of the lists, much less than usual—and not until sheriff began to hold his court. Then our friends from different part of the county communicated with me in regard to getting their names on. The general opinion seemed to be that they could get their names on, even although had not been before the revisers. I was, therefore, particular to tell people who applied to me, that unless application had been made to revisers they could not be considered by the sheriff. When I received the letter, No. 4, from Mr. Gray, on the 24th of March, I was writing him some private business, and I stated to Mr. Gray if these names had not been before the revisers and considered

by them they could not be considered by the sheriff. At the date of writing him, 24th March, I presumed that any names added by the sheriff would have to appear before him and give evidence. That had always been the course adopted. I may say I know none of these parties named by Mr. Gray. I knew fewer men in Stellarton than anywhere else in the county, speaking generally. To this letter I wrote Mr. Gray. I received no reply whatever. No information of any kind as to whether these names had been before the revisers. On the 25th and 26th I was away from home. Passing through Stellarton, I met some of my political friends at station. Some mentioned to me two Conservative revisers in Stellarton had left names of our friends off. No specific names were mentioned, but I heard these complaints from two or three people. I was very much preoccupied. Engaged with other matters. On 27th, Saturday, Mr. Gray was speaking to me over the telephone. I told him I would send him up some forms, so that if any names in Stellarton that could be put on could have the declaration made. The agreement of the sheriff spoke of had been made in the meantime. (Forms shown.) I may say three kinds of forms,—these two and some type-written especially for sheriff's court. I did not myself inclose forms to Mr. Gray on Saturday. Mr. Tanner and I were before the sheriff. I left the office at noon for an engagement. I told boy in office to send election forms to Mr. Gray. I see he inclosed a form of William McDonald, of Blue Mountains, which has not been filled. I paid very little attention to it on account of other pressing matters. On Monday afternoon, 29th, while busy in the office, I received forms from several people. Some from eastern part of county. Quite a collection of forms. These I had just received I placed with them. Monday night not in office. Tuesday morning I was away from home. Tuesday afternoon I was about the street. Tuesday evening I was at a political meeting in Pictou, and had nothing to do with the lists. Wednesday morning I was very busy, and what I might call an exciting day with me. It was the day of the Liberal convention. I had not decided then whether to accept, if nominated, to contest the county. I was a little late in reaching the office that morning. Arrived about ten o'clock. When getting there my office was filled with people from various parts of the county, who desired to see me on various matters; patronage, political and private business, and so on. I may say the crowd kept the same until time to go to the convention, at two o'clock. I could not take time to get my lunch. Among the people there were several who wanted to see about getting names on the list, mostly from West Pictou, western part of the county. Several I told, having discovered they had not been before the revisers, they could not get their names on. Others I told to come back later on and I would endeavour to have papers completed for them. I found I would not have time to do so without being interrupted, and I got filling them up, while talking to the people who were in. I found on Wednesday morning the only forms remaining were those long ones and other printed ones, and the result was that in those printed forms I had to fill in the clause for them. A great number of forms there I had not sent to the sheriff. I have no conscious recollection of filling in those papers that appear to be in my handwriting. I must have done so during the confusion and hurry, and trying to do two things at once, as the clauses in one contains a very indistinct statement. Also, in looking at the papers in

sheriff's office, I saw a great many discrepancies in papers. I was unable to go to lunch that day. Leaving those papers uncompleted and telling my partner in some of them to see they were looked after. I was at convention till five, when by accident I went to office with a gentleman on business. I noticed all those forms had not been sent to the sheriff. I told Mr. McKay to take them to the sheriff, and then I came to New Glasgow. That was the last day, 31st March, I had no time to look over them, owing to circumstances, and they were taken up by clerk without my inspection. I may say I heard nothing in regard to these names until Saturday before election. My friend, Mr. Tanner, came to me and said some mistake about these names that had been put on in Stellarton. He said the revisers there had made a declaration, in which they said the names had been put on without going before them. I said to him, if that was so I would see those persons would not vote. I expressed my regret and surprise that anything had been wrong. Mr. Tanner left me. I heard in Westville Mr. Gray was coming out there that night. I could not meet him. He left for home. I went to Pictou that night, and went to office very early Monday morning, about nine o'clock, and called up Mr. Gray. He had not come to office. I did not know then about affidavits. Before getting him on the telephone, I received his letter there. I learned about additions to affidavits for the first time, and then conversation with him was practically what he says took place. I told him at all hazards to see these men would not vote. I met Mr. Tanner on the street, and told him I instructed my friends in Stellarton to see those men should not vote. I say it would be impossible for me to do this thing, as owing to my intimacy with Mr. Tanner, extending over nine years, we can rely on each other. I would not wilfully break my word with him, and also that I had instructed my friends in the matter. To the contrary, the moment I found any mistake was made, I took the earliest and most complete precautions to see we would not profit by it. On that morning I had to fill in similar applications. All the papers, including the papers in question, were piled on my desk. I can't tell how many. Sheriff told me thirty-five or thirty-seven in all, in this pile on my desk.

Cross-examined.—Some were signed by myself. None had the clause complained of without being written in. It might have been that some of them I had sworn to myself, and thus would write clause myself afterwards. If your mind was thoroughly occupied a mistake might be made. I can't say what must have been done. I have no recollection of it. I can't say how it was done. Ordinarily, a person writing, they would have to write with his hand over them. A person might do so unconsciously. Three lines written in. I may have or not written them consecutively. Affidavits before sheriff are not according to statutes. It was arrangement between Mr. Tanner and me. Sheriff, say on 25th, I presumed, through not hearing from Mr. Gray, the men had been before the revisers, or until I saw Mr. Tanner, who had the declarations from the revisers. I presumed Gray would not have sent the affidavits unless they were not true. I had no presumption on that point, as I do not recollect of looking up the affidavit.

(Sgd.) E. M. McDONALD.

That is the evidence in full of Mr. McDonald with respect to that matter. Briefly summed up the case is this. A local election was on. Lists were being pre-

Mr. MILLS.

pared on which to run that election. Parties had been before the revisers, the revisers were making up their lists, appeals were being made to the sheriff and in order to make appeals to the sheriff that would be considered by him, it was necessary to put in the declaration of appeal, that the parties whose names it was sought to be put on the list by the sheriff had already been before the reviser and had already been refused. These declarations had been made, some by one party and some by another, but in all of them, when the declarations were signed and attested to, they were without the vital clause. But when they came before the sheriff the vital clause was in, and so the sheriff went to work and put the names on. This shows the distinction between the working of the two Franchise Acts; the one being under the revising barrister in the Dominion Act, and the other being a partisan sheriff under the local Act, not understanding the law, but doing just exactly what the party heelers would tell him. The sheriff put these names upon the list, and when the election came on, behold, these names that had no right in the world to be there, were upon the list. If it had not been so carefully looked after by the Conservatives in the district, it would have escaped notice altogether, and thereby the great fraud which had been perpetrated would have been carried into effect, and these men who had no right to vote would have voted. This fraud, however, was immediately brought home to Mr. McDonald, and he at once saw the trap that he was in, and in order to calm down the feelings, as it were, of the Conservatives, he went to these parties who, so far as the lists were concerned had a perfect right to vote, and got them to abstain from voting. I bring these matters forward, not for the purpose of parading these delinquencies of people before the country, but for the good purpose of meeting the charges that hon. gentlemen supporting the Government have made time and again about the iniquities of the revising barristers, when they do not dare to mention one single act of iniquity on the part of these revising barristers. I have shown you, Mr. Speaker, acts of the greatest iniquity perpetrated by the local revisers, not only in the county of Annapolis, but also in the county of Pictou, and I know perfectly that there are many hon. gentlemen here who have experienced similar cases to these. Therefore, I say that this Bill is opening the avenue to impropriety, to fraud, to forgery and to perjury, whereas under the revision in the Dominion Franchise Act all that is largely guarded against. There is not the slightest doubt that fraud prevails everywhere; I believe every individual is tarred with the same old stick that tarred Adam, but it is proper for this Parliament to place such safeguards in our laws as will keep

down the old Adam, and prevent these frauds and iniquities to a great extent. The present Bill does not provide for these safeguards, and therefore I say that the Dominion Franchise Act is in that regard far in advance of the Bill before the House. The present Dominion Franchise Act could have been amended in a great many ways and it could have been made workable. It was workable, the people were understanding it; the revisions were being made with very little expense; the greatest expense was entailed by the salaries of the judges and the revising barristers, and these could have been easily kept down by amending the Act. Had Sir John Thompson gone on with his Bill, he would have been pressed to adopt an amendment something like the following, in order to have made that Franchise Act less expensive. This is an amendment that would have been proposed :

AN ACT TO AMEND THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Be it enacted by the Governor General, the Senate and House of Commons, as follows :—

Subsection 1 of section 15 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor :—

15. Between the first day of June and the first day of July in each year the revising officer shall cause the list of voters to be compared with the last assessment rolls and with all the information that he can obtain from that source, and from any provincial, municipal and other official lists, records and proceedings, shall prepare two supplementary lists, one to be entitled "Names proposed to be added and corrections to be made," in like form as the original lists, being form B in the schedule to this Act, except that the heading or title thereof shall be briefly "Revision of Voters' Lists—189—: Names proposed to be added, polling district No. — (giving number and local designation, if any)," and also that the list of post offices with their reference numbers, geographical description of polling district, and explanation of abbreviations shall not be repeated therein. But amendments in or additions to the list of post offices, and reference numbers, shall be noted thus: List of post offices, with their reference numbers as in the original list (to be amended as follows), and the other list in the following form, which shall be designated Form I :—

FORM I.

Revision of Voters' Lists, 189—. Names proposed to be removed. Polling district No. — (giving number and local designation, if any). Names in full (No. of voters on last revised list). Cause of Removal.
Abbreviations—C—Ceased to be qualified; D—Dead; Tr.—Transferred.

.....(Signature)
Revising Officer.

(Dated) July 189..

Subsection 2 of the said section is amended by striking from line 3 the word "are" between the word "Act" and the word "entitled" and substituting therefor the words "seem to him to be *prima facie*."

Subsection 3 is amended by inserting between the word "Act" and the word "according" in the third line thereof, the words "in his opinion."

Subsections 5 and 6 are repeated.

Section 17 is amended by striking out from line 2 thereof the words "and certified," and from lines 8 and 9 the words "on which shall be shown the names removed as hereinbefore provided."

Subsection 1 of section 19 is amended by striking out the word "five" in the second line thereof, and substituting the word "six."

Subsection 2 of section 19 is amended by striking from the second and third lines thereof the words "or either of the supplementary lists," and by striking out from the 10th and 11th lines thereof the words "or on the supplementary list containing the names proposed to be added," and by adding to said section the words "but no such notice shall be necessary in the case of any whose name is on the list of names proposed to be added or removed provided for by section 15, as hereby amended."

Subsection 4 of section 20 is amended by striking from the 2nd line thereof the words "or supplementary list."

Subsection 6 of section 21 is amended by striking from the 4th line thereof the word "December" and substituting therefor the word "October."

Form C in the schedule shall be amended by striking out from the 10th and 11th lines thereof the words "or on the supplementary list relating thereto," and from line 22 the words "or on the supplementary list," and by adding thereto the words "the original list, and lists of names which the revising officer proposed of his own motion to add and strike off respectively are herewith posted up and exhibited."

If that amendment had been made to the original Act, it would have made the Act very workable. The matter has received considerable attention, not only by myself, but by a gentleman who has spent considerable time in studying the Franchise Act, and who prepared the best amendment possible to make the revision of the preliminary lists workable. Now, there is a uniformity in the present Act which the Bill before the House does not contain. In fact, the hon. Solicitor General in so many words admitted its lack of uniformity. He admitted it thoroughly and emphatically. But the matter of uniformity is something in which we are all interested. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) was very particular about uniformity in his Bill (No. 39), which was before the committee to-day. He gives it as the only excuse for bringing that Bill before the House that it provides for uniformity. These are his words :

I frankly admit that the only ground on which the change was made, and it was made on the very urgent representation of the present chairman of the board, who believed that his presence at the different examinations would ensure uniformity, which the present system does not.

So that uniformity has been considered by the Government in that case, and it should be considered in this; but what is the reason it is not considered? Because the exigencies of the case did not permit of its being considered. Because partisan exigencies overrule all other considerations in this

matter, but did not affect the Bill of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Now, what are some of the incongruities of the provincial Acts? In the addenda to the Bill we have set out the different qualifications of voters in the different provinces. There is quite a distinction between the franchise and the disqualifications. The franchise is one thing, and the disqualifications are quite another thing. The franchise provides what names shall be placed on the list; the disqualifications disqualify certain persons whose names are on the list from voting. That is a very important distinction to keep in mind. One of the grossest incongruities exists in the province of Nova Scotia. In that province we have a new Franchise Act, which is largely upon the line of the present Dominion Act. There is very little difference between the two, the difference being merely with regard to income voters. In the local Act income voters must have an income of \$250, while in the Dominion Act the amount is \$300. I think that is the only difference, so far as the franchise is concerned. But there is a disqualification clause which makes the Nova Scotia Act most obnoxious. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) tells us that that does not come within the present Bill. Well, either the hon. member wishes to misrepresent the facts to this House or he has never read the Bill, or he does not understand the Queen's English—one of the three; because it is a fact that the disqualification clause of the Nova Scotia Act is within the four corners of this Bill. The fifth clause of the Bill says:

For the purposes of any Dominion election held within the limits of a province, except as hereinafter otherwise provided, the qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote thereat shall be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

It goes on further to say that the provincial voters' lists shall be adopted. If it had simply said that and nothing more, then I would say that the hon. member for Yarmouth was right; but it does not stop there, but brings in the disqualifying clause of the Nova Scotia Act. Now, what is this disqualifying clause? It is set forth in the addenda to this Bill. It is this:

Revised Statutes, chap. 4, sec. 67.

Any one who within fifteen days before the election was an employee, or in the receipt of wages or emoluments of any kind as such employee, in the post office, the customs house, the Inland Revenue Department, the lighthouse service, on the Government railroads, in the Crown Lands Office, or the local public works or mines, but nothing in section to extend to contractors to furnish materials for Government railroads, or to perform any other specific contract in respect of the same, or to any person who may have been employed by the day temporarily to repair railroads, or to any postmaster, post office keeper, way office keeper or mail courier.

Mr. MILLS.

That is the disqualifying clause, which is, I contend, the greatest blot that can possibly be put upon the law book of any province. When was that enacted? It was enacted in 1871. Some hon. gentlemen who support the Government say that it was a manly and fair thing and a proper thing under the circumstances to do, and the hon. Minister of Finance got up in his place the other night and said he was proud of it. First he said that he had nothing to do with placing it upon the Statute-book, but that it belonged to some of the hon. gentlemen on this side. To be sure, in 1871 the hon. Finance Minister was writing in the office of the Halifax "Chronicle," a paper supporting the party that put this most obnoxious law upon the Statute-book, and consequently he, as a legislator, had nothing whatever to do with it. But he had to do with it afterwards, and he not only retained it, but supported it, and the very same ideas that permeated the hearts and the breasts of the men who had placed that Act upon the statute-book in 1871 were handed down in succession to the present Finance Minister, who was then the Premier of Nova Scotia, and caused him not only to retain that most obnoxious law but to defend it. This matter was brought up in 1871, in the province of Nova Scotia, by a Bill to secure the independence of the House of Assembly. I want you, Mr. Speaker, to distinctly understand that there is quite a difference between this Bill and the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia. They are two different things altogether. Mr. Purdy, a Conservative member at that time, said:

That the Bill was one which would strike down a very large number of respectable people in his county. He had yet to hear the first argument to show that it was criminal to be appointed by any Government to carry out the laws of the country, or that such an appointment should be a reason for disfranchising men who were born with the inherent rights of citizens. It was recognized by our laws that if a man held a certain amount of property he was entitled to vote, and he did not know upon what principle the Government intended to disfranchise such voters, because they discharged the duties devolving upon them under a law legally and properly passed. It was due to the House that the Government should explain why they sought to disfranchise decent, respectable, honest men for no other reason than that they were employed by a Government, which was recognized by the House and country. If it was the case that this province did not recognize Dominion laws, there might be good reason for disfranchising the servants of the Dominion Government.

What do you suppose the Attorney General of that day stated was the reason this Act should be placed on the Statute-book. He said:

The simple reason for passing the present Bill was that the servant was always under the authority of his master. The man who paid another wages had a right to control his actions

as a general rule, and this applied more particularly to persons in subordinate situations, such as the officers in the customs-house and railway departments and the other departments mentioned in the Bill. It was for the protection of those men that the Act was passed. It was assumed those men were Nova Scotians, and would not wish to be driven to the hustings to vote for Canadian interests against the interests of their own country. The Bill was intended to protect them from the tyranny of their masters. When the hon. member for Cumberland came into the House, he was the greatest anti-Confederate in the country. He could not live under Canadian thralldom, and it nearly broke his heart during the first session. He was not now so badly affected towards Canada after all. He had received an office under Canada.

Perhaps some hon. gentlemen who were so thoroughly imbued with those ideas which were handed down to them in 1882, 1883 and 1886, having since accepted office under Canada, are not so imbued with the ideas they entertained in those years. The Attorney General of that day continued :

That hon. gentleman would now be very sorry to vote against the Canadian Government, because it would take away his own employment.

Think of the Attorney General in the legislature of Nova Scotia talking about Canada as if it were a foreign country. He then went on to say :

The power of taxing this country had been given to the Canadians, and so far as taxation was concerned the people of this country were absolutely helpless. The only liberty left to this country was what was left to this legislature in the regulating of the local affairs of the province. It was not a very extensive power, but was all the more dear on that account.

Therefore, it was in the interest of the country that this House should be swept clear of all Canadian influence. Before the session closed such laws should be passed that every person who had the smell of Canada upon him would be excluded from this House. The members of this House would be taught that they could not serve two masters.

Those were the feelings and the sentiments under which this bastard—because it was a prostitution of the best sentiments of patriotic men—law was placed upon the statute-book of the province of Nova Scotia. Mr. Townsend, who is now Judge Townsend of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, rose in his place and did his best to prevent the passage of this Act, but the Government had a majority in the House and they passed the Bill. Here is another quotation which I shall read in order to show the feeling that prevailed then :

Now we are striving to shield ourselves against a power that is ruling us with a rod of iron, that refused to deal fairly with us financially or otherwise, and makes appointments at variance with our ideas. In adopting this measure we are therefore only carrying out what the people sent us here in 1867 to mature. We were sent here in 1867 to legislate on pure anti-Confederate principles, and to show that the people were dissatisfied at the revenues being transferred to the Canadian Government. We are, therefore,

in 1871, but carrying out these principles to the full extent.

But they were not all of that stripe, they were not all of that opinion in 1871 and 1872 in Nova Scotia. After that Bill was passed, on came the elections of 1872, and the people saw the iniquity that was worked by reason of the passage of that Act. Batches of three hundred and four hundred in each county were stopped from going to the polls and voting at the local elections in 1872, and when the House met in that year of course there was great indignation. Mr. Allison, the member for Hants, in the local at that time, and who sat in this House in 1886, moved the second reading of a Bill for the repeal of the obnoxious law. Mr. Flynn, member for Halifax, moved that the Bill be deferred for three months. In other words, he moved for three months hoist. I shall just read what Mr. Blanchard said—the Hon. Hiram Blanchard, a bluff, hearty, genial, patriotic gentleman, a man whose heart was as warm as his intentions were honest. He said :

That the Attorney General should have himself refrained from attributing motives when he complained so strongly of want of charity in the Opposition.

Mr. Blanchard was opposing the three months hoist to this Bill for the repeal of this obnoxious Act.

No party, unless they were "deceived and seduced by the instigation of the devil," would have put such an Act on the Statute-book with a view to taking away the franchise from men as good as any who sat in the House. He believed the Act to be a cunningly devised contrivance to let officials who were favourable to the Government vote, and to take the franchise from those who were unfriendly to them. Why were the inspectors of fisheries and the takers of the census omitted from the statute? Because the Dominion Government were soft enough to allow the members hostile to them in this country to nominate their own creatures to those offices.

And I call the attention of the right hon. leader of the Opposition to this matter, because he was thoroughly conversant with those things at that time, and I rather think that he was instrumental in allowing some of these men to appoint their own officials, even in the county of Annapolis, at that time against the wishes of the good Liberal-Conservatives and patriotic Tories of that day.

An effort was made to repeal this Bill in 1882. I refer to this not because I wish to lengthen this debate, but because the question has been thrown across the floor: Why did not you repeal the Act when you were in power, because you have been in power since 1871? In 1882, Mr. Blair moved the second reading of a Bill to repeal chapter 3 of the Acts of 1871 and chapter 15 of the Acts of 1872, which Acts had disfranchised Dominion officials. He was opposed by Mr. Campbell and Mr. Kenny, of Yarmouth, and was supported by Mr.

Townsend, now Judge Townsend, and also by Mr. Pugh, of Halifax. The motion for the second reading of the Bill was then put and carried, 28 for and 7 against. I am reading from the "Debates of the Assembly and the Council of the Province of Nova Scotia." But there was a legislative council in which there was a large Liberal majority. The Bill was sent to the legislative council, but was there thrown out, and these Acts were not taken from the Statute-book where they remain to this day.

Now, what were the feelings of the people who placed those Acts upon the Statute-book? They were feelings hostile to the best interests of this country; they were feelings of anti-federalism; they were feelings of secession; they were feelings of rebellion; they were feelings that could not animate the breast of any patriotic man. And those feelings were kept alive down to the time when the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) became Premier of the Government of Nova Scotia. He saw this feeling among the people and went one better. He not only agitated against these Dominion officials, but he even ran an election in 1886 upon the issue of repeal. He came before the country and said: It is time that we should break from our thralldom, that we should cut ourselves free from Canada, that Nova Scotia should be alone as she used to be. They went to the country in 1886 and carried the province on the repeal cry. That was about the time I came into politics. I battled against that cry in every way I possibly could and I am on record as holding that repeal cry in contempt. But Mr. Fielding, then Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, now Minister of Finance of this Dominion, saw fit to run the election upon that question. And not only that, but they came before the country in 1887, when the Dominion elections were run and that was the real issue before the country at that time. In order to give you an idea of what the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia of that day, now the Minister of Finance of the Dominion, thought in 1886, here is an extract from the speech that he made in the county of Annapolis in June, 1886:

I believe that the people in Nova Scotia are in favour of separation from the Dominion of Canada. I believe they were in favour of it in June last.

The 16th June was the day they ran the local election and ran it on the issue of repeal.

I believe they were in favour of it on the 16th June last, because many a man who took little interest in it on the 15th June last and looked upon it as a hopeless question discovered that the clouds had rolled away. When the smoke of the battlefield had cleared away, and the verdict of the people was on record, that repeal was a practical work-a-day question, and many a man who was indifferent on the 15th June will not be

Mr. MILLS.

indifferent when the next opportunity presents itself.

He and the Attorney General had come down to Annapolis and were holding meetings preparatory to the Dominion election campaign which they expected would soon take place. Again, he said:

The people are in earnest in this matter, and the politician who fails to keep faith with them will have every reason to regret that he ever came forward to take part in the agitation.

These are the words of the present Minister of Finance in 1886. The Halifax "Chronicle," which was largely controlled by the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia at that time said, in its issue of the 18th June:

At any rate the government of Nova Scotia will be untrue to their pledges if they do not fulfil, as far as constitutional methods will permit, the wishes of the people so unanimously expressed at the polls on the fifteenth. The demand for repeal must and will be placed before the Government and Parliament of Great Britain.

These were the feelings that animated the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia and his press at the time when the elections of 1887 were being brought on. So far as I was concerned, I came before the people in that election on the National Policy, pure and simple. The repeal issue was brought up, but I ignored it and held it in utter and supreme contempt and stigmatized the agitators for repeal as nothing more or less than a pack of demagogues, charlatan politicians, who were working against the best interests of Nova Scotia, and of our country, Canada, as well. I fought that cry from stump to stump with the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, with the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia to help him as occasion required. And what was the result? We had a majority in Nova Scotia, and we buried that repeal question almost in oblivion. But not so in the opinion of the present Minister of Finance. Notwithstanding the results of the election of 1887, we find him in 1888 still expressing himself on this pet idea of his. What is it? I am quoting from the Assembly Debates of 1888, page 369:

If I believed there was no possible way out of this union—

He wanted to get out of the union quick.

—I should hardly speak as I do. I do not agree with those who say that if the people express a firm determination to separate from Canada their wish cannot be accomplished.

Then referring to those who say that repeal is utterly impossible, for that is what we endeavoured to teach from every stump in the country, Mr. Fielding says:

If I entertained such ideas as that, I should not be loyal. I have no admiration for loyalty of that kind. True loyalty is founded on justice, it cannot thrive on injustice. It is because I have faith in the ability of a people to obtain justice under the British system, because I believe that the will of the people of Nova Scotia in this

matter, if firmly and persistently declared, must prevail that I remain a loyal British subject and join with others in singing "God save the Queen."

That was Mr. Fielding, after 1887, after they got their quietus at the polls. And we have the father of repeal, James A. Frasier, counting noses after 1887. And who does he count among the repeal candidates who ran in the Dominion elections in 1887? This is what Mr. Frasier said with reference to that :

One Liberal was elected in the province of Nova Scotia who was not a repealer.

That was Mr. Flynn, of Richmond, who was elected in 1887.

On the other hand we lost as repealers, Messrs. Ray, of Annapolis, Mackay, of Queen's, Currie, of Windsor, and Fuller, of Halifax, most of them by very small majorities, so small that we take it for granted that in the coming fight, whenever that comes, sooner or later we are going to win all these counties. Then we get the following repealers :—Lovitt—

The present Senator Lovitt in the other House.

—Eisenhaur,—

Who sat in this House in 1887.

—Robertson,—

Who also sat in this House in 1887, and is now a member of Parliament in the province of Nova Scotia.

—the Hon. Mr. Jones (a voice, Borden) ; yes, Borden—I had forgotten Borden.

So the Minister of Militia and Defence was also reckoned as a repealer in 1888. So we have in this Ministry no less than two ardent repealers, who are ready and willing to go to the foot of the Throne to dismember this Canada of ours, to break up confederation, to place Nova Scotia where she was before 1867. Now, in 1888, this matter was again brought up in the House, on an attempt to repeal this obnoxious Act, because the Conservatives all down the line were determined to get rid of that Act if they possibly could. It was brought up, and Mr. Fielding again expressed himself on the floor of the House in 1888, lauding this Act. We remember that no later than the other evening the Finance Minister rose in this House and stated that he was proud of it, he was proud of what he had done in Nova Scotia with reference to disfranchising all those officials. If he was proud in Nova Scotia of disfranchising those officials, there is no doubt but he is also proud of having been an ardent repealer. Now, what did some of the other provinces do with reference to their franchise? In Prince Edward Island, after discussing how this disfranchising of Dominion officials had worked so beneficially for the Liberals in the local affairs of Nova Scotia, they also took the matter up. Mr.

Peters, the Prime Minister of Prince Edward Island in 1893, placed an Act upon the Statute-book disfranchising Dominion officials. On introducing the Act in 1893, "respecting the election of members of the legislature by providing that persons in the employment of the Government of Canada shall not be entitled to vote at elections of members of either branch of the legislature of this province," Mr. Peters, among other things, said this :

We should not brook any interference from the authorities at Ottawa.

Fighting on the lines of their co-Liberals in Nova Scotia.

If the Dominion Parliament choose to come down and say : We want to reciprocate, and take away from the local officials their voice in Dominion politics, let them come down and pass an Act and I for one will say, all right.

Therefore, we have not only one province in Canada disqualifying Dominion officials, but two provinces. These Acts and these disqualifications are incorporated in this Bill now before the House, notwithstanding the assertion of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) to the contrary, when he told the House the other night that they could not be found within the four corners of the Bill. Now, it is absolutely necessary that we should have a complete control of our franchise. We have no control, if the provisions of this Act are carried out. I say this notwithstanding the assertion of the right hon. leader of the Government. He stated the other night, that we had perfect control from the fact that we had delegated that control to the provinces. Well, if giving away control over a matter is a control over that matter, why then we have a control over the franchise in this Bill. But this Bill gives absolute control to the local legislatures and to the municipal councils, so far as the present provisions of the Bill are concerned. There is nothing in the world to prevent any local House or any local legislature from changing the franchise as often as they please ; then, by virtue of this Bill in its present shape, it becomes the law which regulates our Dominion franchise. The franchise has not been extended to women in Canada. It may be extended to women in the province of Nova Scotia, it may be extended to women in British Columbia, it may be extended to women in any other province, and not extended in the other provinces ; in that case we would have the incongruity of a Parliament partly sent here by women and partly not. If we followed out the idea of amending this Bill so as to retain control of our franchise, I think it would be a beneficial act to this country. I do not think that Sir John Thompson had the idea that we should give up entirely our control of the franchise. He had the idea that we should still have our revision, that we should still have our judge, that we should still have revising officers, that we

should still have control of the franchise so far as relates to the Federal Parliament. It should be based upon provincial lists as furnished by the municipalities in the different provinces, and based on all the other information that could be obtained by the revising officers throughout the Dominion of Canada—that was the intention of Sir John Thompson, as I gathered from conversations with him, and also from his speeches that have been recorded in "Hansard." Now, I think that the consideration of any Franchise Act is always an important duty for the country concerned. Our franchise is the fountain spring, the reservoir from which must flow the governing power of Canada, and should be put under the immediate and absolute control of this Parliament. To delegate such control to the legislative assemblies of the different provinces is a retrograde step, for which no combination of circumstances can afford a reasonable excuse. Our franchise, the great source of the people's legislative power, like those reservoirs that give nourishment, health, life and vigour to many of our towns and all our cities, should, like them, be well guarded from polluting influences, which is not, by any means, an element in the Bill before the House.

I object to this Bill, because it does not, in the carrying out of its provisions, accomplish what is claimed by the Government in the matter of expense, purity of franchise and general utility. It surrenders to the different provinces powers, duties, responsibilities and privileges which are peculiarly our own. It provides for no uniformity of franchise. It consigns the greatest safeguard of our liberty to the tender mercies of the narrow-minded, demagogic local politician and ward-heeler. It will bring into the Dominion arena, and will cause this Parliament to endorse abuses and frauds that smell to heaven in their vileness, aye, in their criminality.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Federal Life Assurance Company of Ontario, and to change the name to the Federal Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

Bill (No. 53) to incorporate the Prudential Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Bain.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Dominion Building and Loan Association.—(Mr. Clarke.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Canada Atlantic Transit Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Mr. MILLS.

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 94) to authorize the Canada Eastern Railway Company to convey its railway to the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Tucker.)

Bill (No. 95) respecting the Great Commonwealth Development and Mining Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Nickel Steel Company of Canada.—(Mr. Wood, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the North Shore Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Edmonton and Peace River Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the motion of Mr. Henderson (for Mr. Tisdale) that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 32) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Company.

Mr. SPROULE. When this Bill was under consideration last Wednesday evening, I was pointing out the importance of our taking a new departure in the matter of controlling railways. I had given some history of the result which has followed our bonussing of railways in the past—giving bonuses, in the first place, to build railways in sections of the country where there were no railway facilities, and then to build other railways for the purpose of obtaining competing lines and thus reducing freight rates. I had endeavoured to show that, notwithstanding the fact that the Parliament of Canada and the Ontario legislature had subsidized many lines intended to be competing lines, in the view of securing better transportation facilities, it afterwards turned out that the competing railways and the original lines became merged under the one management, or came to an understanding with regard to freight rates, so that the people were deprived of the advantages which the Dominion and the province had made heavy sacrifices in money to obtain. We have thus reached that point when we find we are unable to give the people what they had expected in return for the expenditure of public money, and we are forced to consider what other means we should adopt, when dealing with railway charters and railway subsidies, to obtain the much-needed competition and reduction on railway rates. It has become absolutely necessary for Parliament to do something to secure the rights of the people as against the great railway corporations. I spoke also of the importance of this link, connecting, as it will, the illimitable wheat fields of the west and the great

waterways of the east, traversing that section of country, extending about 434 miles, between Port Arthur and Winnipeg. This link will not only connect the eastern system of railways, as they may be reached from the waterways of Lake Superior and the other lakes, but it also will be a connecting link between the railway systems of the east and the west. I pointed to the fact that it will pass through a section of country which is not in itself an inviting field for railway construction, and through which one track was already built that had cost a great deal of money. What can be the object of building a second track, except for the purpose of giving the people in that great western country better transportation facilities than they have received from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and furnishing competition to that line? This line is also intended to enable the western farmer to reach the great waterways of Ontario and Quebec, so that, when he reaches Port Arthur, he may be able to secure the cheapest and best transportation towards the sea, either by water or other railways. For that reason, it becomes a very important link, first, because it is through a section of country through which few railways are likely to be built, and through which it is very costly to build railways; and, second, because it will be a long time before we can possibly expect another railway line through the same territory. Therefore, if we do not secure, by some amendment to this charter, to the people in perpetuity the right of other railways to run over this line and the prevention of its amalgamating with some other company, the people in the west will have to wait a long time before they will have another opportunity like the present of getting competition.

I have often heard it said, both in this House and outside, that no sooner will this road be built, than it will come under the control, if not under the name and management of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the people of the west will be just as much without competition as they are now. I am justified in believing, from the rumours I hear from time to time, that, somehow or other, the Canadian Pacific Railway will either own or control that road, and that they have, as far as possible, prevented the building of that link of railway connecting the waterways at Port Arthur with Manitoba and the west. They have prevented, as long as possible the building of that railway, and the present extension of charter which is asked, justifies me, I believe, in coming to the conclusion that it is the object of the Canadian Pacific Railway, provided the charter is passed, as proposed, to hold it seven years in the future without commencing to build the line. Why? Because the clause providing for the extension in the original draft of the Bill did not provide that the railway shall be commenced, but that it shall be finished in seven years. It

had been, in the original charter, given two years to commence, but the two years passed without any beginning having been made, and now seven years have passed, and still the line is not commenced. It is true, there was a short portion built, known as the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway, which will be a portion of this line; but the Rainy River road not a mile is built, although it is seven years since they got their charter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). They only received their subsidy from the Dominion last session, which was a late session.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that; but as long ago as 1895, they received a subsidy from the provincial government of \$115,000 for 35 miles.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They built 80 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. Not of this road, but of the Port Arthur, Western and Duluth. In 1895, they got \$115,000 from the provincial government.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The hon. gentleman must admit that there are two separate charters. The charter for the road running to Duluth, to which the hon. gentleman refers, is not the Rainy River charter, at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I am talking of the two combined, because the Duluth road will be a portion of this one.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). It may, or may not.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the hon. gentleman want? He is anxious to get this road built, and, when others are trying to have it built, he wants to obstruct it. I say that this road was given a provincial subsidy, in 1895, of \$115,000, and in 1897 of \$258,000, and in 1898, \$420,000. And the other road was subsidized in 1892 for \$28,000. And then, in 1897, the Dominion Government gave what will be \$512,000 as a subsidy for this road. That is, they gave \$3,200 a mile, if the road cost \$15,000 a mile or less, but if it cost over that the subsidy would be double, which will be \$6,400 a mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not exactly that. The hon. member (Mr. Sproule) surely will not make a statement that way. If the cost is over \$15,000 a mile, the company gets 50 per cent of the cost over that amount, but not to exceed \$6,400 a mile.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to say that this vote was not a specific one of \$6,400 a mile, but from the information we have as to the cost of the road, and I think the Minister will agree with me, that from the information he has, the bonus is likely to be \$6,400 a mile by reason of the cost of the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should not be surprised. I think it likely that you are right.

Mr. SPROULE. If that be correct, there has been voted already for this road \$1,115,000. The bonuses commenced in 1894, and now we have reached 1898 and none of the road is built yet. Now, I would ask: Does it not look as if somebody held that road in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, not to build it, but to hold it back as long as possible, until Parliament will not wait longer, when they will begin construction, but go on as slowly as possible?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is only seven months since that double subsidy or since any Dominion subsidy was voted.

Mr. SPROULE. I said it was in 1897, that is, at the last session of Parliament. At any rate a beginning has not been made. They asked in this charter seven years to finish the road, saying nothing about the beginning. And they asked under their old charter seven years and allowed that time to pass without doing anything. I am justified, therefore, in saying that they aim at the same thing in this. If they were given seven years to finish the road, saying nothing about the commencement, the people, trusting in the general Railway Act, which provides that such works shall be commenced within two years, they would not commence, but would try to keep the charter alive and the subsidy with it. Does it not look as if this road was controlled by some others who did not intend to build it as long as they could possibly hold back? And when we come to inquire who are the men who own that road, we are told they are Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann; and we know the relations that exist between Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann and the Canadian Pacific Railway, the various lines in which they are interested and the various contracts that they have carried out for the Canadian Pacific and how they work into each other's hands to serve their own purposes. All this goes to show that it is not their intention to build this road and make it, when completed, a competing line with the Canadian Pacific Railway. We, very properly I think, amended that charter in such a way as to compel them to commence the road this year, and within two years to finish eighty miles. I have no doubt that if this charter goes through, they will be compelled to make a better showing in the next couple of years than they have made in the last four or five. But even if the road is built, the people are face to face with a dilemma. Are the people in the east and the people in the west going to obtain competition through the building of this road? We are afraid they will not, and for that reason we seek to

Mr. SPROULE.

have this amendment to the charter made. I believe I am justified in giving weight to the opinion prevalent throughout the country that there is a distinct understanding between Mackenzie & Mann and the Canadian Pacific Railway to stave off the building of this road as long as possible, and, when it must be built, to manage it under one head. If so, what advantage will the people have further than the opening up of the mining country through which this road will run? The province of Manitoba paid a large sum to have competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway in the west. They got the Northern Pacific Railway in, but it did not accomplish what they wanted, because the two companies arranged their freight rates so that they are practically one. The Premier of the province is trying to get another outlet, running from the boundary of the province to meet this road, and he hopes when that is accomplished to have a competing line with the Canadian Pacific Railway from the boundary to Port Arthur, where it reaches the lake. If this is done and proper control over the freight rates secured, it is a guarantee to the producer of the west that he will have more justice done to him in the future than he has had in the past. It will be a guarantee to the manufacturers and shippers of the east they will have competition in these two lines, and so have better terms in the transportation of goods. But that can be secured only by inserting in this charter a clause to compel them to give running powers to other roads. The only available road so far as I know, is the Grand Trunk. If you keep this road independent from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, you leave it open to every road in the older provinces that can reach the lakes. Then, in the west the building of railways is comparatively cheap, and we already have several roads built there which, if connected, would make practically a through line by which communication could be carried entirely independent of both the Canadian Pacific and the Northern Pacific in that country.

If that be the case, it becomes all the more important for us to guarantee to the people the right to use this railway. Suppose Mr. Greenway succeeds in what he is doing. I saw an intimation the other day in the "Globe" that he expected to announce in the forthcoming session of the Manitoba legislature that he had made a contract for a railway extending from Winnipeg to the boundary line, and he intended it to connect with this line of railway to Port Arthur, he intends to have a very cheap freight rate. I forget the exact figures, but I think he intends to secure and believes he can secure a freight rate of 10 cents per cwt. on grain between Winnipeg and Port Arthur and other rates equally cheap. If that be the case, one can understand how his efforts will be entirely nullified if this

railway is left uncontrolled to such an extent that it may be under the wing of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and so Mr. Greenway cannot take advantage of it. And so, what I have held with regard to this Bill is that it should be kept back until an announcement is made in the Manitoba legislature as to this matter. Then, if Mr. Greenway is able to secure cheap freight rates such as he has intimated he could secure, we should be justified in prescribing about the same rates in this Bill and keep this road open so as to secure competition for all time in this link of railway. This done, we shall have done more than we have ever done before in securing the rights of the people in connection with a great railway.

It is for that reason that this amendment is proposed. To my mind, it is an important one. As I said before, we are justified in controlling railway charters to that extent because our efforts in the past have signally failed in securing to the people the rights which we thought they were entitled to, in view of the great expenditure of money belonging to the people that we make to railways every year. I say we have failed hitherto, and therefore we are entitled to devise some new way by which we can secure to the people not only competition in railway lines, but fair freight rates, and also the right of the Government to control these freight rates. It is proposed that this railway should be, comparatively speaking, an independent link, or that we should tack on an amendment similar to that which we tacked on to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway charter. I do not think the Canadian Pacific Railway would object to it, I am quite sure the Grand Trunk Railway hopes to use that line in the future, if it is available. I do not think that any other railway corporation that intends to reach either the lakes in the east or Manitoba in the west, would object to it. This amendment provides :

That running powers over the said railway and all its branches and connections, or any portions thereof, and all lines of railway now hereafter owned or leased by or operated on account of the company between Lake Superior and the city of Winnipeg, and the necessary use of its tracks, stations and station grounds, are hereby expressly conferred on the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Government Railway System, the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other road designated by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or the Parliament of Canada, upon such terms as such Committee or the Parliament of Canada may determine, and according to the provisions of the Railway Act, and of such other general Acts relating to railways as are from time to time passed by Parliament, but nothing herein shall be held to imply that such running powers might not be so granted without the special provisions herein contained.

That so soon as the said railway or any portion of it is opened for traffic, the rates and tolls on the railway, and on any other railway or

steamers used in connection therewith and now or hereafter owned or leased by or operated on account of the company, shall be first approved by the Governor in Council, or by a railway commission, if and when such commission is established by law, and shall at all times thereafter and from time to time be subject to revision and control in the manner aforesaid.

Now, that may appear to some harsh, but the Canadian Pacific Railway allowed that to be tacked on to their Bill for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and I have the authority for saying so of Sir William Van Horne, who said in the committee the other day that, as he understood it, it gave the Government the right to control freight rates on every portion of their railway system. I think that is a very important admission. It was an important admission to this extent, because I think the Government felt that they have no right to interfere with the freight rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway until their earnings show that they are realizing 10 per cent or more upon the money invested in building that railway. But saying nothing about this 10 per cent, Sir William Van Horne admitted that the Government, by that clause, had taken to themselves the right to control freight rates. I say there cannot be any serious objection to taking that right here, if it applies to that great railway system, there cannot be any serious objection to tacking it on to this road, that is only a short road, but a very important connecting link. Then, I say they cannot object to it, even if we go further, and specify what the freight rates should be. If Mr. Greenway succeeds in securing connection with the road in the west where he specifies freight rates over the same ground—because this must be a portion of that line—I say, then, this House is justified in passing this amendment. But while I would not like to go quite so far as the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), and say just exactly what the freight rates should be, or that the passenger rate should be 2 cents a mile, still I think that the other requirements might fairly be made upon them, and this amendment which it is proposed to make to the Bill, ought to be adopted by this House. In view of these things, I support it. I think this Parliament ought to support it, I think the Minister of Railways and Canals ought to support it, and what is more, I think before we pass this Bill, he ought to tell us that he is prepared to assist in granting this charter in such a way as to prevent the possibility of that link of railway coming either under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or under the control of men who are interested in the management of that railway. I think he should do that in the interest of this country and for the information of this House. I hope this amendment will be adopted by the House. I know that the country expects it. I know if we allow this, our golden

opportunity to pass away, it may be a long time before we can have another chance to secure in perpetuity competition to the people of that great western country as well as to those who use the line from this end in sending goods out there. It will be a long time before we can have the advantage which we can secure in this charter to-day. If we are giving so much money for it, that is a stronger ground why we should exercise the greater control over it, and why we should keep it independent. Then, I believe the time has arrived when we ought to tack on to every railway charter that comes before this House, some provision that every railway company that requires to use or run cars over such railway, should have the privilege of doing so. If the traffic becomes so great that it is necessary to build another line, they can easily double-track the road. But why should the country go to the expense of building two roads at a cost of \$25,000 a mile for each, if the track for one will carry all the traffic that is taken over the two? Why not save the extra cost of building one road and secure the right of passing over the one? Then, if the traffic becomes too great for one road, it would be cheaper to double-track one line and use the two tracks than to build two lines. But by building two lines, unless we pass this amendment, we do not secure competition, we do not secure the right to other railways, that may reach either end of this line, to run their cars, their freight and their passenger travel over that road as they ought to have. This, I think, we ought to secure, and I for one am in favour of it. I ask this House to pass this amendment for that special purpose, and let us show to the railway corporations of this country that while we grant them great powers and give them large subsidies to build lines for the accommodation and convenience of the people, we cannot afford to allow them to control the rates just as they like after these lines are built, but that we take to ourselves such powers as are desirable and necessary in the interest of the great transporting people to use those railways after they are built.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for private Bills having expired, we will now proceed to the consideration of the motion for the second reading of the Franchise Bill.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fitzpatrick for second reading of Bill (No. 16), to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. McNEILL. I shall take up the time of the House but for a few minutes in

Mr. SPROULE.

the observations which I am about to make on this measure. I may be allowed perhaps to say, in the first place, that it is gratifying to any one who was present and who took part in the prolonged and acrimonious debates upon the Franchise Bill of 1885, to find that the leaders on both sides of the House on this occasion have approached this discussion in so friendly and judicial a spirit as they have evinced. The subject with which we are dealing, Mr. Speaker, is one which is not only of the first importance to the country, but it is one which affects the individual rights of members of this House, and it affects those rights in a manner as to which members are apt to be very sensitive, and, therefore, I think we may congratulate ourselves upon the fact that so much good feeling and good temper has been displayed in this discussion. After all, the difference between the two sides of the House narrows itself down to a very small compass, I think. The difference of opinion seems to be confined to a difference on this point: as to the authority which shall regulate the qualification of the electors. I think we all agree that the Act of 1885 proved to be far too expensive in its operation. I think Liberals and Conservatives alike agree upon that point, and it was to give effect to the strong feeling in that regard which existed on this side of the House that Sir John Thompson introduced the measure to which reference has been made more than once during this discussion. Sir John Thompson's sudden death, and the death within the period of some three years of three such leaders as Sir John Thompson himself, Sir John Abbott and Sir John A. Macdonald had the effect of breaking, as it were, the continuity of the Conservative policy in this regard; and the overshadowing interest of the Manitoba school question came in to produce the same effect and bring about the same results. The consequence was that nothing further was done by this side of the House before the election of 1896. In fact, if these hon. gentlemen will throw their minds back, they will see it was impossible that anything could be done. Therefore, as I have said, the two parties are agreed on that point, so far as the desire on each side of the House is concerned, to reduce the expense of the operation of the existing law; and the only difference between us seems to be this, that the Government maintain that the provincial legislatures should not only hold in their hands the power to determine the electors for the provincial legislatures, but that they should also be empowered to determine and to dictate who shall be the electors for members of this House. There seems to be the only difference between the two parties. That is the position of the Government. We say that would be an unjust arrangement. We say we do not wish to interfere with the powers of the provincial legislatures to

arrange their own franchise; and say that the provincial legislatures ought not to be empowered to interfere with our franchise, and in so far as they do interfere, to deprive this House of its constitutional right to regulate its own franchise. That being the difference, so far as I am personally concerned, I should be very glad to leave that issue to the country and let it decide between the two parties, provided it ever goes so far, but I hope still that some arrangement may be made.

I listened with very great interest to the speech of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. The speech was a very interesting speech, and if I may be permitted to say so, it was a very able presentation of the case from the Government point of view. So far as I could gather, the right hon. gentleman alleged three main reasons why we should adopt this policy: first, because it was the policy adopted by the republic to the south of us; second, because it was philosophical; and third, because, under a federal constitution, it was the only proper course that could be adopted. So far as the first reason is concerned, it was sufficiently dealt with by my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood), who pointed out that the central principle of our constitution in this regard is diametrically the opposite to that adopted by the United States. Their principle was state rights, as it was called. Our principle is the supremacy of this Parliament. Their principle was, as I have said, state rights, and the framers of the constitution of the Dominion, after the most careful consideration, after having seen what the effect of the principle of state rights in the United States had been, determined they would avoid the danger into which that principle in the constitution of the United States had led the republic, and they adopted, as I have said, the very opposite principle, that of the supremacy of the Dominion Parliament. This proposal made by hon. gentlemen opposite is inconsistent with the supremacy of this Parliament, and is inconsistent even with the independence of this House. The acceptance of the principle of state rights by the people of the United States had the result of bringing about a great civil war, one of the greatest civil wars the world has ever seen; and I do not think even the persuasive oratory of the right hon. leader of the Government will induce the people of Canada to imitate the American constitution in this regard.

Then as to the question of its being philosophical to adopt this principle, I will say that in the first place, I am afraid I am not a good enough philosopher to accept philosophically a proposition which asks this House to denude itself of so important a privilege as the selection of those who are to elect the members of this House. I would call the attention of the right hon. leader of the House if he were in his place—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). You are not asked absolutely to denude yourself.

Mr. McNEILL. I consider that you do denude yourself when you hand this matter over to each provincial legislature to deal with. You may get back the power some day; but I will refer to that point later on. With regard to the philosophical aspect, I call attention to the fact that in all the world there is no more philosophical people than the Germans. If the hon. gentleman wants to deal with philosophers let him go to Germany; if he wants to meet with philosophers, let him go to the country of philosophers par excellence. Now, what do we find with regard to Germany? The German Empire is a great confederation also, but the philosophical Germans do not agree with the franchise views of the right hon. gentleman; they agree with our views. This brings me to the third contention of the Prime Minister, which is, that under a federal constitution, we are obliged to adopt the proposal of the Government in this regard. We find, in the case of Germany, that the German states have, as the provinces have in Canada, their own separate franchise. We find that in Bavaria, for example, the franchise requires, that an elector must be twenty-five years of age, and he must have paid direct taxes for six months previous to the election. In Baden, every citizen not convicted of crime nor receiving parish relief, may vote for a deputy elector; that is to say, for one of a certain body of electors who vote directly for a candidate for the legislature. In Prussia, every Prussian twenty-five years old, and who is qualified to vote at municipal elections in his place of domicile, can vote for a deputy elector. In Brunswick, we find that twenty-one of the members of what, perhaps, I might call the House of Commons there, are elected by those who pay the highest amount of taxes; three are elected by the Protestant clergy; ten are elected by the towns, and ten are elected by the rural districts. Those are some examples of the divergence of franchise which exist among the states of the German Federation. Now, according to the principle laid down by the right hon. gentleman, each of these states ought to send members to the Reichstag upon the basis of these several franchises. But that is not so at all; the Germans, who are sufficiently philosophic to suit even the right hon. the leader of the Government, have utterly repudiated any such idea. They have one franchise for their federal House of Commons, and that is, that a man shall be a German and shall be twenty-one years of age. Therefore, the very opposite of the principle laid down by the right hon. gentleman is accepted in the great German federation. The statesmen who have built up that grand empire, have examined this con-

stitution of the United States, and they, as the statesmen who framed our federal constitution, have repudiated the principle which is now recommended to this House by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir, I do not want to prolong my remarks on this subject. I say that any fair-minded man will, in my judgment, admit that, just so soon as the provincial legislatures are empowered to assail the seats of members of this House by striking from the voters' lists a number of their friends and supporters, just so soon this House ceases to be an independent legislative body. The proposal which is made by hon. gentlemen opposite is simply that proposal; it is a proposal to clothe the provincial legislatures with that power. Against that we protest. That power was entrusted to the local legislatures for some years, in the hope that they would not abuse it. They did abuse the power, and this House, in defence of its privileges and its liberty, took that power from the provincial legislatures. It is proposed now to give that power back to them, and I say that, by giving it back to them, we simply place this House of Commons of Canada under the heel of the provincial machine politician and wire-puller. Such legislation as this is, in my humble judgment, derogatory to the dignity of this House, and absolutely inconsistent with the independence of the Commons of Canada.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House for any great length of time, but I desire to make a few remarks upon this Bill. In the first place, I am heartily glad to learn from the Government that, whatever else may happen, the present Dominion Franchise Act is to be destroyed and wiped out. It is in evidence to-day that, for once at any rate, the Liberal party were right. Hon. gentlemen opposite are slow to admit that it is possible for this party ever to be right; but to-night we have evidence that, for once, the Liberal party was right when it fought the introduction of this Act into the legislation of Canada; because there is not in Canada at the present moment a man who values his reputation who will stand up and defend the Dominion Franchise Act. They may say that there are some good things in it; they may say that there are some good points about it that they like; but to defend the principles of the Act is an utter impossibility. A good deal has been said about the cost of the Dominion Franchise Act. That certainly is an objection that appeals with force to every man in this country, but, to my mind, that is not the only objection, nor the chief objection, that can be urged against the law that has governed the franchise of this country since the year 1885. I know something about the workings of that Act. We have been told, in the course of this debate, a good deal about the frauds that have been perpetrated

Mr. McNEILL.

in connection with the provincial franchises. I do not deny it; I never knew a Franchise Act in this world under which frauds would not be attempted to be perpetrated, if one could only find the rascals to make the attempt; but what I say is this, that the facilities for perpetrating frauds are much greater under the Dominion Franchise Act than they are under any provincial franchise law that I know of.

Mr. WILSON. How is that?

Mr. McCLURE. I will tell the hon. gentleman how. The challenge has been thrown across the floor here to name any revising barrister or judge who acted unfairly. I cannot accept that challenge. I have not a word to say against the revising officers who have revised the lists that I know anything about. But I say that an angel from heaven, with all the skill that is supposed to be possessed by a Philadelphia lawyer, could not prepare a just list under the Dominion Franchise Act. The worst feature of that Act to my mind is this, that it afforded the amplest facilities for loading up the lists with the names of men who were not qualified to vote, and it afforded no facilities for purifying the list when once those names were put on, except facilities which were so expensive that you could not avail yourself of them. The effect of the Act was that in towns and cities, you could get any body you liked upon the list; but in sparsely-settled portions of the country, hundreds of qualified voters would go without votes unless somebody who was not bound to do it, upon whom no duty rested to do it, but who, possibly for some political advantage or from pure patriotism, would go and hunt them up and get from them applications to be placed on the list. Hon. gentlemen have quoted specific cases of fraud under the Franchise Acts of the various provinces. What happens under the Dominion Franchise Act? In the very town in which I live, when the list was revised the last time, the Conservative committee went and got on the list all the names they could of the qualified, responsible, respectable voters. They did nothing more than their right and duty in that. But did the thing stop there? When that was gone, somebody—I do not know who, for everybody has repudiated responsibility for the Act—hired a young fellow without character or reputation, and paid him, according to his own testimony, twenty-five cents for every name he could get on the list. He went and gathered up the names, and swore to their qualifications in batches, and they were put on the list. I do not blame the revising barrister for that. He had the affidavit of an elector, he was bound to accept it, and those names went on the list by hundreds; and we were placed in the position of either leaving them on or applying the expensive machinery of the Act to get them off. Having the sworn testimony

of an elector that they were qualified to vote, it was necessary, under the Act, for somebody to come forward and swear that they were not qualified. That is a very difficult thing to do. You might get a dozen people to say: "I do not know this man; I do not think he is qualified, but I do not know." But there is the oath of an elector that he is qualified. This thing happened, not once or twice, but scores of times under the Dominion Franchise Act. That could happen only in towns and cities; but throughout the country, where electors are scattered over large areas, there would be scores of young men who were not posted in the laws of the country, and were not advised as to the workings of the Franchise Act; and unless somebody went out and hunted them up and got their names placed on the list, they would not be there. I grant at once that the Act is as fair to one party as to the other; and I am bound to say that having it we made the best of it we could; and in the county of Colchester, we made it our duty to see that these men were hunted out of the woods. But is that the way a Franchise Act should be prepared in this country? Should the burden be thrown upon people to go and hunt voters in the woods and have their names put upon the list? We ought to have a law that gives to a man a vote as a natural right, and not something that is conferred upon him as a favour. Instead of this, what do we propose to substitute? The local lists, on which men are elected to the various legislatures of this Dominion. I am told at the outset, and I have heard it frequently stated by Liberals and Conservatives alike: "But after all there is something to be said in favour of this Parliament controlling its own franchise." I have frequently heard that statement, but I have seldom heard anybody go any further, and tell us what that something is. The hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig), I think it was, the other day said that he would oppose this Bill because he believed it was right for this Parliament to retain control of its own franchise, and then he proceeded to give reasons, and what were the reasons? First, he said: "I think it is a good thing for this Parliament to retain control of its own franchise, because it is a good thing for this Parliament to keep the control in its own hands." That was as far as he could go, and that is as far as anybody can go; because, in the first place, there is nothing in this Bill inconsistent with the idea that this Parliament should keep control of its own franchise. I ask hon. gentlemen, what is the difference between saying that the voters' lists shall be prepared by men appointed by us because they are county court judges, and saying that the lists shall be prepared by revising officers appointed by the municipal councils? In principle, what is the difference? And when we come to look at the list—I speak from the

standpoint of my own province mainly—I ask any man from the province of Nova Scotia, whatever his politics may be, to go into any district of his own county, and take the Dominion list and place it side by side with the provincial list, and I challenge him to say whether that provincial list is not a better and truer representation of the voting strength of that district than the Dominion list. There is absolutely no doubt about it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And so in Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT. Not at all.

Mr. McCLURE. Take an illustration of it. I had the misfortune or good fortune to run an election in my county on the same day on which the local members were elected. I had to be elected on a Dominion franchise list two or three years old, while the local candidates were elected on the local list which was made up two or three months before the election. The result was that in every district there were scores of young men between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-three who had the privilege of voting for the local candidate, but who could not vote for the Dominion candidate, and not only young men, but men of all ages and all classes. Not only that, but in very many cases the very men who were voting on the Dominion franchise had actually lost their qualification. It was held by men who had to stand idly by and see men vote on the qualification which they possessed. I could name scores of cases in the province of Nova Scotia in which under the Dominion Franchise Act no less than three men have been qualified on one piece of property worth \$150. Is that fair legislation? Under the Dominion Franchise Act one man can be qualified as the owner; he can rent the property to another man, who will go on the list as the tenant; somebody else will be in occupation of it, and he will go on as the occupant. Three men will be voting on a single qualification, and as the list is prepared only once in a long while, all three may be living in the United States, and may come back on election day and vote, while the man who really owns the property may not have a vote at all. That is a sample of the way the Act works. From beginning to end, from ridge-pole to cellar it is full of difficulties in the way of securing a just and fair franchise list; and to-day it is an outrage and disgrace that when two or three by-elections are being held, there is not a young man in these constituencies between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-four who will have a right to vote, and hon. gentlemen opposite are to blame for disqualifying them. We have had many tears shed in this House and outside of it over the disqualifying of Dominion officials. What shall we say about the disqualifying of the young men of this country at every election held since

this Act was enacted, for we have never had an election when the list was not two or three years old.

They disqualified the young men of this country by scores, and they qualified men who had no right to vote, to take their places. And yet they weep over the poor railway man. Oh, they say, there will be terrible frauds if you adopt the provincial lists. I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) this afternoon undertake to tell us that fearful frauds have been committed in the making of the provincial lists in the province of Nova Scotia. To hear him talk you would think that the Conservatives down in Nova Scotia must be a very poor mealy-mouthed, simple set to run an election. He told us that on the board of revisers, one would be a Tory, and of course an honest man, and the other would be Grits, and of course rascals. The philosophy of the hon. gentleman seems to be that a Grit may be honest in some things, but is bound to be dishonest in elections.

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCLURE. I do not wonder that the hon. member for Simcoe cheers that statement, because his idea is that honesty has nothing to do with politics.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman wants my estimate of him, I shall judge him that way.

Mr. McCLURE. I have never thought of getting the hon. gentleman's estimate of myself, and I trust I will never sink so low as to be worthy of getting it. The hon. gentleman for Annapolis knows that he could not sustain his statement successfully in Nova Scotia. The proof is to be found in the lists themselves, and I ask that hon. gentleman to take the list in his own county and compare it with the Dominion list, and I tell him here—and he cannot dispute the statement—that the local list is much fairer than the Dominion one in his own county. And that is true of every county in the province. The hon. gentleman cited a long extract from a newspaper to show that some fraud had been perpetrated in Pictou. But what did it all amount to? It amounted to this that somebody had tried improperly to get three or four names on the Pictou list, but owing to the fact that we have a franchise law, which could not be made an engine for fraud, he did not succeed in getting them on. But had it been the Dominion Act, he would have got them on very easily and it would have been very difficult to get them off afterwards. An attempted fraud proves nothing. You will find lots of people to attempt frauds under any law. The question is, do they succeed, and the test is the list that is finally prepared. Is that a fair list or not?

But it is a great humiliation, these hon. gentlemen tell us, for this Parliament to be

Mr. McCLURE.

elected on lists prepared by the local legislatures. Why do not the hon. gentlemen know that the men who send them here are the very men who send representatives to the local legislatures. Is there any humiliation in that? The hon. gentleman who last spoke referred to the United States, and thought he had discovered a great answer to the right hon. First Minister when he said that the constitution of the United States was directly the reverse of ours. I think he strained his argument a little far. I know that in some respects it is the opposite of ours, but it is not fair to say that it is directly the reverse. At any rate there is no difference in this respect, that we have a federal Parliament and local legislatures just as they have a federal Parliament and state legislatures. There is a difference between the powers of our local legislatures and the powers of their state legislatures, but not as regards the separate existence of these two legislatures. And in the United States they accept the principle that the state legislatures should control the franchise for the election of members to the federal Congress.

The hon. gentleman would prefer, however, that we went to Germany instead of to the United States. Well, I am willing to go to Germany for philosophy and learning, but not for the laws that protect the liberty of the people, not for the laws that give to the people the right to govern themselves. I would rather take those from a better source than Germany. Great respect as we have for the German Empire, I have never before heard that it is the source from which we should receive inspiration when framing legislation to protect the rights and liberties of the subjects of this country.

The hon. gentlemen have a great deal to say about the disfranchisement of Dominion officials. I do not know that that has anything particular to do with this discussion. I am aware that the hon. gentlemen have asserted that this Bill will disqualify Dominion officials in the province of Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Annapolis seems to forget that there is a vast difference between a Franchise Act and an election Act. The Franchise Act of the province of Nova Scotia does not disqualify Dominion officials. Every Dominion official in Nova Scotia, who has the requisite qualification, is upon the lists that are adopted by this Act, and these are the same lists that are used in the municipal elections in that province. In municipal elections all these Dominion officials vote, and the only reason why they do not vote in the provincial elections is because of the provision in the election law declaring that a voter must not have been in the employ of the Dominion Government within fifteen days before the election, and the oath can be put to him on that point. I am bound to say, in all frankness, that there is a section in this

Act which might be construed as giving the right to put such an oath to an elector, but that clearly never was the intention of the Act; and for my part I would most heartily support any amendment which would remove the obscurity and make it plain, as was evidently the intention of the Act, that these officials should vote in the province of Nova Scotia. At the same time, I am not here to apologize for the Act of Nova Scotia in disqualifying the Dominion officials. I know a good deal more about these officials in that province than some hon. gentlemen. I have known them in my county, and I am bound to say that in the length and breadth of the province of Nova Scotia there is not a class of men who command my respect more than the railway employees of this country. I know the men working on the Intercolonial well. They have been political opponents of mine, they have gone to the polls and voted against me, but I have not an unkind word to speak of them, and although time and again I have been urged to use my influence to secure their dismissal, I have always refused to do so. But let me tell you, Sir, that while they are a noble, intelligent class of men, there are no men on the face of the earth who have been treated more like slaves by hon. gentlemen opposite than the employees of the Intercolonial, and it was as much for the protection of those men themselves as the protection of the legislature that that law was passed. I have met the men themselves, and man after man, by scores, they have told me that they were compelled to vote as they did. Not compelled by the Government—oh, no. The Government would be very careful to issue no order, but indirectly those orders went all the same. I know that the president of the Liberal-Conservative association of the town of Truro went to more than one voter who was suspected of being doubtful, in his allegiance to the Conservatives, and told him that if he was not seen at the committee meeting on a certain night he would know what was the matter, and on whom he had to depend for his bread and butter. They did go and were submitted to a cross-examination, and given to understand that if they dared to vote against the Conservative candidate, they did it at the risk of their office. The hon. leader of the Opposition will indignantly deny that; he will be horrified to think that such things went on under his Administration. But they did; and if he did not know it, he was recreant to his duty as a public man in not knowing that he was keeping in the Government employ men who became the slave-drivers of the free and independent electors of this country. That is why the local legislature disfranchised these men for their own protection, in order that they might not be placed in the humiliating position of having to cast their votes in a certain way whether they wished to do

so or not. There is ample justification for that disqualification. I do not say whether it should apply under this Bill or not. It is not proposed here and does not enter into the discussion. Now, as I said at the outset, the best feature, to my mind, of this Bill is that it will do away with the Dominion Franchise Act. I am gratified, in the second place, to know that we are going to go back to the provincial lists. I am gratified because I think we shall then have a fair list. I do not wish to have imposed upon hon. gentlemen opposite or upon myself the necessity of spending time and money to prevent the young men of this country from being disfranchised by a law which is unjust in its provisions, unworkable in its details and most expensive to the people. The provincial lists fairly and honestly represent the voting strength of the country. How are they prepared? In the province of Nova Scotia every municipal council divides the county in to revising districts and three revisers are appointed for each district. These men are not all partisans, at least, they are not all partisans on one side. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) seemed to think it was sufficient to say that a man was a Grit to prove that he was unfair. It will be impossible for the hon. gentleman to get out of it that way, because the Government that he supported appointed revising barristers in the province of Nova Scotia, and I have yet to learn that they appointed a single Grit among them. I do not make the charge against these men that they were unfair. I will not descend to such a depth as to say that a man must necessarily be unfair because he is a Conservative. It is not a charge against a man as to fairness that he belongs to this party or that; the proof is in his actions. It is not to be forgotten that revisers of the local list appointed by the municipal councils are composed of both Liberals and Conservatives. I think there is not a municipal council in Nova Scotia but has a fair representation of both parties. In my county, as long as I can remember, the council has been about equally divided, and the revising officers appointed have been men of both political parties. Yet not a complaint has come from either as to the manner in which the lists are prepared. And, so far as I know, the same thing is true of every county in Nova Scotia. The qualification for the franchise is practically the same under the Dominion Act as under the provincial law, so the change will make little difference in that respect. In reference to going back to the provincial lists, I think there is a good deal to be said in favour of the idea that the provinces should control the franchise and not this Dominion Parliament. I am glad to notice that as years go by, this Dominion is becoming more and more consolidated into a common

nationality. I am glad to know that in no period of the country's history has this movement towards consolidation of the people of this Dominion gone forward with greater strides than during the years since this Liberal Government came into power. But I am not blind to the fact that great progress as we have made toward the day when we shall be no longer Nova Scotians or Manitobans, but all Canadians, I am nevertheless bound to admit—and it is not to our discredit—that there are local differences and even national differences in this country. I am not ashamed to say that, proud as I am to be a Canadian there is in my heart a feeling of greater pride in the fact that I am a Nova Scotian. It is nothing disloyal to this Dominion to say that I hold Nova Scotia to have the first place in my heart. There being these local differences, is it right, is it wise, is it expedient, to attempt to force upon this Dominion a franchise common to all the provinces? Do not think that I am attempting to create differences between the various classes of people in this Dominion. The best way to weld the people of these various provinces together is to give them to understand that they have the right to stand by their local institutions, to declare that it shall no longer be a crime for a man to be proud of his province and its institutions. Therefore, there is much to be said in favour of giving to the people of the several provinces a right to say who shall represent them in this Parliament—for that is what it means in the end. If this Parliament undertakes to say: We will control the franchise ourselves, it is saying in effect: We will say to the people of each province that they must send to represent them here only such men as we choose to select; that is, we will select the electors who send the representatives here, which is the same thing. I say that that is working backwards. We should say to the provinces: Send to represent you in this Parliament such men as you choose, and to that end, you shall have the right to select the voters and to do it as you please. This talk about fraud in the preparation of the lists is pure moonshine. There is fraud even under the Divine law, and under any other kind of law, but the law is not to blame; the blame must fall upon the rascal who is behind the fraud. You should frame the law so as to remove the facilities for fraud, and there your duty is at an end. That is not what the Dominion Franchise Act did, for it opened wide the gates for fraud, and closed them against the punishment of the perpetrators of the frauds.

So I say I have great pleasure in supporting this Bill. I believe the hon. gentleman who last spoke said that we were surrendering our rights, that this Parliament would lose its independence—I think that was the word he used—if it went back to the old

Mr. McCLURE.

lists. Then this Parliament must have had no independence before the Franchise Act was adopted. Will the hon. gentleman say that that is the case? This Parliament had a species of independence under that Franchise Act, which I trust it will never have again. It had independence of public opinion, which was no credit to it. For years men have sat in this Parliament as representatives of the people, who, if a fair list had been prepared, would never have been elected, men whom the people would never have sent here if they had had an opportunity to vote against them. That is the kind of independence that we do not want.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that on your side?

Mr. McCLURE. It may have been on my side, or it may have been on the other. It does not matter so far as the principle is concerned which side was left at home. I am not here to discuss the matter on the narrow ground of party alone. I hold that the people have a right to be properly represented in Parliament and they cannot be so represented if the voters' list does not represent the full voting strength of the country. I, therefore, most cordially support this Bill. I believe it is a long step in the right direction, a long step when it destroys the iniquity of the Franchise Act, and a still longer step when it restores to the rightful owners the right to control the franchise laws of this country and to declare who shall elect men for this Parliament.

Mr. ROCHE. I had thought that the Bill which was up for discussion was the Bill introduced by the Solicitor General, rather than the Dominion Act of 1885; but the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. McClure) has devoted the principal portion of his remarks to a discussion of the old Dominion Act, which had a thorough threshing out at the time it was placed upon the Statute-book. Although the hon. gentleman, by his camp-meeting style of oratory, seems to invite retaliation, still, I am inclined to take a charitable view and to attribute that to the fact that, though he is very respectable personally, he is apt to lose his head and be carried away by his own eloquence, and, therefore, gives utterance to many things that he really does not believe in himself. This, at any rate, is the charitable view that I take of his performance. I also think that the reputation of the hon. gentleman for fair-mindedness can very well be called into question, when we consider that he is an ardent admirer and warm follower of the Finance Minister, who, in this House the other night, gloried in the fact of having been a party to seeing Dominion officials disfranchised by the wholesale. I think, if that is an evidence of the hon. gentleman's fairness, we may properly take his other remarks 'cum grano salis.' Thus far, hon. gentlemen from the

other provinces have seen fit to discuss this Bill from the point of view of their particular province, so I may possibly be pardoned, if I follow in the same strain, and tell the House something of the iniquities of the beautiful Act which we have in Manitoba. To those who come from other provinces than Manitoba, where the franchises may be in some respects suitable to those provinces, and which may contain elements of fairness approved of by all irrespective of party, the adoption of this proposed Bill, to be sure, may not prove so very objectionable. But from any Conservative coming from Manitoba, a province whose erratic legislation during the last ten years has on more than one occasion set all the world wondering, to any one who has had any experience of the partisan character of the local Election Act of that province, and of the outrageous conduct of the partisan officials who manufacture the lists in the interest of that party, I say, the adoption of this proposed Act may well be viewed with alarm. Not only is the main principle which is involved in this proposed Act most pernicious in its character, by which this Parliament is called upon to surrender the control of its own franchise and to delegate this to the provinces, but, so far as Manitoba is concerned, the substitution of the Provincial Act means handicapping the Conservative party of that province, and subjecting them to a great expenditure of time, labour and money, and even then they will not be placed upon an equal footing with their opponents, or in a position that any man having implanted within his bosom the first elements of fair-play, can approve of. It is not my purpose, at this juncture, to enter into an elaborate defence of the present Dominion Franchise Act. I recognize that it has features that can quite easily be improved on. That it is too cumbersome and expensive in its operation, I readily admit; that a more simple, less expensive and more satisfactory Act may be placed upon the statutes is no doubt true and desirable. But, in my view, the Government will make a very great mistake in adopting this hybrid system under which each province in the Dominion will have a separate basis of representation in this House, differing from its sister provinces no two being alike in this respect. With all due deference to the opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite, I claim that, in compiling an Act for the Dominion, great respect should be paid to the principle of uniformity, and the complicated condition of affairs and confusion avoided, which is bound to be entailed by the adoption of this Bill. The hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches need not be so particular to pass this Bill merely for the purpose of keeping faith with the electors, merely for the sake of fulfilling their ante-election promises, they have already proved recreant to so many of their pledges in the past, that if they violate an-

other one, it will make very little difference, though, no doubt, it will come as a great surprise to the people—the shock may be more than they can stand, under the circumstances—to see them attempt the fulfilment of one of those pledges, and that one not of primary importance. That the present Act on the statute is not an ideal one, we readily admit. But it can be improved on without resorting to a measure that means handing over the control of the basis of representation in this House to provincial politicians to be made subservient to their political ends, which will undoubtedly be the case if those in charge of political affairs throughout the other provinces of the Dominion are of the same calibre as our Lilliputian statesmen of the province of Manitoba. I, therefore, as a member of this House, protest strongly against the adoption of this proposed Bill, especially on the ground that it provides for the substitution of the provincial lists, prepared by provincial officials, instead of lists under the control and direct supervision of officials appointed by this Government. Does the Government know the nature of the Act that they are asking us to substitute for this Dominion Act, so far as the province of Manitoba is concerned? Are they aware of the manner in which the local officials enforce the provisions of the provincial Act which they propose to adopt? Are they at all aware that this Act of Manitoba was condemned at the time it was placed upon the statutes of that province, by no less an authority than the Toronto "Globe," the mouthpiece and family Bible of the Liberal party? That Act must surely have been a very vicious one, when it received condemnation from such a source. Still, that paper pointed out to the Greenway Government that, in enacting such legislation, they were but placing a stumbling block in the way of the Liberals of this House, and called upon them to halt before making a mistake which they would regret for all time to come. Is the Ministry aware of the fact that Mr. Fisher, that old-time Liberal, the gentleman who represented the province of Manitoba on the late Hudson Bay expedition, and for a year or two was president of the Provincial Liberal Association of that province, roundly denounced the Act in that historic observation of his as being a "monstrosity of monstrosities?" If not, I tell these hon. gentlemen so now, in order that they may have an opportunity afforded them to make a thorough research into the operations of that Act, which has been admitted by all independent and fair-minded men to be most unjust, unfair and unworthy of any enlightened and civilized people, inasmuch as it places the Opposition entirely at the mercy of the Government of the day. Why, Sir, the partisan officials who have compiled the lists in that province, have vied with each other in their endeavours to see which of them could disfranchise the greater number of their political opponents.

The names of hundreds of old-time Conservatives, men who had voted at municipal, provincial and Dominion elections for ten or twelve years, aye, and more, were designedly left off those lists in the hope that either the absence of their names would not be noticed in time to send in appeals, or that they would not take the trouble to be present or to be represented at the courts of revision. Affidavits sent in by Conservatives to those officials were ignored, and the mere ipse dixit of the Liberal candidates accepted instead. Now, the old Act that was passed in Manitoba in 1886, by the Norquay Government, provided that the lists should be compiled by officers termed enumerators, but they were to be, as far as practicable, municipal clerks, not compulsory, but wherever feasible. That Act, however, was condemned by the then Liberal Opposition, led by Mr. Greenway. He took the position that, in all cases, the municipal clerks should be the proper officers to compile those lists. He roundly denounced, and gave voice to the sentiment of his party at the time the Act was being passed, in these words :

He (Mr. Greenway) was in favour of having the voters' lists prepared by municipal clerks, and maintained that this could be easily done, as the greater part of the work was complete when the lists for municipal elections were prepared. He objected to the Government taking in themselves the appointment of enumerators. They might appoint partisans, who might put obstacles in the way, in order to exclude from the lists names to which they objected. The greatest freedom should be allowed, and there should not be any taint of suspicion as to the manner in which the lists were prepared. * * * If a partisan enumerator were appointed, how easy it would be for him to ignore certain information which he might obtain in reference to certain individuals whom he might wish to exclude.

So the House will see that Mr. Greenway objected in toto to the Government taking unto itself the appointment of officers to prepare the lists. Mr. Martin, a colleague of Mr. Greenway at that time, moved on the third reading :

That the said Bill be not read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a committee of the whole House, with instructions to amend the Bill by striking out clause No. 14, which provides for the appointment of enumerators, and substituting therefor a clause providing for clerks of municipalities making up the voters' lists.

Every Liberal in the House voted for that motion. In the elections that took place in the following December, from every hustings, and by every Liberal candidate, this principle was laid down, that, with the Liberals in power, an Act would be passed providing for the preparation of the lists by the municipal clerks and their revision by the judges. In January, 1888, Mr. Greenway was called on to form his Cabinet, and in the session of 1889 he, in a moment of honesty, moments which I regret to say are

Mr. ROCHE.

with that hon. gentleman too few and far between, did enact legislation embodying those two features. That Act received the unanimous endorsement of every member of the House, Grit and Tory alike. The municipal clerks, who were appointed yearly by the municipal councils, and who were independent of the government, were to compile the lists. Those clerks were not all of the same political persuasion, and, if they attempted to stuff the lists in the interests of either political party, they ran the risk of losing their positions after the next municipal elections. Self-interest alone, therefore, would compel those officers to do their duty in an impartial manner. But how long, think you, Mr. Speaker, did Mr. Greenway allow that Act to grace the statutes of the province of Manitoba? Only one year. At the very next session of the legislature, he, knowing that was too honest an Act to suit his purpose, fearing an untrammelled verdict from the people he desired to barricade himself behind a partisan election Act, repealed his own Act of the previous session without having given an opportunity to test its practicability at a general election, wiped it off the statutes, and substituted in lieu of the same an Act embodying the very features formerly condemned in the Norquay Act and in the Dominion Act. Yes, and features far more vicious than any contained in either of those Acts. Could duplicity go further? What did this substitute Act of his provide? It provided for the compilation of the lists, not by municipal clerks, but by officers termed "registration clerks," another name for enumerators, and their revision by either judges or barristers of three years' standing, whereas previously judges only could revise the lists; and now we see a host of partisan Liberal lawyers, in return for party services, sent out to the various constituencies to act as revising officers at the several courts of revision. Now, what was one of the principal objections urged by the Liberals in this House against the adoption of the present Dominion Franchise Act in 1885? I will quote to the House the objection of the Hon. Edward Blake, leader of that party :

For the discharge of a duty, the most delicate in the world, that of establishing the lists by which it is to be decided whether the Government are to continue in power or not, the Government takes the power of selecting men, and undoubtedly they will select safe men. * * * The proposal (of the leader of the Government) is to put these revising lists into the hands of his own nominees. * * * He is, in fact, proposing a scheme by which he can take control of the polls. The lists are to be made right for the Conservatives, and the Liberals will have to fight against them. * * * The revising officers will be selected as political men for a political and particular purpose.

If that objection was a valid one when applied to the Dominion Act, with how much more force does it apply to the Act which

It is intended to substitute in lieu of that Act, as far as the province of Manitoba is concerned. For, bear in mind, judges, or barristers of five years' standing, compiled and revised the Dominion lists, whereas the provincial lists are compiled by officers appointed by the government, nominees of the Liberal candidates, whether elected or defeated, whose principal qualification for the position is, that they are political partisans, and, as a matter of fact, the lists are prepared under the direct supervision of the Liberal members, or candidates, in almost every constituency. Men have been selected as registration clerks, in many instances, not from amongst the better class of our citizens, not because the people, irrespective of politics, had confidence in their integrity, but simply because they could be depended on to take every possible party advantage in the interest of the government candidates, and I must say, in that respect, they earned the gratitude of those candidates, many of whom owe their seats in the legislature to the scandalous manipulation of those lists in the interests of the Liberal party. I need not deal in generalities. I am in a position to give examples of specific cases; I have in my possession affidavits and declarations from leading men in one-third of the constituencies in the province, all telling the same story of partisanship, duplicity and fraud, which I will not weary the House by reading, as some of this information has been given to the House before. Suffice it to say that, in North Winnipeg alone, 400 names were left off the lists; the entire Hebrew vote, to the number of 250, was omitted, because it generally went Conservative, while the Icelandic vote, which goes with our Liberal friends, was put on without any personal application on their part. Out of 30 employees in one establishment, 27 were Conservative and 3 Liberal. Strange to say, the 27 were left off and the 3 put on, and that without any formal application; the registration clerk admitting, at the court of revision, that he took those 3 names off an old scrutineer's book.

The fact of the matter is that they had been marked as having voted for the Liberal candidate at the preceding election; that was evidence enough for him that they were entitled to vote; and the twenty-seven Conservative voters who were marked as having previously voted Conservative were deemed to be worthy of disfranchisement. In the constituency of South Brandon the elections were held upon the unrevised lists; no court of revision was held in that constituency at all, and the reason of that is, that the Liberal Government of the province absolutely refused to allow the printing of those lists to be done within the constituency, much against the protest of the local Liberal member, I will do him that justice. There was a sore head in the Liberal party, a man who was on strike, who happened to be in the printing business, and he lived in

the distant town of Emerson, away outside the constituency, miles and miles. To appease his wrath the government transferred to him the job of printing the voters' lists, with the result that those lists were not returned in time to have the appeals sent in, and so the elections had to be held on the unrevised lists. Bad as the lists were after they had passed through the hands of the revising officer, they were ten times worse when they had no revision at all. On the other hand, in the city of Brandon a court of revision was held before the lists were printed and distributed, and the people had no opportunity of seeing whether their names were on the lists or not; it was all a farce. Again, in the constituency of Dennis, out of 1,405 names on the list, 249 were proved to be fictitious, a very fair proportion and one which if maintained on the same average in the different constituencies of the province, it is no wonder Mr. Greenway enjoys such a large numerical support in the legislature at the present day. These are but a few examples of the practices which prevailed generally throughout the length and breadth of that province. Is it any wonder, therefore, that with such a state of affairs, which I have no hesitation in describing as disgraceful in any civilized community, that the Conservatives of that province view with alarm the substitution of provincial lists, prepared by officials who take a delight in disfranchising their political opponents by the wholesale. Is it to be wondered at, that handicapped as the Conservatives were in Manitoba in that respect, fighting against such tremendous odds, that they are so numerically weak in the legislature at the present moment. The wonder is indeed that they have not been legislated out of the local parliament entirely. Well, Sir, I am happy to say that the strength of the Conservative party in the legislature is no criterion at all of the strength of that party in the country, as will very soon be evidenced.

The franchise, Mr. Speaker, is the basis of constitutional freedom, and if we are going to have stuffed lists prepared by partisan officials, the liberty of the subject is gone. If we are going to legislate afresh upon this Franchise Bill, for decency's sake let us not put an Act on the Statute-book that will be ten times more vicious in principle than the one we repeal. What is the use of enacting fresh legislation unless we can improve on the old. I therefore protest and protest strongly against the adoption of this Bill, because of that principle which is involved of submitting the control of the franchise to these two-penny ha'penny politicians whose area of vision is so circumscribed that they cannot see beyond their own political barn-yard. I say, Sir, that this is a most pernicious principle and we in the province of Manitoba have experienced it to our regret and sorrow, fighting as we did against the tremendous odds that we have

there. The result is that we cannot hope for fair-play under the Manitoba Election Act as it exists at the present. I do not see in their places to-night any of the Manitoba members. They have not yet spoken on the Bill, but I know they cannot defend the Manitoba provincial franchise on any ground.

Mr. LARIVIERE. There is one of the Manitoba members here.

Mr. ROCHE. I refer to the Manitoba members on the other side of the House. I am sure they will not attempt any real argument in favour of adopting the Manitoba provincial lists for this Parliament, because they know in their inmost souls that what I am telling is the truth. The other day, the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) pointed out to us with a great gusto that the very best evidence that the people of Manitoba approved of the railway policy of the Greenway Government was the fact that Mr. Greenway enjoyed such a large majority in the local legislature. I say that no more erroneous deduction could be drawn. Any gentleman who is acquainted with the true condition of political affairs in that province, and who is willing to be fair will have to admit, that even with the school question as a powerful lever in the hands of that government at the last election, Mr. Greenway would have been defeated had it not been for the scandalous manipulation of those lists in the interests of the Liberal candidates. Even the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is not in the House to-night, but I am inclined to be very charitable to him, because no doubt he is preparing the mourning for the death of that Yukon first-born of his, which we expect to occur next Tuesday. However, I see by the provision of this Bill the North-west Territories are exempted from its operation, and now I ask the Government to place Manitoba in the same category as the North-west Territories, at least until such time as they can bring pressure to bear on their Liberal confreres of Manitoba to get them to wipe off the statutes of that province an Act that is now a disgrace to it, and for it, substitute a fair Act; a Franchise Act in the widest and truest sense of the term; an Act that will give a Conservative in that province, an equal say in its affairs with his Liberal fellowman.

Mr. HEYD. I do not propose to occupy a great deal of the time of the House, as this Bill has been pretty well discussed in all its bearings. There is one thing which strikes us with singular significance, and that is the different spirit which is manifested to-night by hon. gentlemen opposite, compared with that which they manifested some thirteen years ago. To-night this Dominion Franchise Act is dying a natural death; some thirteen years ago, it was ushered in by the Conservative Government with a blare of trumpets, but its glory has

departed now and even its best friends are willing to see it die. This proves that thirteen years ago the Conservatives were most terribly mistaken, that all the prognostications made as to the benefits it would confer have turned out to be false, and to-day the Dominion Franchise Act has proven itself to be a lamentable failure. Therefore to-night, half the labour on this side of the House has been removed, because that fact is admitted by gentlemen on the other side. The only thing that our friends opposite still adhered to, is the principle of uniformity. Just why that word "uniformity" has such a singular attraction for them I cannot understand, and yet one speaker after another clings on to a uniformity of franchise.

Now, Sir, there is no use concealing our thoughts with words. The word "uniformity" when applied to the franchise, means a franchise law that shall be uniform throughout the length and breadth of this land. Can we have uniformity; that is the first question. Is it possible to conceive of a condition of affairs where we can have that uniformity, unless the Dominion Parliament itself prepares the lists. There is no possible way in which the combined wisdom of this House can devise a scheme for maintaining a uniform Franchise Act, unless this House itself prepares the lists, and if we do so, how can we economize, and how can we get rid of this vast amount of labour that is associated with this word "uniformity." I myself, if it did not cost too much, would rather see a uniform franchise, but I am willing to abandon uniformity if it is going to be too large a drain on the Treasury of this Dominion. It has been proven by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—and I presume it will not be denied by our friends on the other side of the House—that the preparation of the lists for one single election, to the country and to the candidates and those interested in the result, amounted to at least \$600,000. I take it that will be admitted, because it is easily capable of being substantiated. And, when we take into consideration the amount of time and days labour lost by those interested in the result, \$600,000 does not represent the actual outlay. If we can save all that outlay and all that labour by sacrificing uniformity, I believe it would be a good exchange. Can we get a fresh list; a list that is always ready and open for use for an election in this country, and still have uniformity. I say you cannot devise any other scheme that will give us a fresh list, that will not require the preparation of a list every year in order to make it useful; because we can never tell when there will be a dissolution of the House, and if we cannot have a fresh list, we must have the old list on which there are hundreds of names which should not be there, and hundreds of names are off that should be on. What is the char-

Mr. ROCHE.

acter of the Dominion list which we have to-day? I will take my own constituency as an illustration. I suppose that everybody will admit that the last election that took place there was of sufficient importance to induce the two candidates to bring out every possible vote, and every effort was made to bring out that vote. Yet in South Brant in that election out of 8,726 votes, only 5,280 voted; so that there were 3,446 persons unrepresented on the voters' list, or only about 60 per cent of those whose names were on the voters' list voted. And yet we have been told by the eminent leader of the Opposition that even the graveyards of Brantford gave up their dead on that day. That shows that there is something wrong with the Franchise Act, because if the graveyards gave up their dead, the names of the dead in the graveyards must have been on the list. Such a condition of things is deplorable. I do not need to refer to South Brant alone. We will take East Simcoe, which I presume is more of a rural constituency and likely to have fewer changes. Out of 11,010 only 6,393 voted; so that there were 4,617 names on the list the owners of which could not be found or induced to vote.

Mr. BENNETT. Is not the hon. gentleman aware that under the Dominion voters' list every man who owns property in different divisions is assessed there, and his name consequently appears several times? Is not that an explanation of the fact that there were a great many duplicate names? The hon. gentleman must know that.

Mr. HEYD. I know this, that the judge who prepares the list is supposed not to duplicate names, but is to exercise his intelligence to secure a perfect list. I do not think it would be a proper thing in the city of Brantford, for instance, where I have property in five different wards, that my name should be down five times.

Mr. BENNETT. You appear five times.

Mr. HEYD. No, I only appear once, because we make it our business to see that the lists are as pure as they can be made. In Bothwell, out of 8,284 names on the list, only 5,202 voted, or 3,082 names were on the list of persons who did not vote. I allude to that to show that there is a chance for a tremendous amount of personation, and this gives rise to a great deal of the scandal that has been associated with these voters' lists. If the Dominion Parliament should insist on uniformity, it is almost impossible to get rid of that aspect of the matter unless we make a list every year, and if we make it every year, it means an expenditure, to be very moderate, of \$300,000 or \$400,000 a year. Therefore, in order to secure a fresh list with the greatest economy, I am willing to forego what our friends opposite desire so much—uniformity. What need we care whether we have a uniform

franchise of that kind or not? I presume that when confederation was established, the object was to provide for the representation of each province by a certain number of members in this House. I understand that Quebec was taken as the basis, and that sixty-five members constitute the representation of that province in this House. I as a resident of Ontario do not care one whit how Quebec elects her members, unless she has a greater numerical strength in this House than her population entitles her to. What do the people of Manitoba care how the people of Nova Scotia elect their representatives. Or what do the people of Prince Edward Island care how the people of British Columbia do it? As long as each of these provinces has only in this House the number of representatives that its population entitles it to. We are making entirely too much of this word uniformity, because it costs us too much. It gives us old lists instead of new lists.

Now, my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett)—and if there is any man who can put a black complexion on a thing, he can—alluded to the voters' lists of Ontario. I do not think he made a good argument; but I want to defend our lists a little from the aspersions he cast upon them, and I propose briefly to allude to one or two extracts he made from the papers in his constituency, which I think show that those lists were prepared fairly, and not, as he led us to suppose, for the purposes of fraud. Take this extract that he gave:

When the judge comes here to hold the voters' list court of revision, he will find his work cut out for him, and lots of it. The Liberals have about ninety appeals, and the Conservatives somewhere over one hundred.

There are over three hundred appeals against the voters' list in the township of Tay.

There is nothing said there with respect to the political complexion of the three hundred, and I am forced to drop them out. Take his next extract:

His Honour Judge Ardagh held his court of revision of the voters' list for Midland on Tuesday. The Liberals added forty names and struck off eleven. Conservative additions, sixty, and none struck off.

In other words, there were eleven Conservatives on that list that should not be there, sixty Conservatives were off that should be on, and forty Liberals were off that should be on. Take the next one, showing outrageous conduct, to use the language of my hon. friend:

The court of revision will have its hands full when it deals with the revision of the Orillia voters' lists before the county judge. There have been lodged 288 appeals for alleged wrongful omissions and insertions. Of these, 175 are against Conservatives, and 113 against Reformers.

The result, according to these extracts, is that there are 316 Grit appeals against

Conservatives and only 273 Conservative appeals against Grits; showing in that respect that unfair play cannot be alleged against the Liberals of that section of the country. But aside from that, we must take for granted that where the municipalities prepare the lists, as they do in Ontario, there must be a certain amount of politics. A Conservative city naturally has Conservative assessors, and a Liberal city naturally has Liberal assessors. It may be in some cases that they are predisposed to favour their own friends; but as a general rule I am inclined to think the assessors act fairly, and there is nothing to be said against the manner in which they discharge their duty. But the hon. member for East Simcoe has told us that the law provides machinery to purge these lists and make them effective. That is done by municipal candidates and their friends; and after they, and gentlemen who are aspiring for positions in the legislature have spent their time and money to get a perfect list, and it has left the judge's hand as a perfect list, what is there wrong in our picking it up at that stage and saving about \$600,000 by adopting it for electing the members for this House? Our friends opposite say this list costs money. Certainly it costs money. But, having spent so much money, with the result of our obtaining very imperfect lists, is it not time for us to take the advantage of lists that will cost us nothing, and that are much superior to the ones we have under the present Act? Is there any fault found with the local lists? We have had a very close election in Ontario within the past few weeks, and the political parties are very well divided there; but, notwithstanding the fact that four Conservatives were elected in Toronto, the Liberals there are not complaining that the lists were improperly made. These lists were prepared in Toronto by Conservative assessors, controlled by Conservative councils. The Liberals had to fight against great odds in order to get their names on the lists, but do you hear any whining from the four candidates defeated, that the lists were unfair? Do you hear any complaints from the men who were defeated in Hamilton, against the fouling of the lists? Nowhere will you find a word said in Ontario against stuffed lists. That complaint is only made in this House to decry the attempt on the part of the Government to adopt this provincial system. Can you find, during the last contest that took place in Ontario, a single condition such as the one described by Mr. Howland, in the speech which he made on the night of his defeat by our friend Mr. Bertram? He said:

We have taken the opinion of the electorate of 1894, or such fragments of it as could be got together on this occasion. I am sure there is no one here, there is no person who is in a position to judge in this city who was not satisfied from the general colour of public sentiment and opin-

Mr. HEYD.

ion that had the election rested upon voters' lists taken within this year, or even somewhat less recently, instead of lists that were nearly four years old, we would have had a splendid victory.

Our hon. friends opposite will not controvert this statement of Mr. Howland, that he lost his seat in this House owing to the faulty Dominion lists. If we are to believe Mr. Howland, he was defeated because we used the Dominion lists, the list of four years ago, and, had we used the local lists, he would have been the representative in Centre Toronto, instead of our hon. friend Mr. Bertram. If charges like that are being made against these Dominion lists by our friends in Opposition, surely none of us will be willing to continue such a system.

Hon. gentlemen opposite talk of uniformity. If we can have fresh lists, without the terrible burden and expense imposed on us by the present law, I am quite willing to adopt uniformity, but you cannot have uniformity unless you are prepared to pay the expense. These local lists will cost us practically nothing, and we will have fresh lists, made up to date, and not have to hold elections on lists several years old.

There is another thing I would urge in favour of this Bill. While I personally do not care what the qualification of the voter in Nova Scotia is, I think it will have a tendency to bring about this uniformity. As soon as the people in the various provinces learn that there is a difference in the qualifications, will they not think the matter over and try to devise the very best scheme possible, and I look forward with a considerable degree of hope to the various provinces arriving, in a very short period of time, at one standard of political development, and agreeing to accept the best political system in existence in any one of the provinces. At present, I think the one we have in Ontario represents exactly the political development of the people there. I think that our friends in the province of Quebec know better than we in Ontario what best answers their requirements; and, as long as the people of Quebec are satisfied with their provincial lists, I am certainly not going to interfere with them; and, as long as we are satisfied in Ontario, I do not think the people of British Columbia need particularly care. So long as one province does not get an advantage over another in the number of its representatives, what need any of us care what basis each adopts for its lists, particularly if we can save hundreds of thousands of dollars, and at the same time save ourselves an unlimited amount of trouble? For these reasons, not that I am particularly struck upon the Ontario franchise, I am prepared to accept this Bill. There are a few features in the Ontario franchise that I like. I like the one man one vote principle. I like the provision that kills the absentee vote. Those who have anything to do with the absentee vote

in cities, know what labour is involved in getting that vote together. They know what it costs them to foot the bill, or to assist in footing it. The provincial lists will do away entirely with that. We do not give the slightest attention to the names of the men on the lists in Ontario, because the Ontario Act requires that a man should be a resident of the municipality three months before the writ was issued, so that all we have to do is to go over the lists and take down the names of those who are absent more than three months, give them to our scrutineers, and, when the man comes up to vote, the oath is put to him. He will not take it, because he knows the consequence of taking a false oath. This measure will relieve us of a terrible amount of labour; I have gone through several campaigns, and have assisted in the preparation of the lists, and I would rather assist in the preparation of five provincial lists than one Dominion. There is five times as much labour and expense in carrying on a Dominion than a provincial contest. The labour multiplied on every hand under our present Franchise Act, and facilities for wrong-doing are everywhere to be found. The opportunities for stuffing the polls and personating many be imagined from the fact that only about 60 per cent of the people on the lists vote. No wonder, then, the charge is made, that at the Dominion election time the graveyards give up their dead. There is no necessity for the graveyards giving up their dead in provincial elections, because they cannot vote. If absent from the municipality more than three months, that settles the matter, and the dead will not rise again until the trumpet sounds.

Some hon. gentlemen opposite lay stress on the pretended loss of dignity which this Parliament will suffer, in delegating its rights in this respect to the provinces. But in doing this, we are sacrificing nothing. The provinces take the list prepared by the municipalities and in doing so make no sacrifice of their dignity. They take those lists because they answer their purposes and cost nothing, and for the same reason we should take advantage of the provincial lists. In doing so we shall not be sacrificing a wit of our dignity, but will be saving a lot of the people's money and saving ourselves an immense amount of labour. For these reasons, I propose to support the efforts made by our friends on this side to put through this Bill.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I do not propose to take up much of the time of the House this evening in discussing this Franchise Bill; but, after the remark of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), I feel that I would be recreant to my duty, if I did not attempt to correct some of the erroneous impressions which he has endeavoured to convey in connection with the Franchise Act. It takes some hardihood for a member of the

Opposition, a supporter of that party which is responsible for the present Dominion Franchise Act, to find fault with an Act which is intended to furnish a list of the people qualified to vote. The Manitoba Act has come in for a great deal of abuse on the part of the Opposition to the Greenway Government in that province, and, no doubt, the echoes of that abuse have reached us down here in Ottawa, and been heard on the floor of this House. As a matter of fact, however, the Manitoba Franchise Act is infinitely superior, in almost every respect, to the Act which has so long disgraced the statutes of this Dominion. If any one will take the trouble to compare the Dominion lists of any electoral division in Manitoba with the local lists of that same division, he will see at once the infinite superiority of the local lists over the Dominion lists for both local and Dominion purposes.

I have in my possession lists of the Dominion and local lists covering the same ground that I am willing to show to any hon. member and point out to him the remarkable differences in favour of the Manitoba lists. As a matter of fact, the complaints that have from time to time been brought against these lists are entirely without foundation. I doubt if there is any fairer system of compiling voters' lists in any province in the Dominion than the system in use in the province of Manitoba. While these complaints have been rife in newspapers before the elections, when we have brought the men making the charges face to face with those whom they were accusing, it was always found that the difficulty was in other lists in some far distant part of the province, the lists in the vicinity of the place in which these gentlemen making the accusations lived being almost invariably found to be correct. I was elected twice to the local legislature of Manitoba, and in my constituency I never had the slightest complaint from my Conservative friends of unfairness of the registration clerk in making up these lists. The Conservatives in that constituency and in all the constituencies in that neighbourhood, appeared to be perfectly satisfied with the list; and, as I said, it was always at some far distant point that these terrible things were done to which the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) has referred. Now, the Manitoba list is a good list in many ways. It is a new list before each election. According to the law, the lieutenant-governor in council issues a proclamation appointing a registration clerk. These clerks are selected, as a rule, because they are men of probity who are well known in their several communities, and who have the respect of the people. They take an oath of office, which is a very stringent oath. Within two days of their appointment they must put in the local newspapers an advertisement setting forth the fact that

they have been appointed, and giving the people notice of the facilities afforded for registering their names. The registration clerk has thirty days during which application for registration of voters can be made. Men can register themselves personally or any one can apply by declaration to have men with whom they are acquainted placed upon the list. The law provides that the registration clerks shall obtain certified copies of the last preceding voters' list in the electoral division for the municipal, legislative and Dominion parliamentary purposes, and with such copies and such information as he can obtain from the assessment rolls, inquiries or otherwise and such applications as he shall receive, and so on, he shall enter thereupon the names of all persons who are entitled to have their names entered upon the voters' list. Now, the registration clerk is probably a partisan. We find in this Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, almost all our citizens are partisans. It has been often said that we ought to have municipal officers as registration clerks. Well, Sir, the municipal officers, as a rule, are partisans, they are allied with one party or the other. Moreover, while under a system where only such persons are registered as are on the assessment roll, there is no doubt that the municipal officers would be suitable men to compile the list. But when you bear in mind that we have manhood suffrage in Manitoba, that we have one man one vote, and consequently a large number of our voters are not entered upon the assessment roll in the municipality, it is easy to see that municipal officers have no advantage over other men in compiling a list of that kind. It is true that in some cases men are left off the list. It is true that the Conservative party, who have been in Opposition in Manitoba for the last ten years, have been direlict in looking after this important matter, in looking after men, many of whom are labouring men working on farms and so on, who are not entered on the assessment roll or the municipal voters' list; and they have found, when the lists were made up that their Liberal friends had been more active and have secured more declarations of names to be added to the list. If the Conservatives did not get names upon the lists, it was nobody's fault except the Conservatives themselves in not sending in the names of their friends, although every facility is afforded under the law of Manitoba to do so.

When the list is made up, it remains open for thirty days after the proclamation, that is, it remains open until midnight of that day fixed, and after that it is closed. The reviser next undertakes his courts of revision. Now, these courts of revision cannot take place for at least six weeks after the closing of the lists, and, within that interval it is in the power of any one who has any complaint to make about the

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

list to apply for amendment of the list to the court of revision. These lists are put up all over the country. They are sent to every candidate, county court office, to every post office, to every school-house, and to every municipal office, and the clerk also mails fifteen copies to every member of the local assembly and to every defeated candidate, and one to every mayor, reeve, councillor and alderman in the constituency. He is bound also to furnish copies to the public at not more than 20 cents each. In the six weeks' interval there is ample opportunity for every man who has been left off the list in one of these small constituencies—for the constituencies in Manitoba for the legislature are not very large—there is plenty of time for any one who feels himself aggrieved by being left off the list to have his name put on. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) alluded to the fact that prominent Conservatives have been left off the list. He used the word "designedly," and said that these names were left off the list designedly. If they were thus left off, there was a remedy at hand. But, it is a remarkable fact, that in every constituency a large number of prominent Liberals who had been living in the constituency for years and whose names were on the assessment roll were sometimes left off the list also, and I do not think he would accuse the registration clerk of designedly leaving off the names of these prominent Liberals. We all know that there is no list that is perfect. It is entirely impossible to get a list that is perfect. When the hon. gentleman says that names are designedly left off, I think he is going too far, and I do not think he will accuse the registration clerk in his own district—

Mr. ROCHE. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, that is exactly what I mean to do. I have sent in affidavits to establish that. It is admitted that he left off names on the ipse dixit of the Liberal candidate.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The hon. gentleman reminds me of an incident in the constituency of Lakeside in the general election of 1892. Affidavits of applications are ordinarily sent in asking for additional names to be put on the lists. I remember a number of applications came into the clerk in Lakeside in 1892. They were declared before a commissioner in the usual way and stated what purported to be the facts with regard to several applications for registration.

It so happened that one or two of those men were near neighbours of the registration clerk himself; and in looking at the declarations he saw at once that they were false. At that time it was necessary for a man to be six months in the province of Manitoba and one month in the electoral division, and this man, on looking at the affidavits, saw that none of the men to whom they referred had been six months

in Manitoba, had not been three months in Manitoba. The registration clerk himself, knowing that these declarations were untrue, decided not to place the parties upon the list. I do not think that any sensible man would blame him for taking that stand, because the Act empowers him to act in that way. Now that may cover the case to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. ROCHE. Not at all. There is the court of revision.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Where is the complaint? The court of revision was there for that purpose, and the complaint at once falls to the ground. Now the revising officers to whom the hon. gentleman devoted particular attention, are county court judges, or barristers of not less than three years standing. The hon. gentleman complains that they are not all county court judges. Well, as a matter of fact, we have not got county court judges enough to go around. In the province of Manitoba there are only a limited number of county court judges, and the courts of revision there just before a general election, as the whole thing is done within three months, come very close together, and county court judges cannot possibly cover the ground. But they are given all the work that they can do, and reputable men, of high standing in the legal profession, are selected to go out and act as revisers in the other constituencies. I do not think that there is a case on record where a revising officer has not acted in a fair and impartial way at the court of revision. In the constituency where I live, we have the same man acting as reviser for the local lists, and he also acts as revising barrister for the Dominion lists. Judge Ryan, a man in whom every one has confidence, and a man who has given the greatest satisfaction in that capacity. Now the safeguards which surround the court of revision are very satisfactory. No one has any fault to find with them, as a rule there is no difficulty for any one who feels himself aggrieved by having his name left off the list, in having it put on. As a matter of fact they have at courts of revision no difficulty whatever in rectifying such errors as may have crept into the lists through the impossibility, under a manhood suffrage Act, of the registration clerk being personally acquainted with every man in the constituency. In a new country like Manitoba, we have a large transient population. Young men, farmers' sons and others, come up from Ontario, they work there during the summer, and they often go home for the winter, and sometimes they remain during the winter; and it is very difficult for a registration clerk to decide, without intimate personal knowledge of each individual, whether he is qualified to be placed upon the list. When a member of either party takes the trouble to look that man up and ascertain his whereabouts, find his record, and

get a declaration stating the facts, the registration clerk in no case refuses such declaration, providing he has not what he may consider indisputable proof of its being false. The hon. member for Marquette alluded in terms far from complimentary to the present Government in Manitoba. He alluded to their "erratic legislation during the past ten years which made the world wonder." I fancy that some of the legislation of that body made the hon. gentleman, among other denizens of this world, do a little wondering, and they have not got over their wonderment yet. The erratic legislation of that province, as he terms it, has been such that during the past ten years its effects have been felt all through that province in the increased prosperity and freedom from litigation of the people who reside there. There is no doubt whatever that any hon. gentleman who is conversant with the facts, knows that the legislation of that province during the last ten years has been such as almost to deprive the lawyers of a living; the erratic legislation of that country has been such as almost to drive sheriffs and bailiffs out of the business. There is little or no legal work or litigation going on at the present time, simply because of the wise and prudent legislation on behalf of the farmers and settlers in that country, which has been placed upon the Statute-books of that province during the last ten years. If the hon. gentleman were to compare the legislation of the last ten years with that of the decade which preceded it, he will find a remarkable difference in favour of the present Administration. The hon. gentleman alluded to the fact that Mr. Greenway redeemed his ante-election pledge by passing an Act in 1889 which only remained on the Statute-book for one year. That Act provided for the making up of the lists by municipal clerks. As he says, there was no general election held upon that Act, but there were one or two by-elections held upon it, and it was found that the lists made up by the municipal clerks in these elections were so bad that it was utterly impossible to keep that Act upon the Statute-book. They were the worst lists we ever had in the province of Manitoba, either before or after Mr. Greenway's accession to office, and I am sure that is saying a great deal, because the lists previous to the advent of the Greenway Government to power, were bad enough in all conscience. The cases to which he alluded where whole nationalities were left off the lists, are rather remarkable. I did not catch which nationality it was that was left off in North Winnipeg, perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us.

Mr. ROCHE. The Hebrew voters.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Well, as a rule you don't catch a Hebrew asleep, and I fancy that these Hebrews must all have been asleep for three months if they were left

off the lists in North Winnipeg, because they had every opportunity to be put on. There was first, a month's proclamation during which the list was being made up, and then there were six weeks following the proclamation of the revising officer, and during the whole of that time it was surely possible for some good Conservatives to go around and wake his Hebrew friends up, and get their names put upon the list. I think these grievances to which the hon. gentleman alludes, if they were all ventilated, would be found to have as little basis as this one. He says that the Icelandic vote was all upon the list. The reason of that is that the Icelander is a strong Liberal. He comes from Iceland with strong Liberal proclivities, and he is wide-awake, he is not asleep when the list is being made up, and he invariably sees that his name is put upon the list. I am sure that no sleeping Icelanders are found. Then the hon. gentleman talks about the printing of the lists being sent from one constituency to another. Well, the argument I used in regard to the revising officers applies also in the case of the printing offices. These small printing offices throughout the rural constituency, as is well known, are not capable of printing more than one or at the outside two lists in the short time that is afforded them, and the lists have to be sent in some cases outside of the constituency in order that they may be printed, and it may have happened that a little delay was occasioned in one or two instances on that ground. But during the whole time I have lived in Manitoba and since the Greenway Administration came into office we have heard complaints in respect to this Act; but having looked into the grievances and having had them properly aired on the floor of the legislature and elsewhere, they have turned out to be nightmares of the imagination in a great many cases. The system of preparing lists in Manitoba is a fair and equitable system, and I have heard very little reason for complaint against it. The hon. gentleman has stated that the strength of the Greenway Government in the legislature is not at all indicative of its strength in the province. The hon. gentleman probably knows a good deal about that sort of thing, more than the rest of us; but it is a rather remarkable fact that we have had two general elections in Manitoba since Mr. Greenway's Cabinet came into power, and his opponents have diminished in numbers and become smaller, and I may say beautifully less.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is due to the effect of a bad voters' list.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I must say that it does not reflect favourably on the Conservative party in Manitoba when they have ample opportunity of taking their share in the preparation of the lists, and fail to do so. As a matter of fact ever since 1887 and

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

1888, when the Conservatives in Manitoba realized that the Norquay Government was a corrupt Administration, a large number of them have been supporting Mr. Greenway. It is well known in Manitoba that Mr. Greenway owes his power and strength not only to the Liberal voters but also to the Conservatives, who are well satisfied with his administration of provincial affairs. The hon. gentleman has suggested that as the North-west Territories were being left out of the operation of this Act, Manitoba should also be left out. That is a suggestion almost worthy of the source from which it springs. I like to hear a man coming from Manitoba suggesting that the privileges we have obtained in that province should be cast aside, and we should return to the system which is found necessary in less civilized and less educated portions of the Dominion to the west. The hon. gentleman need have no fear in regard to the working of the Manitoba Franchise Act as regards the elections of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman will find, if he will take the local lists for Marquette, which he represents and for the local constituencies embraced in that large Dominion constituency, that they will be infinitely more satisfactory to him or to any other man as an honest expression of popular opinion than the lists which have so long disgraced the Dominion Statute-book. The hon. gentleman will find names on the Dominion lists of men who were dead when the lists were made up; he will find names repeated and repeated, names repeated three or four times on the same page, and that the names of many men who are fully entitled to be on the list have been omitted. If the hon. gentleman will take the last list, and look at the names of the young men on the local list, which was made up only twelve months after the Dominion lists, he will find scores of names that are on the local and not on the Dominion lists. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) alluded to the fact that in the Conservative press he had been taunted with the insinuation that the graveyards had given up their dead. We all know about that insinuation. I want to inform the hon. gentleman that the Grits have not a monopoly of the cemeteries, because it will be found that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the so-called graveyard voters do not support the Liberal party. I have now briefly dealt with the arguments of the hon. member for Marquette. I hope he will reconsider his opinion in regard to the provincial voters' lists. I am sure the more he learns about that list, the better he will like it, and the more thoroughly he goes into an extensive examination of the trumped-up charges against that list, the more he will be satisfied that the provincial law is a fair and satisfactory law and that the lists prepared under it are infinitely to be preferred to those made up under this infamous law, which I am glad the leaders of political par-

ties are willing to have wiped from the Statute-book of the Dominion.

Mr. MOORE. At this late hour I rise with very much hesitation to place my views on record on this very important Bill which is now before us and to which our attention is directed. That it is an important measure will be admitted when we consider that it will affect the political status of the rights and liberties of every elector from one end of the country to the other. I have listened with considerable interest to the speeches made during the evening from the other side of the House, and I desire to offer a few remarks in regard to some of those speeches to which I entertain objection. I not only object to the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure), but also the spirit in which his statements were made. It would seem, in his opinion, that there is not an honest Conservative in the Dominion. I cannot believe that human nature is very different in a Conservative from what it is in a Liberal, and I cannot but believe that both parties contain honest and respectable men. The hon. gentleman challenged any member to stand up in his seat and state that he is in favour of the principles of the Franchise Act. Although we may not agree in regard to its details, although we may have some differences as to the manner in which it operates, although we may have objections regarding the expenditure that has been made in carrying out that Act, yet I can stand here and declare that the principle of the Franchise Act, which has been in force twelve years, has been good, and was designed to act in the interests of the electors of this country. What are the principles of the present Franchise Act? As I can understand them, from reading the discussions which took place from 1883 until that Bill was passed, the principles of that measure are, that this House should have control of the franchise, the control over making up the electoral lists and uniformity in the qualifications of voters throughout the various provinces of the Dominion. I do not believe there are many hon. gentlemen in this House, on either side, who will not admit that uniformity is a desirable thing, and that this Parliament should maintain control over the franchise under which this House of Commons is constituted. I was somewhat amused at the vigour with which the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure) handled the Conservative party, and it struck me that he was somewhat in the position of the old lady in a Presbyterian church which was feeling very badly about the wrangling among its members, and who came to the conclusion that she and the minister were the only two in the church who would be saved, and she sometimes had her doubts about the minister. One would conclude, from the language of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McClure), that he and the

Liberal party were the only ones in this country who would be saved, and some might say that he had reason to have doubts about the Liberal party. I heard one time, of an old gentleman who was upon his death-bed. He had two wives, who were both buried, and, when he came to direct how his body should be laid, he wanted to be placed between his two wives; but he said he liked Mary the better, and consequently he would like the undertaker to twist his neck in her direction. It would appear, from the manner in which the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure) has spoken of the Conservative party, that when he dies, he would like to have his neck twisted not a little towards the Liberals.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Rutherford) who last spoke, told us how perfect the voters' lists were in Manitoba and how impartial was the manner in which the franchise law was administered there. He treated the question in a fluent and familiar manner, and I am certain he spoke as he thought; but no matter how perfect the Manitoba lists may be, they do not guard against the defects of the lack of uniformity and the control of the franchise by this Parliament. Both of these important principles being sacrificed in the Bill now presented to this House. It is the lack of uniformity we complain of, and the lack of control by this House over the most sacred right which the constitution confers upon the electors of Canada. The franchise is a sacred right, and it should be exercised by those who are placed in possession of it, as a sacred trust. The electoral franchise, the vital principle in a representative Government was secured after a long and persistent struggle. The agitation at last gave Canada a responsible Government, and she can now boast of as great a measure of civil, political and religious freedom as is enjoyed by any country in the world.

I maintain that it should be considered as a sacred right and a sacred privilege which should not be used for mercenary purposes, and which should be devoted only to the object of conserving the best interests of the country in which we live. One of the fundamental principles of responsible government, one of the fundamental principles of this Government ought to be, that every man should stand upon an equal footing before the law. If we apply this principle to the Bill before us, we will find that every man does not stand upon the same footing under this Bill which is now submitted to Parliament. In Ontario, there is manhood suffrage, and a man can vote without any property qualification whatever; in the province of Quebec, there is a property qualification of \$300 in the cities, and of \$200 in other municipalities; in Nova Scotia, the qualification is \$150 real estate, \$300 personal and real estate, or an income of \$250; in New Brunswick the qualification is personal property to the amount of \$400, real

estate to the amount of \$100 ; in Prince Edward Island, the qualification is an income of \$6 a year or performance of the statute labour ; in Manitoba, there is manhood suffrage ; in British Columbia, there is a property qualification, and in all the different provinces the qualification varies in the amount of property necessary to enable a man to vote, and also in the length of residence required in the several provinces. If we adopt these different franchises for the Dominion Parliament, the members from the different provinces will sit in this House as the result of these varied franchises and under different qualifications. The great objection which has been raised by the hon. members opposite to the Dominion Franchise Act is the expense, and I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite treat that question in a manner which has been astonishing to me. I was surprised when I heard the Solicitor General, in introducing this Bill, make the statement, that the Dominion Franchise Act cost, for the four revisions under it, \$1,154,000, and then he added half a million dollars more in order to swell the figures to over \$1,500,000. I have taken the trouble to look at the Auditor General's Report, and I found that the cost of making out the lists in 1885-86 was \$159,882.85 ; in 1886-87, the cost was \$193,858.44 ; in 1889-90, the cost was \$233,078.35, and in 1894-95, the cost was \$239,963.33. The total cost of the revision of the lists since 1885, on the four occasions, was \$826,782.97, or, during the twelve years of the operation of the Act, the cost per year was \$68,898, and this cost, I may say, could be easily reduced 50 per cent.

It is not to be assumed by hon. members of this House that because it has been an expensive operation in the past, it must of necessity be an expensive operation in the future. There is no difficulty whatever in finding honest and competent men to make up these lists for one-half of what that work has cost in the past. I am in favour of reducing expenditure, but at the same time keeping the lists under the control of this House. We are told by some hon. gentlemen that under this Bill the preparation of the lists will cost nothing, that this duty will be imposed on the officials of the different municipalities, the secretaries of the municipal councils, who will be compelled to make up the lists free of cost. What would be the result ? I think I have some knowledge of municipal matters, from an experience of the last twenty-five years, and I think that the first thing that would be done after this Bill passed, would be that each of the secretaries of the municipal councils who would be required to make up these lists would say, 'I have greater responsibilities put upon me and greater duties to perform, and I must ask for an increase of salary.' Under the circumstances, I think each of these secretaries would require at least an addition of \$25

Mr. MOORE.

a year. Assuming that there are 2,500 municipalities in the Dominion of Canada that would amount to \$625,000. The Government might save that, but the country would not save it. The poor people of the municipalities would be taxed by a direct tax to make up this \$625,000 a year. Is it an honourable thing for the members of this House to impose upon the municipalities a burden like that, and to shirk it themselves ? I do not think they would like it to go out to the country that they are shirking this burden and throwing it upon the shoulders of the poor taxpayers throughout the length and breadth of this country. Although I do not wish to be severe upon the hon. gentlemen who take the other view of this question, I think perhaps there may be a little insincerity in their plea of economy. I remember in 1885, when this Bill was discussed in this Parliament, it was opposed very strenuously by the then Opposition. The discussion of the question began on March 18th, and the session was protracted by the Opposition discussing this matter till June 6th. The result was that the members of this House received an indemnity of \$1,500, instead of \$1,000, increasing the cost by the opposition they made to this Bill by \$500 to each member. There are 213 members of this House and 78 senators, and the extra cost of printing and clerks brought up the total extra cost on that occasion to \$250,000. That amount would go very far towards making up the lists if they were made in an economical manner. on the principle of retaining their control in the hands of this Parliament, and maintaining the principle of uniformity. I remember also reading not many years ago about a discussion that went on in this House for a long time over a Bill by which a minority in one province were claiming rights under the constitution which were denied to them by some hon. gentlemen opposite. I think that owing to the protracted discussion on that important question and the length that session was increased, cost the people of Canada \$150,000 extra. I remember also that last session hon. gentlemen opposite put corn on the free list, and I would like to call attention for a moment to the loss which this country will sustain year by year in consequence of that move.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman ought to confine himself to something like a discussion of the Bill before the House.

Mr. MOORE. I am only referring to that to show that in one case hon. gentlemen are economical and in the other case they have not been economical.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid a discussion of corn on this question of the franchise would not be in order, and

I would ask the hon. gentleman to confine his remarks as much as possible to the question under discussion.

Mr. MOORE. I will then leave the discussion of that point, that the Government have not shown a great deal of consistency in the matter of economy. I think the Government are capable of devising means by which the cost will be so much reduced as to take away wholly the objections which are urged against the present Franchise Act, while leaving to this House the control of the franchise under which its members are elected. There is another phase of this question to which I would call attention for a moment. That is, that by taking the provincial lists and making them the basis of the Dominion franchise, you throw a political fire-brand, as it were, into every municipality in this country. The result will be that the issues in the municipal elections will be the issues between the different parties in the Federal Parliament. If there is anything that should be avoided in this country it is the introduction of political issues into municipal councils. We have had a great deal of difficulty in our country in avoiding that, and I am quite certain from the experience I have had in municipal matters that if the provincial lists are taken instead of the federal lists, every municipal election will be run on the political issues that exist between the two parties in this House to the great injury of local municipal matters, to which the work of municipal officers should be confined. I need not weary the patience of this House any longer. I think I have said sufficient to put on record my views in opposition to the present measure and in favour of such amendments to the present laws as will make it workable in an economical manner, preserve uniformity, and keep the control of the franchise of this Dominion in the hands of the Government.

Mr. BOURASSA moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 28th March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

APPOINTMENTS OF NEW SENATORS.

Mr. GILLIES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention

of the right hon. First Minister to the following despatch, which I find in the public press of the country:—

Ottawa, 25th March, 1898.—(Special.)—The Cabinet is considering a proposal to appoint six Senators at large, in accordance with section 26 of the British North America Act, to help the Yukon Bill on its precarious way through the Red Chamber. The appointments would be required to be sanctioned by the Imperial Government, and to that end negotiations are said now to be in progress. There are two vacancies, so that the Administration may appoint eight supporters of the Yukon Bill before the division.

I wish to ask the right hon. First Minister if there is any truth in this report.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must tell my hon. friend that if he believes all the yarns published in the newspapers, I cannot help him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not an answer.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is to such a question.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. PENNY moved for leave to withdraw Bill (No. 85) to amend chapter 99 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, being the General Inspection Act.

Mr. SPEAKER. The more regular course would be to wait until the order is called for the second reading of this Bill, and then move to discharge the order and to withdraw the Bill. It is not regular to move for its discharge now.

Mr. PENNY. I bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker.

THE ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Henderson that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee on Bill (No. 32) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The debate on this small Bill has taken quite a wide scope, and if it be really the intention of the mover of the amendment proposed to press his amendment, I regret that he should have raised such an important question on this Bill. The Bill is merely for the revival of the charter of a railway company which was incorporated some years ago and whose charter is now expired. This company intends to build a short road, of about 80 miles, to fill in the gap that now exists between the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway and the proposed road to be constructed from Winnipeg to the south-eastern portion of the province of Manitoba. It is not a trunk line, but merely a local line of a few miles, intended perhaps to become a part and par-

cel of the road running from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, which will be a very important road when constructed. While perhaps it is well for this House to consider the advisability of assuring some facilities for freight and traffic over this road, I think it would be unfair to attach to this small link obligations that should more properly be imposed on the trunk line, such as the one that is to be constructed between Port Arthur and Winnipeg. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) intends to move that freight rates on this road shall be specific and that the fares shall be restricted to 2 cents a mile. And, as an example of the propriety of such action, he cites the case of the New York Central road being compelled to adopt that restriction because a part of the road of that great line had been thus restricted by the local legislature of the state. But there is a vast difference between the position of the New York Central Railway, running through a thickly populated district, and a road running through a portion of the Lake of the Woods country, having to cross the lake at different points upon islands and traversing a district with practically no population. I believe that it is the duty of this House, when granting subsidies to railway companies, to impose certain obligations upon these companies in order to protect the public interest. But in this case we are not asked to vote a subsidy to this road; we are merely asked for the extension of this charter and to give the company facilities so that this road may be constructed; and these facilities will be impaired if we attach to this charter any such restrictions as those my hon. friend from East York proposes to move after this Bill shall have reached committee.

My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has treated this case as if we were now asked to incorporate a road from Port Arthur to Winnipeg. He has spoken about a subsidy having already been granted to the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western. He has also spoken of a probable subsidy that the legislature of Manitoba may be called upon to vote for the Manitoba and South-eastern. But, Sir, these questions are not before this House. We are not aware of the intention of the Manitoba Government. It is only upon hearsay that we know that the subsidy will be granted, and we do not legislate in this House upon hearsay. So, it would be improper, I contend, for us to impose upon this small road any conditions that will prevent its construction, because in that way we may prevent the construction of a trunk line between Port Arthur and Winnipeg. The province of Manitoba is looking for a new road to connect with the great lakes. We desire the construction of that road, and we are ready to make some sacrifices in order to secure its construction. But my hon. friend from East York says: If

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

you pass this Act, you will facilitate the building of a road which will be merely a branch of the Canadian Pacific. That is another supposition, Mr. Speaker. The fact that it is reported that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann are at the bottom of this enterprise, that they are the promoters of the construction of this road, does not justify us in assuming that these gentlemen represent the Canadian Pacific Railway. But, be that as it may, whether the road is built by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, or even by the Canadian Pacific Railway, I say let us have the road, and when the legislature of Manitoba is called upon to assist the construction of the Winnipeg and South-eastern, which will be part of the trunk line I referred to, it will be for the legislature to dictate the conditions upon which that subsidy shall be granted, and upon that legislature will rest the responsibility for whatever action may be taken by this company in constructing that road. Therefore, I say we are merely asking today for the revival of that charter that the company had, and this is not the proper occasion for us to impose upon this company any such regulations as those suggested by my hon. friend from East York.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I desire to point out that there is already in the proposed Bill a clause which covers the case entirely and renders unnecessary the suggestion of my hon. friend from East York. I read clause 4 of the Bill as passed by the Railway Committee of this House. It reads as follows:—

4. Any Act hereafter passed for the purpose of controlling railway companies incorporated by or subject to Parliament as to the issuing of stock or bonds, and as to rates or tolls and the regulation thereof, and as to running powers over or other rights in connection with the railway of any company by any other company, and the exercise of powers conferred upon railway companies, shall apply to the company from the time such Act goes into effect; but this section shall not be construed to imply that such Act would not apply to the company without the enactment of this section.

Well, Sir, by this section the power rests with the Government under the General Railway Act to fix the rates and to give running powers over this line to any other company which wishes to avail itself of these privileges. I will not object that other companies should have running powers over that line.

Under such circumstances I say it would be but fair to confine ourselves to allowing this company to revive its charter, and if, later on, this House or any other House should be called upon to grant subsidies for the construction of that road, then it will rest with such House to restrict or to fix the conditions upon which such aid should be granted. During the course of this debate references have been made to the exorbitant freight rates that have been charged by railway companies in Canada. Well,

Sir, I think it is a great mistake that this House should be the echo of all the complaints that are made against our railways in general, be it the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway or any other railway. I think that our railways in Canada are national concerns, and they have a right to be protected by this Parliament.

Mr. MACLEAN. What about the people?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The people, Sir, are just as you educate them. If you tell them that they are robbed, they will believe it, even though it is not the case. Every session we have acts of one kind or another, merely in order to suit the convenience of a class of people who would like to ride on railways without paying their fare. I am convinced, after looking into this particular case, that this House should not single out this line of railway and attach to it any such restrictions as are proposed by my hon. friend. If we want to nationalize our railways and put them under the direct control of this Parliament, let that be the subject of general legislation. But while other Bills are going through this House to which we attach no restrictions, and to the contents of which we pay no attention, why should we make an exception in this case, a road which, as I said before, is merely a small link of a trunk line, and which in no way will affect the two ends of it, even if this amendment should be accepted by the House. The restrictions that are proposed by my hon. friend will only apply to about 80 miles of the road, while that part from Port Arthur to the end of the road on the one side, and from Winnipeg to the end of the road on the other side, will not be affected at all by the legislation that we are asked to enact to-day. I therefore hope that my hon. friend will keep his amendment, and make it part of a more general provision that will apply to all roads, instead of restricting it to this short line.

Mr. OLIVER. With reference to the remark of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), that members who from session to session trouble the House in regard to railroad questions, are actuated by a desire to ride free upon the railroads. I would like to say, as one of the members who have troubled the House from time to time on this question, and who proposes, as long as he is a member, to continue to trouble the House from time to time on it, that it does not appear to me that those who are antagonizing the railroads, are so likely to secure personal advantage, as those who are supporting railroads on this question. It would seem to me that members of this House who stand up from time to time and support the interests of the railroad companies against the interests of their constituents, are rather more likely to be bidding for free transportation than members who are opposing those companies in the interests of their

constituents. In regard to the line in question, I desire to take issue with the hon. gentleman when he says, that it is only a local line, that an exception should not be made in regard to it, and that this kind of regulation should not be applied to this line, inasmuch as it is a local line, but should only be applied to it in a general way when we come to deal with the question in a general way. I would say that in my humble estimation this is not merely a local line; the construction of this line and its regulation after construction, is not only a local question. If this road is built without the proposed restriction, it will be too late when we come to deal with the matter in a general way, to provide those restrictions in regard to this road which are absolutely necessary to the welfare and prosperity, not only of the constituency which the hon. gentleman represents, but also of the other constituencies extending to the Rocky Mountains. I will here say that it is too late to lock the stable after the steed is stolen. This is the last chance that the North-west Territories and Manitoba have of securing relief from railroad monopoly—that is to say the last chance in sight. It is the last chance, it appears to me, that the manufacturing and the commercial interests of eastern Canada will have to put themselves in a position to compete advantageously for the Manitoba and the North-west market, with the manufacturing and commercial interests of the eastern, central and western States, which at the present time are crowding the manufacturing and commercial interests of eastern Canada, to a certain extent, out of their legitimate market in the west, and are thereby hampering and strangling those interests in eastern Canada. So I say it is within the duty of any member of this House, when he sees and knows, and can prove, that the interests of both western and eastern Canada are being injured by the condition of affairs at present existing, I say it is his duty to find out the position of affairs and to suggest a remedy. Now, I say this remedy is the proper public control of this road about to be built between Lake Superior and the Red River, by the public money of this Dominion and of the several provinces. I believe that what the people pay for they should control; that if the people pay for a railroad they should have the benefit of that road. I am here to say, Mr. Speaker, that the people are not receiving a fair share of benefit from the railroads of this country, for the construction of which they have paid their good money, and are paying it every day. I am perfectly willing to agree that there are local interests connected with this road. There are mines that require to be developed, that will be developed provided this road is built, and provided it is properly controlled. But I absolutely deny the proposition that the

mere construction of a road in any part of this Dominion necessarily means the development of either the mineral or agricultural interests of the country affected. We in the North-west Territories have altogether too much reason to know that this is not a fact, to consider it necessary to argue it for a minute. So I say, that even if the province of Ontario has only a direct local interest in the building of a certain section of this road for the purpose of developing its mining interests in the Rainy River districts, even the province of Ontario, in so far only as its local interests are concerned, is deeply interested in having this road properly controlled in respect to its rates and its management. This is especially the case when the province of Ontario is willing to contribute from its funds to the extent which it has declared its willingness to contribute on behalf of this road, and when the Dominion of Canada, of which the province of Ontario forms such an important part, is also willing to contribute towards the construction of this road for the benefit that it is expected will flow from its construction to all ends of the Dominion; and particularly if the province of Manitoba is also willing to sanction a bonus towards the construction of this road for the sake of the benefits that it is supposed will accrue to the province of Manitoba. When we find the Dominion and two of its great provinces entering into a combination to furnish funds for the construction of certain portions of this road, that is all this House and the country require to show that it is more than a matter of local interest, and it should be dealt with on broader lines than if it were a matter simply of local interest.

I am strongly in favour of the suggestion of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) in demanding that there shall be given running powers over this road to other railway companies, and that this Government shall have the right to control the rates of this road. But I wish to point out to the House that the mere assertion of a right to control does not necessarily mean effective control; but when you say the Government of Canada shall have the right to control the rates on this road, and shall have the right to control the granting of running powers to other companies over the road, your assertion of control does not mean anything unless terms can be secured in respect to the rates and running powers which will be beneficial to the people; an assertion of control does not mean anything unless the conditions are such that, in the nature of things, effective control can be given. In all matters of control in regard to the running of railways comes in the broad question of the right of capital to earn a return on the investment; and I say when you are dealing with a railway and assume to control the rates over that road, it is not within the right, if it is within the power, of this Parliament,

Mr. OLIVER.

to control those rates irrespective of proper and reasonable earnings on the capital for which this road has been pledged. So that unless you provide something more than the mere assertion of the right of control, which I suppose in this day and generation no one will question, you are practically not one step nearer securing for eastern and western Canada those reduced freight rates which are necessary for their increased prosperity, than you were before this provision was inserted in the charter. Any legislation, then, in regard to railways which does not take into consideration a provision in some way against the over-capitalization of the railroad or providing some way that there shall be a clear understanding from the very beginning of the granting of the charter that the country shall not be compelled to pay interest on more than a certain amount of money—unless that is inserted in the charter and there is an understanding from the very beginning—you are compelled to allow the road to earn dividends on the capital invested in it. I do not think that the people of the country are aware of the load of debt which they are carrying in regard to the railways of the Dominion; for let it be remembered that for the railways the people of the Dominion are paying interest, from year to year, on the capital invested and as a matter of fact are taxed with this tremendous burden. The people of Canada, and I as a citizen of the Dominion, do not wish to be understood for an instant as desiring in any way to avoid the giving of a profitable return on any capital that is legitimately and properly invested in the interests of this Dominion. We want capital for the development of Canada. Then, we must treat that capital honestly; we must be willing that the capital shall earn its proper dividend. So I say, when you put simply a provision in a railway charter stating that the Government shall have the right to regulate rates, you do not thereby get away from the necessity of allowing the railway to charge such rates as will give a proper return on the capital invested in it; unless you have an understanding at the very beginning of the granting of a charter.

In proof of what I say, let me read a few figures. I have been looking into the returns of the Railway Department for the last year. I find in these returns that the Canadian Pacific Railway is credited with 3,436 miles of road; that the paid-up shares of that company are \$65,000,000; that the preferential shares are \$8,370,666; that bonds have been issued to the amount of \$102,887,717; that the Dominion Government have granted aid to the amount of \$25,080,000; that the province of Manitoba has granted aid to the amount of \$277,377; that the province of British Columbia has granted aid to the amount of \$37,500; that municipalities have granted aid to the amount of \$497,500; that the total amount

of money so invested in the Canadian Pacific Railway upon which the people of Canada have to pay interest directly or indirectly, is \$202,110,760. I find that the total cost of the railway, 3,436 miles, as stated in the return, was \$162,544,853, and that the country is paying interest on \$39,565,910, which is not represented in the construction of the road; that as a matter of fact, Canada is not only bearing the interest on the total cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but is paying interest on \$40,000,000 more than the railway cost; that when we talk of controlling the rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway, we are compelled to take into consideration the fact that those rates are entitled to be so adjusted as to pay earnings on \$40,000,000 more than the total cost of the road. More than that. I do not find it in the railway returns, but hon. gentlemen will bear me out when I say that over and above the cost as laid down must be considered the cost of the sections between Winnipeg and Thunder Bay and the first section of the road in British Columbia, both of which were constructed at the cost of the Dominion and handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway as part of the company's grant. The cost of those sections amounted to about \$40,000,000. So that instead of paying interest on \$40,000,000 more than the Canadian Pacific Railway cost, we are paying interest on \$80,000,000; and then we wonder that the rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway are high, and we still hope to control those rates by merely inserting a clause in a new Act providing that we shall have control of them! I hold that no clause inserted in any Railway Act now or at any future time has any right to control the earning power of those \$80,000,000 any more than the capital invested in any other part of the road. Admitting that we have the right of control, we are still \$80,000,000 away from getting where we ought to be in the matter of rates over the Canadian Pacific Railway.

But there are other cases. The Calgary and Edmonton road is 295 miles long. I find from the railway returns that bonds have been issued in regard to that railway to the amount of \$5,458,940 bearing 6 per cent interest; I find that the share capital of that company paid up is \$1,000,000; I find that the subsidy granted annually by this Parliament to that road is \$80,000, which if capitalized will amount to \$1,000,000; or in other words, the Calgary and Edmonton Railway stands to this country as \$7,458,940, and the cost of the railway as set forth in that return is \$3,717,882. Therefore in the case of this railway 295 miles in length, this country is paying interest on \$3,741,062 more than that railroad cost. That is to say, for every dollar that that railway cost this country is paying interest on two dollars.

Now, Mr. Speaker, do we reach the end we desire to reach by merely inserting a

clause in the General Railway Act providing for the control of rates over the Calgary and Edmonton road? I say, Sir, that so long as we have to pay interest on two dollars for every dollar that railway cost, so long we cannot get these rates down to the basis they should be on, in order to give to the people of the Dominion a fair return for the money they have invested in that road. But there are others. The Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway is something like 250 miles in length. The share capital paid up of that railway company is \$201,000; the bonds issued are \$3,809,140 and that railway receives \$80,000 a year subsidy which capitalized will reach, roughly, \$1,000,000; so that that railway stands to this country as \$5,010,140, and I find that the cost of the road is \$2,539,600; or in other words, we are paying interest in regard to that railway on \$2,470,540 for which we have received no value. Again we are paying on that road, as on the Calgary and Edmonton road, interest on two dollars for every dollar invested. And there are still others; but I will not trouble the House to refer to them. The point I make is this: That the question of railway rates in this country is tied up with the question of the bonding of the railroad, of the power to raise money upon the railroad; and that we must go to the root of the evil and cut off the right to bond these roads for more money than is actually used in constructing them. Until we do that our legislation is only a matter of form, there is no substance to it. And in regard to this Rainy River road it is of the last degree of importance to both eastern and western Canada that we shall have the very lowest rates in order that we of the west may get our grain and products to the east at the lowest cost, and in order that those in the east shall be able to compete in the markets of the west with their rivals across the line, rivals who are getting the benefit of the very lowest railway rates and to whom these lowest rates are given by virtue of the existence of this very Canadian Pacific Railway, for which the people of Canada are paying interest on \$80,000,000 more than it cost. In order to get that benefit of rates which will enable this eastern country to compete against such unfavourable influences, it is necessary that it should be provided in this charter we are discussing now, that we should not be compelled to pay interest on one dollar more than the road actually cost. In support of my contention, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, in addition to the amendment of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), and with his consent, the following:—

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) permit me to say that there is no amendment before the House. The motion is that I do now leave the Chair. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) when speaking on that motion read an

amendment which he said he proposed to move when the House resolved itself into committee. We are not in committee yet, and so the motion before the House is that I do now leave the Chair. When the House resolves itself into committee, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) will have an opportunity to move his amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. In order to get my views before the House as fully as possible, I shall take the liberty of following the example of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), and I shall simply read now to the House, the amendment which I propose to move in committee. It is as follows:—

During the construction of the said railway, the company hereby incorporated shall from time to time deposit with the Minister of Railways as each mile is completed ready for traffic, a statement of the actual cost of the said mile of road, giving such particulars as to the several items of cost as shall be required from time to time by the Governor in Council.

The railway company shall from time to time as required by Order in Council deposit with the Minister of Railways a statement of the earnings of the railway and the expense of carrying it on, including repairs and improvements, for each year or part of year, during which the railway is operated, in such form, and giving such particulars as may be required from time to time by the Governor in Council.

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, fix rates, terms and conditions for the carriage of freight and passengers over the railway of the company, or for the passage of cars or trains other than those of the company over the said railway.

Provided that when the earnings of the railway over and above operating expenses, and cost of repairs and improvements, which improvements must be sanctioned by the Minister of Railways, amounts to over six per cent on the actual cost of construction, less any aid granted by Canada, or by any province or municipality, the Governor in Council may make such reductions in the rates for the carriage of passengers or freight, or for the passage of cars or trains, other than those of the company over its tracks, as may be necessary to bring the net earnings within six per cent on the above mentioned net cost.

Provided always that the rates specified in section — of this Act shall govern until a reduction becomes necessary as above herein provided.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose that your ruling prevents a general expression of opinion on the motion now before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I had no such intention. I merely pointed out that the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) was moving an amendment to an amendment, which amendment is not yet before the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I had not an opportunity of being present in the Committee on Railways and Canals when this Bill was being discussed, and I rise now for the purpose of asking my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) whether this notice of motion which he has read to the House received the consid-

Mr. OLIVER.

eration of that committee. As we all know, the Committee on Railways and Canals is a very large committee and it is selected with a great deal of care from gentlemen on both sides of the House who are supposed to give attention to questions of that kind. It relieves the House of a great deal of trouble, and it saves a great deal of the time of Parliament to have a very large and influential committee of that kind to deal with questions so important as those that are brought before it. I wish to ask now, whether the intended motion of the hon. member (Mr. Oliver), as well as the intended motion of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), were discussed before the Railway Committee. No person could listen to the notice of motion which my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has just read without feeling that it is a very intricate motion, and that it involves a number of serious and important considerations; and, therefore, I say, if it has not been dealt with by the Committee on Railways and Canals before being brought here, it ought to be dealt with by that committee. Of course, I understand that any member of this House, whether he is on that committee or not, has a perfect right, when the House goes into committee on a Bill, to raise these important questions and have them discussed; but I think it would be interesting for the House to know whether this subject has received the attention of the Railway Committee, because I am inclined to think that the decision arrived at by that committee on a question of this kind would have very great weight with the House when the question is brought up here. I do not mean to say that this House might not overrule the decision of the committee; but, as a general principle, I am sure that the Minister of Railways and gentlemen sitting on both sides of the House will recognize it as a sound one, that it is extremely dangerous for the House, in dealing with the great railway interests of the country, to adopt any conclusion without due consideration on the part of so influential and important a committee as the Committee on Railways. I am not speaking merely with regard to this Bill, but I am speaking of suddenly adopting, with reference to any Bill that may be brought before the House, some decision which does not apply to the general railway system of the country, and which has not received careful consideration and approval by the Railway Committee.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has spoken.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman who preceded me has asked a question, and I wish simply to answer it. I brought up my proposed amendment in the Railway Committee, and I was told there that it was a

broad question, which ought to be brought up in the House. The House is the place to settle this issue, which involves the whole transportation question; and it is in order to get the expression of the members upon it that I have brought it up in the House, and I think it ought to be dealt with here and now.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sorry to see that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is after his manner not in his place, while a subject is being discussed of the greatest possible interest to Manitoba and the North-west Territories. In regard to this Rainy River Railway, I do not see what is the use of building it unless we go into the question of its rates, because I hold that it is a waste of capital to go on duplicating railways. It was long ago found in England, where railways were, owing to the density of the population, greatly multiplied, that competition was impossible in the case of railways. We find that when the railways do compete, what they do is not to compete on business grounds, but to engage in a war of rates, which they sometimes cut down so low that it is impossible for them to continue them without disaster. Unless we are to leave the railways which we charter free to do as they please, we must make regulations in this House to control their rates, because to look to competition is perfectly vain. I will call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to a paragraph in a book on transportation problems by Mr. Hadley, in which the author says:

It is to the credit of English statesmen that they did not deceive themselves in this respect. They learned more in a few years from the workings of a few miles of railroad than the general public has learned from all the railroads of the world in half a century. They recognized that competition could not be relied upon or aimed at with any hope of success.

He refers to the fact, that as early as 1836, Mr. Morrison delivered a remarkable speech, which will be found in the "Hansard" of that year, and goes on:

In the years 1839-1845, several attempts were made to secure railroad legislation, Mr. Gladstone taking an active part in these matters. Beyond a declaration of the right to revise rates, and even to purchase the railroads for state management in the remote future, nothing was actually accomplished.

Now, Sir, I cannot be surprised that any hon. gentleman interested in the country generally, and interested in the North-west Territories particularly, should desire that this railroad, which is ostensibly a competing line with the Canadian Pacific Railway, should, if built, be made a real competing line. If it is not to be made a real competing line, it should not be built at all; because, where you have two lines paralleling each other, and they make arrangements to pool the rates, which is the usual course

with railways, it is a waste of capital, and there is no reason why this House should give \$6,400 a mile to build a railway through a country which is practically served at the present moment. I agree with my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), who states that this railroad has no connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I find in the "Globe," of March 10th, an authoritative statement that this railway is to be built having a view to some political action of Mr. Greenway. This writer says that this railway is one by means of which Mr. Greenway is to give competition to the Canadian Pacific Railway; and, taking up the statement that Mr. Mackenzie, who is running the railway, is in the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and may one day turn it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, this writer assures us, on the authority of the "Globe," which the Ministry will, of course, take for granted, that it has no connection at all with the Canadian Pacific Railway. We may, therefore, assume that it is intended to be a competing line with the Canadian Pacific Railway; and here are the sums which have been voted for it: in 1895, \$115,000; in 1897, \$258,000; and in 1898, \$420,000. The other road was subsidized in 1892 for \$28,000, and in 1897 the Dominion Government gave what will be \$512,000, as a subsidy for this road, and they will give nearly twice as much after certain conditions have been fulfilled. This writer in the "Globe" goes on to indicate how this is going to be a competing line as regards the Canadian Pacific Railway. He says that Mr. Mackenzie also owns the Dauphin Railway, and he explains how this railway will meet the Dauphin Railway; Mr. Mackenzie owns the Hudson Bay Railway also, and he shows that in that way we are going to have competition. The Dauphin Railway has already been subsidized by this Parliament to the extent of 6,400 acres a mile, and a cash subsidy of \$40,000 a year for twenty years.

The present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in 1896, when a colleague of Mr. Greenway, brought in a Bill guaranteeing the principal and interest of their bonds, to the extent of \$8,000 a mile. Is it not a pity that the Minister of the Interior is not in his place to throw some light on the subject? This absence of Ministers from their seats is a thing we have often to complain of, and it would seem as if the right hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues were under the impression, following out the tenor of a remark made by the right hon. gentleman the other day, that there is some analogy between this House and the Congress of Representatives. But, Sir, there is no analogy between them. The Government of this country is a committee of this Parliament, through which we govern the country, and they are bound to be in their places and to give us information when we are discussing important questions of this kind.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.
They are above Parliament.

Mr. DAVIN. They evidently think they are: and of course they will be above Parliament, so long as there is a majority in this House with which they can do what they please. But so long as that is the case, the Opposition are bound to be all the more alert, because there is an air about this particular legislation, and much of the legislation before this Parliament this session, which suggests the necessity of the greatest watchfulness on the part of the Opposition. We have to be watchful, or else the interests, especially of the farmers of the North-west, will be allowed to go by the board. We ought to have a declaration of Government policy on this question. We ought to have a declaration from the Minister of Railways what the Government intend to do. If we are going to build this railway, as a Parliament, we ought to insist on a guarantee that it will really be a competing line. What is the object of this amendment of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean)? It is pretty much what has already been declared by this House in the case of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway and accepted by the Government. When we go into committee, we shall have an opportunity of discussing clauses of this Bill, and I certainly think that we should see, before incurring the expense of building this line, that we have such guarantees as will make it an effective competing line in the interests of the North-west Territories and Manitoba.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MACLEAN. I did think that before we got into committee, we would have had some statement from the hon. Minister of Railways declaring what action the Government intend to take on the amendment I have proposed. I take it that this amendment is the most important one made this session with regard to railway legislation. It is exactly on the lines of the clause embodied in the Crow's Nest Pass Railway Act, and which, we were told in the Railway Committee the other day by the Minister of Railways, and especially by Sir William Van Horne, would be effective in controlling the rates of that railway when built. If that be the case, we ought to have a declaration from the Government to-day whether they intend to embody a similar clause in this railway Bill. My hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) said this was only a little railway and did not amount to much. In my opinion, it is the most important railway Bill before the people to-day. The Yukon Railway is nothing compared with it. This road, when once built, if control is kept in the hands of the Gov-

Mr. DAVIN.

ernment, will effectually settle the question of competition with regard to the great North-west. We have also been told by the Minister of Railways that he intends to give the Grand Trunk Railway running powers over this road, if they desire it. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am in a position to say that the Grand Trunk Railway do intend asking these powers, not only as regards this railway, but every other railway that will hereafter be constructed in the North-west with the aid of this Parliament. This is the most important declaration of railway policy ever made in Canada since the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, namely, that the Grand Trunk Railway now intend to go into the North-west and become a competitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway. If that be the case, why not make a provision to-day to give the Government system of railways also running rights over this road. This is not a trivial railway, as the hon. member for Provencher said, but the most important proposition laid before Parliament since the Canadian Pacific Railway was built. It has been said that my amendment will amount to nothing, because what it calls for is practically covered by what is known as the "model clause." But if the model clause is sufficient, how is it the Government had no confidence in it when the Crow's Nest line was being chartered, and inserted a special provision in that Act? I think it is better to make the provision as specific as possible and name the railways which are to have running rights over this line. We are asked why should we specify the rates that ought to be charged. I may answer by putting another question. Why is it that Mr. Greenway proposes to specify the rates in his Bill? We know that he has a Bill before the Manitoba legislature, and according to the "Globe," the whole keynote of his legislation will be that the railway aided by Manitoba shall impose such rates as it specifies. If Mr. Greenway is successful in getting a ten cent rate on grain from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, why can we not incorporate such a rate in this Bill as well? The hon. member for Provencher asked why should we interfere with a small Bill and make the experiment on this small railway. I reply that the only way in which you can get at these railways is by attacking them one at a time. We are not discriminating against this new road, but are laying the ground which will bring all the other roads into line. My experience is that it is too sweeping a proposition to attack all the railways at once. But if you take them up one at a time, you will do something towards making progress to a settlement of the whole question and effectively protecting the public interest. The hon. gentleman says it is only hearsay evidence we have of Mr. Greenway's intentions. But surely the Government will not say that the article of the "Globe," the other day, was not an official declaration, and that it is not Mr. Greenway's inten-

tion to secure specified rates in the Bill he proposes to bring down.

Another question that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) raised was in connection with the over-bonding of these railways. It is possible, unless the public interests are protected, to so bond and stock railways that the traffic carried over them simply cannot pay the interest upon the obligations; and it is the duty of Parliament, I take it, somewhat on the lines proposed by the hon. gentleman, to protect the public interest in matters of this kind. I must join with the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in protesting against the absence of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) from the House to-day. The hon. Minister knew that this discussion was coming up, and he knew that the North-west had a vital interest in this question. He knew that his old colleague, Mr. Greenway, was introducing legislation and fixing specific rates in that legislation, and he, as a representative of the North-west, ought to secure the same rates here, in the Dominion legislature.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. He was here, but went away.

Mr. MACLEAN. If he were here and went away, that does not improve it; it is not to the hon. gentleman's credit, unless he has strong business reasons for it, that he is not in his place to-day to say what the views of the people of the North-west are with regard to this proposition. And, later on in the discussion, I may take the opportunity to say something further with regard to this amendment of mine. But I wish to point out now, that the clause I propose to put in this Bill is the clause that the Government said it was in the public interest to enact with regard to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, on the ground that the Crow's Nest Pass Railway was largely subsidized by Canada. On the same ground, the clause should be put in this Bill, because this is a road that will be built almost entirely with public money. Moreover, it is a road that commands the situation between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, and, if it is built with public money, it ought to be controlled entirely by the people of Canada, in whose interest it is built.

On section 1,

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I just wish to draw the attention of the House to something I was speaking of the other night—the last section of this clause:

And if the railway is not then completed, then the powers granted to the company shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the railway as then remains uncompleted.

I think this is a very important clause, indeed. Now, I have noticed that, in every railway charter passed by this House for years and years, this same provision ap-

pears, and I know that we in the west have suffered by this clause being inserted in that way. This company will, doubtless, ask for a bonus from the Dominion Government to build the road. They are already getting a bonus from the Ontario Government and one from the Manitoba Government. If they enter into an agreement with this Government to build the road from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, or any other point, there should be some means to compel them, in consideration of this bonus, to carry out the contract in the interest of the people. The very fact that they prepare to build from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, arouses the sympathy of many hon. members, and they are prepared, on account of having a competing line, to vote for a cash bonus, because it is supposed that the road is actually to be built from Port Arthur to Winnipeg. But supposing, when they have built half way, they should then strike some good mining locations, and make the road pay well up to that point, but see no profit in building further, they will undoubtedly stop construction. The Government can do nothing except cancel the balance of the charter, so far as it relates to the uncompleted portion of the road. I claim that, if the people of this country put money into a railway, there should be provision in the Bill to compel the parties to carry out the contract and complete the whole of the road. I pointed out last night the case of the Manitoba and North-western. These parties got a charter to build the line from Portage la Prairie to the Saskatchewan River, close to the town of Prince Albert, and received from this country a large land grant of 6,400 acres per mile. As soon as they got to the boundary of the province of Manitoba, up to which point the country was thickly settled and the land grant valuable, they stopped construction. So the road has remained for several years, and the Government has no means to force them to complete the road to the banks of the Saskatchewan. All the Government can do under this clause is to cancel the balance of their charter, as is provided here, and no other company could be got to complete the road as there would be no outlet. The fact that these people stopped the construction of this road at Yorkton, has kept thousands and thousands of people out of that country and has been the means of causing several hundreds of the best settlers we ever had in the North-west Territories to leave the country. As these people get public money to build this road, there should be some means to compel them to fulfil their contract. Now, this proposed road, the Rainy River road, is, I take it, to be a competing road. I was never in favour of duplicating roads, because I do not believe you can get real competition unless you put in the charter provisions to compel them to carry freight at certain prices. Otherwise, the old road and the new one will make a deal, and the result

is that the people will suffer. In this case, we have the Canadian Pacific running from Winnipeg to the head of Lake Superior. But under the terms of their charter, I believe, the Government have no control over the road and no control over the rates. For that reason, the Government of the province of Manitoba, also the Government of the province of Ontario and this House propose to subsidize another road to give the people of the west relief. But, I submit, we should see to it that we give substantial relief, because, if we do not provide against it, these parties will pool and charge high freight rates, and the people will be no better off. If some provision could be made, as in the case of the Crow's Nest Pass, to give the Government control of the rates and also to give running power to other companies over this road, we should have protection; for then the Government would be in a position, if extortionate rates were charged, to force the company to do what is right. But, if the Bill is passed as proposed here, I do not see that we are going to be in any better position than we were before, even though we have given millions of public money to build the road. I regard this as a very important road, because it is a link in another transcontinental line. At the present time we have the Intercolonial coming into the city of Montreal, and I submit, that the Bill providing for that was the best piece of legislation passed last session, notwithstanding all that was said against it. Montreal is the great commercial centre of this country, and, if the Intercolonial is to pay, it must get into Montreal. Moreover, this gives a connection with the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway, so that we have an independent road, practically, to the great lakes.

We have heard a great deal about the reduction in rates made by the Canadian Pacific Railway in carrying wheat from Fort William to the city of Montreal, but we have not looked into the reasons why that reduction was made. But it is easy to see what the reasons are, because they saw independent elevators were going up on Parry Sound, and if they waited until spring to remove that wheat, in all likelihood a great deal of it would find its way into those elevators and the Canadian Pacific Railway would not get it; so they reduced the rates in order to move it before navigation opened. Now, I say we have a through competing line from the seaboard to Parry Sound. If we get this Rainy River road built we are going to have a competing line to the city of Winnipeg, and after that we have the Manitoba and North-western Railway which will run through the most fertile portion of the North-west Territories, and that will be built or should be built in a very short time on to Edmonton and the Yellow Head Pass, which will give us a competing line to the moun-

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan).

tains and later to the Pacific Coast. Now this link under discussion runs through a country where it is very expensive to build a railway, and if a Government subsidy is given to that link the Government should see that the west is safeguarded. There is no trouble about the prairie country; we can construct our roads very cheaply there and there will be no trouble in that respect. I think the Government should take this into consideration, and should see that when we are giving so large an amount of money for the construction of this road, they should not do it without safeguarding the people of the west. I have not seen Mr. Greenway's Bill, but I understand that he is bringing in a Bill to provide that a certain rate will be charged for grain, cattle, and all kinds of produce we ship out, and for everything we bring into the country; and I submit that something should be put into this charter to protect us in that way.

Mr. MACLEAN. Apparently there is no opposition to this Bill on the part of hon. members, and if the Government are favourable, it should go right through.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You are the only opposition to the Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN. Only to the amendment. In the meantime I wish to point out that this railway has been bonused for several years, and why has it not been commenced yet? Not because it has not had a bonus from the province of Ontario, and not because it did not get large bonuses from this Parliament last year. But it may be that there is an arrangement with a certain railway that it shall not be built, and that the people of the North-west shall not get this competition which has been promised them. That is a matter that could be arranged. As we are dealing with this clause, we ought to see not only that the road is begun now, but that it be completed at the earliest possible date if it is to give the relief that has been promised to the people of the North-west.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I want to point out to my hon. friend who has been discussing this clause, and to the House, that probably no railway Bill ever passed the committee or the House with the limited restriction that there is in this Bill. The conditions are that they shall commence to work on or before the 1st of August next of this year, and complete the first 80 miles which has been bonused within two years. Now in a country such as this road passes through where it is expensive to build a road, the House will see that this is a very limited restriction. Further, the clause provides that the whole road is to be built within four years. I cannot understand any hon. gentleman taking exception to this clause, because I believe I am safe in saying that no railway, or no work of this kind, ever

passed this House with so limited a restriction placed in the Bill by the Railway Committee.

Mr. DAVIN. Would my hon. friend say what is the force of the arrangement that the road should be built within four years ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think that the ex-Minister of Railways, the Minister of Railways and Canals, and the House, should take any serious notice of this factious opposition. We know that there are serious matters that require careful consideration, and it has always been considered that if a charter became null and void it was a sufficient reason why the balance of the road should not be built, and I do not know any other penalty that could be put upon them that would likely be so effective as that one. I am surprised at my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean), discussing an amendment that has never been brought before the House, and complaining that the Government and its supporters have not expressed any view upon it. It has not reached that stage where an amendment could be proposed. It is true that the hon. gentleman gave notice that on the third reading he proposed to do such a thing, but we have never reached the stage where the amendment that is being discussed has ever been proposed, or has been practically before the committee or the House. I am sure that after the committee understands how this clause was amended by the Railway Committee they will agree that it could not be more restrictive than it is. I think it was the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) who moved this restrictive amendment, and it was adopted in committee for the reason that it was desirable that this work should be prosecuted, because the whole province of Ontario, especially, was deeply interested in it. The manufacturers and merchants of that province are deeply interested in the opening up of this district. It is a mining and agricultural district, and they have been endeavouring for a long time to procure transportation facilities between it and the east. The people of the country appreciate the great importance of this work, and are anxious to have it carried on, and I believe that the contractors, or the company, accepted this limited restriction that is placed in this clause.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) has referred to the proposal of the Manitoba legislature to bonus this road. Well, I can say that this Bill is to incorporate a road which is entirely within the limits of the province of Ontario, and the province of Manitoba has no power and no authority at all to bonus this road. I say it is a mistake for this House to drag in these outside considerations when we are discussing a Bill for only a small road which begins, I may say, nowhere and ends nowhere. It is said :

Why was not this road built before ? Well, it was not built before, because the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western road was not built before, and because there was no possibility of seeing a road built in Manitoba to meet this road at the other end. Now, it is known that the province of Manitoba intends to secure the construction of a road from Winnipeg to the Lake of the Woods. But the province of Manitoba has nothing to say with regard to the construction of the Ontario and Rainy River Railway, and cannot bonus the same, because it is without the limits of that province.

Mr. CASEY. It is highly proper to discuss the clauses of this Bill in committee, but the whole discussion on the matter has taken a range that seems to me to be utterly irrelevant to the question at issue, not only irrelevant to the clause which my hon. friend suggests, but irrelevant to the whole Bill. Hon. gentlemen have strayed off into a discussion of general railway questions, how railways should be controlled by the Government, how they overcharge the public, and all this sort of thing, as if that was at all germane to the question before the House. What is the question before the House on this Bill ? It is a question simply of extending the time for the completion of a railway which was chartered a few years ago, and which has received bonuses from this Government and from the Government of Ontario. Circumstances have prevented the building of the road hitherto. It is now asked that the time be extended for two years as regards a portion of the road and four years as regards the balance. What reasonable man can see any connection between such a Bill and a question of freight rates, a 2 cent per mile passenger rate, and matters of that kind ? There is absolutely no connection whatever. If this had been a Bill chartering a railway company, there might have been something germane in the contention of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), that some railways were given too large borrowing powers. There is, however, nothing in the present Bill in regard to bonding or borrowing powers, and they are not referred to. This is simply a Bill to extend the time for the completion of a road ; and I regard the determined effort made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) to delay the progress of this Bill by irrelevant discussion as indicating something unfriendly on his part towards the construction of this road. I am very sorry to see that an Ontario member should take a course which can have no effect except that of injuring the prospects of a railway from which Ontario hopes to derive so much benefit. If the hon. gentleman wants to have railways regulated by a railway commission, let him introduce a resolution or Bill to that effect, and it will be discussed. If he desires a 2 cent rate on railways, let him introduce

a general measure to that effect. What I want to urge is that hon. members should limit themselves as regards discussion to the clauses as they come up, and let them decide whether the extension of time asked for is proper or not; and we do not want to waste more time in discussing general railway law, which has nothing to do with this private Bill. I want again to protest against the introduction of general principles or general legislation into the consideration of a private Bill.

Mr. BERGERON. I am afraid we are losing time in the discussion of matters that are not germane to the question. The Bill now before the committee has been considered by the Committee on Railways and Canals, and no amendment can be moved, except that of the hon. member for East York, because notice has not been given of other amendments. What we are discussing is the amendment of the hon. member for East York. The member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) moved a motion, which I understand the chairman ruled out of order, and we have no right to discuss it. I only rise for the purpose of pointing out that we are losing time in discussing other amendments.

Mr. FOSTER. I suggest to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) that he reserve his amendment for the third reading of the Bill. It will consume a great deal of time if we undertake to discuss a principle in committee, as debate is practically unlimited, and the principle can scarcely be said to be germane to any particular clause. I think it is within the right of my hon. friend to discuss the principle of running powers or rates of fare, but we would certainly make much better progress with business if we were to go through the clauses of the Bill, and if my hon. friend moved his amendment on the third reading.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I beg to move in amendment—

Mr. BERGERON. No amendment has been given notice of.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). My hon. friend can move his amendment on the third reading.

On section 4,

Mr. MACLEAN. I intend that my amendment shall take the place of the 4th section. I again wish to say that I desire as much as any hon. member to see the railway built at the earliest possible moment; but I desire that Government control should be exercised over the road, and the rates should be regulated as it is proposed to regulate the rates and connections of this railway in Manitoba. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) has repeated that this is only a local road. It

Mr. CASEY.

is an integral part of a transcontinental system. It will run from Lake Superior to the boundary line, and is within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. If it were a local line, it would be dealt with by the province of Ontario. It is a railway that will be rival of the one transcontinental railway we possess to-day; it is a railway which, if care is taken to give running powers over it for the Grand Trunk and the Government system of railways, will secure the much-desired competition in the North-west.

Mr. JAMESON. I am opposed to the amendment because this is not a proper time to bring it before the House. I hold that if the company were asking for a bonus or a concession it would be proper to bring up the amendment at this time. I know the district well. You go by the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western twenty miles west of Lake Superior, and then strike this road. Then you strike a portion of the through route, which may have to go through the United States unless a very expensive bridge is built. Then you strike the Winnipeg and South-eastern Railway to Winnipeg. If it became possible to unite all those charters and make these roads one system, we would have a competitive route to Winnipeg; but at present we are dealing with links in the chain from Lake Superior to Winnipeg. If it should become possible to combine these charters to Winnipeg, then this railway would occupy a very different position from that occupied by the Canadian Pacific Railway. It would be under the provisions of the Railway Act, by which the Government in Council can regulate the rates. There would be no difficulty, if the Governor in Council exercised the power conferred, to control the rates on this road and ensure their reasonableness; and this would do away with the necessity of the present amendment. The next question is that of running powers; and I understand it is the intention of the Government that a clause to that effect will be embodied in every charter where a subsidy is given, that the railway shall be subject to future legislation as to running powers. The following clause is embodied in all the charters which have been granted, and in cases where subsidies may be given to railways hereafter:—

Any Act hereafter passed for the purpose of controlling railway companies incorporated by or subject to Parliament as to the issuing of stock or bonds, and as to rates or tolls and the regulation thereof, and as to running powers over or other rights in connection with the railway of any company by any other company, and the exercise of powers conferred upon railway companies, shall apply to the company from the time such Act goes into effect; but this section shall not be construed to imply that such Act would not apply to the company without the enactment of this section.

We have, therefore, in this section the pro-

vision which it is proposed by the amendment to provide; that is to say, the rates will be controlled by the Government, and running powers may be granted to any other railway. We have, then, only to consider the other portions of the amendment, the first of which is, that there shall be a 2 cents a mile rate. Now, Sir, I think that would be entirely unreasonable in this case. A 2-cent rate may be all right in the state of New York, but it is less than the rate which is provided for in the very populous states of Minnesota and Dakota, where there is a 3-cent rate. I do not think it would be reasonable to insert a 2-cent rate in this charter, which is for a line through a country where there is a very sparse population. This whole matter is in such a condition that I think it would be wise for this Parliament to wait until they see what is proposed to be done by the legislature of Manitoba. It is announced, I believe, that on Thursday next Mr. Greenway will state what proposition he intends to make with regard to a through line between Winnipeg and Lake Superior, and we in this Parliament should pause until we know something of the intentions of the Manitoba legislature and until we have before us the exact terms of the bargain that is to be made at Winnipeg.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am quite willing that this Bill should stand until we see what is being done by the legislature of Manitoba.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. JAMESON. I contend, that it will be plenty of time for us to discuss this matter when the question of a bonus comes up. I understand that this company is asking for a certain bonus, and when they ask for that bonus, and when there is something to set off against the concessions which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) is demanding, then we should consider this matter. At present, I do not see that the railway company is demanding anything from us in this Bill. If we were giving any quid pro, then it might be reasonable to make demands upon them; but by this Bill the railway company is merely asking for a reasonable extension of time. They are to begin the railway in August; they are to build 80 miles in two years, and 164 miles in four years, and any one who knows the nature of the country through which the road passes, will agree that that is a very reasonable time in which to complete that railway. I would be quite willing to discuss a motion as to what concession the railway company ought to give when they come before us for a bonus, which, I believe, they intend to ask; but, as the matter at present stands, I intend to vote against the amendment.

Mr. CASEY. I have again to urge that, in the case of a private Bill, it is not proper to insert provisions of this kind. This question was considered before the Railway

Committee by men who are accustomed to deal with railway legislation, and the idea was scouted there, and this amendment thrown out. It would be a most irregular and monstrous idea, to jump upon one particular railway out of the number that are chartered here every session, and say that, because the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) wills it, we must put a restrictive clause in the charter of this particular railway.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Do you refer to the running powers?

Mr. CASEY. I am speaking of the restrictive clause as to rates just now; I will speak about the running powers later on. I am prepared to assist any hon. member in impressing on the Government the necessity of regulating railways under the general law, but I will assist nobody in piecemeal, invidious, personal legislation of this kind, in which they try to attach clauses to a private Bill of one particular company, and leave without any restriction the charter of another railway company. Now, as to the running powers, the right to give running powers is, I believe, already conferred on the Government by the Railway Act without any special provision being enacted, but to make it quite certain, the Minister of Railways has added a clause, which is already in this Bill, declaring specifically that this railway shall be subject to any general legislation on that point that may be passed, as well as being subject to the powers of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I say, Sir, that the clause already in the Bill is perfectly sufficient security as to running powers, and it is every bit as good as, and better than, the clause suggested by the member for East York (Mr. Maclean). That hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) talks about the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial getting running powers over his road, but if he will show us how the several hundred miles between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway and the end of this road are to be bridged over, it will give more reality to his proposition. Of course, they may get there some time, and if they ever do, then, under the clause of this Bill as it has been drafted, they will be entitled to ask the Government to give them running powers, and the Government cannot refuse to give them running powers over that road, if the general law of the land requires it. I think, Sir, that is sufficient to say on the subject. Let us have general legislation, if necessary, for this purpose, but let us avoid this nagging attempt to choke off—that is what it amounts to—by irrelevant talk one particular privilege which this company is asking for, the privilege of an extension of time to complete this very necessary work.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) says: Wait until

the bonus comes before us. I have been long enough in this House to know how its business is conducted, and I know that these bonuses are brought down at the very last hours of the session, when there is no opportunity given members to discuss them, and when members are sent home, so as not to be here. Under these circumstances, I have seen these railway bonuses jollied along. I have been jollied along too much in connection with railway questions in this House, and I intend to stand up for my rights here, and to maintain my position. If I can to-day discuss this question and bring certain facts before the House, then, Sir, I intend to bring these facts before the House on this question. If the political friends of the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg have any platform in Manitoba, it is, that they are in favour of railway reform and the regulation of railways; but now that gentleman comes down here and says he is not in favour of this railway reform, and he is willing to leave this question to be dealt with by the general Railway Act. Why did not the Government leave it to the general Railway Act, when they built the Crow's Nest Pass road?

Mr. CASEY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, I don't wish it. I am making my point, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) can speak afterwards. When the Crow's Nest Pass Railway was dealt with, there was a specific clause inserted in their Bill giving running powers to whatever railways so requesting to go over it. I merely ask that the same clause should be inserted in this Bill. This is not a petty private Bill, as has been said here, but it is a great public Bill, on which the Government ought to declare their policy in regard to these matters, and on which they should take the House into their confidence. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) says that Mr. Greenway proposes to bring down a Bill and to insert specified freight rates in it. I presume that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jameson) can tell the House a good deal about that, if he wishes to do so. That Manitoba Bill is to be brought before the legislature next Thursday, and let this Bill stand until next Thursday, and we will have the provincial law before us. If the Manitoba legislature can regulate these railway rates, why cannot the Dominion Parliament do the same? I say again, that I want to see this railroad built. I believe it will open up a most valuable mineral section in the province of Ontario. We wish to get into that country this year; we thought the bonus granted last year would have the railway there to-day, but it has not. If the first 80 miles of that road are completed in two years, so much the better for Ontario and the opening up of that

Mr. MACLEAN.

country. We not only want a road built in the interests of Ontario, but we want it built in the interests of the whole of Canada, and we want running rights retained on that railway and specified in the Act of Parliament in the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway, in the interest of the Government System of Railways, and in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, if they desire to run that road. If there is any man who ought to be ashamed of himself when he goes back to his constituency, it is the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson), on account of the confession he made here to-day, that he will only protect his province at the tail end of the session, when this bonus is going through. Did he do so last session, when the bonus was going through? Did he raise his voice against that bonus going through without conditions? He sat here and saw this bonus voted and legislation granted, and the railroads got everything, but the people, who have to pay the traffic rates, got nothing, and were not protected in any sense whatever. He condemns the 2-cent a mile clause.

If there is any agitation in the western states which correspond in their standing and industry to our western provinces, it is for cheaper transportation rates. It is true, there will be no great local passenger traffic on this road; but a great transcontinental traffic will pass over it, and it is in the interest of the transcontinental traffic that I wish to provide for the rate of 2 cents a mile; and if that rate is established with regard to this road, it will become the ruling rate over the whole system, which was the result in the case of the New York Central, when a 2-cent rate was fixed for 50 miles. This railway, which has received so much from the public, ought to give the public a reduction in passenger rates. I have told the House before that passenger rates are the one thing that have not been reduced in this country in the last forty or fifty years. All other rates have been reduced; and the proof that a reduction in rates would be in the public interest is found in the fact that to-day, when the railways are running at reduced rates, the trains are crowded. Nobody could get a lower berth in the car I came down in last night. The railways are admitting by their own acts that they can carry people profitably for a cent a mile. When I come and propose that this road should give the public a 2-cent passenger rate, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) says, you are interfering with one railway and not with another. If he will introduce a general Bill, I will support it; but every time I introduce such a Bill I am told that I am interfering with vested interests. Here is a railway that has no vested interests, but which has received large public subsidies, and I ask that it should make some return to the public in the shape of reduced passenger rates.

Mr. CASEY. What I wished to remind the hon. gentleman of was simply that when he said all this on the motion to go into committee, he promised that he would not repeat it in committee.

Mr. HUGHES. I am glad to see that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has returned to his normal condition, and is advocating cheaper rates. But when the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway recently undertook to give the people cheaper rates, we found the hon. gentleman getting up and demanding that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be granted running rights to North Bay in order that the former high rates might be restored. Now the hon. gentleman is back again advocating a 2-cent rate on this road. He charges the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) with not contending that these restrictive clauses should be placed in this Bill last session. This road does not go to Winnipeg, and any amalgamation that may be about to take place, or that has taken place, is entirely subsequent to last session. It will be in the memory of the members of this House that a couple of sessions ago, when a Bill was before this House to give the people of the North-west competing rates, and when the road was to run to the city of Duluth, the hon. member for East York did not stand up in this House and demand that any restrictive clauses should be placed in the Bill to limit the freight or passenger rates. That road was to run to an American port; but this road is to run to a Canadian port, and, forsooth, this opposition is brought up to it. Reference has been made to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway; but when that Bill was before the House, it was stated that there was room for only one railway track in the Crow's Nest Pass between the precipice and the water, and that is one reason why the restrictive clause was inserted. Reference was also made to the Dauphin road, and certain gentlemen have been referred to as having been concerned in it. I want to tell the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) that it was the Liberal-Conservative party in this House that granted that railway 6,400 acres a mile and \$40,000 a year, and not the Manitoba Government.

Mr. DAVIN. The Manitoba Government granted \$8,000 a mile.

Mr. HUGHES. No. The Manitoba Government simply guaranteed the bonds. It was the Conservative party in this House that voted the subsidies to that railway, and both the hon. member for East York and the hon. member for Western Assiniboia supported as I did. I must say I admire the members from the North-west Territories for the way in which on every occasion they stand up in this House and shout that they must have cheap-

er rates of transportation. I tell these hon. gentlemen that they have cheaper rates to-day than the town of Lindsay has. You can lay down goods from Liverpool at Port Arthur or Winnipeg cheaper than you can lay them down at the town of Lindsay, over a thousand miles this side. When this question of freight rates is gone into, a commission must be appointed that will deal with the matter throughout the length and breadth of Ontario as well as in the North-west, and will see that no long haul rate shall be less than the short haul rates. While I admire these gentlemen for standing up for their rights, I must remind them there are other parts of the country where the people have taxed themselves for railways, while the people of the North-west have never taxed themselves a dollar. The people of the province of Ontario have burdened themselves to grant municipal and provincial bonuses to railways, and yet they are charged higher rates than the gentlemen from the North-west who are taking up the time of this House in howling about the high rates they are charged. They have no more ground of complaint on that subject than the people of Ontario. Let this matter not be brought up on a Bill with regard to one railway, but let it be referred to a commission to be settled on broad and statesmanlike lines. If the Grand Trunk wants to get into the North-west, I say God-speed to it. It has a line to North Bay; let it extend that line to the North-west over Canadian territory, and I will support a bonus to it; but I will not be a party to assisting the Grand Trunk or any other railway to run through American territory, to build up American cities and help to develop American railways. I will support any proposition that will give us another line north of Lake Superior. That country is rich in minerals, there are spots found to be valuable for agricultural purposes, and there is ample room for another road there that will give us a competing route to the North-west. Clause 4 of this Bill amply provides for the future, and I am satisfied that it will meet with the approval of the House. Reference was made by my hon. friend from Winnipeg to the possibility of this road connecting with the Manitoba and South-eastern, and running south of the Lake of the Woods. I trust that no Government will ever permit it to run through American territory. A crossing can be made at the narrows of the Lake of the Woods, and in that way it can be kept an all-Canadian route.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to congratulate the hon. member who has just sat down on the erudition of his speech; but I think it would have been more suitable for the "Cavan blazers" than for this House. In regard to the contribution of the North-west to this country in the matter of railway construction, I do not think it is necessary to discuss that question on that Bill.

Let me correct the hon. gentleman in his impression that this road benefits the North-west particularly or solely. I have always understood that the interest of the east in the western country lies in the development of the west. That is why the North-west was bought and that is why it was paid for, and without that development eastern Canada is not getting value for its money; whereas with that development it is, by the expansion of its manufactures and commerce. If the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) cannot see the matter in that light, it is his misfortune and not our fault.

If it is proven that the control we ask for over this road is necessary in order that the agricultural interests of the North-west may thrive—and that is proven—then it is evident that eastern Canada has an interest in our obtaining control over the rates. There is no division possible between the interests of eastern and those of western Canada in the matter of railway rates. The interest of eastern Canada lies in the development of the west and anything that will develop the west is in the interest of the east. It is not we who are asking for this road. We would rather not see it built this year or next year or the year after, unless it is built under such conditions that it will benefit the people of the country for which it is built. It is those who are clamouring for this legislation—possibly with an idea of building the road, or possibly with the idea of preventing its construction—who are bringing this question before the House, and not we. What I say is that when the Dominion is paying a large amount of money to obtain a certain object, it is our duty to see that that object will be obtained by the legislation we are granting. We are not asking for anything, but we are simply using our humble endeavours to point out that this Dominion is going to lose the money it will put into the road unless the charter is guarded by certain conditions.

With regard to the 2-cent passenger rate mentioned in the amendment of the hon. member for East York, let me say that at present the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway are carrying passengers all over this continent at a cent a mile. You can get a ticket to Vancouver for \$25, which is less than a cent a mile. I know, of my own knowledge, that for years the Canadian Pacific Railway has been carrying people from the States to the North-west and back for a cent a mile. If it is possible to carry passengers at a profit—and I never heard that they were carrying them at a loss—at a cent a mile, if it is possible to carry foreigners in and out of that country at a cent a mile, I do not think we are asking anything unreasonable when asking for a 2-cent rate as a condition of our paying one-half, if not

Mr. OLIVER.

the whole of the cost of the railway. I think it is pretty nearly time the people of Canada got something for the money they have put into railways. As far as the game has gone, instead of our people getting the benefit, they have been put at a disadvantage by both the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway as compared with their competitors in the United States. It is notorious that freight is hauled from Chicago to Montreal cheaper than from Windsor to Montreal over the Grand Trunk Railway, and it is notorious that like conditions prevail over the Canadian Pacific Railway. The losses which these companies make in the operation of their branches in the United States are paid out of their earnings on the Canadian lines, so that we have not only to pay for the running of our roads in our own country but for the losses incurred by these companies in the country that is competing with us. That is not a state of affairs which is in the interests of the people of this country. It seems to me it is hardly in order to quibble as to whether this matter should be dealt with to-day, or to-morrow, or the next day. It seems that when millions are at stake and that people are put to these disadvantages, as compared with their competitors, almost any time would be proper to bring this matter before the House. Instead of this being a question which should necessarily be dealt with only in a general way, it seems to me that the proper time to deal with it is when we are asked to give a charter to a railway that will affect in a general way the whole of the Dominion. Although the legislation will not be general, its effect will be, and that is why we wish it to be dealt with on this particular occasion. We are told that we should wait until this company asks for a bonus. I say it will be then too late, because then the only question will be whether we should grant or refuse the bonus. But now is the time at which to make the conditions on which we will be willing to grant a bonus when they apply for one. It is our privilege now to make the conditions, but if we grant this company the privileges they ask, we will not afterwards be in a position to make conditions. We will only then be in the position of refusing or granting the bonus, because we will have previously consented to the conditions on which the company obtained its charter. It is for that reason the matter should be attended to at this particular stage. I am in favour of the motion of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), but I desire to make an addition to it, and I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if I will be in order in moving to do so now?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bain). Have you given notice?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. You will have to give notice.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I ask further, Mr. Chairman, if your ruling is that no amendment can be made to this Bill in committee at this time without notice?

The CHAIRMAN. Not without notice.

Mr. OLIVER. I feel tempted to ask what this committee is sitting for. I beg now to give notice that, on the third reading of the Bill, I will move the resolution which I read some time ago in the House, following the amendment of the hon. member for East York.

Mr. HUGHES. I would just take the liberty of correcting a statement made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway charging foreigners less than Canadians. He drew the inference that the rates from the United States into the North-west were less than those in Canada. In reply, I would point out that for many years the Canadian Pacific Railway have carried people from the district which I have the honour to represent, to the North-west and back for less than a cent a mile. They have regular excursions at all times in the year, especially in the fall season and the spring, when settlers are moving, and on these excursions the rates are less than a cent per mile.

Mr. DAVIN. Less than a cent?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, \$28 is the rate, and it is a good deal more than 2,800 miles there and back. There is another point which I wish to refer to. The hon. gentleman sought to cast a slur on the people of the township of Cavan. My hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig) is not in his place or he would certainly take the hon. gentleman to task. But I venture to tell the hon. gentleman that he will not make use of similar language to the good people of the township of Cavan, who are settled in his riding in the North-west Territories, during the coming elections.

Mr. OLIVER. The statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) that the Canadian Pacific Railway is carrying people at the present moment at 1 cent per mile, I will ask the committee to regard as a very strong support of my assertion that 2 cents a mile is a reasonable rate.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think that the Government should tell us whether they have received communication from the Grand Trunk that that road desired to have running rights over this railway. I think also that we should wait before taking action upon this question until we see what legislation is proposed by the province of Manitoba. Our great North-west has not been built up and settled as our people

thought it would be built up and settled. We are not getting the return to-day that we expected from our large investment in the Canadian Pacific Railway. The answer that is made to the complaint that development is slow is that high railway rates are the cause of slow progress in the great North-west. If that is so, we must do something to relieve the North-west. As the hon. gentleman said, the whole interest that Ontario has in the North-west is that it be built up and give us a large market for our products. If high railway rates are keeping the country back, some relief should be given, and the question of how that relief should be given is the most important feature of this discussion. We know now that trade that Montreal and Toronto ought to have with the North-west is drifting to some of the cities of the western states, the reason given being that dealers in those cities can send to the North-west, even sometimes pay the duty, and still sell at lower prices, because they get better freight rates. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) said that we should take no action, but should leave this matter to the future. Why did the hon. gentleman bring up his proposal for a railway commission? Why did he declare in this House that the time had come for the appointment of a commission and Government regulation of railways, and make a great speech and set himself up before the people of the North-west and eastern Canada as well in favour of such a course? Why, what reason can he have but that there is a railway grievance? Now he says that there is no grievance, that no legislation is necessary, and all he wants is to have this Bill railroaded through. There is a railway grievance in this country and a railway commission is required. We are promised that a commission will be forthcoming, but let us, in the meantime, make as perfect as possible those Bills that come before us. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) is willing that another road should be built from North Bay through that inhospitable region to Port Arthur. If he is willing, let it be built, but I hope that it will not be built with public money. The Grand Trunk is already at Georgian Bay, and by putting on a line of steamers, can be at Port Arthur to-morrow. If they are allowed to run their cars on the Rainy River Railway, we have competition already provided from the wheat fields of the west to the seaboard. The same is true of the Canadian Government Railway System. That system can be at Parry Sound to-morrow, and by a line of freight steamers it can be at Port Arthur as soon thereafter as it pleases, and, if it has running rights over the Rainy River road into the North-west, there you have a third competing line. In this way the relief to the North-west will come, the development of

that great country will come and the trade for the eastern provinces will come. I again ask the Minister of Railways whether he has heard from the Grand Trunk in regard to that company obtaining running rights over this road, or over any other road we are asked to charter in the North-west.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. I present this motion because I think that we should wait until we hear what Mr. Greenway is doing with reference to the South-eastern Railway. It is of the utmost importance for the consideration of this question that we should know what Mr. Greenway is going to do. As far as I can understand, this road will form part of a through line from Lake Superior to Winnipeg, and points further west and north-west, so that it is important we should know all the facts we have to deal with. I understand that they control the South-eastern road from Winnipeg to where it joins this road, is in the hands of the promoters of this Bill, and if that is the case, we may be reasonably sure that Mr. Greenway will attach certain conditions to it by any legislation that he may propose. When we know what the conditions are, we shall be better able to judge whether the propositions made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) are reasonable or not. I am very anxious that this road shall be built, and built at the earliest possible moment. I would be the last one to throw the slightest obstacle in the way so as to prevent its construction within four years. I think it should be constructed within the next two years, but if it is necessary to give them four years to complete it I am willing to do that. At the same time, we should know exactly where we stand and should be assured that this road is not going to be kept on the tenterhooks as it has been for some years, possibly at the request of some other road that does not wish to have it built, does not wish to have it come into competition with it, it will, to a certain extent, no doubt, as a through line, come into competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am quite prepared to wait and see what Mr. Greenway is willing to do, and then I think we shall be in a better position to say whether the amendment offered by the hon. member for East York would be in the interest of the public or not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I hope that this amendment will not carry or any other amendment that has been proposed. I do not see how the action taken by the Manitoba Government, no matter what it may be, can be germane to this question or affect it in the slightest possible degree. Substantially, the amendment that refers to running powers over the road is contained in the Railway Act, which has obtained

Mr. MACLEAN.

due consideration. Moreover, clause 4 of the Bill provides that any future legislation that Parliament may pass respecting the Government control of railway companies shall apply to this company. Then, as to the other parts of the amendment, they can have only one effect, and that is to destroy this project. I leave it to any member of the House who will give it serious consideration to say if there is any other object to be gained by this proposal. Hon. members may talk about the benefit to the country, but the practical result of this amendment is to destroy the project and prevent the work from going on. No company could finance the road under such conditions. As to the insinuations that have been thrown out regarding the delay that has taken place since this road was chartered, I believe that the gentlemen living in Port Arthur and through that district have made as honest efforts to build this road, have spent as much time and money in this project as any citizens of Canada in their honest efforts to carry out this road to completion. I think then, that the insinuations are very unfair. Any person who knows the facts knows of the sacrifices that have been made by the men who hold the charter, of the time they have given and the money they have spent—in fact, some of them are poorer to-day because of the expense they have undertaken in attempting to carry out this work for the benefit of the district in which they live. Now that they have made arrangements with wealthy contractors, as stated in the Railway Committee, to have the road built through and are willing to accept the proposition, unreasonable though it seems, to start construction before the 1st of August next and complete eighty miles within two years, some hon. gentlemen rise to bring in some proposition not at all germane to the question. This is an ordinary charter that ought to be granted in accordance with the precedents we have set and in accordance with the Railway Act. Every hon. gentleman is quite within his right in moving amendments. But let not this road be singled out, but let these provisions apply to all alike. It looks like an attack upon the scheme for the purpose of destroying it, though it is one of the most important enterprises we have to develop the north-west portion of this province.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I rise to repudiate the statement of the hon. member for North Oxford, so far as I am concerned. I deny, in toto, that I have any other object than the completion of this road at the earliest possible moment. It comes with bad grace from the hon. member for Oxford to rise up and lecture people who have a right to give their opinion upon this matter. I say, he has no right to impute motives to people who think proper to make a statement in the interest of the company.

Mr. OLIVER. We are all in sympathy with the pathetic appeal of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) on behalf of the capitalists who have been struggling so hard to build this road. Certainly, we would like to see them succeed; we don't want them to lose their money; but I will suggest that that is not exactly what we are here for. We are not here to look so much after the interests of those capitalists who are going to build the road, as we are for the purpose of looking after the interests of the people who are going to contribute \$9,000 a mile for the construction of a road which will cost \$15,000 a mile; that is to say, we are here representing the people, who are going to give the greater part of the cost of the road. I think the contractors will be able to look after their own interests. I think that, so far as the history of this country has gone yet, these gentlemen have been, on the average, moderately successful—with the help, probably, of this House; but, anyway, they have fairly well succeeded. I do not think the same measure of success has been attained by the people of the country, with whose money those roads have been built, or on whose security the money has been raised to build the roads. We wish to start right here on this road, and suggest ways and means for protecting the interests of the people, who are going to contribute the greater part of the cost of the road; and any imputation of motives, or a desire to drop the construction of the road, I think, can be fairly resented by any member of this House who simply desires to protect the interests of those who are paying their good money.

Mr. MACLEAN. For the instruction of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), I will have to read an article from the "Globe" newspaper, which was, to all intents and purposes, an inspired article, outlining the policy of the Government. If we cannot get a declaration of the policy of the Government, if the Minister will not even tell us whether the Grand Trunk Railway has made application for running rights over this road, or any other company—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not heard of any.

Mr. MACLEAN. I know that they intend to do so. But to give the hon. gentleman the information he desires, I want to read this inspired article in the "Globe" newspaper:

MANITOBA'S NEW OUTLET.

While the Canadian Pacific Railway has secured for itself this profitable field—

That is, the province of British Columbia.

—its grasp of another important portion of its traffic is unquestionably loosening.

I want to see it loosened, then.

There has long been a feeling in the province of Manitoba against the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way, because of alleged excessive rates charged for carrying grain to the east, and especially to Fort William, during the season of navigation. An attempt was made some years ago to secure railway competition by subsidizing the Northern Pacific Railway to extend its lines from the American border northward into Manitoba. That extension failed of its purpose, although not altogether useless. Mr. Greenway and his associates cast about for another means of securing cheaper freights to Lake Superior, and for some time negotiations were conducted with a view to securing a railway from Winnipeg to Duluth. Not a little opposition was aroused in eastern Canada to this proposal, as one little calculated to bind the provinces closer together. Mr. Greenway was urged to secure his competing line through Canada instead of diverting trade to the ports of the United States. The belief is, that arrangements have been practically completed compassing this end.

Now, that is what I wish the committee to take notice of. "The belief is, that arrangements have been practically completed compassing this end." Well, I say, delay this legislation until we know what these arrangements are. Hon. gentlemen know what they are. I think it is their duty now to take this House into their confidence, and tell us what these arrangements are which their inspired organ says have been made.

The Ontario and Rainy River Railway, the charter of which is controlled by Mr. William Mackenzie, of Toronto, is projected to run from a point on the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western (a short line running out of, Port Arthur) through the gold fields of the Lake of the Woods region to a point on the boundary of Manitoba. It will be met there by the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway, the charter of which is controlled by Mr. Mackenzie, and which, if built, will earn a Dominion land grant. These two lines will give a new grain route from Manitoba to Lake Superior.

Does my hon. friend from Provencher hear that? It is not a small local road, then, but it is a great railway that will give a new grain route from Manitoba to Lake Superior. Does the hon. member from Winnipeg know that? If it will do that, now is the time to have that new grain road regulated in the people's interest, and not leave it until the tail end of the session.

A STRONG COMBINATION.

It may be asked what advantage it will be for Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Greenway to arrange for a line to Lake Superior from Winnipeg, so long as the Canadian Pacific Railway holds the interior lines from which the grain must come to Winnipeg. The position is really simple. Between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie there is a line called the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway, the charter of which contains a clause reserving to the Manitoba Government the right to grant running powers. From Portage la Prairie to Gladstone by the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway a similar arrangement can be made. At Gladstone the Dauphin Railway, built and controlled by Mr. Mackenzie, is reached, and it runs to Lake Winnipegosis. With the cooperation of the Manitoba Government, therefore, and the granting of necessary running pow-

ers over the links mentioned, Mr. Mackenzie can secure a continuous line from Port Arthur to Lake Winnipegosis.

That is the line that is before the House. Now is the time when this Parliament has an opportunity to regulate these rates and protect the public interest.

This, however, is not all, for he is understood to have a considerable interest in the Hudson's Bay Railway, which would really be an extension of the Dauphin Railway, the construction of the latter road being the first stage of a road from Manitoba to the bay. These railway-building projects are set forth here to show that the Canadian Pacific Railway's hold of Manitoba will be greatly lessened by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway's hold of Manitoba South-eastern by Mr. Mackenzie and his associates.

Here is another inspired statement, that this is a great railway, a road that is giving relief to the whole North-west, not a petty road; and if it is this great road, now is the time to regulate it.

The time for commencing the Ontario and Rainy River Railway was extended to-day by the Railway Committee of the House of Commons, and in the course of the debate it was asserted that the Ontario and Rainy River charter had fallen into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

That is the very thing I do not wish to see, and the people of this country do not wish to see. Above all things, they do not wish to see this Rainy River Railway fall into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and there ought to be a protecting clause put into this Bill here to-day. The Government should refuse to regrant that subsidy this session, unless a strong clause is put in that on no grounds can this railway fall into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is by railway rates on traffic between the Red River and Port Arthur that the Canadian Pacific Railway roads control the North-west transportation. Unless some protecting clause is inserted when we regrant this bonus, after they spend this \$9,000 of public money per mile on 435 miles, it is possible for the Canadian Pacific Railway to get control of this railway. Yet hon. gentlemen here, on both sides of the House, are willing to see this Bill go through without even putting in a provision that the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot gobble up this railway, which is to cost the people of this country \$9,000 per mile.

Your correspondent is in a position to state that this assertion is absolutely untrue—

Where did he get this information? Did he get it from the Government, or from Sir William Van Horne?

—and that it is the intention of the holders of the Ontario and Rainy River charter to build and operate in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

There is a most important statement, namely, that the men who control the On-

Mr. MACLEAN.

tario and Rainy River road intend to build it, and that they intend to get the Manitoba charter extended to Lake Winnipegosis; and yet in face of that fact, we are taking no means to regulate the rates; we are sinking our money, but we are not saying how our money shall be expended. Now is the time when we should secure legislation and obtain the protection of the public. Let us not leave it to the end of the session when bonuses are going through the House, but let us do this work now. Further, the "Globe" says:

This, notwithstanding the cordial relations existing between Mr. Mackenzie and the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The "Globe" stated that the most cordial relations exist between this firm of contractors and this railway, which aspires to be a transcontinental railway; and yet this House declares that it will not afford any protection in the public interest. I think after what has occurred this afternoon, after this statement made by the "Globe," which to all intents and purposes is inspired, a statement which definitely sets out that a certain railway will be a rival road to the Canadian Pacific Railway and proposes to give the North-west reduced transportation rates, it is the duty of the Government on this occasion to state what their policy is in respect to the Ontario and Rainy River Railway. I give them credit for a desire to carry out railway reform; but if they thought it necessary to put two special clauses in the Act respecting the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, I see no reason why they should not insert similar clauses in this Bill. If they could only secure efficacy by inserting these clauses in the Crow's Nest Pass Act, what objection can there be to inserting them in the present Bill? Some hon. members have said that the ordinary clause is sufficient. It was not so considered in regard to the Crow's Nest Pass road. If it was not sufficient there, it is not sufficient here. I am not trying to embarrass the railway company or the contractors; but after all the experience the people have had and the House has had, now is the time to shut the stable door and not allow the horse to be stolen before the door is shut. In the face of the statements made to-day the Government are bound to hold back this Bill until they learn what is the intention of the Manitoba Government. The people of Manitoba have a grievance, it is a substantial grievance and their experience is acute, and they are not satisfied any longer to have the running powers of railways under provincial control. They want in the bond a statement that the rates of freight shall be specified, and they are going to obtain a 10 cent per 100 lbs. rate from Red River to Lake Superior. If so, why should we not be equally alert, and why should our people look for protection to a local Act passed by the legislature of Manitoba? If for no other reason,

the Government should hold this Bill over until we know what Manitoba intends to do in connection with this proposition. It is not an unreasonable proposal, it is one in the public interest, and it is a move on the part of the Government and this Parliament in the direction of railway reform. Railway reform has to come in this country. A most important statement in respect to railway construction is contained in the current number of the "Atlantic Monthly," which is one of the most influential high-class magazines in the United States. The article to which I refer deals with the general railway question. It is so important that when speaking to our librarian to-day, he told me he had ordered twelve extra copies of the magazine so that members could have an opportunity of reading it, and I hope members will read it. If there is a newspaper in the United States of high standing it is the New York "Evening Post": it is a most influential journal and is the friend of the great financial corporations of the United States; but in its issue of Saturday night it had to summarize this article which appeared in the "Atlantic Monthly," and I propose to read a short extract from the article as published in the New York "Evening Post," to show the importance of Government regulating the power of railways. The article is headed, "The power of railway magnates," and says:

It lies in the theory of modern society that men should succeed or fail according to their abilities. As a matter of fact, a railway manager has it within his power, through the manipulation of rates, to make or destroy, to determine which persons in the community and which communities in the state shall attain commercial success, and which shall struggle in vain for its attainment. * * * Suppose, for example, that one cattle dealer in Chicago is selected by a pool of railways to control the shipment of meats from Chicago to the seaboard, and that, in order to secure him this control, he receives a rate 10 per cent less than the rates charged other dealers, it is evident that the favoured shipper will quickly destroy the business of other shippers by bidding more for cattle than they can afford to bid. Admitting that the discrimination is not approved by common law, what remedy has the small shipper which is sufficiently speedy in its action to rescue the business which he observes to be slipping from him? He has no remedy, and for this reason it is essential that discriminations of the sort referred to should be made a statutory misdemeanour, and that some special method of procedure more rapid in its operation than an ordinary court should be established to cause the railways to desist from their wrong-doings.

The statement made in this article is, that the people have no remedy at the present time, and that discriminations should be made a statutory misdemeanour in the different states. If any people are acquainted with such a situation, surely they are the people in our North-west. The Canadian Pacific Company is in a position to-day in the North-west to make one grain buyer

rich and drive all the others out of the business. The company have taken up the stock industry carried on by one firm and have made it impossible for other dealers to compete. It is impossible for individuals to protect their own rights, and therefore it is necessary to have a court to compel these railway companies to treat all the people equally. This article goes on further to say:

The merchant, the manufacturer, and the farmer, working under conditions of industrial liberty, do not seem to require any particular supervision on the part of the state, for competition is adequate to ensure relative justice as between custom as well as the sale of goods at a fair price. But in the railway industry, competition does not work so beneficial a result. On the contrary, such is its nature that it imposes upon railway managers the necessity of disregarding equity between customers, and of fixing rates without considering fairness, whether judged from the point of view of cost or of social results. Were this not true there would be no railway problem.

But what, it will be asked, is there peculiar about the business of transportation which renders it superior to the satisfactory control of competition? * * * The railway industry is an extensive, and not an intensive industry. It conforms to the law of "increasing" returns rather than to the law of "constant" or of "diminishing" returns. This being the case, ability to perform a unit of service chiefly depends more upon the quantity of business transacted than upon attention to minute details. Another way of saying the same thing is that the expenses incident to the operations of a railway do not increase in proportion to the increase in the volume of traffic. As an industrial fact, this does not pertain to the business of the manufacturer, the merchant or the farmer; but is peculiar to the business of transportation, and it is adequate, when properly understood, to explain why all advanced peoples, without regard to the form of government they may have adopted, or the social theories they may entertain, have surrounded the administration of railways with peculiar legal restrictions. The necessity of some sort of government control lies in the nature of the business itself.

That article is by Prof. C. H. Adams, an admitted authority on the transportation problem. If his statement be correct, there must be some state control over the railways; and why cannot we have it here? Why cannot Parliament and the Government in the present case wait a reasonable time until they ascertain what the Manitoba Government are going to do in the way of railway legislation, and then let us have similar legislation enacted here; and if it were once settled that freight rates should be laid down and running rights given to competing railways, an important step would be taken towards the solution of the transportation problem. I am not asking for anything very radical; I am only asking something in the line of railway reform, and Canada is in a much better position than perhaps any other country in the world to grant railway reform. We have not gone too far in granting privileges here; we still have a state railway

of our own and we have undoubted powers over other railways. The powers of this Parliament are much greater than the power of the Congress of the United States in regard to railways. The Interstate Railway Commission of the United States has been almost ruined because Congress had not the authority to give extensive powers to such a railway commission, but this Parliament is seized of full control over the railways and can regulate them not only on a general basis but in special railway Acts as they come before us. It is to that end and that end alone that I have raised this question. The only feasible way to get this railway reform is to tackle each railway Bill as it comes up and have a clause inserted in it to protect the public. I appeal to the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, if I am asking for an unfair thing in the position I am taking. The motion of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood), a supporter of the Government, is, that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again, so that we may receive information, which we will have in a few days, as to the action of the Manitoba Government.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bain). The question is now on section 4 of the Bill, and the amendment of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean).

Mr. MACLEAN. Seeing the decision of the House, I will withdraw this amendment, on the understanding that the House is now in possession of notice that I will move to incorporate this amendment when the third reading of the Bill comes up.

Section 4 agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment.

And Mr. Speaker having taken the Chair :

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall the Bill be read the third time ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Now.

Mr. MACLEAN. Not now. I wish to move an amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You can settle that now.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, we will not settle it now. There are gentlemen who wish to speak on this question, who are not in the House to-day ; I can name half a dozen.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is : When shall this Bill be read the third time ? That is the question I shall put to the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Now.

Mr. MACLEAN. Not now.

The PRIME MINISTER. Now.

Mr. MACLEAN.

Mr. SPEAKER. Those in favour of reading this Bill now, will please say "aye."

Mr. MACLEAN. Have I the floor, Mr. Speaker ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question before the House is : Whether the third reading shall be now or at a later sitting ? Those in favour of it being read now, please say "yea."

Mr. MACLEAN. I ask that it be not read now.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have asked for the "ayes" and "nays" on the question. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) will have the right to vote on that question. The hon. gentleman cannot at this stage interrupt when the yeas and nays are being taken. Those in favour of the Bill being read now, will please say "yea," and those against please say "nay."

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the yeas have it.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will have to divide the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Five members have not risen to call for a division.

Mr. MACLEAN. There are five members who will rise.

And five members having risen,

Mr. SPEAKER. Call in the members.

Mr. FOSTER. This seems a very unusual proceeding.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question to be voted on is : Whether the third reading of this Bill shall be proposed now, or shall be proposed at the next sitting of the House. This is not a motion for the third reading, but only as to whether the third reading of the Bill shall be proposed now, and that question it is within the will of the House to settle.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, is it too late to rise to a point of order on the question ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is. The members have been called in.

Mr. FOSTER. A very important point of order arises here ; it differs from our ordinary practice.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is too late now.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to have a reason assigned for it at least.

Mr. SPEAKER. The reason assigned is : That after a Bill has been reported from the committee without amendment, the next question is : When shall the third reading of that Bill take place ? That is the question which I propose to the House now. I quite admit that there never has been to

my knowledge a division on that question before; but the question has been raised now, and I shall settle it by taking a division and calling the yeas and nays. Then the question of the third reading of the Bill will come up afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me one word; we are venturing on a new rule of procedure entirely, and the House is precluded from discussing it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The House is precluded now from any further discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. That is decidedly unfair.

Mr. SPEAKER. I shall refer presently to the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. Very well.

Mr. SPEAKER. Those in favour of further considering this Bill now, will please rise.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bain,	Joly de Lotbinière
Bazinet,	(Sir Henri),
Beattie,	Landerkin,
Elair,	Lang,
Borden (King's),	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bostock,	Lewis,
Britton,	Lister,
Calvert,	Logan,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Macdonald (Huron),
Casey,	McGregor,
Champagne,	McGugan,
Christie,	McHugh,
Copp,	McIsaac,
Costigan,	McMillan,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Malouin,
Dechène,	Morrison,
Domville,	Mulock,
Ellis,	Paterson,
Ethier,	Penny,
Fitzpatrick,	Pettet.
Flint,	Ratz.
Fortin,	Savard,
Fraser (Guysboro'),	Scriven,
Haley,	Sifton.
Heyd,	Somerville.
Hughes,	Sutherland.
Hurley,	Talbot, and
Hutchison,	Wood (Hamilton).—56.
Jameson,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bell (Pictou),	Kaulbach,
Bennett,	LaRivière,
Bergeron,	Macdonald (King's),
Bianchard,	Mardonell (Selkirk),
Broder,	Maclean.
Burnett,	McAllister.
Cargill,	McCleary,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Mills.
Davin,	Moore.
Davis,	Oliver,
Douglas,	Pope.
Erb,	Richardson,
Foster,	Rosamond,
Gillies,	Semple.

Gillet,
Haggart,
Hale,
Hodgins,

Taylor,
Tupper (Sir Chas.), and
Tupper (Sir Charles
Hibbert).—35.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas) has not voted.

Mr. DUGAS. I am paired with the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay); otherwise I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. member for London (Mr. Beatty) voted, and the vote was not recorded.

Mr. BEATTY. I voted for the motion.

Mr. MACLEAN. There was no motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. member vote "yea" or "nay"?

Mr. BEATTY. I voted nay.

Mr. SPEAKER. I declare it carried that the third reading of the Bill be proceeded with now.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before I call the order for the third reading—it will then be after six o'clock—and in order that there may be no possible misunderstanding as to the course I have taken, I wish to read—Rule 47 of the House of Commons provides:

All amendments made in committee shall be reported by the Chairman to the House, which shall receive the same forthwith. After report the Bill shall be open to debate and amendment before it is ordered for a third reading. But when a Bill is reported without amendment, it is forthwith ordered to be read a third time, at such time as may be appointed by the House.

Accordingly when a Bill is reported without amendment, the Speaker puts the question: "When shall the Bill be read a third time?"

I did that.

The Bill is either read a third time immediately, or on a future day, as the House may decide.

The House decided. The only way of eliciting the decision of the House that I am aware of is by a vote on the question, whether the Bill shall be read now and not at a future day. So that the next order of proceeding, when we assemble again, will be the motion for the third reading of this Bill.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some hesitation to submit to the Chair the great importance of having the question of order which arose just before six o'clock, a little more fully discussed. I need not express the confidence that I always feel in the desire of the Chair to deal with all these matters with the strictest possible impartiality. I have no hesitation in saying that no gentleman in this

House, on either side of it, is more anxious than I am to be able on all occasions to support the Chair in the most cordial and hearty manner. But I rise for the purpose of asking your permission to have discussed a point of order which has presented itself, I believe, for the first time since confederation. I believe there has been no occasion since confederation, at all events, so far as I am aware—and I have been for a large part of that time a member of the House—on which it has been found necessary to make a decision such as has just taken place. The question having arisen, therefore, for the first time in over thirty years, and having come very suddenly upon the Chair and upon the House, while feeling the most perfect confidence in the desire of the Chair to make a just and proper decision, I would like to ask if you would have any objection to having the question of order upon that point examined with a little care by gentlemen on both sides of the House, in order that any doubt that might arise on the part of any members of this House might be dispelled.

Mr. SPEAKER. With reference to the observations of the hon. leader of the Opposition, I can only say that I shall be most pleased to have the assistance of the distinguished and experienced members of this House in settling this or any other point of order. Of course, if the question is taken up now, it will have to be with the unanimous consent of the House, which I have no doubt will be freely given. The question is undoubtedly, from one point of view, an entirely new one. At least, the mode of disposition of the question is new; and if any suggestion had been made to me before the question was put to the House, I should certainly have invited the fullest discussion of the question of order, which I hope we shall have now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, there would be no very great difficulty in raising the question at a later stage, when Your Honour would put the question as to the third reading. It seems to me that the point of order might even then be raised, although it would be the same as if taken before.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not quite sure that it could. The ruling of the House stands. I think it would be better to consider it now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am quite satisfied as to that, and if there be no objection, I would call attention to two rules which appear to relate to this subject. Your Honour called attention to Rule 47, and there are one or two authorities mentioned in Dr. Bourinot's book under the heading of Rule 43. These two rules, it may be contended, are to provide against the inexpediency, to say the least of it, of a majority in any Parliament unduly

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

hastening legislation. The general purport and object of these rules seems to be that there shall be abundant time afforded, by preventing a Bill taking its stages too quickly, for all possible or reasonable objections to be considered. Rule 43 of the Commons provides:

Every Bill shall receive three several readings on different days, previously to being passed. On urgent or extraordinary occasions, a Bill may be read twice or thrice, or advanced two or more stages in one day.

And the rule to which Your Honour referred was Rule 47:

All amendments made in committee shall be reported by the Chairman to the House, which shall receive the same forthwith. After report, the Bill shall be open to debate and amendment before it is ordered for a third reading. But when a Bill is reported without amendment, it is forthwith ordered to be read a third time at such time as may be appointed by the House.

It will be admitted by parliamentarians, I think that we must have regard to the construction which these rules have received at the hands of this House, or at the hands of the Parliament from which these rules are taken, rather than to any technical or literal construction of the language of the rules themselves. I think that the object which I have attributed to these rules is a fair one, and the question is, what has been the practice of Parliament in regard, for instance, to this question of urgency, and in regard to the construction of the words, "at such time as may be appointed by the House"? Reading them together, particularly in view of the practice hitherto obtaining in this House, I contend that the construction is that while the House has the power to order such time as it pleases, yet that time cannot be and has not been on the same day on which the stage of the Bill has been taken. That is to say, to give any meaning or effect to these two rules, the language of which expressly states that a Bill may not take more than one stage at one sitting of the House, the true construction of the words in Rule 47 as to the Bill being reported and being read a third time at such time as may be appointed by the House, is that when you put the question as to what time it is the pleasure of the House that the third reading shall take place, that means at what time after this sitting of the House; and that has been the practice observed, I think, without exception. The exceptions in any other regard are mentioned in Dr. Bourinot's book, and I have the references under my hand. Unfortunately, even on that occasion there was no discussion whatever, though a Bill was reported and went to its third reading at the one sitting, being read a third time on division; but there is no suggestion that any point was taken or any objection made regarding the third reading taking place on that occasion. It is unnecessary, I am

sure, for those who intend to follow this point to occupy any considerable time.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. What would you think are the three stages ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman. Here we have on the Order paper this last stage :

Further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Henderson, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 32) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.

I would say that a stage was completed when that order, as it stands, was exhausted by the report of the committee. The next stage would be denoted on the Order paper of the next sitting, and that would be "the third reading of the Bill," or "consideration of the amendments proposed in committee."

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Is not the first reading the first stage, and the second reading the second stage ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the authorities are to the effect that each reading is a stage—the first reading is the first stage ; the second reading is the second stage, and the third reading is the third stage. The order on the Order paper to-day would be the completion of the second stage ; and perhaps, to meet the objection which the hon. gentleman suggests, I might say that this is all the second stage before the third is reached. That is, the three stages are the three readings, and the second stage is not exhausted until the Bill is ready for the third reading. Of course, that is merely an opinion, off-hand, but I think it is reasonable.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the language of Rule 43. In that there is no mention of stages, but only of readings. "Every Bill shall receive three separate readings."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a stronger point than I have suggested. Three readings must take place before the Bill passes.

Mr. SPEAKER. As a matter of fact, the second reading took place a long time ago.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The second reading of that Bill is not, perhaps, technically completed until the Bill stands for its third reading. The second reading is not merely the Bill as it came to the committee, but the Bill as it is really read after having gone through the committee and been put in shape for its third reading. I admit that the technical construction of those two rules might go far against the interpretation I am putting upon them, but I venture to say

that, in the construction of these rules of procedure, both the English authorities and our own pay a great deal of attention to the uniform practice which obtains in Parliament, as indicating the construction put by Parliament itself upon these rules. The Speaker has read, and therefore I need not read the comments in Dr. Bourinot's book on Rule 47, except to show that that rule does not carry one very far when it says :

But when a Bill is reported without amendment, it is forthwith ordered to be read a third time, at such time as may be appointed by the House.

If my construction be correct, that would be on some day other than the day on which that particular stage had been taken I shall go on to pages 636 and 637 of Dr. Bourinot's work. Commenting on Rule 43, he says :

As a rule, Bills in the English Commons pass through their various stages with an interval of a day or two between each.

I call again attention to the expressions "readings" and "stages." The words seemed to be employed indiscriminately in the rule and in the comments, which would seem to indicate that in parliamentary practice they mean one and the same thing.

If a Bill is amended in committee, it will not be considered immediately and read a third time on the same day except under exceptional circumstances.

In this case there was no amendment in committee.

Towards the close of the session, however, Bills which have not been amended in committee are frequently allowed to be read a third time forthwith.

It was in this connection I cited the case in 1879, of the Bill of the Marine Electric Telegraph Company, which was actually on the Sunday considered in committee, not amended, read the third time on division, and passed. The reason was, that this occurred towards the close of the session, when the case was one of urgency ; and there is no record in "Hausard" that any member called attention to the fact and objected to the Bill being read the third time. Dr. Bourinot, in this connection, says :

"It was at the option of any hon. member," said Mr. Speaker Denison on one occasion, "if he thought it inconvenient or improper, to interfere ; but if the body of the House was satisfied that there was no objection, then it had not been unfrequent that a Bill, if it had passed through committee without amendment or objection, should be read a third time and passed on the same day." On the same occasion the mover of the Bill stated that he had given notice on a previous day that he should ask to be allowed to pass the Bill through all its stages on that evening. In fact, in England, as in this country, when urgency can be shown, the House will allow a Bill to pass through several stages (except money Bills, of course), on one day ; but

such occasions seldom arise, and the wise practice is to give full consideration to every measure.

What I would urge is not the technical view, but the view the authorities seem to place upon this, and that is the unwisdom of hastening, against the objection of any men in this House, a Bill through these different stages, the reason being obvious. We should adhere to that practice, except towards the last days of the session, when a case of urgency may arise, and in that case only should that practice be departed from.

The PRIME MINISTER. There can be no objection to a discussion on the point of order which was raised this afternoon, though I do not see any very solid ground for raising a point of order. Rule 43 seems to me to state the case absolutely and clearly. It says that two readings of a Bill cannot take place on the same day, but it does not say that a reading and any other stage which is not a reading, cannot take place on the same day. If a Bill is read the second time, and then considered in Committee of the Whole and reported by the committee on the one day, it cannot be read the third time on that day. But if a Bill is read to-day the second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole, and if the Committee of the Whole do not report to-day, but sit again and report on the following day, there is no rule to prevent the Bill being read the third time on the day when it is so reported. The only thing which the rule prevents is reading the Bill twice on the same day. If the Bill is not reported by the Committee of the Whole on the day when it receives its second reading, but is reported only the following day, is there any reason at all why it should not receive its third reading that same day? That would not be two readings on the one day. And now take the language of the comment upon Rule 47:

Accordingly, when a Bill is reported without amendment, the Speaker puts the question: "When shall the Bill be read a third time?"

My hon. friend says that this means another day. It may or it may not. If the Bill has been read a second time upon the same day, objection can be taken that the Bill cannot be read a third time as that would be contrary to Rule 43. But if it is not, the question is put: "When shall the Bill be read a third time?"

The Bill is either read immediately, or on a future day, as the House may decide.

So far, I think the point of order is not well taken. But I agree with one remark made by my hon. friend—that there should be no undue haste in pressing a Bill to its third reading, but that ample time should be given for the consideration for every measure. But there may be exception to

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

this rule. The reason I pressed that this measure should have its third reading was that it had been before the House several times and had made no progress; it had been talked out once or twice before during the hour allowed for private Bills on Wednesdays and Fridays. This being a day devoted for private Bills I thought it advisable to press this one forward.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) allow me to say that so far from being against the Bill, I am in favour of it on its merits and would have voted for it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I was about to say that I understood that several members of the Opposition were in favour of the Bill and wanted it pressed forward. And when Mr. Speaker put the question: "When shall the Bill be read the third time," I noticed no expression on the part of leading members of the Opposition to have it postponed to another day, and, for my part, I pressed to have it read the third time immediately. Then Mr. Speaker had nothing to do, in my judgment, but to put the question: "Shall the Bill now be read the third time," and that question had to be decided accordingly. It is the first time we have divided upon a question of that nature I admit. Still, though it is the first time, I believe that Mr. Speaker could not have acted in any other manner than he did. But if it be the sense of the House that the Speaker should look into the authorities, I am sure we shall, for our part, be glad to have his opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I shall be glad to have the assistance and advice of other experienced members of the House on this point while it is before the House. I propose to reserve it for further consideration, but I shall be glad of any suggestions that hon. members may offer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I do not rise to prolong the debate, but to call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that I entertained much the same opinion when on the other side of the House as he has expressed, and not once, but many times—I will not say how many, but I think not less than a score—when your predecessor was in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I raised the point and was invariably overruled. I would just like to call the attention of my hon. friend to the rule he has referred to, and he will see that the practice is not, perhaps, that which is generally accepted by members of Parliament.

Our rules do not provide that there must of necessity be three several readings of a Bill on three several days. That matter is left to be ordered by the House, the House being the sole judge.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is in cases of urgency.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is what I mean. Under ordinary circumstances, every Bill shall have three readings on three several days. But that may be dispensed with, not by application of the mover, not by the ruling of the Speaker, but by the determination of the House. If, in the judgment of the House, any urgent or extraordinary case arises, it may direct by majority vote that a Bill shall be read three times on the same day.

Mr. SPEAKER. Not without debate.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. It is the general rule that each Bill be read three times on three several days, but that rule may be overruled by the judgment of the House that the occasion is urgent or extraordinary, and a majority of one may determine that a Bill shall be read three times in one day. But the point I rose to call attention to is the one covered by Rule 47. When a Bill has been considered in committee and reported to the Speaker with amendments, the question whether that Bill shall be read the third time now or to-morrow is not one that admits of debate. There is no principle to be discussed, and it must forthwith be decided. The rule reads:

All amendments made in committee shall be reported by the Chairman to the House, which shall receive the same forthwith. After report, the Bill shall be open to debate and amendment, before it is ordered for a third reading.

So that whenever a Bill comes from a Committee of the Whole amended the question when it shall be read a third time with the amendments made in a committee is a question that may be debated by the House as to whether it shall be read now, next day or a week hence. Why? Because amendments may have been made in committee the object or principle, or purport or scope of which the House may have an opportunity of discussing and deciding upon. Therefore it is open to the House to debate whether it shall read the Bill a third time now or not. The House may want to consider, in view of the amendments, whether it is desirable to read the Bill the third time at once or give time for the consideration of the amendments. But I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that if no amendments are made in committee, it is not open to the House to discuss whether you shall proceed to the third reading or whether the third reading shall be postponed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can they do that without discussion?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They cannot discuss it, but can decide it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where does the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) get his authority for that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will see that my argument is contained within the four corners of the section, the first part of which I have already read. There is an express provision that a Bill amended in committee shall be open to debate and amendment before it is ordered for the third reading.

But when a Bill is reported without amendment, it is forthwith ordered to be read a third time at such time as may be appointed by the House.

I cannot conceive of language being used more clear or definite. I need not say to any lawyer what "forthwith" means, we have had hundreds and thousands of decisions in the law courts upon the meaning of "forthwith." The House may appoint its time for the third reading as it sees fit, but it shall forthwith make the order. The rule appears to my mind as beyond any reasonable controversy that, if a Bill is reported from committee without amendment, when the question is put whether it shall be read a third time to-morrow it is not open to discussion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has not dealt with the point in regard to the Speaker appointing a time for the third reading. There is nothing in the rule which says that the House shall not discuss what time the third reading shall take place.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. If I move to discuss it a fortnight from now, the question might come up in a fortnight and be discussed.

Mr. HAGGART. I may perhaps be permitted, as I have heard discussions on this point several times in the House, to give an opinion on this subject. Rule 43 states:

Every Bill so received shall receive three several readings on different days, previously to being passed. On urgent or extraordinary occasions, a Bill may be read twice or thrice, or advanced two or more stages in one day.

If I remember rightly, Speaker White decided that the committee was one stage.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. I raised that point a dozen times, I thought as the hon. member did that the committee was a stage, but he ruled it was not.

Mr. HAGGART. The reason given is that on urgent and extraordinary occasions the Bill may be read twice or thrice, or advanced two or more stages on one day. The reasons why that is included in the rule are found in May. There were disputes as to the validity of a Bill, and to its taking different stages on the same day. That point was never decided by the courts, and I hold that this clause was intended for that purpose, to remove all doubts as to the validity

of a Bill after passing this House and receiving the sanction of the Crown. The only point that was allowed to be discussed at the time was as to the expediency of reading a Bill immediately, or reading it at a future time. An amendment may be moved to that motion; I think that the later practice in this House and in the House of Commons in England allows greater latitude than that. You can not only discuss the expediency of a motion as to whether a Bill should be read immediately a third time or at a future time, but you can go into the principle of the Bill on that motion. Surely some urgency must be shown why it should be read a third time immediately, that should be shown in debate, and then the Speaker, according to this interpretation, should judge of the urgency of the occasion for its being read immediately, and then put the motion. The question of urgency is one for the Speaker himself to decide, whether the urgency of the occasion is sufficient to put the question to the House. It is to be settled by the great body of the House, the House is to judge of the urgency of the occasion :

"It was at the option of the hon. member," said Mr. Speaker Denison on one occasion, "if he thought it inconvenient or improper, to interfere; but if the body of the House was satisfied that there was no objection, then it had not been unfrequent that a Bill, if it had passed through committee without amendment or objection, should be read a third time and passed on the same day."

I looked up the authority on that question. I saw Mr. Speaker Denison's decision on the question. A gentleman had given notice that he intended to read a Bill a third time that day. He asked the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he had any reasons for objecting to the Bill, and he said he had. Upon that objection Mr. Speaker ruled that the Bill should not be proceeded with, although the Speaker, in his observations upon the question, said that it had been customary when there was urgency of an extraordinary occasion, to read the Bill once or twice upon the same day when the body of the House consented.

Mr. SPEAKER. Would it not mean that the Speaker should have discretion, or might decide what the opinion of the body of the House is, without acting on his own opinion.

Mr. HAGGART. It is for the Speaker to decide upon the urgency before putting the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. As expressed by the body of the House.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). On the last question that has just been raised by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), I beg to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to a decision that has just been placed in my hands by the Prime

Mr. HAGGART.

Minister, and which seems to dispose entirely of the argument of the hon. gentleman :

It is the practice of the House, occasionally, particularly at the end of a session, to take two stages of a Bill at one sitting on the ground of urgency.

The question of urgency is the point.

The question of urgency is a matter for the judgment of the House.

The Speaker has nothing to do with it. That disposes of the argument of the hon. member for Lanark, it seems to me, as to the construction to be put upon Rule 47. Rule 47 reads :

All amendments made in committee shall be reported by the Chairman to the House, which shall receive the same forthwith. After report, the Bill shall be open to debate and amendment, before it is ordered for a third reading. But when a Bill is reported without amendment, it is forthwith ordered to be read a third time at such time as may be appointed by the House.

The House is to determine the time when the Bill is to be read. The question must be put by the Speaker to the House and the House must decide what time is to be appointed. But how is the House to decide it ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Whether tomorrow or a week hence ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Is it to be decided by the Prime Minister or by the leader of the Opposition ? The sense of the House is to be taken by the Speaker putting the question. The question must be put by the Speaker, and in what form is the question to be put ? The Speaker must ask the House for its opinion. How is the Speaker to proceed ? The only thing the Speaker can do is to adopt the proceeding pointed out by Dr. Bourinot, that is to say, to put the question in accordance with the terms of the rule. The Speaker must put the question so as to ascertain what the House means to do, he must put the question in the terms which he adopted this afternoon ; that is to say, When shall the Bill be read the third time ? so that the House may decide the point. It was impossible for the Speaker to do otherwise than to put the question in the form which he put it, so as to ascertain what time the House would appoint for the Bill to be read.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Authorities are not agreed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The whole thing turns, it seems to me, upon the construction of the very plain language in Rule 47.

Mr. DAVIN. Here is an authority that I will give the hon. gentleman. He will find it in the English "Hansard," 184, page 2107

On motion that the Bill be read now the third time,

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH asked whether more notice ought not to have been given when it was intended to pass a Bill through all its stages than the mere motion of a member of the Government? He was only desirous that the House should be on its guard against any infraction of its rules.

Mr. SPEAKER said that in the last days of the session it was not unfrequent that Bills should pass through the House in this manner. It was at the option of any hon. member, if he thought it inconvenient or improper, to interfere; but if the body of the House was satisfied that there was no objection, then it had not been unfrequent that a Bill, if it had passed through committee without amendment or objection, should be read a third time and passed in the same day.

That is an authority for the hon. gentleman. There is another question that surely is raised here, and that is, whether the time that the Bill be read the third time is not debatable?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, that is acknowledged.

Mr. DAVIN. We have not had an opportunity.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Bill is not debatable, nor the principle of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. The time when it was to be read the third time is debatable, and yet the Speaker shut us off to-day from discussing it.

Mr. SPEAKER. With respect to the last statement made by the hon. gentleman, that the Speaker shut the House off from discussing the question of time, I may say that the Speaker cannot wait for ever until hon. members rise to speak to the question when put. Time was given to any hon. member to rise. But after the question had been put, after the yeas and nays had been called for, then the Speaker did not allow and could not allow discussion. I hope the hon. gentleman will not raise another question. No attempt was made to shut out discussion at the right time. I am very much indebted to the House for the benefit of the discussion, and I assure hon. members I will give the question the very best consideration within my power, and will place my views before them on the subject.

Mr. HUGHES. I beg to move the third reading of the Bill respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway.

Mr. MACLEAN. After this discussion on the constitutional issue, I think the House should for a short time return to the real and substantial issue involved in this Bill; and in order to test the feeling of the House, I propose that the Bill shall not now be read the third time, but that it be referred

back to the committee for the purpose of inserting the amendment of which I have given notice. I might call the attention of the House to this: that my desire to secure some kind of Government regulation of this railway and my desire to protect the people of the North-west in respect to tolls that may be charged over this road has been prompted by a very large extent by the expression of public opinion in the North-west; and especially have I been strengthened in that position since I read the debate that took place in this House in 1887. Hon. gentlemen who were members of the House in that year will remember that the great issue before the people at that time was the disallowance by the Federal Parliament of the Manitoba Act looking to railway competition, and if there was any party in this country that sought to make a record on that question it was the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. They came here session after session and belabored the then Government for its refusal to grant Manitoba relief. The Government of the day had disallowed the Manitoba Bill, and the members from the province came down here, man after man, and denounced the Conservative party for having disallowed the Bill; and the discussion that took place on that occasion is well worthy of being recalled on this.

On May 26, 1887, the question was raised by Mr. Watson, who came from the province of Manitoba. He came down specially charged by the people of that province to secure them relief from the grievances of the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman made a very long speech on that occasion, and I intend to read a few extracts from it, because what existed at that time exists to-day. At that time hon. gentlemen opposite, who were then on this side of the House, argued that Parliament should do something to protect the interests of the people of the North-west. Mr. Watson in opening his speech, said among other things, this:

On this particular question of railway construction in Manitoba, we have to-day a unanimous legislature, the members of which feel that, though they may differ on other questions relating to provincial or federal affairs, they are united as to the necessity of railway competition in the interest of the people of that province.

I hope hon. gentlemen who come from Manitoba are still in favour of railway competition, and if they are, they must be satisfied that the only way to secure it is to adopt some such measure as I propose to-day. Mr. Watson went on further to say:

The action of the Government has been the means of ruining certain portions of the province, and from the evidence presented within the last few days of the fact that the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway is in a position to intimidate and coerce the people of the city of

Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba, it is evidently time this House took action in the matter.

They were threatened with coercion in those days, and denounced the Conservatives because they kept them under such burdens, and they appealed to Parliament to give them relief. Now that hon. gentlemen are in power, I ask them to adopt measures that will give the North-west relief and keep the control of those railways in the hands of Parliament, but hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem willing to adopt that course. Mr. Watson went on to say :

But a railroad which is built entirely by the public money of Canada ought to benefit the people of Canada, and this road has not had the desired effect, and has not accomplished the object which was stated to the country it would accomplish when the contract was let. We were informed at that time that by letting this contract to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the company would use their best endeavours to have that country settled.

Here is another passage in Mr. Watson's speech, to which I specially call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, because it involves the very principle I am now suggesting, namely, that the way to afford relief to the North-west is to introduce the Grand Trunk Railway into that country. He said :

We have no wish to divert trade into American channels. We wish to have competition in that country; we wish to have another great Canadian railway there, namely, the Grand Trunk. The people of the east are clamouring for connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, because they have been subjected to a Grand Trunk monopoly. We in the west have been suffering from a Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly, and we want to have the Grand Trunk Railway as a competing line—a road which I do not suppose any one will say is an American railway. I believe its stock is owned entirely by British capitalists.

Then Mr. Watson went on to say :

I believe with competition that country would grow rapidly, and the manufacturers in the east would be better served than they are to-day. I am satisfied that such is the case from conversations I have had with manufacturers in the east, who tell me that they want competition for their freights into the North-west Territories. But we are obliged to ship our wheat by a monopoly railway; and I say that to-day the Canadian Pacific Railway is in a position to make more money out of the carrying of farmers' wheat from the province of Manitoba to Port Arthur than the farmers are in a position to make from growing it. The rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway on wheat carried out of that country are so exorbitant that to-day the farmers are questioning whether it will pay them to produce that fine quality of wheat which our country is capable of producing. Coming to the question of population, we find that it has increased very slowly.

That is the charge of the people of the North-west when they were here objecting to the disallowance. It is the charge that

Mr. MACLEAN.

is being made to-day; that the North-west is not being filled up, that these lands up there are not being settled, and the reason given for that is, that they have not railway competition. The members who made this charge that the country had not been settled, were mainly the Liberals of Canada. Now they have an opportunity to give the North-west protection from railway monopolies, and I do not see that they are taking any advantage of that opportunity. On the question of lumber in which the people of the North-west are largely interested, Mr. Watson said :

On green lumber the rate by the Canadian Pacific Railway from Rat Portage to Winnipeg—a distance of 123 miles—is \$4.50 per thousand feet, while the rate by the Canadian Pacific Railway from Ottawa to Montreal—a distance of 120 miles—is \$1 per thousand feet.

Then he quotes a lot of figures, and says :

This comparison shows that these rates are not fair to the west.

Mr. Watson continued to say :

Now, it might be interesting to the House to give an approximate estimate of what a farmer in Manitoba contributes to the Canadian Pacific Railway for shipping his crop, not to Montreal, but from a central point in the province of Manitoba, say the town of Portage la Prairie to Port Arthur, a distance of about 500 miles. For carrying wheat that distance the company charge 30 cents per 100 pounds, which amounts to a very large percentage of the farmer's crop.

They were charged 30 cents per 100 pounds in 1887; they are now charged 17½ cents per 100 pounds. There is a proposition before the House to make the charge 10 cents per 100 pounds, but if that proposition is to be obtained it is to be secured by an Act of the Manitoba legislature under a deal which is supposed to be going on between the Government of Manitoba and the owners of this railway that is chartered by that province. It shows the importance of having these things specified in the law. There was a grievance in 1887 when the charge was 30 cents per 100 pounds, and that same grievance exists to-day, only the charge is less; but any reduction that has taken place has been the result of legislation. That being so, why not adopt that system now and put in this Bill some specific regulation in regard to these rates. Mr. Watson in his speech quoted what took place in the legislature of Manitoba, as follows :—

Mr. Kirchhoffer, who moved the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, said Mr. Van Horne had promised the building of an extension of the Souris branch. Lately, on being reminded of that promise, he treated Mr. Kirchhoffer to a lecture on the attitude of the province with respect to disallowance, and further intimated that not one foot of branch lines would be built here until the question of taxation of Canadian Pacific property was settled. Mr. Kirchhoffer closed his address as follows :—
“Let us be true to ourselves by patriotic firm-

ness, let us succeed in removing the disabilities under which we labour, let this grinding monopoly, which is squeezing our hearts' blood out of us be broken up, and free trade in railways be established within our borders.

That was the cry in Manitoba in 1887: it is still the cry to-day. Mr. Watson went further, and said:

It is in the interest of the whole Dominion that the province of Manitoba should be allowed free competition in railways.

And he went on to read a great deal about the public opinion in that province as expressed at a meeting in Winnipeg, and as expressed in the legislature. I wish to read one or two of these opinions:

Mr. Kenneth Mackenzie said there could be no two opinions on the question either in Winnipeg or throughout the province. We had a right to build a railway, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway was going to act in such a manner as indicated by Sir George, it was just as well that we knew it at once. It was time this province ceased to be a pack-horse for the rest of the Dominion.

At a meeting at St. Laurent the people there declared, that the one thing the province wished was competition in railways, and in Morris the people declared through one of their speakers:

I am heartily in accord with the decision of the Provincial Government to build a line to the boundary in order to relieve the suffering province from the curse of monopoly.

At a meeting in Brandon, this resolution was passed:

Whereas, competition in railway carriage between Manitoba and the North-west Territories and other provinces of this Dominion is essentially necessary to the natural development of the inter-provincial trade, the fostering of Canadian manufactures, both in the eastern provinces and in Manitoba, the encouragement of foreign capital to seek investment in the development of the North-west, the encouragement of immigration and natural progress of the province generally, all of which would be of great advantage both directly and indirectly to every portion of the Dominion.

That is the very thing to-day. We seek to increase trade between the provinces, to build up the North-west and to build up the manufactures in the east. Here is another statement in the speech of Mr. Watson:

One great reason why we should have this competition, and why we should have connection with the Grand Trunk is the fact that the Grand Trunk runs through almost every constituency in Ontario and down to the lower provinces. We occupy the peculiar position in Manitoba of having four lines of railway tapping at our door for admission. The greatest immigrant agents that a country can have, as a rule, are the railway companies. The Grand Trunk to-day is an immigration agent for the western states, because they have no interest in our territory to the west, and you will find in their offices immigration pamphlets for North Dakota, Cheyenne and Minnesota. The Grand Trunk Company state they have no interest in carrying passen-

gers to the North-west. If we had railway competition our country would fill up more rapidly. I would not like to prophesy, as the Minister of Finance did, in 1884, that we should have a large immigration there in a very short time, but I believe that the population would double in two years.

Do hon. gentlemen from the North-west know that what Mr. Watson said I believe to be true to-day, and it is truer now than it was then, namely, that if the Grand Trunk had entrance into Manitoba and the North-west it would bring to them more settlers than any other railway line in this country. Mr. Watson continued:

The price we receive for our grain is not sufficient to induce farmers to raise larger quantities of it, as they would did not the Canadian Pacific Railway charge exorbitant rates for freight.

And so the debate went on, and one of the speakers who denounced the action of the Conservative party at that time, in disallowing these Bills was Sir Richard Cartwright, now Minister of Trade and Commerce. That hon. gentleman said:

I say the true policy, if they could have risen to the level of the situation and understood their duty to the country, in the way of developing the North-west, was to encourage all roads which were willing to go in there. I say that this policy of attempting to exclude the North-west absolutely and entirely from all connection with the country to the south is a policy which could have but one of two results.

He continued:

Sir, the fact of the matter is this: that at this present moment one of the main reasons why immigration will not go to Manitoba, and why men are deserting Manitoba, though possibly the feeling may be overstrained, is the persistence of the Government in preserving this very monopoly.

He further says:

I say there is but one thing the hon. gentleman can do which would be of the slightest real service to the people of this country, and that is to contribute, as far as he can, to fill up this country. * * * The very best thing the Government can do is to allow these people to construct railways, under existing circumstances.

There was another very high authority, a man who championed the rights of the North-west in this House, the Hon. Edward Blake, he made a speech on the occasion and denounced the Conservative party for keeping the people of the North-west in the bonds of railway monopoly. He said:

The facts are that you have there some six score thousands of whites, who are struggling, who are discontented, and who are calling on you to-day for relief, who are asking you to-day for the liberty to live and to prosper.

And again:

That is the question of that portion of their policy which involves the keeping of the North-west in bondage to one railway company. Now it is time that the truth should be heard and

should prevail in this matter, and the truth is that the North-west requires relief in order to its having a chance, a fair and reasonable chance to succeed.

Mr. Blake at that time proposed that the real relief for the people of the North-west was by competition to Thunder Bay, and he quoted from a former speech of his, in which he said :

We are bound, in my opinion, by the most obvious duty to our country, to see that the singular advantages which the Thunder Bay road gives, of taking down the wheat of the North-west to the seaboard, and taking up the manufactures of the east to the North-west at moderate rates, shall be used not to give still larger profits to a railway company, but to secure cheap transports to the public, whose money has paid for that road, and who will have, for generations, to bear the burden of the interest due to it. * * * You not merely do secure, but you prevent designedly, the possibility of competition, and the hon. Minister seems rather to congratulate himself that he has secured a consolidation of interests with the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway Company, so that this very line of railway to Thunder Bay, which the people of the North-west were looking for, and hoping for, and praying for, is closed to them as a means of relief, and the syndicate is to control every gateway to the North-west.

Mr. Blake at that time was most anxious that the railway should be controlled by the people, and in the interests of the people of the North-west. He went on further to say:

We offered amendments with respect to the Sault line, with respect to the monopoly clause, with respect to controlling immigration and with respect to these avenues west and south of the North-west, those gateways, one then constructed and another almost constructed from Winnipeg to Pembina, and from Selkirk to Port Arthur, and the right to keep them open by the Government and give running powers to other corporations should be preserved.

There is the question of running powers outlined by Mr. Blake, who at that time claimed that they should be maintained for all the railways that demanded them. Mr. Watson, in his closing speech in the debate, said :

Do away with this policy of disallowance, and give us free competition in railways, and allow the Grand Trunk to be an immigration agent for that country as well as the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in the very near future you will see the country filled up with a good class of people, happy and contented.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the House will see, from these quotations, that the members from the North-west in 1887 came here and made out a good case. They succeeded eventually in having the railway disallowance removed, and in that way they brought considerable relief to their country. Another opportunity has presented itself to-day in connection with this Bill, and I ask the House to adopt my amendment, in order to protect the interests of both the people of the North-west and the people of the east.

Mr. MACLEAN.

As I told the House this afternoon, I have made no radical proposition. I ask the Minister of Railways to say why he put a similar clause to this in the Crow's Nest Pass Bill, while he refuses to put it in this Bill. The Crow's Nest Pass Railway got a bonus of over \$3,000,000. This road, before it is completed, will have Government bonuses of over \$4,000,000. If the people were protected in the case of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, I cannot, for the life of me, see why they cannot be protected in connection with this railway. The only practical legislation here in regard to railways seems to be to grant them bonuses. As to protecting the rights of the people, nothing is done. Picking up to-night's paper, I read the following in regard to the object of a deputation which has just come to this city :—

Thos. Marks, Col. Ray and other Port Arthur citizens saw the Government yesterday and urged that the maximum bonus of \$6,400 per mile should be granted to the Ontario and Rainy River Railway. It will be remembered that last session an Act was passed providing that this amount might be given to any railway costing over a certain sum per mile which had previously been voted the minimum subsidy of \$3,200 per mile.

Here are these men asking that this railway shall be given \$6,400 a mile. If it is necessary to give this road this much money I am willing, so far as I am concerned, that it should get it; but it should get it only on terms, and when the money is given, the terms should be made. The Minister of Railways announced, a few days ago, that he was willing that the Grand Trunk Railway should be given running rights over this road. What objection, then, has he to incorporate that in the Bill, as it is incorporated in my proposal? What objection has he, in view of the fact that his own political friends, in 1887, stated in this House that the thing that would build up the North-west would be to introduce the Grand Trunk Railway into that country? I cannot see, for the life of me, why there should be any objection to the insertion of my amendment in the Bill. Its words are exactly the words used in the Crow's Nest Pass Bill, that running rights over this railway shall be given to the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Government Railway system, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to any other railway, and it also provides for the Government regulation of rates. How can hon. gentlemen opposite, in view of the declarations made by the members of the Liberal party in 1887, refuse to adopt this reasonable proposition? It is a very plain and simple amendment, and it is in the line of railway progress. In answer to those gentlemen who urge that any proposal in regard to railway reform in this country must be sweeping and general in its nature, and must be brought about by some Government elected upon that question as one of its cardinal principles, I would

say, it is true, we are promised a railway commission, and the sooner that comes the better; but in the meantime, let us take every reasonable and proper step to protect the country from monopoly and secure competing lines, if the country demands them; and especially, if we grant to a railway company large sums of public money, let us provide that the railway shall give running powers, and not pass into the hands of any monopoly. I pointed out, this afternoon, that there is no provision that this railway, to which we are giving \$9,000 a mile, shall not pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We want a line of railway through that country, not merely for the purpose of opening up the mining districts, but for the purpose of competition; and, if it will not afford us competition, we are throwing our money away, and it would be far better to put it into a more remunerative project. I again appeal to the House, especially to hon. gentlemen opposite, to have this proposal of mine incorporated in the measure now before the House. I therefore beg to move:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee to add the following clauses to said Bill:—

3. That running powers over the said railway and all its branches and connections, or any portions thereof, and all lines of railway now hereafter owned or leased by or operated on account of the company between Lake Superior and the city of Winnipeg, and the necessary use of its tracks, stations and station grounds are hereby expressly conferred on the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Government Railway system, the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other road designated by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or the Parliament of Canada upon such terms as such committee or the Parliament of Canada may determine, and according to the provisions of the Railway Act, and of such other general Acts relating to railways as are from time to time passed by Parliament, but nothing herein shall be held to imply that such running powers might not be so granted without the special provisions herein contained.

That so soon as the said railway or any portion of it is opened for traffic, the rates and tolls on the railway, and on any other railway or steamers used in connection therewith and now or hereafter owned or leased by or operated on account of the company, shall be first approved by the Governor in Council, or by a railway commission, if and when such commission is established by law, and shall at all times thereafter and from time to time be subject to revision and control in the manner aforesaid.

That two cents shall be the maximum passenger rate per mile over the said railway or any of its connections between Lake Superior and Winnipeg.

That the maximum freight charged on the articles hereunder mentioned shall be as follows between Winnipeg and Port Arthur:—

	Cents.	
Grain of all kinds, per hundred pounds..		
Live stock	do	..
Agricultural implements	do	..
Iron of all kinds	do	..
Meats of all kinds	do	..

and rates pro rata from any shorter hauls over said railway.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is a number of blanks in that motion.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will fill them in when we get into committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Before the motion is put I would like to say a few words on the question. It has been pointed out that clause 4 of the Bill under discussion covers the ground very fully and does away with the necessity of the amendment which my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) has moved. With the permission of the House I shall read the clause:

Any Act hereafter passed for the purpose of controlling railway companies incorporated by or subject to Parliament as to the issuing of stock or bonds, and as to rates or tolls and the regulation thereof, and as to running powers over or other rights in connection with the railway of any company by any other company, and the exercise of powers conferred upon railway companies, shall apply to the company from the time such Act goes into effect; but this section shall not be construed to imply that such Act would not apply to the company without the enactment of this section.

The last paragraph of that clause is considerably involved and rather difficult to understand, but as regards the clause itself, it seems to me that it would be much better in the interest of the people to put a provision in the Bill at the present time, instead of depending upon any future legislation, giving us power to extend running privileges over that road to the Grand Trunk Railway, the Government system of railways, and the Canadian Pacific Railway. We established a precedent for that when granting a charter to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway last session. In that Act we inserted a clause providing that, on application being made, running powers would be given over the line to any railway, by the Governor General in Council. Following that precedent, might it not be better to put a similar clause into this Bill and have the matter settled. Aid is to be given, I understand, this session to this road. It is always a safe thing, when making your bargain, to exact what conditions you desire. It is all very well to say that some future legislation will be passed at some indefinite period, which will control this company, but in the meantime the company will have secured a subsidy in the vicinity of \$9,000 a mile, and it seems to me now is the proper time to make our conditions. A man who is selling a horse does not say to the man who is buying it: You shall give me something else at some future time, but exacts his pound of flesh when making the bargain. While this clause I have read indicates that something may be done, it gives us no assurance that anything will be done, and I would urge the Government to consent to this amendment requiring running powers to be given the Cana-

dian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Government system of railways.

I may say, in connection with the entire road from Manitoba to Lake Superior, that one of the great difficulties which the Manitoba Government has had to contend against is the fact that if they did give any considerable amount of aid—and it was promised to give a very large subsidy to a competing line to Lake Superior—they could not ensure to the people of Manitoba the absolute independence of the railway to say Duluth, a point in the United States; and I am free to say that it was that fact that they could not ensure the independence of the road nor absolutely secure running powers to any other road, that made it practically impossible for Mr. Greenway to carry out the deal which he had with an American syndicate to construct a railway to the town of Duluth. We have now before Parliament a proposition to build a railway from Fort William to Winnipeg and the west, and thus extend to the wheat raisers of Manitoba and the territories the benefit of railway competition, and it seems to me that this will be the only competing road that will ever be built through that country, because the construction of railways there is a very difficult and expensive operation. What guarantee has the country that even if we give \$9,000 per mile to this line, it will not fall into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as almost all other railway lines in that country have? But if we place this clause in the charter, extending running powers to the Canadian Pacific Railway, Grand Trunk Railway and the Government line of railways, it seems to me that that will accomplish all we ask for. We will then absolutely control the road, so that even if it should pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Governor General in Council or the railway commission will have power to extend running facilities to competing lines, and that will preserve to that country for all time a competing road to the Canadian Pacific Railway from the head of the great chain of lakes to the wheat fields of Manitoba and the North-west. This, I apprehend, will probably be the last opportunity this House will ever have of absolutely protecting the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west, and it is our bounden duty to prevent this line falling into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway has already a sufficiently strong grip on that country, and I believe I voice the opinion of ninety-nine one-hundredths of the people of Manitoba and the Territories, when I declare that the time has come to meet the Canadian Pacific Railway and at every step we take protect and safeguard the interests of Manitoba and the North-west.

We are not sure then we are going to have a railway commission. I had fondly hoped that we should have had such a

Mr. RICHARDSON.

commission this session, but from hints dropped we may take it for granted that we are not going to have a commission this session. I feel that if we are not going to have a railway commission to control the Canadian Pacific Railway and these other railways to relieve the settlers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories from the elevator monopoly and the grain combine, it is absolutely necessary to meet these companies at every step and safeguard the public interest by legislation whenever we have the opportunity. I do not know that I would go the entire length of the amendment my hon. friend from East York has moved. For instance, I do not know that I would agree to declare for a 2-cent rate for that country. But I feel with my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) with regard to that matter—that if the books of the company are exposed to Government inspection at stated times, and it is found that they are making more than 6 per cent on the absolute cost of the railway, then the rates should be lowered. I am against watered stock and against giving the companies power to bond the roads to such large amounts as to be practically ruinous to the people in making it necessary to charge such high rates to meet the fixed and other charges of the road. I would not favour the 2-cent rate if it made it impossible, or even extremely difficult, for the company to float its bonds and thus be hampered by its operations.

Now, with regard to the grain rate, I understand from conversations I have had with members to whom the hon. member for East York has spoken, that he proposes to fix the grain rate at 10 cents per cwt. from Winnipeg to Fort William. I can say that for the last year or two I have made a study of grain rates. When Mr. Greenway announced that he had practically completed arrangements with an American syndicate to build a road from Winnipeg to Duluth, it was stated to be one of the conditions that a rate of 10 cents per cwt. on wheat from Winnipeg to the head waters of Lake Superior was secured. We in the west who have fought so long against the high rate the Canadian Pacific Railway have charged—as high, if I heard my hon. friend reading correctly, as 30 cents per cwt.—have had the satisfaction of seeing the rate reduced to 17½ cents per cwt. We claim that this is still much too high, and the people of the North-west and Manitoba have been persistent in their agitation to secure a reduction to, say, 12½ cents per cwt. The Board of Trade of Winnipeg and other bodies made persistent representations to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the agitation was continued in other ways in hope that by the present time we should have secured this rate of 12½ cents per cwt. One of the conditions of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway is that we are to secure,

by virtue of the aid which the Dominion has voted to that enterprise, a reduction of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents this year and $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents in the coming fall, making a reduction of 3 cents, leaving the charge at $14\frac{1}{2}$ cents in 1899. But our people feel that that is not low enough. Long before Mr. Greenway announced this rate of 10 cents per cwt., our people were contending for a reduction to $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents per cwt., which they thought would be ample. But, though no definite announcement has been made, we have been led to believe, and though I have no definite information on the subject myself, I believe that Mr. Greenway has an arrangement—I do not know how far it has advanced—with the Rainy River people, whoever they are, which will secure a wheat rate of 10 cents per cwt. from Winnipeg to Lake Superior. If that is so, I cannot see how any injury will be done by making that rate a condition of the present charter. I said a moment ago that I had made a study of what it would cost to carry wheat from Winnipeg to Lake Superior. When Mr. Greenway made his announcement that he would secure a rate of 10 cents per cwt. a discussion arose and many people declared it absolutely impossible to carry wheat at that rate. A number of us who were interested, obtained figures from railway corporations, and found that wheat was actually carried in some cases for 10 cents per cwt. for equal distances, and even lower in one or two cases. There seems to me no reason at all why it could not be carried at that rate in this case. Let us see what the Canadian Pacific Railway itself has done with regard to that point. The rate from Winnipeg to Fort William, as I have said, is $17\frac{1}{2}$ cents, and the distance something like 400 miles. But what is their rate from Fort William to Montreal, a distance of about 1,400 miles? Until a recent date their rate was 28 cents per cwt., but a few months ago they cut it to 20 cents per cwt. So they are actually carrying wheat 1,400 miles for 20 cents a hundred. You will easily see that if with this they have been able to pay such handsome dividends as they have been doing, surely they can carry wheat from Winnipeg to Fort William for 10 cents per cwt.

With regard to rates on other classes of freight which my hon. friend has inserted in his motion, I am not in a position to speak, but I understand that, in any bargain which the Manitoba Government may make, they will make an effort, not only to secure a reasonable rate on wheat, but also a low rate on coal, and I hope, on fruit, and probably some other things. Now, I do not wish to play the demagogue in this House or anywhere else, but, as representing an agricultural constituency, I would be very glad, indeed, to see introduced into this Bill a provision, for example, like that put into the Crow's Nest Pass Bill, for carrying agricultural implements at reduced rates. Also,

it would be a great boon to the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, if they could secure a low rate on fruit. Fruit is one of the great necessities of that country. Apart from a few wild fruits that are native to that country, the people are absolutely deprived of fruit, except what has been brought in from other ports, and fruit has always been very expensive. I heard of one case, for the truth of which I cannot vouch, but I will give it for what it is worth—of a farmer who gave a bushel of wheat for one pound of bananas. The story serves to illustrate how very expensive fruit is to the people of that country. They grow scarcely anything beyond the wild fruits, except of course such small fruits as currants and gooseberries. They have no apples, no peaches, no bananas, no oranges, nor fruits of that kind. If we could secure a low rate on fruit, it would be a great boon to the people of that country, and I should be very glad if the Government could see its way clear to insert a clause providing for low rates on that line of products. Now, let me illustrate the advantage of inserting such a clause as is asked for by the hon. member for East York, which will give running powers to other railways over this proposed line. When the Manitoba Government introduced the Northern Pacific and Manitoba system into that country some years ago, we had looked for great things in the matter of competition. We secured considerable reductions all along the line; I think I am safe in saying that the average reduction was at least 25 per cent below the freights then charged, and we secured a reduction on the grain rate from Winnipeg to Fort William, from 21 to 19 cents per hundred. Three cents reduction on the output of wheat in that country, as the House can figure it out for themselves, represents a saving to the farmers of that country of about \$500,000 a year. We looked for more, but unfortunately the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is perhaps the most shrewdly managed corporation on this continent, seems to have been able to suggest reasons to the Northern Pacific Company why active competition should not be carried on, and the result seems to have been an agreement whereby they both charge equal rates. But the introduction of that system did secure a considerable and satisfactory reduction of rates at the time. But, in connection with that contract, the Manitoba Government had just such a clause inserted as we ask should be inserted here. The government in Manitoba, by virtue of the aid which it gave to that corporation, has power to grant running powers to any other line of railway which may enter that country, and that is where a great advantage to the people of the west will be derived from the introduction of this Rainy River Railway system. When that system reaches Winnipeg, they can secure running powers from the Manitoba Government over

what is known as the Portage Branch, belonging to the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway, a branch extending from Winnipeg to Portage la Prairie, and it can also secure running powers from Winnipeg down to Emerson, the point at the boundary reached by the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway. From Morris, a point midway between Winnipeg and the international boundary, it can secure running powers over what is known as the Morris and Brandon Branch, tapping one of the best wheat-producing districts in the province of Manitoba. By virtue, I say, of these running powers, we can have this competition that is so desirable, extended to a very considerable portion of the province of Manitoba. I think the distance is 25 miles from Portage la Prairie to Gladstone, and, if we construct this link, or secure running powers over the Manitoba and the North-western Railway, we can connect the Northern Pacific and Portage Branch with what is known as the Dauphin Railway system, controlled by Mackenzie & Mann. By building that link, or securing running powers from the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway, we would be able to extend competition to the north-western portion of Manitoba, a very rich portion of the province indeed, not so good a wheat-producing country as southern Manitoba, but an excellent grazing country, and likewise a very good grain-producing country. I think I need go no further in this connection. I think the members of the House will understand the desirability of making our protection complete. This is the time of all times when we should exact the concessions we so much desire in that country. While clause 4 indicates that some possible legislation may be passed in the indefinite future, the danger is, that in the meantime the company will issue its bonds and will go on under its fixed charters, and we will not be able to pass any legislation that will be of any benefit in protecting the people in this respect. If Manitoba and the North-west are to be protected, are to have competition in that country, it is absolutely essential that the independence of this Ontario and Rainy River Railway should be insured to the people of that country. It is probable that we never can give aid to any other railroad in that country, because it costs too much, and we have the Manitoba Government, the Ontario Government and the Dominion Government combining to give sufficient aid to build a competing railroad in that country that is so much needed. Now is the time to see that a clause is inserted that will preserve the independence of that railway for all time to come. I trust, Mr. Speaker, the Government will see that such precautions are taken, for they mean considerable to the people of the North-west.

Mr. MACLEAN. With the consent of the House, I will withdraw the 2-cent clause, so as to make the issue before the House the

Mr. RICHARDSON.

one relating to Government control of running rights and Government regulation of rates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have been exceedingly reluctant to make any remarks upon this Bill at its present stage, not because I felt any reluctance in making an explicit declaration of my own views, and of what I thought were the views of the Government, upon the general question which hon. gentlemen have been discussing, but for the reason that this whole subject has been thoroughly threshed out, over and over again, before the very large Railway Committee of this House. I do think that my hon. friend for East York (Mr. Maclean) owes something to this House. I think it is due to hon. members here who are interested in pushing the business of the country with all reasonable speed, that he should not take every convenient opportunity of raising the same discussion, of forcing the same argument, and compelling the same explanations at every stage which it is possible for the Bill to take. The hon. member for East York, before the Railway Committee, ventilated his views precisely as he has ventilated them here. Upon that occasion, I stated to the hon. gentleman that personally, and I think the Government were of the same view, I in the fullest degree sympathized with the desire of the people of that country that the amplest control should be retained and exercised by Parliament over all these railway corporations. Not only with respect to the subject of running rights by other companies over the line of the particular railway corporation then seeking a charter, but in respect also to the issuing of its bonds and watering of its stock, and also to the rates and tolls which it might impose in respect to its franchise. I stated to the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment, that his amendment was not going to carry us one step further than the law on the Statute-book and the amendment which was added as the 4th section of the Bill. I stated to the hon. gentleman, and I think to the entire satisfaction of the committee, because it was pushed no further at that time, the reasons why I felt warranted in putting that view before that large committee. The hon. gentleman is not moved in his present action, in my opinion, with a desire to effect a remedy for some existing grievance, but in order that he may appear before the country at large as the sole and only champion in regard to railway rates. The hon. gentleman's whole conduct, I am sorry to say is the outcome of pretense. He surely knows that he does not monopolize all the interest shown by members of Parliament on this important question. He knows perfectly well that if a question arises in this Parliament in which the impropriety of excessive rates imposed by a company comes up, the members of this Parliament would deal with the question almost as a unit, and

not deal with it in the interest of the railway companies concerned, but in the interest of the people at large, having also proper regard for those considerations which arise in connection with railway venture, where men have invested their money, as well as in any other undertaking in which capital has been invested. I say, therefore, I am not willing that the hon. gentleman should appear before this House or spread himself before the country as having more sympathy than other hon. members with railway interests in the North-west, for I notice he is taking the North-west under his capacious wing, and his heart is now beginning to bleed for the North-west; that he is not the only one who feels sympathy with the North-west, and he is not the only member of this House. If any practicable remedy is available, something which judgment, discretion and wisdom would suggest as an adequate remedy, who would be found supporting it in Parliament. As I have said, there would be a unity of sentiment on that question when it properly arose.

Let us see where the hon. gentleman is on this proposition. I do not think he has used this House quite fairly—though he probably did not so intend to treat the House—because three or four hours ago when the House was in committee on the Bill, the hon. gentleman declined to move his amendment, and announced that he would bring it up on the third reading; and yet the hon. gentleman is now giving notice that he will move that the House resolve itself back into committee, where it was three or four hours ago, in order to take up a question, of which it was fully seized then, with which it could have dealt as effectively then as now. But he did not choose to do so, for what reason I cannot conceive. The hon. gentleman should consult with some discreet friend, if there is any one willing to consult with him, in order to avoid making himself, I will not say ridiculous, but in order to avoid acting in such a way as a person would not act who was dealing with a business question in a business way. The hon. gentleman said: Why does not the Minister of Railways consent to incorporate in this Bill the same provisions as were inserted in the Crow's Nest Pass Railway Bill? I explained to the hon. gentleman in committee the reasons, and he is the only one who did not appear to be able to comprehend the explanation, and I stated that there was no analogy between the Crow's Nest Pass Railway Bill and this proposed legislation. Wherein does the difference lie? Last year we were dealing with an exceptional case, the case of a railway company to which we were giving more than the ordinary subsidy; we were dealing with a corporation which by law had the right, free entirely from the control of Parliament, to maintain its rates until it realized a certain fixed percentage as its dividend. For that reason, in order that we might get the company into a contractual relation with us on this question,

and to induce the company to forego some of the rights they possessed under the former contract and under the law, a very large subsidy was given, and we entered into a contract with them, one clause of which provided that there should be a certain percentage of reduction in the existing rates, and there were other clauses touching the question of running rights. That was a case of contract. This is not a case of contract. We had to get the Canadian Pacific Railway into the contractual relation with the Government and secure their assent to reduce those rates before we were able to pass legislation to reduce such rates. The law last session made this contract legal, and it was in consideration of a large subsidy, given to the Crow's Nest Pass road, that the contract between the Government and the company was entered into. There is no analogy between that case and this. If Parliament desires to annex any conditions to the legislation proposed in regard to this company, we may do so. This course is quite open to any hon. member to propose. It appears the desire of the company is that Parliament should grant them a subsidy of a fixed amount rather than a subsidy under the general Act, which involves conditions that, they say, precludes the company from successfully financing their undertaking. If they come to Parliament or if the Government move this House to grant the request of the company, then it will be quite open to Parliament to say that it will annex as a condition of that grant thus and so in the agreement. There is no analogy between the cases referred to, and there is no hon. member, except the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), who does not see the difference between the case of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway and the application of the company now before the House.

The hon. gentleman says: Why do you not agree that the Grand Trunk Company shall have running rights over this road? The hon. gentleman insisted on my answering a question as to whether the Grand Trunk Company have not applied for running rights over the road. I looked at the hon. gentleman seriously—I thought he was perpetrating a joke. I could not think that he seriously meant, when he thus asked the question, that I would answer such an inquiry. When he asked a second time, I answered, no. I said the Grand Trunk had not made application to me nor to my department, nor, so far as I was aware, to any member of the Government, asking for running rights over this road. Imagine the general manager communicating such request to me at this stage. General Manager Hays would conclude that I would regard him as bordering on an insane condition if he asked the Government to grant him running rights over the line of a company, which has not struck the first blow for the construction of their road and might never build the railway, so that

there could be running rights over it. If the Grand Trunk Railway have it in their mind that hereafter when this road is built, it would be an advantage to them to get running rights over it, I apprehend they will make the application; but they will wait until the time comes, and when, if the application is granted, it can be acted upon. They will not jump while this thing is in the air; while it is a mere matter of contingency as to whether the road will have existence or not. There is ample time. They have two years to build the eighty miles according to the clause adopted in the amendment, and if the Grand Trunk Railway want running rights over the eighty miles, it will be time enough two years hence to apply for them. I will assure this House as I assured the committee, that so far as I am concerned, so far as the Government is concerned, the moment the Grand Trunk Railway Company asks for running rights over this road they will get them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) is under a misconception with regard to the meaning of the fourth clause of this Bill, and as to the state of the law bearing on that question. The fourth clause, you will remember, is the clause which provides that any Act which may hereafter be passed by Parliament relating to the governmental control of railways shall apply to and shall govern and control this company, for any of these purposes enumerated in the clause. Why was that clause put there? I will tell you why. It was not put there because I as a lawyer felt that it was legally and absolutely necessary to put it there; but it was put there at my suggestion in the Railway Committee, because I thought it would be expedient to give notice to anybody and everybody who might be thinking of investing in any of these undertakings which were incorporated by Parliament that Parliament retained its control in all these particulars over that undertaking. That clause was inserted more by way of notice and warning than anything else. But, Mr. Speaker, if we have the right to impose on one company the burden of submitting to running rights by another company over its roads, we do not have it so much by this section as we have it by the general Railway Act, which in this respect applies to all railway companies that are incorporated by Parliament. If I were to be called upon to give a professional opinion upon the question, I would say that in the absence of that fourth clause from the Bill, there would be no doubt as to the right of Parliament to pass any Act of a general character for the governmental control of railways; and that the railways would become by reason of the passing of that Act, subject in these respects to the control of Parliament. It appears to me that

Mr. BLAIR.

my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) is under the misapprehension, that it is necessary to incorporate in this particular Act, a provision that these companies will have the right to use these tracks and run over these other roads, in order that that right may be sure. That is not really so, and I think that those hon. members who are not professional gentlemen, who have not had experience in the drafting of Acts and the meaning of these laws, must yield their judgment on these points to those who have had that experience. My opinion on this matter is, I believe, concurred in by all and I venture to say that there is no legal gentleman upon either side of the House who will express any doubt upon that question. We do not want to make this legislation ridiculous, by inserting provisions, which when they are read by courts or read by persons who are learned in the law, will show that they are senseless, and useless and that they could not have been passed upon by persons who have had experience in respect to these matters. It appears to me therefore that there is no reason whatever for the introduction of the amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean). I will take the first clause of it, that which relates to the question of running rights, and I say there is no reason whatever why this clause should be incorporated in this Bill, any further than it is already incorporated in the fourth section. How much stronger are you going to make the power of Parliament, how much stronger are you going to guarantee the right of the Grand Trunk Railway to use this track by naming it in the Act, than it is under the general clause, that Parliament may give, or a railway commission if it is constituted may give the Governor General in Council may give running rights to any company. That provision in the General Railway Act includes all companies that may apply for it, and if it did not, why this very section in the amendment would be defective because it only names specifically three railways, and who is going to assume that there may not be other railway companies than those named which will be in existence some day in the future. A great many years go to make up the future; and twenty years hence, thirty years hence, fifty years hence; there may be half a dozen other trunk lines of railway that might want to use these very tracks, and if this clause which is found in the Railway Act, and which is repeated in section 4 of this very Bill; if this clause is inefficient because it does not enumerate the railways; then this clause in the amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) is inefficient, because in so far as any specific mention is made, it is limited to these three railways.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) allow me to ask him: if the clause in the General Railway Act provides that the Governor in Council shall fix or control the rates on which running pow-

ers shall be granted to another railway company over this line ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the Railway Act says that the Governor in Council or the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, may fix or determine the terms upon which these rights are exercised.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then the Governor in Council would be able to control the rates ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Act says the Governor in Council may control the rates. Unquestionably the General Railway Act says that, and so far as any general legislation can go—outside of the advantage which might accrue from the constitution of a railway commission—we have gone already by existing legislation. I confess to you that I myself am not very much enamoured of the sufficiency of the machinery, of the sufficiency of the power, which can be exercised by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or by the Governor General in Council. But this amendment does not help that. This amendment which is now being moved does not enhance the advantages, either one way or the other, which would accrue from the constitution of a railway commission. I say that if we adopt this amendment it would not be creditable legislation. I venture to say there is not a legal gentleman in this House who has had this proposed amendment before him, who has advised the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) that it is a proper amendment to move, or that it would be a creditable amendment if it were adopted into legislation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) probably has jumped at this; it serves for a purpose. I am bound to say that after all the explanations the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean has had made to him, I think he ought to have accepted them, and I believe I am warranted in saying that his purpose has not been so much to get effective legislation on the Statute-book, as to pose before the country as the only advocate of the people's rights in these particulars. The hon. gentleman has said, why does not the Minister of Railways consent to a clause being inserted in this Bill that this railway shall not pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you why. Not that I would not very much regret seeing this railway, if it becomes, as is hoped, an important trunk line in the future, pass under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but I am not at this moment really able to advise this House as to what kind of words or what sort of a section could be framed which would prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway from acquiring this road. I wonder how you would go to work to do it. Would you say that the persons who shall invest their money in this enterprise shall

not sell their stock or their bonds to anybody who might be acting in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway? The only way you could do that would be to say that they shall never sell their stock or bonds at all—that the stock or bonds shall never pass out of the hands of the people who invest in them, and that no person who is, or is likely to be, directly or indirectly subject to the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall invest a dollar in this enterprise. Would you not make yourself entirely ridiculous by inserting any such clause in the Bill? If the hon. gentleman cannot come any nearer to a solution than that, he will have to leave things as they are, and run the possible risk of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company buying up those interests. You will have to submit to that contingency, so far as I can see; and no provision that we can incorporate in any law is capable of avoiding it. I would be as averse to the Canadian Pacific Railway getting control of this railway as the hon. gentleman. I am willing to give them fair-play; I think they are entitled to fair-play; but I do not like to see them picking up every little railroad that may be constructed in Canada any more than the hon. gentleman does. The only difference between him and myself in this matter is that the hon. gentleman will plunge blindly and propose utterly valueless and useless legislation. He will not consult anybody who knows what is the proper thing to do—

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman has just said that he does not know. To whom would I go, then, to get this information?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am speaking in a general way. I do not know just how to frame a clause such as the hon. gentleman calls upon me to have inserted in this Bill—I freely confess it; and I would like to hear some gentleman of larger experience in Parliament suggest to me how it can be done. Now, let us look at this amendment. The 2 cents a mile proposal is, I understand, to be dropped. Then, after the clauses which refer to running powers and the general subject of tolls, it goes on to say:

That the maximum freight charged on the articles hereunder mentioned shall be as follows between Winnipeg and Port Arthur.

Just imagine a proposal to incorporate in a Bill chartering a company to build 200 miles of railway provisions which relate to the lines of other companies which are not embodied in the Bill at all.

Mr. MACLEAN. The "Globe" says they are the one company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Surely my hon. friend is not going to ask us to legislate on the strength of some assertion of a newspaper on the

subject. This company, I understand, ask for powers to build a line from Port Arthur, or more properly from a point thirty miles from Port Arthur, on the Port Arthur and Duluth Railway, to Fort Frances, a distance of 200 miles and 200 miles away from Winnipeg, and the hon. gentleman is solemnly and calmly asking Parliament to incorporate in the Act a provision that the maximum freight charged on the articles carried by this railway between points away beyond and outside their authority, and beyond the line they are authorized to build, shall be so and so, and rates pro rata for any shorter hauls over the said railway. I do not see that it is necessary for us to take up any more time on this question, unless my hon. friend will persist in talking and discussing it over and over again. I explained all this to the Railway Committee, as many hon. gentlemen know; and I do trust that the hon. gentleman will now admit that everything in the way of affording protection to the people of that country has been done as far as it can be done at this time and in the present condition of things. Later, after this road is built, if another company comes to the Government—not simply those named in this amendment, but any company—and applies to the Government for the right to run its engines and trains and carry freight over this line, the Government will be ready, I presume, no matter what party is in power, to grant those rights. They will always be ready, as they have been in the past, to regulate as far as possible the rates of freight and tolls that shall be charged; and with that assurance, I think the ground is amply covered. Certainly it is very much more creditably and scientifically covered than it would be by adopting the amendment of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I propose to say a few words. I have listened very attentively to the hon. Minister of Railways, and according to him there are no grievances in this country, or so far as the North-west is concerned, with regard to railways and freight rates and tariffs; or if there are any, there is no remedy for them. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman's propositions at all. I think that there are difficulties, that there are grievances, and I think that this House is the proper place to come to to have those grievances investigated and remedied, if remedies can be provided. More than that, Mr. Speaker, I think we are going too fast in the matter of subsidizing railways. We were told at the beginning of the session, in connection with the building of the Yukon Railway, that the Government were going to give a subsidy of mineral lands, and not a dollar of cash; and the reason stated was that this country had gone to the full extent of its re-

Mr. BLAIR.

sources in granting cash subsidies to railways, and that we could not vote another dollar for that purpose in the future. I have been astonished myself at that, after what we saw last session, when the Government gave large bonuses for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, more than double what the company were willing to build it for, and when we saw how liberally they were purchasing the right of way from Lévis to Montreal to have the Intercolonial Railway extended to that city; and when we also saw that a large list of railway subsidies came down to Parliament, though too late to be investigated by Parliament, because by the time they came down most of the members had got their notice to draw their own subsidies and return to their homes.

The Parliament of Canada at last session was not only asked to vote liberal bonuses but asked to establish a new principle. Some years ago the principle was laid down that bonuses should only be given to such railways as opened up new countries. The Government had an estimate carefully made of the cost of steel rails, fish plates, bolts and other steel and iron appliances, and came to the conclusion that these would cost \$3,200 per mile, and decided to give that amount per mile to roads which would open up new sections of country. It is true that principle was extended, perhaps rightly, but in my opinion too far, and the subsidy given to roads that did not open up new sections. It was given sometimes to roads that traversed old sections but not very well provided with railway facilities. But last session we were confronted with a new era in railway building. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) announced that the former subsidy of \$3,200 per mile would be doubled in the case of railways, whose construction cost more than \$15,000 per mile. What means he would take to ascertain the actual cost of construction we do not know. I think the Government should have proceeded in the opposite direction, and I believe the time has now come when the Government should reconsider their decision and put a stop to this bonusing of railways. It is about time to take a rest, for a few years at any rate, in railway building, and let settlement proceed along the lines of railways already built. We have increased enormously our public debt. I remember well the eloquence with which hon. gentlemen opposite, when on this side, used to declaim against the enormous increase of the public debt for railway building and development of the country. There was truth in their complaint, but now we find them doubling the former subsidy and giving \$6,400 per mile—a totally indefensible proposition in nine cases out of ten.

What necessity has been proved that a subsidy should be given this Rainy River Railway at all? We have a road already from Fort William to Winnipeg. What

does this road propose? It proposes two things. One is to go to certain mineral areas, which are pretty well served to-day by water communication. All those mines are what are called free milling ores. That does not require carriage because the milling is done on the spot, and it does not require much carriage to carry \$100,000 worth of gold. And there is but very little proof that there are valuable mines in that country. So far nothing has been developed to justify the building of a railway through that country at all. There are three mines there which, I am told, have been productive and profitable, but those are almost within a stone's throw of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is no justification for the construction of a railway through the country for mining purposes. It is proposed to give the company \$6,400 per mile. The Government gave a bonus, I think, for 80 miles in the dying hours of last session, and the province of Ontario also in the dying hours of its last session voted that same company \$3,000 per mile, and they are going to get, we are told, a large bonus from Manitoba, making in all more money than will be required to build the road. These gentlemen will have money enough given them by the Parliament of Canada and the local legislatures to build that road from one end to another. Then what do they propose to do? They propose to run the line according to their own sweet will. The hon. Minister of Railways told us to-night that he was perfectly powerless, that he cannot suggest any way of control. We say to him: put in the clause moved by the hon. member for East York, which, I am told, is the same as that embodied in the Crow's Nest Pass Railway Act. But the Minister of Railways says, no, and those gentlemen behind him say, no, and the reason they give is that clause No. 4 is quite sufficient. If that clause in the Railway Act is quite sufficient, how comes it that it was not sufficient for the Crow's Nest Railway? The Crow's Nest Railway clause seems an effective one, and my hon. friend from East York proposes to insert a similar clause in this Bill. Clause 4 in the Bill is not sufficient. It was not sufficient in the case of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and neither is it sufficient in the case of this company.

I waited with a good deal of interest this evening to hear some more evidence from the members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories of their desire to have competition, to have those grievances remedied which we have heard so much about from these hon. gentlemen, both inside and outside this House. I remember that when these gentlemen came down a year and a half ago from the North-west, they had two great difficulties then. They said there were two octopuses with their coils around the people of the North-west, which prevented their development. One was this iniquitous tariff, which was crushing the vitals out of

the people of Manitoba and the Territories. Well, Mr. Speaker, we know what happened. Another session was held and those hon. gentlemen had to swallow up their convictions, they had to go back on their record, on their pledges and promises, and adopt the very thing in the tariff that they had, in season and out of season, from one year's end to another, been condemning from one end of the country to another.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is getting away from the subject.

Mr. WALLACE. I was saying there were two octopuses which these people declaimed against. One was the Canadian Pacific Railway and the other the tariff. I am done with the tariff and am now going to refer to the railway.

Then they said: It is not the tariff that troubles us so much; that is only a little grievance; our great grievance is the railway monopoly. Why, I have heard the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) grow eloquent when he told about the difficulties they had, the enormous freight rates they had to pay, rates that were prohibitory on many articles. They had declared to the people in the North-west that they would have reductions made in the tariff for the benefit of the people of the North-west. But now there is a competing line offered on which this Parliament can impose conditions and fix rates because the people are giving sufficient to build the road. We should have the right to dictate rates even if they were building the road with their own money. How much more so, when the people are providing the money. The rate that it is proposed to fix is based upon the rate of one-half cent per ton per mile which has been found profitable in Pennsylvania, where immense quantities of coal and other freights have been carried at these rates, and even lower.

Then, as to the question of running rights. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) said that the Grand Trunk would not think of asking at this stage to have running rights over this railway. I would like to know at what stage such a request should be made, if not just when the charter rights are being granted and bonuses being given to the railroad? I do not see the Minister of Railways here, because, as usual, when important business connected with his department is coming up, the Minister of Railways is absent. I have had occasion to call attention to that matter before. He gets up and makes a speech, and then goes home, perhaps; at any rate, disappears from the House. I think we ought to adjourn, or at least suspend proceedings for an hour or so, that he can be sent for, so that he can hear the discussion on this matter. The hon. Minister says it would be absurd to consider for a moment that Mr. Hays, of the Grand Trunk should wish to have running power secured at this stage of the proceedings.

But what does Mr. Hays himself say? He says:

I agree with you that such a provision is desirable, and will make formal application that a clause reserving such running powers, in favour of the Grand Trunk, be inserted in all new charters which may be granted to new companies for constructing railways in the Northwest, thus including the Rainy River Railway.

So, they are making application to have running powers over this road. And now is the time when we can reasonably provide for such running powers and fix a tariff of rates which has been found profitable even on roads which were built entirely with the money of those who own them.

I am glad that the mover has proposed to withdraw the clause relating to the 2-cent rate. I think that the people of this country require rather reasonable freight rates than reduction of passenger rates. The interest of the people will be best served by reduction in freights, so that production of the farm, the mine and other industries may be moved to the point of consumption at the lowest possible expense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Railways tried to belittle the hon. member for East York and others who have taken a hand in this agitation. He said the hon. member for East York was not the only champion of the people. I think it is small business of the hon. Minister to speak in that way. It is time that somebody took up the cause of the people, for we find that gentlemen who have been posing for years as champions of the farmers of the Northwest, and of producers generally, are absent on this occasion, or, if here, they roar as gently as sucking doves. Why? Because, in my opinion, they have been got at in some way by somebody. It would be an interesting problem to find out who has got at them. Where is the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)?

Mr. DAVIN. East Assiniboia.

Mr. WALLACE. I beg the pardon of the hon. member for West Assiniboia. He is here, as he always is, championing the rights of the people. Where is the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) and many others? We did hear the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), but I, for one, did not recognize his voice. His constituents will not recognize him when they read his gentle speech, so different from his filibustering style of a year or two ago, when he first came to this Parliament.

I believe the time has come to reduce the subsidies, not to increase them. The time has arrived when this road will have to be justified; the Minister has not done it yet. He proposes to give double the subsidy ordinarily given to railroads of that kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I made no promise on the subject.

Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. WALLACE. The money was voted for 80 miles to the Ontario and Rainy River Railroad. He says now he was not called upon to justify it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon. I thought the hon. gentleman said I had made some promise that the subsidy would be a double subsidy. I did not say that.

Mr. WALLACE. I said I understood there was a double subsidy intended to be given for the first 80 miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was, if the road cost enough to earn it, they would get the double subsidy.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand, they are asking now for the double subsidy.

Mr. MACLEAN. How many miles are there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Including the 80, about 200.

Mr. WALLACE. About 35 miles of the Duluth and Western are already built. Are they asking a subsidy for that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are 200 miles in addition to what is already built.

Mr. GILLIES. What is the whole length of the road proposed to be subsidized, from Fort William to Winnipeg?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not subsidizing it to Winnipeg.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister is not subsidizing to Winnipeg, but I understand the road is to be built on to Winnipeg. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, there are not mines in that country sufficient to justify the Government in building a road into it at all. It may be, there is great mineral wealth there, but it has not been developed.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). There are mountains of ore right through where this railway is going. There are smelting works all over the country.

Mr. WALLACE. I am glad for that information. We all knew that there are mountains of ore, but it has not yet been determined whether that ore is worth working.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). We know, as a matter of fact, it is.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman tell me one case that has been demonstrated to be worth anything?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). We have had samples of ore from that section of the country, and it has proved most satisfactory.

Mr. WALLACE. I have heard about samples before. But I want the hon. gentleman

to tell us of one mine that has proved by actual experience to be a mine that can be profitably worked.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I mean, iron ore.

Mr. WALLACE. On that 35 miles they have got any amount of iron ore. They do not need to travel a hundred miles more for iron ore.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). There is no iron ore on the first 35 miles of that road. At the end of the Duluth and Western there is, but that is in American territory.

Mr. WALLACE. We have abundance of iron ore along Lake Superior, and at a dozen different points there are places where it can be loaded on vessels cheaply, and where you don't require to build a railroad to reach it. But I was referring more particularly to the precious metals, and to opening up a railway for the purpose of reaching gold and silver or copper mines. This railway can only be justified as a through line from Port Arthur, or Fort William, to Winnipeg, and I presume, that is the intention. He says they are asking for a bonus for 200 miles, and I think it is understood that they are going to utilize the 35 miles of this road already built, and they are asking for a subsidy for 200 miles additional. The hon. gentlemen now tell us that the resources of this country have been taxed to the utmost, and that we are not in a position to give a dollar more for railway construction where they claim it is of vital importance, such as the Yukon Railway. Still, they propose to give, with the aid of the provinces, \$12,400, or thereabouts, per mile. The Minister of Railways and Canals intends that they are to get \$6,400 per mile from this Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said, that if an application was made to the Government by this company for a fixed subsidy of \$6,400, it would be entertained. If the matter was brought to Parliament, then it would be open to us to annex to that grant any condition which Parliament might think proper. But I neither directly or indirectly made any statement as to whether the Government would make any such application to Parliament, or whether Parliament would be asked to make a grant.

Mr. WALLACE. What I understood the Minister to say was, that if they demonstrated that that road had cost \$15,000 a mile, they would be entitled to the \$6,400.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What I stated was, that if they expended, under the Subsidy Act of last year, enough money, over and above the \$15,000 a mile, to earn the \$6,400, they would get it.

Mr. WALLACE. That is practically what I said. Now, if they demonstrated that

they have expended this money, then they will be entitled to \$6,400 a mile. Very well; they will probably be able to demonstrate to the complete satisfaction of the Minister, that they are entitled to the \$6,400 a mile. Then, the province of Ontario has voted them \$3,000 per mile; that makes \$9,400.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). That shows the importance of the road.

Mr. WALLACE. It showed that an election was coming on.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). That was last year, before the election.

Mr. WALLACE. It was this year the money was voted.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). It was voted last year.

Mr. MACLEAN. But there was a substantial subsidy passed this last session.

Mr. WALLACE. There was a subsidy passed by the local legislature of Ontario this year for the Rainy River road. Yet in the face of that fact the Minister of Railways contends there is no analogy between the Crow's Nest Pass road and the Rainy River road. The hon. gentleman stated that the Crow's Nest Pass road received a subsidy equivalent to \$11,000 per mile; I say that the Rainy River road will get over \$12,000 per mile. It will receive \$6,400 per mile from the Dominion, \$3,000 per mile have been voted by the Ontario Government, and \$3,000 will be voted by the Greenway Government, which is going before the people and which are to have the satisfaction of making an agreement with this company by which the road will receive only 10 cents per 100 pounds from Winnipeg to Port Arthur.

Mr. DYMENT. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that Manitoba is going to subsidize a portion of a road that is in Ontario?

Mr. WALLACE. I said that the road would not be completed unless it was extended from Port Arthur to Winnipeg.

Mr. DYMENT. The hon. gentleman said the road would be subsidized to an extent of over \$12,000 a mile.

Mr. WALLACE. So it will be.

Mr. DYMENT. The hon. gentleman said that the road received \$6,400 per mile from the Dominion and \$3,000 per mile from Ontario. Does the hon. gentleman mean that in addition to these amounts, the Manitoba Government will subsidize a portion of the road?

Mr. WALLACE. A government that was willing to subsidize a road, three-fourths of which was in the United States, will do something for a road in Ontario if they had any patriotism. The hon. gentleman for Algoma need not worry about it. The Dominion and the Ontario Government are

giving as much, if not more to this road than was given to the Crow's Nest Pass road; yet the Minister says there is no analogy between the two cases. I have demonstrated to the satisfaction of the House, at all events to this side of it, that the subsidy which ultimately will be given to the Rainy River road will be larger than that given to the Crow's Nest Pass road, though no one will say that the cost of the former will be anything like the cost of the latter. For these reasons I think the proposal of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) is a very moderate one. We are practically building the road and we should have control over it. We are not obtaining any control according to the terms stated by the Minister of Railways, who informed the House that clause 4 is quite sufficient. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) has indicated that the granting of clause 4 is a very magnanimous act.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; on the contrary, I said that clause 4 was not any good at all.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not apparently understand the hon. gentleman. I understood him to say that there was great merit in clause 4, and I am glad to hear him repudiate it, because in my opinion the clause is very mild. The Minister of Railways further stated that Parliament was helpless so far as preventing a monopoly; that if the Canadian Pacific Railway chose to come in and own this railway, Parliament had no power to prevent it. Surely we are not completely handicapped, surely we can hedge our legislation around with restrictions in order that the intention of Parliament may be carried out. Of course there are many things Parliament cannot do. But in this case the Dominion is building the railway with public money, and if we seek to gain effective control over it, this Parliament has the power to insert in the Bill restrictions to carry out its view. When an honest effort is being made to assume such control, the Minister announces that we cannot do thus and so. When an effort is being made to control this road, the Government should welcome the efforts of hon. members who seek to assist in this laudable undertaking; but when hon. members find fault, as the hon. member for Algoma and some other hon. gentlemen have done, their actions show that they are not in earnest in their endeavours to place restrictions on the railways, and to show that the Parliament of Canada representing the people are superior to any railway corporation or to all the railway corporations combined.

Mr. DYMENT. I did not intend to detain the House on this question, but the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said that I was not sincere in my advocacy of the road. If there ever was an insincere

Mr. WALLACE.

speech delivered it was that made by the hon. member. The hon. gentleman stated that the road could be built with subsidies. He knows perfectly well that a large portion of the road will run through a country where it is as hard to build a road as in any part of the Dominion, and that the Government of which he was a member granted a subsidy to a railway larger than this united subsidy given by both Dominion and Ontario Governments. As to the contention that the road could be built out of the subsidies, that is arrant nonsense, to say the least of it. But what I should like to contradict principally is the contention that this road is not needed unless it goes through to Winnipeg, because there is not a paying mine in that district. It is not so much on account of the mining industry that the road should be built as on account of the agricultural land that it will open up. We have from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 acres in the Rainy River district, the like of which is not in the Dominion of Canada, and I do not except the North-west of which we hear so much. It appears to me as if the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), for some unaccountable reason, wants to kill this Bill. He was backed up the other night by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and he made some most ridiculous statements also. One of his reasons for not going on with the Bill now was that the Ontario Government had bonused the road for \$3,000 per mile two or three years since, and that the work had not been commenced. He surely would not expect that a road of this magnitude and running as it does through a territory in which it is difficult to construct a railway, would be commenced on a subsidy of \$3,000 a mile. It was absolutely impossible to do anything until this Government took action, and that was not until very late in the last session. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) also went on to say that this charter was in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, I have the most absolute assurance that the Canadian Pacific Railway has nothing whatever to do with it, or never will have anything to do with it, so that the statements made by the hon. gentleman are quite imaginary and suppositious. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) also suggests that we should do nothing in this Parliament until the Manitoba Government took action in the matter. I see no reason why we should wait for that. We can go on with our part and get these eighty miles already subsidized built, and in due course it would be continued to the boundary, and then the Manitoba Government could deal with it as they see fit. I hope the members of the House will not be lured away by these false arguments of the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) and the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), because I am sure that their action is taken only

for the purpose of killing the Bill, and not for the sake of the farmers of the North-west. I trust that hon. gentlemen will see that their designs are frustrated.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I will take but a minute or so of the time of the House. I cannot, for the life of me, see how my hon. friend (Mr. Dymont) could say that this amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) would not be in the interests of the farmers of the North-west Territories, and I cannot for the life of me understand the cogency of the arguments made in the very able speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways. The argument of that hon. gentleman was that they were giving the very large subsidy of \$11,000 a mile for the building of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and that he said was one reason why there was no analogy between the Crow's Nest Pass Railway and this road. Well, Sir, that is only a question of degree. Supposing we were subsidizing this line for a much smaller amount—my hon. friend from York (Mr. Wallace) has shown that it is being subsidized with pretty nearly, if not more than \$11,000 a mile—but supposing the subsidy was less, will any man say that the argument of degree has any cogency whatever? If it was a useful thing to put that clause in the Crow's Nest Pass charter, and which is almost 'ipsisima verba' the language of the amendment of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), surely it would be a useful thing to insert it in the Rainy River Railway Bill.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) said that we were getting certain considerations from the Canadian Pacific Railway that are not being obtained from this road, because this road has no existence yet, and therefore it was a matter of contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. DAVIN. I was coming to that. The Minister (Mr. Blair) said further that they were making a matter of contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but, Sir, that argument again has no cogency, because of the powers that we are giving to this company are ever to fructify, then we are making a preliminary contract with that company now. And, Sir, the statement made that the general clause in the Railway Act and clause 4 of this Bill would fulfil all the purposes that it is desirable in the interests of the community should be guarded, that I venture to say is thrown completely on one side by the usefulness that is claimed for the clause in the Crow's Nest Pass Railway charter. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a very desirable thing indeed to set a precedent—in fact, a precedent has already been set by the qualification that has already been mentioned by my hon. friend—it would be a very useful thing to set the precedent when

passing Bills giving powers to corporations such as we are doing now, that this House would itself safeguard the interest of the public and not depend on the Railway Committee. We know very well that the Railway Committee is a small body, and it is presumably more peccable than a large body like this House; it is certainly easier to get at, and the corporation desiring to get at it has a smaller surface to work on than it would have in this House. Besides, its deliberations are not in public; our deliberations in this House are in public, and I myself think that the sooner the better this Parliament determines when a Bill is before it to safeguard the interests of the public and not place it in the hands of the Railway Committee. I listened with great interest to the speech of the Minister of Railways; it was an able speech, it was a plausible speech; but the moment you analyse it, it does not seem to me that it carries any cogency. There has been a very good reason given by my hon. friend (Mr. Dymont) why we should now do what we are asked to do by this amendment. He tells us that there are thousands of acres of the finest farm lands in the world in the Rainy River district, and if so we are going to have farmers there, and if those farmers are to have all the commodities they require, we want that they should get them under as favourable circumstances as the people at one end or other of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Here we have certain advantages particularized in this Crow's Nest Pass Railway charter, and I do not see why we should not have the same done in the Bill now before the House. I am bound to say I have heard nothing that has tended to alter my opinion that no harm whatever can be done by accepting the amendment as amended by my hon. friend; nothing, in fact, but good can come of it.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I had a good deal of sympathy with the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), but after the able, clear and explicit explanation given by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), I believe we are perfectly safe in leaving the matter in the hands of the Government. What surprised me a good deal was that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) got the assistance of his colleague from West York (Mr. Wallace), and the burden of that gentleman's argument was that this road was not required at all. That circumstance leads me to believe that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) is not really and truly sincere in wanting this road built. I feel aggrieved to think that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean), who to some extent led me in this matter, should have the design of burking this whole project, because I believe that it is of the utmost importance that that road should be built and at the earliest possible moment. The hon. member for

West York (Mr. Wallace) said that there were no mines in that country, and that it had not been demonstrated that his railway was necessary.

When I mention the fact that the smelting works in Hamilton are looking anxiously and waiting for the early completion of this road in order to get the quantity and quality of ore required for the manufacture of iron in Hamilton, I am quite satisfied that the hon. gentleman will realize that there is some importance to be attached to its construction. I simply rose to express my surprise at the way in which the hon. member for East York applauded and supported the statement made by the hon. member for West York to the effect that there was no necessity for that road being built at all, as we had one road now from Port Arthur through to Winnipeg. I am sorry that the hon. member for East York has put himself in the position of obstructing the building of the road rather than urging its early completion.

Mr. BRITTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think any one can have heard this discussion without coming to the conclusion that those who have been pressing for this amendment do not really desire the passage of the Bill at all. It is one of the most simple Bills that has been presented to the House. It is in no sense a Government measure, and I do not understand the arguments we have heard on the other side of the House on the assumption that it is such a private Bill. It is quite true, if we ever come to the time when the road is to be subsidized, then it will be the duty of the Government to take every precaution that the subsidy shall not be given unless all the rights of other companies are preserved, as the Minister of Railways has indicated. Now, what is there in this Bill? In the first place, the company were incorporated as long ago as 1891. Now, they are asking for an extension of time for the completion of the road, for power to bridge the Rainy River, and for power to construct a road from some point on the Port Arthur and Western Railway to some point on the boundary between Ontario and Manitoba. That is all this company are asking. The Bill is a private Bill, brought in the interest of this company and for these purposes. The Government have said that it was part of their policy that this clause 4 shall be inserted in all future railway Bills, for the reason that will commend itself to any member of the House who thinks about it. It is not because the Railway Act is not sufficient in itself to protect the interests of the public, but it is, that no company which hereafter gets any rights from this Parliament shall be in a position to say that subsequent legislation is not applicable to them, or that they have acquired certain vested rights which a subsequent Act of Parliament ought not to interfere with. This is a notice to

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton).

them, as the Minister has said, that any future legislation must apply to them. That being the case, and looking at the Railway Act itself, we have everything which this amendment seeks to obtain for the public from this company. The Government have the right to regulate the tolls, both as to passengers and freight; they have the right to grant running powers to other companies over this road; and, as has been said, if the time comes for a subsidy to be granted, then is the time to protect other roads by the contract granting the subsidy to the company; and that is just the difference between this railway and the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. The Crow's Nest Pass Railway, in which hon. gentlemen have said this clause was inserted, was the contract itself. That Bill provided for the payment of the subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the building of the road. Therefore there is all the difference between asking for that clause to be put in now, when the subsidy is not under consideration, when there is no contract before the House for building the road, and asking to have the rights of the public protected when the subsidy comes to be dealt with.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman know that a subsidy was voted last session?

Mr. BRITTON. Quite so. The subsidy is voted, but the subsidy is not to be paid over. It depends on a great many conditions before it is paid over.

Mr. DAVIN. How shall we pass on it in this House?

Mr. BRITTON. We are not asked to pass on it in this House. That is a matter to be dealt with before the subsidy is paid. The Railway Act protects this country against anything this company can do. The mere fact that they have been voted a subsidy is a very different thing from saying that they are entitled to the money. It is when they are entitled to the money that further protection can be provided if there is a necessity for it.

Mr. MACLEAN. Give the money first.

Mr. BRITTON. No, I do not say that. I say, before the money is given, and when the company is in a position to say that it has earned the money which has been voted, it is time then to see that the Railway Act is complied with and that the powers sought to be inserted in this Bill are provided for. Everybody admits that the Railway Act applies to this company. Does the hon. ex-Minister of Railways say that it does not?

Mr. COCHRANE. It also applied to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, yet the Government made other conditions.

Mr. BRITTON. There is no harm in that.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then it would not be any harm to make the same provision in this Bill.

Mr. BRITTON. There is no harm in making the provision before the money is paid over or in putting clause 4 in this Bill. But I do not think that clause adds to it much more than to give any other company notice that they are to be subject to any future legislation in reference to railroads.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Maclean :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	Kloepfer,
Bennett,	Maclean,
Clarke,	Marcotte,
Cochrane,	Monk,
Davin,	Quinn,
Earle,	Richardson,
Guillet,	Taylor, and
Kaulbach,	Wallace.—16.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bain,	Hutchison,
Bazinet,	Jameson,
Beattie,	Landerkin,
Beith,	Lang,
Bertram,	LaRivière,
Blair,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Borden (King's),	Legris,
Bostock,	Lemieux,
Bourassa,	Lewis,
Britton,	Macdonell (Selkirk),
Broder,	Mackie,
Brown,	MacPherson,
Bruneau,	McCleary,
Burnett,	McClure,
Campbell,	McGregor,
Casey,	McGugan,
Copp,	McHugh,
Cowan,	McLennan (Inverness),
Davies (Sir Louis),	McMillan,
Dechène,	Meigs,
Desmarais,	Mignault,
Douglas,	Parmalee,
Ellis,	Pettet,
Erb,	Pope,
Featherston,	Ratz,
Fielding,	Rinfret,
Fraser (Guysboro'),	Rogers,
Gillies,	Semple,
Graham,	Sifton,
Haggart,	Stenson,
Heyd,	Sutherland, and
Hughes,	Tohnie.—65.
Hurley,	

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Montcalm has not voted. The hon. member for King's, N.B., and the hon. member for Antigonish were not in the House when the motion was put.

Mr. DUGAS. I am paired with the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay). Otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I was in the House when the question was put.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must have been within the precincts of the Chambers and not in the galleries.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I was in my seat when the vote was taken.

Mr. SPEAKER. Was the hon. member in this Chamber when the whole question was put ?

Mr. DOMVILLE. I could not tell, because I could not hear all that was said.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is in doubt I think we had better strike out his name.

Mr. McISAAC. I did not hear the whole question read.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—THE ESTIMATES.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows :—

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the services of the Dominion for the year ending on the 30th June, 1899, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 1898.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** moved :

That the Message and Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** To prevent misapprehension, I wish to say that our expectation is that the Budget speech will be delivered Tuesday week, and not on Friday as seems to have been expected from some remarks of the right hon. First Minister. We hope on Tuesday week to deliver the Budget speech, unless something happens to change the date.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What does the right hon. gentleman propose taking up to-morrow ?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** To take up the Franchise Act.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 29th March, 1898.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORSHIP OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. leader of the House if the statement is well founded that the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) is to be the Governor of the North-west Territories?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If it were well founded, it would be made official. As it is not made official, it is not well founded so far.

DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) as to an item which has been made public for the information of the people generally through some evidence, if I remember well, taken before a committee. It is to the effect that an entirely new arrangement has been made between the Government and the Grand Trunk and Drummond County railways respectively by which the terms which were submitted last year have been very materially altered. It is rather odd if this has been done, that nothing has been laid on the Table of the House and that we first get the information through the public press. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the statement is true, and if so, whether he will lay on the Table for the information of the representatives of the people, the amended arrangement.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that no evidence has been received by a committee examining into the Drummond County matter which tends to show that an entirely new arrangement has been made between the Government and either of these companies. The investigation which has been there conducted led to a request from the committee that the temporary agreement which had been entered into should be laid on the table of the committee and put in evidence. I saw no particular objection to that course being pursued. All the papers that they asked for I thought might be very properly tendered to them. I apprehend that that fact would not be a proper basis upon which to ground a charge that the House had been slighted. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) now desires that the temporary arrangement which was entered into and

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

any modifications that have been made in the previous understanding with these companies be laid on the Table, I would have no objection to producing those papers. They are really now in everybody's possession, and there is no reason for not producing them here if the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be advantageous as conveying information to the House, and is what ought to be done.

TESLIN LAKE SLEIGH ROAD.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the First Minister if the statement made in another place by a member of the Cabinet that the Government had determined to build a wagon road from a port in British Columbia over the Teslin route for soldiers, militia or the mounted police, is true?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I stated some time ago in this House that the Government intended to ask for an appropriation to survey a route from Observatory Inlet to Glenora. What would be the policy of the Government in case of a certain event which may take place in another House, and which we expect to take place. I am not in a position to say. The matter would have to be considered de novo. I am not aware that such a statement was made as referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. No arrangement has been made for building a wagon road?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** No.

OPENING OF THE CANALS.

Mr. QUINN. I desire to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) whether a date has been fixed for the opening of the Welland and St. Lawrence canals to Montreal. I understand that the Corn Exchange and the Board of Trade of Montreal have made representations to the Department of Railways and Canals that it would be to the advantage of the country generally if these canals were opened at an earlier date than usual. Information has been received that ships are already laden ready to come through as soon as it is known that the river and canals are open for navigation and that these vessels can get return cargoes. My object in rising is, as much as anything else, to impress upon the Minister the necessity of an early opening of the canals. I have here a letter from the Corn Exchange of Montreal, intimating that they are very anxious to have the canals opened about the 15th of April if at all possible. I would ask the hon. Minister if a decision has been arrived at as to the day the canals will be opened?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I have been in receipt of the usual anxious inquiries from the merchants and transportation companies as to the date the canals will be opened.

These gentlemen are all exceedingly anxious that the canals should be opened at the earliest possible day; you cannot get them open too early to suit the people who are interested in canal transportation. But it has not been possible for me to name any particular date when the canals can be opened. That will depend entirely upon circumstances over which we have practically no control. Every year these gentlemen urge us most strongly to open the canals earlier than the preceding year. But we have to keep in mind some important considerations which are not present always in the mind of those gentlemen. We are required to make repairs in order that the canals may not break down during the season, that there may not be any complete block in the use of the canals during the season of navigation. We have got to be careful to avoid the possibility of that contingency occurring, and therefore we can only make those necessary repairs late in the close season, during the period between the close of one season and the opening of another season, and we have got to take the necessary time to make those repairs thoroughly. If we were to do otherwise, and neglect those repairs to meet the wishes of the board of trade and others interested in canal traffic, we would incur the very serious danger of having canal navigation absolutely blocked for a considerable period during the season. I am thoroughly convinced, and so are the officers of my department, of the importance of having the canals open as soon as possible, and every effort will be made to that end. That is all the assurance that I can give to the hon. gentleman, and all the assurance I have been able to give to the board of trade. I have not been able to say to them that on any particular day we can rely with confidence that the canal will be open.

RAILWAY POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. DAVIN. I should like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals what is the railway policy of the Government, and in order to put myself right, I will conclude with a motion. I am in a state of bewilderment as to the policy of the Government in this respect. Last session the hon. gentleman laid down certain lines of railway policy, and I want to know whether that is the policy to-day. The words of the Minister of Railways and Canals in another place, to which I cannot refer, are still ringing in my ear, and in the ears of many hon. members. Now, I want to call the attention of the House to the policy as laid down here last session when the Minister of Railways and Canals was presenting his Crow's Nest Pass Railway Bill. This is what he said:

The supposition is but natural that the whole valley of Boundary Creek will be some time one continuous line of city life. Well, now, what does such an ultimate accomplishment depend

upon? Why, it depends solely upon there being transportation facilities afforded, and railway construction, and means by which people who are willing to go in and develop that country may get in supplies, and fuel, and carry the products of their mines out of the country. It only depends upon that, and it does seem to me a serious question whether it is not the duty of Parliament to lend every possible aid, without delay, in order that we may come into possession of this valuable territory. Because the committee must not lose sight of the fact that this important section of the country lies immediately adjacent to the boundary of the United States, it is not very far from an extensive trunk line of railway. It will not take many miles of railway to be laid down in order to penetrate into that Boundary Creek section. Now, the people on the southern side of the border are liable to do in respect of that boundary country what they have almost done in respect of the Kootenay district. They are liable, by building a section of railway into that country, to get possession of it from a business and a trade point of view, and they are liable to divert the trade away from our own country, from the east and from the coast, and carry it to the south of the line. To my own personal knowledge, they have been doing this with respect to Kootenay. Why, Mr. Chairman, it is a fact which only requires to be known, I think, to make a grave impression upon the minds of this House and of the public generally, that the people of the United States belonging to the state of Washington, appreciating the advantages of the possession of British Columbia and of the valuable minerals which are there undeveloped, built a railway up into the Kootenay country and got possession of the business and the trade of that country, and have built up the city of Spokane wholly cut of the business which has originated in the province of British Columbia. To-day the city of Spokane is a flourishing city of 35,000 people. You go into that city and get into conversation with business men and they will tell you that the business prosperity and growth of that place from a little village of seven or eight thousand inhabitants a few years ago has been due to the development which has taken place in British Columbia. These people were there and they took advantage of that trade. I say that it is a matter of considerable importance for the committee to discuss as to whether we will retain possession of this country from a business point of view, or whether we will let the people to the south of us take that trade from under our eyes and become possessed of it in the sense in which the conditions of business will tend to the transfer of that trade in that direction.

I have here been quoting the words of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, who last year laid it down that it was a wrong thing to insert in the charter of a railway any clause limiting its powers. Well, I want to know what is the policy of the Government to-day. There is the policy stated last year on which millions of dollars were voted by this House, it was because of that policy that millions of dollars were voted for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Now I should like to hear from the Minister of Railways and Canals whether he adheres to these words of his last year, or whether he has changed his mind, for it is desirable that we should know what is the policy of

the Government in regard to railway building in this country. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fitzpatrick for the second reading of Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. BOURASSA. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to be able to throw much new light on the question now under consideration, but I deem it my duty to make known to the House the sentiment prevailing in the province of Quebec with regard to the Franchise Act.

The Bill introduced by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to repeal the Franchise Act of 1885 is admittedly the most popular measure that has ever been devised by the present Government. I may say that it is the most important legislation that has ever engaged the attention of Parliament, provided we do not consider the intrinsic value of a legislation only from the standpoint of the public expenditures involved. For one not to admit that a law amending the franchise is one of the most momentous measures, both from a political and a social standpoint, which a Parliament can debate and place on the Statute-book, would be ignoring the most essential mechanism of our parliamentary system and institutions. In fact, the right of suffrage is at the very basis of our parliamentary institutions, as it determines which is the class of citizens who will have the right of making their voice heard and their will obeyed, through their representatives, in the councils of the nation, and as it gives those who rank among the electors of the country a portion of the national sovereignty.

The precursors of the French revolution saw, or fancied they saw, in manhood suffrage a remedy for all the evils the old society was heir to, and a barrier against abuses and corruption of every description. I do not intend here and now to controvert the principles advanced by Rousseau and by his adepts of all shades, amongst whom we find to-day although, perhaps, they may not be aware of it, the hon. leader of the Opposition, and several other hon. gentlemen opposite. But facts are stubborn things, and the records of one hundred years have already given the lie to and shown the utter fallacy of the theories advocated by the philosophers of the eighteenth century, and they show that those brilliant Utopias, when actually applied, can only lead peoples to the failure of liberty. Now, those reformers of 1789 who were in earnest, found in the conditions of the times, a plea and even a ground in support of their system, which

Mr. DAVIN.

cannot be invoked in the present state of things.

Let us review, for one moment, the political and social position of France, at the end of the eighteenth century. What are the facts? Royalty was now holding an absolute sway; the public lands, wealth and offices were being monopolized by a few members of the nobility and by a few powerful officers, the privileges of whom increased in the inverse ratio of their charges; the lower nobility were being crushed down and impoverished for the benefit of the *grande*s of the court; the liberties of the communes and of the provinces, no longer the powerful bodies they were in the middle ages, were now being gradually and systematically taken away from them. It is easy to understand how right-minded men, anxious to better the condition of the people, as also ambitious men impatient to emerge from their obscurity and to sway in their turn, have sought in universal suffrage the surest means of drowning the privileged classes in the mass. Now, it had never occurred to some of them, while it was part of the scheme of others that, by conferring indiscriminately on all citizens the right of vote, without having prepared them beforehand to exercise the great powers of the franchise with which they were invested and without even being initiated into the knowledge of its prerogatives, they were merely handing over the government of the commonwealth into the hands of millions of sovereigns who no longer knew how to govern their own commune. Since then, the good sense of the nation has grown sounder and wild democracy itself has been baptized by the church, to use the expression of a celebrated monk of our times. But in the very cause of the danger, in popular suffrage itself, an antidote has been found against its extreme consequences. The majority of civilized nations in Europe, taught by the grievous crises attending the delivery of political liberty in France, have treaded with more prudence and caution in the footsteps of the French people. And now it may be said that, while England has taught the world the science of self-government, France has stirred up in the breasts of men the instinct of democratical liberty. May the true and noble tendencies of the two great nations that gave birth to our people, ever harmonize in this land of ours and be reflected in our laws and our institutions. Now, should our political and social position warrant us in sharing the blind optimism of the levelling philosophers of the eighteenth century, and in promulgating, in the matter of suffrage, absolute equality? Far from it. We are actually enjoying as large an amount of individual and corporative freedom as may be desirable, nor are there to be found in any portion of the country those abnormal agglomerations of *proletaires* crushed down by a few privileged citizens. On

the contrary, our five million inhabitants are scattered throughout the half of a continent. Our national domain, with its immense wealth and possibilities, requires life-giving capital, property owners who will occupy and till the ground, thrifty and intelligent workmen whose labour will give paying returns. Can there be a sounder and more patriotic policy than that of dividing the national sovereignty between those useful citizens who contribute by their capital, their property and their labour towards the wealth and prosperity of the country, while excluding parasites and hangers-on of every description? For my part, I would be in favour of giving the right of suffrage to all those who need it and use it for the good government of the country, and denying it to all those who make it a matter of vile barter. Now, I must say that I was greatly surprised to hear, at the very outset of the session, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) advocating universal suffrage and suggesting its adoption in our country. Several other hon. gentlemen opposite, I see, have also given expression to the same views in the course of this debate. Have, then, the hon. gentlemen opposite come to such a pass, after having boasted for sixty years past, of being the pillars of order and good government? Have the last champions of the great Conservative party in Quebec reached such a depth, after having, for over half a century, held up to public execration, the red flag, and preached the holy war against the subversive tenets of the Liberal party? Are we, then, to agree with sceptics that all parties are, by the very essence of things, Conservative when in power and Liberal when in opposition? It may, perhaps, be objected that the majority of the provinces, with the exception of Quebec, have adopted manhood suffrage and that, when inveighing against that policy I am also declaiming against the policy of several Liberal administrations. I have given expression to what I believe to be the prevailing sentiment in my own province in that regard, a feeling which is also shared by several political men in the other provinces, who have grown rather cool, I think, with respect to manhood suffrage. However, I respect the contrary opinion which seems to be shared in by the majority of my fellow-countrymen in the English-speaking provinces, and I believe this difference in opinion may be accounted for by the difference in our mental constitution. The Anglo Saxon race may adopt, without great inconvenience, political measures, apparently very radical, which they enforce with judgment and moderation; while the French people, who are more logical and more impetuous, cannot, with impunity, go beyond certain limits. Let, therefore, the provinces of Ontario and Manitoba adopt the franchise which suits them best, but I also claim for the province of Quebec the

right of choosing the system which suits her best. Now, that variety of mental constitutions and ideas offers, I think, the best answer to the strongest of all the objections raised against the Bill introduced by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), and as to which both parties seem to have taken a position which tallies perfectly with their instincts and traditions. I mean the uniformity of the Dominion franchise which is swept away under the provincial control. This objection is seemingly logical, because as the powers delegated by the people to their representatives in the Dominion Parliament extend to the whole nation, and as the laws enacted here apply to the whole country, those powers ought to issue from the same elements, that is to say, from electors having uniform qualifications throughout the various provinces of the Dominion. As I said, there seems to be logic and reason in this objection. But we must bear in mind that the only logical policy in the government of peoples consists in giving to each people such a constitution as is best adapted to their wants and in applying that constitution according to its fundamental spirit. Now, the principle of the British North America Act, by which we are governed, is essentially a provincial and decentralizing principle. The federal power is but the necessary cement that gives cohesiveness to the various materials entering into its structure. I am quite aware of the fact that the Conservative party did never make a secret of their centralizing and federative tendencies. Only the other day we heard the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) telling us that, in his opinion, this Parliament was the supreme authority and, therefore, that we should have a uniform franchise for the election of the representatives to whom the people delegates the power of exercising that supreme authority. I know that it has ever been the policy of the Conservative party to advocate the principle of centralization, and perhaps also to lead us to legislative union. The Franchise Act was not a solitary nor inconspicuous instance of their attempts in that direction. The Conservative Administrations that have succeeded each other have always done their best to take away from the provinces the control of a portion of their legislative power, as shown by the License Act, which was enacted by a Conservative Government with a view to depriving the provinces of a considerable portion of their revenue. We have another instance of the same policy in the Streams Act, by which a Conservative Government sought to deprive the province of Ontario of a considerable portion of her territory. I could cite many other instances to show that ever since confederation, and prior to it, the Conservative party have always favoured centralization, if they did not openly make it a plank of their political platform. The Liberal party, on the other

hand, has always championed provincial freedom and autonomy, and the Bill now under discussion is a fresh evidence of their sincerity in that respect. Each province, as we all know, has the right exclusively to enact laws concerning its civil and religious government, public instruction and the administration of her territory; now, I ask, on what ground would such a province be denied the right of sending here, representatives chosen by the very same voters who are entrusted with the care of her own destinies, in order to protect her interests in the framing of the general laws of the country?

Now, as is often the case in a deliberative body such as this House is, hon. gentlemen opposite have wandered from the real ground of debate and have indulged in considerations which are more or less germane to the matter under discussion. They have spoken of the abuses of power perpetrated by the provincial governments in connection with the preparation of the voters' lists or, rather, in the framing of their Franchise Acts, as the voters' lists are under the control of the municipal authorities, the most competent to deal fairly with the matter. The hon. gentlemen may think that this criticism is a sufficient justification of their attitude, in setting up as reformers of abuses, but I must confess that I am very little affected by such a plea. Now so long as they have not devised a system of franchise that is absolutely above criticism, in theory and in practice, I shall hold firm to the belief that the provincial and municipal system is the most economical, the most equitable system, and the one that meets best the wants and tendencies of our parliamentary institutions. Moreover, the few blemishes that have been pointed out in that system arise from the fact that our provincial laws, as all our other laws, are applied by men liable to err. The disadvantages complained of do not arise from the system itself but from the enforcing of it. These drawbacks, however, sink into insignificance when compared with the abuses of every description that have been creeping in under the Franchise Act of 1885.

I agree that the hon. gentlemen must not have a very vivid recollection of the enforcement of that law, having never been called upon to watch its operation, as they had in the revising barrister a devoted friend who spared them the trouble of attending to the preparation of the voters' lists. But in our case, it was quite a different matter, because we had to go through our several constituencies and to do the work for which that Government official was paid for, so that we know fully the value of that Act of 1885.

By repealing that iniquitous Act we are purely and simply doing away with a law that was inimical to the freedom and autonomy of our provinces; we are imple-

Mr. BOURASSA.

menting a formal and sacred pledge given to the electorate, while, at the same time, blotting out from the Statute-book an Act that constituted one of the most unpardonable attempts ever made against the constitution by the Conservative party.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, Sir, that this is such an important measure that both sides of the House should approach it in a calm spirit, for it is of too much importance to import any heat into this discussion. No party advantage should be sought in dealing with a Bill of this kind. So far, I am glad to say, that judicial spirit in dealing with the measure has been fairly well maintained, and I trust that such will characterize the debate on this Bill through its various stages. For my own part, I propose to take that course throughout, because I must repeat what I said at the outset that no party advantage should be gained by dealing with this Bill. Now, Sir, the present Franchise Bill that has been in operation for some years, is one that has been on trial to a very large extent, and time and experience alone could point out the weak points of that Bill. Those are the only means which we have of determining whether any Act passed by this House has met the expectations of hon. gentlemen who were parties to its enactment. I say that the Franchise Bill has been on trial, and if it has not met the expectations of all those who engaged in framing it, of all those who were strong supporters of it at that time, and if it has accomplished anything more than was expected by those who on that occasion gave it a very honest opposition, it is not at all to be expected that even they should not adhere to the ground that was taken by them when this Bill was introduced. Now, Sir, we have had several years experience of the operation of that Act. No one can pretend that it is without some defects. I do not think it has been urged from any side that some changes should not be made to the Bill. As I said before, time has pointed out some weak points in it, there is no doubt about that; but time has pointed out with equal clearness that there were many strong points in the Bill that the House should not be disposed to give up. I think I can fairly challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to say that there has not been a single move, there has not been any demand whatever in the country for the repeal of this Franchise Bill. True, hon. gentlemen have passed resolutions, and they have introduced Bills, in doing which they were clearly within their right, and they have made very strong speeches in the country. They have endeavoured by every means. I will say constitutional means, to excite public opinion strongly against this Bill. But, Sir, after a trial of something like twelve years of the Franchise Bill, not a single petition has been presented to this House asking for its repeal. Hon. gentlemen must

clearly see that all their efforts have not resulted in any demand coming up from the people of the Dominion of Canada asking for a repeal of that Act. Now if that be the case, it seems to me that our course is very clear. But we have other evidence besides the evidence that there is no demand for a repeal of that Act. We have had two elections take place upon these lists, one in 1887 and the other in 1891. Upon both those occasions hon. gentlemen opposite made the Franchise Bill one of their test questions, indeed I may say that hon. gentlemen went to the country more especially upon that question as one upon which the elections should turn. In 1887 hon. gentlemen were unsuccessful before the people; in 1891 they were equally unsuccessful before the people. As for the election of 1896, I do not think that any hon. gentleman will go so far as to say that they can claim a verdict upon that question as a result of those elections. The truth is that hon. gentlemen gained that election simply by a fluke. So conscious are they of that fact that since they have been in office they have not attempted to repeal one single act that they had condemned so strongly, they do not attempt to redeem a single pledge they had made to the people. It is quite plain, from what has occurred, that hon. gentlemen opposite were then either insincere in their professions, or else they have found since they came into office, that if they carried them out, they would be running counter to public opinion in this country. It is true, the Liberal party out of office made a pledge that the franchise would be repealed, but that pledge of theirs was not any more solemn than their pledge that every vestige of protection would be wiped away. Two years' experience has shown that they have no intention to do that; indeed, the country seems to take it for granted that the Liberals are not to be held responsible for their pledges. Whatever concern that may be to the Liberal party, it is of great concern to the people of Canada, because if they have proven false to their pledges, the country has benefited by it, and we have not had the disturbance in trade and commerce which would have followed on any attempt on their part to keep faith. No doubt, it is to be heralded from one end of Canada to the other, that this repeal of the Franchise Act is to be a sort of redeemer for all the broken pledges of hon. gentlemen opposite, and if that be so, it would have been more consistent had these gentlemen tried to redeem their character in some other direction. But the great difficulty which meets the Liberal party now is, that, from the very outset, they have in an almost insane and unreasoning way, given opposition to the Dominion Franchise Act, and consequently nothing can appease their wrath but the total repeal of that measure. In fact, the Prime Minister stated that nothing but a complete repeal of the Act would be a fair compensation for the

wrongs suffered by the people of Canada for so many years. Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken a not very creditable course in this House and in the country in their opposition to this law. They sought to back up their objections to it by holding up the judges of this country as blind tools in the hands of the Conservatives, and they charged these judges with revising the list in the interests of that political party. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) declared, the other evening, that the great difficulty of the Liberal party in that revision was, that they had to watch the revising officers, and, translated into plain English, that statement means that the judges of this country who acted as revising officers, were false to their sworn obligations. I am glad to say, Sir, that the members of the judiciary of Canada are above any such false aspersions, for we know that if they err at all, it is an error of judgment, and not one arising from venal motives. I say, Sir, that there was no foundation for the imputations which the Liberals made against our judiciary, and which imputations were made for the sole purpose of backing up their statements that the Franchise Act was bad from the beginning. I am prepared to admit that the franchise law has many faults, but it never had the fault of being any political advantage to one party or the other in this country. Any statements to the contrary are absolutely destitute of truth, and yet such statements have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite to gain paltry party advantages. After all the outcry made by the Liberal party against the Dominion Franchise Act for years and years, the people of the country have shown, by the general elections of 1887 and 1891, that they upheld the Conservative party in passing that law, and even to-day there has not been a single petition presented to this House in support of the course taken by hon. gentlemen opposite in proposing to repeal that Act. In view of the denunciation of the judges and the revising officers by the Liberal party, it is a very curious thing that these very gentlemen opposite, under their proposed Bill, place the final revision of the lists under the control of these same judges. Nothing could more clearly demonstrate the slanders that hon. gentlemen opposite have set afloat. I do not say, Sir, that all the Liberal members engaged in this warfare against the judges and the revising officers, but I am sorry to say that a great number of hon. gentlemen opposite were guilty of that offence. Even the other day, the right hon. the First Minister declared here, that these lists were a terror to the people. If they were a terror to the people because of the expense, the hon. gentleman did not say so; and so he left it to be inferred that there was some other ground for the terror which these lists inspired. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that this is the most infamous Act ever

placed on the Statute-books, that the people are chafing under it, and that, for that reason, the Act ought to be wiped out in toto.

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) says, "Hear, hear." Well, I congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite on the improvement in their morals; I congratulate them on their change of heart. I congratulate them that they are now attempting to undo the harm they have done in the past and that they are now proposing under this Bill to give the revision of the lists to these very same county court judges whom they denounced, because, in forty-nine cases out of fifty the final revision of the list will be entrusted, under the authority of the municipal council, to the county court judges.

Therefore, the slander put forth was practically against the judges of the land, and surely could not be assumed to have been made against persons who might have been appointed revising officers, and I do not think they have been attacked any more than the judges. I do not think any hon. member will pretend to say that in this Act, as it stands to-day, there is a particle of party advantage in it. It is not, I repeat, a matter of party advantage we have to consider, but it is one of public utility. It is a question which we can afford to consider with respect to the general safety of the Parliament of Canada, and with a view to secure the vote of every British subject who has not been disqualified under the Act of any legislature; we can afford to consider the Bill on that ground, and I hope before a conclusion is arrived at we will meet on that common ground and frame a Bill on the lines I have indicated.

I come now to the question of expense, because that question as connected with the revision of the lists is practically all that divides the two political parties at this time. If hon. gentlemen opposite were desirous of perfecting a measure rather than of clamouring for the repeal of the present Act, if they were prepared to consider this subject on common ground, then the issue would be narrowed down to a question of expense. The hon. First Minister, in discussing the matter, stated, as an offset against the great cost involved by the revisions which took place at considerable intervals and which nevertheless involved an extremely large expense, that the cost would be entirely removed by handing over the preparation of the lists to the municipal and provincial authorities. The hon. gentleman went so far as to use the following words, which are very strong words, and to which much weight must be attached:—

I place myself in the judgment of the House when I say that the lists so prepared in Ontario, with the exception of the lists in the cities, do

Mr. CLANCY.

not cost a cent to the provincial treasury; the lists in Quebec do not cost a cent to the provincial treasury; and those lists in Ontario and Quebec do not cost a cent to individual members. They are prepared by the municipal councils without any expenditure.

I do not accuse the hon. gentleman of having deliberately made a statement of that kind, I do not believe he would do such a thing; but the hon. gentleman has spoken without that information which he should have possessed in order to guide him in making so strong a statement, that the revision would not cost the province one cent and would not cost the candidates a cent, but the whole work would be done by the municipal authorities. What is the fact in this connection? The list is prepared by the municipal councils throughout Ontario—and I am only speaking for that province. These municipal lists in nine cases out of ten are prepared for the purpose of municipal elections, and if any revision takes place it must be made by a county judge, and for the purpose of purging the list of all the inequalities and faults that will occur in lists prepared for municipal purposes. No one could say that lists prepared by the councils, if left at that stage and there was no provision made to go beyond that, would be non-partisan. Every hon. member who has had experience in Ontario is aware that the lists always take their colouring and political complexion from the clerks, assessors and councils, and those lists are loaded up in every case in this province with the names of persons who have no right to appear on the lists and have no vote. There are hundreds and thousands of men left off under such circumstances, while people possessing the right to vote should have their names on the lists. The preliminary revision of the lists by the municipal council is of the most loose description, and is only a very small measure towards the preparation of provincial or Dominion lists. No pretense is made to revise this municipal list except on the eve of an election. This is because it involves a very large charge to the candidates; and my own experience has been, and I have been engaged in revising the lists both under the Dominion franchise and under the provincial Act, that no hon. member who has placed the lists side by side with lists prepared under the present Franchise Act, would say that the cost to the candidates of revising the provincial lists could be made one farthing less than revising the Dominion lists. I am leaving outside the question as to whether the province or the Dominion should pay the expense, and I am dealing with the subject entirely from the position of the candidate who is undertaking to revise the lists. Suppose we have a provincial election. If the provincial and the Dominion election do not take place on the same year and on the same list, what follows? The Dominion member or candidate must in

every case revise the provincial list, should the Dominion franchise, being based on the municipal lists, he must revise the list the same as if no election had taken place and as if no list had been revised by the candidates for the local legislature.

It is perfectly idle to contend that either a municipal revision, which is a mere preliminary revision, or a revision for the provincial elections, is sufficient to take the place of the revision necessary for the Dominion elections. In every case we must have a revision for the Dominion as well as for the local elections, unless they take place in the same year, which is a most unlikely and a most undesirable thing. Hon. gentlemen in power here and those in power in the province of Ontario are pulling the strings together pretty well now. I do not know how long that will last; but the right arm of the hon. First Minister would no doubt think it a proper thing to bring on the provincial elections at the same time as the Dominion elections. In that case they could use the same lists; but otherwise they could not. With regard to the expense upon the candidates, the local candidates must bear the cost of their own revision, and even if this Bill becomes law, the Dominion candidates will have to bear the cost of revising the lists on their own account just as much as if the Dominion Franchise Act was in force. What happens? Whenever there is a revision of the lists, the judges must be paid, the clerks must be paid, other expenses must be provided for, and in the long run there is not one dollar saved to either the provincial or Dominion candidates. We have therefore to come down to the narrow question as to the sums to be paid to the judges and revisers, and the other expenses, and who should pay them. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen seek shelter under the suggestion that there is something to be gained by unloading the expense upon the municipalities. I do not think that is an expense which the people of Ontario are prepared to take upon themselves; and I do not see any reason why the Federal Parliament of Canada should not bear a fair share of the cost of revising the lists. The question of cost appears now to be the only possible ground of contention between the two political parties, and upon that ground it seems to me that we could meet and get a reasonable Bill, the provisions of which would give no party advantage. We were told by the right hon. First Minister that the cardinal principle of this Bill was to take the revision of the lists out of the hands of those desperate revising officers, and place it entirely under the control of the municipalities. The right hon. gentleman must know that, in view of the varied franchises in all the provinces, particularly those in the province of Ontario to-day, if that be the cardinal prin-

ciple, it is violated on the very threshold. The cities and county towns of the province are to-day under the Registration Act, which means that one-fourth of the whole voting population of Ontario are absolutely beyond the control of the municipalities. I can hardly believe that hon. gentlemen opposite took that into consideration when they made the statement that the revision was to be under municipal control. But that cardinal principle is violated further than that. If the provincial lists be more than one year old, this Bill provides that Dominion machinery may be initiated under the authority of the Parliament of Canada to secure a revision. Hon. gentlemen know perfectly well that they are unable, under the existing laws of the province of Ontario, to put in motion any municipal machinery for the revision of the lists, and therefore they must provide machinery for making up their own lists. It is most likely to happen at any time that the local lists shall be more than one year old, as the scope of the Registration Act is being constantly extended. In fact, there is a provision on the Statute-book to-day that the Registration Act may be extended to all the cities, towns and villages of the province of Ontario; and when that is done, it practically means that in all such cases the lists will be more than a year old, and the greater part of the revision will have to take place under the authority of the federal Act, and not under the authority of the municipalities or the province. Now, there are strong reasons against handing over the control of the federal franchise—to the provincial authorities. We commit ourselves, by an act of that kind, to a franchise that we absolutely know nothing about. We commit ourselves to a franchise which will vary in each province, and will take the insane course of handing over to the provinces the complete control of the Dominion franchise. The franchise adopted by each province—no matter how inconsistent these franchises may be with each other—will form an integral part of the Dominion franchise. Whether it be one that would commend itself to this Parliament or not, and whether it be good or bad, we will have to abide by the consequences.

I submit moreover that this is a dangerous power to place in the hands of the local legislatures. We have striking examples given us of what erratic and mischievous courses these legislatures may follow in order to gain a party advantage at an election. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) has shown us what has taken place in the province of Nova Scotia, and we have had most striking instances of the abuses which have arisen in the province of Manitoba out of the franchise adopted in that province—a franchise based upon the sole ground of party advantage. We are

asked to make this Parliament the mere creature of the local legislatures in this most important matter.

One of the strong reasons against this measure is the fact that it will have the effect of disfranchising a very large number of people who ought to have the right to vote at Dominion elections. Take the province of Ontario, for instance. The franchise of that province differs materially from that of every other province, particularly in this respect that residence is there made a special qualification. To be entitled to be put on the list, the applicant must, as a first essential, have resided in the province one year, and within the particular electoral district for at least three months. Apply this rule to the cities of Hull and Ottawa. A man might be eleven months a resident of the city of Ottawa, and it would be impossible to have his name put upon the list, but a similar rule would not apply when he crossed the provincial line into the province of Quebec, unless a similar Act should be passed by that province. Although a man may be a resident of Canada, although he may have every right one can imagine to entitle him to vote, although he may own half a million dollars worth of property in the city of Ottawa, if he were not a whole year in the province he would, under this Bill, have no right to vote in a Dominion election; and having changed his residence, neither would he have any right to vote in the province of Quebec. My hon. friend the Solicitor General must see the necessity of protecting that class of persons, which is very numerous. The means of travel, the disposition of our people to change about a good deal, point to the necessity of protecting that class of people from disfranchisement. This measure would operate in every case against a person coming into the province of Ontario from any one of the other provinces, unless he had been a resident of Ontario at least a year.

There is another reason which I do not think my hon. friend the Solicitor General can have taken into consideration. The constituencies for the Dominion elections are not now, and never can be, the same as those for provincial purposes. That is perfectly obvious from the fact that there ought not to be so many constituencies represented in a provincial legislature as in the Dominion Parliament from any one province. Consequently, by this Bill you will disfranchise a very considerable number of voters. Let me put a case to the hon. gentleman. Take three local municipalities, A, B and C. These may be all in a single electoral division for the Dominion and in different electoral divisions for the local. Take, for instance, the riding I have the honour to represent, in that riding there are three local municipalities, which are in three separate electoral districts for the provincial elections, but which are all in the one electoral

Mr. CLANCY.

district for Dominion purposes, so that any change of residence from one to the other might have the effect of disfranchising those who make the change. By this means a very considerable number of persons, who possess all the qualifications, would be unable to vote at a Dominion election, owing to their names being excluded from the provincial lists.

It was stated the other evening by an hon. member, as one of the difficulties in connection with the Dominion franchise, that owing to the revision in some cases only taking place at very great intervals, a large number of persons were disfranchised, and consequently the number of votes polled in the Dominion elections showed a smaller percentage of the total number of voters than was the case in the local election. I took the trouble to look into that matter, and I found the reverse to be the case. I compared the Dominion election of 1891 with the provincial election of 1890, in the province of Ontario, the former of which took place in March and the latter in June. I found that the number of votes on the Dominion lists for the province of Ontario in 1891 was 553,904, and that the number polled was 371,105, or 65 per cent of the entire lists. Then I took the provincial votes cast at the elections of 1890, as compared with the number on the provincial lists, and I found that whereas the number on the lists was 528,902 the number polled was 339,287, or 62½ per cent of the total vote as against 67 per cent polled at the Dominion elections.

Mr. CASEY. What was the percentage?

Mr. CLANCY. The percentage of votes cast compared with those on the lists in the Dominion elections was 67 per cent, and in the local election only 62½, taking the list of 1891 for the Dominion and the list of 1890 for the province. There were 25,002 more names on the Dominion lists than on the provincial lists, and there were polled on the provincial list 31,818 less than on the Dominion lists, showing, first, that there was a greater number on the Dominion list than upon the local, and next, that a greater percentage of those cast their vote. That arose from causes that must be perfectly apparent to hon. gentlemen. It was largely due to the fact that persons changed about their local residences, and local residence being the essence of qualification in Ontario, many persons lost their right to vote from the fact that they had changed their residence from one riding to another. I am perfectly well persuaded that that accounts for the smaller vote always being obtained under what is called one man one vote, in the province of Ontario, than would have been the case, had the local residence not been, as I said, the basis of the right to vote. Now, that would affect persons already on the list, and it would affect those to be placed upon the list as being entitled

to vote. It would also raise that other question, which is of serious consequence—that where there are three local ridings, as I have pointed out, in a Dominion riding, a number of people must be disfranchised—and I want my hon. friend to keep that in mind—if they go from one local constituency to another, even though they remain in the same Dominion electoral district. That is a very serious consequence of a Bill of this kind. I think my hon. friend will see, if he looks into what I have pointed out, that it is utterly unworkable, so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, unless he is disposed—and I do not think he is disposed—to disfranchise a large number of people in the province of Ontario who otherwise would have the right to vote. Surely, no hon. gentleman would take the ground that we can afford to pass a Bill of that kind, having the effects that I have pointed out—and I have endeavoured to do it without heat, with a view to making this, if possible, a good Bill.

Now, it does seem to me, that the House will hardly agree with the ground taken by the right hon. the First Minister and others on that side, that the franchise is of such a domestic character that it should be under the control of the municipal councils and of the province. It seems to me, that the true basis on which you can fix a franchise is, to take into consideration the conditions of the people and the subject coming under the control of the legislative bodies to be elected, whether Dominion or local. I do not think you can safely disregard that. It is not disregarded with respect to even municipal franchises. We find that it is not so domestic in its character that you can lay down one uniform rule. Under the Municipal Act, the city has one basis of franchise, towns another, incorporated villages another, and local or rural municipalities another. The reason is, as is perfectly obvious, that the conditions are not the same and that the basis of the franchise must be always suited to the conditions of the people and the subjects that come under their control. While there is a difference in the basis of the franchise, they go further, proving that there is nothing domestic about it. The same franchise is not given for voting a money by-law as for electing a municipal council. No one would say we must lay down that rule either with regard to the province or with regard to the Dominion, and, to my mind, there are rights that would forbid the idea of making the franchise the same for the Dominion as for the province. Suppose that we had a question of direct taxation arising in this country. That may not arise in the time of hon. members present, but we are here discussing a question of principle. No one would think that we should give the same franchise for voting on a question of direct taxation as for the purpose of electing members to this House. The power of direct taxation is an extraor-

dinary power and one which involves serious consequences. This has been taken notice of and acted upon by the municipalities, as I have stated, that in voting for money by-laws and by-laws having a money consideration, they have limited the franchise to those having property in fee or upon long leases. In questions of taxation, you must go back to the principle of giving adequate power to those who are to bear the burden. This may be a rather remote case, but it shows the danger that would result from assenting to the principles that hon. gentlemen opposite have stated.

Now, Sir, no one has denied, not even the right hon. the First Minister, that the principle of federal control of the franchise for election to this House is a sound principle. But the excuse they give for departing from this good rule is: While we place it in the hands of the provincial authorities, we still retain control. It seems to me, that is simply a contradiction in terms. That it should be placed absolutely—I was going to say, irrevocably—in the hands of the provincial authorities, and that we still retain control, I suppose, by the fact that we retain power to repeal the Act. But that seems to me an unsound and far-fetched argument. If hon. gentlemen are disposed to place the control with the provinces, they must have decided that they can do so without danger. To fall back upon the argument, that if they find themselves mistaken, they can retrace their steps after the harm is done, is a very strange and very faulty argument by which to justify any legislation, and especially legislation having such serious consequences as this. I do not say that everything that has been urged against the Franchise Act has not been urged without some ground. I can assent, for instance, to the view that it is necessary for this House to make the revision of the lists cheaper. But when it is proposed to repeal the Franchise Act in order to make the lists cheaper, the argument seems to me very weak indeed. Though I have listened with great interest to the speeches on this subject, I have failed to hear one hon. gentleman prove that it was necessary to repeal the Franchise Act in order to reach the end desired, the cheapening of the lists. The allegation of partiality on the part of the judges seems to me to be unfair and without foundation. We are too prone, on both sides, on occasions of this kind, to have very great and very unwarranted dread of what the judges may do because of their political leanings. I am sure that, in all the election trials that have taken place, and in what we see of the records through appeals, we have found the judges throughout Canada entirely free from partisanship. I doubt whether there is an hon. gentleman in this House—and I never heard one outside—who could say, that, so far as our judges are concerned, even in a case that may involve the seat of

a member for whom, on political grounds, they have the strongest sympathy, they have ever departed from their duty.

I remember very well when this Franchise Act was passed, and when the appointment of revising officers took place; I remember well the case of the appointment of a county judge in the county in which I live. He was a strong Liberal, an extremely strong Liberal; in fact he was known more particularly by his strong partisan feeling in favour of the Liberal party. There was a great dread on the part of the Conservatives that if this judge were made a revising officer they would not have fair-play. Pressure was brought to bear upon Sir John A. Macdonald not to make the appointment on the ground that the judge was an extreme partisan and therefore could not divorce himself from his extreme leanings in the revision of the list. Sir John A. Macdonald refused to make the change, he carried out the uniform practice under the Bill of making the judges revising officers, and what has transpired? No one who then entertained that fear would not be glad to-day to make a public declaration that no fairer man ever existed. While he had strong partisan feelings, he never forgot that he was a judge, and he never forgot to discharge his duties without the slightest partiality. Now I think that obtains generally from one end of Canada to the other. The statements made in vilification of the revising officers, both inside and outside this House, have been without foundation, and I am glad that an opportunity is now afforded hon. gentlemen of retracing their steps and of withdrawing to a large extent what they have said. In proposing to-day to hand over the control of the revision of the lists to these men, they offer a complete vindication of those men. Now I say in conclusion that it is absolutely necessary for the Federal Parliament to have its own franchise. The interests of this country are too great to take a step that may involve so serious consequences. While there might have been years ago safety in employing the lists made under the control of the provinces, experience has shown that that cannot be done now, experience has shown that the provinces have taken advantage of the control of their own lists to disfranchise Dominion officials whenever they thought they could serve their party interests by so doing. In view of the changing conditions, it is always best to make the franchise in this country depend upon existing conditions, to depend upon the great subjects to be dealt with, and for that reason we should control our own franchise. I repeat that there is no ground of contention at this moment except that of expense. But the machinery to be instituted will not be cheaper to any of the candidates. There may be a saving effected, and I hope there will be, with regard to the sums that are to be paid to the revising officer. We must revise the lists just as often, and with just as

Mr. CLANCY.

much expense to the candidates, whether this Bill becomes law or not. It will make no difference, so far as they are concerned, whether the Dominion or the province will bear the greater portion of the sum to be paid for revision, as that will depend much upon the machinery employed. We cannot afford, for the purpose of cheapening the cost of the list, to surrender any of the great advantages which the Federal Parliament enjoys by retaining control of the franchise and the preparation of its own lists.

Mr. CASEY. I have listened with some attention to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down in the hope that he could solve a question that has been puzzling me since this debate began. That question is, Why in the world should an Opposition object to the repeal of the present Franchise Act? I do not know that the hon. gentleman has given me much light on the subject, though I may be able to refer to a hint or two that he has given me, before I close. But it seems to me, as a general proposition, a very strange thing that an Opposition should object to the repeal of an Act which gives such vast powers to a Government as the present franchise law does.

It might seem strange, on the other hand, that a Government should seek to divest itself of these great powers and privileges. My hon. friend does not see any party advantage in it. I think, Sir, those of us who for eighteen years were dragged under the harrow of that Act, were able to see where party advantage came in. It is asserted that our conduct has been marked by a bitter attack on the good faith of the judges of this country who acted as revising officers. It must be remembered that not all the revising officers were judges; it must be remembered, further, that all the revising officers, whether judges or not, employed a revising officer's clerk, who did what some would call the routine and what others might call the dirty work, of the job. It is no use to attempt, as my hon. friend has done, to compare the duties of a judge under the Provincial Franchise Act sitting to hear appeals against a list which has been made by the municipal authorities, with the duties of a judge acting as revising officer in compiling the lists 'de novo,' as he does under the Dominion Franchise Act. The revising officer appointed his clerk, who was always a man thoroughly in the interest of the party then in power, to do the practical work of getting the list ready. No need to go over all the steps which were to be taken. Everybody remembers what facilities the revising officer's clerk had for doing work that had to be done, on the other side, at the expense of the candidate. The result was that, as a matter of fact, the expense of preparing the list was on one side borne by the Government of the day and the people of the country, and on the other side borne by the individual candidate and his supporters. There

is one vast advantage. Even supposing the revising officer himself to have been reasonably impartial when the actual question of admitting or rejecting a vote came before him, it was in the preliminary work of compiling the list and putting men on, whom the other side had to appeal at great cost to get off, leaving men off whom the other side had to appeal at great cost to put on—it was in these preliminary measures that the party in power had a vast advantage under that Act; and how great it was, many of us know to our cost.

The hon. gentleman says that this Act was sustained by the electorate of the country because, in 1887, when, as he correctly says, it was a leading issue, the Government was sustained. Does that prove anything? Sir, if you pack a jury and then appeal to that jury to say whether they were fairly constituted, what answer are you going to get from the jury? If you have a Franchise Act which packs the electorate of this country in favour of a particular party and Government, what answer are you going to get from that electorate when you appeal to them at the polls? The fact that the electorate voted on lists, packed as they were, to sustain the Government that passed that law, shows nothing in favour of the law, but is one of its severest condemnations. In 1891 the election was fought on other lines, not chiefly on this, as the hon. gentleman said, though this was one of the issues, but the same packing of the electorate continued then, and continued in 1896.

Why should we as a Government and a party wish to surrender these great advantages when we come into power? It may seem to be asking the House to believe a great deal, but we ask the House to believe that those who have suffered so long from the injustice of the Franchise Act do not wish to inflict that injustice on others.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be bound by some idea of consistency to stand up for a system that would oppress them. We propose to avoid the expense of correcting the lists, and we know what hon. gentlemen opposite would suffer if we chose to use this machine as it was used before. I do not say that poor, weak human nature does not urge some of us to press on the Government the propriety of retaining the old Franchise Act for a few years and giving hon. gentlemen opposite a dose of their own medicine. I believe that to be the inward feelings of a good many unregenerate hearts on this side of the House; but, having seen in Opposition that the Act was unfair and unjust, we have sufficient sense of consistency to compel us to stand by the promise we made in Opposition, and repeal this iniquity. When we were fighting this law by private subscription to raise funds necessary to cor-

rect the lists, we knew what power the other side possessed. We had no rich contractors at our back, we had no appointments to make.

An hon. MEMBER. You are all right now.

Mr. CASEY. An hon. gentleman says we are all right now.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the Yukon?

Mr. CASEY. No doubt the Government might now obtain favours from contractors. If we had contractors at our back who were prepared to advance funds, we would be in better shape to run elections than we have been for eighteen years. With all those funds supposed to be available, the powers given to us by the Franchise Act, the advantage of being able to raise money without putting our hands in our own pockets, as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has said—what could we not do to hon. gentlemen opposite at the next elections? We could make them a corporal's guard. But consistency, propriety and a sense of justice have compelled the Government, aided by their supporters, to throw aside the Act and revert to the old constitutional law of Canada. New-comers into Dominion politics, like the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) may forget that we have carried on elections for this Parliament under provincial franchises for a much greater number of years than we have carried on elections under the Dominion franchise. The wisdom of the fathers of confederation thought that difficulties might arise from the attempt to arrange and carry out a uniform system for the whole Dominion. They provided that in the meantime the provincial franchise should be used. From 1867 to 1885 it was used, and used to the satisfaction of every one concerned. In 1885, for a party purpose, which was thoroughly carried out by the event, a change was made to a uniform Dominion franchise, and the change involved the one element which I think is fatal to a franchise of that kind. My own theoretical preference is for a uniform Dominion franchise, if it could be obtained without most serious disadvantage. But no such franchise can be obtained unless we place the compiling of the lists in the hands of Dominion officials.

Mr. CLANCY. Is not the hon. gentleman raising the question for himself of a uniform franchise?

Mr. CASEY. My theoretical, individual and personal opinion—I do not think I can make it clearer to the hon. gentleman—would be in favour of a uniform franchise for the Dominion, if it could be had without serious disadvantage. As the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has pointed out, no such franchise can be enforced ex-

cept under the direction of Dominion officials, for we cannot compel municipal authorities to frame lists at our dictation, and this is the radical defect of a uniform system, and one reason that made me give up the idea as one that is not practicable. You cannot secure it without having Dominion officials to compile the lists, and whenever you have those officials, you have Government interference and the evils we have complained of under the present system. The question of expense I will come to later. I should be very glad to see, if possible, a system of uniform manhood suffrage, one man one vote, registration up to the last day possible before the elections; but for the reasons I have pointed out, I believe such a system to be thoroughly impracticable without bringing in the worst evils of which we have complained under the present system.

Defects have been alleged in certain of the provincial systems in the preparation of the voters' lists. If there is some discrepancy, whose fault is it? It is the fault of the electors of the particular province. How are the defects to be cured? By the action of the electors when found out. What will cure them? The very fact that these lists are going to be used for Dominion as well as provincial purposes will go far towards effecting a cure. The fact that the Ontario lists were used for Dominion elections led to a great improvement in the method of compiling the provincial lists in that province. If there were defects, they would be much more likely to be pointed out and removed when there were two sets of candidates, the candidates for the local legislature and the candidates for the Dominion Parliament to look after them.

I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) in all his attacks on the franchise of Ontario. Such an attack comes with all the less grace from the hon. gentleman, because he is largely responsible for that system as a former ornament of the Opposition in that legislature; and I have yet to learn that for some years back the Opposition in that legislature proposed any material change in the Franchise Act of Ontario, pointing in the direction which the hon. gentleman has advocated.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will pardon me for a moment. I made no attack on the provincial franchise. I simply pointed out that it could not be made applicable to this Bill.

Mr. CASEY. I did not so consider the hon. gentleman's remarks. I considered that the hon. gentleman made a distinct attack on the system of Ontario. He alleged that it disfranchised a great many people, that a great many voters did not get their names on the lists, and that its adoption would be unfair to candidates at Dominion elections.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. CLANCY. No, I did not say so.

Mr. CASEY. I took notes of his words to that effect, and I find fault with the hon. gentleman because he did not urge these points in the Ontario House. But coming to the question of expense, I must refer to the very disingenuous attempt on his part to misrepresent the position taken by the right hon. Premier in comparing the expense under a Dominion and a provincial franchise system. The right hon. gentleman stated that the provincial lists of Ontario cost nothing to the provincial treasury, nor to individuals. I think my hon. friend is perfectly correct. Nothing is paid by the Government for the preparation of the lists, the individual pays nothing, except such an amount as he is called upon to pay as a taxpayer in a municipality.

But my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) sought to make it appear that the Prime Minister said it cost the candidate nothing to have these lists revised. Nobody said anything of the kind. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) was putting up a man of straw and knocking him down; nobody ever pretended that it would not cost the candidate something to have the voters' lists revised on the eve of an election. What the Prime Minister did maintain, and what is glaringly true is this: that whereas every revision of the Dominion lists has cost the country something over a quarter million dollars, the annual compilation and revision of the voters' lists used for provincial purposes cost the province as a province nothing, and cost the voters of the country nothing, except the small cost incident to both parties when an election is just in view. That cost is not for the revision of the lists, it is not for the making of the lists; it is merely in connection with appeals made to the judge from the revised lists, and whatever cost there may be in that respect falls equally on both parties, Conservatives and Liberals alike. There is no such state of things as exists under the Dominion law, where the list is packed in advance in favour of one party, and where all the expense of revising it has to fall on the other.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey): Are the county court judges paid special fees by the province of Ontario for revising these local lists?

Mr. CASEY. I really must ask a legal friend whether there is any fee paid to the judge for revision.

Mr. BENNETT. You said there was not.

An hon. MEMBER. They are paid.

Mr. CASEY. The sitting of the court for two or three days may cost a few dollars to the province, but I was speaking of the compiling of the list in the ordinary way, which costs neither the provincial government nor the individual voter anything. Of course, if there is litigation about a

voters' list or anything else, it will cost the province something.

The cost to the municipalities of the getting up of these lists has been urged by some speakers against this Bill. That is entirely beside the question, because that cost is incurred annually by the municipalities for their own purposes. It does not cost us anything if we choose to use the same lists, and it does not matter whether it costs the municipalities \$100,000 or \$1,000,000; that is their own business if they choose to go to that expense in compiling the lists. What we have to decide is: whether we shall use these ready-made lists prepared in the fairest manner known to us, or whether we ourselves shall proceed to prepare lists of our own, imperfect and partial in their nature.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) thought he made a point when he urged that the registration which takes place in the cities and towns of Ontario was a process of a very different kind from the municipal compilation of lists, on which so much stress has been laid. Now, Sir, I do not see that there is any difference in the system. This registration does not supersede the municipal compilation of the lists in Ontario, except in regard to two classes of voters, namely, those whose qualifications are "income" or "manhood suffrage." That registration is specially intended for those who claim to be registered under the manhood suffrage clause, and it is to enable the lists to be made up to date. The registration is conducted by certain named officials not appointed specially for that purpose by the Government of the day, and there is no partiality in the constitution of the board. It has not been complained of by anybody as an unfair arrangement; its working appears to have been fair to both parties, and I do not think either party can claim to have benefited specially by the result, in the cities and towns. One of the best features of the provincial Act, and one of the best features in the proposed Dominion Bill, is, that under that system we shall have a registration which will bring down the voters' lists in our cities and towns to the latest possible moment before a poll is taken.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) makes another difficulty out of the fact that the constituencies are different for the federal and for the local Parliaments. I do not see any trouble in that. The constituencies are as a rule composed of municipalities—at this moment I do not know of any municipality which is split in two, and part in one constituency and part in another—and the lists being made for municipalities, the fact that these municipalities are differently distributed between different constituencies creates no trouble in using the municipal lists. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) urges that this proposed law will disfranchise a great many people on the ground of

residence, and so on. Well, Sir, I know it will do one thing; it will prevent what we have seen year after year in Dominion elections, namely, the importation by hundreds and thousands into Canada of people who have gone to live in the western states years ago, but whose names still remain on the Dominion lists, and who have been brought into the various constituencies simply for the purpose of voting for their party at election times. It will very properly prevent that. It was one of the greatest grievances in the past that the party with money, the party that could obtain passes from the railways, the party in power, in short, had the great advantage of being able to import a number of non-resident voters who had no further interest in the country, but who were simply drawn up like so many soldiers sent to battle to fire their one shot at the enemy and then retire. This very fact, that the non-resident vote will be disfranchised goes a long way to explain the alleged difference in the numbers on the provincial and Dominion lists. It is highly probable that two lists, even under the same franchise, the one including votes of non-residents, and the other on the principle of one man one vote, and giving no vote to non-residents; it is highly probable that as between these two lists, the stricter one as respects the question of residence would have a smaller number of names on it. But when it comes down to the real voting power of the country, to the representation of men who have the right to vote, I say that the list which only includes the residents and which only allows a man to vote once where he has a residence; that list more truly represents the real voting power and the public opinion of the country. On all these points, the proposed Bill will be a distinct improvement over the Dominion Franchise Act. But, Sir, even were I not satisfied that the provincial list of my own province is in all respects superior to the Dominion lists; even then, from the point of view of provincial rights and for the sake of preventing governmental interference with the compilation of the lists, I would vote, as I am going to vote, for the Bill proposed by the Government.

Mr. POUPORE. Mr. Speaker, I propose to say a few words on the question before the House, and to define my position in regard to this Bill. During my election in the county of Pontiac in the election of 1896, I found that a number of responsible electors were by some means or other left off the voters' list. I had a great deal of trouble to explain this to my friends—in fact I could not successfully explain it to them—but I did offer the explanation that there was no intention on the part of the revising officer, or on the part of any one I knew connected with the revision of the list to leave their names off. I then promised positively, that, on the very

first occasion which presented itself in this House of repealing the Franchise Act, I would vote for its repeal. I purpose keeping that promise. I have never, to my knowledge, made any promise during an election that I did not fulfil after I was elected. I do not wish, by expressing myself in this way, to convey the idea that I approve fully of the Bill now before the House. I can see very many objections to it; but I must declare that it is certainly an improvement upon the Franchise Act, which it proposes to abolish. There are many difficulties in the way of providing a perfect franchise law; but, after all, Mr. Speaker, what is it we should seek for when we are preparing a list of the electors of this Dominion? Is it not that those who are entitled to vote in any constituency in Canada should have their names upon that list? And is there any means more easy or more suitable for finding out who are the real, genuine voters in any municipality than to go to the secretary-treasurer of that municipality? I am quite aware that it is impossible to introduce a Franchise Bill into this House which will meet the requirements of the different provinces of the Dominion. In the province of Quebec, in which I represent a county, if we take the municipal lists, prepared by the secretary-treasurers of the municipalities, we can rely upon it that we have in those lists the names of the good, law-abiding citizens of the county who are entitled to vote by virtue of the property qualification or whatever qualification the law requires. Now, it does occur to me, that, in constituting this House of Commons, we should see to it that the people who are sent here shall be sent by the bona fide electors of Canada, and not by a lot of men who are imported for the purpose of voting. The representatives of the people in this House of Commons ought to be sent here by the men who have the property qualification or whatever qualification may be necessary to entitle them to vote.

I wish to point out another feature of this matter, which is this. The Government of the day have the responsibility of introducing a Franchise Bill. They feel that it is necessary to abolish the existing Franchise Act. I approve of them for doing so, and I shall support them so far. They now introduce a Franchise Bill prepared by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), which, I think, is, on the whole, a fairly good measure. But there is one serious objection to it. Every member of this House should be careful to see that the Parliament of Canada does not divest itself of the control of the Dominion franchise. Let us avail ourselves of the information we may receive from the secretaries of the different municipalities in the preparation of the lists; but let the House of Commons of Canada, by some means, control the preparation of that list. I think that ought to be done, and I

Mr. POUPORE.

think it can be done; and when this House resolves itself into committee to discuss the different clauses of the Bill, I hope we may be able to induce the hon. Solicitor General to insert some clause that will reserve to the Commons of Canada that power which belongs to it. As regards the different clauses of the Bill, I may say that I know very little about them.

Mr. BENNETT. That is true.

Mr. POUPORE. I must confess that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is right, for once.

Mr. BENNETT. I am sure you do, or you would not approve of it.

Mr. POUPORE. I view this measure as one which should not be considered a partisan measure. I look upon it as a measure introduced by the Government of the day, which is alone responsible to Canada for the introduction of the Bill. It is our function and our right to amend and criticise it, but I think that criticism should not go to the extent of party criticism. I think we should assist the Government of the day in preparing such a Bill as will afford the honest elector to record his vote when an election comes round by the easiest and cheapest means, and I know of no means so inexpensive and so easy for securing a proper list of the electors, as to take the list prepared by the municipal secretary of every municipality for the purpose of the municipal government of that municipality. In that way you get, not the bogus voter, but the solid, responsible citizen of the country, to express his opinion when election day comes round. The consequence is, that you have elected to this House, not a party man, but a man who represents the intelligence of the county from which he comes. Unfortunately, I must say, I have observed, since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, that partyism is brought into the discussion of every question that comes up. I suppose this is one of the things belonging to partyism: but I must say, that I am not sufficiently partisan to look upon every question that is brought up with the eyes of a partisan. I feel that it is my duty to consider a measure upon its merits; and, if the measure deserves my support, my party ties must disappear. I feel that I have a duty to perform to my county and also to the country I live in. With regard to this Franchise Bill, I do not know how it affects the province of Ontario; but, speaking from what I know of my native province of Quebec, I do not think you can find half a dozen intelligent electors in any county who will say that they approve of the present Franchise Act. On the contrary, from my experience, and with all the means I have had of informing myself on the subject, I can say that the unanimous desire is that the Dominion Franchise Act should be abolished. The late Sir John Thompson, some years

before his death, introduced, or foreshadowed, a measure very much on the principle of the present Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. Not at all.

Mr. POUPORE. Perhaps not. Still the abolition of the Franchise Act was the end aimed at.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. POUPORE. Or a modification, if you will. It was, at all events, a complete modification of the existing Franchise Act. That hon. gentleman, whose opinion was regarded by both sides of the House as of considerable weight, saw that the franchise law for the Dominion was not a success. If some five or six years ago, he saw that the Franchise Act of 1885 was not working properly, that it costs this country too much, that it was time a change was made, do you not think, Sir, that this Government is going outside its duty when introducing a Bill to repeal the Franchise Act and give us what I hope will be an improvement on that measure. If the responsibility rested with the Opposition for the introduction of this Franchise Bill, I would say that we would require to exert ourselves and see that we brought in a good and proper Bill, but when we find that the Government has introduced a Bill, our duty is to try and make that as good as we can from our standpoint and let the Government assume the responsibility for the measure when passed.

I do not propose to detain the House longer. I simply rose to explain my position on this Bill. I am not certain whether an amendment is to be proposed or not; but if there should be one, I would be sorry because, as I have already said, I promised in my county on every occasion, and more particularly on nomination, that I would vote for the repeal of the Franchise Act on the very first occasion that presented itself and as this is the first occasion I wish to inform the House that I shall vote for the Bill.

Mr. ROGERS. It is not necessary for me to say very much on this subject because it is quite evident that, in the opinion, of the great majority of the people, the present Franchise law is expensive, cumbersome and impracticable. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) complained that there had been no protests against the present law and no petition for a change. It seems to me that a stronger protest from the great body of the farmers of Ontario we could not have than in the platform laid down in 1891 by the Patrons of Industry, one of the principal planks of which was the repeal of the present Act. I have never heard of that plank being opposed at any public meeting, and as the platform I have mentioned was subscribed to by 300,000 to 400,000 farmers of Ontario, that constitutes a very practical protest against the continuance of this Act.

I do not pretend to approve of all the features of the Ontario franchise law. I do not believe in its method of registration, nor do I believe in the principle of manhood suffrage. I cannot find any sound, substantial reason in favour of universal or manhood suffrage, especially in view of the fact that every man in the country to-day who takes an interest in public affairs, ought certainly to be able to become possessed of the qualifications required. I know that a great many support that principle on the ground of economy, but it seems to me that if we adopt it, we may be paying too dear for our whistle and be acting on the principle of penny wise and pound foolish. However, as the prevailing sentiment of the people seems to agree in that direction, I suppose we shall have to submit to it. As I have said, both in Ontario and Quebec the qualifications required for the possession of the franchise are so low as really to make the franchise practically universal suffrage—the qualifications consisting in the payment of a small rental of \$20 or the earning of an annual salary of \$300. Surely any man who takes any interest in the country at all can qualify himself to that extent. The system of registration in Ontario has been denounced, and properly so, by many, and I do hope at some future day to see it repealed. I know that many supporters of that Government have expressed their dissatisfaction with it and their desire for its appeal.

In the framing of the lists our great object should be, as the late Minister of Justice stated, to have them controlled by non-partisan officials. In my opinion the municipal officers, as a rule, throughout the province of Ontario at least, are non-partisan and best qualified to say who should and who should not be on the voters' lists. There should be no unfair play tolerated on either side, and I am proud to say that at present there is very much less of that bitter partisan spirit among the farmers than used to exist. I claim, and I think I may claim fairly, that to the Patrons of Industry, more than to any other organization, is due the growth of that feeling and the instilling into the people a greater spirit of independence and non-partisanship and consequently greater clearness and calmness of judgment as to what measures and policies are in the best interests of the country. The people look at things in a broader and more philosophic spirit than they did in the past, and therefore we are entitled to put more confidence in the impartial preparation of the voters' lists by the municipal officers.

In my opinion there is another step forward which we might well take. It is one which I have advocated frequently in private, but which has not yet taken any firm hold on the public. In fact I do not know of its having been brought before any governing body before, except on one occasion, when it was mentioned in the Ontario legis-

lature, I think, by Mr. Bethune. We have now practically manhood or universal suffrage, and I believe that our next step should be compulsory voting. That might have some drawbacks, and I do not pretend to say that there is more need for a compulsory voting under manhood suffrage than under property qualification. In my little experience, the poor man is not the easiest to bribe, but I do believe that one of the best preventives against the curse of bribery would be to compel men to register their votes. You may say, Sir, that that would be an arbitrary measure, but I cannot see it in that light. I would not impose a fine or imprisonment or any similar punishment for the neglect to vote, but I put the matter in this light. We know that there is no right which men more jealously guard than their right to vote. If you try to take the franchise away from a man, he will fight for it and if necessary shed his blood for it. What arbitrary exercise of power therefore would it be to compel him to come forward and exercise a right which, in theory, he values so dearly, and the taking away of which he would resist by force of arms if necessary. He enjoys the advantages and privileges of the laws of our country and the benefit of our institutions, and why should he not bear his share of the responsibility and cast his ballot? If he does not think it worth while to do so, then I say disfranchise him for two or three years until he is brought to his senses and takes an interest in the affairs of his country. I hold that this is a feasible thing. We know, of course, that many things might be said against it. It may be that a man is prevented from voting from sickness or pressure of business calling him away from home. But that can be provided for by allowing a citizen, in such a case, to make a simple affidavit before a justice of the peace or the revising officer that circumstances over which he had no control prevented him from being present and voting. Then, a man may say: I cannot vote for any of the candidates in the field, as I do not regard any of them as worthy of my confidence. But compulsory voting would be an incentive to every man to make sure of having a good candidate in the field. Men would then come to the convention and use their influence in favour of getting good men. But if, as is possible, even then, no candidate met with the citizen's approval he could, what I do not believe in or approve in myself—go to the polls and cast a blank ballot.

Mr. DAVIN. What form of compulsion would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers) use?

Mr. ROGERS. Disfranchisement for two or three years. Another reform that we should bring about is the establishment of an educational franchise qualification for voters. I would not put such a law in force at once, as there are many who have not had the advantages of education and

Mr. ROGERS.

cannot help it that they are illiterate. But no man should be put on the voters' list who cannot read or write. Let an Act be passed providing that three years after the time of its passing this educational test shall be applied. It is a most humiliating thing that one should reach the age of manhood and not be able to read or write, and many a man refrains from casting his vote because he does not wish to acknowledge his lack of education. To pass such a law would really be no hardship, because—I speak for the province of Ontario—we have compulsory education. Every child from the age of seven to the age of fourteen in that province must attend school for at least four months in the year. Free schools are provided and the children have the right to take advantage of them. I do hope that before this Bill comes before the committee these suggestions will be considered. If not adopted now we should move towards their adoption in the near future. The Bill can be improved from time to time, but, even if we cannot have them adopted at once, these points are well worth discussing. I had not intended speaking so long, but my excuse is the importance of the subject. As this Bill is in accordance with the platform of the Patrons of Industry, so far as it goes, I have pleasure in supporting it, and I am glad to see that there is so little opposition to it.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the hon. gentleman sits down, will he allow me to ask him a question? Why should the hon. gentleman, who is in favour of compulsory voting and an educational test for the franchise, support a Bill which puts the power to decide who shall be electors in the hands of other bodies?

Mr. ROGERS. I say that I am in favour of these things personally and would be glad to see them carried out. But I accept this Bill as the lesser of two evils, and hope that the reforms I have advocated will be taken up soon.

Mr. STENSON. I have taken down as well as I could follow them, the main objections to the present Bill made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). They are as follows:—Municipal lists are only preliminary in Ontario and are not really the electoral lists, and judges and clerks must be paid to have these lists revised. The lists are revised only on the eve of local elections. Then this Bill is brought in by the Liberals without having been asked for by the people. The question of expense, I think, has to be considered; the hon. member for Bothwell is of the opinion that there will not be one dollar of difference in expense by adopting the provincial lists as compared with the expense in the preparation of the federal lists. Then, again, he says that the constituencies have not all the same limits

for the provincial and for the federal Houses and therefore the law cannot apply. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I will not pretend to say that these arguments do not apply to the province of Ontario, but I do contend, and I think I shall be able to prove it in a few words, that none of them apply in the province of Quebec. In the province of Quebec, where I have had some considerable experience in preparing the electoral lists during my tenure of office as mayor of a municipality, I have found that the preparation of these lists did not cost one cent to the province nor did it cost more than a mere trifle to the municipality itself. There were no judges to be paid and no clerk to be paid for the revision of the lists. When the municipality prepares its valuation rolls, the electoral lists are prepared at the same time. Every year this valuation roll in each municipality is revised in the month of March, and when it is being revised these electoral lists are also revised by the members of the municipal council, presided over by the mayor, and with no officer either from the provincial government or from the Federal Government or from any other body to interfere with the preparation of these lists. And it is obligatory on each municipality of the province to prepare a list not only for the municipal elections, but for the provincial elections of the whole province of Quebec. This is done without expense to the province. The secretary-treasurer of each municipality has to put into the possession of the county secretary and of the provincial secretary a copy of each one of these lists without any charge. Therefore, the lists are confirmed and legalized. Now, I have never heard any objection made by any one to the preparation of these lists. They are not prepared by partisans, for my experience of municipal life in the province of Quebec is that municipal government is carried on without any political partisanship entering into the formation of its councils. I myself have had the honour of being the head of a council. The council was composed of seven members, of whom five were Conservatives. Yet I was elected by the Conservatives as their mayor, and never did there enter into the debates in council and never was anything done on political or party ground.

Mr. BERGERON. That is a model county.

Mr. STENSON. It is; it has been improving, until it now has a Liberal representative. That county was represented at the board by fourteen mayors of the fourteen municipalities constituting the county, and out of that county board, composed of fourteen mayors, I was the only Liberal mayor, and still I was elected warden of the county and president of that board. This I do not say through personal glorification, but to prove to you that in the province of

Quebec politics have nothing to do with our local organizations.

Mr. BERGERON. They would not have elected a Conservative if they were all Liberals.

Mr. STENSON. Why, certainly they would, if he was only qualified for the position, and if he was not qualified, they would not elect him.

Mr. BERGERON. You do not mean to say there was no Conservatives qualified.

Mr. STENSON. No distinction is made between Conservatives and Liberals, and the proof of that is that I worked to get a Conservative elected as mayor of the council when I was on it, and when there were only four Liberal councillors.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a good place.

Mr. STENSON. It is a good place, and it is improving. But for a number of years it was not so good, it was too Conservative. As the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) had said, every voter in the province of Quebec for municipal and provincial elections, is a bona fide voter, and that is the kind of voters we want. In the province of Quebec all these voters are bona fide voters. There is no officer that can be appointed either by the provincial or the federal authorities, who can know the bona fide voters as well as the neighbours of those bona fide voters, as well as those who conduct the local municipal business of all the bona fide voters, and of every interested party in that municipality. Those seven men composing the local council are chosen, as a general rule, from the different portions of the municipality; they are not all taken en bloc, they are chosen from the different sections and the different portions of that municipality. They are acquainted with all the surrounding families, they know exactly who are bona fide, and who are justly entitled to vote in their local affairs, they know exactly who are justly entitled to vote in provincial affairs; and I maintain that the man who is entitled to vote in local or provincial affairs is the man who is entitled to vote in Dominion affairs, and that each province should have the right of choosing those voters. Not only that, but I contend they are the best qualified to choose them. Each municipality is best qualified to choose its own electors, and those are the electors which cannot be improved upon by any outsider, even if you get a revising officer to go in there. Now, our experience has been that when the revising officer came in to prepare the federal lists, he took those local lists and examined them to see if the qualifications of the federal Act were exactly similar to those of the local Acts. If they were not he had either to strike off a few, and they were but very few, or he had to add a few, and they were but very few. Now, there was a

contest between the two parties to get to the revising officer to try to influence him to put on names, and others to try to prevent those names from being put on, or to put on others from the opposite side. I do not accuse the revising officer in my division; I do not believe that he would have been guilty of putting on any man that should not have been put on that list. But I know that he has put on names there through misrepresentation, and he has left others off, although acting in the very best good faith, he has left others off by being misinformed, by being led into an error by parties who are interested in doing it. Now, when the list is left to the preparation of the local councils, when these seven councillors are sitting there acting without any party or political prejudice at their council board, they cannot be led into that error, because each one of them knows his own section of the municipality, and on his representation no one can come in and deceive the other members. Therefore, with regard to the preliminary stage of the lists in Quebec, that objection does not carry. With regard to the payment of the judges and clerks in the province of Ontario, as mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), that does not apply in Quebec. Now with regard to the list being revised only on the eve of the local elections, that does not apply either in the province of Quebec, for in that province, in the month of March every year, these lists are carefully revised by every local council in the province who does its duty at all. Therefore, the lists are perfectly new every year. Now, with regard to this statement of the hon. member for Bothwell that the Liberals gave a pledge to bring in a new Franchise Bill without being asked, I have only to say that during my contest, not only was I asked but I promised to have the old Franchise Bill abolished, and to have as far as possible a new one based upon provincial franchise. If any proof is wanted that petitions have been sent in, the hon. member for Bothwell ought to be satisfied that a large number of petitions have been sent in here when he sees the majority of members who have been elected to assist the right hon. leader of the Government to abolish this Bill, for it is one of those pledges that we made, and it is a pledge that we are bound to carry out.

Mr. TAYLOR. The only one.

Mr. STENSON. In time we will carry them all out. Now, with regard to the limits of the constituency, the hon. member for Bothwell attempts to make a point by saying that this cannot apply because constituencies for the provinces and those for the Dominion Parliament have not the same limits. I admit they have not the same limits. Too many have been gerrymandered to have the same limits. But notwithstanding the gerrymander, this Bill does apply

Mr. STENSON.

and applies without there being a fault found in it, for surely the hon. member for Bothwell won't find in his gerrymandered constituencies any one municipality that has been split in two.

Mr. CLANCY. Oh, yes.

Mr. STENSON. Well, it will apply all the same, because if there is a list being arranged it will apply everywhere as long as it is done for the Dominion House.

Mr. CLANCY. These municipalities were split, but not for the Dominion.

Mr. STENSON. Well, then let this law be passed and it will apply just the same if they were split into a dozen parts. The list is there for the Ontario elections, the same list will be there in each municipality, and even if a portion of that municipality is put into another constituency, that does not disfranchise those who were set off for they can vote in the constituency in which they reside.

Mr. CLANCY. You do not know much about the Ontario law.

Mr. STENSON. I know something of common sense, and common sense will tell you that that does not disfranchise the portion taken off, but sets them in another constituency. I do not believe my hon. friend will say that the Ontario law is not based on common sense, we have too many sensible men coming from the province of Ontario to believe that. Now, the hon. gentleman says that the municipal lists cannot be made practical in Ontario. Well, I do not know why. We can make them practical in Quebec. If they are not practical in Ontario, go to work and make them as we have made them in Quebec and they will be just as practical in Ontario as in Quebec.

Mr. COCHRANE. What about the manhood franchise?

Mr. STENSON. I have not the slightest objection to manhood suffrage in Ontario. If you have manhood suffrage in Ontario, very well, keep it and use it, but do not ask us in Quebec to accept it, because we do not want it. Leave us free to apply the franchise as we please in the province of Quebec; leave us free also to apply it to the federal elections. I do not see what objections hon. gentlemen from Ontario or any other province can have to Quebec people electing members to this House by the votes that they think best qualified to elect them. As long as we elect our 65 members, we ask no advantage because that just allows us to conduct our affairs according to our views, and you can conduct yours according to your views. In that way we will secure provincial autonomy, and we will allow the province of Quebec and every other province in the Dominion to make its own electoral lists as it may see fit. When this is done, no province will

have any complaint to offer; the members will be elected by bona fide electors, and the members will represent each province in accordance with the franchise of the province.

Mr. POWELL. I do not intend to trouble the House to any considerable extent. I propose to crystallize, as it were, the opinions expressed on this side of the House in the form of an amendment, which I will move before I take my seat. Before doing so, as the matter is under discussion, I may give expression to a few views I entertain concerning this matter. In the first place, there can be no dispute, I think, in this House—and several hon. gentlemen opposite have acceded to the view—that it is very desirable, indeed, that the federal power should have a franchise of its own, and that that franchise should be uniform. This view was dissented from by the right hon. leader of the Government, when he spoke the other evening, and he referred, in proof of the desirability of adopting the view he himself took, to the course of the framers of the American constitution, and adverted to the alleged long discussion that took place in Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, concerning this matter. In respect to that contention, while I agree with the hon. gentleman, that the matter of state representation in Congress and in the Senate formed the subject of a most prolonged discussion before that convention, yet I can scarcely accede to his statement that the question of the desirability of having one uniform federal franchise received any great share of attention at the hands of those illustrious men who formed that convention. It was incidental, but only incidental, to the discussion of the other subject. While I am on that point, I may say that the United States constitution was evolved under peculiar circumstances. The reason that the constitution is as it is with reference to the franchise, was due, not to the fact that any great man who sat around that council board was in favour of state franchises, but it was due to the fact that state jealousies would admit of no other. Under the old federation which existed for five or six years previous to the adoption of the constitution, state differences had become very intense, indeed. To such an extent had state jealousies been carried that war had actually existed between Pennsylvania and New York; war was threatened between Vermont and New York and New Hampshire. To such small matter had these jealousies extended, that in a matter even of a lighthouse site which New York obtained from New Jersey, at the mouth of the Hudson, the state of New Jersey, in return for the practical embargo placed on New Jersey's trade, imposed an annual tax of \$1,800 upon the small piece of ground which New York required for the erection of the lighthouse. In view of those state jealousies,

which were so intense, the convention left the franchise to individual states, for the simple reason that no general franchise could be agreed upon. But while it did so, it reserved to the federal power the right at any time by law to make or alter such regulations as the local powers might adopt, except as to the place for choosing senators; and when the greatest political genius who sat at that council, the greatest political genius this continent has ever had, Alexander Hamilton, wrote his article in the "Federalist," commending the constitution of the state of New York, he approved this feature, this clause, of the American constitution which provided for federal control, and used these words:

I am greatly mistaken, notwithstanding, if there be any article in the whole plan more completely defensible than this.

He was replying to the contention made, that the federal power should exercise no influence over the franchise.

Its propriety rests upon the evidence of this plain proposition, that every government ought to contain in itself the means of its own preservation.

He elaborated that view in the letter which appears as No. 59 in the "Federalist." As to the authorship of that letter there is no question, although it was published anonymously; it is acknowledged to be that of Alexander Hamilton by every person familiar with the "Federalist."

Our constitution adopted at Quebec differs from the constitution of the United States in this way. By mere force of state jealousies in the United States, the Constitutional Convention were bound to allow the fixing of the franchise to rest, in the first instance, with the state authorities, subject to the control and revision of the federal authorities. The fathers of our confederation adopted, however, an entirely different view. Our constitution, so far as this question is concerned, does not recognize—and I need not elaborate this point, because every lawyer is aware of it—any power of provincial autonomy. The provincial franchises had to be followed in the first instance, 'ex necessitate rei,' or the conference would have been obliged to embody in our constitution a complete code of franchise and election law; but the moment this central Parliament repealed those old regulations by the adoption of new measures, then the local franchises became obsolete. The law that governs is section 41 of our constitution:

Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces at the union relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely:—The qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the returning offi-

cers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the trial of controverted elections and proceedings incident thereto, the vacating of seats of members, and the execution of new writs, in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution—shall respectively apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several provinces.

The local franchises, we thus see, were entirely provisional. That being the text of our constitution, if we are following out the genius of the constitution, we should have our federal franchise independent entirely of the local franchise. But this is a matter, not so much of constitutional right, as it is a matter of expediency and regulation under the circumstances of the case, as it is a matter of broad national policy. That being so, what do we find the most advanced political thought of the world to be in this matter? The most modern instance of a federation like ours is the federation of the German Empire. What was done in its formation? Men untrammelled by state jealousies, under the guidance of great masters of political principles, like Bismarck and those associated with him, went to work and build a great imperial fabric. Did they incorporate the ideas of the United States, or adopt the ideas that were embodied in the constitution of Canada? We find that twenty-six states comprise the German Empire. They have most diverse and complex franchises. In some cases, the individual states elected representatives to their local parliaments by direct, and in other cases by indirect electors; in other cases, representatives were sent to the different Houses by electors whose franchises were based on qualifications of rate-paying and other qualifications.

Now, in the German Empire we find that they have adopted one great uniform federal franchise, and that federal franchise is manhood suffrage and manhood suffrage alone. They did not act upon any such idea as the leader of the Government is disposed to have this House follow. It would be antagonistic to the idea of an imperial, national unity.

I come now, Sir, to consider very briefly the great desirability of having uniformity, because every man who is a Canadian citizen should know, wherever he goes, what the requirements of fellow-citizenship are from the Pacific to the Atlantic; we should all exercise our franchise on precisely the same basis. By doing so, we are firmly establishing that which in the United States was their great want; we are building up a strong federal and national sentiment, and a strong federal and central sentiment should under our constitution exist. The evolution of all the United States constitutional history is simply the broadening, and the deepening, and the intensifying of the

Mr. POWELL.

federal sentiment, the working out of a grander federal amplitude. I recognize that the federal power should not entrench on the local, nor the local on the federal; but the maintenance of the federal in its integrity is as much an essential to the existence of any lasting federation in Canada, as is the maintenance of the local. This brings me now to the last point I shall consider, and that is the old Franchise Act. Well, Sir, the old Franchise Act was expensive; there is no question about that, and in my judgment it could have been rendered inexpensive in a very simple manner indeed. But what about the principle of the old Franchise Act? Remember the franchise was adopted by following the precedents of that nation to which we all look as the most highly evolved political society in modern history; I need not say that I speak of Great Britain. We followed the action of the English Parliament in adopting that Franchise Act. Without discussing details of our local Franchise Acts, I will point to the fact that in the local franchises, in the maritime provinces, no matter how one of these revisers, who is generally a fair-minded but legally uneducated man, no matter how he may blunder there is no provision made in these laws to rectify that blunder. He may leave a man off the list who is entitled to get on, and there is no way to get him on; he may, in his honest judgment by taking a cranky view, deprive a man of the franchise, a most serious infraction of a man's rights, but there is no way of rectifying that error. In Great Britain where they realize that every man should vote who has the right to, they guard sacredly every man's right of franchise and provide methods of appeal, but in the maritime provinces under the local Acts, there is no provision for appeal—there is no sufficient protection to a man in the right of franchise. In the province of Prince Edward Island there is not even an election list, and in every other of the maritime provinces the electoral list is only written, not printed. When this matter comes before the committee for discussion of its details I will be able to point out to the Solicitor General—for I will consider it then my duty to assist in perfecting the law so far as the maritime provinces are concerned—I will point out to the Solicitor General certain ways in which this Bill can be improved in respect to matters wherein it is not now workable at all. The amendment, Mr. Speaker, which I shall move is as follows:—

That the Bill shall not now be read a second time, but that it be resolved: That this House, while desirous of reducing the expense of the preparation of the lists so far as may be practicable, considers that no system of franchise will be satisfactory which does not preserve federal control over both the basis of suffrage and the voters' lists.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House for any length of time with the few observations I have to make on this Bill. It is true that we had a somewhat similar measure before the House last session and some discussion upon it. It is also true that the Government made a great deal of noise about the great improvement they proposed to make in the Franchise Act, and we were led to believe we would have a Bill not exactly of the mongrel character of the measure now before the House. No doubt there were some serious objections to the old franchise law; it was perhaps cumbersome and expensive, but at the same time there was a great deal in that Act which commended itself to the better judgment of our people. It was a Bill that applied to the whole Dominion and gave a uniform franchise to all, in accordance with the principle laid down in the British North America Act. In that way, Sir, it was an Act worthy of a progressive country such as Canada is to-day. I do not think that the mongrel character of the franchise which will prevail under this Bill now submitted to us by the Government, will commend itself to the electors of this Dominion. We will have in this Parliament, one franchise for Quebec, another for Ontario, another for New Brunswick, and so on, and in the case of the province in which I have the honour to represent a constituency, I do not think this Bill is applicable at all. In the first place, we have not in the province of Prince Edward Island any system of registration. True, there was a system of registration in force in that province over twenty years ago, and according to section 5, subsection "c" of this Bill, if an election for the Dominion House were to be held there now, the lists that would be used would be the lists prepared over twenty years ago. Section 5, subsection "c" says:

(c.) The voters' lists shall be those prepared for the several polling divisions so established and which on the day next preceding the day fixed for the nomination of candidates for such Dominion election were in force or were last in force under the laws of that province for the purposes of provincial elections.

Now, if an election were held in Prince Edward Island under this Bill, as it stands, the lists to be used if they could be used at all would be lists that were prepared pre-vious to the year 1879, because the registration Act in Prince Edward Island was repealed, if my memory serves me right, in that year, and if there was a revision at all, it must have taken place in some year before 1879. I think that is a very serious oversight in the Bill, so far as it affects the province from which I have the honour to come. I do not know by what means the Government propose to overcome that difficulty. They may get

their friends in the local government of Prince Edward Island to introduce a Registration Act; but the province for its own purposes does very well without a Registration Act, and I do not think it would be fair for this House or this Government to impose upon that province the burden and expense of preparing a system of registration and voters' lists for the purpose of holding Dominion elections. That is one insuperable objection which will cause me to vote against this Bill. In place of being a step forward, I think it is a retrograde step. Under the old Franchise Act we had a uniform franchise from one end of the Dominion to the other; but now we adopt a system of franchises which may hold in a province to-day, but which may be changed entirely at the next session of the legislature; and the effect of the operation of the Bill will be that the candidates for this Parliament will not know exactly under what franchise they may have to run their election. I do not think that is a condition of things which hon. members of this House will support. I am willing to admit that there is very serious objection to the Franchise Act now in force, on account of its expensiveness. The expenses in connection with it come under three heads: First, the expense to the Dominion Government; second, the expense to the candidate; and third, the expense to the elector, as well as his trouble in getting his name put on the voters' list. How does this Bill propose to get rid of these expenses? The Bill does not propose to lessen the expense of the candidate in any way. He has to take the same care in revising the lists under the proposed Bill as he does under the law at present. Then, the expense of the Federal Government is to be thrown upon the local governments. If hon. gentlemen opposite propose to do that, I think they might very well have proceeded one step further. They might have said, While you are revising the voters' lists for the municipalities and for the province, you might as well add a third column for the Dominion list under a franchise adopted by this Parliament, which would have the great merit of uniformity. For instance, I understand that in Ontario there are two lists made up, one list for the municipalities, which is put in one column, and another list for the local legislature, which is put in another column. Why not, while you are about it, add a third column, containing the names of those who are qualified to vote in Dominion elections, under a uniform qualification all over the Dominion? It may require a little more machinery in the Bill than it has at present, but it is not an impossible task. This would give you uniformity. Perhaps the objection may be raised that the Federal Parliament cannot compel the local governments to perform that work; but under the provisions of this Bill the Federal Parliament compels the local government to do

something very nearly akin to it, because I find that section 8 reads as follows:—

Where under the laws of a province the voters' lists for any provincial electoral district or division are prepared not at regular intervals, but at such times as are fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, or some other provincial or local authority, or only from time to time for the purpose of a general or other election in immediate contemplation, the last preceding voters' lists so prepared shall be used for the purpose of any Dominion election in the territory comprised in such provincial electoral district or division, or any part thereof, if such lists have been prepared not more than one year before the date of the writ for such Dominion election; otherwise, new voters' lists shall be prepared, and for the purpose of preparing and giving effect to such voters' lists the Governor in Council may appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers, and in the preparation and revision, and bringing into force of such new voters' lists the provisions of the laws of the province regulating the preparation and revision and bringing into force of the provincial voters' lists in such cases shall, as far as possible, be observed and followed.

It is here laid down, that, when the voters' lists for the provinces are more than a year old, the provinces will be compelled to make up new lists. This Bill imposes on the provinces new labour, and I do not see why, in order to have uniformity, we should not impose on them the further task of having the lists for the provincial legislatures and for the House of Commons prepared at the same time. If that will not prove sufficient, I would commend to the hon. Solicitor General the advisability of having both the provincial and Dominion lists prepared by joint officers appointed by the Dominion and local governments. This would, to some extent, relieve the great trouble and expense to the electors in attending to more than one revision. Those revisions could be proceeded with simultaneously, and if this would require more machinery, it would, as regards general utility and practical purposes, remove the defects of this Bill and a great deal of the labour and expenditure imposed on candidates both for the local legislatures and the Dominion Parliament. In that case the expense could be evenly borne by the provinces and the Dominion share and share alike.

I do not intend to proceed at any great length in further discussing this Bill. The great objection to it is, that it is not such a measure as the constitution of this country requires. Canada, we are told, has lately become a nation. I do not know what has made Canada a nation, but I am sure that the introduction of this mongrel franchise is not one of those things which would entitle Canada to be called a nation. I might proceed and discuss some of the other clauses, but, as they will come up again in committee, I shall wait until that stage is reached. The objections to the Bill are, in my opinion, insuperable; and, until they are eliminated, I cannot support it.

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. BRITTON. It must be admitted that the opposition to this Bill is reduced to a minimum, when it is conceded that the present franchise law must be repealed. With the exception of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) and the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Martin), no one has a good word to say for the old Act, but every one seems willing it should be killed and buried, and not a few are ready to throw a stone at its grave. The hon. member from Bothwell said that there were no petitions against the present law, and no outcry for its repeal. Surely, the hon. gentleman could not have attended the political meetings in the last election campaigns, or he would have heard considerable outcry against it, unless there is very different talk at the meetings in the west, compared to what is heard in the east. The outcry on the part of the Liberals in the west against this law was certainly not dissented from in any way by Conservatives. The latter were as vigorous in their promises to vote for its repeal as was the hon. member who spoke before recess, and on all hands there was unanimity of opinion condemning it. That being the case, and the press of the country also being outspoken, I should not think there was any necessity for any petition to inform this House of the general feeling in the country against the present law. I do not, for a moment, accuse the revising officers under that Act of being dishonest, or of any intention to be unfair. Many of them were county judges, against whom I have not a word to say; and those who were not, were, in many cases, men who intended to be fair to both parties. But the fact remains that these lists were stuffed, and stuffed in a way most unfair to the Liberals. They had in them the names of men who had been dead, in some cases to my knowledge, twenty years, and also the names of men who had ceased to own property in the polling divisions in which they were electors, for years, and had moved away, thousands of miles, in some cases, from the places where their names were registered. It may not have been a desire to be unfair, but the fact remains that, in some cases, these revising officers put the burden of proof on the persons claiming that names were improperly on the lists. They obliged these persons to prove a negative; they obliged them to prove that a person whose name was on the list was not possessed of property sufficient to qualify him; and in many cases the parties appealing abandoned their appeal rather than be put to the expense and trouble of proving a negative. In this way these lists became discredited all through the country, and the time has not come too soon for the repeal of the law. The few words we have heard in this House, this afternoon and evening, in favour of the present law, only amount to damning it with faint praise. If it is conceded that the law should be repealed, the

question is, what should take its place. I, for one, am glad to hear members on both sides declare that they wish to approach this question as free from party bias as possible. There are some members who think that no one can talk on either side without showing party feeling. There is one hon. gentleman who has never said anything, since I have come here, in reference to any member on this side, without imputing unworthy motives to him. I refer to the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). When any one on this side rises to address the House, he is, according to that hon. gentleman, a confessed schemer or has some promise in his pocket, or there is something that disentitles him from saying a word on the question before the House. But I am glad to say that there are others who are fair to hon. members on this side, and are willing to deal with questions of this kind in a generous and impartial spirit. It is in the interest of everybody that these lists should be correctly made, and that every one on them should have the right to vote, and if we can, either through the machinery provided by the provinces or provided by ourselves, get lists that are pure and right, we shall have obtained the desideratum sought for by all members on both sides.

It is proposed that the provincial lists shall be used, and as has been said by the right hon. the Premier and as was said, better than I can hope to say it, by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd), representation by provinces is a part of our system of government in this country, and if the provinces are satisfied to entrust the provincial electors with the franchise for the purpose of sending men to Parliament at Ottawa, it seems to me that we ought not to complain. It is our own doing. If this Bill is passed it is equivalent to our saying that these men qualified to vote for representatives in the provincial House are competent to vote for members in this House. We do not dispose of anything except for the present. We may be putting it in the hands of the provinces to pass laws hereafter that we may not approve of. But in that case the same legislative power exists in this Parliament to alter the law if it is found to work injustice. These laws of the several provinces seem to be good, as they have been described by the different members who have spoken, except in the case of Prince Edward Island as stated by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Martin), upon which I shall comment later. Take the Ontario law, with which I am, of course, more familiar than with that of any other province. One hon. gentleman said that we do not have annual lists in Ontario. We do have annual lists. The first person who has to deal with the names of those who are to be electors is the assessor. As everybody knows, the assessor is a municipal officer sometimes of one side of politics, if he has any politics at all, and sometimes

of the other, but in no sense a political representative. He is chosen, as a rule, because he is a man of good judgment, knows the value of property, and is a fair and disinterested man to make out the list of property liable for assessment. He prepares his roll, which then goes to the clerk of the municipality. In many cases these clerks have held their offices for many years. They are men who come at last to have very little feeling one way or the other in political matters. They hold their office year after year under the different municipal councils, in which the Conservative element sometimes predominates and sometimes the Liberal, and in the course of time they assume a neutral tint in regard to politics. They are sworn men. The clerk takes the list from the assessors and classifies the people according to qualification, those who vote for municipal officers and those who vote in the provincial elections. The list being printed it is sent out. Hon. gentlemen who look at the Act will see what care has been taken to have all this done with the greatest impartiality and in such a way that the greatest publicity can be given to it so that every wrong may be set right. The clerks are obliged to send the lists to the members of the council, and to the different public officers of the municipality. They are obliged to send ten copies to the member of this House, recognizing him as one who is interested in the preparation of the voters' lists. They are obliged also to send ten copies to the defeated candidate for this House if he has polled any votes, also to the provincial representative and the defeated candidate, also ten copies to each of the Reeves. The officials who receive these copies are obliged to put them up in their offices, with a view, as stated, to securing the greatest publicity for these lists. Then comes the question of appeals. Anybody can appeal who is interested in that matter, and the appeal is to the judge. After proper steps have been taken, which I need not specify, the judge hears the appeals and strikes off the names that should not appear on the list and adds those that should. No precaution could be suggested that is not taken in order to give only those who are qualified a place upon these lists. If we are satisfied to accept the same qualification in voters as is provided in the case of the local House, the work is complete and ready to our hand, and that without expense to us. It is true there are small fees given to the clerk of the municipality, and a fee of \$4 a day and personal expenses for the county judge, if I remember well. We have nothing to do with this, we do not pay the money. As to the registration of voters under the Manhood Suffrage Act, there is a slightly higher fee, \$5 a day, I think to the county judge and \$10 a day to the chairman of the board of registration. There is, therefore, a tremendous saving of expense so

far as this Dominion is concerned. As to the expense of the individual candidate, I say without fear of successful contradiction there is a very large saving to him. He knows that the names that come to him for his examination through the channels I have mentioned are, in the main, only names that ought to be there, and so his work is very greatly reduced when he comes to scrutinize the list and to secure the revision of it. But the saving to the Dominion is an absolute saving of all the expenses except, in the event of the lists not having been revised within the year, and the Dominion being obliged to use that board of registration for the purpose of preparing a new list. In that case the officers would be Dominion officers and the Dominion would pay the expense of them, but this would be a mere bagatelle in every constituency, compared with the expense we have now. There is a saving in the very large item of printing and in the revising officers' fees. If there were no other advantages in this Bill, getting such lists as we are likely to get, at any rate as the law is administered in Ontario, it would be well worth saving.

I am free to admit that if there is such a case in Prince Edward Island as the hon. member for East Queen's has stated, if in utilizing the list in Prince Edward Island, we should be adopting a list twenty-five years old, there is a wrong. No list of twenty-five years standing can represent the electors of to-day, and if there is any such list as that, some provision should be made to have a more modern list. I cannot think that the hon. member for East Queen's is correct; I think that there must be some mistake about it. I cannot imagine that Prince Edward Island for its own sake, would be willing to accept a list twenty-five years old without revision. This would mean that a new generation had been born and had grown up since the list was made and were still disfranchised. I think there must be some mistake about it, but if there is no mistake, then such a case as that ought in some way to be provided for. When the debate was on before one hon. gentleman, I think it was the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), said that any province might change the law and might allow women to vote. Well, under present circumstances that is something so easily remedied that it only has to be mentioned to enable us to prevent anything of that kind occurring.

An hon. MEMBER. There would be no harm.

Mr. BRITTON. Perhaps not, but at the present time we are not sufficiently advanced, not so advanced as some of us would like to be, to say that we are willing to give the franchise to women. In all the provinces the law reads something like this: That every male person who is a British

Mr. BRITTON.

subject by birth or naturalization, and of the full age of twenty-one years, and possesses the qualification required in the locality, is entitled to vote. But just now, it seems to me, and I offer it as a suggestion at this stage of the debate, it seems to me that there would be no harm in adopting that as the first part of this clause 5 of the Bill, and say that the persons who are entitled to vote are male persons above twenty-one years of age, who are British subjects by birth or naturalization, and who are possessed of the qualifications necessary for the exercise of the provincial franchise. That would remove any difficulty such as was suggested by the hon. member for Annapolis. As far as Ontario is concerned, the disqualifications are those which show a desire on the part of the Government of the province of Ontario to have an election as free as possible from taint, or any influence that would be bad or that would work against having the greatest freedom of expression of opinion on the part of the electorate. I have not heard any hon. gentleman who finds fault with them on that ground. So I think that, guarded with such care, both as to those who are disqualified and to those who are qualified, and providing for the machinery which we are at liberty to make use of, I fail to appreciate the objections that are made to the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES. In opposing the present Bill, I may be permitted to give a few reasons actuating my course. The proposal, in short, is to return to the old system in vogue before the present Franchise Act was passed some years ago. I presume the members of each province will reason from their own point of view, and I propose to discuss it from the view point of a member from the province of Ontario. Those of us who are familiar with the Ontario election law, particularly those of us who sit on this side of the House, know to our sorrow the defects in that law. I will not say the expense is as great as under the Dominion law, but the difficulty of obtaining a good list is as great as it is under the Dominion law. But once this list is prepared there are other difficulties. When we come to the question of voting we are met, not with the secret ballot we have in the Dominion, but with a numbered ballot, and we know how that is used. In the recent election in the province of Ontario, one gentleman came to me and said he feared he could not support the Conservative candidate because his tenant, a Conservative who rented a hotel from him, had informed him that the license commissioner had told him that they very much feared that if the owner of the property voted for the Liberal-Conservative candidate a license would not be given him for next year. So this man stood face to face with either losing his rent or with having to vote for

the Liberal candidate. I asked him how they could tell in what way they voted, and the answer was that the ballots were numbered, and after the elections were over these were all traced up and marked in every riding, showing whether the elector had voted Liberal or Conservative. However, it is not my intention here to go into the details of these objections. There are some good points in connection with the present Dominion franchise. The two essential points are those that were brought out by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) in making his amendment this afternoon. The main point is uniformity of franchise, and another one is the control of the voters' list. Now, if the Solicitor General will kindly give me a little attention I will make a proposition to him. As I said, it is not my intention to make any lengthy criticism of this Bill now, because I can do that in committee; but I will take the opportunity of making a suggestion which will involve all that is good in the proposal to utilize the provincial franchise, and I am satisfied it will reduce the cost to a minimum. At the present time, whether under the provincial franchise or under the Dominion, there is for every polling subdivision a deputy returning officer and a poll clerk. In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that there should be an agent appointed by each candidate. If there are two parties, let there be two agents, if there are three parties let each candidate in the election have an agent, and let each agent have his clerk. These should be officially recognized in the law. I should say also that these men might be paid out of the Dominion funds, although appointed by the candidates. Then I would suggest that a clerk for each of these agents should be appointed, and I would make provision in the law to have him paid by the candidate appointing him, or for that matter these agents and their clerks might both be entitled to the same pay as the deputy returning officer and his clerk, and be paid by the candidates. However, that matter is a mere question of detail. I would have the nominations take place two weeks before the day of the election. The day after the nomination, or at some convenient time soon thereafter, let this board of six persons meet in each polling subdivision and take what they now take for election purposes, the written list of the clerk of the peace as finally revised by the judge. Let the deputy returning officer and each agent take this list and have it written in triplicate, or according as the number of candidates may be. Then let every candidate go over that list, and let every elector whose name is omitted in any way, every young man who has recently become of age, every tenant who has moved in from an adjoining subdivision or an adjoining county, come before this

board, and by taking the oath, show that he is qualified to be placed on that list. We would thus have a very inexpensive mode of preparing a list. People might object to giving judicial functions to this deputy returning officer by empowering him to administer the oath. Why, you do it in your election law to-day. He is permitted to swear the agent on election day, and why should he not be permitted to swear an elector as well to his right to vote? In the present list we find that the work is well done by the county judges, the work is nearly all done on the basis of the assessor, and I am satisfied from experience that these local officials would do it as honestly and as efficiently as if it were done by the judges of the land. Now, Sir, in the present election law of the province of Ontario there are great defects. In the first place, every young man coming to be twenty-one years of age after the revision of that list is disfranchised from voting until his name is entered on the next list. Every clergyman who changes his station is disfranchised if he does not have his name put on the list a year in advance. Every tenant who moves from one municipality to another is disfranchised under the existing law. If a man the day before an election moves out of one polling subdivision and takes his furniture with him, constituting a change of residence, he cannot return and vote on election day. Under the present provincial franchise in the province of Ontario there are very many men, good, worthy citizens, who are debarred from voting. If a comparison were made between the number who are disfranchised under the provincial law of Ontario and those who are disfranchised under this objectionable law of the Dominion of Canada, I venture the assertion that the number will be found greater who are disfranchised under the provincial law than under the Dominion law. There are other arguments that might be advanced; but I do not wish to occupy the time of the House longer, and I will reserve them for the committee stage, when I will present them. I merely wish to submit to the hon. Solicitor General and the Government the suggestion that while retaining all that is good in the present law and taking the provincial lists as a basis, we should retain control of the preparation of the lists, and of the qualification entitling an elector to vote, and above all things we should regulate the control of the ballots, which in Ontario are numbered, so as to have a free ballot at Dominion elections.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). We are not dealing at the present time with the Dominion election law, but with the Franchise Act. The question of the ballot will come up in connection with the Dominion election law.

Mr. HUGHES. It will not do to have one qualification in one province and a different qualification in another, and also different methods in respect to the preparation of the lists. In the cities and towns of Ontario, we have a registration system that works fairly well. Why should that not apply also to country districts? Why should a young farmer be in a worse position than a young clerk? I will not, however, discuss the matter further, but will take the opportunity of presenting my views in committee.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would not have addressed the House to-night but for the remarks made by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Stenson) just before the dinner hour. The hon. gentleman then said that the chief reason why he supported the Bill was, because he believed in provincial autonomy and provincial rights. If there is any reason why I oppose this Bill, it is because I am a federalist, and believe in federal rights and in the vindication of the Dominion as against any or all of the provinces which compose it. The Dominion of Canada is a much greater country than any of its great provinces, or all of them added together. So long as I occupy a seat in this House, I hope always to be able to raise my voice in favour of the federalist idea in our constitution as against the provincial view presented by hon. gentlemen opposite. And what else can we expect than the provincial view from this Government? The Government is made up of provincial politicians. The introducer of the Bill is a provincial politician, and nothing else, and he proposes a provincial franchise for the Dominion. The right hon. leader of the House, when he formed his Government, said he was forming his Government of provincial politicians, and he took into it, as Finance Minister, a provincial politician, who has muddled and bedevilled the trade situation of this country. The right hon. gentleman took into his Cabinet a provincial politician as Minister of the Interior. What is our experience of the Minister of the Interior? The "Globe" newspaper, the other day, spoke of him as an eminent young statesman from the west. In view of what is taking place in another Chamber to-night, after what took place in the Railway Committee this morning, we see that this young and eminent statesman from the west is simply a small provincial politician, and he is rapidly finding his level. The right hon. gentleman brought in another provincial politician as Minister of Railways, and he takes nothing but a provincial view of politics. This morning, we saw him taking a position in respect to a railway question that he repudiated in this House last night; and the Government all through has no record but a record of provincial politicians, men who take a provincial view of federal affairs. We, as Conservatives, who are federalists at heart, believe in the federalist

Mr. HUGHES.

idea, and most of all in this Dominion controlling its own franchise and regulating it. I believe we can have a franchise which we can regulate, and a voters' list which can be prepared at a moderate cost. I believe in preparing a list at a reasonable expense, but it should be a federal list, first and always, and so long as I have a vote, it will be cast in favour of a federal list. The hon. gentlemen opposite are nothing but provincial politicians, and the proof is, that since they came into power, they have abandoned many of their provincial ideas. Those provincialists tried to put aside the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. He is a federalist, and to-day he commands the respect of his party, because he is a federalist; and I am glad to say, he is gradually overcoming those provincial politicians who are his colleagues, and to-day enjoys more than any hon. gentleman opposite the esteem of this country. But if he does so enjoy the public confidence, it is because of his federal views, and because he has not allowed himself to be put aside, though the attempt has been made, by the provincial politicians who control the Cabinet. And the same can be said of the present Minister of Justice who is gradually growing into a federalist who has had long federal experience and who had to be called in to take the place of another provincialist who had been given that department. The provincialists of the Cabinet at its formation did their best to keep the present Minister out of office, as they tried to belittle the Minister of Trade and Commerce. So far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, the proof that they are provincial politicians and take only a provincial view, is found in the fact that, when they have taken the federal view, they have succeeded, and, when they have adopted the narrow provincial view, they have failed. They adopted the federal view in respect to trade, and they are now wearing our clothes and are claiming credit because they adopted the federal view, the Dominion view, that Canada expects this Parliament to frame the tariff in the interest of the Dominion, and not in the interest of the provinces. Another proof that these gentlemen are provincialists and nothing else is, that provincialism ran side by side and hand in hand with the annexationist movement in this country. Provincialism and annexationism have the same common characteristic, and these have been shown in the past history of hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not afraid to say in this House, that we ought to keep the Dominion franchise in our hands; and I make this prophecy, that if hon. gentlemen opposite adopt the provincial list to-day, they will return to this House after their first experience, and demand a federal franchise. This has been their experience in the past; they have not been able to realize their provincial views. Whenever they have succeeded,

it is because they have adopted Dominion lines; and when they have had an experience of provincial lists, they will come back and ask the Dominion Parliament to pass a federal franchise and have a list prepared entirely on national lines. If the hon. gentlemen opposite will bring forward a measure which will be reasonable so far as cost is concerned, but which will preserve the federal idea, the federal control of our own franchise, I will be willing to accept and vote for such a proposition. If they will lay down those lines they can obtain a conference with our leaders, and a Bill may be framed that both parties and the people will accept; but hon. gentlemen opposite will never get this side of the House to agree to place ourselves in the hands of provincial politicians, such as there are in Ontario and in other provinces, and abandon federal ideas, and accept provincial ideas advocated by men who have never realized in the slightest degree the national idea and the importance of this great country.

Mr. McCLEARY. I have for some days sat as a learner at the feet of the Gamaliels who have been instructing us in regard to the measure now submitted for our consideration. Unlike my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Poupore), I came here unpledged to my electors, and for the simple reason that they never asked me to pledge myself to vote against the Dominion Franchise Act. But if I came unpledged I am free to confess that I did not come unbiassed, because my judgment was that the Dominion franchise law could be improved and I would have been very glad to have given my vote in favour of a proposition that would have placed in the hands of the people of this country a franchise law more simple and less costly than the existing Act, but at the same time a franchise that would be uniform. I have listened to hear some arguments from gentlemen who are in favour of this Bill, in order that my mind might be brought to a definite conclusion as to my duty in regard to the vote which I shall give. I expected that the right hon. the leader of the House would announce some logical reasons why our present Franchise Act should be repealed, and our franchise handed over to the provincial legislatures. But, Sir, his very first statement convinced me that the attitude of his Government on this question was wrong, for, after stating that the franchise of the people of this country lay at the very basis of our parliamentary institutions, he proceeded to propose that this, which he called the very basis of the Federal Parliament, should be handed over to the provincial legislatures, for their making and their imprimatur. Hon. gentlemen opposite who come from Ontario have told us a good deal about the franchise law in that province, and if we were to believe them we would regard that law as a most guileless thing,

as a law devoid of anything questionable, and which was the very ideal that an honest and intelligent and free electorate should demand. But, Sir, those of us who have experience of the Ontario Franchise Act know that it is not the guileless beauty that the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) represented; nor is it the guileless thing that the hon. member for Kingston referred to, nor yet that beautiful perfection which the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) portrayed it to be. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) told us the other night, that he had before denounced the Dominion Franchise Act as the most iniquitous measure that was ever placed on the Statute-books of this country, and he repeated that statement and assured us that he had not changed his mind. Well, Sir, I do not know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) need have said that, in order to justify any vote of his in support of the Government, because no member in this House—except possibly the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright)—denounced the National Policy in more violent terms than did the hon. gentleman, and yet he had no compunction of conscience in sitting quietly beside his Government and supporting a policy which was changed very little, if at all, from that Conservative National Policy which he for eighteen years had been denouncing. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) told us, that we can get our lists from the province of Ontario simply for the cost of printing, and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) followed up in detail the making of these lists from the time the assessor goes around until they come before the county judge, but right there the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) stopped short. The hon. gentleman must know, as we all know, that the most important and vital spot in the whole franchise law of the province of Ontario, is just what takes place after the county court judge gets through with his work. Do we have a printed list then, as the hon. member stated. No, Mr. Speaker, we do not. After the assessor has handed over the roll to the clerk, and the clerk has sent out copies to those mentioned in the Act, do we have the voters' lists hung up in a public place so that the people can see whether or not they are entitled to vote after the revision before the judge? No, Sir, we have nothing of the kind. On the contrary, as was shown the other night by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) after the revision by the county judge, there are hundreds of names written in ink and without being numbered so that they cannot be compared or traced afterwards. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) made a strong argument in this regard. How easy it is for an evil-disposed person to get hold of these lists and write in a name if he wants to, and how easy it is for such an one to draw his pen through the name of a poli-

tical opponent, so that when that man comes up to vote he may not be permitted to. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, is that fair? Sir, it is a dishonest act, and it has occurred time and time again in the province of Ontario. This very last election, in my own town, when the clerk of the peace sent down the roll book to the deputy returning officers, my attention was called to the fact that there were names left off the list. I want to give the clerk of the peace credit for this, that when I telephoned and apprised him of the fact, he had the omission corrected, and on election day these men had their votes. But in the adjoining riding of Monck, in one polling subdivision all the names under the letter S and part of those under the letter W were omitted from the voters' list. And, forsooth, hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that we shall have a complete, honest and fair list if we adopt the franchise of the province of Ontario. No, Mr. Speaker, we shall have anything but a complete and fair list, if we adopt the lists as they are compiled at the present time by those officials. Hon. gentlemen opposite from the province of Ontario who have spoken seem much enamoured of our provincial franchise because it is based on the one man one vote principle. If that is good for the province of Ontario, why is it not good for the whole Dominion? Why do these gentlemen not insist on having a uniform franchise of that kind? I certainly approve of the principle of one man one vote. I would be very glad to see that adopted as the principle of the franchise for this Parliament. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) the other night said that if we would look at the Statute-book, we would find that the Hon. Oliver Mowat ought to receive credit for giving the young men of the province of Ontario the right to vote. Let me tell that hon. gentleman that while that Act is on the Statute-book of Ontario as having been passed by the Mowat Government, if he will look up the journals of the province of Ontario, he will find that years before it was passed the Conservative Opposition in the local House moved to amend the Franchise Act so as to give farmers' sons and the young men in our towns and cities the right to vote, and every Liberal in the House voted against it. So the hon. gentleman must not attempt to take credit to the Ontario Government for this wise provision in the Ontario law. But, Sir, I would be afraid to trust my franchise with a party composed of men like those who have been conducting the affairs of the province of Ontario for the last 25 or 26 years—and, by the way, there are indications that there may be a change in that respect before long. The Liberal Government in the province of Ontario have not hesitated to do some of the meanest things in regard to the franchise law of the province that could be perpetrated by a government having any preten-

Mr. McCLEARY.

sions to decency and honesty. Need I call to the minds of hon. members of this House the Act passed by that government by which they legislated a man into Parliament who could not be elected by the people. When the city of Toronto was by statute entitled to three members, they provided that a voter in that city should have only two-thirds of a vote. They put on the Statute-book a law declaring that while three members were to be elected for the city of Toronto, each voter could only vote for two. The consequence was that the Liberal party, who were in the minority in the city of Toronto, had their man elected by Act of Parliament. What kind of a proceeding is that? Is it fair, is it right, is it just? Of course, they were shamed out of it afterwards. Then they thought that possibly under a system of registration, which they enacted in 1894, and by carving up and manipulating the city of Toronto they might get a member or two. So they applied to the city of Toronto an Act known as the Registration Act. But their Act proved to be equally weak in that regard, because up to the present time they have not been able to get a member elected in that intelligent city.

An hon. MEMBER. They were near it.

Mr. McCLEARY. Near enough to be left. Referring for a moment to the registration in towns and cities, I realize that it acts very unfairly to the larger towns. For instance, take it in my own county. By an Act of the local legislature last session the Registration Act was extended to the county towns. The county town of my county is smaller than the town in which I live, but the former had registration, while the latter had not. A special Act was passed giving registration to the town of Niagara Falls. This registration cost that town between \$500 and \$600. How unfair it is for any Government to have the right to manipulate any franchise law in that way—to say, we will give certain municipalities the right to registration, and will not give it to others. It seems to me untenable and unsound, and we would be a foolish lot of representatives if we were to hand over to any local government the power to control the franchise for this Federal Parliament. Another objection I have to this Bill is that it will bring into our municipal elections such a party feeling that our municipalities must eventually suffer. This matter was brought out the other night by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Moore). There will be a desperate effort on the part of the two political parties in each municipality to get control of the municipal council, and what does that mean? It means that the municipality must eventually suffer, because as long as they can get a party man, they will not look for a business man or a man who has the most interest in the municipality; they will not look for careful and prudent farmers, like the hon. member

for East Huron (Mr. McMillan) to represent them; but they will try to elect some party hack who will do their work in the council, and that will be the cause of the degeneration of our municipal councils. This is a danger which we cannot afford to incur. We ought to oppose any law that would have that tendency. Apart from all these reasons for opposing this Bill, my greatest reason is that which was expressed by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), because it proposes to hand over to the provincial government the right to say who shall be the electors who will send men to this Parliament. We have a responsible Government, and we ought to have responsible parliamentarians; and if the local governments say who shall be the electors, we need not be in the truest sense responsible to them. We ought to have the franchise of this House under our complete control. The question I presume will come up in committee, and I sincerely hope that the hon. Solicitor General will see that the position he has taken is inimical to the best interests of our country. I believe that it is against the genius of our confederation to place such an Act on the Statute-book, proposing to hand over to an irresponsible body the right to say who shall be the electors who shall vote for the representatives who make this Parliament.

Mr. HENDERSON. The very year that the Franchise Act was put upon our Statute-book, the Liberal party declared that as soon as they came to power they would repeal it, and as they are now in power, the repeal of that law is a foregone conclusion, and, therefore, I am not going to discuss the question whether it should be repealed or not. We are not so much concerned, upon this side, about the repeal of the law as we are about what shall take its place. The hon. Solicitor General has introduced a Bill substituting the voters' lists in use in the various provinces for the present lists. To be brief, I desire simply to draw his attention to the fact that the voters' lists, although made yearly by the various municipalities, are by no means, in Ontario at least, made perfect every year. The lists, as they come from the municipalities, are not by any means perfect, and no man would care to run an election on such a list. These lists are only revised once in four years, or during the year in which a provincial election takes place. In the other years, the revision is very superficial indeed, and in fact is only a revision for municipal elections and not a revision to perfect the lists for legislative purposes. It would be unfortunate if a Dominion election were sprung upon the country at any time between the various revisions for legislative purposes, and the elections for this House should be held on lists altogether imperfect, not revised, not completed, but simply handed over by the municipal officers. In every instance, such lists are very imperfect indeed,

and for that reason I think, with many other hon. members on this side, that some control should be had by us over the revision of these lists, in order to make them more perfect when we require to use them. It has been said by hon. members on the other side that one of the great objections to the Dominion franchise law is the partisanship of those who are charged with the revising of the lists, but although the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), a few nights ago, made that charge in a sweeping way, he was still good enough to say that in his country he had no such complaint to make. For my part, living in the adjoining county, I will say that I have had no complaint to make, and I would like to see the hon. member in this House who would rise up and say that in his particular county he has any special complaint to make. My impression has been all along that these general complaints were simply a cry with very little foundation indeed, and that no man was prepared to come down and make a specific charge of partisanship on the part of any revising officer. In my opinion, the revising officers, under the present law, are men who could be trusted a great deal more than the men who make up the provincial lists. Who is it that makes up the provincial lists? It is the assessors. Notwithstanding all that has been said about the assessors in Ontario, I know, from my personal knowledge quite well, that the assessor is selected, not so much on account of his qualification to value property, as on account of his qualification to see just so many of the young men as are politically friendly to him, when he goes around, and to see as few as possible who are politically opposed to him. That is the chief qualification of an assessor in Ontario, namely, to make the best lists in the interest of the party predominate in the municipal council for the time being. I do not make this charge against the Liberals any more than against the Conservative party, because I believe it is true in both cases, but you cannot expect to get an assessment roll, which will at all fairly represent the electorate of the province, and if the lists are made from those rolls, and not specially revised occasionally, so as to make them perfect, a great many men will be left off who are entitled to vote and a great many left on who are not entitled to vote. An hon. gentleman spoke a few minutes ago with reference to the omission of names on the lists under the Dominion franchise law, and of the names of dead men appearing on these lists at election times. Well, men will continue to die from day to day, and we must certainly expect that from the time a list is prepared until used, even if the interval be only one year, a very large number indeed of the names of dead men will be found on it. I remember, on the last occasion when revising the lists in my county for a provincial election,

I found the name of a man on the list who had been dead for over two years, but whose name had been taken from the assessor's roll of that year. I knew as a fact that a man who had been dead two years appeared on the list. The assessor had put him on the roll a year after he was dead, and the clerk continued his name on the list, so that the fact of a dead man's name appearing on a list is not the fault of the Dominion Franchise Act, because the same thing occurs under the municipal system.

A strong charge is made that the cost of revising the lists under the Dominion Franchise Act, is excessive. True, that law imposes heavy expense on the Dominion, but at the same time there is the expense to be borne by the municipalities in the preparation of the provincial lists and the expense to be borne by the candidates concerned in revising the lists. In my experience, and I say it without hesitation, and with some considerable knowledge of revising lists, I would rather undertake to revise a list under the Dominion Franchise Act than under the provincial law. I believe I could do it more cheaply, more easily, with less labour and inconvenience, and more thoroughly. I do not see why there should be such a very large expense to the candidate in connection with the revision of the lists. In the county of Halton, which I have the honour to represent, I have had occasion to revise the list at various times under the Dominion Franchise Act, and I am satisfied that at the expense of \$100 we make a very thorough list indeed. Others perhaps may have paid a great deal more, but that is their fault. With a properly organized system throughout the county for the revision of lists, the thing can be done under the Dominion system, at a cost, I am quite sure, equally as low, if not less, than that of revising the provincial lists. Let us look for a moment at a single municipality, and I have in my mind one in which I was interested in revising the list for the provincial election. There were presented 175 appeals in that township after that so-called "complete" list had been made by the officers. Take it for granted that twenty-five of these appeals related to municipal appeals only. That would leave 150 as the number of names that had been wrongly put on or wrongfully left off, and I am satisfied that there were that number, at any rate, that related exclusively to the list for the purpose of election to the local legislature. This meant that 150 different men had to attend the court in order to have their names put on, or to defend them if they were attacked and an attempt made to strike them off. These 150 men had to be served personally by a bailiff with a notice prepared by the clerk. The clerk had to be paid for preparing it and the constable for serving it, and in reference to many of them subpoenas

Mr. HENDERSON.

to be issued and conduct money paid as well as the cost of the service. The clerk has to be paid, and the judge has to be paid for holding court. Altogether the cost to the candidate, at any rate, is as great if not greater, than in the revision of the Dominion lists. The Dominion system is more perfect than the provincial. There are many young men working as farm assistants or otherwise whose names it is desired to add to the list, who are not allowed by their employers to attend court. If a young man happens to be a Conservative and is employed by a Liberal farmer, he may be detained at home, and his name is not put on the list, as the judge will say—as I have heard him say more than once—that if the young man does not consider his vote worth his day's pay, he should not have it. Under the Dominion Act, we have the plan of adding that name by means of a declaration. The party can make a declaration in the evening without losing time. He can make it before a municipal councillor or a justice of the peace. It is placed in the hands of the reviser, who examines it to see if it complies with the statute, and if it is all right, the name is added to the list. This allows a saving of time and adds the name of a voter to the list in many cases where under the provincial system, it would not be added.

Now, what is wanted, we say, is not the substitution of the provincial lists for the present Dominion lists, but rather some modification of the provincial lists, some machinery by which the Parliament of Canada would have control over the final revision of these lists, so that they could be revised in the interests of those who are to represent the electorate that are placed upon those lists. And I am quite sure that some additional machinery of that kind, a system of revision cheaper and more thorough than that of the province, at any rate in Ontario, would meet the approval of this House very much better than the sweeping proposition that has been made by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick). For these reasons, I am constrained to vote for the amendment that is proposed against the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. GILLIES. In rising to offer a few observations, I may premise what I have to say by congratulating the House upon the tone of the present discussion. It is very different indeed from the debate that took place in this House in 1885, when the Franchise Act was introduced by the late Sir John Macdonald. I cannot help observing that the spirit of that debate was most partisan, bitter and extremely rancorous. In that respect, this debate compares very favourably with the other.

I may say at once that I am entirely opposed to this Bill, and will vote in favour of the amendment. I hold that this Parila-

ment should have control of its own franchise. The design in this respect of the fathers of confederation in arranging the constitution of this Dominion was a most wise and beneficent one. I cannot help thinking that the right hon. gentleman who leads the House skipped lightly over that chapter of history to which he referred when he endeavoured to draw a comparison between the constitutions of Canada and the United States respectively. He said that the constitution under our system is analogous to that of the republic to the south of us. Nothing of the kind. The organizations are distinct and very dissimilar. As was abundantly shown by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), the system which now obtains in the United States and has obtained since the constitutional convention of 1787 was a scheme of compromise that was evolved between the two conflicting parties in the union. If we look back at the history of the constitutional convention, which took place after the sitting of the so-called Continental Congress, and in which such men as Randolph, Read, Morris and Hamilton, and other great men took part, we shall see that the conclusion arrived at on this subject was a matter of compromise. It was held by several of these great men that the representation of the states in Congress should be regulated in the same manner as in the Senate, while others held that representatives of the different states should be elected on a franchise to be laid down by Congress itself. It was in order to reach an agreement that it was concluded then, and the system has obtained from that day, that all members from the House of Representatives should be elected upon a state franchise. But when our Act of confederation was drawn up, it was laid down that the franchise for the selection of members of this House should be controlled by the Federal Parliament itself. And this was for the purpose and with the design of strengthening the Federal authority. Now, it is tolerably clear that there is a very wide difference between the constitution of the United States in this regard and that of the Canadian confederation. The argument, therefore, made use of by the leader of the Government does not apply in the slightest degree, because the cases are not analogous but distinctly and emphatically dissimilar. The 41st section of the British North America Act reads as follows:—

Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces at the union relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely:—The qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the returning officers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the trial of controverted elec-

tions and proceedings incident thereto, the vacating of seats of members, and the execution of new writs, in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution—shall respectfully apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several provinces.

The fathers of confederation could not do otherwise. They simply adopted the franchise of the several provinces as a basis for the election of the first House of Commons, and that was to apply to the election of all subsequent Houses until the House of Commons itself in its wisdom and by the exercise of its constitutional right, powers and functions, adopted another law under which its members should be elected. The explicit meaning of this Act is, that the House of Commons should regulate the franchise under which its members are elected. Acting upon that idea, the House of Commons did, in 1855, enact the law which it is now sought to repeal. That Act has some faults, no doubt; it is cumbersome and expensive; I readily admit these two defects. But, with these defects, it has merits, merits that should commend it to the members of this House. At all events, it has the merit of uniformity, and that should be fundamental in any law passed by this House regulating the franchise. It has also the merit of impartiality. Some hon. gentlemen may be inclined to smile at the statement that the law is impartial; but I venture to assert that there is no hon. gentleman in this House who will rise in his place and state a single instance where partiality has been shown in any constituency in this Dominion from the time the first revision was made, in 1886, down to the present day. Hon. gentlemen say that they have heard of cases of partiality, but we never heard of any single case having been formulated, much less proved, where a revising officer in any part of the Dominion had acted with partiality. Why, these officers were impartial, good reasons may be assigned. They were judges of the land in one case, or they were revising barristers in the other, barristers of high standing in the community in which they were appointed to act. They were sworn into office; they were not removable except by the House of Commons; they were not officers of the Government but officers of the Parliament of Canada, and therefore were only removable by the House of Commons. They were incapable of being elected to the House of Commons of Canada for two years after they had resigned or vacated office. In that respect, the law was more stringent with respect to them than it is towards the judges themselves. A judge may leave the bench to-day and come into the House of Commons to-morrow, but a revising barrister cannot come into the House of Commons, or into any legislative assembly of a province, nor can he be a candidate for any Parliament for two years after he ceases to

be a revising barrister. We may, therefore, understand how careful the Government was, in framing this Act, to separate the revising barrister from all political influence. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was very much surprised when I heard the right hon. gentleman make use of these words in his speech on the second reading :

On this side of the House we have an absolute hostility to the revising officer and the lists prepared by the revising officer. During the last twenty years we have suffered too much at the hands of the revising officers.

Now, I cannot understand why the right hon. gentleman should have such a dislike to the revising officers, a body of men that cannot in any degree with truth be charged with partiality, a body of men who are eminently qualified for their positions, a body of men who discharge their duties wisely and well, a body of men that are not only above political considerations not only above the Government that appointed them, but are irremovable except by action of the House of Commons. It is for their eminent fairness that they can be obnoxious to the right hon. gentleman. A court of revision constituted upon fair lines is unsuitable to him and distasteful to the party that he ostensibly leads. A little further on, the hon. gentleman said :

This very Franchise Act was an abuse of power whereby the revision of the lists was placed in the hands of henchmen of the Administration.

Well, I humbly submit, that this was an asseveration that should not have come from the right hon. gentleman. I do not think it is in consonance with the dignity of the position the hon. gentleman holds in this country. It is an allegation that cannot be substantiated in any way by the right hon. gentleman, or by any other gentleman behind him in this House or country. That they were henchmen of the Administration is an impossibility, because they were above, not only every political party, but above the Government that appointed them. Now, the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill the other day, the Solicitor General, whom I am glad to see in his seat, made a very good speech. Whatever his political views may be, that hon. gentleman generally succeeds in making clear any Act that he introduces into this House, and I must compliment him upon the very clear and brief statement that he made when introducing the measure we are now dealing with. The hon. gentleman claims, as one of the merits of this Bill, that it is based on a Bill introduced some years previously by the late Sir John Thompson. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see the hon. gentleman, in this indirect way, pay to the late Sir John Thompson that high compliment that was his due. I am one of those that did not wait until Sir John Thompson was in his grave to pay tribute to the sterling honesty, superior ability and high-minded pur-

Mr. GILLIES.

poses of that great and lamented statesman. But I would remind the hon. gentleman that the Bill he introduced differs very widely from the Bill which was introduced by Sir John Thompson in June, 1894. The present Bill transfers absolutely over to the local legislatures the control of the franchise under which members are elected to the House of Commons, whereas, the Bill introduced by Sir John Thompson retained in the federal Parliament the right to control its own franchise. The Solicitor General will see at once the difference between the Act he is now promoting and the Act introduced by Sir John Thompson. I am quite ready to admit that Sir John Thompson stated that the property qualification of the electors in the different provinces for elections to the House of Commons should be the same as the property qualification of electors for provincial purposes ; but he did not go further. And the selection of the provincial standard of property qualification was but one means and only one means of enabling the revising officer to make up his lists. If the hon. Solicitor General proposed to go only that far, I will at once agree with him, and accept it as a sort of compromise. If he adopts the property qualification in the different provinces and maintains the franchise within federal control I am disposed to go that far ; but when we are called upon to abrogate our functions as legislators and delegate our right, power and authority to an irresponsible legislature to say who shall vote for members of this House, that would be a humiliating and unwarrantable abdication of those functions which we are supposed to discharge here. In order to show that Sir John Thompson intended that the control of the preparation of the lists should rest in the federal authorities, I need not cite the speech he delivered in introducing the Bill. He said :

We uphold the feature which I regard as the principal feature of the Franchise Act of 1885, and that is that the revision shall take place by officers under the control of this Parliament and of the Federal Government. The great principle which underlay the Franchise Act of 1885 was the control by this Parliament over matters connected with the franchise. It was contended that control should exist in two branches ; in the first place, as regards the laying down of the franchise itself, and, in the second place, as regards the administration of the law by which the franchise was carried out.

The House will see that Sir John Thompson distinctly laid down these two propositions, namely, that the Federal Parliament prescribe the franchise under which persons shall be voters at Dominion elections ; and he also stated most emphatically and unequivocally that the make-up of these lists was to be within federal control. I should like to ask the hon. Solicitor General to explain how he is going to reconcile with the ordinary idea of justice the fact that he under his proposed Bill will disfranchise

many hundreds of good citizens if his proposition becomes law. The hon. gentleman says that the local authorities will make up the lists under the laws of the different provinces. The hon. gentleman nods assent to this and therefore agrees with me as to that. In several of the provinces, thousands of people, qualified in every respect from a property standpoint, are disqualified under provincial law and are not capable of voting at Dominion elections. Does the hon. gentleman propose that those people shall remain disqualified and disfranchised for Dominion purposes; and if so how does he reconcile that position with his idea of justice and fair-play and with the acknowledged right of every British subject coming up to the standard qualification to vote in the community in which he lives? In the province of Nova Scotia from which I come we have a severe disfranchising law. The Minister of Finance who now sits in this House will remember that the Act was introduced by the party of which he was a prominent member. The law was passed in 1871, before the hon. gentleman came into active political life; but it was perpetuated in a very energetic manner, as I may say, by him after he entered public life, efforts were made to repeal it by the Conservative party on several occasions, but the hon. gentleman stood by and defended the monstrosity. That law disqualifies very many worthy citizens of the province from voting at Dominion elections. The classes of those disqualified will be found enumerated in chap. 4, section 67 of the Acts of Nova Scotia, which reads as follows:—

Any one who within fifteen days before the election was an employee, or in receipt of wages or emoluments of any kind as such employee, in the post office, the custom-house, the Inland Revenue Department, the lighthouse service, on the Government railroads—

All these people designated in the Act would be prevented from voting, if we adopted provincial franchises, for members of the House of Commons. I ask the hon. gentleman on what ground of right or justice—of course I am aware that Parliament has the power and can pass any law—he can justify the disfranchisement of 3,000 or 4,000 citizens of the province, men who are discharging the duties of citizenship in a very admirable manner, who are contributing towards municipal taxes, but who, although they pay their taxes, and every other exaction imposed upon them or demanded of them by the municipal authorities, yet are not allowed to vote at Dominion elections because one may be receiving \$100 a year for keeping a lighthouse or \$150 for work done in the custom-house, post office or inland revenue service. On what ground can the hon. gentleman justify the disenfranchisement of such class I have mentioned? Time and again efforts were made in that province to repeal this very obnoxious and unjust measure. All those at-

tempts, however, were checkmated and met with defeat at the hands of the Liberal party, with which the Minister of Finance was identified before he entered this House. Laudable efforts were made by the Conservative Opposition in the local House on different occasions to secure the repeal of this Act, but the Liberal Government always voted on the other side and refused to repeal it. For the life of me I cannot understand why a dignified body like the House of Commons of Canada should give a power of attorney to the legislatures of the provinces to enable them to select the manner of men who should vote for members of this Federal Parliament.

Let me draw the attention of the House to the manner in which the lists are made up in the province of Nova Scotia, whence I come. The municipalities are incorporated as in Ontario; assessors are appointed in the different municipalities, and revisers are placed under them. The Act says that the polling sections of the different localities shall be collected in groups of from two to five in each municipality, and that each group shall have three revisers. In the county of Cape Breton, in which municipality I reside, there are twenty-four municipal districts, and five different revising courts, each comprised of three members, so that there are fifteen revisers for the whole county. These gentlemen meet and go over the electoral lists and compile a list. There is no provision made for having names put on the list, except in a round-about way, by giving notice, and so on; and the final court of revision is the sheriff. Now, Sir, the sheriff is an officer of the local government, and in too many cases in our province is very often a played-out politician who has done local service for years, and, as a last resort, he gets the office. This official is constituted the final court of appeal on those electoral lists. It is easily understood what manner of court it is which is presided over by a functionary of that kind. The Solicitor General is a good lawyer, and I ask him to consider well before he will constitute such a court as I have described, to make the lists that shall govern the election of members from the province of Nova Scotia to this federal House. After the sheriff does his work, the lists are then made up and returned to the clerk of the council, but they are written and not printed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will see what room there is for fraud under conditions of that sort. I am free to admit, that I believe the hon. gentleman is ready to meet such difficulties as that, and to make some effort to reform what would be an outrageous condition of affairs, if this Bill became law. I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick), before he presses this measure to a conclusion, to pause and to ensure that protection will be given against the possibilities of such fraud. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the old Franchise

Act, cumbersome and expensive as it is, is yet capable of such amendment as will commend it to the House and to the country. It possessed the security of uniformity and impartiality, which this Bill does not. And, as to its impartiality, I challenge any hon. member, from Victoria to Yarmouth, in Nova Scotia, to say that the revising barrister, or the revising judge, did not act fairly and honestly from the first revision in 1886 down to the last. I am within the hearing of every member from my province in this House, and I challenge any one of them to contradict this statement. Then why disturb the judicial feature that our present revision possesses, and transfer and hand it over to parties in too many cases absolutely unacquainted with judicial procedure, and complete strangers to the most elementary rules of evidence? The Dominion Franchise Act had, therefore, the transcendent merits of uniformity and impartiality, and the cumbersome and expensive part of it could easily be removed by a well-considered amendment in this Parliament. I believe that, by adopting the amendment moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Powell), we will be moving in the direction of perfecting the present Dominion Act. Now, Sir, as to manhood suffrage. I am a strong believer in it, hedged in and safeguarded by a rigid and careful system of registration under the control of the federal authority. We have this principle admitted in the province of Ontario; we have it in the North-west Territories; we have it in Manitoba; we have it in New Brunswick; we have it in Prince Edward Island, practically, and in the remaining provinces of Nova Scotia and Quebec, the property qualification for voters is so low that it almost approaches manhood suffrage. We have all over the Dominion manhood suffrage practically, and, in my opinion, it would be well for this House to face the question now and at once. I believe, Sir, that manhood suffrage, carried out under a stringent and vigilant system of registration, would fill every want in this country. I believe, Sir, that we should have that registration under the directing eye of the Parliament of Canada, conducted before sworn officers of the federal Government, and if we had that, I submit, that such a system would commend itself to the Canadian people. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, oppose this Bill, because it is contrary to the spirit of the British North America Act, I oppose it because this Parliament having once become seized of its own franchise, it is a retrograde step to go back to the provincial franchise, I oppose this Bill further, because it leads at once to the decentralization of the federal authority, and I believe, Sir, that in the federal authority alone should lie the right to regulate the franchise under which the members of the House of Commons of Canada should be elected. I oppose it because of its want of

Mr. GILLIES.

uniformity; I oppose it because it hands over to the provinces a power which this Parliament should exercise; I oppose it because it forces upon the provinces a burthen which we have no right to lay upon them; and I oppose it further upon the broad principle that every legislative body should have the framing of the rules and conditions under which persons seeking admission would be admitted to its councils and deliberations.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to occupy the time of the House for just a few minutes to state my position with regard to the amendment which has been proposed this evening. I have read it over very carefully, and have tried to bring my mind in line with its suggestions. I cannot, however, see that it provides for the elimination of our old-time friend the revising barrister. I am in full sympathy with the idea enunciated by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) in favour of a uniform federal franchise, if that idea can be worked out without the help of the revising barrister, and without incurring the enormous expense entailed upon the country and upon individual candidates by the present Franchise Act. I am not in love with the proposed Act brought down by the Government. In fact, I am Tory enough to think that the present Dominion law is about as close to universal suffrage as this country ever should go. The Liberals in Ontario have gone to the other extreme; but if they are satisfied, I do not think, in view of the recent elections in Ontario, that Conservatives have much cause to complain. The old Franchise Act, with its revising officers and its expensiveness, is bad for the country, and is of no good for either party. I do not like the Government's proposed Act; but bad as it is, it is better than the system proposed by the amendment, and unless it can be made clear to me that this amendment does not contemplate the retention of our old friend the revising officer, I shall have to vote against it.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise simply to call attention to a point that has not yet been brought before the House respecting the strong objection there is to having the basis of the franchise for this House fixed by the local bodies. The right hon. gentleman who leads the House, and who, with the hon. Solicitor General, made the two principal speeches that have been made in support of this Bill, made a very elaborate argument to show that because the states of the Union fixed the franchise for the House of Representatives, therefore the provinces of confederation of Canada should fix the franchise for this Parliament. My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), however, pointed out what by some accident escaped the attention of the right hon. leader of the House. The right hon. leader of the House said:

By the authority of the precedent, because under the American constitution, which, in so far as the federation principle is concerned, is largely a prototype of our own, the regulating of the franchise for the election of members for Congress is not under the control of Congress.

Why, Sir, of course it is under the control of Congress, and expressly so, as was shown to-night by the hon. member for Westmoreland. The constitution says that it shall not go beyond the control of Congress, as my hon. friend quoted to-night. The right hon. leader of the House went on to say :

But it is embodied in the constitution itself, and is a fixed enactment, beyond and above the legislative powers of Congress.

I have been reading the debates that took place prior to the framing of the constitution. The able men who took part in those debates saw the evils that might arise from allowing the states to fix the franchise; but they were coaxing those states into a confederation, and they were afraid to take any other course than they took. As my hon. friend quoted it to-night, I quote it now, for the purpose of leading on to something else. The 4th section of the constitution reads as follows:—

The times, places and manner of holding elections for senators and representatives shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing senators.

Here the constitution itself does the very thing that my right hon. friend says was not done. But the most singular thing is that my right hon. friend went on to show that Congress could do the very thing which he said it could not do; for after recess he went elaborately into the instance of Congress doing it, namely, when at the close of the war the black vote was brought in. But now I am going to read to you what was said in the "Federalist," and what has not yet been quoted in this House, as a reason why it was possible for those wise men to agree to let the states fix the franchise for the federal House of Representatives, and it suggests a reason why we should not allow the provinces to fix the basis of our franchise :

Upon this clause, which was finally adopted by a unanimous vote, the "Federalist" has remarked: "The provision made by the convention appears to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every state, because it is conformable to the standard already established by the state itself. It will be safe to the United States, because, being fixed by the state constitutions, it is not alterable by the state governments, and it cannot be feared that the people of the state will alter this part of their constitutions in such a manner as to abridge the rights secured to them by the federal constitution."

So that you see that the great "Federalist" writer and statesman saw that it was a most extraordinary thing for a great par-

liament like the House of Representatives to give to lower bodies the power of fixing the franchise, which should be the matrix of what that great assembly would be. But he says it is safe, because as the franchise which they have is embodied in the constitution, it is not alterable by the state governments. The objection I have to the main principle of my hon. and learned friend's Bill after all is this, that he gives the provinces the fixing of the franchise which shall return members to this House. The main objection I have to it is not that it does not introduce uniformity, but that it gives to other bodies—I am not dwelling on the fact that they are inferior bodies, though we know they are certainly inferior in power and dignity—the fixing of the franchise which shall return members to this House.

Mr. MILLS. And the altering of it.

Mr. DAVIN. And the altering of it. Look at the state of things that was called to the attention of this House by my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills). Look at the state of things that was called to our attention by the hon. baronet who leads the Opposition with regard to Manitoba. Look at the state of things in Manitoba that was brought before us by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) this year. And I have one affidavit here by Mr. Ross, which I shall not trouble the House with reading, but which shows that under the present Manitoba Act he was refused the right of putting 165 electors on the lists, all of whom were qualified, and many of whom had been several years in the province. I appeal to my hon. and learned friend the Solicitor General, who has charge of the Bill, to pause. Surely he does not want to introduce legislation that in any one province will do a great wrong. Yet by this Bill he will impose on the Dominion, as regards the franchise in Manitoba, a system which even the Toronto "Globe" condemned at the time it was introduced, and which the Manitoba "Free Press"—an independent or rather a Liberal paper—condemned in the strongest and most emphatic language. I could read article after article from the Manitoba "Free Press" denouncing the present franchise law of that province as a most iniquitous law. I am not speaking now as a Conservative, but simply as a member of this House, and I ask hon. gentlemen who are in the majority: Is it right for them—it may strike themselves to-morrow—to force on the people of Manitoba a franchise for the election of members to this House which, as it has been managed up to the present, is steeped in trickery and has been the means of perpetrating untold wrongs on the electorate. The same language holds good with regard to Nova Scotia, and my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Martin) says with regard to Prince Edward Island.

The right hon. gentleman who leads the

Government, in reply to the hon. baronet who leads the Opposition, said :

In so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, his argument did not go very far. Indeed, he refuted his own argument, because he said, at a later period, that the legislature of that province had repealed the obnoxious law.

It is almost impossible for me to believe that the right hon. gentleman was conscious really of what he was saying at that point. The hon. leader of the Opposition had pointed out that, having in view a prospective election, the Nova Scotia legislature passed a certain law for the purpose of controlling the election, and when that election was passed, then they repealed the law. Was not that a proof of the very thing we complain of? And yet the right hon. gentleman replied to that statement in the language I have quoted. It is really almost impossible to believe that he was conscious of the patent fallacy that underlay his argument. The right hon. gentleman went on to say that he admitted there was force in the argument that a legislature can abuse its powers. What, I ask you, would we naturally expect of a man in the position of the First Minister, who admits there is force in the argument that a legislature can abuse its powers? Would we not expect him to find a means to prevent such abuse? But instead he went on to say that he knew very well what a majority could do, and to indicate that some wrong had come from the majority to the Liberal party in this House. I can only say that I have not yet heard any Liberal mention a single case in which any individual can be accused of having done wrong under the existing franchise law.

Just to be a little more explicit, let me point out the peculiar proposition that lies beneath this Bill of my hon. and learned friend, the Solicitor General. The first proposition is this, that in a federation the popular branch of the central Parliament should not control its own electoral franchise. The next is that in a federation, the legislature of each of the provinces of the federation should not only control its own electoral franchise, but within the provincial bounds the electoral franchise of the central Parliament of the federation. You have only to state these propositions to show their utter absurdity. And what is the argument in their support used by the right hon. gentleman? It reads like a piece of fine satire. He says, practically: Here we have two powers in the federation; our powers are divisible, therefore we shall have one franchise. Where is the logic? Let me read the right hon. gentleman's words:

The reason for that is that our system is a system of divided legislative powers.

And because it is a system of divided legislative powers, it should have only one franchise, and it is the lower assemblies which

Mr. DAVIN.

should control, not only their own franchise, but the franchise of this House. What is the object that we should aim at? Is it not that this House, under whatever law we pass, should be a true representation of the opinion in the country? That is what we should aim at, and I was surprised to hear my right hon. friend talk of principles and philosophy in this matter. We sometimes hear his eulogists tell us that he has been a student of Burke and Fox and the other great Liberal statesmen of England. Well, Burke would have come down on him, if he were in this House, pretty strongly for talking about philosophy in such a connection, or even of principle. What we are aiming at here is simply to work out an expedient or a means by which this House shall be a true representation of the opinion of the country.

It seems to me that my hon. and learned friend the Solicitor General, when he introduced this Bill, was guilty of a little want of candour. He told this House that this Bill had a precedent in the one introduced by the late Sir John Thompson in 1894. Could my hon. friend have been candid in making that statement? Why, all that the Bill by Sir John Thompson in 1894 aimed at was to use the provincial franchises as a basis on which to arrive at a Dominion list, but the Dominion lists were not to pass out of the control of the Dominion Parliament.

The essence of this Bill, as shown by the language of my hon. and learned friend and of his right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and by the Bill itself is to transfer the control from this House to the provincial legislatures. The right hon. gentleman, using the word "control" in one sense at one time and in another sense at another time, which is not very creditable to his logic, to say nothing of morality, says that we give control of the franchise to the local legislatures but we do not part with it, but still exercise sovereignty. It is like saying if you give a five pound note or a dollar bill to a man and he takes it away, you still have it, or, to quote an old and vulgar saying, that you can eat your cake and have it too. I wish to call attention to what the hon. Solicitor General said. I was almost pained I must confess to read the language of the hon. gentleman. Speaking of the province of Quebec, he said that he was determined that Quebec should have its local franchise for the Dominion. So far as I am concerned I am quite content to let Quebec have its local franchise for the Dominion. One of the things I would complain about with regard to this Bill is that it would thrust upon the people of Ontario and Manitoba and New Brunswick who may not wish it, manhood suffrage for the elections of this House. Sir, is there any cogent argument in stating that there should be the same franchise for this House as for the legislature? Have we not to exercise higher powers which the local leg-

islatures do not exercise? Have we not to exercise higher powers? Is it not possible that the same class of people who would effectively choose the minds that should control a municipality or a county may not be the persons who should choose the minds to control a local legislature, still less to choose the minds to legislate in this House. Suppose that we were independent and had to have a foreign policy and still greater questions were coming before us, is it not possible that we should require a different matrix to get a good House of Commons from that which would give us a good local assembly? One of the objections I have to this is that it thrusts will-nilly upon people who may not wish it the system of manhood suffrage for election to this House. In Ontario, instead of giving manhood suffrage certain evidences are required that people are fulfilling their duties to the state. The hon. Solicitor General said that he was determined to keep for Quebec its own franchise. But hear what he says about the poor people of Ontario:

It may be that a desire exists in some provinces to extend the franchise so broadly that all men may have a right to participate in the elections; there may be a desire that all men, even those whose only asset in life is the vote they may dispose of as a marketable commodity in the elections, should occupy the same position as the man who has some stake in the country.

My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) nods to me. Even when after the monstrosity has been brought before him, he smiles approval of the abominable concoction that marks his legislative reign. He says in effect: I am ready to give you an Act of Parliament to give men the franchise whose only estate is the vote you give them and the price they can get for their treacherous act in selling it. And he still nods at me. I say that it is unworthy of this legislature and unworthy of my hon. and learned friend, and still more unworthy of his position, to be ready so to legislate as to give the franchise to those whom the greatest radical that ever lived declared should not be endowed with it. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim to be Liberals. Do they honour the name of John Stuart Mill. Mill declared that no man should be given the franchise who was of this character. No man should be given the franchise, unless though in some small way, doing acts of citizenship and contributing to the common stock. No bankrupt should have it and no man in receipt of public alms. For, as he says, why should we give to these the control of the money of the state? That is what we do. The people who send us here send us to spend money, and if they are a low class of people their representatives here will be of a low class. Mill denounced the idea—I have his words here under my hand—that a man who could not read or write, a man who did not pay his taxes or even an insolvent who had not

got a satisfactory discharge should be on the voters' list. And yet my hon. friend says: I am ready to legislate so as to force upon Ontario, what Ontario does not now allow, that the electors for this House shall include men whose only asset in life is the vote which is for them a marketable commodity. But what I particularly find fault with my hon. friend for is that he, a gentleman of experience, a gentleman learned in the law, should state to this House that this Act is founded upon and was an imitation of the precedent set by Sir John Thompson in 1894. I have Sir John Thompson's proposed Act here before me. I will not take the time to read it, but hon. gentlemen who care to compare it with this Bill will find the comparison instructive. Sir John Thompson proposed to do what I should not object to—to use the municipal lists and the provincial lists to get a Dominion list. I do not mind what you make use of to get a list, so long as that list shall be subject to the control of this Parliament.

The argument of expense is the only one that I have heard strongly used against the present Act. Two kinds of expense have been complained of. I must say, in passing, that we have had from both sides of the House speeches that were most instructive to me. I have listened to them with great interest. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) pointed out that the chief expense was the revision of the lists by the judge. If we pay the judge for the revision of the lists the same price paid by the province, one-half the expense will disappear. My hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Moore) showed the other night that the amounts stated by the Solicitor General as to cost had been exaggerated.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I think my hon. and learned friend is going a little too far. I took my statement from the Auditor General's Report. I am willing to lay it on the Table, giving the page from which I quoted.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I see that, by refusing to agree to that statement of mine, my hon. and learned friend makes his case worse.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I draw a distinction between fact and fancy.

Mr. DAVIN. Suppose I take that sum and divide it by two, and spread it over thirteen years. Mind, I am not saying you must have that Act, but I say that, for the ultimate revision of any lists, we must not be thrown at the mercy of such revising officers as we have in Manitoba; we must not be placed at the mercy of creatures of the provincial governments, who can be got to do any iniquity that is demanded of them by their provincial leaders. In the ultimate revision we must have judges to deal with, and, provided we have due safeguards, I would not care very much what was the process by which you got out the list. But I re-

gard the thing as a means to an end. Now, is it consonant with our dignity that we should allow another and inferior body to fix that which the right hon. gentleman describes to be the very basis and foundation of our political life? I will not so far forget my duty on the present occasion as to go into the details of this measure; I will only point out the course which I think we should follow. My hon. and learned friend introduced it as a Bill that would give us the provincial lists as our lists, and what is the principal clause, after all, in his Bill? The principal clause is the 8th clause, and in that he tells us that the basis he is going to give us for our list is a basis as shifting as the sand of the seashore. It is a basis that has no permanency whatever. He gives you a list that you may find, when you want the list, that it is not there. Then, he provides the same machinery—I wish my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) was here—he provides the same machinery precisely, as an alternative, that he admits now this Act is introduced to supersede. He tells you that, in certain cases, you may not find that you have a provincial list within the twelve months, and then,

If such lists have been prepared not more than one year before the date of the writ for such Dominion election; otherwise new voters' lists shall be prepared, and for the purpose of preparing and giving effect to such voters' lists the Governor in Council may appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers, and in the preparation and revision and bringing into force of such new voters' lists the provision of the laws of the province, regulating the preparation and revision and bringing into force of the provincial voters' lists in such cases, shall as far as possible be observed and followed.

But the officers will be Dominion officers, and you may have, therefore, a machinery very much like that which he wants to supersede. So that, after all, we are not going to have such a cheap system as has been suggested to us, and my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) showed this evening, very clearly, how that was. Now, to show that my fears are not groundless, that we may get little help to guard us against such officers as I have spoken of, as exist in Manitoba, if you turn to the 17th section, which is a section amending the Dominion Elections Act, we read:

Not more than one elector for each compartment shall at any one time enter the room where the poll is held, and each elector upon so entering shall declare his name, surname and addition, which shall be entered or recorded by the poll clerk in the poll-book provided for that purpose, which shall be kept in form R in the first schedule of this Act; and if the same are found on the list of voters for the polling district of such polling station, or if he is found entitled to vote—

“Or if he is found entitled to vote”—what is the meaning of that?

Mr. DAVIN.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that to be for the returning officer to decide?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They have no list in Prince Edward Island to prepare, and you have, therefore, to leave it in the hands of the returning officer.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that a satisfactory state of things? There is another gap, another pit-fall. I pointed out, a moment ago, that what we were doing was forcing on Ontario manhood suffrage for the Dominion, and what you are doing in Prince Edward Island, which now has a good and fair system of returning men to Parliament, is to force on them such a system as they have in Prince Edward Island, and leave it entirely with the returning officer as to whether he will put a name on or not. Now, when we go into committee, I do hope that we may find between the two sides of the House a modus vivendi, some means of coming to a fair arrangement by which, instead of talking of principles and talking of philosophy, we shall regard the making of the lists as a means to an end, an honest means to a noble end, a fair means to a desirable end, a means of giving us honest and trustworthy lists that shall send to this House a fair, just and effective representation of the opinion of the country.

Mr. MOORE. I do not rise to make a speech on this subject. But I have noticed that some hon. members, in commenting upon a speech I made upon this subject last week, dispute the figures which I quoted as to the cost of the various revisions of the voters' lists which were made since the Act was first passed. I understand from the Solicitor General to-night, that he called those figures fancy figures, and disputed the correctness of those which I had quoted. I will say here now, that I took my figures directly from the Auditor General's Report, and I challenge him, or any other man, to show that they are incorrect. The statement I then made was, that the four revisions that have taken place during the operation of the Act, in the last twelve years, cost \$826,782.97, which would amount, spread over the twelve years, to \$68,898 a year. So I say, that the statement made by the Solicitor General, that the cost had been \$1,500,000, does not agree with the Report of the Auditor General, and that my figures are absolutely correct.

Mr. WALLACE. Hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this subject, have taken it for granted that there was nothing to be said in favour of the present Franchise Act; but, when the debate had gone on, we found out that there is nothing to be said to-night in favour of the proposed new Franchise Bill. Speaker after speaker have got up on the Government side and have

exhausted themselves in an effort to produce arguments that would justify this House in abolishing the Franchise Act and taking this backward step. It is a retrograde step that is proposed, and one unworthy of a Government that call themselves progressive and Liberal. This is a step in the wrong direction. It is, as has been truthfully stated on this side of the House to-night, an abdication of the functions of this Parliament. We have the power to regulate our own franchise. It is eminently proper that the power should be vested in this Parliament, and still more proper that Parliament should exercise it. For some years the provincial franchises were used. It was inevitable that they should be used because there was no other means available for the preparation of the lists for the first House of Commons of Canada. Year after year the same franchise was adopted; but Sir John Macdonald introduced a Franchise Bill, which was not passed into law but was brought up for the purpose of familiarizing the House and the country with its provisions so that it might be adopted in years to come. That new Franchise Bill was adopted in 1885. There have been many objections made to it, and we all remember the circumstances under which it was passed. The objections that have been made are, in the first place, that it was cumbersome, that it was hard to learn and hard to understand. It was somewhat cumbersome; but that very fault appears to have led to the preparation of a more perfect list than the local list, as I will conclusively prove. The Act as it has been in force provides for every voter getting his name on the list with the lowest possible expense, and least trouble, and to that extent is in direct contrast to the provincial list in Ontario. The object of the Ontario list appears to be to prevent men who are duly qualified from getting their names placed on the list. The expense is as great, the difficulty is as great, as with the Dominion list, and when all this trouble has been undertaken, you have not in the case of the provincial list got even a nearly perfect list. It is stated as an objection that an immense list is prepared under the Dominion Franchise Act. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) said it looked like a stuffed list. The hon. gentleman was forced, however, to admit that the revising officer was an eminently fair one. Hon. gentlemen opposite are obliged to make this admission because these officers in nine cases out of ten are judges of the land. They perform judicial functions and are the judges of last resort in regard to provincial lists. The only class of men who are entirely removed from the political arena are these men who were made revising officers for the Dominion lists. Yet we have been told—we have not been told to-night, because hon. gentlemen opposite dare not make the statement—that they have acted

unfairly. Although hon. gentlemen opposite have been endeavouring to create that impression throughout the country, they have completely failed. They now say that they have nothing to say against the revising officer, but that there is the revising officer's clerk, a very wicked individual, according to the hon. member for West Elgin. I only know the revising officer's clerk in my own riding. He is the judge's son, a barrister, and an eminently fair man against whom nothing could be said by either side as regards his impartiality and his care in preparing the lists and complying with the law. This charge against some of the revising officers' clerks was untrue and it has been urged for the first time to-night; and no proof has been given in support of it, any more than proof has been given of the unfairness of the revising officers who are principally judges of the land. Then we are told that the Act was expensive. Perhaps so. There are two expenses to be considered: one is the expense to the Government, and the other is the expense to the individual candidate. I presume we are more interested in the latter. We have a very general interest in the expense to the country, but we have a special interest in the expense to the candidate who causes a revision of the list, and I have no hesitation in saying that it is more expensive in the case of the local lists than in the case of the lists under the Dominion Franchise Act. Take my own constituency as regards the local legislature. The Mowat Government gerrymandered it twice in order to make it a safe constituency, if they could. It is not nearly so large as the constituency for Dominion purposes, and the population is not more than half; yet for one-half of this Dominion constituency the local candidates, Mr. St. John and Mr. Hill, have been put to more trouble and expense in revising the lists than in revising the Dominion list for the larger constituency, and yet they did not secure nearly as perfect a list. The provincial list is essentially an imperfect list. In the township of Vaughan, where I live, there were on our side, I think, about 100 appeals put in; but though the court was held for a day or two, it was difficult to get the people to attend from so large a township and remain there until they gave evidence necessary to have their names put on the list. The result, both on the Reform and Conservative side, was that men did not appear to have their names put on the list, because the evidence was not sufficient to satisfy the judge, who desired conclusive evidence; and, therefore, although there was a good deal of expense incurred and a good deal of trouble taken, a very imperfect list was obtained. A large number of names of those entitled to vote were not put on the list, notwithstanding the expense and trouble taken, whereas our Dominion list was more perfect and less expensive. Under the Dominion Act a man

who is entitled to vote can have his name placed on the list without much expense and very little trouble or loss of time by making affidavit, when he has demonstrated his right to vote. Another objection, and to my mind a pretty strong one, is that when this local and imperfect list is obtained, you have neither a written nor a printed list. You have first a printed list, second, you have a number of names written in, and third, you have a pen stroke drawn through a number of names. We had that experience at the last local election. Every one wanted to know where a revised list could be obtained; but nobody could secure one except with great trouble. We had first a printed list, but when the revised list was obtained it was found that a pen had been drawn through certain names and certain other names had been added in writing; and we had therefore a list partly printed, partly erased and certain names added in writing, a list that could be easily tampered with when dishonest men had charge of it, and we know dishonest men have had charge of it in the past and have tampered with the ballot boxes in my own immediate locality. The Government in introducing this Franchise Bill have utterly failed to justify it. We have evidence from every province in the Dominion of the iniquities perpetrated under the local franchise laws; we have had demonstrated to us the injustice of the Manitoba law, and we have had time and again evidence of the unfairness of the Franchise Act passed by the local legislature of Nova Scotia. In Ontario we have a franchise law which aims at disfranchising people. If a man moves from one electoral district to another he loses his right to vote. He does not dispossess himself of his property, he does not break any law of the land, but yet he is an alien when the election comes on. I know of one case, that of Mr. John Abell, who employs 150 men in the city of Toronto. Mr. Abell removed from West York to the city of Toronto; he could not vote in West York because he could not swear he was residing there, and although he had \$150,000 or \$200,000 worth of property in the city of Toronto, he could not vote there because his name was not on the list. So in the case of Dr. Orr, our candidate for the local legislature. He committed the crime of removing from the electoral district of West York, as it was constituted for the local legislature, and removing into the city of Toronto, but remaining in the old electoral district of York as it has been for fifty years constituted as a Dominion constituency, and although he was a candidate for the local legislature, he did not have a vote either in West York or in the city of Toronto. He was treated as an alien in the country in which he was born and had lived all his life. It looks perhaps as if we were going to have a

Mr. WALLACE.

change of government in Ontario, and if so we will have a new franchise Bill in that province. But, Sir, I refuse to let any local legislature—I care not what its politics may be—dictate the franchise for the Parliament of Canada. I know that if a Conservative Government came into power in Ontario they would have removed many of the inequalities and injustices of the franchise law of that province. That they would make it more just and equitable I have not the slightest doubt, but even so, I maintain that we have no right to delegate the franchise for the Parliament of Canada to any local legislature or to any county council or to any municipal council. I say, Sir, that we are lowering our dignity and doing an injustice to ourselves by taking such a course. There is still another objection to this Bill now proposed by the Government. Under the Dominion Franchise Act there is a simple oath specified, which sets forth four things: first, that you are a British subject; second, that you are twenty-one years of age; third, that you have not bribed anybody and that nobody has bribed you; and fourth, that you are the person mentioned on the voters' list. That is a form of oath that is understandable by anybody, but under the local law in Ontario the voter is met with a series of complicated oaths. The one most usual to be administered is that referring to the manhood suffrage, and I venture to say that that oath will not be properly administered by one returning officer out of a hundred. There are half a dozen blanks to be filled up and these blanks state certain dates, and one of the dates is:

That you have resided within this province for twelve months before the.....day of....., being the day up to which a complaint could be made to the county court judge under the Ontario voters' list, and to insert the names of any persons in this list.

That date varies in every municipality in the province of Ontario, and who is going to fill up that blank? The deputy returning officer knows nothing about it, the polling clerk knows nothing about it, the returning officer knows nothing about it, the Ontario legislature provides no date, and the whole thing may be used and is used effectively as a bluff to prevent certain people from voting, whom it is considered desirable should not vote. This oath acts as a deterrent to people from voting and indeed the whole Ontario Act seems to tend in that direction. For all these reasons. I say that we should stick to a Dominion franchise law and amend it, as we easily can do. It is said by hon. gentlemen opposite that the fact that we have admitted that changes should be made in the Dominion Franchise Act is sufficient to condemn it. Not so. We do not claim that the Bill is infallible. In 1894 Sir John Thompson introduced an amendment, in the first place to make the Dominion Fran-

chise Act less expensive, and, in the second place, to remove certain inconsistencies, and to make it work more smoothly. We recognized then that the Act should be amended, and we recommend that course to-day as strongly as we did four years ago. The fact that we admit that does not justify the retrograde step which the Government proposes that the House should now take—a step which I am sure, if they adopt it, either their own Government or a Conservative Government will in the near future repeal in order to revert to a Dominion franchise, which is the true system and the only one that will work effectively. Take all the difficulties that have been pointed out in adopting the different franchises in the different provinces. In the province of Ontario you have one man one vote, while in the province of Quebec you have one man six votes. Why should you give property such an advantage as that in the province of Quebec, if you do not give property an equal advantage in the province of Ontario? Will somebody justify it? Will anybody say that the people of Quebec are more intelligent and have a right to have a wider franchise than the people of Ontario? No one can urge that; they shall all be treated exactly alike. Besides that, a very important consideration is this. Following logically upon the principle of one man one vote, one vote should have one value. But hon. gentlemen opposite have not proposed that that shall be the case. Of course, it could not be done now without a redistribution Act, which I presume hon. gentlemen opposite will not attempt, at any rate until the next census has been taken. But in the province of Ontario, where one man one vote prevails, they have not recognized the principle of representation according to population, which they advocated many years ago, and which logically and consistently should follow. For instance, they have cut up the riding of West York, and have added a large portion of its population to West Toronto. The result is that to-day there are probably 20,000 people in the west riding of York, and probably three times 20,000 in the west riding of Toronto. This is unfair and unjustifiable. We should have as nearly as possible a uniform franchise. It is true, the franchise of the present Dominion Act is not uniform, but it is very nearly so. It is not perfect. Its framers attempted to make a uniform franchise, but they found that they had to depart from it in some minor respects; but so far as the whole Dominion is concerned, the franchise is pretty nearly uniform, so that a man having a vote in one portion of the Dominion is entitled to a vote if he makes his residence in any other portion of the Dominion. In that respect it is a commendable act; but the proposed Bill utterly ignores that object. Now, Sir, it would be in my opinion a calamity to this country if this Bill for the adoption of the franchises

of the different provinces of the Dominion becomes the law of the land. It will not increase the intelligence of the members elected to this House; it will not raise the power and strength of this great central Parliament of Canada. It will be of no benefit whatever that I can see except that it may save the Dominion Parliament from the expenditure of a sum of money which would be necessary for the making of Dominion lists. It increases the expenses to the candidates, which to us is a more important matter. I say that if it does cause expense to the Dominion to obtain a Dominion list, the result completely justifies that expenditure. I do not believe the lists should be revised every year. That is an expense to the Government and both a labour and expense to the individual. But if a by-election is held, there might be some simple and inexpensive machinery for revising the list for the constituency in which that by-election is held, so that it will be held under an up-to-date voters' list. That is not proposed to be done by this Bill.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How do you propose to do that?

Mr. WALLACE. I would propose to do it by a registration.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). How late would you have it?

Mr. WALLACE. I would have it after the vacancy occurred. I would allow sufficient time to elapse between the issue of the writ and the holding of the election to have a registration, so that there would be a list right up to date. But that is only one proposal. There are other methods by which an up-to-date list could be obtained, and I think it is important that it should be obtained. It has been stated that it is wrong to have a by-election on a list two or three years old. I quite agree with that. I say that wrong should be remedied, and it can be remedied cheaply and effectively in various ways. So I hope that this Parliament will not adopt a law which has nothing to recommend it except that it saves this Dominion of Canada the expenditure of a small sum of money, while it takes from the individual candidates a sum much larger than before, and where the expenditure should not be imposed upon the individual candidates. It is the duty of the state to provide as perfect a list as possible, and this duty should not devolve upon the candidates nor upon the political parties, more than to the smallest extent possible. For these reasons I am of opinion that this Bill should be read about this day six months.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I think it but right to extend my congratulations to the hon. gentlemen opposite, for the opposition they are offering the measure now before us. The House can bear witness to the idle opposition which the hon. gentle-

men, during several sittings of the House, have offered this measure which, however, cannot fail meeting public approval. Let them go on, as long as they please, opposing so just and opportune a measure; such a course cannot but help our cause before the country. The Act now in force has often been discussed before the electorate, and I may say, speaking for the province of Quebec, that it has been condemned as formally as possible at the hands of the people. As a matter of fact, never did public opinion declare itself more openly on any important measure than it has done with regard to the franchise law of 1885. Many a time at public meetings and on the hustings did I hear that law inveighed against and denounced, but never yet have I heard any of our opponents utter a single word to vindicate it; on the contrary, they would confess, by their silence at least, if not by word of mouth, that it ought to be repealed. And no later than to-day did we not hear the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) stating in this House that he had pledged himself before his electors to vote in favour of any Bill to repeal the franchise Act of 1885? It was on good ground, therefore, that I stated, at the outset, that by opposing during several sittings the measure now under consideration the hon. gentlemen opposite were rendering us a service. Those hon. gentlemen have thought the best they could do was to have an amendment proposed to the Bill by one of their friends, but it is a spiritless amendment, to say the least, as it only tells us that this House is anxious to reduce the expenses attendant upon the preparation of the voters' lists, so far as may be practicable, while, it adds, no system of franchise would be satisfactory which did not preserve federal control. Such is the opinion given expression to by the majority of the hon. gentlemen. All those, at least, to whose speeches I have listened to, have declared that the expenditure attendant upon the preparation of the electoral lists were too large and even exorbitant. Now, the hon. gentlemen were in power at the time, and they ought to have found some means of reducing that expenditure. The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), when introducing this Bill, told us that the four revisions of the electoral lists had cost the country \$1,154,000, which represents an average of \$288,000 for every revision. Now, if we refer to the expenditure incurred for the last revision which took place in 1894-95, we see, by the reply given by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) on the 12th February, 1896, that the last revision cost no less than \$235,396.98. It is quite evident therefore, that, experience did not teach them how to reduce the expenditure attendant upon the preparation of those electoral lists. Moreover, if we glance over the procedure which the revising officers had to go through, it is easy to understand that it could not be done without a large

Mr. LEGRIS.

expenditure, and, moreover, a useless one, as we have in each province, voters' lists that are prepared by the municipal councils. Those lists are prepared yearly by competent men, chosen irrespective of party politics; they will also, as a rule, give better satisfaction, as they are more easy of access to the interested parties. The case is quite different with the lists prepared by the revising officers appointed by the Dominion Government, and belonging exclusively to one political party. Those officers strongly sympathise with the political party from which they get their appointment and, moreover, as they are often called upon to act in localities they are unacquainted with, they have to rely upon the information their political friends supply them with.

It seems out of question that the electoral lists of the different provinces, being prepared every year, without our having to concern ourselves about them, they would give fuller satisfaction than the Dominion lists can. As a matter of fact, under the Dominion Franchise Act, the expenditure necessarily involved is so large that it has led to the still worse effect of preventing the Government of the day, as also the former Administration, to revise yearly the electoral lists, as provided by the law now in force. What are the actual facts, Sir? Whenever any by-elections are coming off, we have to take lists four years old. This is an intolerable state of things, one that constitutes a real hardship for the voters whose names are not on the lists. Under the present system, a yearly revision would involve too large an expenditure. Therefore we cannot secure fair and equitable lists, without incurring heavy expenditures, whilst it would be quite otherwise, should we use the lists prepared for provincial elections. It is also contended that it is necessary to maintain the present system on the plea that it secures a much desired uniformity. I agree that the preparation of the voters' lists based on different systems may be attended with some inconveniences; but it should also be borne in mind that the provincial lists are prepared by municipal councils, being thereby less liable to lead to mistakes and to hardships than the present lists are. I am sorry, however, that the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has not seen his way clear to insert in the Bill now under consideration a provision by which the right of suffrage of an elector would be restricted to his place of residence. All those who have had to run an election know all the inconvenience of bringing to the polls persons who do not reside in the locality where they are qualified to vote. Those inconveniences are of such a nature as to justify the hon. Solicitor General, if he can see his way clear to do it, in amending his Bill, when it comes under the consideration of the committee, so as to make it provide for residential voting. Every hon. member in this House knows all the trouble and expenditure in-

curred by the candidates and their friends in bringing to the polls those voters who do not reside in the locality where they have a right to vote. But there are further disadvantages which I may merely mention here. Those voters who come from outside to vote are mostly always the cause of controverted election trials being brought about and of elections being voided. As every hon. gentleman knows, one of the most heavy burdens which the candidates and their friends have to bear is the paying of the travelling expenses of those who come from a distance. Now, those expenditures are unlawful; they make the candidate liable to have his election contested and should the trial of the election petition take place, his election may be voided. I am sure the Bill now under consideration would not adequately meet the views of the voters in the province of Quebec, should it not include a clause providing for residential voting. In my opinion, Sir, notwithstanding all what the hon. gentlemen opposite may say to the contrary, it would be far preferable for us to revert to the former state of things and to use the provincial lists. The voters of this country will then be able to express their opinion in the same manner as when voting at a provincial election. The electors will make their voice heard as easily then as they do now; they will be able to give expression to their views by means of the provincial lists in a more satisfactory manner than they can do through the federal lists now in use. This change would save the country and those who concern themselves with the preparation of those voters' lists all the expenditure, and trouble attendant upon the revision of the Dominion voters' lists, under the present system.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in listening to the remarks just fallen from the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Legris), I noticed that while attacking the Franchise Act, he did not say anything in vindication of the Bill now under our consideration. He even went so far as to say that there were deficiencies in the Bill introduced by the hon. Solicitor General, and among other amendments, he did suggest residential voting. Now, Sir, we are not called upon to vindicate the franchise law of 1885, and I may tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that we are all opposed to that law remaining in force any longer, as it stands now. For my part, I say without hesitation, that were I asked to vote in favour of the law remaining in force, as it stands now, I would vote against it. But we have proposed an amendment which points out the main objectionable feature of the Bill introduced by the hon. Solicitor General. As to the matter of expenditure, I quite coincide with the hon. member for Maskinongé. I admit that the machinery of the Act of 1885 is too expensive, as stated in the amendment. But I would have liked the

Government to introduce a Bill which, while reducing the large public expenditure necessitated by the machinery of the Act, would have provided for the control of Parliament over the franchise under which its members are elected. Now, Sir, if we oppose this Bill, it is because this very principle is infringed. We hold that this Parliament is an independent body, superior to the provinces. The provincial legislatures enjoy but delegated powers, which were conferred on them by the Imperial Parliament. At any rate, the Dominion Parliament, so far as its origin and dignity are concerned, is above the provincial legislatures, and it seems desirable that it should have, at least, the control of the voters' lists on which its members are elected. Every parliament is vested with that power. Why, then, should the Dominion Parliament, which is above the provincial legislatures, and is an independent body, not possess the right of electing its own members? Such is the principle for which we are now battling, and such is the reason why we oppose the present Bill, which ignores that principle. If the hon. Solicitor General is willing to insert in his Bill a clause providing for the control of the Dominion Parliament over the voters' lists, let him make a proposition to that effect, and I make bold to tell him that he will have the support of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, or, at least, I give him my word that I will support the Bill. But Parliament should not divest itself of its control over the lists on which the members of this House are elected.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). (Translation.) The hon. gentleman will perhaps allow me to interrupt him a moment. Would the hon. gentleman point out to us what means we should take, in his opinion, in order to exercise that control?

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) I do not think either the member for Terrebonne, or any other hon. gentleman, is called upon to legislate here instead of the hon. gentlemen opposite—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman wants concessions, and I was just asking him what he wants.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) Those concessions, I propose to ask them from the Solicitor General when the House is sitting in Committee of the Whole, and when this Bill is under their consideration I will then propose that this Bill be so modified as to secure to Parliament the exclusive control of the lists on which members of this House are elected. I would certainly endorse this measure, were it enacted that Parliament shall have control over the lists on which members of the House of Commons are elected; and such is, to my mind, the main objectionable feature of this Bill.

Hon. gentlemen have spoken of decentralization in connection with the exercise of the suffrage; they said that it was desirable to give the provinces the right of determining the franchise on which the members of this House should be elected. They have also contended that the Act of 1885 interfered with provincial autonomy. When the Dominion Parliament adopted the present system under which members of this House are elected, it did not in the least interfere with the powers of the provincial legislatures. This House, on the contrary, under the British North America Act of 1867, enjoys the right and privilege of legislating on that matter. The Government of Canada has the right to superintend and control and regulate the preparation of the electoral lists on which the members of this House are elected; it has the unquestionable right of determining its own franchise and to make provisions as to who shall have a right to vote at the election of members of this House.

It is, therefore, out of question to controvert the right of this Parliament to enact a franchise of its own, and it cannot be said that when this legislation was adopted, the rights of the provinces were interfered with. I agree that the machinery of that law is too expensive and that it is necessary to find the means of removing that objectionable feature of that system.

I did not rise, Sir, in order to answer the hon. member for Maskinongé, who is not quite satisfied with this Bill, but only to give expression to my views on the measure introduced by the hon. Solicitor General, and before I resume my seat, let me say here that I cannot support this Bill, because in my opinion it is contrary to the dignity, to the prerogatives and even to the interests of the members of this House. By enacting such legislation, we would find ourselves at the mercy of the local legislatures, which is against the dignity of the Dominion Parliament.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the general question, but simply to remove a misconception which seems to exist on the other side of the House with regard to the provincial law of Nova Scotia regulating the franchise, and which has been given expression to by at least three hon. members on the opposite side. The hon. leader of the Opposition thus spoke on this point, as reported in "Hansard," page 2339, Daily edition:

I need not at this moment go into the evidences that existed in regard to that point, further than to say that it was found that the right and power of the local legislatures to select a franchise, which was afterwards used by the Dominion, was in some cases certainly grossly abused; and so generally was that abuse pursued, that in the province of Nova Scotia the legislature absolutely passed a franchise Act after the general elections to have an effect

Mr. CHAUVIN.

upon the Dominion elections, although they never intended to use it and never did use it, for their own elections, and they repealed the Act before the general elections came on, showing they had absolutely the power to control the representation of this Parliament, by adopting a policy which they did not exercise themselves and never intended to exercise. One such illustration is sufficient to prove the absolute necessity of this Parliament, if it was going to occupy an independent position in the estimation of the country and the world adopting a franchise of its own. That led to the passage of the Act of 1885, &c.

I do not desire to contradict this statement, very general in its terms, and which may possibly refer to something I have not under my hand, but I would be obliged to the hon. gentleman, if he would intimate what Act of the Nova Scotia legislature he had in his mind, because I find that his statement has been made the basis of numerous remarks on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House what particular Act it is to which he referred, or the time when that Act was passed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At this moment I am not able to lay my hands on the Act, but it was an Act that was passed a long time ago. I have it in my recollection, and it has been cited over and over again on the floor of this House. I shall look it up, and give the hon. gentleman, at some future period, the precise information.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I have no recollection of any Act of the kind. I had the honour of being Prime Minister of that province for twelve years, and a member of its Government and legislature for fourteen years, and nothing of the kind ever occurred during that period. I have no recollection of any Act being passed during all these years by the Nova Scotia legislature which had any relation whatever to the Dominion franchise or the Dominion lists. I know of no Act passed during that period which would warrant the statement of the hon. gentleman. If something of the kind occurred in earlier years, it has escaped my memory, and if the hon. gentleman has any recollection of such an Act, of course, I do not presume to contradict him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My recollection is, that the Act was introduced by Mr. Martin I. Wilkins.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. That would carry us back a very long time ago, and would hardly be a justification for the Dominion Franchise Act, which was only passed in 1885. Another point made was, that this disfranchising Act of Nova Scotia was passed by a Liberal government. It may be no harm to remind hon. gentlemen that in 1871, when that Act was passed, parties in Nova Scotia were not divided on the lines of Liberal and Conservative. Before confederation, and for several years afterwards, the parties in Nova Scotia were

divided on the lines of confederate and anti-confederate, and many men who formed part of the anti-confederates then, and who, presumably, approved of that Act, afterwards became included in the Conservative party of Canada. That Act was the outcome of party lines existing at the time of the union, when we did not call ourselves Liberals and Conservatives. I do not wish to go at any length into these matters, but I may say that that Act was introduced simply because it was the avowed policy of the Dominion Government to interfere in the provincial affairs.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, the very reverse.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the very events connected with the passing of that disfranchising Act, there were interferences by the Dominion Government with the rights and liberties of the Nova Scotia legislature which were open to the gravest objection. I do not wish, however, to enter into that aspect of the case, but prefer simply to take this ground. So far as that Act could deal with the provincial franchise, what right has this House to discuss it? What care we what a province may do with respect to its provincial franchise? But, hon. gentlemen may say, the provincial lists are those you are taking for the Dominion. That is the case, and if the Dominion lists are interfered with by the provincial authorities, I admit that that would be fair ground of opposition, but there never was a time when the Dominion lists did not contain the names of these Dominion officials. Those officials disfranchised by that local Act were entitled to vote in the Dominion elections. The disqualification which was created by that provincial franchise law of Nova Scotia, does not touch the voters' lists at all.

Mr. MILLS. I never heard any one say to the contrary in this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then, if the names of the Dominion officials have always been on the lists used in the Dominion elections, what is all this fuss about?

Mr. MILLS. Because there was an Act passed disfranchising them from voting, and that is engrafted in this Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What right has this House to say to any independent legislature of any province how it shall deal with its own provincial franchise, so long as it does not touch the franchise of this House?

Mr. MILLS. It is going to do that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not, and never did.

Mr. MILLS. But that is the intention now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there never was any intention of doing that; it did not do it, and will not do it. I want it clearly understood, that, while there were good reasons—which I do not wish to enter into now, because that is a provincial question—for disqualifying the Dominion officials for provincial purposes, that disqualification never touched the voters' lists at all. The voters' lists, from the beginning, contained the names of these Dominion officials who are otherwise qualified under the general conditions of the franchise, and the disqualification only took place when the voter went to the poll. His right to vote then could be challenged, and the oath put to him, which he could not take if he were a Dominion official. I am prepared to defend that Act whenever and wherever necessary, but whether it be wise or not, so long as it does not affect the lists for the Dominion elections, we have no right to complain. Therefore, there never was any ground for complaint as regards the Nova Scotia lists affecting the franchise of the House of Commons, but, if there had been any such disqualification, I want to point out that, years before the Dominion Franchise Act was passed, that difficulty was met. The difficulty was only imaginary, it was never real; but, imaginary as it was, this House legislated on the question and removed the evil, if it ever had any existence, which it had not. Here is the Representation Act of 1892. In chapter 3 of 45 Victoria, the Act relating to the representation of the various electoral districts of the Dominion, I find this provision:

Notwithstanding anything in any law of the province of Nova Scotia or of the Dominion of Canada, no employee on the Intercolonial Railway in that province shall be disqualified to vote as an elector at any future election of a member or members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada, if he shall have the necessary property and other qualifications therefor required by law. In the event of the name of any such elector being an employee on the Intercolonial Railway, having been omitted by the revisers from the list of qualified voters for a member of the General Assembly of Nova Scotia under the laws in force in that province, or to be returned to the county clerks or clerks of the peace, or omitted from the lists of voters deposited by the sheriff with the county clerks or clerks of the peace, or obtained by the returning officer, or furnished to the deputy returning officer, it shall be lawful for such employee to vote as an elector at any future election of a member or members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada, on his taking, or offering to take, before the sheriff or returning officer, the following oath.

Now, Sir, it will be apparent from what I have stated there never was any disqualification on the part of the provincial legislature of Nova Scotia which touched the lists of voters for members of the House of Commons of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) tell me why it was ne-

cessary, then, to pass this Act which he has just now read? It was necessary to enfranchise these parties who had been disfranchised by the law of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will answer the question of my hon. friend by saying that it was not necessary to pass this law. If the names were on the list, and it is not disputed that they were on the list, will my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) say how came in the disfranchisement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What was the need of the law if they were not disfranchised?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say there was no necessity for it. My hon. friend has not answered the question, if the names were on the lists and it is shown that they were, will he tell how it was that they were disfranchised in the Dominion election?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In this way—while the lists for the local election were the lists for the Dominion election, and the lists from the local preventing these parties from voting, it became necessary, this Parliament was compelled in fact, in defence of the rights of the people of Nova Scotia who were disfranchised, to pass this Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) says that the provincial lists prevented them from voting. That would be a very strong argument only that the hon. gentleman is misinformed as to the facts, for, as I have shown, the local lists did not prevent them voting. The lists contained the name of every Dominion official who was qualified to vote by his property or otherwise in the usual way. That was the list, the official was not disqualified by having his name left off the list and there was no other disqualification. The facts show from the beginning disqualification of Dominion officials was merely a freak of the imagination. Hon. gentlemen have heard the statement and I challenge contradiction of it—that the names of Dominion officials were never left off the lists under the provincial law, and the names being on the lists the parties were entitled to vote in the Dominion election. There was never any need for the passing of the Act of 1882. Hon. gentlemen opposite have pleaded that the Dominion Franchise Act was necessary by reason of the fact of this disqualification in Nova Scotia. I pointed out that the disqualification, as respects the Dominion lists never existed, because the names were on the list, and, second, if by any possibility the names had been left off the list, then, three years before the Franchise Act was passed, this Parliament had passed an Act which would meet the difficulty and give these men their votes. The argument, therefore, that three years later you had to pass a Dominion Franchise Act

Mr. FIELDING.

to get names on the Dominion lists which were already on the provincial list entitling the parties to vote in Dominion elections, shows that that is a mere delusion. If any of the facts that I have stated, which I state in good faith, are disputed, I shall be glad if any hon. gentleman will show, either now or at a later stage in what respect they are inaccurate.

Before resuming my seat, I desire to say a word with regard to the matter on which the lists are made up in Nova Scotia. They are made up by the municipalities. The idea that one would infer from statements that were made that these lists were made up by the local government or by parties interested in the local government are not well founded. I represented the metropolitan constituency of Halifax in the provincial parliament for many years. During that time, the municipality of Halifax was about evenly divided. Perhaps at one time the Conservatives predominated and at another the Liberals. I have never heard any difficulty about the lists. There may have been in some cases partisan revisers; that would happen in any case. I have heard of partisan revising officers under the Dominion law, though I do not make the charge that I personally know of any such. The lists in Nova Scotia were made up, on the whole, free from partisanship—practically, of course, not absolutely. I speak as one who was elected time after time on lists prepared under the direction of officers appointed by a Conservative council, and made, I believe, in the main, fairly. With regard to the Dominion Franchise Act, whatever difference of opinion there may be as to what is the proper basis of the franchise, public opinion has reached the conclusion that, in nearly all the provinces, the difference between the Dominion and the local franchises is so unimportant that there is no excuse for keeping up the organizations and undertaking the expense for two lists. Inasmuch as that is the most convenient in the interests of economy and the convenience of candidates, committee men and officials, and all those who spend time and money in making out lists, inasmuch as the convenient way is to make the reform by doing away with the Dominion lists, I think the public will decide that the Bill is in the right direction.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to say but one word. I agree absolutely with what the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has stated, for it has never been stated in this House, to my knowledge, that the local law of Nova Scotia disfranchised Dominion officials in elections for members of this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why, then, was this Act passed in 1882?

Mr. MILLS. But what was the practical operation of that law as carried out by ignorant revisers. The effect was this—when

they came to the revision of the local lists, they left off a large number of these employees. And that was so generally done that it was found necessary to pass a law here to right wrongs that were being done—illegally done, for legally these employees had the right to have their names upon the lists. In the remarks I made the other afternoon, I expressly asked the House to draw the distinction between the acts that disqualified the electors from voting in Nova Scotia and the franchise law. They were two separate Acts altogether. There is a Franchise Act for Nova Scotia and also an Act disqualifying certain parties from voting for members to be returned to the parliament of Nova Scotia, but there is not an Act of Nova Scotia disqualifying any person whose name is on the local list from voting for the return of a member to this House. But, as I have said, the effect of that Act was such upon ignorant revising officers—ignorant of the law, but otherwise good men—that they disqualified these employees altogether by leaving their names off the local lists, and the Act of 1882 was passed by this Parliament, as hon. members can see who will refer to the debates of that time for the purpose of remedying that evil. The election came on and it was found that a large number of electors had been left off the lists. How could they be got on the lists unless there was a law made to place them there, and it was for that purpose that the Act was passed. The hon. Minister of Finance has put up a target, shot at it and killed it. But it was never alive. It was never stated that the province of Nova Scotia ever enacted a law disfranchising any persons in Nova Scotia from taking part in the elections of a member to this House. But I contend that the effect of this Bill that is before the House will be to disfranchise a large number of employees of the Dominion Government in Nova Scotia in Dominion elections if the Bill is not changed. I state that emphatically—that that will be the effect of the law if it is passed in its present form. But even if the Bill is carried on its second reading, I have confidence enough in the members of the Government to believe that when they see that—and some hon. members opposite do see it—they will remedy this defect. I have full confidence in the Government that they will not disfranchise people in this wholesale manner, and also that there will be a great many amendments that will perhaps make the Bill more presentable than it is at the present time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have never heard of such cases as those the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) has cited of Dominion officials being unable to get their names on the lists. It is entirely new to me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to put my recollection against that of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding),

and, while I am on my feet, to do what I can to settle the question as to the reason for the legislation of this Parliament to which the hon. gentleman has referred. My recollection is the same as that of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), that it was because what the hon. gentleman says the law required in Nova Scotia to be done was not done, and these men who were disfranchised by the Act of the Nova Scotia legislature in the local elections, were, designedly or otherwise, left off the local lists, though, as the hon. gentleman says, had the law been carried out, they would have been there. I rise particularly, however, to show why the hon. gentleman should not be permitted to lead this House to believe that everything done in his time in Nova Scotia with regard to the local lists was above suspicion. If my recollection is right, there was great activity in 1890 on the part of his party in Nova Scotia, and the lists were attended to after a very Liberal fashion. The local legislature in 1891 took those lists as the basis for the lists then settled under the legislation of that year, and what is the result? If my information be correct, in one district in the county of Guysborough, as I am informed by those who ought to know, and who take some interest in these matters, and were affected by the facts I am going to mention—if my information be correct, under this lovely system that prevails in Nova Scotia, and that the hon. gentleman is proud of being connected with, out of a local list in the district of Larry's River, in the county of Guysborough, out of 207 names on the local lists, there are but seven who are qualified to vote in reality, or rather who were on the assessment roll.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know the circumstances to which my hon. friend refers. But I am quite satisfied he will find the system to which he refers is based upon sound reasons, and I do not remember that that part of it was ever challenged in the House of Assembly, which was supposed to be interested in it.

Mr. McNEILL. I think the House owes a debt of gratitude to my hon. friend the Finance Minister, who has called forcibly our attention to the fact that this House, at all events, believed that it was necessary for the protection of its privileges to pass a special Act because of the course pursued by the government of the province of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman desires us to believe that notwithstanding all the able representatives on both sides from that province who were then in this House, this House of Commons of Canada would deliberately place on the Statute-book a senseless statute, something that was of no value whatever, and that had no reason whatever for its existence.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has missed the point.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not think I have missed the point. I think that is exactly what the hon. gentleman was endeavouring to persuade us of, that this Act had been placed on the Statute-book without any good reason whatever. He said it was absolutely unnecessary, that it should not have been placed there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will permit me to make a remark—my point was that it was unnecessary, though that was not the main point. The main point was that if disqualification ever existed, it had been removed three years before the Dominion Franchise Act was passed.

Mr. McNEILL. But the hon. gentleman is not dealing with the point at all. The hon. gentleman said this Act was unnecessary, and in order that he should persuade this House of that fact, he must assume that all the representatives of his own province who were in this House had not among them sufficient ability to explain to this House the fact he has now endeavoured to place before us, and that if they did at that time lay before the House the facts that he has laid before us to-night, or the assumed facts that he has laid before us to-night, either this House was so stupid that they could not understand them, or this House behaved so improperly as to do what they knew was improper or unnecessary. Now, with regard to the other point, my hon. friend says that it was quite unnecessary that the Franchise Act of 1885 should be passed, because of his alleged statement that this Act of 1882 had already been passed. I say, Mr. Speaker, that no stronger reason could possibly be urged for the passing of that Franchise Act than the fact that this House had been obliged, in the protection of its privileges, to put this Act of 1882 on the Statute-book. What stronger argument could possibly be advanced? It may be they guarded the privileges of this House so far as that particular Act is concerned, but that did not cover the Dominion of Canada. If conduct of that kind were possible in Nova Scotia, and if this House found it necessary for the protection of its privileges, to guard itself against the action of the Government of Nova Scotia, it was equally necessary that it should guard itself against similar acts on the part of other provinces which might come into force at any time.

Mr. McISAAC. I would not say a word on this occasion were it not for the reference which the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made to a district in the county of Guysborough. Personally, I do not know very much about

Mr. McNEILL.

it, but the hon. gentleman says that in the district of Larry's River, about the year 1890, some 207 names were put on the provincial list, and he says that he has information that only about seven of them were really qualified to go on the list.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Seven who were on the assessment roll.

Mr. McISAAC. I know nothing about it, except what the hon. gentleman says. But if this be true, his inference is that the provincial Franchise Act in Nova Scotia is unfair as compared to that of the Dominion. Now, if these statements are true, that there are only seven qualified electors in the district of Larry's River, and that 200 were on who had no right to be there, what will this House think when I say that in that same district, under the Dominion Franchise Act, about the same number got on the list, which proves that the Dominion list is no better. The hon. gentleman will remember that the Conservative candidate who ran in that county the last election, got at least seven votes in that district, as many as he says were qualified, but I am told that the Liberal member had over 100 majority, thus showing that if there was anything wrong in connection with names on the provincial list, the same wrong existed in reference to the Dominion Franchise Act. Therefore, there is no argument in the statement of the hon. gentleman. I am sure the information he gives cannot be very reliable, and I am quite sure there was no fraud or improper conduct on the part of those preparing the Dominion and local lists in Larry's River. I am glad the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) made the statement to the House, because I am aware that there were many hon. members from Ontario and elsewhere who were under the impression that the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia did disqualify Dominion officials from voting at Dominion elections. The hon. member said that revisers through ignorance left Dominion officials off the list. Perhaps it may be so in Annapolis, but in my part of the province I never knew such ignorance to exist. So far as I am concerned I would much prefer under existing conditions for party purposes to have the Franchise Act than the Bill now before the House. If the old Act were continued we could make some use of the machinery which hon. gentlemen opposite have made use of when in power. We could utilize the revising barristers and the revising barrister's clerks and so get some of the advantages the hon. gentlemen obtained. Under the Act now proposed the same advantage will be secured by hon. gentlemen opposite as by ourselves. In some districts there will be Reform and in others Conservative officers, and so one political party will not have any advantage over the other.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Powell :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	Macdonald (King's),
Bell (Pictou),	MacLaren,
Bennett,	McAlister,
Broder,	McCleary,
Cargill,	McInerney,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McNeill,
Carscallen,	Marcotte,
Chauvin,	Martin,
Clancy,	Mills,
Clarke,	Monk,
Cochrane,	Montague,
Davin,	Moore,
Dugas,	Morin,
Earle,	Fope,
Foster,	Powell,
Ganong,	Quinn,
Gillies,	Rosamond,
Guillet,	Sproule,
Hale,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Hodgins,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Hughes,	Hibbert),
Kaulbach,	Wallace, and
Kloepfer,	Wood (Brockville).—48.
LaRivière,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bain,	Hurley,
Bazinet,	Joly de Lotbinière
Beausoleil,	(Sir Henri),
Beith,	Landerkin,
Bernier,	Lang,
Bertram,	Lavergne,
Blair,	Leduc,
Borden (King's),	Legris,
Bostock,	Lemieux,
Bourassa,	Lewis,
Britton,	Lister,
Brown,	Logan,
Bruneau,	Macdonold (Huron),
Burnett,	MacPherson,
Calvert,	McClure,
Carroll,	McGregor,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McGugan,
Casey,	McHugh,
Champagne,	McInnes,
Choquette,	McIsaac,
Copp,	McLennan (Inverness),
Cowan,	McMillan,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Madore,
Davis,	Malouin,
Dechène,	Maxwell,
Desmarais,	Meigs,
Douglas,	Mignault,
Dupré,	Morrison,
Edwards,	Mulock,
Ellis,	Oliver,
Erb,	Parmalee,
Ethier,	Paterson,
Featherston,	Pettet,
Fielding,	Poupore,
Fisher,	Proulx,
Fitzpatrick,	Ratz,
Flint,	Richardson,
Fcrtin,	Rinfret,
Fraser (Guysboro'),	Robertson,
Frost,	Rogers,
Gauthier,	Ross,
Gauvreau,	Savard,
Godbout,	Semple,
Graham,	Sifton,

Guay,
Guité,
Haley,
Harwood,
Heyd,

Somerville,
Stenson,
Sutherland,
Talbot, and
Tolmie.—97.

Amendment negatived.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.

Opposition.

Messieurs

Angers,	Casgrain,
Campbell,	Kendry,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Featherston,	Carscallen,
Penny,	Ives,
Parmalee,	Ciarke,
Wood (Hamilton),	Gilmour,
Macdonell (Selkirk),	Roche,
Russell,	Borden (Halifax),
Hutchison,	Klock,
Gibson,	Corby,
Turcot,	McDougall,
Geoffrion,	Tyrwhitt,
Jameson,	Osler,
Tarte,	Bergeron,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	McLennan (Glengarry),
Snetsinger,	Reid,
Rutherford,	Ingram,
Christie,	Craig,
Scriver,	Roddick,
Cameron,	Beattie,
Mackie,	Ferguson,
Fraser (Lambton),	Tisdale,
Dobell,	Prior,
Charlton,	Costigan,
Brodeur,	Bethune,
Livingston,	Maclean,
McMullen,	Robinson,

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. members for Beauharnois, Glengarry, Marquette, East York and London have not voted.

Mr. BERGERON. I am paired with the hon. Minister of Public Works. If I had voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McLENNAN. I am paired with the leader of the Government. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ROCHE. I am paired with the hon. member for Selkirk. If I had voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. BEATTIE. I am paired with the hon. member for West Huron. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am paired with the hon. member for South Waterloo. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. INGRAM. I am paired with the hon. member for Macdonald. I would have voted the usual way, if I had voted.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. member for Huntingdon has not voted.

Mr. SCRIVER. I am paired with the hon. member for the St. Antoine Division of Montreal. Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. PENNY. I am paired with the hon. member for Sherbrooke. If I had voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Bill read the second time, on the same division reversed.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.04 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 30th March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 104) respecting the Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 105) respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

EXAMINATION OF STATIONARY ENGINEERS.

On the order for introduction of Bill "An Act respecting the examination of stationary engineers and the inspection of steam boilers.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I beg to state that I propose to introduce this Bill at the request of the Association of Stationary Engineers. Owing to the point having been raised by several legal gentlemen in the House as to whether the powers contained in the Bill standing in my name come within the jurisdiction of this Parliament or are altogether within the jurisdiction of the provinces, at the suggestion of hon. members on both sides of the House the matter has been referred to the Department of Justice for an opinion. I ask that the Bill be allowed to stand until we have received the opinion of the Department of Justice.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Within what period does the hon. gentleman expect to procure the opinion of the Department of Justice? I do not see why a long time should be occupied in securing an opinion on this subject. The question was brought up on the Bill introduced by the Minister of Marine respecting engineers on steamboats, and I then alluded to the subject.

Mr. SCRIVER.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I do not think there will be any delay whatever in obtaining an opinion. My hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) will take on his own shoulders some of the responsibility for delay, as he did not send over the Bill as quickly as he should have done.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suggest this point for the consideration of the House, whether this course is entirely in order. We have a law officer of the Crown in this House, and no doubt he is here for the purpose of expressing from time to time his opinion on questions that may arise. But it occurs to me—although I cannot at the moment lay my hands on the authority—that the reference of a Bill or other matter direct from the House to the law officers of such, with the object of obtaining a report from them to this House, is not according to English practice. On the contrary, I believe—I am not raising the point of order, but I am merely adverting to the practice—there is authority which prevents the House obtaining the opinion of the law officers of the Crown given to the Crown. That is a confidential document, and on special occasions is submitted, with the consent of the Crown and the consent of the Government, to the House. I suggest this point; and I think it would be a pity, if that be the rule, to unintentionally violate it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill will not be in the slightest degree prejudiced by letting this order stand until this prior question is considered, as to whether it was proper and regular to obtain the law officer's opinion and quote it in this House in regard to a Bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I understand that this course is being adopted on the suggestion of members on both sides of the House who thought an opinion might be had. Whether that will be agreed to by the House, I do not know.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose the objection could be overcome by the Solicitor General stating the decision arrived at as his opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no motion before the House. As to the point raised as to taking the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, I do not understand that any question of that kind has been raised here. It was mentioned by the intended mover of the Bill that it was intended to delay the introduction of the Bill so that he could obtain a legal opinion. I do not think that the question arises now.

THE COASTING TRADE OF CANADA.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 106) to amend the Act respecting the coasting

trade of Canada. He said: Early in the session, in fact during the debate on the Address, I called the attention of the Government to cases that had arisen in connection with the coasting trade on the Pacific Coast, and suggested for the consideration of the Government the propriety of amending the legislation touching the coasting trade of Canada as might be considered necessary to meet the cases that have arisen, or if not, of instructing the customs officers to act in connection with the enforcement of our coasting laws, so that our vessels might be treated in American waters as well and fairly as United States ships were treated in our waters. I am not yet without hope that the Government will deal with this question, and I quite realize that it would be entirely useless, at this stage of the session, for me to expect that this particular Bill could be considered in the ordinary way. Yet I propose to occupy the attention of the House for a short time in the hope that the views I submit may be considered by the Government and the Government may directly deal with the cases that have occurred. The Minister of the Interior will remember, and no doubt the Minister of Customs will recollect, that last fall difficulties in respect to the coasting laws of the United States arose. In connection with this subject, I have had the advantage of discussing it with Capt. Irving, the head of the Canadian Pacific Railway Navigation Company, as vessels under his control were directly affected. I propose, so as to be accurate, to make my statement rather full.

First, let me say that the way in which the case came up was this. The United States authorities put a new construction on their coasting laws so as to prevent British registered ships taking, for instance, Canadian goods, that is, goods freighted over the United States railway system from a United States port to another United States port. When the reference was made, directly or indirectly by Captain Irving to know if that was reciprocal, so far as he was able to learn from the Customs Department the action or want of action on the part of the customs authorities was not so interpreted. I have a copy of a letter written the Customs Department at Victoria by the manager of the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company, where he asks for information under this head, and says:

There is a law which prohibits an American vessel from carrying Canadian freight from an American port to a Canadian port whilst in transit from one Canadian port to another Canadian port by rail through the United States in bond. A similar law prevails in the United States.

And so on. That was as he understood it, but the answer he got from the collector of customs who had communicated with Ottawa was, among other things:

In reply I beg to state that I am not aware of any law which prohibits an American vessel

carrying Canadian merchandise from an American port to a Canadian port, whilst in transit from one Canadian port to another Canadian port by rail through the United States in bond.

In other words, the statute was construed as probably all of us understood it up to this time: as merely concerning a direct shipment on the one voyage from one port of the same flag to another port of the same flag by a vessel carrying a different flag. This letter from the Customs Department is dated the 19th November, and it contains the following clause also:—

The solution of the question raised by Captain Irving is not clear until it is known what facilities will be afforded for the transfer of goods at St. Michael's for Fort Cudahy without payment of United States customs duties on goods so transferred.

The whole question being connected with the Alaskan trade as it came up in the first instance. Captain Irving wrote to the Minister of the Interior on December the 9th and he again mentioned the difficulties that are arising, and the embarrassments that are being put upon Canadian vessels by this interpretation on the part of the United States customs officers, and he quotes cases where under similar circumstances the Canadian authorities do not treat American vessels in the same way. The Minister of the Interior acknowledged that letter on December 16th, and I am merely pressing these letters upon the attention of the House to show that there has been time for the Government to reach a policy on this question, and I am in hopes that either a decision has been reached to interpret our law in the way Capt. Irving mentions, or, if that interpretation be impossible, to pass a Bill this session on the lines of the legislation now going through Congress. The Minister of the Interior, in reply to this letter, wrote on December 16th:

The subject referred to is one on which I cannot give you a positive opinion at the present time. The whole subject referred to will have to be considered and dealt with in the near future, and as it does not affect my department, I am asking the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Customs to give it their consideration.

On December 30th, Capt. Irving wrote to the Minister of Customs:

I have to call your attention to a phase of coasting trade now carried on by the United States vessels between British ports on this coast, under a system absolutely prohibitive in the United States ports to British vessels. Canadian freight from Victoria, B.C., has been carried to Glenora, B.C., near Telegraph Creek, by United States vessels, the transshipment taking place at Fort Wrangel, a port on the United States coast of Alaska. The "Alaskan" is the name of the United States vessel which is taking these goods from Fort Wrangel to Glenora, while boats of the Pacific Coast Steamship Company, all American registered vessels, carry them from Victoria to Fort Wrangel. I refer you to section 2 of chapter 83, R. S. C., an Act

respecting the coasting trade of Canada, and to section 4 of the said Act.

I may say that the views of this department under which this was allowed was no doubt that the voyage before the transshipment was one voyage, and that this double shipment was not within the strict terms of the spirit of our coasting laws. Capt. Irving continues :

The responsibility for the enforcement of our Act seems to rest solely with your department.

That is, that no private prosecutor can proceed against any one for a violation of the coasting laws ; that can be done only on the authority of the Government.

No such evasion of the principle of coasting laws is permitted in the United States, and the competition is consequently most unequal for our vessels on this coast. I do not believe a similar state of affairs is allowed anywhere on the Atlantic Coast. Should, however, by any possibility, the letter of our Coasting Act allow this overriding of the undoubted object of all such legislation, and of the spirit of our Act, which prohibits foreign vessels carrying goods "by water from one port of Canada to another," I hope you will see fit to have an amendment submitted to Parliament which will remove all doubt as to the effect of the legislation now on the Statute-book.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand the object of the writer there is to have prohibition against American vessels carrying goods from Victoria to Fort Wrangel.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Just the same as in a parallel case they would do with our vessels between their ports.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not see the parallel.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is a little involved, but I think I can make it clear. The law of the United States at present is under section 4347 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which reads :

No merchandise shall be transported, under penalty of forfeiture thereof, from one port of the United States to another port of the United States in a vessel belonging wholly or in part to a subject of any foreign power ; but this decision shall not be construed to prohibit the sailing of any foreign vessel from one to another port of the United States, provided no merchandise other than that imported in such vessel from some foreign port, and which shall not have been unladen, shall be carried from one port or place to another in the United States.

Now there happens to have been a case under that clause in the United States and notwithstanding this decision to which I will refer, the law is being carried out under instructions to the customs officers in the United States on the lines of the Declaratory Bill now going through Congress. The case to which I refer is the case of the United States against 250 kegs of nails, the California case, and it is as follows :—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

In the case of the United States vs. 250 kegs of nails, brought in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, the merchandise sought to be forfeited was wholly the product and manufacture of the United States. It was shipped at New York in a Belgian vessel, consigned under regular bills of lading to a commercial house at Antwerp ; there the merchandise was discharged and landed, and was subsequently shipped on a British vessel consigned to the owners at the port of Redondo, in California, under bills of lading signed by the master of the British ship, and was carried to Redondo, where it was entered at the custom-house as a manufacture of the United States, which had been exported and was now returned to this country. The United States District Court, Judge Ross presiding, held that upon these facts the merchandise was not subject to forfeiture under the term of the above-quoted statute. This case was appealed to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, where the decision of the District Court was affirmed. (61 Federal Reporter, 410.) In the latter decision, the court, among other things says :—

"It is urged that the facts disclosed in this case amount to a palpable evasion of the statute, and that such is admitted to have been the intention of the parties to the transaction. The purpose the parties had in view can make no difference with the interpretation of the statute. They practiced no concealment or fraud upon the Government. The acts were done openly. They had the statute before them for their guidance. The unlawful act there defined was 'malum prohibitum' only. The statute left them free to ship freight from New York to Redondo in any manner they saw fit, save and except the manner therein prohibited. They followed a method not mentioned in the statute. They had a right to assume that the whole intention of Congress had been expressed in the words of the statute."

That is, the goods are just taken from one bottom and put into another at the port, although the whole shipment is really between two ports of the one country. The court here said that that clause did not provide for that, though there were two shipments, though the goods were meant to go direct to two ports ; that is, they went on one ship for one part of this journey and out of that ship to another. Although there were two separate voyages instead of one they said that this section of the United States statutes would not cover a case of that kind. And so, in the face of the keen rivalry developed on the Pacific Coast, there has been the interpretation of this section to which I refer in order to prevent Victoria vessels or British Columbia vessels getting any part of that carrying trade. But in order to prevent British Columbia vessels getting any part of that carrying trade coming to Victoria or Vancouver, the officers were instructed, before Congress began to deal with this matter at all, to treat all these cases as a violation of the Act, and to proceed against the vessels.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Were those goods landed at a British Columbia port ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, they were landed. They were taken from one vessel and put into another, and the courts of California held that that could be done, as their statutes did not cover such a case. But the present orders of the department are based upon another construction, that it is a palpable evasion of the statute, and should not be permitted. The department regard the shipment of the goods as going inland from one port under the American flag to another port under the American flag, and are attempting to prevent any of those goods being carried for any part of that journey in any ship that does not fly the American flag. There has been a reference to another section of the statutes, section 3110, but I need not read it. The Seattle "Post-Intelligencer," of 26th January, 1898, contains a statement which corroborates what I have stated to the House. As all these matters are given prominence, wherever they may directly or indirectly worry or annoy their neighbours to the north, this paper prints this statement in large and prominent type, as follows:—

CANNOT EVADE THE TARIFF—TRANSPORTATION OF GOODS FROM ONE U. S. PORT TO ANOTHER, VIA BRITISH PORTS, BALKED BY SECRETARY SPAULDING.

The attempt to evade the United States customs regulations in their imposition of a duty at Alaska ports on Canadian goods, by purchasing outfits in Seattle, shipping them to British Columbia ports in an American bottom, and there transferring to a British bottom for their destination, has been effectually balked by the United States Government officials. As announced in a special despatch to the Post-Intelligencer from Washington, published yesterday morning, Acting Secretary Spaulding has decided that the transportation of freight in such a manner is a violation of our exporting laws, and subjects the merchandise to seizure. Section 4347 of the Revised Statutes, as amended February 15, 1893, under which this ruling is made, is as follows:—

That reads just as I have already read it.

A telegram received by the "Post-Intelligencer" yesterday from Acting Secretary Spaulding, announced that the collector of this district had been advised of the decision, and the officials at Dyea and Skagway will be at once notified.

This matter was first brought to the attention of the Treasury Department on January 14, and since then the British steamers "Danube" and "Tees" have been able to get away with freight which, under the late decision, would be subject to seizure at Dyea and Skagway.

These steamers are Canadian Pacific Navigation Company steamers. I believe the "Danube" has since been seized, libelled, and released under bonds. Then, section 3008 of the Revised Statutes is quoted, and the statement goes on:

This action has never been enforced, and that was probably the reason why it is ignored by Secretary Spaulding. That it exactly fits the

present case is apparent. The shipment of goods to Victoria, Vancouver or Nanaimo would be an export. The transshipment there and subsequent landing at Dyea or Skagway would be a re-landing in the sense of section 3008, and would not only subject the goods to seizure, but persons concerned to a penalty of \$400.

Then on January 24, the British Columbia papers publish a despatch from Washington, which gives the instruction of Acting Secretary Spaulding, and states that his decision was reached in a case presented by the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company. Mr. Irving, in fact, submitted in advance, very wisely, when he first heard of this trouble, a hypothetical case to a collector at one of the ports on the Sound, and this was sent to Washington for instructions. The result of that was a telegram to this effect:

The transportation of American freight from Seattle or other American ports consigned for Alaska, via Victoria, Vancouver or Nanaimo, and at those ports transferred to British vessels, is a violation of American coasting laws, and subjects the merchandise to forfeiture. General Spaulding to-day said:

This measure is one of several in course of preparation by the Treasury which seems to be called for by recent events and new conditions, to protect and develop American interests in the Pacific and Alaska.

Then he refers again to the Act of 1893, and quotes one of these sections which I have mentioned. So we find introduced into Congress this session on a message from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Gage, a Bill amending the laws relating to navigation, Bill 3580, and Mr. Payne in introducing this Bill, says:

The object of the Bill is to protect our sea-coast trade along the Pacific Coast with Alaska. That is the sole and only object of the Bill. It happens now under existing law that a cargo of goods may be shipped from some port like Seattle to Victoria or Vancouver, for 90 miles, in an American vessel, and then the cargo taken some 900 or 1,000 miles in a foreign vessel to Alaska.

Strange to say, Mr. Payne, acting for the Administration, says that the present law permits that, whereas Acting Secretary Spaulding's ruling was that the law did not permit anything of the kind, and instructions were given accordingly to the collectors of the different ports to prevent it in every way in their power. Mr. Payne goes on to say:

The object of the Bill is to prevent that sort of thing, and to follow those cargoes shipped from the Pacific slope, in the United States, to Alaska, whether stopping at Vancouver and Victoria or not, and require that they shall be shipped in an American vessel. That is the prime object of the Bill.

Then he asks that this report from Secretary Gage be read, and in that report Secretary Gage, consistent with the action of the Acting-Secretary, treated this as a declaratory Bill, and not as Mr. Payne seemed to think, a material amendment.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Did Mr. Payne, in introducing the Bill, cite any authority in support of his position that it was lawful to tranship goods shipped from San Francisco ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, although that may be because he had not the matter as well in hand as the Administration. Undoubtedly, they put that construction upon it, and that construction of the law was being enforced at their ports when Mr. Payne made that speech. And so Secretary Gage says :

Section 1 is a stronger and more explicit statement of certain provisions of section 4347 of the Revised Statutes. It is not put in the form of an amendment of that section, as the revisers of the statutes saw fit to incorporate in that section certain legislation based on the Treaty of Washington of 1871. The present validity of that legislation has for some years been disputed, and to avoid any legislative declaration on that dispute as a part of this measure, where it is not involved, the first section is drawn independently, though in effect it amends indirectly the other portions of section 4347.

The essential amendment is in the words "or for any part of the voyage." The question has recently been put to the Treasury whether American goods consigned to Alaskan ports from Seattle can be carried in American vessels to Victoria, a distance of only 72 miles, and at Victoria be put on British vessels to be carried to Dyea, a distance of 900 miles, or to St. Michael's, a distance of about 2,000 miles. The Treasury Department has ruled that this is a violation of the laws reserving the coasting trade to American vessels. It is a palpable evasion of those laws, but in some quarters doubt is expressed whether the courts will not decide, as they did in the case of a shipment of a cargo of nails from New York to Antwerp by a foreign vessel—

He refers to this very case I have mentioned.

—and thence to San Francisco by another foreign vessel, that the law had been successfully evaded, not violated. That decision led to the amendment of the Revised Statutes, section 4347, by the Act of February 15, 1893, prohibiting shipment "via a foreign port." That amendment, however, does not, perhaps, fully cover the transaction here referred to. The policy of the United States is to confine carrying by water for the whole voyage between American ports to American vessels. It is believed that section explicitly affirms that policy and removes all doubt.

That is all, I think, that is material in this memo. from the Secretary of the Treasury. The rest refers to other subjects which have been already discussed. Now, our coasting Act is as much capable of that construction as the section of the United States laws to which I have referred. I am not quarrelling with the United States policy, for I see nothing unfriendly in it at all. The difficulty I have endeavoured to point out is, that this construction has suddenly been put upon that statute, owing to a change in the state of affairs that has arisen on the coast, and that construction is being enforced, whereas

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

on our side we are going on in the good-natured way in which both governments were proceeding before. Our statute says :

No goods or passengers shall be carried by water from one port of Canada to another except in British ships.

Under similar language in the United States law, the United States authorities declare that that cannot be done, either directly or indirectly. The law cannot be evaded by using an American bottom for a short part of the trip, and then transshipping into a foreign bottom at a foreign port for the rest of the journey. The United States contend that the trade between the two American ports should be carried by American vessels and they are going on perfecting and enforcing their laws on that line. The spirit of our Act is equally that the trade between two Canadian ports should be carried by British bottoms ; and I feel satisfied that if this subject is carefully looked into, there will be no hesitation on the part of our Government—if the statute will bear the construction I think it possibly may now bear—in sending to our collectors similar instructions with regard to foreign vessels that the United States have sent to their collectors.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Will the hon. gentleman give a concrete case to show what he wants ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I could not do better than mention the case which actually occurred, and which yet is a case of the kind in which our collectors will not, and have not, interfered. I refer to the case of the steamer "Alaskan," a United States vessel, which took goods from Fort Wrangel to Glenora, while the boats of the Pacific Coast Steamship Company, all American registered vessels, carried them from Victoria to Fort Wrangel. By means of this transshipment at Wrangel, they so arranged that their vessels carried those Canadian goods all the way between Victoria and Glenora, two Canadian ports.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). If the case were reversed, and if our law were exactly the same as the American law, would the hon. gentleman think that the American law, enforced as it is now being enforced, would prevent the transaction he refers to ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have already said that I have not formed a very strong opinion on that point. I think myself, that the construction which the United States Treasury has put upon their existing law would be supported by the courts.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Supposing it were supported by the courts, the hon. gentleman will know that the shipment from Victoria to Wrangel is a shipment from a Canadian port to an American

port. If our law is precisely the same as the American law, and the same interpretation be put upon it as they are putting on theirs, would it prevent the transaction the hon. gentleman refers to ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think it would. If my memory is right, the way in which the thing is done is this. The goods are billed, for instance, from Victoria to Glenora. Glenora is put at the bottom of the bill of lading.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Supposing they were billed first to Wrangel, and then from Wrangel to Glenora ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not know that the courts would care much about the manner in which they were billed, if they got right to the bottom of the transaction and found it was a bona fide shipment of goods from a Canadian port to a Canadian port. I think there is a good deal in the view that our legislation would carry us far enough to meet the case, and if that be so, there is no necessity for this Bill; but that is a point the ship-owners wish to have referred to the Justice Department. Mr. Irving made a very practical suggestion in December, that if the Justice Department thought this was not a construction that could be put upon our Act, we should obtain the necessary legislation declaring that to be the meaning of the law. So that, in order that this Bill may receive the earliest consideration, and not in the expectation that a Bill in the hands of a private member can be advanced into law at this session, even if it had met with the approval of the Government, as a public Bill, I would ask leave to introduce this Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman state shortly the substance of what is proposed by that Bill ? I was otherwise occupied, and unable to catch what he said at the moment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not know whether it would be better to make this a declaratory Bill, but have not done so, and do not see much difference, provided the object is attained. The first clause provides :

Section 2 of the Act respecting the coasting trade of Canada, being chap. 83 of the Revised Statutes, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor :—

No goods or passengers shall be carried by water from one port of Canada to another port of Canada, either for the whole voyage or for any part of the voyage, except in British ships; and if any goods or passengers are so carried, as aforesaid, contrary to this Act, the master of the ship or vessel so carrying the same shall incur the penalty of four hundred dollars, and any goods so carried shall be forfeited, as smuggled, and such ship or vessel may be detained by the collector of customs at any port or place to which such goods or passengers are brought, until such penalty is paid, or security for the

payment therefor given to his satisfaction, and until such goods are delivered up to him, to be dealt with as goods forfeited under the provisions of "The Customs Act."

This is the old section re-enacted, with the interpolation of the words "port of Canada either for the whole voyage or for any part of the voyage." Then, I add the following subsection :—

Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the carrying from one port of Canada to another port of Canada, in a ship other than a British ship, of goods which have been imported in such ship from a foreign port, and have not been unladen at a port of Canada.

Because, of course, we do not aim at disturbing any vessel arriving with goods, where the cargo is not unladen or broken.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is obviously a Bill which under certain circumstances might be very important, and, of course, I have no intention of expressing any opinion upon it now. I merely rose to ascertain if I understood the observations of the hon. mover correctly. I tried to follow them. If I understood the hon. gentleman right, the transportation companies in British Columbia—very properly—tried to get as much of the carrying trade in goods going north as they could, and it was suggested that goods might be carried from San Francisco or Tacoma or Seattle or any of the American ports on their way north and landed at Victoria and there be transhipped from the American vessel to the British vessel which should carry them forward. It struck me, when the matter came before me at first, that there might be some difficulties in that way. Much as we would like, and as I am sure, every member of the House would like to facilitate anything that could transfer the carrying trade to our own bottoms, there is an initial difficulty at Victoria. How could you send the goods from San Francisco to Victoria and tranship them there ? There is no treaty between United States and Great Britain enabling that to be done, nor is there any statute that I know of. When goods are carried from San Francisco to Victoria, when they enter the port of Victoria they must be legally entered I should imagine. I do not see how that could be overcome. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would suggest some means to overcome it. As soon as a ship arrives at Victoria, the collector at the port must say : Under the law, if you land this freight here you must pay duty. How can I take your word, or what authority have I for allowing these goods to be transhipped ? There is no treaty under which you can tranship goods and forward them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They come through in bond.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would like to call my hon.

friend's attention to that. If he will turn to the Treaty of Washington, he will find that the bonding privileges do not extend to goods arriving by sea, and, therefore, the treaty does not provide for bonding goods from San Francisco, Seattle or Tacoma to Victoria.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is nothing to prevent them doing it if they choose.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would be very glad to be informed how that could be reached.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not claim that we can force or compel the United States to change the course they are taking. On the contrary, I said that we could not even complain of their action. But I said also that if that was so and they choose that course, there is only one thing for us to do, and that is not to allow them to take everything. We certainly could prevent American ships carrying between our ports Victoria and Glenora.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I should think that there would be no room for difference of opinion except for the point I have raised, which, however, is of the utmost importance. There should be no difficulty about the proper construction of our Act as there ought to be no difficulty about the construction of the American Act. But an important case in which a difficulty might arise would be in the case of goods from Victoria to Glenora to be transhipped, under treaty rights, at Fort Wrangel. We have the right to carry from Victoria to Glenora and an American ship has not. Without expressing a definite opinion upon a matter which has not come before me, I take it that there can be no reasonable doubt about that point.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is what the Bill means, but at present, the practice is different.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The goods when shipped from one point in British territory to another cannot be carried in American ships. We are at one in the matter, I fancy.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But what is necessary is to get the construction formally put on the present Act and instructions sent out in accordance with it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have been considering the matter. Of course, our object is to give our own transportation companies fair-play and to secure for them as large a share of this trade as possible.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If I followed the hon. gentleman his statement was, that a certain ruling of the department had been given and action taken upon it;

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

but the statute was not strong enough to bear it, and legislation has been introduced in the form of a declaratory Act to give the necessary power?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the United States.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Exactly, and now he proposes to make our law stronger?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If it requires amendment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And he is adding the same words that they are adding—"part of a voyage"?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If I followed the hon. gentleman right, while the Treasury Department made that ruling in the California case, they had not the statutory authority for what they did?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Quite so.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Then the hon. gentleman does not blame the Customs Department of Canada, under the wording of our statute which is similar in its language?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have been arguing that the decision in the California case was not sound and that that was the view practically taken by the Washington authorities. They have, in fact, ignored it. So far as that is concerned, I said that construction had stood only until this excitement, as we may call it, arose on the Pacific, and then in the close competition, the authorities at Washington looked into the matter and ignored the construction put upon the statute in the California case, and gave their law what I do not think should be called an extreme construction. They are following that by a declaratory Act, and all I want is that we shall see if our Act will bear that construction, and, if not, follow it with a declaratory Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DINING CARS ON THE I. C. R.

Mr. McMULLEN asked,

How many dining cars are on the Intercolonial Railway? How many are kept in operation? What was the gross expenditure, including wages, supplies, &c., during the last year, and what were the gross receipts?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There were no dining cars on the Intercolonial Railway previous to the opening of the Montreal Extension on

the 1st March, but there are now three cars, being combined dining and restaurant cars in operation, and have been in operation since the 1st March. The cost of fitting up these cars was \$7,321.97; the cost of equipping them was \$2,528.06; the cost of operating them from the 1st to the 22nd instant, \$913; gross earnings during same period, \$655.55.

LIQUOR PERMITS IN THE YUKON.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

Has a permit or permits to take whisky in the Yukon district been granted to one Chambers, or to Chambers & Chisholm, of Oak Lake, Manitoba, by either the Government of the Dominion or the North-west Territories? If so, for what amount was the permit granted?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). A permit to take 1,000 gallons of whisky into the Yukon district was issued, by the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, to William Chambers, of Oak Lake, Manitoba. No permit has been issued to Chambers & Chisholm, of Oak Lake, Manitoba. I may add that this information now appears for the fourth time on the "Hansard" this session, and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will be able to assimilate it so as to avoid the necessity of asking the question again.

Mr. WALLACE. Myself and a number of members about me, although listening attentively, could not hear the statement made by the Minister of the Interior. I think the members of this House are entitled to have a statement made in such a manner that they can hear it. I would therefore ask that the Minister of the Interior read the statement again.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will not throw any doubt upon the remark which the hon. gentleman has made. I am of course bound to accept his statement that he did not hear what I said. But if he did not hear it, if he will look back at "Hansard" a few days ago, he will get the information twice repeated on the same day. It now appears on the "Hansard" for the fourth time during this session. I am not aware that I am under any obligation to repeat from day to day information which has already been conveyed to the House.

INFANTRY COMPANY, MORRIS, MANITOBA.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked,

Will the request of Capt. Geo. P. Bliss, to be authorized to form an infantry company in the town of Morris, province of Manitoba, be granted?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Bordon). I beg to reply to the hon. gentleman that the matter is under consideration. But I may add for his in-

formation, that the granting of the request of Capt. Bliss would involve an increase in the establishment of the militia, an increase to the numerical strength of the militia, and therefore would involve an increase of the annual vote.

STATISTICAL BRANCH, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. HEYD asked,

1. What is the number of persons at present employed in the Statistical Branch of the Department of Agriculture?

2. Upon what work have they been engaged during the past six months?

3. What was the total cost of the branch, including salaries, for the past fiscal year?

4. Is Mr. George Johnson still the Dominion statistician, so-called, and the chief of this branch?

5. What is Mr. Johnson's salary?

6. About what date will it be necessary to begin to prepare for the taking of the forthcoming decennial census?

7. If Mr. Johnson is still the chief of this branch, will it be his duty to take charge of the next census?

8. Is Mr. George Johnson the same person who was frequently denounced in Parliament and in the Liberal press for active and offensive partisanship?

9. Is it the intention to reorganize the Statistical Branch of the Department of Agriculture?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). 1. Eight. 2. The work includes the Statistical Year Book, Criminal Statistics and General Statistics. 3. For the fiscal year 1896-97, \$22,844.89, made up as follows:—

General statistics.....	\$4,237 55
Manitoba census.....	1,873 35
Criminal statistics	1,509 67
Statistical Year Book.....	7,573 82
Salaries of permanent staff.....	7,650 50

\$22,844 89

4. Mr. George Johnson, who was appointed statistician of the Department of Agriculture in 1889, still holds that position and is chief of the Statistical Branch. 5. \$2,400 per annum. 6. A small amount will have to be placed in the Estimates to be submitted in 1899 for preliminary work. 7. As to who will take charge of the next census, that will be determined by the department when the work comes up. 8. While I cannot state definitely, my impression is that it is the same. 9. The question has not yet been considered.

TELEGRAPH LINE, COUNTY OF CHICOUTIMI.

Mr. MARCOTTE asked,

1. How much has the building of the Government telegraph line cost between St. Alexis and Anse St. Jean, county of Chicoutimi?

2. Who had the contract for furnishing the posts, and what is the amount of the contract?

3. What amount has been paid to the contractor ?

4. Who had the contract for placing the posts and what is the price of this contract ?

5. What is the amount that has been paid for this last work ?

6. Were tenders asked for these works ?

7. What is the length of the said telegraph line between St. Alexis and Anse St. Jean ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). 1. \$4,509.76. 2. The poles were supplied by H. Tremblay, of Anse St. Jean, and J. N. Savard, of St. Alexis, for \$1.50 per pole. 3. Mr. Tremblay has received \$960 and Mr. Savard \$955.50. 4. The contract for placing the poles, the insulators, &c., &c., was given to Elzéar Boivin at the rate of \$50 per mile. 5. The total amount paid to Mr. Boivin is \$2,003.13. 6. An estimate was made by the department of the cost of construction and the parties above named were asked to submit a tender. In the case of the construction of the line the tender first made, which was \$60, was reduced by the department to \$50 and the agreement made on that basis. 7. 40 1-16 miles.

MRS. ROSS, TELEGRAPH OPERATOR.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

1. When were Mrs. Ross's services as telegraph operator at North-east Margaree, Inverness county, Cape Breton, dispensed with by the Government ?

2. How long was she in the employ of the Government as telegraph operator ?

3. Was she dismissed from her position, and if so, why ?

4. Were any complaints lodged against her in the department or with any member of the Government ? If so, by whom, and what were the complaints ?

6. Was an investigation held into the complaints, and if so, where, when, and by whom ?

6. Who is Mrs. Ross's successor as telegraph operator at North-east Margaree, and when appointed, and by whom recommended ?

7. What salary was paid Mrs. Ross, and what salary is being paid her successor ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). 1. 14th January, 1898. 2. Since the 1st January, 1889. 3, 4, and 5. Miss Ross was relieved of her duties on grounds deemed sufficient by the department. No investigation was deemed necessary. 6. Duncan J. Ross succeeded Miss Ross, on the 14th January, 1898, on recommendation of the Minister of Public Works. 7. The salary paid in both cases is a commission of 25 per cent on Government line tolls guaranteed to a minimum of \$50.

WHARF AT MACKAY'S POINT.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

1. Were tenders called for the building of the public wharf or pier at Mackay's Point, Inverness county, Cape Breton ?

Mr. MARCOTTE.

2. Who were the persons that tendered for this work, and the amount of each tender ?

3. Has the contract for this work been awarded, and if so, to whom, and what was the amount of the successful tenderer ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Mackay's Point is known to the department as Judique, and tenders were called for a wharf at the latter place. 2. The following tenders were received :—

Simmons & Burpee, Gibson, N.B....	\$14,143
Donald McDonald, Centennial, Inverness county	15,000
J. B. McManus, Memramcook, N.B...	15,435
John Burns, Ottawa.....	15,960
D. W. B. Reid, John W. Reid, Edgar Archibald, Middle Musquodoboit, N.S.	17,550
John McMillan, Port Head, N.S.....	17,400
McDonald & Moffatt, Sydney, N.S..	17,550
Heney & Smith, Ottawa.....	18,123
John D. Reid, James W. Chisholm, Pugwash, N.S.....	19,545

3. Yes. The contract was given to the lowest tenderers, Messrs. Simmons & Burpee, for \$14,143.

BREAKWATER, SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR.

Mr. POWELL asked,

Were tenders asked for for the construction of a breakwater at Summerside Harbour, P.E.I., and if so, what are the names of the persons who tendered, and the amounts of their respective tenders ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). The contract has not yet been awarded to any of these tenderers, therefore it is not in the public interest to make the amount of the tenders known.

MAILS BETWEEN GOLDEN, B.C., AND ST. EUGENE.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

Who is the mail carrier between Golden, British Columbia, and St. Eugène ? How many times per week does he travel the route ? What does he get per year, and when did he receive the contract ? Who was the former contractor, and what the amount of his contract ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). I must ask the hon. gentleman to make a motion covering the papers.

Mr. FOSTER. There are no papers asked for.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I am aware there are no papers ; but to answer these questions put here categorically would be quite misleading. I am desirous of having the fullest information furnished, and if the hon. gentleman will give notice of motion for a return, I will see that when the House takes up unopposed motions, it will be allowed to be carried at once.

THE MOHAWKS.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

1. Since what period has the Department of Indian Affairs withdrawn its grant towards payment of medical services to the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinté band ?

2. Who, at the time of the withdrawal, were the medical attendants of the band ?

3. How has the band been provided with medical services since, and who have been the attendants ?

4. Has any change been made by the Government in the personnel of the attendants since July, 1896, and if so, what ?

5. Has any change, if any, been made on the recommendation of the band or in opposition thereto ?

6. Why has such change, if any, been made ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Since the 1st of July, 1892. 2. John Newton, M.D., and G. A. Whitman, M.D. 3. The service has been paid for from the funds of the band. Doctors Newton and Whitman continued to be the attendants until April, 1897. In that month the latter resigned, and Dr. John Moore was appointed to succeed him ; and on the 28th November last, Dr. Hicks replaced Dr. Newton. 4. The answer to the third question covers the fourth question. 5. (a). Dr. Moore was appointed on the recommendation of the Indian Council, vice Dr. Whitman, resigned. (b). Objection has been taken at a council of the band to the removal of Dr. Newton. 6. (a). Dr. Whitman resigned. (b). Dr. Newton was removed in consequence of political partisanship.

THE TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. CORBY asked,

Did the Minister of Railways and Canals write a letter to W. H. Biggar, Esq., of Belleville, or any other person, during the month of February last, promising to place a very substantial increase of money in the Estimates of this year in aid of the construction of the Trent Valley Canal, and if so, whether such letter will be laid on the Table of the House ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am afraid I shall have to decline to make either an acknowledgment or a denial as to the contents of confidential communications which may pass between myself and a friendly correspondent. I cannot, therefore, accede to the hon. gentleman's request to lay on the Table any letter or communication which may have passed between myself and the gentleman named.

THE ASSISTANT INSPECTOR OF CUSTOMS, QUEBEC.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

1. Has the Minister of Customs received charges of misconduct, on the part of the Assistant

Inspector of Customs in the province of Quebec, preferred by Dr. Ennis ?

2. If so, when were these charges received ?

3. If any action has been taken on these charges, what is it ?

4. Is it proposed to investigate these charges, if any has been preferred ?

5. If charges have been preferred, what are they ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. The Minister of Customs has received charges of political partisanship, during the Dominion general election of June, 1896, against the Assistant Inspector of Customs for the province of Quebec, preferred by Dr. Ennis. 2. The 2nd of March, 1898. 3. No action has been taken on the charges so far. 4. The question of instituting an investigation into the charges is under consideration. 5. The answer to this is contained in reply to question No. 1.

WHARF AT ST. ANICET.

Mr. BERGERON asked,

1. How much did the wharf at St. Anicet cost when built ?

2. How much has been spent on it since ?

3. Is it true that a pier is to be built in the spring of 1893 ?

4. How much has been promised for such pier ?

5. Will the works be given by tender ?

6. Who was the keeper of the wharf until 1897 ?

7. Who is now ?

8. Why was Mr. Masson replaced ?

9. What is the amount of tolls collected by Mr. Dupuis ?

10. On whose recommendation was Mr. Dupuis appointed, and by whom ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Cost of construction in 1862, \$1,920.50. 2. Repairs, 1889-93, \$709.65 ; reconstruction, 1893-94, \$1,725.35. 3. Yes. 4. \$3,000 were voted by Parliament at its last session for a wharf wing, or return, at the outer end, and repairs. 5. The work is to be done by day labour. 6. There was no regular keeper of the wharf until it was transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries on the 28th August, 1896. 7. Mr. S. Dupuis. 8. Mr. Masson was never put in charge either by the Department of Public Works or by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. 9. No statement of collection has been received from the wharfinger, but he has been called upon by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to forward a statement. 10. By the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

THE PARLIAMENT GROUNDS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked,

1. Was N. Robertson, superintendent of Parliament grounds, dismissed ? If so, when, and for what cause ?

2. Were tenders asked for the work he used to do ?

3. If so, who was the successful tenderer ?

4. What was the amount of his tender ?
5. Did he comply with the terms of the office ?
6. If not, in what respect, if any, were the specifications not complied with ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). 1. N. Robertson was relieved of his duties as superintendent of the Parliament grounds in August, 1889, when it was decided by the then Minister of Public Works, under the authority of Council, to execute by contract the work of taking care of the grounds, which had hitherto been performed by day labour under the superintendence of Mr. Robertson. 2. 3 and 4. No tenders were asked when the contract was first made in 1889, Mr. Robertson being given the work for one year at \$6,000, but in June, 1890, public tenders were asked, and Mr. Robertson, being the only tenderer, was awarded the contract for three years at the price of \$5,600 per year. This contract was extended for three years without tender up to the 1st July, 1896. In December, 1896, public tenders were called for, the lowest being that of J. N. Grieves, and that tender was accepted. 5 and 6. He carried out the contract and the extensions thereof in accordance with the specification.

GATES ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

•Mr. DECHENE asked,

Whether tenders were called for, for the construction of gates on the Intercolonial Railway in 1897 ? If so, who made the lowest tender, and what was the price paid per gate ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). Yes, tenders were called for the construction of gates on the Intercolonial Railway for the year 1897. Charles McNeil's, of New Glasgow, N.S., tender was the lowest. The price paid per gate was about \$1.89.

POSTMASTER AT PICTOU, N.S.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER** asked,

1. Did the hon. the Postmaster General or the hon. the Minister of Public Works make or cause to be made a proposal or intimation that the postmaster at Pictou, N.S., should be janitor as well, and live in the post office building, accepting rent, fuel, &c., in lieu of janitor's salary ?

2. Did the hon. the Postmaster General or the hon. the Minister of Public Works, on or about October, 1896, propose this or any arrangement of this character ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Yes. 2. Yes.

HARBOUR OF REFUGE, ASPY BAY, N.S.

Mr. BETHUNE asked,

1. Has the Government come to any decision as to the making of a harbour of refuge at

Mr. TAYLOR.

Aspy Bay, Victoria county, N.S. ? If so, what is it ? Will the report of the engineer on this proposed work be soon laid on the Table of the House ?

2. When will a wharf be built at Seymour Point, Victoria county, N.S., for which a sum of money was voted last session ?

3. Will a wharf be built at Iona, Victoria county, N.S., this year, and at what estimated cost ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). 1. No, not yet. 2. Plan and specification in course of preparation. 3. Until the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, I am not in a position to answer.

ROADMASTER AT RIVER DU LOUP— PATRICK LAVRY.

Mr. DECHENE asked,

Whether the Government paid the costs of the inquiry instituted in the case of Patrick Lavry, foreman at St. Louise Station, then roadmaster at River du Loup, and if so, to whom ; was Lavry's lawyer also paid, and if so, how much ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). The Intercolonial Railway paid Mr. J. E. Bedard for services and expenses in the case of Patrick Lavry. Lavry's lawyer has not been paid by the railway.

PACIFIC CABLE FROM BRITISH COLUMBIA TO AUSTRALIA.

Mr. BEATTIE asked,

Is it the intention of the Government to take any action towards securing the laying of a cable from British Columbia to Australia, thereby completing the Imperial circle of telegraphic communication ?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). That matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Before the notices of motion are called, I would suggest that in order to save time, we should go through the list and take the unopposed motions. I would ask the Government not to order motions to stand where there is no disposition to discuss them, but simply to have the papers brought down. A number of motions have been requested by the Government to stand in cases which it is considered important that we should have the information at once.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I do not think the last time this course was adopted the Government asked any undiscussed motions to stand.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I think it was done because the Minister

of the particular department happened not to be in the House.

THE VETERINARY INSPECTORS.

Mr. MONTAGUE moved for :

Return giving : (a) Names of Dominion veterinary or live stock inspectors appointed by the Government or the Minister of Agriculture since 13th July, 1896, with date of appointment in each case, and names of parties recommending them for appointment.

(b.) The amount of salary or allowance at which each of such has been appointed.

(c.) Copy of instructions issued by the Minister of Agriculture to such inspectors.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I observe that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) asked for the names of parties recommending the appointments. There will be a discussion on that and the hon. gentleman must let the motion stand or amend it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There will be no discussion so far as I am concerned.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is not information which I think we should be called upon to give, and there will undoubtedly be discussion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In view of what the Minister of Agriculture said last year, I thought he would be glad to give the names.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion stands.

DISMISSAL OF NAPOLEON ALAIN, POSTMASTER.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council, papers, depositions, reports, documents, &c., in relation to the dismissal of Napoléon Alain as postmaster of L'Ancienne-Lorette, and also copies of all instructions given by the department of the Postmaster General or any officers thereof, to the post office inspector in Quebec, or to any other officer thereof in relation to the giving of evidence in an action by the said Napoléon Alain versus one Frederic Belleau for damages.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman must understand that if this motion passes at all it cannot be construed as covering confidential communications between the officers of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. That, I think, is always understood.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is understood distinctly. I mention it now so that there will be no misunderstanding.

Motion agreed to.

THE YUKON TERRITORY—CUSTOMS REGULATIONS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved for :

Copies of all reports to His Excellency the Governor General, minutes of Council, reports, papers and correspondence in any way relating to the navigation of the Yukon or Stikine rivers, or to customs regulations in connection therewith, including the transshipment of cargoes ; also all reports to His Excellency the Governor General, minutes of Council, correspondence and papers touching the customs regulations and fees imposed in connection with Canadian goods passing through St. Michael's, Dyea, Skagway and Wrangell.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think the hon. gentleman had better let that stand. There are negotiations now pending, and it may be impossible to bring down what he asks for.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course, I know that there may be correspondence on that subject that it would not be convenient to bring down ; but the Government will have to exercise their own discretion as to that. We would like to have all the information that can be brought down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Perhaps ten days hence the hon. gentleman might get fuller information.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. On that understanding, the motion might go.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF JAMES M. AITKEN.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council and petitions with the names attached thereto, relative to the dismissal of James M. Aitken, sub-collector of customs at the outport of Montague, Prince Edward Island, together with reasons for which he was dismissed ; also copies of all applications for his position and names of parties applying therefor, and by whom recommended ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). If the hon. gentleman wants to get this passed, the last phrase, after the word "dismissed," ought to be omitted ; otherwise it will have to stand.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I am willing to have it amended in that way, if I cannot get the whole information.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS AT MISTASSINI AND ST. METHODE.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) moved for :

Copies of all instructions, correspondence, &c., in relation to the construction of wharfs at

Mistassini and St. Méthode de Tékouabé ; a detailed statement showing the quantity of timber, iron and stone used in the said works ; by whom the said articles were furnished ; the prices paid therefor to each person ; the names of the carpenters and framers employed and the prices paid them per day, and how much was received in cash by them, as also by the day labourers who worked with them ; all other expenditure in relation to the said works ; copies of all correspondence in relation to the contracts awarded to Messrs. Tétu & Savard, of St. Félicien, for making timber for the St. Méthode wharf ; copies of the said contracts and of all further correspondence as to presenting payment of their accounts ; a statement of the quantity of timber prepared by them, and of the amount paid to them personally.

Copies of instructions issued to J. B. Carboneau, chief carpenter at the Mistassini and Ste. Méthode wharfs ; correspondence as to cancelling of his instructions at St. Méthode and the appointment of a chief carpenter in his place.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman in whose name this motion appears is not in his place, and I presume that the hon. gentleman who has moved the motion for him is not in a position to say whether he can assure the House that there is good reason for asking for all this information. I wish to call attention to this fact, that in many of these cases returns are being moved for which will involve very considerable expense in their preparation, more, I think, than the House should be asked to order ; unless the hon. member is prepared to say, on his responsibility, that he has good ground for pressing that this expenditure should be incurred. We do not want to refuse any information, but the House will agree that where returns are moved for which will necessarily involve a great deal of time and expense in their preparation, hon. gentlemen who move for them should give some reasons for their action.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Better let the motion stand.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to say that I do not know anything at all about the motion, but my hon. friend from Montmorency asked me to move it.

Motion allowed to stand.

**THE UNITED STATES VESSEL
"FREDERICK J. GERRING."**

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for :

Copies of all reports to His Excellency, Orders in Council, papers and correspondence, record of the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada referring to the condemnation and release of the United States fishing vessel "Frederick J. Gerring."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I have no objection to the motion carrying, but of
Mr. CASGRAIN.

course the hon. gentleman understands that the correspondence is going on now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I thought it was concluded.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have received a communication from the United States authorities to-day, and I have made a report to Council in reply, a very lengthy one. That leaves the case pending.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The motion may pass, and it will be understood that only such papers will be brought down as are ready.

Motion agreed to.

**ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE—STAFF
AND EMPLOYEES.**

Mr. TYRWHITT (by Sir Charles Tupper) moved for :

Return showing : (a) The names and appointments of members of the staff and employees of the Royal Military College of Canada who have been struck off the strength between the 30th June, 1896, and 31st December, 1897.

(b) The corresponding dates.

(c) The respective conditions of engagement as regards duration.

(d) The respective lengths of service completed.

(e) The respective retiring allowances, if any, granted.

(f) The grounds upon which the respective grants were made, and the principles regulating them, with explanation of variation, if any.

(g) The appointments which having been vacated have since been refilled, with dates thereof.

(h) The extra public expenditure involved by the respective new appointments other than those caused by deaths, including travelling, lodging and all other charges met or to be met on this account.

(i) In cases of vacancies caused by death, the amounts granted to the families of the deceased employees.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Stand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do I understand that there is any objection to this ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Several hon. gentlemen wish to speak upon it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would it not be better to speak upon it when the papers come down ? I have made an appeal to forward the business of the House and have asked that the Government should not prevent motions of this kind, motions that are simply designed to elicit information, being carried. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Landerkin) will allow this information to be brought down.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Since the hon. leader of the Opposition desires it, I waive any objection.

Motion agreed to.

**GOLDEN TO ST. EUGENE, B.C., MAIL
SERVICE.**

Mr. FOSTER. I ask permission of the House and of the Postmaster General (Mr.

Mulock) to move a motion which was embodied in my request to which the hon. gentleman objected on account of some technicalities connected with it. I suppose that as he has given me the assurance that he will bring down the information, there would be no objection to moving it at this stage. I therefore move :

For copies of all correspondence, reports, Orders in Council, tenders, if any, or papers relating to the carrying of the mail between Golden, B.C., and St. Eugene since July, 1896, the number of trips made by each carrier and the amount paid to each.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). All I told the hon. gentleman was that if he made a motion, I would see to it that there was no objection taken, no delay, so far as I could help it, in the adoption of the motion and the production of the papers. I meant just what I said. I do not know whether the wording of the motion covers all the papers that ought to be produced, and, if the hon. gentleman will give notice of the motion or give me a memorandum of what he desires, I will facilitate his getting the information. I am not speaking to delay him, but in order that there should be substantial production with the papers dealing with the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I have asked for all the papers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know from hearing what has been read what is desired.

Mr. FOSTER. I will send the hon. Minister (Mr. Mulock) the copy of the motion I have read.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Better give notice of motion.

Mr. FOSTER. We shall never reach it again this session.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Having read what the hon. gentleman proposes, I have no objection to the motion.

Motion agreed to.

FREE AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

Mr. DAVIN moved :

That good faith on the part of the present Government with the farmers of the North-west should compel them to place agricultural implements on the free list.

He said : This motion is one in which the farmers of the North-west Territories, and probably more than the farmers of the North-west Territories, take a deep interest. I wish to say, first of all, that I approach this motion in the character of a protectionist, and I see no reason whatever why the

strongest protectionist in Canada should not vote for this motion. It is seconded by my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I want also to say, in order to meet some of my independent friends on the other side and some of the Patrons ; this motion is not a vote of want of confidence in the Government. A vote of want of confidence in the Government is taken on a motion to go into committee, or when you traverse some other motion of the Government. But this motion is not a motion, technically and in the proper sense, implying a want of confidence, so that there is no reason why my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) or any other independent gentleman should not vote for it when we come to a vote, whether to-day or to-morrow, the next day or next week. Because the time will come, as the Greeks said of death, to-morrow, the next day, or the day after. When we come to a vote I hope that we shall not see Ministers sliding up the gangway to interview the Patrons and the independent members. And if they do I hope they won't succeed, as they succeeded in 1896, and in 1897, and once again this very session. It is a humiliating spectacle. Once it was the Postmaster General who did this, another time it was the Minister of Agriculture, and lately it was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Why, Sir, I see the Postmaster General is at it again. Now, Sir, after the leader of the Opposition, I believe that I may say with truth that I have, at an earlier period than any other man in this House, advocated protection for the Dominion of Canada. I am a thorough believer in protection. Now, let me explain what scientific protection is. I understand that some manufacturers throughout the country, when they see in my name a motion like this, think that there is inconsistency on my part, or inconsistency on the part of hon. gentlemen who might vote for me. Why, Sir, this motion says in the first place that the Government, in order to keep good faith with the farmers of the North-west, should place agricultural implements on the free list. If I prove that the Government promised the people of the North-west, held out language to the people of the North-west that sounded as a promise, that they would get implements on the free list, is there any man listening to me who is not bound to vote for that motion ? Now, I want to explain what protection is. Protection does not mean that we are bound to put a duty on all articles that we manufacture in Canada. What protection means is this : That in regard to any industry that will flourish naturally in Canada, it is the duty of the Government to protect them from the foreigner until they get strong enough to fight unaided the world at large. The moment they get strong enough—protection does not say that you are going to put high duties on to keep outside competi-

tion away—to fight outside competition, then the protection may be withdrawn. In regard to this very article in this motion, what do we find? Why, Mr. Speaker, the truth about it is this: The Conservative party has done a great work for Canada and for these manufacturers. Before the Conservative party came into power in 1878, the implement manufacturers were in a sickly, in a poverty-stricken, in a helpless position. But after the Conservative party protected them, they not only made implements as good as were made in any other part of the world, they not only made them cheaper—which is one of the ends protection aims at—but they grew rich, and they grew able to fight the world in outside markets. My hon. friends on the opposite side of the House have again and again pointed out how these very manufacturers we are dealing with now, are able to send their goods to Australia, to the United States, to Great Britain, and to compete with all-comers in those markets, and we rejoice at it. I do not mention that in envious tones, or with a view of doing any harm to these manufacturers. On the contrary, I glory in it, because it is one of the results of a sound and wise policy on the part of the protectionist Government that was in power for so long, and with such great and happy results from this country. I take no stock in what the Prime Minister said on the 12th of October last, in Montreal. It was like one of the extraordinary statements we get from him from time to time. He said that the Liberal party in 20 months had done more for the country than the Conservative party had done in 20 years. Well, that was like some of the boasts I met with in a very interesting book, "Tartarin de Tarascon." When I read the extraordinary gasconading statements of the leader of the Government as to the giants he has fought and killed, and the great game he has brought down, I am reminded of the incomparable Tarascon who went out to fight great game and to shoot lions and panthers, but he only succeeded at last in bringing down a donkey. I take no stock in that kind of statement. I am here to-day as a protectionist and I move this motion and claim support for it on three grounds. First and foremost, is it to be tolerated for one minute that the farmers of the North-west should have held out to them by members who are now sitting on the Treasury benches, that if they got into power they would put those implements on the free list, and that then these hon. gentlemen can get into power, partly by the votes of those men, and when they cross over to the other side of the House, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce, now leading the House, crosses to the other side, when the leader of the Government crosses from this to the other side, when they taste the sweets of office, they can turn round and, to use a

Mr. DAVIN.

vulgar illustration but a very expressive one, make fat bacon at the whole North-west. Is it to be tolerated for a minute? Do you mean to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not bound as a North-west member to express the opinions of the farmers of the North-west, most all of whom are protectionists? But whether protectionists or not, they claim to have their disappointment, their indignation, their scorn, their contempt for men who behave in that way, expressed in this House, and expressed in strong language. Now, I ask again: What is protection? It is putting up a duty that will enable the native manufacturer to struggle on to strength, and wealth, and power, as these very implement manufacturers have progressed, and in doing that, not only give you good implements manufactured within the country, but keep the prices of those implements in the country, give employment to men, and supply a home market for the farmers. One of our mottoes in 1878, was that the workshop should be close to the farmer. I have here pamphlets that were circulated in 1878: I have the principles that were laid down then when we were asking to be returned to power. We wanted to protect the native manufacturer, not simply for the purposes of enriching him, but for the purpose of getting cheaper goods, goods manufactured in this country, increasing the home market, and thus adding to the wealth of the farmer, giving him not merely a market across the Atlantic and across the international boundary, but giving him a market at his own doors. Because my own language was that we wanted the factory near the farm, and our own tall chimneys darkening our own blue skies, the tall chimneys of the factories of Canada. What happened? The Conservative party were in power for eighteen years; and all you have to do is to look over the Trade and Navigation Returns, to look over the records of the Bureau of Statistics of Ontario, and to look over anything that gives a record of the progress of Canada for those years to agree to this proposition, that no country on the face of the earth, no country in history ever progressed more than Canada did during those eighteen years under the beneficent policy of the Conservative party. We had a party opposing the Conservative party, denouncing their policy in the most unmeasured terms, throwing out professions in respect to other matters on which I do not wish to enter now, and by a fluke that party attained power, still holding before the people the idea that if they got into power they would do certain things, and among them that they would give the farmers of the North-west agricultural implements free of duty. I have in a volume near me the official report of the great Liberal convention that was held in 1893, of which Mr., now Sir Wilfrid Laurier, said that since the great Liberal meeting of

1859 there had never been such a grand convention in the history of Canada.

It was a very peculiar course the leader of the House took on that occasion. He did not lay down, as other leaders have done, a programme of his own. He said that he came there to learn; that he invited the magnates of the Liberal party all over Canada to come there and confer on the state of Canada, and enunciate a policy that would be not the policy of the leader, but the policy of the combined wisdom of the Liberal party. Hon. gentlemen will find at page 23 of the report, the hon. gentleman said:

I appear before you now simply to confirm what has already been stated by Mr. Sutherland, that this convention is not a convention to ratify cut-and-dried resolutions, but that the work today remains with the members of the convention itself. This is in every sense of the word a Liberal, a democratic convention. I am anxious, and my friends who are associated with me in leading the Liberal party are anxious, that in the policy to be adopted, all the suggestions should come from the people themselves, who are here represented.

Thus the principle laid down at that convention were the principles of the Liberal party. The convention passed a series of resolutions, and one of these resolutions, which will be found recorded at page 71 of the volume, is as follows—

That the customs tariff of the Dominion—

I ask the attention of the House to these words, because I am going to prove my proposition as I would prove a mathematical proposition.

—should be based not, as now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service.

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been, by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations.

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government.

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

It was put forward before the whole country, and the whole country was called to witness, that if those hon. gentlemen got into power, they would eliminate, to use their own language, every shred of protection from this tariff. What was the utterance of Mr., now Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He said, and his remarks will be found at page 32:

Gentlemen, you have nothing to expect from them.

The hon. gentleman intended to say that the people had nothing to expect from the Conservatives, and that they had much to expect from the Liberals. The hon. gentleman was here referring to the promise made by Sir John Thompson in respect to mouldering branches. Again, the hon. gentleman said:

Apart from the logic of events, you have the word of Mr. Foster himself, who has declared again and again within the last few weeks that tariff reform would consist in this, that there might be a few changes here and there, but that the principle of protection in the National Policy would be maintained. This simply means that the Government are going to scratch off the paint and put on a new coat of varnish, and call it tariff reform.

The hon. gentleman here meant, of course, that he would not merely take off the varnish or put on a new coat of paint, but he would tear down the scaffold and erect a new structure from foundation to roof. He continued:

By virtue of what principle will you tax the farmer in order to give work to the workingman? On what principle will you tax the workingman in order to give better price to the farmer?

There is not, I may say, a single province throughout the Dominion which clamours so much and so loudly to be freed from the incubus of the National Policy as Manitoba. * * * * * I submit to you that every cent that is levied should be levied first and foremost upon the luxuries of the people.

The Prime Minister came west. He spoke at Winnipeg, Moosomin, Regina, Moose Jaw, Prince Albert, and I think at Edmonton—I forget whether he spoke at Medicine Hat or not—and at every one of those places he spoke in the same vein. The hon. gentleman had with him at one time the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and at another time the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Agriculture in definite terms went into the very grievances arising from the duty on agricultural implements. I will not read the speeches delivered on those different occasions, but I will make a quotation from a speech delivered by the present Minister of Agriculture at Moosomin, a report of which will be found in the Moosomin "Spectator," October 4, 1894. The hon. gentleman is of course concerned with any agricultural problems that require consideration at the hands of the Cabinet, and I quote from his speech. He said:

As a farmer, he was not satisfied with the reduction which had been made in the agricultural implement duty.

"What reduction was that? It was a reduction made by the ex-Finance Minister from 20 per cent to 15 per cent." This reduction was made at one fell swoop, to use the sympathetic and eloquent language of the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), and the Conservative Government re-

cognizing that as a protectionist Government it had a duty to perform to the farmers to protect them as well as the manufacturers, and that the farmers of the west and the farmers all over the country occupy a special position. Although it is economically unsound, there is a strong colour of reason for what the farmers declare—although as I have said it is not scientifically correct—that agricultural implements are their raw material; and recognizing this, the hon. member for York, N.B., when Finance Minister in 1894, reduced the duty on agricultural implements by 15 per cent. In Room No. 16 the agent of the Massey-Harris Company stated at a time when iron had \$10 per ton duty on it as compared with \$7 per ton now, that if the duty on agricultural implements was reduced as low as 15 per cent and no lower, the Massey-Harris Company and other manufacturers could do well. But now, at one fell swoop, to use the sympathetic language of the hon. member for East Assiniboia, this reduction to which I have referred was made as low as 20 per cent. As a farmer, the Minister of Agriculture said:

Because the United States Congress had made a standing offer of reciprocity in implements, and it was the duty of the Canadian Government to take advantage of that offer. Last year the farmers of western Canada imported \$120,000 worth of American implements, on which they paid \$40,000 duty. Referring to the Massey-Harris combination, he claimed that the fact that these people spoke of going to the States to fight the Yankees in their own market showed that Canadian manufacturers were able to get along without protection. Canadians were able to hold their own with the Yankees in any walk of life. If Massey-Harris got protection, why should not the farmers?

As the Minister of Agriculture has just come in, I beg to inform him that I have been quoting from a speech delivered by him at Moosomin in October, 1894. The farmers flocked to hear and see these great Liberals, and what impression do you think, Mr. Speaker, was made on the farmers who heard them? Sir, the impression was made that if the Liberals got into power the duty would be taken off these farming implements. But, Sir, the Liberals are not ready to take up their note of hand; they allowed their bills to be dishonoured in the bank of public opinion, and is it to be tolerated for a minute that the indignation of the disappointed farmers of Canada shall not get expression in this House?

Mr. BENNETT. Where are the Northwest members to-day?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not see many of them. My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) and my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) are here, but the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) is not here, and it is a pity, because I am going to quote some eloquent words

Mr. DAVIN.

from that hon. member. Now, a campaign sheet was issued by the Liberal party, and in that campaign sheet for the election of 1896 they held up as one of the enormities of the existing tariff the duty of 20 per cent which was imposed on farming implements, mowing machines, &c. But, Sir, the duty on these farm implements under a Liberal Government to-day is still 20 per cent. I want to call attention to the title page of this election pamphlet, because it is very instructive. It was what Plato would call an esoteric document. It was only intended for the perusal of the political elect and those to whom they would think fit to show it. This is the title:

Dominion of Canada. Principles, Policy and Platform of the Liberal Party

And it says:

This pamphlet is not for general distribution.
(Signed) ALEX. SMITH,
Sec. of the Lib. Association.

And here is what this pamphlet set forth:

A reduction of the tariff as far as the interests of the revenue would permit, with a complete elimination of every feature of the tariff of a distinctive protective character.

And then we have the Conservative party held up to opprobrium because of the duty on farm implements was 20 per cent. Let me ask what impression was made on the farmers by such a pamphlet as that? Do the farmers of this country deserve consideration at the hands of the Government? You must remember that the farmer—I do not use this as the language of a demagogue—the farmer is the most useful man in the community. He begins everything; he lays the foundation of all our wealth; and he works under specially hard conditions frequently, because owing to the peculiarity of his business, if he has to borrow money he has to borrow it at a high rate of interest, and it is well known that the return for the farmer is very small compared with the return to the manufacturer and the business man. I do not see my hon. friend from Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) here, but I am told that he is making in his business 34 per cent profit, and I am told that Massey-Harris & Co. make 34 per cent.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). It is a wonder you did not find that out long ago when you were supporting the National Policy.

Mr. DAVIN. I found it as early as 1892 and 1893, and in the latter year I moved in this House to lower the duties, and it was in consequence of my action that the revision of the tariff took place in 1894.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). That is the time you voted against your own motion.

Mr. DAVIN. No, it was not. I thought that poor joke of yours was knocked to pieces long ago. My hon. friend (Mr. Davis)

knows what happens when out in the North-west a stone is flung by any one at a dog and the dog follows it meaninglessly ; just as meaninglessly as my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) tries to bite at an old chestnut now. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it was in consequence of my action that the tariff was revised in 1894. I call the attention of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) to this ; I call the attention of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) to it ; I call the attention of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) to it ; I call the attention of any of the independent members, I call the attention of the so-called Patrons, if there is a shred of patronism, if there is a shred of independence left in them ; I call their attention to the fact that a Government does not care very much about the opposition that comes to it from the straight Opposition in the House, because the attack of the straight Opposition is discounted by the fact that it is its business to criticise and oppose. But the moment a man from behind a Government, a follower of the Government ; the moment he stands up and expresses his opinion that a certain course contrary to their policy should be taken, that moment the Government pays attention to it. Although, of course, I have a very great respect for the abilities of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), and a great respect for the abilities of my hon. friends from the west, still I do not say that their abilities are overpowering and gigantic. But, Sir, there is not one of these western Liberal members who cannot accomplish more than any twenty men on this side of the House if they will only stand up and fearlessly express the opinions of the people in that western country whence they come.

My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) said to me, why did I not discover this state of things ? Well, Sir, if I did not discover it, his friends, whom he is now following, discovered it. In the very pamphlet to which I have referred they set out a comparison between the farmer and the manufacturer to which I will call his attention as very interesting and instructive. This is the pamphlet on which the fight was fought in the province of Ontario and all over the country ; it is the programme of the Liberal party, and, under the heading of "Manufacturers' Profits and Farmers' Profits," it says :

The question is sometimes asked, why are farm lands decreasing in value ? They are decreasing for the same reason that other stocks decrease—because the profit, after the expense of working them is paid, is so small.

Then it points out that according to the census of 1891 the manufacturers' profit was 34 per cent on a capital invested of \$353,000,000 ; while the farmers' investment for the year 1892, according to the Ontario Bureau of Industries, was \$979,000,000, and the net pro-

ceeds amounted to only \$114,000,000. So that according to the case made out by the campaign sheet of the Liberal party the farmer deserves special consideration at our hands. But what does the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who, as a rule, leads this House, say on this subject ? He said it here in 1894, when we were about to legislate :

The produce of the farmer has been driven to the lowest point, but what he has to buy is sold to him at an increased price, as compared with the price in England. The farmer is bound by his circumstances to sell in the freest and cheapest market ; so also ought he to be privileged to buy in the cheapest market, consistent only with the imposition of such duties as are necessary for raising the revenue of the country. That is a proposition perfectly fair, perfectly just, perfectly equitable—so fair, so just, so reasonable and so equitable that the Government dare not attack it openly. And yet they cannot adopt it. Why ? Because they are chained and yoked to a system which is the reverse of just and fair and equitable.

These are the words of the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, and they apply to the present Government. That is the system they are carrying out now. In the Railway Committee yesterday the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) declared that if the present tariff was not high enough, he would be in favour of a tariff—and he would introduce a Railway Act to enable him to bring it into force by Order in Council—that would fully protect the people in the Boundary Creek country. The Minister of Railways says that, but mark the language of his leader :

And yet they cannot adopt it. Why ? Because they are chained and yoked to a system which is the reverse of just and fair and equitable.

That language went to the west in 1894. What were the farmers to think ? When the right hon. gentleman went west himself, the "Globe" had a picture of him bending over the North-west farmer, whose hands were manacled and gyved by the very tariff which is in force to-day ; and there we had the right hon. gentleman depicted as knocking off the chains and fetters of the poor North-western farmer. We had another picture—a picture of the man who fell among thieves, also the North-west farmer ; and there was the Good Samaritan, Wilfrid Laurier, bending over him and pouring the oil of joy and gladness into his wounds. But what the poor man who fell among thieves got from the right hon. gentleman was bottles of wind, vials of sunny ways of vapidty ; his promise to the North-west having proved of no more value than a dicer's oath. I want to show you, Sir, the disappointment that was felt. I have here the opinion of Duncan Marshall, who gives the views of the Patrons of Ontario, when they saw this tariff : "It is disappointing to the farmers who had been promised substantial changes from the party

now in power," says Duncan Marshall, the well-known Patron campaigner. Hon. gentlemen can find this in the "Sun" newspaper of the 29th of April, 1897. He goes on to mention a number of articles which the farmer is interested in, on some of which the duty is higher to-day than it was under the Conservative Government. Now, my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) when he made his maiden speech in this House, referred to the promises that had been made by the Liberal party. I have here the words of his speech, which will be found in "Hansard" in the debate on the Address. He, relying on such promises, did not think it necessary to support my contention in regard to implements, because he said :

If it is the intention of the Government to place agricultural implements on the free list and to meet the desire of the farmers of the North-west Territories, and carry out the promises made by the Liberal candidates, and by the supporters of the Liberal candidates in the North-west Territories, why delay it? Can any reason be given for delaying?

And I remember that my hon. friend was not able to vote with me, because he had confidence that when Parliament met in 1897 the Government would give the relief to the farmer that he said they had promised; and I can conceive that my hon. friend, with the independence that has already done him honour and placed him on a pinnacle before the people of this country for what he has done this year, is bound to support me on the present occasion. But to show how disappointed the people of the North-west were, I have here what took place in Winnipeg in October, 1897, when the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) were present. This is what the hon. member for Winnipeg said :

He dealt with the tariff first, and said that western members were disappointed with it.

Why were they disappointed with it? Because in that very city of Winnipeg the Prime Minister had promised, with regard to these very agricultural implements, that the farmers of the North-west would get them on very different terms from those on which they were getting them under the Conservative tariff.

He dealt with the tariff first, and said that western members were disappointed with it, but he was sorry to say that in their effort to reduce it, the western men had a force against them which was not all party, and mentioned as instances, Mr. Frost, the implement man,—

That is the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville.

—demanding reduced duties on everything but his products, and the duties on them he would like increased.

Probably that hon. gentleman had some secret promise, because in the contest at West Toronto one of the opponents of the

Mr. DAVIN.

present members declared that the duty of 20 per cent was not enough for Mr. Frost and Massey & Harris, and that the Government would raise it. This is what the hon. member for Winnipeg went on to say :

Mr. Frost, the implement man, demanding reduced duties on everything but his products, and the duties on them he would like to see increased; also, Mr. Fraser, M.P. for Lambton, who is interested in the oil-producing works, wanted the duties kept up on oil, and several other Liberals were likewise in their theoretical love of free trade, but did not want the duties on their own particular goods touched. As a matter of fact, the whole of the east is against the west in the matter of protection.

Then the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) spoke. There is a picture of that hon. gentleman published in this newspaper report, and as I regard my hon. friend as a handsome man, I think he ought to sue for libel the artist who drew this picture of him, but probably the artist accurately depicted the expression of sadness and gloom which then changed the hon. gentleman's appearance, arising from the disappointment he had experienced in Ottawa. Here is what my hon. friend from Lisgar said :

Mr. Richardson spoke of the disappointment the tariff was to him, and said it was hard to get the duty on farmers' implements left alone, as the tendency in the caucus meetings was to increase them rather than decrease.

But who does not remember how that duty was denounced in the Liberal campaign sheets and speeches in 1895 and 1896. If my hon. friend had supported me the last time I brought this matter up, that would not have been the tendency in the caucus, and if he will support me now, he will do a great deal to destroy that tendency in the caucus of his party. He will find that if he is true to himself and speaks out his mind, not merely in meetings when he goes home, but here, which is the place above all where a member of Parliament ought to speak—because, although there is appropriateness in a member of Parliament speaking to his constituents on the platform in his riding and through the press, there is no place where he is so bound to speak out the truth that is in him as in this House of Commons—he will raise himself in the estimation of the people of the west, and he will effect something. That is the way I succeeded in accomplishing what I did. It was by kicking hard from year to year, and there never was a session in which I did not accomplish something for the farmers of the North-west. I believe my hon. friends mean well, but they are young members, and I do not think that in their first session they had a full grasp of their duties as parliamentarians. I know very well, because I have observed it, what a benumbing and hypnotic influence on a young member is produced by his surrounding at Ottawa, when he first arrives. I see that the "Globe" talks of the hypnotizing influence of society on its own

friends. It tells us that even the Ministers of the Crown are hypnotized by Ottawa society. It says that the great social influence is Conservative, and its effect is such that one Minister after another has had to lower his flag before it. If that influence is so benumbing and hypnotizing on the Ministers, what must it not be on a wild bronco, full of fire, like my hon. friend the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). Or take my hon. friend from East Assinibola (Mr. Douglas). Why, my hon. friend was, of course, partly by circumstances and partly by his profession, kept away all his life from society, and we know very well that, when a thing is novel, its impression is far greater. I understand that even Ministers of the Crown who, when west, would not for any consideration have entered a dancing room, or come within the sound of a dancing fiddle, have, some of them, since arriving in Ottawa, taken lessons of a dancing-master, and have become, not merely political leaders, but leaders in the terpsichorean chorus, and gracefully bow and salute in the minuet.

This is what my hon. friend from Lisgar is reported in his own paper as having said:

The great difficulty members had to contend against at Ottawa was that they were not consulted. The Government made up its mind, and brought down its measures, and members as a rule had either to swallow the entire programme or to go into opposition. This policy very often tended to compromise the position of members.

Well, I have consolation in store for my hon. friend. He misunderstands his own leader. He has not read all that his leader has said. On the 12th of October last, speaking at the glorification of Mr. Tarte at the Tarte Club, at the same time that he was presented with the Tarte medal, of which a picture appeared in "La Patrie"—the Tarte medal, with the picture of Israel Tarte on it, hanging side by side with the Cobden medal and the star which emblazoned his consistent and proud bosom—my hon. friend's leader said—and I cite this to show my hon. friend that he need not swallow all the programme of the Government:

The Liberal party does not require of its members a blind support of any measure which seems good to its leaders.

So that I bring my hon. friend some consolation. He will be able now to go back to his constituents and tell them that one of those obscurantist Tories, on the other side of the House, who comes from the west, called his attention to certain words of his right hon. leader which are an emblazonment of liberty for the Liberals behind him. My hon. friend will not, therefore, feel bound to swallow the whole programme of the Government; he will not feel bound to swallow the whole elephant, and do mortal injury to his political digestion; he will not be forced to say, with Hosea Bigelow:

A marcfil Providence fashioned us holler
O' purpose that we might our principles swaller.

I have something further.

Mr. OLIVER. I rise to a question of privilege. I wish to state to the House that the hon. gentleman has distinctly and entirely misquoted my remarks in "Hansard."

Mr. DAVIN. I will send for the "Hansard" of the second session of 1896, and hope to be able to show the hon. gentleman that I have not misquoted him, but that I have given him full credit for what he said. If I have done otherwise, I shall make the 'amende honorable' for I have, for convenience, taken a newspaper report professing to be verbatim.

I want to call the attention of my hon. friend who is now leading the House (Sir Richard Cartwright)—and I am glad to see him leading it, because he leads it with grace and dignity—I want to call his attention to what he said in 1895:

This is not a case for half measures. You have in the fate of the Democratic party of the United States a warning and an example of the doom which will overtake any party that palters with its convictions, and after having placed itself at the head of a great popular movement, will offer the people a stone instead of bread.

That is the language which he used, when speaking of the Liberal policy with regard to the tariff.

These are weighty words, and they seem to be prophetic as well as weighty, for already the indignation of this people of Canada, this outraged and betrayed people is rising against a Government that does not regard its promises, its programme or its professions. What I said in 1896 could be said with still more truth now, the pallor of death is glooming upon the face of that moribund Ministry.

I was walking in the city of Hull the other day. I found that they were changing the names of the streets there, and, in this re-baptising of streets, they call one Avenue Laurier. I thought I would have the glory and pride of walking down this new-named street. While passing along it I began to think how, when the late Emperor Napoleon came into power, they changed the names of the streets in Paris, substituting for names that rang with republicanism those that reminded passers-by of Napoleon and Louis Napoleon. And I remember when I went through those streets of Paris in the autumn of 1870, the names redolent of the coup d'Etat were being torn down and names substituted that rang of the déchéance. I went along this street in Hull called the Avenue Laurier, and do you know whither it led? I hope it will not be injurious to your health, Mr. Speaker, or to the health of the Liberals, it led—'absit omen'—to a graveyard.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return giving. (a.) The names of employees relieved from duty by the Government by dismissal or otherwise upon the Welland Canal and Welland Canal feeder, from the 13th of July, 1896, to the 1st of March, 1898.

(b.) The years of service of each employee so relieved of duty.

(c.) The amount of retiring allowance, if any.

(d.) The cause of dismissals in each case.

(e.) The amount of pay per annum which each employee had been in receipt of.

(f.) The names of new employees appointed, whether permanently or temporarily, between the same dates.

(g.) The amount to be paid to each of such new temporary or permanent employees per month.—(Mr. Montague.)

Return showing the number of bushels of wheat graded into elevators at Fort William from 15th September, 1897, to 15th January, 1898, and the grades of the same as allowed by the Government grain inspector at that point; also, the number of bushels of wheat graded out of the above mentioned elevators during the same period, and the grades of the same as allowed by the said Government inspector.—(Mr. Richardson.)

Copies of all papers and correspondence respecting the enforcement of coasting laws of Canada on the Pacific or Atlantic coasts.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all such papers and correspondence (as can be properly brought down) between the Imperial Government and the Government of Canada, in relation to the improvement of the defences of Canada.—(Mr. Casgrain, by Mr. Bergeron.)

Copies of all papers, reports or correspondence respecting the dismissal of Mr. William Sutherland, car inspector, Stellarton, Nova Scotia, and also all correspondence touching an inquiry into the facts of the case.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all papers, letters, correspondence, depositions, reports, documents, &c., in relation to the suspension from office of Victor J. A. Venner, as Indian agent for the Restigouche band of Indians.—(Mr. McAlister.)

Copies of all instructions given by the Government of Canada, or any department thereof, to Charles Russell, Esq., solicitor, London, England, or to the firm to which he belongs, or to any member thereof, in relation to any case or business in which the Government or any department thereof was or is concerned; also, copies in detail of all bills of costs or accounts rendered by the said persons to the Government or any department since 1st July, 1896.—(Mr. Casgrain, by Mr. Bergeron.)

Copy of the mining lease granted to Chevalier Drolet.—(Mr. Davin.)

Copies of Orders in Council, commission, instructions, correspondence and papers relating to the appointment and duties of Major Walsh, Commissioner of the Provisional District of Yukon, including any directions concerning his duties on the way to Dawson City as well as those after his arrival there.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

Copies of all papers and correspondence, including copy of advertisement, connected with the letting of the Intercolonial Railway contract for farm gates in the winter of 1896-97, Intercolonial Railway contract with one McNeil, of New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, and copies of ten-

gers and deposits by the different parties tendering for the same.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of Orders in Council, commission, instructions, correspondence and papers relating to the appointment and duties of Major Walsh, Commissioner of the provisional district of Yukon, including any directions concerning his duties on the way to Dawson City, as well as those after his arrival there.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

Copies of all tenders received by the Government, or by the Department of Railways and Canals, or by any officials thereof, for railway ties and lumber of all kinds supplied to the Intercolonial Railway between July, 1896, and January, 1898, on the division of the railway in the province of Quebec.—(Mr. Casgrain, by Mr. Bergeron.)

Return showing the amounts paid to each and all persons who worked at the Roberval pier in 1896; the number of days worked; the prices paid; the quantity of timber and iron furnished, and the prices paid therefor; the place where the same was obtained; copies of all instructions, correspondence, &c., in relation to the said work.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Copies of information, evidence of investigation and report, correspondence and papers relating to the dismissal of Thomas H. Miller from the office of shipping master for the port of Bear River, Annapolis county, N.S., and the appointment of Albert Harris.—(Mr. Mills.)

Copies of all petitions, reports, letters, correspondence and papers, including all letters, communications or correspondence between the different departments of the Government, particularly the letter from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, under the late Government, to the then Minister of Public Works, and the letter of the Hon. Mr. Dickey, in said letter referred to, referring to the removal of the remains of piers of the old bridge at the mouth of Bear River, N.S.—(Mr. Mills.)

Copies of all reports, correspondence and papers relating to the dismissal of R. H. Simonds, an employee of the Intercolonial Railway, in the general offices at Moncton, N.B.—(Mr. Powell.)

Copies of papers, correspondence and orders concerning the dismissal of François Corbell, formerly wharfinger on the Lachine Canal.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Copies of all papers connected with the discharge from the Mounted Police of William J. Spencer, who, on 14th May, 1885, was wounded while patrolling through the Eagle Hills with a party attached to Colonel Otter's column; the report of the board which sat on his case, and its recommendation.—(Mr. Davin.)

Copies of all correspondence and reports, direct or indirect, and of minutes of verbal communications between Imperial Government authorities, Canadian Government authorities, and the Commandant Royal Military College of Canada, relating to the granting in the years 1898 and 1899 of commissions in Her Majesty's regular forces, to cadets of the Royal Military College of Canada.—(Mr. Tyrwhitt.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, papers, correspondence, evidence and reports connected with the inquiry in the charges made against Mr. A. F. Cameron, of the customs service at Sherbrooke, Nova Scotia, and his dismissal from office.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Mr. DAVIN.

Copies of all papers in connection with the claim of Amasa E. Killam for cattle killed or injured by the falling of the bridge at Chandler's Cutting, near Moncton, on the Intercolonial Railway; also, copies of all correspondence, papers and documents relating to the settlement between the Government, or the European and North American Railway, and E. B. Chandler, or any other person, concerning said bridge, its use and maintenance; and all receipts, vouchers, releases and discharges executed by said E. B. Chandler, or any one for him, or by any other person, to the European and North American Railway, or to the Intercolonial Railway, or to the Government, respecting said bridge; and all opinions given by the Department of Justice regarding the Government's liability to maintain said bridge or to pay for cattle killed by the falling thereof.—(Mr. McInerney.)

Copies of all correspondence between any Minister of the Crown and other persons respecting the dispensing with the services of John Walker as caretaker of the Cave and Basin Baths at Banff, North-west Territories.—(Mr. Davin.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, reports, correspondence and papers in any way relating to the claim of E. J. Walsh, Esq., against the Government of the Leeward Islands.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Return showing: 1. How many were employed on the dredge "Prince Edward" as caretakers or otherwise since she went into winter quarters at the end of last season. 2. How many were employed during the winter 1896-97. 3. How many cubic yards were removed by dredge "Prince Edward" during the seasons of 1896 and 1897 respectively, and the cost per cubic yard each season. 4. The number of days the dredge "Prince Edward" was doing actual work in each month during the seasons of 1896 and 1897 respectively. 5. The cost of repairs for the dredge "Prince Edward" for the years ending 31st December, 1896 and 1897, respectively. Also, all correspondence in connection with the dismissal of John N. Macdonald from dredge "Prince Edward," and the appointment of his successor.—(Mr. Macdonald, King's.)

Return of copies of all correspondence, instructions, reports, bills of costs and accounts, together with a statement of all moneys paid by the Dominion Government in connection with the prosecutions arising out of the Dominion general elections of 1896 in the province of Manitoba.—(Mr. Roche.)

Correspondence between the Department of Public Works and Mr. L. H. Masson, of St. Anicet, concerning the Government wharf at that place. Also, correspondence between the same department and citizens of St. Anicet regarding the building of a pier at said wharf.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Klondike and Peace River Gold Mining, Land and Transportation Company (Limited).—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 87) for the relief of Augustus Baldwin Hart.—(Mr. Landerkin)—(on division).

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. BRITTON moved second reading of Bill (No. 12) further to amend the Criminal Code. He said: This Bill is of great importance, and I had hoped to have the assistance of the Solicitor General in this as well as in certain other proposed amendments of the Criminal Code. Perhaps it is not an opportune time to discuss the Bill just now, and yet I am afraid that if I let this opportunity pass another may not present itself during the present session. I think I will content myself with moving the second reading of the Bill.

Mitton agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Mr. FORTIN moved second reading of Bill (No. 60) to amend the Weights and Measures Act. He said: I do not think it is necessary for me to make any explanation of the provisions of this Bill at this time, for the reason that there is now before the House, in committee, a measure introduced by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue dealing with the same subject, and it is possible that this Bill might be incorporated with the Government Bill. Under these circumstances I will simply ask that the Bill be read the second time, and referred to the committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

TRADE MARKS AND DESIGNS.

Mr. BERTRAM moved second reading of Bill (No. 61) in further amendment of the Trade Mark and Design Act. He said: I do not think this Bill requires any lengthy explanation. It is simply to enable the owners of trade marks and union labels, that is labels used in connection with associations of workmen and trades unionists, to own them as their property, so that they may be able to use them in the same way as any manufacturer or merchant owns and uses a trade mark. It is a very simple measure, and I think the House will accept it readily. When the Bill gets into committee, if any further explanation is required it will be given.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would ask whether the Minister of Agriculture has examined this Bill, and whether he has any reports with regard to it?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I may say that I have looked into this Bill a little, and I find that there are in my department a good many papers connected with it, which I have glanced over but not very carefully yet. I am not prepared to say that the Bill should be thrown out. I think it is a matter that ought to be thoroughly ventilated in the House before we make any disposition of it. I would therefore suggest that the Bill be

allowed to take its second reading, and be referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee with which it is certainly intimately connected, and then it can be dealt with in the ordinary way.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is the wiser course to pursue.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SPECULATION IN THE SALE OF BUTTER AND CHEESE.

Mr. PARMALEE moved second reading of Bill (No. 83) to prohibit improper speculation in the sale of butter and cheese. He said: When introducing this Bill I took occasion to explain pretty fully its main features, so that I will now merely move its second reading, and suggest that it go to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I would like to suggest that this Bill had better be sent to the Committee on Agriculture. It is a matter of considerable importance to the farmers of the country, and I think that committee would deal with it, perhaps, better than the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of Agriculture is quite correct; I was going to make that suggestion myself.

Mr. PARMALEE. I am quite ready to adopt the suggestion. I suggested that it go to the Banking and Commerce Committee, because I thought it would meet with less opposition there than before any other committee. However, I am satisfied the Bill will receive greater attention before the Committee on Agriculture. While it is a Bill that concerns trade to some extent, it also intimately concerns the farmers and dairymen of this country.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

ADJOURNMENT—TRADE WITH THE WEST INDIES.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). As we have been very industrious this evening, I do not think we will ask the House to do any more business. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MACLEAN. Before the House adjourns, I have a matter to which I wished to call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce when the Orders of the Day were called. There is an item in the London "Times," of Tuesday, March 15, which reports a debate in the House of Commons. It states that Mr. Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, on Monday, March 14, made a statement in the British House of Commons to this effect:

That we are engaged in negotiations with the United States and also with the Dominion of Can-

Mr. FISHER.

ada, which we hope may result in reciprocity arrangements between those countries and the West Indies for West Indian products. I am unable at present to say that the negotiations have made much progress.

I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if he will take the House and the country into his confidence as to the nature of these negotiations, and indicate what is likely to be the outcome of them.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think my hon. friend will be able to obtain full information in a very short time, when the Budget is brought down. The propositions are necessarily closely intertwined with certain proposals of the Budget, and we hope then to give my hon. friend full satisfaction.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 8.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 31st March, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 107) to incorporate the Yukon Overland Transportation Company.—(Mr. Domville.)

Bill (No. 108) to incorporate the Alaska and North-western Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 109) to incorporate the British American Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Rosamond.)

BATTLEFORD INDIAN AGENCY— DEATH OF CATTLE.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan) asked,

What number of cattle belonging to the Department of Indian Affairs died in the Battleford Indian agency during the winter of 1896-97, and what proportion of the deaths were attributable to the carelessness of officials?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Two hundred and seventy head of cattle belonging to the Department of Indian Affairs in the Battleford Indian Agency died during 1896-97. It appears that there is no doubt that the mortality was considerably increased by the lack of forethought of the agent in not providing fodder. But it is not possible to make a definite estimate as to what proportion of the deaths were attributable to that negligence.

CANADIAN AND ENGLISH MAILS— BEAVER LINE STEAMERS.

Mr. IVES (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

1. What are the names of the steamships that have been employed by the Beaver Line Com-

pany in carrying the Canadian and English mails under the contract now in force between the Canadian Government and that company?

2. How many trips has each of such steamships made under the said contracts, and what is the record of each trip of each steamship as to the time consumed in making the voyage?

3. What is the number of letters carried on each voyage?

4. Will the Government lay on the Table the contract above referred to?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). 1. The steamships regularly employed by the Beaver Line in carrying the Canadian and English mails are the "Gallia," "Lake Ontario," "Lake Huron," "Lake Superior," "Lake Winnipeg." 2. So far the "Gallia" has completed three round trips and is now on her return voyage to Liverpool on her fourth trip. The "Lake Winnipeg" has made three round trips, and is now on her way to Halifax on her fourth. The "Lake Ontario" has made two and a half round trips. The "Lake Huron" has completed three round trips, and is now on her fourth trip. The "Lake Superior" has completed two round trips, and is now on her voyage from St. John to complete her third. In addition one round trip has been made by the "Numidian," of the Allan Line, which took the place for that trip of the "Lake Ontario" damaged by collision. The record of each trip as to time consumed between Merville and Halifax, and vice versa, so far as yet reported, is as follows:—West-bound trips: "Gallia," 9d. 4h. 56m.; 10d. 23h. 40m.; 7d. 19h. 45m. "Lake Superior," 9d. 1h. 31m.; 8d. 12h. 41m.; 9d. 0h. 10m. "Lake Ontario," 9d. 1h. 8m. "Lake Huron," 10d. 4h. 15m.; 9d. 23h. 35m. "Lake Winnipeg," 12d. 6h. 31m.; 11d. 23h. 0m. East-bound trips: "Gallia," 8d. 2h. 50m.; 8d. 18h. 50m. "Lake Superior," 8d. 17h. 29m.; 9d. 5h. 10m. "Lake Ontario," 8d. 21h. 50m. "Lake Huron," 9d. 23h. "Lake Winnipeg," 10d. 17h. 1m.; 9d. 15h. 5m. 3. The letters are not counted, and, therefore, the information asked for cannot be supplied. 4. A copy of the contract will in due course be laid upon the Table of the House in compliance with the order of the House of date the 14th of February, 1898.

ONTARIO VOTERS' LISTS—REVISING OFFICERS—COST OF PRINTING.

Mr. **BENNETT** asked,

1. How many revising officers for the revision of voters' lists in Ontario were not senior or junior county judges, and what were their names and districts in which they acted?

2. What was the total amount paid to revising officers in Ontario under last revision of Dominion voters' lists?

3. What was the total cost of printing voters' lists for different ridings in the province of Ontario?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1. For the revision of 1894-95,

there were in Ontario 14 revising officers, who were not county judges. 2. The total amount paid to revising officers in Ontario for last revision was \$71,660.20. 3. The total cost of printing the voters' lists for the different ridings of Ontario was \$34,306.88. I shall send over to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) the names of the revising officers referred to as not being county court judges, and also the detailed cost of printing the voters' list for each riding.

YUKON TERRITORY—LIQUOR PERMITS.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER** asked,

Under what authority and in whose name were the licenses or permits to sell liquor in the Yukon territory in 1897 and 1898 issued?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). All permits to take liquor into the Yukon territory issued since the 1st of January, 1897, which includes the period specified by the hon. gentleman, have been issued in the name and under the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories.

LIGHTHOUSE SUPPLIES.

Mr. **MACLEAN** asked,

To whom has the contract for the delivery of lighthouse supplies from Montreal westward been given, and at what figure? Were there other offers?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). The Collin's Bay Rafting and Forwarding Company, amount of contract, \$3,750. The other offers were \$3,749 and \$3,840. The lowest tender which was \$1 below that of the Collin's Bay Rafting Company, was passed over because the inspector of lighthouses reported against the steamer "Michigan," which the tenderers proposed employing for the work.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY—MEDICAL OFFICER.

Mr. **ROCHE** asked,

1. What is the name of the medical officer attached to the Kingston Penitentiary?

2. Has he been appointed permanently?

3. What is his salary?

4. Does the law allow him to practice his profession outside of his position?

5. Are the Government aware, or have they information to the effect that the medical officer at Kingston Penitentiary is practicing his profession outside of his position?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1. Dr. Daniel Phelan. 2. Yes. 3. \$1,500 per annum. 4. No. 5. No.

LAND DAMAGES AT BELCÉIL.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. Have land owners at Belc eil asked the Government for an indemnity on account of the dredging done by the Government on Belc eil shore for the purpose of building a wharf?
2. What are the names of the claimants?
3. What amounts have been claimed from the Government?
4. Has the Government paid, or agreed to pay, anything to these claimants?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Yes. 2. Tancrede Bienvenu and Cyrille Choquette. 3. T. Bienvenu \$1,675, and C. Choquette \$2,700. 4. No, not yet.

CARETAKER OF BOOMS AT BELC IL.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. Has Bienvenu, caretaker of Government booms at Belc eil, resigned?
2. Who has been appointed in his place?
3. What salary is paid to the new caretaker?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Yes. 2. Mr. Cyrille Choquette. 3. Mr. Choquette is being paid the same salary as that his predecessor received, viz.: \$100 per annum.

MINERS' LICENSES—ASHCROFT STATION, B.C.

Mr. PRIOR asked,

1. Who is authorized to issue Yukon miners' licenses at Ashcroft Station, British Columbia, and by whom was he recommended for the position?
2. Is he paid any salary or commission for issuing same?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). There is no person at Ashcroft Station authorized to issue Yukon miners' licenses. The sub-collector of customs at Ashcroft is authorized to issue such licenses. He was so authorized, not on the recommendation of any one, but in accordance with the rule adopted by the Department of the Interior to have sub-collectors of customs act as issuers of miners' certificates at points at which the department has no agents. He is not paid any salary or commission for issuing same.

QUEEN VICTORIA PARK, NIAGARA FALLS.

Mr. McCLEARY asked,

1. Has the Government arrived at a decision, as to complying with the petition of the municipal and county councils of the county of Welland, who have asked that the Government land surrounding and in which are the ruins of Old Fort Erie, be given to and placed under the control of the commissioners of Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park?
2. Is the Government aware that the commissioners of the park made a report to the Ontario Government on this matter?

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

3. Has there been any communication between this Government and the Government of Ontario in relation to this?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The Government has decided (the municipality consenting) to cancel the lease to the corporation of Fort Erie of the lands surrounding the ruins of the old fort (17½ acres) and issue a new one in favour of the commissioners of the Niagara Falls Park. This decision was conveyed to the reeve of the municipality on the 20th January, 1897. 2. The Government has been informed that the Park Commissioners made a report to the Ontario Government. 3. There has been no communication between this Government and the Government of Ontario in the matter.

THE EASTER HOLIDAYS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who is leading the House, as I think it would be a great convenience to members on both sides to know, what is proposed in regard to the Easter holidays—when the adjournment will take place and for what period?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). In a matter of that kind it would be our desire to consult the convenience of the House on both sides. The adjournment, I think, speaking from recollection, has usually taken place on Wednesday night, and I suppose it will be until Tuesday at three o'clock.

Mr. BERGERON. It used to be till eight o'clock.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Tuesday is a Government day, and we might as well meet at three. However, I will let the hon. gentleman know tomorrow.

THE INSOLVENCY BILL.

Mr. MACLEAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, will the hon. gentleman who is leading the House tell the country whether the Government intend to go on with the Insolvency Bill or not?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is not under the charge of the Government, I may inform the hon. gentleman.

DATE OF THE BUDGET.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it may be assumed that, if nothing turns up to the contrary, the House will adjourn on Wednesday night. Under that assumption, does the hon. Finance Minister still think it best to go on with the Budget on Tuesday?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). That is our present intention, but I am willing to have the matter considered. If a change is to be made, it will be announced to-morrow, in connection with the arrangement for the adjournment. We have no present intention, however, to make any change.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MORRISON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to refer to a matter which is probably only of personal import. It is in reference to some remarks made by me during the debate on the Yukon Railway Bill. My attention has been called to the fact that in the "Hansard" report of my remarks, referring to the reports of Dr. Dawson and Mr. Ogilvie, I made use of the following words:—

I venture to say that there is not a capitalist in this country who would wish to invest \$100,000 upon the strength of Mr. Ogilvie's or Dr. Dawson's report upon a gold mine.

Until my attention was drawn to these words, I was not aware that I had limited that remark to a gold mine. I was talking of the reports published by Dr. Dawson and Mr. Ogilvie, particularly Dr. Dawson's report of 1887, revised in 1898, and what I was contending was that nobody would be justified in investing money on the strength of those published reports. "Hansard" has it that I added the words, "on a gold mine." To the extent that that may be a reflection on Dr. Dawson, I wish in the most unreserved way to withdraw those words. It was not my intention in any way to refer to Dr. Dawson professionally, but rather to his published report as a surveyor, and not as an expert on gold mines; and if any misunderstanding has arisen in regard to Dr. Dawson's ability as a mining expert, I would be the last person in the world to make any adverse comment. I wish to make this explanation so that if any injury is done to Dr. Dawson, he may know that, so far as my intention is concerned, I did not wish to convey that idea. I am very sorry the words appear as they do. I will not say the words were not used as they appear in the revised report in "Hansard," but they escaped my attention.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps it would be desirable, as the matter is of some importance, if the hon. gentleman would say now, with the error before him, what he really intended to say, or what he would say now.

Mr. MORRISON. I thought I stated what I intended to say. I was speaking about the published reports of Dr. Dawson of 1887 and 1898, and Mr. Ogilvie's reports; and I made the remark that I considered that Mr. Ogilvie's report on a gold mine would be of little value in ascertaining the

value of a gold mine, he being a surveyor and not an expert mining engineer. With this remark, in one instance, I coupled the name of Dr. Dawson; but I was talking about his report to the Geological Survey, not on gold mines at all, but on the topography of the country; but the words were added, "on a gold mine." I did not wish to say that capitalists would not be justified in investing on the strength of Dr. Dawson's report on a gold mine, because I think that Dr. Dawson's report on a gold mine, if he had the time and opportunity of investigating it, would be as good as that of any man undertaking to so report. I wish to offset any impression that the addition of the words "on a gold mine" might create, because I certainly had no intention of conveying the idea that a report by Dr. Dawson on a gold mine would be valueless.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to an entry on the Journals, page 216:

And the question being proposed to the House by Mr. Speaker: "When shall the Bill be read a third time?"—and Mr. Speaker being unable to decide from the voices as to the time of reading, he submitted the question to the determination of the House: "That the Bill be now read a third time." and the House resolved the question in the affirmative by the following vote.

Then the votes are recorded, and immediately afterwards appears the entry:

Mr. Hughes accordingly moved that the Bill be now read a third time.

Then there is an entry recording the fact that Mr. Maclean moved in amendment, that the Bill be not now read a third time, but recommended to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of adding certain clauses to it. That may be in exact accordance with what took place, but it certainly puts the House in the position of having voted twice on the same question. It would appear from the Journals, that after the House had resolved that the Bill be read a third time, an hon. member moved an amendment, and the House voted on that amendment. It seems to me that this record can hardly be correct.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. I think that the entry is quite right as it is. The vote which was first taken was taken to decide whether the mover of the Bill was at liberty to move for its third reading now, and the House decided that he was. It was not on the third reading that we voted, but on the question whether the hon. member who moved the Bill would be allowed to move for its third reading at that particular moment.

Mr. ELLIS. If that be the case, then those words should be put in the motion, so that it would not appear on the Journals

that there were two motions of precisely the same character, and that after the Bill was read the third time an amendment was moved to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. In every case of the kind, the entry is the same. When a Bill has passed through committee without amendment, the question is put by the Chair: "When shall the Bill be read a third time?" The question is generally answered "Now" unanimously. Then the motion is put, as in this case, that the Bill be now read a third time, and any hon. gentleman is at liberty to move an amendment.

THE CATTLE TRADE—OPENING THE PORT OF BELFAST.

Mr. QUINN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) if any effort has been made by this Government to induce the Home Government to modify their regulations and allow the port of Belfast to be opened to our cattle trade. I mention this because navigation is about to open, and it would be advantageous to Canadian shippers to know if any steps have been taken in this direction at present. In this connection, I would like to recall the attention of the hon. Minister to the resolution of the Board of Trade of Montreal, passed on the 23rd September, 1897. I am sure that the hon. Minister is familiar with the contents of that resolution, the receipt of which was acknowledged by the Secretary of State, so that I need not quote it. I understand that Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal has made certain representations to the Home Government and done all he could in the matter, but I am informed by gentlemen in the old country, interested in this matter, that if a move were made by our Canadian Government, it would strengthen very much the hands of those in England who are willing to help our people to obtain the opening of the port of Belfast as a port for the receipt of cattle from this country.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to merely putting the question.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would say that this matter was up in the House a few days ago and fully explained then. This Government has already communicated with Lord Strathcona in the sense of the resolution to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

MR. ROTHWELL'S REPORT.

Mr. McINNES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, would the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) inform the House when he expects to be able to lay on the Table the report of Mr. Rothwell on the

Mr. ELLIS.

claims of certain settlers, into whose grievances he was appointed to inquire. I understand that he made a report some time ago, and he has given an order for it to be brought down. -

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I beg to say that I expect the return which the hon. gentleman asks for, and for which an order has been issued to be laid on the Table very soon. The return is very voluminous and involves a great amount of labour in its preparation. It is being got ready as rapidly as possible, and I hope in a few days to be able to lay it on the Table.

DISMISSAL OF COLOURED INTERCOLONIAL PORTERS.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways a question before the Orders are called. I have seen it stated in the New Brunswick papers that all the porters on the Pullman cars have been dismissed from the service of the Intercolonial. I would like to ask if that is true; and if so, whether they were dismissed for cause or whether the hon. gentleman is drawing the colour line in that service.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am not sufficiently informed to give a very definite reply except to say that I am quite sure the colour line has not been drawn. I do not believe that the General Manager would be disposed to draw it of his own motion or without instructions from the Minister, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that he has not received any such instructions. I had a letter yesterday stating that that was the effect of certain action which had been taken by the General Manager. I have written to him on the subject and have not yet had his reply, but I assure the hon. member for York that anything that has been done has not been done with the view of discriminating against the colour line in that service.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Perhaps the gentleman is colour-blind.

ATTACHMENT OF SALARIES AND MONEYS IN THE HANDS OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 14) respecting the attachment of and moneys in the hands of the Government. He said: The object of the Bill is a very simple one. It is to enable the garnishment of moneys in the hands of the Government due or accruing to servants of the Government. It has been impossible, up to the present time, to garnishee the salaries of civil servants, and I think I am correct in saying that it be impossible to garnishee any money in the hands of the Gov-

ernment due to any person. My Bill only provides that moneys due to civil servants and money in the hands of the Government due to any person may be garnisheed, just as in the case of wages payable or money due by ordinary citizens. I think I need not present to the House any reasons why this should be done. Hon. members know that in various parts of the country it has been impossible to compel civil servants to pay their just debts. I do not know exactly how it is in Ottawa, but in the part of the country I come from considerable difficulty has been experienced in that regard, and if reports regarding the position of affairs in Ottawa are correct, I think members will endorse at least the principle of this Bill.

I know there are many difficulties in the way. It will be pointed out that a law of this kind will occasion very great trouble and probably some expense to the Government. But I would answer, that if the Government takes a strong position with regard to officials, very little difficulty need be experienced, and any difficulty that arises will rapidly diminish as years go by. A Bill was passed in the province of Manitoba similar to this, and they have had very little trouble, because, under the rules that have been made, if a civil servant allows his salary to be garnisheed a second time, it is tantamount to his dismissal, for the government will not retain him in office. The province of Ontario has passed an Act of the same kind, and I understand that in the province of Quebec similar steps have been taken.

Since my name has been identified with this Bill, I have received many petitions in favour of its passing. I have here a resolution passed at the regular monthly meeting of the Montreal Grocers' Association, on February 4th, 1897, which reads :

That the secretary prepare a petition praying the Federal Government to amend the law in order that a certain proportion of the salaries of the civil service employees may be made attachable for just debt, and have same distributed for signature by all traders.

I have also before me the petition of the Hamilton Grocers' Association, very largely signed indeed. The petition sets forth :

That by the existing law the salaries of civil service employees are exempt from garnisheed for just debt.

Wherefore, your petitioners respectfully request you to amend the law allowing a portion of the salaries of civil service employees to become attachable for just debt.

I understand that considerable difficulty has been experienced in reference to this very question in the United States, and it has been pointed out to me that the difficulty has been dealt with by resolution of the government, that any civil servant permitting his salary to be garnisheed shall be promptly dismissed. As I know that difficulties will be pointed out in relation to this

Bill, I desire to have the measure brought before a Committee of the Whole House, so that there may be the fullest possible discussion, and the country thus may know exactly how the Government and members of this House feel upon the subject. My Bill may not be as perfect as it ought to be, but I hope that, with the maturest discussion on the subject, we shall be able to frame a measure that will effectually cover the ground.

It is not my desire that the Bill shall be retroactive. I do not think that we should go into questions of past debts : but if the civil service has due notice before the Bill is brought into force, that any debts contracted in future will be attachable, I think that is as far as we ought to go. I would invite the fullest discussion on the Bill.

Mr. FORTIN. I understand, that the object of the Bill is twofold, the first being to declare that all moneys due by the Crown shall be attachable, as if such moneys were due by private parties. So far as that is concerned, I can hardly see any objection. It seems to me that there is no reason why moneys due by the Crown to contractors, or for indemnities in cases of accidents on Government railways, or otherwise, should not be seizable, as if they were due by ordinary individuals, after judgment duly rendered by a competent court. The second object of the Bill, as I understand it, is to allow the salaries due to public officers to be attached. The Bill, as framed, would render the full salary in the hands of the Government seizable by garnishment. Now, with the principle of the Bill I entirely agree. It seems to me that there is no reason why public officers should not be compelled to pay their just debts, as ordinary citizens are. If we are to judge of the value of public office by the number of applicants, by the number of office-seekers, we may fairly conclude that public office offers fair emolument, that the salaries paid by the Crown to these officers are such as to enable the recipients of them to live well, to have sufficient to pay their legitimate debts, like ordinary citizens. As the law stands in the province of Quebec, the wages of a workingman or labourer can be attached for debt, but the amount attachable is limited to one-quarter of the amount of his wages. A labourer earning \$1, \$1.50 or \$2, is liable to have his wages seized to the extent of one-quarter of that amount. In the case of officers of the Dominion Government, not one single cent of their salaries can be attached by garnishment. Now, this is a state of things that seems to me scandalous to a certain extent. There are officials of the Dominion Government in the various provinces, earning very big salaries. I know some who earn as high as \$4,000 and \$5,000 a year. They live extravagantly, most of them, buying wherever they can obtain credit, and never paying a single cent to their legitimate creditors, if

they can avoid it. I say this is a scandal, and the thing should not exist at this present time in our country.

The legislation proposed would by no means be new. We in this Dominion are backward in a good many respects, and this is one in which we are behind the times. It is well known that in England the salaries of public officers can be attached after the officer is put into insolvency.

As is also well known, according to the bankruptcy law of England, any person who has allowed a judgment for at least £50 to remain unsettled for a certain time, can be put into insolvency. By another provision of the same law, upon application to the judge, after due notice to the head of the department where the public officer is employed, the judge may determine what portion of the salary of such public officer shall be paid into the hands of the trustee to be distributed to the creditors of such insolvent person. That is the only way of attaining the end for which we have at present no provision in our own law. In France there are similar provisions, with the difference that the proportion is determined by law. So far back as the promulgation of the Code of Civil Procedure, a portion of the salary of public officers has been declared to be liable to attachment. By article 580 of the Code of Civil Procedure of France, it is enacted that the salaries of public officers are liable to seizure in a proportion to be determined by the law and ordinances on the subject. Now, by a law which was passed on the 21st Ventose, an 9, under the first Republic, the following enactments were passed into law:—It was declared that the salaries should be seizable by attachment in the following proportion—one-fifth for the first thousand francs, that is equivalent to about \$200; one-fourth of the following five thousand francs, or the equivalent of \$1,000; and one-third of the excess, whatever the amount should be. By another article in the French code, these provisions were extended even to members of the army. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there are any servants of the Crown that should deserve protection upon a subject of this kind, it seems to me it is those who may be called upon by their profession to give their lives for the defence of their country. Although their salaries are very small, it has been found well in France that a portion of the salaries of the officers and men composing the army, should be liable to attachment. In the province of Quebec, as has been stated by the hon. member for Lisgar, we have also a statute concerning the seizure of salaries of public officers. But unfortunately that statute only applies to the public officers of the province of Quebec, it does not apply to the officers of this Government. The statute I allude to is 38 Victoria, chapter 12, which has been in existence ever since 1875. By that statute the salary of public officers is

seizable in the following proportions:—1st, one-fifth of every monthly salary not exceeding \$1,000 per annum; 2nd, one-fourth of every monthly salary exceeding \$1,000, but not exceeding \$2,000 per annum; 3rd, a third of every monthly salary exceeding \$2,000 per annum. This statute, as I have said, has been in force ever since 1875. It was argued at the time it was enacted that the law would prove embarrassing to the Government, that it might in some cases prevent the Crown from obtaining the services of the best and ablest men that could be secured. Well, Sir, after an experience of some 23 years, I can safely assert that in no case has this law prevented the Government from obtaining the best and ablest men to serve in public employments. On the contrary, I may say that the law has worked so well, it has given such universal satisfaction, that I think it affords us a sufficient reason for adopting the provisions of that statute to a certain extent. I may add, moreover, that the officials employed by the provincial government of Quebec do not receive, as a rule, such high salaries as those employed by the Dominion Government; and if they manage to pay their legitimate debts and live under such a law, I do not see why the officials of the Dominion Government could not do the same thing.

Now, Sir, as I said before, although I am in favour of the principle of the Bill, I think that principle should not be carried too far. I think we should to a certain extent take into consideration the exigencies of the public service and the position of these men, and consequently, I think only a portion of the salary of the officials of this Government should be attachable as in England, as in France, as in the province of Quebec, and in the other provinces referred to by the member for Lisgar. In the operation of such a law there might be some force in this objection, and if this Bill goes into committee, I intend to move some amendments to it so as to make it as nearly as possible in accordance with the provisions of the provincial statute. There is no difficulty in working the Act. The writ of attachment, or whatever it is, is served upon the head or the deputy head of any department where the public official is employed. That head or deputy head transmits to the court a certificate showing the amount of salary payable to the official, and thereupon the judge declares the attachment valid and orders the deputy or the head of the department to pay to the plaintiff the amount attachable of such salary. It is not necessary, as you observe, for the deputy or the head of the department to leave his office and go to the court to declare what amount may be due to the public official.

But before we come to the consideration of the Bill I think we should examine whether this Parliament has juris-

diction to deal with the subject as to what may or may not be attachable; in other words, whether this law would be constitutional. It may be asked whether the attachment of the salaries of public officers for debt can be dealt with by the Dominion Parliament, or whether that must rest with the provincial parliaments to deal with. I must say that my impression is that it falls entirely within the jurisdiction of the provinces to deal with this subject.

Before the last session of the Quebec legislature commenced, as I was of the opinion that this subject came under the jurisdiction of the province, I had prepared a short Bill to amend our own code of civil procedure, and this Bill was entrusted to the eminent member for St. James Division of Montreal, Mr. Gouin. The Bill was introduced into the Quebec legislature. The Bill went through the legislative assembly, but unfortunately it was killed in the Upper House. It appears that measures of this kind that are progressive and liberal are liable to be killed by the Upper House, not only in this Parliament but in the provincial legislatures. But it is desirable to determine before we go further whether we have the necessary jurisdiction to deal with this matter or not. In the British North America Act hon. gentlemen will find a section referring to this subject.

Mr. PENNY. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if this Parliament can legislate to attach salaries of merchants' clerks?

Mr. FORTIN. I do not believe so; and that is why I doubt very much that we can go so far as to say that any portion of the salary of a public employee of the Dominion can be attached. It seems to me that they fall under the terms of clause 13 of section 92 of the British North America Act, which gives to the different legislatures exclusive power to deal with property and civil rights in the provinces. To my mind there is no difference between declaring what portion of a salary shall be seizable and declaring whether a stove or stove-pipe or bedstead can be seized or not. It seems to me it is a question of civil right; it is civil property, which can only be dealt with by the legislature of the province. This is my own opinion, and I give it for what it is worth to the House. On the other hand, if hon. gentlemen will refer to section 91 of the British North America Act, they will find that by the enacting clause it is laid down as a rule that all subjects which do not expressly fall within section 92, belong to the Dominion Parliament, and we find in subsection 8 that Parliament may legislate as to the fixing of and providing for the salaries and allowances of civil and other officers of the Government of Canada. These are the only references I can find in support of the contention that the Parliament of the Dominion has jurisdiction to deal with

this subject. The question was brought before the courts in an indirect way, and I will give the decisions for what they are worth. The question whether or not the Dominion Parliament has authority to deal with this question, the court was not called upon to decide. The question came up indirectly under the provisions of our provincial statute. Two cases were heard before the courts of Montreal. Rainville, J., in *Crevier v. DeGrandpré & Lamothe*, I.S. 5 L.N. p. 48, held:

(Translation.) I am of opinion that statute 38 Vic., ch. 12 does not apply to officers of the Dominion Government. The exemption of the salaries of public employees from seizure is a matter of constitutional law, and no provincial statute can affect the rights of employees of the federal Government.

The same judge decided, in the case of *Evans v. Hudon & Browne*, T.S. 22 L.C.J. 268:

That the exemption of the salaries of public employees from seizure is a matter of public order, and the Parliament of the province of Quebec has not the power to declare seizable the salaries of employees of the Federal Government, and, therefore, the collector of inland revenue in Montreal is not bound to make the return required by 38 Vic., chap. 12, sec. 5.

These cases do not exactly decide the point. The point submitted in these two cases was not whether a law enacted by this Parliament was constitutional or not; but the question came up indirectly, and the decisions show clearly that this learned judge, the late Mr. Justice Rainville, who was looked upon as a high authority in legal matters, took the view that a provincial legislature had not the power to deal with a question of this kind. I want it to be distinctly understood that although I have doubts as to whether the jurisdiction lies with this Parliament, I have not the slightest reluctance in declaring that a Bill of this kind should be enacted. I entirely approve of attaching the salaries of public officials, just as well as the salaries of other employees, clerks in banks, clerks in mercantile firms and elsewhere, which are seizable. I merely mention this question of authority in order that it may be elucidated by a full discussion in this House. I am not in favour of passing a law which may be attacked before the courts as unconstitutional. It will be far better to ventilate the matter now, and if we come to the conclusion that this Parliament has no power to deal with it, we might then content ourselves with the principle laid down in the first paragraph of the Bill, which has no reference to the salaries of public officers.

Mr. BRITTON. The Bill is a most important one, and I say at the outset that I am in sympathy with the object which the hon. member who proposes the Bill seeks to accomplish. I had thought of the subject before the Bill was introduced, and I read the

Bill as soon as it was distributed and it seems to me that there are at least two most important questions which lie at the very outset of legislation of this kind which we ought to discuss, to say the least of it, and unless the hon. gentleman or some hon. member supporting the Bill is prepared to meet the difficulties which I will suggest, then there can hardly be any object in the House going into committee to-day on the Bill. It will be observed that the Bill is in two parts. The first provides :

1. All moneys in the hands of the Government of Canada, or under its control or management, and payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada shall be liable to attachment at the suit of any judgment creditor of any person to whom any portion of the said moneys is payable in the same manner and by the same process as moneys in the hands of private persons.

The only way to get at moneys that are payable by the Dominion to a creditor or to a person who claims to be a creditor, is by petition of right. The courts are not open to the ordinary suitor to make a claim against the Crown, and if this Bill should be passed just as it reads, that is a difficulty which would confront the judgment creditor. A way is attempted to be provided in the Bill of getting at moneys in the hands of the Crown without the procedure that our statute already provides, and I can easily understand that a person having a claim against the Government and where the privilege of suing by petition of right was denied him, he might, in collusion with some one else, allow a judgment to go against him, in order that this money might be attached and a case against the Crown be fought out on a garnishee proceeding of that kind, instead of on a petition of right, which, perhaps, he was not able to obtain. There is a legal difficulty in that way which stares me in the face in reading the first clause of the Bill. That, of course, involves the question which was raised by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) as to the jurisdiction of the House to deal with a matter of this kind, and whether it does not come under the head of civil rights, and as to the enforcing of these rights as a matter of civil procedure which must be dealt with by the provinces themselves. If the provinces seek to deal with it, we have already a judgment of the higher court which says, that the provinces cannot deal with a question which is cognate to the one which we are now discussing. It has been decided that the provinces cannot tax the salaries of Dominion officials, and so the judges and the higher-paid officers of the civil service, living in any municipality, have their income entirely exempt from municipal taxation. If municipal bodies cannot deal with that question, then there might be a difficulty in their dealing with this question of attaching money in the hands of the Crown. The next part of this Bill seeks to provide for

Mr. BRITTON.

the attachment of the future salary of such person. It occurs to me that the wording of this section must be amended in committee. Of course, we cannot attach a future salary; but if the clause means that after this Act is passed, the salaries of Dominion officials shall be liable to attachment, the same as the salary of an ordinary servant of a corporation or an individual, then that can be made clear in committee. Then comes the difficulty, apart from the question of jurisdiction, apart from the question of our power to deal with civil rights; the difficulty comes up, that each province has a law for itself in reference to the attachment of the salaries of the individuals. In Ontario, you cannot attach wages unless there is at least \$25 owing to a person. That is intended, of course, to prevent those earning small salaries having the wages taken away from the support of the family, and a just enough law it is. In each of the provinces there may be different legislation with regard to that, and it cannot be worked out in any general legislation, such as is attempted here, unless it goes a great deal further; and before it could go a great deal further, we would have to assure ourselves that we have the right to go a great deal further, the right to go far enough to provide the machinery for working out the attachment against money in the hands of this Dominion. That is the difficulty that lies at the very foundation of the Bill. It seems to me that every one in this House ought to seek to place the Dominion officials on no higher or better footing than the servants of ordinary corporations throughout the Dominion. We ought all to be in sympathy with that idea, and consequently we ought to be careful to see that our legislation is not entirely useless to effect the result that we aim at. It may be said: You admit there is an evil, and how do you propose to remedy that evil? It seems to me that the only way we can remedy it without infringement on provincial jurisdiction, would be some such legislation as this: That this Parliament gives the consent of the Crown, as indicated by Parliament, to the attachment of moneys in the hands of the Dominion, if the provincial legislatures think proper to pass a law making these moneys attachable. It is the consent of the Crown that is necessary in order to get at these moneys, and if this Parliament can give the consent of the Crown, then, I submit to gentlemen learned in the law, that we must leave it to be worked out by provincial legislation, on the two grounds I have mentioned: first, in regard to all moneys in the hands of the Crown, and, second, particularly in regard to this class of wages. Now, then, if my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) is prepared, when the House goes into committee, to suggest amendments along the lines indicated by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) and myself, then let us go into committee and pass legislation that will be

of some benefit; but if not, perhaps the matter ought to be postponed until it has been more considered, and until some practical suggestion can be made that will tend to reach the result we seek.

Mr. MACLEAN. This proposition, to my mind, is meddlesome, and is not in line with the spirit of the times. I do not believe that we ought to be making additional laws for the collection of small debts; I believe that we should here, and especially in the provincial legislatures, rather pass legislation that would abolish these laws. As between two individuals, if a man has his goods and another man comes to him and asks him for these goods on credit, the man who owns the goods can protect himself while he has them in his possession, and he should not ask society to join him in collecting the debt, if he wishes to take the risk of disposing of those goods without cash payment. The curse of the day is the ease with which people get into debt, and if merchants and others understood that they were the guardians of their own goods and could not use society and the courts to collect their accounts, they would be much more careful in giving credit, and to that extent the public would be protected. All over the country we see that the principle of paying cash for goods is the only sound principle, and it is those merchants who sell for cash and do not give credit who make money; it is the man who gives credit that loses money. If the cash principle is coming into vogue more and more every day, then our legislation ought to be in the direction of encouraging people to buy for cash, and discouraging those who give credit. In the province of Ontario we have had a great deal of discussion about that matter, and, as far as I can gather, the trend of public opinion in Ontario is against the Division Court and the harshness with which the law is enforced in connection with it. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) who introduced the Bill, if it applies to the money under the control of Parliament out of which the indemnity of the members and the salaries of the officers of the House of Commons are paid?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Why, certainly.

Mr. MACLEAN. But the Bill refers only to moneys in the hands of the Government.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I meant that it should apply to all.

Mr. CAMERON. The salaries of the Ministers of the Crown, and Senators, and everybody else.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then, this Bill, as it is worded, does not apply.

Mr. BERGERON. The members' indemnity is not attachable by that Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then, how do we appear before the country in respect to this

matter? Here we have a Bill which says that the indemnity of the members and the salaries of the servants of this House are not attachable, but which says, on the other hand, that the salaries of those servants who are paid out of the Consolidated Fund, are attachable. This is legislation of a wrong kind. It is not in accordance with the spirit of the age, and we ought not to encourage it here, but should send the matter to the local legislature, where it belongs.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot enter into the legal points of this Bill, as has been done by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), but I should like to put before the House the question from the merchant's standpoint. It has been found that some civil servants—I am glad to know not all of them—have taken advantage, and in many instances criminal advantage, of hiding behind the law as it is at present, to get out of paying their just debts. I ask, why should any one member of the community be favoured more than another? The ordinary citizen or the ordinary merchant's clerk is bound by law to pay his just debts, and the law can force him to do so, and I ask, why should any other man be screened in order that he may by a technicality avoid paying what he justly owes to his fellow-citizens? The civil servant is far more favoured than the ordinary merchant's clerk. He gets his salary on a certain day, and he knows he is sure of it, whereas the merchant's clerk in some instances has to wait several days; and, therefore, there is no reason why the civil servant should not pay his debts as they become due. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has argued that the merchants should not give credit. Under ordinary circumstances I strongly condemn the credit system; but, as every one knows, exceptional circumstances may arise, under which a man may desire credit for a week or two; but that is no reason why he should be given advantages over his fellow-citizens. I represent a constituency which is composed to a very great extent of retail merchants, and I can say that one and all of them heartily endorse the principle of this Bill. In some instances, when they have gone to collect the debts due them, they have been met with the grossest impertinence and arrogance by civil servants. I ask, is this a proper state of affairs? I do not think any hon. member of this House will say that it is. Now, I wish it to be distinctly understood that I do not class the whole civil service in the category of those who wish to shirk their honourable responsibilities, because that would be very wrong. I am sure the great majority of the civil service of this country are above such contemptible practices; but there are in the service those who bring discredit upon their colleagues.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to say a word or two in commendation of the at-

tempt of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) to legislate in the direction of making the civil servants of the country honest. I have often heard it said in this House and outside of it that you cannot by Act of Parliament make people honest or moral. But there are exceptions to all rules, and I think that in this case we find an exception, because if such a Bill as is proposed is passed, we shall be able to make some at least of the civil servants of the Dominion honest, who are not so now and have not in the past been so. Therefore, I think this kind of legislation ought to commend itself to every member of this House. As has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Penny), the civil servants of this country are in a better position to pay their debts than servants engaged in mercantile and other callings in life, because their salaries are fixed, and they know when they are going to get them. In fact, they get better salaries for the services they render than the men in similar positions in mercantile and other businesses, and they ought to be able to live within their means. Therefore, they are certainly to blame if they spend more than they honestly gain, and they ought to be taught by Act of Parliament to be honest men. I think it has been a great scandal in the Dominion of Canada for a long time that civil servants are at liberty to defy their creditors, and that this Parliament allows this state of affairs to continue, and retains in the service of the country men who, from time to time, get credit wherever they can, with the firm conviction that they are not going to pay certain debts, because the Government stands at their back and says that the creditor cannot seize or garnishee their salaries. I do not know anything about the question of jurisdiction, but certainly this Parliament has a sufficient number of legal gentlemen in it to be able to enact a law which will cover the ground. It is desirable that it should be covered, both in the interest of the Dominion, and for the credit of the civil service themselves. I suppose the larger proportion of the civil service pay their debts, and intend to pay them honestly, but there are some who have not done this, and who will not do it unless we by Act of Parliament compel them to do it. We had the statement made by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) that the jurisdiction of the provinces has been set aside in this respect by two eminent judges in the province of Quebec, who have declared that the local legislature has not the power to pass an Act to garnishee the salaries of the servants of the Dominion Government. If that decision is correct, then certainly the Parliament that appoints these civil servants must have the power. Therefore, I think the legal gentlemen in this House, who usually give a good deal of attention to matters of this kind, ought to get their heads together, and frame

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

some sort of enactment that will reach this difficulty. This is one of the few instances in which by legislation we can make men honest, and I think we ought to follow it out until we succeed.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I do not quite coincide in the opinion of my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin) that this is a progressive liberal measure. A very large number of people will consider it a very harsh measure, and not without some cause. At any rate, I think the House should recognize that this measure is a very considerable innovation. Its scope is extremely large. It reaches any man who receives any money whatever from Dominion sources, the highest officials as well as the lowest, and it makes the whole of their salaries seizable.

There are also some details in the measure which, if it goes into committee, will require to be very considerably altered. In its present shape it is, at any rate so far as the laws of my province are concerned, utterly unworkable. For instance, it provides that the moneys can only be seized by a judgment debtor. Well, in the province of Quebec there are circumstances, exceptional if you will, which render it necessary at times for the creditor to seize before judgment, and this Bill would narrow the right down to the creditor who has obtained judgment. There is also the sweeping enactment in clause 2 which provides that the attachment shall be served upon the accountant of the department or the Auditor General. It is evident that in Montreal, where there is a very large number of persons receiving money from the Dominion Government, it will be extremely difficult for a creditor to seize in the hands of an accountant of a department, and be still more difficult and inconvenient for the accountant of the department to conform to the provisions of the code of procedure as regards declaring upon garnishment. The Bill also provides for seizure in the hands of the Auditor General, but I am not aware that the moneys of the Dominion are paid out by the Auditor General himself. They are paid upon his certificate or approval, but not by him. These, however, are matters of detail, and of course the Quebec legislature has recognized, impliedly at any rate, the unseizable character of the moneys of civil servants, paid from the Dominion treasury, as far as provincial legislation is concerned, by passing a special law providing that a certain portion of the salaries of provincial employees may be seized.

My experience is not in conformity with what has been stated by the hon. member for Laval, that this provision of law which makes a portion of the salary of the civil servants of the province of Quebec seizable, is one which has been executed without any difficulty. I believe that the opinion of the Government of the province of Quebec

would be that that provision has caused considerable inconvenience to the public service. There are many reasons which go to show that a civil servant is not in the same position as an ordinary salaried man. In the first place, there is the public reason, which is the cause of the law being as it is to-day, that seizures of this kind will cause very considerable inconvenience and expense to the Government. In the province of Quebec, that has been found to be the case, and I have no doubt that in this larger sphere of the Dominion civil service these drawbacks will be still more considerable. There is also this consideration to be kept in mind. Take, for instance, a judge, because this Act, as I understand it, touches every person who is entitled to receive any money from the Dominion treasury. A judge, for instance, may be a man pre-eminently qualified to fulfil the duties of his position, in the fulfilment of which he is obliged to keep up a certain position, and if he be burdened with debt, however honest he may be, it will be impossible for him, under the provisions of this Act, to continue in his position. If the whole of his salary can be seized at the instance of a creditor, it will be impossible for him to continue occupying a seat on the bench. This will apply to a great many men of ability, honest men, in the employ of the Government, who, in consequence of that employment, have to keep up a certain station, and are therefore liable to be ousted from their positions by the sweeping provisions of this Bill.

I have no doubt that we have jurisdiction. It seems to me that later holdings and the judgments of the Privy Council are in this direction, that in a case of this kind, where, to a certain extent, you invade the domain proper of civil rights, still there is dominating that invasion the principle that we must have the absolute, free control over all our agents; and certainly one of the elements of that control, and perhaps the most important, is the power to decree under what conditions they shall be paid and what shall be the character—seizable or non-seizable—that will attach to the salaries we pay them.

Two objections were raised by the hon member for Kingston (Mr. Britton). One was that this Bill attacked the prerogative of the Crown. We cannot, as a rule, proceed against the Crown except by petition of right, but if we enact a law of this kind, it will constitute a renunciation on the part of the Crown of that prerogative, and it seems to me that Parliament has the right to do so by decreeing that attachment may issue against the Crown.

For the reasons I have given, I do not agree in the principle of this Bill. I would only admit of its being enacted under the restrictions which exist in the province of Quebec; but I believe it would be better

for Parliament not to interfere with the present state of affairs.

Mr. GIBSON. I have noticed on several occasions that when Bills are introduced by members of Parliament who are not members of the legal profession, there is always a large number of that fraternity disposed to criticise them on general principles. I have had some experience in my time with men getting into debt and having their wages garnisheed month after month, and the objections raised by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken seem to me very flimsy. Take the railway corporations of this Dominion and see how the present law applies to them. Why, in the interest of the railway companies it has been the best thing that has ever taken place, and it has been the means of keeping, to a very large extent, railway employees from getting into debt as they formerly did, when it was a very expensive matter to garnishee the wages of employees. The railways have just the same difficulties to contend against as the Dominion Government, and they cover just as large an area. Our railway corporations cover the whole area of the Dominion, and they have no difficulty, when garnishees are entered against their employees, retaining for the time being the amount of money that is claimed by the merchants or those to whom the employee is indebted, until the matter is finally settled.

Now, what has been the result? The railway companies have set their faces against their employees getting into debt, and, as a matter of discipline, they have issued an order that has been in existence for very many years—for a long time, at all events—not only in the Dominion of Canada but in the United States, and railway managers tell me that it has had this salutary effect, that they have not one garnishee order now where formerly they had hundreds. And why is this? Simply because that for an employee to have his salary garnisheed a second time means dismissal, and because even if he is garnisheed for a debt that he has contracted before he entered the railway service, he takes good care to keep out of debt thereafter.

So far as the civil service of this country is concerned, if the law applies to every individual employer of labour throughout this broad Dominion, surely this same law ought to apply to Dominion officials, and this Parliament ought to set itself right upon that matter immediately. There are a large number of good men in our civil service of Canada who never get into debt. But, as the law now stands the Parliament of Canada actually encourages the dishonest civil servant to get into debt and keep in debt, and if the merchant dares to attempt to extort money from him, he has the merchant boycotted by his friends, and the result is that

instead of an honest attempt being made by the civil servant to retrieve his lost ground, he goes deeper into debt, for he changes his merchant, and goes on from bad to worse. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) who has just taken his seat, said that the civil servant had to keep up a certain position. I claim that no man is obliged to keep up a position beyond his income, and I think every civil servant in this country is well enough paid to keep out of debt at all events, and this Parliament should be the last body to give encouragement to anything of that kind. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) is afraid of members of Parliament having their indemnity attached. I, for one, should be very glad if this measure were sweeping enough to take in members of Parliament as well.

Mr. MACLEAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has perverted what I said. I asked if the Bill covered that point and said if it did not I wish that it could be made to apply to the indemnity of members. And, now for the sake of a little political capital he puts this speech in my mouth.

Mr. GIBSON. I am glad that the hon. gentleman takes that view, for on that point I am quite in accord with him.

Mr. MACLEAN. And yet by this Bill, the Cabinet Ministers and lawyers who serve the Government will have their money exempt from seizure.

Mr. GIBSON. But I was rather amused when my hon. friend from East York said that nobody had any right to give credit. I would ask my hon. friend where many of us would have been in business if we had not been able to get credit in the earlier portion of our careers. The credit system is good enough so long as the men who sell their goods have confidence in those to whom they sell them and believe that they will be repaid the amount that is due them. So far as the civil servants who are in the habit of paying their just debts and who are free from debt are concerned, this law would not affect them at all. But what Parliament should do, is, as some speaker on this side has said, is to remove this standing disgrace from the name of the civil service of Canada, that their salaries cannot be attached. Why should any exception be made of one class or of a certain number of individuals? The law should apply to all. As Dominion officials are not employed in any particular province, this is the proper place as I think, and as I submit to the consideration of the House, to deal with the matter. We should not be legislating outside of our sphere. I think it is within the power of Parliament, and Parliament should take speedy measures to see that those civil servants who disobey the law in this regard and who have been in the habit in the past of wilfully getting into debt, even in carrying out the views of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr.

Mr GIBSON.

Monk) that they must keep up appearance for appearance sake, should be compelled to change their course. I think it is far more to the credit of a civil servant to have a seedy coat and be free from debt than to come up here with a gold-headed cane and owing every second man he meets. For one, I am heartily in accord with the principles of the Bill. There may be features in it that can be improved when the matter is threshed out in committee, but I earnestly hope that members on both sides, irrespective of political feeling, will assist the hon. gentleman who has this measure in charge and set at rest for all time to come this pernicious system, the survival of a past age, of allowing one class or body of men to be exempt from the general law.

Mr. CASEY. When my attention was first called to this Bill, I understood it was entirely for the purpose of subjecting the salaries of civil servants and other employees of the Government to be garnisheed in the ordinary way. I was quite in accord with that principle and therefore declared my unqualified support of the Bill. My attention has since been called to the fact that the wording of the Bill seems to give it a larger range and to make it apply to all moneys owing by the Crown, as under contract or in any other way whatever. It has been urged, and, I think with some force, that this might be going too far. It has been urged that the prerogative right of the Crown to refuse to be sued in certain cases should not be encroached upon by this Act at all events, and that other than the summary proceeding necessary to a garnishee order should be taken to tie up moneys owing in the way I have mentioned. I fancy that statement of the case has a great deal of force, and it is probable that if we adopt the Bill, its language must be amended in committee so as to mean only what most of us supposed it meant. Coming to the real meaning of the Bill, the placing of the salaries of civil servants under the ordinary law in regard to garnishee orders, I am quite in favour of it. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) has given a very strong illustration of the usefulness of such an Act from his knowledge of railway matters. There is no doubt that the facility of getting pay from a railway employee by garnishee order has led to greater economy on the part of the men, and to a better system altogether. There is no doubt that the same good results would follow in the case of the civil servants.

I say this as a friend of the civil servant. I think I have shown during all the years I have been in this House that I have a friendly feeling toward the civil service of this country.

I do not think that the civil service are any more inclined, as a body, to get into debt than any other class. I do not think that they are more extravagant than other

people on limited salaries, with an opportunity to get rid of those salaries in keeping up their positions. My arguments on this particular Bill and in favour of this particular provision do not imply a slur upon the character of the civil servant as a man willing to pay when he has the money. But I say it is a slur upon the character of the civil servant, to exempt him in the special manner in which the law now exempts him from the ordinary liabilities of a citizen. I think that this Bill will take the civil servant out of a position of an Indian who cannot be sued at law, and put him in the position of a citizen who is liable to be sued and have his salary garnished the same as anybody else.

It has been urged that civil servants abuse the credit given them by merchants and others. Perhaps they do, perhaps many other people who are not civil servants may do the same thing. But there is another view of the case. The mere fact that the civil servant's salary is exempted as it now is limits his credit. Not only is the civil servant who is inclined to be dishonest, tempted to abuse what credit he may have with the merchants, but another civil servant who wishes to be honest has his credit limited—both by the operations of the present law. A very cautious merchant will not give credit to a man whose salary is not liable in the ordinary way for his debts. That involves an unfairness to an economical manager of his salary. No doubt this new proposition would involve some little trouble to the Government, but I say that the Government should not object, or hesitate for a moment, to accept and to undergo that trouble. As the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) has pointed out, it can be no more trouble to them than to the large railway companies, and even if they were troubled, they should accept it in the public interests. There is no surrender of the prerogative that I can see in this matter of salaries, though there might be in the wider case which this Bill appears, in its present terms, to cover. I think, therefore, from the point of view of the civil servant, from the point of view of the Government, and from the point of view of the man with whom the civil servant deals, there is an advantage in adopting this Bill. I am heartily glad the hon. gentleman has brought it in, and I hope it will pass the second reading and be amended in committee so as to mean exactly what we wish it to mean.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). There are many serious questions involved in this Bill which I think should lead us to postpone it. I think it will be found that much benefit will be derived by postponing the consideration of this Bill until we have had greater opportunities to look into it. This Bill seems to me very much more far-reaching in its consequences than at first sight appears. You have got,

for instance, to take it for granted that the Crown cannot be sued except by way of petition of right, that is to say, the Crown cannot be brought before the courts of the country except with the consent of the Crown. Now, if you pass this law, under the first clause you will be in this position, that a contractor who has a claim against the Crown, and who has applied for a petition of right, which petition of right has been refused, may exercise his claim against the Crown by virtue of this provision. Let me point out in what way. A contractor goes to a friendly creditor, and by collusion with the creditor, induces him to attach moneys in the hands of the Crown that he pretends are due to him. The Crown is obliged to appear before the court and declare whether or not it is indebted to the contractor. Thereupon the issue is engaged, the whole contest is fought out, and the petition of right, the whole principle of the protection of the Crown, is set at defiance. That is one of the consequences which would result from this Bill if allowed to pass in its present form. Now, I think that my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin) has not had sufficient confidence in his own judgment. He says that personally he is doubtful whether it is within the scope of this Parliament to pass legislation of this sort. I am quite aware that there have been cases in the province of Quebec, the few cases to which he referred, which went that far, and they declared that the local government or the local provincial Parliament have not the right to attach the salary of an official of the Federal Parliament. That is the case so far as our province is concerned. There have been two judgments which settle that principle, but they were judgments of the Superior Court alone and those judgments were never carried into appeal. But in Ontario you have the case of Leprohon and the city of Ottawa, which case went so far as the Ontario Court of Appeal; and there, by a divided judgment confirming the judgment of the lower court, it was settled that the provincial legislature had not the right to give power to a municipality to tax the salaries of a public officer in the service of the Dominion Government. Now, if that was good law, of course the necessary logical conclusion would be that the local authorities would have no right to deal with this matter at all. But I say it is impossible to conciliate the judgment of the Court of Appeal in Toronto, in the case of Leprohon and the city of Ottawa, with the judgment of the Privy Council in the case of the Bank of Toronto and Lambe. I have not got the case before me, but no doubt it is well known to all the legal gentlemen here. In that case it was held that the local authorities had power to tax the banks, within the limits of the province, upon their whole capital. Now, banks and banking are exclusively under the authority and control of the fed-

ral power, and if that be so, and if the Privy Council has determined in defiance of the case of Leprohon and the city of Ottawa, that it is within the powers of the local legislature to tax banks and to levy upon their capital, what difference in principle is there between their doing so and a local legislature taxing the salaries of public officials—I mean to say in principle? There may be considerations which may apply in detail, but in principle I can see no distinction. Any hon. gentleman who is interested in the abstract question, can consult with advantage a book which has just been published by Lefroy on the British North America Act, there the case is discussed in the most admirable manner. He will find there the principle laid down in the case of the Bank of Toronto and Lambe, and since that time there is now very much doubt that the judgment in Leprohon and the city of Ottawa can have any further authority in our courts. Now, if we are placed face to face with that position, why should we go further to consider this Bill, at the present time at all events, without giving this matter very serious consideration? Why should we go so far as to have this doubtful principle applied? Suppose we declare here that the salaries of public officials in the employ of the Federal Government are attachable, and find ourselves in Quebec face to face with the statute there which declares that they are not attachable, immediately a conflict of authority would arise, which it seems to me desirable we should avoid. Now, I would like to draw the attention of the House to this other aspect of the case. The last paragraph of this Bill appears to me to be a clear infringement of the rights of the local Parliament to regulate the procedure in the courts. It is provided here by paragraph 3 how the creditors are to proceed to levy a judgment. I say that is a matter to be settled by the provincial courts, it is a matter over which we have no control, with which we cannot deal at all. Clearly then we have got to eliminate, at all events, that part of the Bill entirely from our consideration. Now, some of my hon. friends have made reference to the civil servants. I think it is only fair that I should draw attention to this fact. The civil servant who enters the employ of the Government makes a contract with the Government. At the time he makes that contract he assumes that he is going to contract obligations subject to the laws that exist at the time. If a man is induced to enter the civil service, and gives good value for the money he receives, if a man who has been unfortunate in business enters the service on the understanding that he will be free from attacks by judgment creditors, it would be very unfair, after he had entered the service, that his contract should be violated. That would be an improper act, and could not be justified.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does the contract exist?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When he entered the service, there was an implied contract between the parties, and he takes his position subject to the laws that then exist. Of course, there can be modifications of the laws. Our laws are not as the laws of the Medes and Persians, that cannot be altered. The law may be amended, but it should not be amended lightly and without due consideration being given to the rights the members of the civil service possess.

Mr. MACLEAN. Would the Solicitor General answer the question whether the Bill covers the salaries of members and Senators, and payments made to attorneys for conducting Crown cases?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If they are paid out of the Consolidated Fund.

Mr. SPROULE. As I interpret this law, it seems to me it would apply equally to members of Parliament and members of the Senate, as to members of the civil service, because all the moneys paid in these cases respectively are under the control of the Parliament of Canada. The Consolidated Revenue Fund is under the control of the Parliament of Canada, because we pass votes for every department and for every purpose for which money is required. The Bill provides:

All moneys in the hands of the Government of Canada or under its control or management, and payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada—

The indemnity paid to members is payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

—shall be liable to attachment at the suit of any judgment creditor of any person to whom any portion of the said moneys is payable, in the manner and by the same process as moneys in the hands of private persons.

That language is as plain as it can be made, and it applies to members of Parliament and members of the Senate the same as to any persons in the outside or inside civil service.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. So it should.

Mr. SPROULE. I hold that it does apply, and that it should apply. But it occurs to me that it is in conflict with the principle at present existing and carried out, that no persons can collect money from the Crown except by petition of right. In this case we give leave in advance. Such a law would apply to contractors, as well as to civil servants and members of Parliament. There seems to be two objects in this Bill: First, to give authority to collect money from the Crown; second, to say how it could be collected, or to lay down a way. In laying down that way, it is clearly an invasion on the rights of the provincial legislatures, and it is an authority that can only

be given by a provincial legislature, and not by the Dominion Parliament. Section 2 provides as follows :—

Process for the attachment of the said moneys shall be served upon the accountant of the department—

Where is the difficulty of serving such a notice on the accountant of the House of Commons, or the accountant of the Senate ?

—by which they are payable, or in the case of an attachment against moneys payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, upon the Auditor General.

If moneys are not payable to any department, or through the accountant of any department, then the process may be served upon the Auditor General. But section 3 appears to have an entirely different object in view. It applies solely to civil servants. The first section may or may not apply to civil servants ; but if it does apply to civil servants, it also applies to members of Parliament and to contractors, or to any one receiving money from the Crown ; but section 3 applies only to civil servants, and it applies to the salaries coming due. The previous clause appears to apply to money in the hands of the Crown already earned ; the last clause applies to money to be earned, under a contract of employment, a civil servant hiring for a year, or a contractor earning money under contract with the Crown. The Bill is very crudely drawn and appears to go very much further than the hon. gentleman who introduced it intended. I agree with the opinion expressed by the hon. Solicitor General, that it would be much better to consider this Bill very carefully before the House endeavours to crystallize a crude Bill of this nature into law, and find afterwards that it conflicts with the law at present in force. I am entirely in sympathy with the aim of the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill. I never could see any reason why civil servants should be in the position of wards of the Government, like Indians, and why they should not occupy a similar position to other persons in the community. A civil servant should stand in the same relationship, with respect to his debts and the collection of those debts, as any other member of the community. I do not see why he should be exempted any more than any one else. It should be an inducement to him, so far as possible, to keep himself out of the toils of the law, and he should endeavour to stand with as high credit as possible under the circumstances.

Mr. CAMERON. I have a word or two to say on this subject. The hon. members for Laval and Kingston have expressed some doubts as to the power of this Parliament to pass the legislation proposed. Great lawyers and great men have always doubts. Thank goodness, I never have any doubts, and I do not admit, in the least, that the

Parliament of Canada has not the power to pass this Bill, if it sees fit to pass it, in its present shape. Whether the Bill is a good one or a poor one, is another question. I cannot see any reason, either, why we should limit the operation of this Bill to poor civil servants. I think every man receiving allowances from the Crown should come under the provisions of this Bill or some other Bill. What reason is there why members of Parliament should escape payment of honest debts, while we make poor civil servants, on perhaps \$600 a year, pay their debts ? Why should the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and distinguished members of the Cabinet, not be compelled to pay their honest debts ? My own idea on the subject is, that if the Bill should pass, it should apply to every class—judges, legislators, Senators, Ministers of the Crown and lieutenant-governors. Why, I know of a lieutenant-governor who could not get a pair of shoes on credit. I know a judge who was up before another judge half a dozen times, and escaped on the ground that it was of importance that the position should be sustained, when he could not pay a grocery bill. I know an inspector of inland revenue who had judgments galore against him, and, on the attempt being made to garnishee, appeared before a judge of the county under our Ontario procedure, for examination, and escaped upon the ground that these salaries were assigned by the Government to the civil servants to maintain the dignity of the position, when that man could not pay his grocer's bill—or if he could, he never did. He drew a salary of \$1,600 and lived like a nabob, and yet escaped the payment of his little debts. My own opinion is that the Bill should go to the extreme limit. When I say that, I do not mean to say that it would apply to one-tenth of the civil servants. I do not believe it would. I believe the great mass of the civil servants pay their honest debts, but unfortunately we know that there are civil servants who will not pay their debts if they can escape, and under the law as it is they can escape. You may sue them, you may get judgment against them, but what is the use of a judgment against a civil servant who has nothing in the world to depend upon but the salary he gets from the Government. And so they escape the payment of their debts for the absolute necessities of life ; their grocer's bill remains unpaid, their shoemaker's bill remains unpaid, their baker's and their butcher's bill all remain unpaid. I know of such men within my own knowledge, and I say it is a scandal to the law of the land. Perhaps I should say it is not creditable to the Administration when they allow civil servants to remain in office who will not pay their honest debts. Now, Sir, we have the power here ; if we have not the power

we are bound to resort to the local legislatures, but we certainly cannot give the local legislatures power. Those civil servants have their rights and incomes under the Union Act. There is a provision in the Union Act enabling this Government to provide for and fix the salaries of civil servants, and that question was fully argued before our Court of Appeal some years ago in the case the Solicitor General has referred to. It is well to understand the ground on which the Court of Appeal based its judgment. My hon. friend the Solicitor General has some doubts about the correctness of that judgment, but I am quite sure if he had read the judgment and the reasoning therefor, he would have no doubt whatever. I believe the judgment cannot be impeached in the slightest degree. The Court of Appeal, in giving judgment in that case, said :

Under clause 8 of the Union Act the Dominion Government is vested with the power of fixing and providing for the salaries and allowances of civil and other officers of the Dominion of Canada. If the Dominion Government is vested with the power of providing for and fixing the salaries, the assumption is that no other Government and no other power can interfere with that.

The court further said :

To permit a municipality, under a provincial law, to tax a Dominion salary, would, in effect, be to allow a provincial legislature under a provincial law to appropriate a portion of the Dominion revenue for provincial purposes. The Dominion salary is fixed by the Dominion, regulated by the Dominion, paid by the Dominion, and to allow a local legislature by a local law to interfere with that would be allowing a local legislature to interfere with a Dominion law.

The court further said :

To permit a local legislature by law to appropriate a part of a Dominion salary would be to deprive the Dominion of the power to fix the salary of its officials, contrary to the terms of the constitution, and thus impair, if not defeat, the operation of the federal power.

The reasons assigned by the Court of Appeal in giving judgment in that case appear to me to be conclusive to show that we have the power, and that we cannot vest the local legislatures with any such power.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I approve entirely of the principle of the Bill ; if you can carry out that principle in an Act of Parliament at all. I may say further, that during the recess I paid a very considerable amount of attention to the framing of a Bill that would cover the whole case. I prepared half a dozen Bills, I examined every Canadian and English and American authority I could get on the subject, and I rose from the task with the firm conclusion in my mind, that no lawyer can prepare a Bill that will meet the object sought to be accomplished. It cannot be done ; and there are various reasons for it. Even if you could do it, what would be the re-

Mr. CAMERON.

sult to the Government ? It is proposed to proceed by garnishee ; you have fifty garnishees, you have to employ fifty lawyers to look after them in fifty different divisions, and the expense to the Government would be simply enormous. It would pay the Government better, in my judgment, to pay the debts altogether than to submit to this process of garnishee proceedings. You would have in Ottawa a number of clerks for the purpose of keeping record of all these transactions. In country places you would have to employ lawyers to protect the rights of the Government, because one could easily understand that there might be collusion between the creditor and the debtor in order to fleece the Government, and so to protect the Government you would have to employ lawyers. It will be a grand harvest for the lawyers, I admit, if the Government allow this Bill to pass. It would be a grand harvest for the officials, but it does not pay the creditor and it will not pay the Government.

Another thing, you know that in 99 per cent of these cases, the amount involved is under \$200, and these are within the jurisdiction of the division courts. Now, if the clerk of the division court issues a garnishee proceeding against the Government, how are you going to enforce the garnishee order when you have it ? We may pass a Bill to provide thus far, to get the judgment and to get the attachment order, but will the Solicitor General or one of the wise Ministers now on the Treasury benches tell me how you can get beyond the garnishee proceedings ? There is no process by which you can attach the Government ; they are not bound to pay the least attention to it. The case of Wilcox vs. Pirrell, 3 Law Reports, Exchequer Division, England, discusses the whole question, and it shows that when you attempt to go beyond the attaching order you are stopped. It is true you can take the proceeding known in the English courts, and known in some of our courts, of sequestration and injunction. You can proceed against the Government to sequester the officer's salary and an injunction to restrain the Government paying it over to the official ; but in the name of common sense, who will undertake the proceeding. Suppose the amount of the debt is \$30, \$40 or \$50, why, the sequestration and injunction proceedings alone would cost, before they were finally settled, four or five hundred dollars, and is it to be conceived that any of these small creditors will risk the payment of that enormous sum in order to secure the payment of a small debt. It is a shadowy remedy ; it is no remedy at all. It is no protection to the honest creditor ; it is no punishment to the dishonest debtor, because you never can reach him. I say this Parliament has no power except through the Exchequer Court, or by a sequestration proceeding with an injunc-

tion; I deny its power to enforce an attaching order or to go a step beyond an attaching order. Then, Sir, tell me what is the sense of discussing this Bill? The law officers of the Crown ought at once tell us that a proceeding of this kind is wholly valueless.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). The Solicitor General pointed out that.

Mr. CAMERON. The suggestion which I propose to make will, I think, cover the whole case, but the Bill does not go far enough.

It attacks only the salaries of officials, and, it is said by the Solicitor General, moneys due by the Crown to contractors. If it goes that far, for my own part, I would be opposed to that portion of the Bill. One can easily understand the complications and difficulties that might arise in case a creditor stepped in and took a garnishee proceeding for moneys due a contractor. But as to the civil servants and the judges and the members of the Government, and all officials, I do not know any reason why a creditor should not be able to proceed against them in a cheap and simple way. You cannot do it by Act of Parliament, but you can do it in some other way. Let me suggest to the gentlemen on the Treasury benches a way in which it could be done and ought to have been done long ago. Let them adopt the American system. The Government at Washington have adopted a system which costs nothing. You do not require a garnishee order, or an order of sequestration, or an injunction, or anything of the kind. You can do it with the stroke of a pen, and do it at once. I am not as a rule in favour of taking lessons from the Yankees; but it is well sometimes, when they lay down a good rule, to act on it. The Secretary of the Treasury at Washington issued a circular to the employees to the effect that all clerks receiving a stated salary who neglected to pay their debts, without presenting satisfactory reasons therefor, should not be retained in the service. Let this Government pass an Order in Council or resolution that, if it can be shown, for instance, by the production of a certificate of the clerk of a township or a town, that A. B. is three months in arrear in his taxes, or a certificate from the clerk of a court, under his signature and seal, that a judgment has been obtained against C. D., a civil servant, and that that debt or judgment has remained unsatisfied for three months, that man's office shall thereupon become vacant.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Would you apply that to members of Parliament?

Mr. CAMERON. Yes, I would. At least, I would not apply it so much to members as I would to the gentlemen on the Treasury benches. If you take that course, mark my

words, you will not be troubled very long with civil servants being in arrear. There will be very few to run the risk of having unsatisfied judgments recorded against them. When you let the civil servants understand their position, there will be very few of them who will not pay their debts in full; and I say to the Government, and to any government, that it is not creditable, it is not maintaining the dignity of the civil service, to leave it possible for them to be brought before a judge of a county court and examined touching their estate, for the non-payment of their butcher's bill, or their tailor's bill or their shoemaker's bill, and retain their positions. I know that the late Government had a great many faults—they were nearly all faults; but that was a fault which in some cases they did not commit. I know of two civil servants who were removed some years ago by a Minister of the Crown because they did not pay their debts. One of these was in arrear for his tailor's bill, for the very clothes he wore, and the Minister thought that if he could buy clothes, the least he could do was to pay for them out of his salary, and his services were dispensed with. That was the proper course to take, and I hope this Government will put it on a substantial and unchangeable ground, and will pass an order notifying all civil servants in the sense I have indicated; and if they do, I say again, the Government will have no trouble and no expense, the civil servant will have all the protection to which he is entitled, and the creditor will be enabled to obtain what is due to him.

Mr. FOSTER. How will the hon. gentleman apply that to cabinet ministers?

Mr. CAMERON. I am afraid we will have to pass a special statute respecting cabinet ministers and ex-cabinet ministers.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am in sympathy with the object of the Bill now before the House, and I would like to see it passed into law, even in some amended form. I am in sympathy with it because I think it is going to be beneficial both to the creditors of the civil service and to the civil service themselves. When the civil servants find that they are placed on the same basis as clerks in other institutions, they will practice economy to the extent that will enable them to pay their just debts. I do not think that the whole of the salary of the civil servant should be attached. The law of Ontario leaves \$25 to the labouring man or any other one whose salary is attached, although I understand that in some of the other provinces all the salary is attachable. But if the House passes this Bill, I think it would be right to leave some portion of the salary of civil servants unattachable to be applied to the immediate wants of their families. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says that the Bill is far-reaching in its scope. Well, we might take the wording of the Ontario Act which was

passed very recently, and which defines the classes to whom it applies. I am not going to say that the law should be so sweeping in its operation as to take in the indemnity of members of Parliament, although I will not object to it if it does. The words of the Ontario Act are :

The word "employee," when used in this Act, shall for the purposes of this Act mean any officer, clerk, messenger or other employee of the Government of the province attached or belonging to the departmental staff of the civil service of Ontario at the seat of government, and shall also include the officers, clerks and employees of the Government of the province attached or belonging to the offices of the courts mentioned in section 32 of the Ontario Public Service Act.

If the Government think that this is far enough for this Bill to go, it can be so amended ; but I do hope to see it become law in some form, so that the civil servants will be put on the same footing as clerks in other institutions. I have been told in Ottawa that it is not the clerks on small salaries whom the merchants and others have to complain of, but that it is those receiving large salaries. We will not be doing them any injustice, while we will be doing an act of justice to their creditors, by placing them in a position to collect their debts. I am pleased that the Bill is not to be retroactive, because in that way the civil servants will be forewarned that they must not be extravagant and must not live beyond their salaries.

Mr. TAYLOR. It appears to be the consensus of opinion of members on both sides of the House that a measure should be enacted on the lines suggested by the Bill. I would suggest that the Bill be read a second time, and be then referred to a special committee composed of two or three of our best lawyers and one or two common-sense men ; and let them whip the Bill into shape. I merely throw this out as a suggestion. I think it is the best way to deal with the Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Those who have followed the course of the debate have no doubt by this time become convinced that a very large number of members believe that an evil exists which ought to be removed, and I have no doubt myself that the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill had in his mind's eye this evil and desired to remedy it. But I think that the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) have both shown that the Bill is not primarily aimed at the evil which the introducer says exists. The primary object of this Bill, as contained in the first section, is to enable people who think they have claims of one kind or another against the Crown, which the Crown will not gratify them to have tried by petition of right, to have these claims investigated in a roundabout way by means of

Mr. McHUGH.

garnishee orders. I will undertake to say that if any hon. gentleman introduced a Bill of that kind simply on its merits, it would not receive very much countenance from hon. gentlemen on either side. Those who have been members of the Government formerly and those who are members of the Government now, and hon. gentlemen who have legal experience in connection with petitions of right, know well that governments are always specially careful to give any man who has a fair semblance of claim a fiat, in order that the justice of his claim may be tested in the courts. Experience shows that no really honest case is ever refused investigation at the hands of any government, and therefore I submit that it would be unwise for the House to countenance legislation which practically would have the effect of overriding the petition of right Act. This debate has turned almost entirely upon the necessity of introducing legislation to enable the salaries of civil servants to be garnisheed, but that is only incidentally touched in this Bill. Neither its first nor second section relates to that. It does not seem to me that that was the object of the mover. The third section makes some reference to it. It was dragged into that section in order to attract attention from those hon. gentlemen who are in favour of something being done in that regard. The judgment given by the Appeal Court of Ontario in the case of Leprohon against the city of Ottawa and also the judgment given by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick in the case of ex parte Owen lead me to the conclusion that no legislation can take place by a local Parliament which will have the effect of garnisheeing the pay this Parliament gives to servants engaged in Dominion work. I doubt very much whether legislation can be passed by a local legislature overcoming the difficulty which exists, but I think it would be possible, notwithstanding what my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) has said, for this Parliament to enact a declaration, in some way or other, that the principle which prohibits the salary of civil servants from being attached should be removed. Some general law of that kind might be passed. When that difficulty is removed, then the local legislatures may enact a law enabling these salaries to be attached. I do not think, however, that hon. gentlemen are prepared at once to say that every poor man on the Intercolonial, for instance, will be liable to have his whole salary—for this Bill does not limit the amount—taken and his family go without food.

Now, I want to say a word to my hon. friends. Sneers are constantly being made at the civil servants, as if a large proportion of them are dishonest and do not pay their debts. I want to say, as a Minister who has been about twenty months in charge of a department, that there never has been a complaint made to me of one employee

refusing to pay his debts. I am not aware that any of the employees of my department refuse to pay their debts. I am told, and I believe it is true, that the Intercolonial does take care by regulations to provide, as far as those regulations ought to be pushed, that the employees in the department do pay their debts; and if it is reported to the head of the department that one of the employees is not paying his debts, official steps are taken to insure that a fair proportion of his salary will be apportioned to pay debts which have been incurred for the support of his family. However, be that as it may, I take it there is not an hon. member in this House who is prepared to assume the responsibility of adopting this Bill as it stands.

Nor are they prepared to adopt even the third section of the Bill limiting the attachments to salary. My hon. friend from Laval pointed out that it would be unjust to attach the whole salary, and that we should adopt the system followed in the province of Quebec. I submit that in the different circumstances of the different provinces the local legislatures are in a better position to determine what proportion of these salaries should be attached and what left for the support of the family, than we are. Different rules prevail in the different provinces. These are matters which can be better determined by the provincial legislatures, and with the assistance which the Government have gained from the debate to-day, I think the better plan would be to let the matter stand over and give the Government opportunity to see whether it would be possible to introduce some legislation by which the prohibition now existing against attaching the salaries of civil servants might be removed and let the machinery for the attachment be afterwards carried out, if it can be, by the different provincial legislatures. My own judgment coincides very largely with that of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). I sat down also and tried to work the thing out and failed. If you make the service on the Auditor General, of every attachment that goes out from one part of Canada to the other, he will have to employ an army of lawyers, and the expense will be appalling.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the plan of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron)?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That plan commends itself to my mind very much. I think it is a plan which probably could be worked out, and if that is the evident sense of the House, I dare say the Government will take a note of it. Something of the kind is carried out by the Railway Department, and the same principle which has been for some years in operation in that department might be applied by the Treasury Board, in some careful and guarded way, to the

other branches of the public service. I think it would be better therefore that the debate should be adjourned and the matter carefully considered when the Bill comes up again. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Before the debate is adjourned, I wish to say that I am entirely in accord with the object which the hon. member for Lisgar seeks to accomplish by his Bill, and I am sure that in that object he meets the approval of the commercial community. I consider that a measure of this kind is not only advantageous but absolutely necessary. No one can know better how necessary it is than those who are in business along the line of the Intercolonial Railway. We all, who have any experience over that route, know that employees of the Intercolonial are in the habit of making considerable exactions on the public. There are Intercolonial employees who will open a credit in one store, and when that is exhausted, choose another victim, and keep that process up as long as the public will stand it. A law to prevent this is not only necessary for the protection of the public but also for the protection of the railway employees themselves who pay their debts. Those who do not pay their debts give a bad reputation to the others. Last summer, I induced the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to send a circular to all the employees, telling them that if they did not pay their debts, or come to some agreement with their creditors, they should be dismissed. And I was thanked by nearly two-thirds of the employees of the Intercolonial, because, they said, their reputations had previously been endangered by those who did not pay their debts. But a very interesting question arises in this case, that is, whether we have jurisdiction in the matter. For my part, I say decidedly that I do not think we have jurisdiction, while the provinces have. If we look at the code of procedure of the province of Quebec, at article 628 of the former code—and the same thing is repeated in article 599 in the new code—it is provided that the salaries of public officials are exempt from seizure, and that the salaries of public servants of the province shall be seizable up to one-fifth of the monthly payment, and so on. So, we see, the local legislature of the province of Quebec have declared that they have the right to exempt from seizure all the salaries of public employees, and have made an exception only in the case of employees of the province, whose salaries shall be seizable in part. So, the right of declaring the exemption from seizure of public employees has been taken by the province, and I think the province has the right to do so. Therefore, though I am entirely in accord with the Bill, and though wishing, for one, that all the provinces would enact laws to compel public employees to pay their debts, putting them

upon the same footing as other citizens, I cannot support the measure, as I think it is beyond our jurisdiction. But I think the very best law is one such as the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has suggested—that the Government should pass an Order in Council, or send a circular, saying that public employees who do not pay their debts, or come to some agreement with their creditors, should be dismissed. I think this law would be the best in form, the easiest to work, and the most satisfactory in its results.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) In rising to participate in the discussion of the Bill under consideration, I am aware that I may be open to the imputation of making a pro domo speech, as I am the son of a Government employee, but I am free to state that, from what I have so far heard from the several legal gentlemen who have so ably spoken in support of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), I am not yet satisfied that this measure should be crystallized into law by this House.

In my opinion, Sir, there is a great deal of exaggeration in what has been said here about the dishonesty of civil servants. For my part, I am satisfied that, with the exception of a few isolated cases of civil servants refusing to pay their debts, the great majority of them pay their debts honestly, and do not shirk their responsibilities. I know many contractors, many merchants and banking clerks who are still more eager than Government employees to escape payment of their honest debts, notwithstanding all that has been said here to the contrary.

The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has suggested a plan by which the evil complained of might be obviated, and he told us that by adopting his system that evil would sooner be rooted out than by enacting a law for the attachment of the salaries of civil servants. Sir, if the proposition of the hon. gentleman were adopted, what would be the result? We are told that an Order in Council could be passed by the Cabinet saying that public employees who do not pay their debts should be dismissed. But I have no hesitation in saying that a more radically vicious measure could hardly be devised. As a matter of fact, if such an Order in Council were adopted, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, Cabinet Ministers would feel obliged to interfere in favour of those unhappy officers who would happen to be in the clutches of their creditors. As the Ministers would have a discretionary power in the matter, they could decline carrying out such a drastic measure.

On the other hand, where would be the sanction of such a provision? It is provided by our codes of procedure how creditors are to proceed to secure the execution of judgments obtained against debtors. But, in this particular case, judgment creditors would, I

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

suppose, apply to the Minister and tell him: "We have obtained a judgment from the court against such or such officer of your department; now, if he does not satisfy that judgment you are going to dismiss him." Will any hon. gentleman in this House pretend to say that such a measure could be enforced? It is true the Order in Council would be there, but nobody, with the least insight into human nature, will pretend to say that, under the circumstances, those civil servants, when they happen to be political friends of the Minister, would be removed by him. Therefore, as matters stand, the suggestion of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) cannot commend itself to the judgment of the House. I coincide in the opinion of the hon. gentlemen who preceded me, when they said that Government employees should be put on the same footing as other members of the community. It must also be granted that the mass of our civil servants have but small salaries. It is true some of them are better paid, but they form the exception to the rule. Generally speaking, it may be said that civil servants in our country have salaries which barely enable them to keep up their position. In the face of these facts, I think the well-known motto that "Her Majesty's Government must be carried on" would not be out of place here. At all events, I must say that I am not ready to vote in favour of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). I take it that this Parliament cannot pass a legislation which, under the Union Act, is placed under the control of the provincial legislatures. In my opinion, this House should refrain from enacting a law interfering with provincial rights.

Why, Sir, when I heard my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron) declare that it was within the scope of this Parliament to legislate in the matter, and when listening to the words fallen from the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), it struck me that their speeches did not bear that emphatic stamp of the Liberal principles which our party did so loudly proclaim before the country, when out of power. The Liberal party has unflinchingly advocated and battled in favour of provincial rights, against any encroachment whatsoever by the federal Government upon the prerogatives of our provincial legislatures. Yet, strange to say, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, with a lack of consistency on their part, which is a matter of genuine surprise to me, declare themselves ready, under the intoxicating influence of power, no doubt, to endorse a Bill the scope of which they know perfectly well, and to sanction by their vote an encroachment by the federal authorities upon the rights of legislatures. What were the measures for which the Liberal party have kept battling for over twenty-five years? Upon all matters relating to provincial rights, such as the liquor licenses,

the streams and watercourses, the law respecting escheats and forfeitures, the Liberal party did always unflinchingly resist any encroachment by the federal Government upon the rights of the provinces. Now, should the House pass this Bill into law, this would constitute an infringement of provincial autonomy. Therefore, as a Liberal, and, I may add, as a Canadian devoted to the constitution of our country, and wishing to have it respected, I am bound to register my vote against this legislation.

Mr. McNEILL. I entirely agree with the view that the civil servant should be obliged to carry out his contracts, as well as any other citizen of the Dominion. I am not prepared to say whether there is any great failing in that respect in the civil service or not. I do not know the facts. I think it is quite right that some steps should be taken in the direction, at all events, of securing to the creditor the right to recover from the civil servant as readily as he does from any one else. But I would venture to urge upon the Government the consideration of this point: That though it be right that the civil servant should be compelled to carry out his contract, the Government ought to take care that, in attempting to force the civil servant to carry out his contracts, they do not themselves set the example of breach of contract. I wish to emphasize, if I may, from my humble position in this House, what was said by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in that regard, and I hope that, whatever steps they may take with regard to this matter, the Government will take care that they do not violate any contract, or implied contract, which may have been made with the civil servant who is already in the service. However good the measure may be, if it goes the length of striking at the root of the contract which is entered into by the country with its employees, I think it would be a very serious blow to public faith; and I would suggest that the Government take that part of the question into their serious consideration in any arrangement that they may make in this regard.

Motion (Sir Louis Davies) agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

After Recess.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT— SEDUCTION.

Mr. BRITTON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 12) further to amend the Criminal Code. He said: In making this motion I want to make some remarks now in reference to the Act itself and in reference to the Criminal Code, and the amendments that seem

to me to be necessary to the code. Although I would prefer not making these remarks in the absence of the Solicitor General and of others who are interested in a Bill like this, if I do not make them now probably I may not have another opportunity during the session. Therefore, I will make this motion, assuming that the Bill will not be disposed of to-night, and that before it reaches another stage, I may have the assistance of some members of the Government or of some other hon. gentlemen who are interested in putting the Bill into such a shape that it may be disposed of during the session. The first section of the Criminal Code that I wish to amend is section 684. This section makes it necessary that, in reference to any of the offences mentioned from section 181 to 190 inclusive, in order to obtain a conviction, there must be some corroborative evidence implicating the accused. Section 181 has reference to the seduction of girls above the age of 14 and under the age of 16. Sections 198 and 199 refer to unlawful intercourse with idiots and insane persons. I take it that there will be no discussion whatever as to the latter class of cases. There will be no difference of opinion that these cases ought to be placed in no different position from any other case where an offence is charged, and where a person may be found guilty on the evidence of one credible witness, or on such evidence as a court and a jury may think sufficient to convict a person. We know that our own law is very indulgent, and rightly so. Everybody is presumed to be innocent until he is proved to be guilty, and the benefit of any doubt must always be given to the prisoner. Every judge before whom a person is being tried for any offence will always tell the jury, and he will always act upon the principle himself if he is trying a case himself, that the benefit of every doubt is to be given to the prisoner, and conviction can only take place upon evidence clear, satisfactory and convincing. Now, as these last mentioned persons, idiots and insane persons, cannot give evidence themselves, there should be no more reason for the corroborative evidence of any person who knows of such an offence being committed against them than there would be in any other case. But section 181 stands on a different footing altogether. That section has reference, as I said, to the seduction of girls under the age of 16 and above the age of 14. There seems to me, in many cases, to be a failure of justice because of this section 684 requiring corroborative evidence. I will just give a concrete instance of cases that are in my mind, and that have led me to think that this law ought to be amended. They are cases of girls who are obliged to go out to service, their parents are poor and they let their daughters go out to service at an

early age. A girl goes into a house and is seduced by her master. There is no doubt of the girl's previously chaste character; there is no doubt of the age of the girl, which, of course, must be established in order that there shall be an offence under this Act; there is no doubt about the improper intimacy of the girl with some man, because pregnancy follows, and the offence, according to the girl's own statement, has been committed by the person in whose employment she was, and in his house. Notwithstanding all that evidence, and notwithstanding the further evidence that there was no opportunity, so far as the parents knew, or so far as anybody else knew who was acquainted with the girl, for her to have intimacy with any other man than the one accused by her, yet on this point, and that is the crucial point in the prosecution, judges say, and with propriety in view of these words in the section: Yes, that is all true, but where is your evidence corroborating the statement of the girl and implicating the accused? You have established her previously chaste character, you have established everything else required, but you have not produced any corroborative evidence that the defendant is really the person who had improper relations with this girl. I say that, in many cases, that cannot be established under this provision of the code. If the circumstances I have mentioned are not sufficient corroborative evidence to establish that offence or to convince a jury, then it cannot be established, in many cases. Then it becomes the question whether it is desirable to have offences of that kind go unpunished because of the risk of opening the door to abuses which I need not mention, but hon. gentlemen who hear me will readily understand to what I refer; it becomes a question whether we should let persons who are really guilty go unpunished because of the risk I have suggested. Is the danger in this respect so great that rather than open the door to these abuses, we should allow guilty persons to escape? Now, those are the circumstances with which I wish to deal. The courts in Ontario have not decided precisely what corroborative evidence is necessary, or rather they have not decided what would be corroborative evidence within the meaning of the section I have just read. These cases are ordinary 'nisi prius' cases, cases that are decided before a judge and jury and, unless the judge thinks proper to reserve a case for the opinion of a higher court, no more is heard about it, the man is acquitted, and that is the end of it. One case has been reserved, but has not yet been argued, and that is another reason why I am willing that this Bill should not go much further to-night than a discussion of the points I have mentioned.

The case I refer to is that of the Queen vs. Vahey in which just such circumstances

Mr. BRITTON.

as I have mentioned came up. It was argued by the counsel who prosecuted that those circumstances would be the corroborative evidence that is required by the statute; and the judge reserved that question for the court. So far as I know or have heard, it has not been argued since and is now to be argued in Toronto. That is a case that ought to be made perfectly clear by legislation. I contend, as to the case I have mentioned, that the circumstances ought to be proved, that such a case should not stand on any different footing nor should there be any more required in prosecuting for such an offence than is required for the more serious one of rape or for the more ordinary one of larceny or embezzlement. If the House agrees with me, when we go into committee such an amendment will be moved.

The next point I submit is that there should be an amendment to section 744 of the code. That is to me an absurd provision. It occurs in the case of a judge refusing to reserve any question of law for the opinion of the court; that is where a judge who tries the case refuses to reserve a legal question, when asked, for the opinion of the court. The law, as it is now, provides that before the accused can appeal he must get leave in writing from the Attorney General, and with that leave in his hands he goes to the Court of Appeal, and on motion, notice having been given to the parties, he asks for leave to appeal. If leave is given, then the case comes on for argument. In that case the accused ought to have the right not of appeal but the right to go to the Court of Appeal, and at once ask for leave. That seems to me to be common sense, a very reasonable arrangement and every one with whom I have spoken agrees with that view. The party should not depend upon the whim or caprice or judgment of the Attorney General as to whether he should have leave to go to the Court of Appeal and ask from that Court leave to appeal on some important question which he thinks he should raise in the interest of the prisoner on trial in the way I have mentioned.

Then the other is a very important section indeed. Section 748 of the code allows the Minister of Justice to be a court of appeal. This is new legislation, so far as I am aware, in any country in the world. It is not the law in England, it was not the law in this country, we did not know anything about it until it appeared in our Criminal Code of 1892. It was acted on in the case of Mrs. Sternaman, and under that section she was given a new trial by the Minister of Justice. Another case was decided by the Minister in like manner. I submit that is a section which should not appear on our Statute-book. The Minister of Justice is a politician, necessarily so; he belongs to a party, and represents that party as Minister of Justice. In any case under this section and in every case there will be from this time on friends

of the accused applying, when the case is a serious one and in all capital cases, to the Minister of Justice ; and if he is not willing to have the sentence commuted, at least he may be willing to grant a new trial. I do not think the Minister of Justice will do so in every case—I know he will not. I do not say that in every case where he granted a new trial, it should not have been granted ; but it is a power that should not be given to the Minister of Justice, to sit in his room in the Eastern Block of the Parliament Buildings and there hear persons who come on behalf of an accused, who has perhaps been convicted of a capital offence, as in the case to which I have referred, and hear all their evidence. Affidavits may be presented, that are perhaps false ; it is perhaps asserted that evidence has been found stating different facts, and some paltry excuse made for the fact that this evidence was not given on the trial ; and with this power in the hands of the Minister of Justice, it being possible for the Minister to grant a new trial, the House can easily see that the Minister might be induced to grant a new trial, and in any case where this course is taken it is possible that an absolute failure of justice may follow. No one who has had to do, as all members of the House have had to do, with the Department of Justice, has been exempt from calls made on him on behalf of prisoners. In very many cases their sentences are not interfered with, but objections are made all the same, and all the influence or supposed influence that can be brought to bear on members is first used to intercede with the Minister of Justice in behalf of these persons. All these things are done now, and how much more will they be done when it is known—although all people are supposed to know the law, this provision has not been much known until the case to which I alluded arose—that the Minister of Justice can interfere. Very many more attempts will be made to bring pressure on the Minister of Justice when the accused has friends willing and able to make the application. At all events this section ought to be seriously discussed and seriously considered before we allow it to remain on the Statute-book. I can easily understand that the Minister of Justice might not wish to possess power of that kind ; it is a tremendous power ; it is the power of the Court of Appeal embodied in one individual, exercised without argument, in the sense of a legal argument, and the application is dealt with by him when pressed by friends of the accused ; and while perhaps the Minister might not be willing to go the length of recommending executive clemency, yet he might not be willing to take the responsibility of allowing the sentence to go into effect and therefore might grant him a new trial. If a new trial were granted, there might be an absolute failure of justice. In suggesting these amendments and giving notice of the Bill, I

know there are some points that hon. gentlemen cover with Bills now before the House, and there are other points suggested as amendments to the Criminal Code. If it be possible to add clauses in committee to meet such cases, I submit that these amendments ought to be made.

I believe that in sections 181 and 182 the word "reputation" ought to be used, instead of "character," because, of course, "reputation" is the important matter in a thing of this kind ; "character" is what a person is, "reputation" is what is said of him, and reputation has more to do in a matter of that kind than character. I put it to the judgment of the House, whether there is anything in my suggestion in that regard. Then, section 182 makes this offence complete only when committed under a promise of marriage. Any lawyer here who has practice in the courts of Ontario, will agree with me that this section has been frittered away by the manner in which the judges have dealt with it. For instance, it is said that that offence cannot be committed except committed at the time and under the influence of a promise of marriage. It seems to me that that is absurd. If the relation of engaged persons exists between the two, and if the promise of marriage is existing at the time, that surely ought to be all that is necessary, and so I would suggest that, instead of the words used in the code, some such words as these ought to be substituted:

While the promise of marriage exists—

Or :

Under the promise of marriage and while they are in an engaged relation.

That would prevent the possibility of it being held that, in order to make it an offence, it must be committed just following the promise of marriage. Another very important point is this : Under section 743, the trial judge may reserve a question of law for the Court of Appeal, and in Ontario the Court of Appeal for this purpose is made any division of the High Court of Justice. In the case of the Queen vs. Williams (reported), the Queen's Bench Division decided that the depositions taken before the coroner are admissible in evidence on the trial of the accused, and as against the accused. This decision was given under the Canada Evidence Act. In the Williams case, the trial judge reserved the legal point for the Queen's Bench Division, and they decided as I have stated, and the conviction stood. Then Hammond was tried for the murder of Katie Tough, and he was convicted. The depositions before the coroner were admitted in that case, following the decision in Queen vs. Williams, although there had been a decision the other way by Chief Justice Meredith in the Queen vs. Hendershott. Still, as there was a considered judgment in the case of the Queen vs.

Williams, the trial judge in the Hammond case admitted the evidence given by the prisoner and taken before the coroner. That case was reserved for the opinion of the Chancery Division, and the Chancery Division decided that this evidence was inadmissible. We have, therefore, two decisions of courts of equal jurisdiction—which are made courts of appeal under our criminal code—one in direct conflict with the other. I submit, Sir, that that condition of things must be cured. I understand the Solicitor General, or the Minister of Justice, intends during this session to introduce a Bill amending the Evidence Act, so that the evidence given before the coroner will be admissible. That would, of course, remove the difficulty as to this one question, but it does not remove the difficulty as to any other question. The point I make is, that where you constitute each of these divisions a court of appeal for the purpose of disposing of a reserved case, you permit at any time a conflict of authority between these divisions. I suggest that any reserved case should be to a court of appeal or to certain judges made a court of appeal for that purpose, and I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that this is a very proper amendment for this House to make. There are many other sections that have inconsistencies in them, and that very slight amendments would improve. Let me call the attention of the House to this one case. In the codification of the Criminal law, the gentlemen who did the work apparently omitted to provide any special punishment for the offence of escape. Before the code was adopted, chapter 155 of the Revised Statutes of Canada provided, that whenever a person escaped and was recaptured, or attempted to escape from a penitentiary, his punishment might be, after the term of his present sentence expired, any additional term in the same place of imprisonment. When the code was adopted this Act was repealed, and they omitted to substitute any similar provision in the Criminal Code. I suggest, therefore, that section 955 of the code be amended, and that, as part of subsection 3, the following should be inserted:—

And providing further, that where any one is sentenced for any offence, and is at the date of such sentence serving a term of imprisonment in a penitentiary for any such offence, he may be sentenced for a term shorter than two years' imprisonment in the same penitentiary, such sentence to take effect from the termination of his existing sentence.

I live in the city of Kingston, and I know that there are frequent attempts to escape from the penitentiary there. It was thought to be in the interests of justice that any prisoner attempting to escape, or actually escaping, who is afterwards recaptured, should be tried for that offence. It was considered that the moral effect of trying the prisoner for his attempt would be beneficial. I do not know whether that

Mr. BRITTON.

is beneficial or not; I do not know whether it is worth while to exercise anything more than the prison discipline on such persons, but, at all events, the Government thought proper that such persons should be tried. For escape, the ordinary punishment is less than two or three years' imprisonment, and the law, as it now stands, is, that after trial for attempt to escape, the prisoner, if sentenced to less than two years, must serve out his original term in the penitentiary, and then be sent to a jail to serve his term of less than two years. They have to remain in the penitentiary until their original sentence expires. Then they have to be taken from the penitentiary and brought to the county jail, and maintained there at the expense of the province and the county, mainly the county, to serve the sentence for the attempt to escape. That was never the intention of the law. The Act with respect to escapes specially provides that the sentence shall be a further term in the place from which the escape or the attempt to escape was made. Of course, hon. members know that there is a provision in the Penitentiary Act and in the criminal law for the removal of prisoners from one penitentiary to another, and legislation on that point is not required. But legislation is required to prevent an injustice being done to counties where there are prisons, on the line I have indicated, so that when a judge finds a prisoner guilty of an escape or an attempt to escape, he may sentence him for a further term of imprisonment in the place from which the escape or attempted escape was made. These are the amendments which seem to me to be necessary and well worthy of the time and attention of this House on the present occasion. As to how far the Government will think it proper to adopt these amendments, I have not yet obtained any answer. But I present them to the House, so that hon. members can think them over, and I invite suggestions from the Minister who is leading the House, as to whether he wishes me to move that the House resolve itself into committee, and then let the committee rise and report progress, and sit again, or how he wishes to deal with the Bill, because I have no desire to come to a decision this evening. But in order to put myself in the position I desire, I move that the House resolve itself into committee on the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that my hon. friend has seen fit to move the motion which he has moved to-night, in the absence of the responsible legal adviser of the Crown. I think Bills of this kind to amend the Criminal Code, Bills of the first importance, should be discussed in the presence, under the advice and with the consent of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick). My hon. friend, however, has seen fit, in the absence of almost every member of the Government—all but two—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. five.

Mr. CAMERON. I have only seen three, and not one of them a lawyer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman has moved this motion in the absence of the Solicitor General. I am one of those who as a general rule are opposed to frequent changes in the criminal law, especially in the Criminal Code, which in my judgment has no superior. It is a code which was prepared largely under the advice of the late Minister of Justice, than whom, I am bold to say, there never sat in the Parliament of Canada a more profound criminal lawyer; and I am opposed to changes being made in that Criminal Code, except on the advice of the responsible legal advisers of the Crown. The changes which the hon. gentleman proposes to make by this Bill are of an extremely radical character—changes which I may say at once I am entirely opposed to. The hon. gentleman proposes to repeal section 684, subsection "c" of the Criminal Code. That section provides that in a large class of cases, twelve or thirteen cases, no conviction can be obtained on the unsupported testimony of one witness. Take especially the class of cases which the hon. gentleman proposes to deal with. We all know that the Criminal Code provides for the trial and punishment of a large number of these offences, for instance, seducing a girl under 16 years of age; seducing a female under 21 years of age, under promise of marriage; seducing a ward by a guardian; officers of a vessel seducing female passengers; procuring the defilement of girls; parents and guardians procuring the defilement of their children and wards; landlords permitting their premises to be used for the purposes of prostitution; conspiring to secure the defilement of girls; having carnal connection with idiots; causing the prostitution of Indian women. In the Criminal Code a certain protection is provided for persons who are charged with these offences. Nobody that I know of complains of the law as it stands; that is, that men shall not be convicted of any of these offences on the unsupported testimony of one witness. I never heard a judge or a criminal prosecutor complain of that law. I never heard of any report or petition to this House or to the judges complaining of that provision in the law, which was introduced for wise and benevolent purposes. Everybody who knows anything of practice in the criminal courts knows perfectly well that in the majority of cases—or if not in the majority, at all events in a large number of cases—prosecutions under what is called the Charlton Act and similar laws are instigated not from the best of motives. A great many of these prosecutions are started for the purpose of extorting money, for the purpose of blackmailing, for the purpose of

bleeding; and if you change the law that makes it necessary for two witnesses to the commission of the offence—not two witnesses to the commission of the offence, but one witness, with corroborative evidence—you will open wide the door to crimes worse than those provided for in the Criminal Code—fraud, attempts to extort money, and attempts to blackmail. The Parliament of Canada, for wise and sufficient reasons, in my judgment, cast around innocent men charged with the commission of these crimes, a parliamentary shield, and declared that they should not be convicted on the unsupported testimony of one person. Everybody who has had any practice in the courts knows that these prosecutions are largely instigated and carried on by the female said to have been injured. She lays an information; the man is sent over for trial; he is placed on trial before twelve of his countrymen; the woman goes into the witness box; she tells her story, which is possibly clear and plain enough; the young man may go into the box and deny every word she says; but the chances are ten to one, especially if the girl is a well-developed and good-looking girl, that she gets a conviction. I have been engaged for forty years, both as Crown prosecutor and defender, in scores of these cases, and I think I can honestly say that in my experience, at least 50 per cent of the cases the man was not at fault. And yet you would allow the girl to go into the witness-box—she may be a good girl and may not; she may have been a loose girl, and you know nothing about it, or it may not have been her first offence, and you know nothing about it—but you would allow her to go into the box and tell her story, and the man is convicted, though the chances are ten to one her story is not true. But the law steps in and says wisely, you shall not condemn a man on the unsupported testimony of any one person, man or woman. The law steps in and wisely affords that protection to the innocent. If the offence has been committed, the chances are ten to one there is some corroborative evidence. You need not have the evidence of some one who was actually present and saw the offence committed, but if you have evidence corroborating the probability of the girl's story, that is all that is required, and surely in the interest of the innocent and the guileless, that is all we should require. A man cannot be convicted of forgery upon the unsupported testimony of one witness. A man forges a dollar note, and yet to convict him you must have corroborative evidence. A man is alleged to have had connection with a girl, he may never have had connection with her, but upon her unsupported testimony, under my hon. friend's amendment, he may be convicted although pure and innocent as Joseph was. We know perfectly well how these things often arose. A young man is paying attentions to a young girl. For some

reasons—perhaps good and valid—he abandons his attentions, she gets offended—you know the effect of a woman's scorn, a woman who has been jilted and neglected—she lays an information, has the man put on his trial, and goes into the witness-box, and under my hon. friend's Bill all she requires to establish her own case is her own evidence. I do not think it is desirable to resort to that extreme. I think the law has worked well; I am satisfied it has. I have never, in all the course of my practice, had a complaint against it; I never heard a judge complain against it; I never knew of any petition being presented to change it; I never knew of any remonstrance made to the Minister of Justice to amend the law. And yet my hon. friend, from some reason—it may be my obtuseness, but I have not been able to grapple with his line of argument—comes to the conclusion that the law is no good. In my judgment, Parliament ought not to rescind that law. It is part of our Criminal Code; and until sounder and more cogent reasons than the hon. member has submitted so far are presented to us, we ought not to make that radical change.

By a subsequent section of his Bill, the hon. gentleman proposes to make another amendment. I am not going to deal with all the hon. gentleman's remarks. He dealt with sections he proposes to amend and sections he does not propose to amend. It is sufficient for us to discuss those sections which he proposes to change. As the law now stands, a case may be reserved for the consideration of the Court of Appeal, with the consent in writing of the Attorney General. My hon. friend proposes to do away with the necessity of getting the consent of the Attorney General. I am opposed to that. If the case is a proper one to be argued by a full court, there is no difficulty in the world in getting the consent of the Attorney General. On the other hand, the necessity of getting that consent may, in a great many cases, prevent frivolous appeals, appeals not based on any legal foundation. At all events, it has had that effect, and I think we had better let well enough alone, and not attempt to make an amendment which, in my judgment, is not as good as the law now stands.

But the sting of my hon. friend's Bill is in the third clause. That proposes to amend what is a comparatively new section in our Criminal Code—the section that enables the Minister of Justice, on application for the commutation of the sentence of a convicted person, to grant, if he sees fit, a new trial. I do not think that the grounds on which my hon. friend wants to do away with this section are valid grounds. I do not think his reasons are sound. He says that the Minister of Justice is a politician. Granted; so is every judge almost who is on the bench. But the moment they

come to deal with judicial questions, that moment they assume a judicial attitude, and lay aside their politics. I do not care what Attorney General it is, I would be prepared to trust the strongest Conservative Attorney General that ever sat in the ministerial chair to deal with a purely legal question as I would my own friend, the present Minister of Justice. When they come to deal with questions of that kind, if they are fit for their posts at all, they will consider them solely from a judicial point of view, no matter what their politics may have been or how strong politicians they may have been. The case the hon. gentleman has referred to, so far as my knowledge extends, is the only case in which a Minister of Justice has been called upon to exercise the power vested in him by the Criminal Code. I refer to the Sternaman case. If ever there was a case under the sun that justified a Minister of Justice in exercising the power vested in him by Parliament of ordering a new trial, it was that case. I read every word of the evidence from beginning to end, and I failed to discover, with all due deference to the jury, a particle of proof upon which a jury would be absolutely justified in a conviction. The great point in a criminal prosecution is the motive. Why was the murder committed? People do not commit criminal offences for the fun of the thing. There must be underlying the offence, in every case, a motive. In the Sternaham case, there was not the slightest motive suggested or given in evidence, if my memory serves me right. It was a murder, if a murder at all, without cause and without motive, and yet the jury convicted this unfortunate woman, and she was sentenced to be executed. If it had not been for this, in my judgment, a wise and merciful provision in the Criminal Code, that woman would have expiated her so-called offence on the gallows, or the Minister of Justice might have commuted her sentence. What would that mean? Neither she nor her children nor her children's children would ever escape the stain and stigma that would rest upon her and them, handed down from generation to generation, that she, their mother, was convicted of murdering their father. Here the merciful provision of the code comes in and provides that if the Minister of Justice believes, on examination of all the facts, that there ought to be a new trial, he is at liberty to grant a new trial. The Minister shall exercise his judgment. I think it was in this case a wise exercise of judgment, and whether the Minister were a friend of mine politically or not, I would be prepared to make the same statement. I know not the woman or any of her relatives, but I read every scrap of evidence gathered and submitted. There was some new evidence submitted, it is true. There was an affidavit. My learned friend sug-

gests that it may have been a perjury. We cannot assume that.

Mr. BRITTON. I did not deal with this case at all.

Mr. CAMERON. No, but the hon. gentleman said that there might be affidavits and these affidavits might be false. We cannot assume that the parties who make these affidavits would commit, wilfully, a perjury. This case shows the wisdom of this provision in the law, and to repeal that provision would be to leave the law just as it was before. The unfortunate person convicted, although possibly innocent, would have to suffer the punishment of the law, or if that punishment were commuted, he would have to go through life pardoned, or the sentence commuted, with that stigma and stain resting upon his name, and his children and children's children would have to bear it for all time.

If the Government and Parliament will take my advice, and it is the result of 40 years experience, more or less, in the criminal as well as in the civil courts, they will not touch a single letter that the hon. gentleman seeks to repeal and amend by this Bill. In fact, unless at the instigation of the judges of our courts, who have daily experience of the administration of the criminal law, or at the suggestion of prominent lawyers who are conducting the business of the Crown, I would hardly change a letter in the Criminal Code. There may be here and there a little technicality that does not affect the merits of the Code and does not interfere with the administration of justice, there may be here and there a word which can be replaced to advantage with another word; but do not change this Criminal Code until you find it necessary to do so. And if there is a necessity to do so, let it be done under the responsibility of the Department of Justice. We have the Solicitor General here; let any change be made on his responsibility, and then we shall know exactly what we are doing. Meantime, I say to the Government: Vote against this Bill. And, in order to test the feeling of the House, I move that this Bill be not now referred to the Committee of the Whole House, but that it be referred to the Committee of the Whole House this day six months.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) is possibly not aware that the Bill has been read the second time.

Mr. CAMERON. I know, I did not happen to be here at the time. My motion is that it be not now committed but that it be committed this day six months.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I rise with some trepidation on account of want of legal knowledge attributed to me by the hon. member for Huron. But I had several years experience as Attorney General of my

own province before coming here and have been practising for about twenty-five years in the court. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Cameron) to make a note of that. I think my hon. friend who introduces this Bill will receive the thanks of the Justice Department for the carefully prepared speech he has delivered and the information he has given. With the experience he has known to have had in the courts I am sure that what he has said will receive the most careful consideration, in connection with the Criminal Code and its amendment. I share, but not to the same extent, the objection of by hon. friend (Mr. Cameron) has made to the amendment of the Criminal Code. But I do not entertain the same view that he has expressed as to the Code itself. I think in many respects it is loosely and very badly drawn. I do not know any Act upon our Statute-book that bears evidence of greater carelessness than this. Perhaps I may be held to blame for that. I was one of the members of the Parliament by which this Code was passed. The Act was one of six or seven hundred sections, and the thermometer ranged between 85 and 90 during the time when most of the sections was considered in committee. Several gentlemen sat here, I was almost going to say in their shirt sleeves, discussing it. In point of fact, there were hardly half a dozen members in the House when a large number of these sections went through committee. Still, I have a keen admiration of the Act generally, I think there is a great deal in the hon. gentleman's argument that no hasty changes should be made in the Code as it stands.

Now, I do not wish to refer to the subjects which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) has referred to, but which he has not taken the responsibility of dealing with in his Bill. The hon. gentleman says that amendments can be suggested when we get into committee which he has not put in his Bill. That would be a dangerous course of procedure for this House to follow. I would suggest that if an amendment to the Criminal Code is to be proceeded with, some hon. gentleman should take the responsibility of moving it in the form of a Bill and putting it through its various stages so that it may be properly discussed. The remarks I shall make will be confined to three suggestions covered by the hon. gentleman's Bill. The first relates to section 181 of the Code, which enacts that one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a certain term who seduces a girl between the ages of 14 and 16. The repeal of the wise provision which requires that some corroborative evidence should be given in some material particular is a proposal which, I think will not commend itself to the judgment of the House. I do not know why the hon. gentleman selected that particular section, but I remember very well that for years before this Criminal Code was passed my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)

introduced a Bill containing a clause similar to this, and it was only after a great many years of agitation and argument that he succeeded in inducing the House to accept the principle of his Bill. But when the House reluctantly accepted that principle, they surrounded it and guarded it with this among other precautions to the public, that is that the person accused of the crime should not be incontinently convicted unless there was some corroborative evidence. That was the guard that the House in its wisdom thought fit to throw around the accused. And, for one, unless there is strong evidence that it has worked badly, I would be very loath to remove that protection from the statute-books.

The second suggestion is that in certain cases where there has been a conviction and the courts refuses to reserve a case for the Court of Appeal the party may move the Court of Appeal for leave to have a case reserved. The present law provides that he shall not so move the court where the judge refuses him leave, unless the Attorney General gives his consent in writing. My experience in criminal cases is that it is a very wise provision that, if the judge refuses to appeal or to move for appeal, the party asking for leave shall not have a right to move unless the Attorney General of the province consents in writing to the motion. And the reason is this: We know that in the United States the criminal law has become a perfect farce, in very many cases by reason of the frequent appeals which criminals can take as of right from court to court until, by lapse of time and death of witnesses there is not sufficient evidence to convict the parties. If a man is convicted after fair trial in a British court of justice, and the judge says: Your case is so absolutely clear that I will not reserve a case for the appeal court, if he seeks to appeal, he should get the consent of the Attorney General.

The last suggestion of the hon. gentleman is as to section 748, and provides that the Minister of Justice, if he entertains a doubt whether a person has been improperly convicted of a capital offence may allow a new trial. The only case that has arisen under this section is the Sternaman case. For obvious reasons, I will not discuss that case. It is now sub judice, and I hope that no hon. gentleman will give expression to any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of this woman. She will be tried according to British rules and before a jury of twelve of her peers, before a British judge, and according to the evidence, and I would deprecate any expression of opinion as to her guilt or innocence. But I would say that the suggestion of my hon. friend who moved this Bill that the Minister of Justice may be moved by political considerations is not a very weighty objection. I agree with the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) that the Minister of Justice when exercising the great and grave responsibility which this

section casts upon him very soon sets aside any political considerations. When a matter of life or death hangs upon their judgment or determination, they have the same responsibility as a judge sitting upon the bench. I know, in this case, the Minister of Justice gave the most continued and careful consideration to all the facts before he exercised his judgment. I think the clause sought to be repealed is a good one, because there are cases known to hon. gentlemen frequently, whereby, when convictions are obtained and the death sentence passed, the Crown must either exercise its prerogative and commute a sentence to imprisonment for life or let the death penalty be enforced, and they have no power of determining or sending the case back for a new trial. Now, in a matter of pounds, shillings and pence, where three or four thousand dollars, or any other amount, is at stake, we make provision constantly that there should be new trials, that there shall not be a miscarriage of justice. Look at the case of Mrs. Maybrick in England to-day. There are many people of the highest judicial standing, amongst them the Lord Chief Justice of England, who have avowed their belief in that woman's innocence, but there is no power in the English Act, as there is in our Act, if grave doubts are expressed, as they have been expressed by the Lord Chief Justice, as to the proper conviction of that woman—there is no power to send her back for a new trial, and the Crown is left in this position, that it must either release the woman altogether or let her remain there for life. Therefore, I think we have not had that experience under section 748 of the code, which would justify us, at this stage, in repealing it. I am certain that the one case to which my hon. friend refers, instead of being an argument in his favour, is one very strongly against him. I am glad to see that his main object is established, the laudable one of bringing what he considers to be grave defects in the Criminal Code to the notice of the House of Commons and to the Department of Justice. He does not ask the House to take up any more time than the hon. members who are interested in the Criminal Code think absolutely necessary for its discussion. For my part, if he will accept the suggestion made by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), I think the circumstances of the case will be well met, and I need not say to him, that his remarks and his Bill will have very careful consideration by the Department of Justice.

Mr. BRITTON. I do not think the hon. gentlemen who have spoken have dealt quite fairly with the argument first presented in favour of this clause. Of course, if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries intimates that it cannot go any further, I must accept that intimation. But I must

say to the Minister who is leading the House now—and I see the Minister of Justice is within hearing distance, and will hear what I say—that I have discussed the matter, in part, with the Minister of Justice and expected to discuss the whole question at greater length before the Bill will reach the other House, and I have also discussed it with the Solicitor General. I have brought it up to-night because it seemed to be the only opportunity I would have of getting it considered by the House during this session. I think there certainly ought to be, on the lines I have indicated, some Bill introduced this session to make some changes in the Criminal Code, some change apart from all these that are now before the House in the different Bills that have been introduced. However, I leave it for the Department of Justice to say, whether they are going to present a Bill that will embrace all these matters and cure these defects, during this session. Now, a word or two with reference to my own Bill. I am asked why I selected section 181. I selected it because it is the only section to which the argument applies, for the reasons that I give. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will look at sections 188 and 189, he will see that there is no more reason in the world why there should be any corroborative evidence in regard to that than in regard to any other offence that is committed. These persons who are named in section 189, are persons who cannot give evidence themselves, and therefore, although a man of perfect veracity came forward and swore positively to an offence under this section, under our law as it now stands, the accused could not be convicted unless somebody else swore to the same thing, or could give some corroborative evidence against the accused. There is an absurdity on the face of it, and that has not been dealt with by any hon. gentleman. I do not think this case occurs often, and very likely no great harm will be done by leaving the section unamended. But if such a case should arise in the community, there can be no conviction unless there happen to be two persons to testify to the fact, as the offence cannot be testified to by the person upon whom it is committed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Any material evidence implicating the accused.

Mr. BRITTON. Yes, but it must be material evidence, corroborating the evidence of some one witness. There is no such requirement with regard to nine-tenths of the criminal cases that come before the courts. If, therefore, the person upon whom the offence is committed, cannot be a witness, then, I say, there is no reason why corroboration of an independent witness should be required. But why did I select section 181? Because that refers to the age of unprotected girls. These girls go out from

their home into service, and if the offences are committed at all, they are committed in many cases where, perhaps, there is no doubt whatever about the commission of the offence, but the law cannot be complied with unless there is corroborative evidence implicating the accused. These are the words of the statute that I object to, and it is only as to that class of cases that I am asking to have an amendment made. Section 181 applies simply to a statutory age prescribed; the law prescribes that age. There is a Bill before the House asking that that age be increased. I am not asking for that, but the age is fixed by statute. At that age, girls are sent out from home into the service of strangers, and in an unprotected condition the offence is committed against them. It is not an imaginary case at all; it is a case that has actually arisen, where nobody in court doubted for a moment the statement that was made by the girl, but because there is no corroborative evidence, the guilty person escapes. Now, as to the next section, in regard to appeal, the hon. gentleman has misapprehended it altogether. This section applies to a case where the judge refuses to reserve a case. Before the accused can get his case before the Court of Appeal, as the law now stands, he has got to do two things. First, he has to get the consent, in writing, of the Attorney General; then he has to get leave of the court to appeal. Surely, there is no need for getting the leave of the court to appeal, if he has the consent, in writing, of the Attorney General. Neither is it necessary that he should have the leave of the Attorney General, if he has the leave of the court. As to the other section, nobody is objecting to new trials, but I do object to a Minister of Justice granting new trials. If a new trial is to be granted, let the accused person have a right of appeal; let it be argued in every way before the courts, and let the courts decide whether there shall be an appeal or not.

Under the circumstances, where the matter has not been fully argued and considered, either because it was feebly put or for some other reason, I would be glad if the Bill were allowed to stand. If, however, the Government cannot permit it to go further, I must accept the intimation; but I must say that if the Government do not think proper to take up a Bill remedying defects which it is absolutely necessary should be removed, I must bring in another Bill.

Amendment (Mr. Cameron) six months' hoist, agreed to.

PUNISHMENT OF SEDUCTION AND ABDUCTION.

Mr. CHARLTON moved second reading of Bill (No. 3) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, so as to make more effectual provision for the punishment of seduction and abduc-

tion. He said: I overheard a remark made on this side of the House that this is the old story. It comes from an eminent authority. There is a very old story, and one older than this, concerning doing righteousness and refraining from evil, and the object of this Bill is in line with that old story. The Bill of which I now move the second reading is supplementary to a Bill that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has alluded to, which was under the consideration of the House for two or three sessions before its provisions were accepted, and which after its passage by this House was regularly passed for three or four years before it finally succeeded in securing the sanction of the Senate. That Bill provided that an age of consent should be established by law, and that the seduction of a female of previously chaste character under the age of 16 and above the age of 14 should be a misdemeanour. The law provided that under 14 years the crime should be a felony. That law has been on the Statute-book for many years. The character of the law and its operation are no longer mere theory; but it may be reasonably claimed that the law has proved to be eminently satisfactory, that its working has been satisfactory, and that it is a law which a very small proportion of the people would ask the repeal of at the present time, although it was very bitterly opposed when first introduced and discussed. This Bill proposes in its first section to extend the age of consent from 16 to 18. I imagine there can be no doubt of the truth of the assertion that if it is proper to protect a young girl of the age of 16, it is not improper to protect a young girl up to the age of 18. It will be found on examining the statutes of the various states and countries which have dealt with this question, that in many cases the law throws its shield of protection around the girl up to 18 years. The Bill asks that the protection in this respect should be extended to that age. We had last session a deluge of petitions asking for this amendment to the Criminal Code. These petitions have not been placed before the House to the same extent during the present session, but there were hundreds last year, and the character of the petitions and the sources from which they came clearly proved that the feeling in favour of the age of consent being raised to 18 years is very widespread, if not universal.

The language of the first section of the Bill is as follows:—

1. Section 181 of the Criminal Code, 1892, is hereby amended by substituting the word "eighteen" for the word "sixteen" in the fifth line thereof.

Section 181 of the Criminal Code is as follows:—

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence, and liable to two years' imprisonment who seduces or has illicit connection with any girl of previously chaste character of or above the age of

Mr. CHARLTON.

fourteen years and under the age of sixteen years.

The amendment proposed is to substitute 18 instead of 16. The same provisions in respect to corroborative evidence will apply under the Bill as now apply under the existing law. The principle of the change was accepted last year by the right hon. Premier and it was accepted by the former Premier, Sir John Thompson, if I am not mistaken, and with the sanction of both of these authorities, and with the evidence that so strong a sentiment exists in the country in favour of the change, we may reasonably conclude that the change asked for in this Bill is one that will meet with public approval; and certainly I consider that it will be a change in the public interest, that it will secure in a greater degree the chastity of young females, a matter of very great importance in establishing society upon a safe basis in this or any other country.

The second section of the Bill proposes to amend section 182 of the Criminal Code. That section is as follows:—

Every one above the age of twenty-one years is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment who under promise of marriage seduces and has illicit connection with any unmarried female of previously chaste character and under twenty-one years of age.

The law as it now stands assumes that a male is not responsible for this crime until he is 21 years of age. I propose by this Bill to raise the age of consent to 18 years, from which time a female must care for herself, and it is proposed at the same time to make the male liable for the crime of seduction under promise of marriage from the age of 18 years. I can see no reason why a male should be exempt from accountability and punishment between 18 and 21 years. Certainly he is responsible at 18 years. The Bill, if passed, will change the age of consent by the female from 16 to 18 years, when she must care for herself; and the Bill also asks that the male shall be responsible for the Act declared criminal not from and after 21 years, but from and after the age of 18 years.

The third section of the Bill provides for an amendment to section 283 of the code, and it reads as follows:—

3. Section 283 of the said code is hereby amended by substituting the words "twenty-one" for the word "sixteen" in the fourth and last lines thereof.

Section 283, which we propose to amend, is as follows:—

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to five years' imprisonment who unlawfully takes or causes to be taken any unmarried girl, being under the age of sixteen years, out of the possession and against the will of her father or mother, or of any other person having the lawful care or charge of her.

2. It is immaterial whether the girl is taken with her own consent or at her own suggestion or not.

3. It is immaterial whether or not the offender believed the girl to be of or above the age of sixteen.

This crime of abduction is certainly more serious than the crime of seduction, and the Bill provides that the abduction of a female up to the age of 21 years shall be a misdemeanour, instead of having as at present the age limit of 16 years. These are the three provisions that the Bill contemplates: The raising of the age of consent from 16 to 18 years of age, by which it will be made an indictable offence, a misdemeanour to seduce a girl of previously chaste character, between the ages of 14 or 18. The second provision is, the making of the male responsible for the crime of seduction under promise of marriage from and after the age of 18 years, holding him to be an accountable being from and after the age of 18, instead of the age of 21 years, which is the present limit. The third provision is, to make it a crime to abduct a female under the age of 21 instead of having it as at present under the age of 16. I think all these three provisions are in the interest of law, of morality and of society. The first provision, raising the age of consent to the age of 18 years, has been accepted by the right hon. the Premier last session, and was accepted I believe by Sir John Thompson on a previous occasion. I beg to commend this Bill to the favourable consideration of the House, and I now move its second reading, seconded by Mr. Scriver.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I trust my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) will not press this Bill.

Mr. CAMERON. Hear, hear.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I take it that I have got one very energetic and active supporter at any rate. The reason I submit to the House why this Bill should not be pressed to a conclusion is in the line of the reason I advanced against the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton). The criminal law as it stands in the code was not a hastily devised law; it was a law crystallized into the Statute-book after debates extending, to my own personal knowledge, over eight or ten sessions of Parliament. It was the consensus of opinion of more than one Parliament.

Mr. CHARLTON. Three.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. When we have the consensus of opinion of three Parliaments crystallized in a criminal law, I consider that it is not wise to use a familiar metaphor, to pull it up by the roots to see whether it is growing or not. I think the hon. gentleman would be well advised to leave it alone. Personally I think his Bill went a little further before than it ought to have gone, and I believe his persistency received a reward

which the merits of his argument did not justify. The hon. gentleman now seeks to raise the age of consent from 16 to 18 years, but he has not given us a single argument why that should be done. He has not shown us that the present law worked unjustly; he has not shown us that there is any opinion from the judges, the attorney generals, or the criminal lawyers engaged in carrying out the present law, that it is defective. He has not shown us that there have been petitions from the public that its deficiency is recognized by them.

Mr. CHARLTON. I mentioned that hundreds were received last session.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I did not hear the hon. gentleman say so, and I do not remember the receipt of these petitions. I do not remember them being read in the House and I do not know that any of them came from the part of the Dominion to which I belong.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, from every province in the Dominion.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I am not aware of any prosecution ever having taken place under that section in my part of the country. The second change which the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce is more objectionable still. The law provides now that a man at the age of 21 years, who commits one of these offences shall be liable to punishment criminally, and my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) seeks to make a boy of 18 years, who may not have left school, criminally liable for an offence of this kind. I totally object to that; I think it is a mistake and not a movement in the right direction. You cannot argue these things out logically; there must be an arbitrary age accepted somewhere; you cannot prove to a demonstration that the age of 21 years is the exact age that should be accepted and must logically under all circumstances be the true one, but it is the age generally accepted as the legal age, when a man assumes his full manhood and must be held responsible for all his acts. To say that a boy of 18 years shall be liable to these tremendous punishments is a step in a direction which I for one do not propose to take. The hon. gentleman also proposes in section 283, to substitute 21 years for 16. He wishes to provide that any one who abducts a girl under 21 years, whether, mind you, he has reason to believe she was 23 or 24 years, shall be liable to five years imprisonment. Well, I think that is going a little too far, as I think my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) on reflection will admit. The law now says that it is immaterial whether the girl is taken with her own consent or at her own suggestion or not, and it is further immaterial whether or not the offender believed the girl to be of, or above the age of 16. But my hon. friend wishes to put this age at 21. The offender

may have believed her to be 25, and he may have had every reason to believe her to be of that age, and she may have left the House at her own solicitation, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) says that is no excuse or palliation, and the offender is to be imprisoned for five years in the penitentiary. I submit to my hon. friend that the law is Draconian enough as it is at present; a little more so than I think it ought to be. I protest against this constant tinkering with the criminal law; unless, I grant, that my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) who has given a great deal of consideration to the subject, is able to show that there are facts and circumstances existing in Canada which demand a change in these ages. I frankly confess he has not shown that to my mind, and I think he would be well advised in leaving this matter in the hands of the Minister of Justice, who, I happen to know has been considering many points of this code of late, and will when he has had full time to consider them properly, submit the result of his deliberation to Parliament.

Mr. CHARLTON. I cannot agree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the position he takes with regard to these changes in the criminal law which I propose, being of a drastic character, and not having received due consideration. The hon. gentleman tenders the advice that the Bill should be laid over. Now, Sir, the portion of the Bill with regard to the raising of the age of consent has been frequently discussed in the House of Commons. As I have already said it has been accepted by the Minister of Justice in a previous Administration, and by the Premier of this Dominion last session. This Bill went through its second reading last year and was referred to a committee, and the reason that further action was not taken upon it was due to the fact that the Premier left Canada to attend the Jubilee celebration, and that all legislation was allowed to stand over. Now, the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) says that I would be well advised to leave this matter alone.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I said: To leave it where it is now under the consideration of the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice has not yet had time to give that matter the consideration which it demands, and I believe it is hardly fair to press the matter now until he has had that time.

Mr. CHARLTON. If this Bill goes to the committee and the Bill, or any portion of it, receives the sanction of the committee and the sanction of the House to its third reading, it will then go to the Minister of Justice for his consideration. I do not know that I would press so strongly for the second and third sections as I would for the first. It seems to me that the crime of seduction under promise of

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

marriage is a crime which a person of eighteen years of age ought to know is a crime under the law.

Mr. MONK. I rise to a point of order. I do not know that the hon. gentleman has a right to speak a second time on a motion for the second reading of a Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken, because the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has moved the Order of the Day, and I do not think he has a right to reply without the general consent of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I had one or two reasons to urge, if the House would permit me to do so. But I suppose I cannot trespass on the forbearance of the House, if any hon. gentleman objects.

Mr. REID. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BRITTON. I do not agree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to the reasons why the Criminal Code should not be interfered with. I suppose any one who heard what I said a little while ago would believe that, without my repeating it. But I could give at least twenty instances in which the legislation in the code is of the most slipshod character. I quite understand how that came about, from the hon. gentleman's statement a little while ago, that it went through the committee at railroad speed. But attention can only be called to these matters as they come up, either in actual practice or by a careful study of the code itself. Among other instances, there is no provision in the code at present for collecting an estreated recognisance from a surety in another county, unless by suit on the bond. If there is any legislation of an important character that requires revision, it is the code in very many important particulars. As to the Bill before the House, I do not want it to share the same fate as mine, and if the hon. member for North Norfolk would like to speak, I would move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, when this Bill was before the House, a small deputation waited on the Premier in reference to it, and he expressed himself favourable to the passage of the first section. I think he expressed the same opinion in the House. As to the two other sections, I think he objected seriously to them. I think there is some force in the remark of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the promoter of this Bill should show that the Act as it is at present does not work well. I do not think that he has shown that. I do not know that he has shown that any injury has resulted from leaving the age of consent at sixteen years. I do know that petitions have been sent to this House in favour of raising the age to eighteen years. I have myself seen requests to the effect from

ladies connected with the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. But I think it would be well for the hon. member for North Norfolk to show that the Act as it stands at present does not work well, because no doubt there is great objection to making changes unless they are required.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would not attempt to show that the Act as it stands now does not work well. On the contrary, I would say that it works exceedingly well, so well that it is desirable to extend its provisions and embrace in its operations a larger number of young females. The Act has proved to be beneficent for females between the ages of fourteen and sixteen, and I think it would be just as beneficent for females between the ages of sixteen and eighteen. That is my answer to the hon. member for East Durham.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him, by that method of arithmetical progression, where would he fix the age in the end?

Mr. CHARLTON. I would be content to leave it at eighteen years.

Mr. CRAIG. I wish to say that I do not object to increasing the age to eighteen years. I only say there is a great deal of force in the objection raised by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I am prepared to support the Bill as it stands.

Mr. CHARLTON. Those who support this kind of legislation are almost unanimously in favour of extending the age to eighteen years. We received last year hundreds of petitions, largely from the Women's Christian Temperance Union, from every province and almost from every town and village in the Dominion, asking for the extension of the age of consent from sixteen to eighteen years. In various states, where the law has been called into operation to protect the chastity of young females the age of consent has been fixed at eighteen years. This is the case in the state of New York, with over 6,000,000 inhabitants. That law has been in operation in that state for many years, and has been found to be satisfactory in its operation. If it is necessary to protect young females at all, I can see no reason why that protection should not be extended to females up to the age of eighteen years, as is done by the laws in the state of New York, and in many other states. Of course, that is a matter that has not any particular bearing on this Bill; only it shows that human experience in many states has led to the adoption of this provision. Now, I would be willing, as the hon. member for East Durham suggests, to limit the Bill to the first section. I do not know that I expected to get more, but I did expect to get that; because, as the hon. member says, the Premier of this Dominion intimated to a highly respectable delegation that waited

upon him last year, that he would give his sanction to the provision raising the age of consent to eighteen years, though he did say that he doubted the propriety of granting the other features of the Bill. The same position was taken by Sir John Thompson. If this Bill is permitted to go to the committee, and the first section is, as I believe and hope it will be, sanctioned, and any objection is made to the other two sections, they could be dropped at once. The important feature of the Bill is that raising the age of consent from sixteen to eighteen years—a feature which has been before the House a number of sessions and which received the sanction of Sir John Thompson and, I believe, the sanction of Sir Oliver Mowat. It certainly has received the sanction of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Under the circumstances, I think we may fairly assume that it is proper at least to commit this Bill to the Committee of the Whole and let the committee deal with it. The committee will probably deal with it by expunging all portions except the first section raising the age of consent to eighteen, and then it will pass to the Senate, and the hon. Minister of Justice may deal with it there.

Mr. CAMERON. I think the position of the hon. member for North Norfolk is very unreasonable. He heard the opinion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). He was told by him that the matter was now engaging the attention of the Minister of Justice, and that the Minister of Justice proposed, when he had leisure, to deal with the whole question. Surely my hon. friend cannot want any more. He wants us to take the second reading and go into Committee of the Whole. By doing that, we affirm the principle of the Bill, and I am opposed to it. Surely what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said ought to satisfy any reasonable man and ought to satisfy the hon. member for North Norfolk. I propose to discuss the matter fully, but do not propose to do so now, because I am still in hopes that the hon. member for North Norfolk will adopt the reasonable suggestion made to him.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

FREIGHT RATES ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. REID moved second reading of Bill (No. 7) to regulate freight rates on railways. He said: We all know that in the last few years the building of railways in our great Dominion has considerably increased, and I believe the time has come when we should have some law and rule for adjusting differences that arise between shippers and railway companies more effective than what we have at present. Also in cases where railways discriminate to the injury of different sections of the country and different classes of shippers, we ought to have some means

of adjustment. I have therefore introduced this Bill to meet these conditions, and in that Bill I have embodied a provision for the appointment of a railway commission. I believe that public opinion calls for the establishment of a commission which will have the power to regulate injustices and grievances of the kind I refer to, and I hope therefore that if this Bill should become law the Government will appoint men on this commission well qualified for the positions, who will be able to carry out any and all parts of this Bill, and be competent to remedy any injustice. In the matter of freight rates on railways a great deal of injustice is being done. I shall not refer to many cases, but I see in the Toronto "News" of March 23rd, that the Toronto people are now making serious complaint against the railway companies. Just to show where great wrong exists, let me point out that, according to this list of discriminations published in the "News," the rate from Montreal to Toronto on first-class freight is 42 cents per 100 pounds, while from Toronto to Montreal the rate is 50 cents per 100 pounds. Thus shipping freight west, the rate is 8 cents per 100 pounds less than what it is going east. The same thing applies to freight from Montreal to Guelph, 381 miles, from which the rates is 48 cents, while from Toronto to Upton, 381 miles, the rate is 62 cents. I could give numbers of instances of this kind to show the injustice that is being done in the matter of freight rates. From Morrisburg to Montreal, 92 miles, the rates on milk is 8 cents per four gallons, while from Alexandria to Montreal, 62 miles, the rate is 11 cents for four gallons, or 3 cents more than it is for the longer distance of 92 miles. The object of this Bill is to have all rates fixed on a reasonable and fair basis, and where injustice of this kind is done to refer the matter to the railway commission which will have power to remedy any such grievances. I have also embodied in this Bill a provision to prevent any preference being given to any particular character of freight or any particular locality. We all know that some shippers at one point may be in with a railway company in such a way that he will get a little cheaper freight and thus be able to injure other shippers in that district, either in the purchase of grain or something of that kind. When anything of the sort is done, any shipper injured will have the right to apply to this railway commission and have his grievance investigated.

I also provide by this measure that the rates of freight shall be posted up, so that any person may know what they are. At present you must go to the agent, and it is difficult at times for him to know exactly what the rates are owing to his having not much shipping perhaps at his particular station and consequently not being thoroughly informed. But if the rates are posted up, any shipper can see for himself what they are at any time. Therefore I believe it is in

Mr. REID.

the interests of the public that these rates should be published open to the inspection of the whole public. When a rate is made, it must be published ten days before it goes into force, so that no advantage may be taken of the shippers who are purchasing to ship from that particular point.

I have also embodied a clause to cover cases of accident or injury, which this commission shall also have power to investigate and adjudicate upon. It is a well-known fact that railway companies now take advantage of shippers who are shipping to points where there is no competition. For instance, you can ship from Montreal to Toronto much cheaper than you can ship from Montreal to Cobourg, or from Montreal to Peterborough, or to other points where they have not a competing railway. I have a clause embodied in this Bill according to which a railway may not charge more for the short haul than its rate for the long haul. In other words, whatever rate they might quote from Montreal to Toronto, they could not exceed from Montreal to any intervening point. Then, companies will, at present, carry from Chicago to Montreal for a less rate than they will from Windsor, or London, to Montreal. I do not think that is fair. We now have the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, but it is almost impossible, it would be quite impossible, for that committee to take up all the grievances that exist, and, therefore, I believe it best to appoint a commission that would be engaged almost all the time in looking into these grievances and getting them put right. In the United States they have a law similar to this. It has been in operation for several years, and, so far as I can learn, it has given the very best of satisfaction. In the old country they have a law something similar, or, at least, a law by which grievances can be remedied. Therefore, I think the time has arrived when something of this kind should be brought in in this country. And so I hope that the House will take this Bill seriously into consideration, and, if possible, see that it becomes law during the coming session.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have not been able to go over this Bill very carefully, but I notice that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid) proposes to constitute what he calls an Interprovincial Commerce Commission. He has made some provision in the Bill as to salaries, but I do not observe where the money is to come from that is to pay these gentlemen. Has the hon. gentleman clearly in mind where he gets the money to pay the commission?

Mr. REID. No. They are appointed by the Government as civil servants, and their salaries would be a small item. If this court is going to be in the interest of the public, I certainly think we may leave it to

the Government to provide the \$6,000 to pay them.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am not suggesting that \$6,000 would be an exorbitant sum to pay these gentlemen; but I had some difficulty, in a hasty glance at the Bill, in discovering just where the money was coming from. My hon. friend seems to think that he ought to be able to throw the matter on the generous consideration of the Government, but unless he made some provision in his Bill, the Government itself would not be authorized to pay these officers. And if he put that provision in the Bill to enable the Government to pay, it would, unfortunately, prevent his Bill from being entertained by the House. So, we have a rather awkward dilemma to face. I understand that the hon. gentleman has given a great deal of consideration to this subject, and has matured his views in this form. I would feel, for one, like examining the Bill very carefully. I presume that, before another session of Parliament, the whole subject may receive the consideration of the Government. I hope it will be possible to do that. I apprehend that the hon. gentleman would not think of pressing the Bill further during this session, having opened the discussion and given us the benefit of his views and placed them on record in the form of this Bill. If I am able to give attention to the subject during the recess, I can avail of the suggestions contained in the Bill, and would do so very gladly.

Mr. REID. Under those circumstances, I would move for leave to withdraw the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). As it is now growing late, and we have done a good deal of work, and as I anticipate a rather heavy day to-morrow in the discussion of the Franchise Bill in committee, I would move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 1st April, 1898.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE POST OFFICE ACT.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 110) to amend the Post Office Act.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. It would be interesting if the hon. gentleman would explain what the provisions of this Bill are.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The first clause in the Bill provides that books for the use of the blind shall be entitled to free transmission through the mails. That suggestion has been made to me by Mr. C. F. Fraser, of Halifax, who, I understand, is connected with an institute for the blind, and the subject has also been pressed upon me by Mr. Dymond, who is the superintendent of the Blind Asylum in Brantford. These books are large and bulky and very heavy; the letters being raised so that the unfortunate blind who have lost the priceless treasure of sight may know them by the sense of touch. I have been furnished with a list of these books which are to be found in many libraries now, and I have a statement showing the cost of their transmission through the mails. In some cases the postage alone is equal to the cost of the book in ordinary type. For instance, it would cost to transmit the Bible when prepared for the blind nearly \$4.80. I am sure every member of this House will approve of this suggestion.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Hear, hear.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The next clause provides for the decentralization of the dead letter branch which is now centred at Ottawa. At present if a letter is put in any post office and if the writer omits to stamp it or direct it or otherwise makes it impossible for it to be delivered, it has to be sent to Ottawa to the dead letter office here. The result is often productive of inconvenience and loss to those interested in the letter. For example, a wrongly-directed or unstamped letter dropped into the post office at Victoria would have to be forwarded to Ottawa and delay and loss frequently results. I propose to ask Parliament for permission to decentralize the dead letter office to a certain extent so that this work can be done at other convenient points throughout the Dominion. That is the practice in Great Britain, and it works to advantage there, I understand.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Hear, hear.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Sections 3 and 4 of the Bill have to do with the question of postage. Section 3 proposes a reduction of the letter rate from the present rate of 3 cents to 2 cents. Section 4 proposes a partial restoration of postage upon newspapers. The suggestion in the Bill as to the rate for newspapers is half a cent a pound, to come into force in two instalments; one-quarter of a cent per pound on the 1st of January, 1899, nine months hence; and the other quarter of a cent per pound on the 1st of July, 1899. It was thought advisable to defer the coming into force of this proposition about the reimposition of postage upon newspapers so that those interested in such publications may have opportunity to make such arrangements. In connection with that matter, it is not proposed to absolutely wipe out the free transmission

of newspapers which now prevails all over Canada, but to circumscribe it within ten miles of the point of publication of any newspaper. With regard to the proposition to reduce the rate upon letters, it is not proposed that that shall go into effect at once upon the passing of the Bill, but upon the issue of a proclamation to that effect. The two propositions, to reduce the rate upon letters and to impose a rate upon newspapers hang together a good deal. The question of convenience has to be considered, and whilst I believe that in the near future the expenditure and revenue of the Post Office Department will be at an equilibrium at least; at all events, with the assistance that will be afforded by this measure, yet, of course, that state of affairs is not going to be accomplished before the 1st of July next. I trust that after the clause proposing the reimposition of postage upon newspapers has been fairly in working order, we shall then have the post office a self-sustaining department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is the change on letter postage?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. From the present rate of 3 cents per ounce or fraction of an ounce, to 2 cents per ounce or fraction of an ounce. We substitute two cents for three cents per ounce. The present rate is three cents per ounce; that is, the domestic letter rate within the limits of Canada. While some people may perhaps object to having to pay postage on newspapers—I do not know whether it will fall upon the publishers or upon the subscribers—they will at least have the satisfaction of knowing that if the papers are bearing part or the whole of the cost of their transmission, they will be getting at the same time a much lower letter rate. At this stage it would not perhaps be advisable for me to prolong the explanations, but since my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has asked me to explain the Bill, I will say that the tonnage of newspapers carried free through the Canadian mails, since free transmission has been the law, has grown to enormous proportions, and the system has been, I think, in many respects, considerably abused. In the year 1889 the weight of newspapers carried free through the mails amounted to 9,000,000 odd pounds; in 1891 it went up to 11,000,000 pounds; and in 1897 it had grown to 16,557,490 pounds; and new papers are constantly appearing on the scene, demanding free transmission—papers of more or less importance, and many of them questionable as being newspapers at all, but yet complying with the requirements of the law, and therefore getting free transmission. The cost of the free transmission of newspapers is becoming a very serious matter for the revenues of the country. We have demands now for enormous increases in subsidies to railways, arising out of the tonnage of newspapers that are

Mr. MULOCK.

sent to us for carriage. I have in my hand a schedule showing the quantities of bags which we are called upon to furnish to newspapers from time to time, and I am sure it will be a revelation to the House to be told that two newspapers alone sent a requisition for over 3,000 bags, and another for over 2,000 bags, covering a very limited period of time.

Mr. WALLACE. What do the bags cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The value of a bag is \$1.04½ cents. The 2,500 bags we had to supply to two newspapers a short time ago cost us in cash \$2,612.50; but that is only for a portion of the year. To these same two newspapers a short time before we had to send 3,700 bags, which cost us \$3,886.50. The capacity of each of these bags is eighty-six pounds; so that for these two newspapers alone, we carried free during the short time that these bags were in circulation, 318,200 pounds in the 3,700 bags and 215,000 pounds in the 2,500 bags. For these two newspapers alone, the people of Canada have paid within the last two or three months for carrying over half a million pounds weight, and for handling the papers, and distributing them all over this country. If you go down to the Ottawa post office any morning, you will find our army of letter-carriers engaged in carrying free enormous quantities of newspapers which are published in the city of Montreal, or in the city of Toronto. We have to supply bags for these papers at all points; we have to convey them, or are liable to be called upon to convey them, from the post office to the stations; we pay large sums for railway freight; we have to put on a larger staff than we otherwise would to handle them on the cars and at the points of reception when they arrive; we bring them to the post office; we sort them there; and we have an army of letter-carriers to carry them around and deliver them at the houses of the people—all at the expense of the ratepayers of Canada. All this is going on throughout this whole Dominion at this moment. I think the evil is one that requires a remedy, and therefore I take the liberty of submitting to the House the measure now in your hands. There is one other clause in the Bill, providing that the only examinations to which clerks in the post office shall be subjected for promotion shall be those connected with the work of the office.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am greatly indebted to my hon. friend for the explanation he has given of the character of this Bill. It will greatly facilitate its discussion when we come to the point, to have had this explanation, which will inform both the House and the country of the general features of the measure. I do not propose to detain the House at any length in regard to this matter; but I would draw the attention of my hon. friend at the outset to a conclu-

sion at which I have arrived from the enormously rapid increase in the number of newspapers carried through the mails. How does the hon. gentleman account for that? I attribute it, Sir, to the anxiety of the great mass of the people of this country to obtain information. I regard the publication of newspapers as one of the most potent educational influences that the country possesses. I believe that the fact that Canada can boast to-day of having a better informed population among all classes throughout the country than almost any other country throughout the world, is attributable largely to the eagerness with which they look for the information which can only be conveyed to the great mass of the people by newspapers. I do not want to prejudge this question before we come to consider it on its merits; but I want at the outset to throw out for the consideration of the Government that the fact of this enormous increase in the circulation of the newspapers of the country is one of the most potent reasons why the dissemination of knowledge and information in reference to public questions should not be circumscribed by preventing the publication of these newspapers, if that would be the natural result. Now, Sir, I regard the movement on the part of my hon. friend and on the part of the Government as a great compliment to the position which the Liberal-Conservative party occupy to-day. A few years ago, after one or two years of Liberal administration—almost at the commencement—we had an attempt to suppress the "Hansard." Why? Because it was found that the reporting in the "Hansard" of the discussions which took place on public affairs was so detrimental to the position of the Government that they suppressed its publication, and it was only by compulsion that that suppression was removed and the reporting and publishing of the proceedings of the House was again begun. In the same way I regard this attempt at the suppression of the newspapers, and particularly the suppression of the most influential organs of public opinion, because this is a very partial measure. It strikes at the great newspapers of the country, it strikes the great organs of communication between Parliament and the people. The hon. gentleman is willing that any number of insignificant newspapers, which cannot obtain a circulation outside of ten miles from the place of publication, should go free, because he thinks they will not do any great harm. But what this measure strikes the most potent blow at is the dissemination by the press of the proceedings of this House and the discussions of public affairs. I, therefore, take this measure as an indication that the hon. gentleman wants to limit especially the circulation of the leading organs of public sentiment throughout the country and prevent their reaching the mass of the people. Why? Because he

knows that the discussions of Government measures which took place in this House during the last session of Parliament, and especially during this session, are calculated to be most damaging to the party in power, and wishes to prevent, as much as possible, the reports of these discussions reaching the country. The hon. gentleman is aware of what we all know to be the case, that at this moment the people are, to a large extent, in a condition of revolt against the present Administration. That condition is due to the publication by the newspapers of the transactions of this Government in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, the Drummond Line Railway, and the Yukon Railway, and the discussions thereon. He knows that unless some means can be adopted to prevent the publication of what takes place in this House and its dissemination to the people through the leading journals in the country, which are in a position to do the work, his Government is bound to lose ground every day in public opinion. He therefore asks this House to interpose by an Act of Parliament and cut off communication between the outlying portions of the country and the leading journals of public opinion. The hon. gentlemen pay a poor compliment to the organs of their own party. They, with no unstinted hand, are doing their utmost to sustain hon. gentlemen opposite. But because, with all their efforts, they are unable to maintain the ascendancy of their party, this House is called on to cut off the avenues of communication between this Parliament and those great organs of public sentiment that spread through this country, with all the ability that both parties possess, the facts in relation to public affairs. I look upon the free dissemination of the very class of newspaper which the hon. gentleman proposes to suppress as one of the greatest educational means the country possesses. The very fact that the mails are loaded down, as they are, is evidence of the hunger of the masses for such means of informing their minds and increasing their knowledge of public affairs. I take, therefore, this measure as a great compliment which the Government are paying to the Opposition and to the press that is disseminating throughout the country the discussions that take place in this House and the animadversion of the Opposition upon the conduct and policy of the Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite find these so much to their disadvantage that they wish to suppress these newspapers. I shall not say more at present than express the hope that the hon. gentleman will pause and reconsider his Bill and not seek to prevent the dissemination by the ablest journals in the country, of discussions and facts which are of such great public interest.

Mr. ELLIS. I do not propose to enter upon a discussion of the question as to whether the law should be changed so as to

impose postage on the newspapers or not, but I should like to meet one statement which the hon. Postmaster General has made. He mentioned, in support of his Bill, the cost of the bags furnished the newspapers. Well, that is an arrangement of the Post Office Department itself for the convenience of the post office clerks, because the newspaper publishers might otherwise send their papers in carts or any other form of conveyance and have them dumped right down on the post office floor. It was the Post Office Department itself which proposed, as a matter of convenience, that the newspapers should be put up in bags, which the department furnished, and furthermore, should be put up in bags ready for distribution. Those newspapers that were intended for Toronto were put up in bags labelled Toronto, and those intended for St. John, N.B., were put up in bags labelled N.B., and so on. The system was the result of an arrangement between the Post Office Department and the publishers, and, therefore, the publishers are not in any way at all responsible for the cost of the bags.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that distribution done by the publishers?

Mr. ELLIS. I understand it so. The papers are put up in bags addressed to the different places.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you are helping the post office?

Mr. CLARKE. I would ask the hon. Minister if it is his intention to provide in the Bill now before the House, and which re-imposes the rate on newspapers—that such papers shall be distributed by the letter-carriers in the municipality in which they are published? Or is it intended to continue to charge $\frac{1}{2}$ cent rate?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not proposed to distribute by letter-carriers newspapers in the municipality where they are published. We propose to leave the law as it is in that respect.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not wish to discuss the Bill at its present stage, but I think it would be very much more convenient, when it is brought down, if the hon. gentleman would also bring down a statement of the difference in revenue which he considers the change from three cents to a two-cent rate will cause. The hon. gentleman knows that that has been the stumbling block. More than once a proposition was brought before the House, in one shape or another, to reduce postage on home letters from three to two cents, but the difficulty has always been that the reduction would inflict too great a loss on the revenue. When the United States reduced their postage, they did so on the supposition that the increase in the number of letters would make up for the deficiency in the revenue,

Mr. ELLIS.

and I think the hon. gentleman will find in his own department statements which indicate that that expectation was not carried out, and I think that in discussing this Bill the hon. gentleman should bring down the statement of what he supposes will be the loss or gain. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman believes that the re-imposition of stamps on the newspapers will make up for a great part of the deficiency which will occur from the reduction, but I think that before the Bill can be gone into and discussed intelligently, we should know exactly what the hon. gentleman expects will be the loss or gain by the proposed change.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us that now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will give you my views at a later date.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the hon. gentleman's views that are wanted. He certainly cannot have taken the first step in the consideration of this Bill without making the calculation as to what he would lose by a one-third reduction of the letter postage. He must have that information before him, and it must be information that he could give.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would prefer to discuss that point on second reading of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the hon. gentleman does not wish to give full information. No information he has given, especially that wrong information with regard to the bags, can compare in importance with the information I have asked for, which is the foundation of the whole movement, that is, what the loss will be that will accrue to the country by reducing the letter postage from 3 cents to 2 cents. It is a little more difficult to find out what the gain would be upon the newspapers under the change proposed, though we could make a calculation based upon last year's circulation and tonnage of newspapers. These are not things that require investigation; the Postmaster General must have them before him, he must have them at his finger-ends, for he could not take the first step towards the framing of this Bill without investigating these points. If we are to cogitate over this Bill for a week or so, the information upon such points as these, which is a determining factor in the case, should be given to us also. I would also ask the hon. gentleman if he will have the papers and correspondence asked for with reference to the attempt to lower the foreign newspaper postage, which was granted, I think, some time ago, laid upon the Table. I should like very much to discuss these both at the same time, as they are co-related one with the other. If the hon. gentleman will lay that information on the Table of the House before he moves

the second reading of his Bill, he will facilitate the discussion of it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not aware of the House having passed the order to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) refers. I am aware that there is a motion on the Order paper for such papers.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not passed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not aware of it having passed. I think it is still on the Order paper.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The request was made that it should be allowed to stand.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), as I understood him, said that the House had passed the order. I think he will find himself in error there. If that motion were before the House now, I should be obliged to say to the House that the correspondence between the Home Government and the Canadian Government on this subject is in an incomplete state, because it has to do with approaching negotiations, and at the present time it is of a confidential character.

Mr. FOSTER. I see the motion I referred to has not been passed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I thought not. For the reason I have just given, it would not be proper to lay the correspondence between the Home Government and the Canadian Government before the House. First, we should require the sanction of the home authorities, and, second, even if they were disposed to grant it, there are matters of a confidential character in the correspondence that the hon. gentleman, I am sure, after perusing it, would not think it fair to the country to present to Parliament. With regard to the other information the hon. gentleman desires, I have not lost sight at all of the question as to how the reduction of the letter rate will affect the revenue from postage. But I will say this, that the deficit in the working of the department, at the close of the fiscal year 1896, was nearly \$800,000. I expect that, before this reduction in the letter rate is asked to be brought into effect, that deficit will be wholly, or almost wholly, wiped out. Further, even if a reduction of the letter rate did not cause one single additional letter to be written, the loss to the revenue through the reduction in the letter rate would not cause a deficit equal to that for 1896. So, if the country was able to pay a deficit of nearly \$800,000 a year and have the three-cent postage, it certainly could afford to pay the same with a two-cent rate, but even if the reduced rate does not increase the number of letters, the deficit will not be so great.

Mr. FOSTER. How much would it amount to?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not as much as the figure for 1896.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) means to discuss the financial state of his department at the present moment. It would be very inconvenient to do so. I do not altogether agree with what the hon. gentleman has said, and I think I may point out to the hon. gentleman some other reasons—

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it would be in order for the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) to go on.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I was merely answering the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock).

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) has already spoken.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has spoken three or four times.

Mr. SPEAKER. He (Mr. Mulock) answered a question at some length.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg leave to interpose there, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) did not answer the question, but went on into new matter.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would ask the hon. gentleman as to the Berne Convention—I would not imagine that the hon. gentleman considers that he is giving an answer on that point. It is on the paper, and ought to come up for discussion in its proper place.

Mr. HUGHES. The Postmaster General, in introducing this Bill, gave, as one of his reasons for imposing postage on newspapers, the great cost of railway carriage. Now, I think I am correct in stating—at least, I make the statement subject to correction—that it makes no difference what weight of mail matter is carried under a given contract, but the railways enter into a contract to carry the mail, whatever it may be, for a certain number of years at a fixed rate per year. I would ask if that is not the case?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The rate paid to railways is, from time to time, subject to rearrangement, and I am aware that the railways have demanded a large increase in their remuneration, and I have no doubt that that is partly based on the increased tonnage in consequence of this volume of free mail matter. I may say I received a report from Mr. Sweetnam, the chief inspector, a short time ago, in which he told me that they had been called upon, before I took office, to increase the subsidy of the Grand Trunk for carrying the mail between Toronto and Montreal, being \$25,000 for one car, and he attributes a large part of that increase to the increased volume of mail matter arising from the free transmission of newspapers.

Mr. INGRAM. I would ask the hon. gentleman, if there is not some difference in the rate paid to the Grand Trunk and that paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if so, is that not a cause of complaint on the part of the railway companies now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In 1864 there was a rate fixed, and the Grand Trunk was paid according to that rate. But, from time to time, there have been exceptions and modifications and extra allowances on this road and that, and the Grand Trunk is paid at different rates under different contracts. In one case it is so much per car mile for a baggage-car service; in another place it is so much per postal-car mile; in another case the rate is so much per mile of railway, regardless of service performed. So, there is no fixed rule. But if hon. gentlemen will look at the Estimates, they will observe an item of \$5,000 for the expense of a commission to consider this whole question and endeavour to formulate a scheme upon which payments can be made.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand the hon. Postmaster General to say that he proposed this Bill to reduce the postage on letters from 3 cents to 2 cents, and he hoped to increase the revenue by charging postage upon newspapers. Now, looking at it from the farmer's point of view, I think it is very objectionable, and I hope the hon. gentleman will see fit to withdraw his Bill here and now, for this reason. Ninety per cent of the letters that pass through the mail are written by manufacturers and business men; the average farmer does not send probably more than four letters a year, and the saving to him would be probably about 4 cents. But 90 per cent of the newspapers are supplied to the farmers of this country, so that for the 4 cents he will save on his letters he will pay an additional cost of 25 cents on his weekly or daily newspaper. It looks to me like another blow at the farmer. My hon. friend posed a few years ago as the farmer's friend, the Patron's friend; now he is giving it to him in the neck by adding postage to his newspaper. In my opinion, the farmers will look upon this as one of the most objectionable pieces of legislation that has ever been proposed to this Parliament by any Government.

Mr. CLARKE. Let me ask the Postmaster General if he intends to make any change in the rate on drop letters? Last fall a deputation waited on the Minister in the city of Toronto complaining of the system that obtains there in reference to drop letters; and I understood, having accompanied the deputation, that the Minister promised to take that matter into his consideration. I would like to know if it is the intention of the Postmaster General, in reducing the general rate of postage

Mr. MULOCK.

throughout the Dominion, to reduce the rate for drop letters in the cities from 2 to 1 cent?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no provision in the Bill dealing with drop letters.

Mr. CASEY. I do not intend to discuss the Bill on its first reading, with the imperfect knowledge we can have of it from a verbal statement. But I would like to call the Minister's attention to one or two matters that I have pressed on previous Postmaster Generals, and that I would like to press upon his attention. One of them is a matter which I think would aid him in obtaining the increased revenue which he wishes to get in order to permit a reduction in letter rates. I think a great development could be made in the revenue of the Post Office Department by a system of registration combined with insurance, such as, I understand, is the practice in Great Britain. No doubt, he is better posted as to the practice there than I am; but I understand it is possible in Great Britain to insure parcels and letters transmitted by mail, on a graduated payment. I am sure that if it were possible to send small parcels and money in registered letters by the post office with the same certainty with which they are sent by express companies, for example, a large profit could be made on that line of business. The securities at present given by registration are not sufficient to induce people to send anything very valuable that way, and consequently not much of that kind of business is done. Perhaps the hon. Minister has looked into this matter, if not I would suggest that he look into it as thoroughly as possible before this Bill reaches a subsequent stage, so that we may compare it with the British Bill; and I think he will find he could get a good deal of money out of that. Another point is that the present rate for registration on letters seems to me rather high in comparison with the degree of security afforded. I do not mean to say that there is a great deal of money lost in registered letters, but for all the extra trouble that is taken with them, I think 5 cents is a pretty high fee. It does not bear heavily on the business man who is sending something of moderate value through the mail, but bears very heavily on one large class of people, those who pay a monthly or frequent assessment to benefit societies, that assessment often not being more than a dollar in each case, on which the subscriber has to pay 3 cents postage and 5 cents for registration. It is a pretty large percentage on the amount of his remittance, and if he remits ten or twelve times in the course of a year, it becomes quite a heavy tax upon him. I think there is room for improvement in the direction of reducing the registration fee, and in the direction of instituting an insurance

and registration system such as I have referred to.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL.** In answer to my hon. friend's inquiry, I would say that the subject of insuring letters has received the attention of the department, but at present we do not see our way to suggesting that change. To do so would, in the first place, require the department to equip the cars with burglar-proof safes, which alone would amount to a very large sum. An estimate was made for me of the cost of such equipment, by the president of the Bankers' Association, and my recollection is that according to his estimate such an equipment would involve an expenditure of between one and two million dollars. Therefore, inasmuch as there is, as my hon. friend correctly said, an express company doing that branch of the public service to-day, I have not felt warranted in suggesting it to the House. With regard to the 5-cent registration fee, that was imposed many years ago on the advice of the then Postmaster General, the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart). At that time the House discussed the question as to whether 5 cents was too high, and the majority of the House concurred in the recommendation creating the change, when it went into effect and has continued ever since. I myself have often felt that 5 cents was too high, but I am not yet prepared with any scheme upon the subject. But I would tell my hon. friend that in regard to the class of remittances he alludes to, of a dollar or under, and involving a registration, that objection will be removed on the 1st of July, when the postal note system will go into force, and I think it would not then be necessary for letters to be registered containing anything but postal notes, they being payable to order, and payable at particular places.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER.** Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is leading the House, to a very important question that is now before Parliament; and if necessary, I will conclude with a motion, in order that I may make the few remarks that I desire to make. I refer to the Insolvency Bill introduced by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) in a very able and luminous speech, showing that that hon. gentleman has taken a great deal of trouble to grapple with that important and complicated question. But I wish particularly to draw the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who fortunately, in regard to that question, is at this moment leading the House, to what I regard as

its paramount importance. I know it is a question involving a great diversity of opinion among hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. I have had occasion during a somewhat lengthened residence in England to learn how very important it is to the commercial interests of Canada that some measure of insolvency should be adopted by this Parliament that would relieve the commercial mind of Great Britain and other countries from the impression that they are under great insecurity in trading with this country on account of the risk of being subjected to most unjustifiable and improper loss. I had occasion again and again to listen with great mortification to statements made by commercial men in the great commercial metropolis of the world, pointing out the frightful injustice they had suffered, the losses they had sustained, because a few parties in Canada had obtained their property, and were enabled to divide it among their friends and others in whose hands they wished to place that property, absolutely ignoring all the claim of the persons from whom the property came. I have great reason to know that the effect of that is to place commercial transactions with Canada at a very great disadvantage, and that disadvantage could, I believe, be very easily obviated by a judicious measure in regard to insolvency. I draw the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce especially to this subject at the present moment, because one of the hon. gentleman's colleagues, Mr. Dobell, is not now present in the House or in the country. Mr. Dobell and I attended a very large and important meeting of the British Empire League, presided over by His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, during the time I was recently in London, when Mr. Dobell happened to be there at the same time.

Mr. **SPEAKER.** I suppose, the hon. gentleman means the hon. member for Quebec.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER.** I beg pardon for naming him—I mean the hon. member for Quebec West; but it was in his capacity as Mr. Dobell that he was acting with me on that occasion. At that meeting the hon. gentleman seconded a resolution which was moved by myself, pledging ourselves to press on the Government of Canada the great importance of the introduction and passage of a measure through this Parliament in respect to the question of insolvency; and, having undertaken that duty, and in the absence of the hon. gentleman who acted in London with me at that time, I wish to take this opportunity of redeeming that pledge by pressing on the Government what I regard as the great importance of this measure, a measure that hon. gentlemen know perfectly well, however ably it may be handled by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), and notwithstanding the great time and care he has bestowed on the subject, it is impossible to hope can pass

this House in the hands of a private member during the present session. I, therefore, rise for the purpose of pressing on hon. gentlemen what I regard as a duty we owe to the House and the country, to place that measure, so ably introduced by the hon. member for Laval, upon Government Orders on the Order paper, and take the responsibility of affording it an opportunity of receiving that full and complete consideration at the hands of the House that otherwise hon. gentlemen opposite know perfectly well it cannot hope to receive when in the hands of a private member. I think that too much importance cannot be attached to this subject. I believe hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, diverse as their opinions may be, entertaining, as they no doubt do, different opinions, as do hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—I believe both sides of the House would be disposed to approach this subject with a sincere desire to see if some practicable measure may be arrived at and adopted which will place the commercial position of Canada in respect to its trading with other countries on a greatly improved footing, as compared with that which it occupies today. I do not wish to detain the House, but I take this opportunity of pressing on the Minister of Trade and Commerce and his colleagues the great importance attaching to the measure, and that the Government should adopt the only means by which a full discussion may be had, and sincere efforts made to reach a measure that will prove greatly to the advantage of this country and redound, I think, to the credit of this Parliament. I am quite aware that the right hon. First Minister, when he spoke on this subject at the time the Bill was introduced, referred to the fact that the insolvency measure that passed this House was introduced by a private member. That is quite true; but it is also quite true that the private member, Mr. Abbott, afterwards Sir John Abbott, was a gentleman recognized on both sides of the House as perhaps better able to deal with that question than any other hon. gentleman on either side of the House. I conclude by expressing the hope that this measure, to which too much importance cannot be attached, will receive full consideration at the hands of the Government.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am not at all disposed to underestimate the importance of passing such a measure as is proposed. But the hon. gentleman and I know that, of all the questions which can be discussed in this House, the question of insolvency is the one on which hon. gentlemen of the legal profession and other hon. members are most divided in opinion; and he knows also this, that it is of very great importance, if we are to have an insolvency law over the whole Dominion, that

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

it should be most fully and carefully considered. At the present time, the hon. member who has taken charge of it, and who, I believe, stands in the very foremost rank in his profession in the province of Quebec, has done a great public service in bringing the matter to the attention of the House and the public. But I am afraid I cannot go the length of promising that the Government will take this Bill under their charge as a public measure. Had it been possible for them to have done so, they would have done it in the first instance. Moreover, although it is perfectly true that very considerable abuses in the administration of the law regarding insolvency, or regarding the distribution of assets, in certain of the provinces, have been reported, I am given to understand that the worst of those cases, at all events, is now being remedied. In the various deputations which have waited on the Government on this most important question, so far as I can recollect, it was admitted that the laws in the principal provinces, namely, in the province of Ontario, and in the province of Quebec, where, on the whole, fair and reasonable, particularly in the province of Quebec; and the hon. gentleman probably knows that was true, though perhaps not to the same extent, as regards Ontario. The province in regard to which most objection was taken was the province of Nova Scotia, and I am informed by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) that at the present moment an Act has been passed by the legislature of Nova Scotia, or is in the process of being passed, which, it is believed, will largely remove the abuses that have prevailed in the administration of the law there. All I can say is, that we desire, as much as the hon. gentleman can desire, that the insolvency laws of the various provinces should be such as to afford full redress to all creditors, whether they be English or Canadian, or the people of any other nationality; but we do not think that it is in our power, particularly at this stage of the session, to undertake to press this as a Government measure.

Mr. FLINT. From the remarks made by the right hon. Premier, when the Bill was introduced, we were encouraged to believe it was possible that the Government might at a later stage move to place the Bill on Government Orders. I am sufficiently in the confidence of my hon. friend (Mr. Fortin) to say that when the Bill comes before the House he will ask for a special committee to consider the phases of this Bill, and thus have it submitted to Parliament with the endorsement of the members from both sides of the House who will form that committee. This, together with the friendly action of the Administration, will give the Bill a standing which I trust may lead to its being passed before the close of the session. There can

be no doubt as to the strength of the argument offered by the leader of the Opposition on behalf of the adoption of a reasonable insolvency measure, because we know that the credit of individuals or the credit of the country is likely to suffer from the want of a uniform insolvency law. I trust that at a later stage the House may feel in a mood to take this question up on a non-partisan basis, and to put it through as a commercial measure. There is no doubt of the great importance of this Bill, and from what I have heard from my colleagues in this House I believe there is a strong disposition in favour of some measure of this kind.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). In reply to the question put to me by the hon. leader of the Opposition yesterday, I will state that I propose to give notice that when the House adjourns on Wednesday night it stands adjourned until Tuesday.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Wednesday night at 6 o'clock ?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Well, no ; whenever the House adjourns on Wednesday.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. **OLIVER**. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw attention to something which I see in "Hansard" of March 30th. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), speaking on that occasion, says :

Now, my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), when he made his maiden speech in this House, referred to the promises that had been made by the Liberal party. I have here the words of his speech, which will be found in "Hansard" in the debate on the Address. He, relying on such promises, did not think it necessary to support my contention in regard to implements, because he said :

If it is the intention of the Government to place agricultural implements on the free list and to meet the desire of the farmers of the North-west Territories, and carry out the promises made by the Liberal candidates, and by the supporters of the Liberal candidates in the North-west Territories, why delay it ? Can any reason be given for delaying ?

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I did say on that occasion, as reported in "Hansard," is as follows :—

Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), and I will tell the House, that there is no feeling of disappointment in the constituency that I represent, at any rate—and it contains a great many more votes than the constituency of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) represents—there is no feeling of disappointment at the Address which has been delivered from the

Throne. The election which was carried in my constituency for the Government was not carried by any promises made by the leader of this Government in regard to a reduction of the duty on agricultural implements.

I called the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) to the fact that he attributed to me words and sentiments which I had not used, which were not reported in "Hansard," and which evidently were the words and sentiments of some one else. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) instead of making the matter right at the time, threw out an insinuation that I find further on in his speech, to the effect that I had not stated a fact. It is only fair to myself that I should make this explanation.

Mr. **DAVIN**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) is quite mistaken in saying that I suggested he did not state a fact. What I did do was to send at once to the Library for the "Hansard" in order to see what he said, and I told my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) afterwards, that I quoted from the Medicine Hat "News" which attributed these words to my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver). I probably ought to have verified whether the Medicine Hat "News" had quoted him as he is reported in "Hansard," and I now find on referring to "Hansard," that my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) is quite right and that the Medicine Hat "News" did not represent him correctly. But, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) is quite mistaken in supposing that I suggested he in any way varied from the fact ; on the contrary, I sent at once for "Hansard," and if we had spoken longer than 6 o'clock I would have set the matter right, as I intend to do when the subject comes next before the House.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Hear, hear.

Mr. **OLIVER**. Mr. Speaker, may I quote from "Hansard" what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) said ?

Mr. **SPEAKER**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) having made his personal explanation, it seems to me he stands in a very good position now.

THE FRANCHISE ACT

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. **KAULBACH**. For the want of a certain newspaper which I was unable to obtain before the second reading of this Bill, but which I obtained since, I will ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I offer some few words of comment.

To my mind this Bill is a very important one, not that it purports much good, but on the contrary it is liable to much evil, and

therefore I beg to state that whilst I object to the Dominion Franchise Act of 1885, owing to its being cumbersome and expensive in its operation, still I consider we are not in any sense improving our condition by the present intended enactment, inasmuch as we are not placing ourselves in that independent and dignified position we are entitled to possess, neither are we placing ourselves in the position we justly merit—the principles of the Bill being unwise from the fact of its intending to have our rights of franchise surrendered to the dictates of the respective provinces of this Dominion, as subordinate bodies, they to determine the description of franchise best suited for us, which to my mind is so unnatural. Besides one province adopting universal suffrage, another manhood suffrage, another open voting, and another a something else, to say nothing of the iniquity liable to be practiced in the preparation of the voters' list appears to me to be lacking uniformity, is impracticable and unjust.

Permit me to state that were the Government to submit a Bill allowing us a franchise that is uniform from the Atlantic to the Pacific, on a broad national basis; strong with federal and national sentiment, that would be giving the greatest benefit to the greatest numbers, and giving at the same time the least expense to the people, it would meet as I verily believe with the approval of both sides of this House, as it would be within our control, and would be acceptable to the people of the Dominion.

The present franchise of Nova Scotia is not satisfactory, as corruption can be practiced by assessors, and revisers, and in the making up of the voters' lists, the lists being in writing can be interfered with very considerable, of which we have had the practical proof time and again in the past recent elections, and not only in the making up of the voters' lists, but in the manipulation of ballots, and that by officers of the Crown supposed to be free from guile.

To give an example of how corruption is sometimes carried along by unscrupulous partisans in the shape of officials, I would state that we have a certain functionary in the county I have the honour to represent who possesses the happy faculty of electing or rejecting a candidate as his own sweet will may dictate. This was clearly shown in the last provincial election in Lunenburg county, N.S., in April last, when a Cabinet Minister, C. E. Church, in the Nova Scotia Government was defeated at the polls, his opponent, Mr. A. J. Wolff, a Liberal-Conservative, having had a majority over him of 17 votes, and another Liberal-Conservative, Mr. Emmanuel Hebb, a majority over him of 8 votes, but by the action of the sheriff the Cabinet Minister was returned although having the smallest number of votes at the poll, he being at the foot of the list, and nevertheless to the surprise of every one, even his own party,

Mr. KAULBACH.

this very man Church occupies the important position of Commissioner of Mines for Nova Scotia at this moment, without his having the voice, nor being the choice of the people of that county.

To give the idea more clearly to the House I will read, by permission, an account of the procedure, or an extract that appeared in the "Bulletin" newspaper:

THE RECOUNT ATROCITY.

Lunenburg county's majority for Wolff is 17. Sheriff Creighton's majority for C. E. Church is 2.

Majorities by electors count for nothing nowadays, and it is a wonder the Grit machine did not procure Church a larger majority.

When the result of the election became known, the Grits said the whole thing would be fixed by a recount. Mr. Church himself plainly stated at the dinner table in a Bridgewater hotel that a recount would make him all right.

They have had a farcial apology for a recount, and, as predicted, Church was "counted in."

People of Lunenburg county, calmly consider this matter and judge for yourselves. Over 2,500 electors of this county have been robbed of their votes and their legitimate representative, for so surely as the sun shines above us, through some atrocious rascality, A. J. Wolff has been shamefully cheated out of his seat in the House of Assembly.

Here are the facts, briefly: A. J. Wolff received 17 votes more than C. E. Church. The Grits endeavoured, in the first place, to get Sheriff Creighton to declare Church elected without counting eight ballot boxes, because the poll-books were not tied on the outside of said boxes. The Conservative solicitors prevented this injustice. Then the Grits demanded a recount, and on this they vauntingly relied on electing Church. Now, no one can foretell the result of an honest recount of ballots. It is a game where one candidate has about the same chances as the other, with, perhaps, the odds in favour of the opposition man, because presiding officers at the time of election are supposed to be government partisans. The recount came off, and we are within bounds in stating that the proceedings were a travesty on an honest semi-judicial inquiry, their history would bring the blush of shame to the cheek of a Tammany Hall manipulator. The sheriff's friends may endeavour to excuse him by pleading ignorance on his part, and in a great measure we agree with the plea; but to say he was partisan in his rulings would be to faintly express the popular opinion. He was not even civil to Conservative counsel. On one occasion he told one of the lawyers representing the Conservative candidates to "shut up," at which the other Conservative lawyer sarcastically remarked, "Yes, you are only a Tory." Precedents was something Sheriff Creighton had no respect for. He would make a ruling at one time, and then at another, when it was likely to favour Mr. Church, he would disregard his previous ruling and do the reverse. He admitted ballots for Mr. Church which in all fairness and justice should have been thrown out. He threw out ballots for Mr. Wolff which, according to law, should have been counted. He threw out a ballot for Wolff which he himself received and counted whilst acting in the capacity of presiding officer at the court-house, Lunenburg. Then again, a number of ballots crossed for Hebb and Wolff were spoiled by a cross placed opposite the name of Church, and partly obliterated with

a finger or thumb. (See sample in another column.) These "thumbed" ballots were a frequent occurrence, and the subject of much serious argument, and were vehemently declared by the Conservative counsel to be "cooked" ballots. Many other instances of unjust rulings and manifestly unfair actions on the part of the sheriff and his Grit legal advisers could be cited, but we think we have given the public enough for them to conclude that A. J. Wolff has been juggled out of his seat.

We ask, is it reasonable that in nearly every district Wolff should lose and Church should gain? We are of firm opinion that if Wolff's majority had been 30 he would not have got his seat in the House.

Electors of Lunenburg county, remember this outrage. Remember how you have been deprived of your votes and representative. Remember that now-a-days the only way to win an election is to roll up at least 100 majority for a Conservative candidate. Store these injustices in your memory, and when the time arrives give voice to your indignation by snowing under these election manipulators and unmanly opponents.

I will also read an episode on the same subject which will probably interest hon. gentlemen as well as be a source of amusement:

THE SPOILING OF THE EGYPTIANS.

In a certain land were two Sunday school superintendents, and the name of the one was Trusty Samuel, and the name of the other was Holy Tom.

Now these two men were lawyers, exceeding righteous above all other lawyers that dwelt in that land.

Now there was an election in that land, and afterwards a recount, and the two superintendents watched over the same after the inner ring, called Tammany, had put in their work.

Now before the commencement of the recount the one superintendent cocked his eye at the other and said, "Let us 'prey'."

And, lo, they both "preyed" earnestly for the space of three days, even from the sitting of the court unto the rising thereof.

Now Joseph was the ruler, or judge, of said court.

And it came to pass that as they "preyed," behold, the 17 majority of the man called Wolff gradually disappeared like unto the early cloud and the morning dew. And at this Joseph winked, and was exceeding glad.

And, behold, the 17 minority of the man called Church also died away, and lo, in the stead thereof a majority of 2 arose from the depths of the ballot boxes.

But the figures of "Manny" and the man called "John" changed not. And thus they spoiled the Egyptians.

And one of the Egyptians said unto Joseph, "Show us the riddle, we pray thee, and the interpretation thereof."

And Joseph smote his beard, and spat thrice upon the ground, and answered, "Ye are exceeding fresh. Behold those ballot boxes and the keys, and the remains of the seals thereof. Here are the keys, but the seals, do they last for ever?" And he winked at the two Sunday school superintendents, and the elder thereof snuffed and cocked his eye at the younger.

"Behold, I show you a mystery. Didst thou not see the many ballots of the man called Wolff, which were daubed over even as with the thumb of a man's right hand? Lo, those ballots

availed Wolff as naught, and I cast them aside as the chaff for the burning. Behold, I am judge of all this land from Vogler's Cove even unto Hubbard's Cove, and from the great sea even unto Queen's.

And the Egyptian answered and said unto Joseph, "Who daubed those ballots of the man called Wolff, and why were there not any ballots of the man called Church daubed withal?"

But Joseph spat upon the ground, and answered him never a word.

And the Egyptian said unto Joseph, "Tell thy servant, I pray thee, what was the matter with the ballot of the man called Wolff, which thou and thy prophet Samuel pronounced all very good on election day and which thou didst reject in the recount? Tell thy servant, also, what became of the two ballots of the man called Wolff from the Cove called Mader's, and whence came the stray ballot for the man called Church into the box for Lily Dale?"

But Joseph stroked his beard, and answered him never a word.

And the Egyptian said unto Joseph, "What became of all the plumpers from Petite Rivière, the place of the man called John? Thy servant cannot understand this mighty change. Was it wrought by thine own great hand?"

And Joseph answered and said unto the Egyptian, "What dost thou take me for? Thinkest thou that 17 is too great a number for the judge of all this land to monkey withal? Perchance I could monkey with 50."

And the Egyptian said unto Joseph, "Where did my lord have the ballot boxes stored after the election and before the recount, and what guard did my lord have placed over the same?"

Now at this Joseph waxed exceeding wroth, and smote his beard, and spat upon the ground and said, "Go to, ask the Sunday school superintendents."

So now the Egyptian went and sought the Sunday school superintendents, and when he found them, lo, they were in the office of an ungodly Grit lawyer in the town which is called Lunenburg, and, behold, the two Sunday school superintendents were expounding the school lessons for the next Sabbath day to the members of the inner ring called Tammany.

Now this is the material in the shape of an official this county (Lunenburg) had to tolerate at the time of an election, and although obnoxious to the people, and the government are aware of it, still he is kept in office whilst honest and honourable officials without cause, except exercising the right of franchise, without taking an active part politically, have been removed from office without a hearing or cause assigned. A more diabolical act on the part of an official could not well be thought of, and if he is capable of the iniquitous act as alleged against him, as shown by this newspaper, other papers, disporting in the same way, he is equally capable of repeating such acts, perhaps something worse at any time opportunity offers and giving the lie to cover up his guilt. Where is our Minister of Justice that this matter is not investigated? On the principle that "cheating never prospers" it is to be hoped his sins some day may find him out.

An official of this sort although a convenience to a party, is at the same time

hateful to the better thinking people, and I must say in all sincerity it is not honest to the electorate of the county or any country that they should be compelled to suffer such infamous procedure on the part of an official and have it receive no recognition.

I consider when an honest elector goes to the poll to deliver his vote, he should have confidence in all officials handling the ballots, and particularly the sheriff having the custody of the boxes, that his vote would be counted as legitimate and not tampered with or his ballot manipulated in any way, but that his vote would count in the recapitulation sheet when summing up the totals.

I would, therefore, as a remedy to avoid this evil recommend manhood suffrage, which I might say is practically that now, and open voting, as the present system of voting by ballot is mean and contemptible, and opens the door to all sorts of fraud, and not only that but it encourages in cases false swearing, whilst open voting is simple in its operation, the least expensive and least liable to complications.

Mr. MILLS. Before you go into committee on this Bill, I wish to make a few remarks respecting clauses Nos. 4 and 5. Clause No. 4 reads :

The Electoral Franchise Act, being chapter five of the Revised Statutes, and all Acts amending it, are hereby repealed.

The next clause provides :

For the purposes of any Dominion election held within the limits of a province, except as hereinafter or otherwise provided,—

(a.) The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote thereat shall be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

That is the clause that I have particular objection to, and I think that the Government should give this House some assurance that that portion of the Bill will be remedied, even before we go into committee. The other evening, the hon. Finance Minister brought to the notice of the House the Act of 1882, and that there was no law passed by the legislature of Nova Scotia prohibiting or disqualifying an elector from voting in the Dominion elections. On the spur of the moment, I replied that that was true, and to a certain extent it is. There was no actual law passed by the province of Nova Scotia disqualifying an elector from voting in the Dominion elections, but it is also true that the very same party machine who placed that obnoxious Act upon the local statutes of Nova Scotia put an Act upon the statutes of this Parliament providing that the same law shall affect electors in Nova Scotia voting for members to be returned to this Parliament. In order to place the matter thoroughly and clearly before the House, as I do not think it has yet been

Mr. KAULBACH.

done, I shall commence from the beginning and show the House very concisely and exactly what has been done. In the first place, the British North America Act was passed in 1867 by this House. Section 41 of that Act provides :

The qualifications and disqualifications in the provinces shall govern the election of members to serve in the House of Commons until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides.

Afterwards, in 1871, assented to April 4th, 1871, an Act was passed by the province of Nova Scotia to secure the independence of the House of Assembly of that province. That Act I read the other evening, and that is the obnoxious Act, that is the Act that disqualifies Dominion officials, particularly the employees of the Intercolonial, from voting for members of the House of Assembly in the province of Nova Scotia. That was the Act passed by the Nova Scotia Government at that time, and by which they determined to wipe out from the legislature of Nova Scotia and from Nova Scotia itself anything and everything that had the smell of Canada about it. I am now quoting from memory from the remarks of the Attorney General of that date when he introduced that Bill. On the 14th April, 1871, immediately following the passing of this obnoxious Act of Nova Scotia, there was enacted by the Dominion Parliament a Bill called the Interim Parliamentary Election Act of 1871, which was put in force for two years only, as shown by section 1. I will quote the section itself. It was evidently aimed to operate against the obnoxious Act passed in Nova Scotia that very month.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is the date of it ?

Mr. MILLS. It was assented to on the 14th April, 1871, and the Act is entitled "An Act to make temporary provision for the election of members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada." And the first section of that says :

This Act shall be in force during two years from the time of the passage thereof and no longer, and may be cited as the Interim Parliamentary Elections Act, 1871.

Section 4 of that Act reads :

All persons nominated as revisers, under chap. 28 of the Acts of the Legislature of Nova Scotia passed in the year 1863, entitled "An Act to regulate the elections of members to serve in the General Assembly," shall, in the present year, 1871, in three months after the passing of this Act, and at any future year, at the time of their preparing the annual list of electors qualified to vote at elections of members of the General Assembly, prepare also and file with the clerk of the peace, a like alphabetical list of electors qualified to vote at elections of members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada, by adding to the list of voters for members of the General Assembly the names of all officials and employees of the Dominion Government qualified

to vote at elections of members of the General Assembly under the laws in force in Nova Scotia on the first day of July, 1867, but who may have been disqualified by any Act of the legislature of that province passed after the said day. The lists first made shall form the register of electors of members of the House of Commons until the next year's list shall be made and perfected, and the provisions of sections 25, 26 and 27, respectively, of the said chapter shall be held applicable to such future lists. For any neglect or wilful breach of duty under this section, the revisers shall be subject to the like penalties prescribed in section 24 of the said chapter.

That was passed by this Parliament the very month that the obnoxious Act was passed in Nova Scotia. Understand, it was only to be in force for two years, being a temporary Act. On the 23rd May, 1873, there was another Act passed by this House. That Act is entitled "An Act to make temporary provision for the election of members to serve in the House of Commons." The first section of the Act provides :

This law shall be in force during one year from the time of the passing thereof, and from then until the end of the next session, and no longer.

Section 10 of that Act re-enacts the provision made in 1871. There is no necessity to read it. This Act was assented to on the 23rd May, 1873. On the 23rd November, 1873, the Government of Alexander Mackenzie took the reins of power, and on the 22nd January, 1874, the elections took place. The next legislation with reference to this matter took place in 1874 in this Parliament. This Act is entitled "An Act respecting the election of members of the House of Commons." Section 40 of that Act reads as follows :—

Subject to the exceptions herein above contained, all persons qualified to vote at the election of representatives of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly of the several provinces composing the Dominion of Canada, and no others, shall be entitled to vote at the election of members of the House of Commons of Canada for the several electoral districts comprised within such provinces respectively, and all lists of voters made and prepared, and which would, according to the laws in force in the said several provinces, be used if the election were that of a representative or representatives to the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly of the province in which the election is held (where such lists are required to be made), shall be the lists of voters which shall be used at the elections of members of the House of Commons to be held under the provisions of this Act.

In other words, it does not bring into voting power the Dominion officials as the Act of 1873 did, but goes back to the oldest disqualification Act of 1871. Section 43 of the Act also provides for the disqualifying Act I have mentioned in the obnoxious Act of Nova Scotia of 1871 :

Each elector being introduced, one at a time for each compartment, into the room where the

poll is held, shall declare his name, surname and addition, which shall be entered or recorded in the voters' list to be kept for that purpose by the poll clerk, and if the same be found on the list of electors for the polling district of such polling station, he shall receive from the deputy returning officer a ballot paper, on which such deputy returning officer shall have previously put his initials, and an envelope.

Provided that such elector, if required by the deputy returning officer, the poll clerk, one of the candidates or one of their agents, or by an elector present, shall, before receiving his ballot paper and envelope, take the oaths or oath of qualification required by the laws in force in the province where the election is held, from a voter at the election of a member of the House of Assembly of that province, the words "House of Commons of Canada" being in such case substituted for "House of Assembly" or such other change being made to make the oath applicable to the election of a member of the House of Commons of Canada, and which the deputy returning officer or poll clerk is hereby authorized to administer.

The effect of that is to incorporate into the statutes of Canada, in the Dominion Election Act of 1874, the obnoxious Act of Nova Scotia in 1871, disqualifying Dominion officials and railway employees from voting for members to be returned to this Parliament.

Now, the Finance Minister asks : Why, then, was this Act passed, referring to the Act of 1882 ? There was very good reason why it should be passed. On the spur of the moment I gave the reason which was then uppermost in the minds of everybody—the manner in which the revisers had used the lists and left off these names from the lists in Nova Scotia. But there was another reason, and that was this obnoxious Act was on the Dominion Statute-book that it was legal to prevent the railway employees and Dominion officials from voting in elections for members to be returned to this House.

Now, the next legislation which occurs is the Act of 1878, which is entitled "An Act further securing the independence of Parliament." That Act does not do away with that obnoxious disqualification, but it further endorses it, and further engrafts it into the election law of this Parliament. I refer to section 5, which I will not read, because it simply re-enacts the provisions that I have just read. The very party machine that had caused the Act to be put in the Statute-book of Nova Scotia, caused it to be engrafted into an Act of this Parliament, and made it the law of this Parliament. Therefore, there was every reason why, when a Conservative Government came into power, they should immediately pass the Act of 1882. The next Act is that of 1882, which I shall refer to. This Act is entitled "An Act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, and for other purposes." That Act was passed by the Conservative Government in 1882. The Bill was introduced into this House, as I find by referring to the Debates of that time, with-

out any reference to this obnoxious Act disqualifying Dominion officials in Nova Scotia from not only voting at local elections in that province, but also from voting at Dominion elections in Nova Scotia. But when it went to the Senate, the Senate asserted itself—which it frequently does, I am glad to say—they saw an evil was being done in Nova Scotia, and they determined to have it remedied. So, when the Bill came back to the Commons, it came with certain amendments having reference to the province of Ontario, and one amendment having reference to the province of Nova Scotia. That amendment I will now read to the House :

Notwithstanding anything in any law of the province of Nova Scotia, or of the Dominion of Canada, no employee on the Intercolonial Railway in that province shall be disqualified to vote as an elector at any future election of a member or members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada, if he shall have the necessary property and other qualifications therefor required by law. In the event of the name of any such elector, being an employee on the Intercolonial Railway, having been omitted by the revisers from the list of qualified voters for a member of the General Assembly of Nova Scotia under the laws in force in that province or to be returned to the county clerks or clerks of the peace, or omitted from the lists of voters deposited by the sheriff with the county clerk or clerks of the peace, or obtained by the returning officer or furnished to the deputy returning officer, it shall be lawful for such employee to vote as an elector at any future election of a member or members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada, on his taking or offering to take before the sheriff or returning officer the following oath, viz. :—

I (A.B.) do swear that I am legally qualified to vote at this election, and I verily believe that my name was omitted from the list of electors by reason of my being an employee of the Dominion Government on the Intercolonial Railway at the time such list was last perfected, and for no other reason.

So, the obnoxious Act was repealed by that Act, and at the same time the iniquities of the revising officers in the different districts in Nova Scotia were provided against. It was a fact that the revisers left these men off the list when they had a perfect right to go on the list ; and then others were met by the disqualifying oath, when they came to vote. But they did actually leave them off the list, simply because the party heelers told them it was the law, that they had no vote, and what was the good of putting these men upon the list. So that the Act of 1882 was passed, not only for the purpose of righting those wrongs which were done under semblance of law, but at the same time it was passed to repeal an obnoxious Act which was upon the Dominion Statute-book. That amendment was supported in this House by the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), and was spoken to in the Senate by the present Senator for Colchester, Mr. McKay, and it was advocated by both these gentlemen. The present leader of the Opposition, at that

time, in advocating that amendment, did so with a speech, the gist of which I will give :

All this amendment does is to enable those who pay the amount of taxation the law requires, and whose names have been left off the electoral lists in consequence of the local Act of 1871, to exercise the franchise upon being prepared to take an oath that they have been omitted from the list in consequence of the disqualifying Acts of 1871.

The Debates show exactly what they wanted to do. The very same party machine that did not wish that even the smell of Canada should be upon the electoral lists of Nova Scotia, the same party machine that placed that law upon the books of Nova Scotia, placed that law upon the books of this Parliament. Now, we want to know whether the same party machine, which has exponents even in this House, are going to do the same thing with reference to this Bill, because this Bill has a clause which provides for the very same iniquity. I do not care whether these Dominion officials are to be ruled by the men who are their masters now in Nova Scotia, or not, but they are free men, they are men who are as well qualified to vote as the ablest man in Nova Scotia, and being to-day qualified, having the property qualification, having the qualification of age, they have just as much right to be placed upon that list, they have just as much right to vote, as the ablest and wealthiest man in Nova Scotia. Now, will some member of the Government tell us whether these exponents, of whom we have some in this House, who are determined that not even the smell of Canada shall be in Nova Scotia—are these men going still to persist in this thing, to come again before this House and persist in leaving this blot upon our legislation ? I think, before we go into committee, it is proper for some hon. gentleman to assure this House that no such disgrace will be put upon our Statute-book. Before I sit down, I wish to refer to one other matter. The hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) arose in his place, the other night, and said :

Perhaps it may be so in Annapolis, but in my part of the province I never knew such ignorance to exist.

Referring to the fact that the revisers left voters off the list illegally, being ignorant of the law. I have only to refer the hon. gentleman to the Acts of Nova Scotia of 1880, 1881 and 1882. In every one of those Acts, what do we find ? We find in 1880, an "Act to legalize jury lists and panels of assessment rolls, and revising lists for the present year." The enormities of the revisers were so great that the legislature had to take cognizance of them, and in order to give them a legal status in the country, they had to pass a special Act, so that the elections could be run legally. The Act goes on to say :

Notwithstanding any omissions, errors or irregularities in the preparation of such rolls or lists, or in any of the proceedings in connection therewith.

Thereby giving the rolls as they existed in their mutilated state, in their iniquitous state, a legal existence. The Act of 1880 had to be passed, the very same Act had to be passed in 1881, the very same Act had to be passed in 1882, and still the hon. member for Antigonish comes before this House and says that he knows nothing about any of these iniquities. That may be, but other people know about them, and the legislature of Nova Scotia knows about them. I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but I feel that it is incumbent on us to understand whether this anti-Canadian element in the Cabinet is going to bud and blossom out as it has on the Statute-book of the province of Nova Scotia and in this Parliament heretofore. It did so bud and blossom out when the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was in power here. Now we see the commencement of the same budding and blossoming in this Parliament. The Bill exhibits the cloven foot Act and, to use an expression that has been bandied backwards and forward in this House, the question is whether that cloven foot Act is going to be crystallized into law. That is what we want to know.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BENNETT. Since the adoption of the principle of this Bill was approved by a majority of this House, the only question now before it, as I understand, is: first, to endeavour to frame a Bill, which will, as far as possible, meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen on either side of the House, in this, that first, there will be honesty in the preparation of the election list, with a view to carrying on the elections in a proper manner; and second, the question of cost to the country. The second proposition, however, is a very minor one compared to the former, that of honesty in elections. I should have imagined from the amount of discussion that has preceded this Bill there would be to-day in the House when this Bill is going into committee some of the representatives of the Cabinet from Ontario besides the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I presume, however, the Postmaster General is whetting his appetite by dismissing a couple of country postmasters before dinner, one of his usual indulgences; and as regards the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Pater-son), the hon. Minister of Customs, I presume, after the result of the local election in North Grey the other day, the hon. gentleman is wondering where he will be able to find some place to rest the soles of his feet, after having been driven out of the riding he represented so many years and at last

found a temporary abiding place in North Grey. However, I am glad the Minister of Trade and Commerce is here, for, to borrow a phrase used by that hon. gentleman during the last Parliament when referring to Ministers on the other side of the House, then the Conservative side, I admire him most of the "whole gang," because I know the hon. gentleman has a high sense of honour. I am glad also that the hon. Solicitor General is here, because I believe the Solicitor General has a high sense of honour, and I would prefer to direct my remarks to those two gentlemen, together with the Minister of Inland Revenue, whom I highly esteem and respect, because I think from those three gentlemen we will get a much fairer measure than we would obtain, if I may be allowed to use the phrase, from the rest of the gang. An hon. member mentions the name of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I might hope something from him, but not a great deal. I know that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries comes from the maritime provinces, and if all can be believed that is stated in the House as regards the manipulation of the voters' lists in those provinces one cannot help but think that those hon. gentlemen will cling to the old love, and when an opportunity is given to take a party advantage, they will take it, and with a vengeance, too. I propose to direct my remarks to the Bill with a view to obtaining something like a semblance of honesty and of justice. The Bill, as it stands to-day, has not a semblance of honesty or justice. The Bill itself and every law in the Statute-book are all right; but it is the administration of the law that always brings about its condemnation, and if I can prove to the distinguished trio to whom I particularly address myself that this Bill which is to-day before the House offers to give to party partisans every despicable and contemptible advantage, then I say a change of radical nature should be brought about. In the preparation of the old Dominion list there was this to be said, that when an elector went to the polling place on polling day he had known that his name was on the list even six months before, and he was satisfied that he had a perfect right to vote on that occasion. Hon. gentlemen know what the Dominion list was. It was a list plainly printed; the name of every voter entitled to vote was there; there was no out-scoring of names, and no interlineation of any names, and at least a month or six weeks before polling took place an elector knew that his name was on the list and that he would be given an opportunity to vote. But this Bill, if it goes into force, gives no such assurance, and no voter will know until he tenders his vote whether he will be permitted to vote, and I shall prove that conclusively from the local voters' lists. If the hon. gentleman will refer to section 6 of the Bill he will find as follows:—

Forthwith after the receipt of the writ for a Dominion election, the returning officer shall

obtain from the officers who are the legal custodians thereof, or of duly certified duplicates, or copies thereof, such provincial voters' lists or such certified copies thereof or extracts therefrom.

Let the hon. Solicitor General see what he obtains. There will be placed in the hands of the revising officer voters' lists furnished to him by the proper custodian. Then the voters' lists for the different divisions will be handed to the different deputies, and every hon. member knows that every deputy is chosen by reason of his party affiliations. What would be the result? I have here the list of the township of Tay. I shudder to think, when the lists have been in possession of the deputies two or three days before the elections, how many Conservative voters will be permitted to remain on the lists up to polling day. I should equally shudder to think how many names of Liberals would be written in, in that same voters' list. Let me show to you one page that happens to have 37 names written in. When this list is placed in the hands of a partisan deputy, he is not required to change it at all; he simply may permit it—as it will be in his possession for a few days—to remain down somewhere, where a party friend can come along and score out the names of several men, and the result is that these men cannot possibly vote. I know that there has been that scoring out done in connection with the provincial voters' lists, and that men have been disfranchised in consequence. And if the fight is a little more keen and bitter, something better could be done. A friendly deputy could leave his list in an easy place of access, and a partisan—a designing scoundrel, because he would be such—could write in a number of names on the list. Consequently every semblance of fair-play will disappear by the adoption of the provincial voters' lists, which hon. gentlemen opposite now propose to the House. Here is the voters' list for the township of Flos, and on page after page there are names written in. Let the House recollect that this list remains in the hands of a friendly deputy for a couple of days preceding elections; the deputy need not make the changes at all; all he has got to do is to leave the list where the changes can be made. I say that the idea of putting such a law on the Statute-books of this country is simply a scandal and an outrage on all decency; when in the province of Ontario, and I am not going to discuss the other provinces at present, no man can know until the very moment that he tenders his vote whether he is on the list or not.

But, Sir, it is not only a question of saving expense, but the greater question of all should be this wrong that could be done, on the face of an Act which affords every facility for doing wrong. We are told that it is to be borne in mind that there is going to be a great deal of expense saved to the

Mr. BENNETT.

individual candidate. I deny that statement in toto, and I say that any man who knows anything about the revision of the voters' list in the province of Ontario, will find this out to his cost. He will find that it costs a great deal more money to revise the voters' list under the local Act than it does under the Dominion Act, and I will show some proofs in support of that statement. Under the old Dominion Act the voters' lists were publicly displayed, and if you had an objection to the name of the voter as being there improperly, you simply had to notify him by registered letter and then the appeal came on before the judge at the trial. That is not at all the principle in the Ontario law. If you find the name of a voter on the local list which you think is improperly placed there, you have got to bring that man to court and pay his witness fees. I ask hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who are not conversant with the Ontario franchise law, to hesitate before making some of these changes and to not allow this Bill to go through as it is. So far as I am concerned, and I think most gentlemen will bear me out, the revision of the voters' lists in the province of Ontario has not been fought by the Conservatives with that vigour with which the Dominion lists have been contested, because the Conservatives were at the disadvantage of being in opposition in the local legislature. But let any hon. gentleman fight the local lists in the province of Ontario with the vigour that has been bestowed on the Dominion lists, and he will find to his very bitter cost, that the expense to him under the Dominion Act was comparatively nothing as compared with the expense which such a contest would be under the local Act. The right hon. the Premier fell into the error of stating that these local lists are already prepared, that all we have to do is to take advantage of them, and that no extra cost will be entailed on any one. The right hon. gentleman was wrong in that statement, because the county judges are paid in the province of Ontario, true, not a very considerable sum, but it amounted to some \$8,000 for the small number of appeals that were disposed of under the local Franchise Act. If there is that same vigour thrown into the revision of the voters' list, that has been the case with the revision of the Dominion list, that cost to the province will very materially increase. Again, let us remember that it is all rot and nonsense to state that it costs nothing to the municipality. I defy any of these gentlemen who are making these reckless statements, that there is no cost at all to the municipalities; I defy them to produce a statement from their own municipalities, and if they do, I will be bound to say that it will be shown that the cost to the municipalities will aggregate as much, if not more, than the revision of the Dominion voters' lists. In the first place it must be borne in mind that it is only once in three

or four years that candidates for the Ontario legislature ever devote their time or attention to the local lists. It would be burdensome to these candidates, to year in and year out, keep the lists in a perfect condition, and the result is that for three years as a rule the local lists go without hardly a name appearing, of what is known as "manhood suffrage men." But in the fourth year a rush is made by political parties and the result is that, prepared as these lists are in Ontario, and with the attack on these lists, a large expenditure is occasioned by the municipality. The whole trouble with the Ontario Act is this: That the lists are printed first and the revision is held afterwards. That is what prevents the possibility of any honesty in the acceptance of the provincial voters' list.

Now, Sir, what is the cost to the local municipalities when these revisions take place? After the list has been prepared by the clerk, and displayed the length of time provided by the statute, then the appeals are made to the clerk and afterwards the trials are held by the county court judge. Every municipality has to bear that expense. I take the township of Tay where the expense was \$67.75 on a single municipality; I take the township of Medonte where the cost was \$88.68; I take the town of Orillia where the cost on that municipality was \$90.50, and the town of Midland where the cost was \$50.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How was that cost incurred; what is the nature of it?

Mr. BENNETT. I will come to that in a moment. In the town of Penetanguishene the cost was \$48, and I might quote other municipalities which will bear out my allegation that at every revision of the local voters' list there will be an average cost to each municipality of from \$60 to \$75. I am not referring to the large towns where the registration is in force and where the expense runs from \$300 to \$500, and as in the city of Toronto to \$3,000. The reason of that expense is this: The statute of Ontario provides that the clerk of the municipality shall be paid so much in respect to every appeal that is made. When the lists are prepared, there is no compulsion on the assessor to place the names of these manhood franchise men on the list at all. That is simply optional on his part. It is the duty of the assessor to assess all the property he sees, to get its ratable value for the purpose of raising taxes in the municipality; but there is no statutory duty imposed upon him of collecting the names of all the young men who are entitled to vote as manhood suffrage men. When these lists are prepared, then the work starts, and the candidates or the political organizations have to perfect them; and there is provision made in the Ontario statute by which the clerk is allowed 12 or 15 cents for every ap-

peal that is had. What is the result? I showed the other night that in some municipalities there are as many as 400 appeals. Then it is necessary to have certain stationery provided for these purposes, it is necessary to secure the attendance of certain witnesses, and the expenditure for all these things is forced on the municipality every year. Since the last local revision in the county of Simcoe there have been deep and strong protests on the part of the townships and local municipalities against being driven by the province to bear the expense of perfecting the lists for the provincial elections. How much more deep-seated will that complaint be when it is found that the Dominion will come along and harass the townships more than ever? The result will be that these unfortunate local municipalities will year in and year out be driven to large expenditures simply because the Dominion of Canada refuses to revise its own voters' lists.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will that increase the cost of the revision if it is done for provincial purposes?

Mr. BENNETT. Certainly. If the hon. gentleman could give an assurance that the Dominion and local elections would be held in the one year, one cost would suffice.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is there not a revision every year?

Mr. BENNETT. Certainly; but the hon. gentleman knows that while that revision is permitted by the law, neither he nor his brother, who is a member of the local House, go every year about the county revising the voters' list; because, if they did, the unpopularity of the Act would be so apparent. If my hon. friend was a candidate for the local House, and each year went through every township in his riding and forced upon each of them an expenditure of \$75, or in some cases upwards of \$100, he knows what a protest would arise from those municipalities. While there is a local revision permitted by law, there is not a revision as a matter of fact, because it would be so expensive for a candidate year in and year out to perfect the list; and so he waits until an election is impending, and then revises the voters' list for the township.

Mr. BURNETT. Is it not in the interest of the municipality to have a correct list?

Mr. BENNETT. It is, but the municipality does not compel the assessor to place manhood franchise men on the list at all.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The hon. gentleman is more familiar with the law of Ontario than I am; but I would like to call his attention to this statement of the law as it has been given to me, and I would ask him to say whether it is correct or not:

Under the Voters' Lists Act, section 6, the clerk of the municipality is required to take from the final revised assessment roll a list of all persons of the full age of twenty-one years, subjects by birth or naturalization, appearing by the assessment roll to be entitled to be voters in the municipality. This list so to be prepared is to be in three parts: the first containing the names of the persons entitled to vote both at municipal and provincial elections; the second, those entitled to vote at municipal elections alone; the third, those entitled to vote at provincial elections alone; and opposite the name of every person qualified to vote at provincial elections, the clerk is to place the letters "m.f.", signifying manhood franchise.

If the law is as I have stated it, the clerk is required to do this every year.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman has quoted the law correctly; but there is no statutory duty imposed upon an assessor to go about the riding and collect the names of all who are entitled to go on the list as manhood franchise voters. The duty of the assessor is to assess all the property in the municipality. After he has made that municipal assessment for the purpose of local taxation, then the clerk takes the names of the parties and arranges them in three different ways.

Mr. McMILLAN. Is it not the duty of the assessor to place every manhood suffrage voter on his list, and does not the assessor take his oath before he enters upon his duties that he will perform his duties? And does he not certify at the close of the year that he has truly and faithfully and to the best of his knowledge and ability performed all the duties of an assessor that are incumbent upon him?

Mr. BENNETT. Well, the hon. gentleman does not know the law, if he will excuse my saying so. There is no duty at all imposed upon the assessor that is at all compulsory upon him.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to cite an instance in his own county where a name was tendered to an assessor, and he refused to enter it on the list?

Mr. BENNETT. I have shown the hon. gentleman that in a certain division in the township of Tay the assessor did place a few names on the list.

Mr. BURNETT. You would not expect him to put them on if he was not asked to.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. There is the whole point.

Mr. BURNETT. I want to explain what I mean. How would a man know he was there if he did not ask—if his name was not tendered? I will give you an illustration. Suppose I have half a dozen men employed, and if the assessor comes to assess me. He asks me to give him the names of all

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

the men over a certain age. If I give them I am carrying out the law; if I refuse, I am not carrying out the law. So, I am really compelled by the law to give every name, and the assessor is bound to accept them.

Mr. McHUGH. Here is the section, giving the oath by which the assessor is sworn to perform his duty, and it says:

That according to the best of my knowledge and belief I have entered thereon the name of every person entitled to be so entered, either under this Act or the Manhood Suffrage Act, or any Act amending either of the said Acts, and that I have not intentionally omitted from said roll the name of any person whom I knew or had good reason to believe was or is entitled to be entered thereon, under any or either of the said Acts; and I further say that the date of delivery or transmitting the notice required by section 47 of this Act is in every case truly and correctly stated in the said roll.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, we have in the province of Ontario—I do not know whether hon. gentlemen have it in the other provinces, but I rather think we have a monopoly of it in Ontario—what is known as fireside law, and it is usually administered by gentlemen such as the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. McHugh) and the two other hon. gentlemen we have just heard from. It is a kind of law that is being launched on the people with great cost to themselves, but it yields a great harvest to the lawyers, because it is always reviewed under appeals from magistrates. However, the people have to suffer from it, and I will endeavour to protect the House from fireside law by explaining what the law is. It is quite plain, these hon. gentlemen have not read the law. The assessor is not to omit anybody who asked to be put on, and he certifies that he has not; but it would be monstrous to suppose that he would be obliged to run around a township and hunt up voters for the different political parties. The deduction which hon. gentlemen make is simply fireside law, and nothing else. I prefer to deal with the law of the Solicitor General.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I find it here stated that the assessor is bound to institute inquiries and put on the roll the names of those who are qualified.

Mr. BENNETT. The Solicitor General will find that the law is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. There is nothing compulsory; the assessor is not liable to a fine, and it would be monstrous to suppose that he should go chasing up the highways and down the byways to see how many men should be on the lists. There is no penalty at all attached to the obligation, and the result is, that candidates do not waste their money and time revising the lists year after year, but wait for the year preceding an impending election, and then devote themselves, at great cost, to that task.

What is the result? When a list is revised, page after page is added, and names are interlined, and others struck out. Surely, the hon. gentleman must see that a voters' list prepared under those circumstances is simply an absurdity.

When I was interrupted a little while ago, I was speaking on the question of cost, and I was showing that the municipalities are first taxed, and heavily taxed, for the revision of those lists for local purposes, and then they will be taxed for their revision for Dominion purposes. Assuming that next year there will be an election for the Dominion, and assuming that we were preparing the voters' lists of this year, 1898, then, the unfortunate municipalities would be visited with another and a heavy cost. But it is not only the country municipalities that will have to pay, but look at the immense cost that will be imposed on the cities. In Toronto, I have no doubt that the cost of revising the local voters' lists, under the system of registration, runs up to \$3,000. In the city of Brantford, I was informed the other night by the representative of South Brantford, that the cost of revising the voters' lists amounted to \$450; in the town of Stratford, it was \$600, and in the town of St. Thomas, about the same amount. And yet you are telling the people in the country that you are going to wipe out this expense. You are not going to wipe it out at all, but you are going to shift the burden of expense from the Dominion to the municipalities. We all know that whichever party may be in power, a certain amount of information will be given their supporters as to when they had better prepare for the revision of the voters' lists. What will be the result? If we had a revision of the voters' lists under the Dominion system, then there would be only a close investigation and a close revising of the lists for one year. But what state will we be in, if this Bill is adopted? A candidate who has not a side line of information from the Government will be in this position. He will say to himself that, in the ordinary course of events, an election is not likely to be held until next year, but for fear the Government may appeal to the country before that, he will say: I will not be caught napping, but will go to the expense of revising the lists for this year. The result will be, that in an average riding of ten municipalities—and I am not including a town where there would be registration—the cost would be, likely, upwards of \$600. Should the Government not go to the country on the lists prepared that year, then the candidate would, of necessity, be forced to go over the same ground in a subsequent year, and \$600 more would be piled up on the riding that year. And if there had been a local election but a year or two before, the result would be, that the unfortunate municipalities in Ontario would each have about \$180 muni-

cipal tax imposed on them in a period of three years. That cannot be gainsaid, because the figures are there. Where is the unfortunate candidate to be? In the first place, the revision of the voters' lists for the local elections is, as I have contended, much more expensive. The manhood franchise lists for the local elections are the creation of friendly assessors. I have known assessors who have made for Conservatives nearly as good a list as could be made, but I have known Liberal assessors who have made for Conservative candidates as bad a list as could be made, and as correspondingly good ones as they could make for the Liberals, because the law does not impose on them the duty to treat Liberals and Conservatives alike, but states that they shall put on the list the names of persons who tender their names. The unfortunate part of the case will come in where you reach a large city, and I ask the hon. Solicitor General to bear this strongly in mind. If next year the hon. gentlemen who represent the city of Toronto were to undertake a revision of the voters' lists in that city, what would be the result? They would be put to an enormous expense, because their party friends would have to go about and collect the information for registration. It is true that the city would not be put to the expense of two years succeeding each other, because, as I understand the Bill, there would be in the cities a system of registration preceding a Dominion election, such as there is for the local elections now, but the hon. gentleman must remember that the candidate, anticipating an election, has a lot of expense to go to in a large city in order to find the names; and, as a result, after the adoption of this Bill, he will be, in all probability, put to a large expense. I tell the hon. gentleman that it is unfair for the Dominion to subject the local municipalities to this cost. Why should he impose on each township in my riding, for two years in succession, the cost of \$75 or \$80 in having the local voters' lists revised for federal purposes? The whole question comes to this, that we have set aside the principle of uniformity, and that is no longer in discussion. But what we should have is honest lists, and I submit that the Solicitor General should not ask hon. gentlemen on this side to go into an election contest on voters' lists that offer such facilities for fraud and wrong-doing. It is a monstrous proposition that these lists should be left in the hands of friendly returning officers all over the country for two or three days, so that, if these officers permit them to lie around, they may be tampered with by any person and names scored out and others inserted, thus depriving some men of their votes and giving votes to others not entitled to be on the roll. The question of expense should never come into consideration at all, compared with the question of having honest voters'

lists. What is to be done under the circumstances? If the hon. gentleman will consult the figures under the old Dominion Act, he will find that the great cost of the old Franchise Act—and I am applying myself now more to the province of Ontario—lay in the payment of fees to the judges. Hon. gentlemen have said that their opposition to the present law, when it was brought in, some ten years ago, was so determined that they fought against it day and night. All I can say is, that I have read a good deal of the discussion which then took place, and I have noticed that it was conspicuous by the absence of any suggestions at all to improve the Bill. And if these hon. gentlemen on that occasion had made some suggestions as to cheapening the lists, the lists would not have caused so much dissatisfaction as they have. Now, let us look at the figures. In the Public Accounts for the province of Ontario, 1897, it will be found that there was paid to the county judges, in round figures, \$7,700 for revising the voters' lists for the local legislature, and I find that the judge of the county of Simcoe disposed of all the appeals in that county for the sum of \$214. Now, what does that mean? I do not know how many appeals there were in the other ridings, but I do know that there were upwards of 1,400 appeals in the riding of East Simcoe alone. But hon. gentlemen will stand up and say that if there is in the county of Simcoe this enormous number of appeals, they never have anything of the kind in their ridings. Now, these fees to the county judges must be paid on some scale or allowance, and if hon. gentlemen will look at the accounts they will see that in many of these counties the cost to the province was a great deal more than for the county of Simcoe, and therefore there must have been a great many more appeals in the other counties than there were in the county of Simcoe. I assume that there must have been in the county of Simcoe upwards of 2,500 appeals. We find that the judge was paid there \$214 for disposing of those appeals. Under the Dominion Franchise Act we find that the revising officer in the county, who is the county judge, Judge Ardagh, was paid \$1,100 for disposing of the appeals in that one riding alone. My suggestion is to pay these gentlemen about \$150 in each riding, and I will be bound to say that the county judges will be only too pleased to accept that amount and revise the appeals in each county. Do not run away with the idea that county court judges are driven to death. We find that they have time to go here and there to decide arbitrations. I know that at the present time there is an arbitration pending in the town of Barrie on the subject of waterworks, and the county judge of the county of Durham is one of the arbitrators. I think that a method could be devised which will be simple and inexpensive. My suggestion is to

Mr. BENNETT.

accept the local voters' list of a year preceding that when the revision is determined upon, and then provide a cheap system of appeal. Provide that the appellant may give notice to a man by letter, and let the appeal be heard without making the attendance of the man before the county court judge necessary as it is under the provincial system at present, where a man must be paid his fees to attend. I would have one month allowed in which appeals could be made. Let appeals to add names be made just as under the present arrangement—that is file an affidavit showing that the party whose name is sought to be added has the necessary qualifications, as to age, as to being a British subject, and so on, and, at the end of a month let the court be held. I will be bound to say that there would not be one riding, in the province of Ontario at any rate, in which the county court judge would not be pleased to dispose of all appeals for the sum of \$150.

Now, we have disposed of the cost of the judge. Let us come down to the greatest question of all, the matter of having an honest voters' list—and I know that hon. gentlemen on the other side, some of them at all events, and I will give most of them credit for it, want to have a semblance of fair-play in these lists.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is what we have not had for twelve years.

Mr. BENNETT. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman will not stand up in his place and claim that the county court judge who revised his list did anything wrong.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have done that many times in this House before, and I am prepared to do it again.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) will not allege that Judge Bell, who I am told is a Liberal and an honourable man, ever tampered with these lists.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But it happens that Judge Bell is not the revising officer in my county.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I am misinformed as to who he was. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) will not rise in his place and say that Judge Woods ever tampered with the lists.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, I do, and have done.

Mr. BENNETT. Then all I can say is that the hon. gentleman was not sure of his ground, or he would have called for an investigation long ago. I stand in the judgment of the House when I say that the hon. gentleman never made a charge in this House that Judge Woods tampered with the lists.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I can prove by "Hansard" that I did.

Mr. BENNETT. That is neither here or there. We all agree that the costs are excessive. But there is no use agreeing that the horse is dead; what we want is to prescribe some medicine for the living horse.

Mr. McMILLAN. Why bring up the dead horse then?

Mr. BENNETT. To comfort hon. gentlemen opposite, because, when they have run out of everything else, they make an onslaught on the Franchise Act. Now, I say there is not a county court judge in Ontario but will revise the voters' lists in any one of these ridings at a cost of \$150. Let us come down to the case of honesty in the printing of the lists. Over here in the Printing Bureau, as I am informed, they have standing the galleys of type from which the last voters' lists were printed.

Mr. BURNETT. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to tell what the county judge gets per day for attending the revisions of the lists?

Mr. BENNETT. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman that, but I can tell him that in the county of Ontario the judge got \$200 for revising the local lists. There must have been more appeals in the county of Ontario than there were in the county of Simcoe.

Mr. BURNETT. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to say how many municipalities there are in the county of Ontario?

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman comes from the county of Ontario, and he should know that. Now, as I have said, over here in the Printing Bureau the type of the last Dominion voters' list is standing. And when the last Dominion voters' list was printed, it was not necessary to reset all the type, but it was only necessary to make changes from the original, and the cost was only a trifle, comparatively speaking, for each riding. I think that the average was only about \$150 or \$200 for the corrections. There were twenty ridings in Ontario in which the correction of the list cost less than \$100 each. There were thirteen in Nova Scotia in which the average cost was \$130. In New Brunswick the average was \$130. Some of the others were even less than that. If we are to adopt the local franchise in the province of Ontario, give us a chance for our lives at all events, and, after the lists are finally revised, have them reprinted at the department here. Then the cost will be about \$200 per riding. But I ask hon. gentlemen, and I appeal to them in a spirit of fairness: Do not ask us to go into the elections with voters' lists like these. Do not give it into the power of every partisan deputy returning officer to permit his list to be tampered with by every one who comes along.

Mr. BURNETT. I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact. He

knows that the deputy returning officer receives his instructions and his lists from the judge's hand, it comes from no other person; therefore, no one else can tamper with them. The lists the hon. gentleman refers to are the lists that are first printed by each municipality. They have never been finally revised, and the hon. gentleman is trying to make this House believe that they are the revised lists all the time.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, the hon. gentleman is the possessor of more fireside law than I thought he was; and even at the cost of inflicting the law and its explanation on the whole House, I must do so for the benefit of the hon. gentleman. Now, when a court is held the lists have already been printed. I think we will agree on that. The judge then has in his possession a memorandum that all the changes that have been made, have occurred. That memorandum is handed to the township clerk, and the township clerk makes the changes on the printed voters' list and places it in the possession of the clerk of the peace of the county, with names written in and other scored out. Now, what is the result? The revised list is then in the hands of the clerk of the peace, and this Act says that from the clerk of the peace, who is the proper custodian, you shall receive a corrected voters' list. I ask the Solicitor General if that is not correct?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As I understand it.

Mr. BENNETT. It is folly to talk about such an absurdity as the judge writing stacks of names into books, it is all nonsense. The hon. gentleman is a terrible victim of fireside law. Now, what is the result? Let us have this given to us, let us have a chance for our lives, at all events. After the list has been revised by the judge, and after it has been deposited in the office of the clerk of the peace, let that list be sent down here to Ottawa, and let corrections be made in the galleys of the type that is standing over here, and the result will be that you will correct this list in the Printing Bureau at an expense of about \$200 for the riding. You will then give security to your political opponents that they are going to have an honest list. But if you force upon this House and upon the country a dishonest list like this, you are open to the suspicion that you are providing an engine that any honest man should be ashamed of.

Mr. HEYD. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? I do not do it merely for the purpose of finding fault. But I have listened to the hon. gentleman's representations of the manner in which these lists are corrected, and I do not think he has made it clear yet. He conveys the impression that the printed list is the genuine list. In the city of Brantford, for instance, after a judge has cor-

rected the written list, the clerk makes a copy from it which he hangs up. Now, any one can strike names off that copy, or tear leaves out of that copy, but that don't affect the list which is in the vault of the city hall all the time. From that written list he makes various lists for the polling subdivisions, and no matter how those printed lists are altered, scored or fixed, that don't affect the genuine list at all.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman will see the position he places himself in. He says that you have got the list safely locked up in the vault, and that list nobody can see. Why, it is the lists that are in the hands of the deputy that are voted on, not the list in the vault at all.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Don't you call that fireside law?

Mr. BENNETT. I say such a law as that is not honest fireside law, and that is what I am contending against. Now, my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Heyd) could have said this, and have said it correctly: That in the cities you cannot make this complaint about the list because the registration is there. In the city of Brantford, and in the county towns where there is registration, he could have made that point. A dishonest list would not apply to the cities and towns for the reason that in those there is a special registration, and after the special registration of the city or towns, there is then an honest list printed and of that registration list nobody can complain. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman who is in charge of the Bill, when these lists are corrected, as they are corrected under the Ontario system, where is he going to get his voters' lists? When the candidate knows there is a corrected voters' list lying in the hands of the clerk of the peace, as there is one, I ask the Solicitor General where is the candidate going to get his voters' list? After the list has been finally revised, in Ontario, and when it is lying in the hands of the clerk of the peace, where is the candidate going to get his list to go into a fight with?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Section 6 provides that the revising officer shall apply to the legal custodian for a copy of the list that he has to use in the election. Candidates shall apply to the same person, and I take it for granted that they will get it. I am not familiar with the details of the law of Ontario, but it would appear to me a most curious thing if a public official should have possession of a public document and not be obliged to give a copy of it to any one entitled to it. I do not know of any law in the world that would justify that.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, here is the cause of complaint. I, being a candidate, require an ordinary number of the voters' lists. It is true I can go to the clerk of the peace,

Mr. HEYD.

who is the custodian, but I suppose I should have to pay a dollar or two dollars apiece for them.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Is there no provision in the Ontario law which states that copies of municipal documents must be supplied at a certain fixed rate?

Mr. BENNETT. If my recollection serves me right it is this: That under the Act, 200 copies of the voters' lists are printed by the municipality. Now, what is the result? I know some municipalities in my riding where the clerk of the peace, who is a very strong Liberal, leaves the voters' lists very conveniently around, and the result is that we are unable to get one at all when they are very necessary. There are ten copies under the Act given to a defeated candidate, and to the member elected, but they are not the revised copies.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, they are.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. gentleman say they are the revised copies?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Certainly.

Mr. BENNETT. There is another victim of fireside law. Why, let me show the absurd position the hon. gentleman is in. How is the candidate to know what names are on the list until it is printed, displayed and distributed? Now, what is the result? I must appeal to the Solicitor General, because I prefer his law to the fireside law of the hon. gentleman. Now, let me call the attention of the Solicitor General to this case. I, as a candidate, have a limited number, some ten copies, of the list of each municipality placed in my hands. In some municipalities there are ten polling divisions, and as a result I have only got ten voters' lists for each municipality, or one for each polling division. Now, under the Dominion Act, and according to the suggestion I have made, these copies can be furnished from Ottawa at a trifling cost, a couple of cents apiece. In each township, it may be where there are ten polling places that one polling place may only have eight or ten votes, while in another polling place there may be two or three hundred voters. The result is that with my limited number of voters' lists I have got to go to a polling place with only ten votes with one of my lists, and when I go to a large polling division with 300 voters, I can only have one list, too. There is one course out of it. A candidate, if he is a Croesus, can go to work and get all the lists printed. But surely the Government are not going to force a Bill on the House that will cost every unfortunate candidate and member \$60, or \$75, or \$100 to have a voters' list printed for every municipality. If that is going to be the law in the province of Ontario, all I can say is that men of moderate means had better get out of politics at once. Now, the hon. gentleman must see that his Bill, as it

stands to-day, bristles with irregularities and wrongs that must be corrected before it goes out of committee. I can only say that you are not saving cost to the candidate, you are not saving cost to the public as a whole, because it is all the same whether the public pays it through the municipalities or pays it out of the federal tax. Worse than that and worst of all, you are placing a positive premium on dishonesty in the preparation of such lists. I do not know how the lists are prepared in the other provinces, although I have heard something in regard to them. If in New Brunswick and other provinces they have written and not printed lists, then I say that is worse than the Ontario iniquity, and I hope and trust the Government will see fit to provide that we shall have an honest voters' list, printed after the lists are finally revised under the local administrations.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Manufacturers' Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to "the Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company."—(Mr. Clarke.)

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Victoria Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Quinn.)

KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 6,

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). This clause was amended in the committee by reducing the capital stock from \$2,500,000 to \$1,000,000.

Mr. **LaRIVIERE**. As that does not appear in the Bill before the committee, I think we had better get the committee to rise and report progress, and send the Bill back to the Committee on Railways.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I made the motion myself, and it may possibly have escaped the notice of the chairman or the secretary of the committee. It was agreed by all parties that it should be reduced to \$1,000,000.

Mr. **DEPUTY SPEAKER**. It is moved that the words, "two million five hundred thousand" be struck out, and the words, "one million" be inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Does that not require notice?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I would like to have your ruling on that, Mr. Chairman. Can an amendment be made to a private Bill in committee without notice being given?

Mr. **DEPUTY SPEAKER**. I understand that the change that is asked for now is simply the correction of a clerical error.

Mr. **CASEY**. It was agreed to in the Railway Committee.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I understood that it was changed to \$1,500,000.

Mr. **LaRIVIERE**. I do not know how we can change this Bill, when it is the original Bill as it has come from the Railway Committee, whether it is a mistake or not.

Mr. **HUGHES**. If there is a motion to strike out the word "two," you cannot do that without notice. If it is an error, let us treat it as an error.

Mr. **McINNES**. At this stage, I would like to make a few remarks on this Bill. It is a Bill which received a great deal of consideration at the hands of the Railway Committee, and it is an important Bill, which certainly should not be rushed through this House without very mature and serious consideration. It is an important Bill, not only on account of the richness of the district into which it is proposed to build this railway, but also on account of its very material bearing upon the trade of Canada, and because it involves a question which is coming to the front more and more in our political life.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. May I ask my hon. friend, before he proceeds to that, to allow us to dispose of the very important question which is before the committee. The hon. Minister of Railways says that an amendment was made to this clause, which amendment does not appear in the Bill now before the committee. I understand him to say that the amount of the capital stock was changed to \$1,500,000.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is the recollection of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I want to ask my hon. friend whether his recollection in the committee was that that clause was changed in the way the Minister of Railways recollects?

Mr. **McINNES**. I may say that the chairman seemed to be railroading this Bill through the committee without reference to the questions of order that were raised, and I thought it only right to raise some kind of protest.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Does my hon. friend remember whether clause 6 was amended so as to make the change?

Mr. McINNES. I cannot recollect.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am told that there is no change whatever made in the original report as made to the House; and if that is the case, I am afraid it would be establishing a very dangerous precedent to allow an alteration of so important a character to be made upon the statement of any one member of the House if it were not generally concurred in; and therefore I am under the impression that it is only possible for the committee to take the report as it has come to the chairman's hands.

Mr. DAVIN. Under these circumstances, I move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman who has just made this motion is intensely anxious that the committee should rise. He has a great indisposition to dispose of this Bill. With regard to the question of the amendment in this section, I concede at once that if we were proposing to make any alteration in any feature of the Bill which was at all vital, there would be some reasonable ground for objection to its being done in the absence of any note of it in the report of the committee. But it will, I think, be admitted at once that a change of this nature, reducing the capital stock, is not such a change as need excite any great alarm on the part of the members of this committee. It is one in the direction which I think would generally be approved. I do not speak simply from hearsay. I am stating what has come under my own knowledge. I myself moved that the capital stock be reduced and the promoter of the Bill conferred with his people—I saw him talk to Mr. Bodwell, and they agreed, in my hearing, to the reduction. I said myself that two million and a half of capitalization was excessive and Mr. Bodwell agreed that the amount should be reduced, and I was impressed with the idea that the secretary of the committee had made a note of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) mistakes my opinion on the question. I should be disposed to concur in the view expressed by the Minister of Railways, but it is a question whether in conflict with the rules of the House it be possible to change a Bill as reported from the Railway Committee. We have the Speaker of the House now to express an opinion on that question. I believe it is perfectly understood that it is not competent to make an amendment without notice.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not insisting that it is competent. I take it that the committee is disposed to accept the assurance that I gave that it was by an oversight that the change was omitted to be made. If there is the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

slightest objection I would suggest to leave it as it is. It is no concern to me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it would establish a dangerous precedent to change the Bill as it comes from committee.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not coincide with the view of the Minister. He tells us that the Railway Committee in its wisdom decided that the capital was excessive, and that the Railway Committee decided that the capital should be reduced by more than one-half. It does not appear on the face of the Bill that the reduction was made. If the Railway Committee held that the capital was excessive it would be a monstrous thing for this House to hold that we would have the right to establish the capital at two and a half million dollars. I think myself that the best course to adopt would be to move that the committee rise, and that this Bill be referred back to the Railway Committee. I move that seconded by my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron).

Mr. MORRISON. May I suggest that the matter stand as it is. There is no evidence before the committee sufficient to justify the impression that the capital was reduced, and why not leave the amount at two millions five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. DAVIN. We cannot do that, because the rules of the House preclude it on the reason stated by the Minister of Railways. There is no evidence on the face of the Bill that the change was made in the Railway Committee, and that the capital should be reduced from two million five hundred thousand to one million dollars. It would be an extraordinary thing for this House not to recognize that recommendation of the Railway Committee.

Mr. CASEY. If this is the only thing objected to in the Bill it is quite open to let it go through the committee as it stands, and anybody who objects to it can, if he gives notice now, move on the third reading of the Bill that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole to make the change suggested.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The Bill was either amended or not amended in the Railway Committee, and if it is as is stated by the Minister of Railways, then we have not the Bill that we should consider in this House. My conviction is, from the evidence we have from the Minister of Railways, that the Bill was amended in the Railway Committee in the way suggested, and, therefore, as the Bill appears to us in this House, is not the Bill as amended in the Railway Committee, we cannot consider it.

Mr. CASEY. The fact is, I think, that this amendment was agreed to by the parties, but was probably not put from the Chair and carried in the Railway Committee. It is, however, quite competent for the House to refer this Bill back to the committee and

have the change made that was agreed to in the manner that I have already suggested.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no doubt the change was made because when the question of capital was spoken of I myself said that the capital was out of all proportion to the length of the road, and the Minister of Railways suggested the reduction of capital to one million five hundred thousand dollars. Many members of the Railway Committee agreed to this and I was satisfied the change was made by the chairman.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My recollection does not carry me as far as the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule). I do remember very well that it was proposed, but I do not remember that it was carried by the committee, as having been put to the committee. I remember very well that the gentleman representing the promoters said it was agreed to, and if there is any question about it I do not insist. The course proposed by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) is certainly a proper course and one that would be assented to on all hands unless there is a disposition, which I am almost inclined to think exists in some quarters, to raise obstacles to the passing of the Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I most suspect there is a little evidence of conflict to the Bill, but if there is not we can get rid of the question in the way suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Casey).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The only way we can get rid of the difficulty is by moving that the committee rise and report progress. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) that there is no disposition to do anything but comply with the rules of the House.

Mr. HUGHES. I heartily concur in what the hon. leader of the Opposition says, and I scarcely think that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals is justified in supposing that I have any desire to oppose the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I exonerate you.

Mr. HUGHES. Inasmuch as the railway is not more than thirty miles in length, running down into the United States ten or fifteen miles, and then back into Canada another ten or fifteen miles, with power to build branches in any direction they choose, I think the capital might very well be reduced. I have not the slightest objection to its being changed in the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. I would draw attention to the rule:

No important amendment may be proposed to any private Bill in the Committee of the Whole House on a third reading unless one day's notice has been given.

That is the rule, what are you going to do?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Since the question is under discussion, I sent for the original Bill, and I find that in clause 6 there is no amendment at all. The clause was carried as it stood originally, with a capital of \$2,500,000; and on account of the divergence of opinion expressed by members of the committee, I cannot do otherwise than put the clause as it is.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the best reason why the motion of the hon. gentleman should not be carried, is that we do not know where we stand on the Bill. It was agreed by all parties in the Railway Committee that the capital mentioned in clause 6 should be reduced to \$1,000,000. The motion was made, it was agreed to in committee, and the promoters of the Bill before the committee and the interested parties as well, agreed to the amendment. There can be no question about that fact. I expect, Sir, that there exists in certain quarters a disposition to prevent the Bill from being discussed so as to enable us to give an intelligent vote on the matter. There is, therefore, some evidence of conflict to the Bill, and it is impossible, under the circumstances, to proceed any further.

This Bill was amended in the Railway Committee, and as I read clause 6 which the committee is asked to adopt, it seems to me that quite a different construction is put on it from that agreed to in the Railway Committee. Under the circumstances, and should there be no other ground than this divergence of opinions, to induce us to adopt the motion that the committee do rise. I think we ought to take that course, in order not to waste the time of the House. The promoters of the Bill would benefit by it, and they should agree to the proposition that the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Railways.

There is still another reason why the committee of the House should not proceed now to consider this Bill, and it is that we have had before the committee such conflicting evidence, that it is impossible for the committee, as I said a little while ago, to give an intelligent vote on the matter. I think we did receive no less than a hundred telegrams and as many resolutions from all parts of the Territories. These telegrams and resolutions were in conflict with each other. I think, therefore, that it would be in the public interest, as well as in the interest of the private individuals concerned that the committee should now rise, and that the Bill be referred back to the Railway Committee, so as to allow us not only to embody in the Bill the amendment which was carried by the committee, but also in order that we might ascertain whether those resolutions sent by the Boards of Trade and the municipal councils of the North-west Territories are genuine or not,

and also whether those telegrams signed by different parties, as mayors of the respective localities, are authentic or not. On these several grounds, I think we should not dispose of the Bill now, in order to inquire into the exact nature of the facts mentioned.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is discussing the general question, whether this Bill should be adopted or not, on a particular clause concerning the capital of this company.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I exceedingly regret to say that the point of order is not well taken. The motion before the House is for the committee to rise and report progress, and on such a motion the hon. gentleman has a right to discuss the general question.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) It is quite plain that there exists on the part of some hon. gentlemen a disposition to make obstruction, so as to prevent us from voting upon the motion which is now before the committee, and from discussing the Bill now under consideration. I exonerate the hon. gentlemen from all blame, for trying to call me to order; but, at the same time, let me tell him that I am happy to see, by the few remarks he has just made, that he understands French perfectly, so as to follow in an intelligent way the arguments I have submitted to the committee. According to your ruling, Sir, I have a right to discuss the motion now before us. It must be borne in mind that we are now discussing clause 6, but that we may also deal with the different provisions of this Bill. I do not intend to argue this question at any length, for I do not wish, in protracting the debate, to prevent the committee from voting on this motion before the time allotted to the consideration of similar Bills has expired. However, Sir, I think it right, before resuming my seat, to call the attention of the committee to the principle laid down here to-night. I draw attention to the fact that it would be establishing a very dangerous precedent, for this committee to accept a provision altogether different from that voted upon by the Railway Committee. As I said, supposing there was no other ground to induce us to vote in favour of the motion under consideration, I would not hesitate a single moment to take that course.

Mr. McINNES. This is an important matter, since it involves the question whether we are going to reserve for the citizens of our country the enjoyment of the benefits which will necessarily arise from the full development of our great natural resources. All those who spoke in the Railway Committee or who have given this matter any consideration at all agree that the Boundary Creek section of British Columbia is exceedingly rich in mineral wealth; and while it may be difficult to choose between the different sections of that pro-

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

vince, without making invidious distinctions, yet it can be said that there is greater valuable mineral wealth in the Kootenay country than in any other part of British Columbia, the development of which will certainly give rise to a larger amount of trade than any other region of the same extent in that province. I have before me the "Hansard" of 1897 in which I find the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways upon the Crow's Nest Pass proposition. In that speech he dwelt at length upon the wealth not only of the eastern section of British Columbia, but also of this very Boundary Creek section, which we are now considering in connection with this Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Whose speech is that?

Mr. McINNES. The Minister of Railways, and I intend to read some sections of it, in which he said that he was in a position to speak on these matters with great confidence and considerable authority. I therefore quote with a great deal of confidence the remarks which he made, especially with reference to the mineral wealth of this section:

I have in my hand another authoritative statement which I think it proper to put in possession of the committee. A representative of the Imperial German Government took occasion to visit British Columbia, and spent some months in the portions that I have mentioned, including the Boundary district, of which he made a careful study. He himself was a mineralogical expert, and had studied the situation in Australia, in South Africa, and in other mining countries of the world; and, I suppose it was on account of his ability in that regard that the Imperial German Government charged him with the duty of making to them a careful report of the possibilities and of the outlook of the province of British Columbia, and of the neighbouring state of Washington. He went over both these sections of country. I will only take up the time of the committee by reading an extract from this interesting report. To me it was an exceedingly interesting report, because it was not only a careful and conservative report, the report of a man who apparently was determined not to exaggerate the condition of things at all, but it was a report at the same time of one who had no interest in overstating the case in any way, but who only wished to present the facts for the information of his Government.

Mr. WILSON. What is the name of the gentleman?

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. His name is Hans Geise. He went over all the different districts of British Columbia that I have named. He went first through Rossland, then into the West Kootenay section, the East Kootenay section and Boundary Creek, up to Lillooet, and his survey of the situation embraces all these various portions of British Columbia. In referring to Boundary Creek, he says:

"The third division is the Boundary Creek itself, with its various camps. Here it is not so easy to decide the question of the superiority of any one spot over the other. Midway is here the central point of a wider country, but it is outside the cluster of Boundary Creek camps. There have,

therefore, sprung up in the Boundary Creek Valley three little villages, Greenwood City, Anacosta and Boundary Falls, of which each calls itself the most advantageous, and, therefore, the place of the future; but, as they are all close together, and the valley narrow, the supposition seems but natural that the whole valley will be, some time, one continuous line of city life for several miles."

Now, I want the committee to understand the value of this report; there is the information of an independent authority, there is the opinion of a man who had no interest whatever in exaggerating the favourable conditions which exist in that country. He was making a report for the information alone of his own government; and we find here that he makes a statement after having looked the ground over, and with the knowledge which he has of the effect of mineral development in other portions of the world, that the supposition is but natural that the whole valley of Boundary Creek will be some time one continuous line of city life. Well, now, what does such an ultimate accomplishment depend upon? Why, it depends solely upon there being transportation facilities afforded, and railway construction, and means by which the people who are willing to go in and develop that country may get in supplies, and fuel, and carry the products of their mines out of the country. It only depends upon that, and it does seem to me a serious question whether it is not the duty of Parliament to lend every possible aid, without delay, in order that we may come into possession, so far as possible, the exclusive possession, of this valuable territory. Because the committee must not lose sight of the fact that this important section of country lies immediately adjacent to the boundary of the United States, it is not very far from an extensive trunk line of railway. It will not take many miles of railway to be laid down in order to penetrate into that Boundary Creek section. Now, the people on the southern side of the border are liable to do in respect of that Boundary country what they have almost done in respect of the Kootenay district—they are liable, by building a section of railway into that country, to get possession of it from a business and a trade point of view, and they are liable to divert the trade away from our own country, from the east and from the coast, and carry it to the south of the line. To my own personal knowledge, they have been doing this with respect to Kootenay. Why, Mr. Chairman, it is a fact which only requires to be known, I think, to make a grave impression upon the minds of this House and of the public generally, that the people of the United States belonging to the state of Washington, appreciating the advantages of the possession of British Columbia and of the valuable minerals which are there undeveloped, built a railway up into the Kootenay country and got possession of the business and the trade of that country, and have built up the city of Spokane wholly out of the business which has originated in the province of British Columbia. To-day the city of Spokane is a flourishing city of 35,000 people. You go into that city and get into conversation with business men, and they will tell you that the business prosperity and growth of that place from a little village of seven or eight thousand inhabitants a few years ago, has been due to the development which has taken place in British Columbia. These people were there and they took advantage of that trade. I say that it is a matter of considerable importance for the committee to discuss as to whether we will retain possession

of this country from a business point of view, or whether we will let the people to the south of us take that trade from under our eyes and become possessed of it in the sense in which the conditions of business will tend to the transfer of that trade in that direction.

The Minister of Railways and Canals proceeds to quote further, as follows:—

In a general way this German official concludes his survey of the situation in these words, and I think it will be of interest to the committee if I should read the closing observations of this gentleman upon this subject. He says:

"What the result of these rich and seemingly unlimited mineral deposits will be on the country in which they are found to-day, seems beyond conception."

I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen of this House to the importance of this statement. There is the testimony of an outside authority; it is not the testimony of a man who is looking for a railway subsidy, and who is probably under an impulse to colour the information which he furnishes. There is a competent and independent authority, to which we should attach importance. He says:

Then the hon. Minister continues to quote the report, as follows:—

"Experts who have seen—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say that.

Mr. McINNES. This is Hans Geise's report. But I suppose there is a typographical error; it should be "Experts."

"Experts who have seen the South African and West Australian gold fields, are unanimous in their opinion, that the British Columbia mineral fields rank well with either of them, and, all circumstances considered, it seems superior to both. In South Africa, the gold-bearing rock is the bed of an old lake about 65 miles long and 35 miles wide, and the conglomerative rock in which the gold appears, varies in width from 3 to 100 feet. Only the bodies of smaller and medium width contain enough gold to be worth working. The average value of the ore is only \$10. The country is dry and inhospitable, and the lumber for timbering the mines is lacking entirely.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to know if it is in order for the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) to interrupt the hon. member (Mr. McInnes).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not hear any interruptions, and so I think the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. McINNES. I thank the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) for giving me protection.

The West Australian mines may be very rich, but the conditions of the country are still more unfavourable; timber and water are lacking absolutely. To-day they are facing there a proposition to lift water 2,500 feet and to carry it over a desert country 225 miles. Besides this, the ore is said to be low grade. The British Columbia mining district has enormous bodies of high-grade ore, and still farther greater ones of low

grade ; the ores are said to be most excellent for matting and smelting purposes, as they carry their own flux.

The territory in which the gold-bearing rock is found here, is without doubt far larger than the South African.

All the materials for mining and smelting purposes, as timber, coal, lime, water, &c., are plentiful and close at hand. Power to great amounts can be generated almost everywhere from the swift mountain streams. The climate is, all the year round, mild and agreeable ; winter does not set in until late in the year, and, although there is almost continuous snowfall, the winters are not cold, except for a short period in January.

Farming is possible in all the valleys ; large agricultural districts in the state of Washington and the Canadian province of Alberta are close at hand to furnish food enough for millions of people who will some time need their products.

The district will soon be traversed by several railroads, and every mining camp that will warrant it, will be tapped by them.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), if that refers to the Greenwood district ? Does it bear upon the same district that is to be traversed by this railway ?

Mr. McINNES. Yes, it deals with this district specifically. I have given the evidence of this eminent mineralogical expert, whose report is corroborated by that of the provincial mineralogist, Mr. Carlyle, and also by the testimony of everybody who has had the privilege of going through that part of the country. There is no doubt that this will be one of the richest portions of the country, and one affording the most permanent basis of industry. Various estimates have been made of the trade which would arise, if the resources of this district were properly developed. We had the pleasure, in the Railway Committee some two weeks ago, of hearing Sir William Van Horne upon this subject, and he ventured the estimate, that in the next ten years, if that country were properly developed, it would give rise to a trade of at least \$100,000,000. Is it in the interest of the country to retain that enormous trade for Canadians ? That is the whole issue involved in this Bill. I am pleased to think that it is the policy of this Government to retain the trade of Canada for Canadians. I will again refer to a few remarks made by the Minister of Railways, last session, in connection with this Crow's Nest Pass Railway proposition. On the question of the advisability of developing that country by Canadian railways, so that the trade can be conserved to Canadians, the Minister of Railways, in the same speech from which I have already quoted, says :

It only depends upon that—

That is, railway connection with Canada.

It only depends upon that, and it does seem to me a serious question whether it is not the duty of Parliament to lend every possible aid, without delay, in order that we may come into possession, so far as possible, the exclusive pos-

Mr. McINNES.

session, of this valuable territory. Because the committee must not lose sight of the fact that this important section of country lies immediately adjacent to the boundary of the United States, it is not very far from an extensive trunk line of railway. It will not take many miles of railway to be laid down in order to penetrate into that Boundary Creek section. Now, the people on the southern side of the border are liable to do in respect of that Boundary country what they have almost done in respect of the Kootenay district—they are liable, by building a section of railway into that country, to get possession of it from a business and a trade point of view, and they are liable to divert the trade away from our own country, from the east and from the coast, and carry it to the south of the line.

This was the attitude taken by the Minister of Railways and Canals last session, and the attitude taken by the Government, although I am afraid that in some respects we have reason to believe that it has been departed from by the Minister of Railways and Canals. But I sincerely trust that the Government will remain steadfast to the policy they enunciated last year in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and which they have enunciated again this year in connection with the Yukon Bill, to preserve the trade wherever possible for Canada. I continue quoting from the Minister's speech of last session :

To my own personal knowledge, they have been doing this with respect to Kootenay. Why, Mr. Chairman, it is a fact which only requires to be known, I think, to make a grave impression upon the minds of this House and of the public generally, that the people of the United States belonging to the state of Washington, appreciating the advantages of the possession of British Columbia and of the valuable minerals which are there undeveloped, built a railway up into the Kootenay country and got possession of the business and the trade of that country, and have built up the city of Spokane wholly out of the business which has originated in the province of British Columbia. To-day the city of Spokane is a flourishing city of 35,000 people. You go into that city and get into conversation with business men, and they will tell you that the business prosperity and growth of that place from a little village of seven or eight thousand inhabitants a few years ago, has been due to the development which has taken place in British Columbia. These people were there and they took advantage of that trade. I say that it is a matter of considerable importance for the committee to discuss as to whether we will retain possession of this country from a business point of view, or whether we will let the people to the south of us take that trade from under our eyes and become possessed of it in the sense in which the conditions of business will tend to the transfer of that trade in that direction.

That is the position, Mr. Chairman, which I take to-night. Now, I have another quotation to make from this interesting speech, and it bears upon the same subject which I am now considering, that is, the desirability of retaining this trade in this valuable district for our own people. The Minister of Railways and Canals further on made this

statement, referring to the statement of Mr. Hans Geise :

Now, there is an opinion, I think, to which we might well attach importance. It comes from a source independent at all events of the country through which this road is to travel, and these statements answer the questions that I asked at the outset, and ought, I think, remove the doubts, if any exist, as to the wisdom of the Government of the country at once, before it shall have been exploited by others, before it shall have fallen into the possession of any outside power or country, availing ourselves of the trade that will result from the construction of this work.

So you see we have every reason to believe that the present Government is thoroughly in accord with the Canadian sentiment which is now ringing from one end of Canada to the other, in favour of Canada for Canadians.

The hour for private Bills having expired, the House proceeded to the Orders of the Day.

THE FRANCHISE ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act, and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BENNETT. When the House rose at six o'clock, I had made the statement that there was not each year in the province of Ontario that thorough revision of the voters' lists which would be necessary in order to bring out the voting strength of political parties at an election. That view was rather demurred to by some hon. gentleman opposite who intimated that it was the duty of the municipal councils and the duty of the assessor to see that in each year a fresh list was made, and that, taking one year with another, there would be a fresh roll, and consequently from it there would be drawn a fresh list of voters. Since I last addressed the House I have looked up some figures in that regard which bear out my statement that the list would be a comparatively inefficient one, and one very far short of the full voting strength of the county. In support of that, I will quote some figures. Last year when a provincial election was impending in the province of Ontario, when the two parties were vying with each other to have all voters placed on the list, I find that in the county of Huron there was paid to the county judge in respect of the revision of the voters' lists in that county, the sum of \$204. But in the year preceding when there was no prospect that the list then being formed would be used at a local election, no regard was had to the list by either political party. That is evidenced by the fact that in that year there was only paid to the judge the trifling sum of \$33 in respect of the services performed by him in compiling the list. Now, what does that

mean? It meant that had there been a local election in the year preceding the last election, there would have been hundreds and hundreds of voters disfranchised in the county of Huron, owing to the fact that the assessor, no duty being imposed upon him by law to place these names on the voters' list, and no duty being imposed by law on the municipality to compel the placing of those men on the list, the matter being entirely neglected, the lists in the county of Huron would have been most incomplete, and have given rise to a great many complaints. Take the county of Ontario. I find that in that county last year prior to the general elections coming on, \$200 was paid to the county judge, whereas in the preceding year the trifling sum of \$27 only was paid to him. Now, what did that mean? South Ontario had as its representative until lately, the Minister of Agriculture in the Ontario Government, Mr. Dryden. But Mr. Dryden, as a member of the Government, knowing full well that there would be no election on the list of 1896, did not take upon himself the expense and the trouble of revising the list of that year. The result was that that trifling sum of \$27 was all the expense that was incurred by reason of appeals being brought before the county judge by the two political parties in that riding. But last year, knowing an election was impending, the Liberal members and the Conservative candidates put their shoulders to the wheel, and what was the result? The imperfectly framed and formed lists which had been presented and submitted to the electors, were seized upon by the parties, and they vied with one another in their efforts to have them made complete. As the figures demonstrated, the lists must have been most inefficient until the appeals were made before the county judge. The records of those two counties show beyond doubt that the lists formed and framed every year by the local municipality are most incomplete and imperfect, and if an election ever took place on those lists, there would be a hue and cry from one end of the province to the other, for the reason that thousands and tens of thousands of qualified voters would be found omitted from the lists. I would ask the Solicitor General, what is the meaning of clause 18? Clause 22 says that section 54 of the Act shall be applicable also to electors entitled to vote otherwise than by being named on the list of voters. Let me direct attention to clause 21, which states as follows:—

21. Section 52 of the said Act is hereby repealed, and in lieu thereof it is hereby enacted that no voter who has refused to take the oath of affirmation, or to answer questions or produce evidence as to qualification as aforesaid, when requested to do so, shall receive a ballot paper or be admitted to vote.

Reading those two clauses in connection with clause 18, it seems to me that this clause is certainly a most objectionable one.

But clause 18 is the substitution of an old clause, and, about half-way down, appears the following:—

Any elector present shall, before receiving his ballot paper, answer such questions or produce such evidence as to his qualifications to vote. That places a deputy returning officer in the position of an inquisitor.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The object of these words is to meet cases that may arise.

Mr. BENNETT. There is no provision that this section shall not be applicable to other provinces. I submit that, in its present form, it will be applicable. Assume a man is entitled to vote, and there is no question of his name not being on the list. The deputy returning officer, favouring the powers that be, acts as an inquisitor, and asks the voter, whose name is on the list and whose name has been confirmed by the judge, certain questions, and then refuses to give the voter a ballot. Such a clause is placing in the hands of the deputy returning officer a power which he is liable to abuse. Not only has he the privilege, in his quasi-magisterial capacity, to rule that a voter shall not have a ballot, but where a man's name does not appear on the list, he can proffer to such man a ballot, and he will have the privilege of voting. If that section is to be applicable to all the provinces, I think we might as well dispense with the voters' lists altogether.

Mr. CLANCY. I have just been reading the first clause.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We are on the preamble.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are considering the first section. I have no objection, however, to an hon. member discussing the whole Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will probably make greater progress in that way. Explanations, such as the hon. Solicitor General may be able to give on other clauses, will lead, no doubt, to the adoption of the first clause.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman is a little mistaken as to the practical result. It is really absolutely necessary to take a Bill clause by clause, otherwise the discussion wanders in every possible direction.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose the hon. gentleman remembers the session of 1885. At that time, the same explanations were gone over about five hundred times. The committee is at present considering the first clause, which states that this Bill shall be cited as the Franchise Act, 1898. We can discuss the whole Bill on that clause.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems pretty clear, that the first clause practically includes the

Mr. BENNETT.

whole Bill, and, therefore, gives pretty full range for discussion. I am very glad to hear the conversion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I hope changed circumstances may not have been the means of his conversion. I had not the privilege of sitting in this House when the present Act was under discussion, but I had the privilege of reading many excellent speeches delivered by that hon. gentleman, in which he did not lay down such a rule as he is laying down this evening. I will call attention to some points that have already been mentioned, and I do so with the object of calling the attention of the Solicitor General to the clause to which the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) made reference, that is, regarding the very extraordinary powers placed in the hands of the deputy returning officer. Instead of placing a voter whose name may be properly on the list, at the disposal of the deputy returning officer, which is a very dangerous course to pursue, some mode should be provided by which he should not be subjected to any catechising or badgering, which may result in intimidating a voter, and the voter should then have the right to receive a ballot and vote. My hon. friend should not propose to place voters in a position in which they may be driven from the poll.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I would suggest the inutility of a discussion such as has been entered upon. The Solicitor General has stated that if real objections to the working of any one of the clauses are presented, he is willing to receive suggestions with a view to remove the same. We are at present discussing the first section, which simply provides that the Bill shall be entitled the Franchise Act of 1898. The principle of the Bill having been admitted, we are now proceeding to discuss each clause separately. Let them be intelligently discussed, amendments suggested and accepted, if necessary. If the present course is pursued, it will prevent the Bill being passed. The leader of the Opposition expressed his willingness to use his influence in getting through the Bill to-night. No one can want to prevent hon. members addressing the House, but I rise to deprecate the introduction of a discussion on sections 23 and 24, when the committee is at present considering section 1, which has no relation whatever to either of those clauses.

Mr. WALLACE. I quite disagree with the view taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I consider it is impossible to lay down a hard and fast rule, and say that a member, in discussing the Bill, shall confine himself to one clause, which may cover, as in this case, only the title of the Bill. As hon. members know there is an easy way of getting rid of the objections by moving that the committee rise, and then any hon member can discuss the clauses of

the Bill as he wishes. It will not save any time for the Government to prevent discussion on any clause we wish to refer to.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. My object is not to prevent a general discussion, but I think it would be better to confine our attention to the particular clause before the House. If there is any cognate clause afterwards we can discuss the whole matter. Our desire is to make progress.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Our only object is that the Bill should be a fair one, and we do not think it is a fair Bill as it stands now.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. I believe we all want a Bill that would be workable and as my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) suggests, there are things in this Bill which are unworkable. I would suggest, for the purpose of saving time, that a special committee composed of two members from each of the provinces, should be appointed to consider this Bill, and possibly if that committee consider the Bill whatever amendment they propose the House would adopt the suggestions. If we continue to discuss it in this House as we are doing now, the chances are that the Bill will take several weeks to get through.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I hope it will not. After what the Minister of Marine has said, and it entirely agrees with what has fallen from the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who has charge of the Bill, I think it would be well for us, after the very full discussion we have had, to go on until we come to a clause on which we think an amendment desirable. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that there will be a reasonable disposition on the other side of the House to agree to any well considered amendment. If my hon. friends will support that, I think it will be the best course to adopt.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Hear, hear.

On section 2,

This Act shall not apply to the North-west Territories.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. Why?

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. We must ask the Solicitor General to explain that.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. Because we have a special statute in the North-west Territories. There is no municipal organization in the Territories to enable us to apply this law.

Mr. **CLANCY**. There are some places in the province of Ontario in which there is no municipal organization, and if your logic is good in one place it ought to be good in another.

Mr. **BERGERON**. There is none in Prince Edward Island.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. Oh, yes, there is.

Mr. **BERGERON**. No.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. There is municipal organization in Charlottetown and Summerside. There is a special provision under the law of Prince Edward Island which covers the matter.

Mr. **MACDONALD (P.E.I.)** Where do you find the law in the province of Prince Edward Island?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I quite admit that there are no election lists in the province of Prince Edward Island, but there is machinery to elect local members to the House.

Mr. **POWELL**. Their methods of conducting an election do not apply in this case.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I beg your pardon, there is no franchise law which can be independent of the election law.

Mr. **POWELL**. There is no parallel between the franchise law in Prince Edward Island and the North-west Territories. Every man who is a resident of Prince Edward Island can vote; and why not let the law in the North-west Territories be the same.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. There is a special Act which provides for the election of members for the House of Commons in the North-west Territories.

On section 3, subsection "d,"

(d.) The expression "voters' list," or "list of voters," includes, when provincial lists are referred to, any poll-book or official list of persons entitled to vote at a provincial election.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I move to strike out the words "poll-book or" in the second line. It does not appear to me that there is any necessity for these words.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Are we then to understand that in the province of Ontario we must have the printed voters' lists, with the changes which have been made marked on it—interlineations, and lines struck off?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I am afraid that we shall have to take the same voters' lists as they use in the provincial elections. That is the principle of the Bill. If my hon. friend will read that paragraph, he will see that the words "poll-book or" are surplusage. They do not appear to me to add anything to the paragraph. I cannot imagine a case, so far as my knowledge of the provincial law goes, in which these words would be of any use.

Mr. **POWELL**. And they might do harm.

Mr. **BENNETT**. The hon. Solicitor General may not understand the working of the Ontario law. This afternoon I asked if the list which would be placed in the hands of the deputy would be the printed list as it came from the judge, with names struck out and names added, and I understood him

to assent to that. At present there is not one of these printed lists in the hands of the deputies on polling day. The list in the hands of the deputy is what is called a poll-book, which means a book containing the names of all those who are entitled to vote. I would like to know which of these two lists we are to have. Are we to have the printed list, with the corrections made by the judge on it, or the so-called poll-book which is in use to-day?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In cases where the list has been finally revised by the court, we are to have it in the form in which it is handed over to the clerk. There seems to be a great difference of opinion among hon. gentlemen on the other side as to what the provincial law of Ontario is, and I state the position in this way: we are to have as the voters' list for Dominion elections those used in the provincial elections in Ontario, whatever they may be.

Mr. HUGHES. When the list is finally amended and closed, it is printed with erasures and additions. That is not the list which the hon. Solicitor General proposes to use at all.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Why not?

Mr. HUGHES. Because it is never used. Copies of this are made in poll-books, which are handed to the various deputy-returning officers, and these are used in the election.

Mr. McMILLAN. When the voters' lists are to be revised in the province of Ontario, this is the practice followed. When the assessor completes his work, which is not later than the 30th of May, the assessment roll comes before the township council, and it has to be revised by them. In a great many instances where names are found not to be on the assessment roll, the court of revision gets the assessor to become the appellant, and those names are put on before the roll is finally completed. It is not finally completed until the court of revision closes its sitting; and the township council sometimes adjourns to allow names to be put on. Then, if there are other names, there is an appeal to the county judge, who holds a court of revision, and he gives to the township clerk a list of names to be added.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes. Here is the law:

In case complaints are made as aforesaid, immediately after the list has been finally revised and corrected by the judge, the judge shall make, or cause to be made, and shall sign, a statement (Form 16) in triplicate, setting forth the changes, if any, which he has made in the list; and shall certify in triplicate (Form 17) a corrected copy of the list; and the statement in triplicate, and the corrected copies of the list shall, if the judge so order, and under his direction and supervision, be prepared by the clerk of the municipality, and for that purpose the judge shall forthwith, after the list has been so finally revised and corrected, transmit or de-

Mr. BENNETT.

liver to the clerk all necessary papers and directions, which papers and directions, together with the statement in triplicate and the corrected copies, shall within, at latest, the week next after the list has been so finally revised and corrected as aforesaid, be re-transmitted and delivered by the clerk to the judge, who thereupon shall immediately sign the statement and certify the corrected copies aforesaid.

But should the statement and corrected copies not be re-transmitted and delivered by the clerk to the judge within the time above mentioned, the judge shall immediately thereafter make and sign the statement and certify the corrected copies of the list.

The judge shall retain one of the certified copies and one statement, and shall deliver or transmit by post, registered, one of the certified copies and one statement to the clerk of the peace for the county, or union of counties, within which the municipality lies, and one of the certified copies and one statement to the clerk of the municipality, to be kept by him among the records of office.

The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) stated this afternoon that any deputy returning officer would have full power, when the list came into his hands, where it would lie for two or three days, to strike off any name he thought proper; and the hon. gentleman was horrified to think what the list would be when it came to be voted on. The hon. gentleman had not read the law correctly, or he would have found that that list has to be returned by the deputy returning officer along with his other papers, with the words "voted on" after each name that had been voted on; and his list is retained and can be compared with the list in the township clerk's office. So that there is no opportunity for any deputy returning officer to mutilate the list without coming under severe penalties. The hon. gentleman told me that I knew very little about the law, and he said that there was nothing to make the assessor enter the name of any individual on the list. If he will turn to the Consolidated Assessment Act, section 14, subsection 3, he will find:

The assessor shall also make reasonable inquiries in order to ascertain what persons resident in his municipality, or in the section of the municipality in respect of which the assessor is acting, are entitled to be placed in the assessment roll as qualified to be voters under the Manhood Suffrage Act, and shall place such persons on the roll as qualified to be voters without the affidavit referred to in subsection 1 of this section.

Subsection 1 says that it is the duty of the assessor to find out every one who is entitled to vote and place his name on the list. The assessor first takes the oath of office that he will truly and faithfully perform the duties of the office to which he has been appointed; and at the close he says:

I have not entered any name in the above roll, or improperly placed any letter or letters in column 4 opposite any name, with intent to give to any person not entitled to vote a right of voting.

I have not intentionally omitted from the said roll the name of any person whom I believe en-

titled to be placed thereon, nor have I, in order to deprive any person of a right of voting, omitted from column 4 opposite the name of such person, any letter or letters which I ought to have placed there.

The assessor signs the affidavit that he has done what the law required of him, and he has to take the oath of office. I have been astonished to hear the charges made in this debate. No less than four hon. gentlemen have declared that the assessment rolls were stuffed in the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Halton said that the only qualification for an assessor was that he should be a man who would stuff the assessment with names that ought not to be there and keep out names that ought to be there.

Mr. HENDERSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I never used those words.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have been in municipal life in Ontario for over thirty years and have never yet known an assessor who wilfully stuffed the assessment rolls. But I have no doubt that those hon. gentlemen who make these charges would, if they had the appointment of the assessors, only name those who would stuff the lists. I have never known an assessor to do anything of the kind. I have always found them intelligent men, sometimes with not as much experience as they ought to have, but always willing and anxious to make as correct a roll as the circumstances and their experience would allow. I have known assessors who have held the office for fifteen or twenty years, during which time the political complexion of the councils have frequently changed from the Reform to Conservative, and vice versa; and when the court of revision sits, every elector has a right to appeal against the amount of his assessment. Names must necessarily be omitted, in the cases of young men who have not yet completed their twenty-first year. The assessor begins on the 15th of February to make his roll, and must finish before the 1st of May. Many young men who are not placed on the roll by the assessor because they had not reached their majority, are put on the roll by the judge revising the list, because at the time of revision they were within sixty days of their majority.

Mr. CLANCY. Does that class of voters, those within sixty days of their coming of age, apply to the Ontario elections?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, if they are within sixty days of the time of their majority when the judge is revising the list, it is his duty to place them upon the list.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman had better read the Act before he makes a statement of the kind.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have read the Act to-day carefully and have read it before to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite have de-

cried the assessment rolls and municipal councils, but I would ask them what they would take as the foundation of the voters' lists, even under a Dominion Franchise Act, if they were to throw aside the assessment roll. Is there any class of men in Ontario, or in any other province, so capable of making correct lists as the assessors and the township clerks. As regards the extra expense for payment of the township clerk, there is no extra expense in the municipalities, whose councils understand their business, because a municipal council has a perfect right to make a by-law, when appointing a clerk, that he shall receive no extra remuneration for revising the lists or serving the notices. This will not only keep down the expense, but make the clerk very careful, because if any extra labour is involved, through his making incorrect lists, the expense falls upon himself. There is no body of men who can make more correct voters' lists, and they are independent of the local legislature. The township council is perfectly independent of the local legislature, and so is the assessor appointed by it, and so is the township clerk. In the revision of the lists, under the present law, the judge, in most cases, employs the township clerk as revising officer for the time being, so that in reality the very same individual who revises the provincial lists also revises the Dominion lists. The people of every township municipality have it in their own hands to see that the assessors do their duty. I was twelve years at the head of one municipality, the lists were carefully revised every year, and we never had the judge in the township but once.

As regards the statement that it cost \$200 to pay the judge to revise the lists in the county of Huron, there are fifteen rural and ten urban municipalities in that county, or twenty-five altogether, which makes only a little over \$8 each municipality had to pay the judge and the constable and the other expenses of revising these lists. That is a long way short of what it cost to revise the list under the Dominion Elections Act. Under that Act, it never cost a riding less than \$700 for the expenses of the judge and the other expenses in the revising of the lists.

Mr. BENNETT. I always like to hear the fervid indignation of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan). He is always indignant at any imputation on the good faith of his own party, and yet the hon. gentleman comes from a riding which—be it stated to its discredit—is the only county in Ontario where they have absolutely gone to work and cut up the townships in order to gerrymander their political opponents. Why, the hon. gentleman of all men in this House, should never assume an air of virtuous indignation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). How many townships were cut up?

Mr. BENNETT. I thought that other gentleman from East Huron would at least have possessed his soul in patience, but he, like the other hon. gentleman, seems to glory in his shame.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). We have no shame to glory in.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I will accept the hon. gentleman's word that he has no shame. I say it is no business of the assessor to make himself a political machine for either party, to go about finding these so-called manhood suffrage voters. The Bill provides that he shall make reasonable inquiries in order to ascertain what persons are entitled to go on in that form. But there is no penalty prescribed if he does not place them on the list. In the very county of Huron there were practically none of these men placed on the list before last year, and then a large sum was expended to have them put on in view of the coming election. The hon. gentleman says look at the penalties prescribed. Does he not know that in Ontario any man can, in the interest of the local government, defy the law, and he will be whitewashed by the Ontario local government. He should know that as an employee of the Ontario Government, because he has been in receipt of hundreds of dollars from the local government as lecturer to the farmers' institutes, and I do not wonder at his coming to the defence of his friends. It is notorious that in Ontario most disgraceful things have been done by the local officers. We know that in a case at Rat Portage the local government intervened and whitewashed the man and prevented the possibility of his being sent to jail.

The hon. gentleman knows very well that the lists in Ontario have always had more or less, a tinge of suspicion about them, and he knows very well, and I believe that is why he contends for the carrying of this Act, that the voters' lists as printed in this form will offer facility for wrong-doing and will not give the country the perfect list that the present law affords. Not only does the law contemplate that the assessor is not bound to make this inquiry, but it further says that if the assessor has omitted a name from the list, by placing an affidavit in the hands of the assessor the party is entitled to have his name upon the lists. I contend again that everything I said this afternoon is quite borne out by the facts.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMILLAN), I am quite sure, read the Act correctly, but his interpretation of it is not correct, for he made his statement this afternoon and it was backed up by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) and several other hon. members that the ten copies of the Ontario lists furnished to members of this House and to defeated candidates for this House were the certified and corrected lists.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. McMILLAN. No. I never said that; do not put that to my charge, for I knew better.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made it, then, and several members backed him up in it.

Mr. McMILLAN. I cannot help that, I did not make it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, I have here lists for 1897—

Mr. McMILLAN. I admit that these lists are not the revised copies.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was going to say that I had the lists for nine-tenths of the municipalities in my constituency. There was one short, and I wrote to the clerk of the municipality for it, the list for South Crosby. I have it here, and here is one polling subdivision in which eight or ten names, and another some twenty names are added by the judge; and, as my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) says, in many places there are even erasures, names struck out by the judge. Now, as the ten copies that are supplied to us do not contain these changes, what good are the lists to us? There are no copies of the final lists except the three copies revised by the judge, one copy kept for himself, one for the clerk of the peace and a third for the clerk of the municipality.

Then, when the election comes on are these lists reprinted and distributed? No, they are simply poll-books made out. And I want to ask the Solicitor General what he calls a "poll-book." What is the meaning of "poll-book" if it is not the very identical book that is made by the clerk of the municipality from the revised copy furnished by the judge? That is taken by the deputy returning officer and is the poll-book. If this book is sent out with some names written in, and some others struck out, what is to prevent the deputy returning officer from striking out any names he pleases? The voter comes in, but the deputy returning officer has run his pen through the name, and the man is not allowed to vote. He can get a tendered ballot if he swears he is the party named or purporting to be named, and that he has a right to vote; but that tendered ballot is not counted except in the case of a protest. I saw that myself in a case in the last election. A man came forward. His name was on the list, but it was misspelled, a letter or two being wrong. He took the oath that he was the person named or purporting to be named that he owned the property in respect of which the vote was given, but he was only given a tendered ballot and his ballot did not count—all this because his name was given as "Joseph T" when it should only have been "Joseph." I rose to correct the statement that the lists sent out are the revised lists.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am aware of that.

Mr. TAYLOR. But you corroborated the statement made by the member for North Norfolk that they were the corrected lists.

Mr. McMILLAN. I did not corroborate any such statement

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), this afternoon said with a good deal of energy that persons who would become 21 years of age within sixty days would be entitled to be placed on the list as voters in the provincial elections. The hon. gentleman was a little severe in his criticisms of the lawyers and told them that they knew no law, and he got up as a teacher and read the Act. Now, whatever confidence the hon. gentleman has in himself, the House will have some doubt of the hon. gentleman's infallibility upon law questions after I have read the section to which the hon. gentleman referred. I am quite confident the hon. gentleman did not grasp what the meaning of the section was. It says :

Any person who is rated, or entered, or entitled or liable to be rated or entered in the assessment roll, either as a farmer's son, or for real property or income of the amount requisite to entitle him to vote at municipal elections, and who will be of the age of twenty-one years within sixty days from the final revision and correction of the assessment roll, shall have the right to apply to the judge to have his name entered on the voters' list—

What voters' lists ?

—or upon the assessment roll and the voters' list, as entitled to vote at municipal elections.

The hon. gentleman was teaching law.

Mr. BENNETT. Fireside law.

Mr. MACDONALD. You have the fireside law.

Mr. CLANCY. I think I have heard my hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) ask if there has been any township divided by the local government in what is called the gerrymander of 1885. He asks what they were. I am going to give that hon. gentleman some information, too.

Mr. BENNETT. He knows it.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman knows it, I will not read it.

Mr. MACDONALD. If you intend to give the divisions of the county to which I belong, I may inform you that I know it already.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman protested against that part of it that affected his own division for the House of Commons. If he did, I have only to say that the world has lost something, for the hon. gentleman's protest has never been heard. For the provincial electoral division of South Huron which, I fancy, comprises part of the riding represented by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan),

Hullett and Turnberry were cut in two, the other half being put in the riding of West Huron.

Mr. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) knew the situation there he would say that it was properly done.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD. It is more easily to laugh than to speak common sense in connection with these matters. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) knew the different roads leading through that county he would know exactly why those divisions were made, and would not find fault but would know that what was done had been done in the interest of all parties concerned.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps I could give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) some of the reasons for that. I can tell the hon. gentleman that in order to do that it was necessary to displace certain Conservative members and put in certain Liberals throughout the province. I do not apply it particularly to the hon. gentleman's county.

Mr. MACDONALD. Better confine your remarks to your own county.

Mr. CLANCY. It would be better to confine your remarks to one subject.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am in order. I want to answer the hon. gentleman in this way. He commenced to illustrate the iniquity of the Mowat Government by showing us how the county of Huron was gerrymandered, and the reason why it was gerrymandered. Now, I think that in order to be fair he should continue his illustration with the county of Huron till he gets through. And why? Because I am in a position to put him right if he goes wrong.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I fail to see the connection of the gerrymander in Ontario with the subject under discussion. I do not know who is responsible for first raising it, but I would remind members of the committee that we are now discussing section 3.

Mr. CLANCY. Let me give a few figures. West Huron possessed 22,900 voters before the reconstruction, and when it ended it had 2,605 more. East Huron had 26,248, and after it was re-arranged, the number was reduced to 22,758. What was the object? Why, to place the then hon. member for East Huron, Mr. Gibson, in a safe place for the next election.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It made no difference at all in the representation, consequently I fail to see that it made any difference whatever after the so-called gerrymander was made. Therefore, it shows that these cases are not at all political in their nature. If he can show that there was any difference made in the representation of the riding after the so-called gerry-

mander, then there would be some point to his argument.

Mr. POWELL. I would suggest to the Solicitor General that this section stand over. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals will bear me out in the statements I make, in so far as this clause relates to New Brunswick. I do not blame the Solicitor General for not being acquainted with the local conditions in New Brunswick, but the law is inapplicable to the province of New Brunswick as it now stands. Our method of voting at the local elections in New Brunswick is not the method adopted in Dominion elections. There a man may prepare his own ballot, and a dozen, or two dozen, or as many as the returning officer will allow, seeing it does not interfere with the proceeding of the election—a crowd of men can go into a polling room and the ballots are placed in the box as fast as the returning officer can receive them out of their hands and his clerk record the voters. The result is that our local polling divisions frequently include a population of several thousand, whereas in the Dominion elections they can in no case contain more than sufficient to afford at the most 200 voters. Now, to give an illustration which is within the knowledge of the Minister of Railways and Canals, who knows pretty well the condition of affairs. Take in New Brunswick, the old election Act, which is on page 49 of the Acts of New Brunswick, 1889. Under this Act which regulates their size, the parish of Shediac is divided into two polling districts. I will not read the particular divisions, but those of us who are familiar with the locality know the size of the parish of Shediac. There are no less than 1,200 voters in that parish, and at the present time I feel safe in saying in fact that at least there are more than 1,200, as the Minister of Railways and Canals knows. The heavy poll is in the Barachois district, where there are fully 800 voters, and it is absolutely impossible in a Dominion election that those 800 people can poll their votes, especially if there is any swearing to be done. I have no doubt that in the county of Queen's the same difficulty will occur. And in the larger parishes throughout the different counties in the province, the same difficulty will occur. Take the parish of Dorchester, another very large parish in the electoral district of Westmoreland. There are 1,100 voters in that parish. There is one very large poll and two smaller ones. At the McGinley poll, I suppose there are 600 or 700 voters. There is another very large parish—Sackville, in which there are only three polling places. In one poll there are 800 voters on the list, and it is impossible for these votes all to be polled in one booth under the Dominion law. If there is any swearing to be done or objections taken, fully one-half the voters at least will be denied the privilege of voting. It is

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

so to a less extent in the remaining parishes of Sallsbury and Moncton where the voting lists are too large for practical purposes.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to sub-paragraph b, of section 5, which I think will be the clause that will require to be amended in the case of the difficulty he suggests.

Mr. POWELL. That does not provide for it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. But that is the place where we should discuss the subject when we come to it.

Mr. POWELL. There may be a little collision between the words in this section and the paragraph the hon. gentleman mentions. Now, I am not finding any fault at all, because as between the two methods, federal and provincial, of making up the voters' lists, there is about as much dissatisfaction under one as under the other. I may say that throughout our province, and the provincial members will substantiate what I say, there has been no well-grounded complaint against either the Dominion election law or the local law, so far as the evil of intentionally denying any person the privilege of voting is concerned. Under our law, three men are selected as revising officers. They revise the assessment roll for the parish, and have the privilege of putting on the names of any additional parties who acquire the right to vote, or whose names do not already appear. Now, there should be some way of appeal from the action of these parties. If a man is not placed by them on the roll, he should have the privilege of appealing to the county court judge and have his name put on. I have known several cases where people have complained, rightly or wrongly of unfairness on the part of the revisers. If these men, who are men taken at random and know nothing about the principles of law, in some cases, have done wrong, even if I acquit them of improper motives, I would ask the hon. gentleman to make some amendment, or to add a section, allowing the privilege of appeal. The point I wish to make is, that if this subsection is to apply to New Brunswick it will be necessary to add words such as the following:—"Official lists such as adopted by the judge on appeal."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not see that I can very well adopt the suggestion, so far as giving a right of appeal. If we interfere with the machinery of the local legislature of one province, we may be asked to similarly interfere with another province. I would suggest that this point be left over, and, with the assistance of the Minister of Railways, I shall probably be able to devise a scheme to meet the case of New Brunswick, because a difficulty might occur which must in some way be overcome.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). No doubt, the point mentioned by the hon. member for Westmoreland was overlooked in the preparation of the Bill. Last year, a similar Bill was presented to the House, and it contained a provision whereby the difficulty would be overcome. I had not the opportunity of examining the Bill this year before it was presented; but, on referring to the Bill of last year, it will be found that arrangements were made for dividing the list of voters into three divisions, alphabetically, or for the erection of separate booths. I will look up the Bill of last year, and will consult with the Solicitor General.

Mr. **POWELL**. The present Minister of Railways was Attorney General of New Brunswick at the time the Act was passed. He made a suggestion that worked very well in the local elections, but it would not work here. It was, that two or more ballot-boxes should be provided in each case. The system worked very well in Westmoreland, where there are some large polling divisions in which there were two or three ballot-boxes, and where the election list was divided alphabetically. But it would not work under the proposed Dominion law.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. What would be the objection?

Mr. **POWELL**. It could not be carried out, unless the suggestions of the Minister of Railways were carried out and separate booths provided. Then, provision would have to be made, authorizing the returning officer, or deputy returning officer, to divide up the polling lists. I desire to call attention to another matter, which is a very serious one. At present, in most parts of the province, in fact throughout the province, Dominion elections are conducted in a very orderly manner, and a stranger would scarcely know that an election was going on. Under our local law, in districts where many people come together on election day, it is rather a disreputable day by times.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think that remark should be confined to the south-eastern part of the province.

Mr. **POWELL**. I have no doubt that in the county represented by the hon. gentleman the population are very pious and orderly; but that is neither here nor there. Under the election law of the Mackenzie Government, the revising officer took the franchise list and divided it up, so that in no polling district there were more than 200 voters. The result was, that perfect quiet and order were maintained. New Brunswick occupies an exceptional position. We have a different mode of voting from that adopted by the Dominion, and that province and Prince Edward Island are exceptional in that regard.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I suggest that this matter be left over, and an amendment be carefully drawn and submitted at a subsequent sitting.

Mr. **QUINN**. I should like to present the point as to whether a poll-book of a polling subdivision can be called under this Act an official list or a list of voters. Under our law in the province of Quebec, an official list is one certified by commissioners who have examined it. No portion of it is official until it receives a certain certificate. Under this provision, it would not be an official list.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. By subsection "d." the expression "voters' list" or "list of voters" includes any poll-book or official list of persons entitled to vote at a provincial election. In the province of Quebec, we have two divisions as to lists, city and rural. In the cities, such as Quebec, and Montreal, there are commissioners, and their certificate is put on the list, and it is obtained from the chairman of the revising board by the revising officer, when an election comes on. That is called, under our law, a voters' list. The difficulty is as regards the word poll-book, which we inserted in order to meet the law of Ontario. Under the Ontario law, a voters' list is entirely different from a poll-book. The poll-book is simply a record that is kept of the votes as they are polled.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. No, no.

Mr. **QUINN**. That is hardly correct.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. When I speak of the law in Ontario I am happy to receive information from gentlemen from that province. I refer now to paragraph 33 of the Ontario Elections Act. I see there that when an election comes on, the returning officer obtains from the clerk of the peace for the county, the voters' lists and from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery he obtains the poll book. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery does not at all supply the voters' lists.

Mr. **QUINN**. Apply that to Quebec.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. As far as Quebec is concerned the poll-book comes to the clerk at the time of the election, and is absolutely blank without a name in it, and there he records the name according to the votes registered. No matter how we look upon it the question is whether or not this paragraph is sufficient for the purpose intended. What we mean is, that the voters' list as used under this Act shall include that official list. It seems that it is sufficient to cover it. I am not wedded to the change; I suggest it because I think it will improve the phraseology of the clause.

Mr. **QUINN**. I must confess that I am rusty on the law as regards subdivisions. My recollection is that the subdivisions were

made by the commissioners themselves, who after having gone through the whole voters' lists, then subdivided into the polling subdivision, 200 names each. I think that applies to the electoral districts of the city of Montreal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The word used in the Bill is "the voting subdivision."

Mr. QUINN. If the Solicitor General is satisfied I am quite willing, but I thought it necessary to make the suggestion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I sent for the Bill introduced last year, and the 28th section says: that where the polling division contains more than 200 qualified voters according to the voters' list, the returning officer shall provide separate polling divisions, for the names in alphabetical order. I think a provision in the present Bill similar to that will remove all the difficulties.

Mr. POWELL. I think it is better to have the territorial division of 200. In my own county the sheriff is a Liberal and I do not believe he is going to commit any fraud, but it would be better not to have the people aggregated together in one polling division. The election, I believe, would go on much more respectably if we had not the people huddled together.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I believe it would not be well to interfere with the local arrangement to the extent the hon. gentleman suggests. I have not seen any serious disorder occur to the extent that my hon. friend suggests, and if we divide those polling subdivisions it will interfere with the local arrangement. I think myself that it would be well to make the arrangement as provided in the former Bill.

Mr. BELL (Addington). I admire the very kind manner in which the hon. the Solicitor General has handled this Bill; but I wish to call his attention to the argument of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), that irregularities have occurred and may occur again unless the voters' lists are reprinted after the final revision by the judge. Notwithstanding all the law quoted by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) and his long experience in municipal matters, yet it is beyond doubt or contradiction that the voters' lists are not completed when they leave the court of revision. As the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) drew your attention to the careless manner in which these voters' lists were handled after they left the court of revision to be revised by the judge. I have had some experience of that kind of carelessness. During the last local elections in my county, in one township there were sixty-six names left off the list, and they were put on by the judge. This led to considerable confusion

Mr. QUINN.

and difficulty. But I apprehend that there is no use of discussing this question here, because the answer comes back to us, if we are going to adopt the provincial voters' list, we have nothing to say about it. Now, I do think we are placed in a most humiliating position by handing over to the provinces the entire preparation and revision of the voters' list. If we have any grievances, there is no use of our mentioning them here, because the only answer we can expect is the whole question is under the jurisdiction of the provinces, therefore, I think we are only wasting time to continue this discussion.

Mr. WALLACE. I entirely disagree with the last statement of the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Bell). I think this is an opportune time, at any rate, to place our views on record. To me, this looks like a most humiliating proposition, and it places the Solicitor General in a most humiliating position. What is proposed? These gentlemen say we are going to adopt a new franchise law. What is it going to be? We will abolish the old one—that is the first thing. What is to take its place? The franchise laws of the provinces. They do not stop to inquire whether these are just laws, or whether they are suitable for our purposes in the Dominion Parliament. No such inquiry is made. We must simply swallow the whole thing. The Solicitor General has given a hasty examination of the Franchise Acts of the provinces, with whose laws he is not familiar; and he comes before us with a brief which has been put into his hands, and he has to defend everything in the Ontario list. If he cannot defend it, why does he come here to press it upon the Parliament of Canada? He cannot defend it, even with the assistance of the hon. member from Huron and the members from some other counties, because there are portions of it that cannot be defended. I say it is a humiliating position to have the Government and this Parliament placed in—that we are to adopt laws which the Solicitor General is so unfamiliar with. I presume—and it is no reflection upon him at all—that until a very short time ago he had not studied the election laws of the various provinces of this Dominion outside of his own province of Quebec; yet he gets up here and defends, and will have to defend, the whole of the Ontario law. We cannot, apparently, change it, because the next clause says that "the qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote shall be those established by the laws of that province," and so on. We ask, what are the laws of the province of Ontario? What are the laws of the province of Nova Scotia? We must go it blind, and accept them. The province of Nova Scotia has passed a Franchise Act for that province. We do not know the circumstances or conditions of that province: we do not know the exigencies of the political parties there; and yet this

Parliament is asked to say that that is a perfect law, or is as nearly perfect as we are capable of making it. We cannot do it. Then, as to Ontario; those who are familiar with that province can point out innumerable defects in its election laws; yet the qualifications for voters, and, I presume, all the other machinery, are to be the same, or practically the same, for this House as those that exist for the local legislature. We ought to adopt the principle, that if the franchises of any of the provinces suit us, and are found the most admirable for the purpose, we shall adopt their good qualities—those portions which may be adapted to our circumstances and conditions; but we should not hand over the control of these voters' lists to assessors or other officers over whom we have no control whatever. Hon. gentlemen say that they are under the control of the local legislatures. Well, my experience, where I live, in the township of Vaughan, during an experience of twenty years of revising voters' lists, both for the province and the Dominion, has been, that we have no confidence in the voters' list until it gets into the hands of the judge; and you have to bring witnesses there at great expense to spend one or two days waiting until their turn comes to give evidence, to correct the defects of the voters' list, as made out by the assessor. We have to fight against these difficulties in the province, and now we are asked to have them introduced here. The most serious point of all is, that we shall have a most imperfect list. The most important consideration in framing a voters' list is, that no man who is entitled to have his name put on shall be deprived of his vote. But you cannot find anything like a perfect list in the local elections. That is proved by the fact that, although it professes to be a manhood suffrage, yet the number of votes polled has always been far less than the number of votes polled in the Dominion election, where the franchise is more restricted, showing that it leaves off many men who are entitled to be put on. We found that, in the last local election, although the revision took place only a few months before—in September, October or November. We found, when we came to the elections, that, although both candidates had taken a great deal of pains to get it perfected, the list was a very bad list indeed, and that bad list you are trying to force on this Parliament. I can only utter my strongest protest against so utterly unfair and unjust a measure.

Mr. POPE. I find in the Quebec Election Act, that it is provided that, as soon as the list of electors has come into force, it shall be the duty of the secretary-treasurer of the municipality to certify it in duplicate, and place one duplicate in the archives of the municipality, and transmit the other to the registrar of the registration division in which the municipality is situated. That, I deem, would be the official list, and we pro-

pose to do away with the word "poll-book," and leave the official list of persons entitled to vote at a provincial election. Would the hon. Solicitor General say that this is the list that would be found at every subdivision, or is the list to be found at the subdivisions a list prepared by the deputy from this official list of the people entitled to vote at that polling subdivision? So far as I can see, by the Quebec Act, the only official list would be the one deposited with the registrar.

Mr. HUGHES. Inasmuch as it is possible that there may be some changes made in relation to the voters' lists used in the provinces, why not let this section stand over?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. For what reason?

Mr. HUGHES. Because if the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt the suggestion I took the opportunity of making the other day, the term "voters' lists" would have to be changed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I see the hon. gentleman's point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me there is much to be considered in the remarks of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) with regard to the effect of this subsection. It is proposed to make the voters' lists in the different provinces the lists upon which the Dominion elections shall be run. In listening to the discussion of this Bill, and more particularly to the discussion in committee, I was very much struck with the fact that we are asked, to a very great extent, to vote it through without knowing exactly what it means. When we find that the hon. Solicitor General, with his very great ability and the great amount of time and attention he has devoted to this Bill, is not very sure himself, how can members of this House, who have not the time and a great many of whom have not the technical knowledge which the hon. Solicitor General possesses, be expected to understand what they are doing? We are asked to vote that certain enactments in the provincial legislatures shall form a proper basis for the voters' lists of this Parliament. I as a member of this Parliament, am called upon to determine what shall be the voters' list in the province of Ontario for an election to this Parliament. I must confess that although I have bestowed some little attention to the debate, I have a very hazy idea about that matter, and the learned Solicitor General, to some extent, has to depend upon the views which hon. members from Ontario give in regard to it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not conceal that, and if the hon. gentleman will take the schedule I have printed and attached to the Bill, he will find all he wants.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my memory serves me as far back as yesterday afternoon, I think the hon. Solicitor General wanted light from hon. gentlemen on this side who are interested in the working of the Act in Ontario. When the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was speaking, my hon. friend the Solicitor General stated frankly that he did not profess to understand the Ontario Act in the same way, for example, as he did the Quebec Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would not profess for a moment to know as much about the Ontario law as a gentleman of the standing at the Ontario bar of the hon. member for West Simcoe.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is all my point. My learned and hon. friend the Solicitor General does not understand me, for a moment, as imputing the slightest fault to him or as imputing that he does not know everything about these provincial Acts that any one in his place would be expected to know. But what I suggest is that we are dealing with enactments of which we have but a mere summary in the very useful memorandum which the hon. gentleman has appended to this Bill, and we cannot get a very good idea of the provincial legislation from that. But the great demerit is not only that, but something further. We are not only invited to pass upon legislation which we do not understand, but to pass an Act providing that everything which these provincial legislatures shall enact in the future will be all right. My hon. friend will suggest to me, I suppose, that if the provincial legislatures alter their enactments from time to time, we have the power to correct those enactments so far as they are applicable to elections to this Parliament; and I concede that at once to be the case, but what does that amount to? It means simply that we have to keep a watch over the principal legislatures and check their enactments from time to time. That simply brings us back to the principle that we ought to deal with this matter ourselves. But even if we do adopt the provincial law, I would suggest that we should not go beyond saying that the provincial enactments, as they exist at present, and the bases on which the voters' lists are now made up in the different provinces, shall be the bases on which we shall proceed in the future. I do not see why we should pledge ourselves now to the wisdom of what any provincial legislature may pass in the future.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That question has been thoroughly threshed out in the discussion on the second reading, and we have adopted the principle that the basis of our franchise shall be the provincial franchise. I may, however, suggest to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who has said that I was

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

rather in a humiliating position, that he must know that this is the lenten season and that to be in a humiliating position is not therefore out of place. I am not so sure, however, that when I ask, in a very humble way, I admit, for light from some of my legal friends from Ontario, it was a very bad thing after all; and if my hon. friend from Halifax, who tells us he knows nothing about this, will ask for light on any particular point on which he desires to be informed, I shall endeavour to explain it to him to the best of my ability.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think the hon. Solicitor General appreciates the difficulty which has been mentioned. He attempts to meet it by saying that the principle of this Bill is the adoption of the provincial franchises, whether we understand them or not.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We are supposed to understand them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is, perhaps, a violent supposition. I think the hon. gentleman himself would have difficulty in recounting now, without reference to his memorandum, the different franchises in the different provinces. We have passed upon the principle of adopting the provincial franchises, and we now come to the very important question of the procedure, the machinery, by which this Bill can be carried out. The voters' lists come within the subject of procedure. The hon. gentleman is very kind to confess—and that is not the slightest reflection upon himself or upon any other hon. gentleman who would be in his position—that it is impossible for him to speak with assurance with regard to the working of this machinery, except as regards the province of Quebec, where, of course, his experience justifies him in taking a very strong stand and in giving the committee a great deal of useful information. But he went on to admit that he cannot speak with any assurance with regard to the working of these different laws in the other provinces. Therefore, we not only have to adopt the laws of the local legislatures with regard to the franchise, but, what is more dangerous, their different machinery for giving voters the opportunity of exercising their franchise. On that very important subject, the discussion this evening has made it apparent that we are groping in the dark. We are in the dark as to what constitutes a poll-book in the different provinces and how these lists are made up. Nothing to my mind could make more clear the mistake the Government are making, could show more clearly that it is a plunge in the dark, than the admission of the Solicitor General that he is unable to tell us how these different systems are worked and the procedure to be adopted under a system controllable by this House, we should be not

only in control of the system but in possession of certain and accurate information as to its working.

Mr. ERB. It appears to me that we are wasting a good deal of time on voters' lists. In reading over this Bill, I was struck with surprise to see that in Prince Edward Island they have no voters' list at all. That set me wondering whether the people of Prince Edward Island are more intelligent than the rest of us and whether there is more political morality and less partisanship than among the people of this province. If it is possible in Prince Edward Island to conduct an election without a voters' list and conduct it satisfactorily to the people—and I suppose elections there are held in a manner satisfactory to the people—why is it that we of the other provinces could not do the same? To do without a voters' list would be to save a great deal of expense and a great deal of wrangling. I would like to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries give an account of how they conduct the elections there and whether they are satisfactory. If they are, I think we could not do better than adopt the election machinery in use in Prince Edward Island.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I may tell my hon. friend (Mr. Erb) that the system that prevails in Prince Edward Island is perfectly satisfactory to the people, there is never the slightest hitch or the slightest trouble. It is largely an agricultural community. The province is divided into small districts where every elector is known. But though we get along exceedingly well, I should be sorry to try to force that system upon the large towns or upon the other provinces. The principle that this House has endorsed is that we should take as the franchise for this House the franchises which are found to be satisfactory in the several provinces. And in doing that, we adopt the machinery which experience has shown to be best adapted to carry out the end we have in view.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman state what that is?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** As to Prince Edward Island, the returning officer divides the constituency into districts of about 200 voters. On the morning of election, a man comes up to vote—

Mr. HUGHES. How do they know whether there are 200 or 2,000 voters?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** There is not the slightest difficulty in working the system. It has been working for forty years and no difficulty has arisen. The returning officer knows his county and he subdivides it, and the divisions are known to everybody and have been for years. At the polls are in-

spectors on each side and a deputy returning officer who sits as a kind of judge to receive the votes. A man presents himself to vote and gives his name. If his vote is challenged by one of the inspectors, he can if he chooses, take the oath swearing that he has the qualifications necessary to vote. But it must be understood that each individual is known. It is not like a large city, where, very often, the voter is unknown. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Macdonald) knows that the system works admirably.

Mr. DAVIN. If his qualifications is questioned, he may be called upon to take the oath?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Certainly. His name is entered on the poll-book and the fact that he has been sworn is also entered, in case of a scrutiny.

Mr. DAVIN. We have the same system in the North-west, and it works well.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** The character of the population, is no doubt, somewhat similar. Under such circumstances, it works well. I do not know how it would work in large cities.

Mr. WALLACE. Why?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Because the people are not known. Take the case of the city of Toronto, for instance, how would it be known whether a man had a right to vote or not?

Mr. WALLACE. According to the hon. Minister it does not matter, when this man comes up to vote, whether he has the right to vote or not. When objected to, he takes the oath and votes.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** There is a great deal of difference between a man taking an oath who is personally known to the deputy returning officer and the inspectors on either side, and that of a stranger who would at once disappear and nobody know where he was to be found. People do not take false oaths in the presence of their neighbours and friends.

Now I would like to submit a point for the consideration of the committee. What is the sense of discussing the principle of this Bill in Committee of the Whole? That principle has been affirmed. We have adopted the qualifications of the several provinces, and we are here to carry that out. I would suggest to the committee that it is not fair to discuss the principle of the Bill at this stage. We have taken up the discussion in committee in order to discuss the details. The Solicitor General has told the committee, with perfect frankness, that if any provisions of the Bill require amendment, he is prepared to consider any suggestions that may be made, and if he finds it desirable, to accept it, and I think that

in that he has gone as far as hon. gentlemen can ask him to go. What are we discussing? Section 3 of the Bill, the interpretation clause, the question what a "voters' list" or a "Dominion election" may be. I would respectfully submit to the committee that we will never make progress in this way. When we come to section 5, which provides for the adoption of the provincial franchises, objections may be raised and these objections ought to be considered when they are raised. But to discuss these matters now, seems to me to be beating the air, because it is aside from the clause before the committee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would occupy just a moment to point out to my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) that, while there is great force in what he says, I have been sitting here and listening with all the attention I could as a layman to half a dozen gentlemen learned in the law, and I find that they are absolutely unable to agree upon the construction of this very simple clause. What is the difficulty? The difficulty is that you have undertaken to adopt the legislation of half a dozen different legislatures, and, therefore, the question of the principle again presents itself. It strikes at the very principle of the Bill. If half a dozen gentlemen learned in the law cannot, after an hour's discussion, arrive at a solution as to what is the meaning and what will be the effect of this law, I want to ask you what the general public, what those uneducated in the law who are going to work out this law in all these various provinces can do?

It appears to me that the very fact that this difficulty has presented itself, naturally makes people question whether we have not made a mistake in adopting a principle which, when it comes to be applied, is found to be so impracticable. But that is not all. If we were adopting provincial laws, if we were basing a franchise for this Dominion upon the franchises of the various provinces, as they stand to-day, that would be bad enough. But there would not be a tithe of the difficulty that presents itself when you remember that, after you have arrived at a conclusion as to how it is best to solve this question and what form this clause should take, three or four of these legislatures, before the next session of Parliament, may change all these laws upon which we are now basing our law. Where are we then? Why, it will be a case of confusion worse confounded, when you attempt to work out the principle that has been adopted of taking the laws of all the various legislatures, not the laws as they are to-day, but the laws as they are changed from year to year, and attempt to take them as a franchise for this Dominion. I am much inclined to agree with the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Calvert), especially after hearing the statement of the hon. Minister of Marine

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

and Fisheries. I am inclined to think that it would be better to get rid of this whole difficulty by adopting the plan that the member for West Middlesex has suggested, and which my hon. friend the Minister says forty years of experience has proved to work in the most admirable manner.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In an agricultural community.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It appears to me, that great difficulties will arise by attempting to work out such a complicated system.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I submit to my hon. friend, that these difficulties are purely imaginary. Where does the difficulty come in? Section 1 enacts "That the expression 'electoral district' means any place or territorial area in Canada entitled to return a member to serve in the House of Commons." Is there any difficulty about that? Nobody has suggested any possible difficulty about it. "The expression 'Dominion election,' or 'election,' means an election of a member to serve in the House of Commons." Where is the difficulty about that? "The expression 'provincial election' means an election of a member to serve in the legislative assembly, or House of assembly, or general assembly, of a province of Canada." What does that mean? No difficulty about that. "The expression 'voters' lists,' or 'list of voters,' includes, when provincial lists are referred to, any poll-book or official list of persons entitled to vote at a provincial election." I have not heard any difficulty suggested about that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Solicitor General himself proposed to amend that very clause.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Solicitor General has amended that; he thought the words "any poll-book" were a surplusage, and I agreed with him; I did not see the use of them. And they were struck out.

Mr. CLANCY. The objection to that is, that involves the consequence of the adoption of the provincial lists in section 5 and subsections. If this is passed, and there was any alteration made later on, as to the qualification of voters, then we would have to go back to the old sections. The suggestion was made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), that that should be allowed to stand, pending any changes that might be considered by the Government.

Mr. DAVIN. Nothing can be more appropriate than that we should discuss at this stage the principle of the measure. It need not be supposed that the minority who voted, agreed with the principle of this Bill. It will be remembered that the Solicitor General, in introducing this Bill, made a very

meagre explanation of it, and I understood from him that, on going into committee, he was to explain the Bill further. But when the highest legal authority on the Government side in this House tells us that he is comparatively ignorant of the provincial franchises, except that of Quebec, and when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tells us, as an argument why we should forthwith pass this clause, that these provincial franchises have worked well, I think we have a right to consider what those provincial franchises are. Take the province of Manitoba. Within three short years, from 1889 to 1892, changes were made in that province in regard to the franchise, that reflected undying ignominy on the perpetrators of that legislation. And yet the hon. Minister tells us that worked well. It is notorious all over the North-west Territories that the majority in Manitoba consider the present law, under which local elections take place, as an outrage on justice. I have in my hand here the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, to which I wish to call attention. They have manhood suffrage, and this is the way in which there the lists are made out :

When it has been determined to make and revise a list of electors in one or more electoral divisions, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall, by proclamation, appoint a proper person to be called " a registration clerk "—

In fact, an enumerator.

—for each of such electoral divisions, and, by such proclamation, fix the date for the closing of the list in each electoral division by the registration clerk. Such date shall not be less than four weeks from the date of such proclamation.

Now, here comes an arrangement about divisions, because either a judge or a barrister of three years' standing may be appointed to revise the lists.

A court for the revision of lists of electors shall for that purpose be held in each electoral division, as hereinafter provided. * * * * * Whenever any such judge or barrister is unable or neglects, within two weeks after the date of such proclamation, to appoint a day for the revision of the list for any electoral division assigned to him not later than the day above limited, then the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may assign such electoral division to some other judge or barrister.

So that, if it should be in any division the interest of the party in power to delay the revision, all they have to do is, to tip the wink to the revising judge, or barrister, to neglect doing his duty, and all he has to do is, to postpone advising the Lieutenant-Governor to appoint another revising barrister, or another judge, to attend to the work. I have in my hand evidence that that very thing was done, and, in consequence of that being done, 165 electors were kept off. I have other evidence of other outrages.

Mr. T. Seaman writes :

Yours to hand re registration clerk and revising barrister, and in reply thereto I would

say that personally I know but little re the action of these officers. I was ill at the time of Monkman's visit, and did not see him. The following, however, came under my observation : C. de Sumericourt (the reeve of this municipality) and myself went through the list as prepared, and found fully one-third of those entered to be on the list omitted therefrom, so far as our part is concerned. We filled in applications to all we knew that were so omitted, and de Sumericourt took the affidavits that he personally knew them, but out of about forty applications only three or four names were placed on by the revising barrister, Monkman. Amongst others, we applied to have on were Dan Macdonald and Robert Holland, of 28, 18, 2. Macdonald was the owner of the land and house, and Holland lived with him. Macdonald was known to be a strong Conservative, while Holland promised to vote for Burrows. Macdonald was not put on at the court of revision, but Holland was. They contended the forms we filled in were not the proper ones, but why put on one man and leave the other off ? Besides, Gilmour sent me the forms, and no doubt they were all right. At the settlement of Oak Point, the following to my knowledge were entitled to be on the list :—Pierre Chartrand, Joseph Lucier, Alexander Desjarlis, sr., Alex. Desjarlis, jr., Alex. Desjarlis, 18, 18, 5, Baptiste Lamoureux, Alexander Lamoureux, George Lamoureux, Baptiste Bruno, Moses Lucier, Stanislaus Desjarlis, François Desjarlis, Louis Desjarlis, and Antoine Desjarlis ; but only the two latter were on the list, while every name, or nearly so, appears on our municipal voters' list.

So that though they appeared on the much-belauded municipal lists they were not found on the list for the local election !

These people were natives, several of whom were between forty and fifty years of age, and were born at Oak Point. It was known that to a man they would vote against Burrows. The policy seemed to be to leave off as many as possible bearing French names, and to put on every one with an Icelandic name, many of whom were in Winnipeg, and had not lived here for many years. A young Iclander taught school here two months in the summer—he never lived here before, and left when the school closed. His name was on the list, while scores of people that had resided here for years were left off. To make it almost impossible for our friends to be put on at the court of revision, the courts were placed on the extreme end of the settlement, and many would have to go forty miles to get their names on. You are aware that it is the duty of the registration clerk to give notice by posting notices in all post offices immediately after his appointment, and requiring those desirous of placing names on the list to send the names to him at least, I think, five days before the list closed. The notice reached here on October 30, and the list closed November 5, or exactly the time allowed to send in names, while the clerk lived about 150 miles away, so that it was impossible to place names on in the first instance.

Fancy this ! Here is an outrage. The notice reached them six days before the list was closed.

You should, however, see Glen Campbell. He can give you a far worse story than this. You are at liberty to make whatever use you like of the foregoing, and, if it necessary, to mention my name as the author.

I have here the affidavit of Heriot C. Ross :

District of Lake Dauphin.

Province of Manitoba.

To wit :

I, Heriot C. Ross, of the village of Dauphin, in the electoral division of Dauphin, province of Manitoba, clerk, agent for Glenlyon A. Campbell, one of the candidates at the recent election held in the electoral division of Dauphin, to elect a member to the Provincial Legislature, make oath and say :

That I attended the several courts of revision held by Albert Monkman, revising barrister, and that the accompanying exhibit, marked "A," is a list of the names applied to be placed on the list of electors at the said several courts of revision, and that the said Albert Monkman refused to state whether he would or would not add such names to the list of electors of the said electoral division.

And I know this to be true in substance and in fact.

(Sgd.) HERIOT C. ROSS.

Sworn before me in the village of Dauphin, this 29th day of February, 1896.

CHARLES HICKS,

A Commissioner in B.R.

Here is Exhibit A :

List of names for which applications were made to the revising barristers at the different courts of revision in the electoral division of Dauphin, to be placed on the list of electors, to be used in the elections held in January, 1896, and which at such courts he refused to state would be added or rejected.

Then follows a list of 165 names, every one of whom was entitled to vote. Then there is the following note :—

Many of the persons whose names are given above, and for whom applications were made to add at the court of revision, have resided in the constituency for a number of years.

(Sgd.) HERIOT C. ROSS.

That is the state of things which, according to the hon. Minister of Marine, has been working well. Here is a letter from Wawanesa, Manitoba, February 28, 1896 :

The time was rather short for them. I have only 7—17 and 8—17 fairly full, part of 7—16 and the numbers in 7—18. There are fully 200 names off that should have been on, and about 75 on should have been off. We don't claim all these Conservative, but goes to show had there been a court of revision things would have been different. Of course, the great majority were Conservative. The thing was managed in this way. Mr. Graham and his friends would go to Conservatives, as they came to me and said : "There is no call for any action on your side ; if you have not the time, as we are placing every one on we find entitled to be on. We are using the old lists—municipal, provincial and Dominion—and giving every one fair-play." With such arguments as this, I was satisfied to let them do the work, for, as I told both Haddow and Graham, at the court of revision, we could rectify errors. When it came near time for court of revision, I saw Haddow, and asked him for lists, then twelve days before. He said, "None yet received from the printer." I saw him again after this. He said, "There can be no court of revision now, for there is not time necessary to post lists, and

Mr. DAVIN.

none received from the printer yet." I had sent in some 28 names previous to November 4, and I was anxious to see if they were on. Time went by. Court of revision was to be on Thursday, the 19th. On Tuesday, the 17th, the first list came to our postmaster. I at once wired W. A. Macdonald, Brandon, for postponement of court, or what was going to be done. He replied : "McLeod says, 'No court in Wawanesa, as no applications or objections.'" We found that nearly every one of my 28 names were left off the lists. Now, why were the lists sent to Emerson to be printed ? I would like to know the government reason. My own solution of the deal is this : In 1892, Bailey, printer, came here dead on Greenway, sounded me as to Tory pap, said he had not been used right by Greenway, and if the Government at Ottawa would give him patronage, he would give the Conservative the support of his paper, "The Enterprise," in both houses. He said Greenway owed his \$700 for election expenses in Morden district (not E. D.), that he (B.) had been the means of Greenway's election, that Greenway had induced him to go to Morden by promise of patronage, and after he (Bailey) going to some \$400 expenses, Greenway refused to carry out his promises. I told Bailey I would see. In the following June, 1893, I was waited on by a couple of Conservatives, saying Bailey had been writing, and they came to see about it. I said, "Bailey no good, and using us to squeeze Greenway." In the following August, Bailey came in the store and showed the document from the Attorney General's department to the effect that he (Bailey) was to have the printing of several things, public health pamphlets and other things, and he (Bailey) agreed to drop his opposition to the local government.

I ask the hon. member (Mr. LaRivière) how many miles is Emerson away from—

Mr. LaRIVIERE. A hundred miles away.

Mr. DAVIN. Did you say 200 miles away ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. A hundred miles away.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, that is a long distance.

I have no proof of any contract only Bailey's own words and the fact of from that time to this Bailey has done all in his power for the Greenway Government. His paper did not pay here so he went to Emerson and though Graham, Fowler and others here strongly objected, Greenway and Sifton insisted on him (Bailey) printing the South Brandon voters' lists, and he being a fit one for dirty work so managed that they did not reach Haddow, the clerk, until Friday night, the 13th, or only four clear days, not counting Sunday, before the court was called to sit, thereby not giving us any chance to object or apply—Graham's action in compiling the lists is explained by the fact. It was generally understood the Conservatives were going to run Reeve Canall of Oakland, and as Canall is very popular and strong, living near Graham, Graham used everything in his power to strengthen himself—all we can honestly complain of is the fact of no chance of adding and objecting on account of no court.

I see that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) as usual is not in his place to-night. It would be interesting if he were here for him to tell what part he took with Greenway in insisting that Bailey should have the printing of these lists at Emerson. We are

getting on now to the witching hour of night ; it is twenty minutes past eleven.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And you agreed to put this Bill through committee this session of the House.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes ; does my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) remember the way you and your friends went on in 1885 ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not talking about that ; I am talking about the solemn agreement made across the floor of this House.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, and in 1885, you passed the second reading of the Franchise Act, and you went on arguing and discussing and jabbing for three months in committee.

Mr. QUINN. Where is the Minister of the Interior at the witching hour of night ?

Mr. DAVIN. I have been so devoted to politics now for many years that I forget these descriptive allusions of Byron to scenes of revelry. But I think it will be found in Childe Harold, and that they be- seem the terpsichorean movements of our friend the Minister of the Interior. Any way, it was before the battle of Waterloo, and as described in Childe Harold, that ball took place in the city of Brussels ; but I think the ball to-night may be in commemoration of a battle quite as disastrous to the young Napoleon of the Liberal party as was the ball at Brussels to the great Napoleon of history. The ball at Brussels described by Childe Harold was previous to the defeat of Napoleon, but this ball to-night is subsequent to defeat of the young Napoleon, the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The Duke of Yukon.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. La-Rivière) suggests the Duke of Yukon, but I do not think that just now there are any strawberry leaves for the Duke of Yukon ; the spring frost has nipped the strawberry leaves in the bud.

Mr. BENNETT. This is the winter of their discontent.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, it is their winter—

Mr. TALBOT. That is all very interesting.

Mr. DAVIN. Not half so interesting as the beautiful countenance of my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot).

Mr. TALBOT. Do you think so ?

Mr. DAVIN. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) that nothing gives me so much pleasure as when he interrupts me. I turn around and I look at him and I remember the words of the poet Keats :

- A thing of beauty is a joy for ever,
- Its loveliness increases, it will never
- Pass into nothingness, but still will keep
- A bower quiet for us and a sleep
- Full of sweet dreams and health and quiet
- breathing.

Every time he interrupts me he affords me an æsthetic joy.

Mr. TALBOT. And you are quite an æsthetic man.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, Sir, I will be able to show the Solicitor General, and I will be able to show my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the "Free Press" which is supporting them at the present moment, and has been supporting them for a couple of years past, and has always been a Liberal Organ ; the "Free Press," of Winnipeg has denounced the provincial election lists as an outrage upon justice ; an outrage, in that it completely throws into the hands of a partisan government the manipulation of the making of the voters' lists, so that in every constituency they can gouge the electorate, and make it a certainty that their partisan men shall be returned. In fact I have heard it said by an independent man in Winnipeg, that in the last election Greenway would not have allowed a Conservative to be elected were it not, in the first place that it would have been so patent that rascality had been perpetrated, and in the next place, that if all Liberals were returned he would have a more dangerous opposition than if he had allowed six or seven Conservatives to come in, and so he permitted, for the sake of appearance, a few conservatives to get into the legislature. Is it to be expected for one moment that whether we are in the committee stage of a Bill or not and when it comes to a question of allowing Dominion members of Parliament for Manitoba to be elected under such an outrage of justice, we should sit 'sub silentio' and allow such a Bill to pass without discussion. I may have no objections to accepting the voters' lists of the various provinces as a basis of the franchise, but to accept them without any safeguard or qualification, and to allow under this Bill six or seven members from Manitoba to be forced into this House without having a majority of the electorate behind them ; pushed through the doors of this free Parliament by the foul hand of corruption ; a mockery to this free Parliament ; an outrage on everything like justice. Before we will tolerate any such thing as that, we will fight and fight ; that is my feeling. I owe it to Manitoba and the west. I will certainly fight hard rather than sit tamely by and allow such a thing as that to happen ; and my hon. and learned friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should fight by my side, because in what he said about the local franchise in Prince Edward Island he implied that if the local franchise in any province is not fair, he did not want it, and if it did not work well he did not want it. He says that in the province of Prince Edward Island it works well, and I believe it does, because the same thing works well with us. Why not put in a clause providing that

in the province of Manitoba a man who is entitled to vote, whether his name is on the list or not, can come up and swear himself on at the poll? Why not do that? Because, forsooth, the answer is, this Parliament would then be taking a slight hand in fixing its own franchise; it would be putting its little finger to the machinery of fixing its own franchise, and such an outrage as that cannot be tolerated for a moment! In the face of what fell from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the franchise in Prince Edward Island works well, what answer has he to the offer I make? He may say, you have a big city in Winnipeg. Well, except the big city. It is not more true in Prince Edward Island than it is in the rural districts of Manitoba that every man knows every other man. Manitoba has not a congested population. The rural districts of Manitoba are peopled by respectable farmers, just as are the rural districts of the North-west Territories and Prince Edward Island and Ontario. I have read some of their names to you. There are 165 of them who have been sworn to. If their names have been left off by carelessness, or by an infamous arrangement like sending the list to Emerson 100 miles away to be printed, and then coming back when it was altogether too late, let them have the same right as their brother electors in the North-west Territories and in Prince Edward Island, to swear that they have been residents of the province for two or three years and of the constituency for three months. The only objection to that is that it would be allowing this Dominion Parliament to put its little finger to the machinery that is to bring the electoral lists into force in Manitoba, and that would be such an outrage on the symmetry of our beautifully symmetrical Act, which has not a single principle in it except the principle of heterogeneity, so that it might be described as Dr. Johnson described higgledy-piggledy, as a conglomerated mass of heterogeneous matter.

Mr. HUGHES. I hope the Solicitor General will see the advisability of letting this clause stand. So far as I am personally concerned, I could not accept the provincial list of Ontario, but by a very slight amendment the provincial franchises might be made the basis of our list. Even though the Government do not see their way to have one uniform franchise from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but persist in adopting the franchises of the various provinces, I think in all fairness there should be some little concessions made, so as to provide for such names as have been pointed out by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) being placed on the list in some simple way. If that is done, this definition of "voters' list" would require some amendment. I would respectfully suggest that the Solicitor General allow the clause to stand.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the debate goes over, I want to refer to a statement which has been made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries since the hon. leader of the Opposition has left the House. He made the statement that a bargain was made across the floor of the House that this Bill was to be passed to-night. I did not, nor did any one else on this side of the House, so understand it, and I do not think he can find in "Hansard" that there was any such agreement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought that matter up. By the well-known usage of the House it is customary for the leaders to make provisional agreements with reference to public Bills. During the debate on Friday night last the leader of the Opposition suggested that we should adjourn. The leader of the Government was not here, and as I was leading the House I consulted with the hon. leader of the Opposition. I told him that it was the desire of the leader of the Government that the division on the second reading should take place that night. He consulted with the hon. member for York, who sat beside him, and he said that he could not agree that it was possible to take a division that night, but he thought it could be taken on Tuesday. I said I would go and see the leader of the Government, and come back and if possible make an agreement. I came back, and the hon. leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for York and myself, acting for the leader of the Government, agreed that the division on the second reading would take place on Tuesday night, and that the Bill would be permitted to go through committee on Friday—at this sitting.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Go to or go through committee?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Go through committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am stating what took place—that the Bill would be allowed to go through committee to-night, so far as he was able to control the Opposition and advise them, and he would use his best efforts and exertions to that end. I could not ask him to say more than that. I communicated that statement to the leader of the Government, and on that agreement we consented to postpone the division until the following Tuesday night. Hon. gentlemen can carry that out or not. I submitted it to the hon. leader of the Opposition as what took place at that time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was it made across the floor of the House?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was not made openly in

the House. The hon. gentleman came over here and sat for a moment, and I went over and sat beside him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is a great pity the hon. gentleman did not refer to this before the leader of the Opposition left.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The argument was made when the leader of the Opposition was here and made twice to-night—when he came over to this side and when I crossed over to him.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman said, the first time, that the agreement was made across the floor of the House, but now he tells us it was not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was not made publicly from my seat speaking across the floor of the House to the hon. leader of the Opposition, but it was made in the way I have stated.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is nothing clear. The leader of the Opposition left this Chamber at a quarter past eleven to-night. I happened to go out of the House with him and am satisfied I would have heard about this arrangement, but I heard no such observation from him nor from the hon. gentleman. I was following the debate very closely and am satisfied that if there had been any impression in the mind of the leader of the Opposition that the debate was to close to-night, he would have communicated it to me. From the time the hon. gentleman mentions this conversation took place, no hon. gentleman on this side heard a word about the arrangement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. leader of the Opposition may or may not have communicated it, but it was made in the presence of the hon. member for York, who sits next to him.

Mr. WALLACE. According to the statement of the hon. Minister, there was no knowledge of that communicated to the House, and no consent of the House obtained. There was nothing but the conversation which he says he had with the leader of the Opposition. I was rather astounded at the assurance of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when he said last Friday night that the House must that night come to a division. Well, Mr. Chairman, the House does not come to a division until it is ready. No Government can force the House to a division if the members are anxious to speak, and the members were anxious to discuss this measure, so that the House was not ready to come to a division on Friday night, it was late, as we all know, on the following Tuesday, when the House came to a division, and even then some hon. members, who were anxious to speak,

had to be closed off. But to-night we have had the Minister of Marine and Fisheries get up on two different occasions and attempt to stay discussion. He took up the Bill, read various clauses, told us we could not object to the one or to the other because we had discussed the principle of the Bill, and that principle had been ratified. There was therefore, he said, to be no further discussion. On every clause that comes up, we are to have the same autocratic statement that we must not discuss it, because the principle has already been decided. Mr. Chairman, we are going to discuss this Bill, and it comes with very bad grace when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whose record we know in 1885, when he spent days and weeks and months in discussing a Franchise Bill—

Mr. TAYLOR. After the principle was affirmed.

Mr. WALLACE. After the principle was affirmed, too. I remember, as great a man certainly as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the late Sir John Macdonald, saying that a Franchise Bill was of such an important character that a whole session should really be devoted to that one subject. Yet we have the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who does not know anything about this Bill, who cannot tell the franchise of any one province except that simple one of his own, saying he is going to push this through to-night. He tells us that we must put this complicated Bill, with all those different franchises of all the different provinces—indefensible as many of them are—through in the one night. We are not going to put them through in the one night, and not any sooner than we think it proper and convenient. These matters are too important to be hastily rushed through. We have had an interesting and important discussion here to-night, and yet the hon. Minister gets up on two different occasions and attempts to domineer and dictate to the House by saying to us: You must not discuss this Bill; all you have to do is to pass the clauses. That thing cannot be done. The Minister of Marine must understand that he cannot force a Bill through the House in that arbitrary and despotic manner. This Bill was being discussed in a very interesting way to me. I was listening occasionally, and taking a little part in the debate, and we are going to discuss it still further.

We have heard the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) point out the inequalities of the Manitoba franchise law, and produce incontrovertible evidence, the sworn statement of an honourable man, of the iniquity practiced under that franchise. We are asked to-night to shut our eyes and open our mouths and just swallow this Bill whole without any consideration. I should have expected that the gentlemen who are in charge of the Government would have got up and explained or done something to

answer the charges and statements made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). But instead of that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gets up and says we must pass this Bill through to-night; we must finish a job which should take months for its consideration. That is no answer to the objections of the hon. member for West Assiniboia, though I am free to confess that the hon. gentleman who has the Bill in charge (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is manifesting the most courteous demeanour towards those who are discussing the Bill, and he misunderstood me a while ago when he took it for granted that I said that he was in a humiliating position because he did not know the law of Ontario. I wish to explain that he entirely misunderstood me, because I believe that he is the only member of this House to-day who does understand the laws of the various provinces; he is the only one who has made a study of them. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is familiar with the law of Prince Edward Island, but I am sure he is not with any other franchise law in this Dominion. The Solicitor General does know the laws; he has made a special study of them recently.

There was reference made this evening to the tendering ballot in the province of Ontario. There was never a bigger fraud committed on the people, because I am told that though that law has been in force something like twenty years, authorizing the tender of a ballot, no tendered ballot has ever yet been counted. Yet that useless tendered ballot, which has utterly failed of having any effect in any elections, but has simply deprived the voter of his vote, is retained in this Bill. I know of a dozen tendered ballots, tendered at an election by men entitled to vote, but which were not counted. These men went to vote and were told that their names were not on the list. They showed that they were on the assessment roll and had all the qualifications, and were told to put in tendered ballots, which they did. But no tendered ballot in Ontario has ever been counted for a candidate. The only time an attempt was ever made to count them was in the case of the county of Lincoln election, which after three or four months continuous trial and scrutiny was dropped, as one of the candidates was running for the House of Commons. In this case we are adopting that tendered ballot. What is the use of it? It is simply a fraud. It prevents an elector having his vote recorded as he should. As I pointed out the other night, this Ontario franchise law, instead of giving every opportunity, puts all the obstacles possible in the way of a man voting, and that is one of the reasons why I oppose the very idea of its being adopted by this Dominion Parliament.

Well, as has been stated here, no objection would be made to taking the Ontario voters' lists and making that the basis of a

Mr. WALLACE.

list, as Sir John Thompson has proposed, and these hon. gentlemen quoted approvingly. But why do they not adopt his plan, if they approve of it, to make the Ontario voters' list, or assessment roll—the list of voters, perhaps, would be better—as the basis, and from that make a voters' list? There are many methods that may be adopted. A registration before election has many advantages. It gives a list that is up to date, and gives every one an opportunity of being placed on that list, and thus makes the voice of the people heard in the elections. I think that this clause, No. 3, that is now before us, is one worthy of careful consideration. It is now near midnight, and I do not think the clause should pass to-night, because, although the Bill has been up on a previous occasion, I think it can fairly be said to have been rather sprung upon the House. I do not blame the Government in any way for that, but, as a matter of fact, we have been engaged very constantly in the Railway Committee and other committees and in the work of the House, and so we have not been able to consider the details of the Bill as thoroughly as we should like to have done. I think the Government should be satisfied with the discussion that has taken place on clause 3, and that they could fairly leave it over for consideration when the committee meets again, when further suggestions can be made. Most of the members have gone home, as is usual on Friday night. I hope that the Solicitor General will consent to a postponement for further consideration of this very important Bill. I would, therefore, move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. INGRAM. If it is the intention of the committee to rise, I would defer my remarks.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Before we come to an agreement on that, before the committee rises, at all events—if it is the intention that we should rise now—I would like to call attention to an amendment to the first section which I shall propose, to meet the difficulty in Prince Edward Island, where there are two separate classes of voters. I mention it now so that hon. gentlemen may have an opportunity to consider the matter. I propose that voters there shall include those who have the lower franchise, that is, those who vote for the legislative assemblyman.

Mr. HUGHES. I might point out to the Minister of Marine that there was a misunderstanding on his own side, because the Solicitor General did agree, deliberately agree, to hold the clauses over for another day.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the Solicitor General agreed to hold over clauses, I do not wish to press them forward. I did not know that that

was the understanding. I have been here all the evening, too.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The understanding was, that any suggestions of amendment should be considered. I thought we would go through the Bill, and that any suggestions for amendment to any of the provisions should be taken into consideration, and the whole matter taken up another day.

Mr. POWELL. I suggested one particular that is unworkable. I have another to suggest.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman might communicate his suggestion to me.

Mr. WALLACE. Do the Government consent that the committee rise and report progress? I think we have done pretty well.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Flint). The motion is, that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. Those who are in favour of that motion will please rise.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hon. gentlemen opposite have risen, but the question was not put, that I heard—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CASEY. Hon. gentlemen cannot rise to call for the yeas and nays until the Chairman has asked—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CASEY. The Chair gives me the floor. The point is—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) has the floor.

Mr. CASEY. Hon. gentlemen cannot rise until the question is put by the Chair—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) has risen to a point of order, and I wish him to state it.

Mr. BERGERON. The question has been put, and we are voting now.

Mr. CASEY. The point of order is—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You asked us to rise, Mr. Chairman; how long do you wish us to stand here?

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has the floor.

Mr. CASEY. We cannot be asked to rise until the Chairman has called upon those in favour of the motion to say, "Aye," and those against it to say, "Nay." The point of order is, that the vote cannot be taken under

the present circumstances. I ask the ruling of the Chair on this point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman's point of order is not well taken.

Mr. CASEY. I never heard the question put.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Chairman,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would like to ask the Chairman a question. I sit very near the Chairman, and I did not hear the question put. If he put the question for the yeas and nays, I never heard it. I would ask the Chairman, if he called for the yeas and nays?

The CHAIRMAN. I may state, in reply to the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies), that I stated that the motion was, that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. And I then said: "Those in favour of the motion will please rise."

Mr. CASEY. That should be done audibly, Mr. Chairman.

Committee divided: Yeas 20, nays 35.

Mr. INGRAM. Having had something to say on the principle of this Bill at a previous stage, I reserved my right to say something more on the different sections of the Bill in committee. In making my remarks I do not speak as a lawyer, but as a layman, and as having had some experience with the operation of the local election law in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me for a moment. I certainly understood from some remarks from the leader of the Opposition that he desired for one to have this matter disposed of to-night—at any rate so far as getting the major clauses of the Bill through. But if he left no intimation of the agreement, that I understood he made with the hon. gentlemen opposite, I do not think there is any use in our protracting the discussion at this time. I hope, however, that if we take up the committee now, the hon. gentleman will come to some understanding to make reasonable progress with the Bill on the next occasion. I would like to know from the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) whether he will endeavour to bring about some reasonable understanding on that head. I do not desire, nor does the Government desire, to choke off discussion in this matter. We are aware of its importance, and we wish also to hear the views expressed on both sides. There are difficulties, we know perfectly well, in adapting the local franchises to the

needs of the Dominion. We recognize that, and we accept the assurance which was certainly given by the leader of the Opposition that, speaking for the Opposition, he desired as far as possible that the discussion should be conducted in a factious spirit. I hope his friends will not go back on their leader in that respect. If there is an understanding that reasonable progress will be made then, I will move that the committee rise. But I would like to hear from the hon. member for Pictou, or from whoever is at present leading the Opposition, assurances on that point.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not at present leading the Opposition, but I have no hesitation in telling the hon. gentleman that I am somewhat familiar with the discussions that have gone on among gentlemen on this side of the House, both with the leader, and among themselves, in regard to this Bill. I have heard no suggestion from any quarter that there was to be the slightest obstruction offered to a single clause. But I do know that a very large number of gentlemen, both of the legal profession and others, have given a great deal of attention to the Bill; some of them are not here to-night. I know that a number of gentlemen wish to give their opinions to the committee; and I am satisfied that whatever the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce understood from the leader of the Opposition could not have wished to convey that this week, at any rate, this Bill should go through it at a sitting, because he knew that the criticisms to be offered would make it impossible to do so, even if we sat all night. I feel warranted in speaking for the hon. gentlemen here now, that when the Bill is taken up again we will be only too glad to take advantage of the invitation of the Solicitor General to make such practical suggestions as we can to improve the measure. Many criticisms will doubtless be offered, not for the purpose of obstructing, but to illustrate our objections made on the second reading.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce will accept the statement made by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). Certainly, we have no desire to obstruct the progress of the Bill, but there will doubtless be a good many criticisms made of these clauses, and they may occupy some time, and still we shall endeavour to make reasonable progress. It is not understood that we are going to pass these clauses without careful consideration. We want to make the Government realize, as we do, that we ought to keep control without the Dominion Parliament of the Franchise and of the Election law. Amendments will no doubt be offered with that end in view. The Government may be satisfied that nothing is intended beyond a full discussion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. HUGHES. In justice to the leader of the Opposition, I may recall what occurred while the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) was speaking this evening. He rose to suggest that all opposition to these preliminaries should be dropped and that we should make as much progress as possible.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is hardly worth while to go on with the discussion. I accept the assurances of the hon. member for Pictou and other gentlemen, that they are not disposed to be factious in their opposition. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 4th April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RAILWAY.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Bos-tock.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McINNES. Mr. Chairman, is there a motion before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Flint). The motion is that the committee rise and report progress.

An hon. MEMBER. That motion was carried.

Mr. McINNES. Then, I will move that the committee rise, and in support of that—

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. At the last meeting there was a motion before the committee that the committee rise and report; but the committee rose at the expiration of the hour for private Bills, so that the motion before the committee was not put, and that is the motion still before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. My information is correct, that the motion before the committee is that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. McINNES. Then, I will speak to that motion. When the committee was considering this Bill the other evening, I began a few remarks, and quoted at considerable length some of the remarks that had been made by the hon. Minister of Railways last session in connection with the country through which this railway is proposed to be run, and the policy which the Government then held with regard to retaining the trade of that district for Canada. An insinuation was thrown out by two or three hon. members last Friday evening that there was a desire on my part in making these quotations, and on the part of some other hon. members who were opposing this Bill, to obstruct its progress. I certainly disclaim any such intention. This is a very important measure. To my mind it is the most important measure that has been introduced into this Parliament this session. If you will reflect upon the permanent nature of the industries which are likely to arise there, and the large population which will undoubtedly go into the country, you will see that its trade will necessarily be enormous. In fact, I do not hesitate to say that the commercial interests involved in this Bill are even greater than those involved in the Yukon Railway Bill, because there is this difference, that while there will probably be as large a population in the Kootenay and Boundary Creek district that there will be in the Klondike, it will have this advantage over the Klondike, that it will undoubtedly be a permanent population, and the industries of the country will be permanent. I say I disclaim any intention of speaking simply for the purpose of obstructing the passage of this Bill. If it were necessary to do that, I could talk at considerable length, and might possibly attain the object of killing the Bill by this means; but such a course would be manifestly unfair to those who are seeking charters by Bills which are on the Order paper after this Bill; and, apart from that, I have every confidence in this House, that when all the facts in connection with this matter are presented, they will defeat the Bill, and it will not be necessary to resort to any such tactics as it was insinuated we were attempting on Friday evening I was dwelling, when I was interrupted last evening, on the enormous mineral wealth of this district. I quoted from the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) last session—a speech delivered by him, as he stated, with a good deal of authority and confidence, he having visited that district but a short time previously—as showing that that district was undoubtedly one of great mineral wealth. I also quoted the report of Mr. Hans Geise, one of the most eminent mineralogists probably of the world, who not only depicted in the most glowing terms the greatness of the mineral wealth of that district, but also made a forecast of the future and predicted that it would be-

come one great line of city life. Having established that that country is undoubtedly rich in mineral wealth which is bound to give rise to an enormous and valuable trade, I proceeded to observe that it was the avowed policy of the Government to retain that trade for Canada, and in support of that statement I quoted some other sections of the same speech delivered last session by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. I have now before me a speech delivered on the same occasion by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), which I shall proceed to quote, in order to show that last year, at all events, it was the undoubted policy of the Government to do everything in its power to retain the trade of that promising region for eastern and western Canada alike. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, speaking on the Crow's Nest Railway proposition last session, said:

I believe that the construction of a railway into that country will, in all probability, lead to bringing there a population of many thousands of customers, who will afford a very valuable market to the inhabitants of the north-west portion of Canada, and also to our manufactures in the east. More than that, I agree with him also that it is a matter of moment to us that the great traffic which certainly will spring up, if the representations which have been made to us are confirmed even to only one-tenth or twentieth of the extent to which they appear likely to be confirmed, should be preserved to the people of Canada. A great deal of our trade is now being diverted to American channels.

I would call the attention particularly of hon. gentlemen to these observations:

I need not say to business men in or out of this House that there is no one thing more certain than that if once that trade be allowed to flow into American channels, we shall find it extremely difficult to recover it. These are two reasons sufficient to induce us to do what otherwise we might hesitate to do, ask the House to proceed with an enterprise which necessarily involves an addition of three or four million dollars to the public debt.

It is therefore evident, Mr. Speaker, that the policy of the Government last year with respect to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway was one intended to retain the trade of that section of British Columbia for Canada. But we do not require to go into the records of last session to arrive at the conclusion that this is undoubtedly the policy of this Government. During this session, we had introduced into this House a measure which was defended by the Government upon the very same ground. One of the great reasons, in fact the principal reason assigned for building the Yukon Railway was that the trade should be kept for our own people. While many of us differed in opinion as to the nature of the agreement by which this good purpose was to be attained, yet that sentiment being so strongly announced by the Government and being so prominent in that measure led a great number of us

to deal with it far more mercifully than we might otherwise felt disposed to do. These two propositions then, I submit, are clear—that that country will give rise to an enormous trade and that it is a policy of the greatest prudence and wisdom and has been, up to the present at all events, the undoubted policy of this Government to retain that trade, like the trade of all parts of the country, for our own people.

I make this assertion, and will proceed to prove it, that if this charter is granted to these American promoters, that the trade will go to the United States and cannot be retained for our own people.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). That is absurd.

Mr. McINNES. The hon. member for Hamilton says that proposition is absurd. I say that I can prove it; and if he can disprove it, I shall be very happy to hear him enlighten this House when I sit down. It seems to me it is a self-evident proposition to any person who is familiar with the geography of the western part of this continent. If any person who has watched with any interest at all the course of commerce in this new district, it is practically a self-evident proposition that if this connection is made with the American railway system, that trade will flow south and not east or west. It has been suggested, however, that there is sufficient protection afforded by the tariff to give the advantage to Canadian trade against competition from the south. Well, we certainly know that the protection afforded by the present tariff will not have that effect. And the fact that it will not was dwelt upon by the Minister of Railways this session and by other members of the Government and was embodied in the Yukon Bill. Because you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Yukon Bill provided that there should be no competition whatever from American roads, and there would have been no necessity for such a provision if the tariff gave us sufficient advantage over the Americans. That proposition is, therefore, admitted by the Government, and it was admitted by every hon. member on this side who supported that Yukon Bill, namely, that the tariff itself is not a sufficient protection to give the trade to Canadians against competition from the south.

The contention was put forward in the Railway Committee by the advocates of this charter, that at present the bulk of the trade which is going into the Kootenay over these American roads was actually in Canadian goods. I took the trouble to make inquiries at the Customs Department, and found, so far from that being true—and I knew it could not be true—the very reverse was the case, and as the data may be of some value to hon. members in coming to a conclusion, I will read a few of the figures which will show conclusively that ever since the trade of the Kootenay amounted

Mr. McINNES.

to anything, and ever since this connection by Mr. Corbin's road with the American railway system, the great bulk of the trade with that country has come from the south and not from eastern Canada. I have in my hand a pamphlet which is issued by the South Kootenay Board of Trade; and as it contains a few figures on this point, I will give an extract from it:

Take Nelson, for instance, one of the chief towns of the district. It was made a port in August, 1895. Previous to that time it was an outport of New Westminster. The collections there have grown so steadily that their total was more in 1897 than the total of the seaport of Vancouver, the collections at Nelson being \$431,038 as against \$407,762 at Vancouver.

In order that you may grasp the situation, let me point out that Vancouver is the third shipping port of the Dominion. And yet these figures which I have had verified, I may say, by the Customs Department, show that the imports into the Kootenays amount to more than all the imports at the city of Vancouver. The statement was made before the Railway Committee that, in the early days in the development of the Kootenay, the trade had gone south to the United States for the reason that the manufacturers of eastern Canada had not, up to that time, sufficient experience in manufacturing supplies suitable for a mining district, and that, until they got the machinery necessary to turn out supplies suitable for the trade there, the Americans, who had the experience, controlled the business. But I will quote figures which will show that, year after year, as time goes on, the trade with the United States is becoming larger. In 1895 the value of the imports at Nelson were only \$397,393. Two years later, in 1897, they jumped to the enormous figure of \$1,539,993, an increase of almost 500 per cent, and the duties collected increased in corresponding ratio. It was further argued that the imports into Rossland from the United States at the present time amounted to one-tenth of the imports from eastern Canada. Now, I have a statement before me, signed by a clerk of the Customs Department, which absolutely refutes that. In 1895 the duties collected at Rossland was only \$14,349. In 1897, two years later, there had been an increase of about 1,000 per cent, the duties collected amounting to \$122,646. So, it is absurd to say that the trade with eastern Canada is increasing or that eastern Canada is getting the bulk of that trade, as against the Americans. As I stated when this matter was before the Railway Committee, the facts are well known, that the trade of the Kootenays has been going to the United States, and it is unnecessary to adduce further figures in proof of it. Every person in British Columbia is aware of the fact, as also is every person who has had the pleasure of a trip through that country. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals saw it, and pictured it in glowing terms

here last year. He said that the city of Spokane had increased from a small town of something like 8,000 to a bustling, prosperous city of over 35,000 last year. And he will have to state it again, because it is the fact that that city was built up altogether by the trade which came to it from the Kootenays. I was struck with the statement made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia, in the Railway Committee, when this matter was being discussed. He said: Let us have Spokanes in Canada. That is exactly the idea. If we increase these railway facilities to the United States, there cannot be the slightest doubt but that cities will spring up there, but that, if we pursue a different policy, those cities will spring up within our own border.

Now, I have another proposition, and it is this, that, if the trade of the district goes to the south, as it has been doing, and as it will continue to do if these railway facilities to the south are improved, the smelting of that district will also go south. You are aware that the parties who are interested in this charter, if not directly, indirectly, did all they could to build up a smelter just a few miles to the south of our boundary line at Northport. There was no valid reason assigned before the Railway Committee why that smelter should have been established at Northport, and not at Trail or at some other point in British Columbia. It was stated that at Northport there was a mountain of limestone just behind the smelter. But, Sir, that argument is completely refuted by the fact that it only takes 30 per cent of lime to smelt a given quantity of ore. That being so, it certainly was much cheaper to carry the lime to the ore than to carry three times the bulk of ore to the smelter. So, I say, there was no reason at all why that smelter should be established on the American side rather than on the British Columbia side. But all the interests of these parties are on the other side, and we have every reason to believe that what they did in this instance they will continue to do. Their commercial interests, their political interests—every interest they have lies to the south, and will induce them to build up the cities to the south of the line, and to carry the smelting industry thither, if it is possible to do so.

If this charter is granted and this railway constructed, I say unhesitatingly, the ores of the Boundary Creek country will largely go to the American smelter to be treated. It was argued in the committee, that that would not be the case, because, providentially, the ores of the Boundary Creek were self-fluxing, that is, they carried their own fluxes. I heard the statement which was read in the Railway Committee, on which that argument was based. But the statement did not bear out the argument. The mineralogical expert who was quoted in support of the proposition, was very guarded in his statements. He did

not make the sweeping assertion that all the ores in the Boundary Creek country carried their own fluxes. He said it was understood that some of the ores in that country were self-fluxing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Has the hon. gentleman the quotation with him?

Mr. McINNES. I have not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think that the quotation in the committee was broader than that the hon. gentleman has given.

Mr. McINNES. If it was broader, at any rate it was not sufficiently broad to sustain the argument which was advanced, that there was sufficient ore there carrying its own fluxes to warrant the establishment of smelters there as against establishing them in the United States and carrying the ore thither. We all know that no broad statement of that kind could be made at the present time with any accuracy with regard to the ores of the Boundary Creek, because no persons as yet, have sufficient acquaintance with the ores of that country to be aware of the facts. There has been a good deal of prospecting, and there is good reason to believe that the country is enormously rich in minerals; but I venture to say, that there is not a sufficient body of data before the Government, or before the British Columbia Government, or any one else, to warrant any person in assuming that all the ores of the Boundary Creek country carry their own fluxes. Now, if we have reason to believe that this road, when constructed, will carry the ores, in all probability, to the United States to be smelted, if there is reason to believe that it will stimulate trade with the United States, as against trade with Canada, why should we grant this charter?

Now, there have been two or three reasons suggested, and the most forcible of them all, to my mind, is that it will afford competition. Now, personally I have no faith at all in railways competing with one another. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Wood) again laughs. I hope he will enlighten this House with something more than his laughter when I take my seat. I say I have no faith at all in railway companies competing with each other. We have had numberless instances in this country. A section was accommodated with but one railway line, and the people thought that they were being tyrannized over by a monopoly. These arguments have prevailed to the extent of giving another railway line but they no sooner get another line in there than they have two tyrants tyrannizing over them. They want a third line to go in there for competition, and when they get a third line, it will be a fourth line, and so on. Railway companies will not compete against one another. They will either

enter into an internecine war, like we are having at the present time in this country, or they will come to a mutual understanding and pool rates, and there will be no actual competition in railway traffic like there is in any other kind of business. One of the best instances of this truth is that which was afforded in Manitoba some time ago. You will remember that our good friends on the prairies thought that the Canadian Pacific Railway was harshly exercising its powers which they had under their exclusive charter against the province of Manitoba. They sought connection with the Grand Trunk Railway system per the American railway system and succeeded in getting that connection, and what was the result? They found out that the line which was to bring them competition and reduce rates did not compete against the Canadian Pacific Railway, they found it afforded them no relief whatever. So I make the assertion that so far as the argument of competition is concerned, there is no great force in it under any circumstances. But in this present instance it is absolutely without value, and I will tell you why. The Canadian Pacific Railway in that Kootenay district is not in the same position as the Canadian Pacific Railway in any other part of this country. They have not got control over their freight rates, the control of the freight rates is left entirely in the hands of this Government and of this Parliament; and that differentiates the case out there entirely from what it might be in any other part of Canada. In order that you may see the full force of that argument I will read you a section or two from the legislation which was passed last year in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. The agreement which was then entered into between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway is embraced in these clauses. Clause "c" reads as follows:—

That so soon as said railway is open for traffic to Kootenay Lake, the local rates and tolls on the railway and on any other railway used in connection therewith, and now or hereafter owned or leased by or operated on account of the company south of the company's main line in British Columbia—

You will see that this legislation will operate in connection with this proposed extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway just as much as it does with that part of it which they are building at the present time under this contract.

—as well as the rates and tolls between any point on any such line or lines or railway and any point on the main line of the company, throughout Canada, or any other railway owned or leased by or operated on account of the company, including its lines of steamers in British Columbia, shall be first approved by the Governor in Council or by a railway commission, if and when such commission is established by law, and shall at all times thereafter, and from time to time be subject to revision and control in the manner aforesaid.

Mr. McINNES.

It seems to me that is very explicit, that it gives absolute control over the freight rates, not only upon that section of the Crow's Nest Pass line which is being constructed at the present time, but over any extensions or connections with the Canadian Pacific Railway south of their main line in British Columbia, now or at any future time. There are other sections which also give this Parliament a very large measure of control over the proposed extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway out there. Section "f" reads as follows:—

That the Railway Committee of the Privy Council may grant running powers over the said line of railway and all its branches and connections, or any portions thereof, and all lines of railway now or hereafter owned or leased by or operated on account of the company in British Columbia south of the company's main line of railway, and the necessary use of its tracks, stations and station grounds, to any other railway company applying for such grant upon such terms as such company may fix and determine, and according to the provisions of the Railway Act, and of such other general Acts relating to railways as are from time to time passed by Parliament; but nothing herein shall be held to imply that such running powers might not be so granted without the special provision herein contained.

Section "g" also gives considerable power and control over the Canadian Pacific Railway extension:

That the said railway, when constructed, together with that portion of the company's railway from Dunmore to Lethbridge, and all lines of railway, branches, connections and extensions in British Columbia south of the main line of the company in British Columbia, shall be subject to the provisions of the Railway Act and of such other general Acts relating to railways as are from time to time passed by Parliament.

It is, therefore, clear that the power to regulate the rates and see that the freight charges are reasonable, which shall be collected by the Canadian Pacific Railway on its proposed extension, is entirely in the hands of this Government and of this Parliament. Now, commenting upon these particular sections, last year the Minister of Railways and Canals spoke as follows—and I would call my hon. friend's attention to the interpretation which was placed upon these sections by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and if he is not disposed to take my interpretation of them, I hope he will follow his leader:

The committee will have noted that we have sought to ensure the country a large measure of relief from the rates which have obtained since the Canadian Pacific Railway was started. We have imposed conditions upon the company which are very largely restrictive of their present powers. We have embraced in one of the sub-clauses of these resolutions a considerable list of articles which go into very large consumption among the people of the western provinces, and we have secured an agreement on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway that very substantial reductions will be made upon existing rates. We have also received the consent on

their part that the rates upon all goods, whether they are shipped in or shipped out, either going into or going out of any portion of the province, which is covered by the route of this railway, or any freight or merchandise which either is shipped into British Columbia over this line, or shipped out of British Columbia over this line, are to be subject to the control and supervision of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, as is the case with other railways in Canada. To the extent of the shipment of goods from any part of Canada to British Columbia, and the shipment of goods from any part of British Columbia traversed by this line, to any part of Canada, there has been secured in the contract between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government, a recision of that existing ten per cent clause. From this day forward, so far as that class of merchandise between the several points is concerned, the tariff of rates shall be under the control of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council so long as that tribunal exercises control in these matters, or under the control of a commission, if a railway commission should ever be constituted for that purpose.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce also made a few remarks, some very pointed remarks, on those sections of the Crow's Nest Pass proposition, and I will read what he said :

Remember the Government of Canada are able to control the rates and everything which goes from any part of the Crow's Nest Pass to any portion of Canada, and on anything which comes from any part of Canada to any section of the Crow's Nest line. The reduction of 3 cents per 100 pounds on all the grains going eastward from Manitoba cannot be computed at less than several hundred thousand dollars a year. Now, the difference between the proposals is practically—

The hon. gentleman is referring here to the proposal which was submitted and entertained by the late Conservative Government.

—that we gave, if you choose so to call it, some \$5,000 or \$6,000 per mile to the Canadian Pacific Railway for constructing this line, and we are paying them a further sum of \$5,000 or \$6,000 in return for valuable privileges for the whole of the North-west and eastern Canada as well.

There is no doubt at all that it was the intention last year, and that it was the purpose of the Government last year to obtain complete control over the charges that could be exacted by the Canadian Pacific Railway on goods going from eastern Canada into that Kootenay country. If we have that control, there is no force in the argument that it is necessary to have another road for the purpose of getting reasonable rates. It seems to me it is tantamount to saying that we have not confidence in the Government or in ourselves to apply the powers and provisions we possess. This Parliament last year granted nearly \$4,000,000 to acquire those rights, and are hon. gentlemen now going to say that the advantages for which they gave those \$4,000,000 are of no value whatever? That is practically what

the argument amounts to. We have power to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to give reasonable rates into that district, and if we have confidence in ourselves and in the Government that the Government will do right to the people there and in eastern Canada, we can have no hesitation in concluding that there is no necessity, so far as securing reasonable rates is concerned, for a second or competing line.

As an excuse for granting this charter it has been further asserted that it will give the Grand Trunk Railway a means of entering into that district and an opportunity of sharing in some of the trade. I do not think the Grand Trunk Railway can be very materially interested in that way. This little piece of line, some 70 miles in length, is absolutely independent of the Grand Trunk Railway, and always will be. The distance from the most westerly terminus of the Grand Trunk Railway to the beginning of this little line is over 2,000 miles. If the Grand Trunk Railway Company are to take advantage of this line, they can only do so at the whim or at the desire of the whole American railway system, and at any time the controllers of the Great Northern or the Northern Pacific, or Mr. Corbin himself, saw fit, they could prevent the Grand Trunk having running privileges over their lines, and that minute the Grand Trunk would cease to have any connection with the Kootenay district. And, Sir, there is this feature in connection with the Grand Trunk argument, which I would like to point out. If as a matter of fact the company had always an opportunity of going in there, assuming that the American railway magnates would not prevent the company from enjoying this privilege, you have to recognize the fact, and face it, that by giving the Grand Trunk means of going in there, you at the same time open the doors to every state in the Union as well as to the American system of railways: and it is just a question whether we prefer to give the Grand Trunk a little trade there or to keep the trade for our own people, because putting it in the most favourable light, the Grand Trunk can never hope to get a large volume of trade from the Kootenay country. If that be so, that the trade at the present time which goes through the United States into that country is small, and if it is a fact that it is decreasing rather than increasing, and it is a fact, then the argument in favour of granting this Bill simply because we wish to give the Grand Trunk some little advantage, falls to the ground.

There has been a sentiment also created in favour of granting this charter to Mr. Corbin on the ground, as stated, that he was the first railway promoter to go into that district and open it up. As a matter of fact his railway was not the first railway to be built in that rich Kootenay district. He undoubtedly went in there in the early days of its development, and we give him

full credit for his foresight and pluck in doing so; but he was not the first man to display pluck and energy in building a railway there. Even if he were, that fact should not unduly bias hon. members in this House in his favour in this matter. He has received a large return for everything he has done for that country; and let me tell the House that Mr. Corbin unfortunately, although he has received charter rights from this Parliament and although he has been in receipt of large land grants from British Columbia, this same Mr. Corbin has acted, when it was possible, so as to divert the trade from Canada to his own country, and in every way he has discriminated against the smelting industry of British Columbia. I do not make that assertion on the strength of my own word. I have here the Nelson "Tribune," of 12th March, and in it appears a report of a meeting of the South Kootenay Board of Trade held two days previous to the issue of the paper. That board of trade appointed a committee to investigate into the freight rates and charges which were made by Mr. Corbin, and they submitted a report which I intend to read to the committee. Before I do so, let me point out that in the Railway Committee the advocates of Mr. Corbin made the assertion that no such committee was appointed, and no such report was ever made. An hon. member stated dogmatically that an editorial appeared in one of the Nelson papers containing some idle statement to the effect that Mr. Corbin in operating his railway had discriminated against British Columbia interests. But the hon. gentleman stated that no report had ever been made on this subject. I wish to emphasize this fact, that the Board of Trade at Nelson, the terminus of Mr. Corbin's road, the headquarters of the road in British Columbia, testified as to the dealings of Mr. Corbin and the way in which he operated his road, and they have given us in this report facts which leave no doubt that Mr. Corbin has in every possible way discriminated against the interests of British Columbia and in favour of his own road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And yet the Nelson Board of Trade petitioned or asked that this charter should be granted.

Mr. McINNES. I will deal with that in a few minutes.

Next came the report of the committee on freight rates, laid over from last meeting. Subjoined is the report:

Your committee appointed to look into the question of freight rates, beg to report as follows:—

1. The rate on ore from Hall Siding, 11 miles (or any other point on the N. & F. S. Railway), to Nelson, is \$2.25 per ton.

2. The rate on ore from Nelson, 55 miles (or any other point on the N. & F. S. Railway), to Northport, is \$1 per ton.

Mr. McINNES.

The rate to the smelter in which Mr. Corbin is interested is \$1 per ton.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is he interested in any other smelter?

Mr. McINNES. I have no information on the point.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why say he is interested in this?

Mr. McINNES. I say he is interested in seeing that smelter at Northport made a success. Whether he is directly interested in the management of the Northport smelter or not, I care very little. He has large interests at Northport; he is a large real estate owner at Northport; he gave the site on which the smelter stands; this is the central point of his railway system, and I do not think it can be contradicted for one moment that Mr. Corbin has undoubtedly the very greatest interest in seeing that smelter boomed. You will see from the very first item there referred to, that for hauling ore eleven miles to the Nelson smelter he charges \$2.25 per ton, but he will carry the same ore fifty-five miles to the smelter in which he is interested for only \$1 per ton.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was absolutely denied by Mr. Corbin right there.

Mr. McINNES. I did not hear Mr. Corbin deny that in the committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, that was denied by him through his solicitor.

Mr. McINNES. Now, I have explained what kind of interest Mr. Corbin has in that smelter; he does not necessarily have to be a stockholder to have an interest in it. I say that everything tends to the idea that it is to the advantage of Mr. Corbin to make that smelter at Northport a great success, and no one can successfully controvert that.

Now, Sir, I will continue to read the report:

3. The rate on ore from Rossland to Northport, 17 miles, is 75 cents per ton.

4. The rate on ore from the Velvet Mine, on the Red Mountain Railway, to Nelson, is \$2.75 per ton.

5. The rate on ore from Robson to Nelson, 28 miles, is \$1 per ton.

6. The rate on ore from Siocan City to Nelson, 45 miles, is \$3 per ton.

7. The rate on ore from Sandon and intermediate points to Kaslo, which is being shipped to United States smelters, is \$3 per ton.

8. The rate on ore from Sandon and intermediate points to Kaslo, which is being shipped to Nelson, is \$5 per ton.

9. The rate on ore from Nelson to Tacoma is \$8 per ton.

10. The rate on ore from Hall Siding and other points on the N. & F. S. Railway south of Nelson to Tacoma, is \$6.25 per ton.

A glance at 1 and 2 is sufficient to convince any one that this is a discrimination against Nelson in favour of Northport.

That is not my comment; that is the language of the report:

A glance at 1 and 2 is sufficient to convince any one that this is a discrimination against Nelson in favour of Northport.

The same thing applies to 7 and 8. It is clearly a discrimination against Nelson and Pilot Pay in favour of United States smelting points, and as both the N. & F. S. Railway and K. & S. Railway were subsidized by the provincial legislature, and their rates are under the supervision of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, we consider it is the duty of the board to protest to the legislature and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council against this discrimination, and we recommend that a letter be drawn up setting out the above facts, and addressed to the provincial secretary and our member, Mr. Hume.

With regard to freight rates on merchandise coming into this country, we consider that the most important point against the business welfare of Nelson is the practice of the distribution of carloads to different consignees at different points on straight carload rates, and the notorious "balance of rate" rebate scheme, by which merchants at Revelstoke and Nakusp can ship in carload lots to either of those places and re-ship in small lots to Nelson, Kaslo, Rossland and other points in the district, getting a rebate equalizing the rate to regular carload rates to these points, and as this privilege is not conceded to Nelson merchants, or to any one shipping carloads to Nelson for distribution, it compels jobbers doing business in the district to ship their goods and establish warehouses at Revelstoke instead of at Nelson. If the practice is continued, we consider that Nelson should be placed on the same footing in this respect as Revelstoke to Nakusp.

Your committee further recommend that a committee of this board be appointed to confer with the different railroads centreing in Nelson, as to what steps should be taken in order to make Nelson a terminal point, and thus allow her merchants to compete for the wholesale trade.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that report can leave no doubt whatever in the mind of any hon. member that Mr. Corbin, so far as he has had the facilities to discriminate against our people, has done so. That report and finding were communicated to Mr. Corbin, who was in New York at the time, some six or seven weeks ago, and I wish to read the reply which Mr. Corbin wired to Mr. Martin, who is his agent at Nelson. This is the reply:

Put Croasdale exactly on the same basis as Northport, provided we are not discriminated against;—

Here is this man talking about discrimination:

—but, to avoid misunderstandings, suggest waiting my return.

And so we have no assurance that he has equalized things even yet. He says:

But, to avoid misunderstandings, suggest waiting my return, when the whole question can be discussed and settled.

And here is a peculiar little wind-up:

I don't think Nelson is treating me or themselves well in opposing my extension to boundary; you can show this.

The Minister of Railways interrupted me a few minutes ago and said that the Nelson Board of Trade were in favour of granting this charter. You will see from that telegram that Mr. Corbin there recognizes the fact that at that time they were not in favour of it, for he says that he thinks the board of trade are not treating him well.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They sent a telegram in support of it.

Mr. McINNES. I do not dispute that for a minute, but I say that undoubtedly at that time the Nelson Board of Trade were hostile to Mr. Corbin's extension, and if they have turned since, I think we may possibly find a clue to it in the concluding sentence of this telegram, in which he intimates that these freight rates will be equalized when he gets back there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, considerable has been said along the line that this is an effort on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway to defeat this charter, so that they may monopolize the trade of that district for themselves. I do not think any person in this House will accuse me of being over friendly or partial to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but, Sir, I conceive that in this instance there are other and larger interests involved than any question of friendly or unfriendly feelings towards a single corporation. I conceive it to be a fact that in this instance, at any rate, the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway in seeking this extension, harmonize absolutely with the interests of the country. But it is not necessarily a question of giving the trade of that country to the Canadian Pacific Railway if this charter is not granted. There is another railway company in existence—the Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Railway Company—a British Columbia company, a company that has practically the unanimous endorsement and support and sympathy of the people of British Columbia. They have a charter from the local government to go over this very same ground, and they have a subsidy from the provincial government, which shows that they are considered in the province to be a substantial company, with the endorsement of the people; and there is no reason at all why, if this Bill is defeated that that company should not build the line as well as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. They are as independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as—

Mr. MORRISON. Oh.

Mr. McINNES. The hon. member for New Westminster says, "Oh." I know nothing to the contrary, and I have the assurance of those who are interested in the Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Railway Company, that they are as independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway as Mr. Corbin is, or ever will be. So, I say, it is not a question between the Canadian Pacific Railway and Mr. Corbin; it is not a question between the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway, because there are other lines which can give as many advantages to the country as the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to which this Parliament can show its favour. The assertion has been made—and I regretted very much to hear the member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) dwell upon this point in the Railway Committee—that this was a scheme on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to tie up that whole country. Well, I do not know how killing this Bill is going to operate in that way. There is nothing at all to prevent this Parliament, next year, two years from now, or whenever it is so inclined, granting a charter to Mr. Corbin, or to any one else, for a line of railway coming from the south. There is no tying up of the country involved in throwing out this Bill. The Canadian Pacific Railway will get in there first, if this Bill is thrown out; and that is the great point I wish to make, in conclusion—that we should let our Canadian road in first, that we should give it the advantage, if there is any advantage going; that we should give our own merchants the preference, if there is any preference at all. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should not treat the country fairly, or if this Government or this Parliament should be too weak to enforce the powers placed in their hands to control the Canadian Pacific Railway, there is no reason why, two years, or four years, from now, or at any time in the future, this Parliament should not charter a competing line to come in from the south. But, in the first instance, when we are starting the trade of the country in certain channels, let those channels run in favour of our own people.

There is another point which I wish to refer to before sitting down, that is, the feeling in British Columbia, and throughout the country, on this question. A considerable number of telegrams and resolutions were read before the Railway Committee, some of which had value, and some of which had very little value, to those who understood from what quarters they emanated. But, Sir, if there was one resolution read before that committee which should have carried weight, it was the resolution that was passed by the British Columbia legislature; and, as there are possibly some hon. members here who were not in the Railway Committee, and who did not hear it there, I will read that resolution. I quote

Mr. McINNES.

from the Votes and Proceedings of the legislative assembly:

Mr. Helmcken moved, seconded by Major Mutter:

Whereas a Bill is now before the Railway Committee of the House of Commons of Canada, asking for the incorporation of a company to construct a line of railway, to be known as the Kettle River Valley Railway Company, which railway, when constructed, will be a portion of the Red Mountain Railway Company, whose terminal is at Northport, in the United States of America;

And whereas the construction of such line by the company seeking such Act of incorporation will draw the ores and traffic from the province of British Columbia into the United States, and will most materially affect the commercial and industrial interests of this province and of other portions of the Dominion of Canada;

Be it therefore resolved, That a humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying him to communicate with the Dominion Government, urging that Government to oppose the granting of such charter, or of any other having for its object the diversion of traffic from this province to the United States of America, and to request that the said charter be not granted.

There is no uncertain sound about that.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the vote?

Mr. McINNES. That was carried by a vote of 20 to 10.

Mr. WALLACE. Was it a party vote?

Mr. McINNES. It was not a party vote.

Mr. MORRISON. It was a straight party vote.

Mr. McINNES. It was not a straight party vote.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Who introduced the resolution?

Mr. McINNES. A government supporter, of course, as was very suitable.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). What connection had he with the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. McINNES. I am sure I do not know. I do not know that it is very material.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). It is very material.

Mr. McINNES. I might ask hon. gentlemen, if they are going into these little matters, what connection some have with the Grand Trunk Railway. I hope we have not to descend to such things. The hon. member for Westminster says it was a party vote. The majority who voted for the resolution undoubtedly contained nearly every member on the government side, there is no doubt about that. But equally it is true that all the opposition did not vote against it. In fact, a man on the opposition side who is considered one of the strongest men in the House, Mr. Williams, supported it.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose it is of much consequence, but, as a matter of fact, Mr. Williams opposed it.

Mr. McINNES. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to be so categorically contradicted. I stated that I had in my hand the Votes and Proceedings of the legislative assembly of British Columbia, and if any one can speak with authority on this matter, I think we can speak with authority with that document before us, rather than with any newspaper report which my hon. friend may have seen to the contrary; and, Sir, I will read the names now, for my own vindication:

Original question proposed and carried on the following division:—Yeas: Messrs. Huff, Williams, Smith, Mutter, Helmcken, Baker, Turner, Martin, Rithet, Adams, Higgins, Stoddart, Walkem, Pooley, Eberts, Bryden, Rogers, Hunter, Braden, McGregor—20.

Mr. Baker is the representative of one of the Kootenays, the very district interested in this matter, and a member of the government, and is probably as familiar with the question as any man in this House or in that House. **Mr. Higgins** was Speaker of that legislature up to, I think, three weeks ago. He resigned, presumably because he could not agree with the government. He is considered in that province as an Oppositionist; and, more than that, he is a man who has very large interests in the very district which is sought to be traversed by this proposed railway. I understand that he is one of the largest owners of real estate in Grand Forks; and, if there is a man in that House who stood to gain enormously by the building of a railway through that section, it was **Mr. Higgins**.

Nays: Messrs. Sword, Kennedy, Hume, Forster, Macpherson, Kidd, Vedder, Semlin, Cotton, Graham—10.

Mr. BERGERON. What about Williams?

Mr. McINNES. He supported the proposition.

Mr. WALLACE. What about the statement of the hon. member for Westminster (**Mr. Morrison**)? What is he going to say?

Mr. McINNES. He may make his statement if he wishes.

Mr. BERGERON. He ought to take it back.

Mr. McINNES. I make this assertion. Not only did that resolution pass by a large majority of two to one in the British Columbia legislature, but if all the facts were known then as they are to-day, it would have passed unanimously. I can prove that assertion. One of the brainiest and ablest men on the Opposition side of that House, and one who, should a change take place, will undoubtedly be a member of the new Government, is **Mr. Cotton**, who represents Vancouver City. He also is editor of the

“**News Advertiser**,” of Vancouver, and in discussing editorially the vote that took place in the legislature the day before, he wrote as follows:—

The Opposition laid down the proposition that the interests of Boundary Creek district, and also of those of the province at large, required the immediate construction of a railway connecting that district either with the Canadian Pacific Railway or the American railway systems. Having stated that first proposition—the necessity of immediate railway construction—the Opposition expressed just as clearly its opinion—

Mark this, Mr. Speaker:

—that connection with the Canadian railway was, from a provincial standpoint of view, preferable to one with the American system of railways. It, therefore, earnestly asked the Government to either give the House such information as would show that if **Mr. Corbin** was refused the charter, the Canadian Pacific Railway would build a line at once, or give an assurance that such would be the case.

The Opposition would therefore have supported the resolution then if they had known that the Canadian Pacific Railway were ready to build a road.

Then the Opposition stated it could support the resolution asking the Dominion Government to refuse a charter to **Mr. Corbin**, without any fear that such action on its part might postpone the possibility of railway communication with Boundary Creek another year.

No one will deny that this was a wise and proper course for the Opposition to take, one, too, which the Government, if it was honest in its intentions, should have no hesitancy in meeting, by giving the desired assurance. But the Government did nothing of the kind. On the contrary, it absolutely refused to give any assurance that the construction of a line to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway would be immediately commenced if **Mr. Corbin's** request for a charter was refused.

I think we may fairly assume, in view of that statement and considering the position of the gentleman who makes it, that the legislature of British Columbia is unanimous in the sentiment expressed in the resolution which they passed.

I have here the “**Rossland Miner**,” which is the most important and influential journal in that part of British Columbia; and to show you that the feeling there is not what it has been represented to be, I will quote some portions of an editorial in the last issue of that paper which has come to hand, which will show you clearly that the feeling up there, as in the rest of British Columbia, is in favour of retaining the interests of that country for our own people:

By the granting of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway subsidy, the Dominion Government gained control of the Canadian Pacific Railway traffic rates in British Columbia, and it was also stipulated that, in all its extensions built subsequent to the granting of the subsidy, the Canadian Pacific Railway should not enjoy a monopoly of routes. It will thus be seen that the building the Canadian Pacific Railway from Rob-

son into the Boundary Creek country would not necessarily monopolize the only available pass through the Gold Range.

The Penticton extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway will touch all points in the Kettle River Valley that would be reached by the proposed Corbin line, and will, besides, traverse the entire district of South Yale, east and west. The management of the Canadian Pacific Railway has emphatically declared that the Robson-Penticton road will be completed and in operation as quickly as it would be possible to build a road to the Boundary Creek by any other route.

The Canadian Pacific Railway also promises to foster and encourage the local smelting industry in Kootenay and South Yale.

On the other hand, the Kettle River Railway Company—

Mark this, because it is evidence from them right on the spot.

—has evinced no disposition to promote the prosperity of this country; on the contrary, Mr. Corbin has been at considerable pains to foster and encourage the smelting industry of the United States at the expense of British Columbia. This is best proved by the fact that he preferred to have the Le Roi smelter erected at Northport, Washington, instead of at Sayward, B.C., where the opportunities for economical smelting are just as favourable as at the first-named place.

That is a very good indication of the feeling on this matter in the very district which is to be most affected, but I am also aware that a resolution, purporting to have been passed at a mass meeting in Rossland, was sent to the Government, and we heard it read in the Railway Committee, in favour of this charter. The House will be amused to learn how many people were at that meeting. I take this report of it from the "Rossland Miner":

At a meeting of about twenty-five citizens held last evening in the city hall, a resolution was passed advising the Dominion Parliament that the resolution passed by the British Columbia legislature, opposing the granting of a charter for the Kettle River Valley Railway did not voice the sentiments of the people of the province. The fact that there was to be a meeting was not generally known, in consequence of which the attendance was small.

There can be no doubt that that was a little trumped up meeting and a very small affair. But notwithstanding that fact, the resolution which was sent to the Government was so worded—as such resolutions invariably are—as to lead the Government in the House to believe that an enormous gathering had taken place and that the feeling of the district was about unanimous in favour of the resolution. This is the form in which the resolution was transmitted:

At a largely attended meeting of mine-owners and merchants, held at the mayor's request tonight, it was unanimously resolved:

I therefore make this point, that a number of these resolutions sent to the Government, and which hon. members have heard read, are of very little importance compared with
Mr. McINNES.

other evidences of public opinion to the contrary effect, which have come from that province. To emphasize that point, let me refer to a little incident that occurred in the Railway Committee, and which hon. members who happened to be present will remember. I was taken to task by my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) for speaking, as he thought, in a belittling way of the rising towns of that section of country. Well, nothing was farther from my thoughts than to speak disparagingly of any section of that country or of any of the new towns springing up there. But what I did try to point out was this fact, and I insist upon it to-day, that the resolutions passed in these little towns by two or three merchants meeting together—if there are three merchants in some of them—cannot be taken as having any value compared with resolutions such as have emanated from the British Columbia legislature, and from the Boards of Trade in Vancouver and Victoria and other large centres of the province. We were told that one of these towns actually had eight business places, and that was trotted out as evidence that the committee should treat with the greatest consideration the resolution which these eight business men possibly passed. If the truth were known of these eight men, possibly two were saloon keepers and two barbers, and what the others might be I do not know. I, therefore, insist on the point that the mere number of these resolutions ought to have no weight at all with hon. members. You should look rather to the bodies from which they emanate to see whether they are bodies of men who have had large experience in the trade of the country, who have watched the development of the Kootenay country and seen which way the trade was drifting. Resolutions coming from such bodies are entitled to every respect; I hope they will receive more attention and consideration on the part of this House than they have received at the hands of the Railway Committee. I do not intend to weary the House by reading a large number of these resolutions, but I have one that is typical, and passed by, possibly, the most representative board of trade of British Columbia, that at Victoria. I will read the resolution and also the letter to the hon. Minister of Railways which accompanied it, which will throw a flood of light upon the whole question:

Victoria, B.C., Feb. 26, 1898.

Hon. A. G. Blair,
Minister of Railways, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—The attention of this board has been directed to the application now before the Dominion Parliament for a charter for a railway, being a continuation of the Red Mountain line, running west, parallel with and a few miles north of the boundary. This board is of opinion that the granting of such a charter will be highly detrimental to British Columbia, and Canada generally, for such a line would simply tap

a country very rich in minerals, making the natural outlet for the same the United States, where it is probable the smelting would be done.

The smelting industry is only next in importance to the mining, and should be conserved to Canada. This board therefore has telegraphed to you urging that the charter be refused. The exact wording of the board's telegram is as follows :—

"This board resolved granting of charter Corbin's extension Red Mountain Railway highly detrimental to British Columbia interests, simply outlet for our ores to be smelted in United States."

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) F. ELWORTHY,
Secretary.

Now this is the interesting letter which accompanied this resolution. It also is addressed to Hon. A. G. Blair, Minister of Railways :

Victoria, B.C., March 2, 1898.

Dear Sir,—When writing to you on the 26th ult. with reference to the application for a charter for the extension of the Red Mountain Railway, I omitted to state that this board had placed before it letters from residents of the Boundary country strongly advocating the granting of the charter which this board opposes.

I stop here to make a remark. The advocate of Mr. Corbin in the Railway Committee tried to make the committee believe that these men in Victoria who passed this resolution did not understand the situation, that they did not know the full import of what was being asked for here. Now, I wish to state that if there are any bodies of men in British Columbia thoroughly familiar with the needs of that country, thoroughly familiar with the way that trade is going and will go, they are the Board of Trade of Victoria and the Board of Trade of Vancouver. We have one hon. member of this House who is a member of the Board of Trade of Victoria, who, I believe, was present when this resolution was passed. I refer to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Earle). He is not now present in the House. But as all hon. members know who have had any opportunity to discuss this matter with him, he is decidedly opposed to the granting of this charter. And it must not be forgotten that he is one of the largest wholesale men we have in Victoria city. He has up to the present done everything he could, as has every wholesale man in Victoria and Vancouver, to get a share of that trade, but he has seen that, unfortunately, they were handicapped, that these railway connections with the south have put the Americans in a position of advantage over the merchants on the coast. But not only are these bodies well informed upon matters of this kind, and particularly well informed upon this district, because it has received a great deal of attention lately, but when they were passing that very resolution which has been sent here, they were in possession, as they state in this letter, of arguments pro and con, and they adjudicated upon them, the

result being that resolution. Now, I wish to call your attention to this section of the letter :

The letters in question were from real estate men, and the only reason advanced for the granting of the charter was that the building of the proposed railway would create a boom in the country, and enable the writers to dispose of property which is becoming a serious burden to the holders. No other reason was cited, and this board decided that the object of a railway should be something more than the above, and instructed me to telegraph you its resolution opposing the granting of a charter to Mr. Corbin.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) F. ELWORTHY,
Secretary.

And so I might go on. There is no doubt, I think, in the mind of any hon. member that British Columbia is practically a unit against the granting of this charter. That being so, I would appeal to some of my hon. friends here, who in the past, have been famous champions of provincial rights, to stand by the declaration of the province. The province has put itself decidedly upon record against this measure, and I ask these hon. gentlemen to stand true to their professions and as the people of British Columbia with united voice say that the granting of this charter will be detrimental to their best interest, I ask the hon. gentlemen to give heed to the wishes of the people. British Columbia is practically a unit upon this question, except—and I always make this exception—except the Americans, who unfortunately, are in possession of some of our best fields in the Kootenays. They, I admit, are in favour of the granting of this charter, for it plays into their hands in relation to their interests on the other side of the line. But with the exception of these Americans, who, commercially and politically, are identified with the United States, ninety-nine per cent of the people of our province are hostile to the granting of this charter. And fortunately the good sense of this country is not confined to British Columbia. We find the mercantile centres throughout the whole of Canada have raised their voices against this charter. The Board of Trade of Winnipeg has passed a resolution against, as also have the Boards of Trade of Toronto, Montreal and other places. Some people attach more importance to these kinds of resolutions than others do ; but when we find such remarkable unanimity of expression from the business men, from the solid commercial men of this country against this charter, I say that that should cause every hon. member to hesitate before he goes contrary to their wishes and to their judgment in a matter of this kind.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have about concluded my remarks. I wish finally to make the appeal to this House to throw out this charter. Let our Canadian company get in there first, let Canadian merchants get the preference while that country is new, let trade get started well in Canadian chan-

nels before we give opportunities to the people of the United States to get in there. There is nothing to be lost by refusing this charter. That country will get the same accommodation from the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Railway. There is no doubt about that. The Canadian Pacific Railway have stated, and no person has denied, that they will build in there without a subsidy. There is no point of preference, therefore, as to time or the granting of a subsidy which would make you prefer the granting of a charter to an American road as against our Canadian road. There is absolutely no point of preference for the American road as against the Canadian road. That being so, I appeal to this House to give the preference which a Canadian road has a right to expect from a Canadian Parliament. We do not tie up the country by so doing.

For one year from now, ten years from now, any time this Parliament wishes in future to grant a charter to Mr. Corbin or any other United States railway magnate, there is nothing to hinder it, we do not tie our hands at all, we are absolutely free in the future in that respect. But I wish again to point out this fact, that this road, if built by a Canadian company, will not only conserve the trade of that section to British Columbia and to eastern Canada, but it will do something that Mr. Corbin's road will not do, it will develop that country to an extent four times as much. You who were in the Railway Committee and saw that peculiar map they had displayed on the wall, must have been struck with the fact that Mr. Corbin seeks to build only about thirty or forty miles in British Columbia, in Canadian territory. If the Canadian line is built, it will be built altogether in Canadian territory, and will extend this year alone something like 150 miles. That in itself, I submit, is a consideration which should throw the favour of this House on the side of the Canadian company. But after all is said and done, even if the American company should open up that country to the same extent as the Canadian company, I say it is the part of wisdom and of prudence for us at this time, when that trade is just beginning to get into settled channels, to refuse a charter to the American road and let our own Canadian road have the preference.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not wish to say anything on the main point, but simply to refer to the question at issue between the hon. gentleman and myself. I take it that neither of us have any other knowledge of how this vote went than that furnished by the material before us here. Now, the first vote was taken on the 23rd day of March. On the 24th of March, the Vancouver "World," which is the strongest supporter of the local government in that province, had the following paragraph re-

Mr. McINNES.

ferring to that vote, which appears in the Votes and Proceedings :

Let it be known far and near that those who are desirous of giving away the natural wealth which this province possesses, and the people's inheritance, are the Opposition, with the solitary exception of Mr. A. Williams, senior member for this city, who rose above partyism, and preferring country to faction, voted with the Government on this question, and in the best interests of Vancouver and the province generally.

That was on the 24th, the vote having been taken on the evening of the 23rd. Now, I find in the Vancouver "World" of the 26th, this paragraph :

It now appears that we were in error in stating the other day that Mr. Williams had voted with the majority in the House on Mr. Helmcken's resolution urging the Dominion Government to withhold its sanction for granting a charter to D. C. Corbin for the extension of the Spokane and Northern railroad from Marcus into the Boundary Creek country, and concerning which there is considerable feeling on the coast, in the interior and elsewhere in the Dominion.

That was three days after the vote, and therefore they must have seen occasion to retract the first statement as having been erroneous. If there is a strong supporter of the local government, it is the Vancouver "World," and a most excellent paper it is. Now, when you read the Votes and Proceedings in connection with this, I am bound to take the statement of Mr. McLagan, the editor of the Vancouver "World," that Mr. Williams did not vote as it appeared at first that he had voted. What are the facts? The main motion was put, as we heard read by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), and to that motion an amendment was moved by Mr. Semlin, leader of the Opposition, and for that amendment voted every man of the Opposition, Mr. Williams included. Of course, it was voted down. Then, on the resumption of the debate next day, a member moved the previous question, and all the government members voted for it, and all the opposition, including Mr. Williams, voted against it. Then the original question was put and carried. Now, you will observe that Mr. Williams, who is a strong supporter of the opposition, in fact an indispensable factor of the opposition, at every previous stage of this question voted with the opposition. Then, why should he turn around again and, after voting for the amendment and against the previous question, when it comes to the main question, take a directly contrary course? On the 26th, after, no doubt, Mr. Williams having sought a correction, the "World" stated that it was in error in its first statement that Mr. Williams had voted with the majority. I think I am justified in saying that must have been a misprint, it must have been an error. It is quite inexplicable to me, knowing Mr. Williams as I do and his status in the opposition, that he would vote for

the government in that connection. Even if I did not see that retraction by the Vancouver "World," I still would be perplexed to suppose that Mr. Williams did vote against his party on that occasion. That is the reason I had for controverting the hon. gentleman's statement. I think I am quite justified in assuming that Mr. Williams did not vote with the majority, after the statement by Mr. McLagan, a strong supporter of the government, and that he would not without good cause take such a strong ground from under his own feet as that of Mr. Williams voting with the government.

Mr. DAVIN. Would my hon. friend suppose a newspaper stated that a certain gentleman in this House voted a given way and it was found on the records of the House that he voted differently, would he take the newspaper account as against the Journals of the House?

Mr. MORRISON. If I knew the editor of the paper which published the vote and the other circumstances as in this case, I would be inclined to say there was a typographical error, as such errors occur so frequently in the printing of the proceedings of the House, and take the statement of the paper.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. The question whether this charter should be granted was so thoroughly discussed at the several meetings of the Railway Committee, that I, like my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), do not desire to weary the House; but at the same time I would like to say a word or two in favour of this Bill. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver, and although I paid the closest attention to them and weighed them carefully as he went along, I was not so impressed with any of his arguments as to change the opinion I had already formed that this charter should be granted to the Kettle Valley Railway. I could not reconcile the vote against this Bill with the position that I took when the Crow's Nest Pass Railway discussion took place in this House. I opposed the handing over of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway because I favoured a policy that might have given competitive freight rates over an all-Canadian route to the Kootenay, and ultimately to the coast of British Columbia. The hope of competition on that line, with all the advantages that it presented, has passed away into the dim and distant future. Now, the opponents of this Bill have the nerve to ask us to put the Canadian Pacific Railway in a position of supreme authority over our ever-growing interprovincial commerce. They coolly ask us that the producer, the manufacturer and the wholesale merchant of the east shall deal with the miner, and

the smelter man, and the consumer of the west on whatever terms may be laid down by Sir William Van Horne and the incorporated capitalists who are associated in his enterprise. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I will not by my vote consent to place the miners and the smelter men of the Boundary Creek country, or the merchants and manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec, or the wholesale merchants of my own city, or of Montreal or of any other eastern cities, under the control of the iron hand of Sir William Van Horne or the bosses of the Canadian Pacific Railway. As to the opposition of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I think that if ever an effort was made by the Canadian Pacific Railway to tie this Boundary Creek country up, to use the expression of the hon. member for Vancouver, it has been made in connection with this Kettle Valley Railroad. The Canadian Pacific Railway has never in its history made so desperate an effort as it is now making in order to defeat this Bill. And the fact that we had the president and the vice-president of the road before the Railway Committee, and that every influence has been used, shows how materially interested in this Bill are the Canadian Pacific Railway, and how anxious they are that it should be defeated. Competition is the life of trade. We all know that. So, in order that the greatest amount of good may be done the greatest number, and that the manufacturing, the mining, the mercantile and the industrial interests of this country may receive the greatest benefit in connection with western trade, I think we should grant this legislation without the slightest hesitation.

I believe in the value of railway competition, and my belief is confirmed by the testimony of an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, a practical business man and shipper, the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Kloepper), who, at a meeting of the Railway Committee the other day, put forward some pertinent facts in connection with railway rates and competition. I think that hon. member has a more extended experience than even my hon. friend and colleague the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), who made the statement, in the Railway Committee, that he could obtain better rates to a non-competitive point than to a competitive point on one of the great railways of Canada. When I say the hon. member for South Wellington has a more extended experience, I mean a different kind of experience. The hon. member for Centre Toronto is an immense shipper; but the rates he obtains on half a dozen train loads of steamboats is no criterion as to the rates that smaller shippers would have to pay. A manufacturer, like the hon. member for South Wellington, has a more representative experience than many larger shippers, and I am prepared to take his word that a choice of freight routes is

a good thing and advantageous to both the shipper and the consumer. It is, therefore, because I am in favour of railway competition that I am supporting this Bill. As to the interests of Canada, I am prepared to fight for the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any corporation, so long as the interests of that railway, or that corporation, are identical with the interests of my country. I cannot see how the interests of Canada are to be endangered by giving our fellow-Canadians in the Boundary Creek district the right to have this railway built at private expense; I think it is time, in the interest of Canada, to establish a precedent that there are, at least, some parts of the country rich enough to justify the construction of a railway for its own sake. Canada has been brought up in the belief that the people should be exceedingly thankful to any group of individuals who form themselves into a corporation and come here and accept enough of the country's money to build a railway for their own benefit. Session after session Canada's incorporated benefactors come here and always raise the same old cry—We are going to develop the country's resources. Yes, develop the country's resources on the usual terms; get a subsidy big enough to build a railway which they bond for a good deal more than it cost, and those bonds for ever remain a tax on the unfortunate people who are to use the road. It is proposed by this Bill to allow certain individuals to build a railway and develop the country at their own expense. I understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway under its various names, has built in the United States over 2,200 miles of road to develop the resources of the United States. I understand, these roads in the United States have been built without a dollar's worth of public aid in land or money; and I am told, by those who know, or ought to know, that alien farmers get lower rates over the lines which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have built in the United States with their own money, than the Canadian farmer obtains on the lines which the Canadian Pacific Railway has built in the United States with this country's money. So that, while the American farmer has never had to contribute anything to those Canadian Pacific Railway roads, over which he enjoys low rates, the Canadian farmer is charged higher rates over the Canadian Pacific Railway line in Canada, for which he is taxed up to the neck to provide subsidies. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company do not do this because Sir William Van Horne loves the American farmer better than the Canadian farmer. No; the Canadian Pacific Railway have to lower their freight rates in the United States in order to get away a share of the business from the competing lines in that country, and the company have been able to keep up

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.

the rate in the Canadian North-west because there are no competing lines. I am trying to view the request of our fellow-Canadians in the Boundary Creek district as I would desire them to view a similar application coming from myself, and as if they had the power to deny me rights I might demand, as this Parliament has the power to deny them theirs. To reject this Bill is to place our fellow-Canadians in the Boundary Creek district at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway; it is, in effect, to say that trade between the Boundary Creek country and eastern Canada shall be taxed all that it can bear. I do not think it is in the interest of Canada to retard the development of the Boundary Creek country by placing the Canadian Pacific Railway in a position to exact extortionate and oppressive rates from the people of that district. I do not think it is in the interest of Canada to refuse the Grand Trunk Railway a chance to enter that country, to get into competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and take all the freight that our eastern wholesale merchants and manufacturers can offer.

I am a protectionist; but I am in favour of protecting this country's interest by a tariff, and not by refusing to meet the just demands of fellow-Canadians in the Boundary Creek district. I believe public opinion generally has approved the action of the Railway Committee, and I am perfectly certain, further, that it has approved and endorsed the action of the Minister of Railways. I have heard opinions expressed, since the meeting of the Railway Committee, by scores of people, merchants and shippers of both political parties, in Toronto and elsewhere, and nine-tenths of the opinions expressed were in favour of granting this Kettle River charter. In fact, the only people I have heard talk the other way were men who were not shippers, but who were doing the old flag business at the bidding of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is no danger that public opinion will allow the Boundary Creek country to be drained of its wealth for the benefit of the United States cities. The granting of this charter will not relieve the Government or its successors from the obligation of protecting the interests of the people of this country by the imposition of export duties, and as a protectionist and as a Conservative, I say this country's interests can be better protected by the imposition of export duties than by the establishment of a railroad monopoly.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to say a few words on this matter. There is no doubt that the view just put forward by the hon. member (Mr. Ross Robertson) is the view that, at a superficial glance, will commend itself to nine-tenths of the people who talk or think about a railway, because the sound of competition has an attraction. If we had not

the experience of England and the experience of the United States, if that experience had not been crystallized in volumes, of which I hold two in my hand, showing that what I stated in the Railway Committee, and, I think, in this House, when this question was up before, that competition in railways is a delusion, that you cannot, in the nature of things, have competition in railways, because the cardinal principle behind competition is, that the thing that supplies the competition can be multiplied almost infinitely in proportion to the demand, we should all take the same view. But nobody supposes that a railway is in that position. In fact, in England or in Canada or in the United States or elsewhere, a railway corporation is a body of men to which the Government of the country has given for public ends, part of its sovereignty. You cannot have such a thing as railway competition. I have in my hand, the book published by Mr. Hole on national railways, and chapter 4 deals with that question of competition, and this is what it says :

The idea that the rates for carriage of goods might be left to the competition of companies fell to the ground when it was found that the companies did not compete, although many of them obtained their Acts upon that suggestion. Some call this road we are discussing a Grand Trunk line ; I do not see how they show that ; but the bare fact that this is a line coming from below the international boundary will not prevent the rule that has been found to work in regard to operating railways, namely : That when you have railways contiguous, the very moment they find that their competition is injurious to themselves that moment they come to an arrangement and agree upon rates. If I did not think that competition in railways was a delusion, the eloquent argument of my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) would have great weight with me. Again, this writer says :

Not a ton of iron or coals, not a sack of flour, bushel of fruit, or basket of fish, nor any of the whole (nearly) three hundred millions of tons carried, but is taxed, not at the will of the individual trader, nor at the will of the state, which only fixed the maximum for goods, but at that of the companies (or, rather, their managers), who, it is admitted, charge "as much as could be got," without reference to the cost to the company of performing the service, and therefore cannot be left uncontrolled.

This is his conclusion, and it drives us to the proposition which I have myself laid down, and that my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) has laid down with such cogency and force : that the real control over a railway must come from the Government of the country through which it runs. This is Mr. Hole's conclusion :

No theory of railway management is tenable which regards railways as private property, to be carried on solely with reference to the gain of the shareholders.

Therefore if that proposition be sound, no theory of competition can hold water when applied to railways. I take this book of Hadley on Railways and I find he says :

It is to the credit of English statesmen that they did not deceive themselves in this respect. They learned more in a few years from the working of a few miles of railroad than the general public has learned from all the railroads of the world in half a century. They recognized that competition could not be relied upon or aimed at with any hope of success.

And in a whole chapter he elaborates that, and if the experience of England as crystallized in this volume is correct, then nearly the whole of the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Ross Robertson) falls to the ground, and railway competition is a delusion. My hon. friend, for whom I have the greatest possible respect, says it is not, but still we have here the long years of experience in England and the United States against the judgment of my hon. friend. My hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) also spoke about what we are all gratified at : that here you have a railway coming forward to construct a line without asking large sums of money as subsidies for so doing. Sir, I consider that we might have paused long ago before giving large bonuses for the construction of these railways. I consider that the time has come when we should look to what the country is, and what is the field offered for railway exploitation, and if that field is a field that is likely to pay well we may be perfectly certain that private capital will put railways in there.

But how does that afford an argument against discountenancing the Kettle Valley River Railway, when into the very same country, over Canadian soil one of our own railways is ready to build a line without asking for any money whatever. Therefore, if that line is going to be built without help, and if we are to throw up our caps for one railway, we may as well throw up our caps for the other.

Mr. BOSTOCK. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), but he seems to have forgotten that there is a provincial subsidy to the railway which is being built under the Columbia and Western charter.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not forget that at all, but that subsidy does not come out of our pockets in the Dominion. And what does that prove, but that the British Columbia people feel that the bringing of that Canadian Pacific Railway line will do what is most necessary to be done ; it will secure for the fisheries and other products of the province whence my hon. friend (Mr. Bostock) comes, this Boundary Creek trade. My hon. friend (Mr. Bostock) is in the same position as the Minister of Railways, who sits next him. He forgets what he said last year—and it is really very interesting to look

up these gentlemen. The position that some of these gentlemen opposite are to-day illustrates the position that a Government cannot fail to get into which is a mere opportunist government. That government or that man who acts without principle must be inconsistent; no backbone of principle will run through its career. And to-day we find the Minister of Railways, with his bland and powerful advocacy and with the aplomb with which he always speaks on any subject, the air of a man who settles the thing when he speaks; we find him talking very differently now from what he did last year, and yet he expects this Parliament and he expects the country to accept his words. He expects us to accept his assurances now as he expected us to accept entirely different assurances from him only last session. Here is what my hon. friend from Yale (Mr. Bostock) said last year:

The danger we are under in that country is the same as we are under in the west Kootenay country with regard to Rossland. The natural tendency is for people to come into the country from the south, and we are very much in danger of all our trade and business being dragged that way. We have really to fight against the natural outline of the country, and try to direct the trade north instead of letting it go south. So that, speaking in the interest of the country itself, I think we have to take hold of this question at once and do the best we can with it.

That is the language of the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill; and now he is promoting this railway to do the very opposite. When a man, in the course of one short twelvemonth, blows hot and cold like that, what weight are you to attach to what he says or does or proposes? I think my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) read the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright)—very emphatic, very suggestive, very eloquent, as they could not fail to be, and at the same time, considering all the past, very extraordinary, if now, at the end of twenty months, anything is extraordinary that comes to us from these hon. gentlemen. Then we had our hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), and here is what he said on the subject of our trade with that region:

Our local position is this: At present North Alberta supplies grain, hay and vegetables, and South Alberta cattle, to the mining regions, over the Canadian Pacific Railway main line from Calgary, and its branch lines and steamboat connections. Our competitors, who supply by far the largest part of the produce consumed in Kootenay, are the farmers of the Palouse district of eastern Washington and northern Idaho, for whom the city of Spokane is the trade centre.

These are the competitors at the present moment; and the railway policy we are here discussing is to fortify those competitors to compete with the farmers of northern and southern Alberta and eastern and western Assiniboia. When we have the statement of so high an authority as the hon. member for Alberta, when we have the

Mr. DAVIN.

weighty authority of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and when we have the statement of the policy of the Government made by the Minister of Railways last year, and such a contradictory policy to-day, are not we from the North-west—nay, is not every member of Parliament—bound to ask the Government, what is their policy at the present moment? Did the Minister of Railways express the Government policy last session, or does he express it to-day? Or, if he does not, will some one who is higher in the hierarchy of Liberal leadership, get up and state to us what is the policy of the Liberal party on this question? In fact, I am told on pretty good authority—I would surprise hon. gentlemen if I told them the authority—that the Minister of Railways and Canals in the Railway Committee did not express the policy of the Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Let us have your authority.

Mr. DAVIN. I said I could not give it. Why, when I get a Cabinet secret like that, does the hon. gentleman think that I am going to give it away? Why, Mr. Chairman, if I gave away the gentleman who gives me the Cabinet secrets of hon. gentlemen opposite, I would never hear anything again. No, Sir; I will veil it under that convenient form: "a little bird told me"; but the little bird, I believe, spoke by the book. My hon. friend reminds me—I forgot that—that at the first two meetings of the Railway Committee we had the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) sitting next to the Chairman, and not far from him the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), and when anything was said in favour of the Kettle Valley Railway, we had the Napoleonic frown of the Minister of the Interior, and the Minister of Public Works shook his ambrosial locks, and looked dreadful things. What is the meaning of it? The heavenly twins of the Cabinet—the Castor of Quebec and the Pollux of Manitoba—were both against the Kettle Valley Railway, and they are not here to-day. We are often told by the press that the hon. gentleman who sits in that gallery—if I may so refer to him—who communicates hints beforehand of what is to be the policy of the Government, and who shapes in his great brain future leaders, has declared what a powerful mind the Minister of the Interior has—he is a young Napoleon, one of the masters of the party; and he ought to be here to tell us what the policy of the Government on this question is. Then, the hon. member for Alberta, said:

Until February last year their rate on grain was 25 cents per 100 to Nelson, which is a central point in Kootenay, while our rate was 50 cents per 100. Even with the duty in our favour we were not able to do business. In February last (no doubt in view of possible competition),

the Canadian Pacific Railway cut the rate from Edmonton (which is the principal grain shipping point) to Nelson to 35 cents per 100.

Mark you, he says, that even with the duty they were not able to compete with those men below the boundary; how then will they compete when we have added to the facilities for coming in from the country below the line? The hon. gentleman goes on:

With the duty in our favour this enabled us to compete with the Spokane 25 cent rate to certain Kootenay points most conveniently situated for us, and less conveniently placed for them. But had it not been for the high duties we evidently could not have competed, except at very much lower price for produce at the point of production on our side of the line, as compared with the price on their side.

Why? Because the farmers of Idaho, Washington, and Oregon—because the fruit-growers of Washington and other districts—because the canners south of the boundary, were nearer to the Boundary Creek country. And we are asked to increase the advantages of those competitors, already so successful:

When the Crow's Nest Pass Railway is completed the difference in haul will be 150 miles from Spokane to Nelson, against 600 miles from Edmonton to Nelson.

There is a difference of 450 miles in favour of those competitors, and yet you are going to aid them still further to compete against our own people. He goes on to argue:

The question is not one merely of a cent higher or lower, but possibly involves, in the last resort, getting down to the bare cost of hauling in order to hold the trade for our own country.

The point has been made that this line is not really the Northern Pacific at all, that it is not really Mr. Corbin you are dealing with but the Grand Trunk Railway. Sir, the Grand Trunk Railway is a Canadian line just as surely as the Canadian Pacific Railway. But what came out in the committee? When it was asked how it was the eastern shippers supplied the shopkeepers in the various little towns with goods, we were told that the customers of Canadian shippers who wrote to Canadian firms asking them to send on certain goods were supplied not from Canada but Chicago. The Canadian shippers, instead of sending on the goods from Canada, wrote to their agents or principals in Chicago and elsewhere, and American goods were sent west.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Only such goods as were not manufactured in Canada at all, and the Canadians got the trade.

Mr. DAVIN. But supposing they were the same class of goods, does my hon. friend mean to say that if he had a means of getting goods in St. Paul as in Montreal, he would not prefer to telegraph to St. Paul and have the goods supplied from these,

and get the rake-off, than ship from Montreal and pay the extra freight?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). That does not come into the question at all.

Mr. DAVIN. I want to show my hon. friend what is the character of the country that we will have to compete against. I have in my hand the Encyclopedia Britannica, and this is how it describes the very country south of the border, immediately south of that part of British Columbia which this Kettle River Valley Railway will tap. This Kettle River Railway is an American road, serving American territory, that just dips in and puts its hand into the wealth of Canada to haul it out to what is the main part of its line.

The principal tributaries of the Columbia within the territory are Clark's Fork, the outlet of Lake Pend d'Oreille, an unnavigable stream flowing through a deep cañon, which enters the Columbia just above the northern boundary of the territory. The Spokane River, one of the most important tributaries, is the outlet of Lake Cœur d'Alene, which drains a large extent of the Bitter Root Mountains. The Spokane, from the lake to Spokane Falls, a distance of about 30 miles, flows just below the level of a lovely prairie country.

Such as we have in the North-west, in Alberta and in western and eastern Assiniboia.

At the falls the river takes a plunge of 156 feet, and from there to the Columbia it flows through a deep cañon. These falls of the Spokane furnish one of the finest, most accessible, and most easily controlled water-powers in the world, and already they have been utilized to a considerable extent for manufacturing purposes. The Okinakane is the next important tributary; it rises in British Columbia, and flows southward from Lakes Okinakane and Owoyoos, and enters the territory in 119 degrees and 30 minutes W. longitude.

I call attention to this:

Its course lies through a rich and inviting country.

According to that, our friends below the line have a rich and inviting country, just contiguous to the boundary, and we rejoice to know it. But if we are to carry out the policy which is dear to the heart of Canada, the policy of the Canadian Liberal-Conservative party, and which I thought hon. gentlemen opposite had taken up in imitation of us, if we are to pursue the policy of Canada for the Canadians, of keeping our own wealth within our borders and not doing, as we did in the past, scatter with a lavish hand the wealth of Canada to enrich aliens and foreigners, we will not invite the farmers of that rich country to compete with our farmers in Assiniboia, Alberta, and elsewhere. Turning to Idaho, which is one of the points served by this company, I find it thus described:

Fruit Acreage.—In April the state horticultural inspector reported that about 20,000 acres in

Idaho are devoted to fruit culture—6,695 acres producing apples, 5,632 prunes, 1,838 pears, 1,030 berries, 972 peaches, and 526 cherries. Various other fruits being cultivated on the remainder of the 20,000 acres. From experiments he has conducted, he says that Idaho soil will produce an average of 17 tons of sugar beets to an acre, the Idaho product containing from 17 to 21 per cent of saccharine matter.

Live Stock.—The United States Department of Agriculture in July estimated the number and value of farm animals in the state as follows:—Horses 134,705, value \$3,328,570; milch cows 28,034, value \$567,689; oxen and other cattle 395,852, value \$5,583,492; sheep 1,011,852, value \$2,281,726; and swine 77,518, value \$398,290; total value \$12,189,741.

I have called attention to this to show that not merely shall our farmers have competition in cereals and dairy produce, but from the three states of Idaho, Washington and Oregon we shall have competition in the production of meat. Every man around Regina or Moose Jaw, or southern or northern Alberta, who wants to send a cow or bullock into Kootenay or Boundary Creek, will have these men, with the advantage of short haul, to compete against, and as the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) pointed out, that advantage of short haul is destructive of our competition. We have large flocks of sheep in the North-west Territories. We have exported sheep to Great Britain, but have found that the long haul and the trip across the Atlantic and the consequent deterioration that took place put us at great disadvantage in the British market. We found that although we can ship cattle successfully to England, we cannot send sheep profitably from the North-west Territories to that market, and have to turn to British Columbia. British Columbia is the market to which our sheep farmers are looking. We were told, when voting four million dollars for the Crow's Nest Pass line, that we were going to have the Kootenay trade for our exports of sheep and cattle and wheat, but now these hopes are to be dashed to the ground by this proposed legislation. Take Oregon again:

Oregon has 2,486,247 sheep, from which were secured in 1896 19,389,976 pounds of washed and unwashed wool, with 69 per cent of shrinkage. The scoured wool amounted to 6,165,892 pounds.

Here, again, we shall have competition from Oregon. And I wish to show you what this book says concerning the farm animals in Washington territory. According to the information furnished by the United States Department of Agriculture, in Washington state as it is now, the number and value of farm animals in 1896, were as follows:—

	Number.	Value.
Horses	192,055	\$5,574,956
Milch cows	117,381	2,591,772
Other cattle	381,550	5,803,002
Sheep	756,346	1,318,462

So that from Washington also our sheep farmers, who are looking to this country

Mr. DAVIN.

as their special market, will have great competition.

Mr. Chairman, if the committee will bear with me in making one personal remark, I may say that I take strong personal interest in the policy embodied in the Crow's Nest Pass Bill. I do not think that my hon. friends from the Treasury benches will think I say a harsh thing of them when I say that whatever else their friends may give them credit for, they cannot give them credit for originality. I do not think they have produced an original policy, I do not think they have struck out an original idea with regard to the government of this country since they came into power. Whose idea was it that they copied when they dealt with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway last year? A short time ago, when I ventured to say that it was by being aggressive that I carried so many things in this House—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes. There was an ignorant guffaw.

Mr. CHARLTON. An ignorant one?

Mr. DAVIN. I will not characterize the guffaw I am listening to now. But I will tell the hon. gentleman this, that I can prove it, as I have done—

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Davin's) manners are exceedingly good and should be copied.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) objects to my manners. Of course, I did not have that unexceptional training that has turned out the finished gentleman in my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He must excuse me, my education having been neglected. I did not have the advantages that have given us such a Brummel as we have in my hon. friend. Now, Sir, on July 8th, 1895, the following resolution was moved in this House:—

That the commissioners appointed to inquire into Canadian Pacific Railway freight rates have reported that Canadian Pacific Railway existing rates for grain are from $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 cent per 100 pounds less than the Dakota schedule from all points west of Regina, which last, however, applied to Edmonton and Prince Albert, would be 6 and 7 cents lower than the Canadian Pacific tariff; that, as regards live stock, the Canadian Pacific Railway rate runs at \$1.35 and \$1.84 per car to Montreal, while the Northern Pacific and Great Northern charge from \$1.63 to \$1.91 for the same distance; that, as regards coal and lumber, the comparisons show still more favourable rates to the Canadian public. That this House would suggest—

I ask the attention of hon. gentlemen to this—

—That this House would suggest to the Government that it would be well to open negotiations with the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the view of coming to an arrangement with that company to carry for the next

twenty years produce from the North-west to the sea-board 10 per cent cheaper than at present, on condition of the Government guaranteeing bonds to a certain amount for twenty years, and should the railways of the United States lower their rate, the Canadian Pacific Railway shall lower theirs proportionately.

That was the first time that such a proposition was ever made in this Parliament, and when it was made originally on the platform, it was the first time it was ever made in Canada. Well, now, compare that with the Government's policy on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. I will not read the clause of the Act, it has already been read. But I would refer hon. members to clause 1, subsections "c," "d," "e," and also subsection 1. Reading this, you will see how closely, in some respects, the Government followed that resolution. Where they departed from it, they departed from it for the worst. They departed from it in this—instead of guaranteeing bonds or granting money in some such form, they gave \$11,000 a mile much more than was necessary to give in order to get these concessions. But, generally speaking, the policy laid down in this resolution in 1895 is the policy adopted by this Government in 1897. And, Sir, I am very glad indeed to have such distinguished followers. I am especially glad to have the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) endorse the policy laid down in that resolution. That is not the only thing in which they have carried out my views. I congratulate the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) particularly in what he has done in that way. The only thing that I might object is that the Minister of Agriculture talks as if it were his own policy. The only thing I object to in the case of the Minister of Railways in this regard is that, having laid down that policy, as he did it last year, he is now, in some respects, departing from it. After I had spoken in support of that resolution my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) replied. He said :

I do not know whether there is a prospect of the Canadian Pacific Railway entertaining such a proposition ;—

And again :

—but I do not see that the Government could, in any way, guarantee bonds of the Canadian Pacific Railway—

And so on. The only Liberal exponent who spoke on the subject—it was moved on a Wednesday and rather late in the session, and the debate closed at six o'clock, and the subject was not again reached—was Mr. Martin, who is now in British Columbia. Mr. Martin threw cold water on the idea ; he laughed at it. He said :

The hon. gentleman comes forward with a proposition so absurd and ridiculous that the Minister of Railways simply rises and tells him that he cannot consider it.

Why, Sir, when I originally proposed to get the second homestead for the farmers of the North-west Territories who were entitled to it and put \$400 apiece in the hands of hundreds of farmers, both Liberals and Conservatives laughed at me. But I kept at from 1887 to 1891, when, after I had divided the House and brought the majority down to fourteen, Sir John Thompson came over to my place and said : We will put your resolutions and Bills on the Government Orders. I throw that out to my hon. friends the soi-disant independent members on the other side to encourage them. Mr. Martin further said :

I understood him to say that to expect other provinces of Canada to devote public funds to the Canadian Pacific Railway in order that the company might reduce its rates in favour of a small portion of the Dominion was a proposition—the Minister did not use the words, but I use them—so absurd and ridiculous that it did not require any consideration.

Well, Sir, as on previous occasions, these words appeared at the time to fall on idle ears, but it turns out from the legislation of last session, that they must have been pured from a golden urn. Then Mr. Martin said :

Well, I cannot help it. This is one of the unfortunate things. We are not a party of repudiation.

This is the Mr. Martin, a burning and shining light, who placed the gentlemen opposite where they are now. He it was who contrived the machine—though hoisted with his own machine—that placed you there.

When a thing is done in this House, and when Canada has pledged her name and credit to a contract, we propose as Canadians to carry out these pledges.

I said :

Then you are opposing what is suggested—

Because I knew very well that if he remained in public life and opposed my proposition, I should be able, if I met him on a platform in the west to pound him to some purpose. This is what he says :

I am not opposing it. It does not require any opposition. I am stating what the Minister of Railways and Canals says in regard to it.

He then begins to hedge. Well, there is the fact. I take a deep interest in this subject, and I want to see it carried out fully and successfully. We have been told something about the benefits that would accrue to these towns. I do not think the member for Vancouver misrepresented the situation when he described two or three persons passing resolutions. But I have had a communication from a Canadian living in Greenwood, where, I think, the great majority of the people are citizens of the United States, stating that—and I ask the attention to this of my hon. friend from Yale (Mr. Bostock)—the majority of the people in Greenwood are

citizens of the United States, that they talk of the country as if it was their own, that they bear themselves most arrogantly to the people of Canada who happen to be there.

Mr. BOSTOCK. May I ask the hon. gentleman, where he gets that?

Mr. DAVIN. The letter was sent in confidence; I cannot give the name. If I had permission of the writer, of course, I could tell the hon. gentleman, but he does not give me that permission. But is it to be supposed that he excogitated such a thing as that? Has my hon. friend visited Greenwood?

Mr. BOSTOCK. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, if my hon. friend is in a position to contradict that, and if he gives his word to this House, of course, I would not doubt his word. But mind this, everything my hon. friend says now on this subject will be taken 'cum grano salis,' for this reason, that there are his own words of last year in letters of fire, written against the position he has taken here. Now, here we have news from Rossland, from Trail, from Nelson, from Vernon and from Kaslo:

Rossland, B.C., April 1.—The despatches of to-day announcing the passing of the Kettle River Valley Railway Bill through the Railway Committee, meets with the entire satisfaction of a portion of our American population, who are supporters of Mr. Corbin, but the general feeling seems to prevail that the line, if built, cannot but at once hurt west Kootenay, and ultimately injure Boundary Creek. The only hope for the county, should the Bill pass the House, is that the Canadian Pacific Railway will build through the district. No one in British Columbia credits for one moment Mr. Corbin's reported promises to safeguard the interests of the province, or to develop the smelting industry. It is not in the nature of things that he should. He is a business man. His interests are American, and must remain so.

There is a telegram from the accredited correspondent of one of the first papers in Canada, and he is bound to send to his paper what is the state of feeling. He says that in Rossland the American population is rejoiced; but the British Columbia, or Canadian, population, who are anxious for the future of the country, and who desire to see it go forward on Canadian lines, are not rejoicing, but, on the contrary, they are somewhat anxious.

Mr. BOSTOCK. Does my hon. friend mean to say that the "Gazette" has a correspondent in each of these towns?

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I am not in the secrets of the "Gazette" office, and I never asked my friend Mr. White about it; but I assume that, when that paper publishes correspondence, it comes as correspondence, and not as private letters. When I edited a newspaper, if anybody, no matter how high his position, were to send me a telegram, I would not put it in as a telegram belonging to the

Mr. DAVIN.

paper, but I would put it in as a letter or note coming from that person; and, if he did not want his name to appear, I would make an explanation to that effect.

Trail, B.C., April 1.—In announcing the Railway Committee's report favouring Corbin's Kettle River Valley Railway charter, the Northport, Washington, paper of yesterday rejoices exceedingly, and says: "Now look out for great prosperity for Northport."

"For great prosperity for Northport." We heard a great deal of that. All this points to Northport. The smelting will be done at Northport, and, in order to prevent the ore from going out, we have got a clause in this charter which everybody knows is not worth that much, to keep the ore in our country and to build up some other place besides Northport. Can any one suppose that an exceptional piece of legislation like that would be put in force against the interests that will be brought to bear? Look at the way this Government is going on about the lumber question. Notwithstanding what the Dingley Bill has done, and notwithstanding the promise that was made, notwithstanding the representations of the business people of this country interested in lumber, who are crying out, clamouring and beseeching to have that duty that was promised to be put on, put on now, the duty is not put on. And when they won't do it in one case, do you suppose we can trust them to do it in another? This telegram goes on:

To-day's despatch telling of Mr. Corbin's success before the Railway Committee with his Kettle River Valley Bill, is hardly credited. The hope is expressed that if it has really passed the Railway Committee it will be defeated in the House. Mr. Corbin's advent in Rossland impoverished this community, and it is felt that if aided to further tap the riches of British Columbia, it is all day with us.

Then, from Nelson we have this:

Nelson, B.C., April 1.—Much surprise is expressed here over the reported passing of the Kettle River Valley Railway Bill through the Railway Committee. The statement is not credited. So apparent are the dangers to Canadian trade of such a line, to those living in British Columbia, that they imagine that the situation must be equally clear to all. Should the charter be granted and the line built, it is felt that the death knell of smelting in British Columbia has been sounded.

But is it only the death-knell of the smelting that will be sounded; is it only that Northport will be built up? Why, the obligation will be still greater soon than it is now. The fishing interests, the canning interests, the wheat-growing interests, the beef-raising interests of the North-west will all be deplorably and irretrievably damaged, so far as this great market is concerned that we were to have secured to us by last year's legislation.

Vernon, B.C., April 1.—Although the need of a railway in Boundary is fully acknowledged, to-day a despatch reporting the passing of the

Kettle River Valley Railway Bill through the Railway Committee is looked upon as ominous for this section of the country. It is hoped that the Canadian Pacific Railway will be able to come to the rescue and prevent the farmers of the Colliville Valley, Washington, supply the Boundary Creek district, as must follow the construction of an unopposed line into that territory from the United States.

Kaslo, B.C., April 1.—The Kettle River Railway Bill has created no interest to speak of here, until to-day's despatch reporting Mr. Corbin's victory before the Railway Committee over Sir William C. Van Horne and Mr. Shaughnessy, became known. Those who know the Boundary district are of one voice as to the need of a railway in that section. The feeling seems to prevail that a line from the United States would prove most injurious to the general interests of the country, and should only be permitted in the event of it not being possible to arrange for the construction of a Canadian line through that district.

Sir, if it should turn out that competition is necessary, by shutting out this line now we do not preclude ourselves from the option of near competition or ultimate competition. If it should appear that those clauses which were put into the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill last year for the purpose of enabling the Government to control the freight rates on every line of the Canadian Pacific Railway which communicates by any route with the Crow's Nest Pass road, which means the whole line practically, are delusive, which they are not—if it is found that they are not sufficient to do what I hold is the true policy, to control these lines by Government surveillance and Government control, then we do not surrender our option of obtaining this company, and we may be perfectly certain here will be persons always ready to come in and build a line. It is a departure from the policy of last year; it is contrary to the policy of Canada for the Canadians; it is a retrograde step, and is one which should not be made with the approval of this House. Some hon. members may say: did not this Bill pass the Railway Committee? How did it pass the Railway Committee? With a majority of only six, when a large number, or at all events a considerable number of hon. members opposed to it were absent; and when it is a large national question such as this, is it to be supposed for one moment that we are to be controlled by the mere pedantry that the Bill passed the Railway Committee and should thereby be led not to revise or review the issue here? Let me say to the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) that I do not want to place anyone at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. No one is at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway now with the Act of last session in our hands; and if the people are at the company's mercy, the Government should exercise the power given them by that Act. My hon. friend has spoken of the anxiety of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What about the country

through which the Canadian Pacific Railway goes? It runs through Manitoba, Assiniboia and Alberta. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that that part of Canada is not anxious for the trade of Boundary Creek? I can understand that a great railway makes many enemies, as in fact every railroad does. The Grand Trunk did so in the past, and no doubt has many enemies now. The Canadian Pacific Railway made many enemies in the past, and the fact was not surprising; but the mere circumstance that it may be popular to cry out against the great railway corporations is no reason why, when an issue like this comes before Parliament we should allow our eyes to be blinded and should not consider the question in a judicial frame of mind. Taking the circumstances of the North-west into account, considering the circumstances of Assiniboia, Alberta, the Saskatchewan and Manitoba together with the interests of British Columbia, we should decide whether the best course to adopt is not to prevent this road going through.

Mr. BOSTOCK. I desire to make a few remarks in answer to what has been said in the committee by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes). The hon. gentleman occupied a large portion of the afternoon in placing before the committee the same arguments that had been used before the Railway Committee as to why this Bill should not pass, and he travelled over very much the same ground as was traversed on that occasion. One strong point which I wish to bring before hon. members constitutes a very good answer to what has been said by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in regard to the stand that I took when speaking about the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. At that time I explained the geographical conditions of the country, and pointed to the fact that the mountain ranges in British Columbia run in such a direction that trade would pass down into the United States to the south; but on this occasion that fact is one of the strongest reasons why I am in favour of the present Bill, for we have the geographical conditions with us. The Kettle River, as any one who has studied the map knows, winds in and out of the boundary line, and runs into the Columbia below Northport. The streams running north from the mountain to the south of the boundary line enter Washington Territory; and one of the strong reasons why, from the point of view of British Columbia and the constituency which I represent, I favour the measure is, that by allowing this railway to be built in British Columbia, on the line laid down by the present charter, it will tend to draw the ores from the Eureka country in Washington Territory and from the mountains around which the Kettle River runs into British Columbia. If this charter be not granted, the railway, which can be built by Mr. Corbin without being in

any way under our control, will come up to the boundary line, and will build up on the southern side of the line cities which will take away a large volume of trade from our own cities near the Boundary Creek country. It is a very important matter and one which my hon. friends ought to take into consideration when voting on this question, because we have found in British Columbia, and especially in the Kootenay mining district, that where we have had competition between railways we have been able to build up cities that are making rapid and continuous growth, while those towns which have not had competing railways have not advanced to anything like the same extent. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) in speaking on this question quoted figures from the customs returns respecting Nelson and Rossland, and the returns for those two ports showed a considerable increase. I presume in quoting those figures the hon. gentleman wanted the House to accept the view that the whole of this trade was due to the fact that a line ran into Nelson and Rossland from the south, but it must be remembered that the Canadian Pacific Railway is ready to handle freight from the United States as well as from any part of Canada, and that company is always trying to extend its branches into the United States in order to draw trade from that country to Canada as much as possible. Only the other day when I was looking through a newspaper I found a paragraph showing that that company are now making arrangements for the construction of a line which will run from Portland to Vancouver, and allow the company to get down to cities on the Pacific Coast and tap the Southern Pacific and Union Pacific, and thus place the Canadian Pacific Railway in a position to take hold of trade coming from San Francisco and points to the south, which they have not been in a position to secure heretofore. Now, I do not at all blame the Canadian Pacific Railway for pushing their business in this sort of way, but when they are trying to extend their railway in every possible way into the United States, they should not in my opinion put up such a fight against this Kettle River Valley Railway because it comes from the United States into a part of Canada, in respect to which they desire to keep the whole trade for themselves. The hon. member for Vancouver Island (Mr. McInnes) contended, that the boards of trade and the people on the Pacific Coast knew better what was good for the people in the Boundary Creek district than did these people themselves who have been investing their money to develop that country. Hon. gentlemen will probably remember that last year we had before the House two railway charters for lines to go through this Boundary Creek country; one of these, the Columbia and Western, was in the hands of a gentleman who has lately sold it out to the Canadian

Mr. BOSTOCK.

Pacific Railway, and the other was the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern, which my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) says is going to bring the trade of that country down to the coast and benefit the coast cities. At that time there was a fight between the promoters of these two Bills, and so this Boundary Creek country was deprived of the very requisite railway facilities which they desired to get in order to develop their territory. The people of this particular part of the province of British Columbia are not opposed to any of these different railway charters, but they desire to see a railway into that country which will help them to open up their mines and realize on the money which they have invested there. They know they cannot develop the country any more than they have done at the present time, until they get this railway transportation, and they also know that they have a very rich mineral country which as soon as they get a railway in there will supply sufficient ore, and will support a sufficiently large population, enable not only one, but two, and possibly three railways to do a profitable business in that region.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BOSTOCK. Mr. Chairman, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was trying to bring before the committee the reasons why this Bill should be allowed to pass. I desire to refer to a few more of the points that were made by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) this afternoon. He would give you the idea that the towns in the Boundary Creek country are small towns, which are not to be very much considered owing to their being very largely composed of Americans. But, as I stated in the Railway Committee, there are in that Boundary Creek country a larger percentage of British subjects than in any other part of the mining districts of British Columbia, and the towns that have been built up in the Boundary Creek country have been for the greater part started either by Canadians or by Englishmen who have been in the country a long time, and have invested a considerable amount of money there. I was trying to show that these people are very anxious to get railway communication in there, and they were very bitterly disappointed last year that they were not able to get a railway started, in consequence of the fight that occurred in the Railway Committee between the Columbia and Western and the Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern people. Now we have the gentlemen who were supporting the Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern coming forward and opposing the granting of this charter; and I understand from what was said by the hon. mem-

ber for Vancouver the other day, when speaking of this matter in the Railway Committee, that he is also prepared to oppose the charter to the Columbia and Western, which will come before the Railway Committee later on.

Now, the people in the Boundary Creek country certainly think they are entitled to have the railway facilities which will enable them to go ahead and develop their mines in a way in which they cannot do at present. There are some twenty-two mines that have already shipped ore out of the country for the purpose of testing what its product would be when subjected to a straight smelter test. They have done this at considerable cost to themselves, but it was a cost which they considered justifiable in order to see whether they had valuable properties or not; and they are now very anxious to see this railway charter granted, because they realize that it would be the same for them as it has been for Nelson and Rossland—that the fact of having railways giving them competitive rates would materially assist them in developing the mines in a way which they will not be able to do if they are simply in the hands of one railway.

The hon. member for Vancouver made a great point of the resolution which was passed by the provincial legislature; but in mentioning the vote that was taken upon that resolution, he did not go into the question of the representation of the different parts of the country, which is a very material point in considering a matter of that kind. When that vote was taken in the provincial House, there were only two members of the Opposition who voted with the Government; it was very nearly a straight party vote. If the representation in the House had been according to population, the vote would have shown a very different result. As it is arranged at the present time, there are 2,328 voters in a district that would be in no way affected by the building of a railway in the Boundary Creek country; and these 2,328 voters have ten members in the provincial legislature, who naturally voted in favour of the resolution; while 2,497 voters in the districts that would be affected by the railway when built have only three members in that legislature, and all of these opposed the resolution. I do not think it is necessary for me to go through the whole list on this question of representation. I think the figures which I have quoted are sufficient to show hon. gentlemen that although there was a majority in the legislature voting in favour of that resolution, if there had been a proper representation according to population, the vote would in all probability have gone in a very different way. The hon. member for Vancouver referred to the fact that Colonel Baker voted in favour of the resolution, as if Colonel Baker was very keenly interested in that part of the country which would be

benefited by this railway. Colonel Baker represents a constituency in what is known as East Kootenay, which is some hundred miles to the east of the Boundary Creek country, through which this railway will run, and he is not altogether in touch with the wishes and desires of the people in the Boundary Creek country. I cannot state it as a fact, but I believe Colonel Baker has never made a trip through that country at all. But the members of the provincial legislature most in touch with that part of the country—the men who represent it, Mr. Graham, and the member of the adjoining constituency, Mr. Hume—both voted in favour of this resolution, and they are the best qualified in that House to realize what it means to that mining country to have the facilities for developing it that would be given to it by the granting of this charter.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to go again into the question of smelting, although it has been raised in this debate. It was very fully explained by the promoters of this Bill when it was before the Railway Committee, that the reason why the smelter was placed at Northport, instead of at some place on the Canadian side of the boundary line, was, first, owing to the necessity of having lime to mix with the Rossland ores for the purpose of forming a flux, and secondly, owing to the necessity of obtaining water for smelting. The hon. member for Vancouver to-day suggested that that smelter could have been as well placed at some point on the Canadian side of the boundary line, and I think he mentioned a place called Sayward. Now the hon. gentleman may not possibly know that when the gentlemen who are most largely interested in the smelter were looking over sites for it, they took into consideration the site at Sayward, and they were to some extent favourably impressed with it, and thought it would be a good position for a smelter. But when they came to look further into the matter and to try to find out how they were going to obtain the necessary water for the purpose of carrying on the smelter industry, they found Mr. Heintze had got control of the only available water in that part of the country for their business, and, therefore, they were absolutely precluded from establishing a smelter there, although they desired to do so. The further fact that they had a much better means of obtaining lime at Northport decided them to place the smelter down at that point. I do not think that any gentleman who looks at this matter from a business point of view will consider that they were wrong in taking the position they did. They were practically driven to put in their smelter at the point where they did put it, and any body of men who are going into that country for the purpose of putting up smelters must be guided by the same business principles. I do not consider myself, that the smelter question is very

material in this particular point, because there is a syndicate prepared to start a smelter at Grand Forks, right in the Boundary Creek itself, and which has gone so far as to put a considerable sum into that enterprise, and will go ahead as soon as the necessary railway facilities are provided. Once started, this syndicate will naturally do all in their power to have the smelting done in that part of the country, and will no more desire to see the ore going out of the country than the gentlemen who are opposing this Bill.

The hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) read some telegrams from the Montreal "Gazette," as showing the feeling of the people in that particular section with regard to the granting of this charter. It is very strange that such a number of telegrams from different points in the Kootenay country should all appear in a newspaper published in Montreal. I am not aware that that newspaper has correspondents in all these different towns, interested in sending telegrams to the editor on this particular point at this particular moment. It appears to me, there must be some motive power behind which is instigating these telegrams and arranging for their publication. But I have here a telegram from Nelson, which may throw some light on the way this sort of thing is being done, and the sort of fight that was put up to try and throw discredit on this particular charter. Here is a telegram from the Mayor of Nelson. It reads as follows:—

Forty members of the Nelson Board of Trade met to-night and adjourned without giving the Canadian Pacific Railway official a chance to introduce rescinding resolutions. They were smashed properly.

The rescinding resolution here referred to is one that was introduced for the purpose of doing away with the resolution passed by the Nelson Board of Trade in favour of this charter. That shows the means taken to create the impression on this side of the Dominion that our people in the Kootenay are opposed to this charter.

In talking of the smelter question, the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) referred to the resolution which was passed by the Nelson Board of Trade concerning freight rates on the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway. He was trying to make out that, in voting for this Bill, the House will be doing an act of philanthropy to Mr. Corbin. Hon. gentlemen know that Mr. Corbin does not desire any favours from this Government, further than what he deserves to get as an ordinary business man. Mr. Corbin has put his money into this country, and he has done all he can to develop it, but he has done that as any other railway and business man would, with the desire of helping himself at the same time that he builds up and helps the country. He does not desire to be treated on any other

Mr. BOSTOCK

basis, he does not desire to be looked upon as a philanthropist, but he does desire to have, and I think he has a right to receive, fair treatment at the hands of this House, and not have the charter for which he is now asking refused simply on the ground that the scheduled rates of his railway, the Nelson and Fort Sheppard, are said to discriminate against the smelter at Nelson. An attempt has been made to show that Mr. Corbin has had discriminating rates from this point in favour of the Northport smelter as against the Nelson smelter. As a matter of fact, I do not think that a single carload of ore has ever been shipped. And, as gentlemen who understand this question of railway rates will know, very often, in drawing up a schedule, a rate is put down for the carriage of goods from one point to another, and if no shipment is made from there, no question is raised about the rate and it may stay on the schedule for a long time without any attention being paid to it. And this is the case in the rates that were mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver to-day. Now, I have here the "Globe" of March 28th, which contains a letter written by Mr. Corbin referring to the statement made by the hon. member from Vancouver:

The rate on ore from Hall's Siding to Nelson is stated at \$2.25 per ton, the distance is 11 miles. The fact is there has never been more than two or three carloads of ore shipped from Hall's Siding, and the distance from Nelson is over 20 miles. This ore is concentrates of fine sulphide of iron saved on vanners or tables of the Fern Mine stamp mill, which has only been in operation about three months. I do not know what rate was put in from that station when the schedules were originally made up and before any shipments made from that point. But since it became apparent that there would be such shipments instructions were given to make the rates to Nelson and Northport exactly the same, and this is what has been done.

Then, with regard to the second point, that the rate from Nelson to Northport is \$1 per ton, he says:

This is not correct. The rate from Nelson to Northport is \$1.25 per ton and has never been less, and not a single ton of ore has ever been shipped from Nelson to Northport smelter.

Then, as to the third charge, which states that the rate on ore from Rossland to Northport is 75 cents per ton, he says:

This is correct as far as it goes. Our contract with the Le Roi mine is 75 cents per ton on a tonnage of 3,000 tons or over per month, and \$1 per ton for less than that amount. This, added to the rate of \$1.25 per ton between Nelson and Northport gives \$2.25 per ton, which is exactly the rate on ore offered by my company to the Hall Mine smelter at Nelson, more than a year and a half ago, the distance between Rossland and Nelson being 87 miles.

The fourth charge was that the rate on ore from the Velvet mine on the Red Mountain Railway, which takes the Rossland

rate, to Nelson was \$2.75 per ton. Mr. Corbin says :

This is evidently a mistake in the figures, it should be \$2.25 per ton.

Charge 5 gives a rate of \$1 per ton from Robson to Nelson, twenty-eight miles. This is on a Canadian Pacific Railway line, which had nothing to do with Mr. Corbin, and over which he has no control. The sixth charge gives a rate on ore from Slocan City to Nelson, forty-five miles, of \$3 per ton. This is also a Canadian Pacific Railway line, over which Mr. Corbin has no control. Charges seven and eight refer to the Kaslo and Slocan Railway, a line in which Mr. Corbin has no interest, except he receives their freight, as he would the freight of any other company, and ships it over his line. The ninth give a through rate from Nelson to Tacoma, Everett and Great Falls. This is a rate made in common with the Canadian Pacific Railway, Grand Trunk, Great Northern and Northern Pacific Railways. The tenth is also as to a through rate of which the Nelson and Fort Sheppard and Spokane Falls and Northern Railways only get their proportion, but I think it should be \$6.75 instead of \$6.25. And in this letter, Mr. Corbin goes on to say :

This matter is thoroughly understood by the Board of Trade at Nelson, and that they have no quarrel with me on the question of freight rates is evidenced by the fact that that body passed a resolution favouring the Kettle Valley Railway, which is now before the Railway Committee of the House of Commons.

Now, I think that is a very fair statement of the position as to the rates on the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway, and I think it shows that there is no discrimination on that railway between the Nelson smelter and the Northport smelter. Another point which I tried to bring out the other day in speaking before the Railway Committee was that, owing to the way that Mr. Corbin had been treated in the claim put forward by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the whole of the foreshore right within the limits of the town of Nelson, he has not had an opportunity to get his railway into the town of Nelson, nor is he able to ship ore to the Nelson smelter in a way that he ought to be able to do, in a way that would enable him to give better rates to the smelter. It can easily be understood that if ore has to be transported by means of freight teams a mile and a half to two miles from the station to the smelter, it makes it very much more expensive than it would be if the railway cars could be run right up alongside the ore bins in the smelter and the ore be thrown into the bins.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to detain the committee very much longer. Hon. members have heard a great deal

about this matter, and I think they have heard sufficient from those on both sides to form an opinion as to what is best in the interest of the country. For my part, I desire, most certainly desire, to see this railway charter go through, because I think it is in the interest of that part of the country which I represent. I believe that it will materially assist in building that part of the country, and that it will provide a competing line and enable the shippers and traders in the eastern part of Canada to get their goods into that country in a way that they are not able to do when simply left in the hands of one railway. I think it is a matter which very materially affects the people of the east. They may realize it a little more clearly from an incident which occurred in relation to the carrying of the machinery for the working of the Le Roi mine.

At the time that the company were intending to put in a large compressor plant which they use in that mine, they had occasion to get different rates from the Canadian Pacific Railway and from the Grand Trunk Railway, and they found that they could get a rate amounting to some 15 or 20 cents a ton less from the Grand Trunk Railway into Rossland than they could if shipped over the Canadian Pacific Railway. The consequence was that out of eight carloads of machinery going to that mine from Sherbrooke, in the province of Quebec, seven of those carloads were carried by the Grand Trunk and shipped over the Great Northern to Spokane, and then up to Rossland, and only one was carried over the Canadian Pacific Railway. The owners of the mine were by that means enabled to get a considerably better rate than they would have got if they had been entirely in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, the point has been made more than once that this railway will be throwing trade into the hands of our neighbours to the south, and hon. gentlemen seem to think that that is something we ought not to do. But I think that there is a very much more serious matter to look after, if they are going to take hold of a question of that kind, and try to keep our neighbours from getting any benefit out of the valuable mineral deposits which we have in the Kootenay country. I think that a great deal more money has been made out of, and possibly taken away from the people of Canada, by Americans from the south who have come into that country and have staked out and worked claims, and who have certainly, some of them at least, become very wealthy from the fact of their being able to hold these mineral claims in our country. Now, if hon. gentlemen who are opposing this Bill are so anxious to stop the Americans from getting any benefit out of these mineral regions of British Columbia, I think they would be doing much greater service to the people of Canada if they would take hold and start, I was almost

going to say, an agitation for the purpose of preventing Americans from holding claims in that country. At the present time Americans are able to go into the Boundary Creek country or the Kootenay country, and stake out claims there in competition with British and Canadian subjects; and they can then go across the line to the south which is, so far as one can tell, almost as rich a mineral country as that which we have on the north side of the boundary line, and they can stake out claims there. The consequence is that they are able to hold and develop claims on both sides of the line, or on whichever side they think most advantageous. But a British subject going into that country can only take up a claim in British Columbia. He is handicapped to this extent, that if he should happen to go across the boundary line, as it is possible for a man to do without knowing it, he might take up a claim on American territory, and then find out that he could not hold it because he was a British subject. But up to the present time, if a man is an American citizen it does not matter on which side of the line he operates. Therefore, I say that hon. gentlemen who are opposing this Bill on the ground of putting money and trade into the pockets of our neighbours on the south side of the boundary line, would be doing much better service if they would take up this question from what I may call the foundation, and say that they are prepared to prevent Americans from holding mineral claims on our side of the line. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to detain this committee any longer, but I hope that they will seriously consider this matter and will not vote against what I consider the best interests of the miners and of the mining interests of British Columbia.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I had expected that we would enjoy the advantage of hearing some of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Certainly it does seem to me that we were entitled ere this to know what they would say, if this subject is so important as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Bostock) thinks it is, and if the hon. gentleman from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) is also right in attributing to the measure so great an importance as he did this afternoon. For myself I would have been particularly glad to hear from those hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches who have been pointedly referred to in this debate, whose utterances have been mentioned several times, utterances made last session when the Government were asking for a very large amount, some four million dollars, in aid of the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass road. These statements are serious, they are of very great importance, and particularly so because they are directly in line with the policy of the British Columbia legislature as expressed in the resolution which was read

Mr. BOSTOCK.

in this debate. The hon. gentleman who has taken his seat also shared those views last session. His observations on the general principle were brought to his notice to-day, and in listening very attentively to him I failed to hear from him any explanation of the views he held then as compared with the views that he expresses now. It does not seem to me that the hon. gentleman can hold the same view that he held on that important occasion, and advocate the adoption of this Bill. The hon. gentleman, it is true, endeavoured to get rid of some of the statements from the localities so far as they were attributed to newspaper correspondents. But in that part of his argument it is important to observe that he was unable to deal at all with one of the important communications that the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) read to the House in which the "Northport," a paper published in Washington Territory, confirmed, so far as the expression of the opinion of a paper on a subject like this can confirm, the views of those hon. gentlemen who are of the same opinion as the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Trade and Commerce were last session. The hon. gentleman overlooked, I say, this rejoicing on the part of the "Northport" at the announcement that the Railway Committee had reported in favour of this Kettle River Valley Railway charter. This is what it said: "Now look out for great prosperity for Northport." The view they take is the view of the hon. gentleman then, as it seems to me, so well expressed last session and concurred in by this House. Therefore, whether we are right or wrong in attributing to those observations the great importance attached to them as coming from Cabinet Ministers during the discussion of a very large grant and in advocacy of that grant—whether, I say, we are right or wrong in attributing importance to them, it does seem to me that the duty devolves on hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to deal with the subject, and harmonize, if they can, the position of the Minister of Railways and Canals, at any rate, in regard to this measure. The hon. gentleman is said to have spoken in the Railway Committee, and being a Minister of the Crown, of course his observations must have had great weight there. It would be fair to this Committee of the Whole House that it should have any advantage that might attach to his observations made in another place. Hon. gentlemen, all through this debate, have been referring to the discussions that took place in the Railway Committee; they have done so, contrary to the rules of the House, but apparently with the consent of this committee. Yet no one would pretend that hon. gentlemen have given accurately, that is fully, the various arguments used before that committee. I should like to understand, too, in connection with the apparent change of position taken by the Minister of Railways, whether the Minister of Trade and Commerce has

changed his opinion on the great principles involved, because, in the debate on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway last session, there were two very important positions taken by the hon. gentleman to whom I have referred. One was in regard to the great question of preventing connections with the United States railway system in the Kootenay country, on account of the danger, even more than danger, on account of the probability that Canadian trade would be diverted from north to south; and the hon. gentleman then expatiated strongly on the duty of Parliament to do everything possible to divert that trade north instead of south. The second position was in regard to the question of Government control, in connection with which very important principles were laid down, wholly inconsistent with the position by the Minister of Railways, as reported on the present measure. Last session, the Government held the key to the situation. The Minister of Trade and Commerce boasted of the statesmanship that had caused the Government by that measure to have absolute control, or, to use his own language, to ensure the absolute security of the country against the possibility of a monopoly being created which would have any objectionable or ill effect on the future of the province. Quoting the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I find he said:

Remember the Government of Canada are able to control the rates on everything which goes from any part of the Crow's Nest Pass to any portion of Canada, and on anything which comes from any part of Canada to any section of the Crow's Nest line.

And later on he said:

A great deal of trade is now being diverted to American channels. I need not say to business men in and out of this House that there is no one thing more certain than that if once that trade be allowed to flow into American channels, we shall find it exceedingly difficult to recover it.

That is a very important utterance, and those observations covered those points on which this House seemed to be almost unanimous: that is, the ability of the Government to protect, or, at all events, largely protect this country against a monopoly in the operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway system, as it was advanced through that important mineral country; and the other was the necessity of preventing, as far as possible, the possibility of Canadian trade being diverted south. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been signally silent, and it is, of course, curious, because it is no secret in this House that the Minister of Public Works, when this Bill was announced, was open in his consistent opposition to its provisions. He allowed it to be announced, or, at all events, he was credited with having sympathized entirely with those who saw in this Bill a subversion of the important principles that prevailed last session, and he, with others, gave expression

to opinions adverse to this Bill being adopted, and later on, even now, it is said, the Government have by no means come to a unanimous opinion in regard to advice to be given to this committee as to what it should do with the Bill. Under all these circumstances, it would be very interesting to know exactly where the Government stands. I would not be surprised to learn that they unanimously agreed to take the very opposite position to that which they occupied last session; that, in my opinion, would be a very natural position for this Government to take, and a natural course for them to take. But, having regard to all the statements made, I do not think it possible for the Minister of Railways to say that the members of the Government are a unit in regard to the course which this committee should take on this Bill. Perhaps, the silence of the Minister of Railways is wise. Perhaps, the Bill will have an opportunity of being considered on its merits, and, so far as I am concerned, and, I think, so far as other hon. members are concerned who have opposed this Bill, that is all they desire to be done.

So far as these observations are concerned about the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway putting up a fight, as the last hon. gentleman who represented the opposition to the Bill said, I think a great deal has been stated without the slightest warrant. I have never heard, directly or indirectly, from any person representing either the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, what their particular desire was in regard to the Bill. I know, of course, that the Canadian Pacific Railway, very wisely from their own standpoint, opposed this Bill, and no doubt the Grand Trunk Railway, in other words the railway behind this charter, are as anxious that the Bill should pass; but I do not believe that hon. members on one side of the House or the other are posing, or desire to be considered as posing, here for one road or for the other road. Those statements are made very cheaply and very easily, but what we must be guided by here, and what the whole country will certainly be guided by, are the reasons and arguments advanced on one side or the other. The utterances of the Minister of Railways, of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the member for Yale and Cariboo being all in line one with another, are of additional interest this year, because they are in line, not merely with the resolution of the British Columbia legislature, but, as it seems to me, regardless of what particular division was had on that resolution, with a large majority, almost the whole, of the British Columbia legislature; for it is interesting, since reference has been made to that division, to see what position the leader of the opposition, Mr. Semlin, took when the question came up, or, at all events, to see the position that was

taken when the resolution was moved asking the legislature to make representations to the Dominion Government with a view to prevent this charter being granted by the Dominion Parliament. There was not a direct negative vote taken. The motion was a motion to defer consideration, and that motion would, in itself, suggest great caution in overriding the wishes, not only of the boards of trade on the coast, but of the legislature itself. The speech delivered by Mr. Semlin is reported in the "Daily Colonist," of Victoria, and, as it is comparatively short and has not been quoted during this discussion, I will read it :

Mr. Semlin was not sufficiently acquainted with the Boundary country to make up his mind at once on the subject. He, and he supposed all the members, had at heart the best interests of Canada. A railway was not a patriotic institution, but a business enterprise. The Canadian Pacific Railway was built for business purposes. When they wanted to shut off an opponent they raised the patriotic cry, but they were in their business actuated by their own best interests.

He was not at all in love with Mr. Corbin or his railway actions hitherto. Mr. Corbin was not actuated by sentiment in his railway enterprises any more than the Canadian Pacific Railway. He wanted to make money and so did the Canadian Pacific Railway. The ground Mr. Graham had taken was that railway competition was best for the people of the district of which he spoke. He would, however, like to be better informed as to the condition of things in the Boundary Creek country, and he was of opinion a committee should be formed to make inquiries and report to this House. He moved that the question be referred to a select committee of inquiry. The committee to be composed of Messrs. Rithet, Graham, Higgins, Stoddart and Hume.

The Premier said : There was a certainty of a railway going in there this summer from this side of the line, a line that would be much better than the one under discussion. He referred to the line from Penticton, a line that would connect with the Shuswap and Okanagan and make that railway, in which the province had an interest, and which was costing largely every year, a paying line.

Hon. Mr. Baker said : There could not be a doubt that the Corbin road would carry the ore out of the country to the American side, and the trade would go south instead of being kept in British Columbia. If they voted against the resolution they could not take a more effective way of injuring the business interests of the province.

Hon. Mr. Eberts said : The road from Penticton would be a great help to the province, and put the Shuswap and Okanagan road on a paying basis. For his part, he believed in taking care of ourselves first, and not going against our own province in favour of American roads. The Penticton road, they might be quite sure, would start before next August, as they had to do so in order to hold their charter and get their subsidy. He had nothing to say against Mr. Corbin, who was a most estimable man, but the whole question was whether it was better to allow a road to be built from the United States side or to have a British Columbia road.

The reference to that debate in the British Columbia legislature is, I think, very important, for we must consider the opinion

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

of the British Columbia legislature just as much as any action of this House would be taken to be the expression of opinion of this body. We have from the legislature of British Columbia and from the different boards of trade, overwhelming representations to impress upon this House that in the interests of the trade of British Columbia, and in the interest of the trade of Canada as done in British Columbia, it would be against good policy to grant such a charter as this. I was rather struck by the argument advanced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bostock) who tried to make out that we in this House should take the opinion of his electors—even supposing he does represent the opinion of the majority in his constituency on this question—against the opinion of the local legislature. Now, the legislature of British Columbia has to do with granting of railway charters in that province and it is but a weak argument to advance in this House, that in a certain district of that province there is a public sentiment against the decision of the local legislature. In considering this measure we cannot attach too much importance to the opinion of the local legislature, because we must remember that there was a time when hon. gentlemen opposite paid the greatest possible respect to the expression of provincial opinion and to provincial rights. It must be remembered that it is on account of a very slight circumstance that we are dealing with this Bill in any shape or form in this Parliament. It is a Bill authorizing the construction of a very few miles of railway in British Columbia, and it is merely owing to the fact that this short line of road connects with the international boundary that it has to come before the Federal Parliament at all. If this railway were a great deal longer than it is, but did not connect with the international boundary, then the British Columbia legislature would have the matter completely within their own power. Therefore, I say that if hon. gentlemen opposite have regard to their past record they will think very seriously before interfering with even the slightest semblance of what they used to consider a provincial right. I have already dealt with the observations made last year by some hon. gentlemen opposite and which are entirely inconsistent with the arguments that they have made this session. I am not going out of my way to attribute any very great importance to their utterances ; but I have no hesitation in saying that these gentlemen opposite struck a popular note in the country last year when they based their policy in regard to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway on this principle. Acting on that principle which was adopted by Parliament last year, I shall exercise my privilege of voting against the adoption of this Bill.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Within my recollection no railway Bill has ever received

greater attention than has the Bill now before us. It was discussed during three entire meetings of the Railway Committee, and because of the length of that discussion my remarks now shall be very brief. Among the members of this House few have been stronger in their advocacy of Canada for the Canadians than I have been. I am not going to discuss now whether the members of the Government have agreed among themselves as to their policy in regard to this railway. They have disagreed on more than one occasion, and we are accustomed to their disagreements; but if this measure is one which commends itself to the judgment of those who take an interest in the matter, that their disagreements is no reason why we should not consider the Bill upon its own merits. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has twitted an hon. gentleman on the other side with having spoken of a fight having been put up by the Canadian Pacific Railway against the present Bill. Well, I do not blame the Canadian Pacific Railway for putting up a fight against this Bill, nor do I blame the Grand Trunk Railway for taking the other side. But we all know that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company opposed this Bill as strongly as it was possible to oppose it. We know that the president of that company, whose voice, I believe, was never heard before within the precincts of the Railway Committee, came up and addressed the committee against the Bill; and we know that the vice-president of that great corporation also came up and addressed the committee against it. So that we must admit that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company put up a very strong opposition. But, Sir, without going into the history of the Bill, which has already been gone into very thoroughly, the reason which induces me to support the Bill is that I believe the future of the mining interests of that region is intimately connected with railway competition. It is all very well to say that within the year the Canadian Pacific Railway, in extending the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, will construct a road more perfect and complete than the Kettle River Railway. But what is to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway, who will have expended a much larger amount of money upon the building of a much more expensive line, coming to the Government and saying, "How can we reduce the rates which we are now charging to the mining interests, when you know the large amount of money we have expended to build our line?" Whether the Canadian Pacific Railway would urge upon the Government this consideration or not, there is a check against the possibility of the miners being overcharged for the transport of their ore in the fact of having a railway like the Kettle River Railway, which is a competing line against the Canadian Pacific Railway. Whether the Canadian Pacific Railway line will have

cost a large or a small amount of money, that railway will be compelled by competition to make its rates as low as those of the other line; and, Sir, it is impossible for me to comprehend how any man who has at heart the interests of Canada at large, can object to the Grand Trunk getting a footing in that country. The representatives of the Grand Trunk interest, as well as Mr. Corbin, stated openly before the committee that the Corbin line was to be run in connection with the Grand Trunk; and an hon. gentleman on the floor of Parliament to-night stated that some machinery used in the great Le Roi mine was taken from Sherbrooke, in the Eastern Townships, into that country over this line.

I believe that I am supporting the best interest of the miners of that district when I say that if one line does not treat them properly, another line cannot fail to operate to their advantage, since it will afford competition, and the miners can avail themselves of the one which treats them best. I do not altogether agree in the opinion expressed that because the promoter of this line came from a foreign country, we should treat him as an alien who has no interest in this country. Sir, the alien who comes into Canada and spends \$1,600,000 of his money in building a railway to accommodate Canadians is, it seems to me, almost as good as a naturalized citizen. In any case, he is displaying his great confidence in the future of our country, and it cannot be denied that were it not for this road that country would not be in the position in which it now is, and would not be offering to the miner and investor the great opportunities it now does. This road has been the pioneer of that region. Even those who oppose this charter do not deny that were it not for this road that district would scarcely be opened at present. If I could convince myself that through the building of this line, for which a charter is asked, the trade that should legitimately come to Canada would be diverted to a foreign country, I would oppose this Bill; but from the evidence adduced before the committee, from telegrams received from collectors of customs in the various districts traversed by this line, it has been established, to my satisfaction at least, that 95 per cent of the trade which has come into that country is trade that was furnished by Canadian industry and sent forward by Canadian merchants. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood), who knows more about that question probably than any of us, because he does a very large business in that section, confirms the statement that 95 per cent of the trade came from Canadian sources. Under these circumstances, I find it impossible to believe that this Parliament will refuse to grant the charter asked for, especially in view of the fact that the promoters do not ask a shilling of subsidy from the Gov-

ernment. I would certainly oppose any measure to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway from going into that country, just as I would equally oppose any attempt to prevent the Grand Trunk Railway from getting a foothold there. But if there were three or four railways in that country instead of one, the miners and others who have invested their capital in it would derive the benefit. I recognize all that the Canadian Pacific Railway has done for Canada. I am not supporting this measure because I believe it is hostile to the Canadian Pacific Railway, for I do not believe it is, but I am supporting it because I believe it is altogether in the interests of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say that for certain reasons I am opposed to this Bill. I have always been in favour of railway competition, in so far as such competition is in the interests of Canadian trade and commerce; but when that competition will confer no benefit, but the reverse, on the people of Canada, then I am opposed to it. I have always been strongly in favour of keeping our own possessions for Canadians. Every acre of land, every bushel of grain, every ton of minerals, every portion of raw material we have, should, in my judgment, be used and handled and manufactured by Canadians, so as to be of the best advantage for the Canadian people. If this charter should be granted, I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that the road, when built, will be operated so as to take the raw material out of Canada to the United States, and thus prevent Canadians from enjoying the full advantages they otherwise would reap from the manufacture of their own raw material. If this railway should be built, it will assuredly assist in transferring Canada's raw material to the United States, and therefore I am opposed to this Bill. If any one is disposed to take the contrary view let him look at what has been done since Mr. Corbin first got his foothold in that section of British Columbia. We have been told by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Sir Adolphe Caron) that what Mr. Corbin has done in opening up and developing that portion of country justifies us in giving him greater rights and powers. But I say, if experience teaches us any lesson, it is this, that although Mr. Corbin's railway is short and the time comparatively limited since it struck Canadian territory, the amount of raw material which it has taken out of Canada in that time to be manufactured in the towns south of the line, and the market which it has thus furnished the American farmers, manufacturers and lumbermen to the disadvantage of our people, should teach us the lesson that the sooner we provide for doing that work at home, the sooner we provide for the keeping of that market for the Canadian people, the bet-

Str ADOLPHE CARON.

ter it will be for us. Markets are the urgent need for the Canadian farmers, manufacturers and lumbermen. From the great cattle ranches of Alberta, at the base of the Rockies and from the North-west Territories and Manitoba, we are sending on our food supplies eastward down through the other provinces to the ocean and across the ocean to England to find a market, but when we have a market right at home, should it not be our object, as far as possible, to save it for the Canadian people? By preventing this home market from being monopolized by our American competitors, our farmers out in the Territories would have a market right at home, to which transportation would be cheap and the profits greater, and the money from that section of British Columbia, instead of going across the line, would be used to develop our own country. For these reasons, it is the duty of this Parliament to refuse a charter to this company. Canada has a plentiful supply of the needs of the miner, and the Canadian farmer and manufacturer are justly entitled to that market; and because they are justly entitled to it, there is no reason why we should build a railway across the boundary line so that the farmers from the United States territory lying south may capture it from our own. It is said that the people want transportation facilities and that therefore there is urgent need for this road. But last session we were plied with argument after argument to induce us to grant a very large subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of building the Crow's Nest Pass line. For what purpose? For the very purpose for which we are now told the miners require this road to-day—the purpose of giving the miner the transportation facilities he so much desires. But we are told by the Canadian Pacific Railway that they are pushing the road on as rapidly as possible and that before another year passes they will equip that country with their road, so that the people of that locality will have transportation facilities. The only question that can arise in connection with this charter is: would the people thereby get better transportation facilities than what they would get from the Canadian Pacific Railway? Or would their freight rates be lower? Some say they will, but I am justified, after what has taken place in the committee, in saying that the control which the Governor in Council retains over the Canadian Pacific Railway in the regulating of freight rates is a sufficient guarantee, at least so far as we can keep down freight rates, that these rates will be controlled in the interests of the miner. If we were to grant this charter, would the miner get any better freight rates? I do not think so, because the experience we have had all over the country is that where two railways run in competition, they will combine or come to an understanding regarding freight rates, and the people do not benefit from

competition to the extent I often hoped they would.

If we believe what the hon. Minister of Railways told us last year and what he has told us again this year with regard to this road and others, we are justified in the conclusion that the people will have as good freight rates and as good railway facilities in that section of the country at the end of the year if we do not grant the charter as they would if we do grant it, because the Canadian Pacific Railway will occupy that territory, and if we exercise proper control over their freight rates, the people there will have the advantage of railway communication and also of moderate rates. Will these freight rates be as favourable? I think they will. The control we exercise over them is a guarantee of that. Does the country require a railway in the interests of the miners to haul the raw material out of that country? We are sometimes told that it is absolutely necessary to take the ore across the line and to smelt it there. It is true that in that country they have been hauling out the products of the mines to a smelter in the United States at Northport, and we are told that were it not for the benefits afforded by the Corbin Railway, very little progress would have been made in that country. But we are also told that they have built up a very large and important town at Northport, and that it is built up by reason of the raw material taken from Canada, and when we are told by Mr. Corbin that the natural condition is such that in a short time these minerals must be smelted in British Columbia. It is not reasonable to contend that this railway is absolutely necessary in order to have the raw material taken out of the country and have it smelted in the United States. And if the Canadian Pacific Railway is passing through that country, as it will soon, the miners will be as well supplied by it as they would be by a railway coming from the United States.

I have been not a little amused and interested watching the Government in its attitude on this question. The Government is made up of a class of men who have heretofore been known all over the country as strong defenders of provincial rights. We have had election after election in Ontario in which their cry was provincial rights. The same has been the case in Manitoba and in other provinces from which we have obtained the heads of the various departments who, to a large extent, compose the Government of the present day. If these gentlemen were true to their convictions, or their expressed convictions in favour of provincial as against federal power, we might expect to find them arrayed in defence of the interests of the province against any other country or against the federal power. Now, as I understand it, British Columbia has spoken against giving this charter. In the course of this debate we have heard cited expressions of opinion of

boards of trade, of members of the legislature and resolutions passed by the legislature. These things justify us in saying in concluding that the province is against this charter. How, then, is it that these gentlemen who were such strong defenders of provincial rights are arrayed against that province? When Manitoba was fighting against the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway, none more strongly upheld provincial rights than those who are defending the granting of this charter. I would like to ask these hon. gentlemen, whether if the province of Ontario spoke as a province against a charter being given to a certain railway within the province, if it was declared by the legislative assembly that such a charter would be detrimental to the province, would they be found opposing the opinions of Ontario as they do now those of British Columbia? Or if the case were in Manitoba or in Quebec or Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, I venture to say, these gentlemen would be found standing up for the rights of the provinces. Why, then, should they not stand up for the rights of the provinces to-day. British Columbia has spoken with all the force she can command, through her public men, through her legislative assembly, through her boards of trade, through her town councils—the people have spoken with one voice against the granting of this charter, and yet hon. gentlemen are found forcing this measure upon this distant province to her disadvantage and to our shame. I am opposed to this Bill. As is well known, I am in favour of competition. And I do not think that gentlemen in this House will say that I have ever hesitated to oppose the Canadian Pacific Railway where I thought I should do so in the interests of the people. In fact, I have generally been found opposing. Hon. gentlemen may be sure, therefore, that I do not oppose the granting of this charter because I desire to see the Canadian Pacific Railway getting more power than they have or more lines of railway, but because I think the extension of their railway to that country is going to be for the best interests of the people of that country and is going to retain for the Canadian people what belongs to the Canadians and ought to be kept at home. For these reasons I am opposed to this charter and in favour of supporting a company that is putting in a railway that will not cost the people a cent. It is sometimes said that Mr. Corbin does not ask a bonus. I know he does not, because the outlook upon the future justifies the belief that he will have ample return in the freight rates he can charge. But neither does the Canadian Pacific Railway ask any bonus, and the effect of their building a line will be to keep Canada for the Canadians so far as this matter is concerned. They keep that country for the eastern manufacturer and the western farmer, and keep money at home which is now being

taken away from that mining region to the detriment of the people. I am opposed to this charter and will be opposed to it until it is dealt with finally by this House.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to relieve the minds of those members who seem to be so greatly concerned about the agricultural interests of Alberta, and the North-west Territories generally, in connection with this Bill. If the great agricultural interests of the North-west are likely to be sacrificed for a twopenny-half-penny-thirty-mile railway, I am going to range myself against that danger. While I believe in railway competition, as does every person in the North-west Territories, neither I nor they are so bigoted in our views that, if railway competition meant injury to us in getting a good market for our agricultural supplies, we would not be in favour of competition. But in this particular case I for one do not see that the building of this 30 miles of railroad will bring destruction upon the agricultural interests of the North-west Territories, and particularly of the district of Alberta. On the contrary, it appears to me that the building of this trifling 30 miles of railroad will, to that extent, benefit the agricultural interests of the Territories by increasing the number of consumers who will buy their products; that is to say, the miners who will be employed in the mines in the Boundary Creek country; which mines will become productive whenever that 30 miles of road is built, which mines are not operated now and probably will not be operated if it is not built. Inasmuch as the completion of this road will increase the number of consumers of the produce of the North-west Territories, I am in favour of its being built, and I do not want to be understood as favouring it for any other reason. Hon. gentlemen who have argued against this road appear to think that if this 30 miles is built the whole of the agricultural products of the United States are going to be pushed into the Boundary Creek country, and that the agricultural products of the North-west Territories are going to be kept out. Why? Hon. gentlemen have never told us why. Is it because the Canadian Pacific Railway, whose cause they are advocating so strongly here, would charge the people of the North-west Territories a higher rate of freight to take food supplies into that country than this vile scoundrel Corbin would charge the people of the United States for taking their products in? Hon. gentlemen would do well to consider that point. If that is their position, I think they are putting up a very poor argument on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But as it happens, the matter does not rest on that ground. Let me say that as circumstances now exist, it would not necessarily kill our trade if Mr. Corbin carried freight in there for nothing. If he carried all the supplies required in the Boundary Creek country for nothing, and

Mr. SPROULE.

the Canadian Pacific Railway only charged us the rate that they do now to like points, we would still be in a position to supply the food products of the Boundary Creek country; for the reason that the rate of freight at the present time from Edmonton—which is the principal source of food supply for that country—to Arrow Lake points, is 30 cents per 100, and the duty on oats and flour, which are the principal food products imported into that country, is 30 cents per 100; so, if Mr. Corbin carried the freight for nothing, inasmuch as those products would have to pay as much duty as the Canadian Pacific Railway now charge in freight, we would still be at no disadvantage as compared with the producers of the United States. That is a fact which does not seem to have come to the knowledge of hon. gentlemen who have seen such dire catastrophe threatening from the construction of this road.

Then, it may be asked, Why, in particular, should the people of the Territories desire to have this road built? For the reason already alluded to, that by the building of this road the Boundary Creek mining country, which is acknowledged on all hands to be a good mining country and capable of very large development under certain conditions, would be developed. Those conditions would be met by the construction of this road, that development would take place, and we would be able to sell many thousands of bushels of grain and many thousands of sacks of flour which we do not now sell, and which we cannot in the nature of things expect to sell unless that development does take place. Hon. gentlemen have said that this road is going to carry the ores of Boundary Creek to the States to be smelted there, and that means the employment of American capital and American labour in smelting those ores. Let me put the matter this way: These ores will not be carried to the States to be smelted unless the circumstances are such that they have to be carried there to be smelted. Then if they have to be carried there in order to be smelted, I say it is in the interests of the food producers of the North-west Territories to have them carried there rather than that these mines should not be developed, and that miners should not be employed in producing that ore. Hon. gentlemen who are so much interested in the prosperity of the Canadian smelting industry seem to forget that in demanding that the Canadian smelting industry shall be made to pay at any cost, they are demanding that it be made to pay at the expense of the mines; and if the ore is of low grade, there is a possibility that the mines cannot stand the expense and will not be worked. Therefore, when hon. gentlemen rest their case so strongly on the necessity of compelling the smelting of ores in Canada, they are possibly doing the very thing that they declare themselves against doing, that is to say,

they are possibly preventing a market for Canadian products which otherwise would certainly exist. On that point, as to the possible absolute necessity of transporting Canadian ore to the United States smelters, I would recall to the memory of the members who attended the Railway Committee, the utterances of Vice-President Shaughnessy of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who stated to that committee that the silver ores of Sandoz had to go to the United States smelters in order to be smelted economically, and that that was why his company carried those ores to the United States smelters. Now, I do not suppose for an instant that Mr. Corbin will do any differently from what the Canadian Pacific Railway would do. If it will pay to smelt Canadian ores in Canada they will be smelted in Canada. But if it will not pay to smelt them in Canada, just as we prefer to see the Sandoz ores go to the States to be smelted rather than to see the mines lie idle, so the food producers would prefer to have the ores of the Boundary Creek country go to the States to be smelted rather than that those mines should not be worked. The ores will not go to the States to be smelted unless it is necessary that they should go there in order that the mines may be worked. In regard to the trade that is going to the States from this Kootenay country and Boundary Creek country. The district of Alberta, as hon. gentlemen have themselves said, is in a position to supply the food products of the Kootenay country. As a matter of fact I beg to say that the district of Alberta does supply those products. Three years ago the district of Alberta did not supply those food products, they came almost entirely from the United States. Now, these food products come in large proportion, that is to say, the largest proportion of both cattle, oats and flour, come from the district of Alberta and Manitoba. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen if that is an indication that Canada is losing trade in that country, although Mr. Corbin has his two roads in there. I say it is not. It establishes beyond question the fact which I stated, that Canada is in a position to hold the trade of that country in food products. Under present conditions she is holding it. What she wants now is the further development of the country in order to increase the market; and that development cannot be secured except by the very best and most improved facilities. That is acknowledged on all hands.

As regards the money voted last year for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, hon. members seem to rather misapprehend the position. We paid \$3,500,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway to enable that railway to get into the Kootenay country and compete for the trade there. We are asked this year to burk legislation which would allow another company to enter that country to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It does not seem to me that because we paid

\$3,500,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway to put them in a position to compete for certain trade, we thereby bound ourselves to burk legislation that would enable another company to compete with them. It seems strange that this company, which came to Parliament, last year, declaring that if they did not obtain \$3,500,000 from this Parliament, the trade of that country would be lost to Canada, should, after getting the money on that understanding, now come forward and declare that the same trade will still be lost if we permit this 30 miles of railway to be built.

In regard to railway competition, I have heard some hon. members argue that competition on railways does not compete. What do we expect in railway competition? Do we consider that, so long as two railways are running along side of each other and are charging like rates, there is no competition and no necessity for both roads? Let us apply this argument to other business interests. In the city of Ottawa there are mercantile establishments in which the same classes of goods are sold at practically the same prices. Do those hon. gentlemen hold that that competition does not compete? Although those different mercantile establishments do sell goods from time to time at very much the same prices, we know there is competition, and keen competition, and it would be a bad thing if competition between mercantile establishments here was destroyed. It is the same in respect to railways. If the railways should at the moment charge the same rates, it does not follow that we were not the better for having the competition, or that there is no competition. It is a notorious fact throughout Canada, that wherever there is a railway point that has competition, that point is thriving, and wherever there is a point that has not railway competition, no matter how many railways it possesses, it is not thriving. It is not very long since the manufacturing city of Hamilton, which had three or four lines of railway, they being all under Grand Trunk management, felt it necessary, in order to protect its business interests, to vote to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a quarter of a million dollars in order to get railway competition; and they have not regretted their bargain. It is all very well for hon. members who live at points where there is railway competition, to say that competition does not compete; but no hon. gentleman who lives at a non-competing point will make such an assertion. Take the North-west Territories, and it will be found that it costs as much for passengers and freight from Montreal to Calgary, or Edmonton, practically as it does to Vancouver. Why? Is it because the road to Vancouver is shorter or there are less difficulties to be overcome? The railway has to cross three ranges of mountains to reach the coast and is hundreds of miles longer, but the rates for passengers and freight are

cheaper. The reason is, there is competition to Vancouver, and no competition to Calgary. That is the story all over the country. It comes with very ill grace from hon. members residing at centres which enjoy railway and water competition, to come here and say there is no benefit in railway competition, and that competition does not compete. In this case, I hope they will allow us who have not the benefit of competition to say what we want. What has made Montreal the leading city of Canada, if it is not competition between the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway? What would Montreal be to-day except for that competition? What is necessary in that case is necessary in others; the principle is the same; and there is no part of the whole Dominion in which such competition is more necessary than in the western country, and especially in the Boundary Creek district.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I have sat here for some time, during the whole of this debate, and have heard a very strenuous demand from certain quarters on the other side of the House calling upon the Government to declare its policy upon the subject of this Bill; and it has been assumed by hon. gentlemen who have made this demand, that it was a proper request to make, and that there was a duty resting upon the Government to declare its views upon this question. I am unable to acknowledge the soundness of that proposition. I entirely deny that the Government must sit in solemn conclave upon every private Bill that is submitted to this House, and marshal its followers as supporters of the Government on every piece of legislation that is submitted for treatment. I entirely deny it; and I think some of the hon. gentlemen who have been so urgent that we should make our voice heard and declare our policy, are too well informed upon the constitutional view of this measure to have seriously believed that their claim was well founded. My hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who is at this moment not in his place, who is usually fair, and whom I am always glad to hear, is one of the sinners, if I may say so, in this respect; and the hon. gentleman has not only been very anxious to hear but exceedingly solicitous that we should tender our advice upon this question. My hon. friend, so far as my acquaintance with him as a member of this House is concerned, is never exceedingly anxious for the advice of the Government in guiding his judgment or leading him to a conclusion on any question, particularly if it happens to smell of a political nature. The hon. gentleman knows the Government is under no constitutional duty at all on a question of this sort, but that, rather, its duty lies in the other direction; unless it is impelled by a sense of duty and having regard to the magnitude of the question to make it a

Mr. OLIVER.

Government question, it would be wrong in doing so. Its first duty is, in matters of private legislation, so far as it can do so consistently with public interest, to leave its supporters entirely free from Government influence, and that is the position in which, I think, this Bill stands. Some hon. gentlemen have said that, in a discussion which took place in another place, and which I thought it was a very exhaustive discussion and rendered it quite unnecessary that the debate should be continued in this Chamber, I took some pains to leave the impression that I was speaking for the Government in expressing my views on the question. I challenge any hon. gentleman who was present on that occasion, to say that I used any language which could fairly be interpreted as having that meaning. On the contrary, I simply expressed my own individual views upon it, and I carefully abstained from expressing an opinion for the Government, or any member of it, other than myself, because I was not authorized to speak for the Government. The Government had not taken the question up as a Government measure, and did not regard it as one of sufficient magnitude. Now, Sir, another complaint which has been made, and one which has really constituted a large portion of the subject-matter of this debate is, that, in my views on this Bill expressed elsewhere, I had taken an entirely inconsistent attitude with that which I took upon the Crow's Nest Pass Bill a year ago.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) says "hear, hear." He has done all that in him lies to establish that proposition. He read from what I said a year ago, it was read before that by a prominent member of Parliament in the committee, and it has been read a third time since the present debate commenced.

Mr. DAVIN. I read it first in this House.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is entitled to the distinguished honour of having read it first, and it is perhaps my duty to say that he read the speech very well and with a proper amount of emphasis; but I have to add, without any understanding of that speech. What I said a year ago was said with regard to a totally different question, and I would say the same thing to-day if a similar question were before this Parliament. Last year I was dealing with a problem, the very antithesis of the problem before us in the present Bill. Last year we had before us a proposition from the Government asking Parliament to grant substantial aid for the purpose of enabling a Canadian road to be constructed in territory which was then not occupied by a Canadian railway, but was occupied by a railroad coming from the south, and the con-

nections of which were wholly to the south of the boundary line. We had no Canadian road into that country then, but we had what we may distinctly call an American railway; a railway whose interests were American, whose ownership was American, and whose connections were with a system entirely and exclusively American. Last year we never heard of their having any traffic alliance or any other kind of alliance with the Grand Trunk Railway system of Canada; not a syllable was said with respect to that, so that I presume it was not then a fact. Last year we had in this part of southern British Columbia, no Canadian railroad which was capable of securing that traffic, but we had, on the other hand, a road from the south which had secured the traffic of that country and was carrying it to the States. Why, Sir, the case is practically the reverse of that of today. We have in that country now a Canadian railway, and we have it affirmed in the most emphatic manner by the president and vice-president of that road that by this fall they will have their line extended into this very Boundary Creek. Therefore, we are in possession now by and through a Canadian road; we are in possession from a Canadian railway point of view, I may say, practically of the Boundary Creek country.

Being in that position we are now asked the question: Shall we allow any other railway that happens to have connections to the south of the boundary line into that country, or shall we exclude it? Is not that a very different proposition from that of last year? That we should by all means force a road having Canadian connections and being Canadian, into a country which was then possessed solely by a railway, American in its ownership, in all its interests, and all its connections. It appears to me that it is practically impossible to state two propositions which are more directly opposite, the one from the other. I did not urge this House last year that we should not allow an American road to throw its connections into our country when that country was already possessed by one of our roads; and yet in order that I may be charged with inconsistency, it would be necessary that I should have taken that position last year. I did nothing of the kind. I am in favour—and I so stated to the committee as an individual member of this Parliament—I am in favour of allowing connections in from the south. I am in favour of it for many reasons; and if I had no other reason I should be in favour of it because of the special circumstances and conditions which exist in that Boundary Creek country. I stated in the committee the other day, and I ask indulgence while I repeat it again, that that country is full of low grade ore; it is full of a class of ore which may be profitably worked, which may be the foundation of one of the greatest series of mining camps we have in Can-

ada or any country in the world, providing you permit of all the conditions to concentrate in that country which will insure the cheap production and treatment of that ore. You will have to get all possible facilities there in order that its low grade ores may be turned to profitable account; and these ores cannot be turned to profitable account without causing an immense influx of population, which will vastly enhance the trade of the country. So far as I can form an opinion, the person who undertakes to say that he will not allow this railway or any other railway from the south to come into our country, is taking upon himself a very grave responsibility and one which I as an individual member of the House am not prepared to assume. I am not going to be intimidated into assuming a different attitude, because I am to be told, that in respect to a question before Parliament last year which involved entirely different considerations, I expressed the views which I then did. Mr. Speaker, this whole question has to my mind been sufficiently threshed out in this Parliament, and I think that every member probably has made up his mind as to what his vote is going to be. I merely rose for the purpose of stating that I have not expressed a different view this session from that which I expressed a year ago. If under the same circumstances the question came before Parliament now as it did last year, I would do exactly as I did then. I am glad to know, Sir, that an opportunity is now being afforded to the people to have their interests in that country safeguarded; I am glad to know that an opportunity is now open to them to obtain that railway competition which I am sure they would not obtain unless this railway entered their country. I am glad to know that the people of that district have now an opportunity of getting the facilities necessary for the successful prosecution of their valuable industry.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Mr. Chairman, I shall not answer the explanations given by the Minister of Railways as to how he came to stultify himself between last year and this year in the policy he thought proper to pursue on this railway question. I only wish to remind the committee that we are far from the object of the motion for the committee to rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again. The other day, when we were considering this Bill in committee, and when we had reached clause 6, the hon. Minister of Railways made this statement:

This clause was amended in the committee by reducing the capital stock from \$2,500,000 to \$1,000,000.

I then made the following statement:

As that does not appear in the Bill before the Committee, I think we had better get the committee to rise and report progress, and send the Bill back to the Committee on Railways.

The hon. Minister then stated: "I made the motion myself"; that is, in the Railway Committee. Under these circumstances, the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) moved that this committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again, with the intention at a later stage of referring back this Bill to the Railway Committee, so as to have rectified the mistake or the omission which appears to have been made when this Bill was considered by that committee. We have the statement of the Minister of Railways that the Bill was amended in the Railway Committee, but that amendment does not appear in the copy of the Bill which we have before us; and I said that under such circumstances, we should not consider this Bill, because it is not the Bill as passed by the Railway Committee. Whether it was done by error, omission or commission, is not for this House to decide, but it is a question for the Railway Committee themselves to decide. Therefore, I believe we ought to vote for the proposition made by my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia, that this committee rise and report progress. It is not killing the Bill; it is just in order to rectify the mistake that has been committed, and it is the only way in which, I think, this committee can proceed in order to make matters right.

Motion of Mr. Davin, that the committee rise and report progress, negatived: Yeas, 30; nays, 50.

On section 6,

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I beg to move the amendment of which I have given notice, to reduce the capital stock of the company from \$2,500,000 to \$1,000,000.

Mr. **LaRIVIERE**. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if that motion is in order.

Mr. **DEPUTY SPEAKER**. Certainly, I see no objection to the motion, because notice has been given of it.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 13,

Mr. **HUGHES**. I want to present to the committee this point. Here is a road altogether in Canada not thirty miles long, and the company is asking for power to construct branches twenty miles long. This is reduced to ten miles, but I think six miles, which is the limit provided in the Railway Act, should be the limit here.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. I think the additional mileage is given for the purpose of accommodating the mines, because a road which would not accommodate the various mines would, of course, be useless. I can understand reducing it from twenty

Mr. **LaRIVIERE**.

miles to ten miles, but I think it should be left at that.

Bill reported.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 101) respecting the St. John Harbour.—(Mr. Ellis.)

Bill (No. 104) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 105) respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 107) to incorporate the Yukon Overland Transportation Company.—(Mr. Domville.)

Bill (No. 108) to incorporate the Alaska and North-western Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 109) to incorporate the British American Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Rosamond.)

MONTMORENCY COTTON MILLS CO.

Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the Montmorency Cotton Mills Company.—(Mr. Penny.)

Mr. **LaRIVIERE**. I do not want to raise any objection, but not one of these Bills are printed in French. I think that those who have the printing of these Bills in charge should see that we get them in French the same time as in English.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. Of course, if the hon. gentleman insists on his objection, these Bills will have to stand over.

Mr. **LaRIVIERE**. I do not insist, but simply draw the attention of the House to the fact, and ask that a change be made in the future.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. The hon. gentleman is, no doubt, right, and of course if these Bills stand over they will be translated and printed and distributed in French. I may tell the hon. gentleman, however, that they are translated and printed in French before the committees consider them.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. **DOUGLAS** (by Mr. Lewis) asked,

Is it the intention of the Government to withdraw the Mounted Police station now at Moosomin? If so, when? Will they be replaced by others? If not, why not?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). It is not the intention of the Government.

ALIEN LABOUR ACT.

Mr. **WALLACE** asked,

Have any proceedings been taken to enforce the provisions of the law known as the "Alien Labour Act"? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Proceedings have been taken, as contemplated by the Act referred to.

AUTHORIZED EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS, &c.

Mr. WALLACE asked,

Was an Act passed by the Parliament of Canada in 1897 authorizing an export duty to be placed on logs, bolts and pulp wood, on proclamation of the Governor in Council? Has such proclamation yet been made? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). No proclamation has yet been issued; the matter is still under the consideration of the Government.

NAVAL MILITIA CORPS.

Mr. CAMPBELL (for Mr. Britton) asked,

Has the Government considered the advisability of establishing a naval militia corps, either in connection with or independently of the present militia?

If not, is it the intention of the Government to take up the matter at an early date?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The matter is now, and has been, receiving the earnest consideration of the Marine and Fisheries Department. A final decision has not yet been reached, but it is hoped that it will be reached shortly.

BERTHIER CHANNEL.

Mr. BERGERON asked,

1. Was the work of deepening the Berthier channel, for which a sum of \$7,000 was voted last session (1897), given out by contract?

2. Were tenders called for in relation to the contract?

3. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer?

4. Who secured the contract, and what was the amount?

5. What is the ordinary calling and occupation of the contractor?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows:—1, 2 and 3. No, the work was given out in accordance with the usual practice followed by the department for a number of years. 4. The contract was given to Mr. J. E. Robillard, and the work was done by the dredge "St. Pierre" for the price of \$7 per hour for a day of ten hours, being \$1 less than the price usually paid by the department. 5. He is a merchant.

DOMINION GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE TO CREAMERIES.

Mr. McINNES asked,

1. In what provinces has Dominion assistance been given towards the erection and mainten-

ance of creameries, and to what extent in each such province?

2. What creameries have been so assisted in the North-west Territories, and in each case to what amount?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to extend similar aid to the creamery industry in British Columbia?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). In answer to the hon. gentleman's questions, I beg to state: Various creameries have been operated by the Dominion Government for a few years. They were as follows:—

ONTARIO.

Woodstock, from 1891-92 to 1893-94..	\$518 50
Mount Elgin, from 1891-92 to 1893-94..	790 50
London, 1892-93 to 1893-94.	
Wellman's Corners, from 1892-93 to 1893-94	916 05
Chesterville, 1893-94 to 1894-95.	
Renfrew, 1894-95.	
Kingston (as a dairy school), 1894-95 to 1895-96.	

QUEBEC.

St. Hyacinthe (as a dairy school), 1892-93 to 1895-96.	
Lennoxville, 1894-95.	

NEW BRUNSWICK.

Kingsclear, from 1892 to 1893.	
Sussex, from 1892-93 to 1893-94.	
Sussex (as a dairy school), from 1894 to 1897.	

NOVA SCOTIA.

Nappan, from 1893 to 1898.	
----------------------------	--

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Crapaud, from 1894 to 1896.	
Tryon, from 1894 to 1896.	
New Perth, from 1894-95 to 1896-97.	
Charlottetown (central), 1895-96 to 1896-97, and five tributary stations.	

In the North-west Territories, before the arrangement made last year by my department, the creameries were run as follows:—

Moose Jaw, from 1894 to 1897.	
Prince Albert, from 1896 to 1897.	
Indian Head, from 1896 to 1897.	

Assistance by direct grants of money has not been given by the Dominion Government to establish any creamery except that at Nappan, Nova Scotia, and those in the North-west Territories. The places at which creameries are managed in the North-west Territories by the Dominion Government, and the amounts advanced to the butter and cheese associations at these places, are as follows. The amounts are loaned to the various associations, and are to be repaid, without interest, through the charge per pound on the butter made at the several creameries. In 1897, there were, in all, 16 fully equipped creameries and 16 tributary stations:—

Yorkton	\$1,561 38
Moosomin	1,850 90
Whitewood	2,165 93
Grenfell	1,753 87
Wolseley	1,823 37

Moffat (tributary station).....	\$ 508 20
Indian Head	382 66
Lebret (tributary station).....	63 76
Qu'Appelle	1,752 03
Fort Qu'Appelle (tributary station)—Nil.	
Regina	735 01
Craven (tributary station)—Nil.	
Duck Lake (tributary station).....	670 41
Prince Albert.....	1,201 38
Moose Jaw	1,658 78
Maple Creek	1,565 84
Calgary and two tributary stations.	3,704 35
Innisfail and five tributary stations	5,417 86
Red Deer and one tributary station.	199 57
Wetaskiwin and one tributary station.....	1,911 77
South Edmonton and two tributary stations	3,989 97

Since 1890, the Dominion Government has provided such assistance to the dairying interests of the various provinces as seemed best suited to the particular conditions and circumstances of each of them; and it is now relinquishing that work in the provinces to the various provincial authorities who are taking it up. The conditions on which financial assistance is to be given by the Dominion Government to creameries in the North-west Territories are set forth in the bulletin "North-west Territories Creameries," which has been distributed. In regard to the second question, I have answered that already. As to the third question, I may say that it is the intention of my department to continue to give, in the manner that seems best suited to the circumstances and conditions of dairying in the provinces, such aid as the Government can give to it.

SUB-AGENT, DOMINION LANDS, TENBY, MAN.

Mr. ROCHE asked,

1. Has a petition been received by the Department of the Interior, asking that Henry Robert Gebler be appointed sub-agent of Dominion lands at Tenby, Manitoba?
2. Was any other petition received by the department, asking that John McClung be appointed to the position above referred to?
3. Has Mr. McClung any knowledge of German?
4. Upon whose recommendation was Mr. McClung appointed?
5. What salary does Mr. McClung receive?
6. Where does Mr. McClung keep his office?
7. What is his post office address?
8. Does the Government intend to appoint any German-speaking agent in the vicinity of Tenby?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows:—1. Such a petition has been received. 2. The department has not received any other petition asking that John McClung be appointed to the position referred to. 3. The department has no information upon the point. 4. Mr. McClung was recommended by Mr. J. G. Rutherford, M.P. 5.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. McClung receives a salary of \$10 per month from the department. 6. Mr. McClung keeps his office at Tenby. 7. Tenby is his post office address. 8. No decision has been arrived at upon the point.

PIERS AND WHARFS, P.E.I.

Mr. MARTIN asked,

1. What arrangement, if any, has been arrived at between this Government and the Government of Prince Edward Island in reference to certain piers and wharfs in that province not hitherto assumed by the Dominion as under its control?
2. What are the names of the piers and wharfs, if any, over which such arrangement, the Government has agreed to assume charge?
3. What is the proposed expenditure for repairs if any, to be made on those piers and wharfs, and when is the expenditure proposed to be made?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1, 2, 3. No arrangement has been made for any pier not now under the control of the Federal Government. Several piers were handed over to the Dominion last year and necessary repairs will be made as and when required.

POSTMASTER AT CHAPLEAU.

Mr. POUPORE asked,

At whose request was Patrick Lynch, postmaster at Chapeau, dismissed? 2. Was there a petition sent the Postmaster General asking for such dismissal? 3. Is it true that a very large and influential petition was sent asking that Mr. Lynch be not disturbed?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). 1. The postmaster, owing to unsatisfactory management and having ceased to be able to discharge the duties of the office, was dismissed. 2. No. 3. A petition was sent.

WHISKY PERMITS—YUKON DISTRICT.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Who recommended to the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories to issue permits on 5th May, 1897, to the Alaska Commercial Company for 4,137 gallons of whisky and other spirits, ale, &c., and also 2,000 gallons? Who recommended the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories to issue to Binet Bros., on the 6th May, 1897, a permit for 2,000 gallons of whisky? Who recommended the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories to issue on the 11th of May, 1897, a permit to T. M. O'Brien for 2,000 gallons of whisky? Who recommended to the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories to issue a permit on 7th August, 1897, to William Chambers for 1,000 gallons of whisky; on 20th August, 1897, to Sullivan, McLeod, & McPhee for 500 gallons; on 30th August, to D. Menzies for 500 gallons?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The permit to Binet Bros. was for 600 gallons. With

this correction, the permits referred to were recommended by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. DAVIN. What about O'Brien ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman sees that with the one correction made, the rest were recommended by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Who recommended the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories to issue a permit to James H. B. Brown, on the 24th February, 1898, for 15 gallons of whisky ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The answer to the last question applies to this.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Have any permits to take whisky into the Yukon district been issued by any other authority than that of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories ? Has the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories been advised to issue any permits to take liquor into the Yukon by the Dominion Government, or by any member of the Dominion Government, or by the deputy head of any of the departments of the Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As to No. 1. Not to the knowledge of the Government. As to No. 2. As stated in the foregoing answers.

FUEL—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MARCOTTE asked,

1. How much was expended by the Intercolonial Railway for the purchase of coal, wood and fuel generally, from 1st July, 1891, to 30th June, 1897 ?

2. What was the quantity and value of fuel available on 1st July, 1897, in possession of the Intercolonial Railway ?

3. What was the quantity and value of the fuel purchased by the Intercolonial Railway from 1st July, 1897, to 1st March, 1898 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The amount expended yearly by the Intercolonial Railway for the purchase of coal, wood and fuel generally, from 1st July, 1891, to 30th June, 1897, is as follows:—For the year ended 30th June, 1892, \$428,645.37 ; 1893, \$387,535.98 ; 1894, \$399,122.80 ; 1895, \$362,278.32 ; 1896, \$366,525.13 ; 1897, \$346,959.10. 2. There was available on the 1st of July, 1897, in possession of the Intercolonial Railway 13,410 tons of coal of the value of \$32,529, and 311 cords of wood of the value of \$311, being a total of \$32,840. 3. There was purchased from the 1st of July, 1897, to 1st March, 1898, 107,035 tons of coal of the value of \$234,640.94 ; and 1,200 cords of wood of the value of \$1,200. Total, \$235,840.94.

POSTMASTER—ST. TITE.

Mr. MARCOTTE asked.

1. Has the postmaster of St. Tite, in the county of Champlain, been dismissed ?
2. At whose request, and through whose influence ?
3. Why ?
4. Was an inquiry held ?
5. At whose request ?
6. By whom was it held ?
7. What sum was paid to the person who held the inquiry, if it took place ?
8. Who has been appointed to succeed the postmaster, if so dismissed ?
9. By whose influence ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The member for Chicoutimi having shown that during the Dominion by-election in Champlain, in 1897, the postmaster at St. Tite took an active part in such contest, canvassing and acting as a political leader for one of the candidates, holding election committee meetings in the post office and on election day occupying himself actively in getting voters to the polls, he was relieved of his office, no further inquiry being necessary, nor was had, with regard to the acts referred to, and Mr. Odilon Lacoursière was appointed to the position.

ASHCROFT POST OFFICE.

Mr. PRIOR asked,

1. Who is the present postmaster at Ashcroft Station, British Columbia, and where did he reside previous to his appointment ?

2. By whom was he recommended for the position ?

3. Was he recommended by the M.P. for the district.

4. How many applicants were there for the position, if any, what were their names ?

5. What were their post office addresses, and by whom were they recommended ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). 1. James Charles Shields is the present postmaster at Ashcroft Station. 2 and 3. He was not recommended for the position by the member of Parliament for the district, nor by any one. 4 and 5. There were no other applicants for the position.

Mr. PRIOR asked,

1. Has the contract been awarded for carrying the mails between Ashcroft Station post office and the Canadian Pacific Railway station at Ashcroft, British Columbia ?

2. If awarded, to whom has it been given, and at what price ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. 1. The contract for the mail service between Ashcroft Station post office and the railway station has been awarded. 2. It was awarded to Mr. James Charles Shields, the rate of pay being \$180 per annum.

ADJOURNMENT—TRANSLATION AND PRINTING IN FRENCH.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to call the attention of the Government again to the fact that the printing in French is very much behind. Two or three weeks ago I asked the right hon. the Premier when the translation of Mr. Ogilvie's book on the Klondike would be brought down and distributed among the members of the House. I was told at that time that the translation was ready, and that the book would in a few days be distributed among the members. Every day we receive requests from people living in the province of Quebec for this translation, and we cannot supply it. I would like to state that generally the printing in French has been behind. We have this evening seen that all the private Bills which have been brought before the House this session are printed in English, but not one of them printed in French. I think it is time we should enter our protest against this method of dealing with the French section of the House. Of course, this is a right upon which we will insist. I may say that for my part, when the Bills come up the next time, I will enter my objection so that the Bills cannot be put through.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I do not think any objection can be taken to the complaint or the protest made by the hon. gentleman. The Prime Minister unfortunately has been indisposed for the last few days. I will take care to call his attention to the remarks the hon. gentleman has made about Mr. Ogilvie's book on the Klondike. I am in hopes that the Chairman of the Printing Committee will be in his place to-morrow, and I will take care that his attention is also drawn to the remarks the hon. gentleman has made about private Bills.

Mr. ELLIS. As a member of the committee, I may say that no reference has been made at any of the meetings of the committee, and I have attended all of them, to the subject to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. This work is done entirely outside of the control of the committee. It is being done under orders from the Minister of the Interior; I refer to the English copy, and I believe the French copy is being printed outside of the Printing Bureau and the Printing Committee has not been consulted, and has nothing whatever to do with it.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** The remarks of the hon. gentleman refer entirely to the printing of Mr.

Mr. FISHER.

Ogilvie's reports and not to the fact that private Bills have not been printed in French.

Mr. SPEAKER. In regard to private Bills, I should like to say that these private Bills were all introduced too late by special leave, and that there was only time to print them in English, and not time to translate them. They were given their second readings by consent of the House, and will be translated before they go before the Select Committees, where they will be considered. The translation of these Bills into French proceeds as rapidly as it can be accomplished by the staff, and it will be a difficult matter to adopt means so as to enable members to have the Bills printed in French before them at the second reading, when the Bills are introduced in this irregular way.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Of course, Mr. Speaker, you are perfectly well aware that we vote on the principle of the Bill on its second reading, and therefore, if Bills have to be printed in both languages, they should be so printed for the second reading, because, after the Bills go to committee, there is no record on the Order paper to show whether they are printed both in English and French. This appears only on the second reading, and it is for that stage they should be printed in both languages.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not wish to be understood as quarrelling with the rule of the House which requires that all Bills be printed in English and French. But the matter is entirely and absolutely in the hands of any individual member, who is in a position to stop the second reading until the Bill is printed in both languages.

YUKON DISTRICT—LIQUOR PERMITS.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not rise for the purpose of objecting to the adjournment of the House, although I think it is a somewhat early hour. I have, however, a very important motion that stands first on the Order paper. Unfortunately, we have fallen into the habit in this House, for which there is in the House which we regard as our model no precedent, that when an important question comes up it runs on from day to day, and private members who have the business of the country, other than Government business to attend to, are thrown off till a late period of the session, and then the leader of the Government takes another day. The consequence is that the most important portion of the business—I do not mean legislation—is often in this way put aside. I would not propose to proceed to-night with my motion, because it is one affecting the North-west members and the Minister of the Interior. The Minister of the Interior, as usual, is not in his seat. There is not a North-west member present, not a Manitoba member present.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Here is one.

Mr. DAVIN. I see the hon. member for Lisgar is present.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have been waiting patiently for this motion to be reached.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad the hon. gentleman is here.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Do not omit the hon. member for Provencher.

Mr. DAVIN. I mean Liberal members—of course Conservative members are present. I wish to bring before the attention of the Minister of the Interior a very important thing which has occurred. I, with other members, asked the Minister of the Interior a question in regard to liquor permits in the Yukon, and he answered question after question put by myself, by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), with a syllabic answer that conveyed an impression to our minds and to the public mind other than that we now know to have been intended.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing at present before the House.

Mr. DAVIN. There is the motion to adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not a general motion to adjourn.

Mr. DAVIN. We know now that, under the recommendation of the Department of the Interior, the Alaska Company has received a permit to take in 4,370 gallons of whisky.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to go into a general discussion of this subject on a motion to adjourn, when the motion is simply one for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Every motion to adjourn is open to discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are three kinds of motions to adjourn. If during the course of the debate an hon. gentleman who has spoken wishes to speak again on the subject, and if another hon. member moves the adjournment of the House, the former may speak again on the subject of that debate and not on any other subject. When no question is before the House, in an interval of proceedings, it is open to an hon. member to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a specific subject, which he must state in his speech. The debate can then proceed on that subject, which must be adhered to by all the hon. members who discuss it. The other and the third kind of adjournment, is a motion by the leader of the Government, when the business of the House is supposed to be over, for the actual adjournment of the House, and on that motion my impression is, and my ruling will be, that no general dis-

cussion can take place, except such as is material in connection with the adjournment of the House from to-day until to-morrow.

Mr. DAVIN. I bow humbly to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. But how is it that you are aware, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries meant the motion for adjournment to be a motion for the House to adjourn at this early hour?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is my ruling. Every hon. member knows it is so, and he certainly did not introduce any other subject for discussion when moving the adjournment.

Mr. DAVIN. I humbly submit that hon. members should at any time give a reason why the House should not adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, a reason why the House should not adjourn, but not bring on, by a side wind, a general discussion. The hon. gentleman must give me credit for some intelligence, and that I will not allow an irregular discussion. If the hon. gentleman wishes to give reasons which are germane, that the House should not adjourn, very well.

Mr. DAVIN. You would not for one moment, Mr. Speaker, suppose that I would be guilty of the least disrespect to the Chair. There is not a member in this House who regards the Chair with more reverence than I do, either because of the Chair itself or its present occupant. I was going on to show why at this early hour the House should not adjourn. If the Minister of the Interior were here, I wanted to read the statement that the Alaska Company had received a permit for 4,137 gallons of whisky, and T. M. O'Brien a permit for 2,000 gallons.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is trifling with the Chair.

Mr. DAVIN. Evidently it is too strong for the Government.

Mr. FRASER. But not for the hon. gentleman.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 5th April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I beg to move that the order of the House to go

into Committee of Ways and Means and any motion in relation thereto be made the first order of the day after questions, on Wednesday, 6th April, and on subsequent days until the debate of such order is completed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved that when the House adjourns on Wednesday next it shall stand adjourned until the following Tuesday, the 12th April.

Motion agreed to.

POINT OF PROCEDURE UNDER RULE 47.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before calling the Orders of the Day, I desire to read to the House my conclusions as to the point of procedure which was discussed on 28th March.

On 2nd March, private Bill No. 32 was read a second time and referred to the Railway Committee. On 17th March, it was reported from the Railway Committee with amendments, and was then set down for consideration in Committee of the Whole. On 23rd March, Mr. Henderson moved that the Speaker leave the Chair, but a debate arose and the motion was not put when the hour for private Bills expired. The debate was continued on 28th March, the motion agreed to, and the House went into committee on the Bill, which was reported without amendment.

The Speaker then put the question: "When shall the Bill be read a third time?" and, being unable to decide from the voices as to the time of reading, he submitted the question to the determination of the House: "that the Bill be now read a third time," and a division having been called for by five members, the question was resolved in the affirmative. Accordingly, on the motion of Mr. Hughes, and after a prolonged debate, the Bill was read a third time and passed at the same sitting of the House.

This appears to have been the first occasion when a division was called for upon the question arising under Rule 47, as to the appointing of a time by the House for a third reading of a Bill which had been reported from Committee of the Whole without amendment. Being to that extent at least, a new point, an interesting discussion took place before the motion for the third reading was made, as to the proper procedure. I have since considered the matter carefully, and wish to give the House my views upon the points involved.

My course was based upon the third sentence of Rule 47 of this House, which rule is in these words:

"Rule 47. (1). All amendments made in committee shall be reported by the chairman

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

to the House, which shall receive the same forthwith. (2). After report, the Bill shall be open to debate and amendment before it is ordered for a third reading. (3). But when a Bill is reported without amendment it is forthwith ordered to be read a third time at such time as may be appointed by the House."

This rule applies to private as well as to public Bills. See Bourinot, 748.

The comment made by Bourinot, p. 623, upon Rule 47, is this:

"Accordingly, when a Bill is reported without amendment the Speaker puts the question: 'When shall the Bill be read a third time?' The Bill is either read immediately, or on a future day, as the House may decide."

In exact compliance with the rule, and with this interpretation of it, the question was put to the House who were not agreed as to whether the Bill should be read "now" or later. To inform myself of the true opinion of the House, I asked for yeas and nays, and a division was called for, by which I ascertained beyond a doubt that the House wished the third reading to be moved at once.

The last clause of Rule 47 not only enables the House to fix a time for the third reading, but directs that this shall be done forthwith.

A point was raised in discussion that Rule 43 was to be read as governing the interpretation to be put upon Rule 47, but to my mind it seems to have no bearing upon this case. I will quote the language of Rule 43:

"Rule 43. Every Bill shall receive three several readings on different days previously to being passed. On urgent or extraordinary occasions a Bill may be read twice or thrice, or advanced two or more stages in one day."

The Bill in question, No. 32, was read a second time on 2nd March, and a third time on 28th March, so that Rule 43 was complied with, without the ground of urgency being invoked.

It was, however, pressed upon me that the second reading was not technically completed until after the Bill had passed through committee, and was ready for a third reading. If that contention were valid then this Bill would have improperly received two readings on the same day, contrary to the provisions of Rule 43.

The argument, however, is quite untenable, because Rule 59 says: "Every private Bill when read a second time is referred to the Standing Committee charged with the consideration of such Bill." Bill 32 was referred to the Railway Committee on 2nd March after its second reading, which was then technically and literally completed.

It was further claimed that the practice of this House has been uniformly not to read a Bill the third time at the same sitting as it has passed through committee without amendment.

During my occupancy of the Chair the practice has been, with few exceptions, to give the third reading at the same sitting. I have, however, but followed the practice of my predecessor, for in the session of 1894, out of 46 private Bills which were reported without amendment, 45 were read a third time at the same sitting as they were reported, and only one was postponed to a later day.

The whole matter is in the hands of the minority after all. On the question being asked whether the Bill be now read a third time, a full debate can be had, and amendments can be moved as to the time of reading. It is unnecessary to suggest what other parliamentary rights may be invoked by a minority who may be determined to postpone any question that is before the House.

It is most improbable, therefore, that any one desiring the early passage of a Bill will try to press on a third reading, if it be against the wishes of any considerable number of members.

The provision which permits the third reading to take place at once, after a Bill has passed committee without amendment, seems to me to be based on the sound reason that the House has just had unlimited opportunity to consider and debate every clause of the Bill in Committee of the Whole.

My conclusion is that the course which I adopted as to this Bill was in accordance both with the rules and practice of this House.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

The House again resolved itself in committee on Bill (No. 71) further to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). If I am not mistaken, there is only one section in this Bill which has not been passed in the Committee of the Whole House. I refer to the second section which has been left standing, as a great many amendments are to be proposed by some of the hon. members on different questions affecting the regulations contained in the Bill. I will mention just a few of them: The weight of a bag of potatoes, the weight of a bushel of lime, the contents of a milk can, the contents of an apple barrel, the contents of canned goods, the weight of a barrel of cement, abolishing the practice, which has given rise to so much complaint among the farmers of Ontario, of using testers in order to find out the price to be paid by the millers for wheat. I am waiting to hear what arguments my hon. friends who have given notice of these amendments will bring in support of theirs.

Mr. FORTIN. As will be remembered, I introduced a Bill with the object of amending the Weights and Measures Act with re-

gard to the sale of potatoes by the bag. That Bill has passed its second reading, and was called the other day on the Order paper for consideration in Committee of the Whole House. By request of the Minister of Inland Revenue, it was allowed to stand in order that the object of the Bill might be embodied in the Bill submitted by the Government. I have already explained the reasons which commend to my mind the measure which I proposed to the House. I have stated that the practice of selling potatoes by the bag is universal, more particularly in the old provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Now, the Weights and Measures Act contains no provision by which the standard of that measure is determined. There are provisions regarding the standard of a bushel, there are provisions regarding the standard of hay or straw when these products are sold by the bundle; there are provisions determining the standard of a barrel of apples; and there is a certain statute which was passed in 1888 making special provisions for the standard of a bag of salt, determining how many pounds should constitute a bag of salt. Now, if it was found useful or even necessary to determine the standards of those various measures, I see no reason why such a standard should not be adopted with regard to one of the most important articles of produce of the farm—I mean potatoes. Therefore, I take it for granted that as a matter of principle the measure which I now propose as an amendment to the present Bill, should commend itself to the members of this committee. Now, as regards the question of practical utility, it seems to me beyond dispute that the absence of any provision to that effect is a cause of inconvenience. In the absence of such a law, municipalities avail themselves of their powers to enact by-laws; and we have already pointed out that one by-law was enacted by the city of Montreal, determining the standard for that kind of measurement. Although it is questionable whether the city of Montreal or any other municipal corporation has power to pass such by-laws, as there might be some doubts, I think the best and most useful way to dispose of the question is to make a provision in the Weights and Measures Act that is now before the committee. I may mention that it has been stated in this House during my absence that nobody ever demanded the adoption of such a measure, that there have been no farmers' institutes calling for such legislation, that no board of trade has demanded the same. Since this measure was introduced I have received almost daily resolutions adopted by various municipal corporations and letters from other public bodies, endorsing the principle of the Bill. Perhaps the committee will allow me to quote some of those resolutions. I hold in my hand a resolution adopted by the municipal coun-

cil of the county of Hochelaga, a portion of which I will read :

(Translation.) Whereas, it is impossible for farmers, even when using the imperial measure, to obtain a weight of 90 pounds for a bag of potatoes ; and, whereas, it is in the interest of the farming community in general, and of the farmers of the county of Hochelaga in particular, that the weight of a bag of potatoes should be reduced to 80 pounds.

This Council begs both Houses of Parliament to grant the petition of the honourable member for Laval, Mr. Fortin, and to reduce to 80 pounds the regulation weight of each bag of potatoes.

I have here similar resolutions from a number of municipal councils. It is unnecessary to read them all, but they are all to the same effect, if not all in the same language. I have a resolution adopted by the municipal council of Rivière des Prairies on March 29th last ; a similar resolution passed by the municipal council of St. Dorothée on the 28th March ; another by the parish of St. François de Sales on the 29th March ; another by the parish of St. Léonard, Port Maurice, on the 25th March ; another by the municipal council of St. Martin on the 26th March ; a similar resolution passed by the municipal council of the parish of St. Constant, county of Laprairie, on the 26th March ; a similar resolution adopted by the municipal council of the village of St. Rose on the 24th March ; and another by the parish of Ste. Rose on the 25th March.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is Ste. Rose ?

Mr. FORTIN. My hon. friend surely knows where Ste. Rose is, for if I remember well he was in Ste. Rose some time in 1886, working for the National party, so-called at that time, and against his friends on the opposite side of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. That probably explains the appearance of the hon. gentleman here to-day.

Mr. FORTIN. I do not think it is due to that influence, but I am willing to allow my hon. friend the pleasure of remaining under that impression.

I beg to quote also a letter that I have received from the Chambre de Commerce, of Montreal, in which this measure is also endorsed. The secretary says :

(Translation.) I understand that you are introducing a Bill to the effect of determining the standard of the potato bag, when potatoes are offered for sale in bags.

Allow me to tell you that such a Bill is necessary, as the practice of selling potatoes by the bag prevails throughout the country.

The standard which your Bill proposes to fix seems to meet with general approbation, as well among the farming community as among the merchants, because everybody complains of the by-law of the city which requires that each bag should weigh 90 pounds, a quantity which ordinary bags cannot be made to contain.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think these will answer the objection which was made on a previous occasion, that such legislation was

Mr. FORTIN.

not needed, and had not been called for. I could, without any trouble, have obtained scores of resolutions from other municipal bodies throughout the province of Quebec, to the same effect. Now, although I believe that the standard should be adopted for the whole Dominion, I have been told, and it has been declared before this House, that in some of the provinces it would be an inconvenience. I have been told that in the province of Ontario, for instance, where potatoes are exported to the United States by the bag, it would be an inconvenience to reduce the standard of the bag, because ninety pounds is the standard in the United States. Therefore, in view of this circumstance, I propose to add the words, "in the province of Quebec" in the beginning of the Bill, which I propose to be adopted as an amendment to clause 2 of the present Act. The effect of the amendment will be to make the standard applicable only to the province of Quebec. I think this will remove all the objections that were brought to this measure. It will probably be said that this is exceptional legislation, that it would be unwise to adopt a special standard for one province and that the law should be made applicable to all the provinces. Now, I may state that we have already in the Weights and Measures Act several provisions which are applicable only to the province of Quebec. We have a provision with respect to the measurement of land. The old measurement of the French system is still conserved in our statutes, and is applicable to the province of Quebec. The old measurement with respect to the bundle of hay or straw is also applicable in the province of Quebec. If there are already in the Weights and Measures Act exceptions, the insertion of an additional one would not make much difference. The Weights and Measures Act is by no means an ideal legislation. The whole system will have, one day or another, to be changed. We shall have to adopt the decimal or metric system, applicable to all kinds of measurements ; but until we have reached the time when such legislation should be passed and placed on the Statute-book, we may properly take cognizance of provincial exceptions, and there is no strong reason why the amendment I now propose should not be inserted in the present Bill. I move :

That clause 2 be amended so as to read as follows :—

"In the province of Quebec, when potatoes are sold by the bag, each bag must contain at least 80 pounds of potatoes."

Mr. QUINN. Is there at the present time any standard of measurement for potatoes?

Mr. FORTIN. There is the standard of a bushel, 60 pounds. This is provided for by section 16 of the present Act.

Mr. MACLEAN. Why make a change ?

Mr. FORTIN. We propose to adopt a standard for a bag, because there is no such

standard adopted by law. In the absence of law, farmers are interfered with by municipal regulations, which may vary every day. In Montreal, the regulation is, that a bag of potatoes must weigh 90 pounds. There is nothing, as the law stands, to prevent the adoption of a by-law by another municipality providing that a bag of potatoes shall contain 100 pounds, or anything to prevent another municipality adopting a different standard. It is a mode of selling that kind of produce, and it is just as rational to adopt a standard for that measurement as it is to adopt a standard for the bushel. In my Bill there is a second section to provide for the penalties that are already provided for by subsection 2 of section 16 of the Weights and Measures Act.

Mr. SPROULE. We go far enough when we make a standard bushel. The adoption of the amendment would lead to confusion. Our people move around the country, and may reside at one time in Quebec, another time in Ontario, or in the North-west, or in British Columbia, and if there is a standard bag in one province, it may not prevail in another. It is quite true there is at the present time a standard bushel, and it should be allowed to remain, but there is no necessity for making a standard bag which will be applicable only in the province of Quebec.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would suggest that, instead of complicating this measure, there should be a conference between the United States, Great Britain and Canada, looking to the adoption of a decimal system of weights and measures and of a uniform system applicable all over the world. I believe the time has arrived for such action to be taken, and that the Government should take up the matter. I believe there is a movement in England and in the United States looking to that end; and so, instead of making our system more complicated, we should seek to adopt a uniform system based on the decimal system for use throughout the Empire and the world.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the proposal of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) would be utterly useless. It would not even remedy the grievance he has stated to the House. He has mentioned that the city of Montreal has passed a by-law making a bag of potatoes 90 pounds, or one bushel and a half. That by-law would, no doubt, remain in force, and the proposition of the hon. member would not affect it. What does the hon. gentleman propose? It is that a bag of potatoes shall not be less than 80 pounds in the province of Quebec. The weight may be more than that, of course. In other provinces, a bag would be 90 pounds, but it would be anything over 80 pounds in Quebec, and 90 pounds in the city of Montreal. I oppose the amendment for this reason, that it does not define what

weight a bag of potatoes shall have in the province of Quebec, for the amendment only provides that the weight shall not be less than 80 pounds.

Mr. FORTIN. It might be made to read, "80 pounds."

Mr. WALLACE. The amendment does not state what the weight shall be. It might be 85, 90 or 100 pounds. That would lead to a great deal of confusion. Another objection, and a very strong one, to my mind, is, that, under the proposed arrangement, a bushel of potatoes might have one weight in Quebec and another weight in all the other provinces. I do not think the proposal of the hon. gentleman would lead to anything beneficial, but would add to the confusion, and it should not be adopted.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I do not think the opposition expressed by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is quite fair in regard to the proposition of my hon. friend from Laval. The amendment is simply for the purpose of overcoming the regulation in a certain local market, which, by reason of a by-law, has injured seriously a large number of people living immediately around them. The proposal is, practically, that a new measure of weights and measures should be made. As a matter of practical working, it has been found very difficult to secure 90 pounds of potatoes in an ordinary bag. The result is, that a large number of perfectly innocent men, without any design or thought of wrong-doing, are laid open to prosecution, fine and confiscation of the produce they bring to that market. My hon. friend proposes to adopt a weight for a bag. He does not mean to say that a bushel and a half measure shall be 80 pounds, but that a bag of potatoes, when used as a unit of sale, shall weigh 80 pounds.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman does not propose that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He proposes that a bag shall weigh at least 80 pounds. That simply is to say, that it shall not be less than 80 pounds. If grain is sold by the measured bushel, and it happens to weigh more than the fixed number of pounds, we know that does not contravene the law. A bushel of oats, by our standard, is 30 pounds.

An hon. MEMBER. Thirty-four pounds.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, of course; that was a slip of the tongue.

Mr. WALLACE. I thought a farmer would know the weight of a bushel of oats.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the hon. member (Mr. Wallace) can recognize a slip of the tongue when he hears it, if he wants to. The measured bushel of oats although fixed by law at thirty-four

pounds, will frequently weigh 38 or may be 40 pounds, but nobody would say that this would contravene the law. So also, if a bag of potatoes happen to weigh 84 or 86 pounds, it would not contravene the provisions proposed by my hon. friend. I believe that in the interests of the farmers of the province of Quebec, the proposal of my hon. friend is fair and just. I do not see that it can interfere in the slightest degree with the arrangements in the province of Ontario or elsewhere, where potatoes happen not to be sold by the bag. If the proposition were made that the weight of a bushel of potatoes should be changed it would be a serious one, and I myself would not support it; but where we are adopting the weight of a measure which has not been fixed by any law of Canada, and has only been fixed by certain municipal regulations, I do not see that there is a reasonable objection to the Parliament of Canada fixing the weight of such measure in the province of Quebec. It would, in my opinion, be unfair for the members from other provinces to object to that. Of course, as suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Fortin), if we pass this law it will override any municipal regulations imposing a penalty for the bag of potatoes not being 90 pounds.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) is not well informed as to the custom in other provinces, because it is a very common thing in Ontario to sell potatoes by the bag. It is distinctly understood there that a bag of potatoes shall be one bushel and a half, or 90 pounds, and consequently it would be very confusing to make this change. If we look at the market quotations in Montreal and Toronto and find that potatoes are selling at so much a bag; then if the standard of weight be different in the two cities, one would have to enter into an elaborate calculation to find the comparative value of potatoes in these markets. That would be, to say the least, confusing.

Mr. CLANCY. We have at present a good law fixing the number of pounds for each bushel of potatoes, and no matter what the size of a bag of potatoes may be, it contains an equivalent for the bushel or some proportion perhaps in excess of it. I am unable to see that the proposed amendment would relieve the farmers from the necessity of weighing their potatoes. Suppose we fix a bag of potatoes at 80 pounds, and that a farmer without weighing it puts in 79 pounds; he would still be subject to penalties as provided under the municipal regulations. This amendment does not relieve him of the necessity of weighing. In my opinion it is a dangerous thing to change the law to suit every whim and change that may be suggested by every municipality in Canada.

Mr. TAYLOR. If potatoes that are grown in the province of Quebec were marketed
Mr. FISHER.

and consumed in that province, there could be no objection to this law passing, but such is not the case. Every year grocers and speculators from the province of Ontario, and I presume other provinces, buy potatoes in Quebec, and ship them by rail and water along the shores of Lake Ontario and the River St. Lawrence, where they are sold by the bag. If they purchase an 80-pound bag of potatoes in Montreal, then it will not comply with the Ontario regulation which requires 90 pounds; and there will be a grievance against the province of Quebec for giving light weight; for I take it that nine out of ten of the dealers will not know that this law has been passed at all. If the potatoes grown in Quebec were confined for sale and consumption to that province, there would be no objection to this amendment, but as they are sold in other provinces where the regulation is 90 pounds to the bag, then I maintain that the regulation in Quebec should be the same.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It would appear at first sight that this matter was a very easy matter to settle, but the more we discuss it the greater the difficulties appear to be. In order that we may consider it better I move now that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

He said: I rise to move, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with notice, the motion which you have put from the Chair, and before concluding my remarks I shall place upon the Table of the House a series of resolutions to which it is my desire to invite the attention of the House.

A little less than one year ago, under circumstances which perhaps marked the occasion as one of some importance in the history of Canada, I had the honour to deliver in this House my first Budget speech.

In rising to-day to perform a similar duty, I am sure that I have ample grounds on which to congratulate the House on the condition of the country, and on the results of the policy of the Government which it was my privilege to announce to the House in April last. Canada has had an eventful year, a year marked by great political advancement, material progress and steadily increasing prosperity.

Following the usual practice in Budget speeches, I shall first ask the attention of the House to a brief review of the operations of the financial year 1896-97, which ended on the 30th of June last, the accounts of which have been in the possession of the House for some

time past. The revenue for that year yielded \$37,829,778, as against \$36,618,590 for the year 1895-96, or an increase of \$1,211,187. The total expenditure on Consolidated Fund reached \$38,349,759, as against an expenditure of \$36,949,142 in 1895-96, or an increase of \$1,400,617. The outcome of 1896-97 left us with a deficit of \$519,981, as against a deficit on the previous year of \$330,551. That, in brief, is the result of the year's operations on account of Consolidated Fund.

Following the usual custom, I give the details of the revenue, as compared with the previous year :

	1896-97.	1895-96.	Increase.	De-crease.
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Customs..	19,478,247	19,833,279		355,032
Excise...	9,170,378	7,926,005	1,244,372	
Miscellaneous..	9,181,152	8,859,305	321,846	
	37,829,778	36,618,590	1,566,219	355,032
			1,211,187	

It will be noticed that there was a slight decrease in the customs revenue, which can be attributed to the restrictive effect on the imports of the anticipated changes of the fiscal system inaugurated 23rd April of last year, and to the reduction in the duties between that date and 30th June. The large increase of excise is, of course, accounted for as an anticipation of the current year's receipts, in view of expected changes in the duties of excise. In the items composing miscellaneous, the chief increase is in the

receipts from post office. Taking up the report of my colleague the hon. the Minister of Customs, I find that, on the following articles, important increases in duty have been received :—

Animals, living.....	\$ 17,122
Carriages	59,072
Fancy goods	9,902
Glass and manufactures of.....	10,760
Leather do	17,103
Oils, coal, kerosene and products of	24,880
Sugar of all kinds	584,396
Spirits and wines.....	221,733
Tobacco and manufactures of.....	33,755
Watches	17,574

On the other hand, in the following articles important decreases have taken place in the duties collected, as compared with the previous year :

Books, periodicals and other printed matter	\$ 15,371
Grain of all kinds.....	101,121
Flour and meal of all kinds.....	36,229
Cotton, manufactures of	154,418
Flax, hemp and jute, manufactures of	52,137
Fruit and nuts, dried.....	68,337
do green.....	22,192
Furs and manufactures of.....	28,113
Gloves and mitts.....	40,943
Gutta percha and india-rubber, manufactures of	11,495
Gold and silver, manufactures of..	13,660
Hats, caps and bonnets	16,138
Iron and steel, and manufactures of	63,574
Musical instruments.....	12,010
Oils, all other than coal, kerosene, n.e.s.....	30,293
Oil cloth.....	9,887
Pickles, sauces and capers of all kinds	8,192
Silk, manufactures of.....	166,656
Stone and manufactures of.....	8,917

The details of the increase in excise are as follows :—

Articles.	Quantity, 1896.	Quantity, 1897.	Duty, 1896.	Duty, 1897.	Increase.
			\$	\$	\$
Spirits..... Galls.	2,344,767	2,782,514	3,973,300	4,732,506	759,206
Malt..... Lbs.	51,690,278	68,443,353	775,354	1,026,652	251,298
Cigars..... No.	108,290,260	113,276,105	648,462	678,029	29,567
Cigarettes... No.	80,461,900	93,798,000	120,692	156,257	35,565
Tobacco and Snuff	9,392,487	10,690,765	2,228,697	2,398,443	169,746
			7,746,505	8,991,887	1,245,382

The per capita consumption of the following articles usually finds a place in the Budget, and I give it, as follows :—

	Spirits, Galls.	Beer, Galls.	Wine, Galls.	Tobacco, Lbs.
1894	·742	3·722	·089	2·264
1895	·666	3·471	·090	2·163
1896	·623	3·528	·070	2·120
1897	·723	3·469	·084	2·243

It will be noticed that there is an apparent increase in the consumption of spirits in 1897, but that, I think, is to be accounted for by the fact that in anticipation of the changes in the excise duties last session, very considerable quantities were entered for duty, which will probably affect the consumption for the next year, so that the figures which show an increase, rather show an increase in mercantile operations

than in actual consumption. The average per capita consumption was as follows:—

Spirits	Gall.	1·026
Beer	do	2·920
Wine	do	·130
Tobacco	Lbs.	2·173

We come now to the expenditure of the year.

Mr. FOSTER. Before going to the expenditure of the year, can my hon. friend tell me what amount of the increase is due to the Jubilee stamps of 1896-97?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not included that in my statement, but I shall be glad to give it later on. The post office revenues in the public accounts show it in general terms. I shall furnish it later on if the hon. gentleman desires.

The expenditure on consolidated revenue reached \$38,349,759, being an increase of \$1,400,617 over that of the previous year. Taking up the details of the outlay, I find that in the following services there is an increased expenditure:

Interest on public debt	\$143,233
Charges of management.....	29,905
Sinking funds.....	46,526
Premium, discount and exchange...	36,833
Civil government.....	22,218
Administration of justice.....	16,491
Dominion Police	1,085
Legislation	230,084
Penitentiaries	24,370
Arts, agriculture and statistics.....	13,512
Immigration	7,239
Quarantine	24,914
Pensions	4,801
Militia	530,874
Public Works, Consolidated Fund..	163,949
Railways and canals.....	7,961
Mail subsidies and steamship sub- ventions	18,895
Ocean and river service.....	1,805
Marine hospitals	1,447
Fisheries	16,336
Geological Survey.....	14,331
Subsidies to provinces.....	2,394
Indians	27,655
Miscellaneous	9,392
Customs	48,912
Post Office	124,467
Trade and Commerce	5,141

On the other hand, there have been decreases on the following:—

Superannuation	\$ 3,439
Mounted Police	6,852
Lighthouse and coast service.....	20,314
Scientific institutions	1,705
Government of the North-west Ter- ritories	10,167
Excise	6,443
Weights and measures and gas....	6,150
Railways and Canals, collection....	100,535
Dominion lands.....	8,492
Public Works, collection.....	11,892

The main increases will be found to be in the interest on public debt, legislation, militia, public works, and post office, and the causes operating in these cases were explained in my remarks of the 22nd of

Mr. FIELDING.

April last year and are sufficiently well known. I need not refer to them further than to say that they are the direct result of the apparent economy accomplished by my predecessor in 1895-96, an economy, which I am justified in saying was only apparent, because I think hon. gentlemen themselves will admit that it was not possible to continue the expenditure on the figures of that year. Indeed, hon. gentlemen on the other side, by the remarks they have made on these subjects, have frequently admitted as much.

In concluding my observations upon the business of the fiscal year of 1896-97, ending the 30th of June last, let me express the hope that my hon. friends opposite will allow me to congratulate them on the very happy failure of some of the very gloomy predictions which they made respecting that year. It may be remembered that in the closing hours of the first session of this Parliament, my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) and my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) made very strong attacks upon the financial position of the Government, and predicted that very direful things would happen in the first year of Liberal administration. I do not propose to detain the House with lengthy quotations from their remarks, but I may summarize their predictions very briefly. My hon. friends stated that we were entering upon a year of reckless expenditure which could only end in financial disaster. They declared that within that current year of 1896-97, I would be obliged to borrow at least \$10,000,000, and that I would have to go on the money market under conditions that would greatly damage our public credit. They will, I hope, be gratified to learn that during that current year we did not have to go on the general money market at all; that our total temporary borrowing, in the usual way of treasury bills, did not amount to ten million dollars or even half of ten million dollars; and that the only borrowing in which we indulged, over and above the renewal of a loan contracted by my predecessor, was less than three million dollars, and that when at a subsequent and proper time we did proceed to place a loan on the London market, instead of going with a damaged credit, as my hon. friends predicted, we went under favourable conditions and met with gratifying success.

They also stated that we would not be able to come out of the year's operations with a deficit of less than \$3,250,000. As late as the month of April last, my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance modified his calculation, but even then he predicted that we could not come out of the year with a deficit of less than \$2,000,000. He will, I am sure, be glad to learn that we came out of the year with a deficit, not of \$3,250,000, not of \$2,000,000, but of the modest sum of \$519,000. My hon. friend said

that in the first year of Liberal administration we would have an expenditure of at least forty million dollars. He will be glad to learn, I hope, that the expenditure of that year amounted to only \$38,349,759.

My hon. friend said that he could appeal with confidence to the great arbiter, time, to decide these things. Well, the great arbiter has given judgment, and has given judgment against my hon. friend and in favour of the Administration. I suppose it would be too much to expect of my hon. friends opposite that they will take the cheerful view which we, on this side, are disposed to take of the prospects of the country under a Liberal Administration. I suppose it is even possible that their sense of duty may oblige them to continue to draw the same alarming picture of the future under Liberal rule. We, on this side, will have to comfort ourselves with the thought, when we have these alarming predictions, that time, the great arbiter, will continue to decide against my hon. friends and in favour of the present Administration.

I have given some figures respecting the consumption on spirits and intoxicating liquors, but it has occurred to me that, in view of the agitation on the subject of prohibition, which is likely to be continued and to take a more emphatic shape at an early day, there will be frequent references, no doubt, to the amount of duty and the revenues of the various departments of the Government arising from the liquor traffic. I think that, therefore, it might be convenient to include in the Budget a statement showing exactly what are the revenues derived from that source. The statement is for the year 1896-97.

	Quantity.	Duty.
Customs—		
Alc. beer, &c...Galls.	327,216	\$ 65,245 30
Excise—		
Malt	Lbs. 68,443,353	1,026,652 13
Customs—		
Spirits and wines.G'ls.	1,396,136	2,406,529 81
Excise—		
Spirits	Galls. 2,782,514	4,732,506 19
Or,		
Customs		\$2,471,775 11
Excise		5,759,158 32

Summing it up, we find that the revenues received from these sources are: Customs, \$2,471,775.11; excise, \$5,759,158.32, making a total revenue from that source of \$8,230,933.43.

So far, Sir, I have dealt with the financial year ending June last. Now, let us turn our attention to the current year, of which nine months have elapsed. With this elapsed period as a basis of calculation, I shall endeavour to estimate what our position will probably be on the 30th June next. Up to 31st March last, according to the latest statements we have obtained, our customs revenue amounts to \$16,111,029.82.

Making due allowance for the increase we have lately been experiencing in the receipts

from this source, and keeping in mind that after 1st July the preferential feature of our tariff obtains its full development and consequently there will be a slight check in the imports in May and June, I think I am within the mark when I estimate the customs revenue at \$21,000,000, as against last year's yield of \$19,478,247. From excise, I do not expect to receive more than \$8,000,000, as compared with \$9,170,378 received last year, on account of various disturbing causes. As between the two years, there is no doubt our revenue this year from that source will be less. From miscellaneous sources I anticipate our revenue will be \$10,300,000; or \$39,300,000 in all.

So much for the revenue. On the other hand, the actual expenditure up to the 31st March on account of consolidated fund amounted to \$22,987,258, which is just on about a level with last year, if we take into account the fact that there is a quarter's post office expenditure of last year which does not appear this year but will come in at a later stage of the accounts. We must add to the outlay against us the expenditures which will be imposed upon us in connection with the opening of the Yukon district and the maintenance of law and order in that territory. So, to be on the safe side, I put the total consolidated fund expenditure for the current fiscal year at \$38,750,000. If this estimate proves correct, and if we receive the estimated revenue of \$39,300,000, the business of this year, closing the 30th June next, will end with a surplus of \$550,000.

My aim and expectation in that respect are that we shall have in this current year a surplus which will wipe out the deficit of last year, and leave a balance, possibly even a larger balance than I would now care to state, on the right side. I feel confident that this is a safe and conservative estimate of the result of the year's operations. Some features of the year's business have been so abnormal, there has developed such buoyancy in trade, that I should not be surprised if the outcome of the year should be more favourable than I have indicated. The total consolidated fund expenditure for the current year I have just estimated at \$38,750,000, or some \$400,000 over last year's actual expenditure. The reasons for this are to be found in the additional interest on the public debt that has to be paid on account of the loan of last autumn, the necessary outlay in connection with the opening up of the Yukon district, an increased outlay resulting from a vigorous policy to be pursued in the Department of Agriculture, and also in the branch of the Department of the Interior which has special reference to immigration. The extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal will also go to swell our gross expenditure, although I am assured by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways that the increased outlay will be offset by increased receipts that will accrue from the working of

the extension. Although our borrowings in London, last October, as I shall show, were less than half the amount authorized, and it might be supposed therefore that we should have occasion again to resort to temporary loans at an early day, I am glad to be able to say that, owing to the buoyancy of trade and of revenue, our financial position has become so strong that I do not anticipate that it will be necessary, during the current year, to issue a single Treasury bill or borrow any money in any shape or form.

I desire now to refer to the debt statement for 1896-97. On the 30th June, 1896, our net debt stood at \$258,497,432.77. As a result of the year's operations, it has been increased by \$3,041,163.69, the details of which are as follows :—

Expenditure on Capital Account and on Canadian Pacific Rail- way	\$3,519,875 59
Deficit of the year	519,981 44
Railway subsidies	416,955 30
Rebellion in the N.W.T.	3,284 64
Consolidated Fund transfers, including liabilities incurred prior to 30th June, 1896, Post Office Department	682,880 52
Total	5,142,977 49
Less—Sinking Fund investments	2,101,813 80
Net increase	3,041,163 69
 Making the net debt on 30th June, 1897	 \$261,538,596 46

For the current fiscal year, I find we have expended up to the 31st March on capital account, for railway subsidies and for discounts and charges in connection with the late loan, in all \$4,506,185. To complete the year's requirements on capital account and railway subsidies it is estimated that we shall need \$3,000,000, making a total of \$7,506,185. In order to ascertain the net increase of our debt, we must deduct the sinking fund investments which are estimated to amount to \$2,300,000 and estimated surplus of \$507,000, leaving an increase in the net debt of \$4,500,000 in round numbers for the year 1897-98.

Mr. CLANCY. Where are the cheers ?

Mr. MACLEAN. We are sitting on them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We propose that hon. gentlemen opposite shall continue to sit on those chairs for a long time yet. With regard to the fiscal year beginning on the 1st July next and ending on the 30th June, 1899, it is, of course, too early at this day to estimate in more than general terms. However, I do not think that, so far as the customs revenue is concerned, we should fall behind this year's income, which I have estimated at \$21,000,000. We have to remember, of course, that on the 1st July this year the second stage of our preferential tariff will be reached, and the reduction of 12½ per cent already accrued will be fol-

Mr. FIELDING.

lowed by a further reduction of 12½ per cent, making a total of 25 per cent. The first reduction of 12½ per cent was, perhaps, not large enough to make any great change in the stream of British imports. Besides it takes time for the British merchant to understand the operation of these tariff changes, and just about the moment when he became aware of the reduction, and was prepared to deal with it, the difficulty arose with respect to the Belgian and German treaties, which resulted in the so-called preference being for a time extended to a large number of countries, and therefore Great Britain was not in a position to enjoy the 12½ per cent reduction as fully as we had expected and desired.

Mr. FOSTER. The difficulty arose before that, did it not ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, only in the minds of my hon. friends opposite. There are no difficulties in this question on this side of the House ; there were difficulties which my hon. friends opposite for years sought to remove without success, and which have been removed by this Government. I expect, therefore, that when the full reduction of 25 per cent takes place, when the preference is confined, as it will be, to imports from the mother country and from certain British colonies to which I shall refer, I expect there will be a considerable increase in imports from Great Britain, and on these imports we shall receive a smaller amount of revenue than we have hitherto received. With a view to maintaining our position as a sound one financially, to upholding our credit and guarding against deficits, it will be the part of wisdom to anticipate loss of revenue in that respect by making some increase to the revenue in other quarters, and of that I will speak later on. Excise should provide at least eight and one-half millions, and from miscellaneous sources, making due allowances for increase in railway receipts, from post office and interest on investments, we should receive eleven million dollars. These I estimate will give us a total revenue of \$40,500,000. I am speaking now of the year beginning on the 1st of July next, concerning which, of course, our estimates will have to be of a very general character, with very little opportunities of coming to close quarters, not such opportunities as we have with regard to the current year. We have laid on the Table of the House the Estimates for 1898-99, to the extent of \$39,124,000. These Estimates include two new items, one of \$396,000 for the expense of the Yukon district, and another of \$760,000 for the running expenses of the Intercolonial Railway extension to Montreal. Under our method of keeping accounts, the increased cost of operating the Intercolonial Railway has to be added to our general expenditure, even though it might be a source of profit

to us, represented by an increase on the other side of the account. These two new items for the Yukon and for the Intercolonial Railway, items which were not necessary in our past Estimates, but that we all recognize are necessary now, amount to \$1,156,000. If we take this from the total amount of the Estimates, it will be found that the remainder, \$38,168,000 is about the same as asked for in the main Estimates for the current year.

In April last, in the course of my remarks on the financial outlook, I expressed my belief that when the details of the tariff were once settled and announced, trade would not only continue to flow in its usual channels, but that we might expect a large increase. When those words were uttered, the circumstances that I then enumerated pointed unmistakably in this direction. The good harvest, however, and increased prices have since that time lent their force to the tide of events, and the

period of resulting prosperity that Canada is and has been for some time past enjoying must be indeed gratifying to every hon. member of this House, and to every citizen of Canada, and must confirm the conviction that we all have as to the great possibilities of the future development of our country.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will bear with me when I turn aside for a moment to enumerate a few of the directions in which this development and prosperity have made themselves felt. I propose to speak first as an illustration of the increased prosperity of the country, of the increased business of the country—I propose to speak of the deposits in the banks. In the bank circulation the effect has been most pronounced. I need not weary the House by giving the details of the bank statements, but I may present a table showing the deposits in the chartered banks for the past six years, together with the totals:

	Chartered Banks.	Govt. Savings Banks.	Total.
30th June, 1892.....	\$ 160,942,778	\$ 39,529,547	\$ 200,472,325
30th June, 1893.....	170,817,433	41,849,658	212,667,091
30th June, 1894.....	174,930,936	43,036,012	217,966,948
30th June, 1895.....	180,664,121	44,450,498	225,114,619
30th June, 1896.....	183,769,992	46,799,318	230,569,310
30th June, 1897.....	201,141,688	48,934,975	250,076,663
31st December, 1897.....	222,002,147	49,466,656	271,468,803

That is to say, that in the six months from June last to December the deposits have increased by over \$21,000,000.

To carry on the increased business of the country there has been a very heavy

demand for Dominion notes and bank notes, which the elasticity of our banking system has been fully able to meet. I append the figures relating to note circulation for six years past:

	Government.	Banks.	Total.
31st October, 1892.....	\$38,688,429	\$18,647,063	\$57,335,492
31st October, 1893.....	36,906,941	19,844,248	56,751,189
31st October, 1894.....	34,516,651	22,212,884	56,729,535
31st October, 1895.....	34,671,028	22,893,259	57,564,287
31st October, 1896.....	35,955,150	21,607,553	57,562,703
31st October, 1897.....	41,580,928	24,751,932	66,332,860

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my hon. friend if he took the same date in each case for the Government bank figures?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the figures in both cases are for the 31st of October, 1892, and continuing at the same date each year.

The October circulation, which is, as a rule, the highest of the year, on account of the moving of the crops, ran about 56 or 57 millions of dollars for the year 1896 and the four preceding years. The business of October, 1897, required over 66 millions, or an increase of close to nine millions over 1896.

The volume of the general business of the country was such as to very markedly increase the aggregate bank clearings of the five principal cities—Montreal, Toronto, Halifax, Winnipeg and Hamilton. The total clearings for the three years, 1895, 1896 and 1897, according to the "Monetary Times," were:

1895.....	\$1,039,967,000
1896.....	1,025,960,000
1897.....	1,151,906,000

or an increase of \$126,000,000 in the clearings of 1897 over 1896. For the four weekly periods—ending Thursday—in January, 1898, the total clearings were \$108,509,673, against \$89,901,000 for the similar periods of January, 1897, or an increase of over \$18,000,000. For February last, the total clearings for the five cities mentioned were \$108,385,302, as compared with \$74,612,552 for February, 1897, an increase of \$33,772,750.

The railways, too, have experienced the benefits of this upward movement in trade, and the published traffic returns are an index of the extent of the betterment so far as they are concerned. From 1st July to the end of February last, the weekly statements of the two great railways of Canada show continual and steady increases over the corresponding weeks of last year. The gross receipts of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the year ending 31st December, 1897, were \$24,049,534, against \$20,681,596 for the previous year. The gross receipts of the Grand Trunk Railway, according to their weekly returns, for the same period were \$19,521,588, against \$18,731,885 for the previous year. The increase in the earnings of the roads is mainly attributable to their freight and live stock business. The share and bondholders have, of course, profited by the improvement in the earning capacities of the roads, and the market values of their securities have advanced by bounds. Take the Canadian Pacific Railway ordinary \$100 shares. The closing price of December, 1896, was 56½; the lowest price of 1897 was 46½, and the latest December price was 83½. The closing price on 29th of January last, according to the "Economist," was 91½.

Mr. FIELDING.

In Grand Trunk securities the advance was equally marked. Taking their 4 per cent guaranteed and their first preference stocks, I find the lowest price of 1897 was 39½ and 30½ respectively, while on the 29th January they were quoted at 76½, 77½ and 67½ to 68½ respectively.

Taking the Canadian Pacific Railway stocks quoted in the "Economist," and the principal Grand Trunk issues, I find that securities of these two railways to the nominal value of £88,187,497 were worth on the market: On 31st December, 1895, £48,814,887; on 31st December, 1896, £50,430,613; on 31st December, 1897, £62,317,910.

I will now take a few figures from the Trade Returns for 1896-97.

The total value of the imports into Canada for the year amounted to \$119,218,609, which is nearly a million and a quarter of dollars in excess of the previous year, and over eight millions in excess of the fiscal year 1894-95.

Canada's export trade during the year was, by far, the largest and greatest in its history. The total value of the exports for the year amounted to the sum of \$137,950,253, which is over 16 millions of dollars in excess of the previous year, and 24 millions in excess of the fiscal year 1894-95.

The total value of the imports for home consumption, exclusive of coin and bullion, for the eight months of the current year, up to the end of February, amounted to \$80,821,831, which is \$12,081,330 in excess of the corresponding period of the last fiscal year.

Including coin and bullion, the imports for home consumption for the eight months amounted to \$83,785,737, which is \$10,506,815 in excess of the corresponding period of the last fiscal year.

The total exports for the eight months amounted to \$119,644,464, which is \$26,451,521 in excess of the export trade for the corresponding period of last year, and which is also in excess of the export trade for any whole year in the history of Canada, prior to 1896.

While we have thus placed before us the many evidences of the growing prosperity of Canada, let us not be unmindful of the chief causes of this happy condition of affairs. The general business of Canada has been prosperous because prosperity has come to the great agricultural class. There have been some mistaken notions in the past as to relations between manufactures and agriculture. The idea existed in some quarters that we could build up a prosperous farming community by stimulating manufactures. The home market was everything. Canada for the Canadians was the cry. There are some things in which it is well to have Canada for the Canadians, but we would do well to put a wise limitation on the meaning of the expression, and seek for

prosperity through the markets of the world. I think the country has awakened to the fact that, in the effort to make prosperity for the farmers through the stimulating of manufactures, the cart was being placed before the horse. If we can fill up the farm lands of Canada with industries, prosperous and happy settlers, producing, not for the home market only, but for the markets of the world, we shall have the truest possible foundation for a successful manufacturing industry and for general prosperity. Let us then, while we rejoice in these figures which I have the privilege of presenting to the House, and while we rejoice in this prosperity, let us remember that that prosperity is due chiefly to the success of the farmer, and let us see that by every reasonable and proper effort we shall endeavour to encourage the development of agriculture throughout the Dominion of Canada.

I desire now to draw the attention of the House—though it may be necessary only as a matter of form—to the new loan which I had the pleasure of raising on the London market last autumn. You will recollect that a Loan Act was passed last session for \$15,000,000. There were outstanding borrowing powers at that time to the amount of upwards of \$8,000,000, and that together with our powers under the Act of last session, gave us borrowing powers to the amount of upwards of \$23,000,000. The objects of these large borrowing powers are well known. We had entered upon large expenditures in respect to canals; we had incurred considerable obligations in respect of railways, and it was necessary to make provision for these as the obligations might arise. I may say that at the time the Loan Bill was before the House last session, the impression upon the minds of some hon. gentlemen was that the \$15,000,000 was rather less than we should require. However that may be, taking the \$15,000,000 which Parliament authorized us to borrow, together with the \$8,000,000 outstanding borrowing powers, we were entitled to borrow \$23,000,000. We did not, however, think it wise to exercise that power to the full extent. We came to the conclusion that it would be a wise policy to make our new loan for a moderate amount, and it was decided that we should make a loan for £2,000,000 sterling, or about \$10,000,000. There were several reasons for that. We did feel hopeful, in view of the growing prosperity of the country, that we should not need to borrow so large a sum as many hon. gentlemen thought would be necessary, and there was the further consideration, that after due deliberation we resolved to try a very serious experiment—if one can call anything like that an experiment—we resolved to take the somewhat serious step of making a break in the rate of interest in

the London market, Canada up to that time had no securities below 3 per cent, nor had any other colony. In view of the favourable condition of the money market; in view of the high position of Canadian credit; in view of the general tendency towards a reduction in the rate of interest, we thought the time had come when we could make the experiment—some called it a bold experiment—of going on the London market and asking the investors to buy our bonds at a 2½ per cent basis. And, Sir, having thought that matter out, we came to the conclusion that it would be a wise policy to make our first loan at that rate for a very moderate amount. We so decided for this reason: that in going upon the market with a new loan at a new rate, one always has to meet a certain degree of prejudice; one will never get in a first operation of that character so good a price as may be expected later. We thought, therefore, that if we could get along comfortably with £2,000,000 sterling, it would be wise to confine our loan to that amount in order that we might establish the market for our securities on a 2½ per cent basis, with the expectation that they would increase in value and that at no distant date, when it would be necessary for us to go on the market for the balance, we should have our credit fairly established on the 2½ per cent basis. Believing the moment favourable, in the month of October, we arranged to place our loan upon the market. The conditions of the market up to that time had been reasonably favourable, but the money market did take a slightly unfavourable turn at the eleventh hour of our transaction. After our prospectus had been issued the money market hardened somewhat, and on the very evening before our tenders were to be received, the Bank of England rate—which is the standard which governs all money transactions in London—was advanced a half per cent. Taking such a serious step as we were at that time, one might well have some anxiety as to the result in view of that unfavourable turn. However, I am glad to be able to state that so strong was the position of Canada in the money market, that when this proposal was made, even under that momentary adverse circumstance, the response of the public was very satisfactory and our loan was more than doubly subscribed. We placed the bonds on the market at the price of 91 and they were taken at 91 pounds 10 shillings and 5 pence.

Considering, Sir, that it was the first operation of the kind that any colony had ever attempted, I feel that we all have great reason—and I am sure my hon. friends opposite will join in my words heartily when I say it—we have all great reason to congratulate ourselves, irrespective of party, upon the

very high position that Canadian credit has taken in England. I have here a statement showing the rates of interest that have been paid for the various Canadian loans since confederation, and as it may be found useful for future reference I shall read it.

In 1869 Canada issued a loan which was partly a guaranteed loan, one portion bearing 4 per cent and one 5 per cent, at a price which made the cost to Canada $4\frac{1}{8}$ per cent.

In 1873, another loan was issued which was also a guaranteed loan, and the cost to Canada was 3 9-10ths per cent.

Of course I need hardly say that where a loan had the guarantee of the Imperial Government the rate was more favourable.

In 1874, a Canadian loan cost Canada $4\frac{7}{8}$ per cent.

In 1875, a loan which was partly guaranteed cost $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

In 1876, a 4 per cent Canadian loan cost $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

In 1878, a guaranteed loan cost $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

In 1879, a Canadian 4 per cent loan cost $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

In 1884, a $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent loan cost $4\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

In 1885, the cost of a 4 per cent loan was 4 1-12th in one case, and in another class of bonds 4 1-10th.

In 1888, the cost of a 3 per cent loan was $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

In 1892, the cost of a 3 per cent loan was $3\frac{3}{8}$ per cent.

In 1894, the cost of a 3 per cent loan was $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

In 1897, our $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent loan was sold in London at a price which represents about $2\frac{7}{8}$ per cent.

Mr. FIELDING.

MEMO. re CANADIAN LOANS.

Year.	Amount of Loan.	Rate of Interest.	Price realized per £100.			Actual rate of interest paid.
			£	s.	d.	
1869..	*1,500,000	4)	105	12	11	$4\frac{1}{2}$
	500,000	5)				
1873..	*1,500,000	4)	104	7	8	$3\frac{9}{10}$
	*300,000	4)				
1874	4,000,000	4	90	3	3	$4\frac{7}{8}$
1875..	*1,500,000	4)	99	1	8	$4\frac{1}{8}$
	1,000,000	4)				
1876..	2,500,000	4	91			$4\frac{3}{4}$
1878..	*1,500,000	4)	96	11	9	$4\frac{1}{2}$
	1,500,000	4)				
1879..	3,000,000	4	95	1	10	$4\frac{1}{2}$
1884..	5,000,000	$3\frac{1}{2}$	91	2	2	$4\frac{1}{4}$
1885..	4,000,000	4	101	1	8	$4\frac{1}{2}$
1885..	{ Canada reduced } { 6,443,136 }	4				$4\frac{1}{10}$
1888..	4,000,000	3	95	1	0	$3\frac{1}{2}$
1892..	2,250,000	3	92	0	10	$3\frac{3}{8}$
1894..	2,250,000	3	97	9	2	$3\frac{1}{4}$
1897..	2,000,000	$2\frac{1}{2}$	91	10	5	$2\frac{7}{8}$

* Guaranteed.

I have a more elaborate memorandum showing the comparisons between the various Canadian loans for some years, and this comparison has usually found a place in the Budget speech. If the House will permit me I shall, without reading it, have it incorporated in the statement so that it may be convenient for future reference.

MEMORANDUM respecting Canadian Loans placed on the London Market since 1867.

Loan.	Price in prospectus.	Price realized.		Duration of Loan, years.	Rate per cent.	Total issue.		Discount or Premium.		Amount realized.		Charges, including Discount for immediate payments and Interest on part payments.		Net Amount of Cash realized.		Rate of interest.
		£	s. d.			£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	
Intercolonial Railway, 1869, guaranteed.....	...	105	12 11½	35	{ 4	1,500,000	P. 112,946	...	2,112,946	...	29,896	18 5	2,083,049	1 7	.04125	
do 1869, unguaranteed...	...	104	7 8	{ 30	{ 4	1,500,000	P. 78,971	6 8	1,878,971	6 8	33,449	18 11	1,845,521	7 9	.03916	
do 1873, guaranteed.....	...	90	3 3	{ 30	{ 4	300,000	D. 393,476	17 6	3,606,523	2 6	60,289	9 9	3,546,233	12 9	.04875	
Rupert's Land, guaranteed.....	90	99	1 8	{ 35	{ 4	1,500,000	D. 22,930	9 1	2,477,069	10 11	42,847	6 1	2,434,221	14 10	.0416	
do 1875, unguaranteed.....	...	91	...	{ 30	{ 4	1,000,000	D. 225,000	...	2,275,000	...	57,122	9 7	2,217,877	10 5	.0475	
do 1876, unguaranteed.....	91	96	11 9	{ 30	{ 4	2,500,000	D. 102,347	12 6	2,897,652	7 6	36,602	15 7	2,861,049	11 11	.043	
do 1878, guaranteed.....	96½	95	1 10½	{ 35	{ 4	1,500,000	D. 147,206	6 4	2,852,793	13 8	47,988	8 3	2,804,805	5 5	.045	
do 1878, unguaranteed.....	95	91	2 2	{ 30	{ 4	1,500,000	D. 445,870	...	4,554,130	...	94,693	3 4	4,459,436	16 8	.0423	
do 1879.....	91	91	1 8	{ 25	{ 3½	3,000,000	P. 43,416	...	4,043,416	...	82,098	2 1	3,961,317	17 11	.045	
do 1884.....	99	101	1 8	{ 25	{ 4	4,000,000	D. 54,576	2 9	6,388,540	...	32,977	1 0	6,355,563	19	.04083	
do 1885.....	{ 24½	{ 4	6,443,136	D. 197,904	...	3,802,096	...	67,598	4 3	3,734,498	7 6	.0327	
Canada reduced.....	92½	95	1 10½	{ 50	{ 3	4,000,000	D. 179,009	16	2,070,990	4	31,365	6 7	2,039,624	17 5	.0341	
Loan of 1888.....	91	92	...	{ 46	{ 3	2,250,000	D. 57,145	6 9	2,192,854	13 3	24,807	...	2,168,0470316	
do 1892.....	95	97	9 2	{ 43½	{ 3	2,250,000	D. 169,625	5	1,830,374	15	22,378	7 8	1,808,016	7 4	.28628	
do 1894.....	91	91	10 5	{ 50	{ 2½	2,000,000	
do 1897.....	91	91	10 5	{ 50	{ 2½	2,000,000	

* Or 50 years calculated for 25 years only.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) finished his remarks on the loan business ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the present ; there is one point further, but I shall be glad to have my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) ask me any question now.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) lay the prospectus on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall be very glad to.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the length of the last loan ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Fifty years. There is one other element in connection with that loan to which I may make a passing reference. Not only was it desirable that we should have our loan placed on a 2½ per cent basis, if possible, for the sake of the transaction itself, but such a change to the 2½ per cent rate became of further importance in view of the early maturity of a large amount of our existing loans.

By reference to page lxiv. of the Public Accounts, it will be found that between the years 1903 and 1910, we shall have loans maturing to the amount of £34,443,136, or \$167,623,262. To assist in meeting the payment of these liabilities, I estimate that we shall have accumulated sinking funds to the value of \$66,971,181. So that we shall have to renew or convert the balance of these maturing loans to the amount of over \$100,000,000. The net rate of interest on our last loan, taking into account all charges, was 2.86 per cent. At the rate of interest which these loans that are to mature now bear, it would take about \$4,000,000 to pay a year's interest on the \$100,000,000 ; but at the rate of 2.86 per cent. the interest on the \$100,000,000 would amount to \$2,860,000, or a difference of \$1,140,000. That is to say, if the money market when these various loans mature should prove as favourable to Canada as it was when we placed our recent loan, there would be a saving of interest to the extent of over \$1,000,000 per year, as compared with the rate of interest which these loans now bear. We may reasonably hope to effect that saving, and something more ; for we all anticipate, I am sure, that the credit of Canada, high as it is now, will continue to improve, and that before the date is reached at which these loans fall in, we shall be able to borrow, not simply at the rate of 2.86 per cent, as we did last year, but at a rate which will come much closer to 2½ per cent, which will be the face value of the securities. I think, then, in view of these large maturing loans, as well as from the nature of the recent transaction itself, hon. gentlemen on both sides of the

Mr. FIELDING.

House will have been pleased to learn that we took the step of placing a 2½ per cent loan on the market ; and I am glad to know that the transaction was not a subject of party dispute, but that its success was recognized by the press of the country irrespective of party.

I shall now address myself to a question which was brought very forcibly to my mind and to the minds of my colleagues of the Tariff Commission during our investigations of a year ago. Among the many complaints which were made to us by manufacturers and business men as to the disadvantages under which they laboured, one prominent complaint was that the cost of capital was considerably in excess of what many of their rivals and competitors had to pay. A very large amount of the business of the country is carried on by credit, and the cost of money to the merchant and the manufacturer is a very serious consideration. It might be said that this is a matter with which the Government has little or nothing to do—that it is a matter which must be left to the general law of demand and supply. But a little examination will show that in some ways the Government have the power of influencing the money market, and that, in fact, the money market has been influenced to some extent by the policy of the Government. The banks of the country are borrowers as well as lenders. The banks receive from the public a large amount of capital which they use in the business of the country in the way of loans. This capital is in the form of deposits, and when the banks have to pay an unreasonably high rate of interest on deposits, that is a reason—at all events, it is an excuse—for their not giving lower rates of discount to the business men of the country. It has been said that the position of the banks in this respect has been a forced position. It has been said that they have been obliged in times past to pay more than a fair value for money, because the Government of the country has been doing so. I suppose it will be generally admitted that in the Government savings banks we have been for a long time paying a little more than the fair value of money ; and some gentlemen may say that we ought to do so in the savings banks. But I do not think we ought to accept that position. I think the savings banks of the country were designed to afford a place of safe deposit to the people interested in that class of institution. By the way, I am inclined to think that the original design of the savings bank as a place in which the thrifty classes could put their small savings, has been long since lost sight of, and a very large proportion of the money in the savings bank does not represent that class of depositors at all. However that may be, we find that the Government in past years have been paying a little more than the

value of money in the way of interest on savings bank deposits; and we came to the conclusion, after careful consideration of the matter, that it was desirable, in the interest of the business of the country, in the interest of successful manufacturing, in the interest of every man who had to carry on his business to some extent with borrowed capital, that we should not have an artificial value of money in Canada, but that a man should be able to borrow according to the reasonable laws of demand and supply. We believed that it was a desirable thing to encourage to some extent the savings bank deposits, and we remembered that the number of those deposits was large and that the advantage to the depositors was a matter of some importance; but we came to the conclusion that the interest of the greatest number of the people demanded that we should not pay to the savings bank depositors a larger rate of interest than the reasonable value of money. Therefore, in July last we reduced the savings bank rate of interest from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 per cent. Although it was not a matter of public criticism, there were some who felt at the time that it was a policy which would probably lead to large withdrawals of money from the savings banks. Such, however, did not prove to be the fact. I believe, as a result of that reduction, that there was some reduction in the cost of capital throughout the country—not universally, but to some extent. The banks of the country have their different classes of customers, of varying credit. There is the inner circle, who can get their discounts at pretty good rates; there is the next circle, who do not get them at so good a rate; and there is the outer circle who are glad to get them on any terms at all. I think that the inner circle, the class of corporations and business men who are in a very sound financial condition, already appreciate the reduction that has come to them in the rate of interest. Since that time an incident has occurred which has led us to go a step further. We did not think it was wise to make so radical a reduction as from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent at once; but we did make the reduction to 3 per cent; and since we have been able to place on the money market our own securities bearing a $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent rate, we thought we should regard that as a standard value of money, and that we ought not to pay a rate in excess of that. We know that it costs about $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent to manage the deposits, and if you add that to the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to be allowed upon them, you will be paying $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent, which is about the same as we are paying for our money in the English market.

An hon. MEMBER. Less.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is right—a fraction less. But, as I have already stated, we expect the securities of Canada to advance in value. I

have pointed out that in making a new loan at a reduced rate of interest, we suffer some disadvantage at the moment; but we all expect—barring temporary difficulties, wars and rumours of war, which we hope may soon pass away—that the securities of Canada will increase in value at a very early date; and we may fairly regard a fraction above $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent as the rate at which Canada can borrow all the money she requires. If therefore we pay the depositor $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for his money and pay $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent for the management of the savings bank, we are practically paying him $2\frac{3}{4}$ for the money, and at a very early day we shall no doubt be able to borrow money at that rate in England. We therefore propose that on the 1st of July next there shall be a further reduction of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the interest payable to depositors making the rate $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. A grand stroke of business for the poor man.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend, no doubt, thinks that there are many poor men who have their money in the post office savings bank, but there are many more poorer men who are paying the interest, and who have no money in the savings banks. And the question is, whether a limited number of poor men shall be paid a higher rate at the expense of a larger number of poorer men who have no money to put in the savings banks. I quite sympathize with the desire of my hon. friend to pay a good round rate of interest, but I think he will agree with me that a very large amount of the money in the savings banks to-day belongs to a class of people who do not need any sympathy from us, but are very well able to look after themselves. And as far as the other depositors are concerned, if we give them the security of the public credit and pay them $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, besides the other $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent which the management costs us, I think we are dealing fairly and justly with them. But I do not put it before the House in that light only. The main ground I am arguing on is this, that it is not merely an advantage to the Treasury—though that is a point not to be lost sight of—but that the rate of interest we are now paying on savings banks deposits has a material effect on the cost of money to the business community at large in the Dominion; and if, by this step, we can bring about—not hastily, but gradually and surely—a reduction in the cost of capital to the merchant, the manufacturer, and to every man who has to go to a bank to borrow money, we believe we shall be doing something which is for the good of the whole country.

Mr. SPROULE. The discount charged by the banks since the last reduction has been just as high as ever; so that the reduction

has not resulted as the hon. gentleman predicts it will.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I am afraid the difficulty must be that my hon. friend and I belong to the outer class which cannot dictate to the banks, because I have reason to believe that that favoured inner circle is already receiving some advantage. But I do not put it on that ground alone. If that inner circle were receiving the advantage, and nobody else, then I would not argue that the step was a very advantageous one in the sense I mention. But we all know that the rates of interest do not change in a moment, and, if the borrower who now pays 6 per cent, can get a lower rate—my information is, and I believe it, that many are getting their discounts done at lower rates than twelve months ago—although for the present the advantage may be confined to that favoured inner circle, I believe it will gradually work out of it and my hon. friend and myself may some day get the benefit.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is there any hope of our getting into that inner circle?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Not while we are in politics.

I want to say something now with regard to the tariff policy of last year. I find that there is a change of front on the part of some hon. gentlemen opposed to the Government on that question. When the tariff policy was announced last year, the Conservative speakers and organs—I remember particularly an article in a leading organ of public opinion in Toronto,—took the ground that we were making changes which were threatening the business interest of the country, that the business of the country could not stand the policy which this Government had enacted. The Conservative speakers and organs told us that we were going to destroy the great industries of the country. Well, Mr. Speaker, the cry has changed to-day. Looking over the year's operations under that tariff, and finding that the business of the country has gone on increasing and expanding every day, finding that that cry cannot any longer be used, these hon. gentlemen have turned around and say: You did not make any changes in the tariff at all; you have the old National Policy after all. Well, each of these claims is unjust. We made a change in the tariff—a change that was moderate and reasonable, a change that guarded against rash disturbances, but which, nevertheless, effected substantial reductions on the rates of duty, so that the tariff of the country is no longer the old National Policy. I wish to remind the House that in the old tariff, which hon. gentlemen opposite admire so much, there were specific duties which ran up as high as 40 and 50, and I do not think I go too far when I say,

Mr. **FIELDING**.

60 per cent of the value of the article. All these high duties, at all events a great many of them, have been removed. Many of the articles which in former times paid a duty, under the old tariff, of 40 and 50 per cent, and as high as 60 per cent, will be found scheduled in the present tariff at 35 per cent, subject to a further reduction, under the preferential clause; so that, as between the old and the present general tariff there is a considerable reduction of duties on a number of articles. And, when you take into account the reduction which has taken place, and which will be increased on the first of July next, by the operation of the second stage of the preferential tariff, you will find that this Government has given the country a very substantial measure of tariff reform. I hold a list of about sixty items taken from the tariff. I might have made the list much larger, but that sixty will be sufficient for my illustration, and, perhaps, hon. gentlemen opposite will not want to listen to the whole list. The only reason I ask them to do so is, to get the list on "Hansard," but if, after I have read from the list a few minutes, they will dispense with my proceeding further—

Mr. **FOSTER**. Read it through.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My hon. friend is relentless; but other hon. gentlemen on that side may not be so insistent.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That is the only way you can get it on the "Hansard."

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My hon. friend used to get some things into "Hansard" which he did not read in his Budget speech, and I hope he will not object to my being given the same privilege.

Animals, living, n.e.s.—Under the old tariff the rate is 20 per cent. Under our general present tariff the rate is 20 per cent; but if they should come in under the preferential clause, it will be 17½ per cent, and, after the first of July, the rate will be 15 per cent, as against 20 per cent under the old tariff.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Does my hon. friend expect many?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Not very many; but, such as they are, they will receive the benefit of tariff reform. There are a few cases in which you cannot expect the articles to come under the preferential tariff, because they will not come from Great Britain or the countries entitled to that preference. That is a fair criticism, and I do not want to urge that in every one of the cases the preferential rate will apply, but it will to most of the articles on this list. There are very few cases in which I quote a rate in which the importer will not receive the benefit of the preferential clause. The following is the list—

STATEMENT showing the Old Tariff Rate, the New General Tariff Rate, the Preferential Tariff Rate to the 30th June, 1898, and the Preferential Tariff Rate from 1st July, 1898, on certain principal articles :

No. of Present Tariff Item.	Articles.	Old Tariff Rate.	General Present Tariff.	Preferential Tariff to 30th June, 1898.	Preferential Tariff from 1st July, 1898.
11	Animals, living, N.E.S	20 p. c.	20 p. c.	17½ p. c.	15 p. c.
125	Books, printed, periodicals and pamphlets, or parts thereof, N.E.S., not to include blank account books, copy books or books to be written or drawn on.	6c. p. lb	10 "	8¾ "	7½ "
276	Brass, manufactures of, N.E.S.	30 p. c	30 "	26¼ "	22½ "
540	Indian corn not for distillation.	7½c. p. bush. Free.	Free.	Free.	Free.
325	Bicycles and tricycles.	30 p. c	30 p. c	26½ p. c	22½ p. c.
180	Coal, bituminous, &c.	60c. per ton of 2,000 lbs.	53c. per ton of 2,000 lbs.	46¾c. p. ton of 2,000 lbs.	39¾c. p. ton of 2,000 lbs.
360	Cotton fabrics, printed, dyed or coloured, N.O.P	30 p. c	35 p. c.	30½ p. c.	26¼ p. c.
371	Cotton sewing thread on spools.	25 "	25 "	21¾ "	18¾ "
362	Cotton clothing, including corsets	32½ "	35 "	30½ "	26¼ "
368	Cotton velvets, velveteens and plush fabrics, N.E.S.	30 "	30 "	26¼ "	22½ "
312	Curtains, when made up, trimmed or untrimmed.	30 "	35 "	30½ "	26¼ "
447	Drugs, dyes and chemicals, N.O.P.	20 "	20 "	17½ "	15 "
294	Electric apparatus, parts of, electric light cables, electric batteries.	25 "	25 "	21¾ "	18¾ "

I think that this is an article in which, probably, the Americans will do most of the business. But if the goods are imported

from Great Britain, the duty, under the preferential clause, after the 1st July next, will be 18¼ per cent.

362	Fancy Goods— Braids, bracelets, cords, fringes, tassels, &c.	30 "	35 "	30½ "	26¼ "
	Laces, lace collars and similar goods, lace nets and nettings of cotton, linen, silk or other material.	30 "	35 "	30½ "	26¼ "
361	Flax, hemp and jute, manufactures of— Damask of linen, including napkins, doylies, tray cloths, sideboard covers, damask stair linen and diaper.	25 "	30 "	26¼ "	22½ "
77	Fruits— Dried currants	·01c. per lb.	·01c. per lb.	¾c. per lb.	¾c. per lb.
	Dried raisins.	·01c. per lb.	·01c. per lb.	¾c. per lb.	¾c. per lb.
	Oranges, lemons and limes, in boxes of capacity not exceeding 2½ cub. ft.	25c. per box.	25c. per box.	21¾c. per box.	18¾c. per box.

If I am asked whether I expect oranges to come from England, I reply that I do not, but I expect them to come from some other

place whence we shall receive them on more favourable terms than at the present.

STATEMENT showing the Old Tariff Rate, the New General Tariff Rate, the Preferential Tariff Rate to the 30th June, 1898, and the Preferential Tariff Rate from 1st July, 1898, on certain principal articles :

No. of Present Tariff Item.	Articles.	Old Tariff Rate.	General Present Tariff.	Preferential Tariff to 30th June, 1898.	Preferential Tariff from 1st July, 1898.
343	Furniture of wood or any other material, house, cabinet or office, finished or in parts	30 p. c	30 p. c	26 $\frac{1}{4}$ p. c	22 $\frac{1}{2}$ p. c
406	Fur skins, wholly or partially dressed.	15 "	15 "	13 $\frac{1}{2}$ "	11 $\frac{1}{4}$ "
201	Glass and manufactures of :— Common and colourless window glass, plain, coloured, stained or tinted or muffled glass in sheets.	20 "	20 "	17 $\frac{1}{2}$ "	15 "
403	Hats, caps and bonnets, N.E.S..	30 "	30 "	26 $\frac{1}{4}$ "	22 $\frac{1}{2}$ "
280	Iron and steel, manufactures of :— Hardware, viz. : Builders', cabinet-makers', upholsterers', harness-makers' and saddlers', including curry combs, carriage hardware, &c.	32 $\frac{1}{2}$ "	30 "	26 $\frac{1}{4}$ "	22 $\frac{1}{2}$ "
227	Iron in pigs.	\$4 00 per ton.	\$2 50 per ton.	\$2 18 $\frac{3}{4}$ per ton.	\$1 87 $\frac{3}{4}$ per ton.
315	Machinery, all other, composed wholly or in part of iron or steel, N.E.S.	27 $\frac{1}{2}$ p. c	25 p. c	21 $\frac{1}{2}$ p. c	18 $\frac{3}{4}$ p. c
321	Manufactured articles or wares, not specially enumerated or provided for, composed of iron or steel, &c.	27 $\frac{1}{2}$ "	30 "	26 $\frac{1}{4}$ "	22 $\frac{1}{2}$ "
212	Leather and manufactures of— Calf, kid, lamb and sheep skins, dressed, waxed or glazed.	17 $\frac{1}{2}$ "	17 $\frac{1}{2}$ "	15 $\frac{5}{16}$ "	13 $\frac{1}{8}$ "
212	Upper leather, including dongola, cordovan, kangaroo, alligator and chamois skins, dressed, waxed or glazed.	17 $\frac{1}{2}$ "	17 $\frac{1}{2}$ "	15 $\frac{5}{16}$ "	13 $\frac{1}{8}$ "
219	Boots and shoes, N.E.S.	25 "	25 "	21 $\frac{1}{2}$ "	18 $\frac{3}{4}$ "
173	Oils— Coal and kerosene, distilled, purified or refined, naphtha and petroleum, N.E.S.	6 c. p. gall.	5 c. p. gall.		

I do not put anything in the preferential list for that.

169	Flaxseed or linseed, raw or boiled	20 p.c	25 p.c	21 $\frac{1}{8}$ "	18 $\frac{3}{4}$ "
158	Paints and colours— Dry white and red lead, orange mineral and zinc white	5 "	5 "	4 $\frac{3}{8}$ "	3 $\frac{3}{4}$ "
140	Paper and manufactures of— Envelopes, papeteries, blank books, and manufactures of paper.	35 "	35 "	30 $\frac{5}{8}$ "	26 $\frac{1}{4}$ "
139	Paper, all kinds, N.E.S.	25 "	25 "	21 $\frac{1}{4}$ "	18 $\frac{3}{4}$ "
347	Watch actions or movements	10 p. c	10 "	8 $\frac{1}{2}$ p. c	7 $\frac{1}{2}$ p. c
334	Wood, manufactures of, N.E.S.	25 "	25 "	21 $\frac{1}{8}$ "	18 $\frac{3}{4}$ "
394	Wool, manufactures of— Cloths Coatings Tweeds All fabrics, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, &c., N.E.S.	5c. p. lb. and 25 p. c	35 "	30 $\frac{5}{8}$ "	26 $\frac{1}{4}$ "
		30 p. c	35 "	30 $\frac{5}{8}$ "	26 $\frac{1}{4}$ "

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is good protection.

few cases in which the rates of the general tariff are increased, but in every one of these rates it will be found that when you apply the preferential tariff you have a lower rate than under the old tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That only shows how thoroughly fair I am putting these items in. I am putting a fair statement before the House. There are a

STATEMENT showing the Old Tariff Rate, the New General Tariff Rate, the Preferential Tariff Rate to the 30th June, 1898, and the Preferential Tariff Rate from 1st July, 1898, on certain principal articles :

No. of Present Tariff Item.	Articles.	Old Tariff Rate.	General Present Tariff.	Preferential Tariff to 30th June, 1898.	Preferential Tariff from 1st July, 1898.
	Clothing, ready-made, and wearing apparel of every description, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, N. O. P., &c.....	5c. p. lb. and 30 p. c.	35 p. c.	30½ p. c.	26¼ p. c.
397	Carpets, Brussels.....	30 p. c. ...	35 "	30½ "	26¼ "
	" tapestry.....	35 "	30 "	26¼ "	22½ "
26	Pearline and other soap powders	40c. p. brl.....	25c. p. brl.....		
47	Cornmeal.....	15c. p. bush.....	12c. p. bush.....		
55	Wheat.....	75c. p. brl.....	60c. p. brl.....		
56	" flour.....				
152	Surgical belts and trusses, and suspensory bandages of all kinds	25 p. c.	20 p. c.	17½ p. c.	15 p. c.
153	Surgical and dental instruments (not being furniture) and surgical needles.....	15 p. c.	10 p. c.	Free from 1st January, 1898.	
171	Lubricating oils, composed wholly or in part of petroleum, costing less than twenty-five cents per gallon.....	6c. per gall..	5c. per gall..		
199	School writing slates.....	30 p. c.	25 p. c.	21½ p. c.	18¼ p. c.
245	Stove plates, stoves of all kinds, sad or smoothing, hatters' and tailors' irons, &c.....	27½ "	25 "	21½ "	18¼ "
248	Cast iron pipe of every description	\$10 per ton but not less than 35 p. c.	\$8 00 pe. ton..	\$7 00 per ton..	\$6 00 per ton
255	Iron or steel cut nails and spikes (ordinary builders'); and railroad spikes.....	¾c. per lb..	½c. per lb..	7c. per lb..	¾c. per lb.
257	Wire nails of all kinds, N.O.P....	10c. "	¾c. "	2½c. "	¾c. "
288	Files and rasps N.E.S.....	35 p. c.	30 p. c.	26¼ p. c.	22½ p. c.
289	Adzes, cleavers, hatchets.....	35 "			
	Saws.....	32½ "			
	Hammers, cantdogs, picks, mattocks, anvils, vices and tools of all kinds for hand or machine use.....	35 "	30 "	26¼ "	22½ "
363	White cotton embroideries.....	30 "	25 "	21½ "	18¼ "
433	Binder twine or twine for harvest binders of hemp, jute, manilla or sisal, and of manilla and sisal mixed.....	12½c. "	10 "	till 1st Jan., 1898 and then free.	
469	Tailors', milliners' and mantle-makers' fashion plates.....	6c. per lb. and 20 p. c.	Free.		
479	Artificial limbs.....	20 "	"		
588	Cream separators.....	27½ "	"		
617	Brass trimmings for bedsteads....	30 "	"		
627	Wire of zinc.....	25 "	"		
633	Zinc in plates.....	25 "	"		

I am afraid that I have wearied the House by reading that long list, but I think it was necessary, in view of the criticisms that have been offered, to show that we have

made, if not all the reforms that we desired, a very extended tariff reform and one which I am sure the country will appreciate.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Has appreciated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Has appreciated, my hon. friend says, and I accept the amendment.

The most striking feature of the tariff policy of last session was the preferential tariff. That policy was designed chiefly to bring about preferential trade with the mother country, and I am sure the House will agree with me when I say that that portion of our tariff policy has been successful beyond measure, and has given Canada a world-wide fame. When I say this I do not forget that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, not many days ago, stated that that policy had been a complete failure. I do not know whether my hon. friend wished us to take that remark seriously. But if we are to treat it seriously for a moment, let us consider what grounds he has for that statement. In order that he might give himself some apparent ground, my hon. friend had to create a policy in his own imagination in order that he might have one much easier to attack. He says, addressing the members on this side of the House: "You told the House that you were going to establish preferential trade with the mother country, you said you could do it, you said you would do it, you said you knew all about it, that you had not any doubt about it and you were going to do it; but you did not do it, therefore your policy is a complete failure." That in substance was the statement of my hon. friend not many days ago. Now, what was the attitude of the Government on this question last year? Was it described correctly by my hon. friend? Did we say we knew all about this matter, that we were going to give preferential trade, that there were no doubts and no difficulties, and that we were sure to do it? No, Sir, every fair-minded man knows that that is not a correct description of what occurred in this House.

What we did say was this: That while we knew well that the Belgian and German treaties had for years been regarded as standing in the way of any such arrangement, we felt that the issue respecting these treaties had never been fairly and properly tried out before the British Government; we felt that the moment had arrived when we should challenge the position that was taken on that question, to see if something could not be done to bring about a change for the better. I have stated that we knew that the Belgian and German treaties appeared to stand in the way, but we felt the time had come when we could present the question before Her Majesty's Government in a new form. In the first place, there was room for argument, and we did argue, that inasmuch as

Mr. FIELDING.

the Belgian and German treaties had never been ratified by the Parliament of Canada, or by the legislatures of the province of Canada, or by any particular legislation anywhere, there was fair ground for contending that those treaties could not be made to apply to a self-governing colony like Canada. We had to take the position, in Canada's interest and as the advocates of Canada, that it was our duty to put forward every argument we could put forward in favour of and in support of our claim. We had presented the question to the House in a form not confined to preferential trade with the mother country alone. We presented our proposition to Parliament in the form of an offer to extend preferential trade to such countries as might be willing to extend equal advantages to us. There was a reciprocal condition in the treaty which opened a new question, new at all events as regards Canada and the mother country. There had been no previous proposal on such lines, and therefore we felt there was room for argument, and we were bound to argue, that new conditions that existed enabled us to question whether those treaties would have the effect which hon. gentlemen opposite in this House said they had. We went on to contend, and we did contend, that even if Belgium and Germany were standing in the way, as they had been standing in the way in the past, the new conditions that were imported into the question since the offer was made to other countries, even to Belgium and Germany, if they were prepared to avail themselves of the offer, placed Canada in a position which Her Majesty's Government should consider. We were well aware that these were debatable subjects, that some of them in times past had been the subject of difficulties; we knew there were doubts and difficulties surrounding them; and we further knew that Her Majesty's Government, in dealing with foreign nations, would always be disposed to interpret treaties in a very liberal spirit to the contracting parties; but knowing all these facts, we nevertheless felt that we were bound as the advocates of Canada to put forward every claim which could be put forward in its behalf. That was the position the Government took, and that was the position which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took in this House, and which he took outside of this House, and as an advocate of Canada he was bound to put forward every claim he could in order to sustain Canadian interests.

In order to show that this was the position we took, that we knew there were doubts, that we did not take the position which hon. gentlemen opposite say we took, I am going to ask the House to bear with me while I read a quotation from my Budget Speech of last year, and I read it because I desire to show that from the beginning the position we took was this, not that there were no doubts, not that the course was clear, but that doubts and diffi-

culties prevailed, and that we were resolved to go forward with the firm conviction that even though the views we held could not be sustained by Her Majesty's Government, the outcome of the whole matter would be to present the Belgian and German treaties in a new light and one which was likely to bring about good results. Speaking at the time when I was asking the adoption of this new policy, I used the following language:—

Now, I shall not undertake to pass any judgment upon this very important question of the most-favoured-nation clauses of these Imperial treaties. It is an international question, and it is well that we should reserve our final judgment upon it. We recognize that it is a question upon which we shall ultimately have to consult with Her Majesty's Government, and I need not say that any view that may be taken by Her Majesty's Government will be considered by the Government of Canada with the respect that is due to any representation that might be made upon any subject, but above all, on the question of an international character. I say that it does not seem fair and reasonable that we should be obliged, while we are offering certain terms not to Great Britain only, but to all countries which will place themselves in the same position—it does not seem to be fair and reasonable that we should be obliged to extend the privileges of this schedule, which we call a reciprocal tariff, to nations which are not willing to do anything in return.

I admit there may be difficulties in the way. It may be possible that the view we take of this matter is not the correct view, but we say it is only fair and reasonable in the interests of Canada, in the interests of fair trade between ourselves and Great Britain, that we should to-day take the position that the favoured-nation clauses do not apply;—

I regret that I have mislaid for the moment the page on which I have extended the balance of the sentence.

Mr. DAVIN. It is as follows:—

—and that this resolution, which I put upon the Table of the House, will only extend to such countries as are prepared to give admission to our products under fair terms.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will proceed with the reading, because it is very good sense.

Mr. DAVIN. Sir Charles Tupper then said—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At that stage of the discussion the leader of the Opposition exchanged a few words with me in which he took the ground that the treaty in express terms stood in our way. I continue the quotation:

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Even if it does, the world moves, and possibly the step we are taking to-night may have the effect—and that may be one of the advantages of it—of drawing the attention of Her Majesty's Government and of the English public to the position of those treaties, and thus opening up the question. Meantime, Sir, recognizing the difficulties, recognizing the possibilities that our judg-

ment may be mistaken, and recognizing the obligations we may owe as part of the Empire, we intend for the present to take the view that inasmuch as we offer these conditions to other nations, if they do not see fit to accept them, the responsibility rests upon them and not upon Canada.

From these passages, Mr. Speaker, it will be seen that from the beginning we recognized the debatable character of the subject, and the doubts and difficulties which were before us; and we went forward, not with the assurance that the views which we had advanced would in all respects prevail, but that even if our interpretation of the treaties should not be upheld, we should place the question before the public in such a manner as would show most effectually the objectionable character of the Belgian and German treaties.

True, Sir, the hon. leader of the Opposition said from the beginning that there was no ground whatever for our contention, and that no good could come from our action. But better authorities than he admitted that the grounds we had taken demanded grave consideration. A great organ of British opinion, usually well informed in Imperial and colonial matters, the London "Times," emphatically declared that it was doubtful whether these treaties applied to such a case as was created by the action of Canada. Her Majesty's Ministers in London deemed the position taken by our Government so important that they reserved their judgment until the question could be fully argued before the law officers of the Crown.

Our views were presented to Her Majesty's Ministers and to the law officers and to the British public by my hon. friends the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, assisted in the legal argument by Hon. Edward Blake. Sir, what was the result? The Imperial authorities held that under the treaties in question Germany and Belgium were entitled to receive in the British colonies the same tariff conditions as were available to Great Britain.

Well, Sir, if the matter had ended there, if that were the whole story, undoubtedly my hon. friends opposite would be in a position to tell us that our policy had borne no good fruit. But we all know that the matter did not end there. While these negotiations were going on, while arguments were being heard before the law officers of the Crown in England, as to the position of Canada under these treaties, a great public opinion was being created in the United Kingdom and throughout the Empire which became a potent factor in settling this question. For the first time the people of England were made to fully understand what these treaties meant, and how they stood as a barrier between the mother country and her colonies. Public men in this country had been talking of preferential trade for years, but they had never got beyond the stage of talking. If we had followed on the same

lines no doubt we would have been equally unsuccessful as others had been in disturbing the objectionable treaties. If we had continued to make speeches on preferential trade, and to pass meaningless resolutions which could accomplish nothing. I have no doubt we should have failed in removing the barriers which stood in our way, and I have no doubt we should have gone on for years without accomplishing any substantial result. Efforts have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite to make it appear that we could have obtained preferential duties in the British markets in return for our concessions, if we demanded such. It has been said by these hon. gentlemen that my right hon. friend the leader of the Government had opportunities when he was in England of receiving what are called better terms from the mother country, and that he failed to take advantage of these opportunities; indeed it is said that he refused offers which it is alleged had been made to him.

I believe, Sir, for my part that every man who has had opportunities of sounding public opinion in England on this subject realizes that there was no ground whatever for expecting such preferential terms as we are told we should have demanded. I do not believe that any intelligent man will say candidly to-day, that there is any probability in the immediate or early future of the British people adopting a policy of preferential trade on the terms mentioned by my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Nor on any terms.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Fraser) says "nor on any terms," but I will not go so far as that. I will however go this far, and I will say that upon the terms which hon. gentlemen opposite talked preferential trade, there is not and never was a ghost of a chance of Great Britain accepting it. I believe that every man who has gone to England and has met public men there, and has met the representatives of the press, and has got down among the masses of the people, must realize the fact that you cannot get the masses of the English people to impose differential duties for the benefit of the colonies. There is a cardinal point in respect to these duties which reaches the masses very quickly. The first step is a movement of preferential trade of that sort must of necessity look towards the imposition of duties on grain; a renewal of what are called in England the old Corn Laws. I ventured to discuss this phase of the subject in my remarks a year ago, and I shall ask the House to bear with me while I read a brief extract from what I then said. These were my opinions then:

This question of preferential trade has been mentioned in the House in times past. Leading public men have advocated preferential trade, but always annexing to their suggestions a demand with which it was well known England

Mr. FIELDING.

could not comply. All the advocates of preferential trade, at all events all who have taken an active part in that movement, have assumed that as the first step, England must consent to put a duty on grain. We know that England does not view that project with favour. We know that no more unpopular project can be offered the English people than to ask them to put a duty on breadstuffs. It may be, as time rolls on, and at an early day, they may change their views. It may be that they may see it in their interest to make this distinction, and they may offer some preferential terms to the grain of Canada. If they can be induced to do that by fair argument, I have no doubt it will be a good thing for Canada. But why should we wait for England to take action? England has dealt generously with us in the past. England has given us a larger degree of liberty perhaps than is possessed by any other country on the face of the earth. She has given us liberty to tax her wares even when she admits our goods free, and we have taxed them to an enormous degree. Why should we wait for England to do more? Somebody must make a move in this matter, and we propose that Canada shall lead the way.

As a gauge of the public sentiment in England I believed that these words were true on the 22nd of April last, and I believe they will be found to be equally true to-day. There was no prospect then; there is no prospect now that the English people will agree to tax their bread to please the Canadian people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not say that such a thing is impossible. On the contrary, I admit it is within the bounds of possibility, though by no means likely to come in the near future.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I venture to say, with the fullest confidence, that if such a policy is to be adopted by the mother country, it will not be brought about by any huckstering policy on the part of Canada, or on the part of any of the colonies making demands of an unreasonable character; but it will come as the result of a grand Imperial sentiment which will override all questions of an economic nature. I repeat, that if such a policy is to come it will come as the fruit of the growth of an Imperial sentiment, and nothing that has occurred in colonial history has done so much to create and develop that sentiment as the very measure which the Parliament of Canada placed on the Statute-books of this country last year.

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

After Recess.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock I had been discussing for a few minutes the question of preferential trade, with some reference to the denunciation of

the Belgian and German treaties, and also with particular reference to the views on preferential trade which are sometimes expressed by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. In order to show the views which the Government entertained last year on that subject, I had taken the liberty of quoting a passage from my own speech. It had been represented occasionally—and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister had been particularly attacked on that score—that the Government of Canada, in return for concessions granted to Great Britain, could and should have obtained certain preferential advantages in the British market. I had quoted from my remarks of last session to show that the view which the Government entertained of that question was that, owing to the strong opinion known to prevail in the mother country on the question of protective duties generally, but particularly on the question of protective duties affecting articles of food, there was no reasonable ground for believing that any such preferential terms could have been obtained in the British market.

What was it that moved the British public as the British public had never been moved before by a colonial legislative enactment? It was that the Government and Parliament of Canada, not demanding impossible conditions, not asking things which they knew or should know the British public were not prepared to grant, not raising any demand of an unreasonable character, not trying to have any huckstering or bargaining in the transaction, but in a free and generous spirit, in recognition of the liberal manner in which England has always treated her colonies, had not been content to talk preferential trade, but had acted preferential trade. It was because Canada had thrown open the door, and had declared that at every custom-house, from ocean to ocean, the goods of the mother country should be admitted on terms of preferential trade. It was when that step was taken that the great heart of the English people was moved on this subject; and so, when the moment arrived when the Imperial authorities were obliged by the terms of the German and Belgian treaties to declare that they were not at liberty to accept the conditions of preferential trade which we offered—when the English people found that Canada had opened the door of her custom-houses in the manner I have described, and that by the conditions of those treaties the Imperial Government were obliged to close the door and refuse the offer—then the British people understood, as they had never understood before, the true character of those treaties, and thus there was secured the public opinion which enabled Her Majesty's Government to take the step from which in former years they had been obliged to shrink. I pointed out, Sir, that if we had simply failed to sustain our ground with respect to the application

of the Belgian and German treaties, that the reciprocal character of our tariff entitled us to claim that the treaties did not apply, and that had been the whole story, there would have been some ground for the claim of hon. gentlemen opposite that our tariff policy in that respect had not been a success. But when we were able to show, as a direct and immediate result of the step which Canada had taken, that the denunciation of those treaties, which had been sought by the colonies for so long a time without success, was brought about, then I say the Government of Canada had a splendid vindication of the policy they had pursued on that question. We all know, Sir, with what joy the view taken by the Government of Canada was received by the English people. We know that while the Government of Canada was backed up, and promptly backed up, by the action of the sister colonies, it was backed up still more strongly by British public opinion; and but for that public opinion, which I claim was the direct outcome of the Canadian policy itself, those Belgian and German treaties would not have been denounced down to the present moment.

I have spoken of the effect of the Belgian and German treaties on our movement for preferential trade; and now I must say something with regard to another class of treaties, those commonly called favoured-nation treaties. Great Britain has treaties with many nations, containing what is called the favoured-nation clause, by the terms of which it is declared that if at any time Great Britain should grant to any third power any commercial advantages, she shall be obliged to grant those advantages likewise to the contracting power. When, therefore, by the action of Her Majesty's Government, it was determined that the Belgian and German treaties must apply to Canada, and that we must admit Belgian and German goods on terms as favourable as the goods of England, then it followed that by the terms of the favoured-nation treaties, we were obliged to concede like advantages to every one of the nations which had a treaty of that kind with the mother country. I have here a statement showing the several countries which have been brought under the operation of the Canadian preferential tariff:

Countries admitted by the reciprocal character of their tariff: New South Wales, British India, Netherlands, Japan.

Countries admitted under the Belgian and German treaties: Belgium and Germany.

Countries admitted under the favoured-nation treaties: France, Algeria and the French Colonies; Argentina, Austria, Hungary, Bolivia, Columbia, Denmark, Persia, Russia, Sweden and Norway, Tunis, Venezuela, Switzerland, Liberia, Morocco, Salvador, South African Republic, Tonga, Spain.

The case of France, Algeria and the French colonies was governed by our own Franco-Canadian Treaty, which had, of course,

received the approval of the Canadian Parliament. In the other cases, the favoured-nation treaties had never received the approval of the Canadian Parliament; but they were nevertheless held to apply to Canada. Thus it will be seen that the preference which we wished to give and which we actually did give for several months to Great Britain, had to be extended to the countries I have named; and we refunded to importers duties which had been collected in the interim upon goods from those several countries.

But all this will come to an end at a very early day. At the end of July in the present year the Belgian and German treaties will expire. Canada will not then be obliged to give the preference to either Belgium or Germany.

With the fall of the treaties, the claims of other nations, under the favoured-nation treaties, to receive equal advantages will also fall. Canada will then be free to confine the benefits of her preferential tariff to the mother country and to such colonies as, in the judgment of Canada, should be admitted. That is, Mr. Speaker, what we can do, and that is precisely what I shall have the honour of proposing to the House. Under the terms of the preferential tariff, as it now stands, the second reduction of 12½ per cent, making 25 per cent in all, will take effect on the first of July next. For the moment, it will be necessary for us to give that greater reduction, not only to Great Britain, but to the various nations I have mentioned, because the treaties do not expire until the last day of July. We propose to repeal the section of the law and the schedule dealing with the preferential tariff. We propose that that repeal shall take effect on the first of August next, which will be the day when Canada will no longer be bound by the Belgian and German treaties, and we propose to substitute for the existing law on the subject a new section and schedule, in accordance with the statement I have made. This new section and this new schedule will provide that the preferential tariff shall, in the first place, apply to the products of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and also that it shall apply to the products of any British colony or possession, the tariff of which is deemed to be favourable to the trade of Canada. Under this provision, new South Wales and British India will be admitted, as they now are to the benefits of the preferential tariff. There will be a further provision respecting the operation of the preferential tariff, to which I shall refer as I proceed.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. gentleman kindly say how the denunciation of the Belgian and German treaties affect the favoured-nation clause with regard to other countries?

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. By the favoured-nation clause we are obliged, as part of the Empire, to give to any country having a favoured-nation treaty with Great Britain any privilege which may be granted to any third power. Belgium and Germany are third powers within the meaning of these words. Therefore, when we were obliged, by the decision of the Imperial authorities, to give the privileges of the tariff to Belgium and Germany, these being third powers as respects all other nations, the favoured-nation treaties began to apply, and we had to extend the advantages to the several countries as well.

Mr. McNEILL. I think I did not make my question quite clear to my hon. friend. I was not asking with regard to Belgium and Germany, but with regard to other countries. For example, Holland had a right to come in under our reciprocal offer; would not all other nations having the favoured-nation clause in their treaties have the right to come in as soon as Holland was admitted, irrespective of Belgium and Germany altogether?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I see the hon. gentleman's point now. The point is, that having admitted Holland, we would be obliged, even irrespective of the German and Belgian treaties, to admit the other nations as well. That would be quite correct, but we could easily have refused to admit the goods of Holland, and then there would be no trouble. But we could not refuse to admit the goods of Belgium and Germany with the same freedom as we could the goods of Holland.

Mr. McNEILL. Does the hon. gentleman say that he could, in the face of his reciprocal offer of last session, have refused admission to the goods of Holland?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That, possibly, is a question upon which legal gentlemen might differ. I am strongly inclined to think that there was a measure of discretion remaining in the hands of the Government on that question. I will not say, however, that the question is beyond debate. I think, perhaps, there is room to doubt whether or not we were obliged to admit the goods of Holland. However that may be, Holland received the benefit of the doubt, and we did admit her goods. The hon. gentleman is quite right in stating that the moment any foreign nation, no matter by what method, received the benefits of our preferential clause, we were then obliged, under the Imperial decision to give every other nation having the favoured-nation clause in its treaty the same advantages.

I wish now to say something with regard to changes which may be deemed necessary in the present tariff. The Government have been gratified, and exceedingly gratified, by the manner in which the tariff policy of last

year has been received by the country. We believe that that policy has given unbounded satisfaction. We did not make the mistake, and we do not make the mistake now, of supposing that the tariff is perfect. There are duties in it which are higher than some of us would like them to be. There are duties which we hope will not remain for ever or for a very long time. There has been, however, a very general recognition among the friends of the Government of the fact that, in a matter of this kind, it is necessary that we should proceed in the spirit of compromise. It was realized that, in a large question, affecting such a wide area of country, with so many conflicting interests, we could only hope to work out the details of the tariff by giving and taking, as respects the different sections of the country. It was recognized by the people that we ought to avoid, as we did, such radical changes as might be calculated to seriously disturb the business of the country. All these considerations, into which the Government were bound to enter, and which influenced the policy of the Government to a considerable extent, have been recognized by the public at large. I believe the people are reasonable in that respect, and will not ask us to make at once that which would be a radical change, and that which might have a disturbing influence on business. I think it will be admitted that frequent tariff changes are not desirable. Something in the nature of tariff stability is much to be desired. It is better, even, that we should bear with some inequalities that may exist, than suffer the greater evils which would arise from frequent tariff changes. We have had representations made by a number of interests which, they think, ought to receive more consideration. Some of these presented cases which have, to some extent, commended them to our judgment, and if we were opening up the general revision of the tariff, or a revision to any considerable extent, we would be able to lend a willing ear to some of the representations that have been made to us. But we think, Sir, on the whole, believing as we do that the changes in the tariff should not be numerous or frequent, believing that we should have a large measure of tariff stability, believing that the public understand the policy of the Government in this respect and will be content to have us carry it out in that spirit of moderation and caution that we have so far evinced, we wish to announce to the House that it is not our intention to make any numerous changes in the tariff at the present session. In fact, I may state that, so far as the rates of duty are concerned we have only one change to announce. There are some other changes which are more matters of form than of substance. The preferential tariff will have to be amended in the direction I have already indicated. We think it is expedient to make a change that is purely

technical in the section of the law relating to prohibited goods. As respects the duty on raw leaf tobacco, which we imposed a year ago, we propose that, after the 1st July next, it shall be collected through the Department of Excise instead of through the Department of Customs. It has been arranged that in the Excise Department the duty shall be collected on a basis on what is called in the Inland Revenue Department the standard weight. Under the existing law, tobacco is dutiable on the weight when it passes through the customs. Arrangements have been made by some of the large manufacturers to dry tobacco before it passes out of the warehouse, so that they do not pay on the moist weight. Other manufacturers, not being so well able to do that, are obliged to pay on the moist weight. It seems only fair and equitable that we should treat all alike, and when it is to be dealt with by the Excise Department, that the regulations of that department should be adopted in the matter. With regard to the duties on tobacco, which were increased last year to a considerable extent, I am free to say that I have doubts that this is as wise a measure as we hoped it would prove. I may say frankly that I am afraid it has led to an increase of smuggling to a very considerable extent, and we may well consider, at a future day, whether or not we can successfully enforce so high a scale of duty. However, the law in that respect has been in force for a very short time, and we think it only reasonable to give it a fairer trial before we condemn it. So we do not propose to make any change with regard to tobacco except as I have just announced.

But, Sir, while it is a good thing to avoid what is called tariff tinkering, there is just a possibility that in condemning that practice we may go too far. I find that tariff tinkering is an expression which means different things in the minds of different men. A man who is quite satisfied with the tariff thinks that any interference with it is tinkering, whereas a man who is not satisfied thinks that some change such as he desires would be high statesmanship. We wish to guard against frequent changes in the tariff, against tariff tinkering, but let us be careful how we convey the impression to the public, because we do not mean it, that we regard the tariff as final. Let it not be supposed that the tariff is settled for ten years or even for five years. So long as there are high duties, there must be demands for tariff changes. Nothing is settled until it is settled in accordance with right, and so long as there are high duties, we may expect agitation for reduction. I am afraid there is no rest for the protected manufacturer. I am inclined to think, Sir, that he will find eternal vigilance to be the price of his protection. He must be on guard all the time against the attack that he knows must always come. So long as

there are high duties, there will also be consumers to protest against them, and I think that the manufacturers will show the best understanding of their own position, and best consult the permanent interests of manufacturing enterprises, if they will realize that very important fact. It is well, if they are to-day in a position which affords them some comfort and advantage, that they should apply their time and use their opportunity to get their business upon such a basis that it will be as little as possible dependent upon tariff aid. The tendency of a high tariff policy is to lead men to look too much to tariff and too little to the efforts they should make for the benefit of their business. What a world of good might have been accomplished for the true interests of manufacturing in the Dominion of Canada, if all the time, and all the energy, and all the labour, and all the money that have been expended in the last twenty years in tariff watching and tariff wire-pulling at Ottawa, had been expended in the factories, in the development of business, in new invention and discovery, in producing labour-saving machinery, in learning what might be done with waste products, in dealing with all those forms of industrial progress which have to be dealt with by the manufacturer when he has keen competition. We would, therefore, say to the manufacturer that if he desires permanency in the tariff, he must never expect permanency until the tariff gets down to a moderate point; and to-day there are duties in the tariff so high that I am sure the Government are not prepared to treat them as part of a permanent tariff. I say this, Sir, in no spirit but that of friendliness to the manufacturing interests. While the manufacturers are in a fairly good position to-day, it would be a mistake for them to fail to realize the fact that Canada has turned her face away from a high tariff policy, and though we may proceed slowly, whatever progress we make from this time forward must be and should be in the direction of greater freedom of trade.

Hon. gentlemen have already observed that in the Imperial Parliament the Colonial Secretary, the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, made some reference to negotiations that were taking place between the Dominion of Canada, United States and the West Indies with regard to reciprocal trade. These negotiations, so far as Canada is concerned, have not gone very far, and we have not much to communicate to the House concerning them. But we are of opinion that, without waiting for the completion of these negotiations, without waiting for the development of all that is likely to arise in connection with that subject, there are opportunities opening to us to-day of which we should take advantage to enlarge the trade between Canada and the West Indies. We think that something of this kind should be attempted in the interest of Canadian trade, because there are large opportunities of

Mr. FIELDING.

development in that quarter. There are a million and three-quarters of people in the British West Indies, if we include Bermuda, who are our natural customers, with whom we should have more extended trade relations. When we remember that of the 330,000,000 pounds of sugar consumed in the Dominion of Canada, only 25,500,000 pounds come from the British West Indies, our natural customers, and that the remainder comes from other countries, largely from continental nations which supply us with beet sugar and take little or nothing from us, I think the House will agree with me that we ought to desire an extension of our trade with the West Indies and to consume to a larger extent the products of that country. If we were to put aside all other considerations, the advantages of trade with that country appeal so strongly to us that I am sure the House would desire us to make some special effort to extend our business in that quarter.

But there is another consideration which we may well take into our minds. The West India question to-day is one of the great problems of the Empire. In the olden days when sugar was king, when cane sugar was in great demand and at high price, the West India colonies were among the most prosperous colonies of the Empire. But times have changed in that respect, to some extent, and the West Indies are suffering to-day from a very severe depression. What the causes of that depression are, may possibly be a subject of contention, to some extent. It is alleged that the depression is the result of a failure on the part of the West India planters to live up to the times, and to improve their methods of growing and their methods of treating sugar. I give that as one reason which is sometimes alleged against them, not that I endorse the opinion. There is no doubt whatever that another condition has operated very largely against them, and that is the development of the beet sugar industry, particularly in the case of the continental nations where bounties are given. The West Indies claim that as respects the conflict between cane sugar and beet sugar, the West Indies could hold their own but for the difficulty which is created by the bounty system of Europe, notably of the various continental nations. Just how far that is correct is perhaps a matter upon which none of us can give a conclusive opinion. What we do know, however, is that these million and a half to a million and three-quarters of people in those islands, are suffering a very severe depression. Their finances are in a bad position, the business of the islands is in a bad position, the condition of the West Indies is at this moment a very serious subject to the people of the colonies, and a very grave problem for the Imperial Government and the Imperial Parliament. So keenly has this matter been felt of late, that a few months ago a royal commission was appointed by Her Majesty

to inquire into the condition of the British West India colonies. That commission was composed of General Sir Henry Norman, Chairman, Sir David Barbour and Sir Edward Grey. These gentlemen made a very exhaustive inquiry into the condition of the West Indies, and they reached conclusions, some of which were unanimous, and some of which were matters of division. It was agreed that the financial position of the West Indies was so embarrassed that the Imperial Government would have to grant aid in the way of loans and grants for public works, and that, I may say, is being done at this moment by measures which are before the Imperial Parliament. The chairman of the commission, Sir Henry Norman, went further. He claimed that they were not likely to be successful in dealing with the West India question unless they were prepared to adopt a policy of countervailing duties, that is to say, that wherever a continental nation granted a bounty upon its beet sugar, there should be a countervailing duty upon that sugar if imported into Great Britain. That subject has been very much discussed in Great Britain. I do not think the advocates of countervailing duties there are very numerous, but they are certainly very intelligent, able and influential, and an impression existed in the minds of many people that Her Majesty's Government would yield to the recommendation of Sir Henry Norman and establish countervailing duties. However, any doubt that might have existed on that score has been removed of late by a speech delivered at Liverpool by the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Chamberlain. In that speech he indicated that the British Government were not prepared to accept the remedy of countervailing duties, but that they would seek in other ways to assist the position of the West Indies. I have already stated that measures are before the Imperial Parliament now to give aid in the shape of grants and loans for public works. It is also the desire of Her Majesty's Government to assist the West Indies in other ways. Efforts are be-

ing made to induce the West India people in some of the islands to give up the growing of sugar, and devote their attention to other products which it is thought the islands will successfully produce and no doubt something will be done in that direction. While the production of sugar has been steadily falling off, the production of other articles, chiefly fruits, has been very largely extended. Still, sugar is and must be the chief product of the West Indies for the present and for a long time to come; and unless there can be a profitable market for the sugar of the West Indies, I am afraid there is not very much hope of the relief which the West Indies desire being obtained. Knowing as we do that Her Majesty's Government are following this question very closely, knowing that they are dealing with a serious problem in the face of many difficulties, it has occurred to us that, as the West Indies are our natural market, as they are British colonies, though far away in one respect, colonies with which we have close relations, that we have some Imperial responsibilities in this matter—it has occurred to us that we should be willing in a small way to lend a helping hand to those colonies in the sunny south. If we adhere too rigidly to the underlying feature of our preferential tariff, I am afraid we shall have to admit that the terms of the tariffs of the West Indies are not favourable to us, and perhaps we could not by a mere reciprocal clause extend the preferential tariff to the West Indies.

We have examined the tariff of the West Indies, and we find that while they are high tariffs to a considerable extent, they are in no sense protective tariffs. The duties imposed are largely on food products, and these, as we can well understand, are the very things that Canada might hope to sell. I have here a statement which I shall summarize, if my hon. friends will permit me to do so, showing the operation of these West India tariffs on some of the chief products of Canada:

STATEMENT showing the Import duty levied by the undermentioned British Colonies (British W. Indies, British Guiana and Bermuda), on the various articles as given below :—

	Coal.	Flour.	Oats.	Potatoes.	Butter.	Cheese.	Codfish—dry, salted.	Planks and boards.
Jamaica	Free.....	8s. per brl... ..	3d. per bush... ..	Free	1d. per lb.	1d. per lb.	3s. 6d. per 100 lbs	9s. per 1,000 ft.
The Bahamas.	"	2s. 6d. per brl... ..	"	2s. per brl	20 p. c.	12s. 6d. per 100 lbs	4s. per 100 lbs...	10s. per 1,000 ft.
Trinidad and Tobago.....	"	3s. 4d. "	"	Free	1d. per lb.	1d. per lb.	Free	8s. 4d. per 1,000 ft
Grenada	"	4s. "	"	"	1d. "	7½ p. c.	1s. per 100 lbs...	10s. per 1,000 ft
Barbados	2s. 6d. per ton ..	4s. 2d. "	9d. per 100 lbs.. ..	"	8s. 4d. per 100 lbs	8s. 4d. per 100 lbs	1s. 6d. per 112 lbs	5s. per 1,000 ft.
St. Vincent.....	£10 per £100 value	4s. "	4d. per bush... ..	"	1d. per lb.	1d. "	1s. per 100 lbs...	*
St. Lucia	6d. per ton.....	4s. "	4d. "	"	2d. "	1d. "	2s. per cwt.....	†
Dominica	5s. "	6s. "	"	"	10s. per 100 lbs..	8s. 4d. per 100 lbs	8s. 4d. per cwt..	‡
Montserrat	2s. "	5s. "	"	1s. 6d. per brl... ..	8s. 4d. per 100 lbs	8s. 4d. "	1s. 6d. "	§
Antigua	2s. "	5s. "	"	1s. 6d. "	8s. 4d. "	8s. 4d. "	1s. 6d. "	§
St. Christopher (St. Kitts).	2s. 1d. per ton ..	4s. 6d. "	"	1s. 6d. "	8s. 4d. "	8s. 4d. "	1s. 6d. "	§
Bermuda.....	Free.....	15 p. c.	15 p. c.	15 p. c.	15 p. c.	15 p. c.	15 p. c.	15 p. c.
British Guiana	50c. per ton loose, 32c. p. hogshead	\$1.00 per brl... ..	4c. per lb.	Free.....	2 cts. per lb.	2 cts. per lb.	50 cts. per 112 lbs	\$3.00 per 1000 ft.

* Spruce and white pine, 5s. per 1,000 ft.; pitch pine, 10s. per 1,000 ft.; all other kinds, 12s. 6d. per 1,000 ft.

† Pitch pine, rough or prepared for buildings, 16s. per 1,000 ft.; white pine and spruce, 10s. per 1,000 ft.

‡ Pitch pine, 12s. 6d. per 1,000 ft.; hard woods, £1 0s. 10d. per 1,000 ft.; white pine and spruce and all soft woods, 8s. 4d. per 1,000 ft.

§ Pitch pine, 8s. 4d. per 1,000 ft.; hard woods, £1 0s. 10d. per 1,000 ft.; white pine and spruce, 6s. 3d. per 1,000 ft.

I think it cannot be contended that in any case these are protective duties. They are not designed to exclude the products of Canada, or indeed to exclude the products of any country, but those people find that the necessities of their revenue oblige them to tax food products very heavily. Therefore, as I said a moment ago, were we to apply too rigidly the principle of our preferential tariff to those colonies, I am inclined to think we could not properly admit them to the benefit of that tariff. Nevertheless, in view of the condition of affairs which exists there to-day, in view of our own desire to extend our trade relations with the West Indies, in view of the difficulties which are presented in the treatment of the question by Her Majesty's Government, and with a desire to assist in some small and modest way in working out these great and difficult problems, we propose that without waiting for anything further, without demanding concessions from our West India friends which their needs might not allow them to grant, without insisting upon a rigid compliance with the conditions, we propose, after the first day of August, when the treaties expire, and when we can give full play to our policy of preferential trade, to extend that policy to all the British colonies in the West Indies.

The principal imports to be expected from the West Indies will of course be sugar, but we may expect other things, and notably fruits. On the other hand, we should be able largely to increase our sales of Canadian products to those islands. The maritime provinces have long carried on a trade with those islands, chiefly in fish and lumber, though other products have been sold as well. If we increase our purchases of West India sugars, as we hope to do, there is no reason to doubt that our exports in these lines will be increased. But, Sir, we do not think this trade should be confined to the maritime provinces; there does not seem to be any reason why the products of the province of Ontario and the great west should not find a large market in the West Indies. If we look into the statistics of the islands we will find that the West Indies are large consumers of food products such as we raise in Canada, but we find that the bulk of those products are being received from the United States. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce says, through the United States. There is something in that point; but I think the great bulk of the food products for the West Indies are the products of the United States as well as having been shipped from the United States. There does not seem to be any good reason why the flour, cheese, bacon, ham, lard, butter, and the various articles which the farmers of Ontario and the west produce could not have as fair a chance of sale in the markets of the West Indies as similar products from the United States. There has been a difficulty in the

past, I think, through lack of attention to these markets. Sometimes a merchant, with an unsaleable stock, thinks it a very simple thing to dump it on the West Indies market, and then he complains that he has not made any money on it. You cannot do business in the West Indies or anywhere else in that way. Our producers must realize that in order to sell their goods in the West Indies they must ascertain the conditions of the market and adapt themselves to these conditions. But surely there is no reason why the farmers and merchants of Canada cannot adapt themselves to those markets just as well as the farmers and merchants of the United States. We believe if care be taken to investigate the market, if care be taken in collecting the right articles as to quality, in sending them out at the proper time and in the manner of packing them, taking care that the quality is what the West Indian market wants and the style of package is what is required, there is a fair chance of very considerable extension of Canadian trade in that quarter. For some years we have had two steamship lines running to the West Indies; one from Halifax to Jamaica, and the other from St. John and Halifax to Georgetown, Demerara, which is on the mainland of South America. But the line from Halifax and St. John down to Demerara is by a route involving so many ports of call that by the time the destination is reached the voyage is a very long one, and the importers at the distant points claim they have not the same opportunity to trade with Canada as with the United States. It is very desirable, if it can be accomplished, and though we have no proposal to make on the subject to-day we hope something of the kind will be brought about, that a quick and direct line from Canada, not calling at all these way ports, but calling at Barbadoes, Trinidad and British Guiana, may be established. If attention be given to this trade in the way suggested, we have a strong hope, from inquiries made, that a very considerable trade will be built up in that direction. Whether we are successful in doing so or not, one thing is certain, namely, that the present condition of the West Indies and the Canadian West India trade demands that some effort should be made on these lines, and we think the best we can do for the people of the West Indies is to say: We will give you the benefit of our preferential tariff, without bargain or anything else, and we do not expect you to make very great concessions to us; but if any means can be devised whereby obstacles to Canadian trade can be removed in that quarter, we have no doubt that you, our brother colonists, will meet us in the same spirit as we desire to meet you.

There is another direction in which we think we can do a little to help the people of the West Indies. The present method

of levying the sugar duties in Canada operates unfavourably to the sugar trade with the West Indies. The duty is a flat specific duty of one-half cent per pound on raw sugar. It admits of very large variations and very large injustices. A sugar testing by the polariscope at 75 degrees is worth 86c. per 100 lbs., and 50c. duty represents 58 per cent. Sugar testing 96 degrees is worth \$2.27 per 100 lbs.; 50c. duty represents 22 per cent, as against 58 per cent on the lower grade. I do not pretend that we can have absolute equality in these matters, but it will be admitted that the system of levying duties operates unequally. We had for some years in Canada the polariscope test, and I learn from the customs authorities and from all whom I have asked information, that it worked very well. Then, for several years raw sugar was free. In 1895, $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound was levied. I am not informed, of course, as to what was in the mind of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) when he levied it. It was probably levied in a hurry, without much thought being given to it, and it has operated unfairly. The duty was a small one, and I can readily understand that one might imagine that there could not be very much inequality in applying it. But experience has shown that even with half a cent a pound there is inequality of duty against sugars of the lower grades, and a considerable quantity of the West India sugars is not of high grade.

When we deal with food products generally, it is not desirable to encourage low grades, and for that reason a specific duty on food is advocated by some hon. gentlemen who do not believe in specific duties in other cases; but I call attention to the fact that raw sugar, especially of low grades, is not a food, and is not likely to be eaten. Raw sugar is a raw material which only becomes a food after it is refined, and therefore we have no particular desire to legislate against it. Inasmuch as there is a considerable quantity of low grade sugar, not so low as 75 degrees, but of moderately low grades, on the market, it is not the business of Canada to turn away the trade which this sugar offers. While our tariff is operating in that way, the tariff of the United States is graduated so as to encourage the trade in these low grade sugars. They have adopted the polariscope test, and the effect is to establish a graduated scale of duties whereby low grades pay in proportion to their value. The polariscope system is practically under another name an ad valorem duty; low grade sugar pays its proportion and high grade pays according to its value.

We therefore propose to return to the polariscope system used in Canada so successfully a few years ago. We propose to begin at the limit of 75 degrees by polariscope test and charge for that degree or anything below it a duty of 40c. per 100

Mr. FIELDING.

lbs., and we add $\frac{1}{2}$ c. for each additional degree. The average test of raw sugar used in Canada to-day is, so far as we can obtain information, 92 degrees by the polariscope. That information come from the refiners, who possess the best knowledge; one gave 91 $\frac{1}{2}$ and the other 92 degrees. Assuming that to be the correct average, and applying our new scale of duties to the present consumption of sugar in Canada, we find that on 92-degree sugar the duty will be 65 $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per 100 lbs., as against 50c. per 100 lbs. under the present tariff.

In the early part of my remarks, I stated that in consequence of the reduction we are obliged to make in duties on British imports after 1st July, and to maintain our finances in a strong condition, we want to make some material additions to our revenue in some other quarters, and we propose to do it in the way of making a small increase in the duties on sugar, although the duties we propose will be very much less than those which prevailed in Canada a few years ago. At 92, if we take that as proper standard, the duty shall be 65 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per 100 pounds. But there must be considered in that connection the preferential tariff to which I have referred, and which will take effect as regards the West India sugar after the 1st day of August next. If we apply that preferential tariff to the 65 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per 100 pounds, the quarter of it under the preferential rate will be 16 $\frac{37}{50}$ ths, which will leave the preferential rate at 49 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents as against the existing rate of 50 cents per 100 pounds. That is to say, upon so much of our sugar consumption as we may be able to obtain from the British West Indies under the new order of things there will be no increase, but on the contrary there will be a slight reduction of duty, it being—if the average as given to me is correct—49 $\frac{1}{2}$ as against 50 in the present tariff. But as respects that portion of the sugar which may not come from the West Indies, but which may come from other countries there will of course be the small increase I have mentioned.

Mr. WALLACE. It must be the production of the West Indies; not only sent from there but produced there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, yes; certainly. In the case of fractions of a degree we propose that where a fraction is five-tenths or less it shall not count, but where it is more than five-tenths it shall count as a degree, so that for the purpose of revenue we will have no fractions, not even to the extent of half a degree.

The effect of this upon the revenue is a very difficult question to deal with and we can only guess at it. It depends entirely upon how much sugar may come in under the preferential rate. Upon all sugar that may come in from the West Indies under the preferential rate we will receive no increase whatever, but will receive a little less duty

than under the present tariff ; but for whatever may come in from other countries we will receive an increase to the extent of 15½ cents per 100 pounds. We think it will give us a moderate amount of revenue. One can only guess at how much revenue it will give, because we have no means of knowing as to what proportion of West India sugar will be drawn into our markets by this arrangement. Our hope and desire is that we shall largely increase the consumption of West Indies sugar. As I mentioned a moment ago, our consumption of sugar is 330,000,000 pounds out of which we receive at present only 25,500,000 pounds from the British West Indies and British Guiana, but we trust that the effect of this arrangement may be to largely increase that. If our anticipations in that respect are realized, we will of course get no increase of duty from that source but will actually get a little less. However, upon so much of the sugar as may not come from the West Indies, we will get an increase to the extent of 15½ cents per 100 pounds.

With respect to the duty on refined sugar, we propose to apply the polariscope to that also. In the case of raw sugar we take as our starting point 75 degrees, but in the case of refined sugar we take as a matter of course a higher starting point.

We propose that the duty on refined sugar shall be \$1.08 cents per 100 pounds on sugar testing 88 degrees, or anything below that ; and for every additional degree there will be 1½ cents per 100 pounds added, just as in the case of the duty on raw sugar. On what is called yellow sugar testing 88 degrees, the increase of duty under this arrangement will be 8 cents per 100 pounds ; although the increased duty on the raw material, or so much of it as may come from other countries than the West Indies, will be considerably in excess. If you start at \$1.08 for 88 degrees, and if you add 1½ cents for each degree, you will find that the granulated at 99½ will bear a duty of \$1.24½ per 100 pounds as against the \$1 duty of the present day. That is to say, the increase of the duty on the refined sugar will vary from one-twelfth of a cent per pound on the yellow or soft sugars, running up on granulated as high as 24½ cents per 100 pounds, or practically on the higher and more valuable sugar an increase of a quarter of a cent per pound ; while in the case of the cheaper refined sugars the increase will be about 8 cents per 100 pounds and upwards.

I have now explained all the tariff changes which we propose to make. I want now to read, with your permission, Sir, the new preferential section and schedule :

That it is expedient to provide that section seventeen of "The Customs Tariff, 1897" shall be repealed on and after the first day of August in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, and that the following section shall be substituted therefor :—

17. Articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of any of the following countries may, when imported direct into Canada from any of such countries, be entered for duty or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada at the reduced rate of duty provided in the British preferential tariff, set forth in Schedule "D" to this Act :—

- (a). The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.
- (b). The British Colony of Bermuda.
- (c). The British Colonies commonly called the British West Indies, including the following :—
 - The Bahamas.
 - Jamaica.
 - Turks Island and the Caicos Islands.
 - The Leeward Islands (Antigua, St. Christopher-Nevis, Dominica, Montserrat, and the Virgin Islands).
 - The Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Vincent and St. Lucia).
 - Barbadoes.
 - Trinidad and Tobago.
 - British Guiana.

These colonies are admitted specifically without regard to any reciprocal conditions.

- (d). Any other British colony or possession the customs tariff of which, on the whole, is as favourable to Canada as the British preferential tariff herein referred to is to such colony or possession.

Provided, however, that manufactured articles to be admitted under such preferential tariff shall be bona fide the manufactures of a country or countries entitled to the benefits of such tariff, and that such benefits shall not extend to the importation of articles into the production of which there has not entered a substantial portion of the labour of such countries. Any question that may arise as to any article being entitled to such benefits shall be decided by the Minister of Customs, whose decision shall be final.

2. The Minister of Customs, with the approval of the Governor in Council, shall determine what British colonies or possessions shall be entitled to the benefits of the preferential tariff under clause (d) of this section.

3. The Minister of Customs may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, make such regulations as may be deemed necessary for carrying out the intention of this section.

You will see, Sir, that under the arrangement proposed we admit by name the products of Great Britain and the products of the British colonies in the West Indies ; and then we have a general clause whereby we may admit the products of any other British colony the tariff conditions of which are deemed to be favourable to Canada. Under that clause we will admit at once the products of New South Wales and the products of British India ; and if the tariffs of any other colonies are or shall be made favourable and satisfactory to Canada, the same benefit may be extended to them. I shall move :

That it is expedient to provide that Schedule "D" to "The Customs Tariff, 1897," shall be repealed on and after the first day of August in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, and that the following schedule shall be substituted therefor :—

SCHEDULE "D."

BRITISH PREFERENTIAL TARIFF.

On articles the growth, produce or manufacture of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of any British colony or possession entitled to the benefits of this preferential tariff under section seventeen, the duties mentioned in Schedule "A" shall be reduced as follows:—The reduction shall be one-fourth of the duty mentioned in Schedule "A," and the duty to be levied, collected and paid shall be three-fourths of the duty mentioned in Schedule "A."

Provided, however, that this reduction shall not apply to any of the following articles, and that such articles shall in all cases be subject to the duties mentioned in Schedule "A," viz.:—wines, malt liquors, spirits, spirituous liquors, liquid medicines and articles containing alcohol; tobacco, cigars and cigarettes.

Provided further, that the reduction shall only apply to refined sugar when evidence satisfactory to the Minister of Customs is furnished that such refined sugar has been manufactured wholly from raw sugar produced in the British colonies or possessions.

That is to say, that inasmuch as we would not admit foreign sugar in its raw state under our preferential tariff, we will not admit the refined sugar made from that raw sugar; but if any sugar is refined in countries entitled to the benefit of this preference, from sugar grown not only in the West Indies, but anywhere in the British possessions, that refined sugar shall be admitted into Canada on the terms of the preferential tariff.

As we look back, Mr. Speaker, on the events of the past year, we have much cause for gratification, and when we turn to the future we find it bright and encouraging. The signs that meet us everywhere in Canada are those of peace, progress and prosperity. The one question which seriously threatened the harmony of our people and the good-will which should prevail between our citizens of different creeds—a question which a few months ago was a burning one and a cause of great anxiety—has been so happily settled that now it is scarcely mentioned. At no time in the history of the Dominion have the people been more united, more harmonious, and more hopeful and confident respecting the future of our country. In the centres of manufactures, trade and commerce, there is an activity which tells of confidence in the present and in the future. The great agricultural interests, which are the foundation of our country's prosperity, are on a better footing than for many years past. Encouraged to produce not only for the home markets but for the markets of the world, our farmers everywhere are applying themselves to their work with intelligence and skill. The ships which have come to our seaports during the past year, are insufficient to carry the increasing volume of commerce, and the shipwrights of the world are busy in constructing new vessels for this trade. Our long delayed canal enlargements are being

Mr. FIELDING.

pressed forward to early completion, and give promise of affording increased facilities for the transportation of the products of the great west to our shipping ports. Railway enterprises east and west are actively assisting in the good work. The fishermen of our Atlantic and Pacific coasts continue to reap the rich harvest of the sea. In all directions we find an extraordinary development of the mineral wealth of the Dominion. The powerful magnet of gold, which is found in several quarters of the Dominion, is doing much to attract capital and population. The new mines in the province of Ontario give promise of great development and profit. In the east, the mines of Nova Scotia, which have been working with considerable success for many years, are to-day giving most satisfactory results, and new discoveries are constantly being made. In the west, the province of British Columbia is steadily growing in fame as a rich mining country. The northern regions of our Dominion, which were long regarded as of little value, have become sources of boundless wealth. A few years ago, as I sat at the breakfast table in a Paris hotel, I was addressed by a neighbour, of whose nationality there could be no doubt. "Sir," he said, "from what part of our little Republic might you be?" I answered that I was not from his "little Republic" but from the greater one to the north. My friend was puzzled for a moment, and I had to remind him that the greater part of the North American Continent did not belong to his "little Republic," but was under the British flag. "Well, sir," he said triumphantly, "we do not claim to own the ice house." These great northern regions, which my American friend described so contemptuously as "the ice house," are to-day counted among the famous lands of the world. The "Yukon" and "Klondike" are world-wide names, and the land through which these rivers run is attracting to itself many thousands of people from the great centres of civilization. In nearly every department of industry in Canada there is activity and confidence.

We are not foolish enough to claim that all this has been brought about by our policy, although we are well aware that if the results had been the reverse, the blame, justly or unjustly, would have rested upon our shoulders. We are well aware, and we gratefully recognize the fact, that the prosperity that has come to Canada is due to the liberality of a kind Providence in giving us a bountiful harvest. One thing we do claim, and all we claim, as respects our policy, is that so far as legislative measures may help to encourage and strengthen a people, such has been the result of the action we have taken. Against the representations of our opponents we place the record of the past year, and the judgment of the Empire at large. Never was a tariff policy submitted to Parliament,

which was received with greater satisfaction by the people of Canada, than that which was announced a year ago. Never in the history of the British colonies was a measure proposed which in so large a degree commanded the interest and received the approval of Great and Greater Britain. It was hailed with joy by the friends of British Imperial unity in every land. It was commended by Her Majesty in her Speech from the Throne in the Parliament at Westminster. It was the subject of thousands of articles of the most commendatory character, in the British and colonial press. Rudyard Kipling, the poet of the Empire, was quick to feel the wave of sentiment that passed over Great Britain, and within a few hours from the announcement of the tariff, he embalmed the subject in spirited lines which will live in the history of Canada, and which, even if, as some have thought, they may convey inaccurate impressions as to the coldness of our climate, will, nevertheless, tell to every reader that in 1897 the heart of "Our Lady of the Snows" was full of warmth and devotion to the interests of the Empire. British statesmen, both publicly and privately, expressed their satisfaction with Canada's action. The Colonial Secretary, the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, in an official despatch to His Excellency the Governor General, which I shall place on the Table, a despatch communicating the decision of Her Majesty's Ministers respecting the effect of the Belgian and German treaties—used some words which I may properly quote here :

"I desire," said Mr. Chamberlain, "to add, in conclusion, that the action of the Dominion Government and Parliament in this matter, although, unfortunately, its full effect will be temporarily postponed, has been warmly welcomed and appreciated by Her Majesty's Government and the people of this country as a measure which cannot fail to result in material benefit to the mother country and to Canada, and to weld together still more firmly the ties which now unite them."

Sir, the policy which Her Majesty's Government so warmly commended, was a policy designed to establish preferential trade between Canada and the mother country. To-day we submit a proposal which enlarges the sphere of that preferential trade. To-day we propose to include within its benefits a large group of British colonies, the affairs of which are at this moment a cause of much anxiety to Her Majesty's Government. Thus step by step the good work goes on. One step remains to be taken, and I believe the day is not far distant when we shall be able to take it—a step which will extend the benefits of the preference, not only to Great Britain and the colonies which we have now included, but to every colony and possession of the Empire.

The following are the resolutions :—

1. That it is expedient to repeal section six of "The Customs Tariff, 1897," and to substitute the following section therefor :—

6. The importation into Canada of any goods enumerated, described or referred to in Schedule "C" to this Act is prohibited; and any such goods imported shall thereby become forfeited to the Crown and may be destroyed or otherwise dealt with as the Minister of Customs may direct; and any person importing any such prohibited goods, or causing or permitting them to be imported, shall for each offence incur a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars.

2. That it is expedient to provide that section seventeen of "The Customs Tariff, 1897," shall be repealed on and after the first day of August in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, and that the following section shall be substituted therefor :—

17. Articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of any of the following countries may, when imported direct into Canada from any of such countries, be entered for duty or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada at the reduced rate of duty provided in the British preferential tariff set forth in Schedule "D" to this Act :—

- (a). The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.
- (b). The British Colony of Bermuda.
- (c). The British Colonies commonly called the British West Indies, including the following :—

The Bahamas.

Jamaica.

Turks Island and the Caicos Islands.

The Leeward Islands (Antigua, St. Christopher-Nevis, Dominica, Monserrat, and the Virgin Islands).

The Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Vincent and St. Lucia).

Barbadoes

Trinidad and Tobago.

British Guiana.

- (d). Any other British Colony or possession the customs tariff of which, on the whole, is as favourable to Canada as the British preferential tariff herein referred to is to such colony or possession.

Provided, however, that manufactured articles to be admitted under such preferential tariff shall be bona fide the manufactures of a country or countries entitled to the benefits of such tariff, and that such benefits shall not extend to the importation of articles into the production of which there has not entered a substantial portion of the labour of such countries. Any question that may arise as to any articles being entitled to such benefits shall be decided by the Minister of Customs, whose decision shall be final.

2. The Minister of Customs, with the approval of the Governor in Council, shall determine what British colonies or possessions shall be entitled to the benefits of the preferential tariff under clause (d) of this section.

3. The Minister of Customs may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, make such regulations as may be deemed necessary for carrying out the intention of this section.

4. That it is expedient to provide that Schedule "D" to "The Customs Tariff, 1897," shall be repealed on and after the first day of August in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, and that the following schedule shall be substituted therefor :—

SCHEDULE "D."

BRITISH PREFERENTIAL TARIFF.

On articles the growth, produce or manufacture of the United Kingdom of Great Britain

and Ireland, or of any British colony or possession entitled to the benefits of this preferential tariff under section seventeen, the duties mentioned in Schedule "A" shall be reduced as follows:—The reduction shall be one-fourth of the duty mentioned in Schedule "A," and the duty to be levied, collected and paid shall be three-fourths of the duty mentioned in Schedule "A."

Provided, however, that this reduction shall not apply to any of the following articles, and that such articles shall in all cases be subject to the duties mentioned in Schedule "A," viz.: wines, malt liquors, spirits spirituous liquors, liquid medicines and articles containing alcohol; tobaccos, cigars and cigarettes.

Provided further that the reduction shall apply only to refined sugar when evidence satisfactory to the Minister of Customs is furnished that such refined sugar has been manufactured wholly from raw sugar produced in the British colonies or possessions.

5. That it is expedient to repeal items 435 and 436 of schedule "A" to "The Customs Tariff, 1897," and to substitute the following therefor:—

435. All sugar above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, testing not more than eighty-eight degrees by the polariscope, one dollar and eight cents per one hundred pounds, and for each additional degree one and one-half cents per one hundred pounds. Fractions of five-tenths of a degree less not to be subject to duty, and fractions of more than five-tenths to be dutiable as a degree.

436. Sugar, n.e.s., not above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, melado or concentrated melado, tank bottoms and sugar concrete, testing not more than seventy-five degrees by the polariscope, forty cents per one hundred pounds, and for each additional degree one and one-half cents per one hundred pounds. Fractions of five-tenths of a degree or less not to be subject to duty, and fractions of more than five-tenths to be dutiable as a degree. The usual packages in which imported to be free.

6. That it is expedient to provide that items 445 and 446 of Schedule "A" to "The Customs Tariff Act, 1897," shall be repealed on and after the first day of July in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight.

7. That it is expedient to provide that on and after the first day of July, in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, the following items shall be added to Schedule "B" to "The Customs Tariff, 1897":—

636. Tobacco, unmanufactured, for excise purposes, under conditions of the Inland Revenue Act.

8. That it is expedient to provide that on and after the first day of July, in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, in addition to the excise duties at present levied on manufactured tobacco, cigars and cigarettes, there shall be levied and collected the following excise duties, that is to say:—

(a.) On all foreign raw leaf tobacco, unstemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture, in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, ten cents per pound.

(b.) On all foreign raw leaf tobacco, stemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture, in any

Mr. FIELDING.

cigar or tobacco manufactory, fourteen cents per pound.

Provided that the weight upon which such duty shall be computed shall be with reference to the standard mentioned in paragraph (c) of section 247 of the Inland Revenue Act.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have been asked by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), who is suffering from rather severe indisposition, to move the adjournment of the debate. I have already mentioned the subject to the hon. gentleman who is leading the Government, and he has been kind enough to agree to this course being taken, as for obvious reasons it would be inconvenient to break the order of debate which usually takes place when the ex-Finance Minister discusses the features of the Budget as exposed by the Minister of Finance. In his behalf, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). There is no objection to this motion. We regret the cause very much, we regret the indisposition of the hon. member, but as arranged with my hon. friend, there will be no objection to adjourning the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I suppose if my hon. friends opposite have received as much information as they can very well digest, even though it may have been somewhat sweetened by the concluding paragraphs of my hon. friend's speech, and under those circumstances I would best consult their wishes and the views of my friends behind me by moving that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 9.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 6th April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ANCIENT ORDER OF FORESTERS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 113) to incorporate a Subsidiary Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the 49th Rule was suspended in this case by a previous motion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DUTY ON PULP MILL MACHINERY.

Mr. FOSTER (by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked,

Has the Chicoutimi Pulp Mill been permitted to import and use in their factory machinery without the payment of duty? If so, has this been done on a general system which is to be extended to other like companies? What is the amount of duty so held in suspense, if any?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Machinery for the Chicoutimi Pulp Mill was permitted to be entered in bond for three months during the construction of the mill and pending examination by a customs appraiser from the port of Quebec. The arrangement was only temporary and was a special one, made owing to exceptional circumstances. The time has elapsed and payment of duty has been demanded. The amount of duty held in suspense is \$2,137.

QUEEN'S PRINTER.

Mr. COPP asked,

Who is the Queen's Printer or deputy head of the Printing and Stationery Department? When was he employed? What profession or calling did he follow previous to his appointment? Is he a practical printer?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery is Mr. Samuel Edward Dawson, Doctor-in-Letters of Laval University and Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada. He was appointed on 7th November, 1891. From early youth he has been continuously engaged in publishing, importing, manufacturing and selling printed books; in dealing in paper and manufacturing blank books and other manufactures of paper. From 1862 to 1889 he was head of the publishing house of Dawson Brothers of Montreal. His practical knowledge of printing is derived from his experience as a publisher of books, and from twenty-five years' experience as the principal of a very large factory in Montreal. In that factory every kind of printed matter was made up—editions of printed works, pamphlets and forms of all kinds, as well as every kind of blank books. He is not a practical printer in the sense of having been a compositor or an apprentice to the trade.

MANITOBA SCHOOLS.

Mr. BERGERON (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

1. Has a document concerning the Manitoba schools been presented to His Holiness the Pope, or to the Sacred Propaganda, signed Wilfrid Laurier?

2. If so, could such document be put before Parliament, and will the Government bring it down?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am not

aware that any such document has been presented to His Holiness the Pope.

MR. A. H. HARRIS AND THE INTER-COLONIAL.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

1. What is the position of Mr. A. H. Harris on the Intercolonial Railway system?
2. Is he independent of the general manager?
3. What are his instructions?
4. May he fix rates without first obtaining the sanction of the Minister of Railways and Canals thereto?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows:—

1. Mr. A. H. Harris's position on the Canadian Government railway system is General Traffic Manager.
2. No, he is not independent of the general manager.
3. To devote his attention to the traffic generally in consultation with, and under the direction of the general manager.
4. Yes.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF JUSTICE.

Mr. COPP asked,

Who is the Deputy Minister of Justice? When and by whom appointed? What salary did he receive for the years 1895, 1896 and 1897? Has he received any additional salary or remuneration since 23rd June, 1896? If so, how much, and for what services?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The Deputy Minister of Justice is Mr. Edmund Leslie Newcombe, Q.C., appointed Deputy Minister by Order in Council, 13th March, 1893. His annual salary is \$4,000. He has received no additional salary or remuneration since June 23rd, 1896.

NEUFRAGE POND, P.E.I.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) asked,

Has the Government or Minister of Public Works received a petition from the inhabitants of Neufrage, Prince Edward Island, asking that a survey be made at an early day of Neufrage Pond, with a view of having a harbour opened there? Is it the intention of the Government to grant the request of said petition, if received?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I received a petition within the last three days of the nature referred to in the question asked by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, King's); and, as it related to a matter in the Public Works Department, I referred it to my hon. colleague, Mr. Tarte, with the request that he should have the facts examined into and, if possible, brought before Council.

MR. JUSTICE WEATHERBE.

Mr. ROCHE asked,

1. Is Mr. Justice Weatherbe, of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, absent from that province

by permission of the Government or the Department of Justice ?

2. Did the said Mr. Justice Weatherbe, before his departure, apply to the Government or Department of Justice for leave of absence ?

3. If so, what is the date of the said application, and for what period did he apply for leave to be absent from duty ?

4. Was his application granted, and if so, to what date does it extend ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). In answer to the hon. gentleman I may say that leave was granted Mr. Justice Weatherbe by Order in Council of January 12th, 1898. The answer to the second question is : Yes. The answer to the third question is : Application, dated January 5th, 1898, asking for five months leave ; and to the fourth : Yes, to June 12th, 1898.

COLOURED EMPLOYEES ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to refer to a matter of very great importance to a great many people in this Dominion, and more particularly to myself and other members from the western part of Ontario, with reference to an article that appeared in the Chatham "Planet," the Conservative organ in the city of Chatham. This article is headed : "Have no use for them—Coloured men on the Intercolonial Railway all fired—Premier Laurier promised them fair-play and then they were dismissed—Examples of his preaching and performance." And it goes on to say :

The Liberal leaders at Ottawa seem to have completely lost their heads, and the latest move of Intercolonial management, while hard to explain, is only consistent with the action of men utterly unable to deal with the weighty matters of government which have temporarily devolved on them. It is the old story of Grit professions and practices being inconsistent with each other, for while Premier Laurier speaks in the most flattering manner of the African race, his officials strike them down in a most brutal way, no complaint, no investigation—just kick them out. What have Mr. Campbell, M.P., and Mr. McGregor, M.P., to say to this action ?

The article then goes on to quote an article supposed to have been printed in the Halifax "Herald" giving the names of porters on the Intercolonial Railway who, it alleges, were dismissed without warning.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) to this—that if he proposes to do more than ask a question, it will be necessary for him to make a motion—

Mr. CAMPBELL. If I get out of order, Mr. Speaker, I will put myself in order, by making a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point is very plain. If the hon. gentleman is going beyond asking a question, he must conclude with a motion.

Mr. ROCHE.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will conclude with a motion. Immediately this article appeared, my attention and the attention of the members from Nova Scotia, was called to it. The hon. member from Halifax (Mr. Russell) immediately took the matter up, and he has handed me to-day a letter from Mr. L. B. Archibald, superintendent of the parlour car service on the Intercolonial Railway, and a good Conservative as well. I desire to read what Mr. Archibald says in reference to this matter. The letter is dated Halifax, March 30th, 1898 :

A great outcry has been made here lately by the "Herald" and "Mail" about the dismissal of coloured men from the service. Now for the facts. Now, as you are aware, our service is much larger in summer than in winter, and we drop the men as soon as we have no work for them. At the first of last month, when the dining cars were put on, we only had five sleeping car porters regularly employed, and they were running between Halifax and Montreal. Their names were : Joseph H. Berry, Thomas Arthurs, Jas. Daniels, Charles Dixon, Thos. Wilson (under suspension, and his place filled by R. L. Johnston). Owing to the buffets in the sleeping cars between Halifax and Montreal being discontinued, it was decided to run only one man on each sleeping car (the conductor). The parties affected by the change were provided for as follows :—Joseph H. Berry, given a position in dining car, in charge of the lunch counter, former salary \$35 per month and finding himself, now given \$20 per month and board ; Thos. Arthurs, same as above ; Jas. Daniels, same as above. These men did not lose a day's time. Charles Dixon was given a place in dining car as above, ran a few trips and resigned of his own account to better his position. Thos. A. Wilson, as stated above, was under suspension, and as it had been his third offence in a short time, no offer of service was made to him. R. L. Johnston, who was filling Wilson's place, was a temporary man and belonged to Toronto, his family living there. Thomas Johnston, the last coloured man taken on, on your recommendation, was given a place as assistant cook at \$25 per month and found. While on the sleeping car he had only been getting by our rules \$20 and finding himself. Another temporary employee, Charles Pinhero, was offered a similar position, and threw up the job on account of not being able physically for the work. He is employed as occasion requires at \$20 per month. I trust you will always give me a hearing when complaints are made.

Yours very truly,

L. B. ARCHIBALD.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that sufficiently answers the charge, the unfounded and unwarranted charge, that was made in the Halifax "Herald," and which has been copied widely by the Conservative papers of this Dominion. You will see by the facts that there is not one tittle of evidence for the statements made. They are made out of whole cloth, without any evidence at all. That is usually all the foundation there is for statements emanating from that source. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I wish to add one

word to what has been said by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. The other day, my attention was called to this subject, and I think, if I mistake not, that the hon. member for York evinced a good deal of interest in it, and put a question upon the Notice paper. At that moment I was not in a position to give information on the subject, and I immediately communicated with the general manager, with the result that he furnishes me with practically the information as that which has been read by the hon. gentleman, supplementing it, however, with this statement, which I wish to add, that to-day there are really more coloured porters in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway than there have been at any previous period.

Mr. FRASER. I also had a communication from Mr. Archibald, as I wanted to know about this matter. I think all the members of the House will deprecate the attempt, which can only have one meaning, namely, to raise a race prejudice upon reports that are not founded in fact at all. Everybody that travels on the Intercolonial Railway knows what excellent employees those coloured porters are, what attention they give to those who are travelling. The report that the Government would at once draw the colour line and dismiss all these men, ought to have been rejected by the common sense of the editors of those papers. I trust that, hereafter, those who publish those statements will understand what the country understands, that there must be a terrific dearth of any ground of attack upon the Government, when they are compelled to fall back upon an attempt to raise the prejudices of the coloured population of Canada.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I regret very much that I should have to ask the further indulgence of the Government to-day. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), who desires particularly to follow the Minister of Finance, is still quite seriously indisposed. I have an idea that he had some conversation himself, yesterday, with the acting leader of the Government, when that hon. gentleman was good enough to agree that the debate should be adjourned last evening at his request. I had a note from him, when I moved the adjournment, and had I known, as I should have known, that the House had resolved to make this the first order for to-day and to proceed

with the debate from day to day until it was completed, I would have mentioned, when I asked for that adjournment, that the hon. member for York, in his note to me, had stated that he was satisfied it would be impossible for him to be in his place to-day; and I imagined, when I made that motion, that this debate would not come up again until Tuesday next.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The Government, under the circumstances, will accede to the hon. gentleman's request, and are very sorry for the cause of it. But, under all the circumstances, I think we will best facilitate the business by meeting the hon. gentleman's wishes. I am not going to make any argument, but I would suggest, for the consideration of all parties concerned, that, as there are not many changes in the tariff, my hon. friend who has moved the adjournment, should communicate with his friends and endeavour to have some sort of understanding come to, that we would not prolong this Budget debate unnecessarily.

Mr. HUGHES. Five minute speeches.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Can you get the consent of the hon. member for York to that?

Mr. HUGHES. After the leaders.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will just express the hope to the hon. gentlemen opposite, and to our friends on this side, that the debate might be confined within some reasonable time after the hon. member for York has made his remarks; and, if it is necessary for me to speak, I will endeavour to set the example of compressing my remarks within reasonable limits.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Speaking for myself, I appreciate very much indeed the courtesy of the hon. gentleman, and I believe this side of the House will make every effort to show their appreciation also.

Mr. WILSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

DUTY ON AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

Mr. DAVIN continuing his speech on the motion: That good faith on the part of the present Government with the farmers of the North-west should compel them to place agricultural implements on the free list, said: Mr. Speaker, six o'clock came the other day before I was able to conclude my speech introducing the motion on the paper, and I have a few remarks to make to which I would ask the attention of hon. members on both sides of the House. What

I did up to six o'clock was this. I proved that in the Liberal Convention of 1893 a reduction of the tariff was promised on the lines of providing merely for the revenue and of giving the North-west farmers and the farmers generally exceptional advantages, in case the Liberal party came into power. I then proved that the leader of the Government went west, accompanied by some of his colleagues, and that at Winnipeg, at Moosomin, at Regina, at Moose Jaw, Edmonton and Prince Albert promises were made on the same lines, only more definite; and I quoted a passage from a speech delivered by the Minister of Agriculture which amounted to a definite promise that if the Liberals came into power agricultural implements would be placed on the free list. Those words are in "Hansard." I quoted also from the campaign sheet of 1895-96, which I have here bound with other precious documents issued by the Liberal party, where they expressed an opinion adverse to the present tariff on agricultural implements. I also showed from the "Farmer's Sun" that the farmers throughout Canada were disappointed. I showed by quotations that the hon. member for Winnipeg and the hon. member for Lisgar stated openly and in public in Winnipeg, that they were disappointed; and now I shall proceed to quote statements made by my hon. colleague the member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) to show that he was also disappointed. In fact, he told the Government—what? It is a most extraordinary thing that with the tones of the Finance Minister's speech last night in his ears, knowing that nothing has been done for the farmers or for the farmers of the North-west, the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia sits complacently in his seat, happy and smiling. On that occasion to which I refer, however, he told the leader of the Government that his policy had not left his supporters in the west a leg to stand on. Lest that mere description should be considered too vague, I will quote the language of my hon. friend, and I ask the attention of the Finance Minister to this statement, because some personal references are made by the member for Eastern Assiniboia to that hon. gentleman. This is what the hon. member (Mr. Douglas) said at Wapella:

The tariff had, in a word, been a disappointment. The change was made on the basis of a 10 per cent reduction. We didn't get the changes we wanted. He (Mr. Douglas) had done most of his talking on the subject, not on the floor of the House, but in committee.

What committee? If it was in committee, it was in Committee of the Whole, and was in public. But I think he refers to some secret conclave they had. I may tell the hon. member that it is not a parliamentary proceeding to conduct business that should be conducted on the floor of the House in camera and in secret with the Ministers.

Mr. DAVIN.

The Government must have a revenue, and he did not want any Administration to do that for the farmers which we condemn them doing for the manufacturers. He claimed that he made no promise of free implements, &c. What he wanted was justice.

So, when the hon. gentleman attends an open conference with his party he does so on a good Conservative's advice. That shows the modesty that may be in a bosom like that of my hon. friend. A Latin writer penned that well-known and hackneyed line, which may be familiar to the hon. gentleman:

Tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ?

Dwells such dire anger in celestial minds?

How can such complacency as the following fill the bosom of a divine?

He had made the strongest speech he had made in the House on the excessive rates on implements, &c. He had told the Government he would rather kick them in their own shanty than outside. When Messrs. Fielding and Paterson met with these manufacturers they (the manufacturers) said, "You are making a general reduction of 25 per cent? If that is so, we ask you for an advance on the implement duty to put us on a fair basis," and to compromise the matter they had allowed them free raw material, and the machine men had promised to make a \$5 reduction in the prices of machines.

Do you see, Mr. Speaker, what is admitted? The hon. gentleman has no confidence in the Ministers, who, instead of giving a reduction in the duty on agricultural implements, have given increased protection to the manufacturers.

As soon as he saw the new tariff he wrote to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and asked for an interview. It was granted, and he told the Premier he had come to talk on agricultural implements and coal oil. He had said to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, "Sir, I want to tell you this, you haven't given the members from the North-west a leg to stand on, because this is a large question to our people, and we have not now an argument to meet them with.

In the town of Grenfell the hon. gentleman spoke on the same subject, and used this language:

The farmers did not ask for special favours, but justice. He was not satisfied with the present tariff, and according to Mr. Fielding's budget speech the Government themselves were not satisfied with it. But it was the best that could be done under the circumstances. At least, that was the Government's explanation of it. The old tariff was placed upon a rate of 35 per cent. This was a considerable reduction, but the Bill was, upon the whole, a disappointment to the Patrons of Industry.

Now twelve months have elapsed, and I never saw a man in my life who evidenced complacency more than the hon. Finance Minister, who in his speech last night showed perfect delight in the present tariff, in fact, I thought he was well satisfied with everything. No changes in the tariff have been made, that is to say, no changes have been made to carry out the promises made by

hon. gentlemen during eighteen years, because any changes in the tariff are against the interests of the farmers and against the poor man.

As soon as he saw it he wrote a note to the Premier asking an interview in reference to it.

He repeats this important interview.

This was granted, and he told Mr. Laurier that they had not left their supporters in the west a single argument with which to meet the people. Against this it was held that the general reduction of about ten per cent was a marked improvement, and it was shown as an argument by the manufacturers of machinery that they had been reduced at one fell swoop from 35 to 20 per cent.

But who reduced it from 35 per cent to 20? Not this Government, not the present Minister of Finance; but the Conservative Government and Mr. Foster.

He had been put off from time to time.

Now, this is what I thought would be interesting to the Minister of Finance:

After thinking a good deal over the situation (Mr. Douglas) decided to ask for a hearing respecting the valuation of implements imported from the United States. He had been put off from time to time, but finally having caught Mr. Fielding in the lobby he asked him when he could be heard, Mr. Fielding said, in a good-humoured way, "O, Mr. Douglas, I will hear you next August." To this he (Mr. Douglas) replied, "You shall hear me within twenty-four hours," when Mr. Fielding replied, "I will hear you in twenty minutes."

But he did not succeed in getting the duty reduced. Sir, we have in Grenfell, N.W.T., a man of great ability; a man well known to my hon. friend (Mr. Douglas); a man who is a farmer himself; a man who has founded, I believe, most of the Patron lodges in western Assiniboia, Mr. Charles Nichol. This is the way Mr. Charles Nichol comments on what was done:

Speaking of the duty on agricultural implements, which was one of the points of the old tariff most strongly and persistently attacked by the Liberals—

I ask the attention of the House to this:

—and by Mr. Douglas himself, we believe, previous to the general elections, he said the Massey-Harris Company demanded that the duty be raised from 20 to 25 per cent, and that they had reason and logic on their side, and that in asking that implements be placed on the free list the farmer was trying to shift at least a fair share of the public burdens to other shoulders.

In the course of an article characterized by principles of sound political economy, Mr. Nichol refutes this paltry argument of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), and he thus concludes:

We are told that the Massey-Harris Company have a greater sale for their implements in other countries, such as Great Britain, Australia, &c., than any of their competitors. Assuming that to be correct, and that they do not sell in those

markets without a fair profit, on what grounds of "reason and logic," as Mr. Douglas puts it, can a 20 or 25 per cent duty be defended here? We venture to say neither Mr. Douglas or the Government saw reason or logic in it previous to the last general election. And we venture still further to say that the shallow fallacies of either Mr. Douglas or the Government, or other interested parties, will not impose upon the intelligent electors in the North-west for the time to come.

That, Sir, was written by a man who before he was a Patron was a strong, vigorous Reformer, and if he is anything but a Patron to-day, he is yet a strong, vigorous Reformer. That is the way this gentleman writes in a western town, taking the language of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas); taking the language of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson), and Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), when brought before their constituents in which they say they were disappointed in the tariff. I say, Sir, that I have established beyond cavil that good faith on the part of the present Government would necessitate their taking the steps that I mention in that motion.

Now I am going to show that even the imps and familiars of the Government thought they would take another course. And what must have been the horror in the bosom of one of these who, looking down at the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) last night, heard him when he told us that the debt had been increased which they promised to reduce, and that the expenditure had gone up which they promised to reduce; yes, Sir, by millions. Last night the Minister of Finance told us that both the national debt and our annual expenditure had increased, and he was cheered by his supporters for it. He showed us the country was prospering, by giving us what we could have had from the Trade and Navigation Returns, but he did not explain to us why the debt had increased.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Order.

Mr. DAVIN. I won't be out of order; I will retire at once; I see my hon. friend has got a little paler and I will not be the cause of making another Minister sick. Two of them are ill now, and I certainly do not want to make a third ill. I am glad to know at any rate that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will soon be convalescent, and in fact I have heard—although I have always understood that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was a man of great abstemiousness—I have heard that what he is suffering from is partaking too much of pastry; he has had too much Tarte.

Now, Sir, a pamphlet was published by a gentleman who sits in that Press Gallery and has sat in it for many years. He is a gentleman named Magurn, and he published a pamphlet on the tariff revision in the

spring of 1897, to which pamphlet he attached his name; it was criticized in the "Citizen," and this is what Mr. Magurn says in the pamphlet:

What is to be the tariff of the new Liberal Administration to be laid before Parliament and the country in a few weeks? To go over the tariff item by item, as Mr. Foster did in the revision of 1894, is only necessary in the maintenance of a protective system, and would be a task of great magnitude, as it proved to be at the time. In the present case the tariff commissioners consist of men who believe in the principle that the prime duty of a tariff is to raise a revenue, and that being the main object, the work of revision is simple compared with the other. To classify the imports and deal with them on some general principle is the only thing to be done. A low duty must be placed on the necessaries of life.

Hear that; hear that, ye farmers throughout the North-west and Manitoba, and now sugar is being taxed still higher. Is sugar a necessary of life or not?

Specific duties must be set aside—

And there are 135 specific duties in the present tariff:

Specific duties must be set aside in order to relieve the tariff from the scandal of making the cheapest goods pay the highest tax. Raw materials must be subjected to a low rate of duty in order that legitimate manufacturing shall not be heavily handicapped.

That is written by a devoted henchman of the present Minister of the Interior, and when he was coming back from the Klondike with the Minister of the Interior, he was enabled to put up a deal in Winnipeg by which he became correspondent of the Winnipeg "Free Press." He was already correspondent of the "Witness," and I do not know how many other papers and, Sir, I am sorry to say that on his taurine adolescence I act like a red rag on a bull. The moment he has to write about me he loses himself completely—I know he cannot help it, he is not responsible for it—but the moment he has to write about me he lies like a misplaced milestone which under no circumstances can tell the truth. So, Sir, I tell my friends in the North-west who read the "Witness," and I tell my friends in the North-west who read the Manitoba "Free Press," that when they read anything about me in either of these papers—if they read the leading articles, that is different; the leading articles are written with great ability and with fairness—but whenever that correspondent mentions me in any paper, let them remember the misplaced milestone, and remember, too, that there is an equation that I defy Sir Isaac Newton, if he were to rise from his grave, to find a flaw in; it is: Magurn and misplaced milestone; misplaced milestone and Magurn.

Now, Sir, I think I have demonstrated the proposition. Is there to be any relief?

Mr. DAVIN.

Clearly, none. I must not refer, it seems, to the Finance Minister's speech; but I may say that nothing that has occurred in this House this session can hold out any hope to the people of this country that the promises made will be fulfilled. I see, by the way, that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), as usual, is not in his place. He is never in his place, whether it is late at night or early in the day. This is too early for any terpsichorean exertions, for which I would excuse him at nine o'clock in the evening. But with regard to the young Napoleon, I would say:

Oh, blame not Napoleon if in pleasure's soft dream

He should try to forget what he never can heal.

because I am quite certain that he would feel a strong desire to do better things, only the social duties call him to those terpsichorean exercises.

Oh, give but a hope, let a vista but gleam
Through the gloom of the Klondike, and mark
how he'll feel;

Every passion it nursed, all the hopes it adored.
That instant his heart at Yukon will lay down,
And he'll smile as he can at Mackenzie & Mann,
And deal out dredging claims to his friends
standing round.

That is a parody sent to me by a young friend from Montreal. The hon. Minister of the Interior when at Vancouver, put the stroke of finality on the tariff of last session. He said—and he said the same thing at Regina—and I call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to it:

Sir Richard Cartwright is a pretty good free trader, and Sir Richard Cartwright is satisfied with the tariff.

Thus we have on the authority of the Minister of the Interior—I do not know whether it is a very good authority or not—that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is satisfied with this tariff. Now, Sir, I have demonstrated that hon. gentlemen opposite on several occasions promised that they would, if they got into power, place agricultural implements on the free list. They have got into power, and I say that good faith should compel them to do it. Are we for one minute, Sir, to tolerate the spectacle we are confronted with on these front benches, of men who have got into power upon definite promises, and who, although they have had three sessions, have not yet attempted to redeem a promise? They have betrayed the people to whom they made the promises; they have gone back on their promises. How well I remember how the stalwart form of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) used to rise on this side of the House, and how he would denounce the least tax on the necessaries of life. Where are his sympathies now? They have gone to his boots, as the "Sun" said. Then there is the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who also denounced all taxes on the

necessaries of life, and we know what is now taking place. It is a thing not to be tolerated for a moment; and the farmers of the North-west would hold me as false to my duty to them if I did not put this motion on the paper, declaring that good faith should compel the Government to place agricultural implements on the free list.

But before I sit down I have to say something—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I have to say something else—hon. gentlemen should let me finish the sentence. In the course of my remarks the last time, I referred to my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver). My hon. friend evidently thought that I had done him some wrong, though certainly if I did, I did it unwittingly, and my hon. friend sent me the "Hansard." What I did was to take a quotation from my hon. friend's speech that had appeared in the Medicine Hat "News," and I am free to confess that it does not quite accord, as sometimes happens in a newspaper, with what was said; but I am very glad that my hon. friend called my attention to it, because I think what he said suits me almost better than what was in the Medicine Hat "News." My hon. friend said:

I will say further, that the people of the North-west—at least that section of them I claim to represent—are sensible people, and they are not disappointed at the leader of this Government not doing what, in the first place, it would be unreasonable to expect of him, and what, in the second place, would be an impossibility. They do not expect a revision of the tariff at a moment's notice. But they do expect a revision of the tariff, and they expect a thorough revision.

That expectation is still unfulfilled:

They expect a revision of the tariff that will be in their interest, and I have every confidence they will get that revision from the present Government, and they will get it in good time.

My hon. friend is an instance of misplaced confidence, because he has not got it yet.

I wish further to point this out, sir: the agricultural season in that country is very nearly over, the purchase of farm machinery for the season has been made, and the reduction of the duty which will take effect during the coming winter will be just as beneficial to the people of the North-west as if it were made now.

Showing what my hon. friend expected, and it has not taken place yet, because implements are still at 20 per cent, as they were at that time. Why, Sir, the snows of 1896-97 are gone, and the snows of 1897-98 are pretty well gone, and still what my hon. friend expected has not taken place.

Now, Sir, the same person to whom I have already referred commented on a reference I made to my right hon. friend the leader of the Government. That reference, it seems, struck my friend as not in good

taste because the right hon. leader of the House is poorly. I wish to read what I did say, because, of course, the papers only gave the briefest summary of my remarks. I could not expect them to do otherwise, because they have only a certain amount of space, and I might well be content with the space I got in most of them. They reported me as saying:

Now the people were rising against the Government which did not keep its promises, and the colour of death was upon it. He had noticed that the people of Hull named a street of their city Laurier Avenue, but following it up he found the avenue led to a graveyard.

What do you think the same writer led the people of Winnipeg and Manitoba to understand from that? That I was speaking of the health of the Prime Minister. I, therefore, feel bound to read what I did say, and it will be seen that I was not thinking of the health of the right hon. gentleman at all, but of the health of the Government. This is what I said:

I want to call the attention of my hon. friend who is now leading the House (Sir Richard Cartwright)—and I am glad to see him leading it, because he leads it with grace and dignity—I want to call his attention to what he said in 1895:

"This is not a case for half measures. You have in the fate of the Democratic party of the United States a warning and an example of the doom which will overtake any party that palter with its convictions, and after having placed itself at the head of a great popular movement, will offer the people a stone instead of bread."

That was what the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said would be the fate of a party that did not keep its promises, and it was because of hints thrown out here and there, which came to his ears and, no doubt, shocked his sense of principle and convictions as a free trader, that he held out this warning flag to his party. Commenting on this prophetic warning, I went on to say:

That is the language which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce used when speaking of the Liberal policy with regard to the tariff.

Now, Sir, these are weighty words, and they seem to be prophetic as well as weighty, for already the indignation of this people of Canada, this outraged and betrayed people, is rising against a Government that does not regard its promises, its programmes or its professions. And, Sir, what I said in 1896 could be said with still more truth now, the pallor of death is already upon the face of that moribund Ministry.

It is quite clear that I was speaking of the Ministry, and not at all of the right hon. gentleman who is leading it. Then I went on to make a perfectly clear and legitimate use of a circumstance, because, as Virgil says, there are tears in things, and another Latin poet says there is a prophetic element in the commonest events. I went on to say:

I was walking in the city of Hull the other day. I found that they were changing the names of the streets there, and that in this baptizing of streets they called one avenue Lau-

rier. I thought I would have the glory and pride of walking down this new-named street. While passing along it I began to think how, when the late Emperor Napoleon came into power, they changed the names of the streets in Paris, substituting names that rang with republicanism to those that reminded passers-by of Napoleon and Louis Napoleon. And I remember when I went through those streets of Paris afterwards, the names significant of Napoleonism had been torn down, and the names substituted that were significant of its decheance. I went along this street in Hull, called the Avenue Laurier, and do you know whither it led? I hope it will not be injurious to your health, Mr. Speaker, or to the health of the Liberals. It led—"absit omen"—to a graveyard.

Is it not palpable, that the whole thing was a reference to the Government, and not to the leader of the Government, and that use was made of the circumstance to shadow forth the decay and destruction of that Government, of which my right hon. friend is the head. But what has been the result of the short report that appeared in the newspapers in Toronto? A letter has come to me from a prominent man there, saying that he was very much impressed by what appeared in the papers, but still more by something that he, too, had noticed; for but a few days before he had been up in that quarter of Toronto where St. James Cemetery is, and he sent me a map of that part, which I now hold in my hands. Here you have Parliament Street in one place, Wellsley Street in another, Amelia Street and Sackville Street, and there is St. James Cemetery, and another street leading into it, which has been rebaptized Laurier Avenue. I need hardly say, that the coincidence is very peculiar.

Sir, there is not a man in the Liberal ranks who would feel more sorry than I, if there was anything serious the matter with the right hon. leader of the House. Strong friends of mine have, again and again, taken me to task for what they call a custom of mine, of saying nice things about my right hon. friend. Well, if I ever said nice things about him, it was because I felt them. I am glad now to know that there is nothing serious the matter with him. We know, from the papers, that it is nothing serious, and, therefore, I am free to-day, as I was when originally speaking, to say, "absit omen." There is a prophecy in things, as well as tears, and that prophecy seems to point to the destruction of that Government which has been false to all its promises, and which is false to-day than we ever knew it to be before. The sun that rose this morning and looked down on our fair Dominion, knew that we have, in the present Government, a more perjured Administration than we ever knew it to be before—false to all its professions, false to all its programmes, and, with cynical disregard of its most cherished convictions, nailing its flag to the mast of protection and striking at the poor man in his deposits, in his newspaper, in the sugar that sweetens

Mr. DAVIN.

his tea. And then, we have the Finance Minister, just as if he were cross-fishing a stream, winking pleasantly at Mr. Bertram and saying: Tinkering of the tariff is a thing of the past; and then winking, with equal gusto, at the free traders behind and saying: Never mind what we say to Bertram and the manufacturers, eternal vigilance is required of them; that is what they will have to pay, if they are going to keep their place in the world; we must stick to free trade.

We now know what they will do. We know very well that they have completely gone back on all their professions; we know, from the language of one Minister after another, what they propose to do. We have had the leader of that Government declaring, with a curious cynicism that it pained me to see and that I did not think was possible in him: "I do not mind wearing the clothes of my opponents, provided they fit me." I thought that was a wanton boast on the part of my right hon. friend, seeing that, in his habits of dissimulation he has a vast wardrobe all his own.

Mr. ROCHE. Owing to the very full manner in which my hon. friend from West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) has treated this question, it will not be necessary for me to engage the attention of the House but for a few moments. The motion is one to which I can give my most hearty support, not only because I know that the people of the Northwest Territories are anxious to secure their agricultural implements free of duty, if at all possible, but also because they were led to expect that boon, upon the accession of the Liberals to power, by the speeches delivered during the late Dominion campaign by Liberal leaders and candidates all over the country. As you are aware, that country is a purely agricultural country whose settlers labour under many disadvantages both of the artificial and the natural variety such as, possibly, are not experienced by people living in eastern Canada. To be sure, these natural difficulties cannot be overcome by any legislation within these walls, but those of the artificial variety can very materially be alleviated by the people's representatives here assembled, if they do their duty. Removed as those people are so far from the markets of the world, many commodities imported into that country, articles for consumption, wear or use, are materially increased in price, because of the long haul and the high freight consequent upon that long haul from the centres of manufacture and production. On the other hand, all products raised and exported by the farmer are correspondingly depressed in price for a similar reason. Anything, therefore, that will tend to reduce the price of production on the farm means so much more profit to the farmer, so much more money in his pocket. And, as agricultural implements are the raw material of the farmer, he, in

my opinion, is as much entitled to receive his raw material free of duty, if the necessities of the revenue will permit, and, if not, to have as low a rate of duty as is consistent with the raising of the revenue, as is the manufacturer of those machines. On this question, I am aware, the Conservatives have proved to be the true tariff reformers. They reduced the protection given to the manufacturers of those machines from 35 to 20 per cent with a promise of still further reduction if deemed necessary. This, however, was declared by our Liberal friends to be entirely inadequate, and so far as my own constituency is concerned, it was ornamented from end to end with such placards as: "Vote for the Liberal candidate and free agricultural implements." The people were educated by such means to believe that free agricultural implements would be the natural consequence of the Liberals attaining power. The Winnipeg "Tribune," the organ of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) contained article after article practically in the same strain. And when during the first session of this Parliament, a motion similar to this now before us was introduced by the hon. member for West Assiniboia, the hon. member for Lisgar, in company with his Liberal confreres from the west, opposed the motion on the ground that it was ill-advised and ill-timed. Wait, said that hon. gentleman, until the Government has had time to form their tariff policy and present it to the House; time enough to condemn the Government when they have proved recreant to their pledges. Well, the House and the country waited until another session came and the tariff policy was propounded. And what then did we find? Instead of finding that the protection heretofore enjoyed by the manufacturers, those bloated monopolists, those robbers, those "scoundrels great and scoundrels small," as they were so endearingly called by our Liberal friends, we find that it was materially increased, the protective duty being left as it was and a sweeping reduction made of the duties on the raw material entering into the construction of those machines. This caused a profound feeling of disappointment among that western people, a sense of disappointment not at all confined to one political party. Possibly it was felt most keenly by those poor deluded people who, by the hundred, were drawn away from their own party by those pledges, and who are now realizing how they have been hoodwinked. This was participated in also by the Liberal members from the west, and when, a few months ago, the meeting of the Liberal Association of Winnipeg was held, as has been stated, the hon. member for Lisgar and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) at that meeting expressed their disappointment. They declared that the whole tendency of the Government was

to raise rather than to lower the duties, and they instanced several cases which proved that, while the Liberals were very good free traders in theory, when it interfered with their own interests and the interests of their friends, they proved to be the best of protectionists in practice. They instanced the hon. member for North Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) in regard to the duties on agricultural implements, and the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) with regard to coal oil, and others. But, notwithstanding this, those members from the west voted for the Liberal policy that was produced last session on the ground that the very few concessions that were made, the very small reductions in two or three articles entering into common use on the farm, marked the entering of the thin edge of the wedge of free trade, and formed only an instalment, to use their own words, of what was to come; and from the pledges they had received from the members of the Government, they felt confident that their promises would ultimately be fulfilled.

Another session has come. And what have we had in the interim? We have heard from the gentlemen who originated this tariff policy, who prepared the brief and handed it over to the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), and that gentleman is here now as the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram). And that hon. gentleman has declared that this tariff policy was to remain as it is at present for the next ten years. That hon. gentleman was endorsed by the Ministry, several of whom appeared on the platform and spoke on his behalf. And after the Budget speech we have had from the Finance Minister yesterday, I fear that the members from the west who are depending on the Government meeting their wishes in regard to the duty of agricultural implements are depending on a broken reed. It is true that there exists a prejudice in the minds of many farmers in favour of American-made machinery. Whether this prejudice has any right foundation or not I am not personally aware. Many farmers prefer Canadian-made machines, while many others prefer the American. So far as I am concerned, I think it is only right for our farmers to give the benefit, all other things being equal, to the Canadian manufacturers. That was the design of the National Policy—to lead the people to patronize home industries and keep the money in our own country. If it is the case that American machines are better and can be sold cheaper than the Canadian made article, I hold that it is not the duty of the Government to hamper the farmers in this respect by an unusually high tariff. I recognize also that the manufacturers of those Canadian machines have had their business built up through the wise protective policy of the Conservative party. And a very thankless lot they proved to be. They have had their manufacturing establishments built up

to this extent that they have, in one combination now gobbled up all the smaller concerns. And while I am not accusing that combination of having raised or even kept up the prices of machines because of the combination—on the contrary, I believe that, on account of the improvement in modern methods of production, they are producing a better article for less money—still, in view of the fact that they have so long enjoyed protection and in view of the fact that such sweeping reductions were made in the raw material used in the manufacture of these machines, they should be able to stand now pretty nearly on an equality and be able to compete with their American rivals across the line. Because of this, and also because the farmers of the western country have been promised that this would be the result of the Liberals coming into power—that they would receive free agricultural implements—and because scores and hundreds of those electors have been deluded to give support to the Liberal candidate on the strength of these promises, I most heartily give my support to the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia.

Mr. CRAIG. I am rather surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) should speak about good faith on the part of the present Government with regard to agricultural implements. If we examine their history since they came into power, we will find that they have not kept good faith on any question. Now, what is meant by good faith? I understand it means keeping their pledges. I think if we examine the pledges they made before they came into power, we will find that almost all of them have been broken. Especially is this the case with reference to protection. The cry of the Liberal party before they came into power was, Death to protection. Protection was to be uprooted root and branch. Well, Mr. Speaker, we all know that that has not been done. For my part, I do not blame the Liberal Government for not doing it; I commend them for it. I might blame them in a theoretical way for not keeping their pledges, but, in reality, I give them praise for not keeping their pledges, because, in breaking their pledges, they have benefited this country. We have heard about the feeling of satisfaction with which the tariff of the present Government has been received in the country. Well, I know, from conversation with business men that this feeling of satisfaction arose, not on account of the changes that were made, but on account of the changes that were not made. There was a feeling of apprehension abroad in the country when the Liberal party first came into power, that they would carry out their pledges, that when they talked about rooting up protection, they meant what they said; that when they

Mr. ROCHE.

talked about doing away with all protection, and when they called the manufacturers of this country robbers and all sorts of hard names, and said they were going to take away this protection from them, the people thought they meant it, and they have been gratified to know that they did not mean any of these things at all, that they were only election cries, that these were only appeals made to their own party, and perhaps to moderate men of all parties, so that they might get into power. Now, I may say here that I am not going to support this resolution, because I do not blame the Government at all for not keeping faith with anybody on this question, but I commend them for it. I think that while they have not kept faith with the country, while they have broken nearly all the pledges that they made so far as the tariff is concerned, yet in so doing they have done a great benefit to the country.

But at the same time I think something might be said about the duty on agricultural implements. We find that the Government did not make any reduction on that duty at all. But what did they do? They made raw material lower by reducing the duty on raw material. Now, it would be a very interesting question to discuss as to why they did this, why they discriminated in favour of the manufacturers of agricultural implements. I do not know. I do not pretend to be on the inside and to know all the reasons. But I do know that while they reduced the duty on a few articles, they did not reduce the duty on agricultural implements, but in reality, by making raw materials lower, they increased the protection to the makers of those articles. I think that is rather an inconsistent position for them to take. But, Mr. Speaker, there is one article in which they did reduce the duty, and which they have made free at the present time, and that is the article of binder twine, in which my constituents are somewhat interested. I find that that is placed on the free list. Now, in the town of Port Hope, which I have the honour to represent, they have a factory for manufacturing binder twine, one of the best in this country, I am told, with the most modern and improved machinery. That factory to-day is standing idle, and the prospects are that it will stand idle. The men who have been working in the factory and who worked there up to last fall when the factory was closed, are very anxious to know whether the Government is going to impose a duty on binder twine in order that they may have some prospect of getting employment again. Well, it does not look so by the tariff which was brought down. I regret very much that the Government have not looked on this matter in a favourable light. I think they might well have considered this question. Why should they take the duty off binder twine and make that article absolutely free, while

they do not even reduce the duty on agricultural implements, although both are used by the farmer? I hold that binder twine has a claim to a small protection, say 10 per cent or 12½ per cent. Now, there is a great deal of talk about giving the preference to Great Britain and to the British colonies, we hear a great deal of talk about loyalty and patriotism and binding all the Empire together in this way. But what are we doing by making binder twine free? Why, we are giving to the United States more than a preference, we are giving them this whole country as a market for their goods without paying a cent of duty. We find that the binder twine for this country is being manufactured in the United States, the people who make this binder twine do not contribute one cent to the revenue of this country, while the men who were making it here are now walking about the streets. I consider that is a condition of things which is a disgrace to this country. I really think the Government should impose a duty of, say 10 per cent on binder twine, in order that our workmen may have some advantage in that way, and be protected against the binder twine that is sent in here free from across the line. It may be said that this is done in the interests of the farmers. Well, I hold that the farmers will not buy their binder twine one cent less on account of the duty being removed, there will be no reduction at all in the price to them. If a duty of 10 per cent was imposed on binder twine the price could not be put up. Binder twine is manufactured in the Central Prison, in the penitentiary at Kingston, and in Brantford by a farmers' company there. There are plenty of manufacturers in this country that would keep down the price by competition. I think that argument has no weight at all. I do not think the Government have any ground at all to stand on in refusing to put a duty on binder twine. I would here make a strong appeal to them, as strong as I can, that they should reconsider this matter, now that the matter has been brought to their attention. I know they have decided not to do it for the present, but I hope they will reconsider their decision, and make another one in the interests of the workmen of this country. I am not advocating this in the interests of the Consumers' Cordage Company or of any other cordage company. I have no particular interest in them, but I have an interest in the workmen of this country who have been making this binder twine up to the present, and who, if the duty is not reimposed, will probably suffer considerable injury.

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot agree with the compliment that the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) has paid to the Government. He compliments them for breaking faith with the people of this country. I am a protectionist, have been, and intend

to be as long as we have a country to protect. I believe in protecting every article that we can grow or produce in this country. But those hon. gentlemen opposite came into power promising the people that if they got in they would reduce the duty on coal oil, or give the farmers of this country free coal oil; that they would reduce the duty on almost every article that the farmer consumes. We have their tariff brought down last night by the Minister of Finance with a flourish of trumpets, saying to the people of this country that after the 1st of July we will give a general reduction of 25 per cent on all articles imported into this country. Articles imported from where? From England only. Now, I have carefully read over that list. What can I find in that list that is going to receive the benefit of the preferential duty and that is going at the same time to benefit the farmers of this country? The first article on the list is animals, living. The old duty was 20 per cent, the new duty is 20 per cent, but under the preference, after the 1st of July, it will be 15 per cent. What benefit is that going to be to the farmers of this country? The only animals imported into this country are thoroughbreds for the improvement of stock. These come in free to-day, therefore the preference clause in the tariff on animals is not going to benefit the farmers any. The next item is books. If applied to school books for the different provinces, there might be some benefit in it. But the farmers of this country are not very much interested in a duty on books published in England. So you might go through the list. Another item of great interest to the farmers, is the article of corn, and there we find about the only reduction in the tariff of any importance. Corn they have made free, to the great injury of the farmers, particularly of Ontario, and it will prove to be an injury to those of the North-west and to all others throughout the Dominion. Because all the provinces produced coarse grains, which should be used in feeding and fattening our own cattle. Therefore, as a protectionist, and a strong protectionist, I support the motion of my hon. friend in condemnation of this Government; and I think many hon. gentleman opposite should join us in condemning the leaders of their party for having gone to the country and promised they would do certain things if placed in power. They have been placed in power, on the faith of those pledges. Have they kept their pledges?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I say, no. The hon. gentleman comes from a part of a country near where coal oil is produced. He in fact carried his election on coal oil; but the Government have not reduced the duty on it, and have not carried out their promises. The hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig)

gave hon. gentlemen opposite credit for not having reduced the tariff, because it was in the public interest that the old tariff should be retained. The Minister of Finance, in the course of his speech last night said that we did not have the old National Policy any longer. Yet if hon. members will read the present tariff and the old tariff, which was called the National Policy tariff, they will find there is practically no difference.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was the country ever more prosperous than it is now ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Taking the circumstances into account I say, yes. Why is there prosperity ? Is it due to the fact that manufacturers are more prosperous or that employees are receiving larger wages ? It is because Providence blessed the farmers with a bountiful harvest. I again ask, are our manufacturers more prosperous ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, they are making money hand over fist.

Mr. TAYLOR. You cannot show that the manufacturers are making money hand over fist, except in such a case as that of the Minister of Customs, who is connected with an industry which is in a combine. Of course those who are manufacturers and in a combine are making money ; but other manufacturers, who are competing with Canadian manufacturers only, are cutting the prices so low that they are making very little profit.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They are running day and night all over the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Hon. gentlemen opposite promised to reduce the price of binding twine. Have they done so ? I have looked at the papers brought down to-day. The Government advertised for tenders for binding twine manufactured at the penitentiary at Kingston. The prices offered were 4·4 cents for Sisal, 4·9 cents for Beaver, and 5·25 cents for Maple Leaf. The tenders accepted were as follows :—4·4 cents for Sisal, 4·7 cents for Beaver, 4·90 cents for Maple Leaf. I find the prices at which they were delivered to the company were 4 cents for Sisal, 4·70 cents for Beaver, and 5·25 for Maple Leaf. Hobbs & Co. control the output of the Kingston penitentiary and the Toronto prison, and they make the prices. Why are the farmers this year charged for binder twine 7½ to 8½ cents per lb., or nearly 100 per cent advance ? Hobbs & Co. have fixed that price and they are charged with having made \$25,000 out of binding twine manufactured in Kingston penitentiary and Toronto prison.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How is it that the Cordage Company's factory is closed up ?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not closed up permanently ; it is only closed up this year. The output was all sold together and

Mr. TAYLOR.

brought the same price, and then the market came under the combine in the United States for which Hobbs & Co. are agents. We will obtain explanations in the Public Accounts Committee as to why, when the price was 4·4 cents, the goods were delivered at 4 cents. Perhaps the Hobbs combine contributed the four-tenths of a cent per pound to the election fund ; we do not know that as a fact, but we will investigate the matter before the Public Accounts Committee. The Government promised that the farmers should obtain binding twine at lower prices, but they are called upon to pay this year higher prices than they did during the preceding year. I think hon. gentlemen opposite who are of the opinion that the Government should keep faith with the people, should unite with hon. members on this side of the House in supporting the motion of my hon. friend condemning the Government for having broken faith with the people of the North-west, as with the people of the provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I was sorry I was not in the House to hear the latter part of the speech of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Since I observed his motion on the Order paper I have attended almost every sitting of the House with the object of hearing what the hon. gentleman would have to say and of learning the position he would take in regard to this matter. With respect to the form of the hon. gentleman's motion, I confess I do not exactly like it. It seems to me designed to secure votes on the Opposition side of the House without committing the Opposition to support a reduction in the duty on agricultural implements. Had the hon. gentleman made a square motion to take the duty of agricultural implements altogether, I for one would have supposed it. I would have had no difficulty in doing so, because I have always advocated as a member from the west the abolition of the duty on agricultural implements, although I am free to say that the duty at present is such that is not very far from a revenue basis. I am informed that at least one-half of the agricultural implements imported into the North-west at the present time are manufactured in the United States. If that be so, it will be seen that the duty is approaching at all events a revenue basis.

Mr. SPROULE. It must have been on that basis before the present Government fixed the tariff, because they did not reduce the duty on agricultural implements.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, they did.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. McMILLAN. I shall show it.

Mr. DAVIN. Permit me to say that mowers and reaper knives, mowing machines,

self-binding harvesters, harvesters without binders, sulky and walking ploughs, harrows, cultivators, seed-mills and horse-rakes are all 20 per cent, as they were under the previous Government.

Mr. McMILLAN. There were a lot of agricultural implements reduced from 35 per cent to 25 per cent by the present Government.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Of course, my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) does not mean to contend that I said there had been a reduction in the duty on mowers, reapers and that class of implements. I did not say that, for I know there has been no reduction; and, although there has been a reduction of the duty on separators and other implements used by farmers, still, I would have been very much pleased to have seen the duty on other implements reduced, if not entirely removed.

Mr. DAVIN. You said the duties were down to a revenue basis.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I beg pardon. I did not say they were down to a revenue basis. What I said was, that in view of the fact that about half of the reapers used in Manitoba last year were imported from the United States, it would lead to the belief that they were not far from a revenue basis. However, I might say that, during my election campaign, I had the impression that it was the intention of the Government to take the duty off agricultural implements entirely.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I might add, however, that my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has not proven that the members of the then Opposition declared it to be their intention to do so. Holding the views I do, I would be extremely pleased to see the duty taken off agricultural implements altogether, and, had my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) made his motion to that effect, I would have found no difficulty in supporting it. However, it was my opinion, that the farmers of the North-west, as well as of other parts of Canada, would not, I think, be adverse to bearing a reasonable share of the tariff burdens of the country; and last session, in the committee, I myself moved that the duty on these implements be reduced to 10 per cent. I am prepared to move now, Sir, in amendment:

That all the words after "That" be struck out of the motion, and the following substituted:—

"The duty on agricultural implements be reduced to ten per cent."

If hon. gentlemen opposite are in earnest in this matter, if they desire to relieve the farmers of at least a portion of their burdens in that regard, they will have no difficulty in supporting this amendment. I would be the last one not to welcome any support, no matter from what side of the

House it comes, in order to secure relief for the farmers of that country in the matter of these duties. I do not take a great deal of stock in the position my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) takes in this regard. In fact, I think I can prove to the House, by a reference to his record on this question, that he is entirely insincere.

Mr. DAVIN. Order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think I am in order, Mr. Speaker. If I do not succeed in proving to the House that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is not sincere, I will be quite willing to tender him an apology. I will prove he is not sincere from his own record. I will take the liberty of reading from "Hansard" some remarks which I made last session in reference to the hon. gentleman's record.

Mr. DAVIN. What page of "Hansard"?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Page 4162. This is what I said in the House last session:

In the session of 1891, the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) moved that binder twine be put on the free list, and my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia voted against it; and I understand that he excused himself on the ground that he did not know what his constituents wanted in the matter. I took the trouble to turn up the hon. gentleman's paper, and I find in an article on "binder twine" printed on the 7th April, 1892, these observations:

"In the interests of the farmers of Western Assiniboia, the "Leader" raises its voice against the duty on binder twine. We have felt for years that the National Policy bore too heavily on the North-west, and with regard to the particular item of binder twine, no one has come forward to defend a proceeding which compels the farmers to pay some \$400,000 more for the twine than the twine is actually worth."

He made a speech in Parliament supporting the reduction in the duty on binder twine, and it will be interesting to see how he voted. On Wednesday, the 26th April, 1892, nearly three weeks after the above article appeared. Hon. Robert Watson, then M. P. for Marquette, moved that binder twine be placed on the free list; and the record shows that the hon. member for Western Assiniboia shirked the vote.

I do not think it will be necessary, Mr. Speaker, in view of that, for me to withdraw my accusation of insincerity against the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin).

In the session of 1893, the present Postmaster General again moved that binder twine be placed on the free list, and the record shows that the hon. member for Western Assiniboia supported the motion in a speech, but voted against it. Then, in 1893, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) moved the resolution to the following effect:—

"Since the introduction of the protective system, sufficient time has elapsed for the establishment and development of such manufacturing industries as, under existing conditions, can be successfully carried on in Canada. Moreover, many manufacturers sheltered behind the rampart thus erected have formed combinations and trusts

which prohibit competition and maintain monopolies.

"That the existing tariff, defensible only as a protective measure, has proved in many instances oppressive and burdensome to the great mass of the consuming classes, and especially to those engaged in agricultural pursuits; is unfair and unequal in its incidence, and has been productive of discontent, verging on disloyalty, among those who suffer from its injustice.

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

And the hon. member for Western Assiniboia, on that occasion shirked the vote. But he explained the matter in an article he sent to the Regina "Leader," that court journal to which I have already referred. If you will allow me, I will read the reasons which the hon. gentleman gave for his course. I think they will be extremely interesting to the House. I shall quote very briefly:

"Any resolution impugning the existing fiscal policy is, as demonstrated on the strictly party vote on Mr. McCarthy's motion, regarded as one expressing want of confidence in the Government. It was impossible for Mr. Davin, advocating a protective tariff, to support a resolution condemning such a tariff and suggesting unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, but we do not exaggerate when we say that Mr. McCarthy's proposals of reduction of customs met with the private approval of many members of both parties. It is easily understood that, with party discipline—

No matter what the hon. gentleman thought in private, we see what he did when it came to a vote in the House. I will not say as I said last session—

Mr. DAVIN. You may say anything you like.

Mr. RICHARDSON. For fear of being called to order I shall not say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) took to the woods. I will merely say that he retreated to the tall timber.

Mr. DAVIN. Turn to the page of the same volume, where you will see that I brought down the Government majority to 14.

Mr. RICHARDSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) is getting uneasy now.

Mr. DAVIN. Not a bit of it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. gentleman had better wait until I get through; I have a good many other things to remind him of.

And I would call special attention of the House to this sentence:

—with party discipline carried to the extreme to which it is in this country, individual action must be controlled by party reasons. Parliamentary procedure here leaves the private members no initiative. Expression of honest and true opinion is restricted. The individual responsibility of the people's representatives is overshadowed by the power of the Cabinet."

I think that the House will agree with me after listening to these sentences, that when it was charged recently that the hon. gentleman

Mr. RICHARDSON.

had crawled under the barn, the statement was warranted by the facts. The article continues:

"Members of Parliament, in order to be supporters of the Government, would not require to be extreme protectionists, just as there would no longer be a necessity for a Liberal being a free trader."

Now, in order to keep up the ruse with his constituents, on Monday, 13th February, 1893, the hon. member moved as follows:—

"That it is the opinion of this House that the duty on barbed wire, on agricultural implements, on coal oil and on cotton should be reduced so as to give no more than reasonable protection, and that the duty on binder twine should be abolished."

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) was willing to have reasonable protection then, but he is extremely anxious now to have it abolished.

But he never pressed that motion to a vote. He conveniently took to the woods.

The present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) had previously introduced a resolution to make binder twine free, but this the hon. member for Western Assiniboia had opposed. I will read a brief extract from his speech as reported in his own paper:

"Mr. Foster had promised to make known the Government policy on the tariff, and in the face of such a request he (Davin) could not have voted for the motion. Had he done so, he would have been supporting what, coming from a member of the Opposition, was practically a vote of want of confidence in the Government."

And yet my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and others argue that members on this side would be derelict in their duty—in fact, would be behaving outrageously—if they did not vote want of confidence in the Government of 1898—

Now, in the session of 1893, Mr. Cleveland had a motion for free coal oil, and respecting this, the hon. member for Western Assiniboia sent the following to his paper on 13th February, 1893:—

"A proposal was now before the House to abolish the duty on coal oil. He (Davin) could not go that far,—

But he has no hesitation in seeking to hold up the Government to ridicule, because they have not taken the duty entirely off coal oil—

—but that the duty should be reduced. Speaking on binder twine, he (Davin) made a strong appeal for free binding twine for the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west."

Members from the west can congratulate the hon. gentleman on any strong appeals he may make, but we would like to see him at least consistent enough to vote as he speaks in the House.

Then came the visit of the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and Hon. Mr. Angers to the west, when the hon. member for Western Assiniboia proclaimed that what was wanted was free lumber, coal oil, agricultural implements, barbed wire, &c. He pointed out that coal oil at Regina was 50 cents a gallon. Yet when Mr. Cleveland's motion was up to put it on the free list, the hon. gentleman voted against it.

So you will see the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman.

Then came the tariff revision of 1894, when agricultural implements, lumber and barbed wire were reduced; binder twine was reduced and coal oil was made 7½ cents, though, before the session closed it was reduced to 6 cents. It would be interesting to see what the hon. member for Western Assiniboia said at that time. In the "Leader" 29th March, 1894, he spoke thus:

You see the hon. gentleman had been making a pretense of advocating a reduction along these various lines, for the purpose of standing in with his constituency; and when the Government did make certain reductions, taking some of the duty off agricultural implements, this is what the hon. gentleman said in his paper:

From a commercial and political standpoint, the tariff reductions are bold throughout, and, looking at them all round, are eminently satisfactory.

When the Conservatives reduced the duty on coal oil to six cents a gallon, it was "eminently satisfactory." When the Conservatives reduced the duty on agricultural implements to 20 per cent, it was "eminently satisfactory." What has occurred since to change the hon. gentleman's view? Is it because he sits in Opposition? We know from his own words that he was quite content, when sitting under the whip of his party, to vote against the way he was talking in the House—in one case even voting against his own motion, I am told.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman says that he is told that I voted against my own motion. Will the hon. gentleman say who told him, and, as far as parliamentary etiquette will allow me, I will brand that hon. gentleman as he deserves.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not see the point of order in the remarks made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIN. I will try to put it properly, to suit you, Mr. Speaker. The point of order I make is that the hon. member for Lisgar states that somebody told him that I had voted against my own motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no point of order in that.

Mr. DAVIN. He should give the name.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not say that the hon. gentleman had moved a motion and voted against it. What I said was that it had been reported to me that he had done so. It was a matter of common report in the North-west, and from the most inconsistent record of the hon. gentleman, I do not think there is an hon. gentleman here but would be surprised if he did not make a motion and vote against it. I will sit down for a moment to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to deny the statement, and if he does deny it, I will look up the record.

Mr. DAVIN. Deny what statement?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The statement that has been made to me. He declines to deny it, Mr. Speaker, and I will go on.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I did not do anything of the kind. I wanted to know what statement I was to deny. I say that the statement which the hon. gentleman makes, he knows, that is, the statement made by any one, that I voted against a motion of my own, is false.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that. He is saying that the hon. gentleman is making a declaration which he knows is not true.

Mr. DAVIN. No. I said he quotes somebody—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Take it back.

Mr. DAVIN. Take what back?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the statement made by the hon. member for Lisgar was not correct, and that he knew that it was false.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not say that. The hon. gentleman quoted somebody as saying that I voted against a motion of my own. I said that somebody, whoever he is, that told the hon. gentleman that, if anybody told him, stated what was false. Is that out of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Where is the cheering now?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Evidently, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has lost his temper. I am not surprised at it, in view of the record which I have been able to lay before the House this afternoon; and I am sure that when his constituents read what the record is, he will be disposed to lose his temper to a much greater degree than he has on the present occasion. I may go on now with his record:

The present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved in amendment to the motion for Committee of Supply on 1st April, 1894, the effect of which amendment was to lower the duties on agricultural implements and the necessities of life. The hon. member for Western Assiniboia opposed that and asserted:

That, if the Opposition were in power, they dare not reduce the tariff lower than it has been reduced in the measure just brought down. The changes were too radical to suit Laurier and his friends; it left them but little to complain of, and for that reason they were not pleased.

The hon. gentleman says that if the Liberals were in power, they dare not reduce the duty below 20 per cent; yet he demands now that the duty must be swept away altogether. If it is any worse to introduce a resolution and then vote against it, than

to take the course which I have proved my hon. friend has taken, I would like to know it. I think I am in the judgment of the House in saying that the hon. gentleman's position is quite as bad, if not even worse, as if he had introduced a motion and then voted against it.

I looked over the correspondence sent by my hon. friend to the "Leader" and in the issue of 19th April, 1894, I find the following:—

In Mr. Davin's speech on the tariff, he dwelt on the absurdity of the suggestion made by Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Charlton and others, that the Government, if sustained at the elections on the tariff, would not carry out its promises. He (Davin) pointed out that such a thing was never known as a government propounding a policy and winning on it, and then going back on it.

Now, forsooth, because he thinks that the Liberals won on a certain policy, he condemns them for not putting that policy in force. According to his own words, copied from his correspondence to the "Leader"—

He (Davin) pointed out that such a thing was never known as a Government propounding a policy and winning on it and then going back on it. But he said it was not uncommon for men in Opposition to propound opinions and propose measures in regard to which, on getting into office, they became silent.

I do not propose to devote very much more time to the hon. gentleman. His position recalls to my mind a couple of verses which I came across in a book I was reading the other day; and as the hon. gentleman himself has a weakness for inflicting quotations on the House, I presume he will not object to my giving him a return in kind, and to my taking the liberty of changing a few words in the quotation to suit the case.

Nick Davin, down at Moose Jaw's the blamed-est feller yet!

When he starts in a-talkin' other folks is apt to quit—

'Pears like that tongue o' his'n wuzn't made fer nuthin'

But jes' else to argify 'em down and gether in their pelts:

He'll talk you down on tariff; er he'll talk you down on tax,

And prove the pore man pays 'em all—and them's about the fac's!—

Religion, law, er politics, prize-fightin', er baseball—

Jes' tetch Nick up a little and he'll post you 'bout 'em all.

He stumped old West Assiniboia, through the sunshine and the rain,

And heit the banner up'ards from a-trailin' in the dust,

And cut loose on monopolies and cuss'd and cuss'd and cuss'd!

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHARDSON. In that portion of the hon. gentleman's speech which I read the other day, he compared our honoured leader to Napoleon, and after referring to the fact that certain streets in Paris had been called after Napoleon, when in the

Mr. RICHARDSON.

zenith of his power, and that, after his fall, their names were torn down and changed, he told that when promenading through Hull the other day, he saw that the name of an avenue had been changed to that of Laurier Avenue, and discovered that it led to a graveyard. Well, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion, the other afternoon, to take a constitutional through that locality, and I also came across the same avenue, but found that it did not lead to, but from a graveyard. And the graveyard was that in which the Conservative party was interred on the 23rd of June, 1896. And I would advise my hon. friend to get a plot there, just as quick as he can, because he will require it after the next general election. I would conclude with suggesting a motto for the little slab that may be raised over the mound beneath which the hon. gentleman is sure to sleep:

Under the spreading branches of these goose-berry bushes (planted by the remnants of the party who survived the tornado of June 23, 1896, and whose remains have not yet been interred), repose all that is mortal of Nicholas Flood Davin, poet, orator, statesman and philosopher, whose pretended efforts on behalf of the farmers of the North-west, whom he misrepresented for many years, were too transparent to preserve intact his majority of one.

P.S.—R.I.P.

I beg to move in amendment:

That all the words after "That" be struck out and the following substituted:—"The duty on agricultural implements be reduced to 10 per cent."

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think there is very much in what my hon. friend has said that requires any extended remarks from me, because it is quite evident his intention is to treat this serious motion of mine in favour of the farmers of the North-west as a farce. The hon. gentleman dwelt on my record. I do not need any defence, in the eyes of the farmers of the North-west, against any attacks by the hon. gentleman. Five hundred members for Lisgar, and his newspaper multiplied a hundred fold, would not affect my position with the farmers of the North-west Territories, because that position is entrenched in fifteen years of faithful service.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. What animal is that I hear? I saw a young lion in the window of one of the stores on Sparks Street, but that voice is clearly not the voice of a lion. I rather think it is the voice of an animal which I will not mention, because he has long ears and might hear me.

But take the session of 1891. In that session, in the matter of binder twine, I voted and even spoke against the motion of my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). Why? Because I was, as I am now, a protectionist, and up to that moment—nay, until

I went back and met my constituents at Moose Jaw—I had never heard in the Northwest a syllable against the duty on binder twine. But after I went back and my friends in that country explained to me how the thing was, what did I do? From the moment I became convinced that it was necessary to deal with the subject of binder twine, I pressed it on the Government, and it was in consequence of my pressure and action that the duty was lowered. It was not in consequence of any action on the part of the Postmaster General, because the Government did not care a snap for that hon. gentleman. If the hon. member for Lisgar will take the hint, let me impress on him now and the other members from the west, that if they will only exert pressure on this Government, we will get something done. What happened in the session of 1891? I moved the motion with regard to second homesteads, which I had been pressing on the Government ever since 1887. Sir John Macdonald, the most powerful politician that ever lived in Canada, and my personal friend as well as political leader, was against it, but that did not prevent my fighting that battle. When Sir John Macdonald was ill, and Sir John Thompson took his place, he was also against it and spoke against it that session of 1891, but that did not prevent my pressing it on. But what did the man do, who, the hon. member for Lisgar says, went back on his own motion? Sir, I divided the House and brought the Government majority down to 14; and I succeeded in obtaining for every farmer in the Territories who wanted it, a second homestead. I succeeded in enabling him to second homestead his pre-emption, and thus put \$400 into his pocket and into the pockets of every homesteader in the west. Yet this man, who blows hot and cold in that newspaper of his own at Winnipeg, according to what he thinks suits his own purpose, and who only came into the House the other day, and who wimples and wobbles around here, putting up bogus motions like the one you have read, he says I do not prove my point. Let me tell what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) said when he was in the west, and then—

Mr. RICHARDSON. I rise to a point of order. Is it in order for the hon. gentleman to characterize my motion as a bogus motion?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The expression is, perhaps, not out of order, but I do not think it is an expression that should be used. And I would say the same with regard to another expression that has fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), when referring to a member of the House he said "that man."

Mr. DAVIN. Did I say that man? I apologize to the hon. member (Mr. Richardson) for calling him "that man." It shows how

one, in the heat of debate, is apt to forget himself. It would be impossible, with the deepest plummet that ever sounded the depths of the Atlantic to measure the depth of my respect for the hon. member. I am sorry I called him a man. Nothing on this earth would lead me to repeat any such misnomer with regard to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. EARLE. You will not do it again?

Mr. DAVIN. No, I will not do it again. I am easily corrected; I am corrigible, and, in that respect, I differ from the hon. member, who is incorrigible. I think that is parliamentary. Now, this is what the present Minister of Agriculture said when he was in the west. Speaking at Moosomin, as you will find in the Moosomin "Spectator" of October 4th, 1894, he said:

Because the United States Congress had made a standing offer of reciprocity in implements, and it was the duty of the Canadian Government to take advantage of that offer. Last year the farmers of western Canada imported \$120,000 worth of American implements, on which they paid \$40,000 duty. Referring to the Massey-Harris combination, he claimed that the fact that these people spoke of going to the States to fight the Yankees in their own market showed that Canadian manufacturers were able to get along without protection. Canadians were able to hold their own with the Yankees in any walk of life. If Massey-Harris got protection, why should not the farmers?

Now, that is exactly what we say. The hon. gentleman says I did not prove my point, though I quoted from the programme of 1893, I quoted the campaign sheet of 1895-96, I quoted his own leader and have just quoted the Minister of Agriculture. Sir, I might have quoted the hon. gentleman himself, because he is aware—and he has the proof in his own pocket—that there is a combine with regard to spades and shovels. He has placed before this House the evidence of that combine. And I say here that it is one of the strongest doctrines of protection that the very minute any industry resorts to a combine, that very minute, in the interests of protection, you should strike at that industry. And he himself, I think, knows that there is actually a combine in agricultural implements as well. One great industry has swallowed up a number of the others, and therefore he is bound, not only by what has taken place in this House, but by his own professions—because I believe his constituency was placarded, "Vote for free agricultural implements"—to take radical action upon that subject.

Let me deal briefly with one argument of the hon. gentleman. Would it be parliamentary to say that my hon. friend is a little fresh? It would not be elegant. I will not say it, therefore. He quoted an argument of mine in reply to the criticisms that though an amended tariff was put forward by the Conservative Government in

1894, represented by my hon. friend the member for York (Mr. Foster) as Finance Minister, that they would not adhere to it if they won the election that was supposed to follow in 1895—it was supposed that at that time that it would be held in that year. I argued that there was no such thing known up to that time as a Government winning on a policy that they had propounded in Parliament and carried before the people and going back on that policy, and he says I am inconsistent now because I say in regard to this Government that it should carry out its pledges made before it went to the country. Why, he should see that my argument means that these gentlemen are bound to carry out their pledges. What I said was that there was never such a thing known as a Government having propounded a policy in Parliament and having gone to the country upon it and won, going back on that policy. I had known instances before it was added to by this Government, I had known instances in the history of England where a party, though propounding a policy in opposition, had failed to carry it fully out, not indeed a formal policy, but had failed to carry out many pledges. But they were reprobated as I reprobate this Government.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Would the hon. gentleman allow me a word? The comment I made was made a little too soon. I should have read this paragraph before making it:

But, he said, it was not uncommon for men in opposition to propound opinions and propose measures in regard to which, on getting into office, they became silent.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear. Is that not what I say now; and is this not what these renegades say? Is not that parliamentary? If you will read in the speeches of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, I think you will find it used. If not, I will fall back upon the word "gang" or "crew," which, I think, was a favourite expression of his. If my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) is through with the "Hansard" containing Mr. Cleveland's motion, I would like to see it, as I cannot see it here.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will send the hon. gentleman the "Hansard."

Mr. DAVIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, what do you think that farmers of the country have paid on agricultural implements on which we here demand relief? They have paid, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, \$93,474. That is on agricultural implements, pure and simple.

Sir CHARLES HUBBERT TUPPER. That is, if they pay the duty, as hon. gentlemen opposite say.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, if they do. I am arguing on the theory of hon. gentlemen

Mr. DAVIN.

opposite. Here we have the item of "harvesters, self-binding and without binders." The whole duty paid under this item for the year ending 30th June last was \$40,647, of which \$25,980 was paid in the west. On hoes the amount paid was \$365, of which more than half was paid in the west. On horse-rakes, the duty was \$2,760, of which \$1,887 was paid in the west. On mowing machines the duty paid throughout Canada was \$18,000, of which \$8,700 was paid in the west. And so on. This shows that we in the west are deeply interested in this matter.

Now, in regard to the hon. gentleman's amendment, if he will tell me that there is any chance of its doing any good, I will help him. I will take it as an instalment. I do not refuse to vote for people on the opposite side, if I can help forward the end I am aiming at. The new members in this House must know that I have treated the Government side in a different way from what they have treated me. I have not shrunk from supporting them, if I could do anything for the farmers. Now, I will not cavil at the hon. gentleman's motion. If that will carry, if that motion that we will have 10 per cent—

Mr. RICHARDSON. Be reduced to 10 per cent, instead of 20 per cent.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I will vote for that motion, and next year, if the farmers are not content with that, and I do not think they should be with the promises they have from the Government, we can press further. But, with the hope of making some progress, I will vote for my hon. friend's motion, reducing it to 10 per cent, and I hope his own Government will now support him.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not intend to say anything on this motion, but after listening to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), I cannot refrain from noticing the peculiar position that he took with regard to this question. He moved an amendment to the motion, which amendment is, to have agricultural implements reduced to 10 per cent; but, instead of supporting that amendment by some argument, he used up nearly all his time in trying to convince the House that the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) was inconsistent, that he had not been sincere in his advocacy of the interests of the farmers of the North-west. The hon. member did not bring any argument to show that the western farmers required this reduction, or that they were suffering for want of it, or that his own party had been unfair to the people in leading them to believe that they would get such reduction upon coming into power. There was not a word in the interest of the western farmer, but his whole time was taken up in trying to prove the inconsistency of the hon. member for West Assinibola. He finished up that admirable speech

by making some reference to a graveyard. He said he had been over to Hull and had made an examination of that new avenue, named Laurier Avenue, and he found that, instead of its leading to a graveyard, it led away from a graveyard. Well, I think it depends very much on which way the hon. gentleman was walking, and what time of the evening it was. May it not be possible that, when he examined it, he was going backwards? Then he went on to give us what he regarded as a beautiful epitaph that might be placed over the remains of the hon. member for West Assiniboia at some future time, when he would be laid in that silent place. I thought at the time, that the people of Canada, remembering the professions of his friends the Reform party, before they came into power, as to what they would do for the farmers and for Canada, remembering their promises to effect economies that would redound not only to the credit of the party, but to the benefit of the people of the country, how they would reduce the expenditure in this line and in that line, how they would effect sweeping reductions in the tariff in the interests of the farmers—I say, that the people of Canada, remembering all this, and remembering how little the Government has done in fulfilment of their promises, would be inclined to say that the sooner they are buried in oblivion, the better it will be for the country. If their remains were interred in that noted graveyard where that beautiful avenue has been named after the leader of their party, I think a proper epitaph to put up over them would be that which was said to be put up by the Cornishman over his wife after she died. It was this:

My wife is dead, and here she lies,
Nobody laughs and nobody cries;
Where she has gone or how she fares,
Nobody knows and nobody cares.

And so it would be with the Reform party. If they were buried in that notable place, I am sure the country would say:

Where they have gone and how they fare,
Nobody knows and nobody cares.

The hon. gentleman went on to show that, as a considerable number of agricultural implements had been imported, last year, from the United States, therefore the tariff which we now have, might fairly be considered a revenue tariff. Now, I do not know what impression he meant to convey, either to the House or to the country, by that argument, because his party declared, before they came into power, that their tariff would be at least a revenue tariff, that they would make such sweeping reductions in it as would make it a revenue tariff. Now, he adds that about one-half the implements used have been brought in from the United States, therefore the tariff might fairly be considered a revenue tariff. I presume, he meant the people to infer that they

ought to be satisfied with the tariff we have to-day, that they ought to be inclined to believe that the present Government had, at least, been consistent in promising that the tariff would be a revenue tariff. But it is interesting to know what that hon. gentleman thought of the requirements of the situation before that tariff was made. I have here a copy of the Winnipeg "Tribune," which, I believe, is his paper, and I may be allowed to read to the House the view that he entertained as to what the western farmer was entitled to expect from his party, in the event of their coming into power. This article was written in December, 1896, before their tariff was introduced, and it is an interesting article to read at the present time, especially in view of what the hon. gentleman has said here to-day with regard to the amendment that is moved by the hon. member for West Assiniboia. Here is what I find in the Winnipeg "Tribune" on December 1st, 1896:

It would probably be unfair to prejudge the Dominion Government in the matter of tariff reforms, but to those of us who have entertained a deep conviction that the advent to power of the Liberal party meant sweeping reductions in the tariff—

And he goes on to speak of agricultural implements afterwards, upon which we now know there has been no reduction at all:

—and the placing of a large number of important articles upon the free list, the action of the Government in sending a committee of its Cabinet about the country to take evidence as to the tariff, has a rather disquieting effect. One would have thought that the leaders of the Liberal party knew enough about the tariff and its myriad of iniquities to effect a reformation without going to the manufacturers and saying in effect, "Will you tell us just what you can stand in the way of reductions? It seems to us that while no harm may probably be done by the inquiry, it is not calculated to inspire the confidence of the people who felt confident that tariff reform of a sweeping character would follow in the wake of the advent to power of the Liberal Government.

Mr. Speaker, how that hon. gentleman and his friends must have been disappointed, when they found that these sweeping reductions did not take place which were promised in the event of the advent of the Liberal party to power.

It may be that the Government will redeem the pledges made so profusely in the speeches of the Liberal leaders for the past five or ten years, as well as the promises contained in campaign literature.

It may be the wail of the future, but evidently they have not done it up to the present time.

We can only await the meeting of the House next February, when the Tariff Bill will doubtless be produced. There is no denying the fact, however, that there is considerable uneasiness felt in many quarters that the Government will not go as far in the matter of reforming the tariff as the country had been led to expect that

It would go if the Liberals were returned to power. With the example of the consequences that came to the Democratic party in the United States through failure to redeem the ante-election tariff reform pledges, the Liberal Government of Canada, if it makes a similar mistake, will make it with its eyes open.

I ask if hon. gentlemen opposite made the mistake with their eyes open? The country and the western farmers will notice that not a word has been said since.

The farmers of Canada have for years been led to expect from the speeches of the Liberal leaders, and especially the speeches of Mr. Laurier himself, that the advent of a Liberal Government to power meant the sweeping away of the tariff from all articles which entered into the life of the settler;—

I presume among those were agricultural implements.

—or if not the sweeping away of that tariff, at least a very great reduction.

Where did the reduction come when the tariff was remodelled? There was no reduction made whatever.

In this country we want free agricultural implements,——

Did the hon. gentleman vote for it?

—free twine,——

They have had it since January.

—free barbed wire, free lumber, free nails, free fruit, and the tariff reduced on a great many articles. If the Government is unable to grant us this boon, it ought at least to go as far as possible in slashing down the tariff on all such articles. It may be that the Government will do all that we expect along this line, but meantime it can do no harm to stir up its pure mind by the way of remembrance.

The party's mind was disturbed, and hon. gentlemen brought down a tariff, but it left the farmer very much in the same position as before in regard to many articles that enter into the settler's life, and especially agricultural implements, which are so important, and which the hon. gentleman now moves should be reduced to 10 per cent. The hon. member for Lisgar does not think they need be made free.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the hon. gentleman vote for the amendment?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman should be more concerned as to whether he will vote for it. I have shown what hon. gentlemen opposite promised to accomplish in the event of their accession to power, and the hon. gentleman should now endeavour to square himself with the Government and with his constituents. It is not my funeral, it is that of the hon. gentleman and his friends, and it rests upon the hon. member to show where he stands as regards the position he occupied a few years ago, and to satisfy the western farmers, either that he was wrong then, or that he is inconsistent now, or that he was shielding

Mr. SPROULE.

his friends when he stated what he regarded to be in the best interests of the people of the west at that particular time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Although this is a motion on a particular item, I think the House will agree that we appear to have drifted into a general discussion of the Budget, notwithstanding the fact that we agreed this afternoon that the Budget debate should be postponed to a future day.

Mr. SPROULE. I was only referring to last year's Budget, not to this year's Budget.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is not the only member who spoke, and consequently my observations are true. We all agree, I think, that it would be better not to go into a discussion of the Budget, and as there is an unavoidable tendency on the part of hon. gentlemen who rise to discuss this motion to drift into a debate on the Budget generally, I think I shall meet the wishes of both sides of the House, if I move, as I now do, that the debate on this motion be adjourned.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me that this is scarcely the proper way for hon. gentlemen opposite to get rid of a rather awkward motion. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman in moving the amendment is sincere or not. It is pretty clear that hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches have no notion of voting for that motion, and the Finance Minister has taken occasion, on the plea that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House are liable to enter into what would be a very undesirable discussion, to move the adjournment of the debate. I agree that as regards the tariff discussion, it should be left to a time when it can properly be taken up. But is that the true reason actuating the hon. Minister in moving the adjournment of the debate? I think if a division be taken, he will find that his colleagues and himself will vote against the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment on this occasion. The question before the House is simply whether there should be a reduction on farming implements or not. It is a question whether the Government have fulfilled their pledges to the people of the North-west. It is easy to understand why the farmers of the North-west and Manitoba are most anxious to have free implements. It is not because a protectionist tariff is unfair in its provisions, but owing to the heavy railway freights they have sometimes been compelled to buy goods in the United States rather than in Canada. I am not, however, going to enter into a discussion of that phase of the question; but let us not trifle with the issue now before the House. I observe that the hon. member (Mr. Richardson) is now withdrawing from the Chamber.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am not doing so.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman should not tamely assent to an adjournment of the debate, but he should insist on having a division.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Take a division, and let us see the result.

Mr. CLANCY. I am glad the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has assented to a division being taken. I am not in favour of a proposition to reduce the duty to 10 per cent on farming implements. The interest of the farmers are wrapped up with those of the manufacturers, and no industry can stand alone. I am disposed to vote condemnation on hon. gentlemen opposite on the ground that they made pledges they have not fulfilled. It is a sad condition when leaders of a great political party make pledges and fail to carry them out. We should lay down a rule that when a great party commits itself on any important question, as hon. gentlemen opposite have committed themselves, they should fulfil their pledges, unless they are able to submit substantial reasons, such as changed circumstances, or that public opinion was against them, or that pledges had been made which could not be fulfilled. For my part I shall vote against it, as I have consistently believed on all occasions that we should have a proper means of distributing the burdens of the people of this country, on the manufacturers, the farmers and all classes alike. I believe that all should bear their fair share of the national expenditure.

Mr. DAVIN. It looks to me as if the amendment of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) was made with a view of allowing a motion like this of the Finance Minister to come from the Treasury benches and so let them down easily. Before I speak on the question of adjournment, I call your attention to the fact that the motion is out of order and I ask your decision on it. I may say that if we are allowed a vote, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) will assure me there is a chance that the Government will accept his proposition, I will vote for his amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) be kind enough to state his point of order.

Mr. DAVIN. The point is that a private member moves that a certain definite change be made in the tariff. It does not add to the burdens of the people, I admit, and in that way it may be held to be in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If this motion of the hon. member (Mr. Richardson) is out of order, then the motion of the hon. member (Mr. Davin) would be out of order for the same reason.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There seems to be a distinction, Mr. Speaker,

between the two motions if my reading of the text of Dr. Bourinot's book be correct. There is a distinction between a motion for the removal of duty altogether, and a motion to establish a certain fixed duty. At page 557 of Dr. Bourinot's book I find this in connection with the imposition of taxes :

But it is not regular to propose a new and distinct tax, which is not a mere increase—

That of course does not apply.

—or diminution of a duty upon an article already recommended by Government for taxation. But any proposition for the repeal of a duty is always in order.

I understand the main motion is a recommendation for the repeal of a duty.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). No, it is simply a censure on the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think that either motion is out of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish a few words of personal explanation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has insinuated that the motion of the Minister of Finance is the result of an understanding with myself, in order to side-track the question and prevent a division. I am sure the Minister of Finance will exonerate me from any charge of the kind. My amendment was in perfect good faith, and the idea of adjourning the debate was never suggested to me.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was certainly no understanding between my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and myself. I quite understood that in making the motion, in all probability the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) would not concur in it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He accepts the situation, though.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know that he does.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Richardson), amongst a number of statements he made about myself, quoted what he said last year and to which I did not think it worth while then to reply. He (Mr. Richardson) said :

When Mr. Cleveland's motion was put to place coal oil on the free list, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) voted against it.

Now, Sir, there was no division whatever on Mr. Cleveland's motion. Mr. Cleveland, on Thursday, February 9th, 1893, moved :

That is it expedient to place coal oil on the free list.

And at six o'clock the debate terminated and there never was any division on it. I look in "Hansard" amongst the list of divisions, and there is no division whatever on the motion. Here is the "Hansard" of 1893 to prove it. This is just a sample, Mr.

Speaker, of the reckless statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) here. There is not a shadow of foundation for the statement that I voted against Mr. Cleveland's motion. If the motion of the Minister of Finance is carried now, it will throw the matter over and we will never reach it again this session. I think it very desirable that we should have the opinion of this House as to how it regards the conduct of the Government in being false to its pledges on this matter of agricultural implements. Question, Mr. Speaker.

House divided on amendment to amendment (Mr. Fielding) to adjourn the debate:

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bain,	Hurley,
Beith,	Joly de Lotbinière
Blair,	(Sir Henri),
Bostock,	Lang,
Bourassa,	Legris,
Bourbonnais,	Livingston,
Brodeur,	Logan,
Burnett,	Macdonell (Selkirk),
Calvert,	McGregor,
Casey,	McMillan,
Champagne,	Malouin,
Charlton,	Maxwell,
Christie,	Mignault,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Mulock,
Edwards,	Oliver,
Erb,	Paterson,
Fielding,	Proulx,
Fisher,	Rogers,
Fitzpatrick,	Semple,
Flint,	Somerville,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Sutherland,
Gauthier,	Talbot and
Godbout,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Haley,	Hibbert).—46.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Davin,	Quinn,
Douglas,	Richardson,
Earle,	Roche,
Gillet,	Sproule,
LaRivière,	Taylor,
McNeill,	Wallace, and
Pope,	Wilson.—14.

Amendment to amendment agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has not voted.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am afraid I have committed an error in voting. I have a standing pair with the hon. leader of the Opposition, and, although I am not sure that I am at all breaking it, yet, for safety's sake, my name had better be omitted.

Mr. HUGHES. I am paired with the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram).

Mr. FORTIN. I am paired with the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Chauvin). I

Mr. DAVIN.

thought I might vote on this question, but as doubts have been expressed, I wish to withdraw my vote.

Mr. CLARKE. I am paired with the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmalee).

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I am paired with the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Carscallen). Otherwise, I would have voted for the amendment to adjourn the debate.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I have a standing pair with the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour). If I had not been paired, I would have voted for the amendment to adjourn the debate.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Perhaps, after this exhausting and exhaustive debate, I may perhaps suit the wishes of the House by moving that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 12th April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FAST LINE SERVICE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my right hon. friend, who, I am delighted to see, is able to be in his place in the House to-day, and especially as I observe the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Dobell) is also in his place, if he is able to give the House any information as to the present position and prospects of the fast line service.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am much pleased with the kind words of the hon. gentleman with reference to me personally. I am not prepared at this moment to make any statement on the matter to which my hon. friend has just alluded, but to-morrow I will be able to make a statement.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to acknowledge the kind courtesy of the hon. gentlemen op-

posite in allowing this debate to be adjourned from a day of last week until to-day, owing to some slight indisposition of my own. I hope I shall be able some day to retaliate in like kind by allowing the Finance Minister one or two more days of grace when he gets into a hard place, and does not find himself quite ready at the moment.

The Minister of Finance, in the opening part of his address, congratulated the House on two things: On the condition of the country, and on the results of the policy of the party now in power. I think it would probably have been wiser if he had confined his congratulations to the first subject, and not have mooted the second. In congratulating the House on the condition of the country, he would not raise a very debatable question. I am happy at the outset to be able to agree with him, in the main, as to the general condition and progress of the country, and to agree with him in the main on the panegyric—I can call it nothing else—not undeserved, not unbased, which he passed upon the results of the year 1896-97, and which took up the larger part of his speech. Before, however, going into the subject matter more particularly, there are one or two smaller matters to which we may devote a moment, not for their intrinsic merit, but as forming merely controversial subjects which have come up. The Minister of Finance rather rallied me on certain statements and forecasts or predictions which I made at a preceding session of the House as to the general outcome, from a financial point of view. As I said, it is not of very much importance whether myself or the Finance Minister, for that matter, were strictly accurate in forecasts which were made a year or so before the event; but for fear some of the more thoughtless partisans on the opposite side of the House may have been led to believe that I only was the sinner in this respect, and that the Finance Minister's predictions were well based, it might be well for me to make just a passing reference to that matter.

I acknowledge that my hon. friend had the advantage of me, as the person who holds the reins of the expenditure always has the advantage of the outsider, who is not able so far to look into the workings of both revenue and expenditure as the Finance Minister holding the portfolio for the time being, and who certainly has little or nothing to do with restraining expenditure. It will be remembered that I made my forecasts upon the condition of things and the trend of the Administration so far as it was apparent at that time. I stated that the revenues for 1896-97 would be \$36,000,000. They turned out to be \$37,829,000, an excess of some \$1,200,000. It is a singular circumstance that on looking over the Canadian Gazette a day or two ago, I found that when you compare the excise revenues for

the current year with the excise revenues for 1896-97, up to 31st March of each year, the deficit during the current year, that is the overplus during the preceding year, was exactly \$1,211,000; so that if it had not been for that extraordinary pressure under which the excise accrued with such astonishing rapidity out of its normal rate, my estimate would have been right to \$10,000. But the Finance Minister, who was inside and should have been able to have made a very accurate forecast, was also the small matter of half a million dollars out of his calculations as to the revenues. In expenditure I have still more the advantage. I estimated that the expenditure, taking the basis of the expenditure up to that time and arguing that the same trend of expenditure would be observed, would be \$38,600,000. I estimated it just \$200,000 too much. But the Finance Minister represented that the expenditure would be \$37,850,000, and in that forecast he was exactly \$500,000 too little; so that in that respect, although I overshot the mark by \$200,000, the hon. gentleman undershot the mark, so to speak, by \$500,000. When we come to the matter of deficit, that does not need to be followed out, because if one makes a mistake on revenue or expenditure or the forecast does not come out in these, the result will be in accordance therewith, so far as deficit is concerned.

On capital expenditure I estimated that \$4,300,000 would be spent. The Finance Minister estimated that he would spend \$3,400,000. There was actually spent \$4,500,000; so that my estimate was \$200,000 too little, but the estimate of the Finance Minister was \$900,000 too little. In the addition or increase of debt, I estimated \$4,000,000 increase. The Finance Minister estimated an increase of \$1,750,000. I was \$900,000 too much; my hon. friend was \$1,290,000 too little. If the receipts from inland revenue had been at all normal, my predictions would have been carried out almost to the figure. As they were, my predictions, of course, being based only on what might normally occur, were out that much. I thought it worth while to bring this matter to the attention of the House lest, as I have said, some too excessive partisans behind the Government benches might think that the present Finance Minister was infallible, and that the only fallible predictor was the ex-Finance Minister.

The hon. gentleman also rallied me on my statement that he would have to borrow \$10,000,000 in 1896-97. He declared he did not borrow \$10,000,000 in 1896-97. No, he did not; he postponed it exactly three months, and then went into the money market and borrowed \$10,000,000. I am willing to let the hon. gentleman have the benefit of that small period of grace he can possibly wish. He said I declared that they were entering on a year of reckless expenditure which was to end in disaster. I wish I had used the word era, instead of year, and

then we should have obtained a little more time, and in order to get a good arbiter time must be given in which to prove it. But if the end is disaster, when a Government supported by a party which in its rank and file and leadership made its greatest canvass in the country on the plank that it was going to lop off from the expenditure, succeeded during the very first full year in adding \$1,400,000 to the expenditure, I may well say that even that year ended in disaster; and if the succeeding year, with an expenditure of \$1,800,000 promised to us greater than 1896-97, does not, in view of the pledges publicly given and accepted, end in disaster. So far as party faith and party consistency is concerned, I am not willing to take back my words. Let time be the arbiter; but let us have a sufficiency of time, and I think it will be found out that hon. gentlemen in return for the pledges given to the country on the side of economy in expenditures, will be found to have recorded promises violated and repudiated, and the year certainly will end in disaster to them in that way.

I next wish to say a word or two with respect to the loan. As regards the rate at which the loan was placed upon the British market, I entirely agree with the Minister of Finance in his action in placing it at half per cent lower than the two preceding loans were placed on the market. I disagree with him entirely in his unfortunate remark that it was an experiment. I deny that it was an experiment. The Finance Minister in placing his loan on the London market at a lower rate was following a long line of precedents and a safe line of precedents, and with the premium at which our lowest rate loan then stood on the English market, it would have been a blunder, to say nothing stronger, to have placed a loan on the market at 3 per cent; it was nothing more or less than any prudent business man would have done, and was not in any sense an experiment for Canada, with her credit so safe, assured and undoubted as it was at the time the Finance Minister put the loan on the market. We have had drops in the rate per cent. In 1884 there was a drop from 4 per cent for 1879 to a $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent loan. The net cost was $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent; and the net gain was one-quarter per cent from the ruling of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent before. In 1888 another drop took place, and a 3 per cent loan was placed on the market, following the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent loan of 1885. That cost $3\frac{1}{2}$ and was a gain of $\frac{1}{8}$ ths of 1 per cent upon the rate of the preceding loan.

In 1897, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) placed a $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent loan upon the market, following the 3 per cent loan of 1894, netting $2\frac{1}{2}$ in cost, with a gain of 7-24ths of 1 per cent over the preceding ruling of $3\frac{1}{2}$. Now, Sir, let us compare these. The gain in 1884 from 4 per cent to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent was 6-24ths of 1 per cent; in 1888 from $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to 3 per cent it was 20-24ths of 1 per cent, and in 1897 the loan of the hon. gentleman (Mr.

Fielding) was a gain of 7-24ths of 1 per cent. Therefore, the gain in percentage on the net cost of the loan, governed by the rate of interest, was 20-24ths in 1888, as against 7-24ths in 1897, and as against 6-24ths in 1884. Consequently, although the loan in 1897 was a good loan, and although the gain was a perceptible gain, the gain was not half as much as the gain in the drop from $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to the 3 per cent loan in 1888. Neither was it so popular a loan. The loan of 1892 had 420 tenderers; the loan of 1894 had 566 tenderers, and was subscribed six times over; the loan of 1897 had 183 tenderers only, and was subscribed only twice over. While we may justly laud our country and its credit, and feel satisfied with the loan of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), it is a mistake, in the first place, to say, that it was an experiment; in the second place, that it was the best loan that was ever put on the market, and, in the third place, that it marked the greatest drop in the rate of interest of any loan put upon the market.

Now, having said all that, I grant that, when you come to 3 per cent, or $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, or 2 per cent, you cannot expect such large drops in the absolute credit; but what I mean to say is this, that, taking the precedent history of Canada, taking its high range of credit at the time—its threes running to 106 and 107—taking the stable home conditions of this country, the Minister of Finance could have done nothing else, and he did perfectly right in placing the loan at a $2\frac{1}{2}$ rate. And though he did not get within a point or two of what some of us hoped he would get, he made a good loan, and the effect of it will be felt in succeeding financial transactions which this country will have on the money markets of England. It was a good loan and well placed; but it is Canada that stands at the back of that loan, and it was the condition and progress of the country running through an antecedent history of thirty years, which made it possible for us to congratulate ourselves on both sides of the House, upon the fine position which Canada has assumed in the money markets of the world.

While I am speaking on the loan, I will mention the cognate subject of the reductions which have been made in the savings bank interest rate. When I was incumbent of the office of Minister of Finance, a considerable time after the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent loan had been placed upon the market in London, I recommended a reduction of the rate of interest on savings bank deposits from 4 to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I did so because the difference between the rates at which money could be borrowed at that time upon the London market, all costs and charges included, and the savings bank rate, was too great a difference to justify the country in calling upon the taxpayers to pay the difference between these two rates. But, at the same time, I recognize the view—which

I think, is a view which will be recognized by this House—that, owing to circumstances which I shall detail a little more hereafter, it is a wise and prudent thing for the Government of this country to give to the lenders inside the country itself as good, yes, and a little better interest than is given to those who loan us money from the outside. There are so many advantages in connection with the latter that it weighs against even a considerable percentage of difference between the amounts that you give as interest. Now, Sir, on July 1st, 1897, the present Government, acting upon the same rule, with our 3 per cents up to, and a little above, par, came to the conclusion that the rate should be reduced, and it was reduced from 3½ per cent to 3. With that I was entirely in accord, but I think it would have been well if the Government for the present had rested there, and had gone no further. To me it is plain that they would have rested there, if their necessities, or their lack of courage, had not counselled them to the course which they have taken, and which is the opposite of the course for which I have been arguing up to this time.

What were the reasons given by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) as to why he proposes, on the first of next July, to reduce the rate of savings bank interest from 3 per cent to 2½ per cent? The reason that he gave is this, that he wanted the banks to borrow more cheaply than they otherwise would be enabled to do. He said that the banks were lenders as well as borrowers, or borrowers as well as lenders, and his argument was, that if the banks could borrow more cheaply, they would lend more cheaply, and, consequently, that the general business of the country would be benefited thereby. Now, suppose we admit that reasoning; the moment you carry it beyond a certain point, and that point a fair and reasonable value for money, that moment you are reasoning upon false premises, and if you come to a conclusion from them, you are coming to a conclusion which is not well based. The banks are borrowers as well as lenders, and the Government is a borrower as well as a spender.

The Government, to spend, must borrow; and it has to borrow in the outside market or in the country itself, or in both. Up to this time, the policy of the Government has been to borrow part of its moneys from the people of this country itself. There was one other reason to which the hon. Finance Minister gave expression, in which I do not agree. He gave as the reason for the establishment of the Government savings bank the necessity of having a place of safe deposit for the savings of the people. Sir, I make bold to say that if that had been the reason, and the only reason, we would never have had a Government savings bank established in this country at all. The banking system of this country has proved itself so safe and so sound, that as

furnishing an element of security for the deposits of the people has, it has never been called into question to such an extent, as to make it necessary for the Government, in order to safeguard the deposits of the people, to establish a Government savings bank. But the underlying principle of the establishment of a Government savings bank was the encouragement of habits of thrift among the people at large, by placing this means of saving at their disposal. The hon. Minister of Finance was therefore upon entirely unteuable ground when he narrowed the argument for the establishment of Government savings banks down to the statement that they were necessary in order to furnish the people with places of safe deposit for their savings. Whereas the main reason, the sole reason, in fact, for their establishment was the encouragement of thrift and saving habits among the people at large.

Neither do I agree with him in his effort to make us believe that the savings banks, established and maintained by the Government, have lost their old purpose. Strange argument, too! He gave us, first, as their only purpose, the providing of a place of safe deposit; but by using the second argument, he showed that, in his mind, he went back to the real reason why these banks were established, and that was the encouragement of thrift and saving habits in the people. He said that the reason for Government savings banks, namely, to furnish a place of deposit for the savings of the poorer classes no longer existed, because, as a rule, the deposits in them were made, not by the poorer classes, but mainly by people who use these banks as a convenience. I take issue with the hon. gentleman on that point, and the statistics of the savings department will, I believe, bear me out in the statement that the deposits in the Government savings banks are those of men of small means—men of salary, with gains not sufficient, in any one year or six months, to enable them to make an outside and permanent investment, but only sufficient to allow them a little margin between their earnings and what is necessary to keep them, which they can conveniently place, from time to time, in the savings banks, and so add to their little store, and in this way is encouraged that most useful of all habits, the habit of thrift and saving. Why is it that my hon. friend should be so concerned for the bases of supply for the banks of the country that he refuses to do justice to the small savers the whole Dominion through? Why is it? Did he justify himself, when in reply to my hon. friends who said to him: "You are not doing much for the poor man," he made that smart, but not very well based retort, that there are a great many poorer men in the country who object to paying the interest to the poor men who have deposits in the banks. To my mind the proper way to look at it is this. The taxes of the country are taken,

to a certain extent, to pay what? To pay the interest on the debt which the Government owes. The Government owe to the savings bank depositors \$50,000,000. That is a Government loan. The taxpayers are paying interest on the Government loan; and it is an unfair way of putting it, to say that they are paying interest to a number of depositors and that therefore it is a grievance to them. What rule of right is there by which the hon. gentleman can fly to the rescue of the banks as against the savers of the country? By what rule does he pay $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest to money lenders and refuse to pay that much by $\frac{1}{2}$ of one per cent to the people of the country who deposit in the Government savings banks? For fifty years the poor men and the rich men of this country alike will be paying $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest on the ten million dollars that my hon. friend borrowed, whilst the thrifty savers of the country are docked $\frac{1}{2}$ of one per cent for every dollar that they loan to the Government. For forty years from this date, the poor people and the rich people of this country will be paying interest on fifty million dollars which does not mature until 1938, and will be paying a rate of one-half per cent more than my hon. friend is willing to allow to the savers of this country who deposit their money in the Government savings bank. And for eleven years yet the Government will be obliged to pay $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on 25 million dollars which does not mature until 1909 or thereabouts, while they are paying just one per cent less to the poor thrifty classes of the country who put their money in the Government savings banks and thus make a loan of it to the Government. Why make this distinction? Was there not enough reason for the establishment of the Government savings bank in the argument that it does conduce to thrifty habits? Where is the enlightened and advanced country in the world that has not its Government savings banks established, and established for that purpose and on that principle? Not one. Suppose, for instance, that the depositors in the Government savings banks should take my hon. friend at his word and should say to him: Then get your money in London at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent; we will take out our fifty million dollars. What would that mean? It would mean that \$1,500,000 per year of interest, which now is distributed throughout the length and breadth of the country to these savers, would be sent out of the country into the pockets of the money lenders of foreign countries. Is it a slight thing to have the interest upon a large proportion of the money that the Government must loan to carry on its administration distributed among the thrifty class of this country as a income coming to them every six months of the year—distributed everywhere, permeating every channel of business, every artery and vein of trade and

Mr. FOSTER.

traffic in this country? Or would it be better to have all that paid out of this country into a foreign country? I think no one will say that the latter is the better plan.

Take another argument. Is it not well that the masses of this country should have that intelligent and permanent interest in its institutions and Government which comes in no way better and is held in no way stronger than by the fact that they have not only a stake in the country, but a direct personal, monetary interest in the Government and the institutions of the country as well. The stability of France and its wonderful progress and prosperity among its peasant class is due to that fact very largely indeed. And, therefore, I say, my hon. friend has made a mistake in reducing the interest on savings bank deposits in this country one single fraction less than the rates we are obliged to pay for money in the other markets of the world. And, Sir, I state broadly my conviction, which I hinted at a moment ago, that if it had not been for the necessities or cowardice of my hon. friend, he would not have made this cut in the savings bank interest. Why, Sir, in the cut of 1 per cent which will take place after 1st July, 1898, in the interest of the savings bank deposits, the Government will save half a million dollars. Are they giving that money back to the country? Have their estimates of expenditure been cut down by that amount? Their estimates of expenditure, Sir, are above, and much above, what they were, even though they will save \$500,000 a year by this cut. Having determined upon their rate of expenditure, there was one of two things for them to do. One was to put that much extra taxation upon the country. They did not dare to do that. The other was to put this tax upon the thrift, upon the saving habits of the people and dock the savings bank depositors by that amount. I leave it to this House and to the country to judge which was the better way.

Now, Sir, after having made these observations, I desire to ask whether my hon. friend felt that he could congratulate the House and the country upon the policy of the Administration as shown in its management of the finances for the year 1896-97. Hon. gentlemen must expect, so long as they make pledges and do not fulfil them, so long as they obtain their seats by promises, which they first evade and then violate, and then repudiate, that they will have this state of things brought to their minds, and that very forcibly. Not, I candidly say, because I believe that it will have any effect upon the hon. gentlemen themselves, but because I know and believe that this country demands the fulfilment of the pledges of public men, and, though hon. gentlemen ignore it, they must reckon with it by and by when they meet the electors face to face. On this matter of the ad-

ministration of the finances for 1896-97, does my hon. friend venture to congratulate his party and the country? Let us see?

The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is not now present, but who is somewhere within the precincts of the House, in 1895, after the memorable convention of 1893, which laid down the platform of the party, declared, in elucidation of one section of that platform:

The Liberal party, if in power, could at once reduce the public expenditure and effect other savings to the extent of \$5,000,000 per annum, without impairing the efficiency of the service.

The Prince Edward Island political primer—and now you will see my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) wake up—which is responsible for the utterances of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) declared in well accentuated and well defined terms and under broad headlines—

The Liberal party says that several millions may be lopped off the present expenditure, without injury to the public service. Hon. David Mills estimates the probable saving at \$4,000,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). What paper is the hon. gentleman quoting from?

Mr. FOSTER. I am quoting from the political primer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no such paper.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a periodical paper.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never heard of it.

Mr. FOSTER. It came into existence and was distributed by hundreds of thousands of copies, I suppose, all through the hon. gentleman's province about the time of certain elections that took place in 1896.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) lay a copy of it on the Table?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) has had several copies on his table which he now, very conveniently, lays under the table.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never heard of the thing at all.

Mr. FOSTER. It gave the platform and principles of the Reform party, gave the statements of the Liberal leaders, and was the political primer by which the Liberal party in the maritime provinces, and in Prince Edward Island especially, were to be guided in their estimate of political parties. And so, in that political primer, the hon. gentleman gave voice to the statement which I have already read. Well, Sir, the leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who is now convalescent and may be able to bear the shock of even a repe-

dition of a pledge which he made to the public, said:

And, moreover, they tell us that, if we were in power, we could not retrench and economize. But I do not believe that it will be a difficult task. It would not be a very difficult task to economize to the extent of one, two, three, and Mr. Mills told his constituents a few days ago that it was possible to retrench to the extent of four millions a year.

In Toronto the hon. gentleman said:

Has the expenditure gone down? No. It has gone up. It went up by one, two, three, five, ten millions, and more, until it is now thirty-eight millions and the Conservatives do not shrink from it, but swallow it all. If we get into power we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie, and I say that, although we may not be able to bring back the expenditures to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount two, yes, three millions of dollars per year.

And, Sir, the party itself, in solemn conclave assembled, under the motion of Mr. Gibbons, which was unanimously passed, declared:

We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the Governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand a strict economy in the administration of the Government of the country.

And last, Sir, but not least, as representative of these pledges, is a citation from my hon. friend, now the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who, on a certain occasion, to wit, in 1896, in his place in this Parliament, declared, after I had brought down the Budget:

For my own part, I do not hesitate to tell him that I consider a yearly expenditure of, \$40,000,000, or \$38,300,000, altogether too large for the present resources of Canada. I say it is a disgrace and a shame to the Government that have been entrusted with our affairs that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of \$38,300,000 a year for federal purposes. Sir, the thing is utterly unjustifiable. Sir, there is very little use for hon. gentlemen whining over this matter. They ought to try and meet it, and the way to meet it is to reduce our present establishment, to reduce your present extravagant mode of government, and to reduce your extravagant ideas. I have said before, and I repeat it, that \$38,000,000 is, in my judgment, a monstrous sum for this people to be called on to provide for.

These, Sir, are simply sample statements of the leaders of the party, and of the party itself, in which they solemnly pledged themselves and their party to the country as to the policy they would pursue, if they were put in power by the votes of the electorate. They have been put in power by the votes of the electorate on that pledge. Let us now see whether the hon. gentlemen can congratulate themselves upon fulfilling this particular pledge. What about the debt of the

country? Well, the debt of the country increased while we were in power, from 1890 to 1896, on the average, \$2,652,900 per year; the last year of our administration the increase was \$3,028,000. The increase in 1896-97, under hon. gentlemen opposite, was \$3,041,163, and the increase for 1897-98, the current year, as given by the Finance Minister himself, after eight months of the year has elapsed, is \$4,500,000, or \$1,500,000 over the increase of 1896, and \$1,900,000 over and above the average yearly increase of the debt from 1890 to 1896. So much, then, for their pledge with reference to the increase of the debt.

Now, how about taxation? Well, from 1892 to 1896, the customs revenue of the country averaged \$19,839,684. In 1897 it went up to \$19,891,996. In 1898, the Finance Minister estimates that it will be \$21,000,000, and in 1899, he estimates that it will be still \$21,000,000. So, Sir, for 1898 and 1899 the amount that will be raised from the people of this country by customs taxation alone will be \$1,200,000 greater than it was, on the average, between 1892 and 1896—that is customs impost alone. It was strange, that, when the hon. gentleman was telling what a large amount he proposed to collect next year from customs, to wit, \$21,000,000, some one on that side of the House, in a moment of thoughtlessness, or of weakness, commenced to cheer him, but suddenly left off when they recollected that what they were cheering was an increase of the burdens of taxation upon the people, which they pledged their constituents to lower. Well, go a little further. We will take the total taxation, made up by both customs and excise. The average, from 1892 to 1896, was \$27,710,000. But, when this economical Government came into power, the taxation suddenly raised, in 1896-97, to \$28,648,620. In 1898, it is estimated at \$29,000,000, and in 1899 it is estimated at \$29,500,000. So that the total of taxes to be raised in 1899 is \$1,800,000 greater than it was in 1896-97, and that much greater than it was, on the average, from 1892 to 1896. Take the total revenue of the country, which must come from the country and be paid by the country, and whereas we raised, from 1892 to 1896, \$36,400,000 per year, in 1896-97 they raised \$37,800,000; in 1897-98 they are to raise \$39,300,000, and in 1899 they are to raise \$40,500,000, or \$4,000,000 more of a total revenue than we raised, on the average, between 1892 and 1896.

But hon. gentlemen may say: We are not increasing the burdens of taxation. Well, the burden of taxation is measured by the amount that you take from the pockets of the people. The amount that you take from the pockets of the people will be \$4,000,000 more in 1898-99 than it was in 1895-96. If you take it from the people, the people must pay it. Oh, but you say: We have reduced the tariff very largely; and the Minister of Finance read, the other day, a list of reduc-

tions they have made in the tariff. It is wonderful, Mr. Speaker, how often this reduction in individual rates brought down by the Minister of Finance does not work out the enormous reduction that he expected, when he comes to the actual results of trade and commerce. Let us see how it works out in this respect. In 1893 the rate per cent on dutiable and free goods entered for home consumption was 17·88; in 1896 it was 18·28; in 1897, 17·87. The average from 1892 to 1896 was less than the rate per cent upon dutiable and free goods in 1896-97. But on dutiable goods alone, entered for home consumption in Canada, how do the figures stand? In 1893 that duty was 30·28; in 1894 it was 30·87; in 1895, 30·87; in 1896, 30·07, and in 1897, 30·04, or a reduction in that year of exactly 3-100ths of 1 per cent. But my hon. friend says that is not a fair comparison, because in 1896-97 we only have about two months, from the 22nd April to the 30th June in which the duty was lowered. Grant that. Then, let us take the records of the trade for the first six months of this current year, when hon. gentlemen have had their tariff in operation up to the extent of one-half of the preferential, at least. And what happened, Sir? We find that the rate per cent upon the imports of dutiable goods taken for home consumption for this six months is 29·59 per cent, which, subtracted from the rate for 1896-97, gives a lowering of exactly 4-500ths of 1 per cent in the rate of duty which this country is paying upon dutiable goods entered for home consumption. That is the whole saving. So whereas, in the last year, we charged 30·07 per cent, this year, or the half of it, they are charging 29·59 per cent upon all dutiable goods entered for home consumption.

But, outside of that, we are asked to put on new taxation this year. Not only is there to be a saving of half a million dollars after the beginning of next year, screwed out of the savers and thrifty depositors in the savings bank, for which the country gets not one dollar in remission of taxation, but there is also to be new taxation placed upon the country. To what amount, and under what pretense? Under the pretense, Sir, of helping sister colonies in distress, under the pretense of taking part of the Imperial load, and helping England to carry it. A proposition is made, first, quietly to raise the taxes on raw sugar and refined sugar, and then with a blare of trumpets to say to the West Indian colonies: We will let you in here with your sugar at the preferential rate. They first take the precaution to so far raise the dead level rate that when the percentage taken off for the preferential reduction is made, they will still pay a greater tax than that imposed when brought in here to-day. Under these circumstances and this pretense we are asked to place a duty on sugar. Three hundred and thirty million pounds were brought into this country last year; 25,000,000 of that came from

the West Indies. How much will come under the new arrangement? The Finance Minister could not tell, he could not even guess. No man can tell accurately; but I have this to predict, and I will hazard it and let time again be the arbiter: that the Finance Minister stands to-day to gain, under this imposition of the duty on sugar, somewhere between \$250,000 and \$350,000 of revenue in the full year from the time it goes into operation. How splendid it is to help the West Indian colonies in their struggle! How equally splendid it is, under the guise of high Imperial sympathies and brotherly help, to obtain \$300,000 or \$400,000 of taxes to aid the expenditures of the country, but to give no relief to any home interest by your action. So much with respect to the pledges of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to taxation.

Now as to the expenditure? From 1887 to 1896 we, under our administration, expended an average of \$36,850,000 on consolidated fund account. In 1896, the last year of our administration, for a time, we expended \$36,949,142. The right hon. Prime Minister, when he was not Prime Minister, but when his word was trusted as I fear to-day it is not trusted, declared that when he and his party came into power, they would reduce the expenditure by one, two or three millions of dollars, and the Hon. David Mills said four millions. How has the right hon. gentleman redeemed his word? By reducing the expenditure for 1896-97 by one, two or three million? No; but by increasing it by \$1,400,000, as his own Finance Minister acknowledged when he stood before the House last week and delivered his Budget speech. But time is required, and as the hon. gentleman could not make the reduction last year, perhaps my hon. friend intends to implement his pledge during the current year. If so he has an account to settle with his Finance Minister, who publicly declared that during the current year the expenditure would be \$38,750,000 on consolidated fund account, which is exactly \$1,800,000 more than we spent in 1896, and is \$400,000 more than hon. gentlemen opposite themselves spent last year. But perhaps time is not yet ripe, and my right hon. friend will see fit to implement his promise during 1898-99. Already he has been forestalled by his Finance Minister, who has declared in this House by bringing down the Estimates, which are simply the first Estimates, and various others must be added, that \$39,124,000 is the estimated expenditures for 1898-99, a sum which will be, if expended, \$2,174,000 more than was expended in 1896-97. How wonderful the promises of my right hon. friend have been fulfilled! He declared to the electors of this country: Place me in power, and I will reduce the expenditure by one, two or three millions. The right hon. gentleman was put into power, and within two years instead of reducing

the expenditure one million, two millions or three millions he has reached a point within \$500,000 or \$600,000 of the three millions, and the first Estimates for 1898-99 have only been announced by the Finance Minister.

Do hon. gentlemen opposite believe that there is anything whatever in a pledge? When they first came to this House they were not so bold as they are now. They simply evaded their pledges, and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) still gave them his support, because they did not declare out and out that they would not carry out their pledges. Another year passed, and they deliberately violated their pledges, but they apologized for the act. That stage has now passed, and still the hon. member for North Wellington supports them. Now the Finance Minister has torn off all disguise, and a few days ago he stood up in this House and declared that he repudiated their pledges to reduce the expenditure on consolidated fund account. First, they evaded their pledges; then they violated them, and were quiet about it; then they gained courage to stand up before the country and repudiate them, and declare that it was folly to think that this country could be administered with \$37,000,000 and that we ourselves must acknowledge that this could not be done. I ask the right hon. First Minister: Does he have any respect for his word as a man? No man can hold up his head who makes a square pledge to his brother man and without rhyme or reason violates it; but if a pledge made to a brother man is binding, it is five million times as binding when the pledge is made to 5,000,000 of people, and when the right hon. gentleman gets into position and power by the fact of having made that pledge. A cynical expression sweeps over the face of the young Napoleon from the North-west. He has no qualms of conscience, but the leader of this Government might be supposed to have. What is he going to do about it? Does he deny his promises? No. Will he implement his promises? No; he is as putty in the potter's hands and the men who sit behind him and the men who sit around him use him at their will and raise the expenditure by one million, two millions and even three millions of dollars during the three years they are estimating for. Where, Sir, is the big policeman from Ontario? Where is that big policeman from Ontario who was paraded in the columns of the Montreal "Star" by that "Grit M. P. from Ontario" as a man with huge club who would stand before the Minister of Public Works, and in doughty war if need be, would make him lower his flags of extravagance and promise—even if he did not perform the promise—to be more economical in future. The big policeman is off beat to-day.

An hon. MEMBER. Dead beat.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend suggests "dead beat," but I will not go that far.

Mr. DAVIN. He has burned his baton.

Mr. FOSTER. He has evidently given up the contest, at all events. Now, Sir, what about capital expenditure? On capital expenditure, from 1887 to 1896, we spent \$3,639,000 a year; in 1897, hon. gentlemen opposite spent \$4,460,000; in 1897-98, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) tells us that they will spend \$7,506,185. Adding the two together, and whereas our average expenditure was forty millions and a half from 1887 to 1896, and in 1896 was \$41,800,000; in 1897-98, by the Finance Minister's words they propose to spend \$46,256,185 on consolidated fund and capital expenditure. Are they economizing? Did they promise they would economize? Do they treat the people with contempt? How is it with their own consciences?

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend says, "oh oh." It is a very happy illustration indeed when the "oh, oh," comes from the source it does. What a silly thing is conscience. Why are men troubled with it? The hon. gentleman who said "oh, oh," evidently is not troubled with it, but there are some sober people on these benches who have consciences, and there are a great many people outside in this country who will call these gentlemen to task at the bar of public opinion, and demand from them why they made their pledges and first quietly violated them, and lastly, openly repudiated them. There is but one of two alternatives for these gentlemen to take. Either they were fooling the people when they were making the promises, or else they were ignorant of what they were talking about, and it is remarkable that politicians of ten and twenty years' standing could have been so ignorant. Which horn of the dilemma will they take? Both will be equally unpalatable to many of the hon. gentlemen who support the Government.

I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to one reason which he gave. He said: There is an excess of expenditure of \$1,400,000 in 1896-97. Now, Sir, it has been stated often that expenditures are of two kinds, namely, controllable and uncontrollable, and these hon. gentlemen opposite try to make it appear that the increase of \$1,400,000 is in the uncontrollable expenditure. A list was given by the Finance Minister, and what does it amount to? It amounts to this: that with \$1,400,000 of increased expenditure, \$256,000 alone went to what you may call the uncontrollable items, and \$1,140,000 went for controllable items, which the Government have full power over. They have not even the excuse that this \$1,400,000 was pulled out of them for interest on the debt. The main increase, as I have stated, was

Mr. FOSTER.

on controllable expenditure over which the Government had the rein, and over which they could exercise the power if they wished. But, Sir, in explaining that they called for \$400,000 more for 1897-98 than they spent in 1896-97, the Minister of Finance says there is an excess of \$400,000, and he told us he called for that because of certain reasons, one of which was to pay the increased interest on the loan made in 1897. I call the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) to that, and I ask him the following question: Is it not true that in 1896-97 the hon. gentleman was paying on from four to seven millions in the shape of temporary loans, of the amount for which he afterwards went, in 1897, upon the London market and borrowed. I think I am right in saying that the temporary loans were between four and seven millions, before the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) made the loan in 1897. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) was paying in 1896-97 on these temporary loans 4 per cent—if I am mistaken he can correct me. In 1897-98, these temporary loans at 4 per cent are retired, and they are met by the six or seven millions from the \$10,000,000 on which he is paying 2½ per cent only. He is making a saving in that of \$79,000 or \$80,000. More than that, in 1896-97 the hon. gentleman was paying 3½ per cent on the savings bank deposits. The reduction of ½ per cent comes into force on the 1st of July, 1898; so that as compared with 1896-97, in 1897-98, the current year, he will have the benefit of ½ per cent upon fifty million dollars, which makes \$250,000 that he will save in this current year, as against the year 1896-97. Add the two together and you have a full saving of \$330,000, and take away the whole interest on the ten millions loan for the nine months, which is \$216,000, and the Finance Minister has a saving of over \$100,000 on account of interest on the debt. And yet, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) tries to make this House give the \$400,000 increase, on the ground that he requires a part of it—he did not say how much—in order to pay the increased interest on the public debt. As a fact, he will be paying less interest on the public debt than he paid the preceding year, and when July of next year comes he will save, as compared with that year, \$500,000 on the savings bank deposits alone, for which, as I have stated, he has given the country no relief in any way. The Minister of Finance has now taken the bull by the horns, so to speak, and whereas from the time of the elections up to this year they accomplished the evasion and violation of pledges, with apology or with silence; the Minister himself comes forth with a statement this year which is a virtual repudiation of their intention to carry out these pledges at all. I notice that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Pater-son) is laughing heartily over these viola-

tions of pledges. I should not think my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) would laugh, because of all other men in the Government my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) should consider that a pledge is a sacred thing and ought to be carried out. I am very sorry to see the extreme levity with which he treats such an important matter as the violations of public faith by himself and by his colleagues.

Mr. BENNETT. He is sitting too near the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that he sits too close to the Minister of Public Works, and I am afraid that the bad example is contagious in that respect. The Minister of Finance said:

I think that hon. gentlemen opposite themselves will admit that it is not possible to continue the expenditure on the figures of last year.

That was the year 1895-96 the expenditure of which, in round numbers, was thirty-seven million dollars. There is a statement, straight and clear, made by the First Minister, that he does not propose to reduce the expenditure upon the consolidated fund by one, two or three millions, while his practice has increased it by one million, by two millions and for 1898-99 pretty nearly three million dollars. Having detailed these, I leave the condemnation of the Government to a sturdy stalwart—one of the old guard, and one of the hon. gentleman's old time supporters—the Huntingdon "Gleaner." In July, 1897—what would it say now coming on to July, 1898?—the Huntingdon "Gleaner" said:

Sir Richard Cartwright pledged himself to end all this if he was given opportunity; he would give the people lower taxes and taxes honestly imposed and expended. Within a few months of his making that offer he was taken by the electors at his word, and last week, while acting Premier, and leader of a majority strong enough to do his will, instead of lowering either debt or taxes he submitted the largest Supply Bill yet known, and obtained permission to borrow \$15,000,000 more to add to the debt. There is no reconciling the promises of this man with his performances, for his own acts give the lie to his pledges. He has disgraced himself, and, worse still, disgraced the Liberal party, unless it disavows him, and compels Laurier to dispense with his services.

There are two motives why prompt and decisive action should be taken with the men responsible for the breach of faith with the country. First, as Liberals, we are bound to see that the pledges given by our party are carried out. For eighteen years the Liberal party bore beautiful testimony against the extravagance and jobbery which was piling debt and taxes upon the country. Now that it is in power is it going to redeem its pledges, or is it going to outdo the Conservatives in all that it condemned? Honesty and honour demand that the Liberal party be true to its promises, and disagreeable and difficult though it may be, any Minister who stands in the way must be set aside. Unless this is done, every

sincere Liberal will feel there has been a breach of faith with the electors, who never looked for a Government of our party giving the C. P. R. more money, or resuming the business of dickers in railways subsidies and local contracts. Second, the needs of the farmers require a Government of economy and retrenchment. We know whereof we speak when we say the farmers cannot stand a continuance of the policy of the past month. They are struggling to make ends meet as they never have struggled since the country was first settled, and are utterly unable to be taxed to pay interest on subsidies to enterprises which, even when desirable, can easily be postponed until our finances improve.

When Tupper left office with an interest-bearing debt of \$280,000,000, thoughtful men breathed freely, for they believed the danger that menaced, the country was at an end, and that the debt, under Liberal rule, would begin to be reduced. Instead of that, the close of the current fiscal year will show twenty millions more added to it, which means so much more of the earnings of our farmers snatched from them—so many hundred thousand dollars more sent across the Atlantic to pay interest to the holders of Canada's bonds. This is intolerable, and if the farmers were alive to their interests they would miss no opportunity to make known their demand that all grants to railways and new public works must cease until such time as the revenue exceeds the expenditure, and that under no circumstances must the public debt be increased. That is the platform of the farmers, and the country was led to believe that was the platform of the Liberal party. If Laurier and his Ministers are not prepared to give it effect, the sooner they cease to call themselves Liberals the more they will deserve respect. The country comes before party, and party before individuals. In this instance the interests of the country and of the Liberal party are identical, and no individual, however high his position, can be allowed to stand in their way. The interests at stake are too serious for either Liberals or farmers to stand upon ceremony or to show forbearance.

Having detailed these pledges, having given the proofs that they have been violated, and at last repudiated, I leave the condemnation of the Government to one of their old time supporters, who claims to be a Liberal still, wherever the party leaders may have gone.

Now, I come to another and more congenial part of the Finance Minister's address. It is that part in which he told the story of the great year, the year of plenty and progress, the year, to wit 1896-97. What more could the Finance Minister say about it than he has said?

Canada's export trade during that year was by far the largest and greatest of any year in its history.

He detailed the savings bank deposits, which the gentleman who sits beside him to his right (Sir Richard Cartwright) was wont, during the Liberal-Conservative administration, to pooh, pooh, as an evidence of prosperity. He depicted these in glowing colours; he detailed the deposits in the chartered banks in the same way, the returns of the clearing houses, the carryings of the railway and their consequent appreciation in

share values. All these things he depicted in glowing and befitting terms before the House and the country, and challenged the attention of Canada to the results of the year 1896-97. I bow to the hon. gentleman's power of praise and panegyric, and simply wish to ask him and this House what year was that whose history he was recording. It was the year from the first of July, 1896, to the first of July, 1897, during every month of which the policy of this Government, if they have any, had no more influence or effect, and no more weight than if they had never sat in this House. The year 1896-97—what are the elements that made that year so favourable in a trade point of view and so noteworthy in my hon. friend's mind? Why, the exports of this country rose from \$121,000,000 in 1896 to \$138,000,000 in 1897—\$17,000,000 of an increase. To get down to facts, let me ask my hon. friend to drop off three of those millions and to take, not the basis of the total exports, but the basis of the domestic Canadian exports for those two years, and if he does that he will find that the increase in these exports was just \$14,000,000—a notable increase, an increase worthy of all the glowing colours in which my hon. friend painted it. And, Sir, in what was that increase? The exports from the mines increased by \$3,150,000. Will any gentleman tell me that what influence in the wide world the hon. gentleman's accession to office and remaining in office from July 1st, 1896, to July 1, 1897, had upon the products of the mines of Canada? If there were any things that contributed to the prosperity of the mines, they were antecedent conditions, all of which had been laid under Liberal-Conservative rule and Liberal-Conservative policy. Not one ounce of ore of lead, or silver, or gold, was raised to the surface and sold in that year from any impelling effect that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite had. They had not then announced their policy. In the products of the forest there was an increase of exports to the amount of \$4,100,000. Will any hon. gentleman tell me what influences the Liberal policy had upon the amount of lumber which was marketed in the year 1896-97, almost every foot of which was cut before the elections were held as a result of which these hon. gentlemen came into office? If any portion of what was sold in that year was cut in 1896-97, no policy of the hon. gentlemen could have had any effect upon it, because they had not yet given forth their policy. There was an increase in the exports of animals and their products to the extent of \$3,000,000. No hon. gentleman will tell me that the increase of \$3,000,000 in the marketed animals and their products was in the least degree affected in any way by the fact that the Liberals came into power or by their policy, which was undetermined and not announced until within two months of the end of the year. The animals sold must have been one, two, three

Mr. FOSTER.

or four years old before the elections were held, in June, 1896, which brought these hon. gentlemen into power. Then take the agricultural products. There was an increase under this head of \$7,700,000, and to this the same general remark applies. If you add these all together, you have an increase in these four items of \$17,900,000, whereas the total export increase was only \$14,000,000. The whole of the increase and \$3,900,000 more is accounted for in these four products, upon the production and sale and price of which the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite had not the least appreciable effect.

So far as the sources of supply are concerned, this whole year of plenty was based upon antecedent conditions which grew up under the National Policy and the administration of the Liberal-Conservative party. So far as the crop conditions were concerned, they were entirely the result of the circumstances of the season and the overruling care of Providence; while, so far as the prices were concerned, they were due to want and scarcity, and, in some cases, even to famine and dire disaster in other food-producing countries of the world, which made the supply less, and so raised the prices, and so the sum total in value of our exports. The hon. gentleman did not in that year 1896-97, find a new market for one single pound of Canadian products anywhere the wide world over. Neither, as I said before, did the policy which they announced in April, 1897, have the least appreciable effect upon these productions, all of which had been raised or marketed before that policy was promulgated. The panegyric of the hon. gentleman was a good and a just one, but it was the glorification of an accomplished policy and not the birthsong of a new policy. That is still to be sung by my hon. friend.

Now, let me take up the next question, and ask my hon. friend whether he can congratulate himself and his party on the fiscal policy with which they have been experimenting from 1896 up to the present time? And first, with reference to the faith kept with the public and consistency as amongst themselves on the policies or principles of policies which they advocated. Whenever you come to this subject, Sir, in their dealings with it, you find, on the one hand, broken pledges, and on the other, confusion and hesitation in business. Going back to the hon. gentlemen's career five years and more before their assuming office, there are three great distinctive trends that their policy took. In the first place there were the long years of crusading for the overthrow of protection and the bringing again into effect of the revenue tariff policy of Alexander Mackenzie from 1875 to 1878. Then, there was this demand for an open door to the United States and a door barred and closed to Great Britain and to every other country in the world. And lastly,

there was the holding up of the British model for Canada, the uprooting of the curse and bane of protection and the ushering in of the free trade principles which governed British commerce and British administration. These were the three great lines upon which they conducted their campaigns before the public within a short time prior to the elections. And when the elections were passed and these gentlemen were in power, everybody asked: Which of these will they embody in their tariff policy? The leaders of the Government themselves knew as little which they would embody in their policy as did the great outside public, and so they were, perforce, obliged to wait for a year to see if they could agree upon something amongst themselves. And, although they had been breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the established fiscal and industrial system of this country, they left it with these threatenings and menaces against it for one whole year whilst they were trying to make up their minds what they would propose—to the confusion of business, to the doubt and timidity of capital and of enterprise in industrial pursuits. Well, Sir, in 1897, on the 22nd April, they came down with something that they could agree upon and threw it upon the Table of the House. They let it lie there without action from the 22nd of April until the 25th of May, in order that they might find out what it meant. And, on the 25th of May, they came down with a revised tariff from top to bottom and stood before the House and the country to explain what they had brought.

And what was it? They faced both ways, in fact, they faced all ways at once. As introduced, this measure was a measure of reciprocity open to the world. As explained after its introduction, it was a preferential policy exclusively to Great Britain; as amended, after months' waiting, it was a preferential policy open to be availed of by all most-favoured nations, and as carried out afterwards it was a reciprocal offer open to all most-favoured nations, plus the Netherlands, plus Japan, and, if time had served before another meeting of Parliament, plus, dear knows how many other countries. Now, Sir, am I right or not in stating that these were the phases through which their policy passed? But at first, and from the first, there was, I think, as nearly as I can get at it, amidst the haze, one underlying idea that they proposed to carry out, namely, that it was to be a broad and reciprocal policy, that it was not to be confined to Great Britain, that it did not contemplate narrowing Canada's commercial outlet to any one country, but that in that offer there were the germs of what, worked out, would bring a reciprocal trade on fair and equal terms with any country in the wide world that would listen to their proposals and meet those terms in a fair and equitable way. The Finance Minister said in 1897, in his Budget speech:

By the Belgian and German treaties any colony would be forbidden to make a preferential agreement with Great Britain alone. We do not by our resolution offer anything to Great Britain alone. * * * We make our offer, not to Great Britain only, but to every nation which is prepared to accept it. We make it to every nation which is willing to establish fair and reasonable trade relations with Canada.

The very night of his address, in reply to a statement from my hon. friend who sits opposite me, he said:

To-morrow morning at every custom-house in Canada, from ocean to ocean, the doors will be opened on terms of preferential trade with the mother country.

At first you would think there was a decided antagonism between those statements. There is as great an antagonism as words can make unless you read between the lines, and between the lines you can get the hon. gentleman's contention that the treaties do not apply—this is a reciprocal tariff open to the world—Great Britain is in a position now to be immediately brought in, and we hope the time will come when all other nations will come in. Now, Sir, if that was the statement of the Minister of Finance, let us see what the opinion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was:

I therefore submit that in the face of our customs autonomy, and in the absence of any such restrictions as exist in the Australian Constitutional Acts, and in virtue of the limitation of the treaty-making power of the Crown, and the absence of Imperial and colonial legislation giving effect to these treaties, they do not apply to Canada.

Nothing could be more positive.

I say this resolution neither discriminates nor differentiates. It attaches no terms which are not common to Great Britain and to all countries, and if Great Britain's fiscal system entitles her—as it does—to the immediate benefits which are daily flowing from the acceptance of our conditions, and if Germany and Belgium do not get the same advantages now it is not because of our legislation or our offer, but because of their own refusal to comply with the conditions which we have put in our offer.

There it is again—the treaties do not apply—we affirm that Great Britain is in a position to take immediately the advantage, but this is open to the world and we hope the world will take advantage of it. What about the Premier? When I asked him the question straight, before the vote:

I ask the Prime Minister to-night if he will tell the House, before we are called upon to vote, whether he considers that if this resolution passes and becomes law, he is bound to give the same treatment to Belgium and Germany and other countries that have with Great Britain most-favoured-nation treaty clauses? It is of the utmost importance to the action of this House to know it; it is of the utmost moment that the country should have a clear idea upon this subject.

The answer came from the Prime Minister:

If you want my answer now, I say decidedly that it does not apply to either Belgium or Germany.

The same note—the treaties do not apply—we do not acknowledge that—ours is a reciprocal offer open to the world—Great Britain can take immediate advantage of it—no other country can. Coming again to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, let us hear what he says :

Any gentleman who sat here and listened to that resolution as it was explained by the Minister of Finance knows that it was, and was intended, to be an offer of reciprocal trade to any country which would accept the conditions embodied in the resolution. It was not confined to one country more than another.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce himself was good enough to say :

But I say with respect to the offer we now make, that it is not a preferential offer at all in the true legal sense of the word. That offer is open to all the world. The Americans may avail themselves of it, so may the Germans and the Belgians. The whole world are welcome to avail themselves of it on the same terms and conditions on which England may take advantage of it. * * * We have undoubtedly offered better terms to those countries who trade with us fairly, but that offer has been made to the United States just as freely as it is to any other country, even Great Britain herself.

And again :

I tell the hon. gentleman that this is an offer of preferential trade to all countries that are qualified to come in. * * * If the Americans were willing to give us full, and fair and reciprocal advantages, I would recommend trading with them for the benefit of Canada and the Empire, too. I think Mr. Foster may find out before he is many years older that very probably, although I admit it is a little roundabout way, this is not a bad way to get it.

Now, Sir, you can only take one straightforward interpretation from these expressions, and that is that the hon. gentlemen proposed as their policy a policy of reciprocal trade open to all the nations of the world and denied to none. In looking over the nations of the world we deny, they said that any treaties that exist preclude them from this legislation, and preclude the governments from taking advantage of it. In looking over the nations of the world we declare that Great Britain is in a position at once to take advantage of it. But that does not prevent other countries from taking advantage of it, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce hoped that before I was many years older I would see the United States coming in by that door. They were not going to narrow trade. Canada was to have the markets of the wide world over, and to get them by barter and trade, giving to every other country that would give her compensating advantages, and so enlarging the bounds of trade. That was what they started with. Did they continue in that road? No, Sir. They had not long been

launched upon that road before they had to admit the force and cogency of the remarks that we made upon this side of the House, and to place a clause there which would allow them to get out if the Belgian and German treaties were found to be operative, more than that, which allowed their Bill to get the sanction of the Governor General by giving a loophole by which the British authorities could assent to the Bill and save the rights of the treaty nations of long years standing. Well, Sir, time went on and those treaties were upheld, the contentions of hon. gentlemen opposite were shown to be a blunder and wrong, from the beginning. When the law officers of the Crown buoyed up my hon. friend by giving him a chance to argue his case before them, that did not mean at all that they had any doubts upon the rights of the treaties, but it showed that they were courteous to the hon. gentleman, that they were not unwilling to deny him the right to argue his point, at least, before that august and learned body.

Then came the decision. And where were my hon. friends? They had, although they brought in a treaty which was not, and which was not intended to be, preferential to Great Britain exclusively, which they declared was not so intended, placed before the British people and British countries the argument, inducement and thought, that here was completely exclusive preferential treatment to Great Britain, that it applied to them, and was intended to apply to them, and to them alone. For consumption in Great Britain it was a good argument in Jubilee year, and it bore fruit in many ways, and it bore fruit quickly. But I am inclined to believe that the latter end of that business will be more prejudicial to the best interests of Canada and to the feeling of good faith between the two countries than if the hon. gentlemen had taken the square and manly position and had put before the British public just what they did do, nothing more and nothing less; for the British public awakened to the idea, a little later, that they were not getting exclusive privileges, but that Germany and Belgium and thirty-one other countries were getting exactly the same rights and privileges as the British manufacturer and the British trader. More, Sir. Those hon. gentlemen, in carrying out their measure, went further than the most-favoured nations; they went further than Germany and Belgium, and stepped outside of the pale of favoured nations, and were forced to take Holland and Japan, and would have been forced to have taken in many other countries, as well.

The hon. gentlemen come down to the House this year, and what is their position? Directly opposite to the position they occupied last year. Last year, they stood on broad phrases: the world for Canada; markets wherever you can get them; markets on the reciprocal plan, giving compensation,

Mr. FOSTER.

if compensation is given to us ; no restrictions in trade. That great principle of freedom of trade, consecrated by the acceptance of the Cobden medal by the right hon. First Minister, was the rule and guide. To-day where are they ? To-day they have deserted that position entirely ; to-day they stand—they have been forced there, not from their liking, but from the relentless logic of the circumstances, mostly inflicted by themselves and by their blunders of previous legislation—before the world with an exclusive one-sided preference in favour of Great Britain and certain British colonies, and a closed door against the other nations. This reciprocal clause, which was to go out, as an angel of invitation, and gather trade reciprocally and mutually beneficial from every country in the world, has passed away, and to-day they have, by a discrimination, closed the doors against every country in the world, with the exception of Great Britain and of certain colonies, by favour, and not on principle, this one-sided preference having nothing in it as regards compensation to Canadian traders and producers. So, they have gone half the round of the compass, and are diametrically opposed, in their position to-day, to the general principles and practically carrying out of them, as compared with the position in which they stood a year ago.

Just at this moment it might occur to us to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, what has become of the sixty million market of which my hon. friend was so enamoured, not in his callow days, when his beard was just sprouting and an elementary moustache was making its appearance, but in his maturer days, after having grounded in every fibre of his mental and physical system, by long years of active conflict and experience in political warfare, tariff and fiscal questions. What did he say ? At Chatham the hon. gentleman said :

But what is of even more immediate consequence, we propose to obtain for you the power to trade freely with the rest of this continent ; to have leave to make the best you can of your great natural advantages, which can only be done by full, free, and unrestricted reciprocity with our kinsmen in the United States.

And again, he said at Chatham, 1891 :

But let us always bear in mind that the geographical position of the bulk of Canada is such that at the best, very best, all and every other foreign market is but a makeshift, and can in no way ever really replace to you the market of the United States.

At Oakwood ("Globe," November 6, 1891) he said :

The fact is plain, and clear and simple, the best market for the articles you produce, not by the decree of man, but by the decree of the Almighty, lies in the country which extends to the south of you, separated generally by a mere imaginary line along the 3,000 miles of our southern frontier, reaching from that line almost to the equator. There is your market, there is

one market you can hope to hold, there is the market you have the natural advantages to enable you to compete for.

I deliberately tell you that the market of the United States is absolutely and exactly worth all the rest of the world to us, situated as we now are.

That was the mature opinion of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, only six or seven years ago. Where is he to-day ? By the force of political necessity, not of his own free will and from conviction, he has taken the diametrically opposite position. Then the United States market was worth everything to us, and for it we must impose discrimination against Great Britain, if it were necessary. To-day it is discrimination against that very best of our markets to give one-sided preference in the British market. What about the right hon. First Minister ? I think it was at Montreal, or Toronto, since he came back from England, he parodied that phrase so well known to us, Canadian trade for Canada, and he said he had a higher and wider motto now, and it was, the trade of the world for Canada. It was not simply the trade of one or two restricted countries, but the trade of the world ; let us go out into the world and capture its trade for Canada. Five, six or seven short months have passed since then, and no longer is the cry, the trade of the world for Canada ; but it is narrowed down to the trade of Great Britain and such British colonies as the Minister of Customs may allow to come into this arrangement for an exclusive preference on one side only.

Summed up, what have these hon. gentlemen, in their fiscal ramblings, got for Canada ? For years they assailed the National Policy, on the ground that it was not opening enough new markets, that it was too restrictive, that it secured us nothing. If they were in power, said the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), they would go down to the United States, and in one year have obtained a favourable reciprocal treaty. We could not get it, for we were Tories and Jingoists, and were not grateful to the people of the United States. Turn out that Government, they said, put the Liberals in power, and they will go down and get reciprocity from the United States in the twinkling of an eye. Those hon. gentlemen have been placed in power, they have made their request, they have come back, they have brought us nothing in the shape of reciprocity from the United States ; but, after all their honeyed words, their representations and protestations of good will, they get a higher tariff imposed against the products of Canada entering the United States than we have ever had to meet before. They gave the United States free corn ; they did not get free barley. They gave them half the duty on iron ; they got nothing in return. They reduced the duty on coal ; they got nothing in return. They have turned the cheek towards the United States, and have been well smitten on it

—they have got nothing from the United States. From what country have they secured anything? That is a simple question, and one to be asked and answered. After two and a half years in power, what markets have these people got for us as Canadians? But the hon. gentleman says: Why, we have introduced preferential trade with Great Britain. Does a single pound of meat, a single bushel of grain, a single product in this country anywhere go into the British market to-day, or will it go after the 31st of July next, at one cent advantage, that it has not had these last thirty years. Whilst you give off against the industries of this country, one-quarter of the protection which they have enjoyed for a while back, whilst you give that off and enlarge and intensify the competition to our industrial people here to the products they make, what compensation do you get for that in the market of England? None. What compensation do you get in the markets of the West India Islands, that you have brought in? None. The United States is your competitor in the West India market for all the products of the field, which the West Indian people have to buy. The United States have now nine-tenths of that trade in their hands. It would have been something if you could have got a compensation for Canadian products in that market for giving them a lightening of the tax upon their sugars. You have given them a preferential tariff on their sugars, but you do not put a pound of butter, or a pound of cheese, or a pound of anything that our farmers raise, into the West India market at any advantage over and above that which you have had during the last five or six years. It is all very well, as far as good-will is concerned, but the question which the people of Canada will ask is: Was there not a way by which you could have got something in return, and had a mutual advantage? We are told: "Oh, but it will weld the Empire more together." I am somewhat doubtful of that. I do not think you weld two peoples together when you make them live side by side under unequal conditions. I do not believe that you add to the real feeling of love and respect and attachment between two peoples when it is always "give" on one side, and "not give" upon the other. And in the course of this competition which is to take place, when British manufacturers begin to come in with the 25 per cent reduction; when the harder times come; when these more buoyant times will have passed away, as they will, and when the stress and strain of competition comes and our industrial people—capitalists and labourers—meet that competition and fall here and there under its power; it will not add to their loyalty or strength of devotion to feel that they themselves are being made poor in order that the manufacturers, even of the mother country, may be made rich. It would seem

Mr. FOSTER.

to me that you lay the most lasting foundations for that good feeling, which can only be founded upon mutual fair treatment, when there is give and take on both sides. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had the right idea if he only had held to it. He had the true preferential idea when he spoke in London and when he spoke in Toronto. He had it perhaps when he started on his vessel to cross the Atlantic; but in some way or other the right hon. gentleman on his voyage across, if not before, had a change of heart, gave up his opinions, and put the whole weight and strength of his great influence at that time against the preferential idea in Great Britain. And to-day we have the Minister of Finance rising in this House and giving the most cogent of reasons to the British public, and to the West India public, why they should not give us any return for what we have given them. He has done that by trying to make it apparent as his belief that the time never will come, and that it is idle for us to expect that the people of Great Britain will allow themselves to be taxed in regard to food products from the colonies, for the purpose of cementing and binding us together in business as well as in Imperial relations. Sir, these hon. gentlemen opposite have got no reciprocity for us anywhere. They have got no compensation for us among the preferred countries. They have not found any new market for the Canadian products. They have told the British public practically not to reciprocate. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Government has told them so. And when our advocates in England, numerous and powerful as they are, go to the British public and say, "Let us give a slight differential duty on the food products of the colonies in return for what they are doing for us, and in order to weld the Empire together," the British public will look in the face of these advocates and say: That is all very well, but the Prime Minister of Canada scouts that idea, and the Canadian Finance Minister scouts that idea; why, they have given us all for nothing. So wedded are they to the freedom of trade embedded in the Cobden principle that they do not believe that even for this great purpose, it is better to deviate in the least from that principle of unrestricted freedom of trade, even though it may be to give the colonies a 'quid pro quo' for what the colonies have given them. The outside world has been antagonized by the differential tariff. It certainly will not make the outside world any more favourably inclined to Canada. The possibilities are that it will make them less favourably inclined to Canada and more inclined to be retaliatory. No advantages have been got from abroad by this Government, but there is an intensified competition, the area of which has been extended, and it will be thrown into the centre of every industrial operation

in this country, in so far as that competition is strengthened by the reduction of one-quarter on the protected duties now imposed. And, Sir, more than that, and I think most unfortunate of all; even after having made these reductions, even after having made them without compensation, even after having subjected the industrial forces of this country to that intensified and enlarged competition, the Minister of Finance had nothing better to do at the end of his speech than to stand up in this House and declare:

That so far as the protected industries of this country are concerned, eternal vigilance must be the price of their protection.

He said that the days of the protected industries of the country—what protection remains—are few in number and full of harassment; that, in one way or another, they will be pursued until they are wiped off the face of the Dominion and an era of free trade or tariff revenue established to stay. Sir, in all the annals of the pronouncements of Finance Ministers, I have never heard anything so signally stupid and malevolent, in a political sense, as that statement. What is the first requisite that capital requires? It must first have some thing like stability, or it will not seek investment. Where is the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), who conducted his campaign almost entirely upon the National Policy as it is, with no disturbance for ten years, backed by the Toronto "Globe," with all its power, and flanked by Ministers of the Crown, when he made his canvass and appeal to the electorate? What is the hon. member for Centre Toronto going to do about it? Capital, before it will make its investment, must have something fairly stable to rely upon. The mutations of a tariff are disturbing and menacing enough, in all conscience, without a Finance Minister adding to their disturbing influence by making from his seat in this House the standing menace to the industries of this country that they must buy their safety. What did the hon. gentleman mean when he said that eternal vigilance must be the price for their protection? Why, Sir, the statement will have the effect of preventing the putting of money into industries, which are supposed by those who have the investing capital to require at least a fair protection in order to keep them up. So far as this phase of the matter is concerned, nothing could be more calculated to prevent the development of industrial life in this country, because, as I have said, the mutations of the tariff which will take place from time to time, under parties and governments in this country, are sufficient for capital and industry to contend against and it was not necessary—it was quite the opposite—that the hon. Finance Minister should make this menace, the tendency of which is not only to cripple the industrial enterprises already established, but to cripple

and restrain the investment of fresh capital and fresh energy in these or cognate industries. In a country like this, where party politics run so high, and where political methods are used which, although they may not be much, if any worse, than in other countries, are still well known, this declaration of the Finance Minister looks very like a threat. By it the Finance Minister gives fair warning to our manufacturing industries: If you want to live, pay the price. If you do not, you will not be allowed to live; you will be harassed; you may be wiped out. But there is a certain way by which you can gain our ear. You must make certain arguments to us, and if these are conclusive you will not be disturbed; but beware from this out, for you are in a condition of utter insecurity, and you only buy your existence by being eternally vigilant—and, he might have added, everlastingly subservient.

What else have the Government to congratulate themselves upon? Upon economy in administration? I think I have said enough to show that they cannot congratulate themselves upon that. Upon having fewer Cabinet Ministers? That was the bait held out to the country, but the fact is they have one more. The right hon. First Minister's pledge lies dangling on the Table of this House, that he would have fewer Cabinet Ministers, but instead one more is added, and the salaries are larger and so are the expenses in every way. We do not find, therefore, that they have carried out, in any sense, that part of what was to be their framed policy. Have they made a reduction in the expenditure of the civil service? Look at the Estimates. There has been a change—but has there been a reduction? No. There has been a change for efficiency sake, or patronage sake, whichever you will, but their promise was that there was to be a material reduction in the expenditure, and that has not been fulfilled. Then there was to be cessation of the granting of railway subsidies, which they claimed, were chiefly remarkable for their power to corrupt the constituencies. Well, since these hon. gentlemen have been in power, have we found any progress in this respect? We have found progress, but it has been the progress of the crab, backwards, because in no similar number of years have there been larger operations and more extravagant ones attempted, if not thoroughly carried out, than have been attempted by these hon. gentlemen. True, they put through the Crow's Nest Pass scheme but at an added cost of two million dollars. And what was the promise they held out? A large proportion of that added cost of two million dollars was paid in order that we might buy the control of the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway and thus prevent exorbitant charges. But this year we have had the influence of Ministers cast in favour of the granting of a charter to a railway from the United States into the very heart

of the mining country, connecting it with every great line of railway in the United States—and for what purpose? In order to make sure that extortionate rates will not be charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway—in order to make sure that we shall secure what we were asked last year to pay two million dollars more to the Canadian Pacific Railway for. Or is the Drummond County or Grand Trunk deal, one they can congratulate the country upon? Rushed into with secrecy, and brought before this Parliament in the dying days of the session, but happily laid over for a brief season of counsel and contemplation by the Upper Chamber, the utter extravagance and unwarranted nature of that deal is shown by the fact that after that season of rest and contemplation, the Government have been able to make another bargain over these very lines, involving a saving of \$500,000 or \$600,000 as compared with the last one. Have they to congratulate the country and their party upon that part of their forward policy? Or the Yukon deal—rushed into in secrecy against all the canons laid down by the party ever since they were a party; in utter defiance of the rules of tender and contract; rushed through within a few days of the session, with the half of a kingdom of gold as a recompense for that part of the gamble as the Minister of Railways calls it—but that also happily held over for a period of contemplation by the Upper Chamber. And the country will save by that action of the Upper Chamber, no one knows how much, but no doubt a large amount, on a bargain which was characterized by haste and extravagance, if by nothing worse. What about the independence of Parliament which used to be a favourite theme with hon. gentlemen opposite? In these two or three short years, what have we found? We have found a member of Parliament sitting behind the Government with the Premier's written pledge of a judgeship or a Governorship in his pocket—sitting there and voting against his own free will and under compulsion for measures, of which he did not approve, and kept on dangling by that beautiful device of purity in the party, until he kicked so long and so hard that he was elevated to a judgeship. We have found the right hon. First Minister himself sitting down and writing to a member of Parliament pledging him a railway subsidy in order that that hon. member might hawk it around in a contested election, and so mildly influence his constituency. Independence of Parliament! Sir, independence of Parliament is a by-word and a reproach with my hon. friend under these circumstances. Independence of Parliament, Sir! With the blanketing of gold rivers, to the Merciers, and the Guerins, and the Drolets, and other hangers-on of the party, for small sums of money, giving franchises which to-day are hawked about the streets at from one to three thousand fold increase, and disposed

Mr. FOSTER.

of at these rates, as I am informed. And yet, you talk about the independence of Parliament and the Liberal party in relation thereto.

The Pacific cable—what has been done by the hon. gentleman and his party with regard to that? Of paramount importance, as it was declared to be by the Colonial Convention in this city and by the Australasian colonies and by Great Britain, in the two years that they have been in office have these hon. gentlemen made one single forward step? If they have done so, they have not informed Parliament of it.

The fast Atlantic line—what about that? They found when they came into office a contract ready to be executed which would have put a fast line of steamers on the ocean between Canada and Great Britain by this time or very soon after. But these hon. gentlemen tore up the contract, and have been doing absolutely nothing for two years. And, to-day, so far as Parliament knows, they have made no substantial progress.

Sir, to-day the timbermen and lumbermen of British Columbia and throughout our country have a grievance against this Parliament and against this Government, in that, whilst the United States have privileges of export into this country either free of duty or at low rates, our exports to the United States are met with an almost prohibitory tariff. This is allowed to go on long after it is plainly seen that nothing that we offer serves as an inducement to the United States to give anything in return. The tariff is brought down and the policy is promulgated, and nothing is said by the Government as to its policy in regard to that great interest.

Then, Sir, there is a most important subject, which affects the mining industries of this country. To-day, Canada imports every ounce of the lead she uses. It is not a very large consumption, but it is a fairly large and constantly increasing consumption, and I think I am not wrong in stating, that we import it all. Out in the mining districts of British Columbia where men toil to bring forth the hidden riches of the earth, where mighty industries are nascent, which industries are asking for a helping hand, this question of the lead duties plays a prominent part. To-day, Sir, you may mine ore with 60 per cent of lead in it, and send it, as you have to send it, to the American smelter and pay the American duty, and you cannot get the cost of your mining and your treatment out of it by the sale of your lead. The duty is 1½ cents per pound, to which you must add \$22 for freight and treatment for every ton of ore that is sent out to be smelted. It is contended by mining men that an import duty equal to that of the United States upon lead would effectually establish a great smelting industry in those regions which would give employment to many and which, by its consumption of

farmers' products and of the mercantile supplies of the country, would be a great element in the progress, the business, and the upbuilding of Canada. The Government has no time for these things. Nothing has been done by them to solve those vexed questions, they are all lost sight of while my hon. friend, with his great good nature, is congratulating the House and the country and panegyricizing this great year of plenty and progress which is really the crowning year of the Liberal-Conservative policy and not the opening year of the Liberal policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have about finished the remarks I had to make. I thank the House for its kindly interest and attention. I have endeavoured to criticise the statements of my hon. friend, and though I have criticised them vigorously I think I have not criticised them unfairly. When it came to that branch of his speech upon which he threw out the challenge of his administration and eulogized their policy, I think it was my duty as it is the duty of gentlemen upon this side of the House, to call the attention of the House, and more particularly the attention of the country, to the fact that the gentlemen now in office for one year and a half, have implemented scarcely one pledge that they made when they were seated in Opposition; and that they come up to this, the third year of their administration without having carried out these pledges. On the other hand, they have not originated anything in the shape of a fiscal and tariff policy which has opened to the products of Canada one single market in any portion of the world. In one thing, Sir, we on this side of the House will always agree with hon. gentlemen on that side. They can say nothing too much in praise of the conditions and resources of this country, of its progress and its great prospects for the future. They will find that, so far as we are concerned, we will draw a strong and steady line between the errors of an Administration and the condition of the country, its industries, its progress, its prosperity. He can say nothing too much in praise of the great future which we as Canadians so plainly see before us and which it will not be within the power of any single party whatever its blunders to more than retard for a brief period, but certainly not to restrain or prevent of ultimate fulfilment. But it is our duty on this side of the House to call the attention of the electorate at large to the lapses of hon. gentlemen opposite and to demand of them that they keep their pledges or give a reason why they should not do so. We believe too much in confidence being maintained between the electorate and the rulers of the country, who are a committee of that electorate, to allow any set of men to get into office by making pledges and then cynically and indifferently to break and violate those pledges, and not call them to account for this violation of faith with the people. We believe that

every Government will have its faults, that no Government, being a collection of human beings, can be perfect. But we believe, with all this, that it is the duty of an Opposition to criticise faithfully and keenly, even if strongly, these lapses, these faults and these failures for the information of the electorate and to keep the conscience of the electorate pure and strong as regards these great public questions. I wish to thank again my hon. friends opposite for having allowed the debate to be held over for two or three days. Grippe is sometimes more powerful than any of our desires and I cannot think too highly of the courtesy they have shown me while its victim.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend's arithmetic is in other respects as faulty as in the computation he makes of the number of years we have been in office, I am afraid he has a good deal to learn. I beg to inform him that twenty months of office do not by any system of arithmetic that is known to me, equal two and a half years, though I can well believe that the twenty months have seemed as long as thirty to my hon. friend.

Now, Sir, it has been remarked by persons who take an interest in that kind of thing that there are few sights dearer to gods and men than to see good men struggle with adversity.

I am bound to say that I, like a noted Scotch divine, feel a little compassion even for a naughty man under similar circumstances. My hon. friend, I think, will in future bear in mind that it is wise not to prophesy before he knows, and he undoubtedly did indulge, two years ago, in various prophecies as to the results of the Government policy, which have hardly been fulfilled by the actual issue of events. Sir, I think the hon. gentleman might learn, by this time, that it is folly to struggle with manifest facts. He does not deny—and so far I do not find fault with him—the fact of manifest prosperity, the signs of which meet us on every side; and it is equally idle for him, under any pretext whatever, to deny the significance of the political gain which Canada has made within the last year under the guidance of my right hon. friend, and most particularly in the reception which our trade proposals met with at the hands, not merely of the English Government, but of the English nation at large. Sir, I could not but feel how grievously the tables had been turned upon my hon. friend, when I heard the hon. the Minister of Finance go over, one by one, all these various indicia of prosperity to which, in former times, he had been wont to point as incontrovertible evidences of the goodness of their policy.

Now, Sir, I do not take it for granted that the increases of savings deposits are inevitably a proof of the great prosperity of the country at large, nor yet the bank de-

posits, nor yet the circulation, nor yet any of these matters. What I have said before, and what I repeat now, is this: They are all good, and very good, so far as they go. I never denied that, so far as they went, they were good indications of prosperity; but I pointed out then, and I point out now, that there are other far more important indications of prosperity which accompany these indicia to-day, and which were notably absent during the entire period of the administration of the hon. gentleman and his friends. It is good, it is very good, to see our savings bank deposits expand, to see our circulation expand, to see our exports and imports expand; but it is not so good when, as in his time, certain of those indications were accompanied by a marked diminution in the value of properties over an enormous area of the country, and, what I always esteemed a far more important matter, when they were accompanied by an enormous exodus of the best elements of our country. But, Sir, were it the case to-day, as it was then, that the people of Canada were flying from their country by tens of thousands, aye, and hundreds of thousands, I would not, as I do now, claim that these are proofs that a new era of prosperity had dawned upon her. Sir, I am happy to tell the hon. gentleman that circumstances have changed; I am happy to be able to tell him—and I have not the slightest doubt that the approaching census will confirm, in the highest degree, all that we state here to-day—that, at long last, after eighteen years of misgovernment, the tide has turned, that Canadians are now remaining in their own country, and that we are not likely again to see the miserable spectacle which his own province exhibited to the world, when, in 1891, it turned out that the total growth of the great province of New Brunswick, with room and space enough to accommodate twice or thrice its present population, was, I think, some 32, all told. Now, I would ask the hon. gentleman, why he cannot quietly accept the present situation? I am not going to dispute with him the fact that luck has been on our side to a very considerable extent during the last year or two. I remember the time when times were not so prosperous for the Liberal party; I remember the times when none were more forward than the hon. gentleman who sits immediately opposite to me (Sir Charles Tupper) in denouncing the Liberal party because of a world-wide depression, which affected all the other countries with which we had any acquaintance or knowledge, infinitely more than it did Canada.

But what I more particularly wish to call the attention of the House to is the new role of economist in which my hon. friend appears. He is very grievously alarmed at the extravagance which distinguishes the present Administration, and, very early in his speech, I perceived that he made a very special charge against us, that we had added

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

\$1,400,000 to his last year's expenditure, and that, in this identical year, we were about to add \$1,800,000 to his last year's expenditure. Now, Sir, I like to see an honest statement made, particularly by an hon. gentleman in his position; I like to see an honest statement made of what the actual comparison should be between his last year's expenditure and our expenditure for the present time, and I think, when I get through with the matter, the House will be convinced of this one thing, that, whatever other merits the hon. gentleman may claim for himself, that of making an honest statement of the actual state of affairs in the last three or four years, is one to which he can lay very little claim. I believe it is quite true, that the hon. gentleman, in the year 1896, had gone out of office with an expenditure of \$37,000,000, in round numbers. But it is not true, that the hon. gentleman had effected any permanent saving or reduction on the expenditure of the preceding year, which for 1895 amounted to \$38,200,000, in round numbers. Sir, I hope my hon. friends will bear this fact in mind; I hope my hon. friends will take care, whenever appeal is made to the last year of the hon. gentleman's expenditure, to call the attention of their audience to the fact that, if ever there was a case of colossal cooking, it was the cooking that was practiced by that hon. gentleman for obvious party reasons in the year 1896. He made no permanent saving, he made no genuine reduction of the public expenditure. What he did was to throw over a million or more of expenditure properly belonging to that year, 1896, on to the shoulders of the year 1897. He did it for obvious party purpose; he did it, foreseeing that, in view of the perilous position in which the nest of traitors found themselves, the country was extremely likely to express an unfavourable opinion of men who did not respect the obligations imposed upon public men of holding up a high standard of public faith. He took all the care he could, so to arrange his accounts that he might appear to make a reduction, no matter at what cost or at what risk of demoralizing the public service. The methods he adopted were mainly these two: He totally neglected to call out the militia and give them any exercise in the various camps, thereby rendering almost the whole of the expenditure for the year for militia purposes absolutely useless; and in the case of public works, in like manner, he deliberately cut down the necessary expenditure, with the effect, as my hon. friend can show him, of involving for the succeeding year a great deal of additional and unnecessary expenditure, by reason of the parsimony—no, I cannot call it by so honourable a term, but by reason of the most improper reductions which he made in the service of that year. What would any railway company, having a similar income, say of a manager who came forward and claimed that he had

made a reduction of \$1,400,000 in expenses for a particular year, when it was shown in the preceding year he had spent almost precisely the same sum that was required to be expended for the succeeding year, and when, what is more, his own estimates, now in my hands, show distinctly that so far from effecting any permanent reduction, he contemplated in his first original estimate an expenditure of \$38,359,000 for 1897. Sir, I say the hon. gentleman has no right whatever to come before this House and contend that the expenditure actually incurred in 1896 was in any shape or form a true proof of the extent to which he had reduced the expenditure. His real year with which comparison should be made is either the actual ascertained expenditure of 1895, which amounted to \$38,200,000; or his own original Estimates, I will not charge him now with the Supplementary Estimates for that year, for the year 1896-97, which I have under my hand. And if the hon. gentleman wants to make comparisons with the Estimates now submitted by my hon. friend the Finance Minister, I am prepared to show him, and I shall be prepared to show this House after six o'clock, that for the identical services for which that hon. gentleman demanded \$38,359,000, my hon. friend is asking less than \$38,000,000. All the rest and excess I propose to show the House, is incurred for services and for purposes which will probably return into the treasury quite as much as we take out of it, but for which there was no shadow of equivalent in the Estimates brought down by that hon. gentleman. As it will take a little time to go into that comparison, and it is hardly worth while to repeat it after recess. I shall be obliged if you, Mr. Speaker, will call it six o'clock.

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

After Recess.

THE MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose, I had been calling attention to the statement made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), and on which, as the House will have observed, a very large portion of his whole speech depended, that the present Government had been guilty, as compared with himself and his fellow-Ministers, of very great extravagance in the actual expenditures and Estimates for the years 1897, 1898 and 1899; and the hon. gentleman, as the House will remember, based that statement on the fact that he had succeeded, as he stated, in reducing the expenditure for consolidated fund account to \$37,000,000 for the year 1896. Sir, if that reduction had been a genuine, bona fide reduction, if it had been one which the hon. gentleman or his friends beside him had the smallest ground for stating was a permanent reduction, I would have given

him credit for it, and I would have felt that the present Government were called upon to enter into a very minute explanation of the causes which had compelled them to increase that sum. But when we examine the facts, we find a very remarkable state of things. We find that in 1895, when the hon. gentleman had no particular reason for in any way taking action so as to specially adjust his accounts, he expended \$38,132,000. We find that for the succeeding year, 1897, in the first Estimate brought down by that hon. gentleman, and I need not tell the House, for the matter was explained to hon. members time and again, that the hon. gentleman had actually under consideration Supplementary Estimates which would have involved an additional charge of several millions—we find that the hon. gentleman brought down in his first and primary Estimate, charged under Consolidated Fund for the year 1897, no less than \$38,359,000. Under these circumstances, I am justified in stating to the House and stating to the country that the expenditure of 1896 was purely illusive, that it was not a genuine substantial reduction, but it was, as I have already stated, a deliberate case of cooking the accounts by causing large amounts which belonged properly to 1896 to be transferred for political purposes and made a charge on the succeeding years, notably in regard to two large items, militia and public works. The House will recollect the hon. gentleman stated that in 1897 we expended \$1,400,000 more than he did during the last year of his administration; that in 1898, the present year, we propose to expend \$1,800,000 more than he expended in his last year; that for 1899 we propose to expend \$2,500,000 more than he expended in 1896. Sir, I propose to show to the House that the actual expenditure made by the Finance Minister for 1897 was somewhat less, not much, than the first Estimate for that year laid on the Table of the House by the hon. member for York. I propose to show the House that, deducting certain expenditures for which there is no counterpart, the expenditure of the present year would barely equal the sum that he demanded for the services in 1897; and I further propose to show the House that for the services of 1899, the Estimates of which we are now discussing, the Finance Minister proposes for the selfsame services for which the hon. member for York estimated he would require \$38,359,000, to ask \$37,980,000. The remainder, as I will show to the House, is for services for which we may expect to receive a corresponding amount to put into the public treasury, and which had no counterpart whatever in 1897. The way to judge of the comparative economy of the two Governments is to judge of the charges for the selfsame series of services. If the Government have done wrong in asking for the additional amount, let them be judged on these additional amounts and let the

House take into account the fact I have alluded to, namely, that with respect to these additional sums they have good grounds for believing the country will receive a return.

I will take, in the first instance, and after that I propose to go through the items in some little detail: I will take in the first instance the demands made by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) for 1899, and the demands made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) in 1897. The House will remember that my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) is now asking for \$39,125,000, in round numbers, for the services of 1899. In that \$39,125,000 are included these three items: First, for the rental of the Intercolonial road into Montreal, \$210,000, for which no corresponding sum whatever is to be found amongst the charges for 1897; next, a sum of \$396,000 for the services of the Yukon district, for which, I need not say, not one farthing is to be found of a corresponding character in the expenditure for 1897 as proposed by the hon. member for York; lastly, for the running expenses of the Intercolonial Railway as extended into Montreal, a further sum of \$560,000 for which there is no corresponding entry, making a sum total of \$1,166,000 for which we expect to receive a return.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How much did the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) say was for the extension of the Intercolonial into Montreal?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Five hundred and sixty thousand dollars extra is allowed for the expenses of that, including what is known as the Drummond County Branch. Now if hon. gentlemen opposite will do me the favour to deduct \$1,166,000 from \$39,125,000, they will see that after taking out these extra sums there remains \$37,959,000, being the sum required by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) for the selfsame identical services for which the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) asked \$38,358,000 in 1896-97. Therefore, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) proposes to defray the expenses of the country, so far as regards these services, for \$400,000 less than the hon. member for York thought was necessary two years ago.

It is worth while remembering also that the country has not stood still during the last two years, that the population has increased very considerably, more rapidly, than it did during the period the hon. member for York was administering the Government. I believe, from all the evidence which has come to our hands; from the evidence as to the increased immigration; from the evidence as to the diminished exodus, which I regard as even of more importance; I believe that the actual fact of the case is, that for the selfsame services, with 200,000 people more in 1899 than in 1896-97, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), is asking for \$400,000 a year less. I again call the attention of

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

the House to the fact that there is good reason for believing that the whole, or at any rate by far the greater part of that \$1,166,000 of extra expenditure, will be repaid into the treasury of this country in the shape of increased receipts from the Intercolonial Railway, and in the shape of increased receipts which we are even now receiving from the Yukon territory.

But, Sir, it is always well in these cases to go a little into detail. I have before me the Estimates laid on the Table of the House by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) for 1896-97, and here I may observe that doubtless owing to a clerical error the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) omitted a fixed charge of \$50,000 for a certain mail service under the heading of sums authorized by statute. The actual amount he demanded therefore was \$38,358,000, and not \$38,308,000 as is inaccurately put down. If the House will take the trouble to turn to the Estimates for 1899, and will compare them, step by step, as far as may be with the Estimates laid on the Table by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) in 1896, they will see how far he (Mr. Foster) is justified in asserting that our administration of the country is inferior in point of economy to the administration which he was prepared to give us had he been returned to office in 1896. Take the first item in the Estimates, I find that the hon. the Minister of Finance asks for charge of public debt, including sinking fund, a sum of \$12,853,000; and observe that our economical friend from York (Mr. Foster) two years ago, asked for that same service \$12,982,000, being a difference of \$130,000 on that item in favour of the present Ministry. I observe that on charges of management, he asked for \$165,000, and my hon. friend proposes to be content with \$152,000. In the item of civil government—that much disputed item—we ask for \$1,418,000, and my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), two years ago, thought it was necessary to demand \$1,449,000. I note that in the administration of justice there is a small increase. Certain additional judges have been demanded by the several provinces, and the expense of the administration of justice is therefore, not by any act of our own but by the act of these legislatures, increased \$14,000. The police service is the same in both years. Now I come to another point, which will perhaps contrast as well as any other our relative economy. We demand for the service of the penitentiaries \$417,000 for the year ending July, 1899. The hon. gentleman, in 1896-97, demanded \$481,000 for the same service. We demand for the services of the legislatures \$705,000, and I observe that the hon. gentleman seems to have demanded \$754,000. For arts, agriculture and statistics—and to this item I call the special attention of the House—we demand a much larger sum than my hon. friend did. We demand \$322,000, but with respect to that

item I have to say this. If the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Foster), or any other of them, will choose to accept the gage which I have thrown down, and will choose to hold that the sums we are now appropriating for cold storage and for the development of agricultural pursuits in various directions are ill spent and will vote to reduce them, I shall be only too happy to undertake a discussion of that matter with them at any moment. In that matter which affects the well-being of the greatest class in the country, we are much more generous than our predecessors, but nevertheless we make savings in other respects, which will very much more than compensate for that increase. I observe that for the services of the militia, the next large item, we demand for 1899 \$1,397,000. I observe, and I am not condemning him for it, that the hon. gentleman in 1897 thought that \$1,478,000 was the least that he could get along with, which shows a considerable difference in favour of the present Government, I observe that on public works we demand \$1,650,000, and the late Government demanded \$1,576,000, being an increase on our part; and I have no doubt my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Tarte) will be perfectly able to give an excellent explanation of the reasons which require this vote. Now, a very large proportion of the remainder consists of what are known as fixed charges—charges for collection of revenue. I shall not weary the House by going through those in detail, but I repeat this fact, that for the identical class of services for which we ask a little less than \$38,000,000, the hon. gentleman thought it necessary, three years ago, on a population of nearly one-quarter of a million less, to demand something like \$38,359,000. Under those circumstances, it hardly becomes the hon. gentleman to speak too highly of the economies which he effected. Had these economies been effected by any genuine reduction in the expenditure, I would give him credit for them, but when we come to examine and see that they were effected by such means as refusing to drill our militia during an entire year, and by such other expedients as reducing the expenditure of public works to a sum \$400,000 below what the hon. gentleman himself expended during the preceding five or six years, and generally in such a fashion as compelled the present Minister of Public Works, the moment he came into office, in order to avert great public injury, to expensive and costly public works, to incur large additional expense, I do submit that there is no just cause whatever for the claim of the hon. gentleman, that because, under such circumstances, he did force the reduction to \$37,000,000 in 1896, he is therefore entitled to claim that he and his Government had really reduced the expenditure to that point. They are to be judged by their actual expenditure in a year when they had no temptation to curtail the expenditure improperly; they are to be judged by

the estimates they themselves brought down for the service of 1896-97. I turn now from that to another important portion of the hon. gentleman's speech, and here I confess I was rather disappointed at the mode in which he handled the subject. He took a very great deal of exception to the reduction made by my hon. friend beside me in the rate of interest payable on Government savings bank deposits. That is a question on which there is a very considerable deal to be said on both sides, and I hoped that a man of his experience and occupying his position, and who himself had occasion to reduce the interest on savings bank deposits, would have put the House in full possession of the actual state of the case, and have given something like a fair resumé of the true position and of the causes which operated in inducing my hon. friend to make this somewhat large reduction in the rate of interest. The hon. gentleman spent a great deal of time in denouncing the Government because, as he said, we were reducing the rate at the expense of the small savers. He must have had in his possession or have had access to certain facts respecting the savings banks, which I myself caused to be brought down in a return to this House, some three or four years ago, and I may say here that the facts to-day are substantially as they were then, or, if anything, rather bear out our pretension more to-day than they did then. To listen to the hon. gentleman one would suppose that the whole \$50,000,000 now invested in the Government savings banks were held by small savers, poor people to whom it is a matter of very great moment indeed that they should receive a small additional return; and the hon. gentleman waxed warm and eloquent in depicting the injury to the cause of thrift which would be inflicted if we disturbed the rate of interest. It may be interesting to the House to know that at present, of those \$50,000,000 on deposit in the Government savings banks, something like two-thirds of the whole are held by rather less than one-sixth of the depositors. It may be interesting to the House to know that in 1894 something like \$25,300,000 of the then deposits, which amounted to about forty million dollars were held by 26,000 depositors, being as nearly as may be an average of one thousand dollars per head. Now, I do not think that men who are able, on an average, to deposit a thousand dollars per head, can be regarded as people deserving the paternal care of this Government. For the smaller depositors a great deal more may be said, but the smaller depositors at that time averaged something like \$100 apiece and no more. The larger depositors, as I have stated, those of \$500 and upwards, had an average of \$1,000; the smaller depositors had an average of very little over \$100. I have no doubt that, if it were possible for my hon. friend to have done so, he would have been very glad indeed to have divided this

matter, and very glad indeed to have so arranged it that the small depositors, if possible, should have received a larger indulgence at the hands of the Government than he thought was fairly due to the persons who held the greater part of these deposits. But here again I have a little to complain of with regard to the hon. member for York. As a Finance Minister of some years' standing, he knew perfectly well when he stated that we were paying $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to money-lenders in Europe and only $2\frac{1}{2}$ to the depositors of this country, and consequently that the depositors were docked $\frac{2}{3}$ of 1 per cent, that he omitted the material fact that the people of Canada have to contribute a considerable additional sum for the management of those savings banks. It is not the truth to say that we went out of our way to give $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to English money-lenders, all expenses paid, while we reduced the rate to these people to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, because, as a matter of fact, the actual cost of management, raises the cost to us of the money we borrow of these people to $2\frac{1}{2}$, at any rate to $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. But there are other considerations which the hon. gentleman I think should, in all justice, have presented to the House in considering this disputed question. I think he ought to have told the House, what is obvious to every man of experience, that you cannot fairly compare the rate of interest which is obtained by parties who are entitled to withdraw their money at an hour's notice, or a few days' notice, with the rate of interest obtainable on loans having a period of years to run. Which of us, as a business man, would, if he were a business man, pay the same interest on a sum withdrawable at call as for money which was allowed to remain in his hands for fifty years? That is a point, I think, that the hon. gentleman ought to have considered well before he chose to make use of his position to stir up the minds of the people against the Government for a policy which, as I shall presently show, is likely to result in advantage to a large part of the community. More than that, the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, and if he does not, there is no banker of standing but could have explained the matter to him, that in the last resort, the rate of interest all through this country depended upon the interest paid by the banks and the Government for money on call. That is so plain a proposition that I am astonished that the hon. gentleman should have overlooked it. What follows? Why, this follows—that if you desire to see the interest on the farmers' mortgages lowered, if you wish to see the interest on money used for manufacturers and by others engaged in various enterprises the development of this country lowered, you must consent to a lowering of the rate of interest on deposits. Unfortunately, tied up as we are, involved as our affairs are, it is not possible for

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

the banks which control the larger part of the deposits in Canada, to reduce the rate of interest on their deposits unless the Government will do so too. I point that out to show that there is more than one side to this question. Every man here knows from his own experience that the rate of interest on good security has fallen extremely in Canada within the last ten or twelve years. It is only a few months ago that it was my duty to make inquiries, on behalf of certain parties for whom I am trustee, of certain trusts societies in Toronto to know what rates of interest they would guarantee, and all I could obtain was a statement that if the money was left in their hands for a term of years, they would guarantee 4 per cent. I need not tell this House that municipal corporations and almost all corporations of good standing, are able to borrow money in the markets of the world at considerably less than 4 per cent—from 3 to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I desire to point out that, while we wish, as far as we can, to encourage thrift, as the hon. gentleman said, to protect the interests of the smaller depositors, we are called upon to consider the interests of all classes, to consider the interests of the farmer, to consider the interests of those who are carrying on industrial enterprises in our midst. More than that, I say my hon. friend beside me would have been false to his trust to the people of Canada as a whole if he had consented to pay a small portion of them, except for extremely good cause, more than the average rate of interest at which money was borrowed by the Government in the open market. I put it, under all these circumstances, whether any man could say that money on call, which could be taken out of the control of the Government on very short notice, is worth more than it costs the Government, that is, something like $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. And I think those who know the difficulty of finding good investments, those who look at the rate paid on stocks by banks in good standing and similar classes of investments, will admit that even if the reduction to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent does appear and be, so far as a certain small section of the taxpayers are concerned, a measure attended with some hardships—and I do not deny that it may appear or be so—they must grant that the Government had a duty to consider, and I think they will admit that there is a great deal to be said for the policy adopted by my hon. friend, first, of saving a very large sum of money to the country at large, which, as the hon. member for York truly said, must otherwise be made up by increased taxation, and, second, taking a course which probably, in the long run and not at a very distant day, may contribute largely to reduce the rate of interests on mortgages and in all probability raise the price of farm land. I may add that I do not think it

was a good sign of progress in Canada to see what I and others have witnessed—farms by the score put up at auction in country towns where, to my knowledge, a million and more of money was lying on deposit, without obtaining a bid. I do not think we shall see that again as often as in the past, at least I hope not. I hope that, under these circumstances, all fair-minded men will agree that, even if my hon. friend was forced by the exigencies of his position to reduce this rate somewhat faster than he would have liked to have done, he had ground in the general interest for pursuing the ground he took. Now, I might add to that this consideration, which I think is worthy of a little attention on the part of the House. I do not deny, I have never denied, that it would be a matter of very great moment, of very great interest, and worthy of some sacrifice, if the people of Canada could be induced to invest in Government securities permanently. If these fifty millions had been invested in a Canada 3 per cent loan, I do not know that that would have been lightly disturbed by my hon. friend. If it had been invested in such a way that the money would not have been called upon at short notice, but invested for a term of years, shorter or longer, there would be a good deal to be said in favour of the argument of my hon. friend from York. But there is a wide distinction between borrowing money, as we are doing on call, which may be demanded from us at short notice, and borrowing money for terms of years, which is the best way that a Government can possibly borrow it.

That is a matter which might be very fairly brought up for debate. I offer no opinion upon it, one way or another. But I do call attention to the fact that it is, by no means, of equal importance or interest to a community that it should be a borrower to a large amount from the people at call, as that it should have a large amount of the people's money invested in the permanent securities of the nation. Now, I observe that another charge brought by the hon. gentleman was, that we had absolutely and actually gained, I think he said \$1,200,000 more customs, and that we had done it under a reduced scale of taxation. I believe, Sir, that statement is true. I acknowledge the impeachment, I am proud of the crime, if crime it be, that we are getting more money, and we are getting it on a reduced scale of taxation. That is just exactly what we wanted to do. But I differ with my hon. friend on one point that he alluded to. He was pleased to declare that there was very little difference between the percentage on dutiable goods nowadays and the percentage on dutiable goods in former times, and he was good enough, I remember, to call attention to the fact that, during the year 1896-97, when, as he truly said, his own tariff system was in full swing—and on that I will have a word

or two to say presently—there had not been any very appreciable reduction. I have here a statement of our principal dutiable imports entered for consumption during the first seven months of this year, and I call attention to the results. In the year 1897, which the hon. gentleman justly claims as his own, we appear to have imported \$36,800,000 worth of dutiable goods, upon which we received \$11,131,000. Apparently, the percentage on that amount, making the calculation roughly, amounts to something like 30·05. Now, for the first seven months of this year we appear to have received \$40,438,000 of dutiable goods, and we obtained for them \$11,932,000 duty. Well, Sir, on this \$11,932,000 the percentage would appear to be 29·50. There is, therefore, quite an appreciable reduction in the rate of duty which now prevails under our present tariff—not nearly as much as I could desire to see, but I may remind the House that a good many goods which were absolutely prohibited under the late tariff, are now being imported under rates prescribed by us, that go to swell our revenue, whereas, in former times, they were excluded altogether. That is one thing, I may remark incidentally, which renders these calculations of percentages rather apt to be misleading, when you are comparing a tariff framed in the main for revenue with a tariff in the main protective. If you exclude the goods altogether, there is no doubt you get a diminished apparent percentage, but at an enormous cost to the consumer. I would remind the House that the hon. gentlemen claim the full merit of the year 1896-97 as being the year in which their policy culminated and bore its full fruits.

Now, I would like to call the attention of the House particularly to a number of the results of the policy of those hon. gentlemen from the year 1887 down to the present time. Sir, hon. gentlemen will recollect that our friends on the opposite side, in former times, had a monopoly of all the loyalty in this country.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have not got it all now.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, I think not. Well, Sir, these ultra-loyalists in 1887 imported something like 45 million dollars worth of goods from Great Britain; in 1888 they fell to 39 millions; in 1889 they rose to 42 millions; in 1890 they imported 43 millions; in 1891, 42 millions; in 1892, 41 millions; in 1893, 43 millions; in 1894, 39 millions; in 1895, 31 millions; in 1896, they imported 32 millions, and in the year in which, according to the hon. member for York, their policy had attained its full and perfect maturity, they imported 29 million dollars worth of goods from Great Britain. Now, in those ten years, you will observe, their imports from Great Britain had diminished by 15 million dollars. In that interval, although the population increased far more slowly than we could desire, we had added, in all probability, at

least 500,000 to our population. So it follows that in ten years, such was the excellent effects of their policy that our imports from Great Britain in 1897 were 15 millions less than in 1887 on a population half a million smaller. But we made up for it in another direction, for I see that in 1887 they imported 45 million dollars worth of goods from the United States; in 1888 they imported 49 millions; in 1890, 50 millions; in 1891, 52 millions; in 1893, 53 millions; in 1894, 58 millions; in 1895, 54 millions; in 1896, 58 millions, and in 1897 they imported 61 million dollars worth. While they diminished their imports from Great Britain by 15 million dollars, they increased their imports from the United States by 15 millions in the same period of time. Now, it may be true, that the steps which have been taken to increase our trade with Great Britain may not have as swift an effect as we desire; still, there are reasons for it. During the period of eighteen years in which these hon. gentlemen have worked their wicked will, they have reduced our imports from Great Britain to the figures that I have read to the House, and we cannot be expected to reverse all that in an afternoon; but I have very little doubt that, when the next decade occurs, and when my hon. friends on this side—where I have no doubt they will still be—have the pleasure of dilating on those figures to an attentive House, they will be able to show that the current of trade has been reversed, and that they will then be importing a very much larger quantity of goods from Great Britain than ever before. Now, I know that percentages are odious. I know they are very often unfair, and we have had experience of that time and again. But I will just call the attention of those economists to two or three patent facts pretty well known in history. The Liberal-Conservative economists became the custodians of the affairs of this country in 1867. In 1873, for reasons which I will not now stop to particularize, they were obliged to devote their talents to some other occupation. In the interval, however, they had added 11 million dollars a year to the annual expenditure of Canada. In 1873, Mr. Mackenzie assumed the reins of power, and in 1878 Mr. Mackenzie laid them down. He entered office with an expenditure of \$23,313,000, and he left it with an expenditure of \$23,519,000 or a difference of \$200,000. Those hon. gentlemen during eighteen years exercised their own will and pleasure. They began with an expenditure of \$23,500,000, and left off, as I have shown, with an estimated expenditure of \$38,500,000, an actual expenditure in 1895 of \$38,133,000. I cannot accept their statement for 1896, for the obvious reason I have given. But, Sir, it follows that the increased expenditure in those eighteen years amounted, giving them the most liberal construction possible, to close on \$14,000,000. Now, \$14,000,000 would represent interest on the sum of \$560,000,-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

000, and this may be taken as the sum their administration during eighteen years has cost the country, estimating it by a reasonable and fair standard. I will not insist, however, too much on that point, because there are some little reductions that might be made, but nevertheless substantially it is correct.

The hon. gentleman entered on another subject as to which I desire to say a word or two, though I do not wish to weary the House by enlarging too much on matters already pretty well threshed out and which no doubt my hon. friends beside me will take up in more detail. The hon. member for York enlarged extremely on the fact, that acting in conformity with the conclusion arrived at by the British Government, we were obliged to abandon our original and more liberal treatment of nations that extended liberal terms to us. I may be a heretic and very unorthodox, but I have to say, that I do not regard the opinion of the British law officers as conclusive. They have the power, I admit, and they are able to enforce their views, and to decide what the favoured-nation clause shall mean; but I hold that the opinion of the British law officers is vastly different from an opinion given by a British court of high degree. They are the advisers of the Government, and they advise the Government substantially on the line of the Government's policy. It may be very true that it is not on the whole inconsistent with the policy of Her Majesty's Government to stand by the most-favoured-nation clause, for very obvious reasons; but I am far from being convinced, and it will require much better arguments than I have heard on that side or I have read in any of the despatches from Her Majesty's Government given by the Imperial officers that we are not right in maintaining, as I maintain, that a reciprocity treaty has nothing whatever to do with the most-favoured-nation clause. A reciprocity treaty is in the nature of a bargain between two nations, under which we give and obtain substantial considerations; while I maintain that the favoured-nation clause, rightly and properly construed, means that nations having the right to the favoured-nation clause should grant similar terms to those nations from which they expect to obtain special privileges. That is the new world contention as opposed to the old world contention, and I am not in the least degree disposed to abandon it, holding it as being the more logical, equitable and fair construction. We are not, however, an independent nation, but are dependent on the British Empire, and bound therefore in matters of this kind to obey the directions we receive from the home authorities; and when they tell us that for reasons of state and for reasons of policy they are obliged to maintain this particular construction as to the most-favoured-nation clause, we have no alternative but to obey them and abandon

our better and more generous contention and accept the system as we now have it. But it was a very strong testimony to the substantial soundness of our view that while the British Government insisted, as I have said, for good reasons of state policy to their own particular construction as to the favoured-nation clause, they at the same did for the present Government what they had entirely declined to do on various occasions for previous governments—they denounced the German and Belgian treaties which prevented our extending a preference to British dominions. I say that that, rightly understood, was not only in itself a great and positive gain, but it was recognizing in such a manner as had not hitherto been recognized, the weight and importance which Canada has now attained in the councils of the Empire.

Sir, the hon. member for York, and I regret he is not able to be here to-night, was good enough to twit us with having turned our cheek to the United States and getting nothing for it. I have not in the slightest degree changed my opinion as to the enormous value and importance to both countries of extended trade relations with the United States, and I shall require very much better reasons than I have hitherto heard to induce me to abandon my position in that regard. But it takes two to make a bargain, and when the United States did not see fit to trade with us, it became our business to do the best we could for ourselves and extend our trade with the mother country and in other directions. That we have done, and if our action, as the hon. gentleman stated, is to be construed as turning the other cheek to the smiter, it is a new translation of the text to which the hon. gentleman referred. When the United States would not trade with us, we showed that country that while not disposed to retaliate on them in any way or to injure ourselves in order to inflict small injury on some portion of their population, at the same time we were masters of our destiny; that the gates were ours to open and to close; that we open them to the country that deals liberally with us and keep them closed to the country which refuses to trade with us, which is good policy, good business and good common sense. What the hon. gentleman may have meant by his allusion to those political methods which he imputed to my hon. friend beside me, to that malignant and malevolent action of holding all manufacturers in subjection, I do not know. He probably is better acquainted with the effective use of the political methods he alluded to for political purposes than we can pretend to be. We are his disciples in that matter, and we should be glad to receive from him or the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Charles Tupper) any useful instruction he may choose to communicate, for no doubt those hon. gentlemen are perfectly well versed in the art of applying those political

methods to recalcitrant manufacturers under particular circumstances.

With respect to the general accusation brought by the hon. member for York, that the Government have not been able to economize to the extent they desired, and that certain of the hopes and expectations which were entertained by certain of my colleagues as to the extent of the saving that could be made, have not been verified, I have to say, so far as those hon. gentlemen are concerned, it practically amounts to this, that they have succeeded in doing a great deal more mischief and doing it more permanently than we had supposed possible. It is not so easy to undo the evil effects of their administration as some of my more sanguine friends would suppose. I call attention to the fact, that in all the attacks I made on hon. gentlemen opposite when I was on the Opposition benches, I was careful, knowing there were serious difficulties in the way, while I pointed out that we had an annual expenditure which I thought excessive and disproportionate to our resources, my chief burden of complaint was that the then Government had increased the permanent charges out of proportion to the revenue and it would be exceedingly difficult to reduce those charges. I am in the judgment of the House, as my hon. friend opposite would say, as to whether that was not on all occasions the burden of my attacks. It is my opinion still. The amount of our capital and fixed charges is enormously out of proportion to our income. If hon. gentlemen will go carefully over the present list of expenditures they will see that, after deducting fixed charges, which are wholly and entirely apart from collection of revenue and which amounts to a sum not far short of \$20,000,000 a year in the items authorized by the statute, the amount left to cut and carve upon is exceedingly small. Deducting \$19,000,000 and adding \$11,000,000 required for post office, railways, inland revenue and customs and other matters, over which the Government has extremely little practical control from the nature of the case, deducting these sums from a total amount of \$38,000,000 it will be found that there are not more than \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 in the form of expenditures under direct control of the Government, and no inconsiderable portion of this is devoted to expenditure for Indians, which is in the nature of treaty obligations, although not granted by statute. While not desiring to palliate any extravagance, if extravagance is committed, or withdrawing from the statement I have made that the amount of expenditure is very large in a country like ours, I point that out, not at all desiring to palliate any extravagance, if extravagance has been committed; not as at all withdrawing from the statement I have often made, that the amount of expenditure is very heavy for a country like ours; but as pointing

out that the great fault which the people of Canada are entitled to complain of is, that permanent charges to such an enormous extent as I have indicated were inflicted upon them. These charges were not inflicted by the Liberals; they were inflicted against our advice and against our protest, and it is not fair to say at this moment, that if on coming into office we found it more difficult to reduce these than we had supposed, therefore we are to be held responsible—unless hon. gentlemen can show that the items which we are now demanding are excessive in amount. It does not lie in the mouth of hon. gentlemen opposite to make that charge, for as I have shown, we are actually asking less for the present services of the country with a considerably increased population, than they themselves proposed to ask two years ago. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was good enough to lay claim to all the results of the year 1896-97 as properly belonging to the policy of the late Conservative Government; and amongst other things he claimed that there had been an increase of \$17,000,000 in our exports, the credit of which was due to the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party. Well, be it so for argument's sake. I find that in the first six months of this current year—to which he (Mr. Foster) will hardly venture to make claim—in the first six months which ended on the 31st of December, 1897, I find that we exported of home products a sum total of ninety millions odd, being an increase of \$20,000,000 over the exports of 1896. Although I do not pretend to say that that is wholly and entirely due to the feeling of confidence, and the general feeling of rest and stability which has ensued on the expulsion of hon. gentlemen opposite from power and the installation of the present Ministry; it is at least good evidence that during our term of office the increase in the wealth of the people of Canada, which this evidences, has gone on far faster than it did before. The House will do well to recollect that there are new sources of wealth opening before us; the House will do well to recollect that there is every reason to believe that our population is decidedly on the increase, and that in a very considerable number of industries which in former times we did not reckon upon much—in all those connected with mines and minerals; in the wonderful development which appears likely to await the pulp and paper industry and in several others wholly apart from our staple agricultural industries, there is such promise of increased prosperity and permanence, that we have fair reason to believe that this extraordinary development is not likely to be merely ephemeral but will remain for a number of years. It is plain that Canada is entering on a new era of prosperity, and outside of hon. gentlemen opposite very few indeed will be found to question that the political position of Canada has likewise improved enormously. Sir,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

we have shown that while the Liberal party were not as fond of talking loyalty as non-gentlemen opposite used to be; we have shown how Liberal acts can outweigh Conservative promises and professions a thousand times over. We have set an example to the Empire, and if we have not done it in a huxtering spirit, if we have not endeavoured to obtain pound for pound and cent for cent, we have at any rate shown that when we were generously treated, we were willing to the best of our ability to treat our mother country generously in return.

I grant that we have not done all that some of us had hoped to do. It is not possible—the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to the contrary notwithstanding—to undo in one single year, or even in two years, all that the Conservatives succeeded in doing during a period of eighteen years. If in a corresponding period we have no better record to show than they, I would be willing for one to submit to the severest censure and punishment which can be inflicted upon us, though probably by that time, it will not much concern either myself or my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) opposite. The truth is that we have found ourselves in the position of being heirs to a deeply mortgaged estate. There are two ways in which we can get out of that awkward position. We can reduce the rate of interest, and we are doing it in spite of the remonstrances of hon. gentlemen opposite, or we can do the other thing: we can improve and develop the productiveness of our estate. We can—and I think we will be able to in a short period of time—we can increase the population of Canada to such an extent that the same results will be attained as if we had been able to cut down the expenditure by even as many millions as we had hoped in our fondest expectations. We may not be able to reduce the expenses of the service, but we can get a better service. In all these ways we can increase and improve the efficiency of the Government of Canada. This we desire to do; this we hope to do. I think, Sir, that in that way, in all probability the real safety and the real advantage which Canada is likely to derive from the present period of prosperity is likely to remain with us. I cannot forbear saying one thing—and I think I am justified in saying it—I verily believe that if, eighteen years ago the people of Canada had been content to go on under the reasonable revenue tariff they then enjoyed, the manufacturers of Canada as a whole for whose benefit these enormous additional taxes were imposed, would have been infinitely better off than they are to-day. Their progress I believe would have been as great; I am certain it would have been infinitely solder and more permanent, and it would not have been attended with the disadvantages and inconveniences which have flowed from the system then adopted. I do not

want to dwell upon these themes too long, but I do say—and I think I would obtain a pretty universal verdict from these gentlemen when I say it—that on the whole and all things considered a very grave error was committed when Canada turned her back on the well-known fiscal policy of Great Britain and took up with a system of protection, which was after all but the cast-off rags of Americanism. It may be that we have been to blame in some respects; it may be that we have not been able to live up in all respects to the expectations our friends formed, but I repeat that if it can be shown that in the Estimates we submit there is any undue extravagance, any undue expenditure that cannot be reasonably defended, we will not be afraid or ashamed to retrace our steps if good cause be shown. But I do protest that it is not right or fair or reasonable for gentlemen opposite, who laid burdens upon us which we are now endeavouring to liquidate, to complain of our course. With respect to the charge that we have increased the capital account, I may say that with one exception all the increased charges on capital account have accrued from obligations contracted by the late Government. All we have done has been as business men to hurry forward such enterprises as the completion of the canals, in order that they might become within the lifetime of the present generation of some little use to the people of Canada. The chief items of expenditure which the hon. gentleman complains of, I am quite willing to stand by, and abide the judgment of the people of Canada. But I may remind the House of one fact, which they very well know, that during last session, when we were proposing the policy of giving a large subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, there was no man in this House who was so anxious as the hon. member for York—unless perhaps it was his hon. friend beside him (Sir Charles Tupper)—that that measure should be brought forward and pushed through with all speed. If I remember rightly, the hon. gentleman approved of that measure, urged it, did not divide the House upon it, or vote against it in any way; and now, after having urged and approved of and agreed to it as a necessary measure, he turns round and reproaches us with broken promises and violated pledges, because we did the very thing he urged us to do. Sir, there should be some little reasonable fair-play in these matters. I do not object, it would ill become me to object, to any amount of criticism which hon. gentlemen opposite please to level against us. I am an old parliamentarian, and I am aware that Providence can temper the wind to the shorn lamb; and I am likewise aware that official hides acquire an extraordinary toughness and thickness under the strokes that come, sometimes from supporters and sometimes from opponents;—I say I do not object

to any amount of criticism; but hon. gentlemen of their standing and ability, knowing the weight which properly belongs to their words, should be a little fair and reasonable, and not endeavour as the hon. member for York did, to argue on totally false premises, and to endeavour to bind us down by comparisons which do not fairly apply to the condition of things as they exist to-day. I thank the House for the extreme courtesy with which they have listened to me, and, as I promised not to be unduly long on this occasion, I now take my seat.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before dealing with some of the observations which have just fallen from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) I purpose in the first place to say that those who heard my observations on the Address, during the present session will not be surprised to learn that I have heard with great pleasure the announcement of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that the Government purpose to repeal the reciprocity clause in the Tariff Act of last session, and to adopt a policy of preferential trade towards England. I stated on that occasion that, in the position in which that question stood, I felt that the Government of Canada would be entirely discredited if they adopted any other policy; and I am therefore glad to find that the hon. Minister of Finance, at great cost to himself, at great cost to his party, at still greater cost to the leader of the Administration, has adopted the policy which he has announced to the House in regard to that important question. Those who heard my remarks on the occasion of the Budget discussion during the last session, will not be surprised to learn that I also approved most heartily of the policy proposed of restoring the West India trade to Canada. It will be remembered by gentlemen who were in the House then that I urged my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in the strongest manner not to allow that important trade to Canada to be entirely destroyed by the policy which he was propounding to the House. Although the hon. gentleman could not be induced then to adopt the views I suggested in regard to that important question, I need not say that I have heard with pleasure his announcement that he proposes now to rescue the West India trade from the position of depression in which it stands at present.

Before dealing generally with the subject of the Budget, I must pay a little attention to the remarks that have just fallen from my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. After the able and exhaustive exposition of the financial question by my hon. friend the member for York (Mr. Foster), I do not intend to weary the House by going over and discussing the figures which that hon. gentleman dealt with in such a masterly manner, and in a manner which has rendered it utterly impossible for

the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to offer any effective criticism that can to any extent modify it. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce admits the gravamen of the charge of the hon. member for York that during the present year the Estimates brought down to this House, and which this Parliament is asked to vote, exceed the average estimates for many years under the Liberal-Conservative party by \$1,400,000; and that the Estimates which the hon. gentleman has submitted to the House for 1898-99, apart altogether from the Supplementary Estimates which will no doubt be brought down, will exceed the average estimates under the Liberal-Conservative party by \$1,800,000. The hon. gentleman has not ventured to challenge the accuracy of those figures, although he has endeavoured in some respects to qualify them.

The hon. gentleman began his observations by saying that prophecy was a very dangerous ground, and that he would recommend the hon. member for York not to venture in future upon that dangerous ground. Well, Sir, I happen to have under my hand a prophecy made by the hon. member for York, to which I will for a single moment draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce; and he will find, I think, that my hon. friend was not so entirely astray when two years ago he ventured upon the prophecy that under the policy of the Liberal-Conservative Administration the tide had turned, that under that policy the public affairs of Canada had been conducted with such ability and such success that it had tided Canada over a period of depression that had affected most deeply and seriously many countries in the world, and especially the great Republic alongside of us, in a manner that reflected the greatest possible credit upon the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman, on that occasion, which was two years ago, prophesied that the tide had turned, and that there was going to be an onward wave of prosperity which would give Canada a position of which every Canadian might well be proud. I draw the attention of my hon. friend to that prophecy—a prophecy that has already been realized. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) thanked, in becoming terms, the hon. Minister of Finance for the glowing eulogium he pronounced that year, which my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce says may rightly and properly be claimed as a year of administration by the Liberal-Conservative party. I listened with close attention to the speech made by the Minister of Finance, but I listened in vain to find a single jot or tittle on which he could put his finger to show that this Government had contributed to that progress and prosperity. He frankly and rightly admitted that the only great progress and prosperity that Canada could hope to enjoy was with regard to her great agricultural industry. He admitted that the position which Canada occupies

to-day was due, to a large extent, to that bountiful crop with which Providence had favoured her, and to what the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, on a former occasion, referred to as an incident connected with the crop, namely, the prices, which are beyond the control of Canada and are the result of the competition of other countries for food products. These, taken in connection with the enormous mineral development of this country, to which this Government has in no wise contributed—and other trade advantages to which no gentleman on the Treasury benches has ventured to make a shadow of a claim, account for the position Canada enjoys; and I listened, with unmixed pleasure, to the panegyric which the hon. gentleman pronounced upon the present progress and prosperity of our country. But these hon. gentlemen opposite enjoy an advantage to-day which we never did. They enjoy the inestimable advantage, which it is impossible to overrate, of having the Opposition benches occupied by men who are as ready to promote the progress and prosperity of Canada when the Government is in the hands of their opponents, as when they themselves had the administration of public affairs. But, in the many long years during which the Liberal-Conservative party governed this country, they were met by a continued wall of despair from hon. gentlemen opposite. Every one knows that, instead of joining in anything calculated to promote the progress and prosperity of the country, they did their utmost from their position—and a powerful and influential position it was—to deprive, and retard, and keep back everything that would facilitate the progress of this country. But that is not our vocation. We would feel that we were ill discharging the duty we owe to our great party and our great country, if we could, for a single moment, fail to sustain hon. gentlemen opposite to the utmost of our power in anything and everything that can contribute, in the slightest degree, to the progress and prosperity of Canada. The hon. gentleman referred to the denunciations of the Liberal party during the period they were in power by gentlemen on this side of the House, from 1873 to 1878. But the hon. gentleman did not state the facts. We never denounced the Liberal party as being the cause of the bad times, but what we denounced them for was, their refusal to come to the rescue of our sinking country. We denounced them because they refused to adopt a single measure calculated to assist our country out of the deplorable condition in which it then was. We charged them, rightly and properly, with failing in their duty to Canada, when they refused to come to the rescue of the country by adopting such means as were pointed out to them as undoubtedly calculated to promote the progress and prosperity of our country. But I will remind my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce of a

very important fact, and that was, the confession which he made on the floor of this Parliament. What was it? It was, that he had become convinced that the policy propounded by the Opposition—then the Liberal-Conservative party—was a sound policy. He confessed that the policy of increasing the tariff and preventing the business of Canada being done in Boston and New York, the policy of remedying the paralysis from which every manufacturing industry in this country was suffering, was the only sound policy; and, having become convinced it was his duty to increase the tariff, the hon. gentleman determined to do so, and prepared a tariff providing for a large increase in duties, as pressed upon him by the Opposition. But he afterwards surrendered his judgment, and failed in what he knew to be his duty to his country, at the shrine of party and in order to retain power. When Mr. Jones, of Halifax, came, with the Scotia brigade, and told the hon. gentleman that if he came down with the tariff which he himself admitted he had prepared and was ready to offer to Parliament, as a means of staying the tide of disaster and ruin that was overwhelming the country, they would walk across the floor and vote against it, the hon. gentleman abandoned what he knew to be in the interest of his country, and accepted the policy dictated to him by one of his supporters, contrary to his own judgment.

Mr. MCGREGOR. What did the hon. gentleman do the same evening?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman has anything to say, I will give him the floor.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The hon. gentleman came that evening, as a moderate tariff reformer, in favour of a duty of 17½ per cent, and, before he went away, he was a full-fledged protectionist. He asked the hon. gentleman to withhold his speech and call it six o'clock at five thirty, and then came back, in the latter part of the evening, a full-fledged protectionist.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is a Rip Van Winkle. I am sure he has been asleep for the last twenty years. Does he not know that that slander was buried long ago?

I will tell the hon. gentleman the facts, since he seems to know so little about the affairs of the country in that respect. I learned that the Minister of Finance of that day the Minister of Trade and Commerce today, had determined to raise the tariff, as the Opposition in this House had demanded and implored the Government to do. And I went down, the day before the meeting of the House, to consult with that great statesman, whose memory will never die in Canada, the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. I told him I had had news from a party point of view, that the Minister of Finance had made

up his mind to adopt our policy and take our advice. And Sir John said: Well, what have we to do under these circumstances? I said: There is not a question as to what we should do. The moment that policy is propounded, from my position as financial critic of the Government of the day, I shall stand up and commend the Finance Minister and pledge the heartiest support of myself and party to his policy. And the right hon. gentleman said that that was the only course; and there and then we agreed that, as public men, injurious as we recognized this step on the part of the Government would be to the party to which we belonged, we owed to higher duty, our duty to Canada, and must commend that which was in the country's interest. And so, I tell the hon. gentleman that he has a little to learn before he undertakes to interrupt me in discussing these questions upon which I profess to know something.

Now, Sir, I was very sorry—because I like to carry on these discussions in a pleasant and agreeable manner—to hear the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce charge my hon. friend from York with cooking the accounts. No charge, in my judgment can be more grave than cooking the accounts. I say that any public man who is capable of cooking an account is capable of any deception which can be practised upon Parliament or upon the people. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) himself is a pastmaster in cooking accounts—he compels me to tell him so. Go back to the "Hansard" of 1874, when that hon. gentleman brought down his first Budget Speech, and you will find it not only alleged but brought home to the hon. gentleman that, for the purpose of turning a surplus into a deficit, he had actually transferred, by cooking the public accounts of this country, a sum of \$500,000 voted by Parliament for capital expenditure and expended by the hon. gentleman's Government for capital to consolidated revenue expenditure. And when the hon. gentleman attempted to deny it, I told him that if he would move that the question be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts, I would put upon the witness stand some of the most trusted officers of the Government to establish my contention. And so I fastened upon him one of the most discreditable charges of cooking public accounts that ever was known in Canada.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman talks about increased imports from the United States under the Liberal-Conservative regime. Why, does he not know that that fallacy that that misstatement, that that attempt to delude and deceive the people of this country by the Convention of 1893, in which they charged the Liberal-Conservative party with adopting a discriminative policy in favour of the United States and against England, is as completely without foundation as any charge ever made by man?

Does not he know that during the five years of his regime from 1873 to 1878 the imports from Great Britain fell by thirty-seven million and a half dollars, while the imports from the United States increased. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that, if it be true that a large importation from United States and a smaller one from Britain establishes a charge of discrimination against the mother country by the Government, the public records fastens that charge upon himself. But the hon. gentleman knows that the character of imports from the United States the smaller duty they pay upon their imports than is paid by Great Britain happens, last year, as it happened years ago, to show apparent ground for the charge of discrimination, but that there was really no discrimination in the matter. I am astounded at the hon. gentleman should venture to trifle with the intelligence of the hon. members of this House by bringing forward such a question for a single moment.

The hon. gentleman says : It is quite true that we have increased the expenditure this year by \$1,400,000 over the expenditure of last year, but that is only apparent, it is only a matter of book-keeping, and there is no real increase. And how does he account for it? He says that \$210,000 of that is what was paid for the Drummond County Railway, and \$560,000 is what is to be spent for operating the Intercolonial Railway over and above all that it has ever cost before, and so you have \$770,000 accounted for. Accounted for! Why, Sir, I tell the hon. gentleman that he ought to be ashamed to name the subject of the Drummond County Railway in this House.

He knows that when that project was put before Parliament, the Minister of Railways and Canals was utterly ignorant of everything connected with that question, and was unable to present the slightest grounds for any hope that Canada could ever receive any benefit from it. The hon. gentleman knows that it was proved in that discussion that when that Drummond County Railway was obtained at this enormous cost in connection with the Grand Trunk Railway arrangements, increasing the debt of Canada by seven million dollars, the hon. gentleman knows that no man in the public service could be brought forward to give the shadow of a shade of ground for the expenditure, for the waste of this enormous sum of money. The Senate having rejected that measure, a new contract has been made, by which the Government admit, in their new arrangements with the two companies, that they are now prepared to submit to the Parliament a proposition a million dollars per annum better for Canada than before.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It was half a million before dinner, according to the member for York (Mr. Foster).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The member for York was discussing the question of the Drummond County Railway alone, but I tell him there is another branch of that subject, and that is the Grand Trunk Railway. It will be remembered that I made another charge against this Government, a charge so damning to their judgment, to their position and to their character, that the ablest man they have got in the Senate, the moment that Bill was put before the Senate, said, That will have to be amended. Here it was all right, here the Government were prepared to brazen it out, and their supporters behind them were prepared to sustain them in this monstrous proposition that Canada should be chargeable with one-half of all the expenditures connected with the Grand Trunk Railway station at Montreal and to pay 5 per cent upon the interest of one-half of all that expenditure. That is the charge, and the Government have been compelled by the action of the Senate to reconsider and readjust their arrangement with Mr. Green-shields, representing the Drummond County Railway, and the contract with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, shows that the Senate of Canada have earned the confidence and support of the people of this country by placing at the credit of this country a million dollars in that one transaction, if it never goes any further. Now, I say if that is all the excuse the hon. gentleman has for this \$1,400,000 that they are adding to the expenditure of this country, over and above the highest expenditure that has ever taken place before, it is a very poor and a very pitiable excuse. Let me state what my position was. I said: The late Government, my Government, Sir John A. Macdonald's Government, the Liberal Government, the present Government, are all pledged and committed to give substantial aid to the construction of a railway bridge at Quebec. I do not hesitate to say that in my judgment neither the late Government nor the present Government would hesitate to contribute a million dollars for the purpose of securing that great object, the construction of a bridge that would bring the Intercolonial Railway and Grand Trunk Railway from Point Lévis into Quebec. Then, Sir, what happened? Why, it has been shown in the most conclusive manner that the company, of which the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) is, I believe, president, or at all events, in which he has a deep interest, is prepared, with the aid of a million dollars from Canada, to secure the construction of that work. Well, my policy was this: I said, build a bridge, we are all committed to that expenditure, it will have to be done in the end, and then it will be useless in the one case and useful in another. Build the bridge and bring the Intercolonial Railway and Grand Trunk Railway into the city of Quebec. Then,

Sir, the Intercolonial Railway would be in a position to say to the Canadian Pacific Railway: We haul your traffic from St. John to Halifax, 276 miles, and we ask you in return, on the same terms as we take you into Halifax, to give us the right of way over your railway for 176 miles into the city of Montreal. Under those circumstances, this country would have enjoyed all the advantages of having the Intercolonial Railway brought into the city of Montreal without the expenditure of a single dollar outside of that one million dollars. But all that was lost upon these gentlemen who had got their own arrangements to make. I am afraid they had received the money and had to deliver the goods, that is what I am afraid was the matter with them. They were fast bound to Mr. Greenshields, they were slaves to be manipulated in his hands, and they were not in a position to listen to anything from this side of the House or from anybody else. That was the trouble. Now, what has happened? Why, I have consulted the ablest and best railway men in Canada, and they tell me that for that \$770,000 which you have in this Estimate, as the hon. gentleman says to account for these increased charges, you will not have one dollar's worth of additional traffic for the Intercolonial Railway. And how could you have it when it is known that from Montreal to the city of St. John, by the Drummond County Railway, the distance is 248 miles longer than it is by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and how is it possible to compete with that disadvantage? What did the Minister of Railways and Canals tell the people of St. John? He said: I intend to compete, I am going to carry all the traffic over that 248 miles extra distance to St. John at the same rate as the Canadian Pacific Railway takes it over a route 248 miles shorter. Does any man with a head on his shoulders require to be told that if that be the case, instead of its being a business transaction, it is going to load us down not only with this three-quarters of a million dollars, as the hon. gentleman has pointed out, but with untold sums of money in order to retrieve the misfortunes in which we will find ourselves involved.

Now, I must notice a further remark that the hon. gentleman made about the savings banks. I was never more astonished in my life than when I heard the Minister of Finance explain to this House that he intended to cut down the interest on the loans of the thrifty depositors in the savings banks, who, as the hon. gentleman has said, are largely of the poorer class of people who are able to deposit any money at all. The hon. member for York pointed out to the House in terms that the hon. gentleman was unable to answer, that the very foundation principle of savings banks in Canada was to encourage thrift among

the people. That was the policy, and it is all to be swept away. What does the hon. gentleman say? He says: Do you mean to tell me that you can get money at call, or on a short term deposit in the savings banks on the same terms that you can get a fifty-year loan? Let me ask the hon. gentleman: Can you get more from the capitalists of Europe for a thirty-years loan or a fifty-years loan? The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the longer the loan is the cheaper you can get the money. Every man who knows that money is steadily cheapening in the markets of the world, knows that all he has invested in this fifty-years loan is safe for $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent or $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent, which is what Canada has to pay for it. That is safe for fifty years, whereas, in all probability, before half of that fifty years has rolled round, the interest will be down to 2 per cent, if we are to judge the future by the past. Therefore, I say it is a miserable plea to say that they can get cheap money for a longer term, when every man who knows anything of finance knows that the longer the term the cheaper you can get the money. A deeper wrong in my judgment never was done in this matter, and I speak with confidence, because the Minister of Trade and Commerce will do me the justice of saying that I was the first Finance Minister who proposed many years ago to reduce the interest paid to savings bank depositors. I hold now, as I held then, that as money becomes cheaper the country has the right to pay a lower interest. But did any one ever before attempt in the history of this Parliament to offer to poor savings bank depositors a lower rate of interest than the Government are paying to foreign countries and to capitalists abroad. No such thing has ever occurred before in the history of Canada and I trust will never occur again. The Minister of Trade and Commerce gave his solution, however, of this extraordinary conduct on the part of the Minister of Finance, when he told us that the hon. gentleman had no alternative before him, for unless he took this sum of \$500,000 a year out of the pockets of the savings bank depositors he would have had to levy additional taxes on the people. It was one of those not statesmanlike actions, but one of those smart transactions of which alone the present Finance Minister seems capable, a transaction by which he wrings \$500,000 a year out of thrifty depositors, for the purpose of enabling him to expend \$1,500,000 over and above the expenditure of any other Government. That is the position of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it might as well be fairly and fully understood.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has shown me to-night that he has lost the high position which I credited him last session with occupying in the House. I knew that at the time of the general elections his

name was regarded throughout the country as having a deterrent influence on his party, that his party had wisely muzzled him in order to prevent him going on the public platform and expressing his opinion. I knew that leading men managing the party had pledged themselves solemnly that if they got into power he would never occupy the position of Finance Minister; I know that as a fact, and I can give the hon. gentleman the names of men of high standing and character who so pledged themselves. Why did they do it? Because the policy propounded by that hon. gentleman in past years had been so utterly disastrous that Canada dreaded him. The reason he had to be deprived of the high position of Finance Minister, and why he came to be regarded as a man who should not occupy that position was because, while hon. gentlemen opposite were declaiming in favour of free trade, they were visiting all the leading manufacturers and saying to them: do not be afraid of us—we do not mean it. The manufacturers replied: That is all very well, but Sir Richard Cartwright has not said so, and he will be Finance Minister. Then they declared: He will never be Finance Minister; give us your support; get us into power and your position will be even better in our hands than it was before. That is the reason why the hon. gentleman was relegated to the back ground. But last session when I saw on the Journals this reciprocity clause, I thought he had asserted himself and had been too much for his colleagues, that those innocent gentlemen were altogether unequal to cope with the hon. member on financial questions, and that while he had been satisfied with having the name without the reality, the hon. gentleman was now taking sure and certain means of securing that free trade for Canada which he had so long declared was absolutely necessary. But I find the hon. gentleman has fallen from his high state. He has fallen so low that he absolutely stands here as the defender, as the protector of the man who has taken his place, who has swept aside with his right arm all the policy the Minister of Trade and Commerce had built up during the whole period of his political life, and the hon. gentleman has become simply his mouthpiece and defender, to apologize to this House for the entire change of front adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has been reminded by my hon. friend for York (Mr. Foster) that not only over Canada but in the United States and everywhere hon. gentlemen opposite for many long years have been declaring that all that was necessary to secure sympathy and peace between the two countries and satisfactory arrangements with the United States was to let the Liberal party get into power. What does the hon. gentleman tell the House now? He said they did not possess the Christian virtue whereby when slapped

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

on one cheek they turned the other to the smiter, but that when for certain reasons the United States did not see fit to trade with us, the Government turned their attention to a country that would trade with us, that they opened the door to that country and closed it to the United States. I shall have something more to say on that subject later on. The hon. gentleman further stated that he hoped the time would never come when the party now in power would have no better record to show than the party that preceded it in power. What did the hon. gentleman mean? Is he blind; is he deaf; is he incapable of knowing what the universal sentiment of Canada is to-day? He ought not to be ignorant of it. Again and again the electorate have repeated in tones that were sufficient to reach even his ears and penetrate his mind, that the policy he propounded was a policy of ruin, and that the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party was one which had raised Canada from the very slough of despond into which the hon. gentleman and his Government had sunk it and had placed it in a proud position, making it the envy of the world. Do I use too strong language? Hon. gentlemen may search the world over to find another instance in which 5,000,000 of people have given such evidence of capacity to govern and elevate a country into the conspicuous and proud position which is occupied under the Liberal-Conservative Administration. The Liberal-Conservatives are not in power to-day, not because of any reversal in that regard of the sentiment of the people, but as the accident of an accident. Monseigneur Bruchesi gave the solution of the question on his arrival at New York, when he told those who interviewed him that the question of the Manitoba schools was more a political than a religious question. He said the Liberal party having declared they could not obtain power in this country by any other means, combined with the Liberals of Manitoba to raise this school question, as it was the only means by which declaiming in favour of free trade, they the Conservatives could be divided and displaced from power. To that conspiracy the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) owes his position to-day, and he knows it. Let him take the judgment of his own party on himself. Why did they chain him by the leg away up in Woodstock, and prevent him from going upon any public platform in Canada during that struggle. It was because they knew the policy that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) propounded was death to the Liberal party, and they knew they never could reach power in this country unless they started a side issue to divert the attention of the people.

He reproaches us about the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Sir, that is an act of black ingratitude on his part. After he had denounced the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the most unmeasured terms for many years,

in this House and out of it, the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) supported a policy with reference to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway which was objected to by a large body of his supporters behind him. I may tell him more; I tell him that the Opposition in this House, had they combined with the opponents of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway amongst the Liberal members, could have defeated the Government and prevented that measure being carried. Why did we not do it? I supported the measure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Why?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) why. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) was determined to build the Crow's Nest Pass Railway as a Government road, and I knew what that meant. When the Conservative Government were in power, I had ascertained from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the terms on which they would build the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and I had agreed to those terms, because I felt then, as I feel now, that it was a matter of the most vital consequence, not to the Canadian Pacific Railway, not to that particular section of the country, but of vital consequence to the whole of Canada, that that railway should be constructed as promptly as possible. I knew that the construction of that road was the only means by which the trade of the East and West Kootenay could be saved to Canada. And, having come to that conclusion, I was prepared to give to the Canadian Pacific Railway one and a half million dollars; no, not a million and a half, because the half million dollars was a loan, and that would have cost the country absolutely nothing, less than nothing, in fact, because we should have received from the Canadian Pacific Railway more than the entire loan of \$20,000 a mile. Our arrangement would practically have cost Canada \$1,000,000, and, when this present Government came down with a measure involving an additional \$2,000,000, why did I support it? I supported it because I considered it was absolutely necessary that that road should be constructed without any delay, because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were the only parties who were in a position to accomplish that work at that time, and because, if the measure was not supported by Parliament, the Minister of Railways stood ready to undertake the construction of that road as a Government work. If that had been done, I knew it would utterly fail to accomplish the object which the country had in view; it was Hobson's choice; it was a choice of two evils, and of the two evils, I chose the least. After saving the hon. gentleman, and after the members on this side of the House came to his rescue, I think it comes with a bad grace from him to reproach us for having supported the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. I

shall not detain the House farther with this, but I will draw attention to a cardinal fact which the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) seems to have lost sight of altogether.

It is not a question between the two parties as to whether the present Government can provide for the needs of Canada at a smaller expenditure than was made by their predecessors. That is not the question at all. The question is, that, for many long years, these gentlemen opposite have denounced the Liberal-Conservative party in this House and out of it, for wasting the public money by spending an inordinate sum in governing the country, and they have sworn, as far as people can swear by the most solemn declarations on the hustings and on the floor of Parliament, that if they got into power, they would govern this country for a comparatively small sum. They have declared, most solemnly, that they could save from one to three millions, and they have quoted the Minister of Justice, who is now one of their colleagues, as authority for the statement that they could govern Canada for four million dollars less than was expended by the Liberal-Conservative Government. Have they carried out that pledge to the people? No, Sir. They stand convicted, by their own estimates, of having played upon the credulity of the people of this country, of having trifled with the intelligence of the people, by making declarations which, I presume, they knew then, as they know now, had no foundation in fact. They talk about the Estimates of 1896, and they tell us that there were others to be brought down than those laid before the House. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows he is trifling with the intelligence of the House, when he raises such a question as that. He knows that, until an estimate has passed Council and received the imprimatur of the Governor General, it is merely an estimate, and can be reduced 50 per cent. or 60 per cent, or rejected altogether. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows that, but, I suppose, he has become accustomed to the idea that Council can do anything in its own sweet will with reference to the expenditure of the country, irrespective of the Governor General. Well, I do not blame him for that. There is very good reason for it, and I might give the House a striking illustration. You will remember, Mr. Speaker (Mr. Brodeur), that while you had the honour of occupying the Chair, I had occasion to make some animadversions upon a speech made by the Governor General of Canada, at Toronto. And, Sir, you very properly decided that I must hold Her Majesty's Ministers entirely responsible for that speech. Well, the moment I could get them to assume the responsibility, which they declined in the first place, I did so. The First Minister told us in the beginning: Oh, that is a speech of Lord Aberdeen's; Lord Aberdeen can say

what he pleases, and I have nothing to do with it. But when he found that that was not constitutional, he reconsidered his position, and the Government assumed responsibility for the speech. Now, Sir, that was a very curious speech. It was a speech attacking the views of the Opposition in this country in reference to the question of preferential trade, and pointing out how impossible it was that preferential trade should ever be adopted in England. His Excellency came to the rescue of his Ministers, and his Ministers, as in duty bound, afterwards came to the rescue of His Excellency. Now, Sir, what was that policy? The policy of His Excellency was that there should be no countervailing duties adopted in reference to the West India trade. Well, Sir, we have now the policy of countervailing duties in reference to the West India trade brought down by the Finance Minister, with the approval of His Excellency. Who has changed? Has His Excellency become converted to the doctrine of countervailing duties, and thrown over that cardinal doctrine of the free traders of England? Or have the Government changed their position? Yesterday they adopted in this House the policy of His Excellency, that there could be no countervailing duties; and to-day they are the advocates of countervailing duties, brought down here with the approval of His Excellency.

But I am wandering from the subject. I say an estimate is nothing but an estimate. It is a thing that may be wiped out altogether, and no Government and no party can be held responsible for an estimate until it is approved in Council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Even though the hon. gentleman should make it public outside?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No gentleman can make anything public outside, in the shape of an Estimate, unless it has received the imprimatur of His Excellency, and has been laid on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I can show that he made a statement that certain moneys would be provided which were not included in any Estimate approved by His Excellency and laid before the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman could produce an instance in which a Minister of the Crown, without the approval of His Excellency, and on the occasion of an election, stated to the electors that he was prepared to bring down an Estimate for a certain amount. I refer to the Minister of Railways and Canals in regard to the expenditure on the Trent Valley Canal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My reference was to the hon. leader of the Opposition himself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so; but the hon. gentleman need not go quite so far afield. He has an example close at home, in the Minister of Railways and Canals, who publicly declared that he was prepared to give \$1,500,000, or whatever it was, for the Trent Valley Canal; there was a beautiful portrait, and under it the words, "Vote for the Trent Valley Canal and Mr. Baker," with the letter to Mr. Baker signed by Mr. Blair. I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite should conclude that governors general have become somewhat obsolete, and that there is no particular necessity at the present time of paying much attention to what they say with reference to these matters one way or the other.

Now, Sir, I have told the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that this is not a question of comparative Estimates or comparative expenditures at all. It is a question of public policy. It is a question of which the Liberal party for twenty years have been dinning into the ears of the people of this country, that the country could be governed for a much smaller sum than was expended by the Liberal-Conservative party. Mr. Laurier, at Lachute, in 1895, said:

The present Government expended \$38,000,000. * * * Where does this \$38,000,000 come from? Well, my friends, the Government has a magic wand which draws, quarters, half dollars and dollar bills out of your pockets.

Sir Richard Cartwright, as will be found in the "Hansard" of 1889, complained:

We find charges like these: Civil government, \$1,316,000; charges for keeping these buildings and Rideau Hall in order, lighting and warming and repairing them, \$300,000; pensions and superannuations, \$400,000. That is the way our money goes.

Did that mean anything? Was the hon. gentleman serious when he was presenting that as an extravagant expenditure? If so, let him look at the present Estimates for 1898-99, and he will find civil government put down in these Estimates at \$1,418,438, as against \$1,316,000. For keeping these buildings and Rideau Hall in order, lighting, warming and repairing them, we are asked to vote \$424,000 for 1898-99, as against the \$300,000 which the hon. gentleman complained so bitterly against. For pensions and superannuations we are asked to vote for 1898-99, \$434,000, as against \$430,000 which the hon. gentleman complained so bitterly of. In 1896, during the Budget debate, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said:

I say it is a disgrace and a shame to the Government that have been entrusted with our affairs, that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of \$38,300,000 a year for federal purposes. Sir, the thing is utterly unjustifiable. That, Sir, was the language of the hon. gentleman when standing here; but we have

different language from him now that he is standing there.

I want now to say a few words to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance on the question of preferential trade. He said a few nights ago :

We have made, if not all the reforms that we desired, we have made a very extended tariff reform, and one which I am sure the country will appreciate.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Has appreciated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Has appreciated, my hon. friend says, and I accept the amendment. The most striking feature of the tariff policy of last session was the preferential tariff. That policy was destined to bring about preferential trade with the mother country, and I am sure the House will agree with me when I say that that portion of our tariff policy has been successful beyond measure, and has given Canada a world-wide fame. When I say this I do not forget that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, not many days ago, stated that that policy had been a complete failure. I do not know whether my hon. friend wished us to take that remark seriously.

One of the most disastrous and complete and thoroughly farcial failures that ever was presented to this House was that policy which the hon. gentleman presented last year. But I propose to deal first with the question of this extended tariff reform which the country, he says, will appreciate. What did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) say in the county of Annapolis, after the Liberal party had held a convention in 1893 and published to the world the result of their deliberations? He said :

Well, gentlemen, I say no more. Whatever doubts and difficulties there may have been about our trade policy in times past, there is none now. Our platform is clear and definite. To-day the people stand face to face with such an issue, and the next contest is to be one between free trade and protection. A 17 or 20 per cent tariff was high enough to give protection to the manufacturer. If it were not, the manufacturers should go down.

What does the hon gentleman say to-day in the face of that declaration of his that the manufacturers should go down if a 17½ or 20 per cent tariff would not keep them up? If you want an answer, look at the tariff which the Finance Minister has brought down, and of which he boasts as one which ought to excite the wonder and admiration of the world. Hon. gentlemen opposite had plenty of time to consider their tariff. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said in the session of 1896 :

But when the tariff is to be brought down by men who are awake to their responsibility, by men who desire to do their duty by the immense and varied interests of the country, and who have weighed and understand how extensive and how intricate the complications are which are involved in any material change of the tariff,

then, Sir, they would be false and recreant to their duty if they allowed any of this silly badinage—I can call it by no better name—to cause them to depart from their policy or to anticipate by one hour the time when they can lay a well-considered scheme before the Parliament and the people of this country.

That was the hon. gentleman's statement. He continued :

We must have time, and I tell the hon. gentleman we will take time—but the Government know their duty, and mean to do it. Moreover, the Government do not propose to be coaxed, bullied or humbugged into taking a step until they have well and maturely considered it.

Well, they took the ordinary period of nine months incubation, and brought forth their tariff at the end of that term. I am inclined to think, after the experience we now have had of that tariff, it would be no sin to worship it. It is said that we must not worship the likeness of anything in the heavens above or the earth beneath or the waters under the earth, and I believe it would be no sin to worship this tariff, which they brought down after nine months incubation, for it has no likeness to anything that has ever existed in the one place or the other.

We were treated a year ago to a reciprocity tariff—to a tariff that was open to the world. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, speaking of it, boasted : We are asking nothing in this resolution for England, nothing that is not opened to every other country in the world, and we invite, not only all the countries in Europe, but even the United States, to come in under that tariff. I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me when I say that that was a reciprocity tariff in the strongest and most emphatic sense of the term. It declared in so many words that any country in the world, which would give the same consideration to Canada that Canada gave to it, was in a position to claim that reduction at the hands of Canada. Great Britain was not specially meant, but the offer was open entirely, in the clearest terms, to the whole world. Well, what happened. The matter came before this House and the Premier said :

I told him a moment ago that the only country in the world which is entitled to this is Great Britain, and possibly New South Wales. The Government of Canada is not aware of any country in the world which is entitled to the benefits of the reciprocal clause.

What had these hon. gentlemen been doing during that nine months of gestation? They had had all the tariffs of the world under their hand. They had obtained these tariffs from the Customs International Bureau at Belgium and paid for them, and that right hon. gentleman had declared from his place that they had examined all the tariffs in the world, and that Great Britain was the only country which could take advantage of that reciprocal clause. That was the position taken by the Government last

year, and the Minister of Finance tells us that that resolution created great excitement in England and was met with great acclaim by the press and public men of all classes. But that is not a very difficult thing to accomplish. All that the hon. gentleman had to do was to say, as he did, as Finance Minister of Canada, that Canada was giving a great boon to England, that he was putting the tariff of Canada in such a position as would greatly benefit the manufacturing and commercial interests of England, in order to excite this great acclaim on the part of public men and everybody else in that country. What they want is to sell their goods, and when they were told that the high tariff which the Liberal-Conservative party had imposed under the National Policy was to be lowered, that 12½ per cent of the duties was to be at once remitted, and that at the end of the year a reduction of 25 per cent was to take place, is it to be wondered at that this announcement was acclaimed by all classes in that country? But they were the most grossly deceived people on the face of the globe. The hon. gentleman knows well that before he left England, the people were waking up to the fact that they had been grossly deceived by this preferential tariff clause, and that under it their trade was decreasing week by week and month by month, until it dwindled to smaller proportions than it ever descended to before. The hon. gentleman said on that occasion—that is a year ago :

We do not by our resolutions offer anything to Great Britain alone. We recognize the fact that Great Britain, by her liberal policy, is in a position to avail herself of this offer immediately, but we make our offer not to Great Britain only, but to every nation willing to accept it. We make it to every country which is willing to establish fair and reasonable trade relations with Canada.

Is that the policy of the Government to-day? That was the policy they put before the people of Canada a year ago, not as one which was to last but a year, but as one which was the result of careful deliberation during nine months before it was propounded and was intended to be permanent. Well, it is as unlike the policy of to-day as black is unlike white. One of the most transparent, palpable delusions ever attempted to be palmed off on a great country was this preferential tariff. The policy of this Government a year ago—who knows what the policy of this Government will be for an hour? Nobody does. When I stood here a year ago and told the hon. gentleman: You cannot pass this Bill into law until you have changed it, you must add a clause recognizing all the treaties that England has made, the hon. gentleman laughed me to scorn. But he came down a month afterwards, when he found that what I told him was true, when he found that he could not get the Governor General to assent to his tariff, without a clause to provide for its extension

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

to other countries which had treaties with England. That clause, as first introduced, was as follows:—

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the Reciprocal Tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce, or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty, or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada, at the reduced rates of duty provided in the Reciprocal Tariff set forth in Schedule "D."

The First Minister stated that this applied to England and to England alone, that no other country in the world could get in under it. They had examined—these wise-aces had examined—all the tariffs of the world, and they found that England alone could take advantage of this, and therefore it was a straight preference to England of 12½ per cent. I ventured to question that. I told that hon. gentleman that he would have to reckon with the German and Belgian treaties, and that under these treaties England could not accept what they proposed, but that to make that effective, they must bring down another clause which would extend to all the countries with which England had most-favoured-nation treaties. They found that they were wrong and I was right, and they brought down a clause in specific terms applying it to those countries. When I congratulated the hon. gentleman on what he had done, I was taken to task by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. And what did he say? He said :

When this resolution was tabled the hon. gentleman (referring to Sir Charles Tupper) declared it an illegal and unconstitutional resolution. Can he lay his finger upon a single paragraph published in any newspaper of weight in the world endorsing that extravagant statement of his? Can he produce the opinion of a prominent lawyer or even of a fledgeling lawyer endorsing the absurd and ridiculous statement made by him that the resolution was unconstitutional and illegal?

Well, Sir, he got his answer from the highest legal authority in the Empire, from the law officers of the Crown in England, who told them that the resolution as the Government brought it down and before they proposed the clause which made it apply to the countries having most-favoured-nation treaties was an unconstitutional and illegal clause. They found that it was illegal because the instruction of the Governor General would prevent his giving assent to it, and because Canada is part of the great British Empire, and was bound by treaties in which she had been included by the Imperial Government. He found that it was not a fledgeling lawyer, but the highest legal authority in the Empire that taught Sir Louis Davies and taught Mr. Edward Blake. What had Mr. Blake to do with it? These gentlemen had so little confidence in

their own judgment, in their own knowledge of law, that they took the public funds of this country to employ Mr. Blake to plead their case before the law officers of the Crown. But the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) has found out who was the fledgeling lawyer who ventured to controvert my statement that the action they proposed was illegal and unconstitutional. Hon. gentlemen opposite generally found it out. They have not converted the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I believe that hon. gentleman studied the profession. I have not learned that he was able to reach the bar, but I suppose he may be regarded as a legal authority. He says, in effect: I consider my opinion much more valuable than that of the law officers of the Crown. I believe he is alone in Canada holding that opinion of himself.

Every position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite a year ago was shown to be untenable and had to be abandoned; every position taken by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House a year ago—maintained down to the present hour—has been shown to have the sanction of the highest legal authority in the British Government, and to that hon. gentlemen opposite have been compelled to bow.

Now, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a most extraordinary, and I think most impudent, attempt—and I do not hesitate to use the word—a most impudent attempt to mislead the Government, the manufacturers and the people of England, made in this House by the hon. the Finance Minister last session. How did he arouse this furore? How did he get all classes, the press, the Parliament, the people of England, excited with enthusiasm over the policy that he was propounding? He did it by the solemn declaration on the floor of Parliament, that the policy he was bringing down was a policy that would give a preference immediately to the industries of Great Britain in the Canadian market of 12½ per cent, as compared with the general tariff of Canada. Was that true? I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) if that statement upon which he caused this furore in the minds of English workmen and manufacturers, was true?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does the hon. gentleman expect me to answer?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I do.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Every statement I made was true.

Mr. DOBELL. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to find that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has one friend behind him to give him a cheer. That gentleman happens to be one of his colleagues. But where is the rank and file of the party? A high authority has said, "Oh, that mine enemy would write

a book." You have written a book. You have brought down a tariff, tabulated it and put it in a Budget speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will please address the Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope I shall always address the Chair, but I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that I am speaking in reference to the views and statements of the Finance Minister. I am obliged now to go into particulars, and if I do not satisfy every independent man behind him, except the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) that my statements are true, I shall be deceived in my powers of argument.

I have here the tariff as brought down by the Finance Minister. One item of it says, "cotton fabrics, printed, dyed or coloured, n.o.p., 30 per cent, 35 per cent." What does that mean? It means that the hon. gentleman sought to delude the British public into the belief that he was taking 12½ per cent off the tariff of Canada. But before doing so, he added more than 12½ per cent to it. That is what it means, and the hon. gentleman knows it. And what is the result? Why, take the figures that the hon. gentleman himself has furnished. Instead of paying 30 per cent under this preferential tariff of 30th June, 1898, the English goods of this class have to pay 30½ per cent—so that the duty was actually higher than it was under the tariff which existed before these hon. gentlemen came into power, over the tariff as it existed when the hon. gentleman came into power. That may have been smart, it may have been very cunning, it may have been very illusory, but I ask him if it was honest. When the duty of adopting a tariff for this country rested upon your shoulders, and when you came to make such a tariff, after you had pledged yourselves to the people of this country, through long years, that if you got into power, you would strike down every root and vestige of protection, I ask, was it honest for you to raise the duty on that staple article of import, cotton fabrics, printed, dyed or coloured, from 30 per cent, under the old National Policy tariff, to a rate of 35 per cent? Was that a deception, was it a palpable deception? Why, the people of England seized with the wildest avidity the delusive statement of the Minister of Finance that he was giving them a great boon, but they came to realize the fact that, instead of a boon, he had added 5 per cent to the National Policy tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Would the hon. gentleman say what statement I made that was not correct?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say, that on the floor of this House, the hon. gentleman declared, in stentorian tones, and when he

went to England, he paraded it all over that country, that the policy of the Liberal party of this country was to reduce the high tariff on goods coming from England by 12½ per cent. Did he, or did he not, make that statement?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The statement I made was, that we had a general tariff, the rates of which were expressed, and that there was a preferential tariff which would give one-eighth reduction immediately, and a further reduction at a future date. I did not state as to any particular article the rate was to be one-eighth, or one-quarter, of the previously existing duty. It was to be one-eighth, or one-quarter, as the case may be, off the general tariff, which general tariff was read at the desk, every item of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am in the judgment of the House, when I say that the statement made on the floor of this House by the hon. gentleman, in the most definite terms, was, that he was reducing the tariff to the people of England to the extent of 12½ per cent.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Would my hon. friend quote any such statement of mine. Instead of stating it in that manner?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am now saying what was understood by every man in this House, and by every man outside of this House. I say, there is not an intelligent man in Canada who did not understand this question as I am putting it to the House now.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Nobody understood it so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me, that the people of England would have been so delighted, if he had made an honest avowal to them, that, instead of giving them an advantage of 12½ per cent below the tariff of Canada, he was absolutely adding ½ per cent to the National Policy tariff of Canada, to the high tariff that the hon. gentleman and his party had spent twenty years in denouncing? I say, the hon. gentleman knows that he could not have created this furore and this excitement on the other side of the water. The people of England, the Government of England, everybody was deceived. Now, what do we find? Cotton fabrics, printed, dyed or coloured, n.o.p.—is that imported from England?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The hon. gentleman is selecting one or two items out of the tariff, and he is talking of these.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I am selecting all the leading staple articles, staple imports from England.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There are only two or three items of that kind in the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

whole tariff, and he is treating these as if they were the whole tariff.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, cotton fabrics, dyed or coloured, is a matter of considerable importance to the English manufacturers. Does the hon. gentleman think he could have created a furore, if he had told the people of England: Gentlemen, I reduced that 12½ per cent to you, but I am going to put it up more than 12½ per cent. I say, it is one of the grossest delusions that was ever practiced upon an intelligent people, was this pretended preferential tariff that was brought down last session. Well, the old tariff, the National Policy tariff, was 30 per cent. The hon. gentleman raised it to 35 per cent; then he took 12½ per cent off for England, as a great favour, leaving England to pay ½ per cent more than the highest tariff that ever existed in this country till he came into power. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say, that, when he came into power, pledged as one of the strongest free traders in this country, the people expected that his first act would be to adopt, not only the National Policy tariff for Canada, but to increase it over and above what it ever was before? Because that is what he did, and that is what I am confronting him with to-night, and what he is unable to answer.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Why did the hon. gentleman say I am unable to answer it? I have pointed out that he is stating an exceptional item. On that very item, by the effect of that tariff, the duty will be 26 per cent and a fraction.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had better possess his soul in patience. I am dealing with the present year.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The tariff deals with more than one year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it does not.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The tariff distinctly dealt with two years, with two stages of reduction.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now I come to curtains, when made up, trimmed or untrimmed, of which there is a large import from England. When the hon. gentleman came into power, after he had spent twenty years in denouncing the National Policy as an infamous robbery on the people of Canada, his first act was to raise the duty on this item to 35 per cent. Then he takes off his 12½ per cent, and leaves it ½ per cent higher upon English goods than it was when he came into power. I am now dealing with that tariff as it was presented to England during the past year.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. Twenty-five per cent was the tariff presented to England. We are not changing the tariff this year; therefore 25 per cent comes off in July.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Minister of Customs seems to forget that they have repealed all that; they propose, in this very Act, to repeal the Act of last year. The first step they have taken is, to repeal that Act; therefore, we are dealing with that Act as it stood last year.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Not on that point.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly, the whole clause is repealed. The hon. gentleman, in his Budget speech, has declared that he repeals the Act of last year, because, if he does not repeal that Act, he finds that, when the Belgian and German treaties are removed, he is no nearer being able to give any preferential tariff to England.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** If the hon. gentleman means to say that we propose to repeal the 25 per cent reduction, he is entirely wrong.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say, the whole clause that contains the 25 per cent is repealed.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Another clause is put in, in place of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman may put what he likes in place of it, but I say, the clause that gave the 25 per cent reduction, is gone. Now I come to fancy goods, bracelets, corsets, fringes and tassels. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to get copies of this Budget speech, have them pasted up, show them to the people, because I thank the hon. gentleman from the bottom of my heart for putting in condensed form the evidence of this frightful delusion that he has attempted to practice upon the people of England. On these articles there was 30 per cent when he came into power; he increased it to 35 per cent when he prepared his tariff for Canada. Then, when you take off 12½ per cent, the English people find that they can send these same articles in here by paying ½ per cent more than they ever had to pay under the old tariff.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** How much will be paid when the 25 per cent is taken off?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then take flax, hemp and jute. The hon. gentleman said there were only a few articles. These are all articles in which England is most concerned. The tax was 30 per cent when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power; they raised the tax to 35 per cent. Twelve and a half per cent off would bring it down so that British manufacturers would have to pay only five-eighths more. Yet all England was put in a flame of excitement by the wonderful preferential trade that hon. gentlemen opposite declared they were prepared to give. Then take domestic linens, including bed covers and diapers. The duty was 25 per cent when they came into power; they raised it to 30 per cent. That is only one

and a quarter to be paid by English exporters to this country over what they had to pay before. Then I come to flaxseed and linseed. The tax was 20 per cent; it was raised to 25 per cent by the hon. Finance Minister when he presented his free trade tariff. The allowances granted reduced it to 21½ per cent to be paid by English exporters instead of 20 per cent, or 1½ per cent more than ever before. Then on all fabrics, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, &c., n.e.s., the tariff was 30 per cent; it was raised under the free trade tariff to 35 per cent, so that British exporters had only to pay ½ per cent additional.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** How much will have to be paid under the next stage?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Let the hon. gentleman possess his soul in patience, for I shall have something to say about the next stage in a few minutes. We come next to carpets, brussels and tapestry, on which the tax was 30 per cent. The hon. gentleman was not satisfied with that tax, but raised it to 35 per cent under the free trade tariff, and the English exporters were called upon to pay ½ per cent more than under the National Policy. I have satisfied hon. gentlemen opposite that not on two or three articles but on almost every single article exported from Great Britain the present tariff has increased the rate ½ per cent or 1¼ per cent and more. That is not the worst of it. We are told to-night by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that when they went, cap in hand to the United States, they said: Now, your Liberal friends are in power in Canada and we want to make a favourable arrangement with you. The United States gave them however, the cold shoulder, and told them that the sooner they went home the better, that the United States did not propose to change its tariff for them or for anybody else. What did hon. gentlemen do? They used brave words in this House. They said they were ready to make favourable arrangements with the United States, but when they found they would have nothing to do with us, we then determined to turn our face to old mother England. That was a curious confession for those ultra loyalists to make. These hon. gentlemen, we were told, were filled with burning loyalty to the Crown, that they wanted to come to the rescue of British manufacturers to whose interests they were devoted. That was the story; but to-night we have been told that they only turned their faces to the motherland when they met with a rebuff from the United States. I stand here to-night to say that the tariff as exhibited by the Finance Minister's speech is one that should be read by the people, and I hope the hon. gentleman will scatter as many copies as possible. Generally a Finance Minister has a very liberal issue made, covering 100,000 copies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is that the correct number ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I trust the hon. gentleman will send 100,000 copies of his speech all over Canada, for the reason that no speech was ever made by any man on the floor of this House, no speech can ever be made and no act ever accomplished that will damn this Government as will that speech when examined by the people. How great will be the astonishment of the Liberals ? Are there any Liberals in this country, are there any honest Liberals who believe in the principles of the Liberal party which during the past twenty years has denounced the Liberal-Conservative party and the National Policy ? If there are any such, they will turn in disgust from the party that has signalized their entrance to power by a tariff in which they have shown themselves not only prepared to abandon all their free trade theories and to throw them to the winds, but to take the National Policy tariff in its essential elements and add 5 per cent to the highest tariff ever enacted in this country. Under these circumstances there is no service that the Minister of Finance can perform to this country more important to the great party to which I belong than to scatter broadcast this damning evidence of having sacrificed and trampled under foot every principle for which the Liberal party has contended during the last twenty-five years in this country. But that is not all. How did hon. gentlemen opposite treat the United States which gave them the cold shoulder ? The tariff of last year was a pro-American tariff. It was not a British tariff, having preferential features in it, for it provided for increased taxation on British goods, and the result has been a large diminution in the imports from England. The hon. gentleman admitted that in the speech at Sheffield, although he had been loud mouthed in declaring in Parliament that it would be a boom to the mother country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has invented what I said at Sheffield.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will read in a moment to the hon. gentleman what he said, so that he may have the pleasure of hearing his own words. Corn was 7½ per cent under the National Policy. The Finance Minister made it free. Was that turning to the mother country ? It was going down on bended knees to the United States and when one cheek had been smitten, turning the other cheek to the smiter, and declaring that for the purpose of conciliating them we would take the duty off corn. The hon. gentleman was prepared to sacrifice all our agricultural interests, our farmers who on their poorer lands growing coarse grains, by allowing American corn to come in duty free. Did you do anything of the kind for England ? Nothing of the sort.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should address the Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You will understand, Mr. Speaker, that I am always speaking through you.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is the rule that an hon. gentleman should not refer to another hon. gentleman in the second person, but in the third person.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know you are right, Mr. Speaker, but at this stage of the evening one is sometimes likely to make a slip. I bow with all respect to your decision, but I am inclined to think you will find in the Reports of Parliamentary Debates in England, that occasionally parliamentarians do apostrophize the person of whom they speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it were only occasionally.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to draw the attention of the Finance Minister, the gentleman sitting just opposite, to the fact that he made corn free. I want to draw his attention to the fact that he reduced the duty on corn meal from 40 cents per barrel to 25 cents.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Judging from what my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) says, I did not think we reduced anything ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am showing the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) that he did nothing for England.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We did a good deal for Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will show that the hon. gentleman did nothing for Canada, except to increase the national tariff higher than ever it was before, by 5 per cent on a great number of articles. I want to draw his attention to the fact that he reduced corn meal coming from the United States alone, from 40 cents to 25 cents.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why does the hon. gentleman use the word "alone" there ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because it only comes from the United States and nowhere else.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We did it to please the people of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why was wheat reduced from 15 cents a bushel to 12 cents ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To please the people of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman think the farmers of this country are pleased with that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They seem to be.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I contend, Sir, that the farmers of this country are not pleased at having their protection cut down. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) reduced the duty on flour from 75 cents to 60 cents a barrel. I could understand him if he had abolished the duty on flour, because his leader declared to the people that when the Liberal party got into power they would wipe out the duty on flour and coal. What does the Finance Minister say to that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is a good thing to reduce it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman feels that the declarations upon which he and his friends attained power are to be treated as idle wind, and that the pledges of the head of the Government under whom he serves are to be taken as of no consequence whatever. He reduced stove plates, stoves of all kinds, sad or smoothing, hatters' and tailors' irons from 27½ to 25 per cent. He reduced iron pipe of every description from \$10 per ton to \$8. Iron or steel cut nails and spikes (ordinary builders') and railroad spikes from ½ cent per pound to ¼ cent per pound. Wire nails of all kinds, N.O.P., 1 cent to ¾ cent per pound. Files and rasps, n.e.s., from 35 cents to 30 cents. Adzes, cleavers, hatchets, from 35 to 30 per cent, saws from 35½, hammers, cant dogs, picks, mattocks, anvils, vices and tools of all kinds for hand or machine use, from 35 per cent to 30 per cent. Was it England that got the benefit of these reductions? Was the benefit given to that great country with which the hon. gentleman told us it was their object to promote trade. No, Sir. The benefit was given to the United States, that country which the Minister of Trade and Commerce told us had given Canada the cold shoulder. It was for the United States that these advantages were prepared, and the hon. gentleman knows it. Here is what is said by the "Iron Age," a paper published in the United States:

Of all the changes made in the general tariff, the most sweeping were those made in the duties on iron and steel and manufactures thereof. Large slices were taken off most of the old duties, and some of the most important articles of mining machinery and (next year) barbed wire, were put on the free list. What foreign country will receive most, if not all, the advantage of this? Clearly the United States. It is true Britain gets her goods in at a rate of duty now 12½ per cent, and next year 25 per cent less than the general rate, but nobody supposes, the Government least of all, that she can ship iron and steel goods into this country against United States competition. Looking over the whole list of Canadian imports of iron and steel goods, we find in nearly every article that the balance is enormously in favour of the United States.

Was that a pro-British or a pro-American tariff?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not found any Englishmen to complain of that part of the tariff.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say you have all but strangled the iron industry in Canada, and you have done it, not in the interest of England but in the interest of the United States of America. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) knows that the United States have captured our iron trade, and the hon. gentleman knows that these reductions have seriously crippled the iron industries of Canada which have been built up by the expenditure of an enormous amount of capital.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know anything of the sort.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You have swept away the tariff that gave them that protection which enabled them to carry on their operations in a manner advantageous to themselves, and which enabled them to give a suitable return to their employees. You have compelled them to reduce the wages they paid to their employees; you have injured Canadian trade and you have injured it to benefit the United States. On every platform throughout England the Prime Minister spoke of the glorious boon that Canada was giving England, and the people over there were wild with enthusiasm over the idea that Canada had come to the rescue of poor England, that in all their difficulties they had at last found a protector, and that the Canadian Finance Minister was coming to the rescue of the poor British manufacturers. And, Sir, the people of course were wild with enthusiasm. But when it was tried out, what did they find? Why, Sir, here is the statement of one of the most enthusiastic and devoted papers in support of the present Government to be found in London. It is headed:

The tariff in operation.—A startling result. And it says:

The Canadian preferential tariff has now been in operation for four months, and what is the effect? We published the official figures last week for the year so far as expired, and let us see how the record of British exports to Canada stands for the four months at the lower tariff. The result is at first sight a startling one.

The able and diligent secretary of the London Chamber of Commerce issued a circular, in which he said:

The expectations of the free traders have undoubtedly been disappointed by the extension to practically all countries except the United States of what was supposed to be an exclusive British preference.

Why did they suppose it was an exclusively British preference? You told them so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Your Prime Minister said you had examined all the tariffs in the world, and found that England, and England alone, would be entitled to the advantage of the preferential tariff. Did you tell them that or did you not? Did you sit there silent or did you rise and tell the Prime Minister that he was making a mistake? You sat there and heard your Premier declare to the world that England, and England alone, would have the advantage of that tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman asks and I will answer. If England did not get the advantage which Canada designed, it was not the fault of Canada, but it was due to the act of the English Government themselves. The hon. gentleman knows it, and he knows he is not stating the case fairly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will not lead me off the track of my argument in that way. He knows that I told him, from my place in this House, when he produced this tariff, exactly what the position was. I told him that he could not do what he proposed, and what was his answer. He said: "You must not tell me that we cannot do it—we have done it."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. "To-morrow morning," he said, "every custom-house in Canada has the order to admit English goods at the reduction." I told the hon. gentleman that he was only rendering himself ridiculous, and that he would not only have to admit all these other countries to the benefit of his preferential tariff, but would have to pay them back every dollar of duty which they had paid, over and above that at which English goods were to be admitted. If the hon. gentleman did not know what the position was, it was not my fault, because I told him here and then that what he was attempting was to practice a complete delusion on the people of England, as he did. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman said:

I claim it was the direct outcome of the Canadian policy itself, those Belgian and German treaties would not have been denounced down to the present moment.

I ask the hon. Minister of Finance if that is what he told the people of Sheffield. Did he tell the people of Sheffield that it was Canada that had done this thing? No; he told them the very reverse. But I will give a better evidence than that of the Minister of Finance. I will give the evidence of the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, who declared on the floor of the House of Commons of England what led to the denunciation of the treaties. He said:

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The Premiers of the self-governing colonies unanimously and earnestly recommend the denunciation at the earliest convenient time of any treaty now hampering the commercial relations between Great Britain and her colonies. This was the unanimous wish of all the self-governing colonies, and it was accompanied by a most important and significant resolution, which was this: "That, in the hope of improving the trade relations between the mother country and her colonies, the Premiers present undertake to confer with their colleagues with a view to seeing whether such a result would be properly secured by preference given by the colonies to the products of Great Britain." On receipt of these resolutions the Government decided to withdraw their adherence to the treaties.

That gives the lie direct to the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is very harsh language.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must see, on reflection, that that is too strong.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw it. But I will say this, that it would be impossible, in stronger, more concise, or more complete terms, to contradict the statement made by the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman might say that it lacked the essential element. That is a famous phrase with us in Nova Scotia.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I say that it lacked the essential element of truth, and that phrase was never more appropriately applied than it is on the present occasion. But I will give the hon. gentleman an authority that he will respect even more than that of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I can give this House no higher authority than that of the Secretary of State for the Colonies; but I will give a higher authority for the hon. gentleman, and that is his own.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A good authority.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What does he say? Standing in the presence of English gentlemen, who knew and understood this question, did he say that Canada had accomplished this thing? No; the very reverse. He said:

In conclusion, I have to say that the action of Her Majesty's Government, at the request of the Colonial Premiers—influenced possibly by the action of Canada—the action of Her Majesty's Government in denouncing those treaties, which seemed to be a barrier between the mother country and the colonies, is one which deserves and receives the profound gratitude of the people of Canada.

That was the statement he made—not that Canada had done it, not that Canada had forced it; but he confirms the statement made by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for the Colonies

on the floor of the House of Commons, that this was done, not by the action of Canada, but at the unanimous request of the Premiers of all the colonies there assembled, and in compliance with a resolution passed by them, that if this was done, they would endeavour to obtain favourable consideration for the trade of England in their various colonies. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman referred in most sneering terms to the question of preferential trade. He said :

It had been represented occasionally—and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has been particularly attacked on that score—that the Government of Canada, in return for concessions granted to Great Britain, could and should have obtained certain preferential advantages in the British market. I had quoted from my remarks of last session to show that the view which the Government entertained of that question was that owing to the strong opinion known to prevail in the mother country on the question of protective duties generally, but particularly on the question of protective duties affecting articles of food, there was no reasonable ground for believing any such preferential terms could have been obtained in the British market.

These are the terms in which, standing in his place here the other night the hon. gentleman referred to the question of preferential trade. Had he no respect for his leader? Had he no respect for the solemn declarations made by the leader of his Government and his party, in the presence of the electors of Canada, that if they gave him power, he would take up this question and press it to a conclusion? Let me, at the expense of wearying the House at this late hour, call his attention to what his right hon. leader said on this question, and to ask him whether he thinks it is respectful to this House for him to sneer at this question of preferential trade as one that is utterly outside of public consideration altogether. On the 17th of May, at London, Ont., Sir Wilfrid Laurier said :

In regard to this question of preferential trade, Mr. Laurier desired to say that Sir Charles Tupper was no more favourable to the idea than himself.

My hope is, nay, my conviction is, that on the 23rd of June the Liberal party will be at the head of the polls; and then it will be the Liberal party, with its policy of a revenue tariff, that will send commissioners to London to arrange for a basis of preferential trade.

Was that an attempt, Sir, on the part of the hon. gentleman's leader, to deceive and delude the people of this country? If there is any ground for the statement which the hon. gentleman made in this House the other night, then his leader stands convicted by him of a most disgraceful attempt to deceive the electorate of the country in order to get power. That is the position. I leave the hon. gentleman to take whichever horn of the dilemma he pleases. I leave him to say whether his leader, for the purpose of grasping power, was ready to lend himself

to a palpable delusion, such as the present Government altogether repudiate, as outside any kind of probability, or whether he is the party at fault. What did the leader of the Government say at London, Ont. :

Now, the statesmen of Great Britain have thought that the governments of the colonies have come to a time when a new step can be taken in their development? What is that? That there shall be a commercial agreement between England and the colonies. That practical statesman, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, has come to the conclusion that the time has come when it is possible to have within the bounds of the Empire a new step taken, which will give to the colonies in England a preference for their products over the products of other nations. What would be the possibilities of such a step if it was taken? We sell our goods in England. We send our wheat, our butter, our cheese, all our natural products, but there we have to compete with similar products from the United States, from Russia, and from other nations. Just see what a great advantage it would be to Canada, if the wheat, cheese and butter, which we would send to England, should be met in England with a preference over similar products of other nations. The possibilities are immense.

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the new and progressive Secretary of the Colonies, has declared that the time has come when it is possible to discuss that question. But, sir, if England is going to give us that preference, England would expect something from us in return. What is it she would expect? England would expect that we would come as closely to her own system of free trade as it is possible for us to come. England does not expect that we should take her own system of free trade, such as she has it; but I lay it before you, that the thing the English people would expect in return is that, instead of a principle of protection, we should adopt the revenue form of tariff, pure and simple. These are the conditions on which we can have that boon.

There is the declaration of the hon. gentleman's leader. That is the policy propounded in the face of the country, upon which these gentlemen got into power—not perhaps on that issue alone, but that was one of them. And I say that no Government is in a position, when obtaining power upon a declaration of public policy, to turn their backs upon it as the hon. members turned his back upon this principle of preferential trade the other night. What did Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the head of this Government say, when he got to England? To-night my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) said that when the right hon. gentleman left the shores of Canada, he left ready to advocate preferential trade in England. I do not agree with him, I believe that when Sir Wilfrid Laurier—and I say it with deep regret—left the shores of Canada, pledged in the most solemn manner to the policy of negotiating preferential trade with Lord Salisbury if he got power, he had pledged himself to somebody that he would defeat that policy. Why do I say that? I say it because you cannot read his speeches, his declarations, and promises without seeing

that at that time he was sincere and believed that preferential trade was a practicable thing. But between that time and the time when he got power, I believe that he pledged himself for some purpose—I will not say what—that if he did get power, he would defeat that preferential trade policy which was calculated to injure the trade of the United States. Why is it that in that great struggle between the right hon. gentleman and myself, between the Liberals and the Liberal-Conservative party in this country, every newspaper in the United States was praying for the success of hon. gentlemen opposite? If he was prepared to go, the length that his speeches at London and Toronto bound him to go, there was no reason why the United States should wish for his success. But between that time and the time when he won the battle in the struggle between the two great parties in this country, I believe the hon. gentleman had bound himself to prevent that preferential trade, which was to interfere with the interests of the great agricultural population of the United States, that is the only conclusion at which we can arrive.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps my hon. friend would mention to whom he bound himself?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say that in my judgment, there is nothing clearer. You have the great organs of public opinion in the United States fighting his battle down to the last moment, you have the hon. gentleman himself pledged to preferential trade, but the moment he touched the shores of England we find him declaring that he would have nothing to do with such a policy. I leave it with the hon. gentleman himself to work out the problem. Well, Sir, he had no sooner touched the shores of England than he turned his back upon preferential trade. The man who had declared that Mr. Chamberlain was ready to entertain the subject. The man who had pledged himself as solemnly as man could pledge himself to man to go to Lord Salisbury and negotiate for preferential trade with England immediately he reached England, did all he could to prevent preferential trade being realized. This is what the right hon. gentleman said:

What we give you by our tariff we give you in gratitude for the splendid freedom under which we have prospered. It is a free gift. We ask no compensation. Protection has been the curse of Canada; we would not see you come under its baneful influence—for what weakens you must weaken us.

Mr. DOBELL. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Was that what he said in Canada? No, the very reverse. He pledged himself to the great electorate of Canada, that if he obtained power, he would negotiate preferential trade with Lord Salisbury. He knew what that meant—that

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

England should give Canada some consideration for a policy that would place her manufacturers and the result of her industries upon the market of Canada upon preferential terms. If he had wished to say to the people of Canada, in the clearest and most emphatic terms: I was deluding you; I had no intention of negotiating preferential trade with Lord Salisbury; I intended to kill it as soon as I got an opportunity—he could not have said it more clearly than he has.

Mr. DOBELL. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) says, 'Hear, hear.' Does he deny what I have said?

Mr. DOBELL. Perhaps, I may be allowed one word, as the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is not present. I say, there is nothing inconsistent with the statements that our Premier made on this side of the Atlantic with those which he made when he attended the banquet in Liverpool and spoke before the great merchants of that city. He said: We are giving you a preference of 25 per cent, and we give it to you without asking for anything in return. Why? Because this country has got to work out to a free trade basis before we can approach Great Britain to give us preferential trade. Mr. Chamberlain himself distinctly stated, at a dinner given by the Canada Club, that as soon as Britain saw that Canada was capable of entering into such an arrangement, then, the mother country would be only too glad to discuss with her the subject of preferential trade.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) had better have retained his seat. Did he hear me read the statement made by the Prime Minister before he went to England?

Mr. DOBELL. Certainly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman hear me read the following:—

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the new and progressive Secretary of the Colonies, has declared that the time has come when it is possible to discuss that question. But, sir, if England is going to give us that preference, England would expect something from us in return. What is it she would expect? England would expect that we would come as closely to her own system of free trade as it is possible for us to come. England does not expect that we should take her own system of free trade, such as she has it; but I lay it before you, that the thing the English people would expect in return is that, instead of a principle of protection, we should adopt the revenue form of tariff pure and simple.

Mr. DOBELL. Quite so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, the right hon. gentleman declared that if he got power, he would go and negotiate preferential trade with Lord Salisbury. And, when he went to England, before he saw Lord

Salisbury, the moment he touched the shores of England, he came out and took a position diametrically opposed to that which he had expressed here. I can understand the hon. member for Quebec West not understanding the subject, but I cannot understand any other hon. gentleman in this House not understanding it. The Prime Minister, from the hour he touched the shores in England, down to the hour he left it, did everything man could do to prevent Canada obtaining preferential trade with Great Britain. He took every step, adopted every policy, committed himself to every principle that could make against preferential trade. And what more? Why, he accepted the Cobden medal. The hon. member for Quebec West bows his head. On what terms did the Premier accept the Cobden medal? Does the hon. gentleman know?

Mr. DOBELL. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will sit down, and let the hon. gentleman tell us what those terms were.

Mr. DOBELL. I do not wish to detain the House, but I may say that I myself attended a dinner of the Cobden Club, and the first resolution on the order of the day was on the question whether it would be expedient for Great Britain to change her fiscal policy, even if the colonies were disposed to give preferential trade to the manufacturers of Great Britain; and, after discussion, in which most of the extreme free traders of Great Britain spoke, we gained the vote by a majority of one, that it would be expedient. Therefore, I say that our Premier was perfectly justified in taking the medal of the Cobden Club, as an earnest that we are going to work this country into a freer and better state of trade than she has had.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad to have heard the hon. gentleman's interesting account of that dinner. I am afraid it was a long dinner, and that the hon. gentleman enjoyed himself very much. But I wish to draw his attention to what Lord Farrar said, when he presented the Cobden medal. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) will understand the position of this question, when I read that. Lord Farrar said:

There is a party amongst us who would willingly discriminate against German and Belgian goods, and who look upon the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties as a step towards what they have been pleased to call the commercial federation of the Empire—a system under which commercial union in the different parts of the Empire will be fostered by laws excluding or discouraging foreign goods. If this were to be the consequence of what you have done, I need hardly say that we of the Cobden Club would not have been here. It is because we believe that your efforts are founded on the opposite principle, and will be followed by opposite results, that we, followers of Adam Smith

and of Peel, of Bright and of Cobden, are here to congratulate and to thank you.

Now, I want to know what the hon. member for Quebec West will say, now that I have given him my evidence that the medal of the Cobden Club was given to Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the distinct declaration denouncing the exclusion of Belgium and Germany from the operation of the Government's new policy.

The policy of the Minister of Finance is one utterly fatal to the doctrine propounded by Lord Farrar. Lord Farrar supposed that the policy of a year ago was going to be the policy of Canada, he supposed so owing to the declarations of the Premier of Canada all over England, that, strong a free trader as he was when he came to England, he was a much stronger free trader then. But the policy propounded by the Minister of Finance makes it utterly impossible for the right hon. gentleman to retain that medal a single hour. The moment his Government declared that the very principles on which Lord Farrar delivered the medal into his hands, are gone, that the reciprocity which was open to all the world is repealed, and that in place of it a discriminatory tariff in favour of England only is adopted, and against Belgium, Germany and all these other countries. I say at that moment the principles upon which that medal was given, are swept away. I say if it was an ordinary transaction between men, the Cobden Club would have a right of action against the Premier for having abandoned the principles upon which he received the medal, and the moment this becomes law the Cobden Club would have a legitimate action against the right hon. gentleman for having received goods under false pretenses, and the criminal statutes of Canada could be made to apply to such a transaction.

Now, Sir, in conclusion, let me say that I regret from the bottom of my heart that the Government of Canada have been so lost to their duty to their country, so forgetful of the pledges made by the Prime Minister as to have treated this great and important question in the way that they have done. The Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech, made sneering references to this question. Why, Sir, what is preferential trade? It is the grandest, it is the greatest scheme that has ever been propounded or, in my judgment, ever will be propounded for promoting the unity of the Empire. It is a policy by which that most potent of all influences, whether as regards men or nation, can be brought into operation, the policy of self-interest. But this pretended policy of preferential trade that the hon. gentleman has offered us, this delusive policy that he has offered to England, is a farce compared with that great policy that would have made it the interest alike of Canada, of Australia, of South Africa, of all the great outlying colonies of the Empire, to take up this great

question with a view of adopting a policy that would make self-interest a common bond between the colonies and the Empire, such a bond as can never be created in any other way. This proposal may be accepted, as any proposal would naturally be accepted, by Great Britain with the most effusive thanks, because it is a policy of giving everything for nothing. But the policy to which Mr. Chamberlain committed himself by his speeches at the great congress of the Boards of Trade of the Empire, was based upon the policy of binding England and her colonies together by motives of self interest. Now, I do not hesitate to say, having giving this subject the greatest consideration, having examined it from its inception down to the present time, that if the Government of Canada had said to England: We will give you a reduction of 25 per cent upon whatever the tariff of Canada may be at any time, in favour of England, if you will give a corresponding advantage to the agricultural products of Canada in your market, I say that in this Jubilee year it would have been done. Now, let me refer to the language of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in a report that he has laid upon the Table of the House of Commons. That language must convince any one that if there is a man living who has examined this question from top to bottom, and who was convinced that in it is contained the germ of a solution of the great question of the unity of the British Empire, that man is the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain. I will quote from a report of his speech at a conference with the premiers of the self-governing colonies, which report was laid upon the Table of the House of Commons:

I pass on, then, to another question, and that is as to the future commercial relations between this country and her colonies. How far is it possible to make these relations closer and more intimate? I have said that I believe in sentiment as the greatest of all the forces in the general government of the world, but at the same time, I should like to bring to the reinforcement of sentiment the motives which are derived from material and personal interest. But undoubtedly the fiscal arrangements of different colonies differ so much among themselves, and all differ so much from those of the mother country, that it would be a matter of the greatest complication and difficulty to arrive at any conclusion which would unite us commercially in the same sense in which the Zollverein united the empire of Germany. It may be borne in mind that the history of that Zollverein is most interesting and most instructive. It commenced entirely as a commercial convention, dealing in the first instance only partially with the trade of the empire, it was rapidly extended to include the whole trade of the empire, and it finally made it possible and encouraged the ultimate union of the Empire. But this is a matter upon which at the present time, rather than suggest any proposals of my own, I desire to hear the views of the gentlemen present.

In the meanwhile, however, I may say that I note a resolution which appears to have been passed unanimously at a meeting of the Pre-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

miers in Hobart, in which the desire was expressed for closer commercial arrangements with the Empire, and I think it was suggested that a commission of inquiry should be created in order to see in what way practical effect might be given to the aspiration. If that be the case, and if it were thought at the present time you were not prepared to go beyond that inquiry, if it were the wish of the other colonies, of Canada and of the South African colonies, to join in such an inquiry, Her Majesty's Government would be delighted to make arrangements for that purpose, and to accept any suggestions as to the form of the reference and the character and constitution of the commission, and would very gladly take part in it.

What does the hon. gentleman think of that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Would my hon. friend like to read what Mr. Chamberlain said about this Government's policy? It would come in very nicely there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think if the hon. gentleman had treated this House with sufficient respect when quoting from the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, he would have done what he said he would do, lay his despatch on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I instantly did so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to hear it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let me add a word. I laid it on the Table, and the Clerk of the House returned it to me that afternoon. I shall be glad to produce it again. I placed it on the Table of the House, knowing the rule.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman's statement, because having quoted from it he was bound to lay the statement on the Table of the House. I had not the pleasure of perusing it. The Colonial Secretary stated that if all the Premiers of the great colonies of Australasia, including New Zealand, passed a unanimous resolution asking for a commission to consider this question of closer relations with the Empire, and they did it with a special view to this question of preferential trade, and if Canada and South Africa were prepared to join in that request, he would be delighted to join and frame a commission in order to ascertain what could be done. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that Canada is not responsible for lack of action? South Africa had declared here at Ottawa that it was in favour of preferential trade. The hon. gentleman knows that under these circumstances Canada is alone responsible for having crushed out, as Sir Wilfrid Laurier showed from the first hour he landed in England down to the hour he left it he was determined to crush out every attempt to secure preferential trade between different portions of the Empire.

I now wish to turn my attention to the sugar duties. I have already told the hon.

Finance Minister that he will remember I endeavoured to persuade him last session to take up the question of the sugar duties. I find a very high falutin paragraph in the speech on the Budget about the hon. gentleman's anxiety to assist the people of the West Indies. A year ago the hon. gentleman took the great manufacturing interests of England under his wing, and he showed how determined he was to improve their condition by charging the exporters only $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent more than formerly. He found that England was not able to take care of the West Indies, and so he went to their assistance. A year ago I told the hon. gentleman he was destroying the West Indian trade with Canada. The hon. gentleman treated my suggestion with the amount of respect he usually gives to my suggestions.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What does the hon. gentleman mean by saying that my policy was destroying the West India trade?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The tariff of last session gave the final blow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say there is no foundation for the hon. gentleman's statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is another attempt, a most transparent attempt to delude the British public. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that England has sunk to a position in which she requires to be grandmothered by the Dominion of Canada? Yet hon. gentlemen cannot read the Budget Speech without coming to such a conclusion. No doubt people in England will be delighted with the speech, and it will be generally commended there. Why? There is only one way of relieving the West India Islands, and every one in England knows it is by adopting countervailing duties. Such a system, however, would interfere with the policy of free trade, and Lord Farrer does not like it. So it is left for Canada to adopt those countervailing duties which England cannot adopt. It is all a farce. The hon. gentleman cannot convince me that England has anything to do with this West India policy. I will let hon. members into the secret. After refusing to adopt my suggestion, the hon. gentleman went to Halifax, where he received the cold shoulder from the West India merchants; they would hardly speak to him—leading merchants, who felt he had struck a fatal blow against their interests.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I never heard of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman never see George Mitchell, Alfred Jones or any of the great West India merchants after the close of last session? The hon. gentleman may tell me he never heard of this expression of opinion; but if so, he is the only man who did not hear it. The

truth is the hon. gentleman found he had made a mistake, and that he must do something to retrieve his position. Instead of saying: I am in an awful hole with my friends in Halifax and Nova Scotia in regard to the West India trade and you must help me out, he manufactured this great Imperial policy, to come to the rescue of England as regards the West Indies. He has taken this action owing to compulsion on the part of West India merchants in Halifax, and I am glad he has done so. They are right and he was wrong. The West India trade is of the utmost importance. But if the hon. gentleman wanted to save the West Indies and to save the people from a protectionist tariff, why did he not adopt the plan proposed by the Toronto "Globe"? The hon. gentleman, however, as was stated by the hon. member for York, wished to wring out of the pockets of the people between \$300,000 and \$500,000 of additional taxation under the pretense of doing something very grand to help England out of the trouble as regards the West Indies. Why, I repeat, did the hon. gentleman not adopt the plan proposed by the Toronto "Globe," which was this:

Indeed, from the recent discussion regarding reciprocity with the West Indies, it seems not altogether improbable that he contemplates a rearrangement of the sugar duties, expressly excepted heretofore from the operation of the preferential tariff, a rearrangement that will give our sister colonies an advantage over foreign sugar producers in our market. This could, of course, be done in two ways; by an increase of the duty on sugar produced from beets, while that on cane sugar remains the same, or—and this is the more likely means—by a reduction of duty on all sugar imported from the British West Indies.

He had the opportunity of giving a preferential tariff to the West Indies without taxing the people of Canada.

If such a reduction were substantial it would doubtless lower the revenues from sugar as well as the price to the consumer.

This is a matter which the Finance Minister has wholly failed to consider.

There are many who think a mistake is made in such a country as ours, where fruit is plentiful and cheap, in seeking to raise heavy revenues from sugar instead of encouraging the preserving of fruit for exportation by making sugar as cheap as possible. If the Government has seriously entered upon the task of including the British West Indies in the Imperial preferential trade arrangement these questions will assume an importance not hitherto attached to them. A buoyant revenue is a very stimulating thing for the Finance Minister, and Tuesday's Budget may contain more than one project for improving our trade relations with the sisterhood of Britannic nations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, if the hon. gentleman's object was to assist the British West Indies, had he not an opportunity of doing it without taking three or four hundred thousand dollars a year of fresh taxes

out of the pockets of the people. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) did this because his interests in the province of Nova Scotia compelled him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Would the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) permit me to say, that I heard no complaint in the province of Nova Scotia respecting the sugar duty, except that we had not changed some duties which the late Government levied. The only complaint was, that the duty imposed by the late Government was unfairly imposed, and that the method ought to be changed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) did not hear the strongest denunciations of his allowing the West Indies trade to go to ruin, he is the only man in Halifax who did not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I heard no complaint about our tariff.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has not only been deaf, but blind, because public men in Halifax expressed themselves in the press in the most positive terms, and deputations came from Halifax to the hon. gentleman, to whom he turned a deaf ear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Against the late tariff.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I tell the hon. gentleman, that that tariff has its foundation in the interests of Halifax, and that the pretense about the West Indies is merely a side issue to excuse the imposition of three or four hundred thousand dollars taxes. The Liberals used to talk a great deal about a free breakfast table, but the first attempt of this free-trade Government to give us a free breakfast table is to put three or four hundred thousand a year extra taxes on an article regarded as an essential of life. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) said, in his speech :

Never was a tariff policy submitted to Parliament, which was received with greater satisfaction by the people of Canada than that which was announced a year ago.

Well, I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding). Never was there a tariff received with greater satisfaction by the people of Canada, except one, and that was in 1878, when the National Policy was announced. The second tariff of great satisfaction to the people of Canada was last year, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) came down and adopted the National Policy almost in its entirety. Mr. Bertram explained why this wonderful satisfaction was exhibited by the people of Canada. He told us that the people of Canada were in a state of dread lest the Liberals would carry out their promises, and the people were so relieved to find that these free traders opposite had swallowed themselves, that there was the wildest de-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

light throughout the country. We had, this year, the astounding declaration from the Finance Minister, that while this tariff had been received with the wildest delight, that while Canada had prospered in every way under its operation, yet the hon. gentleman threatens the most dire consequences unless every manufacturer in Canada is continually on his knees before him. The Government found something was necessary in order to terrorize the great manufacturing industries of this country, and so the Finance Minister made the most unblushing and shameless declaration that has ever emanated from a man in his position. In that declaration, the great manufacturing industries of this country are told that the Government have them by the throat, and that they would press them with a grip that would be fatal, if they did not respond to their wish.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was that the old way ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That never was the old way, and you will have to search the parliamentary records in vain to find such a threat made by a responsible Minister of the Crown. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) closed his speech by reading an extract from Mr. Chamberlain's despatch :

"I desire," said Mr. Chamberlain, "to add, in conclusion, that the action of the Dominion Government and Parliament in this matter, although, unfortunately, its full effect will be temporarily postponed, has been warmly welcomed and appreciated by Her Majesty's Government and the people of this country, as a measure which cannot fail to result in material benefit to the mother country and to Canada, and to weld together still more firmly the ties which now unite them."

Well, Sir, when I read that despatch, the scriptural declaration at once rose to my mind : "There should be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety-nine just persons which need no repentance." What was the reason of this outburst on the part of the Colonial Minister in favour of the action of this Government. Why Sir, it is to be found in the history of the Liberal party in Canada. There is no doubt that every intelligent man in the Empire has been greatly disturbed for many years by the action of the Canadian Liberal leaders. There is no doubt that great anxiety has been felt as to what role they were likely to assume, if they came into power. And it is no wonder, therefore, that the Colonial Secretary would be delighted to find such a display of devoted loyalty to the Crown and to British institutions from hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Chamberlain knew that, only as late as 1891, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the present Prime Minister, said :

While they (the Conservatives) commit the mistake of basing their trade policy upon uniformity of allegiance and a mere sentiment, we of the Liberal party maintain that the policy of this country must be based not upon sentiment but

upon business principles ; and, fresh as we come from the people, I say that the only policy which will benefit this country is unrestricted reciprocity and continental freedom of trade. Sir Charles Tupper says in an article published a few days ago in the "North American Review," that the delusion, as he calls it, of unrestricted reciprocity was dead and buried. Dead and buried! I am as good an authority on the subject as is Sir Charles Tupper, and I say that it is more alive than ever.

That was a very alarming statement coming from the head of a great political party. That was a very alarming statement for the head of the great Liberal party of this country to make in favour of continental free trade, a policy that would make the tariff of Canada manufactured at Washington, and that would turn the back of Canada upon England. Well, Sir, who is right? You cannot hire a man in the Liberal party now to admit that he ever was a supporter of unrestricted reciprocity. It is not only dead and buried, but it is past resurrection ; and why? It was because of that great statesman, the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, that devoted patriot, who laid down his life in defence of British institutions, who would have lived many more years, in my judgment, but for the fact that British institutions were attacked by the leaders of the Liberal party in this country. That is what led him into the battle ; and although he won it, everybody knows that before we were able to plant on the ramparts of the country a policy of standing by Great Britain and remaining true to British institutions to the death, that right hon. gentleman had sacrificed his own life to the struggle. It was on that occasion, when these hon. gentlemen adopted a policy so disloyal—when in combination with the Farrers and the Erastus Wimans and the traitors to every British sentiment in this country, they were defeated in that great struggle—it was on that occasion that British principles were established at once and for ever and will remain to the end of time. Mr. Chamberlain knew that. He knew the position these gentlemen occupied on that occasion, and therefore you can imagine the joy and delight with which he found them out-bidding the Liberal-Conservative party in their professions of loyalty and devotion to British institutions, though very hollow and insincere they were on most occasions. I will never forget to the last moment of my life that on that memorable occasion on which I went with Sir John Macdonald to London, Ont., and at the last meeting which we took part in together, he said to me, "Tupper, I am getting really terribly alarmed at the disloyalty of the leaders of the Liberal party."

An hon. MEMBER. Blake was the same.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Sir, did not Mr. Blake think the same? Why did he leave them? Why did he refuse to fight the battle side by side with those men on

that occasion? Sir, it is a matter of history that he has put on record, and that will go down to his credit, whatever faults he had, that he refused to fight that battle with hon. gentlemen opposite because he would not fight under false colours, and because he believed the policy they had adopted was going to be fatal to British institutions. That stands on record in the London "Times" newspaper, in a letter published over his own signature, which to the last hour of his life will reflect credit upon him, but the most undying discredit on hon. gentlemen opposite. But I must not be led away from my story. I said to Sir John: "Well, Sir John, you have one great consolation." "What is that?" he asked. "Why, my dear sir," I said, "you have the consolation of knowing that at any moment you can change that disloyalty into the most loud and blatant loyalty you have ever heard." "How is that?" he asked. "Why," I said, "all you have to do is to resign and let them take your place, and they will outbid your loyalty; they will make the welkin ring with their shouts of loyalty."

We had Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at the St. Jean Baptiste Society in 1891, saying:

It has also been said that we should establish a line of steamers between England and her possessions, by virtue of which trade could be cultivated between Canada and the British Empire to the exclusion of the rest of the world. I have only to say, with regard to such an idea, that it is absolutely absurd. For my part, I prefer the Yankee dollar to the British shilling, especially when the dollar is so near and the shilling is so far away.

Mr. Chamberlain knew all that; and when he found that these gentlemen were out-Heroding Herod, and out-bidding the great Liberal-Conservative party of Canada in their loyalty to the Crown and their devotion to British institutions, he naturally came to the conclusion that the change was one that Her Majesty's Government might express the most profound satisfaction with, as he has done it. Well, Sir, I want to ask the hon. Minister of Finance, who has been very obliging, and I thank him very much for it, in answering my questions, why he has not extended this policy to all the colonies instead of to New South Wales alone. Will the hon. gentleman tell me that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will consider that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says he will consider that. He has perhaps not thought that matter out. I can tell him why he did not do it, if he does not want to tell me.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman should not have asked me if he knew.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows that it is perfectly within the

power of Canada to make any fiscal arrangement with any colony in the Empire, and he knows that under such an arrangement it is perfectly practicable to get a quid pro quo. He knows that, though Sir Wilfrid Laurier innocently thought that the abrogation of the German and Belgian treaties enabled the colonies to make fiscal arrangements with each other, that was provided for several years ago by an Act of the Imperial Parliament at the request of the conference at Ottawa; and under this power it is perfectly practicable for Canada to make any fiscal arrangement with any colony in the British Empire. He knows that under that power Canada did negotiate a treaty with New Zealand, which provided that if we admit the products of New Zealand on more favourable terms, we would secure the admission of our products into New Zealand on more favourable terms; but the New Zealand legislature, by a very small majority, defeated that treaty. The hon. gentleman knows that he has a good ground for arranging with all the British colonies, on terms mutually beneficial, a treaty under which, if they got the advantage of the reduction provided for in our legislation we would get the same from them. That is the reason the hon. gentleman says that he proposes to defer at present dealing with the other colonies of the Empire. But I want to ask the hon. gentleman, if he is so anxious to save the West India trade and come to the rescue of the West Indies, why does he not do it now? Will the hon. gentleman tell me why, if he is so anxious to come to the rescue of the West Indies, he delayed until the 1st of August next?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will consider that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He is unable to tell me. I can tell him why. He wants to ring out of the people of Canada the increased taxation before he gives any remission. He has deluded everybody connected with the West Indies trade completely. He knows that by the first of August, the time will be passed for any substantial benefit to result from this policy, and he is going to get \$300,000 or \$400,000 by increased taxation out of the pockets of the people of Canada before he gives the remission.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Between now and the first of August? I am afraid my hon. friend is dreaming.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Let my hon. friend stand up and say why he does not bring this into operation on the first of July. Why does he not bring it into operation at once. The Belgian Treaty has nothing to do with it. The reason is because he wants to ring out of the people a large amount of taxation. Let me inform the hon. gentleman of the sentiment in Halifax which he appears to ignore.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said that I knew the Halifax sentiment correctly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Here is what appears in the Halifax "Herald," as the result of an interview with Mr. George Mitchell, M.P.P.:

The tariff is a grand move in the right direction, said George Mitchell, M.P.P. In nearly every particular it is what the West India merchants of Halifax have been asking the Government to enact.

Why did he not do that a year ago?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What they have been complaining about is the tariff of my predecessors.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And when you got into power to remedy that tariff, why did you not do it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because we cannot do all things at once.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has done this for the West Indies without any quid pro quo, why should he do it? He has failed altogether in accomplishing what he proposed with reference to the West Indies, and for this reason. He knows that the United States is the great market for West India sugar, and he knows that the countervailing duties the United States have imposed, give to the West India trade a much greater advantage than anything they are going to enjoy under this tariff. Therefore, it looks to me as if the hon. gentleman, under the pretense of accomplishing much for the West India trade, is disposed to adopt a policy which is calculated to give him increased taxes without any material advantage to the people of the British West Indies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is quoting Mr. Mitchell to say that I do give an advantage.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Mitchell does not see, as I do, that it is in the power of the hon. gentleman to put this in operation at once instead of postponing it until the first of August. No doubt it would be beneficial, and I have already told the hon. gentleman I am very glad to learn that he has done it, but I regret deeply he did not do it before. I do not propose to occupy the attention of the House longer than to say that in my opinion the people of Canada will at no distant day say to this Government:

You obtained power by pledging yourselves to adopt a revenue tariff from which every vestige of protection should be removed. You have not only adopted the policy you had denounced but largely increased the duties on a number of staple imports from Great Britain and while pretending to give her preferential trade, made reductions in the tariff on articles upon which Great Britain cannot compete with the United States. You denounced the public expendi-

ture of your predecessors as grossly extravagant, declaring that you would reduce it by several millions per annum. You have increased it beyond anything ever known before. You pledged yourselves to send a commission to negotiate preferential trade within the Empire with Lord Salisbury if you obtained power. You refused to consider the question when invited by the Colonial Minister and publicly denounced it as involving protection which you said would be "a curse." You enacted last session a policy of reciprocal trade with all the world and your Premier was decorated with the Cobden Medal in virtue of that policy. You now propose to repeal that policy and substitute a policy of discriminatory duties. The repudiation of all the pledges made to the electors when seeking power and the adoption of the policy you then denounced is the best evidence that by your own confession you are unworthy of our confidence.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I move that this House do now adjourn. I sincerely hope that the leader of the Opposition will be none the worse for his rather prolonged effort.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 13th April, 1898.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 112)—(from the Senate)—for the relief of Edwin Heyward.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

IMMIGRATION OF WOMEN SERVANTS.

Mr. **ROCHE** asked,

Has the Government sent Mrs. Livingstone to the old country in connection with a scheme to bring women servants to Canada? If so, has the Government decided to prepay the passages of such servants?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). 1. Yes. 2. The department has arranged for a half rate, and will advance the amount to be repaid within six months.

MILITIA POINT, N.S., POST OFFICE.

Mr. **GILLIES** (by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked,

1. When was Daniel McIntosh appointed postmaster at Militia Point, county Inverness, Nova Scotia?

2. Was Daniel McIntosh dismissed from the position of postmaster of Militia Point, and if so, when, why, and at whose request?

3. Who succeeded Mr. McIntosh as postmaster at Militia Point?

4. By whom was his successor recommended?

5. Was there a petition lodged with the Postmaster General asking for the appointment of one Murdoch McLeod as postmaster at Militia Point? If so, what are the names to this petition?

6. Was there a petition sent to the Postmaster General by the people of Militia Point, asking that Mr. McIntosh be retained in office and that the post office be not removed from his residence?

7. If so, what are the names attached to this petition?

8. Why was not the prayer of this petition granted?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). 1. Kenneth McIntosh was appointed postmaster at Militia Point on the 20th June, 1896. The inspector had reported in favour of an office at Mr. Murdoch McLeod's place, the site of the present post office, in January, 1896, but that report was disregarded and Mr. McIntosh appointed. 2. The Militia Point post office was removed to a more convenient situation on the 1st of March last on recommendation of the post office inspector at Halifax, and Mr. McIntosh then ceased to be postmaster. 3. Mr. Murdoch McLeod has succeeded Mr. McIntosh. 4. The residence of Mr. McLeod having been recommended as most convenient to public needs by the post office inspector, and Mr. McLeod's name having met with the approval of Dr. McLennan he was appointed postmaster. 5, 6, 7 and 8. Petitions in favour of Mr. McLeod and Mr. McIntosh, respectively, were sent to the department, and in the public interest Mr. McLeod was appointed.

MAIL COURIER—MILITIA POINT.

Mr. **GILLIES** (by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked,

1. Who is the mail courier from Militia Point to Marble Mountain, Inverness county?

2. What amount is now being paid for this service?

3. Was there a tender to perform this service for fifty dollars annually sent the department by Mr. Daniel McIntosh?

4. Was his offer to perform this service lower than the amount that is now being paid the present contractor?

5. If so, why was not his offer accepted by the department?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). 1. The contractor for the Marble Mountain and Militia Point mail service is

Mr. Murdoch McLeod. 2. The rate of pay for the service is \$72.50 per annum. The arrangement for this service was made under the following circumstances. The department had before it a recommendation made to the late Government by the post office inspector at Halifax on the 9th January, 1896, that a post office to be called Militia Point be opened at the residence of Mr. Murdoch McLeod, which the inspector represented as the most convenient site for the office in the settlement. This recommendation was disregarded at the time and the Militia Point post office was placed at the residence of Mr. Kenneth McIntosh, a less convenient site, and served twice a week from Malagawatch at \$20 per annum. The facts were brought to the attention of the department in November, 1897, and Mr. Murdoch McLeod offered his residence for use as the Militia Point post office and undertook to serve it tri-weekly instead of semi-weekly in connection with his contract for the Malagawatch and Marble Mountain service for an addition of \$10 per annum, though at his contract rate he would have been entitled to \$66 per annum for the additional travel. The effect of the arrangement was that Militia Point was removed to the site originally recommended as the most suitable, was served tri-weekly instead of semi-weekly, and \$10 per annum was saved as compared with the former arrangement. An offer was received from Mr. McIntosh to do the service for \$50 per annum, but not until the arrangement with Mr. McLeod had been concluded.

FREE MINERS' CERTIFICATES.

Mr. MACLEAN (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

How many free miners' certificates were issued by the Government up to, and inclusive of March 31st: (a.) In the different cities of Canada; (b.) In Great Britain?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Up to the 31st March, 1898, 10,852 free miners' certificates were issued in Canada; and up to the 26th March, which is the latest date for which we have received returns from Great Britain, 23 have been issued there.

BANKING BUSINESS IN YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. MACLEAN (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

1. What rate of compensation has the Minister of Finance or the Government decided upon to the Canadian Bank of Commerce for transacting Government banking business in the Yukon territory?

2. Has application been made to the Government by the Bank of British North America, or any other Canadian bank for permission to transact banking business for the Government in the Yukon territory? If so, what answer has been made to such request?

Mr. MULLOCK.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). In reply to the first question, I beg to say that the compensation to be paid to the Canadian Bank of Commerce has not yet been decided on. As regards the second question, there has been some correspondence between the Finance Minister and several banks, not so much with respect to their doing business for the Government, as to the conditions under which they might do a general banking business in the Yukon district. The banks have been assured that every possible assistance in the way of police protection, and whatever other assistance from the Government that can be extended, will be given to the various banks, and I have assurances that these representations have been received with satisfaction.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. MACLEAN (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

What arrangements does the Government or the Minister of the Interior propose making for sending geological surveyors or mining experts into the Yukon territory this year? Has the Government or the Minister of the Interior chosen any geologist or surveyors to undertake the work? If so, who are the officers so chosen?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The arrangements for geological work in the Yukon district are now under consideration. The details of the arrangement have not yet been settled, and therefore I am not in a position to say who the officers will be who will be placed in charge of the work.

GOVERNMENT WHARF AT ST. MICHEL.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked,

1. Were any repairs done to the Government wharf at St. Michel, county of Bellechasse, in the course of 1897?

2. If so, what was the cost of said repairs?

3. What were the daily wages paid to the foreman and to the labourers respectively?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes. 2. \$295. 3. Wages of foreman, \$2 per day; wages of carpenter, \$1.25 per day; wages of labourers, \$1 per day.

THE I. C. RAILWAY—STATION AT ST. MICHEL.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked,

1. Did the Government build a station on the Intercolonial Railway at St. Michel, in 1897?

2. If so, what was the cost of said station?

3. Was the work done by contract or by day work?

4. If by day work, what were the daily wages of the foreman and labourers respectively?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Yes, the Government did build a station on the Intercolonial

ial Railway at St. Michel, in 1897. 2. The cost of the said station was \$1,182. 3 and 4. The work was done by contract.

MAIL SERVICE OF ST. MICHEL.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked,

1. Have any changes been made in the mail service between St. Michel de Bellechasse and the station of the same name on the Intercolonial Railway?

2. What change has been made in the cost of such service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). 1. Yes. 2. The original service was by stage from Lévis via Beaumont to St. Michel de Bellechasse, at a cost of \$300 per annum. This route, at the request of the residents and on the report of the superintendent of railway mail service, was broken up and two services substituted. One from Lévis to Beaumont costing \$160, and the other from the railway station of St. Michel de Bellechasse to the post office costing \$70. By this arrangement the mails arrive earlier and a saving of \$70 has been effected.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER AT ST. ANNE DE LA PÉRADE.

Mr. MARCOTTE asked,

Whether Mr. Elzéar Lanouette, postmaster of Ste. Anne de la Péraide, has been dismissed?

If so, for what cause?

At whose request?

By whose influence?

Was an inquiry made?

By whom?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). Mr. Elzéar Lanouette, postmaster at Ste. Anne de la Péraide, has been dismissed. A charge of undue political activity in the last general election having been made against Mr. Elzéar Lanouette, the matter was investigated by L. Lavergne, Esq., who reported to the department stating that the charges had been proven and recommending the dismissal of the postmaster, and accordingly the dismissal was made.

CHARGES AGAINST ASSISTANT INSPECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT QUEBEC.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

1. Has any action been taken on the charges made against the assistant inspector of customs for the province of Quebec on the 2nd March, 1898?

2. If so, what?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). No action has been taken in this matter.

THE FAST ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP LINE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yesterday my hon. friend the

leader of the Opposition called attention to the fast Atlantic steamship service, and wanted to have some information as to the condition this project was now in. I may say, as the House is aware, that the contractor, Mr. Petersen, in the carrying out of his contract, has met with very serious opposition and some severe difficulty; but he has been all along progressing favourably, and as an earnest of his good faith and his power to carry out this contract, he at one time deposited £5,000 sterling, and at a subsequent period gave a guarantee of a similar amount. We have now information which we consider satisfactory that Mr. Petersen is progressing favourably with the organization of his company. The capital has been underwritten and a very strong board has been organized; and, if our information is correct, and we have every reason to believe that it is correct, we have reason to believe that on the 1st of July the vessels will be under construction and under way.

THE PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE.

Mr. CRAIG. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask a question and to make a few observations on the plebiscite; and, to place myself in order, I will conclude with a motion. We all admit the importance of this subject, no matter what we may think about the question of prohibition, and I notice that there is a good deal of impatience in the country at the present time because this Bill is not yet brought down. This was one of the prominent planks in the platform of the Liberal party when in Opposition, and I suppose it is so to-day. They promised then to the temperance people of this country that if they succeeded in coming into power, they would introduce a Bill to take a plebiscite on this important question. Now, Sir, I am not going to say anything about the other pledges which they made; but the people of this country, and the temperance people especially, expect that this pledge will be kept, no matter what other pledges have been broken or may be broken. The first session of this Parliament was a very short one, called especially to pass the Estimates, and so that session was allowed to pass by without this Bill being brought down, and no particular complaint was made. It was expected, however, that in the second session this Bill would have been introduced; but because of the Premier having to go to England to attend the Jubilee celebration, the question was further postponed, and that session was allowed to pass without seeing the Bill. Now we are in the third session, we have been here over two months, and still the Bill is not brought down; and I think I am not exaggerating at all when I say that the temperance people are becoming very impatient indeed on this question. They are beginning to be afraid that the Government

intend to postpone this Bill to another session, and to keep putting the matter off until they have no opportunity of fulfilling their promise. I do not say that I entertain that opinion at all. I believe the Government intend to bring down this measure. A short time ago I asked the Premier when this Bill would be introduced, and his reply was as soon as the decks were cleared. That answer was rather indefinite. I do not know what progress has been made since then in clearing the decks. I hope the decks are pretty well cleared now, and that there will be no further delay. It has been said that the reason for the delay is that the Government themselves cannot agree on a very important matter, that is, how the question will be put. The temperance people are urging very strongly that the simple question should be asked: Are you in favour of prohibition? Other parties contend that other questions should be asked as well. It is said that the question of increased taxation should be submitted, and also the question of compensation. We are told that on these questions the Cabinet is very much divided. How that is, I do not know, but I hope to hear from the Premier with reference to these questions. I notice in the "Templar," the temperance organ, in its issue of April 7th, the following:—

It is just about as certain as anything can be, that one of two things will happen with respect to the plebiscite Bill this session. It will either be submitted with the provision for questions upon direct taxation and compensation, as well as on prohibition, or it will be postponed.

If the Government can make sure of carrying the Bill through the House, in its present loaded-up form, and can make sure that the Prohibitionists will not repudiate the humbug and carry the question into practical politics, the Bill will be rushed through next week.

If the opposition to the riders is so serious as to threaten the existence of the Government, it will be laid on the shelf for another year, and the delusive bait will continue to dangle before the eyes of the Prohibitionists, diverting attention and activity from actual prohibition work.

These views are borne out by the statement of Sir Wilfrid to the representatives of the Methodist Church, who waited upon him recently. He took great care to tell these gentlemen that when he publicly promised that the question of prohibition would not be complicated with other issues, and that that was the reason why the Liberal party had adopted the plebiscite policy, he did not mean that the question would be separated from other questions which were inseparably connected with it.

Sir Louis Davies also wrote a letter recently, in reply to certain requests and interrogations of his constituents in Prince Edward Island, in which he very clearly intimated that it was not the intention of the Government to submit the single question of prohibition on the plebiscite ballot.

We are on the verge of some sensational developments in connection with the prohibition question, and it is the duty of advocates of the reform to arouse the public conscience, mobilize the temperance forces, and clear the decks for action.

Mr. CRAIG.

Those concluding words seem remarkable in view of what the Premier told me in his answer about this measure being brought forward when the decks were clear. I hope that the decks will soon be clear and that we may have a definite answer as to when this Bill will be introduced. I think it would be most unfortunate if an important Bill like this were postponed to so late a stage of the session that there could be no fair chance for discussion. I do not intend to say anything now about how the Bill should be prepared or the questions put. That is for the Government to settle, and when the question comes before the House, we can discuss it. But I rise to ask for a definite answer on the points I have raised if the right hon. gentleman is in a position to give it. I should like to know when the Bill will be brought down, and also what form it will take. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I have no fault to find with the anxiety of my hon. friend (Mr. Craig). I know that he is a temperance man both in precept and in practice. I have observed his course for several years on this question, and I am not aware that his anxieties have troubled him up to this moment. I have no fault to find on that point, however. I am glad to give him the information he is seeking. First, with reference to the answer I gave upon a former occasion that the Bill would be introduced as soon as the deck had been cleared, I may say that I consider the deck has been very considerably cleared since that question was put to me. It is almost absolutely clear now, and when we have disposed of the debate which is now engaging the attention of the House, I see no reason why the Bill should not be introduced almost immediately afterwards. I may say to my hon. friend that I am happy at this moment to relieve his mind as to his anxiety regarding the form of the Bill. I have reason to suppose, knowing his views, that he will find the Bill altogether satisfactory, and that he will have no hesitation in voting for it. And, moreover, with regard to the question itself, I am not prepared to say at this moment what shape the Bill will be in, but I may say to my hon. friend that he should not be too prone to believe newspaper statements as to divisions existing in the Cabinet. The Cabinet is united upon this question, and will deem it its duty to carry out the pledges which the party gave at the convention of 1893. Now, while I am on my feet, perhaps I may be allowed to say that I would submit to both sides of the House that the practice of moving the adjournment of the House at an early stage of the sitting is one which is becoming too frequent. I do not wish to make any objection, so far as the action of my hon. friend is concerned, but I would submit that in the interests of sound parliamentary

practice, such motions should be made very, very sparingly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have listened with great interest and pleasure to the statements just made by the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and, as the right hon. gentleman seems to be disposed to give us all the information touching this question that he properly can at this stage, I would like to ask him whether the Government propose, in introducing the Bill to submit to the people of this country the decision as to the question of prohibition, to accompany it with a declaration on the part of the Government that, if the public will is expressed in a clear and unmistakable manner in favour of prohibition they will give effect to that decision?

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) will be ready, when the will of the people has been manifested, to abide by it, and so will the Government.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) if he has yet laid on the Table the second or subsidiary agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Drummond County Railway people?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think that it has not yet been laid on the Table. I have given instructions that the copy be prepared, and it will be made immediately. I will see to it at once.

MINING AND DREDGING LEASES.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) if he is prepared to lay on the Table the return in answer to the Order of the House with respect to the mining and dredging leases made by the Government? It is very important that we should have them at an early date.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that two or three extra clerks have been working on this return for the last two weeks—ever since the Order passed. I think it will be ready in a few days.

OPENING OF THE CANALS.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to direct the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to the fact that there are a number of vessels now in Lake Erie and a number in Lake Ontario wishing to get through the Welland Canal. Would he be good enough to tell the shipping in-

terest when the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals will be opened?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have had several communications on this subject, but have not been able to give any assurance as to an exact date for the opening of the canals. The Welland Canal will be the later one opening, I fancy. We are doing everything possible to get them ready at the earliest possible moment. Night and day staffs are at work upon them, and no time will be lost. There is no object in delaying the opening, and it will not be delayed more than is absolutely necessary in the interest of the service.

GANANOQUE DRILL SHED.

Mr. TAYLOR. I desire to ask a question of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden). I am sorry he is not in his place, but perhaps the Prime Minister will be good enough to draw his attention to the matter. On the 14th March, I moved for a return of all correspondence between the corporation of Gananoque and the Government with reference to the moving of the drill shed, and I would like to know whether that correspondence will soon be brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. colleague is not here, but if the hon. gentleman will send me a note, I shall be happy to call his attention to the matter.

BUOYS ON THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works about the placing of buoys on the St. Lawrence. I see that the gentleman who has the contract at Sorel, Mr. Monarque, I think, has given up the contract, and now it is to be given to a higher tenderer, a gentleman by the name of Paul. Last fall, there was a discussion between the Departments of Marine and Fisheries and Public Works as to which was in charge of the buoys. I need not tell the hon. gentleman that it is important to have these buoys placed in good position as soon as possible.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I quite appreciate the importance of the question, but am not in a position to make any statement just now, for the obvious reason that tenders were called for and were before the departments, and, as the hon. gentleman says, one of the tenderers, who was notified that his tender was accepted, has withdrawn. By to-morrow I hope to be in a position to make a definite statement, and I can assure my hon. friend that no time will be lost.

REPAIRING WESTERN BLOCK.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask the hon. Minister of Public Works, whether he has the

written report I asked for on the ornamental defacing or refacing of the Western Block ?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). There was no written report, as I stated at the time. The work which is going on is very easy. A part of the walls was simply bulging out, and we were obliged to restore it. It is not very expensive work.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is it proposed to be continuous ?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. No, the chief engineer came to my office this morning, and told me that there is only one small piece at the corner which will have to be rebuilt. Formerly, the road was not on the same level as now. It was made level, and a kind of second wall, which then existed, had to be taken down, and the wall which was rebuilt was, I am sorry to say, not built in a safe manner, and we consequently are obliged to do the work which is now going on. Very little remains to be done now.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That is encouraging.

HON. MR. TARTE AND THE SENATE.

Mr. **MARCOTTE**. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) to a telegram published in the newspaper "Le Soleil" on the 30th March last, and which reads as follows :

The Hon. Mr. Tarte wires from Ottawa to "La Patrie" :

Ottawa, March 28, 1898.

To-morrow, Nebuchadnezzar de Boucherville the invalid Ross, the wise Pierre de Blois, the distinguished J. H. Bellerose—

Mr. **SPEAKER**. The hon. gentleman can only ask a question. He cannot enter into a discussion, nor can he move the adjournment, because that has already been moved. If he simply wishes to ask a question, he can do so.

—the learned Armand, and a couple of other luminaries of the same stripe, are going to challenge the majority of the country, the representatives of the Canadian nation in the House of Commons.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Order.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. I understand, this is the foundation of a question.

Mr. **MARCOTTE**. (Translation). What do the names I have just mentioned signify from the standpoint of political and moral influence, from that of popularity and of the people's will ?

You may add to them Montplaisir, Bolduc, Landry, and ask the electorate of the country whether they are going to allow the will of their representatives to be overridden by a handful of irresponsible and insignificant Senators.

For over twenty years, the Tory party has crammed the Senate with their creatures.

Mr. **FOSTER**.

If, at least, they had always made good appointments, and if they had called to the Senate men who were able to give a fair and honest consideration to the questions of public policy brought before the Upper House.

There is to be found in the Senate more fanaticism, more blind partisanship than in any other public body of this country.

And who are the men of worth who sit in that House ? Let somebody single them out, if possible, in the ranks of toriyism.

The great majority of the seats in the Senate are occupied by men who can claim no other credit but that of having always slavishly endorsed whatever policy their leaders have thought fit to propound.

You know our Senators from Quebec, well, those from the other provinces are perhaps worth still less.

Is it true as stated by the newspaper "Le Soleil" that this article was wired to "La Patrie" by the hon. Minister of Public Works himself ?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Translation). Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentleman, I may tell him that I read with a great deal of interest the article he has just read to the House. It is no doubt a most interesting and creditable article. I cannot say exactly who wrote it, though I could guess who it was.

Mr. **MARCOTTE**. (Translation). Is it true as stated by the "Soleil"—

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Order.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. The hon. gentleman says this is another question.

Mr. **MARCOTTE** (translation). Is it true, as stated by "Le Soleil" that this article was wired to the "La Patrie" by the hon. Minister of Public Works himself ?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). (Translation). I have nothing further to say in addition to what I have just said. Even supposing that I had written that article, I have not to account for it to the House ; still, I do not agree to having written it.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. I would like to draw attention to the fact that it is not quite proper to ask members of the Government about private matters of their own, but only about questions of public interest.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). In rising to reply to some of the statements made by the hon. leader of the Opposition last night, I desire, at the outset of my remarks, to heartily congratulate my hon. friend upon being able to be in his

place in the House to-day after his great physical effort of last night. I am sure that I simply echo the sentiments of every member of this House, when I say that we rejoice to see the great vigour which the hon. gentleman displays, and to have this convincing evidence of the excellent condition of his health. I had feared, after the exhaustive effort he made last night, that, perhaps, when he reached his home and pondered over the rather harsh, and, I may be permitted to say, incorrect statements he made in his lengthy criticism, his night's rest might have been disturbed, and physical weariness, combined with uneasiness of mind and conscience, might have prevented his being with us to-day. I am very glad, however, to see him here, and shall all the more willingly endeavour to show the fallacy of many of the arguments and the incorrectness of many of the statements he made use of. I shall not, however, take up the time of the House with any reference to his criticism of the speech of my hon. colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) on the finances of the country. That statement was so clear, so fair, so satisfactory, that the House cannot have been surprised at the failure of the hon. leader of the Opposition to weaken it in any respect. I would have been glad had the health of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) permitted him to have been present while that speech was being made, for I am confident he would have been forced to admit that it was an eminently fair and convincing reply to his attack on the financial record of the present Administration. I think he would have been forced to admit, as every one must be in candour, that if we compare the expenditure of one Government with that of another, the fair way to make a comparison is to take up the various items of expenditure under their different heads, and contrast these with each other, and not take the total expenditure in one lump sum, as the hon. gentleman did. The hon. gentleman knows that there is over one million dollars of expenditure for new purposes which this Government had to incur, and which the former Government never had to provide for at all.

That was the line upon which the Minister of Trade and Commerce proceeded, and I think he made it abundantly evident, even to the gentlemen of the Opposition, that the criticism that was levelled against the able speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance, was weak and was not really a fair statement. I dwell no longer upon that.

I proceed next to notice a statement that the hon. gentleman made that it was by an accident of an accident that the Liberal party are in power. I do not know what he means by that exactly. But if it were by an accident that the Liberal party attained power, then I am bound to say that every manifestation we have witnessed throughout the country shows the verdict of the people to be that it was a very lucky

accident, for they have but strengthened the Government from that day to this. Then we were told, and I thought it rather a marvellous statement, that if success attended the efforts of the Liberal Government in legislation they were in a different position from that of the late Government, because, he said, when the hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches were in Opposition, they opposed the late Government and objected to its measures, while now the Opposition are lending their help and their aid to the Government in order to develop this country and promote its prosperity. Well, it is true that gentlemen now on the Government side, when in Opposition, did object to the actions of the then Government, but it was to actions they objected, and they gave reasons for their objection. But when hon. gentlemen opposite claim that they are assisting gentlemen on this side of the House to promote the prosperity of Canada, to help her onward and forward, I ask him what means are they taking to do it? Is it by attributing corrupt motives to the men who sit in the Ministry and lead the Liberal party to-day, insinuating charges against members of that Government that they have not the courage to formulate, trying to weaken the influence of that Government in the country by base and cowardly insinuations when no one has dared to prefer a charge? Is that the help the Opposition are giving to the present Government in order to carry on the affairs of the country? Ah, but the hon. gentleman points to an instance of it, and says it was a case of black ingratitude for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to have mentioned it, namely, that he had supported the Government in their Crow's Nest Pass Railway policy last year. What is he afraid of in that respect? He asked the question: Why did I do it? Well, I shall not attempt to give the answer, but I could not help thinking at the same time that he might have asked himself another question. If the gallant men from York had swept down upon him from the east and from the west, chaining him to their chariot wheel as they did on a late occasion, his question would not have been: Why did I do it, but, Why did I not do it. He did help us in that, it is true; but in another case in which he was convinced the Government were right, which he had advocated and supported, in that case when the two men of York, from the east and the west, brought their influence to bear upon him, they led him captive and made him, in the light of open day and in the face of Parliament, eat the words he had uttered. Then, Sir, I mention this, not as a reproach but I say it with pity for one for whom I entertain respect as a bold and a valiant leader—he said he failed to find anything the Government had done to promote the prosperity of this country. Let me tell the hon. gentlemen opposite what I believe with reference to the prosperity of the country. This

very fact itself, that the Liberal Government attained power inspired confidence in the people of this country, gave them that confidence which is necessary to business and to business improvement; the very fact of the Liberal party being in power, and a stable, harmonious Government, a Government loyal to the country and loyal to one another, being in power—that very fact, I say, stimulated the confidence of the people of this country. Who doubts it? How could business enjoy any stimulus when, in the very legislature of the nation, the men directing its affairs were at daggers drawn? How could they have confidence that the affairs of the country would be carried on satisfactorily when they saw, at a critical time in this country's history, at a time when the peaceful relations that had existed so long between the motherland and the neighbouring land were actually endangered, how could they have confidence on an occasion like that, when they saw the gentlemen entrusted with the reins of Government bringing on a crisis, seeing the Minister of Militia and Defence, who might have been called upon at any moment to marshal his troops and send them out, gone out on strike, leaving that important department without any head? How could they have confidence when they saw the Minister of Railways and Canals, whose services might have been in demand at any moment to provide facilities for transportation, also out on strike, and that department without a head? How could they have confidence when they saw the Minister of Finance also out on strike, leaving the finances of the country without any control at a time when funds might be needed? They saw these gentlemen divided among themselves, a Government whose members were in open war with each other upon the floors of this Chamber. Scenes like that will go down to history, and form a black page in the otherwise bright annals of this country of ours. I say that when a Government such as that was displaced by a Government loyal to the country and loyal to one another, when the people saw the present Government seated in power, then a feeling of confidence revived throughout this whole Dominion, and from that day to this that confidence has gone on increasing. I think I am not using the language of exaggeration when I say that in the minds and in the breasts of the people of Canada there is to-day a feeling of confidence, an assurance of prosperity, and a hope of better things, stronger than have ever existed among them before.

Then, Sir, I come to notice another part of the hon. gentleman's speech in which he took up a good deal of time, and I will ask the patience of the House, or of those members who may be inclined to listen to me, while I deal in detail with some of the changes of the tariff. The hon. gentleman, in discussing this tariff, made several very

Mr. PATERSON.

rash statements. He said we had adopted the National Policy in its entirety.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But the leader of the Government did more than that; he outdid himself, for, after having made that statement, he said that in all the essential features of the National Policy we had added 5 per cent to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for the promotion he has given me.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not quite understand the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman refers to me as the leader of the Government.

Mr. BERGERON. It is coming; it is coming.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, if ever the party opposite attain to power I shall not begrudge that honour to the hon. gentleman, though I do not wish to see him enjoy it at the present time. If I made a mistake like that, I think he will understand that, with all my best wishes for him, I hope he will long continue to hold his present position. Well, now, the hon. gentleman dealt with the speech of the Minister of Finance, and he will have to pardon me if, though I unintentionally paid him a compliment just now, I am obliged to allude to his manner of dealing with that speech in words which cannot be complimentary. What do I find? The Finance Minister, in the able speech he had delivered, with a fairness that characterized his whole utterances, had given a list of articles, sixty items of the tariff, in order to show the changes that had occurred therein; and, in doing so, he did what was fair. Among those articles he selected and put in the list were articles that comprised nearly all in the tariff in regard to which it could be said that the general tariff of this Government was higher than the general tariff of the preceding Government. My hon. friend gave the preferential list with one-eighth off and with a quarter off, 12½ per cent in the one case, and 25 per cent in the other. The hon. leader of the Opposition did not do himself credit when, in criticising that statement, he took up eight of these articles which had been raised in the general tariff from 30 to 35 per cent, he read the reduction of 12½ per cent, and said that the British manufacturers had to pay ½ of one per cent more under this tariff than they had to pay under the old tariff. Is that true?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If it was true, it was not the whole truth, and that is what men are expected to say in fair debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will perhaps allow me to tell him

that I was not dealing with the case of the law as it would come into effect on the 31st July. I was dealing with the law which the hon. gentleman put on the Statute-book last year, and the position in which the British manufacturer and exporter, during that year, occupied under it. I would, therefore, have gone outside of the argument, when I was dealing altogether with that point, if I had embodied more than that which operated under the law as it stood on the Statute-book last year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is where I wholly differ with the hon. gentleman. He is dealing with the tariff which this Parliament enacted last session, and, under the operation of that tariff, a 25 per cent reduction was made in the preferential schedule after a certain date. That was as much part of the tariff as the 12½ per cent reduction; it is the same tariff to-day as it was last year; it is not changed at all. But the hon. gentleman took the 12½ per cent reduction, and ignored the fact that part of the law provides for 25 per cent reduction after the 1st July. There, I say, was a suppression of truth in respect to this matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It was unworthy of the hon. member to do it. I tell the hon. gentleman that, when he expressed the desire that 100,000 copies of the speech of the Finance Minister might be circulated broadcast throughout this country, I re-echo his wish; but when 100,000 go out, it will be a fortunate thing for the hon. gentleman's reputation, if 100,000 copies of his own speech do not follow, for if the people read his speech, and read the speech of the Finance Minister, they will say, with shame on their faces: We did not believe it possible that the leader of one of the great political parties would read utterances and deal with statements of an opponent, and, in doing so, suppress the truth and garble it to suit his own ends.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should like, if the hon. gentleman would permit me, to ask him one question. Under that tariff as it stands to-day, dealing with it from the standpoint that the hon. gentleman is dealing with it, I ask him if that which the people of England were led to expect, namely that there would be a reduction of the duties as they existed in Canada, of 12½ to 25 per cent, when the whole tariff came into operation, was carried out, and if I did not demonstrate to the House yesterday, that, in respect to a large number of staple imports from England into this country to-day, under the operation of the 12½ per cent reduction, there are not duties over those which hon. gentlemen opposite found when they came into power? Instead of a reduction, the hon. gentleman knows, that, having raised the duties more than 12½ per cent over the

whole list of articles referred to, as the duties stood when they came into power, the result was, that last year British manufacturers and exporters to this country were met with a higher duty, instead of a reduction of 12½ per cent, as they were led to expect; they were, in fact, met with ⅓ of 1 per cent higher duty than that which existed when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, and yet the English exporter was led to expect he would receive 12½ per cent reduction. To-day, with 25 per cent off on all these leading staple imports into this country, instead of there being a reduction of 25 per cent, it is less than 12½ per cent, because hon. gentlemen opposite, before they made the reduction, raised the tariff 12½ per cent, so that they have ⅓ of 1 per cent less than 12½ per cent in the proposed reduction, which they were led to believe would be 25 per cent. That was the position.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not taking exception to that part of the hon. gentleman's speech. Out of sixty articles, he picked out eight, with his usual fairness—items on which our general tariff has been above the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite; but, in commenting on this, it must be considered as one tariff and one law; there are not two laws, one providing for a reduction of 12½ per cent on the 1st August, 1898, and another providing for a reduction of 25 per cent afterwards; one law was enacted, and the hon. gentleman is talking about the tariff law we passed. While my hon. friend the Finance Minister had given both columns, the hon. gentleman quoted only the 12½ per cent reduction with respect to those eight items out of the sixty on which the reduction had taken place, and he determinedly refused to take what the Finance Minister had stated and what was before his own eyes, that when the 25 per cent reduction was carried out, as it would be after 1st of July, the rate of duty would be materially below the tariff which hon. gentlemen opposite had adopted. That is the point to which we take exception in the hon. gentleman's statement.

A great deal has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to the present Government adopting the National Policy. Their tone has changed. We had criticisms made last year by the late Finance Minister. In what direction were they? He said that the present Government had taken the National Policy in some respects, and not in others. This year, the leader of the Opposition said the Government have taken the National Policy in its entirety; nay, more, they have in all essential particulars added 5 per cent. What did the late Finance Minister tell us last year, in criticising our policy? He saw the woollen schedule of imports, of which there are millions a year in value, and that it had been raised from 30 to 35 per cent, at all events in regard to

some of its items; and he recognized the fact that England was a keen competitor in these lines, and we were enacting a law, not for a day, but a law which we thought would stand for years, and we enacted in that law that a year and a few months afterwards 25 per cent should come off, which would be a great reduction. The hon. gentleman knew then that in these items we had raised the general tariff 5 per cent; but his criticism at that time was that this would not save the great woollen industries of the country. He said, "Wait till your 25 per cent preferential tariff, or even your 12½ per cent preferential tariff, comes into effect, and you will wipe out the great woollen industries of this country." They do not say so this year—why? Because the predictions they made have been falsified by the returns from the woollen mills in the country. What do the papers tell them? Mill after mill reopened and running on full time, and other mills running overtime. We have heard nothing about the destruction of the woollen industries on this occasion. Now, this is a point which I want to have fully understood, because I believe there are people in the Liberal party who think we have not done quite as much, or who have not realized how much this Government has done in the way of tariff reform; and I will therefore ask your attention and the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to some tables which I have prepared in reference to this point. I have had prepared a statement of the articles entered for consumption in the six months ending December 31st, in the years 1896 and 1897. In the one six months the National Policy was in force; in the other six months the preferential tariff was in force to the extent of 12½ per cent. Hon. gentlemen should bear in mind that the imports referred to in this statement are not only the imports from Great Britain, but the imports from all countries, and therefore the reduction which I will show has been made on these lines is not a reduction on imports from Great Britain alone, but a percentage reduction on the total imports in the various lines I will mention. I have here an import of some \$16,000,000 in round numbers during the six months ending December 31st, 1897, under the new tariff, and an import of \$13,500,000 in round numbers in the six months ending December 31st, 1896, under the old tariff. Taking the total importations and dividing them by the duties collected, you get at the average ad valorem percentage, and I take the different ad valorem percentages and show the reductions that have been made in the duties on the articles which I enumerate.

Mr. SPROULE. But if the values are changed, it will spoil your calculation.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was about to refer to that myself. Hon. gen-

Mr. PATERSON.

lemen will recognize that where the articles change in value, and you have a number of items of specific duties, you are not in a position to arrive at a correct conclusion, and that mode of calculation would be fallacious, because of the reason the hon. gentleman has stated. Therefore, I take those articles in which, except in the case of coal, the duties are ad valorem. Now, what are the facts? On bituminous coal, on the importation for those six months, the reduction in duty has been 4 per cent. Cotton and manufactures of, was an item on which one hon. gentleman said we had increased the duty; but these tables show that instead of an increase under the working of the new tariff, there has been a percentage reduction, as compared with the old tariff, of 6 2-5ths per cent. On glass, there has been a reduction of 5 7-10ths per cent. On hats and caps, there has been a reduction of 5½ per cent. On iron and steel and manufactures of, of which the imports for the six months are nearly \$6,000,000, there is a percentage reduction of 14 per cent. On leather, there is a slight increase, but so slight that I have not worked it out. On woollens and manufactures of, of which there have been over \$4,000,000 of imports during the six months—another of the items in which hon. gentlemen said we had increased the duty—instead of an increase there is a decrease of 4½ per cent. These are the great leading articles on which hon. gentlemen said we had raised the duties.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question which is pertinent? Are these percentages of reduction percentages of the cost of the article or percentages of the duties?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Percentages of the reductions of duty under the new tariff as compared with the duty under the old tariff.

Mr. WALLACE. That is, supposing cotton manufactures were 30 per cent before, they would be 23½ per cent now—is that what we are to understand?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. As I proceed with another table, you will see exactly the way I have worked it out.

Mr. WALLACE. I think we are entitled to a statement as to that right here.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You shall have it, if you possess your soul in patience a little. Now, I want to deal with a few other items. Without desiring to be sectional or to recognize different interests in the community, we do recognize the fact stated by the Finance Minister that the greatest of all the industries of this country, without belittling any other industry, is the great agricultural industry of the country. We cannot look at the exports without that fact being impressed upon our minds, and you cannot converse with a

business man in any of the business centres, the towns or villages, without finding that he recognizes that the great agricultural industry, without belittling any of the others, is the great preponderating interest of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavoured, by statements devoid of truth in many cases, to lead the agriculturists of this country to believe that no reduction has been made in the rates of taxation that bear upon them. I am aware that in one or two or three articles, such as reapers and mowers and ploughs, hon. gentlemen opposite have sought to charge the Liberal party with having broken solemn pledges for a reduction of duties on these articles when they came into power.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Hon. gentlemen say, "Hear, hear." Whatever may have been the opinion of different members of Parliament or different individuals throughout the country in reference to the reduction of taxation which they would like, I have this to say, that while ideas no doubt differ somewhat with regard to different articles and while there may be disappointments and while some people may have understood from something that may have been said that there might be a reduction or a wiping out of certain duties to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, I fail to find that any direct pledge was ever given, such as the hon. gentleman sought to make us believe was given, by any of the members of the Administration. The hon. gentleman knows that the platform of the Liberal party was adopted at the great Liberal convention, and that in that platform we declared for the lessening of the burdens upon the people and a return to a revenue tariff.

Mr. DAVIN. I quoted the words of the Minister of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think, from my recollection of the words of the Minister of Agriculture, that he expressed the belief that the duty on agricultural implements was too high, as regards many of these articles, and he desired to see the duty reduced, but I do not think he declared that he would put reapers and mowers on the free list.

Mr. DAVIN. Was the duty reduced then?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, but the hon. gentleman wants to make out that the Minister of Agriculture promised that these articles would go on the free list.

Mr. DAVIN. I made that out, too, but now you use the word "reduced."

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Very well, let us look at this. I say there may have been an understanding and there may have been desires on the part of different individuals in this direction and that, but I wish to point out how the Government had

to view this question. When this question of reapers and mowers came up before us for consideration, what did we find? We found that these articles had been taxed 35 per cent under the old tariff, and that in 1894, the late Government, departing from its principles and with the ulterior object in view of strengthening itself with the people, cut down the duty on these to 20 per cent, while they left other articles in the high dutiable list. We recognized the fact that there were duties in the tariff which were excessive and bore too heavily upon the farmer, and we determined to reduce them. Let me tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that the difference between the two political parties upon this question—and I do not intend to enter into a discussion of the question of free trade and protection—is this.

Mr. DAVIN. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to read what the Minister of Agriculture said?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I will not. You can read it afterwards.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He does not want to hear it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Would the hon. gentleman like to be thus continually interrupted in an argument he is making?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, when an hon. gentleman charges in his place on the floor of this House that an inaccurate quotation has been made by another hon. member, he ought to be ready to hear that quotation read and allow the House to decide.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think there is no difference between us as to the accuracy of the statement. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the Minister of Agriculture did not promise that these would go on the free list. Does he want to read an extract in which the Minister of Agriculture said that mowers and reapers would be placed on the free list?

Mr. DAVIN. That is exactly what I want to do. This is it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Whose speech?

Mr. DAVIN. The Minister of Agriculture's.

Some hon. MEMBERS. When delivered?

Mr. DAVIN. At Moosomin in October, 1894, you will find it in the "Spectator." This is it:

As a farmer he was not satisfied with the reduction which had been made in the agricultural implement duty, because the United States Congress have made a standing offer of reciprocity in implements, and it was the duty of the Canadian Government to take advantage of that offer.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN (reading)—

Last year the farmers of Western Canada imported \$120,000 worth of American implements,—

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN (reading)—

—on which they paid \$40,000 duty. Referring to the Massey-Harris combine, he claimed that the fact that these people spoke of going to the States to fight the Yankees in their own market showed that Canadian manufacturers were able to get along without protection.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN (reading)—

Canadians were able to hold their own with the Yankees in any walk of life.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN (reading)—

Massey-Harris got protection, why should not the farmers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. That holds out a clear promise.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I ask—and I am in the judgment of this House—if it is not a piece of impertinence for the hon. gentleman to rise and make a statement like that. He attempts to contradict me and when I gave him the opportunity of proof he utterly fails. I will show the hon. gentleman, before I am through, what it was the hon. Minister of Agriculture desired, but I want now to lay down the distinction that exists between the two political parties with reference to this matter. The principle of hon. gentlemen opposite is protection to the manufacturers, and if this brings any revenue, that is merely an incident. But the policy of the Liberal party is, first of all, revenue, and then what protection may be involved in that is the incident. That is the distinction between the two political parties, and when hon. gentlemen opposite quote expressions of Liberal speakers in favour of eliminating every vestige of protection from the tariff, they are quoting simply the policy of the elimination of the principle of protection, as the main feature of our tariff, and the substitution in its place of a revenue tariff in which protection is merely an incident. Hon. gentlemen know what the platform of the Liberal party was. It was formulated by the great Liberal party in convention assembled. In that convention the Liberal party declared what in their opinion was the best policy for this country, and this Government is determined, as far as it can, to carry out that platform.

Mr. DAVIN. I thought the hon. gentleman was going to explain—

Mr. PATERSON.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have no desire to be discourteous but I must protest against these interruptions.

Mr. DAVIN. I thought the hon. gentleman was going to explain what the Minister of Agriculture said and what he led the people of the North-west to understand.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We have heard the hon. gentleman read already what the Minister of Agriculture said.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not wish that there should be any misunderstanding. Hon. members must understand that they cannot interrupt an hon. gentleman who has the floor, without his consent.

Mr. DAVIN. I have no desire to do it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He is willing.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, but not to be interrupted all day. In order to show that I have rightly understood the policy of the two political parties, and the distinction between them, let me quote from the ex-Finance Minister's speech in 1894, when he introduced his tariff resolutions. As I have stated, you can find the platform of the Liberal party laid down in the convention of its representatives assembled in this city, but you cannot find anything of the kind to show what the policy of the Conservative party really is. They never ventured to call their representatives together in convention, and I am forced therefore to take as an avowal of their policy a declaration of it from the mouth of the one best fitted to give it expression, namely, the Finance Minister, when he introduced his tariff in 1894. You will find it in the "Hansard" of 1894, vol. 1, page 207 :

I wish to state here that the Government of to-day, and the party which supports the Government of to-day, take their stand squarely and firmly upon the embodiment and upon the preservation of the principle of protection in the tariff, the degree of that protection to be according to the circumstances of the industry and the conditions of business and of trade at the present time.

In the same speech he lays down this proposition :

The tariff which was made in 1878—

He refers, undoubtedly, to 1879.

The tariff which was made in 1878 was a practical tariff, and the tariff which is to be arranged during this session must also have that feature, if possible, of being a practical tariff, and must take cognizance of the varying conditions of different industries, and must mete out to them, on the principle which we have stated, the protection which is reasonably due to them, and necessary in order to maintain possible industries in their position in this country.

That is the policy of the Conservative party, of which party the hon. member for

West Assiniboia has been a most loyal member. Whatever they proposed in this House, they could count upon him not only to vote for it but to defend it. Or, even if he should speak against it, they could always rely upon his vote. Now, let me ask that hon. gentleman, as a member of the party. In the face of this declaration of policy of the party with which the hon. gentleman is connected, if they had been returned to power in 1896, instead of the Liberal party, and the agricultural implement manufacturers had made representations of the facts to the Government, what would the hon. gentleman have done? If the manufacturers had come and said to the Finance Minister: We want you to look at these figures taken from your own trade returns. What are they, he would say. They would answer: We beg to point out to you that in the year 1896, in the six months ending 31st December, 372 harvesters of a value of \$37,071 were imported into Manitoba and the North-west Territories, to say nothing of the rest of the Dominion, while, for the corresponding six months of the three next years in which we have worked under a tariff reduced by you from 35 per cent to 20 per cent, there has been a marked increase. In 1895, for the corresponding six months the number of harvesters imported into Manitoba and the North-west alone was 760, in 1896 it was 803, while for the six months ending December 31st, 1897, the number of harvesters imported into Manitoba and the North-west alone was 1,432, representing a value of \$144,289. And they would say to the hon. Minister of Finance—

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman asked me what I would say. I will tell him, if he will allow me.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is very anxious to take every opportunity to rise. I could not know exactly what the hon. gentleman would say, but I venture to say that if the Government acceded to such a request on the part of the manufacturers and had put implements back to where they were, he would have supported them.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is my impression.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has pointed to me and has said he would like to know what I would do if my party had got into power in the last election and certain figures were laid before the Finance Minister. Do not you think, Mr. Speaker, that I should have an opportunity to tell the hon. gentleman what I would say.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid I must leave that largely in the judgment of the hon. member who has the floor to say whether

he wanted a response, or whether he was only using a figure of speech.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If I have said anything wrong I am sorry for it. My argument is that if hon. gentlemen opposite had been returned to power in 1896 and the implement manufacturers had come to them and had shown, that since the reduction of the tariff the number and value of those machines imported was increased four times over in Manitoba and the North-west, and had demanded, in view of the party declaration that the tariff must be arranged with a view to protection of the industry regardless of revenue, that they should restore the duty to 30 or 35 per cent, if they were consistent with their principles, they would have been forced to concede that point. The manufacturers could have pointed out in addition that they were charged 30 or 35 per cent on all the machinery in their factories and that even the workmen were compelled to pay 30 or 35 per cent on the tools. All this being shown if the Conservatives desired to be consistent they would be obliged to grant the request. While it is true with regard to reapers and mowers that the rate of duty was not lowered, I contend that by the plan that was adopted by the Government in this matter of giving the agricultural implement manufacturers relief by reducing the duty on their raw material, substantial advantage resulted to the consumer. The reduction of the duties on the raw material enabled the Canadian manufacturers voluntarily to reduce the price of implements, I believe, by \$5 apiece. And the Customs Department gave a ruling admitting at \$92 each a large line of implements that, up to that time, had been charged duty on the value of \$100. But I wish to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite these two or three items of which I have spoken, only a few among the items used by the farmer, as instancing a fulfilment of the pledge that was given by the Minister of Agriculture. I have here a list of sixteen agricultural implements, and I propose to show the rate of duty under the old tariff and the rate of duty under the general schedule of the Fielding tariff. I am not going to quote the preferential tariff, because I will be candid with the House and say that, so far none of the agricultural implements I am about to name have come from the old country. Some may come when the 25 per cent reduction is in force. No one can foretell how that will change the current of trade.

But I tell you frankly now that none have come in so far, and, therefore, I do not institute a comparison with the old National Policy rate and the preferential rate, but I institute a comparison between the old general rate and the National Policy rate, and the general rate that was enacted by the Fielding tariff. Notice what reductions have been made, and tell me whether they are

substantial or not. I give the percentage of reduction, the difference in the rate of duty determines the percentage of reduction from the old rate of duty. Some may say: You take 25 per cent off; that is very little. People do not realize how much 25 per cent off the old tariff rate amounts to. If you tell a farmer in the North-west, or anywhere else: I will give you 60 cents a bushel for your wheat, when he has been getting 80 cents a bushel, and he should say to you: Why, that is a terrible reduction; then you may turn round and say, in the language of hon. gentlemen opposite: No, that is no reduction; that is only 25 per cent off. But they would think it was a reduction, just the same, and just so surely does this percentage of the reduction in the duty on the implements they use bear that relation to the taxes that were imposed upon them under the National Policy. Now, let us look at some of these articles:

	Percent- General age of Tariff, Tariff, reduction, 1894. 1897. 1897.		
	p.c.	p.c.	p.c.
Axes	35	25	28½
Hay or straw knives.	35	25	28½
Hand rakes	35	25	28½
Farm rollers	30	25	16½
Road or field rollers.	30	25	16½
Windmills	30	25	16½
Horse powers	30	25	16½
Portable engines	30	25	16½
Threshers	30	25	16½
Feed cutters	35	25	28½
Separators	30	25	16½
Potato diggers	35	25	28½
Grain crushers	35	25	28½
Fanning mills	35	25	28½
Hay tedders	35	25	28½
Manure spreaders ...	25	20	20

Now, then, to summarize, I have given you sixteen articles of agricultural implements used by farmers, seven of which have been reduced at the rate of 16½ per cent, one has been reduced 20 per cent, and eight have been reduced at the rate of 28½ per cent from the old tariff. I invite attention again to a statement I am going to make, that, in that table, I have a comparison of the reductions in the old rate under the National Policy, and the general tariff rate under the Fielding tariff—not the preferential rate, for if any came in under the preferential rate, there would be 25 per cent further reduction off the amounts that I have already given. Now, I am about to read a table which, I fear, will prove tiresome to you, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps to the members of the House. But I desire to get upon "Hansard" something which I consider valuable to the people, at the risk of making myself wearisome and tedious. I desire, also, to do it for the benefit of the ex-Minister of Finance, who, when he goes upon the platform, may not desire to give that close scrutiny to the facts of the case that might be desirable, and I am about to place upon the

Mr. PATERSON.

"Hansard" a statement from which he can see for himself the enormous reductions that have been made in the rate of taxation upon the farmers of this country. So, when he goes again upon the platform, he can tell the people: I said before that you have no relief under this tariff; but I find, upon closer investigation, that the reductions in taxation have been simply enormous, and it is my duty to lay the facts before you. I have given you sixteen articles under the general tariff, and I propose now to give you a list of 107 articles. There are about 447 dutiable items in the tariff and 200 free items, and I think I may say, speaking subject to correction—but I believe I am absolutely correct—that there is not one among all these items that, if a full preferential tariff were applied to it, would not show a lower rate of duty than that under the National Policy. Then, I want to point out that, under that tariff, the great bulk of the rates on goods coming in from all countries have been reduced. Why, Sir, the preferential rates, applied to articles that come from Great Britain will show a reduction greater, I think, than some people have been led to believe. Now, on those 107 articles I am about to give you, as I have verified by officers in my department, there are imports of all of them, though in some cases very few, that come in from Britain or that will come in under the preferential rate. I want to draw your attention to another point, concerning which my views differ a little, perhaps, from those of some hon. gentlemen, though, in a general sense, I am in agreement with them in this matter. I lay it down as a proposition that it would be difficult to controvert successfully, that, when you introduce an article into a country, its introduction under a lower rate of duty would, under normal circumstances, extra circumstances not coming into the case, have an effect, not only upon the article that was introduced, but upon a vast quantity of that same article that is produced and bought in the country. You, therefore, gain an idea of the amount of the reduction. Now, I do not propose to weary the House with the figures. I want to give them in detail sufficiently to bring me within the rules of the House and warrant me in placing this table in the columns of the "Hansard." I will omit the general tariff of 1897, which, as I said, reduces the duty on most of these articles coming from all countries. You will observe upon what articles the percentage of reduction does not amount to 25 per cent. I, therefore, will give the rate of duty under the National Policy tariff, and then the rate of duty under our tariff at the preferential rate of 25 per cent discount, which goes into effect on the 1st of July, and I give it on articles, not, as I said, all of which come from England, but some or all of which will come from England. And who will say that if these articles from England came

in under the 12½ per cent reduction, what the increase will be when a reduction of 25 per cent is made? Every one of these articles is an absolute necessity, and is used by every agriculturist in the country in his house or on his farm. Among these articles, I ask attention to a long list of agricultural implements, over and above that I have already read; and I ask atten-

tion to the reductions as answering the question whether the Government has carried out its pledges to reduce the duty on agricultural implements and reduce the burdens on the farmers? The list of articles, with the new rate under the preferential duties, and the percentage of reduction under the new rates as compared with the old, is as follows:—

Articles.	1894 95.		1897.		Percentage of Decrease.	Percentage of Increase.	Reciprocal Tariff, ¼ p. c. off.		Percentage of Decrease.
	Specific.	Ad val.	Specific.	Ad val.			Specific.	Ad val.	
Soap, laundry.....	1c. per lb.....	p.c.	1c. p. lb....	p.c.			¾c. p. lb....	p.c.	25
Soap, N.E.S.....	35		35				26½		25
Rice.....	1½c. per lb.....		1½c. p. lb....				1½c. p. lb....		25
Seed, N.O.P.....	10		10				7½		25
Strawboard.....	30c. per 100 lbs.....	25¾	25				18¾		25
Tarred paper.....	25		25				18¾		25
Wall paper.....	35 p.c., also 1½c. per roll and 25 p.c.	r38	35	8			26½		31
Paints.....	25		25				18¾		25
Paris green.....	10		10				7½		25
Building brick.....	20		20				15		25
Crockery.....	30		30				22½		25
Window glass.....	20		20				15		25
Glass tableware.....	30		30				22½		25
Whips.....	35		35				26½		25
Boots and shoes.....	25		25				18¾		25
Springs and axles.....	\$20 p. ton but not less than 35 p.c., also 1c. p. lb. and 20 p.c.	or38	35	8			26½		31
Cut nails.....	¾c. per lb.....		½c. p. lb....	33½			¾c. p. lb....		50
Nails, N.E.S.....	30		30				22½		25
Wire nails.....	1c. per lb.....		¾c. p. lb....	40			¾c. p. lb....		55
Cut tacks.....	(1½c. per 1,000.....) (1½c. per lb.....)	34	35	3			26½		23
Wood screws.....	3c., 6c. and 8c. p. lb., but not less than 35 p.c.	or45½	35	23			26½		42
Buckthorn fencing.....	½c. per lb.....	or15	15				11½		25
Wire fencing, N.E.S.....	27½		15	45½			11½		60
Iron or steel nuts, washers, strap hinges and bolts.....	{1c. p. lb. & 20 p.c.} {1c. p. lb. & 25 p.c.}	or44¾	¾c. p. lb. & 25 p.c....	or43¾	2½		32¾		25
Locks, butts and hinges, N.E.S.....	32½		30	7½			22½		30
Cutlery.....	32½		30	7½			22½		30
Files and rasps.....	35		30	14¾			22½		36
Adzes.....	35		30	14¾			22½		36
Cleavers.....	35		30	14¾			22½		36
Hatchets.....	35		30	14¾			22½		36
Saws.....	32½		30	7½			22½		30
Wedges.....	30		30				22½		25
Hammers.....	35		30	14¾			22½		36
Crowbars.....	30		30				23½		25
Picks.....	35		30	14¾			22½		36
Mattocks.....	35		30	14¾			22½		36
Tools, not agricultural.....	35		30	14¾			22½		36
Scythes.....	35		25	28¾			18¾		46
Sickles.....	35		25	28¾			18¾		46
Reaping hooks.....	35		25	28¾			18¾		46
Edging knives.....	35		25	28¾			18¾		46
Hoes.....	35		25	28¾			18¾		46
Pronged forks.....	35		25	28¾			18¾		46
Snaths.....	35		25	28¾			18¾		46

Articles.	1894-95.		1897.		Percentage of Decrease.	Percentage of Increase.	Reciprocal Tariff, $\frac{1}{4}$ off.		Percentage of Decrease.
	Specific.	Ad val.	Specific.	Ad val.			Specific.	Ad val.	
Post-hole diggers.		p.c. 35		p.c. 25	28 $\frac{1}{2}$			p.c. 18 $\frac{3}{4}$	46
Agricultural tools, n.e.s.		35		25	28 $\frac{1}{2}$			18 $\frac{3}{4}$	46
Shovels and spades.	50c. p. doz. and 25 p.c.	or 36		35	3			26 $\frac{1}{2}$	27
Lamps and lanterns.		30		30				22 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Clothes wringers.	25c. each and 20 p.c.	or 35 $\frac{1}{2}$		35				26 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Agate, granite and en- amelled iron or steel hollow-ware.		35		35				26 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Tinware.		25		25				18 $\frac{3}{4}$	25
Pumps, iron or wood.		30		25	16 $\frac{2}{3}$			18 $\frac{1}{2}$	37 $\frac{1}{2}$
Pails, tubs, brooms, washboards, pounders and rolling pins.		20		20				15	25
Clocks and watches.		25		25				18 $\frac{3}{4}$	25
Furniture.		30		30				22 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Cotton wadding.		22 $\frac{1}{2}$		20		11		18 $\frac{3}{4}$	16 $\frac{2}{3}$
Cotton yarns.		25		25				18 $\frac{3}{4}$	25
Cotton fabrics, white.		25		25				18 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Cotton fabrics, un- bleached.		22 $\frac{1}{2}$		25		11		18 $\frac{3}{4}$	16 $\frac{2}{3}$
Cotton fabrics, coloured		30		35		16 $\frac{2}{3}$		26 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
Damask of linen.		25		30		20		22 $\frac{1}{2}$	10
Table cloths.		30		30				22 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Towels.		25		30		20		22 $\frac{1}{2}$	10
Cotton quilts, white.		25		30		20		22 $\frac{1}{2}$	10
do coloured.		30		30				22 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Sheets.		32 $\frac{1}{2}$		30	7 $\frac{7}{10}$			22 $\frac{1}{2}$	30
Handkerchiefs.		30		35		16 $\frac{2}{3}$		26 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
Curtains.		30		35		16 $\frac{2}{3}$		26 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
Linen, silk and cotton clothing.		32 $\frac{1}{2}$		35		7 $\frac{7}{10}$		26 $\frac{1}{2}$	20
Collars.	24c. doz. and 25 p.c.	46		35	24			26 $\frac{1}{2}$	43
Cuffs.	4c. pair and 25 p.c.	36		35	3			26 $\frac{1}{2}$	27
Shirts, over \$3 per doz. do under \$3 per doz.	\$1 per doz. and 25 p.c. 35 p.c.	36 $\frac{1}{2}$		35	4			26 $\frac{1}{2}$	28
Velvets and silk fabrics		30		30				22 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Ribbons.		30		35		16 $\frac{2}{3}$		26 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
Cotton thread in hanks		12 $\frac{1}{2}$		15		20		11 $\frac{1}{2}$	10
do N. E. S.		25		25				18 $\frac{3}{4}$	25
Horse clothing, jute.		30		30				22 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Linen and jute manu- factures, N. E. S.		20		25		25		18 $\frac{3}{4}$	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
Bags of linen, jute or seamless cotton.		20		20				15	25
Socks and stockings.	10c. p. doz. pr. & 35 p.c.	40		35	12 $\frac{1}{2}$			26 $\frac{1}{2}$	36
Knitted goods, N. E. S.		35		35				26 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Shawls.		25		30		20		22 $\frac{1}{2}$	10
Wool fabrics.		30		35		16 $\frac{2}{3}$		26 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
Tweeds, flannels, blank- ets, cloths, coatings (wool).	5c. per lb. and 25 p.c.	32 $\frac{1}{2}$		35		7 $\frac{7}{10}$		26 $\frac{1}{2}$	20
Carpeting, jute and hemp.		25		25				18 $\frac{3}{4}$	25
Carpets, ingrain wool.	5c. p. sq. yd. & 25 p.c.	36		35	3			26 $\frac{1}{2}$	27
do do cotton.	3c. p. sq. yd. & 25 p.c.	36		35	3			26 $\frac{1}{2}$	27
do N. E. S.		30		35		16 $\frac{2}{3}$		26 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
Enamelled floor, stair, shelf and table oil cloth.	30 p.c. but not less than 4c. per sq. yd.			30				22 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Window shades.	35 p.c. but not less than 5c. per sq. yd.			35	27			26 $\frac{1}{2}$	45
Umbrellas.		35		35				26 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Gloves and mitts.		35		35				26 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Hats and bonnets.		30		30				22 $\frac{1}{2}$	25
Braces and suspenders.		35		35				26 $\frac{1}{2}$	25

Mr. PATERSON.

Articles.	1894-95.		1897.		Percentage of Decrease.	Percentage of Increase.	Reciprocal Tariff ¼ p.c. off.		Percentage of Decrease.
	Specific.	Ad val.	Specific.	Ad val.			Specific.	Ad val.	
		p. c.		p. c.	p. c.	p. c.		p. c.	p. c.
Fur caps, coats, &c.		25		30		20		22½	10
Fertilizers, compound- ed or manufactured.		10		10				7½	25
Combs.		35		35				26¼	25
Brushes		25		25				18¾	25
Twine and cotton cord- age		25		25				18¾	25
Cordage, N. E. S	1½c. per lb. and 10 p. c.	29¾		25	15			18¾	38

Articles.	1894-95.		1897.	Percentage of Decrease.
	Specific.	Ad valorem.		
		p. c.		p. c.
Books on agriculture.	6c. per lb.		Free.	100
Binder twine.		12½	do	100
Barbed wire.	¾c. per lb.		do	100
Rape seed.		10	do	100
Mushroom spawn.		20	do	100
Seed beans from Great Britain.	15c. per bush		do	100
Galvanized iron or steel wire, Nos. 9, 12 and 13 gauge		25	do	100

I leave it to hon. gentlemen opposite to say whether we have not advanced in the direction of tariff reform respecting agricultural implements.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that 27 per cent reduction on shovels and spades with the preferential allowance off?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Hardly any of these articles come in from England.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I instructed my officers to carefully prepare the list. I have already said that some come in in larger and others in minor quantities; but they come in under the 12½ per cent reduction, and it is impossible to tell what the increase will be under the 25 per cent reduction. There is, at all events, that relief given. I have placed in this list, because these articles are needed by agriculturists as well as others, cottons, woollens and other items, just as the Finance Minister did, not selecting some articles that support my case, but dealing with the general staple articles that come in from Great Britain in large quantities and which the

farmers have to buy. Now, I feel as great regret as hon. gentlemen do at my having to read this statement, which I know is not interesting, and which, if one wanted to make a speech at all interesting, he would eschew by all possible means. But I felt it desirable to put these figures upon "Hansard," and I invite criticism upon them. I know what the criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite will amount to. It will amount to this, that there are very few of some of these articles coming from England. I grant that in some few items; but, nevertheless, even in these some do come from England; and if some have come in under the 12½ per cent reduction, vast quantities may come in under the 25 per cent reduction. In this list I have included the great staple lines which are used by all classes in the community, which go into every household. I have shown that even in the items on which the least reduction has been made, it is a very great reduction in the burdens which the people have to bear. Now let me summarize. In these 107 items which I have read, we have made the following reductions:—

PERCENTAGE OF REDUCTIONS UNDER THE
RECIPROCAL TARIFF.

1	reduction of	6½	per cent.
6	do	10	do
6	do	12½	do
2	do	16½	do
2	do	20	do
1	do	23	do
45	do	25	do
4	do	27	do
1	do	28	do
4	do	30	do
2	do	31	do
9	do	36	do
1	do	37½	do
1	do	38	do
1	do	42	do
1	do	43	do
1	do	45	do
9	do	46	do
1	do	50	do
1	do	55	do
1	do	60	do
7	do	100	do

Of these 107 articles, on which these reductions have been made, all or nearly all are articles used by the farmer, and many are agricultural implements and tools, on which there are reductions of from 36 to 45 per cent, while some articles, like binder twine, and wire for fencing, have been made free. Now, while I anticipate, and have anticipated, what the criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite will be, I shall want them, when criticising these figures, to demonstrate to the House, as they will be bound to do, that if articles have come in from Britain, it may be in small quantities in some cases, under the 12½ per cent reduction, under a 25 per cent reduction large quantities of these goods will not come in. If they are able to do that, they will have weakened my case.

Mr. DAVIN. That is asking us to prove a negative, which you know it is not right to do.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I know it will be difficult to do; but the hon. gentleman is sometimes able to prove a negative.

Mr. DAVIN. I say that according to the rules of logic it is impossible.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I invite the attention of the House to another thing. The full benefit of the Fielding tariff, which was introduced into this House last year, will not be experienced till after the 1st of July, and will not be experienced at once; for, while we were pledged to reform the tariff and lighten the burdens of taxation on the people of the country, we were business men, we knew that we had to recognize the conditions created under hon. gentlemen opposite, and we would not throw this country into a commercial panic, but would reach our end by safe means, and we believe it will be reached with perfect safety to those who have invested their money in industrial undertakings. Now, what do I find? I find, from a

Mr. PATERSON.

table I had prepared for me, taking the importation of goods entered for consumption into Canada under the reciprocal tariff, and the duty collected thereon during the six months ending the 31st of December, 1897, that the abatement of duty under the 12½ per cent reduction amounted to \$521,451 during the six months. If you double that, you get the year's operations as fairly as we can estimate them now. I think you will be safe in doubling it, because trade does not all at once find its new channel. The Englishman realized that this was an opening greater than he has enjoyed before, but in many lines he had to make his arrangements, and so during the first few months you could not expect the trade to flow as freely through this new channel as it will later. Any business man can understand that. But if you double that trade of the first six months, what would that mean? It would mean that besides the reduction in the burden of taxation on the people, owing to our reduced tariff, owing to our general lowering of duties on the great bulk of the items, there is the further reductions under this preferential clause. I say double that and you will have \$1,042,000 of relief. That is the relief in one year, under a reduction of 12½ per cent. I venture to say that there is not a man who will not admit that with this current of trade now established, and with the impetus which 25 per cent will give it as against 12½ per cent, a reduction of two million dollars of taxation will represent the reduction on the imports under that reciprocal tariff after a year from next July.

An hon. MEMBER. Reduction?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, reduction. I say that under the 25 per cent reduction, in the face of the figures I have given, in the face of events that have actually transpired, it is small hazard to predict that when this preferential tariff is in full force for a year, with the 25 per cent reduction, there will be a reduction, not on the old rates of duty of the late Government, but on the reduced general tariff rates of the new Government that will equal three million dollars; and I ask any hon. gentleman in this House who ventures to say that there is no reformation in this tariff, that the pledge of the Liberal party to reduce the burdens of the people has not been carried out, how, when this takes place as we think it will, he can hope to maintain his position. What does it amount to? Let me illustrate. What is the equivalent of that reduction in the taxation of the people, so that we may grasp the amount of reduction that has been made? It will be equivalent to taking ten million dollars worth of imported goods, on which 30 per cent duty has been levied, and transferring that ten million dollars to the free list. That is what it means.

Mr. CLANCOY. Does the hon. gentleman mean by that statement that there will be

a loss to the revenue of three million dollars.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** There will be a loss to the revenue on that account, but that loss will be made up by the stimulus given to trade, and the wealth we hope to put into the people's pockets, which will enable them to buy more goods, and on a larger scale than they are doing to-day—buy millions of dollars more of goods and pay for them. They will have the money to do it. And by giving that stimulus to trade, every manufactory in the country will be running full time and over-time, too. That is what we hope to see.

I have been a little tiresome, I am aware, on that subject, and I now want to touch upon another point. My hon. friends opposite, the leader of the Opposition and the ex-Finance Minister, said last session, when the tariff was introduced, that it would have to be changed. They said that it filled them too with humiliation. Canada had been humiliated. They told us what an awkward position we were putting ourselves in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** They told us how ignorant we were with reference to that matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** And the same mournful spirit is upon them yet. I could not help thinking, as I gazed upon my hon. friend, of the lines :

Talk not of grief
Till thou hast seen the tears of bearded men.

Their grief was so great over the humiliation which they said was brought upon Canada, so great at our having deceived and deluded the great British public.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** That was the language of the hon. gentleman last year. He is still sad and lonely in his grief. But let me ask him to look at a bright picture, for I hate to see grief wasted. The hon. gentleman is wasting it. Let me ask him to look at a bright picture—not a fancy picture but a true one. Let him transport himself, in his mind, to the great throbbing centre of the Empire a year ago or less—London. Let him gaze upon the scene taking place there. Let him look upon the hundreds of thousands of English people and British citizens from all parts of the world assembled there. Let him look upon, the mightiest of earth's sovereigns, as she passes along those streets, lined with loving subjects, with "God bless you my people" falling from her gracious lips, and let him listen to the responses from the hundreds of thousands of loyal subjects "God save our gracious Queen." Let him contemplate that scene, as she winds her way to give grate-

ful thanks to the King of Kings, who has so abundantly blessed her and her people, and let him grasp the fact that in that supreme moment the thoughts of the English people were stirred as they never had been stirred before. Who can conceive it possible that other thoughts or subjects of minor importance could even find a resting place in that scene. I ask him to gaze on that scene. But enraptured as the people were, entranced as they were, with the sight of their beloved sovereign, there was another sight in that procession that also arrested their attention. It was when they saw the carriage that bore Wilfrid Laurier, Canada's Prime Minister and representative. England's heart had been touched as it had never been touched by any colony before because of that very tariff that the hon. gentleman feels ashamed and humiliated that the Parliament of Canada should have passed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They did not realize the deception that had been practiced.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** There, again, the hon. gentleman refuses to be comforted. "They did not realize the deception that had been practiced"—so he told us last night. Then the hundreds of thousands of Englishmen, the statesmen, the editors of the world's great newspapers, all the literary men, all the dwellers in that land are, according to the hon. gentleman, so obtuse, so devoid of intelligence that they could not understand that tariff, every particular of which, so far as the reciprocal clause was concerned was published not only in their dailies but in their other newspapers. And yet the hon. gentleman says that they could not understand it. Why, what contempt the hon. gentleman is pouring upon himself and upon the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). They spent hours last session, yes, days and weeks, before the Prime Minister went to England, demonstrating to their own satisfaction, that it was a fraud and pointing out to the English people that they would get nothing from it. Did not the English people believe what they said?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They did when they had it from the lips of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), the confession made at Sheffield that no preference was given.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). No such confession was made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can prove to the hon. gentleman out of his own mouth that at the banquet at Sheffield he said that, though they had attempted to give a preference they had failed.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The hon. gentleman knows that he is burlesquing what I said, and if he will read the words they will prove it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can establish what I have said. Then it was that the English people found that they had been deceived.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If we are to accept the statement of the hon. gentleman, though I would not want to do it for his own sake, all we are led to believe is that the English did not believe when he said it, but they did believe it when the Finance Minister said it. I spare him that. If he had been right in his statement, the English people would have believed him. They, no doubt, read what he said, read all his strictures upon the Finance Minister, but they saw what utter nonsense they were. Do you suppose that these men in England, whose goods have been coming over and getting the benefit of this preference—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, to the tune of a falling off of £171,000 for the first four months of its operation.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman must remember that £171,000 is not such a very great deal in the immense commerce of Great Britain. And does the hon. gentleman mean to say that statements of succeeding periods will not balance that and more? I need not argue that with the hon. gentleman. I know his ability, and I know that he knows better than he is saying now. The hon. gentleman says that we made a great mistake. There, again, grief and sadness overwhelmed him, because, when we gave this preferential tariff we did not demand better terms for Canada on the exports we are sending into that country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear. The mistake of your lives, as you will find out.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, I grant the hon. gentleman that we did not stipulate when concession was being given to Great Britain that they must give us a return for it. The hon. gentleman knows, I believe, that we could not maintain the tariff we have now and get that concession from Britain. He knows that British public opinion would have to be educated before that could be done. If these hon. gentlemen take the position that we ought to have sought a preferential tariff at all costs, they must mean that our tariff should have been so reduced as to make such an arrangement possible even with British public opinion as it is to-day, and, according to the principles that they themselves had laid down, this would mean such a reduction as to make it difficult for many of our manufacturers to live at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And I wish him to rise boldly and accept the logical results of his own reasoning. Mr. Chamberlain's statements have been read

Mr. PATERSON.

time and again, and I need not take up the time of the House by reading them. But hon. gentlemen will remember his statement as to what they would demand from us in return for a concession of preferential trade. And the hon. gentleman says that the Prime Minister did not do his duty to Canada in that he did not urge then and there the granting of this preferential arrangement. The Prime Minister knew that he could not do it with any hope of success, that even if they had been willing to grant it, they would have demanded terms, they would have demanded concessions that he could not possibly have given in the present state of the trade of the country. And while I am on that point, I would ask the hon. gentleman in all sincerity to explain one sentence of his. I have been charged with uttering some words that I myself did not realize. I would fain believe that one sentence that fell from the hon. gentleman's lips last night was a mistake—when he stated that the Prime Minister of this Dominion was bound—he did not say to whom—when he went over to England, to oppose preferential trade in the interests of the United States. To make a charge like that—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to answer him now?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, give us your authority.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will answer the hon. gentleman. The statement I made was this, and I repeat it: The action which the Prime Minister took on that occasion was utterly at variance with the pledge he had solemnly given to the electors of Canada as to what he would do if he obtained power, that one of the first acts of his Government would be to send a commission to England to negotiate preferential trade with the Government of Lord Salisbury. There is the further fact that as soon as he got to England, before he had a word of discussion with any person, except the proposition made by the Duke of Devonshire opening the way to carry out this very project, he took the strongest ground against preferential trade, declaring that it would involve protection which had been a curse to Canada and would be a curse to England. This proved to me that before he left Canada, he had changed his mind, that he had determined to abandon, to violate the solemn pledge he had given to the people of this country. And taken in connection with the fact, that, in the struggle with the hon. gentleman and myself, he had the sympathy of the United States, the people there hoping he would come into power, I could arrive at no conclusion but the one I stated. I say I cannot arrive at any other conclusion until the hon. gentleman gives what he has never ventured yet to give to this House and to the people of this

country, the reason for this volte face, the reason for this sudden change of the hon. gentleman from a pledged supporter—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has permission to answer a question, but he cannot enter into a discussion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman who has asked me, who has challenged me—

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I asked you a question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I am answering it, and before I take my seat—

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman is abusing the courtesy of the Chair. I only asked the hon. gentleman a question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I am answering it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, the hon. gentleman did not answer it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He is afraid to hear the truth.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman, having answered the question, has no right to go on and make a speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was asked to justify my statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is abusing the permission that has been given him to answer a question.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am sorry. I do not wish at all to show the slightest discourtesy to the hon. gentleman opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will any hon. gentleman say I have done so?

Mr. FOSTER. You did not want to hear him, when he was trying to answer you.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman placed a very serious statement upon the "Hansard."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I am prepared to justify it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If I understood him aright, he said that the Prime Minister was bound in some way, in the interests of the United States, as I understood him to say, to parties in the United States. I thought he had said more than he meant to say, that he had said it in a sudden heat, and that he might wish to explain it or withdraw it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no. The hon. gentleman said no such a thing. The

hon. gentleman asked me to justify the statement I made, and I am prepared to do it now.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman has entered upon a course of reasoning by which, he says, he convinced himself that something was done. Very well. Let it go at that. But what I said was, that he had made a direct statement, so I understood him, and now he says he reached it by certain conclusions. I asked him if there was not a contradiction between the conclusions he had reached and a broad statement that that was the case. Now, with reference to what the Prime Minister did, what has been charged against him by the hon. gentleman who has just interrupted me, that has been up time and again in the House, and I do not intend to go into that at all at this time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, you had better not.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The House is thoroughly conversant with that matter. But leaving that question, I desire to maintain the position that has been taken on this side of the House with reference to that preferential tariff. I venture to say that every one in Canada would hail a preference given to us in the British market, if it could be obtained on terms advantageous to both, and in the interests of both. What I want to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite is this, that, by the preferential tariff enacted by this Government, though no law has been placed upon the Statute-book of England to compel the people of England to give a preference to Canadian products in their market, the very fact that that Act was passed by this Canadian Parliament touched the British heart, and to-day, though there is no law compelling it, they are, of their own free will, giving a preference to Canada. But, Sir, our legislation did more; it accomplished the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties, which, so far as we can judge, would have gone on for many long years further, if action had not been taken by Canada. But the hon. gentleman takes exception to that. He says that the right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister and the Government and Parliament of Canada had nothing to do with the denunciation of those treaties. Well, it is a strange thing that the English newspapers, the English public, distinguished citizens of the British Empire, even in her remote colonies, recognized that our action here was the prime moving cause that brought about the denunciation of those treaties. I think it is in vain for the hon. gentleman to say that the Prime Minister, the Government and Parliament of Canada, are to have no credit for that result. Why, Sir, in the Conservative papers published in this city, no longer ago than the early part of this month, I find a report of an interview with Cecil Rhodes, a

man whom, I think, hon. gentlemen opposite will admit has been an important figure in the history of South Africa, and this is what he says :

Mr. Cecil Rhodes arrived at Madeira to-day. In the course of a recent conversation he spoke warmly of the service Canada had rendered to the Empire by compelling the British Government to clear the German and Belgian treaties out of the way of future interimperial co-operation. Those treaties formerly were in his way in his tariff arrangements in South Africa. "Sir Wilfrid Laurier," he said, "has now got rid of them for us and the whole of the Empire."

That, at any rate, was the view of a distinguished man from an outlying British possession.

Mr. DAVIN. That is an opinion adverse to the policy of the Government.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What do I find in a special cable published in the Montreal "Star," a paper that is not, I believe, particularly friendly to the Administration or its acts? It is dated from London, England, and is as follows:—

The crises in Cuba and China almost fill the papers here.

The Budget of the Hon. Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance, Canada, attracts a good deal of attention. I heard a Conservative member of Parliament say this morning: "Our Ministers jaw, jaw, jaw, and do little but jaw about the unity of the Empire, but Canada keeps on doing, doing, doing."

I said that the action of the Canadian Parliament in offering those terms to the British people, had touched the British heart, and that led them of their own motion to make inquiries respecting the products of this Dominion. What do we hear from shippers and merchants? To-day in the principal markets inquiries are made for Canadian goods; a trial is given them, and the result is seen in the widely increased exports to the English market. Let me give the House a statement of our exports to Great Britain during the first six months of the present fiscal year. We find that our exports, as compared with the corresponding period of the last fiscal year, increased by the large sum of \$22,500,688. That is our total exports for the six months over the corresponding six months of the last year. I think it is a fairer way to leave out the foreign products, and if we do so, we find that during those six months our home products exported to Great Britain show an increase of \$19,237,864 during the six months of the present over the corresponding six months of the previous year, which itself was a large year for exports. Where do I find the increases? Take the figures. Products of the fisheries, increase, \$32,664; products of the forest, increase, \$3,348,299; animals and their produce, increase, \$6,564,942; agricultural products, increase, \$8,640,134; manufactures, increase,

Mr. PATERSON.

\$782,759. The exports of produce of the mines to Great Britain decreased during the six months by \$108,648, and there was also a decrease in the exports of miscellaneous articles to the extent of \$22,216. Deducting these decreases, the increase in the other line of home products during the first six months of the present fiscal year over the corresponding six months of the previous year amounted to \$19,237,864. I desire to call attention to the fact that while our exports have shown an increase during those six months of nearly \$20,000,000 as compared with the corresponding six months of the previous year, the total imports into Great Britain during that time had decreased nearly \$90,000,000. Can anything speak louder for the position that Canada has taken in the British market even in the short space of time our tariff has been in operation?

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is very good preferential trade.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I had not intended to occupy the time of the House so long, but the reading of the tables took a longer time than I had anticipated. I have not attempted to deal with the financial part of the statement made by the Minister of Finance and offer any criticism thereon, for the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in his very fair and able criticism, gave an explanation and defence of the administration of this Government, which may disappoint some of our friends who may have anticipated that greater results would have been attained, but which will enable them to see clearly that the Government, so far as was consistent with the welfare and prosperity of the Dominion, have endeavoured, so far as in them lies, to economically carry on the administration of the finances of the country, while they are at the same time advancing its prosperity.

Mr. DAVIN. What about sugar?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is just an element in the policy that has been introduced by this Government, that of binding together the colonies as well as the mother country. I would say to hon. gentlemen opposite that I have never claimed credit, nor has this Government ever claimed credit, that in our preferential tariff as regards England or English colonies we have acted solely and alone to benefit the motherland or the colonies. We are looking after our own interests as well as developing the interests of the motherland. The reductions in our burdens give advantage to Canada, and the preference accorded to England is an advantage given to her by Canada, and the same remark applies to the West Indies. What did the leader of the Opposition say with respect to the present sugar tariff? He declared we had adopted the right policy, that he had urged

it upon us last year, that under the tariff as it existed our West Indian commerce had been destroyed. I was unable at the time to find or to remember where the hon. gentleman last year made that recommendation. He did not give us the time when he made it or the page where it could be found, and I am told by an hon. gentleman who has looked through "Hansard" that he failed in the hasty glance made at its pages to find the hon. gentleman's statement. I would be sorry to say that he did not make it, but he did not give the House the reference.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman's colleague can tell him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman cannot now tell when he did it, because he did not do it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman did so, I will be willing to look it up in "Hansard." My memory wholly fails to recall it, if the hon. gentleman ever proposed anything such as we propose. I say I accept his word, but I have no remembrance of it. But if I accept his word, I ask him in what position he places the ex-Minister of Finance and the party who supported him. We left the sugar tariff last year on raw sugar as we found it left by the previous Government; and it is this question of raw sugar and not the refined that affects the West India trade.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend say that the question of refined sugar does not affect the West Indies?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, both affect the West Indies; but the question at issue is the raw sugar. The hon. gentleman knows that; if he does not know it, he ought to know it; but I suppose it is possible that he does not know, because his leader told us last night that under the tariff he had ruined the West India commerce.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, it was under the tariff as we found it and left it. All we did was to reduce the duty on the refined sugar, the protection to the refiner, 14 cents on the hundred pounds. We left the duty on raw sugar just as it was, and it is on the raw sugar that we are giving a preference to the West India planters, which the hon. gentleman admits will be a boon to them, but not to them alone, because he considers that it will revive a trade which will be profitable to the maritime provinces and to all parts of the Dominion. Now, I have spoken on sugar, as the hon. gentleman asked me to do, and I trust I have made myself plain.

Mr. BENNETT. Tell us about the English postage you announced at Toronto.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The English postage is something on the same line; it is coming. The hon. gentleman has alluded to that in the House before. He spoke, I think, of myself as having been treated somewhat unfairly, as he supposed, by the Postmaster General. Well, I have not felt very badly over that matter. I am told by people who were present that when the announcement of that reduction in English postage was made, it was well received by the audience. In fact, I was at the meeting myself. I am told that the announcement was made in clear and stentorian tones, and that the whole Massey Hall audience heard it. Being myself an eye witness, I can say that the statement was made in all good faith, and that the effect on the audience was electrical. It showed me that, although the Postmaster General has perhaps been delayed in the consummation of his wishes for a short time, as we have been in our desire to confine our tariff preference to the British Empire, yet the heart of the Canadian people was with him in that Imperial-Canadian movement; and when that comes about, then the hon. gentleman can have the satisfaction of knowing that still another act has, through the instrumentality of the Canadian Government, united still more closely and bound more firmly together the motherland and this the greatest of her possessions.

I have spoken of the postage, as requested. If there are any other matters on which hon. gentlemen would like to hear me speak, I would like to oblige them, though I must close my remarks, for I certainly will not continue them beyond the dinner hour. Let me note, in conclusion, that hon. gentlemen make serious charges against us. They charge that we have not fulfilled a single promise that we made to the people—that we have failed in all our pledges. Well, Sir, that is a serious charge. Is it true? Do the hon. gentlemen mean in earnest to make a charge of that kind? After the figures I have given, taken from official records, will they say that this Government have not been true to the pledge they gave to the people of this country to reduce the burden of taxation. In the light of the figures given by the Finance Minister, and dwelt upon more in detail by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, will they not say that in many of the branches of the public service economies have been practiced and retrenchments made? We promised that there would be increased prosperity, and do they mean to say that increased prosperity is not in the country to-day? The Prime Minister, two or three years ago, when standing before a distinguished audience of commercial men, after having listened to a vast array of statistics read by the ex-Minister of Finance, in order to convince them that they were prosperous, said to them: "If you put me and my party in power, we

will not need to use this long list of statistics to prove that you are prosperous, for you will feel it in your pockets." Is that true? Hon. gentlemen have said that it was by an accident that we attained power—referring, I suppose, to a question that had created a sharp division among the people of Canada—a question involving religious feelings, feelings which are the deepest in the hearts of us all, and which ought to be recognized with charity and forbearance, and with a disposition to give to others the same privilege of liberty of conscience that we demand for ourselves. When those feelings were stirred up and aroused in the country, and a great deal of discontent was excited among the people, the hon. First Minister said: "I believe that if I were entrusted with power, I would be able, by different means from those employed by our opponents, by means that would commend themselves to all the fair-minded men of this country, to bring about a peaceable and happy solution of this question." Where is it to-day? Was the promise kept? I say that if there was nothing else that stood to the credit of the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government, that alone entitles him to a renewal of the confidence of the people of this country. What more did we promise?

Mr. BERGERON. The coal duty.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We promised that we would wipe out the Franchise Act. We are at it now, though opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. They demand economy on our part. We proposed to repeal that Act which, if it was carried out every year—as it ought to be in justice to the people of the Dominion—would entail millions of dollars of expense. These hon. gentlemen call upon us to economize, and then try to force that Act upon us, the carrying out of which, as it ought to be carried out, would entail millions of dollars of expense. We promised a plebiscite to ascertain the views of the people on the question of prohibition and intend to carry out that promise. We want also to readjust the boundaries of the constituencies and remedy the iniquity perpetrated by hon. gentlemen opposite in that regard. We have not taken up that matter yet. Will these hon. gentlemen, when we do, give us the assistance which the leader of the Opposition says they always give us on the other side? We have not been perfect, we have not been able to accomplish everything. In our tariff revision we have not been able to do all that every one expected, but bound as we are to look to all interests, recognizing that we had a country to govern under a condition of things that was prevailing through a course of eighteen years' legislation of hon. gentlemen opposite, we felt it was our bounden duty, as statesmen, to see that while lightening the burden of taxation we were careful to preserve the best interests of the

Mr. PATERSON.

country. That, I believe, we have done. It may be that we shall be able to do more in the future than in the past in the way of economy, but as my hon. colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce pointed out, a large part of our expenditure is fixed and uncontrollable, and is due to debts incurred by hon. gentlemen opposite. As regards the smaller portion, the controllable expenditure, we hope we may be able to effect economies perhaps in a measure greater than we have accomplished up to the present.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the coal duties?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The coal duties were lowered, as were the duties on almost everything else in the tariff.

An hon. MEMBER. What about biscuits?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. An hon. gentleman says, what about biscuits. You may sometimes find in newspapers that are not careful for their reputation statements and insinuations unworthy and untrue, but when a member of Parliament ventures to insinuate here a lie that has been published in the Tory newspapers, and, I suppose, will be republished time and again, namely, that there was in the revision of the tariff an advantage given to certain lines of manufacture in which I at one time was interested, which I at one time managed—when I find an hon. member so lost to decency, then language fails me to adequately describe his conduct and keep within parliamentary bounds. All I can say is, look at the tariff and you will find that these articles were imported, in large quantities, under the preferential clause, during the past year, and will be imported much more in the future, and you will find that these articles, the duties on which were not increased in the general tariff and are greatly reduced under the preferential clause, stand in the same position as many other articles, so that instead of extra protection being given to them, the protection is greatly reduced. I never care to touch upon matters that concern a business in which I was engaged myself. I can allow newspapers that care not for their reputation to repeat and reiterate their false statements and charges, but I did not expect that a member of Parliament, who has access to the records of Parliament, would throw out an insinuation such as has been thrown at the present time.

Let me say this, in the minute or two at my disposal. I have shown how we have redeemed our pledges. We all know that certain predictions were made by hon. gentlemen opposite before the last election. We all know that predictions were made by them which we may consider as their pledges, if they were honourable men, and believed what they said. What did they promise would happen if the Liberal party came into power? They predicted that

trade would stagnate. Well, Mr. Speaker, every transportation line on land and water, endorsed by every bank and clearing house, proclaims that prophecy as false. They predicted that factories would be closed and manufacturing industries crushed. To-day the thousands of factories established throughout this Dominion and the many new ones that are springing up give flat contradiction to that prediction. They predicted that our artisans and mechanics would walk the streets in vain begging for work and no work to be had. Sir, the electric lights blazing in many of the factories throughout this broad Dominion, all through the long hours of the night, declare not only that our artisans, under Liberal rule, are not seeking for work and unable to obtain it, but that they are constantly employed and that more artisans have to be found to man those factories, night as well as day, in order to keep up to the demands of trade. They contrast the promises with the performances of the Liberal party. I would place before them their own predictions and the absolute failure of these predictions, and by the unanswerable logic of facts the Liberal party, at any rate, may well be content to abide.

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

After Recess.

THE KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RAILWAY.

The House proceeded to consider amendments made in Bill (No. 26) An Act to incorporate the Kettle Valley Railway Company.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I am very sorry indeed that, owing to illness, I have not been able to follow the debate which took place in the committee and in the House on this Bill. However, I have tried to get as much information as I could, and the result of my consideration of the subject, so far, is the conclusion that this Bill should not be sanctioned by the House. A wrong impression has prevailed as to the position of the Government in this matter. I may say, at once, that the Government has come to the conclusion that it was not necessary to have a policy, as a Government, upon this question. It is an open question, and all members of this House, on our side, at any rate, may rest well assured that they are perfectly free, from the Government standpoint, to vote just as they please on this Bill.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). We always do that, anyway.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend understands me, I am sure. This is not a Government question, and, so far as the Government is concerned, every member is free to vote as he chooses. The

Bill is a very plain one. Mr. Corbin and his friends are asking for the privilege of building a road that starts in American territory and has its terminal point in American territory. I have the map of the scheme before me. Sir, I have been for a number of years a member of the Railway Committee and a member of the House, and I have always understood that the policy of this House has been not to give charters to two railways covering the same ground. When we have given a charter to a railway company, and that company has proven its ability to go on with the work undertaken, we have, so far as I know, never granted a charter over the same ground.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). They are asking to do it to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection to being interrupted. This is a free question, and it is well to have a free discussion. What are the facts of the case? Last year, we obtained from this Parliament a unanimous vote in favour of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. The Crow's Nest Pass Railway was considered then, and is considered now, I hope, in fact I am sure, as a link in a great railway policy. The motto of both political parties in the House is, Canada for the Canadians, as much as possible. Well, I ask the House to consider the great interest that is at stake now. We have the pledge of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that, during the coming season, they will build a railway to Boundary Creek. That corporation is in a position to carry out that pledge. Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway line is altogether on Canadian soil, and I ask the House not to lose sight of this point. Is it not safer for us to have a line of railway built on Canadian soil, under the circumstances?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One of my hon. friends, for whom I have the greatest respect, says, "No." I ask him to weigh the question, pro and con. The map that I hold in my hand is an answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Wood). The Northport smelter is a living answer to the hon. gentleman. The Northport smelter has been located but a few steps, relatively speaking, from the Canadian boundary. Why? Because its owners desired to locate it on American territory. Is it not a fact that if we permit the building of Mr. Corbin's road, we run the greatest risk of our Canadian ores being carried over the American frontier for treatment? And what does that mean? It means the building up of towns and the building up of trade on American soil with Canadian raw material. So far, I have not been able to reconcile myself to that view of the case. I have not heard any

argument which would convince me that this is a sound policy. But, I am told, we must have competition. I again call the attention of the House to what we did last year. We obtained money from Parliament to build the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and, at the same time, we obtained control of the rates on that railway. Is it fair to give competition before we have reason for it?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am told, Yes. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) will say the reason for that is, that we do not want any monopoly. Is that it?

Mr. MACLEAN. Partly.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. "Monopoly" is a word that has been much abused. I am bound to be my own boss in my own house—

Mr. MACLEAN. They say you are the boss.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will my hon. friend say that it would be a monopoly to have a Canadian line on Canadian soil, to have Canadian smelters on Canadian soil? Is this a monopoly? It cannot be a monopoly, it is simply national protection to national industries. I say that there is no danger that the Canadian Pacific Railway will exact undue rates, because we have got control.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend laughs, he laughs at what he has voted for. He has a perfect right to laugh at everything that may be sound and true, but I feel that I am standing by the policy that the Liberal party has propounded; more than that, I am standing by the policy that is supported by both political parties. We have built the Canadian Pacific Railway at an expense of millions and millions of dollars. I happened to be on the other side of the House when the Canadian Pacific Railway was originated, and I am on this side now, and I am a witness of the unanimous opinion of the House in reference to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I say that in my humble opinion it would be a grave mistake if we were to-day to go back on what we have done. We have control of the railway rates, there cannot then be any danger of undue rates being exacted. The Canadian Pacific Railway have pledged themselves to give running privileges during the running season. If we find next year that another railway is necessary, it will then be time to take action. I am told that we must have competition. I am told that the Grand Trunk Railway has an interest in that scheme. Now, Sir, the Grand Trunk Railway has no better friend in this House than myself, but I am a friend

Mr. TARTE.

of that railway only so long as it is worked in the interest of Canada, and no longer. I cannot really see what interest the Grand Trunk Railway has. I suppose there is not much more to be said.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Oh, yes; there is lots more to be said.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I see my hon. friend is impatient. He may be a wise man, I have no doubt he is, but I do not know of any man of any age who has had a monopoly of wisdom. I have not the same experience, no doubt, as he has had, still I am giving to this House the result of my careful study of this question. I may be wrong, but still I think that I am consistent with the policy of my party which, as I said a moment ago, is Canada for Canadians.

Mr. MACLEAN. I was told to-night that we would see the kettle boil, and I think we have evidence of that already. I was told that this was to be a Government measure, and that the Liberal party were committed to the policy involved in this Bill, and would stand by that policy. I was surprised to-night to hear the Minister of Public Works repudiate what I took to be the policy of the Liberal party in connection with this Kettle River, as I shall endeavour to show. Now, if there is a project before the country that offers relief to it, if there is a project before the country that offers relief to British Columbia, and offers relief to the great North-west, it is that of allowing the Grand Trunk Railway to get into that North-west. All the Grand Trunk Railway asks to-day is to be enabled to get into the North-west and British Columbia, and it proposes in this instance to get in by the Kettle River Railway. If the Government had a policy last session it was to secure improved railway facilities for the people in British Columbia. We gave last year nearly four million dollars to the Crow's Nest Pass road, and we attached a most important condition to the contract whereby that bonus or that franchise was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and what was it? In that contract there is this clause, known as clause "f":

That the Railway Committee of the Privy Council may grant running powers over the said line of railway and all its branches and connections, or any portions thereof, and all lines of railway now or hereafter owned or leased by or operated on account of the company in British Columbia south of the company's main line of railway, and the necessary use of its tracks, stations and station grounds, to any other railway company applying for such grant, upon such terms as such company may fix and determine, and according to the provisions of the Railway Act and of such other general Acts relating to railways as are from time to time passed by Parliament.

Now Parliament declared last year that the Canadian Pacific Railway was to have

this franchise and this bonus only on the condition that all other railways were to have running rights over it, and were given the use of the tracks, stations and everything else. The day has come when a most important railway in Canada asks to get the use of those provisions and of those rights. I am not breaking any confidence when I say that since I raised the question the other day in this House, I have been told that the Grand Trunk Railway have to-day filed an application with this Government asking for running rights over all railways west of Lake Superior, and over this road in particular. If we gave all that money last session, nearly four million dollars, if we gave all those coal lands, and gave that franchise to the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was that the Government should have control of the rates, and furthermore, that the Government should have control of the tracks, and should give running rights over those tracks to any railway asking for it. Sir William Van Horne came to the Railway Committee only a few days ago and told that committee and the people of this country that this was a most important provision, and it did secure for this country the control over that Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and especially did it secure it because they have given running rights over it. And it is because the Grand Trunk Railway to-day are asking to be made a competitor with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and because the Grand Trunk Railway to-day is asking for admission to British Columbia, that the Canadian Pacific Railway is here to-day with all their lawyers and solicitors to try to prevent the Grand Trunk Railway from getting access into the North-west and British Columbia. Furthermore, I am told that the Minister of the Interior is doing his very best to keep the Grand Trunk Railway out of British Columbia.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Will the hon. gentleman give his authority for that statement?

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, we will see later on. I wish the hon. gentleman had been in his place—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I tell the hon. gentleman that he is talking about something, as he usually does, that he does not know anything at all about.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, I know all I am saying, and the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to set himself right. Only a short time ago we were trying in this House to get the Grand Trunk Railway into the North-west to serve his province, and to remove that monopoly that he and his party complained that the North-west was under, and he was not here to say a word in favour of the admission of the Grand Trunk Railway into the North-west. I challenge him to say to-night whether he will support the Grand Trunk Railway hav-

ing running rights over the Rainy River when that subsidy comes down.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I will support it.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman has made great progress.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will do it in a business-like way, not in such a way as to kill the construction of the only road over which the Grand Trunk Railway could get in, and that is what the hon. gentleman is doing.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, I am trying to secure running rights to the Grand Trunk Railway, both by the Kettle River Company and by the Rainy River Company. The hon. gentleman is a member of the Government that voted four million dollars of the people's money for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and they are bound to vindicate that policy of last session and to come here and stand up by any Canadian railway that desires to get into the North-west by the Kettle River Railway. Surely they are not going to abandon that policy that they said last year was in the interests of the people of Canada. Now when the greatest corporation outside the Canadian Pacific Railway declares it wants no money or aid but simply asks a franchise to get into British Columbia, the Government are bound to stand by that policy and not abandon it, as the Minister of Public Works has done to-night. It is not a free question. It is a question on which the party is committed, on which the Minister of Railways very properly informed the House that it was in the public interest that the road should be built, and if he informed the House and the Railway Committee that this enterprise was in the public interest, then the Government are committed to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He spoke for himself.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman spoke as Minister of Railways, and I call upon him to stand by his declaration. If he cannot stand by that policy, then it is time for him to go out of the Government. I believe, however, that he will stand by the policy, and that he will bring his colleagues into agreement with his view. The Minister of Railways is perfectly right in taking the position assumed by him this session in respect to this Bill. It has been said that his statement was out of harmony with his declarations last year. What I understood his position to be was that he, as Minister of Railways, desired last session to open that country and secure a Canadian line there. The hon. gentleman can obtain a Canadian line into that country and have it there this year. The people of that country come here and say:

We have given large sums for the construction of a railway by the Canadian Pacific Railway; give us competition against the Canadian Pacific Railway, and allow the Grand Trunk, which is coming in from the south, to furnish us with that competition. Getting railway competition is one thing, and keeping the trade for our own people is another thing. We can attain both, but in different ways. We can get competition by giving railway franchises, and I believe you can thus secure competition in this instance. If you want to keep the trade in the country, there is a good old rule by which it can be accomplished, by the National Policy, by the tariff, and by levying export duties. We keep the trade in our country and prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway, at various points where it crosses in the United States, from taking away our trade, by the action of the National Policy, and we can keep it still further here by imposing export duties. Hon. gentlemen opposite are adopting the National Policy more and more every day, and it would be no trouble to them, after the progress they have made on the line of the National Policy, to come to this House and ask this House to place an export duty on ores and keep the trade here. This result can be accomplished by the National Policy being extended in that direction, and increased customs duties could be imposed, if they were necessary to keep the trade in Canada, and at the same time we should secure to our people railway competition. Who asks for this competition as regards British Columbia to-day? The people of Ontario, who contributed the larger portion of the \$4,000,000 voted last year. It is true the merchants of Toronto, notwithstanding the fact that they were hoodooed into refraining from passing a resolution in favour of the Kettle River road, demand entrance into British Columbia by way of Kettle River. They want that competition. When members of the Toronto Board of Trade attended a meeting the other day to pass a resolution in favour of this road, two or three Canadian Pacific Railway magnates induced the committee to postpone action; but the merchants of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec are to-day in favour of the Grand Trunk gaining free entrance into British Columbia by way of the North-west. Hon. members who spoke last session in defence of the Government's Crow's Nest Pass Railway Bill laid great stress on the advantage of competition and common trackage. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) said:

The Government will regulate that matter; I do not have the control of it personally at present. Then, we have the running powers over the new road through the Crow's Nest Pass. That is a very important item. It is a very good thing to have, and I have no doubt that the privilege will be carefully conserved in the interests of the people of Canada by the pre-

Mr. MACLEAN.

sent Government, which contains among its members some business men who, when they make a contract make it on business principles and in a business way.

That hon. gentleman considered last session that this Government when voting the large sum of money and giving this franchise to the Crow's Nest Pass road would accord common running rights over the railway, and give those running rights to any road asking for it. The Grand Trunk now asks to be allowed to enter that country and enjoy those rights, but the Minister of Public Works, who is a member of the Government, says they should not obtain them. Hon. gentlemen who supported the Crow's Nest Pass road pointed out the importance of giving running rights, and yet they are here to-day opposing a road which seeks to get into that part of the country. The Canadian Pacific Railway is posing as the all-Canadian road. To-day it crosses the boundary at a number of places, everywhere when there is an opportunity to obtain trade from the United States. Does the Canadian Pacific Railway give a single concession to the Canadian merchants? They give better terms to American merchants who will visit them at Montreal and obtain their rates across the continent. They have not granted liberal terms to any merchant in this country, but in everything they have been willing to sacrifice Canadian interests in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway. When another company comes to this House and asks permission to build a railway, it appears as if it could not obtain it. It is all very well to secure for an American road entrance into our country if we cannot get there with our own roads; but if we are there, we can protect ourselves by customs duties and export duties. This, however, is not an American road, but it is the Grand Trunk; they do not ask for any aid, but the Canadian Pacific Railway get everything. Here are members of the Government opposing legislation, and opposing a policy on which they are on record by legislation passed last session. I do not propose to detain the House any longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN. I see the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) in his seat, and I should like to hear him voice the opinion of his city on this question, and say whether the people of Ontario, in view of the money they have given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, not only in the North-west, but in British Columbia, are willing when a great railway company like the Grand Trunk simply asks for permission to get into the North-west, that the company should be prevented by members of the Government, who last session committed themselves to grant running rights over the very railway which they now seek to deny. I hope the Minister

of Railways will maintain his position, and I can tell him that the Grand Trunk are in earnest and have placed on record their desire and intention to get into the North-west. The Grand Trunk know that the moment they can touch the Crow's Nest Pass road they will have secured entrance into the North-west, for they can easily reach Lethbridge within six months. Let the Grand Trunk Railway reach that point, and they will soon get eastward to Port Arthur by some route or other. All we have to do in order to solve the transportation problem as regards the North-west is to allow a certain amount of freedom. Liberals are, however, blocking freedom and competition.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN. Especially the hon. gentleman who professes to be a Liberal, but who is a restrictionist, and who has no desire that British Columbia shall have the benefit of railway competition. I take issue with him on that point. British Columbia, the North-west and Manitoba are looking to-day to the time when the Grand Trunk will enter those portions of the Dominion, and that day will be the first time in the history of this country when the Canadian Pacific Railway will meet with a rival that will compel it to do justice to the Canadian people.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) appears to be very much interested in allowing the Grand Trunk to secure an entrance into the province of British Columbia, and he has dilated at great length on the necessity of allowing that road to reach Lethbridge. It is an easy matter for the Grand Trunk to reach Lethbridge to-day. That road could run directly from the United States and reach the Crow's Nest Pass, and then go down to the territory under discussion in this Bill. I fail to see what great benefit can accrue to the Grand Trunk by going over the twenty or thirty miles of this little railway which will be in Canada, seeing that they can reach the district over the Crow's Nest Pass Railway from Lethbridge. But this is not my main objection to this Bill. What I take exception to is, that this railway starts from American territory, enters Canadian territory, then skirts along the border for five or six miles, then runs back into United States territory, and then comes again into Canada, tapping the mines in the Greenwood Valley. Its advocates do not claim that there will be over 30 miles of it in Canada, and yet they have the assurance to come here and ask permission to build branch lines 20 miles long in any direction from these little spurs. I have told them, that if they will build their railway entirely in Canadian territory, I will support it. They tell us that, to do that, they will have to cross ranges of mountains. Well, others have to do that,

and, in doing so, they would, no doubt, open up rich mineral districts which would be of great value to Canada, whereas the road they now propose to construct will not confer any benefit on Canada, but will tap Canadian mines and bring the ores to the smelter at Northport. It has been already pointed out how, as soon as the Bill passed the committee, its promoters, supposing that it had passed the House, telegraphed in haste to the Pacific Coast, and caused rejoicing in Spokane and other American towns along the border, showing that the object was to take Canadian ores to Northport and to make Canadian territory the back-yard. I will support the Bill, if its promoters will make this an all-Canadian road, but I will oppose it in its present form.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, it has given me particular pleasure to hear the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) address the House to-night, because, we all know, that he has not been very well lately; and when he talks of Canada for the Canadians, I recognize the old Conservative training under which the hon. gentleman was brought up, and I am perfectly willing to admit that, when he was serving a different party, he did it in a manner altogether in the interest of Canada. I agree with him to-night, as I agreed with him before he left the old flag and the old policy, and, if I may say so, the old man. At that time we believed that the building up of Canada depended on keeping Canada for the Canadians. In supporting the Kettle River Railway Bill to-night, I consider that I am helping to keep Canada for Canadians. I want to know how any hon. gentleman who takes an interest in Canada, can stand up to-night and say that, to enable the Grand Trunk to get into that country, would be hurtful to the interests of Canada. We know that the development of the mines of that country is dependent upon obtaining the cheapest possible transport for the ores. I would be the last man to do anything to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway going into that country; but where is the cry of Canada for the Canadians, if you refuse the same privilege to the Grand Trunk, the pioneer railway of this country, when miners tell you that it is imperative for the successful development of the country that the low-grade ores produced there should be transported at the lowest possible rates? That is the reason I support this Bill to-night. Before that country was much known to the rest of Canada, Mr. Corbin and his friends went into that country and spent \$1,600,000 to open it up. They believed in the future of the mining interests of that region, and they spent their money freely to promote its development. Is it reasonable, then, after they have shown this interest in our country, that we should turn our backs upon those people and say to them: You cannot come into this country, because the

Canadian Pacific Railway is opposed to your scheme? I am one of those who took an interest in the building up of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Canada, and I think nobody can ever accuse me of having opposed the construction of that great work, which has so greatly developed the interests of Canada and made Canada what it is to-day. But, because we were successful in securing the co-operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate to build that railway, I, as a Canadian, believing in the future of Canada, am not prepared to say that we must halt now, and place the great undeveloped mineral lands of Canada in the hands of a monopoly. I do not want to keep the Canadian Pacific Railway out of that country, but I want to see the Grand Trunk have access to it, and I want to see those who believe in the future of Canada encouraged to invest their money, as Mr. Corbin has done, to develop the great mineral interests of the country.

The hon. Minister of Public Works has said that we wanted to keep that country in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway were building the Crow's Nest Pass and were going to build a railway into that country, which would furnish all the service required. Those who were present in the Committee on Railways and Canals know perfectly well what the discussion there disclosed. We were told there that the Canadian Pacific Railway were going to build a railway equal to that which they built across the continent. Sir, the miner may be called upon to face this difficulty. This Canadian Pacific Railway may go to the Government and say: The building of our line cost us \$25,000 or \$50,000 a mile, how can we reduce the rates to accommodate the miners? If Canada wishes to be true to the great mining interest of that region, she will allow another railway to enter that country and compete against the Canadian Pacific Railway. She will allow the Corbin Railway, which will be the line on which the Grand Trunk Railway will get a foothold, to obtain this charter, and thus by competition force the Canadian Pacific Railway to charge reasonable rates. It is impossible for me to understand how in this free Parliament of Canada a voice can be raised to prevent a great corporation like the Grand Trunk Railway getting a foothold in that country. It is perfectly right that the Canadian Pacific Railway should have the same privileges as the Grand Trunk Railway or any other company, but if the great mineral interests of Canada are to be developed, that country must have railway competition and thus have facilities for the transportation of its ores at the cheapest possible rate from the mines to the smelter. Standing by the principle of Canada for the Canadians, as I have always done, standing up in the interests of what I believe will be a new era in the history of Canada, anxious

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

to further the development of the undeveloped wealth in that part of the country. I propose to do all in my power to obtain for the Boundary Creek country all the railway facilities which are indispensable to its successful development. I am told that this new line is going to take away from Canada the trade and business which rightly belong to our people. I say it will not, for this reason. As my hon. friend from York has said, the Government of this country has got in its own hands the means of preventing the business of Canada from being removed into the United States. The Government has control of the tariff, it has all the means within its own hands of protecting Canada against the invasion of foreign goods; and in this district, which the greatest experts of the world believe is going to be one of the wealthiest mineral centres in the globe, it is our duty to let private enterprise have every facility to invest its funds in the building of railways and in every other means calculated to develop it. Sir, I am in favour of allowing every railway access into that country, and I think that in doing so I am serving the best interests of Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no desire to put off taking a vote on this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. But you are doing it.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no desire to do so if the House, in my humble estimation, properly understands the importance of the question on which it is called to vote. This is more than a question of building or not building thirty miles of railway. It is a question which, at one time, agitated the province of Manitoba, and with regard to which a rebellion was nearly caused in that province. It is the same question that it cost this country \$15,000,000 to settle with regard to the North-west; and to-day this House is asked to absolutely give away for nothing what cost us so much in times past. I do not think that so far as the House appreciates the gravity of the situation. This is an attempt to re-establish by precedent, on the authority of this House, the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway in western Canada—to establish that monopoly which was the principal objection on the part of the Liberals to the original Canadian Pacific charter; to repeat that provision which was the most objectionable one in that charter, and which the very Government that made the bargain had to buy out at a cost of \$15,000,000. Surely this new Parliament, under a new Government, will not perpetuate, of its own motion, for no consideration whatever a condition of affairs that it cost the country already \$15,000,000 to get rid of it. It is a question of more than millions. It is a question as to whether the country can be kept under the Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly or not.

That is the question before the House and the one on which as a resident of the North-west for many years I desire to speak. I say that however great have been the advantages of railway construction and railway extension in that region, the disadvantages of railway monopoly have to a very large extent destroyed those other advantages which cost this country so many millions of dollars. If the merchants, manufacturers and business men of this eastern country have not received those returns in extended trade in the North-west which they had the right to expect, they can thank the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In British Columbia there is as great necessity for railway competition as there has been in the North-west. There is greater necessity, if that were possible, and I ask this House to pause and reflect before adopting a policy which will be one of absolute railway monopoly in British Columbia and thereby in the North-west Territories as well.

An hon. MEMBER. That will do.

Mr. OLIVER. No, it will not do. I wish to speak of the effect of competition in regard to the development of the Kootenay country, in which the constituency I represent is equally interested with the British Columbia coast cities, for which some gentlemen speak so loudly. Let me give one instance in regard to the development of the trade in the Kootenay country. There is a district there, known as the Sandon district, in which silver-mining is carried on. It is in that district that the greater part of the products sent from Alberta to the Kootenay are sold. There are in that district two railways, the Kaslo and Slocan and the Canadian Pacific under the name of the Nakusp and Slocan. Both of these were built into the Sandon country for the purpose of carrying the ores of that country to the smelters of the United States. The Kaslo and Slocan is practically a connection of the Great Northern. It is only by the competition of these two railways in carrying the ores to the smelters that the Sandon district is a paying proposition. The ores are chiefly carried, I believe, to Omaha, by both—

Mr. SPEAKER. The time for consideration of private Bills having expired, the House will resume the consideration of the Budget.

WAYS AND MEANS--THE BUDGET.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the House was delighted this afternoon to find that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), after a couple of years' resting, had recovered his usual vigour of utterance. I was much interested in a pleasant story he told about an English Conservative member of Parliament, who stated that in Eng-

land it was jaw, jaw, jaw all the time. Now, if that English member of Parliament had been in this Chamber this afternoon, or if he had been within a mile of this Chamber this afternoon, he would have said there was jaw, jaw, jaw in Canada as well. I am quite sure that the statements made by the Minister of Customs were as utterly reckless and void of accuracy as they were loud and bombastic in utterance. They were a tissue of—shall I call them misrepresentations? I think that is quite parliamentary. Some of his statements call for an answer, and I shall endeavour to reply to some of them, at any rate, as briefly as I can. The hon. gentleman says that we insinuate base and cowardly charges against some of his colleagues. He did not give their names, but he looked upon the gentleman on his right, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), and pictured him as an angel of light. Well, that is not the opinion that his political friends have of that hon. gentleman. We read in the daily papers that down in Montreal, which, I believe, is the home of the Minister of Public Works, there are various Liberal clubs. One of these is called the Club Letellier, a good Liberal name. Its members have been spending their time pitching into the Minister of Public Works, and in no measured terms either. Then, there is the Geoffrion Club, another Liberal organization, named after one of the hon. gentleman's colleagues, whose members have been equally vigorous in attacking the Minister of Public Works. Then, there is the Bickerdike Club, named after a prominent Liberal, whose members have been also employed, not only in opposing, but in exposing, the hon. Minister. And I remember reading a speech, the other day, by Mr. Lebeuf, a very vigorous speech, which I have no doubt the Minister of Public Works has read.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was very long.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, and very pointed; and it does not spare the Minister of Public Works, but accuses him of every political crime in the calendar, and proves them pretty well, I think. But there is still another club there, and it does not abuse the hon. Minister, for every member of it is an ardent friend of his. It is called the Tarte Club. There is nothing too good for the members of the Tarte Club, I am told, just as the Prime Minister said nothing was too good for Mr. Tarte himself.

Now, at the winding up of the speech of the Minister of Customs, he stated, as he has stated in Parliament before and on the hustings many times, that the Tories predicted all sorts of calamities if the Liberals should get into power. Well, I suppose we must plead guilty to that charge. And why did we make these predictions? Because we believed that these gentlemen were honest in proclaiming their programme, and

that they would carry out in office what they had pledged themselves to when in Opposition. Have they done so? Not in a single instance have they carried out their programme. I challenge the hon. gentleman to state one single item of their programme in Opposition that they have carried into effect to-day, though their third session in office has nearly elapsed. Why, we all know what their programme was, for we read their speeches and the resolutions that were passed in the Liberal conventions. I have here the speech of an hon. gentleman who said:

In a farming community such as this we should be allowed to import agricultural implements free of duty. I know from personal experience, especially from what I saw in Manitoba, that the manufacturers in Canada do not take advantage of the high duty to improve their goods for the benefit of the people of Canada. They take that 30 per cent and put it in their own pockets, and that is the main result of the National Policy.

The gentleman who made that speech is now sitting on the Treasury benches.

Mr. SPROULE. Name.

Mr. WALLACE. That is the speech of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). What has he to say to-day? That he was overruled in the Cabinet, or that he has changed his views? Why, these hon. gentlemen, when they got into power, not satisfied with the protection which had been given to the manufacturers of agricultural implements by the Conservative protectionist Government, actually gave them further protection. They left the duty of 20 per cent on the implements untouched, and reduced the duties on their raw material.

An hon. MEMBER. Biscuits.

Mr. WALLACE. Just as in the case of biscuits where they have given more protection by reducing the duty on their raw material. It is true that now they have increased the duty somewhat, but as to the working out of that, the Minister of Finance is not able to express an opinion. There is another member of the Government who also, in addressing the electors, laid down what the programme of the party was to be. The present Prime Minister of Canada made a speech in Halifax in which he said, as reported by the Halifax "Chronicle":

In 1878, on the return of the Conservative party to power, flour was taxed 50 cents per barrel. Last year the tax was increased to 75 cents per barrel. What is the reason for that tax, and what is its effect? I suppose that every Conservative will agree that though we must pay taxes and levy a revenue, if there is an article which should be exempted from taxation it is bread. That is an article which should only be taxed when a country is driven to defend its territory and its honour. We in Canada are not in that position. If we were, every one would be willing to sacrifice his life if necessary. The

Mr. WALLACE.

tax cannot be necessary for the purpose of revenue, for we have more revenue than we want. If it is not for revenue, what is it for? The intention is to prevent American flour from coming into the country, to force you to buy Canadian flour, to make the article scarce, to prevent competition, and to make bread dear.

These were the evil results of putting a tax on flour.

Is that not the reason? In this province you do not grow wheat, and in our province we are obliged to import our flour; but in Ontario and Manitoba wheat is grown, and it is to put money into the pockets of the farmers of Ontario and of Manitoba at the expense of the people of Quebec and of this province that that tax is being imposed.

That was the statement made by the present Prime Minister. What is their position to-day? Why, Sir, 12 cents a bushel on wheat and 60 cents a barrel on flour is the tariff they have got this House to adopt. He made another speech in which he said, with regard to the question of coal:

You produce large quantities of coal in this province; in Ontario and Quebec we do not produce coal, but we have a cold climate and must have coal. In order to compel us to get it from Nova Scotia, and in order to put a profit into the pockets of the coal owners of this province a duty of 50 cents a ton has been put on the American coal that lies within a stone's throw of our borders. This may be politics, but it is not patriotism.

How does the Government stand to-day? They have increased the duty from 50 cents to 53 cents per ton. Of course, 50 cents was robbery, was unjustifiable and unpatriotic, but 53 cents is exactly right. What have these gentlemen to say as to that? What have they to say as to their broken pledges, as to their utter disregard of the promises they made to the electors when seeking their suffrages? So I say that when the Minister of Customs taunts us with a non-fulfilment of our predictions, these statements are an answer to him, because they prove that when these gentlemen were in Opposition they gave utterances to statements and to a policy which they were either dishonest in stating at that time, or, after they came into power, they were afraid to put their theories into practice.

Now, Sir, I have some remarks to make with regard to that elaborate statement made by the Minister of Customs with regard to the effect of the preferential tariff, and how it was going to reduce the prices of articles. Sir, I have this to say of it, that a more dishonest statement was never presented to this House, it is a statement misleading and untrue. The Minister of Customs said it was prepared for him. Well, I do not know or care who prepared it, but I shall prove that it is a dishonest and misleading statement. He starts out with saying that he is going to give a list of articles upon which there has been a decrease of duty under the new tariff. In

that statement he quotes coal. There was a specific duty upon that, but he says there was 4 per cent of a decrease in the duty paid on importations; on cotton manufactures there was 6½ per cent of a decrease; gloves, 5 7-10ths per cent; hats and caps, 5½ per cent. I asked the hon. gentleman, was that decrease a reduction of the percentage of the cost of the article, or of the percentage of the duty itself. The hon. gentleman did not reply. Whether he could not reply, or whether he did not desire to, he knows best himself. Then he turns over the leaf and says: I will give you a list of 107 articles on which there have been reductions of some enormous percentages. He says: Here is a reduction on an article of 20 per cent, here is a reduction on an article of 46 per cent. Why, Sir, what is the truth of the matter? Take, for example, paris green, the first item that strikes my eye. The old duty was 10 per cent under the preferential tariff as applied to Great Britain, he says it will be 7½ per cent, that the duty paid for British importations under the new tariff after the 1st of July, will show a reduction of 25 per cent. Why, I say it is a reduction of 2½ per cent, just one-tenth of what he says. A more misleading statement never was presented to this House. Then he goes on to say that on bricks the old duty was 20 per cent, under the preferential tariff from Britain it will be 15 per cent, which, he says, is a reduction of 25 per cent. I say it is a reduction of 5 per cent and nothing more. The entire statement is misleading, whether it was intended to be or not, and is untrue as well.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The statement is quite correct. What is the difference between \$10 and \$7.50? Is it not 25 per cent?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the hon. gentleman must take his hat off when he addresses the House.

Mr. WALLACE. No matter, there is nothing underneath it. Then the hon. gentleman says buckthorn fencing was 15 per cent, under this preferential it would be 11½ per cent, and he says there is 25 per cent reduction. I say it is 3½ per cent reduction, no more and no less. On one hundred dollar's worth of importations, under the old they paid \$15 duty, under the new they pay \$11.25 duty, or 3½ per cent on the one hundred dollars less duty. That is the sum and substance of it. Then there is another article, mushroom spawn. He says they were 20 per cent and they made that free, a reduction of 100 per cent. I would like to know how they could reduce it 100 per cent.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Because it was put on the free list.

Mr. WALLACE. The people will be delighted that mushroom spawn is put on the free list, and that is perhaps the most important reduction submitted for our con-

sideration. Every farmer in this country will be delighted to hear that mushroom spawn is reduced 100 per cent. They can get it free.

Mr. BERGERON. On toast.

Mr. WALLACE. Here are files and articles the farmers use. The hon. gentleman did not tell the House that as regards agricultural implements nine-tenths of the articles remain the same to-day as they were before, that is 20 per cent. The reduction of one-fourth of the duty in favour of Great Britain will not affect the price of those articles one cent to the farmers. Take binders, mowers, ploughs and the whole list; they are not coming here from Great Britain, our opposition is the United States. We are sending them to Great Britain. The hon. gentleman said that there are a lot of other articles which Great Britain sends to us, and here he hands us a list of 107 articles used by farmers and largely imported from Great Britain. The hon. gentleman was bound to give us the information he had under his hand as to how many of those articles come from Great Britain and how many from the United States, so that we might be able to judge whether he was presenting the case fairly to the House. But the hon. gentleman has not done so. I have prepared a brief statement during the short time at my disposal, and I will read some of the returns of the articles quoted by the hon. gentleman, showing that as regards the articles so quoted when he said the duty was 35 per cent under the tariff, and that under the one-fourth reduction the rate would be 18½ per cent, the farmers will receive no benefit. Those articles are produced principally in the United States; the Americans are our competitors, and practically they are our only competitors. The hon. gentleman did not tell the House that fact. He stated that those articles are imported largely from Great Britain. Why did he not tell the House what quantities were imported from Great Britain and the United States respectively. Take the first article of agricultural implements. Of scythes there was imported from Great Britain \$2,572 worth, and \$15,200 worth from the United States. The hon. gentleman did not tell the House that those articles were imported almost entirely from the United States. Of post hole diggers and agricultural tools, the importation from Great Britain last year was of the value of \$1,519; from the United States \$38,000. The hon. gentleman had these facts under his hand, but he appears to have kept them back. About twenty-five times as much in value came in from the United States as from Great Britain. If the hon. gentleman takes another quarter off the duty our competitors will still be the United States, and Great Britain is not in the race. Shovels: the value from Great Britain was \$1,601; from the United State, \$20,340. Why did the hon.

gentleman not tell the House that fact. Clothes wringers: the value from Great Britain was \$14; from the United States, \$6,804. Yet the hon. gentleman talks of the benefits the Government are conferring on English manufacturers. The hon. gentleman said a short time ago when the leader of the Opposition stated that the preferential tariff was not understandable, that "all the papers in the United Kingdom everywhere have understood this tariff and understanding it have appreciated and admired it." Did they understand it, and do they know that there is a preference of one-fourth of the duties given on clothes wringers, of which \$14 worth was imported last year from Great Britain as compared with \$6,804 in value from the United States. Next we have farmers' pronged forks: from Great Britain there came the value of \$3; from the United States, \$8,065.

An hon. MEMBER. What percentage?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister of Customs is a good hand at reckoning percentages, and no doubt he will do so. Then there were of pumps imported from Great Britain the value of \$1,085; from the United States, \$85,506. Yet the hon. gentleman says, look at the immense benefits we are conferring on the manufacturers of England. It is an utter delusion. These goods will be made in Canada or in the United States; there will be no competition from Great Britain, and the figures show it. Pails, washtubs and so forth: from Great Britain the value of \$82; from the United States, \$13,545. Furniture from Great Britain the value of \$26,559; from the United States, \$249,754, or more than nine times as much. So the list goes on. I have not time to read all the figures, but no doubt these facts will be sufficient to show the House the true state of the case.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Give us woollens and cottons.

Mr. WALLACE. As regards woollens and cottons, I will speak of them a little later, and I will be able to demonstrate, that hon. gentlemen opposite, if they get their own way with respect to this matter, will destroy the woollen industry and badly cripple the cotton industry as well. There was to be an enormous reduction in price. But hon. gentlemen have increased the duty on cleaned rice. I have here a statement which I have received through the courtesy of the Minister of Customs; it is a statement of the imports for six months of the year 1896 and the corresponding six months of the year 1897. In the six months of 1896 there was imported \$66,000 worth of rice, on which a duty was paid of \$37,000, and in the six months of 1897 there was imported \$147,000 worth, on which a duty was paid of \$83,000. The duty in 1896 was 56 per cent, and in 1897 55½ per cent, notwithstanding the fact that there was a 12½ per cent reduction, not only for Great Britain, but for all the British

Mr. WALLACE.

possessions, including Burma and the other countries from which rice comes. Next year rice will not come from these countries at the same rate, because we are informed that British India will not be included in the preferential rate. Therefore, it is admitted that these goods have come in this year at a lower rate than they will be admitted at next year. It is the same with regard to all the other articles. On wood screws the duty was 35 per cent, and it is now 26¼ per cent, which the hon. gentleman says is a reduction of 25 per cent. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a reduction of just about one-third of that—a reduction of 8¾ per cent. The duty on straw board was reduced from 25 per cent to 18¼ per cent, a reduction of 6¼ per cent; and yet the hon. gentleman makes it a reduction of 25 per cent. With regard to small agricultural implements, he claims a reduction of 46 per cent. Even with the tariff at the preferential rate, it would only be a reduction of 16¼ per cent; but, as a matter of fact, it is only 10 per cent reduction.

Hon. gentlemen say that a reduction in the duty means a decrease in price to the consumer. Does it, Mr. Speaker? I would like to ask these hon. gentlemen where they get their proofs of that. I will quote to them some figures which, I think, will entirely disprove their statement. You know that some years ago the Government of that day abolished the duty of 50 cents per ton on anthracite coal. It is a matter of fact that can be verified, and I make the statement because I have watched the course of events ever since, that the consumer never got one farthing of advantage from that reduction of duty. The transportation companies or the mine-owners, or both put together, have kept up the prices, so that they are higher to-day than they were when the duty was on. They have not reduced the price because the duty was taken off, and it will be the same with regard to other articles.

The hon. gentleman boasted that they had reduced the duty 100 per cent on binder twine. Well, Sir, I have a statement here, which I present as an accurate statement, showing that binder twine was sold by the Hobbs Company in 1897 as follows: Sisal, \$5.25; standard, \$5.50; and manilla, \$6.25.

Mr. TAYLOR. And they got it at \$4.

Mr. WALLACE. And the developments of the Public Accounts Committee showed that they got it at \$4 from the Government of Canada. The Minister of Customs told us that 100 per cent was taken off the duty. You would think the farmers would get their binder twine for nothing. What are the facts? Here is the price list for 1898; Sisal, \$5.75 against \$5.25 when there was a duty on it; standard, which was \$5.50 last year, is \$6.25 this year, or 75 cents per hundred pounds dearer than it was when the duty was on it; manilla, which was \$6.25 last year, is this year \$6.87.

What does that show? It shows that, though the Government have taken off the duty, they have destroyed a Canadian industry without a single reason for doing so, because I say that if the farmer needs protection—and he does, and he gets it in abundance, and hon. gentlemen opposite are afraid to touch one single item of that protection, except one which I will refer to later—and if the manufacturers of other lines of goods are entitled to protective duties, then I say the manufacturers of binder twine are equally entitled to protection from the Government of Canada. They have destroyed a Canadian industry without cause, and the farmer is paying from 50 cents to \$1 per hundred pounds more for binder twine than he was when there was a duty on it. The result that will inevitably follow will be that the American manufacturers, who have a combination, will raise the price as soon as they have destroyed the competition here. That is the history of American manufacturers, and it will continue to be so if we permit them to exploit in Canada and take possession of Canadian industries. The men who made binder twine have had to go to the United States to seek employment. It is an utterly indefensible proceeding, for the benefit of American manufacturers, and to the injury of the Canadian farmers.

Barbed wire was sold last year at 2½ cents a pound. This year, although the duty has been taken off or reduced 100 per cent, as the Minister of Customs tells us, the price is still fixed at 2½ cents a pound. The farmer does not get one bit of advantage, while the country loses the duty and the manufactures of this country are destroyed, and the workmen have to cross the line to seek employment which is denied them at home.

The Minister of Customs told us with a great flourish of trumpets that they had paid out for a half year \$521,000 under this preferential tariff. To whom did they pay it? To people they intended to pay it to? Nothing of the kind. The present tariff law denies that privilege to nineteen-twentieths of the countries. They paid it out under a mistake; they blundered. I do not know how much of it would belong to Great Britain, and how much to other countries. Perhaps the Minister of Customs can tell us.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It was not paid out. It was that much reduction on the rate of duty, and the refunds that were paid on claims that came in under the reciprocal tariff.

Mr. WALLACE. The refund is paying out, I should think. You collected the duty and then the Government had to pay it back, because they collected it erroneously. The Minister of Customs refunded it to the parties who had paid it.

Mr. WALLACE. Why did the hon. gentleman say it was not paid out?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It would not have been paid out if the goods had been correctly entered.

Mr. WALLACE. That is, if the Government had done their duty, it would not have been paid, but it was paid because they did not.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know that I can explain it so as to make it clear to an hon. gentleman who says that if an article is charged 15 per cent duty, and you then transfer it to the free list, you are only making a reduction of 15 per cent on the duty.

Mr. WALLACE. If on \$100 worth of importation, the duty is 15 per cent, and you throw off 15 per cent, that 15 per cent which you throw off amounts to \$15. You do not give \$100 back, but only \$15. The hon. gentleman thinks he is giving \$100 back, but he does not. He has been refunding so liberally that he does not know whether he is giving back the principle or the interest. Hon. gentlemen laugh. It is very laughable, is it not, Mr. Speaker? The hon. gentleman has not answered my question as to how much of that \$521,000 went to Great Britain—because he told us there was an abatement of that amount—and how much went to other countries.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not the exact information under my hands. I suppose the hon. gentleman means how much went to other countries that shared in the preferential clause. I have not that under my hands at present, but, of course, he knows, from his knowledge of the Customs Department and of trade generally, that the great bulk of it would be an abatement of the duties on goods from Great Britain.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not so sure of that. They tell me to-day, and I know it is true, that German agents are going through this country selling goods that will benefit by the full reduction of 25 per cent between the first of July and the first of August. These goods are to be delivered here in July, and will get the benefit of that 25 per cent reduction. After the first of August they will not be entitled to it, but they are selling millions of dollars worth of goods for delivery in July, and it was never intended by this Parliament that German goods should be entitled to this reduction at all. But that is just due to the blunder of hon. gentlemen opposite, who would not take the views of the Opposition with regard to that matter.

Now we come to the speeches on the Budget themselves. The statements made by hon. gentlemen so far have been more remarkable for what they did not contain than for what they did contain. Why,

there is the very important question of the duty on lumber. Parliament passed an Act last session giving the Government the power, if the Americans placed a duty on lumber, to put a corresponding duty on lumber of \$2 per thousand feet. The American duty is \$2 per thousand feet, and on lumber tongued, planed and grooved the duty reaches as high as \$3.50 per thousand feet. What have the Government done with regard to that power which they received? They have not told us what conclusion they have come to. We are told that they are a business Government, attending to business all the time. I very much doubt it from what we saw to-night. We saw one Minister getting up on an important question of public policy—the question of the right of railways from a foreign country to come into Canada—and making a speech strongly in favour of allowing that right, and another Minister making a speech as violently opposed to it. I think that in a great question of that kind, the Government should have a policy, and should come down to this House as a unit. But we are told that this is the outcome of quarrels inside the closed doors, and that the gentlemen who aired themselves on the question settled their difficulties in Parliament when they could not settle them in the Cabinet. I think we are entitled to a statement from the Government with regard to the duty on lumber and with regard to the export duty on logs. They received the power last year to put an export duty on logs if the American Government put a duty on lumber. The American Government did put a duty on Canadian lumber. What has become of that law which these hon. gentlemen placed on the Statute-book a year ago. They have to-day no statement to make on that point. The Ministers of Finance and Trade and Commerce have made no declaration with regard to that matter, and we are entitled at this stage to know what the Government propose to do.

Then there is another matter. We know that negotiations were proceeding during the whole of last summer, fall and winter with regard to additional subsidies to the provinces of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Quebec and probably to other provinces as well. We ought to have a definite statement on that subject. Why have the Government not come down with one? If they are going to grant additional subsidies to those provinces, why have they not come down with a statement, or why, when those different provinces are looking after this matter, does the Government, in its financial statement, not say we are unable or unwilling to and refuse to give additional subsidies to the provinces. Why do they not come with a statement of that kind and relieve the country and relieve those provinces from the uncertainty under which they are labouring. If it is the intention of the Government to supply these addi-

tional subsidies, it was their bounden duty to inform the House of it in the Budget speech.

There is another matter and that is the coolness of the Government in assuming credit for everything to themselves. If there are prosperous times in this country, if the mining interests are booming, that is all due, according to the Minister of Customs at any rate—the others were a little more modest—to the administration of this Government. Why, they never moved their hand in these matters. They are not entitled to one particle of credit, because they have done absolutely nothing to promote the mining interests and industries of this country. But if the fisheries interest has improved, if the lumber interest has improved, it is not due to any action of the Government. In fact their policy has been injurious to the lumber interest of the country, and the Government ought to take the House and the country into their confidence now and tell us what they propose to do. But they have had good example for taking credit to themselves for everything. For do we not know that the Prime Minister of Canada himself, in a speech which he made in Montreal, and in another which he made in Toronto, distinctly took credit to himself for everything that had occurred within the last few years, even before he came into power? Why, he stated, in the city of Montreal, that it was found impossible for one colony to have a treaty with another colony. I protested against that, said he, and I had the law changed. Did the hon. gentleman know that that was done years before he came into power? Did he know that that was the outcome of the Ottawa Conference, at which a resolution was passed, demanding that Great Britain should give the colonies power to make treaties among themselves? The British Parliament, in response to that request, did give the colonies that power. And yet the hon. Prime Minister claimed credit for that, when addressing a meeting in Montreal. Another thing he said was, that the transportation problem was the great problem of the future, and that, if food could be carried cheaply from this country, they would be delivered cheaply in Liverpool, and so that we could control the trade of the English market. And he said:

With that object in view, we have commenced to deepen the canals, and it is, I am sure, an operation which must be welcomed in every part of Canada.

Why, you know, Mr. Speaker, for you have been in Parliament a long time, that millions of dollars had been voted every year for twenty years for the purpose of deepening the canals. The plan was to make a 14 foot canal system throughout, and the work was nearly completed when these hon. gentlemen came into power. It only required a year or two for its completion. The work

was started by Mr. Mackenzie, more than twenty years ago. "We have commenced deepening the canals," said the hon. gentleman. Why, he was only carrying out the plan of a 14-foot system, which had already nearly been completed, but which could not be brought into use until the last link in the chain was finished.

Another statement that he made at the meeting in the city of Montreal was, that he had made Canada a nation—as though he had done it by the waving of a magic wand. Now, I do not believe that more unfair or more ungenerous statements could be made by a public man—unfair to every other colony of the British Empire. In Montreal the hon. gentleman said :

I was in Paris, in the land of my ancestors, when the telegraph wires flashed the news that England had denounced the treaties which she had maintained for twenty years and more with Germany and Belgium. What was Canada before that day? On the continent of Europe, what was it—in France, in Germany, and everywhere else? Simply a name, simply a blotch on the map, and nothing more. But when the day came that at the instance of Canada,—

At the instance of Canada, mind you.

—England, a great nation, denounced her treaties with Germany and Belgium, and signed to the German Zollverein and to the Belgium Kingdom that twelve months hence those treaties would cease, on that day I felt a proud citizen, because on that day my dreams were realized, and Canada became a factor among the nations of the earth.

What are the facts with regard to that matter? At a conference of the colonial Premiers, at a conference at which there were ten other premiers beside Sir Wilfrid Laurier, held on the 4th June, 1897, in the city of London, Mr. Chamberlain delivered an address, in the course of which he said :

Her Majesty's Government desires to know from the colonies whether, so far as they are concerned, if it be found that the arrangements proposed by Canada are inconsistent with the conditions of these treaties, they desire that these treaties shall be denounced. If that be the unanimous wish of the colonies, after considering the effect of that denunciation upon them, as well as upon us, because they also are concerned in the arrangements which are made by these treaties, then all I can say at the present time is that Her Majesty's Government will most earnestly consider such a recommendation from the colonies and will give to it the favourable regard which such a memorial deserves.

Well, Sir, in pursuance of that invitation from Mr. Chamberlain, the conference passed a resolution, in the following terms :—

That the Premiers of the self-governing colonies unanimously and earnestly recommend the denunciation at the earliest convenient time, of any treaties which now hamper the commercial relations between Great Britain and her colonies

There was the resolution passed at a meeting of the representatives of eleven distinct

colonies of Great Britain. And yet, Sir, the Prime Minister of Canada coolly takes to himself the whole credit for it. I say, it is ungenerous and unfair—

An hon. MEMBER. And untrue.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, and untrue. Now, after the Canadian Prime Minister had ostentatiously refused to ask for a preferential treatment for colonial products in the British market, he made the excuse, in Toronto, that perhaps he was asking for too much, and was trying to delude the British statesmen. Why, there never was a greater injury done to Canadian interests than that done by the Prime Minister on that occasion. What does Mr. Chamberlain say? He made a speech the other day, which, the papers say, was one of the most important he ever delivered. He invites Canada and the other colonies to take the initiative to ask for what they want, and says that Britain will meet them more than half way. I will read only one or two extracts from his speech, as it appears in the Toronto papers of Saturday last :

There is another duty which, I think, is incumbent upon the British Government, and that is to draw closer to our colonies, to the sister nations of our race across the seas, and to seek in our own family the strength and support which we shall never find from foreign nations.

Again, he says :

What was it that struck every intelligent impartial observer? It was the growth of an over-mastering and a universal desire in favour of closer union. * * * Our policy is to bind the colonies closer to us by all means in our power, and, if not now, yet to pave the way for a future union which will be closer than anything that is now practicable. We shall not attempt—that would be foolish—we shall not attempt to put pressure upon our colonies to go one step further than they themselves desire to go. It is not for us to take the initiative. We would rather follow the lead; but what I think we have already accomplished is to convince them that wherever they live, however far their homes may be from the centre and from the motherland, we, at any rate, are prepared to meet them more than half-way in any approach which they may make to us, in any desire which they may express for their closer union. * * * In what form I know not—it would be foolish to attempt to predict. It may be in the shape of a commercial union, of the Imperial Zollverein, which I do not think to be so absurd as do some political economists. * * * But in whatever way it may be presented to us, we shall not be deterred either by the economic pedantries or the selfishness which is a virtue with some politicians, from giving favourable consideration to any proposals which our brethren across the seas may make to us. And in such a consideration I, for one, do not believe the English people will keep a strict account of profit and loss—that they will seek to be assured of a present pecuniary gain in return for so much concession on their part. * * * I have endeavoured to speak to you, and perhaps to indicate and suggest even more than I stated, about the policy which we think it right to

pursue in reference to our colonial system, and to the attacks which are being made upon it. * * * We shall try to earn the confidence of our colonial fellow-subjects by making their interests our own.

In face of that speech the Minister of Finance told us the other day that Great Britain was wedded to the abolition of the corn laws, that they would never listen for a moment to a proposal to give a preference in their markets to the products of Canada or of any other British colonies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I did not say they never would.

Mr. WALLACE. No, the hon. gentleman said the day was so far distant that it was useless to build upon it. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance what he has to say now to that statement made by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain about the same day. I say that in view of that statement the immediate duty of the Government is to revive the question, to put aside the statement made by the Prime Minister when he was in England, and to say that the interests and views of the people of Canada are not as the Prime Minister stated them to be, but that it would bind the colonies to Great Britain in a more lasting union if they were conceded, and they can be conceded without injury to Great Britain.

Now, I must say that in my opinion the Government have been remiss in their duties with regard to opening up trade in the Yukon country. We know that last summer when the Government knew the enormous possibilities of that Yukon trade and what it was necessary to do in order to secure it, not a single step had been taken by the customs authorities to make arrangements with the United States so that we could have what we were justly entitled to with regard to that trade. They stood by with folded hands during the last session of Parliament, from March, 1897, because we were told that they then had information of the enormous discoveries in that Yukon country. But we find that there were speculators, that there were railroad contractors that knew all about this matter. They went up there, they sent their men up there, and they explored the route for getting into that country. The Government knew all about it, but they folded their arms and took no steps. Now we are asked to vote a sum of \$396,000 to provide for the government of the Yukon. I venture to say that this is a totally indefensible proposition, there is no necessity for such an enormous expenditure. I remember when I was Controller of Customs that one of the managers of these transportation companies that carry goods up the Yukon River into the British Yukon country, told me that they would deliver provisions into the British Yukon for \$1 per day per man, that they would buy the provisions and deliver them in Dawson City or any of those points for \$1 per day, all the provi-

Mr. WALLACE.

sions a man would require. Well, that is not such an enormous expenditure. Anywhere else in Canada I presume the cost would be one-half of that. If you send up a number of the North-west Mounted Police for the preservation of order there, it will not involve such an enormous expenditure. Therefore, I say the necessity for expending \$396,000 is altogether out of proportion to the necessities of the occasion. But when this Stikine Railway proposal came up we found that neither the Minister of Finance, nor the Minister of Trade and Commerce, nor the Minister of Customs had gone to Washington to make arrangements, but it was the Minister of the Interior who was sent. I would like to know what he knows about customs arrangements. He came back and said everything was fixed. He had been up in the North-west himself, and been through a portion of the country, and he had made up his mind that the Stikine River route was the proper route; yet in going to Washington he makes no negotiations regarding customs on goods going by that route. Arrangements were made for going up the Yukon River and by other routes, but not by this route where the Government propose to build a railway. Why, Sir, I say that the Customs Department was grossly negligent and remiss in their duties. I remember that when I was Controller of Customs, on the first notice that we had, I think it was in 1893, that gold was discovered there, we lost no time in sending up a customs collector. He was a member of the North-west Mounted Police, and was to receive, I think, 10 per cent on the collections, in addition to his pay as a member of the force, which was pretty fair remuneration for him. Now, the Government propose the enormous expenditure of nearly \$400,000 for the North-west Mounted Police and carrying on the Government without having made the necessary customs arrangements with the United States. They are all at sixes and sevens with regard to that matter. I saw a statement in a paper the other day that the Americans were not carrying out the arrangements that the Minister of Customs announced to the House had been made. Is that correct?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know what you may have seen in the papers, what I stated in the House would be correct.

Mr. WALLACE. What I saw in the papers was that the Americans refuse to carry out the arrangements that the Minister stated in the House had been made, because they said the Canadian customs officers were placed at a point they would not recognize as Canada, at Dyea and Skagway.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have seen that statement in the papers.

Mr. WALLACE. Has the hon. gentleman any knowledge of the correctness of that statement?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, that is the report just come down.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, we would next like to know if the Minister has taken any steps to verify that statement, has he done anything to protect Canadian interests and to see that some arrangements are made, not only there but on the Stikine-Teslin route? In my opinion the department have been grossly negligent in their duty in that regard, and have not looked properly after Canadian interests, and as a consequence, the business is being largely done through American sources. Again, the regulations which he has announced are drawn in such a loose way that I think the Government will not collect much of the revenue they are entitled to. I have here a copy of the regulations, and I think the Minister entirely misapprehends the whole position there. If settlers come to any part of Canada, bringing their wives, their families, their furniture and household goods with them, we bid them a warm welcome, because they come here to make Canada their home. We do not ask what country they come from or what religion they profess, we give them a warm welcome, and only require that they shall obey Canadian laws. But with those going into the Yukon country the case is entirely different. They are not settlers in any sense of the term. They are simply adventurers coming from all parts of the world into Canada to make what they can here, and to get out of it as quickly as possible. Yet the Minister in his regulations says:

Wearing apparel, articles of personal adornment, toilet articles and similar personal effects of persons arriving in Canada, may be passed free, without entry at customs, as travellers' baggage, under the provisions of the customs tariff, but this provision shall only include such articles as actually accompany and are in the use of and as are necessary and appropriate for the wear and use of such persons for the immediate purpose of the journey, and present comfort and convenience, and shall not be held to apply to merchandise or articles intended for other persons or for sale.

All those people going into the North-west we are told are taking their equipments with them; one year's or six months' provisions, together with blankets and goods of every description. Under the loose drawing of this clause all these goods may probably go in free. The Minister has no right to let them go in free.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Does the hon. gentleman say that six months' or one year's provisions will go in free?

Mr. WALLACE. It does not say that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Why did you say it?

Mr. WALLACE. They are taking in six months' or twelve months' provisions.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Who told you that?

Mr. WALLACE. I read it in the papers. I have not made the statement that they have not paid duty on it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You are quoting the articles given free admission.

Mr. WALLACE. I read the clause of the customs regulations.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is the regulation defining what is traveller's baggage under the tariff applicable to all parts of the Dominion. It is the ordinary regulation. But the hon. gentleman is leading the House to understand, whether intentionally or not, that six months' or a year's provisions are going in free.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not going to allow the Minister to misstate what I said. I said this, that these goods have free entry to go into the Yukon and Stikine districts; that this is a special regulation made for that country. The Minister now tells us that it is a regulation which prevails everywhere.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. For travellers' baggage.

Mr. WALLACE. Regulations that prevail everywhere else should not prevail in the Yukon district.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is a different ground.

Mr. WALLACE. The people did not go there as settlers or to remain in the country, but simply to make a haul and go out. Every one knows they will not remain there permanently. Under these regulations, drawn as they are and interpreted as the customs officers there will interpret them, and we have seen them interpret other regulations, the matters will be very loosely conducted, because I suppose the custom-house officers are men who have had no experience. Am I correct?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Who is the officer?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Earle) will be able to tell the hon. gentleman that one of the most experienced custom-house officers in Victoria was sent there. He is aided in his work by members of the mounted police force there. At Skagway, in order to facilitate Canadian trade, we have had to put on one of our experienced officers from Vancouver, not for the purpose of collecting duties, but to help our Canadian trade.

Mr. WALLACE. Is the officer from Victoria at Dawson City or at the boundary line?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He was at Tagish. I know that the hon. member for Victoria will say that he is one of the best officers. His name is Mr. Godson.

Mr. EARLE. He is an experienced officer.

Mr. WALLACE. Under these regulations, loosely drawn as they are, which may be applicable elsewhere, it is questionable whether large quantities of American goods are not taken in. New regulations are needed, not old regulations. Every importation should be subject to duty more strictly than in any other part of Canada, because the people take in six or twelve months' provisions, and do not become settlers; and under this regulation they will be able to take in a large portion, if not the whole of their outfit, duty free. So the Government, from the beginning to the end, have not been doing their duty with respect to the interests of Canada in the Yukon country.

Another point to which I wish to refer is the injurious effect of this tariff. It can easily be demonstrated that this tariff is not one in the interest of the people of Canada. Take, for instance, Indian corn. Hon. gentlemen opposite announced with a loud flourish of trumpets that corn was to be made free. What effect has the change had? In 1897, and for eighteen years previous, very little American corn came into the Dominion. In 1897, 1,788,000 bushels were entered, of the value of half a million dollars; the year before there was a little more and the year before that a little less, but about 2,000,000 bushels annually came in. This corn was used by distillers, glucose manufacturers and corn starch manufacturers; in fact, it was principally consumed in those industries. The Government said they would make Indian corn free. I have here a statement furnished to me by the hon. Minister for the six months from 1st July, 1897, to 1st January, 1898, which shows that there was corn to the value of \$3,153,000 imported into this country from the United States. If the same proportion should be brought in during the next half year, that would mean \$6,300,000 worth brought in during a single year. I have here the prices for every month of those six months, and the price of corn at Chicago averaged 27½ cents per bushel. Taking it at that figure for the year, the importation would mean 22,900,000 bushels of corn imported for one year. There were during the first six months imported 11,500,000 bushels. The hon. gentleman has pointed to the increase in exports and imports. Here are \$8,000,000 worth of corn imported into Canada during one year, displacing a like value of our coarse grains. We have therefore \$8,000,000 worth more to export and find a market for in other parts of the world. The trade of the country, it is true, has increased by \$12,000,000; but can any hon. member say it is for the benefit of Canada, for I believe it is to our distinct injury. I have here the prices of oats during those months. The prices in

Mr. WALLACE.

western Canada ran from 22 cents to 24 cents per bushel, the latter being the highest price according to the Toronto "Globe." through western and northern Ontario. But the price was down to 19 cents and 20 cents per bushel at different periods, and the Government by their action are compelling our farmers who grow oats, peas, barley and other coarse grains to send their produce away, and the produce during the past year was very abundant. We have ample of the coarse grains to feed all the cattle Canada has to-day, and far more; yet we are importing 22,930,000 bushels of corn in a year. We have actually imported 11,500,000 bushels in the six months from the 1st of July, 1897, to the 1st of January, 1898. That will displace 11,500,000 bushels of Canadian grain, which will have to find a market where it can. I say, that course is injurious. If these hon. gentlemen say it is right, why do they not take the duty off oats, peas, wheat and all other agricultural products? They dare not do it, Mr. Speaker. It is a wrong policy. The policy of protection is the only right policy in the interest of Canada; and, when the farmers of Canada learn that 11,500,000 bushels of American corn were brought into Canada in the last six months to displace the coarse grains which the farmers of Canada have grown, to please supposed farmers, like the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), and men of that ilk, they will rise in their might, and demand protection. It is the old story. In 1878, 7,300,000 bushels of free Indian corn were brought in. As soon as we placed a duty upon corn, the farmer grew more coarse grains to supply the Canadian market. The course then found to be wrong and injurious to the farmer, is equally so to-day. In other respects this tariff is injurious. It is not made on any definite plan or principle. It is not a free-trade tariff, because these gentlemen dare not adopt a free-trade policy. If they dared to do so, why do they not strike off all the protection to the farmers? They dare not do it. This is the only instance in which they have done it, and even this the farmers will pronounce to be injurious to them.

These gentlemen have undertaken to make a tariff, and how do they make it? One man comes and says: We want free trade. Another man comes and says: We want protection. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) told us how it was made. He is a protectionist. He came down here. He says he did, at any rate, and I suppose he told the truth. What does he say? He says:

I spent many an hour with the Finance Minister and with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, trying to impress upon them what duties should be imposed.

He took good care that there should be a pretty high duty on what he manufactured—a very good and substantial duty. He got better terms under this Government than

he had before under the old Government. He said :

I was trying to impress upon them what duties should be imposed, and there is not a single article in these schedules that I did not go over, and send to the Government my opinion of what the duty should be.

That is the way the tariff was made. He went to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who, I think it is no disparagement to say, does not know very much about the tariff. He did not go to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, it appears, or to the Minister of Customs, but he went to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Finance Minister. He said :

I maintain that the improvement in a great many of the manufacturing interests of the city of Toronto is due to the work I did at Ottawa during the session as a humble member of the Liberal party.

That is the way the tariff was made. Then, when the tariff came down, the Minister of Customs said : We have given to its preparation whatever time we had to spare, the little time we had. They had nine months, it appears, from the time they came into power until their tariff was produced. That was on the 23rd of April. On the 25th of May, they came down with another tariff, and what did they say then ? "The tariff we presented to you on the 23rd of April was all wrong ; we made so many mistakes and blunders in it that we propose now to correct those mistakes and blunders." And they made a new tariff, which is the tariff now in force. They increased duties and lowered duties, but most of the changes were of a protective character. The Minister of Customs said : "We do not make a protective tariff ; that is only incidental." Yet the changes from the 23rd of April to the 25th of May were changes to a distinctly protective tariff. I have here the tariff, with all the changes marked in it. I will not go over them, but I think I have counted as many as seventy-four changes which they made in their own tariff of the 23rd April, 1897. Many of these changes are most important, and some of them are revolutionary in their character, showing, to my mind, that there is nothing stable about their programme or their tariff, and that they were simply acting without regard to any principle. One man was coming, wanting free trade, and another man was coming, wanting more protection.

Sir, during the eighteen years the Conservative party were in power, they made a tariff on one line, and one line only. It was a protective tariff, a tariff that would give proper protection, without giving too much protection, to the various industries of the country. They may have made mistakes ; they did make mistakes. In some instances, they did not give enough protection ; in others, they may have given more protection than was required. From time to time, changes were made, but they were all of a

protective character. In 1894, the duties were reduced, because of a clamour that was got up, or a justifiable objection to giving too high a protection to some of the industries of the country. The result was a paring down of the tariff, which in some instances was pared too closely, because some of the industries of the country were injured ; but the intention was to have a tariff that would give adequate protection to the industries of the country. But what have hon. gentlemen opposite done further ? In woollen cloths the competition is most largely from Great Britain, some from Germany, very little, perhaps, from the United States. In that case I have no hesitation in saying that the products of the Canadian factories, made from Canadian wool, will be seriously injured, if not entirely driven out, by this one-quarter reduction. They will have a protection of 26½ per cent against British woollens. In my opinion, that will be injurious to the low-priced tweeds and cloths made in Canada from the coarse Canadian wools, the long wools of Canada, and in that regard I am quite sure the Government have made a very serious mistake. This is not felt so much now, as it will be when the other one-eighth is taken off the duty on British goods. Another point in that connection is this. Woollen clothing gets exactly the same protection as the woollen cloths from which they are made, giving no protection to the clothing manufacture in Canada. The last Government gave an advantage of 5 per cent. I think this Government should give that too, if we are to keep the clothing industry in Canada, and both the clothing industry and the woollen factories are very important, employing, as they do, many thousands of Canadians in their establishments.

Then with regard to cotton goods, the same argument will apply. All coloured cottons 35 per cent and the products made from them 35 per cent, with one-quarter off, will bring the protection, under the new tariff, down to 26½ per cent. That is not sufficient protection for the manufacturer of coloured shirts. There is no protection in that for those who make ladies wear, all those blouses and coloured cotton goods, the manufacture of which is being rapidly built up in Canada. That is a new industry and a very important one, and under this tariff it receives no protection. The reduction of one-quarter will be very injurious to these manufacturers, and to the manufacturers of cotton goods perhaps as well, but as to cotton goods I am not prepared to speak with any authority. All these matters are of such importance to the people of Canada and will be injuriously affected by the course of this Government.

There is just one other matter that I might mention, and that is tobacco. The excise duty on tobacco is 30 cents per pound. It was 25 cents before, and the Government have added 14 cents, making it 39 cents.

What has been the result? In the last six months under the old tariff, there were \$60,000 pounds of tobacco leaf imported into Canada, but in the last six months, since this tariff came into force, only 250,000 pounds were imported, less than one-third, showing that the Government policy has entirely failed. The American excise duty on tobacco is 6 cents a pound; ours is 39 cents. A man can take a twenty-pound caddie under his arm, and cross the boundary line into Canada and clear \$6.60. I am quite certain that the Government will be unable to check the smuggling which will take place, as it has been unable to check the smuggling which is evidently taking place extensively now. I believe the late Government reached the highest limit when they charged 25 cents a pound. They had got right up to the limit where the duty would supply a revenue and not be productive of smuggling.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). Has the hon. gentleman noticed that the American duty is likely to be raised?

Mr. **WALLACE**. If the Americans have raised the duty that may be a protection, but I think our tariff is an unjustifiable increase of duty on these imports. You may call tobacco a luxury if you like, but to very many people, and people of limited means, it is a necessity, and the duty of 39 cents a pound on it is totally unjustifiable.

I do not intend to trouble the House much further, except to say that the duties which the Government are proposing and the reductions they are proposing to make—and to make not upon any defined lines—are going to be injurious in many ways. The proper course to take, in my opinion, if Great Britain is to have a preference, would be to give it a preference on these goods Canada has to import. Give it a preference over all other nations on such goods. Such a course would be just to Canada and generous to Great Britain. But this reduction of one-quarter on all the duties, without regard to how it will affect Canadian industries or Canadian workmen, is totally unjustifiable. It will deprive many thousands of Canadians of employment, and our first duty is to our own people. It should be our duty to provide them with employment and not deprive them of the labour they have to-day in Canadian industries. On those articles which we have to import, I would say give Great Britain the preference. Even in the case of free goods, we might impose duty against other nations, so as to give the preference to Great Britain. In the necessities of life, we could give Great Britain a preference, and on goods which we cannot, for various reasons, make ourselves, we could impose a duty which would give a preference to the mother country. That is a true solution of this problem of preferential trade.

Mr. **WALLACE**.

When this one-eighth added reduction comes into force next July, it will be found injurious to many of the best industries in the Dominion, but this Government will not listen to reason, they will listen to no objection. When we talked to them of the iniquity of the Drummond County Railway deal, that only made them the more anxious to put it through Parliament. When showed that we were paying for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway two million dollars, and I also contend, three million dollars more than necessary, without justification, they forced the proposal through the House of Commons, at any rate, and through the Senate as well. When this other proposal, which we disposed of this session, the Yukon Railway contract, came before this House, we pointed out conclusively that it was a totally unjustifiable bargain, that it violated every principle which the Reform party had advocated during the whole of their career, especially in Opposition.

They took the power to make a bargain without the consent of Parliament and without public tender in secret; they did not let the public know that they desired to have a railroad built there. There was only one firm of contractors, Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, that knew that the Government intended to build that road. They did not offer cash, but better have offered three times the cash necessary to build the road than this enormity of handing over to these contractors the most valuable mines, as we suppose, that the world has ever seen. But, the Government is going on in its course. They will be called to account at no distant day by the people of Canada. They will be called to account for their extravagant expenditure, exceeding anything that the Conservatives, whom they were so fond of denouncing as extravagant, ever reached when they were in power. They will be called to account for the wild schemes they have promulgated and carried through this Parliament. And they will be called to account for having violated every pledge that they made to the people of Canada when they were in Opposition.

Mr. **MACDONALD** (Huron). I do not intend to detain the House very long.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Hear, hear.

Mr. **MACDONALD** (Huron). I suppose that is good news to those who do not wish to hear the truth. I am somewhat surprised at the speech made by my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) who has just taken his seat. I will first refer to some of his remarks in connection with the corn question. I think, if I understood him aright, that he stated that we imported for the use of Canada something like seven millions of bushels of corn.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. Eleven millions.

Mr. **MACDONALD** (Huron). I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) did not wish to misrepresent the case when he said, if he

said it, that corn to the amount of 11,000,000 bushels was imported for the use of the Canadian people during the last year. If he stated that, then, either the hon. gentleman is wrong, or the Trade and Navigation Returns, which I have before me are wrong. Let me inform the hon. gentleman from the Trade and Navigation Returns what we imported.

Mr. TAYLOR. When are they made up?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). For 1897.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) quoted the imports for the last six months of 1897.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I cannot help what he quoted. I wish to put him right. I have here the last statistics that we have and they are the proper ones to use in a discussion of this kind. If the hon. gentleman had not used the proper statistics that is his fault, and not mine. If he will look at page 46, under the head "Imports" he will find that we imported 9,190,000 bushels of corn, but only 1,788,000 bushels were imported for consumption in Canada. Now, if he is as far astray in other things as he has been in this, we cannot place much confidence in what he has told us.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. gentleman permit me just a moment. I quoted the figures of our imports of 1897 at 1,788,147 bushels at a value of \$512,000—giving the figure the hon. gentleman has just given. What I quoted in addition were the figures furnished for the six months from the 1st July, 1897, to the 1st January, 1898, furnished me by the Minister of Customs. These figures which I will hand over to the hon. gentleman show that there was imported on the free list, Indian corn, n.e.s., value, \$3,153,017. I take the quoted prices of corn in Chicago for the first day of every month.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The prices have nothing to do with the objection I have taken. But the hon. gentleman, when he quoted importations of corn, did he at the same time, give the exportation of corn for Canada? For in that way only will he find what has been consumed in Canada. The rest represents a trade in the purchasing of American corn and sending it out to foreign countries to be sold.

Mr. WALLACE. This statement covers the importation for home consumption.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It cannot be for home consumption at all. It is an unofficial document.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, this document was furnished me by the Minister of Customs.

Mr. TAYLOR. And so it must be correct.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I do not know whether it is correct or not, but I have

here before me the official documents, and I am bound to hold the hon. gentleman to the last official document that we have at our disposal. I cannot take time to enter into a discussion—

Mr. WALLACE. I will ask the hon. gentleman—

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Allow me to finish my sentence. I cannot enter into a discussion—

Mr. SPROULE. He is afraid to hear the facts.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will please keep quiet. I cannot allow any hon. gentleman to discuss a question on the basis of unofficial documents—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Let the hon. gentleman understand that I am not prepared to discuss questions upon the basis of figures which are not official and are not in the hands of all the members. If he wants to make a point he must take the last official figures in the hands of the members, and in this case those figures are to be found in the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1897. I cannot be supposed to have examined every document that is to be read and placed in the hands of any hon. member.

Mr. BERGERON. But if he has it?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I do not know whether he has it or not. I have here what all admit to be the official document, and I cannot accept any other documents than those that are official. Basing my argument on the figures I have given you we have imported 9,190,000 bushels and have exported 7,247,000 of corn, the balance being all that is used in Canada for feeding purposes. Further, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) must bear in mind that, even if we do import a larger quantity of corn, we export a larger quantity of beef. If feeders of cattle did not believe it to be to their interests to import corn for the purpose, they would use the coarse grains of Ontario. But they find it more profitable to them to use imported corn. And this is more profitable to the country, because the more money they make the more money is kept in the country. Now, the hon. gentleman made another serious mistake, and I am sure he will admit it. He said that a reduction from a 20 per cent duty to 15 per cent duty was not a reduction of 25 per cent.

Mr. WALLACE. I said it was a reduction of 5 per cent duty.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). We will take the hon. gentleman at his word. Then, a reduction from 20 per cent to 10 per cent would be a reduction of 10 per cent, would it?

Mr. WALLACE. I think so.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Now, I want to draw attention to the principle on which the two parties differ. The Conservatives of this country are protectionists; we call ourselves free traders, that is, so far as it is possible to be free traders in this country. We all agree, on both sides, that the revenues required to conduct the affairs of the country must be raised on customs duties. Now, so far as customs duties go, there is protection in them; but there is quite a difference between a protective principle and a revenue tariff principle. Let me illustrate this to my hon. friend. Suppose that he sits down to consider a pair of shoes from a protective standpoint; he would reason somewhat after this fashion: There is a pair of shoes that can be manufactured in this country, the leather of which they are made can be manufactured in this country, but, in order to give a protection to the manufacturer, we must make the duty high, in order to prevent competition from abroad. That is his process of reasoning. Now, the Liberal will sit down and take up that very pair of shoes, and say: These can be manufactured in Canada, true, but they are an article that is largely used by everybody in Canada, particularly by the poorer people; so we must make this duty as reasonable as possible. In the first case, the Conservatives had in view the benefit of the manufacturers, while the Liberals had in view the benefit of the consumers. Now, there is the whole difference between what we call a protective tariff and a revenue-producing tariff. We have had in view the revenue, with the interest of the consumer; they have in view the revenue, with the interest of the manufacturer. Next, my hon. friend pointed out what he calls the blunderings of the Government with reference to the Yukon country. Sir, I think, if the Government is deserving of praise for anything which they have done within the last year, they deserve it with regard to the despatch and energy which they put forth in order to render the Yukon what it is to-day. The hon. gentleman opposite says the news came to the Government in March. The hon. gentleman knows very well it did not. It was well on into July before we heard very much about the discoveries of gold in the Klondike. True, we knew that there was gold in the Yukon district; we knew that for the last eighteen years. But there were no great finds until the finds were made in the Klondike about the middle of June. If we take the action of the Government after that, we must give them credit for putting forth every energy and taking every possible step to provide means for the preservation of law and order in that country. Again, the hon. gentleman finds fault with the Government in regard to the Yukon Railway question. He has already spoken upon that; we have all spoken upon it. I think he will find that the sentiment of the country, as I have found

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

the sentiment in the country up west, both among Reformers and Conservatives, is strongly opposed to the action of the Opposition, and particularly opposed to the action of the Senate in this matter. Many go so far as to advocate a change in the constitution of this country, so as to do away with the Senate altogether. I believe that the rejection of that Bill has done a great deal to injure the trade of this country. I am sure that the manufacturers of the city of Montreal, of Hamilton, of Toronto and other cities, who were preparing to provide outfits and supplies for that country, are strongly condemning the action of the Opposition in opposing that Bill, and in causing it to be thrown out of the Senate.

Now, it may be asked: What is expected of the Liberal party? They were expected to carry out the promises that they made when they were sitting on the opposite side of the House. They have largely accomplished that. We promised to reduce, so far as the exigencies of the country would permit us, the high protective tariff that was inflicted upon it for so many years by the Tory Government. We have sought to do that; we reduced the general tariff very considerably, and then we made the large saving that has been spoken of, by the reduction of 25 per cent in the general tariff. Now, not a single individual on the opposite side will stand upon his feet and find fault with the Government with that line of policy. In 1892, when we offered that policy to the Conservative party, they refused to accept it at our hands, and they propounded a policy at that time, through a resolution moved in this House, that if England gave us something additional to what she is giving us at the present time, they would extend to her some preference in the Canadian market. That is as far as they would go. Let me read the resolution that was moved at that time, I think by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and voted for by every Conservative in this House. It is well to bring to their minds what they did offer on that occasion, and here it is:

That if and when the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland admit Canadian products to the market of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than is accorded to the products of foreign countries, the Parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages by a substantial reduction in the duties it imposes upon British manufactured goods.

Is that the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party to-day? No person will volunteer an answer. Now, we did not borrow their clothes upon that occasion; we offered them an independent policy, a policy which we were willing to submit, and did submit, as soon as we came into power. But, previously to coming into power, we offered it to the Conservative party, but they rejected it, notwithstanding all that they said in regard to their loyalty, and their love for the old land, and their desire to benefit her as far

as possible. Still, they rejected our resolution, and voted for their own. Now, let us see what it is that we promised to carry out when we came into power :

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

That was our policy in 1892. Surely, we did not steal that policy from the Liberal-Conservative party. How can it be said, by speaker after speaker, that we have adopted their policy? Sir, I say that this same resolution has placed Canada in a more favourable position before the eyes of England than it ever occupied before. Our credit stands higher to-day, largely owing to that resolution, than it ever stood in the English market before. The people of the whole of the three Kingdoms are now more directly interested in Canada than ever before, owing to the offer we have made in that resolution. Consequently, we have taken a higher stand, as a colony, in the eyes of Great Britain to-day by the policy submitted in 1892 and carried into execution in 1897 by the Liberal party of this country. Notwithstanding all that, we hear many people tell us that we have borrowed the clothes of the Liberal-Conservative party, just as if their clothes were sufficiently large to cover the respectable Liberal party of this country. Now, there was another promise we made in Opposition. We promised to reduce the general tariff just so far as the revenue needs of this country would permit us. We did that. We came in at a time when the scale of expenditure was very high. It was not possible to cut down that scale of expenditure in one year to the point where we thought it ought to be. We have attempted to do so, and we are doing so to a certain extent, and, if the extraordinary expenditures of this last year were deducted from the total expenditure, we would have a considerably less expenditure under the ordinary heads than we had last year, showing that economy has been exercised, and is being exercised, by the Government in power, and that they are endeavouring to cut down the expenditure of this country as far as possible.

We found fault with the Government for an extravagant expenditure, nay more, for a corrupt expenditure, and we proved beyond cavil or doubt, by evidence under oath, that there were large corrupt expenditures made by the late Government. We promised that when we came into power our administration of public affairs would be purer and more honest than the administration of the late Conservative Government; and we have proved such to be the case. True, there have been charges made; but has a single hon. member had sufficient moral courage as an independent member of this House, to rise in his place and formulate any

charge of corruption or maladministration against any single member or members sitting on this side of the House? No. Until hon. gentlemen opposite have the courage to do so, I take the loud mouthings on public platforms and from desks in this House as merely political clap-trap. When we were in Opposition we believed there were corrupt expenditures, and we formulated charges against the Government and asked for committees, before which we were prepared to prove them. Committees were given to us on some occasions, and in 1892 we proved corruption of a most extraordinary character against the Government; we proved it to such an extent that one Minister had to resign his position and take a back bench, another eminent man in that transaction was dismissed from the House, and others served terms in the prisons of the country; and we proved that many of these transactions were known publicly to a large circle of people who occupied leading positions in this country. When hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to formulate charges against an hon. member, they will show their honesty of purpose by reading those charges from their seats and asking for a committee of investigation as to the proof of those charges.

When we came into power there was a very disturbing question in the political arena, a question disturbing to a large extent owing to the negligence of the party that went out of power two years ago, a question that tore asunder, as it were, the different religious denominations in this country, a question which we promised to settle amicably, properly and rightly in the interest of all parties when we came into power. The Manitoba school question has been relegated where it should have been relegated before, and its removal from the arena of federal politics has been performed, and that question will not come into federal politics any more. For accomplishing that result the Liberal party deserve not only the admiration of the people, but the admiration of all parties, and they should receive the admiration and endorsement of the party now in Opposition for securing the settlement of that question. It was asserted that the question could not be settled in the way it was decided. We knew we could accomplish it, and we succeeded in accomplishing it, and thus promoting the interests of the whole country.

Another duty we discharged on coming into power was to frame a policy which would result in creating a large amount of trade, a policy which hon. gentlemen opposite have opposed. We propounded a policy which carries the marks of common sense on its face, a policy of extending the Intercolonial from a point opposite Quebec into the very mouth of competition, the city of Montreal. The object is to reduce as far as possible the transportation rates, and so far as we reduce those rates, we will give preferential treatment to Cana-

dian goods in the foreign markets. We were charged with having paid nearly \$7,000,000 to secure that privilege. Hon. gentlemen opposite know well that we have not added \$7,000,000 to the debt of the Dominion for that purpose. It is true we have to pay \$210,000 annually for running powers over the Drummond County and Grand Trunk roads and the use of the terminus in Montreal. If we earn \$210,000 additional annually there will be neither gain nor loss; but if we obtain one dollar more it will be so much gain, and if we obtain one dollar less we shall be so much behind. It is the opinion of all railway and business men that it is altogether likely we shall earn a much larger proportion of money than before; so much so that not only will we be able to pay \$210,000 annually, but there will be a respectable surplus to place to the credit of the country. If so, how can it be said that this policy deserves the opposition of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Another promise we made was that we would enlarge the canals for the purpose of facilitating transportation from the west. The canals on the St. Lawrence are only nine feet deep. We propose to deepen them to fourteen feet. This will give vessels on the upper lakes the opportunity of coming to Montreal and delivering their cargoes to sea-going vessels without breaking bulk till Montreal is reached, which will effect a large saving in transportation rates and give us a position which we do not now occupy as regards securing freight going by Buffalo to New York. We can more than compete with the Erie Canal, which has only seven feet of water, where boats are drawn by horses at four miles an hour, and have small tonnage, whereas our boats will carry 2,000 tons. Thus we will secure an advantage against which the Americans even cannot compete. That presents itself to me as a very wise policy, not to be condemned by the Opposition, but to be supported by every hon. member; and although we require to spend \$3,500,000 for the purpose of accomplishing that work, we believe the expenditure is in the interest of the country, and will bring back in the form of returns far more than the interest on the amount of capital which the country will be called upon to pay. Again, we find that increased trade has come to us during the last year or last year and a half, I believe largely through the policy of the Liberal party. I do not say for one moment that all this prosperity has been caused by the advent of the Liberals to power, but after seventeen or eighteen years of corrupt Government and maladministration, the honesty of our Administration has given confidence, and that has added largely to the prosperity which prevails at the present day. It has spread into every class. The farmers, the labouring men,

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

the traders, the manufacturers feel it, and at no time during the past fifteen or seventeen years have the manufacturers been in a more prosperous condition or have they employed a larger number of hands; nor was there a time during the last eighteen years when the people have been more contented and happy and have looked forward with greater confidence than at the present time. We predicted that result. We were not prophets nor the sons of prophets, but we knew that after eighteen years, when honest men were placed at the head of affairs, a greater measure of prosperity would flow to the people than they enjoyed before, and these results and fruits came just as we expected. Again, during the seventeen or eighteen years of the Liberal-Conservative regime our people were leaving us.

The flower of our country was leaving us. Our young men and fair young women, fairer than any other country possessed, were leaving us in thousands and going to the United States to add strength and dignity to that nation. To-day there is not one leaving to five who left before; but on the contrary many are returning; and Canada, which was formerly a nursery for the American nation, now becomes a nursery for our vast fields of fertile lands in the west. Hundreds and thousands are going to tenant our own lands and to add strength and dignity to our own country. When we consider all these things, we have reason to congratulate ourselves that the Liberal party came into power, and by wise policy turned the stream of population towards our own western country.

Another line of policy which the Liberal party supported was the development of the agricultural and mineral resources of the country; and, therefore, the Government last year concluded, and I think wisely concluded, that it would be in the interest of the country that the Crow's Nest Pass Railway should be extended from Lethbridge westward to the Kootenays. They decided, and I think wisely, to subsidize that road pretty freely, so that the settlers of the western country might find a market for their butter, cheese, flour and other products of their labour, where they would realize the highest possible price. The Government desired to preserve that market for Canada. We all know that that is one of the richest countries in the world. I suppose it is the richest gold quartz country in the world to-day; and it is rich, not only in gold, but in silver, lead, iron and other minerals, which will be developed in the near future and contribute largely to the wealth of this country. As a party we believed that as that wealth was ours, we had a right to develop it and retain the trade of the country as far as possible for Canada. The trade was going largely to the United States. Spokane was built up to be a large and prosperous town. Thousands of miners

went into the country, carrying nothing with them but their brawny arms and their skill in mining, and they were forced to buy what they needed in the United States to the south. In other words, Canada laid the golden egg, but the golden egg, after being laid, rolled into the United States. We thought, and I think wisely, that it would be in the interest of Canada to spend \$3,630,000 to aid the Crow's Nest Pass Railway for the purpose of preserving that trade as far as possible to our own country. We believed it was wise also because it would give us control of a large portion of the coal area which would otherwise be controlled by a private corporation. By that arrangement we obtained 50,000 acres of the best coal beds in America, which gives the Government a handle by which they can control the price of that product for all time to come, and thus prevent monopolies from interfering with the development of that country. In these ways, I think the Government acted wisely and discreetly and in the interest of Canada. We also obtained concessions from the Canadian Pacific Railway in the interest of Manitoba and the North-west, and in the interest of the eastern provinces as well. We obtained a reduction in the rate on flour and wheat to the extent of 1½ cents per hundred pounds in the first year, and 3 cents per hundred pounds in the following years; we obtained large reductions in the carrying rates from any point of Canada to any point of Manitoba or the North-west Territories. In fact, all parties agree that those reductions equal if not exceed \$500,000 a year to the farmers of that country; and when we consider that we have enabled the farmers of the west, by that transaction, to keep in their hands no less than half a million dollars every year, we have reason to think that the Government acted wisely in adopting a policy of that kind and in carrying it out so effectively.

Then we agreed when in Opposition that if we ever came into power—and we had strong expectations of coming into power before very long, just as we have strong expectations to-day that the Canadian people will keep us here for a long time to come—we would reform the tariff. We contended, and I think rightly, that the higher duties were imposed on the people who were least able to bear them, being imposed on those necessary articles which the masses of the people had to purchase, and we did relieve the poorer classes to a great extent, and placed the heavier duties upon luxuries. In that way the burden will rest in a greater degree upon those who are best able to pay, and those who are less able to pay will be to that extent relieved. We have very largely done away with the anomaly in the tariff of specific duties, duties, which when reduced to an ad valorem basis, showed many of the duties to be extreme. This Government has removed these to a very large extent.

Again, when in Opposition we proposed that as soon as we got into power we would remove one of the most iniquitous acts which the Conservative party ever placed on the Statute-books, and that is saying a good deal. That Act we call the Franchise Act, an Act which has imposed an expenditure on the people of this country every time the voters' lists were revised of no less than \$250,000. That expenditure will be saved by the repeal of that Act. One million, one hundred and sixty thousand dollars was spent on four revisions, and under it three elections were held, so that nearly \$400,000 was spent under that Act every time we had an election. Now, that money can be saved to go to build up the country in some other way. Then we told you that when we came into power we would seek to readjust the constituencies.

Those members who were here in 1882 will remember that the redistribution or gerrymander took place that session just on the eve of a general election, and without imputing motives, the only object it could have was to strengthen the Conservative party in the coming elections. The Government had not sufficient faith in the National Policy at that time to go to the country on it without taking the preliminary of carving out the constituencies in such a way as to legislate rather than elect a large number of members to this House in the interests of their party. When I give you a few figures in connection with this matter, you will see how the members of the Conservative party were legislated into this Chamber by virtue of that iniquitous Act. In the election of 1882, 186,000 Conservative votes were polled in Ontario and 182,000 Liberal votes. You will see, therefore, that we should have reasonably expected a representation in this House from that province of about an equal number of members on either side—say, 45 Liberals and 46 Conservatives. Was that the way in which Ontario was represented here? No, Sir. There were 33 Liberals and 59 Conservatives returned from that province. How was it that 186,000 Conservative votes elected 59 Conservatives and that 182,000 Liberal votes only elected 33 Liberals? That result was due solely to the operation of the Gerrymander Act, and that shows conclusively how well that iniquitous Act which was placed on the statutes in 1882, worked for the Government that devised it. Let me give you another instance. For every 3,150 Conservative votes polled there came a Conservative representative to this House; but for every 5,550 Liberal votes polled, there just came one Liberal member. Can any reasonable person find any reason for such a discrepancy between the representation of the two parties other than the iniquitous Gerrymander Act, which had the intended effect of legislating members into this House.

I do not propose, at any length, to review what the Liberal party has done since it came into power; but will content myself

with saying that in the section of the province of Ontario which I represent, the people are perfectly satisfied that the Liberal party has done a good work for the country. When we put together all that they have done during the two short years they have been in power, we cannot help finding it remarkable that the Government should have succeeded in doing so much in the interest of the country in such a short time. It is rather astonishing, as well as amusing at times, to find hon. gentlemen opposite accuse us of having stolen their policy and almost in the same breath tell us that we are all wrong in everything we have done and in this very policy that we have stolen. You must bear in mind, Sir, that absolute free trade in this country is out of the question. During Mr. Mackenzie's regime we had not free trade; and so long as we adhere to the principle of raising revenue by means of customs duties, we can never have it. The only question is how much we shall take from the people in the form of customs duties, and that must depend largely on the public works we undertake, on the expense of carrying on civil government and legislation, and on the other necessary expenditures entailed upon us as a Government. Therefore the only difference between the two parties is in the adjustment of the duties on our imports and in the end we each seek to attain. Two or three years ago, I discussed this question with the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) when travelling on the railway to this city, and I ventured to express the opinion that the article of tea was quite a legitimate object of duty. But, he said, do you not see that the Conservative party is opposed to putting a duty on tea, because that would not give any protection to any manufacturing industry in this country. There is the whole difference. We believe in putting a duty on these articles which will give us revenue, and which will not put it in the power of other parties to fleece the consumer by charging too high prices on the articles he consumes. That is all the difference between a protective and a revenue tariff.

I do not propose to weary the House by going over the ground that has been so well travelled by the hon. gentlemen on this side who have preceded me, and shall therefore draw to a close these somewhat rambling remarks. I must admit that I did not feel called upon, in the face of the prosperity which the country is now enjoying under the policy from which hon. gentlemen opposite predicted so disastrous results, to go very minutely into statistics and returns, and shall therefore resume my seat, after giving this expression of my confidence in the Government and approval of its policy, and thanking the House for its patient attention.

Mr. CRAIG moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The House is so exceedingly thin, that I do not see why we should object to the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In moving the adjournment of the House, I think I ought to make a little announcement, which possibly has not reached some hon. gentlemen, and that is that we have the pleasure of knowing that the district of West Prince, Prince Edward Island, has returned a Liberal member by a majority of about 150.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much did it cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Reaction, reaction.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 14th April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Cañon Railway Company.—(Mr. Frost.)

Bill (No. 33) to incorporate the Pacific and Yukon Railway, Navigation and Mining Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 114) further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey. He said: The Bill is simply for the purpose of removing the effect of a change which was made by the Act of 1895 amending the Civil Service Act. Previous to that time the director of the Geological Survey was able, upon the order of the Minister, to employ persons having technical or special qualifications at a rate of pay exceeding \$400 a year. Since that time he has not been able to do so, except as it has been provided from time to time in the Appropriation Act. This amendment is for the purpose of doing away with the necessity of making a special provision in each Appropriation Act for this purpose.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the Bill for the purpose of doing away with the tests required

by the Act for those employed as temporary clerks in the Geological Survey ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Only those who are employed for their technical qualifications.

Mr. **HAGGART**. It leaves the head of the Survey to be the sole judge of the qualifications ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Certainly. He must make the recommendation, and upon his recommendation the Minister may employ.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COLOURED PORTERS ON THE I. C. R.

Mr. **FOSTER** (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

1. Have any coloured porters of Pullman or parlour cars been dismissed since Manager Harris took charge, from any part of the Intercolonial Railway service ?

2. If so, how many, and what was the date of the order for dismissal, and on what charges were they dismissed ?

3. Have any who were dismissed been since employed ; if so, how many ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). No coloured porters of the sleeping or parlour cars have been dismissed from the service on any part of the railway since Traffic Manager Harris took charge.

CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY— AMOUNT PAID C. P. R.

Mr. **FOSTER** (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

What amount has been paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on account of the Crow's Nest Pass construction, and on what number of miles ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). \$453,750 has been paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on account of the Crow's Nest Pass construction, for 42½ miles.

REVENUE FROM JUBILEE STAMPS.

Mr. **FOSTER** (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

What is the total amount received for Jubilee stamps, and what portion thereof, if any, is included in the revenue for 1896-97 ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). Jubilee stamps having been issued concurrently with ordinary stamps, the department, without obtaining a special return from postmasters as to the respective quantities of each kind of such stamps still in their hands, is unable to state how much has been realized from the sale of Jubilee stamps alone.

I. C. R. BETWEEN MONTREAL AND LEVIS.

Mr. **FOSTER** (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

What number of passengers, local and through, have been carried on that portion of the Intercolonial Railway between Montreal and Lévis during the month of March ; also, what tonnage of freight, local and through ? What are the gross receipts and working expenses of this portion of the road for that period ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I am not in a position to give the hon. gentleman the information asked for. The returns for the month of March are not yet in and they will not be compiled until at earliest the 25th or 26th of the current month. That is the information I have. After they have been compiled it will be necessary that a further compilation should take place in order to give the specified information which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) asks for.

MR. OGILVIE'S SERVICES SINCE JANUARY, 1898.

Mr. **FOSTER** (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

Has Mr. Ogilvie, surveyor, of the Interior Department, been on salary since January, 1898 ? Is he now in England on any official business, and did he serve with Mr. Dan Rose in connection with the compiling and publishing of the Klondike Official Guide in Canada and the United States under instructions from the Government or any department ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). Mr. Ogilvie, surveyor, of the Interior Department has been on salary since January, 1898. He is not now in England on official business, but he is under salary while in England upon leave of absence granted by the Governor General in Council according to the provisions of the law. The Government furnished the copy for the Klondike Official Guide, and Mr. Ogilvie, under instructions of the department, assisted in preparing the copy for the department, and read the proof to ensure the correctness thereof. The department is not aware that he had any connection with the compiling and publishing of the Klondike Official Guide other than what has been stated.

POSTAL MAIL CLERKS—NOVA SCOTIA.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER** (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

1. Have any of the postal mail clerks in Nova Scotia been moved from their former places of residence ?

2. If so, what are their names ?

3. Have those clerks who have been removed been allowed or paid anything for the transportation of their effects ? If so, what is the amount allowed or paid in the case of each individual ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). 1. Yes. 2. Their names are Messrs. S. Hall, G. A. Hawkesworth, W. Bennett, J. D. Ross, A. Macdonald, J. P. Keating, F. N. McMillan and J. S. F. McLeod. 3. The following clerks were allowed moving expenses:—Messrs. S. Hall, A. Macdonald and J. P. Keating. Mr. S. Hall was paid the sum of \$38.60, Mr. A. Macdonald, \$34.40 and Mr. J. P. Keating \$39.06. Messrs. W. Bennett and J. D. Ross, since first appointment, did not reside at the starting point of a route, and, therefore, were not entitled to moving expenses. Messrs. S. Hall, Macdonald and Keating resided at a point which formerly was the starting point of a route and therefore were entitled to moving expenses. Mr. G. A. Hawkesworth has not removed his family and does not intend doing so. Messrs. F. N. McMillan and J. S. F. McLeod are single men and no expenses were incurred in moving.

DEPUTY POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Mr. TAYLOR asked,

Who is the present Deputy Postmaster General? When was he appointed? What is his salary? What profession or calling did he follow previous to his appointment? What training did he have especially qualifying him for the position?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). R. M. Coulter was appointed Deputy Postmaster General on the 1st of August, 1897. Previous to his being appointed Deputy Postmaster General he practised medicine. The question as to salary was answered on the 14th day of February and the answer appears on page 475 of the "Hansard" of the present session. As to his qualifications for the position, they were such as were deemed satisfactory to the Government.

W. W. WILLIAMS, POSTMASTER.

Mr. TAYLOR asked,

Has W. W. Williams, postmaster at Seeley's Bay, been dismissed? Were there any charges preferred against him? Was there an investigation? Has Mr. Williams been postmaster for the last twenty years or more? Was the office conducted in a satisfactory manner? Was the office kept at a central point in the village? Has it been removed to the westerly limit of the village, where it is inconvenient for the public to get their mail thereat? Was a petition, signed by nearly all the residents of the surrounding district, presented to the Postmaster General protesting against any change being made? Was the change made on the recommendation of Mr. W. Fredenburgh, the defeated candidate? If not, on whose recommendation was the change made? Has C. C. Gilbert been appointed postmaster, and by whom was he recommended?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). I might ask the hon. gentleman (Mr.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Taylor) to move for the papers in the case. The question is a very lengthy one.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But the answer might be a very short one.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) accept this as notice of motion for the papers?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. In the ordinary way, according to the practice of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think that the answer is too long to give in this form.

ABENAKIS INDIANS—AGENCY AT ST. FRANCIS.

Mr. BERGERON (by Mr. Dugas) asked,

Whether Mr. Wilfrid Conrad, notary, of Pierreville, has resigned the agency for the Abenakis Indians of St. Francis, and if so, when? Has his resignation been accepted by the Department of Indian Affairs? When does it take effect? Who has been appointed to succeed him in the position? Has no person as yet been appointed, and if so, why?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). Mr. Wilfrid Conrad Boucher, notary, of Pierreville, who is probably the person referred to, resigned the agency on the 7th of February, 1898. The resignation was accepted, and took effect on the 1st instant. Dr. A. O. Comire, of St. François du Lac, has been appointed acting agent, pending his appointment as agent by Order in Council.

DEPUTY MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. BERGERON asked,

Who is the present Deputy Minister of the Interior? When was he appointed? What is his salary? What profession or calling did he follow previous to his appointment? What training did he have especially qualifying him for the position?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). 1. James Allan Smart. 2. 1st April, 1897. 3. \$3,200. 4. Mr. Smart was not in business at the time of his appointment. 5. His previous training qualifying him for the position of Deputy Minister consisted in the fact that he had been for five years Minister of Public Works for the province of Manitoba, in which position he displayed exceptional ability as an administrator.

ROCKLIFFE RIFLE RANGE—LAND VALUATOR.

Mr. BENNETT asked,

Who has been selected to act as valuator by the Government in acquiring the lands requisite for the Rockliffe rifle ranges? What remuneration is to be paid to such valuator?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). In the absence of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), I beg leave to answer

E. Wallace, Esq., was appointed to act as valuator by the Government in acquiring the lands requisite for the Rockliffe ranges. The question of remuneration has not been decided.

DISMISSAL OF W. W. WILLIAMS, POSTMASTER.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call attention to the questions which appear on the Order paper under my name, and to which the hon. Postmaster General has objected giving any reply. I merely wish to say a few words, and if necessary will conclude with a motion. I put a question on the paper which reads as follows:—"Has the postmaster at Seeley's Bay been dismissed?" In reply the hon. Postmaster General asked me to move for the papers. I have only heard by rumour that Mr. Williams has been dismissed, and want to ascertain whether he really has been or not, and I do not see why the hon. gentleman cannot give me the information, nor do I see what there is in the question that can involve the bringing down of papers. I propose now to read all the questions relating to this matter which I put on the paper, in order to get them upon "Hansard," and to show the House that the hon. Postmaster General had no right to answer me as he did. Of course, when a question is put on the paper which calls for the production of papers in reply, it is proper for the hon. Minister to whom the question is put to ask the questioner to make a motion for the papers. But in all these questions, which appear in my name, I simply ask for information that does not call for the production of papers at all, and I hold it is the duty of the hon. gentleman to give me a direct answer. These are the questions:

Has W. W. Williams, postmaster at Seeley's Bay, been dismissed? Were there any charges preferred against him? Was there an investigation? Has Mr. Williams been postmaster for the last twenty years or more? Was the office conducted in a satisfactory manner? Was the office kept at a central point in the village? Has it been removed to the westerly limit of the village, where it is inconvenient for the public to get their mail thereat? Was a petition, signed by nearly all the residents of the surrounding district, presented to the Postmaster General protesting against any change being made? Was the change made on the recommendation of Mr. W. H. Fredenburgh, the defeated candidate? If not, on whose recommendation was the change made? Has C. C. Gilbert been appointed postmaster, and by whom was he recommended?

There is nothing in any one of these questions that calls for a return, nothing which would warrant me in making a motion for the production of papers. They are plain, straightforward questions such as a Minister of the Crown, responsible to Parliament, should

be prepared to answer after he had two days' notice of them. The hon. Postmaster General will have to learn to treat the members of the Opposition with some respect when they ask for nothing unreasonable. The Opposition have rights and intend to assert them. They are not to be bluffed, as the hon. Postmaster General has attempted to bluff me, by refusing to answer straight questions and asking me to move for a return. What return can I ask for to show that the postmaster at Seeley's Bay has been dismissed. If I were to move for a return, he would probably tell me that the postmaster was dismissed and that he had no papers to bring down. I do not know that this postmaster has been dismissed, but I put the question and am entitled to the information, and in order that this matter may be discussed, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). I beg, first of all, to assure the hon. gentleman that in the answer I gave him, nothing was further from my mind than to be discourteous to him in any way. The reason why I suggested a motion for papers instead of categorical questions and replies, was because the production of the papers would put the House in a more satisfactory position to know the merits and demerits of the matter than would categorical answers, unaccompanied by proper explanations. For instance, the hon. gentleman asks—and I may be permitted to satisfy him to some extent even at this stage—whether any charges were made against the postmaster at Seeley's Bay. If I were to reply that there were none, it would then look as if he had been dismissed without cause, whereas the facts are that while Mr. Williams was dismissed, it was not because of charges made against him, but because Seeley's Bay is a long distance away from where he lives. If I remember rightly, he had moved to Smith's Falls and taken a position in some store there.

Mr. TAYLOR. By permission of the Government?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know whether by permission or not.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know that it was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman evidently is not lacking in information, but I just offer that to the House as a fair ground for asking that the reasons for Mr. Williams' removal be laid before the House in a full and fair way. Then, the hon. gentleman asks whether there was not a petition signed by nearly all the residents of the surrounding district presented to me, protesting against any change being made. I do not know of any petition representing public opinion or signed by nearly all the residents of the surrounding district. On that point, I am not in a position to weigh the merits of this peti-

tion and to decide whether it was signed by all, or nearly all, the people, but the petition when produced will speak for itself, and the hon. gentleman will then be able to see whether it represents public opinion or not. I could point to other respects in which the House could be better informed by the production of the papers than by my merely giving categorical replies. I am extremely surprised, on reading these questions, to observe that they indicated to my mind—I do not say it is the case—a certain degree of familiarity or acquaintance with the proceedings that led to the vacating of this office, which I do not understand, and which enables the hon. gentleman to put these questions so pointedly—

Mr. TAYLOR. Name one of them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL—these various questions, suggestive of more or less departmental information conveyed to the hon. gentleman. I do not object to his having it, but I certainly formed that impression, and I think that the proceedings of our department will afford good grounds for that impression. I have not the slightest intention to embarrass the hon. gentleman in the production of the papers. Quite the contrary, he is welcome to them, but on more than one occasion, when an hon. member has been asked to move for papers, it only led to confusion when the motion was interjected in the midst of other proceedings in order to get information in this way.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Every hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches, I assume, is anxious to forward the business of the House and to have as little time occupied in the matter as possible. The hon. Minister knows very well that one way of evading a question altogether and thus evading giving to this House the information it is entitled to, is to ask the hon. gentleman who puts the question to put instead a motion on the Order paper for papers, knowing that in many cases it is impossible for the motion ever to be reached. I think I can relieve the hon. gentleman's mind from the apprehension that any of the officials in his department are betraying their trust. Does he not know that every point in these questions is familiar to the parties who are interested? It is a very familiar practice, when the Government desire to get rid of one officer and put another in his place, to move the office, and it is a practice to which the hon. Postmaster General has again and again resorted when he could find no charge or no grounds for dismissal. In many cases he has moved offices in opposition to the wishes of the whole community, merely for the sake of getting one person out and putting another one in.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In this case, I may tell the hon. gentleman that

Mr. MULOCK.

the postmaster moved away to a point forty miles from where his post office was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has often taken advantage of his position as Minister to answer questions by bringing down sheaves of papers and reading them to the House. He could have resorted to that expedient in this case, but he felt that he could not answer these questions without exposing himself to severe animadversion, and he suggested to my hon. friend that he could not get this information without putting a notice on the paper. No information is sought here that my hon. friend could not learn from the parties in the neighbourhood who are interested in this post office, and I am afraid, therefore, my hon. friend will find that it will hardly form a basis for making a vacancy in his own department, which is what he appears to indicate as likely to be done. Is this for the purpose of terrorizing the department, to tell the officials of this Government, that if they answer any questions, if they express any opinion, they are to be turned out? Is this the object of the scarcely-concealed threat of the Postmaster General? I think it is very unwarranted, and the hon. gentleman should have better grounds for it before he holds out any such threat. There are no grounds for it in this case. There is not a question asked there, but the information would necessarily come from any person connected with the Post Office Department, whether here or elsewhere. These are all matters known to the parties and to the people who are interested, and they have taken the only means they could take, when they failed to get justice at the hands of the Government, when they failed to get any information or any consideration, by coming here, and on the floor of Parliament, through my hon. friend, asking the questions in the manner in which he has asked them. I am glad that the Postmaster General has condescended to give a good deal of important information with regard to this matter, and I see no reason why he should not have answered, without the slightest information, every question that was asked.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If I may be permitted to say a word, I would say that it seems to me that the strictures of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) upon my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) are unwarranted, are unfounded, in view of the statement made by the hon. gentleman who asked this question, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). The postmaster who, it appears, was removed a few days ago, was postmaster at a point called here, in the question, Seeley's Bay. Some few years ago, as I understand from the statement made, this gentleman removed to Smith's Falls, a place 40 miles away from the place at which he was postmaster. He so removed himself, as I understood from the hon. gentleman (Mr.

Taylor), being allowed by the late Government to retain his office as postmaster at Seeley's Bay, and yet to reside at Smith's Falls.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is what I understood.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, you did not.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman stated that he had removed to Smith's Falls with permission from somebody. From whom? There was no one who could give him permission, except the Postmaster General of that time. I submit, that if the Postmaster General allowed that postmaster to retain the postmastership at Seeley's Bay, while he did not discharge the duties of the office, but resided at a place 40 miles away, the Postmaster General of that day committed a gross breach of the duties he owed to the public. I do not pretend to know the facts, but I gather them from information given by the hon. gentleman a moment ago. And, whether that statement is accurate or not, I think the case amply justifies the position taken by my hon. friend the Postmaster General, that this is a peculiar case, in which the only method of making known the facts, so that the public may fairly judge the matter, is to have the whole record placed before the House, as is suggested by the Postmaster General.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not prepared to say whether this case came before the department when I was managing it or not, but it is quite evident that the information sought by my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) from the Postmaster General is information that should be placed upon the Table of Parliament as soon as possible. The Postmaster General, after refusing to reply to the question put, altered his mind and told us that the postmaster had been dismissed. Now, I would like to draw the attention of the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to this fact, which has come under my notice on more than one occasion, as Postmaster General. It may be that the family of the postmaster were living in the place where the post office existed, and carried on the duties of the office. In that case, the public would not suffer in any way from the fact of the postmaster being absent. And I must say that, reading the question as it has been submitted by my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) to the Postmaster General, it is impossible for me to find any reason why a return should have to be brought down to give the information that is sought. I think that question, as it is put upon the Order paper, can very easily be answered without putting my hon. friend from Leeds to the trouble of preparing a motion for the return. Moreover, Sir, if notice were given, at this period of the discussion, it is very likely that it would not be reached this ses-

sion, so that the Postmaster General would have until next session to frame additional excuses for having dismissed a public officer without any valid reason.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are we to have any assurance from the Postmaster General as to when the papers will be produced, if a motion is made, instead of reliance being placed upon the answering of the question? We have had some experience which justifies us in supposing that we should not get the information this year, and perhaps not next year. Some motions that we moved last year, one of which I have particularly in mind at this moment, are not answered even now. They were for information which the House should have been in possession of at the very moment the Government had completed their work in the matter, the work in which was all ready, requiring only the copies of certain papers to be made and that the Minister could take the trouble to lay them on the Table—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Was that in my department?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The case I refer to related to the appointments which were made by the late Government just before they went out of office, and as to that class of those appointments which were approved by His Excellency.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was laid on the Table yesterday.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It appears, then, that it was laid on the Table yesterday, after a silence and inactivity of about a year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There were so many recommendations that it took a long time to get it ready.

Mr. MONTAGUE. These were all figured out and gone over by the Government before the request was made that the papers should be brought down, and so, instead of any work being necessary in the preparation of the papers, all that was required was, that copies should be made and that they should be laid on the Table of the House. Now, if we are to allow questions not to be answered, in this way, and are put off with the statement that we can move for a return, I think we ought to have assurance from the Postmaster General that he will bring the papers down at once. He could bring them down to-morrow. It does not take long to prepare copies of papers such as these. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is to drop the questions and give notice of motion, the Postmaster General should give a pledge to the House that the papers shall be brought down at once.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me that if the hon. gentleman had made his question shorter, and had not made so many statements in it as he does, the Postmaster General might have been able to give an an-

swer. But I appeal to fair-minded men on the other side of the House if it is possible for the Postmaster General to answer this part of the question :

Was a petition, signed by nearly all the residents of the surrounding district, presented to the Postmaster General protesting against any change being made ?

How is the Postmaster General to decide whether a petition that was presented to the department was signed by nearly all the residents of the surrounding district ? If the hon. gentleman had put his question in a manner that it could have been answered by the Postmaster General, I have not the slightest doubt he would have got an answer. But the hon. gentlemen should not fly in a passion over a matter of this kind. I would just ask them to remember the experiences of the hon. gentlemen now on this side of the House for the last 15 or 16 years. I have been frequently met myself in putting questions from the other side by the reply that I had better move for the papers in the ordinary way. It is not an uncommon thing to decline to answer questions of this kind. I admit frankly that it is the duty of a Minister of the Crown to give to the House all the information that can reasonably be expected. I say that as a rule when questions are put, they should be answered. But questions are sometimes put in such a way that it is impossible to give an answer, and I contend that this is just one of those questions. If the hon. gentleman had confined himself to points that could have been reasonably answered by the Postmaster General, the probabilities are that he would have got an answer. But how can he make an answer to that portion of his question I have just referred to ? It is utterly impossible, it would be a mere expression of opinion on the part of the Minister. The only way the House can judge with regard to the petition that was presented, is by asking for a copy of that petition to be brought down and laid upon the Table of the House ; and then hon. gentlemen who are acquainted with the people in that district, in reading over the names attached to the petition, will be able to decide whether the point the hon. gentleman makes here in his question, is correct or not, that a very large majority of the people in that district did or did not sign the petition. Unless the Postmaster General went out and took a census of the whole district and made an exhaustive inquiry as to how many did or did not sign the petition, and what was the standing of those who did sign it, it could not be possible for him to give an answer to that question. I do not think this is an occasion where hon. gentlemen opposite should allow themselves to fly off the handle because this question is not answered, because I can say that on several occasions I have been met in the same way. I am not going to say there

Mr. McMULLEN.

was not a justification for the Minister in refusing to answer me. I am making no charge of any kind. But I maintain that the Postmaster General is fairly warranted in taking the course he has under the present circumstances.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has made an argument which is entirely destroyed by the reluctance of the Minister to accept this as a notice and bring down the papers. The hon. gentleman argues that the question was put in such a way that it cannot be fairly answered off-hand, and that it was necessary to bring down the papers in order to give a correct answer. If that be the only objection, and if the Postmaster General was willing to bring down the information, you would naturally expect that he would accept this question as a notice and bring down the papers forthwith, and that is the feature of it that attracted my attention. If there was no reasonable objection, why should he not offer to accept this as a notice of motion, knowing at this late stage of the session, with the number of notices on the paper, and with the days nearly all taken away from the private members, that it would be utterly impossible to reach this motion before the end of the session. That has been done with many other questions that have been put on this paper before, the question itself has been accepted as a notice of motion, and the Government consented to bring down the papers without going through the formality of putting another notice on the Orders for those papers.

Mr. TAYLOR. In reply to the Postmaster General and to the leader of the Government, and in justice to the civil service, against whom the Postmaster General has been kind enough to issue a veiled threat by saying that in view of my familiarity with this question, some person in the department must have furnished some information—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say it.

Mr. TAYLOR—in the department or outside of the department, I would like to ask the Postmaster General to point out one question that was asked here that gives him reason to make that insinuation. I want to inform the hon. gentleman that Seeley's Bay is a village 12 miles from where I reside, and I hear of the happenings of that village every day when I am at home. Mr. Williams, who has been the postmaster, was appointed by the Mackenzie Administration. The Postmaster General and the leader of the Government have stated that he had moved 40 miles away from the point where the post office is kept. Such is not the case. Mr. Williams, the postmaster, has a business at Seeley's Bay where his wife and daughter reside. He comes home every Saturday night, and goes

back to Smith's Falls. I do not know where my hon. friend resides, but I know that Mr. Williams visits his home every Sunday. His wife and daughter carry on a mercantile business and attend to the post office. Before he went to Smith's Falls he wrote me to ask if the post office authorities would have any objection. I went to the department and was informed that there was no objection as long as the office was conducted by his wife and daughter just as well as if he was there. The business there was not sufficient to allow him to make a profitable living, and he thought he could earn a little something at Smith's Falls, and he has been there for two or three years. I have so been informed by himself, and by leading Reformers in that section, because Mr. Williams was a Reformer, and is a Reformer to-day. I believe the principal charge against him is that he voted for me. Whether he did so or not, my hon. friend opposite does not know, but the chances are that he did. The office there has been closed, and a gentleman has been appointed living at the westerly limit of the village, so I am informed. A petition was got up, signed by Conservatives and Reformers, and I think it was presented to my hon. friend from North Leeds (Mr. Frost) to present to the Government, and even to Mr. Fredenburgh, the defeated candidate. Many in the neighbourhood, both Conservatives and Reformers, have told me that they signed it. The Postmaster General says there is evidence that points to information having been received by me from some official of the Government. I say this in my place here, that I have conversed with no official of the Government, either in the inside or outside service, in reference to this matter. What information I have I have gathered at home in conversation with people residing in the locality, and from that information I have framed these questions. There is not a question there to which the Minister could not say, yes or no. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who is always ready to come to the rescue of the Government, gets up and says, that the Minister was not able to answer the question whether there was a petition presented largely signed by the residents. It was not necessary to go into the details as to whether it represented the majority of the residents of the locality. He could have given the information, he could have said there was a petition. Now, I ask the Postmaster General, who, judging from what he has said here to-day, is conversant with the papers, whether he will bring them down and lay them on the Table of the House within a week or ten days?

An hon. MEMBER. To-morrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, to-morrow if he can have them ready then. But I am not particular for a day or two. But I will insist, if he will not promise me that he will give

the information by producing the papers, as he has a right to do, and must do, that the House do not adjourn until we thoroughly discuss this matter. The questions there are plain questions that a Minister has a right to answer. Even the hon. member for North Wellington can not justify the Minister in refusing to answer all the questions that are on the paper, including the one referring to the petition. If the hon. gentleman will promise me to lay the papers on the Table during the early part of next week, I will accept the situation. But if he forces me to put a notice on the paper that will not be reached this year, I say this for myself, and I believe there are many hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the House who will support me, that we will not accept any such treatment from the hon. gentleman occupying the Treasury benches.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can only repeat what I told the hon. gentleman before, that my reply to him, when he asked the question, was in good faith, not for the purpose of delay, or for any purpose of withholding from the House any information.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, will you bring it down?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I must say to my hon. friend that I cannot, in self-respect, submit to any threat on the part of the hon. gentleman when he declares what he will or will not do. No Government, I think, can tolerate that, or submit to be dictated to under such circumstances. If the hon. gentleman will allow us to conduct the affairs of our departments in our own way, we will probably make as much headway. I will tell the hon. gentleman as much in regard to this question as he has a right to expect me to give here, and then we shall see whether this ought to be the subject of any further inquiry. I have told him twice what my object was, and I have only one object.

Mr. TAYLOR. I asked nothing unreasonable, when I requested the hon. gentleman to bring down the papers in a day or two.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL—

Has W. W. Williams, postmaster at Seeley's Bay, been dismissed?

You may call it dismissal or removal from office. He has been removed from office, or, at all events, has been ordered to be removed; and I cannot speak from memory, one way or the other. I believe the new appointee has been installed in office.

Were there any charges preferred against him?

I do not call it a charge against the man—it is a harsh term to use. My recollection is, that it was in evidence that he had left the place where the office was, that he neither discharged the duties nor exercised supervision over those who did.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is not correct.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That may not be correct, but I believe that is the opinion in the department, and the late Administration took the view—that, at all events, is my view—that, whilst these small postmasters are not required personally to discharge the duties, still, they are bound to be so situated that they can exercise a reasonable control over the exercise of the duties by those who are placed in charge. That is the course of procedure I have myself thought it proper to apply, and that officer was not in a position to exercise that supervision. I do not call that, however, a charge against the gentleman.

Was there an investigation ?

I believe the matter was reported to the inspector, and he reported as I have stated. I believe he also made a subsequent report, and that report is the report I had not seen, that I heard of to-day for the first time, when this question was brought before me. On 19th November last, on reading the report of the inspector, who found this postmaster was living at Smith's Falls, which, I am told, is 40 miles away, I deemed it a case calling for a change, and I directed accordingly. By some error in the department or act of authority, which was without authority, an officer in my department directed an investigation on a matter which was brought under the notice of the department, as to the proposed location of the new office not being convenient, and a second report was made by the inspector on the proposed location, regarding its convenience or inconvenience, the tenor of which I do not with certainty speak, but I think it was unfavourable as to the locality.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is that the old or the new locality ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The new locality. I say this, that the reference back to the inspector was without my knowledge or authority, and the second report was never brought to my knowledge, and I never knew of its existence until to-day, when I found it on looking through the papers with a view to making this answer. I think I have a grievance against some one in connection with that action.

An hon. MEMBER. Fire him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not intend to fire them. I have received explanations and have accepted them. I do not wish to take that harsh view. There was a reference to the inspector ; there was this report made, put away, and I am told it was docketed up, and I did not know of it. I do not know how the contents of the report became public.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should like to direct the attention of the Minister to the

Mr. MULOCK.

fact that there is no reference to any report being referred back, or to a second report.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am giving all the information I can.

Has Mr. Williams been postmaster for the last twenty years or more ?

I really do not know, but it is not very material, I suppose. We might assume that to be the fact. The hon. gentleman lives so near the place that, no doubt, he is aware of the fact.

Mr. TAYLOR. He was appointed by the Mackenzie Administration.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then, that would answer the inquiry.

Was the office conducted in a satisfactory manner ?

We may assume so ; he has not been removed because he was unsatisfactory.

Was the office kept at a central point in the village ?

I am unable to answer this point, but the hon. gentleman himself is familiar with the place.

Has it been removed to the westerly limit of the village, where it is inconvenient for the public to get their mail thereat ?

That is an argumentative question, and is irregular, and should not have been included in the question ; and Mr. Speaker would strike it out, if attention were called to it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You have answered it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then, there is nothing more to be said about it.

Was a petition, signed by nearly all the residents of the surrounding district, presented to the Postmaster General protesting against any change being made ?

I do not know whether a petition was signed by nearly all of the residents or not.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is immaterial.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On that point, I would say that, though a petition was presented, it was never brought to my knowledge until to-day.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, the hon. member for North Leeds did not do his duty.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL—

Was the change made on the recommendation of Mr. W. H. Fredenburgh, the defeated candidate ? If not, on whose recommendation was the change made ?

That is a matter for the guidance of the Government.

Has C. C. Gilbert been appointed postmaster, and by whom was he recommended ?

I do not know the name of his successor, but, no doubt, the hon. gentleman knows the name.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I desire to ask a question. If I remember rightly, the hon. Minister has stated that he has a report in his possession, which was pigeon-holed, showing that this office is now very inconveniently situated. Does the hon. gentleman intend to suit the public convenience?

Mr. WALLACE. The statements now made by the Postmaster General could have been very properly made when the question was asked by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). He had all the information under his hand, and, in my opinion, the papers brought down would not have given the information as to many of the inquiries. The questions that have been asked are very proper ones. I have looked them over. There was one referred to by the hon. member for North Wellington: "Was a petition, signed by nearly all the residents of the surrounding district, presented to the Postmaster General protesting against any change being made?" That could have been easily answered by the Postmaster General stating that there are 150 to 250 signatures, or whatever the number may be, to that petition, and allow hon. members and the public to judge whether that was the whole of the community interested or not. That question could be easily and fairly answered. With respect to all other questions, they were not, as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said, statements. There is not a single statement there, from beginning to end. I believe the rules of the House prevent statements being inserted in questions. There are no statements made, but questions asked. Hon. members have rights in this House, and members of the Government have duties to perform, and this is not the only instance in which members of the Government have curtly dismissed questions that may have been inconvenient to answer. Taking my mind's eye back to the days when the Conservatives were in power, I know the late Sir John Macdonald recognized most fully the duty of the Government to furnish information to hon. members who might ask for it. It is true that a member may sometimes ask questions which he himself may think can be answered, but which the Minister finds can only be answered by a return, and in such case as that, the Minister has the right to ask that the return be moved for. But, Sir, in this case, the question could clearly be answered in the ordinary way. The Minister has told us just now that the report of the inspector was that the new location of the post office was unfavourable, but only a few minutes before that he told us that the location of the old post office was unfavourable, and that the new location is favourable. What are we to think when such statements are made by the Postmaster General? We are entitled to have the report of the inspector on that location, and we should have it. We have the state-

ment of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that he inquired from the post office authorities at Ottawa whether this postmaster might leave his wife and daughter to attend to his duties for a certain portion of each week, and the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) was answered that the postmaster could do so. It was a most high-handed proceeding on the part of the Minister to dismiss this man, when his family attended to the duties of his office and were well able to do so. It would be preposterous to suppose that in those country post offices where the salary is from \$40 to \$100 a year, the postmaster should give all his time personally to the duties of his office for that small sum. The usual course is that members of his family attended to his duties, and are duly appointed by the Government as his deputies. I hold that in the case of Mr. Williams, he complied with the law and it appears to me that the dismissal was totally unjustifiable. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has made threats against the officers of his own department. Well, there is not one single suggestion or question put by the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) which could not be based on the information which the late postmaster (Mr. Williams) could give, and the threat of the Postmaster General is entirely uncalled for. The Postmaster General also tells us that if the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) would permit the department to conduct its business in their own way, a good deal more headway would be made. Well, I do not know about that. Conducting business in his own way may produce good results or it may not, but we are bound to conclude that the Postmaster General conducts the business of the department according to law. However, in this case both the law and the regulations have been violated. The dismissal of Mr. Williams has apparently been made without sufficient cause and therefore the law has been violated. I hope that when the Postmaster General lays the papers on the Table of the House, they will include the report of his own inspector with regard to the location of the new post office at Seeley's Bay.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the Postmaster General might very easily have given all the information asked for in the question of the hon. member (Mr. Taylor). Why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has not brought down this information is possibly open to the excuse that the Deputy Postmaster General is not conversant with the duties of his office, and that owing to the fact that the Postmaster General saw fit to dispense with the services of the late deputy, and took a novice into the office, who, beyond knowing the concession lines in the riding of North York and being very well conversant with the voters' list of that riding, he having aided the hon. the Postmaster General at all times and occasions in his elections, knew nothing whatever about the postal depart-

ment of this Dominion. There is another good reason for the appointment of the present Deputy Postmaster General and that is, that he was an aspiring man, and the Postmaster General saw in him a probable candidate for the Liberal nomination in North York. That was one reason why that gentleman had to be foisted on the public service and the services of a very efficient Deputy Postmaster General dispensed with. I see, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the Postmaster cannot give me his attention, but I suppose it is not necessary to remind him of the services of his present Deputy Postmaster General, because no doubt he is very well acquainted with all his deputy has done for many years past in the riding of North York.

Now, Sir, what is the position of matters? The Postmaster General has told the House that a report has been made by an officer of his department, made unknown to him and that this return was not brought down until to-day. Why, Sir, it seems very striking that in the Post Office Department there should be no regard for decency, and that the officers there do not consult their chief. I am glad that the Postmaster General is so deeply engrossed at present with the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron). Probably they are arranging the terms upon which the postmaster was expelled from the Goderich office a little time ago in order to let in the son-in-law of the hon. member for the riding (Mr. Cameron); or it may be, that there is a hiatus to-day, and that the Lieutenant-Governorship which is to go to the hon. member for West Huron is hanging in the balance, and he is endeavouring to enlist the services of the Postmaster General in that regard. I am only sorry the session of the House is on at present because I have no doubt that were it not, the Postmaster General would visit Seeley's Bay and make a personal inquiry into the matter. Why, Sir, if there is an hon. member of the Cabinet, who pays every possible attention to the duties of his office, it is the Postmaster General; for last year when there was a by-election in the riding which I have the honour to represent, there was to be found the Postmaster General of the Dominion; doing what? Attending public meetings and addressing them as any Cabinet Minister would? Why, not at all. He was visiting the country post offices; the Postmaster General of the Dominion running around from one country post office to another; imagine that, Sir! And the result was that the postmasters did not vote. Fancy; fancy, I say, Mr. Speaker, a Postmaster General whose estimate of his high position is, that in going into a campaign he should go around from one country post office to another, to see how the postmasters would vote. Fancy him doing that at the risk of having his conduct contrasted with the conduct of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who when Conservative Cabinet Min-

Mr. BENNETT.

isters visited that riding. When the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) and other gentlemen of the late Conservative Administration came to the riding of East Simcoe during election times, were they to be found hanging around country postmasters to see now they would vote? Why, not at all. In the case of their visit the people beheld the spectacle of how high a Cabinet Minister could be, and in the case of the Postmaster General, they saw how low a Cabinet Minister can be. The contrast was marked.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should confine himself to the point raised in reference to this particular post office. I cannot allow a general discussion on a particular motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. He is endeavouring to attract the attention of the Postmaster General to what he is saying.

Mr. SPEAKER. I will not allow any hon. member to interfere with a well-understood question of order. The hon. member who has the floor knows quite well, I am sure, that he should not exceed the general discussion of the question raised as to the answering or not answering of this question.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I, of course, have to bow in submission. I was endeavouring to extenuate the conduct of the Postmaster General in not going and inquiring into the details himself, because, with my knowledge of the hon. gentleman, I know that he does not deem it beneath the dignity of his position to visit country post offices.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Allow me to say to the hon. gentleman—of course, I cannot prevent him saying these things; but if he desires to give it out that on any occasion I called on a postmaster and directly or indirectly in the slightest degree, intimated to him or to any officer in the department or under me, how he ought to exercise his franchise, he is, of course, incorrectly referring to me. I never suggested to any postmaster how he should vote. On the contrary, when I have had occasion to take part in campaigns, which is my right and duty, I have studiously avoided any contact whatever with country postmasters; and I challenge any person to be able to cite one single case to the contrary.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Postmaster General deny that he visited the postmaster in the Orillia post office in the month of February last? The hon. gentleman will not dare to deny it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will answer the hon. gentleman, because he indulges in a suggestion there. I was in Orillia for some days. I presume I have

a right to use the mails, and some of the citizens of Orillia told me that there was some defect in the position of a partition in the office, so that the public had insufficient accommodation. I went into the post office in regard to that subject. That was all I went in for, and I had no conversation with any person except on that one point.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. gentleman deny that he visited the postmaster in the post office at the village of Coldwater ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never was there in my life.

Mr. BERGERON. I believe you. Coldwater is a bad place.

Mr. SPEAKER. The House will see how very irrelevant indeed subjects may be which are brought in on this question. What Coldwater has to do with the question it is difficult to see.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall take the occasion, when it is afforded to me, of calling the attention of the House to other post offices which the Postmaster General did visit during that campaign ; and if he does the riding the honour of visiting it in another election, I will produce "Hansard" with his denials of having been there, and I will produce witnesses who saw him there, and leave the constituency to judge as to his veracity. As to the question under discussion, as I understand it, the Postmaster General is justifying his conduct on the ground that this postmaster was not himself personally giving attention to the office. I can only say in reply that the Postmaster General knows very well that in the riding of East Simcoe many of the postmasters do not give their personal attention to the duties of the office. As for the question propounded by the hon. member for Leeds, I have only this to say, that the Postmaster General must have in his possession the report of the inspector of that division, and from that report there is not one of these questions which, to my mind, could not have been satisfactorily answered. To-day, after the discussion, the Postmaster General has practically answered nearly all the parts of the question that were formulated, and I think it is the duty of the Postmaster General, with a brand new Deputy Postmaster General, to give this trifling information which the hon. member for Leeds has asked.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

ADDRESS TO THE HOLY FATHER.

Mr. McDUGALL. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House to an omission which I have discovered in the public records of the proceedings of this House. It will be in the recollection of hon. members of this House that I put

a question to the Government on the eighth day of this session. That question was answered by the right hon. Prime Minister. But I found about three weeks ago that the question and the answer were omitted from "Hansard." I was called away suddenly to my home, and only returned last night ; and this is my first opportunity to call the attention of the House to the omission. The question was :

Has the Government or the Minister of Public Works any knowledge of a reply being made to the document addressed to the Holy Father and signed by forty-five members of the Senate and House of Commons, and which was read to this House by the hon. Minister of Public Works on the 30th March, 1897 ? If so, what is the nature of the reply ?

The right hon. First Minister replied that the Government had no knowledge, and the newspapers reported the question as having been put by myself and answered by the right hon. First Minister. As proof of that, I will read the reference made to it by the Toronto "Globe" of February 15th, on page 4, as follows :—

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in reply to Mr. McDougall, stated that the Government had no knowledge of a reply being made to the document addressed to the Holy Father and signed by forty-five members of the Senate and House of Commons.

My object is to ask that this question and the answer be restored to the public records of the proceedings of this House. I cannot see any reason for the omission of this question. I took the trouble of going to the "Hansard" room, and made the inquiry there, but I could not ascertain why it was left out. The question, as I said before, was put and answered.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I may observe that that question was answered, I think, by myself in the absence of the Premier.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McDUGALL. I may say that on the same day I put the question in a little changed form on the Order paper, and put it to the House in this way on the 16th of February :

Has the Hon. J. Israel Tarte, a member of the Government, any knowledge of a reply being made to the document addressed to the Holy Father and signed by the said Hon. J. Israel Tarte and forty-four Senators and members of the House of Commons, and was read by the hon. Minister of Public Works on the 30th March, 1897 ? If so, what is the nature of the reply ? If not, does the hon. Minister of Public Works expect an answer ? If not, why not ?

You, Mr. Speaker, ruled that question out of order on that occasion, and an answer was not made by the Government. But the first time I put the question, in the first form, it was answered by the right hon. First Minister, after some little hesitation, I must

say. His attention was called to it by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), who sat behind him, because he did not appear to notice at the time that I was putting the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman speaks of correcting the records of the House. Of course, he understands that the "Hansard" is not part of the records of the House, but the Votes and Proceedings, and that the answers to questions do not go on the Journals of the House, but are only taken down by the "Hansard" reporters. As regards any question raised concerning the "Hansard," the Speaker and officers of the House have no control, but the Committee on Debates, appointed by this House; and I have no doubt that if any mistake has been made, they will look into it. I may mention to the hon. gentleman, however, that the remarks he has made to-day, on rising to a personal explanation, have, no doubt, been taken down and will go in "Hansard."

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say, that I have a vivid recollection of the hon. gentleman putting the question and of my answering it as the hon. gentleman said I did.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As "Hansard" is a very important record of the proceedings of this House, and is under the control of the Debates Committee, I think the attention of the Debates Committee should be drawn to what has taken place to-day. No doubt, they will investigate and report to the House why this important omission has occurred.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman could have taken a more expeditious way of having the matter corrected, by calling the attention of the committee to it, instead of bringing it before the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think he adopted precisely the correct mode. It is not the business of any member to hunt up the Debates Committee and draw their attention privately to a matter which is of public interest. The proper place for my hon. friend to raise the question is here. It is of vital importance to every member that there shall be a correct record in the "Hansard," which costs the public a large sum of money, and, when attention has been drawn to the fact that there has been an obvious neglect on the part of the reporters of the "Hansard," it becomes the duty of the committee appointed by this House to investigate the matter and let us know the result.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is exactly what I have been saying—that it is the duty of the committee to look into this matter, and that the hon. gentleman should call the attention of the committee to it.

DELAYED RETURNS.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to returns

Mr. McDOUGALL.

which I asked for during last session, and would like to know when they will be down.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I did not catch what the hon. gentleman said, but I gather from his remarks that he was calling attention to some orders of the House which, he says, have not been complied with. If the hon. gentleman would have the kindness to send me a memo. of the orders referred to, I shall at once give attention to the matter.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. CRAIG. I must confess that I resume the discussion of this subject with some hesitation, Mr. Speaker, because it is impossible for me to say anything new on this question after the speeches to which we have listened during this debate. I suppose, however, that it is only by discussion in Parliament on both sides of the House that the people of the country become informed on public questions, so that fair and thorough discussion is a very important element in the education of the people. I have no intention of speaking at any great length to-day, and I shall endeavour, in all I say, to treat the subject in a fair and reasonable manner.

I shall first give attention to some of the remarks made by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald). In closing his statement, he said that he was not prepared as well as usual, but I must say that I was rather surprised at the great number of subjects to which he gave attention. The first subject he noticed was the Yukon Railway. He thought it was most unfortunate that this Bill had been thrown out by the Senate, and expressed the opinion that the Senate was no longer a necessary part of the Government of this country. Well, I am happy to say that, not only the Conservatives, but a great many Liberals, and some prominent Liberals in this House, do not agree with the hon. gentleman. They think that the Senate discharged a most important duty in rejecting the Yukon Bill, and further, that the Senate did considerable service to the Government of the day by the course they took. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I entertain the same opinion myself. I thought that it would be a good political stroke for the Conservative party, if the Senate allowed this Bill to pass; but, at the same time, I, of course, felt that in so acting they would not be doing justice to the country and their own sense of duty.

Then the hon. gentleman went on to put the question: What was expected of the Liberal party? I may reply that a great

deal was expected of them before they came into power, but, as to what is expected of them to-day, I would find it very difficult to answer that question. The hon. gentleman said they were expected to reduce the tariff, and did reduce it; and, in order to prove this, he instanced the 25 per cent reduction which will come into effect on the first of July on goods from Great Britain and some of the colonies. Well, I think that that 25 per cent preference was a most politic stroke on the part of the Government, and I think so for this reason. Most of the regular tariff has not been reduced very much at all. Most of the duties have been retained as they were under the Conservative Administration, and a great many Liberals were not at all satisfied. They are not satisfied to-day, but they console themselves with the reflection that the preferential clause makes a large reduction. In that way they reconcile themselves to the course of the Government, and try to make it appear that the Government has been consistent and has carried out its pledges. I must say that my hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) is very easily satisfied, if he thinks that the Government has fulfilled its pledges with regard to the tariff. I shall refer later to some of these pledges, but I repeat, he must be very easily satisfied, and that his party fealty evidently overrules his better judgment.

The hon. gentleman went on to say that the Liberal party had been accused of wearing the clothes of the Conservative party, but that that was not the case, because these clothes were not large enough for the progressive Liberal party. I think that the clothes of the Conservative party would be quite large enough, if the Liberal party had not only adopted, as they practically have done, the tariff of the Conservative party, but were willing to admit that they have. But, when we find that they want to travel in two directions, when we find that they have adopted a protective tariff, and yet want to make people believe that they are going in another direction, then the clothes of the Conservative party will not fit them at all, because the Conservative party, whatever else it may have been, has always been consistent on this question.

Then the hon. gentleman took up the subject of expenditure, and I was rather surprised to hear him say that the Liberal party had promised to reduce taxation, as far as the expenditure would allow. That would have been a very safe promise to make, because the expenditure can always be kept up or increased to any amount by the Government. But that was not the promise they made at all, and what do we find their performance has been? We find that the expenditure is not being reduced, but quite the reverse. We find that it is being increased, and I have no doubt that, if the revenue increases, they will contrive to likewise increase the expenditure, and then the

hon. gentlemen will, no doubt, still pretend that they are really keeping their promise of reducing the taxation as far as the expenditure would allow. I propose to show that this was not what they promised at all. The hon. gentleman said, further, that the Liberal party had promised to be more honest and pure than the Conservatives had been.

And he said that they had not had any great scandals, and so on. Now, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) remarked the other day, they have only been twenty months in power. It certainly would be remarkable if during only twenty months of office there were any great scandals for us to point to. I think we must give them a little longer time in order to show what they can do and will do. I sincerely hope, as we all hope, that they will be honest and pure. I was a little surprised when the hon. gentleman went on to remark that some members of the Conservative party tried to pass slurs upon prominent members of the party opposed to them and made insinuations as to their honesty and political straightforwardness. He designated this as political clap-trap, loud-mouthing and that sort of thing, and he read a lecture to this side of the House on that subject. Well, it seems to me that he ought to read a lecture to his own side. If there ever was a party that indulged in abuse of political opponents it is the Liberal party of this country. When the late leader of the Conservatives, Sir John Macdonald, was alive, as we all know, the Liberals continuously abused him. Their great organ, the "Globe" newspaper, in Toronto, followed him with abuse of the very worst kind. And the present leader of the Opposition has been subjected to similar abuse. I am not in sympathy with this sort of thing; I do not believe in abusing men in political life; I believe in showing them up if they have done wrong, but I do not believe in making insinuations against them or slandering them. I hope that in this matter the Conservative party will not follow the example of the Liberals. Public men have enough to bear without being subjected to slanders and innuendoes.

The hon. gentleman went on to refer to what the Liberal party had done in carrying the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal. Whatever may be said about the merits of this question, I think we must all admit that the Senate did great service to the country in throwing out the Drummond County deal last session. The result has been that the Government has made a new bargain which saves hundreds of thousands to this country. This is a complete justification of the course of the Senate and of the Conservative party and a condemnation of the Liberal party for making any such bargain as they made last session.

Then the hon. gentleman went on to talk about the canal system, and said they pro-

posed to spend three and a half millions in deepening the canals. Any person not familiar with the circumstances of the case would imagine that the Liberal party had inaugurated this policy of deepening the canals. As a matter of fact, it was the Conservatives who inaugurated this policy of deep waterways. I am glad that the Liberals are carrying out this part of the Conservatives' policy, as they have adopted so many other parts of it. I have no fault to find with them for pursuing this policy, but I do find fault with them for trying to lead the public to believe that this policy is original with them.

Then the hon. gentleman says that the Liberal party caused the prosperity of the country. I confess that I could not understand this part of the hon. gentleman's speech. I think it could be accounted for only in the light of what he said in his opening remarks that he was not so well prepared to discuss the question as he would have liked to have been. In this connection I may refer to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce concerning the exodus to the United States. We used to hear a great deal about the exodus. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that it has ceased. We have not the information before us, but we hope that what they say is true. The hon. gentleman says that our young men, instead of going to the United States, go to our great North-west. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman, that at the time to which he refers as having been marked by so great an exodus, our young men had no North-west to go to, and to find an opening in a new country they had to go to the United States. And who was it that opened the great North-west? Sir, it was the Conservative party, and further, the Conservative party opened the great North-west in the face of the strongest opposition of the Liberal party. So, for the hon. gentleman to claim credit for the exodus being stopped because our young go to the North-west is absurd. We claim credit for that, as we have a right to do.

The hon. gentleman cast a slur upon the Conservative party on account of what he called the gerrymander. I wish to say that the men who carried this Act in the Dominion Parliament were only apprentices to the business compared with the men in Ontario. Why, Sir, in the provincial gerrymander, the townships were cut up and the whole thing was arranged by the Ontario Cabinet in a most scientific manner. In this matter also the hon. gentleman had better turn his attention to his own side and give them the benefit of his lecture instead of directing it at us.

The hon. gentleman made one admission which I was not surprised to hear him make now, though I should have been surprised to have heard it when they were in Opposition. He said that free trade was impossible. We all know it, but many mem-

bers of the Liberal party did not know it a few years ago. They used to talk loudly about free trade. The gentleman who opposed me in my constituency talked free trade and sought to make the farmers believe that they should have free trade if the Liberals were returned to power. He learned that lesson from speeches made in this House. While these gentlemen may have thought absolute free trade was impossible, they gave the people the impression, that if they were returned to power, they would bring about absolute free trade, or as near it as possible.

I do not intend to say more as to the speech of the hon. member, but I propose to address myself to some of the remarks made by the Finance Minister and also to speak upon two or three planks of the Liberal platform. I have no idea that I shall convert any member of the Liberal party or that I shall convince any of them that they were wrong before or are wrong now, but I may give them a few twinges of conscience and help them on a little in the right path. Now, first, as to economy. When the Liberal party was in Opposition they talked a great deal about economy and declared that the Liberal-Conservative party was most extravagant. If the Liberal party were returned to power, how economical they would be. They would not overtax the farmers or spend the money of the people extravagantly. They held up their hands in holy horror at an expenditure of thirty-eight million. They looked back to the time when Alexander Mackenzie was in power, and the expenditure was about twenty-three millions and asked the people to compare Conservative extravagance with Liberal economy. They forgot to say—that they are making an excuse now—that the country had grown in the meantime. They forgot to say that great public works had been undertaken by the Conservative party and carried out successfully. They simply declared: If you will put us in power, we will be economical and will guard the money of the people as carefully as if it were our own. Now, I will read some figures which have already been read in this House. We find that the average expenditure under the Conservative rule, from 1889 to 1896, was \$36,800,000. In 1895 the expenditure was nearly \$37,000,000.

Now, what did the Liberals say about this? The leaders of the party declared on many platforms in this country that if the Liberal party came into power, this expenditure could be reduced and would be reduced from 1 to 4 million dollars. Well, Sir, the people believed that, I think that had a great effect on the minds of many people. They said: Why, is it possible the Conservative party are wasting 1, 2, 3 or 4 million dollars a year? Is it possible that what these men tell us can be true, that if they are placed in power they will reduce the expenditure to that extent? If this is

so, it is time we had a change. Many people thought that. But what do we find? We find that in this current year there is an expenditure of \$38,750,000, or an increase over 1895-96 of \$1,800,000. We find further that the first estimates for 1898-99 are over 39 million dollars. There is no sign of reducing the expenditure, the expenditure is increasing instead of diminishing. I wondered, as I saw the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) get up and speak a little while ago, whether he would get up and protest against this enormous expenditure, this increase to \$39,124,000 for the current year, without any Supplementary Estimates at all. Why, if the Conservative party had brought down estimates of that kind, I do not know what the member for North Wellington would have said. He would have become almost frantic, the country would be on the verge of ruin. But everything is all right now, because the Liberal party bring down these estimates, and they are quite right. I do not think we will hear him raising his voice against these estimates at all. There is nothing said now about reducing these estimates, on the contrary, this is what the Minister of Finance said :

I think hon. gentlemen themselves will admit that it will not be possible to continue the expenditure on the figures of 1895-96.

Which was about 37 million dollars. He admits that there must be an increase over that amount. Then the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in his speech, made excuses for this. He said : The fixed charges are about 20 million dollars—now we cannot touch them. Well, I do not remember him saying anything like that when he was in Opposition. He used to blame the Conservative party although the fixed charges were about 20 million dollars. Now, he says that 20 million dollars is fixed absolutely, and they have no control over them. That is one of the excuses that he makes to-day for this increased expenditure. He turned round to the Minister of Public Works when he was speaking, and said : I find that in the department of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works there is an increase, but I have no doubt he will be able to give good reasons for that. How easily satisfied they are to-day. If there is an increase, we can give a good reason for it, they say. If there is a slight reduction, then they claim great credit for it. So you see it is all twisted round. Because their party is in power it is all right, but when the Conservative party was in power, it was all wrong. I think the people will see through this, they will see that there is not much sincerity in this sort of argument. It seems to me it would have been better for the Minister of Finance, and for the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and for every member on that side of the House who says anything on this question, to confess honestly, either that

they did not know anything about what they were talking when they complained about this expenditure in Opposition, or else that they were trying to humbug the people. But they won't admit that. They say now that these expenditures are all necessary. Well, we said they were necessary at that time, but they would not accept our excuse, what we said had no avail. We said these expenditures were necessary, and we showed they were necessary, but that did not matter with them. They went over the country insisting how extravagant these men were. But now, because they have brought down these estimates, which are a great deal larger than the Conservatives ever brought down, they can give a good reason for everything, and everything is all right.

There is another question on which I wish to say a word, and that is the question of reciprocity with the United States. I remember how the Liberal party talked about reciprocity, if they got into power they could get reciprocity in twenty-four hours. They said : It is no use the Conservative party trying to get reciprocity with the United States because the Conservative party have not been friendly to them, the Conservative party insisted on their rights in every dispute, and so they cannot expect to get favours from the United States. The Conservative party replied that they did not ask any favours, they asked for fair-play, they asked for a treaty which would be mutually beneficial. But the Liberal party said : Oh, well, you cannot get it, besides you are not trying to get it, you are only fooling the people. Now, I believe that they themselves were only fooling the people by this talk of theirs. Have they made any honest effort to get reciprocity? I do not think they have, or if they have, they have miserably failed. So every word they said to us on that question comes back on themselves, and can be quoted against themselves with ten-fold more force than they used it against the Conservative party.

There is another thing they said very often they would do, and that was to lighten the burdens of the people. How much they cared for the people in those days. They were always talking about the people of this country, how solicitous they were for their welfare, and how they pitied them for being under Conservative rule, how they were being taxed, how the Conservatives were bleeding them white, as one hon. member said. They promised to lighten the burdens of the people. Now, what does that mean? Well, I can only give it one meaning, and it is this, that they would take less money in taxes from the people of this country. But are they doing that? Let us see whether they are or not. I find that under the Conservative Government, from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, the customs receipts averaged \$19,840,000. Now I find that under the Liberal Government, in the year 1896-97, the customs receipts were \$19,891,000, or \$50,000

more. But I find that in the year ending 1898 the Finance Minister estimates the customs receipts to be \$21,000,000. I find in addition to that that there will be an increase of the debt for the year 1897-98, of \$4,500,000. Now, Sir, I do not see how this is lightening the burdens of the people at all. I cannot understand how this pledge is being carried out. We find that instead of taking less taxes from the people, they are taking a million dollars more than the Conservatives did during the four years preceding the advent to power of the Liberal Government. Now, is that lightening the burdens of the people? If it is, I do not understand the meaning of that term. Moreover, instead of reducing the debt by any increase of taxes which they receive, they are going further into debt, the debt for this year will be increased by \$4,500,000. If they were receiving more money in customs from the people as a result of improved business, of more goods coming into the country, and if they took the surplus to pay off the debt of the country, then I could understand what they meant by talking of lightening the burdens of the people. But they do not reduce the debt as the result of receiving more money in customs, but on the contrary they increase it. Then, I say, that instead of lightening the burdens of the people, they are increasing them.

Now I will say a few words about the reduction of the rate of interest in the post office savings bank. We are told that the people of this country have about 50 million dollars in these savings banks. Now, the Government a while ago, reduced the interest from $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to 3 per cent, and now they propose, beginning at the 1st of July next, further to reduce the interest to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. To my mind, there is not the slightest excuse for this. I have no doubt that the only reason, or the principal reason, why this is done, is because the banks of this country have brought great pressure to bear upon the Government to do this. We know that the banks subscribed for a large part of the recent loan at low rates. Perhaps they got more than they expected. They put in tenders, and I think they got about what they tendered for. The Government had to do the banks of the country a favour, and they have done a favour to them and not to the people by reducing the interest in the savings banks from 3 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. What is the reason given by the Finance Minister for his action? The great reason given is that it will reduce generally the rate of interest throughout the country. But the rate of interest generally is being rapidly reduced, not in this way, but by money being brought into the country. It is coming in through the loan companies and the rates of interest are being reduced all the time, and I hold that it was striking a blow at thrifty and saving people by reducing the interest on their deposits from 3 to

Mr. CRAIG.

$2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I do not view this matter in a political light, but it is unfortunate that people who have small savings, perhaps \$100, \$200, \$300 or \$400, should have the rate of interest reduced, and I was surprised to hear the Minister of Trade and Commerce state that people who had \$1,000 on deposit did not deserve any sympathy. That is not very much to have on deposit in the savings banks, and the depositor no doubt had earned it by hard work and by depriving himself of many luxuries and by practicing self-denial, by depositing perhaps one dollar at a time until \$1,000 was reached. Surely such a man is deserving of as much sympathy as the depositor who has saved \$100. While the depositor with \$1,000 at the present time receives \$30 annually, he will for the future receive \$25, and thus \$5 will be taken away from every \$1,000 depositor in the savings banks. It is a most unfortunate step for the Government to take, it will not be a popular step, and I venture the prediction that the people will not get money cheaper at the general banks of the country on this account. The Minister of Finance said the inner circle had already felt the benefit. I hold that the inner circle can take care of itself and look after their own interests, and that it is not the business of the Government to look after millionaires; but we do want the Government to look after depositors of small amounts, acquired by hard work and possibly privation, and on behalf of these people I protest against this reduction proposed by the Government. The Finance Minister said that the outer circle, and those who have not very good credit have not got the benefit of it yet. They are the parties, however, who need assistance, and instead of the customers getting any advantage, the banks will obtain it. I think the Government should take every precaution possible to assist the people in obtaining a proper return for their savings. It is a good thing to find workingmen and working girls saving their money instead of spending it and scattering it around, but unfortunately the inducements to save are less now than before the reduction in the rate of interest. The return on \$100 for the future will be only \$2.50 yearly, and some people may think it is not worth while to save in order to obtain such a return and will spend the money; and on this ground alone the action of the Government is unfortunate. I am satisfied that if the Government consulted the people they would find no general desire to make a reduction in the rate of interest paid at the savings banks, but rather that the working people, who wished to save money and deposit it in a safe place, should receive as much interest as the Government is able to pay. The Government can afford to pay 3 per cent. They obtain money abroad for $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, including all charges. The people have the first claim on

the Government in this regard, and the step taken by the Finance Minister has been made, no doubt, at the instance of the banks, which are looking after themselves and do not think of the poor people who have money on deposit in the savings banks.

There is another unfortunate feature of this change. People will go to private banks and deposit money there or to loan companies, and run a great chance of loss. Suppose a man has \$1,000 and he can obtain \$5 more interest by depositing it with those who are in the inner circle, he may be led to do so, for this sum may appear to be an important amount to a poor man or woman. I do not suppose, however, it is any use to give the Government advice, but I think they should retrace the step they have taken and make the interest on money in the savings banks at 3 per cent.

I now proceed to another promise made by the Liberal party when in Opposition, and that is their promise to abolish protection. I was rather amused at the ingenious manner in which the Minister of Customs stated that they had fulfilled this promise. He said they did not promise to abolish protection, but the principle of protection. That was a good way to put it. I never heard hon. gentlemen opposite, however, state when in Opposition that they objected only to the principle of protection; they declared that protection should be abolished and entirely wiped out. I am glad they have not carried out their threat, for the sake of the country. I made the remark the other day to the effect that I was glad they had not fulfilled their pledges, and I did not blame them. I might have blamed them in a moral sense; but I was glad they have not fulfilled their pledge to abolish protection. The Finance Minister, in speaking on the tariff, said that sweeping changes are not desirable, and we must be guarded against tariff tinkering; but at the same time he said we must not regard this tariff as final. I can imagine the hon. gentleman turning around to protectionists and saying: tariff-tinkering is a bad thing, we must have a stable and permanent tariff, so that the people shall have confidence; and shortly afterwards turning around and saying: I do not mean that the tariff must be regarded as final; you free traders need not be alarmed. During the election in Toronto, the present hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) said that the tariff was fixed, in his belief, for ten years. He said further that it would be a good thing for the business men to have a friend at court rather than a member of the Opposition, who would have no influence with the Government, and that if he found the Government tinkering with the tariff or reducing it, he would take care to look after their interests, and he believed the tariff would remain as it was for ten years. The Finance Minister evidently does not agree with that opinion, although I believe

in his heart he does so. I do not think there will be many changes in the tariff during the next ten years. I hope the party will not be in power that long, but if they are in power, there will not be many tariff changes or reductions. This session the only change made in the tariff—this is a horrible thing for me to say—is not a reduction, but an increase. Let hon. members think over the fact that this is the action of the Liberal party, which promised to reduce taxation. There is only one change in the tariff, and it is an increase, and it is an increase on an article used by people all over the country. It is horrible to contemplate a party so far lost to all sense of decency that, after all the predictions and promises made by them to make sweeping reductions, it makes only one change and that is to impose direct taxation. We have had protection applied so that the people did not have to pay increased burdens, but they are giving a bonus to refiners by their increase in the sugar duties, after a course of action which they condemned loudly when in Opposition. Then, the Finance Minister, in the course of his speech, proceeded to give the manufacturers a lecture. They are no doubt very much obliged to him, but I trust they will not take it to heart too seriously. He stated that if the manufacturers want protection they must fight for it, that eternal vigilance is the price of protection. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to cast a slur on the manufacturers and made most undeserving reflections on their ability and enterprise. The hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) said to the manufacturers of this country: During the last eighteen years, when the Conservative party were in power, you have been spending your time trying to get more protection. If instead of doing this, you had been perfecting your machinery and finding out how to make goods cheaper, you would have been far better employed. I hold, Sir, that the manufacturers of this country are not open to any such lecture from the Finance Minister. Our Canadian manufacturers have been perfecting their machinery and cheapening their products, and they have kept themselves abreast of the times. They have constantly watched the Government of the day, as they had a perfect right to do, but I maintain that, in doing this, they have not wasted their time; I maintain, Sir, that they are the equals of any manufacturers in the world. Any one reading the remarks of the Finance Minister, would draw the inference that Canadian manufacturers have been leaning entirely on protection, and that, were it not for protection, they would be completely wiped off the face of the universe. Well, I do not think that remark was intended for the manufacturers of Canada by the Finance Minister; I think it was rather intended for his free trade friends. The Finance Minister and

his colleagues opposite, before they got into power, tried to please the manufacturers, and, now that they are in power, they have got to try and please the men who believe in a revenue tariff. Hence it is that their words and their actions are inconsistent. Be that as it may, as long as by their actions they maintain the policy of protection, I care very little how they talk.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word or two with reference to the question of binder twine. It is a most unfortunate thing that the Government have selected this article to discriminate against, and I do not believe they can give any reason why it should be so selected. They have not discriminated against agricultural implements, but true, there may be a reason for that. I suppose a good many of their friends are in that business, and that may be a reason why they have not discriminated against the agricultural implement business. Why, in the name of common sense, should this Government leave the duties on agricultural implements as they were before they came into power, and remove the duty on binder twine? That is a question I submit for the consideration of the Government, and I trust they will answer it, when they carefully think it over. An hon. member from the North-west told me that he did not want free binder twine, because, as he said, he believed the farmers should pay their fair proportion of the taxation and expenses of the country. There are gentlemen opposite who say, they do not believe in a protective tariff, but they do believe in a revenue tariff, and yet they allow American binder twine to come to Canada without paying a cent to the Canadian revenues. They allow this binder twine in free, and in consequence, although they get no revenue from it, the Canadians engaged in that industry either have to take low wages or to remain in enforced idleness during part of the year. I have always held that binder twine can be sold in Canada as cheaply as in any other country, and that fact is true to-day. These manufacturers in the States do not pay one cent to the Canadian revenue, and the men who work for them do not buy one dollar's worth of produce from Canadian farmers, or wear one dollar's worth of clothes made by Canadian manufacturers. The binder twine makers in this country did buy the produce of the Canadian farmers, and did contribute to the revenue, but their industry is wiped out without any apparent reason, to benefit foreign workmen from whom the revenue of the country receives no contribution whatever. I hope that even yet the Government will see their way clear to place a small duty of 12½, or even 10 per cent on binder twine, so that, if they do not do it by way of protection, they may at least collect a revenue tariff from the imported article.

I wish, Sir, to make a few references to the question of preferential trade, about which we have heard a good deal recently.

Mr. CRAIG.

The Minister of Finance, in his recent Budget speech, said, referring to the policy of the Government on this matter :

This was not brought about, and will not be brought about, by huckstering,—

Mark the word, Mr. Speaker.

—or on the part of any of the colonies in making demands of an unreasonable character, but it will come as a result of a grand Imperial sentiment, which will override all questions of an economic nature.

Again, the Finance Minister says :

Government not demanding impossible conditions, not asking things which they knew or should know the British public were not prepared to grant, not raising any demands of an unreasonable character, not trying to have any huckstering or bargaining in the transaction.

Well, Sir, that sounds very high-toned, but it is a very simple way of doing business, when you give everything away for nothing. If you act in that way, you can do it without any "huckstering," to be sure, and, in fact, you can do it without any ability whatever. The Conservative party, when in power, were endeavouring to secure a real preferential arrangement with Great Britain—a preferential arrangement which would be mutually advantageous to Canada and the mother country—and I do not see that there was anything very disgraceful in that. The Conservative party are now taunted with bargaining, in the carrying out of their policy, and as asking something unreasonable. Well, the Conservative party, or any other party in this country, have a right to make a bargain for the benefit of Canada. This Parliament—not the Conservative party alone, but all this Parliament—is not sent here to look after Imperial interests. I hold that the Imperial Parliament can look after Imperial interests, but I hold that it is our duty, in this Canadian Parliament, to look after the interests of the Canadian people, who sent us here. And, while it may be right for us to do everything fair which will bring about this grand Imperial sentiment which we are told is going to override all question of economy, yet we must remember, in this Parliament, that we should not give away too much of what belongs to the Canadian people. There is no disgrace in a government trying to make a bargain for its country, and, in my opinion, it would have been far better if this present Government had bargained. It would have been better if this Government had tried to obtain concessions from the British Government—such concessions as the Conservative party demanded, when they were in power. The Finance Minister taunts us here with bargaining and with huckstering. Well, Sir, that is a very impolitic remark for him to make, but it seems to bear out the conduct of the Prime Minister in England, who forbore to make any demands on the British Government, and who, in fact, it would ap-

pear, would not take even all that was offered to him. The remarks of the Finance Minister, that the demands of the Conservative party were impossible and unreasonable, are, in my opinion, very unwise, because, Sir, I have hope that even yet, in spite of all that has been done by this Liberal Government to prevent it—even yet we may, by a bargain, secure a preference for Canadian products in the British market. I have the hope, that some day the British public will be so enlightened, and the British Government will be so enlightened, as to see that it is in their interest to give a preference to their own colonies which give a preference to them. I see nothing disgraceful in a bargain of that kind. I know, indeed, that men who are absolute free traders smile at anything that savours of protection. I notice my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) smiling at that. He believes in free trade, but he does not agree with the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), who does not believe in free trade. He does not agree with any other member on that side of the House. I do not believe there is any other member on that side of the House who talks such rubbish as absolute free trade. I call it sentimental nonsense, and nothing more. It is a very nice sentiment to talk about; but when you get down to practical business, there is no such thing as free trade on the face of the globe. Men talk of the British public having free trade. They have no such thing. They have a great many taxes, and customs taxes, too. They admit a great many articles free, because it is in their interest to do so. I believe the British public are not guided in these matters by Imperial sentiment, but by hard common sense. I do not blame them for that. I think that is the way our legislators should be guided, if they are to do all they can for the people of Canada, and not allow themselves to be carried away by grand sentiments which do not amount to anything.

The hon. Finance Minister spoke about helping Jamaica, a sister colony in distress. That is a very good sentence; it sounds very well, and I give the hon. gentleman credit for making it. He believes we ought to help this sister in distress. Well, how is he helping her? He is doing it by making the duty on sugar just about what it was before. After raising it to a certain point, he then says: "I will cut it down 25 per cent," and he brings it just about to what it was before. But in doing this he raises the duty on sugar from many other countries. And what does he do in order to help Jamaica, the sister colony in distress? He puts a tax on the sugar of the people of this country to the amount of about \$300,000 a year. That sounds like a very nice contribution, but after all I do not think it is helping the sister in distress. I think the Government are helping themselves in distress. The Finance Minister

told us the reason for putting on this duty. It is this: "When we take off the other 12½ per cent of duty under the preferential tariff, making the reduction 25 per cent, there will be a loss of revenue, which we must make up, and we do it by putting a tax on sugar." So he makes this plea of helping a sister colony in distress as an excuse for putting an extra tax of about \$300,000 on sugar. I admire the Finance Minister's ingenuity. I think he shows that he is fitted for his position in this House. I hope, however, that the people of the country will not be humbugged by swallowing all this talk about helping a sister colony in distress; because it is the Government themselves who are in distress, and who want \$300,000 more taxes to make up what they will lose by the preferential tariff. The Liberal Government are indeed a liberal Government. How are they liberal? They are very liberal with the people's money. I do not know that they are very liberal in other respects, but they are liberal in that respect. As one member suggests, they are liberal in giving away gold lands and coal fields. They are liberal in giving away something that belongs to the people. They have done that to a great extent. The preferential tariff shows that. This helping of colonies in distress reminds me of Artemus Ward in war time, when he was willing to sacrifice all his wife's relations for the sake of the country.

The Finance Minister goes on to congratulate the country and the Government themselves and the Liberal party on the condition of the country and on the results of the policy of the Government announced in April last. He also congratulates the Opposition on the failure of some of their very gloomy predictions made in 1896 and 1897. I may remark that the congratulations for those years were entirely due to the National Policy, and not to the present Government at all, and I am very glad on behalf of the Conservative party and on behalf of the National Policy to accept these congratulations and to thank the Finance Minister for giving them to us, because in 1896 and 1897 the National Policy was in force. Now, let me say something about the predictions of the Conservative party—those gloomy predictions which have not turned out to be correct. Well, Sir, on what were those predictions based? That is a very important question. I say those predictions were based on our faith in the sincerity of the Liberal party. We believed they meant what they said when they pledged themselves to do away with protection and reduce the tariff down almost to free trade, or tending towards free trade. We thought then, and we think now, that if they did that, it would be disastrous to this country. They themselves have been converted to our view. Why do they pretend that they have carried out their pledges and promises to the people of this country?

The Minister of Customs, in his speech yesterday, said that they had carried out those pledges, and were going to carry out everything else. Well, I cannot find that they have done it at all, and I am very glad they have not. He said they had carried them out, because they had done away in their minds with the principle of protection. Well, if they continue to do those things in their minds, and give us a new definition of the word, they may do what they like in their minds, so long as they do not interfere with the progress of this country. Now, I would ask the Minister of Finance a question. When he was congratulating the country on its continued prosperity and its increased prosperity since they have been in power, I would ask him what would have been the condition of the country if they had succeeded in carrying commercial union? I would ask the Liberal party that question, because they do not believe in commercial union to-day. They have entirely changed their ground on that question. But supposing they had carried commercial union, where would have been the country to-day? I do not think it would have been in the proud position it occupies. We might ask the same question about unrestricted reciprocity, with discrimination against Great Britain. Where would the country have been to-day if they had carried unrestricted reciprocity, which they almost carried, which they did their best to carry, and which was defeated only by the superhuman efforts of the Conservative party and its great chieftain whom we miss so much to-day? If they can congratulate the country, it is due to the Conservative party, and they ought to thank the Conservative party, who kept them from carrying out the designs they had at that time. I believe the sensible members of the Liberal party—and there are some sensible men among them—do thank the Conservative party that they were prevented at that time from carrying out the policy of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity; because it would have landed us, I believe, in great trouble and distress; and instead of having this sentiment of loyalty and the preferential tariff for Great Britain which they glory in to-day, we would have had a preferential tariff and almost free trade with the United States of America, with discrimination against Great Britain and all other countries in the world. Then the Minister of Finance pays high compliments to the farmers. Well, Sir, he cannot pay too high compliments to the farmers. I agree with everything he says about the farmers being the source of prosperity to this country. I am going to read what he says:

The general business of Canada has been prosperous because prosperity has come to the great agricultural class.

I am glad to hear that admission because in reading another part of his speech you would imagine that prosperity had come to

Mr. CRAIG.

this country because the Liberal party had come into power. But here he admits that it is because the farmers are prosperous. I suppose he does not claim that we have good crops because the Liberals have come into power. I know that the late Sir John Macdonald used to say, in a joking spirit, that the country had good crops just because he was in power. But we always looked on that as a joke, and I hope that this Liberal Government does not claim that because it happens to be in power and the crops are good, the one is the cause of the other.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. (Mr. Fielding). Will you not allow us to have our joke?

Mr. CRAIG. Certainly I do. The hon. gentleman went on to say:

Let us remember that that prosperity is due chiefly to the success of the farmers, and let us see that by every reasonable and proper effort we shall endeavour to encourage the development of agriculture throughout the Dominion, and encourage the farmers to produce not only for the home market but for the markets of the world. Our farmers everywhere are applying themselves to their work with intelligence and skill.

Listening to the words or reading them, one would imagine that the Government had given some fresh encouragement to produce, not only for the home market, but for the market of the world. And here I may say that I am glad the hon. gentleman realizes the importance of the home market, for that is the great market after all for our farmers, the one which consumes the greater part of their products. But the Government have done nothing new. Our farmers have not been encouraged to further incentive by anything new in the policy of the Liberal party. Why, it was the Conservative party that encouraged the farmer to produce for export to the markets of the world. It was the Conservative party that inaugurated the system of cold storage, and the fast line, and the experimental farm. We did everything we could for the agricultural community, and I commend this Government for continuing that same policy, because I agree with the Finance Minister that the prosperity of the farmer is at the base of the prosperity of this country. The hon. gentleman went on to say: "Let us encourage the farmers." That is what we all say, and that is what we all intend.

An hon. MEMBER. By putting a duty on sugar.

Mr. CRAIG. An hon. member says that the Liberal party are encouraging the farmer by putting a duty on sugar. But perhaps the Finance Minister expects that that will encourage them to work a little harder. I remember in the old times their being told by the Liberal party to go home and work a little harder and eat a little less. We do not give the farmers that advice to-day, but

we believe in encouraging them. Who was it opened Manitoba and the North-west and built the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that our farmers could settle in that country and produce wheat which is the admiration of the world? I need not say that it was the Conservative party which did all these things, and I am very glad indeed to know that the Liberal party are following in our footsteps in these matters. I commend them for so doing. I am glad that they know a good thing when they see it, and that even though they are aware that the Conservative party initiated these things to assist the farmers, the Government are willing to carry them out and expend money for the same purpose.

The hon. Finance Minister went on to say that the Government were gratified at the manner in which the tariff policy of last year was received by the country. Well, I think we were all gratified, but why was the country gratified? I know that the country was gratified with the tariff policy because the fears which the people entertained were allayed by the action of the Government. What did the country fear? The merchants and manufacturers all over the country feared that the tariff policy of this Government was going to be a radical change on that of the previous Government, and that protection to home manufactures was going to be taken away. They were justified in those fears by the speeches made in different parts of the country by the leaders of the Liberal party. Now, however, they find that their fears were groundless, and it is no wonder that they received with satisfaction the tariff policy of the Government, because it was not half so bad as they were afraid it would be. They were afraid that the business of the country would be entirely upset by the Government, and were gratified to find that the common sense of some members of the Cabinet prevented such a consummation. I believe that there are some members of the Cabinet who would have gone to extremes, I believe that some members of the Cabinet had talked so much on the subject that they succeeded in persuading themselves that they were right. But the common sense of the others prevented the Government taking an extreme course. What did we find in the formation of the Cabinet? We found that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who was looked upon as the coming Finance Minister, was not allowed to go out into the country at all to enunciate his well-known views on the public platform. I heard a well-known Liberal say, before the election came on, as I was travelling on the cars: If you want to succeed in the country, you had better keep Cartwright at home. He must have told the other members of the Government this, or they must have known it themselves. They must have recognized that the country was in favour of protection,

and so they kept him at home, and when the Cabinet was formed he did not obtain the position people were afraid he would, but was given a position in which he could not do much harm. I congratulate the Liberal party on having discarded and thrown to the winds their former tariff policy. They found the country did not want it but that, as a whole, it is in favour of moderate protection. Of course I do not expect them to admit this in so many words, but they have admitted it by their tariff. I am glad that they have abandoned their former policy, and have practically adopted a policy of moderate protection. I hope with the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) that the Government will stick to that policy, and that there will be no reduction in protection and no serious tariff changes for the next ten years at least. I do not care what they say about abolishing the principle of protection, for that is a sentimental idea, so long as they do not abolish the thing itself. I hold that protection is necessary in this country and am willing to sustain in that the Government so long as they retain it. It is specially necessary because we lie along the United States which has a high protective tariff, and which has advanced very much in manufactures, and is always ready to dump into this country its surplus manufactures in order to keep up prices in its own. I do not object to the Government calling their tariff a tariff for revenue only, so long as it is in reality a protective tariff.

I was rather amused to hear the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) say that luck has been with the Liberal party. He is perfectly right, and I thank him for that admission. Luck has been with it since it came into power. The right hon. First Minister himself was very lucky, to have just become Premier when the Jubilee celebration was at hand. He went to the old country and represented Canada in that celebrated fete of the Queen's Jubilee. He was lucky in that, and the party has been lucky since—lucky because the farmers have been prosperous, and have had good crops, lucky because mining development has assumed great proportions, and because business improvement has been moving along for these reasons. But I regret that this luck has not attended the Minister of Trade and Commerce himself, and I am moved to make this remark, not for any personal reason, but because of remarks which he made himself with reference to the ex-Minister of Finance. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said this:

Now, sir, it has been remarked by persons who take an interest in that kind of thing, that there are few sights dearer to God and man than to see a good man struggling with adversity.

I am bound to say that I, like the noted Scotch divine, feel a little compassion even for a naughty man under similar circumstances.

I remark how apt a description this hon. gentleman gives of his own position. We might say that he is an object for our compassion under these circumstances. I do not press the subject further, but merely mention it on account of the hon. gentleman making this remark about the ex-Finance Minister. I hope, however, the Government will not imagine that the good luck which has attended them will keep up for ever. I hope they will not depend upon luck, but will govern the country well and will keep out of such transactions as the Drummond County Railway deal, the Yukon deal, and all deals of that kind. I hope that the Premier will try to hold his followers in better check than some of them are held at the present time, and will not allow them so much liberty. I trust he will try to conduct the Government on strictly business principles. For eighteen years the Conservative party governed this country. Under Conservative rule the provinces were consolidated, the Canadian Pacific Railway was built—against great opposition from the Liberal party—Manitoba and the North-west were peopled up, and Canada was made a nation. We have heard a great deal about Canada becoming a nation in one night. It seems that the Premier went to bed one night, when Canada was only a speck on the map, and when he woke up, Canada was a nation. And he rejoiced. It was truly a wonderful transformation scene. Sir, Canada was being made a nation under the Conservative party, led by the greatest statesman of this country—I might say, the greatest statesman of this century—the late Sir John Macdonald. Under the wise, strong rule of himself and his successors for eighteen years, Canada became a nation, and was recognized as a nation, quite as much as today, by Great Britain and by the republic to the south of us. If the Liberal party were lucky, the Conservative party were unlucky. In five years, during one Parliament, this party lost three leaders, three Premiers. No party ever suffered such misfortune before. It is no wonder, under the circumstances, that the party became a little demoralized. Why, I can imagine the demoralization of the party on the other side, if their leader were taken away. I sincerely hope he will not be. But what would be the condition of that party, if he were taken away, and another leader, and another? I hold that, considering the circumstances, the Conservative party deserves the sympathy of the country, and that it struggled along in a way worthy of admiration.

I wish to say, in all sincerity, that I am not sorry the Liberal party came into power. And why? I will tell you why. I am glad because getting into power has made them loyal to the Empire. I do not say that they were disloyal before, as individuals, but I say that we never heard very much of their loyalty as a party. In 1891, when we were fighting the battle against unrestricted re-

ciprocitiy, at a political meeting in my constituency, at the town of Port Hope, a gentleman, speaking on behalf of the Conservative party, spoke of the loyalty of that party. The gentleman on the Liberal side who followed, pooh-poohed the idea, said he was tired of this loyalty talk, and did not want to hear more of it. By such speeches as that, they were training the young Liberals of this country, not to be disloyal, perhaps, but not to be proud of a strong sentiment of loyalty. The Liberal party has become loyal to the Empire, as they were not loyal before. They had their eyes turned more towards the country to the south than towards the Empire, so far as trade relations are concerned, aye, and in far more than trade relations. To-day they are loyal, and it does us good to hear them talk of their loyalty; they cannot talk about it too much for me. I hope they will keep on being loyal and will do everything they can to forward the interests of the Empire. We hear no more about unrestricted reciprocity or of commercial union. But there is one more matter that is more important than loyalty to the Empire, and even a stronger reason why I am glad they have got into power—it has made them loyal to Canada. I maintain that they were not loyal to Canada while in Opposition. How do I prove it? In those days, as I remember, prominent members of the party talked about this country being ruined, about it going to the dogs, about the people leaving it, about the black flag floating over every farm, about every farm being mortgaged. I have before made the remark, that, if at that time I were a young man, living in Europe and intending to emigrate, and read all this about Canada, it would be enough to keep me from coming here. These gentlemen, for party purposes, were decrying this country; they were trying to make the country believe that the Conservative party were bringing the country to ruin, and they almost succeeded in persuading some of the people to believe it. I was speaking one day with a gentleman about the prospects of the farmers in my constituency. And what I told him was this: If you want to find a farmer who thinks things are going wrong, go to a Liberal. He has been taught by his leaders that the country is going to the dogs and that he is being oppressed and ruined by the party in power. The Conservative farmer, on the other hand, may not be making so much money as he would like to, but he is satisfied that things are going along pretty well. So, I say, the Liberals were not loyal to the country, because they were decrying it. They did this, not that they believed there was anything really the matter with the country, but because they thought it was good political tactics to make the people dissatisfied. And I said before, and I say now, that if there was an exodus, a great part of it was due to the speeches of such gentlemen as the hon.

member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who decried this country, who, instead of encouraging our young men to stay here, made them think it was a good thing to go away from a country governed by the Conservative party. And now we find that their eyes have been opened, and they can see what they could not see before. I do not know whether it is because they sit on that side of the House that things look different, but I suppose it is. At any rate, they do see things in a different light. The "Globe" newspaper, that used to be continually talking about ruin and disaster, says now that everything is prosperous. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) smiles at this. I do not think he ever ran down the country. He was too well trained, and is too good a Conservative for that. Hon. gentlemen are now sitting on the Government side of the House, and so they see things differently; everything is lovely, the country is prosperous, and I have no doubt they will continue to say so as long as they are in power. I hope the country will continue to be prosperous, even though they remain in power. Good times are more to me than any Government. If hard times are necessary to put these hon. gentlemen out of office, I hope the times will remain good for ever. I prefer the interests of the country to any party, and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will do all they can to make the country prosperous. I hope they will look after the workingmen of this country, and will do everything they can to furnish employment. I hope they will see that articles are made in this country that can be made here. I hope they will do everything they can for the farmers of the country. In every well-considered proposal looking to this end, they may count on my assistance.

But getting into power has done more than make these gentlemen loyal. It has shown the people of this country how much these hon. gentlemen meant by all this talk about ruin and devastation; it shows the people how much they meant by all the promises they made.

Why, it shows that they were humbugging the people all the time. If they were honest they would get up and say so now. I think it would be a good thing for them to make a confession once for all, so that we could say no more to them about it. If the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was the chief sinner, would only get up and confess that after all what he said was not so, that he was guided by party exigencies, and that he had to talk as he did in order to get the Conservative party out of power, then I think we would be able to forgive him a good deal. It is a good thing after all that the Liberal party has got into power, because they have shown the people of this country that things before were not as they described them, that they did not mean what they said, and it is a good thing for the country to know

that. Sir, I have sometimes thought that among the Liberal party there was a good deal of what might be called pharisaism. Why, Sir, they stood on a high plane, and the poor Conservative was looked down upon as a publican, he was down below, he could not do anything good at all, nothing was too bad to be said about him, but nothing was too good for the Liberal party to say about themselves. But they are now in a position where the people can judge them at their true worth, and the people are finding that they are just like ordinary men who. I have no doubt, are trying to govern this country as best they can, who are trying, under a Conservative tariff, to raise the public revenue, and I wish them success in that matter. But for the future I would commend to them, and I think they have already learned that lesson, to have a little more charity and a little more modesty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise to ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments to make a personal explanation. The Minister of Finance was anxious that I should give him the words in which he had declared that the British preferential tariff was not in operation last year. He did not feel inclined to take my view of it, and I shall now comply with his request by reading a single line of what he said at Sheffield.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Read a few more, please; do not confine yourself to a single line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not want to take up the time of the House. The hon. gentleman challenged me for the proof, and in the fewest possible words I will state on what ground I made the assertion that he declared when in England that the British preferential tariff was not in operation. He said:

For the present, therefore, there is no preferential tariff in Canada for British goods.

That is the language used by the hon. gentleman in the speech at Sheffield, and I have quoted it verbatim from the papers which published that speech the next morning. I need not say another word on that subject. Now, a much more important question arose between the Minister of Customs and myself. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that I was mistaken in supposing that I had criticised the tariff with regard to the sugar question at the last session. Well, I referred him to the Minister of Finance, who surely could not have forgotten. But my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would give no support to my statement; he seemed under the impression that I was wrong in having adopted that position—in fact, both these gentlemen, I think, stated that the "Hansard" had been searched in vain to find any confirmation of my statement. Now, I will

detain the House for a few minutes while I give them the ground on which I made my statement. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the "Hansard" of last session, page 4395, they will find the following:—

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee on Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

"All sugar above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, one cent per pound."

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) propose to make any change in this?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). No, we do not propose to make any change.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) if he has any information as to the effect of these sugar duties as now arranged on the West Indian sugar trade at Halifax? There is a very strong feeling there that a very serious injury will be occasioned by that duty.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is somewhat mistaken as to the position of the matter. The item in which the West India trade is more particularly interested is the first item in the schedule. Upon that item we have made no change. The item stands exactly as it was before. I am prepared to say that it is represented by the West Indian trade that the specific or flat duty of one-half a cent a pound on all grades of sugar does not encourage that trade; and that is well worthy of consideration. We have found some difficulties, however, at the present stage of the session in the way of reopening the question, and we are inclined to think that it is better that the matter should stand for a few months longer, during which we will consider the question of changing the form of the duty when Parliament meets again. The particular product in which the West India trade are interested is raw sugar, and on that we have not made any change.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But still the alteration made in the duties has struck a severe blow at the West India trade.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I think that is hardly correct. It is not the alteration of the duty which they object to; but it is the flat duty, which my hon. friend inserted in his tariff, and which, like all specific duties, bears somewhat hardly on the lower grades. The sugar question is always a very difficult and complicated one; and, after full consideration, we have come to the conclusion that it is better to allow the matter to rest for the present than to attempt to make a change now which might meet the views of the West India trade, but might not on the whole satisfy all parties concerned.

The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) then made some remarks, and the Minister of Finance answered. In the present state of my voice I will not read these two speeches, but I will go to what I said in reply to the Minister of Finance:

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend seems to think that the West India trade is alone affected by the duty on raw sugar, and that inasmuch as he has not changed that duty,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

he has not done anything to interfere with the West India trade. The hon. gentleman could wipe out the West India trade completely, and still leave the duty on raw sugar just as it is. What is to be done with the sugar after it is brought in is the question on which the subject turns; and, therefore, it is a mere evasion, in my opinion, to say that the West India trade is not seriously affected because the duty remains on raw sugar as it was before. I do not question the statement of the hon. gentleman that the West India trade may not have been satisfied with matters as they stood. My information is that since the change of tariff made by hon. gentlemen opposite the merchants of Halifax have sent to 140 parties with whom they were trading in the West Indies, directing them not to forward any sugar. In fact, they regard the change made by the hon. gentleman as not only having struck a severe but a fatal blow at the West India trade; and I do think there is a great deal of force in the suggestion of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) that, inasmuch as the hon. gentleman admits that after all the consideration they have given to this subject they have not yet made up their minds whether the policy they have adopted is one that it will be wise to continue to maintain, it would be reasonable to leave the question open, as it stood before, for consideration a little longer, and not thus, by a change which they themselves are not at all satisfied will be permanent, disarrange more thoroughly than before so important a trade as that between Canada and the West Indies. I really think that my hon. friend would be consulting the interests of the Government, and I am sure he would be consulting the interests of the country, if, until he is able to give this question such consideration as to leave no doubt in his mind as to what course should be pursued, he leaves matters as they were before. I submit to my hon. friend that it is not too late to adopt that course, and it would be a course perfectly consistent with the statement he has made to-day.

My only object in drawing attention to this matter is to justify myself, since it became a question of fact as to whether I had drawn the hon. gentleman's attention to this question of the condition of the West India trade, and to the belief on the part of the gentlemen connected with that trade that the change made last session was a serious blow, and increased the difficulties under which that trade had been. I think I have satisfied the hon. gentleman that I was not mistaken in the statement I made that I had drawn his attention to this important question in that discussion which I have just read. I have satisfied him that it was in the "Hansard," notwithstanding that he was unable to find it. I have only to thank the House for allowing me to make this personal explanation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must ask the consideration of the House while I add to the personal explanation offered by the hon. gentleman. The extracts he has read are very interesting, but they do not happen to be, for any earthly purpose, a defence of the position which the hon. gentleman took.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman mistakes me. I am not arguing the question. I am dealing simply with the question of fact raised by the Minister of Customs, that he had not found in "Hansard" evidence that I had referred to the question of the West India trade last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I also will deal with the question of fact and refer to the statement made by the Minister of Customs, which I confirmed, and which I shall show was absolutely correct. First, however, I will consider for a moment some remarks made by the hon. gentleman with respect to a speech delivered by me before a public gathering at Sheffield. The hon. gentleman pursued the somewhat extraordinary course of selecting part of a sentence from that speech—I doubt whether he selected even a whole sentence—out of a report which occupied a column and a half in a leading daily paper. What is the point at issue? The hon. gentleman had used an argument to the effect that we had practiced a tricky deception on the public of England with respect to the preferential tariff, and that the people only discovered the true character of that preferential tariff when I made what the hon. gentleman called a confession at Sheffield. I have stated to the hon. gentleman repeatedly that what I said at Sheffield was this: that the Government of Canada had designed to establish a preferential tariff that would affect the mother country, that we had put the tariff in operation, that it had been in operation for several months, and that when it ceased to be in operation, it ceased, not by any action of the Parliament of Canada or the Government of Canada, but by reason of a course taken by the Government of Her Majesty itself. Therefore, Canada did intend to give preference to England and did give preference to England, and when the preference ceased to exist, it ceased by reason of the action of Her Majesty's Government. How out of that statement and the causes so far as they exist the hon. gentleman can make anything in the way of a tricky deception is more than mortal man in this House can understand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has entirely misapprehended the position. How did this question arise yesterday? The Minister of Customs was showing what was accomplished during the past year under the preferential rate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, he was not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I told the hon. gentleman it had no existence last year, and when he challenged the accuracy of that statement, I said the Finance Minister, at Sheffield, stated that the preferential tariff with England was not in existence last year, and I quoted the hon. gentleman's remarks. I did not require to quote a col-

umn of the hon. gentleman's speech to confirm that statement; all I wanted were the 'ipsissima verba' of the hon. gentleman, which I read, in which he declared that for the present, that is until subsequent legislation, there is no preferential tariff in Canada for British goods. That was the question between the Minister of Customs and myself, and nothing else. The question of the deception practiced on the English people I have gone into at length, and given evidence of it; but this was the special point—did or did not the Finance Minister at Sheffield declare that there was no preferential tariff for British goods? I have given the words out of his own mouth, in which he declared that there was no preference.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman might as well find a declaration made by me that his name is Charles Tupper. Everybody knew that the preferential tariff had ceased to operate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the whole question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has never been any question as to that in the mind of anybody who understands the matter; the hon. gentleman himself knows better, and he is simply trying to delude himself into believing anything else.

Mr. COCHRANE. If everybody knows it, why had it to be stated?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Many things have to be stated and restated, and they are none the worse for being repeated. Every one knows the Lord's Prayer, but he is better for saying it over and over again. Perhaps the hon. gentlemen opposite could not repeat it, and my remark may not apply. Passing from my speech at Sheffield, in regard to which it is stated that I said something that everybody knew, let me say a word or two with respect to the sugar question. What was the issue there? The Minister of Customs referred to something the hon. gentleman had said the previous evening; and what was it? I have not at hand "Hansard" for to-day, but I am sure my words will be borne out by the official report. The Minister of Customs said the leader of the Opposition had referred to some proposal he made for the benefit of the West India trade last year, that he had submitted some scheme with respect to the West Indies and we had not listened to his proposal. The Minister said: I do not know what the proposal was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will tell the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am coming to what the hon. gentleman proposed. I am now only discussing what occurred between the Minister of Customs and himself. The point was that the Minister of

Customs had called attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman had been endeavouring to convey to this House the idea that he had proposed some great measure of relief for the West India trade last year, and that we would not listen to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will tell you what it was.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am coming to that. I know it. I have not "Hansard," but I remember every word of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is here. I have read it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let me state what occurred. The Minister of Customs said he was not aware of any proposal that the hon. gentleman had made, and he was informed by those who had looked through "Hansard" that they could not find any such proposal. That is exactly what was said.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then the hon. gentleman said the Minister of Finance would tell him what it was. I said I did not know what it was, and that he could not tell what it was, for he had made no proposal. The "Hansard," if hon. gentlemen will turn to it, will confirm my words; and I have a fair memory for these things. Now, did the hon. gentleman make a proposal last year for the relief of the West India trade? The hon. gentleman complained that we had done—what? That we had reduced the duty on refined sugar 14 cents per 100 lbs. Was that the trouble with the West India trade at that time? If you give the refiner a protection of a dollar per pound, you do not thereby help the West India trade. So long as the refineries are running, and they have been running all the past year, the question of the protection to the refiner does not concern the West India importer. He is concerned with the method by which the duty on raw sugar is levied. The complaint in regard to the West India trade was on that point. The hon. gentleman—I am quoting his own words—said that our chances had struck not only a severe blow but a fatal blow at the West India trade. He said that was the complaint of the West India trade. I said they made no such complaint. The complaint was that the old duty, a flat specific duty of 50 cents per 100 pounds, had not been changed. The complaint was that we continued an injustice perpetrated by the late Government. So far as that complaint goes, we are willing to meet it. We continued that system for a year. I have already stated what the reasons were; but the point I wish the House to understand clearly is, that the change we made in the sugar tariff last year had no relation to the

Mr. FIELDING.

West Indies because it did not touch the duty on raw sugar. The hon. gentleman made no proposal. His contention was to leave things alone; his proposal was to leave the duty as it was. Was that meeting the complaint made by the people of the West India trade? They were saying that they wanted a change in the raw sugar duties; but the hon. gentleman said, let the duty alone and make no change. That was his position. The hon. gentleman declared that he made some sort of proposal which he urged on the House for the relief of the West India trade. No such appeal was made by him. I have stated that he made no such proposal. Let hon. members read the "Hansard" extract which he has read and they will find his suggestion was to let the duty alone. The West India merchants complained that the system was not a fair system, that under it the tax on high grade sugar was no more than on low grade, that we taxed 58 per cent on low grade and 22 on high grade; but the hon. gentleman said, let it alone, allow it to stay as at present. That was the hon. gentleman's proposal, if he made any proposal, and yet he dared to stand up in this House and state that he made a proposal for the benefit of the West India trade and that we would not do anything in regard to it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had better regard the hour and not waste too much time in preventing any answer being given to the observations just made. I will tell the hon. gentleman what I proposed. I made a most important proposal, but the hon. gentleman was as ignorant of the subject of the sugar duties and the sugar trade a year ago as he is now. What was that ignorance? Why, Sir, the ignorance was this. The hon. gentleman did not leave the sugar duties as he found them. He made a change, and the proposal I made was not to make any change, but to hold his hand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that is correct.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What was the result? The result was that the change he made, as I have shown, induced the merchants in Halifax engaged in the West India trade to write to 140 of the parties from whom they had ordered sugar: "Do not send it."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has not shown it; he has only said it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman would not allow me to interrupt him, and now he must bear the infliction for a few moments. What did I show him? I showed him—and I have just read from "Hansard" my statement—that he could crush out and destroy the West India trade

completely without touching the duty on raw sugar. That was what the hon. gentleman did not understand then, and what he pretends he has not learned since. But he has learned it. He has learned that the West India sugar trade was a trade which, without the slightest alteration in the duty on raw sugar, could be completely wiped out, and the change which the hon. gentleman made was one that was regarded by the West India merchants of Halifax as a fatal blow to that trade; and the proposal I made to him was to hold his hand and not make the change which he did.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I want just a word in reply.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Six o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that while I was temporarily out of the Chair there was a sort of unanimous agreement come to that these two hon. gentlemen might be as much out of order as they liked. This is all out of order; but, that being the case, I think the hon. gentleman had better be allowed to continue.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman went a little further in his remarks than the passage he has read. I think he rather conveyed the impression that last year he proposed some of the very things we have proposed this year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all. On the contrary, although I told the hon. gentleman that I was glad to have any measure adopted that was calculated to restore the West India trade to Halifax, I did not approve of the proposals which the hon. gentleman had made, and I do not approve of them now. They make a very bad case better than it was; but if he had adopted the policy which I read from the "Globe" newspaper in my speech the other night, he could have rescued the West India sugar trade of this country without adding one farthing to the taxation of the people of this country. But that did not suit the hon. gentleman. Under the pretense of restoring the West India trade, he wanted to wring out of the pockets of the people of this country some \$200,000 or \$300,000 of additional taxation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend was so unsuccessful in saying these things the other night that I do not wonder that he wants to say them over again in the hope that by repeating them often enough he will get some people to believe them. I do not want to go into the discussion. It is simply a question of fact. The hon. gentleman has said that the West India merchants represented that the change

made last year was a fatal blow to the West India sugar trade.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have read the evidence.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has not read a particle of evidence that that change interfered in the slightest degree with the gentlemen engaged in the West India trade. I have conversed with gentlemen engaged in that trade, and I state now that that is not the fact, and that the hon. gentleman has not a shadow of foundation for the statement. The change desired was simply a change in the method of levying the duty on raw sugar. The hon. gentleman wanted it left alone. That is the only thing he proposed, and the statement that our tariff levelled a fatal blow at the West India trade is a statement for which there is not a shadow of foundation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The foundation, Mr. Speaker, is found in the fact—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must say that everything is out of order. I really cannot see that the understanding can be carried out, unless these two hon. gentlemen continue here by themselves.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will agree that the hon. gentleman shall finish it, and I will say nothing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will leave it where it is, then, Mr. Speaker.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a few remarks in reply to the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) who has addressed the House at considerable length this afternoon. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) made many charges against the Reform party; charges of omission as well as charges of commission, and he tried to prove three things, first, that the Reform party had stolen the clothes of the Conservative party; second, that the Reform party since they came into power have not kept their pledges to the people, and third, that instead of reducing the debt of the country since they came into power the Reformers have increased it. Now, with regard to the charge that we stole the clothes of hon. gentlemen opposite, I have but to say that it would be a sad hour indeed in the history of the Reform party of Canada, when they were compelled to clothe themselves in the filthy rags that have been worn by hon.

gentlemen opposite for 18 years. The history of the Conservative party of Canada has not been very creditable; their career has been much in line with the career of every Government that has adopted protection as a principle. Even the history of England shows that under protection, rottenness, corruption and debauchery of the worst type reigned. Protection brought the people of that great country almost to the verge of starvation. The landlords of England, Scotland and Ireland extorted from them heavy rents and declared that if the ports of the old country were open to free corn, the agriculturists would be virtually ruined. But after suffering from these conditions for a long period of years, the people of the motherland afterwards threw off the shackles of protection and adopted free trade. From that day down to the present, they have experienced continued prosperity, until to-day England is the most advanced, the wealthiest, the most progressive nation in the world. She has no equal. Now, Sir, the Liberals of Canada contend that although during the past eighteen years Canada has made considerable progress, yet, that she did not make that rapid progress which a new and richly endowed country like this should make; and we believe, too, that her lack of advancement is largely attributable to the policy and administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. But, Sir, these gentlemen take credit for everything; the hon. gentleman from East Durham (Mr. Craig) took credit to the Conservative party for the enlargement of the canals, and for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He surely must know that the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, when Liberal Prime Minister of Canada, let the first contract for the deepening of our canals, and as to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway the question which divided the Liberals and Conservatives was not as to the necessity of the work, but as to the manner in which it should be carried out. The Reform party at the time claimed that it would be better to build that road as the development of the country demanded, and if that policy had been followed out the probabilities are that it would have been all the better for Canada to-day. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to realize this, and the wonder to me is that amongst the claims made by the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) on behalf of the Conservative party, he did not claim that they built the Rocky Mountains. The hon. member (Mr. Craig) told us that the Liberals promised honest and pure government. So they did, and so they are giving it. I trust that hon. gentlemen opposite will set themselves vigorously to discover anything that is dishonest in the administration of the present Government. I assure them that they will get every opportunity of making a thorough and exhaustive investigation into

Mr. McMULLEN.

the public expenditure of this country, and if they can prove that there is anything dishonest and corrupt, the people of Canada will appreciate their efforts in that direction. I earnestly hope and believe, as an humble follower of the present Cabinet, that hon. gentlemen opposite will not be able to show that there is anything dishonest in the present Administration. There is nothing more desirable in the interests of Canada than that we should have an active and efficient Opposition in this House, and I am glad to notice that gentlemen on the other side are developing in that direction. During the first and second sessions of this Parliament they appeared to be very much lost. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) this afternoon claimed for the Conservatives the credit of having inaugurated the system of cold storage, and be that as it may, the fact remains that these hon. gentlemen have evidently been on cold storage for the last two years. I am glad to say that they now seem to be getting reconciled to the changed conditions under which they exist as a political party. They no doubt fancy, as they have very good reason to fancy, that they will remain on the Opposition benches for many years to come, and I trust that during these many years they will be justly able to lay claim to an earnest discharge of the duties which devolve upon them as a loyal Opposition in this House. Now I hope we are going to have honest government, and I believe we are. I hope that the period of disgraces and scandals, of Curran bridges, of Tay canals, of Langevin blocks, is passed never to return.

Now, my hon. friend spoke at considerable length on the question of free trade. I am sure that it would be a delight to the majority of the people, yes, to all the people of this country, if Canada were in a position to adopt absolute free trade. But we know that we are loaded down with a national debt and with responsibilities that, in the meantime, absolutely preclude the possibility of our adopting the principle of free trade—that is, free trade as they have it in England. But, after all, we can commence to shape our policy to that end. While England adopted the principle of free trade in 1846, it has taken her a long time to reach the goal of her ambition in regard to free trade, and she has hardly reached it even yet. She has made progress towards it year after year until now you can count on your fingers all the articles on which she levies import duties. We have started in the right direction. We have declared that protection shall not exist in this country as the chief principle on which the tariff shall be levied. That declaration we intend to carry out. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that we have protection still. I hope they may be able to convince the manufacturers that, even after the reduction of the duty on British goods

after the 1st July next they are realizing all the advantages of protection that they realized under the late Administration. But I am satisfied that hon. gentlemen opposite will have very great difficulty in persuading the people of this country that the system that they inaugurated and which was enforced for so many years prevails now to the same extent as it did when they were in power. I think the people are already beginning to realize considerable advantages in the prices of every day commodities owing to reduced prices, and, from year to year, as duties are still further reduced, they will realize the more the results of the adoption of a policy by the efforts of this Government to secure to the people the necessities of life at the lowest possible cost.

Now, the hon. gentleman said further that we had promised economy. I believe that the members of this Government are anxious to economize as far as it is possible to do so; and while, in past years, we did point out that a very considerable saving could be made if the affairs of this country were properly handled, we realize that there are difficulties in the way of hastily bringing about the reform that I have no doubt will come, though more gradually. I know as do other hon. members, that since the present Government took office, when reductions are made in the civil service staff or in the number of employees on the Government railways or in the Post Office Department, hon. gentlemen opposite unite in a yell and wail that the Government are treating harshly and cruelly men who should be kept in the Government employ and allowed to draw Government pay, notwithstanding the fact that if they were discharged it would not be necessary to employ others in their places. We know that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals discharged some men on the Intercolonial Railway and immediately there was a howl, and it was said that he had done it to serve party ends and that it was wicked and cruel. We know also that in the Post Office Department men were dismissed who were considered unnecessary, and immediately an appeal was made to have them reinstated. In the face of these influences, it is hard for a Minister to make the reduction that I think should be made and that I earnestly hope will eventually be made. For my part, I do not believe that any member of the Cabinet will be able to reduce the civil service staff, inside or outside, to proper proportions except with the assistance of a civil service board of supervisors. If such a board were created, I believe it would be comparatively easy to make the reduction that should be made. I know very well that hon. gentlemen opposite look upon the civil service of this country as a little Tory preserve to be kept for the lambs of the flock; and so, when any others are appointed there

is considerable complaint. But these hon. gentlemen must begin to realize that there are men in the employment of the country for whom there is little or nothing to do, that there are men who are absolutely inefficient; and if a Minister removes one of these men, they must recognize that it is in the interest of the country that it is done. And I earnestly hope that more will be done in the future than has been done in the past, because I believe that Canada today has a thousand civil servants more than are absolutely necessary.

Now, the hon. gentleman said also that the present Government had increased the annual expenditure. But had he taken the figures submitted by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, in which the new expenditures are shown by themselves, he would have found that in the old expenditures a very respectable reduction has been made. Nobody will say for a moment that it was not the duty of the Government to provide the necessary service for the Yukon district. Nobody will challenge the course of the Government, I think, in providing the necessary service for the Rossland district in British Columbia. Moreover, the Crow's Nest Pass Railway is responsible for a considerable increase of expenditure, and it met with the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite as well as of those on this side of the House; in fact, none of these questions were pointedly and determinedly opposed when presented by the Government. In view of these additional expenditures, I think it is hardly fair to put the whole volume of expenditure together and say that very large increases have taken place. The proper way is to take the several departments, as stated before these new avenues for the expenditure of money were opened up and make an honest and fair comparison. If hon. gentlemen will do this, I think they must admit that there has been considerable reduction.

Then the hon. gentleman said something with regard to reciprocity, that the Government had promised when they came into power that they would secure a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and would do everything in their power to bring about more friendly trade relations with the people to the south of us. But the hon. gentleman must remember that about the time we came to power, and the party in the United States that had introduced a tariff very considerably lower than the previously existing one was deprived of power and the Republican party gained control. This party it was that passed the Dingley Bill, which was even worse than the McKinley Bill, before it, and passed it without any reference whatever to what course Canada might deem it prudent to take. Since that there has not been any evidence of any desire on the part of the people south of us to do anything with regard to

reciprocity. But I have not the slightest doubt that the Government is keeping its eye open to anything that may transpire which may lead to more friendly intercourse between us and them, and will be prepared to take advantage of it.

Then the hon. gentleman said that we promised to take less taxes from the people I contend that we are doing so. When you take into consideration, Sir, the very great increases in the exports of our products and the very positive evidence we have of the improved condition of our people under the present policy, you cannot help being convinced that the policy of this Government has been so far a success. Hon. gentlemen opposite attribute this success to luck. They say that the right hon. First Minister has been very lucky. Well, if he has, all the better for the country. The people are well satisfied with their present condition, they are well satisfied with the progress that has been made, they are delighted with the improved condition in which they find themselves, and after all taxes to a people who have the means to meet their obligations are not so serious as they are to people struggling with difficulties and embarrassments and trying to make headway against bad times, which was the condition of the people when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power.

The next thing my hon. friend spoke about was the reduction on interest in the Government savings bank deposits. For my part, I am anxious that every inducement should be given to the working classes of this country to lay by their savings, so as to have something for a rainy day; and I think it is good policy for the Government to offer them any reasonable inducement to do so. I should have been glad if in the adjustment of the rate of interest on deposits, there had been a sliding scale established, and that on very small sums the rate of interest had been kept higher than on larger sums, and I frankly admit that the country should be willing to pay its own subjects a rate equal to what it has to pay when borrowing in a foreign market. But at the same time, I do not think it is right that we should pay an excessive rate, and the action of the Government will, I believe, eventually prove an advantage because the banks have complained for years that the Government were borrowing local funds in competition with them, and thus prevented their extending accommodation at the reasonable rates necessary. If our manufacturing institutions are to prosper. I have no doubt that while the poorer classes may complain perhaps about not receiving as many cents on their few dollars as they otherwise would, when the whole mass of the people is taken into consideration, this change will prove an advantage, everything considered.

I had some difficulty in following my hon. friend, for he travelled up and down the re-

Mr. McMULLEN.

cord. He touched upon protection two or three times, and he twitted us with having abandoned our policy to abolish protection. I think, on the contrary, Mr. Speaker, that we have made rapid strides in that direction. When you come to consider the very considerable reduction, in addition to what has already been made, that will be made the first of July next on all goods imported from Great Britain, I think you must admit that the people of this country will experience very great relief indeed in this matter. I went over the items of the goods that we imported during the past year from Great Britain. Our entire imports of dutiable goods amountd to \$21,338,661, on which the duty collected was \$6,520,055. On the first of July next there will be another reduction on the duties, and should we import the same quantity of goods—and the probabilities are that we shall import considerably more owing to that reduction—we will have to pay \$815,000 less than we did during the last year. I think that is making a very considerable reduction, when you take into consideration that fact that a reduction of one-eighth has already been made. But if you will take into consideration the whole amount of the reduction in the tariff from what was charged under the National Policy, our people will actually get these goods from Great Britain at \$1,630,000 less than they paid for them under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite.

The leader of the Opposition said that there were increases in many cases. That may be true, but the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) admitted that levelling up the whole tariff, taking everything into consideration, the duty was a fraction of one per cent less than what it was under the old tariff. If that be the case, then the people will reap every dollar of the advantage I have just stated, because while in some cases the duties are slightly increased, on the whole there is a reduction, and the result now to the people will be the saving which will take place when the full benefit of the preferential clause comes to be realized.

My hon. friend (Mr. Craig) has stated that he hopes there will be no change in the tariff for ten years. If the people of this country are as well content under the existing tariff for years to come, as they now are, with very few exceptions, I shall not be surprised if the popular sentiment would point in the direction of leaving the tariff as it is. So long as it gives satisfaction, it will be the part of prudence for the Government not to make any change; but from year to year, I have not the slightest doubt that evidences will present themselves to clearly indicate what changes are necessary, and as from session to session the experience of the people is applied to the working of the tariff, any changes that are necessary will no doubt be made.

I venture to predict that every change made will be in the direction of lowering to the people of this country the commodities that they require, and in the direction of eliminating every vestige of protection that is left in the tariff. We claim that the present tariff is a revenue tariff. Now what is the difference between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff? Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they made their tariff, invited all the manufacturers of this country, every man that made anything from a needle to an anchor to present his reasons why he should have protection, and every advantage that he asked for himself under the tariff which he said was necessary in order to make his business successful, was willingly and cordially granted by the then Minister of Finance. Now was he in a position honestly and fairly to hold the balance between the consumers of this country and the manufacturers? He was not, for the simple reason that he required to be a skilled mechanic himself in all the different lines of manufacture in order to enable him justly to hold the balance between the producer and the consumer. But he was entirely at the mercy of the producers. They came here and presented their arguments, they gave their plausible reasons and they went away full of satisfaction. They got all they wanted, and the result was that year after year the tariff was increased and increased. One time it was raised to 22½ per cent, then to 25 per cent, then to 27½ per cent, and then to 30 per cent, and as they were able plausibly and cutely to present to the Minister of Finance their arguments why the tariff was not yet high enough, why they had not protection enough, why they could not make money enough, he was willing to accede to their requests. Under the application of that tariff combinations were formed, men were made wealthy simply because they were able to humbug the ex-Minister of Finance into the belief that they needed all that protection in order to enable them to make a living. Now what is this change, so far as our tariff is concerned? The hon. the Minister of Finance has declared that the great guiding principle which will prompt him in arranging the tariff, is that the necessities of the country shall be the first consideration, the amount of money to be raised shall be the leading feature of the tariff, and if there is any incidental protection at all in the application of a tariff of that kind, all right, we have no objection to it, we are perfectly willing that they should have it. We believe that is the true and honest principle. The people of this country have a right to expect that that principle shall be carried out. The Government has started in that direction, and I believe they intend to implement every promise that they made. Now, I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will be able to distinguish between the tariff that they them-

selves lived under, and the tariff that has been adopted by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and I think that they will in time get educated to know the difference, and that they will not charge us any more with having stolen their clothes. From time to time we intend to see that combinations are not formed. For instance, my hon. friend from West Durham this afternoon asked why it was that the duty was taken off binder twine. Well, he has been a member of this House for quite a number of years, and I am rather surprised that he would virtually expose his ignorance by asking that question. Now, why was the duty taken off binder twine? Simply because a combination was formed in Canada, and only that there was a combination that was supposed to extend throughout the United States, and that combination was so powerful that it was considered absolutely necessary, in order to give the farmers of this country relief, that twine should be admitted free in order, if possible, to break up that combination. I hope that from year to year, as there are evidences of other combinations being formed, the Government will do with them the same as they have done with binder twine, place them upon the free list in order to relieve the people from the extortions to which they would otherwise be subjected.

Now, my hon. friend had a good deal to say with regard to preferential trade. I am sure there is not a member in this House who would not be rejoiced if we could persuade England that it would be to her advantage as well as to the advantage of the colonies, to consent to preferential trade. No doubt it would be quite a boon to the people of this country, and I am sure that every Minister and every member of this House would be glad if England were willing to make certain concessions in our favour. But up to the present there has been no evidence to show that England is to-day disposed to enter into negotiations with the view of giving to her colonies a preference such as has been spoken of in this House. There has been a very friendly feeling created between England and her colonies, and it is a good thing for us. The fact of the matter is that we look upon the denunciation of the Belgian and German treaties as a step in the direction of closer commercial intercourse between England and the colonies than ever existed before. I consider we will reap a great advantage from it. How will we do it? Why, Sir, the fact that Canada has, by her First Minister, offered to England advantages in our market that have never been offered by any colony before, has produced in the minds of the people of England a more friendly feeling towards Canada than has ever existed. I believe that if the people of England would only give Canada the advantage of a preference in her market, it would be a de-

cided boon to this country. We would like to see this condition of things exist: A man goes into a shop in England to buy a quantity of cheese, and cheese of the different countries are placed before him on the counter. The customer says: What country is that from? And he is told that one cheese comes from the United States, another from Canada and another from some other country. Then he will say: Well, owing to the fact that Canada has shown a willingness to give us the preference in her market, I will try the Canadian cheese rather than the United States cheese, or any other cheese. I think that would be a great advantage to us, and I hope that we shall take steps by which we can secure such an advantage in the English market. I have in my hand a clipping, cut from an evening paper published in Toronto, which I will read:

ANGLO-CANADIAN TRADE.

Toronto, April 14.—The "News" cable from London states the Anglo-Canadian trade continues to improve. The exports to Canada during March increased six per cent, and for three months increased twelve per cent.

Exports to all countries decreased four and three per cent respectively. This remarkable contrast in Canada's favour is partly attributed to the new Canadian tariff.

Imports from Canada were stationary for a month, but increased fifteen per cent for three months. Imports from all countries increased seven and one per cent respectively.

The chief increases in imports from Canada in thousand pounds sterling for three months are: Animals, £19,000; wheat, £104,000; wheat flour, £9,000; bacon, £15,000; butter, £10,000; eggs, £2,000; fish, £63,000.

Chief decreases are: Hams, £5,000; cheese, £1,000; timber, £75,000.

The chief decreases are in hams, cheese and timber. That statement shows there is a very considerable and desirable increase in our trade with Great Britain, and I am sure we earnestly hope it may continue. No doubt the British market is the most stable market after all. While we may at times enjoy advantages in the American market, that is by no means so steady and progressive a country as England. The market is not so reliable as the English market, and we are glad we are making progress in reaching that market on a basis and under conditions that will undoubtedly be very advantageous to the people of the country. I look upon this largely as the result of the fortunate visit of the First Minister to England, of the manner in which he discharged the duties resting upon him as First Minister of Canada, of his creditable and noble record, and the appreciation by the people of that country and of Canada the manner in which the First Minister represented us, and he came away having embedded in the hearts of the people a feeling of appreciation and having furnished

Mr. McMULLEN.

evidence that he is a statesman from head to foot and well fitted to promote the country's progress and prosperity, and no doubt the people of Great Britain felt as we feel, that if his health is spared, he will be a blessing to this Dominion.

The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Craig) spoke for a considerable time with respect to commercial union. The hon. member endeavoured to fasten on the Reform party their adoption of that principle as a party. He did not venture to produce any resolution of the convention held here in 1893 to show it was favourable to commercial union, and he did not attempt to produce evidence that any representative man in the party ever declared himself openly and fairly in favour of commercial union. We know that Mr. Wiman, of New York, is the father of commercial union, that he is a Canadian by birth, and at that time took an earnest interest in seeking to bring about what he deemed would bring about advantageous conditions between the two countries. But I deny that any prominent Reformer ever openly committed himself to the principle of commercial union. If any hon. gentleman wishes to produce the references of prominent men of the Reform party to this question, I should like him to do so. No doubt if commercial union, with proper restrictions and qualifications, had been established between Canada and the United States it might have worked beneficially.

Mr. MILLS. How about the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, who was my opponent?

Mr. McMULLEN. At the same time I am prepared to say that commercial union was never adopted by the Reform party as a principle. It was very much talked about, but never was adopted.

The hon. member for West Durham also said something with respect to good crops. We are glad we have good crops this year, and our people are unquestionably making progress financially owing to these good crops to a greater extent than previously. But I remember sitting in this House some years ago when hon. gentlemen opposite, who then occupied the Treasury benches, did not hesitate to take all the credit to themselves for good crops, and good prices. I heard an hon. member from Huron, who is not now in the House, say that he was prepared to vote for a Government that raised the price of wheat from 85 cents to \$1.25, the price of eggs from 7 cents to 15 cents, and he was prepared generally to support a government and a policy that gave additional prices to the farmers. They did not hesitate to take credit then. I can remember when the Ministry of the day received with approbation statements made with respect to increased prices received by the farmers.

The leader of the Opposition, in the course of this discussion, made a discourteous attack upon the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He tried to point out that there was a feeling in this country in opposition to that hon. gentleman occupying the position of Finance Minister. I can honestly say this—and I believe I am inside of the secrets of the rank and file of the Reform party—that I never heard any insinuation in the party or from any member of the party regarding the Minister of Trade and Commerce not faithfully, efficiently and well discharging the duties of Minister of Finance, or expressing any opposition whatever to his appointment. I believe there is no man in the ranks of the Reform party to-day more looked up to and more highly respected and whose presence in the party is more appreciated than the Minister of Trade and Commerce. When the leader of the Opposition was making that statement, I thought it would have been very much better if it had been made by some other member of the party opposite. I acknowledge the hon. gentleman's great ability, and I am sure we are all glad to see the vitality and energy and devotion to duty that have been evidenced by the leader of the Opposition during the progress of this session, but after all the leader of the Opposition does not enjoy the estimation of the hon. gentlemen opposite and their followers in the country to the same extent as does the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the Reform party. I have heard some very discourteous remarks made with respect to the leader of the Opposition, and I would not have referred to them, except for the hon. gentleman's references to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I have heard it said that hon. gentlemen opposite never expect to return to power while the present leader of the Opposition is leader of the party. I have heard it said that the country has already had enough Tupperism, and cannot stand it very much longer. Before the hon. gentleman insinuates anything of that kind against the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), he ought to recollect that he himself lives in a glass house, because the views I have stated are those entertained by a great many Conservatives in this country in regard to him.

Now, Sir, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) made rather a characteristic speech last night, and considering that he once occupied a distinguished position in this House, I was amazed to find that his statements were in many cases far removed from facts. He declared that the present tariff was unpopular, but that cannot be the case since we have heard no complaints about its operation except in one or two minor cases. We know that as a rule the tariff has been accepted as satisfactory by the people of Canada. He (Mr. Wallace) declared too that the tariff of the Conserva-

tive Government was a protective tariff. Well, Sir, the people of this country for 18 years had experienced sufferings, stagnation and poverty under that Conservative tariff, and if these gentlemen fancy that they will again return to power on the basis of a high protective tariff, they will find themselves a very long time in Opposition. Sir, the people of this country approve of the present tariff, and they regret that they did not make the change long ago. If it be true, as hon. gentlemen opposite assert, that the Reform party would never have got into power but for the Manitoba school question, then, Sir, it is a pity that question did not arise long ago, if it has brought about this change of Government, and this great prosperity in Canada which now prevails. My hon. friend from West York admitted that sometimes the protective tariff was too high, and then he said that sometimes it was too low. Well, it is a wonder that these hon. gentlemen when they were in power did not adjust the tariff more evenly. They certainly did a good deal of tinkering on it. At the last revision of the tariff made by the Conservatives, day after day we were asked by the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) to reconsider it because clerical errors had been made, and alterations were made from higher to lower, and from lower to higher duties; but notwithstanding all that the hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace) now admits that in some cases it was too high and in other cases too low. Well, I have no doubt my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) will admit that is a pretty hard thing to administer a protective tariff, and to hold the balance evenly between the consumer and the producer. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) told us that the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) had stated that the duty on Paris green was reduced from 10 per cent to 7½ per cent, and he (Mr. Wallace) said: Oh, that is only 2½ per cent of a reduction. I do not know where my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) went to school, but it is apparent that he has never been taught how to calculate percentages. It would appear to me that a reduction from 10 per cent to 7½ per cent is in reality a reduction of 25 per cent, and you will find a great many men in the country who in their simplicity have similar views to mine on arithmetic. Again, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) told us, that during the last financial year we had imported from 25 to 50 per cent more goods from the United States than we did from Great Britain. The hon. gentleman must remember that the Liberal party came into power only about 20 months ago, and he must not forget that a large part of the period covered by these imports to which he refers, was governed by the protective tariff of his own Government, and consequently that the tariff made by hon. gentlemen opposite was not any evidence of an overflowing loyalty to the mother country.

But it is needless to dwell on that, for we know that the loyalty of the Canadian Conservatives always ran in the groove that suited their own political interests, and when on the occasion of the introduction of the National Policy a Liberal member in this House told them that it might endanger British connection, a prominent Conservative supporter at once replied: Well if it is bad for British connection, all the worse for British connection. If the party interests of those gentlemen opposite are not served by loyalty, then we all know that they can afford to be somewhat else than loyal. The hon. member from West York (Mr. Wallace) told us that during the first six months of this year, we had imported into Canada free of duty, eleven and a half million bushels of corn, and that, as that corn had displaced the coarser grains of our farmers, it was a serious loss to them. I do not know where my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) got his figures, but I will give him the correct figures as I got them from the records of the department.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to tell him that I got them from the figures furnished to me by the Minister of Customs.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have the figures furnished from the Department of Trade and Commerce. The Indian corn brought in during the six months ending the 31st of December, 1897, amounted to 9,793,213 bushels. I want my hon. friend to note this point, that during the same time we exported of corn not the product of Canada 7,795,363 bushels; so that out of the entire importation of corn there remained for use in Canada only 1,997,850 bushels. And yet the hon. gentleman told this House of the serious injury the tariff caused to the farmers of this country because 11,500,000 bushels of corn had come in and displaced so many bushels of the coarser grains of this country. He did not state what we had exported; he only gave what we imported.

But I want to give the hon. gentleman some other figures. We have exported during the first six months of this year more oats than we have exported in the same six months of any former year. During that time we have imported 806,719 bushels; but during the same time we have exported of oats the product of Canada 4,984,735 bushels. The farmers of this country have been able to bring in corn at about half a cent a pound or a little over that; and any person* who has any knowledge of the feeding of cattle or milk cows or young stock will admit that corn is very much preferable to oats for that purpose. It is a better and stronger food; and if the farmers of this country have been able to import about two million bushels of corn at a very low price and use that for feeding

Mr. McMULLEN.

their stock, and have exported in its place 4,984,735 bushels of oats, for which they received a higher price proportionately than they paid for the corn, that was a decided advantage to them. I contend that there never was a change made in the tariff of this country from which the farmers derived greater advantages than they have derived from that which made corn free.

Mr. SPROULE. What will the farmers in the west think of it?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will allow the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to follow me when I am done; but if he has any question to ask, I will be glad to answer him. Canada is a great cheese country, and there is no food for cows from which you can obtain better cheese or butter than you can from a mixture of corn. You cannot produce the same quantity of milk, cheese or butter from cows fed on any other grain; and free corn has been unquestionably a decided advantage to the farmers during the last six months.

Now, let me give the figures of the exports of live cattle from this country. In 1896-97, in the full year, we exported 156,471 fat animals. In the first six months of the present year, since corn was made free, we have actually exported 137,584 fat animals, or within 18,000 of as many as we exported during the entire year previous. That shows that the farmers of this country are taking advantage of the privilege they enjoy of getting cheap food for their stock; and is it not a great benefit that we should be in a position to fatten our cattle, put them in first-class condition, send them across the Atlantic, and secure the top price on the market there, thus reaping the advantage of every dollar it is possible to reap? I hope that when my hon. friend from West York again undertakes to enlighten this House on any such question as this, he will try to keep within proper limits and not make such exaggerated statements as he has presented to this House with regard to corn. To give some little idea of the advantages reaped by our people from having Indian corn free, I will give the imports and exports for three years. I have already given those for 1897. In the year ending 30th of June, 1896, we imported 6,050,860 bushels and exported 2,489,315 bushels. In 1894-95, we imported 2,937,400 bushels, and exported 1,535,236 bushels. Now, I want to give you the quantity of oats. We are becoming very large exporters of oats, and the reason is simply this, that owing to the advantages our farmers are enjoying of cheap corn, they are selling their oats and buying corn, and in that way they are making a profit which they could not make if they had not that privilege. For instance, in 1896-97 we imported 1,090,860 bushels of oats,

and exported 7,247,991 bushels. In 1896 we exported only 1,001,956 bushels, and in 1895 we exported only 935,814 bushels. This shows that under present conditions, with the decided advantages the farmers now enjoy, they are making very desirable headway: they are realizing the advantages of free corn; and I will venture to predict that after they have been in the enjoyment of that advantage for a number of years, hon. gentlemen opposite, if they should reach the Treasury benches and attempt to deprive them of the privilege, will meet with a vigorous and determined opposition on the part of the farming community.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? If it is because of the importation of free corn that they have been able to sell so much more oats, how is it that the figures he has given apply to a time when corn was not brought in free?

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend is mistaken. He evidently has not enough room in his caput to contain more than one idea at a time. But, Sir, in order to enlighten my hon. friend, if he will try and find a space in his cranium for enlightenment, I will give him the figures again. I told him that in 1897 we exported 7,247,991 bushels of oats.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the fiscal year of 1897.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes. Now I give him the fiscal year of 1896. Is that what he wants? In the fiscal year of 1896 we just exported 1,100,000 bushels, so that, in the fiscal year of 1897, we exported over 6,000,000 bushels more of oats than we did in 1896.

Mr. SPROULE. How much of the fiscal year of 1897 was the present tariff in force, allowing farmers to bring in free corn?

Mr. McMULLEN. This calculation I have not made, but, in order to give the hon. gentleman a basis upon which he can form a reliable opinion, I shall give him the six months from the 30th of June last to the 31st of December, and he will admit that the full tariff of the present Government was in force during that time. That ought to be satisfactory to my hon. friend. In the first six months of the year ending 31st December last, we exported 4,984,735 bush-

els of oats, and in the previous year we only exported altogether one million of bushels; so that my hon. friend must now see that, while the farmers imported corn and used it for feeding purposes, they exported their oats to advantage. They reaped a benefit by selling their oats and buying corn. Now, does the hon. gentleman understand, or does he want me to repeat the thing again?

Mr. SPROULE. This I do not understand, and perhaps he will make it plainer, that the year before there was only about one-third the crop of oats in Ontario that we had last year, and I presume that would account for the small export. The figures he has given for the last six months are also for that portion of the year when we export the bulk of our oats. During the next six months the exports will not be anything like that amount.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend says that the first year the crop of oats was not quite so good, and that is the reason why there was not such a large export. The crop of last year, he will admit, was remarkably good.

Mr. SPROULE. It was.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then, the farmers, instead of using that enormous crop for feeding purposes, found it more advantageous to use the privilege granted them, under the tariff, of importing free corn and exporting their oats. Notwithstanding their enormous crop of oats, they still imported corn, and evidently found it more advantageous to do so and sell their oats.

Hon. gentlemen opposite persist in repeating that the people of this country are subjected to as high a rate of taxation under the present tariff as they were before, and the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), the other night, tried to point out that in some cases the tariff was not lowered, but increased. He tried, also, to belittle the statement made by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, with regard to the reduction which the people are bound to realize under the full application of the present tariff. I went through the old tariff of 1894 and the new tariff of 1897, and, although the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has referred to a good many of the items, I do not think it would be amiss for me to draw attention to a few more.

	Tariff.		Preferential rate from England.
	1894.	1897.	
			p.c.
Iron or steel cut nails and spikes.....	½c. per lb.....	½c. per lb.....	
Axes, scythes, hay knives, forks, rakes, hoes and other agricultural implements, N. E. S.....	35 p.c.....	25 p.c.....	20
Adzes, hatchets, picks, mattocks.....	35 “.....	30 “.....	22½
Steam engines, boilers.....	27½ “.....	25 “.....	20
Barbed wire.....	½c. per lb.....	15 “ and after Jan. 1, '98, free	
Indian corn.....	7½c. per bush.....	Free.....	
do not for distillation.....		Free.....	
Cotton batts, batting and sheet wadding, dyed or not.....	22½ p.c.....	25 p.c.....	20
Cotton warps and yarns, dyed or undyed.....	25 “.....	25 “.....	20
do gray, unbleached.....	22½ “.....	25 “.....	20
do fabrics, bleached.....	25 “.....	25 “.....	20
Binder twine.....	12½ “.....	10 “ and after Jan. 1, '98, free	
Jeans, sateens, &c., when imported by corset and dress stay makers for use in their own factories.....	25 “.....	20 p.c.....	15
Embroideries, laces, braids, tassels and bracelets, handkerchiefs, lace nets, nettings of cotton, linen curtains.....	30 “.....	35 “.....	26½
Lubricating oils, composed wholly or in part of petroleum, and costing less than 25c. per gall.....	6c. per gall.....	5c. per gall.....	
Crude petroleum, fuel and gas oils, when imported by manufacturers (other than oil refiners) for use in their own factories for fuel or for the manufacture of gas.....	3c. “.....	2½c. “.....	
Surgical and dental instruments.....	15 p.c.....	10 p.c. and after Jan. 1, '98, free	
Coal, bituminous.....	60c. per ton.....	53c. per ton.....	
Plaster of Paris, calcined.....	40c. per brl. of 300 lbs.....	12½c. per cwt.....	
Flagstones, sandstones, all building stones.....	20 p.c.....	15 p.c.....	
Iron, in pigs, iron, kentledge.....	\$4 per ton.....	\$2.50 per ton.....	
do or steel ingots.....	\$5 “.....	\$2 “.....	
Bar iron or steel, rolled.....	\$10 “.....	\$7 “.....	
Wire nails.....	1c. per lb.....	½c. per ton.....	

These things are of vital importance to the farmers. There is no class in the community that uses more iron than do the farmers. Nearly everything they use is made up of iron, and, where reduction is made to this extent in iron, it is undoubtedly an advantage to the farming community.

ple will reap substantial benefits in the form of lower prices for these goods. Now, I do hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will try to realize the advantages that are offered under this tariff. They say that protection is still in force. We are perfectly willing that those who are in the habit of benefit-

No. of Tariff Item.			Tariff.		Preferential Rate from England.
1894.	1897.		1894.	1897.	
434	369	Ribbons of all kinds and materials.....	30 p.c.	35 p.c.	26½ p.c.
442	379	Hair cloth of all kinds.....	30 “	30 “	22½ “
441	389	Shawls of all kinds.....	25 “	30 “	22½ “
456	402	Gloves and mitts of all kinds.....	35 “	35 “	20½ “
458	407	Hats, caps.....	30 “	30 “	22½ “
460	404	Braces or suspenders.....	35 “	35 “	26½ “
169	201	Window glass, common and colourless and plain coloured in sheets.....	20 “	20 “	15 “

These are things that are largely used by the poorer classes, and I contend that, as the new tariff is applied to these commodities and the reductions take effect, the peo-

ing by protection should try to persuade themselves that they are still in the enjoyment of these advantages. All we want is to supply the every day needs of the people,

Mr. McMULLEN.

and particularly in those goods that are imported from England, at the lowest possible prices. We believe that by following out the course that hon. gentlemen on this side have adopted, instead of the enormous tide of smuggling on the border being from the United States into Canada, the tide will be turned and that the smuggling will be from Canada into the United States, that large quantities of goods brought into Canada under the cheaper conditions will be bought here and carried into the United States. We believe that the United States will begin to realize the difficulty of keeping up the enormous regiment of preventive officers necessary to prevent this smuggling, and that the best thing that they can do is to concede to Canada a fair system of reciprocity. For English goods are bound to be cheaper in this country. Goods that are imported into the United States at from 45 to 50 per cent will come into Canada at from 15 to 20 per cent and, as a result, these will be placed on the counters of our retailers at enormously reduced prices. The Americans are cute enough to see that they can make money by buying these goods, and so the tide of smuggling will run from Canada into the United States.

Sir, I have dealt with the different points I desired to bring before the House. I claim that we have a magnificent policy in force at this moment and that the future of this country, under the application of that policy is assured. Canada has turned the corner. We have got away from the principle under which our people were struggling in poverty, and under the new policy a brighter and better day is dawning for us. Increased development will take place, our mineral resources will be developed, our great Northwest will be filled up and the country will go on prospering and to prosper. I believe that it was the brightest day in the history of this country for a hundred years when the people intrusted to Wilfrid Laurier and the men surrounding him the management of our affairs, and that under their administration we shall have a period of development and prosperity such as was never experienced by any country upon the continent of America.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to follow the hon. member for North-Wellington (Mr. McMullen) in his lengthy address, but I may refer to some matters on which he has touched. First and foremost let me join with him in his congratulations to the Minister of Trade and Commerce on his honesty and ability, because I quite agree with what the hon. gentleman has just said. But I trust that the Minister of Trade and Commerce will not feel annoyed if I liken him to a celebrated character in romance—to Gulliver tied down by the Lilliputians. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is a giant towering above the pigmies who surround him, but he is unable

to break the bonds with which they have tied him. What do we see in our politics to-day? We have the spectacle presented in a civilized country of a great political party—for the Liberal party in Canada is a great political party—after nearly two score years in Opposition, and after having on each successive occasion when they appealed to the electorate denounced the principle of protection, denied that it was in the interest of the country, now that they have taken office endorsing that principle almost in its entirety and saying that while they believe it is wrong, they are driven by circumstances to adopt it. That is practically the position they take. For twenty years they preached from the house tops that the country with which Canada naturally should trade was the great Republic to the south of us. But to-day hon. gentlemen opposite say that Canada has no use for the trade of the United States, but that our great market, the natural market for Canada, is in Great Britain. Then we have been told for years and years past that the Conservative party was a party of political debauchery, that it was a party that dissipated the public funds, that if the Liberal party were but returned to power, there would be seen an era of economy such as Canada had never seen before.

Well, the hon. gentlemen are in power to-day, and after preaching for years that this country could be conducted on lines of economy, they have forced up the public expenditure by leaps and bounds, and have increased the public debt by upwards of five million dollars over what it was under Conservative rule. While these hon. gentlemen denounced an annual expenditure of thirty-four million dollars as being outrageous, they to-day have the temerity to come down and tell the House that with the Supplementary Estimates, the expenditure for the current year will in all probability be upwards of forty million dollars. Where are all the pledges these gentlemen made to the public? Do they not think their words are worth respecting? Did not the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the giant of the whole aggregation, when he sat on this side of the House, declare in his strongest tones that it was rascally to have so many members in the Administration? Yet to-day the Administration is greater in numbers than it ever was before, and I regret to say that the province of Ontario, the premier province, has the least number of members in the Cabinet. Why has not the province of Ontario one of the great spending departments? Where is the Minister of Public Works? Is he to be found in the strong man that should be the Minister of Public Works for the good of the country, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce? Not at all, but the master of the situation, the present Minister of Public Works, controls the Cabinet to-day. These gentlemen made

these pledges that there should be a reduction in the number of Ministers, now we find that instead of a reduction, the same story goes on as before. Then these hon. gentlemen denounced, and the strongest denunciations were made by the hon. member for North Wellington, the number of civil servants as being too great, that they were excrescences, that men were walking about the corridors doing nothing, standing in each other's way. Yet there sits the hon. member for North Wellington, and he will vote acquiescence to every grant of money to increase the number of civil servants in this country. Why, what a spectacle was presented last year by the hon. member for North Wellington. He stood up and chided the Minister of Inland Revenue in this, that the expenditure in his department was too high, and while he was doing that, he was actually endeavouring to force another official into that department, and the hon. member for North Wellington cannot deny it. He nods his head, he did not dare to shake it last year. I can tell the hon. gentleman and I will tell him privately, the name of the party who applied to him for a position, and he was informed that he could not do anything for him because he had a friend of his own applying for the position. Then the hon. member says: Look at the Conservative party in the past, every one of them had lambs for offices. Well, the hon. gentleman had his lamb placed in office, he had a relative placed in the Kingston penitentiary. Surely the gentleman will not deny that. He nods acquiescence to that statement. It is not the fault of hon. gentlemen opposite if they have not got their friends in all the offices, because the greatest part of them, from the province of Ontario at all events, are themselves applicants for offices under this present Government. Last year when the Drummond Railway deal was before the House, the present Judge Lavergne was one of the men who stood up in this House with a judgeship in his pocket, and one of those who talked the loudest in favour of that infamous Drummond deal last year when statements were made against the interests of the city of Quebec, was the present Judge Langeller, who sat in his place and did not say a word in demur to expenditures that were not in the interests of the city of Quebec. Sir, I say to-day that next session we shall find that from the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite who a few weeks ago supported the Yukon deal, there are more than half a dozen of them who have their positions in their pockets to-day. Yet these hon. gentlemen stand up and chide the Opposition for the statements they make in this House. Why, Sir, if ever there was a party that had no record for decency, it is the hon. gentlemen who sit to-day on the Government benches. I noted the frank confession of the Minister of Trade and Commerce the other day in debate, when he said: The fact of the matter

Mr. BENNETT.

is we minimized the expenditure of the country, we thought we would cut it down, but we frankly admit now that we were mistaken in our views. That is not the only reason. The reason is that the Minister of Trade and Commerce finds that there are so many importunate camp followers behind them that they cannot retrench the expenditure, that is the reason why it is going up by leaps and bounds. Now, the hon. member for North Wellington, who has just left the Chamber, expressed the hope that there would be honesty in this Administration. He expressed that hope with a great deal of fervour, but at the same time with a great deal of doubt in his mind. I can understand why that hon. gentleman should feel a little dubious. Did he not last year see a Minister under an obligation to a great railway corporation, under a pecuniary obligation, as the Minister of Public Works was, to the Drummond County Railway?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). It is not true. But say it all the same.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman says it was not true that he was under an obligation to the Drummond Railway Company.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not one dollar.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, we have had the evidence of one gentleman that he owed them \$20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not fifty cents. It is not true, and the hon. gentleman knows it.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, the hon. gentleman's dealings with the Drummond Railway Company are to-day before a committee. The statements made on all hands have been before the public, and if it should prove that the hon. gentleman was never a debtor for fifty cents, then he is right and I am wrong; but if, on the other hand, it should prove that he was their debtor for many thousand dollars, then the hon. gentleman must be wrong and the records to-day before the public must be right.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no such record, and the hon. gentleman knows it.

Mr. WALLACE. The evidence of the court shows it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is not a word of truth in that.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman from North Wellington says he hopes there will be honesty. Perhaps it was the relations of the Minister of Public Works with the Drummond Railway that made him suspect there was something wrong, but if it was not that, he must have had the Yukon deal.

before him. Now, there is not a sane man in the Dominion of Canada to-day who believes that that matter was straightforward and honest in its entirety. It is true, there has been no charge made against any Minister of the Administration in regard to that, but we do know that the very best elements of the Liberal party to-day, some of them now sitting on the benches opposite, are heartily glad that the Senate disposed of that Bill in the way that they did. Time alone will tell the true inwardness of their dealings with it. Is it any wonder, therefore, that the hon. member for North Wellington standing up in the House with fear and trembling, says that he hopes and trusts that there may be honesty in the present and future of the Administration? Now, the hon. gentleman went over the political record of his party and claimed they had been consistent. He says that they were never a party to the doctrine of commercial union. Does he not know that the then leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Edward Blake, quit his party for the very reason that they had espoused that cause? Does he not know that the contest of 1891 was fought out on that line of commercial union with the United States? Does he not recollect the correspondence, I may say the treasonable correspondence, that passed between certain parties and his own leaders, in which it was openly advocated that it was better to make one bite of a cherry and to go at once for political alliance with the United States. As I said before, here is the spectacle presented of a party going back on every pledge they have ever made. When they found themselves last year in power, more to their surprise than to any person else, they looked about them to frame some financial policy for the country. Who framed the policy of the Government? Who framed the tariff as it exists, as it was brought down last year? With his innate modesty, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) made the startling announcement that he was the gentleman who consulted, from time to time, with the Minister of Finance as to how the tariff should be formed.

But he was not the only hon. gentleman who had the honour of framing the tariff, for I am bound to believe that the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost), representing a large agricultural implement establishment, had a hand in the framing of that tariff. What was the result? Those hon. gentlemen saw that the interests of their friends particularly were interests that would be affected by the lowering of the duties between Canada and the United States, and they at once looked about to get out of the dilemma that presented itself. True, the Minister of Trade and Commerce had the same honest idea he has always had, that trade with the United States was to be preferred. What was he to do? He was cribbed, cabined and confined; the pigmies

had fastened him down; he was utterly helpless, because his ideas were not to prevail, but the ideas of such amateur tariff-makers as the hon. member for Centre Toronto and the hon. member for North Leeds. What did we find? We found the party announcing to the world that they would go in for a tariff on the lines promulgated last year. It was a tariff by which Great Britain was to get certain preferences, and the rest of the world was to be barred out and estopped from those privileges. When the hon. gentlemen enunciated that policy, they were told by hon. members on this side of the House, that, owing to international arrangements entered into by Great Britain with Germany and Belgium and other countries, those other countries would be entitled to the same benefit. True, they had some great and mighty legal opinions on the other side. They had the mighty legal opinion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; but it all turned out as was predicted by this side of the House, and Germany and Belgium did come in, and we had the humiliation, month after month, of being forced to pay back to exporters from Germany and Belgium the rebate to be allowed to them under that treaty. What further? It was pointed out, in addition, that hon. gentlemen opposite were in this position, owing to treaty arrangements between Great Britain and many other countries, that all those other countries would be entitled to the preference, and this year the hon. gentlemen had the humiliation—that is, if there is any humiliation in their composition—of coming down and announcing to the House that an arrangement had been perfected by which our people would give to Great Britain a preference, and to Great Britain alone. Where do we find ourselves? We find ourselves brought to-day face to face with the arrangement with Great Britain, and Great Britain alone, which will seriously damage and impair some of our manufacturing interests, while, at the same time, it will not give to the mass of the people of Canada those benefits which hon. gentlemen opposite promised when they were so many years in Opposition. I am loyal to Canada, to England and to Great Britain, but I believe in loyalty, first, to Canada and to the people here who are endeavouring to build up this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite, so far in the debate, have endeavoured—and I will not say whether it was done deliberately or not—to place in their party press statements which would lead the readers to believe that this tariff is one which will be beneficial to the farmers, mechanics and artisans. Nothing could have been more absurd than the statement made yesterday by the Minister of Customs. Column after column of figures were read by the hon. gentleman by which he tried to lead the people to believe that great advantage would be derived by them from the adoption of the tariff. But all these assertions were exposed in the

twinkling of an eye, when the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) showed that, as regards every article in which those reductions were to be made, the importations from England were practically nothing at all. Those hon. gentlemen, for years in this House, and particularly in the province of Ontario, were always to be found, on the platform and in the press, denouncing as foremost of all outrageous arrangements in the tariff, the duty on agricultural implements. There is not a man among them in Ontario but would point out this fact, that the Massey Manufacturing Company had made thousands and tens of thousands of dollars, drawn out of the pockets of the farmers of the provinces of Ontario and Manitoba, that other large establishments manufacturing similar articles were making untold thousands, and yet hon. gentlemen libelled all their past by retaining the duty on agricultural implements to-day. It must be a matter of great congratulation to the honest Liberal farmer, who believed that hon. gentlemen opposite were honest, to look over the tariff reductions and find how many advantages are accorded them. When the farmer complains that the price of a reaper and mower is too high, it will be a matter of great satisfaction to him to know that the Minister of Trade and Commerce announced that mushroom spawn was to be free. And, as the farmer toils day in and day out, paying what hon. gentlemen have always contended to be an enormous price for a reaper and binder, it must be a great satisfaction for him to learn that the duty on laces and silks has been reduced from 30 per cent by a considerable amount. If he is not satisfied with the reductions on mushroom spawn and on laces and silks, he will have the great consolation of knowing that he can buy a bicycle much cheaper from importers from England because the duty on bicycles has been very materially reduced. So far as regards those articles that come from the old country and enter into the consumption of the farmers, it is an absurdity to argue that there has been the reduction made which hon. gentlemen opposite promised. Where do those hon. gentlemen find themselves? They have framed a tariff policy which is not at all in the interest of the farmers, but which is in the interest of the wealthy people, and of the wealthy people almost exclusively. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) derived satisfaction from the fact that there is to be a high state of morality attained in Canada at last, that the honest, toiling artisan in the Dominion, deprived, probably, of work in the woollen mills and in many other manufacturing concerns, can at least turn into the profitable occupation of being a smuggler of goods from this country into the United States. It is to be regretted that the hon. gentleman should hold up such a code of morals, under which our honest labour may be turned into such channels,

Mr. BENNETT.

and our people become smugglers as between Great Britain, Canada and the United States. I have always held that an interchange of goods between Canada and the United States might prove of great advantage to both countries. How are we to hope to attain that end? Is it to be that, when we are importing into Canada in a month or so high-priced velvets, silks and the upper grades of cloths and clothing, we are simply to smuggle those goods into the United States? I always thought the hon. member for North Wellington posed as an exemplar of purity and honesty, and yet he encourages the young men of Canada to become law-breakers by smuggling goods from Canada into the United States.

Where do hon. gentlemen find themselves on the question of expenditure? Those hon. gentlemen, year after year, spoke of the outrageous expenditure in this country, and they told the people that if they were once entrusted with the reins of power, there would be an end to all kinds of extravagance. There was to be, in every branch of the public service, a large reduction made, and that most outrageous expenditure in our system of government, the superannuation system, was to be at once, if not altogether eradicated, placed on an honest and fair basis. I perused to-day a return of the superannuations that have been made during the past year.

It will be news to the country, and it will be gratifying to hon. gentlemen opposite who have friends to place in the public service, to learn that last year superannuations were made to the amount of \$64,200 per annum, which will be an increased charge on the public expenditure for many years to come. In addition to that, these gentlemen opposite last year gave no less than \$12,850 in gratuities to solace disposed of officials. If new men had not been placed in these vacated offices it would not have been so bad, but I will be bound to say that in most cases the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) or some of the gentlemen beside him had friends whom they quickly placed in these positions. But, Sir, of all the sinners in this respect, the Postmaster General was the greatest, for notwithstanding all his protestations of honesty and economy for years, last year the Post Office Department was saddled with superannuation payments to the extent of \$23,400 per annum, and the gratuities in the department amounted to \$7,656. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) says that he has improved the efficiency of the public service. Let us see how he has done it. I regret that the Postmaster General is not present to hear this, but when his Estimates come up, I will take occasion to let him know. When he (Mr. Mulock) came into office he found installed there as Deputy Postmaster General Col. White, who for efficiency and for the knowledge of his duties had not his superior in

the civil service. Well, Sir, we find that in order to make place for a political friend, the Postmaster General brought down from his own riding a practising physician and made him Deputy Postmaster General. The consequence is that to-day we are paying Mr. Griffin, a superannuated Deputy Postmaster General, \$2,240 a year, we are paying Col. White, another superannuated deputy, \$2,240, and we are paying to the present incumbent of the office \$3,200. No wonder, I say, that in this regard the Postmaster General is the greatest sinner of them all.

Mr. WALLACE. And he paid Col. White a salary after superannuating him.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, the beauty of the whole thing is, that after the Postmaster General and his newly found deputy were installed in office there commenced such a series of blunders—such as the reduction of the postage rate to England, which made us the laughing-stock of the world—that they actually paid extra for the services of the late Deputy Postmaster General, so that he might direct these two gentlemen as to the details of the department. Then, the Postmaster General went to the city of Kingston, intent, no doubt, on economy and efficiency of the service, and finding there an excellent postmaster, he dispensed with his services in order to put an older man in his place. The result is that to-day the country is paying and will pay for years, a superannuation of \$680 a year to the late postmaster, in addition to the salary of the present postmaster.

Then, the Minister of the Interior, the young Napoleon as they delight to call him, the gentleman who shakes the whole aggregation by the head when the Minister of Public Works is not engaged in that playful pastime, he found an efficient officer in the service, Mr. Hayter Reed, and so the Minister of the Interior disposed of Mr. Hayter Reed, and charged the country with his superannuation of \$1,024 a year. The Minister of Railways found a most efficient officer in Mr. Balderson, a man not forty years old, and he superannuated him at the rate of \$680 per annum. I might go through the whole actions of these economic gentlemen over there and show that their object was the superannuating of competent officials and the placing of friends in their places at an extra charge to the country. I promise, Sir, that when the post office Estimates come down, I shall treat the House to some further facts in regard to that department, which will not redound to the credit of the Postmaster General.

Now, Sir, we find that these hon. gentlemen are boastful of the present condition of the country. True, they do give a little credit to the good crops of last year; true, they do admit that Providence dispensed favours with a bountiful hand; but

their great argument is that the presence in power of a Liberal Administration has been the cause of almost all the so-called prosperity. I am not going to deny that we in this Dominion last year had a turn in the tide for which we are all thankful, but as far as these hon. gentlemen opposite having had anything to do with it, why, they have been simply as matches on the Niagara River, tossed about. Had it not been that up to last July every importer in this country was holding back his hand and waiting to see what the tariff policy of these gentlemen would be, the deficit of half a million dollars would have been very considerably increased. The Minister of Finance, in the most airy way, tells the country that next year we are going to have a large surplus. Well, that remains to be seen; time alone will be the arbiter of that; but it must be borne in mind that last year we had a bountiful crop, that good prices were obtained by the farmers, and that a great stimulus was given to trade in Canada owing to the unexpected development of our mining country. The Minister of Trade and Commerce told us the other night that we have an increased population. Well, Sir, if the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) can tell the House what section of the province of Ontario is having an increased population, then he will tell us something that no person knows. I can tell the Minister that in the northern towns of western Ontario there is certainly no increase in population, but rather a decrease. There is undoubtedly an increase of population in the Yukon district, but the hon. gentleman cannot think that the policy of his Government cuts any figure at all in that. Take the maritime provinces, and the experience of every hon. gentleman coming from there is that to-day the tide of emigration is westward from these provinces. Hon. gentlemen should not shout before they are out of the woods; they had better wait for next year and see what will be the result. I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) in detail, but I do ask the indulgence of the House while I endeavour to place before the Government a matter of very great importance to the northern part of the province of Ontario; I refer to the lumber industry. If there is one industry in Canada that is to-day being crippled and maimed by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is the lumber industry. Not only have we to contend against the prejudices of these hon. gentlemen, but we have also to contend against the prejudices of the Ontario Government in regard to that great industry. Last year these hon. gentlemen took to themselves the power to impose an export duty on logs. I do not altogether blame them for not putting that in operation, owing to the fact that the local Government have promised that they will do it. I myself would

much desire to see that go into effect, and go into effect at once, instead of trusting ourselves to the tender mercies of the local government; and I do contend that, in the light of present events, the Government are acting in the most suicidal way, when they treat the question of the lumber duties in Canada as they are treating it to-day. Why, Sir, what do we see? We see all along the shores of the Georgian Bay saw-mill after saw-mill closed up, and the men who have been working in these mills for years regretfully wending their way to the United States of America. We see these hon. gentlemen and their friends in the government at Toronto, by the line of policy they are pursuing, permitting the exportation of millions upon millions of saw-logs from Canada to the United States; and to our mortification we find that if any man is loyal enough to lose some dollars, and endeavour to help the country by manufacturing lumber on the shores of the Georgian Bay, the moment his lumber goes to the United States, it is taxed with a duty of \$2 a thousand. It is a most outrageous arrangement, and under it the whole business is being slowly but surely transferred to the United States. We see the logs leaving our shores and going to Michigan to be manufactured there; and we see these Canadian logs, converted, so to speak, into American lumber, brought back and sold in our own cities and towns, and our men at the same time thrown out of employment and leaving the country. There can be no justification for such a line of policy, save and except this, that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) says it must be so, and of course, if he says so, that settles it. I appeal now to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). In all fairness, is it honest to the province of Ontario, the great tax-producing province of this whole Dominion, that a great industry like the lumber industry should be paralyzed, simply that the Minister of the Interior may be able to go to the province of Manitoba and say, "See what my strong hand has done." I acknowledge the strength of the Minister of the Interior. He showed his strength a few weeks ago, when he dragged the whole party, the strong man of the Government, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, with the rest, into his Yukon deal; and I suppose he holds over them the threat that if they dare to propose a duty on lumber he will go out of the Cabinet, and fire the heather of Manitoba with the school question again. And so, the hon. gentlemen have to bow down and worship the Minister of the Interior, simply that he may be able to build up a reputation for himself in the province of Manitoba.

There is another matter which I intend to refer to, but not at great length, as interesting the constituency which I represent; that is, the question of the policy of the Government of the day on the Trent Valley Canal.

Mr. BENNETT.

The Government stand pledged to the performance of that work. In the recent local elections the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) wrote and sent a telegram that very much influenced the elections in the county of Hastings; and yet no provision is made in the Estimates for a continuation of that work. There is a small grant for some uncompleted sections; but the hon. gentlemen who represent constituencies adjacent to the line of that canal, and who give this Government a most unqualified and unstinted support, should stand up in this House and attempt to convince the Government of the merits of this project, and place upon them the responsibility of saying whether or not the work shall be carried to a consummation.

I do not propose to discuss the questions I have referred to at any greater length. I can only say that I trust and hope that there will be in this country for the next year, and for many succeeding years, an era of prosperity brighter even than hon. gentlemen opposite themselves have predicted; but I believe that the policy which these hon. gentlemen have inaugurated is not a policy that will bring about that fruitful result. The tariff they have framed is one that will strike the farmer, who is the greatest factor in the country's prosperity. Despite the theoretical reasoning of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to the contrary, I say that the introduction of American corn into the province of Ontario—and I know that the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) nods assent to this—has been and is a great deterrent factor against the farmer. I say that the introduction of cheap goods from England, under the operation of the preferential clause, will have a most deterrent effect on the farmer. To-day, in every little town and village in Canada, is to be found a small woollen mill, which is the best purchaser of the coarse wool produced by the Canadian farmer; and I contend—and time will prove it, and I am speaking by the authority of men in the business—that with the introduction of cheap woollen goods from England, every one of these small factories will be driven to the wall: and with the American tariff against Canadian wool, the only market for which is in the United States, the price of wool will be greatly depreciated in the next year in the province of Ontario and in the other provinces of the Dominion. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) yesterday afternoon talked about the woollen industry; but he was not talking alongside of the fact at all, when he stated that the woollen mills of this country were running night and day. As a matter of fact, they have been running at a great deal less than full time; and it is to-day the belief of every woollen-mill man in this country that with the reduction in the tariff on woollen goods, nearly every woollen industry in the country will be driven to the wall. In conclusion, I

again reiterate the hope that Canada is to see an era of prosperity for a number of years; but if that prosperity comes, it will not be due, in my humble opinion, to any policy which these hon. gentlemen have formulated, but it will be due to the fact that the people of Canada have industry, thrift and frugality on their side, and that under the beneficent influence of the National Policy for the last eighteen or twenty years we have established the foundations of a strong manufacturing business, which I hope and trust the inroads which hon. gentlemen opposite are to-day making in the tariff will not be able to upset or throw down.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I would have spoken on this very important question except for one matter that has been brought prominently forward, that is, the statement that the importation of free corn into the Dominion of Canada is injuring the farmers and is deterrent to their prosperity, as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Bennett) has told us. I can congratulate that hon. gentleman upon the wish he expressed that the prosperity of this country would be greater even than we on this side of the House could anticipate. I believe that an era of prosperity has commenced, that it is running strongly in this direction, but I differ greatly from hon. gentlemen opposite when they say that none of that is due to this Government.

Let me say that a considerable part of the prosperity which the farmers of Ontario have enjoyed during the last twelve or eighteen months has been due to the action of the Minister of Agriculture in going to the United States and making an arrangement whereby the quarantine regulations were relaxed and a large number of our cattle allowed to go into that country. I had contended for this for years. Before 1896, I urged the Government to go to the United States and get these regulations removed, because their removal would be of great benefit to our farmers by allowing them to take their young cattle across, as they used to do in the days gone, before the McKinley Bill. During the last year some 50,000 or 60,000 head of young cattle went to the United States, and brought \$7 to \$8 per head more than they would have done had the regulations continued in force. They were a class of cattle which it was not in the interest of farmers of Ontario to feed themselves, but which it was in their interest to get rid of in the best possible manner, and by the removal of these quarantine regulations they did get rid of them. I am perfectly convinced that we sold over 518,000 head of cattle during 1897 or some 66,000 more than we did for a length of time, and 200,000 of those cattle brought \$8 per head more than they otherwise would, putting \$1,600,000 into the pockets of the farmers of Ontario, which they realized from selling

their young cattle in the United States more than they would have got had the quarantine regulations not been removed. Our beef cattle also have, by the removal of these regulations, been allowed to go into the United States. The Americans purchase them in Ontario and give us a better price, and ship them to the old country market. All that is due to the action of this Government.

There is another direction in which prosperity has set in, and that is through the system of establishing cold storage in the different creameries through the country. To the Government and particularly to the Minister of Agriculture is due the credit for the establishment of cold storage in our creameries. For the first time in the history of Canada, in the month of March last, a creamery situated at St. Mary's sent a large shipment of butter into the British market, and that butter brought from one shilling to one and sixpence per pound higher than the best Danish butter on the market. This is due to the establishment of cold storage in our creameries, in which to put our butter and keep it in good condition before shipping it on the cars. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will say that none of the credit is due to the Government of the day, but that the late Government inaugurated the system of cold storage. They did inaugurate that system on the lines of railway and on ocean steamers, but not in the different creameries through the country, nor did they ever suggest doing so. Not only that, but a great many followers of the leader of the Opposition were not even aware, although it had been announced in this House, that the Government were offering a bonus of \$100 to each creamery which would be fitted with a proper system of cold storage.

I was a little astonished at the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) asking how my hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) could have had the audacity to speak about gerrymanders, when one of the worst gerrymanders ever perpetrated, was made in the county of Huron. I grant that it was, but not by the local government. It was made by the Dominion Government, because in all the local gerrymanders that ever took place the local Ontario Government never violated county lines. But how does the county of Huron stand to-day, as regards the different ridings for representation in the Dominion House? Why, we have the township of Stephen, the town of Exeter and the town of Osborne. The township of Stephen is put into North Middlesex and so is Exeter. Osborne is put into South Perth, and all this was done to gerrymander the county. It was done for the purpose of giving the late Government two representatives from the county of Huron, and the first time I took my seat in this House I had to congratulate the leader of the Government on making me a member by Act of

Parliament, because I represented the Liberal hive of the county riding of South Huron. As regards the local House, no more compact ridings can be laid out in any country than those of Huron. The ridings are compact, nearly equal in territorial limit and population, and very nearly equal in the number of voters in each riding. It is impossible to lay them out in any better manner—very different from what Huron was, when at one time a gentleman came from the county of Huron and said it would be no sin to worship that map, for it was not a likeness of anything in the heavens above or the earth beneath or the waters under the earth. Nothing of the kind was done by the Ontario Government in the county of Huron.

I was likewise very much amused at that hon. gentleman when he told us about the opening up of the North-west. He said that it was the Conservatives who inaugurated the Canadian Pacific Railway. When these hon. gentlemen talk so much about bribery and corruption, let them go back to that time when the Canadian Pacific Railway was inaugurated, and certainly its inauguration was no credit to the Conservative party. When they undertook to sell the charter to Sir Hugh Allan, they gave him \$360,000, and when the House met after the elections, an hon. member for Manitoba stood up and said he had been approached on a Sunday and offered a certain amount of money to give his vote to sustain the Government. When they saw the cat had got out of the bag, after attempting to purchase the different constituencies, they attempted to purchase members on the floor of the House. That is the way the Canadian Pacific Railway was inaugurated, and I was therefore astonished to hear the hon. gentleman talking so much about the Drummond Railway. Is it not fresh in the memory of the gentlemen of this House that in 1891 there was over \$90,000 bonuses given the Drummond Railway, that it was in the end of the month of February that the House adjourned before the general election, and before two weeks elapsed there were \$9,000 of the bonus paid over, and before three weeks elapsed \$70,000 of bonuses were paid over—that is within two or three weeks of the general election. Judging by the facts, even if there was nothing wrong in it, it looked very suspicious. Yet hon. gentlemen will tell us about bribery and corruption and hint that everything done in this House is done for the purpose of getting funds for the elections. Why, the hon. member for East Grey told us some time ago that he believed that out of a certain deal, there had come a certain sum to carry the Ontario elections. I am not astonished at the hon. gentleman making that statement because he judges us by the record of his own party. If we go back to the early days of confederation, we find that the Canadian Pacific Railway charter was sold

Mr. McMILLAN.

to Sir Hugh Allan for \$360,000 to assist Sir John A. Macdonald to carry the elections in 1873, and shortly before the late Government had to give up the reins of power, we find that Mr. Goodwin, a contractor on the Soulanges Canal, put in a claim of \$210,000, which the Government first repudiated and then wanted to pay, but which the Opposition compelled them to bring before the Exchequer Court. And the judge of that court, in awarding \$70,000, made the plain statement that he did so on account of the action of some of the officials of the late Government. I hoped not to hear so much talk about bribery and corruption, seeing that there was so much of it indulged in by the late Government, and so many cases of it brought home to them. They have not been able to bring home a single case to the present Government, and the same was true of the previous Reform Government that held office for five years.

Now, as to the importation of corn, the statement was made yesterday afternoon that 11,500,000 bushels of corn had come into this country in the last six months of last year. And it was stated that this corn had displaced an equal amount of our coarse grains. Now, I will accept the hon. gentleman's statements that this quantity of corn came in and that it displaced an equal quantity of our coarse grain. Any gentleman who knows anything about feeding cattle or hogs knows that if we feed corn, peas or oats, pound for pound, corn is a little the best feed. So, if 11,500,000 bushels of corn came in, it would require 18,941,176 bushels of oats to furnish an equal quantity in weight of feed. Take the quantity of corn at 27½ cents per bushel, which was the price the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) stated, and take the oats at 24 cents per bushel. What would be the gain or loss to the Canadian farmer in buying corn and selling oats? The gain would amount to the handsome sum of \$1,440,882 to the Canadian farmer in this transaction. This is the way I want to see the Canadian farmers ruined all the time. Now, look at it another way. Suppose we take a steer, and put him up for 200 days and give him eight pounds of meal per day. What will be the result with these several feeds? It would take 26½ bushels of peas at 55 cents per bushel, or \$14.63 for meal. It would take of oats 47 bushels at 32 cents per bushel, or \$14.04. It would take of corn 28½ bushels at 37 cents or \$9.54. This shows a gain by feeding corn, the gain over peas amounting to \$5.09 and the gain over feeding oats \$4.90. This would be the gain on each animal fed in the country. Now, we have stall fed \$200,000 animals within the last five months. This means that about \$1,000,000 has been put in the hands of the farmers more than they could have had by feeding their coarse grain. And yet hon. gentlemen who know nothing about the question will stand up

and tell us that the Canadian farmer is injured, that he is ruined by having corn brought into the country. It was stated that in 1878 seven millions of bushels of corn came into Canada.

Take the report of the committee that was appointed in 1882 to investigate the effect of the National Policy, and note the effect that the National Policy had upon the agriculture of the country. In 1878, the very year when seven millions of bushels of corn came in to be consumed in Canada, oats were 9 cents per bushel higher than in the United States. That was before the National Policy came into force. But in the year after the National Policy was imposed, we find that only 1,700,000 bushels of corn was imported, and in Canada oats were only 3 cents per bushel higher than in the United States. I dare any hon. gentleman to controvert these facts. I have gone over the figures carefully and know whereof I speak. I say that no greater benefit was ever conferred on the farmers of Canada, and especially on the farmers of Ontario than by allowing corn to come in free. This year oats are selling well up to the price of corn. I see that the price is 33 cents per bushel in Toronto, while corn is only 37 cents, or a difference of only 4 cents as between 34 pounds per bushel of oats and 56 pounds per bushel of corn.

We sold and slaughtered in the province of Ontario in 1896, 436,451 cattle. In 1897 we sold and slaughtered 503,007 cattle. This shows an increase in one year of 66,556. This increase in fat cattle would not have taken place had it not been for the import of corn coming into the country in 1897, for we had not the coarse grains from the crop of 1896 wherewith to feed our cattle. So that the free importation of corn was a great and continued benefit. There is another reason in its favour; farmers want to make all the manure they can. Let us get all the corn we can into our own country, feed it with our own coarse grains and return everything we can to the soil.

Now, with respect to the prosperity of the farmer, I find that when we go back to the year 1882, the whole value of the farmers' field crop in Ontario was \$155,000,000, or for each farmer, \$789. When we come down to 1896, we find that the value of the field crops had fallen to \$88,900,135, or for each farmer only the small sum of \$400.50. But, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to state that in 1897 our field crops had again increased. Though there had been a steady decline from 1882 down to 1896, we find that in 1897 there is a rebound to \$99,488,336. So that, instead of \$400 for each farmer, the amount was \$452 for each farmer. There is no doubt that an era of prosperity has set in in more ways than one.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the crops were almost a

total failure in 1896, while there was a very large crop last year?

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not know that. I know that in many places we had a fair crop in 1896, and last year oats were more of a failure than in 1896. The hon. gentleman is always interjecting remarks. I would advise him to keep his little soul in patience. He is so impatient at the prosperity of the country, at the success of the Government of the day that he cannot sit still while any other gentleman is addressing the House, without making some interruptions. Then we have been told that this Government is not opposed to protection, that they have adopted a policy of protection. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) told us that the Government have adopted the policy of protection, and then he told us that the woollen manufacturers of the country were going to be ruined by cheap woollen goods coming in from England. What is going to bring more cheap woollen goods in from England than have been coming in in the past? How can that be if the Government of the day has adopted a policy of protection? One statement of the hon. gentleman contradicts the other. If it is a fact, as he says, that a large quantity of woollen goods will come in from England, it shows that the duty must have been reduced, and that the farmers are going to get cheaper goods. Then the hon. member for East Simcoe told us that the woollen factories were nearly all going to be closed up. I remember being much astonished once, just before the elections of 1896. I had been in Almonte, where there are a number of woollen factories, and having been told a few days after that all these factories were closed down, and that the workmen were walking about, I was greatly surprised to find these factories in full operation. When I hear gentlemen make such statements as that in the House, I am not astonished at the extravagant statements they make when they go before the people of the country, if they think they can make a point by it.

Then they say the duty on farmers' agricultural implements has also been reduced. There is one thing that we always contended against. We complained that the late Government valued those implements coming in from the States higher than they ought to have done. There was a revaluation. We can all remember the discussions that took place in this House, when it was clearly proven that the manufacturers of the agricultural implements in Canada had sent an agent to the United States to visit a great many of the factories there, in order to find out what their implements were shipped at, and what they were costing. In the matter of reapers alone, they were valued at one time as high as \$110. When the late Government went out of power they were valued at \$100, with 20 per cent of a duty. But the present Government reduced the

valuation to \$92, which had the same effect as if the duty had been reduced 13-5 per cent. So that we have not been paying such an extravagant price for our agricultural implements as in the past. We find that on no less than fifty implements there has been a reduction from 35 per cent to 25 per cent, and from 30 per cent to 25 per cent, by the present Government. Here is a list that the Minister of Customs gave us last night, of agricultural implements on which there have been reductions:

	Tariff, 1894.	General Tariff, 1897.	Percent- age of reduction, 1897.
	p.c.	p.c.	p.c.
Axes	35	25	28½
Hay or straw knives	35	25	28½
Hand rakes	35	25	28½
Farm rollers	30	25	16½
Road or field rollers	30	25	16½
Windmills	30	25	16½
Horse powers	30	25	16½
Portable engines....	30	25	16½
Threshers	30	25	16½
Feed cutters.....	35	25	28½
Separators	30	25	16½
Potato diggers.....	35	25	28½
Grain crushers.....	35	25	28½
Fanning mills.....	35	25	28½
Hay tedders.....	35	25	28½
Manure spreaders...	25	20	20

All these are implements that the farmer uses upon his farm, and upon these large reductions have been made. There is another large class of implements also upon which there have been reductions in the interest of the farmers. But the farmers remember that there was a time when a previous Minister of Finance, making his speech in this House, attempted to hoodwink the farmers. Why, Sir, would you believe me when I say that the Minister of Finance at that time attempted to make the farmers believe that all their implements were made out of timber grown from their own lands, and that to the best advantage? I told him across the floor of the House that I did not know where he had been; I thought he must have been with Rip Van Winkle in Sleepy Hollow for the last 30 or 40 years when he made that statement. However, he came to know better, and he learned that the farmers were under a very grievous burden indeed with respect to the duty on agricultural implements.

Now in the matter of corn, I was sorry to hear the leader of the Opposition make a remark which showed that he had not made a very close observation of the subject, otherwise a gentleman of his ability and knowledge never would have made the statement he did the other day, that the introduction of free corn had wrought an injury to the farmers of this country, that upon their poor land they were growing coarse grains, and that corn was coming and supplanting those grains. He also found fault with the Government for reducing the duty

upon wheat from 15 cents to 12½ cents a bushel, and the duty upon flour from 75 cents to 60 cents a barrel. Let me say that the duty upon wheat has not benefited the farmers of Ontario one cent. I stated to this House on a previous occasion this session that during the whole winter wheat had been 10 and 12½ cents a bushel higher in Detroit than it was in Toronto. I was told at the time that my statement was not correct, but I think I proved it to be correct. I repeat to-night, that wheat to-day, in both Buffalo and Oswego, is 10 and 11 cents a bushel higher than it is in the frontier cities of the province of Ontario. If the duty was swept away entirely, that condition of things could not continue to exist, because our wheat would go up equal with that of the United States, or theirs would come down equal with ours. So it is with flour. He says he was astonished that the Government had not taken the duty of 60 cents off flour, though he was not so much astonished at wheat. If they had done that, it would have injured our millers to a great extent. If the one is taken off, the other should be taken off, and most of our millers are willing that that should be the case. Now, with respect to agricultural implements, there are 107 articles given by the Minister of Customs, on 100 of which the rate of duty is largely reduced. The reduction is from 10 to 12½, 16, 20, 23, 25, 27, 28, and up to 55 per cent—all articles that the farmer largely uses upon his farm. And yet the hon. gentleman states that the Government have not reduced the price of the farmers' implements. The farmers of the province of Ontario know that that statement is not correct, and hon. gentlemen only discredit their own statements, when they try to palm off such a statement upon the farmers of Ontario.

Let me say that I was much pleased, the other day, when I came across the statement that our creamery butter was rapidly taking the position our cheese had taken in the English market. I do not say that no credit is due to the late Government for the advancement of our butter and our cheese industries; but I say the main part of the credit is due to the province of Ontario for what they have done in that direction. When the Government of Canada wanted a commissioner, where had they to go? They had to go to the Ontario Agricultural College, where they found a gentleman who is, no doubt, well posted with respect to dairying in all its different phases. There is no doubt in my mind at the present time that trade has taken a start in the province of Ontario, and all over the Dominion of Canada, and I believe that a great deal of confidence has been inspired into both the farmers and the manufacturers all over this country. When the reciprocal tariff was brought down a year ago, we were told that the manufacturers of the country would be all ruined, and that the factories would all

be closed down. But for the last seven or eight years our farmers have not been so prosperous as they are at the present time. They are getting encouragement in every direction. They know that they are going to get better markets for their produce than they have ever had before. The late Government was always telling what they were going to do for the farmers. They talked about a preferential tariff. Were they favourable, when a preferential tariff was offered to them? I think it was in 1894 that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries brought a resolution into this House to reduce the duty upon the classes of goods that were imported from Great Britain into Canada. But what did our friends opposite do at that time? Did one of them vote for it? Not one. Yet they kept on talking about encouraging preferential trade with Great Britain; they were always going to encourage, but it was these treaties with Belgium and Germany that stood in the way and kept us from getting these benefits that we otherwise would have obtained. They talked and talked, but they did nothing. But, when the present Government came into power, they immediately took action, and now we have a prospect of greatly improved trade relations, not only with Great Britain, but with every colony of the British Empire. This action of the Government has been admired by the people both on the continent of Europe and in the United States.

The people of England have come to understand that we have statesmen in Canada who have taken a step in advance of the representatives of any other British colony, and in advance of any position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power. Those hon. gentlemen talked a great deal, but took no practical steps. They talked about reciprocity. The leader of the late Government almost became enamoured of reciprocity. Do we not remember when the hon. gentleman in 1888 came from Washington and stated that they were in favour of securing reciprocity with the United States in a large number of articles, that the United States had removed certain articles from their tariff schedule, and the Government decided to insert in the tariff measure a declaration that when the United States should remove duties from any or all of those articles or portions of the duty, then Canada would reciprocate? Was this carried out? No. The leader of the Government of that day told the House that the Government had passed an order to remove those duties which the United States had removed, but he finished by stating that the Canadian Government awaited the further action of the United States Government in the same direction. Did the Government remain true to their declaration? No. They violated the pledges they had given the United States and they violated their own declarations that they would enter into a reci-

procuity treaty with our neighbours when opportunity offered. The people of Ontario are well pleased with the action of the present Government. I travelled over a large portion of the province last fall, and this preferential tariff was admired not only by Reformers, but by Conservatives. With respect to the Yukon Railway Bill, I desire to say that a very considerable number of respectable Conservatives consider that the Senate in rejecting that measure did an act that will not redound to their credit or for the benefit of the Dominion. In fact a strong Conservative told me that it was my duty to come to Ottawa and place a notice on the paper asking the Government what they propose to do in order to reform or abolish the Senate, or at all events make it responsible to the people. An irresponsible ruling body in a democratic country is an anomaly. That is the feeling among a good many Conservatives in Ontario. With respect to the changes in the tariff, while I am an out-and-out free trader, I consider it was the duty of the Government to make such changes as were necessary gradually, in order that private interests and the interests of manufacturing and other corporations and wholesale houses might not be injured; and if the Government continue to progress at the same rate as they have done since they came into power, the last vestige of protection will be buried in the dust at the end of ten years, and this result will be accomplished without materially injuring any interest. I was glad to hear the Finance Minister state that the manufacturers should not rest, but be prepared for other tariff changes. We believe such changes must come, and that when our reciprocity treaty with England comes into full play, the Government will be warranted in making still further reductions. The Government have the full sympathy of the country to-day, not only in regard to the tariff, but to the manner in which they are conducting public affairs; and when hon. gentlemen find fault with respect to the superannuation system they must remember that the Government have been in power only twenty months, while during the twenty years hon. gentlemen opposite were in power they had the opportunity of making the superannuation system self-supporting. It ill-becomes hon. gentlemen opposite to find fault with a Government that, although it has been only twenty months in power, has remedied many overt acts and abolished injurious measures put in operation by the Conservative party during the last twenty years. It would have been extraordinary if the Government had been able to accomplish everything, and I have been astonished that they have been able to do so much, and they can rest satisfied that they are receiving the hearty support of the country. I am convinced that Canada stands to-day, largely through the influence of the Premier and the noble band of men by whom he is surrounded, in the

position of a nation and not of a small colony, as was the case formerly. Canada has been able to dictate terms to nations, if not directly, indirectly, in respect to treaties containing preferential clauses, which hon. gentlemen opposite declare could not be abrogated. Those hon. gentlemen never possessed the tact of statesman to go to foreign countries and make treaties. They talked about going to Washington; but I hope there will never again be a deputation that will secure a recognition lasting only three minutes, and come home without having any statement to make except that they were going to return. But we knew before they went that the whole visit was a farce, that they never intended to secure reciprocity, that they were not in earnest. I hold that the Government have acted up to their professions and have carried out as rapidly as possible their pledges, notwithstanding the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite placed all possible obstacles in the path. Not one of these gentlemen opposite has ventured to stand up and to say that the Franchise Act ought not be abolished, and yet they give a factious opposition to the excellent law which it is proposed shall take its pace. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for the patience with which you have listened to me.

Mr. KLOEPFER. Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen supporting the Government have for the last few days been telling us that we never have had before such good times in Canada, and they have been good enough to tell us that this Liberal Government has been the cause of the good times. Well, it is clear to everybody that we have good times, but the Government have had nothing to do with it, and I propose briefly to outline what is the cause of our present prosperity. In the first place, Providence blessed us with good crops from one end of Canada to the other, and the farmers were able to sell them at good prices. In former years we used to have good crops in the east and bad crops in the west, or good crops in the west and poor crops in the east, but this year the crops have been good from one end of the Dominion to the other, and so our prosperity has been general. Then again, our mineral lands in British Columbia, in the Territories and in northern Ontario have been more developed than ever before in consequence of the gold discoveries. The people have been given confidence as a result, and when our people have confidence the times are better. It is also a fact that while the crops have been good in the Dominion of Canada they have failed in foreign countries, and so our exports have been larger and more remunerative. Another reason is that the merchants throughout Canada feared the tariff would be lowered, and for the year previous to this they consequently did not take in any stock. Neither did the manufacturers make goods, because they did not know what would

Mr. McMILLAN.

become of them under the new tariff, and so this year both merchants and manufacturers are busy making up for lost time. The Government have also spent more money in constructing railroads, and the circulation of this money through the country has tended to make times better. It is also a fact that our neighbours to the south, as well as European nations, have spent a great deal of money preparing for war, some estimate it at £750,000,000 sterling, and the general circulation of that money throughout the world has tended towards prosperity for the time being. I can tell the Government that they had better be on the lookout, for if it should unfortunately occur that our crops would fail any year, they will find and the country will find to its cost, that their fiscal policy will not make things prosper. With the American tariff at 45 per cent and our tariff at 25 per cent, it is quite plain that when a normal condition of things arrive, we cannot compete with these people. Hon. gentlemen opposite have told us that the present Government are protecting the farmers better than did the Conservatives. Well, it is a peculiar way to do that, to reduce the duty on wheat from 15 to 12½ cents a bushel. It is a peculiar way to protect the farmers to reduce the duty on flour and on wheat and to let corn come in free. If this corn had not been allowed in free, I can tell the hon. member from Huron (Mr. McMillan) that no matter what he may say, we would get a better price for our oats and for our coarse grains in the districts where they fatten cattle. I acknowledge that the times are good, but I have given the reasons, and these reasons show that our prosperity is more due to a bountiful Providence than to a Liberal Government. If in view of the high tariff in the United States the Canadian Government does not raise the duty instead of lowering it, they will find, should there be a failure of crops, that the times will not be so prosperous as at present.

Mr. BROWN. We will have better times.

Mr. KLOEPFER. In what way?

Mr. BROWN. Things are going in that direction.

Mr. KLOEPFER. In what direction?

Mr. BROWN. In the right direction; lowering the tariff.

Mr. KLOEPFER. I want you to understand that if you do not protect the manufacturers you cannot protect the farmers. If you do not protect the manufacturers so that they can employ workmen, the Canadian farmers will have no home markets. Our workmen will go to the other side of the line, manufacture the goods for Canadians there, and there will be no population here to eat the produce of Canada. I state here, Sir, that I believe that there should

be a higher tariff than we have at the present time. I believe in protecting our manufactures in order to afford a home market for our farmers. I believe in keeping our people in our own country, and I do not believe in putting the tariff down so low that the Americans can send their goods in here to displace the workmanship of Canadian artisans. I would not mind if the Americans would sell their goods in Canada at the same price that they do at home. But they make a Canadian slaughter market for their goods, and sell them here at about 25 per cent less than they do in their own market. If we could meet their tariff by shipping goods to the United States, matters would not be so bad; but they shut out our goods by putting a different value on them. That is all I have to say at the present time.

Mr. TAYLOR moved the adjournment of the debate.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is rather early for adjourning, but I had a little conversation with the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I understand that hon. gentlemen opposite will be prepared to close the debate to-morrow. On that understanding, we will put no obstacle in the hon. gentleman's way; but to avoid any trouble hereafter, I want to mention expressly that that understanding was arrived at, and I hope the hon. gentlemen will see their way to carry it out.

Mr. WALLACE. There are a number of members on this side who desire to speak in the Budget debate, and I do not think they know that any such arrangement was proposed.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That arrangement was proposed between the leader of the House and the leader of the Opposition, and I understood just now from the leader of the House that he had consulted with the hon. gentleman opposite, and he thought the debate could be closed to-morrow evening, which would be very convenient, for obvious reasons. If that is impossible, of course, we will have to sit a little later to-night; but I understood that the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) was aware that that agreement was come to. I think that with a little compression of the speeches the matter might be arranged.

Mr. WALLACE. I think very good progress has been made to-day. We have had a large number of speeches, and there are members who wish to speak and may not have an opportunity to-morrow evening. The hon. gentleman knows that many members return to their homes on Friday evening.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood from the leader of the Opposition that it was the intention, if at all possible, to close the debate at to-morrow's sitting. It may be late to-

morrow night; but I think that all the members who intend speaking on this side of the House can easily deliver themselves at to-morrow's sitting. I know it is the wish of the leader of the Opposition to close the debate to-morrow, and he fully expects that it will be done.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 15th April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 115) respecting the British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company, and to change its name to the White Pass Yukon Company.—(Mr. Wood, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 116) to incorporate the Canadian Mining Institute.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 117) to incorporate the Klondike and Dawson City Bank.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 118) to incorporate the Dawson City and Victoria Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 119) to incorporate the Dawson City and Victoria Lighting and Tramway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved:

That from this date Government Orders shall have precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays, after questions to be put by members, and that the Order of the Day on Mondays, after Private Bills, be the Order of the Day of Wednesdays under Rule 19.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very anxious to do everything possible to facilitate the business of the House, and at this period of the session I am not at all surprised at my right hon. friend making a motion of this kind; but I would like to ask him to make an exception with regard to going over the notices of motion, in order that all unopposed motions may be dealt with.

The PRIME MINISTER. I shall be very glad to accede to my hon. friend's request.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to ask what prospect there will be for reaching Public Bills and Orders if this resolution passes. On the last occasion when Public Bills and Orders were reached, I was unable to attend the House, and I should like very much to have the opportunity of moving the second reading of the Bills in my name.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is aware that if this motion carries, Monday nights after six o'clock will be devoted to Public Bills and Orders. On two or three occasions when these were the Order of the Day, the Order paper was exhausted and the House adjourned before nine o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to make an appeal to my hon. friend the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. I am told that it adjourned until Monday next, and, as my hon. friend is aware that we have a very slim attendance generally on Monday, I would ask him if it would not be equally convenient to call that committee on Tuesday or some other day than Monday?

Mr. McMULLEN. I have much pleasure in complying with the request of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and shall give notice that the meeting will take place on Tuesday.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. CRAIG. I regret that I have to ask the attention of the House for a very short time this afternoon to a personal matter, and it may be necessary for me to do what I agree with the right hon. First Minister we should as much as possible avoid doing, namely, move the adjournment. However, I see no other way of accomplishing what I desire. It may seem that the matter I wish to speak about is a very small one, but I think I shall be able to show that, after all, it is of some importance. Two or three days ago I took occasion to make a few remarks on the plebiscite and to ask a question, and I find that the Montreal "Witness," a newspaper which most of us receive during the session—comments as follows on my course:

Before the debate was resumed, Mr. Craig moved the adjournment of the House in order to ask the Premier when they might expect the plebiscite Bill. It was not necessary to move the adjournment of the House to do this, except that Mr. Craig, with that extremely narrow partisanship which characterises all his proceedings on the temperance question, desired to read an extract from the "Templar," of Hamilton.

I do not care very much, personally, what the Montreal "Witness" says about me and

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

my course on this question, and I know that it does not make these remarks because it has anything against me but because I happen to belong to the Conservative party. The argument seems to be that if a man belongs to the Conservative party and is a prohibitionist or takes an interest in the temperance question, he must be a hypocrite. I cannot see that there is any other argument in it. They want to make out that I am not sincere. But if I belonged to the Liberal party, I suppose, according to the "Witness" opinion, I should be perfectly sincere in everything I said on this question. What does this lead to? It leads to this, that if there is any credit in belonging to the temperance party and advocating prohibition, as they claim there is, they want all the credit for the Liberal party. Now if the "Witness" were a party paper, or rather if it professed to be a party paper, I should not find fault, though I might bear a little grudge against it for making statements of this kind that are not correct. But the "Witness" poses as an independent paper. The management must have a strange idea of independence, because whenever they can do it, they take sides against the Conservative party, and condone in every possible way the sins of the Liberal party. I do not think that it is fair for them to take the position that they are independent and, under the guise of independence, do party work. As to my record on this question, as to my constituency, I am ready to leave that to the members of this House. When I sat on the other side of the House, I seconded the motion in favour of prohibition several times, and spoke in favour of it, though my doing so was not regarded with great favour by some who sat near me, and though the question was looked upon as an embarrassing one to a Government, as, no doubt, it is regarded still. But when the Conservatives were in power, I took the same stand as I am taking to-day. I am not going to say anything about the "Templar." The "Witness" says I moved the adjournment in order to read something from the "Templar." Well, the "Templar" is not my organ, it is the recognized organ of the temperance party in Ontario, and it is quite able to take care of itself. I do not know anything about their politics, but I read an extract from it, so that the Premier, in case he had not seen it might know what was said, and in hope that he would give an answer, as he did.

The "Witness" is a prohibition paper and has always taken that side. Well, the "Witness" may want prohibition, but it is taking the best course to hinder it. If the "Witness" wants to introduce party politics into this question, and to say to the Conservative members in this House: We do not want your assistance, leave that to us—then, we might as well give up all hope of getting prohibition. To see such articles as this in newspapers which claim to be in-

dependent and in favour of prohibition is enough to make one who sincerely desires prohibition almost despair of ever seeing it. Further, the "Witness" is a good moral paper—I will say that for it, and it is more, it is a religious paper. But, after all, I think it sometimes works in a good deal of party politics under the guise of religion. It is very well to preach about religion, but it would be a good thing for the management of the "Witness" to practice it as well. I will give the management a hint for its practice. They might try and keep one of the commandments—it might be hard for them to do it—that commandment that says "Thou shalt not bear false witness." That will be a very good thing for the "Witness" to do. And I will give them another text—"Judge not that ye be not judged." Why, Sir, the "Witness" is judging me. If they say I act from political motives, what are we to say about the "Witness" and the members on the other side of the House who have begun this imputing of bad faith to members on this side who advocate reforms of this kind. Let me give them another text which, I think, they could heed to advantage: "A house divided against itself cannot stand." I hope they will publish all these texts. If the prohibitionists are not going to be united on this question, we need never hope to see prohibition. I do not wish to detain the House, and so I conclude by saying that if the "Witness" wishes to be fair to me and the Conservative party, it will give a full report of what I have said to-day.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I purpose saying a few words only on the question now before the House. First, in reply to my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMILLAN), who was the last speaker on that side of the House. This hon. gentleman represents himself and has always represented himself in this House as a practical farmer. Now I want to ask the members of this House through you, Sir, is he? I have had the honour and pleasure of sitting with the hon. gentleman in this House for some sixteen years, for four or five and sometimes even six months every year. At the end of that time the hon. gentleman returns to his home to recuperate for a few weeks after his arduous labours of the session. Does he take off his coat then, and go to work upon his farm? Judging from the remarks he made last night, he visited every constituency in the province of Ontario except the

constituencies of Nipissing and Algoma and spent two or three days in each constituency. I think that would consume the balance of the year. What is he doing while travelling? He is working for the Ontario Government for two dollars and a half a day and his expenses. It is evident that the hon. gentleman has found this better than farming, for he not only gives his own time to it but the services of his son employed in the same business—talking to the farmers.

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not deny it, but that is more than the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Taylor) could get.

Mr. TAYLOR. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMILLAN)—I could not get the pull on the Ontario Government that he has got. The hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, employs men at fifty or seventy-five cents per day to feed his cattle on American corn, while he is away earning two dollars and a half a day from the Ontario government for talking to the farmers about how to run their farms. But the hon. gentleman has talked so much that by this time, I think, judging from the remarks he made last night, he does not himself believe what he says. He made the statement last night that he was a free trader. He made the further statement that the protective duties on agricultural products were of no benefit to the farmers of this country. He cited the fact that during all last season wheat was 10 to 12 cents higher in Buffalo and Oswego than it was in the Canada markets on this side of the river. Now, I quote from the "Globe," because that is the hon. gentleman's bible, he won't believe anything he sees in any other paper. Here is what the "Globe" of Wednesday says, giving the Toronto market:

No. 1 hard, at \$1.07½; Midland, \$1.15, grinding intransit, and \$1.12 at North Bay.

\$1.12 at North Bay would be equal to \$1.15 for No. 1 hard in Toronto.

Buffalo—No. 1 hard, \$1.08. Oswego—No. 1 northern, \$1.11 to \$1.12; No. 2 hard, \$1.05.

Eight or 10 cents a bushel less than it is in the Toronto market. Yet the hon. gentleman had the hardihood to get up in this House and say that American markets had led the Canadian markets by 10 or 12 cents a bushel on wheat.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. No. 1 hard is not a wheat that the Ontario farmer sells; that is wheat that comes from the North-west.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not talking about the Ontario farmer; I am talking about Canadian wheat.

Mr. McMILLAN. Allow me to make a statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is no point of order there.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Huron cannot interrupt a member who has the floor, without his permission.

Mr. TAYLOR. He rose to a point of order, but he has no point of order.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have always understood that, when any member of this House made an incorrect statement, the member he was referring to had a right to correct the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Huron said he rose to a point of order. The hon. gentleman's point of order, I am afraid, is not well taken, because no hon. member has a right to interrupt another, except with his consent.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) did as he usually does, as a great many members on that side of the House usually do, devote the greater part of his speech to eulogizing the statesmen who now compose the present Government; not only are they statesmen, but he says the present Government is composed principally of business men, as well. Mr. Speaker, compare the ability of the statesmen forming this Government with the ability of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition in this House. Where do they stand? If you talk privately with the hon. gentlemen opposite, they will admit that the right hon. leader of the Opposition has more ability and has shown it both in this House and out of it, than any other gentleman in the country. All you have to do is to refer to what he said last year, when the Government came down with their preferential tariff that was only going to apply to England. The right hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition told us, with regard to that question, as he does with regard to all others, what would be the outcome, and he pointed out that, as soon as that proposition became law, nearly every country in the world would come in under it as well as England, and he was right. But the leader of the present Government and his colleagues said it would only apply to England. Then, as to the business ability of this Government; let us stand them up here, man by man, and see where the business ability is. Take, in the first place, my hon. friend who sits nearly opposite me, the Minister from the wild and woolly west, the Minister of the Interior. Is he a business man? Why, he is a lawyer, and who ever knew a lawyer to be possessed of very much business ability? This Government entrusted the Minister of the Interior, a lawyer, with the duty of making a business transaction with two sharp and shrewd business men, Messrs. Mackenzie &

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mann, and what sort of a bargain did he make for the country? Does it show any business ability in the Minister of the Interior, when he practically gave away a continent in order to get built 150 miles of tramway? Take the hon. Postmaster General, who sits alongside him; he is another lawyer. Is he a business man? The only business I know that was ever entrusted to him was his appointment as manager, or president, of the Farmers' Loan Society, and we hear to-day of the howling success he made of that business. Then we take the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He is a lawyer, too, not a business man. I have never known him to do any business but legal business. Has he business ability, practical business ability? Then we will take the hon. the Prime Minister, another lawyer. Has he ever been a business man? Why, the whole institution is a Cabinet of lawyers. I admit, as every man in this House and outside of it will admit, that as Prime Minister he makes a very good figure head, but what business ability has he ever shown? Then we will take my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, a barrister. But where have we ever found his tracks in the business world of this country? Then we will take the Minister of Finance. Is he a business man? Why, the business of his life has been politics and writing for newspapers. They know something a little less, I think, than lawyers, do newspaper men. Then we will take the Minister of Agriculture. Is he a business man? Why, they had to have a farmer, and they picked upon him, and I must say that he has shown, at least, a great deal of prudence in the management of the Experimental Farm and the dairy business of this country, under the direction of Professor Saunders and Professor Robertson. He called these and the other heads of the department together, and I have no doubt he said to them: Gentlemen, I know nothing about farming or anything else. You run the business, and I will sign the papers that you present. These gentlemen were appointed by the late Conservative Government; they were the best men that could be selected in the country, and Professor Saunders, Professor Robertson and others are running the business on the old lines and following out the policy that the late Government left for them to carry out, in the way of cold storage and transportation. Then we have another business man, in the person of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, another lawyer. Where does his business ability shine? Surely, not in the deal that he made with business men in the purchase of the Drummond County Railway. Then we have another gentleman, the hon. Minister of Public Works, sitting alongside of him. Is he a business man?

AN hon. MEMBER. He is a notary, and signs notes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, he is a notary ; but he knew how to deal or to have a finger in the deal, not for himself, but for the members of his family, when he admitted in his place here in the House, that his sons had got \$20,000 out of the gentleman with whom the deal was being made in reference to the Drummond County Railway. But he said it was party funds that he was purchasing a newspaper for his sons. Then we have the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence. Is he a business man ? He has practised medicine all his life until he came in here as Minister of Militia and Defence. Then we have the Minister of Justice, another lawyer, the Solicitor General, another lawyer.—

The PRIME MINISTER. Do you want them to be farmers ?

Mr. TAYLOR—the Secretary of State, another lawyer—not much business in either of these gentlemen, nor in any other member of the Cabinet that I have named thus far. But we have three others; two of them are tax-collectors. The hon. Minister of Customs is a practical business man, and so is the Minister of Inland Revenue, but these practical business men have got to give their services for \$2,000 a year less than their colleagues. Then we have a business man, in the person of the hon. Minister of the Exterior, the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Döbell). He is a business man, but possessed of such business ability that this Government think it best to keep this business man out of the House and trot him across to England, because every time he gets up in this House, he shows his ability, and the members in the House and the people in the galleries recognize that ability. The hon. gentleman is constantly travelling across the ocean in order to tell the people of England how to build a line of bottle-necked steamships, which will be the fast line of this country. The Minister of Finance made a great flourish of trumpets when he announced to the House that he had carried out radical changes in the tariff, and I must say this as regards the hon. gentleman, that he presented the case in much better form than the Minister of Customs, to whom I shall refer very shortly. The Minister of Finance made the statement that he had selected sixty items out of the tariff, the National Policy of his predecessors, and he pointed out the changes made in that tariff which were beneficial to the farmers. He enumerated the items under the old National Policy, the present tariff, and worked out the details under the preferential clause. How does the preferential tariff apply to the figures given ? I will read the old and the new, giving different columns :

Articles.	Old Tariff Rate.	General Present Rate.
Animals, living, N.E.S..	20 p. c. . . .	20 p. c.
Books, printed, periodicals and pamphlets, or parts thereof, N.E.S., not to include blank account books, copy books or books to be written or drawn on.	6c. p. lb. . . .	10 “
Brass, manufactures of, N.E.S.	30 p. c. . . .	30 “
Indian corn, not for distillation.	7½c. p. bush. . . .	Free.
Bicycles and tricycles. . . .	30 p. c. . . .	30 p. c.
Coal, bituminous, &c. . . .	60c. per ton of 2000 lbs. . . .	53c. per ton of 2000 lbs.
Cotton fabrics, printed, dyed or coloured, N.O.P.	30 p. c. . . .	35 p. c.
Cotton sewing thread on spools.	25 “	25 “
Cotton clothing, including corsets.	32½ “	35 “
Cotton velvets, velveteens and plush fabrics, N.E.S.	30 “	30 “
Curtains, when made up, trimmed or untrimmed. . . .	30 “	35 “
Drugs, dyes and chemicals, N.O.P.	20 “	20
Electric apparatus, parts of, electric light cables, electric batteries.	25 “	25 “
Fancy goods—		
Braids, bracelets, cords, fringes, tassels, &c. . . .	30 “	35 “
Laces, lace collars and similar goods, lace nets and nettings of cotton, linen, silk or other material.	30 “	35 “
Flax, hemp and jute, manufactures of—		
Damask of linen, including napkins, doylies, tray cloths, sideboard covers, damask stair linen and diaper.	25 “	30 “
Fruits—		
Dried currants.	101c. per lb.	101c. per lb.
Dried raisins.		
Oranges, lemons and limes, in boxes of capacity not exceeding 2½ cub. ft.	25c. per box	25c. per box

The hon. gentleman in giving those figures worked out how the preferential tariff would apply, showing a large percentage of reduction in favour of the new tariff, and that the farmers would obtain their goods at a less price.

Furniture of wood, &c. 30 p. c. 30 p. c.

That is a specimen of the sixty items enumerated, and I point out that there are

more increases than reductions. I want to ask that hon. Minister or any hon. member what quantity of furniture we will import from England under this preferential tariff? In what respect will this benefit the farmers? Again, what agricultural implements come in here from England by which the farmers will be benefited? My hon. friend will admit the fact that there is not an article in the list of agricultural implements which will come in from England for use by our farmers. What benefit will this preferential tariff confer on them? The same remark applies to carriages, axles and every article enumerated. The Canadian farmers use agricultural implements adapted to the country, and the English farmers do the same. If an Englishman comes here, he will not trust his life in one of the light carriages we use. So as regards the whole list of the sixty articles, the Canadian farmer will get no benefit from this preferential tariff, because there are only two items in the whole list that will apply, and those items are cottons and woollens. On those two lines the Government, before adopting the preferential tariff, increased the duty from 30 to 35 per cent. Under the preferential tariff the duty will be about 26½ per cent, and so the reduction will be only 3½ cents on the dollar's worth. The Government have admitted corn free, which in my opinion is a great injury to the farming industry, notwithstanding the opinion of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. McMillan). On the whole list of sixty articles the farmers will probably effect a saving of a few cents a year; but it will be more than counter-balanced by duties raised above the old tariff. Take the sugar duties, put on a few days ago. Every farmer uses sugar, and there is now an increased duty of ½ cent a pound. Then there is the increased duty on tobacco. So the farmer will pay on tobacco and sugar more than he will save under the preferential tariff. Another tax proposed is one on newspapers. The Postmaster General proposes to reduce the letter postage to 2 cents, but he intends to tax the newspapers to make up for the loss, and thus he will place another tax on the farmers. Another tax proposed by the Finance Minister applies to farmers and mechanics who save a little money, and it is to reduce the interest on deposit in post office savings banks from 3 to 2½ per cent. Then hon. gentlemen opposite point with pride to the reduction on coal oil, I wonder the right hon. Prime Minister is not afraid to use the word coal oil, after having promised the people to make it free and only reducing it from 6 to 5 cents per gallon. Hon. gentlemen opposite are also making a great outcry in regard to placing binder twine on the free list. What are the facts? The Government are manufacturing binder twine in the penitentiaries. They asked for tenders from their friends, and

Mr. TAYLOR.

received offers from three firms, McCaul Bros., Wood & Valence and Hobbs Brothers. Hobbs Brothers' tender was 4 cents for sisal McCaul Bros., 4·40 cents. Hobbs Bros. having received notification amended their tender to 4·30 cents. Finding they had not reached the proper point, they sent a telegram to their agent here to increase the tender by 10 cents, making it 4·40 cents, which was the tender of McCaul Bros., and Hobbs' tender was accepted. We find in the penitentiary account the output is entered as having been sold at 4 cents instead of 4·40 cents. Now, at what price did Hobbs Brothers sell the binding twine? I made some inquiries last week of a large consumer who purchased from them last year. I asked the price, and they showed me the contract, and stated that the price was 5½ cents for the binding twine, which, as I have pointed out was obtained at 4 cents, leaving a pretty good profit. Do we find the Hobbs Brothers buying and selling binding twine to-day? I asked the same party where he bought his binding twine this year, and whether he bought it at as cheap a rate as last year. He said he bought it from a new concern, the Ontario Binder Twine Company. I asked him whether he knew who composed the firm. He replied that he would find out. I asked him whether he bought it at the same price. He replied that he was paying 5½ cents for sisal and more for higher grades. So the result is that the farmers will have to pay probably for their binding twine ¼ of a cent or 1 cent more this year than last, notwithstanding the fact that it has been placed on the free list. I wrote to a friend of mine in Toronto asking who the Ontario Binder Twine Company was, and here is his letter:

In reply to your letter of yesterday requesting to know who composes the firm of the Ontario Binder Twine Company, I beg to say that this is said to be merely a trade name for the Hobbs Hardware Company of London, of which T. S. Hobbs, ex-M.P.P., is the head and general manager.

The Hobbs people are said to have purchased a quantity of binder twine from the Ontario Government and did not care to dispose of it under their own firm name, and consequently adopted this trade name for the purpose.

I believe this information to be reliable as it is from the Mercantile Agency.

We therefore find that the Hobbs Company were ashamed to do business under their own name for this Government and the Ontario Government, and so they adopted a new name and called themselves the Ontario Binder Twine Company. I wrote to another person about it, and here is his answer:

I believe that the Hobbs Hardware Company of London run their twine business under the name of the Ontario Binder Twine Company, also the Independent Cordage Company.

They made two companies out of it so that they would be supposed to have a little com-

petition, but the same people run the two companies.

And again I believe that the Plymouth Twine Agency in Canada is controlled by them.

Therefore, the American Plymouth Twine monopoly have appointed Hobbs their agent for Canada, and the Hobbs people control the whole thing. That is one reason why the farmers of this country will this year pay from $\frac{3}{4}$ of a cent to 1 cent per pound more for their binder twine than they did last.

The present Government talk about the reduction of the duty on barbed wire, and let us see how they have reduced it. Why, they have reduced barbed wire so that there is not a yard of it manufactured in Canada to-day. They have driven the Canadian manufacturer of barbed wire across the line to the United States. When I was home on Saturday I inquired from the people where they were buying their barbed wire this year, and they told me they had brought a carload of it in from Pennsylvania. They paid $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents for it last year and they are paying $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents for it this year. Where is the reduction? Some time ago we had a thriving manufactory of woven wire fencing in this country. There is a manufactory at Walkerville employing forty or fifty hands, and how is this Government serving that factory? That woven wire fencing is now largely used by all the railway companies; by the farmers in the North-west Territories, and all through Canada, and how is the manufacturer of it treated at the present time. Well, Sir, the article manufactured in the United States is admitted into this country at 15 per cent, in order, it was said, to reduce the cost of it to the farmers. How are the Government treating every Canadian industry engaged in the manufacture of that wire? Why, they charged them 20 per cent on the raw material that goes into the construction of that fencing. I have here in my hand a diagram of the fencing, and I find that there are ten wires used in the construction of it. One of the wires, "No. 9," is admitted free of duty, and all the other wires are charged a duty of 20 per cent, so that this industry is thinking of closing up to-day, going across the river, manufacturing the fencing in the United States, and sending it back to Canada, for by this means they will have 5 per cent margin. They will have 5 per cent better margin by manufacturing it in the United States than if they manufactured in Canada at the present time.

Then, Sir, the Minister of Finance, after making practically only one change in the tariff, that of increasing the cost of sugar to the consumers of Canada, wound up his speech by holding a club over the heads of Canadian manufacturers. He said, speaking of the manufacturer:

I am inclined to think, Sir, that he will find eternal vigilance to be the price of his protection.

By that threat the Minister of Finance elevates a club in his fist and says to Canadian manufacturers: If you want to continue your industry in this country you have to support the Government in power, or off goes your head so far as the tariff policy of this Government is concerned.

I regret that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has just left his seat in the House because I intend referring to some of his remarks. I stated a few moments ago that the Minister of Finance was more fair and more honest in his presentment of the case than was the Minister of Customs, and I repeat that statement. I have no doubt that the speech made by the Minister of Customs was for the purpose of influencing the opinion of the farmers, and the people of Canada, so as to make them believe that the Government under the new tariff had made great reductions, and that they were to be largely benefited by them. Now, such is not the case. In this speech the Minister (Mr. Paterson) was simply carrying out the policy of the Government since they came into power, in trying to delude the people. The Government promised to reduce taxation and they have not done it. They promised to reduce expenditure but they have increased it; and now the Minister (Mr. Paterson) tries to make the people believe that this Government have reduced the taxes and revised and remodelled the whole tariff. The hon. gentleman commenced his speech by words which bore the construction, that this Government had taken 25 per cent off the cost of every article used in this country. Here is what he said:

You take 25 per cent off; that is very little. People do not realize how much 25 per cent off the old tariff rate amounts to. If you tell a farmer in the North-west or anywhere else; I will give you 60 cents a bushel for your wheat, when he has been getting 80 cents a bushel, and he should say to you: Why, that is a terrible reduction; then you may turn round and say, in the language of hon. gentlemen opposite: No, that is no reduction; that is only 25 per cent off.

The Minister of Customs had no other object in view than to lead the people to believe that the Government had taken 25 per cent off, and that the reduction would have the same effect upon the price of every article they bought, as if a bushel of wheat cost 80 cents, and if 25 per cent were taken off, the cost then would be 60 cents a bushel. He said: Here is a bushel of wheat at 80 cents, but you take 25 per cent off the cost, and it will then be only worth 60 cents, and he tried to make the people believe that the new tariff would have the same effect on the cost of any articles the people bought. But the hon. gentleman must have known that that was not right. Here is how it would work. A farmer crosses the river to the United States and buys an article for \$1. If he brought it under the old tariff of 30 per cent it would cost him \$1.30 in Canada. Now, suppose the Government

have reduced that tariff from 30 to 25 per cent, and a man goes across and buys an article at \$1. When he pays the 25 per cent duty under the new tariff, the article will cost him \$1.25 instead of \$1.30, which is a reduction of 5 cents; and yet, in view of this, which is actually the case, the hon. gentleman told the people of this country that the cost of that article would be reduced to the same extent as the price of a bushel of wheat in the instance he gave, namely by 25 per cent on the total cost. Again, the hon. gentleman tried to mislead the people of this country when he quoted a list of some sixteen articles, and then said:

I have given you sixteen articles under the general tariff, and I propose now to give you a list of 107 articles. There are about 447 dutiable items in the tariff, and 200 free items, and I think I may say, speaking subject to correction—but I believe I am absolutely correct.

Now, Sir, I have looked over the tariff, and I find there are 447 items under the dutiable list, as the hon. Minister said. But he held out to the people that his Government had changed 107 of these items and given a reduction. Now, Sir, let us see if that is true. He named 107 articles on which he said there were reductions, but he quoted them so as to make them appear as if each article was an item in the tariff.

Adzes, cleavers, hatchets, saws, wedges, hammers, crowbars, picks, mattocks, tools not agricultural. Now, if you turn up the tariff, item 289, you will find that these ten articles are in one item; so that instead of ten items being changed, there is only one. Take the next item, 290: It contains nine articles—axes, scythes, sickles or reaping-hooks, hay or straw knives, edging knives, hoes, rakes, pronged forks, snaths, farm, road or field rollers, post-hole diggers, and other agricultural implements, n.e.s. He makes nine separate items of these, whereas in the tariff they are all included in one item. Is that an honest or fair way of putting the matter? I have the present tariff in my hand, and I have the changes marked in it. We will take up that tariff. On the first page of the tariff, which is page 7 of the pamphlet, there are seven items, and only one change made; so that six items on that page are left without change. On the next page there are two items and no change; these are liquors. On the next page there are twenty-six items, in some of the items seven or eight articles enumerated, and there are but two changes in the twenty-six items. On the next page there are twenty-seven items and not a change; on the next page twenty-five items and not a change; on the next page twenty-one items and not a change; on the next page eighteen items and not a change; on the next page nine items and five changes; on the next page fifteen items and three

Mr. TAYLOR.

changes; on the next page fifteen items and one change; on the next page fifteen items and three changes. This gives us 179 items of the 447 that are dutiable, and in these 179 items there are only seventeen changes made. I might go through the whole tariff and show the same thing. The Minister of Finance put the matter fairly when he said that out of the 447 items, there were about sixty items changed. Yet the Minister of Customs held out to the people of this country that there were 107 items changed. Moreover, of these seventeen changes which I have mentioned, many are increases from 30 to 35 per cent, while others are slight decreases, such as 30 per cent reduced to 25 per cent; but there will be no practical reduction in the cost of the goods imported.

Then, the Minister of Customs made another misleading statement, and I ask my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Customs (Mr. Wallace) to pay particular attention to this, because I am quite sure he will corroborate the statement I make. The hon. Minister of Customs made this statement:

I find, taking the importation of goods entered for consumption into Canada under the reciprocal tariff, and the duty collected thereon during the six months ending the 31st of December, 1897, that the abatement of duty under the 12½ per cent reduction amounted to \$521,451 during the six months. If you double that, you get the year's operations as fairly as we can estimate them now. I think you will be safe in doubling it, because trade does not all at once find its new channel.

Then he went on:

I say double that and you will have \$1,042,000 of relief. That is the relief in one year, under a reduction of 12½ per cent. I venture to say that there is not a man who will not admit that with this current of trade now established, and with the impetus which 25 per cent will give it as against 12½ per cent, a reduction of \$2,000,000 of taxation will represent the reduction on the imports under that reciprocal tariff after a year from next July.

If the hon. gentleman wanted to be fair and honest with the people of this country, he should have made out and presented a table showing the reduction in the duty on goods from England alone; but during the six months the reciprocal tariff allowed goods to come in at reduced rates of duty from almost every country in the world. A large proportion of these goods came from Germany and other countries that will be shut out from the preferential tariff after the 1st of August. Yet the hon. Minister of Customs says that after the 1st of August this trade will go on increasing, and will save the people of this country two or three millions a year. Is that fair or honest? When I was at home on Saturday last I was talking to a merchant, who showed me a box of collars and cuffs imported from Germany which he was opening out. He said to me: "A German agent

was here a few days ago, and we made a large contract with him for goods to be delivered after the 1st of July next and before the 1st of August, so that they will come in under the preferential tariff." To-day there are German agents in many parts of the country taking orders for goods to be delivered after the 1st of July and before the 1st of August, to the great detriment of the Canadian manufacturer, while the consumers of these goods will not derive any benefit in reduced prices. When the Minister of Customs told us the saving that had been effected to the people under the preferential tariff for the six months ending the 31st of December, 1897, and said that that amount would be doubled in a year's operations, was that fair or honest, when he knew that the preferential tariff applied to forty or fifty countries? After the 1st of August the preferential tariff will not benefit the people of this country, except in the two lines of woollens and cottons, because it will only apply to England and it will not affect many classes of goods which the people of this country use very largely, such as wagons and agricultural implements. Therefore, I say, his whole statement amounted to a piece of deception, to humbug the farmers of this country and to make them believe that they were going to have reduced prices on the goods they imported under the preferential tariff. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the hon. Minister of Customs is not in his place, but I have not said a word during his absence that I would not have said were he present. The speech he made here was, in my opinion, nothing more nor less than an electioneering speech, such as was made by that hon. gentleman and other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House previous to the election of 1896, for the express purpose of trying to deceive the electorate of this country.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has taken upon himself to give the Government of the day the benefit of his opinion on their tariff. He grew very facetious over the fact that the Cabinet is composed largely of that very poor and despised class of the community called lawyers. He never raised any objection to lawyers when his own party sat on this side of the House. He even found fault with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) being a farmer, while he knows very well that in his own Government a Minister of Agriculture was a physician; but that seemed to be quite satisfactory. Then, he made a charge against the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) because the Ontario Government had given him a fee of \$2.50 a day to go about and attend farmers' institutes. The hon. member knows well that the Ontario Government employs every winter a large number of farmers, qualified men, to go about and discuss matters pertaining to farming,

and they make no distinction between parties.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh oh.

Mr. FROST. That is quite true. I can give the names of a dozen gentlemen who last winter went about discussing farming questions at these institutes, and I can give the name of one gentleman, a most qualified man in my own constituency, who has been employed at this work for the last four years and who is a very strong Conservative. It is to the credit of the Ontario Government that it has been always perfectly fair in these matters, and has employed gentlemen on both sides, irrespective of political differences, so long as they were well qualified. And we know there that there is not a better qualified man in Ontario to discuss those practical questions than my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), who has been a successful farmer himself, and who is not only well known but is very acceptable at all the farmers' institutes throughout Ontario.

My hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) blows cold in one moment and hot in the next. He tells us that this Government has adopted the policy of the late Government, and then, almost in the same breath, condemns this Government for removing protection and destroying industries. Let me say that no Government could have greater reason to congratulate itself on the result of its management of public affairs than has the present one, and I am sure that no people have greater cause for congratulation in having such experienced, far-sighted and business-like men at the head of affairs than have the people of this Dominion. We know that under eighteen years of Conservative rule, hon. gentlemen opposite had, by their pernicious fiscal policy, by their persistent swelling of the public debt and expenditure, brought about a period of depression such as never before existed and such as was felt from one end of the country to the other. If there is any test of business qualifications it is in changing a condition of depression into one of prosperity, and can we not point to a change in twenty-two months that this Government has been in power from depression to prosperity, such as never previously took place in the history of this country. Let me call your attention, Sir, to what has been done. For many years prior to the advent of this Government, we know that farm lands became so depressed in value that it was almost impossible to sell a farm anywhere, and the prices of products fell so low that the farmers were at their wits' end to make both ends meet. We know that everywhere manufacturing industries were depressed, that the tall chimneys promised at the inauguration of the National Policy eighteen years ago did not materialize to any extent, and that from those which did very little smoke was coming. We know that thousands of men had to go to the

United States for work, and all because of that boasted policy which was intended to build up the industries of this country. But what is the condition to-day. Looking about this country, we can point to the evidences of improvement everywhere. Why, the very town in which my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) lives is more prosperous now than it ever was. Every factory in it is running, not only all day but half the night. The hon. gentleman knows that his own town has never been so thriving before. I know as a fact that only a few days ago the hon. gentleman himself stood in a carriage factory in a neighbouring town, in company with another prominent member of this House, and was told by the manager that he could not fill orders rapidly enough and that now they were turning out three carriages per hour when formerly they made but two, and proposed making arrangements to turn out four per hour.

Mr. TALLYOR. I did not make the statement that we could not fill our orders, for we can, and are making four carriages now in place of three.

Mr. FROST. I hope that the factory will be able not only to turn out four but five.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are not making any money, though.

Mr. FROST. The hon. gentleman has himself furnished an evidence of the improvement under the policy of the present Government. There is scarcely an industry in this country that is to-day able to fill its orders, and I call your attention to what is going on in the industrial world as an evidence of the success of the careful readjustment of the tariff by the Finance Minister. I propose to read to the House a few quotations taken from the last number of the "Canadian Manufacturer," a journal which every hon. member knows is the exponent of the protective interests of Canada. It is a journal which opposes the Liberal party, which at one time stated that if the Liberal party came into power every industry in this country would become stagnate and every interest depressed, and we would have practically to shut up shop and transfer our manufacturing business to the United States. Looking over the first of July number of that newspaper, I find the following:—

The Cobban Manufacturing Company, of Toronto, are employing a record-breaking number of hands, and report a good outlook.

The Gurney Foundry Company, of Toronto, sees extending trade ahead. February of this year has been a much better month for them than February, 1897.

The Abell Engine Works, of Toronto, are running up to their full capacity. They are filling \$50,000 of orders for the North-west Territories.

Mr. FROST.

The Sydenham Glass Company, of Wallaceburg, Ont., has a contract for the manufacture of several carloads of lantern globes.

The Bertram ship-yards in Toronto are taxed to their utmost. Overtime is the rule, and everybody is so busy that he has scarcely time to eat his lunch.

The Canadian Pacific Railway is so busy that eighteen men in the paint shop at Toronto Junction, Ont., are laid off, as cars cannot be spared from the road to be overhauled, the traffic is so great.

The cut of logs on the Tobique River, N.B., is expected to reach 50,000,000 feet for the past winter. The cut on the Upper St. John will likely be twice as great as the Tobique cut.

The Metallic Roofing Company, of Toronto, have found it necessary to increase their floor space by one-third, owing to the fact that their sales for this year are already three times what they were during the same period of last year.

Menzie, Turner & Co., window-shade manufacturers, Toronto, report that their engines are running day and night, and so far this year they have doubled the business of the same months of last year. They are employing twice as many hands.

The Dyson-Gibson Company, of Winnipeg, manufacturers of spices, &c., are asking permission by way of letters patent to increase their capital to \$100,000.

The Dechènes Electric Light Company, of Dechènes Mills, Que., is having plans prepared for a system of dams to develop 3,000 horse-power at Dechènes Rapids. A new power house will also be built.

John Hope & Co., bobbin and spool manufacturers, Lachute Mills, Que., report a very busy winter. They have just received large contracts from some of the leading cotton mills of Canada.

Two more 252-inch looms, for making felt, have been recently added to the plant of Hamelin & Ayers, Lachute Mills, Que. This makes six looms of this size now working in their mills.

I call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that the woollen industry is certainly upon a very prospering basis.

Milton Pulp Mill, at Milton, Queen's county, N.S., is putting out about 2,000 tons per month. The mill uses from six to eight carloads of wood per diem, and is working splendidly. Manager Hughes has reason to be proud of his factory.

The Canadian Pacific Railway will shortly have an 800,000 bushel elevator at St. John, N.B. They already have a 300,000 bushel elevator at this point.

There are scores and scores of applications here for joint stock companies, with capitals of from \$50,000 to \$500,000. This whole paper is full of evidence of the prosperity which has come to this country within the past year, and particularly since the introduction of the revised tariff by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I could quote a great many more, but I will not weary the House. The evidence is here that this country is upon the highroad of prosperity. And when we remember that under the boasted National Policy the country was stagnant from one end to another, that the industries of the country were so depressed that men were fleeing the country, I have reason to say,

and reason to call the attention of the member for South Leeds to the fact, that what he says cannot be supported by the facts of the case.

Then, again, the Government has been very strongly accused of not carrying out their pledges. If these charges were true, the Government certainly would be culpable. But if we look at the work they have done in twenty months, to the unprejudiced mind it must appear something a little less than marvellous. What were the pledges they gave to this country when in Opposition? Did not the right hon. leader of the Government declare that, if he was placed in power, he would settle the Manitoba school question inside of six months, settle it for ever, and settle it to the satisfaction of the entire country? Has not that been done? Has not that question been settled to the satisfaction of the country? Why, that is the reason we have peace from one end of the country to the other. We were disturbed with race and creed difficulties for years. To-day you do not hear a word of these difficulties, but everywhere, instead of fighting over race and creed, people are devoting themselves to making money and building up a great nation here. Here, it must be confessed, is a pledge that has been fulfilled. The Government promised they would stop the exodus to the United States. Can we not fairly say that it has been stopped, that every man in this country who is able to and willing to work, has the opportunity to be employed? Cannot we say that the way in which the promise to reduce the tariff so as to fulfil the requirements of the revenue, and at the same time to enable the industries of this country to thrive better than they throve under the boasted National Policy, has been carried out in its fulfilment? What I have just read is ample proof of that. Did not the leader of the Government say that, if he were returned to power, the vacant lands of Manitoba and the North-west would be rapidly settled? And has not that been going on this year? Is there not an immigration into Manitoba and the North-west greater than ever was known before in the history of that country? I think that the members from Manitoba and the North-west will bear me out in that statement. Then, again, was not the promise given that, if the Liberals were returned to power, they would give freer trade with Great Britain? And is not the preferential tariff a sufficient fulfilment of that? We have heard something of what the preferential tariff was, according to the mind of my hon. friend from South Leeds. But has he stated the case with accuracy? Has not the preferential tariff of Canada been one of the greatest things that has ever been done to bind the Empire together? We have been told that in Great Britain they were deluded in this matter. If so, they are certainly a more stupid class of people

than they are usually thought to be. The people of Great Britain have a trade and commerce outrivalling that of any other country on the face of the globe. For any hon. gentleman to tell us that such a people has been deluded on a question of business and finance, is certainly to make great demand on our credulity. We know that such is not the case. The right hon. leader of the Government went to Great Britain last year, and was received as no other representative of a colony was ever received. We were not only pleased and delighted, but we were astounded at the reception accorded to him. There was not a club, not a section of the people, not a representative statesman, but vied with the others in doing him honour. And the policy he has carried out, this preference accorded to Great Britain, has been greatly enlarged, to the benefit of a sister colony. And in this way our right hon. leader has been doing more to bind together the different portions of the Empire, and has done more to bring this country forward into the position of a nation and to make it prominent before the countries of the world, than was ever done before. Another pledge was, that there should be a revival in agriculture. Can any one deny that that pledge has been carried out? Has there not been an increase in prices; has there not been a great increase in exportation to the old country by reason of the policy of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher)? Have not the cold storage facilities, have not the increased transportation facilities which the Minister has been the means of securing since he became the head of the department, conduced to make a revival of agriculture and to make an increase of prices of all products? To-day we find there were sixteen millions of exports last year, more than the year before, and in the six months ending 1st of January last, there was a further increase of sixteen millions, making a total of thirty-two millions up to the 1st January last.

I think these things are evidences that the Government are keeping their pledges. They have improved the transportation facilities, they promised to stop deficits. Will any hon. gentleman deny that the deficits are stopped? They are certainly stopped, notwithstanding that the Government have given the mother country a preference in her market of 12½ per cent, to be followed by another 12½ per cent on the 1st of July. I think, therefore, that during the short time which the Government have been in power they have accomplished a great deal, and done it as business men. I do not care whether they are lawyers, or doctors, or what may have been their profession, I say that they have done enough during the 20 months that they have been in power to stamp them as business men. Moreover, the country supports them. I believe that every

by-election that has taken place in this country since the general election, has gone in favour of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FROST. Well, every seat that was held by a Liberal has been kept by Liberals, and we have gained a good number from the hon. gentlemen opposite. We are quite willing to give them one or two, I think only one. But on last Wednesday we had another evidence of the popularity of this Government, when in the county of Prince, P.E.I. the Government candidate obtained a majority of 289, while at the general election the Government candidate received only 81 majority, showing almost a three-fold increase since the general elections. Now, I think that is complete evidence that the popularity of this Government is permanently established, and as long as they handle the affairs of this country in the statesmanlike and businesslike way in which they are doing it now, I am satisfied they will be sustained by the people, and it will not make a particle of difference in the minds of the people whether the Ministers are lawyers, or doctors, or what their previous occupation may have been. But they have made other pledges, and it will not be long before these other pledges will be carried out. We have now before this House the Franchise Bill. A pledge was given to the country that the present iniquitous Franchise Bill would be abolished, and abolished it will be by a vote of this House, whatever may befall it in another House. Then there is the Superannuation Act, of which a good deal has been said in this House. We will see that Superannuation Act also abolished. Then there is another important matter; a solemn pledge was given by the right hon. the leader of the Government to the people of this country that a plebiscite would be submitted on the temperance question. A Bill for a plebiscite will be submitted, and the pledge will be carried out to the satisfaction, I think, of my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig). Now, this and many other things have been accomplished by the present Government to promote the progress and advancement of this country. They show that this Government, strong in the affections of the people, are patriotic and determined to carry out the pledges they have given. Hon. gentlemen opposite have sometimes been found calling attention to their loyalty, and the Liberals have been, year in and year out, accused of being disloyal. Now, during the 25 years that the Conservatives have been in power since confederation, I would like any hon. gentleman opposite to point out one single thing they have done to entitle them to lay any special claim to loyalty as their distinguishing characteristic. The fact is that a great many things have occurred which show that the very opposite might be said of them with con-

Mr. FROST.

siderable truth. Yet the Liberals no sooner obtain power, than through the wise and conciliatory course of the right hon. leader of the Government, a position is secured for this colony in the Empire and throughout the world that it has never occupied before. We were told that it was impossible to secure the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties, because, forsooth, they were not willing to give us a quid pro quo for what we were giving. Yet this policy pursued by the right hon. leader of the Government not only brought about the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties, but it opened up all the other treaties between Great Britain and other countries, and in a very few months we will be placed in the position of a nation competent to make treaties as we like, and in accordance with our own desires and our own interests. More than this, 20 years ago when the National Policy was introduced, the then leader of the Government presented a resolution in favour of the development of the mineral resources of this country. Well, 20 years have rolled round, and no development of those mineral resources took place until the present Government came into power, and since they assumed the reins of power there has never been seen such a development as has recently taken place in the mineral resources of British Columbia and the Yukon district. Those resources are now attracting the attention of the whole world, and many thousands of miners are flocking thither in the hope of securing the gold and silver to be found in those regions. Millions and millions of dollars will be invested there within a short time in the development of those mineral resources. Why is all this? Simply because the Government have been alive to the great possibilities of that northern half of the continent, and have realized that it was necessary for them to take vigorous measures in the direction of developing those resources. I say there is no man in this country, no matter how obtuse he is, but will admit that no set of men could show greater business ability than has been shown by this Government in regard to the development of the mineral resources of Canada. Then the Crow's Nest Pass Railway is being built. The Government took that matter up boldly, and are carrying it through, and to-day we have a road running through the British Columbia mining district, and in connection with it an arrangement has been made for the reduction of the tariff rates that never could have been accomplished in any other way. The Canadian Pacific Railway has yielded to the Government the control of the rates, and we know that the rates all over the North-west Territories have already been reduced in accordance with the agreement that has been made, as well as the rates between the east and the west. Then this Government took hold of the Intercolonial Railway, a railway that has never paid us,

a railway that has always been sinking from half a million to a million dollars a year. The late Government were unable practically to do anything with it, but this Government took hold of the matter, and to-day we have cars running into Montreal direct from Halifax over our own Inter-colonial Railway line. True, charges have been brought against the Government, and I heard to-day a charge brought against the Minister of Public Works. I heard that same charge made last night by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), and notwithstanding that the Minister of Public Works has stood up in his place in this House and denied that statement over and over again, that same charge bobs up.

Mr. BENNETT. Certainly.

Mr. FROST. Then why don't you ask for a commission, and bring your charges before it in a manly and straightforward way? Why do you continue to make innuendoes here?

Mr. BENNETT. As the hon. gentleman has singled me out, let me tell him this—

Mr. FROST. I singled you out because I heard you make the statement.

Mr. BENNETT. I am rising by the hon. gentleman's courtesy, if he will allow me. If the hon. gentleman will consult the "Hansard" of last year, he will find the statement of the Minister of Public Works that he did obtain \$20,000 from Mr. Greenshields. I believe him and you do not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Permit me to say that the statement the hon. gentleman has just made is altogether untrue, and he knows it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FROST. It is an easy matter to deal in charges and slanders in this way, but it is not so easy to prove them. If any hon. gentleman thinks he can prove them, let him move for a commission.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order. The Minister of Public Works said that the statement made by my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Bennett) was untrue, and that he knew it to be so. Is that in order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Perhaps the hon. member for Simcoe was also out of order in making the charge that I understood him to make last night against the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister of Public Works answered that the charge was not true. It is true also that the Minister of Public Works was out of order when he stated that the hon. gentleman made a statement that he knew was not true. But if that charge had not been made, perhaps the answer would not have been given.

Mr. CLANCY. I should like, Mr. Speaker, to know if your ruling is that one offence is to be offset against another. My hon.

friend called attention to a very important fact, that the hon. gentleman is out of order by making the statement that the hon. member for Simcoe had made a statement that was untrue and he knew it to be untrue. My hon. friend asks your ruling on that point.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It is too late to raise the question because we have passed from that matter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I submit that the Finance Minister is entirely wrong. We have not departed from that matter. The question has been raised by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was not raised at the time the words were spoken.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, at the time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question was not brought up last night.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, because the words used last night by the Minister of Public Works were again stated to the House only a few minutes ago. The case is a very clear one, and every one who knows anything about the rules of the House is aware that the Minister of Public Works must withdraw his words. We have the statement made that the declaration of an hon. member was absolutely untrue and that he knew it to be untrue, and I submit that we cannot accept such a statement even from the Minister of Public Works. The dignity of the House must be maintained even if the dignity of the Minister of Public Works has to suffer for the moment.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I rise to speak on the point of order. When the hon. gentleman stated that last year I said that I had obtained money from the Drummond Counties Railway and that the statement would be found in "Hansard," I replied that the statement was untrue and that he knew it. I said it, and if my hon. friend stated that in the "Hansard" of last year it is recorded that I said that I got money from the Drummond Counties Railway, I say again that my hon. friend says what he knows is not true, because such words are not there. I maintain that I am perfectly in order, when a member of the House has before him the "Hansard," the official record, and he asserts that another hon. member has stated what he did not say, in saying that the hon. gentleman has said what is not true.

Mr. BENNETT. I desire to say a word on this point as I am the head and front of the offending. The Minister of Public Works did not catch exactly what I said last night. I did not, I think, say the statement was to be found in "Hansard." I said that was the statement, and he had to meet it. I have only this to say further to the Minister

of Public Works, that I did not make the statement with a view to damaging him in the least in his position in the Cabinet, because I know he is so strong there it would not affect him one bit.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We should have the point of order decided.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not spoken on the point of order, and I rise for the purpose, not of interposing at all in this discussion further than to say there is something more important in this matter than the exchange of opinions on a question of this kind between the two sides of the House. There is a fundamental question of order involved which will have to be decided by the hon. gentleman occupying the Chair. He knows from long experience in this House that if it is absolutely incompetent and in violation of the rules of the House for any hon. member to say, however great the provocation, however strongly he may hold the opinion—and it is never permitted by the Chair, and has never been permitted during the thirty years during which this Parliament has been in existence—that an hon. member made a statement which was untrue and he knew it to be untrue. That is contrary to the rules of order of this House, and I am quite certain that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would be the last man to change so important a rule of order. The hon. gentleman may have strong provocation, he may have good foundation for making his statement, but it is a statement which the rules of order absolutely preclude; and I am sure the Minister of Public Works will not hesitate, under these circumstances, to say that he withdraws the statement he has made, that the statement made by my hon. friend was untrue, and he knew it to be untrue, because that is not permitted under any circumstances.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. May I be permitted—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. May I be permitted to say a word?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman intends to speak to the point of order?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood that the hon. gentleman had already made some remarks on the point of order. Perhaps I am mistaken.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has already spoken to the point of order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was interrupted, and was not permitted to finish my remarks on the point of order. I want to submit a point for the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is in the recollection of the House—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The recollection of the House may not be the recollection of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It may be not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am prepared to submit to the ruling of the Deputy Speaker, but I was interrupted in my remarks.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I ask your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the point of order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If you hold, Sir, that I have already spoken on the point of order, I am willing to bow to your ruling.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I thought the hon. gentleman had spoken.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was interrupted.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I wish to say—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the Minister of Finance wishes to speak to the point of order. I thought he had spoken to the point of order. I shall be obliged, of course, to apply the same rule in his case as in others.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I ask permission to say a few words, as I was interrupted before and had not an opportunity to finish my sentence. The point I take is, that objection to words that are offensive must be taken at the time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I wish further to say—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman is making a personal explanation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I submit this point—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When the hon. gentleman speaks to the point of order I shall be obliged to call him to order, because he has already spoken on it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I submit that I have not spoken to the point of order, because I was not allowed to finish.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Chair has decided.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the Chair has decided, the Chair will say so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Chair has said so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Chair said so twice.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Brodeur). I may perhaps be mistaken, but I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has expressed his opinions upon the point of order. Perhaps the interruption has prevented the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) from continuing to speak, but it is my belief now that he has already spoken. With the unanimous consent of the House the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) can speak again.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not ask for the consent of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise to a point of order—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say, Sir, that if, after the Chair—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order ; Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How am I out of order ? I am speaking to a point of order.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has spoken already. He cannot speak again.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What I say, Mr. Speaker, is this—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. One point of order has been raised which has not been decided yet. That point of order I am ready to decide now. An hon. member can speak only once on that point, and I think the leader of the Opposition has already spoken, as has the Minister of Finance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will you permit me to say a word, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, not one word ; you have spoken already.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will be obliged to rule that the leader of the Opposition has already spoken.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will you allow me to explain.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid I cannot, except with the unanimous consent of the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He cannot speak more than twice, any more than I can.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Except with the consent of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order ; Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A point of order has been raised, and the hon. member has already spoken on it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to speak on that point of order at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, you have spoken already.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am willing to wait for the opinions of other hon. members on that point of order before I decide it ; but those hon. members who have already spoken cannot speak again.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not the point of order I wish to speak on.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, there is no better understood rule of this House, than that one hon. member cannot say to another: that he made a statement in the House knowing it to be untrue. The hon. Minister (Mr. Tarte) made such a statement with reference to the hon. member (Mr. Bennett), and I understood, Sir, that you ruled the hon. Minister (Mr. Tarte) out of order, but you did not request him to withdraw the statement, nor has he done so. There is no palliation or excuse for the statement of the hon. Minister (Mr. Tarte). One offence is no justification for another, and although the provocation may have been great, that was no justification for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte). Before the debate goes on in the usual way, I think it is incumbent on you, Mr. Speaker, to insist that the hon. member (Mr. Tarte) should withdraw the offensive statement he has made.

Mr. CAMERON. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that two points of order were raised, and only one has been discussed. The first point was, that the hon. Minister (Mr. Tarte) made a statement that was unjustifiable and unparliamentary. I shall not question the rule laid down by the leader of the Opposition on that point, but there is another question before the Chair which you have not heard discussed, and I think the Minister of Finance was rather harshly treated in not being permitted to discuss it. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) commenced to discuss that other point of order, when he was stopped. That other point of order was this : It is clear that if offensive language is used by one member towards another, he is liable to be called to order for it, but he must be called to order at the moment he gave utterance to it. Instead of that being done, the hon. member who had the floor was allowed to proceed for at least four sentences before the point was raised.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CAMERON. Some time elapsed before the hon. member for West Assiniboia

(Mr. Davin) rose in his place and raised the question of order, and it is perfectly clear that the point could not have been raised then. It ought to have been made at the moment that the language objected to was used, and not having been so raised it cannot be raised at all. I do not think that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has been fairly dealt with in this matter.

Mr. MILLS. You contend that the expression was outlawed.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Cameron) is not quite correct as to the facts. What occurred was this: when the mistake was made by the hon. Minister (Mr. Tarte), I cried out "order," and looked to you, Sir, with that deference to the Chair which you know is part of every fibre of my frame. I waited for the intervention of the Chair, for I suppose a second, and when I saw, Sir, that it had escaped your attention then I arose and made the point of order. As to the time that elapsed my hon. friend (Mr. Cameron) is quite mistaken. I took the point of order promptly, and I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, to see the firmness and dignity with which you have maintained order in this Chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I regret the occurrence of last night as well as the incident of this afternoon in the Chamber. I understand that last night a very serious charge was made against a member of this House, and I imagine, so far as I am concerned, that I will be obliged to be a little more severe in the future than I was then, for if I had been more strict last night, probably the incident of this afternoon would not have arisen. As I have said, a very serious charge was made last night against an hon. member of this House, and he denied it. Although the terms which he used may not have been absolutely in order, yet the statement made by the Minister should have been accepted by the hon. member who made the charge. However, the hon. gentleman who made the charge did not think it proper to do so. It was an unfortunate occurrence and I trust it will not happen again. However, as to what happened last night I am not called upon to give a decision to-day. My attention was not called to it then, and although perhaps I should have interfered of my own motion at the time, yet the matter passed off quietly, and I thought it as well to let it so pass without comment. Now, as to what occurred this afternoon. The charge of last night was repeated, although not in the same terms, and a denial came from the Minister (Mr. Tarte), and I understand that the denial has been accepted by the hon. member (Mr. Bennett). At all events there is no doubt that no hon. gentleman in this House has a right to say to another, that he made a statement which

Mr. CAMERON.

he knew was not true. Such an expression is not parliamentary. I beg to say again, that I trust in view of that good feeling which should prevail in the House, that no such charge as was made last night and repeated to-day, shall be made against any hon. member, except on the occasions and under the conditions permitted by the rules of the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Speaker, in deference to your decision I withdraw the expression.

Mr. FOSTER. Then let us proceed, and have some more frost.

Mr. FROST. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, I really ought to apologize to you for the tempest that has been raised by these few observations which have been made. When I was cut short in my remarks I was endeavouring to show that charges were being preferred against leading members of this Government in an irregular and irresponsible manner, when it would be much better for all concerned if any hon. member who wishes to make such a charge should proceed in the parliamentary way by moving for an investigation, and such an investigation would, I am sure, be willingly granted by the Government. If the hon. members would take the trouble to call for a commission, I am very sure that commission would be granted at once, and everything would be investigated in a straightforward, honourable and manly way, and there would never afterwards be such a scene as we have witnessed this afternoon, with charges and recriminations bandied across the floor of the House. Let us hope we may never see such a scene in this House again.

Now, I am about through with what I have to say. The Budget speech, as a whole, must be very gratifying to this country. Let me, before concluding, invite the attention of the House to the outlook in the country at the present time. It is quite true that the Minister of Finance took an optimistic view of the trade of the country, and he had very good grounds for doing so. For instance, if we look at the revenue we find that, notwithstanding the preferential tariff, which has reduced the duty on goods from Great Britain, the revenue is increasing rapidly. We also find that the exports from the country are rapidly increasing. We find that the clearing houses show something like \$126,000,000 more for 1897 than they did for 1896. We find that the deposits in our banks and savings banks have increased in the six months, from June to December, 1897, by over \$21,000,000. We find that our bank stocks and railway stocks are increasing in value, the Canadian Pacific Railway stock having nearly doubled, and the Grand Trunk Railway stocks having increased in value something over \$44,000,000 during the past year. We also find that

the number of failures, which is a very good barometer of the state of trade and business throughout the country, show a very encouraging state of affairs. For the first quarter of 1898, that is the last quarter of which we have any information, there were only 423 failures in the Dominion, with assets of \$2,365,388, and liabilities of \$2,941,067, while for the corresponding quarter of last year there were 674 failures, or nearly 33½ per cent more, with assets of \$4,100,571, and liabilities of \$5,185,000. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me that we have every reason to be encouraged by the outlook when we look at the immense traffic of our railroads, when we look at the activity of our seaports, St. John and Halifax, when we know that at St. John there is not harbour room for the vessels coming there, when we look at our North-west filling up, when we look at our mining and agricultural resources being developed in every province of the Dominion, when we see every industry thriving, our workmen employed everywhere, and our farmers prospering. Look at the state of the butter trade. Three years ago only half a million dollars worth of butter were shipped out of the country, while last year over \$2,000,000 worth was exported; and we may expect still greater improvement in the future. When we see all these evidences of prosperity—and these are evidences that are clear and palpable—I say we have good reason to believe that the change of Government which has taken place in this country is one of the blessings for which we are not yet sufficiently thankful. That change of Government has been for the best interests of this country; and as we have seen the various elections that have taken place since this Government came into power, going one after another in favour of the Government, with increased majorities everywhere, we have reason to conclude that it was not an accident of an accident that this Government came into power, but that it was the deliberate intention of the people that the Government should be changed and should be put into hands that were able to conduct the country's affairs in a straightforward way, and in a way that would redound not only to the greatness and importance of this country as a nation, but to the advancement and prosperity of the people who inhabit it. Therefore, I have to-day to express my thankfulness as a business man that we have such a Government, and I am heartily in accord with the Minister of Finance and his able associates in everything they have done for the advancement and progress of this great nation.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, in continuing this discussion, I wish for a few moments to direct attention to some of the statements made by the hon. member for North Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost). One of his last ones was to the effect that it was not by an accident of an accident that

his party were in power to-day. Well, if that remark does not apply to his party, at least it applies to himself, because it is by an accident of an accident of the returning officer that he sits for North Leeds and Grenville in this House to-day. Had the return not been made too early, the probability is that he would never have graced the seat he does in this Chamber at the present time. One of the statements he made was to the effect that we had made such progress through the able instrumentality of the present leader of the Government that in a short time we would have the power to make our own treaties without interference. I wonder how much intelligence that hon. gentleman displayed when he made that statement, or what he knows about the rights and powers of this country to make treaties, or how far he was drawing on his imagination for his alleged facts. I am quite sure that neither the leader of the Government nor any other member of the Government would go so far as to make the statement the hon. member made; and to intelligent people in this country, it can only be regarded as the simplest moonshine. The hon. gentleman went on to say that all the by-elections went against the Conservative party; but he afterwards qualified his remark a little by saying not quite all, but nearly all. And why did they go against the Conservative party? Because he said his friends of the Reform party had kept their pledges—every one of them. I would like to ask him, if they kept that pledge which they made to the farmers of Canada when they told them that in the event of their coming into power they would take the duty off agricultural implements. No man knows better than the hon. member himself, because he is a manufacturer of those implements; and if we are correctly informed, he was one of the manufacturers who were instrumental in persuading the Government not to disturb the duty on agricultural implements, so that it remains to-day at 20 per cent, as it was before they came into power.

Mr. FROST. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I never spoke to the Government in regard to the duty on agricultural implements, except on a deputation along with a dozen other agricultural implement manufacturers who waited on the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a very innocent and very refreshing statement—as if he could not express his views as a member of a deputation as well as in any other capacity.

Mr. FROST. Would you deny me the right to go with other manufacturers on a deputation to the Government?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not deny that right at all, but it is the most refreshing innocence to try and persuade the country that the Government have kept their pledges, when they

never touched the duty on agricultural implements, although they promised, most emphatically, the farmers that, in the event of their coming into power, they would reduce or take off the duty.

The hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost), who is one of the manufacturers so often spoken of by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, as the bloated manufacturers and wholesale robbers of the country, has, nevertheless, so much favour in the eyes of the Government that he was able, with the assistance of his friend the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), to persuade the Finance Minister not to disturb the duty. This is certainly a pledge which these hon. gentlemen did not keep.

Mr. FLINT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question, if he will permit me. Do I understand him to say that the Government promised to remove the duty from agricultural implements?

Mr. SPROULE. I say, that members of the Government, before they came into power, told the farmers that this was one of the great injustices under which they were labouring, and that, if returned to office, they proposed to remove it. What other conclusion could we come to than that they would remove the duty? The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is one of the very men who gave this promise.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If my hon. friend will permit me. He says that he will find a speech of mine denouncing the late Government for not reducing the duties below 20 per cent. He will not find any such speech, but he will find that I denounced them for not reducing it below 35 per cent. Will he produce any speech in which I denounced the Government for not reducing the duty on agricultural implements below 20 per cent?

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say that the hon. gentleman in enumerating to the farmers the disabilities they were labouring under, spoke of the duty on agricultural implements.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Which was 35 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. And I am told—I do not know it personally—that in his letter to the Patrons we find the same expression.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman does not want, I presume, to misrepresent me.

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly not.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is quite true, that, when the duty was 35 per cent, I condemned it. But it is not true, that, when the duty was 20 per cent, I said anything about it.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. SPROULE. When the hon. gentleman condemned the duty before it was reduced to 20 per cent, he never said he would be satisfied with 20 per cent, or 10 per cent, or any other rate, but that one of the hardships under which the farmers were labouring was the high duty on agricultural implements.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Quite true.

Mr. SPROULE. And that this was a duty they should not be compelled to pay. The hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) spoke about the revival of agriculture as a fulfilment of promises made by his friends. Does he mean to say that the revival in agriculture is due to his friends' accession to power? Does he mean to tell the intelligent farmers of this country that the very large crops they had last year—much larger than they have had for many years—was due to the election of his friends to office? Does he mean to say, that, because a kind and beneficent Providence gave larger returns last year to the husbandmen, Providence did so because his friends had come to power? If he does, he claims more than the members of the Government themselves have ventured to claim. I know that they have conveniently refrained from giving any credit to Divine Providence, and, by implication, take all the credit to themselves; but the hon. gentleman has outdone his leaders, and has given the Government direct credit for these things. He said that, before this Government came to power, hard times existed, the prices of products were low, and the farmers could not sell their lands. Does he mean to say that it was his friends who raised the prices of farm products? In what manner did they succeed in achieving this? Was it by getting better markets for the farmers? Was it owing to their influence and to their policy that a famine was created in India, and that there was scarcity of crops in foreign countries and large crops in this country? I scarcely think he would venture seriously to claim credit for these things, if he went into them in detail but he has not scrupled to do so in a general way.

The hon. gentlemen contended that our factories would not be working overtime, but that, on the contrary, every industry would have dwindled down, and every factory would have closed, if the Reform party had not come into office, and he tried to establish this proposition by reading some items from the columns of the "Manufacturer," a newspaper which deals particularly with the manufactures of the country. Well, Mr. Speaker, no one on this side pretends to say that we are not enjoying a fair measure of prosperity. We do not shut our eyes to the fact that prices are better abroad and also improved, in some respects, at home, and that we have had much larger crops than we have enjoyed for years past. No

one here denies that there is improvement in the country; but the difference between hon. gentlemen on that side and this is, that they are inclined to attribute the good crops and increased prosperity to something done by the Reform party, while we consider them due to the accidents of life in other countries and the kindness of Divine Providence to this country. My hon. friend dwelt some considerable time on the competency and ability of the Government, and told us what great men they were in their various lines of life. As he thus dwelt on their great merits, I could not help thinking of the old saying: Ask my brother if I am a rogue. Could it be expected of the hon. gentleman that he would rise to tell us of their shortcomings? If he spoke of them at all, it would naturally be in the line of eulogy, and in this respect he has followed the example of many of his friends, by lavishing on the Cabinet Ministers the highest eulogium which one man could possibly extend to others. It would be, however, a little more in keeping with the situation, if he would give us some arguments to justify that they were, in some way or other, instrumental in creating prosperity, and then allow the electorate to judge the value of those arguments.

He said that the Ontario Government made no difference between political parties when selecting men to lecture to the farmers of Canada at the farmers' institutes. He ought to know that that is not correct. He can name but very few Conservatives who are employed by the Ontario Government to talk to the farmers of Canada at their institutes. I think I am safe in saying that they do not employ one Conservative to every eight or ten Reformers in that work. Why? Because this Reform Government has an opportunity to hire a few of their friends, who are doing work for them in other lines, and pay them out of the public funds of the province to go round and do a little talk to the farmers, and at the same time a little political work, so as to make the Government stand better with the people afterwards. The hon. gentleman would have done better to have let that subject alone, because the people of Ontario are well aware that the Ontario Government have not selected men from both political parties to do this work.

Mr. FROST. What political complexion is the Chairman of the Farmers' Institutes Committee—Mr. Hodge?

Mr. SPROULE. That was not the statement the hon. gentleman made, at all.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). He is a Tory of the Tories.

Mr. FROST. I said that few were Conservatives, but the great majority were Reformers.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said that the Ontario Government made no dis-

tinction between parties, but selected these men indifferently from either party. He said he could name dozens of them who were Conservatives. I challenged him to name one dozen, or half a dozen.

Mr. FROST. I know quite a number in Eastern Ontario, and they are all Conservatives.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman will get it down, after a little, to something like reasonable proportions, but it bears a good deal of paring down yet before you get his statement to conform to the facts.

I regard the financial statement made to this House as an announcement to the people of the result of stock-taking for the year, as showing how we stand financially, and how our business is turning out. What does the statement of the present Finance Minister disclose? It discloses two or three things that I wish to call attention to. First, that there has been a larger expenditure than that of the previous Government for several years past; secondly, that there has been an increase in our debt, and, third, that there has been a heavier taxation. Yet these are the three very things which they told the people of Canada would, if they came to power, be reduced. They said, first, that the expenditure could be reduced by three million dollars or four million dollars.

Have they made it? Through the mouth of their Finance Minister, they have acknowledged that that reduction was not made. He tells us that the expenditure in 1896 was \$36,000,000; in 1896-97 it was \$37,829,000, and that in 1897-98 they expected it to be \$38,750,000, that is, an increase every year since they came into power, instead of a reduction of three or four millions. Now, what have the people of Canada to say with regard to this? They must come to one of two conclusions. Either that these hon. gentlemen were dishonest or untruthful, when they made the statement and knew that this reduction of which they spoke could not be carried out, or else they must believe that these gentlemen believed what they said, and, therefore, were incompetent, in that they did not know what the requirements of the country were. Which horn of the dilemma will they choose; which view will the Canadian people take of their conduct? The Finance Minister now tells us that there is so little of the expenditure controllable that they could not be expected to decrease it, and that the service of the country demands an increase, instead of a decrease. I candidly confess that I agree with him in that. But what does he say in defence of himself and his friends, who said that the country could be run efficiently with an expenditure of three or four millions less than before?

His next statement is with regard to the taxation of the people, which he said should be less. The hon. member for South Oxford

(Sir Richard Cartwright) said, and in a very remarkable letter to the "Economist," in England, some years ago, that the people of Canada were bled white by taxation. And how much was then taken from the people of Canada? In that year the revenue was \$38,579,310, being the amount taken from the people of Canada by customs and inland revenue and other taxes. How much was taken out of them last year by the same means? I find that the revenue in 1895-96 was \$36,946,000. And the hon. gentleman told the farmers of Canada that they were bled white by taxation. In 1896-97, when the hon. gentleman and his friends were in power—it is true, they were in power only a portion of the year—the amount raised was \$38,349,000. And for the present year they intend to raise \$39,300,000, according to the statement of the Finance Minister a few days ago. If the farmers were bled white by taking \$38,000,000 from them, with how much greater truth this may be said, when these hon. gentlemen take \$39,300,000. And what will the people of this country think of the hon. member for South Oxford? They were charitable enough to believe that he knew what was required to run the country and that he was honest enough to state what he believed to be true, and, therefore, that when he said that the people were bled white by having so much money taken from them, when he came into power, he would take less. We see that he has not done so. We are sometimes told that he occupies the position he does because the people were afraid to have him made Finance Minister, that his own friends were afraid to give him control of the Finance Department. The hon. gentleman said, in this letter, that it was not merely that \$38,000,000 was taken out of the country, but that far more was taken. When the then Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) drew his attention to the letter to the "Economist," and to the fact that he said that the system of taxation took something like \$60,000,000 from the people, the hon. gentleman said that this was absolutely correct, and he repeated it, that the system of taxation took from the people, not \$38,000,000 merely, but \$60,000,000. But has he changed the system? No, they keep exactly the same system, and with that system they raise a larger amount. If the people of Canada were bled white before, they must be bled whiter still to-day. This is what he said:

I say that if ever there was a case which deserves special consideration at the hands of the Government, it is the case of the Canadian farmers, from one end of Canada to the other, to-day. The best that can be said is this: Many of our farmers must prepare for a total change of system, and I need not tell the House that you cannot change the system of agriculture in any country without a considerable expenditure of capital, nor need I tell my friends here that in the case of a vast number of our farmers it is utterly hopeless and impossible for them, as matters now stand, to raise that requisite capital.

Mr. SPROULE.

What is the condition of the farmers of Canada? At this present moment the policy of the Government is to pay huge bounties out of the people, out of the pockets of these very farmers, for the purpose of encouraging certain petted and special manufacturers.

Has he done away with these bounties? No, he has rather increased them in some lines. He goes on:

When the Minister of Finance stated that I compute the tax paid by the people of Canada at \$60,000,000, he stated what is perfectly correct. We paid \$30,000,000 into our national treasury for our national expenditure, and we are taxed, in all human probability, to a much larger amount for the purpose of promoting the interest of a couple of hundred favoured manufacturers. I will give but a few illustrations of this. Why, Sir, at this very moment the community of Canada are taxed to the tune of nearly \$2,000,000 on the article of sugar alone, of which tax only a most insignificant fraction goes into the public treasury.

Has he taken away this bonus on sugar? Why, they have put more on this year. As he said it was a burden on the farmer, is it not reasonable that they should expect that, by putting the hon. gentleman in office, they would secure a reduction of that burden? But he has sat by and acquiesced, when the Finance Minister raised that tax on sugar, thus increasing, according to his own reasoning, the burden on the farmer.

If you look over his previous statement, and consider it in the light of what has taken place, and if you consider the statement made by the Minister of Finance a few nights ago, you can only come to one of two conclusions: either that he did not know what could be done, or he was dishonest, and attempted to mislead the people into the belief that this taxation could be imposed and the affairs of the country carried on if he and his friends were in power. But when they got into power they found it could not be done. The next matter upon which they dwelt was that the debt of the country was growing too rapidly, that it was becoming too great a burden upon the people. What was that debt when they came into power? In 1896, the net debt was \$258,497,000. Have they reduced that debt since they came into power? The very next year the Finance Minister tells us that the net debt was \$261,538,000, or an increase of \$3,041,000 in one year. Now, is the burden any less on the people than it was then? Decidedly it is not. Then he went on to tell us that the net debt on the 30th of June, 1898, would be, according to his calculation, increased by \$4,500,000; or, in the twenty months during which this Government have been in power, according to the Minister of Finance's own statement, or at the end of their first two years, they have increased the net debt of Canada by \$7,541,000. Then, I ask: Was the hon. member for South Oxford correct when he told the people that the net debt of Canada should not be in-

creased, and that if he and his friends were in power they would reduce it? I say that he could not have been correct then in his judgment, or else he was not honest in what he told the people of Canada. One thing or the other must be true, that he was not honest then, or else his judgment was very far astray. It is also pertinent to inquire: Have the Government carried out the lines of policy which they announced to the people as the correct ones upon which the affairs of the country should be carried on? The hon. member for Leeds and Grenville said they had carried out every one of them. I asked him with regard to one—the duty on agricultural implements, and I had no satisfactory answer, either from him or from any other gentleman on that side of the House. So I need not again draw attention to the fact that they did not reduce the duty on agricultural implements to prove to the Canadian people that they have not carried out their policy in that respect. Now, have they reduced the expenditure? I have shown they have not. Have they kept the public debt at the same point as it was before? I have shown they have not, that that debt has gone up. Have they reduced the taxation of the people of Canada? The Minister of Finance says no, we expect to raise more out of them this year than we did last year, and last year we raised more out of them than was raised for several years before.

Next, one of the promises they made was that we were to have freer trade with the world, or free trade as they have it in England. In the elections preceding the last, that was the great panacea which they held out for the ills of the people of Canada, we wanted free trade as they have it in England. That was what the hon. member for South Oxford said, and his friends. Now, they have got into power and have control of the destinies of this country. Have they given us free trade as they have it in England? Not at all, Sir. They have disturbed very few items indeed in the tariff of this country. They have not changed the system of raising the taxes, therefore, I say, they have not carried out their pledge with reference to that particular line of policy. They have neither give us freer trade, nor have they given us free trade as they have it in England. They also told the Canadian people that if they were entrusted with the duty of government, they would give us reciprocity with the United States. They talked about the Conservative party trying to get markets in every other country except with our neighbours. The great market to the south of us was the market for us. They said that while we were travelling through Europe, and Asia, and Africa, and every other foreign country for markets, we made no efforts to get reciprocity with the United States, which would be

the best market for us, and that if they came into power they would give the Canadian farmer reciprocity with the United States. Have they done it? There is no person in this country but knows that there is no change in the situation with regard to reciprocity with the United States. They have done what their predecessors did, they have attempted to get reciprocity, they went to Washington, but were obliged to come back home and admit that they had no more power, no more ability to secure reciprocity with the United States than their predecessors had. Then, we were told by the Minister of Finance that the forebodings of evil of the late Minister of Finance and his friends had not been fulfilled, he said that the predictions they made with regard to what would happen if the Reform party came into power have not been fulfilled. I would ask him why they have not been fulfilled? Simply because the Reform party, when they came into power, did not carry out the principles which they advocated when they were in Opposition. In so far as they have departed from their own principles and adopted those of their predecessors, their Government was a success; but in so far as they have diverged from the principles of their predecessors and introduced new ones of their own, their Government has been a failure. Now, they have already diverged from the policy of their predecessors in some lines. They told the Canadian people that the duty on binder twine should be taken off because it was too dear, and they would get it much cheaper. Well, they did take the duty off, and what has been the result to the Canadian farmers? Did it bring down the price of binder twine? The statement made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and which I find on inquiry to be correct, is that although that duty was taken off binder twine, it is to be sold this year to the Canadian farmer at a higher price than it was when the duty was on. Therefore, I say that in having diverged in that respect from the policy of their predecessors, they have committed a blunder, they have not accomplished for the Canadian farmer what they promised him. What were the prices last year? Here is the price-list for 1898: Sisal, \$5.75, against \$5.25 last year when the duty was on; the standard, which sold at \$5.50 last year, is to be sold at \$6.25 this year after the duty has been taken off, or 75 cents dearer than it was last year when the duty was on; manilla, which was \$6.25 last year, is this year to be sold at \$6.87. If I take every one of these lines, I find that after the duty is taken off the price has been put up to the Canadian farmer by the Hobbs Company largely because it is under a combine in the United States, and they have put the whole trade in the hands of their friends here, and so it is prac-

tically under a combine here made up of their own friends, this Hobbs Company, but under another name, so that the farmers of Canada may not understand that it is sold by the same parties who sold it last year. When the duty was on, the lower price prevailed, when the duty is taken off a higher price to the Canadian farmer is the result. Then they took the duty off barbed wire, and they told the Canadian farmer what great results would be brought about. They said the Conservative party had kept that duty on to the detriment of the farmers, and that it had enhanced the price. Is barbed wire sold any cheaper at the present time than it sold last year? The hon. member for South Leeds told us, and I know it to be correct, because I made inquiry, that it is sold exactly at the same price now as it was last year. I have no doubt it will be sold this year at 2½ cents per pound, as it was last year, and after a while it is very likely it will be sold dearer, because they have killed out every manufacturer of barbed wire in Canada, and it will be entirely under the control of the Americans, who show themselves such great adepts at making combines in every line of life. Another respect in which they diverged from the policy of the old Government was in taking the duty off corn. They told the Canadian farmer what a blessing it would be to him if they took the duty off corn. We heard the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) last night say that the Canadian farmer was able to sell his oats, and use corn instead, and he told the quantity of oats that was exported last year after the duty was taken off corn. Now, I tried to remind the hon. gentleman that that duty had only been in operation two months of that year, and therefore the large importations of corn in the two months could not account for the very heavy exportations of oats that year. It was evidently absurd, because all the influence the duty could have had would not have operated to the extent the hon. member for Huron said, because the corn used was in the line of feeding cattle. And he went on to show how many cattle were slaughtered and exported, and that the number had increased largely by virtue of the policy inaugurated by the present Government, by which the duty was taken off corn, and under which Canadian farmers imported corn, which was cheaper feed than their own coarse grains. The hon. gentleman said that the Canadian farmers appreciated this change, and he did not think one farmer in a hundred would be willing to return to the previous duty. I have stated before, and I repeat it to-night, that such farmers as the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. McMillan) might benefit to some extent by the importation of free corn. Why? Because the hon. gentleman is not a grain farmer, but he makes

Mr. SPROULE.

his money out of feeding cattle, and his object, of course, is to obtain cheap feed. It does not matter to him whether the general value of feed produced by the Canadian farmers is reduced in value or not, so long as he obtains feed for his own cattle at a cheap rate. He is therefore in favour of importing corn free from the United States, irrespective of the price obtained by farmers generally for their coarse grains. The hon. gentleman said that the farmers sell their coarse grains and buy corn. How many farmers in his own county sold their coarse grains and bought corn last year? I venture to say not one in five hundred. While one farmer in every five hundred sold his coarse grain and bought corn, and was able to benefit by the exchange, free corn would be a distinct disadvantage to the other 499, who lived out of the money they obtained for the grain they produced. Thus, the tariff change would benefit one farmer while it injured 499 who were living, to a large extent, by the coarse grains they grow and sell, and who were not purchasers of corn. So far as hon. gentlemen opposite have departed from the policy of their predecessors, they have inflicted a distinct injury on the Canadian farmers, and such is the case to-day. I need only quote the figures given by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), showing that during the first six months of the present year, when the tariff was in full operation, large quantities of American corn were brought into this country, to prove the truth of my assertion. No less than 11,500,000 bushels were imported during the six months, and at the same rate, 23,000,000 bushels will be imported during the year. The corn thus imported will come into direct competition with the 25,000,000 bushels of corn produced in Canada, according to the bulletins of the Ontario Bureau of Statistics. This tariff change brings our farmers into competition with the farmers of the United States, who are now allowed to send in their corn free of duty. Statistics show that 24,466,000 bushels of corn were produced in Ontario last year, and there have been 11,000,000 bushels brought in from the United States free of duty during the last six months, and yet we are told that no injury is inflicted on the farmers who raise pease, oats and barley. This change is a distinct disadvantage to our farmers, who will be compelled to accept lower prices for their coarse grains, and who will be compelled to find for their coarse grains a foreign market, to reach which they will be compelled to pay the freight. So I am justified in saying that so far as hon. gentlemen opposite have diverged from the policy of their predecessors, it has been a disadvantage to Canadian farmers, and such will be the case so long as the present tariff is continued. It might be asked what the Government might have done to benefit

the Canadian people which they have not done? They have twice within twenty months reduced the interest paid on poor men's savings in the Government savings banks. A year ago last July they reduced the interest from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 per cent, and this year they are reducing it from 3 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. If there is any class in the country requiring the greatest indulgence and support from a paternal Government it is the poor man, who, by economy, is endeavouring to save money for future needs. He is learning the lesson of economy by depositing his money in the savings banks, and should receive a fair rate of interest. If he makes money, he does not know how to invest it as does a broker or a note-shaver, and he is at the mercy of unscrupulous corporations, and when the Government devise means by which these savings can be deposited in a safe place, where they can yield a fair return, they are conferring a distinct benefit on him. They are placing a premium on his economical habits and desire to save money. When the present Government reduced the rate of interest at the savings banks for the purpose of allowing the general banks of the country to obtain money at a cheaper rate, and allow men in the inner circle to benefit, they are inflicting an injury on working people. It has been said that after a time the benefit would reach the inner circle. At what time will it reach the poor man? He is only allowed in the savings banks interest at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, but when he goes to a private bank to borrow money he will be charged 12 per cent. The poor man will be driven from the Government savings banks to private banks, which offer a higher rate of interest, and the consequence will probably be that some of the private banks, which are not inspected by the Dominion Government, will fail and the poor man will lose his savings, all this being due to the reduced rate of interest given in the Government savings banks, the depositor being driven to invest his money elsewhere in order to secure a higher rate of interest. But whom do the Government favour? The class of men who can always protect their own interests. The course of the present Government has throughout been to come to the defence and assistance of the rich men and corporations, but the poor man has been left to struggle alone with all the disadvantages incident to poverty and hardship; and this paternal Government has not only left him to struggle, but has added other burdens and reduced the interest on his deposits in the Government savings banks, which he has been able to make by practicing economy. I have always believed that one of the important duties of the Government was to offer as high a rate of interest as possible to the poor man who could be

induced to save money and deposit it in the savings banks.

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

After Recess.

THE KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RAILWAY.

The House proceeded to consider amendments made in Bill (No. 26) An Act to incorporate the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, when the hour for the consideration of private Bills was concluded last Wednesday evening, I was speaking in regard to the mineral development of a section of the Kootenay country and as to how that mineral development depended upon railway competition. I spoke of the Slocan district, a district which food products exported to British Columbia and to which go the greater part of the food products exported to British Columbia from the district of Alberta. The Slocan district is now severed by two railways; one a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the other practically a branch of the Great Northern. It is a matter of notoriety that the value of the mines of the Slocan district, and the consequent value of that district as a consumer of the food products of the Territories, depends, to a very great extent, upon the competition existing between the Great Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway in that district; by means of the Kaslo and Slocan Railway, which is practically a branch of the Great Northern, and the Nakusp and Slocan Railway, which is a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It may be worth while to let the House know that both these roads transport the ores to the smelters of the United States, Omaha being the point to which the greater part of these ores are carried by both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Great Northern. We have there the greatest amount of prosperity existing in any part of the mining district of British Columbia, and consequently the greatest consuming centre for the produce of Alberta, in consequence of the existence of railway competition, competition directly to the United States smelters and competition in which the Canadian Pacific Railway (which seeks to exclude competition from the Kettle River country on the ground that it would take the ores to American smelters) shares. I will go further, Sir, and say that it was to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway to compete on more advantageous terms in the work of carrying Canadian ores to the Omaha smelter, that the demand was made upon this country for aid to build the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. The reason for the

construction of that railway was not to have Canadian ores smelted in Canada, but it was distinctly for the purpose of carrying Canadian ores to United States smelters. If it is a fact—and we have it on the best authority—that it is necessary for these ores to be carried to United States smelters in order that the mines may be worked profitably, then I say it is in the interest of the people I represent, who supply food products to the miners of that country, that the ore should be carried to the United States and be smelted there rather than that these mines should not be worked at all and that there should be no miners there to consume the products of the North-west. What is true with regard to the Slocan district is equally true with regard to the Kettle River district. If it is impossible to have prosperity in mining in the case of the high grade ore of the Slocan district without railway competition and without smelting these ores in the United States, it is certainly much more necessary to have railway competition, (and possibly, for aught I know, to have the ores smelted in the United States) in the case of the low grade ores of the Kettle River country. If it be established that railway competition is necessary for the development of the mines of that country, then the question is: Can that competition be provided through any other source than that offered by the Kettle River Railway. It is within the knowledge of every member who has considered this question that any competition that is to be in British Columbia or the North-west Territories, must come from or through the United States, just as this Kettle River Railway comes from the United States. If it is held by this House that there shall not be railway competition in British Columbia or the North-west Territories, then we understand the position. But let there be no mistake about it; unless we are to be allowed to have competition from the United States or through the United States, there can be no railway competition in the North-west Territories or in British Columbia.

Either we are to have competition or we are not to have it. That is the question before this House in connection with this Kettle River Railway Bill. If anything were required to prove that that is the question at issue, the exertions of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to secure the defeat of this Bill would be ample evidence. There is no probability that that company would take the interest it does to prevent the construction of such a short length of railway unless something more was involved than the competition that would occur in the small section of country served by it. There must necessarily be something more involved, or we would not have the president, the vice-president, the secretary, and every other important officer of that company lobbying the members of this House as they have done for the past week or

Mr. OLIVER.

more. We would not have it announced in the papers that a special train would be run to-night to carry to their homes members of this House who would remain here to oppose this Bill.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. It is to carry any members, whether they are against the Bill or in favour of it.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member seems to be thoroughly posted on this matter. Perhaps he can give us some further information about the lobbying methods used by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I say that the evidences before the House and the country are that the question at issue is the large question of railway competition in Manitoba, the North-west and British Columbia, and not simply the question of competition in a small section of mining country. And it is not merely the question of railway competition. Within the past year the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has gone into the smelting business, having bought the Heinze smelter at Trail; and now they want not only the absolute monopoly of transportation in British Columbia, but also the absolute monopoly of smelter work in British Columbia. They drop the question of transportation out of sight in their arguments, but they put the question of smelter work forward. They say, we want the monopoly for the purpose of keeping the smelter work in Canada—in other words, for themselves. Therefore, I say this is not only a question of transportation monopoly, but a question of smelter monopoly as well. The experience of Manitoba, the North-west and British Columbia has shown that the natural industries of these districts cannot thrive under a monopoly of transportation, much less under a monopoly of manufacture; and when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company come to us and demand, as they are doing in their opposition to this Bill, an absolute monopoly not only of transportation, but also of the smelting of ores in British Columbia, they are asking something that this House cannot afford to grant, and for my part it shall not grant without having a knowledge of the facts. It is all very well to say we should smelt our own ores in Canada. There are many things that we should do in Canada, and that we would do in Canada if it paid us to do them. But if circumstances are such that it is not profitable to smelt our ores in Canada, then it is better to have them smelted somewhere else, and content ourselves with having the mining done in Canada, rather than that the natural resources of the country should be locked up and the country not developed. The position is this, that we have in the Boundary Creek country a large body of low-grade ores, the development of which depends on facilities being provided for cheap transportation and cheap smelting; and unless

the conditions for smelting are just as favourable as the conditions for transportation, that country cannot be opened up to furnish a market for the agricultural producers of the west and the commercial men of eastern Canada. It is for this House to say whether it will consent to tie up the natural resources of that country and prevent the development of its trade for other parts of the Dominion simply for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway in its transportation monopoly and in its proposed smelter monopoly.

It may be said that other capitalists have an equal opportunity to put their money into smelting industries in that country. I say that is not so. If you give the Canadian Pacific Railway a monopoly of transportation, they can have a monopoly of smelting if they desire it, just as they can have a monopoly of any other trade or manufacture. I do not suppose that they intend to go into any other trade or manufacture; but they do intend to go into smelting; and if you give them a monopoly in transportation, you ensure to them a monopoly of smelting as well, and you ensure that monopoly being worked for all it is worth in the interest of that company. Some people hold that what is in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway is in the interest of Canada, and they take up the cry of Canada for the Canadians. I am a Canadian, and I believe in Canada for the Canadians; I am here to advocate Canada for the Canadians. But the question is what Canadians are to have Canada? Are they those Canadians at the head of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who ask a monopoly of transportation and smelting in British Columbia? Or the rest of the people of Canada, who desire to profit by the sale of their agricultural products in that country, the employment of their labour there, or the carrying on of trade with it? These are the people whom I desire to see profit from the development of that country. It may be that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would not, under such circumstances, make as much for themselves as otherwise, but still I say that is a policy of Canada for the Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, the argument has been used that the trade of the Kettle River country would be done by the United States if this road were built. One hon. gentleman, a manufacturer, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), was very emphatic in his desire that Canada's trade should not be lost to the United States. That practically means that there should not be trade between Canada and the United States; and if so, I would ask that hon. gentleman how long would he run his foundries in Toronto if it were not for the coal he buys from the United States? Is he the man to say that there shall not be trade between these two countries? Here, in this city of Ottawa, which depends so

largely on the lumber industry, we see railways and fleets of boats to carry Canadian lumber—where to? To the United States; and without the market of the United States, the lumber industries of the city of Ottawa could not be carried on. As circumstances exist, it is an absolute necessity for these Canadians to deal with the United States. Why should an exception be made in the case of the Boundary Creek country?

There is no reason from a national or Canadian point of view, there is only a reason from the standpoint of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has at last, at long last, waked up the Grand Trunk Railway to active competition. And finding that the Grand Trunk Railway is ready to meet them at all points, they put forth every effort and use every argument to prevent that railway from competing with them. This proposed railway would be the means not only of developing the Kettle River country but of affording the farmers of the west, as well as the merchants and manufacturers of the east a good market for their products and of advancing the interests and industries of Canada as a whole. For, we all know that capital is shy of investment in any country in which it must depend for its returns upon the will of a single corporation. That is why north-western Canada has suffered so much for lack of capital for the development of its industries—simply that every man of money knew that if he put money into the North-west or British Columbia he placed it more or less completely at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This would not be if there were no monopoly. Hon. gentlemen who represent the eastern part of the country talk very glibly about there being no monopoly and about competition being of no value. It is all very well for those who enjoy the benefit of both rail and water competition to talk in that fashion. But in this city of Ottawa or in the city of Toronto or eastern Canada generally would not have grown and developed to what they are but for railway competition. The people would not think for an instant of depending in such a matter upon clauses in railway charters or upon the General Railway Act to give them the advantages that they now enjoy from railway competition. If railway competition is necessary in this eastern country, it is just as necessary and even more necessary in that western country. And if we are to have competition, apparently the only company strong enough to give it to us is the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and the only way they can give it to us, is through the United States. So, if this House decides that this Kettle River Railway Bill shall not be granted, it decides that the North-west and British Columbia shall remain under railway monopoly, the right to which was bought out by the late Government for millions of dollars and

which has been the greatest bar to the progress of the Canadian west.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, so far as I have been able to gather, the people of Ontario generally and the wholesale merchants and manufacturers generally approve of the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) and of the action of the Railway Committee in reporting this Kettle River Valley Railway Bill. I know that the Liberal papers of Ontario took hold of the sturdy, patriotic words of the Minister of Railways and flung them in the teeth of the newspapers that were accusing this Government of subserviency to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am afraid that these newspapers will learn that the hon. Minister of Railways is not privileged to speak for the whole Government. We have been informed that the hon. Minister of Railways spoke only for himself. I wish that more of his colleagues had spoken for themselves instead of for Sir William Van Horne and the autocrats of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I am as patriotic as the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), who always seems ready to get behind the breastworks of the Canadian Pacific Railway when Vice-President Shaughnessy throws up the semaphore and signals the friends of the Canadian Pacific Railway into active service. The hon. Minister of Public Works talks about keeping Canadian ore for Canadian smelters. There is an easy way, and the hon. Minister knows it, to do this. An export duty on Canadian ores will do that work, an export duty on Canadian ores will build up Canadian industries; but from all I can gather from the remarks of the Minister of Public Works, he is only in favour of building up Canadian industries when he can, at the same time, build up the fortunes of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway must surely be a hard taskmaster when this great national Government is afraid to come down out of the grand stand into the field and take a hand in the fight for the rights of the Canadians of the Boundary Creek country. The wing of the angel Government that the Minister of Public Works speaks for seems to be content to leave these Boundary Creek Canadians of ours at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We are told, we have been told a dozen times, that the Canadian Pacific Railway is pledged to build the line into the Boundary Creek district. We are also told that the Canadians of the Boundary Creek country need have no fear that they will be oppressed. Oh, no. The Minister of Public Works tells these Canadians who ask them for their rights that the Government have the power to protect them, that the Government has the power to control and will control the freight rates. Why, Sir, it is a question in my mind whether this Government has entire control of its own actions,

Mr. OLIVER.

in cases where the interests of the country conflict with the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am trying to deal with this question as I would like to be dealt with were I a free miner in the Boundary Creek country instead of a free member of Parliament sitting in my place in this House of Commons at Ottawa. All I have to say is that I would sooner take my chances of letting Mr. Corbin regulate the Canadian Pacific Railway by a competing line than of waiting until a Government dominated by the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of the Interior regulated the Canadian Pacific Railway with any scheme for reducing freight rates. This cant, Mr. Speaker, about Canadian trade being diverted will have to be revised when the Canadian Pacific Railway breaks into Spokane, as it assuredly will on its own account. I am not a prophet, nor am I the son of a prophet, and I do not expect to sit in this Parliament for many years. But I do expect to sit here long enough to see the Canadian Pacific Railway build a line from the Kootenay down into Spokane and threaten to take the trade of this country into the United States by that route unless this Government extends its line to Vancouver with the country's money. I believe that the hon. leaders of the Opposition in this House are throwing great discredit on the good old Tory policy and principle of protection when they insist that this Boundary Creek district and its people shall be handed over body and soul to the tender mercies of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The resources of the Conservative trade policy would have been sufficient to smite the American smelter.

But now it seems to me as if it were part of the Canadian policy to smash the Canadian miner by any freight rates that the Canadian Pacific Railway may choose to exact. I am in sympathy with the Conservative trade policy. I believe in protection. But I also believe in justice, and if this measure of justice fails to secure the approval of this Parliament, such a result will, in my judgment, indicate that it will be useless for any one to come to Ottawa looking for justice from this high court of Parliament when the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway can be secured by injustice.

House divided :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Beith,	Landerkin,
Belcourt,	Lang,
Blair,	Lavergne,
Eastock,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brodeur,	McCormick,
Burnett,	McGregor,
Cargill,	McGugan,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McHugh,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Morrison,
Christie,	Mulock,
Clarke,	Oliver.

Cowan,
Dobell,
Domville,
Erb,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Godbout,
Graham,
Guité,
Jameson,
Kloepfer,

Paterson,
Penny,
Quinn,
Rinfret,
Robertson,
Russell,
Semple,
Sifton,
Talbot,
Tisdale, and
Wood (Hamilton).—44.

NAYS .

Messieurs

Angers,
Bazinet,
Beattie,
Beausoleil,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bertram,
Bourassa,
Cameron,
Carroll,
Champagne,
Chauvin,
Choquette,
Clancy,
Cochrane,
Copp,
Davin,
Dechene,
Douglas,
Dugas,
Earle,
Ethier,
Foster,
Frost,
Ganong,
Gauthier,
Gauvreau,
Gilmour,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hale,
Haley,
Henderson

Hodgins,
Joly de Lotbinière
(Sir Henri),
Klock,
LaRivière,
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Macdonald (King's),
MacPherson,
McAlister,
McCleary,
McClure,
McDougall,
McInerney,
McInnes,
McIsaac,
Malouin
Marcotte,
Martin,
Maxwell,
Mignault,
Mills,
Morin,
Powell,
Proulx,
Savard,
Sproule,
Tarte,
Turcot,
Wallace,
Wilson, and
Wood (Brockville).—64.

Amendments negatived.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has not voted.

Mr. TAYLOR. The chief whip of the Government and myself have standing pairs on all questions when either one is not present.

Mr. FLINT. The hon. member for North Wellington has not voted.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am paired with the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Livingston). He was in favour of the Bill; I am against it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) has not voted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I shall be pleased to vote if I am allowed, but I entered while the vote was being taken.

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to have your opinion, then.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend wishes, I will volunteer the

statement that if I had had the privilege of voting, I would have supported the Bill.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I am paired with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). If I had voted I should have voted for the Bill.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 44) An Act to confirm an agreement between the St. Stephen and Milltown Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

Bill (No. 45) An Act respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

Bill (No. 87)—(from the Senate)—for the relief of Robert Augustus Baldwin Hart.—(Mr. Landarkin.)

NICKEL STEEL COMPANY BILL.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Nickel Steel Company of Canada.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Before this Bill goes into committee, I ask that it be reprinted, because it was so amended in the Private Bills Committee that I think the father of the Bill himself would not recognize his child. I do not think it would be fair to ask this House to consider this Bill without its being reprinted.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press that Bill in its present shape. It is utter chaos to one who has not been in the Committee, and it had better be reprinted.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I have no objection, but I have seen other Bills pass through committee having quite as many alterations. I think the alterations are very few.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend will get ahead just as fast if he has it reprinted.

Motion withdrawn.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed consideration of adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. SPROULE. When you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was dealing with one of the acts of the present Government, which I

said would have been better left undone, that of reducing the interest on the poor man's deposits in the savings banks of the country. I said then, and I repeat now, that I regard it as one of the duties of the Government to hold out every inducement possible to the poor man or the labouring man, to economize and to save the proceeds of his labour. For that purpose it was decided many years ago that savings banks should be established where a reasonable rate of interest would be offered to the poor man who put his money there. This was done for two reasons, first, to induce him to save his money and work harder, and secondly, because he is always a bad financier, for after he has earned his money he does not know well how to invest it, to save it for himself or to get a proper return. For that reason the Government assumed the duty of looking after the financing of his money and giving him a fair interest on it. But this Government have seen fit on two occasions within the last twenty months, to reduce the interest upon the poor man's money, the first time on the 30th of last June, and the second time will be the 1st of the coming July. The first time they reduced the interest from 3½ to 3 per cent, and now they are going to reduce it from 3 to 2½ per cent; so that the depositor gets the magnificent return in the shape of interest upon his deposits of 2½ per cent, although if you went to any bank in this country to borrow money, you would have to pay at least 7 or 8 per cent. I believe that to be a unsound principle. But the Minister of Finance said that the depositors in the savings banks can in no sense be regarded as poor men, and he drew attention to the aggregate of those deposits to show that a great many of them at least were made by wealthy men instead of poor men. Now, in looking up the return I found that these deposits were made by a large number of people, that though the aggregate of the deposits was large, the amounts standing to the credit of the depositors individually were in the main very small. I have here a return from the Public Accounts, and I find that there are in this country 779 post office savings banks, the number of depositors is 135,737, the average amount deposited by each of these depositors is \$238.55.

I respectfully submit that it must be regarded as evidence of the amount of deposits and that they are made by poor people, when the average amount at the credit of each of those 135,357 is only \$238.55. This amount represents the small savings of poor people, labourers, servant girls, widows and orphans, who have endeavoured to save money which may prove useful in case of need. The number of depositors this year is 161,151, and I give the figures to show that the amount of deposits is very small and they must belong to the poor class, \$51.02 being the average deposit. And yet the Finance Minister considers he

Mr. SPROULE.

is justified in reducing the interest on that amount deposited by labourers and servant girls and orphans to 2½ per cent. If he were in a similar position, would he act in that way? For what purpose was this reduction made? It was for the purpose of giving what he called the inner circle, or men who control large capital, the power to dictate terms to the banks in the country when they wish to borrow money. That is no justifiable defence, and this is one of the acts that will never redound to the credit of even the Finance Minister or the Government of the day, because as I have already explained these poor people are not so well able to invest their money as are capitalists and others. So it is necessary to provide some place where their savings will be secure and where they will obtain a moderate return on their deposits. This they do not receive at the present time, and this action on the part of the Government was one they had better have left undone.

There are some other things that the Government had better have left undone. They made two distinct free gifts of valuable rights to other countries and got nothing in return. What were they? They made concessions to Great Britain and to other countries coming under certain terms as regards the duties, but the principal concession was made in the interest of the mother country. England did not ask Canada to make this reduction in the tariff. She treated us no better than any other country with respect to our trade, and it was distinctly unfair to the people of the Dominion that the Government should make concessions without getting anything in return, especially when they were made in such a generous fashion. So long as they are custodians of the people's rights and control public affairs, it is not right for the Government of the day to give away anything belonging to the people of Canada without getting something in return or in lieu thereof. First, the Government made this concession to England and English colonies. They followed that up by making a free gift to the West Indies; they extended their charity to countries that did not want their charity. It is very well to be charitable with respect to your own goods, but when the Government are using the goods of the country it is a wrong principle to follow, and the electors of Canada will not justify this action when it is submitted to them, and they have the opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it. We have been asked by the Minister of Finance to extend the most-favoured-nation clause to our tariff as regards the West India islands. For what reason? Not because they have done anything for us, but because financially they have been rather in an unfavourable position, and England expressed a wish that something might be done for those islands. How do the West Indies treat us in trade matters?

We want to send our cheese there. Jamaica charges a duty of one penny per pound; Bahamas, 12s. 6d. per 100 pounds; Trinidad, 1d. per pound; Granada, 7½ per cent; Barbados, 8s. 4d. per 100 pounds. I find that one colony charges 8s. 4d., another 8s. 4d., another 15 per cent and another 2 cents per pound. We also want to send our flour there. The duties are 8s. per barrel, 2s. 6d., 3s. 4d., 4s. 2d., 4s., 6s., 5s., 4s. 6d. Bermuda, 15 per cent; British Guiana, \$1 per barrel. On potatoes and butter and some other articles we are compelled to pay similar duties. The West Indies give us no advantages that they do not give to every country. Why, then, should we give them special advantages which the Finance Minister proposes by making a reduction of 25 per cent off the duty on sugar sent from the West Indies to Canada? We should not take this action, first, because we are giving away something that does not belong to us; and second, because we are giving a valuable consideration and receiving nothing in return. So with respect to the concessions to England. We have got no right to give away privileges unless we get something in return, and that is a principle which the Government should always keep in view.

There are some things which the Government should have done and which they have not done. Why did they not place an export duty on nickel? That is one of the lines in which we believe Canadian trade can be stimulated, and a very strong pressure was brought to bear on the Government to impose such an export duty, but they treated all these appeals with deaf ears and paid no attention to them, and that industry has been labouring under disadvantages during the last two or three years. This might have been done with great advantage, but it was left undone.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). They will do it all right.

Mr. SPROULE. We would have expected the announcement to have been made by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech, because that was the proper time to make it.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). It was not necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. The consensus of opinion, undoubtedly, would be that the announcement should be made when the Budget speech was delivered. It is true they may yet do it, but so far they have given no intimation that they intend to carry it out.

The Government might have imposed an import duty on lumber. The lumbermen of the country have been applying to them vigorously for the imposition of such a duty. They sent a memorial, which I hold in my hand, and it states the situation very plainly. It is as follows:—

Dear Sir,—The Lumberman's Association of Ontario has instructed me to send you a copy (printed within) of a petition presented by the western lumbermen of Canada, to the Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, setting forth the injustice under which the lumbering trade of Canada is now labouring, on account of American lumber being allowed to come into this country free of duty, while the Dingley Bill puts a heavy tax on Canadian lumber going into the States.

The association of Ontario are in entire sympathy with the views expressed in the said petition, and they pray that you will use your influence to have the duty put on American lumber equal to that imposed by the Dingley Bill on Canadian lumber.

Yours respectfully,

(Sgd.) J. B. MILLER,

Sec.-Treas.

I expected to hear the Minister of Finance announce that the Government had decided to put a duty upon lumber, because I could hardly imagine that they would leave that great Canadian industry—great throughout Canada, and particularly great in Ontario—to struggle under its adverse conditions. We allow the Americans to take our logs out of our country free of export duty. We allow them to saw them in Michigan and send them back here, in the shape of manufactured lumber, free of duty. We allow the Americans to do all this to the detriment of our own country, and yet, while they put a duty of \$2 a thousand on our sawn lumber, we allow their lumber to come free into Canada. I could hardly have believed that the Government could allow this condition of things to exist. This petition to the right hon the Premier says:

The peculiar condition of the lumber trade of Canada, suffering, as it now is, from unfriendly legislation by the neighbouring republic, is in an entirely opposite position from what it was when the lumbermen of north-western Ontario and Manitoba had the pleasure of appearing before the Tariff Commission at Winnipeg. Before that commission we stated that we had no grievance and no complaint to make against the tariff. Rough lumber and lumber dressed one side was on the free list, and this was fair and equitable, as the United States then had rough lumber on their free list, and our statement was, that so long as the United States admitted lumber free that the Canadian Government should do the same, but should the United States Government impose an import duty on lumber, it was the duty of your Government to impose a similar duty. The latter condition has arisen, the United States has passed an Act which not only imposes a duty on lumber but presumes to punish by imposing double duty on the lumber of any foreign country which may impose an export duty on logs. Under these circumstances we ask the Government to impose an import duty on lumber entering Canada.

Our position is not changed since appearing before the Tariff Commission at Winnipeg. We believe in free lumber if it is reciprocal, but we object to the one-sided condition of affairs that at present exists, and believe that by meeting them in the same spirit they themselves display the desired condition of free lumber on both sides

of the line will be sooner reached than by giving them free access to our markets, which they are now allowed to enjoy. We believe that the vigorous policy of the Ontario Government, if supplemented by the imposition of an import duty on lumber, will bring to the front an influential and numerous body of men in the United States who will exert sufficient influence to bring about the desired condition of free lumber in both countries.

Some anxiety has been expressed that in Manitoba and the Territories a raise in the price of lumber would result from an import duty; this would not be the case, the price would remain as it is, but the trade which is now divided to a very large extent would then flow naturally to Canadian mills, giving employment to many thousands of Canadians (instead of, as at present, this labour going to foreigners), and give increased trade to Canadian merchants and manufacturers. If Canadians have any trade or calling which is capable of being called their national calling, we think it is that of producing lumber, and they can be depended upon to keep the prices at a reasonable rate through competition. Lumber is widely diffused, and no corner has ever been successfully formed in lumber either in Canada or the United States. It has been the experience of the trade that if lumber from any cause becomes scarce and the price abnormal, it springs from all points of the compass to fill the demand and reduce the price. It is quite generally accepted as a fact that large portions of the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories are treeless, but nature has provided within their own limits, extensive tracts of timber, which supply mills at Whitemouth, Selkirk, Winnipeg, Brandon, Dauphin, Rapid City, Calgary, Edmonton, Prince Albert, and numerous other points in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. To supplement these sources of supply are the inexhaustible forests of British Columbia. To the east are extensive mills at Keewatin, Rat Portage, Savanne, Fort William and Port Arthur, and further east are the mills on Georgian Bay, which are now shut out of the American market and anxious to ship lumber to Manitoba. We might say that many millions of Georgian Bay lumber have been shipped to Manitoba and the Territories. With all these sources of supply, operated by as enterprising lumbermen as any in the world, it would seem to us unreasonable to conclude that it is necessary to divide the limited home market of Canada with the United States lumbermen for fear of high prices, which cannot nor will not occur, except in the minds of men who do not understand the conditions. It is a great hardship to have the markets of the neighbouring republic shut to us, and besides have to divide our market with the United States lumbermen. We can compete with them, and do compete, but with Canada treated as a dumping ground, and foreign railways granting rates on traffic consigned to Canada much more favourable than they grant their own countrymen similarly situated, we cannot more than compete on even terms trade naturally divided. As further evidence that no attempt would be made to advance the price in Manitoba or the Territories, we would state that all lumber is sold at one price, and that price is the Winnipeg price, and although there are many points in Manitoba, and the whole of the North-west Territories, which cannot be reached by American lumber, owing to the fact that the American and Canadian railways do not pro rate their freight charges, and all

Mr. SPROULE.

this territory is entirely dependent on Canadian mills for their lumber. Still, each and every point so situated is supplied at the Winnipeg price, which is the centre of railway competition and the lowest price in the province.

The mills at Rat Portage and Fort William shipped lumber to the United States, and would have continued to do so had it not been for the imposition of the United States duty, in fact the mills at Savanne were built with a view to shipping to the United States. The mills at Fort William devoted all their attention to the American market, and last season, owing to the threatened impost of United States duty, the mills at Fort William were idle, the logs sawed in the United States, and to illustrate how the Canadian market is whip-sawed, as it were, the Fort William people, although sawing in Duluth, were able to market a portion of their lumber in Sarnia, Ont., thus proving that the Canadian market can be divided with ease by a country of pronounced antagonism to our lumber trade. These mills, like all Canadian mills, are shut out of the United States, and are besides forced to divide a limited home market with American lumbermen. There is twice as much plant in north-western Ontario and Manitoba as would suffice to supply the home market, which is a strong argument that competition will keep the price reasonable.

We also protest against lumber being the only important industry allowed to be subject to free trade, more particularly when there is no reciprocal treatment by the United States. Our market is divided with foreigners, and everything we use, such as machinery, belting, oil, pork, and food and farm products, &c., are highly taxed.

Much capital is invested in the lumber business which is now greatly impaired by the existing of tariff arrangements, and we ask for relief at the hands of your Government. So far as the mills of north-western Ontario, Manitoba and the North-west Territories are concerned, it is not more money per thousand that is required, it is more sales; this is in your power to grant, with great benefit to a large number of Canadians, and to the detriment of no citizen of our country.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the lumber trade of western Canada.

(Sgd.) J. B. MILLER.

That letter expresses the wishes and the wants of the lumbermen of this country; it expresses the wishes of these gentlemen who control a great deal of capital and employ a large number of men. We know, by painful experience in the Georgian Bay district, what it costs to Canada that there is neither an import duty on lumber nor an export duty on logs. The logs are taken from Canada by the hundreds and thousands, sawn in the United States by American workmen, and our own labourers are deprived of the employment which rightly belongs to them. That vast amount of money is taken out of Canada, which should properly be spent at home. To-day we see the Georgian Bay mills idle by the dozen, and towns that were as busy as hives, a few years ago, are to-day as silent as the grave. The machinery is idle, the mills are closed, there are no workmen congregated there, and the raw material of Canada is taken

away to enrich the Americans, while they, in return for all this benefit, impose a duty of \$2 per thousand on our lumber. That, Sir, in my judgment, is wrong. The Government were willing to cater to the lumbermen before, but they now turn a deaf ear to them, and they allow the anomaly to continue, to the disadvantage of our country.

Now, Sir, when the Minister of Finance made his Budget speech, a year ago, he told us that the object of the Government was to attack the combines, and that, where it was made clear to them that an article was under a combine, they would take the duty off that article. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance why he does not take the duty off Spanish sole leather. That article is under a combine to-day. I have letters from gentlemen who are in the trade, and they tell me they are unable to sell one dollar's worth of that leather, unless they go into that combine. They have also told me that they sent a letter to the Minister of Finance, representing these facts, and asked him to take action for their relief. A year ago, the Minister of Finance stated that he would take the duty off any article that was under a combine, if it was brought to his attention. This matter has now been brought to his attention, and why does he not take the duty off? Several letters have been sent to hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. I think the gentleman who wrote to me said he sent one to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). That hon. gentleman was very vigorous in attacking these combines when he was in Opposition, and in declaring that when he got into power he would take the duty off and leave them to the open competition of the world; but now that he is in power, he fails to do it, and the fact is brought to his attention. I have on the Order paper a Bill to deal with these combines, but at this late stage of the session and with the limited time at the disposal of private members I do not hope to reach it unless the Government will be kind enough to take it under their wing. If they would, and help to carry it through, I think it would go a long way to break up these combines.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it would be a proper thing to ask here if the Ministers named have received these letters?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). You must not interrupt my hon. friend.

Mr. SPROULE. Before we part from that, it would be interesting to the House to know if these letters were received, because I have a letter from Mr. Smith saying that he sent them, one to the Finance Minister and one to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and asked for relief.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will not say that the letters have not been re-

ceived. I have had a large mass of correspondence of late, some of which I have not yet been able to overtake. I have at present no recollection of receiving such a letter; but if the hon. gentleman says that it was sent to me, I certainly will not contradict him.

Mr. SPROULE. It has been overlooked or neglected or disregarded, and I do not know which is the greater crime. I made a statement before six o'clock with reference to the hon. member for South Oxford, and I referred to a letter written by him to the Patrons of Industry, which I had not in my hand at that time. I find that that letter was written by Sir Richard Cartwright to a Patron in the county of Lennox, and was dated the 1st of October, 1894. In March, 1894, the duty on agricultural implements was reduced from 35 per cent to 20 per cent, and the hon. gentleman represented that the tariff was still high on the farmers, and ought to be reduced.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). May I ask my hon. friend, does he say that the tariff was reduced in 1894 on all agricultural implements? It was reduced on some, certainly not on all.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that the reduction had been made on agricultural implements—I did not say on how many or how few; but I drew attention to the fact that his letter was written after the duty was reduced from 35 to 20 per cent, and he claimed that the taxes on the farmers should be further reduced.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What I stated was a somewhat different thing. I did not ask for a further reduction in the case of those articles that had been reduced to 20 per cent. My objections always had been to the higher rates of duty.

Mr. SPROULE. That is practically what it was—a reduction of the higher rate of duty.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It was not reduced on all agricultural implements.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman did not say whether he wanted the duty reduced on few or many. He said in that letter:

I know, no man better, how enormously the real taxes paid by farmers and all wage-earners have been increased of late years.

That letter was written to show the farmers that the taxation they were paying was very heavy, and it was written after the reduction had been made from 35 to 20 per cent. Therefore, it must have applied to

the tariff when it was at 20 per cent on agricultural implements as a general thing. I think it bears out the statement I made with regard to the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not in the least.

Mr. SPROULE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to continue this debate much longer, because I have said about what I wished to say. I have only to repeat that so far as the present Government have disturbed the duty, they have done it in the wrong direction. As an example of that, they took the duty off barbed wire, closed up the factory at Lachine and threw 400 men out of employment, while they did not reduce the price of barbed wire one cent to the farmer, because it is sold at 2½ cents to-day, the same as it was before the duty was taken off. They also closed up, I believe, two other factories.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Does the hon. gentleman say that barbed wire is sold to-day at 2½ cents?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes. Only one week ago to-morrow, I inquired at the hardware store where I have bought barbed wire for several years, and I had to pay exactly the same price.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Well, it must be by the single pound, because barbed wire is a cent a pound less than it was last year.

Mr. SPROULE. That must be by wholesale.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I am talking of the retail price. I have bought barbed wire for several years, and I know what I am talking about. It is the retail price the farmer has to pay, and that price is the same this year as it was last year, notwithstanding the fact that the Government by their act have thrown 400 men out of employment and destroyed the capital invested in the machinery of these factories. So far as they have left the tariff as it was, it has worked all right; no complaint is made to-day, and the greatest justification they can offer for their tariff is that it was much the same as you had it when your party was in power. The difference between their professions before coming to power and their practices after coming to power suggest one of two things: either that they did not know what was needed before they came to power, or else they were dishonest, and for the purpose of convincing the people of the country that a change was necessary they deluded them with promises to reduce the tariff in all these lines, and then failed to do it; or else they were not well informed, and when they came into power the new condition of things compelled them to leave the tariff as it was before. I say that in so far as they

Mr. SPROULE.

have made changes these were in the wrong direction; but in so far as they have carried out the policy of their predecessors, they have done right. The conduct of these hon. gentlemen has gone far to destroy the confidence of the people in the honesty and integrity of the public men of Canada. If these men did the same things in private life or in connection with private corporations, they would not be recognized as respectable in any part of the country; their word would not be taken as worth anything, and they could not be regarded as reliable men in any line of life. But they seem to think they can do these things with impunity in connection with the Government of the country. I say that is distinctly wrong. It tends to destroy at the fountain-head the respect which we ought to have for human integrity, honesty and truthfulness. If a public man can with impunity state one thing to mislead the electors or to induce them to support something that he does not believe in or intend to carry out, and then when he comes into power fails to carry it out, his conduct destroys the confidence we ought to have in humanity, and tends to lower our public men in the estimation of the people. That is the exact position of the present Government to-day. Many of their own friends, and their best friends, declare that they were either dishonest and untruthful in the past, or else they are ignorant and incompetent and do not know what the country requires when charged with the responsibilities of Government. I think they should take a lesson in time. Let them try to elevate, if possible, the standard of morality, honesty, integrity and business principle which should actuate every man—and no one more than the politician—who for the time being is charged with controlling the affairs of the nation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). My hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sproule) seems very positive that nobody in Canada has any confidence in the present Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, not later than the day before yesterday an election was held and the electors were called on to say whether they had confidence in us or not.

Mr. FOSTER. They voted confidence in public works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They did the day before yesterday, as no doubt they will in future, vote confidence in our policy. Our friends on the other side took off their coats and fought the battle to the best of their ability, but as usual they were badly beaten.

Mr. MILLS. We cannot run an election on prayers.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is not your fashion.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** That is not the only by-election we have had since the general election, and at every by-election our hon. friends opposite were defeated. My hon. friend is quite sure that everything we have done has been badly done.

Mr. SPROULE. Not everything.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** Well, nearly everything. He says that our policy, as regards manufacturing interests, has especially been a very bad one indeed. Well, let the leaders of the Opposition go to the great city of Montreal and see what is going on there. Let them consider the great cotton industry, for instance, which was going, they said, to be destroyed by us. What has been the experience of that industry last year? In one mill at Valleyfield—and I have no reason to speak too kindly of that mill—the output was increased in one year by the amount of \$200,000. What was the reason of that increase? Because by our policy we have stimulated their energy. We cut down the duty a little, and they started to work up foreign markets. I was told a few days ago by the manager that they have begun to export cotton, and that last year they sold \$200,000 more worth of cotton than during the previous year. That is, indeed, not a very bad showing.

Mr. WALLACE. They have more protection to-day than they had previously.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** They have less. I know there has been an increase of duty on American cotton, but our policy is Canada for the Canadians, and not for the Americans. I was just about to allude to the great iron industry.

Mr. WALLACE. Before the hon. gentleman goes on to iron, I would like an answer on the cotton question. I said that the duty was increased.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I think I have already answered the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. The duty was increased both on British importations and American.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I must protest, Mr. Speaker, against these interruptions. I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman when he spoke, and I expect the same courtesy from him. I was alluding to the great iron industry, which hon. gentlemen opposite also said our policy was going to destroy. What has been the result of our policy? Mr. McMaster, whom the ex-Minister of Finance knows well, and who is not one of our political friends, will tell him that last year they largely increased their output. Their works have been going day and night, and they are employing a very large number of men.

I see that my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) is very solicitous about the workmen from Montreal. Let me tell him that the workmen of Montreal have more work to-day than they ever had during the past twelve or fifteen years. The country deserves to be congratulated on its present condition. Our financial credit is as high, if not higher, than it has ever been. Our manufacturing classes are very prosperous, and our great agricultural community has had a very satisfactory year indeed. Our friends are aware of all that, and therefore have not ventured to grapple directly with our policy, but have tried side issues, and have done their best to belittle our railway policy. Of course, they could not pass by what they called "the Drummond County deal," and the leader of the Opposition went not only fully, but violently, into that matter. What did he say? He said that there was altogether too much Greenshields in it, that we were all sold to that gentleman. I am always surprised when I hear a gentleman of his standing rushing into such rash statements. I can understand irresponsible members of the House—there are some—saying anything that may come into their minds, but I am very much surprised that the hon. leader of the Opposition should have done so. I am sorry he is not in his seat, but I invite him to come up to the committee room upstairs, where he will be made welcome, and there repeat his statement. We all know that he is not very scrupulous in his statements, that his words are always big, his sentences always very long and sounding, and his gestures always very sweeping. Well, there is one thing which I invite him to do. I invite him to come upstairs to the committee, and there bring forward the proof of what he has said. I see that my hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) is smiling. I like him when he smiles; he does not smile every day. I invite him also to attend that committee, because he also made statements concerning that Drummond matter which he cannot prove, and which he knows he cannot prove. He made them outside this House; he has been sufficiently prudent not to make them free. Well, I challenge him—he is now face to face with me—to make these statements. He dare not do so. Nobody will do so except irresponsible men. O'Connell, speaking one day of one of his opponents, said: "I think that he is a worthy heir-at-law of the blasphemous thief and liar who died on the cross." Of course, it would not be parliamentary for me to apply those expressions to any member of this House, not even to the one I see before me to-day, but I would call the attention of the House to this fact. There is nothing easier than to slander. Any man with no ability, any villain, can slander any public man; but when it comes to proving his statements, that is a little more difficult. An hon. gentleman who spoke yes-

terday—I allude to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett); perhaps I should not pay attention to him, but the "Hansard" is there and the people may not always know with whom they have to deal—made a statement that aggravated me. I replied that it was not true, and that the hon. gentleman knew it was not true, and I of course was out of order, and had to withdraw the charge, because it was not parliamentary. What the hon. gentleman said is this:

Did he not last year see a Minister under an obligation to a great railway corporation, under a pecuniary obligation, as the Minister of Public Works was, to the Drummond County Railway?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). It is not true. But say it all the same.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman says it was not true that he was under an obligation to the Drummond County Railway.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not one dollar.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, we have had the evidence of one gentleman that he owed them \$20,000.

It was a definite statement. I immediately told him:

Not fifty cents. It is not true, and the hon. gentleman knows it.

Well, now, certainly he has repeated this very statement in another form, and it is not more true in that form than it was in the other. He stated that, in the "Hansard" of last year, I had admitted that I was indebted to the Drummond County Railway for \$20,000. I spoke on this question on the 2nd June, last year, and I have the "Hansard" here containing what I said. Let any hon. gentleman of good faith read what I said, and I am sure he will say that there is not one word there such as the hon. gentleman has stated. But, in his statement yesterday, he said that one witness before the Drummond County Railway said that I was indebted to that company for the amount of \$20,000. The only gentleman who was heard on that point before the committee up-stairs, was Mr. Greenshields. Allow me to quote a few words of what he said:

In regard to the "La Patrie" statement, I may premise by stating that in no instance was one single dollar ever, either directly or indirectly, either of the Drummond County Railway or my own, given to Mr. Tarte himself or to his sons, or "La Patrie" or anybody else.

Well, Sir, that is a very clear statement, and, in the face of such a statement, I want to know how any gentleman worthy of being a member of this Chamber can dare to slander me any more. There are two committees appointed, one by the House of Commons, and one by another branch of this legislature, and I challenge any member of this House to go before either of them and prove that what Mr. Greenshields has said is not true. I will not say anything

Mr. TARTE.

more on that question. I will only add this: Why can we not in this House discuss public questions without slandering each other? We may differ among ourselves; we cannot all hold the same opinion. But I want to know why we should not discuss questions like gentlemen, without trying to damage each other's reputation. I have found this out, Sir, that the newspaper men and the public men who do not speak the truth, do not improve their reputations or their positions very much. I am an old newspaper man, and I have learned to fear the newspaper when it speaks the truth. But, when it says what is not true, I do not fear it, for truth, like water, will find its level. There is no public man who has been more slandered than I have, but I have not been killed. My hon. friends on the other side do not gain very much by the work they have tried to do against me. They have lost a good deal. I made up my mind—and I will make up my mind in the future, as I have in the past—I have made up my mind, that when I am right, I am not to be put down. I have made up my mind, that I have a right to my reputation, and that nobody can take it away from me. Well, Sir, enough of personal matters.

The leader of the Opposition has spoken very fully of our railway policy. I was very much surprised indeed to hear him say that the Intercolonial Railway could never compete with the Short Line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Is that a correct statement? If so, on whom does the responsibility rest? In 1887 the Conservative party were in power, and I was with them then. What did our party do? We voted a subsidy of \$250,000 a year for twenty years to build the Short Line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then, if the hon. leader of the Opposition is right, that the Intercolonial Railway cannot compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway Short Line, the Conservative party is responsible for it—they have simply voted to destroy that national property. But I hold that the leader of the Opposition is altogether astray. The hon. gentleman speaks of distances, and says it is 247 miles longer by the Intercolonial Railway than by the Canadian Pacific Railway. But distance is not everything. Is it not a fact? Does not my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) know, having been a party to the vote, that this \$250,000 a year to the Canadian Pacific Railway was for the purpose of building up the port of St. John, as against the port of Portland? That cannot be denied. And still, there is a longer distance from the port of Montreal to St. John than from Montreal to these American ports. Now, the argument of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is altogether wrong, and the best evidence of it is that, during the last winter, the port of St. John has had more trade than it ever had. They have trebled their trade, and we hope in the future to have it a great deal more. But

the leader of the Opposition takes a deep interest in the fine old city of Quebec. I remember very well the magnificent speeches he delivered to us at Quebec, particularly about the bridge. The hon. gentleman was then High Commissioner. He started from London to come to the old city of Quebec to promise us the bridge. That was ten years ago. My hon. friends from Quebec will remember, I am sure, that one of our opponents, Mr. Chateauvert, gave a promissory note before the election that the bridge would be built immediately, the Government being ready to vote a million dollars for it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. But he never paid the note.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, Sir, ten years have gone by, and the hon. gentleman, who came to Quebec and made that speech, has repeated it to-day. He is ready, now that he cannot do anything else, to make big speeches, and make big promises; he is ready to vote a million for the Quebec bridge. In a former speech I said what I will repeat to-night—that I have every confidence that the Liberal party will celebrate its victory in the next general election on the Quebec bridge. By extending the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal, we have in no way interfered with the prospects of the bridge. We have simply secured direct communication between the west and the east.

I need not say much more, as the question before the Chair has been threshed out thoroughly by many members of the House before me. I only wanted to put myself right once more in respect to these personal matters to which I have been obliged to allude. I dislike very much to allude to myself, but I am accused in such a free way that at times I feel it is due, not perhaps to myself, but to my friends, who have confidence in me, to put myself right before Parliament. I cannot complain of the support which has been given me. My hon. friends opposite have been after my scalp during the last six years because I thought proper to part company with them. Well, I parted company with them because I thought it was time for me to do so. I am very sorry that they have taken it so much to heart. I think we might continue to be good friends. I am not the only political man in the world who has changed his opinions, men much more able than I have done so. But it appears that in the Conservative party to-day we must either believe or die. Well, Mahomet is no more, and his maxim has no chance of surviving here. I shall not die. I will try to live as long as possible, in spite of all attempts of the hon. gentlemen opposite to kill me.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not think that the debate on the Budget makes many converts, at least in the House of Commons, but I do

think that it makes many converts in the country at large. When Pope wrote his remarkable essay on Critics, and said:

'Tis with our judgments as with our watches,
none

Go just alike, yet each believes his own.

I believe he must have had in his mind the two political parties in England, and it may apply to the two political parties in Canada as well. I regret, indeed, my inability to speak fluently the language of the majority of this House, and I will ask the indulgence of the members, if I occasionally refer to some notes I have before me.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear. Vous le parlez bien.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was reported, not long ago, Mr. Speaker, in a now famous correspondence, that there existed in this Dominion such a province as "ambitious Nova Scotia." I feel, certainly, that there will be no dissenting voice this evening, when I say that Nova Scotia might well be called ambitious, after the array of brilliant and distinguished sons she has given this country, on both sides of the House. Indeed, inordinate ambition must be restrained; but ambition, which is a desire to excellence, of superiority, when based upon talent, upon patriotism and true loyalty, is not only legitimate, it is praiseworthy. This was my first thought the other day, when listening to the masterly speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Finance, and when joining with this side of the House in the hearty cheers that greeted his eloquent peroration. His Budget speech, Mr. Speaker, must have been a relief for the unfortunate readers of the Conservative press, who, for the last twenty years, have been taught by hon. gentlemen on the other side, that the banner of the Liberal party was nothing else but the signal of distress and ruin. Sir, let us be fair. True it is, that under the Mackenzie Government there were deficits, for the occurrence of which our party suffered defeat at the polls. But it is also a matter of history that the deficits of that eventful period were not caused by the unwise administration of public affairs. Impartial history will declare, that, on the contrary, they were due to the great commercial depression which at that time was felt, not only in our country, but throughout the world.

The veteran leaders who for twenty years stood bravely the brunt of the battle have been completely vindicated by the great success achieved by the Liberal policy during the past two years. Sir, what is the record of the present Government for the two last fiscal years? In 1896-97, for which we are only partly responsible, there was a deficit of \$519,981. In 1897-98 there is a surplus of \$551,000, making in all a net surplus of \$31,000. I will not venture to compare these two years with the administration of public affairs by the Conservative party. Comparisons, we all know, are very often, if not

always, odious, and I would rather be cheerful than sad. Nothing, I am sure, would convey more melancholy to the hon. gentlemen opposite than my reference to the various deficits incurred by them from 1878 to the 23rd of June, 1896. Suffice it to say, that in 1894-95 there was a deficit amounting to a little over \$4,153,000; in 1895-96 there was another of \$330,000, making in all a total deficit of \$4,484,000. The hon. gentlemen opposite cannot explain these figures, unless they admit an extravagant expenditure during their tenure of office. One can hardly understand their vituperations against this party, when we all know their methods of government and their reckless administration of the public funds. It has been said, during the debate on the Yukon Railway Bill, that the party opposite was the happy possessor of that indisputable quality called the instinct of government. That my hon. friends opposite have enjoyed too long the confidence of Canadian electors, I am ready to admit. Granted also, that during the last twenty years they have displayed, to a certain degree, their so-called instinct of government; but, on the other hand, they have displayed to a much higher degree the instinct of expenditure and taxation.

Mr. DAVIN. And now you exceed us.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend reminds me of the garrulous and gossiping old lady, of whom the Latin poet said: "Lassata necdum satiata."

At the end of the financial year 1878, when Mr. Mackenzie went out of office, the net debt of the Dominion was \$140,362,069.91.

At the end of the Conservative regime in 1896, the national debt stood close upon \$250,000,000, an increase of nearly \$110,000,000.

The expenditure which in 1878 amounted to \$23,503,158, had reached nearly \$40,000,000 in 1896.

On the other hand, if we look at the net taxes paid by the Canadian consumer during that same period of time, we find that in 1877 the total taxation amounted to \$17,841,938—whilst in 1896 it amounted to \$28,000,000 in round figures.

This is, Sir, the record of the Conservative party during their eighteen years uninterrupted lease of power. I charge the hon. gentlemen with having advocated and maintained a policy, which, in the language of the resolutions of 1893, did not only tend to promote extravagance, but which decreased the value of farms, oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few, checked immigration, caused a great loss of population, impeded commerce, and above all discriminated against Great Britain, the mother country.

The Liberal party has not yet unrooted all the evils which during that time flourished in our political soil. Reformers, in all times, in all countries, did not remove obstacles,

Mr. LEMIEUX.

did not wipe out abuses at one fell swoop. The effort of to-day calls forth the effort of to-morrow, and nothing is perfect until the ideal is attained.

Yet, Sir, imperfect as we are, as all human associations are, the Liberal party can claim some credit for the many reforms it has accomplished in such a short period of time.

The tariff has been reformed to the general satisfaction of the country and to the great benefit of industry and employment.

The fiscal freedom of the country has been greatly widened by the denunciation of the Belgian and German treaties.

A customs preference has been given to Great Britain, which admits \$70,000,000 of our products absolutely free.

A cold storage service has been set in motion that will undoubtedly revolutionize the exportation to Britain and elsewhere of perishable products. The hon. Minister of Agriculture deserves special credit for this great innovation, and whilst speaking on this subject I might add en passant that in the maritime counties, and especially in Gaspé, there is a strong feeling in favour of this cold storage system and of the advisability of applying it not only to the exportation of our butter, our cheese, our eggs, &c., but also to the exportation of our fresh lobsters, which could command a good price on the English and French markets.

The question of canal deepening is now being earnestly considered and the hope is expressed that the task will be completed at no distant time. I am not an optimist, but, Sir, I venture to say that before the new century dawns, the passage of vessels of fourteen feet draught from Port Arthur to the sea will be a fait accompli, thus transporting through Canadian territory the whole of the enormous traffic coming from the west of the United States and our own North-west.

The fast line project is definitely arranged for, at a price \$250,000 a year less than Conservative Administrations had offered to pay for it.

This Government has also brought to terms the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Arrangements have been made by which the agricultural products of the prairies would be greatly served. Such concessions have also been obtained as to bring the manufacturer, the merchant and the workman of the east into commercial relations with the consumer of the west. This vexed question of freight rates has been debated long ago in the press and here in Parliament, but with no practical result. I do not say that it is altogether settled, but the Government must be cordially congratulated for having struck the first blow at the railway monopoly.

The mineral lands of British Columbia and the gold rivers of the Klondike existed forsooth, long before our party came to power, but the new problems which these remarkable discoveries of the west raised.

were energetically dealt with. The Yukon Railway Bill, it is true, was defeated in the Upper Chamber. Sir, I am one of the young members of this House, and I would not dare to pass judgment upon the extraordinary vote given by the Senate when this most vital question came before them. I will venture to say this, however: We live in a country where the true principles of popular government is becoming more and more fully appreciated. We live also in a century where irresponsible bodies, the remnants of a distant past, are apt to disappear in the conflicts which may arise, when they will stand in direct defiance to the popular will.

The Manitoba school question is now practically settled. Conciliation has at last prevailed where racial and religious quarrels were threatening the peace of the Dominion.

Much as I admire the hon. leader of the Opposition for his energy, his vigour of mind and his endurance, yet, Sir, he fails to convince me that his present policy is wise and worthy of support. His power of exaggeration cannot help his cause. I ask this House, what confidence can he inspire when he deliberately prophesies ruin, bankruptcy and national dishonour as the outcome of the Government's policy? Sir, prosperity and welfare are no mere idle words in this Dominion, and we have unmistakable evidence that they exist. There is a revival in trade and commerce; wheat is firm; the working classes generally receive good wages. Speaking for the province of Quebec, I can state that never in the history of colonization has there been such a rush of settlers as at present. Our people are coming back from the United States, not only to reach the Yukon gold fields, but in order to settle quietly upon Canadian farms. In the annual report published last year by the Colonization Department of Quebec, I observe that from September, 1896, up to June, 1897, 3,905 French Canadians came back to Quebec. These figures were given by the agents of the Fichburg Railway Company alone, whereas I am informed four other large United States railway companies can show similar results.

The general agent of "La Société de Colonisation de Montreal" gives in his annual report the following figures:—

THE RESULTS OF A YEAR'S LABOUR.

(Translation.) For the twelve months of the year 1897, the total number of immigrants who have settled down in the various regions of the province, through the instrumentality of the society, was 2,146. In 1896, it was 1,994, which leaves a small increase in favour of 1897, in the number of immigrants registered at our offices. As a matter of fact, a considerable increase has taken place in the general business of the society.

After having given those figures, Dr. Brisson predicts most encouraging results for next year.

(Translation.) We find that the prospects of immigration are more promising than ever, and they are grounded, first, on the prosperous condition of our agricultural industries and on the fact that business is improving in all directions; and further, on the crisis that is prevailing to such an extent in the manufacturing centres in the New England States, where so many Canadians, who were formerly prosperous farmers, are threatened with starvation and ruin in the near future.

Several parties have already come back to Canada, and by availing ourselves of the present favourable conditions and vigorously promoting immigration, an impetus could be given to the repatriation movement altogether unprecedented in the annals of colonization.

From the 1st of July, 1896, up to the 3rd of June, 1897, 2,528 immigrants registered at the Immigration Bureau in Montreal. On the other hand, from the 1st of July, 1896, up to the 30th June, 1897, 3,108 immigrants were registered at the Quebec harbour. There has also been great activity in real estate, a fact which will be pleasing to my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn), as it is to me. During the last month of March, there were in the city of Montreal and in the town of Westmount 191 real estate transfers recorded at the registry offices, amounting to \$1,457,395. During the corresponding month last year the transfers recorded amounted only to \$670,761.81. Another evidence of welfare is the diminution in the number of failures. Let us take the number of failures in the month of March, 1898. There were 516 failures, with liabilities amounting to \$3,840,495. If we take now the corresponding month of 1896, there were 781 failures, with liabilities amounting to \$5,753,586.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say that we are entering into a new era with a progressive, originating, prompt and capable Government.

I have read somewhere that at the time when Addington was called by the King to succeed William Pitt as Prime Minister of Great Britain, the people assembled near Westminster at the opening of Parliament. When the King appeared he was cheered and cheered again. Suddenly, a poor workman emerged from the crowd, holding in his hands a petition which he presented to His Majesty. It contained the following brief yet significant sentence: "We want peace! We want bread! No war! No war! No Pitt." This historical reminiscence, Mr. Speaker, is suggestive of another petition which undoubtedly was made by the Canadian electors when Parliament was dissolved in 1896. And would they not tomorrow, if Parliament was again dissolved repeat, with a slight change, the brief yet powerful sentence: "We want peace! We want prosperity! No war! No Tupper."

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure no one can have any fault to find with the hon. member from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). He has given the House a capital essay, one

to which no doubt he has devoted much attention and he has delivered it in admirable style. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) concludes that during the period the Liberal party have been in power, they have done sufficient to warrant his belief that they have fully redeemed their promises. Well, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) is very easily satisfied, and while we may admire the excellence of his essay, many will be inclined to have but a poor opinion of the sentiments he in many instances announced. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) has discovered for the first time that the Fast Atlantic Line was a new thing, and that it was an invention of the Liberal party.

The cold storage project has given great satisfaction to that hon. gentleman, and also the deepening of the canals. Well, Sir, these are matters that engaged the attention of the former Government, and I congratulate my hon. friend from Gaspé, who has been so long asleep and never discovered that these great works were undertaken before the present Government came into power. Even when the fast line project was mooted for the first time in the session of 1896; there was a good deal of rebellion against it on the Liberal side of the House, many of the members stating openly that they would not support the Government on that scheme. But my hon. friend is so thoroughly convinced that he is satisfied with everything the Government has done.

Now, I have just a word to say with regard to the very short, but very significant, speech that was made by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). We were told, the other evening, I think by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), in very solemn tones, that we should discuss public questions with fairness, that we should not seek to gain any political advantage by our manner of discussing these questions, that nothing could be gained by slandering Ministers or other public men, and that charges of corruption and misdeeds on the part of the Government of the day were not the best means of helping along this country. I quite agree with that; but let me ask the hon. Minister of Public Works—I am sorry he is not in his place just now—if he has not invited a good deal of hostile criticism in this country. Let us be perfectly fair. The people are an intelligent, newspaper-reading class, who keep abreast of public questions. Is there an intelligent newspaper reader in Canada who has not watched with some anxiety, and with a great deal of interest and curiosity, the actions of that hon. gentleman? Let me call attention to two occasions on which the hon. gentleman, while perfectly within his legal rights, refused to answer certain important questions, the answers to which might have entirely emancipated him from hostile criticism—if he had given those straightforward answers which innocence alone would enable a man to give.

Mr. CLANCY.

The hon. gentleman on those occasions refused to give those answers. The hon. gentleman, I repeat, was quite within his right. Let me come to a very recent case. When an examination was being made in the committee appointed to inquire into the Drummond County matter, he characterized Mr. Greenshields as his friend, and said he would stand by him because he had been his friend. The public are anxious to know to-day why he is Mr. Greenshield's friend, and why he should stand by him. It is idle for the hon. gentleman to say: You cannot prove it. That does not mean anything. We often know the misdeeds of individuals from a chain of circumstantial evidence, though we may be unable to bring them home to them. I am not making a charge against the hon. Minister, but I say that his conduct has been such as to invite hostile criticism, and if he receives it, let him not complain.

Now, I desire to take up as little time as possible, and I wish to call attention to only one or two matters. I am glad to see the Minister of Customs in his place. He made a very admirable speech, from his point of view—one of great force, and one that he expects, very justly, to be read in this country, and to carry influence and weight, as the words of a Minister always do. If they are wrong, it is the more serious to the country, if they are believed, and the more serious to the Minister who utters them. I am not going to charge the hon. gentleman with intentionally or deliberately making these statements, but I will say that, if he had, in the most cold-blooded manner, tried to practice deception on the people, he could not have succeeded more admirably than he did when he made some of the statements he made the other evening. Let me refer to one or two of them. The hon. gentleman has a very strange mode of making calculations. In "Hansard" I find a table giving his figures. When the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) questioned this mode of calculation, the hon. gentleman and many of his friends on that side of the House joined in a sort of sneer at him for doing so. But I say, that there could be nothing more deceptive than the arrangement of those figures. The hon. gentleman stated that the figures were prepared for him, but he used them, and so far he is just as much to blame as if he had made the calculation himself. I will not go over this long table, but I will rest my case on a single item in it, which may be taken as a guide to the accuracy of the whole statement. The hon. gentleman gave us a classification of 107 items, for the purpose of showing how the farmers had benefited from the changes in the tariff. He heads his table in this way: In the first column, he gives the duties of 1894-95, as left by the Conservative Government; in the next column, he gives the duty as arranged by the present Government; in the next column, he gives the decreases and increases made by the Liberal tariff, as com-

pared with the Conservative, and, in the last column, he shows the percentages of decrease in applying the preferential tariff. Now, I desire to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the extraordinary percentages he was able to arrive at in this last column. I will refer to wire nails. In the table, the hon. gentleman states that, under the old tariff, wire nails bore a specific duty of 1 cent per pound, and in the next column he states that the duty was reduced by the present tariff to $\frac{2}{3}$ cent per pound, specific duty. That seems to be correct; but what conclusion does the hon. gentleman reach from that? That there was a reduction of 40 per cent. Then, applying the 25 per cent reduction under the preferential tariff to Great Britain, there will be a further reduction of 9-20ths of a cent per pound, specific duty, making a further reduction of 55 per cent, according to the hon. gentleman. In all making 95 per cent reduction, if the hon. gentleman is correct. Now, let me see what follows. Why, since the tariff came into force there was imported last year \$14,405 worth of nails, the duty paid on which was \$4,860, or 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. Now, what have we? We have, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, 95 per cent reduction, and yet still we have a duty paid on these nails to the extent of 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. I leave the hon. gentleman to settle that with the country. I ask him if he intends it to go to the country that there has been a sweeping reduction first of 40 per cent, because that is what is put here in plain figures, and then 55 per cent, or 95 per cent altogether. He says he means something else, but he has allowed it to go to the country that there was a reduction of 40 per cent, and then a reduction of 55 per cent. And yet there is still a duty, even if the preferential tariff were applied, of nearly 30 per cent. The people are not so dull in this country that they are going to be deceived by that kind of thing.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLANCY. It is a great pity he did not come to that conclusion before he made the speech.

Mr. DAVIN. Pity he made the speech at all.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend says it is a pity he made the speech at all. I desire to call the hon. Minister's attention to this fact. How is he going to explain that he has made a reduction of 95 per cent on the duties, because that is what he said, and still have this amount collected on nails.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Where did the hon. gentleman see that?

Mr. CLANCY. I read it over to the hon. gentleman once. Will the hon. gentleman

say that he did not state that there is a reduction of 40 per cent, being the difference between 1 cent a pound and $\frac{2}{3}$ of a cent per pound?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Very well, will the hon. gentleman say that in applying the preferential tariff, which reduces the rate from $\frac{2}{3}$ of a cent per pound to 9-20ths of a cent, he has not made a calculation showing a still further reduction of 55 per cent? Will he deny that fact?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Does the hon. gentleman mean a further reduction or an additional reduction?

Mr. CLANCY. He has put it down in this table as a 55 per cent reduction.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is what it is. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I do not wish, out of sympathy for him, that it should go before the country that he has made such a palpable mistake. If an article costs a cent per pound and is reduced $\frac{2}{3}$ of a cent per pound, is not the percentage of reduction 40 per cent. Then, in the second column, I show that, under the preferential tariff, the cost is reduced to 9-20ths of a cent per pound, which shows a reduction of 55 per cent. Surely every man ought to understand that. It is the simplest, plainest calculation that can possibly be given, and any man who takes exception to it only places himself in a ridiculous light.

Mr. CLANCY. There are reductions here in percentages of 40 per cent and 55 per cent. I desire to say to the hon. Minister of Customs that the whole calculation upon percentages is one that is most palpably misleading. Let him take the case of a 30 per cent duty. Is there any little boy in school who would not receive the condign punishment he deserved if when he put on 30 per cent and then took it off again, he were to say that he took off more than he put on. I say it is juggling with figures to do that sort of thing. This calculating of percentages and percentages is misleading. We charge 30 per cent on goods, and that means adding 30 per cent to their value; and when you take off that 30 per cent, to make an honest statement, you should show that you have taken that proportion off the value.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The hon. Minister was not dealing with the values of goods at all, but with the percentages of the tariff.

Mr. CLANCY. Now we have finally got a solution. My hon. friend is as blind as the Minister of Customs. He closes his eyes and tells the House—and I am glad now that he is on record—that he is not dealing with the tariff as applied to the values of the goods, but only dealing with

percentages on percentages. But what the people want is not percentages on percentages, and the hon. gentleman's way of putting things is misleading. I will do the hon. gentleman the justice to say—without offering him the sympathy he was kind enough to offer me for what he thinks was my stupidity—that he did not see the consequences of making such a statement or he would not have committed himself to it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I assume all the responsibility for these figures. I did not give them to the House without knowing what I was doing, and they are correct. If the hon. gentleman will run down the column, he will find that I not only give the percentages of decreases, but also the percentages of increases. The percentages of increase is against the Government, as far as the hon. gentleman's argument goes. If he will look, he will see that there are many items in which the rates of duty have been increased over what they were under the previous tariff. Take, for instances, linen and jute manufactures, n.e.s. They are charged a duty of 20 per cent under the old tariff. Under the general tariff of this Administration the duty is 25 per cent. According to the hon. gentleman's theory, we should show as the percentage of the increase 5 per cent, but he will find that we are giving the percentage of increase as 25 per cent, the duty having been increased by that percentage. It would have been impossible for me to have made a perfect statement to the House and have put it in any other way. When I say that an article on which 15 per cent duty was charged has been placed on the free list, and that consequently there is a reduction of 100 per cent in the duty, according to the hon. gentleman's argument we not only have thrown off the duty, but are giving the goods to the consumer for nothing.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman has not made his case any better. I have not found fault with the hon. gentleman for having in some cases counted against himself. True, he has put out a few decoy ducks as a sort of justification, but he is quite as erroneous in calculating against himself as in calculating for himself.

Now, Sir, I appeal to the hon. gentleman and ask him, in applying the rates of ad valorem duty, what is it based upon? It bears the same relation to one hundred as the whole duty does to the value of the goods. That is our mode of calculation of percentages. Any school boy could tell the hon. gentleman that and no person can be misled. When the hon. gentleman states that he in wiping off a duty and making goods free, takes off one hundred per cent, it is only true that he takes off one hundred per cent of the percentage, but he only takes off 10 or 15 or 20 per cent upon the

Mr. CLANCY.

goods. I am willing to leave it go to the country as the hon. gentleman has explained it, together with my own calculation. I feel quite sure that there is not a man outside of this House that will take the view of the matter as he has taken.

Now, the hon. gentleman gave 107 items showing the great interest the Government had manifested in making reductions. He applied the preferential tariff in every case. I copied from this table 31 or 32 items relating to the requirements of a class for whose welfare hon. gentlemen opposite just now manifest great solicitude, I mean the agricultural class. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) paid special attention to that. I do not find fault with that, for I think they are on the whole the greatest class in the country. They are the greatest producers and upon their prosperity depends largely the prosperity of the country. I may be a little tedious in reading these items, but I desire to place them upon the "Hansard" as an exhibit, side by side, with the statement the hon. gentleman has made. Now I will take the importations from Great Britain to which the preference would apply and also the importations from the United States alone. The comparison would be more favourable if I included all the other countries, but I give the figures only of imports from the United States as against Great Britain :

	Great Britain.	United States.
Saws	\$ 3,612	\$ 72,365
Wire nails	746	13,961
Forks, pronged.....	3	8,065
Hoes	115	1,152
Carpenters' tools	18,050	165,489
Files and rasps.....	9,349	42,695
Cordage, n.e.s.....	2,620	48,505
Seamless bags.....	97	10,499
Fertilizers	1,375	52,747
Furniture	26,559	249,394
Seeds, farm and garden.	11,852	524,227
Tubs, pails, &c.....	82	13,532
Wood screws	25	6,363
Scythes	2,572	15,282
Nuts, bolts and washers	3,059	44,417
Butts and hinges, n.e.s.	275	11,014
Braces and suspenders..	21,138	36,048
Brooms	28	1,278
Brushes	12,269	38,792
Picks, mattocks and grub hoes	319	8,793
Tools of all other des- criptions, n.e.s.....	7,149	54,613
Spades	1,601	21,276
Other agricultural tools, n.e.s.....	1,509	38,115
Clocks	4,658	39,370
Cotton cordage, all kinds	2,841	12,976
Pumps, wood or iron, n.e.s.....	391	61,824
Paper, tarred.....	None.	6,948
Paper hangings, all kinds	6,271	81,599
Cut tacks	63	13,715
Locks, all kinds	4,845	54,148
Boots and shoes.....	12,787	299,760
	\$156,260	\$2,098,922

Less than 7½ per cent came from England.

Now what does the hon. gentleman's carefully prepared table mean so far as these items are concerned? It means that the preference will apply to importations to about \$156,260 as against importations of about \$2,098,922 to which it would not apply.

Mr. FLINT. Would my hon. friend say for what period he is quoting his figures? Was it 12 months or 6 months?

Mr. CLANCY. I will give my hon. friend a civil answer, because I think he has asked it in that way. It has been for 12 months. The hon. gentleman surely does not think that any member of this House could make a statement of that kind for 6 months, and leave the House to believe that it was for a year. I tell the hon. gentleman that it is for the year 1896-97, as I stated at the outset. I find those particulars in the Trade and Navigation Returns that are open to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FLINT. I asked the question in perfect good faith. I had the misfortune not to hear the opening remarks of the hon. gentleman when he introduced that table.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me for one moment? I suppose the hon. gentleman has taken these, as he says, from the Trade and Navigation Returns up to the 30th June, 1897. Well, it was on the 23rd of April, 1897, that the preferential tariff went into effect, so it was only for two months instead of 12 months that the goods came in from England under the preferential tariff. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, has overlooked that, I know he would not do it otherwise.

Mr. WALLACE. I am quite sure that he has not overlooked the fact, and the House will not either, that these goods will not be made in Great Britain under any circumstances. They are made and will continue to be made in the United States, who will continue to be Canada's only competitor.

Mr. CLANCY. The application of the argument I am now making, as the Minister himself will admit, is not altered in any sense. The hon. gentleman will see that in applying the preferential tariff we are bound to take as a basis the last imports for 1896-97. Any other mode of calculation would be entirely speculative. The hon. gentleman's reasonings were capital, but his conclusions were drawn from false premises. The hon. gentleman assumed a certain state of things and then proceeded to reason thereupon. Now, what did the hon. gentleman say? He said: These goods are not imported largely now, but we are bound to say these goods will be imported largely in the future, and the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite are closed unless they are able to prove that these goods will not be imported. I may tell the hon. gentlemen that with regard to all the goods I have mentioned just now, England never did and never will

manufacture them. Take the case of scythes, axes, all the implements that we use in the country. We do not use any of the goods that the English people manufacture for the wants of their own country. Every one acquainted with the condition of affairs knows that the English people do not manufacture a class of goods suited to our Canadian people. Take farming implements, buggies, carriages, ploughs, and implements of that kind. The English people do not now and never will manufacture for the Canadian people in those lines. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood), who is a very successful merchant, and can speak with authority on this question, will not say that he has been a purchaser of English goods. He will say that he has been able to buy from the United States to better advantage but the real reason is that the English people do not manufacture those goods for the Canadian trade. To apply the preferential tariff to a large class of goods which the hon. gentleman has put in his list, is perfectly idle and will be barren of results in the future as it has been in the past.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question in good faith? My hon. friend will admit that England is a great manufacturing country. He has referred to a list of goods which he says we should not consider in connection with the preferential tariff because they are not likely to be made in England, which is a fair argument. Will he tell me what class of goods manufactured in England are going to be excluded from the benefit of the preferential tariff? England makes something, I presume, as a manufacturing country. Will he show me the particular class of goods that England makes which is going to be excluded from the preferential tariff?

Mr. WALLACE. That is begging the question. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) quoted the articles that were brought to the attention of the House by the Minister of Customs and was commenting on them, and the Minister of Finance wants to draw a herring across the trail, and brings up another question.

Mr. CLANCY. I will candidly answer the hon. Minister of Finance. The question now being discussed is not as to whether England is excluded or not. But the Minister of Customs put forth his argument, he wished it to be understood in this country, because it would be beneficial to the party in power, that the Canadian people would derive as consumers immense advantages by having such goods placed upon the preferential tariff. What I am pointing out is this, not that any goods are excluded, but that English goods will never come into this country for the reasons that I have stated, and therefore the people of this country will derive no advantage such as has been suggested by the Minister of Customs.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will have to submit to time, the great arbiter.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, that is the last resort. If my hon. friend can gain any comfort in that prospect, I will not deny it to him. But I repeat that the hon. gentleman has put forth a false proposition. The hon. gentleman, if I may be pardoned for using a rather vulgar phrase, has been kite flying, he has been blowing bubbles. He has held out to the people of this country the prospect that they were going to receive enormous advantages from this preferential tariff, when the facts of past experience are a standing witness that the hon. gentleman is entirely wrong, and no one can hope for the realization of any such results in this country. Now, I desire to say a word with regard to the action of the Government in lowering the rate of interest. This seems to me to be a very important question, and it must be treated seriously in this country. The argument is made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that you cannot compare money borrowed that may be demanded on call with money borrowed for fifty years. I leave it to the judge to which the Finance Minister referred—the arbiter of time. Experience shows that every money contract made in the past has been in favour of long periods, and the person who has money at call has always been the sufferer, for there has been a steady decline in the rate of interest. The Government is always in a position to reduce the rate of interest. They have perhaps \$50,000,000 to-day on deposit in the shape of savings of the people. The people are to-day in the hands of the Government. The Government have placed a loan for fifty years at a good rate of interest, 2½ per cent. The interest on savings bank deposits is reduced to 2½ per cent, the hon. gentleman was not able to state how much the cost of management would be but, leaving that aside, it would even then amount to something less than 2½. It is perfectly plain to every depositor, I do not care how small his means may be or how slight his ability may be at making calculations, that the Government may reduce the interest on the deposits in their hands, but they cannot reduce the rate of interest on the loan for fifty years on which they have undertaken to pay a certain percentage. The duties of the Government are largely parental. We owe a duty to the people. There are certain cases where in our treatment of foreigners we owe them nothing but business courtesy and on business principles. It is unfair, however, to take such ground as regards our own people. What the people require is greater encouragement in saving surplus means, and joined with that, a place where their savings may produce some return to them from year to year. I wish to point out what the effect of this policy with respect to the interest paid on savings banks deposits will be. It will have

Mr. CLANCY.

an effect on every labouring man. Life is short, and men are compelled to invest their money in two or three channels. What are they? Some people, especially those with small means, deposit their money in the savings banks. Others go into life insurance and pay premiums. Others again join benevolent societies. Millions of dollars are invested in life insurance through different societies. I will now ask the Minister of Finance a pertinent question. Is it not a fact the moment you have reduced the rate of interest, because the Government is all powerful to reduce the price of money, certain results must follow. Every one acquainted with life insurance in the United States and in Canada is aware that the rates the companies charge are infinitely less than in Great Britain. Why? Because the interest on money from investments in England is very low, and they are obliged, in order to give cheap rates, to secure profitable investments in this country, and this operates as a tax to a larger or smaller extent on people who are endeavouring to make provision for their wives and children. What will be the result? Every life insurance company will be obliged to increase its rates or go to pieces, because in order to secure an equal return it will be necessary to impose higher rates. As regards the price of money, every man has an interest in the shrinkage that will be caused by the action of the Finance Minister. The hon. gentleman stated that in order to have cheap money in the banks we must give the banks the means of borrowing money cheaply. I need not call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that when the Government were paying 4 per cent interest on deposits in the savings banks, the banks were complaining that the rate of interest was entirely disproportionate to that charged by the bank rates, and that the Government were paying a higher rate of interest to depositors than the rate charged for money borrowed abroad. The hon. gentleman will see that he is simply correcting a complaint on the part of the banks. You cannot meet a gentleman in financial circles but will declare that the Government have equalized the interest for the first time the Savings Banks and Chartered Banks, when they have placed it at 2½ per cent, and all the banks stand on even footing at that rate. We cannot hold out the hope that people will get cheap money, and I put it to the hon. Minister whether he can hold out any such hope.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I do.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman stated that unfairness prevailed, that there are different financial circles, that those in the inner circle obtain money cheaper than those in the next circle, and they again obtain money cheaper than those outside. I call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that there will

always be circles in money matters. The hon. gentleman is perfectly well aware that money can be borrowed on gilt-edge securities at a lower rate than in other cases. If I am charged 6 per cent, and another man, who is in the inner circle, gets money at 5 per cent, he is able to offer better security than I. There is no sentiment in the banking business; they lend it at low rates when they have the best possible security, and they lend it at low rates when they lend in large sums. If the Finance Minister were to reduce the rate to 1 per cent, it would not alter the condition of things which exist.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There will be always the circles; they will always come down a shade.

Mr. CLANCY. The Finance Minister will have to show that the lowering of the rate has improved the condition of borrowers generally throughout the country, and he must not forget that a borrower at one time may be a lender at another. My hon. friend has wisely not attempted to put forth the proposition that this lowering of the rate will confer benefit on all the people generally, and I say that no act of the Government will be more unpopular in the country than this. Much as I should desire to see the present Government displaced, yet the price is too high and the welfare of the country will suffer too much to cause me to rejoice to see them out of office because of such an ill-advised policy as this.

Now, Sir, with regard to the position taken by the Government on the tariff. I regret that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is not in his place, but I notice, with pleasure, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) is here. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) gave the idea that he did not at all agree with the conclusions reached by the law officers of the Crown in regard to the most-favoured-nation treaties applying to Canada. He, no doubt, in order that he may let the Government down easily on the defeat of their preferential policy, will still hold that the Canadian Government were defeated, not because they had not right on their side, but because the law officers of the Crown were wrong. Well, that is not consistent with the position of hon. gentlemen opposite. Last year, when the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) tabled his preferential resolutions, he told us that, on a certain day, the custom-houses would be open to admit British goods at the preferential rate; but he told us, at the same time, that the idea was founded on a much broader principle, and that the intention was to apply the preferential rate to the whole world, as well as to Great Britain, when other nations complied with the conditions specified. Here is what the Minister of Finance said:

I stated that the tariff I am about to read to you is the general tariff, but that before I con-

clude I shall be prepared to make a statement in relation to a special tariff, that will apply to Great Britain and any other country which is prepared to accept the conditions that that tariff imposes.

It is clear here, that the Finance Minister was trying to make the Canadian people believe that the preferential rate would not only apply to Great Britain, but that it would apply to every other country that would comply with the conditions. He again said:

We do not by our resolutions offer anything to Great Britain alone. We recognize the fact that Great Britain, by the Liberal policy, is in a position to avail herself of this offer immediately, but we make our offer not to Great Britain only but to every nation which is prepared to accept it. We make it to every country which is willing to establish fair and reasonable trade relations with Canada.

It is well that the country should know in what position the Government stood when they introduced this preferential tariff. Here is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said:

But I say with respect to that offer we now make, that it is not a preferential offer at all, in the true legal sense of the word. That offer is open to all the world. The Americans may avail themselves of it, and so may the Germans and the Belgians. The whole world are welcome to avail themselves of it on the same terms and on the same conditions on which England may take advantage of it.

We had the Minister of Marine telling us:

The Premier thoroughly understands it. The Premier took that stand which the Minister of Finance took what every member of the Cabinet took and hold to-day, that these treaties did not apply and did not bind Canada. The Premier took the stand which is now carried out in every custom-house in Canada: that these treaties do not bind Canada, and that German and Belgian goods are not entitled to preferential treatment because of these treaties.

The right hon. the First Minister, replying to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), said:

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) surely cannot suppose that we propose to place upon the Statute-book that law without looking in advance as to where it would lead us. We had to look around in the world so as to see what countries would be admitted under the preferential tariff, and having looked over the world from the one pole to the other, we saw only one nation in a position to take advantage of that tariff, and that was Great Britain.

It is quite clear, from these utterances, that the Ministers, having pledged themselves to the people of Canada that there would be a general reduction of the tariff, sought to delude the people into the belief that this low preferential tariff would apply to all countries, as well as to England. And then again, these very same gentlemen sought to deceive the people of England by making them believe for the time being that

this preferential tariff was solely in favour of England. These very same gentlemen to-day have changed their policy on this important matter, and now they tell the people of Canada that this favoured tariff is only to apply to England. I ask the Finance Minister, what has brought about this change of heart? Why have they abandoned that part of their reciprocal tariff which applied it to all the nations of the world that would comply with the conditions they named, and why do they now say that it shall only apply to England? I would like to ask the hon. Finance Minister, why the Government have abandoned in toto that reciprocal portion of their tariff, which they put on the boards last year and held out as a boon to the country, and now confine the preference to Great Britain. I think I have a right to demand, on the part of the people of this country, why that change has taken place, and why the hon. gentleman has practically excluded all other countries than Great Britain from the reciprocal tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend has given such close attention to the Budget speech that he must have discovered that I discussed that question at very considerable length, and I do not think I should interfere with his speech to discuss it at length now. I showed that we had abandoned no principle, but had maintained the principle of our tariff as far as the condition of the treaties made it possible to do so.

Mr. CLANCY. I admit that the hon. gentleman discussed the subject of the preferential tariff at considerable length, but I think he did not discuss the question I now bring to his mind. This is not a matter involving treaty rights or having any relation to them. The question I raise is this. Last year two things were stated; one was that there was a reciprocal tariff under which every country in the world complying with the conditions of that tariff might export goods to Canada at certain reduced rates of duty—one-eighth reduction last year, and one-fourth reduction this year; and, owing to Great Britain having a free trade policy, it was held out as a boon that all goods coming from Great Britain would at once come in under the reduced tariff. The question I ask the hon. gentleman is why was that position abandoned, and instead of having reciprocal relations with all other countries, they confine themselves now entirely to the preferential tariff with Great Britain. That is the question I ask the hon. gentleman—what trade reasons he can give for that change of policy. I do not mean what reasons may have been present in the mind of the hon. gentleman—I would not like to inquire into that; but I mean the reasons which the country is asking why the reciprocal tariff of last year has been abandoned for a preferential tariff this year. I think the hon. gentleman should answer that question.

Mr. CLANCY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I wish to be courteous to the hon. gentleman. I answered the question so fully in the Budget speech that I cannot think the hon. gentleman did not understand it. If he looks over the Budget speech, he will find that I answered it so fully, clearly and forcibly that the ordinary wayfaring man could understand it, and I cannot believe that there is any doubt about it.

Mr. CLANCY. I read the hon. gentleman's speech with great care, and I had the pleasure of being in the House when he delivered it, and I paid all the attention to it that my meagre abilities would allow me. The hon. gentleman says he discussed that question very fully. He discussed the change which he made, but he did not discuss the reasons for making the change.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I did.

Mr. CLANCY. I will not dispute the question with the hon. gentleman; but I tell him that the people of this country, who read the newspapers, will see that he made no such statement, that he made no reference to the change of front on that particular point, and he very wisely refuses to make any statement now. The people of this country have not lost sight of the attitude of these hon. gentlemen in the past. The hon. Minister of Customs told us that there was a magnificent convention held in the city of Ottawa some years ago, at which the Liberal party laid down certain planks of their platform. The whole country knew the reasons why the Liberal party were called together on that occasion. The hon. gentlemen know that they were utterly discredited throughout this country. They know that they went to the country with a policy that was rejected, and they were discredited from one end of this country to the other. The charge against these hon. gentlemen was that they had advocated the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, which in essence was a synonym for commercial union, and both of them were synonyms for political union with the United States. I am not putting that too strongly, because I have the interpretation placed upon their acts by their own friends as meaning that, and meaning no less. The hon. gentlemen met in convention and laid down a new platform, and they did not at that great meeting utter a single sentiment in favour of the policy on which they had gone to the country and tried conclusions with the Conservative party. They went there to cast off every particle of their clothing and to be rehabilitated in a new dress, and to make a new platform. I have here an open letter which was written by Sir Oliver Mowat to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie on the 12th December, 1891, after the election, after hon. gentlemen had been not only beaten but discredited; and it shows that they had beyond all doubt committed themselves to unrestricted reciprocity. This

is what Sir Oliver Mowat had to say with regard to that :

As a remedy for existing evils, the Liberals in the Dominion Parliament, including yourself, adopted as a plank of the Liberal platform unrestricted reciprocity of trade in the products natural and manufactured in Canada and the United States. This was a substitute for the so-called National Policy, the McKinley tariff, and other unfriendly devices on the part of the two countries respectively in relation to their mutual intercourse. The adoption of this article of the Liberal platform was approved of by the party generally, including those who had the strongest attachment to British connection.

The hon. gentleman went still further. We have here the evidence of the acquiescence of the right hon. leader of this House, for this is what Sir Oliver Mowat says :

Again, in the address to the electors of Canada by Mr. Laurier in the last election campaign, he pointed out that "in the present contest nothing is involved which in one way or another can affect the existing status of Canada." He placed unrestricted reciprocity in the front as the object of the Liberal party.

He went on further to say :

In behalf of the Liberal party of Canada, I hasten to say that the one thing of all things which we at this moment hold to be of the utmost importance is, that the relations between the United States and Canada should be made as friendly and as close as become the dignity and interest of two nations of the same kith and kin on this continent of America.

In fact, the first article at this moment in the programme of the Liberal party is, if possible, to establish absolute reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States for all products of the two countries, whether natural or manufactured.

Then the hon. gentleman went further. He had this to say because there was no doubt about his attitude :

In the very nature of things, from the sole fact that Canada is growing, developing and progressing, the interests of Canada and the interests of England must be divergent, and whenever the interests of Canada are on one side and the interests of England are on the other, the only consideration for me is what is best for Canada, leaving it to the people of England to consider and do what is best for England. This is not a question of sentiment, and for my part, I am firmly convinced that the economic interests of Canada lie with this continent, and it is on the basis of continental freedom of trade that I place the question.

Now, there could be no possible doubt of the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite in that respect. They were forced to call a convention, and at that convention they adopted a new platform. The people have not forgotten, in any sense, the record of those gentlemen, and are not blind to the fact that these hon. gentlemen, by their conduct during the past two sessions and the present one, have shown that they are sitting here under false pretenses. They held out to the people hopes which they do not intend to

fulfil and what they dare not fulfil. They came into office without the slightest realization of the responsibilities attaching to power. They came in without any settled policy, and were forced to continue a shifting policy of deception to England on the one hand, and to Canada on the other. We heard the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce tell us, not that the pledges of the Liberal party have been redeemed, but that in some items the expenditure of this Government is less than that of the former Government. I tell the hon. gentleman that that is not an answer. They were pledged to reduce the expenditure, and instead they have increased it. They were pledged to reduce the public debt, but instead have made it still greater. They pleaded that they could carry on the affairs of the country with a good deal less money, and at the same time give us better service, but they have not made a single attempt to redeem that pledge and they know perfectly well that they never can redeem it.

It was stated in this House that these hon. gentlemen came into office on a mere accident. What was the accident? Although they adopted a policy in 1893, I challenge them to show that they won a single seat in the whole Dominion on that policy. They know perfectly well that they won on another question altogether, and a question which should never have entered the political arena, and concerning which the conduct of the Liberal party does not reflect credit on it. They were not content to appeal to the electorate on their platform of 1893, but turned their back completely on it, and donned a new suit. They were satisfied that had they adhered to that platform, they would have been defeated, and so took hold of a vexed question to help themselves out. I appeal to the hon. Minister of Public Works and to the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) to say if there was one seat won in the province of Quebec on the great political issues that divided the two parties. They must admit that these issues were completely overshadowed by another question that was hatched out by certain members of the Liberal party, and by a brood of conspirators against the public peace. They succeeded in Quebec, where the Government got three-fourths of their majority, and when they contend that they represent the opinion of the country on the trade policy, I challenge them to show one seat in that province which was carried upon any other issue than the one to which I have referred. My hon. friend who is smiling opposite (Mr. Bourassa) came here pledged to do certain things, he signed a pledge in fear and trembling, and so did the hon. Solicitor General, and neither of these gentlemen can say that he was elected here on legitimate political issues or have fulfilled their pledges.

What has become of these hon. gentlemen who in Opposition were so wont to declaim against the extravagance of the late Gov-

ernment? My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) in particular achieved rather an unenviable record for his searching criticisms into every small detail of expenditure. He was even credited with counting the napkins at Rideau Hall, and some hon. gentlemen have gone so far as to say that he looked into the pots there to see if they were cracked. Nothing was too small to escape his attention, but now his role is changed. When a man makes it a habit of investigating small things, he is apt to descend to just as small a level when he undertakes to plead on the other side and defend his own friends. The man who goes to extremes on the one side may be expected to go to extremes on the other. These hon. gentlemen, however, may make as many excuses and pleas as they like, the people are looking to the Government for an honest fulfilment of their pledges. I should hope, in the interest of the country, that they will not carry out all their pledges.

I say it would be a great calamity to this country if they had carried out their policy. They say that the factories are running. I challenge them to show a single case where they have changed the tariff in accordance with their promises to the people with a result benefiting the industry affected. The factories are not running under a policy proposed by hon. gentlemen, but under a policy that was in force before they took office and that they dare not change. They were drunk with unexpected success. None were more surprised than they when they got into office. They found that they had made promises that they could not fulfil, that they dare not fulfil. Such changes as they had made in the tariff were made on a scale and in a way not creditable to them. We were told that specific duties were the bane of this country and that it would be the duty of the Liberal party—and this was very clearly explained by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce—to abolish specific duties. There were 190 cases of specific duty in the old tariff. Of these there are 108 that they never touched at all; twenty they lowered slightly; ten were raised, thirteen were done away with and higher ad valorem duties substituted, thirty-five were replaced with ad valorem duties at a lower rate, and three were abolished. Is that an honest fulfilment of their duties.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. WALLACE. In one case an ad valorem duty was put in place of a specific.

Mr. CLANCY. I have no doubt that there were some cases even of that kind. And now, with regard to another important feature of the tariff. I do not desire to be offensive to hon. gentlemen personally, but I say that their policy was a policy of deception and concealment. They held out to the people of England the hope that they were going to get special advantages. But,

Mr. CLANCY.

as was pointed out in the clearest possible terms by the leader of the Opposition an evening or two ago, the tariff was prepared for this reduction by an increase in the duties on those lines of goods that were especially imported from England, while, if any reductions were made, it was on those lines that were imported mainly from the United States. Taking the importations in 1895-96, which was the last report before the change of the tariff, we find that these increases applied to \$10,687,880 worth of goods coming from England. On the other hand, the goods from the United States to which these increases would apply amounted to only \$2,707,344. Could there be a clearer case of deception? Take, on the other hand, the goods that were selected for a reduction of duty, and you find that they made the same invidious selection. The goods coming from the United States, which under the new tariff amounted to \$4,421,825, as contrasted with \$1,009,823 from England. Now, Sir, the loyalty of the Canadian people to the Empire is undoubted. We can say that of both political parties. I should be sorry to charge hon. gentlemen opposite with being less loyal than the Conservative party. I am bound to say that they have given evidence in some cases that would lead us to believe, if we were inclined to be critical, that they were not so loyal as we should like to see them. But I am going to take it for granted that they are as loyal as the Conservative party. Yet I do not believe in putting forward what I may call silly sentiments. I do not believe that we should seek to show our allegiance to England by striking a severe blow at our manufacturers and turning our workmen out of employment. England is not so unfair as to ask us to do that. But when hon. gentlemen say that we have struck a tender chord in the hearts of the English people by such means as this, I ask if it is not a contention unworthy of a great political party. If this tariff works out as hon. gentlemen say it will and the customs revenue is greatly decreased, our workmen must be taxed to make up for that loss, and this at the same time that their chances of employment are made less—and all to carry out the visionary policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. Minister of Customs says that all this will be made up by great extension of trade. How will it come? We reduce the opportunities afforded to our workmen and manufacturers in this country, and this will certainly react upon agriculture, because the two interests are so closely interwoven that you cannot dissociate them. I leave the people of this country to judge the hon. gentlemen and the visionary schemes they have put forth, and let the hon. gentlemen take the consequences when they go again before the tribunal of public opinion.

Mr. DAVIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. No.

Mr. **FLINT**. I think the hon. gentleman ought not to ask for the adjournment of the debate.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My hon. friend is aware, I suppose, of the distinct agreement that was made, so far as such agreement is possible, by the leader of the Opposition, that the debate should close to-night. If the hon. gentleman is not aware of that, let him ask the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who is aware of that officially.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I believe no member from the west on the Liberal side has spoken, and the west has not been heard from on this subject. I appeal now to the leader of the House not to press us to go on.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I must say to the hon. gentleman that I must distinctly refuse. It was agreed, in as positive a manner as possible, with the leader of the Opposition, and with the ex-Minister of Finance, as well as incidentally with the Whip, that the debate should close to-night. We cannot possibly allow an adjournment to take place.

Mr. **WALLACE**. There was no agreement understood across the floor of the House in any way. The first intimation we had of that arrangement was from the acting leader of the Government, the Minister of Trade and Commerce; but I stated then that it was an unfair proposition, if there were members who were desirous of speaking, from British Columbia, from the North-west Territories, and from Manitoba, who have not been heard on this subject. Yet the leader of the House proposes that the debate should be closed to-night. We are now at the hour of midnight, and I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce will admit that there has been no attempt on this side of the House to prolong the debate unnecessarily. I do not care what arrangements have been made that were not known to the members of the House, because they were not known to the members of the House until they were stated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, last night. I am sure those hon. gentlemen who expected to speak on this question were greatly surprised. It is unreasonable to ask us at this hour to go on with the debate, to say that the debate must go on, no matter if it takes until next Sunday morning. Are we going to revert to the old style?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I must point out to the hon. gentleman, who is an old parliamentarian, he knows very well that there are hardly any cases in which, after the leaders of the House have formally agreed, and the thing has been notified the night before, an attempt has been made to break an agreement

of that kind. There is the hon. member for North Leeds, at whose instance I allowed the House to be adjourned at a very early hour last night, and he agreed that we should close to-night.

Mr. **WALLACE**. These arrangements, so far as I remember, are usually made across the floor of the House between the leaders, and with the approval and consent of the members on each side; because, if a number of members get up and say they will not approve of these arrangements, they have to be dropped. But this arrangement that has been spoken of, was made between the First Minister and the leader of the Opposition; it was unknown to the members of the House, and therein it differs from the usual arrangements made across the floor. Every member has a right to concur in the arrangement made by his leader, or to object to it. But no such opportunity was given to us. I think we can fairly appeal to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has always acted generously in these matters, not to force the question.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. Reference having been made to myself, I will just quote what was said last night. About 11.30, I moved the adjournment of the debate. Some objection was made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he referred to an arrangement that had been made between him and the leader of the Opposition. I made these remarks:

Mr. **TAYLOR**. I understood from the leader of the Opposition that it was the intention, if at all possible, to close the debate at to-morrow's sitting. It may be late to-morrow night; but I think that all the members who intend speaking on this side of the House can easily deliver themselves at to-morrow's sitting. I know it is the wish of the leader of the Opposition to close the debate to-morrow, and he fully expects that it will be done.

I made that statement, and the hon. members on this side of the House could have closed the debate, and would have closed the debate, I think, if it were not that two Ministers, followed by one of their own supporters, occupied the time that ought to have been allowed to the Opposition. However, I know that was the wish of our leader last night. I know it is his wish to-day, and it is the wish of the members on this side of the House. But they should receive fair treatment, and they should have been allowed the time remaining, or, at least, two men from this side to one on the other side. The debate has not been unusually long. I think, certainly, that the North-west and British Columbia should be heard from.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. It is quite impossible to accept the motion to adjourn.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I have to speak mainly on the subject that was dealt with so disin-

genuously by the present leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman has a right to speak. The hon. gentleman has made a motion to adjourn, and I see, by Dr. Bourinot, page 418 :

If a member should move the adjournment of the debate and the House should negative that motion, he will have exhausted his right to speak on the main question.

Mr. BENNETT. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken on the subject.

Mr. McDUGALL. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before you put the motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) moved the adjournment of the debate simply for the purpose of not going on to-night. I do not think the rule read by you will apply in this case.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has the right to dispute the ruling. There can be no doubt about it ; and perhaps the hon. gentleman has not understood exactly what I meant. An hon. gentleman has the undoubted right to move the adjournment of the debate, and if his motion carries, he has the right to speak at the next sitting. If the motion is not carried, it is well understood, as I showed by a quotation, that he has no right to speak again.

Mr. DAVIN. I will speak to the motion for the adjournment of the House, and I intend to bring before the House the subject raised to-night by the Minister of Public Works, the subject of his own exploits. First, I will bring before the House an article from "Le Reveil," which reads as follows :—

LA RAISON.

Un article de notre dernier numéro, intitulé : D'où est venu le magot ? a inspiré la note suivante à un lecteur :

MONTRÉAL, 23 mars 1898.

MON CHER "RÉVEIL" :—

Vous dites, dans votre dernier numéro, que les Tarte ont payé vingt mille dollars à Beaugrand pour "La Patrie" et qu'en sus, ils ont trouvé une somme au moins égale pour "renipper" cette même "Patrie" quelques jours plus tard.

Mr. BOURASSA. I should like to know if the Italian language is allowed in the House of Commons of Canada ?

Mr. DAVIN. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not think I pronounce French in the Parisian style, or as the hon. gentleman pronounces it.

Mr. BOURASSA. Not exactly, but the hon. gentleman has such a melodious pronunciation that I supposed he was speaking the tongue of Dante.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. DAVIN—

Est-ce tout ce que les Tarte ont payé pour la "Patrie" ? Oui. . . Alors, vous n'y êtes pas du tout. Vous ignorez donc qu'ils ont payé, de plus, quinze mille dollars à Beaugrand ? Greenshields a bien juré qu'il avait donné son chèque pour vingt mille piastres, et que les Tarte avaient couvert ce chèque dès le lendemain ; mais il n'a pas dit qu'il avait, en outre, endossé des billets au montant de \$15,000, que ces billets étaient signés par les Tarte en faveur de Beaugrand, et qu'ils ont été payés à échéance par les Tarte. . . .

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. It is very amusing no doubt, but the people of Canada had to pay the piper for it, and although hon. gentlemen are full of laughter about it they may be perfectly satisfied that when we go before the people they will dance to that tune, even more gracefully than the Minister of the Interior dances, and that is saying a good deal.

Si vous voulez de plus amples informations adressez-vous donc à M. Alphonse David, avocat, qui a fait la collection des billets pour M. Honoré Beaugrand, pendant l'absence de ce dernier.

Je pense que M. Téléphore Beaugrand, frère d'Honoré, pourrait aussi vous donner quelques renseignements sur ce point.

Maintenant, que dites-vous de l'achat de la nouvelle presse, \$25,000, que les Tarte viennent de faire pour imprimer la nouvelle Patrie ? C'est depuis que le coup du Yukon est en marche que cet achat a été fait. Il y a toute une mine de déductions à exploiter et vous n'en parlez pas.

Enfin, je ne veux pas vous chicaner, vous le seul journal qui fasse son devoir, et Dieu merci, vous le faites bien. Continuez : les libéraux ont les yeux sur vous, et, tôt ou tard, votre mérite sera reconnu.

Votre vieil ami,

LIBÉRAL.

Before I proceed to translate this article for the benefit of the House—

Mr. TALBOT. Read it in French first.

Mr. DAVIN. We who speak English as our native tongue do not show such hyper-criticism when hon. gentlemen whose mother tongue is French, speak in English ; and I may tell those hon. gentlemen who consider they are descended from grand seigneurs and wonderful fellows from old France, that they do not show that politeness which is supposed to be hereditary in French people. Nor need they be too certain that in point of accent they have any advantage of me, for all or most of them speak French with what Edmund About would call "un accent déplorable." That may be accounted for by ancestral peculiarities that perhaps are not to be linked with the seigneurial people to whom I have referred a moment ago. There is a reference in that letter to a \$25,000 press, and the Minister of Public Works declared in our hearing in this House that he had no property in the press of "La Patrie." But he himself or some of his friends circulate the paper called "La Patrie," and here is a picture of the press, and on the press is written : J. Israel Tarte.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is christened that way.

Mr. DAVIN. So this paper rather contradicts the statement made here. I will now translate that letter :

Montreal 23rd March, 1898.

My dear "Reveil,"—You say in your last number that the Tartes have paid \$20,000 to Beaugrand for "La Patrie," and that in addition they have found another sum at least equal for "reniffer" the same "Patrie" a few days after.

Is that all the Tartes have paid for "La Patrie" ? Yes ? Then you are not acquainted with everything. You forget then that they have paid still more \$15,000 to Beaugrand ? Greenshields has well sworn that he had given his cheque for \$20,000, and that they covered this cheque on the morrow, but he has not said that he had further endorsed paper to the amount of \$15,000.

That he had still further endorsed paper to the amount of \$15,000, and that these bills were signed by the Tartes in favour of Beaugrand, and that they had been paid by the Tartes. If you wish further and ample information, address yourself then to Mr. Alphonse David, advocate, who has made the collection of those notes for Mr. Honoré Beaugrand, during the absence of this last person. I think that Mr. Téléphore Beaugrand, brother of Henri, can also give you some information upon this point. Now what do you say of the purchase of these new presses for the \$25,000 that the Tartes have bought to print the new "Patrie" ? It is since the coup de Yukon—

Mr. BENNETT. What ?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know that I can translate that.

Mr. BENNETT. Steal.

Mr. DAVIN. Not exactly. We say coup de main, coup de grace, and so coup de Yukon.

Mr. BENNETT. Scoop.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, it is the scoop of the Yukon.

It is since the coup de Yukon that this purchase was made. There is a whole mine of deductions from that, and yet you are silent. I find I do not wish to trifle with you—you, the only journal who make its duty to expose these things, and, God be thanked for it, you do it well. Continue. The Liberals have their eyes upon you, and soon or late your merit will be recognized.

Now, Sir, this is the comment of "Le Reveil" :

Notre correspondant a raison ; il y a là toute une mine à exploiter. De fait, quand nous dirigeons la loupe sur l'évolution matérielle de "La Patrie," nous trouvons sans cesse des mines à exploiter. Des mines plus riches en surprises que ne le sont celles du Yukon en déçoivent nous pour les gens qui aiment les affaires droites et claires.

Si nous avons l'air de refuser d'aller jusqu'au fond du gisement, jusqu'au bout du filon, c'est qu'il nous prend un écoeurement insurmontable. Constater sans cesse que le parti libéral ne se soulève pas en bloc à la vue de ce qui se passe au soleil ou se découvre après enquête, c'est, à la fin, si pénible que sans nous sentir découragés, nous éprouvons un impérieux besoin de mettre rapidement un point final à nos articles sur ces sortes de sujets.

LA DIRECTION.

That is signed "La direction" and La Direction is the editorial staff. In order to

edify the House and in order also to be just to the requirements of this House, because the two languages prevail, I shall translate it, and it will no doubt afford a certain amount of amusement to these classical and highly educated gentlemen on the other side. There is my friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) whom the French members of his own party used to call the "tape worm," and who used to get at the inside, as we know, and work about the inside of the Auditor General's Report, but who now does not do anything like that now, and has become a vermicular ossification, a sort of fossilized tape worm. He will be amused at this: I think it would be better, Mr. Speaker, if we had a little courtesy to-night ; I think I will teach that Treasury bench before I am done with them to-night that it would be much better if we had a little courtesy from them. Here is the translation :

Our correspondent is right. There is a whole mine to work upon. In fact, when you direct the lens upon the material development of the Patrie you always discover mines to work (exploite), mines more rich in surprises than are those of the Yukon in deceptions, for gentlemen who love matters clear and direct. If it appears that we refuse to go to the bottom of this matter, to the end of the lode, it takes us with an insupportable heartache. It is a difficult thing to go on stating clearly without a pause, that the Liberal party does not raise itself—

Here now I have come to a part that I cannot translate very well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Bring it over here and I will help you.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I do not want your help. Remember I am translating it off-hand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Come along and I will help you.

Mr. DAVIN. I will translate it in this way :

—At the sight of that which passes in open day or which is discovered as a result of inquiry, it is in the end so painful that, without feeling ourselves discouraged, we experience the imperative need to bring rapidly to a close our articles on this sort of subject.

Now, Sir, this writer who signs himself "Vieux Rouge" has an article on the 2nd of April, 1898, which he entitles "Simple Reflexions."

SIMPLES RÉFLEXIONS.

Après la crise, ou si on le veut, le caucus, il importe d'étudier la situation nouvelle qui est faite au parti. Assez de jours se sont écoulés depuis pour en parler avec une juste mesure. Qu'on se note bien : nous n'avons à revenir sur aucun de nos écrits. Ce que nous pensions hier, nous en sommes aussi intimement convaincus aujourd'hui. Toutefois nous sentons qu'il n'est que naturel d'essayer de saisir, d'analyser la vraie philosophie qui s'échappe du bruyant événement.

The translation is this :

After the crisis, or if one wishes, the caucus, it is necessary to study the new situation which is made to the parti Liberal. Enough of time has rolled away since to enable us to deal

with this question justly. Let it be noted, we have not to recede from one of our writings. That which we thought yesterday we are also profoundly convinced of to-day. However, we feel it is only natural to attempt to analyse the true philosophy which escapes from this disturbing event.

Tout d'abord, à César ce qui appartient à César.

Deux hommes ont tout particulièrement donné, au caucus, la note juste. Dans un langage non moins énergique dans le fonds que modéré dans la forme, ils ont en face des ministres recité des griefs, interprété le sentiment du parti, désigné et touché l'endroit malade.

And to begin with: to Cæsar that which belongs to Cæsar. Two men have quite particularly given to the caucus the true note, in a language not less energetic and profound than moderate in form. They have, in the face of the Ministers, recited the griefs, interpreted the sentiment of the party—designated and touched the diseased spot.

Au risque de se rendre impopulaire en "cour," de s'attirer la défaveur de Jupiter et, peut-être, de ne recevoir qu'un appui platonique des autres collègues présents, ils ont extrait la vérité du puits.

At the risk of rendering themselves unpopular at the court, and of attracting upon themselves the disfavour of Jupiter—

This refers to the leader of the Government.

—and perhaps not to receive but a Platonic support from the other colleagues present, they have drawn the truth out of the well.

D'autres ont voulu continuer la plainte discrète, la bouderie prudente et improductive, enveloppant sans cesse dans un pli de rose les représentations trop amères.

Others, however, wished to continue the discreet complaint, the prudent murmur and unproductive, unceasingly enveloping in a fold of the rose—enveloping in rose leaves too bitter representations.

Les endormeurs sont de tous les temps, et, si nous en croyons l'histoire de tous les partis dans tous les pays, cette gent n'a jamais prévenu ni préparé une catastrophe.

The wheedlers are of all kinds, and if we believe the history of all parties in all countries, these gentlemen have never foreseen nor repaired a catastrophe.

Mais il s'est trouvé deux hommes bien décidés à mettre fin à ce système de laisser-faire, qui n'était, en réalité, que de la couardise badigeonnée de discipline mal entendue.

But two men have been found thoroughly decided to put an end to this system of go-as-you-please which is in reality but the miserable cowardice of an ill-understood discipline.

Nous voulons parler de MM. Préfontaine et Beausoleil.

We wish to speak of Mr. Préfontaine and Mr. Beausoleil.

Déjà, une effluve de reconnaissance, partant des rangs du parti, monte jusqu'à eux; déjà on parle d'assouplissement chez certains ministres: déjà quelques injustices sont réparées.

Already a flood of thankfulness, bursting from the ranks of the Liberal party, has come to them. Already one speaks of softening, of bending with certain Ministers; already some injustices have been repaired.

Le Réveil est donc certain d'être l'écho de la grande masse des libéraux en félicitant et remerciant les députés de Maisonneuve et de Berthier.

Mr. DAVIN.

"Le Réveil" is therefore certain to be the echo of the great mass of the Liberals in felicitating and thanking the deputies of Maisonneuve and Berthier.

Et nous ne craignons pas d'ajouter que si le chef est encore l'homme de cœur et de grande intelligence que l'on a connu, il saura avant longtemps reconnaître que le cri d'alarme lancé par ces deux représentants, vaut plus pour le parti que les flatteries, les duperies et les "à-quat'pâtissemets."

And we do not fear to add that if the chief is still the man of heart and of great intelligence that he is known to be, he will know before long time to recognize that the cry of alarm thrown out by these two representatives values more for the party than the flattery, the dupery of others.

Peut-être est-ce déjà fait.

Perhaps it is already done.

Depuis le caucus, des organes ordinairement hostiles et réticents, dévoilent leur pensée. Seul, et pour cause, le *Temps* et la *Patrie* font les carpes.

Since the caucus the organs ordinarily hostile and reticent express their thought. Alone and for cause "Le Temps" and "La Patrie" carp.

Ce franc parler n'est pas un des moindres résultats de la réunion.

This frankness of speech is not one of the least results of the caucus.

Puissent les autres députés libéraux secouer également leur torpeur et ne pas craindre de mettre les points sur les i.

May the other Liberal deputies equally rise from their torpor and not fear to place the dots on the "i's."

C'est pour le parti; c'est aussi pour le pays.

It is for the party; it is also for the country.

Il ne faut ni casser les vitres, ni demander l'impossible.

It is not necessary to break the crockery, nor to demand what is impossible.

That refers to the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BENNETT. He is china.

Mr. DAVIN (reading)—

Exiger justice, fustiger les traîtres, abattre les petits états qui s'érigent dans l'Etat, c'est-à-dire les coteries bâtardees qui s'établissent dans le parti, l'absorbent, l'épuisent, l'encanaillent, voilà le programme.

To demand justice, to flog the traitors, to beat down the small bodies which erect themselves in the state—that is to say the bastard coteries which fasten themselves on the party, absorb it, destroy it, "l'encanaillent"—dogify it; that is our programme.

To whom is it they refer when they say "l'encanaillent"—dogify the party?

Si on l'eût suivi dès le commencement, on ne verrait pas aujourd'hui le spectacle à la fois comique et attristant que nous offre nos clubs, nos caucuses, nos journaux. Quand on pense qu'à peine trois mois après la victoire notre parti était déjà en proie à des divisions intestines d'une nature, d'une gravité telles que l'on ne peut en trouver l'équivalent à aucune époque et dans aucun pays.

If one had followed this programme from the commencement, one would not see to-day the spectacle at once comical and sad that our clubs, our caucuses, our journals present. When one thinks that scarcely three months after the vic-

tory, our party was a prey to intestine divisions of a nature and a gravity that one could not find an equivalent for in any other epoch or in any country.

Mark this, Mr. Speaker :

Si jamais parti devait être assuré d'un long règne c'était bien le nôtre. Tout nous était donné, tout nous souriait. Situation vraiment inélite dans les annales de a politique.

If ever a party could have been assured of a long reign, it was ours. Everything was given us, everything smiled on us. It was a situation truly unknown in the annals of politics.

Hélas ! on a débuté par de grossières erreurs. Ingratitude a présidé à la confection du cabinet.

Alas ! we began by gross errors. Ingratitude presided at the making of the Cabinet.

You remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the first session after this Government came into power, I told my right hon. friend that he had been guilty of injustice to his party in forming his Cabinet, and that he would have to justify his conduct to his party in this House and the country. Well, Sir, the Nemesis of what he did on that occasion, in committing that injustice to his party now confronts him. He brought in seven new men ; he turned his back on the men who had stood by him on those benches for eighteen years, and brought in seven new men. What has been the result ? These are the men who have brought all the trouble upon him.

Nous fâmes néanmoins, pour l'amour du pays, du parti, et du chef, disposés à fermer les yeux sur cette tache originelle.

Sans doute, disions-nous, les aubains, à qui les portefeuilles sont donnés de préférence à nos vétérans, vont s'efforcer de faire oublier cette injustice ; ils seront plus dévoués, plus sympathiques, plus justes, plus courtois. Enfants adoptifs auxquels on a donné la meilleure place au foyer, ils vont doubler la dose d'affection et d'abnégation.

Ingratitude presided over the formation of the Cabinet. We were, nevertheless, disposed, out of our love for our country, our party and our chief, to close our eyes to this original sin. Without doubt, we said to ourselves, these foreigners to whom portfolios have been given in preference to our veterans, will endeavour to make us forget this injustice. No doubt they will be more devoted, more sympathetic, more just, more courteous. Adopted children, to whom we have given the best place at the hearth, they will double the dose of affection and abnegation.

Quels naïfs nous étions de nous bercer de cet espoir.

Ce sont précisément ceux-là qui, depuis, ont, comme à plaisir, été la cause directe et indirecte de tout le mal. Dans la haute administration ou dans la régie interne, ils ont commis ou fait commettre bêtise sur bêtise.

What innocents we were to cradle ourselves in this hope ? It is precisely those who since have made it a pleasure to be the direct and indirect cause of all our trouble. In the higher administration, as well as in the internal economy of the party, they have committed or caused to be committed folly upon folly.

Et ce que nous leur reprochons le plus, c'est d'entraîner d'une façon habile, sournoise, systématique, l'honorable M. Laurier à l'impopularité.

And what we reproach them with is to have dragged down, in a skilful, underhand, system-

atic manner, the Hon. Mr. Laurier into unpopularity.

The writer is speaking in this paragraph of the right hon. leader of the Government.

Cet homme n'est déjà plus le même. Ceux qui l'ont vu en ces temps derniers ont peine à croire qu'il soit le Laurier diplomate, attentif, flegmatique, méticuleusement courtois de jadis.

The man is no longer the same. Those who have seen him in these latter days have difficulty in believing that he is the diplomatic, attentive, phlegmatic, scrupulously courteous Laurier of other days.

Est-ce bien le Laurier de 1895 qui dans le dernier caucus disait à peu près ceci ?

" Vous, députés, dites-moi ce que vous voudrez ; ayez raison ou ne l'ayez pas ; il reste certain que je ferai à ma tête."

Un peu plus, à un prochain caucus, il s'y rendrait éperonné, cravache en mains et il n'aurait plus qu'à parodier le mot de Louis XIV : " L'Etat, c'est moi !"

Is it, indeed, the Laurier of 1895, who, in the last caucus used language to this effect : You deputies, you may say what you like, whether you are right or not ; one thing is certain that I will have my way. Let him go on, and we will have him at another caucus, spurred and with whip in hand, and ready to parody the saying of Louis XIV : " L'Etat c'est moi."

So that we have to go to a leading French journal of the Opposition to learn what a transformation power has wrought in the gracious personage whom we were accustomed to respect and like when he led the Opposition. It seems that he feels now somewhat as Cassius described Cæsar when he exclaimed :

Upon what meat does this our Cæsar feed, that he hath grown so great ?

And Cassius adds :

Why, man, he doth bestride the narrow world,
Like a Colossus ; and we petty men
Walk under his huge legs, and peep about
To find ourselves dishonourable graves.

Mais non, chassons ce pessimisme ; qu'on nous permette de croire que le chef a su depuis quelques jours bien saisir la portée de ce qui vient de se passer,

But no, let us banish this pessimism ; let us permit ourselves to believe that our chief has learned since some days to appreciate well the tenor of what has just taken place.

Il ne nous insultera pas, espérons-le, en croyant rétablir la paix grâce à quelques nominations semées dans la province, autrement dit en nous jetant quelques os.

He will not insult us, it is to be hoped, in believing to establish peace with some nominations scwn in the province, otherwise throwing a bone to a dog.

Non, ce qu'il faut c'est, d'une part, une plus grande prudence dans la transaction des hautes affaires administratives et, de l'autre, une réforme radicale dans l'économie interne du parti.

No, that which is necessary is, on one part, a greater prudence in the transaction of high administrative affairs, and, on the other, a radical reform in the internal economy of the party.

Cette réforme doit commencer en haut, dans le cabinet, en passant par les départements pour aller aboutir dans les succursales du gouvernement sur tous les points de cette province.

This reform ought to commence in the high places in the Cabinet, not passing by the departments for to go—

Now mark this.

An hon. MEMBER. Never mind it.

Mr. DAVIN. Ah, but it relates to my hon. friend, and I would like to translate it with correctness. At any rate, the sense of it I may say is this: Clean out the Augean stable of the Cabinet and, in cleaning the Augean stable the Minister of Public Works would go rapidly before the broom.

Le cabinet n'est pas un dogme, une arche d'alliance.

The Cabinet is not a dogma or an arched alliance.

L'honorable M. Laurier n'a pas craint d'y toucher quand pour elaguer un invalide et réparer une injustice, il a donné congé à l'honorable M. Mowat et appelé M. Mills.

The Hon. Mr Laurier had no fear to touch it when, for the retiring of an invalid and the repairing of injustice, he has taken the portfolio from Sir Oliver Mowat and called upon Mr. Mills.

Que le chef n'écoute pas seulement une cloche: qu'il recherche encore la collaboration de ceux qui pendant dix, quinze, vingt ans ont été ses meilleurs amis, ses plus loyaux compagnons. Il leur doit beaucoup, puis, ce sont eux qui constituent le *bone and marrow* du parti. Qu'ils lui retirent leur appui, et le chef, qu'il nous laisse le lui rappeler, sera toujours bien dans la piètre position du meilleur écuyer du monde auquel il ne manquait qu'une chose: la monture.

Let the chief not listen to a clock, let him still seek the aid of those who, during ten, fifteen or twenty years have been his best friends, his most loyal companions. He owes them very much, since they are those who constitute the bone and marrow of the party. Let them draw him to their support and let the chief that leaves to us to regulate it, be always still in position of the best of his party.

Que les hommes auxquels nous objectons dans le ministère reçoivent ailleurs une récompense honnête sagement mesurée, nous en sommes. Que le chef ne veuille pas être tenu en tutelle, nous en sommes, mais il y a tout un océan entre une mise en tutelle et une rationnelle interprétation des droits et des devoirs d'un leader de parti.

Let the men to whom we object in the Ministry receive further the honest recompense we will measure out. We agree to that. Let the chief now not wish to be held in tutelage. That is our opinion. But there is an ocean, there is a whole ocean between the situation, in which the chief is in tutelage, and a rational interpretation of the rights and duties of the leader of the party.

I see that somebody has sent me Webster's dictionary. I am very glad that it has been sent to me, because it is an English work to which I attach very great importance, and, by and by, if there is any word that needs elucidation at the hands of Webster, I will thank the hon. gentleman and read the definition he has given of that word.

En voilà assez pour un second jet. Il nous secuit supérieurement agréable de n'avoir plus à revenir là-dessus, ce qui signifierait que tout est remis en l'état désiré. Quoi qu'il en soit, nous ferons, qu'il en coûte peu ou prou, ce que nous croyons être de notre devoir de bon et loyal partisan. Il nous est impossible de flagorner ou de mettre une sourdine à notre plume.

Mr. DAVIN.

Ah! Ce n'est pas par plaisir que le *Réveil* dit des vérités parfois pénibles; pas plus que ce qui s'est passé au caucus n'a été appris par nous avec une joie égoïste.

Mais le *Réveil* a cru et croit encore que c'est aimer le pays, le parti et le chef que de crier: Gare! quand il en est encore temps.

Pendant de longs mois on a pu penser ou essayer de convaincre les autres que notre journal était isolé, qu'il exagérait, qu'il mentait. Le caucus nous a bien vengé, mais notre satisfaction serait bien maigre si, de ce concile, ne devaient pas sortir pour le parti libéral, les éléments d'une ère nouvelle.

Une reconnaissance, quoi?

It will be supremely agreeable not to find it necessary to return any more to this subject, and it will signify the establishment of a state of things much to be desired. Whatever may happen, we will do, let it cost what it may, that which we believe to be our duty as good and loyal party men. It is impossible for us to behave in a manner otherwise than loyal to our chief and to our party. And it is no pleasure for the "Reveil" to speak painful truths, any more than that which has passed at the caucus has been learned by us with egotistic joy, but the "Reveil" believed, and believes still, that it is love of country, of party and the chief to cry: "Take care!" while there is still time. During the long months one has been able to think and attempt to convince the others that our journal was isolated, that it exaggerated, and that it lied. The caucus has well avenged us, but our satisfaction will be very meagre if, from this assembly there will not emanate for the Liberal party the elements of a new era. A renaissance. What?

I am very sorry that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has left the House, but, as he no doubt reads the "Hansard," I will, for his edification, call his attention to an article that appeared in the Montreal "Star," entitled "Sir Richard's Repentance." When I think of what the hon. member for South Oxford was when on this side of the House, and what he is now, when I think of the lion-like way he used to behave here, as financial leader of the Opposition, and there he is now, like one of those lions we read of, in Algeria, with his claws blunted and eyes taken out, and trained to do nothing but to hold a timber bowl in his mouth and beg alms for certain religious bodies. That, Sir, is the position he is in now for that godly, or that ungodly, body that makes up the Government of Canada. He is that blind and maimed lion, with that little bowl in his mouth. This writer says:

SIR RICHARD'S REPENTANCE.

There will be—at least, there ought to be—an interesting ceremony in Ottawa shortly. Sir Richard Cartwright will do—or ought to do—public penance for his grievous and public offences against his fellow-countrymen generally and against the members of the several Conservative administrations in particular. With ashes on his head, with sackcloth around his shoulders, with a lighted taper in his hand, the humble and honourable gentleman will kneel, or ought to kneel, before the front Opposition benches and ask the pardon of the men whom for years he has calumniated.

While Sir Richard, as the chief offender, is in this becoming attitude, Sir Wilfrid, Mr. McMullen, Mr. Charlton and Mr. Mills, and nearly

all their political friends will—or ought to—chant penitential psalms.

It is not to be expected that Sir Richard will remember all the wicked things he said about the men whom he has so persistently maligned. He may recall with remorse that he impugned their honesty and questioned their veracity, that he called them ignorant and mischievous charlatans; that he accused them of failing in everything except heaping up debt, making scandals and plotting and conspiring among themselves; that he accused them of exacting millions of dollars per annum from the people of Canada in the shape of unnecessary taxation; that he pledged his knightly word that when the Liberals got into power they would relieve the country of this burthen of excessive and unfair taxation, that they would reduce the tariff to the needs of honest economical and efficient administration. It must add a pang to Sir Richard's bitter repentance to think that he not only slandered the Macdonalds, the Tupper and the Bowells himself, but that he seduced many other Liberals into committing the same heinous offence.

While reading his recantation he ought to read the amendment to the Supply Bill for 1894-95, which he moved, and which contained the following:—

“That inasmuch as enormous sums of money are exacted from the people of Canada which are not paid into the Treasury, and inasmuch as the burdens of the people are hereby unnecessarily increased, and as it is of the utmost importance to the well-being of the community that not only should the present extravagant expenditure be diminished but that the said burdens should be reduced as largely and speedily as possible, it is expedient that in making provision to restore the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure, as recommended in the Speech from the Throne, the existing tariff be so modified that it may be made a tariff for revenue only.”

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the hon. member for West Assiniboia if, in the resolution he read, the Minister of Trade and Commerce was applying that to the present financial year? It appears to me that it exactly suits the present occasion, and I supposed the Minister of Trade and Commerce was applying it to the present year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Might I be allowed to ask if it will apply to the worm that crawls up the tree and leaves a trail behind.

Mr. DAVIN. I am afraid the hon. gentleman knows more about the worm that dieth not than the worm that crawls up the tree. I quoted in a former debate, which I do not want to refer to improperly, the language of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. That is a prophecy.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That refers to the antiques.

Mr. DAVIN. The Government is doomed to destruction:

When he has read this he will—or ought to—explain that the estimates for that year only amounted to \$38,517,152. Then he might go on and read the following little table, showing the revenue and expenditure of each year from 1888 to 1896:—

	Revenue.	Expenditure.
1888.....	\$35,980,463	\$36,718,495
1889.....	38,782,870	36,971,835
1890.....	39,879,925	35,994,031
1891.....	38,579,311	36,343,568
1892.....	36,921,872	36,765,894
1893.....	38,168,609	36,814,053
1894.....	36,374,693	37,585,026
1895.....	33,978,129	38,132,005
1896.....	36,618,591	36,949,142

He will then, or should then, acknowledge that in 1896 he declared that an expenditure of \$38,000,000 was too large for Canada to afford, that it was a disgrace for the Government to ask the people of Canada for that sum to be expended for federal purposes.

At this point it is to be hoped that Sir Charles Tupper will assure the repentant Minister of Trade and Commerce of his forgiveness, and authorize him to divert himself of his sackcloth and ashes.

It would be too humiliating, too crushing, too cruel, besides being unnecessary, to allow poor Sir Richard to go on and repeat the confessions made in Mr. Fielding's Budget.

Do not ask the man who called it a disgrace for the Government to ask for \$38,000,000 in one year, who said that the sum was too much for Canada to afford, to admit that the Government of which he is a member expects to take \$39,000,000 out of the pockets of the people of Canada this year, and to spend \$38,750,000 of it!

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman is reading his speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is transgressing the rules of the House and is reading his speech. I have listened to the hon. gentleman very carefully since he began his speech, and I have noticed that he has been reading all the time, and not simply referring to the notes.

Mr. DAVIN. I can assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am simply reading extracts, brief extracts.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I prefer to have the hon. gentleman give the House something original.

Mr. DAVIN. I am reading an extract from the Montreal "Star."

Do not ask him to acknowledge that he and his colleagues have been scheming to extract \$40,500,000 from the pockets of the people of Canada in the year 1898-99, and that they have actually planned to spend \$39,124,000 of that amount. The Conservatives can afford to be generous, the economy of their financial policy has been vindicated by the deeds of the very men who maligned them, their tariff has been vindicated by its adoption by the very men who abused it. Let them not triumph unduly over fallen foes—(fallen into a good thing, no doubt, with good salaries and good perquisites)—but fallen from their high estate of purity and from the lofty elevation which enabled them to call their opponents rogues, thieves and liars; fallen in their own estimation and fallen in the estimation of their fellow-countrymen. Mr. Fielding should vary his estimates (not increase them) so as to include provision for a home for fallen men.

I desire now to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to a certain point.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He is not here.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman is generally absent, but I am glad to say he is here now. The hon. gentleman quoted the bank clearances, and he made it out that the revenues of Canada too were an indication that his policy had been successful, and I suppose he meant to indicate that his tariff which according to his contention, is somewhat lower—though I do not think it is—than the tariff of his predecessors, and it was owing to that fact that the returns of the clearing-houses had been of such a satisfactory character. The statements of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs as to the signs of prosperity that obtained, lead palpably to the inference that for eighteen years the country has been governed so admirably, that now when these gentlemen come into power they have reaped where the Conservative party sowed.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Cabinet of antiques.

Mr. DAVIN. No. The difference between this Government and the Government I called a Cabinet of antiques is, that while that was a Cabinet of "antiques" this is a Government of "anties." This is what the Minister of Finance said :

The volume of the general business of the country was such as to very markedly increase the aggregate bank clearings of the five principal cities—Montreal, Toronto, Halifax, Winnipeg and Hamilton. The total clearings for the three years, 1895, 1896 and 1897, according to the "Monetary Times," were :

1895.....	\$1,039,967,000
1896.....	1,025,960,000
1897.....	1,151,906,000

or an increase of \$126,000,000 in the clearings of 1897 over 1896. For the four weekly periods—ending Thursday—in January, 1898, the total clearings were \$108,509,673, against \$89,901,000 for the similar periods of January, 1897, or an increase of over \$18,000,000. For February last, the total clearings for the five cities mentioned were \$198,385,302, as compared with \$74,612,552 for February, 1897, an increase of \$33,772,750.

Now, if I mistake the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding), I trust he will correct me ; his argument was that because of the lower tariff introduced by the present Government these happy phenomena occurred in the various clearing-houses of Canada. Now, the improvement in Canada is only 12½ per cent, while under the Dingley Bill, which is a far higher tariff, I find from the New York "Commercial" for Saturday, 2nd April, 1898, that this is what occurred from the various clearing-houses in the United States :

It would be interesting to know what the grand total of March bank clearings throughout the country would have amounted to had it not been for war prospects during the past month. As it is, the grand total of March clearings of about

Mr. DAVIN.

\$5,700,000,000 is only 1.1 per cent larger than those for February, notwithstanding that March had 31 days and no holidays, as compared with February's 28 days and two holidays. Clearings for January amounted to more than \$6,000,000,000, and very naturally fell off to \$5,581,000,000 in the short month which followed. The rule is for March clearings to heavily exceed those of February, but this year they almost prove an exception. January bank clearings this year were about one-third larger than those for January, 1897, those of February were nearly 50 per cent larger than those for the like month last year, while bank clearings for the month just ended exceed those for March, 1897, by a little less than 33 per cent. In these totals and percentages is found the story of the ravages in business circles due to prolongation of the prospect for war.

MARCH TOTALS OF CLEARINGS.

	1898.	1897.
•New York.....	\$3,418,019,442	\$2,387,110,544
Boston	454,098,000	396,984,043
Chicago	439,308,827	336,343,377
Philadelphia	310,404,163	247,737,435
St. Louis	120,343,884	108,121,600
Pittsburg	85,535,027	62,553,241
Baltimore	72,236,992	61,047,615
San Francisco...	69,948,407	55,003,425
Cincinnati	53,132,800	49,280,750

The total for all the great cities of the United States was, in 1898, \$5,674,090,729, and in 1897 it was \$4,236,875,620. What becomes, then, of the argument of the hon. gentleman ? The clearings showed an increase of 12½ per cent in Canada, and in the United States an increase of 33½ per cent. The statement of the hon. gentleman as to the prosperity of the country did not reflect upon the efficiency of his Government, but it did tell as to the efficiency of the previous Government, because if the previous Government had managed the affairs of the country badly, if they had kept house badly, then when the new tenant came in he would have found it uninhabitable, and not at all so comfortable as this Government found it. I see that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has come back to the House, and I have no doubt that like other great minds his intellect works best at night. I will ask his attention to this—

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, to us who do not smoke it is really most offensive that a gentleman opposite is smoking in the Chamber. It is disgraceful. Let us have a little decency anyway. It is the first time I ever saw it permitted.

Mr. DAVIN. Who is the offender ? Who is smoking ? It is most improper. In defending the action of the Minister of Finance in lowering the rate of interest, here is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said :

It may be interesting to the House to know that in 1894 something like \$25,300,000 of the then deposits, which amounted to about \$40,000,000,

were held by 26,000 depositors, being as nearly as may be at an average of \$1,000 per head.

He therefore tried to give the House this impression that the average deposit was \$1,000.

Now, I do not think that men who are able on an average to deposit a thousand dollars per head can be regarded as people deserving the paternal care of this Government.

In order to defend the action of the Finance Minister, he laid it before this House that the persons who were using the Government savings banks were persons having \$1,000 to their credit, each one. Again I say it was a most extraordinary thing. We say in regard to some things done by hon. gentlemen opposite that they are done either wickedly or ignorantly. But it is hard to suppose that this was done ignorantly, because I think the hon. gentleman said he had the return in his hand—a return that he himself had called for. This is the return :

Return to an Order of the House, dated the 25th April, 1894, for a return, showing :

1. The total number of depositors in the Dominion and Post Office Savings Banks.
2. The number of said depositors having deposits of \$1,000 or upwards, and the total amount held by them.
3. The number having deposits of \$500 and over, not exceeding \$1,000, and the total amount held by them.
4. The number of depositors having deposits of less than \$500 and the total amount held by them.
5. The number of depositors not residing in Canada, and the total amount held by them.

Well, Sir, here is a return—

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to defer his remarks till the reporters come in. They have all gone out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. DAVIN. Here is a return to an Order of the House for certain information respecting the depositors in the post office savings banks. It gives: first, the total number of depositors—114,275. Then it gives the number of depositors having deposits of \$1,000 or upwards, and the total amount held by them—the number, 5,418, and the amount held by them, \$7,419,615.94. The number of depositors having \$500 and over, but not exceeding \$1,000, and the total amount held by them—the number, 9,200, and the amount, \$6,421,018.96. Now, mark this: the number of depositors having deposits of less than \$500 and the total amount held by them—the number, 99,657, and the amount, \$10,312,558.76. There is a note here :

Note.—Many of the large balances belong to accounts transferred from the Dominion Government Savings Bank and were created many years

ago when deposits could be made beyond the limits fixed for the Post Office Savings Bank.

We have also here a statement of the Dominion Government savings banks, showing the number of depositors having deposits less than \$500, the number having \$500 and not exceeding \$1,000, and the number having \$1,000 or upwards. Here you have the number and amount of the depositors having from \$1 to \$500: in Nova Scotia, 19,905 depositors with \$2,395,285; in New Brunswick, 12,822 depositors with \$1,796,141; in Ontario, 1,327 depositors with \$173,784; in Prince Edward Island, 5,227 depositors with \$675,125; and so on, making a total of 45,305 depositors of from \$1 to \$500, having a total of \$5,502,848. Then, those having from \$500 to \$1,000 in all these provinces were 5,127 in number, having to their credit \$3,517,030.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How many millions have you in there?

Mr. DAVIN. Then, with \$1,000 or upwards the number is 4,607 and the amount \$6,676,586. Now, I have here a return of the business of the post office savings banks taken from the Public Accounts, from the 1st of April, 1868, to the 30th of June, 1897. I will not go over all these statements; but I will take the information for 1897. The number of post office savings banks at the close of the period was 779; the number of deposits received during the period, 161,151; the total amount of the deposits received during the period, \$8,223,000; the average amount of each deposit received during the period, \$51.02; the amount of depositors' accounts transferred from Dominion Government savings banks during the period, \$1,856,474; the number of withdrawals during the period, 91,398; the total amount withdrawn during the period, \$7,656,086; the number of accounts remaining open at the close of the period, 135,737; and the total amount, \$32,380,829. And what do you think is the average amount standing at the credit of each open account at the close of the period? The average amount is \$238.55. And yet, with the return in his hand, the hon. gentleman said what I read from his speech. Why, Sir, it would be scandalous in any member of the House; but in a man who has occupied such a high position, and who has enjoyed such great respect, and until the last few months such well-deserved respect, it is a scandalous thing to try to palm off on the country a statement having so little foundation as he has done. I have here the average deposits from 1891 to the last year. In 1891 the number of depositors having from \$1 to \$10 was 53,217.

Mr. WILSON. Out of a total of how many?

Mr. DAVIN. Out of a total that year of about 144.

		1890-1	1891-2	1892-3	1893-4	1894-5	1895-6
		Depositors	Depositors	Depositors	Depositors	Depositors	Depositors
From	1 to 10	53,217	52,891	53,219	53,093	53,314	58,841
do	11 to 20	26,427	25,141	24,906	24,249	23,941	26,065
do	21 to 50	37,561	36,457	37,444	36,375	35,411	37,982
do	51 to 100	17,685	17,589	18,610	17,927	16,918	17,920
do	101 to 200	7,965	7,405	8,380	7,941	7,824	8,029
do	201 to 400	4,091	3,628	4,026	3,788	3,740	3,962
do	401 to 600	407	987	1,228	1,240	1,206	1,428
do	601 to 800	147	357	420	474	454	538
do	801 to 1,000	172	468	635	673	787	993

Thus we see that in the year 1893-94 the percentage was :

		Depositors.
From 1 to 10	36.370
11 to 20	16.620
21 to 50	25.060
51 to 100	12.280
101 to 200	5.440
201 to 400	2.600
401 to 600	0.850
601 to 800	0.330
801 to 1,000	0.460

You see by these figures that the contention made by the hon. Minister of Finance, and buttressed up by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, had not a tittle of foundation, and those banks are used by the poor people, as I have demonstrated from these official figures. I am not done with this subject, because I think that the feature is the worst and blackest of the most miserable financial statement that was ever made in any Parliament.

An hon. MEMBER. Go on.

Mr. DAVIN. I intend to, and so is the Conservative party going on, and there is another party going on, but in a different direction, down that Laurier Avenue which leads to a graveyard. I have in my hand the forty-third report of the Postmaster General of England, and what, Sir, do you suppose is the rate of interest paid in the post office banks in England?

Mr. BEATTIE. I rise to a point of order. There is liquor being drunk in the House by members, and there are members interrupting the speaker, who appear to be intoxicated. That, I say, is out of order.

Mr. FRASER (in the Chair). I am new to this position, but it seems to me that the hon. member who has raised the point of order is bound to name the person to whom he refers.

Mr. DAVIN. There he is, Sir, on your right hand.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. DAVIN. I believe it is the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) to whom my hon. friend refers. However, I do

Mr. DAVIN.

not know whether, under the influence of beer, he is much worse than when in his sober senses. It will be hard to make him much worse than he naturally is. I was proceeding to point out the rate of interest paid to depositors in the Government savings banks of England. A rate of 2½ per cent interest is paid them, as you may see by page 14 of the forty-third report. I am sorry the Finance Minister has gone because I intended this for his benefit. He argued that the rate of interest in the post office banks should be lowered in order to correspond with the rates paid by the chartered banks and the average rate of interest paid in the country. Well, in the North-west, the interest which people have to pay on very good paper is 10 per cent. I believe it is 8 per cent in Manitoba, and if it will interest any person to know, although my paper, I do not suppose is gilt-edged, I have always in the North-west been able to discount it at 8 per cent. I suppose they took my character as eking out my meagre balance, but the fact is that where other persons had to pay 10 per cent, I always could discount at 8 per cent. When you go east, you pay 6 per cent and 5 per cent. Let me call attention to the monthly summary of finance and commerce of the United States which I hold in my hand. It gives the rates of interest in New York and London. In 1898 the rate of interest in London was as low as 2 per cent. In the months of January and February, and in the previous September and October it was 2½ and 2 per cent. So that in England, the Government savings banks paid 2½ per cent on deposits, when the average rate in the chartered banks was 2 per cent. Yet the hon. Minister of Finance, shedding crocodile tears about the bankers and financial men and the inner circle and gilt-edged paper, told us that it was to provide a safe place of deposit that the post office savings banks were inaugurated.

He told us that it was for safe keeping that the saving banks were inaugurated. That was unpardonable ignorance—for I will not accuse him of more than ignorance. He is a journalist by profession, he has been an editor of a paper and now occupies a great position in the Government. And

yet he is so ignorant of the history of England and of Canada that he is not aware that in 1861, when Mr. Gladstone established the savings banks, he stated emphatically that it was to encourage thrift. And if the hon. gentleman goes back to the establishment of these banks here in Canada, he will find that the men who occupied seats on the Treasury benches at that time had hearts far different from those of himself and his colleagues. I have here the Life of a Postmaster General of England, Henry Fawcett. We read at page 439 of that life :

Fawcett was more profoundly interested in the various institutions by which the post office endeavours to—

To do what, guard their money for them? No, Sir—

—to stimulate thrift. In his first year of office, he took up the question of the Post Office Savings Bank. They had been in action since 1861, when Mr. Gladstone had introduced a measure embodying the scheme suggested by Mr. (now Sir W. C.) Sikes and Mr. Chetwynd, of the post office. The measure was signally successful. The Post Office Savings Bank thrived and became more popular than their old-fashioned rivals, the trustee Savings Bank. A considerable deficiency meanwhile had arisen in the old banks, owing to the fact that too high rates of interests had been allowed on the deposit. * * * * In his report of 1884, Fawcett gives some information which he had collected to show the needlessness of the jealousy which had been aroused.

That was the same jealousy as here. Fawcett would not yield to the chartered banks; Gladstone would not yield to the jealousy of the banks; but our Finance Minister makes himself their humble servant and dog Tray, ready to fetch and carry for them.

He pointed out that in Cambridgeshire, a population of 190,000, had only ten places provided with a bank, whereas there were forty-seven towns provided with a post office savings bank. He inferred that the post office banks might attract savings, where private enterprise would not offer the necessary facilities.

And, Sir, do we not know that the man who wears a corduroy coat and has the soil of his day's labour upon him does not want to go into the grand private bank with the fine brass fittings and to rub shoulders with millionaires and high officials and Ministers of State and the acolytes and emissaries and mandatories of Ministers of State. He likes to go into a little savings bank where he knows the postmaster and where he can feel that he is putting his little savings into an institution that belongs to him. But what is the analysis of these deposits? I forgot to give that. An analysis of the figures shows that 87 per cent of the deposits at this moment are under \$500, 8 per cent between \$500 and a \$1,000, and 5 per cent only over \$1,000. Now, I give these facts, and they are unanswerable facts, and if you give me an opportunity I will demonstrate that 50 per cent of the accounts amount to less than \$100. So much for the

attempt to make this sage means whereby the great leaders of the Conservative party meant to encourage thrift in this country, following in the wake of the wise and noble men in England, who had founded these institutions an attempt not a help to the poor but to make the savings banks a darkey engine for the financial and speculative, and so much for the position of this Government with regard to it. On page 431 of this Life of Fawcett you will find something which I wish we could imitate here.

He described, however, a scheme which had been suggested to him by the late Mr. Chetwynd, Receiver and Accountant General of the Post Office. It had been fully worked out, and Fawcett resolved to try it as a mode of meeting the various difficulties which had arisen. This is the now familiar scheme of "stamp slip deposits," which would have rejoiced the heart of Benjamin Franklin. Bank slips issued at every post office may be filled up with twelve stamps and will then be received at the savings bank as a shilling deposit. The plan was first tried in certain selected districts in September, 1880, and succeeded so rapidly that on November 15, Fawcett decided to extend it to the whole country. By the end of March, 1881, 576,560 slips had been received and now 223,000 new accounts were estimated to have been opened in consequence. In his report of 1882, Fawcett states that the daily average of receipts was 2,481. In 1884, he remarks upon the great increase in the number of children who are depositors. In four years the total number of depositors had increased by a million, of whom not less than a quarter were young persons. By thus encouraging the habits of saving in early life, the post office, he remarks, is probably doing more to assist than to retard private enterprise. The clauses for investment contributed to the popularity of the savings banks. The total amount invested in Government stocks at the end of the financial year, March 31, 1884, was £1,519,983 held by 20,767 persons.

How completely that answers the statement of the Finance Minister that it was only for safe keeping that these banks were established. The scope, the object, the aim was thrift. These wise statesmen saw that, even if the Government gave to its poor depositors a slight advance on what the banks gave, it did not interfere with the banks or lower the rate of discount, as proven unmistakably by Fawcett, and it encouraged habits of thrift and gave to the community a solidarity and force that it could not otherwise acquire. You will, remember, Sir—I thought for the moment that I was addressing your predecessor (Mr. Deputy Speaker) in the Chair, who belongs to the great French race. But you (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough) are a reading man and will recollect how when France was beaten by Germany and a most overwhelming indemnity, an indemnity of milliards was ex-

acted by the conqueror, in a short time France rose to the occasion and paid off the indebtedness. And how did she do it? By calling out the thrifty hoardings of her peasants and labouring class whom she had encouraged to thrift by means not unlike those I have described as taking place in England to encourage thrift even, paying them a higher rate of interest than the banks would pay. But it seems we have got into a different rut, are under a different regime and have different men to deal with. Fawcett, in the management of the post office was full of schemes for the purpose I have described to you, and he was eminently successful.

Now, Sir, I am very sorry indeed that the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) has gone. I am sorry the Minister of Finance has left the Chamber, because I want to refer to a feature of his Budget speech. It is a most peculiar thing, because he gives you an Imperial reason for legislation in this Chamber. This is the great statesman who is now Minister of Finance, because we have not only the most wonderful crew we ever had in Ottawa, but we have also the greatest statesmen that have ever sat on the Treasury benches. Never was Ottawa so gay as it is now, with balls, parties and dinners. Some hon. gentlemen, when they come in here, after their revelings and junketings, remind me of a senator in Washington, who, before he went there, was a member of a church, and he used to scorn the waste of time at social entertainments. A friend who used to see him with his shirt front all exposed, like a vast plain of snow, after these junketings, and dancings, and terpsichorean exercises, used to say of him: "What an extraordinary man he is, what a change has come over him since he went to Washington; the society at Washington has completely bedevilled him. Formerly, he did not care very much how often he changed his linen, but now he is the shirtiest man in all Washington." So, we have amongst the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite some of the shirtiest men in all Canada. Now, this is what that great statesman who was described by the organ of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as a cross between a white-linen draper and an inspired alderman. This is what the hon. gentleman said:

Whether we are successful in doing so or not, one thing is certain, namely, that the present condition of the West Indies and the Canadian West India trade demands that some effort should be made on these lines, and we think the best gift we can make to the people of the West Indies is to say: We will give you the benefit of our preferential tariff, without bargain or anything else, and we do not expect you to make any very great concessions to us; but if any means can be devised whereby obstacles to Canadian trade can be removed in that quarter, we have no doubt that you, our brother colonists, will meet us in the same spirit as we desire to meet you.

Mr. DAVIN.

Now, there we have an Imperial reason given for an Act in this colonial Parliament, and it raises the question whether the Imperial Parliament under which we live, has done its duty in the premises. It is a curious thing, that, while Mr. Chamberlain had made it perfectly clear that he intended to do the proper thing, and put on a countervailing duty to help our West Indian colonies and to meet the bounty system on the continent, a very narrow politician, one of those men without breadth or originality, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, has had the best of it, evidently, in the Cabinet in this matter over Mr. Chamberlain, and he has turned Mr. Chamberlain down. Now, when the Minister of Finance was over in England, he had a conversation with Mr. Chamberlain, and he heard what Mr. Chamberlain intended to do. Then he thought he could see a way out of the difficulty and a danger which confronted him in his own province. After the Minister of Finance went to Halifax, leaving behind him his tariff of 1897, none were so poor as to do him reverence. Not a soul called on him, not a soul invited him to dinner; he had offended the West Indian merchants in Halifax, to whom he had made promises concerning sugar, and they would have nothing to do with him. When they did see him on the street they gave him a bit of their mind. Here was the Minister of Finance of a powerful Government, with all these budding honours on him, going back to the city where he had conducted a great paper, and not a soul, not one of those leading men, would look at him. Ah, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the Minister of Finance has come in. Now, when the Minister of Finance had this conversation with Mr. Chamberlain, it occurred to him that he saw a way by which he could accomplish what he desired for his West Indian friends in Halifax, and at the same time sugar-coat the pill of raising more money by sugar for his colleagues, and, as his so-called preferential clause had such vogue in England, he thought that a second edition of it might go very well, and, no doubt, it took the fancy of the Prime Minister the moment he suggested it to him. So, we have this most extraordinary thing, because I could easily demonstrate that it will not do the West Indian colonies very much good. But I will tell you what it will do. Raising the duty on sugar will do what is perfectly consistent for the men now in power, it will be one other act by which they swallow all their professions. For, if there was one thing they were loud, and long, and eloquent, about, it was this, that they would not tax the sugar of the poor man. Now, they tax it.

Sir, you remember the story told by the Puritan divine, how a great Israelitish warrior met Elisha, and the man of God looked at him and wept—not those tearless tears, which I attributed to the Finance Minister a few moments ago—the tears streaming

down his rugged cheeks. And the warrior said to him: Why doth the prophet weep? Elisha said: I fear what thou wilt bring on the people, thou wilt destroy their kings, their warriors, their women, and even their children will not be spared. The captain said to Elisha: Is thy servant a dog to do this thing? But the Puritan divine said: The dog did it after all. So might the Finance Minister say: Is thy servant a dog to do this thing, to impose higher duties on sugar? But the dog did it after all. It was a cardinal plank in the Liberal platform that they would not tax sugar, but they have taxed it, and have come forward with a petty excuse that it is to help the West India colony. I wish to say a few words to form an imperial standpoint, for I hope my words will go across the Atlantic.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. They have been heard there before, and their echo will be heard again. I am going to show how the only argument against Mr. Chamberlain's original proposal can be disposed of. I do not ask mockers to pay attention, but I ask the attention of the statesmen and those who aspire to be statesmen, to the subject of the sugar duties. In 1874, I remember it well, Sir Stafford Northcote had a surplus of \$30,000,000, and of course he asked what he had to do with it. That chancellor of the Exchequer, imitating Mr. Gladstone, thought of Mr. Gladstone's method of reducing taxation; and I must say this, that often the best thing a Finance Minister could do with a surplus, and Sir Stafford Northcote should have done it, was to apply it to the reduction of the national debt.

Mr. BENNETT. Could he not have bought a Drummond County Railway?

Mr. DAVIN. Sir Stafford Northcote was not a man of that sort. One of the things he determined to do was to reduce the duty on sugar. At that time there were in Scotland and England flourishing refineries. The duties on sugar were from 2s. to 2s. 10d., or 48 cents and 68 cents per 100 pounds, according to quality, and on refined sugar 72 cents per 100 pounds. At that time the British imports of sugar were as follows:—Sugar from British colonies, 245,000 tons; sugar from foreign countries, 335,000 tons; beet sugar, 125,000 tons; refined sugar from foreign countries, 146,000 tons, or an aggregate importation of 831,500 tons. Cane sugar was at that time imported in the raw state, principally from British West Indies, Cuba and the East Indies, and refined in England and Scotland. But the bounty system began to work its evil effects on the continent. Let me say here in regard to a man who in some respects was the greatest parliamentarian ever sat in any Parliament, that great and astonishing as were his marvellous powers of verbal resource and facility and fertility

of expression, William Ewart Gladstone had not the logical faculty, and in his whole career, and this is true of nine statesmen out of ten in England and Canada, you will not find a new idea. He was, as Disraeli said of his great leader, Robert Peel, a burglar of other men's ideas; and having sat at the feet of Adam Smith, he thought only of carrying out the ideas of Adam Smith, without regard to the conditions that were before the minds of that author when he laid down the propositions contained in his great work. Sir Stafford Northcote, who was secretary to Mr. Gladstone at one time, was a most estimable and honourable man, but was essentially a mediocre man, and was not able to cope with the situation; and those bounties, which violated every doctrine of political economy, and were an offence to political economists, were accepted by free traders, who were prepared to say, let this device work its way and give the people cheap sugar, not thinking that the refiners were being ruined by it, just as Mr. Gladstone took the duty off silk in order that fine ladies might obtain cheap silken gowns, and left Coventry with scarcely a factory running, as silent as a city of the dead and scarcely a single thread to weave in it. That was the result of following Adam Smith's doctrine. England could not impose countervailing duties. I do not think, under present treaties, England could tax continental beet directly, and that is no doubt where a point was made against the policy enunciated by Mr. Chamberlain. I will show, however, how the difficulty could be surmounted. A classification could be adopted without infringing treaties. Let raw cane sugar pay a stipulated duty, raw beet the same, plus the continental bounty, and manufactured beet plus the additional bounty again. Then let the rate be fixed to bring in the amount received from tea, and abolish the duty on that commodity; because the chief argument against Mr. Chamberlain's proposal is that you tax food. Tea is as much food as sugar. They get from tea \$18,000,000, speak roughly, and they can give that back. That is the way I would meet and overcome the difficulty. But to speak more particularly in regard to the matter, I find there are ninety pounds per capita of sugar used in England per annum. This quantity is not used individually, because the breweries consume 114,000 tons.

Then a small amount is used by the confectioners, so that fully one-third is used up in that way, leaving about 60 pounds per capita used by individuals. There is only six pounds of tea used per capita. As I say, give them the duty on tea, which makes up \$18,750,000. For the year ending 31st December, 1896, there was imported into the United Kingdom 385,000 tons of cane sugar, 400,000 tons of raw beet and 740,000 tons of refined. Look how that im-

port has gone up. Of refined beet in 1874, there were only 126,000 tons imported. Remember tons; multiply that by 2,240 and you will see the number of pounds. It is a very difficult thing to get at the average rate of bounty, but so far as it can be made out, the exporting countries of Germany and France, pay about 30 cents per cwt. on the raw beet and 42 cents per cwt. on the refined. Take the 385,000 tons of cane sugar at 36 cents per cwt., and you get \$2,722,000; and take the 400,000 tons of raw beet at 36 cents per cwt., plus 30 cents the amount of bounty, and you get 66 cents per cwt., or \$5,280,000. On the 740,000 tons of refined beet at 36 cents, plus 42 cents, you get 78 cents per cwt. or \$11,544,000. You get in all \$19,596,000. You give them the tea free and you put a duty on the sugar and you get rid entirely of the argument. Sugar is an article used more by the rich than by the poor. Excepting those families that use alcohol, tea is the great stimulant of the poor all over England, but for the rich there are light wines and various stimulating drinks and the rich do not use tea as much as the poor. The rich use sugar in various ways, much more so than the poor, so that this would be a poor man's policy and in another way it would confer a great benefit on the people. The only harm in tea is that when you allow it to be overdrawn, the tannin is brought out of it and it becomes injurious. If you draw it for five minutes or so, you get the pure liquor, and the result of this policy would be that while there would be more tea bought there would not be more of the liquor drunk. It would be the pure liquor of the tea and not the tannin that would be used, and in this way such a policy would have great advantages to the health of the English people. Once more let me show the havoc which has been wrought in that trade amongst the refiners. In 1874 there was imported cane from the British possessions 245,000 tons as against 155,000 tons in 1896. There were imported from foreign countries in 1874, 335,000 tons as against 230,000 tons in 1896. There was imported from foreign countries 125,000 tons of raw beet in 1874, as against 400,000 tons in 1896, and there was imported of refined beet from foreign countries 126,500 tons in 1874 as against 740,000 in 1896. The aggregate amount in 1874 was 831,500 tons as against 1,525,000 tons in 1896. This shows what havoc has been wrought amongst the refiners in England and Scotland. I say here, that if the British sugar-growing colonies could be helped by countervailing duties, you would not only be helping them by taking the course I suggest, but you would be helping to deal a deathblow to the bounty system on the European continent. The moment it would be seen that the bounty was going into the pockets, not of the manufacturers in Germany or France, but into the pockets of the English exchequer, that moment you would find they

Mr. DAVIN.

would think twice before they would adhere to the bounty system. Now, Sir, that I am not wrong in my surmises as to what took place in England, I have here the "Saturday Review," of the 19th of March, and it says:

It is currently supposed that in matters colonial Mr. Chamberlain has pretty well his own way; his sugar speech on Monday last goes far to weaken any such supposition. That the man who, less than two years ago, made bold and enthusiastic declarations in favour of a Customs Union, proclaiming loudly his contempt for the timid politicians and model-headed economists who feared to put duties on imports, should be running away, as he is now doing, from the harmless, necessary countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar is fair presumptive evidence that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's voice is as potent in the Cabinet as the Colonial Secretary. The spectacle is rather pitiful. With swelling breath Mr. Chamberlain declared that he would never desert the West Indies, while all the time he was conscious of his own fearfulness or inability to bring forth the only just and satisfactory measure for the relief of the West Indies.

That mysterious remedy which he hinted at in the Liverpool speech, which threw us into sceptical wonderment has now been disclosed in the House of Commons. It is a poor thing. Reciprocity with America is its name. How will it set the colonial staple industry on its legs again? Already America is the West Indies' best customer, now that the mother country has abandoned itself to the German beet stuff, and it is not in the least likely that the United States will take more of the West Indian sugar because of any reciprocity arrangements. As a matter, as a serious fact, they will take less than that in future; for they also are going in heavily for cultivating sugar themselves. The United States are the last market which the West Indies can look to for the future sale of their sugar. Instead, they will ere long have to face severe competition from the United States, both in America and in England as well, unless England adopts a preferential tariff.

You know very well, Mr. Speaker, that this journal is considered one of the most enlightened in the Empire, and certainly for a long time—and I doubt if it has changed its opinion—it was a devoted disciple of the financial and economic principles of Adam Smith; but yet, the logic of events has brought them to see that the time has come when they must break away from the pedantry of free trade, and do something for Great Britain and her colonies. I have here what is called the Jubilee Report of Mr. Chamberlain, and it contains statements from all the colonies, including one from the Minister of Trade and Commerce of Canada. In reading these reports you come to the conclusion that the trade along the whole line is slipping away from England, and I shall read the comments of that most enlightened man who edits the "Pall Mall Gazette." I think it is still Mr. Greenwood, and if it is, I know him, because he at one time was editor of a paper of which I was one of the staff, and he is a thoroughly enlightened man. He says:

According to this journal, the Dingley tariff ought to incite Great Britain to perfect the scheme for preferential trade within the Empire.

I am reading this for the behoof of the Finance Minister. We remember how he told us that the time was distant when England would entertain preferential trade, if at all; and yet we find the "Saturday Review" attributing to Mr. Chamberlain the views we know he had and expressed. And here we have the "Pall Mall Gazette" advocating preferential trade, as follows:—

The other lesson taught is the need of cementing and furthering trade relations within the Empire. The United States have made it plain that they intend as far as possible to be a self-contained commercial unit. Other nations are following the same path. Let England—Greater England—do likewise. Let her federate her magnificent Empire in a customs union, and she can afford to go her own way, heedless of the tariff walls which other countries build around their borders. Whether we like it or not, it is a fact that in the future we shall have to look to the colonies, and not to foreign countries, for extended trade, and seeing how great are the prospects of growth in the colonies, commercial as well as patriotic considerations must incline us to regard the prospect with pleasure. At the same time we have no guarantee that even those markets will be ours. Mr. Chamberlain's Jubilee Blue-book demonstrated that the foreigner was steadily and in some cases swiftly creeping into the markets of Greater England. Yet we can stop the encroachment. It can be done to some extent by the adoption of better business methods on the part of our own manufacturers and merchants, but only completely by the founding of a customs union for preferential trade with the Empire.

And yet we are told here that there is no movement whatever in England in favour of preferential trade. Sir, was it the way to get preferential trade, to go over to England, and when it is mentioned to flout it? Is it the way to get preferential trade when we give a preference like this, not to say one word about getting any advantages in the mother country—the first step in the right direction; but to say to them, "We give it to you as a free gift, but we will be very glad if you will do anything for us out of gratitude." That, I think, is poor statesmanship, and I would be very glad if any argument I have used to-night would get these gentlemen out of that rut.

Now, the Minister of Trade and Commerce made an extraordinary appeal to us on this side of the House when the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) was moving the adjournment of the House. He appealed to us to ring down the curtain as quickly as possible upon the miserable play; he said, as it were, the Government was a spectacle for gods and men, and he appealed to us for heaven's sake to ring down the curtain: "I feel uneasy; do not suppose that my position is a pleasant one; I do not like the task of defending all the petty—I suppose I cannot say villainies—of their conduct, and

throw the fading skirts of my vanishing respectability over their nakedness; I do not want to have to do that;" and with a naivety that was refreshing, the hon. gentleman appealed to us to close the debate as quickly as possible. But, Sir, we cannot do that. We have a duty as an Opposition to perform—to expose any blunder that this Government may commit; to show the weaknesses in any measure they propose. As Lord Randolph Churchill said, the duty of an Opposition is to oppose. Our duty is to show where their measures fail, and if possible to keep them in the right track. But there is another duty on our part which dwarfs completely the duty I have described; and that duty is to hold up in all its hideousness before the people of Canada the fearful betrayal of the people's interests and their own opinions made by these gentlemen in power. Let them not suppose that we will allow the people of Canada to forget their words. Let them not suppose that if—

A marcfiful Providence fashioned them holler
A purpose that they might their principles
swallow.

—that we will not show the people how hollow all their professions were in the past, or how unworthy they are of the seats they occupy. The Minister of Public Works has denied in a sort of way the charges of boodling. There are some men that you cannot touch but they reek all over with boodle. Some things may be perfectly certain that you do not see. Now, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is a reading man, and I know he is a great student of Shakspeare. He will have some reminiscences of his Trinity College days, and I suppose he used to dip into Aeschylus. Well, the scene in "Macbeth," when Duncan is being murdered, and Lady Macbeth feels all the horror of the crime, is supposed by many critics to be the greatest scene in all dramatic literature to inspire horror. But there is a scene that dwarfs the scene in Macbeth; and that is the scene in "Agamemnon." Just after Agamemnon has come back to Mycænae, and has gone into the palace, Cassandra, seated in the chariot at the gate, cries out, "blood, blood," and she smells the blood, and says the cow is striking the bull—

Mr. FLINT. No, she said "ber-lud."

Mr. DAVIN. This is not for you; it is for the classical members of the party. I can recognize a gentleman who has only had a dragged-up culture; but I am not speaking to him, I am speaking to the scholars on the other side. She is perfectly certain of the deed taking place in the palace; she is perfectly assured of what that deed is, although she does not see it. And so, since this Government has come into power, we have seen evidences of corruption. First, it was vermicularly small—business is business; but the worm grew

to be a serpent, and the serpent swelled into a python; and there it rises and grows and swells, and is pouring out of malign jaws the slaver of corruption all over Canada. The Minister of Trade and Commerce need not make any admisericordiam appeals to us, for if we have to make any exposures, it is our duty to do so. Was there a profession made by them like their profession of adherence to the independence of Parliament? We all remember what denunciations we had from the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) against a party that could tolerate any one of its supporters holding a seat in this House and at the same time having a promise of place in his pocket. But these gentlemen had hardly got into office, when we had Mr. Langelier, whom we used to regard as a Simon Pure, sitting here with the promise of a lieutenant-governorship from the Prime Minister in his pocket. And we have other members, with promises of lieutenant-governorships and judgeships, sitting in this House to-day, supporting the Government, and these hon. gentlemen, who were wont to so vigorously denounce such abuses, are now like the dumb dogs of Jupiter—they cannot bark.

I am sorry that that dulcet-voiced gentleman, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Pater-son), is not here, for I love to hear him.

Mr. COWAN. He is here.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, I see he is asleep. He is turning his face to the wall. Absit omen, again. What is the omen of a street re-baptized "Laurier," which leads to a graveyard, compared with the omen of a gentleman holding so high a position as the hon. Minister of Customs turning his face to the wall? We know that that is a sign of death—the death I mean, of course, of the Government.

The hon. Minister of Customs, trying to meet a statement which I made, concerning the Massey-Harris Company, quoted how many implements had come in during the last year, and he made a very peculiar argument, for a free trader. He said:

If the manufacturers had come and said to the Finance Minister. We want you to look at these figures taken from your own trade returns. What are they? he would say. They would answer: We beg to point out to you that in the year 1896, in the six months ending 31st December, 372 harvesters of a value of \$37,071 were imported into Manitoba and the North-west Territories, to say nothing of the rest of the Dominion, while for the corresponding six months of the three next years, in which we have worked under a tariff reduced by you from 35 per cent to 20 per cent, there has been a marked increase. In 1895, for the corresponding six months, the number of harvesters imported into Manitoba and the North-west alone was 760, in 1896, it was 803, while for the six months ending 31st December, 1897, the number of harvesters imported into Manitoba and the North-west alone was 1,432, representing a value of \$144,289.

Mr. DAVIN.

The hon. gentleman is, not only literally, but figuratively asleep, because the North-west has made great progress, and that number of harvesters would be but a mere flea-bite compared with what they use. In one town, Indian Head, the agent of the Massey-Harris Company, Mr. Van Patten, told me a few months ago that they had sold \$50,000 worth in that one little place of the large implements this year. Apply that to all Manitoba and the North-west, and you will find that the number thus imported was only a flea-bite. But who was making that argument? It was a good free trader, who used to denounce protective duties, and who was one of the loudest denouncers in 1892 and 1886 of the increased duty on sugar. I have here a letter from the Massey-Harris Company, the whole of which I will not read, but in which they say, writing to the Mayor of Toronto, and wanting, I suppose, a good site for their premises:

For some years, as is pretty generally known, our company has had a steadily growing foreign trade. We have expended a very large amount of capital and energy in recent years to get our European business established, and, as a result, are now receiving very large orders from our London, England, office.

I remember telling you, Mr. Speaker, at a previous period, that they were doing a large business in Australia, and they now tell us that they are doing a large business in Europe. I am glad to see that our policy has brought them to that position, just as it has brought this country to the position it now occupies, and for which these hon. gentlemen have the effrontery to claim credit. But this shows how completely the fact that I have given with regard to Indian Head is an answer to the statement made by my hon. friend. Practically, only very few came in, and my own belief is, that, if you were to take away the duty altogether, so excellent are the machines that the Massey-Harris Company are making—because they have been making them for a quarter of a century and have brought to such perfection that they can compete with McCormack or any other competitors in any market of the world—they would still hold their own against the foreign article.

I wish to say a few words with regard to that precious feature of the tariff which shows—if I may use an inelegant expression, though I hate to be inelegant, in case I might shock the fine and delicate nerves of some hon. gentlemen opposite—that in this portion of the Budget the hon. Postmaster General has had his paw. I refer to the tax on newspapers. I propose to speak only for the North-west papers. There is not a paper in Moosomin, Indian Head or any prominent town of the North-west Territories that does not circulate further than 10 miles, and five or ten dollars will hit these little papers very hard. They have a hard struggle as it is, and, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has said, you can do a community no greater

harm than to strike at its newspaper, because the newspapers, small and great, in this country have been brought to such excellence that, if a man were to take such a newspaper, for instance, as the "Mail," or St. John "Sun," and read it carefully, and use Webster's Dictionary, when necessary, and look up the geographical references, and occasionally aid his imperfect knowledge by reference to the encyclopedia, at the end of six or seven years he would be an educated man, with a good knowledge of politics, contemporaries, history and a large amount of mental discipline. I regard that tax as a small and petty thing, but, of course, I do not, for a moment, place it side by side with the reduction in the rate of interest on deposits, or with this miserable make-shift policy, devised solely to square the Finance Minister with the West Indian merchants in Halifax, by taking \$500,000 out of the pockets of the poor sugar-eaters, in order to stand well with Mr. Jones and others in Halifax, and then coating the pill in order to make his leader, colleague, guide, philosopher and friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, swallow it without a wry face. I notice, that the day it was propounded, the Minister of Trade and Commerce came in, looking unusually pale, and I knew that the pill had disagreed with him, even though it was coated. But the real reason is, as I have said, an electioneering one. To make himself square with these powerful men in Halifax, \$500,000 is to be taken at the breakfast table out of the poor people of this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal more to say, but it is growing late, I think.

An hon. MEMBER. Go on.

Mr. DAVIN. The night is young. For my part I never speak to "Hansard," I always put my arguments as tersely as I possibly can, because my main object is to carry conviction, to make as many converts as possible. For, I may say, I do not entirely despair of all the hon. gentlemen opposite. Some of them are very young, they have only been in the House for twenty months, and, as members of Parliament, might be called fledglings.

Mr. McMULLEN. They have been here long enough to measure you up.

Mr. DAVIN. They might be here for a hundred years and not measure my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) for it would be impossible to measure the height and depth and length and breadth of the political meanness embodied in his carcass.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member is not nearly so deep.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Reply to that.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not want my hon. friend to reply to me. He has the advantage of me. He can see a good deal more than I can just now.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget has gone forth to the country. It has been criticised with great ability from this side of the House. Its weaknesses are patent. It is an attempt to befool the people. But that attempt will fail, and it will be known as one more of the many acts of this Government, in the brief time they have been in office which marks them as at once incompetent as disingenuous and dishonest.

Mr. ROCHE. I regret that I am obliged at this hour in the morning to undertake the delivery of a two hours' speech—more or less. Still, I am compelled to do so by the stubbornness of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WALLACE. I would suggest that the hon. leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) consider the question of adjournment.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that I cannot accept the motion for adjournment. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) and also the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), who are supposed to represent the Opposition, respectively and together assured me that they would agree to the closing of the debate to-night. And the leading Whip of the party, as the hon. gentleman knows, corroborated that statement. Now, I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) that I have never before known an agreement of that kind entered into by the leaders of the party, to be utterly repudiated. It is not an affront to us, but an affront to them. I am very sorry that neither of them saw fit to remain here in order to explain the situation to their friends. I must say to hon. gentlemen opposite that they would show more reasonable respect to their leaders and also to the usages which have always prevailed in this House, if they would bring the debate as agreed to, to a close. Of course, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) desires to deliver himself of speech, we will remain here and listen to him. But I think we must carry the thing through to-night. There is an end to all possible arrangements unless we live up to these we make. I may remind the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) that contrary to the usual practice, we gave two whole days, Tuesday and Wednesday of last week in order to oblige the leader of the Opposition, in view of the indisposition of the ex-Minister of Finance. I think that that conduct on our part might be met with some better return than this.

Mr. ROCHE. I thank the Minister of Trade and Commerce for expressing his intention of stopping here and listening to my speech. But I feel confident that I am expressing the idea of every member on this side when I declare that I do not think it at all necessary for that hon. gentleman to lecture hon. members on this side on the duties we owe to our leaders. We owe a duty to

our leaders, but we owe a duty also to our constituents, and I propose to discharge that duty, even though I take up a few minutes more of the hon. gentleman's time, and though I, like the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, would like to be in my bed. And while I shall cut my remarks as short as possible, I think that even if this debate went on for another twenty-four hours it would be as short a budget debate as ever was known in this House. It is usual not to end the budget debate in less than a week to two weeks. We have not yet been a week upon it. Instead of drawing it to a premature conclusion, members who make up their minds to say something should have time afforded to them to express their opinions. To say that the budget speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, delivered on the 5th April was the tamest affair of the kind, both in matter, and manner of delivery, as well as in its reception by even the Government supporters, is to put it very mildly. And were it not for the revival of trade that has taken place in Canada in common with every other country in the universe, a revival which by the way had been predicted by the ex-Finance Minister, the hon. member for York, before he left office, which prediction was met with the usual amount of scepticism by our Liberal friends, were it not, I say, for that fact, the Budget speech of this year would have been devoid of almost a single feature of interest either to this House or to the country at large. The only portion of it that seemed to infuse even a moderate amount of enthusiasm into the hon. gentleman's supporters was the type-written peroration, the delivery of which caused a sardonic smile to pass over the features of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, though I must admit the Finance Minister read it very nicely. Had any of the Government's political opponents predicted two short years ago that within so short a period the leaders of the great Liberal party, with the responsibilities of office on their shoulders, would go back so thoroughly on their old-time traditions of the past, would relegate to the back-ground their theoretical professions of free trade which they have preached throughout the length and breadth of Canada for the past twenty years, would turn so complete a summer-sault not only on the trade question, but on almost every other question of public policy, he would have been laughed to scorn by the Liberal party as being a person "non compos mentis."

It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that a great sense of disappointment and chagrin should pervade the ranks of the Government supporters because of the falling from grace of those whom they had been taught to look up to as the prospective saviours of their country, as master hands in statescraft, honest, upright and consistent, who were imbued with so fine a sense of political morality as to make it impossible

Mr. ROCHE.

for them to preach one code or doctrine to-day and practise a diametrically opposite one to-morrow. I say, therefore, that under the circumstances it is quite excusable on the part of the Government supporters to display the amount of apathy which they did during the delivery of the Budget speech of the Finance Minister, though party fealty will not permit them to do their duty to their constituents by denouncing from their places in this House the deception which had been practised on the electors by those political friends of theirs in authority, who to judge them in the light of their post-election performances, had utilized any and every cry to cajole and hoodwink the people for the sole purpose of gaining the Treasury benches. Those hon. gentlemen had become so inured to the cold shades of Opposition for so many years, that on each successive occasion that the people were appealed to for their verdict, they as a party became more and more reckless in their charges, more profuse in their pledges, more fickle in their ideas of political economy, and more determined to gain the ascendancy by hook or by crook, that having at last gulled the people in sufficient number to gain their point and being brought face to face with all those past professions, they may well recoil from their self-imposed task and thus stamp themselves as designing and unscrupulous politicians. While we rejoice to know that even at the eleventh hour our opponents have seen the error of their ways, and have become converts from the advocacy of that policy which had it been put into operation would have resulted disastrously to the best interests of this country, still it would be beyond human nature to expect us to condone the offence committed against the public by the Liberal party in having obtained the support of the electors under false pretences, by making pledges which they never intended to fulfil, by posing as political moralists while at the same time they were political hypocrites, by wrapping themselves in a mantle of superior virtue and expressing thanks that they were not as other men, while their moral stamina in the political line was rotten at its foundation. It would, I say, be too much to expect us to excuse the duplicity which our righteously indignant electors now see was practised upon them by a desperate party in their endeavours to secure the loaves and fishes. And still we find some of those hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches true to their past record in blowing hot and cold in the same breath, even at the present time, preaching free trade while practising protection, and thus trying to pander to both elements, but thus far the free traders have had to content themselves with the shadow while their opponents obtained the substance, and it is but paying a poor compliment to the intelligence of the people if the Government imagines that after the experience of the past those electors will be satisfied with vain promises

and empty professions. No party of men who ever had charge of the political affairs of this country have in so short a time become so utterly discredited as have the political pirates who now misgovern the country, except the same party during the years between 1873 and 1878. And as the people of Canada at the first opportunity in 1878, meted out deserved punishment to those in power, so I venture to say will history repeat itself and a similar verdict be pronounced by the great electorate on the very first occasion the Government affords the opportunity. It would be amusing were it not so absurd to hear some of those hon. gentlemen trying to square themselves with their promises, attempting to convince this House that they have kept their plighted faith with the electors, when as a matter of fact there is scarcely a beneficial feature of their policy that they have not stolen from their political opponents, and scarcely a principle which they have adopted that did not formerly meet with their condemnation. Why, Sir, who does not remember the ridicule that was heaped on the tariff commission appointed by the Conservative Government, by the Liberal Opposition at that time, who declared that such a commission was entirely unnecessary, that all the facts and the iniquities, as they were pleased to term them, incident to a protective policy were already well known and it was entirely superfluous and an unnecessary expense to have that roving commission travelling round the country for the purpose of gaining information to assist them in making a proper tariff revision. But what was one of the very first acts of the Liberal Government on this question? Not content with the evidence produced before the first commission, they, too, appointed a commission to travel from city to city and from town to town to learn something about that which they had declared they were already cognizant of. This act on the part of the Liberal Government constrained even that partizan organ supporting the Administration, the "Winnipeg Tribune," edited by the hon. member for Lisgar, to say the following:—

It would be unfair to prejudge the Dominion Government in the matter of tariff reform, but to those of us who have entertained a deep conviction that the advent to power of the Liberal party meant sweeping reductions in the tariff and the placing of a large number of important articles upon the free list, the action of the Government in sending a committee of its Cabinet about the country to take evidence as to the tariff has a rather disquieting effect. One would have thought that the leaders of the Liberal party knew enough about the tariff and its myriad of iniquities to effect a reformation without going to the manufacturers and say, in effect: Will you tell us just what you can stand in the way of reductions. It seems to us that while no harm may probably be done by the inquiry, it is not calculated to inspire the confidence of the people who felt confident that tariff reform of a sweeping character would follow in the wake of the advent to power of the Liberal Government. It may be

that the Government will redeem the pledges made so profusely in the speeches of the Liberal leaders for the past five or ten years, as well as the promises contained in campaign literature. We can only await the meeting of the House next February when the Tariff Bill will doubtless be produced. There is no denying the fact, however that there is considerable uneasiness felt in many quarters that the Government will not go as far in the matter of reforming the tariff as the country had been led to expect that it would go if the Liberals were returned to power.

So that we find condemnation from a member of their own political household for Act No. 1 in connection with the Government method of tariff revision. And while on this question of commissions, I might just mention that it was the declared intention of the Prime Minister to effect a settlement of the Manitoba school question by means of a commission to investigate into all the facts and circumstances in connection with that question. He blamed the Government of Sir Charles Tupper for having acted with undue haste, without having a full knowledge of all the facts, and pledged himself that one of the first acts, if he were elected Prime Minister, would be to appoint a commission to obtain this necessary information, and on the strength of the report of that commission he would effect a settlement that would be satisfactory to everybody. Who ever heard of this promised commission having been appointed? If Parliament was not seized of all the information in the first instance, what further information did this Government obtain, and from whom was it obtained? Sir, that promise was made by the Prime Minister for the express purpose of deceiving the people. That question was kept open year after year by the provincial government, and made a political football to assist the Liberal party. Twice in provincial campaigns it had proved the salvation of that party; so, it was decided to play it for all it was worth in the Dominion election, and, having worked successfully on that occasion, the Premier was brought face to face with his promise of a commission to investigate, and as usual, went back on his promise. But, fearing it might act as a boomerang on the Liberal party, he and Mr. Greenway put their heads together and effected a settlement, not by keeping faith with the electors, but to suit political exigencies, and to-day we see Mr. Greenway conceding on the instalment plan that which he had refused to a Conservative Government. So, Mr. Speaker, commission promise No. 2 went by the board. Again, the Premier declared in the city of London, Ont., during the election campaign, that he was as ardent an advocate of preferential trade as Sir Charles Tupper, and pledged himself, that, if his party was returned to power, one of his first acts would be to send a commission over to England to negotiate with Lord Salisbury to obtain such a boon. We all know, Sir, how the promise of this third commis-

sion has been kept. Instead of advocating or trying to promote such a policy, he did everything in his power to kill preferential trade in the speeches he delivered while in England. Why, Sir, it has almost become an established fact now, that, if the people of this country desire to inform themselves as to the proposed policy of the Government on any particular thing, all they have to do is to obtain the pledge of the Prime Minister for a certain line of action, and they then make up their minds that a directly opposite policy will be adopted, so exceptional is the case that the hon. gentleman adheres to his pledges. The hon. Minister of Customs, in his explosion in this House the other evening, and since becoming a member of this House—I can readily understand how appropriately the hon. member has been named "Little Thunder," for what he lacks in force of argument, he makes up in lung force—he, in stentorian tones, enumerated the reductions that would take place in the duties on a number of articles under the preferential clause with Great Britain. Unfortunately for the Minister, though, his little bubble was pricked by the hon. member for West York, who showed how hollow were those pretensions and how insignificant was the amount of importations of many of those articles from England, the major portion of which came from the United States. The hon. Minister of Customs is a self-deceived man, if he really believes the assertion he made in the House, that there is a feeling of satisfaction in the country because of the confidence people had in the Government, and he loudly asserted, that the Ministry did not go out on strike, were loyal to each other, and were, in short, a happy family. Why, Sir, I have too much respect for the intelligence of the hon. gentleman to think that he has not observed abundant evidence to prove the contrary. What mean those articles in the Independent press, in the Liberal press, those murmurings, long and loud, from the Government supporters, those deputations innumerable who have visited the capital to seek redress, to obtain changes in the tariff to save them from ruin? And, while the Ministry preserves an outward semblance of unity it has not been all peace within. We could not expect those hon. gentlemen, after wandering in the wilderness for eighteen years, hungering after the spoils, to resign their positions, though disagreements were numerous and bickerings frequent. Self-interest compels those gentlemen to hang on to their seats at all hazard, though we may see resignations more frequent in the future, since the Bruneau episode. And still, methinks, we have heard of the Minister of the Interior leaving the Council board in the sulks on more than one occasion; of the endeavours made to knife the Minister of Railways in his own political household, and, as for the Minister of Public Works, he who runs may read, and he who reads

Mr. ROCHE.

cannot have failed to see the love which he has inspired in the breasts of his fellow-countrymen in Quebec, and the so-called harmony that exists in the clubs and Liberal associations of that province. What did "La Patrie" say, the organ of the Minister of Public Works, in discussing the defeat in the by-election for the Magdalen Islands of the Liberal candidate:

Those behind the scenes know the attitude of the Senate last session was due to certain persons who called themselves followers of the Laurier Cabinet, but would not hesitate at anything to destroy it. The Ministers have most complete proofs of intrigues which took place recently and which led Sir Mackenzie Bowell to believe he could precipitate a new appeal to the people, with a chance of a Conservative victory. We make these observations to put the Liberals on their guard against the acts of certain malcontents who are ready to adopt any pretext to sow disunion in our ranks.

On this same subject the Edmonton "Bulletin," the organ of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), comments as follows:—

As in the case of the vote on the fast Atlantic service, several of the strongest and most bitterly partisan Liberals considered it necessary to oppose the Government, showing that the gulf between Opposition promises and Government performances must be very wide indeed when they could not jump across it, even to support the Government.

Again, we heard from the Huntingdon "Gleaner," one of the ablest Liberal papers in Quebec:

The session of Parliament which is about to end at Ottawa is not looked back upon with satisfaction either by the Liberals or by the electors generally. The new Government has failed to realize the expectations of those who placed it in their power in three regards: in the tariff, in not reducing the expenditure, and in granting of subsidies.

It deals at length with the derelictions of the Government under each of these three heads, and concludes:

We stand aghast at such a revival of a system we hoped was dead, and see nothing before the country save a continuance of high taxes, of deficits, and increases of the debt. It was not for this that the Liberals were chosen a year ago, and unless speedy change is made in their policy they will lose that independent support to which their success at the polls was due.

Even the Winnipeg "Tribune," edited by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), partisan organ as it is, was constrained to say as follows:—

Viewed from a western standpoint we must admit in perfect frankness that great disappointment exists owing to the failure of the Government to meet western expectations in the revision of the tariff.

Last but not least, we read in the Montreal "Witness," an organ that gives a very hearty support to the Government of the day, the following:—

The heavy extra expenditures carried through Parliament this session have been a subject of a good deal of jeering and jibing. In opposition the Liberals strongly objected to the growing tendency of Government to take all sorts of industries and projects under its wings and foster them with subsidies. They held that steamship lines, railways, manufacturing and other industries, as well as other commercial enterprises, should cease to be dependent upon the Government, and should be left to individuals and corporate enterprises founded upon a pure business basis. That was the theory and policy of the Liberals in Opposition, and yet this session, with a Liberal Government in power, new and costly lines of railway have been heavily subsidized, new steamship lines have been given large annual grants, cold storage warehouses and transportations have been undertaken at a considerable cost, increased expenditures upon canals proposed, and for other projects considerable sums voted. Liberals who have been and are strong supporters of the Government have objected to the Government's course; indeed they have been perhaps the most strenuous all-round opponents of extra expenditure this session. These Liberal critics are for the most part the old guard of the party, who have through seventeen years of extravagance been the champions of economy and of free trade, and of purity of administration. They hope that the victory of their party meant the immediate radical reform of every abuse, the immediate curtailment of every abuse, the immediate curtailment of every extra expenditure. They have been disappointed, and have taken no pains to conceal the fact.

Are these, Mr. Speaker, the evidences that the Minister of Customs referred to of the peace, quietness and harmony that is supposed to exist in that well-regulated household? And these are but a tithe of the evidences that might be produced in the same line to show the nature of the smouldering volcano over which the hon. gentlemen are whistling to keep their courage up. If this is the Minister's idea of political quietude and contentment, what a Donnybrook fair it must be when, in his opinion, there is a row in the camp. The record of the present Government since assuming office is so diametrically opposite to their past professions, that one is struck with amazement to hear any hon. member on that side of the House attempt to justify their actions on the ground that these pledges have been fulfilled. It shows what arrant humbugs those political acrobats have been. What became of their promise to reduce the expenditure of the Government? We all remember how the financial critic of the then Opposition (Sir Richard Cartwright) denounced the expenditure of the Conservative Government as being most extravagant, and in his criticism of the Budget speech of the then Finance Minister, declared that \$38,000,000, let alone \$40,000,000, was in his judgment a monstrous sum for the people of Canada to provide for. And still, we find that whereas the ordinary expenditure for the last year of Conservative rule was \$36,949,142, it had increased to \$38,335,086 for the year ending June 30th, 1897, while the

public debt was increased during the first year of Liberal rule by \$2,791,000. This is rather a unique method of fulfilling pledges of economy. Now, while we rejoice in the returning wave of prosperity that Canada in common with other countries is participating in, we of the Conservative party are not of the blue ruin variety of politicians, and will not be found decrying the fair fame and name of our country in order to gain a paltry political advantage, as did our opponents; still, it was rather amusing to see the Finance Minister enumerating the various examples of this prosperity, following in much the same line as his predecessor, the hon. member for York, but a practice which was condemned by the then Liberal Opposition as being an entirely misleading one. Take, for instance, the deposits in the Government savings banks. The Minister of Trade and Commerce formerly scouted the idea that this was an evidence of the country's prosperity, and declared on the other hand it was an evidence that money could not find investments and was therefore locked up. But now that the Liberals are in power it is pointed to as an indication that the country is booming. Consistency thou art a jewel.

Is it not a significant fact, Mr. Speaker, that, whereas the Liberal party, a few short years ago, proclaimed from the housetops that the only salvation for Canada was in adopting a policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, to-day you cannot find a man amongst them to even give utterance to the name, unrestricted reciprocity? I am glad to see, they are all so thoroughly ashamed of their actions on that occasion, and to find that the responsibilities of office have had so beneficial an effect on their party, that they are now vieing with their opponents as Imperialists, though their ultra-loyalty is of so recent a date. The leader of the Government, at a banquet given in the city of Boston in 1891, when referring to the question of Imperial federation, declared that he wanted no European interference in Canadian affairs, and pronounced as absurd the idea that Canada would establish a line of steamers with England, by reason of which trade would be cultivated between Canada and Great Britain. "For my part," said Mr. Laurier, "I prefer the Yankee dollar to the British shilling, especially when the dollar is so near and the shilling so far away." Thus spoke the American, Mr. Laurier, but what a wonderful change in his time to-day. Now he is an Imperialist, but only after he met with a rebuff at the hands of our American neighbours to the south. And at Valleyfield, Quebec, he said:

We will get a treaty with the United States if we can, and if England objects we will consider her objections. Let Lord Salisbury take care of the interests of England and we will take care of the interests of Canada.

You will see the veiled threat of the Premier

in that paragraph to Lord Salisbury, practically telling him to mind his own business. Again, at Toronto, the First Minister said :

Every great reform has cost the reformers years of labour, and those years of labour I am prepared to give. Though the Democrats may be defeated in the United States and the Canadians may grow faint-hearted in Canada, the Liberal party, so long as I have anything to do with it, will remain true to the cause of unrestricted reciprocity until that cause is successful.

Has the Premier remained true to that cause? Did he keep his word and adhere to that policy? We all know different, and if these are still the sentiments of the hon. gentleman, he is now again deceiving the people in his pro-British utterances in this House and in the country. The Premier is too fickle to be trusted by the people of this country; he has the unfortunate habit, which may pass for the moment, of trimming his utterances to suit the particular audience he may be addressing, and, when confronted with his contradictory statements, it shows him up in anything but a favourable light. The man who then scoffed at the idea of Imperial federation, now pretends that, were he somewhat younger, his supreme ambition would be to sit in an Imperial Federal Parliament at Westminster. The man who then ridiculed the idea of a fast Atlantic line, is now giving enormous subsidies to Petersen & Tait for the purpose of securing one. The gentleman who then sneered at the British shilling, has now accepted a British title, though a Democrat of the Democrats, and a Cobden medal. And still we are told that these hon. gentlemen are consistent and have fulfilled their promises. What have they done for the farmers of this country? They have reduced the protection on wheat from 15 cents to 12½ cents per bushel; on flour, from 75 cents to 60 cents a bushel; on cornmeal, from 40 cents to 25 cents per bushel; on corn from 7½ cents a bushel to the free list; but they have taken good care to go back on their pledges in reference to the duties on agricultural implements, coal oil, lumber, fruit, and a host of other articles which the people were led to expect would be placed on the free list or sweeping reductions made on the duties. And now, to cap the climax, we find an additional tax being placed on sugar, to assist those sugar barons, who formerly came in for so much abuse at the hands of the Liberal party. The Finance Minister notwithstanding the fact that taxation is yearly increasing, that our expenditure is going up every year, that our national debt is increasing by leaps and bounds, that we are still having deficits, coolly tells the House that it is his intention to levy three or four hundred thousand dollars of additional taxation on sugar, a necessary of life, in order that Canada may pose as a philanthropist, and do the charitable act to our fellow-colonists in the West Indies though the mother country has given no special privileges to those colonists. Oh, but say they, we

Mr. ROCHE.

have placed barbed wire and binder twine on the free list. See how much cheaper farmers will be able to secure these articles because of this. And as drowning men grasp at straws so the Government imagines that this Act will square them with the farmers. Well, as far as binder twine is concerned (Manilla), sold in carload lots f.o.b., at Winnipeg, in 1897, at \$6.50 per hundred pounds. It is now worth \$7.15 per hundred pounds, or an increase over last year of \$1.25. So, I fail to see where the benefit comes in on that article. The hon. member for South Leeds has pointed out that the Government sold the whole output of the binder twine of the Kingston Penitentiary to one of their own political friends, Mr. Hobbs, ex-M.P.P., of London, at 4 cents a pound, and that gentleman has secured the sole agency for American twine as well, thereby cornering it and raising the price to the farmers of Canada. And as for barbed wire every manufacturer of barbed wire in Canada has been compelled to close down business, and the farmers pay just as much for wire as previously. Time will not admit me, Mr. Speaker, to produce all the evidence that can be produced to show how incapable these hon. gentlemen have proved to be, but I think sufficient has been advanced to demonstrate that fact, and, in conclusion, I would commend to hon. gentlemen opposite the following words of Ian MacLaren:—

No party has ever existed in civil history without containing patriotic men, and no party has laboured for the commonwealth without doing it service. Any party that declares itself to have a monopoly of honesty; any party that declares that the other cares only for its interests, but that they alone care for the well-being of the people, is condemned there and then. It ceases to be a party of patriotism; it becomes a party of Pharisaism.

In the light of our experience of these hon. gentlemen during the last few years, after their declarations that the advent of the Liberals to power would mark the end of extravagances and corruption, and the beginning of an era of economy and sound government, the application of these words to them is most appropriate, and I commend them to their earnest consideration, and trust they will result beneficially to the party.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) That the House resolve itself into Committee on Ways and Means, agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

1. That it is expedient to repeal section six of "The Customs Tariff, 1897," and to substitute the following section therefor:—

6. The importation into Canada of any goods enumerated, described or referred to in Schedule "C" to this Act is prohibited; and any such goods imported shall thereby become forfeited to the Crown and may be destroyed or otherwise dealt with as the Minister of Customs may direct; and any person importing any such pro-

hibited goods, or causing or permitting them to be imported, shall for each offence incur a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars.

Mr. WALLACE. In what way does that differ from the last?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The former resolution required the goods to be destroyed. This leaves it to the discretion of the Minister how to deal with it.

Mr. McDUGALL. To what goods does this clause refer?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Anything included in the prohibited list—books that violate the copyright law, &c. Such things had to be destroyed when they came into the hands of the officials, but under this clause the Minister of Customs may deal with them as he deems best.

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. DAVIN. I think we ought now to adjourn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The understanding was that if the sugar duties were reserved, there was nothing else likely to create debate, but if any hon. gentleman prefers to have a portion left over, I have no objection.

Mr. WALLACE. This second resolution is a very good item to discuss.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 3.40 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 18th April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I was very much surprised, in looking over "Hansard" of the 15th, page 3611, to read the following:—

Mr. BEATTIE. I rise to a point of order. There is liquor being drunk in the House by members, and there are members interrupting the speaker, who appear to be intoxicated. That, I say, is out of order.

Mr. FRASER (in the Chair). I am new to this position, but it seems to me that the hon. member who has raised the point of order is bound to name the person to whom he refers.

I had never imagined, Mr. Speaker, for one minute that the remarks of the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie), which I had then allowed to pass as a joke, should be recorded in "Hansard." I had every reason to believe that the hon. member, for whom I have great personal respect, should possess sufficient "gentilhomme" not to allow such a charge against the dignity of the House to go on record. But as this is a charge against the general dignity of the House, I leave the older members to take the matter up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I quote again "Hansard":

Mr. DAVIN. There he is, Sir, on your right hand.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. DAVIN. I believe it is the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) to whom my hon. friend refers. However, I do not know whether under the influence of beer he is much worse than when in his sober senses. It will be hard to make him much worse than he naturally is.

The member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), whose presence has been inflicted upon this honourable House by the unfortunate casting vote of the returning officer, consequent upon his past record, made against me a personal charge which I should despise as him who made it, were it not that persons who do not know the member for Assiniboia might take advantage of his contemptible—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member should bear in mind that in calling attention to the incident he is referring to, he must be careful not to use unparliamentary language.

Mr. TALBOT. Very well, Mr. Speaker, I ask your protection and the withdrawal of this charge.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is certainly very desirable that any mistake occurring or any misstatement made with regard to an hon. member the other evening charging that liquor was being drunk in this Chamber, should be corrected. That, at any rate, is a matter which, I am sure, the House will be glad to see corrected, as, undoubtedly, it is not the case at all. Some bottles of ginger ale were drunk in the House, but certainly no liquor was passed around. It is quite proper, I am sure, that the statement should be corrected.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Perhaps I may explain. At one o'clock on Saturday morning, or about that hour, many of the members of the House, who had been sitting up for a long time, appeared to be very much tired, and I ordered ginger ale, I may say, all round.

I did not order anything else, and I am quite sure that nothing else was drunk, on this side of the House, at any rate.

Mr. BEATTIE. Being the member who raised the point of order, perhaps a few words from me may not be out of place. On Friday night last, or rather early on Saturday morning, while the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was addressing this House, several members on the opposite side were making what I considered unbecoming interruptions. On several of the desks there were glasses, and on some of them bottles, and I felt that the stimulants were aiding the interruptions. But, Sir, independent of that, I do not feel that this Chamber should be made a refreshment hall. There is a restaurant in the building which can be used for such purposes, and I felt then and I feel now, that innovations of that kind should not be allowed, no matter to what hour this House should be called upon to sit. I do not wish to pose as an extreme advocate of temperance, nor as a prohibitionist, as I am neither. Had it not been for the uncalled-for interruptions made, I might not have called the attention of the Chair to the point of order. I did not do so for the purpose of making capital out of it.

Mr. DAVIN. As I have been referred to, I wish to say here that my hon. friend (Mr. Beattie) behind me, has given, I think, a historical account of what occurred. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) was sitting somewhere near where the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is sitting now, and certainly my belief then and my belief now—subject, of course, to correction—was that, while the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) and the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) and some others were drinking ginger ale or something like that, the hon. member for Bellechasse had a bottle of Carling's beer. That was my impression, I say, but subject to correction. And, as you know, Mr. Speaker, Carling's beer is a powerful stimulant, and, with certain temperaments it could not fail to be uncondusive to order. I might just mention that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough), who occupied the Chair then, said he could not interfere unless the name was given. I pointed to the fact, palpable to every one, that the hon. member for Bellechasse was imbibing a bottle of Carling's beer in this Chamber.

Mr. TALBOT. I entirely deny the charge, and I desire that every word that has been put on "Hansard" by the hon. gentleman be withdrawn.

Mr. DAVIN. There will be no withdrawal without an investigation. If we have an investigation, bring Mr. Barnett, who is in charge of the restaurant, and I think I will be able to prove that some-

Mr. TARTE.

thing stronger than ginger ale was drunk on that occasion. I would even express the hope that something stronger was drunk, for it would be an excuse for conduct that would be doubly disgraceful if it emanated from men in their sober senses.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, the question arose at a former sitting of the House, and I cannot interfere in the matter, even if it be desirable to do so. I hope that when an hon. member on the floor of the House makes a statement of fact which certainly was within his own knowledge, every other hon. gentleman will accept it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I was one of the members who was on this side that night, and I took notice of what went on. I say here positively that a bottle—I do not know what it contained—such as Carling's beer is usually put up in, was on the hon. member's desk before our eyes. I pointed it out to a number of hon. gentlemen sitting alongside of me. I do not know what was in the bottle or what was in the glasses. I may say also that there was smoking going on.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do hope, for the credit of this House, that no smoking or drinking, even ginger ale, will be carried on in this House except when an hon. member is making his speech, and he has his glass of water before him. I hope that nothing of that kind, no matter how late the House sits, will occur again.

Mr. McMULLEN. As one who sat on this side that evening and listened to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) almost the whole time he was speaking, I can testify that anything supplied here was pure ginger ale—

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member (Mr. Wallace) may laugh. I beg to tell him that neither he nor any other hon. member can prove either by those who were here or by any person downstairs, that there was a single drop of liquor used. Hon. gentlemen should be careful in making their insinuations. I would not expect anything better from the hon. member for West Assiniboia, but I certainly would from the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). The hon. member for West Assiniboia declares that he saw a bottle containing something of the colour of Carling's beer, and he went on to say that it was well known what the strength of that beer was. I presume that the hon. gentleman is unquestionably a judge of that matter. But I can tell him that there was no Carling's beer on this side of the House. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), in the kindness of his heart, and out of sympathy for members compelled

to sit here by the hour and listen to the twaddle and nonsense of the hon. member—

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know what reason the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) has to call "order"?

Mr. FOSTER. I may tell you that when you get through.

Mr. McMULLEN. Very well. We had to sit here during these long hours, but the ex-Finance Minister was not here. He does not realize the punishment to which we were subjected. We endured it very patiently. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), out of the goodness of his heart, furnished a little refreshment to members of this House who would take it, and that was supplied by ginger ale and nothing else. I most pointedly and positively deny that there was anything else on this side, and I defy any hon. gentleman on the other side to show that there was. I am surprised that the hon. member for West York should give his sanction to what has been said by the hon. member for West Assiniboia, of whom nothing else could be expected.

Mr. WALLACE. Of course, I am most thankful to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). But I made no remark whatever. I simply laughed when I could not help it, at the statement of the hon. member, but I made no statement myself. When the hon. member said that he sat there for long hours in his place and knew the contents of every bottle that went round that side of the Chamber, he displays a pretty wide acquaintance with other people's business.

Mr. SPEAKER. This discussion is all out of order and should stop now.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the discussion stops, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may be allowed a word. I am sure, Sir, that you were not in the Chair when these goings-on took place in the House. I am equally sure that, had you been in the Chair, beer bottles of any kind would not have been sitting on these tables, nor would cigars have been smoked. The only thing I have to regret is that no senior members of the Government were here when such unseemly conduct took place; and the hon. Minister of Public Works seems to have been giving refreshments and helping on the situation. I think it would be well, Mr. Speaker, to take extra care when, owing to circumstances, you do find it impossible to be here to keep order, to leave somebody in the Chair who will.

Mr. FRASER. After the remark of the ex-Minister of Finance, it is necessary to

say a word. I happened to be in the Chair at the time referred to. A member of the House came in with a cigar. My attention was called to that, and he immediately stopped, and went out, and there was nothing further. I was in the Chair when as old a parliamentarian, and one that knows as much about Parliament as any hon. gentleman here, was in his place. I mean the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and he ordered and obtained some tea and refreshments. I did not see any difference between sandwiches and ginger ale, and a piece of bread and a cup of tea, none whatever. They may have been out of order, but I did not think so. At any rate, if it was out of order for an hon. gentleman to call for tea, would it be contended for a moment that it would be out of order for an hon. gentleman to take a glass of water with a sandwich in this House, if he was weary? Certainly, I think not. But in any case, when I saw that being done by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in whom I think every hon. gentleman on both sides of the House has confidence, and he did not think it unparliamentary, the covert sneer of the ex-Minister of Finance is hardly worth while.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I happened to be present in the House as a Minister, and I must say I do think that it is unfortunate for the good name of the House that any hon. gentleman should convey the idea that there was any violation of the rules of order in the best sense—certainly that he should convey the impression that there was any intoxicating liquors of any sort used. I heard the hon. the Minister of Public Works, at a very late hour in the night, or rather an early hour in the morning, tell one of the officials to bring him some ginger ale and sandwiches. The bottles were brought up and they were opened here in the presence of the members, who drank the ginger ale and ate the sandwich. Whether that was strictly in accordance with the rules of the House is a matter upon which others better qualified than I am, may speak. But as for the impression sought to be conveyed by anything that has been said here to-day, that intoxicating liquors were brought upon the floor of the House, I have no hesitation in saying there is not a shadow of evidence for it, and I trust that, for the honour and good name of the Canadian Parliament, no member will endeavour to convey that impression.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman could not see through his poll behind him, otherwise he would have known that it was beer.

Mr. BENNETT. I happened to be that night in the Chamber, and I must say that I hardly think hon. gentlemen were acting in an exemplary manner. The fact of the

matter was this, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was leading the House, had brought in for him a cup of tea, and I think nobody would have any objection to that. It was done in a decorous and in a gentlemanly manner, and no person made any complaint. However, it was a case of little ones apeing big ones, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce had to be followed. Doubtless it was in recollection of participating in lemonade at circuses.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not make the thing worse than it is by bringing in outside matters. There are no rules of the House that I know of that would prevent an hon. member from bringing into the House one or more bottles of ginger ale. But it is evident that such a practice must give rise to unpleasant scenes, and I have no doubt that it will not occur again.

NICKEL STEEL COMPANY OF CANADA

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Nickel Steel Company of Canada.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. At the last sitting of this House, the hon. member made a similar motion, but I objected because the Bill had been so much amended by the Private Bills Committee that it was unfair to expect members of this House to take cognizance of it without having the Bill reprinted. The Bill has since been reprinted, but we only received the copies a few minutes before the opening of the House and have not had time therefore to consider its provisions. This is a Bill to incorporate a company with very extensive powers. It is, in fact, an omnibus Bill which has been so amended by the committee it was referred to that it is almost a new Bill. The company has power to acquire mines, to build railways, establish steamship lines, and so on, with a capital of \$20,000,000, and I fail to see in the Bill the clause which the hon. Minister of Railways very properly insisted upon being inserted in every Bill, namely, giving running powers to other railways who want to make use of the tracks which this company may build. I therefore would suggest that the promoter of the Bill should have it referred to the Railway Committee, so that the Railway Committee might assimilate it to the other railway Bills by inserting a provision to cover the omission I have mentioned. If the hon. gentleman would move to refer the Bill to the Committee on Railways and Canals, I think he would be taking the wisest course, and that committee could then put it in the same shape as similar Bills that have passed this House. I believe the hon. Minister of Railways will accept my suggestion.

(The hon. member resumed his seat.)

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I beg to move—

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already made a speech. He resumed his seat and gave up his right to the floor, and I cannot allow him to make more than one speech.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I did not give up the floor, Sir. My intention was to move an amendment, but I suggested that the promoter of the Bill should do so himself, and I merely sat down to give him the opportunity of doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman says he sat down for that purpose—

Mr. LaRIVIERE. That was my object. I only sat down to wait for an answer from the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood), and not with the intention of giving up the floor or my right to put the motion in case he should not do so.

I now move that you do not now leave the Chair, but that Bill (No. 96) an Act to incorporate the Nickel Steel Company of Canada, as amended by Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways and Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. SCRIVER. I wish to say, as chairman of the committee which reported this Bill, that it was very carefully considered. We held it over at the suggestion of one of the Ministers in order to consider some clauses that seemed somewhat objectionable, and I may say, with reference to the clause conferring railway privileges, that these privileges are confined exclusively to the purposes of the company and limited to furnishing connections from its mines to existing railways or railways that may be built. The clauses were very carefully considered, and it was the opinion, at all events of the majority—indeed of all the members of the committee who were present—that the Bill was, in every respect, a proper one and not likely to trespass on any existing rights whatever.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Bill, I presume, it is generally understood by the House, was not considered by the Railway Committee but the committee of which the hon. gentleman who has just spoken is chairman, and perhaps therefore that portion of it which has reference to the subject of railway construction did not receive the same consideration, and could not be expected to receive the same consideration, as it would have received in the Railway Committee. I have no doubt that the general desire of the House is to give the Bill as favourable consideration as possible.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And only to perfect it as far as it may seem to need amendment or alteration. I have no hesitation myself in saying

that I think the eighth section of the Bill is not just in the form in which it is desirable it should be before becoming law. It will be observed that the eighth clause authorizes the company to construct railways to connect its furnaces with other lines of railway. This is a very large power and is capable of very wide interpretation, and I think that in that respect it would be well to change somewhat the wording of the clause, so as to more properly define the extent to which the company might construct railways. I should think that power to construct the necessary tramways might be sufficient, though perhaps it might be a little difficult to define the difference between tramways and railways. Or if it be made to appear that lines of railway are necessary, let us know just in what direction and to what points they shall be constructed, and no doubt the House will be disposed to confer that power. But I would be decidedly adverse to our making, in a general way, the provisions of the Railway Act applicable to the undertakings of this company, because the Railway Act confers powers of expropriation and other powers which would not be at all applicable to this undertaking, and which it would not be proper for us to invest it with.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest to the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) to let the Bill stand for the present and have it referred to the Railway Committee where we may give attention to the eighth section.

Mr. LARIVIERE. That is my motion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it would be well to act on that suggestion, because it would necessarily involve very great delay. Some hon. members conversant with these matters would probably be able to find time to give further consideration to clause 8. If this suggestion were acted upon, no doubt the hon. gentleman would withdraw his motion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I made the suggestion because, as the Minister of Railways has raised the question as to whether the granting of large railway powers by this Bill was open to exception. I was under the impression that the rule of the House was, that all measures involving railway matters were referred to the Railway Committee. I think, a shorter plan would be, to refer the Bill to that committee, which would in due course report to the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think, if the Bill had railway construction as its principal object, the remarks of the hon. gentleman would apply, but such work only comes in as a collateral issue. The construction of a tramway would be only incidental to the larger undertaking, and I do not think it is necessary to refer the Bill to the Railway Committee.

Mr. WALLACE. Subsection 9 of the 2nd clause gives powers to construct tramways.

In clause 8 power is taken to construct railways. These different clauses should be made to harmonize, which they do not at the present time. It is the well-understood rule of the House, that Bills for the construction of railways should not come in through any other committee except the Railway Committee, and should not be, as it were, smuggled through another committee when a company is given powers to construct railways. In this instance the Bill, under which the company proposes to build railways or tramways, should be supervised by the Railway Committee. While I say that, so far as I am concerned, I would give the utmost latitude possible to this company, which is undertaking a new enterprise here, and the company should be given the greatest encouragement in their enterprise, because it is not only a new one, but a most important one.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I am glad to hear the statement made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). The Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee does not sometimes allow Bills to be smuggled through.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not mean in that sense; I mean that Railway Bills go through committees other than the Railway Committee.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This Bill did not even slip through; but, as the chairman of the committee explained, it came before the committee in a looser and longer form than it is now, and it was subjected to a great deal of criticism. I criticised nearly every clause, and I called special attention to subsection "f" of section 2, and section 8, which contain clauses relating to the construction of railways. The hon. gentleman has said, and said very properly, that this is a most important enterprise, in which a large amount of capital will be invested, an enterprise which deserves encouragement at the hands of Parliament. I recognized all the arguments that were submitted to the committee, and I pointed out to the promoters of the Bill, that they had better be very careful in regard to the powers asked for, as they were stretching the powers of this Parliament a little too far. The consideration of the Bill was postponed from one meeting to another; on the last occasion, I was not able to be present, not being very well, and the Bill was passed, with powers very much minimized, compared with those asked for. If thought desirable, the Bill might stand for further consideration; but its reference to the Railway Committee would be of no benefit. This Bill is for the purpose of developing mining interests; the promoters intend to invest a large amount of money, and the whole enterprise seems to be bona fide and honest, and one which should receive encouragement at the hands of Par-

liament. At the same time, I pointed out the great inconvenience which would arise from companies seeking incorporation for the purpose of developing mining interests acquiring power to construct railways, and I pressed on the promoters the advisability of confining their powers with respect to transportation to tramways, which I thought might not be objectionable. However, the promoters thought it essential to have power to build railways. I am the last man to throw an objection in the way, but this question arises: Has this Parliament the power to give authority to construct these lines of railways within a given province, unless this Parliament declares those lines to be constructed for the general benefit of Canada?

An hon. MEMBER. Does not the same objection arise with respect to tramways?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are precedents for granting these powers for the construction of tramways. Tramways do not carry passengers or freight.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend makes a mistake; they carry passengers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I mean, for tolls. The ordinary traffic from the mines to the point of transportation is not freight.

Mr. BERGERON. They also carry passengers. We passed, the other day, a Bill in the Railway Committee for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not for tolls, I think. A tramway running from the mines to the place of transportation is very different from a railway as defined under the Railway Act. I call attention to the fact that section 8 asks powers only to connect the different mines by railways, so as to give power of transportation. My own idea is, that these powers ought to be acquired by the company from the province in which the railway is to be situated; but the company thought differently, and they take the risk. Unless the House sees grave objection to section 8, it might be hedged down with more restrictions; but the main point is, whether we have the power to give this right to construct railways in any province. That is the responsibility which meets the promoters at the threshold. The Bill was discussed thoroughly on these lines in the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not intend to press the view that this Bill should go to the Railway Committee, but the discussion that has taken place shows the danger of departing from well-established rules. This very discussion shows that the Bill should properly have been sent to the Railway Committee. If it had gone through that committee, this

Sr LOUIS DAVIES.

discussion would not have taken place, because these clauses would have been considered by the committee specially appointed to consider these matters.

Mr. SCRIVER. The hon. gentleman will permit me to say that it is a Bill that could not be very properly sent to the Railway Committee, because it is not a Bill for the construction of a railway proper; the railway was subsidiary to the main objects of the company.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I understand that the principal objects of the Bill were for other purposes, for developing mines, &c.; but the Bill contains clauses and provides for powers for the construction of railways—powers almost unlimited in their scope, in the opinion of the Minister of Railways himself. We know that Bills do contain provisions for different powers, and are sent to different committees, and the clauses in this Bill that refer to railways should have been sent to the Railway Committee. I would press that view were it not for the fact that the Bill, which is admitted to be of great importance, would be endangered in its passage by any delay, and that I think would be a pity. In consenting to deal with this Bill in the manner suggested by the Minister of Railways, the House should understand that this will not be taken as a precedent, and this very discussion shows the propriety of following more closely the rules of the House in this regard.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to mention that when these Bills are referred to committees, the House has to be guided largely by the title of the Bill, and this was called "An Act to incorporate the Nickel Steel Company of Canada." Of course, prima facie, that Bill would go to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. More than that, I have instructed the examiner of private Bills to examine every Bill (as I have in the case of several private Bills to-day), and to mark which of the committees, after studying the question, he considers the Bills ought to go to. It was not only on the title of this Bill, but on the recommendation of the examiner of private Bills that this Bill went to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Mr. WALLACE. I should think the House would consent to go into committee on this Bill.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I have no objection to allow the Bill to stand, as has been suggested by the Minister of Railways, but I do object to its going back to the Railway Committee. On account of the congested state of business before that com-

mittee at the present time, it may not get through for several weeks and this Bill is one of the utmost importance to the country. It is a Bill that when passed, and the company formed under it, and the work started, will be of immense importance to Canada. Therefore, I feel that if it is allowed to go to the Railway Committee, it will be a large waste of time, and objection may be taken to it there; for the purpose—I will not say of killing the Bill—but I would prefer it to go as the Minister of Railways wishes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The object of this Bill appears to have very general support in the House, and I have not heard yet a reason for supposing there would be any danger to the Bill by observing in its regard the regular rules of the House. If it were made apparent that by this Bill being sent to the committee to which it should have gone, there would be any danger of it not being considered this session, I would be the last to suggest any technical difficulty.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman looks at the Bill, he will see that there is no doubt but that it was referred to the proper committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If there is even a reasonable doubt suggested as to what the rules of the House are, that doubt should be removed. I submit that this Bill should have gone originally to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. Rule 59 deals with these references, and rule 59 is very explicit. Hon. gentlemen have contended that the reference in this Bill to railway powers is a mere accident, but the moment such powers were asked under clause 8, authorizing almost an unlimited construction of railway lines connected with these works, then the Bill should have been submitted to the Railway Committee under the rules of the House. Rule 59 sets out that Bills relating to banks, insurance, trade and commerce, shall be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce; Bills referring to railways, canals, telegraphs and railway bridges to the Committee on Railways and Canals; and Bills not coming under these headings to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills. Under that rule, the moment a Bill asks power for the construction of railways, then it should be referred to the Committee on Railways. I find in Bourinot that in 1891, two Bills respecting a benevolent society were sent first to Private Bills Committee, and subsequently to Banking and Commerce Committee, because they contained provisions affecting insurance. I submit, Sir, that this Bill was not referred to the proper committee, no matter whose mistake it was. The course laid down in Dr. Bourinot's book is as follows:—

Sometimes, when the House discovers that a Bill has been referred to the wrong committee,—

As was the case here.

—or that it can be more conveniently considered by another committee, a motion will be made to discharge the previous order of reference and send it to the proper committee.

I cannot understand why there should be any fear with regard to this Bill. Unless there is a fear grounded on some reason not given, then we should follow the proper course and send the Bill to committee where it can be properly considered. Unless that is going to endanger the Bill going through Parliament this session, I hope the rules of the House will be observed and the Bill sent to the Committee on Railways and Canals. I do not think there is the least danger that all the Bills before that committee or that will come before it next week, will not be considered and go through both Houses this session.

Mr. FOSTER. My opinion coincides entirely with that of the last speaker (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). This Bill is acknowledged by the whole House as being an important Bill, and I have not heard an expression from either side looking towards its defeat.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite satisfied that there is no such idea on either side of the House. In the case of an important Bill like this where there is without doubt, on the face of it, almost unlimited power of railway building and railway connection asked for, it would be a mistake for us not to put such a Bill before the proper committee, even though it takes a little time. Much better do that than to attempt here in the Committee of the Whole House to do the real work of the Railway Committee. There has been a question raised by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries which is a very important one, and which ought to be discussed by the Railway Committee, and which may be gotten over by some method adopted by that committee and reported to the House. If you look at clause 8 and to the preceding subsection, you will find that there is really no limit to the railway building which may be done. The connection between the furnaces and the works of the company may be very wide; but the connections between the furnaces and the works of the company on the water front are illimitable. They may take in the Pacific Ocean or the Atlantic Ocean. Anyway, they afford an arrangement for almost unlimited railway building. I am satisfied that this Bill will make better progress if it goes to its appropriate committee, and then comes back to this House, than it will by proposing the two clauses in the Committee of the Whole. To save the principle and to expedite the Bill, I would be

in favour of that. The mover of the Bill may be assured that no attempt will be made to burk the Bill in the Railway Committee. I am in favour of it, because there is a promise in it of great and important works in this country. Works of that kind will have to compete with equally great and with greater works established in other parts of the world; and I am quite willing to give the company cognate powers as far as I possibly can with those great works with which they will have to compete. But I think my hon. friend will see that the principle for which we are contending is important, and on the ground of expediting the passage of the Bill, I think it should go to the Committee on Railways and Canals, where I am sure it will not meet with any factious opposition.

Mr. SCRIVER. I have no objection to the course suggested by the hon. member who has just spoken or to the course suggested by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair); but I am not willing to admit that the Bill was not properly referred in the first place. Judging by the title of the Bill and by its contents, it was properly referred, and the features of the Bill now under discussion are incidental.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think that the cases cited by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) are at all analagous to the present case. The Bills he refers to were referred to the Private Bills Committee, I do not say by mistake, and they were returned to the House, and then referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee, to which they properly belonged. The present Bill, I think, every hon. member will admit, was referred to the proper committee when it was referred to the Committee on Private Bills; and this clause providing for the building of branch railways for the purposes of the works of the company is merely incidental. There may be an honest difference of opinion as to whether this clause gives too wide powers; but I am satisfied that the intention of the company and the intention of the committee is only that the company shall have power to construct tramways or railways for the purposes of their work. Even if this power were granted, I do not believe they could succeed in raising one dollar for any other purpose. Two or three words in this clause would, however, so limit their powers that all fears might disappear.

Mr. FOSTER. You might do away with your Railway Committee. The trouble is in letting in a precedent on so important a case.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman seems to think that this Bill should have been referred to the Railway Committee. But according to the rule and

Mr. FOSTER.

practice a Bill for the purposes for which this company are to be incorporated, properly belongs to the Private Bills Committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The rule says that if it relates to a railway, it must go to the Railway Committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the main object of the Bill is to build a railway, there is no doubt that is so. But we have passed many Bills containing incidental clauses giving power to build wharfs and tramways to other railways, and so on. In this case, I do not think there is any intention to do anything else, and as the Bill has gone so far, I would suggest to my hon. friend, who says that he has no objection to the Bill on its merits, that it be allowed to stand till the next meeting of the House when private Bills shall be considered; and then, if the words suggested by the hon. Minister of Railways and others are not sufficient, it could again be discussed. I am satisfied that two or three words to limit the powers of the company would be sufficient to meet the views of the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment, as he has no intention at all to place the promoters of the Bill in danger of losing the legislation they require.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would not the adoption of that suggestion be attended with greater delay? Because it is not unlikely that the result of the discussion of this matter by two or three or half a dozen hon. gentlemen would leave the question still open, and we would then be practically where we are now; whereas if the Bill goes to the committee, it will go where every point can be dealt with in a more convenient way. I think the course suggested on this side of the House is the more expeditious one.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). As a member of the Private Bills Committee, I think that the hon. member for Pictou is putting a forced construction on the rule. He must read the rule as if it meant this, that if there is any reference in a Bill to a railway, it shall go to the Railway Committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If it relates to a railway.

Mr. FRASER. That must mean if it is a Bill relating to a railway, and that is the primary object of it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It does not say so.

Mr. FRASER. That is the common-sense meaning; otherwise it would mean that if there is any reference at all in a Bill to a railway, it must go to that committee. Here is the difficulty: If this Bill went to the Railway Committee, and came back here, the objection might be taken that this House should not deal with it because it should

have gone to the Private Bills Committee. Therefore we would have the two committees dealing with the Bill at the same time—one dealing with the part relating to railways incidentally, and the other dealing with the rest of the Bill. Now that the mover of the Bill has accepted the suggestion, I think it would be well, in the present congested state of business in the Railway Committee, to let the Bill rest where it is, and we will reach it all the sooner. When a company of this character asks this House to give them the right of having communication with their mines, I think they ought to get it. I admit that this House ought to say that they should not carry passengers; but if it is simply for the purpose of carrying their ore from the mines to the smelter, or carrying anything else they need in their business, they should be given that right. They do not interfere with any law relating to railways. Why should they be asked to go again and seek powers from the Railway Committee to do that which we can grant them now, without interfering with the general railway law?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). In view of the fact that hon. gentlemen on both sides have expressed their willingness to see that this Bill shall go through at the earliest possible moment, I have no objection to refer it to the Railway Committee, if the hon. gentleman will withdraw his resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to refer the Bill to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I understand that my hon. friend wishes me to withdraw this amendment in order that he may make the motion himself to refer it to the Railway Committee?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Hamilton cannot do that because he has put a motion in my hands that I do now leave the Chair.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. In that case then I shall persist in my amendment.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill referred to Committee on Railways, &c.

MILES CANON AND WHITE HORSE TRAMWAY COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Miles Cañon and White Horse Tramway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bostock), who is promoting this Bill, to the fact that section 9 has been struck out. This section provides that the Railway Act shall apply to the company and its undertakings. Is there any clause provided under which the Governor in Council

will have supervision of rates? If not, I should object very much to the striking out of that clause.

Mr. BOSTOCK. There is a clause, 11a, that gives power to the Governor General to regulate the tolls.

On section 11a,

Mr. FOSTER. Does that allow the Governor General in Council to vary the tolls fixed by the directors? Has the Governor General in Council any power under that clause other than simply to say whether these charges thus fixed shall be in force or not? It does not seem to me that it is a very flexible clause.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is the same in effect, I think, as the general Railway Act. It is a mere question of submitting a tariff that meets approval or not. If it does not meet approval, it cannot go into effect, and they cannot collect.

On section 11c,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was there any particular object in omitting from this Bill the clause which was inserted in a similar Bill, No. 23, which we have just considered? Such section applies to the clauses of the Railway Act. A somewhat similar clause was struck out in this Bill, and this is hardly made up for by the amendment which deals only with the question of tolls. In this Bill 35, section 9 was struck out, which was similar to section 11 which remains in the other Bill—the usual clause making the Railway Act apply, except so far as it is changed by the Bill.

Mr. BOSTOCK. I understand, that as this company do not propose to build any branch lines, it is not necessary for the clause to be inserted. That is the reason it was struck out by the Railway Committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It does not relate to the construction of branch lines, but to the application of the Railway Act. Here we have two Bills providing for similar works in about the same territory, and in one case it is provided that the Railway Act shall apply except where there is an express change made by this Bill. The other strikes out that clause altogether, and thus the Railway Act is not made applicable in express terms.

Mr. BOSTOCK. But the clause was passed making the Companies' Clauses Act apply to the company, and this clause referring to the Railway Act was struck out.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but why was it struck out in one Bill and not in the other? The Companies' Act has nothing to do with it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will notice that an amended clause was put in this Bill—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is as to tolls.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; it covers everything, I think. The whole undertaking, as I understand, was an undertaking to build a tramway, and there were no branch lines, and so on, and it was thought better that this clause should be struck out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). There is no public reason why the Railway Act should apply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose it was left out on the ground that a tramway was not a railway.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 46) an Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

(In the Committee.)

On subsection 4a,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On the point about the notice, it seems to me just as well that that amendment to the Bill should be dropped. I could understand if notice was given in a newspaper in the district where the railway was to be built, or this roadway and tramway was to be built, as well as in the "Gazette," as, for instance, in the case of an application to Parliament, where the notice is not confined to the "Gazette," that reaches very few. The two things have always gone together in applications of this kind, a newspaper publication as well as publication in the "Gazette." The "Gazette" is very formal, and does not amount to much, and I should think if it were deemed necessary to give notice in the locality affected, it is hardly necessary to put that notice in the "Gazette." My point is that to make that effective, there ought to be more than a "Gazette" notice.

Mr. FOSTER. Two months notice in the nearest newspaper.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the opinion of the committee was that this extension of the line should be the only thing which should affect the other companies that were operating railways in the immediate neighbourhood. There would be no popular objection, it could only be where there was some interest going to be interfered with by the construction of the additional line. Therefore the insertion of an advertisement in the local papers would not really seem to be necessary when it provided that the persons who are really interested in being heard before the Governor in Council should have notice that such an application is being made. I think

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

that covers the ground the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) referred to. It was considered by the committee, and that was the conclusion arrived at.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then I would say that would be sufficient, but when it was suggested that notice should go in the "Gazette," it seemed to me the desire was to notify the public. The Minister says the idea was rather that the public would not be endangered and could have no objection, but some other vested interest, such as a railway company, might alone be concerned. Well, notice to that company, it seems to me, would be sufficient. My point is that if it is necessary to put a notice in the "Gazette," it has always been considered necessary also to give popular notice in the nearest newspaper.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think myself it was not necessary to strike out the clause relating to publication in the "Gazette," and I intimated to the gentlemen who were promoting the Bill that they ought to have a clause requiring such notice to be given. They drafted it with a publication in the "Gazette." Then I suggested that that might not come to the notice of the interests which were concerned, and that they had better add a requirement to give a written notice to the other railway companies who were operating lines of railway in the locality, or in the vicinity, so that it would be brought to their individual attention. I have no doubt the Governor General in Council will require evidence that these parties have had notice of this application before they deal with it, so that every interest may be adequately protected.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Cowichan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. McInnes.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Queenston Heights Bridge Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)

Bill (No. 54) respecting the Edmonton District Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 66) respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Jameson.)

Bill (No. 112)—(from the Senate)—for the relief of Edwin Heyward—on division.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Miles Cañon and Lewes River Tramway Company (Limited).—(Mr. Morrison.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 113) to incorporate the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Forest-

ers in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Land-erkin.)

Bill (No. 115) respecting the British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company, and to change its name to the White Pass and Yukon Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

Bill (No. 116) to incorporate the Canadian Mining Institute.—(Mr. Haley.)

Bill (No. 117) to incorporate the Klondike and Dawson City Bank.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 118) to incorporate the Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

NORTH SHORE OF LAKE HURON— POUND-NET LICENSES.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

(a.) What application, if any, for licenses for pound-nets in waters east of an imaginary line drawn from Cape Hurd, on the Bruce Peninsula, to a point at or near Spanish River, on the north shore of Lake Huron, have been received, and whose applications, if any, have been granted for these waters?

(b.) When were such licenses first granted, if at all, in such waters?

(c.) Were any, and if so, how many, and in what years, pound-net licenses for these waters granted between 1878 and 1896?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). (a) Applications were received from Larry King and John Sullivan for pound-net licenses, east of an imaginary line from Cape Hurd to the mouth of the Spanish River, and licenses have been granted to these parties. (b) In 1897. (c) Previous to 1885, pound-net licenses were granted east of the line above referred to, but it would be impossible to supply a correct statement of these, owing to the loss of the records during the fire, last year.

WILLIAM BAXTER, LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER.

Mr. BENNETT asked,

1. Is William Baxter keeper of the Gin Rock lighthouse, Georgian Bay?

2. If said William Baxter is now keeper of said lighthouse, was he, in the year 1895 or 1896, fined by Fishery Inspector F. J. Smith \$50 for illegally fishing with nets and harbouring persons in said lighthouse and engaging with them in such illegal fishing?

3. If there was such conviction of said Baxter, is it intended to retain said Baxter in his said position?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Yes. 2. No. Mr. Baxter was fined \$20 in 1895 by Overseer Smith for illegal fishing. 3. Yes.

SAMUEL BODDY, FISHERY OVERSEER.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Mills) asked,

1. When was Mr. Samuel Boddy appointed fishery overseer?

2. Have his services been dispensed with?
3. Was any charge preferred against him?
4. Was there an investigation?
5. Who is now in charge of the district that Mr. Boddy attended to?
6. Did Mr. Boddy attend to his duties faithfully?
7. Who recommended his dismissal?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Samuel Boddy was appointed fishery overseer on 31st May, 1890. 2. Yes, on the ground of economy and efficiency. 3. For inefficiency and partiality in performance of his duties. 4. There was no investigation, in view of the information on which the department relied. 5. A. J. Flood. 6. Answered by No. 3. 7. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

WILLIAM HICKS, FISHERY OVERSEER.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Mills) asked,

1. When was Mr. William Hicks appointed fishery overseer?

2. Have his services been dispensed with?

3. Was there any charge preferred against him?

4. Was there an investigation?

5. Who is now fishery officer in charge of Charleston Lake?

6. Who recommended the dismissal of Mr. Hicks?

7. Who recommended his successor?

8. Did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries promise this House that no officer in his department would be dismissed without an investigation?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Mr. Hicks was appointed fishery overseer in January, 1890. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. The charge was inability to attend to his duties on account of old age, and alleged gross mismanagement of his district. 4. There was no investigation. 5. S. Y. Bullis, Athens, Ont. 6. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries. 7. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries. 8. No.

PAYMENTS TO UNITED COUNTIES RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Monk) asked,

1. What is the total amount of subsidies paid to the United Counties Railway Company, under the Act 57-58 Vic., chap. 4?

2. When, to whom, and in what manner, was the last payment made?

3. Is there any amount whatsoever still due to the said company under the Act aforesaid?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The total amount of subsidies paid to the United Counties Railway, under the Act 57-58 Vic., chapter 4, is \$95,680. The last payment was made on the 27th October, 1897, by cheque, in favour of the Bank of St. Hyacinthe, attorney for the United Counties Railway. There is an amount of \$1,488 due, a cheque for which is about to be issued to the Bank of St.

Hyacinthe, attorney for the United Counties Railway.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—HORSE KILLED.

Mr. GAUVREAU (by Mr. McGregor) asked,

Whether the Government is aware : 1. That a horse belonging to Madame Charron, a widow, of Isle Verte, in the county of Témiscouata, was killed by a train on the Intercolonial Railway, last fall ?

2. That it was proved at the investigation that the gates, where the horse was killed, opened towards the railway, instead of opening towards the farm, which is contrary to the dictates of prudence ?

3. If so, is it the intention of the Government to pay Madame Charron's claim ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The Government believe it to be true that a horse belonging to Madame Charron, a widow, of Isle Verte, was killed by a train on the Intercolonial Railway last fall, and the matter was investigated. 2. It is believed, at the time of the accident the gates were hung so as to open towards the railway. I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to drop the last clause of question No. 2, as it would not be well to make any admission of the kind referred to. 3. Up to the present, it has not been made clear that the accident was due to negligence on the part of the railway employees, and the Government has not, therefore, decided to pay the claim

SALE OF GOVERNMENT BINDER TWINE.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Mills) asked,

Has the Government sold, or agreed to sell, the binder twine manufactured and to be manufactured in the Kingston Penitentiary for this season ? If sold, to whom, and at what prices for the different brands ? Was it sold by tender ? Were tenders called by public advertisement ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). No arrangement has yet been completed for the disposal of the output for the current year, but tenders have been called for by circulars and are now under consideration of the department.

IMPORTATION OF CORN.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Mills) asked,

What quantity of corn has been imported into Canada for home consumption since the 1st of July, 1897, to the 1st of April, 1898 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The information required under this inquiry cannot be furnished for at least a month without communicating specially with the customs ports. The quarterly returns of imports for the quarter ending 31st
Mr. BLAIR.

March, 1898, have yet to be received from sixty-six ports and it is not expected that they will all be received before a month from now.

INSPECTION OF ASHES.

Mr. PREFONTAINE asked,

Has the Government the intention to render compulsory the inspection of ashes as the only means of assuring to the purchaser reliable and uniform grades thereof, which assurance the Board of Trade of Montreal has declared to be absolutely necessary to the continued existence of the trade in pot and pearls ashes by resolution dated the 13th February, 1896 ?

Mr. SPEAKER. This question and question No. 14, under the name of Mr. Marcotte, contain statements of fact, which may or may not be disputed.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I have the answer to this question : The Government appreciates the importance of the question, which is now under consideration.

IMPORTATION OF CORN INTO MANI- TOBA.

Mr. ROCHE asked,

What number of bushels of foreign corn were imported into the province of Manitoba between 1st July and 31st December, 1897 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 183,175 bushels.

INUNDATIONS ON ST. LAWRENCE RIVER.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Monk) asked,

1. Whether in pursuance of the promise made by the hon. the Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Public Works to the members for Berthier and Champlain, in the fall session of 1896, the Government have provided for the adoption of means to prevent inundations on the St. Lawrence River caused by the damming of the ice ?

2. Have surveys been made ?

3. What has been the result of such surveys ?

4. Have the Government come to any decision in the matter ?

5. If nothing has been done, what is the reason ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The department is now having made a complete survey of the River St. Lawrence and, when that survey will have been completed, the Minister will be in a better position to answer the question of the hon. gentleman.

VALUATOR OF ROCKLIFFE RIFLE RANGES.

Mr. BENNETT asked,

What are the special qualifications of Mr. E. Wallace, who has been appointed to value lands

to be purchased for Rockliffe rifle ranges, to fit him for such duty ?

What is or has been Mr. Wallace's occupation up to the present time ?

Has he ever been employed by the Government for purposes of valuing lands or otherwise heretofore ?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). Mr. E. Wallace is an ex-alderman of this city. He was alderman for several years. He is an owner of real estate in Ottawa and vicinity. He is agent for a loan company, and has been valuator for two or three years for two building societies. His occupation is real estate dealer. As Mr. Wallace is a Liberal in politics, he has never before been employed by the Government.

CLAIM OF J. P. O. ALLAIRE.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked,

Is it the intention of the Government to put into the Supplementary Estimates a sum of \$296 to pay the claim of J. P. O. Allaire, of St. Boniface, ex-chief inspector of licenses appointed under the provisions of the Act commonly known as the "McCarthy Act," as the same appears in a return dated 24th February, 1896, Sessional Paper No. 52 of the session of that year ?

The **MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE** (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). The matter is under consideration.

GOVERNMENT BLACKSMITH AT GRAND NARROWS, C.B.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked,

1. What was the reason for dismissing the blacksmith employed in the Government forge and railway bridge at Grand Narrows, Cape Breton ?

2. Who asked the dismissal ?

3. Was there an investigation ; if so, before whom ?

4. Who gave evidence against the dismissed man ?

5. Who was appointed in place of the dismissed man ?

6. By whom recommended ?

7. Is he doing the same work as the man who was dismissed was, and is he capable of so doing ?

He said : I find that one of my questions is omitted : Is he a blacksmith ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I may say that I have not information on that point ; but I presume he is. My answer to the other parts of the question is : R. McNeil, bridge-tender and blacksmith at Grand Narrows, C.B., was dismissed for political interference. There was an investigation held by Mr. John T. Ross. J. J. McKinnon was appointed in his place. He was recommended by persons in whom the department has entire confidence. He is doing satisfactorily the same work as McNeil was doing.

HARBOUR MASTER AT MIDLAND, ONT.

Mr. BENNETT asked,

1. Is John White harbour master at Midland, Ont. ?

2. When was he appointed ?

3. What are his duties ?

4. What is his salary ?

5. What amount of harbour dues has he returned to the department, if any, collected by him ?

6. Is it intended to continue the office ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Yes. 2. By Order in Council of the 13th July, 1897. 3. To carry out provisions of Harbour Masters' Act. 4. \$200 per annum, payable out of fees collected. 5. \$93.50. 6. Yes.

TOUSSAINT BOYER, LOCKMASTER ON BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. BERGERON asked,

1. Has Toussaint Boyer, lockmaster on the Beauharnois Canal, been discharged ?

2. If so, for what reason ?

3. Has a successor been appointed ?

4. Who is to act in his place ?

5. By whom has Boyer's successor been recommended ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). Toussaint Boyer, lockmaster on the Beauharnois Canal, was dismissed, because he took an active and offensive part in the recent elections. Sévère Leduc, of St. Timothée, has been appointed in Toussaint Boyer's place. He was recommended by persons in whom the department has confidence.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT BERTHIER.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL (by Mr. McGregor) asked,

1. Has the Government acquired any real estate in the town of Berthier for the purpose of establishing thereon a post office or other public offices ?

2. If so, when was it acquired ? From whom ? What price has been paid or agreed upon ?

3. Is the real estate acquired provided with the necessary buildings for establishing a post office, and in such case what amount would require to be expended for repairs and the establishing of the office ?

4. Is the real estate acquired under lease or otherwise ; if under lease, how many years has it to run ? What is the annual rent or interest, and what is the amount of the capital which it represents ?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). To the first question the answer is no, but steps are now being taken for such acquisition. The other questions I cannot answer just now.

B. C. ALIEN LABOUR ACT.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

1. Has the Governor in Council or the Government taken any action with reference to the

Allen Labour Act, 1897, passed by the legislature of British Columbia, but in regard to which the Royal assent was reserved by the Lieutenant-Governor of the province?

2. Is the opinion of the law officers in favour of or against the right of the legislature to pass said Act?

3. Has any communication been sent to the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia in regard to this Act? If so, what is the tenor of such communication?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). 1. The Governor in Council has decided not to take any action in the matter. 2. This is not a question which it is incumbent upon the law officers to answer. 3. The Lieutenant-Governor has been informed that His Excellency the Governor General does not propose to take any action with respect to the said legislation.

IMPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. **MILLS** asked,

1. What is the value of dutiable articles entered for consumption into Canada from the United States, in the nine months ending 31st March, 1897; also, for the nine months ending 31st March, 1898?

2. What value of free goods was entered from the United States in the above-mentioned respective periods?

3. What is the value of goods entered duty free from Great Britain in the above two periods?

4. What is the value of dutiable goods entered from Great Britain in the above two periods?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). Inasmuch as the quarterly returns of imports for the quarter ending 31st March, 1898, have not all been received from the ports yet, the information required under this inquiry cannot be furnished at present. Such quarterly returns have yet to be received from sixty-six ports and it is not expected that they will all be in before at least a month from now. The monthly returns do not show the imports by countries.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE HOLY SEE.

Mr. **McDOUGALL** moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, letters, memorials, documents, &c., forwarded to the Holy See, Signed by the Hon. Israel Tarte, a member of the Government, or by any member of the Government, and forty-four or any other number of members of the Senate and House of Commons, and referred to on several occasions by the hon. the Minister of Public Works in the House of Commons during the session of 1897, and of all answers thereto received, directly or indirectly, by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, the hon. Minister of Public Works, the hon. Solicitor General, or any other member of the Government.—(Mr. McDougall.)

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Stand.

Mr. **DAVIN**.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. I do not propose to discuss this motion. Do I understand a member of the Government to say that he wishes it to stand?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman could not have misunderstood.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). Of course we have stated on more than one occasion, that hon. gentlemen must recollect in regard to all motions of this class that confidential correspondence and communications cannot be brought down.

Mr. **McLENNAN**. In any case I would wish to make a few observations with regard to this question.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. The motion stands.

DISMISSAL OF ALBERT GODBOUT.

Mr. **CASGRAIN** (by Mr. Bergeron) moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, complaints, instructions, depositions of witnesses, reports, petitions, correspondence and documents in relation to the dismissal of Albert Godbout as postmaster at Ste. Anne de Beaupré, county of Montmorency.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) requested me to ask that all these notices regarding his department be allowed to stand.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Why?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do not know why.

Mr. **BERGERON**. This is only a motion for papers.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. Postmaster General requested me that he would like to have these notices stand.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I move that this notice be dropped. We can bring the matter up in Supply.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. The motion stands.

OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. **BELCOURT** moved:

That a select committee of the House be appointed to act conjointly with the select committee appointed by the Senate of Canada to investigate and report upon the feasibility of, and the advantages which would accrue to the Dominion from the construction of a canal uniting the waters of Lake Huron with those of the St. Lawrence via the Ottawa River, said committee to consist of Messieurs Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, R. Préfontaine, R. W. Jameson, J. A. Macdonell, T. B. Flint, W. J. Poupore, Geo. McInerney, Angus McLennan, H. A. Powell, J. V. Ellis, John Yeo, A. Martin, G. E. Casey, W. Hutchison, W. T. Hodgins, A. McNeill, T.

H. MacPherson, A. E. Dymont, Thos. Mackie, B. Rosamond, J. G. H. Bergeron, R. Lemieux, M. J. F. Quinn, T. G. Roddick, N. F. Davin, J. A. C. Madore, A. Malouin, P. A. Choquette, W. C. Edwards, G. R. Maxwell, A. C. LaRivière, J. H. N. Bourassa, L. N. Champagne, Thos. Fortin, and the mover; with power to send for papers, persons and records and to employ such persons as the committee may deem necessary for the purposes of the investigation, and to report from time to time.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Mr. BELCOURT. Inasmuch as the rule of the House is that only fifteen members are allowed to be appointed on such a committee as this, I would ask to amend the order by adding the words in the fifth line: "Notwithstanding any rule of this House to the contrary."

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I would like to adopt my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt's) amendment, but I am afraid this notice of motion must be allowed to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion stands.

REINSTATEMENT OF EMPLOYEES OF INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) moved for:

Copies of Orders in Council, letters, telegrams, petitions, correspondence, recommendations, evidence, reports, departmental orders or instructions and other papers, writings, documents and communications relating to:

(a.) The appointment or reinstatement since the first day of August, 1896, to any office or position in the service of Her Majesty, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, of all persons who previously to that date had been dismissed for alleged incapacity or for alleged neglect of duty, disobedience of orders or regulations, breach of discipline or other alleged misconduct, from the service of Her Majesty in connection with the Intercolonial Railway;

(b.) The previous dismissal as aforesaid of any such person or persons or the cause of said dismissal;

(c.) The grounds or cause of said subsequent appointment or reinstatement as aforesaid. Also, a list of all persons so reappointed or reinstated as aforesaid, after having been so previously dismissed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to make some observations on this subject, and will ask that this motion be allowed to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion stands.

EMPLOYMENTS AND DISMISSALS, 1878-79.

Mr. BELCOURT moved for:

Return giving: (a.) The names and offices or employment of all persons employed temporarily or permanently in the various departments in and about the Parliamentary and all Governmental buildings at the city of Ottawa, relieved from duty by the Government, by dismissal or otherwise, from the 17th day of October, 1878, to the 1st day of November, 1879; (b.) The cause of dismissal, if any; (c.) The names of all new

employees appointed, whether permanently or temporarily, between the same dates.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Mr. POWELL. I wish to discuss that.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion stands.

DISMISSAL OF RODERICK FERGUSON.

Mr. GILLIES (by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, inspectors' reports and all documents respecting the dismissal of Roderick Ferguson, late postmaster at Lower L'Ardoise, Richmond county, and the removal of the post office to the store of Joseph Matheson, late M.P.P. for the said county of Richmond; also, copies of all letters recommending Daniel K. Matheson as successor to Mr. Ferguson; also, copy of the writ of summons issued out of the Supreme Court of the province of Nova Scotia against the said Daniel K. Matheson for corrupt practices in the general local election of the year 1894; also, copy of the judgment of Mr. Justice Henry, dated 3rd July, 1895, condemning the said Daniel K. Matheson, the present postmaster at Lower L'Ardoise, in a penalty of \$400 and costs for corrupt acts committed by him in said election, and of which he was found guilty by the judgment of the said Mr. Justice Henry, one of the Supreme Court judges for the province of Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Gillies.)

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I must ask my hon. friend to allow that to stand, as my hon. friend the Postmaster General expressly asked me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think he meant that one.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He did not make any exception. He asked me as a favour to see that none of those was moved.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion stands.

DEATH OF EMPLOYEES ON CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) moved for:

Return of all correspondence, letters, telegrams or reports in possession of the Government in connection with the death from diphtheria of Macdonald and Fraser, who contracted the disease when employed on the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway; also, with the holding of an inquest on bodies of said Macdonald and Fraser, and the adjournment of said inquest, and issuing of an injunction to prevent Coroner Mead, of Pincher Creek, from proceeding with such adjourned inquest.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I am afraid the hon. gentleman will hardly get that by an order of the House. An inquest was not held, if I understand aright—I am speaking with some misgivings on the point—by order of any Government official, but by local officials. That would have to be obtained.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As a matter of fact, they are in the Department of Justice now.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. All right.

Motion agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF A. H. HARRIS.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER** moved for :

Copies of Order in Council, commission, appointment and instructions relating to A. H. Harris, Esq., traffic manager of the Intercolonial Railway.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that no commission was issued in that case, and there was no Order in Council. He was just appointed in the usual way, by a letter of instructions.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. The order could go in that way.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. As long as that is understood.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return containing a statement of expenditure out of income made for permanent improvements, extensions, additions and betterments, exclusive of works or ordinary maintenance and renewals, or account of the Intercolonial Railway from 30th June, 1891, to 1st July, 1897.—(Mr. Powell.)

Copy of the report forwarded to the Government by Mr. Wilfrid Mercier, appointed to hold an investigation into the conduct of employes on the Ste. Anne Lock on the Ottawa River.—(Mr. Monk.)

Return showing the sums paid to the several deputy heads of the several departments, over and above their stated salaries, for services supposed to be rendered by them in excess of their ordinary duties or otherwise for the years 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896 and 1897; also, the sums paid to any of the inside service outside of their stated salaries for the same period.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing the names of all clerks employed in each of the departments outside of the permanent staff, showing the names, rate of salary paid, the gross amount paid within each year to each clerk for the years 1895, 1896 and 1897, and the gross amount paid in each of the above years in each department.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing, by departments, the expenditure in each year, beginning 1st July, 1890, for salaries in the different departments of the inside service of all persons, whether permanent or temporary, and to what vote charged.

This return to include all employes except those actually employed on maintenance and repairs of buildings.

Return showing, by departments, the expenditure in each year, beginning 1st July, 1890, for salaries in the outside service of the Post Office, Customs and Inland Revenue departments, detailed by posts and sub-posts in the case of the Inland Revenue and Customs, and by post offices in case of employes in the postal service, of all employes, whether temporary or permanent.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**.

Return showing names of parties from whom lands were purchased for new improvements on Iroquois section of Galops Canal, and amounts paid to each person for property so purchased from them, also quantity of land purchased from each person.

Also, a similar statement for the lands purchased for the Cardinal section of the Galops Canal.—(Mr. Broder.)

Copy of the report of the committee appointed by the Imperial Government in 1896 to consider the question of a telegraph cable between Canada and Australasia; also, of any reports or correspondence to the Canadian Government from the Canadian representatives on said committee, or Sir Sandford Fleming, in regard to the same subject.—(Mr. Casey.)

Copies of all petitions, papers, correspondence, Orders in Council, commission, instructions, evidence, reports and documents relating to the inquiry into the conduct of Judge Spinks, judge of the County Court of Yale, by the Hon. Mr. Justice McColl, of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all reports, correspondence, documents and papers in relation to a claim by one Amable Frigon, of Montreal, for an indemnity for an injury received by him at the military camp of Laprairie in September, 1891.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Copies of all instructions, correspondence, &c., in relation to the construction of wharfs at Mistassini and St. Méthode (Tékouabé); a detailed statement showing the quantity of timber, iron and stone used in the said works; by whom the said articles were furnished; the prices paid therefor to each person; the names of the carpenters and framers employed and the prices paid them per day, and how much was received in cash by them, as also by the day labourers who worked with them; all other expenditure in relation to the said works; copies of all correspondence in relation to the contracts awarded to Messrs. Tétu & Savard, of St. Félicien, for making timber for the St. Méthode wharf; copies of the said contracts and of all further correspondence as to presenting payment of their accounts; a statement of the quantity of timber prepared by them, and of the amount paid to them personally.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Copies of instructions issued to J. B. Charbonneau, chief carpenter at the Mistassini and St. Méthode wharfs; correspondence as to cancelling of his instructions at St. Méthode and the appointment of a chief carpenter in his place.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Copies of all instructions, correspondence by letter or telegram between the Government or any other person in relation to the postponement of the hearing of the appeal before the Court of Queen's Bench in the case of the Queen vs. Coulombe and others during the last term of the said court at Quebec, and of all documents in relation thereto.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Return of all correspondence, letters or telegrams, reports in possession of the Government in connection with the death from diphtheria, of Macdonald and Fraser, who contracted the disease when employed on the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway; also with the holding of an inquest on the bodies of said Macdonald and Fraser, and the adjournment of said inquest, and issuing of an injunction to prevent Coroner Mead, of Pincher Creek, from proceeding with such adjourned inquest.—Mr Bell (Pictou.)

Copies of accounts of Mr. H. H. Robertson, registrar of the Election Court in the election trial held at the city of London, in the fall of 1897, contesting the right of Thomas Beattie, Esq., to sit as member for the city of London, in connection with the said trial, with vouchers and certificates, and all correspondence relating thereto.—(Mr. Calvert.)

Copy of the report of W. L. McKing respecting the manufacture of militia clothing in Canada.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Copies of all letters, papers and correspondence or reports between the Minister of the Interior or any of his departmental employees, and any Indian agent or agents regarding the dismissal of Dr. George T. Orton as medical superintendent of Indians in the province of Manitoba.—(Mr. Sproule, by Mr. Wallace.)

Copies of all petitions, reports, applications, letters, telegrams, evidence, depositions, arguments, papers, writings, correspondence, judge's charge, judge's report, Orders in Council, and other documents of every kind relating to the commutation of the sentence pronounced by Mr. Justice Ritchie, of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, upon Lyman Dart, or to the pardoning of the said Lyman Dart, or to any application for such commutation or pardoning, and including all documents which were taken into consideration by the Minister of Justice or by the Solicitor General, or by His Excellency the Governor General in Council in connection with such commutation or pardon.—(Mr. Borden, Halifax, by Mr. Bell, Pictou.)

Copies of Orders in Council, correspondence, claims, memoranda, statements, memorials, &c., in connection with the Government of Prince Edward Island and a delegation, consisting of Mr. Warburton, Premier of the province, Mr. H. C. Macdonald, Attorney General of the province, and others in regard to questions at issue between the Government of Prince Edward Island and the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Martin.)

Copies of all tenders for ties for the use of the Intercolonial Railway from 1st January, 1896, to date, giving names, quantities, prices, and which tenders were accepted.—(Mr. Foster.)

Copies of all tariffs of every kind, supplementary, regular and special, in force from time to time on the Intercolonial Railway since the appointment of Mr. Harris.—(Mr. Foster.)

Address to His Excellency the Governor General for copies of order in council, commission, appointment and instructions relating to A. H. Harris, Esq., Traffic Manager of the Intercolonial Railway.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Return showing the names of all employees in the Printing Bureau on the 23rd June, 1896, the duties and salary of each, when first employed, and the calling or profession of each previous to employment. Also, all those who have left the employ since said date, either by dismissal, superannuation, death or otherwise. Also, all persons who have been employed since said date, temporary or otherwise, and the duties and salary or wages of each. Also, all changes made in the said department or bureau, if any, since said date.—(Mr. Copp.)

Return giving : (a.) The names of employees relieved from duty by the Government by dismissal or otherwise in the Montreal custom-house from 13th July, 1896, to 1st March, 1898.

(b.) The years of service of each employee so relieved of duty.

(c.) The amount of retiring allowance, if any.

(d.) The cause of dismissal in each case.

(e.) The amount of pay per annum of each employee at date of dismissal.

(f.) The names of new employees appointed, whether permanently or temporarily, from 13th July, 1896, to 1st March, 1898.

(g.) The amount to be paid to each such new temporary or permanent employee per month.—(Mr. Quinn.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, Orders in Council and papers relating to the giving the work of printing the Klondike Official Guide to Mr. Daniel Rose, of Toronto.—(Mr. Foster.)

Copies of all letters, telegrams and correspondence with respect to the dismissal of Thomas Walton, late Indian agent of the Parry Island band ; also, report of investigation regarding the same.—(Mr. McCormack.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, memorials, correspondence and every other document in connection with the granting of 150,000 acres of public lands to the University of Manitoba, and the transfer and patenting of the same to the university.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Return showing the amount spent by the Government in the years 1896-97, 1897-98, and the proposed expenditure for the year 1898-99 on private piers and wharfs, and piers and wharfs not under Government control and not the property of Canada, together with the names of such piers and wharfs and the owners thereof, as well as the sums spent on each for years mentioned.—(Mr. Martin.)

Copies of all correspondence, papers and applications in connection with the granting of licenses for pound-nets in waters east of an imaginary line drawn from Cape Hurd, on the Bruce Peninsula, to a point at or near Spanish River, on the north shore of Lake Huron.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copy of a proposal from Major General Gascoigne to the Minister of Militia in regard to the issue of Lee-Enfield rifles to rural corps, as mentioned on page 27 of the Report of the Department of Militia and Defence, 1897.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Copies of all reports and recommendations from the inspectors of cavalry, artillery and infantry on their inspections for the financial year 1897-98.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Copies of all proposals to clothe, feed, arm, nurse and pay an army in the field submitted by Major General Gascoigne to the Minister of Militia, as mentioned in his report on page 18 of the Report of the Department of Militia and Defence for 1896.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Return giving a statement of the distribution and numbers of officers and men in the Northwest Mounted Police in the North-west Territories, British Columbia and the Yukon district, according to the latest returns now in the hands of the Government.—(Mr. Casey.)

DISMISSAL OF JOHN F. TENNANT.

Mr. QUINN. Mr Speaker, it is now ten minutes to 6 o'clock, and ten minutes will hardly be sufficient for me to speak on the motion in my name on the Order paper.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) A good deal can be said in ten minutes.

Mr. QUINN. I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, for :

Copies of all papers in connection with the dismissal of John F. Tennant, late collector of customs at Gretna, Manitoba.

I wish to draw the attention of the House to the circumstances surrounding the dismissal of Mr. Tennant, and to draw the attention of the Government in the most formal manner possible to what I consider the great injustice ; nay, the outrage, that has been committed in this case, in the name of the Department of Customs of Canada. In an article in the "Nor'Wester," a paper published in Winnipeg, the career of Mr. Tennant is placed before the public, and under the heading, "A victim of spite," that paper says :

A VICTIM OF SPITE.

The axe is still falling on the necks of the civil servants. One of the recent dismissals is of a particularly scandalous character. That is the dismissal of Mr. Tennant, of Gretna, from his position of customs officer at that port. Mr. Tennant has held that position for nine years, during which period he has earned the highest commendation from his superior officers for the manner in which he has performed his duties. He has been in the Government service some twenty years altogether, having been employed in the international boundary survey, in the Dominion land guide service, and on the frontier in the customs service. He is an "old timer" in Manitoba, having come here in the Wolseley expedition of 1870. Mr. Tennant has been dismissed without even the farce of a commission of investigation. The reason for his dismissal is "partisanship," but Mr. Tennant is able to show that he did not take any part at all in the Dominion campaign. The real reason of his dismissal is that he attended a meeting during the provincial elections, and being appealed to as to the correctness of certain charges by Attorney General Cameron against the Roman Catholics, demonstrated the Attorney General to have been guilty of a falsehood. For this, the Attorney General has been seeking vengeance against Mr. Tennant, and he has now secured the gratification of his animosity. It is indecent that old and faithful public servants should be thrown out of employment on such pretexts. The dismissal has aroused the indignation of a number of prominent Grits who are Mr. Tennant's personal friends ; and if Mr. Laurier is wise he will require the Controller of Customs to reconsider the case.

My object in reading this paragraph is to draw the attention of the House to the creditable record of Mr. Tennant. He went to the North-west with the Wolseley expedition in 1870 and he has been honourably serving his country in different capacities since that time. Mr. Tennant has established a character for bravery and courage unequalled by any man in the North-west Territories. After a number of years he obtained a small position in the Government service and eventually was appointed deputy collector at the port of entry at Gretna. Mr. Tennant is the son of a British soldier ; he himself has fought for his country, and in

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

his old age he certainly deserved something better than that his official head should be chopped off on the report of some irresponsible person who never occupied any position in this House, and whose recommendation should not have any weight with the head of the Customs Department. Mr. Tennant was first notified of his dismissal in the following bald letter from the Customs Department, dated the 6th May, 1897 :—

Ottawa, 6th May, 1897.

Joseph Tennant, Esq.,
Gretna, Man.

Sir,—I have it in command to acquaint you that His Excellency the Governor General in Council has been pleased to order that your services as sub-collector of customs at the outport of Gretna, under the survey of the port of Winnipeg, Man., be dispensed with, the Order in Council being dated 9th April, 1897.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) JOHN McDOUGALD.

Commissioner of Customs.

Through the Collector at Winnipeg, Man.

Here we see that no reason is given for dispensing with Mr. Tennant's services, and so this gentleman who for over nine years occupied the position of deputy collector was dismissed without any reason being assigned. He naturally inquired what was the cause of his dismissal, and he was first told that he had interfered in the election against an hon. member of this House ; I think the hon. member for Winnipeg.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Lisgar.

Mr. QUINN. Very well. On receipt of this information Mr. Tennant, I think, proved to the satisfaction of that hon. gentleman, if not at any rate to the satisfaction of any unprejudiced judge, that he did not interfere in this election in any manner whatever. Then another reason for his dismissal was given and he was told that he had deserted his office on several occasions, and particularly on election day, and allowed it to be taken charge of by one of the customs officers of the United States. Mr. Tennant at once forwarded a statutory declaration disproving this charge, and then another charge was made, namely, the one referred to in the article which I have read in the "Nor'Wester." Now, Mr. Tennant explained this charge and he proved conclusively that the Attorney General of Manitoba had used language not only unfit for a public man—

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) permit me to ask him, whether that was the present Attorney General of Manitoba or a past Attorney General ?

Mr. QUINN. The present Attorney General ; Cameron is his name. I say he used language not only unfit for a man occupying any public position in this country, but unfit for a man who wished to be called a Cana-

dian. The Attorney General of Manitoba spoke on a public platform, as I am informed, stating that it was impossible for any man to be a loyal Canadian and to be a Roman Catholic. It is further asserted that Mr. Cameron stated particularly, that it was impossible for any man to be a loyal subject of Her Majesty and to advocate in any way the existence of separate schools in Manitoba. Now, Mr. Tennant who heard this charge at a meeting held in the interests of one of the candidates for the local legislature, necessarily felt wounded; he a man who had served Her Majesty in the army; he who had sacrificed his liberty and even his blood in proof of his loyalty to his Queen and country. It was natural that such a man should resent that insult and Mr. Tennant did so. He did so to the satisfaction of the audience present, and he did so to the great discomfiture of the Attorney General who made the charge. This was the last ditch for the Minister of Customs; for this was the only charge that could be proven against Mr. Tennant. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, in the first place, that such a charge is not one that should be entertained by any Minister of the Crown for the purpose of dismissing a Dominion public servant, and that, no matter what the charge might have been, it is not only fair and even-handed justice, but it is in accordance with the principles laid down by the right hon. leader of this Government and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, about a year ago, that no officer occupying the position that Mr. Tennant occupied should be dismissed without having had the benefit of an inquiry and been given an opportunity to defend himself.

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

After Recess.

SAFETY OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND PASSENGERS.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 4) further to secure the safety of railway employees and passengers.—(Mr. Casey.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am sorry that we have not a larger committee present to consider this Bill, although I recognize that it has been already before a very competent committee and has been reported on favourably. That committee sat last year and heard evidence upon the general subject. It took the testimony of gentlemen connected with railways, and I have no doubt gave the Bill every consideration, but while that was the case, I think it is to be regretted that we have not the benefit of the opinions and judgments of a larger number of mem-

bers of this House, so that we may be sure to pass a Bill which has been thoroughly considered on all sides and to which the judgment of the members of this House has been generally applied. I am in entire sympathy with any measure which has for its object the safety and protection of the employees upon our railways, and under existing conditions, perhaps, that safety is not as well secured as it is desirable it should be. But I am afraid that in adopting these somewhat stringent provisions, imposing these duties upon railway companies generally, we may be placing obstacles in the way of a number of the smaller railways and branch lines, which are not able to equip themselves up to the standard required under this Bill. The effect may be, therefore, to prevent their running at all, and it is important that we should realize that if the law is to be enforced, as it now stands, it may have the effect of actually preventing the running of many railways which are very useful and necessary, which have small capital and limited means and find it quite up to their present capacity to run their roads as the law now requires. Before requiring an expensive equipment, we must contemplate the possibility that we may thereby shut down some of these many smaller railways; while I am not prepared at this moment to say that the Bill as proposed by my hon. friend, or at least the earlier sections of it, should not be enacted, and while, at the same time, I would be very adverse either to our casting upon the Governor in Council, or the Railway Committee any additional duties to those now imposed upon them, yet it does seem to me just possible, in the interests of these many railways, and without any real prejudice to life and safety or security of railway employees, that exception should be made from the operation of the Bill in those cases in which it is not found possible for railway companies, owning and operating small lines, to equip themselves as this Bill requires them to do. In the case of the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway and Canada Southern and some other wealthier corporations, there would be no difficulty in their complying with this Bill, but there occurs to my mind a number of very useful small railways in the maritime provinces, which will have to shut down if required to comply with this Bill, unless possibly it be found that the section we are now considering does not, after all, mean very much, and that these smaller companies may become possessed of second-class or other old cars and run them upon their roads, and by so doing not subject themselves to any of the penalties imposed in this Bill.

Mr. CASEY. There is nothing costly in these provisions at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are required to build cars

of a certain standard and with certain appliances. Possibly these things may not be expensive. I have no means for forming a judgment upon that, but it occurs to me that there is just the danger that we may be placing obstacles in the way of small railways, which have all the difficulties now to overcome that they are capable of meeting successfully.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman is no doubt quite right in his reference to the smallness of this committee, which is called upon to pronounce on this important Bill; but according to the evidence submitted to the special committee last year, the railway employees did not object so much to the trunk lines as to the smaller lines. They held that the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canada Southern, and, I believe, the Intercolonial have endeavoured, as far as their means would allow, to have the improvements on the rolling stock made as fast as possible, but the railway employees found that the smaller railway lines did not, in any sense, try to have their rolling stock made so as to prevent accidents to employees. That was the chief objection they raised, and that was the reason they wanted this Bill passed. The trunk lines have complied with this pretty well, though the Canadian Pacific Railway have, I believe, some objection to the outside ladders. They think the end ladders are sufficient, but the Canada Southern have both the outside and end ladders in use. It is chiefly to compel the smaller roads to use these ladders that this Bill is intended. They would not suffer by it, because they have only, in some cases, three or four cars, and it will be no hardship at all to them to comply with it.

Mr. ELLIS. While I am in favour of the Bill generally, yet I think there was an understanding last year in the committee that it would not be so rigid as to apply to the smaller roads to which the hon. Minister of Railways refers. I recollect the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), who is now not in his seat, and who took a great deal of interest in the proceedings, having been a constant attendant at the committee, took special objection to the application of the rigid regulations of the Bill to some of these smaller roads in the province of New Brunswick. I think the Bill is really a little more stringent with regard to these roads than I thought the hon. gentleman would have made it, having in view the evidence taken by the committee.

Mr. CASEY. I think that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has had his fears a little too much aroused on behalf of the smaller railway companies. That question was fought out pretty thoroughly in the committee. The smaller railway companies of the maritime provinces had their representative there

Mr. BLAIR.

and put in a written statement. I have forgotten the gentleman's name, but my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis) was there, and, I doubt not, knows to whom I refer. I do not remember any objection being made by this gentleman to the provisos here stated. This matter of ladders on cars is not a matter of car construction. They can be added at a cost, I should think, of two or three dollars per ladder. It was proven clearly to the satisfaction of the committee that ladders were requisite both on the ends and on the sides of the car for the convenience of the brakeman getting on and off. Any gentleman with a knowledge of these affairs will know that it is necessary for the brakeman to get on sometimes at the end and sometimes at the side when the car is moving. As a matter of fact the Michigan Central operating the Canada Southern carries out exactly this plan, and I think it is also in use on most railways in the United States. As to the standard height of cars, an agreement has been reached as to the standard height of cars in America by the Master Carbuilders Association. An important point is to have the draw-bar, the coupler part of the car, of a uniform height above the rail, so that a man going between the cars to couple them may know where to expect the draw-bar to come, and so that the two cars which are to be coupled will come together in the same plane. This is not a question of expense but a question of convenience. I know that it is no more expensive to build cars of a uniform height from the rails than it is to build them at different heights. This provision of the Bill is only designed to crystallize into law what has already been provided by the practical good sense of the Master Car Builders' Association. I do not think my hon. friend (the Minister of Railways) is running any risk in letting that section pass.

Mr. DAVIN. The railway men of the west took a very great interest in this legislation, as hon. gentlemen who were in the House in 1891 will remember. I placed before the House on that occasion the feelings and sentiments of western railway men when I brought a Bill before the House covering some of the more important provisions of this Bill, which was read a second time and referred to the Railway Committee. If we are to attain the object of this Bill, which is to safeguard life and limb, I cannot see how we can make an exception of a small railway company. An accident on a small railway will impair a man's soundness of limb as completely as one on a great railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But a very small proportion of the injuries occur on the small railways.

Mr. DAVIN. Naturally, under the doctrines of chance it could hardly be otherwise, for there are a larger number of people employed on the large railways than on

the small. But I have often read of accidents on small railways, and my impression is that, if we had the casualties tabulated, it would be found that in proportion to the number of cars, the number of trips and the number of employees, you have relatively a larger number of accidents occurring on the small railways than on the larger ones.

Mr. INGRAM. I might draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that Mr. Harris, who represented the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railways, stated that he had control of thirty-six miles of railway, and that his railway owns two box cars and thirty-two flat cars, but they transfer from the Intercolonial Railway and handle foreign cars. So, it will only affect this road to the extent of two box cars. There would appear, therefore, to be nothing in the argument as regard the small railways.

Mr. CASEY. I am very glad that my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) has called attention to this point. These small railways use almost exclusively the freight cars of other companies. I have known some of the worst accidents on some of the excursion trains of small railways, as my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) knows also, no doubt. And, moreover, these accidents occurred for lack of carrying out the precautions provided for by this Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not wish to be understood as being desirous of raising serious objections to this portion of the Bill, for I really have none. My suggestions were made in order to call the attention of the committee to the ideas that occurred to my own mind, and if the committee is of opinion that the Bill could safely pass in its present form, I shall offer no further objections to that portion of it, at all events.

On section 3,

Mr. INGRAM. Though I am quite in sympathy with this Bill, I can see that this section would do great injustice to the trunk lines in Canada. For this reason—all the railways now in Canada have a large number of old cars on hand, and they would, not unnaturally consider it a great hardship to be obliged to fit out old cars that may not last a year or even six months longer with all the devices specified in section 2.

Mr. CASEY. This only applies to the ladders, you know.

Mr. INGRAM. Now, take old box cars, it would be most unfair to expect a railway to fit out old cars, however old, with all these devices.

Mr. CASEY. Let me say, in the first place, that this clause only refers to the ladders.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And the draw-bar.

Mr. CASEY. That would not be fitting out a car with an attachment, it would mean the rebuilding of the whole car. I think there is no doubt about that.

Mr. DAVIN. Make it clear that it applies only to the ladders.

Mr. CASEY. I would suggest then that it should be made to read "with ladders as required by section 2." I am astonished that my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) should object to this clause, if he objects to it when taken in that restricted sense. There is no doubt that the main trunk lines have a lot of old cars, but, if it is considered right that cars should be fitted with ladders for the safety of the men employed, I think it is right that old cars as well as new ones should be fitted up in that way. The companies have two years to fit up the cars with these ladders. They need not fit out cars that are old, unless they think it will pay them. They can keep them for two years without ladders and then throw them aside. If they are good enough to keep in use, it will be worth while to put ladders upon them, as this will cost not more than \$4 or \$5 per car. I am not a mechanic but I think it can be done for at a small cost.

Mr. INGRAM. I was speaking of a section as I found it. It requires the companies to have cars of a standard height and to be supplied with ladders. The hon. gentleman sees fit to amend it by making it apply only to ladders, and to the clause in that form I can see no objection.

Mr. CASEY. I thought it was quite well understood, in committee, that this meant to apply only to the ladder. I thought we thoroughly understood that we could not rebuild an old car very well and make it of a standard height. If I understand the matter correctly, it would mean putting a lot of new substructure under the car.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not think you could make it of the standard height.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the meaning of the date "herein mentioned" in section 4? There is more than one date herein mentioned.

Mr. CASEY. That means the date of the passing of this Act. If the hon. gentleman does not think this clear enough, we will put in some words that will make it so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are going to have two different dates.

Mr. CASEY. Because the Act provides that some things must be done immediately, and other things need not be done for two years. All box freight cars built after this date must have such appliances; all old cars need not have them for two years.

Mr. INGRAM. I think that is quite clear. The first line will cover the two sections.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It seems to me that the fourth section is intended to impose a penalty upon any person who shall build cars which have not these appliances. Section 2 provides that all cars built after the passing of this Act must have these appliances; therefore, it is intended that the penalty shall apply immediately to any case that arises after the passing of the Act. It cannot apply to cases referred to in section 3, because that has reference to applying these equipments to cars already built.

Mr. INGRAM. Section 2 applies to all cars built for use on Canadian railways. The other section applies to old cars that are already built, and they must be fitted within two years. Surely, that is plain.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move the following amendment:—

The penalty for building such car, in violation of section 2 of said Act, shall be \$25 for each car.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 5,

Mr. CASEY. This section imposes a penalty for using any car which is not built or remodelled in accordance with sections 1, 2 and 3. There is a penalty for building cars illegally, and another for using cars which do not comply with the provisions of this Act. I move to strike out the words "after the date herein provided."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 6,

Mr. CASEY. This is a section which naturally has a personal interest for the Minister of Railways, and which certainly may properly form the subject of discussion. The section was inserted because the employees themselves asked for it, and as it appeared to be necessary to appoint some special person to enforce the penalties for infringements of the Act, the Minister of Railways was thought to be the proper person to appoint, as he would be capable of bearing the heavy responsibility which would rest upon him. It was considered that, if the duty was left to any ordinary person to proceed in the ordinary way by information, the railway companies would go scot free. Employees would not lodge information or start proceedings to recover penalties, because the penalty of dismissal would be enforced on them, whether the prosecutions were successful or not; and, therefore, unless some one was charged with the duties, *ex officio*, of public prosecutor, the Act would not be enforced. There is a great deal of force in that contention, and it will be necessary to charge some one with the duty of enforcing this public Act.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. DAVIN. Would not the proper person be the Minister of Justice? Why should this burden be thrown on the Minister of Railways?

Mr. CASEY. I suppose, the Minister of Justice might be charged with the duty. He could hardly, however, proceed in the provincial courts, *ex officio*.

Mr. BERGERON. We might appoint a special officer, as there are many persons now looking for positions.

Mr. CASEY. I would be willing to agree to the appointment of a public prosecutor, if provision were made for his remuneration.

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot see that this Bill gives greater power to the Minister of Railways than he possessed before. Under section 205 of the Railway Act:

Whenever the Minister of Railways receives information to the effect that any bridge, culvert, viaduct, tunnel, or any portion of any railway, or any engine, car, or carriage used or for use, on any railway, is dangerous to the public using the same from want of repair, insufficient or erroneous construction, or from any other cause, or whenever circumstances arise which in his opinion render it expedient, he may direct one or more engineers to examine and inspect the railway or any portion thereof, or of the works connected therewith, or the engines and other rolling stock in use thereon, or any portion thereof, and upon the report of the inspecting engineer may condemn the railway or any portion thereof, or any of the rolling stock or appliances used thereon, and with the approval of the Governor in Council may require any change or alteration therein or in any part thereof, or the substitution of any new bridge, culvert, viaduct or tunnel, or of any material for the said railway, and thereupon the company to which such railway belongs or the company using, running or controlling the same shall after notice in writing proceed to make good or remedy defects in the said portions of the railway or in the locomotive, car or carriage which has been so condemned, or shall make such change, alteration or substitution as has been required by the Minister.

According to section 6 of this Bill, it does not give the Minister any more power than he has already under the General Railway Act.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will see that under the clause of the General Railway Act the Minister of Railways is called upon to act in an administrative capacity; this Bill calls on the Minister to act really as the prosecutor and to put the legal machinery in motion, which if they succeed against the railway company will entail penal consequences.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) might let this 6th clause drop. It does appear to me to add very materially to the duties which are attached to the office of Minister of Railways, and from the little experience I have had I am inclined to think they are already sufficiently labo-

rious. I would not want my successor to be saddled with any greater load of duties than I have myself to discharge.

Mr. BERGERON. You have two years yet for that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) would allow the section 6 to drop for the present, we might after consideration and experience arrive at some conclusion with regard to this matter.

Mr. QUINN. I am sorry to say that I do not agree with the Minister in this particular, nor do I agree with this method of providing a law such as has been introduced. I am in perfect sympathy with the Bill as it stands, but I think it should be taken charge of by the Minister of Railways himself and put in the form of an amendment to the General Railway Act. We provide for penalties in this Bill by sections 3, 4 and 5, but when we come to provide for the means of collecting these penalties we are face to face with great difficulties. This places the power of proceeding, either in the hands of an officer of the Government, or of a private individual. If we place it in the hands of an individual to collect these penalties we render the persons liable to be proceeded against subject to blackmail, and on the other hand if an official is to look after the matter, we know from experience that the duties are very often performed in a perfunctory manner. I therefore think it would be well if my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) would induce the Minister of Railways to take this Bill in his charge, and to make it an amendment to the General Railway Act which provides the means of collecting these penalties. If my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) puts it in the hands of any individual to institute proceedings against the railway company and to collect \$5 a day for the user, or \$25 for the construction of a car not fitted up in the manner provided for by this Bill, he is putting great power in the hands of irresponsible people. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) provides that the action should be taken by the Minister of Railways he is charging an already overburdened official with work that it would be impossible for him to look after, and which must necessarily devolve upon his officials. I would suggest that a section might be put in the Bill providing that the penalties should be collected by any one who would institute an action in the name of Her Majesty.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The penalties might be recovered in the name of Her Majesty under the Summary Convictions Act.

Mr. QUINN. The same as a qui tam action.

Mr. CASEY. There is no use saying that if everybody is allowed to institute pro-

ceedings you are subjecting the railways to blackmail, for we know that any person is subject to be prosecuted for any offence against the law upon the information of any other person, and I do not see why the railway companies should be exempted from that rule. The great thing is to provide that this Act should be enforced. If my hon. friend the Minister of Railways thinks that he, or his successor, should not be burdened with these duties, I am willing to strike the provision out and to leave in the latter part of the clause: that any person may institute proceedings for the recovery of any penalties provided by this Act. How he shall institute the proceedings, I suppose will depend on the legal procedure in each province.

Mr. QUINN. That would be an outrage. My hon. friend says very truly that railway companies should not be protected any more than private individuals; but we do not, for instance, make the mere possession of a bundle of bananas the basis of a prosecution against a fruit merchant, whereas in this case the mere possession of a car not fitted up according to the requirements of this Act would be the basis of a prosecution against a railway company. I think all railway companies require protection in a matter of this kind. You would not surely put in the hands of any disgruntled employee the power to institute against a railway company, not one action, but 500 actions, simply because it had that number of cars which did not comply with the provisions of this Act. The railway company would be required to defend every one of these actions, and be put to enormous expense, only to find in the end that the man who instituted the actions was entirely worthless. That would be the effect of the clause as it now stands.

Mr. CASEY. I think that, under all the circumstances, we had better leave the clause as it is, making it the duty of the Minister of Railways to see after this. He is a responsible party, and would not institute proceedings on flimsy grounds. Of course, as has been pointed out, he would have to delegate that duty to an official of his own department, which could easily be done.

Mr. McALISTER. I would suggest that the word "handling" in the second line is unnecessary and objectionable. Suppose, for instance, that there is a car in a yard not fitted up, and it is shunted from one place to another. That would be handling it. I think the word "using" is sufficient to cover the whole.

Mr. CASEY. I move that this clause be amended by inserting after the word "shall" in the first line the words, "on the information of any credible person," and by striking out these words where they occur later in the clause, and also striking out

the words at the end of the clause, "provided, however, that any other person may institute any proceedings for the recovery of any penalties provided by this Act." This leaves the clause in such a shape that it will be the duty of the Minister of Railways to proceed on the information of any credible person, and does not leave it to everybody to prosecute. In other words, if a man has a grievance, he has first to complain to the Minister of Railways, and then it will be the duty of the Minister of Railways to prosecute.

Mr. INGRAM. While the hon. gentleman is amending the clause in that way, it might be well for him to go a little further. There might be some doubt as to who would be a credible witness. Suppose the Minister of Railways considered a representative of the railway employees to be a credible witness; if so, why not amend the clause to provide that any employee associated with the Railway Employees' Union would be a credible witness?

Mr. CASEY. I think it would be for the Minister himself to determine, to a certain extent, who would be a credible person.

Mr. QUINN. We have got to the point I feared a few minutes ago. We are passing an Act which is utterly unworkable. We are placing the power in the hands of the Minister of Railways to institute an action; if the railway company guilty of an infraction of the law happens to be in any way friendly to the Minister of Railways, he might refuse to take action. I am against the passage of any Bill which purports to do something which, as a matter of fact, it does not do. I am opposed to the passage of an Act which purports to protect railway employees and does not protect them at all. I say that this section is unworkable. It says that the Minister of Railways shall proceed on the information of a credible person; but what power is there to compel the Minister of Railways to proceed? What defence can he set up if charged with not proceeding in a particular case? He might say, "I do not know this man at all." As my hon. friend suggests, the question is, who is a credible person? One credible to me might not be credible to the Minister of Railways, and one credible to the Minister of Railways might not be credible to me. If it is the intention of the Government to pass an Act of this kind—and I say it is a good Act and ought to be passed—the Minister of Railways ought to take charge of it and put it into such shape that it can be worked.

Mr. CASEY. I understand my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) to suggest that certain persons should be named in the Act as being ipso facto credible persons, upon whose information the Minister should

act, though he could also act on the information of other credible persons. I think that is a very good suggestion; but on the whole, perhaps we had better let this clause stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 7, subsection 1,

7. Every employee of a railway company injured while in the discharge of his duty shall, for every day during which he is thereby unfitted for duty, be entitled to compensation from the railway company at the rate of not less than sixty per cent of the current rate of wages for men similarly employed by the company, at the time the injury occurs, to be paid for not more than fifty-two weeks.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to similar legislation which was passed by the British Parliament at its last session, and to urge the necessity that exists in Canada for a provision of this kind. It is well known that it is almost impossible for a railway employee to obtain ample compensation for injuries he has suffered while in the service of the company, in cases where any question arises inviting litigation. No doubt, in a number of cases, perhaps in the great majority, the railway companies give what they consider fair compensation without going into court at all; but, when a railway company does go into court, and the question as to its liability is raised, hinging on some such point as its liability for the actions of any of the fellow-employees of the one who is injured, litigation goes on almost ad infinitum, and the wealthy corporation has all the advantage of wealth in its favour. I have two or three times brought before the House an individual case which arose in Montreal, and which was carried through the courts of the province of Quebec and thence to the Supreme Court, and was sent back to the provincial courts, and then came again before the Supreme Court, and was finally adjudicated upon by the Privy Council in favour of the employee. That case would never have been fought to a conclusion by the plaintiff, if he had not been assisted by his fellow-workmen, and by men who were not fellow-employees, with considerable sums of money to fight the railway company. No doubt, there are many similar cases in which justice was not done, simply because of the lack of funds on the part of the complainant to push the case through the courts. I do not propose to trouble the committee with details, but I think it will be admitted that a railway employee is not in a position to fight a railway company in the courts for compensation in the case of injury, disability or death. This view of the matter was so strongly felt in England that, during last session, a Bill was passed by the Imperial legislature, applying, not merely to railway employees, but to all those who are engaged in what

Mr. CASEY.

are considered dangerous employments. On page 118 of the report of the special committee will be found the text of this Bill, which subsequently became law in Great Britain :

1. (1.) If in any employment to which this Act applies personal injury by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment is caused to a workman, his employer shall, subject as hereinafter mentioned, be liable to pay compensation in accordance with the first schedule to this Act :

(2.) Provided that :

(a.) The employer shall not be liable under this Act in respect of any injury which does not disable the workman for a period of at least two weeks from earning full wages at the work at which he was employed.

(b.) When it is decided as hereafter provided, that the injury was caused by the wilful and wrongful act or default of the employer or some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, nothing in this Act shall affect any liability, civil or criminal, of the employer or persons for whom he is responsible ; but the employer shall not be liable to pay compensation both independently of and under this Act, and shall not be liable to pay compensation independently of this Act except in case of such wilful and wrongful act or default.

Mr. DAVIN. Has that passed the English House of Commons ?

Mr. CASEY. Yes, and is now the law. In other words, the employer is liable in any case, either under this Act or the common law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would my hon. friend allow me to interpose a remark or two to the committee ?

Mr. CASEY. I should like first to make out my case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know that my hon. friend would like to enter into a full discussion of the English legislation ; but there is a difficulty which arises at the threshold, and upon which, I think, the committee should come to some conclusion before we take up our time considering these clauses. It appears to me, that we ought first to satisfy ourselves that, in passing the sections and subsections, from No. 7 down to the end of the Bill, we would really be legislating within our competency. There is very serious doubt as to whether this is not a subject of civil rights, within the exclusive competency of the provincial legislatures. What the civil rights of an employee against his employer shall be, whether upon a railway or any other class of work, may be a matter which can only be properly legislated upon and determined by the legislatures of the various provinces ; and I fear that, in passing this Bill, we would be holding out an illusory hope, and thus mislead and deceive the people who have applied to us to pass this Act. It may be found that the people instead of getting bread from the Parlia-

ment of Canada, were simply given a stone. That is the fear I entertain, and I would like to know, before we enter into details, what the sense of the committee is upon this point, and whether my hon. friend has taken the precaution to ascertain what the views of gentlemen learned in the law are upon it. I do not think it is one which requires a great deal of argument. If any hon. gentleman thinks that the law is clear, it seems to me that his opinion would be, that the law is clearly against our jurisdiction.

Mr. CASEY. I am sorry my hon. friend interrupted me. I think it is a little late to raise the question of ultra vires after passing this Bill three times to a second reading, the second reading being the stage in which the question of "vires" should be considered ; and, after it has been considered by a special committee of this House. But, if it is determined to raise that point now, I have only to say in regard to it that during the three years that this Bill has been before the House I have never heard that point raised by any lawyer in the House. I have heard the Bill objected to on every other ground, but never on that ground. The Dominion railways and all concerning them, are stated by the constitution to be entirely within the control of this House. We regulate the railways in all their relations to the public. It has been held by the courts in the province of Ontario that on such matters as the drainage of railway lands these railways are not subject to the law of the provinces. Even though the constitution states that the provinces have the right to legislate as to property and civil rights, they have no right to legislate as to the real estate of the Dominion railways. The question has never gone, I believe, to the Supreme Court or the Privy Council, but that is the decision of the highest courts of the province. That is, that every question of Dominion railways is within the power of this Parliament and within its exclusive power by virtue of an article in the constitution which puts Dominion railways under our charge. The hon. Minister of Railways says it is a matter of civil rights, as it involves the relations of employer and employed. A vast deal of our legislation does the same. We legislate about the civil service, and claim the right to regulate the relations of employer and employed in regard to superannuations and a hundred matters of the civil service. And why we cannot make similar laws with regard to the Dominion railways that are specially committed to our care, I confess I do not see. I am not a lawyer, but I have been, to some extent, a student of the constitution. I await the opinion of some legal gentleman who is a constitutional lawyer, and who has experience of matters of this kind, one who is an authority, before I consider my case entirely hopeless. I would ask the

hon. Minister whether before he opposes the clause on this ground he asked the opinion of the Minister of Justice, who is admittedly the highest constitutional authority in this country. If he takes the position he does on the basis of an opinion of the Minister of Justice, he has some valid objections, but I think he should not raise this point except after advice by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) is a lawyer, too.

Mr. CASEY. That may be, but he is not the member of the Government charged with guarding the constitutionality of Bills, and I think he would strengthen his case by having the opinion of the Minister of Justice on such a matter. When the hon. Minister interrupted me, I was pointing out the scope of the British legislation on this subject. I was pointing out that the employer was always liable for an injured employee either under the special Act or under the common law.

Mr. INGRAM. Does that Act apply to every employer?

Mr. CASEY. No, there is a list of occupations given, to which it applies, but the list includes railway men. In the schedule at page 120, my hon. friend will find the scale of compensation. An injured man, or his representatives if he is killed, have an option as to how they will be compensated, whether under this Act or under the common law. If they accept compensation under the Act, they cannot go to law with the employer. That proposition is also embodied in a subsequent provision of my own Bill. When death results from injury, if the workman leaves dependents, the compensation is the amount of his wages for three years next preceding the injury or £150, whichever is the larger, but not exceeding £300, provided that the amount of pecuniary payments made under the Act shall be deducted. In case of incapacity, 50 per cent of the weekly earnings in weekly payments, such weekly payments not to exceed £1. There is no limit to the time over which these weekly payments shall extend, according to the British Act, but according to this Bill it is provided that they shall not extend over more than one year. There is provision in this British Act as to who shall be considered dependents and so on. It closes with a provision that if the registrar of friendly societies certifies that any scheme of insurance for the workmen provided by the employer is not less favourable to the workmen than the provisions of the Act, the employer may until the certificate is revoked, contract with any of the workmen that the provisions of these schemes shall be substituted for the provisions of the Act, and this employer is liable then only under the provisions of

Mr. CASEY.

the scheme. If this Bill is proceeded with, I propose to move to add a clause of that kind. I propose to provide that if the railway company puts forward a scheme of insurance or compensation which shall be reported by the superintendent of insurance to be as favourable to the workmen as the provisions of this Bill, the railway may contract itself out of its obligations to the men, but otherwise it shall be liable under the provisions of the Bill. That will put the Bill on all-fours with the British Act. I think that is perfectly fair, for it will not deprive the employee of his rights under the Bill, unless it can be shown on the certificate of this actuary that what the railway is doing for him is quite as favourable as the terms of the Act.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the Minister of Railways to express grave doubts as to whether this Parliament had the right to pass this section. I may say that that was brought up before the special committee while Judge Clarke was giving evidence with respect to sections 7 and 8. Mr. Powell, who was a member of the committee, asked the judge this question. Hon. members will find it at page 101:

Mr. Powell.—Is there any decision in Ontario which says that the local Act applies to railways?

Mr. Clark.—No, I don't know that there is; and I am rather of the opinion that it would be ultra vires. My own opinion, and I say it with hesitation, because I do not think it is common among lawyers, is that for the purpose of building and carrying out Dominion railways on the theory of their good to the country, no provincial legislation can affect them.

Mr. Casey.—Your contention is that Dominion railways are quite outside the provincial Acts regarding employer's liabilities?

Mr. Clark.—Yes, sir. It is a very interesting subject to me, and my theory is that it may be necessary in an Act embodying this. A Dominion railway is an implement in the hands of the Government for Government purposes, managed by the Dominion Parliament. It declares the conditions under which companies shall build, the same as a lighthouse or a fortification, and it is inconsistent for a local government to interfere.

Mr. Choquette.—You do not go so far as Quebec or Ontario laws, making laws against railways passing through our provinces.

Mr. Clark.—There is no limit. If it is good for anything, it is good to this extent. If the Government want a railway built, say from Toronto to Montreal and want it built through every provincial parliament ground and every graveyard, it is sufficient—it may be bad judgment but good law—for them to say so. If it is wanted and authorized by the Dominion Parliament, which means that it is wanted for Canada, no local legislation can affect it in any way.

So according to that, it seems to me, though I am not a lawyer, that this Parliament would have power to pass section 7 and subsections. That was the judgment of Mr. Clarke, who has given a great deal of experience to this subject.

Mr. ELLIS. That refers only to railways within the Dominion law by the Act itself. It would not apply to provincial railways.

Mr. INGRAM. There are so few provincial railways that they are scarcely worth mentioning.

Mr. CASEY. My own opinion on this question is still unchanged, but, as it appears that a discussion of the powers of this House in this matter may lead to the waste of valuable time on the subject to-night, I suppose we had better postpone the further consideration of the Bill until this day week, as the remaining portions of the Act will all be affected by the questions that have been raised. In the meantime, those who take opposite views of the question can enlighten themselves by further reading and consultation. I confess, it has been quite a new view of the question to me, that we have not the power to legislate in this respect regarding Dominion railways. But, with the view to clearing that matter up, I beg to move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again; and this night week we hope to settle the matter more effectually.

Committee rose and reported progress.

ATTACHMENT OF SALARIES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Richardson: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 14) an Act respecting the attachment of salaries and moneys in the hands of the Government.

Mr. FLINT. There has already been a very valuable debate on the principle of this Bill, and I would suggest, in order to facilitate the discussion of the details, that the Bill go into committee. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) has two amendments to propose, and I think we can discuss the measure more thoroughly and with a greater likelihood of reaching a result, if we discuss it in committee.

Mr. BELCOURT. I desire to speak on the principle of the Bill before it goes into committee. If I understand rightly, the measure introduced by the hon. member for Lisgar has two objects. One object is to render attachable, at the instance of any person, all moneys payable by the Government to any person for any cause or reason.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I intend to withdraw that clause in committee.

Mr. BERGERON. You had better do it now.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I withdraw it.

Mr. BELCOURT. As the hon. gentleman abandons the first and second clauses, I need not discuss them any further. Then,

the other object of the Bill is provided for by section 3, and that is, to render attachable the salaries of all civil servants. As was pointed out to us the other day by the Solicitor General, there are grave doubts as to the constitutionality of that provision. It has been argued here, that it would be a violation of the principles of the British North America Act, and that it would be an interference with property and civil rights. I have not gone into that question, and I am not prepared to discuss it, but there has been such great doubt raised as to that part of the Bill, that I think it ought to engage our serious attention before it is adopted. The principal objection I have to urge against this Bill is, that there is no occasion or necessity for it. The civil servants in the city of Ottawa, I think—and I speak of those in Ottawa, because I have personal knowledge of the civil service here—are an honourable class, and they have, to my experience at all events, discharged their obligations as well and as faithfully as any other class or section of the community. There may have been a few delinquents in this city. Some of them may not have fulfilled their legal obligations as promptly and as satisfactorily as they might have wished, but that has been a very rare exception. During the fourteen years that it has been my privilege to live in the capital, during all of which years I have practised the profession of law, and had, therefore, special opportunities of judging, my experience has been, that the civil servants have, as a class, fulfilled their obligations faithfully and well. Now, there have been a few delinquents, but they are largely recruited from that class of civil servants who borrow from money-lenders. There have been in this city a certain number of people who have made it a practice to loan money to civil servants at exorbitant rates, and I cannot for myself very much blame some of the civil servants in having endeavoured to get out of the performance of contracts that were of the most usurious kind. Contracts have been made for the loan of money at rates running from 20 to 60 per cent. Those are the only persons who have not fulfilled their legal obligations as they might. Some hon. gentlemen have indulged in what I consider unjust declamation against the civil servants. Some politicians think civil servants are fair and legitimate game. I know that in rural districts the civil servant in Ottawa are considered as drawing enormous and extravagant salaries. The civil servant who is drawing a salary of \$1,000 is pointed out as a man who receives enormous remuneration. No doubt it must appear a large amount to people living in rural districts and who handle very little money. But when it is remembered that civil servants are called upon to pay large amounts for rents and other expenditures their salaries should not and really do not appear extravagant. The result of this unjust

and unfounded declamation is that unfair measures are adopted against the civil service. The Government are pressed either to decrease their salaries or impose unjust imitations on the service. I am sorry to say I do not quite agree with the present Government in the policy of doing away with the statutory increases to civil servants. I am glad to know that the matter is still under consideration, and when it is again considered I trust that it will receive the fair and impartial attention to which it is entitled, and the service will in the end receive the statutory increases to which its members are entitled by law and justice. I may be pardoned perhaps for referring to a matter that may not be exactly germane to this question, and I take this opportunity of directing the attention of the Government to this subject and in behalf of the civil service beseeching them to give a better and more fair consideration to their case. I believe in the end the system of statutory increase, which is properly called automatic, is the best one. There may be certain objections which can properly be urged against it, but on the whole it is the only satisfactory method. Uniformity of increase among the civil servants is the only practicable method. If there is not uniformity there is unjust discrimination, and pressure is brought to bear on the Government to increase salaries in cases where a claim does not exist as a matter of right but merely as a matter of courtesy, or of political influence.

Another objection which I have to this Bill is, that by adopting it this House will be encouraging the practice of giving credit, which is against modern progress, which is to discourage credit among all wage-earners, and this House will not be acting in accordance with modern ideas by adopting legislation of this kind. To my mind also this measure is not, as it has been termed, a liberal or progressive measure. It is not a progressive measure in this sense that it renders the salaries of wage-earners attachable. The tendency is all in the other direction. We know that one time all the salaries of all wage-earners were attachable. These salaries have been made partially unattachable, and the tendency has been all along to render the salaries of all wage-earners less and less attachable. This is going back to a system which has been abandoned, to an idea which does not prevail to-day, and for that reason the Bill is neither liberal or progressive.

But perhaps the most serious objection that can be urged against the Bill is, that by adopting it Parliament will be creating a means of collecting moneys or debts for a certain class, for a minority, which certainly is not in accord with either the practice or theory of Government. You will enable a certain number of people who are creditors of a civil servant to collect their debts at the public expense. It is quite plain that

any measure of this sort cannot be carried out except with great expense to the Government. Officers and legal gentlemen will have to be appointed to look after attachments, attend at court and make declarations on the part of the Government. That will entail the appointment of several officers who will have to receive pretty large salaries. And for what purpose? In order that a few people may collect their debts at the expense of the community. I submit it is contrary to good government that the whole community should be taxed and called upon to meet the expense of collecting these debts for the benefit of the few. Some hon. members told the House the other day that the Government was not in a different position in a matter of this kind from a railway company. The cases are not parallel, they are entirely different. A railway company is engaged in business, has servants and employees for the purpose of trade and gain. The Government is not in business, it has no objects of commerce, gain or profit. It is simply administering the affairs of all for the benefit and advantage of all. To my mind this Bill, if adopted by this House, would be utterly unworkable. It would be expensive, and as I have shown, it would be illiberal and not progressive. I am opposed to the principle of the Bill, and if I have the opportunity I shall vote against it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot see how any hon. gentleman can plead that the civil servants of this country should be protected against paying their honest debts any more than any other class. The rule in this country is that money can be garnisheed, but an exception to that rule is made in favour of civil servants. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has spoken very strongly in behalf of civil servants; but this House should remember that there is no class in this Dominion so well paid. The civil servants in Ottawa receive an average salary of a little over \$1,200. I should like any hon. member to state any other line in which there is an average salary paid of \$1,200. Do clerks and managers of banks, or clerks in wholesale houses, or employees of any other class receive such a large average salary? Why is it that the law which calls upon all other classes to pay their honest debts should not call on civil servants to do so? It is unfair that they should be protected by any law that prohibits money justly due them being garnisheed to pay their honest obligations. The hon. gentleman said it would be an injurious practice. I do not think so. It would be placing them in the class with all other people and on a par with all other persons who are wage-earners, and would enable those to whom they are indebted to obtain what is justly due, and I do not see why they should not be able to do so. My hon. friend has stated that the adoption of this Bill would entail very considerable expense on the Govern-

Mr BELCOURT.

ment, because when salaries were liable to be garnisheed, it would be necessary for the Government to appoint officers to appear in the courts and look after orders made against the Government for payment of money honestly due. That could very easily be avoided by his suing the civil servant, getting a judgment. The Government would not require to appear in that case. The Act could provide that a certificate of the judgment should be filed with the accountant of the department in which the civil servant works, and then, if proper provision is not made for payment within a reasonable time, the civil servant would be liable to be hauled up before a judge, and the judge would make an order that a certain amount of the wages should be paid until the debt is liquidated. That order would be filed with the accountant of the department, and he would be supposed to see that the order of the judge would be carried out, and in that way the Government would be put to no trouble at all; they would not have to hire a lawyer to attend court. My hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) says that there have been few delinquents in Ottawa, but I have heard of men in Ottawa who gave credit to such a number of civil servants that it eventually resulted in driving them into insolvency. These fellows could strut up and down the streets, dressed in the best, and their families moving in the highest circles, but, notwithstanding that, they would not pay their honest debts. It is not creditable to this Parliament that any class of persons should be placed in that position. For my part, I shall vote for this Bill in some form which will reach this privileged class and place them upon an equal footing with others in this country whose salaries can be garnisheed for their honest debts.

Mr. QUINN. I wish to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, in opposition to this Bill. I have followed with a good deal of interest the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen), and, when he speaks of a number of merchants being ruined by giving credit to civil servants, his argument will not hold water. What reason have they to give credit to civil servants to an extent which put them into bankruptcy, when they knew that the wages of civil servants have been unseizable. If they gave credit to such a large number, knowing that the salaries could not be seized, then they were incompetent and unable to conduct their business properly. They were acting in the face of the law of the country, which said that these salaries were not seizable. I agree with my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), who states that the civil servants are as respectable men as can be found in any other class of the community. The evil of making the salaries of civil servants liable to seizure is, principally, that it subjects the officers of the Government, and subjects the revenues

of Her Majesty, to attacks by all sorts of people; it affords an easy way of attacking the public Treasury, and a way which has never been permitted in this country before. My hon. friend (Mr. Richardson), with a looseness which characterizes all legislation of this kind, asks this House to pass a Bill permitting any individual who has a judgment against a civil service employee, to put a seizure in the hands of whom? In the hands of, as the second clause provides:

2. Process for the attachment of the said moneys shall be served upon the accountant of the department by which they are payable, or in the case of an attachment against moneys payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, upon the Auditor General.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have already announced that I intended to drop clause 1, and I might have added that I intend to drop clause 2. If clause 1 is dropped, it would naturally follow that clause 2 should also be omitted.

Mr. QUINN. Then, let us take section 3; it provides:

3. Any judgment creditor of a person employed in the public service of Canada may attach the future salary of such person, whether such salary is payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund or otherwise, in the same manner and by the same process as salaries of other persons payable out of moneys in the hands of private persons, and service of such process shall be in the same manner as in the next preceding section provided.

There must be somebody made "tiers saisi," or garnishee, in the matter.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is the reason I desire to get into committee; I have an amendment to propose which will cover that ground.

Mr. QUINN. We are obliged to take this Bill as it is presented to the House; and let me ask, who is going to be the garnishee? It must be Her Majesty the Queen; and, therefore, this Bill puts it in the power of any person to take an action against Her Majesty the Queen on a judgment for \$1 or 50 cents.

Mr. FLINT. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) allow me to ask him a question. There is a law of this kind affecting the salaries of civil servants of the province of Quebec. My hon. friend is a professional gentleman from that province, and I would like to ask him how that law operates? It has been represented to the House that it worked well.

Mr. QUINN. I have not much experience of the operation of that law in the province of Quebec, because, I am happy to say, that the public employees in the province of Quebec all pay their debts. I have never had occasion to operate the law against any of the public servants in that province. I understand, however, that in the province of Quebec the law is, that salaries up to \$500 or \$600 may be seized to the extent of one-

fifth, and salaries above that to the extent of one-fourth or one-third, according to the amount of the salary. How the law has operated, I really do not know, because, as I have said, the civil servants in the province of Quebec have paid their debts very regularly, and there have been very few seizures. Be that as it may, it does not do away with the objection I have taken. We have here the objection that the funds of Her Majesty may be seized, and that an action may be taken against Her Majesty for 50 cents or any larger sum of money that may be found to be due by the civil servants. The consequence of that will be, that in each department of Government it will be necessary to have an officer specially appointed for the purpose of looking after these seizures, who shall, when the seizure is put in, on the authority of an Order in Council or by some other proceeding, make the necessary declaration in court. It would be necessary for him to be thoroughly posted on the amount due by the department to every officer in Canada, no matter where he is. Not only that, but it will necessitate the existence in each department of a particular legal representative to defend the rights of Her Majesty in each case that may come before the court. If this Act is passed, it will require the employment of a legal representative of each department of the public service in every city, and town, and hamlet, in the Dominion.

Mr. McMULLEN. You ought not to object to that.

Mr. QUINN. I am not looking for jobs of that kind. I do not say that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and other hon. gentleman opposite are supporting this Bill for the purpose of giving some of their friends employment. I would not attribute that to them. I merely point this out as a serious difficulty, which has been avoided by all governments that have existed in this country up to the present time, and which I believe will present itself so strongly to the members of this House as to prevent the passage of this Bill. The case of the civil service employees has been so ably advocated by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), who is certainly competent to speak on that subject, that it is not necessary for me to say anything on that subject. But I will say this, that probably the most respectable men in our different towns and villages throughout the Dominion have been or are public employees; and it would be not only a reflection, but a very serious stigma upon their character for this House, without any representation from the outside at all, but at the whim of a private member, to pass an Act of this kind. If such an Act is necessary, let the Minister of Justice assume the responsibility of introducing it and passing it through the House as a Government measure. But until it becomes absolutely neces-

Mr. QUINN.

sary to pass such an Act, and until that necessity is manifested by the Minister of Justice introducing it, I do not think this House ought to take it into consideration. If it were possible to pass any Act on this subject here, I would rather favour the passage of an Act which would exempt all salaries and all wages from seizure. I think the giving of credit by retail merchants is the greatest curse of this country, particularly the giving of credit to people who are drawing a limited salary or wage. Look at the power which the provincial laws of this country vest in petty creditors. For instance, in the province of Quebec, if a man who owes \$20 or under, is sued by his creditor, and judgment obtained, a seizure is placed in the hands by his employer, and by the time the judgment is executed, the costs of the case, involving perhaps \$5 or only \$1, will amount to \$15. There is no reason in the world why a labourer should be subjected to such proceedings because he happens to be unfortunate enough to owe a man \$2 or \$5. I would rather support an Act if it were in the power of this Parliament, which would render the salaries and wages of labouring men altogether unseizable than to put on the Statute-book an Act like this. I think, as the hon. member for Ottawa says, it is a retrograde step.

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to say a few words on this question, as the rural representative has been mentioned as the instigators of this motion; otherwise I would not have spoken. I believe that the respectable portion of the class under discussion to-night do not want any legislation made in their favour: I believe if the question were left to themselves, they would vote against any such special legislation. They would say, "We are responsible men, and we are willing to bear our share of the burdens of life, and pay our debts." The majority of them are, I am glad to say, honourable men; but unfortunately the minority bring that class under the ban of shame, which renders this legislation necessary. I am glad to say that in my own constituency we have no trouble of this kind, because rural people generally do not live beyond their means and pay their debts; but in the cities something needs to be done. I know many instances in the city where I live in which men have lost seriously through not being able to collect the debts due to them.

Mr. BELCOURT. Would not this be special legislation against the civil service?

Mr. ROGERS. Not at all. If it would, I would not ask for it for a moment. The man to whom I pay a dollar a day has to pay his debts.

Mr. BELCOURT. Are not the wage-earners of Ontario exempt up to \$25 of their wages?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. BELCOURT. Is not that discrimination? This Bill provides for the attachment of all the salary of the civil servant.

Mr. ROGERS. I am willing to put them all on the same footing, and the Bill could be amended to do that. Hon. gentlemen will remember that there has been an agitation in the Ontario legislature on this subject for a number of years, and just on the eve of the last election the Ontario Government thought it well to pass a law, and they did pass a law to compel the Government employees of that province to pay their debts like other men. That was done because of the demand that came from the rural constituencies. I know that this will be a live question at the next election if this House does not take action upon it. I think it is a slight upon the civil service to say that they shall not pay their debts the same as other men in the community. It is said that the civil servants are not well paid, and are hardly dealt with as a class. Then, why is it that so many are after positions in the service? We all know how many are after every vacancy that occurs. If the work were put up to tender, if that were possible, it could be done for 50 per cent of what it costs to-day. That is evidence enough that they are either too well paid or have too little to do. It is said that this measure is not constitutional in this House. Well, if members of the civil service are put on the same basis as the employees of railway corporations, that would fill the bill. Then, if there were a judgment against any civil servant, and that judgment were not at once or within a limited time redeemed, the civil servant should be dismissed. That would avoid the necessity of any laws and save all trouble. It might be provided that on the second or third appeal, or at the end of three months, the civil servant would be dismissed if within that time the judgment was not redeemed. I think it would be a charity to the civil service if that were the law. I agree with the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) and would not object if a law were passed providing that no salaries or wages should be seizable, although that might give rise to hardships by preventing these people obtaining credit when, in cases of sickness, they were unable to earn money to pay cash for what they get. I know that this is a live question and will continue to be one, and any hon. member who opposes the doing away with these exemptions will find himself in a pretty hard box when he goes before the people again. The Ontario legislature dared not dissolve the last House without taking some action in the matter. I believe it would be rather a benefit than a disadvantage to the civil service if this measure were passed. No honourable straightforward men want any special legislation in their own interest, but are willing that every man should be made to pay his debts, and it would be a great advantage to

the community at large if action were taken along that line.

Mr. DAVIN. Now that the two clauses are to be eliminated, which the hon. gentleman says he is willing to strike off in committee, this Bill will be rendered completely abortive that there can be no earthly use in putting it on the Statute-book. We have heard a great deal said about the character of the civil service, but for my part I must say that having been a constant visitor to Ottawa for the last twenty-five years, I entirely endorse all that has fallen from my hon. and learned friend, the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) in their regard. The Ottawa civil service, the Dominion civil servants throughout the country at large, will stand comparison in character and honour with any class in the country. I have no sympathy whatever with certain hon. gentlemen and certain gentlemen outside this House, in the dead set which it is their fashion to make against our civil servants. They are most unjust to ninety-nine one-hundredths of them. We meet these civil servants in society, we transact business with them in the departments, and it is our experience of them in all the departments, that these men who are so often described throughout the country as idlers who do nothing but carry little short sticks in their hands and walk up and down the sidewalks, are, on the contrary, up to their eyes in business and as hard working, on the whole, as any class to be found in Canada. I entirely object to legislation that makes a dead set against an entire class and tends to make the minds of the people of Canada uneasy by giving them a false impression of the public service. What we are asked to do here is to pass legislation to protect people who recklessly give credit under circumstances which they are fully acquainted with, by enabling them to collect the very smallest sums by means which will entail a large expenditure upon the country. Why, to carry out what is proposed we should require to employ legal gentlemen to attend in court whenever Her Majesty is served with a writ, in order that Tom, Dick or Harry may collect some trifling sum for which he has given a civil servant credit. And although it does not bear on the subject under discussion, I propose to follow the example of my hon. and learned friend (Mr. Belcourt) in expressing the hope that the Government will pay heed to his representations with regard to the statutory increases, and not break the contract which the Government has entered into—because no one can doubt that a contract has been made—with these gentlemen when they entered the civil service, not only to pay them a certain amount of wages per annum but also to pay them statutory increases. I am very glad that my hon. friend made his appeal to the Government of which he is so distinguished a supporter, and certainly, if

one vote from this side can help him, I shall be glad to give him my support should he bring that question before the House. In the condition in which this Bill is at present—mutilated, decapitated and detrun- cated, with nothing left but the feet, and these feet in a puddle, because he says he will have to take away the closing sentence—the best thing he can do is to withdraw his Bill and not ask the House to stultify itself by putting on the statutory book so lame and impotent a conclusion as this Bill, in its mutilated shape, would amount to. I listened very carefully to my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) as I always do, but I must say that he is not as instruc- tive on this subject as I have found him on other occasions. I fear that the argu- ments he put forward to support my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) were not of that conclusive character which gen- erally characterizes what he says about sub- jects of an agricultural nature, about which he knows a great deal more than he does about this matter. I hope that my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) will be satisfied with the elucidation this Bill has received from this House. I really sympa- thize with him. As he told us that he will take away the first and second clauses, I have drawn my pencil through them, and as I look at the Bill, with those clauses struck out, it bears such a dilapidated appearance and is altogether such a pitiable thing, that I really sympathize with him and think that the best thing he can do with his poor little bantling is to reform it out of existence altogether. It is evidently not destined to live. It is battered so completely about the head and the waist and loins that it is at its last gasp, and I think he will best consult his own dignity by withdrawing it.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not rise to dis- cuss the merits of the Bill because I do not think it makes much difference what is said either for or against it on either side of the House, but I think it is of such a nature that we ought to have the opinion of the law officers of the Government upon it. Is the Government of opinion that it is com- petent for this Parliament to pass a Bill of this nature? If that opinion were given in the negative, that would at once put an end to all discussion. My own opin- ion, which I give for what it is worth, is that this Bill, if passed, would be unconstitu- tional. I do not think that this Parliament has the power to pass an Act making the salaries of any persons garnisheeable. I think that the process of garnishee and at- tachment comes altogether within the pur- view of the local legislatures, and that they alone can pass an Act of this kind. This is a view which many lawyers share, and I think that it is due to the House that Par- liament should have the opinion of the Gov- ernment on this point.

Mr. DAVIN.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COM- MERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am quite aware that the hon. gentleman is within his right in requiring that the Gov- ernment should express an opinion on this question. I may say to my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) that the Solicitor General had taken this into special consideration and fully expected to have been present, but as the House is aware, he has been summoned to the city of Quebec to perform a melancholy duty, and it was impossible for him to be present to-night. Perhaps in view of the very large alterations my hon. friend proposes to make, the best course would be for him to move the House into committee, make such alterations as he proposes, and have the Bill reprinted in order that the House may then consider it in its amended form. It would be quite impossible for us, I think, to express an opinion on it as matters stand. By the time it is reprinted, the law advisers of the Crown will be present with us and we will be able to get an opinion on the somewhat complicated questions that are involved. I may say to my hon. friend from Lisgar, though his object is excellent and though, prima facie, the thing appears very simple and straightforward, I am perfectly aware that in working it out there is a risk of a good deal of difficulty arising in the different departments, and, what is quite as important, a considerable extra expense may be inflicted on the country at large. I fear it would prove that the par- ties who will make the most out of it will be the legal gentlemen, who, it may be, must be employed by us. In any case, I am not in a position to offer an opinion on the legal questions raised. That must be decided by the law officer. Now, if it meets the wish of the House, I think the course I have suggested to my hon. friend—that we should go into committee and then have this Bill reprinted for the use of the House, by which time the law officers of the Crown will be ready to give their opinion, is the best solution that I can offer for the moment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not propose to speak on the merits of the Bill or of the amendments I offer. I think it would be a pity to kill the Bill at the present stage, and I would be glad to adopt the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to go into committee, and place before the committee the amend- ments I propose, which, I think, will sim- plify matters considerably and meet with the approbation of nine-tenths of the mem- bers of this House. If hon. members will allow the Bill to go into committee, I will make a few remarks on it which I think will show the Bill to be one acceptable to hon. members.

Mr. CLANCY. Before proceeding I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and

Commerce what is the policy of the Government with regard to a Bill of that kind involving all the difficulties it does, including some to which the hon. gentleman himself made reference. Even if it were in the power of the House to pass such a Bill, it is contended that it would raise many serious difficulties in connection with every department of the civil service.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I have already stated to the House that this matter has been referred to our law advisers and only the accident of the Solicitor General's absence prevents us getting the benefit of the opinion they have arrived at.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Would the hon. gentleman allow it to stand until the Solicitor General comes?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I propose to do that virtually, but I think it is only reasonably courteous to my hon. friend from Lisgar that he should be allowed to have the Bill reprinted so that the House may see what it is asked to pass upon. He proposes to strike out two-thirds of the Bill, and, if I understand, to largely amend the remainder. We shall thus have virtually a new Bill. I want it printed and laid before the House so that every man, the law officers of the Crown included, may see what the hon. gentleman proposes. I think that would save a good deal of unnecessary discussion.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I understand the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his kindness to the hon. member for Lisgar, desires to kill the Bill in committee instead of killing it now.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) must not put that construction on it.

Mr. **BERGERON**. We have witnessed here since eight o'clock just such treatment of another Bill. It was very nearly killed, and, in fact, it can hardly live after the treatment it received at the hands of the Minister of Railways. If the proposal is as I have suggested, I do not see any reason why we should not allow the Bill to be killed in committee. But I would remind the hon. Minister that this is the second reading of the Bill and affirms a principle.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. The hon. member is mistaken, this is a motion that I leave the Chair and the House go into committee. The second reading has been carried.

Mr. **BERGERON**. If it is so, the House and the committee will stand on the same footing, because three-quarters of the Bill is cut off.

Mr. **RICHARDSON**. It is not cut off yet.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Anyway, I will not discuss mere words. It is evidently the intention of the Government to kill it in committee, and I will allow them to do it.

Mr. **McINERNEY**. While I sympathize with this Bill, I can see an easy way to get along without it. The garnishee would be troublesome to Government. If the Governor General in Council would issue an order to each department to instruct the civil servants in every branch of the service that if they are reported a second time as not paying a just debt they will be dismissed, we shall have no trouble.

Mr. **McMILLAN**. It is time this question was settled. There is more feeling in the country on this subject than many hon. gentlemen are aware of. While the civil servants are, in the main, an honest class, there is a remnant of whom that cannot be said. I was made administrator of an estate to which a civil servant owed a considerable Bill. I sued as executor and got judgment, and the judge decided that the debtors should pay \$2 a week. He made two payments and no more. Since then I have been unable to get a cent from him simply on account of his being a civil servant. Had he been in ordinary employment I could have secured the payment of the debt. We hear it said that this law should not be passed to discriminate against the civil servants; but I ask that there should be no discriminating in favour of any class, but that all should be equally compelled to pay their debts. I do not agree with the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) or the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that it would be necessary for the Government to have a lawyer go into court in each of these cases. Let the civil servant employ his own lawyer if he thinks his case is worth defending. Let the judge give his judgment and let that be recorded. That takes it out of the hands of the court. I am under the impression that the majority of the civil service would rather be placed on an equality with other classes than left in an anomalous position as at present. With regard to doing away entirely with the credit system, I may say that I have lived for fifty-four years in Canada, and I know that there is a large and respectable class of workmen who, especially within the last two years, have been unable in the summer to earn enough to carry them over the winter, and had there been no credit system, a large system of charity would have to be organized to prevent these people from starving. But, having a small credit given them, they are able to tide over the winter, and they come forward and pay their debts in the spring. If debts had not been collectable by process of law, I think the credit would not have been given, and their case would have been much harder that it is.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. I do not know how it is with the civil servants in the province

of Ontario, one of whose constituencies is represented by the gentleman who has just taken his seat, but I know that in the province I come from there is no distinction in respect to the obligation to pay his debts between a civil servant and any other member of the community; he is just as much obliged to pay his debts as any other man. The civil servant does not seek any special privileges over other members of the community, and for that reason, so far as my own province is concerned, I cannot understand why any special legislation should be made against that class. If a civil servant happens to owe a debt to one of his creditors in the province of Nova Scotia, he can be brought up before a commissioner and be examined as to his means of paying his debts, and, if he is possessed of means and is able to pay his debts, an order can be made upon him to pay them in such instalments as the commissioner thinks just. If he does not obey that order, he is guilty of contempt of court and can be imprisoned. If other provinces have not laws as equitable or as effectual as we have in Nova Scotia, we are willing to furnish them with the patent if they desire. I understand from my hon. friend near me that such is substantially the law in the province of Ontario. The hon. gentlemen who are so furiously pursuing the civil servants with this special legislation against them say they do not want civil servants to have any special privileges. Neither do we. Why is it, then, that by this clause, by the remainder of this Bill, which is still on its last legs, and still has a gasp of vital breath in it—why is it that by this clause they want to impose special burdens upon the civil servants not borne by any other members of the community? Why pick out of the whole community one particular class and say we are going to put them under a special disability, and put them in a different category from any other part of the community? I am unable to understand that. If the friends of the Bill can show me that this is not the effect of the Bill, I might be somewhat inclined to vote for it; but I would have to be convinced that this Parliament has power to pass this Bill before I would be disposed to give it my support. I am inclined to agree with the view that has been propounded by some professional gentlemen on the other side of the House; I am inclined to concur, at all events, in the doubts that were expressed on a former occasion by the Solicitor General. Of course, I would be diffident in expressing an opinion on the subject, after the information that has been given to us, that the matter is under the consideration of the Solicitor General. But, if we must go on and consider it to-night, and if our friends are so anxious to get at the civil servants that they cannot wait a single day or a single hour until the Solicitor General gives us the benefit of his opinion on this question, then we must use the best intelligence and information we have

Mr. RUSSELL.

at our disposal without that assistance. My own impression is, that, in spite of the fact that a court in Quebec and the Ontario Court of Appeal have given judgment which would seem to show that this Parliament alone could pass an Act such as is before us, I am inclined to think these judgments will not be sustained when they get into the Supreme Court of Canada. I think that the reasoning on which these judgments have proceeded—though I have not looked at them for a long time, my recollection is, that the grounds upon which those judgments proceeded are grounds which do not exist in this country at all; that our courts in this matter have gone by light which has “led astray”; they have gone according to the condition of things south of the line; they have gone upon the analogy of United States cases, which ought not to have any application to the condition of things in this country. There are, I believe, decisions in the United States, on the strength of which decisions have been pronounced in Ontario and Quebec upon this question. There it was necessary for the Supreme Court to lay down the position, that a state legislature could not by legislation encroach upon the salaries or incomes of a servant of the central government, because, if they had power to do that, they would have power to cripple the central government in the execution of its administrative powers. But no such reasoning as that can apply to the condition of things in this country, because we have a remedy for anything of that sort in the Dominion of Canada, which they do not have in the American Republic. If any legislation of any local legislature encroaches upon the rights and powers and administrative action of the Government of the Dominion, the Government of the Dominion can advise its disallowance. I think the existence of that power altogether destroys the analogy of the cases in the United States courts upon which our courts have mistakenly adopted the conclusion that the Dominion Parliament alone can pass an Act which will make the salary of a Dominion official attachable. However that may be, I only express it as a matter of doubt, and I think, before we are asked to vote on this question, we should have those doubts cleared up, and until they are cleared up, when we are asked to vote to put the civil servants under a special disability which does not exist with reference to any other members of the community, I am prepared to vote against this Bill.

Mr. McINERNEY. With the permission of the House, I wish to make a suggestion. I think, that by going into committee now it would be like putting the cart before the horse. If the opinion of the law officers is, or will be, that this Bill is unconstitutional, I do not see why we should lose time by going into committee upon it. I think the Bill might stand over until we get that opinion.

Mr. INGRAM. Whatever I may attempt to say on this Bill, I say it from the standpoint of a layman, because I am not a lawyer. I think the hon. member for Lisgar deserves a great deal of credit for introducing a Bill of this kind. I found that our Patron friends, during the last election, urged that the Government supporters at that time should be condemned for not supporting a Bill of this character, compelling the civil servants of the Dominion to pay their debts; and I understand that other hon. gentlemen who were opposed by third parties, had to deal with this same question. I have had some experience in railway matters, and with the manner in which railway companies guard themselves against their employees taking advantage of their creditors, and I approve the simple method they have adopted of issuing a general order to all their employees that every one who is garnisheed twice shall be dismissed from the service. We have heard the arguments produced here by several legal gentlemen and others, showing the enormous expense that an Act of this kind would entail upon the people of this country, who would have to pay fees to our legal friends throughout the Dominion for carrying on cases, where civil servants might be garnisheed. Now, there are two evils complained of. One is that civil servants buy goods and do not pay for them, and there is no existing means by which they can be compelled to pay for them. Then, there is a complaint of the character that I have just named, namely, the large expense the people of this country are put to in professional fees to lawyers for the collection of the debts of civil servants. Now, of the two evils, I prefer choosing the least. I would endorse the suggestion of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) and also by the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie), that each department issue a circular, that any employee being garnisheed twice would be dismissed from the service, unless he could show good reason why he did not pay his debts.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Unless this Bill is passed, they cannot be garnisheed.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood, from the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), that in the province of Nova Scotia civil servants have no undue advantage over other classes of the community, and we are told that in the province of Ontario the same rule could be made applicable to civil servants. For that reason, as well as the other reasons I have named, I, for one, shall oppose this Bill. I understand, the Solicitor General intends opposing this Bill. When that hon. gentleman spoke upon this Bill before, he raised objections, which will be found on page 2955, unrevised addition of the "Hansard," and these objections are of such a character that we cannot hope for any support from that hon. gentleman for this Bill. The hon. gentleman says it is unconstitu-

tional. Instead of accepting the suggestion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, after hearing all the discussion on the previous occasion and on this occasion, I consider it is simply loss of time for the House to go into Committee of the Whole, and I shall oppose the motion.

Mr. CALVERT. I think it is only fair that we should allow the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) to go into committee to consider this Bill. The hon. gentleman has proposed to eliminate all objectionable portions, and when we hear the amendment, no doubt the committee will agree with them. I cannot understand why any hon. member should desire a civil servant to occupy a different position in the country from any other citizen. If we took the vote of the civil servants, 95 per cent would vote that they should be placed on equal footing with every other citizen. I think if the proposition made by the hon. member for Lisgar, that the House should go into committee on this Bill, should meet with approval, and it is only fair to the hon. member that this should be done. The Bill should be reprinted, and should afterwards be passed.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. RICHARDSON. The discussion which has occurred on this Bill is exactly what I have desired. When I introduced the Bill I did it with but one object, and that was to remedy a grievance in the country. I did not introduce this Bill because I had any personal desire to do so, but because a great many people had spoken to me on the subject and urged that such a Bill should be introduced. Since my name has been connected with the Bill I have received petitions from many commercial associations, letters from all parts of the country, and from men of whom I never heard before, thanking me for the position I have taken and urging the adoption of this measure. Whether this Bill is right or wrong, I leave it for hon. members to decide, considering the merits of the question. I am not here to say anything against civil servants as a class. I believe as a class they are quite as honourable, and quite as above reproach as any class in the Dominion. The position I am here to take is that the exemption which exists in their favour should be removed and they should be placed on the same basis as all other classes in the Dominion. Surely that is a fair position. One hon. gentleman has spoken about the "fury" raised against the civil service in the country. Surely there is no "fury" against this class. So far as my observation goes there is as large a percentage of honest people in the civil service as in any other class in the Dominion. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) and other hon. members have spoken as if this Bill was specially directed against members

of the civil service in Ottawa. I wish to remind the hon. member for Ottawa that there are others, and other hon. members who hold his views, that there are many civil servants throughout the Dominion besides those who live in the capital, and I am quite sure from the expression of opinions heard from members of the service that they themselves are quite satisfied that such a Bill as this should become law. They do not desire any special exemption, in fact many of them, doubtless a majority, consider it would be infinitely better in their own interest that such a Bill should become law. It may be asked, why should a layman take up this subject. I approached it with a great deal of diffidence and I discovered by the debate which took place, the extreme danger a layman like myself incurs in bringing a Bill like this before the House. I would not have done this, if any member of the legal profession had been prepared to introduce it. There is no particular glory in introducing a Bill of this description. There are no doubt very many clever lawyers in the House, and had any one essayed to introduce such a measure I would have been only too glad to have supported him. I was not in the House the other day during the closing hours of the debate—I had an important engagement and was obliged to leave the House for a brief time—but I read the remarks of various members who spoke on the Bill and I discovered that very many objections were raised. I discovered that the most prominent objections were raised to clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill. I did not draw the Bill; I had a number of legal friends draw Bills for me, I had three different Bills and I selected, on the advice of disinterested friends, the Bill which I considered covered the ground in the best way. I am not prepared to say that it is a constitutional Bill, but after obtaining the expression of the opinion of the House, if we could not find that we could carry a Bill that was constitutional, then, so far as I am concerned, I would be quite satisfied with a declaration from the Government that if any civil servant was sued twice that would be equivalent to a dismissal. I understand the rule in the United States is that if a civil servant is garnisheed that is tantamount to sacrificing his position. If the Government or members of the Government will rise and declare they will adopt that principle and will take such a measure to see that civil servants are placed in the same position as all other classes, I will be quite satisfied to withdraw the Bill. But I propose that, inasmuch as I have been memorialized by various mercantile associations throughout this country and been pressed all along the line to introduce and force to a conclusion such a Bill, if I do not obtain such a declaration from the Government, I propose to press my amendments in committee and leave members of the House to judge whether it is a righteous measure or not. If the committee will allow

Mr. RICHARDSON.

me, I desire to say that I have been considerably misrepresented in connection with this measure. I, like the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), have to complain of the spiteful misrepresentation of the correspondent of a paper published in the city where I reside—the Winnipeg "Free Press." I will read to the House one or two of the headings on a paragraph sent in respect to this effort of mine to put the civil servants in the same position as any other class of the community, and I will allow hon. members to judge whether I have been misrepresented in this effort or not: "Lisgar's Member. Severely Criticised by the Minister of Marine. An Attempt to Deceive. Richardson's Bill to Authorize the Attachment of Money in the Hands of the Government meets with general opposition. A Shocking Proposition." I listened to a portion of that debate, and it did not disclose general opposition, on the contrary, the consensus of opinion was that the principle of the Bill was all right. Many hon. gentlemen learned in the law took the view that it was not constitutional, and that it would be difficult to put it into operation, but so far as I could judge the general consensus of opinion was, that so far as my effort was concerned I was doing what I thought was right. I spoke to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) in regard to this, and whilst he saw the legal difficulties he considered that my efforts were in the right direction, and said he had no thought of reflecting on my action in the remarks he made. If any hon. member thinks that I attempted to mislead the House, or for a moment thought to railroad through any clause by deception, I would like him to state that to the House now. I know that members are obliged to submit to spiteful misrepresentations by spiteful correspondents, and as a newspaper man I am prepared to take my share of that. I want to vindicate myself before this House; I want hon. gentlemen to understand that I have but one object, and that is that civil servants may be placed on the same footing as any other class of the community. Recognizing the difficulties in the way, I have an amendment to propose which I think will meet with the general approval of the House. It probably does not go so far as I would like, but it is a step in the right direction, and if the amendment is adopted we will, I believe, discover in a year or two that the difficulty we wish to avoid will have entirely disappeared. I propose to substitute for clause one, the following:—

All moneys or salaries due or accruing due to any person employed by the Government of Canada shall be liable to attachment in each and every province of the Dominion of Canada, according to the laws and rules of procedure in force in such province.

That removes the exemption that exists in the provinces with regard to Dominion civil

servants, and surely a clause of that kind will be acceptable. If, as many hon. members fear, such an Act as this will be expensive, I am sure that if the Government adopt the rule which I have urged: that any civil servant who is garnisheed twice shall forfeit his position, then the difficulty will be removed. That, after all, is the real way of getting at the evil. If the civil servants understand that they must not allow their salaries to be garnisheed, then they will readily pay their debts. Some years ago an Act of this kind was passed in the legislature of Manitoba, and they have the rule there, that if a civil servant is garnisheed twice he loses his position. That has been found to work admirably and no trouble has arisen from it and civil servants pay their debts like other citizens. It will not be necessary to employ lawyers or extra officials, because the moment that civil servants throughout the length and breadth of the land are placed in the same position as all other classes, that moment we will find that their debts will be paid. I made a personal allusion a moment ago, with reference to the spiteful manner in which I have been misrepresented, and I mentioned the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as stating to me that he perfectly approved of the principle of my Bill, and he believed I was perfectly honest in bringing it forward. Let me read a sentence from the speech which the hon. Minister (Sir Louis Davies) made on that occasion:

I think it would be possible, notwithstanding what my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) has said, for this Parliament to enact a declaration, in some way or other, that the principle which prohibits the salary of civil servants from being attached should be removed. Some general law of that kind might be passed. When that difficulty is removed, then the local legislatures may enact a law enabling these salaries to be attached.

I may say that I took advantage of the suggestion of the Minister of Marine, and I went to the law clerk and had him draft a clause which I thought would cover the point. I also induced one or two of my legal friends in the House, men of great legal acumen, to draw up a clause covering that, and the result is the amendment which I have read to the House. Permit me to read the clause which I propose to substitute for clause two:

This Act not to apply to any debt contracted before its passage.

I have thought it would be unfair to make such an Act as I am introducing retroactive. I think that the civil servants should be placed in a perfectly fair position. Many of them have obligations hanging over them; old debts; and it would be ruin to such if this were a retroactive measure, and so I have decided that it shall only apply to debts contracted after the passing of this law. It will hardly be necessary for me, Mr. Chairman, to make any further explanation of this Bill.

Mr. INGRAM. What about section 3?

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the committee think that what I have substituted for clauses 1 and 2 will cover the object of the Bill, I have no objection to drop clause 3. My hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) characterizes the measure as illiberal. I have the highest estimation and the deepest respect for my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt), but surely hon. gentlemen will recognize that a measure of this kind is not an illiberal measure, when it simply seeks to place the civil servant on the same footing as is occupied by every citizen of this country.

Mr. BELCOURT. Perhaps it does now, but it certainly did not before.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I explained, at the outset of the discussion, to the hon. member (Mr. Belcourt), that if he would wait until I introduced my amendment in committee it would probably meet with his approval. I take it from his remark that this now meets with his approval, and I shall be happy to get his support.

Mr. BEATTIE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) allow me to ask him a question. Is he aware that under the present law in the province of Ontario the sum of \$25 of wages cannot be garnisheed?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am aware of the existence of that law in Ontario, but there is nothing in my proposed amendment which will conflict with it.

Mr. BEATTIE. There is.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have no desire to put the civil servant in Ontario in any different position from any other person in that province; nor have I any desire to put the civil servant in the province of Manitoba or in any other province of the confederation, on a different basis from that of his fellow-citizen. All I ask is, that civil servants shall be placed on the same footing as other members of society with respect to the laws of the provinces in which they live. I do not think anybody can object to that. If that is not a liberal, it is certainly an honest measure; and I believe that no member of this House can, after due deliberation, offer opposition to it. Its design is just, then why should we not adopt it? There may be constitutional difficulties raised, but if we place such an Act as this on the Statute-book it will be possible to garnisheed the salaries of civil servants, and if the Government adopt the rule which prevails in Washington: that persons who allow their salaries to be garnisheed twice shall lose their positions, then we get over the difficulty completely and there will be no cost whatever to the Dominion treasury in connection with the operation of the law.

Mr. BEATTIE. You will have to get the Ontario Government to repeal their present law. For instance, take a custom-house officer in the city of London. He is

an Ontario citizen, and I do not think you could make that apply to him, because according to the laws of Ontario he would be exempt to the amount of \$25.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have not the slightest objection to that. I would beg to move that clauses 1 and 2 be dropped, and that the clause I have read be inserted in their place; and also that clause 3 be dropped.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is quite obvious that my hon. friend has introduced a totally new Bill. I do not at all object to his doing so, and I dare say the new Bill will be found on consideration a great improvement on the one before us, and it may be one that will command the attention of the House. But he will see himself that in introducing a perfectly new Bill, it is only just and fair to the House that the new Bill should be printed before being discussed. I shall therefore ask him to move that the Bill be reprinted, and that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have no objection to adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, although I would like to know if there is any prospect, if that is done, of reaching the Bill again this session.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think so.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am exceedingly anxious that it should be passed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the country is put to the expense of printing another Bill, I would like to draw the attention of the leader of the House to the remarks already made by the Solicitor General that deals with the amendment now before the House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If I might suggest to the hon. gentleman, as the Solicitor General is unfortunately absent to-night—

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to read what the Solicitor General said on this amendment.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Is it worth while discussing it?

Mr. TAYLOR. No further than to make this quotation, because I think that after I make it the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce will advise the hon. member to withdraw the Bill altogether. The Solicitor General said:

Suppose we declare here that the salaries of public officials in the employ of the Federal Government are attachable, and find ourselves in Quebec face to face with the statute there which declares that they are not attachable, immediately a conflict of authority would arise, which it seems to me desirable we should avoid.

Mr. RICHARDSON. There is no conflict there.

Mr. BEATTIE.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Solicitor General says that the salaries of federal officials are not attachable and you say they are.

Mr. INGRAM. If it is true that the Federal Parliament has not power to attach the salaries of public officials, this law would not be applicable in the province of Quebec at all, and therefore it would be entirely useless.

Mr. FLINT. I think it would be wise to accept the suggestion to have the Bill reprinted, and to discuss it at another time in the light of the remarks that have been made. I would therefore move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CLANCY. The first ground on which the hon. member has rested his Bill is that it places civil servants on the same basis as all other persons; but I desire to point out that the hon. gentleman is absolutely destitute of any such ground. The Bill provides that the Crown may be made indirectly a party to every suit under this Bill; no person else can be; so that the Bill is placing them in an exceptional position in that respect. If I had a claim against any person in Canada who had moneys in the hands of the Crown, I could not proceed under this Bill; I would have to receive the assent of the Crown before I could proceed. Therefore, the Bill places civil servants in a position entirely different from that of everybody else in Canada. With regard to the drastic treatment which the hon. gentleman is proposing, that the civil servant should be dismissed upon any person twice bringing an action against him—

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is not in the Bill.

Mr. CLANCY. But the hon. gentleman advocates it in case of the Bill not becoming law. Let me point out what that would lead to. Some civil servant who has always paid his debts might fall sick and get behind, and might be made a victim by any one who chose to sue him twice.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The Government could exercise its discretion.

Mr. CLANCY. I am pointing out what the aim of the hon. gentleman is. He repeated the statement two or three times this evening that he was quite willing to drop his Bill if the Government were prepared by Order in Council or resolution to adopt so drastic a measure. No such power should be in the hands of any person. I therefore think this Bill is surrounded with great danger.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 19th April, 1898.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Mr. **GIBSON** moved :

That Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Pacific and Eastern Railway Company, be withdrawn, and the fees thereon be refunded, less the cost of printing and translation, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. **GIBSON** moved :

That the first report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament be concurred in.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is that just for the printing ?

Mr. **GIBSON**. This does not relate to the report presented to-day, but has reference to certain papers the printing of which was asked for by the hon. gentleman and the other members of the committee, and Dr. Dawson is simply waiting for concurrence in the report that he may go on with the printing.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the North American Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Hurley.)

DELAYED RETURN.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to remind the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of the question I put to him some time ago about the wharf at St. Anicet. Amongst the questions was this : "What is the amount of toll collected by Mr. Dupuis," the man who was in charge of the wharf then ; to which the hon. gentleman answered : "No statement of the collection has been received from the wharfinger, but he has been called upon by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to forward a statement." I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether this statement has come, and if so, would he be kind enough to lay it on the Table of the House ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I will make the necessary inquiries.

WAYS AND MEANS—RATE OF INTEREST ON DEPOSITS.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter of great importance to the country generally, and to a very important class of the poor and the thrifty in the community. When this debate was going on on Friday last, or rather in the early hours of Saturday morning, I was addressing the Government and the hon. gentlemen who happened to be in the Chamber, amongst whom, I may say, there was a very wakeful lot of members of the Opposition, and there was not a man on the opposition side of the House that was not fully awake, and from what has since come to my ears, I can safely say that without exception there was not a man on the Opposition side of the House that did not, in a way most gratifying to me, appreciate the facts and figures that at that early hour in the morning I brought before the attention of this House. I do not know what impression I made upon the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I will say this, that the fumes of the Bohea, which I always find myself conducive to intellectual activity, must have quickened his usual apprehensiveness to a very high power ; and if so, I would fain hope that I had made a favourable and useful impression upon him. I do not know what impression I made upon the Minister of Finance, which may be of more importance, in the arguments I addressed to him relating to a feature of his Budget which I believe to be one of the worst features that has ever characterized any Budget brought forward in this House, which is inimical to the interests of the country, and which I trust the hon. gentleman would reconsider. Sir, the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Finance, in laying before this House his reasons for reducing the rate of interest on deposits in the post office savings banks, laid down certain propositions, and none of the propositions have a leg of logic, or fact, or sound reason to stand on. The first proposition was this, that in the establishing of the savings banks, and of the Government savings banks more particularly, the object had in view by those who established them was the safe-keeping of the money of the poor—that, he said, was the main object, not the profit that they gained, not the encouragement of thrift. Well, I was able to show, and I can show in a still more ample manner if necessary, that so far from that being the case, the main object held in view by those who established the savings banks originally in England, and subsequently in this country, was thrift ; and Mr. Gladstone lays down in his own eloquent and far-seeing way that

there is no wealth in the community so great, so useful, so resourceful, so sinewy, so binding and clamping together of all the affairs of the community, as the principle of thrift amongst the poorer classes. Well, then, the second proposition that was laid down, and it was laid down not merely by the Minister of Finance, but it was supported by the powerful authority and weight of a statesman, the Minister of Trade and Commerce—it was this, that the depositors in our savings banks were men that did not need consideration, that there were poorer persons who had to pay the piper for their deposits, and that it was a mistake to suppose that it was the poor, the humble, the working classes, that were depositors in our savings banks. Then came the third proposition that the hon. gentleman, if not in form, yet by implication, laid down, namely, that in accordance with precedents, there should be a strict relation between the amount of interest allowed to depositors in the post office savings banks and the ordinary rate of discount in the chartered banks of the country. There, again, there is not a leg to stand on for this proposition. Now, Sir, it would be a pity if I did not give the Minister of Trade and Commerce a chance to explain in this House how it was that he who, in 1894, moved for a return which, as quoted by me, overturned completely the position that he laid down—how it was that he so misrepresented that return as to palm upon this House and upon the country the statement that the average depositor in the Government savings bank had a thousand dollars to his credit.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). No such statement was ever made.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I have the "Hansard" here.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. You have not in the least understood it. I will save the hon. gentleman a lot of trouble. What I said was this: That one-sixth of the depositors held very nearly three-fifths of the whole deposit, according to a return in 1894, and that some 26,000 depositors held among them twenty-five million dollars, being an average of about \$1,000.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very glad the hon. gentleman retires from the position. I will give what the hon. gentleman said. If my hon. friend makes the statement now that he did not say what I said he did then, I will prove by "Hansard" that he is mistaken. If he retires from the position he took up, well and good. But I will prove to the House that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce laid it down that the average depositor had to his credit \$1,000.

Mr. DAVIN.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman, I am very glad to see that much evidence of the repentance that the Montreal "Star" has been hoping he would exhibit; it is edifying and the sooner we see that repentance still more complete, the more edifying it will be. Now, I will prove what I said in one moment. But meanwhile here is the language of the Minister:

It may be interesting to the House to know that in 1894 something like \$25,300,000 of the then deposits, which amounted to about \$40,000,000, were held by 26,000 depositors, being, as nearly as may be, at an average of \$1,000 per head.

Is that correct?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is perfectly correct.

Mr. DAVIN. Is this correct, that the depositors have at their credit \$1,000 per head?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What has that to do with the allegation that I represented that each depositor had over \$1,000? There were 160,000 deposits in the bank.

Mr. DAVIN. I will read again what the hon. gentleman said:

It may be interesting to the House to know that in 1894 something like \$25,300,000 of the then deposits, which amounted to about \$40,000,000, were held by 26,000 depositors, being, as nearly as may be, an average of \$1,000 per head.

What I attributed to the hon. gentleman was that he said that the deposits averaged \$1,000 per head for 26,000 depositors.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is not what the hon. gentleman said. What he said was each depositor. The depositors were 160,000, and if each had a deposit of \$1,000 on an average, there would be \$16,000,000 in the treasury.

Mr. DAVIN. I said average depositor.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It was exactly what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. Minister of Finance consider that as a correct presentation of the state of things in the savings bank?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Perfectly.

Mr. DAVIN. Then I join issue with the hon. gentleman, and I will heap confusion on him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I will heap confusion on him; a thousand "ohs" will not prevent my doing so. There was a return moved for by the Minister of Trade and Commerce on 25th April, 1894, as follows:—

Return to an order of the House, dated the 25th April, 1894, for a return showing :

1. The total number of depositors in the Dominion and Post Office Savings Banks.

2. The number of said depositors having deposits of \$1,000 and upwards, and the total amount held by them.

3. The number having deposits of \$500 and over, not exceeding \$1,000, and the total amount held by them.

4. The number of depositors having deposits of less than \$500, and the total amount held by them.

5. The number of depositors not residing in Canada, and the total amount held by them.

Now, mark this, the number of depositors having deposited more than \$500 was 99,667, and the total amount of deposits was \$10,312,558. The object, of course, was to present an argument that would bear especially on the present time, and I looked over the Public Accounts and found that the depositors from 1891 to 1896 were as follows :—

	1890-91. Number of Depositors.
From \$1 to \$10.....	53,217
11 20.....	26,247
21 50.....	37,561
51 100.....	17,685
101 200.....	7,965

Pretty much the same results following 1893-94. In 1896 the number of depositors averaging from \$1 to \$10 was 58,841. These persons so depositing are those represented by the hon. gentleman as having on an average \$1,000 at their credit. What is the fact? The tabular statement will be found in the Public Accounts, and it shows that the average deposit in the Government savings banks, taking the whole \$32,000,000 was standing at the credit of each depositor, \$238; and yet the hon. gentleman represented that the average at the credit of the depositors, which was not true in 1894, which is not true now, which has not been true for a single year in the whole history of the savings bank, was \$1,000, and the hon. gentleman thinks he is in a position from which he must not recede and therefore holds that the average deposits is of that amount. I defy the hon. gentleman to show it, and he will have an opportunity of doing so. According to the Public Accounts, the average amount standing at the credit of depositors was \$238.85. Take 1894, when the hon. gentleman got his return, the average amount at the credit of each depositor then was \$215. What is the result of analysing these figures? The analysis shows that 85 per cent are between \$500 and \$1,000; 8 per cent between \$500 and \$1,000; and 5 per cent over \$1,000; yet hon. gentlemen try to convey the idea that the deposits did not represent the savings of hardworking people.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman give the amounts held by those depositors who had on deposit between \$500 and \$1,000,

and the amount held by depositors who had over \$1,000 invested.

Mr. DAVIN. I gave the figures the other evening, and the percentages are as I have stated. I now come to the question of the lowering of the rate of interest, and I say that the reduction of the rate of interest to 2½ per cent is unjustifiable, on the ground shown by the ex-Finance Minister, namely, that it would be actually a lower rate of interest than we were paying now for money borrowed in England. We have before us the precedents of England as well as the precedents of this country and other countries; but taking the precedents of England, what do we find? I showed the other night by quoting from the last returns of the Postmaster General the amounts on deposit in the post office savings banks in England at 2½ per cent interest, and I further showed by the return that the average amount in the chartered banks varied as regards interest from 2 to 3 per cent. If the hon. gentleman referred to what had been the tradition of the post office savings banks in the past, if he decided that he would be governed by English precedents, he would consider the calculation to be one in proportion, as follows :—As 2 or 3 per cent is to the average rate in the chartered banks of Canada, 5 or 6 per cent, so is 2½ per cent allowed in the English post office savings banks to the result. It will give you far more than 3 per cent, and what it would give would be, on the English basis, what might be allowed as interest in the Government savings banks. That seems to have dawned on the present Finance Minister, and it rather astonished me, because he has been a journalist, and as a rule journalists study almost every question. They are the most widely read, if not the most profoundly read of all the community.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I have to put in that qualification, because you cannot always have extent combined with depth. You may occasionally have it, but, as a rule, anyway, journalists are the most widely read men in the community. Sir, Lord Goulburn, Sir George Cornwall Lewis, Mr. Gladstone, they studied this question; they have dealt with the very matter which is being discussed here, and they refused to take any part in the reduction of interest on savings banks deposits. Lord Goulburn refused to look at it from the standpoint that we should only pay to the poor depositors in the savings banks the interest that was, as it were, legally due on their deposits. These eminent men studied the question, and they would not banish the idea of thrift. And, Sir, what was the result of their encouraging the post office savings bank? Why, between 1825 and 1841, and between 1841 and 1861, as the savings banks increased, and the number of depositors in the

savings banks increased, and the deposits increased in amount, the number seeking for poor relief decreased in proportion, and in that way the nation was strengthened and repaid for its generous treatment of the depositors. The nation was repaid in two ways. In the first place, the money taken out of the treasury for poor relief was saved, and in the second place, the manhood of the nation was saved, and it gave it an extent of backbone and strength that it would not otherwise have had.

So, Sir, I say it is a pity that the shortsighted and poor conception of this question has presented itself as it has to the Minister of Finance. The other night, I quoted what Mr. Fawcett had done when he was Postmaster General, and how Mr. Fawcett, following the lines of Mr. Gladstone, would not banish from him the idea of thrift. Mr. Fawcett had to meet with these bankers; he had to meet with objections of the moneyed forces, but he never yielded to them, and I read to you the other night how that gentleman, when Postmaster General of England, followed in the wake nobly set him by previous statesmen, and refused to listen to the remonstrances of the chartered banks. Indeed, Sir, it is not in the interest of the chartered banks themselves even, in the end, because it affects actually at no distant date the wealth of the country, and it is not in the interest of any portion of the community, much less that portion of the community so completely concerned in our material and commercial progress as bankers, that the course taken by the hon. the Finance Minister should be approved of. I, therefore, move, seconded by Mr. Hale :

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that this House regrets the determination of the Government to lower the rate of interest paid to the depositors in the Post Office Savings Banks, and would urge its reconsideration.

Mr. MACLEAN. While a great deal may be said in favour of this proposition of the Government, there is something to be said on the other side in the interest of the Canadian people. The main objection against the proposal of the Government to reduce the rate of interest on the savings bank deposits is, that by it the Government are making their savings banks a less encouraging place for people to deposit their money in, and so the people are driven to deposit their money in a lot of concerns that call themselves savings banks, and which year after year rob from the people of Canada a million dollars. I believe that, for the last ten or fifteen years, an average of \$1,000,000 annually has been lost on account of people depositing in so-called savings banks and private banks which are not solvent. It is the duty of the Government to encourage the people to place their money in a sound institution, such as the Government savings bank. We have in Ontario a law regulating

Mr. DAVIN.

the loan companies of that province, but that law is not administered as it ought to be, and the public are not protected as they ought to be. It is high time that this Parliament, and that the legislature of Ontario, should move in the direction of protecting the people who deposit their money in these wildcat concerns. It is a backward step for this Parliament to take, when it passes legislation which drives the people from depositing in a solvent institution, like the Government savings bank, and compels them to invest in these worthless monetary institutions. I, consequently, believe that it is a mistake for the Government to reduce the rate of interest on savings bank deposits.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to express my sympathy with the resolution of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). While I have not carefully gone into the figures presented to the House, I do know, from observation in the town in which I reside, that the labouring men deposit their savings to a considerable extent in the post office bank. It is within my experience, that men with small earnings, who have earned their dollars hard, are anxious to deposit them in some such place as the post office savings bank, which gives them a guarantee of security, and which has the endorsement of the Dominion of Canada. In addition to what the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has referred to, the failures of so-called loan companies, there have been an astounding number of losses through private bankers collapsing. There is hardly a little town in western Ontario which has not in the last few years been the victim of these so-called private banking enterprises; and many people who have been attracted to them by the higher rates of interest they have offered, have been losers to a very considerable extent. Not only has this been the experience of people who have been perhaps able to lose their money, or who have a lifetime before them in which to retrieve their losses, but large amounts of trust funds have been lost in this way. In the city of Toronto, I know of two cases, which are well authenticated, of men having actually suicided because of the losses they have suffered in these concerns. If the Government is going to reduce the rate of interest to the extent proposed, it must necessarily follow that poor people will be driven more than ever to deposit in these hazardous banking institutions, with the view of getting something tangible for their money. I do trust that the Government will reconsider this proposition. While it may effect a considerable saving in the interest to be paid by the Government, still I think it would be preferable to increase some of the customs duties to make up the difference; or, better than that, the Government should in some of the departments where they have promised rigid economy, practice that economy,

and make up the loss that would be caused by keeping up the rate of interest.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had this question fairly well debated, and there are just one or two points that I would like to emphasize before it passes away, if indeed this ends the discussion on so important a matter. One of the reasons advanced for reducing the rate of interest upon the savings bank deposits is this, that the prime object for which the savings banks were instituted has largely gone out, namely, to provide a place of savings for depositors of small means—for men receiving small earnings, who are not able to have by them at one time sufficient for an independent and outside investment. That argument is, I think, untenable in the light of the facts. You may easily make up an average to show that a very small number of persons hold a comparatively large amount of funds in these savings banks; but that is not conclusive. You have to look at the overwhelmingly large number of those whose money on deposit, although not very heavy in the aggregate, represents to them a great deal of thrift and small investment. In this respect the return which was asked for in 1894 is very suggestive. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has very thoroughly gone into the figures, but it will not harm to bring them out again. The number of depositors who at that time had \$1,000 or more in the post office savings banks was only 5,418—a very small number. It cannot fairly be said that these were wealthy men.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but I apprehend from the printed returns in the Public Accounts that the return he has in his hands is only a partial one. He will observe that in 1894 the sum total of all our savings banks deposits was \$43,036,000. It strikes me that the return refers only to the post office savings banks.

Mr. FOSTER. I am taking both kinds of savings banks. What I was going on to say was that we must not judge from the fact that these 5,418 depositors have each \$1,000 or upwards in the savings banks, that they are not poor persons; because the conditions which existed then, and which exist now, provide that a person may deposit a certain sum every year up to a maximum, and he may continue to deposit up to that maximum year after year; but the deposit must not go above a certain aggregate. That aggregate was very large formerly, but by regulation it has been brought down, so that I think the maximum that can now be held is \$1,000. But my argument is this, that for all we know, and indeed it is probable, the larger number of these depositors have put in that \$1,000 in the course of three, four or five years. In small sums from time to time. When you come to the depositors having between \$500 and \$1,000 each, the number is 9,200. The argument holds still

more with these, that they are likely to be poor people who have been depositing that amount, little by little, for a number of years, the deposits being the results of their steady savings. Even then the number is small. But when you come to the number of depositors having less than \$500, what do you find? You find that the number goes up to pretty nearly 100,000 people—99,657, while in both of the other classes together you have less than 15,000. Now, I care not what is the aggregate amount at the credit of each of these two classes. I hold that the thrift and saving is represented by the 99,000 as compared with the 5,000 and the 9,000 who have between \$500 and \$1,000 on deposit.

Now let us come to the Dominion savings banks. Those depositors who have to their credit from \$1 to \$500 amount to 45,305. Those that have from \$500 to \$1,000 amount to 5,127, and those that have \$1,000 and upwards amount only to the small number of 4,607. So that out of the total number of depositors of 55,039, 45,305 have less than \$500 in the Dominion savings banks. If you add 45,000 and 99,000 together, you get pretty well up to an aggregate of 150,000 persons who hold less than \$500 each in the savings banks of both kinds as compared with 15,000 who hold from \$500 to \$1,000, or above \$1,000. That is indisputable proof that these deposits are not the deposits of moneyed men for convenience sake, but the deposits of poor men who put their money there for the sake of saving what little they can keep out of what is necessary for their daily or monthly or yearly expenses—not enough, as I have said, to make an independent outside investment, but sufficient to put by, in the children's names or the wife's name or the father's name, in a convenient post office near by, where it can be done right under their eyes and with perfect security. What would become of these if these offices were not established? In nine cases out of ten, the saving would not take place. The little amounts would go for expenditures of one kind or another, and what is of greater moment than the habits of thrift in the family, which are promoted by the parents saying to the children: Now, you have so much money in your little bank, put that in the post office savings bank, and let it draw interest for you, and see how much you will have when you are twenty-one or eighteen years of age. Everybody knows that that process is going on from one end of the country to the other; and in these days of comparative extravagance and high living, it is an inestimable lesson for the young people of this country to learn. I am not going to say that a large proportion of this money will not be kept in the savings banks, even when you reduce the interest to 2½ per cent, but is it not something that the country owes to the great mass of the people who do deposit in these banks, that it should give them an incentive to learn habits of thrift by

making these investments. I commend this most earnestly to the Government, in the hope that even yet it is not too late for the Government to reconsider their policy. Leaving aside the other argument, I think I have proved beyond doubt that it is an encouragement to thrift and saving that is proved by these figures I have given.

Now, how is it with reference to the other argument. I am not going into a laboured argument, but it seems to me that with the money rate as it is in this country, with the bank rates as they are in this country, the Government might very well have left the rate as it was, without any fear that it would react or act adversely to the general credit of the country. I think it will not act that way. I do not think you will find that because you take away from these depositors the one-half per cent that they have been used to getting, the great mass of borrowers in this country, for business or other purposes, will get their money a single shade cheaper than they are getting it to-day, because I believe that 3 per cent is a fair and reasonable value for money—that is for money in the gross. Very few people at this day get money from the banks at 5 or 6 per cent on business ventures, on call loans or short loans; more are paying 7 per cent than 5 per cent by long odds, and 6 per cent is about the average rate that the banks will charge on loans for business purposes and business ventures of a good kind, too. So that while you are taking away a strong inducement to thrift on the part of the people, you are giving no benefit to the great mass of the people, and I believe that the reduction is a great folly. I am sorry, therefore, that the Government has undertaken to reduce the rate by one-half per cent.

The argument relied on by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was this. He said you might add about three-eighths per cent for management, and then you would be putting this rate on about a par with what we are getting money for in this last loan. I want to call this fact to the attention of my hon. friend. Unless you anticipate the closing of the savings banks entirely—and I do not imagine that the hon. Finance Minister anticipates or contemplates that at all—you are not saving, comparatively speaking, one single cent in the matter of expense. So long as you have savings banks at all, you will pay about the same for managing banks that have in them \$20,000,000 of deposits as you will for managing those that have in them \$50,000,000 of deposits. You have about \$50,000,000 in your Government savings banks to-day. Suppose that \$20,000,000 or \$50,000,000 of those deposits are taken from your banks, the cost of carrying them on will not be lowered to any extent at all. On the contrary, in proportion you will have heightened it because you will have just about the same expense whether you are

Mr. FOSTER.

administering \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000. So that you will save nothing at all in the item of the expenses of management by the reduction of one-half per cent, and if that has the effect of driving a portion of these deposits out of the Government savings banks, I am afraid it will end disastrously. What the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said is true. A portion of these depositors will be attracted from the said Government savings banks to the less safe—I am not going too far in that—loan companies of the country. Far be it from me to say a single word against the credit and standing of the loan companies, and I am not going to do that, but I say that they are not any safer—and I think the chances are they are not nearly so safe—than the Government savings banks; and you administer almost a stinging blow to the habit and thrift and saving among the people if you drive them to put their investments where they are liable to meet a loss, because then they will argue: what is the use of our trying to save? We put our savings in the savings banks, and they go to pieces and we lose all, and we might just as well spend the money as we make it. Taking all these things into consideration—and I am not speaking from any partisan point of view—the Government are making a mistake, and it would not be unwise in them to revise their opinion, and instead of saving half a million dollars by reducing the rate of interest on these deposits, which encourage thrift, they would do better to try and live up to their ante-election pledges and dock the expenditure by \$200,000. We would be then just as well off by the end of the year and the country would be much better off.

Mr. McDougall. Coming as I do from a part of a province where there is a large number of labouring people and others, who, at the cost of great sacrifice, manage to save a little money for deposits in the Government banks, in order that they may earn a little interest, I feel I would not be doing my duty if I were to remain silent on this question. I find that in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, we have a much higher rate of deposits per head of our population than the other provinces have. I have here a statement of the average deposits per head of the population in 1896; and according to that, I find that while the average deposits per head of the population of the Dominion in that year was \$9.13, in the province of Nova Scotia the average was \$19.46; in New Brunswick it was \$25.43; in Prince Edward Island, \$20.05; in Ontario, \$9.02; in Quebec, \$3.23, and so on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one very strong reason why the amount on deposit per head of population in the province from which I come is so large is that a large proportion of our people are of the mining class who man-

age to save a little money from their wages. They feel that there is less certainty of constant employment for them than for many other classes, and they manage, with great sacrifice for the time being to the comfort and convenience of their families to save a little when they have the opportunity, and they put these savings, for convenience, in the Government savings bank. I feel that the change in the policy of the Government with regard to the interests on these deposits will be very hard on this class of people, and it will have the effect of causing a great many of them failing to continue to put their little savings in these banks, and, in some cases even to withdraw what they have there and put their savings into investments that are not safe and will not, perhaps, in the end, prove so profitable. For these reasons, I feel that I should not be doing my duty if I were not to enter my protest against this reduction in the rate of interest, which was already small enough—for I consider that 3 per cent interest is low enough as compared with what these people would have to pay if they had to borrow money from the banking or loan institutions of the country. The difference between what they receive and what they have to pay, which was great enough before, will be greater than ever now. This step will not afford the people any guarantee that when they want a hundred or a thousand dollars they will be able to borrow it at a less rate of interest than they do at present. A number of banking institutions of the country, who were not placed so conveniently within the reach of the people as the Government savings bank, are paying 3 or 3½ per cent, and I cannot see the reason why the Government should reduce the interest they pay to 2½ per cent, especially while they pay for what moneys they obtain from other quarters at a higher rate than 2½ per cent, and considerably higher when you consider the expenses connected with obtaining these loans, even those which are obtained on the most favourable terms. Therefore, I do hope that the hon. Finance Minister will see the propriety of reconsidering this matter and restoring the old rate of 3 per cent interest on the deposits of the poor class of people. For it is the poor and not the wealthy class that are affected by this. We cannot say that a man who has five or six hundred dollars or even a thousand dollars saved from his hard labour extending over many years should be classed among the wealthy or even among the comfortable. It is the poor that this will affect and for that reason I appeal to the Finance Minister to restore the half cent that he proposes to take off the savings of the poorer class of people.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). This matter was pretty well discussed in the general debate on the Budget, and, I suppose we cannot get much new light on it

to-day. So far as the argument goes in relation to the encouragement of saving and thrift in the small depositors, it is one which has to a very large extent my sympathy. The difficulty, however, is that the moneys in the savings banks, as has been pointed out by several speakers, are to a large extent, not the moneys of small depositors but the moneys of persons in moderate circumstances, and not the particular class for whom the savings banks were designed.

Mr. DAVIN. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) allow me a moment?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIN. I make the statement, which statement my hon. friend is in a position to test, that 50 per cent of the depositors have to their credit less than \$100 each.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That may be correct and yet my statement be correct also. The returns of 1894 used by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his remarks showed that out of the total amount of forty-two millions about fourteen and three-quarter millions were held by six per cent of the depositors. I am not denying that a large number of depositors hold small sums. I quite realize that that is the fact. But the figures show that the bulk of the savings are not held by the small depositors but by those having larger deposits. The Minister of Trade and Commerce made an observation in the course of his speech in the Budget debate which is now occupying the attention of the Government—that we should endeavour to make some discrimination between the smaller depositors and those whose deposits are larger. This might be done by a differential rate in the savings bank itself, but this would be somewhat inconvenient. Or it might be done, as the hon. Minister suggested, by the issue of Canadian stock, such as was issued some years ago, bearing 3 per cent interest and payable on a fixed date. Either of these would meet the cases of the small depositors and encourage thrift. This is well worthy of consideration, and, as the change is not to take effect until 1st July next, there will be ample time to consider that side of the question. As far as the bulk of the deposits are concerned, I feel confident that the views of hon. gentlemen opposite are erroneous. Every argument used for a higher rate than the ordinary commercial rate is, in my opinion, a mistake. Canada has everything to gain by such a rate for borrowers as will encourage the industries of the country, and if, by the action of the Canadian Government, we have an artificial value placed upon money, I do not think that that is the best way to develop the trade of the country. At all events, we have a strong opinion that inasmuch as by the acknowledgment of all concerned, there has been an artificial value placed on money by the high interests on savings bank deposits, we should not continue that

but, as respects, at all events, the larger depositors, we should pay only the fair value of the money. I know that it is argued that, no matter what your savings bank rate is, it will not affect the rate of discounts at the banks. I think that is a mistake.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the argument was pressed that far, whatever may have been said, because that would not be fair—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The argument was certainly that, so far as any changes we had made, no difference had been caused in the rate of accommodation to the public, and that it was not going to make any difference. I admit that the difference does not become perceptible in a moment. A great change of that kind must come about gradually. But I believe the change is already taking place and that it will continue to extend its effects, and that the result of the course we are pursuing will be to make money cheaper to the borrowers of the country. I happen to have a helper here from whom we do not generally get much comfort—I refer to the Toronto "Mail and Empire." This journal contains an interview with Mr. D. R. Wilkie, general manager of the Imperial Bank of Canada. I know that the opinion of a banker is not regarded by some as worthy of much weight in this discussion. One hon. gentleman referred to the banks as financial sharks. I suppose that, if we want things from the banks which we cannot get, we are apt to consider them a hard lot. But the fact remains that they occupy a very important position in carrying on the business of the country, and I do not think that anybody will deliberately say that the opinion of the managers of the great banks in the country is not worthy of consideration. An hon. friend near me says that Mr. Wilkie is a Tory. I have the pleasure of knowing Mr. Wilkie, but I do not know his politics. Of course, the fact that he has carried his interview to the "Mail and Empire" is suggestive. The "Mail and Empire," introducing the interview, says :

Mr. D. R. Wilkie, general manager of the Imperial Bank of Canada, has come out strongly in support of the Government policy of reducing the rate of interest on deposits in post office savings banks from 3 per cent to 2½ per cent. A "Mail and Empire" representative interviewed Mr. Wilkie yesterday, and the latter outlined his main arguments on the matter.

"I am totally opposed," said Mr. Wilkie, "to making the policy of the Government a political issue. It is one of commercial expediency, pure and simple, and the Government should be allowed to take the responsibility for its action without opposition from the Conservatives. Were I not firmly convinced that it is not a political question, my mouth would be closed."

Mr. Wilkie goes on to make an observation of which I have no knowledge, but hon. gentlemen opposite have.

Mr. FIELDING.

As many people are well aware, it was the desire of the late Conservative Government to bring about a reduction in the rate of interest paid to the depositors in post office savings banks which would bring it into some proportion with the interest paid on Government loans.

What I suppose it means is that my hon. predecessor in office realized, as I did, that it was a desirable thing, but for good reasons, I do not say for reasons other than good, he hesitated to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell my hon. friend what I think it means. It means that this rate was reduced from 4 per cent to 3½ per cent by the Conservative Government, and that it was the intention of the Government in due course to reduce it from 3½ per cent to 3 per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. "And so on," not of course stopping at 3 per cent. Then Mr. Wilkie goes on to point out that if you consider a gold reserve, which ought to be held, perhaps we might argue, as against savings bank deposits, the rate we are allowing is a very considerable one. But passing that point, he presents what the editor's heading describes as "The borrowers' side of it." He says :

In addition to that feature, is the fact that the lower the rate of interest paid by the Government to depositors, the lower the rate charged by the borrower. The post office savings bank has kept up for years a rate of interest to borrowers, in consequence of the large sums locked up, higher than it should be to enable borrowers to compete with the foreign manufacturer and the trader. The proposed reduction should be hailed with delight by the borrowing community, who are really the class on whom the country's development is most dependent.

Now, I take that to mean that in Mr. Wilkie's opinion, as a banker, the borrowers will receive the advantage which they should from this reduction in the rate of interest. But if hon. gentlemen opposite are determined to regard the bankers as mere financial sharks, and if we are to regard them as men whose opinion is not entitled to any consideration, if it is to be popular to attack the bank in the House with the view of making a little party capital, then I want to go outside of the banking community and offer the opinion of a commercial body. I have received to-day from the secretary of the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto a communication conveying a resolution which he informs me was unanimously passed by the council of the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto :

Whereas the payment of the Government of 3 per cent upon post office savings deposits is, by virtue of the cost of management and the necessity of keeping a reserve against demands equal in reality to 3½ per cent ;

And whereas the Government has effected and can effect loans at a net cost of 2½, or ¾ of 1 per cent under what is presently the cost of post office savings bank deposits ;

And whereas the rate which the Government pays for deposits is a standard by which rates of

interest are to a large extent regulated, and, if unduly high causes the withdrawal of money from trade and increases the cost of money to the farmer, the trader and the manufacturer, conduces to hoarding and checks enterprise ;

And whereas this Board of Trade has for a number of years past advocated a reduction in the rate of interest on post office savings deposits to a figure that, with expenses added, would not exceed the cost of moneys borrowed for fixed periods by way of debentures ;

Be it therefore resolved that this council approves the decision of the Government to reduce the rate of interest paid upon post office savings bank deposits to 2½ per cent on the 1st of July next.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend sustain the position of the Board of Trade of Toronto that we have to keep a reserve for our post office payments ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, as a matter of law we have not to keep any, but there is much to be said in favour of keeping it, and I am inclined to the opinion that it would not be inaccurate to say that it is something which should always enter into the consideration of a Minister of Finance, though to-day there is no legal enactment on the subject.

Mr. DAVIN. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question ? Mr. Gladstone says—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member who had the floor did not seem to object to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) asking a question.

Mr. DAVIN. The quotation from Mr. Gladstone dealing with that subject holds quite a contrary opinion to that of the board of trade.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All we are concerned with in this instance is the fact that the council of the Board of Trade of the great city of Toronto, representing not bankers, but representing traders and merchants of that city, second perhaps in number only, I imagine, to the Board of Trade of the city of Montreal, is a body to which we ought to pay great attention on commercial and financial questions. The Board of Trade of the city of Toronto, by unanimous resolution of its council, has declared that the policy of reducing the interest in the savings banks is sound policy, not in the interest of the banks only, but in the interest of the trade and commerce of the country, in the interest of the borrowers.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the date of the letter ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The letter is dated the 16th of April, and I think the meeting was held on the same day. Now, I do not wish to argue this at any further length. I have already stated that as respects the class of smaller depositors

to whom reference is made, I have much sympathy with what has been said ; and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, at an early stage of this debate the other day, suggested that the Government might still further consider whether something should not be done to deal with these small depositors as a distinct class from the larger depositors. That matter is under consideration, and the Government have every desire to do what is fair and reasonable to encourage thrift in that class of depositors, while at the same time not paying on the bulk of the deposits a rate of interest more than the fair value of money, and one which disturbs the business conditions of the whole country.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is not the board from whom this resolution came, which the Minister of Finance has quoted, composed of some seven or eight bankers in the city of Toronto ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot answer my hon. friend's question, but I know that in the community in which I have lived for the most of my life, a representative meeting of the board of trade would naturally represent the business elements, and I do not imagine that the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto differs in this respect from boards of trade elsewhere.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it the banking section of the board of trade who passed that resolution ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will read the letter I have received from the secretary :

I have the honour, by direction of the council, to place in your hands copy of a resolution unanimously adopted in connection with the Government's proposal, now before the House, for the reduction of interest on post office savings bank deposits.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Yours faithfully,
EDGAR A. WILLS.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a resolution of the council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of the council, as I said.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not wish to prolong this debate, but to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to two very important points as to the support which he has claimed for the action of the Government from the paper which he has just read to the House. The hon. gentleman, in the first instance, I think, was mistaken as to the source from which this had emanated. The hon. gentleman refers to the board of trade, and to the great importance which the opinion of the Board of Trade of Toronto should have in this House. Now, Sir, it appears that this is not a report of the Board of Trade of Toronto at all, but the communication comes from the council of the board of trade, which

would naturally embrace these leading banking and financial influences with which we are contending. No person doubts for a single moment that the banking interest of Canada is entirely in favour of the view that the hon. gentleman holds; no person in this House can doubt for a moment that the Minister of Finance would have at his back every banking and financial institution in this country if he would cut down the interest to 2 per cent on the deposits of the poorer classes of this country. The hon. gentleman has admitted that the great bulk of the depositors are poor, they may be classed as thrifty poor, but it is most important in the interests of the country that they should be induced to husband their resources. The hon. gentleman has also destroyed the value of the evidence which he has just given from the council of the Board of Trade of Toronto, because he has shown by his own statement to the House that the council of the board of trade were altogether wrong in the premises upon which they based their argument. The council of the board of trade stated in this paper, that, in their judgment, the Government of Canada is compelled to hold a large reserve of money for the purpose of meeting those deposits in the savings banks. The Minister of Finance has just explained that they are all wrong in their premises, because no such deposits are held, although perhaps it is worthy of consideration as to whether they should be held. I do not propose to prolong this discussion, because to do so would be useless from the position the Finance Minister has taken after the cogent arguments, the unanswerable arguments advanced from this side of the House. Let me ask the Finance Minister, if he can put his finger on the government of any country which is doing what he is doing? The mover of this resolution has shown that the policy adopted by the present Government is entirely at variance with the practice of the Government of the great Imperial country to which we belong, and, while we all admit the wisdom and propriety of having the interest paid to depositors bear some due relation to the cost to Canada of obtaining the money from other sources, the hon. Minister of Finance cannot show any country where the Finance Minister or Chancellor of the Exchequer is demanding a sacrifice at the hands of the thrifty poor, whose saving deposits should be encouraged, and refusing to pay them interest equal in amount to that paid to the great monetary institutions from which loans are obtained. The hon. gentleman has admitted that he paid 2½ per cent for the \$10,000,000 borrowed for a term of fifty years, the lenders well knowing that, in all probability, twenty-five years hence they would not be able to obtain over 2 per cent for their money. When the hon. gentleman told the House that he was paying 2½ per cent to those large financial institutions which have loaned money to Can-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

ada, he failed to show to this House any ground, or to give any substantial reason why the Government of Canada should treat the thrifty poor in the mode proposed, to do that which has never been done before in Canada by any Government, even by the former Liberal Government. They made a reduction before, but they still kept the interest paid to savings bank depositors at about the rate which was paid by the Dominion for loans obtained abroad. Had the hon. Finance Minister maintained and pursued that policy, the House would have seen the reasonableness of it, but the hon. gentleman, by reducing the rate of interest paid to thrifty depositors, will induce them, in many instances, to withdraw their savings and risk the amounts in institutions which will not afford them the safety and security of the post office savings banks, and which probably will result in disaster and trouble to the poorer classes. The hon. gentleman stands to-day without having been able to offer any precedents, any arguments, or furnish any proof of necessity for the step taken, and I believe this action on the part of the Government will be regarded as a heavy blow and a great discouragement by a vast portion of the industrial depositors, whom it is of the utmost importance that Canada should induce to husband their resources by depositing them in the savings banks. The statement made, that we must provide for the expenses connected with the administration of the savings banks goes to the wall, because these banks are part of the post office system. The same parties who are employed in other branches of the postal service, take charge of the post office savings banks.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a percentage paid, according to the amount of the deposits.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We would sweep away the utility of the whole post office, if we applied the principle which the hon. gentleman is applying to the savings banks. Does not every one know that, for the purpose of giving postal facilities to the people, a large amount is taken from the consolidated revenues, and why, therefore, we should take the ground that we must give a lower rate of interest on deposits and take action with respect to the savings department which we do not adopt with regard to any department of the public service, I do not understand. I will not prolong the argument, because the Finance Minister stands before the House without having been able to adduce any precedent, any argument, or any answer to the unanswerable arguments offered in criticism of a policy that I believe will be condemned, and justly condemned, by the people.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Finance Minister was in severe straits, when he quoted, as authorities in favour of his proposal, an

able banker, Mr. Wilkie, and a very acute one, as his interview with the "Mail and Empire" would indicate, and the council of the board of trade. The bank, I am told, reduced its rate on deposits some time ago, or is reducing it now, on the ground stated by the manager, that there is too much money being forced upon them. The bank reduced the rate of interest, and the "Mail" published a statement, which I give for what it is worth, to the effect that the bank was induced by the Finance Minister to invest in the loan made last autumn or winter and take a larger amount than it could easily handle. The bank has, therefore, a little grudge against the Finance Minister, and in order to appease the bank, he came down with this reduction of the rate of interest paid to depositors in the Government savings bank. What are the facts of the case? Mr. Wilkie is the manager, I believe, of the Imperial Bank. How does the bank stand? I have here the bank statement for 1st January last, and this statement shows that the bank, on 1st January, had at deposit payable on demand, \$3,600,000, and of deposits payable after notice on a fixed day, over \$7,018,000. That is, they had, on a capital of \$2,000,000, permanent deposits, payable after a fixed date, of over \$7,000,000. They had ample funds at their disposal, and a large sum they could not apparently invest profitably. What does the general statement of the bank show? On 1st January, deposits payable on demand were over \$78,000,000, and there were deposits by the people after notice or on a fixed date of \$140,700,000. Between the deposits payable on demand and the deposits payable on a fixed date, there were over \$220,000,000 in the banks of Canada on deposit. These banks reduced the rate of interest, and, in order to make the public swallow the dose, they presumably put a pistol at the head of the Government and compelled them to reduce the rate of interest on savings bank deposits. I dispute the statement that 2½ per cent is the rate of interest paid to depositors in the post office savings banks.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Who said that?

Mr. WALLACE. You, yourself, Sir.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The figures I gave were \$2.86.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of Finance stated to the House that when you counted the expenses of administering the Government saving banks, the rate paid to the depositors would be about the same as the rate of the last loan.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course this change does not take place until the 30th June, and I stated, that barring the war scare or anything of that kind, we anticipated that our securities would advance. I said that 2½ per cent, plus the cost of management, would probably bring it to a

rate to correspond with what our credit would be on the 1st of July next, assuming there was nothing accidental to interfere with the condition of the market.

Mr. WALLACE. That is practically what I have been saying. I said that the Minister of Finance told us that the 2½ per cent paid to post office bank depositors, when you added the expenses to it, would bring it to about 2½, which was about the amount paid on the last loan. Now, Sir, in the post office savings bank the payment of interest on deposits commences on the first of the month, and if a deposit is made at the beginning of the middle of the month no interest is computed on it until the first of the following month. In the same way if a depositor draws money on the last day of the month, say the last day of March, he is not allowed interest on that money for the month of March. I was informed some years ago, and I think the statement is correct, that these lapses of interest on such deposits, paid the expenses of administering the post office saving banks, and that being the case, the Minister of Finance made a mistake when he added ½ of 1 per cent for the cost of administration. As a matter of fact 2½ per cent interest is all the depositor gets in the Government savings bank, and 2½ per cent is all that the money costs the Government. That being the case, the Government paid more interest on their last loan, and I say, Sir, the Government have no right to pay to the great money lenders of Europe or anywhere else, a larger amount of interest than they pay to the depositors of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. And the money lenders were paid before the Government got their money.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, that is so. More than that, we know from the experience of the last fifty years, and the last twenty years, and the last ten years, that the rate of interest has continually been going down. We have no reason to suppose that that decrease is ended, but on the contrary as the wealth of the world increases we may fairly estimate that the rate of interest will continue to decrease, and that is the judgment of the Finance Minister himself, who told us that in his opinion when another loan was made some years hence it would be at a still lower rate. The Minister made his last loan for fifty years at 2½ per cent, and he, therefore, is actually paying less to the depositors of Canada than he is paying to the European money lenders. In my opinion it was wise in the first instance to establish the post office savings bank in order to encourage our people in habits of thrift and economy. It is also wise that we should continue to encourage the people in these habits, and so there will be widespread dissatisfaction at this reduction of the rate of interest. I contend, Sir, that the rate of interest should have remained at 3½ per cent,

and should not have been reduced last year to 3 per cent and this year to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. As has been pointed out, private banks pay 5 per cent on deposits, and so the Government is only giving one-half the rate of interest that can be obtained in these other institutions. That will be the means of inducing the public to deposit in these private banks where the security is not so sound, but where the interest is twice as high. That will lead in the future as it has done in the past to disaster to hundreds of poor people, because as has been pointed out, during the last ten years the average loss to depositors by the failure of private banks and other such monetary institutions has been \$1,000,000 per annum. Mr. Wilkie states in this interview that he favours the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent rate. Of course he does, for it is in the interest of his bank to do it; but the interests of the people of Canada should be of much greater concern to Parliament and to Government than the interests of any banks. I am sure, Sir, it was the pressure brought by the banks that induced the Minister of Finance to reduce the rate of interest, and it was not done because of any consideration of the public welfare, nor because of these patriotic motives which we are told will result some time in the future by which manufacturers and borrowers can get money at a lower rate. The banks today have \$140,000,000 on deposit, payable at a fixed date in the future; that is abundance of money for them, and they have no right to attempt to divert the savings bank deposits to their coffers, when in these savings banks the people have the amplest security, and by their means are trained to habits of economy. But, Mr. Speaker, there is another consideration. Suppose the people of this country should say: Very well, Mr. Minister of Finance, we will not accept your $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent; we will find other means of investing our money and we will deposit it in other institutions. There is \$50,000,000 in these institutions. Suppose that one-half of that amount in the next twelve months were taken out of the savings banks and invested in other ways; in what position would the Government be then? Would they be in a better position, if they had to go to the old country and say: On account of unexpected causes we have to come back; we borrowed \$10,000,000 last year, and we have to come back to borrow \$25,000,000 more. I do not think that would be good for the credit of this country. The best creditors the country can possibly have are the 150,000 depositors in the post office savings banks; they are the men who give stability to our credit; they are the men whom the Government ought to get their money from, instead of going to the foreign money-lender. The other consideration is this, that the interest on that \$50,000,000 comes back to the people of Canada, every dollar of it, except that on the very small amount that may be deposited by

Mr. WALLACE.

foreign depositors. We ought to encourage the deposits, so that as much as possible of the public debt of Canada shall be in the hands of the Canadian people; but the motion made by the Minister of Finance produces exactly the opposite effect. Now, the Finance Minister said that, of the \$42,000,000 in the Government savings banks in 1894, \$14,750,000, or very little over one-third, was in the hands of 6 per cent of the depositors. Does the Minister find fault with that? Is he dissatisfied that 6 per cent of the depositors, or 10,000 out of the 150,000, had \$14,750,000? I think that, a few years ago, the regulations prevented any one having more than \$500 on deposit. If he does not want any depositor to have more than that amount, it is easy to so provide. But if this alone, under present conditions, produced a lower rate of interest by $\frac{1}{3}$ of 1 per cent for the recent admirable loan he has made, I say he should encourage as many as possible at this rate, instead of making it a subject of reproach that 10,000 people have \$14,750,000 on deposit. But the important matter is not with regard to the 6 per cent, but with regard to the 94 per cent of the depositors—the 140,000 people who have the lesser sums on deposit. They are the most important, numerically and in other ways. They have \$27,550,000 of the \$42,000,000 on deposit; and the Government is reducing to them the rate of interest below the legal value of money in this country. It is not a call loan, for only two or three days, such as the banks make to gamblers or others; it is a loan which can only be taken out on short notice; but, if it is, the Government has the advantage of the interest. This \$42,000,000 is a loan which the Government should encourage the people to increase and not to diminish. I hope, therefore, that the Government will reconsider the position they have taken, because I am quite sure that, on investigating all the circumstances, they will come to the conclusion that the money should remain at 3 per cent, though, to my mind, it should be $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. We are told, that at some places the banks lend money at 5 or 6 per cent. Well, I do not believe they do. I believe that, except in the case of the inner circle we hear about, they charge, on the average, 7 per cent. That is the ordinary rate they charge to ordinary business customers, who form the majority; and the bank that lends its money at 7 per cent, can surely afford to pay more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to its depositors. I will only say, in addition, that this is a matter removed from politics, as Mr. Wilkie said, and I hope the Government will take into account the representations that have been made on a purely business basis, and reconsider their decision.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly fair and just that this matter should be considered in its purely business aspect. The

Government desire to pay for the money they borrow from depositors, large and small, all that the money, in their judgment, is fairly worth; but they do not feel justified in embarrassing the whole business of the country by keeping money at an artificial value. I think a good deal of confusion arises in the minds of some hon. gentlemen by not quite reflecting on what the deposits in the hands of the banks really do—what functions they discharge in the economy of trade and business. Some of my hon. friends would appear to think that the banks hold that money, so to speak, in their vaults, or that, if they put it out, they merely put it out on short call loans for the accommodation of gentlemen on the stock exchange or elsewhere. As a matter of fact, the \$220,000,000 which now lies in the hands of the banks, constitutes practically the wage fund of this country. From that source are defrayed all the enormous expenditures and is provided the capital which every manufacturer, every trader, every importing merchant in this country uses; from that fund, to a very large degree, comes the wages of the labourers from one end of this country to the other. Now, there is no one thing that our manufacturers and merchants have insisted on more than this, that, by reason of the comparatively high rate of interest charged in Canada by the parties who supply them with money, they are put at a very great disadvantage with their competitors in the United States, and notably with their competitors in England and in Germany, where it is notorious that lower rates of interest prevail; and, if the Government have acted in this matter, it has been with the view, not merely to a reduction of the interest on a large part of the public debt, but with a view to a reduction of the rate of interest to the great bulk of the community. It is quite true, a comparatively small number, perhaps 2 or 3 per cent, of our population, may be somewhat inconvenienced by the reduction, although, as my hon. friend has pointed out, the Government desire and hope, as regards that class, that they may be able to devise a means of lightening the matter to them. But, as regards the great bulk of the community, the House ought to remember that the only possible way in which cheaper capital can be obtained for the use of the community is by reducing the rate on deposits to what the money is fairly worth. I fail utterly to understand how in this country, where large corporations, like those in Toronto and Montreal, are able today to borrow money for considerable terms of years at something like 3 per cent, or a mere fraction above that, and when my hon. friend is able to borrow money at a little over 2½ per cent—I fail to understand how business men can say that money which is at call on a very few days' notice can be held to be worth more than 2½ per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite who are acquaint-

ed with financial matters, know that in England, at this moment, outside of special institutions, like the Government savings banks perhaps, it is impossible to obtain for money on deposit more than 1 or 1½ per cent, as a rule; and most of the banks will not allow even that.

Mr. WALLACE. What do the Government pay the banks for their temporary loans?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In England?

Mr. WALLACE. No, here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Four per cent.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Well, that depends on where they borrow their money. Our banks are in the habit of charging very considerably more than 3½ or 4 per cent to their customers, and they cannot be expected to lend, even to the Government of Canada, if they can find more profitable occupation for their capital elsewhere. This is one of the things that are necessarily governed by the law of supply and demand. What I want to call the attention of the House to is this. Of course, if this money were lying idle in the banks, there would be a good deal to be said for the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WALLACE. So it is.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Oh, no. The \$220,000,000 on deposit that he spoke of, supplies the life blood of every manufacturing institution in the country.

Mr. WALLACE. They have \$220,000,000 on deposit, and they have \$227,000,000 loaned. That leaves a deficit of \$7,000,000; but they have a capital of \$62,000,000 and a rest of \$27,000,000, making a total of \$90,000,000. Deducting \$7,000,000, you have \$83,000,000 not lent out.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. But my hon. friend, as a business man, surely knows that no banker who is worthy of the name, would venture to draw on this \$220,000,000 without holding a very large proportion of that in reserve to meet sudden calls and emergencies.

Mr. WALLACE. They have \$80,000,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is not too much, or very little too much, but the hon. gentleman perhaps knows that a good deal of the bank loans are of a somewhat permanent character, and could not be very readily converted into cash. However, that is a question that we need not now discuss. But he knows that this \$220,000,000 consists practically of deposits to be drawn out on short notice or on calls, and the banks must hold a very considerable percentage of that in

reserve to meet sudden calls and emergencies. The percentage may vary. It may be as low as one-fifth in some of the banks, but the old conservative rule is, in banks which are conducted on sound lines, that it should be as high as one-third, and I do not know, all things considered, that that is too much. But what I wish to impress on the House is, that the condition of things here is totally different from what it is in England. There the amount of money that goes into the Government savings banks does not, in the slightest degree, affect the plethora of capital available for business purposes, owing to the fact that it is a lending and not a borrowing nation. Consequently, it does not affect the rate on money allowed by the banks in the shape of interest on deposits. Here, however, it affects the rate promptly, and if it were possible for us to disentangle the two things and deal with the rate of interest on Government savings bank deposits without, at the same time, affecting the rate which is paid on the \$220,000,000 on deposit in the banks, there would, I think, be a good deal to be said in favour of the hon. gentleman's contention. But the fact is, that, while we do not desire to borrow money from the people on any rate less than its value, we do not think we ought to be asked, in the interest of some proportion of the people, to keep the rate of money at an artificial level. I have no hesitation in saying that the very high rate of interest paid on deposits has a distinctly prejudicial effect on the general business of the country, and, therefore, indirectly, on the wages paid to the artisans and others employed in the various branches of trade and manufacture. In a certain degree, to lower the rate of interest on deposits, the lower the rate will be to all persons engaged in business, the more these persons will be able to extend their business, and the greater the general prosperity of the country, because there can be no doubt that the cost of capital in Canada is one of the serious impediments in the way of manufacturers making the best of their opportunities. The cheapening of money in Canada will lead to a very considerable enhancement of the general prospect of the country. That is the point to which I desire most to draw the attention of the House.

The other—and it is the only one I will spend any time on to-night—is this. As intimated in the Budget debate, the Government are not at all unwilling to consider the expediency of issuing a funded loan at 3 per cent for the benefit of the smaller class of depositors. There is a good deal to be said, not perhaps for borrowing money at call from the public at large, but for encouraging investment for a longer or shorter period in the funds of the country, and that is the thing on which my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Fielding) might very well, with the concurrence of the House, allow a difference

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

of $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, and I dare say that we would not be at all the poorer for that. So far, the Government are willing to consider the matter, but we do not think we ought to be called upon, under the circumstances, to pay more than the legitimate value on the money which we take on deposit. The point which I want to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to is this. A great proportion of the \$50,000,000 which we borrow, in the shape of savings bank deposits, is, I think, comprised in a very small number of accounts, comparatively speaking. I must say, with all due consideration to the encouragement of habits of thrift and so forth, insisted upon by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), that I cannot, for the life of me, conceive how the Government ought to pay, out of the earnings of the rest of the people, more than money is worth to parties who have deposits of \$1,000, or even \$500 and upwards, in the Government savings banks. If you want to grant any particular indulgence to the smaller depositors, if the House thinks that it is expedient to promote habits of thrift among the poorer classes of the population, then let them select those who are best entitled to the indulgence. Let them select those persons, amounting to five-sixths of the whole, who are investing small sums. I find, in the return of 1894, that those persons amounted to five-sixths of the whole, and that the average of their investment was very little above \$100 apiece, whereas the average of the others is about \$1,000 apiece. For these five-sixths, as I have said, it is possible to provide—and, I think, with advantage to them and the community—by allowing 3 per cent Canadian stock to be created in small sums, which these persons can have either in scrip or issued to them in the form of credits. That is a detail I do not wish to go into now. So far as the Government are concerned, they are willing to consider the suggestion thrown out for the purpose of meeting the needs and wants of that smaller class of depositors, and so far as they are concerned we would have liked, if it were possible, to separate the rate of interest which we pay on our savings bank and other deposits from the rates which the banks have to pay. But every hon. gentleman knows that, practically speaking, the interest paid by the Government in these two ways must, of necessity, form the standard of the rate which is allowed by the banks at large, and I must repeat, that, if you desire to obtain cheap money in this country, you cannot afford to pay more than a fair rate for the money. That we intend to pay, but I do not think we ought to be called upon to pay more.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has put forward what appears to be a very strange argument, namely, that, by reducing the rate of interest on the deposits of the poor man in the Government savings banks,

the Government will thereby entitle us to obtain cheap money. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, why it is that, when the Government goes to rich men to borrow money, they pay 4 per cent on their temporary loans, as the hon. Finance Minister has just told us they do ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) permit me ? When I stated to the hon. member for West York that the rate on temporary loans was 4 per cent, I was thinking of a quoted rate and not the actual rate. The temporary loans placed since I assumed control of the Finance Department have paid from 3 to 3½ per cent. I desire to make that correction.

Mr. SPROULE. But even that is a difference. The hon. Minister of Finance is willing to pay to the rich owner of money, the bank, from 3 to 3½ per cent. But when he receives the savings of the hired man, or the hired girl or the labourer or mechanic, though the security is the same, he will only pay 2½ per cent. Is that putting a premium upon industry, economy and frugality ? I think it is the very reverse, and, to my mind, this is one of the weakest arguments that the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) have given in support of their proposition. I quite agree with what the hon. member for South Oxford said, that it would be a good thing to have some means, by the purchase of Government bonds or in some other way, that the poor man, the small depositor, could get 3 per cent. But the Government intends to reduce it to 2½ per cent on the plea that the present rate makes money borrowed by ordinary people in the ordinary way dearer. For whom, then, is this reduction ? For the banks. When they loan money to the poor man they charge 6 or 7 per cent. They insist on a poor man paying—

Mr. DAVIN. Seven or 8 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, even 7 and 8 per cent. They compel the Government—that is they practically compel, as the argument they offer is sufficient to induce the Government to do it—to reduce the rate on the savings of the poor man in the post office savings bank. This will compel him to put it in the ordinary bank. The Finance Minister asked : What right have we to pay the poor people more for their money than we pay for the money we borrow ? But does he consider the difference in the quantity of money ? The last loan he floated was something like \$10,000,000. And because he can get a loan of \$10,000,000 for fifty years at 2½ per cent, therefore he is only willing to pay to the man who loans him \$10 the same rate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The rate on the last loan was about 2½ per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, and so the Finance Minister pays a higher rate for the large sum than he pays for the small sum loaned to him by the poor man. If I went to a loaning institution and asked for a loan of \$10,000 for twenty years, if the security I offered was regarded as perfectly good, I would expect to get that money at a lower rate than if I wanted only \$100 for a short time. You are compelling a man who loans his \$5 or his \$10 to accept the same rate of interest on the small loan, which often is for a short time, as the man who pays who is borrowing a million. That is not the way the banks do. If a man goes for an accommodation of \$100 for a year, they charge him 8 per cent. But if they can place a loan of \$10,000 for ten years they will charge less. If they could loan a million for a term of years they would accept even a smaller rate of interest, because the investment is a permanent one and a large one. But the Government are making the same rate for the poor man as for the rich. The hon. Finance Minister said this was to lower the rate of interest to the class who could dictate the rate of interest, that is to people who are strong financially. One of these men can say to the banks : My security is good, and I want money at a small rate of interest. So, this is for the purpose of making the rich class of the community still richer and impoverishing those whose savings are small. If the Government does not wish to pay 3 per cent to those having large sums of money on deposit, then, as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said, let the amount which each one may have in the post office savings bank be limited to \$500 or \$1,000, but still keep the institution open where the poor man can put his small savings where they will be safe, and so that he may have every encouragement to prudence and economy. Above all men in this House, the one whose position on this question most surprised me is the Postmaster General (Mr. Mullock), for he is at the head of the Post Office Department and it is to be presumed that he recommended this reduction of interest. What would be the result if this reduction takes place ? It would induce the poor people to take away their money and invest it where they can get a better rate of interest. They cannot invest in the ordinary banks unless they are prepared to accept a lower rate of interest. They cannot invest in the Farmers' Loan and Savings Company for that has gone down, and it also was carried on under the auspices of the hon. Postmaster General. This proposal has for its object to drive the poor people out of the post office savings bank to places where the security is not so good. Suppose this had passed a few years ago. Or suppose that as a result of the last reduction—and, no doubt, such a thing did happen—a large number of people took their money out of the savings bank and invested it in the Farmers' Loan and Savings Company, in which they could get

4 per cent. And widows and orphans are crying out now because that institution has gone down which was under the financial management practically of the Postmaster General. It has resulted in compelling them to take their money out of an institution over which the hon. gentleman the Postmaster General presided under the ægis of the Government and put it into this other institution over which also he presided. So it will be when they take their money from the post office savings banks and invest it in the private banks, some of which are going down all the time, but which offer a high rate of interest. Now, I have always believed that the two great objects in establishing these banks were, first, to put a premium on industry, economy and frugality, and, second, to handle the money of a class of people who are not business people, not financiers, people who could earn money but who could not invest it or look after it from year to year. It did not matter how poor the person was, if the money was invested in a Government or post office savings bank, the party knew that the security was all that could be desired. Then, it was managed by people with business training and financial ability, and so the people felt that it would be managed to advantage. Now, who are the people who put their money into the post office savings banks? They are the labourers, the mechanics, the domestic servants, both male and female, the poorer farmers, who sometimes have a little money but who cannot invest it or take care of it, and the widows and orphans of the country. You cannot pick out a single one of these classes which can be said to be composed of business people, men or women of financial ability, able to look after and invest their money. The Government, for that reason, has provided this means of inducing them to work industriously and save their money, by offering them a place of security with a fair rate of interest.

Now, then, they earn money, they save money, and they put it in here, and the Government turn round and say: You are earning too much interest on your money. we can borrow ten million dollars at 2½ per cent, therefore we will only pay you 2½ per cent. But suppose I go to that poor man and I ask to borrow \$100 from him, or \$50, or \$25, and I give him a note for it. How much do I expect to pay? Why, I expect to pay him the same rate of interest as the banks are charging me, 6, 7 or 8 per cent—it would be 8 per cent to-day. I would expect to pay him that, because it is a small amount of money when I borrow money for a short time, and because I would have to pay the same rate to the bank if I went there to borrow. Therefore, I say the Government has a right to pay them as much as the banks are charging for money when they loan it out, at least as much as the banks pay for money when they borrow to the

Mr. SPROULE.

tune of millions, or as much as the Government pays for it when the country is standing at the back of the Government as security. The parties who have induced the Government to make this reduction are the parties who, above all others, should not have first claim to consideration, I mean the banks of the country. I understand that Mr. Wilkie, the president of one of the banks, and a prominent member of the Board of Trade, is one of the largest bankers of the country, therefore it is for the benefit of the bankers of the country this is done, to compel the poor man to withdraw his money from the post office savings banks and to put it into the chartered banks where he would get a small rate of interest, therefore, the bankers ask the Government to reduce that rate of interest. I say this is unfair. It takes away a stimulus to the industry of the poor people of this country. Then again we might ask: What is the legal rate of interest in the country according to the judgment of Parliament? If I owe a debt, and there is no stipulation with regard to the interest, I am compelled to pay 6 per cent. Why? Because the wisdom of Parliament says 6 per cent is not too high a rate of interest to pay in this country. Parliament has not reduced the rate of interest below 6 per cent, because they think it wise it should be kept at that high rate, and yet the Government proposes to fix the standard rate of interest to the poorer class of the community, at 2½ per cent when they save and invest money, or a little over one-third of the legal rate. I think the Government should reconsider their decision, because if there is any class in the country that ought to be the wards of the Government, whose industry ought to be stimulated, and who should be induced, if possible, to save their money and to put it by where it will be taken care of, it is the poorer class of people who have recourse to these savings banks for the purpose of investing their small earnings, and from which they will receive a reasonable rate of interest.

Mr. MOORE. There are a few points of view from which we might look at this question, which have not been touched upon. The Minister of Finance made the statement that he had consulted the manager of a bank, and he had also consulted a section of the Board of Trade of Toronto. Well, Sir, I have no doubt the managers of all the banks of this country would be very glad indeed to have the Government reduce the rate of interest to 2½ per cent upon deposits in the Government savings banks. I have no doubt that the boards of trade, representing the business men of this country who are borrowers of money, would be very glad to have the Government reduce the rate of interest to 2½ per cent, which they think would enable them to hire money at less rates than they are paying to-day. But if the Minister of Finance had consulted the depositors, if he consulted the thrifty poor who are making

deposits in the savings bank, instead of the bank managers and boards of trade, he would have found a different view prevailing, and he would have found a request for a higher rate of interest than what the Government propose to give. The Minister of Trade and Commerce tells us that 3 per cent is more than money is worth. That is the opinion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, whose opinion is very valuable, undoubtedly. But when we see what money is being loaned for, and what business men are paying for it, I think we would have a right to claim that 3 per cent is not more than money is worth in this country. Money is worth what it will bring, it is, like any other commodity, regulated by supply and demand, and if the demand is great enough to lead men to pay over 3 per cent, then we must consider that money is worth more than 3 per cent in this country. The Minister tells us that corporations are hiring money at 3 per cent. These corporations have to give gilt-edged security in order to get it at that low rate. I can name a corporation in this country that is paying more than 3 per cent. I call your attention to a corporation that stands at the head of all other business corporations of Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that is paying 5 per cent interest on a large amount of money to the province of Quebec. If there is a corporation in this country that can hire money cheaply, the Canadian Pacific Railway certainly should be the one, and still it has been paying for a good many years 5 per cent interest to the province of Quebec on millions of dollars. It is undoubtedly an advantage to the banks of this country that the rate of interest should be reduced. This will enable them to make money a little faster than they have been making it in the past, by enabling them also to reduce the interest on deposits, and it will have a tendency, as has been pointed out already, to induce the poorer depositors to take money from the Government Savings Bank and spend it, or put it in the chartered banks, or in other places, where it is, perhaps, not as safe. Now to show you the position the banks occupy at the present time, and to show you that they are quite able to take care of themselves, I will read you a quotation of the value of stocks in a number of the banks of this country. The Bank of Montreal is quoted at 245 premium, the Ontario Bank at 110 premium, Molson's Bank at 206 premium, Bank of Toronto, 235, Merchant's Bank, 180, Eastern Townships Bank, 160, Banque Nationale, not quite so high, Union Bank, 115, Bank of Commerce, 140½, Hochelaga Bank, 155, Bank of Nova Scotia, 230. That is the position of the banks of Canada at the present time, and that is what their stocks are worth. A man who has \$100 in the stock of these banks, has an investment worth from \$160 to \$245 to-day. They have been paying a very low rate of interest. It has been said that

the banks are charging the people from 5 per cent to 6 per cent. I know one of the best banks in this country, one of the soundest institutions in Canada, and yet if they are asked to carry a discount note of a customer, he has got to give them a note at 7 per cent, and that is compounded every three months, which amounts to about 9 per cent. A great proportion of these notes are taken at 8 per cent. Now I believe that the banks are able to take care of themselves as they have made large sums of money as shown by the quotations I have read by giving low rates of interest on deposits and letting it out at high rates. This Government might well afford to let them look after themselves, and to give instead a little attention to the poorer people to provide for them a place of deposit where they can keep their money in safety and upon which they can draw 3 per cent interest, which is a low enough rate. A 3 per cent rate from the Government is not any better than 2½ per cent from the banks. The formalities through which people have to go when they want to draw their money out of the post office savings bank, are so great that they would prefer to loan their money to the chartered banks at a half per cent less. When they make their applications for withdrawals, these have to come to Ottawa and be ratified, and then be sent back again, and it takes a good deal of time, and the people are subjected to considerable trouble when they want to make withdrawals. The Government have complained that this is to be made a political question; I think if they will say that the rate of interest shall remain as it is, it will not be made a political question, and every man on this side of the House will support the Government in so doing.

Mr. ROGERS. After the orations we have heard from the big guns on this subject, you will scarcely expect to hear much of importance from me. We have heard some hon. members express a good deal of solicitude for the interest of the banking and commercial interests of this country. My little experience in this House shows me that they are generally pretty well taken care of; therefore, I will devote my remarks to the great agricultural interests of this country. I should like to assist poor men who are striving to accumulate earnings for a rainy day, as far as I could consistently, and I would favour encouraging such even more. But when I read the enormous amount of money accumulated in our savings banks, I ask who are the people who have deposited this large sum, from what classes of the community has it come? I have had some experience both from observation and otherwise, of the agricultural class, and I am satisfied that very little money is deposited by farmers in the savings banks. No doubt, private investors place some amounts there, but the

great majority of the deposits are made by mechanics. I have always felt that the National Policy has enabled them to put a good deal of money in the savings banks, and I have always felt, at the same time, that they were putting it in the banks at the farmers' expense. A 35 per cent duty on agricultural implements has enabled them to deposit a good deal every year.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the duty now ?

Mr. ROGERS. The great point I wish to come to is this : what percentage of return on the capital invested is earned by the agricultural community ? We know that farming does not pay 2 per cent, notwithstanding all the hard labour put into it. I should like a loan company or private money-lender to compile a statement of operations on hundreds of thousands of acres thrown upon their hands, and ascertain what percentage is earned on the capital invested. Let one of the best farms of the province be placed in the hands of a loan institution, and let it hire all the help, and make an allowance for wear and tear, and at the end of five or seven years it will not show 2 per cent interest on the capital invested. This is not 50 per cent of the return secured by other industries. When money is loaned on farm lands, and farmers and their families work for years in order to pay 5 or 6 per cent interest on money borrowed, the only advantageous result is that the farmers, by working long hours and exercising great economy and self-denial have been able to increase our exports. This interest is, however, paid at the expense of almost the life-blood of the people. It is stated that there are \$140,000,000 on deposit in the banks, and that \$83,000,000 are lying idle. The only remedy for the high rate of interest charged is to let money flow into the banks until they cannot find investments, and then our farmers may be able to get money at cheaper rates. I can well remember the time when 8 per cent was paid for advances on good farm security. I admit the rate is getting less all the time. The reason is that it no longer pays to invest money in farm lands. The time is coming when the rate must be still lower. The enormous amount of money on deposit in the savings banks and elsewhere shows that there are not good investments to be had outside, or so much money would not be invested there. If our industry paid 4 or 5 per cent, there would be less money in the savings banks. The post office deposits are made, however, not so much on account of the interest received as because the money is thus made a safe investment. I have no sympathy with the banks, which have pressed heavily on the people, especially on the agricultural class. While a farmer has been compelled to obtain two names on his notes, with the security of a good man worth perhaps

Mr. ROGERS.

\$10,000, an ordinary business man has been able to obtain money without such additional security. That is the reason why private loan companies have had a great run, because the banks have not given farmers accommodation. I am glad to say the banks have at length become more reasonable in dealing with the great farming class, and have been glad to obtain farmers' notes. Loan companies do not care any longer to lend money on agricultural lands, which should be the best investment, and that is one of the principal reasons why there is so much money in the hands of banks and money-lenders. The Government is taking the right stand in seeking to give the people cheap money. The banks will have to lend money at 4 per cent, and that demand is being made. Any agricultural representative in this House who does not join in that demand will have a hard time when he goes back to his constituents, because the people of the country want it. The farming community are the backbone of this country and we know that if the farmers go down, then all others will go down with them. I am glad to see the action taken by the leaders of the Government along that line, and I am glad to hear the interest they express in the welfare of the agricultural classes. When I came to this House first, it was said that there were only a few Patrons in it, but I am pleased to see now that when any question comes up relating to the farming community, there is a sort of rivalry as to who can say most on behalf of the farmers. I trust, Sir, that sentiment will grow, and if it does it will be a good thing for the country.

Mr. BRODER. The hon. gentleman from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) takes rather an extraordinary view of the business conditions of this country. I have yet to learn that there should be one set of business principles for the farmer, another for the mechanic, and another for the commercial man. The reason why the farmers have not been successful borrowers from the banks is, in my opinion, that the farmer sometimes overlooks the fact that time is the essence of the contract ; he sometimes does not pay sufficient attention to the day his note is due, and so the endorser often has to look after it. I question very much the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers) that the farmers as a rule have no deposits in the savings banks of this country. My experience is, Sir, that they have relatively more deposits in the savings banks than have any other class in the Dominion. I know one man, a farmer, and a well-to-do farmer, too—I do not know whether he is a Patron or not, but he has good stuff to make one of—he went to a cheese manufacturer and borrowed fifty dollars in advance on his milk. His milk would not be going to the factory before three months, but the fifty dollars was

an accommodation, and he got it without interest. Now, the cheese manufacturer had occasion to go down to the bank shortly afterwards, and he found his good farmer friend depositing fifty dollars in the savings bank branch. That happened in my own town. Now, Sir, no mechanic in this country could do that; he could not borrow in advance on the milk that was to come from his mechanical operations. I state here that the farmers have more money in the savings banks of Canada than any other class of the community. It is true that the farmer who has a new farm and is improving it does not deposit money in the savings bank, because he has to spend it on his improvements, but if we go into the older settled sections of Canada where there are improved farms, you will find that many of the farmers—and it is to their credit, and I am glad to be able to say it—have money in the savings banks. And why should they not have money in the savings banks as well as any other class of people. My friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) ought to remember that the argument he uses has no foundation at all, because it is not guaranteed to the farmer, or to any other borrower in this country, that he can get money cheaper because the rate of interest has been reduced. If it did cheapen money for the farmer then there might be some argument in its favour, but it does not. I can tell the Government that this reduction in the rate of interest affects a much larger class than many people think. For instance, it will affect depositors in the chartered banks. A great many farmers who are not in a position to loan money out at long terms and in large sums, have gone to the chartered banks to deposit their thousand dollars, and I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers) that some of them are even shareholders in these banks. The reduction in the rate of interest will affect that class of depositors to a very considerable extent.

But, Sir, what has become of these gentlemen on the Treasury benches who in the past have been so anxious about the welfare of the poor people, and who have been breaking their hearts about the farmers for the last eighteen years. Since these gentlemen came into power, they seem to have lost all their love for the farmer and the workingman, and their policy now is to get the financiers of the country into their hands. They are done with the poor people, they want the capitalists and the financiers and the manufacturers and the railway contractors and the bank managers. It is these men that the Liberals want now since they came into power, and not the farming classes. They have lost their love for the poor farmer, and the only voice we hear raised for him in this Chamber now is the voice of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers). I fear that his voice, too, may be silenced. Since the

Government came into power they have done many unpopular things, but there is nothing which they have attempted to do which will be more unpopular than their present proposal. A small depositor in the savings banks cannot venture into schemes in which to invest his money. The depositor in the savings bank cannot lend money to the farmer, and why? Because if a farmer wants to borrow from \$1,000 to \$3,000 in buying a farm the poor depositor has not that amount to lend him. The ex-Minister of Finance raised a point here which has a great deal of force in it, and which ought to be considered by the House in this connection. Many a man in Canada, who when his son is first able to write his name, deposits \$5 in the bank for that boy. The father endeavours to teach that boy the value of money, and when you have taught him that you have taught him a good deal towards getting along in the world. Will the reduction in the rate of interest help on this commendable work? No, Sir, it will not. Such things as that ought not to be smothered out in the country, but ought to be encouraged by the Government. Now, Sir, why should my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) get up in this House and discredit his own class? Why should he get up here and say that his fellow farmers are in beggary throughout this country. That is not true. I say, Sir, that the average wealth of the farmers is equal to the average wealth of any class in the community, and it is a credit to our farmers that it is so. If a business man would go around decrying his business as our friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) decries his business of farming, why that business man would have no credit in this country in six months. I tell you, Sir, the farmer of Canada has got to be strong financially and in every other way, to stand the abuse he gets from his friends. It is about time some one should stand up in this House to defend the farmer; it is about time my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers) would take another line, if he is going to promote the interests of Canadian farmers. I, for one, have a great deal of respect for that class of the community; I was born and brought up in that class, and I hope I shall die in it. I venture to say he will never hear me state here that the farmers of Canada are at poverty's door, and that they have to stay up day and night and work hours after hours to pay the interest which they owe for money loaned them. It is without doubt that many a farmer in Canada in his early history would not be able to have a farm at all had it not been that some one advanced him money with which to buy it. The business men throughout Canada, the men who are abused by such gentlemen as the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) have done more to put the farmers in a solid position than any other class. The business men have credited the farm-

ers with their seed grain ; they have given them their groceries until the crop was marketed ; they have lent them money to till the farm and to build the little house, and they have waited until the farmers were able to pay it, and with the increase in the value of the land, put the farmer in a prosperous condition. It is time that the material benefits conferred by one class of the community on the other should be recognized in this House rather than that one special class should be selected for abuse. I respect the man who has helped the poor farmers of this country, no matter what his business may be. There are some gentlemen on these benches on the other side of the House, and there are gentlemen upon this side of the House, who from the manner in which they have treated the farming community not only deserve the respect of the farmers, but deserve the recognition of the country at large.

Mr. CLARKE. I wish to draw the attention of the House to a statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance during the course of his remarks this afternoon, in which he made special reference to the action of the council of the Toronto Board of Trade on this matter. The hon. the Minister of Finance, very properly in my humble judgment, spoke in the highest terms of the gentlemen who compose the council of the Board of Trade of Toronto, but he did not inform the House that all of them, or nearly all of them, are directors or managers of banking institutions in that city. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) quoted approvingly the remarks of Mr. D. R. Wilkie, the very able general manager of the Imperial Bank, as approving the policy of the Government in reducing the rate of interest, but he forgot to tell us that Mr. Wilkie is one of the leading spirits on the council of the Board of Trade in the city of Toronto. It must surely be within the recollection of the House that the high opinion entertained by the Minister of Finance of the commercial and business ability of the council of the board of trade, is an opinion that has been recently formed by that hon. gentleman. Within the past two or three weeks the council of the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto passed unanimously a resolution against the Bill that was before this House to incorporate the Kettle Valley Railway Company, and yet, if my memory serves me rightly, every member of the Government from the province of Ontario voted for the second reading of that Bill. The opinion then entertained by the members of the Government as to the soundness of the business and commercial views of the members of the council of the board of trade, has been considerably changed.

Now, this reduction in the rate of interest will affect thousands of thrifty depositors in the city of Toronto and throughout the province of Ontario. The Government have

Mr. BRODER.

not been in office two years, and yet twice have they cut into the earning power of the savings of these classes. The interest was first reduced from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 per cent, after they had been but a few months in power ; and now, less than twelve months after that first cut, another cut is to be made from 3 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The people who are affected by this change are among the most industrious and thrifty classes of our population. As has already been pointed out by gentlemen who have spoken, they are not experts as to the best means of investing their money, or as to how to get the best possible returns from their investments ; but having confidence in the stability of the Government and post office savings banks, they have been induced to put their money in them ; and it would in my judgment be sound economy and wise policy on the part of the Government to allow the highest rate of interest possible for that money, in order that these people might be encouraged to keep it in institutions which are absolutely secure, rather than be induced to withdraw it and invest it in other institutions where it will not be nearly so safe. I fear that the effect of these repeated reductions in the rate of interest will be that many persons who are not adepts as to how best to invest their money, will be induced, by representations, or misrepresentations, of designing persons, to withdraw it from the Government and post office savings banks, and invest it in institutions less sound and stable.

I am not aware that there has been any agitation throughout the country for a reduction in the rate of interest on deposits. I am not aware that any petitions have been sent here by merchants and business men of the city of Toronto or the province of Ontario or the Dominion of Canada, asking that the rate of interest paid in the Government institutions should be reduced. We may wonder, then, what influence has prompted the Government twice, without any appeal being made to them, to cut down the rate of interest paid in those institutions. So far as I know, the only influence brought to bear on the Government has been the influence of those gentlemen engaged in banking. I believe I am safe in asserting that notwithstanding the fact that last July the rate was reduced from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 per cent, those who have been compelled to go to the banks since to get accommodation have not yet discovered any appreciable lowering in the rate of interest ; and I venture to say that after the rate has been reduced from 3 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, those who have to do business with the banks will find that they will have to pay just as high a rate of interest during 1899 as they have had to pay during 1898. Those who are let in on the ground floor, those who compose that inner circle referred to by the Minister of Finance, may derive some benefit from the change ; they may be able sometimes to

dictate terms to the banks ; but the great mass of the people who go to the banks for accommodation will not be substantial gainers. I have not seen any evidence that the lowering of the rate of interest has been of any benefit to the working classes ; I have not seen that it has in any degree increased their wages ; and thus far we have had no evidence to substantiate the statements to that effect made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Sir, it seems to me that the people who are affected, along with other classes of consumers in this country, will be greatly disappointed at the policy which this Government have pursued during the short time they have been in office. They have reduced the rate of interest paid on deposits one-third in less than two years, and at the same time they have passed legislation to increase the price of some at least of the necessaries of life. By the legislation proposed this session they will increase the price of sugar to the consumer ; during last session legislation was imposed upon us which increased the price of the tobacco of the masses of the people ; and now we have this third proposition, to decrease the earning power of the savings of the people. I venture to affirm, with all due deference to what hon. gentlemen have said on the other side, that nothing more unwise or unfair to those people, or more unpopular, has ever been presented by this Government to the people of Canada. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce made a point that these deposits in the post office and Government savings banks are there on call. Technically that statement may be correct ; but I could not conceive it possible that at any given time all the depositors would ask to have their deposits remitted to them. These deposits are there to all intents and purposes permanently, and it is absurd to suppose that the Government in one year would be called upon to pay out forty or fifty millions of money which the people have deposited in doles from time to time. That being the case, they have a right to demand at least as high a rate of interest, and a little higher, than the Government pay to capitalists in the old country or elsewhere from whom they borrow the money they require from time to time to carry on the affairs of this country. I regret exceedingly the action the Government have taken. I believe it is a move in the wrong direction, and I will hail with satisfaction the opening of the opportunity to the wage-earners of this country to invest their savings in Canadian stocks, such as the Finance Minister has stated may be afforded. We should try to cultivate habits of thrift and industry among our people, and we can do that successfully by allowing them as high a rate of interest as they are fairly entitled to, rather than by cutting it down, as it has been twice since this Government came into office.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Davin :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Beattie,
Bell (Addington),
Bell (Pictou),
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Cargill,
Clancy,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Davin,
Earle,
Foster,
Ganong,
Gillies,
Gilmour,
Gullet,
Hale,
Hughes,
Ingram,
Kaulbach,

Kloepfer,
Macdonald (King's),
Maclean,
McAlister,
McCleary,
McDougall,
McInerney,
McLennan (Glengarry),
Martin,
Mills,
Moore,
Morin,
Powell,
Sproule,
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles),
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace, and
Wilson.—40.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bain,
Pazinet,
Beith,
Belcourt,
Bernier,
Bertram,
Blair,
Bcstock,
Bourassa,
Britton,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Burnett,
Cameron,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Charlton,
Copp,
Cowan,
Davies (Sir Louis),
Desmarais,
Douglas,
Ellis,
Erb,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Flint,
Fraser (Guysborough),
Godbout,
Haley,
Harwood,
Heyd,
Hurley,
Landerkin,
Lang,
Legris,
Lemieux,

Lewis,
Lister,
MacPherson,
McClure,
McGregor,
McGugan,
McHugh,
McIsaac,
McLennan (Inverness),
McMillan,
McMullen,
Madore,
Maxwell,
Meigs,
Mignault,
Monet,
Mulock,
Oliver,
Parmalee,
Pettet,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Richardson,
Rinfret,
Rogers,
Ross,
Rutherford,
Savard,
Scriver,
Semple,
Sifton,
Somerville,
Stenson,
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Tarte,
Toimle, and
Wood (Hamilton).—76.

Amendment negatived.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.

Angers,
Campbell,
Featherston,
Dyment,
Penny,
Macdonell (Selkirk),

Opposition.

Casgrain,
Kendry,
Carscallen,
McCormick,
Ives,
Roche,

Russell,	Borden (Halifax),
Hutchison,	Klock,
Gibson,	Corby,
Guay,	Dugas,
Graham,	Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Lavergne,	Broder,
Mclsaac,	Gillies,
Dechêne,	Marcotte,
Logan,	MacLaren,
Domville,	Prior,
Paterson,	Wood (Brockville),
Godbout,	Reid,
Fraser (Lambton),	McNeill,

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. members for Montcalm and Dundas have not voted.

Mr. DUGAS. I have paired with the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay). Otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. BRODER. I have paired with the hon. member for Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne). Otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. member for Charlotte was not in the House when the motion was put and voted.

Mr. GAGNON. The hon. member is mistaken.

Mr. McCORMICK. I was paired with the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dymont). Otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. BOSTOCK. The hon. member for Halifax has not voted.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was paired with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), or I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. PENNY. I was paired with the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives), or I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I was paired with the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Déchêne). I would have voted for the amendment.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into Committee on Ways and Means.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

After Recess.

The House again resolved itself into Committee on Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 2,

2. That it is expedient to provide that section seventeen of "The Customs Tariff, 1897," shall be repealed on and after the first day of August in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, and that the following section shall be substituted therefor:—

17. Articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of any of the following countries may, when imported direct into Canada from any of such countries, be entered for duty or

Mr. CLARKE.

taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada at the reduced rate of duty provided in the British preferential tariff, set forth in Schedule "D" to this Act:—

(a.) The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

(b.) The British Colony of Bermuda.

(c.) The British Colonies commonly called the British West Indies, including the following:—

The Bahamas.

Jamaica.

Turk's Island and the Caicos Islands.

The Leeward Islands (Antigua, St. Christopher-Nevis, Dominica, Montserrat, and the Virgin Islands).

The Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Vincent and St. Lucia).

Barbados.

Trinidad and Tobago.

British Guiana.

(d.) Any other British colony or possession the customs tariff of which, on the whole, is as favourable to Canada as the British preferential tariff herein referred to is to such colony or possession.

Provided, however, that manufactured articles to be admitted under such preferential tariff shall be bona fide the manufactures of a country or countries entitled to the benefits of such tariff, and that such benefits shall not extend to the importation of articles into the production of which there has not entered a substantial portion of the labour of such countries. Any question that may arise as to any article being entitled to such benefits shall be decided by the Minister of Customs, whose decision shall be final.

2. The Minister of Customs, with the approval of the Governor in Council, shall determine what British colonies or possessions shall be entitled to the benefits of the preferential tariff under clause (d) of this section.

3. The Minister of Customs may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, make such regulations as may be deemed necessary for carrying out the intention of this section.

Mr. DAVIN. We should like the hon. Minister of Finance to give us some idea of what the result will be on the importations into this country and on the revenue—whether the revenue will be strengthened by means of this clause or diminished, and in the event of the revenue being swelled, how will it affect the production of our home manufactures? How, in fact, will it affect in the end the tax-paying power of the community?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). My hon. friend has given me a pretty large contract, and I think I could make a three hours speech in answer to these questions. So far as the revenue is concerned, I made in the Budget speech a general reference which is about all I could say. Undoubtedly the effect of the 25 per cent reduction, which is not new but simply a carrying out of the old clause, will be to increase British importation. To some extent, it will involve a loss of revenue, but I think it will lead also to some expansion of trade, and in that way a part of the loss of the revenue will be met. But in so far as the loss of revenue is not met by the expansion of trade, we look to some increase in

the duty on sugar to make good the balance. I do not think I can say anything from the point of view of revenue which would cover the ground more fully than that. We anticipate some loss through the 25 per cent reduction, but it will undoubtedly be made good by the expansion of trade, at any rate to a large extent, and whatever else is necessary, it is expected will be made up by the small increase of the duty on sugar. Of course the preferential rate is not an increase but a reduction, but I do not estimate that all the sugar, or even a great part of it, will come under that preference, and so I speak of an additional revenue from the sugar business. As to the effect of the reductions upon home industries, I am afraid that that is a question upon which the hon. gentleman and I should differ, because, perhaps we will look at it from different points of view. I think this will not injuriously affect the best interests of the country. My hon. friend has taken the opposite view. I am afraid that if we discussed that matter, we should only be able to state and re-state our views without adding much light to that aspect of the question.

Mr. IVES. Will the hon. Finance Minister explain the term "substantial portion of the article has been manufactured or created by the country favoured"? As I understand the words, it is not intended by the Government to admit, for example, German or Belgian goods or the goods of countries not participating in the favoured arrangement and manufactured to some extent in Great Britain or a favoured colony and then allowed to come in as if entirely the product of Great Britain or the favoured colony. I think it is important that we should know what are the views of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) or the Minister of Customs as to the extent of this "substantial portion," which is a very wide door, and which may be made wide enough to admit everything if the Government wish to so interpret it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has referred to a question which, I admit, is one of considerable difficulty. But I am afraid we are not likely to come nearer to a solution than we have in the words of the resolution. We must recognize the fact that Great Britain, which is a great manufacturing country, imports a large portion of raw material. If it were necessary that the material should be produced in Great Britain, as well as the manufactured article, this would restrict the benefit of our preference to a great extent. Where the manufacture is bona fide a British manufacture, even if it includes a considerable proportion of foreign materials, if British material or British labour was incorporated into it in a substantial degree, we should treat that as of British manufacture. If the hon. gentleman asks what is a "substantial portion," I have no means

of answering him. I think he should leave that to the reasonable discretion of the Minister of Customs. I think the hon. Minister of Customs should deal with it in the spirit which my hon. friend has referred to. We must guard against colourable manufactures which would evade the law. We do not desire that foreign goods, that could not get the benefit of the preference if imported direct, shall be sent to England and there have a colourable amount of labour put on them and sent here as British goods. But if an article is a bona fide British manufacture, made in the ordinary way, with a substantial proportion of British labour entering into it, we must give it the benefit of the preferential tariff. We must ask the House to leave the question with us, in the hope that as a result of the experience of the coming year, we shall be able to define more clearly what a "substantial portion" is. I am afraid that we can only, for the present, give the statement that it is intended to prevent a colourable importation of foreign goods under the guise of British manufactures.

Mr. IVES. It is not usual to leave even to the whole Government substantially the making of the tariff of the country, and it seems still less desirable to leave it to a single member of the Government. Take, for example, a printing press. Does the hon. Minister of Finance mean that if the material, the iron or steel, is brought from Germany to Great Britain and there made up into a printing press, it will be entitled to a reduction as if the raw material had been British? Or does he mean that if the printing press is made up all but, say, the turning of the cylinders—nineteen-twentieths manufactured in Germany and only the last twentieth in Great Britain, would it then come in under the preferential arrangement? The same question might be asked with regard to every item of manufacture. For instance, paper, as to which the Germans are on our list as vigorous competitors, it might be brought from Germany to Great Britain, and there run through a stack of calendars and sent out here as a British manufacture. This clause will leave an enormous discretion to the Minister of Customs and may play havoc with the revenues and the industries of the country. The cases I have given are only two, but a great variety of cases might be instanced. I think that as business men, we ought to have some rather distinct declarations from the Government as to whether this phrase is going to be stretched in the direction of widening or whether it is going to be contracted and only used in cases where clearly the great majority of expenditure and material is the result of British labour and British capital. I think we are entitled to at least that statement as to what the intention of the hon. gentleman is.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to point out for the information of the hon. Minister

and the House that this clause will have to be very carefully interpreted by the Government, or the industries of this country will be attacked in a way that our people have no idea of at the present time. There is a very large class of fancy goods imported into this country concerning which care will have to be taken. These goods are made up for the main part of goods imported from Germany and other portions of continental Europe to England and after being put together are shipped to this country as British goods. There are such goods as laces, for instance, that are imported from Germany, France and other countries. These will be imported into England, attached to some common material and sent to this country as British make. Unless the greatest care is taken this country will be simply swamped with the goods of all Europe, and not only will England not get the preference but our own industries here will be greatly hampered.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The cases the hon. gentleman have given show how difficult it would be, at the present stage, to lay down any hard and fast rule in the matter. I will answer the questions the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ives) asked me. As I view it, and not, of course, speaking on behalf of the Minister of Customs, I would say that a printing press made in England, even though the raw material came from abroad, was British manufacture. Of course I do not speak officially, and the Minister of Customs might do otherwise. But if it were made abroad and brought into England, and a few parts burnished up, I would say that it was not of British manufacture and ought not to be allowed to come in under the preference. While I give that as my own view, the hon. gentleman will see that there would be a thousand such cases, and it would be exceedingly difficult in a legislative enactment to express exactly what we desire. We understand that we should not stretch the clause one way or the other. If an article is bona fide the manufacture of British industry, and if there is any large substantial percentage of British labour in it, we ought not to exclude it merely because the raw material comes from abroad. I quite concede that efforts may be made to evade the object we have in view, and to bring in goods as of British manufacture which really have very little British labour upon them. The very object of the clause is to prevent that. But I think the hon. gentleman will see that if we are asked to define it in any other way, it would be exceedingly difficult to find a form of words which would express better what we all have in our minds.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me that what the Minister of Finance has pointed out is a clear indication of the difficulties of a section of that kind at all. Now I am sure it would be beyond the possibility of man to

Mr. MACLEAN.

discover in future to what extent English labour has been employed upon any article where the raw material has come in in any stage from a foreign country. It does seem to me utterly impossible to adopt a clause of that kind with any measure of safety. As has been pointed out, the ingenuity of men must be trusted, and the exigencies of trade will always induce men to defeat a law of that kind. No sooner will it be placed upon the Statute-book than persons will at once take advantage of it. Now, the hon. gentleman laid down a rather hard and fast clause last year. I see he has departed from that this year, and that was that the article should be of the growth and product—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The same as here.

Mr. CLANCY. But the hon. gentleman has made it wider this year by expressly stating in that clause that a substantial amount of English labour should be employed upon the goods. He will see that he has greatly broadened the clause, and has therefore greatly increased the difficulties. Now I think that with all our desire to give a preference to goods that are English goods in every sense, we must draw the line somewhere. Is it not the safer way to define it by statute, rather than leave it to discretionary power that will always be defeated, because the fraud will be most difficult to detect? I cannot see that this can be worked out with safety. The word "substantial" admits of a great deal of latitude. It may mean, by comparison, a very considerable or very little. No one can say whether one-third of the labour employed in the manufacture of an article was English labour, or whether there was not a substantial amount of foreign labour employed. Yet would that be a fair reason, if two-thirds, I may say, of the labour put upon the goods coming into Canada, was foreign, that under such circumstances they should be admitted? I desire to point out to the hon. Minister of Finance the utter impossibility of detection of that other two-thirds. I say in many cases it would be impossible to determine seven-eighths. I would like the Minister now, since he has asked for such discretionary power, to say what machinery he intends to employ to detect the amount of English labour or foreign labour that is put on goods that will be admitted under this clause. It seems to me doubtful whether the hon. gentleman can lay down anything like a rule to guide the Minister of Customs in dealing with matters of that kind. The truth is that he is not in a position to do so. This is in the hands of the customs-house officers throughout the country, and an investigation in every case seems to be utterly impossible. Whatever measure the hon. gentleman may devise to reach the object he is aiming at, it seems to me the present one is extremely faulty, and if it

were applied to-morrow, I cannot see how he can proceed to work it out with safety.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I do not profess to believe that that particular clause is absolutely perfect ; all I do claim is that it is about the best we can do under the circumstances, and I am open to any suggestion for improving it. The hon. gentleman says we had last year a hard and fast rule, and we have now varied it. If he will compare the two clauses he will see that we are this year drawing the line a little tighter. We did not have this clause in last year, but in the light of our experience we see it is necessary to guard against an evasion of the law, which is the danger, I presume, the hon. gentleman wishes to guard against. I am afraid the objection he takes would strike at the root of the whole question of preferential trade. We might differ as to the ways of bringing it about, but I believe the hon. gentlemen wish it to be understood that they would favour preferential trade under certain circumstances and conditions differing from ours. But the same difficulty would arise then as arises now. This is a question which we have thought over a great deal. We realize all the difficulties that are in it, but after looking into it very carefully we have come to the conclusion that it is not a matter in which we can lay down, in the statute, a rule to govern every case. You must lay down a general principle, state the object you have in view, as I have stated it, and then leave something to the discretion of the Government, particularly of the Minister of Customs who may be expected to carry it out in the spirit in which we desire on both sides of the House it shall be interpreted. I do not think it is possible to do better, at least I have heard no suggestions of any form of words that could be accepted as accomplishing the purpose any better than those we have put in the resolution.

Mr. **IVES**. I think it would save all the trouble and danger if the hon. gentleman would simply require that the article should be wholly the product of British labour.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. That would destroy the whole preference to England.

Mr. **IVES**. It is preference to England, not to Germany, or Belgium or any other country, that you are after. I do not suppose it is preference to the British importer that you are after, it is not to give a preference to the British importer of an article from Germany, it is not to give a preference to a man who brings a half finished article over for the purpose of finishing it, and getting the advantage of the 25 per cent reduction. Now, you will see what will happen under this clause. You will find an enormous amount of labour thrown upon the Minister of Customs, you will find that he will have to work from early morning to late at night in deciding upon applications for

admission of articles under this clause. You will find that the taking of evidence will be so enormously expensive that you will have to rely upon the affidavits that you receive, you will find there will be an enormous amount of evasion and fraud, and you will have to repeal it sooner or later, you will do so yourselves. You cannot possibly work such a clause. I know from my own experience as having been one time in the Department of Trade and Commerce, that the number of appeals and of questions coming before the Minister of Customs to decide, is enormous. There is still, I suppose, an appeal to the courts, by petition of right, from his decision. So hon. gentlemen opposite will find themselves involved in an enormous amount of litigation.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. It is made final.

Mr. **IVES**. The Minister will, no doubt, want evidence as to where the goods are produced, affidavits from England or from Germany, and he will not trust to ex parte affidavits, and the Minister will be utterly unable to do the work with satisfaction to himself, and will be the victim of fraud and attempts to defraud, which will make his life a burden. The result will be, that a very large amount of goods will come in, to the detriment of our own manufactures, and hon. gentlemen opposite will have to repeal this section, and, in all probability, repeal it next year.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The hon. gentleman, I am afraid, has hardly given us a remedy. I have already stated that the Government do not contend that this section is perfect, but the hon. gentleman will, no doubt, come to the opinion, on reflection, that his remedy will not meet the case. He has stated that the material should be British and the labour British. That, however, would limit very much the range of manufactured products coming into this country. Britain imports the raw material for her manufactures. Let us take as an example cottons. Does England grow cotton? No; she imports it from the Southern States and from distant markets; and, if the interpretation of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) were to prevail, we would shut out all her cotton goods. England does not produce a large quantity of wool, but imports it from abroad; and because the wool was not of British origin and the goods made by British labour, we would shut out all British woollen goods under the interpretation of my hon. friend; and so, in fact, throughout the whole range of manufactures. The hon. gentleman will see, on reflection, that the effect of his interpretation would be to destroy the preference altogether.

Mr. **CRAIG**. I do not know whether my suggestion will be a good one or not, but, in

my opinion, this clause would be improved by allowing it to read as follows:—

Provided manufactured articles to be admitted under such preferential tariff shall be bona fide the manufactures of a country or countries entitled to the benefits of such tariff.

Then any question arising might be decided by the Minister of Customs. I think it would be better than any statement as to the goods being the bona fide manufacture of a country, and then the question whether such was the fact would be decided by the Minister of Customs.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That matter was very thoroughly considered, and we were advised, and correctly advised, I think, that if you left out the following words, there would be no limitation. An article the bona fide production of England, no matter what proportion might be English product, could come in. It was thought that we would, by adopting that suggestion, open the door more widely. The other words were put in deliberately, with a view to giving a limitation, which we thought was within the spirit of the resolution.

Mr. MACLEAN. Do the Government propose to compel importers who claim preference, to make an affidavit that those goods were substantially the product of Great Britain?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suppose that will be done, but it will come under the regulations to be framed under these resolutions.

Mr. MACLEAN. There might be an affidavit made in England, where the goods originate, and also by the importer to the same effect. If that were insisted on, a great many frauds would be barred.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand, with respect to entries in the Customs Department, that, in the event of a ruling being made by the Minister in respect to which the party feels aggrieved, the importer can, by petition of right, with the consent of the Department of Justice first had and obtained, bring an action in the courts. I think I am correct in that assumption. I submit, that, having regard to the very large number of entries made, it is placing in the hands of the Minister a very large power, when it is stated that, in regard to all these appeals, no matter how vast may be the amount involved, he, and he alone, is to be the sole judge as to the merits of the case. If the clause is adopted as at present drafted, it must, of necessity, result in appeals being taken from the decision of the Minister of Customs. Would it not, in view of that fact, be better to stop at the word "customs," and omit the words "whose decision shall be final"? There will, from time to time, be very large claims made on account of differences of opinion which may arise or exist in regard to entries made, and this

Mr. CRAIG.

resolution will throw on the Minister almost unlimited work in taking, viva voce or by affidavit, the evidence of the parties concerned. I submit, it would be unfair to say that the Minister of Customs is to be sole arbitrator, and by the passage of this clause prevent an application being made to the courts by petition of right, although the court has been opened to importers, and by the passing of this statute they would be estopped from carrying an appeal beyond the Minister of Customs.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is very important to have an authority to determine the question promptly. No doubt, at the beginning, there will be difficulties, such as have been suggested, but each case determined will help the Minister to lay down general rules, and he may be able to make regulations which will cover certain matters. When new questions arise, it is very desirable to have each transaction promptly settled, and, if we allow appeals from the Minister to the Treasury Board or to the Governor in Council—I am waiving for the moment the question of appeals to the courts—it will so weaken the hands of the Minister that there will be a lack of that firm administration in the carrying out of the law which is so desirable. Suppose an importer wishes to bring in certain goods or articles under the preferential tariff which, in the opinion of the Minister, do not come under it, if the Minister promptly gives judgment, the matter may be finally settled. If the party could, however, appeal to another tribunal, those goods would continue to be brought in, and the question would be revived. It is very desirable that the Minister, who, of course, has to be responsible to his colleagues, and through them to Parliament, should be clothed with power to deal with matters promptly, and not encourage people to take appeals against the ruling of the Minister. It would not serve the purpose which hon. members on both sides of the House have in view, and which this clause is designed to carry out.

Mr. BENNETT. It is admitted that differences of opinion will arise, particularly in respect to what is meant by the words "substantial portion." Assume, for the sake of argument, that a heavy importation of goods from the old country is questioned, and the Minister holds out that there has been a violation of this principle of preference, and that the goods do not come within the purview of the clause, what must necessarily arise? It would be a most expensive proceeding to bring witnesses from the old country to give evidence before the Minister of Customs. The Minister would not be in the same position to deal with the matter as would a court, in this, that a court, being, I assume, a court of record, might issue a commission for the examination of witnesses in the old country, and the evidence taken by that commission might come before the

court, and the case be adjudged on it. There would be no process to compel the attendance of witnesses in England to testify in behalf of the importer or person aggrieved. If you add the remaining words, you effectually shut out any appeal to the courts, to which an importer can now appeal. I submit, that this is a matter of very grave importance, and, if appeals are to be shut off and the Minister is to be the sole judge, it must necessarily result in the Minister of Customs being occupied during the best portion of his time in listening to the evidence of witnesses in regard to customs claims.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I think, if the hon. gentleman had had any experience, he would know quite well that almost every custom-house officer throughout the country is accustomed to know the classes of goods imported from each country.

Mr. FOSTER. Customs officers ?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Collectors of customs at all large points where importations are made. They are perfectly conversant with the classes of goods made in Germany, Switzerland, Belgium and elsewhere. There would, therefore, be no trouble in regard to arranging with respect to the classes of goods coming from the different countries.

Mr. IVES. Do you think an ordinary collector could tell the difference between German and English goods ?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). There is always a stamp mark on German and French goods, and with that safeguard I can see no trouble to be anticipated at the custom-houses. Further, when an entry is made, there is a declaration by the importer as to where the goods come from. So, hon. gentlemen opposite are alarmed before they are hurt.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is very true that the importer makes a declaration, where the goods come from. We can see the absurdity of such a declaration, because it is impossible for him to know where they are manufactured. He may know that he bought them in England, but he does not know where they were made. I place very little confidence in the affidavit of the importer, and, in fact, it is unfair to ask him to make any such declaration, because it will be impossible for him to know the facts.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). If they are made in Germany, there is a mark to that effect on the goods, and there is no difficulty.

Mr. HENDERSON. If we are going to rely on the brand, we may expect that goods from Germany will be marked "manufactured in England." The question of brand is of very little importance. The hon. Minister (Mr. Fielding) did not fully answer the question of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), and it is a very important question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) repeat it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I shall. I say it is an important question because I anticipate that the customs officers throughout the country and the importing public will watch this debate very closely, and will be guided to a very considerable extent by what is said here as to the manner in which they shall carry on their business. The question was : What machinery is the Minister of Customs going to employ in order to determine where the goods were manufactured. There is a difficulty there that I am unable to get over. The Minister of Customs may be a very wise man ; he may have knowledge of a great many different lines of business, but I am utterly at a loss to know what kind of evidence he can get to satisfy him in each particular case where these goods were made, or how much labour had been expended upon them in Great Britain and how much in other countries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is the very fact that you cannot at present determine all your machinery which makes it necessary to leave a large measure of discretion to the Minister. I think myself the Minister might adopt various means. The affidavit, if affidavits are to be used, should not alone be the affidavit of the importer, but you may have to produce some evidence from the manufacturer. However, these are matters of detail which it would be utterly impossible to determine in a statute, and that is the reason we ask to leave it to the Minister of Customs, feeling assured that his desire will be to carry out the clause in the spirit which both sides of the House seem to determine it should be interpreted.

Mr. MacPHERSON. I regret very much that I have not heard the whole of this discussion.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You have not missed much.

Mr. MacPHERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) says I have not missed much, and I dare say he is correct, but I wish to draw attention, in a few words, to the clause more particularly in so far as it relates to sugar refineries. I understand that the Minister of Finance has had communications from the sugar refiners, drawing attention to the fact that under the new tariff they will be in a worse position than they have been in since the commencement of sugar refining in Canada. I have no desire to speak on behalf of the refiners, but I do think they ought to have a fair hearing.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That question will come up on section "d" a little later on.

Mr. MACLEAN. I wish to impress upon the Government that they must take the greatest care in interpreting this preferen-

tial clause, that it shall be confined to England, and that other countries shall not get the benefit of it. If they do not start in to make the clause as narrow as it ought to be; if they allow it to be opened in the least degree, any number of frauds will be attempted to be perpetrated. The clause must be narrowed down to what it says and be kept there, and it will require the greatest firmness on the part of the Minister of Customs to protect the country against fraud.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We certainly have no desire to narrow it down with a view of defeating the preferential clause, but we have no intention to broaden it to the extent of allowing the fraudulent importation of goods.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Finance, talk around the matter as he pleases, is quite able to see the immense difficulties of administering this clause as it is worded. In the first place, the autocratic nature of it is plainly apparent. The Minister of Customs is really the boss of the whole situation; he is the supreme arbiter, he is the sole arbiter, and I do not have any sympathy with him for the amount of work that will be put on him, because in the first place he has invited it upon himself, and in the second place he is not here to-night when all these valuable suggestions are being made which might make his work a good deal easier, and which would give him a good deal of information which he will sadly need when he comes to the administration of this clause. So far as the manufactures are concerned, the clause is a most difficult one to administer, and it will really have the effect, especially in regard to goods coming from Great Britain, to render it possible to bring in under the preference certain manufactured goods from continental countries. I do not see how the Minister of Customs is going to keep them out. What is he going to do with regard to the large classes of manufactures that are almost indefinite in number, which can be partly made on the continent and brought to England and finished, and stamped as English manufacture, if they are stamped. The Canadian merchant goes to Birmingham or London or any other great mart and he buys these goods from the wholesale dealer. They are British goods; he is not to ask whether they are British goods or not; he simply buys them and he imports them into this country from Great Britain. What is the Minister of Customs going to do with reference to that? Who is to raise the question in the first place? Take a plate or anything of that kind, and suppose nine-tenths of the material and labour have been supplied in Germany or in any other continental country, and then it has been brought over to a British wholesale establishment and the finishing touches put on, and it is sold to the Canadian importer.

Mr. MACLEAN.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Would the hon. gentleman name one or two of this class of goods?

Mr. FOSTER. It does not require to name them in detail; they are legion. My hon. friend (Mr. Wood) says that any customs officer in this country can tell whether certain wares are made in Germany or Switzerland or not.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). So he can.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is intelligent, and he knows he is far more intelligent than the average customs officer, because of his long experience in business; but can he tell, when a ware is made partly in two countries, which country it is manufactured in? If the whole article is completed in one country an experienced man will be able to tell, but does not my hon. friend (Mr. Wood) see that the conditions are now entirely changed. Formerly other countries paid the same duties as did Britain, and therefore they had no object in partly making the goods in one country and sending them to be finished in Great Britain. But under the present circumstances this would be a great advantage to them.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I am speaking of my own class of goods in which I have been dealing for nearly fifty years. It is well known throughout Canada by the customs officers, what class of goods are made in the different countries. They are known not only by the quality and appearance of the goods but by the invoice and everything about them.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot get my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) to look at it from my point of view. Suppose you take the pattern of a spoon or fork or knife; suppose you cut it out with the die in the United States, and bring it to Canada and have it finished here by a Canadian finisher. My hon. friend knows nothing about what has taken place in the process. Is he going to tell, when that is presented to him as a finished article, whether a part of it was made in the United States or whether it was not?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). An experienced hardware man can tell it in an instant. It is his business to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. It will be exactly the same pattern and will be made out of the same kind of raw material. Is there anything in the air of Rochester, for instance, which will leave on a piece of steel an impress or a smell which will enable my hon. friend to distinguish it when he puts his nasal organ near it?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). There is a finish on the goods peculiar to each country that is easily detected by an experienced man.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I do not think I can carry on the argument with my hon.

friend. I will have to address my argument to the common sense of plain men who have not had that experience in hardware and kindred goods. I am addressing myself now to the Minister of Finance and the administrators of the tariff. How can they tell whether an article has been manufactured in Great Britain or not? Who will raise the question? The British exporter will not raise it, because it is his interest to sell the goods to Canada; the manufacturer in Germany or Belgium or Switzerland, who has sent the raw material or the half-finished goods to the British manufacturer will not raise it; the importer himself will not raise it. Who, then, is to raise the question? It can only be raised in two ways. Either the Customs Department must be suspicious of everything, and demand the evidence with regard to everything imported from Great Britain, or else those who make a similar article in this country must have their legion of spies and detectives everywhere, and object to everything in their line that comes in. This is a common-sense way of viewing the matter. That is exactly what will take place. I fear that what we shall really have under this combination of things will be, not preferential trade with Great Britain, but that manufactured goods will trickle through Great Britain or be collaborated between the two countries, and will be brought in from every manufacturing country in Europe, so far as that can be profitably done; and the competition in business is so great that wherever an opening can be found for goods at one-fourth less duties by carrying out a certain process of collaboration, the incentive is to do it. Then, I would like to ask my hon. friend on what principle it is that he gives the preference to the West India Islands, making no distinction between the good and the bad, but letting the rain of his bounty fall equally on the just and the unjust. In the different colonies, as he knows, the duties are very divergent. Some of them have very high duties on the products which we send to them; others have very light duties. In Bermuda, I believe, the whole tariff on imported goods is extremely low, and goods from there might be let in under the preferential tariff on the same ground as goods from Great Britain. But there are other colonies, the tariffs of which are especially hard on the products which our farmers would send them. You make no distinction; all is given up, and for nothing. There can be no principle for this at all, except one of unbounded generosity, under which, without getting anything at all in return, we give to the West Indies a preference in our markets. With reference to the substantial portion of the labour, suppose the question does arise, and the Minister of Customs is to make his decision, what course of argument will have to be taken

to convince him of the exact amount of labour necessary? I have not heard my hon. friend make any explanation of what would be called a substantial portion of the labour to be put into the production. There is nothing definite at all. It is one of the most indefinite clauses that could possibly be framed, and it is so framed that in the end what it will evolve itself into is, I think, practically an import of all that class of articles which can be brought through British channels of trade into this country, oftentimes by having them finished in Great Britain, perhaps more frequently by not having them finished at all; because our German friends are particularly bright in adapting themselves to the foibles and customs of the people with whom they trade. I cannot understand how my hon. friend is going to guard that phrase. Perhaps he has some idea of what he understands by a substantial portion of the labour.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think my hon. friend overlooks this important fact: Great Britain is still a very great manufacturing country; and, although in some few lines Germany has run her close, it is not to be supposed that in the great majority of articles that will come in, the Germans can afford to handicap themselves, as they would be obliged to do if, instead of importing direct to us, as at present, they would first have to send their goods to Great Britain to undergo there some process of finishing, and to pay the middlemen for handling them before sending them to Canada. I think the English manufacturer, with that advantage in his hands, would be able, not in all cases perhaps, but pretty completely, to keep out of our market his German competitor, whom he is very anxious to keep out; while, on the other hand, if it were proved that evasion was taking place, I think you could trust our manufacturers, who will keep a tolerably close eye on these matters, to keep the Minister of Customs pretty well advised as to any attempts at evasion by means of colourable importations. After one or two years of administration it may be possible to comply with the hon. gentleman's wishes to define this provision more closely. But I would point out that in England, where an enormous proportion of everything she makes is made up of articles imported from every quarter of the globe, it would utterly destroy any preferential advantage we propose to give her if we were to construe this clause too strictly. The hon. gentleman exaggerated the number of articles that will be imported from Germany and other foreign countries through England. What little experience I have had in that way tends to show that you cannot possibly send goods from the place of manufacture in a foreign country to a centre like London, Birmingham or Manchester or any of the other export points in England, with-

out incurring pretty considerable additional expense in the way of transport charges and the treatment necessary in England to put these goods in shape for export. If we attempted to define exactly how this is done, we should fall into tenfold trouble. The only possible way of carrying this out is to give a reasonable amount of discretion to the Minister of Customs. The hon. gentleman knows too that this is necessary, in the interest of the revenue, to prevent the interminable litigation that may occur if the exporters were allowed to appeal from pillar to post—from the Minister of Customs to the Governor in Council, the Treasury Board and the courts. After all is said and done, it is a question of the remission of duties. It is a question of giving certain privileges to certain parties who qualify for them, and therefore it is fair and just that the Government should impose reasonable regulations on these parties and put the onus of proof on them in case of any dispute.

Mr. HUGHES. I notice in the resolution that certain islands, Jamaica, the Bahamas and other West India islands come under the preference schedule. I do not rise to find fault but only to make a suggestion, and it is this. Canada bonuses a line of steamships running to Australian colonies. En route they call at the Fiji Islands and New Zealand. Queensland produces all tropical commodities that these other localities do. For instance, Queensland is reputed to be one of the best sugar districts in the world. The Fiji Islands also produce vast quantities of sugar and tropical fruits. These colonies take immense quantities of Canadian manufactures. They also take farm products and are consumers of large quantities of Canadian flour, and other Canadian commodities in the off seasons, which they themselves produce. For instance, while Tasmania and other Australasian colonies produce apples in great quantities, which they export to the old land in season, they also import apples in the off season. They also import large quantities of our wood and timber. There is not a steamer leaving Vancouver, which does not leave behind it hundreds of tons of freight. The difficulty is to encourage return freight. These colonies buy so much from us that it is only fair, following out this line of policy, that the Government should give them some consideration, when giving consideration to the other colonies, and I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that the Australasian colonies are just as loyal, just as favourable to the preferential trade, and were just as anxious to see the privileges accorded to Germany and Belgium in the treaties abrogated as we were. For years, these colonies endeavoured, as Canada did, to have these treaties abrogated, so that when these privileges are being extended to our sister colonies in the West Indies, it is only fair they should be extended to the Australasian colonies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. McDUGALL. Referring to the point that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) speaks so lightly of, I would like to ask the hon. Finance Minister what there is in these resolutions that would prevent the exporting houses of Germany, Belgium or France from sending the cheap products that enter into the manufacture of certain lines of goods to England, putting them together in England, and then exporting them to this country, without paying the duty that would otherwise be imposed upon them. Take, for instance, the article of ladies' hats, which might consist of ribbons, feathers, velvets, laces and a number of other articles, all of which might be manufactured in foreign countries and be worked into hats in England. How can it be expected that the customs officers in this country will be able to tell where any of those articles come from that enter into the composition of a hat made in England. I am satisfied it would be impossible. The same argument might be applied to hundreds of other articles. Take, for instance, mantles, certain lines of dress goods, boots and shoes, woollen and silk goods, socks, stockings, ties, buttons, in all of which the cheap products that enters into their manufacture may be made out of England but put together in that country and thence imported into Canada, under this reduction. In what way are the officers of customs going to be able to tell where any of these products were originally manufactured.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman could not have been present when I previously answered the same question. It is difficult to tell exactly how it will be done, and that is the reason why we should not endeavour to do it. The object of the clause is to give the Minister of Customs power to deal with the cases as they present themselves. If, in the case of hats, it is apparent to the Minister of Customs that only a small part of the work was done in England, and that it was practically of foreign manufacture, sent to England to evade the law, the Minister would exclude it from the effect of this clause. I do not see how by any words we can meet the difficulties, and I think it much better to leave the matter to the discretion of the Minister. I do not pretend that you can define the exact way in which this difficulty can be met, but everything possible for human intelligence to do will be done, and the object of the provision will be best carried out by leaving to the Minister the discretion we desire to leave him, rather than attempt to tie him down by any hard and fast line which hon. gentlemen opposite would have great difficulty in defining.

Mr. McDUGALL. The hon. gentleman must admit that it is impossible for the Minister of Customs or the officers of customs to make the distinction, and therefore why

not put some other machinery in the hands of the hon. Minister.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. What would the hon. gentleman suggest?

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. I would suggest this. If it were my business, I would put such machinery as this in the hands of the customs. Let him exact from the manufacturers a declaration to the effect that the articles which enter chiefly into the manufacture of any particular article are the product of British manufacture and not of foreign manufacture.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. That is a fair suggestion and no doubt the Minister of Customs will adopt it.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. I contend that it is Parliament that should give him power to do so.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Parliament gives it by this resolution.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. I speak subject to correction, but it seems to me that Parliament should specifically give this power to the Minister of Customs.

Mr. **WOOD** (Hamilton.) That is largely done at present.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. The power should be given by this resolution.

Mr. **CLARKE**. I would like to have some information with regard to the importation of such articles as biscuits, confectionery, marmalade, jams, &c. These articles are made, to a great extent, in the British Isles out of the bounty sugar of foreign countries. Is it intended that they shall be admitted under the preferential tariff? Then take the case of pulp. Vast quantities of wood pulp are exported from this country to the old country and there made into paper. Will that paper be allowed in under the preferential tariff?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I should almost hope that it would, if made out of good Canadian pulp. I do not know why it should not.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. Of course the importation of wood pulp is not confined to wood pulp from Canada. Vast quantities will be imported from the United States and other countries. Will the pulp manufactured from that foreign wood pulp come under the preferential clause?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Much would depend on the proportion of British labour entering into it. If it were substantially the manufacture of British industry, it would come in, but there again it is a matter concerning which we cannot give any details. The hon. gentleman will observe that we have made provision for dealing with refined sugar; but sugar enters

into the manufacture of so many articles that I am afraid it would be impossible to follow it in all its ramifications. We have made provision for the admission of refined sugar only when manufactured from raw sugar produced in the British possessions; but as respects the various articles into the manufacture of which sugar enters, that would open up a wide range of articles indeed.

Mr. **CLARKE**. Would marmalade, biscuits, and so on, come under this preferential clause?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Only when shown to the satisfaction of the Minister of Customs that the percentage of British labour entering into them was such that they ought to get the preference.

Mr. **IVES**. Take the article of paper to which my hon. friend has referred. Wood pulp is imported from the United States. Chemical wood pulp, when the freight is paid and it is delivered free on board in London or Liverpool, costs about £9 or very nearly two cents a pound. That is all from the United States, and the result of United States labour and wood, and the British manufacturer will make that into paper and send it back here, and sell it for 3½ cents per pound, so that more than half the value of the paper is the result of United States labour and material and freight charges. There is a case in which you let in an article, under the preferential clause, of which more than half is the result of foreign labour and material, coming from a country not entitled to a preference at all. I think that you will find that you must limit this resolution to raw material, even if you have to set up a separate clause declaring that wool and raw cotton and other articles we might mention are to be considered raw material. Limit the resolution to the importation of goods made entirely from British labour, though the raw material be imported, and by a second clause say that, for the purposes of this Act, wool, pig iron, steel, &c., shall be considered as raw material for the purposes of this Act. The difficulty is working out the provision, as it is, will be found insuperable.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I just want to point to two or three articles only that enter largely into the imports of Canada, for instance, bicycles and their parts. A large quantity of bicycles and parts of bicycles are imported from foreign countries into England. We expect large quantities, and if we are able to export large quantities, other countries can do likewise. We also import very large quantities of bicycles and their parts. I would like to ask how it would be possible for the Minister of Customs, under the discretionary powers given him and with the desire that we ought to have the resolution lived up to as nearly as possible, to be able to judge matters of that kind.

Take also leather, of which large quantities are imported into England from all countries. Canada, in fact, exports very considerable quantities, and imports again. Take leather belting. Could any customs officer, or could the Minister of Customs himself, tell anything about a matter of that kind? He is absolutely in the dark in the application of this clause. What will follow? There will be an uncertainty and disturbance in trade that the people of this country should not be subjected to. Suppose that a large quantity of rice is imported, what would be the hon. gentleman's view with regard to that? I do not know whether he regards the cleaning of the rice as a manufacture. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce thought it a very small part of the work, and used to think that a few rice-mills were living at the expense of the people of this country. And yet that is a question the hon. gentleman will have to deal with, if this resolution becomes law. This is not a question of giving discretionary power. After all, that is given. The question is, as to the utter impossibility of the Minister of Customs working it out, no matter what machinery he is able to employ. I have pointed out that it was quite impossible for the hon. gentleman to learn the facts upon which to decide these questions. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) tells us that he would know; but we have not a hardware man, or an expert in woollens or cottons at every customs-house. The Minister of Customs himself, doing him full justice, would not be able to work it out. But we are told, and I admit that it has much weight, that, if we have preferential trade, the same question will arise. I hope that that question will come under a different form from this. When it does, we shall have to lay down some hard and fast rules. We may not be prepared to admit so many classes of goods as here proposed, and the reason why we would limit them would be, the safety of the people manufacturing a similar class of goods in this country. The great question is, as to the difficulty of applying this clause.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Finance, if he has any idea what amount of trade in imports into this country will be diverted from foreign countries to Great Britain. Of course, I do not suggest an exact computation; a general estimate is all we can ask for. But, in looking over this matter, the Minister of Finance must have considered the effect of this clause, and must have considered whether, in this matter, we are giving any substantial advantage or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I am unable to give the hon. gentleman a formal estimate. We do consider that we are giving, in one sense, a substantial advantage to Great Britain, so far as favourable tariff terms are an advantage.

Mr. CLANCY.

and also an advantage to the people of Canada, in giving this reduction. We have not made even an approximate estimate of the amount. Speaking generally—and we can only speak generally—when you come to make a distinction of 25 per cent between British goods and foreign goods, the importations of British goods must very substantially be increased. But we are not able to give figures; we have made no estimate.

Mr. POWELL. According to the figures of British trade, the situation must certainly be alarming to the British traders. Since 1878, I find by our returns that our importations have increased twenty millions, taking the year 1878 and last year. I find that while our total importations have increased twenty millions, our importations from Great Britain have decreased eight millions, but our importations from the United States—I am speaking of importations for home consumption—have increased no less than thirteen millions, from France, \$1,500,000; from Germany, \$7,000,000; from Belgium, \$700,000; from China and Japan, \$2,800,000; from all other countries, \$4,500,000. Now, if the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the Minister of Customs hope to turn the tide of affairs and to allow a further increase to British trade at the expense of foreign trade, then I would like to know that before I vote for this measure. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he hopes so to divert trade from foreign countries to Great Britain as to turn the tide that has been running against Great Britain for the last twenty years.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman will see that on the whole Great Britain will have an advantage as against her American and German competitors, of probably six to nine per cent. Now, if the British merchant is not able, with such an advantage as that, greatly to improve his position, he does not deserve to. In my opinion he will have a great advantage over the whole of his foreign competitors, and we mean him to have it, it is for him to make use of it. In my opinion he has been negligent, and his own official reports show that he has been negligent in adapting himself to our trade, and to the trade of other countries. But he is picking up. We are giving John Bull a chance. There is no doubt that the tide has been turning heavily against English importations. Our trade with the Americans has increased very much faster than our trade with Great Britain, and I think it is time to give the old country a chance. I cannot say, nor can any man say absolutely, how soon or how far that may extend.

Mr. POWELL. We might have an estimate.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is a matter of extreme difficulty, as the hon. gentleman knows, particu-

larly if he will cast his eye over the column of imports he has in his hand, and it depends on a good many more things than the exact amount of taxes levied under a tariff, to say how trade will develop itself.

Mr. FOSTER. And so none of you have attempted it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Some of us may have attempted it, but having examined it, we find how extremely impossible it would be to estimate the exact amount, as it was for my hon. friend to estimate the exact amount of revenue he would be receiving for the year 1897. He will recollect there, that with all his experience, he was considerably out, although he accounted for it. But I think everybody will see this, that where you give such advantages as we propose to give, there is a strong probability that English trade will increase and expand. I may remark that with such information as has come to us within the last two or three months, the Government are able to say that it is increasing. There was a considerable improvement in the quarter ending on the first day of this month in the exports from Great Britain to Canada. I have not got the figures by me, perhaps my hon. friend has, but they were quoted. I think to the best of my recollection that the exports from Great Britain showed an increase of 12 per cent over the corresponding quarter of last year. Now, that is a tolerable indication that the steps that have been taken—

Mr. POWELL. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if that is more than proportional to the general increase of importations during the same period?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think it is considerably more. The increase in importations generally I think has not been that. Of course, these are taken from the British trade returns. The exports to Canada during March increased 6 per cent, and for the three months increased 12 per cent. That is the statement which was quoted by my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). All British exports to all countries during the same period decreased 4 to 3 per cent respectively. This contrast in Canada's favour may fairly be attributed to the new Canadian tariff. I cannot at this moment give the exact increase in our importations for these three months. But speaking from recollection, I think that although they did increase to the extent of 12 per cent, I think perhaps they may have increased all told to the amount of 7 or 8 per cent. But to make an absolutely accurate estimate would be really impossible; I would not undertake to do it. If the hon. gentleman wants a guess he must recollect it would be purely a guess—my impression is that the increase in all probability may be four or five millions on that trade, that is, as soon as the

25 per cent tariff comes into operation. At present he will remember that we are working under a reduction of 12½ per cent, which is not likely to make anything like as great an improvement as the 25 per cent tariff. But remember I do not offer it as a prediction, but simply as a very rough estimate.

Mr. POWELL. I am prepared to accept that. Now, Sir, in any view we may take of this matter, it is a perfect sham. In the first place, if it does not give a benefit to the British trader and to the British exporter, it is a sham. It is a sham so far as the British manufacturer is concerned. If it does act favourably to him, and increases the exportations from Great Britain to this country to the amount of five millions, then it is a fraud and a sham so far as the gain to the taxpayers of this country is concerned. The Minister of Finance said that the taxpayers of this country would derive all the benefit that would result from increased importations from Great Britain. That is the most palpable fallacy. Suppose, for instance, that this scheme is going to divert the import trade to the amount of ten millions from the United States to Great Britain. What does that mean? If we import goods to the amount of ten millions from the United States, supposing we take an average duty of 33½ per cent, that would mean \$3,333,333 of customs duties to be paid into the public treasury. A quarter of that would mean \$833,333 which is the amount under the preferential tariff which is really given as a bonus to the English manufacturer. Now if that amount, under the preferential tariff, is necessary, and it may be necessary, because the question is of such dubiety that a gentleman so versed in commerce as the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not willing to stake his reputation upon its diverting any foreign trade to Great Britain, it must be a matter of extreme dubiety whether it is going to take the full amount of that preferential 25 per cent to give the trade to the British producer. If it does, what does that mean? We pay him the same amount with duty paid for our goods as we pay the producer of the United States, but the difference is this to the taxpayers of this country; if we buy ten million dollars worth of goods from the United States we are paying \$3,333,000 into the public treasury, and if we buy from Great Britain we are paying in, not that amount, but \$833,000, or one-fourth less. It is all hollow, it is a sham. If we do that, we are making to British producers and British manufacturers a present of \$833,000 per annum, and we actually ask the taxpayers of this country to put their hand into their pockets and pay that amount. That is the actual outcome of it, we cannot possibly avoid it. If the hon. gentleman estimates the effect of preference to British trade as against foreign trade, at five million, then the diversion of trade to Great Britain, for the sake of a sham fealty to the Empire, a fantastic Imperial idea, the taxpayers of

this country are asked to put their hands into their pockets for \$416,000 per annum. If we are going to buy those goods from Great Britain, let it be because British manufacturers can produce them as cheaply as others. If we are going to pay any amount to Great Britain, let us pay it to Great Britain herself. She protects our commerce on every sea, and, if we wish to assist her, let us contribute a ship to the navy or make a contribution in some such way; but to contribute money to men whom we are to assume to be lame and impotent, who are not able to hold their own in fair competition with the rest of the world, is absurd. Where are all the arguments of the Minister of Trade and Commerce which he formerly advanced against protection and against bloated protectionists? Where is his loud complaint about the hundreds of millions of dollars that he, when in Opposition, said went into the already too-full pockets of the manufacturers? There is no sympathy for our manufacturers now, so we are going to put the money into the pockets of the manufacturers of England.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Our taxpayers will get the benefit from getting goods at reduced rates.

Mr. POWELL. No, not at lower prices; but we will enable the British manufacturers to get their goods in here. We will not get the goods cheaper or get any benefit, but the British producers will get the benefit and have that portion of our trade, and by the amount of the reduction through the preference our revenue will be short. I would be untrue to my constituents, did I in any way undertake or desire to deny our right to help Great Britain along; but if we are going to help Great Britain, let us help, not the producers in Manchester or Sheffield but the British nation as a nation, and let it be a fair business equivalent for the need of protection she affords our commerce on every sea.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As Great Britain takes two-thirds of our exports, and is likely to take a great deal more, and as there is no better axiom in trade than that, if you want some one to buy from you, you must buy from them, we will be encouraging trade with them and assisting our own producers, too. It is clear as daylight, that, if you reduce the tax on a given article, the Canadian consumer will get the benefit of it. I know, of course, that hon. gentlemen opposite do not care anything for the interest of the consumers.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman says, that, in order to have trade, we must buy from those whom we wish to buy from us. Hon. gentlemen opposite in this show the fallacy of their whole argument. Our exports to Great Britain have been rolling up by leaps and bounds, and last year increased \$17,000,000, while imports from Great Britain have, year to year, decreased; at the

Mr. POWELL.

same time, our exports to the United States have declined, while our imports have increased year after year.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. By the National Policy.

Mr. POWELL. I do not care what did it. The hon. gentleman is too keen a logician not to know that his remarks are not pertinent to the issue. The hon. gentleman made the point, that reciprocity was needed to secure export trade. My contention is that under modern conditions that is not true, and my contention is supported by the results of trade in every part of the civilized world.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I wish to inquire, what amount of money was refunded to countries outside of Great Britain for goods that were imported subject to duty without giving the preferential tariff of last year, up to the time it was decided to apply the preferential tariff to those articles?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry I cannot make a definite reply to the hon. gentleman, in the absence of the Minister of Customs. I think the amount was about \$100,000; I make that statement subject to correction.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then, about \$100,000 was the necessary reduction under the 12½ per cent. It is understood that it cost the country \$100,000 for the Government to adopt the plan adopted last year, by going blindly into giving a preferential tariff only to Great Britain.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only difference between my hon. friend and myself is, that I do not agree that we proceeded blindly in this matter, but that we proceeded with very intelligent sight, and accomplished what we desired.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I understood the hon. gentleman said the preferential tariff would not apply to those other countries, and he went into it blindly. If he had taken the advice of the ex-Minister of Finance, who told him that it was impossible to carry out the plan as laid before the House and the country, we would not have been obliged to pay \$100,000. It would have been better to have induced the mother country to remove the restrictions which were subsequently removed, and have thus saved \$100,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the Minister of Finance will bring down a correct statement of the refunds paid, because it will show the amount we were obliged to pay, and for which the people have got no benefit, and which they had to pay for the blunder of the Minister. Those goods were brought in, they paid an increased duty, they were sold to the consumers on the basis of the increased duty, and, after the consumer had paid the full price, plus the increased duty, it was found that the Government had to put their hands into the Treasury to the amount of \$100,000 and make a present to

those gentlemen who exported the goods. The hon. gentleman may be cock-sure of many things, but, if he is cock-sure about tariff changes, it would be a very good lesson to him, if he had to pay the penalty. It is very easy to make these blunders, and then, when the penalty has to be paid, to put your hands in the Treasury and pay out the necessary money. I want to make the point plainly—and the hon. gentleman cannot deny it—that the consumers first paid the increased duty and then had to pay a penalty in the shape of \$100,000, or \$150,000, for this blunder of the Minister. A cognate point has been made by my hon. friend (Mr. Powell), and the Minister of Trade and Commerce did not answer it, and did not attempt to answer it. It was, that, if you put up a general tariff to a certain height, and if a country cannot on certain articles come in and compete, and you let down the fence so that that country is able to compete under the general tariff, and you allow it to come in, what benefit would the consumer obtain from a little gap being made. They are as bright and keen for the penny, those English exporters and manufacturers, as are Canadian, and, when they get through the gap and find the general height of the tariff is so much, they intend to have everything allowed by the general tariff. If they do not get the benefit, the importers here will get it, but the consumers will not obtain it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not imagine that we on this side of the House will ever be able to act so that hon. gentlemen opposite will not be able to rise in their places and denounce our actions, and say that we have blundered. It is an easy thing for the hon. gentleman to say that we have committed a blunder in everything, but the repeated assertion of that has not been accepted by the country as a fact, and will not be accepted as a fact in the future. If hon. gentlemen assume that, by stating day after day that we have blundered, they are making any gain and progress, I can tell them that they are under a mistake. The public will judge by results, and not by the empty statements of hon. gentlemen opposite. When the hon. gentleman says that, on goods on which a part of the duty was refunded, the consumers had to pay the higher tariff, his statements are open to doubt. The bulk of the goods were, no doubt, sold after a reasonable period had elapsed after the facts respecting the refunds became known, and sold in the ordinary way and at prices which would allow an ordinary selling profit to the merchant. So, it is fairly open to argument as to whether whatever was repaid did not really go back to the people. Something has been said about preferential trade being a sham. If any sham, if there has been any sham, it is in hon. gentlemen opposite pretending to be in favour of preferential trade in any way, when every statement they have made and every argument they have used to-night has been against preferen-

tial trade in every shape and form. They put up difficulties in the way and they ask: How are you going to do this, how are you going to do that, and how are you going to do the other thing; when every one of these imaginary difficulties would arise if they had preferential trade according to their own way of getting it. And yet, Sir, they assume that all these difficulties are peculiar to the preferential trade we propose to establish, when they must know that if they exist at all, they will exist under any system. If we take two prominent gentlemen opposite who have discussed the question to-night as fair exponents of the views of the Conservative party, then it is a perfect sham to say they are in favour of preferential trade in any form. My hon. friend from Sherbrook (Mr. Ives) says he would admit no goods from England unless the whole of these goods were made in England from English materials. Well, you cannot admit English manufactures at all if you do that. When an hon. gentleman says that any goods made in England out of commodities imported from abroad shall not receive the benefit of preferential trade, then he denies the whole theory of preferential trade. There is not an English manufacturer who would not say that preferential trade of that kind offered to England is a sham of the worst sort. Then, my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) is against preferential trade altogether, because the whole trend of his argument went to show that by a reduction of 25 per cent you give nothing to England. How much would he give? Is it not a fair question to ask him, would he give a reduction of 26 per cent, 27 per cent, 28 per cent, or 50 per cent. If 25 per cent preferential rate will give nothing to England, how much are they prepared to give on the other side of the House. My hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) makes it clear that he is not prepared to give anything, for he does not want any goods to be brought from England under a preferential tariff. My hon. friend from Westmoreland says it is a sham because the preference is only 25 per cent, but I venture to say that hon. gentlemen on the other side are not prepared to name the rate of preference at which they will admit English goods. If there is any sham at all in this matter, it is not a sham on the part of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; it is a sham on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite who talk preferential trade as they have been talking it for the last ten years, but who have taken very good care never to carry it into effect.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has waxed very warm indeed at the position taken by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House with reference to preferential trade.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is your position?

Mr. HENDERSON. In order perhaps to give the hon. gentleman a little more reason for speaking as he did, I may say that so far as I am concerned, I am totally opposed to his plan of preferential trade, and have always been. I am not ashamed to state that; I stated it last year when this question was under discussion and I have not changed my mind since.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is your plan?

Mr. HENDERSON. My system of preferential trade would be one by which we would get something for what we give. I never approved, and do not expect ever to approve, of a system of preferential trade that will be all give and no get. I do not think that is the kind of preferential trade we want in Canada. The Minister (Mr. Fielding) asked the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) to name the rate of preference that would be satisfactory to him. The rate I name would be, the equivalent to Canada for what we give to Great Britain. I think that would be a fair rate and the only rate that can be properly named. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce told us some time ago that he desired to give John Bull a chance. Well, I am sure that John Bull will be very grateful indeed to Canada for the chance we propose to give him. But, Sir, we must remember that in this country we have a great many of John Bull's children who have come here to make their home and their living, and it is our duty to give them a chance just as well as to give it to their father in England. They are much more entitled to our care than is John Bull, Sr., who is much better able to take care of himself. I am much more interested in John Bull's children in this country than I am in John Bull himself in the old land, and I believe it is unfair that we should open the door for the exclusive advantage of the manufacturers of Great Britain and give them an opportunity to send their manufactured goods in here to the detriment of our own mechanics, our own artisans, and our own workmen. We must remember that every dollar's worth of goods that is sent in here from Great Britain must of necessity reduce by a corresponding amount the quantity of goods manufactured in this country; it must have a tendency to reduce the employment of labour in this country, and also to reduce the wages paid for that labour. For that reason, I again say that I am not in favour of the kind of preferential trade which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has imposed.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I am surprised to hear an Englishman talk as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) has. England has for years taken everything we had to send her without charging us a cent of duty, and now are we to say to England: You must give us 5 per cent preference over every other country or we will not

Mr. HENDERSON.

give you preferential trade with us. I am surprised that any man claiming to be not only an Englishman, but a Canadian would make such a statement as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson). It has been stated on the other side of the House that as the result of this preferential tariff the merchants did not reduce their prices, and that therefore the consumers did not get any advantage because of the reduction of the duty. I may tell hon. gentlemen opposite that all the leading wholesale houses not only reduced the price of the goods imported under the 12½ per cent reduction, but they also reduced the price of the same class of goods in stock before the reduction. I am satisfied that the people of Canada have derived a very substantial benefit, and when they come to get the 25 per cent reduction on the 1st July next, the price of the stock on hand will also be reduced to that amount, so that the consuming population of this country will derive a substantial benefit from the preferential tariff.

Mr. TAYLOR. On what articles?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). On all articles imported from England, and that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) knows quite well. He is conversant with the fact that in buying certain English articles which he uses in his manufactory, he got the benefit of the reduced tariff even to the one-eighth, and when the reduction comes to the one-quarter, he will receive the benefit of it, not only upon the stock freshly imported, but upon the stock held on hand at that time.

Mr. POWELL. In reply to the Minister of Finance, I may say that while he does not mean to be unfair, he might as well mean it, for he has displayed unfairness in his argument. What I said was this: that this was a sham in any way we looked at it. If it did not divert trade from foreign countries to Great Britain, it was a delusion so far as the British exporter was concerned, and if it did, it was a sham so far as the Canadian taxpayer was concerned. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) asks me, what amount of reduction I would have? I would have no reduction without there was a quid pro quo. That is what we understand on this side of the House by a preferential tariff. If there is a quid pro quo, then I am prepared to make a reduction, but not otherwise.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am quite satisfied with that explanation.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told us that the consumer got the benefit of the rebate in duty that was given to the importer, and that statement was backed up by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood). It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that every man in this House ought to know, that it is not

the consumer who buys the goods first after they enter into this country. Take, for instance, the importer from Montreal who imports goods from Germany. He imports the sample first. His traveller goes all over the country and sells the goods on the sample at a certain price. The importer orders a sufficient quantity of the goods to supply the sales which have been effected by his traveller; the goods are imported by the importer, and they are distributed to the retailers throughout the country. Does the Finance Minister mean to tell me, after the importer in Montreal imported \$4,000 worth of goods and paid \$1,000 of duty on them, and after say, six months, the Government refunded 12½ per cent of those duties, that the importer in Montreal went to all his customers throughout Canada, amounting to a hundred or several hundred, and handed over to them their share of that refund? I say no. No sane man would attempt to offer such an argument. The consumer paid the duty, and the importer or the manufacturer got the benefit. Not only did the consumer pay the 12½ per cent refunded by the Government, but whatever profit the importer and the retailer chose to put on that 12½ per cent, and not one cent of the money refunded by the Government went to the consumer. It may be that to the extent of what the importer kept in his warehouse, if he ventured to import a certain quantity above what he sold in advance, and held it for future sales, he would cut down his prices; but on the goods that were already distributed to the retailers throughout the country and from them to the consumers, not one cent was given back to the consumers or to the retailers.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask the Minister of Finance a question or two in reference to a statement made by the Minister of Customs in his speech on the Budget. The Minister of Customs stated that for the six months ending the 31st of December, 1897, the reduction, owing to the 12½ per cent on the preferential tariff, amounted to \$521,451. I want to inquire if he took into consideration the \$100,000, more or less, that the Minister of Finance just now stated, in reply to an inquiry from this side of the House, was refunded—if that sum of \$521,451 was collected over and above the refund, or if it should be reduced by the amount of the refund? Then I would like him to tell me also what proportion of the goods that made up this \$521,451 came from England, and what proportion came from other countries; because the Minister of Customs made the statement that if the reduction were applied to a year it would amount to \$1,000,000, and if applied to two years it would amount to \$2,000,000; though it is patent to everybody that the preferential tariff for the six months preceding the 31st of December, 1897, applied to nearly all countries. I believe that the United States was about the

only exporter to Canada that did not receive the abatement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it would be better that I should leave my hon. friend to put that question to the Minister of Customs at a later stage, when he will be here. I have not the figures with me, and I would prefer that the Minister of Customs should answer the question himself.

Mr. DAVIN. I rather think some of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches misunderstand the position taken on this side of the House in regard to a preferential arrangement with England. We are glad, of course, to see that the hon. gentlemen who for so long took a pro-United States position, now that they are in power, are driven by the logic of events to take the loyal and Imperial position which they now take. The only thing in which we differ from them is this, that we think it would not only be better for Canada, but better for the Empire at large, in making a preferential arrangement, if it were found feasible—and an attempt should be made to see whether it is feasible or not—not to have a jug-handled arrangement, but to have one that would be strictly and mutually preferential. In regard to the very thing we are now discussing, on March 30, my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) asked a question of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was then leading the House, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce said in reference to the question, which referred to a debate that took place on March 14, in the Imperial House of Commons:

I think my hon. friend will be able to obtain full information in a very short time, when the Budget is brought down. The propositions are necessarily closely intertwined with certain proposals of the Budget, and we hope then to give my hon. friend full satisfaction.

My hon. friend from East York was not the only person in this House who was very curious to know what was the significance of a most interesting debate which took place on the 14th of last month in the Imperial House of Commons, when Mr. Chamberlain moved for £120,000 for sundry colonial services, including certain grants in aid. In the early part of his speech, Mr. Chamberlain, referring to the general question of the trade of the West India Islands which Mr. Labouchere wanted to enter upon, said:

As I have already stated, in answer to a question of the hon. member for Northampton, that it will be impossible for me to enter upon this general question at the present time, and the reason will satisfy the House. It is this: that we are engaged in negotiating with the United States, and also with the Dominion of Canada, which we hope may result in a reciprocity arrangement between those two countries and the West Indies for West Indian products. I am

unable at the present to say that the negotiations have made much progress.

Mr. Chamberlain, referring to the grant, concluded with these words :

It is a small one, and must be treated as part of a great question of the future condition of the West Indies. To that matter we shall return as soon as the negotiations with the United States and Canada have come to an end ; but in the meantime we hope that the committee will not refuse the small grant we have asked.

Acting on the request of Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Labouchere and others abstained, apparently with difficulty, from going into the general question, and the vote was carried by 236 to 78, with a majority of 158. Now, there is a clear indication that at that time Mr. Chamberlain had some negotiation with this Government and with the Government of the United States for the purpose of bringing about a reciprocity between the West Indies and Canada and between the West Indies and the United States.

We have nothing to do with the United States here, but we have with Canada and the West Indies. As the Government are determined to make a one-sided preferential arrangement with England, I may say that I was very glad to see them take up a thoroughly Imperial position and show an interest in our colonies generally ; but I do not think, in the light of what we have here, and of what we know took place in the Imperial Parliament, that we ought to be satisfied with what the Minister of Finance tells us, in his Budget speech, on the very matter we are now discussing in committee. He said :

Knowing as we do that Her Majesty's Government are following this question very closely, knowing that they are dealing with a difficult problem in the face of many difficulties, it has occurred to us that, as the West Indies are our natural market, as they are British colonies, though far away in one respect, colonies with which we have close relations, that we have some Imperial responsibilities in this matter—it has occurred to us that we should be willing in a small way to lend a helping hand to those colonies in the sunny south. If we adhere too rigidly to the underlying feature of our preferential tariff, I am afraid we shall have to admit that the terms of the tariffs of the West Indies are not favourable to us, and perhaps we could not by a mere reciprocal clause extend the preferential tariff to the West Indies. We have examined the tariffs of the West Indies, and we find that while they are high tariffs to a considerable extent, they are in no sense protective tariffs.

The hon. gentleman gave the list of the West Indian tariffs, but now, when he states that these tariffs are high but not protective—that is his description of them—what would be in the way of any one or all of these islands that he set out in that list in his financial statement, giving to Canada, say, the 25 per cent preference which Canada is now about to give them ? I think we ought to be told in the committee why it is that the

Mr. DAVIN.

Government have not sought to get that preference in their markets on, for instance, our flour, oats, potatoes, butter, cheese, codfish, planks and boards. Why should it work other than well in their case to give us a 25 per cent preference ? Seeing what the character of their tariff is, they are not estopped by any free trade tendency, as is supposed to prevail in England and with the English people generally. I explained, the other night, that, even in England, there would be no difficulty—but I only referred to that in passing—in meeting the only argument that was used against Mr. Chamberlain's original idea to impose a countervailing duty on sugar, namely, that it was a tax on food. I just refer to that in passing, but what I say now is, that, in the light of the debate in the Imperial House of Commons, and the promise of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that, when the Minister of Finance came to deal with this matter, he would enlighten us with regard to the debate in the Imperial Parliament and Mr. Chamberlain's statement, we ought to have some explanation from him. Now that we are in committee, and can probe, in a conversational way and at the same time in a more thorough way, any subject that comes up, I think the Minister of Finance should give us some information on this matter.

As regards the question that was raised so pointedly by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), I think it would be a misinterpretation of the position taken by him, to hold that he feels any antagonism against giving a preference to England, or that he feels that some injury would be done to us, if England gained something by the preferential tariff. One of the horns of the dilemma set up by the hon. member for Westmoreland was this, that, if English goods come in, it would be because the 25 per cent preference enabled them to compete with goods from the United States, and so the Canadian consumer would not really get the benefit that was intended, because there was a contradictory position taken by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and, I think, also by the Minister of Finance. At one time they say : We are giving you 25 per cent of advantage, and we put a plus quantity on the side of the consumer in Canada : and the next moment, they say : We give you a 25 per cent advantage, and we put a plus quantity to the same amount on the side of the manufacturers and merchants in England. You cannot have your cake and eat it. The consumer cannot have the advantage of that, and at the same time the English manufacturer. The Government must adhere to the one side or the other, and I think that was a point well taken by the hon. member for Westmoreland, and pressed home logically, and not met.

What I rose chiefly to say was this. Those hon. gentlemen have taken the position and not the best position—that they will give

what they called a preference and not ask any advantage for Canada in return. As they have determined not to take the wise and logical course, both for Canada and the Empire, of asking for a preference for our manufacturers, our exporters and our farmers in the British markets, I am glad, nevertheless, to find that they are standing on good Imperial ground. I prefer to see them do that a great deal more than turn their eyes toward reciprocity or commercial union with the United States. I much prefer to see them take a course which has a Conservative colour to it, than see them take that course which would be in accordance with their past tradition. Nevertheless, there is one stage better than that, and it is a stage that would give us what Mr. Chamberlain, and Lord Salisbury, and the Duke of Devonshire thought we would have asked for, namely, that position in the British market which would be as advantageous, in the long run—aye, more advantageous—to the British manufacturing merchant than this one-sided arrangement, which has neither logic nor statesmanship in it.

It has none of the elements in it that will commend it all round. While I can rejoice that these hon. gentlemen have been forced into this position now, I certainly would prefer that the view that has been so well expounded many a time and oft by my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) should prevail. I showed in a speech that I made on the Address, when I quoted from reports of small mechanics' institutes and farmers' institutes throughout England, that a year before the right hon. the Premier went over there the people of England were discussing this question of preferential trade. Why, Sir, the English people were ripe for it, the English statesmen were ripe for it, and the unfortunate thing was that, no doubt, the strong free trade and pro-American party in the Cabinet, those men who were determined at all hazards to seek the Yankee dollar in preference to the English shilling, had made the Premier forswear his professions at Brantford, they had denuded him of the strength he had put on when he said he was as much in favour of preferential trade as Sir Charles Tupper himself, and by the time he had got across the Atlantic the message that was in his mouth was a wholly different one from what the people expected. It was the reverse of what happened in the case of Balaam. Balaam was brought to curse Israel, and he blessed Israel. The Canadian electorate, in voting for the present Prime Minister thought they were voting for a man who would bless preferential trade; but when he went to England he cursed it up hill and down dale; he could do nothing better than raise his head and throw out his hands and say that preference was protection and protection was a curse. He declared that we could not have a Zollverein, much to the amazement

of Mr. Chamberlain, of the Duke of Devonshire, of Lord Salisbury and all the English statesmen who thought that the time had come for a new step forward in binding the Empire more closely together. They found the Prime Minister of England's premier colony saying that he would have nothing to do with any preferential arrangement, a proposal that the statesmen of South Africa, the statesmen of Australia, one statesman excepted, that the statesmen of Canada—those statesmen who had built Canada up to what she is to-day—had nursed into the ripeness that it had attained; they found the Prime Minister of practically seven colonies, flouted the idea, and so for the time dashed our hopes to pieces. But, Sir, he did not kill the idea of preferential trade, and it is barely possible, looking at that debate in the Imperial Parliament, there may be something more for us to learn. I cannot believe that the answer given to my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) by the Minister of Trade and Commerce had no significance. It is barely possible that the Secretary for the Colonies, in asking the Finance Minister to do this favour for the West Indian colonies and so help the Minister when he was regularly pressed back in his seat, when he was turned down in the Cabinet by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, being enabled to say to the West Indies: In addition to the £120,000 voted, here is the great Dominion of Canada going to give you 25 per cent preference in her market—it is possible, I say, that there may have been some negotiations or arrangements. I would ask the Minister what negotiations or arrangements took place between himself and Mr. Chamberlain, and what inducements Mr. Chamberlain held out to him with reference to the future of inter-Imperial trade that is so dear to those who sit on this side of the House.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I must say I am somewhat surprised at the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), though I should not be surprised at any statement that he may make. I happened to attend the meeting of the United Chambers of Commerce, when the hon. gentleman's leader (Sir Charles Tupper), a gentleman of eloquence and ability, discussed this question with the statesmen of England. And, after two days hard work, there was not a vestige of his argument left by Sir John Lubbock and several of the leading statesmen of England. They stated that the manufacturers would never consent to even a 5 per cent preferential trade with Canada or any other colony. They showed that they had only 4 per cent of the trade of Canada, while we, like a lot of sturdy beggars, were asking for a 5 per cent preference upon our trade, though they had been for years and years taking everything we had to send them without charging us a farthing of duty. And yet the hon. gentleman wanted the

workingmen and operatives to pay an extra duty upon their imported goods for the purpose of enabling us to sell more in that market. I am surprised that Englishmen should attempt to handicap the mother country in such a way. Competing, as the English manufacturers do, with every part of the world, unless they have their capital and labour at the cheapest rate, it is not possible for them to be successful in the competition with the Germans, French and Belgians in foreign countries. They now receive everything we send free of duty, and we are still harping on getting a preference on the ground that we are letting them into our markets at less than we are charging other countries. I do hope the hon. member (Mr. Davin) will take a more patriotic view of this matter and come to the conclusion that anything we can give is a benefit to ourselves as well as to them.

Mr. DAVIN. Patriotic view, Mr. Chairman! The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) need not lecture me about patriotic views. I have nothing to learn about patriotism from the hon. gentleman or anybody else. There is a vulgar proverb that what is good for the goose is good for the gander. If it is good for our friends in England to have 25 per cent preference, why should it not be good for Canada to have 5 per cent? If it is no harm to give England 25 per cent preference, why in the name of Heaven should it do any harm to England, or do them anything but good, to give us 5 per cent preference? Now, I would like the hon. Minister of Finance to give us a little enlightenment on the subject that I brought to his attention a moment ago in reference to the West Indies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I made allusion to that subject in the Budget speech, and I do not think it would be politic, in the interests of the Dominion, that I should go into that question any further. This tariff is, so far as it relates to the West Indies, unconditional. We do however hope that good may come of it in another direction. I see the difficulty of hon. gentlemen opposite who do not view the matter from the same standpoint as we do. They still insist that unless we get something at every move, therefore the thing is a failure. The hon. gentlemen seem unable to learn that there is that that scattereth and yet increaseth. We do not think it is sound policy to demand at every stage that we shall get something for what we give. But we believe we will get something in most cases.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) says that the Canadian people are sturdy beggars. I would like to know what the hon. gentleman means by sturdy beggars.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Begging something for nothing.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton).

Mr. CLANCY. He is constantly saying that England is giving us so much, and we are giving nothing. We are speaking now entirely of trade matters, not of sentimental bubbles. England treats us justly, as she treats every other country in trade matters. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) pointed out a very serious fact. He shows that the trade in England is constantly declining, especially in certain articles and manufactures that hon. gentleman said would be a special benefit to us. He pointed out that England was behind in trade, and you must bring her up at the expense of the Canadian people. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) pointed out that if the English people are behind the age you have to bring them up by preference. Where will the difference stop? Just at the point barely to exclude foreign goods from other countries, and the Canadian people are to pay the whole price. If hon. gentlemen will say that England is now fighting for a share of Canadian trade, that she is standing on a level with all other countries, then if you give her a slight preference of 5 per cent and they would come in to that extent, give them 25 per cent and you will have English goods. But I defy any hon. gentleman on that side of the House to declare that that state of things exists to-day. There is no hope held out to the Canadian people beyond the one mentioned by the hon. member for Westmoreland, that to the extent that you are able to bring in goods that are constantly on the decline, and they must inevitably be brought in at the expense of the Canadian taxpayer.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the concluding words in that clause which says: "Whose decision shall be final." Is it intended by that that henceforth it is to be understood in the Customs Department that there are to be no appeals to any court of law on any rulings or decisions of the Minister of Customs? At present, I understand that if a party feel aggrieved in respect of an entry, then by petition of right to the Exchequer Court an appeal can be had. It must of necessity arise that a great many cases will present themselves where importers will ask that the Minister of Customs shall have placed before him every evidence, and under this ruling it will be necessary to bring the witnesses from England. On the other hand, if resort can be had, as the present procedure allows, then evidence can be taken in the old country by a commission.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This clause does not in any way interfere with any practice of the Customs Department, except as to the particular matter of which it treats. In dealing with the question, whether an English article shall be admitted at the preferential rate or the general rate, the design of this clause is that the judgment of the Min-

ister of Customs shall be final. We have put that in deliberately, because we believe that if you are going to have appeals either to the Treasury Board, or to the Governor in Council, or to the courts, or to any other body, constantly arising as they might under that, then that preferential tariff will be unworkable. We believe that after a few cases the meaning of that clause will be so clearly defined that importers will understand it, and there will be no need of appeal. But we thought that in the interest of the efficient working of the tariff, and in order to prevent the evasion of the law by colourable importations of foreign goods under the preferential rate, it is of the utmost importance that some tribunal shall have authority to decide finally, and we cannot imagine any other tribunal under our system than that of the Minister of Customs, who of course, in all these things, is not going to act arbitrarily. We are bound to consider that he will act as an intelligent official, responsible to his colleagues and through his colleagues to Parliament. But we think it would be a misfortune to leave room for appeals on the point the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it provided in the present customs regulations that there shall be no appeal beyond the appeals to the Minister of Customs, or do the present regulations of the Customs Department apply which allow appeal to the courts?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If there is such a regulation, this does not in any way change it. This deals particularly with the present case. As a matter of fact we know that appeals are made occasionally, I presume by petition of right. However, in this case the judgment of the Minister of Customs is intended to be final, but in the general administration of the tariff, whatever rights are open to the importer remain untouched by this Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask my hon. friend with relation to number 2 in connection also with "c" just above:

The Minister of Customs, with the approval of the Governor in Council, shall determine what British colonies or possessions shall be entitled to the benefits of the preferential tariff under clause "b" of this section.

Clause "b" is:

Any other British colony or possession, the customs tariff of which, on the whole, is as favourable to Canada as the British preferential tariff, herein referred to, is to such colony or possession.

I ask my hon. friend on what principle he gave preferential advantage to the West India colonies, inasmuch as there was a wide divergence in the duties they imposed on the products of Canada. With respect to the other colonies which are referred to in the clause I read, what is the principle which

the hon. gentleman and the Government are going to adopt? Are they going to let those colonies in arbitrarily because they think it would benefit the West India colonies to do it, or have they laid down a fixed principle that with respect to those other colonies they must come up to a certain range of preferential tariff with respect to Canadian goods different from what they give to outside countries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The principle acted upon is first to give the preference to Great Britain because Great Britain has a free trade system. In the second place we extend it generally to the colonies whose tariffs are favourable to our goods. Further, we admit the West Indies, because, while under a fair interpretation their tariffs are not such as would admit them, we specifically admit them for the reason stated in the Budget speech, that we desire to extend our trade with those colonies particularly, and further that owing to the difficulties under which the West India colonies are labouring, we think it is not desirable to drive a hard bargain, but to make more liberal terms with those colonies than we find it necessary to make with others, the position of the West Indies being peculiar at this time. No doubt some of the islands have more favourable tariffs than others, and yet we thought it not expedient to divide them, but to admit the whole group. Clause "d" will be found to contain substantially the words of the tariff of last year; so we are simply renewing what we at that time declared, except to make it apply to the colonies only and not to other countries.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman lays down a principle and immediately proceeds to violate it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the case of the West Indies, by arbitrarily admitting them.

Mr. FOSTER. They are British colonies and as such they have all the same difficulties.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not all the same.

Mr. FOSTER. They are all British colonies, and they have difficulties which they consider very tangible ones. The hon. gentleman has made no statement as to whether the Government are going to admit other colonies under present conditions. They admit that under present conditions the Australian colonies cannot be admitted. If the conditions had been favourable, no doubt in this section New Zealand and Cape Colony would have been admitted. After a year, however, hon. gentlemen opposite are still in doubt as to whether they can let in Australia or the African colonies, and consequently they do not take them in. I understand then that until those colonies make

some concessions which are not made at the present time by their tariff to this country, their goods will not be allowed entrance here at the preferential rate. Am I correct?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is not very materially wrong. In the Budget speech I stated that under the general clause we proposed to admit at once New South Wales and British India. They are enjoying the benefit of the preferential tariff, having been specially admitted. Whether we will go further and admit other colonies is a matter which has not been up to the present moment decided. I am not able to state that we will not admit those colonies, but we may do so subsequently by negotiation. Our present intention is only to admit New South Wales and British India.

Mr. FOSTER. If there is any good in this preference as regards sugar, the hon. gentleman is working a great injustice to British Columbia. The refiners there might get their sugar from Fiji or Queensland, and they no doubt do so. The hon. gentleman is making an arbitrary tariff by which the Halifax and Moncton refiners and the Montreal refiners, to a certain extent, can get their sugar at a preferential rate. They are going to get sugar cheaper by securing a reduction of one-fourth of the duty, and the Government are thus practically giving a bonus to those refineries. But a refiner who places his capital in works in British Columbia will find he is shut out from this advantage. He has as good a right, if by arbitrary rule you grant this reduction so that the Halifax and other eastern refiners shall take advantage of it, to secure an equivalent reduction on sugar imported from Queensland and Fiji, and thereby be placed on equal footing with the eastern refiners. Surely the hon. gentleman is committing an injustice in this respect.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have had the case of the British Columbia refiners brought to my notice. The colony of Queensland imposes a pretty stiff tariff on Canadian products. According to the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite, that we should get something in return, we might fairly wait and open negotiations with Queensland. As regards the West Indies, we admit that we are making an arbitrary rule.

Mr. HUGHES. It is more necessary to build up at the present time our Pacific Coast interests than those on the Atlantic, which are at the present time pretty well looked after. Our interests on the Pacific are new, and the line of steamships to which I have already referred, which is sailing every month, will no doubt sail every two weeks during next season. The Government should endeavour to uphold our interests in British Columbia and on the Pacific, and the adoption of such a measure as has

Mr. FOSTER.

been suggested would be of very material service to the country. I trust the Minister will see his way clear to take colonies in the Pacific Ocean under his patronage, as he has taken the West India colonies.

Mr. MAXWELL. As regards the British Columbia sugar refinery referred to, which is in my constituency, I may say that I have heard no complaint whatever with respect to the present tariff.

Mr. OSLER. I must contradict the hon. gentleman, because I saw a telegram from the manager of the refinery, stating that the business would be ruined if the preferential clause in the tariff was not extended to British colonies in the Pacific from which the sugar used in that refinery was obtained. The telegram was signed by Mr. Rogers.

Mr. MAXWELL. That does not invalidate my statement, because I said I had heard no complaint.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. member (Mr. Maxwell) spoke for the industry in that part of the country.

Mr. MAXWELL. I simply said, I had heard no complaint.

Mr. OSLER. Well, I have heard a complaint, and that is the complaint I have heard to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a very serious matter, and I do not think the Minister of Finance is justified in doing nothing, simply because one member from British Columbia says he has not taken interest enough in it to know how the proposal will affect that industry in his province.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In justice to the hon. member from British Columbia, I should say that, before the tariff was brought in, and in consequence of some newspaper rumours that the arrangement would work against them, I received a telegram. I do not wish to say that we are indifferent to that industry. My information is, that they are in such a position that they are not likely to fear the competition, as would the Atlantic refineries. I am quite willing to consider the question, but I certainly have not been persuaded up to the present time that their interests will be adversely affected.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) does not need time to consider that labour and capital are higher in British Columbia than on this side of the continent. Nearly all the conditions make it to the disadvantage of the manufacturer on the western coast. Everybody knows that, in staple articles like this, a very small margin makes the profit or loss, and, when you raise raw sugars by a duty of 15 or 16 cents a hundred and then give to one class of refiners, on account of their geographical situation, an advantage

of one-fourth on that duty, you are putting up a competition on an unfair basis, and the industry which does not get the advantage must be prejudiced. If the West India Islands have to do their business under difficulties, Queensland could tell you of her difficulties, and the Fiji Islands could tell you of the difficulties under which she labours. Why is it that this milk of human kindness which flows in my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), does not flow out a little to our sister colonies in the Pacific, especially when the restraint in that respect is making the conditions of trade very onerous to these manufactures on the Pacific Coast?

Mr. HUGHES. In the case of the Fiji Islands, nearly all their northern trade is with Canada, and they import large quantities of Canadian produce and Canadian manufactures of various kinds. I know that the Fiji Islands are about sending a commissioner here to consider the question of trade with us. The large Island of Trinidad, which, next to Jamaica, is the most important of the West India Islands, takes very little of our Canadian produce. Here are the figures for last year:

	United States.	Canada.
Bread	\$ 43,000	Nil.
Butter	9,467	\$ 489
Cheese	24,345	1,915
Coal	11,808	Nil.
Oats	59,553	22,430
Flour	611,390	Nil.
Fruit	9,948	48
Meats	206,563	547
Wearing apparel	32,031	14
Peas and beans.....	27,360	2,952
Lard	75,705	Nil.

We see from this that the bulk of the trade of these West India Islands is with the United States. The British Pacific Islands do trade with us, and I maintain that they have on us at least, the same claim as, if not a better one, from the view point of trade, than have the West India Islands. More than that, I maintain that our British Columbia sugar industry requires to be built up just as much as the Halifax sugar refineries do. Before these resolutions are finally adopted, I would impress upon the Finance Minister the necessity of his reconsidering his decision, and of allowing the same privilege to Fiji Islands, and to Queensland, and other Australian colonies, too, I hope, as he does to the West India Islands.

Mr. McNEILL. I want to say to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that I think he was—unintentionally, I am quite sure—scarcely fair to hon. members on this side of the House in some remarks he has made. I heard him say that we on this side of the House would give nothing at all to Britain, unless we got something in return; in other words, that we must have our pound of flesh every time. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has forgotten that from this side of the House, last ses-

sion, there was a resolution moved, especially stating that we were prepared to give “an appreciable and unconditional preference” to England. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) and his confrères were not prepared to do that then, but we were. I am glad to find that he is willing to give a preference to the mother country to-day, although he was not ready then. It is but fair that the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) should be called to that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is only fair, I should say, that I believe my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has not indulged in the same strong anti-British sentiments as those which came from hon. gentlemen on his side of the House. Might I ask my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill), what is the meaning of the words “appreciable reduction” in the resolution he moved last year? I have not been able to discover from hon. gentlemen opposite how much they meant by appreciable reduction. We on this side of the House have placed on record what we meant; we meant 12½ per cent reduction last year, and 25 per cent this year. What rate per cent reduction do hon. gentlemen opposite mean by “appreciable reduction”?

Mr. POWELL. The same as “substantial reduction,” I suppose.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) answer.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) is not meeting the proposition I have placed before him. The statement he made was, that we were not prepared to give any reduction without something in return, and I have pointed out that we moved last year in this House, that we would give “an appreciable and unconditional reduction.” My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) was not willing, at that time, to give any preference to England, as compared with other countries. My hon. friend will remember that I tried very hard to get him to say then, that he would give a preference to England alone, but he would not say so. He asks me, what amount of reduction exactly we are prepared to give, and my answer is: It will be time enough for us to tell my hon. friend, when we have an opportunity of making the reduction. We are now stating the principle in general terms; we are not specifying details; that is for the gentlemen who are framing the policy of the Government to do. We stated the broad principle, that we are prepared to give “an appreciable and unconditional advantage” to the mother country, and I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), in fairness, whether it is quite right for him to say that we are not prepared to give any reduction at all, when, at the very time, we were offering this preference to the mother country, he

would not give a preference to Great Britain, except that which he knew was only an accidental and ephemeral preference?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. When my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) said last year that we were not willing to give a preference, my answer was: We are doing it. Although my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) joined others in saying that we could not do it, we know now that the result was, that a preference was actually given to the mother country through our policy. My hon. friend and his colleagues, for years, were talking about preferential trade, and did nothing. I am quite sure that Kipling must have had my hon. friend in his mind, when he wrote:

Carry the words to my sisters,
The queens of the east and south;
We have proven faith in the heritage
By more than the word of mouth.

Kipling must have had my hon. friend in mind, because he had been talking preferential trade for a long time, and never came to the point of doing it. But my hon. friend says I have done him an injustice to-night, when I represent that hon. gentlemen on that side are not prepared to grant anything without getting something in return. That is not true, he says. Let him ask the hon. gentleman who sits beside him (Mr. Powell), who distinctly declared twice to-night that he would give nothing unless he got something in return.

Mr. McNEILL. I think the hon. Minister of Finance does my hon. friend an injustice in what he says now, because my hon. friend said that he would be willing to give a substantial sum, if necessary, to assist in the defence of the Empire.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. That is another question.

Mr. McNEILL. Do not, then, say that he was not prepared to give anything. He may not be prepared to give it in the same form as my hon. friend, but it is not fair to say that he is not willing to give anything. Will the hon. Minister of Finance say that he is willing to give a substantial sum to assist in the defence of the Empire?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. We are discussing to-night the question of preferential trade, and there will probably be an opportunity later on when one can offer his opinions on that very important subject; but I do not propose that hon. gentlemen opposite shall get away from the question of preferential trade by introducing an entirely different question. The hon. gentleman sitting beside my hon. friend to-night distinctly stated that he would not be prepared to give England a preference in our markets unless we got a substantial preference in return.

Mr. OSLER. I would like to make one remark on this question. By the proposal

Mr. McNEILL.

to give a preference to the eastern refiners and not to the refiners in British Columbia, an injustice is done not only to the western refiner, but to the trade of western Canada. We are endeavouring in every way in our power to increase our trade with Australia, and I am told that during this year it is expected that 1,500 tons a month of sugar may come to Canada as return cargo in our vessels coming from the Australian colonies if the British Columbia refiners are not discriminated against. Surely, it is not fair either to those refiners or to our shipping on the Pacific Ocean to discriminate in any shape or form against the sugar industry of British Columbia, as will be done if this tariff goes into effect. I am very diffident in speaking about this matter, because I am a shareholder in the British Columbia sugar refining industry to a small extent. In looking over correspondence, I found that the manager of the refinery had no idea that the Government was going to discriminate against them. He wrote as if it was so plainly in the interest of the country that he took for granted that there was to be no preference given to the east over the west.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I can certainly say that the Government had no thought or intention of discriminating against the western refiner or against the trade of British Columbia, and if it can be shown that this arrangement will have that effect, I am willing to reconsider the matter before it goes through. Of course, if we accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion, we will be open to the charge of giving something to the Australian colonies and getting nothing in return.

Mr. OSLER. I am only speaking of the Canadian interest that is affected.

Mr. HUGHES. The sugar trade of the Pacific Coast is largely handled by the Americans. They bring sugar from the Hawaiian Islands, and supply the refiners of the whole Pacific Coast, and our refiners in British Columbia cannot get that sugar without paying duty on it. But the Canadian vessels control the trade of the Fiji Islands, and tributary to them are the Solomon Islands. If that group were brought under this clause of the tariff, it would be a great advantage to our sugar refiners, and we would sell to them more goods than we do now.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Is it feared that the eastern refiners will be put in such a position by getting cheaper raw material that they will be able to compete unfairly against the refiners of British Columbia? Unless that is the case, I do not quite see the force of the argument. The general argument in favour of extending our trade is a fair one.

Mr. HUGHES. The fact is that the western sugar refiner will have to go out of

existence because of the way he will be handicapped in comparison with the American refiner.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This does not touch the American refiner. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the Montreal and Halifax refiners are going to send their sugar to British Columbia because of getting their raw material on preferential terms? If so, that is a fair argument; but I should think that the British Columbia refiner would have a sufficient advantage in his own market by reason of the long haul.

Mr. HUGHES. I think the hon. gentleman will find that Germany sends any amount of beet-root sugar to this country, and it is sent to British Columbia. I would be strongly in favour of increasing the duty on bonused sugar; but of course that is not under discussion at the present time. The western refiner has the advantage of the long haul; but when the preference is given to the eastern refiner, the western refiner is simply wiped out of existence.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These resolutions do not propose to give any advantage to the Americans or the Germans. Unless the hon. gentleman means that the eastern refiners are going to get their raw material cheap and send their product to British Columbia, there is nothing in his argument. If it is going to enable him to compete unduly with the British Columbia refiner in British Columbia, that is a fair matter for consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend will do well to look into that, because it means a great deal of trade. My hon. friend makes the mistake in supposing that the British Columbia refiner is refining only for British Columbia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is not going to refine for Montreal and St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. He is not, but he is going to refine for the whole country as far east as Winnipeg. It does not take a very great difference to give competing power to your eastern refiner in order to put him into that market. But the particular ground I took at first was this. If we are one country, and going to have uniform legislation, what is the reason why we should in an article like sugar give a preference to any part of the country? There is on the other side a sister colony, and if you can give away the whole principle of your tariff and by that means put the eastern refiner on a certain basis with reference to his raw sugar, why not stretch a point and put the sister colony on the other side in a similar position?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I were satisfied that we were going to injure the trade, that is a matter we ought to con-

sider. We do not want to dismiss the point lightly.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to hear the Minister of Finance say that he will look into that matter. He will act very wisely in following the suggestion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Even if we get nothing back.

Mr. FOSTER. If you have departed from your principle in one case, why not depart from it here? These hon. gentlemen have no regard for consistency. These patriots of to-night who are boiling over with loyalty, were shouting five or six years ago for discriminating against Great Britain, and a trade union with the United States. Last year when they brought in their tariff, they had not the remotest idea of giving an exclusive privilege to the mother country. It was the whole world they were going to give an advantage to, and when my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) suggested that they should give a direct preference to Great Britain, they scouted the idea. They were not going to narrow down their offer at all. They blundered into the position in which they are to-night when they have to turn around now and say that it shall be excluded. These hon. gentlemen who try to rally us about patriotism are patriots from opportunism.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to say to the hon. Minister of Finance that, so far as his course with reference to the West Indies is concerned, I, at all events, feel very strongly that a very exceptional condition of things exists there to-day. Those colonies are standing on the verge of ruin. They are in such a position that the Imperial Government was actually obliged to come to their assistance with a money bonus to save them from absolute black ruin and destruction, and therefore on that account there may be something to be said in favour of the position taken by the hon. gentleman.

I do hope that my hon. friend will carefully take into consideration the arguments presented to him with regard to the unfair competition which is likely to be imposed on the sugar refinery in British Columbia. He has promised to do so.

And now with regard to the other matter I was speaking about when I was last on my feet, I just want to say again to him that he did not at all meet what I brought to his notice. When we on this side last session moved a resolution in favour of a straight preference to the United Kingdom, my hon. friend would not support any such proposal. Under these circumstances, it is not fair then—and I think his sense of fairness will bear me out in this statement—to hurl at this side of the House the broad statement that we are not prepared to give anything at all to the mother country unless we get something in return. It is true my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Powell) made a remark of that kind with reference to the tariff, but he coupled it with

the statement that he was prepared to give something substantial to the mother country in the form of a grant of money for purposes of imperial defence. It is all very well to say that this proposal has no reference to the tariff, but it is inconsistent with the statement of my hon. friend the Finance Minister that the hon. member for Westmoreland is not prepared to give anything to the mother country unless we get something in return. I think my hon. friend should retract his statement.

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to the question with regard to British Columbia. It will be seen that there was imported from Belgium last year no less a quantity than 4,000,000 pounds of refined sugar, and from Hong Kong, China, Belgium and Japan nearly 2,000,000 more. Of the 6,000,000 pounds of refined sugar imported into Canada, 2,000,000 pounds went to British Columbia, which pretty nearly substantiates the statement made here that British Columbia is suffering from the competition of bonused sugars.

Mr. DAVIN. How much raw sugar is brought in from the Fiji Islands and Queensland?

Mr. HUGHES. That trade has only been started.

Mr. CLANCY. Only a small quantity comes from there, but it would not affect the argument in any way, because the bonused sugar we get from Germany would come in and would compete against the long distance pointed out by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. OSLER. We accept the Finance Minister's statement that he will look into this matter, and if he will go carefully into the letters and figures I have mentioned and finds that they are correct, I am quite sure he will make the change required.

Resolution agreed to.

On resolution 3,

That it is expedient to provide that Schedule "D" to "The Customs Tariff, 1897," shall be repealed on and after the first day of August in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, and that the following schedule shall be substituted therefor:—

SCHEDULE "D."

British Preferential Tariff.

On articles the growth, produce or manufacture of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of any British colony or possession entitled to the benefits of this preferential tariff under section seventeen, the duties mentioned in Schedule "A" shall be reduced as follows:—The reduction shall be one-fourth of the duty mentioned in Schedule "A," and the duty to be levied, collected and paid shall be three-fourths of the duty mentioned in Schedule "A."

Mr. McNEILL.

Provided, however, that this reduction shall not apply to any of the following articles, and that such articles shall in all cases be subject to the duties mentioned in Schedule "A," viz.:—wines, malt liquors, spirits, spirituous liquors, liquid medicines and articles containing alcohol; tobacco, cigars and cigarettes.

Provided further, that the reduction shall only apply to refined sugar when evidence satisfactory to the Minister of Customs is furnished that such refined sugar has been manufactured wholly from raw sugar produced in the British colonies or possessions.

Mr. WALLACE. Why do you not make a reduction on wines, malt liquors, &c.?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is exactly as it was in the resolutions a year ago. We know no reason why we should reduce the duties on that class of goods.

Mr. WALLACE. That is a very good reason, as far as it goes. But why are these exempted from the reduction? The principle being established, why is it departed from?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are not exactly convinced that there should be a reduction on that class of goods.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no change in these duties?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, these words are exactly the same as they were before, except the change with regard to sugar.

Mr. WALLACE. But I do not remember that the Minister gave reasons for these exceptions last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that the whole thing was so patent that I was not asked for any reason.

Mr. WALLACE. But why should these things be omitted from the preferential tariff? The hon. gentleman said that it is not desirable that they should be included.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a good reason.

Mr. WALLACE. A lady's reason. But I think we are entitled to some reason.

Resolution agreed to.

On resolution 4,

That it is expedient to repeal items 435 and 436 of Schedule "A" to "The Customs Tariff, 1897," and to substitute the following therefor:—

435. All sugar above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, testing not more than eighty-eight degrees by the polariscope, one dollar and eight cents per one hundred pounds, and for each additional degree one and one-half cents per one hundred pounds. Fractions of five-tenths of a degree or less not to be subject to duty, and fractions of more than five-tenths to be dutiable as a degree.

436. Sugar, n.e.s., not above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, melado, or concentrated melado, tank bottoms and sugar concrete, testing not more than seventy-five degrees by the polariscope, forty cents per one hundred pounds, and for each additional degree one and one-half cents per one hundred pounds. Fractions of five-tenths of a degree or less not to be subject to duty, and fractions of more than five-tenths to be dutiable as a degree. The usual packages in which imported to be free.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend give us an idea of what the effect of this will be, in the first place, on the actual absolute duty, and, in the next place, in the protection which will hereafter be enjoyed, compared with what is now enjoyed by the refiner? The hon. gentleman gave a very general statement about that, but I would like him to go more into particulars, according to the different degrees.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The protection is, perhaps, difficult to determine exactly, owing to the fact of the duty being a graded one. At present you have a difference of 50 cents in the duties, as between raw and refined of all grades. As we propose a graded duty in this case, it is not the same all along the line. For example, taking what are called yellow sugars, a class of refined sugar, testing 88, there will be an increase of 8 cents per hundred pounds on the refined, while the increased duty on the raw material will average, it is estimated, 15½ cents. Assuming the average of our sugar used in Canada to be last year, as stated by the refiners, 92, and applying this to our raw sugars, we will get duty of 65½ cents per hundred pounds, instead of 50 cents. I am leaving out the question of preference now, for the sake of simplicity. Assuming the average to be as I have stated, we are going to get 15½ cents more on the raw sugar. But the refiner will have 7½ cents less increase on the refined than on his raw material. If you follow it along until you come to sugar testing 93, the increased duty on the refined will exactly correspond with the increased duty on the raw. Beyond that, the increase is greater, until finally, at 99½ degrees, you reach an increase on the refined of 24½ cents, while the raw material would only pay, on the average, 15½ cents. Summarizing the matter, the refiner will have a little more advantage in the higher grade, and a little less advantage in the lower grade, and, on the average, I think, he will be left about where he is now. The exact effect of these changes upon the refiners, I do not think the refiners themselves have quite determined. They are a little uncertain, a little anxious, and desirous of having more—I do not hesitate to say. My own opinion is, that the refiners are left in no worse position, at all events, though I think some of them will not concur in

that. They are anxious about the preferential rate. We have provided a preferential rate on raw sugar, and also on refined sugar when made from sugar grown in the British possessions. Just what amount of sugar will be brought in at the preferential rate is what they are in doubt about. If they felt that a large amount of refined sugar was to be brought in, I think they would feel that they were placed at a disadvantage or, at least, deprived of the advantage they had. What proportion of refined sugar will be brought in is uncertain, as is also what proportion of raw material they can get in at the preferential rate. The United States is a sharp competitor for the West India trade, and I do not venture to estimate how much of the West India sugar our refiners may be able to get. As to the effect upon the revenue, I think it will not differ from the estimate made by the hon. gentleman himself. He said that we would get from \$250,000 to \$400,000. That is a wide range of estimate, and I do not think I would differ materially from my hon. friend. It is not easy to make a close estimate, owing to the doubt as to what may come in under the preferential rate. I think that the refiner is left where he is, that the revenue will get the advantage of the increased duty, which, of course, will be carried to be refined, and the consumers will, on the higher grades, have to pay a little more than hitherto, while, on the lower grades, the advantage to the refiner will be less.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has made some things pretty clear. He has made it clear that what he actually proposes, under this duty arrangement on sugars, is to get from \$250,000 to \$400,000 more taxes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that the latter figure is high.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but it will be somewhere between the two. That is rather a come-down from the high and generous ground which was taken, of the benefit to the struggling colonies in the West Indies, because the statement the hon. gentleman makes to-night is, in the first place, by the readjustment of duties the refiner will stand about where he is now or a little worse position.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He says so; I do not think he is right.

Mr. FOSTER. And the consumer will not pay less, but practically a little more. So that the consumer in Canada will certainly not get cheaper sugar. The refiner will, I think, occupy no better position, and the question, what advantage it will be to the West Indies, is a very doubtful one, indeed. There are two things which, I think, will make it rather uncertain as to whether the West Indian producer is going to get much benefit out of this trade or not. One reason has been stated by my hon. friend, and that

is, that the United States market is a choice market for the West India cane sugar, and the great bulk of the sugar which is marketed from the West Indies to foreign countries, that is to say, not in Great Britain, goes to the United States. The currents of traffic are very firmly set in these directions, and all affiliations are made and have been made for years, and it is very difficult to break them. The other element that I refer to is, that there is a very close connection between the British capitalists and the sugar estates of the West Indies in many instances, and that they will draw the raw sugar in a certain proportion, which will probably not be interfered with by this preference to Great Britain.

I do not anticipate that you will find any West India raw sugar which now goes to the British refiner, will be drawn away by this preference, for the reason that it is in intimate connection of the British capitalist with the sugar estate, in fact it is one usual condition of the sugar estate, even the actual working of the sugar estate; then there is a roundabout process of a preference upon refined sugar made from West Indian raw sugar that will take place in the case of the British refiner. Those two elements, I think, will combine not to divert any West India raw sugar that now goes to the British refiner away from the British refiner. I doubt if you draw much of it away from the United States market where it has found its way for so many years. So that the advantage to the West India raw sugar producer is very illusory. The consumer here will get no benefit, the refiner will get no benefit, I think he is left in a worse position. But the coffers of the country will be the richer by \$250,000 to \$400,000. What this Government has really done, and what I must say it intended to do, is to add taxes to the country in order to spend them. Instead of reducing the expenditure from any considerable point, in the second year of their administration, as in the first year of their administration, instead of decreasing the expenditure, they have taken the alternative of increasing the taxes of the country in three ways. They have increased the excise taxes very largely last year, they have gained a large amount of money for their own spending by docking the savings of the country one-half per cent, and by docking them in prospect another half per cent on the 1st of July, whereby they will have \$500,000 more next year to spend than they had last year, I mean taking into account the current year. Then there is a large addition to the excise revenue, which is taxation for those who use those articles, and there is a large proportion of the people who do. Now we have an extra tax of from \$250,000 to \$400,000 placed upon the sugar consumers of the country all through. This is a very high appreciation of taxation. On the other hand, we have no relief so far as expenditure is concerned. Now, with reference

Mr. FOSTER.

to raw sugar, the average is 92 degrees, but there is a great deal of it which will go more than 92, otherwise the average would be lower. Now, has my hon. friend made any calculation as to how the refiner would stand on that class of sugar above 90 or 92 degrees, raw sugar upon which he places a larger sum than 15½ cents, and it is a very large class of sugars. On that the refiner is put in a much worse condition than before under the disparity of duties.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend must take the average as being conclusive. He says there is considerable sugar of a higher grade imported, on which the refiner will have to pay more than 15½ cents increase. Certainly there will also be a considerable amount of sugar of a lower grade, there will be a considerable amount on which he will pay less than 15½ cents. We are now dealing with the duty on the raw. The refiner, on the average of his total import of raw sugar, assuming he was to keep the average of last year, would pay exactly 15½ cents. We say the tendency of this tariff will be to reduce the average, because while you have flat specific duty in which you charge the same rate on 100 pounds of sugar worth \$2.15 as on another 100 pounds worth less than a dollar, the natural tendency of that system is to induce the refiner to use the higher grade material.

Mr. WALLACE. Sugar that is worth \$1, what does it grade?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Speaking from memory, sugar testing 75 degrees would be less than \$1 per 100 pounds. I have quotations making it still lower than that, quotations of a few weeks ago while I was considering this matter. Raw sugar testing 75 degrees was selling in bond as low as 86 cents per 100 pounds; on the same day sugar testing 80 is quoted at \$1.36; testing 85 at \$1.82; these were the selling prices in bond. For 90 it would be \$2.09; for 92, \$2.15; 94 would be \$2.19; 96 would be worth about \$2.91. I was pointing out that the tendency of a flat specific duty of half a cent a pound is to induce the refiner to use a higher grade material. Per contra, a graduated duty will not leave him in the same position; he will not have the same inducement to use a higher grade, and it is only reasonable to suppose that he will import some lower grade sugars from the West Indies. If the average is reduced he will pay less for 100 pounds than the 15 cents I have mentioned as the increase. Everything depends upon what the average is.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the Minister of Finance taken any steps to tax the beet root sugar coming in from bonused countries? As he is well aware, the British sugar refiners in the West Indies, in British Guiana and all over the world, have been petitioning the British Government for years, and the British Government has given very serious con-

sideration to the request, to impose a duty on sugar coming in from a country like Germany, where they make it from beets, and where they pay a bonus on all sugar exported. Into Canada last year there came more sugar from Germany than from any other country, five or six times more than from the West India Islands. This sugar was all bonused by the German Government, just as they bonused the steamships that carried it. They control our markets with that cheap commodity. I am told that it is an adulterated commodity, but our people have not yet caught on to that. There were 125 million pounds of sugar imported from Germany last year alone. If the hon. gentleman wishes to upbuild the Empire and help our Canadian refiners he should take into consideration the propriety of taxing the sugar from those bonused countries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The effect of this arrangement will undoubtedly be to tax sugar coming in from those bonus countries at a higher rate than now.

Mr. FOSTER. Not proportionately.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I admit not proportionately, but to the extent of 25 per cent. If the hon. gentleman asks if the Government are going to impose countervailing duties I must reply that this is a large question, and we do not intend to do so now.

Mr. WALLACE. Raw sugar brought in last year would pay a duty of 70 cents per 100 pounds as against 50 cents. We imported raw sugar to the amount of 329,000,000 pounds, costing \$2.23 per 100 pounds. Ninety-four degrees came in at \$2.19; 96 degrees at \$2.31; 95 degrees at some figure between those values.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have given the hon. gentleman the source of my information. I have stated on the authority of the refiners that the average was 92 degrees. The prices are very uncertain.

Mr. WALLACE. The prices have been very steady during the past year. My figures are taken from the Trade and Navigation returns, and the average quality would be 95 degrees. That sugar paid 40 cents plus 30 cents or 70 cents, which would be 20 cents more than the present duty. So that the importation of raw sugar would involve an additional charge of \$660,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. WALLACE. I am taking the figures given by the hon. gentleman and those published in the Trade and Navigation Returns. This quantity of raw sugar would give an increased taxation of \$660,000, or twice as high as the hon. gentleman's estimate. But the hon. gentleman says that under the specific duty the higher grades

would come in and that under the ad valorem duties lower grades would be brought in. If sugar worth only 86 cents per 100 pounds comes in and sells for less than 1 cent per pound, while sugar of 95 degrees sells at 2½ cents, which it does, a great many more pounds must come in to make the quantity of refined sugar. Of course, sugar selling at 86 cents per 100 pounds, or less than 1 cent a pound, more than 21 pounds would be required to make a pound of refined sugar, and more than 2½ pounds to make one pound equal to 95 degrees. So that if a larger quantity of cheaper sugar comes in to refine it will increase the revenue over \$660,000, and this I estimate as the increased taxation imposed by the tariff placed before the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If a larger quantity comes in it will be at a lower rate.

Mr. WALLACE. As it takes 2½ pounds to make one pound equal to 95 degrees, when it comes in at a lower rate the quantity will be enormously increased and thus impose higher taxes on the people. So that under any calculation there will not be less than \$660,000 more taxation imposed, taking last year's importations as a basis, or twice as much as the estimate submitted by the Finance Minister. So far as I am able to judge, the protection to the refiner will be somewhat increased. The Finance Minister has told the committee that the information he has received from the refiners is directly contrary to that statement. No doubt, the result is problematical, but we are entitled to our opinion as to the protection given to the refiners, and my opinion is that it will be somewhat increased. It will be increased by about \$60,000, and \$600,000 will be added to the taxes on the sugar paid by the people. That is a pretty high tax to propose on one of the necessities of life, because sugar is considered a necessary. The taxation on sugar will be increased from \$1,750,000 to \$2,500,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Even if we were going to tax sugar of 95 degrees at 70 cents as an average, I want to call attention to the fact that under a tariff which existed when the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were in power, there was a duty on the same grade of 95 of no less than \$1.83. So that by comparison with that tariff our taxation will be extremely moderate and the country will no doubt be grateful.

Mr. WALLACE. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns it will be found that the duty imposed was 64 cents per 100 pounds. The hon. gentleman has referred to the duties under the polariscopic test. We subsequently abolished the duties.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You abolished the duty on raw, but you kept the

duty on refined. My hon. friend is mistaken in the assumption that there is going to be \$660,000 added to the Dominion treasury. I suppose I should not regret if that were the case, because we are interested in keeping up a sound financial position, and as we are making material reductions in the duty on other classes, it might perhaps be well to have something to compensate for that, because we do not want to become a party of deficits.

Mr. WALLACE. The Trade and Navigation Returns give the average of all the importations of raw sugar at so much per hundred pounds in value.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Inasmuch as there was no ad valorem duty there was no particular reason for being critical as to giving the value of the sugars. The value I gave the hon. gentleman is the value in bond.

Mr. WALLACE. There is no talk about being critical here; the invoices are produced and sworn to as being the correct price.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would be f.o.b. at port of shipment, but the value I gave the hon. gentleman was the value in bond at Halifax, and the value would probably be the same at Montreal. The refiners would have no interest in misrepresenting the average test of the sugars they used last year. I have had information from several refiners separately, and that information leads me to believe that 92 was as nearly as may be the correct average. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) is mistaken in saying it was 95. When the polariscopic test was in force before, the average of the several years was from 78 as high as 90, and when we allow 92 as the average for the past year, we are allowing for the tendency to use a higher grade of sugars. This is one of the questions we will have to leave to that great arbiter time. If my hon. friend can show me next year that we have \$660,000 additional revenue I shall be surprised.

Mr. WALLACE. And pleased.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, it will not embarrass me, and I hope not to need it. I am not counting on any such money, and I do not believe we will get it.

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend wish to put through the tobacco resolution to-night? I am afraid there will be quite a discussion on that.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). It is a very short thing.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but very short things are sometimes very dangerous.

6. That it is expedient to provide that items 445 and 446 of Schedule "A" to "The Customs

Mr. FIELDING.

Tariff Act, 1897," shall be repealed on and after the first day of July in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight.

Mr. CLANCY. If we consider this resolution to-night it will take up considerable time. I am surprised that the Government should make this change. Last year when they introduced their tariff they held out an inducement to the western people and to the people in Quebec, to engage in the extensive growth of tobacco, by changing the excise duty to a customs duty and increasing it somewhat. As a result the people of western Ontario and also Quebec, have gone into the production of a superior class of tobacco which will largely take the place of the foreign leaf formerly imported.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. I am glad to hear my hon. friend say "hear, hear," but I would call his attention to the fact that the change he now proposes will destroy the prospects of those farmers who have prepared to engage in the cultivation of this tobacco. This is a matter of very great importance, and I trust that the Minister of Finance will not press the resolution to-night. Although a reference was made to this in a former speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding), I hardly thought there would be such an outcome as we have here. I trust that the hon. gentleman will reconsider the proposition that he now makes, of changing the duty from customs to excise.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This does not change by one cent the result of last year's resolution, and as to which my hon. friend appears to be so satisfied. This resolution merely gives to the Excise Department the duty of collecting the 10 cents on unstemmed, and the 14 cents on stemmed tobacco that was imposed last year. It does not interfere at all with the farmers growing the tobacco. The reason the change has been made is this. Last year it appeared as though it would be easier to collect the duty through the customs than it would through the excise, but we found it was impossible to carry that out in practice. We had all the warehouses connected with the tobacco factories, and our officers had to weigh the tobacco and deliver it and to do all the work in connection with it. It seemed logical that since our officers had to do the work the Excise Department should assume the collection of the revenue instead of the Customs Department. This resolution does not alter by one cent the amount that is to be collected.

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the customs duties will still be collected on foreign leaf as formerly?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There was no duty collected on foreign leaf formerly.

Mr. CLANCY. I am speaking now of the law that was passed last year. There was a customs duty of 10 cents a pound on unstemmed tobacco, and 14 cents a pound on stemmed tobacco.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is the same duty that was collected by the Customs Department. The only difference is, that it will be collected by the Excise Department.

Mr. CLANCY. The point I am making is that, by making this an excise tax, you have taken away the encouragement given to the grower of Canadian leaf, because the foreign leaf will come in now.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The foreign leaf pays the 10 cents and the 14 cents the same as before, only the Excise Department collects it, instead of the Customs Department. The encouragement is the same as before to the Canadian-grown tobacco.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to collect any excise duty on native-grown tobacco?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There is no charge on native-grown tobacco, except when it is manufactured, when it pays 5 cents. The duty is exactly the same as before.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to have that made clear. I think I can see now what the hon. gentleman proposes—that, instead of the tobacco going through the Customs Department, it will go through the Excise Department, and the persons taking it out will have to pay what is equivalent to a customs duty, but will pay it to the Excise Department.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. DUGAS. The excise duty is collected only after it is manufactured.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The 10 cents and the 14 cents will be collected when the tobacco is taken out of the warehouse and delivered to the manufacturer. There is no change in the law in that respect.

Mr. FOSTER. All foreign tobacco that comes in must go into the warehouse?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. DUGAS. I understand, that from the customs warehouse to the excise warehouse there is a certain limited time, and you give the manufacturer more time to pay the duty than before?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, it is exactly the same thing.

Mr. DUGAS. I mean, that you will not collect any duty except when the tobacco is

manufactured, and you give the manufacturer permission to keep the money in the bank, whereas, under the old system, he had to pay the customs duty at the customs warehouse.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Let me remind my hon. friend that it was only when the tobacco was ex-warehoused that the duty was paid. It was supposed to be put in the customs warehouse, but as we had no customs warehouse, the moment the tobacco was passed, the importer was obliged to apply to our warehouse; but the duty had to be paid only when the tobacco was ex-warehoused.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am sorry the hon. Finance Minister has seen fit to continue this high duty on tobacco, as he must know that the advance that was made in the duty on tobacco last year is very unpopular in the country, especially among the working classes, who, as everybody knows, must have their tobacco. I know plenty of people who would rather go without their third meal than without their tobacco, and it seems to me quite unreasonable for the Government to expect to meet approval with any great portion of the people of this country for their action. Under this very resolution they provide for making the silks and the expensive goods of the wealthy cheaper, while they keep up the price of tobacco which the poor man consumes and must have, and which cannot properly be classed as a luxury; it is a necessity. The great bulk of the people throughout the country consume tobacco, especially the poorer classes, and I do hope the hon. Finance Minister will see fit to bring the duty on tobacco to where it stood before he interfered with it a year ago. I do not wish to detain the committee; but, while on my feet, I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, whether he proposes to make any change in the regulations under which his officers collect the duty on tobacco leaf. I have heard several complaints made with respect to the regulations regarding the allowance made for the moisture in the leaf, which worked rather hardly against the tobacco manufacturers. The regulations complained of had reference to the allowance they considered it was necessary to make for moisture in taking the weight of the tobacco, and collecting the duty on that. I would like the hon. Minister to promise that something will be done to meet the wishes of the people in that respect.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. My hon. friend will see that this is provided for in the regulation, because in Resolution No. 8 it is provided that the weight upon which such duty shall be computed shall be with reference to the standard mentioned in paragraph "C," of section 247 of the inland revenue law. That paragraph "C" establishes the old standard. Experience has

shown that no kind of tobacco can ever be found with any amount of pliability, that would not break when it was touched or handled, that had not at least 10 per cent of moisture. Instead of our charging actual weight, we have thought that the tobacco manufacturers were right, and that it was only just to go back to the old standard instead and take into consideration the amount of moisture.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is there any standard of allowance of the moisture?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The manufacturers complain that the officials were not acting according to the regulations issued and were not allowing enough for the moisture.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This new measure covers the case.

Mr. DUGAS. What amount do you allow for the standard?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It will be calculated by the amount of desiccation by our officers.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to inform the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, as well as the Minister of Customs, that there is a general complaint all along the frontier on the part of our merchants that they are not selling any tobacco, but that the American storekeepers are supplying all the Canadians on the border with the tobacco they use. I am quite conversant with that in my own town.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Under ground?

Mr. TAYLOR. Not quite underground, but the people are crossing every day and buy a plug of tobacco the length of your arm nearly for 15 cents on the other side, for which they have to pay 30 cents at home. I know some friends of hon. gentlemen opposite who are making a business of peddling this American tobacco throughout the country, which they get by the underground railway. I drew attention to the fact last year, but the business is going on the same.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If my hon. friend will come to my department, he will see that within the last six months we have made 150 seizures of smuggled tobacco. We are doing our very best to prevent smuggling. And if our neighbours on the other side adopt the means by which they expect to raise money to carry on the war—which I hope will not take place—by placing an excise duty on liquor and tobacco, I hope we shall have much less smuggling than we have had.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. Minister would have less smuggling and would not be obliged to make so many seizures if he
Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

would lower the duty. Moreover, I think that if this duty were lowered it would meet the wish of the people of the country.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I would rather fight the smugglers than to give way to them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But if the duty were lowered there would be less smuggling. I understand that the revenue has not been increased since the imposition of these high duties. If it were lowered, there would be less temptation to smuggle and less smuggling. If I have any influence with the Minister of Inland Revenue, I trust he will lower the duty on tobacco. I do sincerely hope he will reduce it, and I think my voice ought not to be raised in vain on this question.

Mr. DUGAS. I desire to ask for information as to this question of 10 per cent of moisture. The customs duty provides for a standard. Suppose an excise duty is collected will it be on the basis of the same 10 per cent of moisture? The longer it stays in bond the greater is the moisture up to about 25 per cent.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We think it only fair to make the tobacco manufacturers pay for 10 per cent of the moisture, because, to make his tobacco at all tractable for working it must have this proportion of moisture. And even if it be dried out, it will absorb 10 per cent of moisture in half an hour. But if there is more than 10 per cent of moisture, we think it fair to credit him with the excess.

Mr. DUGAS. That is in favour of the manufacturer which is the point I want to get at.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do hope the duty on tobacco will be reduced as a means of increasing the revenue and meeting the very general wish of the people throughout the country.

Mr. FOSTER. As to this question of desiccation, I desire to ask the hon. Minister if, when the manufacturers waited on him they were unanimous?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. They were so unanimous and especially the cigar manufacturers, that if my hon. friend would read some of the petitions I have here, he would see that they were not only unanimous, but unanimous in abusing us.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Minister of Inland Revenue on what condition tobacco was formerly admitted under customs duty as to this percentage of moisture? The reason I ask is that the drier the tobacco, of course, the less the duty, and this takes away the protection of the Canadian growers.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That standard was not used formerly in

charging the duty on tobacco. Before the change in the tariff last year, the only charge on imported tobacco was after it was manufactured, so that there was no question of standard or desiccation. The tobacco manufacturer applied, say for 10,000 pounds to be manufactured. When he got the tobacco he knew that he must show a certain proportion of manufactured tobacco for that, I think it was 95 per cent. This precaution was taken to make sure that none of the tobacco was withdrawn and disposed off illegally. In some of the large factories, McDonald's, and others, they were satisfied with a 10 pounds moisture to 100 pounds of tobacco, and never asked us to ascertain the standard. But others did. When it was found that the moisture was for instance 20 per cent, when they had to return manufactured tobacco at the rate of 95 for a hundred pounds of tobacco, we credited them for the extra amount of moisture. For instance, if there were 20 pounds of moisture we asked them to return not 95 pounds of the manufactured tobacco, but 85 pounds. The standard was not established to fix the price.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I feel that I owe an apology to the Minister of Inland Revenue. I understand that it was he who raised the duty on tobacco. But I find it was the Minister of Finance, and it is he that I am going to assail now, and I want him to regard what I say with some consideration. I find that throughout the country there is a widespread feeling that the duty on tobacco should not have been increased. I find that the revenue has not been increased by the increase of the duty, and I do not see why the department should wish smuggling to be continued to reduce the revenue. I hope the hon. Minister of Finance will take this matter into his serious consideration, and see to it that the duty is lowered.

Mr. INGRAM. Does this proportion of 95 pounds to 100 pounds apply in the case of cigars as well as in manufactured tobacco?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There was a different scale. For every 22 pounds of tobacco they were to return a thousand cigars. Generally it takes only 18 or 19 pounds of tobacco to a thousand cigars.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to know what excuse the Finance Minister had for increasing this duty and thereby increasing the smuggling?

Mr. WALLACE. I think that is a very proper question. In the six months of 1896, from the 1st of July to the 1st of January, there were \$860,000 worth of tobacco leaf imported into Canada. For the corresponding six months of the next year, under the new tariff, there were \$146,000 worth free and \$114,000 worth that paid duty. That made altogether \$260,000 worth of tobacco leaf imported for the six months under the

new duty as compared with \$860,000 under the old duty—the one entirely under the new duty and the other entirely under the old duty. Unless the Minister can explain it, it appears to me that instead of \$860,000 worth of tobacco leaf being imported in the last six months, as in the corresponding six months of the former year, there were \$600,000 less, and the only explanation I can think of is that that \$600,000 worth of tobacco was smuggled into the country. Now, the duty the Government have put on, I think, is out of all reason. It is so high that it encourages smuggling. There is an excise duty of 39 cents a pound upon tobacco, 25 and 14. In the United States there is an excise duty of 6 cents a pound on tobacco, and that gives an advantage to the Americans of 33 cents per pound. Now, take one example. Tuckett & Billings, of Hamilton, make a celebrated brand of tobacco sold all over Canada. It is considered one of the best brands of tobacco that is sold. They sell it in large distinctive plugs, and in packages. Now, they have a factory in the States as well as in Canada where I am told, they make the T. & B. plug. Everybody knows they make exactly the same kind in the States as they do in Canada, the same size, and same appearance, and all that, three plugs to the pound. Suppose a man takes a caddy of this American make under his arm and carries it across the boundary, on a 20-pound package he makes \$6.60 by the operation. The American tobacco is 33 cents a pound cheaper than the Canadian tobacco. Tobacco can be manufactured, I presume, as cheaply in the States, and tobacco leaves can be bought as cheaply there, so that there is 33 cents of preference for the American tobacco on every pound. The figures the Government have supplied here prove that they have widely overshot the mark when they added that 14 cents a pound additional duty on tobacco. I thought the late Government, in placing the excise duty at 25 cents, had gone to the extreme limit, and even that allowed tobacco to be smuggled in. But when you added 14 cents a pound additional, you made it a very great object for people to smuggle tobacco across. The Minister of Inland Revenue tells us that he has been remarkably successful in hunting up smugglers.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, I have tried. I have not caught them all.

Mr. WALLACE. But the Minister made the boast that he had made 150 seizures, and that that was more than in any former period, and I believe it is. At any rate, 150 seizures won't stop the smuggling of tobacco, it is too profitable an enterprise. They more than double their money by smuggling it in. Tobacco in the States is not worth as much as 33 cents per pound, yet it is worth more than twice that here by the additional duty put on. I think the Gov-

ernment should reconsider their decision. They have put on too high a duty, and they have defeated the very ends they were aiming at. The duty, of course, was put on to increase the revenue; by the statement I have here the revenue will be very largely decreased by reason of the smaller importations of tobacco leaf, and the smaller amount of excise revenue they will receive in consequence. But outside of that is the other question, that a necessity, as tobacco is to many people, is taxed at far too high a figure. An excise duty of 39 cents a pound is a good deal more than 100 per cent on what is a necessity to very many people in this country, largely poor people. Rich people are able to afford it, and may not make complaint. But there are in this country many people who are working hard, who have not many pleasures, and tobacco is a solace and a comfort to them, and it has become a necessity as well. Therefore, I think the Government is not justified in putting more than 100 per cent duty upon an article that is a necessity. Besides the policy has been found, according to their own returns, to be unsuccessful, because instead of getting an increased revenue from the manufacture of tobacco, they have obtained less. I presume that the Inland Revenue returns will correspond, if not exactly, very largely, with the customs statement which I have just quoted showing that \$260,000 worth were imported this year, and \$860,000 worth were imported last year, for the half year in each case. I think the Government ought to reconsider their decision in this matter, both for the sake of revenue and for the sake of doing justice to those who use tobacco. They will increase the revenue of the country, and they will benefit those who are presumably getting cheaper tobacco by breaking the laws of the country, and having the Minister of Inland Revenue pursuing them with a troop of his officials.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Let me explain the difference between the revenue on tobacco last year and that of this year. My hon. friend will see that if there has been a decrease, the decrease was not caused to any great extent, by smuggling. Now it is interesting to see what happened in March and April of last year. On the eve of the bringing down of the tariff last session, the tobacco importers and the tobacco manufacturers knew that some change was to be made, but they did not know exactly what it was going to be. They had an idea that the duty would be increased, and that instead of being added to the excise duty it would be added to the customs duty. In order to avoid the customs duties, the manufacturers imported a quantity of tobacco much greater than the importations during a similar period of other years. They did so because they thought a customs duty would be imposed, and they stored it in our excise warehouses. The following is a comparison between the revenue of the Inland

Mr. WALLACE.

Revenue before and after the tariff of last year :

	1896.	
March		\$ 602,609 00
April		637,702 69
May		670,716 00
June		704,745 32
July		566,830 95
	1897.	
March		\$1,654,302 00
April		1,608,902 00
May		342,147 00
June		201,894 76
July		344,986 84

The revenue is now recuperating at the rate of about \$150,000 a month.

Mr. INGRAM. If it is the case that during March and April last year the tobacco imported was \$2,000,000 in value in excess of the importations of March and April of the previous year, are the Government aware that the tobacco is now manufactured in smaller plugs than formerly and a higher price charged.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am aware of that fact.

Mr. INGRAM. The workingmen use this form of tobacco in large quantities, and they complain very much of the increased duty imposed. If the increased duties should not be removed entirely, they at all events should not be increased.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Why do not the workingmen smoke Canadian tobacco. We are making efforts to instruct the farmers as to how to take care of their tobacco, not so much when it is growing for they perfectly understand that part of the business, but how to take care of it after it has been cut. It is the curing of the tobacco which is defective, and we are seeking some help from the Government, not to do as much as has been done in regard to the dairying industry, but to teach our farmers that which they evidently cannot learn for themselves, that is the proper curing of tobacco.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the hon. Minister's figures are incorrect, for the total imports for the year amounted \$2,000,000. The imports for the last six months were of the value of \$860,000, and for the last half of 1897 they were down to \$600,000. The importations of tobacco are less because tobacco smuggling is going on, the people are using this smuggled tobacco, and so the Government are getting little or no revenue.

5. That it is expedient to provide that items 445 and 446 of Schedule "A" to "The Customs Tariff Act, 1897," shall be repealed on and after the first day of July in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight.

6. That it is expedient to provide that on and after the first day of July, in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, the following items shall be added to Schedule "B" to "The Customs Tariff, 1897" :—

636. Tobacco, unmanufactured, for excise purposes, under conditions of the Inland Revenue Act.

7. That it is expedient to provide that on and after the first day of July, in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, in addition to the excise duties at present levied on manufactured tobacco, cigars and cigarettes, there shall be levied and collected the following excise duties, that is to say :—

(a. On all foreign raw leaf tobacco, unstemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture, in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, ten cents per pound.

(b.) On all foreign raw leaf tobacco, stemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture, in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, fourteen cents per pound.

Provided that the weight upon which such duty shall be computed shall be with reference to the standard mentioned in paragraph (c) of section 247 of the Inland Revenue Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Resolutions to be reported.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I was asked, the other day, by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) for copies of the contracts or agreements entered into between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, with reference to the Intercolonial Railway extension. I am willing to lay them on the Table, but I understand it will be necessary, in conformity with the rules of the House, that a motion be made for a return. I beg to move, seconded by Sir Louis Davies :

That an Order of the House do issue for a return of copies of all agreements not hitherto laid on the Table of the House, entered into by the Department of Railways with the Grand Trunk Railway Company in connection with the Montreal extension of the Intercolonial Railway.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg to lay these papers on the Table of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg to move that the papers laid on the Table of the House be printed, and that the rules be suspended in that regard.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask, what business will be taken up to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The Premier is not here, and I cannot give a definite answer, but I fancy we will go into Supply.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The franchise.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the Solicitor General is here, the Franchise Bill will be taken up first, but if not, it is likely we will go into Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. A number of gentlemen on this side are not here who would like to be present when the Franchise Bill is up.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Premier stated, the other day, that he hoped to take the Franchise Bill up after we got through the resolutions on Ways and Means. If the Solicitor General is here to-morrow, we will ask the House to go on with this Bill. But if not, we may take up Supply.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 20th April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE presented the second report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the Official Debates of the House, and moved that the House concur in the same. He said : I wish to say just a few words before this report is concurred in. The committee have ordered to appear before them all the official reporters of the House in order to explain a little inaccuracy which appeared a few days ago in the report of the Debates, when a question put by an hon. member and answered by a Minister, were not reported in the "Hansard." All the gentlemen employed in making the official reports explained to the satisfaction of the committee that this omission occurred through no fault of their own. At the same time, they complained of the too narrow limits of the room in which they do their work. Though the report of the committee has been read from the Table, I think it well for me to read it over again, because I believe that some members of the House have not heard it clearly, and afterwards some members of the committee will explain the purport of the recommendations. The committee recommends that better accommodation be provided for the gentlemen who are doing a very important work, and doing

their best to make an accurate report, but under conditions somewhat unfavourable. The committee report :

The committee recognize the utter inadequacy of the present accommodation.

Now, you remember, Mr. Speaker, that last session I went several times to your rooms to speak to you about this matter, and a sub-committee composed of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière)—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend will allow me to interrupt him for a moment, I would like to draw his attention to the fact that it is the practice of the House not to move the adoption of a report on the day on which it is presented, but to allow it to lie over until the House has had an opportunity to consider it. I think it would suit the convenience of the House if my hon. friend were to adopt the usual course, and let that lie upon the Table and to-morrow he can move its adoption.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I quite agree with the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, but perhaps it might be well for me briefly to outline the recommendations so that the members of the House may be the better prepared to discuss them.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must insist on a compliance with the rules. Either the hon. gentleman must ask leave of the House to make the motion now, or else he cannot speak upon it. As has been suggested, if the report lies over till to-morrow, it would appear in the Journals, and full information can be given when the motion is made afterwards.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Then I will let it stand until to-morrow.

SHIPPING ACCOMMODATION AT MURRAY RIVER, P.E.I.

Mr. MARTIN asked,

1. Has the Government received a petition or memorial from the inhabitants of Murray River, High Bank, Glen William, Peter's Road, &c., in the province of Prince Edward Island, asking for improved shipping accommodation at Murray River ?

2. If so, has the Government decided to grant the prayer of the petitioners and what steps, if any, has the Government decided to take in the matter ?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to send the steam dredge to Murray River during the coming season ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes. 2. A report has been obtained from the local engineer, and the matter is under the consideration of the department. 3. The engagements of the dredge "Prince Edward" for the present season are such that it does not appear probable that it will be possible to send her to Murray River this season.

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

OAK MILLS POST OFFICE, P.Q.

Mr. McALISTER (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

1. Has Oak Bay Mills post office, in the county of Bonaventure, province of Quebec, been closed ?

2. If so, when, for what cause, and at whose request ?

3. What was the revenue from this office for the years ending 30th June, 1895, and 30th June, 1896, respectively, also for the half-year ending 31st December, 1896 ?

4. What was the revenue from Oak Point post office, in said county, during these years respectively ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. Yes. 2. It was closed on the 1st of April, 1897, after communication with Mr. Guité, because in the public interest it was not considered as needed. 3. The revenue for the year ending 30th June, 1895, was \$75; for the year ending the 30th June, 1896, \$71, and for the half year ending 31st December, 1896, \$40. 4. The revenue of Oak Point Post Office for the same periods was \$39.69, \$39.27 and \$22.35.

BREAKWATER AT TROUT COVE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER asked,

Were any repairs done to the breakwater at Trout Cove in the course of 1897 ?

If so, what was the cost of such repairs ?

Was any money paid to Solomon M. Dakin, William Cossaboom, Adrian Dakin, Alfred Ward, and Capt. Thompson, respectively ; if so, what was the amount paid each and for what purpose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Yes ; repairs were made to the breakwater at Trout Cove at a cost of \$3,989.77. The following sums have been paid to the parties named :—

S. M. Dakin, conductor.....	\$208 50
Wm. Cossaboom, labourer and team.	118 99
A. Dakin, labourer.....	44 06
A. Ward, carpenter.....	153 75
E. R. Thompson, hardware and freight	143 43

DISMISSAL OF FINLAY BEATON.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER asked,

Whether Mr. Finlay Beaton, postmaster of Beatonville, Inverness County, has been dismissed ?

If so, for what cause ?

At whose request ?

Did the post office inspector make a report ?

If so, what is his report ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Complaints having been made by patrons of the office and others against Mr. Finlay Beaton, postmaster of Beatonville, that he kept the office in an unsuitable place, in the kitchen of his dwelling house ; that his general management of the office was poor and his treatment of the public rude and discourteous, the matter was referred to the post office inspector for investigation, and a report was received from him stating

that the charges against the postmaster were fully borne out by the facts. Under these circumstances, the postmaster was removed from office.

MAJOR GENERAL GASCOIGNE.

Mr. BENNETT asked,

Has a militia commission been issued to Major General Gascoigne as major general in the militia; if so, on what date?

If issued, is it in the same general form as those issued to other militia officers; if not, in what respect does it differ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). No commission has been issued to Major General Gascoigne, and I am informed by the Deputy Minister that commissions have never been issued to Major Generals in command of the militia prior to Major General Gascoigne.

THE FISHERIES OF CANADA.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked,

1. Was an appeal instituted by the Government from the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in the matter of a reference in relation to the fisheries of Canada and ownership of the beds of rivers, harbours, &c., to Her Majesty in her Privy Council?

2. If so, at what date was said appeal so instituted?

3. Has the case been argued before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and, if so, when?

4. Who were the counsel for the Government?

5. Has judgment been delivered?

6. If not, have the Government any intimation of the date upon which judgment will be rendered?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1. Yes. 2. February, 1897. 3. Yes, in July, 1897. 4. Mr. Robinson, Q.C.; Mr. Haldane, Q.C., and Mr. Loehnis. 5. No. 6. No.

THE DREDGE "MUDLARK."

Mr. McINNES asked,

1. Is the Government aware that the working time on the dredge "Mudlark" has been increased from nine to ten hours per day?

2. On whose recommendation and for what reason was the change made?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the increased working time?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I have no knowledge that the working time on the dredge "Mudlark" has been increased. We have wired our resident engineer at New Westminster for this information, but a reply has not been received as yet.

THE REPRESENTATION OF BAGOT.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that a vacancy has occurred in the representation of

the county of Bagot, in the province of Quebec, in this House, by the death of our late colleague, Mr. Flavien Dupont, in order that said county may be represented in this Parliament at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SPEAKER. Notification having been given by an hon. member, I will order a writ to be issued immediately.

INSOLVENCY.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is the leader of the House in a position to inform the House and the country, whether the Government intend to make arrangements for taking up the question of insolvency and putting through a Bill during the present session?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). That question, as the hon. gentleman is aware, is in the hands of an hon. member of the House at the present moment. I cannot say that the Government will interfere in the matter.

GANANOQUE DRILL SHED.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, and as I now see the Minister of Militia in his place, I beg to repeat the question I put a few days ago, when the right hon. Premier said he would make a note of it, and would give information the next day—when will the correspondence moved for on March 4th, in respect to the removal of the drill shed at Gananoque, be brought down?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I will make inquiries, and within a day or two I will be able to lay the return on the Table of the House.

MANITOBA PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I wish once more to call attention to a return ordered for papers and correspondence connected with the Manitoba Government, regarding their claims against the Federal Government for the erection of public buildings in Manitoba. On March 2nd of this session, the Minister of Trade and Commerce took note of my claim, and he said he would inquire into the matter. I again called attention to it on March 25th, and I did not have extended to me the courtesy of an answer at that time. And now, for the third time, I ask, when we may expect to obtain this return, which was voted last session?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). My hon. friend recently made a statement respecting this return. I subsequently discovered that some misunderstanding had occurred, that the order of the House had been sent to the Public Works Department, and the correspondence could not be found in that department. The matter has been referred to my department, and within a day or two I promise that the papers will be laid on the Table. If it is

not so, if the hon. gentleman will be good enough to remind me again, either personally or on the floor of the House, I promise him it will be attended to.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I have done so three times before, and I suppose I can do it the fourth time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter has only come to my department within a few days; I promise the hon. gentleman there will be no further delay.

EDMONTON BRIDGE.

Mr. DAVIN. I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact, that the return respecting the Edmonton Bridge has not been brought down. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) promised me quite a time ago now that it would be brought down the next day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). These papers will be brought down as soon as possible. I may have forgotten something about it, but I will see that they shall be brought down to-morrow if they can be got ready.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman told me a week ago they were ready.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think I said anything of the kind. I said just what I say now, that I will try to get them ready. We have been pressed very much in the department, but I will see that they will be brought down as soon as possible. I do not think there will be any more delay.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT— FRENCH TRANSLATION.

Mr. BERGERON. I call the attention of the Government to the fact that the Auditor General's Report which was laid on the Table three weeks or a month ago, has not yet been translated into French. I know that the French copy does come down later than the English, but I trust that the French translation shall be done as soon as possible. Some of our members have been asking for the French copy of the report, and it is important that it should be brought down as soon as possible.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is in the printer's hands.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It should be in the members' hands.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I understand it is being pressed forward, but there is such a mass of matter with the printer that there has been delay. It is hoped it will be brought down within a few days.

Mr. FIELDING.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House do resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Charges of management..... \$152,843 80

Mr. FOSTER. There is a reduction of \$200 in the Winnipeg office which might be explained. The Minister of Finance should give us an idea of the changes which have taken place in the country savings bank of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia which cause the reduction there. I suppose it is because of transfers to the Post Office Department. The Minister might also explain the increase of \$5,000 for printing Dominion notes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The expenditure on charges of management for the Winnipeg office last year was \$5,254.69, and we are taking \$5,400 this year.

Mr. FOSTER. There has been no change in the office.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been no change. With regard to the country savings banks the reduction has been caused by the transfer of the following agencies to the post office, namely, Annapolis, New Glasgow, St. Andrews, Woodstock, Liverpool, and Summerside, P.E.I.

Mr. FOSTER. What has occasioned these changes?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In two cases, I believe, dismissals were made on political grounds; in the other cases they were caused by death.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the two political dismissals?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Annapolis and New Glasgow.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman might explain why he made the changes in these important offices.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In both cases charges were made and communicated to the gentlemen referred to. I believe I am correct in saying that they did not deny the accuracy of the charges; and, according to the rule which has been laid down, they were subject to dismissal, and they were dismissed. I do not think I can say more.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there a formal investigation in each case?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was not, because the gentlemen accused did not deny the charges.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the charge a heinous one?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a matter of opinion. It was a charge of active political partisanship.

Mr. FOSTER. Did they shoot two good Grits?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think their conduct was that bad.

Mr. FOSTER. I think their conduct should be explainted. What did they do?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One of them was the secretary of the Conservative committee in his county. The other took the public platform and made speeches against the Liberal party.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Were they good speeches?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was not present, but I have no doubt they were the best speeches that could be made in support of a very poor case.

Mr. FOSTER. Were the speeches a personal arraignment of any one of the Ministers, or disquisitions on the issues of the day as between the two parties?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think in either case they would be open to the charge. I think that public officials are not to go on the stump to engage in discussions of the political issues of the day.

Mr. FOSTER. And now it is laid down as a principle that the secretary of a Conservative club cannot receive deposits at the desk and pay over interest.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I should think he had better not try to do the two things at once.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase of \$5,000 in printing Dominion notes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That arises from the increased circulation. The figures have already been given. The circulation is exceptionally large, and there is a corresponding increase in the expenditure for printing.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the engraving for these notes being done in New York as before?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The making of the die was, I believe, done in New York, and I believe the contract was made on that understanding. But I believe that all the work now being done is going on in the building in sight of this building.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, the printing?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The printing, and I believe also the engraving, if there is any.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend sure of that? Can he tell us that the work of engraving for these notes is really being done by engravers in that building?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I fancy that at the present moment there is no engraving going on. I presume the notes are being printed from plates which were engraved months ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose I were to make the assertion that all the engraving from which these notes are now being printed was done in New York and none of it done here, would my hon. friend feel like disputing that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend will make the assertion on his responsibility that the contract is not being complied with, I am sure I would feel it my duty to investigate it.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the question is as to the contract not being complied with. My question was whether the engraving was done here or in New York. My impression is that every bit of the engraving has been done in New York, and that Canadian workmen have nothing to do with the matter.

The Governor General's Secretary's Office. \$11,450

Mr. FOSTER. What makes the increase of \$50 here?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only change is the addition of \$50 to the salary of one of the clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a statutory increase?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, might I ask my hon. friend to give us an idea now of what the policy of the Government is as to statutory increases? In the session before last it was stated very decidedly, as a matter of permanent policy of the Government, that statutory increases were to be done away with. That was heralded throughout the country from one end of it to the other. Gradually, as the session went on, it was found that some Ministers had favourites to whom they gave increases varying from \$50 to \$200. Later on the Postmaster General came down with very general statutory increases, and an unedifying contest took place at a late hour one night between him and his colleagues, which resulted in those statutory increases being withdrawn. And now the first item we come to has a statutory increase. Is this a matter of favour, to be extended now to one and now to another, according to the good-will of the Minister, or have the Government reconsidered their position, and are they going to allow statutory increases?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot recall any occasion when any member of the Government stated that no statutory increases would be granted. The idea intended to be conveyed was that statutory increases were not to be granted as gene-

rally as they had been in former years. The present policy of the Government is to grant statutory increases on the recommendation of the Minister to such officers as may be deemed worthy of them. Of course, different Ministers may have different ideas as to who may be deserving of statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. The statutory increases were never given except on the report of the Deputy Minister, as given to the Minister, and approved by the Minister. I grant you that statutory increases were the rule, and I would much rather that they would be the rule—that every deserving and painstaking officer should have his statutory increase as a matter of right, and that it should not be, as it seems to be in the present case, brought down simply to a matter of favouritism. My hon. friend says that he does not understand that there was a general declaration against statutory increases. My hon. friend knows that it was stated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and one or two of the other Ministers, as a great advance on the former policy, that they were to be done away with, but now it appears they are not to be done away with but that one man is to be picked out here and another there according to the favour of the Minister, while equally deserving and painstaking officers go on year after year without any statutory increase at all.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What was stated was this. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, from long experience in the office of Finance Minister, that for a very long term every man who was entitled to a statutory increase got it as a matter of course, whether he was good, bad or indifferent. There were Estimates upon Estimates brought down in which every single officer, out of hundreds who were entitled to the statutory increase, got it. He knows perfectly well that there is the widest possible difference in the capacity and diligence of the various clerks in the departments. You have some who barely earn their pay, and you have others who are worthy and most efficient and capable men, oftentimes deserving larger salaries than we are able to grant them. This applies particularly to the higher branches, because I have always maintained that our higher branches were underpaid while our lower branches, as compared with the salaries paid in banking and other institutions are decidedly overpaid, and we have decided that we could not endorse the system of giving statutory increases indiscriminately. But the hon. gentleman is in error in assuming that we arbitrarily declare that we would make no increases at all. We never said that we would make no increases at all, but that when any deserving case arose, we give it due consideration. My own opinion is that the sum

Mr. FIELDING.

demand for civil government is quite as large as Canada ought to pay, and if we are to give the statutory increase indiscriminately, that would involve the necessity of dismissing a larger number of men and giving the statutory increases to the remainder, or dispensing with the statutory increases, except in specially deserving cases, and thus keep the sum total as near as possible to where it is.

Mr. FOSTER. What rule is now being adopted? I would judge that this is the rule, that all deserving clerks who are eligible for statutory increase in every department should get it, and therefore when, as in this case, the Minister brings down only one statutory increase, it is to be presumed that other clerks in the department are not painstaking and deserving of it. They do not get theirs for that reason, but this gentleman gets his because he is worthy of it. The inference is that the others do not do their work well or neglect their work. How many are there in the Governor General's Department who are eligible for the statutory increase?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What we said was that those who are specially deserving will get it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are two, one of whom got the increase.

Mr. FOSTER. Who got the increase?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Walker got it.

Mr. FOSTER. And who is the other?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Sladen.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the relative time in office of these clerks?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I really am unable to answer the question.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a very important question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Walker entered in 1886, but I have not the date of Mr. Sladen's entrance.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it is quite possible that Mr. Walker is the junior clerk.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman will know that one of these gentlemen is at the maximum of his class.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked the Minister of Finance who are eligible, and he told me that two were, and I am relying on his statement.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. You were asking about the other first-class clerk, and he is at his maximum.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Finance Minister said that two were eligible.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. One is first-class and one is second-class.

Mr. FOSTER. And they are Messrs. Sladen and Walker ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The gentleman who gets the increase is a first-class clerk, and the other is a second-class clerk who is getting \$1,100.

Mr. McNEILL. Are we to understand, then, that the second-class clerk who does not get the statutory increase is not worthy of it ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not necessarily, but not sufficiently.

Mr. McNEILL. This is monstrous, in my judgment. I do not think the word is too strong. These gentlemen entered this service on the distinct understanding that if they conducted themselves and discharged their duties as they should, they would get that statutory increase. That has been the rule for years. If the Government thought that that was a bad rule, they should make a change, as to the men who now enter the service. But that they should deal in this way with men who entered the service under the distinct understanding that they were to get the statutory increase is a disgrace to Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. There must be some method by which we can get at the information as to what are the relative services of these two classes. This department, I believe, is under the President of the Council.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In a sort of a fashion it is, as the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. FOSTER. Under whose supervision, as deputy, does this department come ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think, if it can be considered under anybody's supervision, it would be that of the Governor General's Secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. Am I to understand that the Governor General's secretary favourably recommended Mr. Walker and did not favourably recommend Mr. Sladen ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All I can say is that the gentleman who is getting the increase was certainly recommended, but I would not like that to imply any reflection on the other gentleman, by any means.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will not say that both were recommended, as in the case, for instance, of some other departments ?

Mr. INGRAM. Is this W. H. Walker the same gentleman who received a salary for three months at the rate of \$1,200 and for nine months at the rate of \$1,250 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, he is the only person of that name.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Mr. Sladen was appointed the 1st of January, 1891. Mr. Walker was appointed in 1886.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. Minister tell us if it is understood that the same principle is to apply in all the departments with reference to the statutory increases, or does every Minister regulate that according to his own judgment ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is largely given on the recommendation of the Minister. Each Minister makes such recommendations as, in his judgment, are deserving, and the Council deals with them. That is the only way this matter can be dealt with.

Mr. SPROULE. And there has been no understanding come to by the Council that the same principle will prevail in every department, namely, that each Minister exercises his own judgment with regard to the promotions he makes in his own department ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Each Minister recommends those who, in his judgment, are specially entitled to consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that that is a very unhealthy rule, and a very unfair one to the civil servants. These men are making their engagements from year to year upon the assumption that if they do their work creditably and are efficient employees, they will get an increase at the beginning of the next year, and there is no doubt that many of them are embarrassed to-day owing to the new system that has been adopted within the last couple of years. As my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said, when they went into the service it was with the distinct understanding that if they did their work satisfactorily they would get the increase, and their outlay was, no doubt, based upon that understanding. But they find now, perhaps after having incurred expenses which they would not have incurred but for this understanding, that they are deprived of the increase and they know of no reason why they should be deprived of it. Many of them are afraid that the custom will prevail that only favourites of the deputy heads will be likely to get the increase, while none will know in advance whether they are to get the increase or not. This is a pernicious system, because it leaves it to the Minister or Deputy Minister to advance their own favourites, whether their term of service is short or long, and those who have not the pull on the Minister or the Deputy Minister will remain as they are. I have always thought that the proper way would be to allow a statutory increase, great or small, whatever might be considered fair, and give it to all deserving employees in the service, of course with the same restrictions as heretofore,

that when the civil servant reaches the maximum of his class the increase shall cease. Then let the Deputy Minister, say at the end of the year, make a report on the employees of his department, and where he finds any that were not suitable, let him so state, so that those who are not doing their duty or who are not fit to be in the service may be dismissed, while those who are efficient may be advanced in salary, not as a matter of grace or of favour, but as a matter of statute and as a matter of right. I think this would add to the efficiency of those who remain in the service, while it would weed out those who are not faithful or not efficient.

Mr. FOSTER. What salary is Mr. Walker getting now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He was increased from \$1,400 to \$1,450.

Mr. FOSTER. I find by the Auditor's report that Mr. Walker, in the Governor General Secretary's Office, got in 1896-97 for the first three months, \$1,300, and for the succeeding nine months, \$1,350. If he is getting \$1,400 now he must have got a statutory increase in the meantime. And it is proposed to grant him a further increase next year. Thus, so far as Mr. Walker is concerned, the statutory increase has been regularly given to him from the time the present Government came into office.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). He was appointed a first-class clerk on the 1st July, 1897—that is, he was promoted.

Mr. FOSTER. That is equivalent to the same thing.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is not a statutory increase, but only giving him the regular salary.

Mr. FOSTER. Is \$1,400 the maximum of the second-class ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then Mr. Walker received two statutory increases and got his pass over the limit of the second-class, and another increase for him is now estimated. So that, with statutory increases and promotions, the advancement of salary is steadily carried out with regard to Mr. Walker, while Mr. Sladen, a second-class clerk is refused his statutory increase.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand the rule is that when a clerk is promoted the first year of promotion is the same as the last year of the statutory increase, and, therefore, the increase does not take effect by reason of promotion until the year after.

Mr. INGRAM. There is another point in connection with that. As I understand, Mr. Sladen did receive his increase in 1896-

Mr. SPROULE.

96, why should he be refused his increase this year, while on the other hand, Mr. Walker received his increase year before last and last year, also this.

Mr. BENNETT. It will be within the recollection of the House that last year when the Estimates of the Post Office Department were being passed, the question of statutory increases for some officials in that department came up. I am free to admit that the two officials who, in that instance, were rewarded had, according to the evidence of the Postmaster General, and according to the printed evidence—because they were the gentlemen who compiled the printed correspondence that they succeeded in finding in some of the hidden archives of the Postmaster General's department—rendered special service. They were picked out for this increase despite the fact that they enjoyed very considerable salaries. On that occasion the Postmaster General laid down what would be the guiding principle in future as regards preferment and promotion, that is, so far as salaries is concerned. He spoke as follows :—

I therefore intend to have a special report with regard to each officer, not to be severe, but simply to grant these rewards in an intelligent way.

May I ask if that has been adopted in all the departments, and has it been accepted as a rule in the other departments ? At the same time I wish, on behalf of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to register his protest against these increases, and I cannot do better than quote the hon. gentleman's own language of last year, although he seems to be weakening in the faith of protesting against expenditure. Last year he said as follows, with regard to the proposed increases :—

I am exceedingly sorry to notice that the system of granting sums of money to civil servants, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, is being continued. In the cases mentioned by the Postmaster General, there may have been exceptional services rendered ; but if we are going to continue this system, I think it would be much better to amend the Civil Service Act.

And yet the hon. member is perfectly silent and docile at the present moment, and I presume, from his present attitude, that he intends to continue so throughout the whole discussion of the Estimates. There may have been some special reasons for exceptional advances last year, but the hon. member for North Wellington has not satisfied me that the gentleman whose statutory increase is being given is worthy of it on the ground that he has rendered exceptional services.

So far, I have not heard that this gentleman has rendered any exceptional services. The whole basis of the case is, that there is a contract between the people entering the service of the Government, and the Govern-

ment, and from this out it is to be laid down as a principle, that, if a man has, so to speak, a political pull, he is to have an increase of salary, while, on the other hand, if he has no political pull, he is not to have an increase, or, if circumstances should arise, as did arise in the case of two clerks last year, who were able to render exceptional services to the Postmaster General, then they are to be rewarded. If exceptional services are performed by these clerks, then there may be some reason for giving them advancement; but, if this is to be the principle henceforward, that no advancements are to be made except according to the will and caprice of the Minister in charge of the department, then all I can say is, that in plain English it means that resort can be had to political leverage.

Mr. DAVIN. Unless we have a statement from the Government that they intend to proceed on a principle, they can hardly justify what I find to be the case here. We are asked to vote here \$11,450 for the Governor General's Secretary's Office. The amount that was asked for in 1896-97 was \$11,112; there is an increase in a very short time for this office of \$300. If the Government says this increase is in consequence of a binding contract between the Government and the officers in this department, well and good; but, if they say they have selected two particular clerks, then I have to say, speaking for the people who have to pay the money, that this is not carrying out the promises of economy we have had from the hon. gentlemen.

Mr. CRAIG. I think the plan chosen by the Government in these matters is most unfortunate. It seems to me that all the deserving clerks ought to get this increase, if any get it; then we would understand that those who did not get it were not deserving, and they should not be retained in the public service at all. But to select one or two out of a great number. I think is a most unfortunate plan, and will lead to great abuses. It will lead to wire-pulling, and to having friends use their influence with the Deputy Minister, or the Minister himself, to obtain these increases. It seems to me, the proper business method is, either to do away with these increases altogether, and let the clerks understand that their salary is fixed at a certain figure while they do that work, or else let it be understood that all the clerks who do their work well get this increase, and, if they do not deserve the increase, let the Government dispense with their services altogether.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, if he has found, in his experience, that there is any uniformity in the departments as to the advance to be given to the clerks in each department. It is easy to understand that there is naturally a constant pressure in all the departments. Under our party system, I am afraid the

hon. gentleman has had time to see the difficulties that will arise under the new system now adopted. I have no hesitation in saying, that there is no protection for any clerk in the service, if you adopt this plan now proposed. I have no doubt that, in the present service, as there always must be in any service—I care not what system you adopt—there must be drones. That has been the case in all other classes of business; it will obtain to some extent in the public service. But you must make the service independent, in the first place, and to make it independent, you must give them a statutory increase, it matters not what party may be in power. At present hon. gentlemen have a means of harassing the present service, and if they were to remain for a considerable time in power, it is easy to understand that an incoming party might apply the same lever; yet there would be as many drones in the service in one case as in the other. I think the Government of the day should have an efficient and an independent service, a service independent both of the whim of the Minister and of the whim of the deputy head. There is no deputy head in the service who might not make it impossible for a single clerk to get an advance, if he thought proper to do so. I do not make any charge, but I say that hon. gentlemen have made it possible for that to be done. It may be very proper to weed out from the service those who are unable to perform onerous duties, and some who are not entitled to increases; but you must weed them out according to some system. It seems to me a great mistake to place the service under the thumb of an incoming Government, I care not whether it be Liberal or Conservative. Now no man dare say his life is his own, politically speaking, because he feels it necessary for him to become almost the abject slave of his superior officer in order to be recommended for an increase. I would like to know, from the hon. gentleman, if there is any uniform opinion among the Ministers as to how many clerks should be put upon the list. I venture to say, that, when this comes up at Council, hon. gentlemen will say: We are swelling this much greater than we expected; some are asking more than others. The only uniform system is to adopt statutory increases of some kind, and weed out of the service men who are unfit to perform their duties satisfactorily.

Mr. WALLACE. The Finance Minister has not explained why the two officers who were promoted on the 1st of July, 1897, one to be a first-class clerk at \$1,400 a year, and the other to be a second-class clerk at \$1,100, and why it is now proposed to increase the salary of one by the statutory increase, and not the salary of the other, who is, however, receiving the smaller salary. If the circumstances are parallel, the Government should give us some reason why they have increased the salary of the higher-priced offi-

cer, and have not touched the salary of the lower-priced officer.

Mr. CLARKE. As the question of the policy of the Government in granting or withholding statutory increases has been raised, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to the position occupied by the letter carriers in the public service. I think it will be conceded by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, that of all the officials in the service of the Crown in Canada, they are the most deserving, and receive the poorest remuneration for the work they perform. Throughout this Dominion they perform their duty with great accuracy, with great celerity and with great regularity. They enter the service at a salary, probably, of \$25 or \$30 per month, and I think I am correct in saying that, for the past two years, this miserable pittance these men have been receiving has not been implemented by the usual statutory increase. This matter has been mentioned elsewhere, and I thought, from the kindly way in which the proposition was received by the Minister of Finance, we had reason to hope that the matter would be favourably considered by the Government, and that provision would be made for giving these men the increase to which they are justly and fairly entitled.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will bring this matter up when the Postmaster General is in his seat, as I am not in a position to answer his inquiry.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Government should inform the House how many clerks there are in the service who claim this increased allowance, and also whether they believe what is said to be their opinion, that there are too many clerks in the service or not. On this first discussion the Government should announce how many men are entitled to the increase, and the reason why the increase was not given to all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think I can state the reasons in all cases. The contention that each member of the civil service should have a statutory increase as a right is one in which the Government do not concur. We are not prepared to go so far as to say there should be no statutory increases, but we hold that they should be given on the judgment of the Minister on the various claims and services of the officials. That there will be inequalities in the judgment of different Ministers is quite possible, but at the present time we do not see any other way of proceeding. As to why a particular officer receives an increase while other officers do not receive the increase, we not being able to give to all applicants the increase, I am bound to say that under such circumstances the increases must be deemed to be given to those who are considered to be the most worthy.

Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. INGRAM. That is the very strongest reason why we should now, in the face of all the complaints made in the city of Ottawa, on entering into this first department of the service, receive an explanation why Mr. Walker received an increase and Mr. Sladen did not. Surely we are entitled to learn the reasons why increases are not given. If it is to be understood that we are not to receive any reply or satisfaction, we had better understand that now and refrain from asking questions in respect to increases in the different departments of the service at Ottawa. I think we are entitled to this explanation in the present case, and if the hon. gentleman is not in a position to give it to-day, the item should stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With every desire to be courteous to the hon. gentleman, I must say that if hon. gentlemen are going to take up a large number of names and ask why a certain officer received an increase and another did not, it will be impossible to furnish information. But if an hon. member asks why we give an increase, I will be able to say, as I have already done, that the increase was recommended and approved. I cannot undertake to prove the negative as to why a large number of officers do not receive increases, especially as if we were to attempt to give reasons we might convey the impression that we were reflecting on the character and services of certain officers. But even among officials who are all in a certain sense meritorious, there will be some in every department of the service whose services will be considered particularly valuable, and those naturally claim consideration which does not exist as regards other officers, who may in their way be very worthy.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Sladen was refused the increase because he was a Tory, while Mr. Walker, who received the increase, was a Grit. So I was informed by a gentleman who knows.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then the hon. gentleman has information which I have never heard of until this moment. This I can say, speaking especially for my own department, and I think I can speak also for the other departments, that the hon. gentleman is mistaken, and that in no case have politics entered into these matters.

Mr. FOSTER. What amount is Mr. Sladen receiving now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. \$1,100 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Sladen is receiving \$1,100. Who is the second man eligible to this statutory increase?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Walker was one and Mr. Sladen the other.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Sladen is at the maximum of his class ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is in the first year of the second class.

Mr. SPROULE. What we should obtain from the Minister is information in regard to the principle adopted. Is the deputy instructed to report on all the officers in his department, and say who are entitled to statutory or any increases ? Or does the Minister trust him to report only on certain officers ? It seems to me very unfair if the deputy does not report on the whole number of officers in his department, because there will be injustice done to some, whether intentionally or otherwise, while others, not deserving any more consideration, will receive a good deal of consideration. The same principle should be followed in every department of the service. If the deputy has to report, let him be instructed to report on all the officers, and thus the deserving will obtain increases to the extent they may be given in each branch. If such a rule is not carried out, unfairness is done to the service and no stimulus given to ambitious officers who desire to do what is right to the service. I repeat that a great hardship is being done in many deserving cases. I know some civil servants who from misfortune or sickness contracted debts with the intention of paying them out of their statutory increases, and made promises on the strength of receiving those increases. But they have not received those increases, and they are now liable to be charged with dishonesty when the fault did not rest with them, but was due to the principle introduced by this Government. Any officer who desires to keep his expenditure within his income cannot do it if he does not know what his income will be. His promises are based on what he believes will be his income, including the statutory increase. He finds subsequently that he does not receive the increase, and this action embarrasses him and does a gross injustice to his creditors. The Government should lay down some principle applicable to all the departments, and state to the House what the rule is.

Mr. McNEILL. Has this gentleman, who is not to get the increase, been negligent in his duty ?

The FINANCE MINISTER. I am not aware that such has been the case, nor do I wish anything of that kind to be inferred.

Mr. McNEILL. The Act says :

The increase, statutory, to any officer, clerk or employee, authorized under this Act for the then current year may be suspended by the head of the department for neglect of duty or misconduct.

But the hon. Finance Minister does not

pretend to say that there has been any neglect in the discharge of duties by this officer. Then, by what right does he deprive him of the statutory increase ? Not by the law. The law distinctly says that the minimum salary for a third-class clerk shall be \$400 per annum, with a yearly increase of \$50 up to the maximum of the class. That was the understanding and arrangement made when these clerks entered the service, and that is the law. The law says, moreover, that if an officer is negligent in his duties or guilty of misconduct, the Minister may deprive him for that year of the statutory increase, and that he may be subsequently restored by such head, but without arrears. That is the law, and that is the law only. By what right do hon. gentlemen treat men, deserving men, who have entered the service, men whom the Minister does not deny are deserving men, in this way ? By what reason does he endeavour to deprive such a man of the legal claim he has for this statutory increase ? If an attempt is being made to get round the spirit of the Act by means of a legal quibble, I repeat what I said before, that it is a disgrace to Canada to treat the civil service in such a way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). My hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) is misreading—at any rate as the Government are advised—the law. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) has taken the trouble to examine the different sections bearing upon these statutory increases. If the hon. gentleman does take that trouble he will see that those who drafted the Act originally, obviously intended that the statutory increase should not go as a right to every official.

Mr. COCHRANE. Give us the clause that supports that statement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The original intention of the statute was that this increase should be given to the officers who were held to be deserving, by the Deputy Minister in the first place, and by the head of the department afterwards.

Mr. COCHRANE. Read the statute.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Would the hon. gentleman kindly allow me for one moment. As years rolled by, the Ministers and the deputies did not take the trouble to make any discrimination between deserving and undeserving men, and for years up to 1896 these statutory increases were granted to every officer as a matter of course. It came to be an accepted axiom that this was a statutory right, but it never was. It was a statutory privilege, and nothing more. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) will remember that last year the Government brought down the opinion of the Justice Department—Sir

Oliver Mowat was then at its head—that this section did not give a statutory right to the increase, and the Government from the first acted upon the opinion of the Department of Justice. The section which the hon. gentleman refers to merely enables the head of the department to suspend the increase for the current year for which it was granted, because of any misconduct or any neglect of duty, on the part of the officer to whom the increase had been granted. If the hon. gentleman will look at the previous section he will see that the increase is only to be passed by Council and recommended to the House, when the deputy in the first instance and the head of the department subsequently, reports that the individual officer is deserving of such an increase. That implies the exercise, not of a capricious judgment but of a proper judgment on the part of the Minister and of the deputy. For years this Act had been flagrantly abused. No attempt was made to exercise that discretion which the law imposed, and when this Government came into power they found the increases were granted to every clerk whether he was deserving or not. It became a public scandal and disgrace. The efficient officers who work early and late—and I am proud to say that there are a large number of them in the different departments of the public service who are ready at all times to give their best efforts to the Minister or the deputy at any hour of the day or night—these men received no recognition from the Government more than did the “4 o’clock men,” who sit watching the clock from a quarter to four until it is time to leave. Rightly or wrongly the Government came to the conclusion last year that this was an unfair system, and that it involved a large annual increase in the public expenditure which could not be justified. The Government found that they had either to grant increases to the most deserving, as the deputy and as the head of the department determined, or that they had to exercise the pruning knife and dismiss a large number of clerks from the departments altogether. The whole country was crying out against the system which prevailed before this Government came into power, and members of Parliament on both sides were denouncing this continual increase in the cost of the public service. We all know that the statutory increases, in the manner in which they are given, amounted to about \$47,000 a year. The Government stopped that. As is well known there are in every department gentlemen whose whole heart and soul is in the public service, who are willing day and night to do their work, and the Government thought it proper not to repeal the section but to administer it in the spirit in which I have no doubt the draughtsman of that section intended, namely: that the increase should not be given indiscriminately as it had been given for many years, but

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

that it should be given to those whose conduct recommended itself to the department and to the head of the department, as men whose services should be specially recognized and rewarded. It does not follow that because others have not been specially rewarded in this way, that they have been guilty of neglect of duty; not by any manner of means. In all departments there have been men who for one reason or another have rendered special service, and these gentlemen are recommended for an increase. This power has been used most sparingly; I think in my own department there is but one, and I believe a great many of the departments have not seen any special reason to recommend anybody for the increase. In each department the circumstances may have been a little different. I rose chiefly to point out to my hon. friends opposite, that they were labouring under two errors, one, that the Government are not acting on a principle in this matter, and the other, that like my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) they have not correctly interpreted this section of the Act. I say, Sir, that we are acting upon a principle, and upon a defensible principle. I acknowledge that you cannot lay down any principle which is not open to some criticism, and a good deal of the criticism offered by hon. gentlemen is reasonable. There are men who perhaps looked forward to obtaining this increase but who did not get it, and probably they have suffered some inconvenience. No one regrets that more than do my colleagues and myself, but we have carefully considered it. We felt that in the public interest we were bound to stop the yearly increasing amount which had been heaped upon the civil service for many years back, that it was not possible consistently with the mandate we have received from the people, and consistently with the views entertained by the majority of this House, to go on adding \$50,000 a year in an indiscriminate manner to the salaries of the civil servants. Our plan may be open to some criticism; you may say that the Minister will not exercise his judgment fairly, but in answer to that, my reply is: the exercise of that judgment is a matter that in each case must be submitted to the representatives of the people.

In every single case in which there has been an increase this year, that increase must be justified by the Minister, not only to his colleagues in the first instance, but to the House and the country afterwards. There is no desire on our part to do injustice; but we have to recognize that there is a certain person in this country known as the taxpayer, who must not be absolutely ignored. We must also recognize the fact that in Canada we have an abnormally large civil service. We must recognize that if we had dismissed a large number of these men, we would have been charged with cruelty to them. So that, if we wanted to economize at all, the fairest

and most just and honest way to do was to put the civil service on the basis on which the law intended that it should be put in the first place, and grant the increase only to those who are recommended to Council as entitled to receive it.

Mr. McNEILL. I am glad my hon. friend has made that explanation, because it puts the case very clearly before the House. The hon. gentleman's opinion is that only those who are specially deserving should have the increase, and that that is the sense of the Act. I would like to ask my hon. friend how he as a lawyer, reading the Act, can justify a statement of that kind.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I told my hon. friend that that was the opinion the late Minister of Justice gave in writing to the Government.

Mr. McNEILL. I think the late Minister of Justice gave the opinion to the Government that the Government could hold back the statutory increase of a civil servant. We all understand that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are not bound to give it. It is a matter of discretion.

Mr. McNEILL. The statute provides that the minimum salary of a third-class clerk shall be \$400 per annum, with an annual increase of \$50 up to a maximum of \$1,000; that the minimum salary of a second-class clerk shall be \$1,100 per annum, with an annual increase of \$50 up to a maximum of \$1,400; and that the minimum salary of a first-class clerk shall be \$1,400 per annum, with an annual increase of \$50 up to a maximum of \$1,800. Does my hon. friend mean to say that the Minister of Justice declared that that meant that only the deserving men among these men should get the increase?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I do not. My hon. friend is not acting with his usual fairness.

Mr. McNEILL. I am, as far as my mind is capable of being fair.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend must be aware that the section he before referred to is not any one of the three he has just read.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend must not interrupt me.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman asked me the question, and I am answering him. The section he referred to was section 26.

Mr. McNEILL. I am coming to section 26. We are talking of the whole Act; we are not talking of one section. My hon. friend spoke of the meaning of the whole Act, and when I referred to that particular section, he ran away from it and referred to the whole Act, and now when I refer to the

spirit of the Act he runs away to the clause; and now he accuses me of unfairness because I take up the very argument he used himself. I say again that the Act is as plain and clear as the English language can make it, so far as these sections are concerned. With regard to section 26, it is an enabling section—a section controlling these other sections.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not an enabling section.

Mr. McNEILL. A controlling section. It is enabling in one sense: it enables the Minister to withhold the statutory increase, and it is a controlling section, because it controls the increase in a certain sense. That section is this:

No officer, clerk or employee shall receive any increase of salary except by Order in Council passed on the report of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the department, stating that such officer, clerk or employee is deserving of such increase.

And then the subsection says:

The increase of salary of any officer, clerk or employee authorized under this Act for the then current year may be suspended by the head of the department, for neglect of duty or misconduct.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It can only be suspended after it is granted.

Mr. McNEILL. If the deputy head reports in favour of the clerk, he gets his statutory increase, unless he has been guilty of neglect or misconduct. That is as clear as it is possible for the English language to make it. My hon. friend talks a great deal about the cost of the civil service, and about the way in which the expense of the civil service was being heaped up by these statutory increases. That is all very well; but this is the law that we are dealing with. If my hon. friend wishes to make another law applying to men who are entering the service under other conditions, he can do so; but he has no right to violate the contract entered into by Canada with Canada's civil service, simply because he wishes to make political capital, or for any other reason. These gentlemen have rights here; and however the taxpayer of Canada may feel indisposed to increase taxation, I will say this for the taxpayer of Canada, that he wants to see the men in his employment properly treated, fairly and honestly treated; and I do not think it is honest treatment to bring men into the civil service under a distinct understanding, and under the provisions of a law, and then violate the law and break the understanding. My hon. friend speaks of members of the civil service who work overtime and of the zeal of some of the civil service. No doubt there are many members of the civil service who are zealous to a degree. The civil service of Canada is a service of

which we may very well be proud ; but the fact that certain members of the civil service work overtime and are specially zealous, and deserving of recognition, is no reason why other men should be deprived of their rights. I believe that the rights that have been secured to these gentlemen under the statute are rights which no Government has any right to violate ; and I am very much surprised at the defence which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has set up in this matter.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do not wish to enter into a discussion of the general policy ; upon that my hon. friend and I probably would not agree ; but I do not want him to go away with the impression that I have tried to misconstrue the law. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that by the section which the hon. gentleman attempted to rely upon, in the first place, the increase which may be suspended on account of neglect of duty is an increase that has already been given, and you cannot suspend a thing that has not been given. It does not relate to the giving of the increase at all, but to the suspension of the increase for misconduct after it has been given. On the other point, I venture the assertion that section 26 involves the exercise of judicial discretion on the part of the Deputy Minister and the Minister of the department and that no officer was entitled—

Mr. **DAVIN**. That is, if there was misconduct.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It had nothing to do with misconduct at all. Misconduct has only reference to the suspension of an increase already given, and has nothing to do with giving the increase in the first instance. The giving of the increase in the first instance is a matter which depends on the report of the deputy to the head of the department.

Mr. **DAVIN**. No, it depends on the conduct of the clerk.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Not at all. That report must be dependent on whether, in the opinion of the deputy, he is, in the language of the statute, deserving of such increase. Those words necessarily import the exercise of judicial discretion upon his work and conduct, and until the deputy has reported that the clerk deserves an increase, in the language of the statute, he has no statutory right to it whatever. Therefore, the practice which has existed so many years, of giving the increase in every case, was one directly contrary to it, and we are now carrying out the spirit and intent of the statute.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I do not think that the hon. and learned gentleman understands the meaning of the word "suspension." He

Mr. **MCNEILL**.

asks us to believe that he would not misconstrue a statute. After the speech we have just heard, it would be hard to convince us that he would not. My hon. friend has a habit at times of extemporizing his law, and I rather think that, in the earlier part of this discussion, he extemporized the law, and now he is trying to twist the statute. I propose to show you that he has failed signally—I shall not add, ignominiously. Section 18 reads as follows :—

The minimum salary of a first-class clerk shall be \$1,400 per annum, with an annual increase of \$50 up to the maximum of \$1,800.

Section 20 reads in precisely the same terms, respecting second and third-class clerks, the only difference being in the figures of their salaries. Their salaries are to be so much at first, with an increase of \$50 every year until they reach the maximum, subject to no provisions. Then comes the provision to section 26, which was necessary in order to prevent persons who had been guilty of misconduct, but not of such misconduct as would justify their dismissal, from getting the benefit of the statutory increase. It provides :

No officer, clerk or employee shall receive any increase of salary except by Order in Council, passed on the report of the deputy head, and concurred in by the head of the department, stating that such officer, clerk, or employee is deserving of such increase.

What that means is this, that, in order to give action and fruition to sections 18, 19 and 20, the deputy head shall state that the clerk has not placed himself outside of the law, as any one can do. There is not a right that any of us enjoys in regard to which we cannot place ourselves outside of the law ; and, when we do, we discover that the protection which belongs to us at other times no longer exists, because we have forfeited it by misconduct. No officer, clerk or employee shall receive an increase of salary, except by Order in Council, as I have read. Then comes subsection 2 :—

The increase of salary of any officer, clerk or employee, authorized under this Act for the then current year,—

Mark you, the increase for the current year. That evidently provides for the increase imperatively provided for in section 18, 19 and 20, which goes into operation in the natural way, as provided by the statute, the deputy head having reported that this man has behaved himself. Then, what is said :

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. What section is the hon. gentleman quoting ?

Mr. **DAVIN**. Section 26. It provides that that increase may be suspended by the head of the department for neglect of duty or misconduct. What is the contention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries ? I do not know whether my hon. friend who has just put me that question, was in the

House when his learned colleague was speaking, and I ask his attention to this :

The increase of salary of any officer, clerk or employee, authorized under this Act for the then current year, may be suspended by the head of the department.

What is the meaning of that? The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries contends that it leaves it optional with the Minister and his deputy to give the increase or not. He contends that the increase could not be given without their volition and action, and, therefore, if they were of the opinion that he should not get it, it would not be given. But where, then, would be the need of suspension? Where would there be room for a suspension? On the contrary, it is because an almost automatic increase is going forward in the regular way, and because this man has placed himself outside the law, we provide that, instead of the increase going into action and fruition in the manner provided by the statute, it may be suspended by the head of the department in the case of neglect of duty or misconduct. And so strongly did the men who framed that section feel that this increase was part of the salary that they provided that, although it might be thus suspended, as it was going forward into action, they provided that it might be subsequently restored by such deputy head, but without arrears. If the man behaved himself in such a manner as to, as it were, wipe out his misconduct, then the statutory increase might be restored to him, but he would not be entitled to any arrears. Why, according to the contention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that word "restore" is an improper word, just as "suspension" would be an improper word. How could the increase be restored, if it did not properly belong to the man—if, in fact, it was not part of his salary? I hope that we shall hear from my hon. and learned friend the Solicitor General, who asked me the question on that head. I see that he shakes his head, and I am quite convinced he will not interfere, because he knows very well that his colleague has a talent for extemporizing law and excogitating facts, and I do not think he will come to his rescue in the matter. I say, let us either have that Act carried out as it should be, or repealed. I agree with my hon. friend who last spoke on this side. If the people of Canada owe these clerks the money, let us pay it, and let us afterwards take any course that may be deemed necessary to limit the number of civil servants. But, if we owe them the money, do not let us eke out a saving by docking \$50 here and \$50 there. And where is the economy to come in? My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries speaks of \$47,000 as the savings, but where do we save that? Apparently, we are saving very little, as I will show in a moment with regard to this very item. All we are saving now is the statutory increase

that the caprice—or, if you like, the wisdom—of an odd Minister may think it well to withhold, because that the Government are not withholding the increase in certain cases is palpable from this very item. Not only that, but so far as I can see in the item before us, we have increases such as were not provided for by the law at all. It is a very remarkable thing that the increase which took place from 1895 to 1896-97 was only \$100 in this office. From 1896-97 to 1897-98 an increase took place very much greater than that, an increase of about \$300 in one year. And, to some extent, this House was deceived by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. I do not say he did intentionally, but certainly we last year voted this item under a statement from the Minister of Trade and Commerce that gave us a false impression. This is the argument used by the Minister last year in order to induce us to vote the items for that year :

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). This is precisely as heretofore, with the exception of a very small statutory increase of \$25 in the one case and \$12.50 in another.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the Government had stopped all statutory increases this year.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. These were statutory increases that had been granted before. They are just balanced periods. They had been granted, in the one case, terminating on the 1st October, and in the other case, terminating on the 1st of January next.

So that the hon. gentleman, when asking for the vote last year, gave the House the idea that there would be no statutory increase. I have also the hon. gentleman's language in 1895, when we were in committee :

As to the particular small increases of \$50 per annum, we know very little about the efficiency of the clerk, and I am not going to criticize them. But I am bound to say this, and it applies also to the other estimates in connection with the civil service, that we are at present expending about one million and a half for civil government, as it is called, which is very nearly double the amount it was found necessary to expend under this head sixteen years ago.

The standard he had in his mind was the expenditure of 16 years before, and yet he is not increasing the expenses of this office by \$100 a year, as in former times, but by \$300, and that in a way that cannot be justified on the ground of statutory increases :

There has been no pretense whatever made that the work of governing the country is double now what it was then, nevertheless our expenditure has gradually grown until it is about double the expenditure of 1878.

Said the hon. member for South Oxford, now the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce.

I would not have complained, nor would the country, of a moderate increase, but it is utterly

and entirely disproportionate as compared with expenditures in previous years.

And now let me say, I would never complain in regard to this item or any item increased on statutory grounds. But what I say is that we cannot allow these hon. gentlemen to come forward and say to the House and the country that they are going to economize, that they are not going to give statutory increases, but are going to select here and there those who are to receive increases, and actually, in one item, make a larger increase in a single year than ever was made in the past. I say the gross inconsistency is one thing to complain of, but the extravagance is another thing which we have an equal right to complain of. We have no adequate explanation as to the increase that has taken place. I confess I am surprised when I see my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) sitting quietly there.

Mr. COCHRANE. He is smiling.

Mr. DAVIN. I want him to do more than smile. I love to see him smile, but it fills me with rapture when I hear him criticise budgets. Therefore, I would like my hon. friend to get back his voice. There are cases in medical history of persons suffering from hysteria and losing their voices. It is a matter partly of fancy on their part, and partly of craft. I heard of a very eminent medical man who had a case of that kind. He said to the father of the patient, who was a lady: Send your daughter to the hospital and I will see to it that she is cured in three or four days. He gave directions to the consulting physicians what was to be done, as the patient pretended to be deaf and dumb.

Mr. BENNETT. He (Mr. McMullen) is not deaf.

Mr. DAVIN. No, he is only dumb. The consulting physicians had their directions to say in the hearing of the patient that if the powders to be given were not successful, her hair, which was long and beautiful, should be cut off, and if that did not succeed in three days she would be sure to die. In two days the patient was quite well. I think that if we could have it whispered in the ear of the hon. member for North Wellington, that the high office he is aspiring to would not be given to him unless he recovered his voice, we should soon have him in his pristine vigour criticising hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. I am anxious for the hon. gentleman's reputation. He had a historical character, in this Parliament, and he has almost entirely lost it. The Montreal "Star," a newspaper for which I have the greatest respect, takes a fatherly interest in the hon. member for North Wellington, and almost weeps over the fact that McMullen is silent. I want to hold up a picture to my hon. friend, and it is the picture that he himself presented in

Mr. DAVIN.

other days. Even so late as a year ago, the heroic memories of 16 years clung glorious around him, and the aureole of Auditor General's criticisms flamed around his brow. In 1897, he said:

I am exceedingly sorry to notice that the system of granting sums of money to civil servants, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, is being continued.

I am not complaining only of the increase, but of the inconsistency. These are not statutory increases that have taken place. In one year, we have \$300 added to the cost of the department, which is \$200 more than was ever added before. And yet this is a Government of economy, a Government that will violate the just claims of the civil servant in order that they may make a bastard claim to economy before the people of this country. The hon. member for North Wellington continues:

In the cases mentioned by the Postmaster General, there may have been exceptional services rendered; but if we are going to continue this system, I think it would be much better to amend the Civil Service Act. I found fault with hon. gentlemen opposite when they practised this system.

That is perfectly true, there never was a man so persistent in this respect sitting on this side of the House.

It appears that every clerk who has any possible excuse upon which to hang a claim for additional salary, makes application and presses it until, eventually, possibly with the assistance of the deputy head, the Minister gives way and the evil continues.

This is exactly what appears to be going on now.

I think the Civil Service Act should be amended in some way, so that we shall not be asked every year to pass votes of this kind.

The hon. gentleman, however, is silent. I have again to reiterate that I have shown that my hon. and learned friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) was palpably astray in the administration of an Act of Parliament.

At first he misstated the law, but when he had the law in his hands, he hovered around the point and never touched it, and tried to becloud it to this House. I hope he will acknowledge that he utterly failed to answer the able argument made by my hon. friend from Bruce; and I think that before we pass this item we must have some more satisfactory explanation from the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. ORAIG. I think the explanation given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not be satisfactory to those who have read this Act. It seems to me that any fair-minded man reading this Act would understand it to mean what has been contended by those on this side of the House.

Any man entering the civil service and reading this Act over carefully, would understand that he was entering at a certain salary, and that if he faithfully performed his duties he would be entitled to a statutory increase of \$50 a year until he came to the maximum, on condition that he faithfully performed his duties. Section 26 lays down the way in which a clerk shall get this increase, and that is by deserving it. All that is necessary in order that he shall get it is that a report be made to Council that he deserves it, and if he deserves it he shall get it. I hold this Act reads fairly that all who deserve the increase should get it, not that one or two should get it, and that all the rest should be left out. Clause 2 of section 26 says :

The increase of salary of any officer, clerk or employee authorized under this Act—

Not granted under this Act, but authorized under this Act.

—for the then current year, may be suspended by the head of the department for neglect of duty or misconduct.

Only for that; and I maintain that if the Government do not intend to carry out this Civil Service Act—and I am not saying they should do this, I am not advocating that every clerk should receive the \$50 increase yearly—but I maintain that as long as this Act is on the Statute-book the Government are bound to go by it, and not construe it as they please, not make a ruling just to suit themselves. I maintain that a fair interpretation of this Act is that every officer in the civil service who faithfully discharges his duty is entitled to this increase yearly, and that those only who fail to discharge their duty, who are guilty of neglect or misconduct, should fail to get this increase. If the Government do not agree with that principle, then let them bring in a Bill repealing this Act, and I do not say that I would not support it. I only say that while this Act remains on the Statute-book the Government should be guided by it, and not pick out one or two from a department, one this year and one next year, and so on, and give them the increase, and leave all the others out. I say they are misrepresenting the men in the service who do not get this increase. I hope the Government will reconsider this matter and arrive at some conclusion and not leave these increases to wire-pulling or to favouritism. Suppose there are a dozen men in an office, and there are one or two who get these increases, while it is withheld from all the others, the inference will be that these men have used some underhand means to influence the deputy head or the Minister. If that state of things continues it will be most unfortunate for the country and the civil service.

Mr. TISDALE. There is one point I have not heard mentioned that ought to

simplify the construction to be placed upon this statute. I understand it is held that it is in the discretion of the Minister and the deputy to give the increase or not. If that is so, is it not extraordinary such a provision was not placed in the law? When all these different sections were being passed how simple it would have been to say in the first section what the minimum and maximum should be, and then provide that in the discretion of the Minister or the deputy, upon the good conduct of the employee being certified to them, he should get his increase. That would have been all the law required to justify the contention of the Government. I think my hon. friend from Assinibola (Mr. Davin) gave the true construction, and the only construction that a court of justice would put upon it. It seems to me that having that law on the Statute-book, especially in view of the fact that our civil service as a whole is creditable to the country, we ought to carry it out. I do not see how it can be successfully contended that Parliament in passing this law would have deliberately ignored these four or five sections and subsections, if all they wanted to say was that in the discretion of the Minister or his deputy the increases should be made from time to time up to the maximum.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the Solicitor General tell us where this report of the Attorney General is to be found construing the law?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He has not reported upon it, it is simply his advice.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say a word to the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). If we were now considering a Civil Service Bill, his remarks would come in very well, but the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House made the law, and this Government are now administering it. If the law was intended to be imperative, certainly clause 26 would not have been put in. The law is simply permissive, the deputy head or the Minister of any department may consider it prudent and in the interest of the country to recommend that certain statutory measures should be given to certain clerks in the departments; and if they do not consider that the clerks are entitled to them, or if they think they are sufficiently paid for the work which they do, they may decline to make the recommendation. I think that is clearly pointed out by section 26. Hon. gentlemen opposite are taking a very peculiar course in this discussion. When the Budget was under consideration, they charged the Government with not carrying out their pledges. They said that we on this side of the House had promised to make reductions in the annual expenditure, and hon. gentlemen opposite assailed the Government fiercely because they were making no effort to carry out those promises. But now when the

Government are making an effort to promote economy by declining to grant statutory increases to civil servants in Ottawa who are not entitled to them, hon. gentlemen opposite assail them fiercely and bitterly because they do not go on and make the statutory increases. But when we come to consider the gross expenditure they will again assail the Government fiercely, and say: You are expending this year more than the previous Government did. Hon. gentlemen should be a little consistent. The Government are trying to do what they think best in the interests of the country. I think there is no class in the Dominion that is better paid than the civil service, and I think the Government will see that no deserving increase is withheld. I am a little surprised, and amused also, at the course hon. gentlemen opposite are taking in connection with this matter.

I wish to say a word with respect to the Civil Service Act. I should like very much indeed to see it carried out; I do not like to see after an item in the Estimates, the words, "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act." Frankly, I object to that. There may be some cases of great hardship where men have been employed on special work and not paid; but the Civil Service Act should be carried out in its entirety, or it should be amended. Nor am I disposed to have the civil servants placed in a position to dance attendance on the deputy head or the head of any department for the purpose of getting at the end of the year \$50 increase. The Act should provide that civil servants be fairly and sufficiently paid, and there should be no discrimination against any officer by a deputy head who is disposed to do injustice. I admit that the Act is not all what it should be, but the Government have to administer it until such time as it is amended; and I earnestly hope a change will be made and that the service will be placed on a better footing than it occupies at the present time.

Mr. CRAIG. I desire to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that I wish the Government to carry out their promises; I want them to be economical. The hon. gentleman says he wants them to be economical. But we are not finding fault with the Government for being economical. They are not exercising economy, for they are placing in the Estimates votes for statutory increases. If such increases had not been in the Estimates, this discussion would not have taken place. Now, is the hon. gentleman going to vote for this increase? He says he is in favour of economy, and therefore he should vote against the increase. I propose to vote against the increase, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to do so. I want to make the Government economical, but it is difficult to do so. I repel the insinuation that we are doing this for any other reason

Mr. McMULLEN.

than because we consider this question one open for discussion as to whether there should be increases granted or not. What we object to is that the Government should retain in their hands the power of giving two or three officers increases, and refusing them to other officers, who are perhaps equally deserving and are receiving lower salaries, and have larger and more expensive families to maintain. Let the Government either give no increases or give all the officers increases. There is no proper discrimination made, and if we were in the inside circle we would learn the true reason why one or two officers receive increases and the others do not. I hold that the officials who have the most influence and who are able to pull the most wires receive the increases. I do not say that they are not deserving, but there are other officers equally deserving. Hon. members on this side of the House are not in favour of extravagance, or in favour of increases, but we are in favour of fair-play, and we want the Government either to carry out the Act and grant the statutory increases all round, or bring in a Bill to amend the present Act, and then hon. gentlemen will find out where we stand. They cannot ascertain that now when increases are proposed to some officers on the recommendation of somebody, while increases are refused to others. We do not know at the present time why this officer in question has been recommended for an increase. He has been recommended by somebody; who made the recommendation? It appears it was the opinion of this gentleman that the officer was deserving. I maintain there are other officers equally deserving who have not received increases. We are desirous of having the Government conducted economically, but we want these increases to be granted according to law, and if the Government do not believe in carrying out the present Act, let them repeal it, and in doing anything to promote the interests of the country we are prepared to give them our assistance.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries laid down the rule that increases were only given when certain work had been done for which the officer deserves special consideration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On the special recommendation of the Minister.

Mr. SPROULE. Because the officer had done some special service in the interest of the Government or the department. The House is entitled to information as to what special work this officer did.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say special work, but I said specially deserving.

Mr. SPROULE. What special work has this officer done that entitles him to an increase, while his colleague, who is not re-

garded and has not been said to be other than an efficient servant, is not entitled to an increase? What special consideration has he given to the country to entitle him to the increase, while increases are withheld from others?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I cannot answer the question; I am neither the head of the department nor the deputy head. The hon. gentleman has been informed already that the officer's name was reported favourably to Council.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. By whom?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. By the head of the department.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Who is the head of the department?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Jones, I think, is his name; I do not know his name.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I understand the head of this department is the Minister of Finance. I refer to the principle laid down by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that an officer having done special work was entitled to an increase. I think the Minister of Finance should be well able to inform the House what special work was done by this officer.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I did not say special work, but that he was specially deserving.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I understood the Minister to say that this increase was for special work. The hon. gentleman said that certain officers were available at all hours and were often called upon to do special work, and in consideration thereof they were entitled to the increase while others were not. What special consideration was there in this case that did not apply to others?

Mr. **TAYLOR**. I understood the Minister of Trade and Commerce, at the commencement of this debate, to say that the Government had one alternative or another to a department, either to reduce the staff or to cut off the statutory increases. I should like to ask that hon. gentleman, whether since the hon. gentlemen opposite came into power the staff has been reduced? I look through the departments and find that instead of reductions, there have been increases. Since the present Government have been in power vacancies have occurred in the departments by death and otherwise. Have the Government curtailed expenses? They filled up the vacancies and superannuated certain officers. You cannot go down town without meeting officials who have been superannuated at the expense of the country. Among officers of the Indian Department you will meet Mr. McGirr, who has been superannuated. We meet Mr. Balderson, the late secretary of the Depart-

ment of Railways and Canals walking about the streets. He was an efficient officer; he is a young man in the prime of life, and he has been saddled on the superannuation fund, and another man has been put in his place.

An hon. **MEMBER**. No.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. The hon. member from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) nods his head, to affirm that he cannot justify that; no honest man could justify such conduct on the part of the Government. These gentlemen talk about economizing, but they go on superannuating young and able officials at a heavy annual cost to the country, and they go on putting other men not half so efficient in their places. Look at the case of the late Deputy Postmaster General. He was one of the most efficient officers in the service, but he has been superannuated at an extra cost to the people of two or three thousand a year, and another official at a high salary has been installed in his office. The services of Mr. Balderson, Secretary of Railways and Canals, were dispensed with and we were told the office was abolished, but there is a secretary to that department to-day. At this very moment each of the departments has as many officials as it had under the late Government, and yet these gentlemen when in Opposition told us, day after day, that there were two or three clerks to do one man's work. Now that they are in office, they find the staff hardly able to do the work, and we find gentlemen on this side asking for returns, ordered this session and even last session, and the answer from the Government is that the clerks are not able to keep up with the work. In addition to all that, we find that an increased amount is asked for contingencies and clerical work in nearly every department. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) can justify a pretty bad case, but when he shakes his head and says he does not justify superannuating young men at the expense of the country, it is a sign that he is commencing to repent. In this case which we are discussing we have one clerk getting the \$50 increase and the other clerk not. Why, Sir, the Government ought say that they will violate the law altogether and give no increases, or else that they will apply the law and give the increases, particularly to the third-class clerks who commence at \$400 a year.

Mr. **DAVIN**. They have not shown that their action is according to law.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries tried to construe this law to suit his view, but when the Solicitor General is asked to back up the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Solicitor General shakes his head and leaves the Chamber, as much as to say that the construction put upon the law by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is correct. That is the only inference we can draw from the con-

duct of the Solicitor General. The Government talk about economy, but here they are bringing down Estimates to the amount of three or four million dollars more than was ever asked for by a Conservative Government during the last eighteen years.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) wishes to increase the expenditure of the civil service within the next two or three years, I would be pleased if he would put a notice on the paper to say, that in his judgment, and in that of his friends, it is desirable that the civil service of this country should cost \$1,600,000 or \$1,700,000 annually. Then we would know they had some honest belief in the statements they have been making this afternoon. I would point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor), that the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) brought down in 1896, Estimates for the civil service, contingencies included, to the amount of \$1,449,000, and we ask, after two years with a considerably larger population, for \$1,418,000. In these very Estimates in my hand, I see there are the salaries of about a dozen less employees asked for than we asked for last year. There is one less in the Department of Militia; one less in the Department of Printing and Stationery; one less in the Auditor General's office, apparently; three less in the Department of Agriculture; two less in the Department of Public Works; one more in the Geological Survey; one less in the Department of Trade and Commerce. On the whole there are several less, as the hon. gentleman will see.

Mr. TAYLOR. Two more in the Post Office Department.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. There appears to be an increase of two there, but on the whole there are some eight or ten less, as far as I can see, asked for in civil government on this occasion. I may just repeat once for all, that the position we take is this. No civil servant has a right by law to any increase whatever. That is the position we take, and that position of ours was confirmed by Sir Oliver Mowat when he was Minister of Justice, and is confirmed by the opinion of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Fitzpatrick). We take the position that it is our duty and our right, and we propose to exercise it, when special merit is brought to our notice, to increase the salary of the officer having that special merit. We take the position also, that the Act was most flagrantly abused during the half dozen years before we got into office. I repeat what I have said often from the other side of the House: that it was a farce, and a disgrace and a scandal, that over and over again Ministers came down and told us that there was not a man in the civil service who was not qualified to receive the increase. Over and over again I have pointed that

Mr. TAYLOR.

out, and it is only necessary to look at the rate of increase to see that the late Ministry made the Act as a dead letter. They gave every man, good and bad and indifferent, an increase if he was qualified by law, which I say was a flagrant abuse. It is in consequence of that flagrant abuse that we have been obliged to introduce this somewhat stringent rule. It is as clear as daylight, that under section 26 no man has a right to claim an increase.

No officer, clerk or employee shall receive any increase of salary except by Order in Council passed on report of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the department, stating that such officer, clerk or employee is deserving of such increase.

Here are three parties required to concur. First, the deputy head, next the head of the department, and third, it is within the province of the Governor in Council to refuse any increase whatever, if in the public interest they think that the civil service is costing money enough. We think the civil service is costing money enough; costing a great deal too much money, taking into account the proportion which it bears to the sum at our disposal for general expenditure, deducting fixed charges. My opinion is that there are a very large number of the inferior members who are much better paid than they would be in any other department of civil life, though I repeat that there are some of the superior officers who are not paid sufficiently. I say that we would not be justified in going on, raising the salaries of these men from the sum of \$1,100 to \$1,400, or from \$1,400 to \$1,800, or from \$1,800 to \$2,400, without any regard to special merit and qualification. We have reversed the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. Instead of giving this increase as a thing of course, we give it now on special merit, on our own responsibility, and if we find that a man is specially deserving we propose to give it to him. I do not desire by that to make any reflection on those who are not thought specially deserving. It simply means that they are doing their work in the ordinary fashion and way which ordinary clerks do it, but they have not established a special claim. That is all we contend.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, putting it on that ground, may I ask my hon. friend if he will inform the House, what is the special claim in the case of Mr. Walker which entitles him to the consideration of an increase, while Mr. Sladen does not get it?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. All I can say is, that Mr. Walker was reported by the officers specially in charge of that department; that is, by the officers close to the Governor. They reported Mr. Walker as deserving of the increase, as having been a specially good officer; that is all. They are the parties with whom he comes in contact; they are the parties who

know who is the best deserving, and we have to take their recommendation in each particular case. Of course, there is no Minister, as the hon. gentleman knows, who can be considered as specially responsible for this particular office; all the Ministers in their capacity as a Council are responsible for it. These things are usually done on representations from the chief clerk of the Governor General's Secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has missed the point of the contention on this side of the House, and, no doubt, without meaning it, has misrepresented our position. If the Government wish to take the ground that statutory increases ought not to be given at all, let them so act; that would be consistent. But, if they take the ground that the power is simply discretionary, and they carry it out in this way, by picking out one or two from five, or six, or eight, or ten, clerks, the large proportion of whom are equally deserving, so far as straightforward, honest work is concerned, and give to the one or two the statutory increase, and refuse to give it to the others, that is a principle of favouritism, if you call it a principle at all. If you provided some machinery by which the special services in each case could be reported upon and made a matter of record, not only for the Ministry, but for the House, there would be some principle in that; but, when we ask in this case, where is the report on the special services, there is none at all; the Minister has none, and I believe none is asked for by him. I believe the Minister consults with his deputy or not, as he pleases, and comes to the conclusion that this man or the other man shall have the increase, and he puts it in his estimates, and it is submitted to Council, and is carried or not, as the case may be. It may be, that the Minister has an outside friend or supporter who is anxious that a certain clerk shall get the increase. He goes and pleads with the Minister, and the result is that the clerk gets the increase. That is what we complain of. We complain, in the first place, that you are destroying the morale and the efficiency and the proper ambition of the service by making the increase simply a matter for the whim of the Minister—a matter of favour. If it is not, have your board, or your proper officers, who will report on the clerks, and carry out the recommendations of those officers. Who knows more about the department and the work of the clerks—the deputy head or the Minister? There is no doubt about it; it is the deputy head, the permanent officer. He is the man who can tell, if he is qualified—and you should not have him there if he is not—the special merits and the conduct of every clerk in his department. If he makes a report and recommends that the increase be given in certain cases, it is for the Minister to take his report or not, because the Minister must be the one to decide in the last resort. You would then have something to go

upon; but you do not have that; you have simply the will or the whim of the Minister himself, for whatever reason may at the time be uppermost and have weight with him. It may be the persistent appeals of a supporter; it may be one thing or another. Under this system, you are keeping the whole power to give the statutory increase, but you are simply using it as a matter of favour for the individual Ministers; and, while it is a good thing for the man who gets the increase, it destroys the morale of the whole service. For instance, it will be found, when we come to the Finance Minister's estimates, unless he changes them, that he has recommended statutory increases for seven or eight of his clerks; but, when the Auditor General asks that statutory increases shall be given to a certain number of his clerks, than whom there are none better or more hardly worked in the service, and he has so rearranged the work by dropping a clerk, that, even with these increases the aggregate expenditure will not be more than it was before, and he puts his application before the proper Minister, he is refused those increases, and is afterwards given the opportunity of picking out for the increase two or three out of the eight or ten. What is the rule of parity between these two cases? In the one case all the clerks, or nearly all, get the increase; in the other case only a minimum of the clerks, though equally deserving—I do not say, more so—get it. How do the young men feel when they walk beside each other? Some of them say, "We could not get it, because the Minister would not give us his ear: but you could get it, because the Minister gave you his ear." That, I think, is going to injure the service. We do not ask hon. gentlemen to pile up the expenditure. We ask them to decrease it. I fully agree with my hon. friend, that the civil service of this country costs too much. My hon. friend is not consistent in keeping the cost at the same as, or a little above, what we had; he is only consistent with his professions, if he brings it down to hundreds of thousands of dollars below our expenditure. I will go as far as he can go to prune the service and bring it down to a reasonable point. I am not asking that hon. gentlemen opposite should put all the increases on or take them all off; but I say they should devise some method by which a man in the service would know what to expect. Now he may work as hard and as faithfully as a man can, and he does not get the increase, while another man, who works no harder or more faithfully, gets it; and the knowledge of that rankles in him, and it destroys the efficiency of the service. Let hon. gentlemen devise something that will be equitable and fair in its working, and the House, on both sides, will support it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The whole difficulty arises from the neglect of the law in former years. I

am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman, if he could, would have enforced such a provision as we are enforcing. He knows that they never refused the increase to anybody, and nothing could be more demoralizing to the service than to reward all alike. If proper distinctions had been made by our predecessors, it would not have been necessary to apply this rule so strictly as we are now doing; and, unless we introduced the American spoils system—

Mr. FOSTER. You are going a long way towards it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think not. The hon. gentleman knows that there is an extreme difference between the American spoils system and the line we have taken. But there is no doubt whatever that, so far as regards the economy of the service, it would have been very largely promoted by the dismissal of a very large number of civil servants and by its complete reorganization. That, however, would have involved certainly a great hardship, and what is more, in a political sense, to be deprecated, probably the introduction of a system closely akin to the American system. That was one of the reasons why we did not feel disposed to dismiss right and left ruthlessly a great number of civil service employees. But if we did not do that, we did feel that we were not justified in asking for a larger sum than we now ask. If the hon. gentleman thought it was necessary to vote \$1,449,000 for the service of 1897, which was the sum he asked, he must consider that if we had gone on accepting his Estimates and adding the regular number of statutory increases, we would have had to come down to-day and ask for a sum of probably \$1,540,000 or \$1,530,000, instead of \$1,418,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the difference now?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We would have had to add something like \$80,000 to the sum he demanded for the service of 1897.

Mr. FOSTER. For statutory increases?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman figure it out?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There will be two years, you will observe, since 1897. He asked, as he knows, for about \$1,450,000, in round numbers, for 1897. If we had gone in the same ratio we would have probably have required to ask for something like \$1,480,000 or \$1,490,000 for the service of 1898, and would have required \$1,530,000 or thereabouts, in all probability, for the service of 1899, whereas we are not asking more than \$1,418,000. The only way to avoid

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

that was to stop these statutory increases. I do not mean to say at all that that does not involve hardship, but you must remember that you have to deal with this thing in the mass. For a very large number of years, the civil service got the increase indiscriminately, and I do not accuse the hon. gentleman on that account. It would be far pleasanter and easier for us all to grant the thing indiscriminately. It is not pleasant for Ministers to refuse it, but we think the sum we ask of \$1,418,000 is as much as the country ought to pay for its civil service. The hon. gentleman is not himself in favour of indiscriminate increase. I think he exercised a tolerably close hand in the treasury when he was Minister of Finance, but nevertheless he could not avoid the large increase going on from year to year in this item. When did my hon. friend become Minister of Finance?

Mr. FOSTER. It is so long ago—1888.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I see that in 1888 the expenditure was \$1,211,000 only, and yet in the last year for which he brought down Estimates he was compelled—and I think it was wholly due to the statutory increases, or almost wholly due—to ask for \$1,450,000. The statutory increases look but little in each individual case, but in a term of years, it amounts to a great deal of money, and he was compelled to increase the expenditure nearly a quarter of a million of dollars from the year he first became Finance Minister until the last year of his term. If we were to give the statutory increases indiscriminately, I have no doubt whatever that we would have to run up our expenditure, in the course of four or five years, to something like \$1,600,000 or \$1,700,000, and the country and our friends would feel bitterly aggrieved if we did that. We have had to call a halt. I think the expenditure on the civil service was too great by far during the last years of the late Government, although, frankly, I acquit the hon. ex-Minister of Finance of having done more than go with the tide and yielded to the pressure put on himself and colleagues. But it is now time to call a halt. I do not believe that the hon. gentleman, if he were to go over our various departments, would say that at this moment the minor officials in those departments are underpaid. I do not think he would say that they are receiving less than they are fairly worth or could get in the open market of the world. It may be quite true—and I believe it is—that some of our superior officers, some men of special talents, are receiving considerably less from Canada than they could obtain in other countries and from other employers, but that is not the case as regards the work performed by the great majority of the employees. That work—and none know better than the two hon. gentlemen before me—is, in the great

majority of cases, clerical work, which does not require any very superior degree of intelligence and accuracy, and it is work which is exceedingly well paid for, in my judgment, in the majority of cases, at the salaries the employees now receive. I would not like, nor would my hon. friend, to ask any man to work for the country for less than he is fairly worth, and I look upon it as a matter for regret that in some very important offices we are deprived of the services of men of great value to the country because we find it impossible to give them adequate salaries, but that does not apply to the great majority of the civil service. They are exceedingly well paid, compared with the salaries granted by many railway companies and banks, and unless there was a special compact, a legal compact, I think the course we have taken is a just and right one. We inquired carefully into that matter, and I think, if I remember right, that there is one thing in connection with it that is overlooked. I think there was at one time a series of clauses which might seem to bear out the contention made by one or two hon. gentlemen opposite. Those were the old clauses 21, 22 and 23, which were deliberately repealed by 58-59 Victoria, passed, I think, by the hon. gentleman himself, or at any rate in a year in which he was a member of the Government; and the repeal of those clauses shows conclusively that he had come to much the same conclusion, namely, that these increases were not to be made as a right, but must be in the discretion of the Government. If the hon. gentleman will look back to 58-59 Victoria, chapter 15, section 2, I think he will see that it bears out largely my contention.

Mr. FOSTER. The tone of my hon. friend's remarks are all that could be desired, but he has scarcely done justice to the preceding Government. I admit candidly that the burden of the civil service made itself apparent to the late Government just as it does to this. It was felt that the burden was a serious and heavy one, and there has been no time within the last few years that I have not been ready to admit that our civil service was costing us more than it should. My hon. friend details the difficulties which occur to any Government in reducing the Estimates, but he did not feel it so difficult three or four years ago. The late Government did take steps to reduce the cost, and one of the things done by it was an almost perfect remedy in a very large class, intended to act gradually but still most effectually. As my hon. friend says, there is a great deal of work being done in these departments by men who are paid \$1,000 per year, which could be equally as well and effectively done by persons at, say, \$500 or \$600 per year. And when you had a system of third-class clerks who commenced at \$400 and went up to \$1,000, and the clerk got

up to his maximum, or between \$600 and \$1,000, in these cases you were paying just that much too much for the amount and kind of work done. Three years ago the Government, at my own suggestion, abolished the appointment of third-class clerks entirely.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For the future.

Mr. FOSTER. We found the difficulty of interfering with an establishment, but, for the future, no third-class clerks were to be appointed. Consequently, we avoided the whole difficulty of ultimately having a large number of high-class and highly-paid men doing what you might call clerks and writers' work. That is the endeavour that was made, and no one can look at the facts or at the statistics without seeing that to-day you are getting a great deal of this clerks and writers' class of work done by young men and young women who come in at \$400 and go up to \$600 or \$650—I do not recollect exactly—when they become stationary. No third-class clerks are appointed, so you save all the sums that would be paid in salaries for that class of work above \$600 and up to \$1,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But the hon. gentleman will see that that, inasmuch as he preserved—and I do not question that, but I will say properly preserved—the rights of the existing third-class clerks, it will take years before his system works out in the way he says.

Mr. FOSTER. Not so many years. Those above third-class clerks die, and promotions are made. Third-class clerks also die, and so vacancies are made which cannot be filled. If the hon. gentleman will look over the list he will find that there are departments in which there is only one third-class clerk. So we are reaping the fruits of that policy, and I hope that my hon. friends will not disturb it, as they have not disturbed it so far. My hon. friend, to be fair, must give us credit for having introduced that legislation which, in the course of not very many years, ten or fifteen years, must almost entirely do away with third-class clerks and introduce in their places those who are getting from \$400 to \$600 for writers' work. That would be a great saving.

With reference to the increase, it is a fact that it became the rule for the increase to be granted. There were some departments in which it was perfectly right that the increase should be given, because of the class of work done and the quality of the clerks who did it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend will hardly say that it was so in all.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I will not say that it was so in all. It depended, to a large extent, on the deputy. He had it in his power, in making his report, to discriminate. That has been done frequently in cases within my own knowledge, but the majority of the deputies felt, I suppose, the same disinclination to interfere between one and another that the Ministers feel, for reasons which are well known, and so it came about that the increase was given largely as a matter of course. But because it was given largely as a matter of course, that does not militate against the principle, and provided you fix the maximum of salaries at the right point, I believe it is the best principle you can have—to allow statutory increases and give them only when the clerk has been deserving and faithful in his work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend approves of that. But under your rule, you are not giving it to those who are deserving. Out of eight or ten who are deserving, you give to three or four, while you deny it to the others. That is the weakness of the plan hon. gentlemen opposite have adopted, and they will find that it will not work well. It will be an odd thing if, with both sides of the House anxious that the civil service should be made as effective as possible, we cannot come to some conclusion which will give the clerks a firm assurance of what will be their due and what will be given to them if they do their work faithfully and well. Under the plan followed by hon. gentlemen opposite, this will not be. Under the old rule, it was almost as bad, because the undeserving class got their increases the same as the deserving. Both of these systems are bad in their effect upon the morale of the departments. Can not there be a system by which the clerk will occupy something like solid ground and have every incentive to do his work? It demoralizes the service when a man works hard and is denied an increase, while an increase is given to another who works no harder.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask one question before six o'clock to save time—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Lake Bennett and Klondike Railway and Tramway Company.—(Mr. Haggart.)

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Mr. FOSTER.

NAKUSP AND SLOCAN RAILWAY.

The House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 52) respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—(Mr. McPherson.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOSTOCK. I had given notice of a clause to be added to this Bill in order to protect the interests of the mine owners in that part of the country in the event of the competition between the Nakusp and Slocan Railway and the Kaslo and Slocan Railway, after this branch is built, resulting in the Kaslo and Slocan Railway being practically driven out of business. My object was to protect these people in that part of the country from being left at the mercy of one railway after the other was practically knocked out. But I may say that after I had drafted this amendment and had it placed on the Order paper, the matter was brought to my notice, and it was shown to me that in the way this clause was drafted it would cause a hardship and an unfairness to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. As I had no intention of proposing anything that would be unfair or unjust to that company in any way, my only object being to protect the interests of the miners and the mine owners in the country in the event of competition between these two lines resulting in the transport trade of that part of the country being left in the hands of one railway. I think it will be better not to press this amendment. But I desired to take advantage of this occasion to make a few remarks in order to point out to this House the danger that may possibly arise under this Bill which is now before the House.

Bill reported, and read a third time, and passed.

DAWSON CITY ELECTRIC LIGHTING AND TRAMWAY COMPANY.

Bill (No. 118) to incorporate the Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Company, was read a second time.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Mr. SPEAKER. With respect to referring this Bill to the proper committee, I find that although it is a Bill to incorporate a Tramway Company, they do not propose to ask for any powers of expropriation under the Railway Act. I therefore think it will be properly referred to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Bill referred to Select Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 119) to incorporate the Dawson City and Victoria Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Bill (No. 120) respecting the North American Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Hurley.)

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce a question. We have heard a great deal regarding the opinion given by the law officers with respect to the construction of the Civil Service Act, especially the opinion of the law officers at the time Sir Oliver Mowat was Minister of Justice. I do not suppose it is a matter of very much importance as to who was Minister at the moment, but as that fact has been referred to, I should like to ask the hon. Minister whether it be a fact that Sir Oliver Mowat, as Minister of Justice, advised that under the Act those who were entitled to a statutory increase were only those who were especially deserving?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). What the Minister of Justice advised, to the best of my recollection, was this, that there was no right under the statute for any increase, that it was a matter resting at the discretion of the Government.

Mr. McNEILL. It is very evident that a Deputy Minister or head of a department and the members of the Council could block the statutory increases, but I do not think that view in the slightest degree meets the point which we have been endeavouring to impress on the committee, which is that the Act had in contemplation that every man who performed his duties properly as a civil servant, was entitled to a statutory increase. It is perfectly true it was made necessary under the Act for the protection of the country and of the employees that men who are not performing their duties should not obtain this increase, and therefore the Deputy Minister makes the recommendation, the Minister approves and the order is passed by Council. But what I want to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has kindly discussed this matter with me, is whether he thinks in equity it is right to take advantage of a technicality of that kind, and whether he does not think and know that when the Act was passed it was intended that every civil servant who discharged his duties should receive the statutory increase. Does he really think that it would have been a right thing under the Act for a Deputy Minister to have refused to recommend. Suppose all the men in a department were performing their duties properly, would it be carrying out the spirit of the Act if the Deputy Minister refused to recommend the statutory increases? And yet if he did not make the recommendation, those men could not obtain the statutory increases. I admit there is the legal technicality. I commenced my argument by saying that the Government might take advantage of the legal

technicality, but that Canada was under a moral obligation to pay these men the statutory increase under a well understood and definite arrangement. It is all very well to say that strictly under the law you can get out of your moral obligation; but that is not meeting the point put forward. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, who discussed the question with the greatest possible perspicacity and good taste, gave another reason why it should not be done. He said it would cost a great deal of money if the country carried out its obligation and contract with the civil servants. Is the honour of Canada so cheap as to be bought with \$100,000, for that is what it comes to? The question is, are we in honour bound?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We do not admit the obligation in the slightest degree.

Mr. McNEILL. The fact that we may be able, by resorting to a legal technicality, to absolve ourselves from an honourable obligation into which we have entered is one thing, but if the country is honour bound to give this statutory increase, that is another thing.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is what we deny. I may say that is exactly what we utterly repudiate. We utterly repudiate the idea that the country is bound to give one cent.

Mr. McNEILL. Does the hon. gentleman mean honourably?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Either morally, equitably, honourably or any other way.

Mr. McNEILL. Then, I venture to say that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) will find that the country will not agree with him in that. The only argument that has been adduced is not an argument as to moral obligation at all, but it is an argument as to this mere legal technicality. I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he will say that he believes, that, under this Act, the man who discharges his duty as a civil servant properly and well, is not entitled to a statutory increase. I will ask the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies), whether he does not think that these men who did discharge their duty properly, should have the statutory increase. I do not want any legal technicality now; I want to know what the hon. gentleman considers is the meaning of the Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As I said this afternoon, I do not think that was the spirit or intention of the Act as it was passed. I said I thought the practice had been to prostitute the Act, so that many men during the last few years, before this Government came into power, received statutory increases who ought not to receive them, according to the spirit and intention of the Act. I do not give any dogmatic opinion on it, but my judgment,

after a good deal of consideration, was, in accordance with the judgment of Sir Oliver Mowat, that it was a discretionary matter, which the Minister was responsible for exercising in each department. I do not think that a civil servant who fairly discharges his duty is necessarily entitled to a statutory increase. Numbers of men may discharge their duties fairly well from year's end to year's end who do not necessarily become entitled to the increase. The presumption is, that a man gets what his services are worth, and I do not think he is entitled to a statutory increase, under this particular section, unless the deputy, and the Minister after him, report that his services are of such a special kind that they would entitle him to this increase.

Mr. IVES. Does the discretion exist, if the servant has deserved the statutory increase and has performed his duties faithfully and well, or is the discretion limited to granting it or not granting it in cases where the servant is entitled to it on the report of the deputy?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think the Minister is bound to follow the deputy. The judgment which the Minister is bound to exercise is not a capricious judgment at all.

Mr. IVES. Under the statute, does the Minister have discretion as between those deserving of the statutory increase?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman assumes the very point in issue. The Minister, before he can concur in the report of the deputy, must exercise his judgment. He cannot do that capriciously, but he must bring his mind to bear on the facts. That involves ministerial responsibility and discretion, and, therefore, it appears to me beyond argument that the increase does not go as a matter of course.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) has answered the question, so far as that is concerned. I never for a moment suggested that the Minister was not to exercise his discretion. I say, this clause is put here for the protection of the public, in order that men who are not deserving should not get the increase, but I say also, that the deserving man is entitled to the increase under the Act, and if Council does not give it to him, or if the Minister does not give it to him, or if the deputy does not recommend it, they are violating the spirit of the Act. You cannot go on reading out of the Act these clauses which lay down in a most explicit way, that the increase shall be given.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Read the sections together.

Mr. McNEILL. Of course, you must read them together, but you cannot read them together in the sense my hon. friend lays

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

down. If all these clauses were put in the Act to express merely what my hon. friend suggests, it makes the Act ridiculous, because all that could have been said in a very short clause. Here is what is explicitly laid down in the law:

The minimum salary of a third-class clerk shall be \$400 per annum, with an annual increase of \$50 up to \$1,000.

In face of this explicit declaration, the Minister says that the official is not to have this increase.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Act says he is not to have it.

Mr. McNEILL. The Act does not say so. The Act says that there are certain conditions precedent to his having it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Act is in the negative; it says that no officer shall receive it unless certain conditions precedent are complied with.

Mr. McNEILL. Exactly; but does my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) say that the Act would be complied with, if all these men in the service had been properly discharging their duties, and the Deputy Minister refused to report in favour of the statutory increases? That argument goes so far as to say that the Act would have been complied with, if not one of these men got a dollar of statutory increase from the day that Act was put upon the Statute-book, although all were discharging their duties well. Does the Minister say that would be in accordance with the spirit of the Act?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) cross-questions me upon it, I suppose I must answer. If the Act, in so many words, declares that no such increase shall be granted unless the Minister and the deputy report in favour of it, and the Council concur in that report, then, unless those three things come about, you cannot get the increase.

Mr. McNEILL. I may, then, leave the matter as it stands between the Minister and myself. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) contends that the spirit of this Act is complied with, if no civil servant got a statutory increase at all. His contention goes to the extent, that, if from the passing of this Act until the present moment, not a single civil servant in Canada had got statutory increase, although they had all discharged their duties efficiently and well, the spirit of the Act would be complied with. There is the difference between my hon. friend and myself, and I am glad it comes down to that point. I say, the spirit of the Act would have been violated; my hon. friend says the spirit of the Act would be complied with, under those circumstances.

and I am quite willing to leave the matter at that.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. My hon. friend is going to leave that there. I just put this point to him: The Act singles out two high officials in whom it places certain discretionary power, to be exercised, not capriciously, but judiciously. They are selected because they occupy positions from which they are supposed to judge properly, and they have to report to Council whether in their opinion any individual officer is entitled to the increase—deserves it. If they do not report in his favour, he cannot get the increase; there can be no question about that.

Mr. McNEILL. We know he cannot get the increase; there is no difference between us as to that. But the question is whether, supposing these men had discharged their duties efficiently and well, the spirit of the Act would be complied with if no civil servant in Canada got the increase which the Act says they should get; or whether, when this Act was put on the Statute-book, it contemplated giving to the civil servant who discharged his duties faithfully and well, the statutory increase of \$50 a year.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I go further than that. Suppose there had even been a report in favour of an increase from the deputy, and the Council thought that the man was already receiving as much or more than he ought to receive, they would not be justified either by the spirit or the letter of the Act in giving him the increase.

Mr. McNEILL. That is another matter. We will just keep the matter where it is between my hon. friend and myself. The hon. gentleman says that the Civil Service Act would be complied with if, from the moment the Act was put on the Statute-book, not a civil servant of Canada ever got a statutory increase, no matter how efficiently or well he discharged his duties. When my hon. friend says that the Act had been abused, that men had been recommended for statutory increases who did not deserve them, that is another matter altogether. That may be true, and it would be right that that should be put an end to; men who have not been discharging their duties properly should not get the statutory increase. I think that is what the Act meant; and in that respect the Act should be more rigorously enforced than before. But that does not touch the question between my hon. friend and myself at all; and I am quite satisfied to leave the matter as it is at present between us.

Mr. QUINN. I would like to say a word on this question, which is probably one of the most important questions that we may have to debate. I do not quite agree with anything that has been said in the present debate. I take a different reading of the statute al-

together to any that I have heard, certainly different from hon. gentlemen opposite. I would like to have had an expression of opinion from the Department of Justice on this question; I think the House is entitled to that. It is all very well for us to be told that Sir Oliver Mowat said this, that or the other thing on a certain occasion; but unfortunately he is not here. But we have the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) here representing the Department of Justice, and I have waited until this late hour in the hope that he would give us his opinion, to which I would bow at once. I have nothing to say of the opinion given by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He is a lawyer, but he is not saddled with the responsibility of a legal opinion in this House; therefore, his opinion on a point of law only carries the importance of that of a prominent lawyer; it is not as important as an opinion coming from the Department of Justice. Now, I take it that the Civil Service Act was passed for one object, that is, to secure permanency in the civil service, and to secure the public employees from possible interference, either on political or other grounds, that would deprive them of the benefit of their appointments. The civil service is not the same as ordinary mercantile employment. A bookkeeper, who is dissatisfied with his employment, or with the salary he is receiving, in a mercantile house, may give up his engagement and go to another mercantile house. But the civil servant cannot do that. There is only one power in Canada that employs civil servants, that is, the Dominion Government; so that the civil servant requires that there should be some permanency in his employment, in order that he should accept it and work diligently in it. In order to secure that permanency, the Dominion Parliament passed the Civil Service Act, and in order to secure the best persons possible to fill the positions in the service, certain clauses were incorporated in that Act—sections 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20. Either section 16, section 18, or section 20 will be sufficient for the purposes of the argument, because they are almost word for word, referring to chief clerks, first-class clerks, and second-class clerks. Take section 20:

The minimum salary of a second-class clerk shall be one thousand one hundred dollars per annum, with an annual increase of fifty dollars up to a maximum of one thousand four hundred dollars.

Now, nobody will pretend that a second-class clerk could be appointed at a salary of \$900, because that would be in direct contravention of the Act, which provides that the minimum salary shall be \$1,100. The word "shall" there is imperative; it is not permissive. The minimum salary shall be \$1,100, with an annual increase of \$50; that is, there shall be an annual increase of \$50—"shall" is carried through the sentence. So that this section is imperative: the mini-

mum salary shall be \$1,100, and there shall be an annual increase of \$50 until the maximum is reached. Every second-class clerk comes under this section; he is subject to all the disabilities and is entitled to all the privileges of the section. Then there is a mode set down in the Act by which this increase shall be administered, and that we find in section 26. This is not a governing section, it is merely directory, defining the powers of the deputy head, the head of the department, and the Council in this regard, and what does it say:

No officer, clerk or employee shall receive any increase of salary except by Order in Council passed on the report of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the department, stating that such officer, clerk or employee is deserving of such increase.

There is no such word here as "specially deserving," all that is necessary is that he should be deserving. There is no question here about whether the Government wishes to economize or not; that is not part of this Act. It is not made discretionary with the Government as a matter of economy; but by the law the civil servant is entitled to his increase if he be deserving. This clause then is merely directory. That is, the deputy head is bound to report to the head of the department whether the civil servants in his department are deserving of the increase. Then the Minister has to bring the matter before the Council in order to have the increase granted. That is the law. What is the recourse of the civil servant, in the event of this law not being carried out? It is the recourse he has here to-night. The Estimates come down, and we find that men who are admittedly deserving of the increase do not all get it. One of them gets it and the other does not. What is the recourse of that one? It is to ask the Minister: Why did you not carry out the law? What does the word "deserving" mean? I lay down the general principle that any man in the employ of the civil service is entitled by law to his increase, but of course there may be circumstances which would disentitle him to his right, as, for example, if he had been notably inattentive to his duties. Then, the matter would be reported by the deputy to the head of the department, and the head of the department would refuse to recommend the increase to the council and no Order in Council would be passed. Then, when the Estimates come down, and it is found that out of thirteen clerks entitled to the statutory increase, only twelve received it, the Minister could be called on to say why it was refused to the thirteenth. The Minister would reply: Here is a report against him; he was not deserving of it.

Then we come to subsection 2 of section 26:

The increase of salary of any officer, clerk or employee, authorized under this Act for the
Mr. QUINN.

current year, may be suspended by the head of the department for neglect of duty or misconduct, and may be subsequently restored by such head, but without arrears.

That does not mean that no deputy head has the right to refuse to report in favour of his clerk, but it means that notwithstanding the fact that the law says he shall receive his statutory increase, and notwithstanding even the fact that an Order in Council has been passed granting it to him, the increase may be suspended by the head of the department for good and sufficient reasons. Therefore, I conclude that there can be no question as to the right of the civil servant to the increase where there is no report against him. The statute declares that the increase is due, as a matter of law, to every public employee, and that it can be taken from him only for cause shown, and that the man who refuses to grant it is responsible and answerable to Parliament for his refusal. He is bound to give Parliament a reason for refusing it, or he is not doing his duty. That may be a very light thing, and a majority of Parliament may at any time do an injustice, but it will not save the Minister from the responsibility of having acted unjustly, whatever the vote of the House may be. In this instance, no reason having been given by the Minister why one should receive the increase and the other should not, the general public opinion must be that the one who did not receive it has been very badly treated.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I quite agree with my hon. friend in his construction of the second paragraph of section 26, but I beg to differ from him in the construction he has put upon the words "annual increase" in section 20. I shall take the same section as he did, and endeavour to state, as briefly and clearly as I can, the construction that I put upon this section 20:

The minimum salary of a second-class clerk shall be \$1,000 per annum, with an annual increase of \$50 up to a maximum of \$1,400.

The words that it is necessary to consider here are the words, "with an annual increase of \$50." Now, the whole question turns upon this. Under section 20, does the law operate automatically? If there were no other section, would the effect of section 20 be that each year a second-class clerk would be entitled to receive the sum of \$50 increase up to the maximum salary of \$1,400? My answer is yes, it would. But now we come to section 26, and with regard to that section I differ from my learned friend in this respect, that I say it is a governing section. I said a moment ago that the words important to construe are the words, "with an annual increase." What does section 26 say:

No officer, clerk or employee shall receive any increase—

Therefore, section 26 governs the preceding section, and the effect of it is, in my judgment, that no officer, however he may be entitled to it under the preceding section, shall receive the annual increase unless the deputy head reports that he is entitled to it and unless that report is concurred in by the head of the department, and finally sanctioned by the Governor in Council.

Mr. QUINN. If my hon. friend would permit, what is that report to be—that he is deserving?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The report from the deputy head, I will grant, may be that he is deserving of the increase, and in that report the head of the department may concur, but there may be reasons, in the opinion of the Governor in Council—reasons of public necessity, such as, for instance, the condition of the public exchequer—which may make it imperative on the part of the Governor in Council to refuse the increase. In a word, section 26 puts upon the Governor in Council the exercise of the discretion which they alone can exercise, and for which they are responsible to the public. Surely you will not contend that the head of the department, with the assistance of the deputy head, can impose on the exchequer this burden if the Governor in Council is not of the opinion that it should be imposed. But the discretion of the Governor in Council must be exercised in the last resort. I say in this case, and I concur in what has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for York, the merits or demerits of the employee must be ascertained by he who is in direct and daily contact with him and knows his capacity. And he having made his report to the head of the department, the head of the department, in his turn, has a discretion to exercise, to say whether he concurs in the report of the deputy. And I think that the Governor in Council is there also for some purpose. Why is he called upon to act if he has no discretion?

Mr. QUINN. If my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will allow me, I will answer that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If it is unautomatic, it is unnecessary.

Mr. QUINN. It is in order to the permanency of the Act—that is the reason he is there.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That gives away the whole case. The Order in Council is necessary for what? Does it operate automatically, or must it be exercised with discretion on the part of those who pass it. It requires discretion that must be exercised in the last resort. I give my construction of the statute, and it is for gentlemen on both sides to put a value upon it. I give it because I have been called upon to do so. My view is that section 26 makes it necessary that some person, having the knowledge of

the duties performed by the employee should report to the head of the department that these duties have been fulfilled in such a way as to entitle that employee to his annual increase. And then there is a discretion to be exercised by the head of the department which must be exercised by him, I think, according to the honest view of the case that he ought to entertain, and I think no head of a department would be justified in lightly setting aside the report of the deputy head, because he is the person who is best in a position to ascertain the merits of the employee. But after that is done, even if the head of the department concur with the deputy head, the whole matter must be submitted to the Governor in Council, and that is the last tribunal to which he must have recourse, and that is the tribunal that is responsible to Parliament for the exercise of discretion both by the deputy head and by the head of the department.

Mr. QUINN. I desire to say a few words in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I am glad to see that he takes the interest he does in this matter and that he has given me the information, for which I am very much indebted. As regards the Order in Council, we know that the Department of Railways cannot pay a contractor even a proportion of the amount due him for work done, on the certificates given, unless an Order in Council is passed. An ordinary employee of a merchant, if his salary is increased, is really under a new engagement. And so with the civil servants; and the Order in Council is to consecrate by a new engagement the increase of salary given to the employee. It is a new engagement made by him. That is the object of the Order in Council. I deny what my hon. friend says about the discretion of the Minister. I say the discretion is the one thing of which the Civil Service Act deprives the Ministry. They are bound to do this, and they are answerable to Parliament if they do not do it, they are bound to give explanations in Parliament if they fail in their duty as regards the most insignificant officer of the civil service. Let us read this section 26 in a new way, first as it is in the statute:

No officer, clerk or employee shall receive any increase of salary except by Order in Council passed on the report of the deputy head concurred in by the head of the department, stating that such officer, clerk or employee is—

What?

—is deserving of such increase.

What is it that is necessary? As a matter of fact, once it is established by the deputy head of the department that he is deserving of that increase, the Order in Council as of necessity follows. Now let us read it another way. What is the converse of it? It is this: Every officer, clerk or employee shall receive an increase of salary by Order in

Council passed on report of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the department, stating that such officer, clerk or employee is deserving of such increase. Now, my hon. friend says that there is, after all, an appeal to the Governor in Council. I say there is no such thing. Reasons of public importance, forsooth. Condition of the exchequer. The Government of Canada is supposed, when they passed this statute, to have been in a position to pay these increases. The Parliament of Canada is here sitting at the present time for the purpose of voting the supplies to pay these increases of salary. This Act was not passed in a blind manner by the Parliament of Canada, but it was passed as a living Act to conduct public affairs, and it was passed as well, we must remember, for the protection of these employees as for the protection of the exchequer of Canada. So when my hon. friend says there may be public reasons, reasons of public importance, the condition of the exchequer and so on, which might induce the Governor in Council, notwithstanding the advice of the Minister, to refuse to increase the salary of the civil servant, I cannot follow him that far. I regret, of course, to differ with my hon. friend the Solicitor General, but his argument, though very able and very good special pleading, has not convinced me that my view of the matter is wrong, and I still adhere to it. And I would ask the Minister of Finance to give the reason, now that he has had time to find out why the second clerk does not get the \$50 increase as well as the first.

Mr. MONK. I do not pretend to decide between the opinions put forward by the hon. the Solicitor General and my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Quinn). But what I wish to draw the attention of Parliament to is the difference between the law as laid down by the Solicitor General and the answers given this afternoon by the gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches to repeated questions from this side as to what was the system followed in granting the increases in the several departments, and what, in particular, had been the system followed with regard to these two clerks in the Governor General's Department. So far as my own opinion may be worth anything, I should be inclined, I must confess, to support the proposition that under section 26, even after a favourable report has been made by the deputy head of the department and that report has been concurred in by the head of the department, the Council would still be at liberty to refuse the increase. I think that a different interpretation might lead to a great deal of confusion in the carrying out of this section with regard to increases. I do not think that the law works automatically. But, under section 26, conditions are imposed upon the granting of the increase. The first of these conditions is a favourable report from the deputy head,

Mr. QUINN.

and that must be concurred in by the head of the department. And I really believe that as section 26 ought to be read, after these formalities have been complied with, the Governor in Council is still there to decide as to whether these reports shall be acted upon. But what took up a great deal of time this afternoon, it seems to me, was the repeated queries from this side as to what system had been adopted by the Government. That is what we want to know. Are the provisions of section 26 carried out? For instance, in regard to the matter under discussion, were the formalities pointed out as necessary by the Solicitor General followed? Was there a report by the deputy head, and was it concurred in by the head of the department? And, if so, why was it not acted upon by the Governor in Council? It is here, it seems to me, that our right begins, for we are entitled to say to the Government: Why do you, in the face of the fulfilment of these formalities, in the face of a recommendation of the deputy head concurred in by the head of the department, increase one man and not another, and we are entitled to know the reason. And that is precisely what we failed to apprehend this afternoon. But I took particular care to notice that of those gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches who spoke, the Minister of Finance only stated that the increases were made upon the determination of the head of the department, which is absolutely contrary to this section 26. Now, I think the Government will save considerable time if, at this stage, it tells us exactly whether in all the departments the provisions of section 26 are observed, and then when we come to face the increases, if there are many in the different departments, we will be entitled to know from the Government what the reports are in regard to the employees of the civil service, and what the state reasons are which prevent the Government from acting upon these reports and giving the increase which the civil servants were entitled to.

Mr. QUINN. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) agrees with me perfectly when he says it is a moral duty on the part of the deputy head to make his report if the officer is deserving, and it is a moral duty on the part of the head of the department to concur if the report is favourable, and it is the moral duty of the Governor in Council to pass this, unless there is some objection to it. That is the argument of my learned friend, and it is my argument in a nutshell. I say the deputy head is bound, both by law and morally, to make his report independent of every other consideration except whether the man is deserving or not. That is the only thing that he has to consider. In the next place the head of the department is bound to concur in it, and in the ordinary course of events, he must bring that before

Council. When we find that has not been done, then the duty of Parliament comes in. I say it is our duty now, a duty that weighs just as heavily upon us as upon the head of a department, to inquire from the Minister, and it is his duty to answer, why the other officer in this department has not received his statutory increase. Is it because the Dominion of Canada finds that it is impossible to saddle \$50 more per annum upon it? Is it because the head of the department has refused to concur in the report of the deputy head, or is it because the deputy head has refused to obey the law and to make a favourable report, or finally, is it because the servant has not been deserving of the increase? That is what we want to know.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not want to be discourteous to my hon. friend. First of all, I have to say that our view of what is the law differs from his, so that we cannot agree with him.

Mr. QUINN. Does the Solicitor General agree with me?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Solicitor General does not agree with my hon. friend, nor does any other member on this side of the House of the legal profession, so far as I know. My hon. friend insists that this is law, and bases his statement on something that somebody else has told him. As we are advised, it is not the law, and we do not feel bound to answer the hon. gentleman in the terms of his request. I have already stated that to the best of my knowledge no recommendation has been made for any increase that has not been recommended by a deputy head, where there is a deputy head. But if the hon. gentleman means that in every case where no increase is given we are to be catechised as to why we did not give an increase to that particular individual, all I can say is that that is not our view of the law, and I am afraid that we shall not be able to accommodate the hon. gentleman and give him the answer exactly as he requests.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the Minister say whether the clerk asked for the advance?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know, but I have no doubt they would all be very much pleased to have it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not wish to say anything unnecessarily to prolong this debate. I apprehend, however, that if my hon. friend the Solicitor General, who has been practicing law in the province of Quebec and is entitled to practice law in the province of Ontario, had been appealed to on behalf of a civil service employee as to what his interpretation of this law was six months ago, or one year ago, it would have been such as the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) has explained. No one

supposes that what the Solicitor General says as to section 20 providing for this automatic increase, is the case. I do not for one moment suppose it is. But on reading section 26 it is plain that if an employee in any department is deserving of that statutory increase which was a part of his agreement with the Government when he entered into their service, it is the duty of the deputy head of that department to state so frankly as pointed out by the law. Then it is equally the duty of the head of the department to approve of that, and take that to Council. No one supposes that the Governor in Council is bound to act upon it even then; no one supposes that there is not discretion in the Governor in Council to grant it arbitrarily if they choose. However, if there is an arbitrary dismissal of any report, or if the Governor in Council declines to act upon that report, it is my humble opinion that this Parliament has a right to call for that report, this Parliament has a right to judge of the action of the Governor in Council upon this as well as upon any other question that comes before Council and is determined by it. I apprehend that is the only question at issue between the parties here to-day. From what I have heard I do not believe that the question will drop here, as the Government propose that it shall, unless something further is given to this side of the House more satisfactory as to what the policy of the Government is going to be towards the civil service of this country, whether the civil service is to be at the caprice, I will say, of any Minister of this Government or of any other Government. The hon. gentlemen are not going to remain in their present places for ever. When an official entered into the service of this Government there was a plain bargain that, though he entered upon the minimum salary of a third-class clerk or a second-class clerk, if he behaved himself, he had a right to expect every year there would be a certain increase. Now you repeal this enactment without stating what your policy is to be except that you alone will arbitrarily decide whether any clerk shall have his increase. If that is to be the position taken by the Government, all I can say is that it is one of the most arbitrary, I believe, that any Government has ever taken with regard to the civil service of this country.

Mr. MONK. I wish to press my question, because the Minister of Finance refused to answer my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Quinn) on the ground that his interpretation of the law did not agree with that of the Solicitor General. My interpretation does agree with it, therefore, I expect him to give me an answer. I think it is treating us in a very arbitrary manner to ask for a vote upon this item when we are not informed what reason has prompted the Government to withhold an increase in one instance when there has been a favourable report by the deputy and by the head of the department,

and to give the increase in another instance. Suppose ten clerks are employed in the department, and favourable reports are sent in by deputy heads respecting five of them, is this committee to be asked to vote statutory increases, under the interpretation of the Act submitted by the Solicitor General, to those five clerks and refuse it to the others, and not know the reason why? I would not vote on such information as that.

Mr. McNEILL. Irrespective of the legal argument that is going on across the floor—in which, I think, the right side is our side—I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Trade and Commerce to this other view of the question. The hon. Minister of Marine has stated, that the statutory increase cannot be demanded by members of the civil service as a right. The hon. gentleman knows, as well as he knows he is sitting in his seat, that members of the civil service who entered the service in years past, entered it with the understanding, and in the belief, that they were entitled to this statutory increase; and under these circumstances to deprive them of the statutory increase on the ground—to put it at its highest point—that there is a doubtful question of law involved, is an immoral act on the part of Parliament, and it is something that Canada should be ashamed of.

Mr. QUINN. The Minister of Finance refuses to give information, because he does not appear to look at the Act eye to eye with me. Yet the Minister is in this position, that he is no more independent than I am, because he is asking me to vote \$50, when I do not know what it is for—\$50 of an increase to a man of whom I know nothing, and as to whose good conduct and deserts I have no information. And yet, because the hon. gentleman happens to have a majority on whom he can rely, he refuses to furnish the information to which I am entitled. That is not a proper spirit in which the Finance Minister should approach the subject. I should not like to set myself up as being able to teach the Finance Minister anything in parliamentary procedure or parliamentary debate, but I cannot help saying, as a young member, that I hardly expected to be so treated by a Minister of the Crown, when we are discussing a question with the light we possess. I am entitled to information as to why this officer is to get an increase, and his colleague in the same department is not to receive an increase. All we know is, that the statute is there. The Minister, in one case, invokes the statute for the purpose of giving \$50 increase to an officer, and he invokes it again in order not to give another officer an increase. Why this discrimination? I cannot help looking upon this case as one of those cases in which it is intended that the Act should prevent the possibility of any political discrimination. When an hon. gentleman

Mr. MONK.

pointed out that the beneficiary in this case happened to belong to the same political party as the Minister of Finance, it was a very convincing argument with me, and I am afraid it was also with the Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I told the hon. gentleman that I never heard what the politics of the gentleman were until an hon. member mentioned them to-day. I have not even the pleasure of knowing the gentleman, which is a great disadvantage to me. It was not from any desire not to be courteous to an hon. member, that I did not repeat my statement half a dozen times. Some members appear to think it is desirable to do so, but I think that, if I state the matter clearly once, I should not be asked to repeat my statement. I stated to the hon. gentleman, or to some other hon. member, that this particular officer is to receive this increase because, in the judgment of the Government, he is a specially meritorious person. That does not lead me into a discussion as to why a number of other officers do not receive increases, because, as we are not proposing a vote in any of those cases, they stand in a somewhat different position. We are bound to give information when we propose to grant increases, but not in the cases of other officers. It is the difference between proving the affirmative and the negative.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister should not refuse to give this information. He says it is proposed to give Mr. Walker the increase for special meritorious reasons. Will he detail to the House what those reasons are?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot. I simply say that the chief officer recommended him to the Government, that Council adopted and confirmed the recommendation, but I cannot give the hon. gentleman details of the various services he rendered.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister places himself in this position—and he might as well confess it first as last—he does not know.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Indeed, I do not.

Mr. FOSTER. Between two persons the Government pick and choose; they give \$50 increase to one man, and refuse to give a like increase to his colleague. The hon. gentleman does not tell the committee what point of merit the one officer possessed that he should receive the increase, and he confessed he did not know anything about it. He does not put on the Table the report containing the recommendation on which action was taken, the report, not of a deputy head, but of the secretary of the branch.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The head of the branch.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The hon. gentleman does not put the report before the committee.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Was it ever done?

Mr. **FOSTER**. Was there ever a Government that undertook to pick and choose in this way?

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Yes.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Hon. gentlemen opposite have changed the conditions, and, when they are no longer going to give every deserving officer the statutory increase, but they are going to pick out the persons they think deserving, and take the responsibility, we ask them to give the committee the foundations for judging as to their action, and thus be able to place the responsibility where it belongs. What have we got? Nothing but a statement from the Finance Minister equal to this: I know nothing about the man; I never met him; I know nothing about his work or as to why he should receive \$50 increase. We say: Who asked that the increase be made? The hon. gentleman replies, that the head of the department recommended it. Then, let us have the report of the head of the department and ascertain the meritorious points of Mr. Walker, who is to receive this increase, while his colleague is not mentioned. We have a perfect right to ask for that report. If hon. gentlemen are going to pick and choose and assume the responsibility, let them give us the grounds on which they pick and choose.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The grounds are, that we are advised by the competent party to judge, that the man has done his duty specially well.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Has the competent authority given the Government information that the other man has not done his duty well?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There is nothing about him.

Mr. **FOSTER**. On what points has the recommendation been made?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It is simply as to one man.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Move to strike it out.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. If the head of the department mentions that A deserves special recommendation, and does not say anything about B, how can we bring down anything about B?

Mr. **FOSTER**. But you can bring down something about A.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. We have told you.

Mr. **FOSTER**. If the Solicitor General laid down anything as the basis of his argument, it was, that in justice to the civil service, under this Act, you were bound to have a report from the deputy head. I appeal to the hon. gentleman, if he did not take that position. What ground is there for fair and even-handed justice to the civil service employees in the department, if the deputy is able to refuse to report? The Solicitor General saw the point, and made it strongly, that, in order to carry out the Act honestly, it is the duty of the deputy to report upon those officers to his Minister, and then the Minister may concur and carry the recommendation through Council, and Council is the arbiter. Are hon. gentlemen going to set aside that law, with its moral obligation, and make it abortive by saying to deputy heads, that they need not do anything? If so, a civil servant is powerless. When a young man engages to enter the civil service of Canada, he does not come up here under an engagement to receive \$1,000 per annum as a second-class clerk. He comes up here on a system of graded salaries; graded with superannuation abatement; graded with certain increases to come according to desert, and his salary is not fixed at the simple \$1,000, but it is fixed at a beginning of \$1,000 and an increase of \$50 each year, under certain conditions. Keep your deputy from reporting and you nullify that condition, and you break your contract under which you engaged your civil servant. Then, we are told that it is the duty of the deputy head to report. Shall he report on a favourite of his? No, he shall report on all, and it is the only fair and just way. Shall the deputy head pick out his favourites; for deputy heads do have their favourites; I know it. Deputy heads are mortal men the same as Ministers, and as Ministers have their favourites, so will the deputy heads, and the only fair thing for the service is that the deputy head shall be asked to report on all, and the Minister can take the onus of picking and choosing if he likes. The fact of the case is that these hon. gentlemen opposite have not a report from one single deputy head. The fact is, that the Minister of Finance knows nothing about it, so far as these increases are concerned. He is the medium through which they are brought and he asks us to vote \$50 for one man and nothing for the other man who is a colleague of this fortunate clerk. Are these gentlemen on the Treasury benches going to be fair to the civil servants, or are they not? Are they going to be fair to Parliament or are they not? If they are going to take this absolute and arbitrary responsibility, let them give us the ground so that we can say whether their responsibility is rightly assumed. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) cannot get away from that ground, and I am quite certain the Solicitor General would not attempt to get away from it.

The CHAIRMAN. Shall this item be carried ?

Mr. DAVIN. No, Sir, because I am about to bring before the House the opinion on this subject of a great lawyer who was at one time highly respected by hon. gentlemen opposite. With reference to the opinion we have had from the Solicitor General, it may be described as this : that he agrees entirely with the interpretation of the law that came from this side of the House, qualified by the statement that there might occur an instance where the Government of Canada would have to make a declaration of bankruptcy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. That is it. The Muscovite Government has been characterized as a despotism qualified by assassination. This law is a law guaranteeing, as a matter of course, increases of salary to the civil servants of Canada, and in the opinion of the Solicitor General it is qualified by the possibility that there might come a time when, if these \$50 increases were granted, the Government would have to make a declaration of bankruptcy, and say that the condition of public funds would not allow them to do it. When the Act was before Parliament in 1885, the Postmaster General took a hand in the debate, and even the Minister of Marine, who can take so convenient a view of a legal question, took a hand in. But, Sir, greater than either of these took a hand in, and that was the Hon. Edward Blake. When this very clause granting the statutory increases was before the House, the following occurred :

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The late Act makes no provision for the annual increase of \$50.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend has not read the amendment to Victoria 46.

Mr. BLAKE. This has been amended by providing for the annual increase of \$50.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It has.

Mr. BLAKE—

Now, Sir, observe the opinion of this great lawyer, Mr. Blake, who stood so high in Canada, and who has justified the statement I made, when asked about him in 1872, that if he were to go to London, he could stand up to the greatest man in Westminster Hall or the greatest man in Chancery Lane. Mr. Blake has gone over and he has taken the very highest position at the English bar. He does not say that this is an elastic clause, which gives a discretion.

Mr. QUINN. He was ex-Minister of Justice at the time.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, well, he has gone higher than the Minister of Justice since. Mr. Blake says :

In pursuance of the notice which I gave in the course of the debate, I rise to call attention to
Mr. FOSTER.

those parts of this measure which prescribe once again the principle on which the salaries and promotion in the civil service have been and are to be regulated. The subject is one of very great gravity, in view of the enormous increase which has taken place and is taking place in the cost of the service, and added gravity is attached to this particular part of the system to which I desire to call attention, by the official statement which was made in the earlier part of the session, as to the effect of the law which we are asked once again to consecrate by the third reading of the Bill. In the Budget debate, on the 3rd of March last, the Finance Minister adverted to the expenditure for civil government in these words :

"While the expenditure for civil government for 1877-78 was \$823,369, last year it was \$1,584,417, or an increase of \$261,047."

Mr. CASGRAIN. Hear, hear.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman says hear, hear. I do not wonder at it, because hon. gentlemen opposite have made this one of the great charges against the Administration throughout the length and breadth of the country, to prove the extravagance of the Administration. Now, I desire to call the attention of the House to the facts as regards the cost, to the circumstances that have led to this increase of \$61,000 in six years. One of the difficulties that every Government must experience in preparing the civil service estimate is the increase that is inevitable under the provision of the Civil Service Act, by which a very large proportion of the employees receive each a yearly increase of \$50. This increase for the last six years is estimated as follows :—It is estimated that 420 of the civil service employees have received an increase of \$50 each year, and each year since 1877-78, that is during six years, or a total increase of salary to each employee of \$300. That amount for 420 civil servants gives \$1,275,000 of an increase.

Now, Sir, there is an addition of \$126,000 a year to the cost of the civil service. And that addition does not stop there ; it is progressive. Under this law it is to be progressive, and you have already accumulated under the law an addition which represents a capital charge of more than \$3,000,000.

Could anything be more explicit than that as to the view which the Hon. Edward Blake took as to the significance of this law ? Again, Mr. Blake says :

But, Sir, the practical operation of the law, which was passed in conformity with the recommendations of the commission, and which has not worked in conformity with those recommendations, is that there are these increases and these promotions going on steadily.

He says further :

That the mischiefs to which I refer still prevail, and they prevail to this extent, as the Finance Minister sums up the case, that 420 out of the civil servants of the country have, within the last six years, received increases which make them now in receipt of \$300 a year by virtue of these \$50 increases apart from the promotion increases, or a total of \$126,000 a year, which would be equal to the average wages of 420 mechanics with families.

He goes on further :

I maintain that it ought to be changed ; I maintain that the system is a bad one. In those

cases in which you give increases, the increases ought not, in my opinion, to be given as this law gives them.

Not as the Government have interpreted the law; not as the Council sitting on the recommendation of the Minister, who has had a recommendation from his deputy head, and thinking whether the finances of the country will justify them in making a partial declaration of bankruptcy, but to be given as the law gives them. Mark again the words of Mr. Blake:

I maintain there ought to be no right to an increase, even in those cases in which increases may be given.

What is the meaning of that? It is senseless if there was not a right to the increase: "I maintain that there ought to be no right"—he declares there that there is a right; and when speaking on legal subjects at any rate, Mr. Blake was confessedly a master of precision. He says:

I maintain that the increase should only be given as a stimulus to extra exertion; whereas, by this law, it is given as a matter of course.

"As a matter of course" is almost equivalent to the word automatic, which I used in an earlier part of this debate, and mark how that agrees with the interpretation I ventured to give of the second subsection of section 26. I never give an opinion on legal matters here without much deference to the men who are constantly in practice; but this agrees entirely with the opinion given by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) and other legal gentlemen on this side as to the meaning of the second subsection of section 26. Mr. Blake says:

I maintain that the increase should only be given as a stimulus to extra exertions; whereas, by this law, it is given as a matter of course, for unless a man's conduct is disgracefully bad, the rule is to give the increase. If the rule is not without exceptions, let us hear the exceptions. But I need not argue this point, because the Finance Minister himself describes the increase as an increase inevitable under the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

He then moves a motion that all the words after "that" be left out, and that the said Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending the same. Who spoke afterwards? Another lawyer, and a member of the present Government—no less a person than the hon. gentleman who at present presides over the Post Office Department (Mr. Mulock), and this is what he said, seconding the motion of Mr. Blake:

When we pass to the first-class clerk, we find he draws a salary of \$1,400, increasable to \$1,800 by an annual increase of \$50.

This language is as precise as Mr. Blake's—

Then we descend in the grade, and we find a second-class clerk commencing with \$1,000, increasable at the same arbitrary rate, as time

rolls on, to \$1,400 a year. The same fixed sum of \$50 a year is added to the salary of each clerk, whether he is of the lowest class or the highest class. The Secretary of State must know that increases in salaries should be in proportion to the value of the services, having due regard to the then salary; whereas, in this case, there is an arbitrary sum of \$50 a year, without rhyme or reason, added to the salary of each officer, from the lowest class up to the highest.

The motion of the Hon. Mr. Blake was negatived, and then the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) moved a motion, which did not relate to the question we are discussing to-night; but he gave us an obiter dictum on that subject, and this is what he said:

Yet, in the face of this fact, Parliament is asked to increase the salaries of these mechanical clerks, and give them \$50 annual increase.

It is really amusing to read these expressions in the light of the observations we have had from these learned gentlemen to-day. Then we had a statement from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who I know is not a legal authority, but still he used to be a man of some account among them, and he said:

Any person who listened to the speech delivered by the hon. Finance Minister must have been struck with the fact of the announcement he made on that occasion, that an increase of \$126,000 annually took place, through the operations of this Act, by giving the increase of \$50 a year to the servants in connection with the civil service.

If necessary, I could quote some remarks of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) which show that the impression on his mind was the same. Now, what do these extracts which I have read from the debate of 1885 show? They show, in the first place, that in the mind of the Government of that day, and in the mind of Mr. Chapleau, who had charge of the Bill, the idea was that unless there was gross misconduct the \$50 was added "as a matter of course," to use Mr. Blake's phrase. They show also that it was the opinion of Mr. Blake, the opinion of the present Postmaster General, and the opinion of my versatile friend in regard to legal opinions, the hon. and learned Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Now, whatever we do, surely the first step, if reform is needed, for a man or for a Parliament is to go to the bottom facts which you have to deal with.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I see that one of my hon. friends opposite feels badly. He may well feel badly, because he sits behind a Government that presented a spectacle to-day not dignified or to the credit of the Government of Canada. We have one opinion from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—a wabbling opinion on this subject; so that he might be called a wabbling Minister, just as his leader might be called the

wimpling Wilfrid, for the one wabbles and the other wimples. What have we seen? We have had an opinion from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), and then we have had a wholly different opinion from the learned Solicitor General, whose position and character at the bar will not allow him to endorse the opinion of his colleagues. He had to tell us that he agreed entirely in the interpretation of the law which came from the hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Quinn) and my own humble interpretation of it, and he had to take refuge in this plea, that there might possibly come a time when the fact of adding \$50 a year to a clerk's salary would cause the Government to make a declaration of bankruptcy. Then we had the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who rose in his seat, or rather he did not rise but remained seated, like a cardinal in the purple, who speaks ex-cathedra and therefore does not need to stand on his feet. The hon. Minister spoke there, sitting in his chair and waving his hands, and in that authoritative manner which he knows how to assume—and in which after all there is very little—he declared that as regards the statute of 1885—which was a guarantee to the public that a Minister would not promote clerks improperly, and which was a charter, at the same time, to the civil servants themselves that they would have some position of independence in the service, and that if they were worthy men and behaved themselves properly, a certain increase yearly up to a certain sum would take place—did not care a fig about it, and the Government were perfectly at liberty to do what they pleased in spite of it. That was frank, there was something noble about that, he butted his head against the Act of Parliament, and the only thing that could be said about his conduct was what a Yankee said about the conduct of a bull which charged a railway train. The Yankee said: "I admire the beast for his courage but darn his discretion." So I admire the courage of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, but darn his discretion, if that is parliamentary, and if it is not, why you know, Mr. Chairman, that even in anticipation I will do, as the Princess Chemay did. She did what she was told before she heard it. And so I am ready to apologize for any breach of order even before I commit it, to such a state of discipline have I been brought in the last two years by our present rulers. Then we had a most extraordinary exhibition from the hon. Minister of Finance. He got up and he told us that he could not really help it if we could not agree with him. He did not tell us what the law was, but he said: Our view of the law is not the same as yours, and so much the worse for you. But what his view is, we have not been able to make out. He struck me as very like the man—an Irishman, of course—

Mr. DAVIN.

found in a railway station at Hamilton. He was asked where he was from, and he said: I am from everywhere but here, and I will be from here as soon as I can. That is exactly the position of the hon. Finance Minister on the law. The first thing we ought to do is to ascertain what the law binds us to do, and then do justice though the heavens should fall. I do not think that the people of Canada want to have economies made by wrong-doing. No greater wrong can be done than to rob some poor civil servant who may have a large family in order to make a small economy; and the plea that great wrong should be done in order to effect a small economy comes from that Government which is ready to run into the most reckless extravagance and spend millions, or at least a million and a half—I will not go too far—if it will only give a helping hand to a fellow who is a man and a brother, and who stands to us, and especially if it falls within the sanction of the new Evangel of those benches; "business is business." I say that in the interests of the Government and in the interests of the civil service, there ought to be some principle of promotion, and we ought not to sanction the claim of hon. gentlemen to promote at caprice. We ought to protect our civil service against such caprice. Why, there must have been increases beyond the statutory ones, because in one year \$300 are added to the expenditure of an office whose expenditure previously was increased by only \$100 a year. I might even appeal to the heart—because I know that even still the Minister of Trade and Commerce has some heart left—of that hon. Minister for he has a couple of very near relatives in the civil service.

Mr. FOSTER. What?

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, yes, he has given hostages to fortune. There is the hon. member for Wellington who has given quite a number of hostages to fortune.

Mr. FOSTER. A bashaw with two tails.

Mr. DAVIN. There are three or four or five others in the same position, and if these hon. gentlemen stay in office long enough, you will see what will take place. We should deliver any class in the community, but especially the important class in it that is doing our business, from the mere caprice of a Minister or a Deputy Minister, and I say here we have not had a satisfactory statement yet from those Treasury benches. I may say for myself that—and I can only speak for myself—but with my humble convictions on this question, we must have a more satisfactory statement from the Government benches or they will not get on very rapidly with their Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the hon. Minister of Finance another question, and see if I will be more successful than I was before. I appreciate his position because of course he is not now dealing with his own

department, but he has, or ought to have, the advantage of the recommendations of the superior officer in that branch. Does he recollect whether or not any reason was given by that officer as to why this increase should be given Mr. Walker. Was it just generally recommended or was there any special reason for it?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The reasons were general rather than special—that he was a particularly deserving officer.

Mr. **FOSTER**. My hon. friend has no doubt reasons for the increases granted of different kinds. What we want to get at if possible is on what ground my hon. friend himself, when it comes to a matter of personal knowledge, is going to decide. If I recollect rightly, in the case of one of the departments, he put in the plea why certain clerks were selected for the increase, that they were young men who had the smallest salary, and who, with the families they had, found it most difficult to get along.

Now, there is tenable ground. Does my hon. friend mean to recognize that in other departments as well? Is that the principle which governs in these cases? I do not want to go into the private affairs of the different members of the civil service, but is there a reason in this case that pecuniary circumstances are more difficult in the one case than the other, and so the statutory increase is given in one case and not in the other?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. That element was not alleged in this case?

Mr. **INGRAM**. This matter may not be of very great importance to some hon. members of the House, but it is of very great importance to those who are not drawing large salaries in the civil service. As I understand it, previous to the dissolution of the last Parliament a number of civil servants in the different departments found a great deal of fault with the late Government for what they held to be injustice done to them by that Government. Since then this Government has come into power, and, as the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said, found that the late Government had abused the Civil Service Act by granting increases to civil servants in the different departments. We know that in the late election many civil servants used their influence against the Government on account of this alleged injustice. But hon. gentlemen opposite, having come into power, have failed to grant the increase to the civil servants as provided in this Act. Now, several hours have been spent in trying to ascertain what is the principle by which these men are to receive their increases from year to year. We have been unable to obtain any information, and now I want to know from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has accused the late Government of being too free in granting statutory in-

creases, what method this Government have adopted in order to bring down in these Estimates the increases that are to be granted to a number of civil servants. We have been told that it was on account of certain special services that these employees had rendered. In view of the number of increases granted, as shown by these Estimates, and in view of the number of employees to whom increases have not been granted who heretofore have received them, I want to know from the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether any of these gentlemen who have not been placed in the Estimates for increases have done equal service with those who are getting these grants. I say that if there is not some principle established by which every civil servant can be rewarded on his merits, we are placing in the hands of the Government a very dangerous weapon indeed. From my experience of the Liberal party and their leaders in this country, I have been led to believe that they were always favourable to their own. Now, if what we read in the "Globe" is correct, and is to take place, several Deputy Ministers who are Conservatives are liable to be beheaded and friends of the Liberal party appointed as deputy heads. I believe the civil servant will not fare very well at the hands of the deputy heads under these circumstances. Therefore, it is the duty of this Parliament, who are responsible to the people, to try to shield the civil servants as well as possible from the influences of party politics. After having expended about six hours of the afternoon in trying to get information, we are still left to ask for it. Instead of refusing to answer, I think the Government will save time if they will give us such information as we may fairly expect, and tell us what the treatment of the civil servants will be provided they do their duty, no matter whether they are Grit or Tory, and no matter what department they are in. If they do their duty, they should have reason to feel confident of the increase from year to year as the Civil Service Act provides.

Office of the Queen's Privy Council for
Canada \$29,750

Mr. **FOSTER**. We would like to have an explanation of the increases.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. There are none.

Department of Justice, including an allowance to the secretary of the Solicitor General, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary \$25,160

Mr. **FOSTER**. We would like to have an explanation of the increases here, please.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. There is one chief clerk at \$2,600 and one \$2,400, Mr. Fraser. This brings the salary of Mr. Fraser up to the maximum. Then

there is a first-class clerk at \$1,800 and one at \$1,550, which is an increase of \$50.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is that ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Mr. Coté. There are five second-class clerks, two at \$1,400, one at \$1,350, one at \$1,150, and one at \$1,100. There is an increase of \$50 to Mr. Narraway. There is one third-class at \$750, an increase of \$50—Mr. Harris.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask my hon. friend how many clerks in the department are eligible for the statutory increase ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think there are two unprovided for.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, will my hon. friend give the committee the reason why, if there are these clerks who are eligible for the increase and there are only four selected—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There are more than that altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. Not more who are eligible. The hon. gentleman has provided for four, and he tells us that there are two unprovided for. What I wish him to inform the committee about is on what ground he has made his selection of four and left out two.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think I may safely say, so far as the department is concerned, that the report was made by the Deputy Minister to the head of the department. I am not familiar with the contents of that report, nor, if I were familiar with them, would I consider it right to discuss them in this House. I speak subject to correction, being a junior member of the House, but my opinion is that it would not be right to give this House the report made by the deputy head to the head of the department. It is a matter of internal economy of the department, and I do not think a discussion of it would be fair to the employees.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. gentleman inform me whether the two that are not provided for were unfavourably reported ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot say that, I cannot say anything of the sort. I do not think there is an employee in the department I could make such a statement as that about.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, my hon. friend sees what he has done. As I said before, this Government assumed the reins of office with a flourish of trumpets that the old system was to be done away with. It has been disputed to-day that that statement was made absolute. That may be tenable, but the general result of the declarations was, that now under the new Government the statutory increases do not hold. There may be cases now and then in which an increase will be given, but such a thing as statutory in-

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

creases are a thing of the past. Consequently, there would be a very large saving. Now, out of six possible statutory increases which could be made in the Justice Department, the hon. gentleman has made four ; so that, so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, the majority of four to two shows that the rule exists that statutory increases have not been done away with. Now, my hon. friend raises a very vital and, I think, important question. Is the case over which he, or the Minister of Justice, for the time being happens to preside, is that a close corporation as between the Minister of Justice and the servants, or are these servants the servants of the country ? As the country pays them, the country has a right to know how those servants are doing their work, whether they are earning their money, and if some of them are not earning their money and not doing well, has the Minister of Justice a right to step in between Parliament, who provides the salary, and whose officers these clerks really are, and to say : No, I will not give you any information. The deputy has reported to me, but that report I will not give to the representatives of the people, I will keep that myself, but I will ask the representatives of the people to vote the money for this establishment. Its affairs are semi-private, at least, so far as this is concerned ; it is a private matter between myself and them, and I will not give the information. That is the logical conclusion of the hon. gentleman's remarks. I take the liberty to say, that I do not believe that this is the attitude which a Minister ought to take. The Ministry, on the whole, are simply a committee of this House to administer the affairs of the country, and are responsible to the representatives of the country in this House. Wherever we delegate a committee to look after our affairs, we do so on the ground that they are to give us the fullest information with reference to those persons whom we employ, as in this particular instance. I think we have a perfect right to the report of the deputy with reference to these clerks. Anyway, I want to point out, that, if we are not given this information, we are simply reduced to this—the principle is as good in one case as another—that the Minister has simply to say : I think this ought to be voted ; I am not going to give you any reasons why, but I think it ought to be done. When we ask for the reports, we are told : That is simply between myself and my subordinates. Now, I can understand the motive of my hon. friend. He may say : Well, I do not want to compromise the clerks. There may be something in this report which will not be creditable to one of the clerks.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, I will not say that ; that would be unfair.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not say the hon. gentleman made that statement, but why does he refuse the report ? If everything is all

right, what grounds is there for his not letting Parliament know as much as he knows about it? Parliament has as great an interest in the administration of the Justice Department as my hon. friend, probably more; I think he will admit that. What right has he to intervene between Parliament and the workings of that department, and refuse to give us the report of its authorized head as to the work of the clerks under his department? His making a selection is *prima facie* proof that the other two clerks are not as good as the four that he selected, that is, that there is something against them. Now, I do not want to press this too far, because there are cases where a confidential report is necessary in order to get at the truth. If the Postmaster General, for instance, wants to understand the truth about certain matters, he may find it almost impossible to get it, unless there is a confidential report which will be respected between him and his confidential officers. There is detective work to be done, and you can only do it properly under the veil of secrecy. But, in the ordinary workings of the department, surely that principle cannot be obtruded. I think my hon. friend has taken ground which is not tenable.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It appears to me, at first sight, that perhaps the better way to get this information would be for the hon. gentleman to move for this report. It would be hardly fair to expect that, as each item in the Estimates is under discussion, all the information with reference to that, such as the hon. gentleman now points out should be obtainable. Let me say now what, perhaps, I should have said before, with reference to one of those who does not receive the statutory increase, that is, the gentleman who is my private secretary, one of the employees whom I found in the department when I came in. I did not think, as he was already in the receipt of a salary, as a private secretary, that he should receive an increase over and above his usual salary. Coming now to deal with the other case, I take it to be my duty to say that there is not, to my knowledge, in the department a single gentleman who has been reported against as being undeserving of the statutory increase. But, assuming that the Deputy Minister did make a report recommending all the employees for their statutory increase, and that the Minister concurred in it, then we have got to deal with the Council. The matter goes before the Council, if the report reaches that stage. Now, how are they to deal with it? Of course, in the exercise of our discretion, we may decide not to give the increase; that is a matter of political responsibility. How are you going to deal with that?

Mr. FOSTER. Parliament ought to be put in possession of the facts as far as the door of the Privy Council.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I still maintain the view, that it is open to us to say that the report from the Deputy Minister to the head of the department is a matter of internal economy in connection with the department. That is simply my view, and I think the report should be the subject of a notice of motion.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no time more pertinent for that information than when you are asking for the money on that very head. The moment my hon. friend singles out four from the six, he raises the question in reference to the others. I think it is fair that this committee should be put in possession of the report of the deputy head. If the deputy head has reported that these two clerks are eligible for the increase, and that is concurred in, we will say, by the Minister—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I did not go that far.

Mr. FOSTER. I am taking it as the basis of an argument. The committee ought to be put in possession of that report, in order that they may judge as to the responsibility of the Council. Suppose the Deputy Minister says that four of these clerks ought to have their increases because of special work, but the two other clerks he cannot recommend. Very well, that would be one stage of the case. Or he might say: The six are eligible, and I recommend them for their statutory increase. How can you place the responsibility on the Minister unless you know what was the report of the deputy head which reached the Minister? I think it will be necessary under this new arrangement to have the reports of the deputy heads. What I want at this moment to call the attention of the Ministry to is this. We are going to come across departments soon where there are clerks equally as deserving, and I am saying nothing against the clerks of my hon. friend, equally painstaking, whose term of service is as long and who have as great difficulty to make ends meet and who require equally as much the \$50 increase as this officer in question. We have passed a vote for the Privy Council where there are no statutory increases. Are all the men there doddards, have they no work to do? If there are gentlemen doing their work well, who are eligible to increases, how will they feel when they walk side by side with the four clerks in the Justice Department, who are perhaps equally good, but no better, but who are receiving \$50 increase? This is going to act like poison in the civil service, and will not promote its welfare.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman cannot reproach me for not attempting to do my best, in view of the fact that I succeeded in securing the statutory increase for four clerks out of six.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the explanation of the hon. gentleman is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). No member of the committee wishes to reflect on the hon. Solicitor General on account of the way he has treated the officials in his department, but that is not the question at issue. What I wish to emphasize is that in view of the new system of treating civil servants, it will be found necessary to have the reports of the deputy heads submitted. Then we will know the reasons which actuated the deputy head of the department. This will be necessary especially since it has been ascertained that the Government do not treat all the officials alike. I emphasize again what has been said, that Ministers had better be prepared to answer all questions as to the reasons why they have given increases in these special cases.

Department of Justice — Penitentiaries
Branch \$3,150

Mr. FOSTER. There are no statutory increases?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is no increase at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any clerks in this department eligible for increases?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think there is one, but I am not positive.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman know of any reason why that one clerk was not given the statutory increase?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not in a position to answer that question.

Mr. FOSTER. Was any report made in regard to that clerk?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not able to answer the question.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will make a note of my inquiry.

The Department of Militia and Defence, including \$2,000 to J. W. Borden, \$2,800 to Lt.-Col. D. A. Macdonald and \$1,400 to Lt.-Col. Guy, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary \$41,250

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I move that the item be reduced by \$50.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman give information on this vote in two lights: First, the number of clerks eligible for statutory increases; and second, the number of those to whom increases have been granted.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There have been no statutory increases granted. Six clerks are eligible. I observe there is a mistake in the item. Instead of two clerks at \$1,250, there is

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

one at \$1,250, and one at \$1,200. The mistake was made in printing.

Mr. MONK. I moved for a return in March last, and the Minister would confer a great favour if he would bring it down.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will do so.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of the third item, in which the salary of \$2,400 is given as against the general provisions of the Civil Service Act?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is the salary of the accountant.

Mr. FOSTER. How did the accountant's office become vacant?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The former accountant was superannuated.

Mr. FOSTER. At what time?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In September or October last.

Mr. FOSTER. What salary was he getting?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. \$2,400.

Mr. FOSTER. What is his superannuation allowance?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. \$1,600.

Mr. FOSTER. And you are giving the new accountant, what?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. \$2,400.

Mr. FOSTER. How much saving does the department make by that transaction?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman presses me to state how much saving will be effected. I cannot tell at the present moment, but I think by the end of the year we will be able to show a saving. I do not wish to reflect on the former accountant, but if I am forced to make a statement I will say that a good many thousand dollars have been saved to the country by the change.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The former accountant, Mr. O'Meara, was known as being one of the very best accountants in the service. I do not know what the Minister has found out which would require him to take a new man and put him into the position of an old servant, who has been for a number of years in the civil service, at the same salary as Mr. O'Meara was receiving. The Minister of Militia promises us the information later on, but the Government are always promising us something later on, and we never get it. When we move for returns they are not brought down, and so we have to discuss all these matters on the Estimates

at a most inconvenient time. I have nothing to say about the new accountant of the Department of Militia, but I can say that during the troublesome times of the North-west rebellion, the late accountant, Mr. O'Meara, proved himself to be one of the very best officers the civil service of Canada ever had. I do not know what reasons the Minister (Mr. Borden) had for superannuating Mr. O'Meara, but it cannot have been because of economy, because the hon. gentleman has appointed in his place a new man, and an untried man, however able he may be, I am not prepared to say anything about the new accountant's ability, but I do know that the Minister has superannuated at \$1,600 a year, a gentleman who I am prepared to state is as good an officer as the Government of Canada ever had as an accountant. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) takes in a new man and gives him the full salary of the position. Well, it has been the rule almost invariably that even when a Deputy Minister was succeeded by a new man, the new incumbent did not get the salary that the old deputy had earned after years and years of service. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) considers it quite prudent to give us all the information about this superannuation, and as to how he expects to save so many thousand dollars, I shall be most anxious to look into the matter closely.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the age of Mr. O'Meara ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Sixty-five years, I think.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not know about his age being 65, but I know that he is as good for the position he filled as when he was forty-five.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not desire to say anything reflecting upon any former officer of the department, but I do say that I found it absolutely necessary in order to carry on the business of the department, to have a new accountant. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) was head of the Militia Department some years ago, and I dare say at that time the officer in question may have been very efficient. He had been in the service since 1861; thirty-seven years. I believed that the time had come when it was necessary to introduce more modern methods of keeping the accounts and of administering the accountant's branch. As the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) knows, the accountant's office in the Department of Militia is a very important one indeed. He has to a large extent, to perform the duties of an auditor, and he has an enormous number of accounts to check coming in from the different depots and military districts. I found it was necessary to make a considerable change in the method of transacting the business of the department. Under the for-

mer system the moneys were sent out in large cheques to the different districts, but I found this very inconvenient and undesirable, and I have made a change so that now we pay nearly all the bills from the head office here, and consequently the number of cheques issued at present by the office at Ottawa, is at least ten times what it was when I came into the department. I think the committee ought to accept the statement which I make and ought not press me to go beyond what I have said, when I stated that I found it absolutely necessary in order to carry on the business of the department that a change and an improvement should be made. I have no reflection whatever to make upon Mr. O'Meara as to doing anything intentionally wrong; but the system of keeping the books, so far as any books were kept at all, was antiquated, and I found it impossible to induce him to make any change, so that it was necessary that I should make a change. Now, with regard to the gentleman who has succeeded Mr. O'Meara; the hon. member (Sir Adolphe Caron) says that he is an untried man. He is a gentleman who had experience at one time in the office of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Winnipeg, at a time when they were doing an enormous amount of business there in the boom years of 1881 and 1882. Subsequently he went into banking and he rose from the position of clerk and accountant to that of manager of a branch bank. I believe him to be one of the very best men that could have been selected for the position, and I may say that since he came in we have proofs in the department that he is the right man to fill that office. As to the salary; he would not have taken the position for anything less than the salary he is receiving. He was receiving not quite that salary where he was, but considering the difference in the cost of living here as compared with where he was—

Mr. WALLACE. What place was that ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He was living in Kentville, N.S. He said he would not accept the position for anything less than \$2,400, and I believe that the country will not lose anything by the change which I made.

Mr. WALLACE. Is he a relative of the Minister of Militia and Defence ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes; he has that advantage.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The question of his being a relative does not enter into the point I am discussing at all. I do not know the gentleman who has been appointed, but I do not doubt for one moment that the Minister selected a very well qualified man to occupy the position. However, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has not answered a single objection which I have submitted to him. He does not submit any reason why Mr. O'Meara should be turned out except, as

he says, that he changed the system of book-keeping and he could not get Mr. O'Meara to change his system. Well, that is no reason, for the Minister lays down the rule in his department and the officers have got to comply with it. This new accountant may not be an untried man in so far as his professional qualifications are concerned, but he is untried in so far as the Department of Militia is concerned and yet the Minister gives him \$2,400 a year.

The hon. Minister of Militia, giving his reason, says: "I gave him \$2,400 because he wanted \$2,400, and he would not accept anything less." Under such a system, the Government will be helpless to resist pressure for increases of salary from gentlemen who are allowed to judge of their own qualifications. The cutting off of \$50 a year to the poor civil servant is not considered. But the pressure which the hon. gentleman will have to resist under the system he has introduced will leave him powerless to carry out the Civil Service Act. When selecting a new accountant, he sent for this gentleman, and he said that \$1,600 was paid to the late accountant. "Oh, but," says this gentleman, "you do not half know me; I am a far superior man to the other man, and you must give me \$2,000." The hon. gentleman says that he could not secure the services of this eminent expert without conceding to him the salary he considers himself entitled to. Sir, it is no use any longer to have Estimates; it is no use discussing them in council to decide what is right and what is not right, if the gentlemen who are appointed to the service are going to settle for themselves the salary they are to receive. I was unfortunately not here during the discussion which was taking place in regard to the \$50 statutory increases. As I read the law, especially the Post Office Act, with which I am more familiar, a man is appointed at \$500 or \$600, with an annual increase of \$50 or \$40 according to his grade. That means that the salary is fixed at \$600 and the additional amount forms part and parcel of that salary, unless in the judgment of the Minister, supported by his Deputy Minister, who is supposed to know more about the civil servants than the Minister himself, the increase is withheld. That is my reading of the Post Office Act, and I think it is impossible to controvert that opinion. I think it is conceded that Canada, whether under one Administration or the other, has been blessed with one of the best civil services that any country has ever employed to carry on the work of the different departments of the Government, and if the system which the hon. gentleman wishes to introduce now is followed, it will be impossible to secure in the future as efficient a civil service as we have to-day, because without giving any reason, the hon. gentlemen who are administering the different departments can say, "I give an in-

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

crease to this man, and I will not give an increase to the other man." Who is going to stand between the civil servant who does not receive an increase, while his comrade in the same department, probably in the same branch, receives it, and the Minister who chooses to make a difference between the two. It is introducing a system which I think will be injurious to the country and will interfere greatly with the efficiency of the civil service. But coming back again to the new accountant of the hon. Minister of Militia, I say that no new man, however proficient he may be, should be taken into a department at the same salary as a man receives who has been there for thirty years. That is the principle I acted upon in the department, and I am prepared to stand by that principle.

Mr. SPROULE. Last session, in answer to a question which I put upon the paper, we were given a return showing that in nine months hon. gentlemen opposite had superannuated or dismissed no less than fifty-two employees of the civil service. That was about one out of every twenty-four or twenty-seven in the whole service. In justification of that course, they explained to this House that it would result in a great saving of money to the country, because, while they had dismissed these men, some owing to age and others owing to incompetency, they were filling their places with better men at much smaller salaries. By that one act, these hon. gentlemen saddled on this country an additional expenditure of \$18,229 annually under the superannuation law, which is a permanent addition to the expenditure until these men die. In addition to that, \$3,179.79 was paid in gratuities to some of the men they dismissed. In looking over that list, I find that of those dismissed two were twenty-eight years of age, two or three others thirty years, two or three others thirty-one years, others thirty-three, thirty-four, thirty-eight, forty, forty-one, and I think the highest was seventy-one or seventy-two years of age. It was claimed that in all these cases there was a great saving to the country, because in many instances it was not necessary to fill the places of these men. But in looking over the Estimates before us, I find that there are about the same number in the civil service at the present time as there were before these dismissals were made; and it cannot be successfully claimed, if they filled the places of these men with new men who are drawing as large salaries as their predecessors, that any saving was effected. In looking over the Estimates before us, we find that the aggregate salaries paid to them are quite as large as those that were paid before. There is another feature of the matter which I think is very reprehensible. I have always had strong views on the subject of nepotism on the part of members of a government or a

party. I do not think the Ministers of this Government should be so much given as they are to appointing their own relatives in the civil service. I do not think the principle is right, for two reasons: one is because it creates a jealousy among outsiders; another is that hon. gentlemen are using the position which the people put them in for the purpose of promoting their own interests or those of their relatives.

I think, if a member is elected to this House, and he has anything to give, he should give it to his constituents, and not to his own family or relatives. I, therefore, regard the principle as a very unsound one. It may be said, that both parties indulge in it. It is none the less reprehensible on that account. Two wrongs will never make a right. Then, the other feature is wrong, of bringing in a new man and giving him the same salary as a man who occupied the position for over thirty years. There ought to be much stronger reasons to justify that, than the Minister of Militia has given in this case. I notice that hon. members opposite seem to be prone to this principle, because I remember very distinctly that the same argument was advanced with reference to the bringing in of Mr. Lash as Deputy Minister of Justice under the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, as has been given to-night, namely, that he was a good man, and would not come unless we gave him the salary. He was given a larger salary than usually paid to new men, and the plea for giving it to him was, that he would not accept a smaller one. I do not think that is a sound argument, and I think the less frequently it is used, the better it will be for the service and the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. Minister a report from his deputy head with reference to the clerks in his department, showing how they carried out their duties, and whether they are entitled to the statutory increase or not?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There was no report and no commendations made.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no consistency in the actions of the Government at all, and I would call the attention of my hon. friend who is leading the Government to this point. One department has clerks, for instance, that of my hon. friend, six of whom are eligible for the statutory increase, but not one has been given it. The hon. Minister will not say that these are undeserving clerks and not doing their work well, because, if they are not, they ought not to be there, and from what my hon. friend has said, they would not be there if they were not doing their work well. What position is the civil service placed in, when young men, serving the Government equally well, whether in the Militia Department or the Justice Department, are discriminated against in

that way? In the one department they get no statutory increase, although they do their work well and deserve it, and in another they get the increase, although they are not doing their work any better. Is that fair? Can the Government hope to carry on its affairs satisfactorily on such a principle of divergence and discrimination? Have the Government no conception at all of the effect that will have on the civil service? Nobody who loves justice and fair-play, will say that this is not unfair treatment. You should either treat them all alike by giving the increase, or by simply giving increase for special good work, and that upon proper report; but for one department to refuse the increase and another to give it to all, or nearly all, its employees, is a discrimination which cannot be considered otherwise than unfair, and which will work to the detriment of the service. Another point brought out in the treatment of the department by my hon. friend is this. He says that he is going to make great savings in the department. We are now discussing the question of civil government, and in that my hon. friend has done what? He has superannuated one man, giving him a superannuation allowance of \$1,680, and he has put a new and inexperienced man in the department at a salary which this other officer, after thirty or forty years service, was receiving. What is the reason the hon. Minister gives? The reason he gives is, that the new man would not take any less. But the hon. gentleman has a good precedent for that. When the Drummond County arrangement and the Grand Trunk Railway arrangement made last year was explained to the House by the Minister of Railways and Canals, he was asked why he gave so much money to the Drummond people, and he said he tried to give less, but these men would not take any less.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I made the best trade I could.

Mr. FOSTER. When the Yukon arrangement was being so ably explained by the hon. Minister of Railways, he declared that the Ministers wore out their trousers going down on their knees and begging these people to take less, and the Government gave them the 25,000 acres per mile because they would not take any less. My hon. friend who is junior member of the Cabinet, may, of course, shelter himself behind the precedent set by the eminent head of the Department of Railways, who has so much experience in political life. But, at the same time, he has thrown completely to the winds the cardinal tenet of the Opposition which they have been preaching for years, that, in the first place, the superannuation business must be done away with, and that, in the second place, if you do superannuate, you must show a saving. My hon. friend shows a saving of \$1,680 on the wrong side of the

ledger. I want to point out one other thing. I am not going to take too strong ground with reference to the employment of relatives, but I do say this, that, if a relative is to be employed, he had better be employed in some other capacity than that of the responsible accountant of an office in a department of which the Minister to whom he is related is at the head. I say that it destroys, or has a tendency to destroy, the proper discipline of the department, when a son, or a brother, or a cousin, of the Minister who runs the department is put in the responsible office of accountant for that same department. Whether it influences the Minister or not, it will have the tendency in the department to make the other employees believe that it does influence him. This gentleman may be very capable, but my hon. friend is knocking to the winds the rule that hon. gentlemen opposite strove for during all the years they were in Opposition. He superannuated the former accountant, and gave him \$1,680 superannuation allowance, and put in his place a new and untried man at the very same salary that the former accountant received, while he refuses the \$50 increase to the deserving clerks who are entitled to it under the Act.

Mr. QUINN. I cannot help congratulating the Minister of Militia on having the power to put his relative into this position and on having set aside the law of the land to secure a position for him that would be sufficiently remunerative, and to secure for the country such eminent services. I look at the list of civil servants, in connection with the Department of Militia and Defence, I would like to call the attention of the hon. the Solicitor General to the names. I am glad to see the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) present, because he is the hero probably, of the system. I would like to call the attention of the Solicitor General and also the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Hurley), who I see, is here, the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. McHugh), and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Stenson), while I read the names of the three leading officers in this list. I quote from page 15 :

Col. Charles Eugène Panet—present rank, Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence; date, 4th February, 1875; present salary, \$3,200; date of birth, 17th November, 1830; date of first appointment, 4th February, 1875.

Lt.-Col. John Macpherson—present rank, chief clerk, director of stores; date, 25th April, 1891; present salary, \$3,000; date of birth, 8th January, 1830; date of first appointment, 1st September, 1872.

Cornwall Herbert O'Meara—present rank, chief clerk, accountant; date, 1st July, 1881; present salary, \$2,400; date of birth, 25th May, 1833; date of first appointment, 1st June, 1861.

So that, of course, the relative of the Minister of Militia and Defence must be provided for. It is very unfortunate, and I draw the attention of the Solicitor Gen-

Mr. FOSTER.

eral and the other gentlemen to whom I have referred to it, that a man named O'Meara should be displaced, but it is quite usual. I draw their attention to this fact that it is quite in keeping with the system, or rather the theory that has been broached by the Minister of Public Works in that famous newspaper of his, and of course I am glad to see it followed. I am sure these gentlemen will enjoy it, and I hope they will vote to support the decision that Cornwall Herbert O'Meara, a principal officer of the Militia Department, who, on the admission of the Minister of Militia was dismissed or superannuated, not because he was too old; not because he was not faithful in the discharge of his duties; not because there was anything dishonest about him, but he was superannuated and Mr. Borden replaced him probably only because his name was O'Meara.

Mr. McINERNEY. I would like to call attention to one thing. I have not risen to find fault with the appointment of Mr. Borden to this position, nor have I risen to find fault because Mr. Borden happens to be the cousin of the hon. Minister. I do not make any point against the Minister on that account. But he has brought into his department a new man as accountant, giving him a salary of \$2,400. Now when we run over these Estimates of the amounts paid to the accountants of the different departments, we find that in the Department of the Interior, the accountant is paid \$2,350, the Department of Indian Affairs \$1,950, the Department of Marine and Fisheries \$1,800, the Department of Public Works—it has been reduced from \$2,400—\$1,800.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a new appointment, I suppose.

Mr. McINERNEY. I suppose so. The accountant in the Department of Railways and Canals receives \$2,000, and the accountant in the Post Office Department \$1,800. So that we have a brand new man brought into the Militia Department at a higher salary than the accountant of any other department.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what was the salary given to the clerk in question before his appointment, and also why Mr. O'Meara was incapacitated? The hon. Minister must bear in mind that it must appear strange that a previous clerk should be set aside at an expense to the country of \$1,600 a year, that a relative of his own should be taken into his own department at a salary of \$2,400, and that he should claim that he would not come here for any less. What was he getting then?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not know that I am bound or that I am in a position to state. I have stated already that this gentleman told me that he was receiving what he con-

sidered a full equivalent to the salary he now receives.

Mr. DAVIN. Taking the cost of living into account?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Exactly.

Mr. DAVIN. Where was he living?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. At Kentville, N.S., as I have already stated. With regard to the statement that has been made that I allowed this man to dictate his own salary, I said nothing of the kind. What I said was that I believed the man appointed was worth the amount of money he receives and that a man as good as he is to fill the place could not be got for less. I repeat that. He is one of the best in the service to-day, not only in the Militia Department, but in any department.

He will earn to the department and to the country more than the amount of his salary. Now with regard to the question of nepotism which has been raised by some of my hon. friends on the other side, I may say by way of preface that possibly they are about the last people to advance a criticism of that kind. But for the comfort of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) who asked me whether he was a relative of mine, and for the satisfaction of some of my hon. friends opposite, I will say at once that he is my cousin. But while he has that disadvantage, he has the very great advantage of being a brother of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden); so that possibly my hon. friends may not feel so badly after they are fully aware of what his relationships are.

Mr. HUGHES. The discussion of this item may be a good occasion for me to make a few suggestions to the Minister. I notice here that salaries ranging from \$550 to \$1,000 are paid to third-class clerks, and salaries from \$700 upwards are paid to second-class clerks. I wish to draw the Minister's attention to this fact, that the officers who serve in the permanent corps in Canada are paid very much less than is paid to second-class or third-class clerks. Take, for instance, the officer commanding a battery and compare the work he does with that of one of these clerks, or an officer commanding a school of infantry, or an officer commanding a school of cavalry, and compare the work they do, their training, their technical knowledge and otherwise, with that which these clerks require. Then contrast the qualifications that are required for the militia with those of a third-class or second-class clerk, and there is really very little comparison between the two. I would take this opportunity of suggesting to the Minister the advisability of working out some system whereby the officers of the permanent corps of cavalry, in-

fantry or artillery, might be placed at least in a position somewhat equal to that of a second-class clerk. Officers commanding an infantry corps get \$3.50 a day, which is really less than many of these third-class clerks are getting, although they have to by their own uniform, a very expensive uniform, and are subjected to a great many other calls upon their purse that no civil servant in Ottawa is called upon to meet. I am satisfied that the people of this country would be pleased to see these officers placed, at all events on the same salary as a third-class clerk. Let the field officers be placed on the salary of a second-class clerk, and the officers commanding corps be placed in the same rank as first-class clerks. I am satisfied that would meet with the approval of the entire electorate of the country, and then we would be able to retain the services of the very best men that we now have in the force.

There is another point to which I will take the liberty of calling the Minister's attention, although it may not be strictly in order under this item. It is in connection with the working out of a scheme for the mobilization and transport of troops and supplies at the present time. The department at the present time is in a very chaotic condition in that respect, it has never been anything else. I would take the liberty of suggesting to the Minister of Militia and Defence that it might be advisable to form a mobilization department, putting our capable quartermaster general at the head of it, and having under him, say, the heads of the leading railways of the country. For the Grand Trunk Railway, take Mr. Wainwright, for the Canadian Pacific Railway, take either Sir William Van Horne or Mr. Shaughnessy, for the Canada Atlantic Railway, take Mr. Chamberlain, or any other officials of those roads for officers. Give them the rank of lieutenant colonel, perhaps, but let these men work out a plan whereby, in case of war, or if need arose of going into camp, the troops might be mobilized and moved from place to place. The steamship companies also might be represented. More than that, the men who have been in the habit of carrying out large contracts might have a place on this board. Take, for instance, a man like Mr. Davis, who has had great experience in engaging men and carrying out contracts—such a man would be invaluable for engineering purposes and in the construction of field works. Take, for conducting transportation, a gentleman like Mr. Mann or Mr. Mackenzie, who has had large experience in handling men and transporting material. These would be able to render invaluable service to the department in the way of bringing up troops. At the time the North-west rebellion as high as \$20 a day was paid for teams when the whole outfit was not worth more than \$40 or \$50. Yet these men were getting \$25 for stealing, for that is what

they occupied themselves about, while the volunteers were fighting for 50 cents a day. If we had had at that time some proper system organized with such men as I have named at the head of it, if such a system had been organized in advance, I am satisfied the country would have saved two million dollars in that North-west campaign alone.

Then there is another point that I take the liberty of suggesting to the Minister. On the 24th of May, the 1st of July and Thanksgiving Day, it is the custom in many localities for the volunteer officers to meet at their own expense. I would suggest to the Minister the advisability of passing a vote so that any corps that was regularly called out, or which regularly turned out, having first obtained the authority of the department therefor, when such corps turns out for a field day under proper command on either of the days mentioned, each member should receive his day's pay. Now, on the 24th of May the celebration in Ottawa, I believe, is likely to be a failure owing to the fact that many of the volunteers cannot afford the expense to come from a distance to take part in it. I suggest that the department take a vote of a few thousand dollars, \$5,000 or \$6,000 would cover the need for the whole of Canada. I am satisfied that the country would reap much more than that value of benefit from having the volunteers turn out.

Mr. WALLACE. I think that the explanation made by the Minister of Militia and Defence will hardly be considered satisfactory by the House. His last attempt to bluff off inquiry was by saying that as to the charge of nepotism, those on this side should be the last to raise that question. I do not think that would be accepted by the House or by the country, either as an answer to the charge of appointing his own relation, which perhaps is not a crime, or to the circumstances which accompany this appointment. I contend that in that appointment, the law of the land has been violated. The law requires that appointees to the civil service, except certain specified appointments, shall have passed the civil service examination, under those requisite qualifications, excepting unspecified cases. The cases specified are as follows:—

When the deputy head of a department in which a vacancy occurs reports, for reasons set forth in such report:

(a) That the qualifications requisite for such office or employment are wholly or in part professional or technical;

(b) That the requisite qualifications are not possessed by any person then in the service of the department; and

(c) That it would be for the public interest that the examination herein provided for should, as regards such vacancy, be wholly or partially dispensed with;

The Governor in Council may, without reference to the age of the person, if the head of the department concurs in such report, select and

Mr. HUGHES.

appoint such person as is deemed best fitted to fill the vacancy, subject to such examination as is suggested in the report.

Was there any examination held in this case? There was not. Then the law was violated in that instance, because it says there shall be an examination, not a full examination, if it were, none of these cases would be applicable. But I find in that case the examination has been held. But are we to be told here that these qualifications are professional or technical. What are the qualifications of an accountant? Why, that is the occupation of a large portion of the civil service in Ottawa, doing accountant's work. In every branch of the public service here in Ottawa there is a staff of accountants. In the Department of Militia we are told that there is a great deal of work to be done, and there should be a branch, and I suppose there is, to cope with that work.

A statement has been made that there was no one in that department fitted for the position, that the training other officials had received under Mr. O'Meara did not qualify them to carry on the work after Mr. O'Meara's superannuation. I decline to believe that such is the fact, in the absence of any evidence, none of which has been produced so far. The appointment was made; the requisite qualifications were not possessed by any other person in the department. The statement had to be made by some one that the qualifications had to be professional or technical. They were not professional or technical any more than the qualifications of civil servants are of that class. It may be that in some department a doctor is required; and in the Department of Inland Revenue a chemist is sometimes needed, and then the qualifications are distinctly technical. In some departments a legal adviser may be needed, and his qualifications are technical. Looking at the Auditor General's Report, it will be seen that a large number of the departments are occupied in doing what, for the purpose of this appointment, is called technical work. I contend that the law has been distinctly violated in this appointment. But the Minister says this new officer is the best man in the civil service. I characterize that statement as a piece of bombast. A gentleman who has not spent one-fourth of the time since his appointment in performing his duties, is not in a position to say what are the qualifications of every officer in every department; and in making that statement he was simply making a bombastic utterance when he could have no knowledge as to the truthfulness or untruthfulness of his statement. What do we find the Minister doing? He said in the innocence of his heart that he could not offer this officer this office at a less salary. I presume he means that he had offered him a less figure. There are differ-

ent grades of office. The highest grade is that of a Deputy Minister, and the next is that of chief clerk. The latter commences with a minimum salary of \$1,800, and the maximum is \$2,400. This gentleman was made a chief clerk, I presume. Is that correct?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He was.

Mr. WALLACE. This officer was given the maximum salary of a chief clerk the first day he stepped into his office. I do not think there is an example of a similar proceeding in any department of the Government since the new Administration came into office, and I am quite sure there was not such a case under the late Government. He got the most-favoured treatment. An hon. member has read the list of salaries of accountants of the different departments. The other Ministers have recognized that when a new accountant came in he was doing pretty well if he was promoted to the position of chief clerk and commenced with the minimum salary of that position. But this gentleman was a relative of the Minister. He tells us he was a brother of the member of Parliament for Halifax; but I do not think the member for Halifax appointed him or recommended him. It is not usual for members on this side of the House to be called upon to make recommendations; it was not the practice under the old Government, and is not under the new Government. The outrageous proceeding, in my opinion, consisted in this, that this officer is a relative of the Minister and was given treatment not accorded to any other gentleman, that when he was taken into the service because he was a relative, and from the start he received the maximum salary of a chief clerk. The Minister made some insinuations about Mr. O'Meara, and said he could tell something if he only wanted to do so. I contend, however, that now is the time and here is the place to give the committee information, and it is entitled to receive all information. If Mr. O'Meara has been incompetent, we are entitled to know it. We have the evidence of his chief for many years, the late Minister of Militia, who testifies from his experience that in the greatest emergency which has tested the capacity of the department, in 1885, Mr. O'Meara proved a most capable and efficient officer. That was the opinion I had formed from a general knowledge of Mr. O'Meara's capacity, capability and honour. If there is anything to be said derogatory to him, we should know it. He received a superannuation allowance of \$1,680 a year. He received \$2,400 for performing the duties of his position, and the performance of those duties now costs the country \$4,080; \$2,400 to this gentleman with the fortunate name of Borden, and \$1,680 to Mr. O'Meara, whose days of usefulness have not passed

away. But he was superannuated, I understand from the Minister, because he was getting old; or was it because he was inefficient?

Mr. QUINN. It was because he could not change his name.

Mr. WALLACE. No Irish need apply. I do not think, however, it was for that reason; but we are entitled to know whether it was on account of his age or his inability to adapt himself to the new system of book-keeping which the Minister was inaugurating.

Mr. BERGERON. For the sake of economy.

Mr. WALLACE. I think we are certainly entitled to a full statement of what the Minister has insinuated he could say with respect to this matter, something that will satisfy the committee, for we want to be satisfied. We desire that the Minister shall tell us what he has not told us yet and furnish some justification for the superannuation of Mr. O'Meara at \$1,680 a year and the appointment of the Minister's relative at \$2,400 a year, without examination, without complying with the Civil Service Act, in defiance of the law of the land and in defiance of fair-play to other officials in the public service. In this connection I might fairly ask the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who is making his bow across the House and who apparently is ashamed of this conduct, for he usually sits behind the Minister of Militia, and he has now got as far away from him as he possibly could without coming over on this side of the House; I would like to ask the Minister—no the hon. member for North Wellington—

Mr. FOSTER. He should have been a Minister.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. member for North Wellington were Minister of Militia and Defence—

Mr. BERGERON. Borden would not have been there.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Borden would not have been there with \$2,400 a year to commence with, in defiance of all law, and Mr. O'Meara would not have been superannuated at \$1,600 a year when he was in good health and capable of efficiently discharging his duty. I once had a little faith in the hon. member for North Wellington; more than I have lately. This world is full of surprises and indeed I would not be surprised to hear that hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) get up and say that this was the finest transaction that he ever knew of in his life.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, yes. I would not be surprised to hear him say that everything in connection with it is most economic.

Mr. BERGERON. The "Hansard" for the past eighteen years would fall on his head.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; but it is said the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) had a relative of his own appointed, and he may be looking out for a position for himself.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Brodeur). Order.

Mr. WALLACE. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, you are calling these gentlemen opposite to order.

The CHAIRMAN. The reference is to you.

Mr. WALLACE. To me, Sir. We want to know, Mr. Chairman, the reason why the late accountant was superannuated, and why the Act of Parliament was violated so that this man could get the maximum salary when others and we presume capable men—we must assume that the Government keep capable accountants in every department—are getting far less salary, although they have been long in office. I think the action of the Minister highly unjustifiable in this case.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) was in the House or not—

Mr. WALLACE. I was.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have endeavoured to explain why I found it necessary to superannuate Mr. O'Meara. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has seen fit to say that I have indulged in insinuations against Mr. O'Meara. I am not aware that I did, and I certainly did not intend to.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister said that he could state something.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) allow me for a moment. I know the hon. gentleman is very fond of hearing his own voice.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not so fond of appointing my own relatives.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well, I am not so sure the civil service list would not show something of that kind.

Mr. WALLACE. You do not know anything about it, then.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I was saying that I did not make any insinuation against Mr. O'Meara. I stated that I found Mr. O'Meara entirely unfit to fulfil the duties of the position in which I found him, and for that reason, in the public interest, I superannuated him. If I were to be asked fifty times over I could only re-

Mr. WALLACE.

peat that in my judgment, as the head of the department, Mr. O'Meara was not competent to discharge the duties of the position in which I found him. I do not think I ought to be asked to go further than that. With regard to the law being violated, of course I know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is a very eminent authority on a great many subjects, but I did not know that he was an eminent lawyer. I do not profess to be, but I took the opinion of the Department of Justice with reference to this matter, and I have the written opinion of the Department of Justice, that the appointment of an accountant is one which comes under section 37, which the hon. gentleman referred to. Under that section, and upon the statement of the Deputy Minister of the Department of Militia, I made the appointment. So far as the examination is concerned, the gentleman who has been appointed could pass the examination without the slightest difficulty. It happened, however, that he was beyond the age limit, being somewhere about forty years instead of thirty-five, and therefore he could not come into the civil service. I consider that the position of accountant is eminently a technical one. We know that we have now a profession, known as the profession of accountants, and I think the committee will agree with the written opinion given by the Department of Justice that this position may be fairly classed as a technical one. There was no violation of the statute; I proceeded in conformity with the requirements laid down in section 37.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). What about the examination?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is no examination.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). There should have been.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister (Mr. Borden) says that the accountant's metier or business has now become a profession, and if a profession it would be a profession containing a considerable number of professors. Did the Minister make any effort to get tenders or offers to see how many persons would be candidates for this position.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister took this gentleman in at \$2,400 a year which is higher than is paid to the accountant of any other department, some \$600 a year higher than is paid to some of the accountants, and at least \$500 a year is given to this new man more than the average salary of the accountants in all the departments. The only reason given by the Minister for this is, that the cost of living is so much higher in Ottawa than in the place where this gentleman comes from. The place mentioned is not sufficiently known to fame for me to remem-

ber, or probably my education has been neglected.

Mr. BERGERON. Kentville.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes; it did not sound very familiar to me. But, Sir, I am told on very good authority that the only commodity cheaper in Nova Scotia than in Ottawa are apples.

Mr. BENNETT. They are very wholesome.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, and I am told they are cheaper in Nova Scotia than here. But from what we know of Ottawa we know that if a man lives a simple life he can live as cheaply here as in any other part of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. But he must not learn frivolities.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course I grant you that if he is a man of fashion, it is a very expensive place. It is barely possible that this gentleman may have been under the impression that when he obtained the high position of accountant in the Militia Department, he at once became a man of fashion and would have to incur expenses to keep up the dignity of the position. He may have had false impressions with regard to the social encumbrances of the new office.

Mr. FOSTER. He may possess some accomplishments.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, the Minister says that this man was earning nearly as much salary at Kentville; he refuses to tell us what the discrepancy is. It is a case of 'hiatus valde defendus'—there is a large gap to be spanned. Under these circumstances, we may come to the conclusion that he was not earning anything like \$2,400. But the reason given by the Minister why he could not come in at \$1,800, was the great difference in the cost of living. Well, Sir, a simple man, like myself, can live as cheaply in Ottawa as at Regina or at Kentville; but I am not a fashionable man. There is an article here in the "Journal" which may indicate the streams and rivers of rumour that have gone out from this great capital, this Washington of the North, which the present leader of the Government was to do such great things for. The right hon. gentleman sees visions and dreams dreams when he talks of his achievements in the last twenty months—how he has made Canada a nation, and done many other great things.

Mr. BENNETT. But he could not build the Yukon Railway.

Mr. DAVIN. No, there are limits to the highest capacity. You know what the French judge said to Alexander Dumas before he had achieved his fame.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member for Assinibola, but there are four Ministers sound asleep, and perhaps he had better wake them up.

Mr. DAVIN. I will wake them up shortly; but I am afraid to tell this story about Dumas, with the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) before me, because, in his sublime unconsciousness of the imperfections of the accent with which he speaks his native language, he does not think that my accent is what it ought to be; but it was in Paris that I learned French, and I am sure his accent is what Edmund About would call "un accent déplorable."

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not accept the judgment of the hon. gentleman on this point, as on many other points.

Mr. DAVIN. When Dumas went before a French judge, he was asked what his profession was, and he replied that he was of the same profession as Corneille. The judge said to him: "Ah, il y a des degrés"—there are degrees. And so I say, there are degrees of power; and, although the leader of the Government could do great things, he could not build the Yukon Railway. But here is the extract from the Evening "Journal," which is a paper for which I have the greatest respect:

A SOCIAL POINT.

A newspaper outside Ottawa printed recently a report that one of the Cabinet Ministers was taking dancing lessons, and use was made of the report as a text for sneers and smart remarks at the expense of the Minister. Most people will be inclined to consider that sort of journalism a thorough'ly dirty business. If a newspaper in this city were to use a similar rumour in a similar malicious way about some Sparks Street merchant or city lawyer or doctor, there would be no two opinions about the contemptible nature of the publication. In personal matters the fact that a man is politically prominent gives no excuse for assaults on what he has a legitimate private right to do.

As far as dancing is concerned, the man who is liable to be thrown in the way of it and who, not having conscientious objections to it, does not fit himself to do it tolerably well, he is a fool. Any man is a fool who is willing to look like a fool because he can't do commonplace things which people favour into whose society he must come more or less.

And the paper goes on to say that a Cabinet Minister who fits himself by terpsichorean studies for the exigent claims of the society into which he may be thrown, displays wisdom rather than the reverse. I say that, with such articles as that going out from this city, you can easily understand how a candidate for a high position in the Militia Department might think there would be social claims upon him here of a higher kind than there would be at Kentville. Not only would he have to pay a higher price for his apples than he would at Kentville, but he would have to dress better, take dancing lessons, and so forth. I say, that we must in future disabuse the minds of candidates for high positions in the civil service of such an idea. We do not want our civil servants to run away with the idea

that they are to be pampered by society or the curled darlings of fashion. The hon. Minister himself, who is a man of university training, and who knows something of logic, knows that if a man gives a reason for a proposition which he lays down, and that reason is found not to exist, the proposition falls completely. He laid down the proposition that this man should receive \$2,400, and the reason he gave was, that the cost of living in Ottawa was great. I am sure that at Kentville, save in apples, the cost of living is as great as it is in Ottawa, and the hon. gentleman is not justified in giving this man \$600 more than he would to any other good accountant. The hon. gentleman advanced another reason, and it was a lame and impotent one. He said that this man was a brother of an hon. member here. What do we care about that? It is not the principle of this Opposition, I can tell him, to place men in the public service merely because they happen to be relatives of prominent politicians. He says some Conservatives did it. The more shame to the Conservatives, if they did it. We who are in this Opposition do not justify any Conservative Minister who may have taken relatives into his office; and I echo what the ex-Minister of Finance said, that, above all, to take into the responsible accountant's office a near relative of the Minister, is utterly unjustifiable. Why, Sir, a thing like that, but not so flagrant or heinous, drove one of the greatest lawyers that ever sat on the English woolsack, Lord High Chancellor Westbury, from office, and the other day, in France, a man high in political life was driven from his position because he was guilty of nepotism. The people of Canada want to see the same high standard introduced into our public life that exists in England, where we have the august mother of parliaments, on which our own is modelled; and so long as I sit in this House, I will protest in the strongest terms I can against thrusting on the public service men because they happen to be relatives of the Ministers. If the salaries of the Ministers are not high enough—and I think they are not—let us raise them; but let us not do it an underhand way by appointing relatives of the Ministers to office. The Minister adds \$600 to the \$1,800 of the late accountant, and he superannuates him at \$1,680. This is equal to 33½ of the statutory increases; and then he has the equivalent of 12 statutory increases given to the man who comes in, so that you have 45½ statutory increases swallowed up in this one's man's case. So that, while they are boasting, and boasting hypocritically, of their economy in refusing the statutory increases, in this one case—and it is part and parcel of their whole policy—they add on a burden to the public Treasury equal to 45½ statutory increases. For that reason, I move that the amount placed in this item over and against the accountant shall be reduced by \$600.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Militia whether his deputy made a report in this case, as required by subsection 3 of section 37 of the Civil Service Act?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He did.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Let me read this for the benefit of the committee:

The Governor in Council may, without reference to the age of the person, if the head of the department concur in such report, select and appoint such person as is deemed best fitted to fill the vacancy, subject to such examination as is suggested in the report.

That report would not be complete, in my judgment, unless an examination of some kind had been suggested in it by the deputy head. Then if the deputy head did suggest an examination, the head of the department must have ignored the suggestion, inasmuch as we have been informed by the hon. Minister that no examination was held. With regard to the contention of the hon. Minister that the position is a technical one within the meaning of the Act, I must say that I never heard any more absurd contention put forward. It simply means that the Government may ignore every line and section of the Act. The existence of a society of chartered accountants is no reason why the members of that society should be placed on the status of a profession. They are not a profession in the sense of the Civil Service Act or in the sense that members of the other professions are, which are chartered by Act of Parliament. I have not heard any argument put forward that will justify this most extraordinary proceeding. Assuming that the qualifications for this position are technical, within the meaning of the Act, and assuming that a professional accountant should be appointed to take the place of the old and experienced official who preceded him, there is nothing in that contention to justify this Government in appointing as chief clerk a new man with a salary of \$2,400, or the full maximum of that office. That cannot be justified. In 1895 my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Wallace) appointed to the office of accountant of the Customs Department a gentleman with every technical knowledge required in order to keep the books of that most important financial department perhaps in the whole Government, in so far as the keeping of books is concerned—in which \$20,000,000 a year have to be accounted for in one way or another—and that gentleman received a salary of \$1,650, and has gone on relying upon the statutory increase as the only addition to his salary. The position of accountant to the Department of Inland Revenue, perhaps, requires more technical qualification than even that of customs, and I venture to say that no gentleman who has not experience in the methods of bookkeeping in that branch of the service could take his place,

and yet I assert that there is not a single line of justification in the Act for the appointment of a professional man to that position. Yet we find that this Government, without regard to anything laid down in the Act, has appointed a practical accountant to the position of accountant in the Militia Department and appointed him without any examination and at the maximum salary. We certainly require more explanation of the policy of the Government regarding their interpretation of the Civil Service Act than we have been able to get to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. The point raised is a most important one. If the contention of the hon. Minister of Militia is to hold, we are going to have a complete change, with reference to one office at least in all the departments. We are going to take that office out of the Civil Service Act entirely and make it one to which any person can be appointed, whether he comes up to the requirements of the Act or not. I have had experience in the Government since 1895, and I confidently assert that never in the wildest times of Liberal-Conservative Administration did I know of the Government even contemplating the idea of making the position of accountant a technical office. It was never contemplated and it was never held by any Minister of Justice that it was possible to do it. But there seems to have been an accommodating Minister of Justice of late to warrant this departure from the Act, and we are asked to vote \$2,400 in order to pay this man, who has been appointed in violation of the Act, the maximum rate which an accountant will receive. And the word accountant is not used at all in the estimate. What we are asked to vote is the \$2,400 for a chief clerk, and the hon. Minister asks us to do that on the ground that it is a technical office. I want to know if the Government are going to take this as the basis of their administration of the civil service, and if from this time out we are to consider that any Minister may appoint an outsider, irrespective of the terms of the Civil Service Act, to any chief clerkship, simply by dubbing him an accountant and setting him to work keeping books. This is no light matter, and the member of the Government who leads it for the present, should give us the policy of the Government with reference to this.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The point is whether, in legal parlance, the qualifications required for this particular office are such as warrant the Minister in considering it technical. On that point he consulted the Minister of Justice, and I understand he was informed that it did come within the terms of the Act. That is a legal question, and my hon. friend took the only means in his power of ascertaining whether he was within the law.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that quite meets the question I put. The

vote is not for an accountantship at all. We are asked for \$2,400 for a chief clerk. When we inquire whether the Civil Service Act has been complied with, we are told that the chief clerk is a technical officer in this respect, and that it is so construed to be a technical officer by the Minister who wants the office calling this man an accountant and telling the Minister of Justice, to whom he applies for an opinion, that an accountant, in his opinion, is a professional man, and consequently this may be held as a technical office. Now, if that be so, every accountant and sub-accountant in any department of the Government may be appointed on technical grounds, and the provisions of the Civil Service Act, as it has been administered from the first, set aside, because the Minister says, what I think is questionable, that the accountant, doing the work of book-keeping, is from this time forward to be called a member of a profession and his office a technical office. I do not see how we can vote this.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I suppose the Minister of Militia would have no objection to bringing down the report of his deputy as to the appointment. I think we are fairly entitled to that, and also the report of the Minister of Justice should be brought down, for this reason—it seems to me to be antagonistic to the whole Civil Service Act, and in these reports we may be able to find some reasons why this appointment was made contrary to the Civil Service Act. The only ground on which I put it, not wishing to go behind the record, is simply that it seems to me that that report breaks through the Civil Service Act, and if so, we ought to know the reasons which induced the Minister to, as I believe, break the law existing up to that time.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that this item stand until we have these reports and papers. This is a very important point and we want the opinion of the Minister of Justice and the presentation of the case made to him.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The question does involve important considerations, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) desires it, I will not object to the matter standing over. Now, it is twelve o'clock, and I do not wish to press hon. gentlemen opposite unduly. But there are two or three items in which there is absolutely no difference. Could he take these and adjourn?

Mr. FOSTER. The three following?

Mr. BERGERON. This other will stand over?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It will stand over. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that, as there is a considerable reduction

in the Department of the Secretary of State—

Mr. FOSTER. No, an increase.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think there is an increase in the Secretary of State's Department.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, \$100.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Where?

Mr. QUINN. That is what we want to find out.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. At page 14 of the Department of the Secretary of State is \$34,412, and it was \$34,950.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it was \$36,400, and it is \$36,500. You have the wrong Estimates.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. So I have the wrong Estimates. My hon. friend handed me the Estimates for 1898 instead of those for 1899.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that in this first plunge into the Estimates we have had important questions to discuss—

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am not at all objecting. It is perfectly fair, and I will not press the thing if the hon. gentleman cares about it. We would come to the Department of the Interior, and I suppose, of course, he would wish to have some discussion. But the two before that, the Secretary of State and Printing and Stationery do not involve any increase.

Mr. FOSTER. We must keep some easy work for to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Then we will do some work to-morrow, I suppose.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Resolution to be reported.

Mr. FOSTER. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We shall probably proceed with Supply or go on with the Franchise Bill. We may have the plebiscite first reading. The main time will be on Supply or the Franchise Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Are we not to expect the plebiscite?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It will be introduced to-morrow, but we could not pretend to discuss it—it will be only the first reading.

Mr. FOSTER. It has the look of a very important child.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is one in which, I know, the Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

hon. gentleman will take an interest. I understand that it will be ready to be introduced and distributed to-morrow, and, if so, it will probably be introduced. Afterwards it will be the Franchise Bill or Supply. I move that this House do now adjourn.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 21st April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BAGOT
—ISSUE OF WRIT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that my attention having been called by the hon. member for Beauharnois, in his place, to the fact of the demise of Flavien Dupont, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Bagot, I have, in accordance with section 8 of chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

REPORTING AND PUBLISHING THE
DEBATES.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that, in obedience to the order of the House of the 14th February last, the Clerk has laid on the Table a return showing the cost of "Hansard" for each year from and including 1890 and 1897—the return covering the cost of reporting, transcribing, translating, printing, binding, circulating through the post office or express offices and all other expenses connected with the present system of reporting and publishing the debates of the House.

SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY AND
MINING COMPANY.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved:

That the petition of the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company, praying for leave to present an Act to amend their Act of incorporation, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for receiving private Bills, be received forthwith, and be referred to the Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

**PROHIBITION OF THE IMPORTATION,
MANUFACTURE AND SALE OF
INTOXICATING LIQUORS.**

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 121) intituled "An Act respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, to give an explanation of the purport of the Bill, although no doubt, in a general way, the House thoroughly understands its object. It is, however, a Bill which has been looked for with some expectancy and with a little impatience on the part of a very large number of people in the country, and it is well a short resume of the provisions of the Bill should be placed before the House before asking for the discussion which will naturally arise upon the second reading. I may say, Sir, that at the present stage of the proceedings there is no desire at all to argue the question in any way or shape; I shall, therefore, confine myself to a short explanation of the clauses of the Bill and the object aimed at.

The Bill is a short one, as simple as it could possibly be made to reach the object desired. It contains first of all the title, the interpretation clause, and in the third clause there comes the question to be submitted under the Act, based on this Bill, to the people of Canada. We are all aware that this question has been the point in the Bill which has been most commented upon and most discussed by the people who are interested in this measure. I am very gratified indeed to be able to say here and at once, that the question as contained in this Bill will, I think, meet fully the approbation of those who have been interested in the submission of this question of prohibition to the people of Canada. I will read the question. The section of the Bill reads thus:

There shall be submitted to the vote of the electors hereinafter declared entitled to vote thereon, the following question:—

"Are you in favour of the passing of an Act prohibiting the importation, manufacture or sale of spirits, wine, ale, beer, cider and all other alcoholic liquors for use as beverages?"

Mr. FOSTER. Manufacture "or" sale?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Manufacture or sale. The "importation, manufacture or sale." This, I think, Mr. Speaker, is as simple a question as could be framed to ask the opinion of the people upon. It is largely framed upon the lines of the prohibition resolutions which have been on various occasions submitted to this House of Commons, and it is, I believe, a thoroughly satisfactory form of question on

which to ask the vote of the people of Canada.

The fourth clause provides, that the Governor in Council shall by proclamation name a day on which the vote shall take place in the country.

The proclamation shall be published in at least three successive issues of the "Canada Gazette" and of the "Official Gazette" of each province.

This follows practically the lines of proclamations for a general election, and I may say here that the whole tenor of this Bill is to adapt to the purpose for which the Bill is introduced, the election law of the Dominion of Canada.

The provision as to who may vote, provides that everybody who is entitled to vote for the election of a member to the House of Commons under the Franchise Act as now before the House of Commons, shall be entitled to vote in the plebiscite.

Mr. MACLEAN. Cannot the women vote on it?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Those who are entitled to vote for a member of the House of Commons, without any change as to personnel or as to qualification.

Clause 6 provides for the application of the Dominion Election Act and the Franchise Act to the vote to be taken under this Act. This clause takes in every provision of those Acts, providing thereby not only for the franchise—that is to say, those who are entitled to vote—not only for the manner in which the vote shall be taken, but also providing for the machinery and providing the necessary provisions to enforce law and order, and such penalties as may be incurred by contravention of the Franchise Act or the Election Act. I think, that the clause is complete in this respect, and that it provides in the simplest and plainest form for everything that is necessary.

Clause 7 provides for regulations:

That the Governor in Council may from time to time, for the purposes of this Act, make and give all such regulations, orders and instructions, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, as are in his judgment necessary or expedient for the effectual carrying out of such purposes, and to the adapting of such purposes, of the Dominion Elections Act and the North-west Territories Representation Act and their amendments, and the Franchise Act of 1898.

Clause 8 provides for the ballot paper, and the ballot paper as proposed contains simply the question which I have read, and beyond to the right hand of the question, are two columns, one under the word "yes" and one under the word "no." These columns contain the space on which the cross shall be made. Those who wish to vote "yea," affirmative on the question of prohibition, will place their cross under the word "yes"; those who wish to vote "no" or negatively on the question of prohibition, will place their cross under the word "no." Hon. gen-

lemen can see here the form of the ballot which is as simple as it possibly could be and is only changed from the ordinary election ballot, as is necessary in consequence of the substitution of a question of this kind instead of the names of candidates for whom the votes shall be cast. The Bill says that the ballot paper shall be prepared at Ottawa by the Queen's Printer and forwarded to the different returning officers.

Clause 9 provides for the appointment of representatives at the polls, of the two sides of this question, in very much the same way as the Election Act provides for the presence of the representatives of the candidates at the poll.

Clause 10 provides for the oath being administered to the voters in the same way as in the Dominion Election Act.

Clause 11 provides for these representatives showing and producing a written authority from any authorized or known body of electors who may wish to be represented at the poll. For instance, the Dominion Alliance, or the Good Templars, or other temperance organizations on the one hand; and the Licensed Victuallers or any other liquor organization on the other hand, can give an authorization to one chosen by themselves to represent the side of this contest, the interests of which they wish to see safeguarded in the election.

Clause 12 provides that in case no such person with any authority comes to represent one side or the other, the returning officer may, as in the Dominion Election Act when there is no representative of a candidate; he may call upon any elector present to come and act in reference to the counting up of the ballots and for the conduct of the election.

Clause 13 provides what shall be done in the presence of those representatives who are rightly and properly appointed by any particular organization.

Clause 14 describes the way in which the ballot paper shall be marked, just in the way I have already described.

Clause 15 provides that after summing up the votes, as provided in the Dominion Elections Act, the returning officer shall declare the total number of votes given for the affirmative and the negative with respect to the question asked, and clause 16 provides for the returns to be made in practically the same way as returns are made by the deputy returning officers and the returning officers of each electoral division under the Dominion Elections Act; they being transmitted by post duly registered to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Two copies of the return in each polling division must be delivered to the representatives of the two sides of the question, just in the same way as under the Dominion Elections Act a copy of the returns is delivered to the agents representing the various candidates. The forms of the returns and of the summing up, and the closing of the polls, and all the

Mr. FISHER.

routine work, are to be exactly the same as they are in the case of Dominion elections.

Clause 17 provides that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall declare in the "Canada Gazette" the result of the voting in each electoral division as the returns come in. Clause 18 provides that after all the returns of the different electoral divisions shall have come in, a summary of all the returns, by electoral divisions, by provinces, and for the whole Dominion, shall be made up and published in the "Canada Gazette." This is the whole of the Act, showing, as I started out to say, that it is perfectly simple, that it provides only and solely for the submission of the question which I have read to the people of Canada, by means of the machinery which would be employed were a Dominion election to be held. I do not know that any further explanation is required; and as there is no need, upon the first reading, to go into details or into any argument on the matter, I will leave the Bill in the hands of the House, and move its first reading.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. I think that in the main question the word "or" is used. It struck me, as the hon. gentleman read it, that the word should be "and" instead of "or."

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The question is: "Are you in favour of the passage of an Act prohibiting the importation, manufacture or sale." I think the hon. member will see that this means the prohibition of each or any of these particular things; that is to say, the importation will be prohibited, the manufacture will be prohibited, and the sale will be prohibited.

Mr. FOSTER. All of them?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Each and all.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Each one separately or all together. If the hon. gentleman's amendment were made, it might be read by lawyers to mean that it would be the whole collectively that would be prohibited, or nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine that was the ultimate purpose of those who asked for the plebiscite—that all should be prohibited.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But if my hon. friend's amendment were made, reading it in the light of my knowledge of the language, I would say that if any one of the things were done, it might be held that was not a contravention of the prohibition, but that a person would have to do the whole three in order to be guilty of contravening the law; and that certainly is not the intention or object of the people who have the temperance cause at heart.

Mr. FOSTER. I just made the criticism as a verbal one. The hon. gentleman speaks of my amendment. I do not call for any amendment.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not mean that.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that the Government mean to make it thoroughly inclusive—that what they intend to obtain is not simply an expression whether the electorate is in favour of one of these things and not the others, but all of these things. On the first reading of the Bill, I do not intend to enter into its merits or to offer any criticism of it, except to state this, that I think the hon. gentleman will have to add another clause to his Bill in order to give any point to it at all; and I throw this out for him in the meantime, so that when the Bill comes to the second reading he may be prepared; that is, if we are going to the cost of a plebiscite, which will not be a trifling matter at all, to obtain the opinion of the people, a clause should be added that in the event of a majority of votes being cast in favour of prohibition, the Government would then consider it its duty to introduce at the next succeeding session, a prohibitory law to carry out the effect of the popular will.

Mr. CASEY. You cannot put that in a Bill.

Mr. McINERNEY. If I understand the hon. gentleman correctly, he intends that the vote shall be taken under the Franchise Act now under consideration. But suppose that Act does not pass.

Mr. LISTER. It must pass.

Mr. McINERNEY. Suppose that Act were withdrawn. The hon. gentleman knows that there is no such thing as the Franchise Act of 1898.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Government have not the slightest degree contemplated that Bill being withdrawn or not passing. The Government have decided, so far as they are concerned, that that Bill shall pass at this session of Parliament; and therefore it is not necessary to raise that question.

Mr. McINERNEY. There are other Bills which the Government determined to pass, which have not passed into law. Every Bill the Government determines to pass does not necessarily pass. What I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to is this. This Bill provides that the vote shall be taken under the Franchise Act of 1898, and I call his attention to the fact that when he introduces this Bill, there is no such thing as the Franchise Act of 1898; and if any accident should happen to that Bill—because I believe that when it comes to be considered, the Government will have

good sense enough to withdraw it—or if it should be defeated—

Mr. CASEY. Where?

Mr. McINERNEY. In this House or in another place having the authority to defeat the Bill, then we would have no such thing as the Franchise Act of 1898, and the temperance people of this country would be deprived of any opportunity this year of passing on the prohibition question.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not know whether we are to interpret the words of my hon. friend who has just spoken as a threat that the fate which has already overtaken another Bill that has passed this House this session is to overtake the Franchise Act; but I will wait until the Senate have pronounced against the will of the people once more before I will accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. But let me remind my hon. friend that if the Franchise Act which is before this House should be rejected in another House, then this House will have to determine whether to have what I have called before a terror to the members of this House—another revision this year of the electoral lists—or to have the vote of the people on the plebiscite taken on lists four years old. I suppose my hon. friend does not consider that it would be advisable on such an important measure that the vote should be taken on so imperfect an electorate as is provided by lists four years old. Then another question would arise, whether or not this measure would have to be postponed until another year, so that a new revision of the lists could take place, for I may say that it does not enter into the intentions of the Government to have this plebiscite taken on lists four years old, which disfranchise perhaps one-fourth of the rightful electors of this country. Therefore, we have contemplated that the votation under this Act shall take place under the franchise which we hope shall by-and-by be the franchise of Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I consider that the manifestation of temper which we have had from the Prime Minister—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN—in consequence of an attempt of a member on this side of the House to place a member of the Government in a proper position—in consequence of a member on this side of the House, who happens to be the chairman of a committee of ourselves who have been going over that Franchise Act, suggesting, very properly, as I consider, and, with great deference to the Prime Minister's superior experience, very properly as a parliamentarian, that, when initiating legislation in this way, it is not a proper thing to place in the Bill which is introduced a statement that a franchise which has not yet

been called into existence by Parliament or by this House shall be the base on which the vote is taken. Why, Sir, it is only common sense, and the Prime Minister falls into what I cannot help characterizing as a piece of buncombe unworthy of one of his high position, when he comes forward and attempts to make a piece of platform claptrap by a reference to the Senate. Is it to be supposed that this House is so degraded that any Government is in the position to declare, before a Bill has been considered in committee, that as sure as fate it is going to pass. One of the Quebec newspapers described the right hon. Prime Minister as telling his followers in Room 16 that whether they are right or wrong he is going to hold his head. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) laughs. Would he prefer that I gave the description of the First Minister which the hon. gentleman himself gave of him, namely that he was a man who is venerated all over and absolutely without principle? The right hon. gentleman is assuming to-day the attitude that, according to truthful chronicles from that caucus, he assumed when he told his followers that he was going to have his head no matter whether his followers thought he was right or wrong. But he cannot have his way in this House without convincing this House that he is right. I need not suppose that because he has a big majority behind him, if a Bill is found on discussion to be a piece of legislation that it is neither in the interests of this country nor in the dignity of this Parliament, to pass, this Parliament has fallen so low that it will pass at his dictation, such a Bill. I hope Parliament has not fallen that low. This exhibition of temper, in reply to the fair comment as made by my hon. friend behind me on the Bill brought forward by a colleague of the right hon. First Minister, was unworthy of the Minister, most unworthy of his past record, and most unworthy of his present high position.

Mr. CRAIG. I merely rise to put a question concerning this proposed measure. As my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) said a few minutes ago, it will cost a great deal of money, and no doubt a great deal of trouble will be taken by the temperance people to see that the friends of prohibition record their vote. The suggestion is most opportune that before we spend any more time on this Bill we should have the assurance from the right hon. First Minister that if a majority is recorded in favour of prohibition, the Government pledges itself to bring in a prohibitory Bill. Another most important point on which we should be informed is this—whether the Government will require a majority of the votes recorded or a majority of voters on the lists before they feel called on to bring in a prohibitory Bill. These are two most important questions, and temperance people would be greatly obliged

Mr. DAVIN.

to the hon. First Minister if he will answer them, and let us know where we stand—whether a majority of votes will be sufficient or whether a majority of the voters will be required before the Government pass a prohibitory Bill, and whether they will pledge themselves, in case there is such a majority, to pass it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The Franchise Acts of the provinces, according to this Bill, are those on which the voting will take place. In Ontario the franchise law provides that before an election, there shall be a registration of the voters in the towns and cities. Is it intended that before this proposition is submitted to the people, there shall be in all the towns and cities where that law now prevails a registration of the voters?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. (Mr. Fisher). That point is provided for in the Franchise Bill before the House, the terms of which will apply to this election, just as if it were an election for the House of Commons.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That simply means that the Government will not be able for some months to submit the proposition to the people, as there would have to be a registration in the towns and cities of Ontario previously.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My impression is that the Franchise Bill provides that if a year has expired between the registration in cities and towns in Ontario and the date of another election, a new registration would have to be made; but if it has not, the last registration would be taken and acted upon.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to say that it seems to me the criticisms of my hon. friend beside me on this Bill were perfectly well taken, and I rise to enter my protest, as strongly as I can, against the position taken by the Government. I think that it is not short of insult to the House of Commons for the members of the Government, one after another to declare in this House that they are determined that a Bill shall pass which has not been fully discussed in this House. It is equivalent to saying either that their followers are impervious to any argument that may be adduced, or that no matter how completely convinced they may be that the Bill ought not to pass, the Government have the power to make them pass it. My hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) shakes his head. If he will be good enough to show me how it is possible to explain in any other way the position that the Government has taken I shall be very glad to hear of it. But I repeat I cannot understand how any Government can have the assurance to declare in this House that a Bill shall pass, which has not been discussed at all in committee, except on the supposition I have referred to,

namely, that they are convinced that their supporters are impervious to argument or that they are determined, no matter how convinced their supporters may be, to compel them to pass it.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. I shall explain it when I am in order.

Mr. BERGERON. Every one can understand that it will cost a great deal of money to carry out the Bill which is presented by my hon. friend. The vote will be taken according to the law governing our Dominion elections, which means expenditure for the payment of returning officers, clerks, and so on. I wish to ask the Government whether they have examined into the constitutionality of their measure in this respect. Supposing that the majority in certain provinces voted in favour of prohibition, and that in some other provinces the majority went against it. Would it be constitutional for this Parliament and Government to enforce prohibition in the one province which may have voted against it? The reason I ask this is because I was present one day at a demonstration where the Attorney General of Quebec, who is supposed to be a very learned lawyer, declared that he looked upon an Act of that sort as unconstitutional, and if the Parliament of Canada should submit this question and it should carry in the Dominion as a whole, while the majority in Quebec voted against it, he, as Attorney General of the province, would move that an address be presented to the Imperial Parliament to preserve Quebec from being subjected to the Act.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Oh, no.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not surprised to hear the hon. Solicitor General laugh, because, I suppose, he has not studied the question very much. I think it is a good deal more serious than the Solicitor General seems to think. Let us take it for granted that prohibition will carry and that the Government will carry out its promise and bring before Parliament a Bill to give effect to the vote of the majority. I suppose that the province of Quebec will vote against prohibition—I believe sincerely that it will. I want to know whether, in such a case, this Government is going to impose prohibition on Quebec. And I think this should be known before we go on to expend from \$400,000 to \$500,000 for plebiscite purely and simply to carry out what hon. gentlemen opposite call a promise made at their convention. Before taking this step, we should be perfectly sure that we are not doing something that is unconstitutional.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to add: If a province is to have that right, why should a county or a city have it also? I would like to see the city solicitor of Toronto free to send a similar address in case

prohibition is carried, although we vote against it.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I understand that my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) will not vote for the amendment which, I understand, is to be moved by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) to the effect that the Bill should contain a declaration that, if there is a majority for prohibition, the law shall have effect as soon as the vote is taken.

Mr. BERGERON. I have not heard of any amendment yet.

Mr. IVES. The temperance people were a good deal exercised until recently by the fear that this measure would be harnessed up with a question that would perhaps militate against an affirmative verdict. But I think that while their minds may be set at rest on that point, they will have equal reason to find fault with the leader of the Government for having harnessed this question up to his odious franchise measure, which is now before Parliament. He must know very well that the Franchise Act is a measure that the Liberal party promised for years, but one which has been opposed by the Conservative party from the first. By harnessing the plebiscite to the repeal of the present franchise law and the adoption of the local lists as the basis of representation in the House of Commons, he is arraying against his plebiscite measure more or less of opposition which he might very easily have avoided. It is quite possible also that the right hon. gentleman, in his astuteness, thinks that this is going to afford a door of escape in case he does not think it politic hereafter to introduce a measure founded on a vote for prohibition. One thing is certain—it is a gag upon this Parliament, and upon both branches of this Parliament, to force them to adopt the Franchise Act. If either House were not to pass that measure *hokus bolus*, without the slightest possible amendment, the hon. gentleman would have an adequate excuse, in his own mind, for refusing to go on with the plebiscite vote or refusing to introduce the measure to make it binding and effective. Supposing the Senate were to amend the measure in any particular, the right hon. gentleman could say: I will not submit this Bill upon a Franchise Act mangled and amended by a Tory Senate that ought to be abolished, and all that sort of thing. But if the hon. gentleman is harnessing this Bill up to something that it should not be entangled with, he is incurring the opposition of strong Conservatives in the country against the harnessed measure, and he is doing that quite unnecessarily. It is evidently in order that he may have a door to escape, if a door of escape he finds it necessary to seek. Supposing the Senate, when the measure comes before them, were to amend that part of the Bill which relates to the

adoption of the local franchise, supposing they were to pass the measure in all other particulars, but in that particular they were to say that the Dominion shall have its own franchise which shall be one and the same all over the Dominion—for example, manhood suffrage; in that case the right hon. gentleman could retire gracefully with this measure, and say: I will not submit it, I will not go on with the plebiscite because the Senate has mangled my Franchise Act. This question is not a political question and ought not to be a political question. There are quite as many temperance people in this country who are Conservatives as there are temperance people who are Liberals. The desire on this side of the House is to keep it free from political entanglements and partisanship, and the first step this Government takes is to make a partisan measure and one that a large number of Conservatives must oppose because of the course the Government have taken.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) in discussing the lists to be used in the cities and towns where registration is in existence, said that the Act provided that, if a list was in existence for one year previous to the submitting of this plebiscite vote, the Government would prepare the lists themselves. Now, section 8 of the Franchise Bill now before the House provides that when a list is not in existence for 12 months "the Governor in Council may appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers, and in the preparation and revision and bringing into force of such new voters' lists the provisions of the laws of the province regulating the preparation and revision and bringing into force of the provincial voters' lists in such cases shall, as far as possible, be observed and followed." I apprehend that there is nothing in this Act which compels a province to pay for the revision of this list to be used in the plebiscite vote. On the other hand, I see no provision in the Act to compel this Government to pay for it. Surely you could not compel the province to bear this expense.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Clause 7 of this Bill provides that where it is necessary on the part of the Governor in Council to make regulations, they can make the necessary regulations without appealing to the provincial authorities, but they must do it on the same lines as those upon which the provincial authorities can do it.

Mr. INGRAM. That is clause 7 of the Plebiscite Bill which you have just introduced. It provides for payment of costs of that kind.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think so.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why could not the Government have the vote taken on the municipal lists?

Mr. IVES.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear; that is not so bad after all.

Mr. TAYLOR. If you want to remove this question from the arena of politics and do the thing fairly, the last municipal list should be the one used. There is no question but that this is going to affect property. There are a certain number of women in municipalities who own property in their own right and have the right to vote. These persons should have the right to vote on this question. To base this law on a Bill that is not yet made law is unfair. But in every province there is a municipal list for the election of municipal councils and if this question were referred to this class of voters it would remove it from politics and would bring out a fair expression of opinion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

POST OFFICES CLOSED.

Mr. TAYLOR asked,

How many post offices have been closed since the 1st day of July, 1896?

Where the same located?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). There were 169 post offices closed, 19 of which have been reopened, making in all 150 which have been closed since the 1st of July, 1896. During the same period, 297 post offices have been opened, making a net increase during that period of 147 post offices. The hon. gentleman asks where these offices are located. Now, I must say to the hon. gentleman, if he does not desire me to think I am treating him as he thought I did about Seeley's Bay, does he seriously wish me to proceed and read the list?

Mr. TAYLOR. Not necessarily. Lay it on the Table of the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am willing to lay it on the Table.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister volunteered information that was not asked for. I did not ask for the number of new offices opened during the same period.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was sure the hon. gentleman was thirsting for information, and so I gave it to him.

IMPORTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN AND UNITED STATES.

Mr. WALLACE asked,

What was the amount of the total importations entered for consumption from Great Britain and the United States, respectively, for the six months ending 31st December, 1896, and for the six months ending 31st December, 1897; also, the duties paid by Great Britain and the United States, respectively, for the same periods?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The total value of goods imported

from Great Britain and entered for consumption, during the six months ending 31st December, 1896, amounted to \$15,080,272; and for the corresponding period of the year 1897, the amount was \$15,391,318. The total value of goods imported from the United States and entered for consumption, during the six months ending 31st December, 1896, amounted to \$32,214,340; and for the corresponding period of the year 1897, the amount was \$38,577,025. It is not possible at present, to furnish information as to the duties paid on such imports from the United States and Great Britain, respectively, for the reason that in the statistical books of the Department of Customs the duty collected on articles entered for consumption is not kept separately for each country. Such duty is arrived at by calculations usually at the end of each year—the calculation being made by applying the tariff rate to each item by countries. To make this calculation for the periods in question would involve a very large amount of work, and it could not be completed in time to be of use during the present session of Parliament.

DISMISSAL OF WM. REID.

Mr. BERGERON asked,

1. Whether William Reid, bridge-keeper on the Beauharnois Canal, has been discharged?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. By whom has he been succeeded?
4. Who recommended the appointment of Mr. Reid's successor?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. William Reid, bridge-keeper on the Beauharnois Canal, has not been re-employed when the department were engaging employees for the opening of the new season. 2. The reason he was not re-employed was that another person was preferred. 3. He was succeeded by Hormisdas Lecavalier. 4. Mr. Lecavalier was recommended by a person in whom the Government has the most implicit confidence.

DISMISSAL OF XAVIER LEFAIVRE.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. Why was Xavier Lefaiivre dismissed as lockmaster of lock No. 3, St. Gabriel, on the Lachine Canal?
2. Was there any complaint made against him, and by whom?
3. Was there any complaint made against Xavier Lefaiivre's successor in office?
4. Was there any inquiry on said complaint, and what was the finding of the person who made the inquiry?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Xavier Lefaiivre, lockmaster of lock No. 3, St. Gabriel, Lachine Canal, was not dismissed, but he was not re-employed on the 1st May, 1897. 2. The employment of the present lockmaster, Jos. St. Denis, was recommended by those in

whom the department had confidence. 3. A complaint was made against Xavier Lefaiivre's successor, Jos. St. Denis, by some of the lockmen and boat captains. 4. An inquiry was made into the complaint, which was not sustained.

COMMISSIONERS—ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. What is the amount claimed from the Government as compensation by each of the commissioners appointed to investigate the administration of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary?
2. How much has been paid to each in partial or final settlement of such claims?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1. O. K. Fraser, \$2,480; James Noxon, \$2,710; D. A. Lafortune, \$7,350. Mr. Noxon has received on account \$560; Mr. Fraser, \$570; Mr. Lafortune has not received anything.

JUBILEE STAMPS.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. Postmaster General a question, although it is not on the paper? I think the question was put once before, but the hon. gentleman did not give an answer, and he may have the knowledge now. I wish to know how much was received from Jubilee stamps up to the 30th June, 1897, and how much since?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I think the answer which I read to the House met the case. It explained the impossibility of giving the information.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it impossible to give it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Jubilee stamps were furnished along with ordinary stamps to the postmasters, and there has been no separate return made from all over Canada. There is always a certain amount of stamps outstanding in the hands of postmasters; and unless we applied to all the postmasters to give returns showing what particular portion of stamps on hand were Jubilee stamps, it would be impossible to know what quantity of Jubilee stamps were actually sold. Stamps are not sold for cash, but accounts are kept throughout the whole country. I think the hon. gentleman sees the difficulty of answering his question.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me—Does he mean to say to the House that these postmasters have not made a return for the year 1896-97?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then if they have made their returns, they must have returned what they have unsold.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It don't show whether they are Jubilee stamps or others.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he certain of that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I gave the answer of Mr. Stanton, I think it is, who is in charge of the branch, the answer that he gave me. I know nothing about the details, but I will make inquiry again and see if he is in error.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Postmaster General knows that when the Jubilee stamps were issued a certain amount of ordinary stamps had been issued already, and these can be accounted for under the returns coming in from the various post offices. Now, if the Postmaster General will look into the amount of the Jubilee stamps which he has issued, and take the amount of the old outstanding stamps which were in existence when he issued the Jubilee stamps, he can arrive at a solution of the difficulty.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, you have to ask for further returns.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I beg to differ with the hon. gentleman. He knows that the stamps which are issued must be accounted for by the different postmasters. There can be no question about that. That is a fact well known in the post office, and cannot be contested. Now, up to a certain period of time, there was only one class of stamps, that is the old stamps. Accounts must have come in regularly—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will allow me to point out the irregularity of his making a speech now, when a mere question was asked by courtesy.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not making a speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then I am afraid I do and know what a speech is. There is nothing at all before the House, the hon. gentleman sees this is quite irregular. I must insist on carrying out the rule.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I really do not mean to make a speech, I am putting a question to the hon. gentleman. I ask the hon. gentleman whether he cannot make out a statement according to the rule which I have just laid down, and which every officer in his department knows.

Mr. WALLACE. I should like to ask the Postmaster General a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot ask questions of which notice has not been given. When the Orders of the Day are called, certain subjects are allowed to be brought up as a matter of courtesy, but at this stage of the proceedings there is no possibility of allowing any questions unless they appear on the Notice paper.

Mr. WALLACE. The question I wished to ask was in regard to stamps.

Mr. SPEAKER. Because I was wrong in allowing the hon. member for York to

Mr. MULOCK.

ask a question irregularly, that does not permit other members to continue. I made the mistake, and I admit it, and I will endeavour not to repeat it.

Mr. WALLACE. I bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of the Interior for the year 1897.—The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton).

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to know when we may expect the report of the commissioners appointed to investigate the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). To-morrow.

JUBILEE STAMPS.

Mr. WALLACE. I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether the statement is correct that postage stamps of the Jubilee issue are not redeemable. The other issues can be redeemed in large quantities, and I desire to ascertain whether the same rule applies to the stamps of the Jubilee year, and whether they are also redeemable.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There is no law requiring the department to redeem stamps. It is quite the exception to redeem them, Canada being practically the only country that does so. We have been redeeming the regular issue of stamps, but the Jubilee stamps when issued were declared to be issued finally and not redeemable.

CANNED GOODS FOR THE YUKON.

Mr. QUINN. I should like to call the attention of the Government to a clipping from the "National Provisioner," of New York and Chicago. It is in the following terms:—

A contract has been awarded at Ottawa to Libbey, McNeill & Libbey. The contract is a large one, and requires canned meats to be furnished for use both in the Klondike and northwest. This is the first time such a contract has been awarded to a Chicago concern, the Canadian Government having heretofore secured these goods in the Canadian market.

I have received intimation from an eminent packing firm in Canada, which tells me it has received an order for about 100,000 pounds of canned goods for the Yukon, bought by a large American company, and this is in competition with the people who have secured this contract from the Government. They also intimate that the contract, if awarded, was awarded with-

out any tenders being asked for, and in a way to prevent Canadian packers receiving any benefit from it; and this firm which has communicated with me declares it possible only to produce the goods and sell them to the Government at the same prices, but even at lower prices than they can be supplied for. I therefore wish to ask the Government if such a contract has been given, or rather if the article I have read is true in effect or not.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have received no notice of this matter, and I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not communicate with me, because I might have been able to give him some information. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will hand me the paper from which he read.

Mr. QUINN. Certainly. I may say in explanation that I received it only a few minutes before the House opened.

INQUIRIES RESPECTING RETURNS.

Mr. McALISTER. I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that an order of the House was passed for correspondence and papers relating to Oak Bay Mills post office. When will this return be brought down?

Mr. MONK. I desire to call attention to the dilatoriness of the Government in bringing down returns. Two returns were ordered to be brought down by the Department of Public Works on 15th February last. I think those returns will be very short. One has reference to the wharf at Pointe Claire and the other called for the report of an engineer connected with some survey at Ste. Genevieve. These returns cannot be more than two or three pages at the outside. As we are now considering the Estimates, I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to these matters. Short returns were also called for on 14th March, two from the Department of Public Works and two from the Department of Militia. I trust that these returns will be brought down before we proceed with the Estimates.

Mr. DAVIN. Did the Minister of Public Works remember to make inquiries respecting the Edmonton bridge?

WORKS ON THE RIVER STE. ANNE.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works a question. It is in connection with the protection works which are to be carried out on the River Ste. Anne, for which an appropriation of \$5,000 was voted last session? In reply to a question which I asked him last session, the hon. Minister of Public Works informed me that the matter was under consideration. As I do not see any appropriation in the Estimates which were brought down this year, I should like to know what action is to be taken in this regard?

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

IMPORTATION OF HORSES FROM UNITED STATES.

Mr. MARTIN. Is the Minister of Customs aware that a large number of American horses are being taken into the Northwest and Alberta at very low valuations? I find from a letter the following:—

Americans are rushing horses in here entered at \$10 per head, on which they pay but \$2 duty. This is a manifest injustice, as we cannot send a horse into the United States under \$50 duty. * * * Three thousand have already come in, and 10,000 are soon to follow.

I would ask the Minister of Customs if he is aware that those horses are entered at this new valuation?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Representations of a nature similar to that have been made to the department on several different occasions formerly, and they have been renewed lately. Some time ago the department took action and we wrote to our collectors asking them to ascertain the facts known to them in connection with the matter. It is engaging the attention of the department, and has been for some little time.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I beg to move that after the word "Canada" in the 16th line, sub-paragraph 3, the following words be added:—

And in the province of Prince Edward Island means the election of an Assemblyman.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That is because they have two different franchises there.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. In subsection (a) of section 3, the hon. gentleman will see that it refers to an electoral district of the House of Commons. Now, the provincial lists are prepared for provincial electoral divisions, and that cannot in the province of Ontario be the same. Has the hon. gentleman made provision to meet that?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In section 7, I have endeavoured to provide for the emergency the hon. gentleman suggests.

On section 5,

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who has charge of this Bill, what provision he has made, if any, for Prince Edward Island, which, as I pointed out on a former occasion, has no voters' list at present in existence.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). It is not essential that there should be a voters' list. I would like my hon. friend to point out in what respect he thinks we have overlooked the case of Prince Edward Island. The first paragraph of this section provides for the adoption of the provincial qualifications. In the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario the essential requisite to enable any one to vote is his registration on the voters' list. In the province of Prince Edward Island there is no such requisite. I draw my hon. friend's attention to section 17, where he will find it provided that upon an elector entering the room where the poll is held, and declaring his name, if he is found entitled to vote, he shall receive from the deputy returning officer a ballot paper. I may say to my hon. friend that when we reach that section I intend to introduce an amendment to make it absolutely clear, so as to provide that in Prince Edward Island the same method of voting shall be pursued as in the local elections.

Mr. HEYD. I must claim the indulgence of the House for a few minutes, while I allude to the effect which this section has in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. It says :

The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote thereat shall be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

Unfortunately for some 647 of my constituents, their names do not appear on the provincial lists. The provincial laws of Ontario do not recognize Indians, in the ordinary sense of the term, to be qualified to exercise the provincial franchise; but some twelve years ago provision was made in the Dominion Franchise Act, for the first time in the history of this country, to admit Indians of that kind to the exercise of the franchise, and they have exercised that right on four different occasions. Whether that legislation was wise or unwise is a question I am not going to discuss to-day. At the time the Bill giving them the franchise was introduced, it created a great deal of excitement. The party who introduced were charged with having introduced it for political purposes. But I do not propose to discuss that question or introduce anything of a controversial character. The clause of this Bill which I have read has given rise to a good deal of comment in my constituency, as our In-

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

dian friends, after having enjoyed the franchise for the last twelve years, and having exercised it on four different occasions, have learned to regard it with considerable affection. I am quite willing to admit that at the time the franchise was conferred upon them, they objected to it. It was a new thing, something that had never been indulged in before. On the reserve in South Brant the affairs of the tribe were conducted on the old tribal system, under which the chiefs were elected by the females of the family; and to have suddenly obtained the right to take part in the management of the affairs of this Dominion was rather a big undertaking for them. But now, after having exercised that right in four different elections, they appreciate it, or at least a large portion of them do; and I have received petitions from that section represented by 647 votes, or nearly 4,000 people, who are affected by this proposed change; and I will read these petitions in order that the House may understand the position these people occupy :

Ohsweken Council House,
21st February, 1898.

C. B. Heyd, Esq., M.P.

My dear Mr. Heyd,—I herewith inclose you a copy of a minute passed by the Six Nations Council on the 17th inst., respecting the Franchise Act, which you referred to in your letter to me for the consideration of the council. The majority of the chiefs desired me to ask you kindly to do all you can to retain the privilege of the franchise which they enjoyed heretofore, and to pay no attention to protests which may be forwarded to you by a few of the chiefs who are opposed to the measure.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,
JOSIAH HILL,
Secy., S.N.C.

I have also received a petition signed by a large number of the chief warriors of the tribe, to the number of some 276, as follows :—

Honourable Sir,—We, the undersigned warriors of the Six Nations band of Indians, residing on the Grand River reservation, in support of the wise legislation and decision of the Six Nations Council to retain the franchise, we the undersigned electors beg to subscribe our names in support of that decision upon the following grounds :—

In the interests and in behalf of civilization and education, we desire to advance as an intelligent community, and not go back or retrograde to a state of disregard of all Christian principles, and an irresponsible state of government of our national affairs.

We realize that the conferring of the franchise has been a great educating factor amongst our people, and that in having a voice in the government of the Dominion, in which our treaty rights exist and have been respected, that we have a power in our representative in Parliament which we did not have before the franchise was conferred, in the management of our affairs by the Government of Canada, in whose safe-keeping our treaty rights have been intrusted by

the Imperial Government of England, by the sanction of our mother, Her Britannic Majesty the Queen of Great Britain.

We desire, in conclusion, to request the Government to concede to us, in accordance with the decision of the Six Nations Council of 17th February last, the privilege of exercising the franchise, in a special manner, as heretofore given to us by a special provision, by Act of Parliament of Canada.

Your Government is requested to consider the fact that there are some of that portion of the population of our reserve who are Pagans, and many of whom are not, in regard to property qualifications, entitled to a vote, even if they so desired, who are desirous of setting aside the Franchise Act. That in regard to civilization, education, enlightenment and progress, it would be unwise for the Government to support the weak contentions of these people, who are praying for the retrogression of our people to a position such as existed two hundred years ago.

In conclusion, we desire to express the hope that the Government may kindly support the recent decision of the council, and retain for us the exercise of the franchise, as herein requested by us.

And we, your humble petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

In support of that petition, there are some 276 names. These names include, of course, the great majority of the chiefs and leading men of the Six Nation Indians. It would not be fair, although I have pledged myself to always try and advance the interests of the Six Nation Indians, as expressed by their regularly constituted authorities, to conceal the fact that I have also received a petition, signed by 354, asking that the franchise, which was forced upon them some twelve years ago, be taken away because it introduces an element of discord in their midst and instead of bringing about that era of civilization which it was expected to promote, has tended to bring about discord and antagonism among the various families living on the reserve. The petition against the franchise is as follows:—

We, the undersigned, warriors and members of the Six Nations, residing in the townships of Tuscarora, Oneida and Onondaga, in the province of Ontario, desire from the council of chiefs held 1st March, 1898, a privilege to express our views respecting the enfranchisement to the Indians of the Six Nations

And at the council of the warriors, held 4th March, in their council-house, a decision was arrived at, that a petition will be circulated to solicit the signatures of those who are not in favour of the enfranchisement.

Therefore, your petitioners desire to ask you to bring the matter before the House of Commons, now in session, to have that privilege, and to exempt the Six Nations from the operation of the enfranchisement.

We, therefore, your petitioners, hope to have the fullest attention from you, as we ever pray, &c., &c.

This petition is signed by 354 who are opposed to the retention of the franchise. I have a petition here signed by the Missisagua Indians, who have a council of their own election, and are not governed by the here-

ditary system, signed by some 31, in favour of the franchise. These are the peculiar circumstances in which the Six Nation Indians are placed.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the relative number for and against?

Mr. HEYD. I think that the two petitions in favour of the franchise contain together 276 names, while the petition opposed to it has 354 names. The Six Nation council is constituted of some 60 chiefs, who are elected by the women from the various families of the tribe. These are almost unanimously in favour of the franchise. Those opposed to the franchise are principally the pagan element, which has always objected to it. Numerically the hostiles have the majority. Now that they have had the privilege of exercising the franchise, that they did not at first want, these people have learned to appreciate it. Being precluded from exercising their hereditary combative instincts, they find an opportunity of getting rid of their superfluous steam at election time, and have learned to be most inveterate politicians. They take the Conservative or Liberal side in the most ardent manner, and take a most lively interest in politics, and are just as well qualified to exercise the franchise as are the whites. It may be a matter of some interest to those members who have not large Indian settlements in their constituencies to learn that in my constituency out of 4,000 Indians 667 have the right to vote, and of these a great many have learned to appreciate that privilege. It is on their behalf that I am lifting up my voice to-day, and while I am sorry to take up the time of the House, it must be admitted that a great deal of its time has been absorbed in much more frivolous discussion. Although, in the first place, a great many were opposed to the franchise, they appear to have exercised it to a considerable extent when they had the opportunity. In the first election after they were given the franchise, which took place in 1887, there were 463 voters on the list, and of those 250 voted.

An hon. MEMBER. What did they cost?

Mr. HEYD. I am proud to say that it does not cost anything to get an Indian to vote. He is sufficiently loyal to our country to come forward and vote as he thinks best in the interest of his country without any money inducement. It may be interesting to hon. gentlemen to know how they voted. In 1887, the magnificent personality of the present Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) induced 123 to give him their support, while 127 went against him. It was supposed by the Liberals that the Indians were put on the list because they were under the control of the Government that managed their affairs. That may or not have been the case; but naturally the Indian is loyal to the Government, and they

have steadily stood by the Government ever since the right of the franchise has been conferred on them. In the election of 1891, out of 414 on the lists 214 voted—102 for the Liberal party and 112 against. In the election of 1896, 647 were on the roll. The number had been increased by over 200. Of these 400 voted, showing that a very large proportion of those who had the right to vote, exercises that right. Well, at the last election out of 647 on the roll, 437 cast their vote.

Mr. BERGERON. How did they vote ?

Mr. HEYD. My modesty prevents me from saying.

An hon. MEMBER. He raked them in.

Mr. HEYD. Some hon. gentleman says, I raked them in. I am happy to-day that I got a majority. The Indians probably thought that they ought to stand by the Government, and they stood by it in good stead, so far as I was concerned. Under the circumstances, I believe that their right to the franchise should be continued. And I beg to move the following resolution :—

That after the word "election" in the thirty-third line of the Bill, at the end of subdivision "a," the following words be added :—

"Provided that, notwithstanding any provincial enactment, the Six Nation Indians and other Indian tribes that have the right to vote, under the Electoral Franchise Act of 48-49 Victoria, chap. 40, and shall be entitled to vote at any election for the Dominion Parliament."

Now, I desire, before I sit down, to make the plain statement that these Indians are educated, in a great many instances, that on the reserve in the county from which I come there are ten schools in active operation, and there is also an industrial school which has 125 pupils. Some of these men who are being deprived of their vote are amongst the most intelligent people of Canada. While many among them have probably not had the advantage of education, they all know what they are doing when they come to vote for. In the last election, out of the large number, 442 that cast their votes, there was only two spoiled and three rejected ballots, being a much smaller proportion, I believe, than amongst the white population in any part of the Dominion. Believing that these Indians are intelligent, and that they are qualified to vote, and as they have exercised the franchise in four general elections, I stand up and ask that they shall have that right conceded to them under this Bill.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would be prepared to vote in favour of this motion for this reason—I feel that now that the franchise has been granted to the Indians in Canada, it would be a retrograde step to deprive them of it. I believe it is almost an unheard of thing for the franchise, once conceded, to be taken away from the people who have enjoyed it.

Mr. HEYD.

Mr. QUINN. This is only for a portion of the Indians.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not so understand it. I understand that it includes all the Indians that have the right to vote under the existing franchise law. It is that principle that I support.

Mr. QUINN. I think my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) is mistaken.

Mr. BERGERON. The amendment applies only to the Indians in the county of Brant.

Mr. LISTER. I take it that it does not matter to what county the Indian belongs. I believe that the amendment introduced by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Heyd) ought to become part of the Bill in some shape, though, perhaps, as drafted, it cannot be incorporated at the present moment. There is a principle in this matter. We are not to consider whether the granting of the franchise to the Indians was a wise step or not. We are not now to consider whether the Government of that day, in view of the fact that the Indians were the wards of the Government, should have given the franchise to the Indians. We are face to face with the fact that it has been the law for the past twelve or fourteen years, and that the Indians have exercised the right to vote during all that time, and that it is now proposed by the Bill under consideration to take away from them this privilege. I think I may fairly challenge the Government to produce an instance in which the franchise has been given to a class of the population and afterwards taken away from them by the law. So far as the right of these people is concerned, it is not of very much consequence in the consideration of the present question, whether they have exercised the right which was given to them wisely or not. They have had the same right as every other voter in the Dominion of Canada. But I may say to the House that my experience is that the Indians upon the reservation in my county have exercised that right as wisely, as prudently and as intelligently as any other class of the people in the county of Lambton. I may say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the tribe in the county of Lambton differs from that in Brant inasmuch as they have, for many years, elected their own chiefs and other officers, and in every contest that has taken place these Indians have taken an active and intelligent part in the election in which they have had a right to vote. As an instance of their great intelligence, I may say that, notwithstanding the fact of the old Government being in power, I have always received a majority of the votes of the Indians upon that reservation. That proves one thing—it proves that the influence which it was supposed the Government would have had on the Indians has not in fact existed, but that the Indians, notwithstanding that they are wards of the Government, have been sufficiently independent to vote as they thought proper.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, you have been mistaken?

Mr. LISTER. How?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) opposed the enfranchisement of the Indians very strongly.

Mr. LISTER. No, not very strongly. I have thought as I think now, that if the Indians were to have the vote, the Government should have freed them from the position they then occupied, but the Government thought differently and granted them the franchise. They gave them full rights of citizenship, and now we propose to take those rights away from them.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. LISTER. Yes, unless the local government passes an Act extending the right to them, which we have no guarantee they will do. The result will be that the Indians who have for years exercised this right will be deprived of it. After giving a class of the population the right to exercise the franchise, that right should not be taken away from them. Therefore, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think that the argument the hon. gentleman has just put forward shows the weakness of this whole Bill. The fact that provincial legislatures can do things that will deprive us in effect of a federal franchise, is the weakness of the whole case, and shows the danger to this Canadian people as it has never been presented before. I should like to see the Indians have their vote. I know many of them on the Grand River reservation, they are intelligent farmers and well qualified to exercise the franchise. But the argument put forward by the hon. gentleman proves what we on this side have always said, and would almost go so far as to justify another body in defending the Canadian people in the matter of their franchise. I hope now that this question is put that the greatest care will be taken to insert some provision under which the provincial legislature cannot rob the Canadian people of the management of their own franchise.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think it can be said that this Bill or the action of this House proposes to take from any class of the community the right of the franchise. This Bill merely proposes to abdicate the exercise of a power to the provincial government. We are dealing with a question irrelevant to the issue when we talk about the right of Indians or anybody else to be on the list, for we propose to adopt the principle that we will not meddle with the formation of the lists. The Government in 1885 passed a franchise law and proceeded to establish a separate set of machinery for the purpose of having a voters' list for the Dominion. In view of all the evils that followed this action, we now propose to declare that that

was a step which was not in the interest of the people.

The Bill proceeds upon the assumption that the condition of things that existed in this Dominion for eighteen years after confederation, when the elections were held upon the provincial lists, was a condition of things we had better return to. During that eighteen years there was not the slightest objection to the operation of that principle. There was never any serious objection raised in this House or in this country that the provinces had not dealt properly or fairly with any element of the population in their regulation of the matter of the franchise. I repeat that we are simply going back, by the provisions of this Bill, to the old regulations which worked smoothly and to the public satisfaction for the first eighteen years of the life of this confederation. It was unfortunate when that condition of things was set aside, without reason, without application upon the part of any element of society in Canada that that step should be taken. We have gone on under the operation of this Bill now for many years. We have found it to be costly and unworkable. We have only had, I think, four revisions since 1885; we held the last two elections on voters' lists two years old, when no citizen of Canada under twenty-three years of age had a right to vote. Now, we are going back to the old principle, relegating to the provinces the power to deal with this question; in point of fact, saying to the provinces: the right of representation in your ridings and for your people in this House is a civil right over which you may exercise jurisdiction, stating by your laws who shall or shall not vote, and we will accept your voters' lists for the sake of uniformity, for the sake of avoiding difficulties, injustices and expenses. Now, if we are going to take up that policy, we have got to follow it out right straight to its conclusion. If we are going to break in upon that principle by providing that this class in any province who do not have votes shall have votes, and that that class who do not have votes shall have votes, we may as well sweep away the whole Bill, and have a Dominion Franchise Act. We either want a Dominion Franchise Act or we want to put this matter back in charge of the provinces and allow the voters' lists of the provinces to be the voters' lists for elections in the Dominion. The issue is a clean-cut one, a distinct one. So far as the Indians are concerned, I have not a word to say against them. There is not an Indian in Brant county, and there is not an Indian in the county of Lambton, who cannot be a citizen if he chooses to become so. But I object to giving to a class of the population who are living in tribal relations and who are not citizens of this country, special rights that belong to me. If I do not have

the rights that belong to them. If I cannot have the tribal advantages of the Six Nations, I do not want the Six Nations to have the citizen's advantage that I have, and I do not think they have a right to claim them. For that reason, while I would not deprive these Indians of a right, while I have the utmost sympathy for them, I would advise them, if they want to exercise the rights of citizenship, to become citizens of Canada. I think we might as well either dismiss all this work of tinkering with this Bill, and making exceptions here and exceptions there that the provincial laws do not make, or we had better adopt the provincial laws and have done with it. It is a very clean-cut, distinct alternative—on the one hand, adopting the provincial franchises in their entirety, and on the other hand sweeping them all away, and having a franchise of our own. There is properly no middle ground.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to ask the Government what they propose to do in respect to the very important question which has been raised by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I think we should understand at the outset whether the Government intend to take the franchises of the various provinces purely and simply as they exist to-day, and as they may be changed from time to time at the will of the local legislatures all over Canada, and that they shall be the franchises for the election of members to the House of Commons. If I am not mistaken, I think it was the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure) who expressed the wish and the expectation that the officials who were disfranchised from voting in the provincial elections in the province of Nova Scotia would be enfranchised under this Bill, and that they would enjoy the franchise for the election of members to the House of Commons. I believe I am also correct in stating that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) has also expressed an opinion to that effect, that the officials who are disfranchised under the local laws of Nova Scotia would not be disfranchised under this Act. It therefore becomes important that at the very threshold of this question, when we are dealing with who are to have the franchise, the Government should say whether they intend to adopt, pure and simple, the laws of the various provinces in reference to the parties who enjoy the franchise, and adopt whatever changes they may make in them from time to time, or whether, taking the electoral franchises of the various provinces as a basis, they propose that, as in the case of the Indians who have been enfranchised under the Dominion Act, they shall continue to enjoy this right; or, as in the case of the officials who are disfranchised under the local laws in some of the provinces, they shall be enfranchised under the Dominion.

Mr. CHARLTON.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The principle of the whole Act is that we intend to adopt the provincial franchises as the basis of the franchise for the Dominion. That is our intention. It is idle for my hon. friend to assume, or to suppose that we assume, that the provincial franchises existing to-day will continue for all time. I cannot follow the argument of hon. gentlemen on the other side who say that we dispossess ourselves of control over our franchise. We do not do anything of the sort; we simply adopt for the present the franchises of the provinces. But if at any time the provinces should do anything that we consider detrimental to the interests of the Dominion, we are entirely free, we do not tie our hands for all time, to make any change that we think proper. We do not dispossess ourselves of our control over the franchise.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not at all suggest that. I did not assume that the permanent franchise we adopt by this law is the franchise that exists to-day in Ontario or in Prince Edward Island, that is not proposed by this Bill. This Bill proposes that we shall adopt as the franchise for electing members to this House the franchise as it exists at the time whenever a general election or a by-election is held for this House, that we shall adopt whatever may be at that time the franchise of the provincial legislature.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As long as this law is in force.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The point I wanted the hon. gentleman to meet was this: Whether my hon. friend who preceded me is right in saying that you do not propose under this Bill to enfranchise any person to vote for a member of the House of Commons who has not the franchise under the local legislature. That is the point I wanted the hon. gentleman to meet.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We certainly do not intend to adopt amendments, so far as Indians are concerned. When I come to argue that point, I think I will be able to point out that under the provincial franchises, to a large extent, the Indians now have a right to vote. So far as Dominion officials are concerned, that is an open question which I think has been treated from the standpoint of relieving them altogether from this disability. Of course, I am not prepared to say more on that point at the present time.

Mr. LISTER. I want to say a word about the remarks of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Chariton). My hon. friend says the Bill now before the House does not deprive the Indians of their vote.

Mr. CHARLTON. No. The point I made was that this Bill does not absolutely

disfranchise anybody, because it simply adopts the franchise of each province.

Mr. LISTER. Well, I say that it temporarily, at all events, disfranchises the Indians of this country, it may not do so permanently. My hon. friend may trust to the local legislatures throughout the country granting the franchise to the Indians of the different provinces. That, however, is problematical, that may never be done, and if it is not done, as a matter of fact the Bill now under consideration deprives the Indians who have voted for the last fourteen years, of the right to vote. I say this is an arbitrary measure. The hon. gentleman says this Bill must go through, that there can be no exception made. The Solicitor General says that if it turns out in the future that a province acts unjustly in adopting provisions respecting voting, then we can intervene and undo what they have done. If that is the intention of the Bill and if that is the power the Government reserves to itself, which is no doubt the case, then they are depriving unjustly a portion of the population of the right they possess, or of the right to continue to vote under the Franchise Act. I say again that once having given the franchise to a portion of the people, who have proved themselves able to exercise it intelligently, the Government should not now take away from those people that which free men all consider a boon, and do an act which the Indians will remember as one of the greatest injustices ever perpetrated upon them by any legislature in this country. The Solicitor General has stated that a large portion of the Indians of Ontario have the right to vote now. I deny it. A very small percentage of the Indians of that province are entitled to vote as enfranchised Indians. They are living on the reserves, and everybody knows that Indians have an objection to becoming enfranchised for many reasons, tribal reasons among others. But we need not go into these questions, but remember the one question, and that is, that we once gave the vote to these men, they have had it for years, and there is no good cause for taking it away from them.

Mr. MACLEAN. Do we understand the Solicitor General to lay down the basis of this Act as follows: That this Parliament has a session and it closes. The Government then decide they will go to the country. The legislature of Ontario happens to meet, and that body deprives a large number of citizens of the franchise, and they are not able to vote when the Dominion elections come on. Is that the situation which the franchise occupies in this Act? If so, then it is the worst Act ever submitted by a Canadian Government, it is the greatest attack ever made on our federal institutions. It is the strongest attack ever made on the autonomy of Canada; and I hope now that this statement has been

made, Parliament will be able to defend its franchise from the attacks made by the Liberal party, and I hope in some other quarter the rights of the people will be protected, and the federal power will continue to control its own franchise so that the voice of the people of Canada may be heard.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. By whom was the assault made on the people of Canada from 1867 to 1885?

Mr. MACLEAN. That is another question.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I also point out to the hon. gentleman that if he had carefully read the Bill, he would have found that the very case he has discussed has been provided for by subsection 2 of the section we are now considering.

Mr. LISTER. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, for again addressing the House. I say, what I stated in 1885, that no Government ever introduced a more unjustifiable measure than the Government did in that year. I opposed it then, and have opposed it since. The Liberal party has pledged itself, election after election, that if returned to power, the Act would be repealed. They are bound to the people to repeal that Act, and I believe I voice the feelings not only of the Liberal party but of a large portion of the Conservative party when I say they desire the repeal of that Act. It has been most burdensome in its working, and every member who has had anything to do with elections knows hundreds of dollars have been expended during the twelve years for the purpose of trying to make perfect an Act which it was impossible to make perfect. We have pledged ourselves, over and over again, to the country to repeal it; the people have returned us to power on that pledge, and we will prove false to the people if we do not repeal the Act. But I say in this one case an exception might be made by the Government and Parliament, so as to continue to the people who have been given votes under the Act the right to vote at elections for members of this legislature.

Mr. QUINN. I think this is the clearest proof in the world that in the one case in which the Liberal Government have attempted to carry out its promise, it has made the usual leap in the dark. The party pledged itself to the country to repeal the Franchise Act. Hon. gentlemen introduce a measure framed for that purpose, and the first clause is attacked on all sides by their own followers. We have the question of the Indians discussed. What difference is there between the Indians affected by the Ontario Franchise Act and the class of persons included under section 15 of the Quebec Election Act? The following persons in that province are not allowed to vote:—

Clerks of the Crown, clerks of the peace, sheriffs, registrars, Crown lands and Crown timber

agents, collectors of provincial revenue, and the officers and members of the provincial police force.

There is great solicitude expressed by the hon. member for Lambton and the hon. member for Brant for the Indians because, I suppose, there happens to be a certain number of them in their constituencies, and they happen to be a class of the community I suppose who can, at all events, discriminate between the methods of Liberal and Conservative candidates towards the electors, and they probably have recognized their influence in the way of bringing the Indians to their way of thinking, at all events to their way of voting. With virtuous indignation the hon. member for Lambton says that if we once enfranchise a man it is an insult to him to withdraw the franchise. Here are: "Clerks of the Crown, clerks of the peace, sheriffs, registrars, Crown lands and timber agents, collectors of provincial revenue." who from time immemorial have the right to vote on the Dominion Franchise Act, but who by subsection "a" of this Act will be disfranchised, because the qualification necessary to entitle any one to vote at Dominion elections shall be that established by the law of the province and such as is necessary to entitle the same party to vote at provincial elections. So it is impossible for all these officers to vote at Dominion elections. Is this disqualification imposed because these men are officers of the provincial Government, is it because they are personally not competent men, is it because officers of the provincial Government are unable to discriminate between what is right and wrong? The hon. member talks about outraging the feelings of the people. I cannot conceive a greater outrage on these responsible officers of the provincial Government of Quebec than to provide that they shall be disfranchised by a single clause of the Bill. It shows the absurdity of having for the Dominion of Canada a sort of crazy-quilt Franchise Act, instead of adopting one system for the whole Dominion. We find in one province men entitled to vote because they come under the provincial law, while in another case provincial men are disfranchised because the ideas prevailing in that province happen to be more narrow than those existing in a province next door.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are disqualified in the province of Quebec now?

Mr. QUINN. The judges of the Supreme Court, the Exchequer Court, the Court of Queen's Bench, the judges of sessions, the district magistrates and recorders, clerks of the Crown, clerks of the peace, sheriffs, registrars, Crown Land and Crown Timber agents, collectors of provincial revenue and officers and men of the provincial police force. Under the Manitoba Act I am informed that the exemptions are: the provincial judges, Indians, those disqualified for corrupt practices, lunatics and prisoners, all

Mr. QUINN.

officials and employees of Dominion and Manitoba Governments, in receipt of a salary to the amount of \$350, all regular soldiers and persons enrolled in military services, and all registrars, sheriffs, county court clerks and bailiffs in receipt of fees to the amount of \$350 per annum. If they are so accomplished as not to be able to earn \$350 a year they are entitled to vote, but if they are intelligent enough to merit \$350 a year by salaries or fees, then the Manitoba law says they are too intelligent to exercise the Dominion franchise.

Another peculiarity of the Provincial Franchise Act in Quebec is, that it includes as persons who are disqualified, men who have committed offences against the provincial Act. We can easily understand why persons who have been guilty of an infraction of the Dominion Franchise Act should be disqualified in a Dominion election, and that persons who have been guilty of an infraction of the Provincial Franchise Act should be disqualified at a provincial election, but why persons who have been guilty of an offence against the provincial franchise should be disqualified at a Dominion election, is something I cannot understand. In Quebec you will have men disqualified, while at the same time men who are guilty of the same offences in the other provinces would be entitled to vote. I say, Sir, that the Act which is presented to us here is more in the form of a crazy quilt enactment than anything that has ever before been presented to this Parliament. It seems to me an absurdity that we cannot, for the purpose of Dominion elections, form some basis upon which the voters of this country shall vote in the election of members to this House of Commons. Why should we here in the Parliament of Canada be governed by the prejudices which exist in the different provinces in local matters. It is not my intention to reflect disparagingly on the prejudices or privileges that exist in the different provinces concerning the right of one man to one vote or to many votes. In the province of Quebec we have the principle, that if a man holds property in two or in fifty constituencies, he has the right to poll his vote in each, if it be a physical possibility for him to do so. With the greatest deference and respect to the majority in the province of Quebec, I may tell the House that this was an enactment made for the protection of the English-speaking minority of that province. It was a concession granted to the English-speaking minority, who in the province of Quebec are usually those possessing most real estate. It was enacted for the purpose of giving them not only the representation to which they are entitled by their numbers, but also the representation which their more extensive ownership of land in that province might entitle them to. That was done in Quebec for provincial purposes and for municipal purposes. But, it was never contemplated that it should be extended to the

Dominion franchise because as we know the English-speaking minority in the province of Quebec becomes the majority in the whole Dominion of Canada. The French Canadian majority in the province of Quebec, with their usual liberality, gave to the English-speaking minority the right to protect themselves in all the constituencies in which they might own land. There is no necessity for protecting the English-speaking people in the Dominion of Canada in that way, but it was felt by the French Canadians in Quebec that in that province where the English are a minority they should have that protection. In consequence of that principle, Mr. Chairman, you see a larger representation of the English-speaking minority in the provincial legislature in Quebec, than you do of any proportionate minority in any provincial legislature in the Dominion of Canada. That principle has worked admirably for the protection of the minority in that province. The reason why this liberality was evidenced on the part of the French Canadians, is because in the provincial legislature the civil rights of the people are legislated for, and in municipal institutions the property of these people is taxed. It was felt that those who contributed to municipal taxes and who held real estate should be properly represented in the different municipal councils. But no such reason for this principle exists when we come to elect members of the House of Commons of Canada. While the principle in Quebec works well and is a just principle, yet I do say, that when the principle is carried into the Dominion franchise, and when a man owning property in fifty or sixty constituencies in Quebec can vote in every one of them if it is physically possible, it is absurd that he can do so while in the province of Ontario, a man equally wealthy and holding as much property can only poll one vote. Instead of passing section 5 as it appears in the Bill, it is in my opinion the duty of the Government to strike out the clause and to present to the House some settled basis of a Dominion franchise, which will make it uniform throughout the whole country, and which will include not only the Indians of the Six Nations, but these Indians and other persons all over Canada who are included in the Dominion Franchise Act which it is now sought to repeal.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) says that his party is committed to repeal the present Dominion Franchise Act, which he says is a bad law. That is one thing, but to repeal that law by abandoning Dominion rights and by surrendering to the provinces our most important privileges is quite another thing. I would point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) that one does not at all follow from the other.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to call the attention of the Solicitor General to the statement that was made by the hon. gentleman

from Lambton (Mr. Lister) in regard to the number of Indians who will be disfranchised by this Bill. I am quite sure that my hon. friend made the statement he did in all good faith, that comparatively few would be disfranchised, and that a comparatively large percentage would still retain the franchise under the local law. With regard to my own constituency, where there are two bands of Indians, my hon. friend's remark is really not correct at all. I do not think that any of them would have a vote under the local law; if any would have, they would be very few. This Bill practically disfranchises the Indians in my constituency and, as my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) said, it is a very strong measure to deprive any class of the community of rights which they have enjoyed, and have not abused in any way, for many years. As the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) has pointed out, it is not only the Indians who are going to be deprived of their franchise, but many other people throughout the Dominion. When the hon. leader of the Opposition called attention to this matter, my hon. friend the Solicitor General asked, What became of the rights of the people that we allege are now being assailed, from 1867 to 1885? Well, I will tell my hon. friend what became of them. Those rights were subject to the caprice of the local legislature, and the local legislature so abused the power with which they had been entrusted by this House, that this House itself had to pass an Act to protect the rights of the people of Nova Scotia from the improper action of the local legislature.

Mr. CHARLTON. Were there any complaints made by the public upon which this House acted?

Mr. McNEILL. I am astonished that a gentleman who has had a seat in this House so long as my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should ask such a question as that. Does my hon. friend suppose that this House would put an Act upon the Statute-book without reason?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). When did the legislature of Nova Scotia commit these outrages?

Mr. McNEILL. I do not think it is at all necessary for me to state the date. It is the Act of 1882 I am referring to. It was previous to that Act, I think, in 1871 that the wrong was done and the Act of 1871 was recognized in 1889. But the hon. Postmaster General knows that it does not matter what the date was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, it does.

Mr. McNEILL. It does not matter at all. This Parliament felt it incumbent upon itself, in defence of its privileges, to pass an Act to protect itself from the Acts of the legislature of Nova Scotia. I think that is

a sufficient answer to my hon. friend the Solicitor General. We tried the experiment, and it proved to be a failure, and this Parliament, in protection of its privileges, passed the Act of 1885. Whether that Act was a good or a bad Act is not the question. There are many of us who are ready to admit that in operation it proved cumbersome and expensive; and, as has been pointed out in this House before, the Conservative party, under Sir John Thompson introduced an Act for the purpose of simplifying and cheapening its operation. But the fact that the Act is defective in some particulars is no reason why a measure of this kind should be introduced. You may amend or improve the Act, but there is no reason why you should deprive this Parliament of its privileges. Surely there is enough statesmanship on the other side of the House to manage affairs a little better than that. Surely it is not necessary, in order to cheapen the operation of the Franchise Act, that the privileges of this Parliament should be taken away from it and handed over to the local legislatures. My hon. friend says we may take these privileges back again; but why does he hand them over in the meantime? We have already tried the experiment; the experiment proved a failure; and why does he propose to repeat it now? Surely, it would be more reasonable for the leaders on both sides of the House to meet together and endeavour to arrange some compromise in regard to this matter, so that this House shall still be seized of such an important privilege as this. What possible excuse is there for giving back to the local legislatures a power which they have already been entrusted with, and which they have abused?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The reason I asked the hon. gentleman for the date when the offences were committed by Nova Scotia, which he said had led to the passage of the Franchise Act of 1885, was this: The Bill which led up to that Act was, I believe, the Bill which the Government led by Sir John Macdonald, introduced into the Dominion Parliament in the year 1871 or 1872. Now, if the Acts which my hon. friend speaks of had been committed prior to that time, it is most extraordinary that the Conservative Government, for thirteen long years, failed to do justice to the people and protect them from those outrages, and allowed the general elections to be held three times on those fraudulent lists which the hon. gentleman refers to. I think I can give a better explanation for the passage of the Franchise Act of 1885 than the one which my hon. friend gives. Having listened to the debate of three months which ended in the passage of that Act, I think I can safely say that you will not find that any person who was in favour of that Act ever suggested the alleged outrages by the legislature of Nova Scotia, now cited for the first time, as the moving cause of that legislation. The object of that Bill was, I

Mr. McNEILL.

think, known to every person. The late Government had exhausted their methods for obtaining favourable verdicts from the people. They had passed a Gerrymander Bill which did violence to every sense of right, and they had so mismanaged the affairs of the country that at last a rebellion broke out in the North-west that threatened to sweep the Government from power. That, I think, was the moving cause that incited the Government to introduce the Franchise Bill; and though it failed to accomplish what its movers designed it should accomplish, they were unable to abandon it, and it had to go through in its present form. The ground advanced by Sir John Macdonald for the measure was to secure what he called uniformity throughout the whole Dominion in the franchise under which members were elected to this House. While many trifling reasons were advanced, the real and only standing ground the Government adopted in respect to that measure was uniformity and, as it was called, control of their franchise in order to have uniformity. These alleged outrages are, I think, the creation of an inventive mind at the present time.

Mr. McNEILL. In regard to the observations of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, I am surprised that any hon. member who heard the debates of 1885, as he did and as I did, should have forgotten the reference that were made to the attacks by the local legislatures at that time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Side references.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not know what my hon. friend means by the interruption. I say that references were made, and I am very much surprised my hon. friend has forgotten the fact. That was one of the principal reasons at that time for the action of the House. How has my hon. friend met the statement that in 1882 this Act was passed? He has not met it at all. Does he pretend to say that Act was passed for no reason at all? Does he mean to say that this House passed an Act in 1882 protecting the privileges of certain subjects of Her Majesty in Nova Scotia from the action of the local legislature of that province, when there was no need for such protection? My hon. friend has not, in the slightest degree, answered the objections that I have brought forward.

Mr. GILLIES. I am not at all surprised at the statement we have just heard from the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), because we have had already frequent displays of lamentable ignorance on the part of the hon. gentleman concerning the administration of the department he is supposed to control. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that he should be entirely ignorant of the administration of matters affecting the franchise of the different provinces of the Dominion. He asked my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), in a very flippant manner, to tell him the

year in which the disqualifying clauses of the Franchise Act were passed in Nova Scotia, showing most palpably that this was the first time he had ever heard of that disqualifying Act. I am here to tell the hon. gentleman when that Act was passed, and to read it to him. And I would ask him to keep the information in his mind, and not in future show such lamentable ignorance when addressing the House on a matter of so much concern to the House and country generally. The disqualifying Act of Nova Scotia was passed in 1871, and the very words of that Act are to-day the words of the disqualifying Act which now obtains in that province. These are the words :

It shall not be lawful for any person to vote at an election for a member or members to represent the people, in the general assembly of this province, who, at any time within fifteen days before the day of election, was in the receipt of wages or emolument of any kind as an employee in the post office, the custom-house, the Inland Revenue Department, the lighthouse service, on the Government railroads, in the Crown land office, or the local public works and mines.

The hon. gentleman will see that that was a wide Act in its operation, and that Act was passed in 1871, and is word for word the Act we have to-day in the statutes of Nova Scotia. But the Act did not end there. Section 4 provided that in the case of any names of these parties getting, in any way whatever, upon the list they are to be struck out. It reads as follows :—

The names of the persons disqualified under the first section of this Act shall not be inserted in the lists or register of electors, and, if entered, shall be struck off in the manner provided in chapter 28 of the Acts of 1863.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the law now in Nova Scotia ?

Mr. GILLIES. Yes, the disqualifying Act is word for word as it is to-day.

Mr. McNEILL. What is the date of that ?

Mr. GILLIES. 1871. That is what the Postmaster General asked for in that non-chalant manner which it would be much better for him to leave aside and thus not expose his lamentable ignorance.

Now, we had complaint after complaint from the province of Nova Scotia that a large number of persons qualified in every respect, who paid their assessments and taxes and contributed in every way to the revenue of this country, were disqualified from voting in a federal election if they were in the enjoyment of a small emolument from the Federal Government. Complaint after complaint came to us asking for some Dominion legislation to remedy this grievance ; and it was in pursuance of these complaints that the Act of 1882 was passed by this Parliament, and not until

that Act was passed by this Parliament were any Dominion officials of the province of Nova Scotia permitted to vote. The hon. Minister of Finance surprised me very considerably when he showed, on the second reading of the Bill, what I think was in him an inexcusable want of knowledge. He said repeatedly on that occasion that the Dominion officials were not disqualified from voting in the province of Nova Scotia at a federal election. He stated that not once but several times, and when the correctness of his statement was questioned by the hon. leader of the Opposition, he spoke as follows :—

My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) said that the provincial lists prevented them from voting. That would be a very strong argument, only that the hon. gentleman is misinformed as to the facts, for, as I have shown, the local lists did not prevent him from voting.

Now, I have read the law :

The list contained the name of every Dominion official who is qualified to vote by his property or otherwise, in the usual way.

How could the list contain the names when this very Act was the law in the province at the time we passed the Dominion Franchise Act, and the 4th section of the Act stated that they would be struck off if in any way they should have got on ? How could these names be on the lists when the Provincial Act provided that if any of them were put on the local lists they should be struck off ?

Mr. RUSSELL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that section 4 of the Act of 1872 is still in force ?

Mr. GILLIES. No ; I am coming to that in a moment. My hon. friend need not be in the slightest degree apprehensive that I will make any statement which will not be entirely correct in this House or elsewhere. He may possess his soul in patience. I shall get down to that to which he now alludes. I do not at all say that section 4 is now existent, but that section 4 of the Act of 1871 was the only law governing in the preparation of the lists in Nova Scotia at the time the Dominion Franchise Act was passed in 1885.

Mr. McCLURE. The hon. gentleman is wrong in that. That section was repealed by the revised statute passed in 1884.

Mr. GILLIES. That fact does not save the hon. gentleman, as I will show in a moment. The hon. Minister of Finance went still further. He said :

The facts show from the beginning that the disqualification of Dominion officials was merely a freak of the imagination.

Now, how can it be a freak of imagination when the law expressly, unequivocally, and most emphatically, as I have shown by reading it, disqualifies them ? And how

can it be a freak of the imagination when they were not permitted to vote, as we have been saying all the time since this Act was passed. Section 4 expressly says that if, by any manner of means, they get on the list, they shall be struck off. Well, my hon. friend did not stop there. He went a little further and said:

Hon. gentlemen have heard the statement, and I challenge contradiction of it—that the names of Dominion officials were never left off the lists under the provincial law, and the names being on the lists the parties were entitled to vote in the Dominion election. There was never any need for the passing of the Act of 1882

Now, I need not labour that part of the question any further, because I think I have completely met the position taken by the Minister of Finance on that occasion. And, having done so, if he has any sense of justice, and I am sure he has, he will acknowledge it. I should gather from the position that he took on that occasion that if these people were to be disqualified in any way and forbidden to vote under the provincial laws, he would be inclined to look upon it as a grievance. I think the hon. gentleman went even that far. Let him go to the law as it is at this very moment. The disqualifying clause that I read to you, that was passed in 1871 is as I have said, the disqualifying clause that is on the Statute-book to-day. What does it say about the making up of the lists? I will read the law as it is at this very moment:

The revisers, when making up the lists, shall include the following persons, if of the full age of 21 years and subjects of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization, and not disqualified by any section of this Act.

Now, I have read the disqualifying section of this Act which provided that if a man is employed in any way by the Federal Government that disqualifies him, and provides even that if he is "otherwise by law prevented from voting" be excluded from those entitled to have their names entered on the lists of the electors. Now, by law the Dominion officials are prevented from voting, and, therefore, Dominion officials cannot be included in the lists that are made by the revisers as prescribed by this section. I, therefore, say, and in this I fully agree with my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) that it is a most retrograde step to take, once a body of men is enfranchised, to disfranchise them. If this is a hardship as affecting the Indians of his constituency, how much more is it a hardship as respects the white men of Nova Scotia. They were disfranchised under the Franchise Act of 1871. The Dominion Parliament came to their relief by the Franchise Act of 1885. From that time until now they have been exercising their right to vote for candidates for this Parliament just the same as the Indians in the constituency of my hon. friend. We now propose to take away this

Mr. GILLIES.

right by enacting this clause. Heretofore the franchise law of Nova Scotia was applied to the election of members to the House of Assembly of that province. That Franchise Act disfranchises a large number of white men in the province of Nova Scotia.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) probably did not hear the Solicitor General state that the Government were considering the propriety of amending the Bill so as to maintain this right.

Mr. GILLIES. I am aware of that, and I am arguing this question on a similar line with my hon. friend the Solicitor General who has studied the Act and knows its genius very much better than the Minister of Finance. He admitted that these people were disqualified under the franchise law of Nova Scotia. What I wish to impress upon the committee and particularly upon my hon. friend from Lambton is, that if it is a hardship for the Indians of his constituency to be disfranchised, if it is a retrograde step to deprive them of the right they have enjoyed for thirteen years, he will surely agree with me, and his friends associated with him also, that it is a much greater hardship and much more a retrograde step to disfranchise the white men in Nova Scotia who have been enjoying the rights of voting for members of the House of Commons.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On one point the hon. gentleman has shown that I was inaccurate as to something in the law of Nova Scotia a quarter of a century ago. One does not care to admit that he remembers so far back as that. If the hon. gentleman has quoted correctly, I am bound to admit that I was inaccurate. But when he went further and stated, in answer to the question, that that was the law of Nova Scotia to-day, I think he is mistaken; and for all practical purposes, as bearing on the point before us in the previous discussion, my hon. friend was wrong and I was right. What was the question? After all we only deal with the Act of 1871 as a matter of history, which is interesting, but we are more concerned in the Act of 1888 in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MILLS. You mean 1889.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The law as it is to-day is the one we are concerned in. We propose that the franchise lists of Nova Scotia shall be the lists for Dominion elections. My hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) found fault with the provincial lists and said they were bad for our purposes because they excluded Dominion officials. I submitted to my hon. friend that he was wrong because the lists did not exclude the names—

Mr. GILLIES. That is the provincial lists?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The provincial lists of to-day.

Mr. GILLIES. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) permit me.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Mr. GILLIES. How does my hon. friend explain this one line in the Act? This prescribes the manner in which the provincial lists shall be made up. Now, these are to be the lists for federal purposes if this Bill becomes law. The law says:

The following persons, being males of the full age of 21 years, subjects of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization, and not disqualified by any section of this Act, or otherwise by law prevented from voting,—

—shall be on the lists. Now the law says that Dominion officials cannot vote—there is no doubt about that. For the law says:

It shall not be lawful for any person to vote at an election for a member or members to represent the people in the general assembly of this province who at any time within fifteen days before the day of election, was in receipt of wages or emoluments of any kind as an employee of the post office, custom-house, inland revenue, lighthouse service, Government railroads, Crown lands office, or local public works and mines.

Here you say any person who, within 15 days before the election, is in receipt of any emolument of any kind from any of these sources, cannot vote. The law to-day says that whoever is prevented in any of these ways from voting, cannot go on the list.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The best answer I can give to that is that they do go on, and they are on. I state now that in the community in which I live we have very good Conservative lawyers and campaigners—

Mr. GILLIES. How can they go on?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman might as well ask me: How can he be in his seat there to-day? He is there. I see him there, and I know he is there. If he were to read me a thousand clauses in the statutes to show he was not there, I would still believe my own eyes.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is a member of a Government who has brought a Bill down here, and the hon. gentleman has placed in that very Bill he has brought down the class of persons who, in Nova Scotia, are disqualified to vote. There it is, on page 7, and under the heading "Nova Scotia," which says: "Any one who, within 15 days before the election, was an employee or in the receipt of wages or emoluments of any kind as such employee in the post office," and so forth, and so forth. His own Bill declares that they shall not vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman must not imagine that he has made a point, because he has not. What we

have said repeatedly in discussion is that the Nova Scotia lists are to be applied to the Dominion elections; therefore the whole question is whether these officials have their names on the Nova Scotia lists.

Mr. FOSTER. This says they have not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This does not say they have not, it says they can not vote. It has always been the case—I won't say always, that is too long, but I do say that for many years—within my observation, Dominion officials have their names on the local lists. I see them on in the city of Halifax where we have several hundred officials. I would probably not be wrong if I say there are three or four hundred Dominion officials there whose names appear on the lists. I can give my hon. friend several reasons why I know they are there. In the first place, I have seen them there, they are on the list. My hon. friend will understand that if they are on the list, and if that list is adopted, as we intend it shall be adopted, for Dominion purposes, then they have a right to vote.

Mr. McALISTER. Take the case of an alien who, under our law, cannot vote. Suppose he owns property in the Dominion of Canada and has his name on the Dominion list, would he be entitled to vote?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If his name is on the list, the only way you can prevent him from voting is by challenging him, and he can vote unless you can show some disqualification. Notwithstanding what my hon. friend has read, the Nova Scotia law has been understood for years to mean that the disqualification only arises at the polls, and with the knowledge of the disqualification, Dominion officials as a rule would not go to vote at a local election. When I say I know their names are on the list I can give my hon. friend various pieces of evidence in that direction. In the first place, I have seen their names on the list; in the second place, I know that in the party rooms, where they always get to the bottom of things, men are told off to go to the polls with a list of the Dominion officials and challenge them, so that they shall not vote. That is a proof that their names are on the list. My hon. friend says that they have no right to be there. I tell him that an experience of many years enables me to say that they have been there, and if his view is correct, no doubt that some of the sharp party campaigners in Halifax would long ago have found it out, and they would have taken very good care to have the law interpreted as he reads it.

Mr. GILLIES. The law distinctly says that whoever is prevented in any way by this section from voting, cannot go on the list. How can he get there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is there. It is the old story, we have already heard it here, of the lawyer who told a man

he could not be put in jail for something ; and the man says : I am there.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

After Recess.

The House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not see in the House any members in charge of the Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You had better wait a little.

Mr. MONK. We were told on behalf of the Government by the Solicitor General that he intended to give the committee the policy of the Government in regard to the right of Indians to vote, which has been taken away by this Bill. I do not know whether the right hon. Premier is able to tell the committee what the policy is. It seems to me that before voting on this amendment it is important we should know the policy of the Government.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry I was not in the House this afternoon when the question was discussed. There can be no doubt what the policy of the Government is on this subject. We have introduced the principle and have fought for it for many years that the franchise ought to be regulated by the provincial legislatures, that it is for them to decide whether or not the Indians should be admitted to vote or not. If it be the opinion of the legislature of the province of Ontario, for instance, that the Indians there have reached that degree of civilization when they can be entrusted with the franchise, the legislature will so enact. If the hon. gentleman had been in the House in 1885 when the present Act was introduced he would remember that, as introduced, it gave the right of the franchise to the Indians, not only in the older provinces, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but it gave the right of suffrage also to the Indians in the North-west Territories; and it was pointed out at the time to Sir John Macdonald by Mr. Mills that, according to the Bill, as introduced, Poundmaker, who was at that time engaged in rebellion, and Big Bear, would be invested with the franchise. The Bill was modified subsequently, and Indians were granted the franchise only in the older provinces and the Indians of the North-west Territories were restrained. This shows that even according to the Act some discretion is to be exercised in this matter. Who is to exercise it? We think it should be left to the provincial legislatures. Accordingly, after this Bill becomes law, if it should become law, it would be for the legislatures of the different provinces to determine whether or not Indians should be admitted to vote. This is the policy of the Government on the subject.

Mr. FIELDING.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very sorry the right hon. First Minister was not in the House this afternoon, for we had a very interesting and instructive discussion on this subject, which I think it would have been well if the right hon. gentleman had been able to hear it. The policy of the Government, as stated by the hon. Solicitor General, is that the Indians shall not be enfranchised under this Bill. That was clearly stated by the hon. gentleman.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I say they are not to be enfranchised further than they are now under the provincial laws, and the leader of the Opposition stated that under certain provisions of the Ontario law they are not entirely enfranchised. I shall have occasion to refer to that matter again.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That was not the point at issue. The question was, will the Indians, under this Bill, be enfranchised or not. The hon. gentleman stated that they could not be enfranchised under this Bill, because under the laws of the provinces they did not enjoy the franchise, and it was under the federal law they enjoyed the franchise.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Except to a limited extent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That does not affect the question, because, up to a limited extent there has been no issue on this subject between the political parties. There was a very interesting discussion, as the hon. gentleman may remember, in 1885, when the federal Franchise Bill was passed, as to whether the Indians should be enfranchised or not. It was no doubt a very legitimate object for discussion on which hon. gentlemen might fairly be expected to differ. We are not in that position to-day. I want to call the attention of the committee to the position occupied by the right hon. gentleman as the leader of a Liberal Administration, whose first important act is to take away the franchise from a large body of British subjects in this Dominion who at the present time enjoy it. That is not a position upon which the right hon. gentleman will plume himself as leader of the Liberal Administration. One of the great principles of the Liberal party throughout the world has been to broaden and extend the franchise to all persons who could properly enjoy it. If the right hon. gentleman had been here to-day he would have had an instructive lesson from both sides of the House and from his friends on both sides. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) went very fully into the question and made a very powerful argument against the disfranchisement of the Indians who now enjoy the suffrage under existing legislation, and he pointed to the fact that whatever had been the difference of opinion at the outset when any question was first considered, any doubts as to the propriety of the enfranchisement of the Indians in certain cases had been entirely removed by that

most potent of all influences, the influence of experience. He showed the impression prevailed at the time that because the Indians were wards of the Government they should not be enfranchised. The argument was followed up still more fully by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), who showed that the great danger felt in respect to the enfranchisement of Indians was that they were wards of the Government, and it was therefore supposed the Government of the day would exercise an overwhelming controlling influence over them and they would not be in a position to give free votes and exercise the franchise freely and intelligently. Those hon. gentlemen went into the evidence on this point, and they proved to the House conclusively, in my judgment, that all the fears entertained in regard to the enfranchisement of the Indians had proved to be delusive, that they exercised the franchise as intelligently and independently as any other class of the electors, that instead of being entirely swayed by the Government, they had again and again, although somewhat dependent on the Government, shown their independence by dividing their votes, in a great many cases, about equally between the two political parties. Those hon. gentlemen showed that the Indians were perfectly qualified to vote, and they proved by many long years' experience in those counties where the Indians, in very considerable numbers live, that they were well qualified to exercise the franchise in a wise, judicious and independent manner. I put it to my hon. friend whether he can find any Liberal Government in the world, except the Government of the province of Nova Scotia, where a Liberal party ever attempted to induce Parliament to take away the franchise from men to whom it had been entrusted, who had been exercising it, without being able to show that those men had in the slightest degree failed to discharge in an independent and intelligent manner the duties imposed on them.

My right hon. friend is in a very awkward position when he finds his friends to the right of him and to the left of him complaining of this provision in the Bill. It is not these unfortunate Tories whose opinions have no weight with my right hon. friend who are now complaining, but it is his strongest supporters who tell him that they would regard it as an outrage and as a complete abandonment of these great principles of Liberalism for which they have long fought and of which they thought the right hon. gentleman was an exponent; if, as he now proposes, he disfranchises a large class of the population. Long ago the question was decided as to whether the Indians should be enfranchised or not, and year after year they have proved that they possessed all the qualifications necessary to exercise the franchise in a wise, independent, and judicious manner in the interests of the country. For the leader of the Government

to deprive them of that franchise, without being able to advance a reason for his action, is a thing for which you will search in vain for a parallel all the world over. You might find some fossilized Tory who would go back on Liberal principles and who would not regard the importance of maintaining good faith with a large body of the electorate; but except in one memorable instance where a Liberal Government of Nova Scotia tried to do something of the same kind, you cannot find in parliamentary history any attempt to take away the franchise from a section of the population to whom it had been entrusted, and who for many years had wisely exercised it.

This is a most significant illustration of the vicious character of this measure, and to-night the Premier's own friends point it out to him. It is all very well to say that the legislatures of the provinces shall have the right to exercise their judgment as to who shall have the franchise. They have shown in the different provinces that they differ very widely on that question, but so far as their own legislature is concerned, they have an indefeasible right to exercise their judgment and to say what class of the community shall elect its members. But, Sir, it is an entirely different thing when you undertake to say that you are going to turn over to the provincial legislatures the power to say what shall be the franchise on which members of this great Federal Parliament of the Dominion are elected. It is a very different thing when you come to legislate here, that you shall commit to half a dozen independent legislatures in which you have no voice, all of them differing more or less one from the other on the question of franchise; the control over the representation in this Federal Parliament. It would be bad enough if it were to rest there, and if you were to legislate that the existing franchise laws of the provinces should be the franchise of the Dominion, but under the present Bill you have no security whatever as to that. You have not even the security that in these provinces the franchise for this Dominion Parliament will be the same as they intend to use for themselves. If you were to take the provincial franchises of to-day it would be bad enough, but it would at least have the merit of being permanent. The members of this House and the men who are to be candidates for seats in this House in years to come, will be in a frightful position indeed if we in this Parliament adopt a franchise law that enables a local legislature, after a general election in that province has been held, to change the franchise and to manufacture a special franchise law, not for the purpose of the representation in their own legislature, but for the purpose of controlling the Federal Parliament of Canada. If we pass this Bill we will give the local legislature the power of adopting a franchise without the slightest intention of using it themselves, but for the

sole purpose of promoting the interests of their party in the federal elections, intending subsequently to repeal that Act and to go back to their old franchise before the provincial elections come off. That has occurred before, and you will search the world in vain to find anything that will correspond with such a state of things as that which can exist under these circumstances. But that is not all. What have we here in evidence from gentlemen who not only know whereof they speak, but who have had a practical experience of the effect of the franchise of some of the local legislatures. Does my right hon. friend admit for a moment, that any member of the Parliament of Canada should be subjected to a franchise under which, not the legislatures but the government of a province can control the representation in this House from that province? My right hon. friend will, I am sure, instantly repudiate the idea that we should have members of the House of Commons of Canada elected from any province, not by the independent electors of that province but by the government of that province. Go to Manitoba, and what do you find? It has been proven by indisputable testimony—testimony that no man has been able to refute—that the franchise of Manitoba is a franchise under which the Government of Manitoba can elect whom they please.

Mr. LISTER. They lost an election a short time ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They did; but there is such a thing as a Government becoming so unpopular that a province rises in revolt against it. If the hon. gentleman wants an illustration of what I am saying, let him look at the two elections that took place in the province of Manitoba, one almost immediately following the other. I mean the elections of 1896, when a general election took place for the local legislature, in which only four or five members opposed to the Government obtained seats, and a short time afterwards a Dominion election took place, in which but for the fact that our candidate for Lisgar was attacked with typhoid fever, the Liberal party would not have elected a single member from that province.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Providence interfered.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Providence has done a great deal for hon. gentlemen opposite—a great deal more than they have done for themselves, in many instances. Then everybody knows that the hon. gentleman who represents Selkirk in this House would not be here to-day but for an unfortunate error on the part of the judge, a friend of ours, I admit, who advised the Conservative candidate to deposit his \$1,000 in the wrong place; and that prevented a recount, which would have given a majority of at least twenty to the Conservative can-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

didate. The constituency of Brandon was carried by a very distinguished member of this House, but certainly not under the banner of the Liberal party; it was carried on a religious question, the school question. But apart from Lisgar, where, as my hon. friend suggests, Providence interfered in their favour, the Liberal party returned only one man out in the whole province, and that in a province where the battle-cry was that the Conservative party were for coercing Manitoba and the Liberal party were for preventing that coercion. I give that to my hon. friend as an evidence of the most overwhelming character to show the frightful nature of the local franchise of Manitoba. Under that franchise they appoint an insignificant member of the community, some person who has no standing, no character, who has nothing to lose, and they place the control of a constituency in his hands. I gave an illustration of this to the House before, but it will bear repeating, because it is a historical matter. Where there was a real majority of at least fifteen for the Conservative party in a constituency, fifteen names were put on the list. What names? Names of people who did not exist in the country at all, known to nobody—utterly fictitious names. What happened then? Of course, they were challenged.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I call my hon. friend to order. He is not speaking to the amendment, which has reference to the Indian vote, but he is going into a general discussion of the Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I hope it is not too late yet for the hon. gentleman to learn from the discussion that has taken place on the Indian vote, that he is making a frightful mistake in this measure, and I am endeavouring to draw his attention to the fact that his own strongest friends and supporters are denouncing this measure in this particular; and where does that denunciation come from? It comes from the vicious character of this measure, that hands over the franchise of the members of this House to the local legislatures, and leaves us powerless, however desirous to protect the Indian vote, or any other vote that ought to be protected; and I hope it is not too late to make every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House feel that we are not asking to take away any control or any power from the Government. In every word we are using in relation to this measure we are placing ourselves largely in the hands of the Government to which we are opposed; and if we do that, I think hon. gentlemen opposite ought to feel that we are asking for no party advantage, but are asking for an independent franchise that will protect the rights of every elector in this country who is entitled to exercise the franchise. I will not pursue the subject further; but I leave with the House that

illustration of putting fictitious names on the list, and the person who acted as the reviser refusing to strike them off, because the parties who objected to them could not prove that they had served the parties with a notice, the fact being that the reason why they could not serve them with a notice was that no such persons existed. I give that to show that a measure that involves such an outrage upon everything that would be held to be fair and honourable and just in the character of a franchise, ought not to be passed by this House. The old law is not under discussion. I cannot understand why hon. gentlemen opposite have paid so much attention to the old law, because in 1895 the leader of the Conservative Government announced in this House that he intended to repeal it, and to-night we have repealed it by the clause which we have already passed. The question now is, can we not find some basis upon which gentlemen on both sides of the House, who desire to treat one of the most vitally important questions that can ever be considered in a free legislature, can arrive at some general principles which will prevent these acts of great injustice being perpetrated in the future? I do not see any difficulty, if you proceed, as Sir John Thompson proposed you should, for the purpose of lessening the expenditure connected with the list. If you take the franchise of the local legislatures as a basis but still preserve that independent control that will secure some security to the people of this country that even-handed justice will be meted out to every independent elector in this country entitled to use the franchise, that is all we ask. We do not ask for the maintenance of the old law, although it is true beyond controversy that it is much fairer than the one proposed, and I have no hesitation in saying that if the old law had been open to the objection made against it on the other side, namely, that it gave the Dominion Government an inordinate power of controlling the constituencies, we would not have had this proposition to repeal it to-day. I am inclined to think that hon. gentlemen opposite would have held to it, but it is because they know, after many long years of trial, that that law was not open to any such objection and that it has never been charged against it that it has been the means of any undue influence being used to prevent a free expression of public opinion in the different constituencies, that they now ask to repeal it. No man in this House ought to be willing that the question of the franchise for this Parliament should be a party question. In a question of that kind we should rise above and beyond party, and be ready to treat it fairly, without reference to party, and see if we cannot engraft upon this measure, taking the provincial lists as a basis, such action as will secure to every independent elector in this country, who is entitled to

be put upon the roll, the putting of his name upon the roll and prevent men not entitled to that privilege from being put on it. There ought to be no difficulty in half a dozen gentlemen on both sides arriving at a common ground that would be acceptable to both sides of the House, and thus save a great deal of heart-burning and feeling of deep injustice, which will undoubtedly prevail in the great majority of the people, if this measure be forced through in its present form.

I shall just read a short extract from an article in a newspaper, which is a strong supporter of the present Government, on the Franchise Bill, and that paper is the Manitoba "Free Press." After saying a good deal against the old franchise law, which I shall not trouble the House with reading, as it is rather too long, and my voice is not in a condition to read more than I am obliged to, the Manitoba "Free Press" says:

Now the Liberals have their turn, and one of their first acts is to repeal the present law. They intend to wipe it out and substitute the provincial lists, without any federal interference.

There is the point at issue between us. We do not object to taking the provincial lists as a basis, but we do object to making them absolute and taking all control and power from the Dominion Parliament. How long hon. gentlemen opposite may be in a position to exercise power, I shall not undertake to say, because prophesying is a rather dangerous thing, but I say that we are willing that the federal control should be in their hands, and they ought not to vote want of confidence in themselves and say that they are afraid to trust themselves with that power. I would infinitely prefer that it should be in their hands than that these lists should not be subject to federal influence at all.

The "Free Press" goes on to say:

In one province, Manitoba, the principle of government control of the lists is the very foundation of the law, and in its operation an election is assured in every doubtful constituency by the dishonest practices of the registration clerks. The law could not contribute more effectively to the stuffing of the lists in the interest of the ruling party if it had been specially and avowedly designed for that purpose. In Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island the laws are also capable of gross abuse. We need not inquire whether the Liberals have forgotten or swallowed their scruples of 1885; it is sufficient to know that by the Bill now before the House a federal election law will be imposed on this province, and on other provinces, that will be infinitely worse than the existing Dominion law was ever claimed to be. Our only hope of escape from a measure under which the electorate will be left at the mercy of the Government agents, and the free expression of the popular will need not be permitted, lies in the Senate. To that body we make our appeal, and should the Bill go to it in its present shape we ask, in the name of electoral purity and electoral decency, that it be rejected.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is the date of that article?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. April 15th, 1897. And as I have said, it is a paper that certainly is no supporter of hon. gentlemen on this side. I might call attention to another opinion. I have not the paper under my hand, but I have a reference to it, and that will take less time. The "Globe," on the franchise, on May 14th or May 20th, 1896, said:

The qualification of electors cannot be left to the provinces.

Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman will listen either to his own friends or to the dictates of justice, and will be disposed to do that which is fair between man and man and party and party, I think we will be able to get along and he will save a great deal of time. I think we would then be able to remove all the objections to the old law and arrive at a franchise that will be regarded as a fair and just franchise, which will protect the rights of electors all over Canada.

Before I sit down I intend to make just one general reference to some observations made by the hon. Minister of Finance. I cannot understand that hon. gentleman. He got up the other night, at the close of the debate, after I had spoken just before the question was put, and made a number of statements to the House on what he regarded, I have no doubt, as matters of fact. Well, he has found out that his statements were not statements of fact. He found out that he was altogether wrong, and to-night he admitted that he had been altogether wrong in the controversy I had with him on that subject. But he still claims that he was not wholly wrong. I would just say to him that he must not hope in this House, by vehemence of statement, to prevent people understanding facts when they are established beyond controversy. The hon. gentleman, with great warmth, when my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Gillies) read the law and showed that he was altogether wrong and that under the laws of Nova Scotia these officials, who had been disfranchised, could not be on the lists, his answer was: Oh, I saw them on the lists. But I must say to my hon. friend that vehemence of statement is worthless.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In the face of absolute proof made by my hon. friend from Richmond, I think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would have done better if he had simply said: Well, I find that I was mistaken.

The following persons, if of the full age of 21 years—

—this is the present law of Nova Scotia—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

—of the full age of 21 years, and subjects of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization, and not disqualified by any section of this Act—

Mark, this Act contains that disqualification, the Act which you have on the last page of this Bill, under which a large number of officials are disqualified—

—and not disqualified by any section of this Act, or otherwise by law prevented from voting, shall be entitled to have their names entered on the lists.

Now, can the English language furnish proof more conclusive of the fact that the names were not allowed to be entered on the lists than the law declaring that only those could have their names on the voters' lists who were free of any disqualification by this Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let us go back to the Indian.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will come back to the Indian.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman the same question that I was desirous of asking the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies). The revisers make up their lists some time in April or May. Now, by what possible divination or inspiration can they know who will or will not be disqualified from voting in an election which may not take place for two or three years, seeing that there is no disqualification in the Nova Scotia statutes of Dominion officials as such, but only a disqualification of persons who, within a certain fixed and limited period receive Dominion money as officials of the various departments? How, then, can a reviser undertake to leave a Dominion official off the list when he is revising, simply because he imagines that probably, two or three years hence, when an election is on, that Dominion official may be disqualified? I think it was the discovery of that impossibility that led to the repeal, in 1885, of the provision that these officials should be struck off the lists, and my apprehension of the matter is there has never been any attempt on the part of the reviser to leave Dominion officials off the lists, because they were not disqualified and disentitled to vote as Dominion officials pure and simple, but only if they continued to be in the employ of the Dominion within 30 days, or, as amended 15 days, of the time of an election. The provision which authorized and instructed the revisers to strike the names off the list was repealed by the repealing clauses of the statute of 1885, and since then there has been no power in the revisers to leave off the names of Dominion officials, and I am certain, as a matter of fact, they never were left off, except in such cases as that

pointed out by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), where revisers mistook their duties. But it is well understood that they are not to be left off and have not been left off. And my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) knows that there is no pretense that Dominion officials are disqualified in municipal elections, and yet these elections are held upon the lists thus prepared.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I could not have a better evidence given to this House of the utterly untenable position that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance occupies than the defence put forth by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), one of the ablest jurists in this House. If that hon. gentleman has nothing more to say in defence of the position of the Finance Minister than he has said just now, it will be unnecessary for me to take up much further time. I would ask the hon. gentleman: Can the fact that the lists are made up perhaps long before the election takes place controvert the fact that under the Nova Scotia law this clause is to be found, as every hon. gentleman has it in his hand, furnished him, I am glad to say, by the Solicitor General? This is given as Revised Statutes, chap. 4, section 67:

Any one who, within fifteen days before the election, was an employee or in the receipt of wages or emolument of any kind as such employee in the post office, the custom-house, the Inland Revenue Department, the lighthouse service, on the Government railroads, in the Crown lands office, or the local public works and mines, but nothing in section to extend to contractors.

And so on. There is an absolute disqualification by name of large classes of people, and that clause is embodied in the law that is here proposed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Disqualification of whom? Not Dominion officials, but Dominion officials who are in receipt of emoluments 15 days before the elections.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) has been looking at this with a microscope.

Mr. RUSSELL. If by that the hon. gentleman means that I have been looking at it with accuracy, I do not deny it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I say, there is a disqualification absolute and complete of all persons who are in receipt of money from the Dominion. Fifteen days has nothing to do with postmasters and customs' officers and Inland Revenue Department officers and railway employees; it has nothing to do with parties who have been for long years in the enjoyment of these offices. It has no bearing on the question that the hon. gentleman has raised. I have read the section which declares that British subjects of the full age of 21 years, and not disqualified by any section of this Act, are

entitled to have their names on the lists. And here you have a disqualification by a section of the Act. I cannot conceive how it is possible for any case to be made clearer, more overwhelming or more complete. Now, Sir, I may recall to the mind of hon. members the ground upon which that disqualification was made. In those days, Sir, the hon. Minister of Finance—

The PRIME MINISTER. I must ask my hon. friend to keep to the question, and the question is the Indian franchise, and not the franchise in Nova Scotia.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is not aware that I am replying to the speech made by the Minister of Finance this afternoon. If the Minister of Finance, from the Treasury benches, is permitted to discuss this question as he did, am I not right in calling the attention of the Chair to the answer?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). I hope hon. members will keep to the point.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid I have been keeping too close to the point. I was about to explain how this disqualification was put on the Statute-book of Nova Scotia. The Liberal party of that time, as the Minister of Finance knows, was in bitter hostility to the Dominion of Canada, and he knows that the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, in introducing this Bill in 1871, said:

Before the session closed such laws should be passed that every person who had the smell of Canada upon him would be excluded from this House.

That was the policy of the Liberal party at that time, and this Bill would prevent any person in the employ of the Canadian Government from being walked up to the polls and voting, whether he was asked or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. "Being walked up." That was it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not quite certain whether he walked up or whether he was carried up in a carriage. At all events, these are the circumstances under which this Bill was passed; and I ask the Solicitor General as a loyal Canadian, I ask him as a man who believes in maintaining the integrity of this wide Dominion—indeed I do not require to ask him, because he has already said that he is preparing to deal with this question in such a way as will enable these parties thus disfranchised to vote, and I thank him sincerely for it. I am aware that the Government has changed hands, that these officials are now the officials of a Liberal Government. But that would not induce me for a moment to lend myself to the degradation of an official because the Government was in the hands of one party or the other. I want to see the franchise in the hands of men of independent character

who will faithfully discharge their duties in relation to it ; and I am certain that whichever party is in power, they may be entrusted safely with that duty. I was glad to learn from the Solicitor General that he intends to protect these parties, and that he is going to provide for maintaining their rights as electors. But what position does that put him in with the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), and with the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd), if the rights of the Indians, which it has been proved they have exercised wisely and independently, are to be taken away because the legislation in Ontario does not preserve them. How is it that the Solicitor General is going to make fish of one and flesh of the other? How is he going to restore the franchise to these men from whom it was thus improperly taken away, so improperly that this Parliament had to interfere in order to restore it? I still hope that my right hon. friend and the Solicitor General—the latter I see has given this measure a great deal of careful consideration—will seriously consider whether it is yet too late for us to look calmly at that question with a view of finding whether we cannot arrive at some general principle that will enable us, while avoiding the great expense attending the operation of the late law, and making the lists of the province the basis of the franchise, will yet preserve federal control over the franchise under which our members are elected, and which I consider absolutely indispensable, after what we have seen in the various provinces, to the independence and freedom of this House.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend has dilated at considerable length on a question which is not before the House. The only question which we have to deal with at this moment is the amendment moved by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) regarding the franchise to Indians.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend allow me—is that the correct rule? We have a substantive motion which we are discussing, an hon. gentleman has moved an amendment to that motion. Does the right hon. gentleman contend that we have no right to discuss the substantive motion on the amendment which has been proposed, and that we must confine ourselves entirely to the amendment?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is my opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will ask the ruling of the Chairman with reference to it.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend will refer to the debates of 1885, which I have reason to remember, because at that time I sat on the other side of the House, he will agree with me that we were rigidly confined to the amendment which was under discussion before the Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). I think the Chairman read the whole of section 5, and this is an amendment to that whole section. Therefore I think that the whole section as well as the amendment are under consideration.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend appealed to me in the name of Liberal principles not to allow a class of electors, the Indians, to be disfranchised under this new Act. Sir, I cannot but feel flattered at the encomium which was passed by my hon. friend upon Liberal principles, but I differ from him in toto in the application of those principles. He applied them, not as a Liberal but a Tory. I noticed that in one part of his argument he spoke of a decision rendered by a judge against the interest of his party, and he used this expression, "though that judge was a friend of ours." Sir, this is not a Liberal principle, this is a Tory principle. A judge ought not to be the friend of any party. A judge is to administer justice according to the law, and to say upon the floor of Parliament that a judge—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me—I had the very highest authority in this country for characterizing a judge as a friend.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not aware to what authority he is referring. But I know that when the hon. gentleman speaks of a judge as a friend of his party, there is no authority in this country, or in any other country, which can warrant such language. However strong a party man a gentleman may be before his appointment, the moment he ascends the bench he should leave behind him all the party proclivities which he entertained up to that time. My hon. friend appealed to me in the name of Liberal principles to retain the franchise to the Indians, and he exclaimed: What, is it to be the case that this so-called Liberal Government is going to disfranchise a portion of the electorate? Sir, this is not the question before the House. The question is whether this franchise is to be regulated by this Parliament or by the local legislatures, and upon that question we differ. The hon. gentlemen opposite have taken the ground that this Parliament should regulate the franchise, while we have taken the ground that the best method of dealing with it, in view of our complicated government under a federative system, is to have one uniform franchise for each province and for the Dominion, that is to say, that the same authority which regulates the franchise for the local legislature should also regulate it for the Dominion Parliament. Now, this is the principle upon which this Bill is based, and I claim that it is the correct one. The hon. gentleman stated a moment ago that such a system had never been seen in any part of the world. Why, Sir, he has only to go to the other side of the line where he will find that, though the people have dual legislatures,

federal and state, there is only one legislature which determines the franchise, and that is the state legislature, equivalent to the provincial legislature here. But if we are to deal with the question as an abstract question, if we are to determine whether the Indians should have the right to vote or not, I would not for my part have any objections to giving them that right after the testimony we have heard of the qualifications of the Indians to exercise the franchise. But in any well regulated system of government the proper thing must be done, not alone because it is just per se, but the proper thing must be done by the proper authorities. It is only a few days ago that we had a discussion in this House upon a Sabbath Observance Bill, a very good measure in itself. But this measure was killed because a large majority of the members were of the opinion that this Parliament was not the proper authority to legislate upon that question, that it was more properly the concern of the local legislature, and that it was for them to deal with it. So it is with this question as to whether the Indians ought to be admitted to the right to vote. It is a question which should not be debated upon the floor of this Parliament, it is a question which concerns the local legislatures. It may be that the Indian is as well qualified as the white man to vote, I do not dispute the statement at all. But with this question, as with the Sabbath Observance Bill, this is not the place to discuss it. There are provinces where it may be advisable that the Indians should have the right to vote, but under this very law which we are now engaged in repealing, these very questions were determined in one way for one set of Indians and in another way for another set of Indians. Under this very Act which we are repealing, the franchise was given to the Indians in the older provinces, and was refused to the Indians of the North-west Territories. Why? If the Indians should have the right to vote in one province, why should they not have it in another province? If, as a matter of justice, they should have the right to vote in Ontario and Quebec, why should they not, as a matter of justice, have the right to vote in the province of Manitoba? I stated that under the Franchise Act the enfranchisement of the Indians does not extend to the province of Manitoba. There must be some reason for that fact. The reason is that Parliament thought the Indians were not yet sufficiently advanced in civilization that they could safely be given the right of the franchise. What does this prove? It proves that the right of voting is a local question, depending on the education of the people. And who is to determine that question? Is it not the legislature of each province? Why have we this complicated system of federal government, under which power to legislate on certain subjects is given to the local legislatures, while power to legislate on other subjects is given

to this Parliament? Because there are certain subjects which can better be treated on local lines. Take the question of education. Whoever thought it would be right that the question of education should be determined by this Parliament? No one believes that would have been wise. It is a question properly allotted to the local legislatures, because a system that might suit one province might not suit another. So it is with the question of the franchise. But, as I said a moment ago, if we were called upon to determine as an abstract question whether the Indians could vote or not vote, I would be fully prepared, after the testimony given this afternoon that they were fully competent to grant the franchise to them. But if the Indians are qualified to vote, as has been stated this afternoon, the local legislatures will deal with that question and give them the right to vote, and then hon. gentlemen will be satisfied. If in Ontario, for instance, the Indians are properly qualified to vote, the legislature—the Liberal party, which, thank heaven, are in power in that province—will deal with the question. And it will be the same in Manitoba. If the people are satisfied that the Indians who live with them are competent to take hold of the franchise, it will be granted them. But the hon. gentleman declared that the Liberal Government were about to disfranchise the Indians. I tell the hon. gentleman that the policy of the Liberal party, the principles of the Liberal party is not to disfranchise the Indians, but it is to refer that question to the authority competent to deal with it. But I will give the hon. gentleman the policy of his party. He referred to the Bill introduced by Sir John Thompson, and he wanted us to go back to that Bill and, if I understood him correctly, he wished to embody the provisions in this Bill. I am not doing an injustice in stating that the hon. gentleman wanted the Government to adopt the provision in the Bill of Sir John Thompson, who had taken the provincial lists as the basis and on that wanted the list for the Dominion to be prepared. There was a paragraph, an enactment in the Bill introduced by Sir John Thompson, with this end in view, which I commend to the hon. gentleman. Subsection 2 of section 4 provided:

No Indian shall be qualified to have his name upon the list of voters unless he is enfranchised within the meaning of the Indian Act.

This is the same provision as is contained in the law of Ontario.

Enfranchised Indians, whether wholly or partly of Indian blood, shall be entitled to vote without having a property qualification.

Under the Ontario law an enfranchised Indian can vote. If the hon. gentleman had his will, he would have a different state of things prevailing: he is going back on the policy of his predecessor, Sir John Thomp-

son. We take a broader view than did Sir John Thompson. The view we take on this question, as on many others, is that a settlement is to be made not on the floor of this House but in every province where, according to the education of the Indians, the legislature thinks the Indians should or should not be entitled to the franchise. There are certain provinces where that may be; there are other provinces clearly where it could not be. Still the hon. gentleman wants us to have a uniform system on that subject. The arrangement proposed shows the position we have taken, that the question is to be considered by the provincial legislatures. I do not want to go out of the records and I have only one remark to make to the hon. gentleman on this point. Should this duty devolve on the provincial legislature or on the Dominion Parliament? Let me recall to the hon. gentleman's mind, because he seems to forget these matters very readily, that for the first nineteen years of confederation, this Parliament was elected on lists prepared by the local legislatures. Let me recall further that there were no complaints made at that time against that system. Let me recall again that under the system of the Dominion Franchise Act passed in 1885, there was not a year but there were complaints and grievous complaints in regard to that matter. I ask my hon. friend this question: Is it not the fact that if this Franchise Act is not passed during this session we shall be obliged to have a revision of the Dominion lists. There is not an hon. member who would not look with absolute terror on the prospect that in July he would have to meet the worry and expense of a revision of the lists. If hon. gentlemen opposite have a better system to propose, let them offer it; but as between a Dominion and provincial franchise, as between a Dominion list and provincial lists, there can be no hesitation, because we have had for nineteen years a provincial list and provincial franchise.

Mr. MILLS. The right hon. First Minister has told the House that we had, previous to 1885 a law giving the control of the franchise to the different provinces, and that there was no complaint and no cause for complaint. On that ground I differ entirely from the leader of the House. There was a great cause of complaint, and it existed in the province of Nova Scotia, where men were disfranchised from voting at the local elections. Their names were struck from the local lists and being so disfranchised they could not vote at elections for members of this Parliament. That matter was before this House in 1882. It was a cause of complaint then, and that was before the Franchise Act of 1885. It was such a serious cause of complaint at that time that this Parliament passed an Act providing that the electors who were struck off the lists in Nova Scotia by the iniquitous Act of 1871

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

should be restored to the voting power, and they were restored by a special Act, incorporated in a measure that was being passed through the House in 1882.

The Act of 1882 was introduced by the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, and after passing through this House it went to the Senate. It was amended by the Senate because it was brought to the ear of the Senate that some of the people of Nova Scotia who were disfranchised were—to use the words of the right hon. leader of this House—educated enough to vote intelligently for a member of this Parliament. The Senate amended the Act passed through this House in such a manner as to enable those who were disfranchised in Nova Scotia to vote at the federal elections that were about to take place. The right hon. the Premier is therefore incorrect in saying that previous to 1885 there was no complaint of the manner in which the provincial franchises were regulated. I have heard that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was proud of the work done in Nova Scotia disqualifying these men. He is now, however, endeavouring to shuffle the responsibility for these disqualifications on to the shoulders of other parties, but I tell the House that he cannot by any means get rid of the responsibility for that most infamous and most iniquitous Act.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. I am glad that what I say is meeting with the approbation of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan). I know it would have had his approbation at one time in his political existence, and though he may have turned his coat in the meantime, yet he may have some solid and substantial reasons for so doing. If the responsibility for maintaining this Franchise Act on the statutes of Nova Scotia rests upon any person in this House, it rests upon the Minister of Finance. He was not a legislator in 1871, to be sure, but he was in a hot-bed of secession, and in a hot-bed of repeal at that time, and it was the hot-bed of secession and the hot-bed of repeal that gave vitality to that Act disfranchising a section of the community in Nova Scotia. It was the hot-bed of secession, it was the hot-bed of repeal, it was the hot-bed of anti-federalism, that caused that Act to be retained, as it is retained to-day in that province. The question was asked in this House, whether the fourth section of the Act of 1871 is still in force in Nova Scotia? I say that it is in force, and that it prohibits those voters not only from voting at an election, but it prohibits their names from being placed upon the list. The occurrences in this House this afternoon are a strong argument in favour of having a man of a trained legal mind to act as reviser, for even the lawyers in this House are at variance as to the correct interpretation of the Nova Scotia franchise law. We

have the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) disputing with some hon. members on this side, and although there is no man more eminent in the law in the province from which I come, on that side of the House, still he is at variance with other able lawyers as to who, under the Act, can be placed on the voters' lists of Nova Scotia. If that is the case with lawyers, how will it be with ignorant revisers who know nothing about the law, but who are partisans above everything else; ignorant so far as the law is concerned, having knowledge in their own spheres of life, but being ignorant of the law, being partisans, being always in doubt, they look to their ward heelers who want to get men on or off the list, and so they do exactly as the machine politicians dictate to them. If you have a man who can intelligently review these lists, a man who understands how to properly interpret the law and has the courage of his convictions, then you will have a proper voters' list. The right hon. the Premier has stated that it is the policy of his Government to have the franchises regulated by the different provinces because, as he says, the provincial legislatures understand better the local conditions. I do not know but that he also stated that they knew who were sufficiently well educated to vote for the return of a member to this Parliament. He made the reference, at all events, to the Indians, and if that expression will apply to the Indians, it must apply to those disfranchised electors in Nova Scotia. Not only are some of these men kept off the lists, but many are called to halt when they go to the polls by that disqualification oath, and will any one tell me that these men are not intelligent enough to vote at an election, in the interests of the country. If this Bill passes in its present form, it will be one of the most degrading laws that was ever enacted in this Parliament. Sir, we are taking a long stride in retrogression if we put such a law upon the Statute-book. In 1892, or 1893, I brought to the notice of this House that most disgraceful franchise law of Nova Scotia, and I endeavoured to get Parliament to pass a retaliatory measure which would prohibit all local officials from voting at a Dominion election, so that the local government might be forced to remove the disfranchising clause which prohibited Dominion officials in Nova Scotia from voting at provincial elections. The Minister of Finance, to a certain extent, was correct when he said that the province of Nova Scotia enacted no law prohibiting any man in Nova Scotia from voting for a member of the Federal Parliament. They had no power to do that, but they did enact a law preventing the names of Dominion officials being placed upon the list, and disqualifying them from voting at the provincial elections, and, Sir,

that very same law is engrafted in this Bill now before the House. So, if this Bill passes, the Parliament of Nova Scotia will have enacted a law which will prohibit Dominion officials in Nova Scotia from voting for candidates for this House. I think it is the duty of this side of the House to give this Bill a most decided opposition—a continued opposition, if you will. I believe that a good, fair, square, substantial Act could be enacted in this House. Let men get together and meet each other as men, and enact a Franchise Act that will do justice to all. Then, it will be a credit to this House and a credit to this country. The right hon. leader of the House points to the United States of America as an example of allowing the states to regulate the franchise for the federal parliament. To be sure it does; but it keeps a control over that franchise. Did it not do so when the fifteenth amendment was passed, calling into the voting arena the black population of the United States? That was entirely against the feeling of a great number of the Southern States but still the federal parliament passed that amendment; and there were other Acts, which I cannot just now remember, passed by the federal parliament of the United States, whereby it showed its control over the franchises of the different states under which members to the federal house were returned. I believe we would be doing something degrading if we gave to other parliaments the responsibilities and duties that are specially our own. It would be entirely a retrograde step, and I protest as strongly as I possibly can against any such transaction as this. There are a great many iniquities in this Bill, which should be amended; but there is no clause that should be more particularly amended than the clause we have under consideration at the present time.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). With regard to the observations of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), I may say that, however much I admired the melody of his voice, and the very strong points he appeared to be making, in his own estimation, I did not rise equal to applauding him with the vehemence that some other hon. gentlemen did. The fact of the matter is I did not applaud him at all. While on my feet, I may say, with regard to the application of the Franchise Act in the province of Nova Scotia that I have been for sixteen years a member of the municipal council of Inverness, upon which body among other duties devolved the duty of applying the Franchise Act of the province. I am not a lawyer and therefore cannot join in the disputation which the hon. member for Annapolis declared was being waged between the lawyers in this House. I was one of the members of a body whose duty it was to apply the law, and not to dispute with regard to this, that, or any other phase of

it. We read it as we thought it was our duty to read it, and applied it according to the purpose for which the legislature of Nova Scotia passed it. Our application of the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia was this. That Act conferred the right to vote, upon the basis of a property qualification, an income qualification; and a qualification consisting of both combined. The assessors prepared the first instalment of the electoral lists, and then posted up their lists so prepared in three public places in the various electoral districts. The revisers then took these lists and copied therefrom all names opposite which they found the requisite amount of property stated. These revisers did not know or could not be supposed to know whether these names were the names of Dominion officials or not. The next step was that any person finding that he had the requisite qualification made application to the revisers to have his name placed upon the list within a fixed date. The revisers again were not supposed to know whether these applicants received their income from the Dominion Government, from the local government, from a private corporation, or from an individual. It was not the business of the revisers to know this at all, nor did they ever, to my knowledge, take the trouble to know it. The revisers met at a time fixed by statute and received these applications, and there and then took down this list as the list of electors qualified to vote at municipal elections, and at elections for members of the legislature. I ask the hon. leader of the Opposition or the hon. member for Annapolis where was the right of any of these revisers to leave off any of the names of the applicants I have indicated? What proof, for example, could they furnish that this, that, or the other person was a Dominion official? All they required to know was that they possessed the necessary property or income qualification to entitle them to vote. The lists were then made up in this manner, comprising these two sets of qualified electors. When a municipal election took place, all whose names were on the list went to the polls to vote. If there was then any disqualification, under the Act of the legislature, the question of the disqualification came up in the polling booth. In the same manner, when the elections for the local legislature came off, the very same lists were applied, and again, if there was any disability under the Act, the challenge could be made in the polling booth. For example, in the year 1882, a provincial and a Dominion election took place in Nova Scotia. The lists then made by the municipal authorities were the lists upon which the Dominion elections were contested. The elector whose name was on both lists went into both booths on the same day; he would first go into the booth for the local legislature and poll his vote, and then go into the booth for the Dominion Parliament and poll his vote there

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness).

also; and it was left to the candidate whom he opposed, or his agent, to object to his vote on the ground that he was a Dominion official. I therefore cannot see for a moment where the great hardships depicted by the hon. member for Annapolis would come in, nor can I see, for the life of me, where the iniquities charged by the hon. leader of the Opposition came in. I represent a constituency comprising 27,000 of a population and with over 6,000 electors, and I have contested several elections there, Dominion and local, and in all my experience I never yet knew of an instance of a Dominion official being kept off the voters' lists. I have known of a few instances of such electors being challenged in the booths, but I never knew of an instance of a name being kept off the lists by the revisers in that constituency. So far as my knowledge goes, then, and I claim considerable acquaintance during that long term of service in the municipal council of Inverness, with the working of the Franchise Act in that constituency, and also considerable acquaintance with the work in other municipalities throughout the province, and I have never yet heard of a different order of things existing in any of these. Therefore I, for one, have no hesitation in declaring that the people of Nova Scotia are perfectly willing to have the franchises, Dominion, local and municipal, held in their own hands. If, for instance, an Indian in the province of Ontario desired to vote, as appears to be the case, from the memorials read in this House this evening, the people of Ontario would certainly have a better right to declare whether he should have the right to vote for the election of a member to this House than the people of Nova Scotia or any other province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). That is exactly what this Bill now before Parliament seeks to bring about, namely, that every elector in every province shall have the right to declare who is entitled to vote for a representative from that province to this House. As the right hon. leader of the House has very truly said, this has been the order of things for nineteen years, and from my knowledge of the history of that time, in the province from which I come, I feel satisfied that there was no justification for this Parliament passing a Dominion Franchise Act, owing to any difficulty existing in the application of the Nova Scotia franchise law. I therefore have no hesitation in supporting the Bill now before the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, asked me a question, and I propose to answer it very briefly. He asked me on what ground I challenged the mode in which they constructed the lists in Nova Scotia. He took up all the time in which he spoke in informing the House that he did not know how

to discharge the duties with which he was vested as a revising officer.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Not as revising officer, but as municipal councillor, having the right to appoint those who applied the law.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well, he went on to state that he had been engaged in preparing the lists of voters.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Not at all. I said that I was a municipal councillor, and as such had the right to appoint those who applied the Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman occupied the time of the House in speaking of something that is not under consideration at all. No one has been questioning the right of a municipal councillor to put all the parties, qualified by law, on the assessment roll.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). If the hon. gentleman puts it in that way, I am afraid I am not alone in my opinion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So far as the duties of the revisers go, they are laid down in this Act, and this Act shows that the revisers are bound, in making up the lists, to leave off the name of every man who is disqualified by the law of Nova Scotia from voting for a member of the House of Assembly. That law declares that the names of such men shall not be put on the list. It instructs them to leave these names off the list. Therefore, what he might have done in the discharge of his duty as municipal councillor we have nothing to do with. That is not the question before the House. The question is that of the voters' lists, and if he is not speaking of what he did in the character of a reviser, what he said had nothing whatever to do with the subject under discussion. The question we are discussing is whether, in the construction of the voters' lists, the revisers may put on the names of parties who are disqualified by the law of Nova Scotia.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Will the hon. gentleman answer this question? Let us suppose he was a reviser himself, and that he was given a list by the assessor, how could he determine in revising that list and checking over the names of persons with the required property qualifications, that certain of these persons were Dominion officials.

Mr. MILLS. The party machine would tell him in every county.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). How is he to determine which of these were Dominion officials, and which were not?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a matter of notoriety who are Dominion officials. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he or the reviser in the county of Inverness

did not know who were postmasters in the municipality and who were customs officers, and so on.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Let us suppose that there were a half dozen people of the same name, how could the reviser tell which one of those was a postmaster or a customs officer? There might, for instance, be half a dozen John Macdonalds.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) made one important statement in the first speech he made tonight. He said that, as proof of the fairness of the lists made in Nova Scotia previous to 1895, that the same lists were used in every constituency, both for local and federal elections. I am informed by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) that in his county such was not the case, but that a separate list was made for the local elections and a different list for the federal elections, and that in the list for the federal elections, the officials disqualified by the Nova Scotia Act, enumerated in the memorandum attached to this Act by the Solicitor General, were kept off the list prepared for the federal elections. If that be so, Sir, then the argument of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) loses its foundation, and the basis of his argument being gone his conclusion is quite unjustified.

Mr. McLENNAN. I mentioned the lists of 1882.

Mr. McINERNEY. I said that. But that does not weaken the point I made, because the Dominion Franchise Act was only enacted in 1885. So that, in 1882, or 1879, what ever year you take previous to 1885, it reduces the hon. gentleman's argument to an absurdity. He says that the lists were fair because the same lists were used in both elections, the federal and local. Now, I am informed, and believe that the information is correct, and the hon. gentleman does not contradict it, that in the constituencies of Nova Scotia one list was made for local elections and a totally different one for federal elections, and in the federal lists the names of Dominion officials disqualified by the provincial law, did not appear.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire, with the hon. member's permission, to ask a question.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) has made about half a dozen speeches on this subject so far.

Mr. RUSSELL. And how many has the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInerney) made?

Mr. McINERNEY. This is the only one. I have risen several times, but have always given way, notably to the hon. member for Inverness. I rose before he did and

caught the Chairman's eye, but at the Chairman's instance, I allowed the hon. gentleman to speak. Now, I propose to say what I have to say in as brief a way and in as fair a way as possible. I think I have met the only statement of importance put forward by the hon. member for Inverness. If the conclusion that he drew was based upon it, it must be erroneous.

Now, the Prime Minister threw a new bone of contention into this debate. He is the first to announce the doctrine that to the local legislatures belongs the franchise. I would ask him if he states that as a constitutional principle or as a question of policy. I would like the hon. gentleman to state what ground he takes. He surely cannot seriously state, in the presence of many lawyers in this House, in the presence of men who know the constitution of their country, in the presence of the intelligent members of this House, such a doctrine as this as a constitutional doctrine. For, it is a complete absurdity, it is known to be utterly foreign to the facts, it is known to be completely erroneous. His statement was applauded by members on the back benches, but not by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), not by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), not by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), not by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), not by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), not by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister). There was not a lawyer of standing on that side who cheered this doctrine announced for the first time in this House, announced for the first time before any serious deliberative body in Canada, announced for the first time before sensible men—the doctrine that to the local legislatures belongs the franchise of the country. That is an entirely erroneous constitutional doctrine. This Parliament certainly has the power to say what shall be the franchise upon which members shall be elected to this House. Does the hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) deny that? I am not here to say that we cannot delegate that power to the local legislatures. It may be that my right hon. friend may take the other horn of the dilemma and claim that it is true as a matter of policy. But if he should stand up in this House and enunciate the doctrine—that it is the constitutional right of the local legislatures to control the franchise, I deny it most emphatically, and I do not believe there is a lawyer even on his own side of the House who will endorse his statement. I shall be surprised, astonished, if there is a single gentleman on the other side, of legal training, or a man of common sense, who will stand up and enunciate the doctrine that to the local legislature and to them alone belongs the right to declare what the franchise shall be upon

Mr. McINERNEY.

which the members of the Canadian Parliament shall be elected. But if he takes the ground that it is a matter of policy, then the hon. gentleman is turning back the hands of the clock, he is making a retrograde movement. I understand that the Liberal party has claimed to be a party of progress. Who ever heard of the Liberal party in England, for instance, passing laws to restrict the franchise. I have never heard of it. Why, it was the boast of Mr. Gladstone, it was the boast of the Liberal party in England that they had extended the franchise and had given it to many who had never possessed it before. But hon. gentlemen opposite have made a retrograde movement. Why, will hon. gentlemen opposite name to me a single confederated country in the world in which there is not uniformity of franchise or in which the power to control the franchise does not rest with the federal authority?

The PRIME MINISTER. Do you say that seriously?

Mr. McINERNEY. I ask it most seriously. In the republic of Switzerland is it not provided that there is uniformity of franchise and with the central government lies the power to say what it shall be. In the German confederation is not the same thing true, and in the old North German confederation was not the same thing true? I can give the hon. gentleman the sections of the constitutions of these countries on which I rely, because I have them under my hand. They show that in every case it is declared that the franchise shall be uniform or that the central government shall have the power to control the franchise. On this side of the Atlantic, in the republic of Brazil, the United States of Brazil—because it is a federated country—the same rule and doctrine holds as in these older countries that I have mentioned. Now, the hon. gentleman may point out to me the case of the United States of America. In the United States of America there is a general provision that every citizen of twenty-one years of age shall have the franchise. I am not here to maintain that in some particulars and in some instances, certain restrictions are not put on individuals claiming the franchise in certain states, or that in certain other states they have not enlarged the franchise locally, that is beyond the general principle as recognized, as, for instance, in Wyoming, where they allow women to vote.

But, Sir, in the United States of America the general principle of the constitution is that every citizen 21 years of age shall have a vote. But there is an important difference between the principle underlying their constitution and that underlying ours. In the United States it is well known that every power which is not expressly stated in the constitution as belonging to the federal authority, belongs to the state authorities;

while with us the opposite principle prevails, that every power that is not expressly stated in the constitution to belong to the local authority, belongs to the federal authority. So there is one reason why we in Canada should go further in the direction in maintaining federal control over the franchise than they have gone in the United States. I am, therefore, surprised that the right hon. gentleman should have enunciated the constitutional doctrine, if it is a constitutional doctrine, that to the local authorities in this Dominion belongs the right to control the franchise of the country. I am the more surprised that having announced this as the policy of the Liberal party, he should then seek to turn back the hands on the dial and to restrict the franchise by giving control of it over to the different provinces. Now, Sir, I sympathise heartily with the views expressed by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister). I believe the hon. member for Lambton is thoroughly sincere in the views which he has put forward. He has called timely attention to the fact that the Liberal party of Canada pledged itself to this country for many long years that when they got into power they would repeal the Franchise Act of 1895 and amending Acts. They protested vigorously against the enactment of that Act, and from that time down to the last general election they had not ceased to protest vigorously against what they call the iniquities of the Franchise Act of 1895. Sir, I am here to admit that it was part of their duty, and I praise them for it, now to carry out that pledge, that plank in their platform. I say they are bound to carry it out; and when an hon. gentleman flung the charge across the House at me that I was holding out a threat in saying that this Act would not pass this Parliament, and that I was implying that another body would throw it out, that was the furthest thing from my mind and I cannot see how I could have been so entirely misunderstood. When I made that statement I was interrupted by an hon. gentleman from the other side of the House who asked me: Where will it be defeated? and I replied: In this Chamber. Therefore, when the hon. gentleman charged me with threatening that this Bill would be thrown out in some other Chamber, he entirely misunderstood me. I do not believe in that policy, with regard to this Bill. I am not here to say what the duty of any branch of this Parliament may be in regard to this or any other Bill. I believe that each branch of this Parliament is free to do as it pleases with regard to any piece of legislation. But I am free to say that since the Liberal party of Canada put the plank in their platform that they would repeal the Franchise Act of 1895, I think it is their duty to do so. I think in that respect they represent the voice of the people of this country—I freely admit that. Why, Sir, it would be strange if I did not admit it. It may not be interesting to this House for me to explain my

own position with regard to the Franchise Act of 1895. However, I may be allowed to remind the House, and I do so in no boasting spirit, that when I first came into this Chamber in 1893, I was honoured by an invitation to move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. At that time, although there was no mention of the Franchise Act in the Speech from the Throne, I departed from the matter of that Speech and took occasion to declare that I was in favour of the repeal of the Franchise Act as it then existed. But if the Liberal party is held to fulfil its pledges to repeal the Franchise Act, it does not follow, and I think the hon. member for Lambton will agree with me here, that in repealing that Act it is necessary to enact this one. The repeal of the Franchise Act of 1895 does not necessarily mean the enactment of such a piece of legislation as this. I am willing to say that the Solicitor General has done his best in a difficult situation in endeavouring to frame this Bill, but I am also bold to state, after a careful study of this Act, that I do not believe it ever came under the consideration of all the hon. gentlemen representing the different provinces in the Government. Does the Minister of Railways and Canals, for instance, tell me that he considered this Bill and helped to frame it in its present shape? I can tell him that in his own province some sections of it are perfectly unworkable, and I think he knows it. Why, he himself, when he was Attorney General of New Brunswick, passed an Act dividing the parish of Dundas, in the county I represent, all the electors in which had previously voted at one poll, and which formed one subdivision at local elections. He cut off a small part of that parish, and made a separate subdivision, but he made no further provision, and when the local elections followed soon after, the sheriff and returning officer did not know what to do. The returning officer wired the hon. gentleman to get his opinion as to what he should do in the premises, and I may say that the hon. gentleman had no opinion to give him at that time, and could not tell him what to do. There was no lawyer in the country that could tell him what to do, because the law dividing the parish had made no provision allowing the returning officer to make a separate list for each subdivision, and left him completely in the dark. With that instance before us, I cannot believe, therefore, that the Minister of Railways and Canals, the former Attorney General of New Brunswick, helped to frame a Bill of this kind in which it is provided that the subdivisions for the local elections shall be taken for the Dominion elections, and that the lists for those subdivisions shall be used for Dominion elections. Let me tell the Solicitor General that in the parish of Dundas and in the parish of Wellington, in my county, there are from 900 to 1,000 votes in each of these parishes, and all have to vote at one poll. If you are going

to take the local subdivisions for Dominion elections, how are you going to get 900 or 1,000 voters to vote at one poll in one day? How can we suppose, therefore, that the former Attorney General of New Brunswick, with the circumstances in his mind that I have just mentioned, has had this Bill under his consideration, and has approved it? I do not believe that this Bill has ever come before Council for their serious consideration at all. Now, when the Liberal party went to work to repeal the Franchise Act, I would have imagined that they would have gone in a forward direction instead of taking a backward movement. I would have imagined that the Liberal party of Canada, having in its ranks such men as the Minister of Railways and Canals, having in its ranks such men as the present Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, who was until recently a member of the Government, having in its ranks such men as the Minister of Finance and other eminent gentlemen from the various provinces who have in days gone by enacted manhood suffrage—I would have imagined, I say, that a Liberal Government composed of such men, would have brought down some enlarged measure, instead of bringing down a measure to restrict the franchise, such as this measure undoubtedly does.

Why, Sir, with such men in the ranks as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis), who as long ago nearly as I can remember him on the floor of the local legislature of New Brunswick raised his voice in season and out of season, session after session, in favour of manhood suffrage, how comes it that the Liberal party, instead of adopting the principle of manhood suffrage, should have brought in such a piece of legislation as this, which restricts the franchise of the people. It does not restrict it, I hear some one say.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It extends it.

Mr. McINERNEY. Is the franchise of the province of Quebec as broad locally as the old Franchise Act of the Dominion?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. McINERNEY. It will be open to the Solicitor General to prove it. But, at all events, there are many other provinces in which the local franchise is not as broad.

Mr. LISTER. Not at all.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has argued against one restriction.

Mr. LISTER. Simply as regards the Indians.

Mr. McINERNEY. That is one restriction. Non-residents are cut out, Dominion officials and local officials are excluded from voting in many of the provinces. Take these three pages of disqualified persons in the different provinces, attached to the Act by

Mr. McINERNEY.

the Solicitor General, and ascertain what they mean. They mean that a large number of the most enlightened citizens are excluded from the franchise by this new piece of legislation, introduced by the great Liberal party. I am amazed that a party claiming to be a party of progress has not, instead of introducing this restrictive measure, brought in a Bill broadening the franchise of the people; and I am more than astonished that the hon. Prime Minister should, in the face of the constitutions of all the federated countries, South American, and others, and in the face of the principle, which is the basic principle of our constitution, which retains to the federal authorities all powers not given specifically to the local legislatures, have declared that as a matter of principle and law the local authorities have a right to control the franchise. I am more than amazed. I am astounded and surprised that as a question of party policy the hon. gentleman should declare that he will hand over to the local authorities the preparation of the lists and allow them as they please to regulate the franchise on which the members representing both political parties in Canada will be elected.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Amendment lost.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not yet ready to vote, and two hon. gentlemen were on their feet. The Chairman must cast his eyes around the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. I looked around.

Mr. FOSTER. I must protest against the amendment being declared either lost or carried.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no objection to my hon. friend going on. The Chairman did not see anybody rise.

Mr. FOSTER. We saw them.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then I hope the hon. gentleman will proceed.

Mr. FOSTER. I was going to rise to my feet, but I did not like to take the place of the Solicitor General or the member for Halifax. I kept my place, thinking the Chairman would look around the Chamber.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. member has no right to speak in this way about the Chairman. He acted in good faith. There is no intention whatever to curtail the discussion. I hope the hon. gentleman will proceed, and I shall be glad to hear him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no desire to intimate that the Chairman did anything but discharge the duty, but it is absolutely necessary while discussion is going on and two hon. members on their feet, that a motion should not be declared lost or carried.

The PRIME MINISTER. Go on.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to say a few words—

Mr. FOSTER. I gave way to the member for Halifax and the Solicitor General. I have two or three words to say, although the discussion has taken a wide range, and it would almost appear as if there was nothing more to be said on the question. The first point to which I wish to call the attention of the House and the country is the divergence of sentiment and opinion between the members of the Government themselves. I think that has been most marked. I want to ask the Solicitor General now, after the events of the last hour or two have transpired, if he is prepared to rise and reiterate his pledge to the House that they are taking into consideration the remedying of what we consider to be a grievance, that gentlemen who in Nova Scotia now have the Dominion franchise will, if this Act is passed, on the principle on which the Prime Minister declared it must be passed, be disfranchised—if he will stand up now and say he has under consideration a measure for giving those gentlemen their votes. Will the hon. gentleman answer me that question?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What I understood from the Minister of Finance was that some such measure was in contemplation.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt it was in contemplation, and no doubt until the First Minister placed himself directly in the face of two responsible colleagues, one of whom has charge of the Bill, it was contemplated in good faith that such a measure should be carried out. Will it be carried out now? Will the Solicitor General be as brave as his words were two or three hours ago?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not go back on my words.

Mr. FOSTER. I believe the hon. Solicitor General wanted to do what was honest and right. I want, however, to put to the leader of the House this simple question: What right has he to take away from gentlemen, just as well educated as himself, just as good in every respect as himself, a franchise which they have enjoyed and hold as one of the most precious rights of citizenship? The hon. gentleman, simply to carry out a fantastic theory, which my hon. friend (Mr. McInerney) showed a moment ago has no reason in the constitution and is doubtful on the question of policy, presumed to say that, in order to carry out that pedantic and fantastic fancy or theory, which has no foundation in the constitution, he will ruthlessly take away the right of the franchise from one thousand men in Nova Scotia and two or three thousand in Quebec and in other provinces of the Dominion, any one of whom is in every respect as free as is the

hon. gentleman so far as citizenship is concerned.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. So far as regards Quebec there is no disqualification which does not exist under the Franchise Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I will come to that by-and-by.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You are at it now.

Mr. FOSTER. I will reach it before I sit now; but I want to carry out my theory. The Solicitor General will not deny that my general assertion was correct, that there are probably thousands of gentlemen of high intelligence and standing in the community to-day have the right to vote for their friends and exercise the right of citizenship in giving that vote in the different provinces of this Dominion; who, if the theory of the Prime Minister is carried out, will from the moment this Bill becomes law be deprived of that right of franchise. Am I right or wrong in that? There is no gentleman in this House who will deny that assertion. In the explanations the Government have attached to their own Bill, there is a list of disqualifications greater than you can find in any Franchise Act in any other Anglo-Saxon country.

Mr. FLINT. They are not disqualified to vote for members of the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. So my hon. friend says, but what are we attempting to pass in this House. We are attempting to pass a Dominion Franchise Act to settle who shall be eligible to vote for Dominion representatives, and the list that is printed here is to inform us who, as far as the provincial lists now go, are disqualified from going upon these lists. Am I right or wrong in that? The Prime Minister says that there shall not be a cross over a "T" or a dot over an "I" different from the local voters' lists.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster)—

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) want to make another little speech?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; only to ask a little question.

Mr. FOSTER. A little question of half an hour long.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, not long at all, and I feel confident that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) with his long parliamentary experience and great ability will not be so sensitive as the gentleman behind him (Mr. McInerney) with regard to my asking him a question. I want to know if there is anything in the law of Nova Scotia as it stands, which prevents Dominion officials from being put upon the lists? The point the

hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) makes is, that certain people in the province of Nova Scotia who ought to be voters are disqualified from being put upon the list, and I ask him if it is his reading of the statute, that any person, or taking the matter in the concrete, that Dominion officials as such are disqualified from being put upon the lists of voters in the province of Nova Scotia. I distinguish, remember, between being put upon the list and being capable of voting. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has acumen enough to see that.

Mr. FOSTER. I will take my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) upon one ground first, and then go to the other. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) think that it is a dignified position for him to take as a representative of the people, to argue about a mere quibble?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, is my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) attaching any weight at all to the question he put?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I am.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose that the wrong man gets upon the list, and suppose that when the man comes up to vote some one is there who knows he ought not to be upon the list and puts the oath to him or challenges him, can he vote?

Mr. RUSSELL. My hon. friend knows—

Mr. FOSTER. Can he vote?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, he cannot vote at a provincial election if he is challenged.

Mr. FOSTER. He cannot vote if he is challenged.

Mr. RUSSELL. Excuse me for one moment. Surely my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), who is a sharp reasoner sees exactly the fallacy he is endeavouring to impose upon this House. Is it not altogether a different thing, the right to be put upon the list which we say is going to be the list of voters for the Dominion Parliament, and the right to vote in a local election although being upon the list when the party is challenged and his vote is prevented from being recorded. Surely my hon. friend cannot fail to see that difference. Suppose that under this Bill, as we understand it,—and if there is any obscurity in it, it can be made plain—suppose that every person whose name is put upon the list is to be eligible as a voter for a member of the Dominion Parliament, and suppose also we say that as a matter of legal contention, and construction, and universal practice in the province of Nova Scotia, every person who possesses the necessary property or income qualification is to be upon the list notwithstanding the fact that he may be a Dominion official, does my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) say that any Dominion official will be disqualified by the operation of this clause?

Mr. RUSSELL.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) say they are not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I will certainly say they are not intended to be disqualified.

Mr. MILLS. The intention and the fact are different things.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not wish to deal with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) now as it is not my intention to take the floor from the ex-Minister of Finance, but I do want an opportunity of explaining this matter. Surely my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) did not listen to the explanation given a while ago, namely, that the very clause of the statute of 1871 which did prevent these persons from being put upon the lists was expressly repealed, by the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, and ever since 1885 they have had the right to be put on the lists. If we adopt that list as the basis of the Dominion franchise they can only be disfranchised by putting some oath to them which will disqualify them. Of course in local elections there is an oath which can be put to them and which disqualifies them. It is for us to say whether we shall have the disqualification here or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) through now?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Entirely through.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, he has made speech No. 10 as a sort of interpolation between the speeches of other hon. gentlemen when they are trying to put their views before the House. Now, Sir, to commence where I left off when my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) interrupted me, I make again this assertion, that what the Prime Minister proposes to do is to say that the provincial lists shall be the lists upon which Canadian electors shall vote for Dominion representatives. That is a ground I suppose we all agree upon. Then I go to the lists themselves. I do not go any further for the present than the information which I have here, and I take what the Government itself gives for our information as to who are qualified to be put upon the list and who are not. I find then with reference to Nova Scotia to take a concrete instance, the classes of persons who are declared to be disqualified and are not eligible to go upon the lists.

Mr. RUSSELL. Who do you say they are?

Mr. FOSTER. I will give them to the hon. gentleman, or he can read them for himself at page 6 of the appendix to the Bill. These are they:

Any one who, within fifteen days before the election, was an employee or in receipt of wages or emoluments of any kind as such employee, in the post office, the custom-house, the Inland

Revenue Department, the lighthouse service, on the Government railroads, in the Crown lands office, or the local public works and mines.

These are the persons who are enumerated and all these are disqualified.

Mr. RUSSELL. From what ?

Mr. FOSTER. From going upon the list.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, they are disqualified from voting.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, in the local elections in Nova Scotia.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, if they are disqualified from voting, can they go on the list ?

Mr. RUSSELL. They must go on the list.

Mr. FOSTER. Why must they go on the list ?

Mr. RUSSELL. Because the law puts them on the list.

Mr. FOSTER. The law puts them on the list then, and the law explicitly states that they are disqualified from voting.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the kind of law you have in Nova Scotia ?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, that is exactly the kind of law we have.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it is worse than I thought it was. It is an immoral law ; it is a cheat ; it is a fraud. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) says that they have a law in Nova Scotia which in the first place declares that certain men are disqualified to vote, and in the second place puts them upon the list as if to tell them that they can vote. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) think that that is an honest law ?

Mr. RUSSELL. Have you not many men on your lists who cannot vote, if challenged ?

Mr. FLINT. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) allow me ?

Mr. FOSTER. No. I cannot be interrupted any longer. I will have the whole horde interrupting me if I allow it to continue. The pertinacious member from Halifax (Mr. Russell) is all I can get along with. He is up on his feet every two or three minutes, and as he knows something of what he is talking about as a rule, I will take his interruptions as best I can. So much with reference to Nova Scotia. The contention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) is that disqualified men can get upon the list, and if that be so there is something very wrong with the machinery, and if they do get upon the list when they come to vote they cannot vote, for if there are sharp men at the poll they will challenge that vote. And there will be sharp men at the poll who will challenge that vote ; party

men on both sides are there for that purpose and they will do it. The absolute actual effect will be that at the voting these men will be disqualified from voting. The oath will be put to them there, they will be objected to, and they will be unable to vote. Now, Sir, we are on the same ground on these terms. Therefore, I say the absolute effect in the ultimate resort will be this, that in Nova Scotia that class of people cannot vote for a Dominion representative, and are consequently disqualified entirely. We cannot but agree on this point, that under the existing law they are not qualified to vote ; my hon. friend will not deny that ; so that when this Bill becomes law, these gentlemen, thousands of them, who to-day are qualified to vote, will then be disqualified to vote. Now, I ask what right has my right hon. friend or a majority of this House to disfranchise thousands of the citizens of this country, just as intelligent as we are who sit and vote in this House ? I say that this is a retrograde movement ; that it is unjust ; and although there may be the mechanical majority to force it through the House, it does not lose one iota of its injustice or one shade of its retrograde character. My hon. friend the Solicitor General saw that, and he sees it yet, and in the course of the afternoon's debate he was quite willing to take that matter into consideration, with the view of preserving the right of the intelligent white voter who to-day in the different provinces has the franchise, prizes it, considers it a part of his citizenship, and will feel aggrieved if deprived of it. I can go to other provinces and show the same thing to exist there. My hon. friend has said that in the province of Quebec there are no persons to-day qualified to vote on a provincial franchise basis, who will be disqualified if this Act is put through. I do not think my hon. friend is right in that ; let us see. We find the list of disqualifications in Quebec at present on page 6.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I was speaking of Dominion officials.

Mr. FOSTER. I am speaking of voters. Does my hon. friend rest his case simply on Dominion officials ? He does not deny that people vote there to-day in a Dominion election who would not be qualified to vote in a Dominion election if this Bill becomes law.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL. The employees of the local government are disqualified under the local Act passed by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) two years ago. Among the Dominion officials there is not a single disqualification.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not concerned as to who passed the Act. Now, I have what

my hon. friend means. He means that the province of Quebec is different from the province of Nova Scotia in that in the province of Quebec the Dominion officials are not as Dominion officials disqualified; but he does not go so far as to say that there are not electors in Quebec possessing the franchise to-day and voting in Dominion elections who could not vote in Dominion elections after this Bill passes.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no difference then between us on that point. Then, where is the rule or reason for disfranchising such gentlemen as these? Because a man in Quebec or in any other province happens to be the agent of a local candidate in a local election, where is the right or reason for depriving him of his vote for a Dominion representative in a Dominion election? And yet, if this Bill becomes law, every man who has been an agent for a local candidate is disfranchised because of that fact. Can anybody give a reason for it? These gentlemen are not connected with the Dominion Government in the least; they are simply agents for an entirely different election, and may be for an entirely different party, they are intelligent men and good citizens. By what right are they deprived of their vote? Then, we will come to the officers of customs. In some of the provinces the officers of customs are upon the disqualified list, so far as the provincial lists go. To-day these officers of customs, amongst the most intelligent classes of our people, vote for Dominion representatives. In that, they affirm their citizenship in the wide Dominion, they give emphasis to their intelligence and their moral worth, and they take a deep and abiding interest in the affairs of their country; but are you going to cut off from citizens of that kind the only effective way in which they can register their moral worth, their intelligence, their views with reference to their country's policy and their country's growth? Can any reason at all be given? Take clerks of the peace in all the provinces of the Dominion. What disability has a man, because he is a clerk of the peace in British Columbia or in Nova Scotia that he should be disqualified from casting his vote for a Dominion representative? Clerks of the peace in some provinces of the Dominion, I am not sure but all of them, have a legal training. In order to carry out a mere quixotic idea, which has no foundation in the constitution of this country, you are going to disfranchise every clerk of the peace in some provinces of the Dominion. Take the county Crown attorneys. They have no connection with the Dominion Government. They are the appointees or representatives of a certain power in the provincial legislature. They are disqualified by provincial enactments from voting for provincial representatives and there may

Mr. FOSTER

be some reason for that; but what reason is there for depriving them of the right to vote for Dominion representatives? They have no connection at all with the Department of Justice or the Government here. Take registrars in the same way; take deputy clerks of the Crown; take agents for the sale of Crown lands and Crown timber agents in all the provinces. Because they happen to be agents of local authority, they are debarred from voting in another electoral sphere with which they have no official connection whatever. There might be a good reason why a Crown timber agent in a province, receiving his appointment directly from the Minister who is administering that department, should be debarred from voting in the province; there may be a reason; I do not admit it; but if there is any reason for that, there is no reason why such a man should be debarred from voting in the wider arena of the Dominion. Take postmasters, take stipendiary magistrates, take police magistrates, take district magistrates as a whole; if I am not misinformed, in some provinces they are put upon the prohibited list of the province. The magistrates of the country selected presumably because they are able and efficient—I am not going to say that that always holds good, but we are bound to stand to the theory that the dispensers of justice are men of intelligence, men of standing, men of general worth and good citizens—yet you are going to disfranchise them. They now vote, they will not be able to vote hereafter. Go through the whole list. The collectors of provincial revenue—how many are there? Why, they are legion, but no collector of provincial revenue in some of the provinces, if this Bill is passed, will be able to vote for a Dominion representative. The district magistrates I have already mentioned. Then there are the officers and men of the provincial police; and in Quebec, for instance, you disfranchise them. To-day they have the right to vote, the right to influence public opinion and public policy, and so contribute to the commonwealth and the progress and stability of the country, as a whole, but hereafter they will be deprived of that right. This is a segregated instance, but, at the same time, it is an instance of the rule of right that by this Bill it will be applied all through. The contractors with a local Government will also be disfranchised in some of the provinces. Wherever there is a contractor with a local government, in any line of contract, large or small, they are to be disfranchised under this Bill, in some of the provinces, because they are put upon the prohibited list, through having some connection with the powers that be in those provinces in the matter of bargain and sale, in the matter of contract work. These men are to be debarred from voting, on this ground, in an arena in which there is no such intimate relations between them and the Do-

minion Government through the payment for services which is presumably the reason why they are weeded out in the provinces. I have gone barely through the list of disfranchisements that will take place. Why do they take place? Solely because the right hon. leader of the Government feels that the easiest way for him to get out of a piece of perplexing legislation is to shunt off all responsibility for it and leave it to the different provinces, no matter what the principle or methods may be, as far as the provincial franchises are concerned. It requires some brains, some backbone, some mental struggle to bring down a franchise measure and put it through this House for the election of members to this House, and face the varied oppositions which will take place, and make a good law. It is no child's play to make such legislation, and my hon. friend does not propose to undertake it. He sets up a theory which no man in this Dominion but himself can or would attempt to justify, namely, that by constitutional right the franchise of this country should be in the power of the local authorities instead of in the power of this Parliament. He sets up this fantastic doctrine, because he sees that the easiest way is to shove all this troublesome thing off to the local legislatures and have no trouble with it here at all. Simply because we are members of Parliament and a gentleman outside just as good is not, does not give us the right to take away that man's citizenship without good reason. What right have we, because we happen to have the accident of power on our side, to say that he shall no longer be a full citizen? He is performing all his duties, he has not sinned against the moral law or the law of his country, he is a good citizen and an intelligent man, yet simply because by the accident of our being here and having a majority, and because the right hon. gentleman chooses to set up a theory for which there is no foundation, we reserve ourselves the right to take away this man's citizenship. The thing is monstrous. That word is not too strong to characterize such action.

What is the ground on which it is contended that the local government should have the power of fixing the franchise? Where do they get that power? Not in the constitution of this Dominion, for in that constitution it is expressly laid down that the establishment of the franchise shall be within the powers of this Dominion Parliament. If that power were exercised for nineteen years by the local legislatures, it was so exercised by permission of that constitution by permission of this body which has the power, because it is enacted in the constitution that until the Dominion Parliament fixed its basis of franchise, the provincial franchises should be accepted. Five months after confederation was established, this Dominion Parliament—if it had not had more pressing work to do may be, or work that it thought was more pressing to

go on with—could have exercised this right for the whole period of confederation. It allowed instead that right to be exercised by the local legislatures, but when the fulness of time came, it took to itself its own undisputed constitutional right, and fixed the basis of its own franchise. Now, we are to go back simply because an hon. gentleman gets up and says: no matter what the constitution provides, I say that the right of fixing the basis of the franchise for this body belongs to entirely alien and different bodies, who move in different spheres and have different constitutional rights to exercise. Unless a better reason can be given, I make my protest against depriving citizens of the dearest right of citizenship. Is it a light thing to take away a man's franchise? I answer that question by asking another. What better, what more earnest, what more serious, what more bloody work was ever done in the world's history than the work of gaining the power of the franchise. Read the history of every country in its upward progress, and it is the history of its struggle for self-government, for the power to place upon the Statute-book, through its representatives, the views of the people with reference to the policy and the work of governing the country. That is the privilege for which the world has struggled, and it is no light thing to deprive any class of citizens, on a mere arbitrary opinion, of this dearly bought right. I protest against that. Every honest and justice-loving man, in this House will protest against it, and however he may vote, will wish that he did not have to do that.

The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) is not here, but in the course of the afternoon he was as brave as any man I have seen in this House for some time. He declared with the utmost freedom and conviction that he would not subscribe to the principle that by this enactment you should take away from any class the franchise they already enjoyed, and he stood up for the Indian. I sympathize with him for the Indian. Now if he will stand up full of sympathy and courage for the Indian, will he not stand up full of even greater sympathy and courage for the intelligent district magistrate, the intelligent customs officer, the intelligent clerk of the peace and the intelligent registrar in his country who, for his whole political life, has enjoyed his franchise, has given expression to his political principles, has read his political paper, has formed his political views, and has gone up to the consummation of all those to the poll and voted for his representative, and through his representative for his views upon the Government and the history of his country. The hon. gentleman entertains great sympathy for the Indian, who had the franchise given him a few years ago, will he have no word to say for the thousands and tens of thousands of intelligent and high-class white men who will be deprived of the franchise they have exercis

ed for their whole political life since their majority in this country?

Why, Sir, the more you look into this thing the more monstrous—and I use the word advisedly—it seems to be. And what is it done for? For a mere theory and to get rid of a delicate and difficult piece of business, the making of a franchise which shall be properly applicable to the whole Dominion and yield general satisfaction. These gentlemen can tear down the preceding franchise law—they love to do that. And they knew all about it then. But, Sir, it is a difficult thing, after they have torn it down, to construct an edifice as good or better. These architects and carpenters confess that they are unable to do this, and so they turn it over to the cheaper workmen of the different provinces, and say: Put up a hut in every province, we cannot raise a central temple for this Dominion. Now, Sir, I do not know that I need to try to find words more strong to characterize this than I have already used. But, Sir, it does seem to me to be inherently necessary, if any parliamentary body is to keep its self respect and its power, that it shall regulate its own franchise. Why, the Solicitor General said this afternoon—and will he say it now after his leader has spoken?—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. He will. Inwardly, I suppose. But whether he will vocally make known the same feeling, I do not know. He said this afternoon: We are not giving up control of the franchise; and if, after we have enacted this plan, we find the local legislation in its transmutations, should change the franchise in a way that we do not think right, we will correct the evil. But the moment you step in to correct, that moment you come against your Prime Minister and leader, for he has declared that it is the inherent and sole right of the local legislatures to fix the franchise. If it is the sole and inherent right of the local legislatures to fix the franchise, what business has this legislature to meddle with it, no matter what the local legislature does? By the hon. gentleman's own theory, he cannot meddle with it—or else he denies himself which, it is true, is not a difficult thing for him to do. But surely he will not attempt that trick every day of the year and on all questions that come up. I ask him, if he makes that assertion and lays down the principle that the local authority ought to be the only repository of power with regard to the franchise, as it has the best knowledge of it and is, therefore, best fitted to fix it, is he going to lay the antagonistic principle alongside of it, and expect them to rest together, that we should interfere with the laws passed by the local authority if at any time they do not please us? No man who has the least idea of logic or consistency could put there two antagonistic principles together. And so the right hon.

Mr. FOSTER.

gentleman and the Solicitor General cannot occupy the same chair in this respect, because the Solicitor General declares in the first place that he would like—and is only considering the method—to remove the grievance as to the white voters, and if the local legislatures does not do what is right, we will step in and reform the case to such an extent as it is wrong. But, Sir, what about the independence and self respect of this body, when we look out upon seven different provinces, and find these provinces working fantastic changes with the franchise, changes dictated by party spirit or by what they may consider good principles, it makes no difference which, but which in every case may be totally and diametrically opposed to our convictions upon this matter? We sit here and legislate on a set of conditions which we reprobate and do not consider to be the best, and yet say we keep our self respect. It is impossible to do so, Sir. And if, this year, this Jubilee year, the hon. gentleman has boasted that he has brought a nation to birth, during this same year if he carries this Bill, he can put forth another boast—that after the nation was born, he degraded it by saying that it was not fit to form and frame its own franchise. Sir, the Government must be a unit upon this matter. The Solicitor General must give up that Bill now and let somebody else take it, or the right hon. gentleman must moderate his theory. Which will be done? Neither. Neither, Sir. The Solicitor General will hold on, as he has held on before; and the right hon. gentleman will theorize, as he has theorized before. And both will scrape along drawing their salaries, the Solicitor General feeling that he has not been able to do what his sense of justice prompted him to do, and my right hon. friend will sail along utterly oblivious to whether his theory is right or not, or what wrong he commits to men as good as he, or I, or any of the rest of us, if he can get his fantastic theory of the franchise carried out—the theory that this great body shall have nothing to say with reference to the franchise upon which it exists.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would endeavour, if at all possible, to lift this discussion to the level which it ought to occupy by reason of its importance. I would endeavour, if such a thing were possible, to have this grave question discussed in a quiet and judicial manner. I am afraid, however, that this would be expecting too much from my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who has just taken his seat. The hon. gentleman does not seem to be aware of the many contradictions which are involved in his argument. He laboured, and laboured at great length to prove the malignancy of this Government in taking away the franchise of certain persons in a province if this Bill should become law. He stated, and stated with some warmth, that it was wicked for this Parlia-

ment to attempt to take away the franchise from anybody. What could be dearer to a man, he said, than the right to vote? I will ask, does he so far forget his own past, does not he remember that he was one of those who forced upon Parliament this Franchise Act against which we are now protesting and of which we are now trying to rid the country? Does he not remember that the Act which he helped to place upon the Statute-book took away from hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of men—

Mr. FOSTER. From whom?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will tell him directly. Did not the Government that he supported at that time enact a Franchise Act, which, under the pretense of making uniform the franchise deprive of a vote every man in certain provinces who did not happen to be owners of \$150 worth of property—

Mr. FOSTER. Which province?

The PRIME MINISTER. Or did not happen to be in occupation of real estate to the value of at least \$150? He forced upon Parliament a law which deprived every man of his vote even though he had it by the law of his province, unless he had a property qualification to the amount of \$150. Now at that time British Columbia had manhood suffrage, and by forcing upon British Columbia the Franchise Act of 1895 which he helped to put upon the Statute-book, he committed this very crime with which he charged us a moment ago of depriving men of the right to vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Whom did we deprive of the right to vote in British Columbia?

The PRIME MINISTER. Every man who was not the owner or possessor of property.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has forgotten to read the law.

The PRIME MINISTER. Is it possible the hon. gentleman attempts in that way to deny the proposition I have now made? Is it not a fact that in 1855 British Columbia had manhood suffrage, and that the Opposition of that day protested against the Franchise Act which deprived men in that province of the right to vote unless they were the holders of property to the extent of \$150? But he did it, therefore he was guilty of the crime with which he is now reproaching us. But this shows that we are approaching this subject upon broad principles, and not with the ad captandum arguments with which the hon. gentleman appealed to the committee a moment ago. The hon. gentleman for Kent, N.B. (Mr. McInerney) said a moment ago that he was astonished that a Liberal Government had not endeavoured to enlarge the suffrage instead of restricting it, and he quoted the example of Mr. Gladstone, who, in his days, extended the suffrage. But my hon. friend

knows very well that neither Mr. Gladstone nor any other Liberal statesman of Great Britain ever attempted to force manhood suffrage upon the British people. Now why is it that we do not wish to force the manhood suffrage upon the people of Canada? Why is it that when we, a Liberal Government, are now dealing with this question, we do not adopt the principle of manhood suffrage? There are two reasons for it. In the first place, I want to know why the Liberal statesmen of Great Britain, John Bright, Mr. Cobden or Mr. Gladstone himself, never at any time of their career proposed the adoption of manhood suffrage? Simply because they thought the suffrage ought to be a question of education, simply because every community ought to determine for itself what class of voters should be entrusted with the franchise.

Mr. FOSTER. Which community?

The PRIME MINISTER. The community which has a right to pass the legislation, in our case, the seven communities composing this nation. Now why did not the Reformers of Great Britain, when they enlarged the franchise, as the French did in 1848, at one fell swoop adopt manhood suffrage? Because they thought it better to wait for the influence of education, and to enlarge the franchise gradually until such time as the various classes of the community were ready for a wider franchise. We know that the French nation did otherwise. In 1848, after the proclamation of the second republic, they passed at once from a very restricted franchise to universal manhood suffrage. It is a question to-day whether the French people, in taking that step, acted in the best interests of their country. For my part, Liberal of the Liberals as I am, I do not believe that the French nation acted wisely in 1848 when they gave the right of suffrage to every man, whether he was qualified or not. Now we have the example of the United States, in every state of which to-day manhood suffrage prevails. It was all very well after the establishment of the republic in 1789, when the people of the United States were a small agricultural population, when every man could read and write, when every man was acquainted with the constitution, it tickled the vanity of the American nation to be able to say that every man was a voter, and accordingly they made every man a voter. The system worked well for a time, but in the course of years, when the country was invaded, if I may use that expression, by foreign immigration, at all events, when European immigrants came in in large numbers, many of them illiterate, knowing nothing of the laws of the United States, nor even of their own laws, the principle of universal suffrage began to develop weaknesses, and to-day it is a question whether the United States acted wisely in adopting

universal manhood suffrage. At the present time I think the preponderance of opinion amongst the more educated classes of the United States is to the effect that the American people have prostituted their franchise. Now, Sir, why do I make this argument? Simply to show that the franchise is a question to be determined by every community for itself. There is my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), on the other side of the House. He and I do not agree upon many things, but I would like to know if he would dare to go into the province of Quebec and advocate universal manhood suffrage? Neither my hon. friend from Beauharnois, nor my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), I am sure, would dare advocate the cause of universal manhood suffrage in the province of Quebec.

Mr. MONK. If manhood suffrage is going to be conferred upon the other provinces, I would revendicate it for the province of Quebec. We would be entitled to it, it would be an injustice to deprive us of it.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman is very careful to qualify his admission. If it is to be conferred upon the other provinces, he wants it for the province of Quebec. But he does not want it for its own sake, however. Neither he nor I want it for our province, and that is the reason why I want to leave the question to each province to deal with as it deems best. This is the very foundation principle of this Bill now before the House. If the province of Ontario desires to have manhood suffrage, well and good; let them elect their legislature upon manhood suffrage. We in the province of Quebec will suffer nothing by it. But we in the province of Quebec believe that manhood suffrage is not the correct thing. If, then, we believe it is not best, why in the name of everything that is just should it be imposed upon us by this Parliament? Now, the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney), a moment ago in speaking, did not fairly represent the arguments that I had made. I never pretended that we have not the right to determine the franchise that should elect the members of this House; on the contrary, we have that right, it is vested in us. But I maintain this principle, that in a system of federated government such as we have, it is more in accord with the fitness of things that this right should be determined by the provincial legislature.

Mr. FOSTER. Why?

The PRIME MINISTER. Because the franchise is of the nature of a civil right, not absolutely a civil right, but of the nature of a civil right.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the distinction?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will not give it in my own language, but I will give it in Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

the language of "Story's Commentaries upon the American Constitution." Story says this:

The truth seems to be that the right of voting, like many other rights, is one which, whether it has a fixed foundation in natural law or not, has always been treated in the practise of nations as a strictly civil right, derived from and regulated by each society, according to its own circumstances and interests.

Now in Canada we are seven different communities, we have seven provinces composing this Dominion. Each one has its own system of laws, each one has its own civil rights, each one has to determine what are its civil rights, and how they should be regulated. Now, I do not pretend that, technically, franchise is a civil right; but I say that in the nature of things it belongs to civil rights, and therefore its regulation is a function that belongs to the provincial legislature.

Mr. DAVIN. Does the hon. gentleman mean that civil rights as coming within the jurisdiction of a province?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do mean that. Does my hon. friend mean anything else?

Mr. DAVIN. I will show what I mean in a moment.

The PRIME MINISTER. I mean to say that civil rights, under our constitution, come within the purview of the local legislature, the franchise being of the nature of a civil right, I say should be determined by the local legislature. My hon. friend said a moment ago he had never heard of such a doctrine before. Why, this was the very contention of the Opposition when the Franchise Act was passed. If I may be permitted to go back to the important debate which took place in 1885. I will say that, having had to speak upon this very subject, I was entrusted by my friends with the duty of moving an amendment. On that occasion I used the following language:—

The member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) said yesterday that the regulation of the franchise was a matter which properly came within the attributes of civil rights, and therefore had better be left in the hands of the provinces. I do not contend that we have not the right, constitutionally, to establish a franchise of our own to apply to the whole Dominion; but I say that, according to the spirit of our constitution, the regulation of the franchise is a matter of civil rights, which comes properly within the attributes of the local legislatures.

This is the doctrine we laid down in 1885.

Mr. McINERNEY. Was that the hon. member for St. John?

The PRIME MINISTER. Those were my own words. The reference was to the late Mr. Weldon. That was the language I used and the doctrine I laid down, and it is the doctrine I am now endeavouring to put

into force. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) stated we wanted to get away from the difficulty. Sir, this question is full of difficulties; it is surrounded with difficulties; and no people know it better than hon. gentlemen opposite, since, after a trial of their own law for twelve years, they admitted that they had not found the true solution of the question, and another law was to be desired. Nothing can be more conclusive than that this question is one of very serious difficulties. What should we do? That is the question. We propose a remedy which has in it the merit, if no other merits are visible to the naked eye, that it has been in operation nineteen years and given satisfaction. I propose to revert to it. But I come back to the proposition laid down by the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. McInerney). Suppose we were to adopt manhood suffrage as a principle, would that relieve us of the difficulties? I do not say but that perhaps it would relieve us of some difficulties, but not of all the difficulties of the case. Because if we adopt manhood suffrage as the Dominion franchise, still we would have to provide for the preparation of the lists.

An hon. MEMBER. Registration.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not care whether you call it registration or preparation of the lists; we would have to follow the electors at an expenditure of time and money. If I remember rightly, it is not long ago in this House I heard the system of registration denounced by no less an authority than the leader of the Opposition. He denounced it as in force in Ontario, where it does not apply to all the municipalities, but only in cities and towns. It will be in the recollection of hon. members that the leader of the Opposition on that occasion attacked the system of registration prevailing in towns and cities. If we were to adopt manhood suffrage it would have to be done under a system of registration, and you would have the evils of that system extended all over the country, not only in towns and cities, but in the municipalities. Sir, I repeat what I said a moment ago, this question is one full of difficulties. How are we to meet it? We propose a system which has been in operation for nineteen years here. We propose a system that has been in operation in the United States ever since the establishment of the constitution. If there is anything better to be offered, I should like it now to be offered; but if we are only asked to adopt a system of registration, it will not at all remedy the evil, it will not relieve the expenditure necessary to-day; but if the House adopt the principle of the Bill we propose, we shall have a list prepared without any trouble, without any expenditure, and we will have, I believe, the best system of franchise and preparation of lists the country has had so far. I want to say a word more to my hon. friend, and it

will be my last. The hon. gentleman says if we adopt this Bill we will be abdicating our rights to determine the franchise for the purposes of this Parliament. But we will keep our control over the lists.

Mr. FOSTER. How do we keep control over the lists?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will show it very plainly. When this sovereign Parliament says the lists for elections for this House shall be those of the local legislatures this Parliament exercises its own power as if it were to say we shall have this or that franchise of our own.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question?

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman says that if we use our power to fix these local lists as the lists which shall rule in Dominion elections, do we not abdicate our power to that extent?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. You do not on one condition, and I want to know if the hon. gentleman is prepared to subscribe to that condition. Do you propose after delegating that power to local legislatures and adopting their lists as the franchise list for this Parliament, to say that there shall be no change in those lists by the local legislatures, except by permission of this Parliament on the one side; or do you propose next year to come and take the power out of the hands of those local legislatures? If you do not, you have delegated your power, which you have a right to do, but you have abrogated your power as regards any future usefulness.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is easy for hon. gentlemen opposite to pick flaws and create difficulties, but after all we must suppose there is some reason and conscience in them. Local legislatures are likely to represent the people of the province; they are elected to represent the same people we represent here, and no other people. It is supposed, and it is not a very violent supposition to make, they will exercise that power in the very best interests of their constituents, according to their judgment and light. It is supposed they will adopt the best franchise to suit the province. But I will go further. Let us suppose that everything the hon. gentleman anticipates and dreads will take place, that the legislature will actually be guilty of fraud—I will go as far as fraud—in order to secure power and injure this Parliament, Parliament has always in its own hands the power to meet fraud by counter legislation. It is because we believe and suppose that the local legislatures will act as they have been acting, in the best interests of their own constituents, that we are acting in this way. In 1885 the legislature of the province of Que-

bec was in the hands of the Conservative party. It had been in the hands of the Conservative party ever since confederation, with the exception of two years. But I would not have hesitated to accept the franchise provided by a Conservative legislature in Quebec, because, though there were many things in that franchise, on the whole, to which I would have objected, still as it satisfied the province it would have satisfied me. It is in the same way as regards other provinces. It is possible that the control of the several provinces may pass into the hands of the Conservative party, still on a question of this kind. I am quite disposed, for my part, to accept the franchise prepared by the legislature, whether Liberal or Conservative. But, if the day comes when a fraud is committed against this Parliament, when legislation of a hostile character is brought forward in the legislatures, then it will be always open for this Parliament to resume its own powers, and to enact a franchise law of its own.

Mr. McNEILL. After the mischief has been done.

The PRIME MINISTER. Before the mischief has been done; before the general elections take place.

Mr. McNEILL. Not necessarily.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend will have the right of legislating at all times before a general election, and if it is found there has been fraudulent legislation against the Parliament here, then we have always the power to remedy the evil.

Mr. INGRAM. May I ask the right hon. gentleman a question? Suppose a local election takes place and the legislature meets and passes an Act affecting the representation in this Parliament, and the Dominion Parliament has dissolved and gone to the people, how are you going to remedy that?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is too thin altogether.

Mr. INGRAM. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) knows very well that if a dissolution of this Parliament takes place we will know by that time what are the lists that are in force, and the elections will take place upon the lists that are in force at the time of dissolution, though they should be afterwards altered. That is the law. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would ask our friends on the other side of the House to approach this question in a fair and judicial spirit. We have had two systems of franchise on trial in this country. We had the provincial franchise which lasted for nineteen years, and we have had a Dominion system of franchise which lasted for twelve years. The last system has not given satisfaction, even according to those who were the au-

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

thors of the Act. I ask them to give a new trial to the other system, and if after giving it a new trial—and I am bound to repeat once more that the question is not free from difficulties—they find that the new system does not work any better than the old, then we will have to devote ourselves to the task of framing a better system. I want to ask another question. Do gentlemen on the other side pretend that there must absolutely be a franchise for the provincial Parliaments, and a franchise for the Dominion Parliament? Would it not be far better, as a matter simply of good government, if the elections to this House could be conducted on the local lists, and that the members of this Parliament and the members of the legislature who represent the same body of people, should be elected by the same electors? Is it not better that it should be so? Then, I say, that this system which has been proposed should not be condemned in advance, but a trial should be given to it.

Mr. DAVIN. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in reply to the argument of the ex-Minister of Finance taunted him and his party with disfranchising electors, and when my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) said: How did we disfranchise electors? The right hon. gentleman answered: You did it in British Columbia. Why, Sir, the right hon. gentleman is as far astray in his facts as he is in his constitutional law, as I will presently show. The Franchise Act of 1885, section 9, reads as follows:—

In the provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, besides the persons entitled to be registered as voters and to vote under the foregoing provisions of this Act, every person who at the time of the passing of the same—

(1) Is of the age of twenty-one years and is not by this Act or by any law of the Dominion of Canada disqualified or prevented from voting; and

(2) Is a British subject by birth or naturalization and resident in the province, and is entitled to vote in the said provinces respectively by the laws now severally existing in the same,—

Shall have a right to be registered as a voter and to vote so long as he shall continue to be qualified to vote under the provisions of the said last mentioned laws and no longer.

Mr. FOSTER. When the right hon. gentleman made that statement with reference to British Columbia, and charged it on this side of the House, and when I asked him whether he had not better read up the law, will the right hon. gentleman now acknowledge that he made a mistake or will he not?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will answer by and by.

Mr. FOSTER. When it is pointed out to you directly, right in your face—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman is not ready to admit it.

Mr. DAVIN. The right hon. gentleman started out with that accusation; he made the most he could of it; he treated it rhetorically, and he flung it defiantly across the House, but as I said about another Minister, the fact was excogitated. Take the constitutional argument of the right hon. gentleman. When the right hon. gentleman was reading Story, I asked him what he took Story to mean there by "civil right," and I asked the right hon. gentleman whether he meant by "civil right," that it came within the civil rights as reserved to the provinces of the British North America Act. The right hon. gentleman said it did, and that it was in that sense he used "civil right." The right hon. gentleman is a lawyer, and I ask his attention to the 41st section of the British North America Act:

Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces of the Union relative to the following matters:—

And one of them is the "franchise." I contend that as that is laid down there, it implies that this right is entirely within the province of this Parliament, and if you look at the 84th section, it reads:

Until the legislatures of Ontario and Quebec respectively otherwise provide, all laws which at the Union are in force in those provinces respectively, relative to the following matters, or any of them, viz.: The qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected to sit or vote—

Where? Is it in the Parliament of Canada? Not at all; but—

—as members of the Assembly of Canada.

Therefore, it is clearly laid down in the British North America Act that the right of voting for a member in this House is not within the provincial jurisdiction. I will not ask the House to take my interpretation of that, but I will ask the House to take the interpretation of a judge of high standing, and I will put his judgment on this very point against the position taken by the right hon. gentleman. On this very head this is what Chancellor Boyd says:

The subject of this class of legislation are of a political character, dealing with the citizen, as related to the Commonwealth, whether province or Dominion, and they are kept distinct from the federal constitutional Act, from matters of civil rights in the provinces, which regard mainly the meum and teum as between citizens.

What Chancellor Boyd means is, that they are not included in the clause of the British North America Act which defines what comes under the jurisdiction of the provinces.

It is, in my view, rather confusing to speak of the right of voting as comprehended under the civil rights mentioned in section 92, subsection 13, of the British North America Act. This franchise is not an ordinary civil right, it is historically and truly a statutory privilege of a political nature, being the chief means whereby the people, organized for political purposes,

have their share in the functions of government. The question in hand, therefore, falls within the category, not of civil rights in the province, but of electoral rights in Canada.

Now, so far as there was anything vertebrate at all in the speech of the hon. gentleman, it was the statement he made as to the disfranchisement that took place in British Columbia, and his argument as to constitutional law. Well, Sir, even if I were not reinforced by Chancellor Boyd, I think having pointed out what is the clear meaning of the two sections I have quoted, the House will agree with me that the constitutional argument of the right hon. gentleman signally failed. Where are we in regard to this Government whenever it has to express an opinion on any subject? Last night we found the greatest possible contradiction on the Treasury benches, and to-day we have the Prime Minister contradicting point blank the position taken by the Solicitor General this afternoon. I am not surprised that there was a disposition to-night on the part of the Premier to prevent the Solicitor General from speaking; because the Solicitor General is a lawyer in practice and a lawyer of repute, and he would not dare to risk his reputation by buttressing the fallacious propositions respecting constitutional law that come to us from the amateur lawyers, and—I will not say the amateur statesmen, but we will say the experienced statesmen on those benches. The hon. gentleman made a flourish about the evils of manhood suffrage. He told us that the best citizens of the United States regretted manhood suffrage; and what is he doing by this Bill? He is trying to force manhood suffrage for the Dominion on provinces where we have not now manhood suffrage.

Mr. FOSTER. Without any education.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, without any education. He is forcing manhood suffrage for Dominion purposes on Ontario, on Nova Scotia, on New Brunswick, on British Columbia and on Manitoba, in which provinces manhood suffrage for Dominion purposes does not exist to-day. If there be conviction behind the rhetoric, if there be a strong and abiding conviction in the right hon. gentleman's mind, as to the evils of manhood suffrage, why does he want to force manhood suffrage on the foremost province of the Dominion—certainly foremost as regards wealth and population? The fact is that it looks as if any argument was taken up that would suit at the moment, and as if these arguments are not thrust upon us at all as convictions. Let me ask the right hon. gentleman, in regard to the latter part of his speech, where he has gone? The Solicitor General said to-day: we simply adopt for the present the provincial franchises, and if the provincial legislatures do not do what we think right, we can change the law at any moment. The right hon. gentleman took the view that the declaring who should vote

for members of this House belonged as a civil right to the local legislatures, though towards the close of his speech, after laying that down, and laying it down weightily, he said something like what the Solicitor General said. Now, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman: if it is the function of the local legislatures to declare as a matter of civil right who shall exercise the franchise for the Dominion, by what right do you sit in judgment on them and declare that they have done wrong, and propose to remedy the wrong? After listening to the right hon. gentleman's speech, I am reminded of the criticism that Matthew Arnold made on the first publication of a man who has since attained some celebrity: he said, "Here is a man who has some of the finest gifts that any literary man ever possessed, in speaking and writing the English language; but he cannot reason." And we might almost say the same of the right hon. gentleman. Towards the close he made an argument as to expediency. He said, would it not be a nice thing if all the provinces voted on the same franchise as the Dominion, and the Dominion voted on the same franchise as all the provinces? I do not know whether he meant that they should be uniform, or whether he means that no matter how bizarre or how different the franchises in the various provinces might be, still there was something beautiful and symmetrical in electing members to this House on the same franchise. But when the British North America Act expressly declares that it is for this House to decide what shall be the franchise for sending men to this Parliament, it is far from symmetrical, far from logical and far from expedient that we should give to other assemblies the right of making that decision. Is it not absurd to argue in that way, with the words of an hon. and learned gentleman who stands high in his party, the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), ringing in his ears? The very words of that hon. member were these: "We have no guarantee that the provincial legislatures will legislate in the right direction." These are the words of a man who aspired to be Minister of Justice, and who, if party justice had been done, would have been Minister of Justice. The right hon. gentleman said that the provincial franchises had been in operation nineteen years without one word of complaint. Why, Sir, how can he say that? It has been demonstrated again and again here that there were complaints. It has been shown by the leader of the Opposition and by other hon. gentlemen that you actually had to legislate in this House to undo the evils of a provincial legislature; and what more solemn complaint can you have than a complaint that is crystallized into an Act of Parliament? It would have been regrettable if the right hon. gentleman had not attempted to reply to the reasoned presentation of the objections to this Act made by my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney),

Mr. DAVIN.

as at first he seemed inclined to do. But I must confess that I feel disappointed that we do not hear more from the Solicitor General. He is chary of giving us anything like a reasoned opinion on this subject.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have no opportunity, there are so many others.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman shakes his head; but I have so much respect for what is in that head that I think it is a pity he does not give us a reasoned opinion. Up to the present I have not heard anything which can alter the opinion I have formed of this Bill, that it is ill-conceived, founded on a wrong principle, and contradictory in its provisions, and that, if passed in its present state, it would introduce confusion into the electoral franchise of this Dominion. If this were to pass, even with such amendment as may be possible—if such a misfortune were to happen, I believe it will throw back Canada in the march of progress and be a blot upon the administration of the right hon. gentleman.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) appealed to me a moment ago to correct a statement which I made that by the Act of 1885 he had disfranchised a number of voters in the province of British Columbia. The only correction I have to make is to add to that statement, and to say that by the Act of 1885 he not only disfranchised men who had the right to vote in British Columbia, but also in Prince Edward Island. Let me call his attention to a clause which was read a moment ago by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Section 9 of the Electoral Franchise Act of 1885 enacts as follows:—

In the provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, besides the persons entitled to be registered as voters and to vote under the foregoing provisions of this Act, every person who at the time of the passing of the same—

(1) Is of the age of twenty-one years and is not by this Act or by any law of the Dominion of Canada disqualified or prevented from voting; and

(2) Is a British subject by birth or naturalization and resident in the province, and is entitled to vote in the said provinces respectively by the laws now severally existing in the same,—

Shall have a right to be registered as a voter and to vote so long as he shall continue to be qualified to vote under the provisions of the last mentioned laws and no longer.

This means that under this Act any person in New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island who was twenty-one years of age on the 20th July, 1885 when the Act was passed, was entitled to be a voter and was a voter. The first lists made in 1886 in British Columbia and Prince Edward Island were lists based on manhood suffrage, but that was only to apply to those who were of age on the 20th July, 1885 or at the

time this Act came into force. Subsequently, in the revisions of 1891 and 1894, there was no manhood suffrage, and the lists were made upon restricted franchises, and it is a matter of notoriety that in these provinces that fact was complained of. The fact was well known to every one in these provinces that in the subsequent revision of the franchises, the lists were restricted according to the terms of the Dominion Franchise Act.

Mr. FLINT. A few moments ago I was most rudely and discourteously refused by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) the privilege of asking him a question—a privilege which is always most courteously allowed on this side of the House to hon. gentlemen opposite. As it was the first time I rose to ask this privilege of the hon. gentleman, I now give him notice that it is not likely I shall ever do so again.

Mr. FOSTER. Thanks.

Mr. FLINT. The hon. gentleman not only did so in a manner which I thought was ungentlemanly and discourteous, but he added impertinence and insult, which I, for one, will not take from him or any other member of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg leave to ask the hon. gentleman to point out what insulting words I used with reference to him.

Mr. FLINT. I will repeat the words which I considered were insulting, and which, I think, if the hon. gentleman were possessed of the spirit of fairness that ought to characterize a gentleman in his position, especially in the circumstances under which I rose, he would not have made use of. He was making an argument upon a particular legal point in connection with the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia and I asked him politely if I might put to him a question. In the manner I have not seen him use towards any other gentleman on this side, he refused me, as was his right, the privilege, and then he added that he had already given way to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), who knew something about this question, but he would not give way to the hon. gentleman for Yarmouth, who knew nothing about it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is drawing inference of his own, which he had a perfect right to do, but which is not borne out by what I said, and has imputed to me a discourtesy of which I am guiltless.

Mr. FLINT. I have given the very words of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. I leave that to "Hansard."

Mr. FLINT. The hon. gentleman has the right to hold such opinion of me as he thinks fit. My own opinion of myself is modest enough, and I do not claim to know more of this question than any other of my colleagues.

Mr. FOSTER. I give the hon. gentleman notice that when the "Hansard" is out, I will bring this matter to the attention of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend will allow me, the words used by the hon. member for York were not exactly as my hon. friend stated, but it struck me that my hon. friend had some reason to complain. My hon. friend from York did not mention my hon. friend from Yarmouth, but he said: I gave way to the hon. member for Halifax because he generally knows what he is talking about, but I shall not give way to another. There was an inference in that remark which justifies the complaint of my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. FLINT. The hon. gentleman, of course, will never be interrupted by me again under any circumstances whatever. The point to which he was addressing himself was one which this discussion made important, although in my opinion it had not previously been of very great importance. In the few observations I made on the Franchise Act, when first introduced, I referred to the suggested or implied disqualification of certain qualified voters in the province of Nova Scotia from voting at Dominion elections, and I said then, with the concurrence, I believe of all my colleagues on this side, that although there was no disqualification in the law now existing with regard to that class of voters, yet if there was any doubt, I was convinced that when we reached the committee stage there would be a general disposition to make the matter so clear that doubt would be removed. The ex-Minister of Finance reiterated the point that all Dominion officials were excluded by the Nova Scotia franchise from the lists, and it was contended, I think correctly, upon this side that they were not excluded from the voters' lists, although they were excluded by the election Act from voting in the local elections.

Mr. MILLS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put him a question?

Mr. FLINT. Certainly; I am not like the ex-Minister of Finance.

Mr. MILLS. The Nova Scotia Act provides:

The names of persons disqualified under the first section of this Act shall not be inserted in the list of registered electors, and if entered therein shall be struck off.

Is that the law now?

Mr. FLINT. No, it is repealed by the Act of 1885.

Mr. MILLS. What Act of 1885.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Consolidated Statutes of 1885.

The PRIME MINISTER. Apologize.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. FLINT. It was not my intention then, nor is it my intention now, to enter into a discussion of that question.

Mr. GILLIES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Section 9 of the Act of 1889 is still in force, and that section prescribes the manner in which the electoral lists of Nova Scotia shall be made up by the reviser. It states what persons shall be entitled to vote and what persons shall be put upon the lists. And who are they? The following persons shall be put upon the lists:

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The voters' list.

Mr. GILLIES. Yes.

The following persons, if of the full age of twenty-one years and subjects of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization, and not disqualified by any action of this Act or otherwise by law prevented from voting—

Well, now the Dominion official is prevented from voting.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). No, not absolutely.

Mr. GILLIES. They are disqualified.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are prevented.

Mr. COCHRANE. They could not be prevented if they were not disqualified.

Mr. GILLIES. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) does not understand it, and he has admitted it, and I am sure, will admit it now, that the Dominion officials are disqualified from voting. The section says that any person who is in receipt of pay from any of these departments within 15 days of the election.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Ah, within 15 days.

Mr. GILLIES. No person receiving pay from the Government within 15 days of the election is permitted to vote—he is disqualified. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will admit that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think he is, he is prevented from voting under the local Act. If my hon. friend will allow me, he is continually confusing the Voters' List Act with the Election Act. What we touch here is the Voters' List Act. The election Act of the province we do not adopt. There is the confusion in the minds of hon. gentlemen.

Mr. GILLIES. You are adopting the election Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. GILLIES. Well, or of course we are making the Franchise Act here; we are

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

making a Franchise Act for the Dominion—

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

Mr. GILLIES. If my hon. friend (Mr. Flint) will allow me one moment—

Mr. FLINT. I have the floor. I yielded the floor to the hon. gentleman for Richmond (Mr. Gillies), but I want to know my status before the committee. I yielded the floor to answer a question of the hon. member for Richmond, but he seems to have forgotten that and addresses his remarks to somebody else. If he will address his remarks to me, I will try to answer him.

Mr. GILLIES. Section 9 of the Act of 1889, under which the provincial lists are made up, states who are eligible to go on the lists, and no others can go on, now is that correct?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. GILLIES. And it is provided that any person in receipt of emolument from the Dominion Government within 15 days of the date of the election cannot vote. Very well. This section says that any person prevented from voting cannot go on the lists.

Mr. FLINT. I understand the hon. gentleman asks me a question. I would frankly admit that there is a basis for argument and difference of opinion. But I will go further and say that, as a matter of fact in the province of Nova Scotia the opinion always has been held and the practice always has been that these persons are entered upon the lists, even though they may be prevented from voting if they hold one of these Dominion offices 15 days before the election. But I did not rise for the purpose of debating that question but to state my willingness, and I think that that willingness is concurred in by my colleagues from Nova Scotia and by gentlemen on this side of the House generally, if there is doubt on the point, to make it so clear that there will be no doubt. Now, the observation I rose more particularly to make was in reply to the ex-Minister of Finance who raised the point that it was immoral and outrageous and abominable—

Mr. FOSTER. Monstrous, I said.

Mr. FLINT. He used all the language of vituperation, of which he is a master, to state his disapproval of the laws of the province which deprived a person who was on the list of a vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Monstrous, I said.

Mr. FLINT. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was only indulging in that vague and wide vituperation to which we are accustomed from him and which passes harmlessly over those to whom he is opposed. But if he looked at the Franchise Act of which he is proud and which we are attempting to repeal, he would find that all

these monstrous things occur there. The list is made under the Act, yet carrying out the intention of this legislature, with universal consent, large numbers of persons are prevented from voting though their names are on the lists. And so these Dominion employees names are upon the voters' lists, and they vote, unless within 15 days of the election they continue to hold these Dominion offices. And there is nothing immoral, outrageous, or unjust, or monstrous in the fact that they should be upon the voters' lists, and yet when the day of voting comes they should, for good cause moving the legislature to that end, be deprived of the right to vote. This franchise law which we are trying to repeal, as I say, has embodied in it the same principle. The list for the Dominion election is made up, but when the day of voting arrives large numbers of persons whose names are upon the lists are refused this great and glorious privilege of voting which the ex-Minister of Finance is never tired of eulogizing. Who, under either circumstances, would be more readily accorded the vote than our judges? Who are more worthy of eulogies as to their intelligence, their patriotism and the other qualities of which the hon. gentleman speaks, than the judges in our courts? And yet, for reasons that seem sufficient to Parliament, they are not allowed to vote. And the same is true of revising officers, and returning officers, and election clerks, and a large number of other persons. It may be open to question, it may be debatable, whether Parliament was altogether wise in preventing some of these persons from voting, and that is a question that may well be debated and settled in Parliament.

The principle of refusing persons the privilege of voting, either because they have been bribed or because they hold positions which seemed to the Nova Scotia Parliament incompatible with the right of voting, certainly does not render the Act liable to all those violent charges which the ex-Minister of Finance has made against it; consequently the superstructure which he built upon the assumed injustice of the Nova Scotia Act falls to the ground. The legislature of Nova Scotia, for its own wise purposes, may have thought it improper that in the local election certain Dominion officials should have the right to vote. With that we have nothing to do here. It is purely an academic question, which can be best settled upon the floor of the Nova Scotia legislature. But no one upon this side of the House contends that we would be doing right to prevent that class of voters from voting for representatives to the Dominion Parliament, and we have offered, and we offer now, to make that point clear. I

trust that the time of the committee will not be taken up by objurgations and re-primations as to a purely local Act, which is strongly supported in Nova Scotia, and has been sanctioned there in election after election.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Flint), undertook to lead the House to believe that the universal practise in the province of Nova Scotia in carrying out the franchise law that existed previous to the adoption of the present franchise law, was to use the same lists for Dominion and local elections. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have had some experience as a reviser and as a municipal councillor in connection with the county sessions that had to do with the appointment of the officials who were revising the lists under those Acts. We revised the lists from the assessment rolls, under the qualifications stated in the statute. We made two separate and distinct voters' lists: one excepting the names of the Dominion officials who were not permitted to vote at local elections, and the other for Dominion election purposes, containing the names of all those who were qualified under the statute, and not disqualified by reason of holding office. These lists, after being taken from the basis of the assessment roll, were posted up, and notice was given to anybody who was displeased with the voters' lists, who wanted to add any names, or who wanted to object to any names, attended on a certain day fixed by the revisers for the purpose of hearing appeals. The two separate lists were then completed, after the revisers had given a hearing in this way. When the elections were held, the list with the heading "List of electors qualified to vote at Dominion elections," was used at the Dominion elections, and the list of electors qualified to vote at elections for members to the provincial Assembly was used for that purpose. So we had the two lists. The counties, they were counties before they were incorporated into municipalities, paid for the expense of making those two different lists. Now, my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) told the House that the revisers in his county made only one list, and received all the names that were presented to them, in addition to those that were taken off the assessment roll under the property qualifications. He says they took all the names that were submitted, but were unable to tell who should be struck off or who should be put on, were unable to say who held an office under the Dominion Government or who did not. Now those revisers had to make an affidavit, and for the information of the committee I will read that affidavit:

We, the undersigned revisers duly appointed for revisal, section....., No....., in the county of, do hereby solemnly swear that we will well and faithfully discharge the duties assigned to us without favour or partiality, that we will place no name on the list of registry, and will strike no name off the same, unless we shall be satisfied that the same, by the law under which we have been appointed as revisers, should be placed on or struck off the same, and that we will in all respects conform to the said law, to the best of our judgment and ability.

The hon. member for Inverness stated that it was ridiculous to expect the revisers to know who held a Dominion office within the limits of the section in which they were appointed to revise the lists, and yet this is the affidavit which was taken by those revisers. Now, there is another point. It is impossible to have any such thing as a universal system for the making of those lists, even under the Act, when we have, as we do in Nova Scotia, 200 or 300 different revisers revising the lists to be used at elections for provincial and municipal purposes. I feel that I would be perfectly safe in saying that, under the machinery with which these revisers are appointed, not one out of every three of those revisers are competent to interpret the Act. The machinery by which their appointment is made, is this: Under the existing circumstances we have municipalities, we have the different districts of the municipalities represented by councillors, each councillor nominates the revisers in his own part of the municipality, and the result is that in a great many cases a number of those who are appointed to revise the lists are incapable of interpreting the statute. Consequently, our lists are imperfect, our lists are not made in conformity with the statute, and so imperfect are our lists looked upon that year after year it is the custom of the legislature of Nova Scotia to pass an Act legalizing the voters' lists for the province, notwithstanding any irregularity or anything that is at variance with the statute. I believe that has been the invariable custom, and continues to the present day. On account of the errors and irregularities, and want of conformity with the law in making up those lists, it was always considered necessary to pass an Act in the Parliament of Nova Scotia legalizing those lists, otherwise they could not be used. Yet those are the lists that we are called upon by the measure now before the House to adopt as a basis for the franchise for the election of members to this House. There are other influences brought to bear in the preparation of these lists and in their revision. There are local influences, there are political influences, and all these influences tend to make an imperfect list and one altogether unsuited to the requirements of the election of members to this House. The

Mr. McDougall.

hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) told the House that the lists were only revised every two or three years, by the local revisers. The lists are revised annually, every winter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I rise merely to call attention to a single point.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me to call attention for a moment to the statement made by the leader of the House, in which I think we all agree, that we are dealing with a question of vast moment, one that requires to be dealt with in a calm and judicious spirit; and in dealing with a question of this importance we have reached an hour that is not calculated to enable us to deal with it in that calm and collected manner which is desirable, and I suggest to the hon. leader of the House, especially with a view to prevent so great a calamity as that the leader may not be able to be with us, that he should consent to an adjournment. There is this amendment before the Chair with respect to the Indians, an amendment to which I am prepared to give my hearty support; but when that amendment is disposed of there will be another amendment moved, dealing with the question from the standpoint of the general discussion that has taken place to-night, the question dealt with by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). I hope that hon. member, who followed on the lines of the hon. Solicitor General, will receive the support of the First Minister in regard to removing any disqualification with respect to officials that may exist in the franchise laws of the different provinces. Why I rose particularly, however, was for the purpose of suggesting that while we should like to hear the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), we have reached an hour when the Prime Minister would be consulting the convenience of the House if he would adjourn the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say for my part that I shall always be willing to consider any amendment which may be offered from the other side with a view to the improvement of this Bill. I do not say that this Bill is perfect and should not be subject to amendment. At the same time I wish to say to the hon. gentleman, who asks the House to adjourn at twelve o'clock, that we have not made the slightest progress.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have done a great deal.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no tangible shape in which we can see it to-day. If the hon. gentleman will tell me that we will make a reasonable progress to-morrow, pass the Bill through committee to-morrow, I have no objection to adjourning at the present moment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is impossible at this stage to arrive at that conclusion, but I desire to press the Bill forward as rapidly as possible.

The PRIME MINISTER. In the meantime I will be able to meet the hon. gentleman and see if we cannot arrive at an agreement. I will not press the hon. gentleman to give me his pledge to pass the Bill through committee to-morrow, but I will take his

pledge that he will facilitate the passage of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well.
Committee rose and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Friday).

INDEX.

THIRD SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT, 1898.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remarks or debate; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C. P. R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in *Italic* and parentheses are those of the mover.

Angers, Mr. L. C. A., Charlevoix.

- Chicoutimi, Saguenay and Gaspé Judges, increase of salaries (remarks) 7385 (ii).
- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 4656 (ii).
- Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 2032.
- Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6175; on M. for 2°, 6771; on M. for 3°, 7046 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T. W., North Wentworth.

- Agriculture and Colonization Com., 1st Rep. conc., 1174 (i).
- Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2382 (i).
- Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 5850 (amt.) 5853 (ii).
- Prudential Life Insurance Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 53) 1°, 1272 (i).
- San Jose Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1916 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works: Buildings (N.S.), 5075 (i).

Beattie, Mr. T., London.

- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 3710 (i), 4665 (ii).
- Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1980 (i).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4757 (ii).
- Ry. Passenger Tickets (B. 36) 1°, 903 (i).
- Stimulants in the Chamber during Debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3639 (i).
- Order (Ques. of) 3611 (i).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., Berthier.

- Berthier, Public Buildings, Purchase of Site (Ques.) 3662 (i).
- Post Office, site, &c. (Ques.) 6008 (ii).
- Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 2026.

Belcourt, Mr. N. A., Ottawa.

- Alaska and North Western Ry. Co.'s Pet., prop. Res., 2142 (i).
- Incorp. (B. 108) 1°, 2844 (i).
- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3689 (i).
- Dismissals and Appnmts., from 1878 to 1879 (M. for Ret.) 3665 (i) 4246 (ii).
- Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4057, 4373 (ii).
- Govt. Officials, dismissed from 1878 to 1879, names, &c. (M. for Ret.) 4246 (ii).
- Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7735 (ii).
- Heyward, Edwin, Relief (B. 112) 1°, 3309 (i).
- Militia Clothing in Can., W. L. McKing's Rep. (M. for Copy*) 3669 (i).
- Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co. (B. 105) Sen. Amts., 5905 (ii).
- Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co., Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) to Com. of Sup., 6486 (ii).
- (M. for Sel. Com.) 3664 (i).
- National Museum, Erection at Ottawa (remarks) 5323 (ii).
- Ontario and Quebec Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 25) 1°, 744 (i).
- Ottawa and New York Ry. Co. (B. 80) 1°, 1839.
- Personal Explanation, par. in *Gazette re* Alaska and N. W. Ry. Co.'s B. 6242 (ii).

Belcourt, Mr. N. A.—Continued.

Private Bills Legislation, M. to Proceed with, 7466 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) par in *La Patrie re Man. Schools* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7719 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Government : Geological Survey, 7478 (ii).

Union Bank of Can. Amt. (B. 24) 1^o, 743 (i).

Bell, Mr. A. C., Pictou.

Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2218 (i).

Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2503 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2^o, 1188 (i).

— Telegram to High Commissioner *re* Mr. Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1010 (i).

Civil Service Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6797, 6798; on M. for 3^o, (Amt.) 6932 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Death of Employees (M. for cor.*) 3668 (i).

— (M. for Ret.) 3666 (i).

— Treatment of Workmen on M. for Com. of Sup., 6593 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4274 (ii).

— on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3^o, 5685 (ii).

I.C.R. Eastern Extension, Dining Car (Ques.) 2345 (i).

— Reduction in number of Brakesmen (Ques.) 478 (i).

— Westville, N.S., Station Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 2342 (i).

King's Head Light, N.S. (Ques.) 1932 (i).

Returns (inquiry) 4605, 5394 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Government : Customs (contingencies) 4589.

Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7263.

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 5612.

Bell, Mr. J. W., Addington.

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Commission, Printing of Rep. (Ques.) 6466 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2987 (i).

SUPPLY :

Post Office : Outside Service (letter carriers) 7782.

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) Sen. Amts., 7784 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., East Simcoe.

Address, on The, 308 (i).

Alien Labour Law, Appnmt. of Agent at Georgian Bay (remarks) 4523, 6240 (ii).

— Enforcement (Ques.) 5392 (ii).

— Enforcement at Toronto (remarks) 5012 (ii).

Appnmts. by late Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Montague*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4838 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—Continued.

Baxter, Wm., Lighthouse-keeper, Emplmt. (Ques.) 3657 (i).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2160 (i).

Budget, The, 3477 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 1857 (i).

Certificates to Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 37 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1862 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2^o, 2321; in Com., 2941, 2969, 2978 (i), 4068, 4083, 4093, 4141, 4152, 4254, 4453, 4468, 4492, 5262; on M. for 3^o, 5704 (ii).

Gascoigne, Maj. Gen., Militia Commission (Ques.) 5825 (i).

Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1867 (i).

Gravenhurst, Ont., Appnmt. of Postmaster (Ques.) 5320 (ii).

Midland, Ont., Appnmt. of Harbour Master (Ques.) 3662 (i).

Ont. Lumber Cut, on M. (Mr. *Britton*) to adjn., 1843 (i).

Ontario Voters' Lists, Revising Officers, cost of printing &c. (Ques.) 2845 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 5734 (ii).

— Savings Banks, Reduction of Interest, on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3720 (i).

Rainy River Judicial District, Appnmt. of Judge (remarks) 5011 (ii).

Rockliffe Rifle Range, Land Valuator (Ques.) 3408, 3660 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1878 (i).

Stimulants in Chamber during debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3642 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 5038 (ii).

Canals : Trent (construction) 6539 (ii).

Civil Government : Customs Dept. (contingencies) 4588 (ii); Gov. Gen. Sec's Office, 3836 (i); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 4596; Post Office, 4864; Public Works (contingencies) 4591; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 4599 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service : (construction) 4999; (salaries) 4991 (ii).

Post Office : Outside Service (miscellaneous expenses) 6716 (ii).

Public Works : Buildings (N.S.) 5076; (Ques.) 5093; Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 6073; Ont., 6087; (Kaministiquia) 5068 (ii).

Ways and Means :—The Tariff.

In Com. (preferential clause) 3763, 3792 (i).

Waverley, Ont., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ques.) 598 (i).

White, Mr., ex-Dep. Postmaster Gen., Superannuation (Ques.) 474 (i).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—Continued.

Williams, W. W., Postmaster at Seeley's Bay,
Dismissal on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 3422 (i).
Wyebridge, Wyevale Postal Service (Ques.) 598 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Beauharnois.

Abenakis Indians, St. Francis Agency (Ques.)
3408 (i).
Address, on The, 430 (i),
Alaska and North-western Ry. Co.'s Pet., on
prop. Res. (Mr. Belcourt) 2142 (i).
Aud. Gen's Rep., French translation (remarks)
3827 (i).
Bagot, Electoral District, Issue of Writ (M. to
adjn.) 5234, 5255 (ii).
—— (notification) 3825 (i).
—— (Ques.) 4772 (ii).
Berthier Channel, Deepening (Ques.) 3085 (i).
Beauharnois Canal, Dismissal of Touissant Boyer
(Ques.) 3662 (i).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation,
on prop. Res. (Mr. Marcotte) to ref. to Com. on
Privs. and Elections, 2188 (i).
Canadian Yukon Railway B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on
amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to M. for 2°, 1440 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr.
Richardson) on M. for Com., 3701 (i).
Dep. Min. of Interior, present occupant (Ques.)
3408 (i).
Drummond County Ry. Investigation, Rep. of
Commission on M. (Mr. Lister) 7113 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in
Com., 2971 (i).
French Line of Steamers, Negotiations, &c. (re-
marks) 6465 (ii).
Gaspé Line of Steamers, Subsidy, &c. (Ques.)
7120, 7685 (ii).
Gatien, Louis, Postmaster at Marieville, Dis-
missal by Govt. (Ques.) 7685 (ii).
Homestead Land Laws in the Yukon (Ques.)
1338, 1784 (i).
Judges of the Provincial Court Act Amt. B. 150
(Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 6131, 6166,
6183, 7137; on M. for 2°, 6778; in Com., 6795.
Judges of the Province of Quebec, Reps. from
Montreal Bar (M. for Ret. *) 505 (i).
Lachine Canal, Dismissal of François Corbeil (M.
for Ret. *) 2840.
—— (Ques.) 2343 (i).
Lavoie, Dr., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7119 (ii).
Legris, Narcisse, Postmaster at St. Eulalie,
Letter in *La Patrie* (Ques.) 7688 (ii).
London and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr.
Lister) in Com., 4073 (ii).
Man. Schools Fund B. 168 (Mr. Fielding) in Com.
on Res., 7436 (ii).
Man. Schools Question, Address to the Holy
Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5344, 5363,
5411 (ii).
—— document presented at Rome (Ques.) 3165.
Military Camp at Beauharnois (remarks) 6638 (ii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—Continued.

Mint, Govt. Establishment (Ques.) 1340 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 163
(Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 6867, 6911; on M.
for Com., 7171 (ii).
Ogilvie's Klondike Rep., French translation
(Ques.) 2529.
—— (remarks) 1577 (i).
Ontario and Rainy River Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. Tisdale)
in Com., 2627 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Asphalt Sidewalks, &c.,
contractor (Ques.) 487 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. (Special Delivery) B. 167 (Mr.
Mulock) on M. for 1°, 7409 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *La Patrie re Man.*
Schools, 7697, 7715 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite
B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 3933; on M.
for 2°, 4718 (ii).
Returns (inquiry) 3713 (i), 4348 (ii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. Casey) in Com.,
3680 (i).
Reid, Wm., Bridge-keeper, Beauharnois Canal,
Dismissal (Ques.) 3937 (ii).
St. Anicet Wharf, Cost when built (Ques.) 2818 (i).
—— Cor. between L. H. Masson and Public
Works (M. for copy*) 2841 (i).
St. Cyprien Postmaster, charges against (Ques.)
6007 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Placing of Buoys (remarks)
3318 (i).
St. Michel de Napierville post-office, *cor re* (Ques.)
1471 (i).
Soulanges Canal, expenditure on construction
(Ques.) 5133 (ii).
—— Tenders for Cement, &c. (Ques.) 4176 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Canals : Beauharnois (contingencies) 7189; Cham-
bly, 7651; Soulanges (construction) 6446, 6530 (ii).
Civil Government : Agriculture (salaries) 4845.
Public Works (books, &c.) 6984 (ii).
Customs : (Laboratory) 7774 (ii).
Fisheries : (protection service) 5273, 5301 (ii).
Legislation : House of Commons (debates) 7014;
(stationery, &c.) 7035 (ii).
Miscellaneous : (litigation costs) 7770; Man. School
case (litigation) 7771; (Parliamentary Compan-
ion) 6796 (ii).
Penitentiaries : (St. Vincent de Paul) 6640.
Post Office : Outside Service (letter carriers) 7775;
(miscellaneous expenses) 6703 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings (general) 5494; (B.C.)
5494; Ont. (Major's Hill Park) 5455; Que., 7217;
(repairs, &c.) 7218. Harbours and Rivers
(dredging) 6079; N.S. (New Harbour) 7609;
(Ont.) 6087, 6094; (Que.) 5648, 7226. Roads and
Bridges (Dom.) 6100. Telegraph Lines (St.
Lawrence shores) 6101 (ii).
Railways : I.C.R. (general expenses for investiga-
tions) 7203; (increased accommodation at St.
John) 7647; (iron bridges) 6401; (rolling stock)
7644 (ii).

Bertram, Mr. G. H., Toronto Centre.

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 7 (i).

Anglo-American Commission and Govtl. Action (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7689 (ii).

Canadian Yukon Railway B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 2°, 735 (i).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. Charlton) Amt. (Mr. Maclean) that Com. rise, 2405 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 3°, 6125 (ii).

Ry. Rate War and Man. Settlers on M. (Mr. Maclean) to adjn., 1480 (i).

Sons of England Benefit Society (B. 122) M. for Com., 6048, 6060 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7268 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 6076 (ii).

Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. (B. 61) 1*, 1387; 2°, 2842 (i).

Bethune, Mr. J. L., Victoria, N.S.

Aspy Bay, Harbour of Refuge, Construction (Ques.) 2819 (ii).

Baddeck Drill Shed, Land Title (Ques.) 1467 (i).

Lobster Packing, Size of Catch, &c. (Ques.) 1340.

Storm Signals, C.B., &c., Number of (Ques.) 7118.

Telegraph Lines, N.S., Govt. rates, &c. (Ques.) 6006 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G. (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Sunbury and Queen's.*

Alien Labour Law, Enforcement (remarks) 5791.

Boyer, Touissant, Lockmaster Beauharnois Canal, Dismissal (Ans.) 3662 (i).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Marcotte) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections. 2188 (i).

Can. Pac. Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 3665 (i).

Canadian Yukon Railway (B. 6) 1° m., 186; 2° m., 521; agreed to (Y. 111, N. 72) 1733; land subsidy, prop. Res. 515; in Com. on Res., 1772; in Com. on B., 1851 (i).

— exclusion of Foreign Labour (Ans.) 827 (i).

— Govt. Amts. (remarks) 744 (i).

— plans, papers &c., 402 (i).

Canals, Date of Opening (Ans.) 3318 (i).

— (remarks) 2700 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. Richardson) in Com., 4643, 4666 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Construction, Amount Paid, &c. (Ans.) 5391 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Agreement with C.P.R. Co. (Ans.) 2036 (i).

— Amounts Paid to C.P.R. Co. (Ans.) 3405 (i).

— Construction, &c., 6240 (ii).

Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 6944 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—Continued.

Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 7158.

Drummond Co. Ry. and G.T.R., new arrangements (remarks) 2699 (i).

— second agreement (Ans.) 3317 (i).

— through traffic (Ans.) 472 (i).

Floods on Grand River, on M. (Mr. Montague) to adjn., 2527 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 2985 (i), 4078, 4091, 4122, 4128, 4256, 4470; Sen. Amts., 7532 (ii).

Galbraith, Thos. J., canal officer, Port Colborne, Resignation (Ans.) 516 (i).

Grain Transportation in Man. and N. W. T. by C. P. R. and Elevator Co. (Ans.) 483 (i).

Grand Narrows, C.B., Dismissal of Govt. blacksmith (Ans.) 3661 (i).

G. T. Ry. and C. P. Ry., connection at North Bay (remarks) 4353 (ii).

G. T. R. and O. A. & P. S. Ry., connection at Scotia Junction (Ans.) 454 (i).

— Regulations on (Mr. Wallace) M. to adjn. (remarks) 6014, 6026 (ii).

G. N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. Morrison) on M. for 2°, 5965.

— Ques. of Procedure (remarks) 6004 (ii).

"Hard-pan" Claims, Cape Breton Ry. (Ans.) 5131 (ii).

I.C.R. Agreement with A. H. Harris (Ans.) 3166 (ii).

— (remarks) 5393 (ii).

— Archibald, Mr., Chief Engineer, dismissal on M. for Ret., 1835 (i).

— Brakesmen, Reduction in Number (Ans.) 475 (i).

— Carriage of coal (Ans.) 4448 (ii).

— Coloured Employees, on M. (Mr. Campbell) to Adjn., 3168 (i).

— Dismissal (remarks) 2852; (Ans.) 3405 (i).

— Construction of Gates, Tenders (Ans.) 2819.

— Dining Cars, Number, &c. (Ans.) 2812 (i).

— Diversion of Route through Springhill (Ans.) 1929 (i).

— Eastern Extension, Dining Car (Ans.) 2345 (i).

— Employees, Reductions in Passenger and Freight Depts. (Ans.) 602 (i).

— Expenditure for Fuel (Ans.) 3089 (i).

— Extension to Montreal, Agreement with G. T. Ry. on M. for Ret., 3821 (i).

— contracts, &c. (copies laid on table) 3821 (i).

— passengers from Lévis, number of (Ans.) 3406 (i).

— Govt. Lands, Trois Pistoles, Occupation, &c. (Ans.) 4179 (ii)

— Killam's Claims, Destruction of Cattle, on inquiry for Ret., 4693 (ii).

— Lowering Schedule Rates (remarks) 1481.

— Madame Charon's Horse (Ans.) 3659 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—Continued.

- I.C.R. Moncton Ry. Station, construction (Ans.) 477 (i).
 — plumbing and heating contract (Ans.) 2346 (i).
 — Murray, J. H., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5318 (ii).
 — News Stand at Lévis, lease (Ans.) 1338 (i).
 — Patent Locomotive cylinder (Ans.) 1335.
 — Powlie, A., Car Inspector at Springhill, Dismissal (Ans.) 1933 (i).
 — Purchase of Locomotives in U. S., &c. (Ans.) 477 (i).
 — Riviere du Loup, cost of inquiry (Ans.) 2820 (i).
 — Rory McNeil, Dismissal of (Ans.) 603 (i).
 — Ste. Michel, Station, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3312.
 — Stewart, A., Tank Man at Springhill, Dismissal (Ans.) 1933, 2342 (i).
 — Train Service, Issue of Time-tables (remarks) 6242 (ii).
 — Westville, N.S., Station Improvements (Ans.) 2342 (i).
 Killam, A. E., Position on I. C. R. (Ans.) 827 (i).
 Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2957, 3023, 3079 (i).
 King, W. C., Station Agent, Antigonish, Dismissal (Ans.) 7120 (ii).
 Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 4807 (ii).
 — Locomotive Works, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn. House, 612 (i).
 — Telegrams *re* Order for Locomotives (Ans.) 454 (i).
 Klondike, Edmonton and Prince Albert routes 453 (i).
 Lachine Canal, Dismissals, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) 4622 (ii).
 — of Francis Corbeil (Ans.) 2343 (i).
 — Storekeeper, applicants for position (Ans.) 456 (i).
 Lake Bennett and Klondike Ry. and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 31 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. to Conc. in Sen. Amts., 5905, 6266 (ii).
 — Temiscamingue Ry. and Ry. Act (Ans.) 2349 (i).
 Laurentian Ry., Telegraph Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 4923 (ii).
 Lafavre, Xavier, lockmaster, Lachine Canal, Dismissal (Ans.) 3937 (ii).
 Linloff, Edward, Appmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5319 (ii).
 London and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 67 (Mr. *Lister*) in Com., 4073 (ii).
 Long Lake, Qu'Appelle and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 4254 (ii).
 McKay, Kenneth, lockmaster, St. Peter's Canal, Dismissal (Ans.) 1070 (i).
 Matheson, John D., Appmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7121 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—Continued.

- Mercier, Wilfrid, Commissioner, amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 4345 (ii).
 Montreal and Lake Ontario, completion of fourteen foot navigation (Ans.) 6010 (ii).
 Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood*, Hamilton) on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 3644 (i).
 Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to ref. back to Com., 2676 (remarks) 2123 (i).
 Otonabee River Floods, Investigation as to cause (Ans.) 484 (i).
 P. E. I. Ry., Curve at North Wiltshire (Ans.) 2345 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4729 (ii).
 Public Officers' Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7581 (ii).
 — Works Aid (B. 161) 1°, 6892; 2°, *m.*, 7411, 7570; in Com., amt., 7570 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. (B. 145) 1°, 5662 (ii).
 Rys. and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1341 (i).
 — Appmnts. (Ans.) 1784 (i).
 — Commission, Board of (Mr. *Jameson*) 1815.
 — Committee of the Privy Council, Constitution (Ans.) 1472 (i).
 — Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 2055, 3673, (i) 4210, 4671 (ii); on M. to ref. back to Com., 5147; in Com., 5162, 5174 (ii).
 — Freight Rates B. 7 (Mr. *Rcid*) on M. for 2°, 2912 (i).
 — Rates to Stickine River (Ans.) 1070 (i).
 — Rate War, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1476 (i).
 — (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn., 1183 (i).
 — Regulations, Enforcement, &c. (Ans.) 7118.
 — Transportation, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1764 (i).
 Reid, Wm., Bridge Keeper, Beauharnois Canal, Dismissal (Ans.) 3937 (ii).
 Returns, on Inquiry for, 4774 (ii).
 Roche Fendue and Calumet Dams, on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) for Cor., 4161, 4619 (ii).
 St. Anne's Lock, Commissioner, amount paid (Ans.) 4345 (ii).
 St. Peter's Canal, Repairs to entrance (Ans.) 1339 (i).
 St. Pierre River Works, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 476.
 Soulanges Canal, Expenditure on Construction (Ans.) 5133 (ii).
 — Tenders for cement, &c. (Ans.) 4176 (ii).
 Southport to Murray Harbour, P.E.I. Ry. Extension (Ans.) 972 (i).
 Stellarton, Car Inspector Sutherland, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1833 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Beauharnois (contingencies) 7189; Chambly, 6553, 7651; Cornwall, 6532, 6554; Farran's Point, 6532; Galops, 7650 (construction) 6538; Grenville (enlargement) 6552; Lachine (enlarge-

Blair, Hon. A. G.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

ment) 6551; Murray (repairs) 6558; North Channel (construction) 6535; Rideau, 7182; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6550; (contractors claims) 7105; Soulanges (construction) 6446, 6510, 6516; Trent (construction) 6540, 6553; Welland, 7652; Williamsburg (gratuities) 7192 (repairs) 6554 (ii).

Civil Government: Railways and Canals, 4558; (contingencies) 4597 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (N.B.) 5092; Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 7634 (ii).

Railways: C.P.R., 6391; Crow's Nest Pass (salaries, &c.) 7110, 7182; I.C.R., 6427; (accommodation at Moncton) 6388, 7084; (Halifax) 6382; (Mulgrave) 6428; (St. John) 7646; (general) 6433; (claims for damages) 7183, 7373; (culverts, &c.) 7085; (Dalhousie wharf) 7084; (expenses of commissions) 7194; (Indiantown branch, land damages) 7078; (iron bridges) 6388, 6564; (Montreal extension) 6564; (North Sydney) 6386; (original construction) 6385; (Oxford and New Glasgow) 6385; (rolling stock) 7643; (miscellaneous) 6562; P.E.I. Ry. (rolling stock) 6434; (subsidies to N.S. Central Ry. Co.) 7809; (subsidies unpaid) 7653 (ii).

Toronto and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 77 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for Com., 4569; Sen. Ansts., 5906 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Promised aid by Govt. (Ans.) 2817 (i).

United Counties Ry., Payments to (Ans.) 3658 (i).

U.S. SS. "Yantic", Passage up St. Lawrence (Ans.) 830 (i).

Wellington Bridge, Montreal, Accident (Ans.) 4775 (ii).

— (remarks) 4604 (ii).

Winnipeg Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Transportation (B. 148) 1st, 5867; 2^d, *m.*, 6232; in Com., 6232 (ii).

Woods, H. W., Postmaster, Welsford, N. B., Dismissals (Ans.) 7120 (ii).

Borden, Hon. F. W. (Minister of Militia), King's, N.S.

Aldershot, N.S., Military Camp, Supplies, on M. for Ret., 1786 (i).

Baddeck Drill Shed, Land Title (Ans.) 1468 (i).

Brigade Military Camp, Third District (Ans.) 5786 (ii).

Côte Leisse, Rifle Ranges, Farmers' Grievances (remarks) 6323 (ii).

Côte St. Luc Rifle Range, Accidental Shooting (remarks) 6030 (ii).

Domville, Lt. Col., M.P., Charges against (remarks) 5393, 6031 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 2990 (i).

Gananoque Drill Shed, on M. for Ret. (remarks) 3826 (i).

— on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 5108, 5111 (ii).

— letter from Lt. Gov. Patterson laid on Table, 5316 (ii).

— site (Ans.) 457 (i).

Borden, Hon. F. W.—Continued.

Gascoigne, Maj. Gen., Militia Commission (Ans.) 3825 (i).

Illinois National Guards, Permission to enter Can. (Ans.) 599 (i).

Imperial Army, Soldiers at Toronto (remarks) 4523 (ii).

Infantry Schools, Fredericton and London, cost of lighting, &c. (Ans.) 7121 (ii).

Militia Act Amt. (B. 140) 1st, 5331; in Com., 5965 (ii).

Militia Annual Camp Drill (remarks) 5324 (ii).

— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2425.

— Force, Permanent, inspection by Maj. Gen. Gascoigne (Ans.) 1782 (i).

— General Orders, qualification of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 1782 (i), 7124 (ii).

— Harness and Saddlery contracts (Ans.) 1471 (i).

— Promotions (Ans.) 2433 (i).

— Camp at Beauharnois (remarks) 6638 (ii).

Mounted Police Medals (Ans.) 451 (i).

North-west Mounted Police, contract for transportation of supplies (remarks) 5499 (ii).

— Yukon Force, contract for supplies (remarks) 5116 (ii).

Officer commanding Militia, Increased Allowance, in com. on Res., 4930, 4937 (ii).

Oliver Militia Equipments, adoption by Govt. (Ans.) 4347 (ii).

Permanent Force, subaltern officers, &c., appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7122 (ii).

— Qualifications for Commissions (Ans.) 6010.

Peterborough Drill Shed, tenders, &c. (Ans.) 5132.

Ry. Regulations, enforcement, &c. (remarks) 7119.

Repatriation of 100th Regiment (remarks) 6613 (ii).

Rifle Range, Target Practice, (Ans.) 6612 (ii).

Rockliffe Rifle Range, land valuator (Ans.) 3661 (i).

Rogers, Lt. Col. R. Z., retirement, &c. (Ans.) 5787 (ii).

Royal Canadian Regiment (remarks) 5232 (ii).

Royal Military College, amalgamation of classes (Ans.) 973 (i).

— Employees, Suppl. Ret. (remarks) 6035 (ii).

St. Helen's Island, allotment for Military purposes (Ans.) 456 (i).

St. Luc Rifle Ranges, action of Govt. *re* accidents (remarks) 5569 (ii).

San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1^o, 1914 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Militia and Defence (accountant) 3899; (salaries) 6564, 6985 (ii).

Militia: (arms and accoutrements) 7523; (Dom. Artillery Association) 7521; (Dom. Cartridge Factory) 6570, 7075; (Dom. Rifle Association) 7521; (Fredericton School) 7057; (gratuities) 6573, 7517; (medals, &c.) 7515; (messenger) 7482; (permanent force) 7056; (Rifle Associations) 6570; (salaries) 6564; (unforeseen expenses) 6570; (Yukon force) 7059; (contract for supplies) 7793; (ii).

Borden, Hon. F. W.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. 5622; (New Harbour) 7594 (ii).

Railways: Subsidy to Nova Scotia Central Ry. Co., 7814 (ii).

Sutton, Lt., instruction *re* Military course in England (Ans.) 1782 (i).

Volunteers of 1866, granting of medals (remarks) 6613 (ii).

Yukon Military Contingent, expenditure &c. (remarks) 1577, (i); 4795, (ii).

— H. N. Bate's contract (Ans.) 6009 (ii).

— Contract for transportation of Supplies (remarks) 4602 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L., Halifax.

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Peterson and Tate's contract (Ques.) 829 (i).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2178 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1251; (amt.) 1271; Neg. (Y. 65; N. 119) 1732 (i).

— Telegram to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposal, 1002 (i).

Cape Negro Island Light, Appnmt. of Keeper (M. for Ret. *) 1839 (i).

— (Ques.) 1929 (i).

Civil Service Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6371, 6380 (ii).

Dart, Lyman, Commutation of Sentence, Pets. &c. (M. for copy *) 5669 (i).

— in Com of Sup., 6641, 6647, 6656 (ii).

Drummond Co. Ry. Investigation, Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Lister*) 7114 (ii).

— 2nd Rep. of Com. (remarks) 6580 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4383, 4419, 4476; Sen. amts., 7527 (ii).

Fishermen's Safety B. 111 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com. 4788 (ii).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 5967 (ii).

Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) for Com. of Sup., 6970 (ii).

I.C.R., Dismissal of Chief Engineer Archibald (M. for Ret.) 1834 (ii).

— reinstatement of employees (M. for Ret.) 3665 (ii).

Identification of Criminals B. 156 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6964 (ii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6793 (ii).

— in Com. on Res., 7127 (ii).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 5959 (ii).

Manitoba and North Western Ry. Co. on M. for Com. of Sup., 7473 (ii).

Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7426 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—Continued.

P. E. I., Suits by non-residents (remarks) 7410.

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2094, 2112 (i).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice: Supreme Court (purchase of books) 6638 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (distribution of literature) 5991 (ii).

Indians: N. B. (medical attendance) 7298 (ii).

Inspection of Staples (grain standards) 6698 (ii).

Miscellaneous (pilotage investigations) 7103.

Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7349; (St. Vincent de Paul) 6641 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7598 (ii).

Railways: I.C.R. (claims for damages by fire) 7375; (increased accommodation at Halifax 6382; (iron bridges) 6393 (ii).

U. S. SS. "Yantic," passage up St. Lawrence (Ques.) 830 (i).

West Indian Trade, extension of (Ques.) 1339 (i).

Bostock, Mr. H., Yale and Cariboo.

Cameron *vs.* Queen, Papers, &c. (M. for copy) 1827 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 940 (i).

Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°, 903.

Indictment for Libel, depositions and papers (M. for copies) 1827 (i).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 26) 1°, 744 (i); in Com., 3042, 3054 (i).

Lord's Day Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., on amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2408 (i).

Miles Cañon and White Horse Tramway Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°, 903 (i).

Nakusp and Slocan Ry. B. 52 (Mr. *McPherson*) in Com., 3868 (i).

San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1917 (i).

Bourassa, Mr. J. H. N., Labelle.

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2703 (i).

Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 2020.

Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7451 (ii).

— School Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5425 (ii).

Montfort Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°, 1736.

Britton, Mr. B. M., Kingston.

Alien Workmen, importation to Toronto, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4039 (ii).

Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6235 (ii).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 1858 (i).

— Order (Ques. of) 1505 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2858 (i); in Com., 4642 (ii).

Britton, Mr. B. M.—Continued.

- Criminal Code (Abduction and Seduction) B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2908 (i).
- (1892) Act Amt. (B. 12) 1°, 270 (i); 2°, 2842; M. for Com., 2885; on amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) 6 m. h., 2900 (i).
- Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6950 (ii).
- Dart, Lyman A., Commutation of Sentence, in Com. of Sup., 6670 (ii).
- Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2744 (i); in Com., 4095, 4504 (ii).
- Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1866 (i).
- Judges of the Provincial Courts B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6782; in Com., 6786.
- Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. 69, 1°, 1736 (i); in Com., 4806 (ii).
- Locomotive Works, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 610 (i).
- Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1970 (i).
- Naval Militia Corps, establishment (Ques.) 3085.
- Ontario Lumber Cut, (M. to adjn.) 1840 (i).
- Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Fisdale*) on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to refer back to Com., 2695 (i).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4738, 4762 (ii).
- Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4220, 5163 (ii).
- Reciprocity in Wrecking, Can. and U. S. (remarks) 6612 (ii).
- Cañon Ry. Co.'s (B. 27) 1°, 744 (i).
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1870, 1903, 2084, 2087, 2094, 2097, 2532 (i).
- Statutes, Revision and Consolidation (Ques.) 2343.

SUPPLY :

- Administration of Justice* : (Judge's salaries) 6989, 7487 (ii).
- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* : (Year-book) 5027 (ii).
- Canals* : Rideau, 7182; Trent (construction) 6544; Williamsburg (gratuities) 7194 (ii).
- Civil Government* : Customs (clerical assistance) 7477, Post Office, 4861, 4871 (ii).
- Fisheries* : Behring's Sea (claims commission) 7287 (ii).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* : (maintenance) 4998.
- Miscellaneous* : Privy Council (records) 7282 (ii).
- Ocean and River Service* : (life saving stations) 4954; (winter mail service) 4976 (ii).
- Penitentiaries* : (expenses of commissions) 7345; (Kingston) 6686, 7490 (ii).
- Post Office* : Outside service (letter carriers) 7781.

Broder, Mr. A., Dundas.

- Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2379 (i).
- Cornwall Canal Construction, amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 5391 (ii).

Broder, Mr. A.—Continued.

- Galops Canal, Purchase of Land, names and amounts paid (M. for Ret.*) 3668 (i).
- Insurance Companies, changes of law governing (M.) 5136 (ii).
- Post Office Savings Banks, Reduction of Interest on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 3748 (i).
- SUPPLY :
- Canals* : Williamsburg (gratuities) 7192.
- Yukon Military Contingent, supplies, &c., H. N. Bate's contract (Ques.) 6009 (ii).

Burnett, Mr. L. South Ontario.

- Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2947, 2953 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., West Middlesex.

- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3706 (i).
- London Election Trial, 1897, Mr. H. H. Robertson's accounts (M. for Ret.*) 3669 (i).
- Returns (inquiry) 4774 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Penitentiaries* : Dorchester, 6676 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. M. C., West Huron.

- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2873 (i).
- Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for Com., 2892; (Amt.) 6. m. h., 2897, 2910 (i).

Campbell, Mr. A., Kent.

- Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2370, 2482 (i).
- Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1246 (i).
- Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6958 (ii).
- Drainage Across Rys. Provision (B. 18) 1°, 405 2° m., 2058; ref. to sel. com., 2059 (i).
- Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2952 (i).
- Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) to Com. of Sup., 6971 (ii).
- I.C.R., coloured employees, (M. to adjn.) 3167 (i).
- Judges of the Provincial Courts B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6794 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Immigration* : (agents' salaries), 6834 (i).
- Miscellaneous* : (prohibition expenses), 7094 (ii).
- Quarantine* : (cattle slaughtered) 7007 (ii).
- Post Office* : Outside Service (letter carries), 7777.
- Railways* : I.C.R. (iron bridges) 6407; (rolling stock) 7644 (ii).
- Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joli*) Sen. Amts., 7784 (ii).

Cargill, Mr. H., East Bruce.**SUPPLY :**

- Public Works* : Buildings (Dom.) 5607 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. K.C.M.G., Three Rivers.

Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 2195 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 4668 (ii).

Dupont, Mr., late M. P., decease (remarks) 1774.

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3947, 4469 (ii).

Gascoigne, Maj. Gen., Resignation (remarks) 4167 (ii).

Jubilee Stamps, receipts from sales (Ques.) 3939.

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co's B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 3068; on consdn. of Amts., 3366 (i).

Klondike and Peace River Transportation Co.'s B. 91 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 4169 (ii).

Man. Schools Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5432 (ii).

Officer Commanding Militia, Increased Allowance, in Com. on Res., 4935 (ii).

Oliver Equipments, Militia, adoption by Govt. (Ques.) 4347 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2919 (i); on M. for 2°, 5553 (ii); on M. for Com., 5719; in Com., 5750 (ii).

— Free Postage for Newspapers (remarks) 4041 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquor—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4748 (ii).

Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4670 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris Exhibition) 5942 (ii).

Civil Government: Interior, 4528; *Militia and Defence* (accountant) 3900, 3922 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries, &c.) 4993.

Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 3413 (i).

Carscallen, Mr. A. W., North Hastings.

Certificates to Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 37 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1860 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard, G.C.M.G.

(Minister of Trade and Commerce) *South Oxford*.

Address, on The, 151 (i).

Adjnmt. for Easter (remarks) 2848 (i).

— (M.) 3095 (i).

Alien Labour Law, copy of instructions from Dept. of Justice (remarks) 5519 (ii).

Appnmts. by late Govt. (remarks) 4927 (ii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, negotiations, &c. (Ans) 600 (i).

— (remarks) 6609 (ii).

— Peterson and Tate's contract (Ans.) 829.

— prop. Res., 5215 (ii).

— (remarks) 7385 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. — Continued.

Auditor General, Powers and Duties on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 6205 (ii).

— Rep., French Translation (remarks) 3827.

Budget, The, 3242 (i).

— M. for precedence on Wednesdays, 3094 (i).

Business of the House, Easter adjnmt. (remarks) 2929 (i).

— (M.) 6109 (ii).

— (remarks) 5885 (ii).

Canadian and English Mails, Beaver Line Steamers (Ans.) 2845 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1712 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3700; in Com., 3711 (i).

— Superannuation. Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6374 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Treatment of Workmen on M. for Com. of Sup., 6593 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3010 (i).

Gaspé, Line of Steamers, Subsidy, &c. (Ans.) 7686 (ii).

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., Decease of (remarks) 5868 (ii).

Grain Transit, Man. and N. W. Regulation B. 19 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2°, 2080 (i).

Hawaiian Vessels, Navigating Canadian waters (Ans.) 603 (i).

Insolvency B., Govt. legislation (Ans.) 3826 (i).

— Govt. measure (Ans.) 2848 (i).

— Govt. policy, on M. to adjn., 2927 (i).

L'Ancienne Lorette, Postmaster Alain, Dismissal, on M. for Res., 2821 (i).

Man. Schools, documents, &c., on M. for Cor., 3664 (i).

— Pet. presented at Rome (Ans.) 3165 (i).

Mistassini and St. Methode Public Works, on M. for Ret., 2823 (i).

Montague, P. E. I., Sub-collector of Customs, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2822 (i).

Montreal Harbour, Commissioners Loan B. 163, on prop. Res., 6440, 6880, 6908 (ii).

Pacific Cable between Vancouver and Australia, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) for Com. of Sup., 6197 (ii).

— *re* Conference (remarks) 7385 (ii).

Post Office Savings Banks, reduction of interest, on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3715, 3736 (i).

Preferential Trade with G.B., on Amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 5861 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4735 (ii).

Queen's Printer, Qualifications (Ans.) 3165 (i).

Smelting Silver Lead in B.C., regulations, &c. (Ans.) 6012 (ii).

Sons of England Benefit Society Co.'s incorp. B. 127 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com., 6057 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

Civil Government : Agriculture (salaries) 4849; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 3831, 3859; High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 4561, 4577; Interior, 4535; Justice (penitentiary branch) 3899; Militia and Defence (accountant) 3921; Privy Council Office, 3894; (contingencies) 4582; Public Works, 4558; Trade and Commerce, 4560; (contingencies) 4598; (salaries) 7483 (ii).

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7592, 7606; Que. (River St. Lawrence) 5057 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck, &c., East Bay and Irish Cove) 7723; (Can. and South Africa) 7720; (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 6687; (Halifax and St. John) 6686; (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7659; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 6688; (St. John, Halifax, &c.) 7282; (Victoria and San Francisco) 6687 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7266.

Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act, &c.) 6690 (ii).

Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 935 (i).

Trade with W. Indies, on Adjmt. (remarks) 2844 (i).

Veterinary Inspectors, Appnmts. on M. for Ret., 2821 (i).

Ways and Means, on M. (Sir C. H. Tupper) to adjn. Deb., 3170 (i).

— on M. (Mr. Davin) to adjn. Deb., 3593 (i).

— In Com. (preferential clause) 3770 (i).

Woods, J. P., ex-Judge, retiring allowance (Ans.) 825 (i).

Yukon District, Customs Regulations, on M. for Ret., 2822 (i).

Yukon Ry., action of U.S. Senate, on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn., 1326 (i).

— Land subsidy (remarks) *re* exchange (Ans.) 2037 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E., West Elgin.

Alberta and Yukon Ry. Nav. and Mining Co.'s incorp. (B. 124) 1°, 4348 (i); in Com., 7163 (ii).

Atlas Loan Co.'s (B. 55) 1°, 1379 (i).

Bruneau, Mr., M. P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Marcotte) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2157 (i).

Business of the Hse., Morning Sittings and Committees (remarks) 6110, 6227 (ii).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to M. for 2°, 1725 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. Richardson) on M. for Com., 2868; in Com., 4645 (ii).

Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 6941 (ii).

Drainage Across Ry. Lands (B. 5) 1°, 185; 2° m., 2055; ref. to Sel. Com., 2056 (i).

Federal Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 29) 1°, 902 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 2720 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.

Govt Business, Precedence on Thursdays on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2522 (i).

G. T. R. Regulations, on M. (Mr. Wallace) to adjn., 6018 (ii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. Bostock) in Com., 2958 (i).

Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. 30 (Mr. McGregor) 1°, 902 (i).

Man. Schools Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. to Com. of Sup., 5418 (ii).

N. W. Mounted Police, distribution in N.W.T. (M. for Ret. *) 3670 (i).

Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. Tisdale) on M. for Com., 2394; in Com., 2626.

Order (Ques. of) Chairman's ruling, 71 (i).

Pacific Cable between Vancouver and Australia, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6186 (ii).

— Imp. Govt.'s Rep. (M. for copy*) 3668 (ii).

— (M.) to print papers, 6226 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 1°, 2924 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 4714 (ii).

Ry. Employees Safety (B. 4) 1°, 185; 2° m., 2054; in Com., 3675, 4209, 4213, 4638, 4669, 4676; ref. back to Com., 5148; in Com., 5148; (amt.) neg. (Y. 21, N. 80) 5174 (ii).

Ry. Regulations, Enforcement, &c. (Ques.) 7118.

Returns (inquiry) 5232 (ii).

San José Scale Pest, Prohibition of U. S. Nursery Stock, on M. (Mr. Churlton) to adjn., 2249.

SUPPLY :

Legislation : House of Commons (debates) 7031.

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions : (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7673 (ii).

Railways : Crows Nest Pass (salaries, &c.) 7111.

Casgrain, Mr. T. C., Montmorency.

Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Marcotte) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2234 (i).

Canadian Defences, Improvements (M. for cor. *) 2839 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 2°, 758 (i).

Chambord, Chicoutimi, Customs House, establishment (Ques.) 1469 (i).

Coulombe *vs.* Queen, appeal before Court of Queens Bench (M. for cor. *) 3668 (i).

— (Ques.) 1068 (i).

Drummond County Ry., Com. of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 513 (i).

Fisheries of Can. appeal from Supreme Court (Ques.) 3825 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) French translation and printing (remarks) 2434 (i).

French Translation and Printing (remarks) 3091.

Frigon, A., Indemnity for injury (M. for Rep. *) 3668 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. T. C.—Continued.

- Godbout, A., Dismissal (M. for Ret.) 3664 (i).
 I. C. R. Employees, reduction in passenger and freight depts. (Ques.) 602 (i).
 — news stand at Lévis Station, lease (Ques.) 1338 (i).
 — St. Michel Station (Ques.) 3312 (i).
 — ties and lumber supplies, tenders (M. for Ret. *) 2840 (i).
 Judges of the Provincial Courts B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6755; in Com., 6784 (ii).
La Canadienne, SS., chartered by Govt. (Ques.) 5318 (ii).
 L'Ancienne Lorette, Postmaster Alain, Dismissal (M. for Ret.) 2821 (i).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2407 (i).
 Mistassini Wharf and St. Methode, construction, &c. (M. for copy of instruction*) 3668 (i).
 — (M. for Ret.) 2822 (i).
 Ogilvie's Rep., and Hansard translation (remarks) 1576 (i).
 Rivière la Pipe Wharf, purchase of timber (Ques.) 1468 (i).
 Roberval Pier, Payments to men, &c. (M. for Ret. *) 2840 (i).
 Russell, Chas., English Solicitor, Amounts paid (M. for Ret. *) 2839 (i).
 St. Anne de Beaupre Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 1072 (i).
 St. Michel, Govt. Wharf, repairs (Ques.) 3312 (i).
 — Mail Service (Ques.) 3313 (i).
 Telegraph Lines, North Shore St. Lawrence (Ques.) 1336 (i).
 — tenders, &c., for contract (Ques.) 7123 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J., North Norfolk.

- Alien Labour Law, Enforcement (remarks) 5797.
 Bagot Electoral District, vacancy, issue of writ, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5250 (ii).
 Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1628 (i).
 Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction (B. 3) 1°*, 185; 2° m., 2907 (i); on M. for 2°, 4221 (ii).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3949, 4277 (ii).
 Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) for Com. of Sup., 6967.
 Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal incorp. B. 99 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6331, 6934 (ii).
 Land Grants to Ry. Corporations in Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 482 (i).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance (B. 2) 1°, 184; 2° m., 1950, 1975; in Com., 1977, 1984, 1989, 2042, on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2045, 2411 (i).
 — (M. to restore to order paper) 2426 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co., construction, &c., on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) to Com. of Sup., 6498 (ii).
 San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1909, 1926 (i).
 — (M. to adjn.) 2241 (i).
 Spanish Ambassador, late, presence in Can. (remarks) 5788 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris Exhibition) 5047; (Year-book) 5028 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 5075; Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 5923 (ii).

Chauvin, Mr. L. A., Terrebonne.

- Bagot Electoral District, vacancy, issue of writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5236 (ii).
 Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 5 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2057 (i).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2785 (i).
 Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 7171 (ii).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, revolt of convicts (Ques.) 1069 (i).
 Terrebonne, Excise division, Prevost's rep. into conduct of Collector (M. for copy*) 1837 (i).
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 1384 (i).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., Montmagny.

- Budget and Hansard translation (remarks) 1576 (i).
 Can. Atlantic Transit Co.'s incorp. B. 92 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2429 (i).
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2882 (i).
 Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. (presented) 3822 (i).
 — conc. (M.) 4246 (ii).
 Govt. Tolls on Wharfs (remarks) 4351 (ii).
 Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) Sen. Amts., 7461 (ii).
 Train Service, issue of Timetables (remarks) 6242 (ii).
 Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2962 (i).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (Amt.) 2046 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Canals: Murray (repairs) 6562.

Christie, Mr. T., Argenteuil.

- Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1980 (i).

Clancy, Mr. J., Bothwell.

- Agricultural Implements, free entry on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3204 (i).
 Alien Labour Law, Appnt. of Agent at Wallaceburg (remarks) 6612 (ii).
 — Enforcement &c. (remarks) 7126 (i).

Clancy, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Alien Workmen, importation to Toronto on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4035 (ii).
 Budget, The, 3574 (i).
 Butter Industry in Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2506 (i).
 Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to M. for 2^o, 1562 (i).
 ——— Telegram to High Commissioner, re Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1026 (i).
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3700; in Com., 3712 (ii).
 Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6379 (ii).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2^o, 2708; in Com., 2971, 2981 (i), 3942, 4115, 4338, 4486, 4503 (ii).
 Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) to Com. of Sup., 6972 (ii).
 Judges of the Provincial Courts (Pension) B. in Com. on Res., 7135 (ii).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2^o, 1973 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4749 (ii).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2095, 2104 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Adulteration of Food* (expenses, &c.) 6000 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 5024; (cold storage) 5997; (creameries, N.W.T.) 5994; (experimental farm) 5978; (Year-book) 5927 (ii).
Civil Government: Agriculture (salaries) 4854; Aud. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 4587; Finance (contingencies, charwomen) 4599; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3835; Indian Affairs (contingencies) 4586; Inland Revenue (contingencies) 4590; Justice (contingencies) 4583; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 4596; Public Works (contingencies) 4592; Sundry Depts. (private sec.'s salaries) 7486 (ii).
Culling Timber (contingencies) 6000 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 5297 (ii).
Indian Affairs: N.B. (medical attendance) 7299; N.S. (erection of fence) 7298; Que. (Oka Indians) 7291 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7028; (sessional clerks) 7013 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4990 (ii).
Militia (Yukon Force) 7071, 7354 (ii).
Penitentiaries (expenses of commission) 7340 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Man., 5929; Ont., 5922, 7642; (Toronto Harbour) 5891, 5906; Public Buildings: Ont. (Arnprior P.O.) 5449; (Major's Hill Park) 5461; (Summer House, Ottawa) 7221; Harbours and Rivers (general vote) 6071; N.S. (New Harbour) 7614 (ii).
Railways (general expenses for investigations) 7212; I C.R. (claims for damages) 7183; Indian-town Branch (land damages) 7082 (ii).
 Toronto Harbour Improvements, amounts paid W. E. Phin (Ques.) 1337 (i).

Clancy, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Ways and Means—The Tariff*:
 In Com. (preferential clause) 3759, 3791: (tobacco) 3812 (i)
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2135, 3103 (i); 6582 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., Toronto.

- Address, on The, 377 (i).
 Alien Labour Law, appnmt. of Officers in Ont. (Ques.) 5317 (ii).
 ——— appnmt. of Agent at Toronto (remarks) 4254, 4349 (ii).
 ——— enforcement at Toronto (remarks) 5011, 5445, 5799 (ii).
 Alien Workmen, Importation to Toronto, M. to adjn., 4029 (ii).
 Bell Telephone Co.'s Rates (remarks) 7126 (ii).
 Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1^o*, 1068 (i).
 Civil Service Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2^o, 6339; in Com., 6371, 6797 (ii).
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Investigation, on conc. 7848 (ii).
 Dom. Loan (1897) Amount applied for by banks (Ques.) 4177 (ii).
 Dredging in Toronto Harbour, expenditure (Ques.) 482 (i).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4500, 5262; on M. for 3^o, 5698 (ii).
 Govt. Contracts, prohibition of sweating (Ques.) 599 (i).
 Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7741 (ii).
 Illinois National Guards, permission to enter Can. (Ques.) 599 (i).
 Judges of the Provincial Courts (Pension) B. in Com. on Res., 7135 (ii).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2048, on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2407 (i).
 Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7423 (ii).
 Manufacturers Guarantee and Accident Insurance Co., change of name (B. 57) 1^o*, 1380 (i).
 North-west Mounted Police, Supplies, transportation, &c. (Ques.) 5520 (ii).
 P.E.I. Legislation, Disallowance of Act (remarks) 7553 (ii).
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1^o, 2919 (i); on M. for 2^o, 5540; in Com., 5748, 5768 (ii).
 ——— Amt. (Special Delivery) B. 167 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1^o, 7409 (ii).
 Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, reduction of interest, on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3751 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4733, 4756 (ii).
 Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co. on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 4253 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—Continued.

Queenston Heights Bridge Co.'s (B. 58) 1st, 1380.
Royal Canadian Regiment (remarks) 5232 (ii).
Ry. Employes Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com.,
4674 (ii).

Sheridan, John, Inspector Live Stock, Appnmt.
by Govt. (Ques.) 6010 (ii).

Sons of England Benefit Society Co.'s incorp. B.
122 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com., 6059 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris Exhibition) 5046.
Civil Government: Customs (conc.) 7818; Gov.
Gen. Sec's Office, 3839; Post Office, 4874, 4877;
(contingencies) 4915; sundry Depts. (private
sec's salaries) 7486 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 7746 (ii).

Militia (gratuities) 7521; (medals) 7516; (perma-
nent force) 7156; (Yukon Force) 7059 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Alien Labour Law (Man. and
N.W.T.) 7275; (Crow's Nest Pass commission)
7256, 7273; (pilotage investigations) 7104 (ii);
Yukon Provisional District (administration of
Govt.) 7330 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection)
7732; (maintenance, &c.) 4948; (winter mail ser-
vice) 4970 (ii).

Penitentiaries: Kingston, 7488, 7789 (ii).

Post Office (temporary clerks) 7040 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S., 7214; Ont., 217;
(Major's Hill Park) 5462; (repairs, &c.) 5448;
Que., 7587 (ii); Harbours and Rivers, N.S., 7589;
(New Harbour) 7594; Ont., 7641; (dredging)
7227, 7231; Que., 5655, 7639 (ii).

Railways: Crow's Nest Pass (salaries) 7112, 7182;
(general expenses for investigation) 7210; I.C.R.
Indiantown Branch (land damages) 7078, 7081

Scientific Institutions: (meteorological service)
7285; (Toronto Observatory) 5002, 7733 (ii).

Toronto Harbour Dredging, expenditure (Ques.)
482 (i).

—— contract (Ques.) 4771 (ii).

—— liability incurred (Ques.) 971 (i).

Toronto and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B.
77) 1st, 1839 (i); Sen. Amts. (M.) to conc., 6268.

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com. (preferential clause) 3773 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri*
Joly) in Com., 2127 (i).

Cochrane, Mr. E., East Northumberland.

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in
Com., 4023 (ii).

Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act
Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1864.

SUPPLY :

Canals: Murray (repairs) 6554; Trent (construc-
tion) 6548, 6553 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Montreal)
St. John and Manchester) 7679 (ii).

Militia (Yukon Force) 7068 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (P.E.I. and Mainland)
7731 (ii).

Penitentiaries: Kingston, 7489 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (Major's Hill Park)
5586; (Woodstock P.O.) 5467 (ii); Harbours and
Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7615 (ii).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

Railways: I.C.R. (iron bridges) 6403 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri*
Joly) Sen. Amts., 7784 (ii).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S., Digby.

Deputy Minister of Justice, Appnmt. (Ques.)
3166 (i).

Lobster Fishing in Bay of Fundy (Ques.) 479 (i).

Printing Bureau Employees, Names, Salaries, &c.
(M. for Ret. *) 3669 (i).

—— H. T. Smith's position and duties (Ques.)
2350 (i).

—— superintendent's status (Ques.) 2431 (i).

Queen's Printer, qualification (Ques.) 3165 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works: Buildings (N.B.) 5092 (ii).

Corby, Mr. H., West Hastings.

Belleville P. O., Dismissals, on M. for Com. of
Sup., 6208 (ii).

—— (Remarks) 6112 (ii).

G. T. Ry. Regulations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to
adjn., 6021 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Promised Aid by Govt.
(Ques.) 2817 (i).

Costigan, Hon. J., Victoria, N.B.

Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition B. 76
(Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6375 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in
Com., 4265 (ii).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri*
Joly) in Com., 5968 (ii).

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., Decease of, Res. of
condolence, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6120
(ii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts B., in Com. on
Res., 7141 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 136
(Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5325 (ii).

Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood*,
Hamilton) on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to ref. to
Com., 3647 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *La Patrie re Man.*
Schools (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7714 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Government: Inland Revenue Dept. (con-
tingencies) 6978 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks)
6993 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers N.B., 7634;
N. S. (New Harbour) 7617 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir
Henri Joly) in Com., 2118 (i).

Cowan, Mr. M. K., South Essex.

Alien Workmen, Importation to Toronto, on M.
(Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4034 (ii).

Craig, Mr. T. D., East Durham.

Address, on The, 328 (i).

Agricultural Implements, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3183 (i).

Budget, The, 3428 (i).

Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2365 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1086 (i).

Criminal Code, Seduction and Abduction Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2908 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2309 (i).

Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 2033.

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1958; in Com., 1998; on Amt. (Mr. *Macleay*) that Com. rise, 2421 (i).

Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Montreal Witness*, 3503.

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3931; in Com., 4753; on M. for 3°, 6039 (ii).

—— Letter of Min. of Jus. (remarks) 5321 (ii).

—— (M. to adjn.) 3314 (i).

—— (Ques.) 2441 (i).

Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 5161 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Government: Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3837.
Ways and Means—The Tariff.

In Com. (preferential clause) 3762 (i).

Yukon Territory, Liquor Permits (Ques.) 1781, 2434 (i).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) Queen's, P.E.I.

Address, on The, 385 (i).

Alien Labour Law, Enforcement (Ans.) 3085 (i).

—— B.C. Govt. action (Ans.) 3663 (i).

Appnmts. by late Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Montague*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).

—— (remarks) 4926 (ii).

Arichat Harbour, Buoys, &c. (Ans.) 5320 (ii).

Aspy Bay, Harbour of Refuge, Construction (Ans.) 2820 (i).

Baxter, Wm., Services as Lighthouse-keeper (Ans.) 3657 (i).

Bear River Bridge, Report as to Piers (Ans.) 975.

—— Shipping-master, Dismissal (Ans.) 1072 (i).

Behring Sea, British Vessels seized by Russia (Ans.) 1072 (i).

Belœil, Caretaker of Booms, Resignation (Ans.) 2847 (i).

—— Land Damages (Ans.) 2847 (i).

Berthier Channel, Deepening (Ans.) 3085 (i).

Binder Twine, Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of (Ans.) 3659 (i).

Bounty to Fishermen, Application to Gabarous (Ans.) 674 (i).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2710 (i).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis—Continued.

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3821 (i).

Can. Yukon Ry., Telegram to High Commissioner, on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 985 (i).

Cape Breton, Marine Dept., Changes (Ans.) 673.

Cape Negro Island Light, Appnmt. of Keeper (Ans.) 1929 (i).

Certificates to Masters and Mates Act Amt. (B. 37) 1°, 936; in Com., 1860 (i).

Chicoutimi Co. Telegraph Line (Ans.) 2815 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2879 (i).

Coasting Trade of Can. Act Amt. B. 106 (Sir *C. H. Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 2809 (i).

Criminal Code, Amt. Seduction and Abduction B. 12 (Mr. *Britton*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) to M. for Com., 2897 (i).

—— B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2905.

Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Death of Employees, on M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 3666 (i).

Dart, Lyman, Commutation of Sentence, in Com. of Sup., 6643, 6660, 6671 (ii).

Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co's incorp. B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com. 6939 (ii).

Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7162 (ii).

Dom. Lands, Tenby, Man., sub-agent, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3087 (i).

Drummond County Ry. Com. of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 510 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2972, 2993 (i), 4082, 4109, 4388, 4409, 4477, 4508; Sen. Amts., 7528, 7566, 7792 (ii).

Fishermen's Safety (B. 111), in Com., 4781 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 127), 1°, 4522; in Com., 4946 (ii).

Fisheries Act, Amt. (Saw-dust in Rivers), (B. 166) 1°, 7115; 2°, *n.*, 7470 (ii).

Fishery Overseer Boddy, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3658 (ii).

Fishing Licenses, amount paid by Lake Erie Fishermen, &c. (Ans.) 601 (i).

French Translation and Printing (remarks) 3091 (i).

Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. (B. 38), 1°, 936; in Com., 1863 (i).

—— (B. 135), 1°, 4922; in Com., 5325 (ii).

Hicks, Wm., Fishery Overseer, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3668 (i).

Hudson Bay Expedition, James Fisher's Rep. (Ans.) 2350 (i).

—— Report of Commissioner, (Ans.) 604, 975 (i).

—— Report as to navigability (Ans.) 975 (i).

Joint Commission, U. S. and Can., proposed conference (remarks) 6609 (ii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6752; in Com., on Res., 7132 (ii).

King's Head Light, (Ans.) 1929, 1932 (i).

Klondike and Peace River Transportation B. 91 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 4169 (i).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis—Continued.

- La Canadienne*, SS. Charter by Govt. (Ans.) 5318 (ii).
- L'Ardoise, St. Peters Canal, &c., Outports, medical aid to sick seamen (Ans.) 1339 (i).
- Lavoie, Dr., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7112 (ii).
- Lighthouses between Vancouver and Stikine River (Ans.) 976 (i).
- Supplies, Montreal West, Contract (Ans.) 2846 (i).
- Lobster Packing, Size of Catch, &c. (Ans.) 1340 (i).
- Logs, &c., Export Duty authorized (Ans.) 3085 (i).
- Mackay's Point Wharf, Judique, N. S., tenders for buildings, &c. (Ans.) 2816 (i).
- McNabb, Campbell, Claim against Govt. (remarks) 5447 (ii).
- Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res. 7397; in Com., 7402 (ii).
- Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. Marine Branch (presented) 5 (i).
- Midland, Ont., Harbour-master, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3662 (i).
- Naval Militia Corps, Establishment (Ans.) 3085.
- Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 136) 1°, 4923; in Com., 5328 (ii).
- Neufrage Pond, P.E.I., Survey (Ans.) 3166 (i).
- Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3646 (i).
- N.W.M.P. Supplies, Transportation, &c. (Ans.) 5520 (ii).
- withdr. from Moosimin (Ans.) 3084 (i).
- Oyster Fisheries, P.E.I., Leases, &c. (Ans.) 1776.
- Parliament Grounds, Dismissal of late Supt. Robertson (Ans.) 2819 (i).
- Parry Sound, Harbour-master (Ans.) 5135 (ii).
- Perry, Mr. S. F., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 938 (i).
- Pictou Postmaster (Ans.) 2819 (i).
- Piers and Wharfs in P.E.I. Govt. control (Ans.) 3088 (i).
- Pilotage Investigation at St. John, N.B. (Ans.) 825 (i).
- Point Jérôme, N.S., Appnmt. of Light-keeper (Ans.) 5321 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5772 (ii).
- Pound Net Licenses, North Shore of Lake Superior (Ans.) 3657 (i).
- P.E.I., suits by Non-residents (remarks) 7410 (ii).
- Private Bills, allowed to stand (remarks) 5540 (ii).
- Privilege, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Members of Parliament and Representatives of the press (remarks) 5127 (ii).
- Procedure, on third reading of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2656 (i).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4731 (ii).
- Racine Fishery and Riparian Owner, License for erection (Ans.) 4772 (ii).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis—Continued.

- Reciprocity in Wrecking, Can. and U.S. (remarks) 6612 (ii).
- Returns, on Inquiry for, 5519, 5569 (ii); (remarks) 2820 (i).
- Royal Military College, on inquiry for Ret., 5571.
- St. Anicette Wharf, cost of (Ans.) 2818 (i).
- St. Lawrence Channel, placing of buoys, Contract (Ans.) 4180 (i).
- (remarks) 3318 (i).
- Stationary Engineers, Examination, on prop. introd. of B. (remarks) 2800 (i).
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 39) in Com., 1869, 1903, 1937, 2084, 2113, 2531 (i); Sen. Amts., 4525 (ii).
- Steamboat Inspection, remission of penalties (Ans.) 2344 (i).
- Storm Signals, Cape Breton, number, &c. (Ans.) 7118 (ii).
- Summerside Breakwater, Tenders for construction (Ans.) 2816 (i).
- SUPPLY:
- Civil Government*: Auditor General's Office (contingencies) 4587; Finance Dept. (charwomen) 4600; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3842; Indians, 4553; Inland Revenue (contingencies) 4591; Interior, 4541; Marine and Fisheries, 4558; (contingencies) 4596; (extra clerks) 7481 (ii).
- Fisheries* (Behring Sea Claims, commissioners) 7286; (litigation expenses) 7285; (protection service) 5269, 7285; (salaries, overseers, &c.) 5004 (ii).
- Indians*: Man. and N.W.T., 7767 (ii).
- Legislation*: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6991, 7012 (ii).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction) 4999; (maintenance) 4938; (repairs to wharfs) 5000; (salaries) 4985 (ii).
- Marine* (hospitals) 5003 (ii).
- Miscellaneous* (Alien Labour Law, enforcement) 7773; (Boundary, Can. and U.S.) 6860; (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7266; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 7094; (Pilotage Investigations) 7102; (Prescott and Russell Fire Relief Fund) 7091; (Wharfinger, Sault Ste. Marie, salary) 7098 (ii).
- Ocean and River Service* (Biological Station) 7733; (cattle inspection) 7732; (life saving stations) 4953; (maintenance) 4947; (obstructions) 4964; (P.E.I. and mainland) 7730; (registry of shipping) 4954; (repairs to "Stanley") 7283; (tidal service, &c.) 4957, 4961, 7732; (winter mail service) 4964, 7284 (ii).
- Public Works*: Buildings (Major's Hill Park) 5582; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7611; Ont., conc., 7821; P.E.I., 5631, 7537; Que., 5658; Miscellaneous (professional services) 7243.
- Railways*: (Subsidy to N. S. C. Ry. Co.) 7515 (ii).
- Scientific Institutions* (hydrographic service) 5000; (meteorological service) 5002, 7235; (Toronto observatory) 5002, 7284 (ii).
- Steamboat Inspection*: 5003 (ii).
- Trade and Commerce* (Chinese Immigration Act, &c) 6693 (ii).
- Unprovided Items* (per Aud. Gen. Rep.) 7351 (ii).
- Yukon Provisional District* (Administration of Govt.) 7332 (ii).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis—Continued.

- Telegraph Operator Ross, North Margaree, Dismissal (Ans.) 2815 (i).
 Thessalon Point Lighthouse, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).
 Tolls on Govt. wharfs (remarks) 4352 (ii).
 U. S. SS. *Frederick J. Gerring*, Supreme Court Judgment, on M. for Ret., 2823 (i).
 ——— *Yantie*, passage up St. Lawrence (Ans.) 830 (i).
 ——— collision with *La Canadienne*, &c. (Ans.) 4451 (ii).
 Winter Communication, P.E.I. and mainland (Ans.) 1779 (i).
 Yukon District, Liquor Permits (Ans.) 3088 (ii).
 Yukon Ry., Action of U. S. Senate, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn. Hse., 1289, 1312 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F., West Assiniboia, N.W.T.

- Address, on The, 272 (i).
 Agricultural Implements and Free List, prop. Res., 2825 (i).
 ——— Free Entry, 3170, 3196 (i).
 Alien Labour Law, B. C. Govt. action (Ques.) 3662 (i).
 ——— prosecutions under (Ques.) 474 (i).
 Appnmts. in N. W. T. (Ques.) 977 (i).
 Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Agreements, &c., on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5231 (ii).
 ——— Telegram from London *re* Contract (Ques.) 7356 (ii).
 Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of Writ, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Adjn., 5249 (ii).
 Banff Baths, Caretaker, Dismissal of (Ques.) 451.
 ——— (M. for Ret. *) 2841 (i).
 Business of The House, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 5012 (ii).
 Budget, The, 3594 (i).
 Butter Industry in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2357, 2498 (i).
 Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6237 (ii).
 Canada Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1214; in Com. (Land Subsidy) 1859 (i).
 Cattle Shipments from Canada to United Kingdom, on M. (Mr. *Hughes*) to adjn., 2441 (i).
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3698, 4639 (ii).
 ——— Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6352; in Com., 6371 (ii).
 Creameries in N.W.T., number, patrons, &c. (M. for Ret.), 487, 503 (i).
 Criminal Code Act Amt. (B. 65) 1°, 1573 (i).
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Investigation, on conc., 7840 (ii).
 ——— Treatment of Labourers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6614 (ii).
 Dairying in N.W.T., subsidy, prop. Res. 504 (i).
 Daunais, C. M., Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1928 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—Continued.

- Deaf Mutes in N.W.T., Provision by N. W. Govt. (Ques.) 1930 (i).
 Deptl. Buildings, Fire at West Block (Ques.) 2347 (i).
 Dom. Land Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 4681; in Com., 5937 (ii).
 Dredging Licenses, Regulations respecting (remarks) 746 (i).
 Drolet, Chevalier, Mining leases granted (M. for copies) 2839 (i).
 ——— (Ques.) 671 (i), 4924 (ii).
 Edmonton Bridge, Contract for Construction (Ques.) 1341 (i).
 ——— Freight rates, &c. (Ques.) 6010 (ii).
 ——— (M. for Ret. *) 1838 (i).
 ——— penalties imposed on contractors (Ques.) 5316 (ii).
 ——— Return *re* (Ques.) 2528 (i).
 ——— (remarks) 3827 (i).
 Edwards, Dr. O. C., Indian Medical Officer, Appnmt. by Govt., 4607 (ii).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 6 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2768; in Com., 2996 (i), 4016, 4282, 4354, 4483, 4492; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3°, 5688, 5707; Sen. Amts., 7564 (ii).
 Galician Settlers in N.W.T., Rep. *re* Destitution (remarks) 101 (i), 6032 (ii).
 General Inspection Act. Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 5970 (ii).
 Gisborne, Mr., Govt. inspector of Tel. Lines, N.W.T., Dismissal (Ques.) 5317 (ii).
 Grain Liens, Man., and N. W. T. legislation *re* (Ques.) 1930 (i).
 Grain Standards, Inspection System (Ques.) 1780 (i).
 G. T. R. Regulations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to Adjn., 6022 (ii).
 Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7741 (ii).
 Immigration Literature, Correction (remarks) 6581 (ii).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 2°, 5960; in Com., 5964 (ii).
 Indian Dept., Law clerk, Appnmt. (remarks) 7654, 7658 (ii).
 ——— Lands, Qu'Appelle Valley, rights of settlers (M. to adjn. Hse.) 516 (i).
 ——— Reserves, Assiniboia, distribution of seed (M. for Ret. *) 4678 (ii).
 ——— Reserves, crops grown on (M. for Ret. *) 1837 (i).
 ——— Reserves, N.W.T. (Ques.) 452 (i).
 ——— Reserves, Qu'Appelle District (Ques.) 451.
 ——— Supplies, Purchase of, Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 452 (ii).
 Interior Dept., Dismissal of Employees in N.W.T. (Ques.) 829 (i).
 Japanese Immigration, Imposition of poll tax (remarks) 2441 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—Continued.

- Jones, Charles A., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4607 (ii).
- Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Res., 6130; on M. for 2°, 6732 (ii).
- Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. Bostock) in Com., 2957, 3040 (i).
- Klondike, Edmonton and Prince Albert routes (Ques.) 453 (i).
- Lands Titles Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Sifton) on M. for 2°, 5951 (ii).
- Reserved for settlement in Man. and N.W.T. (M. for Ret. *) 1837 (i).
- (Ques.) 971 (i).
- Surveys in N.W.T. (Ques.) 450 (i).
- Lieut. Gov. of N.W.T., rumoured Appnmt. of Member for North Wellington (Ques.) 101 (i).
- McCarthy, Dalton, M.P., Candidature for Brandon (Ques.) 4610 (ii).
- Militia Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Borden, Kings) in Com., 5965 (ii).
- Noel, L. P. O., Dismissal, N.W.T., 6319 (ii).
- N. W. T. Irrigation Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. Sifton) on M. for 1°, 5663; in Com., 6123, Sen. Amts.. 7790 (ii).
- N. W. M. P. Act (1889) Amt. (B. 15) 1°, 307; 2° m., 4239 (ii).
- (Pension) Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. Davis) 1°, 271 (i).
- (Land Grants) Further Provision B. 123 (Mr. Sifton) on M. for 2°, 5960 (ii).
- contract for transporting supplies to the Yukon (remarks) 5116, 5397 (ii).
- medals (Ques.) 451 (i).
- number in Territories (Ques.) 452 (i).
- Dismissal of Dr. Bain (Ques.) 2349 (i).
- Pensions, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5019 (ii).
- Tenders for Drugs (M. for copy*) 4246 (ii).
- Tenders for Drugs (Ques.) 2349 (i).
- withdr. from Alberta District (remarks) 404 (i).
- N.W. Territory Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. Sifton) on M. for 1°, 4600, 4682; in Com., 5945 (ii).
- Dismissals, &c. (inquiry for Ret.) 6317 (ii).
- Govt. Officials, dismissed since 1896, names, &c. (M. for Ret. *) 4246 (ii).
- and Immigration hand-book (M. to adjn.) 5932 (ii).
- Seed Grain, amount due Settlers (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5569 (ii).
- (Ques.) 5135 (ii)
- Status of Coroners (remarks) 7855 (ii).
- Order (Ques. of) Ways and Means, 3525 (i).
- Ontario and Rainy River Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. Tisdale) on M. for Com., 2617; on M. (Mr. Maclean) to ref. back to Com., 2693 (i).
- Parliament Buildings, Contract for asphaltting walks (Ques.) 1783 (i).
- Perjury, Convictions at Battleford (Ques.) 1780 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—Continued.

- Personal explanation (Mr. Oliver) remarks, 2930.
- par. in Manitoba *Free Press* re agricultural implements, 4349 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for Com., 5739; in Com., 5944 (ii).
- P. O. Savings Banks, rate of interest, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (i).
- reduction of interest, on Amt. to Com. on Ways and Means, 3714 (ii).
- withdr. (Ques.) 6465 (ii).
- Prince Albert Mail Service delay, on M. (Mr. Davis) to adjn., 2518 (i).
- Privilege (Ques. of) Members of Parlt. and Press representatives, on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn., 5123 (ii).
- Procedure, on third reading of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2660 (i).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 3930; on M. for 2°, 4721; in Com., 4728 (ii).
- Ry. Commissioners, Board of legislation, prop. Res. (Mr. Jameson) 1822 (i).
- Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. Casey) in Com., 3676, 4209; on M. to ref. back to Com., 5146 (ii).
- Ry. Policy of the Govt., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 2701 (i).
- Rate War and Man. Settlers, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to adjn., 1477 (i).
- Transportation, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to adjn., 1758 (i).
- Rankin, Immigration Agent in Kansas (Ques.) 1779 (i).
- Reciprocity with the U.S. (Ques.) 452 (i).
- Regina District, Registry Office (Ques.) 5319 (ii).
- Industrial School, Emplmt. of Dr. Wilmoughby (Ques.) 828 (i).
- Registry and Land Office, Regina (Ques.) 1931 (i).
- Returns (inquiry) 4773, 5519, 6115 (ii).
- Rouleau Post Office, Abolition of (remarks) 5018.
- Saskatchewan District Timber Berths held by Moore & McDowall Co. (Ques.) 481 (i).
- Skelton vs. The Queen, Affidavits, &c. (remarks) 6112, 6240, 6317 (ii).
- application for new trial (Ques.) 5319 (ii).
- Skelton vs. Queen, conviction at Battleford (Ques.) 1780 (i).
- Personal explanation, 6890 (ii).
- Postmaster at Battleford, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6803 (ii).
- Proceedings against (remarks) 5117, 5258.
- (remarks) 5931 (ii).
- Spencer, Wm., late of N.W.M.P., Discharge (M. for Ret. *) 2840 (i).
- Pension remarks) 6325 (ii).
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir Louis Davies) in Com., 2108 (i).
- Stimulants in the Chamber during Debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Talbot) 3639 (ii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (archives) 5022; (creameries, N.W.T.), 5936; (criminal statistics) 5025; (distribution of literature) 5991; (Paris exhibition) 5041; (patent record) 5023; (year-book) 5030 (ii).
- Canals:* Soulanges (construction) 6524 (ii).
- Civil Government:* Agriculture (contingencies) 5021; (salaries) 4851; Auditor Gen. Office, 4549; (contingencies) 4586; Gov. Gen. Sec's Office, 3837, 3847, 3887; Indians (contingencies) 4585; Justice (contingencies) 4583; Marine (contingencies) 4596; Militia (accountant) 3916; Privy Council (contingencies) 4582; Public Works (conc.) 7839; (contingencies) 4594; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 4597; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 4598 (ii).
- Dominion Lands* (commissioner's salary) 6858; (surveys, &c.) 7307, 7822 (ii).
- Government of N.W.T.* (insane asylums) 7305; (schools) 6857 (ii).
- Immigration* (agent's salaries) 6819, 748 (ii).
- Indians* (B.C.) 7763; Man. and N.W.T., 6854, 7301, 7767; (surveys) 6848 (ii).
- Inspection of Staples* (grain standards) 6695 (ii).
- Legislation:* Library of Parlt. (American History) 5990 (ii).
- Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7667 (ii).
- Miscellaneous* (Alien Labour Law enforcement) 7772; (Canadian Mining Institute) 7770 (ii).
- Penitentiaries* (expenses of commissions) 7341 (ii).
- Post Office:* Outside Service (letter carriers) 7775; (miscellaneous expenses) 6704 (ii).
- Public Works:* Buildings (N. W. T.) 5489; Ont. (Major's Hill Park) 5460, 5573, 5598; (Ottawa grounds) 5473 (ii); Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 5928; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton bridge) 6245, 6268, 6311; (conc.) 7822 (ii); Telegraph lines (N. W. T.) 6316 (ii).
- Yukon Provisional District* (maintenance of force) 7355; (service of N.W.M.P.) 6858 (ii).
- Tennant, John F., Dismissal by Govt. on M. (Mr. Quinn) for Ret., 5183 (ii).
- Territorial Exhibition, N.W.T., Miss Cumming's claims (Ques.) 1780 (i).
- outstanding indebtedness (Ques.) 486 (i).
- payment for prizes (Ques.) 976 (i).
- P. Lamont's account (Ques.) 2431 (i).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff: M. to adjn. deb., 3593 (ii).
- In Com. (preferential clause) 3756, 3786 (ii).
- Winnipeg Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Transport Contract B. 148 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 6233 (ii).
- Yukon Provisional District Administration B. 145 (Mr. Sifton) on M. for 2^d, 6927 (ii).
- Customs Officials, par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 4451 (ii).
- Liquor Permits M. on Order Paper (remarks) 3092 (ii); (Ques.) 2433, 3088; (remarks) 2269, 3092 (i).
- Municipal Regulations (remarks) 1747 (i).
- Provisions, purchase of by Govt. for N.W.M.P. (Ques.) 1931; contract for carrying (remarks) 4602 (ii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—Continued.

- Yukon Timber Limits granted H. Domville (Ques.) 474 (i).
- Yukon Ry. Co.'s Land Subsidy, Sir Richard Cartwright's remarks (Ques.) 2037 (i).
- Action of U. S. Senate on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn. 1295 (i).
- Yukon Route through the N.W.T., on M. (Mr. Davis) for plans, &c., 5139 (ii).
- Davis, Mr. T. O., Saskatchewan.**
- Battleford and Indian Agency, Death of cattle (Ques.) 1574, 2844 (i).
- Board of Ry. Commissioners, legislation on prop. Res. (Mr. Jameson) 1794 (i).
- Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to M. for 2^d, 1728 (i).
- Donaldson, S. J., Immigration Agent, N.W.T., amounts paid (Ques.) 4176 (ii).
- Duck Lake Indian Industrial School, maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 2356 (i).
- Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 19 (Mr. Douglas) on M. to refer to Ry. Com., 2082 (i).
- Great North-west Central Ry. Co's B. 141 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 7736; Sen. Amts., 7459.
- Hudson Bay and Pacific Ry. Co's (B. 22) 1st, 743 (i).
- Hudson Straits, Navigability, Commander Wakeham's Rep. (Ques.) 1934 (i).
- Indian Title in Athabasca, Mackenzie and Yukon (Ques.) 824 (i).
- Industrial School, Battleford (Ques.) 1574 (i).
- Judiciary in the N. W. T., additional judge (Ques.) 1775 (i).
- Klondike and Peace River Gold Mining Land and Transportation Co's incorp. (B. 91) 1st, 2429.
- Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. (B. 28) 1st, 744 (i).
- Man. and North-west Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 7470 (ii).
- Mounted Police and Edmonton Route to Klondike (Ques.) 1574 (i).
- N. W. Mounted Police Pensions Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. Davin) on M. for 2^d, 4242 (ii).
- N.W.T., Thomas McKay, amount of timber dues (Ques.) 4176 (ii).
- Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co's B. 32 (Mr. Tisdale) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2394; in Com., 2621.
- Remarks, 2123 (i).
- Prince Albert Mail Service, delay in transmission (M. to adjn.), 2517 (i).
- Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. (M. to adjn.), 4248 (ii).
- Rebellion Claims, N.W.T., Appnmt. of Commissioner, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (ii).
- Losses (1885) documents in possession of Govt. (M. for copy*) 4246 (ii).
- Returns (inquiry) 4774 (ii).
- Saskatchewan District, Appnmt. of Judge (remarks) 7042 (ii).

Davis, Mr. T. O.—*Continued.*

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2098 (i).

SUPPLY :

Immigration (agents' salaries) 6842 (ii).

Indian Affairs (surveys) 6849 : (Man. and N.W.T. 6855) (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (summer house, Ottawa) 7220 (ii).

Yukon Route through N.W.T. (M. for Reprs.), &c., 5136 (ii).

Dechene, Mr. A. M., *L'Islet.*

I. C. R., Construction of gates, tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2819 (i).

— Rivière du Loup, roadmaster, cost of inquiry (Ques.) 2820 (i).

Dobell, Hon. R. R., *West Quebec.*

Atlantic S.S. Fast Service, agreements, &c., on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5229 (ii).

Budget, The (remarks) 3297 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. Co's B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2^o, 954 (i).

Debts due Dom. on loans to Public Works, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6239 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioner's Loan B. 163 on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6919 (ii).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on Amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 5861 (ii).

Quebec Harbour Commissioner's Loan (B. 142) 1^o, 5568; 2^o m., 6229; in Com., 6231; 3^o m., 6444 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works: Roads and bridges, N. W. T. (Edmonton Bridge) 6314 (ii).

Trade and Commerce; (Chinese Immigration Act) 6691 (ii).

Domville, Mr. James, *King's, N.B.*

British Joint Stock Co. in the Yukon (Ques.) 1471 (i).

Hawaiian Vessels navigating in Can. waters (Ques.) 603 (i).

Personal Explanation, Alleged whisky transportation into Yukon, 2039 (i).

St. John Bridge B. 78 (Mr. *Ellis*) on M. for 2^o, 1950 (i).

Yukon Provisional District Overland Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 107) 1^o, 2844 (i).

— Timber berths, names of tenderers (Ques.) 485 (i).

— sales, &c. (Ques.) 1784 (i).

— Mining regulations (Ques.) 2036 (i).

Douglas, Mr. J. M., *East Assiniboia.*

Colonization Co.; Grants of land, Conditions (Ques.) 479 (i).

Deaf and Dumb mutes, N.W.T. (Ques.) 4345 (ii).

Grain Trade at Fort William (Ques.) 475 (i).

— Transit, Man. and N.W.T., Regulation (B 19) 1^o, 450; 2^o m., 2059 (i).

Mounted Police, withdrd. from Moosimin (Ques.) 3084 (ii).

Dugas, Mr. L. E., *Montcalm.*

Kildare Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 1575 (i).

Lavaltrie Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 473 (i).

Nulty, Thos., Pets. *re* Commutation of death sentence (Ques.) 4770 (ii).

St. Felix de Valois, Postmaster, complaints against (Ques.) 4610 (ii).

St. Jacques L'Achigan Postmaster (Ques.) 1783.

St. Jacques Model Farm, Establishment by Govt. (Ques.) 7121 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff :

In Com. (tobacco) 3813 (ii).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*

Address, on The, 392 (i).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *Algonet.*

Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. (Mr. *Macleod*) to ref. back to Com., 2690 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (dredging) 7249; Buildings, Ont. (Ottawa grounds) 5476 (ii).

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*

Silver Lead Smelting in B.C., Regulations, &c (Ques.) 6012 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Indians (B.C.) 7764 (ii).

Militia (medals) 7517; Yukon force, 7067, (contract for supplies) 7793, 7802 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 7242: (general vote) 6066 (ii).

Quarantine (general vote) 7514 (ii).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*

Bagot, Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5236 (ii).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to M. for 2^o, 1557 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioner's, Loan B, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6887 (ii).

Ellis, Mr. J. V., *St. John City, N.B.*

Certificates to Masters and Mates B. 37 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1863 (i).

Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6370 (ii).

Fishermen's Safety B. 111 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 4785 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4077, 4474 (ii).

French Translation and Printing (remarks) 3091 (ii).

Hansard, cost from 1890 to 1897 (M. for Ret.*) 505 (i).

Harbour of St. John Amalgamation (B. 101) 1^o, 2430 (i).

Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7407 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 136 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5327 (ii).

Ellis, Mr. J. V.—Continued.

- Pilotage Investigations at St. John N.B. (Ques.) 825 (i).
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1^o, 2918; in Com., 5755, 5764 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4764 (ii).
 Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Cassey*) in Com., 3675 (i), 4209, 4216, 4677 (ii).
 St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co.'s (B. 78) 1^o*, 1839, 2^o m., 1950 (i).
 San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1^o, 1919 (i).
 — on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn. 2262 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2097 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Civil Government* : Marine and Fisheries (extra clerks) 7481 (ii); Public Works (contingencies) 4593 (ii).
Legislation : House of Commons (debates) 7014 (ii) (sessional clerks) 6994; (stationery, &c.) 7036 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax and St. John) 6686 (ii).
Post Office : Outside service (letter carriers) 7775; Mail Clerks (salaries) 7051 (ii).
Public Works : Harbours and Rivers (N. B.) 7633 (ii).
Railways and Canals : I.C.R. (claims for damages) 7377; (rolling stock) 7645 (ii).
 Votes and Proceedings, Record of Vote of third reading of Bill (remarks) 2850 (ii).

Erb, Mr. D. H., South Perth.

- Butter Industry in Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2490 (i).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2993 (i).
 Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale B., on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) for Com. of Sup., 6970 (ii).
 Judges of the Provincial Courts B. in Com. on Res., 7139; on M. for 3^o, 7142 (ii).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2420 (i).
 San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1^o, 1916 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Justice* : Administration of (salaries) 7487 (ii).
 Woods, J. P., ex-Judge, retiring allowance (Ques.) 825 (i).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., Two Mountains.

- Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1^o, 1382 (i).

Featherston, Mr. J., Peel.

- Butter Industry in Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2461 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.

- Agricultural Implements, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3204 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—Continued.

- Alien Labour Act Amt. (B. 155) 1^o*, 6577; in Com., 6965 (ii).
 Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 307 (i).
 Binder Twine, re-imposition of duty (Ans.) 455.
 Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 159 (Mr. *Paterson*) on prop. Res., 6724 (ii).
 Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 2215 (i).
 Budget, The, Date of delivery (remarks) 2849.
 — Financial Statement, 3104 (i).
 Cape Breton Co., Dismissals (remarks) 6034 (ii).
 Companies Act Amt. (B. 138) 1^o*, 5259; 2^o m., 5331 (ii).
 — (B. 165) 1^o*, 7086; 2^o m., 7470; in Com., 7470 (ii).
 Dom. Loan (1897) Amount applied for by Banks, (Ans.) 4177 (ii).
 Estimates, The (Ans.) 1935 (i).
 — Year ending 1899 (presented) 2698 (i).
 — Suppl. (presented) 5663, 6439, 7378 (ii).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2^o, 2787; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3^o, 5681; in Com., 3964, 4270; on Sen. Amts., 7554 (ii).
 Georgian Bay Timber Districts, Output of logs to Michigan (Ans.) 827 (i).
 Identification of Criminals B. 156 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1^o*, 6577 (ii).
 Insurance Companies, Changes in the law governing, on M. (Mr. *Broder*) 5136 (ii).
 Interest paid Ont. and Que. during 1897 (Ans.) 455 (i).
 Klondike and Dawson City Co.'s incorp. B. 17 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5118 (ii).
 Loan Companies (B. 164) 1^o*, 7086 (ii).
 Man. Debt Account (B. 169) prop. Res., 6861; M. for Com., 7386, 7390; in Com., 7402; 1^o* of B., 7467; 2^o of Res., 7466 (ii).
 Man. and North Western Ry. Co.'s on M. for Com., 7474 (ii).
 Man. Public Buildings (remarks) 3826 (i).
 Man. School Fund (B. 168) prop. Res., 4029, 7411; in Com., 7423, 7453; 1^o* of B., 7466; 2^o m., 7571, 7575; agreed to (Y. 61, N. 32) 7578 (ii).
 Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2698 (i), 5663, 6439, 7378 (ii).
 Military College Employees, Suppl. Ret. (remarks) 6035 (ii).
 Mint, Govt., establishment (Ans.) 1341 (i).
 Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan (B. 163) prop. Res., 6862; 1^o*, 7011; M. for Com., 7142, 7153 (ii).
 Nova Scotia Southern Ry. Co. Subsidy (remarks) 7818 (ii).
 Officer Commanding Militia, Increase of Salary (M. for Com. on Res.) 4522 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Montague*) in Com. of Sup., P. O. Dept., 4892 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—Continued.

- Petroleum, reduction of duty, legislation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Moore) 1949 (i).
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 5769 (ii).
 ——— Savings Bank, rate of interest, &c. (Ans.) 5318 (ii).
 ——— reduction of interest, on M. (Mr. Davin) to Com. on Ways and Means, 3725 (i).
 ——— withdrs. (Ans.) 6465 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 4762 (ii).
 Public Accounts, Annual Rep. (presented) 267 (i).
 ——— Com. Meetings (remarks) 2528 (i).
 Public Officers (B. 170) 1st, 7523 (ii).
 Rubber Goods, Tariff respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6638 (ii).
 St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co.'s (B. 157) prop. Res., 6111, 6233; in Com. on Res., 6234; 1st of B., 6582 (ii).
 Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 173) prop. Res., 7655; 1st of B., 7657 (ii).
 Sessional Indemnity to Members, prop. Res., 7382.
 Shirt and Collar industry, on M. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6587 (ii).
 Sons of England Benefit Society incorp. B. 122 (Mr. Bertram) to M. for Com., 6048 (ii).
 Spades and Shovels combine monopoly, on M. (Mr. Richardson) to adjn., 1936 (i).
 Steamship Co.'s Cold Storage authorization (B. 149) 1st, 5930 (ii).
 Stimulants in Chamber during Debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Talbot) 3642 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Charges of Management*: 3828; (printing Dom. notes) 3829 (i), 6976 (ii).
Civil Government: Aud. Gen.'s Office, 4546, 7475; (contingencies) 4587; Finance, 4554; (cleaning deptl. buildings) 4600; (contingencies) 4588; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 3830; (contingencies) 6978; High Commissioner's Office, 4560; (contingencies) 4561; Interior, 4528; (contingencies) 4582; Marine and Fisheries (clerical assistance) 6984; Post Office, 4863; (savings bank branch) 4581; (printing and stationery) 4527; Privy Council Office (private secretary) 6978; Queen's Printer (salaries) 7483; Sec. of State, 4526; Sunday Depts. (private secretaries' salaries) 7484 (ii).
Customs: Outside service, 7364; (salaries, &c.) 6001.
Immigration (agents' salaries) 6819, 6839 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional indemnities of absent members) 7782; Library of Parl. (American History) 5999; Senate (unforeseen expenses) 6994 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck, East Bay and Irish Cove) 7724; (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7667; (St. John, &c., and Yarmouth) 6688 (ii).
Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 6861; (Can. Mining Institute) 7770; (Deep Waterways Commission) 7282; (parliamentary companion) 6975; (printing) 7851; (Prescott and Russell Fire relief Fund) 7089; (prohibition expenses) 7094 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers N.S., 5617; (New Harbour) 7591, 7599; Ont. (conc.) 7821; Que. (dredging) 7240 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (claims for damages by fire) 7374; (iron bridges) 6408; (subsidy to N.S. Central Ry. Co.) 7807 (ii).
Unprovided Items: Per Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 7351 (ii).
 Supply (Res. for Com.), 449 (i).
 ——— (B. 174) 1st, 7854; on M. for 2^d, 7871 (ii).
 Tanner, J. E., Detention by Spanish Govt. at Porto Rico (Ans.) 6011 (ii).
Ways and Means—(Res. for Com.) 449 (i).
 ——— The Budget (Financial Stmtnt.) 3104 (i).
 ——— Personal explanation (Sir Charles Tupper) *re* Speech at Sheffield, 3452 (i).
 ——— on M. (Mr. Davin) to adjn. deb., 3593 (i).
 ——— The Tariff, Res. in Com., 7582.
 In Com. (preferential clause) 3756, 3781; (British preferential tariff) 3804; (sugar) 3805; in Com., 7853 (ii).
 West Indian Trade, extension (Ans.) 1339 (i).
 Yukon Provisional District, Banking Business in (Ans.) 1071, 1467, 3312 (i).

Fisher, Hon. S. A., Minister of Agriculture, Brome.

- Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1473 (i).
 Appnmts. by late Govt. on Amt. (Mr. Montague) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4817 (ii).
 Ashcroft (B.C.) Mail contract (Ans.) 3090 (i).
 ——— Post Office, position of Postmaster (Ans.) 3090 (i).
 Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 2357, 2450 (i).
 Butter and Cheese Speculation B. 83 (Mr. Parmelee) on 2^d, 2843 (i).
 Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 2^d, 700 (i).
 ——— Tel. to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 992 (i).
 Cattle exported from Canadian Ports (Ans.) 475.
 ——— from Can. to United Kingdom on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 2436 (i).
 ——— Shipments to Belfast (Ans.) 484 (i).
 ——— Trade, Opening Belfast Ports (remarks) 2851 (i).
 Chapeau Postmaster, Dismissal of Patrick Lynch (Ans.) 3088 (i).
 Cheese Factories in the Prov. of Que. (remarks) 1578 (i).
 Cold Storage for P.E.I., Provision (Ans.) 828 (i).
 ——— S.S. Accommodation (B. 149) in Com., 6727 (ii).
 Copyright International, Action of British Govt. on M. for Com. of Sup., 6631 (ii).
 Creameries in N.W.T., number, patrons, &c., on M. (Mr. Davin) for stmtnt., 495 (i).
 Experimental Farms, distribution of bulletins (remarks) 2454 (i).
 ——— Rep. (presented) 7378 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—Continued.

- Govt. Creameries (Ans.), 3086 (i).
 Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) to Com. of Sup., 6973 (ii).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2^o, 1972; in Com., 1977, 1981, 2044 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite (B. 121) 1^o, 3925; 2^o m., 4684; in Com., 4740, 4768; 3^o m., 6035-36 (ii).
 Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7009 (ii).
 Rockliffe Rifle Range, Land Valuator (Ans.) 3408 (i).
 St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 3090 (i).
 San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock (S. 82) 1^o, 1904, 1921, 1925 (i).
 — on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2252 (i).
 Sheridan, John, Inspector of Live Stock, Appmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6010 (ii).
 Statistical Branch, Agricultural Dept. (Ans.) 2814.

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (archives) 5022; (cold storage) 5997; (creameries, N.W.T.) 5994; (experimental farm) 5972; (criminal statistics) 5025; (dairy station, N.S.) 7513; (N.W.T. exhibition accounts) 6995; (Paris Exhibition) 5039; (patent record) 5023, 7512; (year-book) 5025 (ii).
Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 5020; (salaries) 4845, 4855 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7675 (ii).
Quarantine: 7514; (cattle) 5998; (cattle slaughtered) 7004; (gratuities) 6995; ("Scientific Dairying") 7001; (Trans-Mississippi Exhibition) 7003 (ii).
 Sydney and N. Sydney, Quarantine Officer Physician (Ans.) 1781 (i).
 Territorial Exhibition, Miss Cummings' claims (Ans.) 1780 (i).
 — N.W.T., outstanding indebtedness (Ans.) 486 (i).
 — payment of prizes (Ans.) 976 (i).
 — P. Lamont's account (Ans.) 2431 (i).
 Trade Mark and Designs Act Amt. B. 61 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for 2^o, 2842 (i).
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3102 (i); Sen. Amts., 7784.
 Yukon Ry., Action of U. S. Senate, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 1314.

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C. (Solicitor General) Quebec County.

- Alien Labour Law, Appmt. of Agent at Georgian Bay (remarks) 4523 (ii).
 — Toronto, 4254, 4286, 4292, 4350 (ii).
 — prosecutions under (Ans.) 474 (i).
 Canada Evidence Act Amt. (B. 143) 1^o*, 5786; 2^o m., 6234 (ii).
 Canadian Yukon Ry. Co's B. 6 (Mr. *B'air*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2^o, 1342.
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2869 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C.—Continued.

- Civil Service, List (presented) 184 (i).
 Copyright in Canada, Powers of Parlt. (Ans.) 473.
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Investigation, on conc., 7840 (ii).
 — Treatment of Labourers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6623 (ii).
 Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co's Award, prop. Res., 6722.
 — (B. 162) 1^o* of B., 6962 (ii).
 Fisheries of Can., Appeal from Supreme Court to Imp. Privy Council (Ans.) 3825 (i).
 Franchise Act Repeal (B. 16) 1^o, 308; 2^o m., 2270; in Com., 2946, 2971, 2984 (i), 3942, 4044, 4067, 4075, 4083, 4097, 4254, 4366, 4454, 4484, 4523; M. to refer back to Com., 5259; 3^o m., 5664; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3^o, 5688; on M. for 3^o, 5700; Sen. Amts., 7467, 7527, 7543 (ii).
 — French Schedules, Translation and Printing (remarks) 2434 (i).
 Identification of Criminals (B. 156) 2^o m., 6962; in Com., 6963 (ii).
 Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. (B. 150) prop. Res., 5867; in Com. on Res., 6124, 6185; 1^o of B., 6185; 2^o m., 6732, 6738; in Com., 6784; 3^o m., 7127 (ii).
 — (Pension) B., prop. Res., 7087; in Com. on Res., 7127 (ii).
 Judiciary in N.W.T., additional judge (Ans.) 1775 (i).
 Justice Dept., Agent at Charlottetown, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1075 (i).
 — Dep. Min., Appmt., &c. (Ans.) 3166 (i).
 Kingston Penitentiary, Medical officer (Ans.) 2846 (i).
 Legal Agents of Govt. in G. B., amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 5135 (ii).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1987; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2422 (i).
 Noble, Mr., Payments to, by Govt. (Ans.) 5133.
 Ontario Court of Appeal, extra judge (Ans.) 1071 (i).
 Ont. Voters' List, Cost of printing, &c. (Ans.) 2845 (i).
 Penitentiary Commissioner's account, stmt. (presented) 7383 (ii).
 Procedure on 3^o of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2659.
 Queen vs. Cameron, Indictment for libel, deposition, &c., on M. for papers, 1831 (i).
 — vs. Colombe, Whisky smuggling (Ans.) 1069 (i).
 — vs. Skelton, perjury convictions at Battleford (Ans.) 1780 (i).
 — proceedings against (remarks) 5117, 5258.
 Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 7009 (ii).
 Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4213, 5152 (ii).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Claims of Commissioners (Ans.) 3938 (ii).
 — Revolt of convicts (Ans.) 1069 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C.—Continued.

Spinks, Judge, Investigation *re* conduct (remarks) 5268 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice (Judges salaries) 7487 ;
Exchequer Court (Reps.) 6639 ; Supreme Court
(judges salaries) 6986 ; (purchase of books) 6638.

Civil Government : Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 3876 ;
Justice, 3894 (i) ; (contingencies) 4583, 6983 ;
Penitentiary Branch, 3899 (ii).

Dominion Police : 7488 (ii).

Miscellaneous (alien labour law enforcement)
7772 : (Chief Justice's expenses to England) 7089 ;
(German Treaties, &c.) 7088 ; (law books, &c.)
7088 ; (Law library, Eng.) 7088 ; litigation costs)
7770 : (Man. School case litigation) 7770 ; (Quebec
Land slide claims) 7087 (ii).

Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7339 ;
Kingston, 6686, 7488 : St. Vincent de Paul, 6640.

Post Office : Outside service (letter carriers) 7778.

Weatherbee, Mr. Justice, Absence from Prov.,
3167 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B., Yarmouth, N.S.

Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation,
on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on
Privs. and Elections, 2193 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr.
Richardson) on M. for Com., 3689 (i).

Criminal Code Act Amt. (B. 134) 1°, 4769 (ii).

Fishermen's Safety B. 111 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in
Com., 4784 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on
M. for 2°, 2334 (i) ; in Com., 4021 (ii).

Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt.
B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1867 (i).

Insolvency B. and Govt. Policy, on M. (Sir
Charles Tupper) to adjn., 2928 (i).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*)
in Com., 1984 (i).

N. W. M. P. Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Davin*) on M.
for 2°, 4241 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) Press Representatives and
Members of Parlt., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
to adjn., 5130 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B.
121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4761 ; on M. for 3°,
6043 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, Ont.
(Toronto Harbour) 5915 : Roads and Bridges
(Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6293 (ii).

Tennant, John F., Dismissal by Govt., on M.
(Mr. *Quinn*) for Ret., 5205 (ii).

Fortin, Mr. T., Laval.

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr.
Richardson) on M. for Com., 2854 (i) ; in Com.,
4646 (ii).

Insolvency (B. 84) 1° 2004 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Rep. (M. to
print) 6607 (ii).

Fortin, Mr. T.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7345 ;
(Kingston) 7501 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 60) 1° m.,
1380 ; 2° m., 2842 (i).

— B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3097 (i) ;
6582 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E., York, N.B.

Address, on the, 103 (i).

— to His Ex. on departure from Can.
(seconded) 7380 (ii).

Adulteration of Food Act Amt. B. 72 (Sir *Henry
Joly*) Remarks, 2137 (i).

Alberta and Yukon Ry. Nav. and Mining Co.'s
incorp. B. 124 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 7163 (ii).

Anglo-American Commission and Govtl. Action,
on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 7694 (ii).

Appnmts. by late Govt. (remarks) 4927 (ii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) 6609 (ii).

— Contract, &c. (remarks) 7385 (ii).

Auditor General, Powers and Duties, Amt. to
Com. of Sup., 5202 (ii).

Bagot Electoral District, issue of writ (remarks)
4350, 4449, 4602 (ii).

— Vacancy, issue of writ on M. (Mr. *Ber-
geron*) to adjn., 5243 (ii).

Banking Business in Yukon District (Ques.) 1071,
1467 (i).

Belleville Post Office, Dismissals on M. for Com.
of Sup., 6221 (ii).

Bonding, &c., Arrangement with U.S. on Pacific
Coast (M. for cor.) 1786 (i).

Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 159 (Mr. *Paterson*)
on prop. Res., 6723 (ii).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation,
on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on
Privs. and Elections, 2205 (i).

Budget, The (date of delivery) remarks, 2848 (i).
— (reply) 3208 (i).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3821 (i) ; 7525 (ii).
— Morning Sittings and Committees (re-
marks) 6109 (ii).

— on M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) for Ry. Com. to
sit during session of the Hse., 6227, 6318 (ii).

Can. Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr.
Borden, Halifax) to M. for 2°, 1580 ; in Com.,
1858 (i).

— ref. in Speech from Throne (remarks) 7, (i).

— Telegram to High Commissioner on ex-
planation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 983 (i).

Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Fitz-
patrick*) on M. for 2°, 6234 (ii).

Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition B. 76
(Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6334, 6355 ; in Com.,
6367, 6797 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) to M.
for 3°, 6933 (ii).

— (remarks) 2141 (i).

Colonial Premiers, London Conference (M. for
cor.) 1785 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- Commissioners to inquire into conduct of Govt. Employees (M. for Ret. *) 1837 (i).
- Connor, John, Gold Dredging leases in N.W.T. (Ques.) 1074 (i).
- Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Amounts paid C.P.R. (Ques.) 3405 (i).
- Construction by Co. (remarks) 6241 (ii).
- J. B. Charleson's connection, &c. (remarks) 7685 (ii).
- Treatment of Workmen, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6593 (i).
- Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) In Com., 6947 (ii).
- Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6939 (ii).
- Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7162 (ii).
- Douville, Lt. Col., M.P., charges against (remarks) 5393, 6031 (ii).
- Drolet, Chevalier, mining concessions, &c. (Ques.) 1073 (i).
- Drummond Co. Ry., Com. of investigation on prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 508 (i).
- Rep. of Com. on M. (Mr. *Lister*) to conc., 7115, 7524 (ii).
- Rumoured new arrangements (remarks) 2699 (i).
- 2nd agreement with G.T.R. (Ques.) 3317.
- 2nd Rep. (remarks) 6586 (ii).
- Through traffic (Ques.) 472 (i).
- Estimates and Budget Speech (Ques.) 1935 (i).
- Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3979, 3996, 4097, 4136, 4255, 4296, 4403, 4476, 5260; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3^d, 5691, 5693; Sen. Amts., 7468 (ii).
- Distribution of printed copies (remarks) 7854 (ii).
- Gananoque Drill Shed, site (remarks) 459 (i), 5316 (ii).
- Geological Survey Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4776 (ii).
- Golden, B.C., and St. Eugene Mail Carrier (M. for cor.) 2824 (i).
- (Ques.) 2816 (i).
- Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2524 (i).
- Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7736, 7742; Sen. Amts., 7464 (ii).
- Imports, Dutiable value and amount collected (Ques.) 600 (i).
- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 75 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2139 (i).
- I.C.R. Rys., Agreement with Mr. Harris (remarks) 5392 (ii).
- Coloured Porters, Dismissals (Ques.) 3405.
- (remarks) 2852 (i).
- Extension to Montreal, passengers carried from Lévis (Ques.) 3406 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- I.C.R., Schedule rates, lowering of (remarks) 4811.
- Tariffs, &c., since appmnt. of Mr. Harris (M. for copy*) 3669 (i).
- Tenders for ties from 1896, prices, &c. (M. for Ret. *) 3669 (i).
- Train service, Issue of New Time-table (remarks) 6242 (ii).
- Joint Commission, U.S. and Can. prop. conference (remarks) 6609 (ii).
- Jubilee stamps, amount received from sale (Ques.) 3405 (i), 3938 (ii).
- Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6128; on M. for 2^d of B., 6734; Sen. Amts., 7854 (ii).
- Kingston Locomotive Works, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adju., 612 (i).
- King, W. A., station agent, Antigonish, Dismissal (Ques.) 7120 (ii).
- Klondike and Dawson City Bank Co.'s incorp. B. 117 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5118, 5125 (ii).
- Klondike and Peace River Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 4168 (ii).
- Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6328 (ii).
- Lt. Gov. of N.W.T. (Ques.) 1073 (i).
- Confirmation of appmnt. (remarks) 6466.
- Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2047, 2050; on M. to restore to order paper, 2428 (i).
- McCallum, John, Appmnt. and Dismissal by Govt. (Ques.) 7686 (ii).
- Maj. Gen. Commanding—Order (Ques. of) *re* Letter read by Prime Minister, 6464 (ii).
- Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7387 (ii).
- School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7413; on M. for 2^d, 7571 (ii).
- Mann and Mackenzie, Sleigh road contract, Construction (Ques.) 1928 (i).
- Teslin Lake Wagon route and Govt. Policy (remarks) 2700 (i).
- See "Yukon."
- Mohawk Indians, Withdrl. of grant for medical services (Ques.) 2817 (i).
- Montmorency Cotton Mills, incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Penny*) in Com., 4174 (ii).
- Montreal Harbour Commissioner's Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 6864, 6874; in Com. on Res., 6929; on M. for Com., 7142 (ii).
- Nanaimo, Member elect, resignation (remarks) 4605 (ii).
- Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to refer to Com. on Rys., 3650 (i).
- Norwood, H. H., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7120 (ii).
- Officer Commanding Militia, Increased allowance, in Com. on Res., 4945 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- Ogilvie, Mr., services since Jan., 1898 (Ques.) 3406 (i).
- Official Rep. on Klondike, translation (remarks) 604 (i).
- Mr. Rose's contract for printing (M. for cor. *) 3670 (i).
- Ont. and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 2627 (i).
- Order (Ques. of) Montreal Harbour Loan B., 6926 (ii).
- Palmer's Point Lighthouse-keeper (M. for cor. *) 504 (i).
- Postal rate between G. B. and Can., copy of Instructions to Postmasters (inquiry for Ret.) 6322 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2920 (i); on M. for Com., 5710, 5722, 5738; in Com., 5750, 5880 (ii).
- Special Delivery B. 167 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 7409 (ii).
- Savings Banks, Reduction of Interest, on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3721 (i).
- Preferential Clause, Admission of Foreign countries to commercial privileges (M. for cor. *) 1837.
- Printing Com., Rep., M. to print evidence on Pub. Accounts, 6317 (ii).
- Private Bills legislation, Order of procedure (remarks) 7586 (ii).
- Privilege (Ques. of), Par. in *La Patrie* re Man. Schools (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7711 (ii).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3928; on M. for 2°, 4692; in Com., 4742; on M. for 3°, 6035.
- Public Accounts Com., organization (remarks) 2517, 2528 (i).
- 5th and 6th Reprs., M. to print evidence 6640 (ii).
- M. to print papers, 6465 (ii).
- Public Officers Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7580 (ii).
- Public Works Aid B. 161 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 6893; on M. for 2°, 7411, 7570 (ii).
- Pulp Mill Machinery, duty, &c. (Ques.) 3165 (i).
- Quebec Bridge, prop. subsidy (remarks) 7385 (ii).
- Quebec Harbour Commissioner's Loan B. 142 (Mr. *Dobell*) on M. for 2°, 6229; in Com., 6231; on M. for 3°, 6444 (ii).
- Racine Fishery and Riparian Owner, License for erection (Ques.) 4772 (ii).
- Reciprocal clause of tariff, 1897, amounts, refunds, &c., paid (Ques.) 4175 (ii).
- Returns (inquiry) 4774, 6028, 6114, 6446 (ii).
- St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co.'s Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6233 (ii).
- San José Scale Pest, Prohibition of U. S. nursery stock on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2266 (i).
- Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 173 (Mr. *Fielding*) prep. Res., 7655 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- Shirt and Collar Industry on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to Com. of Sup., 6590 (ii).
- Spencer, W. J., Pension to (remarks) 6326 (ii).
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2090, 2095 (i).
- Steamship Service (winter), St. John, &c., to G. B. (M. for cor. *) 504 (i).
- Stimulants in the Chamber during debate on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3641 (ii).
- SUPPLY :
- Administration of Justice*: Exchequer Court (reports) 6639; Supreme Court (judges' salaries) 6986; (purchase of law books) 6638 (ii).
- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Paris Exhibition) 5043, 5047; (patent record) 7512 (ii).
- Canals*: Galops, 7550; Murray (repairs) 6556; Soulanges (construction) 6454, 6510 (ii).
- Charges of Management*: 3828; (printing notes) 3829 (i); 6976 (ii).
- Civil Government*: Agriculture (contingencies) 5920; Aud. Gen's Office, 4546; Customs, 4555 (clerical assistance) 7475; conc., 7852; Finance, 4554; Geological Survey, 4559 (salaries) 7477; Gov. Gen's Sec's. Office, 3830, 3861 (contingencies) 4581, 6978; High Commissioner's Office, 4560; (contingencies) 4561, 4580; Indian Affairs, 4553; Inland Revenue, 4556; Interior, 4532, 4551; Justice, 3895 (i), (contingencies) 4582, 6983; Penitentiary Branch, 3899 (i); Marine and Fisheries, 4558 (extra clerks) 7481; Militia and Defence (accountant) 3899, 3905 (i), (messenger) 7482; (salaries) 6564; N. W. Mounted Police, 4545; Post Office (statutory increases) 7482; (printing and stationery) 4527; Queen's Printer (salaries) 7483 (ii); Privy Council Office, 3894 (i), 7483; (contingencies) 4582; Private Secretaries, 6978; Public Works, 4558 (books, &c.) 6934; Railways and Canals, 4558; Sec. of State, 5426; Sundry Depts., Private Secretaries (salaries) 7484; Trade and Commerce, 4560 (salaries) 7483 (ii).
- Customs*: Chicoutimi Pulp Works (machinery, duty paid) 7792; (laboratory) 7773 (ii).
- Dom. Lands* (surveys, &c.) 7311 (ii).
- Dom. Police*: 7488 (ii).
- Fisheries* (Behring Sea claims commission) 7286; (litigation expenses) 7285; (protection service) 5298, 7285 (ii).
- Immigration* (agents' salaries), 7287, 7745 (ii).
- Indians*: B. C., 772; N. B. (medical attendance) 7300; Ont. and Que. (industrial schools) 7754; (Oka Indians) 7291 (ii).
- Inspection of Staples* (grain standards) 6695 (ii).
- Legislation*: House of Commons (debates) 7014; (sessional clerks) 7912; (sessional indemnity of absent members) 7752; (stationery) 7035; Senate (unforeseen expenses) 6994 (ii).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (salaries) 4981, 4987.
- Mail Subsidies and N.S. Subventions* (Baddeck, East Bay and Irish Cove) 7723; (Can. and South Africa) 7721; (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 6687; (Gaspé Basin and Que.) 6688; (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7660; (St. John, &c., and Yarmouth) 6688; (Victoria and San Francisco) 6687 (ii).
- Militia* (Dom. cartridge factory) 7075; (gratuities, &c.) 7517; (medals) 7517; (Yukon Force, contract for supplies, &c.) 7059, 7072, 7793 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

Miscellaneous: Alien Labour Law (enforcement) 7773; Man. and N.W.T., 7276; (Chief Justice's expenses to Eng.) 7089; (Crow's Nest Pass commission) 7263; (deep water ways commission) 7282; (German treaties) 7088; (gratuities outside service) 7769; (Hudson Bay expedition) 7094; (law books) 7083; (law library, Eng.) 7088; Man. School Ques. (litigation) 7770; (parliamentary guide) 6975; (pilotage investigation) 7102; (Prescott and Russell Fire relief fund) 7089; (professional services) 7243; (prohibition expenses) 7094; (Quebec land slide claims) 7087 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (biological station) 7733; (life saving stations) 4953; (P.E.I. and mainland) 7730; (repairs to "Stanley") 7284; (winter mail service) 4972, 4979 (ii).

Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7340; St. Vincent de Paul, 6629 (ii).

Post Office: Outside service (letter carriers) 7775; (salaries) 6698 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Man., 5485; N.B., 5092, 7586; N.S., 5071, 7214, 7586; Ont., 7217; Arnprior P. O.) 5450; (deptl. block, Ottawa) 5069; (Major's Hill Park) 5453, 5572, 5577, 5591; (Ottawa Grounds, &c.) 5472, 5479, 7587; (summer house) 7218; (Rideau Hall) 5599; (repairs) 5448; (telephone service) 5605; (Woodstock P. O.) 5464; Que., 5093, 7217, 7587; (slides and booms) 7643; Harbours and Rivers, B.C., 6024, 7242; (dredging) 6072, 6081; (general service) 6099; (general vote) 6067; N.B., 7589. (New Harbour) 7590; Ont., 5886, 5889, 7242, 7641; (Kaministiquia, 5067; (Toronto Harbour) 5902; Que., 7638; (dredging) 7227; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 5051; *Miscellaneous* (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's monument) 6105; (over expenditures) 6244; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge) 6280, 6301; Telegraph Lines (B.C.) 6102; (St. Lawrence shore) 6101 (ii).

Quarantine (Trans-Mississippi Exhibition) 7003.

Railways: C. P. R., 6381; Crow's Nest Pass, (salaries) 7110, 7181; (general expenses for investigations) 7198; I. C. R., (accommodation at Moncton) 6388; (accommodation at St. John) 7645; (claims for damages) 7186; (culverts, &c.) 7085; Indiantown branch (land damages) 7073; (iron bridges) 6394, 6564; (North Sydney) 6387; (original construction) 6386; (rolling stock) 7643; *Miscellaneous* (survey, Klondike district) 6563; Subsidies unpaid, 7653; subsidy to N.S. Central Ry. Co., 7810 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (Toronto observatory) 7284.

Steamboat Inspection: 5003 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act &c.) 6690 (ii).

Yukon Provisional District (administration of Govt.) 7335; (maintenance of force) 7338; (steamers) 7769 (ii).

Supply B. 174 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2^o, 7858.

Walsh, Administrator in Yukon, instructions and commissions (remarks) 1080, 1387 (i).

— Appmt. to Force (Ques.) 480 (i).

— Commissions and instructions (Ques.) 1777.

Ways and Means:—The Tariff:

In Com.: (preferential clause) 3767, 3794; (sugar) 3805; (tobacco) 3833 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

Western Deptl. Block, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 2528, 3319 (i).

West Prince, P. E. I., Vacancy, issue of writ (Ques.) 2241 (i).

Wood, H. W., Postmaster Welsford, N. B., Dismissal (Ques.) 7120 (ii).

Yukon Provisional District Administration B. 154 (Mr. Sifton) on M. for 2^o, 6728 (ii).

— Contingent, &c. (remarks) 4774, 4795 (ii).

— Dredging Leases Issued; Inquiry for Ret., 5322 (ii).

— (M. for cor. *) 504 (i).

— (M. for Ret. *) 1838 (i).

— (Ques.) 1074, 1934, 3317 (i).

— (remarks) 6895 (ii).

— Liquor Permits (Ques.) 473, 2813 (i).

— (remarks) 745 (i).

— Mann and Mackenzie's Sleigh road (Ques.) 1777 (i).

— Military Force, cost, &c. (remarks) 4604 (ii).

— Mounted Police, contract for transportation of supplies, 5499 (i).

— Placer Mining and Timber Licenses (Ques.) 460 (i).

— Routes and Passes, explorations (Ques.) 482 (i).

— Stikine-Teslin winter road (remarks) 1187.

— Timber Berths, &c. (M. for cor. *) 504 (i).

— Troops for (remarks) 1577 (i).

— U. S. Relief Expedition (Ques.) 102 (i).

— U. S. Senate, Action of, on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn., 1284 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysboro' N.S.*

Alien Labour Law, Enforcement (remarks) 5803.

Anglo-American Commission and Govtl. action on M. for Com. of Sup., (remarks) 7697 (ii).

Anglo-French Telegraph Co. (M. to present Pets, &c.) 5143 (ii).

Canada Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Tucker) 1st*, 2430 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 2^o, 855 (i).

— Telegram to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1008 (i).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Investigation, Treatment of Workmen, 6598, 7845 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 5263; Sen. Amts., 7539 (ii).

I.C.R., Coloured Employees on M. (Mr. Campbell) to adjn., 3169 (i).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. Charlton) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) that Com. rise, 2423 (i).

Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) on M. (Mr. LaRiviere) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3652 (i).

Ottawa, Montreal and James Bay Ry. Co incorp. (B. 50) 1st*, 1068 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—Continued.

Pacific and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 40) 1^o*, 970 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5773 (i).

Prince Albert Mail Service, Delay in Transport on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 2521 (i).

Stimulants in the Chamber during debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3641 (i).

SUPPLY :

Post Office: Mail Clerks (salaries) 7053 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7622 (ii).

Frost, Mr. F. T., Leeds and Grenville.

Budget, on The, 3517 (i).

Butter Industry of Can. Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2373 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals: Murray (repairs) 6559 (ii).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., Charlotte, N.B.

Campobello Island, Telephone communication, cost, &c. (Ques.) 4177 (ii).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2^o, 1132 (i).

Deer Island Telegraph Cable, &c., Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 4177 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 3^o, 5708 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 136 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5330 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries: Protection service, 5311; (salaries, overseers, &c.) 5008 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Ottawa grounds, &c.) 5476; Harbours and Rivers, N.B., 5643; Telegraph Lines, B.C., 6102 (ii).

Gauthier, Mr. J., L'Assomption.

Laurentian Ry., Telegraph Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 4923 (ii).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., Temiscouata.

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 18 (i).

Hebert, I. A., Postmaster at Princeville, and sale of intoxicating liquors (Ques.) 7689 (ii).

I.C.R. Govt. Lands, Trois Pistoles, occupation, &c. (Ques.) 4175 (ii).

— Madame Charon's Horse (Ques.) 3659 (i).

Personal Explanation, Temiscouata Election (remarks) 5447 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 7640.

Gibson, Mr. W., Lincoln and Niagara.

Canadian Yukon Ry., Tel. to High Commissioner re Hamilton Smith's proposals, 1004 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2866 (i).

— Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6798 (ii).

Dundas, Mr., Dismissal by Govt. (remarks) 6578.

Gibson, Mr. W.—Continued.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., reported decease (Ques.) 4347 (i).

Great Commonwealth Development and Mining Co.'s (B. 95) 1^o*, 2430 (i).

Man. School Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5423 (ii).

Members Sessional Trunks, &c., Contracts, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 7047 (ii).

Pacific and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 40 (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) M. to withdraw B., 3713 (i).

Prince Albert Mail Service, delay in transmission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 2519 (i).

Printing of Parl., 1st Rep., conc. (M.) 3713 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Commissioner's Rep., on M. (Mr. *Fortin*) to print, 6608 (ii).

San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1^o, 1913 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals: Soulanges (construction) 6521 (ii).

Civil Government: Post Office, 4867, 4872 (ii).

Militia (gratuities) 6575 (ii).

Railways: I.C.R. (culverts, &c.) 7086 (ii).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 79) 1^o*, 1839 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A., Richmond, N.S.

Appnmts. to office (remarks) 1186 (i).

— New Senators, ref. to telegraphic despatch (remarks) 2606 (i).

Arichat Harbour, Buoys, &c. (Ques.) 5320 (ii).

Chapel Cove Breakwater, Govt. aid (Ques.) 4345.

Cheticamp Customs Collector, Name, &c. (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

Ferguson, Roderick, L'Ardoise Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for cor.) 3666 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2^o, 2760 (i); in Com., 3960, 4438, 4488 (ii).

Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1864 (i).

Hubert, Miss A., Pets. (remarks) 7525 (ii).

I.C.R., Purchase of Locomotives in U.S. (Ques.) 476 (i).

Lachine Canal, Dismissals (M. for Ret.) 4621 (ii).

L'Ardoise Breakwater, repairs, &c. (Ques.) 972.

— St. Peter's, &c., outport, medical aid to sick seamen (Ques.) 1339 (i).

Linloff, Ed., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5319 (ii).

Lower L'Ardoise Postmaster (Ques.) 1069, 1334.

McKay, Kenneth, lockman, St. Peter's Canal, Dismissal (Ques.) 1070 (i).

Mackay's Point Wharf, Tenders for building, &c. (Ques.) 2815 (i).

Mail Contracts, N.S., Cancellation since 1896 (Ques.) 4609 (ii).

Margaree Customs Collector, Dismissal (Ques.) 4181 (ii).

Matheson, John D., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7121 (ii).

Militia Point Mail Carrier, amount paid (Ques.) 3310 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A.—Continued.

Militia Point Postmaster, Appmnt. (Ques.) 3310.
Point Jerome Lightkeeper, Appmnt. of J. E. McNeil (Ques.) 5320 (ii).

Port Mulgrave and St. Peter's Mail route (remarks) 6323 (ii).

Postal Rates Empire, Authority for reduction (Ques.) 4345 (ii).

Postmaster General's Rep, (Ques.) 2527 (i).

Postmasters, Dismissals since 1896 (Ques.) 4609.

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 5765 (ii).

Returns (inquiry) 5519, 5932 (ii).

St. Peter's Canal, repairs to entrance, (Ques.) 1339 (i).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice : Supreme Court (judges salaries) 6986 (ii).

Civil Government : Post Office, 4576, 4884 (ii).

Fisheries (protection service) 5286, 5307 (ii).

Indians : N.S., 7293; (erection of fence) 7297 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Baddeck, East Bay and Irish Cove) 7724 (ii).

Miscellaneous (wharfinger, Sault Ste. Marie, salary) 7098 (ii).

Penitentiaries : St. Vincent de Paul, 6640 (ii).

Post Office : Outside service (miscellaneous expenses) 6767 (ii).

Public Works : Buildings, Ont. (Major's Hill Park) 5462; Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 6081; Mar. Provs., 6085; (general vote) 6067; Que., (St. Lawrence River) 5062 (ii).

Railways : General expenses for investigations, 7207; I. C. R., (North Sydney) 6386 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act, &c.) 6694 (ii).

Telegraph Operator Ross, North-east Margaree, Dismissal (Ques.) 2815 (i).

Gilmour, Mr. J., East Middlesex.

Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. (Mr. Maclaren) to Com. of Sup., 6973 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works : Buildings, Ont. (Woodstock, P.O.) 5469 (ii).

Guay, Mr. P. M., Lévis.

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1*, 1840 (i).

Guillet, Mr. G., West Northumberland, O.

Brigade Camp, 3rd Military District (Ques.) 5786.

Cobourg Postmaster, attendance at reform convention (Ques.) 602 (i).

Rogers, Lt.-Col. R. Z., retirement, &c. (Ques.) 5787 (ii).

Tennant, John F., Dismissal by Govt. on M. (Mr. Quinn) for Ret., 5194 (ii).

Whisky for the Klondike, the *Manaunses* cargo (remarks) 1188 (i).

Guite, Mr. J. F., Bonaventure.**SUPPLY :**

Post Office : Outside service (miscellaneous expenses) 6713 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., South Lanark.

Appmnts. by late Govt. on Amt. (Mr. Montague) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4832 (ii).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 1, 212; on M. for 2, 674; in Com., 1855 (i).

— Kaslo-Slocan Ry. plans, Request for papers (remarks) 402 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 6950 (ii).

Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 6945 (ii).

Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 7163 (ii).

Drummond County Ry. Com. of Investigation on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 511 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 4057, 4289, 4384, 4457, 4480 (ii).

Geological Survey Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. Sifton) on 1, 3404 (i).

G. T. Ry. Regulations on M. (Mr. Wallace) to adjn., 6024 (ii).

Identification of Criminals B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6964 (ii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts (Pension) B. in Com. on Res., 7137 (ii).

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Britton) in Com., 4806 (ii).

Lake Bennett and Klondike Ry. and Tramway Co.'s incorp. (B. 31) 1*, 903 (i); Sen. Amts., 5905, 6266 (ii).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence River Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 6330 (ii).

Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) prop. Res., 7394; in Com., 7404, 7467 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 163 (Mr. Fielding) prop. Res., 6915; in Com. on Res., 6931 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co., Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Pouppore) to Com. of Sup., 6502 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 5883 (ii).

Procedure on 3^d of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2658.

Public Works Aid B. 161 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 1, 6893; on M. for 2, 7570 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 5022; (Paris exhibition) 5049 (ii).

Canals : Chambly, 6553; Cornwall, 6532, 6554; Grenville (enlargement) 6552; Farran's Point, 6532; Lachine (enlargement) 6551; Murray (repairs) 6557; North Channel (construction) 6535; Rideau, 7183; Sault Ste. Marie (contractors' claims) 7106; Soulanges (construction) 6446, 6526; Trent (construction) 6543; Williamsburg (repairs) 6554 (ii).

Charges of Management (printing notes) 6977 (ii).

Civil Government : Agriculture (contingencies) 3021 (i); Aud. Gen.'s Office, 4547, 7475 (ii).

Customs : Outside service, 7357 (ii).

Dom. Lands (surveys, &c.) 7307, 7316 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

Fisheries (litigation expenses) 7285 (ii).*Penitentiaries* (expenses of commissions) 7342 (ii).*Public Works*: Buildings, Ont. (Major's Hill Park) 5456, 5574; Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 5928, (Ont.) 5887, 5922; (Toronto Harbour) 5914; Que. (dredging) 7237; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6251, 6260 (ii).*Railways*: I.C.R., 6427; (accommodation at Mulgrave) 6432; (claims for damage by fire) 7184, 7373; (increased accommodation) 6433; (increased accommodation, Halifax) 6385; (iron bridges) 6388; (Montreal extension) 6564; (North Sydney) 6386; P.E.I. (rollingstock) 6434; (general expenses for investigations) 7197; Miscellaneous (surveys, Klondike district) 6563 (ii).*Minor Revenues* (printing law stamps) 7251 (ii).*Unprovided Items*: Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 7352 (ii).*Yukon Provisional District*: Maintenance of Force, 7354 (ii).Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2120 (i).**Hale, Mr. F. H., Carleton, N.B.**Customs Collector at Centreville, N.B., Investigation *re* (Ques.) 830 (i).**Haley, Mr. A., Hants, N.S.**

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S., 5620.**Henderson, Mr. D., Halton.**Butter Industry of Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2371 (i).Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2^d, 2757 (i); in Com., 4512 (ii).Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7741; Sen. Amts., 7464 (ii).Halstead, Mr. Freeman, sentenced at Porto Rico, *par.* in *Toronto World* (remarks) 6028 (ii).

Interest paid Ont. and Que., 1897 (Ques.) 455 (i).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1977, 2045; M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to restore to order paper, 2128 (i).Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7421 (ii).Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4740 (ii).Public Officer Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7582 (ii).San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1^o, 1913 (i).— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2252 (i).Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1877 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Post Office, 4876 (ii).*Dom. Lands* (surveys, &c.) 7322 (ii).*Fisheries* (overseers' salaries, &c.) 5010 (ii).*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 7291 (ii).*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (salaries) 4994 (ii).**Henderson, Mr. D.—Continued.**

SUPPLY—Continued.

Public Works (Buildings, Ont.) 5482: (Ottawa grounds, &c.) 5470: (summer house, Ottawa) 7220; (Woodstock P. O.) 5464; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7602; Ont. (dredging) 6098 (ii).*Ways and Means*—The Tariff:

In Com. (preferential clause) 3765, 3782 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2128 (i).**Heyd, Mr. C. B., North Brant.**Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2^d, 2587; in Com., 2954 (i) 3943 (ii).

Mount Elgin Institute, Establishment (Ques.) 672 (i).

Sons of England Benefit Society incorp. B. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com., 6052 (ii).

Statistical Branch, Agriculture Dept. (Ques.) 2814 (i).

Volunteers of 1866, Granting of Medals (remarks) 6613 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2125 (i).**Hughes, Mr. S., North Victoria.**

Anglo-American Commission and Govtl. action, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 7696 (ii).

Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6219 (ii).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2^d, 746 (i).

Cattle Export Trade, Montreal, G. B. and Ireland (remarks) 2270 (i).

— (M. to adjn.) 2435 (i).

— to Belfast (Ques.) 484 (i).

Customs Dept., Appmt. of Irish Roman Catholics (Ques.) 4608 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2^d, 2748; in Com., 3003 (i); on M. for 3^d, 5699 (ii).G.T.R. Regulations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn. (remarks) 6017 (ii).Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6127 (ii).Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2958; on consdn. of Amts., 3365 (i).Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2^d, 1968; in Com. (Amt.) 1980 (i).

Militia Annual Camp Drill (remarks) 5324 (ii).

— Corps, issue of Lee-Enfield Rifles (M. for copy*) 3670 (i).

— Inspection, recommendation, &c. (M. for Rep.*) 3670 (i).

Miners Free Licenses, Issue of (remarks) 4773 (ii).

Motion, Notice of (remarks) 6027 (ii).

Noble, Mr., payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 5133.

N.W.M.P., reported loss of men in Yukon (remarks) 7659 (ii).

Officer commanding Militia, Increased Allowance, in Com. on Res., 4936, 4944 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. S.—Continued.

- Ontario and Rainy River Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 2633 (i).
 Order (Ques. of) P.O. Dept. (Mr. *Montague*) in Com. of Sup., 4892 (ii).
 Payments to Militia on active service (M. for Rep.*) 3670 (ii).
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1st, 2922 (i); in Com., 5762, 5944 (ii).
 Repatriation of 100th Regiment (remarks) 6613.
 San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1st, 1916 (i).
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2249 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1880 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Canals*: Murray (repairs) 6557; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6551; Trent (construction) 6540, 6553 (ii).
Civil Government: Militia (accountant) 3909 (i); (salaries) 6567; Post Office, 4859, 4875, 4888 (ii).
Fisheries: Protection service, 5315 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (expenses at election trials) 7505 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7676 (ii).
Militia (Dom. Artillery association) 7522; (Dom. cartridge factory) 6571; (Dom. Rifle association) 6570, 7521; (gratuities, &c.) 6573, 7519; (medals, &c.) 7515; (unforeseen expenses) 6570; Yukon contingent (contract for supplies, &c.) 7800 (ii).
Miscellaneous (pilotage investigations) 7104; (Prescott and Russell Fire relief fund) 7690 (ii).
Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7351 (ii).
Post Office (temporary clerks) 7041 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.B.) 5093, (N.S.) 5084, (Que.) 5093; Harbours and Rivers, B.C., 6065, (dredging) 6073; Ont. (dredging) 6091; Mar. Provs. (dredging) 7243; Miscellaneous (clerical assistance) 6104; (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's monument) 6108; (National Art Gallery) 6104; Roads and Bridges, 6100; Slides and Booms, 6099; Telegraph Lines, (B.C.) 6102; (St. Lawrence Shores) 6101 (ii).
Railways: Crow's Nest Pass (salaries, &c.) 7110; I.C.R. (North Sydney) 6388 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District: maintenance of force, 7356 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
 In Com.: (preferential clause) 3771, 3795; (sugar) 3808 (i).
 Yukon Military Contingent, expenditure, &c. (remarks) 4797 (ii).

Hurley, Mr. J. M., East Hastings.

- North American Telegraph Co.'s (B. 120) 1st*, 3713 (i).

Hutchison, Mr. W., Ottawa.

- Ottawa Interprovincial Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 125) 1st*, 4448 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., East Elgin.

- Address, on The, 385 (i).
 Belleville Post Office, Dismissals on M. for Com. of Sup., 6217 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—Continued.

- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3705 (i); in Com., 4640, 4653, 4665 (ii).
 County Court Judges, Age limit, cor., &c. (Ques.) 7124 (ii).
 Fishing Licenses, amount paid by Lake Erie fishermen (Ques.) 601 (i).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3010 (i); 4417, 4442, 4456, 4477, 4487, 5261; on M. for 3rd, 5700 (ii).
 Judges of the Provincial Courts B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6791 (ii).
 ——— (Pension) B. in Com., on Res., 7127, 7134.
 Kingston Locomotive Works on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn. (remarks) 611 (i).
 Penitentiary Commissioners' Accounts (remarks) 7383 (i).
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1st, 2923 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1st, 3935; in Com., 4734, 4747 (ii).
 Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 3675 (i); 4674 (ii).
 St. Thomas Mail Service, Tenders and Contracts (Ques.) 453 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Civil Government*: Agriculture (salaries) 4850; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3833, 3893 (i); Post Office, 4857, 4872, 4882, 4895, 4914; (contingencies) 4919; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 4599 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 5289 (ii).
Immigration (agents salaries) 6832 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6994; (stationery, &c.) 7036 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Alien Labour Law (Man. and N. W. T.) 7279; Crow's Nest Pass Commission, 7258; (pilotage investigations) 7104 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (life saving stations) 4952.
Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7345 (ii).
Post Office (temporary clerks) 7039 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Dom., 5607; (heating, &c., generally) 5494, 5607, 5608; Ont. (summer house, Ottawa) 7225; (Major's Hill Park) 5576; (Telephone service) 5606; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (dredging) 6087 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle slaughtered) 7005 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (claims for damages) 7188, 7377; (general expenses for investigations) 7194, 7201; (iron bridges) 6405, 6425; (land damages) 7083.
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act &c.) 6692 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
 In Com.: (tobacco) 3817 (i).
 Yukon Ry., Rothschild's Agents (Ques.) 486 (i).

Ives, Hon. W. B., Sherbrooke.

- Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Negotiations (Ques.) 600 (i).
 Canadian and English Mails, Beaver Line steamers (Ques.) 2844 (i).
 Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2nd, 947 (i).

Ives, Hon. W. B.—Continued.

Canadian cablegram to Lord Strathcona (remarks) 1078 (i).

— Telegram to High Commissioner, *re* Hamilton Smith's proposals, on explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 989 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1^o, 3934 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Government : Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 3871.

Ways and Means—The Tariff :

In Com. : (preferential clause) 3757 (i).

Jameson, Mr. R. W., Winnipeg.

C. P. R. Lands exempt from Taxation (Ques.) 1340 (i).

Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s (B. 66) Sen. Amts., 4807 (ii).

Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 2628 (i).

Ry. Commissioners, Board of, legislation, prop. Res., 1787 (i).

— Com. of the Privy Council, constitution (Ques.) 1472 (i).

— Transportation, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1756 (i).

SUPPLY :

Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass commission) 7269.

Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H., K.C.M.G.
(*Controller of Inland Revenue*) *Portneuf*.

Adulteration Act Amt. (B. 72) 1^o, 1743 (i) ; in Com., 4777 (ii).

Allaire, J. P. O., Claim against Govt. (Ans.) 3661.

Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. 6950 (ii).

Gas Inspection Act Amt. (B. 73) 1^o, 1744 ; in Com., 2138 (i).

General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 128) 1^o*, 4522 ; in Com., 5966 (ii).

Grain Standards Inspection System (Ans.) 1780.

— Trade at Fort William (Ans.) 475 (i).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 75) 1^o, 1744 ; in Com., 2139 (i).

— (B. 172) 1^o*, 7585 (ii).

— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 194 (i).

Inspection of Ashes, Govt. (Ans.) 3660 (i).

McNaughton, Wm., Emplmnt. in Inland Rev. Dept., N.S. (Ans.) 1931 (i).

Napanee Customs Collector, amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 6008 (ii).

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. (B. 74) 1^o, 1744 ; in Com., 2138 (i).

SUPPLY :

Adulteration of Food (expenses, &c.) 6000 (ii).

Civil Government : Inland Revenue, 4556 ; (contingencies) 4590, 6983 (ii).

Culling Timber (contingencies) 6000 : (salaries, &c.) 7250 (ii).

Excise : 6000 ; (contingencies, &c.) 7243 (ii).

Inspection of Staples (grain standards) 6695 (ii).

Minor Revenues (printing law stamps) 7251 (ii).

Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H.—Con.

Ways and Means—The Tariff :

In Com. : (tobacco) 3812 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. (Potatoes) B. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1^o, 1384 (i).

— (B. 71) 1^o, 1737 ; in Com., 2115, 2137, 3097 (i) ; 6582 (ii).

Yukon Provisional District Administration B. 154 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1^o*, 6439 (ii).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., Luacnburg.

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 3^o, 1937 (i).

Fishermen's Safety B. 111 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 4778 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for Com., 2930 (i) ; in Com., 4045, 4418 (ii).

Georgian Bay Timber District, output of logs to Michigan (Ques.) 826 (i).

Nova Scotia Southern Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 7818 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5777 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 3^o, 6045 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5982.

Fisheries (protection service) 5294 (ii).

Indians (N. S.) 7294 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (maintenance, &c.) 4950.

Public Works : Buildings, Dom. (heating, &c.)

5611 (ii) ; Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs.

(dredging, &c.) 6083 (ii) ; N.S., 5614, 7630 ; Ont.

(Toronto Harbour) 5895 (ii).

Railways : Subsidies to N. S. Central Ry. Co., 7812.

Transport of Merchandise in U. S. Vessels (remarks) 1076 (i).

Kloepfer, Mr. C., South Wellington.

Budget, The, 3499 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G., South Grey.

Bagot, Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5238 (ii).

Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6224 (ii).

Dundas, Mr., Dismissal by Govt. (remarks) 6578.

Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 1839 (i).

Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s Pet., ref. to Standing Orders Com. (M.) 3924 (i).

— (B. 126) 1^o*, 4522 (ii).

Standing Orders Com., suspension of Rule (M.) 5013 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Legislation : House of Commons (debates) 7019 (ii).

Supreme Grand Lodge of the Sons of Eng. Benefit Society's B. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) 1^o*, 4029 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff :

In Com. : (tobacco) 3815 (i).

Lang, Mr. J., East Peterborough.

Lakefield and Apsley Mail Route, tenders, &c. (Ques.) 4930 (ii).

Lang, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Otonabee River Floods, Investigation as to cause (Ques.) 483 (i).
Peterborough Drill Shed, tenders, &c. (Ques.) 5132 (ii).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., Provencher.

- Allaire, J. P. O., Claim against Govt. (Ques.) 3661 (i).
Business of the Hse., Morning Sittings, 6228 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com. on M. to conc., 4247 (ii).
French translation and printing (remarks) 3091.
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4084, 4093, 4115, 4295, 4467, 4494, 5262; on M. for 3^d, 5699, 5705 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6163 (ii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2957, 3012, 3082 (i).
Manitoba Public Buildings, Ret. *re* (remarks) 3826.
—— Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7401; in Com., 7404.
—— School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7414; in Com. on Res., 7425, 7465; on M. for 2^d, 7577 (ii).
Man. Claims against Dom. (inquiry for Ret.) 1030 (i).
—— (remarks) 2525 (i).
—— Schools Ques., Address to the Holy Father on M. for Com. of Sup., 5436 (ii).
—— University Land Grant, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 5571 (ii).
—— (M. for O.C., &c.*), 3670 (i).
—— (Ques.) 7124 (ii).
Montmorency Cotton Mills incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Penn*) on M. for 2^d, 3084 (i).
Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for Com., 3643; (M. to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c.) 3644 (i).
North-west Settlers, Amount due Govt. by Settlers (remarks) 5570 (ii).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. for Com., 2606, 2625 (i).
Prince Albert Mail Service, delay in transmission on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 2521 (i).
Provencher Postmaster, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6006 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Commissioner's Rep. on M. (Mr. *Fortin*) to print (objection), 6607 (ii).
School Lands in Man., Sales (Ques.) 2432 (i).
Standing Orders Com., on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to suspend Rule 49, 5014 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Charges of Management*: (printing notes) 6977 (ii).
Civil Government: Inland Revenue (contingencies) 6982; Post Office, 4865 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7015; (sessional clerks) 7012 (ii).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—Continued.**SUPPLY :**

- Militia*: (medals) 7515 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Man., 5928; (dredging) 6099; Ont. (Kaministiquia), 5068; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.), 6288 (ii).
Quarantine: (cattle) 5998 (ii).
University of Man. and Govt. Grant of Land (M. for O.C., &c.*) 3670 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (President of the Council), *East Quebec*.

- Address, on the, 81 (i).
—— Precedence of Deb. (M.) 160 (i).
—— Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 936 (i).
—— to His Ex. on departure from Can. (M.) 7379 (ii).
—— (Jubilee) to Her Majesty, Reply, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1465 (i).
Adjournment for Ash Wednesday (M.) 903 (i).
—— Queen's Birthday (M.) 5930 (ii).
Administration of Oaths of Office B. 1, 1st, 3 (i).
Alaskan Boundary Dispute, Telegram to N. Y. Press (remarks) 1735 (i).
Alberta and Yukon Ry. Nav. and Mining Co.'s incorp. B. 124 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 7166 (ii).
Alien Labour Law, Appnmt. of agent at Georgian Bay (remarks) 6240 (ii).
—— Hamilton (Ans.) 6612 (ii).
—— Ont. (Ans.) 5317 (ii).
—— Parry Sound (remarks) 6613 (ii).
—— Wallaceburg (remarks) 6613 (ii).
—— Enforcement (Ans.) 5392 (ii).
—— at Toronto (remarks) 5012, 5117, 5792, 7126 (ii).
—— Instructions to Agents (remarks) 6581 (ii).
Alien Workmen, Importation to Toronto, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4039 (ii).
American Canned Meats, contract with Canadian Govt. (remarks) 3141 (i); 5018 (ii).
Anglo-American Commission and Govtl. action, on M. for Com. of Sup., (remarks) 7692 (ii).
Appnmts. by late Govt., and Colonial Office, cor. &c. (Ans.) 7689.
—— on Amt. (Mr. *Montague*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4836 (ii).
—— (remarks) 1187 (i); 4926 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Agreements, &c., on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5225 (ii).
—— (remarks) 3208, 3313 (i).
—— Telegram (Mr. *Davin*) from London (Ans.) 7357 (ii).
Atlantic Fisheries, U. S. Legislation *re* Papers (presented) 1273 (i).
Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5247 (ii).
—— (Ans.) 4772 (ii).
—— (remarks) 4350, 4449, 4602, 4928 (ii).
Banff Baths, Caretaker's dismissal, (Ans.) 451 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Continued.

- Bell Telephone Co.'s Pet. (Ans.) 6031 (i).
 — Rates (remarks) 7126 (ii).
 Belleville Post Office, Dismissals (remarks) 6112.
 Bonding, &c., Arrangement with U.S. on Pacific Coast, on M. for cor., 1786 (i).
 B. C. Coast Surveys, Rep. of Mr. Coste (remarks) 5323 (ii).
 Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Marcotte) (remarks) 2038, 2083, 2143 (i).
 Business of the House, Govt. precedence on Mondays (M.) 5012 (ii).
 — Morning Sittings and Coms. (remarks) 6110, 6227 (M.) 6229 (ii).
 — Precedence (M.) 1840 (i).
 — (remarks) 5115, 5787, 5937, 7525 (ii).
 Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. Blair) Govt. Am'ts. (remarks) 745 (i).
 — precedence of deb. (M.) 252 (i).
 — Contract (Ans.) 102 (i).
 — Hamilton Smith's communication (remarks) 674, 831, (presented) 903 (i).
 — Kaslo-Slocan Ry. Plans, Papers *re* (remarks) 402 (i).
 — Ref. in Speech from Throne (remarks) 7 (i).
 — Tel. to High Commissioner (explanation) 980 (i).
 — (remarks) 939 (i).
 Chicoutimi and Saguenay and Gaspé Judge, Increase of salaries (remarks) 7385 (ii).
 Chignecto Ship Ry., par. in *Montreal Gazette* (remarks) 5664 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. McMullen) on M. for 2°, 4231 (ii).
 — Examiner's Rep. (presented) 4248 (ii).
 — Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. Mulock) Remarks, 2141 (i).
 Colonial Premiers, London Conference, on M. for cor., 1785 (i).
 Colonization Companies, Grants of land, conditions (Ans.) 479 (i).
 Copyright, International, Action of British Govt. on M. for Com. of Sup., 6635, 6802 (ii).
 County Court Judges, Age limit, cor., &c. (Ans.) 7124 (ii).
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Commissioner's Rep. (remarks) 6031 (ii).
 — printing of Rep. (remarks) 6466 (ii).
 — Investigation on conc., 7848 (ii).
 — Treatment of Labourers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6626 (ii).
 — Member called to order, 6618 (ii).
 Dart, Lyman, Remission of sentence in Com. of Sup., 6653 (ii).
 Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 6939 (ii).
 Debates, Official, Omission of Ques. from Rep., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. McDougall) 3427 (i).
 — Rep. Sel. Com. (M.) 449 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Continued.

- Dredging for Gold in Peace River, Permit to Dr. Roughsedge (Ans.) 478 (i).
 — Licenses, Regulation respecting (remarks) 746 (i).
 Drummond Co. Ry., Com. of Investigation, prop. Res. 506 (i).
 — Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Lister) to con., 7114 (ii).
 — (M. withdn.) 7523-4 (ii).
 Duck Lake Indian Industrial School, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 2356 (i).
 Dupont, Mr. late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 1773 (i).
 Elevators Monopoly, Man. and N. W. Ter. (Ans.) 598 (i).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 2279 (i) ; in Com., 3967, 3979, 4008, 4069, 4098, 4308, 4406 ; on Amt. (Sir Charles Tupper) to M. for 3°, 5671 ; on M. for 3°, 5700, 5702 ; Sen. Am'ts., 7468 (ii).
 — Distribution of printed copies (remarks) 7853 (ii).
 French Language in N.W.T., articles in *L'Ouest Canadien* (remarks) 2531 (i).
 French Line of Steamers, Negotiations, &c. (remarks) 6466 (ii).
 Gananoque Drill Shed, inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 3318 (i).
 Gascoigne, Maj. Gen., Resignation (remarks) 4167 (ii).
 — letter read, 6320 (ii).
 — Order, Ques. of (Mr. Foster) 6442, 6464 (ii).
 Galician Immigrants, *re par.* in *Nor-Wester*, Govt. treatment (remarks) 6033 (ii).
 Gaspé Line of Steamers, subsidy, &c. (Ans.) 7121.
 Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., Rep. of decease (Ans.) 4347 (ii).
 — Decease, Res. of Condolence (M.) 6115 (ii).
 Govt. Business, Change of procedure on order paper (M.) 3502 (i).
 — Precedence on Thursday (M.) 2521 (i).
 — Two Sittings of the Hse. (remarks) 6013. (M.) 6862 (ii).
 Gov. Gen. and Ministerial responsibility, on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn., 260 (i).
 G. T. Ry. Regulation, on M. (Mr. Wallace) to adjn., 6023 (ii).
 Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 7741 (ii).
 — Ques. of Procedure (remarks) 6003 (ii).
 Halstead, Mr. Freeman, sentenced at Porto Rico, par. in *Toronto World* (remarks) 6029 (ii).
 Hubert, Miss A., Pets. (remarks) 7525 (ii).
 Indian Dept., Appunt. of Law clerk (remarks) 7659 (ii).
 Indian Reserves in N.W.T. (Ans.) 452 (i).
 — Qu'Appelle District (Ans.) 451 (i).
 — Supplies, Man. and N.W.T., Purchase (Ans.) 452 (i).
 Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. Fortin) on M. for 1°, 2029.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Continued.

- Internal Economy Commission, Mess. of His Ex. (presented) 405 (i).
- Japanese Immigration, Imposition of poll-tax (Ans.) 2441 (i).
- Joint Commission, U.S. and Can. prop. Conference (remarks) 6611 (ii).
- Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6132; on M. for 2°, 6761; on M. for 3°, prop. Amt., 7043; Sen. Amts., 7854 (ii).
- Pension B., in Com. on Res., 7128 (ii).
- Kingston Locomotive Works, &c., on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn. (remarks) 605 (i).
- Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence River Ship Canal, incorp. B. 99 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6329, 6928 (ii).
- (remarks) 6647 (ii).
- Land Grants to Ry. Corporations in Man. and N. W. Ters. (Ans.) 482 (i).
- Surveys in N.W.T. (Ans.) 450 (i).
- Library Committee, Joint (M.) 671 (i).
- Lt. Gov. N.W.T., Confirmation of Appnmt. (remarks) 6466 (ii).
- rumoured Appnmt. of member for N. Wellington (Ans.) 101 (i).
- (remarks) 2399 (i).
- (Ans.) 1073, 2529 (i).
- Lobster Fishery in Bay of Fundy (Ans.) 479 (i).
- Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1964; in Com., 1998, 2047 (i).
- London and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Lister*) on M. to suspend Rule, 6607 (ii).
- Macdonald Elections, cost of Prosecutions (Ans.) 2349 (i).
- McCarthy, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5389 (ii).
- Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 6722 (ii).
- School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7442, 7465 (ii).
- Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5344, 5405 (ii).
- Man. Schools, Cor. between Charles Russell and Cardinal Rampolla (Ans.) 4926, 7125 (ii).
- Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 405, 936, 1465 (i).
- Montreal Circuit Court, extra Judge (Ans.) 598.
- Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 7177 (ii).
- Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co., Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) to Com. of Sup., 6507 (ii).
- Motions, Notice of (Mr. *Hughes*) Remarks, 6027.
- Nanaimo, Resignation of member, 4606 (ii).
- Newfoundland and Can., Negotiations between (Ans.) 5391 (ii).
- (remarks) 4928 (ii).
- North Simcoe and West Huron, vacancy (remarks) 7042 (ii).
- N.W. Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2058 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Continued.

- N.W. Mounted Police, B. 15 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 2°, 4245 (ii).
- Contract for Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 4041 (ii).
- Dismissal of Dr. Bain (Ans.) 2349 (i).
- (remarks) 5116 (ii).
- Edmonton route to Yukon (Ans.) 1574 (i).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., 5020 (ii).
- number in Ters. (Ans.) 452 (i).
- Tender for Drugs (Ans.) 2349 (i).
- withdr. from Alberta District (remarks) 404 (i).
- Yukon Detachment (remarks) 4453 (ii).
- Nulty, Thos., Death Sentence, Commutation (Ans.) 824 (i), 4771 (ii).
- Officer Commanding Militia, Increased allowance, in Com. on Res., 4934 (ii).
- Ogilvie's Lecture on the Klondike (remarks) 307.
- Official Rep. on Klondike, Translation (Ans.) 604, 2529 (i).
- Pacific Cable (remarks) 7126 (ii).
- Perry, Mr. S. F., late M.P., Decease (remarks) 937 (i).
- Preferential Duties on adjnmt. (remarks) 506 (i).
- trade with G.B. (remarks) 4168, 4452, 4604, 4775, 4928 (ii).
- Prendergast, Judge, Commission of inquiry (Ans.) 1076 (i).
- P.E.I. Legislation, Disallowance of Act (remarks) 7553 (ii).
- Prince, West P.E.I., issue of writ, &c. (Ans.) 1481 (i).
- Printing Bureau, H. T. Smith's position (Ans.) 2350 (i).
- Superintendent's status (Ans.) 2431 (i).
- Committee, Joint (M.) 597 (i).
- Private Bills, Legislation, Order of Procedure (remarks) 7586 (ii).
- Priv. (Ques. of), Representative of the Press and Members of Parlt. on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 5122 (ii).
- par. in *La Patrie re Man. Schools* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7717 (ii).
- Procedure on 3° of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2655.
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3930; on M. for 2°, 4704; on M. for 3°, 6038 (ii).
- (Ans.) 2441 (i).
- on M. (Mr. *Craig*) to adjn., 3316 (i).
- Cor. of Min. of Jus. *re* publication in newspaper, 5321 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 5710, 5738 (ii).
- Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to print 5th and 6th Reps., 6440 (ii).
- organization (remarks) 2517 (i).
- Public Works Aid B. 161 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 6894; on M. for 2°, 7411 (ii).
- Quebec Bridge, prop. subsidy (remarks) 7386 (ii).
- Questions by members, order of Procedure, 7118.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Continued.

- Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4639, 4675; M. to ref. to Com., 5144, 5147; in Com., 5151, 5160 (ii).
- Rate War and Man. Settlers, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1477 (i).
- Rainy River Judicial District, Appnmt. of Judge (remarks) 5011 (ii).
- Reciprocity with the U.S. (Ans.) 452 (i).
- Returns, on inquiries for, 5117, 5232, 5931 (ii).
- St. Jacques Model Farm, Establishment by Govt. (Ans.) 7121 (ii).
- St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Commissioner's Rep. on M. (Mr. *Fortin*) to print, 6608 (ii).
- Saskatchewan District, Appnmt. of Judge (remarks) 7042 (ii).
- Timber Limits held by Moore & McDowell (Ans.) 481 (i).
- San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1927 (i).
- Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2425 (i).
- Select Standing Coms. (M.) 5 (i).
- Com. to prepare Lists (M.) 450 (i).
- Lists (presented) 591 (i).
- Standing orders, on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to suspend Rule 49, 5014 (ii).
- Skelton vs. Queen, Affidavits, &c. (remarks) 6112, 6322, 6317 (ii).
- application for a new trial (Ans.) 5319 (ii).
- Personal Explanation (Mr. *Davin*) 6891 (ii).
- Postmaster at Battleford, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6816 (ii).
- (remarks) 5931 (ii).
- Spanish Ambassador, late, Presence in Can. (remarks) 5789 (ii).
- Speech from the Throne, consdn. (M.) 4 (i).
- Spencer, W. J., Pension to (remarks) 6325 (ii).
- Statutes, Revision and Consolidation (Ans.) 2343 (i).
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2096 (i).
- SS. Service, Can. and France, Establishment (Ans.) 456 (i).
- Superior Court, Magdalen Islands, (Ans.) 598 (i).
- SUPPLY.**
- Civil Government*: Agriculture (salaries) 4850; N. W. M. P., 4545; Post Office, 4861; Privy Council, 7483 (ii).
- Indians*: Ont. and Que. (industrial schools) 7757.
- Legislation*: House of Commons (debates) 7025; (sessional indemnities to absent members) 7783.
- Miscellaneous* (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7262; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 7097; Man. School Case litigation) 7771; (Prescott and Russell Fire relief fund) 7090; Privy Council (records) 7281 (ii).
- Penitentiaries* (commission's expenses) 7350 (ii).
- Unprovided Items*: per Auditor Gen.'s Rep., 7352.
- Yukon Provisional District*: Maintenance of Force, 7339, 7353 (ii).
- Treasury Board Recommendations, non-production of Returns (remarks) 1076 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Continued.

- U.S. Customs Regulations at Skagway and Dyea (Ans.) 101 (i).
- on the Stikine (remarks) 621 (i).
- on the Yukon (Ans.) 454 (i).
- (remarks) 6 (i).
- Occupation of Dyea and Skagway (remarks) 619 (i).
- Transport of Merchandise in U. S. vessels (remarks) 1076 (i).
- War Ships in Canadian Canals (remarks) 4350 (ii).
- in Canadian Waters, Right to exclude (Ans.) 825 (i).
- Victoriaville Public Building, Erection, &c., (Ans.) 7120 (ii).
- Walsh, E. J., Claims against the Govt. (remarks) 6325 (ii).
- Walsh, Administrator of Yukon, Appnmts. to Force (Ans.) 480 (i).
- Appnmts., &c. (Ans.) 479 (i).
- Instructions *re* Immigration (Ans.) 601 (i).
- Instructions *re* non-production of (remarks) 1387 (i).
- Instructions and Commission (presented) 1174 (i).
- Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2117 (i).
- West Prince (P.E.I.) Vacancy, issue of writ (Ans.) 2241 (i).
- Whisky for the Yukon, *re* *Mananunses* cargo (remarks) 1188 (i).
- Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 3412 (i).
- Yukon Provisional District, Action of U.S. Senate, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 1276 (i).
- Customs Officials, par. in *Ottawa Citizen*, 4452 (ii).
- Liquor Permits, Govt. right to grant (Ans.) 473 (i).
- (remarks) 746, 2269 (i).
- Placer Mining and Timber licenses (Ans.) 460 (i).
- Purchase of provisions, for N.W.M.P., &c. (Ans.) 1931 (i).
- Rothschilds' Agents (Ans.) 486 (i).
- Routes and Passes, explorations (Ans.) 482.
- Teslin Lake Wagon route, and Govt. Policy (remarks) 2700 (i).
- (remarks) 1188 (i).
- Timber Berths, Names of Tenderers (Ans.) 485 (i).
- limits granted to H. Domville (Ans.) 474.
- Troops for (remarks) 1577 (i).
- Wagon Road (remarks) 1185 (i).

Lavergne, Mr., Drummond and Arthabaska.

- Victoriaville, Public Building, Erection, &c. (Ques.) 7120 (ii).

Legris, Mr. J. H., Maskinongé.

- Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2782 (i).
Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fiddling*) in Com. on Res., 7451 (ii).

Lemieux, Mr. R., Gaspé.

- Budget, The, 3569 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1229 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2883 (i).
Magdalen Islands Mail Service (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Montreal Circuit Court, extra Judge (Ques.) 598.
Nulty's Death Sentence, Petitions for commutation (Ques.) 824 (i).
St. Helen's Island, allotment for Military Purposes (Ques.) 456 (i).
SS. Service, Can. and France, establishment (Ques.) 456 (i).
Superior Court, Magdalen Islands (Ques.) 597 (i).
SUPPLY :

- Fisheries* (salaries, &c., overseers) 5006 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (dredging) 6083 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's monument) 6106 (ii).

- U.S. SS. *Yantic* and *La Canadienne*, Collision, &c. (Ques.) 4451 (ii).

Lister, Mr. J. F., West Lambton.

- Chignecto Ship Ry., par in *Montreal Gazette* (remarks) 5663 (ii).
Drummond County Ry. Investigation, Rep. of Com. (M.) 7113 (ii).
—— 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 1272 (i).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 6580 (ii).
—— (M.) to print Evidence and Rep., 6580 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3948 (ii).
London and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67) 1°, 1736 (i); in Com., 4072 (ii).
—— (B. 158) M. to suspend Rule, 1*, 6607 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) Press Representatives and Members of Parlt., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 5124 (ii).
Safety of Ry. Employees B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4209, 4212 (ii).

Logan, Mr. H. J., Cumberland.

- Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 93) 1°, 2430 (i).
Missaquash Commissioners, Confirmation of Acts (B. 103) 1°, 2430 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., King's, P.E.I.

- Butter Industry in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2458 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2974 (i).
Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1865 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C.—Continued.

- Lambert, Martin, Montague, P.E.I., Dismissal (Ques.) 5787 (ii).
Macdonald, A., Postmaster at Peake's Station, Dismissal (Ques.) 4344 (ii).
Montague, P.E.I., Sub-collector of Customs, Dismissal (M. for cor.) 2822 (i).
Neufrage Pond, Survey (Ques.) 3166 (i).
Prince Edward, Dredge, Number of caretakers and employees (M. for Ret. *) 2841 (i).
—— (Ques.) 2345 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. Curve at North Wiltshire (Ques.) 2345.
Returns (inquiry) 7526 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Fisheries* (salaries, overseers, &c.) 5004 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: Salaries, 4996 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Wharfinger, Sault Ste. Marie, salary, 7102 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (P.E.I. and Mainland) 731; (Winter Mail Service) 4980 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (heating, &c.) 5609; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7598; P.E.I., 5630, 7638 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act. Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2124 (i).
West Prince, P.E.I., Vacancy in Electoral District, Notification, 1079 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., East Huron.

- Budget, The, 3392 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1055 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2301; in Com., 2978-2982 (i).

Mackie, Mr. T., North Renfrew.

- Roche Fendue and Calumet Dams, on M. (Mr. *Pouppore*) for cor., 4621 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. conc., 7821 (ii).

Maclaren, Mr. A. F., North Perth.

- Alien Labour Workmen, Importation to Toronto, on M. (Mr. *Clark*) to adjn., 4034 (ii).
Robert, H. A., Post Office clock, Stratford, caretaker, dismissal (Ques.) 4344 (ii).
Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6965 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Woodstock, P.O.) 5469 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., East York.

- Address, on The, Member's Stmt. challenged, 93 (i).
Board of Trade at Toronto (B. 43) 1°, 970 (i).
Butter Industry in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2469 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 844 (i).
—— Telegram to High Commissioner on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 985 (i).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—Continued.

- Canals, Date of opening (Ques.) 3317 (i).
 Cattle exported from Canadian Ports (Ques.) 475.
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2861 (i).
 Dom. Building and Loan Association (B. 41) 1*, 970 (i).
 Dredging for Gold in Peace River, &c., permit to Dr. Roughsedge (Ques.) 478 (ii).
 Foreign Immigrants, settled in Can. (Ques.) 6109 (ii).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2^c, 2751; in Com., 3949; on M. for 3^c, 5702 (ii).
 Free Miners Certificates, Number issued (Ques.) 3311 (i).
 Galician Immigrants, settled in Can. (Ques.) 6109 (ii).
 Govt. Business, precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2523 (i).
 G.T.R. and C.P.R., connection at North Bay (remarks) 4353 (ii).
 G. T. R. and O. A. & P. S. Ry. connection at Scotia Junction (Ques.) 454 (i).
 Insolvency Bill, Govt. legislation (Ques.) 3826 (i).
 — Govt. measure (Ques.) 2848 (i).
 Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) consdn. of amts., 3360 (i).
 Lighthouse Supplies, Montreal west, Contract (Ques.) 2846 (i).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2^c, 1962; in Com., 1979; (Amt.) that Com. rise, 2045; on M. for 3^c (Amt.) to re-commit, 2400, in Com., 2401; (Amt.) that Com. rise, 2402, 2417 (i).
 — on M. to restore to order paper, 2427 (i).
 Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7406 (ii).
 — School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7424 (ii).
 Miners' Free Licenses, Issue of Certificates (Ques.) 5133 (ii).
 Montreal & Lake Ontario, Completion of fourteen foot Navigation (Ques.) 6009 (ii).
 Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. for Com., 2386, 2616, 2647; in Com., 2619 (i).
 — M. to ref. back to Com., 2661 (i).
 Ontario Court of Appeal, Extra judge (Ques.) 1071.
 Prince Albert Mail Service, Delay in Transport, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 2519 (i).
 Privilege (Ques. of) Press Representatives and Members of Parlt. on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 5130 (ii).
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5749, 5759 (ii).
 — Savings Banks, reduction of interest on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3719 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1^c, 3933 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—Continued.

- Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 5144; in Com., 5150 (ii).
 — Commissioners, Board of, legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1805, 1821 (i).
 — Rates to Stickine (Ques.) 1070 (i).
 — rates, War, and Man. Settlers (M. to adjn.) 1473 (i).
 — Transportation (M. to adjn.) 1749 (i).
 San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1^c, 1938 (i).
 — on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2250 (i).
 Spanish Ambassador, late, presence in Canada, 5789 (ii).
 SUPPLY
 — *Civil Government*: Gov. Gen. Sec's Office, 3839 (i).
 Trade with West Indies, on Adjmnt. (remarks) 2843 (i).
 Walsh, Major, Appmnt. as Administrator of Yukon District (Ques.) 479 (i).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff:
 — In Com.: (preferential clause) 3758 (i).
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3191 (i).
 Yukon Provisional District, Banking Business (Ques.) 3311 (i).
 — geological survey of (Ques.)

Macpherson, Mr. T. H., Hamilton.

- Alien Labour Law, Appmnt. of Agent at Hamilton (Ques.) 6611 (ii).
 Edmonton and Peace River Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 98) 1*, 2430 (i).
 Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s (B. 100) 1*, 2430 (i); Sen. Amts., 4606 (ii).
 International Radial Ry. Co. Revival Act Amt. (B. 137) 1*, 5215 (ii).
 Nakusp and Slocan Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1*, 1174 (i).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff:
 — In Com. (preferential clause) 3766 (i).

McAlister, Mr. J., Restigouche.

- Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3966, 4486 (ii).
 Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1865 (i).
 I. C. R. Train Service, issue of new time tables, 6243 (ii).
 Oak Bay Mills Post Office, Closing (Ques.) 3824.
 — imperfect Return (remarks) 5324 (ii).
 — Return (inquiry) 3941 (ii).
 Ogilvie's Reports, sent from Yukon, dates (Ques.) 974 (i).
 Ry. Employees Safety B. (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 3682 (i).
 Restigouche Indians, Agent, Dismissal of J. A. Venner (M. for Ret. *) 2839 (i).
 — (Ques.) 4611 (ii).
 — (remarks) 1786 (i).
 Returns (inquiry) 4928 (ii).

McAlister, Mr. J.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

- Civil Government* : Geological Survey (salaries) 7478 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 5594; (salaries, overseers') 507 (ii).
Indians : N.B., 7294 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 4999.
Post Office : Outside Service (miscellaneous expenses) 6712 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings, N.S., 5087; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7590; Ont., 7642; (dredging) 6093; Que., 7633 (ii).
Railways : I. C. R. (increased accommodation at St. John) 7649; (rolling stock) 7644 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D., North Simcoe.

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4465 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Civil Government* : High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 4579 (ii).
 Toronto and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 77 (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Com., 4570 (ii).

McCleary, Mr. W., Welland.

- Alien Labour Law, Appmt. of Agent at Fort Erie (Ques.) 4178 (ii).
 — Enforcement of (remarks) 5789, 5807 (ii).
 — Workmen, Importation to Toronto, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4036 (ii).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2753 (i).
 Horses for feeding, Licenses by farmers (Ques.) 2343 (i).
 Johnson, Mr. J. T., Customs Collector at Fort Erie, Dismissal (Ques.) 4178 (ii).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2041 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher* in Com., 4740 (ii).
 Queen Victoria Park, Niagara Falls (Ques.) 2847.
 San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1913 (i).
 — on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2247 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Canals* : Soulanges (construction) 6459; Welland, 7652 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings, Ont., 5463; Harbours and Rivers, Ont., 5463, 7642; (Toronto Harbour) 5899 (ii).
Railways (General expenses for Investigations) 7206 (ii).

McClure, Mr. F., Colchester.

- Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 832 (i).
 Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 49) 1°, 970 (i).
 Dart, Lyman, Remission of Sentence, in Com. of Sup., 6666 (ii).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2571 (i); in Com., 3962, 4398 (ii).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1986; on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2425 (i).

McClure, Mr. F.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

- Indians* (surveys) 6851 (ii).
Railways : I.C.R. (claims for damages by fire) 7376.

McCormick, Mr. G., Muskoka and Parry Sound.

- Alien Labour Law, Appmt. of Agent at Parry Sound (remarks) 6613 (ii).
 — Enforcement, &c. (remarks) 7126 (ii).
 Parry Sound Harbour-master (Ques.) 5135 (ii).
 Walton, T. M., Indian Agent at Parry Sound, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor. *) 3670 (i).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., Cape Breton.

- Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 159 (Mr. *Paterson*) on prop. Res., 6724 (ii).
 Bounty to Fishermen, Applications at Gabarus (Ques.) 674 (i).
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 5787 (ii).
 Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 961, 1030 (i).
 Cape Breton County, Marine Dept. changes (Ques.) 673 (i).
 — Dismissals (remarks) 6033 (ii).
 Certificates to Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 37 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1861 (i).
 Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6800 (ii).
 Debates, Official, omission of Question from Rep. on Ques. of Privilege, 3425 (i).
 Dismissals in Cape Breton, inquiry for Ret., 6321, 6519, 6569 (ii).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4026, 4042, 4080, 4103, 4270, 4293, 4333, 4401, 4416, 4454, 4487 (ii).
 Fishermen's Safety B. 111 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 4780 (ii).
 Gabarus Breakwater, Grant, &c. (Ques.) 4179 (ii).
 Grand Narrows, C.B., Dismissal of Govt. blacksmith (Ques.) 3661 (i).
 — Preventive officer, duties and salary (Ques.) 1781 (i).
 McNeill, Rory, section foreman I. C. R., Dismissal (Ques.) 603 (i).
 Man. School Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5331 (ii).
 — cor. between Mr. Charles Russell and Cardinal Rampolla (Ques.) 4924, 7124 (ii).
 — documents and cor. with Rome (M. for cor.) 3663 (i).
 Members' sessional trunks, Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to Com. of Sup., 7049 (ii).
 Military College Employees, Suppl. Ret. (remarks) 6035 (ii).
 Ottawa and Truro Mail Service (Ques.) 1575 (i).
 Port Morien, Breakwater, Grant by Govt. (Ques.) 4179 (ii).
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 5716 (ii).
 — Savings Banks, Reduction of Interest on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3724 (i).

McDougall, Mr. H. F.—Continued.

Returns (inquiry) 5930 (ii).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir
Louis Davies) in Com., 2086 (i).
 Stimulants in Chamber during debate, on Ques.
 of Privilege (Mr. *Talbot*) 3640 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (creameries, N.W.T) 5994;
 (Farm Bulletins, distribution) 5994; (Patent
 Record) 5024; (Year-book) 5038 (ii).
Canals: Sculanges (construction) 6449 (ii).
Civil Government: Inland Revenue (contingencies)
 4591; Post Office, 4859, 4883; (contingencies) 4915;
 Public Works (contingencies) 4593; Railways and
 Canals (contingencies) 4597; Trade and Commerce
 (contingencies) 4598 (ii).
Dom. Lands: Surveys, &c. 7321 (ii).
Excise (preventive service) 7248 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 5277 (ii).
Indians: N.B. (erection of fence, &c) 7294; (sur-
 veys) 6851 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4987 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Halifax, St.
 John, &c.) 7282 (ii).
Militia (Fredericton school) 7057 (ii).
Miscellaneous (pilotage investigations) 7104 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (life saving station) 4954;
 (maintenance) 4951; (registry of shipping) 4954;
 (tidal surveys) 4963; (winter mail service) 4966,
 4975 (ii).
Post Office: Mail Clerks (salaries) 7051 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (heating, &c.) 5608;
 Man., 5488; N.S., 5074; Ont. (depl. block, Ot-
 tawa) 5070; (summer house) 7220; Harbours and
 Rivers (general vote) 6071; Mar. Provs. (dredging)
 6082; N.S. , 5612; Que. (St. Lawrence Ship Chan-
 nel) 5053, 5059; Toronto Harbour) 5908 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle slaughtered) 7004; (gratuities)
 6995 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation at Mulgrave)
 6428; (claims for damages) 7183; (dismissal of Rory
 McNeil) 6415; (increased accommodation) 6433;
 (iron bridges) 6405; (general expenses of investi-
 gations) 7195 (ii).
 Sydney and North Sydney quarantine. Phys-
 icians (Ques.) 1781 (i).
 Yukon Military Contingent, Expenditure, &c.
 (remarks) 4797 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
 In Com. (preferential clause) 3772, 3780; (to-
 bacco) 3814 (i).
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir
Henri Joly) on M. for 1°, 1741; in Com., 2120,
 2133 (i).

McGregor, Mr. W., North Essex.

Alien Workmen, importation to Toronto, on M.
 (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4035 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in
 Com., 6959 (ii).
 San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock, on
 M. (Mr. *Churlton*) to adjn., 2264 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Ocean and River Service (winter mail service) 4973.
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (dredging)
 6078; Mar. Provs. (dredging) 6083 (ii).

McHugh, Mr. G., South Victoria, O.

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr.
Richardson) on M. for Com., 2878 (i).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in
 Com., 2948 (i), 4460 (ii).
 Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Caseg*) in Com.,
 4676 (ii).
 Tamagamingue Ry. Co's incorp. (B. 62) 1°, 1465.

McInerney, Mr. G. V. (Kent, N.B.)

Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation,
 on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) ref. to Com. on
 Priv. and Elections, 2167 (i).
 Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on
 M. for 2°, 794 (i).
 Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr.
Richardson) on M. for Com., 3699 (ii).
 Elgin, N.B., Postmaster, Dismissal, (M. for cor. *)
 1837 (i).
 European and North American Ry., Settlement
 between Govt. and E. B. Chandler (M. for
 Ret. *) 2841 (i).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*)
 in Com., 3990, 4074, 4084, 4100, 4133, 4254, 4266,
 4374, 4377, 4473, 4525 (ii).
 Hillsborough Customs Collector, Dismissal (M.
 for cor. *) 1838 (i).
 I.C.R., Carriage of Coal (Ques.) 4448 (ii).
 — Killam's claim, cattle destroyed, inquiry
 for Ret. 4683 (ii).
 — position on I. C. R. (Ques.) 827 (i).
 McNaughton, Wm., Emplmt. in the Inland
 Rev., N.S. (Ques.) 1931 (i).
 Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 136
 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5330 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B.
 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3929 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Government: Militia (accountant) 3908 (i).
Fisheries (protection service) 5273 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 5642.
 Yukon Ry., Action of U. S. Senate, on M. (Sir
Charles Tupper) to adjn., 1298 (i).

McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., Vancouver, B.C.

Beaumont, Wm., Claims for salary as Postmas-
 ter (Ques.) 4611 (ii).
 Boundary between Can. and Alaska (Ques.) 1076.
 Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt.
 (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1722, 1723.
 Cowichan Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 48) 1°,
 970 (i).
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Agreement with C. P. R.
 (Ques.) 2036 (i).
 Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*)
 1°, 4247 (ii).
 Dom. Govt. Creameries (Ques.) 3085 (i).
 Immigration into Yukon, Maj. Walsh's instruc-
 tions (Ques.) 601 (i).
 Japanese Immigration Restriction (B. 70) 1°,
 1736 (i).
 — (remarks) 2528 (i).

McInnes, Mr. W. W. B.—Continued.

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2958, 2963, 3012 (i).

"Mudlark," Dredge, Increase in working hours (Ques.) 3825 (i).

Rothwell's Rep. *re* Claims of settlers (remarks) 2851 (i).

U. S. Customs Regulations in the Yukon (Ques.) 453 (i).

— Relief Expedition to Yukon, Military Escort (Ques.) 970 (i).

Vancouver Island Ry. belt, Settler's claims, Rep. of Mr. Rothwell (remarks) 4452 (ii).

Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 64 (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1st, 1573 (i).

Yukon Mines, Telegraph connection (Ques.) 1472.

McIsaac, Mr. C. F. (Antigonish, N.S.)

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2^d, 2795 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S., 7633 (ii).

McLellan, Mr. B. D., West Prince, P.E.I.

SUPPLY :

Railways and Canals: P.E.I. Ry. (rolling stock) 6437 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. R. R., Glengarry.

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 4666 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Canals: Farran's Point, 6533; North Channel (construction) 6536 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (dredging) 6087; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6286, 6290 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. A., Inverness, N.S.

Butter Industry in Canada, prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2496 (i).

Cape Breton Ry., Hard-pan Claims (Ques.) 5134.

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3986, 4413, 4492 (ii).

Grand Etang, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 5317 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) Ref. to Mr. Mills's speech in *Hansard*, 4603 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture &c. (creameries, N.W.T.) 5994; (dairy stations, N.S.) 7513 (ii).

Fisheries (protection service) 5295 (ii).

Militia (Dom. Artillery associations) 7522 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (dredging) 6082; N.S., 5617, 5623 (ii).

Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation at Mulgrave) 6430; (dismissal of Rory McNeill) 6417 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) on M. for 1^o, 1741 (i).

McMillan, Mr. J., South Huron.

Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6225 (ii).

Budget, on The, 3489 (i).

Butter Industry of Can. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2377, 2501, 2511 (i).

McMillan, Mr. J.—Continued.

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2^d, 1672 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3702 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2947, 2975 (i).

Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) to Com. of Sup., 6972 (ii).

Man. School Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5423 (ii).

Personal explanation *re* Mr. Taylor's speech on Experimental Farms, 6113 (ii).

Ry. Commissioners, Appnmt. (Ques.) 1784 (i).

— legislation on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1823 (i).

San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1^o, 1915 (i).

— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2265 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris Exhibition) 5048 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S., 5082 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2131 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J., North Wellington.

Address, on The, 422 (i).

Aliens Act Amt. (B. 63) 1^o, 1466 (i).

Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5254 (ii).

Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6221 (ii).

Budget, on The, 3458 (ii).

Butter Industry of Can. Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2363 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1^o, 219 (i).

— Telegram to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's proposals, 1015 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 17) 1st, 405 (i); 2^d m., 4222, 4237 (ii).

— Board of Supervisors, Authorization, (B. 10) 1^o, 270 (i).

— Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3692 (ii).

— Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2^d, 6348; in Com., 6367, 6797 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Investigation on conc. 7843 (ii).

Debts due the Dom. on Loans to Public Works on M. for Com. of Sup., 6238 (ii).

Dep. Minister and Clerks, amounts paid for extra services from 1890 to 1897 (M. for Ret. *) 3667 (ii).

Experimental Farm, Distribution of Bulletins (remarks) 2454 (i).

Extra Clerks and Civil Service, Salaries and amounts paid from 1895 to 1897 (M. for Ret. *) 3667 (i).

— inside and outside service (M. for Ret. *) 3667 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2^d, 2314 (i).
 Govt. Business, Change of Procedure, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3502 (i).
 ——— Precedence on Thursdays on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2523 (i).
 G. T. Ry. Regulations on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 6022 (ii).
 I. C. R. Dining cars, number, &c. (Ques.) 2812 (i)
 Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6152, 6184 (ii).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2^d, 1960 (i); in Com., 1985; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2404 (i).
 Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7406 (ii).
 N. W. Mounted Police, Contract for transporting supplies to Yukon (remarks) 5510 (ii).
 Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Montague*) P.O. Dept., 4892 (ii).
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 5731; in Com., 5779 (ii).
 Preferential Trade with G. B. on Amt. (Mr. *McNeil*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 5839 (ii).
 Public Accounts Committee, Meetings (remarks) 3503 (i).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Commissioner's Rep. (Ques.) 3940 (ii).
 San José Scale Pest, Prohibition of Nursery Stock on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2249 (i).
 Sons of England Benefit Society incorp. B. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com., 6061 (ii).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2093 (i).
 Stimulants in the Chamber during debate on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3640 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice*: Supreme Court (judges' salary) 6990 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (N. W. Ter. exhibition account) 6995; (year book) 5027 (ii).
Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (contractors' claims) 7105; Soulanges (construction) 6529 (ii).
Civil Government: Agriculture (salaries) 4848; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 3854; Interior, 4544; Post Office, 4891; Sundry Depts. (Priv. Secs.) 7484 (ii).
Govt. of North-west Terns.: Insane Asylums, 7306.
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7030 (sessional clerks) 6991; (stationery, &c.) 7037; Senate (unforeseen expenses) 6994 (ii).
Minor Revenues (printing law stamps) 7251 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Crows Nest Pass Commission, 7260.
Penitentiaries (expenses of commission) 7350 (ii).
Post Office: Outside Service (letter carriers) 7776.
Public Works: Buildings, N.S., 5074; N.W.T., 5490; Ont. (Major's Hill Park) 5457; (Woodstock P.O.) 5468; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6299 (ii).
Quarantine (gratuities) 6997; ("Scientific Dairying") 6999 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Railways*: I.C.R. (accommodation at Halifax) 6383; (iron bridges) 6389; (original construction) 6386 (ii).
Unprovided Items: per Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 7351 (ii).
 Tennant, John F., Dismissal by Govt. on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for Ret., 5196 (ii).
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2118 (i).
 Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 3414 (i).
- McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce.**
 Address, on The, 410 (i).
 Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 2228 (i).
 Butter Industry in Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2460 (i).
 Civil Service; Attachment of Salaries B. 14 Mr. *Richardson* on M. for Com., 2885 (i).
 ——— Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2^d, 6343, 6347 (ii).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2^d, 2567, on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2^d, 2794 (i); in Com. 3957, 4283, 4375, 4396; Sen. Amts., 7534 (ii).
 G. T. Ry. Regulations on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 6020 (ii).
 Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6173; on M. for 2^d, of B., 6767; in Com., 6791 (ii).
 ——— (Pension) B. in Com. on Res., 7131 (ii).
 Man. Debt Account B. 159 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7408 (ii).
 Man. Schools Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5421 (ii).
 Pacific Cable between Vancouver and Australia, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) for Com. of Sup., 6199 (ii).
 ——— (remarks) 7125, 7384 (ii).
 Personal Explanation, Misquotation of quotation (remarks) 518 (i).
 Preferential Trade with G.B., Amt. to Com. of Sup., 5808 (ii).
 ——— (remarks) 4168, 4452, 4604, 4775, 4928 (ii).
 Privilege (Ques. of) Press Representatives and Members of Parl., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 5131 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1^o, 3932; in Com., 4751 (ii).
 Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4220 (ii).
 ——— Transportation on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1770 (i).
 San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1^o, 1924 (i).
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2251 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2104 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris exhibition) 5046 ;
(year book) 5027, 5099 (ii).

Civil Government : Agriculture (salaries) 4848 ;
Aud. Gen.'s Office, 4549 : Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s
Office, 3833, 3841, 3869 (i) ; Interior, 4528, 4538 (ii).

Legislation : House of Commons (debates) 7033 ;
(stationery, &c.) 7037 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4987 (ii).

Public Works : Buildings, Ont. (Major's Hill Park)
5458, 5573 ; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (dredging)
6092 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff :

In Com. (preferential clause) 3797 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri
Joly*) in Com., 2120 (i).

Marcotte, Mr. F. A., Champlain.

Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ,
on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5243 (ii).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation,
prop. Res., 2037 (i).

—— M. to refer to Com. on Privs. and Elec-
tions, 2142 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for
2°, 1208 (i).

Chambord Junction Custom-house, Cost, &c.
(Ques.) 4179 (ii).

Cheese Factories in Prov. of Que. (remarks) 1578.

Chicoutimi County Telegraph Line (Ques.) 2814.
—— Wharf, Govt. Expenditure, &c. (Ques.)
4180 (ii).

Dagneau, Mr., Dismissal (Ques.) 4609 (ii).

Houde, Charles E., Dismissal by Govt. (Ques.)
7686 (ii).

I. C. R., Expenditure for fuel (Ques.) 3089 (ii).

Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com.
on Res., 7432 (ii).

Ogilvie's Official Rep. on Klondike, translation
(Ques.) 604 (i).

Personal Explanation, par. in *La Patrie*, on M.
for Com. of Sup., 7657 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in
Com., 5769, 5779 (ii).

Rivière Ste. Anne de la Pérade, Repairs to work,
&c. (Ques.) 1785 (i), 3941 (ii).

—— Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for O.C.*)
4678 (ii).

—— (Ques.) 3313 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel, Placing of buoys, Con-
tract, &c. (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

—— River, Inundations (Ques.) 3660 (i).

St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 3090 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (dredg-
ing) 6093 ; Que., 5649, 7640 ; Miscellaneous
(Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's monument) 6108 ;
Slides and Booms, 6100 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. Mr., and the Senate, par. in *Le Soleil*
(remarks) 3319 (i).

United Counties Ry., Payments to (Ques.) 3658.

Martin, Mr. A., Queen's, P.E.I.

Belle River Breakwater, Govt. control (Ques.)
1785, 2036 (i).

—— (remarks) 2040 (i).

China Point Wharf, Condition (Ques.) 671 (i).

Cold Storage, P.E.I., Provision (Ques.) 828 (i).

Double Hill, P.E.I., Post Office, closing (Ques.)
1931 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on
Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2741 (i) ; in
Com., 3943 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 7560 (ii).

Importation of Horses from U.S. to N.W.T.
(Ques.) 3942 (ii).

Justice Dept., Agent at Charlottetown 1075 (i).

Piers and Wharfs in P.E.I., Govt. control (Ques.)
3088 (i).

—— Private, Expenditure, &c., by Govt. (M.
for Ret.*) 3670 (i).

—— (remarks) 7241 (ii).

P.E.I. and Can. Govt. local delegation *re* Out-
standing Disputes (M. for O. C.'s*) 3669 (i).

—— Ry. branches (M. for cor.) 4622 (ii).

—— St. Mary's Road Post Office, closing, &c.
(M. for cor.*) 4246 (ii).

Red Point Wharf, repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1074 (i).

Returns (inquiry) Expenditure on Private Wharfs
and Piers, 6581 (ii).

—— (inquiry) 3427 (i), 5018, 5117, 7526, 7655 (ii).

Shipping Accommodation, Murray River (Ques.)
3823 (i).

Southport to Murray Harbour, P.E.I. Ry. Ex-
tension (Ques.) 972 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 5997 (ii).

Fisheries : Protection Service, 5288 ; (salaries,
overseers, &c.) 5007 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Montreal, St.
John and Manchester) 7681 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (P.E.I. and Mainland)
7732 ; (winter mail service) 4970, 7284 (ii).

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I., 7636.

Railways : P.E.I. Ry. (rolling stock) 6434 (ii).

Tignish Breakwater, Tenders, &c., for construc-
tion (Ques.) 1074 (i).

West Point Pier, Tenders for construction (Ques.)
1075 (i).

Winter Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland
(Ques.) 1778 (i).

Wood Island Breakwater, Dredging, &c. (Ques.)
2350 (i).

Yukon Ry., Exclusion of Foreign labour (Ques.)
827 (i).

Maxwell, Mr. G. R., Burrard, B.C.

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt.
(Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1527 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 20) 1°, 597 (i).

Dredging Leases issued to J. A. Mercier, miles
of River (Ques.) 1934 (i).

Lighthouses between Vancouver and Stikine
River (Ques.) 976 (i).

Maxwell, Mr. G.—Continued.

N. W. Mounted Police, Contract for transporting supplies to the Yukon (remarks) 5517 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S., 5616; Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 5912 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff :

In Com. (preferential clause) 3796 (i).

Mills, Mr. J. B., Annapolis, N.S.

Bear River Bridge, Rep. as to condition of Pier (Ques.) 975 (i).

— removal (M. for Ret. *) 2840 (i).

— Shipping Master, Dismissal (M. for Ret. *) 2840 (ii).

— (Ques.) 1071 (i).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2184 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2533; on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2792; on M. for Com., 2933 (i); in Com., 3983, 4065, 4255, 4260, 4313, 4411, 4454; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3°, 5690; Sen. Amts., 7551, 7554 (ii).

— (Personal Explanation) 4520 (ii).

Imports from U.S. and G.B. (Ques.) 3663 (i).

Lafrance Fire Engine, duty, &c., charged (Ques.) 6011 (ii).

Middletown Post Office District, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 7687 (ii).

Ogilvie's Official Guide to Klondike, Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 4611, 4771 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4757, 4767 (ii).

Returns (inquiry) 4605, 5321 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1885 (i).

SUPPLY :

Excise (contingencies, &c.) 7244 (ii).

Indians: N.S. (erection of fence) 7295 (ii).

Militia (gratuities, &c.) 7519; (Yukon Force) 7059.

Post Office: Mail Clerks (salaries) 7055 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 7216; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7619 (ii).

Railways (accommodation at St. John) 7649; (subsidy to N.S. Central Ry. Co.) 7807 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D., Jacques Cartier.

Bagot, Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5242 (ii).

Beloil, Caretaker of Booms, Resignation (Ques.) 2847 (i).

— land damages (Ques.) 2847 (i).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2197 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 909 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2864 (i).

— Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6373 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—Continued.

Commission *re* Civil Service Employees in Prov. of Que., Names, &c. (M. for Ret. *) 504 (i).

Côte de Liesse Rifle Ranges and Farmers Grievances (remarks) 6322 (ii).

Cote St. Luc Rifle Ranges, Accidental Shooting, &c. (M. for Cor. *) 4678 (ii).

— (remarks) 5569, 6029 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3967, 4050, 4151, 4463, 4500 (ii).

French Language in N.W.T., article in *L'Ouest Canadien* (remarks) 2529 (i).

Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 2023.

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6130, 6142, 6171 (ii).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence River Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6332 (ii).

— (remarks) 6647 (ii).

Lefavre, Xavier, Lockmaster Lachine Canal, Dismissal (Ques.) 3937 (ii).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2046 (i).

Militia Clothing, contract since Sept., 1896, &c. (M. for Ret. *) 1838 (i).

— Force, Permanent, Inspection by Gascoigne (Ques.) 1782 (i).

— General Orders (Ques.) 1782 (i).

— Harness and Saddlery, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1470 (i).

— (M. for Ret. *) 1839 (i).

— Promotions (Ques.) 2433 (i).

Montreal Drill Shed, repairs executed (M. for Ret. *) 1838 (i).

Ogilvie's Official Guide to Klondike, French translation (remarks) 1078 (i).

Point Claire Wharf, construction (M. for cor. *) 505 (i).

— (Ques.) 476 (i).

— Ret. *re* (inquiry) 3941 (ii).

Richelieu River Works, estimated cost, &c. 484 (i).

Rifle Range, Ottawa, Target practice (Ques.) 6612 (i).

Ste. Anne Lock, Investigation, &c. (M. for Ret. *) 3667 (i).

— (Ques.) 4345 (ii).

St. Geneviève Floods (M. for cor. *) 505 (i).

— (Ques.) 476 (i).

St. Hyacinthe Customs Office, Dues and Officials (Ques.) 600 (i).

St. Pierre River, dredging, &c. (M. for cor. *) 4678 (ii).

— Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 476 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Claims of commissioner (Ques.) 3938 (ii).

Shirt and Collar Industry, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6583 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

Civil Government: Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 3879;
Militia (accountant) 3900, 3908 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 5000.

Public Works: Buildings, B.C., 5444; Dom., 5606;
(generally) 5495; Ont., 5484; (Major's Hill Park)
5457; (Ottawa Grounds, &c.) 5475; (Rideau Hall)
5599; Telephone Service, 5606; Harbours and
Rivers (dredging) 6074; Ont. (dredging) 6090;
Ques., 5651 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (Toronto observatory) 5002.

Sutton, Lt., Instructions *re* Military course in
Eng. (Ques.) 1782 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr.
Fortin) on M. for 1^o, 1386 (i).

—— B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2113 (i).

Yukon Provisional District, Govt. claims (Ques.)
5133 (ii).

—— placer Mining, claims entered, &c. (Ques.)
6006 (ii).

Montague, Hon. W. H., Haldimand.

Agricultural Implements, M. allowed to stand,
1949 (i).

Alien Labour Law, Copy of Instructions from
Dept. of Justice (remarks) 5518 (ii).

—— instructions to Agents (remarks) 6581 (ii).

Appmnts. by late Govt., on M. for Com. of Sup.,
4797, 4809 (ii).

Butter Industry in Can., Encouragement of, on
prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2361 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for
1^o, 240 (i).

Cattle Shipments, Can. to United Kingdom, on
M. (Mr. *Hughes*) to adjn., 2437 (ii).

Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition B. 76
(Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. 6797 (ii).

Dawson City, Electric Lighting and Tramway
Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com.,
6940 (ii).

Dawson City Electric Co's. B. 123 in Com., 7161 (ii).

Drummond County Ry., Com. of Investigation
on prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 508 (i).

—— Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Lister*) 7114 (ii).

Dundas, Mr., Dismissal by Govt. (remarks) 6579.

Experimental Farms, Distribution of Bulletins
(remarks) 2454 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in
Com., 4258, 4294, 4387, 4446, 4456, 4495, 4524.

Galbraith, Thos. J., Canal Officer, Port Colborne,
Resignation (Ques.) 516 (i).

Grand River Floods (M. to adjn.) 2526 (i).

G. T. Ry. Regulations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to
adjn., 6026 (ii).

Imperial Army Soldiers at Toronto (remarks)
4523 (ii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150
(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2^o, 6744 (ii).

—— (Pension) B. in Com. on Res., 7128, 7140.

Montague, Hon. W. H.—Continued.

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*)
in Com., 1989, 2042; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*)
that Com. rise, 2409 (i).

Militia Annual Camp Drill (remarks) 5324 (ii).

N.W. Mounted Police, Contract for transporting
supplies to the Yukon (remarks) 5512 (ii).

Prince Albert Mail Service, Delay in transmis-
sion, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 2520 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite
B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4728 (ii).

Quartz Mining in Yukon, Regulations (Ques.)
1341 (i).

—— (Remarks) 2000 (i).

Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com.
2055 (i).

Returns (inquiry) Alien Labour Instructions, 6114.

San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B.
82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1^o, 1919 (i).

Sons of England Benefit Society's incorp. B. 122
(Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com., 6049 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice: Supreme Court (Judge's
salary) 6989 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c.: N.W.T. Exhibition accounts,
6995; (creameries, N.W.T.) 5992; Experimental
Farms, 5974 (ii).

Canals: Farran's Point, 6533; Grenville (enlarge-
ment) 6552; North Channel (construction) 6535;
Rideau, 7183; Soulanges (construction) 6448 (ii).

Civil Government: High Commissioner's Office, 4561;
(contingencies) 4561; Inland Revenue, 4556; In-
terior, 4529; Post Office, 4860; (contingencies) 4917;
(Order, Ques. of) 4891; (printing and stationery)
4527 (ii).

Dom. Lands: Commissioner's salary, &c., 6858; sur-
veys, &c., 7309 (ii).

Excise: 6000 (ii).

Indians: N.B. (medical attendance) 7299; N.S.
(erection of fence, &c.) 7295; (surveys) 6852 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7029;
(sessional clerks) 5999, 6991, 7011; Library of Parlt.
(American History) 5999 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé Basin
and Que.) 6388; (Victoria and San Francisco) 6687.

Militia (Dom. Cartridge factory) 6570; (gratuities)
6574; (perman. force, &c.) 7056; Yukon Force)
7063 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Crow's Nest Pass Commission, 7267;
Privy Council (records) 7281 (ii).

Ocean and River Service: (winter mail service)
4967 (ii).

Post Office: Outside Service (salaries) 6700; tem-
porary clerks) 7038 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (B.C.) 5493; (Experimental
Farms) 5495; (generally) 5495; Man., 5487; N.S.,
7215; Ont., 7218; (Major's Hill Park) 5459; (Ottawa
grounds, &c.) 5471; Harbours and Rivers (dredg-
ing) 6074; B.C. (dredging) 6099; Ont. (dredging)
6087; Que. (dredging) 7227 (ii).

Quarantine (cattle slaughtered) 7003; "Scientific
Dairying") 7001; (Trans-Mississippi Exhibition)
7003 (ii).

Montague, Hon. W. H.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

Railways: C. P. R., 6382; I. C. R. (accommodation at Mulgrave) 6433; (claims for damages) 7185; (increased accommodation) 6434; Indiantown Branch (land damages) 7081; (iron bridges) 6397; (general expenses for investigation) 7197; Miscellaneous (survey Klondike district) 6563 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act, &c.) 6691 (ii).

Yukon Provisional District: Administration of Govt., 7323 (ii).

Veterinary Inspectors, Appnmt. (M. for Ret.) 2821 (i).

Welland Canal and Feeders, Employees dismissed, Names, &c. (M. for Ret. *) 2839 (i).

West Prince, P.E.I., Vacancy, Ret. Officer, Appnmt. (Ques.) 2040 (i).

Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 3414 (i).

Yukon Ry., Action of U.S. Senate on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn., 1305 (i).

Moore, Mr. A. A., Stanstead.

Bagot, Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ, on M. (Mr. Bergeron) to adjn., 5255 (ii).

Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 2355 (i).

Can. Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 2^d, 1080 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2^d, 2601 (i).

— (personal explanation) 2776 (i).

Petroleum, Reduction of Duty, legislation *re* prop. Res., 1945 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 4763 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (year book) 5034 (ii).

Fisheries (protection service) 5296 (ii).

Morin, Mr. J. B., Dorchester.

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 2^d, 1161 (i).

Morrison, Mr. A., New Westminster.

Anglo-French Telegraph Co.'s incorp. (B. 139) 1st, 5315 (ii).

Brandon and South-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1st, 970 (i).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1st, 970 (i).

C.P.R. Co.'s (B. 46) 1st, 970 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 1st, 235; on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to M. for 2^d, 1448, 1481 (i).

Dawson City, Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. (B. 118) 1st, 3502 (i); M. to dschg. B., 4805; in Com., 6940 (ii).

Dawson City Electric Co.'s (B. 123) in Com., 7159.

Dawson City and Victoria Tel. Co.'s incorp. (B. 119) 1st, 3503 (i).

Morrison, Mr. A.—Continued.

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 141) 1st, 5518; in Com., 7734; Sen. Amts. conc., 7456.

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. Bostock) in Com., 2960, 3035 (i).

Klondike and Dawson City Bank, incorp. (B. 117) 1st, 3502; in Com., 5118 (ii).

Lewes River Tramway Co.'s incorp. (B. 23) 1st, 743 (i); Sen. Amts., 4606 (ii).

N.W. Mounted Police, Contract for transporting supplies to Yukon (remarks) 5501 (ii).

Personal Explanation *re* Ogilvie's Rep., 2849 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7596 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. W. (Postmaster General) North York, O.

Agnes Postmaster and Removal of Office, on M. for Cor., 1787 (i).

Alien Labour Law, Enforcement at Toronto (remarks) 5445 (ii).

— Workmen, Importation to Toronto, on M. (Mr. Clarke) to adjn., 4033 (ii).

Ashcroft Post Office, present Occupant (Ans.) 1470 (i).

Beatonville Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 3824 (i).

Beaumont, Wm., claims for salary as Postmaster (Ans.) 4611 (ii).

Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6214 (ii).

Berne Convention Papers, laid on Table, 6446 (ii).

Berney, Mr., Dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 7687 (ii).

Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition (B. 76) 1st, 1744; 2^d m., 6334; in Com., 6367, 6796; 3^d m., 6932 (ii).

Cobourg Postmaster, attendance at Reform Convention (Ans.) 602 (i).

Craigville and Stroud Mills Service, tenders (Ans.) 487 (i).

Dep. Postmaster Gen., present occupant of Office (Ans.) 3407 (ii).

Double Hill, P.E.I., Post Office, closing (Ans.) 1931 (i).

Dundas, Mr., Dismissal by Govt. (remarks) 6579.

Elkhorn, Man., Postmaster, Appnmt. of (Ans.) 4771 (ii).

Empire Postal Rates, Authority for Reduction (Ans.) 4345 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3959 (ii).

Gatien, Louis, Dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 7685 (ii).

Golden, B.C., and St. Eugene Mail Carrier (Ans.) 2816 (i).

— on M. for Cor., 2825 (i).

Govt. Contracts, Prohibition of Sweating (Ans.) 599 (i).

Gravenhurst P. O., Appnmt. of Postmaster (Ans.) 5320 (ii).

Hebert, I. A., Postmaster at Princeville and Sale of intoxicating Liquors (Ans.) 7689 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Houde, Charles E., Dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 7686 (ii).
- Isaac's Harbour, Postmaster Griffin, Dismissal, on M. for Ret., 1834 (i).
- Jubilee Stamps, receipts from Sales (Ans.) 3405 (i), 3938 (ii).
- Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Ques. of Order (Sir C. H. *Tupper*) 6155 (ii).
- Kildare Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 1575 (i).
- Kootenay District, Postal, &c., facilities, telegrams (remarks) 1747 (i).
- Lakefield and Apsley Mail Route (Ans.) 4930 (ii).
- Lavaltrie Mail Service, contract (Ans.) 1473 (i).
- Leeds County Postal Service, Pets., &c. (Ans.) 4181 (ii).
- Legris, Narcisse, Postmaster, St. Eulalie, and letter in *La Patrie* (Ans.) 7688 (ii).
- Loch Levens, C.B., Postmaster (Ans.) 1777 (i).
- Lower L'Ardoise Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 1335 (i).
- McCallum, John, Appnmt. and Dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 7686 (ii).
- McLeod, M. G., Postal Mail Clerk, Dismissal, on M. for O. C., 4181 (i).
- Magdalen Islands Mail Service (Ans.) 1575 (i).
- Mail Contracts, N.S., cancelled since 1896 (Ans.) 4610 (ii).
- Middleton, N.S., Post Office District, *re* (Ans.) 7688 (ii).
- Militia Point Mail Carrier, amount paid (Ans.) 3310 (i).
- Postmaster, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3310 (i).
- Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 6924 (ii).
- Oak Bay Mills Post Office, Closing (Ans.) 3824.
- imperfect Ret. (remarks) 5325 (ii).
- Ottawa and Truro Mail Service, N.S. (Ans.) 1575.
- Peakes Station, P.E.I., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ans.) 4344 (i).
- Port Mulgrave and St. Peters, Mail route (remarks) 6323 (ii).
- Postal Mail Service, N.S., Removal from former residence (Ans.) 3407 (i).
- Postmasters, Dismissals since 1896 (Ans.) 460 (ii).
- Postmaster Gen.'s Rep. (Ans.) 2528 (i).
- Postal Rates to G.B., Instructions to Postmasters on inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 6114, 6322 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. (B. 110) 1°, 2913 (i); 2° m., 5520; M. for Com., 5710, 5744; in Com., 5748, 5870, 5885; 3° m. 6121; M. to ref. back to Com., 5943; in Com., 5944 (ii).
- (Special Delivery) B. 167, 1°, 7408; 2° m., 7579 (ii).
- Post Offices closed since 1st July, 1896 (Ans.) 3936 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt., Free postage for newspapers (Ans.) 4041 (ii).
- Prince Albert Mail Service, Delay in transport on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 2520 (i).

Mulock, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Provencher Postmasters, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6006 (ii).
- Public Officers Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7580 (ii).
- Returns on inquiry for, 4928, 5018, 7526 (ii).
- Rouleau Post Office, abolition of (Ans.) 5018 (ii).
- St. Anne de Beaupre, Dismissal of Postmaster (Ans.) 1072 (i).
- Ste. Anne de la Pérade, Dismissal of Postmaster (Ans.) 3313 (i).
- St. Cyprien Postmaster, Charges against (Ans.) 6007 (ii).
- St. Felix de Valois Postmaster, Charges against (Ans.) 4610 (ii).
- St. Jacques L'Achigan, Postmaster (Ans.) 1783.
- St. Michel Mail Service (Ans.) 3313 (i).
- St. Michel de Napierville Post Office, *cor. re* (Ans.) 1472 (i).
- St. Thomas Mail Service, Tenders and Contracts (Ans.) 453 (i).
- Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal of W. W. Williams (Ans.) 3407 (i).
- on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 3410, 3418 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Government: Post Office, 4857: (clerical assistance) 7038; (contingencies) 4915: (statutory increases) 7482; Sundry Depts., (Priv. Sec.'s salaries) 7486 (ii).

Post Office: Mail Clerks (salaries) 7051; Outside service (letter carriers) 7775; (miscellaneous expenses) 6703; (salaries) 6698; (temporary clerks) 7038 (ii).

- Waverley Postmaster, Removal (Ans.) 599 (i).
- White, Mr., Dep. P.M.G., Superannuation (Ans.) 475 (i).
- Williams, W. W., Dismissal on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 3410, 3418 (i).
- Wyebridge-Wyevale Postal Service (Ans.) 598.

Oliver, Mr. F., Alberta.

- Butter Industry in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rcid*) 2472 (i).
- Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1098; on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1495 (i).
- Crows' Nest Pass Ry., Treatment of Workmen on M. for Com. of Sup., 6600 (ii).
- Edmonton District Ry. Co.'s (B. 54) 1°, 1379 (i).
- Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 3075; on consdn. of Amt., 3368, 3546.
- Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. 66 (Mr. *Jameson*) on Sen. Amts., 4807 (ii).
- North-west Irrigation Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 7789 (ii).
- N. W. M. P., Yukon Detachment (remarks) 4453.
- Ont. and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. for 2°, 2609; in Com., 2634 (i).
- Personal Explanation *re* Liberal promises to N.W. farmers, 2929 (i).
- Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 173 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res. 7685 (ii).

Oliver, Mr. F.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

- Immigration* (agent's salaries) 6839 (ii).
- Indians*: B. C., 7765 (ii).
- Miscellaneous* (Alien Labour Law Enforcement) 7773; (Crow's Nest Pass commission) 7263 (ii).
- Public Works*: Roads and Bridges, (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6259, 6297 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B., West Toronto.

- Address, on The, 386 (i).
- Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 2°, 724 (i).
- Chignecto Ship Ry., par. in *Montreal Gazette* (remarks) 5664 (ii).
- Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 3°, 5705 (ii).
- Long Lake Ry., M. to adju. 4449 (ii).
- Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. Charlton) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) that Com. rise, 2419 (i).
- Preferential Trade with G. B., on Amt. (Mr. McNeill) to M. for Com. of Sup., 5846 (ii).
- Rubber Goods, Duty &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6637 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Canals*: Trent (construction) 6538 (ii).
- Immigration* (agent's salaries) 6820, 6837 (ii).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff :
In Com. (preferential clause) 3796 (i).

Parmalee, Mr. C. H., Shefford.

- Butter and Cheese, Improper Speculation in Sale, Prohibition (B. 83) 1°, 2001; 2° m., 2843 (i).

Paterson, Hon. W., (Controller of Customs), North Grey.

- Alien Labour Law, Appmnt. of Agent at Ft. Erie (Ans.) 4178 (ii).
- Appmnts. by late Govt. on Amt. (Mr. Montague) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4841 (ii).
- Bath (Ont.) Customs Officer, Appmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6007 (ii).
- Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res., 6334 (ii).
- Budget, on The, 3220 (i).
- Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 2°, 887 (i).
- Chambord Customs House, Cost, Establishment, &c. (Ans.) 1469 (i) 4179 (ii).
- Cheticamp Customs Collectors, name, &c., (Ans.) 4181 (ii).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. McMullen) on M. for 2°, 4231 (ii).
- Coasting Trade of Can. Act Amt. B. 106 (Sir C. H. Tupper) on M. for 1°, 2811 (i).
- Corn importations, 1897 to April, 1898, (Ans.) 3659 (i).
- foreign imports into Man. (Ans.) 3660 (i).
- Customs Act Amt. (B. 152) 1°, 6318; in Com., 6946 (ii).
- B. 174 (Mr. Fielding) 1°, 7585 (ii).
- Ass't Inspector at Quebec (Ans.) 2817 (i).
- Collector at Centreville, N. B., investigation *re* (Ans.) 831 (i).

Paterson, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Customs, Collections in the Yukon (Ans.) 826 (i).
 - Dept., Appmnt. of Irish Roman Catholics, 4608 (ii).
 - Dept., Changes in Officials, Ret. laid on Table, 6895 (ii).
 - Customs and Fisheries Further Protection (B. 153) 1°, 6319; 2° m., 6961 (ii).
 - Inspector, Ass't. in Prov. of Quebec (Ans.) 3313 (i).
 - Dismissals in Cape Breton Co., on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. McDougall) 6321 (ii).
 - Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 4322, 4386, 4424, 4468, 5264 (ii).
 - Grand Narrows, Preventive Officer, duties and salary (Ans.) 1781 (i).
 - Hagersville, Collector of Customs, defalcations (Ans.) 974 (i).
 - Horses for Feeding, &c., Importation, Licenses by Farmers (Ans.) 2343 (i).
 - from U.S. into N.W.T., &c. (Ans.) 3942.
 - Imports from G.B. and U.S. (Ans.) 3663, 3936.
 - Dutiable value and amount collected (Ans.) 601 (i).
 - Iron and Steel Bounties (B. 159) prop. Res., 6723; 1* of B., 6727 (ii).
 - Johnson, J. T., Customs Officer at Ft. Erie, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4178 (ii).
 - Kootenay District, Postal, &c., facilities (remarks) 1747 (i).
 - Lafrance Fire Engine, Duty, &c., charged by Govt. (Ans.) 6011 (ii).
 - Margaree Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4181 (ii).
 - Pulp Mill Machinery, entry in bond (Ans.) 3165.
 - Reciprocal clause, Tariff, 1897, Amounts paid, refund, &c., to Customs (Ans.) 4175 (ii).
 - Returns *re* Dismissals (remarks) 5519 (ii).
 - St. Hyacinthe Customs Office, dues and officials (Ans.) 600 (i).
 - Shannon, Thos., Customs Collector at Killarney, Man., Dismissal (Ans.) 4770 (ii).
- SUPPLY :
- Civil Government*: Customs, 4556; conc., 7852 7818; (clerical assistance) 7475; (contingencies) 4588 (ii).
 - Customs* (laboratory) 7774; (machinery, Chicoutimi Pulp Works) 7792; (outside service) 7356 (ii).
 - Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 5903, 5907; Que. (dredging) 7238 (ii).
 - Railways*: I.C.R. (iron bridges) 6409 (ii).
 - Tennant, J. F., Dismissal of, on M. (Mr. Quinn) for cor., 4203 (ii).
 - on M. (Mr. Quinn) for Ret., 5176 (ii).
 - Trade and Navigation Rets. (presented) 184 (i).
 - U. S. Customs Regulations at Fort Wrangel (remarks) 1186 (i).
 - at Skagway and Dyea (explanation) 264 (i).
 - SS. "Yantic," passage up St. Lawrence (Ans.) 1336 (i).
 - Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir Henri Joly) on Sen. Amts., 7783 (ii).

Penny, Mr. E. G., Montreal.

- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2862 (i).
 Criminal Code (1892) Cruelty to Animals (B. 11) 1^o, 271 (i).
 General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 85) 1^o, 2035 (i);
 withdr. of B. (M.) 2606 (i).
 Holidays Act Amt. (B. 9) 1^o, 270 (i).
 Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1^o, 2026.
 Montmorency Cotton Mills Co.'s incorp. (B. 102) 1^o, 2430 (i).
 Montreal Harbour Commissioner's Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 6916; on M. for Com., 7175 (ii).
 Montreal and Province Line Ry. Co.'s (B. 56) 1^o, 1380 (i).
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1^o, 1384 (i).

Pope, Mr. R. H., Compton.

- Address, on The, 365 (i).
 Agnes Postmaster and removal of office (M. for cor.) 1787 (i).
 Butter Industry of Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2384, 2443 (i).
 Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 1859 (i).
 ——— Telegram to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1018 (i).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2989 (i).
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5779 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4736 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Paris exhibition) 5049 (ii).
Civil Government : Indians (contingencies) 4586; Inland Revenue (contingencies) 4590; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 4596; Post Office, 4897; Public Works (contingencies) 4594 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7674 (ii).
Militia (gratuities) 7517 (ii).
Penitentiaries : Kingston, 7489 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings (experimental farm) 5495; Ont., 5464; (Arnprior P.O.) 5453; (Dept. Block, Ottawa) 5070; (Major's Hill Park) 5453, 5462; N.S., 5084, 5087; N.W.T., 5492; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7612; Que., 7639 (ii).

Yukon Ry., Action of U. S. Senate, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to *ad*jn., 1319 (i).

Poupore, Mr. W. J., Pontiac.

- Chapleau Postmaster, Dismissal of Patrick Lynch (Ques.) 3088 (i).
 Des Joachims and Mackie's Station Mail service (Ques.) 5135 (ii).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2^o, 2726 (i).
 Lake Temiscamingue Ry. and Ry. Act (Ques.) 2349 (i).

Poupore, Mr. W. J.—Continued.

- Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6466.
 Roche Fendue and Calumet Dams (M. for cor.) 4612 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Canals* : Soulanges (construction) 6520 (ii).
Culling Timber (salaries, &c.) 7250 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass commission) 7274.
Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, Ont., conc.,

Powell, Mr. H. A., Westmoreland.

- Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2233 (i).
 Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2^o, 1540.
 ——— Telegram to High Commissioner, *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1006 (i).
 Dart, Lyman, Remission of Sentence, in Com. of Sup., 6673 (ii).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2^o, 2737; Amt., 2740; in Com., 2983; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3^o, 5691 (ii).
 I.C.R., A. Stewart's Dismissal (Ques.) 1933, 2342.
 ——— Diversion of route through Springhill (Ques.) 1929 (i).
 ——— Expenditure for Improvements, &c. out of income (M. for Ret.*) 3667 (i).
 ——— Moncton Ry. station, Construction (Ques.) 477 (i).
 ——— plumbing and heating contracts (Ques.) 2346 (i).
 ——— Powlie, A., Car Inspector, Springhill, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).
 Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6796 (ii).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2052 (i).
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5760 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4764 (ii).
 Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 5152 (ii).
 Simonds, R. H., I.C.R. employee, dismissal (M. for Ret.*) 2840 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1885, 2105, 2113 (i).
 Summerside Harbour Breakwater, Tenders for construction (Ques.) 2816 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Fisheries* (protection service) 5309 (ii).
Legislation : House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6990 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (obstructions in navigable rivers) 4964; (winter mail service) 4966, 4968 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings, N.S., 5087; Harbours and Rivers, N.B., 5641; N.S., 5617; P.E.I., 5632 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle slaughtered) 7008 (ii).
Railways : I.C.R., (accommodation at Moncton) 7084; (culverts) 7085; (iron bridges) 6390 (ii).

Powell, Mr. H. A.—*Continued.**Ways and Means*—The Tariff :

In Com. (preferential clause) 3775 (i).

Préfontaine, Mr. R., *Maisonneuve.*

Inspection of Ashes, Govt. (Ques.) 3660 (i).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence River Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. (B. 99) 1^o, 2430 (i); M. for Com., 6328 (ii).Montreal Harbour Commissioner's Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 6895 (ii).North Shore Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 97) 1^o, 2430 (i).**Prior, Hon. E. G.**, *Victoria, B.C.*

Ashcroft Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 3090 (i).

—— Postmaster, present occupant (Ques.) 1470.

—— Post Office, position of Postmaster (Ques.) 3000 (i).

Miners' Licenses, issued at Ashcroft, B.C. (Ques.) 2847 (i).

Royal Military College, amalgamation of Classes (Ques.) 973 (i).

U.S. Occupation of Dyea and Skagway (remarks) 619 (i).

Quinn, Mr. M. J. F., *Montreal (Ste. Anne's).*Adulteration Act Amt. B. 72 (Sir *Henri Joli*) in Com., 4777 (ii).

American canned meats, Contracts with Can. Govt. (remarks) 3940, 5017 (ii).

Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6223 (ii).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2179 (i).Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2^o, 1503; in Com., 1854 (i).—— Telegram to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1028 (i).

Cattle Trade, opening Belfast Port (remarks) 2851.

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3693; in Com., 4648 (ii).Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2986 (i), 3948, 4286, 4462, 4501 (ii).Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6145, 6180.

Lachine Canal Storekeeper, Applicants for position (Ques.) 456 (i).

Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7428, 7465 (ii).

Montreal Custom House, Dismissals, 1896 to 1898, names, &c. (M. for Ret. *) 3669 (i).

Navigation, Opening of Canals (remarks) 2700 (i).

Order (Ques. of) in Com. on B. 150 (Sir *C. H. Tupper*) 6156 (ii).Post Office Act Amt. (Special Delivery) B. 167 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2^o, 7580 (ii).Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4739 (ii).**Quinn, Mr. M. J. F.**—*Continued.*Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casidy*) in Com., 3681 (i).

Returns (inquiry) 5519 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1890 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Government (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) 3873;*Militia and Defence* (accountant) 3907 (i).*Militia* (Dom. Artillery Association) 7522 (ii).*Penitentiaries* : Kingston, 7490 (ii).*Public Works* : Buildings, Ont., 5464; (Major's Hill Park) 5453; (repairs) 5448; (Woodstock, P.O.) 5465; Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (dredging) 6084; Ont. (dredging) 6095; N.S. (New Harbour) 7603 (ii).

Tennant, J. F., Customs Collector at Gretna, Man., Dismissal (M. for cor.) 4182 (ii).

—— (M. for Ret.) 3670 (i), 5206 (ii).

Victoria Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 59) 1^o, 1380.

Wellington Bridge, Montreal, accident, Mr. Mattison's services, &c. (remarks) 4775 (ii).

—— (remarks) 4604 (ii).

Yukon Ry., Action of U.S. Senate, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 1331 (i).**Reid, Mr. J. D.**, *North Grenville.*

Butter Industry of Canada (prop. Res.) 2350, 2482 (i).

Freight Rates on Rys., Regulation (B. 7) 1^o, 271; 2^o, m., 2910 (i).**Richardson, Mr. R. L.**, *Lisgar.*Agricultural Implements, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3188 (i).Board of Ry. Commissioners, legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1812, 1825 (i).Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries (B. 14) 1^o, 271; M. for Com., 2852, 3700 (i), 4639; in Com., 3706 (i), 4640, 4653 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Construction by Co. (remarks) 6240 (ii).

—— Treatment of Labourers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6622 (ii).

Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T., Regulation B. 19 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2^o, 2064 (i).

Grain Transport by C. P. R. and Elevator Co. of Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 483 (i).

Great North-west-Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7734; Sen. Amts. 7460 (ii).Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2^o, 1970; in Com., 1981 (i).Ont. and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to ref. back to Com., 2670 (i).Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5763 (ii).Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4759 (ii).Ry. Act (Grain Shipments) Amt. (B. 21) 1^o, 671.

Spades and Shovels, Combine monopoly M. to Adjn., 1935 (i).

Richardson, Mr. R. L.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

Immigration (agents' salaries) 6838 (ii).*Legislation* : House of Commons (debates) 7033 (ii).*Miscellaneous* (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7271.*Penitentiaries* : St. Vincent de Paul, 6540 (ii).

Tennant, J. F., Customs Collector at Gretna,

· Man., on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for cor., &c., 4198 (ii).—— on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for Ret., 5191 (ii).

Wheat graded and put in Elevators at Fort

William (M. for Ret.*) 2839 (i).

Yukon Provisional District, Liquor permits

(Ques.) 1472 (i).

Robertson, Mr. J. Ross, East Toronto.

Bell Telephone Co.'s Pet. (Ques.) 6031 (ii).

Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) onM. for 1^o, 248 ; on M. for 2^o, 1126 (i).

Copyright, International Action by British Govt.,

on M. for Com. of Sup., 6627, 6801 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Commissioner's Rep. (re-

marks) 6030 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) onAmt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2^o, 2768 (i) ; on M.for 3^o, 5701 (ii).

Infantry Schools, Fredericton and London, Cost

of Lighting, &c. (Ques.) 7121 (ii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*)

in Com., 3037 ; on consdn. of Anits., 3551 (i).

Permanent Force, Subaltern Officers, &c.,

Appmnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7122 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M.for 2^o, 5548 ; in Com., 5755 ; on M. for 3^o, 6122.

—— Free Postage for Newspapers (remarks)

4041 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (patent record) 5023 (ii).*Miscellaneous* (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7251,

7273 ; Privy Council (records) 7279.

Public Works: Buildings, Ont., 7217 ; (repairs, &c.)5449 ; *Miscellaneous* (monument for Hon. Mr.

Mackenzie) 6105 ; (National Art Gallery) 6103 ;

Telegraph Lines (St. Lawrence Shore) 6101 (ii)

Scientific Institutions (Toronto observatory) 5002.*Yukon Provisional District*: Administration of

Govt., 7328 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J., Marquette.

Agricultural Implements, Free Entry, on prop.

Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3180 (i).

Budget, on The, 3626 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) onM. for 2^o, 1106 (i).

Corn, Foreign, Imports into Man. (Ques.) 3660.

Côté, Thos., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4176 (ii).

Dom. Elections, 1896, cost, &c., *re* prosecutions in

Man. (M. for Ret.*) 2841 (i).

Dom. Lands, Tenby, Man., sub-agent, Appmnt.

(Ques.) 3087 (i).

Elkhorn, Man., Postmaster, Appmnt., &c. (Ques.)

4771 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) onM. for 2^o, 2580 (i) ; in Com., 4144 (ii).**Roche, Mr. W. J.—Continued.**

Hudson Pay Expedition, James Fisher's Rep.

(Ques.) 603, 2349 (i).

Immigration of Women servants (Ques.) 3309 (i).

Kingston Penitentiary, Medical Officer (Ques.)

2846 (i).

Macdonald Election, Cost of Prosecutions (Ques.)

2349 (i).

Shannon, Thos., sub-collector of Customs at Kil-

arney, Dismissal (Ques.) 4770 (ii).

Tennant, J. F., Customs Collector at Gretna, on

M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for Ret., 5189 (ii).

Weatherbee, Mr. Justice, Absence from Prov.

(Ques.) 3166 (i).

Roddick, Mr. T. G., Montreal (St. Antoine).

Appmnts. by late Govt. and Colonial Office Cor.,

&c. (Ques.) 7689 (ii).

Newfoundland and Canada, Negotiations between

(remarks) 4928 (ii).

—— (Ques.) 5391 (ii).

Rogers, Mr. D. D., Frontenac.

Address, on The, 374 (i).

Butter industry in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr.

Reid) 2480 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr.

Richardson) on M. for Com., 3696 (i).—— Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com.,

6378, 6797 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) onM. for 2^o, 2729 (i).

P. O. Savings Banks deposits, reduction of

interest, on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com.

on Ways and Means, 3746 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals : Trent (construction) 6545 (ii).*Civil Government* : Post Office, 4895 (ii).*Miscellaneous* (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7271.*Post Office* : Outside service (letter carriers) 7777.*Public Works* : Buildings, Ont. (Rideau Hall) 5602.**Rosamond, Mr. B., North Lanark.**

British American Light and Power Co.'s incorp.

(B. 109) 1^o, 2844 (i).

Pacific and Yukon Ry., Nav., Trading and Min-

ing Co.'s (B. 151) 1^o, 6227 (ii).**Russell, Mr. B., Halifax.**Atlantic Fisheries, U.S. Legislation *re* (remarks)

1272 (i).

Bear River Bridge, Removal (Ques.) 1337 (i).

Bruneau, Mr. M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation,

on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on

Privs. and Elections, 2200 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) onM. for 2^o, 774 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr.

Richardson) on M. for Com., 3702 (i).Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in

Com., 3962, 3976, 4046, 4062, 4434 (ii).

Russell, Mr. B.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

Civil Government : Public Works (contingencies) 4594 (ii).

Tanner, J. E., Forcible detention by Spanish Govt. at Porto Rico (Ques.) 6011 (ii).

Rutherford, Mr. J. G., Macdonald.

Board of Ry. Commissioners, legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Jameson) 1795 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 2°, 1116 (i).

Elevator Monopolies, Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 598 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 2593 (i); in Com., 4150 (ii).

Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 19 (Mr. Douglas) on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 2081 (i).

Hudson Bay Expedition, Rep. as to Navigability (Ques.) 975 (i).

Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. 66 (Mr. Jamieson) 1°*, 1736 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 5776 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Immigration (agents' salaries) 6844 (ii).

Public Works : Buildings, Man., 5487; Harbours and Rivers, Man., 5929 (ii).

Miscellaneous : (Crow's Nest Pass commission) 7261 (ii).

Yukon Ry. Action of U.S. Sen. on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn., 1302 (i).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Judges of the Provincial Court Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 6775 (ii).

North Shore Electric Ry. Co. incorp B. 97 (Mr. Préfontaine) Sen. Amts., 7788 (ii).

Scriven, Mr. J., Huntingdon.

Nickel Steel Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) on M. (Mr. LaRivière) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 3644 (i).

Private Bills Pet., Extension of time (M.) 935, 970 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (patent record) 7513 (ii).

Canals : Beauharnois (contingencies) 7191 (ii).

Semple, Mr. A., Centre Wellington.

Butter Industry in Can. on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 2475 (i).

Can. Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 2°, 1242 (i).

Manitoba Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7408 (ii).

San José Scale, Prohibition of U.S. Nursery Stock on M. (Mr. Charlton) to Adjn., 2250.

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir Henri Joly) in Com., 2126 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C., (Minister of Interior), Brandon.

Abenakis Indians, St. Francis Agency (Ans.) 3408 (i).

Appnmts in N. W. Ters. (Ans.) 977 (i).

Battleford Indian Agency, death of cattle (Ans.) 1574, 2844 (i).

Boundaries of the Prov. of Que. (B. 160) 1°, 6746; 2°, and in Com., 7410 (i).

Boundary between Can. and Alaska (Ans.) 1076.

British Joint Stock Co. in Yukon (Ans.) 1471 (i).

C. P. R., Lands exempt from taxation (Ans.) 1340 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 2°, 571, 621; on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to M. for 2°, 1727, in Com., 1856 (i).

— Hamilton Smith's Proposals (Ans.) 979 (i).

— Telegram to High Commissioner, 999 (i).

Coasting Trade of Can. Act Amt. B. 106 (Sir Charles H. Tupper) on M. for 1°, 2508 (i).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Treatment of Workmen, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6604 (ii).

Daunais, C. N., Emplmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1928.

Deaf Mutes in N. W. T., Provision by N. W. Govt. (Ans.) 1930 (i), 4345 (ii).

Dep. Min. of Int., present occupant (Ans.) 3408.

Des-Joachims and Mackie Station Mail Service (Ans.) 5135 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°, 4679; in Com., 5937 (ii).

Donaldson, S. J., Immigration Agent, N. W. T., amounts paid (Ans.) 4176 (ii).

Dismissals in N. W. T., on inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 6115 (ii).

Dredging Leases issued to J. A. Mercier (Ans.) 1934 (i), 6317 (ii).

— Miles of River (Ans.) 1935 (i).

— Drolet, Chevalier, Mining Leases, &c. (Ans.) 671, 1073 (i), 4924 (ii).

— (explanation) 831 (i).

Edwards, Dr. O. C., Indian Medical Officer, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4607 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 4127, 4139; on Amt. (Sir Charles Tupper) to M. for 3°, 5674 (ii).

Free Miners Certificates, number issued, &c. (Ans.) 3311 (ii), 4773, 5133 (i).

Galician Settlers in N. W. T., Rep. *re* destitution (remarks) 101 (i).

Geological Survey Act Amt. (B. 114) 1°, 3404 (i); in Com., 4776 (ii).

Govt. cattle and Battleford Agency (Ans.) 1574, 2844 (i).

Grain liens, Man. and N. W. T., legislation *re* (Ans.) 1930 (i).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 7737, 7742, 7787 (ii).

Immigration Literature, correction of statement (remarks) 6581 (ii).

Immigration foreign, settled in Can. (Ans.) 6109.

— women domestics (Ans.) 3309 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C.—Continued.

- Indian Act Amt. (B. 144) 1^o, 5661; 2^o m., 5960; in Com., 5963 (ii).
- Indian Dept., Annual Rep. (presented) 1473 (i).
- Law Clerk, Appmnt., 7654, 7658 (ii).
- Lands, Qu'Appelle Valley, rights of settlers, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn. 518 (i).
- Reserve crops in N. W. T. (remarks) 5571.
- Titles in Athabasca, Mackenzie and Yukon (Ans.) 824 (i).
- Industrial School, Battleford (Ans.) 1574 (i).
- Interior Dept., Annual Rep. (presented) 3940 (ii).
- Dismissals in N.W.T. (Ans.) 829 (i).
- Jones, Charles A., Immigration Agent, Appmnt. by Govt., 4607 (ii).
- Lands Reserved for settlement in Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 971 (i).
- Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 132) 1^o, 4683; 2^o m., and in Com., 5957 (ii).
- Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2^o, 1967 (i).
- McCarthy, Dalton, M.P., Candidature for Brandon (Ans.) 4610 (ii).
- McKay, Thos., amounts due for timber dues (Ans.) 4176 (ii).
- Man. Claims, on inquiry for Ret., 1030 (i).
- Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7425 (ii).
- University and Driving Park Grant, &c. (Ans.) 7124 (ii).
- Militia Bounty (land) N.W.T. Extension B. 133, 1^o, 4683; 2^o m., 5960 (ii).
- Miners Licenses issued at Ashcroft, B.C. (Ans.) 2847 (i).
- White and Chilkoot Passes (remarks) 4602.
- Mining and Dredging leases, on inquiry for Ret., 5322 (ii).
- issued (Ans.) 3317 (i).
- Mohawk Indians, withdr. of grant for medical services (Ans.) 2817 (i).
- Mount Elgin Institute, Establishment (Ans.) 672.
- Noble, Mr., Payments to, by Govt. (Ans.) 5133.
- N.W. Ter. Act Amt. (B. 131) 1^o, 4681; 2^o m., 5945; in Com., 5946; 3^o m., 6064 (ii).
- Irrigation Act Amt. (B. 146) 1^o, 5662; in Com., 6124; Sen. Amts., 7788 (ii).
- N. W. Mounted Police, Contract for transporting Supplies to Yukon, 5500 (ii).
- Reported loss of men (remarks) 7659 (ii).
- N. W. Settlers, amount due Govt. for seed grain (remarks) 5135, 5570 (ii).
- N.W.T., Dismissals, on inquiry for Ret., 6115, 6317 (ii).
- Immigration Hand-book, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 5936 (ii).
- Norwood, H. H., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7120.
- Ogilvie, Mr., Services since 1898 (Ans.) 3406 (i).
- Official Klondike Guide, number distributed (Ans.) 4612, 4772 (i).
- Translation (remarks) 604 (i).
- Rep. sent from Yukon, dates (Ans.) 974 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C.—Continued.

- Orton, Dr., Indian Medical Supt., Dismissal (remarks) 5394 (ii).
- Priv. (Ques. of) Press Representatives and Members of Parlt., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 5128 (ii).
- Queen Victoria Park, Niagara Falls (Ans.) 2848.
- Rankin, Immigration Agent in Kansas (Ans.) 1779 (i).
- Rebellion Claims Commission, N.W.T., Appmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5321 (ii).
- Regina Industrial School, Emplmt. of Dr. *Wilmington* (Ans.) 828 (i).
- Registry and Land Office, Regina (Ans.) 1931 (i).
- Restigouche Indian Agent, Dismissal of V. J. A. *Venner* (Ans.) 4611 (ii).
- Rothwell's Rep., re claims of settlers (remarks) 2852 (i).
- School Lands, sales in Man. (Ans.) 2432 (i).
- Seed Grain, amount due Govt. by Settlers (Ans.) 5135, 5570 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
 - Civil Government* (Geological survey) 4559; (salaries) 7477; Indians, 4553; (contingencies) 4585; Interior, 4527, 4551 (ii).
 - Dom. Lands* (commissioners' salary) 6858; (surveys, &c.) 6860, 7307 (ii).
 - Geological Survey* (Yukon District survey) 7754.
 - Govt. of N.W.T.* (Insane asylums) 7305; (schools, &c.) 6857 (ii).
 - Immigration* (agents' salaries) 6821, 6827, 7277, 7288, 7744 (ii).
 - Indians* (Oka Indians) 7291; B.C., 7761; (General Inspector's salaries) 7303; (Man. and N.W.T.) 6854, 7301, 7765; N.B., 7294; (medical attendance) 7298; N.S., 7293; (erection of fence) 7294; Ont. and Que. (industrial schools) 7755; (surveys) 6849 (ii).
 - Militia* (Yukon Force) 7060 (ii).
 - Miscellaneous*: Man. and N.W.T. (Alien Labour Law) 7275; (Boundary U.S. and Can.) 6860; (fencing N.W.T. Park) 7251; Interior, Outside service (gratuities) 7769; (Rocky Mountain Park) 7769 (ii).
 - Mounted Police*: 6856 (ii).
 - Yukon Provisional District*: Administration of Govt., 7325; (service of N.W.M.P.) 6858; (steamers) 7769 (ii).
- Telegraph Lines, north shore of St. Lawrence, tenders for contract (Ans.) 7123 (ii).
- U.S. Customs in Alaska and boundary Line (remarks) 407 (i).
- Occupation of Dyea and Skagway (Ans.) 829 (i).
- Relief Expedition to the Yukon (remarks) 102 (i).
- military escort (Ans.) 971 (i).
- Vancouver Island Ry. Belt, Settlers' claims, &c. (remarks) 4452 (ii).
- Walsh, Administrator in the Yukon, Instructions (Ans.) 1777 (i).
- (presented) 1341 (i).
- Yukon Provisional District Administration (B. 154) 2^o m., 6727; in Com., 6731 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C.—Continued.

- Yukon Dredging Leases, Advertisement from *Chicago Record* (remarks) 409 (i).
 — Geological Survey (Ans.) 3312 (i).
 — Gold Dredging (Ans.) 1074 (i).
 — Homestead Land Laws (Ans.) 1338, 1784.
 — Govt. Claims (Ans.) 5134 (ii).
 — Liquor Permits (Ans.) 1472, 2433, 2813, 2446, 1781 (i).
 — Mining Leases, &c. (Ans.) 2036 (i).
 — (remarks) 6895 (ii).
 — Mann and Mackenzie's contract, Omissions (remarks) 1079 (ii).
 — sleigh Route (Ans.) 1777, 1928 (i).
 — Municipal Regulations (remarks) 1748 (i).
 — Placer Mining, Claims entered, &c., (Ans.) 6006 (ii).
 — Quartz Mining, regulations (Ans.) 1342 (i); (remarks) 2000 (ii).
 — River Routes, Mr. Jennings' Rep. (presented) 409 (i).
 — Timber Sales, &c. (Ans.) 1784 (i).
 — Transport of Supplies (remarks) 6581 (ii).
 — accounts ordered by Public Accts. Com. (remarks) 4350.
 — Wagon Road (remarks) 1341 (i).

Snetsinger, Mr. J. G., Cornwall and Stormont.

Butter Industry in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 2477 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Galops, 7650 (ii).

Somerville, Mr. J., North Wentworth and Brant.

Butter Industry in Can. on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 2500 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. Richardson) on M. for Com., 2862 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 4325 (ii).

Hagersville Collector of Customs, Defalcation (Ques.) 974 (i).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. Charlton) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) that Com. rise, 2402, 2418 (i).

— M. to restore to order paper, 2427 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 4737 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7030 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (SIR JAMES D. EDGAR) West Ontario.

Address, Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 936.

— Jubilee to the Queen, Reply, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1466 (i).

Agricultural Implements, Ques. of Order (Mr. Davin) ruling, 3205 (i).

Alien Workmen, on M. (Mr. Clarke) to adjn., 4030 (ii).

Appnmts. in the N.W.T., Ques. (Mr. Davin) ruled in order, 977 (i).

— to Office (remarks) 1187 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—Continued.

Bagot Electoral District, issue of writ (notification) 3924 (i).

— (remarks) 3826 (i).

Bills not printed in French (remarks) 3084 (i).

— presentation, remarks as to seconders, 671.

— Royal Assent, 2089 (i).

Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 159 (Mr. Paterson) members remarks checked, 6726 (ii).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation, member called to order, 2165 (i).

— (Personal Explanation) 1772 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. Blair) Amt. (Mr. McInnes) declared out of order, 1725 (i).

Controverted Elections, Judges' Rep. (read) 1 (i).

Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Charlton) on M. for 2' (ruling) 4221 (ii).

Dawson City, Electric Lighting, &c., Co.'s B. ref. to Miscellaneous Private Bills Com., 3868.

Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123, ref. to Sel. Com. on Rys., 4387 (ii).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. (ruling) 3823 (i).

— Omission of Ques. from Rep., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. McDougall) 3427 (i).

— Ret. *re* (presented) 3924 (i).

— French translation and printing (remarks) 3092 (i).

Gananoque Drill Shed (remarks) 5316 (ii).

General Inspection Act, withdr. of B. (remarks) 2606 (i).

Georgian Bay Timber on prop. Ques. of Mr. Kaulbach (ruling) 826 (i).

Gov. Gen. and Ministerial Responsibilities on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn. (remarks) 267 (i).

Inspection of Ashes (remarks) 3660 (i).

Jubilee Stamps, Irregularity of deb. (remarks) 3939 (ii).

Kingston Locomotive Works, &c., on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 605 (i).

Lalonde, Messenger, House of Commons, charge of canvassing in Russell (remarks) 909 (i).

Library of Parl., Joint Rep. (presented) 5 (i).

McCarthy, Dalton, Candidature for Brandon, relevancy of Ques., 4610 (ii).

Maj. Gen. Commanding, Order, Ques. of (Mr. Foster) *re* Letter read by Prime Minister (ruling) 6441, 6463 (ii).

Members asking questions (remarks) 2433 (i).

Members called to Order, 271, 613 (i).

— New, Certificates of Ret. (notification) 2 (i); 4347 (ii).

— New (notification) 3, 270 (i).

— interrupting Speaker (remarks) 987 (i).

— remarks checked, 1051, 2922 (i); 5013, 5324, 6320, 6326 (ii).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 405, 936, 1466, 2698 (i); 5663, 6439, 7378 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Loan B. on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) Order, Ques. of (ruling) 6927.

Nickel Steel incorp. B. 96 on M. (Mr. LaRiviere) to ref. to Ry. Com., 3648 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—Continued.

- North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 140, Ques. of Procedure (remarks) 6002 (ii).
- Ontario Lumber Cut, on M. (Mr. *Britton*) to adjn. (remarks) 1843 (i).
- Ont. and Rainy River Co.'s B. on M. for Com., (ruling) 2614 (i).
- Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Domville*) 1702 (i).
- (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) in Com. on B. 150 (ruling) 6155 (ii).
- (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) re Crow's Nest Pass Labourers (ruling) 6618 (ii).
- Unparliamentary Language, 1679 (i).
- W. W. Williams, Dismissal (remarks) 3424.
- Parliament, Opening, Mess. by Black Rod, 1 (i).
- Personal Explanation (Mr. *McNeill*) (remarks) 520 (i).
- (Mr. *McMillan*) (ruling) 6113 (ii).
- Prince Albert Mail Service, delay in transmission on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., Irregularity in deb., 2520 (i).
- Privilege (Ques. of) Press Representative and Members of Parl. (Sir *Charles Tupper*). Members remarks checked. 5125 (ii).
- (remarks) 5132 (ii).
- Procedure, Ques. of, 3^d of B. (remarks) 2647 (i).
- stmnt. read, 3095 (i).
- Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (notification) 7818 (ii).
- Mess. from His Ex., 7886 (ii).
- Questions asked by members, Answers must bear on subject matter (ruling) 459 (i).
- put by members, order of procedure, 7118.
- Ruled out of order, 602 (i).
- Speech from the Throne (rep.) 3 (i).
- Stationary Engineers, Examination B. on prop. introduction (remarks) 2800 (i).
- Stimulants in the Chamber during debate (remarks) 3638 (ii).
- SUPPLY :**
- Legislation* : House of Commons (Debates) 7034; (sessional clerks) 5999, 7011; (stationery, &c.) 7035 (ii).
- Suspension of Rule 49 on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) (ruling) 5016 (ii).
- Tarte, Hon. Mr., and the Senate (remarks) 3319.
- Vacancies (notification) 2 (i).
- Votes and Proceedings, Record of vote on 3^d of B. (remarks) 2850 (i).
- Warrants for writs of elections, 2 (i).
- West Huron and North Simcoe, Vacancy (remarks) 7043 (ii).
- issue of Warrant, 7087 (ii).
- West Prince, P.E.I., vacancy (remarks) 1079 (i).
- issue of Writ, 1173 (i).
- Winter Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) 1779 (i).
- Yukon Provisional District, Accounts asked for by Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 4354 (ii).
- Liquor Permits, members remarks checked on M. to Adjn., 3093 (i).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. L. P. BRODEUR) Rouville.

- Alberta and Yukon Ry. Navigation Mining Co.'s B. in Com. (ruling) 7166 (ii).
- Cattle Export Trade, Montreal, G.B. and Ireland, members remarks ruled out of order, 2270 (i).
- Lord's Day, Better Observance B., section before Chair (remarks) 2041 (i).
- Members called to order, 437, 1961 (i), 4158, 4207, 7604 (ruling) 7606 (ii).
- remarks checked, 4444, 4446, 5145, 6153, 6221, 6578 (ii).
- requested to withdrw. remarks, 6871 (ii).
- N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. on M. for 2^d (ruling) 4242 (ii).
- Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Britton*) 1505 (i).
- (Mr. *Montague*) in Com. of Sup., 4891 (ii).
- (ruling) 3526, 3531 (i).
- Ways and Means, stimulants in the Hse., 3611 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. on M. for Com., Members remarks checked, 5720 (ii).
- SUPPLY :**
- Civil Government* : Post Office (members' remarks checked) 4867; (unparliamentary language) member called to Order, 2507 (i).
- Ways and Means*—On M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn. deb. (ruling) 3595, 3606 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., East Grey.

- Address, on The, 337 (i).
- Agricultural Implements, Free Entry on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3200 (i).
- Alien Labour, Enforcement (remarks) 5795 (ii).
- Workmen, importation to Toronto on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4040 (ii).
- Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Agreements, &c., on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5230 (ii).
- Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of Writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Adjn., 5240 (ii).
- Boundaries of the Prov. of Que., B. 160 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1^d, 6747 (ii).
- Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 2223 (i).
- Business of the Hse., Morning Sittings, 6228 (ii).
- Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2367, 2479, 2511 (i).
- Budget, The, 3533, 3554 (i).
- Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2^d, 1657 (i).
- Hamilton Smith's Proposals (Ques.) 979 (i).
- Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2872 (i); in Com., 4665 (ii).
- Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2^d, 4233 (ii).
- Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2^d, 6346; in Com., 6797 (ii).
- Combination in Restraint of Trade, Prevention Act Amt. (B. 88) 1^d, 2241 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Continued.

- Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Investigation on conc., 7845 (ii).
- Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6842 (ii).
- Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7160 (ii).
- Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies (B. 90) 1st, 2241 (i).
- Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2^d, 2296 (i); in Com., 4118, 4375, 4455; on M. for 3^d, 5703; Sen. Amts., 7543 (ii).
- Grand Trunk Ry. Regulations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 6025 (ii).
- Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2525 (i).
- Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) on Sen. Amts., 7463 (ii).
- Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1st, 2035.
- Judges of the Provincial Courts Act. Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com on Res., 6128, 6159 (ii).
- (Pension) B. in Com. on Res. 7140 (ii).
- Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2961, 3071 (i).
- Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 4805 (ii).
- Klondike and Peace River, &c., B. 91 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 4170 (ii).
- Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence River Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6333 (i).
- Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2^d, 1969 (i).
- Maj. Gen. Commanding, Order, Ques. of, *re* Letter read by Prime Minister, 6443 (ii).
- Manitoba Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7396; in Com., 7402, 7467 (ii).
- School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7419; in Com., 7424 (ii).
- School Ques., Address to the Holy Father on M. for Com. of Sup., 5416 (ii).
- Members' Sessional Trunks, Contract, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 7050 (ii).
- Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 6917; on M. for Com., 7173; in Com., 7180 (ii).
- North-west Irrigation Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 7788 (ii).
- N. W. Mounted Police, Contract for transportation of supplies to Yukon (remarks) 5517 (ii).
- Officer Commanding Militia, Increased allowance in Com. on Res., 4930, 4946 (ii).
- Ontario Lumber Cut, on M. (Mr. *Britton*) to adjn., 1847 (i).
- Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdalc*) 1st, 903 (i); on M. for Com., 2397, 2560 (i).
- (remarks) 2123 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Continued.

- Order (Ques. of) *re* Montreal Loan B., 6925 (ii).
- (Mr. *Montague*) in Com. of Sup., P. O. Dept., 4893 (ii).
- Orton, Dr., Dismissal as Indian Agent in Man., (M. for cor.*) 3669 (i).
- (remarks) 5393 (ii).
- Pacific and Yukon Ry. Navigation and Mining Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1st, 903 (i).
- Personal Explanation *re* par. in Ottawa Citizen *re* Man. School Question, 5496 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 3^d, 6123 (ii).
- Savings Bank, reduction of interest on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 3740 (i).
- Preferential Trade with G. B., on Amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 5853 (ii).
- Prince Albert Mail Service, Delay in Transport, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to Adjn., 2520 (i).
- Private Legislation, on M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) to proceed (objection) 7466 (ii).
- Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Bergeron*) *re* par. in *La Patrie* *re* Man. Schools, 7720 (ii).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2^d, 4712 (ii).
- Ry. Commissioners, Board of, Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1814 (i).
- Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4208 (ii).
- Rate War (M. to adjn.) 1175 (i).
- Man., Settlers, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1478 (i).
- Transportation, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1752 (i).
- St. John Bridge Co.'s B. 78 (Mr. *Ellis*) on 2^d, 1950 (i).
- San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1st, 1907, 1912 (i).
- on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2251 (i).
- SUPPLY:
- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Paris exhibition) 5041; (patent record) 5023; (year book) 5025 (ii).
- Canals*: Grenville (enlargement) 6552; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6550; Soulanges (construction) 6448, 6528; Trent (construction) 6547 (ii).
- Civil Government*: Agriculture (salaries) 4850; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3834; Militia and Defence (accountant) 3904 (i); Post Office, 4857, 4878; (contingencies) 4918 (ii).
- Customs* (laboratory) 7774; (outside service) 7362.
- Dominion Lands* (commissioner's salary, &c.) 6858; (surveys) 6860, 7308 (ii).
- Fisheries* (protection service) 5268 (ii).
- Government of N.W.T.*: Insane Asylums, 7306; (schools, &c.) 6857 (ii).
- Immigration* (agents' salaries) 6821 (ii).
- Indians*: Man. and N.W.T., 6856, 7767; N.S. (erection of fence, &c.) 7296; (surveys) 6853 (ii).
- Legislation*: House of Commons (debates) 7031; (stationery, &c.) 7038 (ii).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (repairs to wharfs) 5000; (salaries) 4988 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and South Africa) 7722; (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7660 (ii).

Marine Hospitals, 5003 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Man. and N.W.T. (alien labour law) 7277; (arbitration accounts, Can. and Provs.) 6861; (Boundary Can. and U.S.) 6860; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 7098 (ii).

Militia (gratuities, &c.) 7518; (Yukon Contingent) 7796 (ii).

Mounted Police, 6856 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (winter mail service) 4971 (ii).

Penitentiaries (commissioners expenses) 7339, 7348; Kingston, 7489 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, B. C., 7581; N. W. T., 7589; Ont., 5470, 5482; (Ottawa grounds, &c.) 5471; (Woodstock P. O.) 5468; Harbours and Rivers (general vote) 6072; B. C., 7242; N. S. (New Harbour) 7590, 7600; Ont., 5886; (dredging) 6091; (Toronto Harbour) 5893, 5909; Que. (St. Lawrence Ship channel) 5054; Miscellaneous (clerical assistance) 6104; (National Art Gallery) 6103; (Hon. Mr Mackenzie's monument) 6105; Roads and Bridges, 6100; Que., 7587 (ii).

Quarantine (cattle slaughtered) 7004; ("Scientific Dairying") 6997 (i).

Railways: Crow's Nest Pass (salaries, &c.) 7110; I.C.R. (claims for damages by fire) 7373; (accommodation at St. John) 7649; P.E.I. Ry. (rolling stock) 6437 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (hydrographic service) 5001; (meteorological service) 5001 (ii).

Unprovided Items: per Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 7351 (ii).

Yukon Provisional District: Maintenance of Force, 735 (ii).

Thessalon Point Lighthouse, total cost (Ques.) 1932 (i).

Toronto and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 77 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for Com., 4562; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 6268 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Fortin) on M. for 1^o, 1386 (i).

— Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2115, 3101 (i); Sen. Amts., 7785 (ii).

West Huron and North Simcoe, Vacancy (remarks) 7042 (ii).

Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal, on M. (Mr. Taylor) to Adjn., 3416 (i).

Yukon Military Contingent, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) 4797 (ii).

Stenson, Mr. M. T., Richmond and Wolfe.

Butter Industry in Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 2466 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2^o, 2732 (i).

Sutherland, Mr. J., North Oxford.

Ancient Order of Foresters, Subsidiary Court incorp. B. 113 (Mr. Landierkin) 1^o, 3164 (ii).

Anglo-French Telegraph Co. on M. (Mr. Fraser) to present Pet., 5143 (ii).

Sutherland, Mr. J.—Continued.

Business of the Hse.—Morning Sittings and Committees (remarks) 6110 (i).

— Sittings of Committees (M.) 6227, 6318 (ii).
Butter Industry in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 2486 (i).

Canadian Mining Institute incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Huley) 1^o, 3502 (i).

Canadian Ry. Accident Ins. Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Belcourt) 1^o, 970 (i).

Dawson City, Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 6939 (ii).

Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 7159 (ii).

Experimental Farms, distribution of Bulletins (remarks) 2486 (i).

Great Commonwealth Mining and Development B. 95 (Mr. Gibson) M. to withdrw. B., 6227 (ii).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 7743 (i).

Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale on M. (Mr. MacLaren) for Com. of Sup., 6967 (ii).

Klondike and Peace River, &c., Transportation Co.'s B. 91 (Mr. Davis) in Com., 4173 (ii).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence River Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 6329, 6937 (ii).

Montreal Island Belt Line, Ry. Co.'s B. 105 (Mr. Belcourt) 1^o, 2799 (i).

Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) on M. (Mr. LaRivière) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3651 (i).

North American Telegraph Co. B. 120 (Mr. Hurley) in Com., 5363 (ii).

Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. Tisdale) in Com., 2624, 2639; ref. to Ry. Com. (M.) 1774 (i).

Ottawa and Georgian Canal Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Belcourt) 1^o, 2799 (i).

Pearson, James, Relief (B. 147) 1^o, 5867 (ii).

Private Bills Legislation (M.) 7042 (ii).

Sons of England Benefit Society incorp. B. 122 (Mr. Bertram) on M. for Com., 6061 (ii).

Stationary Engineers, Examination B., prop. introduction (remarks) 2799 (i); 4769 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Militia: (gratuities) 6576; (Yukon contingent, &c.) 7798 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Woodstock, P.O.) 5466; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 5910; Que. (dredging) 7231 (ii).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., Bellechasse.

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 7739; on Sen. Amts. (Amt.) 7456 (ii).

I.C.R., Train Services, issue of Time-tables, 6243.

Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *La Patrie* re Man. Schools (Mr. Bergeron) 7716, 7719 (ii).

— Stimulants in the Chamber during debate (explanation) 3637 (i).

Talbot, Mr. O. E.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5988.

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7030 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Fortin) on M. for 1^o, 1386; in Com., 2121 (i).

Tarte, Hon. Mr. J. I. (Minister of Public Works)

St. John and Ibcerville.

Arnprior Post Office, Inspector, &c. (Ans.) 4177.

Bear River Bridge, N.S., Removal (Ans.) 1337 (i).

Belle River, P.E.I., Breakwater, Govt. control (Ans.) 1785, 2036, 2040 (i).

Berthier Post Office, site, &c. (Ans.) 6008 (ii).

— Public Building, real estate, purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 3662 (i).

Budget, on The, 3564 (i).

Campobello, N.B., Telephone Communication, cost, &c. (Ans.) 4178 (ii).

Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. Blair) on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to M. for 2^o, 1430.

Chapel Cove Breakwater, Govt. aid (Ans.) 4347.

Chicoutimi Wharf, Govt. expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 4180 (ii).

China Point, P.E.I. Wharf, condition (Ans.) 672.

Côté, Thos., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4176 (ii).

Dagnault, R., Dismissal (Ans.) 4609 (ii).

Deer Island, N.B., Telegraph Cable, surveys, &c. (Ans.) 4177 (ii).

Deptl. Buildings, Fire at West Block (Ans.) 2348.

— Refacing Wall (Ans.) 2528; (remarks) 3319.

Drummond County Ry., Com. of Investigation on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 512 (i).

Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T., contract for construction (Ans.) 1341 (i).

— Ret. *re* (Ans.) 2528, 3827 (i).

— Penalties imposed on Contractors (Ans.) 5317 (ii).

— Freight Rates, &c. (Ans.) 6001 (ii).

Gananoque Customs House (Ans.) 4923 (ii).

Gabarus Breakwater, grant, &c. (Ans.) 4179 (ii).

Gisborne, Mr., Govt. Inspector Telegraph Lines, N.W.T., Dismissal (Ans.) 5317 (ii).

Grand Etang, Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 5317 (ii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. Bostock) on consdn. of Amts., 3357 (i).

L'Ardoise Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 972 (i).

Montague, P.E.I., Dismissal of Caretaker (Ans.) 5787 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 163 (Mr. Fielding) prop. Res., 6864; on M. for Com., 7154, 7167; in Com. on Res., 6928 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co., construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Poupore) to Com. of Sup., 6505 (ii).

Morien Port, Breakwater, Govt. grant (Ans.) 4179 (ii).

Mudlark, Dredge, Increase in working hours (Ans.) 3825 (i).

Napanee Public Building, Caretaker, &c. (Ans.) 6008 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. Mr. J. I.—Continued.

Noël, L. P. O., Dismissal in N.W.T., 6320 (ii).

Parlt. Buildings, contract for asphaltting walks (Ans.) 487, 1783 (i).

Point Claire, construction of wharf (Ans.) 476 (i).

Prince Edward Dredge, number of employees (Ans.) 2345 (i).

Private Piers and Wharfs, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) 7241 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *La Patrie re Man. Schools*, 7711 (ii).

Red Point Wharf, P.E.I., repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1074 (i).

Regina District Registry Office (Ans.) 5319 (ii).

Returns, on Inq. for, 4774, 5322, 7526, 7655 (ii).

— expenditure on private wharfs and piers (Mr. Martin) 6581 (ii).

Richelieu River Works, estimated cost (Ans.) 484 (i).

River St. Anne, repairs to work, &c. (Ans.) 1785 (i); 3941 (ii).

Rivière la Pique, wharf, purchase of timber (Ans.) 1468 (i).

Robert, H. A., caretaker of Post Office clock, Stratford, dismissal (Ans.) 4344 (ii).

Ste. Geneviève Floods (Ans.) 476 (i).

St. Lawrence River inundations (Ans.) 3660 (i).

St. Michel Govt. wharf, repairs (Ans.) 3312 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals: Chambly, 7651 (ii).

Civil Government: Public Works, 4578; conc., 7838; (books, &c.) 6984; Justice (contingencies) 4583, 4592 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry.: Investigation on conc., 7838 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Man. and N.W.T. (alien labour law) 7277; (Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Commission) 7274 (ii).

Post Office: Mail Clerks (salaries) 7050 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, B.C., 5493, 7589; (deptl. block) 5069; Dom., 5607; (heating, &c.) 5608; (experimental farm) 5495; Generally, 5494; (Major's Hill Park) 5572, 5598; Man., 5485; N.B., 5092, 7586; N.S., 5071, 7214, 7586; N.W.T., 5489, 7589; Ont., 5463, 5970, 5482, 7217, 758; (Major's Hill Park) 5453; (Ottawa grounds, &c.) 5470, 7587; (repairs, &c.) 5448; (Rideau Hall) 5599; (summer house) 7218; (telephone service) 5605; (Woodstock P.O.) 5464; Que., 5093, 7217, 7587; (repairs, &c.) 7218; Collection of Revenues (slides and booms) 7643; Harbours and Rivers, B.C., 6064, 7242; (dredging) 6072, 6099; (dredging generally) 6099; Ont., 5889; (dredging) 6087; (Toronto Harbour) 5891, 5905, 5922; Man., 5928; (dredging) 6099; Mar. Provs. (dredging) 6082, 7242; N.B., 5641, 7633; N.S., 5612, 7589; N.S. (New Harbour) 7590; Ont., 5886, 7242, 7641, 7820; (Kaministiquia) 5067; P.E.I., 5630, 7637; Que., 5648, 7638; (dredging) 7226; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 5050; (general vote) 6066; Miscellaneous (clerical assistance) 6104; (monument for Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) 6105; (National Art Gallery) 6103; (over expenditures) 6244; Roads and Bridges (Dom.) 6100; (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6245, 6272; Slides and Booms, 6099;

Tarte, Hon. Mr. J. I.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

Public Works—Continued.

Telegraph Lines (B.C.) 6102; (N.W.T.) 6316;
(St. Lawrence Shores) 6101 (ii).

Railways (general expenses for investigations)
7204 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. Mr., and Senate, par. in *Le Soleil*
(remarks) 3320 (i).

Telegraph Lines, N.S., Govt. rates, &c. (Ans.)
6007 (ii).

— North Shore, St. Lawrence (Ans.) 1336 (i).

Tignish Breakwater, P.E.I., tenders for con-
struction (Ans.) 1075 (i).

Toronto Harbour Improvements, amount paid
W. E. Phin (Ans.) 1337 (i).

— dredging contract, &c. (Ans.) 482 (i) 4771.

— liability incurred (Ans.) 972 (i).

Trout Cove, Breakwater, repairs (Ans.) 3824 (i).

West Point Pier, P.E.I., tenders for construction
(Ans.) 1075 (i).

Wood Island, P.E.I., Breakwater, dredging
(Ans.) 2350 (i).

Yukon Mines, telegraphic connection (Ans.) 1473.

Taylor, Mr. G., South Leeds.

Address, on The, 390 (i).

Agricultural Implements, Free Entry, on prop.
Res. (Mr. Davin) 3185 (i).

Alien Labour Act Amt. (B. 8) 1°, 268 (i).

Alien Labour Law, Enforcement (remarks) 5804.

— Workmen, Importation to Toronto, on M.
(Mr. Clarke) to Adjn., 4037 (ii).

Berney, Thos., Dismissal by Govt. (Ques.) 7687.

Binder Twine, re imposition of duty (Ques.) 455.

— sale of Govt. output Kingston Penitentiary
(Ques.) 3659 (i).

Budget, on The, 3505 (i).

Butter Industry of Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr.
Reid) 2375, 2513 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry., Telegram to High Com-
missioner re Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1017.

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr.
Richardson) on M. for Com., 2879; in Com.,
3711 (i).

Civil Servants superannuated, 13th July, 1896,
to 1st Feb., 1898 (M. for Ret. *) 505 (i).

Corn Importation, 1897 to April, 1898 (Ques.)
3659 (i).

Dep. P. M. G., present occupant of office (Ques.)
3407 (i).

Fishery Overseer Boddy, Appmnt. (Ques.) 3657.

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in
Com., 2973, 2979 (i); 4110, 4445 (ii).

Gananoque Customs House (Ques.) 4923 (ii).

— Drill Shed, Inquiry for Ret., 3318 (i).

— (M. to adjn.) 5098 (ii).

— site (Ques.) 457 (i).

— (remarks) 5315 (ii).

— Ret. re inquiry, 3826 (i).

— Removal, &c. (M. for Cor. *) 1837 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G.—Continued.

Hicks, Wm., Fishery Overseer, Appmnt. (Ques.)
3658 (i).

Insurance Companies, Changes in the law govern-
ing, &c. (prop. Res.) 5136 (ii).

Kingston Locomotive Works, Telegram re order
for Locomotives (Ques.) 454 (i).

— and Gananoque Drill Shed (M. to adjn.)
605 (i).

Leeds Co. Postal Mail service, Pets., &c. (Ques.)
4181 (ii).

Parliament Grounds, Dismissal of late Supt.
Robertson (Ques.) 2818 (i).

Personal Explanation (Mr. *McMillan*) Speech re
Experimental Farm, 6113 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M.
for 1°, 2923; on M. for Com., 5712 (ii).

Post Offices closed since 1st July, 1896 (Ques.)
3936 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite
B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3935; in Com.,
4750 (ii).

Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal of W. W.
Williams (Ques.) 3407 (i).

— (M. to adjn.) 3409, 3416 (i).

Sons of England Benefit Society Co.'s incorp. B.
122 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com., 6058 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farm) 5990.

Civil Government (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) 3857.

Customs (laboratory) 7774 (ii).

Fisheries: (protection service) 5275 (ii).

Immigration (agent's salaries) 6834 (ii).

Indians (surveys) 6851 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (sessional indem-
nities to absent members) 7783 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Man. School Case, costs) 7770 (ii).

Post Office: Outside Service (miscellaneous ex-
penses) 6701 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S., 5073, 7216: Ont.

(Arnprior P. O.) 5451; (Major's Hill Park)

5461, 5597; (Ottawa grounds, &c.) 5474; (Rideau

Hall) 5600; (summer-house, Ottawa) 7218; Ont.

(dredging) 6093; Harbours and Rivers, Que.

(dredging) 7237.

Ways and Means, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn.
deb., 3594 (i).

— The Tariff:

In Com. (preferential clause) 3785; (tobacco, 3815.

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri*

Joly) in Com., 3103 (i); Sen. Amts., 7786 (ii).

Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster,

Dismissal (M. to adjn.) 3409, 3416 (i).

Tisdale, Hon. D., South Norfolk.

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr.
Richardson) in Com., 4645 (ii).

Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. *Flint*) on
1°, 4769 (ii).

Dawson City, Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*)
in Com., 7162 (ii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts (Pension) B. in
Com. on Res., 7130 (ii).

Tisdale, Hon. D.—Continued.

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 4806 (ii).

Officer Commanding Militia, increased allowance in Com. on Res., 4934, 4941 (ii).

Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4638, 4676 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) 3853 (i).

Militia (Dom. cartridge factory) 7075; (Yukon Force) 7060 (ii).

Yukon Military Contingent, expenditure, &c. (remarks) 4796 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C., Bart., Cape Breton.

Address, on The, 23 (i).

Adjmnt. for Easter (remarks) 2848 (i).

Alaskan Boundary Dispute, Telegram to New York press (remarks) 1735 (i).

Alien Labour Law, Enforcement (remarks) 5794.

Anglo-French Telegraph Co. on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) to present Pet., 5143 (ii).

Appnmts. by late Govt. on Amt. (Mr. *Montague*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4819 (ii).

— (remarks) 4926 (ii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contracts and Agreements, &c., on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5220 (ii).

— (remarks) 3208 (i).

Auditor General, Powers and Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Com. of Sup., 6203 (ii).

Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of Writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5237 (ii).

— (remarks) 4927, 5233 (ii).

Beatonville Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 3824 (i).

B.C. Coast surveys, Rep. of Mr. *Coste* (remarks) 5323 (ii).

Budget, on The, 3262 (i).

Business of the Hse., Govt. precedence on Mondays on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5012 (ii).

— on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1840 (i).

— (remarks) 5115, 5787, 5885, 6029 (ii).

— unopposed Motions for Rets. (remarks) 2820 (i).

[See "Govt. Business."]

Canadian, Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 538; on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1678; in Com., 1852 (i).

— Contract (Ques.) 102 (i).

— Govt. Amts. (remarks) 744 (i).

— Hamilton Smith's Communication (remarks) 674, 831 (i).

— Telegram to High Commissioner on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 980, 1078 (i).

— (remarks) 271, 939 (i).

Chignecto Ship Ry., par. in *Montreal Gazette* (remarks) 5664 (ii).

Civil Service Superannuation Act Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 1745 (i).

Debates, Official 2nd Rep. presented (remarks) 3823 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C.—Continued.

Debates, Omission of Ques. from Report, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *McDougall*) 3427 (i).

Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 5 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 2056 (i).

Drummond County Ry. Com. of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 507 (i).

Dupont, Mr., late M.P., Decease (remarks) 1773.

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2274; in Com., 2971, 2995 (i), 3964, 3968, 4058, 4069, 4122, 5261; on M. for 3°, 5665; (Amt.) 5670; neg. (Y. 48; N. 88) 5696 (ii).

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., Decease of (remarks) 5869 (ii).

— Res. of Condolence on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6120 (ii).

Govt. Business, Change of Procedure on Order Paper on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3592 (i).

— precedence on Thursdays on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2522 (i).

Gov. Gen. and Ministerial Responsibility (M. to adjn.) 253 (i).

Insolvency Bill, Govt. Measure (M. to adjn.) 2925 (i).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2958 (i).

Kingston Locomotive Works on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 611 (i).

Kootenay District Postal, &c., Facilities, Telegram, 1746 (i).

Lieut. Governorship of N. W. T., rumoured Appnmt. (remarks) 2699 (i).

London and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. 67 (Mr. *Lister*) in Com., 4073 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr., M.P., Decease, (remarks) 5390.

Military College Employees, Suppl. Return (remarks) 6034 (ii).

Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to ref. to Com. of Rys., 3645 (i); on M. for 3°, 4071 (ii).

Officer Commanding Militia, increased allowance, in Com., on Res., 4932, 4939 (ii).

Ogilvie's Lecture on the Klondike (remarks) 307.

Ont. and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. for Com., 2615 (i).

Pacific Cable between Vancouver and Australia, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) for Com. of Sup., 6192 (ii).

Perry, Mr. S. F., late M.P., Decease (remarks) 938 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2916 (i); on M. for 2°, 5541; on M. for Com., 5714; in Com., 5871; on M. for 3°, 6122 (ii).

— Savings Banks, reduction of interest, on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3730 (i).

Preferential Duties on Adjmnt. (remarks) 505 (i).

— Trade with G. B. on Amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) to M. for Com. of Sup., M. to adjn. deb., 5866.

Privilege (Ques. of) Press Representatives and Members of Parlt. (M. to adjn.) 5118 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C.—Continued.

Procedure; on 3^d of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2650 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 3^d, 6036 (ii).

— on M. (Mr. *Craig*) to adjn., 3317 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Meeting (remarks) 3503.

Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 5172 (ii).

— Transportation on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1756 (i).

Royal Military College, Staff and Employees, on M. for Ret., 2824 (i).

— Inquiry for Ret., 5571, 6034 (ii).

San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1st, 1910 (i).

Sel. Com. on Standing Orders, on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to suspend Rule, 5014 (ii).

Speech from the Throne, consdn. (remarks) 4 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (year book) 5028 (ii).

Civil Government: Agriculture (salaries) 4846 (ii).

Treasury Board Recommendations, non-production of Ret. (remarks) 1077 (i).

Trout Cove Breakwater, Repairs (Ques.) 3824 (i).

U. S. Customs Duties in Alaska. Tel. in *Montreal Gazette* (remarks) 405 (i).

U. S. Customs Regulations at Fort Wrangel (remarks) 1186 (i).

— Skagway and Dyea (Ques.) 161 (i).

— Stikine (remarks) 620 (i).

— in the Yukon (remarks) 6 (i).

Walsh, Major, Commissioner, Yukon district (M. for Ret. *) 2839 (i).

Ways and Means—Personal Explanation in ref. to speech of Min. of Finance at Sheffield, 3450

West Prince, P. E. I., Vacancy, Appmnt. of Returning Officer (Ques.) 1481 (i).

Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 3411 (i).

Yukon Provisional District, Action of, U. S. Senate (M. to adjn.), 1274 (i).

— Customs Regulations (M. for Ret.) 2822 (i).

— Liquor Permits (Ques.) 2846 (i).

— Mann and Mackenzie's contract, Omissions (remarks) 1078 (i).

— Mounted Police, Contract for Supplies (remarks) 5116 (ii).

— Routes, Mr. *Jenning's* Rep. (M. to print) 410 (i).

— Wagon Road (remarks) 1184, 1341 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H., K. C. M. G., Pictou.

Address, on The, 164 (i).

Agricultural Implements, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3205 (i).

— on Ques. of Order, 3205 (i).

Aldershot Military Camp, Supplies (M. for Ret.) 1786 (i).

Atlantic and Pacific Coasting Laws of Can. (M. for Ret. *) 504 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—Continued.

Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of Writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Adjn., 5251 (ii).

Behring Sea, British Vessels seized by Russia (Ques.) 1072 (i).

Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 159 (Mr. *Paterson*) on prop. Res., 6725 (ii).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2038, 2147 (i).

Butter Industry in Can. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2491 (i).

Cameron, A. F., Customs service, Sherbrooke, N.S., Dismissal (M. for Ret. *) 2840 (i).

C.P.R. Co. B. 46 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 3655 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on M. for 2^d. 1366, 1388.

— Tel. to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 994 (i).

Certificates to Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 37 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1860 (i).

Coasting Laws, Atlantic and Pacific (M. for cor. *) 2839 (i).

Coasting Trade of Canada Act Amt. (B. 106) 1, 2800 (i).

Connors, D., Bayfield, Antigonish, Fire claims (M. for Ret. *) 1837 (i).

Copyright in Can., Powers of Parl., &c. (Ques.) 473 (i).

— International, Action by British Govt. on M. for Com. of Sup., 6634 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Treatment of Labourers on M. for Com. of Sup., 6619 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) on M. for 1, 6318 (ii).

Customs, Assistant Inspector, Que. (Ques.) 2817, 3313 (i).

Dagneau, J. T., Postmaster at Robitaille, P. Q., Charges against (M. for Ret. *) 4246 (ii).

Dart, Lyman, Remission of sentence, in Com. of Sup., 6657 (ii).

Fishermen's Safety B. 111 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 4779 (ii).

— Fisheries Act Amt. B. 127 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 1st, 4522, in Com., 4946 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2^d, 2793; in Com., 2992 (i); 4256, 4269, 4358, 4432, 4462, 5260 on

Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3^d, 5678. (ii)

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 5971 (ii).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co's B. 141 (remarks) 6001; (M.) 6002 (ii).

Gov. Gen. and Ministerial Responsibility, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 261 (i).

Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1863 (i) 5325.

Identification of Criminals B. 156 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2^d, in Com., 6963 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—Continued.

- I. C. R., A. H. Harriss' Appmnt., (M. for Cor.) 3667 (i).
 ——— (M. for O. C.'s*) 3669 (i).
 ——— (Ques.) 3166 (i).
 ——— Charles Hoar, Employee at Pictou, Dismissal (M. for Cor.*) 1838 (i).
 ——— Contract for Farm Gates (M. for Ret.*) 2839 (i).
 ——— J. H. Murray, Appmnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5318 (ii).
 ——— Lumber Schedules (remarks) 2442 (i).
 ——— Patent Locomotive Cylinder (Ques.) 1335.
 Isaac's Harbour, Postmaster Griffin, Dismissal (M. for Ret.) 1834 (i).
 Joint Commission, Can. and U. S., prop. Conference (remarks) 6611 (ii).
 Judges of the Provincial Courts Act. Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6125, 6137, 6164, 6182; on M. for 2, 6731, 6747; in Com., 6784; on M. for 3, 7043; (Amt.) 7045 (ii).
 ——— Order (Ques. of) 6153 (ii).
 Kettle River Valley Ry. Co's B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 3063 (i).
 Kings Head Light, Pictou, Request to turn on (Ques.) 1929 (i).
 Land Titles Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 5959 (ii).
 Lt.-Gov. N.W.T., Present Occupant, (Ques.) 2529 (i).
 Loch Leven, C.B., Postmaster (Ques.) 1776 (i).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1988 (i).
 Macleod, Mr., Postal Mail Clerk, N.S., (M. for O. C.'s., &c.) 4181 (ii).
 McNab, Campbell, Claim against Govt. (remarks) 5446 (ii).
 Manitoba Schools Ques., Address to the Holy Father on M. for Com. of Sup., 5404 (ii).
 Miners Licenses at White and Chilkoot Passes (remarks) 4601 (ii).
 Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 136 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5328 (ii).
 Nickel Steel incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3649 (i).
 N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 5946; on M. for 3, 6064 (ii).
 Oxford, N.S., Postmaster R. S. Thompson, Appmnt. (M. for Cor.*) 1838 (i).
 Petroleum Inspection Act. Amt. B. 74 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2138 (i).
 Pictou Postmaster (Ques.) 2819 (i).
 Port Mulgrave Station Agent, Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 1832 (i).
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 5711, 5743; in Com., 5944 (ii).
 Postal Mail Clerks, N.S., Removal from former residences, &c. (M. for Rep.*) 4246 (ii).
 ——— (Ques.) 3406 (i).
 Pound Net Licenses, North shore of Lake Huron (Ques.) 3657 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—Continued.

- Pound Net Licenses, North of Lake Superior (M. for Cor.*) 3670 (i).
 Prendergast, Judge, Commission of Inquiry (Ques.) 1076 (i).
 Procedure on 3^d of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2651.
 Public Works Dept., Temporary and Permanent clerks, Number dischgd., &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1838 (i).
 Queen vs. Cameron, Indictment for Libel, on M. for Papers, 1828 (i).
 Returns (inquiry) 4348, 6028 (ii).
 Ross, David, Fishery Officer, North-east Margaree (M. for Ret.*) 1837 (i).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Commissioner's Rep., on M. (Mr. *Fortin*) to print, 6608 (ii).
 Spinks, Judge, Investigation *re* (remarks) 5268 (ii).
 ——— (M. for Reps.*) 3668 (i).
 Stationery Engineers, on prop. introduction of B. (remarks) 2800 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1871, 1903, 2085, 2113, 2532 (i); on consdn. Sen. Amts., 4525 (ii).
 Steamboat Inspection, Remission of Penalties (Ques.) 2344 (i).
 Stellarton, Car Inspector Sutherland, Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 1833 (i).
 ——— (M. for Ret.*) 2839 (i).
- SUPPLY:
- Administration of Justice*: Exchequer Court (travelling expenses) 6639 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c.: Experimental Farm, 5983.
Civil Government: Geological Survey, 4560; Interior, 4528 (ii).
Customs (salaries, &c.) 6000 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 5269 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 7012 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (life saving station) 4953; (maintenance) 4947; (tidal survey) 4955; (winter mail service) 4964 (ii).
Penitentiaries: Dorchester, 6678; St. Vincent de Paul, 6640 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 5071, 5081; Ont., 5470, 5482; (Major's Hill Park) 5456, 5572; (Ottawa Grounds, &c.) 5471, 5477; Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 5612, 5623; (general vote) 6066, 6069; Ont., 5898; (dredging) 6097; Que. (St. Lawrence River) 5060 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (accommodation at Halifax) 6385; (iron bridges) 6388 (ii).
- Tides and Currents, Reps. of Surveys (M. for copy) 1835 (i).
 U. S. Customs, Duties in Alaska, Boundary line (remarks) 407 (i).
 ——— Occupation of Dyea and Skagway (Ques.) 829 (i).
 ——— Regulations at Skagway and Dyea (remarks) 265 (i).
 ——— Vessels in Canadian Waters, Right to exclude (Ques.) 824 (i).
 ——— SS. *Frederick J. Gerring*, Supreme Court Judgment (M. for Ret.) 2823 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—Continued.

- SS. *Yantic*, Clearances, Entries, &c., at Can. Ports (M. for copies) 1834 (i).
- passage up St. Lawrence (Ques.) 1336 (i).
- (remarks) 830 (i).
- Walsh, E. J., Claim against Govt., 6324 (ii).
- Claim against Leeward Islands (M. for Ret. *) 2841 (i).
- Ways and Means, Adjmt. of deb. (M.) 3169 (i).
- Yukon Provisional District, Action of U. S. Senate on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 1291.
- Mounted Police, Contract for Transportation of Supplies (remarks) 5497, 6580, 6894 (ii).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., South Simcoe.

- Craigville and Stroud Mills Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 487 (i).
- Military College, Commissions granted to Cadets 1898-99 (M. for Cor. *) 2840 (i).
- Staff and Employees (M. for Ret.) 2824.
- Militia General Orders, Qualifications of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 7124 (ii).
- Permanent Force, Qualifications for Commissions (Ques.) 6010 (ii).

Wallace, Hon. Mr. N. C., West York.

- Alien Labour Act, Enforcement (Ques.) 3084 (i).
- Enforcement at Toronto (remarks) 5116.
- Workmen, Importation to Toronto on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Adjn., 4032 (ii).
- Budget, on The, 3369 (i).
- Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for P. 220; on M. for 2^c, 868 (i).
- Kaslo-Slocan Ry., Plans, Papers (remarks) 403 (i).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2^c, 4234 (ii).
- Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Investigation, on conc., 7823 (i).
- Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6947 (ii).
- Collections in the Yukon (Ques.) 825 (i).
- Experimental Farms, Distribution of Bulletins (remarks) 2454 (i).
- Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2^c, 2776; in Com., 2972, 2985, 3005 (i); 4318, 4451 (ii).
- Grand Trunk Ry. Regulations (M. to adjn.), 6013 (ii).
- Imports from G. B. and U. S. (Ques.) 3936 (ii).
- Jubilee Stamps (remarks) 3939, 3940 (ii).
- Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6127, 6177 (ii).
- Legal Agents of Govt. in G. B., Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 5135 (ii).
- Liquor Permits in the Yukon (remarks) 2313 (i).
- Logs, &c., Authorized Export Duty (Ques.) 3085.
- Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2403 (i).

Wallace, Hon. Mr. N. C.—Continued.

- McCarthy, Mr., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5390 (ii).
- Man. Schools Ques., Address to the Holy Father on M. for Com. of Sup., 5394 (ii).
- Ques. of Priv. *re par.* in *La Patrie* 7717 (ii).
- Mann and Mackenzie's Contract, Omissions (remarks) 1079 (i).
- Miners' licenses, Issue (remarks) 4773 (ii).
- Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. (Mr. *La Rivière*) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3645 (ii).
- Officer Commanding Militia, Increased Allowance, in Com. on Res., 4940 (ii).
- Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to ref. back to Com., 2683 (i).
- Pacific Cable between Vancouver and Australia on M. (Mr. *Cassey*) for Com. of Sup., 6201 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5756, 5768, 5773, 5876 (ii).
- Post Office Savings Bank Deposits, Reduction of Interest on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3732 (i).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liqueur-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4745 (ii).
- Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Cassey*) in Com., 4672 (ii).
- Rate War and Man. Settlers on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Adjn., 1475 (i).
- Transportation on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Adjn., 1768 (i).
- Returns (inquiry) 7526 (ii).
- Sel. Com. on Standing Orders, on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to suspend Rule, 5015 (ii).
- Stimulants in Chamber during debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3641 (ii).
- SUPPLY :
 - Administration of Justice* : Supreme Court (Judge's salary) 6990 (ii).
 - Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Paris exhibition) 5045; (year book) 5035 (i).
 - Civil Government* : Customs (contingencies) 4598; conc., 7852; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3838; High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 4575; Militia (accountant) 3911, (salaries) 6985; Post Office, 4837, 4868, 4912; (contingencies) 4916; Public Works, conc., 7823; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 4598 (ii).
 - Customs* : Outside Service, 7357 (ii).
 - Dominion Lands* (surveys, &c.) 7316 (ii).
 - Fisheries* (protection service) 5270 (ii).
 - Indians* : B.C., 7750; (inspectors' salaries) 7303 (ii).
 - Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and South Africa) 7723; (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7684 (ii).
 - Miscellaneous* (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7259, 7274; (printing, &c., conc.) 7850 (ii).
 - Public Works* : Buildings (depl. block, Ottawa) 5071; (N.S.) 5072; (New Harbour) 7624; Ont., 5886, 5926; (Major's Hill Park) 5457; (Toronto Harbour) 5896; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (River St. Lawrence) 5063 (ii).
 - Quarantine* ("Scientific Dairying") 7003 (ii).

Wallace, Hon. Mr. N. O.—Continued.

- Tennant, John F., Dismissal by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for Ret., 5197 (ii).
 U.S. Customs Regulations at Skagway and Dyea (remarks) 266 (i).
 ——— Warships in Canadian Canals (remarks) 4350 (ii).
 Walsh, E. J., Claim against Govt. (remarks) 6325.
Ways and Means—The Budget, 3369 (i).
 ——— on M. to adjn. deb. (Mr. *Davin*) 3593 (i).
 In Com.: (preferential clause) 3804; (sugar) 3809; (tobacco) 3817 (i); Res. in Com., 7583 (ii).
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1^o, 1385 (i).
 ——— B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2128, 3101; Sen. Amts., 7784 (ii).
 Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 3421 (i).
 Yukon Provisional District, Accounts, &c. (remarks) 4350 (ii).
 ——— Military Contingent, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) 4795 (ii).
 ——— Mounted Police, Contract for transporting Supplies (remarks) 5509 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., Lennox.

- Address, on The, 356 (i).
 Anderson, T. E., Customs Collector at Napanee, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 6008 (ii).
 Bath (Ont.) Customs Officer, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6007 (ii).
 Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2^o, 1235 (i).
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5263 (ii).
 Lalonde, Messenger, Charge of canvassing in Russell Co. (remarks) 909 (i).
 Napanee Customs Collector, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 6008 (i).
 ——— Public Building, Caretaker, &c. (Ques.) 6008 (ii).
 Sel. Com. on Standing Orders, on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to suspend rule, 5016 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (patent record) 5023; (year book) 5026 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont., 5450 (ii).
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2117 (ii).

Wood, Hon. J. F., Brockville.

- Adulteration Act Amt. B. 72 (Sir *Henri Joly*) on M. for 1^o, 1743 (i).
 Brockville and St. Lawrence Bridge Co.'s (B. 86) 1^o*, 2084 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6947 (ii).
 ——— and Fisheries, Further Protection B. 153 (Mr. *Paterson*) on M. for 2^o, 6962 (ii).

Wood, Hon. J. F.—Continued.

- Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2^o, 2290 (i); in Com., 4044 (ii).
 Grand Trunk Ry. Regulations on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to Adjn., 6019 (ii).
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2^o, 1967; in Com., 1977, 1985 (i).
 Manitoba School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7430 (ii).
 Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co., Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 6500 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1^o, 3932 (ii).
 Stationary Engineers, &c., on proposed Introduction of B. (remarks) 2799 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1880, 2086, 2094 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Canals: Williamsburg* (gratuities) 7194 (ii).
Civil Government: Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3881 (i); Inland Revenue (contingencies) 6983 (ii); Justice, 3899; Militia (accountant) 3920 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 7038 (ii).
Culling Timber (salaries) 7249 (ii).
Customs (outside service) 7356 (ii).
Dominion Lands (surveys, &c.) 7309 (ii).
Excise (contingencies) 7243 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6992 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Man. and N. W. T.) (Alien Labour Law) 7279; Crow's Nest Pass Commission, 7265.
Penitentiaries: Expenses of Commissions, 7344.
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (New Harbour) 7592; Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 5901; Que. (dredging) 7226 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (claims for damages) 7185; (General expenses for Investigations) 7194 (ii).
 Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Transport Contract B. 148 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6232 (ii).

Wood, Mr. A. T., Hamilton.

- Adjournment, Ash Wednesday, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 903 (i).
 British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s, Change of name (B. 115) 1^o*, 3502.
 Nickel Steel Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 96) 1^o*, 2430 (i); in Com., 4072 (i).
 ——— on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3648 (i).
 Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 2639 (i).
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to ref. to Com., 2688, 2694 (i).
 Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 5158 (ii).
 St. Stephen and Milltown Ry. Co. and C.P.R., Confirmation of Agreement (B. 44) 1^o*, 970 (i).

Wood, Mr. A. T.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (year book) 5034 (ii).*Legislation* : House of Commons (debates) 7031 (ii).*Public Works* : Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6282 (ii).*Ways and Means*—The Tariff:

In Com. (preferential clause) 3765, 3782 (i).

Yeo, Mr. J., East Prince, P.E.I.

Oyster Fisheries, Leases, &c. (Ques.) 1775 (i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (overseers' salaries) 5005 (ii).*Ocean and River Service* (Winter mail service) 4978, 4981 (ii).*Railways* : P. E. I. Ry. (rolling stock) 6436 (ii).

INDEX—PART II

SUBJECTS

- ABENAKIS INDIANS, ST. FRANCIS AGENCY: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3408 (i).
- ADDRESS, THE, IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: consdn., M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4 (i).
- moved (Mr. Bertram) 7; seconded (Mr. Gauvreau) 18 (i).
- Deb. (Sir Charles Tupper) 23; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 81; (Mr. Foster) 103; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 151; (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 164; (Mr. Davin) 272; (Mr. Bennett) 308; (Mr. Craig) 328; (Mr. Sproule) 337; (Mr. Wilson) 356; (Mr. Pope) 365; (Mr. Rogers) 375; (Mr. Clarke) 377; (Sir Louis Davies) 385; (Mr. Osler) 386; (Mr. Taylor) 390; (Mr. Dupont) 392; (Mr. McNeill) 410; (Mr. McMullen) 422; (Mr. Bergeron) 430.
- REPLY: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 936.
- (JUBILEE) TO HER MAJESTY, REPLY: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1466 (i).
- DEPARTURE FROM CAN.: moved (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7379; seconded (Mr. Foster) 7380 (ii).
- ADJOURNMENTS, Ms.:
- ALIEN WORKMEN IMPORTED TO TORONTO: (Mr. Clarke) 4029 (ii).
- ASH WEDNESDAY (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 903 (i).
- CATTLE SHIPMENTS TO UNITED KINGDOM (Mr. Hughes) 2435 (i).
- EASTER (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3095; Remarks 2929; (Sir Charles Tupper) 2848 (i).
- GANANOQUE DRILL SHED (Mr. Taylor) 5098 (ii).
- GOVERNOR GENERAL AND MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY (Sir Charles Tupper) 253 (i).
- GRAND RIVER FLOODS (Mr. Montague) 2526 (i).
- G. T. RY. REGULATIONS (Mr. Wallace) 6013 (ii).
- I. C. R. COLOURED PORTERS (Mr. Campbell) 3167 (i).
- N. W. T. AND IMMIGRATION HAND BOOKS (Mr. Davin) 5932 (ii).
- ONTARIO LUMBER CUT (Mr. Bennett) 1843 (i).
- PRESS REPRESENTATIVES AND MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (Sir Charles Tupper) 5118 (ii).
- PRINCE ALBERT MAIL SERVICE (Mr. Davis) 2517 (i).
- PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE (Mr. Craig) 3314 (i).
- QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. (Mr. Davis) 4248 (ii).
- (Mr. Osler) 4449 (iii).
- QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5930 (ii).
- RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION (Mr. Maclean) 1756 (i).
- RY. RATE WAR AND MANITOBA SETTLERS (Mr. Maclean) 1473 (i).
- SPADES AND SHOVELS COMBINE, &c. (Mr. Richardson) 1936 (i).
- WILLIAMS, W. W., POSTMASTER AT SEELEY'S BAY, DISMISSAL (Mr. Taylor) 3409, 3416 (i).
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 7486.
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1^o*, 3; *pro formá*.
- Adulteration Act Amt. B. No. 72. (Sir Henri Joli de Lotbinière) 1^o, 1713 (i.); 2^o, and in Com., 4777; 3^o*, 4777 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 24.)
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 6000 (ii).
- ADVOCATE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7631 (ii).
- AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:
- AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION, SEL. COM., 1ST REP.: CONC., 1174 (i).
- AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4845, 5020 (ii).
- DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1473 (i).
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5972, 7512 (ii).
- BULLETINS AND REPORTS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 5991 (ii).
- BUTTER INDUSTRY IN CANADA, ENCOURAGEMENT OF: prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 2350; Amt. (Mr. Sutherland) to adjn. deb., Agreed to (Y, 80, N.34) 2515.
- CATTLE EXPORTED FROM CANADIAN TERRITORY: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 475 (i).
- EXPORT TRADE, MONTREAL, G. B. AND IRELAND: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 2270 (i).
- INSPECTION, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7732 (ii).
- QUARANTINE SLAUGHTER COMPENSATION; in Com. of Sup., 7003 (ii).
- SHIPMENTS TO BELFAST; Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 484 (i).
- TO THE UNITED KINGDOM: M. (Mr. Hughes) to Adjn., 2435 (i).
- TRADE, OPENING BELFAST PORT; Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 2851 (i).
- CHEESE FACTORIES IN QUEBEC; Remarks (Mr. Marcotte) 1578 (i).
- COLD STORAGE FOR P. E. I., PROVISION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 828 (i).
- SHIPMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (ii).
- COPYRIGHT IN CAN., POWERS OF PARLT., &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 473 (i).
- COPYRIGHT INTERNATIONAL, ACTION BY BRITISH GOVT.: M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. Ross Robertson) 6627, 6801 (ii).
- CREAMERIES, DOM. GOVT.: Ques. Mr. McInnes) 3085.
- IN N. W. T., NUMBER OF PATRONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 487, 503 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 5994 (ii).
- DAIRYING in N. W. T., SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 504 (i).
- DAIRYING SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5994 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

- EXPERIMENTAL FARMS : in Com. of Sup., 5972 (ii).
 — DISTRIBUTION OF BULLETINS : Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 2454 (i).
 — REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 7378 (ii).
 HORSES FOR FEEDING, LICENSES BY FARMERS ; Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2343 (i).
 LYNCH, MR.. PROMOTION : in Com. of Sup., 4855 (ii).
 PARIS EXHIBITION, PREPARATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (ii).
 PATENTS, CANADIAN AND U. S., CLASSIFICATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7512 (ii).
 "PATENT RECORD" : in Com. of Sup., 5023 (ii).
 QUARANTINE, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 7514 (ii).
 — CATTLE : in Com. of Sup., 5998 (ii).
 — GRATUITY TO W. McK. McLeod : in Com. of Sup., 6995 (ii).
 ST. JACQUES MODEL FARM, ESTABLISHMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 7121 (ii).
 "SCIENTIFIC DAIRYING" : in Com. of Sup., 6997 (ii).
 SHERIDAN, JOHN, INSPECTOR OF LIVE STOCK, APPNMT. BY GOVT., Ques. (Mr. *Clark*) 6010 (ii).
 STATISTICAL BRANCH, AGRICULTURE DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 2814 (i).
 — YEAR-BOOK : in Com. of Sup., 5825 (ii).
 SYDNEY, AND NORTH SYDNEY, QUARANTINE PHYSICIAN : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1781 (i).
 VETERINARY INSPECTORS, APPNMTS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Montague*) 2821 (i).
- AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, FREE ENTRY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2825, 3170, 3196 ; Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) to adjn. deb. agreed to (Y. 46 ; N. 14) 3207 (i).
 — Motion allowed to stand, 1949 (i).
 — Personal explanation, par. in Man. *Free Press* (Mr. *Davin*) 4349 (ii).
- AGNES POSTMASTER AND REMOVAL OF OFFICE : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Pope*) 1787 (i).
- Alaska and North-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 108** (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1^o*, 2844 ; 2^o*, 3084 (i).
- ALASKAN BOUNDARY DISPUTE, TELEGRAM TO N. Y. PRESS : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1735 (i).
- Alberta and Yukon Ry. Nav. and Mining Co.'s incorp. B. No 124** (Mr. *Cusey*) 1^o, 4348 ; 2^o*, 4606 ; in Com., 7163 ; 3^o*, 7456 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- ALDERSHOT (N.S.) MILITARY CAMP SUPPLIES : M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1786 (i).
- ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY : in Com. of Sup., 5482.
- ALIEN LABOUR LAW, AGENT AT FORT ERIE : Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 4178 (ii).
 — GEORGIAN BAY : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 4523, 6240 (ii).
 — HAMILTON : Ques. (Mr. *MacPherson*) 6611 (ii).
 — OFFICERS IN ONTARIO : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5317 (ii).
 — PARRY SOUND : Remarks (Mr. *McCormick*) 6613 (ii).
 — TORONTO : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 4254, 4349.
 — WALLACEBURG : Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 6612.
 — BRITISH COLUMBIA GOVERNMENTAL ACTIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3662 (i).
 — ENFORCEMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5392 (ii).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 3084 (i).
- ALIEN LABOUR LAW : Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 7126 (ii).
 — Remarks (Mr. *McCleary*) 5789, 5807 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 7772 (ii).
 — MAN. AND N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7275 (ii).
 — TORONTO : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5011, 5445. (Mr. *Wallace*) 5116 (ii).
 — INSTRUCTIONS : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Montague*) 6114 (ii).
 — TO AGENTS : Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 6581.
 — FROM JUSTICE DEPT. : Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 5518 (ii).
 — PROSECUTIONS UNDER : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 474.
- Alien Act Amt. B. 63** (Mr. *McMullen*) 1^o, 1466.
- Alien Labour Restriction B. No. 8** (Mr. *Taylor*) 1^o, 268 (i).
- Alien Labour Restriction B. No. 155** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1^o*, 6577 ; 2^o, and in Com., 6964 ; 3^o*, 7011 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 2.)
- ALIEN WORKMEN IMPORTED TO TORONTO : M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Adjn., 4029 (ii).
- ALLAIRE, J. P. O., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 3661 (i).
- AMERICAN CANNED MEATS, CONTRACT WITH CANADIAN GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 5017 (ii).
- AMERICAN HISTORY, BOOKS ON : in Com. of Sup., 5999 (ii).
- ANDERSON, T. E., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT NAPANEE, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6008 (ii).
- ANGLO-AMERICAN COMMISSION AND GOVT. ACTION : Remarks (Mr. *Bertram*) 7689 (ii).
- Anglo-French Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. No. 139** (Mr. *Morrison*) 1^o*, 5315 ; 2^o*, 5827 ; in Com. and 3^o*, 7456 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 111.)
- ANGLO-FRENCH TELEGRAPH CO.'S PRTS., &c.: M. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 5143 (ii).
- ANNAPOLIS AND NEW GLASGOW, DISMISSAL OF OFFICERS : in Com. of Sup., 3828 (i).
- ANSE À BEAUFILS HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 5658.
- APPNMTS. BY LATE GOVT. : M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Montague*) 4797, 4809 (ii).
 Deb. (Mr. *Fisher*) 4817 ; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4819 ; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 4825 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4832 ; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4836 ; (Mr. *Bennett*) 4838 ; (Mr. *Paterson*) 4841.
 Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4928 ; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4926 ; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 4926 ; (Mr. *Foster*) 4927 ; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4927 (ii).
- APPNMTS. AND COR., &c., COLONIAL OFFICE : Ques. (Mr. *Roddick*) 7689 (ii).
 — TO OFFICE : Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 1187 (i).
- ARBITRATION, DOM. AND ONT. AND QUEBEC ACCOUNTS : in Com. of Sup., 6851 (ii).
- ARCHIVES : in Com. of Sup., 5022 (ii).
- ARICHAT HARBOUR, BUOYS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5320 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).
- ARMS AND ACCOUTREMENTS FOR MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 7523 (ii).
- ARMSTRONG, MR., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4857.
- ARNPRIOR P.O., INSPECTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4177 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 5449 (ii).

- ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 6065.
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS : in Com. of Sup., 5972, 7212 (ii).
- ASHCROFT, B. C., MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3090 (i).
- MINERS' LICENSES ISSUED : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2847 (i).
- POST OFFICE, POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3090 (i).
- PRESENT OCCUPANT : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1470.
- ASH WEDNESDAY, ADJNMT. : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 903 (i).
- ASHES, GOVT. INSPECTION : Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 3660 (i).
- ASPY BAY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 2819 (i).
- ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, CONTRACT : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7385 (ii).
- NEGOTIATIONS : Ques. (Mr. Ives) 600 (i).
- PETERSEN & TATE'S CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 829 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Dobell) 3297 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6609 (ii).
- Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3313 (i).
- TEL. FROM LONDON *re* CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 7356 (ii).
- ATLANTIC FISHERIES, U. S. LEGISLATION : Remarks (Mr. Russell) 1272 (i).
- ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC COASTING LAWS OF CAN. : M. for Ret.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 503 (i).
- Atlas Loan Co.'s B. No. 55 (Mr. Casey) 1^o*, 1379 ; 2^o*, 1509 (i) ; in Com. and 3^o*, 4562 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 92.)
- AUDITOR GENERAL, POWERS AND DUTIES : Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Foster) 6202 (ii).
- OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 4546 (ii).
- CONTINGENCIES. : in Com. of Sup., 4586 (ii).
- ADDITIONAL EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 7474.
- REP., FRENCH TRANSLATION : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3827 (i).
- BADDECK DRILL SHED, LAND TITLES : Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 1467 (i).
- BADDECK AND IONA MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 7723 (ii).
- BAGOT, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, ISSUE OF WRIT : (Mr. Speaker) 3924 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4350, 4449, 4602 (ii).
- BAGOT ELECTORAL DISTRICT, VACANCY, ISSUE OF WRIT : M. (Mr. Bergeron) to Adjn., 5234, 5255(ii). Deb. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5247 ; (Mr. Edwards) 5236 ; (Mr. Chauvin) 5236 ; (Sir Charles Tupper) 5237 ; (Mr. Landerkin) 5238 ; (Mr. Sproule) 5240 ; (Mr. Monk) 5242 ; (Mr. Marcotte) 5243 ; (Mr. Foster) 5243 ; (Mr. Davin) 5249 ; (Mr. Charlton) 5250 ; (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 5251 ; (Mr. McMullen) 5254 ; (Mr. Moore) 5255 (ii).
- Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 5233 ; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5233 (ii).
- Notification (Mr. Bergeron) 3825 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4772 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 3826 (i).
- Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 4927 (ii).
- BAIE ST. PAUL WHARF, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 7639 (ii).
- BANFF, CARETAKER CAVE AND BASIN BATHS, DISMISSAL : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davin) 2841 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Davin) 451 (i).
- BATH (ONT.) CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 6007 (ii).
- BATTLEFORD AGENCY AND GOVT. CATTLE : Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1574, 2844 (i).
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL : Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1574.
- BAXTER, WM., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER : Ques. (Mr. Bennet) 3657 (i).
- BEAR RIVER BRIDGE, REMOVAL : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Mills) 2840 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Russell) 1337 (i).
- REPORT AS TO CONDITION OF PIERS : Ques. (Mr. Mills) 975 (i).
- BEAR ISLAND SHIPPING MASTER, APPNMT. : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Mills) 4605 (ii).
- DISMISSAL : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Mills) 2840 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Mills) 1071 (i).
- BEATTIE, JOHN, INDIAN AGENT AT HIGHGATE : in Com. of Sup., 7291 (ii).
- BEATONVILLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 3824 (i).
- BEAUHARNOIS CANALS, DISMISSALS : in Com. of Sup., 7189 (ii).
- BEAUMONT, WM., CLAIMS FOR SALARY AS POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 4611 (ii).
- BECK, JOHN, DISMISSAL : in Com. of Sup., 5301 (ii).
- BEHRING SEA, BRITISH VESSELS SEIZED BY RUSSIA : Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1072 (i).
- CLAIMS COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 7286 (ii).
- BELFAST PIER : in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).
- BELGIAN AND GERMAN TREATIES, LEGAL EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 7088 (ii).
- BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER (P. E. I.) GOVT. CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1785, 2036 ; remarks, 2040 (i).
- BELL TELEPHONE CO.'S PET. : Ques. (Mr. Ross Robertson) 6031 (ii).
- RATES : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7126.
- BELLEVILLE P. O., DISMISSALS : M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Corby) 6112, 6208 (ii).
- BELOEIL LAND DAMAGES : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2847 (i).
- CARETAKER OF BOOMS, RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2847 (i).
- BENNETT, MR., MAIL CLERK : in Com. of Sup., 4869.
- BERNEY, MR., DISMISSAL : in Com. of Sup., 5275 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 7687 (ii).
- BERRY, MR., DISMISSAL : in Com. of Sup., 4952 (ii).
- BERTHIER CHANNEL, DEEPENING : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3085 (i).
- POST OFFICE, SITE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. Beausoleil) 6008 (ii).
- PUBLIC BUILDING, PURCHASE OF SITE : Ques. (Mr. Beausoleil) 3662 (i).
- BERTILLON SYSTEM, IDENTIFICATION OF CRIMINALS : in Com. of Sup., 7488 (ii).

- BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.**—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*.)
1^o*, 3; *pro forma*.
- BILL (No. 2) To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest.**—(Mr. *Charlton*.)
1^o, 184; 2^o *m.*, 1950; in Com., 1977, 2041; 3^o *m.*, 2400; amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to refer to Com., 2400; agreed to (Y. 64, N. 58) 2401; in Com., 2401; M. to restore to Order Paper, 2426 (i).
- BILL (No. 3) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, so as to make effectual provision for the punishment of Seduction and Abduction.**—(Mr. *Charlton*.)
1^o, 185; 2^o *m.*, 2902 (i); neg., 4221 (ii).
- BILL (No. 4) Further to secure the safety of Railway Employees and Passengers.**—(Mr. *Casey*.)
1^o, 185; 2^o *m.*, 2054; in Com., 2055; ref. to Sel. Com., 2056; in Com., 3673 (i), 4208, 4638, 4670, 5144; 3^o*, 5175 (ii).
- BILL (No. 5) Respecting Drainage on and across the lands of Railway Companies.**—(Mr. *Casey*.)
1^o, 185; 2^o *m.*, 2055 (i).
- BILL (No. 6) To confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Railway Company.**—(Mr. *Blair*.)
1^o *m.*, 186; 1^o, 252; 2^o *m.*, 521, 621, 674, 746, 831, 909, 940, 1030, 1080, 1188, 1214, 1342, 1388, 1481, 1579; 2^o agreed to (Y. 111, N. 72) 1734; Res. prop. (Land Grants) 1772; agreed to, 1850; in Com., 1851; 3^o *m.*, 1937; agreed to, 1945 (i).
- BILL (No. 7) To regulate freight rates on Railways.**—(Mr. *Reid*.)
1^o*, 271; 2^o *m.*, 2910; withdn., 2913 (i).
- BILL (No. 8) To amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.**—(Mr. *Taylor*.)
1^o, 268 (i).
- BILL (No. 9) To amend the law respecting Holidays.**—(Mr. *Penny*.)
1^o, 270 (i).
- BILL (No. 10) To authorize the appointment of a Board of Civil Service Supervisors.**—(Mr. *McMullen*.)
1^o, 270 (i).
- BILL (No. 11) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to Cruelty to Animals.**—(Mr. *Penny*.)
1^o*, 271; 2^o*, 2058 (i).
- BILL (No. 12) Further to amend the Criminal Code.**—(Mr. *Britton*.)
1^o, 270; 2^o *m.*, 2842; M. for Com., 2885; Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) 6 m. h. agreed to, 2902 (i).
- BILL (No. 13) To amend the Mounted Police Pension Act.**—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1^o, 271; 2^o and in Com., 2058; 3^o*, 2058 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 14) Respecting the attachment of salaries out of moneys in the hands of the Government of the Dominion of Canada.**—(Mr. *Richardson*.)
1^o, 271; 2^o*, 2058; M. for Com., 2852, 3689; in Com., 3706 (i), 4639; on Order, 5175 (ii).
- BILL (No. 15) Further to amend the Mounted Police Pension Act, 1889.**—(Mr. *Davin*.)
1^o*, 307 (i); 2^o *m.*, 4239 (ii).
- BILL (No. 16) To repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.**—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)
1^o, 308; 2^o *m.*, 2270, 2532, 2567, 2703; agreed to (Y. 97, N. 48) 2799; M. for Com., 2930; in Com., 2941, 2969 (i), 3942, 4042, 4074, 4254, 4354, 4387, 4453, 4523, 5259; 3^o *m.*, 5664; 3^o, 5709; Sen. Amts., 6467, 7527, 7553, 7792; 3^o, 5709 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 17) To amend the Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.**—(Mr. *McMullen*.)
1^o*, 405 (i); 2^o *m.*, 4222 (ii).
- BILL (No. 18) Further to amend the Railway Act.**—(Mr. *Campbell*.)
1^o, 405; 2^o *m.*, 2058; ref. to Sel. Com., 2059 (i).
- BILL (No. 19) To regulate the transit of grain in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.**—(Mr. *Douglas*.)
1^o, 450; 2^o *m.*, 2059; ref. to Com. on Rys., 2083 (i).
- BILL (No. 20) Further to amend the Chinese Immigration Act.**—(Mr. *Maxwell*.)
1^o, 597 (i).
- BILL (No. 21) To amend the Railway Act with respect to the shipment of grain.**—(Mr. *Richardson*.)
1^o*, 671 (i).
- BILL (No. 22) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.**—(Mr. *Oliver*.)
1^o*, 743; 2^o*, 824; in Com. and 3^o*, 2122 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- BILL (No. 23) To incorporate the Lewes River Tramway Company, Limited.**—(Mr. *Morrison*.)
1^o*, 743; 2^o*, 824; in Com. and 3^o*, 3656 (i); Sen. Amts., 4606 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 24) To Amend the Charter of the Union Bank of Canada.**—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1^o*, 743; 2^o*, 824; in Com. and 3^o*, 2122 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 118.)
- BILL (No. 25) To incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Bridge Company.**—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1^o*, 744; 2^o*, 824 (i).
- BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Kettle River Valley Railway Company (as amended by Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines).**—(Mr. *Bostock*.)
1^o*, 744; 2^o*, 824; in Com., 2957, 3012, 3357, 3546.
- BILL (No. 27) To incorporate the Cañon Railway Company.**—(Mr. *Frost*.)
1^o*, 744; 2^o*, 824; withdn., 3404 (i).
- BILL (No. 28) Further to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.**—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1^o*, 744 (i).
- BILL (No. 29) Respecting the Federal Life Assurance Company of Ontario, and to change the name to the Federal Life Assurance Company of Canada.**—(Mr. *MacPherson*.)
1^o*, 902; 2^o*, 1017; in Com., and 3^o*, 2559 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 103.)

- BILL (No. 30) Respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company—(Mr. McGregor.)**
1^o*, 902; 2^o*, 1018; in Com. and 3^o*, 1774 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 69.)
- BILL (No. 31) To incorporate the Lake Bennett and Klondike Railway and Tramway Company. (Mr. Haggart.)**
1^o*, 903; 2^o*, 1018; in Com. and 3^o*, 3867 (i). Sen. Amts., 5905, 6266 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 32) Respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company—(Mr. Tisdale.)**
1^o*, 903; 2^o*, 1018; recom. to Com. on Rys., 1774; in Com., 2123; M. for Com., 2386, 2560, 2606; in Com., 2619; 3^o, 2697 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 81.)
- BILL (No. 33) To incorporate the Pacific and Yukon Railway, Navigation and Mining Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)**
1^o*, 903; 2^o*, 1018; withdn., 3404 (i).
- BILL (No. 34) Respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)**
1^o*, 903; 2^o*, 1018; in Com. and 3^o*, 3554 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 61.)
- BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Miles Cañon and White Horse Tramway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)**
1^o*, 903; 2^o*, 1018; in Com., 3653; 3^o*, 3655 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 74.)
- BILL (No. 36) To amend the Act respecting the sale of Railway Passenger Tickets.—(Mr. Beatty.)**
1^o*, 903 (i).
- BILL (No. 37) Further to amend the Act respecting the Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Sir Louis Davies.)**
1^o*, 936; 2^o and in Com., 1869; 3^o*, 1863 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 45.)
- BILL (No. 38) Further to amend the Act respecting the Government Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters.—(Sir Louis Davies.)**
1^o, 936; 2^o and in Com., 1863; 3^o*, 1869 (i). (61-62 Vic. c. 42.)
- BILL (No. 39) Respecting the Inspection of Steamboats and the Examination and Licensing of Engineers employed on them.—(Sir Louis Davies.)**
1^o, 937; 2^o and in Com., 1869, 2084, 2531; 3^o*, 2532 (i). Sen. Amts., 4525 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 40) To incorporate the Pacific and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)**
1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214; withdn., 3713 (i).
- BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Dominion Building and Loan Association.—(Mr. Clarke.)**
1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214; in Com., and 3^o*, 2559 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 101.)
- BILL (No. 42) Respecting the Canadian Railway Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)**
1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214 (i).
- BILL (No. 43) Respecting the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto.—(Mr. Osler.)**
1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214; in Com. and 3^o*, 2122 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 117.)
- BILL (No. 44) To confirm an agreement between the St. Stephen and Milltown Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)**
1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214; in Com. and 3^o*, 3554 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 84.)
- BILL (No. 45) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)**
1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214; in Com. and 3^o*, 3554 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 46) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)**
1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214; in Com. 3655; 3^o*, 3656 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 47) Respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway.—(Mr. Morrison.)**
1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214; in Com. and 3^o*, 3867 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 48) To incorporate the Cowichan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. McInnes.)**
1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214; in Com. and 3^o*, 3656 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 49) Further to amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. McClure.)**
1^o*, 970 (i).
- BILL (No. 50) To incorporate the Ottawa, Montreal and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)**
1^o*, 1068; 2^o*, 1214 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 76.)
- BILL (No. 51) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)**
1^o*, 1068; 2^o*, 1214; in Com. and 3^o*, 3656 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 57.)
- BILL (No. 52) Respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)**
1^o*, 1174; 2^o*, 1334; in Com., 3868; 3^o*, 3868 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 53) To incorporate the Prudential Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Bain.)**
1^o*, 1272; 2^o*, 1509; in Com. and 3^o*, 2559 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 113.)
- BILL (No. 54) Respecting the Edmonton District Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)**
1^o*, 1379; 2^o*, 1509; in Com. and 3^o*, 3656 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 55) Respecting the Atlas Loan Company.—(Mr. Casey.)**
1^o*, 1379; 2^o*, 1509; in Com. and 3^o*, 4562 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 56) Respecting the Montreal and Province Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Penny.)**
1^o*, 1380; 2^o*, 1509 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 57) Respecting the Manufacturers' Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to "The Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company."—(Mr. Clarke.)**
1^o*, 1380; 2^o*, 1509; in Com. and 3^o*, 2957 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 102.)

- BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Queenston Heights Bridge Company. (Mr. Clarke.)**
1^o, 1380; 2^o, 1509; in Com. and 3^o, 3656 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 114.)
- BILL (No. 59) To incorporate the Victoria Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Quinn.)**
1^o, 1380; 2^o, 1509; in Com. and 3^o, 2957 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 119.)
- BILL (No. 60) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. Fortin.)**
1^o m., 1380; 1^o, 1387; 2^o m., 2842 (i).
- BILL (No. 61) In further amendment of the Trade Mark and Design Act.—(Mr. Bertram.)**
1^o, 1387; 2^o m., 2842 (i); in Com. and 3^o, 4208 (ii).
- BILL (No. 62) To incorporate the Tamagamingue Railway Company.—(Mr. McHugh.)**
1^o, 1465; 2^o, 1775 (i); in Com. and 3^o, 4072 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 63) To amend the law relating to Aliens.—(Mr. McMullen.)**
1^o, 1466 (i).
- BILL (No. 64) Respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Maxwell.)**
1^o, 1573; 2^o, 1775 (i); in Com. and 3^o, 4387 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 65) To further amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. Davin.)**
1^o, 1573 (i).
- BILL (No. 66) Respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Jameson.)**
1^o, 1736; 2^o, 1775; in Com. and 3^o, 3656 (i); Sen. Amts., 4807 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the London and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Lister.)**
1^o, 1736; 2^o, 1775; in Com., 4072; 3^o, 4074 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 68) Respecting the Montford Colonization Railway Company, and to change its name to the Montford and Gatineau Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Bourassa.)**
1^o, 1736; 2^o, 1775 (i); in Com. and 3^o, 4387 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 69) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Britton.)**
1^o, 1736; 2^o, 1775 (i); in Com., 4805 (ii); 3^o, 4807 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 67.)
- BILL (No. 70) To amend the Chinese Immigration Act, so as to extend its application to Japanese—and to provide for a more equitable distribution of the revenue derived therefrom.—(Mr. McInnes.)**
1^o, 1736.
- BILL (No. 71) Further to amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)**
1^o, 1737; 2^o and in Com., 2113, 2123, 3097 (i), 6582; 3^o, 6582; Sen. Amts., 7783. (60-61 Vic., c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 72) To amend the Adulteration Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)**
1^o, 1743 (i); 2^o and in Com., 4777; 3^o, 4777 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 73) To amend the Gas Inspection Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)**
1^o, 1744; 2^o and in Com., 2138; 3^o, 2138 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 74) To amend the Petroleum Inspection Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)**
1^o, 1744; 2^o and in Com., 2138; 3^o, 2139 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 75) Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)**
1^o, 1744; 2^o, and in Com., 2139; 3^o, 2141 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 27.)
- BILL (No. 76) To provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act and for the retirement of members of the Civil Service.—(Mr. Mulock.)**
1^o, 1744 (i); 2^o, 6334; in Com., 6367, 6796; 3^o, 6932 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 77) To incorporate the Toronto and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)**
1^o, 1839; 2^o, 1949 (i); M. for Com., 4562; in Com. and 3^o, 4606; Sen. Amts. 5906, 6268. (61-62 Vic., c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 78) Respecting the Saint John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.—(Mr. Ellis.)**
1^o, 1839; 2^o, 1950 (i); in Com. and 3^o, 4072 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)**
1^o, 1839; 2^o, 1949; 3^o. (61-62 Vic., c. 120.)
- BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)**
1^o, 1839; 2^o, 1949 (i); in Com. and 3^o, 4072 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)**
1^o, 1840; 2^o, 1950; in Com. and 3^o, 5827 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 78.)
- BILL (No. 82) To protect Canada against the introduction of the insect pest known as the San José Scale.—(Mr. Fisher.)**
1^o, 1904; 2^o, 1926; in Com. and 3^o, 1928 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 83) To prohibit improper speculation in the sale of butter and cheese.—(Mr. Parmelee.)**
1^o, 2001; 2^o m., 2843 (i).
- BILL (No. 84) Respecting Insolvency.—(Mr. Fortin.)**
1^o, 2004 (i).
- BILL (No. 85) To amend Chapter 99 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, being the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. Penny.)**
1^o, 2035; M. to withdraw B., 2606 (i).
- BILL (No. 86) Respecting the Brockville and St. Lawrence Bridge Company.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)**
1^o, 2084; 2^o, 2240 (i); in Com. and 3^o, 4072 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 87 from the Senate) For the relief of Augustus Baldwin Hart.—(Mr. Landerkin.)**
1^o, —; 2^o, 2841; in Com., and 3^o, 3554 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 121.)

- BILL (No. 88 from the Senate) Incorporating the Central Canada Loan and Savings Company—(Mr. *Casey*.)
1°, 2°, 2240; in Com., and 3°, 4562 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- BILL (No. 89) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to combinations in restraint of Trade.—(Mr. *Sproule*.)
1°, 2241 (i).
- BILL (No. 90) Respecting Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies—(Mr. *Sproule*.)
1°, 2241 (i).
- BILL (No. 91) To incorporate the Klondike and Peace River Gold Mining, Land and Transportation Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1°, 2429; 2°, 2841 (i); in Com., 4168; 3°, 4174 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- BILL (No. 92) To incorporate the Canada Atlantic Transit Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1°, 2429; 2°, 2559 (i); in Com. and 3°, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 93) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1°, 2430; 2°, 2560 (i); in Com. and 3°, 4387 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- BILL (No. 94) To authorize the Canada Eastern Railway Company to convey its railway to the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. *Tucker*.)
1°, 2430; 2°, 2560 (i); in Com. and 3°, 4606 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- BILL (No. 95) Respecting the Great Commonwealth Development and Mining Company (Limited Liability) and to change its name to the Alberta and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gibson*.)
1°, 2430; 2°, 2560 (i); withdn. 6227 (ii).
- BILL (No. 96) To incorporate the Nickel Steel Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*.)
1°, 2430; 2°, 2560; M. for Com., 3554, 3643; ref. back to Com. on Ry's., 3653 (i); in Com., 4071; 3°, 4071 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 110.)
- BILL (No. 97) To incorporate the North Shore Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*.)
1°, 2430; 2°, 2560 (i); in Com. and 3°, 5827; Sen. Amts. 7744, 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 98) To incorporate the Edmonton and Peace River and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson*.)
1°, 2430; 2°, 2560 (i); withdn. 4922 (ii).
- BILL (No. 99) To incorporate the Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*.)
1°, 2430; 2°, 2698 (i); in Com., 6328, 6934, 7158; 3°, 7156 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 107.)
- BILL (No. 100) Respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson*.)
1°, 2430; 2°, 2560; in Com. and 3°, 3554 (i); Sen. Amts., 4606 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 104.)
- BILL (No. 101) Respecting the St. John Harbour.—(Mr. *Ellis*.)
1°, 2430; 2°, 3084 (i); in Com. and 3°, 5049 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 115.)
- BILL (No. 102) To incorporate the Montmorency Cotton Mills Company.—(Mr. *Penny*.)
1°, 2430; 2°, 3084 (i); in Com., 4174; 3°, 4171 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 108.)
- BILL (No. 103) To confirm certain public Acts of the Legislatures of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, so far as they relate to the Missaquash Commissioners of Sewers.—(Mr. *Logan*.)
1°, 2430 (i).
- BILL (No. 104) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1°, 2799; 2°, 3084 (i); in Com. and 3°, 5363 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 109.)
- BILL (No. 105) Respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1°, 2799; 2°, 3084 (i); in Com. and 3°, 4807; Sen. Amts., 5905 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- BILL (No. 106) To amend the Act respecting the Coasting Trade of Canada.—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*.)
1°, *m.*, 2800 (i).
- BILL (No. 107) To incorporate the Yukon Overland Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Domville*.)
1°, 2844; 2°, 3084 (i).
- BILL (No. 108) To incorporate the Alaska and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1°, 2844; 2°, 3084 (i).
- BILL (No. 109) To incorporate the British American Light and Power Company.—(Mr. *Rosamond*.)
1°, 2844; 2°, 3084 (i); in Com. and 3°, 4562 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
- BILL (No. 110) Further to amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. *Mulock*.)
1°, *m.*, 2913 (i); 2° *m.*, 5520, 5568; M. for Com., 5709; in Com., 5748, 5870, 5943; 3°, 6121 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 111 from the Senate) For better securing the safety of certain fisherman.—(Sir *Louis Davies*.)
1° —————; 2°, and in Com., 4778; 3°, 4930 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 112 from the Senate) For the relief of Edwin Heyward.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1°, 3399; 2°, 3656 (i); in Com. and 3° on div., 4175 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 122.)
- BILL (No. 113) To incorporate the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. *Landerkin*.)
1°, 3164; 2°, 3656 (i); in Com. and 3°, 5569 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
- BILL (No. 114) Further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey.—(Mr. *Sifton*.)
1°, 3404 (i); 2°, and in Com., 4776; 3°, 4777 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 18.)

- BILL (No. 115)** Respecting the British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company, and to change its name to the White Pass and Yukon Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson*.)
1°*, 3502; 2°*, 3657 (i).
- BILL (No. 116)** To incorporate the Canadian Mining Institute.—(Mr. *Haley*.)
1°*, 3502; 2°*, 3657 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4562 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- BILL (No. 117)** To incorporate the Klondike and Dawson City Bank—(Mr. *Morrison*.)
1°* 3502; 2°*, 3657 (i); in Com., 5117; 3°*, 5118 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 105.)
- BILL (No. 118)** To incorporate the Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)
1°*, 3502; 2°*, 3868; ref. to Com., 3868 (i) 4805; 6939, in Com. and 3°*, 7158 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 99.)
- BILL (No. 119)** To incorporate the Dawson City and Victoria Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)
1°*, 3502; 2°*, 3868 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5363 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 100.)
- BILL (No. 120)** Respecting the North American Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Hurley*.)
1°*, 3713; 2°*, 3868 (i); in Com. and 3°, 5363 (ii).
- BILL (No. 121)** Respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)
1°, *m*, 3925; 2°, 4684; in Com., 4728; 3°, 6035 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 122)** To incorporate the Supreme Grand Lodge of the Sons of England Benefit Society.—(Mr. *Bertram*.)
1°*, 4029; 2°*, 4175; M. for Com., 6048; in Com., 6266; 3°*, 6328 (ii)
- BILL (No. 123)** Respecting the Dawson City Electric Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Morrison*.)
1°*, 4247; ref. to Com. on Rys., 4387; 2°, 4606; in Com., 7158; 3°*, 7163 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- BILL (No. 124, from the Senate)** Incorporating the Alberta and Yukon Railway, Navigation and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Casey*.)
1°, 4348; 2°*, 4606; in Com. 7163; 3°*, 7456 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 125)** To incorporate the Ottawa Interprovincial Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1°*, 4448; 2°*, 4808; in Com. and 3°*, 6647 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 112.)
- BILL (No. 126)** Respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company, and to change its name to the Saskatchewan Pacific Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Landerkin*.)
1°*, 4521; 2°, 4606, in Com. and 3°*, 6647 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- BILL (No. 127)** To further amend the Fisheries Act.—(Sir *Louis Davies*.)
1°, 4522; 2°, and in Com., 4946; 3°*, 4947 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 128)** Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*.)
1°*, 4522; 2°, and in Com., 5966; 3°*, 5972 (ii). 61-62 *Vic.*, c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 129, From the Senate)** “An Act to incorporate the Tobique Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. *Taylor*.)
1°*, 2°*, 5050; in Com., and 3°*, 6266 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c., 116.)
- BILL (No. 130)** Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Sifton*.)
1°, 4679; 2°, and in Com., 5937; 3°*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 131)** Further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Sifton*.)
1°, 4681; 2°, and in Com., 5945; 3°, 6064 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 132)** Further to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Sifton*.)
1°, 4683; 2°, and in Com., 5957; 3°*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 133)** To make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-west.—(Mr. *Sifton*.)
1°, 4683; 2°, and in Com., 5960; 3°*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 134)** Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Flint*.)
1°, 4769 (i).
- BILL (No. 135)** Further to amend the Act respecting Government Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters—(Sir *Louis Davies*.)
1°, 4922; 2°, in Com., and 3°, 5325 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 136)** Further to amend the Act respecting the Protection of Navigable Waters.—(Sir *Louis Davies*.)
1°, 4923; 2°, and in Com., 5325; 3°*, 5330 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 137)** To revive and amend the Acts respecting International Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson*.)
1°*, 5215; 2°*, 5540; in Com. and 3°*, 6647 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 138, from the Senate)** Further to amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1°*, 5259; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 5331 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BILL (No. 139)** To incorporate the Anglo-French Telegraph Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Morrison*.)
1°*, 5315; 2°*, 5827; in Com. and 3°*, 7456 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 111.)
- BILL (No. 140)** Further to amend the Militia Act.—(Mr. *Borden, King's*.)
1°*, 5331; 2°, and in Com., 5965; 3°*, 5966 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 141, From the Senate)** Respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)
1°*, 5518; M. for 2°, 5930; and ref. to Com., on Rys., 5965, 6001; in Com., 7456, 7733, 7787; 3°*, 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 64.)

- BILL (No. 142) To authorize the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to borrow money.—(Mr. *Dobell*.)
1^o, 5568; 2^o, and in Com., 6229; 3^o, 6444 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- BILL (No. 143. From the Senate) To amend the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)
1^o, 5786; 2^o, 6234; in Com. and 3^o, 6446 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 144) Further to amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. *Sifton*.)
1^o, 5661; 2^o and in Com., 5960; 3^o, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 145) Further to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Blair*.)
1^o, 5662; 2^o, 5966; 3^o, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 146) To amend and consolidate the Northwest Irrigation Acts of 1894 and 1895.—(Mr. *Sifton*.)
1^o, 5662; 2^o and in Com., 6123; 3^o, 6946; Sen. Amts., 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- BILL (No. 147, from the Senate) For the relief of James Pearson.—(Mr. *Sutherland*.)
1^o, 5867; 2^o, 5885, 5906; in Com. and 3^o, 6266 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 123.)
- BILL (No. 148) Respecting the transport contract between Her Majesty and the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Blair*.)
1^o, 5867; 2^o and in Com., 6232; 3^o, 6446 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 149) To authorize certain contracts with Steamship Companies for cold storage accommodation.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)
1^o, 5930; 2^o and in Com., 6727; 3^o, 6747 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
- BILL (No. 150) Further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)
1^o, 6185; 2^o, 6732, 6747; in Com., 6784, 7043; ref. back to Com., 7126; 3^o, 7142; Sen. Amts., 7854 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- BILL (No. 151, from the Senate) An Act to incorporate the Pacific and Yukon Railway, Navigation, Trading and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Rosamond*.)
1^o, 6227; 2^o and ref. to Sel. Com. on Rys., 6334.
- BILL (No. 152) Further to amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Paterson*.)
1^o, 6318; 2^o and in Com., 6947; 3^o, 6961 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 153) Further to protect the Customs and Fisheries.—(Mr. *Paterson*.)
1^o, 6319; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 6962 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- BILL (No. 154, from the Senate) To provide for the Government of the Yukon District.—(Mr. *Sifton*.)
1^o, 6439; 2^o and in Com., 6727; 3^o, 6747 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
- BILL (No. 155, from the Senate) To amend Chapter 11 of the Statutes of 1897, intituled: An Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1^o, 6577; 2^o and in Com., 6964; 3^o, 7011 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 156, from the Senate) Respecting the Identification of Criminals.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1^o, 6577; 2^o and in Com., 6962; 3^o, 6964 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.* c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 157) Respecting the repayment of the moneys advanced to the Saint John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1^o, 6582; 2^o, 6801; in Com. and 3^o, 7011 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 158) Respecting the London and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lister*.)
1^o, 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 6607 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 159) To amend the Act to provide for Bounties on Iron and Steel made in Canada.—(Mr. *Paterson*.)
1^o and 2^o, 6727; in Com. and 3^o, 6747 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 160) Respecting the Boundaries of the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. *Sifton*.)
1^o, 6746; 2^o and in Com., 7410; 3^o, 7527 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 161) Respecting the payment of grants in aid of the construction of Public Works.—(Mr. *Blair*.)
1^o, 6892; M. for 2^o, 7411; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 7570 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.* c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 162) To confirm a certain award in favour of the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)
1^o, 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 6962 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 163) To grant further aid to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1^o and 2^o, 7011; M. for Com., 7142, 7166; in Com., 7180; 3^o, 7241 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 164, from the Senate) Respecting Loan Companies.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1^o, 7086; 2^o, dschgd., 7525 (ii).
- BILL (No. 165, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1^o, 7086; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 7470 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 166) In further amendment of the Fisheries Act.—(Sir *Louis Davies*.)
1^o, 7115; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 7470 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 167) In further amendment of the Post Office Act.—(Mr. *Mulock*.)
1^o, 7408; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 7579 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 168) Respecting the Manitoba School Fund.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1^o, 7466; 2^o and in Com., 7571; 3^o, 7655 (ii).
- BILL (No. 169) Respecting the Province of Manitoba Debt Account.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1^o, 7467; 2^o, 7571; in Com. and 3^o, 7579 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 170, from the Senate) Further to amend the Act respecting Public Officers.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1^o, 7523; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o, 7580 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.* c. 16.)

- BILL (No. 171) To amend the Customs Tariff of 1897.**
—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1^o*, 7585; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 7786 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 172) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.**—
(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1^o*, 7585; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 7786 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 173) Further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.**—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1^o* and 2^o*, 7657; in Com. and 3^o*, 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 174) Granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1898, and the 30th June, 1899, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.**—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1^o*, 7854; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 7857 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- BILLS, FRENCH TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*)** 3084 (i).
— **PRESENTATION: Remarks as to seconders (Mr. *Speaker*)** 671 (i).
— **Royal Assent, 2089 (i).**
- BINDER TWINE re IMPOSITION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*)** 455 (i).
— **SALE OF GOVT. OUTPUT AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*)** 3659 (i).
- BIOLOGICAL STATION, GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup.,** 7733 (ii).
- BIRON, MR. N., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup.,** 4994.
- BOARD OF CUSTOMS LABORATORY: in Com. of Sup.,** 7356, 7773 (ii).
- BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS, LEGISLATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*)** 1787 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Davis*) 1794; (Mr. *Rutherford*, 1795; (Mr. *Maclean*) 1821; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1812, 1825; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1814; (Mr. *Blair*) 1816; (Mr. *Davin*) 1822; (Mr. *McMillan*) 1823 (i).
- BOAT HARBOUR, EASTERN PASSAGE: in Com. of Sup.,** 5618 (ii).
- BODDY, MR. A., APPNMT. AS FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*)** 3657 (i).
— **in Com. of Sup.,** 5275 (ii).
- BONDING, &C., ARRANGEMENTS WITH U. S. ON PACIFIC COAST: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Foster*)** 1786 (i).
- BORDEN, MR., ACCOUNTANT MILITIA DEPARTMENT: in Com. of Sup.,** 3899 (i), 6563 (ii).
- Boundaries of Prov. of Quebec B. No. 160 (Mr. *Sifton*)** 1^o, 6746; 2^o and in Com., 7410; 3^o*, 7527 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- BOUNDARY BETWEEN CANADA AND ALASKA: in Com. of Sup.,** 6860 (ii).
— **Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*)** 1076 (i).
- Bounties on Iron and Steel B. No. 159 (Mr. *Paterson*)** 1^o*, 2^o*, 6727; in Com., and 3^o*, 6747 (ii). (62-61 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, APPLICATION AT GABARUS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*)** 674 (i).
- BOYER, TOUISSANT, LOCKMASTER BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*)** 3662 (i).
- BRAE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup.,** 5633 (ii).
- Brandon and South-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 47 (Mr. *Morrison*)** 1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214; in Com., and 3^o*, 3867 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BRANDON ELECTORAL DISTRICT, MR. MCCARTHY'S CANDIDATURE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*)** 4610 (ii).
- BRANTFORD POST OFFICE LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup.,** 7775 (ii).
- BRIDGE TENDERS MURRAY CANAL, DISMISSALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup.,** 6553 (ii).
- BRIGADE CAMP, THIRD MILITARY DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*)** 5787 (ii).
- British American Light and Power Co.'s B. No. 109 (Mr. *Rosamond*)** 1^o*, 2844; 2^o*, 3084 (i); in Com., and 3^o*, 4562 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
- BRITISH COLUMBIA:**
- ALIEN LABOUR ACT, B.C. AND GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*)** 3662 (i).
- ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup.,** 6065 (ii).
- ASHCROFT, B.C. MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*)** 3090 (i).
- **MINERS' LICENSES ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*)** 2847 (i).
- **POSTMASTER, PRESENT OCCUPANT: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*)** 1470, 3090 (i).
- ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC COASTING LAWS OF CAN.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*)** 504 (i).
- BEAUMONT, WM., CLAIMS FOR SALARY AS POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*)** 4611 (ii).
- BEHRING SEA, BRITISH VESSELS SEIZED BY RUSSIA: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*)** 1072 (i).
- BOUNDARY BETWEEN CAN. AND ALASKA: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*)** 1076 (i).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA COAST SURVEYS, MR. COSTE'S REP.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*)** 5323 (ii).
— **M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*)** 2839 (i).
— **TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup.,** 6102 (ii).
- COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup.,** 6064 (ii).
- CREAMERIES, DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*)** 3085.
- DREDGING LEASES ISSUED TO J. A. MERCIER: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*)** 1934 (i).
- FRASER RIVER SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup.,** 6065.
- GOLDEN, B.C. AND ST. EUGENE MAIL CARRIER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*)** 2824 (i).
— **Ques. (Mr. *Foster*)** 2816 (i).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup.,** 6064 (ii).
- KASLO-SLOCAN Ry., PLANS, PAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*)** 402 (i).
- KOOTENAY DISTRICT POSTAL, &C., FACILITIES: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*)** 1746 (i).
- LIGHTHOUSES BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND STIKINE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*)** 976 (i).
- NANAIMO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, MEMBER ELECT, RESIGNATION: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*)** 4605 (ii).
- QUEEN vs. CAMERON, INDICTMENT FOR LIBEL, DEPOSITIONS, &C.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Bostock*)** 1827 (i).
- ROTHWELL'S REPORT re CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*)** 2851 (i), 4452 (ii).
- SILVER AND LEAD SMELTING, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*)** 6012 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

- SPINKS, JUDGE, INVESTIGATION *re*: Remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 5268 (ii).
 — M. for Copy of Rep.* 3668 (i).
 VANCOUVER DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).
 VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. BELT, SETTLERS' CLAIMS, REP. OF MR. ROTHWELL: Remarks (Mr. McInnes) 2351 (i), 4452 (ii).
 YALE COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INQUIRY *re* JUDGE SPINKS: M. for Copy of Rep* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3668 (i).
 — Remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 5268 (ii).
- B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 45** (Mr. Morrison) 1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214; in Com. and 3^o*, 3554 (i), (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 56).
- BRITISH JOINT STOCK CO., IN THE YUKON: Ques. (Mr. Donville) 1471 (i).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA COAST SURVEYS, REP. OF MR. COSTE: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 5323 (ii).
 — PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5493 (ii).
- British Yukon Mining, Trading and Trans. Co.'s B. No. 115** (Mr. MacPherson) 1^o*, 3502; 2^o*, 3657 (i).
- Brockville and St. Lawrence Bridge Co.'s B. No. 86** (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 1^o*, 2084; 2^o*, 2240 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- BRUNEAU, MR., M. P. FOR RICHELIEU, ALLEGED RESIGNATION: prop. Res. (Mr. Marcotte) 2037; remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2038, 2083; (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2038 (i).
 — REF. TO PRIV. AND ELECTIONS COM.: prop. Res. (Mr. Marcotte) 2142 (i).
 Deb. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2142; (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2143; (Mr. Casey) 2157; (Mr. Bennett) 2160; (Mr. McInerney) 2167; (Sir Louis Davies) 2170; (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2178; (Mr. Quinn) 2179; (Mr. Mills) 2184; (Mr. Bergeron) 2188; (Mr. Flint) 2193; (Sir Adolphe Caron) 2195; (Mr. Monk) 2197; (Mr. Russell) 2200; (Mr. Foster) 2205; (Mr. Fielding) 2215; (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 2218; (Mr. Sproule) 2223; (Mr. McNeill) 2228; (Mr. Blair) 2228; (Mr. Powell) 2233; Mr. Casgrain) 2234 (i). Neg. (Y. 39; N. 79) 2239 (i).
- BUDGET AND HANSARD TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. Choquette) 1576 (i).
- BUDGET, THE, ADJNMT. OF DEBATE: M. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3169 (i).
 — DATE OF DELIVERY: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2848 (i).
 — FINANCIAL STATEMENT (Mr. Fielding) 3104 (i).
 — REPLY (Mr. Foster) 3208 (i).
- BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 5494, 5598; (N.S.) 5071 (ii).
- BULLETINS AND REPORTS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 5991 (ii).
- BURNT CHURCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (ii).
- BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, MORNING SITTINGS (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6227, 6229 (ii).
 — CHANGE OF PROCEDURE ON ORDER PAPER: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3502 (i).
 — MORNING SITTINGS AND COMMITTEE: M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 6109 (ii).

- BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, MOTIONS FOR RETS.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2820 (i).
 — NOTICES OF MOTIONS (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1840 (i).
 — PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS, WEDNESDAYS AND THURSDAYS, TUESDAYS AND FRIDAYS (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1840 (i).
 — MONDAY: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5012 (ii).
 — THURSDAYS: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2521.
 — Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3821 (i), 7525 (ii); (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5787, 5937 (ii); (Sir Charles Tupper) 5115, 5885, 6029 (ii).
 — TWO SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6013 (ii).
 — SITTINGS OF COMMITTEE (Mr. Sutherland) 6227.
- Butter and Cheese, Improper Speculation in Sale, Prohibition B. No. 83** (Mr. Parmalee) 1^o, 2001; 2^o m., 2843 (i).
- BUTTER INDUSTRY IN CAN., ENCOURAGEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 2350 (i).
 Deb. (Mr. Moore) 2355; (Mr. Davin) 2357; (Mr. Fisher) 2357, 2450; (Mr. Montague) 2361; (Mr. McMullen) 2363; (Mr. Craig) 2365; (Mr. Sproule) 2367; (Mr. Campbell) 2370; (Mr. Henderson) 2371; (Mr. Frost) 2373; (Mr. Taylor) 2375; (Mr. McMillan) 2377; (Mr. Broder) 2379; (Mr. Bain) 2382; (Mr. Pope) 2384, 2443; (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 2458; (Mr. McNeill) 2460; (Mr. Featherston) 2461; (Mr. Stenson) 2466; (Mr. Maclean) 2469; (Mr. Oliver) 2472; (Mr. Semple) 2475; (Mr. Snetsinger) 2477; (Mr. Sproule) 2479; (Mr. Rogers) 2480; (Mr. Campbell) 2482; (Mr. Reid) 2482; (Mr. Sutherland) 2486; (Mr. Erb) 2490; (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2491; (Mr. McLennan) 2496; (Mr. Davin) 2498; (Mr. Somerville) 2500; (Mr. McMillan) 2501, 2511; (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 2503; (Mr. Clancy) 2506; (Mr. Taylor) 2513 (i).
 Amt. (Mr. Sutherland) to adjn. Deb., agreed to (Y. 80; N. 34) 2515 (i).
- Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 51** (Mr. Clarke) 1^o*, 1068; 2^o*, 1214; in Com., and 3^o*, 3656 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- CAMERON, A. F., CUSTOMS OFFICER, SHERBROOKE (N.S.): M. for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2840.
- CAMERON, MR., FISHERY OVERSEER AT ST. PETERS, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5307 (ii).
- CAMERON AND LENOIR, FISHERY OFFICERS, N.S., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5097 (ii).
- CAMPBELLTON WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (ii).
- CAMPBELLON ISLAND, TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4177 (ii).
- Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 93** (Mr. Belcourt) 1^o*, 2430; 2^o*, 2560 (i); in Com., and 3^o*, 4387 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- Canada Atlantic Transit Co.'s B. No. 92** (Mr. Belcourt) 1^o*, 2429; 2^o*, 2559 (i); in Com., and 3^o*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- CANADA AND AUSTRALIAN CABLE, AND IMPERIAL GOVT.'S REP.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Casgrain) 3668 (i).
- CANADA AND SOUTH AFRICA, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (ii).

- Canada Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 94** (Mr. *Tucker*) 1^o*, 2430; 2^o*, 2560 (i); in Com., and 3^o*, 4606 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. No. 143** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1^o*, 5786; 2^o, 6234; in Com. and 3^o*, 6446 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- CANADA SUGAR REFINING CO., LITIGATION EXPENSES:** in Com. of Sup., 770 (ii).
- Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 49** (Mr. *McClure*) 1^o*, 970 (i).
- CANADIAN DEFENCES IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor.*** (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2839 (i).
- CANADIAN AND ENGLISH MAILS, BEAVER LINE STRS.:** Ques. (Mr. *Ives*) 2844 (i).
- CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL DEEP WATERWAY COMMISSION:** in Com. of Sup., 7282 (ii).
- CANADIAN LAW LIBRARY, LONDON:** in Com. of Sup., 7086 (ii).
- Canadian Mining Institute B. No. 116** (Mr. *Haley*) 1^o*, 3502; 2^o*, 3657 (i); in Com., and 3^o*, 4562 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS:** in Com. of Sup., 7770 (ii).
- Canadian Yukon Ry. B. No. 6** (Mr. *Blair*) 1^o, m., 186; 1^o, 252; 2^o, m., 521, 621, 674, 746, 831, 909, 940, 1030, 1080, 1188, 1214, 1342, 1388, 1481, 1579; 2^o agreed to (Y. 111, N. 72) 1734; Res. prop., 1772; agreed to, 1850; in Com., 1851; 3^o m., 1937; agreed to, 1945 (i).
- On M. for 1^o:
- Deb. (Mr. *Blair*) 186; (Mr. *Haggart*) 212; Mr. *McMullen* 219; (Mr. *Wallace*) 220; (Mr. *Morrison*) 235; (Mr. *Montague*) 240; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 248.
- On M. for 2^o:
- Deb. (Mr. *Blair*) 521; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 538, 1678; (Mr. *Sifton*) 571, 621, 1727; (Mr. *Haggart*) 674; (Mr. *Fisher*) 700; (Mr. *Osler*) 724; (Mr. *Bertram*) 735; (Mr. *Hughes*) 746; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 758; (Mr. *Russell*) 774; (Mr. *McInerney*) 794; (Mr. *McClure*) 832; (Mr. *Macleane*) 844; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 855; (Mr. *Wallace*) 868; (Mr. *Paterson*) 887; (Mr. *Bostock*) 940; (Mr. *Ives*) 947; (Mr. *Dobell*) 954; (Mr. *McDougall*) 961, 1030; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1055; (Mr. *Moore*) 1080; (Mr. *Craig*) 1086; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1098, 1495; (Mr. *Roche*) 1106; (Mr. *Rutherford*) 1116; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 1126; (Mr. *Ganong*) 1132; (Mr. *Morin*) 1161; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1188; (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1208; (Mr. *Davin*) 1214; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1229 (Mr. *Wilson*) 1235; (Mr. *Semple*) 1242; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1246; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) amt., 1271; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1342; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1388; (Mr. *Tarte*) 1430; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1440; (Mr. *Morrison*) 1448, 1481; (Mr. *Quinn*) 1503; (Mr. *Britton*) 1505; (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1527; (Mr. *Powell*) 1540; (Mr. *Edwards*) 1557; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1562; (Mr. *Foster*) 1580; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1628; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1657; (Mr. *McMillan*) 1672; Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1712; (Mr. *McInnes*) 1722; (Mr. *Casey*) 1725; (Mr. *Davis*) 1728; amt. (Mr. *Borden*) neg. (Y. 65, N. 119) 1732; 2^o agreed to (Y. 111; N. 72) 1733 (i).
- Canadian Yukon Ry. B. No. 6—Con.**
- In Com.:
- Deb. (Mr. *Blair*) 1851; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1852; (Mr. *Quinn*) 1854; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1855; (Mr. *Sifton*) 1856; (Mr. *Bennett*) 1857; (Mr. *Britton*) 1858; (Mr. *Foster*) 1853; (Mr. *Davin*) 1859 (i).
- CANADA YUKON RY. AND HAMILTON SMITH'S PROPOSALS; TELEGRAM TO HIGH COMMISSIONER:** Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 980 (i).
- Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 980, 1078; (Mr. *Foster*) 983; (Mr. *McLean*) 985; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 985; (Mr. *Ives*) 989, 1078; (Mr. *Fisher*) 992; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 994; (Mr. *Sifton*) 999; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1002; (Mr. *Gibson*) 1004; (Mr. *Powell*) 1006; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 1008; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1010; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1015; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1018; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1026; (Mr. *Pope*) 1018; (Mr. *Quinn*) 1028 (i).
- ACTION OF THE U.S. SENATE: M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 1274 (i).
- Deb. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1276; (Mr. *Foster*) 1284; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1289, 1312; (Mr. *Davin*) 1295; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1291; (Mr. *McInerney*) 1298; (Mr. *Rutherford*) 1302; (Mr. *Montague*) 1305; (Mr. *Fisher*) 1314; (Mr. *Pope*) 1319; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1326; (Mr. *Quinn*) 1331 (i).
- (Land Subsidy)
- Deb. (Mr. *Blair*) 1851; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1855; Mr. *Bennett*) 1857; (Mr. *Foster*) 1858; (Mr. *Britton*) 1858; (Mr. *Davin*) 1859; (Mr. *Pope*) 1859.
- GOVT. AMENDMENTS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 744 (i).
- LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 515 (i).
- remarks *re* Exchange (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3037 (i).
- EXCLUSION OF FOREIGN LABOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 827 (i).
- HAMILTON SMITH'S PROPOSALS: presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 903 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 979 (i).
- remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 674, 831 (i).
- PLANS, PAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 402 (i).
- TELEGRAM TO HIGH COMMISSIONER: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 939 (i).
- Canadian Ry. Accident Ins. Co. B. No. 42** (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214 (i).
- CANALS:**
- BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, REPAIRS, &C.:** in Com. of Sup., 7189 (ii).
- BERTHIER CHANNEL, DEEPENING:** Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3085 (i).
- BOYER, TOUSSANT, LOCKMASTER, DISMISSAL:** Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3662 (ii).
- BRIDGE TENDERS, MURRAY CANAL, DISMISSAL, &C.:** in Com. of Sup., 6563 (ii).
- CANALS:** in Com. of Sup., 6446 (ii).
- DATE OF OPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Macleane*) 3317 (i).
- CHAMBLY CANAL:** in Com. of Sup., 6553 (ii).
- ST. JOHN, P.Q.: in Com. of Sup., 7651 (ii).
- CORBEL, FRANÇOIS, EMPLOYEE, LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL:** Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4348.
- Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2343 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*

- CORNWALL CANAL, CONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT PAID :
Ques. (Mr. Broder) 5391 (ii).
— ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 6532 (ii).
— REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6354 (ii).
DANIS, MR., DISMISSAL FROM BRAUHARNOIS CANAL :
in Com. of Sup., 7203 (ii).
FARRAN'S POINT, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup.,
6532 (ii).
GALBRAITH, THOS. J., PORT COLBORNE, DISMISSAL :
Ques. (Mr. Montague) 516 (i).
GALOPS CANAL, CLAIMS FOR EXPROPRIATION OF LAND :
in Com. of Sup., 7650 (ii).
— PURCHASE OF LAND, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr.
Broder) 3668 (i).
— STRAIGHTENING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6538.
GRENVILLE CANAL, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup.,
6552 (ii).
HOGAN & ONDERDONK, CONTRACTORS, SOULANGES
CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 6510 (ii).
LACHINE CANAL, CORBEIL, FRANÇOIS, DISMISSAL :
Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2343 (i), 4348 (ii).
— ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 6551 (ii).
— LEFAIVRE, XAVIER, LOCKMASTER, DISMISSAL :
Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3937 (i).
— ST. PIERRE RIVER, DEEPENING : in Com. of
Sup., 6551 (ii).
— STOREKEEPER, APPLICANTS FOR POSITION :
Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 456 (i).
— WHARFINGER, DISMISSAL OF F. CORBEIL : M.
for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 2840 (i).
MCKAY, KENNETH, LOCKMAN, ST. PETER'S CANAL,
DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1069 (i).
MONTREAL AND LAKE ONT. NAVIGATION, &c. : Ques.
(Mr. Maclean) 6009 (ii).
MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL CON-
STRUCTION : M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Poupore)
6466 (ii).
MURRAY CANAL, BRIDGE TENDERS, DISMISSALS : in
Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).
— FLOATING WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).
NAVIGATION, OPENING OF CANALS : Remarks (Mr.
Quinn) 2700 (i).
REID, WM., BRIDGE TENDER, BEAUHARNOIS CANAL,
DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2937 (i).
RIDEAU CANAL, LAND DAMAGES, &c. : in Com. of
Sup., 7182 (ii).
ST. FRANCIS LAKES, REMOVAL OF BOULDERS : in Com.
of Sup., 6533 (ii).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of
Sup., 6550 (ii).
— CONTRACTOR'S CLAIMS : in Com. of Sup., 7105.
SOULANGES CANAL, CEMENT, &c. : in Com. of Sup.,
6457, 6510 (ii).
— CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 6446 (ii).
— CONTRACTORS' CLAIMS : in Com. of Sup., 6447,
6510 (ii).
— EXPENDITURE ON CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr.
Bergeron) 5133 (ii).
— TENDERS FOR CEMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ber-
geron) 4176 (ii).
TRENT CANAL, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 6538.
— GOVT. AID : Ques. (Mr. Corby) 2817 (i).
— REMOVAL OF ROCK : in Com. of Sup., 6553 (ii).
WELLAND CANAL, DISMISSALS : in Com. of Sup., 7206.
— EMPLOYEES DISMISSED, NAMES : M. for Ret.*
(Mr. Montague) 2839 (i).
WELLINGTON BRIDGE, MONTREAL, ACCIDENT : Re-
marks (Mr. Quinn) 4604 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*

- WELLINGTON BRIDGE, MR. MATTISON'S SERVICES :
Remarks (Mr. Quinn) 4775 (ii).
WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, GRATUITY TO GEORGE REID :
in Com. of Sup., 7192 (ii).
— REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).
"YANTIC," U. S. SS., PASSAGE UP ST. LAWRENCE :
Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 830 (i).
— Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1336 (i).
— IN CANADIAN CANALS : Remarks (Mr. Wallace)
4350 (ii).
Cañon Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 27 (Mr.
Frost) 1*, 744 ; 2*, 824 ; withdn., 3404 (i).
CANNED GOODS FOR YUKON, PAR. IN *National Pro-
visioner* : Remarks (Mr. Quinn) 3940 (ii).
CAPE BRETON COUNTY, MARINE DEPT., CHANGES
Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 673 (i).
— DISMISSALS : Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 6033,
6034 (ii).
CAPE BRETON RY., "HARD PAN" CLAIMS : Ques.
(Mr. McLennan, Inverness) 5134 (ii).
CAPE NEGRO ISLAND LIGHT, APPOINT. OF KEEPER :
Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1929 (i).
— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1839 (i).
CASSELMAN, MR., LOCKMASTER AT MORRISBURG, DIS-
MISSAL : in Com. of Sup., 7192 (ii).
CATTLE EXPORTED FROM CANADIAN TERRITORY : Ques.
(Mr. Maclean) 475 (i).
— EXPORT TRADE, MONTREAL, G. B. AND IRELAND :
Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 2270 (i).
— INSPECTION, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup.,
7732 (ii).
— SHIPMENTS TO BELFAST : Ques. (Mr. Hughes)
484 (i).
— SHIPMENTS TO G. B. OR UNITED KINGDOM : M.
(Mr. Hughes) to Adjn., 2435 (i).
— QUARANTINE : in Com. of Sup., 5998 (ii).
— QUARANTINE, SLAUGHTER, COMPENSATION : in
Com. of Sup., 7003 (ii).
— TRADE, OPENING BELFAST PORT : Remarks
(Mr. Fisher) 2851 (i).
CEMENT USED IN SOULANGES CANAL : in Com. of Sup.,
6457, 6510 (ii).
CENTRAL RAILWAY, N. B., UNPAID ACCOUNTS : in
Com. of Sup., 7653 (ii).
Central Canada Loan and Savings Co.'s
B. No. 88 (Mr. Casey) 1*, 2*, 2240 ; in Com.
and 3*, 4567 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
CHAMBLY CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 6553, 7651 (ii).
CHAMBORD JUNCTION, CUSTOM-HOUSE, COST : Ques.
(Mr. Marcotte) 4179 (ii).
— ESTABLISHMENT : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1469.
CHAPEL COVE, N. S., BREAKWATER, GOVT. AID :
Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 4345 (ii).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 3828 (i),
6976 (ii).
CHARLOTTE COUNTY, FISHERY OVERSEERS, DISMISSALS :
in Com. of Sup., 5311 (ii).
— TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 6102 (ii).
CHEESE FACTORIES IN QUEBEC : Remarks (Mr. Mar-
cotte) 1578 (i).

- CHETICAMP CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, NAME, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 4180 (ii).
- CHICOUTIMI WHARF, GOVT. EXPENDITURE:** Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 4180 (ii).
- TELEGRAPH LINES: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 2814.
- CHIEF JUSTICE STRONG'S EXPENSES TO ENGLAND:** in Com. of Sup. 7089 (ii).
- CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY, PAR. IN MONTREAL** *Gazette*: Remarks (Mr. Lister) 5663 (ii).
- CHINA POINT WHARF, P.E.I., CONDITION, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. Martin) 671 (i).
- PIER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (ii).
- Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. No. 20** (Mr. Maxwell) 1°, 597 (i).
- **B. No. 70** (Mr. McInnes) 1°, 1736 (i).
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 6690 (ii).
- Civil Service Supervisors Authorization B. No. 10** (Mr. McMullen) 1°, 270 (i).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 17** (Mr. McMullen) 1°, 405 (i) 2° m., 4222 (ii).
- Civil Service Superannuation B. No. 76** (Mr. Mulock) 1°, 1744 (i); 2°, 6334; in Com., 6367, 6796; 3°, 6932 (ii). (61-62 *Vic. c. 17.*) 2° m., 6334 (ii).
- Deb. (Mr. Foster) 6334, 6355; (Mr. Clarke) 6339; (Mr. McNeill) 6343, 6347; (Mr. Sproule) 6346; (Mr. McMullen) 6348; (Mr. Davin) 6352 (ii).**
- In Com.
- Deb. (Mr. Foster) 6367, 6797; (Mr. Clarke) 6371, 6797; (Mr. McMullen) 6367, 6797; (Mr. Davin) 6371; (Mr. Ellis) 6370; (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6361, 6380; (Mr. Monk) 6373; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 6374; (Mr. Costigan) 6375; (Mr. Rogers) 6378; (Mr. Clancy) 6379; (Mr. Mulock) 6796; (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 6797; (Mr. Montague) 6797; (Mr. Rogers) 6797; (Mr. Sproule) 6797; (Mr. Gibson) 6797; (Mr. McDougall) 6800 (ii).**
- 3° m.
- Deb. (Mr. Foster) 6933 (ii).**
- CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES IN PROV. OF QUEBEC, NAMES, &c.:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 504 (i).
- SUPERANNUATED 1896-98: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 505 (i).
- CLEANING, &c., DEPTL. BUILDING:** in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
- CLERKS, EXTRA, IN CIVIL SERVICE, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 3667 (i).
- CLERICAL ASSISTANCE:** in Com. of Sup., 6104 (ii).
- CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7475 (ii).
- COASTING LAWS, ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC:** M. for Cor.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2839 (i).
- Coasting Trade of Canada Act Amt. B. No. 106** (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1° m., 2800 (i).
- COBOURG POSTMASTER, ATTENDANCE AT REFORM CONVENTION:** Ques. (Mr. Guillet) 602 (i).
- Cold Storage and Steamship Companies B. No. 149** (Mr. Fisher) 1°, 5930; 2° and in Com., 6727; 3°, 6747 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c. 7.*)
- COLD STORAGE FOR P.E.I., PROVISION:** Ques. (Mr. Martin) 828 (i).
- SHIPMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (ii).
- COLLECTION OF REVENUES:** See "SUPPLY," &c.
- COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR:** in Com. of Sup., 5886 (ii).
- COLMER, MR., INCREASE OF SALARY:** in Com. of Sup., 4561 (ii).
- COLONIAL PREMIERS, LONDON CONFERENCE:** M. for Cor. (Mr. Foster) 1785 (i).
- COLONIZATION COMPANIES, GRANTS OF LANDS, CONDITIONS:** Ques. (Mr. Douglas) 479 (i).
- Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34** (Mr. Bostock) 1°, 903; 2°, 1018; in Com. and 3°, 3554 (i). (61-62 *Vic., c. 61.*)
- COLUMBIA RIVER (B.C.) IMPROVEMENTS:** in Com. of Sup., 6064 (ii).
- Combinations in Restraint of Trade B. No. 89** (Mr. Sproule) 1°, 2241 (i).
- COMMERCIAL AGENCIES:** in Com. of Sup., 4575, 6690.
- COMMITTEES MEETING DURING SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE** (Mr. Sutherland) 6318 (ii).
- COMMITTEES:**
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL, SEL. COM.:** M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 449 (i).
- 2ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. Choquette) 3822; conc., 4246 (ii).
- LIBRARY COM., JOINT:** M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 671.
- PRINTING COM., JOINT:** M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 597.
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., MEETING:** Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 3503 (i).
- 5TH and 6TH REPS.: M. (Mr. Foster) to print Evidence, 6440, 6465 (ii).
- SELECT STANDING COMS., COM. TO PREPARE LISTS:** M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5, 450 (i).
- Lists presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 591 (i).
- Companies Act Amt. B. No. 138** (Mr. Fielding) 1°, 5259; 2°, in Com., and 3°, 5331 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c. 50.*)
- **B. No. 165** (Mr. Fielding) 1°, 7086; 2°, in Com., and 3°, 7470 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c. 49.*)
- CONNORS, D., ANTIGONISH, FIRE CLAIMS:** M. for Ret.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1837 (i).
- CONNOR, JOHN, GOLD DREDGING LEASES, N. W. T.:** Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1074 (i).
- CONTINGENCIES:** in Com. of Sup., 4581-4600 (ii).
- CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' REPS.:** Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- COPYRIGHT IN CANADA, POWERS OF PARLT., &c.:** Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 473 (i).
- ACTION BY BRITISH GOVERNMENT: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Ross Robertson) 6627, 6801 (ii).
- CORBELL, FRANÇOIS, LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL:** Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 4348 (ii).
- CORN, FOREIGN IMPORTS INTO MAN.:** Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3660 (i).
- IMPORTATIONS SINCE 1897-8: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3659 (i).
- CORNWALL CANAL, CONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT PAID:** Ques. (Mr. Broder) 5391 (ii).
- ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 6532 (ii).
- REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).
- CORONERS, N.W.T., STATUS:** Remarks (Mr. Davin) 7855 (ii).
- COTEAU LANDING, DREDGING:** in Com. of Sup., 7226.

- COTÉ, THOMAS, EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 4176 (ii).
- COTE DE LEISSE RIFLE RANGES AND FARMERS' GRIEVANCES: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6322 (ii).
- COTE ST. LUC RIFLE RANGES, ACCIDENTAL SHOOTING OF FARMER: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Monk) 4678 (ii).
— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6029 (ii).
- COULOMBE VS. QUEEN, APPEAL QUEEN'S BENCH: M. for Copy* (Mr. Casgrain) 3668 (i).
- COUNTY COURT JUDGES, AGE LIMIT, COR., &C.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7124 (ii).
- COURT OF APPEAL, ONT., EXTRA JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 1071 (i).
- COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7590 (ii).
- Cowichan Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 48 (Mr. McInnes) 1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214; in Com. and 3^o*, 3656 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 62.)
- C. P. R. and St. Stephen and Milltown Ry. Co.'s B. No. 44 (Mr. MacPherson) 1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214; in Com., and 3^o*, 3554 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 84.)
- Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. Morrison) 1^o*, 970; 2^o*, 1214; in Com., 3655; 3^o*, 3656 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 60.)
- C.P.R. BALANCE OF AWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 6381.
— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 6382 (ii).
— LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1340 (i).
- CRAIGVILLE AND STROUD'S MILLS MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 487 (i).
- CREAMERIES, DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3085.
- CREAMERIES IN N.W.T., ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5994 (ii).
— NUMBER OF PATRONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 487, 503 (i).
- CRIBBONS POINT, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5614 (ii).
- Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. Charlton) 1^o, 185; 2^o m., 2902 (i) neg., 4221.
— B. No. 11 (Mr. Penny) 1^o*, 271; 2^o*, 2058 (i).
— B. No. 12 (Mr. Britton) 1^o, 270; 2^o m., 2842; M. for Cora., 2885; Amt. (Mr. Cameron) 6 m. h., agreed to, 2902 (i).
— B. No. 65 (Mr. Davin) 1^o, 1573 (i).
— B. No. 134 (Mr. Flint) 1^o, 4769 (i).
- Criminals Identification B. No. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1^o*, 6577; 2^o and in Com., 6962; 3^o*, 6964 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 54.)
- CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 5025 (ii).
- CROW'S NEST PASS RY., AGREEMENT WITH C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 2036 (i).
— AMOUNTS PAID C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3405 (i).
— COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. Ross Robertson) 6030 (ii).
— PRINTING OF REP.: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 6466 (ii).
— remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6466 (ii).
— COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7251 (ii).
- CROW NEST PASS RY., CONSTRUCTION BY COMPANY: Remarks (Mr. Richardson) 6240 (ii).
— DEATH OF EMPLOYEES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 4605, 5394 (ii).
— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 3668 (i).
— M. for Ret. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 3666 (i).
— EMPLOYEES: on conc., 7823 (ii).
— ENGINEER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 7110, 7181 (ii).
— J. B. CHARLESON'S CONNECTION: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7685 (ii).
— TREATMENT OF WORKMEN: M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 6593 (ii).
Deb. (Mr. Foster) 6593; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 6593; (Mr. Fraser, Guysboro') 6598; (Mr. Oliver) 6600; (Mr. Sifton) 6614; (Mr. Davin) 6614; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6618, 6626; (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 6619; (Mr. Richardson) 6622; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 6623 (ii).
- CROW'S NEST PASS RY. INVESTIGATION: on conc. (Mr. Wallace) 7823 (ii).
Deb. (Mr. Davin) 7840; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 7841; (Mr. McMullen) 7843; (Mr. Sproule) 7845; (Mr. Fraser Guysboro') 7845; (Mr. Clarke) 7847; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7848 (ii).
- CULLING TIMBER: in Com. of Sup., 6000, 7249 (ii).
- CUSTOMS:
- ANDERSON, T. E., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, NAPANEE, SALARY: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 6008 (ii).
- BATH (ONT.) CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPOINT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 6007 (ii).
- BONDING ARRANGEMENTS WITH U.S. ON PACIFIC COAST: M. for Cor. (Mr. Foster) 1786 (i).
- CHAMBOARD, CHICOUTIMI, CUSTOM HOUSE, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 4179 (ii).
— CUSTOM HOUSE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1469 (i).
- CAMERON, A. F., CUSTOMS SERVICE, SHERBROOKE (N.S.): M. for Ret.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2840.
- CHETICAMP, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 4180 (ii).
- CORN, FOREIGN IMPORTS INTO MAN.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3660 (i).
— IMPORTATIONS FROM 1897 TO 1898: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3659 (i).
- CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 4555, 4588, 6000, 7355, 7357, 7475; conc., 7818, 7852 (ii).
— ASSISTANT INSPECTOR, PROV. OF QUE.: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2817, 3313 (i).
— APPOINT. OF IRISH ROMAN CATHOLICS: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 4608 (ii).
— CHANGES IN OFFICIALS: Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Paterson) 6895 (ii).
- COLLECTOR AT CENTREVILLE, N.B., INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. Hale) 830 (i).
— COLLECTIONS IN THE YUKON: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 825 (i).
- GANOQUE CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4923.
- GRAND NARROWS, C.B., PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DUTIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 1781 (i).
- HAGARVILLE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DEFALCATION: Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 974 (i).
- HILLSBORO' CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McInerney) 1838 (i).
- IMPORTS, DUTIABLE VALUE AND AMOUNT COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 600 (i).

CUSTOMS,—*Con.*

- JOHNSTON, J. T., CUSTOMS OFFICER, FORT ERIE, DISMISSAL; Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 4178 (ii).
- LAFRANCE FIRE ENGINE, DUTY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 6011 (ii).
- LOGS, &c., EXPORT DUTY; Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 3085.
- MARGAREE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 4161 (ii).
- MONTAGUE (P.E.I.) CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. Macdonald) 2832 (i).
- MONTREAL CUSTOMS HOUSE, DISMISSALS, 1896 TO 1898, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Quinn) 3669.
- NAPANEE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 6006 (ii).
- N.W.T., HORSES IMPORTED FROM U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 3942 (ii).
- PETROLEUM REDUCTION OF DUTY, LEGISLATION *re*: prop. Res. (Mr. Moore) 1945 (i).
- PULP MILL MACHINERY, ENTRY IN BOND: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3165 (i).
- RECIPROCITY WITH U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 452 (i).
- ST. HYACINTHE CUSTOMS OFFICE, DUES AND OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 600 (i).
- TENNANT, J. F., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. Quinn) 3670 (i) 4182 (ii).
- U.S. AND GREAT BRITAIN, IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 3663 (i).
- "YANTIC," SS., CLEARANCE, ENTRIES, &c., AT CANADIAN PORTS: M. for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1834 (i).
- Customs Act Amt. B. No. 152** (Mr. Paterson). 1°, 6318; 2°, and in Com., 6946; 3°, 6961 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- **B. No. 171** (Mr. Fielding). 1°, 7585; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 7786 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- Customs and Fisheries Protection B. No. 153** (Mr. Paterson). 1°, 6319; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 6962 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- DAGNEAU, J. T., POSTMASTER AT ROBITAILLE, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4246 (ii).
- DAGNAULT, Mr. R., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 4609 (ii).
- DAIRYING IN N.W.T., SUBSIDY; prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 504 (i).
- DAIRYING SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5994 (ii).
- DALHOUSIE WHARF EXTENSION, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7084 (ii).
- DANIS, MR., DISMISSAL FROM BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7203 (ii).
- DAUNAIS, C. M., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1928 (i).
- DART, LYMAN A., COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE, PETS. *re* &c: M. for copies* (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 3669 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 6641, 6653 (ii).
- Dawson City and Victoria Telegraph Co.'s B. No. 119** (Mr. Morrison) 1°, 3502; 2°, 3868 (i); in Com. and 3°, 5363 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 100.)
- Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s B. No. 118** (Mr. Morrison) 1°, 3502; 2°, 3868; ref. to Com., 3868 (i); 4805, 6939; in Com. and 3°, 7158 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 99.)

- Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. No. 123** (Mr. Morrison) 1°, 4247; ref. to Com. on Rys., 4387; 2°, 4606; in Com., 7158; 3°, 7163 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- DEAF AND DUMB MUTES, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. Douglas) 4345 (ii).
- PROVISION BY N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1930 (i).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL, 2ND REP. OF COM.: conc., 4246.
- OMISSION OF QUESTION FROM REP.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. McDougall) 3427 (i).
- OFFICIAL REPORTING AND PUBLISHING: Return presented (Mr. Speaker) 3924 (i).
- PUBLISHING: in Com. of Sup., 7011 (ii).
- DEER ISLAND TELEGRAPH CABLE, SURVEYS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4177 (ii).
- DEPTL. BUILDINGS, FIRE AT WEST BLOCK: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2347 (i).
- REMOVAL OF FACING WALL: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2528 (i).
- DEPUTY MINISTERS, RECOMMENDATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4899 (ii).
- DES JOACHIMS AND MACKIE'S STATION MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Poupore) 5135 (ii).
- Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. No. 90** (Mr. Sproule) 1°, 2241.
- DISMISSALS:
- ANDERSON, T. E., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT NAPANEE, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 6008 (ii).
- ANNAPOLIS AND NEW GLASGOW: in Com. of Sup., 5836 (i).
- BANFF, CAVE AND BASIN BATHS, CARETAKER: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 2841 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Davin) 451 (i).
- BEAR RIVER SHIPPING MASTER: M. for Ret. (Mr. Mills) 2840 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Mills) 1071 (i).
- BEATTIE, JOHN, INDIAN AGENT AT HIGHGATE: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (ii).
- BEATONVILLE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 3824 (i).
- BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7189, 7203 (ii)
- BOYER, TOUSSANT, LOCKMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3662 (i).
- REID, WM., BRIDGE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
- BECK, JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 5301 (ii).
- BELLEVILLE P. O.: Remarks (Mr. Corby) 6112 (ii).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., 6208 (ii).
- BENNETT, MR., MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 4869.
- BERNEY, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 5275 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 7687 (ii).
- BERRY, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 4952 (ii).
- BIRON, MR. N.: in Com. of Sup., 4994 (ii).
- BRIDGE TENDERS, MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 6553 (ii).
- BODDY, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 5275 (ii).
- CAMERON, A. F., CUSTOMS OFFICER; M. for Ret.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2840 (i).
- CAMERON, MR., FISHERY OVERSEER AT ST. PETER'S: in Com. of Sup., 5307 (ii).
- CAMERON AND LENOIR, FISHERY OFFICERS, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 5307, 7096 (ii).
- CAPE BRETON COUNTY: Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 6033 (ii).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. McDougall) 6321 (ii).

DISMISSALS—Con.

- CASSELMAN, MR., LOCKMASTER, MORRISBURG: in Com. of Sup., 7192 (ii).
- CHAPLEAU POSTMASTER, PATRICK LYNCH: Ques. (Mr. Poupore) 3088 (i).
- DAGNAULT, MR. R.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 4609 (ii).
- DAGNEAU, J. T., POSTMASTER AT ROBITAILLE, P. Q., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4246 (ii).
- DANIS, MR., BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7203 (ii).
- DISMISSALS AND APPNMTS. FROM 1878 TO 1879: M. for Ret. (Mr. Belcourt) 3665 (i).
- ON INDIAN RESERVES, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 7302 (ii).
- BY GOVT.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. McDougall) 5519, 5569 (ii).
- DOBBINS, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 6858 (ii).
- DUNDAS, MR.: Remarks (Mr. Montague) 6579 (ii).
- DUNLOP, JAMES: in Com. of Sup., 5278 (ii).
- ELGIN, N.B., POSTMASTER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McInerney) 1837 (i).
- FERGUSON, RODERICK, POSTMASTER AT LOWER L'ARDOISE: in Com. of Sup., 6707 (ii).
- M. for Cor. (Mr. Gillies) 3666 (i).
- FISHER, MR., MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 4872 (ii).
- FORREST, MR., DIRECTOR NAPPAN EXPERIMENTAL FARM, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (ii).
- GALBRAITH, THOS. J., CANAL OFFICER AT PORT COLBORNE: Ques. (Mr. Montague) 516 (i).
- GATIEN, LOUIS, POSTMASTER AT MARIEVILLE: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7685 (ii).
- GISBORNE, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 6316 (ii).
- GODROUT, ALBERT: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casgrain) 3664.
- GOFFETT, MR., POSTMASTER AT ORILLIA: in Com. of Sup., 6718 (ii).
- GOVT. OFFICIALS DISMISSED, 1878 TO 1879, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Belcourt) 4246 (ii).
- GRAND NARROWS, C.B., GOVT. BLACKSMITH: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3661 (i).
- GRAVENHURST P. O., CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 6716 (ii).
- HAGARVILLE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: Ques. (Mr. Samerville) 974 (i).
- HICKS, MR., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5275 (ii).
- HILLSBORO, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McLucney) 1838 (i).
- HOUDE, CHARLES E., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 7686 (ii).
- I. C. R., COLOURED PORTERS: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3405 (i).
- Remarks, 2852 (i).
- CAPE BRETON in Com. of Sup., 6414 (ii).
- HOAR, CHAS.: M. for Cor.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1838 (i).
- ISAAC'S HARBOUR POSTMASTER GRIFFIN: M. for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1834 (i).
- MCNEILL, RORY, SECTION FOREMAN: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 603 (i).
- POWLIE, A., CAR INSPECTOR, SPRINGHILL: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 1932 (i).
- STEWART, A.: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 2342 (i).
- JOHNSON, J. T., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT FORT ERIE: (Mr. McCleary) 4178 (ii).
- KELLY, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 5274 (ii).
- KILDARE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1575 (i).
- KING, W. A., STATION AGENT, ANTIGONISH: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7120 (ii).

DISMISSALS—Con.

- LACHINE CANAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Gillies) 4621 (ii).
- FRANCOIS CORBEIL: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2343 (i).
- M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 2840 (i).
- LEFAIVRE, XAVIER, LOCKMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3937 (i).
- LAMBERT, MARTIN, MONTAGUE, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 5787 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 5609 (ii).
- L'ANCIENNE-LORETTE, POSTMASTER ALAIN: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casgrain) 2821 (i).
- LOWER L'ARDOISE POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 6707 (ii).
- MARGAREE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR. DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 4181 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 5271 (ii).
- TELEGRAPH OPERATOR ROSS: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 2815 (i).
- MARCHILDON, THOS., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 4991 (ii).
- MATHESON, JOHN D., DISMISSAL FROM ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7207 (i).
- MILITARY COLLEGE EMPLOYEES, SUPPL. RETURN: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 6034 (ii).
- MACDONALD, A., POSTMASTER AT PEAKE'S STATION: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 4344 (ii).
- MCCALLUM, JOHN, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7686 (ii).
- MCKAY, KENNETH, LOCKMAN, ST. PETER'S CANAL: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1070 (i).
- MCLEOD, M. G., POSTAL MAIL CLERK, N.S.: M. for O.C.'s, &c. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4181 (ii).
- MCNEILL, MR., CARETAKER: in Com. of Sup., 5609.
- MC EACHREN, MR., NORTH SYDNEY: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (ii).
- MUNROE, MR., FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 5310 (ii).
- MONTAGUE, P.E.I., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: M. for Cor. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 2822 (i).
- MONTREAL CUSTOMS HOUSE, DISMISSALS, 1896 TO 1898, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Quinn) 3669 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE, DR. BAIN: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2349 (i).
- MURRAY CANAL BRIDGE TENDERS: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).
- NOEL, L. P. O., N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 6319.
- N. W. T. GOVT. OFFICIALS DISMISSED SINCE 1896, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davin) 4246 (ii).
- NORWOOD, H. H., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7120 (ii).
- ORTON, DR. GEO., INDIAN AGENT IN MAN.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sproule) 3669 (i).
- Remarks, 5393 (ii).
- PALMER, BENJAMIN, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 4981 (ii).
- PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, DISMISSAL OF LATE SUPT. ROBERTSON: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2818 (i).
- PICKETT, GEO. B.: in Com. of Sup., 4998 (ii).
- PORT MULGRAVE STATION AGENT: M. for Cor. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1832 (i).
- POSTAL MAIL CLERKS, N.S., REMOVAL, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3406 (i).
- POSTMASTERS DISMISSED SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 4609 (ii).
- REID, WM., BRIDGE TENDER, BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
- RESTIGOUCHE INDIAN AGENT, J. A. VENNOR: Ques. (Mr. McAlister) 4611 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

- Remarks, 1786 (i).
 — M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McAlister*) 2839 (i).
 RETURNS *re* DISMISSALS: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 5519.
 ROBERT, H. A., STRATFORD P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *MacLaren*) 4344 (ii).
 ROSS, DAVID, in Com. of Sup., 5270 (ii).
 STE. ANNE DE BRAUPRÉ POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1072 (i).
 STE. ANNE DE LA PARADE POSTMASTER: M. for O. Cs.* (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4678 (ii).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3313 (i).
 ST. CYPRIEN POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6007 (ii).
 ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7207 (ii).
 ST. TITE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3090 (i).
 SASKATCHEWAN INDIAN AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6854 (ii).
 SHANNON, THOS., CUSTOMS OFFICER, KILLARNEY: in Com. of Sup., 7365 (ii).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4770 (ii).
 SIMOND, R. H., I.C.R. EMPLOYEE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Powell*) 2840 (i).
 STELLARTON CAR INSPECTOR SUTHERLAND: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1833, 2839 (i).
 TENNANT, J. F., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, MAN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Quinn*) 3670 (i), 4182, 5206 (ii).
 VERGE, J. ALBERT, FISHERY OVERSEER: in Com. of Sup., 5304 (ii).
 WALTON, T. M., INDIAN AGENT AT PARRY ISLAND: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McCormack*) 3670 (i).
 WAVERLEY POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 598 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 7206 (ii).
 WELLAND CANAL EMPLOYEES, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Montague*) 2839 (i).
 WILLIAMS, W. W., POSTMASTER AT SEELEY'S BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3407, 3409, 3416 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 6701 (ii).
 — Ques. of Order: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 3424.
 WINSTANLEY, MR., MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 4866 (ii).
 WOOD, H. W., POSTMASTER AT WELSFORD, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (ii).
 WOOD, MR. W. F., INDIAN AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 7303 (ii).

DIVISIONS:

- AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS AND THE TARIFF: on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) to adjn Deb., agreed to (Y. 46, N. 14) 3207 (i).
 AUDITOR GENERAL, POWERS AND DUTIES: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) neg. (Y. 32, N. 49) 6207 (ii).
 BRUNEAU, MR., M.P. FOR RICHELIEU, RESIGNATION: on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, neg. (Y. 39, N. 79) 2239 (i).
 BUTTER INDUSTRY OF CAN., ENCOURAGEMENT OF: on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*), Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland*) to adjn. Deb., agreed to (Y. 80, N. 34) 2515 (i).
 CANADIAN YUKON RY. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*), Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to M. for 2°, neg. (Y. 65, N. 119) 1732 (i); M. (Mr. *Blair*) for 2°, agreed to (Y. 111, N. 72) 1733 (i).
 FRANCHISE ACT REPEAL B. 16: Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) neg. (Y. 48, N. 97) 2797 (i).
 KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) on Sen. Amts., neg. (Y. 41, N. 64) 3553 (i).

DIVISIONS—*Con.*

- LORD'S DAY, BETTER OBSERVANCE B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to recom., agreed to (Y. 64, N. 58) 2400; M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to restore to Order Paper, neg. (Y. 52, N. 93) 2428 (i).
 ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RY. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) neg. (Y. 16, N. 65) 2697.
 POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS, REDUCTION OF INTEREST: Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) neg. (Y. 40, N. 76) 3754 (i).
 PROCEDURE, QUES. OF, ON 3° OF BILL AFTER REPORTED FROM COM., DIVISION DEMANDED BY MEMBER: agreed to (Y. 56, N. 35) 2649 (i).
 RY. EMPLOYEES SAFETY B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) Amt. (Mr. *Casey*) to recom., neg. (Y. 21, N. 80) 5174 (i).
 • SONS OF ENGLAND BENEFIT SOCIETY'S Co.'s INCORP. B. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) M. for Com. agreed to (Y. 85, N. 14) 6063 (ii).
 Divorce (Augustus Baldwin Hart) B. No. 87 (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1*, 2*, 2841; in Com., and 3*, 3554 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 121.)
 Divorce (Edwin Heyward) B. No. 112 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1*, 3309; 2*, 3654 (i); in Com. and 3° on div., 4175 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 122.)
 Divorce (James Pearson) B. No. 147 (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1*, 5867; 2*, 5885, 5906; in Com. and 3*, 6266 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 123.)
 DOBBIN, MR., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 6858 (ii).
 DOM. ARTILLERY ASSOCIATION (GRANT): in Com. of Sup., 7521 (ii).
 Dom. Atlantic Ry, Co.'s B. No. 162 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1*, 2*, in Com. and 3*, 6962 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 8.)
 Dom. Building and Loan Association Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1*, 970; 2*, 1214; in Com. and 3*, 2559 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 101.)
 DOM. CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 6570, 7075 (ii).
 DOM. GENERAL ELECTIONS (1896) COST, &C., OF PROSECUTIONS IN MAN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Roche*) 2841 (i).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 130 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°, 4679; 2°, and in Com., 5937; 3°, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 31).
 DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6858, 7307 (ii).
 DOM. LANDS, TENBY, MAN., APPOINTMENT OF SUB-AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3087 (i).
 DOMINION LOAN (1897) APPLICATION BY BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4177 (ii).
 DOMINION NOTES, PRINTING AND ENGRAVING: in Com. of Sup., 3829 (i).
 DOMINION POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 7488 (ii).
 DOMVILLE, LT. COL., M.P., CHARGES AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 5393 (ii).
 DONALDSON, S. J., IMMIGRATION AGENT, N.W.T., AMOUNTS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 4176 (ii).
 DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 6676.
 DOUBLE HILL (P.E.I.), P. O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1931 (i).

- DOUCET'S LANDING, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 7639 (ii).
- Drainage across Railway Co.'s Lands B. No. 5** (Mr. Casey) 1^o, 185 ; 2^o m., 2055 (i).
- DREDGES, BUILDING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5050, 6072, 6081, 7226 (ii).
- DREDGING, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 6099 (ii).
- GENERAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 6099 (ii).
- MAN. : in Com. of Sup., 6099 (ii).
- MARITIME PROVINCES : in Com. of Sup., 6082.
- ONT. AND QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 6087 (ii).
- TORONTO HARBOUR EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 482 (i).
- IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNTS PAID W. E. PHIN : Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 1337 (i).
- CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4771 (ii).
- LIABILITY INCURRED : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 971.
- DREDGING GOLD LEASES, APPLICATIONS, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1838 (i).
- GOLD PERMITS IN PEACE RIVER : Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 478 (i).
- GOLD LEASES, ISSUED TO J. A. MERCIER : Ques. (Mr. Maxwell) 1934 (i).
- MILES OF RIVER LEASED : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1934 (i).
- AND MINING LICENSES : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 3774 (ii).
- REGULATIONS RESPECTING : Remarks (Mr. Davin) 746 (i).
- DROLET, CHEVALIER, MINING CONCESSIONS : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 671 (i) 4924 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1073 (i).
- M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davin) 2839 (i).
- Explanation (Mr. Sifton) 831 (i).
- DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., COMMITTEE OF INVESTIGATION : prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 506 (i).
- 1ST REP. OF COM. : Presented (Mr. Lister) 1272.
- 2ND REP. OF COM. : Presented (Mr. Lister) 6580 ; conc., 7113 (ii).
- M. TO PRINT EVIDENCE AND REPORT : (Mr. Lister) 6580 (ii).
- M. TO WITHDRW. : (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7523-4.
- G. T. R. AGREEMENT : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3317 (i).
- REMOURED NEW ARRANGEMENTS : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2699 (i).
- THROUGH TRAFFIC : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 472 (i).
- See "I.C.R. Extension to Montreal."
- DUNDAS, MR., DISMISSAL BY GOVT : Remarks (Mr. Lauderkin) 6578 (ii).
- DUNLOP, JAMES : in Com. of Sup., 5278 (ii).
- DUPONT, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASED : Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1773 (i).
- EAST RAGGED ISLAND WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5618.
- ECLIPSE FILES : in Com. of Sup., 4584 (ii).
- Edmonton and Peace River Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. No. 98** (Mr. MacPherson) 1^o*, 2430 ; 2^o*, 2560 (i) ; withdn., 4922 (ii).
- Edmonton District Ry. Co.'s B. No. 54** (Mr. Oliver) 1^o*, 1379 ; 2^o*, 1509 ; in Com. and 3^o*, 3656 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 63.)
- EDMONTON BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 6245, 6268 ; conc., 7822 (ii).
- CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1341 (i).
- M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davin) 1838 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 4773 (ii).
- FREIGHT RATES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 6010.
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 3827 (i).
- remarks (Mr. Davin) 2528 (i).
- PENALTIES TO CONTRACTORS : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 5316 (ii).
- EDWARDS, DR. O. C., INDIAN MEDICAL OFFICER, APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. Davin) 4607.
- ELEVATOR MONOPOLY, MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. Rutherford) 598 (i).
- ELGIN, EAST AND WEST, INVESTIGATION INTO CHARGES AGAINST FISHERY OVERSEERS : in Com. of Sup., 5289 (ii).
- ELGIN, N.B., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : M. for Cor. (Mr. McInerney) 1837 (i).
- ELKHORN (MAN.), POSTMASTER, APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. Roche) 4771 (ii).
- ENGINEERS, &c., PUBLIC BUILDINGS, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5607 (ii).
- ESTIMATES, THE, 1898-99 : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2698 (i).
- Suppl., 5663, 7378 (ii).
- AND BUDGET SPEECH : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1935.
- EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN RY., SETTLEMENT BETWEEN GOVT. AND E. B. CHANDLER : M. for Ret.* (Mr. McInerney) 2841 (i).
- EXCHEQUER COURT, TRAVELLING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6639 (ii).
- EXCISE : in Com. of Sup., 6000 (ii).
- PREVENTIVE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 7243.
- EXPERIMENTAL FARMS : in Com. of Sup., 5972 (ii).
- LABORATORY : in Com. of Sup., 5495 (ii).
- DISTRIBUTION OF BULLETINS : Remarks (Mr. Montague) 2454 (i).
- EXTRA ALLOWANCE TO CIVIL SERVICE CLERKS : in Com. of Sup., 7484 (ii).
- FARM BULLETINS AND REPORTS : in Com. of Sup., 5991 (ii).
- FARRANS POINT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 6532 (ii).
- FASCINE FISHERY, CHARLEVOIX COUNTY : in Com. of Sup., 5298 (ii).
- Federal Life Assurance Co. of Ont., Change of Name B. No. 29** (Mr. MacPherson) 1^o*, 902 ; 2^o*, 1017 ; in Com. and 3^o*, 2559 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 103.)
- FENCE ON INDIAN RESERVE, ANTIGONISH COUNTY : in Com. of Sup., 7294 (ii).
- FERGUSON, RODERICK, POSTMASTER LOWER ARDOISE, DISMISSAL : in Com. of Sup., 6707 (ii).
- FINANCE :
- ARBITRATION, DOMINION AND ONTARIO AND QUEBEC ACCOUNTS : in Com. of Sup., 6851 (ii).
- AUDITOR GENERAL, POWERS AND DUTIES : Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Foster) 6202 (ii).
- REP. : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 397 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*

- BELGIAN AND GERMAN TREATIES, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7088 (ii).
 BINDER TWINE *re* IMPOSITION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 455 (i).
 CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (i) 6976 (ii).
 DOMINION LOAN (1897) APPLICATION BY BANKS: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4177 (ii).
 DOMINION NOTES, PRINTING AND ENGRAVING: in Com. of Sup., 3829 (i) 6976 (ii).
 FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4554 (ii).
 ——— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4587 (ii).
 IMPORTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN AND U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 3936 (ii).
 INDIA RUBBER BOOTS AND SHOES: in Com. of Sup., 7583 (ii).
 INSURANCE COMPANIES, CHANGES OF LAW GOVERNING: M. (Mr. Broder) 5136 (ii).
 INTEREST PAID ONTARIO AND QUEBEC, 1897: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 455 (i).
 LIQUOR TRAFFIC COMMISSION, AMOUNT DUE "HANSARD" REPORTERS: in Com. of Sup., 7093 (ii).
 LOANS TO PUBLIC WORKS, DUE THE DOMINION: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Dobell) 6239 (ii).
 MINT, GOVERNMENT ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1340 (i).
 "PARLIAMENTARY COMPANION," PURCHASE OF COPIES BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 6975 (ii).
 P. E. I. AND CANADIAN GOVT., OUTSTANDING DISPUTES: M. for O. C's.* (Mr. Martin) 3669 (i).
 RECIPROCAL TARIFF CLAUSE, AMOUNTS, REFUNDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4175 (ii).
 RUBBER GOODS, TARIFF RESPECTING: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Osler) 6637 (ii).
 SAVINGS BANKS: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (i).
 ——— P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4581 (ii).
 SHIRT AND COLLAR INDUSTRY: M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. Monk) 6583 (ii).
 SUGAR: in Com. of Ways and Means, 7585 (ii).
 SUPPLY: Res. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 449 (i).
 ——— See general heading.
 TREASURY BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS, NON-PRODUCTION OF RETURN: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1077 (i).
 WAYS AND MEANS: Res. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 449 (i).
 (See "Customs," "Trade and Commerce," &c.)

FISHER, MR., MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 4872.

FISHERIES:

- APPEAL TO PRIVY COUNCIL, LEGAL EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7285 (ii).
 ——— Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3825 (i).
 ATLANTIC FISHERIES, U.S. LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. Russell) 1272 (i).
 BIOLOGICAL STATION, GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 7733 (ii).
 BODDY, A., APPOINT. AS FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3657 (i).
 BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, APPLICATION AT GABARUS: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 674 (i).
 DISMISSALS. See general heading.
 FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 5003, 7285 (ii).
 FISHING LICENSES, AMOUNT PAID BY LAKE ERIE FISHERMEN: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 601 (i).
 HICKS, WM., APPOINT. AS FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3658 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

- LOBSTER FISHERY IN BAY OF FUNDY: Ques. (Mr. Copp) 479 (i).
 ——— PACKING, SIZE OF CATCH: Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 1340 (i).
 METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7285 (ii).
 NOBLE BROTHERS, ACTION BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 5268 (ii).
 ——— PAYMENTS TO, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 5133 (ii).
 OVERSEERS IN C. B., DISMISSALS: in Com. of Sup., 5277 (ii).
 OVERSEERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5004 (ii).
 OYSTER FISHERIES, LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Yeo) 1775 (i).
 PROTECTION SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4948, 5268 (ii).
 ROSS, DAVID, FISHERY OVERSEER, MARGAREE: M. for Ret.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1837 (i).
 [See "MARINE."]
 Fishermen's Safety B. No. 111 (Sir Louis Davies) 1^o, 2^o and in Com., 4778; 3^o*, 4930 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 44.)
 Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 127 (Sir Louis Davies) 1^o, 4522; 2^o and in Com., 4946; 3^o*, 4947 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 39.)
 ——— No. 166 (Sir Louis Davies) 1^o, 7115; 2^o in Com. and 3^o*, 7470 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 40.)
 FORREST, MR., DIRECTOR NAPPAN EXPERIMENTAL FARM (N.S.), DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5983.
 Foresters, Ancient Order of, B. No. 113 (Mr. Landerkin). 1^o, 3164; 2^o*, 3656 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 5569 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 91.)
 Franchise Act Repeal B. No. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1^o, 308; 2^o m., 2270, 2532, 2567, 2703; agreed to (Y. 97, N. 48) 2799; M. for Com., 2930; in Com., 2941, 2969 (i), 3942, 4042, 4074, 4254, 4354, 4387, 4453, 4523, 5259; 3^o m., 5664; 3^o, 5709; Sen. Amts., 6467, 7527, 7553, 7792; 3^o, 5709 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 14.)
 Deb. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2270; (Sir Charles Tupper) 2274; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2279; (Mr. Wood, Brockville), 2290; (Mr. Sproule) 2296; (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), 2301; (Mr. Craig) 2309; (Mr. McMullen) 2314; (Mr. Bennett) 2321; (Mr. Flint) 2334; (Mr. Mills) 2533; (Mr. McNeill) 2557; (Mr. McClure) 2571; (Mr. Roche) 2580; (Mr. Heyd) 2587; (Mr. Rutherford) 2593; (Mr. Moore) 2601; (Mr. Bourassa) 2703; (Mr. Clancy) 2708; (Mr. Cusey) 2720; (Mr. Poupore) 2726; (Mr. Rogers) 2729; (Mr. Stenson) 2732; (Mr. Powell) 2737 (i).
 Amt. (Mr. Powell) 2740:
 Deb. (Mr. Martin) 2741; (Mr. Britton) 2744; (Mr. Hughes) 2748; (Mr. Maclean) 2751; (Mr. McCleary) 2753; (Mr. Henderson) 2757; (Mr. Gillies) 2760; (Mr. Ross Robertson) 2768; (Mr. Davin) 2768; (Mr. Wallace) 2776; (Mr. Legris) 2782; (Mr. Chauvin) 2785; (Mr. Fielding) 2787; (Mr. Mills) 2792; (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2793; (Mr. McNeill) 2794; (Mr. McIsaac) 2795; Amt. Neg. (Y. 48, N. 97) 2797 (i).
 In Com.:
 Deb. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2930 (i), 4045, 4418 (ii); (Mr. Mills) 2933 (i), 3983, 4065, 4255, 4260, 4313, 4411, 4454 (ii); (Mr. Bennett) 2941, 2969, 2978 (i), 4068, 4083, 4093, 4141, 4152, 4254, 4453, 4468, 4492, 5262; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2946, 2971, 2984 (i), 3942, 4067, 4075, 4083, 4097, 4254, 4366, 4454, 4484, 4523; (Mr. McMillan) 2947, 2975; (Mr. McHugh) 2948 (i), 4460 (ii); (Mr. Burnett) 2947, 2953;

Franchise Act Repeal B. No. 16—Con.

In Com.—Con.

(Mr. Campbell) 2952; (Mr. Heyd) 2954; (Mr. Bergeron) 2971; (Sir Charles Tupper) 2971, 2995 (i), 3964, 3968, 4058, 4069, 4122, 5261 (ii); (Mr. Clancy) 2971, 2981 (i), 3942, 4115, 4338, 4486, 4503 (ii); (Sir Louis Davies) 2972, 2993 (i), 4082, 4109, 4388, 4409, 4477, 4508; (Mr. Wallace) 2972, 2988, 3005 (i), 4318, 4457; (Mr. Taylor) 2973, 2979 (i), 4110, 4445 (ii); (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 2974; (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 2978-2982; (Mr. Powell) 2983; (Mr. Blair) 2985 (i), 4078, 4091, 4122, 4128, 4256, 4470 (ii); (Mr. Quinn) 2986 (i), 3948, 4286, 4462, 4501 (ii); (Mr. Bell, Addington) 2987; (Mr. Pope) 2989; (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2990 (i) 4383, 4419, 4476 (ii); (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2992 (i) 4256, 4269, 4353, 4432, 4462, 5260 (ii); (Mr. Erb) 2993; (Mr. Davin) 2996 (i), 4016, 4282, 4354, 4483, 4492 (ii); (Mr. Hughes) 3003; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3010; (Mr. Ingram) 3010 (i); 4417, 4442, 4456, 4477, 4487, 5261 (ii); (Mr. Belcourt) 4057, 4373; (Mr. Britton) 4095, 4504; (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 4274; (Sir Adolphe Caron) 3947, 4469; (Mr. Charlton) 3949, 4277; (Mr. Clarke) 4500, 5262; (Mr. Cochrane) 4023; (Mr. Costigan) 4265; (Mr. El'ie) 4077, 4474; (Mr. Fielding) 3964, 4270; (Mr. Flint) 4021; (Mr. Foster) 3979, 3996, 4097, 4136, 4255, 4296, 4403, 4476, 5260; (Mr. Fraser, Guysboro') 5263; (Mr. Gilvie) 3960, 4438, 4488; (Mr. Haggart) 4057, 4289, 4384, 4457, 4480; (Mr. Henderson) 5412; (Mr. La Rivière) 4084, 4093, 4115, 4295, 4467, 4494, 5262; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3967, 3979, 4008, 4069, 4098, 4308, 4406; (Mr. Lister) 3948; (Mr. Maclean) 3949; (Mr. McAlister) 3966, 4486; (Mr. McCarthy) 4405; (Mr. McClure) 3962, 4398; (Mr. McDougall) 4026, 4042, 4080, 4103, 4270, 4293, 4401, 4416, 4454, 4487; (Mr. McInerney) 3990, 4074, 4084, 4100, 4133, 4254, 4266, 4374, 4377, 4473, 4525; (Mr. McLennan) 3986, 4413, 4492; (Mr. McNeill) 3957, 4283, 4375, 4396; (Mr. Martin) 3943 (ii) (Mr. Monk) 3908 (i) 4050, 4151, 4463, 4500; (Mr. Montague) 4258, 4294, 4387, 4416, 4456, 4495, 4524; (Mr. Mulock) 3959; (Mr. Paterson) 4322, 4386, 4424, 4468, 5264; (Mr. Roche) 4144; (Mr. Russell) 3962, 3976, 4046, 4062, 4434; (Mr. Rutherford) 4150; (Mr. Sifton) 4127, 4139; (Mr. Somerville) 4325; (Mr. Sproule) 4118, 4375, 4455; (Mr. Wilson) 5263; (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 4044 (ii).

FRANCHISE ACT REPEAL B. 16 (Mr. Fitzpatrick),
FRENCH TRANSLATION AND PRINTING OF SCHEDULES : Remarks (Mr. Casgrain) 2434 (i).

— **DISTRIBUTION OF PRINTED COPIES :** Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7854 (ii).

FRASER RIVER (B.C.) IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 6065 (ii).

FREELAND, MR., FISHERY OVERSEER, CHARGES AGAINST : in Com. of Sup., 5290 (ii).

Freight Rates. See "Railways."

FRENCH LANGUAGE IN N.W.T., ARTICLE in L'Ouest Canadien : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 2529 (i).

FRENCH LINE OF STEAMERS, NEGOTIATIONS : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6465 (ii).

FRENCH TRANSLATION AND PRINTING : Remarks (Mr. Casgrain) 3091 (i).

FRIGON, A., INDEMNITY FOR INJURY : M. for Rep.* (Mr. Casgrain) 3668 (i).

GABARUS BREAKWATER, GRANTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 4179 (ii).

GALBRAITH, THOS. J., CANAL OFFICER AT PORT COLBORNE, RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. Montague) 516.
GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6819 (ii).

— **IN CANADA :** Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 6109 (ii).

— **PAR. IN North-Wester, re TREATMENT BY GOVT. :** Remarks (Mr. Davin) 6032 (ii).

— **REPORT re DESTITUTION :** Remarks (Mr. Davin) 101 (i).

GALOPS CANAL, CLAIMS FOR EXPROPRIATION OF LAND : in Com. of Sup., 7650 (ii).

— **PURCHASE OF LAND, &c. :** M. for Ret.* (Mr. Broder) 3668 (i).

— **STRAIGHTENING, &c. :** in Com. of Sup., 6538.

GANANOQUE CUSTOMS HOUSE : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4923 (ii).

GANANOQUE DRILL SHED : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 3318, 3826 (i).

— **M. FOR RET. :** Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 3826 (i).

— **LETTERS OF LT.-GOV. PATERSON :** LAID ON TABLE (Mr. Borden, King's) 5316 (ii).

— **M. (Mr. Taylor) to Adjn.,** 5098 (ii).

— **REMOVAL AND NEW SITE :** M. for Cor.* (Mr. Taylor) 1837 (i).

— **Ques. (Mr. Taylor)** 457 (i).

GASCOIGNE, MAJ.-GEN., MILITIA COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3825 (i).

— **RESIGNATION :** Remarks (Sir Adolphe Caron) 4167 (ii).

— **LETTER READ (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)** 6320 (ii).

— **Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster)** 6464 (ii).

Gas Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 73 (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) 1^o, 1744; 2^o* and in Com., 2138; 3^o* 2138 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 26.)

GASPÉ BASIN AND DALHOUSIE MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).

— **AND QUEBEC MAIL SUBSIDY :** in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).

— **LINE OF STEAMERS, SUBSIDY :** Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7120 (ii).

— **STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH QUEBEC, SUBSIDY :** Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7685 (ii).

GATIEN, LOUIS, DISMISSAL BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7685 (ii).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 85 (Mr. Penny) 1^o, 2035; M. to withdrw. B., 2606 (i).

— **B. No. 128 (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière)** 1^o*, 4522; 2^o, and in Com., 5966; 3^o*, 5972 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 25.)

Geological Survey Dept. B. No. 114 (Mr. Sifton) 1^o, 3404 (i); 2^o, and in Com., 4776; 3^o*, 4777 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 18.)

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 4559, 7477 (ii).

— **YUKON DISTRICT SURVEYS :** in Com. of Sup., 7754 (ii).

GEORGIAN BAY TIMBER DISTRICTS, OUTPUT OF LOGS TO MICHIGAN : Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 825 (i).

— **Ruling (Mr. Speaker)** 826 (i).

GISBORNE, MR., DISMISSAL BY GOVT. : in Com. of Sup., 6316 (ii).

— **Ques. (Mr. Davin)** 5317 (ii).

- GLADSTONE, RT. HON. W. E., REPORT OF DEATH :
Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 4347 (ii).
- DECEASE OF : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5868 (ii).
- RES. OF CONDOLENCE : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6115 (ii).
- GODBOUT, ALBERT, DISMISSAL : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cusgrain*) 3664 (i).
- GODERICH HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 6087 (ii).
- GOLDEN, B.C., AND ST. EUGENE MAIL CARRIER :
M. for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2824 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2816 (i).
- GOLD PLACER MINING IN N.W.T. AND YUKON : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).
- GOFFETT, POSTMASTER AT ORILLIA, CHARGES AGAINST :
in Com. of Sup., 6718 (ii).
- GOVERNOR GEN.'S SEC.'S OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 3830 (i) 4581, 6978 (ii).
- GOVERNOR GEN. AND MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 253 (i).
- GOVT. BUSINESS. See "Business of the House."
- CONTRACTS, PROHIBITION OF SWEATING : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 599 (i).
- EMPLOYEES AND COMMISSIONERS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1837 (i).
- Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. No. 38** (Sir *Louis Davies*). 1°, 926; 2° and in Com., 1863; 3°, 1869 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
- **B. No. 135** (Sir *Louis Davies*). 1°, 4922; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 5325 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- GOVT. HOUSE, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 5491, 6857.
- OFFICIALS DISMISSED FROM 1878 TO 1879, NAMES, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Belcourt*) 4246 (ii).
- STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).
- TOLLS ON WHARFS : Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 4351 (ii).
- GRAIN LIENS, MAN. AND N. W. T., LEGISLATION :
Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1930 (i).
- STANDARDS : in Com. of Sup., 6695 (ii).
- INSPECTION SYSTEM : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780.
- TRADE AT FORT WILLIAM : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 475 (i).
- TRANSPORT BY C.P.R. AND ELEVATOR CO. OF MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 483 (i).
- GRAND ETANG DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 6083 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 5317 (ii).
- GRAND NARROWS, DISMISSAL OF GOVT. BLACKSMITH : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3661 (i).
- PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DUTIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1781 (i).
- I.C.R. RESTAURANT : in Com. of Sup., 6428 (ii).
- GRAND RIVER FLOODS : M. (Mr. *Montague*) to Adjn., 2526 (i).
- WHARF, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5648.
- Great Commonwealth Development and Mining Co.'s B. No. 95** (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°, 2430; 2°, 2560 (i); withdn., 6227 (ii).
- Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 141** (Mr. *Morrison*). 1°, 5518; M. for 2°, 5930; 2° and ref. to Com. on Rys., 5965, 6001; in Com., 7456, 7733, 7787; 3°, 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- G. T. R. AND C. P. R. CONNECTION AT NORTH BAY :
Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 4353 (ii).
- O. A. AND P. S. RY. AND C. P. R., CONNECTION AT SCOTIA JUNCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 454 (i).
- G. T. R. REGULATIONS : M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to Adjn., 6013 (ii).
- GRATUITIES TO RETIRED MILITIA OFFICERS : in Com. of Sup., 6573 (ii).
- GRAVENHURST POST OFFICE (ONT.) APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5320 (ii).
- CHARGES AGAINST : in Com. of Sup., 6716 (ii).
- GREEN HOUSE, OTTAWA GROUNDS : in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).
- AMT. (Mr. *Montague*) TO REDUCE VOTE : Neg. (Y. 26; N. 31) 5481 (ii).
- GRENVILLE CANAL ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 6552 (ii).
- HAGARVILLE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, DEFALCATION :
Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 974 (i).
- HALIFAX BANKING CO. AND NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RY. CO. : in Com. of Sup., 7807 (ii)
- HALIFAX DRILL SHED : in Com. of Sup., 5071, 7586.
- HALIFAX, ST. JOHN AND YARMOUTH MAIL SUBSIDY :
in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).
- HALSTEAD, MR. FREEMAN, SENTENCED AT PORTO RICO, PAR. IN TORONTO *World* : Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 6028 (ii).
- Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s B. No. 100** (Mr. *MacPherson*). 1°, 2430; 2°, 2560; in Com., and 3°, 3554 (i); Sen. Amts., 4606 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 104.)
- HANSARD, COST FROM 1890 TO 1897 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ellis*) 505 (i).
- REPORTERS, AMOUNT DUE FROM COMMISSION ON LIQUOR TRAFFIC : in Com. of Sup., 7093 (ii).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 6064.
- GENERALLY : in Com. of Sup., 6066 (ii).
- MAR. PROVS. : in Com. of Sup., 5642 (ii).
- N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 5612, 7589 (ii).
- ONT. : in Com. of Sup., 5067, 5886 (ii).
- P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 5630 (ii).
- QUE. : in Com. of Sup., 5050 (ii).
- HARRIS, W. C., PAYMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES : in Com. of Sup., 7243 (ii).
- HAWAIIAN VESSELS, NAVIGATING CANADIAN WATERS :
Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 603 (i).
- HEATING, DOM. BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 5608.
- HICKS, WM., APPNMT. AS FISHERY OVERSEER : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3658 (i).
- DISMISSAL : in Com. of Sup., 5275 (ii).
- HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 4560, 4561, 4575 (ii).
- HILLSBORO', CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McInerney*) 1838 (i).

HOGAN AND ONDERDONK, SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6510 (ii).

Holidays Act Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. Penny). 1°, 270 (i).

HONEY LOCUST PLANT AND SAN JOSÉ SCALE ACT: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. MacLaren) 6965 (ii).

HORSES FOR FEEDING, LICENSES BY FARMERS: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 2343 (i).

HOUE, CHAS. E., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 7686 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ADDRESS TO HIS EX., CONSDN.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4 (i).

— REPLY, MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 936 (i).

— DEPARTURE OF HIS EX. FROM CANADA: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7379 (ii).

ADJOURNMENT FOR ASH WEDNESDAY (M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 903 (i).

— EASTER: M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3095 (i).

— Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2929 (i).

— Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2848 (i).

— QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5930 (ii).

BAGOT, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4350, 4449, 4602 (ii).

— (Mr. Speaker) 3924 (i).

— Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 4927 (ii).

— NOTIFICATION (Mr. Bergeron) 3825 (i).

— Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 3825 (i).

— VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4772 (ii).

BILLS, FRENCH TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 3084 (i).

— PRESENTATION, REMARKS AS TO SECONDEES: (Mr. Speaker) 671 (i).

— Royal Assent, 2089 (i).

BRANDON ELECTORAL DISTRICT, MR. MCCARTHY'S CANDIDATURE: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 4610 (ii).

BRUNEAU, MR., M.P. FOR RICHELIEU, ALLEGED RESIGNATION: prop. Res., (Mr. Marcotte) 2037; Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2038, 2083; (Sir Charles Tupper) 2038 (i).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 6109, 6237, 6329 (ii).

— MOTIONS FOR RETURNS: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2820 (i).

— PRECEDENCE: Notices of M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1840 (i).

— MONDAYS: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5012 (ii).

— MONDAYS, WEDNESDAYS AND THURSDAYS, TUESDAYS AND FRIDAYS: Notices of M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1840 (i).

— THURSDAYS: Notice of M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2521 (i).

— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3821 (i) 5787, 5937, 5115, 5885, 6029, 7525 (ii).

— SITTINGS OF COMMITTEES: Remarks (Mr. Sutherland) 6227, 6318 (ii).

— SITTINGS OF THE HSE.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6862 (ii).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' REP.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL: in Com. of Sup., 7011 (ii).

— OMISSION OF QUESTION FROM HANSARD: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. McDougall) 3425 (i).

— REPORTING AND PUBLISHING, COST, &c., RET.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 3924 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—Con.

DISMISSALS BY GOVT.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. McDougall) 5519, 5569 (ii).

GLADSTONE, RT. HON. W. E., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 5868 (ii).

— RESOLUTION OF CONDOLENCE: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6115 (ii).

GOVT. BUSINESS, TWO SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE; Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6013 (ii).

— CHANGE OF PROCEDURE ON ORDER PAPER: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3502 (i).

HANSARD, COST FROM 1890 TO 1897: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ellis) 505 (i).

HURON, WEST, AND SIMCOE VACANCIES: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7042 (ii).

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, MESSAGE FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 405 (i).

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 405, 936, 1466, 2698 (i), 5663, 6439, 7378 (ii).

LALONDE, MESSENGER AND PROVINCIAL ELECTION IN RUSSELL COUNTY: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) 909 (i).

LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 5999, 6990, 7011, 7504, 7782 (ii).

LIBRARY OF PARLT., JOINT COM.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 671 (i).

— REP. PRESENTED (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i).

LORD'S DAY, BETTER OBSERVANCE B. 2, SECTION BEFORE CHAIR: Remarks (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 2041 (i).

MCCARTHY, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASED: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5389 (ii).

MCLELLAN, D., MEMBER FOR WEST PRINCE, P. E. I.: Introduced, 4347 (ii).

MANITOBA CLAIMS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. LaRivière) 1030 (i).

— UNIVERSITY LAND GRANT: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. LaRivière) 5571 (ii).

MEMBERS ASKING QUESTION: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 2433 (i).

— CALLED TO ORDER (Mr. Speaker) 437, 613 (i); 4158, 7606 (ii).

— INTRODUCED: 3, 370 (i); 4347 (ii).

— NEW: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

— REMARKS CHECKED, 444, 446, 5013, 5324, 6326, 6320, 6578 (ii).

— REQUESTED TO WITHDRAW. REMARKS (Mr. Speaker) 68, 71 (i).

— SESSIONAL TRUNKS: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Gibson) 7047 (ii).

MOTION, NOTICE OF (Mr. Hughes): Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6027 (ii).

NANAIMO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, REPORTED RESIGNATION OF MEMBER: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4605 (ii).

ORDER, QUESTION OF, ON CHAIRMAN'S RULING (Mr. Casey) 71 (i).

— WILLIAMS, W. W., DISMISSAL (Mr. Speaker) 3424 (i).

PARLIAMENT, OPENING: Mess. by Black Rod 1 (i).

— PROROGATION, COMMUNICATION FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7818 (ii).

PERRY, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASED: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 937 (i).

PRIVATE BILLS, PETS.: M. (Mr. Scriver) 970 (i).

— LEGISLATION: M. to Proceed (Mr. Belcourt) 7466 (ii).

— M. (Mr. Sutherland) 7042 (ii).

— ORDER OF PROCEDURE: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7586 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

- PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Witness* (Mr. *Craig*) 3503 (i).
- PRESS REPRESENTATIVES AND MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 5118 (ii).
- STIMULANTS IN CHAMBER DURING DEBATE: Explanation (Mr. *Talbot*) 3637 (i).
- PROCEDURE, QUES. OF, ON 3^d OF BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 2647; Ruling, 2650; Stmt. read, 3095.
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., ORGANIZATION: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2517, 2528 (i).
- QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 459 (i).
- RULED OUT OF ORDER (Mr. *Speaker*) 602 (i).
- RETURNS, INQUIRY FOR, 5931 (ii).
- (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3713 (i); 4348 (ii).
- (Mr. *Davis*) 4774 (ii).
- (Mr. *Foster*) 6028 (ii).
- (Mr. *Gillies*) 5923 (ii).
- (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1030 (i); 5571 (ii).
- (Mr. *McDougall*) 5930, 5931 (ii).
- (Mr. *Martin*) 3427 (i); 7526 (ii).
- (Mr. *Mills*) 5321 (ii).
- (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4348, 4028 (ii).
- (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5571 (ii).
- ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2089 (i).
- SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND MINING CO.'S PET. REF. TO STANDING ORDERS: M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3924 (i).
- SESSIONAL AND EXTRA CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 5999, 6090, 7011 (ii).
- INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 7382 (ii).
- SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6862 (ii).
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
- TRUNKS FOR MEMBERS: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Gibson*) 7047 (ii).
- VACANCIES: Notifications (Mr. *Speaker*) 2, 1079 (i).
- VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, RECORD OF VOTE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) 2850 (i).
- WEST PRINCE, P. E. I., VACANCY, APPNMT. OF RET. OFFICER: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1481; (Mr. *Montague*) 2040 (i).
- ISSUE OF WRIT: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1173 (i).
- Notification (Mr. *Macdonald, P. E. I.*) 1079 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2241 (i).
- WARRANTS FOR WRITS OF ELECTIONS: (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
- HUBERT, MISS, PET. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 7525.
- Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. *Oliver*). 1st*, 743; 2nd*, 824; in Com. and 3rd*, 2122 (i). (61-62 *Vie., c. 65.*)
- HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION, COM. WAKEHAM'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1934 (i).
- JAMES FISHER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2349.
- PRINTING REPS.: in Com. of Sup., 7092 (ii).
- REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 603 (i).
- REP. AS TO NAVIGABILITY: Ques. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 975 (i).
- HURON, WEST, AND SIMCOE VACANCIES: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 7042 (ii).
- HUSSARS, 8TH, CHARGES AGAINST COLONEL: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6031 (ii).

- HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 5000 (ii).
- ILLINOIS NATIONAL GUARDS, PERMISSION TO ENTER CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 599 (i).
- IMMIGRATION:
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6690 (ii).
- DONALDSON, S. J., IMMIGRATION AGENT, N. W. T. AMOUNTS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 4176 (ii).
- GALICIAN SETTLERS IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 6109 (ii).
- N. W. T., REP. *re* DESTITUTION: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 101 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 6819 (ii).
- PAR. IN *Nor' Wester re* TREATMENT BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6032 (ii).
- IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6819, 7287 (ii).
- IMMIGRATION AGENTS SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6819, 7287, 7744 (ii).
- BUILDINGS, DOM., REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5611 (ii).
- IMMIGRANTS, FOREIGN, SETTLED IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 6109 (ii).
- IMMIGRATION LITERATURE: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6581 (ii).
- WOMEN DOMESTICS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3369 (i).
- JAPANESE, IMPOSITION OF POLL TAX: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 2441; (Mr. *McInnes*) 2528 (i).
- JONES, CHARLES A., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4607 (ii).
- N. W. T. AND HAND BOOK: M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Adjn., 5932 (ii).
- RANKIN, MR., IMMIGRATION AGENT IN KANSAS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1779 (i).
- [See "AGRICULTURE, SUPPLY," &c.]
- IMPERIAL ARMY SOLDIERS AT TORONTO: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 4523 (ii).
- IMPORTS, DUTIABLE, AND AMOUNT COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 600 (i).
- FROM G. B. AND U. S.: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 3936 (ii).
- INDIANS:
- ABENAKIS INDIANS, ST. FRANCIS AGENCY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3408 (i).
- BATTLEFORD INDIAN AGENCY, DEATH OF CATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2844 (i).
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1574 (i).
- DISTRIBUTION OF SEED, ASSINIBOIA RESERVE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 4678 (ii).
- EDWARDS, DR. O. C., INDIAN MEDICAL OFFICER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 4607.
- ERECTION OF FENCE ON INDIAN RESERVE, ANTIGONISH COUNTY: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (ii).
- INDIAN AFFAIRS, MAN. AND N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 6854 (ii).
- INDIAN DEPT., LAW CLERK, APPNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7654, 7658 (ii).
- INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 4553, 4585, 6848, 7291 (ii).
- INDIAN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, DUCK LAKE, N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2346 (i).
- INSPECTORS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7303 (ii).
- LANDS, QU'APPELLE VALLEY, RIGHTS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 516 (i).
- RESERVES IN QU'APPELLE DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 451 (i).
- RESERVES CROPS IN N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 5571 (ii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

- INDIAN RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 452, 451 (i).
 — SUPPLIES, MAN. AND N. W. T., PURCHASE: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 452 (i).
 — TITLES IN ATHABASCA, MACKENZIE AND YUKON: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 824 (i).
 MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, N.B. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (ii).
 — N.S. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (ii).
 MOHAWK INDIANS, WITHDR. OF GRANT OF MEDICAL SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2817 (i).
 MOUNT ELGIN INDIAN SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 7754.
 — Ques. (Mr. Heyd) 672 (i).
 NIXON, THOS., INDIAN PURVEYOR, CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7765 (ii).
 N.W.T. INDIAN RESERVES, CROPS SEEDED, NUMBER OF ACRES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davin) 1837 (i).
 ORTON, DR. GEO., INDIAN AGENT IN MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 3669 (i), 5393 (ii).
 REGINA INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, EMPLOYT. OF DR. WILLOUGHBY: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 828 (i).
 ST. Sulpice SEMINARY: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (ii).
 SURVEY OF INDIAN RESERVES: in Com. of Sup., 6848.
 TYANDENAGA INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 7754 (ii).
 VENNER, J. A., RESTIGOUCHE INDIAN AGENT: Remarks (Mr. McAlister) 1786 (i).
 — M. for Ret.* (Mr. McAlister) 2839 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. McAlister) 4611 (ii).
 WALTON, T. M., INDIAN AGENT AT PARRY ISLAND, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCormack) 3670.
 WOOD, W. F., DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Wallace) 7526 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 7760 (ii).
- Indian Act Amt. B. No. 144** (Mr. Sifton) 1^c, 5661; 2^c, and in Com., 5960; 3^c*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 34.)
- INDIANTOWN BRANCH, I.C.R., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (ii).
- INDIA RUBBER BOOTS AND SHOES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 7583 (ii).
- INFANTRY SCHOOLS, FREDERICTON AND LONDON, COST OF LIGHTING: Ques. (Mr. Ross Robertson) 7121.
- INGONISH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).
- INLAND REVENUE:**
- ASHES, GOVT. INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 3660 (i).
 ELEVATOR MONOPOLY, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. Rutherford) 598 (i).
 GRAIN LIENS, MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1930 (i).
 — STANDARDS, INSPECTION SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1780 (i).
 — TRADE AT FORT WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. Douglas) 475 (i).
 INLAND REVENUE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4556, 4589, 6978 (ii).
 — REP.: Presented (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) 194 (i).
 McNAUGHTON, WM., EMPLOYT. IN INLAND REVENUE, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. McInerney) 1931 (i).
 TERREBONNE EXCISE DIVISION, PREVOST'S REP., AGAINST COLLECTOR: M. for Copy*, (Mr. Chauvin) 1837 (i).
 WHEAT GRADED IN ELEVATORS AT FORT WILLIAM: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Richardson) 2839 (i).

- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 75** (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) 1^c, 1744; 2^c, and in Com., 2139; 3^c*, 2141 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 27.)
 — **B. No. 172** (Mr. Fielding) 1^c*, 7585; 2^c*, in Com. and 3^c*, 7786 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 28.)
- INSANE ASYLUMS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 7305 (ii).
- Insolvency B. No. 84** (Mr. Fortin) 1^c, 2004 (i).
- INSOLVENCY BILL, GOVT. LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 3826 (i).
 — GOVT. MEASURE: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 2848 (i).
 — Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2925 (i).
- INSPECTION OF STAPLES, GRAIN STANDARDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6695 (ii).
- INSURANCE COMPANIES, CHANGES OF LAW GOVERNING, M. (Mr. Broder) 5136 (ii).
- INTEREST PAID ONT. AND QUE. DURING 1897: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 455 (i).
- INTERIOR:**
- ALASKAN BOUNDARY DISPUTE, TELEGRAM TO N. Y. PRESS: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1735 (i).
 ASHCROFT, B.C., MINERS' LICENSES ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2847 (i).
 BANFF BATHS C. RETAKER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 451 (i).
 — M. for Ret. (Mr. Davis) 2841 (i).
 BATTLEFORD AGENCY AND GOVT. CATTLE: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1574 (i).
 BOUNDARY BETWEEN CANADA AND ALASKA: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 1076 (i).
 C. P. R. LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1340 (i).
 COLONIZATION COMPANIES, GRANTS OF LANDS, CONDITIONS: Ques. (Mr. Douglas) 479 (i).
 CONNOR, JOHN, GOLD DREDGING LEASES, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1074 (i).
 DEAF AND DUMB MUTES, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. Douglas) 4345 (ii).
 DOMINION LANDS, TENBY, MAN., APPOINT. OF SUB-AGENTS: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3087 (i).
 DREDGING, GOLD LEASES, APPLICATIONS, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1838 (i).
 DREDGING FOR GOLD IN PEACE RIVER, PERMITS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 478 (i).
 DREDGING LEASES ISSUED TO J. A. MERCIER: Ques. (Mr. Maxwell) 1934 (i).
 — MILES OF RIVER: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1934 (i).
 — REGULATIONS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 746 (i).
 DROLET, CHEVALIER, DREDGING LEASES: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 671 (i).
 — MINING LEASES: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 4924 (ii).
 — (Mr. Foster) 1073 (i).
 — Explanation (Mr. Sifton) 831 (i).
 — M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davin) 2839 (i).
 [See "YUKON," &c.]
- GEORGIAN BAY TIMBER DISTRICT, OUTPUT OF LOGS TO MICHIGAN: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2825 (i).
 — RULING (Mr. Speaker) 826 (i).
- INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 4527, 4551, 7769 (ii).
 — DEPT., DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 828 (i).
 — DEP. MINISTER, PRESENT OCCUPANT: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3408 (i).
 — REP.: Presented (Mr. Sifton) 3940 (ii).
- LAND GRANTS TO MANITOBA AND N.W.T. RY. CORPORATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 482 (i).
 — M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davin) 1837 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

- RESERVED FOR SETTLEMENT IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 971 (i).
- SURVEYS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 450 (i).
- MANITOBA UNIVERSITY AND LAND GRANT OF DRIVING PARK: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 7124 (ii).
- M. for O. C.'s* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3670 (i).
- MERCIER, J. A., DREDGING LEASES ISSUED, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1934 (i).
- MINERS' FREE CERTIFICATES, NUMBER ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *Macleay*) 3311 (i); 5133 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 4773 (ii).
- MINING AND DREDGING LEASES ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3317 (i); 5322 (ii).
- MINERS' LICENSES, WHITE AND CHILKOOT PASSES: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4701 (ii).
- NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE, NUMBER IN TERRITORIES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 452 (i).
- NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES, GOVT. OFFICIALS DISMISSED SINCE 1896, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 4246 (ii).
- MCKAY, THOMAS, AMOUNT OF TIMBER DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 4176 (ii).
- ONTARIO LUMBER CUT: M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Adjn. 1843 (i).
- REGINA DISTRICT REGISTRY OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1931 (i); 5319 (ii).
- ROTHWELL'S REPORT *re* CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 2851 (i).
- SASKATCHEWAN DISTRICT, TIMBER BERTHS HELD BY MOORE, MCDOWELL & CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 481 (i).
- SCHOOL LANDS IN MAN., SALES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2432 (i).
- SEED GRAIN, N.W.T., AMOUNT DUE SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5135 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5569 (ii).
- SMELTING SILVER LEAD IN B.C., REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 6012 (ii).
- TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION, N.W.T., P. LAMONT'S ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2431 (ii).
- MISS CUMMINGS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1789 (i).
- OUTSTANDING INDEBTEDNESS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 486 (i).
- PAYMENT FOR PRIZES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 976.
- TIMBER BERTHS HELD BY MOORE, MCDOWELL & CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 481 (i).
- TIMBER BERTHS IN N.W.T. AND YUKON: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).
- TIMBER DUES IN N.W.T., AMOUNT DUE THOS. MCKAY: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 4176 (ii).
- UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA AND GOVT. LAND GRANT: M. for O. C.'s* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3670 (i).
- [See MANITOBA, &c.]
- VANCOUVER ISLAND RAILWAY BELT, SETTLERS' CLAIMS, REP. OF MR. ROTHWELL; Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 4453 (ii).
- WHISKY FOR THE KLONDIKE, SS. "MANAUNSE'S" CARGO: Remarks (Mr. *Guillet*) 1188 (i).
- YUKON ROUTE THROUGH N.W.T., PLANS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 5139 (ii).
- [See YUKON, &c.]

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

- ARCHIBALD, CHIEF ENGINEER, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1834 (i).
- BAIN, N., THOMPSON, R. S., HOAR, CHAS., SUTHERLAND, WM.: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4348 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

- CAPE BRETON DISMISSALS: in Com. of Sup., 6414 (ii).
- COAL CARRIED, AMOUNT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 4448 (ii).
- COLOURED PORTERS, DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: M. (Mr. *Campbell*) to Adjn., 3167 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3405 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2852 (i).
- DINING CARS, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2812 (i).
- ON EASTERN EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2345 (i).
- DISMISSALS. See general heading.
- DIVERSION OF ROUTE OF I.C.R. THROUGH SPRINGHILL: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1929 (i).
- EMPLOYEES REINSTATEMENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3665 (i).
- REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF BRAKESMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 478 (i).
- REDUCTION IN PASSENGER AND FREIGHT DEPTS.: Ques. (Mr. *Caugrain*) 602 (i).
- EXPENDITURE FOR IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Powell*) 3667 (i).
- FARM GATES, CONTRACT, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2839 (i).
- TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 2819 (i).
- FENCING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6432 (ii).
- FUEL EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3089 (i).
- HALIFAX ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 6382 (ii).
- HARRIS, MR., AGREEMENT WITH GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 5392 (ii).
- APPOINT. BY GOVT.: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3667 (i).
- M. for O. C., &c. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3669.
- POSITION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3166 (i).
- TARIFFS ISSUED SINCE APPOINT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Foster*) 3669 (i).
- HOAR, CHAS., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1838 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4348
- INDIANTOWN BRANCH, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (ii).
- INVESTIGATIONS, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7194 (ii).
- IRON BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 6388, 6564 (ii).
- KILLAM'S CLAIMS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McInerney*) 4683 (ii).
- Position on I.C.R., 827 (i).
- KIRK ESTATE, DAMAGES BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 7183, 7373 (ii).
- LAND DAMAGES, CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7078.
- LOWERING OF SCHEDULE RATES: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1481 (i).
- LUMBER SCHEDULES: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2442 (i).
- MCNEILL, RORY, RAILWAY EMPLOYEE, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 603 (i).
- MADAME CHARON'S HORSE, CLAIM, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 3659 (i).
- MONCTON ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 6368 (ii).
- STATION, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 477 (i).
- PLUMBING AND HEATING CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2346 (i).
- MONTREAL EXTENSION, RENTAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6553, 6564 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

- MONTREAL AGREEMENTS WITH G.T.R. Co.: M. for Ret., 3821 (i).
 ——— CONTRACT, &c.: Copies Laid on Table, 3821 (i).
 PASSENGERS CARRIED FROM LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3406 (i).
 MULGRAVE ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 6428.
 MURRAY, J. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 5318 (ii).
 NEWS STAND AT LÉVIS STATION, LEASE: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1338 (i).
 NEW TIME TABLE: Remarks (Mr. Choquette) 6242 (ii).
 ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 6386 (ii).
 PATENT LOCOMOTIVE CYLINDER: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1335 (i).
 PAYMENTS TO A. KIRK, DAMAGES BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 7183, 7373 (ii).
 POWLIE, A., CAR INSPECTOR, SPRINGHILL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 1932 (i).
 PURCHASE OF LOCOMOTIVES IN U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 476 (i).
 REPLACING WOODEN TRESTLES WITH MASONRY: in Com. of Sup., 7085 (ii).
 RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ROADMASTER, COST OF INQUIRY AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. Dechene) 2820 (i).
 ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (ii).
 ST. MICHEL STATION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3312 (i).
 SIMONDS, R. H., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Powell) 2840 (i).
 SNOW FENCES (N.S.): in Com. of Sup., 6427 (ii).
 STATION ACCOMMODATION GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 6433 (ii).
 STEWART, A., TANKMAN, SPRINGHILL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 1933, 2342 (i).
 SUTHERLAND, WM.: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2839 (i), 4348 (ii).
 TARIFFS, &c., IN FORCE SINCE MR. HARRIS' APPNMT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 3669 (i).
 THOMPSON, R. S., HOAR, CHAS., SUTHERLAND, WM., AND N. BAIN: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4242 (ii).
 TIES AND LUMBER SUPPLIES, TENDERS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Casgrain) 2840 (i).
 ——— TENDERS FROM 1896, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3669 (i).
 TROIS PISTOLES, GOVT. LANDS, OCCUPATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4175 (ii).
 WESTVILLE, N.S., STATION IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 2342 (i).
 INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, Mess.: presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 405 (i).
 International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. No. 137 (Mr. MacPherson). 1^o*, 5215; 2^o*, 5540; in Com., and 3^o*, 6647 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
 INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 6690 (ii).
 INVESTIGATION ON GOVT. RYS., EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7194 (ii).
 IONA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).
 ISAAC'S HARBOUR, POSTMASTER GRIFFIN, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1834 (i).
 ISLE PERRAULT WHARF, ADDITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (ii).
 JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, IMPOSITION OF TOLL TAX: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 2441 (i).
 ——— Remarks (Mr. McInnes) 2528 (i).

JOHNSTON, J. T., FT. ERIE CUSTOMS OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 4178 (ii).

JONES, MR. C. A., IMMIGRATION AGENT, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 4607 (ii).

JUBILEE STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 4916 (ii).

——— RECEIPTS FROM SALES: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3405, 3938 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 7526 (ii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act
 Amt. B. No. 150 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 5867; 1^o*, 6185; 2^o, 6732; 6747; in Com., 6784, 7043; ref. back to Com., 7126; 3^o, 7142; Sen. Amts., 7854 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 52.)

Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 6124, 6185; (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 6125, 6137, 6164, 6182; (Mr. Hughes) 6127; (Mr. Wallace) 6127, 6167; (Mr. Foster) 6128; (Mr. Sproule) 6128, 6159; Mr. Monk) 6130, 6142, 6171; (Mr. Davin) 6130; (Mr. Bergeron) 6131, 6165, 6183; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6132; (Mr. McMullen) 6152, 6184; (Mr. Quinn) 6145, 6180; (Mr. La Rivière) 6163; (Mr. McNeill) 6173; (Mr. Angers) 6175 (ii).
 1^o, 6185; 2^o m. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 6732, 6738 (ii).

Deb. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 6731; (Mr. Davin) 6732; (Mr. Foster) 6734; (Mr. Montague) 6741; (Mr. Britton) 6782; (Sir Louis Davies) 6752; (Mr. Casgrain) 6755; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6761; (Mr. McNeill) 6767; (Mr. Angers) 6771; (Mr. Sward) 6775; (Mr. Bergeron) 6778 (ii).
 Deb. in Com. (Mr. Casgrain) 6784; (Mr. McNeill) 6791; (Mr. Bergeron) 6795; (Mr. Britton) 6786; (Mr. Campbell) 6794; (Mr. Ingram) 6791; (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6793; (Mr. Powell) 6796; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 6784; (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 6784.

3^o m., 7043; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7043 (ii).
 Deb. (Sir Charles Tupper) 7043, 7045; (Mr. Angers) 7046; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 7127 (ii).

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS (PENSION) B. prop. Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 7127 (ii).

Deb. in Com. (Mr. Ingram) 7127, 7134; (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7127; (Mr. Montague) 7128, 7140; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7128; (Mr. Tisdale) 7130; (Mr. McNeill) 7131; (Sir Louis Davies) 7132; (Mr. Clancy) 7135; (Mr. Clarke) 7135; (Mr. Bergeron) 7137; (Mr. Huggart) 7137; (Mr. Erb) 7139; (Mr. Sproule) 7140 (ii).

JUDIQUE WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 5612 (ii).

JUSTICE:

ALIEN LABOUR ACT AND BRITISH COLUMBIA GOVT. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 3662 (i).

——— AGENT AT FORT ERIE: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 4178 (ii).

——— (GEORGIAN BAY: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 4523, 6240 (ii).

——— HAMILTON: Ques. (Mr. MacPherson) 6611 (ii).

——— PARRY SOUND: Remarks (Mr. McCormick) 6633 (ii).

——— TORONTO: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 4254, 4349.

——— WALLACEBURG: Remarks (Mr. Clancy) 6612.

——— APPNTS. OF OFFICERS IN ONTARIO: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 5317 (ii).

——— ENFORCEMENT: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5392 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 3084 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Clancy) 579, 5807, 7126 (ii).

——— AT TORONTO: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 5011, 5445.

——— Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 5116 (ii).

——— INSTRUCTIONS TO AGENTS: Remarks (Mr. Montague) 5518, 6114, 6581 (ii).

——— PROSECUTIONS UNDER: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 474.

JUSTICE—*Con.*

- WORKMEN IMPORTED TO TORONTO: M. (Mr. Clarke) to Adjn., 4029 (ii).
- BINDER TWINE, SALE OF GOVT. OUTPUT AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3659 (i).
- COULOMBE *vs.* QUEEN, APPEAL QUEEN'S BENCH: M. for Copy* (Mr. Casgrain) 1068, 3668 (i).
- CHIEF JUSTICE SUPREME COURT AND JUDICIAL COMMITTEE: in Com. of Sup. 7089 (ii).
- COUNTY COURT JUDGES, AGE LIMIT, COR. & C.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7124 (ii).
- SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (ii).
- COURT OF APPEAL, ONTARIO, EXTRA JUDGE: Ques (Mr. Maclean) 1071 (i).
- CROW'S NEST PASS RY., DEATH OF EMPLOYEES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 3686, 3668 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 7110, 7823 (ii).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bell) 4608, 5394 (ii).
- DART, LYMAN A., COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE, PETS. & C.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Borden) 3669 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 6653 (ii).
- DOMINION GENERAL ELECTIONS, 1896, COST, & C., OF PROSECUTIONS IN MAN.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche) 2841 (i).
- EXCHEQUER COURT TRAVELLING EXPENSES, & C.: in Com. of Sup., 6639 (ii).
- FISHERIES CASE, APPEAL FROM SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3825 (i).
- JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 3894 (i); 4582, 6638, 6983 (ii).
- AGENT AT CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1075 (i).
- DEPUTY MINISTER, APPNMT: Ques (Mr. Copp) 3166 (i).
- REP.: Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 7009 (ii).
- JUDGES, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. Angers) 7385 (ii).
- PROV. OF QUEBEC, REPS. FROM MONTREAL BAR: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 505 (i).
- JUDICIARY IN N. W. T., ADDITIONAL JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1775 (i).
- YUKON PROVISIONAL DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (ii).
- KINGSTON PENITENTIARY MEDICAL OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 2846 (i).
- LEGAL AGENTS IN GREAT BRITAIN, AMOUNTS PAID: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5135 (ii).
- LONDON ELECTION TRIAL, 1897, ACCOUNTS, & C., OF MR. H. H. ROBERTSON: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Calvert) 3669 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 6676 (ii).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Calvert) 4774 (ii).
- MACDONALD ELECTIONS (MAN.) COST OF PROSECUTIONS: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 2349 (i).
- MONTREAL CIRCUIT COURT, EXTRA JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 598 (i).
- NULTY'S DEATH SENTENCE, PETS. FOR COMMUTATION: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 824 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Dugas, 4770 (ii).
- NORTH ONTARIO COUNTY ELECTIONS, LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7504 (ii).
- PENITENTIARY COMMISSIONERS' ACCOUNTS, STMT.: Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 7383 (ii).
- PENITENTIARIES, EXPENSES FOR COMMISSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6639, 7349 (ii).
- PERJURY CONVICTIONS AT BATTLEFORD: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1780 (i).
- PRENDERGAST, JUDGE, COMMISSION OF INQUIRY: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1076 (i).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

- PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS, COR. OF MIN. OF JUSTICE *re* INQUIRY FOR LETTER PUBLISHED IN NEWSPAPER (Mr. Craig) 5321 (ii).
- QUEEN *vs.* CAMERON INDICTMENT FOR LIBEL, DEPOSITIONS, & C.: M. for Copies (Mr. Bostock) 1827 (i).
- RAINY RIVER JUDICIAL DISTRICT, APPNMT. OF JUDGE: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5011 (ii).
- RUSSELL, CHARLES, SOLICITOR, COSTS, & C., RENDERED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Casgrain) 2839 (i).
- ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY COMMISSIONERS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3438 (i).
- INQUIRY FOR REP.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 3940 (i).
- M. (Mr. Fortin) to print, 6607 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 6639 (ii).
- REVOLT OF CONVICTS: Ques. (Mr. Chauvin) 1069 (i).
- SASKATCHEWAN DISTRICT, APPNMT. OF JUDGE: Remarks (Mr. Davis) 7042 (ii).
- SKELTON *vs.* QUEEN, AFFIDAVITS, & C.: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 6112, 6240, 6317, 6322 (ii).
- APPLICATION FOR NEW TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 5319 (ii).
- POSTMASTER AT BATTLEFORD: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Davin) 5931, 6403 (ii).
- PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. Davin) 6890 (ii).
- PROCEEDINGS, & C.: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 5117, 5258 (ii).
- SPINKS, JUDGE, INVESTIGATION *re*: Remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3668 (i) 5268 (ii).
- STATUTES, REVISION AND CONSOLIDATION: Ques. (Mr. Britton) 2343 (i).
- SUPERIOR COURT, MAGDALEN ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 597 (i).
- SUPREME COURT LIBRARY: in Com. of Sup., 6638 (ii).
- U.S. SS. "FREDERICK J. GERRING," SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT: M. for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2823 (i).
- WEATHERBEE, MR. JUSTICE, ABSENCE FROM PROVINCE: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3166 (i).
- WOODS, J. P., EX-JUDGE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. Erb) 825 (i).
- YALE COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INQUIRY *re* JUDGE SPINKS: M. for Copy of Rep.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3668 (i), 5238 (ii).
- KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 5067 (ii).
- KASLO-SLOCAN RY., PLANS, PAPERS, & C.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 402 (i).
- KELLY, MR. J., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 5274 (ii).
- KENTVILLE P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5071 (ii).
- Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 26** (Mr. Bostock) 1^o*, 744; 2^o*, 824; in Com., 2957, 3012, 3357, 3546 (i).
- KILDARE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1575 (i).
- KILLAM, MR. A. E., POSITION ON I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. McInerney) 827 (i).
- KING'S HEAD LIGHT: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 1932.
- Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1929 (i).
- Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 69** (Mr. Britton) 1^o*, 1736; 2^o*, 1775 (i); in Com., 4805; 3^o*, 4807 (ii). (61-62 *Vic. c.*, 67.)
- KINGSTON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 5453 (ii).

- KINGSTON HARBOUR, DREDGING**: in Com. of Sup., 7242, 7641 (ii).
- **LOCOMOTIVE WORKS AND GANANOQUE DRILL SHED**: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 605 (i).
- **TELEGRAMS re ORDER FOR LOCOMOTIVES**: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 454 (i).
- **PENITENTIARY COMMISSIONERS' REP.**: in Com. of Sup., 7490 (ii).
- **MEDICAL OFFICER APPMNT**: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2846 (i).
- **MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT, INCREASE OF SALARY**: in Com. of Sup., 7488 (ii).
- KING, W. A., STATION AGENT AT ANTIGONISH, DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (ii).
- KINROSS (P. E. I.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL**: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 5018 (ii).
- Klondike and Dawson City Bank B. No. 117** (Mr. *Morrison*) 1^o*, 3502; 2^o*, 3657 (i); in Com., 5117; 3^o*, 5118 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 105).
- Klondike and Peace River Gold Mining Land and Transportation Co.'s B. No. 91** (Mr. *Davis*) 1^o*, 2429; 2^o*, 2841 (i); in Com., 4168; 3^o*, 4174 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- KLONDIKE DISTRICT, LIQUOR PERMITS**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2433 (i).
- KLONDIKE, EDMONTON AND PRINCE ALBERT ROUTES**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 453 (i).
- KLONDIKE RY.**: Exploratory Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6562 (ii).
See "Yukon."
- KOOTENAY DISTRICT, POSTAL, &c., FACILITIES re TELEGRAM**: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1746.
- "**LA CANADIENNE**," SS., CHARTERED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 5318 (ii).
- L'ANCIENNE-LORETTE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL**: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2821 (i).
- LACHINE CANAL, FRANCOIS CORBEIL, DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2343 (i).
- M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2840 (i).
- **DISMISSALS**: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4621 (ii).
- **ENLARGEMENT**: in Com. of Sup., 6551 (ii).
- **ST. PIERRE RIVER, DEEPENING**: in Com. of Sup., 6551 (ii).
- **STOREKEEPER, APPLICANTS FOR POSITION**: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 456 (i).
- LAFRANCE FIRE ENGINE, DUTY, &c., PAID**: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 6011 (ii).
- Lake Bennett and Klondike Ry. and Tramway Co.'s B. No. 31** (Mr. *Haggart*). 1^o*, 903; 2^o*, 1018; in Com. and 3^o*, 386; Sen. Amts., 2905 (i) 6266 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.* c. 68.)
- Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. No. 99** (Mr. *Préfontaine*). 1^o*, 2430; 2^o*, 2698 (i); in Com., 6328, 6934, 7158; 3^o*, 7456 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 107).
- Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 30** (Mr. *McGregor*). 1^o*, 902; 2^o*, 1018; in Com. and 3^o*, 1774 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 69).
- Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. No. 66** (Mr. *Jameson*). 1^o*, 1736; 2^o*, 1775; in Com. and 3^o*, 3656 (i); Sen. Amts., 4807 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- LAKEFIELD AND APSLEY MAIL ROUTE, TENDERS, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 4930 (ii).
- LAKE MANITOBA, OUTLETS, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (ii).
- LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE RY. AND RY. ACT**: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 2349 (i).
- LALONDE, MESSENGER, CANVASSING IN RUSSELL CO. DURING PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS**: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 909 (i).
- LAMBERT, MR., CARETAKER AT MONTAGUE (P. E. I.) DISMISSAL**: in Com. of Sup., 5609 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 5787 (ii).
- LAND GRANTS TO MAN. AND N.W.T. RY. CORPORATIONS**: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 482 (i).
- LAND RESERVED FOR SETTLEMENT IN MAN. AND N.W.T.**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 971 (i).
- LAND SURVEYS, N.W.T.**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 450 (i).
- Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. B. No. 28** (Mr. *Davis*). 1^o*, 744 (i).
- **B. No. 132** (Mr. *Sifton*). 1^o, 4683; 2^o and in Com., 5957; 3^o*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- LANGEVIN BLOCK, FIRE PROOF ATTIC, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (ii).
- LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS, DREDGING, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 5653 (ii).
- L'ARDOISE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 5622 (ii).
- **AMOUNT VOTED**: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 972 (i).
- **POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL**: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3666 (i).
- **ST. PETER'S, &c., OUTPORTS, MEDICAL AID TO SICK SEAMEN**: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1339 (i).
- LAURENTIAN RY., TELEGRAPH REGULATIONS**: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 4923 (ii).
- LAVALTRIE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT**: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1473 (i).
- LAVOIE, DR., APPNMT. BY GOVT.**: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7119 (ii).
- LAW STAMPS, PRINTING, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 7251.
- LEEDS CO. POSTAL SERVICE, PETS., &c.**: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4181 (ii).
- LEFAIVRE, XAVIER, LOCKMASTER ON LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3937 (ii).
- LEGAL AGENTS, G. B., AMOUNTS PAID**: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 5135 (ii).
- LEGISLATION**: in Com. of Sup., 5999, 6990, 7011, 7504, 7782 (ii).
- LEGRIS, NARCISSE, POSTMASTER AT ST. EULALIE, LETTER IN *La Patrie***: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7688.
- LENOIR, MR., FISHERY INSPECTOR AT ISLE MADAME (C. B.) DISMISSAL**: in Com. of Sup., 5307 (ii).
- LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 6698 (ii).
- Lewes River Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. No. 23** (Mr. *Morrison*). 1^o*, 743; 2^o*, 824; in Com., and 3^o*, 3656 (i); Sen. Amts., 4606 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 73.)

- LIBRARY : in Com. of Sup., 5999 (ii).
- LIFE SAVING STATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4953 (ii).
- LIEUT.-GOV. N. W. T., APPNMT. OF MEMBER FOR NORTH WELLINGTON : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 101 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1073 (i).
- Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2529 (i).
- RUMOURED APPNMT. OF MEMBER FOR WEST HURON : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2699 (i).
- CONFIRMATION OF APPMNT. : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6466 (ii).
- LIGHTHOUSES BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND STIKINE RIVER : Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 976 (i).
- LIGHTHOUSE SUPPLIES, MONTREAL WEST, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 2846 (i).
- LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4998, 4999 (ii).
- LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPERS, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4981 (ii).
- LINLOFF, EDWARD, APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5319 (ii).
- LIVERPOOL P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).
- LIVINGSTONE COVE : in Com. of Sup., 7633 (ii).
- Loan Companies B. No. 164** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1*, 7086 ; 2*, dischgd., 7525 (ii).
- LOANS TO PUBLIC WORKS DUE THE DOMINION : M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Dobell*) 6239 (ii).
- LOBSTER FISHERY IN BAY OF FUNDY : Ques. (Mr. *Copp*) 479 (i).
- LOBSTERS, EXTENSION OF CLOSE SEASON : in Com. of Sup., 5280 (ii).
- LOBSTER PACKING, SIZE OF CATCH, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1340 (i).
- LOCH LEVEN, C. B., POSTMASTER : Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1776 (i).
- LOGS, &c., EXPORT DUTY : Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 3085.
- London and Lake Huron Ry. Co's B. No. 67** (Mr. *Lister*). 1*, 1736 ; 2*, 1775 ; in Com., 4072 ; 3*, 4074 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- **B. No. 158** (Mr. *Lister*). 1*, 2*, in Com. and 3*, 6607 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- LONDON ELECTIONS, &c., ACCOUNTS RENDERED MR. H. H. ROBERTSON : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Calvert*) 3669 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Calvert*) 477 i (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 6676 (ii).
- LONDON CAMPING GROUND : in Com. of Sup., 7516 (ii).
- Lord's Day Observance B. No. 2** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 184 ; 2° m., 1950 ; in Com., 1977, 2041 ; 3 m., 2400 ; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to ref. to Com., 2400 ; agreed to (Y. 64 ; N. 58) 2401 ; in Com., 2401 ; M. to restore to Order Paper, 2426 (i).
- Section before Chair : Remarks (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 2041 (i).
- L'ORIGINAL WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 5922 (ii).
- LOWER L'ARDCISE, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : in Com. of Sup., 6707 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1069, 1334, 1335 (i).
- LUNCHES FOR PRIVY COUNCIL : in Com. of Sup., 4582.
- LYNCH, MR., PROMOTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4855.
- LYNCH, PATRICK, POSTMASTER AT CHAPLEAU, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3088 (i).
- MACDONALD, A. L., PEAKES STATION (P.E.I.), POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 4344 (ii).
- MACDONALD ELECTIONS (MAN.), COST OF PROSECUTIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2349 (i).
- MACKENZIE, LATE ALEXANDER, MONUMENT : in Com. of Sup., 6105 (ii).
- MCCALLUM, JOHN, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7686 (ii).
- MCCARTHY, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5389 (ii).
- MCEACHREN, MR., NORTH SYDNEY, DISMISSAL : in Com. of Sup., 5608 (ii).
- MCKAY, KENNETH, LOCKMAN, ST. PETER'S CANAL, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1069 (i).
- MACKAY'S POINT WHARF, TENDERS FOR BUILDING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2815 (i).
- MCLELLAN, MR. B. D., MEMBER FOR WEST PRINCE, (P.E.I.), INTRODUCED, 4347 (ii).
- MCLEOD, M. G., POSTAL MAIL CLERK, N.S. : M. for O.Cs. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4181 (ii).
- MENABB, CAMPBELL, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. : Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5446 (ii).
- MONEILL, RORY, SECTION FOREMAN, I.C.R., DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 603 (i).
- MONEILL, MR., CARETAKER, DISMISSAL : in Com. of Sup., 5609 (ii).
- MONAUGHTON, WM., EMPLOYMT. IN INLAND REVENUE, N.S. : Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 1931 (i).
- MAGDALEN ISLANDS WINTER MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1575 (i).
- MAIL CLERKS : in Com. of Sup., 4857 (ii).
- MAIL CONTRACTS, N.S., CANCELLATION SINCE 1896 : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4609 (ii).
- SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 6686, 7282 (ii).
- See "Post Office."
- MAJOR GENERAL COMMANDING MILITIA, LETTER READ (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6320 (ii).
- Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) 6464 (ii).
- MAJOR'S HILL PARK, STONE FENCE : in Com. of Sup., 5453, 5572, 7588 (ii).
- GROUNDS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5606 (ii).
- MANITOBA :
- ALLAIRE, J. P. O., CLAIMS AGAINST GOVERNMENT : Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 3661 (i).
- BRANDON ELECTORAL DISTRICT, MR. MCCARTHY'S CANDIDATURE : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4610 (ii).
- C.P.R., LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXATION : Ques. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1340 (i).
- CLAIMS AGAINST THE DOMINION : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1030, 2525 (i).
- CORN, FOREIGN, IMPORTS INTO MAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3660 (i).
- DOMINION LANDS, TENBY, MAN., APPNMT. OF SUB-AGENT : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3087 (i).
- ELKHORN POSTMASTER, APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4771 (ii).
- GALICIAN SETTLERS IN CAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 6109 (ii).

MANITOBA—*Con.*

- GRAIN TRANSPORT BY C.P.R. AND ELEVATOR COMPANY OF MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. Richardson) 483 (i).
- HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION. REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 603, 2349 (i).
- COMMANDER WAKKHAM'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1934 (i).
- IMMIGRATION OF WOMEN DOMESTICS: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3309 (i).
- INSANE ASYLUMS: in Com. of Sup., 735 (ii).
- LAKE MANITOBA, OUTLETS: in Com. of Sup., 5928.
- MACDONALD ELECTIONS (MAN.) COST OF PROSECUTIONS: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 2349 (i).
- MANITOBA PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. La Rivière) 3226 (i).
- SCHOOLS QUESTION, ADDRESS TO THE HOLY FATHER: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bergeron) 5344, 5363, 5411 (ii).
- Deb. (Mr. Wallace) 5394; Sir Charles H. Tupper) 5404; (Mr. Sproule) 5416; (Mr. Casey) 5418; (Mr. McNeill) 5431; (Mr. Gibson) 5423; (Mr. McMillan) 5423; (Mr. Bourassa) 5425; (Sir Adolphe Caron) 5432; (Mr. La Rivière) 5436 (ii).
- COR. BETWEEN MR. CHARLES RUSSELL AND CARDINAL RAMPOLLA: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 4924, 7124 (ii).
- DOCUMENTS PRESENTED AT ROME: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3165 (i).
- DOCUMENTS AND COR. WITH ROME: M. for copies (Mr. McDougall) 3663 (i).
- FUND: prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 4029 (ii).
- LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7770.
- UNIVERSITY AND GOVT. LAND GRANT: M. for O. Cs. (Mr. La Rivière) 3670 (i).
- INQUIRY FOR RET. (Mr. La Rivière) 5571 (ii).
- DRIVING PARK GRANT: Ques. (Mr. La Rivière) 7124 (ii).
- ORTON, DR. GEO., INDIAN AGENT IN MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 3669 (i), 5393 (ii).
- PAR. IN "LA PATRIE": Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bergeron) 7697, 7715 (ii).
- PAR. IN OTTAWA "CITIZEN": Personal Explanation (Mr. Sproule) 496 (ii).
- PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5485 (ii).
- PRENDERGAST, JUDGE, COMMISSION OF INQUIRY: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1076 (i).
- PROVENCHEE POSTMASTERS, APPOINT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. La Rivière) 6006 (ii).
- SHANNON, THOS., KILLARNEY CUSTOMS OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 4770 (ii).
- SCHOOL LANDS IN MANITOBA, SALES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. La Rivière) 2432 (i).
- TENNANT, J. F., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. Quinn) 3670 (i), 4182 (ii).
- WHEAT GRADED IN ELEVATORS AT FORT WILLIAM: M. for Ret. (Mr. Richardson) 2839 (i).

[See "NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES."]

Manitoba Debt. Account B. No. 169 (Mr. Fielding). 1°, 7467; 2°, 7571; in Com. and 3°, 7579 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 4.)

Manitoba School Fund B. No. 168 (Mr. Fielding). 1°, 7466; 2° and in Com., 7571; 3°, 7655 (ii).

MANN AND MACKENZIE'S CONTRACT, OMISSIONS: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1078 (i).

MANN AND MACKENZIE'S SLEIGH ROAD, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1928 (i).

[See "YUKON," &c.]

Manufacturers Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co. Change of Name B. No. 57 (Mr. Clarke). 1°, 1380; 2°, 1509; in Com. and 3°, 2957 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 102.)

MARCHILDON, THOS., DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4991 (ii).

MARGAREE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR. DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 4181 (ii).

— **FISHERY OVERSEER, DISMISSAL:** in Com. of Sup., 5271 (ii).

— **PIER, EXTENSION:** in Com. of Sup., 5616 (ii).

— **TELEGRAPH OPERATOR ROSS. DISMISSAL AND APPOINT.:** Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 2815 (i).

MARIA STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 6100 (ii).

MARIA (QUE.) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (ii).

MARINE:

ARICHAH HARBOUR, BUOYS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 5320 (ii).

ASPY BAY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 2819 (i).

ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC COASTING LAWS OF CAN.: M. for Ret.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 504 (i).

BAXTER, WM., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3637 (i).

BEAR RIVER SHIPPING MASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 1071 (i).

— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Mills) 2840 (i) 4605 (ii).

BEHRING SEA, BRITISH VESSELS SEIZED BY RUSSIA: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1072 (i).

CAPE BRETON COUNTY, MARINE DEPT., CHANGES: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 673 (i).

CAPE NEGRO ISLAND LIGHT, APPOINT. OF KEEPER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1839, 1929 (i).

COASTING LAWS, ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC: M. for Cor.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2339 (i).

DISMISSALS. See general heading.

FISHERY PROTECTION SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).

GOVT. TOLLS ON WHARFS: Remarks (Mr. Choquette) 4351 (ii).

HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION, JAMES FISHER'S REM.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 2349 (i).

— **REP. OF COMMISSIONERS:** Ques. (Mr. Roche) 603 (i).

— **REP. OF COMMANDER WAKKHAM:** Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1934 (i).

— **REP. ON NAVIGABILITY:** Ques. (Mr. Rutherford) 975 (i).

— **PRINTING REPS.:** in Com. of Sup., 7092 (ii).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS; in Com. of Sup., 5000 (ii).

KINGS HEAD LIGHT: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 1932 (i).

— Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1939 (i).

"LA CANADIENNE" SS. CHARTERED BY GOVT.; Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 5318 (ii).

L'ARDOISE, ST. PETERS, &c., OUTPORTS, MEDICAL AID TO SICK SEAMEN: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1339 (i).

LIGHTHOUSES BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND STIKINE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. Maxwell) 976 (i).

— **SUPPLIES, MONTREAL WEST, CONTRACT:** Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 2846 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

- MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4558, 4596, 7481 (ii).
 — REP.: PRESENTED (Sir Louis Davies) 5 (i).
 METEOROLOGICAL SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 5001 (ii).
 MARINE HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 5003 (ii).
 MIDLAND HARBOUR-MASTER, APPNT.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3662 (i).
 "MUDLARK," DREDGE. WORKING HOURS: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3825 (i).
 MURRAY RIVER, P. E. I., SHIPPING ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 3823 (i).
 PALMER'S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 504 (i).
 PARRY SOUND HARBOUR-MASTER; Ques. (Mr. McCormack) 5135 (ii).
 PILOTAGE INVESTIGATION AT ST. JOHN, N. B.: Ques. (Mr. Ellis) 825 (i).
 POINT JÉRÔME LIGHT-KEEPER, APPNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 5320 (i).
 POUND NET LICENSES, LAKE SUPERIOR: M. for Cor.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3670 (i).
 — NORTH SHORE LAKE HURON: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3657 (i).
 "PRINCE EDWARD," DREDGE, CARETAKERS AND EMPLOYEES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 2841 (i), 7526 (ii).
 — NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 2345 (i).
 P. E. I. AND MAINLAND, WINTER COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1778 (i).
 RACINE FISHERY AND RIPARIAN OWNER, LICENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4772 (ii).
 RECIPROCITY IN WRECKING, CAN. AND U. S.: Remarks (Mr. Britton) 6612 (ii).
 REWARDS FOR SAVING LIFE: in Com. of Sup., 4952 (ii).
 ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL, PLACING OF BUOYS, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 4180 (ii).
 — Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3318 (i).
 "STANLEY," REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7383.
 STATIONARY ENGINEERS, EXAMINATION BILL, PROP. INTRODUCTION: Remarks (Mr. Sutherland) 2799.
 STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, REMISSION OF PENALTIES: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2344 (i).
 STORM SIGNALS, C. B., NUMBER, &c.; Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 7118 (ii).
 THESSALON POINT LIGHTHOUSE, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1932 (i).
 TIDES AND CURRENTS, REPS. OF SURVEYS: M. for Copies (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1835 (i).
 TRANSPORT OF MERCHANDISE IN U. S. VESSELS: Remarks (Mr. Kaullbach) 1076 (i).
 TORONTO OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5002 (ii).
 [See "FISHERIES," &c.]
 MARITIME PROVINCES, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7242 (ii).
 MARYSVILLE (N. B.), P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5092 (ii).
 Masters and Mates (Certificates) of Ships Act Amt. B. No. 37 (Sir Louis Davies) 1^o, 936; 2^o, and in Com., 1860; 3^o, 1863 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 45.)
 MATHESON, JOHN D., APPNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 7121 (ii).
 — DISMISSAL FROM ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7207 (ii).
 MEAFORD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (ii).
 MEDALS FOR MILITIAMEN DURING FENIAN RAID: in Com. of Sup., 7515 (ii).

- MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, INDIANS, N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (ii).
 — INDIANS, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (ii).
 MEDICINE HAT COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7589.
 MEMBERS ASKING QUESTIONS: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 2433 (i).
 — CALLED TO ORDER (Mr. Speaker) 437, 613 (i), 4158, 7606 (ii).
 — INTRODUCED: 3, 270 (i), 4347 (ii).
 — NEW: 2 (i).
 — REMARKS CHECKED: 4444, 4446, 5013, 5324, 6320, 6326, 6578 (ii).
 — REQUESTED TO WITHDRAW. REMARKS, 68, 71 (i).
 MERCIER, J. A., DREDGING LEASES ISSUED, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. Maxwell) 1934 (i).
 — WILFRID, COMMISSIONER, AMOUNT PAID: Remarks (Mr. Blair) 4345 (ii).
 MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:
 ESTIMATES, THE, 1897-98: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2698 (i).
 — SUPPL., 1897-98, 5663 (ii).
 — SUPPL., 1898-99, 7378 (ii).
 QUERN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE, ADDRESS, REPLY: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1465 (i).
 SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, REPLY: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 936 (i).
 METHEGAN BREAKWATER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5619.
 METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5001, 7265 (ii).
 MIDDLETON P. O. DISTRICT, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 7687 (ii).
 MIDLAND HARBOUR-MASTER, APPNT.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3662 (i).
 Miles Cañon and White Horse Tramway Co.'s B. No. 35 (Mr. Bostock) 1^o, 903; 2^o, 1018; in Com., 3653; 3^o, 3655 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 74.)
 MILITIA:
 ALDERSHOT (N. S.) MILITARY CAMP SUPPLIES: M. for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1765 (i).
 AMERICAN CANNED MEATS, CONTRACT WITH CAN. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. Quinn) 5017 (ii).
 — PAR. IN *National Provisioner*: Remarks (Mr. Quinn) 3940 (i).
 BADDECK DRILL SHED, LAND TITLE: Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 1467 (i).
 BRIGADE CAMP, THIRD MILITARY DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. Guillet) 5786 (ii).
 CANADIAN DEFENCES, IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Casgrain) 2339 (i).
 COTÉ DE LEISSE RIFLE RANGE AND FARMERS' GRIEVANCES: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6322 (ii).
 COTÉ ST. LUC RIFLE RANGES, ACCIDENTAL SHOOTING: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 5569, 6029 (ii).
 DOMVILLE, LT.-COL., M. P., CHARGES AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5393 (ii).
 GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, LETTERS OF LT.-GOV. PATTERSON: laid on Table, 5316 (ii).
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 3318, 3826 (i).
 — M. (Mr. Taylor) to Adjn., 5098 (ii).
 — M. for Ret., 3826 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 457 (i).
 — REMOVAL AND NEW SITE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Taylor) 1837 (i).

MILITIA—Con.

- GASCOIGNE, MAJ. GEN., COMMANDING MILITIA, COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3825 (i).
 — LETTER READ BY PREMIER, 6320 (ii).
 — Order, Ques. of (Mr. Foster) 6464 (ii).
 — RESIGNATION: Remarks (Sir Adolphe Caron) 4167 (ii).
- HUSSARS, 8TH, CHARGES AGAINST COLONEL: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6031 (ii).
- ILLINOIS NATIONAL GUARDS, PERMISSION TO ENTER CANADA: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 509 (i).
- IMPERIAL ARMY SOLDIERS AT TORONTO: Remarks (Mr. Montague) 4523 (ii).
- INFANTRY SCHOOLS, FREDERICTON AND LONDON, COST OF LIGHTING: Ques. (Mr. Ross Robertson) 7121.
- MILITARY COLLEGE, COMMISSIONS GRANTED TO CADETS, 1898-99: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 2840 (i).
 — EMPLOYERS, SUPPL. RET.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 6034 (ii).
- MILITARY SCHOOLS, FREDERICTON: in Com. of Sup., 7057 (ii).
- MILITIA AND DEFENCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 3899 (i); 4585, 6564, 6984, 7056, 7482, 7515 (ii).
 — REP.: Presented (Mr. Borden, King's) 2425 (i).
- MILITIA, ACTIVE SERVICE, PAYMENTS TO: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Hughes) 3670 (i).
 — ANNUAL CAMP DRILL: Remarks (Mr. Montague) 5324 (ii).
 — ATTENDANCE AT FUNERALS: in Com. of Sup., 6571 (ii).
 — CAMP AT BEAUBENOIS: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6638 (ii).
 — CLOTHING, CONTRACT SINCE SEPT., 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1838 (i).
 — IN CANADA, MR. MCKING'S REP. re CLOTHING: M. for Copy* (Mr. Belcourt) 3669 (i).
 — CORPS, ISSUE OF LEE-ENFIELD RIFLES BY MAJ. GEN. GASCOIGNE: M. for Copy* (Mr. Hughes) 3670 (i).
 — FORCE, PERMANENT INSPECTION BY GEN. GASCOIGNE: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1782 (i).
 — GENERAL ORDERS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1782 (i).
 — QUALIFICATIONS OF OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 7124 (ii).
 — GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 7517 (ii).
- HARNESS AND SADDLERY, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1470 (i).
 — M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1839 (i).
 — INSPECTION, RECOMMENDATION, &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Hughes) 3670 (i).
 — NAVAL CORPS, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. Britton) 3085 (i).
 — PROMOTIONS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2433 (i).
- MONTREAL DRILL SHED, REPAIRS EXECUTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1838 (i).
- OLIVER MILITARY EQUIPMENT, ADOPTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 4345 (ii).
- PERMANENT FORCE, OFFICERS APPOINTED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Ross Robertson) 7122 (ii).
 — QUALIFICATIONS FOR COMMISSIONS: Ques. (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 6010 (ii).
- REBELLION LOSSES (1885) DOCUMENTS IN POSSESSION OF GOVT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Davie) 4246 (ii).
- RIFLE RANGE AT OTTAWA, TARGET PRACTICE: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6812 (ii).
 — ROSKLIFFE, LAND VALUATOR: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3408, 3680 (i).
- ROGERS, LT.-COL. R. E., RETIREMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Guillet) 5787 (ii).

MILITIA—Con.

- ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 5232 (ii).
 — REPATRIATION: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6613 (ii).
- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, AMALGAMATION OF CLASSES: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 973 (i).
- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, STAFF AND EMPLOYEES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 2824 (i).
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Charles Tupper) 5571 (ii).
- ST. HELEN'S ISLAND, ALLOTMENT FOR MILITARY PURPOSES: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 456 (i).
- SUTTON, LT., INSTRUCTIONS re MILITARY COURSE IN ENGLAND: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1782 (i).
- VOLUNTEERS OF 1866, MEDALS GRANTED: Remarks (Mr. Heyd) 6613 (ii).
- YUKON, &c. MILITARY FORCE, COST, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4624 (ii).
 — TRANSPORTATION OF SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 7793 (ii).
 [See "Yukon," &c.]
- Militia Act Amt. B. No. 140 (Mr. Borden, King's). 1^o*, 5331; 2^o and in Com., 5965; 3^o*, 5966 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 19.)
- Militia Force, Land Grants B. No. 133 (Mr. Sifton). 1^o, 4683; 2^o and in Com., 5960; 3^o*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 13.)
- MILITIA POINT, N.S., MAIL CARRIER, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 3310 (i).
 — APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 3310 (i).
- MINER'S FREE CERTIFICATES, NUMBER ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 3311 (i).
 — LICENSES ISSUED: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4773.
 — Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 5133 (ii).
 — WHITE AND CHILCOOT PASSES: Remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4601 (ii).
- MINING AND DREDGING LEASES ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3317 (i).
 — inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 5322 (ii).
 [See "Yukon."]
- MINISTERS, DEPUTIES AND CLERKS, AMOUNTS PAID FOR EXTRA SERVICE, 1890 TO 1897: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 3667 (i).
- MINT, ESTABLISHMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1340.
- Missaquash Commissioners of Sewers B. No. 103 (Mr. Logan). 1^o, 2430 (i).
- MISTASSINI AND ST. METHODE, PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casgrain) 2822 (i).
 — WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. for Copy of Instructions* (Mr. Casgrain) 3668 (i).
- MOHAWK INDIANS, WITHDR. OF GRANT FOR MEDICAL SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2817 (i).
- MONCTON (N.B.) STATION ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7084 (ii).
- MONROE, MR., FISHERY INSPECTOR, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5310 (ii).
- MONTAGUE (P.E.I.) CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 2822.
 — DISMISSAL OF CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 5787 (ii).
- Montford Colonization Ry. Co., Change of Name B. No. 68 (Mr. Bourassa). 1^o*, 1736; 2^o*, 1775 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 4367 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 75.)

- MONTREAL CIRCUIT COURT, EXTRA JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 598 (i).
- Montmorency Cotton Mills Co.'s B. No. 102** (Mr. *Penny*). 1st, 2430; 2^d, 3084 (i); in Com., 4174; 3^d, 4174 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 108.)
- Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. No. 163** (Mr. *Fielding*). 1st, 2^d, 7011; M. for Com., 7142, 7166; in Com., 7180; 3^d, 7241 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. No. 105** (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1st, 2799; 2^d, 3084 (i); in Com. and 3^d, 4807; Sen. Amts., 5905 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. No. 104** (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1st, 2799; 2^d, 3084 (i); in Com. and 3^d, 5363 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 109.)
- Montreal and Province Line Ry. Co.'s B. No. 56** (Mr. *Penny*). 1st, 1380; 2^d, 1509 (i); in Com. and 3^d, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 81** (Mr. *Préfontaine*). 1st, 1840; 2^d, 1950; in Com. and 3^d, 5827 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- MONTREAL CUSTOMS HOUSE, DISMISSALS, 1896 TO 1898, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 3669.
- DRILL SHED, REPAIRS EXECUTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1838 (i).
- MONTREAL AND LAKE ONT. NAVIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 6009 (ii).
- MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Pouppore*) 6466 (ii).
- MONTMAGNY P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5093 (ii).
- MONTREAL P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (ii).
- MONTREAL, QUEBEC AND MANCHESTER MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7659 (ii).
- MONUMENT TO LATE ALEXANDER MACKENZIE: in Com. of Sup., 6105 (ii).
- MORIEN, PORT, C.B., BREAKWATER, GOVT. GRANT: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4179 (ii).
- MORDEN, WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5615 (ii).
- MOTION, NOTICE OF (Mr. *Hughes*): Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6027 (ii).
- MT. ELGIN INSTITUTE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Heud*) 672 (i).
- INDIAN SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 7754 (ii).
- MOUNTED POLICE AND EDMONTON ROUTE TO YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1574 (i).
- TENDER FOR DRUGS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2349.
- Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. No. 13** (Mr. *Davis*) 1st, 271; 2^d, and in Com., 2058; 3^d, 2058 (i).
- Mounted Police Pensions (1889) Act Amt. B. No. 15** (Mr. *Davin*) 1st, 3070 (i); 2^d m., 4239 (ii).
- "MUDLARK," DREDGE, WORKING HOURS: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3825 (i).
- MURRAY CANAL, BRIDGE TENDERS, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).
- MURRAY CANAL, FLOATING WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).
- MURRAY RIVER (P.E.I.) SHIPPING ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3823 (i).
- Nakusp and Slocan Ry. Co.'s B. No. 52** (Mr. *MacPherson*) 1st, 1174; 2^d, 1334; in Com., 3868; 3^d, 3868 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- NANAIMO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, REPORTED RESIGNATION OF MEMBER: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4605 (ii).
- NAPANEE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6006 (ii).
- PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6008 (ii).
- NAPPAN (N.S.) DAIRY STATION, BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 7513 (ii).
- NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 6103 (ii).
- MUSEUM, OTTAWA: Remarks (Mr. *Belcourt*) 5323 (ii).
- NAVIGABLE RIVERS, OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).
- Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. No. 136** (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1st, 4923; 2^d, and in Com., 5325; 3^d, 5330 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- NAVIGATION, OPENING OF CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 2700 (i).
- NEUFRAGE POND, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 3166 (i).
- NEW BRUNSWICK:**
- CAMPOBELLO ISLAND, TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4177 (ii).
- CAMPBELLTON WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (ii).
- CENTRAL RY., N.B., UNPAID ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 7653 (i).
- CHARLOTTE COUNTY, N.B., TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (ii).
- CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CENTREVILLE, N.B., INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 830 (i).
- DEER ISLAND TELEGRAPH CABLE, SURVEYS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4177 (ii).
- DOMVILLE, LT. COL., M.P., CHARGES AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 5393 (ii).
- ELGIN, N.B., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McInerney*) 1837 (i).
- EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN RY., SETTLEMENT BETWEEN GOVT. AND E. B. CHANDLER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McInerney*) 2841 (i).
- HILLSBORO' CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL; M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McInerney*) 1838 (i).
- I. C. R., DIVERSION OF ROUTE THROUGH SPRINGHILL: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1929 (i).
- KILLAM'S CLAIM: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McInerney*) 4683 (ii).
- POSITION ON I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 827 (i).
- MONCTON RY. STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 6368, 7084 (ii).
- CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 477 (i).
- PLUMBING AND HEATING CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2346 (i).
- POWLIE, A., CAR INSPECTOR, SPRINGHILL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1932 (i).
- SIMONDS, R. H., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Powell*) 2840 (i).
- STEWART, TANK MAN, SPRINGHILL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1953, 2342 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

- LOBSTER FISHERY IN BAY OF FUNDY: Ques. (Mr. Copp) 479 (i).
- PALMER'S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 504 (i).
- PILOTAGE INVESTIGATION AT ST. JOHN, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Ellis) 825 (i).
- ST. JOHN INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7645 (ii).
- MARINE CEMETERY: in Com. of Sup., 481.
- QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 7586 (ii).
- STEAMSHIP SERVICE, ST. JOHN, &C., TO GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 504 (i).
- TOBIQUE RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7633 (ii).
- VENNER, J. A., INDIAN AGENT AT RESTIGOUCHE, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. McAlister) 4611 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. McAlister) 1786 (i).
- SUSPENSION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McAlister) 2839 (i).
- WOOD, H. W., WELSFORD POSTMASTER, N.B., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7120 (ii).
- NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADA, NEGOTIATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Roddick) 5391 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. Roddick) 4928 (ii).
- NEWFOUNDLAND AND CAPE BRETON, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7282 (ii).
- NEW HARBOUR (N.S.) BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7590 (ii).
- NEWSPAPERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4581, 4590 (ii).

NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS:

- AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, PAR. IN MAN. *Free Press*: Personal Explanation (Mr. Davin) 4349.
- ALASKAN AND N. W. RY. CO.'S BILL, PAR. IN *Gazette*: Personal Explanation (Mr. Belcourt) 6242 (ii).
- ALASKAN BOUNDARY DISPUTE, TELEGRAM TO N. Y. PRESS: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1735 (i).
- CANNED GOODS FOR KLONDIKE, PAR. IN *National Provisioner*: Remarks (Mr. Quin) 3940 (i).
- CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., PAR. IN *MONTREAL Gazette*: Remarks (Mr. Lister) 5663 (ii).
- FRENCH LANGUAGE IN N.W.T., ARTICLE IN THE *L'Ouest Canadien*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 2529 (i).
- GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS, PAR. IN *Nor'-Wester re TREATMENT BY GOVT.*: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 6032 (ii).
- HALSTEAD, MR. FREEMAN, SENTENCED AT PORTO RICO, PAR. IN *TORONTO World*: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 6023 (ii).
- LEGIS, NARCISSE, POSTMASTER AT STR. EULALIE, LETTER IN *La Patrie*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7688.
- MANITOBA SCHOOLS, PAR. IN *OTTAWA Citizen*: Personal Explanation (Mr. Sproule) 5496 (ii).
- PAR. IN *La Patrie*: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bergeron) 7697, 7711, 7715 (ii).
- PERSONAL EXPLANATION, PAR. IN *La Patrie*: ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP. (Mr. Marcotte) 7657 (ii).
- PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, PAR. IN *MONTREAL Witness*: (Mr. Craig) 3503 (i).
- TARTE, HON. MR., AND THE SENATE, PAR. IN *La Soleil*: Remarks (Mr. Marcotte) 3319 (i).
- U. S. CUSTOMS DUTIES IN ALASKA, TELEGRAM IN *MONTREAL Gazette*: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 405 (i).
- YUKON PROVISIONAL DISTRICT, PAR. IN *OTTAWA Citizen re CUSTOMS OFFICIALS*: (Mr. Davin) 4451.
- PAR. IN *SASKATCHEWAN Times re LIQUOR PERMITS*: Remarks (Mr. Davis) 1174 (i).

- Nickel Steel Co.'s B. No. 96 (Mr. Wood, Hamilton). 1*, 2430; 2*, 2560; M. for Com., 3554, 3643; ref. back to Com. on Rys., 3653 (i); in Com., 4071; 3*, 4071 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 110.)
- NIXON, THOS., INDIAN PURVEYOR, CLAIMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7765 (ii).
- NOBLE BROS., ACTION BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 5268 (ii).
- PAYMENTS TO, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 5133 (ii).
- NOEL, L.P.O., N.W.T., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 6319 (ii).
- NORTH BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (ii).
- NORTH CHANNEL, DEEPENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6535 (ii).
- NORTH SYDNEY, EASTERN EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 6386 (ii).
- North American Telegraph Co.'s B. 120 (Mr. Hurley). 1*, 3713; 2*, 3868 (i); in Com. and 3*, 5363 (ii).
- North Shore Electric Ry. Co.'s B. No. 97 (Mr. Préfontaine). 1*, 2430; 2*, 2560 (i); in Com. and 3*, 5827; Sen. Amts., 7744, 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- North-West Irrigation Act Amt. B. No. 146 (Mr. Sifton) 1*, 5662; 2* and in Com., 6123; 3*, 6946; Sen. Amts., 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- North-West Territories Act Amt. B. No. 131 (Mr. Sifton). 1*, 4681; 2* and in Com., 5945; 3*, 6064 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
- NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:
- APPNTS. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 977 (i).
- Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 977 (i).
- ALIEN LABOUR LAW, ENFORCEMENT IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7275 (ii).
- BANFF CAVE AND BASIN, BATHS, CARTAKER, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davin) 2841 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Davin) 451 (i).
- BATTLEFORD INDIAN AGENCY, DEATH OF CATTLE: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1574, 2844 (i).
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1574.
- COLONIZATION COMPANIES GRANTS OF LANDS, CONDITIONS: Ques. (Mr. Douglas) 479 (i).
- CONNOR, JOHN, GOLD DREDGING LEASES, N.W.T. Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1074 (i).
- CORONERS, N.W.T., STATUS: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 7855 (ii).
- CREAMERIES IN N.W.T., NUMBER OF PATRONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 487, 503 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 5994 (ii).
- CROW'S NEST PASS RY., AGREEMENT WITH C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 2036 (i).
- AMOUNTS PAID C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3405 (i).
- COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. Ross Robertson) 6030 (ii).
- CONSTRUCTION BY COMPANY: Remarks (Mr. Richardson) 6240 (ii).
- DEATH OF EMPLOYEES; M. for Cor.* (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 3666, 3668 (i); conc., 7823 (ii).
- inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 4605, 5394.
- ENGINEER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 7110, 7181 (ii).
- EXPENSES OF COMMISSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7251 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

- DAIRYING IN N.W.T., SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 504 (i).
- DAUNAIS, C. M., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1928 (i).
- DEAF MUTES, PROVISION BY N.W.T. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1930 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 4345 (ii).
- DISMISSALS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 6115, 6317 (ii).
- See general heading.
- DONALDSON, S. J., IMMIGRATION AGENT, AMOUNTS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4176 (ii).
- DREDGING FOR GOLD IN PEACE RIVER, PERMITS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McLean*) 478 (i).
- LICENSES, REGULATIONS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 746 (i).
- DROLET, CHEVALIER, MINING LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4924 (ii).
- EDMONTON RY. BRIDGE, CONTRACTS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 3827 (i) 4773 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2528 (i).
- CONTRACT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1836 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1341 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 6245, 6268; conc., 7822 (ii).
- FREIGHT BATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 6010.
- PENALTIES TO CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5316 (ii).
- EDWARDS, DR. O. C., INDIAN MEDICAL OFFICER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 4607.
- ELEVATOR MONOPOLY MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 598 (i).
- FARMERS AND LIBERAL PROMISES: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Oliver*) 2929 (i).
- GALICIAN SETTLERS IN N.W.T., REP. re DESTITUTION: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 101 (i).
- PAR. IN "NOE"-WESTER" re TREATMENT BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6052 (ii).
- GISBORNE, MR., INSPECTOR OF GOVT., TELEGRAPH LINES, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5317 (ii).
- GOLD PLACER MINING IN N.W.T. AND YUKON: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).
- GRAIN LIENS, MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1930 (i).
- STANDARDS INSPECTION SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).
- TRADE AT FORT WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 475 (i).
- GOVT. OFFICIALS DISMISSED SINCE 1896, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 4246 (ii).
- GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. Co.'s B. No. 140: QUES. OF PROCEDURE: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 6001; (M.) 6002 (ii).
- HORSES IMPORTED FROM U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3942 (i).
- IMMIGRATION HAND-BOOK: M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Adjn., 5932 (ii).
- INDIAN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, DUCK LAKE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2346 (i).
- LANDS, QU'APPELLE VALLEY, RIGHTS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 516 (i).
- RESERVES, ASSINIBOIA, DISTRIBUTION OF SEED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 4678 (ii).
- RESERVES, CROPS IN N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 5571 (ii).
- NUMBER OF ACRES SEEDED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1837 (i).
- RESERVES IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 452.
- QU'APPELLE DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 451.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

- INDIAN SUPPLIES, MAN. AND N.W.T., PURCHASE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 452 (i).
- TITLES IN ATHABASCA, MACKENZIE AND YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 824 (i).
- INDIANS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7301.
- INTERIOR DEPT., DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 828 (i).
- JONES, CHARLES A., IMMIGRATION AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4607 (ii).
- JUDICIARY IN N.W.T., ADDITIONAL JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1775 (i).
- KLONDIKE, EDMONTON AND PRINCE ALBERT ROUTES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 453 (i).
- LAND GRANTS TO MAN. AND N.W.T. RY. CORPORATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 482 (i).
- LANDS RESERVED FOR SETTLEMENT IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 971 (i).
- M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1837 (i).
- LAND SURVEYS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 450 (i).
- LIEUT.-GOVERNOR N.W.T., APPNMT. OF MEMBER FOR N. WELLINGTON: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 101 (i).
- RUMOURED APPNMT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2699 (i).
- CONFIRMATION OF APPNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6466 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1073 (i).
- Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2529 (i).
- MCKAY, THOS., AMOUNT OF TIMBER DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4176 (ii).
- MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. Co.: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 7470 (ii).
- MEDICINE HAT COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7589.
- MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 4545, 6856 (ii).
- CONTRACT FOR SUPPLIES: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4041 (ii).
- Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5116 (ii).
- DISTRIBUTION IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 3670 (i).
- DISMISSAL OF DR. BAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2349 (i).
- MEDALS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 451 (i).
- NUMBER IN TERRITORIES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 452 (i).
- PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6577 (ii).
- M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 5019 (ii).
- REPORTED LOSS OF MEN IN YUKON; Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 7659 (ii).
- SUPPLIES, TRANSPORTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5520 (ii).
- remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5497 (ii).
- TENDER FOR DRUGS: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davin*) 4246 (ii).
- WTHDEL. FROM MOOSONIN: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 3784 (i).
- YUKON DETACHMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 4453 (ii).
- NOEL, L. P. O., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6319 (ii).
- PERJURY CONVICTIONS AT BATTLEFORD: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).
- PRINCE ALBERT MAIL SERVICE, DELAY IN TRANSMISSION: M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Adjn., 2617 (i).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5489 (i).
- RAILWAY RATE WAR AND MAN. SETTLERS: M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Adjn., 1473 (i).
- RANKIN, MR., IMMIGRATION AGENT IN KANSAS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1779 (i).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

REBELLION CLAIMS, N.W.T., APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 5321 (ii).

— CLAIMS OF (1885) DOCUMENTS IN POSSESSION OF GOVT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davis*) 4246 (ii).

REGINA DISTRICT, REGISTRY OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5319 (ii).

— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, EMPLOYMT. OF DR. WILLOUGHBY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 828 (i).

ROCKY MOUNTAIN PARK, FENCING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7251, 7769 (ii).

ROULEAU P. O., ABOLITION OF: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5018 (ii).

SASKATCHEWAN DISTRICT, APPNMT. OF JUDGE: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 7042 (ii).

— TIMBER BERTHS HELD BY MOORE, McDOWELL & Co.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 481 (i).

SASKATOON BRIDGE: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 4774 (ii).

SEED GRAIN, AMOUNT DUE GOVT. BY SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5135, 5569 (ii).

SKELTON *vs.* QUEEN, POSTMASTER AT BATTLEFORD: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 6803 (ii).

— AFFIDAVITS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6112, 6240, 6317, 6322 (ii).

— APPLICATION FOR NEW TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 53 9 (ii).

— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Davin*) 6890 (ii).

— PROCEEDINGS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5117, 5258, 5931 (ii).

SPENCER, WM., EX-POLICEMAN, DISCHARGE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2840 (i).

— PENSION: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6325 (ii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6316 (ii).

TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION, N.W.T., ACCOUNTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (ii).

— MISS CUMMINGS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).

— OUTSTANDING INDEBTEDNESS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 486 (i).

— PAYMENT OF PRIZES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 976.

— P. LAMONT'S ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2431 (i).

— TIMBER BERTHS IN N.W.T. AND YUKON: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).

[See "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," "YUKON," &c.]

NORWOOD, H. H., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA:

ADVOCATE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7631 (ii).

ALDERSHOT MILITARY CAMP SUPPLIES: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1786 (i).

ARICHAH HARBOURS, BUOYS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5320 (ii).

ASPY BAY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 2819 (i).

ATLANTIC FISHERIES, U. S. LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 1272 (i).

BADDECK DRILL SHED, LAND TITLE: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1467 (i).

BEAR RIVER, BRIDGE AT MOUTH, REMOVAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills*) 2840 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 1337 (i).

— REPORT AS TO CONDITION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 975 (i).

— SHIPPING MASTER, APPNMT.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 4605 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

BEAR RIVER, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills*) 2840 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1071 (i).

BRATONVILLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3824 (i).

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, APPLICATION AT GABARUS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 674 (i).

BURNT CHURCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (ii).

CAMERON, A. F., CUSTOMS OFFICER, SHERBROOKE (N.S.): M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2840.

CAPE BRETON COUNTY DISMISSALS: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 6034, 6321 (ii).

— MARINE DEPT., CHANGES; Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 673 (i).

— RAILWAY, "HARD PAN" CLAIMS; Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 5134 (ii).

CAPE NEGRO ISLAND LIGHT, APPNMT. OF KEEPER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1839 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1929 (i).

CHAPEL COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4345 (ii).

CHETICAMP CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4180 (ii).

CONNORS, D., ANTIGONISH, FIRE CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1837 (i).

COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7590 (ii).

DALHOUSIE WHARF EXTENSION, IMPROVEMENTS, &c., in Com. of Sup., 7084 (ii).

DART, LYMAN, REMISSION OF DEATH SENTENCE: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6653 (ii).

GABARUS BREAKWATER, GRANTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4179 (ii).

GRAND NARROWS, GOVT. BLACKSMITH, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3661 (i).

— PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1781 (i).

HALIFAX DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 7586 (ii).

HUBERT, MISS, PET. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 7525.

INDIANTOWN BRANCH RY. CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (ii).

INGONISH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).

I. C. R., ARCHIBALD, CHIEF ENGINEER, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1834 (i).

— EASTERN EXTENSION DINING CAR: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2345 (i).

— EMPLOYEES REINSTATED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3665 (i).

— FENCING: in Com. of Sup., 6432 (ii).

— GRAND NARROWS RESTAURANT: in Com. of Sup., 6438 (ii).

— HALIFAX, ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 6382 (ii).

— KIRK ESTATE, DAMAGES BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 7183, 7373 (ii).

— MULGRAVE, ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 6428 (ii).

— MURRAY, J. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5318 (ii).

— PATENT LOCOMOTIVE CYLINDER: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1335 (i).

— PURCHASE OF LOCOMOTIVES IN U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 476 (i).

— REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF BRAKESMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 478 (i).

— WESTVILLE STATION, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2342 (i).

IONA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

- ISAAC'S HARBOUR, POSTMASTER GRIFFIN'S DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1834 (i).
- KING'S HEAD LIGHT: QUES. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 1932.
— Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1929 (i).
- KING, W. A., ANTIGONISH STATION AGENT. DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7120 (ii).
- L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 972 (i).
- ST. PETERS, &c., OUTPORTS, MEDICAL AID TO SICK SEAMEN: (Mr. Gillies) 133 (i).
- POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. Gillies) 3636 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1335 (i).
- LINLOFF, EDWARD, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 5319 (ii).
- LIVINGSTONE COVE: in Com. of Sup., 7633 (ii).
- LOBSTER PACKING, &c., SIZE OF CATCH: Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 1340 (i).
- LOCH LOVEN POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1776 (i).
- MCKAY, KENNETH, LOCKMAN ST. PETER'S CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1070 (i).
- MCKAY'S POINT WHARF, TENDERS FOR BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 2515 (i).
- MCLEOD, M. G., POSTAL MAIL CLERK: M. for O.C.'s (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4181 (i).
- MENABB, CAMPBELL, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 5446 (ii).
- MENNAUGHTON, W.M., EMPLOYMT. IN INLAND REVENUE: Ques. (Mr. McInerney) 1931 (i).
- MENEILL, RORY. SECTION FOREMAN, I.C.R., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 63 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 6416 (ii).
- MAIL CONTRACTS, CANCELLATION SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 469 (ii).
- MARGAREE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 4181 (ii).
- TELEGRAPH OPERATOR ROSS, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 2815 (i).
- MATHESON, JOHN D., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 7121 (ii).
- MIDDLETON POST OFFICE DISTRICT, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 7687 (i).
- MILITIA POINT, MAIL CARRIER. AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 3310 (i).
- APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 3310 (ii).
- NAPPAN (N.S.) DAIRY BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 7513 (ii).
- NAPANEE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 6006 (ii).
- NORTH SYDNEY, EASTERN EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 6386 (ii).
- NOVA SCOTIA SOUTHERN RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 7818 (ii).
- OAK BAY MILLS P. O., CLOSING, IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. McAlister) 5324 (ii).
- INQUIRY FOR RET. (Mr. McAlister) 3941, 4928.
- in Com. of Sup., 6712 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. McAlister) 3824 (i).
- OTTAWA AND TRURO MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 1575 (i).
- OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 6385 (i).
- OXFORD POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: M. for Cor.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1838 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

- PICTOU POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2619 (i).
- PIRATE HARBOUR P. O., CLOSING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7051 (ii).
- PORT HILLFORD BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7628.
- PORT MORIEN, BREAKWATER, GOVT. GRANT: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 4179 (i).
- PORT MULGRAVE STATION AGENT, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1832 (i).
- PORT MULGRAVE AND ST. PETER'S MAIL ROUTE: Remarks (Mr. Gillies) 6323 (ii).
- ROSS, DAVID, FISHERY OVERSEER AT MARGAREE: M. for Ret.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1837 (i).
- RETURNS, INQUIRY FOR (Mr. Gillies) 5923 (i).
- ST. PETERS CANAL, REPAIRS TO ENTRANCE: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1339 (i).
- STELLARTON CAR INSPECTOR SUTHERLAND, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1833 (i).
- M. for Ret.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2839 (i).
- STORM SIGNALS, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 7118 (ii).
- SYDNEY AND NORTH SYDNEY QUARANTINE PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 1781 (i).
- TANNER, JOHN E., DETENTION BY SPANISH GOVT. AT PORTO RICO: Ques. (Mr. Russell) 6011 (ii).
- TELEGRAPH LINES, GOVT. RATES: Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 6006 (ii).
- TRACADIE (N.B.), ADDITIONAL PURCHASE; in Com. of Sup., 7635 (ii).
- TROUT COVE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 3824 (i).
- WALSH, E. J., CLAIM AGAINST LEEWARD ISLANDS: M. for Ret.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2841 (i), 6324 (ii).
- WEATHERBEE, MR. JUSTICE, ABSENCE FROM PROVINCE: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3166 (i).
- WEST INDIAN TRADE, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1339 (i).
- WINDSOR DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 7214 (ii).
- NULTY, THOS., COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 824 (i).
- PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 4770 (ii).
- OAK BAY MILLS P. O., CLOSING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6712 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. McAlister) 3824 (i).
- INQUIRY FOR RET. (Mr. McAlister) 3941, 4928 (ii).
- IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. McAlister) 5324 (ii).
- OATHS OF OFFICE. See "ADMINISTRATION."
- OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4947, 7731 (ii).
- OGILVIE, MR., LECTURE ON THE YUKON: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 307 (i).
- GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 7323 (ii).
- OFFICIAL REP. ON YUKON, CONTRACT FOR PRINTING: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 3670 (i).
- DISTRIBUTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 4611, 4771 (ii).
- FRENCH TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1078 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2529 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Foster) 604 (i).

- OGILVIE, MR. : Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 604 (i).
 — AND HANSARD TRANSLATION : Remarks (Mr. Casgrain) 1576 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 7323 (ii).
 — PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. Morrison) 2849.
 — REPS. SENT FROM YUKON, DATES, &c. ; Ques. (Mr. McAlister) 974 (i).
 — Mr., SERVICES SINCE 1898 : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3406 (i).

OLIVER MILITARY EQUIPMENT, ADOPTION BY GOVT. : Ques. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 4345 (ii).

ONTARIO :

- ALIEN LABOUR LAW, AGENT AT FORT ERIE : Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 4178 (ii).
 — GEORGIAN BAY : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 4523.
 — HAMILTON : Ques. (Mr. MacPherson) 6611 (ii).
 — PARRY SOUND : Remarks (Mr. McCormick) 6613 (ii).
 — WALLACEBURG : Remarks (Mr. Clancy) 6612.
 — ENFORCEMENT AT TORONTO : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 5011, 5445 (ii).
 — Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 5116 (ii).
 — INSTRUCTIONS TO AGENTS : Remarks (Mr. Montague) 6581 (ii).
 ALIEN WORKMEN, IMPORTED TO TORONTO : M. (Mr. Clarke) to Adjn., 4029 (ii).
 ANDERSON, T. E., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT NAPANEE, SALARY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 6008 (ii).
 ARNPRIOR P. O. INSPECTOR, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4177 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 5449 (ii).
 BATH (ONT.) CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 6007 (ii).
 BAXTER, WM., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3657 (i).
 BELLEVILLE P. O., DISMISSAL : ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP. (Mr. Corby) 6208 (ii).
 — Remarks (Mr. Corby) 6112 (ii).
 BINDER TWINE, SALE OF GOVT. OUTPUT AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3659 (i).
 BODDY, A., APPNMT. AS FISHERY OVERSEER : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3657 (i).
 CATTLE SHIPMENTS TO BELFAST : Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 484 (i).
 COBOURG POSTMASTER, ATTENDANCE AT REFORM CONVENTION : Ques. (Mr. Guillet) 602 (i).
 CORN IMPORTATIONS SINCE 1897 TO 1898 : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3659 (i).
 CORNWALL CANAL, CONSTRUCTION AMOUNT PAID : Ques. (Mr. Broder) 5391 (ii).
 COURT OF APPEAL, ONTARIO, EXTRA JUDGE : Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 1071 (i).
 CRAIGVILLE AND STROUD'S MILLS MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS ; Ques. (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 487 (i).
 DUNDAS, MR., DISMISSAL BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. Landerkin) 6578 (ii).
 FISHING LICENSES, AMOUNT PAID BY LAKE ERIE FISHERMEN : Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 601 (i).
 GALBRAITH, THOS. J., CANAL OFFICER AT FORT COLBORNE, RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. Montague) 516.
 GALOFS CANAL, PURCHASE OF LAND, &c. : M. FOR RET.* (Mr. Broder) 3668 (i).
 GANANOQUE CUSTOM HOUSE : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4923 (ii).
 GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, REMOVAL AND NEW SITE, LT.-GOV. PATTERSON'S LETTER : laid on Table (Mr. Borden, King's) 5316 (ii).

ONTARIO—Con.

- GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, REMOVAL AND NEW SITE : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 3826, 3318 (i).
 — M. (Mr. Taylor) to Adjn., 5098 (ii).
 — M. FOR COR.* (Mr. Taylor) 1837 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 457 (i).
 GEORGIAN BAY TIMBER DISTRICT, OUTPUT OF LOGS TO MICHIGAN : Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 825 (i).
 — Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 826 (i).
 GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS, PROHIBITION OF SWEATING : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 599 (i).
 GRAND RIVER FLOODS : M. (Mr. Montague) to Adjn., 2526 (i).
 G. T. R., OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. AND C. P. R. CONNECTIONS AT SCOTIA JUNCTION : Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 454 (i).
 GRAVENHURST P. O., APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5320 (ii).
 HAGARVILLE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, DEFALCATION : Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 474 (i).
 HICKS, WM., APPNMT. AS FISHERY OVERSEER : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3658 (i).
 HURON WEST AND SIMCOE VACANCIES : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7042 (ii).
 IMPERIAL ARMY SOLDIERS AT TORONTO : Remarks (Mr. Montague) 4523 (ii).
 INFANTRY SCHOOLS, FREDERICTON AND LONDON, COST OF LIGHTING : Ques. (Mr. Ross Robertson) 7121.
 INTEREST PAID ONTARIO AND QUEBEC DURING 1897 : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 455 (i).
 JOHNSON, J. T., FORT ERIE CUSTOMS OFFICER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 4178 (ii).
 KINGSTON, HARBOUR DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 7242, 7641 (ii).
 — LOCOMOTIVE WORKS AND GANANOQUE DRILL SHED : M. (Mr. Taylor) to Adjn., 605 (i).
 — TELEGRAM re ORDER FOR LOCOMOTIVES : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 484 (i).
 — PENITENTIARY, MEDICAL OFFICER : Ques. (Mr. Roche) 2846 (i).
 LAKEFIELD AND APSLEY MAIL ROUTE, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lang) 4930 (ii).
 LOGS, &c., EXPORT DUTY : Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 3085.
 LONDON ELECTION TRIAL, 1897, ACCOUNTS RENDERED MR. H. H. ROBERTSON : M. FOR RET.* (Mr. Calvert) 3669 (i).
 LUMBER CUT : M. (Mr. Bennett) to Adjn., 1843 (i).
 LYNCH, PATRICK, POSTMASTER AT CHAPLEAU, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Poupore) 3088 (i).
 MEAFORD HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 5927 (ii).
 MIDLAND HARBOUR-MASTER, APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3662 (i).
 MOHAWK INDIANS, WITHDRL. OF GRANT FOR MEDICAL SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2817 (i).
 MONTREAL AND LAKE ONTARIO NAVIGATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 6009 (ii).
 MT. ELGIN INSTITUTE, ESTABLISHMENT : Ques. (Mr. Heyl) 672 (i).
 NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CARETAKER : Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 6008 (ii).
 NORTH BAY WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5927 (ii).
 ONTARIO COUNTY ELECTIONS, LITIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 7504 (ii).
 ORTON, DR. INDIAN MEDICAL SUPT., DISMISSAL ; Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3669 (i) 5393 (ii).
 OTONABEE RIVER FLOODS, INVESTIGATION AS TO CAUSE : Ques. (Mr. Lang) 483 (i).
 OTTAWA GROUNDS, REMOVAL OF SHEDS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, ASPHALT SIDEWALKS, CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 487 (i).

PARRY SOUND HARBOUR-MASTER: Ques. (Mr. McCormick) 5135 (ii).

PETERBOROUGH DRILL SEED, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lang) 5132 (ii).

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 5926-7 (ii).

POST OFFICES CLOSED SINCE JULY, 1896; Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3936 (i).

POUND NET LICENSES, NORTH SHORE LAKE HURON: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3657 (i).

QUEEN VICTORIA PARK, NIAGARA FALLS: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 2847 (i).

RAINY RIVER JUDICIAL DISTRICT, APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE: Remarks. (Mr. Bennett) 5011 (ii).

RAT PORTAGE PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 7588 (ii).

ROBERT, H. A., STRATFORD P. O. CLOCK CARE-TAKER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Maclaren) 4344 (ii).

ROCKLIFFE RIFLE RANGE, LAND VALUATOR: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3408 (i).

ROGERS, LT. COL. R. Z., RETIREMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gullet) 5767 (ii).

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, STAFF AND EMPLOYEES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 2824 (i).

— Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Charles Tupper) 5571 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL, PLACING OF BUOYS, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 4180 (ii).

ST. THOMAS MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 453 (i).

SAULT STE. MARIE WHARFINGER, BALANCE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 7096 (ii).

SEELEY'S BAY POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF W. W. WILLIAMS: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3407 (i).

— M. (Mr. Taylor) to Adju., 3409, 3416 (i).

SHERIDAN, JOHN, INSPECTOR OF LIVE STOCK, APPOINTMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6010 (ii).

THESSALON POINT LIGHTHOUSE, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1932 (i).

TORONTO HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNTS PAID W. E. PHIN: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 1337 (i).

— CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4771 (ii).

— EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 482 (i).

— LIABILITY INCURRED: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 971.

— in Com. of Sup., 5891, 7231 (ii).

TORONTO OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5002, 7284.

TORONTO PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5448, 7217 (ii).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. Corby) 2817 (i).

VOTERS' LISTS (ONT.) REVISING OFFICERS, COST OF PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2845 (i).

WALTON, T. M., INDIAN AGENT AT PARRY ISLAND, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCormack) 3670.

WAVERLEY POSTMASTER, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 598 (i).

WELLAND CANAL, EMPLOYEES DISMISSED, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Montague) 2839 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 7652 (i).

WILLIAMS, W. W., POSTMASTER AT SEELEY'S BAY, DISMISSAL: M. (Mr. Taylor) to Adju., 3409, 3416.

— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3407 (i).

WOODS, J. P., EX-JUDGE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. Erb) 825 (i).

WYBRIDGE-WYSEVALE POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 598 (i).

Ontario and Quebec Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 25 (Mr. Belcourt) 1^o*, 744; 2^o*, 824 (i).

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7243 (ii).

Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 32 (Mr. Tisdale) 1^o*, 903; 2^o*, 1018; recom. to Com. on Rys., 1774; in Com., 2123; M. for Com., 2386, 2560, 2606; in Com., 2619; 3^o, 2697 (i). Amt. (Mr. Maclean) Neg. (Y. 16, N. 65) 2697. (61-62 Vic., c. 81.)

ORDER, QUES. OF (Mr. Montague): in Com. of Sup., 4891 (ii).

— ON CHAIRMAN'S RULING (Mr. Casey) 71 (i).

— W. W. WILLIAMS' DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 3424 (i).

ORTON, DR. GEO., INDIAN MEDICAL SUPT. IN MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 3669 (i).

— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5393 (ii).

OTONABEE RIVER FLOODS, INVESTIGATION AS TO CAUSE: Ques. (Mr. Lang) 483 (i).

OTTAWA, DEPTL. WESTERN BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5069 (ii).

— BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 7588 (ii).

OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Belcourt) 3664 (i).

OTTAWA GROUNDS, REMOVAL OF SHEDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).

Ottawa Interprovincial Bridge Co.'s B. No. 125 (Mr. Belcourt) 1^o*, 4448; 2^o*, 4808; in Com., and 3^o*, 6647 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 112.)

Ottawa, Montreal and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. Fraser, Guysboro') 1^o*, 1068; 2^o*, 1214 (i); in Com., and 3^o*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 76.)

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. No. 80 (Mr. Belcourt) 1^o*, 1839; 2^o*, 1949 (i); in Com., and 3^o*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 82.)

OTTAWA RIVER STEAMBOAT CHANNEL: conc., 7819 (ii).

OTTAWA SUMMER HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7218 (ii).

OTTAWA AND TRURO (N.S.) MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 1575 (i).

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5889 (ii).

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 6385 (ii).

OXFORD, N. S., POSTMASTER, APPOINTMENT: M. for Cor.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1838 (i).

OYSTER FISHERIES, LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Yeo) 1775 (i).

OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 5314 (ii).

PACIFIC CABLE, CANADA AND AUSTRALIA: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 5232 (ii).

— M. (Mr. Casey) for Com. of Sup., 6186 (ii).

— Deb. (Sir Charles Tupper) 6192; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 6197; (Mr. McNeill) 6199; Mr. Wallace) 6201 (ii).

— M. (Mr. Casey) to print papers, 6226 (ii).

— Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 7125, 7384 (ii).

Pacific and Canadian Yukon Ry., Nav. and Mining Co.'s B. No. 83 (Mr. Tisdale) 1^o*, 903; 2^o*, 1018; withdn., 3404 (i).

- Pacific and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 40** (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 1^o, 970; 2^o, 1214; withdn., 3713 (i).
- Pacific and Yukon Ry., Nav., Trading and Mining Co.'s B. No. 151** (Mr. *Rosmond*) 1^o, 6227; 2^o, and ref. to Com. on Rys., 6334 (ii).
- PALMER, BENJAMIN, DISMISSAL**: in Com. of Sup., 4981 (ii).
- PALMER'S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER**: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).
- PARIS EXHIBITION, 1900, PREPARATION, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (ii).
- PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, CONTRACT FOR ASPHALT SIDEWALKS**: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 487 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1783 (i).
- **DISMISSAL OF LATE SUPT. ROBERTSON**: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2818 (i).
- **SIDEWALKS, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).
- "PARLIAMENTARY COMPANION," PURCHASE OF COPIES BY GOVT.**: in Com. of Sup., 6975 (ii).
- PARLIAMENT, OPENING**: Mess. by Black Rod, 1 (i).
- **PROROGATION**: 7885 (ii).
- PARRY SOUND HARBOUR**: Ques. (Mr. *McCormick*) 5135 (ii).
- PATENTS, CANADIAN AND U.S., CLASSIFICATION, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 7512 (ii).
- "PATENT RECORD"**: in Com. of Sup., 5023 (ii).
- PEAKES STATION, P.E.I., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER**: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 4344 (ii).
- PENITENTIARIES**: in Com. of Sup., 3899 (i), 6639 (ii).
- **COMMISSIONERS' REPS.**: in Com. of Sup., 7490.
- **EXPENSES OF COMMISSIONS**: in Com. of Sup., 7339 (ii).
- **COMMISSIONERS ACCOUNTS, STMT.**: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7383 (ii).
- PERJURY CONVICTIONS AT BATTLEFORD**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).
- PERMANENT FORCE, OFFICERS APPOINTED BY GOVT.**: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 7122 (ii).
- **QUALIFICATIONS FOR COMMISSIONS**: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 6010 (ii).
- PERRY, MR. S. F., LATE M. P., DECEASE**: Remarks: (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 937 (i).
- PERSONAL EXPLANATION re EXPERIMENTAL FARMS**: (Mr. *McMillan*) 6113 (ii).
- **PAR. IN Gazette re ALASKAN AND N.W. RY. CO.'S BILL** (Mr. *Belcourt*) 6242 (ii).
- **PAR. IN La Patrie**: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 7657 (ii).
- **MISQUOTATION OF QUOTATION**: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 518 (i).
- See "Privilege," &c.
- PETERBOROUGH DRILL SHED, TENDERS, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 5132 (ii).
- PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S CONTRACT, TELEGRAM FROM LONDON**: in Com. of Sup., 7356 (ii).
- PETIT DE GRAT, DREDGING, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).
- "PETREL," SS., REP. OF CAPT. McELHINNEY**: in Com. of Sup., 4967 (ii).
- Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 74** (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1^o, 1774; 2^o, and in Com., 2138; 3^o, 2139 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 29.)
- PETROLEUM (REFINED), REDUCTION OF DUTY, LEGISLATION re**: prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 1945 (i).
- PHIN, MR., TORONTO HARBOUR DREDGING CONTRACT**: in Com. of Sup., 5892 (ii).
- See "Toronto Harbour."
- PHOTOGRAPHS, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 4591 (ii).
- PICKETT, G. B., DISMISSAL**: in Com. of Sup., 4998.
- PICTOU, N.S., POSTMASTER**: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2819 (i).
- PIERS AND PRIVATE WHARFS, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 3670 (ii).
- PILOTAGE INVESTIGATIONS, MONTREAL DISTRICT**: in Com. of Sup., 7102 (ii).
- **AT ST. JOHN, N.B.**: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 825 (i).
- PIRATE HARBOUR P. O., CLOSING, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 7051 (ii).
- POINT CLAIRE WHARF**: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (ii).
- **Construction, &c.**: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 504 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (i).
- **Inquiry for Ret.** (Mr. *Monk*) 3941 (i).
- POINT JEROME LIGHT-KEEPER, APPOINT. BY GOVT.**: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5320 (ii).
- PORT BURWELL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 5922 (ii).
- PORT COLBORNE PUBLIC BUILDING**: in Com. of Sup., 5463 (ii).
- PORT HILLFORD, N.S., BREAKWATER**: in Com. of Sup., 7628 (ii).
- PORT JOLI WHARF, REPAIRS**: in Com. of Sup., 5628.
- PORT LATOUR BREAKWATER**: in Com. of Sup., 5628.
- PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P. O.**: in Com. of Sup., 5485 (ii).
- PORT MULGRAVE, &c., AND IRISH COVE MAIL SUBSIDY**: in Com. of Sup., 7723 (ii).
- PORT MULGRAVE AND ST. PETER'S MAIL ROUTE**: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 6323 (ii).
- PORT MULGRAVE STATION AGENT, DISMISSAL**: M. for cor. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1832 (i).
- PORT STANLEY PIER, REPAIRS, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 5926 (ii).
- POST OFFICE**:
- **AGNES POSTMASTER AND REMOVAL OF OFFICE**: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Pope*) 1787 (i).
- **ASHCROFT (B.C.), MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT**: Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 3030 (i).
- **PRESENT OCCUPANT OF P. O.**: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1470, 3030 (i).
- **BEATONVILLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3824 (i).
- **BEAUMONT, WM., CLAIMS FOR SALARY AS POSTMASTER**: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 4611 (ii).
- **BELLEVILLE P. O., DISMISSALS**: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Corby*) 6208 (ii).
- **Remarks** (Mr. *Corby*) 6112 (ii).
- **COBOURG POSTMASTER, ATTENDANCE AT REFORM CONVENTION**: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 602 (i).
- **DAGNEAU, J. T., POSTMASTER AT ROBITAILLE, P.Q., CHARGES AGAINST**: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4246 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

- DAUNAIS, C. M., EEMPLT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1928 (i).
- DES JOACHIMS AND MACKIE'S STATION MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 5135 (ii).
- DOUBLE HILLS (P. E. I.) P. O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1931 (i).
- ELGIN (N. B.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McInerney*) 1837 (i).
- ELKHORN, MAN., POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4771 (ii).
- GOLDEN (B. C.), AND ST. EUGENE MAIL CARRIER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2816, 2824 (i).
- GRAVENHURST (ONT.), APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5320 (ii).
- ISAAC'S HARBOUR, POSTMASTER GRIFFIN, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1834 (i).
- JUBILEE STAMPS, AMOUNT RECEIVED FROM SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3405, 3938 (i).
— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 7526 (ii)
- KILDARE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1575 (i).
- KINROSS (P. E. I.), POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 5018 (ii).
- KOOTENAY DISTRICT, POSTAL, FACILITIES, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1746 (i).
- LAKEFIELD AND APSLEY MAIL ROUTE, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 4939 (ii).
- L'ARDOISE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3666 (i).
- LOWER ARDOISE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1069, 1334 (i).
- L'ANCIENNE-LORETTE POSTMASTER ALAIN, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2821 (i).
- LAVALTRIE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1473 (i).
- LEEDS COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE, PETS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4181 (ii).
- LEGRIS, NARCISSE, POSTMASTER STE. EULALIE, LETTER IN *La Patrie*: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7688 (ii).
- LYNCH, PATRICK, POSTMASTER AT CHAPLEAU, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3088 (i).
- LOCH LEVEN (C. B.), POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1776 (i).
- MACDONALD, A. E., PEAKE'S STATION (P. E. I.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 4344 (ii).
- MCLEOD, M. G., MAIL CLERK: M. for O. Cs. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4181 (ii).
- MAIL CONTRACTS (N. S.), CANCELLATION SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4609 (ii).
- MIDDLETON POST OFFICE DISTRICT, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 7687 (ii).
- MILITIA POINT (N. S.) MAIL CARRIER, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3310 (i).
— POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3310 (i).
- OAK BAY MILLS P. O., CLOSING: Ques. Mr. *McAlister*) 3824 (i).
— in Com. of Sup., 6712 (ii).
— Imperfect Ret.: Remarks (Mr. *McAlister*) 5324 (ii).
— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McAlister*) 3941, 4928 (ii).
- OTTAWA AND TRURO (N. S.) MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1575 (i).
- OXFORD (N. S.) POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1638 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

- PEAKE'S STATION (P. E. I.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 4344 (ii).
- PICTOU (N. S.) POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2819 (i).
- PORT MULGRAVE AND ST. PETER'S MAIL ROUTE: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 6323 (ii).
- POSTAL MAIL CLERKS (N. S.) REMOVAL, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3406 (i).
— TRANSFER OF RESIDENCE: M. for Rep.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4246 (ii).
— RATES, BERNE CONVENTION; Papers Laid on Table (Mr. *Mulock*) 6446 (ii).
— REDUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4345 (ii).
— INSTRUCTIONS TO POSTMASTER: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 6114, 6322, 6446 (ii).
- POSTMASTERS, DISMISSALS SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4609 (ii).
- POSTMASTER-GENERAL, DEP., PRESENT OCCUPANT OF OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3407 (i).
— REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2527 (i).
- POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT, FREE TRANSMISSION OF NEWSPAPERS: Remarks (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 4041 (ii).
- POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS, RATE OF INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5318 (ii).
— REDUCTION OF INTEREST: Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. on Ways and Means, 3714; Neg. (Y. 40, N. 76) 3754 (i).
— WITHDLS. FROM SAVINGS BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 6465 (ii).
— POST OFFICES CLOSED SINCE JULY, 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3936 (ii).
- POST OFFICES, P. E. I.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 7526 (ii).
- POST OFFICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4857 (ii).
— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 7038.
— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4915 (ii).
— LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6698, 7050, 7482, 7775 (ii).
- PRINCE ALBERT MAIL SERVICE, DELAY IN TRANSMISSION: M. (M. *Davis*) to Adjn., 2517 (i).
- PROVENCHER POSTMASTER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lakiviere*) 6006 (ii).
- ROBERT, H. A., STRATFORD P. O., CLOCK CARE-TAKER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Maclaren*) 4344 (ii).
- ROBERT, I. A., POSTMASTER AT PRINCEVILLE, AND SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: Ques. (Mr. *Gautreau*) 7689 (ii).
- ROULEAU, P. O., ABOLITION OF: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5018 (ii).
- STE. ANNE DE BEAUPRE, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1072 (i).
- STE. ANNE DE LA PARADE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3313 (i).
- ST. CYPRIEN POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6007 (ii).
- ST. FELIX DE VALOIS, POSTMASTER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 4610 (ii).
- ST. MARY'S ROAD P. O., CLOSING, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Martin*) 4246 (ii).
- ST. JACQUES L'ACHIGAN POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1783 (i).
- ST. MICHEL MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3313 (i).
- ST. MICHEL DE NAPIERVILLE P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1471 (i).
- ST. THOMAS MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 453 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

- ST. TITE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3090 (i).
- WAVERLEY POSTMASTER, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 598 (i).
- WHITE, MR., EX-DEP. POSTMASTER GENERAL, SUPER-ANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 474 (i).
- WILLIAMS, W. W., POSTMASTER AT SEELBY'S BAY, DISMISSAL: M. (Mr. Taylor) to Adjn., 3409, 3416. — Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3407 (i).
- WOOD, H. W., WELSFORD POSTMASTER (N.B.) DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7120 (ii).
- WYERRIDGE-WYREVALE POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 598 (i).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 110** (Mr. Mulock) 1°, m., 2913 (i); 2°, m., 5520, 5568; M. for Com., 5709; in Com., 5748, 5870, 5943; 3°, 6121 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 20.)
- 2° m., 5520, 7579;
- Deb. (Mr. Clarke) 5540; (Sir Charles Tupper) 5541; (Mr. Ross Robertson) 5548; (Sir Adolphe Caron) 5553 (ii).
- 3° m., 6121.
- Deb. (Sir Charles Tupper) 6122; (Mr. Ross Robertson) 6122; (Mr. Bertram) 6123; (Mr. Sproule) 6123.
- M. for Com., 5709;
- Deb. (Mr. Foster) 5710, 5722, 5738; (Mr. Mulock) 5710, 5744; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5710, 5738; (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 5711, 5743; (Mr. Taylor) 5712; (Sir Charles Tupper) 5714; (Mr. McDougall) 5716; (Sir Adolphe Caron) 5719; (Mr. McMullen) 5731; (Mr. Bennett) 5734; (Mr. Davin) 5739 (ii).
- In Com.
- Deb. (Mr. Foster) 5750, 5880; (Mr. Mulock) 5748, 5870, 5895; (Sir Charles Tupper) 5871; (Sir Adolphe Caron) 5750; (Mr. McMullen) 5779; (Mr. Clarke) 5748, 5768; (Mr. Maclean) 5749, 5759; (Mr. Ross Robertson) 5755; (Mr. Ellis) 5755, 5764; (Mr. Wallace) 5756, 5768, 5773, 5876; (Mr. Powell) 5760; (Mr. Hughes) 5762; (Mr. Richardson) 5763; (Mr. Gillies) 5765; (Mr. Fielding) 5769; (Mr. Marcotte) 5769, 5779; (Sir Louis Davies) 5772; (Mr. Fraser, Guysboro') 5773; (Mr. Rutherford) 5776; (Mr. Kaulbach) 5777; (Mr. Pope) 5779; (Mr. Haggart) 5883 (ii).
- (Special Delivery) **B. No. 167** (Mr. Mulock) 1°, 7408; 2°, in Com., and 3°, 7579 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 21.)
- POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS, REDUCTION OF INTEREST, AMT. (Mr. Davin) to Com. on Ways and Means, 3714 (i).
- Deb. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3715, 3736; (Mr. Maclean) 3719; (Mr. Bennett) 3720; (Mr. Foster) 3721; (Mr. McDougall) 3724; (Mr. Fielding) 3725; (Sir Charles Tupper) 3730; (Mr. Wallace) 3732; (Mr. Sproule) 3740; (Mr. Rogers) 3746; (Mr. Broder) 3748; (Mr. Clarke) 3751 (i).
- POUND NET LICENSES, LAKE SUPERIOR: M. for cor.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3670 (i)
- NORTH SHORE OF LAKE HURON: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3657 (i).
- PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES, COMMERCIAL PRIVILEGES: M. for cor.* (Mr. Foster) 1837 (i).
- PREFERENTIAL DUTIES, ON M. TO ADJN.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 505 (i).

- PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. McNeill) 5808 (ii).
- Deb. (Mr. McMullen) 5839; (Mr. Oster) 5846; (Mr. Bain) 5850 (amt.) 5853; (Mr. Sproule) 5853; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 5861; (Mr. Dobell) 5861; (Sir Charles Tupper) 5866 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 4168, 4452, 4775, 4928.
- Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4604 (ii).
- RESOLUTION: Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 4604 (ii).
- PRENDERGAST, JUDGE, COMMISSION OF INQUIRY: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1076 (i).
- PRESCOTT AND RUSSELL FIRE, RELIEF FUND: in Com. of Sup., 7089 (ii).
- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
- BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER, GOVT. CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1785, 2036 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Martin) 2040 (i).
- CHINA POINT WHARF, CONDITION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 671 (i).
- COLD STORAGE FOR P.E.I., PROVISION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 828 (i).
- DELEGATION TO DOM. GOVT.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Martin) 5117 (ii).
- DOUBLE HILL P. O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1931 (i).
- JUSTICE DEP., AGENT AT CHARLOTTETOWN: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1075 (i).
- KINROSS POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Martin) 5015 (ii).
- LAMBERT, MARTIN, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 5787 (ii).
- MACDONALD, A. L., PEAKES STATION POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 4344 (ii).
- MCLELLAN, B. D., MEMBER FOR WEST PRINCE, P.E.I.: introduced, 4347 (ii).
- MONTAGUE CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 2822 (i).
- DISMISSAL OF CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 5787 (ii).
- MURRAY RIVER, SHIPPING ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 3823 (i).
- NEUFRAGE POND SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 3166 (i).
- OYSTER FISHERIES LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Yeo) 1775 (i).
- PEAKES STATION, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 4244 (ii).
- PIERS AND WHARFS, GOVT. CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 3088 (i).
- PRIVATE EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Martin) 3670 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Martin) 6581, 7241, 7665.
- RY. BRANCHES: M. for Cor. (Mr. Martin) 4622 (ii).
- P.E.I. AND CANADIAN GOVT., OUTSTANDING DISPUTES: M. for O.Cs., &c.* (Mr. Martin) 3669 (i).
- P.E.I. RY., CURVES AT NORTH WILTSHIRE: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 2345 (i).
- ADDITIONAL ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 6434 (ii).
- REMOVAL OF CURVES: in Com. of Sup., 6434.
- PERRY, MR. S. F., LATE M.P., DECEASE: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 937 (i).
- POST OFFICES, P.E.I.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Martin) 7526 (ii).
- "PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 7526 (ii).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

- RED POINT WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1074 (i).
- ST. MARY'S ROAD P. O., CLOSING, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Martin) 4246 (ii).
- SOUTHPORT TO MURRAY HARBOUR, P.E.I., RY. EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 972 (i).
- SUITS BY NON-RESIDENTS: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7410 (ii).
- SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7637 (ii).
- BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 2816 (i).
- TIGNISH BREAKWATER, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1074 (i).
- WEST POINT PIER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1075 (i).
- WEST PRINCE (P.E.I) VACANCY, APPOINT. OF RET. OFFICER: Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1481 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Montague) 2040 (i).
- ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2241 (i).
- ISSUE OF WRIT (Mr. Speaker) 1173 (i).
- NOTIFICATION (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 1079.
- WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1778 (i).
- WINTER MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7284 (ii).
- WOOD ISLAND BREAKWATER, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2350 (i).
- [See "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]
- PRINCE ALBERT MAIL SERVICE, DELAY IN TRANSPORT: M. (Mr. Davis) to Adjn., 2517 (i).
- "PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE, CARETAKERS AND EMPLOYEES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 2841 (i).
- NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 2345 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 7526.
- PRINTING BUREAU EMPLOYEES, NAMES, SALARIES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Copp) 3669 (i).
- H. T. SMITH'S POSITION AND DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. Copp) 2350 (i).
- SUPERINTENDENT'S STATUS: Ques. (Mr. Copp) 2431 (i).
- PRINTING, MISCELLANEOUS: conc., 7850 (ii).
- NOTES: in Com. of Sup., 6976 (ii).
- PRINTING, 1ST REP. OF COM. CONC.: M. (Mr. Gibson) 3713 (i).
- PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4527, 4545 (ii).
- PRIVATE BILLS, PETS., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. Scriver) 970 (i).
- M. (Mr. Landerkin) 1839 (i).
- LEGISLATION: M. (Mr. Sutherland) 7042 (ii).
- M. (Mr. Belcourt) 7466 (ii).
- ORDER OF PROCEDURE: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7586 (ii).
- PRIVATE SECRETARIES' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 7484 (ii).
- PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, PAR. IN *La Patrie* re MAN. SCHOOLS (Mr. Bergeron) 7597, 7715 (ii).
- PAR. IN MONTREAL *Witness* re PROHIBITION (Mr. Craig) 3503 (i).
- PRESS REPRESENTATIVES AND MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to Adjn., 5118 (ii).

PRIVILEGE, REF. TO MR. MILLS' SPEECH IN *Hansard* (Mr. McLennan, Inverness) 4603 (ii).

— REPRESENTATION FOR RICHELIEU: Explanation (Mr. Speaker) 1772 (i).

— STIMULANTS IN CHAMBER DURING DEBATE: Explanation (Mr. Talbot) 3637 (i).

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3894 (i); 4582, 7483 (ii).

— CLASSIFICATION OF OLD RECORDS: in Com. of Sup., 7279 (ii).

— PRIVATE SECRETARY'S ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6978 (ii).

PROCEDURE, QUES. OF, ON 3^d OF B. AFTER REPORTED FROM COM., DIVISION DEMANDED BY MEMBER: Agreed to (Y. 56, N. 35) 2649 (i).

— Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 2647 (i); Ruling, 2650.

— STMT. : READ (Mr. Speaker) 3095 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—

Plebiscite B. No. 121 (Mr. Fisher) 1^o m., 3925; 2^o, 4684; in Com., 4728; 3^o, 6035 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 51.)

Deb. (Mr. Foster) 3928; (Mr. McInerney) 3529; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3930; (Mr. Davin) 3930; (Mr. Craig) 3931; (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 3932; (Mr. McNeill) 3932; (Mr. Bergeron) 3933; (Mr. Maclean) 3933; (Mr. Ives) 3934; (Mr. Ingram) 3935; (Mr. Taylor) 3935 (i).

2^o m., 4714 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. Casey) 4714; (Mr. Bergeron) 4718; (Mr. Davin) 4721 (ii).

In Com.

Deb. (Mr. Montague) 4728; (Mr. Blair) 4729; (Sir Louis Davies) 4731; (Mr. Clarke) 4733, 4756; (Mr. Ingram) 4734, 4747; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4735; (Mr. Pope) 4736; (Mr. Somerville) 4737; (Mr. Britton) 4738, 4762; (Mr. Quinn) 4739; (Mr. McCleary) 4740; (Mr. Henderson) 4740; (Mr. Wallace) 4745; (Mr. Fisher) 4740-4768; (Mr. Foster) 4692; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4704, 4766; (Mr. Sproule) 4712; (Sir Adolphe Caron) 4748; (Mr. Clancy) 4748; (Mr. Taylor) 4750; (Mr. McNeill) 4751; (Mr. Craig) 4753; (Mr. Mills) 4757, 4767; (Mr. Beattie) 4757; (Mr. Richardson) 4759; (Mr. Flint) 4761; (Mr. Fielding) 4762; (Mr. Moore) 4763; (Mr. Powell) 4764; (Mr. Ellis) 4764 (ii).

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS, COR. OF MIN. OF JUSTICE re INQUIRY FOR LETTER PUBLISHED IN NEWSPAPER (Mr. Craig) 5321 (ii).

— M. (Mr. Craig) to Adjn., 3314 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. Craig) 2441 (i).

PROROGATION, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7818 (ii).

— MESS. FROM HIS EX. (Mr. Speaker) 7886 (ii).

PROVENCHEUR POSTMASTERS, APPOINT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 6006 (ii).

Prudential Life Assurance Co.'s B. No. 53 (Mr. Bain) 1^o*, 1272; 2^o*, 1509; in Com. and 3^o*, 2559 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 113.)

Public Officers Act Amt. B. No. 170 (Mr. Fielding) 1^o*, 7523; 2^o in Com. and 3^o*, 7580 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 16.)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., ORGANIZATION: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2517 (i).

PUBLIC MEETING : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 2528 (i).
 — Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3503 (i).

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, DOM.: in Com. of Sup., 5448, 7386 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS :

ALLAIRE, J. P. O., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 3661 (i).

ARNPRIOR P. O., INSPECTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4177 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 5449 (ii).

BEAR RIVER, BRIDGE AT MOUTH, REMOVAL : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills*) 2840 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 1337 (i).

— REP. AS TO CONDITION OF PIERS : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 975 (i).

BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER, GOVT. CONTROL : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1785 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2036 (i).
 — Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 2040 (i).

BELCEIL, QUE., CARETAKER OF BOOMS, RESIGNATION ; Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2847 (i).

BERTHIER P. O., SITE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 6008 (ii).
 — PURCHASE OF SITE : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 3662 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA COAST SURVEYS, REP. OF MR. COSTE, Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5323 (ii).

CAMPABELLO ISLAND (N.B.) TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4177 (ii).

CHAPEL COVE (N.S.) BREAKWATER, GOVT. AID : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4345 (ii).

CHICOUTIMI COUNTY TELEGRAPH LINE : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 2814 (i).
 — WHARF, GOVT. EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4180 (ii).

CHINA POINT (P.E.I.) PIER : in Com. of Sup., 7636.
 — CONDITION : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 671 (i).

COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 5886 (ii).

COTE, THOMAS, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4176 (ii).

DEER ISLAND TELEGRAPH CABLE, SURVEYS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4177 (ii).

DEPTL. WEST BLOCK, REFACING WALLS : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2528, 3319 (i).
 — FIRE : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2347 (i).

EDMONTON RY. BRIDGE, CONTRACT, &c. ; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1838 (i).
 — CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1341 (i).
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 2528, 3327 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 6245, 6268 (ii).
 — PENALTIES TO CONTRACTORS : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5316 (ii).

GABARUS (C.B.) BREAKWATER, GRANTS, &c. ; Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4179 (ii).

GISBORNE, MR., INSPECTOR OF GOVT. TELEGRAPH LINES, N.W.T., DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5317 (ii).

GODERICH HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 6087 (ii).

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS, PROHIBITION OF SWEATING : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 599 (i).

GRAND ETANG, DREDGING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*, *Inverness*) 5317 (ii).

GRAND NARROWS (C.B.) DISMISSAL OF GOVT., BLACKSMITH : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3661 (i).

GRAND RIVER FLOODS : M. (Mr. *Montague*) to Adjn., 2526 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

HALIFAX DRILL SHED : in Com. of Sup., 5071 (ii).

KAMINISTQUIA RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 5067 (ii).

KENTVILLE P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 5071 (ii).

KINGSTON DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 5453 (ii).

L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 872 (i).

LIVERPOOL P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).

MCCALLUM, JOHN, APPOINT. AND DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7686 (ii).

MAJOR'S HILL PARK GROUNDS : in Com. of Sup., 5606 (ii).

MANITOBA PUBLIC BUILDINGS, INQUIRY FOR RET.: Remarks (Mr. *La Rivière*) 3826 (i).

MCKAY'S POINT WHARF, TENDER FOR BUILDING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2815 (i).

MARYSVILLE P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 5092 (ii).

MISTASSINI WHARF AND STE. METHODE, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. for Copy of Instructions* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3663 (i).
 — PUBLIC WORKS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2822 (i).

NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6008 (ii).

NEUFRAGE POND, SURVEY : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, *King's*) 3166 (i).

NEW HARBOUR (N.S.) BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 7590 (ii).

OTONABEE RIVER FLOODS, INVESTIGATION AS TO CAUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 483 (i).

OTTAWA SUMMER HOUSE ; in Com. of Sup., 7218 (ii).

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5889 (ii).

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, ASPHALT SIDEWALKS, CONTRACTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 487 (1).
 — CONTRACT FOR ASPHALTING WALKS : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1783 (i).
 — DISMISSAL OF LATE SUPT. ROBERTSON : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2818 (i).

PETERBOROUGH DRILL SHED, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 5132 (ii).

POINT CLAIRE, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (i).
 — M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 504 (i).
 — Inquiry for Ret., 3341 (ii).

PORT MORIEN, BREAKWATER, GOVT. GRANT : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4179 (ii).

P.E.I. PIERS AND WHARFS, GOVT. CONTROL : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3088 (i).

PRIVATE PIERS AND WHARFS, GOVT. EXPENDITURE : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 3670 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CLERKS, NUMBER DISCHARGED : M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1838.
 — in Com. of Sup., 4558, 4591, 5050, 5444, 6244, 6984, 7214; conc., 7822 (ii).

QUEBEC BRIDGE, PROP. SUBSIDY : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7385 (i).

RAT PORTAGE PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).

RED POINT WHARF, P.E.I., REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1074 (i).

RICHELIEU RIVER WORKS, ESTIMATED COST : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 484 (i).

RIVIERE STE. ANNE DE LA PÉRADE, REPAIRS TO WORKS : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1785 (i).

RIVIERE LA PIPE WHARF, PURCHASE OF TIMBER : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1468 (i).

ROBERVAL PIER, PAYMENTS TO MEN, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2840 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

- ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Poupore*) 4612 (ii).
- STE. ANNE LOCK, INVESTIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4345 (ii).
- CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3941 (ii).
- REP. OF W. MERCIER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 3667 (i).
- ST. ANICETTE WHARF, COR. L. H. MASSON AND PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2841.
- COST WHEN BUILT: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2818.
- in Com. of Sup., 5301 (ii).
- ST. GENEVIEVE FLOODS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 505 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (i).
- ST. PETER'S CANAL, REPAIRS TO ENTRANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1339 (i).
- ST. PIERRE RIVER WORKS, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (i).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER INUNDATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3660 (i).
- ST. MICHEL GOVT. WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3312 (i).
- SUMMERSIDE (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2816 (i).
- TELEGRAPH LINES, NORTH SHORE, ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1336 (i).
- TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7123 (ii).
- N.S., GOVT. RATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 6006 (ii).
- TIGNISH BREAKWATER (P.E.I.) TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1074 (i).
- TORONTO HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4771 (ii).
- AMOUNTS PAID W. E. PHIN: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1337 (i).
- EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 482 (i).
- LIABILITY INCURRED: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 971.
- in Com. of Sup., 7231 (ii).
- MR. PHIN'S CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 5892.
- EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 5891.
- TROUT COVE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3824 (i).
- VICTORIAVILLE PUBLIC BUILDING, ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 7120 (ii).
- WEST POINT PIER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1075 (i).
- WHARFS AND PIERES, GOVT. EXPENDITURE: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 6581, 7241, 7665 (ii).
- WOOD ISLAND (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2350 (i).
- WOODSTOCK P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5464 (ii).
- Public Works Construction Aid B. No. 161** (Mr. *Blair*). 1°, 6892; M. for 2°, 7411; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 7570 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- PULP MILL MACHINERY, ENTRY IN BOND: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3165 (i).
- QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY: M. (Mr. *Davis*) to Adjn., 4248 (ii).
- M. (Mr. *Oster*) to Adjn., 4449 (ii).
- QUARANTINE (B.C.): in Com. of Sup., 7514 (ii).
- (CATTLE): in Com. of Sup., 5998 (ii).
- GRATUITIES TO W. MCK. MCLEOD: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (ii).

QUEBEC:

- ABENAKIS INDIANS, ST. FRANCIS AGENCY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3408 (i).
- AGNES POSTMASTER AND REMOVAL OF OFFICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Pope*) 1787 (i).
- ANSE A BEAUFILS HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 5658 (ii).
- BAIE ST. PAUL WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7639 (ii).
- BERTHIER CHANNEL, DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3085 (i).
- POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 3662 (i); 6008 (ii).
- BELLEIL, QUE., CARETAKER OF BOOMS, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2847 (i).
- BOYER, TOUSSANT, LOCKMASTER BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3662 (i).
- CANADIAN DEFENCES, IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2839 (i).
- CHAMBORD JUNCTION, CUSTOM HOUSE, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4179 (ii).
- ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1469.
- CHEESE FACTORIES IN QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1578 (i).
- CHICOUTIMI COUNTY TELEGRAPH LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 2814 (i).
- WHARF, GOVT. EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4180 (ii).
- CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES IN PROV. OF QUEBEC AND COMMISSION, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 504 (i).
- CORREIL, FRANÇOIS, EMPLOYEE LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4348 (ii).
- COTEAU LANDING, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7226.
- COTÉ, THOS., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4176 (ii).
- CÔTE DE LEISSE RIFLE RANGES AND FARMERS' GRIEVANCES: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 6322 (ii).
- CÔTE ST. LUC RIFLE RANGES, ACCIDENTAL SHOOTING: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 4678 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 6029 (ii).
- ACTION *re* ACCIDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 5569 (ii).
- COULOMBE VS. QUEEN, APPEAL QUEEN'S BENCH: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3668 (i).
- DAGNAULT, MR. R., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4609 (ii).
- DAGNEAU, J. T., POSTMASTER AT ROBITAILLE, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4246 (ii).
- DES JOACHIMS AND MACKIE'S STATION MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 5135 (ii).
- DOUCET'S LANDING, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7639.
- DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY, THROUGH TRAFFIC: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 472 (i).
- FRIGON, A., INDEMNITY FOR INJURY: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3668 (i).
- GASPÉ, &C., STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH QUEBEC, SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7120, 7685 (ii).
- GATIEN, LOUIS, DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7665 (ii).
- GODBOUT, ALBERT, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3664 (i).
- GRAND ETANG, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6083.
- Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 5317 (ii).
- HOUDR, CHAS. E., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 7686 (ii).
- I.C.R., MADAME CHARON'S HORSE, CLAIM *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 3659 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- I.C.R., MONTREAL EXTENSION, PASSENGERS CARRIED FROM LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3406 (i).
 — NEWS STAND AT LÉVIS STATION, LEASE: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1338 (i).
 — ST. MICHEL STATION: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3312 (i).
 — TIES AND LUMBER SUPPLIES, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Casgrain) 2340 (i).
 — TROIS PISTOLES, GOVT. LANDS, OCCUPATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4175 (ii).
 — RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ROADMASTER, COST OF INQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. Dechene) 2820 (i).
 ISLE PERRAULT WHARF, ADDITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (ii).
 JUDGES OF PROVINCE OF QUEBEC, REP. FROM MONTREAL BAR: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 505 (i).
 KILDARE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1575 (i).
 LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL OF FRANCOIS CORBEIL: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2343 (i).
 — DISMISSALS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Gillies) 4621 (ii).
 — STOREKEEPER, APPLICANTS FOR POSITION: Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 456 (i).
 — WHARFINGER, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 2340 (i).
 L'ANCIENNE-LORETTE, POSTMASTER ALAIN, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casgrain) 2821 (i).
 LAURENTIAN RY. TELEGRAPH REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Gauthier) 4923 (ii).
 LAVALTRIE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1473 (i).
 LAVOIE, DR., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7119 (ii).
 LEFAIVRE, XAVIER, LACHINE CANAL, LOCKMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3937 (i).
 LIGHTHOUSE SUPPLIES, MONTREAL WEST, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 2346 (i).
 MCCALLUM, JOHN, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7686 (ii).
 MAGDALEN ISLANDS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1575 (i).
 MARIA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7638 (ii).
 MILITARY CAMP AT BEAUHARNOIS: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6638 (ii).
 MISTASSINI WHARF AND STE. METHODE, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. for Copy of Instructions* (Mr. Casgrain) 3668 (i).
 — M. for Ret. (Mr. Casgrain) 2822 (i).
 MONTREAL CIRCUIT COURT, EXTRA JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 598 (i).
 — CUSTOMS HOUSE, DISMISSALS, 1896 TO 1898, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Quinn) 3669 (i).
 — DRILL SHED, REPAIRS EXECUTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1838 (i).
 NULTY'S DEATH SENTENCE, PETS. FOR COMMUTATION: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 824 (i).
 PETIT DE GRAT, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).
 POINT CLAIRE WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5689 (ii).
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 3941 (ii).
 — M. for Cor.* (Mr. Monk) 504 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. Monk) 476 (i).
 POINT JEROME LIGHT-KEEPER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 5320 (ii).
 QUEBEC BRIDGE, PROP. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7385 (ii).
 — CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- QUEEN VS. COULOMBE, WHISKY SMUGGLING: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1068 (i).
 REID, WM., BRIDGE-KEEPER, BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
 RICHELIEU RIVER WORKS, ESTIMATED COST: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 484 (i).
 RIVIÈRE LA PIPE WHARF, PURCHASE OF TIMBER: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1468 (i).
 RIVIÈRE STE-ANNE DE LA PÉRADE, REPAIRS TO WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 1785 (i).
 ROBERT, I. A., POSTMASTER AT PRINCEVILLE, AND SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 7689 (ii).
 ROBERVAL PIER, PAYMENTS TO MEN, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Casgrain) 2340 (i).
 ROCHR FONDUE AND CALUMET DAMS: M. for Cor. (Mr. Poupore) 4612 (ii).
 STE. ANNE DE BEAUPRE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques.: (Mr. Casgrain) 1072 (i).
 STE. ANNE DE LA PÉRADE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 33.3 (i).
 — M. for O. Cs.* (Mr. Marcotte) 4678 (ii).
 ST. ANICETTE WHARF, COR. L. H. MASSON AND PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 2341.
 — COST WHEN BUILT: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2818 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 5656 (ii).
 STE. ANNE LOCK, INVESTIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4345 (ii).
 — REP. OF W. MERCIER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 3667 (i).
 STE. ANNE RIVER WORKS, CONTINUATION: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3941 (ii).
 ST. CYPRIEN POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6007 (ii).
 ST. FELIX DE VALOIS, POSTMASTER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 4610 (ii).
 STE. GENEVIEVE FLOODS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Monk) 505 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. Monk) 476 (i).
 ST. HELEN'S ISLAND, ALLOTMENT FOR MILITARY PURPOSES: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 456 (i).
 ST. HYACINTHE CUSTOMS OFFICE, DUES AND OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 600 (i).
 ST. JACQUES L'ACHIGAN, POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1783 (i).
 ST. JACQUES MODEL FARM, ESTABLISHMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 7121 (ii).
 ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (ii).
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER INUNDATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3660 (i).
 — PLACING OF BUOYS: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3318 (i).
 — SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5050 (ii).
 ST. MICHEL DE NAPIERVILLE P. O., COR., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1471 (i).
 ST. MICHEL GOVT. WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3312 (i).
 — MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3313 (i).
 ST. PIERRE RIVER, DREDGING, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Monk) 4678 (ii).
 — TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 476 (i).
 ST. ROCHES DES AULNAIES WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5658 (ii).
 ST. TITE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3090 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY, COMMISSIONERS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3938 (ii).
 — REP.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 3940 (ii).
 — REVOLT OF CONVICTS: Ques. (Mr. Chaurin) 1069 (i).
 SAGUENAY RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7639.
 SOULANGES CANAL, EXPENDITURE ON CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Berperon) 5135 (ii).
 STEAMSHIP SERVICE, CANADA AND FRANCE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 456 (i).
 SUPERIOR COURT, MAGDALEN ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 597 (i).
 SUTTON, LT., INSTRUCTIONS *re* MILITARY COURSE IN ENGLAND: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1782 (i).
 TELEGRAPH LINES, GODBOUT AND POINTE AUX ESQUIMAUX: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (ii).
 — NORTH SHORE, ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1336 (i).
 — TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 7123 (ii).
 TEMISCOUATA ELECTION: Personal Explanation (Mr. Gauvreau) 5447 (ii).
 UNITED COUNTIES RY., PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3658 (i).
 UNITED STATES SS. "YANTIC" AND "LA CANADIENNE," COLLISION: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4451 (ii).
 VICTORIAVILLE PUBLIC BUILDING, ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. Lavergne) 7120 (ii).
 WELLINGTON BRIDGE MONTREAL, ACCIDENT: Remarks (Mr. Quinn) 4604 (ii).
 — MR. MATTISON'S SERVICES: Remarks (Mr. Quinn) 4775 (ii).
 QUEBEC BRIDGE, PROP. SUBSIDY; Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7385 (ii).
 — CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (ii).
 Quebec Harbour Commissioners Loan B. No. 142 (Mr. Dobell). 1st, 5568; 2^d and in Com., 6229; 3^d, 6444 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
 QUEBEC LAND SLIDES COMMISSION, CLAIMS &c.; in Com. of Sup., 7087 (ii).
 QUEEN'S PRINTER, QUALIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. Copp) 3165 (i).
 — SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7483 (ii).
 Queenston Heights Bridge Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. Clarke) 1st, 1380; 2nd, 1509; in Com. and 3rd, 3656 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 114.)
 QUEEN VICTORIA PARK, NIAGARA FALLS: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 2847 (i).
 QUEEN *vs.* CAMERON, INDICTMENT FOR LIBEL, DEPOSITION, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Bostock) 1827 (i).
 QUEEN *vs.* COULOMBE, WHISKY SMUGGLING: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1068 (i).
 QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 459 (i).
 — RULED OUT OF ORDER (Mr. Speaker) 602 (i).

RAILWAYS:

- BELLEIL LAND DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3947 (i).
 BOARD OF RY. COMMISSIONERS, LEGISLATION: prop. Res. (Mr. Jameson) 1787 (i).
 CAPE BRETON RY. HARD PAN CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. McLennan, Inverness) 5134 (ii).
 CROW'S NEST PASS RY. AGREEMENT WITH C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 2095 (i).
 — AMOUNTS PAID C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3405 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

- CROW NEST RY., CONSTRUCTION BY COMPANY: Remarks (Mr. Richardson) 6240 (ii).
 — J. B. CHARLTON'S CONNECTION: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7685 (ii).
 CONNORS, D., ANTIGONISH, FIRE CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1837 (i).
 DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. AND G. T. R. AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3317 (i).
 — RUMOURD NEW ARRANGEMENTS: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2699 (i).
 — COM. OF INVESTIGATION: prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 506 (i).
 — INQUIRY, FIRST REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. Lister) 1272 (i).
 — THROUGH TRAFFIC: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 472 (i).
 EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN RY., SETTLEMENT BETWEEN GOVT. AND E. B. CHANDLER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McInerney) 3341 (i).
 G.T.R. AND C.P.R. CONNECTION AT NORTH BAY: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) 4353 (ii).
 G.T.R., OTTAWA, ABERPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. AND C.P.R. CONNECTIONS AT SCOTIA JUNCTION: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 454 (i).
 — REGULATIONS: M. (Mr. Wallace) to Adjn., 6013 (ii).
 GRAIN TRANSPORT BY C.P.R. AND ELKVATOR COMPANY OF MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. Richardson) 483 (i).
 I.C.R. AGREEMENT WITH MR. HARRIS: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5392 (ii).
 — ARCHIBALD, CHIEF ENGINEER, DISMISSAL; M. for Ret. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1834 (i).
 — BAIN, N., &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4348 (ii).
 — COAL CARRIED: Ques. (Mr. McInerney) 4448 (ii).
 — COLOURED PORTERS, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3405 (i).
 — M. (Mr. Campbell) to Adjn., 3167 (i).
 — Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2852 (i).
 — DINING CARS, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2812 (i).
 — DIVERSION OF ROUTE THROUGH SPRINGHILL: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 1929 (i).
 — EASTERN EXTENSION DINING CARS: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 2345 (i).
 — EMPLOYERS, REDUCTIONS IN PASSENGER AND FREIGHT DEPARTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 602 (i).
 — EMPLOYEES REINSTATEMENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 3665 (i).
 — EXPENDITURE FOR IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Powell) 3677 (i).
 — FUEL EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3089 (i).
 — GATER, &c., TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Dechene) 2319 (i).
 — M. for Ret.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2839 (i).
 — HARRIS, APPOINT. OF: M. for Cor. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3667, 3669 (i).
 — POSITION: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3166.
 — HUAR, CHARLES, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1838 (i) 4348 (ii).
 — LOWERING SCHEDULE RATES: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1481 (i).
 — Remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2442 (i).
 — MADAME CHARON'S HORSE, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3659 (i).

RAILWAYS—Con.

- I.C.R., MONCTON RY. STATION, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 477 (i).
- PLUMBING AND HEATING CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 2346 (i).
- MONTREAL EXTENSION, ARRANGEMENTS WITH G.T.R. Co.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Blair) 3821 (i).
- MONTREAL EXTENSION, CONTRACT, & C.: Copies laid on table (Mr. Blair) 3821 (i).
- PASSENGERS CARRIED FROM LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3406 (i).
- MURRAY, J. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 5318 (ii).
- NEWS STAND AT LÉVIS STATION, LEASE: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1338 (i).
- NEW TIME TABLE: Remarks (Mr. Choquette) 6242 (ii).
- PATENT LOCOMOTIVE CYLINDER: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1335 (i).
- POWLIE, A., CAR INSPECTOR, SPRINGHILL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 1932 (i).
- PURCHASE OF LOCOMOTIVES IN U. S., & C.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 476 (i).
- REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF BRAKEMEN: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 478 (i).
- RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ROADMASTER, COST OF INQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. Dechene) 2820 (i).
- SIMONDS, R. H., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Powell) 2840 (i).
- STEWART, A., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 1933, 2342 (i).
- ST. MICHEL STATION: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3312 (i).
- SUTHERLAND, Wm.: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4348 (ii).
- TARIFFS, & C., SINCE MR. HARRIS' APPNMT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 3669 (i).
- THOMPSON, R. S.: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4348 (ii).
- TIES AND LUMBER SUPPLIES, TENDERS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Casgrain) 2840 (i).
- TIES, TENDERS FROM 1896, & C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3669 (i).
- TROIS PISTOLES, GOVT. LANDS, OCCUPATION, & C.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4175 (ii).
- WESTVILLE, N.S., STATION IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 2342 (i).
- KASLO-SLOCAN RY., PLANS, PAPERS, & C.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 402 (i).
- KILLAM, A. E., POSITION ON I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. McInerney) 827 (i).
- KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS AND GANANOQUE DRILL SHED: M. (Mr. Taylor) to Adjn., 605 (i).
- TELEGRAM re ORDER FOR LOCOMOTIVES: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 484 (i).
- KING, W. A., ANTIGONISH STATION AGENT, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7120 (ii).
- LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE RY. AND RY. ACT: Ques. (Mr. Poupore) 2349 (i).
- MCNEILL, ROBY, SECTION FOREMAN, I. C. R., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 603 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 6414 (ii).
- MERCIER, WILFRID, COMMISSIONER, AMOUNTS PAID: Remarks (Mr. Blair) 4345 (ii).
- MONTAGUE (P.E.I.), DISMISSAL OF CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 5787 (ii).
- P. E. I. RY., CURVES AT NORTH WILTSHIRE: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 2345 (i).

RAILWAYS—Con.

- PORT MULGRAVE STATION AGENT, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1832 (i).
- RAILWAY COMMISSION, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. MacMillan) 1784 (i).
- RY. COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL, CONSTITUTION: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1472 (i).
- RAILWAY POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 2701 (i).
- RAILWAY RATES TO STIKINE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 1070 (i).
- RAILWAY RATE WAR AND MAN. SETTLERS: M. (Mr. Maclean) to Adjn., 1473 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 1175 (i).
- RAILWAY REGULATIONS, ENFORCEMENT, & C.: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 7118 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7119 (ii).
- RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION: M. (Mr. Maclean) to Adjn., 1749 (i).
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4558, 4597, 6381, 7643 (ii).
- REP.: Presented (Mr. Blair) 1341 (i).
- SOUTHPORT TO MURRAY HARBOUR (P.E.I.) RY. EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 972 (i).
- STELLARTON, CAR INSPECTOR SUTHERLAND, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1833, 2839 (i).
- UNITED COUNTIES RY., PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3658 (i).
- U. S. SS. "YANTIC" AND "LA CANADIENNE," COLLISION: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4431 (ii).
- [Sec "I.C.R.", & C.]
- Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 18 (Mr. Campbell). 1^o, 405; 2^o m., 2058; ref. to Sel. Com., 2059 (i).
- B. No. 145 (Mr. Blair). 1^o, 5662; 2^o*, 5966; 3^o*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 22.)
- Ry. Employees, & C., Safety B. No. 4 (Mr. Casey). 1^o, 185; 2^o m., 2054; in Com., 2055; ref. to Sel. Com., 2056; in Com., 3673 (i) 4208, 4638, 4670, 5144; 3^o*, 5175 (ii).
- Ry. Freight Rates Regulation B. No. 7 (Mr. Reid). 1^o*, 271; 2^o m., 2910; withdn., 2913.
- Ry. Passenger Tickets (Sale) Act Amt. B. No. 36 (Mr. Beattie) 1^o*, 903 (i).
- RAINY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5888 (ii).
- JUDICIAL DISTRICT, APPNMT. OF JUDGE: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5011 (ii).
- RACINE FISHERY AND RIPARIAN OWNER, LICENSES, & C.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4772 (ii).
- RANKIN, IMMIGRATION AGENT IN KANSAS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1779 (i).
- RAT PORTAGE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5470, 7588 (ii).
- REBELLION CLAIMS, N.W.T., APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 5321 (ii).
- LOSSES (1885) DOCUMENTS IN POSSESSION OF GOVT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Davis) 4246 (ii).
- RECIPROCAL TARIFF CLAUSE, 1897, AMOUNTS, REFUNDS, & C.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4175 (ii).
- RECIPROCITY IN WRECKING, CAN. AND U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Britton) 6612 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. Davin) 452 (i).
- RED POINT WHARF (P.E.I.) REPAIRS, & C.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1074 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 5633 (ii).

- REGINA DISTRICT, REGISTRY OFFICE : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1931 (i) 5319 (ii).
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, EMPLOYMENT OF DR. WILLOUGHBY : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 828 (i).
- REGISTRY AND LAND OFFICE, REGINA : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1931 (i) 5319 (ii).
- REGISTRY OF SHIPPING : in Com. of Sup., 4954 (ii).
- REID, WM., BRIDGE KEEPER, BEAUCHARNOIS CANAL, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3937 (i).
- REPORTS PRESENTED :
- AGRICULTURE (Mr. *Fisher*) 1473 (i).
- AUDITOR GENERAL (Mr. *Fielding*) 307 (i).
- CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINER'S (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4248 (ii).
- LIST (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 184 (i).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (Mr. *Fisher*) 7378 (ii).
- INDIAN AFFAIRS (Mr. *Sifton*) 1473 (i).
- INLAND REVENUE (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 194.
- INTERIOR (Mr. *Sifton*) 3940 (ii).
- JUSTICE AND PENITENTIARIES (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7009 (ii).
- LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT REP. (Mr. *Speaker*) 5 (i).
- MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir *Louis Davies*) 5 (i).
- MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 2425 (i).
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Mr. *Fielding*) 267 (i).
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. *Blair*) 1341 (i).
- SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2425 (i).
- TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 935 (i).
- TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS (Mr. *Paterson*) 184 (i).
- RETURNS, Inquiry for, 5931 (ii).
- (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3713 (i) 4348 (ii).
- (Mr. *Foster*) 6028 (ii).
- (Mr. *Gillies*) 5923 (ii).
- (Mr. *Martin*) 3427 (i).
- (Mr. *Mills*) 5321 (i).
- (Mr. *McDougall*) 5930 (ii).
- (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4348, 6028 (ii).
- REWARDS FOR SAVING LIFE : in Com. of Sup., 4952.
- RICHELIEU RIVER, BELCIEL CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 5653 (ii).
- ESTIMATED COST : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 484 (i).
- RICHIBUCTO HARBOUR, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5642.
- RIDEAU CANAL, LAND DAMAGES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7182 (ii).
- RIDEAU HALL, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5598.
- Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) to reduce Vote : Neg. (Y. 19, N. 46) 5605 (ii).
- RIFLE ASSOCIATION GRANT : in Com. of Sup., 6570.
- RIFLE RANGE AT OTTAWA, TARGET PRACTICE : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6612 (ii).
- RIVIÈRE LA PIPE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5660 (ii).
- PURCHASE OF TIMBER : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1468 (i).
- RIVIERE ST. ANNE DE LA PÉRADE, REPAIRS TO WORKS : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1785 (i).
- ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 6100, 6245 (ii).
- ROBERT, H. A., STRATFORD P. O., CABSTAKER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Maclaren*) 4344 (ii).
- ROBERT, I. A., POSTMASTER AT PRINCEVILLE AND SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 7689 (ii).
- ROBERVAL PIER, PAYMENTS TO MEN, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2840 (i).
- ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Poupore*) 4612 (ii).
- ROCKLIFFE RIFLE RANGE, LAND VALUATOR : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3408, 3660 (i).
- ROCKY MOUNTAIN PARK, FENCING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7251, 7769 (ii).
- ROGERS, LT.-COL., R. Z., RETIREMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 5787 (ii).
- ROSS, DAVID, DISMISSAL : in Com. of Sup., 5270 (ii).
- FISHERY OVERSEER, MARGABEE : M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1837 (i).
- ROTHWELL'S REPORT re CLAIMS OF SETTLERS : Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 2851 (i).
- ROULEAU P. O., ABOLITION OF : Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5018 (ii).
- ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5232 (ii).
- REPATRIATION : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 6613.
- ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, COM. FROM GOV. GEN'S SEC. : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2089 (i).
- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, AMALGAMATION OF CLASSES : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 973 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5571 (ii).
- STAFF AND EMPLOYEES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2824 (i).
- RUBBER GOODS, TARIFF RESPECTING : M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Osler*) 6637 (ii).
- RUSSELL, CHARLES, SOLICITOR, AMOUNT PAID, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2839 (i).
- STE. ANNE DE BEAUPRE, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1072 (i).
- STE. ANNE DE LA PÉRADE, RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 5649 (ii).
- POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : M. for O. Cs.* (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4678 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3313 (i).
- STE. ANNE LOCK, OTTAWA RIVER, INVESTIGATION : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4345 (ii).
- REP. OF W. MERCIER : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 3667 (i).
- RIVER WORKS, CONTINUATION : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3941 (ii).
- STE. ANNE'S WHARF AT SEYMOUR POINT : in Com. of Sup., 5616 (ii).
- STE. ANICET WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5301, 5656 (ii).
- COR. L. H. MASSON AND PUBLIC WORKS : M. for Copy* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2841 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3713 (i).
- COST WHEN BUILT : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2818.
- ST. CYPRIEN POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6007 (ii).
- ST. FELIX DE VALOIS, POSTMASTER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 4610 (ii).
- ST. FRANCIS LAKE, REMOVAL OF BOULDERS : in Com. of Sup., 6528 (ii).
- STE. GENEVIEVE FLOODS : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 505 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (i).

- ST. HELEN'S ISLAND, ALLOTMENT FOR MILITARY PURPOSES: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 456 (i).
- ST. HYACINTHE CUSTOMS OFFICE, DUES AND OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 600 (i).
- ST. IRENE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5656.
- ST. JACQUES L'ACHIGAN, POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1783 (i).
- ST. JACQUES MODEL FARM, ESTABLISHMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 7121 (ii).
- ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (ii).
- St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Co.'s B. No. 78 (Mr. Ellis) 1^o, 1839; 2^o, 1950 (i); in Com., and 3^o, 4072 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 83.)
 — B. No. 157 (Mr. Fielding) 1^o, 6582; 2^o, 6801; in Com. and 3^o, 7011 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 9.)
- ST. JOHN, HALIFAX AND LONDON MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7282 (ii).
 — W. INDIES AND S. AMERICA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6686 (ii).
- St. John Harbour Co.'s B. No. 101 (Mr. Ellis) 1^o, 2430; 2^o, 3084 (i); in Com., and 3^o 5049 (ii). (61-62 Vic. c. 115.)
- ST. JOHN (N.B.) INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 7645 (ii).
 — MARINE CEMETERY: in Com. of Sup., 7481 (ii).
 — QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 7586.
- ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL, PLACING OF BUOYS, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 4180 (ii).
 — REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 5656 (ii).
 — NORTH SHORE, TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (ii).
 — PLACING OF BUOYS: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3318 (i).
 — INUNDATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3660 (i).
 — SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5050 (ii).
- ST. LUC RIFLE RANGES, GOVT. ACTION *re* ACCIDENT: Remarks (Mr. Borden, King's) 5569 (ii).
- ST. MICHEL DE NAPIERVILLE P.O., COR., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1471 (i).
 — GOVT. WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3312 (i).
 — MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3313 (i).
- ST. PETER'S CANAL, DISMISSALS: in Com. of Sup., 7207 (ii).
 — REPAIRS TO ENTRANCE: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1339 (i).
- ST. PIERRE RIVER WORKS, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 476 (ii).
 — DREDGING, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Monk) 4678 (ii).
- ST. REGIS, RIVER BRACHES: in Com. of Sup., 6538 (ii).
- ST. ROCH DES AULNAIES WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5658 (ii).
- ST. SULPICE SEMINARY: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (ii).
- ST. THOMAS MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 453 (i).
 — POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5494 (ii).
- ST. TITE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3090 (i).
- ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY, COMMISSIONER'S CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3938 (ii).
 — M. to Print Rep. (Mr. Fortin) 6607 (ii).
 — Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 3940 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 6639 (ii).
 — REVOLT OF CONVICTS: Ques. (Mr. Chauvin) 1069 (i).
 — REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS: in Com. of Sup., 7491 (ii).
- SAGUENAY RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7639.
- Salaries Attachment B. No. 14 (Mr. Richardson). 1^o, 271; 2^o, 2058; M. for Com., 2852, 3689; in Com., 3706 (i) 4639; On Order, 5175 (ii).
- SANFORD BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7630 (ii).
- San José Scale B. No. 82 (Mr. Fisher) 1^o, 1904; 2^o, 1926; in Com. and 3^o, 1928 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 23.)
 DEB. (Mr. Fisher) 1904, 1921, 1925; (Mr. Sproule) 1907; (Mr. Maclean) 1908; (Mr. Charlton) 1909, 1926; (Sir Charles Tupper) 1910; (Mr. Henderson) 1913; (Mr. Gibson) 1913; (Mr. McCleary) 1913; (Mr. Borden, King's) 1914; (Mr. McMillan) 1915; (Mr. Hughes) 1916; (Mr. Erb) 1916; (Mr. Bain) 1916; (Mr. Bostock) 1917; (Mr. Ellis) 1919; (Mr. Montague) 1919; (Mr. McNeil) 1924; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1927 (i).
 M. to Adjn. (Mr. Charlton) 2241.
 DEB. (Mr. McCleary) 2247; (Mr. Casey) 2249; (Mr. Hughes) 2249; (Mr. McMullen) 2249; (Mr. Maclean) 2250; (Mr. Semple) 2250; (Mr. McNeill) 2251; (Mr. Sproule) 2251; (Mr. Henderson) 2252; (Mr. Fisher) 2252; (Mr. Ellis) 2262; (Mr. McGregor) 2264; (Mr. McMillan) 2265; (Mr. Foster) 2266 (i).
- SAPPER'S BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 6100 (ii).
- SARNIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5482, 7588 (ii).
- Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s B. No. 126 (Mr. Landerkin) 1^o, 4521; 2^o, 4606; in Com. and 3^o, 6647 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 85.)
- SASKATCHEWAN, DISMISSALS OF INDIAN AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6854 (ii).
 — DISTRICT, APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE: Remarks (Mr. Davis) 7042 (ii).
 — TIMBER BERTHS HELD BY MOORE, McDOWELL & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 481 (i).
 — PET. REF. TO STANDING ORDERS: M. (Mr. Landerkin) 3924 (i).
- SASKATOON BRIDGE: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Davis) 4774 (ii).
- SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 6550 (ii).
 — CONTRACTOR'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 7105.
 — WHARFINGER, BALANCE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 7096 (ii).
- SAVINGS BANKS: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (i).
 — POST OFFICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4581 (ii).
- SCHOOL LANDS IN MAN., SALES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 2432 (i).
- "SCIENTIFIC DAIRYING": in Com. of Sup., 6997 (ii).
- SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7284 (ii).
- SECRETARY OF STATE:
 APPOINTMENTS BY LATE GOVT. AND COLONIAL OFFICE, CO &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roddick) 7839 (ii).

- SECRETARY OF STATE—Con.**
- CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES IN PROVINCE OF QUEBEC AND COMMISSION, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 504 (i).
- REP.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 184 (i), 4348 (ii).
- FRANCHISE ACT, DISTRIBUTION OF PRINTED COPIES: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7854 (ii).
- PRINTING BUREAU EMPLOYEES, NAMES, SALARIES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Copp) 3669 (i).
- H. T. SMITH'S POSITION AND DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. Copp) 2350 (i).
- SUPERINTENDENT'S STATUS: Ques. (Mr. Copp) 2431 (i).
- QUEEN'S PRINTER, QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Copp) 3165 (i).
- SECRETARY OF STATE'S DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2425 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 4526 (ii).
- VOTERS' LIST (ONT.), REVISING OFFICERS, COST OF PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2845 (i).
- SEED GRAIN, AMOUNT OWING BY FARMERS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 5135, 5569 (ii).
- SEELEY'S BAY POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF W. W. WILLIAMS: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3407 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 6701 (ii).
- Senate and House of Commons Act further Amt. B. No. 173** (Mr. Fielding) 1^o*, 2^o*, 7657; in Com. and 3^o*, 7788 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 15.)
- SENATE PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6994 (ii).
- SENATORS, NEW, APPOINTMENTS, REF. TO TELEGRAPHIC DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. Gillies) 2606 (i).
- SESSIONAL ALLOWANCE TO ABSENT MEMBERS: in Com. of Sup., 7782 (ii).
- CLERKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5999, 6990, 7011.
- INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 7382 (ii).
- SHERIDAN, JOHN, INSPECTOR OF LIVE STOCK, APPOINTMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6010 (ii).
- SHANNON, THOS., KILLARNEY CUSTOMS OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 4770 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 7365 (ii).
- Shipment of Grain—Ry. Act Amt B. No. 21** (Mr. Richardson) 1^o*, 671 (i).
- SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR (N.B.) EXTENSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5641 (ii).
- SHIRT AND COLLAR INDUSTRY: M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. Monk) 6583 (ii).
- SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6862 (ii).
- SKELTON vs. THE QUEEN, POSTMASTER AT BATTLEFORD, APPLICATION FOR NEW TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 5319 (ii).
- AFFIDAVITS re: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 6112, 6240, 6317, 6322 (ii).
- M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Davin) 6803 (ii).
- PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. Davin) 6890 (ii).
- PROCEEDINGS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 5117, 5258 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. Davin) 5931 (ii).
- SLADEN, MR., STATUTORY INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., 3831 (i).
- SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 6099 (ii).
- SMELTING SILVER LEAD IN B. C., REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Earle) 6012 (ii).
- SNETSINGER, J. G., CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 7650 (ii).
- Sons of England Benefit Society Co.'s B. No. 122** (Mr. Bertram) 1^o*, 4029; 2^o*, 4175; M. for Com., 6048; in Com., 6266; 3^o*, 6328 (ii).
- SONS OF ENGLAND BENEFIT SOCIETY B. No. 122 (Mr. Bertram) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6061 (ii).
- SOULANGES CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 6446 (ii).
- CONTRACTORS' CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 6447, 6510 (ii).
- EXPENDITURE ON CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 5133 (ii).
- TENDERS FOR CEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4176 (ii).
- SOURIS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5630 (ii).
- SOUTH AFRICAN TRADE WITH CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 6691 (ii).
- SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE WITH CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 6688 (ii).
- SOUTHPORT TO MURRAY HARBOUR (P.E.I.) RY. EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 972 (i).
- SPADES AND SHOVELS COMBINE, &c.: M. (Mr. Richardson) to Adju., 1935 (i).
- SPANISH AMBASSADOR, PRESENCE IN CANADA: Remarks (Mr. Charlton) 5788 (ii).
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
- CONSDN.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4 (i).
- SPENCER, WM., MOUNTED POLICE, DISCHARGE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davin) 2840 (i).
- PENSION: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 6325 (ii).
- SPINKS, JUDGE, INVESTIGATION re: Remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 5268 (ii).
- STANDING ORDERS, SEL. COM., SUSPENSION OF RULE: M. (Mr. Landerkin) 5013 (ii).
- "STANLEY" REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7283 (ii).
- STATIONERY ENGINEERS EXAMINATION BILL, PROP. INTRODUCTION: Remarks (Mr. Sutherland) 2799 (i).
- STATISTICS GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (ii).
- STATISTICAL BRANCH, AGRICULTURE DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. Heyd) 2814 (i).
- YEAR-BOOK: in Com. of Sup., 5025 (ii).
- STATUTORY INCREASES, AGRICULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 4846 (ii).
- AUD. GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4546 (ii).
- CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).
- FINANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4554 (ii).
- GOV. GENERAL'S SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3830 (i).
- INDIAN AFFAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4554 (ii).
- INLAND REVENUE: in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).
- INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 4527, 4551 (ii).
- JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 3895 (i).
- PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4559 (ii).
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4558.
- SECRETARY OF STATE: in Com. of Sup., 4527.

STATUTES, REVISION AND CONSOLIDATION: Ques. (Mr. Britton) 2343 (i).

Steamboat Inspection and Licensing of Engineers B. No. 39 (Sir Louis Davies) 1°, 937; 2°, and in Com., 1869, 2084, 2531: 3°, 2532 (i) Sen. Amts., 4525 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 46.)

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 5003 (ii).

— REMISSION OF PENALTIES: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2344 (i).

STEAMERS FOR FISHERY PROTECTION SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7285 (ii).

STEAMSHIP SERVICE, CANADA AND FRANCE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques.: (Mr. Lemieux) 456 (i).

— ST. JOHN, & C., TO GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 504 (i).

STELLARTON, CAR INSPECTOR SUTHERLAND, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1833, 2839 (i).

STIKINE RIVER, SURVEYS, & C.: in Com. of Sup., 7242.

STIKINE-TESLIN WINTER ROAD: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1187 (i).

STORM SIGNALS (C.B.) NUMBER, & C.: Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 7118 (ii).

STREET CAR FARES: in Com. of Sup., 4582 (i).

SUGAR: in Com. of Ways and Means, 7585 (ii).

SUMMERSIDE (P. E. I.) BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 2816 (i).

— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7637 (ii).

— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5634 (ii).

SUPERIOR COURT, MAGDALEN ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 597 (i).

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, King's) Yukon Contingent, 4795; (Mr. Montague) Appointments by the late Government, 4797; (Mr. Davin) Mounted Police Pensions, 5019; (Sir Charles H. Tupper) Judge Spinks, Charges against, 5263; (Mr. Wallace) Manitoba School Question—Address to the Holy Father, 5394; (Mr. Clarke) Alien Labour Law, Enforcement, 5445; (Sir Charles H. Tupper) Campbell McNab, Claim of, 5446; (Mr. Gauvreau) Temiscouata Election, Personal Explanation, 5447; (Mr. Davin) North-west Settlers, indebtedness due for Seed Grain, 5569; (Sir Charles Tupper) Royal Military College, Imperfect Ret., 5571; (Mr. Sifton) Indian Reserve Crops, Assiniboia, 5571; (Mr. LaRivière) Manitoba University Land Grant, 5571; (Sir Charles Tupper) Business of the Hse., 5885; (Mr. Casey) Pacific Cable from Vancouver to Australia, 6186; (Mr. Foster) Auditor General's Powers, 6202; neg. (Y. 32, N. 49) 6207; (Mr. Corby) Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, 6208; (Mr. McMullen) Debts due the Dom., 6238; (Mr. Davin) Queen vs. Skelton, 6240; (Mr. Bennett) Alien Labour Law at Georgian Bay, 6240; (Mr. Richardson) Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Construction, 6240; (Mr. Belcourt) Yukon Ry. Bill and par in Montreal Gazette, 6242; (Mr. Choquette) I.C.R. Train Service, 6242; (Mr. Poupore) Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, 6486; (Mr. Monk) Shirt and Collar Industry, 6582; (Mr. Bell, Pictou) Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Treatment of Work-

SUPPLY—Con.

men, 6593; deb. rsmd., 6613; (Mr. Ross Robertson) International Copyright, 6627, 6801; (Mr. Osler) Rubber Goods, duty on, 6637; (Mr. Bergeron) Beauharnois Military Camp, 6638; (Mr. Davin) Battleford Postmaster, Charges against, 6803; (Mr. MacLaren) Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, 6965; (Mr. Gibson) Sessional Trunks, Contract, 7047; (Mr. Davis) Manitoba and North-western Ry., 7470; (Mr. Marcotte) Personal Explanation re Par. in *La Patrie*, 7657; (Mr. Davin) Appointment of Mr. Rimmer as Law Clerk, Indian Dept., 7658; (Mr. Hughes) N. W. Mounted Police, Reported loss of men, 7659; (Mr. Bertram) Anglo-American Commission, 7689; (Mr. Bergeron) Manitoba School Question, Par. in *La Patrie*, 7697, 7715 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for 1898-99, 2698 (i); Suppl., 5663; further Suppl., 6439; further Suppl., 1899, 7378 (ii).

RES. (Mr. Fielding) FOR COM., 449; Ms., 3828 (i) 4526, 4795, 4947, 5019, 5268, 5394, 5569, 5885, 5972, 6064, 6186, 6238, 6381, 6446, 6466, 6582, 6613, 6801, 6965, 7242, 7470, 7657, 7689 (ii).

IN COM.: 3828 3869 (i) 4526, 4575, 4845, 4947, 5020, 5050, 5268, 5448, 5572, 5886, 5906, 5972, 6064, 6226, 6244, 6268, 6381, 6446, 6510, 6638, 6819, 6975, 7011, 7087, 7179, 7242, 7474, 7586, 7659, 7720, 7744, 7792 (ii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. See "Justice."

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:

Archives, 5022 (ii).

Bulletins and Reports, Distribution, 5991 (ii).

Classification of Can. Patents, 7512 (ii).

Cold Storage, 5997 (ii).

Creameries in N.W.T., 5994, 5996 (ii).

Criminal Statistics, 5025 (ii).

Dairying Service, 5994 (ii).

Experimental Farms, 5972 (ii).

General Statistics, 5039 (ii).

Nappan, N.S., Dwellings at Dairy Station, 7513 (ii).

North-west Exhibition (1894) Outstanding Accounts, 6995 (ii).

Paris Exhibition, 5039 (ii).

Patent Record, 5023 (ii).

Statistical Year-Book, 5025 (ii).

Charges of Management, 3828 (i).

Dominion Notes, Printing, &c., 6976 (ii).

Civil Government:

Agriculture, 4845 (ii).

Auditor General's Office, 4546, 7475 (ii).

Contingencies:

Agriculture, 5020 (ii).

Auditor General, 4586, 7475 (ii).

Customs, 4588 (ii).

Finance, 4587, 4598 (ii).

Governor General's Office, 4581, 6978 (ii).

High Commissioner's Office, 4561, 4575 (ii).

Indian Dept., 4585 (ii).

Inland Revenue, 4589, 6978 (ii).

Justice, 4582, 6963 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries, 4596, 6984, 7481 (ii).

Militia and Defence, 4585, 6984, 7482 (ii).

Post Office Dept., 4915, 7038, 7482 (ii).

Privy Council Office, 4582, 7483 (ii).

Public Works, 4591, 6984 (ii).

Queen's Printer, 7483 (ii).

Railways and Canals, 4597 (ii).

Trade and Commerce, 4598, 7483 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Civil Government—Con.*

- Customs, 4555, 7475; conc., 7818, 7852 (ii).
- Finance, 4554 (ii).
- Geological Survey, 4559, 7477 (ii).
- Governor General's Secretary's Office, 3-30 (i).
- High Commissioner's Office, 4560 (ii).
- Indian Dept., 4553 (ii).
- Inland Revenue, 4556 (ii).
- Interior, 4527, 4551 (ii).
- Justice, 3894 (i) 6983 (ii).
- Penitentiaries Branch, 3899 (i).
- Marine and Fisheries, 4558, 6984, 7481 (ii).
- Militia and Defence, 3899 (i), 6564, 6984, 7482 (ii).
- Mounted Police, 4545 (ii).
- Postmaster General's, 4581, 4857, 7038, 7482 (ii).
- Privy Council Office, 3894 (i), 7483 (ii).
- Private Sec.'s Salary, 6978 (ii).
- Public Printing and Stationery, 4527, 4545, 7483 (ii).
- Public Works, 4558, 6984 (ii).
- Railways and Canals, 4558 (ii).
- Secretary of State, 4526 (ii).
- Sundry Depts., Private Sec.'s Salaries, 7484 (ii).
- Trade and Commerce, 4560, 7483 (ii).

Collection of Revenues :

- Adulteration of Food, &c., 6000 (ii).
- Culling Timber, 6000, 7249 (ii).
- Customs, 6000 (ii).
- Chicoutimi Pulp Works, 7774, 7792; conc., 7852 (ii).
- General Vote, 7355 (ii).
- Laboratory, 7773 (ii).

Excise :

- Contingencies, Preventive Service, &c., 7243 (ii).
- Printing of Law Stamps, 7251 (ii).
- Salaries, Officers, Inspectors, &c., 6000 (ii).
- Post Office (Outside Service):
- Letter Carriers, &c., 6698, 7775 (ii).
- Miscellaneous Expenses, 6701 (ii).
- Salaries, &c., 7038, 7050 (ii).

Public Works :

- Slides and Booms, Dues, Salaries, &c., 7643 (ii).

Railways :

- I.C.R., Damages by Fire, Payment to A. Kirk, 7373 (ii).

Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."

Dominion Lands—Capital :

- Surveys, &c., 6860, 7007; conc., 7822 (ii).

Dominion Lands—Income :

- General Vote, 6858 (ii).
- Salaries, Extra Clerks, &c., 7323 (ii).

Dominion Police :

- Bertillon System for Identification of Criminals, 7488 (ii).

Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."

Fisheries :

- Behring Sea Claims Commission, 7286 (ii).
- Fisheries, Reference to Privy Council, 7285 (ii).
- Repairs to Fishery Protection Steamers, 7285 (ii).
- Salaries, Inspectors, &c., 5004, 5268 (ii).

*Geological Survey, 7754 (ii).**Govt. of North-west Territories, 6857 (ii).*

- Insane Asylums in Man., 7305 (ii).

Govt. of the Yukon Provisional District :

- Services of North-west Mounted Police, 6858 (ii).
- Steam Launches, 7769 (ii).

Immigration :

- Agents and Employees in Canada, salaries, 6819, 7744 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Immigration—Con.*

- Contingencies, 7744 (ii).
- General Vote, 7287, 7733, 7744 (ii).

Indians :

- General Vote, Inspectors' Salaries, 7303 (ii).
- Manitoba and N. W. T., 6854, 7301 (ii).
- Purveyor's salary, 7765 (ii).
- New Brunswick, 7294, 7298 (ii).
- Nova Scotia, 7293, 7294 (ii).
- Ontario and Quebec, 7291 (ii).
- Mt. Elgin, Ont., Industrial School, 7754 (ii).
- Sundries :
- Survey of Indian Reserves, 6848 (ii).

Inspection of Staples :

- Purchase and Distribution of Flour and Grain Standards, &c., 6695 (ii).

Justice, Administration of :

- Exchequer Court, Salaries, Expenses, &c., 6639 (ii).
- To Chas. Morse, for furnishing Reports of Decisions, 6639 (ii).
- Supreme Court, Law Library, 6638 (ii).
- Mr. Justice McGuire's Salary, 6986, 7486 (ii).

*Legislation :**House of Commons :*

- Additional amount required, 6990 (ii).
- Committees, Sessional Messengers, &c., 7782 (ii).
- French Translation of Experimental Farm Report, 7011 (ii).
- North Ontario Elections, Litigation Costs, 7505 (ii).
- Publishing Debates, 7011 (ii).
- Sessional and Extra Clerks, 5999, 7011, 7782 (ii).
- Sessional Indemnities, Absent Members, 7782 (ii).

Library :

- American History, Books on, 5999 (ii).

Senate :

- Unforeseen Expenses, printing debates and contingencies, 6994 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service :

- Construction, &c., of Lights, 4999 (ii).
- Maintenance and Repairs of Lights, 4998 (ii).
- Repairs to Wharfs, 5000 (ii).
- Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 4981 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions :

- Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, Big Pond and East Bay, 7723 (ii).
- Can. and South Africa, 7720 (ii).
- Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 6687 (ii).
- Montreal, Quebec and Manchester, 7282, 7659 (ii).
- Port Mulgrave and St. Peter's and Irish Cove, 7723.
- Quebec and Gaspé Basin, 6688 (ii).
- St. John and Digby, 6226 (ii).
- St. John and Halifax via Yarmouth, 6688 (ii).
- St. John, Halifax and London, 7282 (ii).
- St. John and London, Liverpool, &c., 7282, 7659 (ii).
- St. John or Halifax and West Indies and South America, 6686 (ii).
- Victoria and San Francisco, 6687 (ii).

Marine Hospitals :

- Marine Hospitals and Shipwrecked Seamen, 5003 (ii).

Militia :

- Arms and Accoutrements, 7523 (ii).
- Artillery Association, Entertainment of English Team, 7521 (ii).
- Camping Ground at London, 7516 (ii).
- Dominion Cartridge Factory, 6570, 7075 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Militia—Con.*

- General Vote, 7056, 7515 (ii).
- Gratuities to Officers, retired, &c., 6573, 7517, 7521.
- Lt.-Col. Worsley, D. A. G. at Halifax, 7519 (ii).
- Miscellaneous and Unforeseen, 6570 (ii).
- Mounted Police Pensions, Rebellion of 1885, 6577 (ii).
- Rifle Association, Grant, &c., 6570, 7521 (ii).
- Thos. Moore, sen., loss of son at Batoche (1885) 7520.
- Yukon Contingent, Supplies, &c., 7793.

Miscellaneous :

- Alien Labour Law, Enforcement in Man. and N. W. T., 7275, 772 (ii).
- Arbitration, Dom., and Ont. and Quebec Accounts, 6861 (ii).
- Banff, Rocky Mountain Park, 7769 (ii).
- Boundary between Canada and U.S.A., Expenses, 6860 (ii).
- Canadian Mining Institute, 7770 (ii).
- Cases of the B.N.A. Act, Publication, &c., 7088 (ii).
- Classification of Privy Council Records, 7279 (ii).
- Contributions for Can. Law Library, England, 7088.
- Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Expenses of Commission, 7251.
- Deep Waterways Commission, Expenses, &c., 7282.
- Expenses of Chief Justice Strong, 7089 (ii).
- Gratuities, &c., Interior, 7769 (ii).
- Hudson Bay Expedition, Printing reports, &c., 7094.
- Legal Expenses *re* Belgian and German Treaties, 7088 (ii).
- Liquor Commission, Payments to *Hansard* Reporters, 7094 (ii).
- Litigation Costs, Can. Sugar Refining Co., 7770 (ii).
- Man. Schools, Litigation Costs, 7770 (ii).
- Parliamentary Guide*, Purchase of Copies, 6975.
- Pilotage Investigations at Montreal, 7102 (ii).
- Printing, Miscellaneous, conc., 7850 (ii).
- Quebec Land Slide, Commission, 7087 (ii).
- Relief for Sufferers of the Prescott and Russell Forest Fires, 7089 (ii).
- Rocky Mountain Park, Fencing, &c., 7251 (ii).
- Salary to J. C. Roland, Sault Ste. Marie, 7098 (ii).

Mounted Police, 6856 (ii).*Ocean and River Service :*

- Biological Station, Marine, Gulf of St. Lawrence, 7733 (ii).
- Can. Registry of Shipping, 4954 (ii).
- Cattle Inspection, Salaries, &c., 7732 (ii).
- Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs, 4947 (ii).
- New Steamer to replace SS. "Stanley," 7730 (ii).
- Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, 4964 (ii).
- Repairs to SS. "Stanley," 7283 (ii).
- Rewards for Saving Life, 4952 (ii).
- Tidal Service, &c., 4955, 7732 (ii).
- Winter Mail Service, 4964, 7284 (ii).

Penitentiaries :

- British Columbia, 7339 (ii).
- Dorchester, 6676 (ii).
- Kingston, 6686, 7339 (ii).
- Surgeon's Salary as Superintendent of Insane Ward, 7488 (ii).
- Manitoba, 7339 (ii).
- St. Vincent de Paul, 6639, 7339 (ii).

Post Office : See "Collection of Revenues."

Public Works—Capital :

Buildings :

- Ottawa, Western Deptl. Block, 5069 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Public Works—Capita'—Con.*

Harbours and Rivers :

- River Kaministiquia, 5067 (ii).
- St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 5050 (ii).

Public Works—Income :

Buildings :

British Columbia :

- Dom. Public Buildings, 5493 (ii).
- Vancouver Drill Hall, 7589 (ii).
- Victoria Public Building, 5493 (ii).
- General Vote, 5494 (ii).

Manitoba :

- Portage la Prairie P.O., 5185 (ii).

New Brunswick :

- Marysville P.O., 5992 (ii).
- St. John Quarantine Station, 7586 (ii).

North-west Territories :

- Dom. Public Buildings, 5489 (ii).
- Medicine Hat Court House, 7589 (ii).

Nova Scotia :

- Kentville and Liverpool P.O., 5072 (ii).
- Halifax Dom. Building, 7214 (ii).
- Halifax Drill Hall, 5071, 7586 (ii).
- Windsor Drill Shed and Building, 7214 (ii).

Ontario :

- Alexandria Reformatory, 5482 (ii).
- Arnprior P.O., 5149 (ii).
- Dom. Public Buildings, Generally, 5448 (ii).
- Experimental Farm, Laboratory, 5495 (ii).
- French Translators' Office, Ottawa, 7218 (ii).
- Kingston Drill Hall, 5453 (ii).
- Major's Hill Park (stone fence) 5453, 5572, 7588.
- Ottawa Public Buildings, Sidewalks, &c., 5470, 5471, 7217 (ii).
- Ottawa, Payments to Howell Estate, 7587 (ii).
- East Block, New Elevator, 7588 (ii).
- Langevin Block, Fire Proof Roof, 7587 (ii).
- West Block, New Boilers, 7588 (ii).
- Port Colborne Public Building, 5463 (ii).
- Rat Portage Public Buildings, 5470, 7583 (ii).
- Sarnia Public Building, 5482, 7588 (ii).
- Summer-house, Ottawa, 7218 (ii).
- Toronto, Repairs, &c., 5448, 7217 (ii).
- Woodstock P.O., 5464 (ii).

Quebec :

- Montmagny P.O., 5093 (ii).
- Montreal P.O., 7587 (ii).
- Rimouski P.O., &c., 7217 (ii).
- Quebec Custom House, 7587 (ii).

Rents, Repairs, Furniture, &c. :

- Dom. Buildings, Ottawa, 5598 (ii).
- Dom. Immigration Buildings, 5611 (ii).
- Heating, Fuel, &c., Dom. Public Buildings, 5608.
- Major's Hill Park, Ottawa, 5606 (ii).
- Rents, Dom. Public Buildings, 5606 (ii).
- Rideau Hall Grounds and Renewals, 5598 (ii).
- Salaries of Caretakers, Engineers, &c., of Dom. Pub. Buildings, 5607 (ii).
- Telephone Service, Ottawa, 5605 (ii).

Dredging, 7242 (ii).

- British Columbia, 6099 (ii).
- Dredge Vessels, Repairs, 6081 (ii).
- General Service, 6099 (ii).
- Manitoba, 6099 (ii).
- New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, 6082 (ii).
- New Dredging Plant, 6072 (ii).
- Ontario and Quebec, 6087 (ii).
- Prince Edward Island, 6082 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Public Works—Income—Con.*

Harbours and Rivers, Generally, 6066 (ii).

British Columbia :

Columbia River Improvements, 6064, 6065, 6066.

Fraser River Improvements, 6065 (ii).

General Repairs, &c., 6065 (ii).

Stikine River, Examination, &c., 7242 (ii).

Manitoba :

Lake Manitoba Outlets, &c., 5928 (ii).

Maritime Provinces, Generally, 5642 (ii).

New Brunswick :

Burnt Church, Wharf, 7636 (ii).

Campbellton Wharf, Repairs, 7635 (ii).

Cape Tormentine Breakwater, 5642 (ii).

Shippegan Harbour, 5641 (ii).

Tracadie, Additional Block, Repairs, &c., 7635.

Upper Tobique River, Improvements, &c., 7633.

Nova Scotia :

Advocate Harbour, Wharf, 7631 (ii).

Cow Bay, Breakwater, Repairs, 7590 (ii).

Cribbons Point, Repairs to Wharf, 5614 (ii).

Eastern Passage, Boat Harbour, 5618 (ii).

East Ragged Island, Wharf, 5618 (ii).

Ingonish, North Bay, Breakwater, 7589 (ii).

Iona Wharf, 7589 (ii).

Jordan Bay Breakwater, Repairs, 7629 (ii).

Judique Wharf, 5612, 5615 (ii).

L'Ardoise, Repairs to Breakwater, 5622 (ii).

Livingstone Cove Wharf, 7633 (ii).

Louis' Head, Repairs to Crib-work, &c., 7630 (ii).

McNutt's Island, Beach Protection, 7629 (ii).

Margaree, Extension of Pier, 5616 (ii).

Meteghan Breakwater, Repairs, 5619 (ii).

Morden, Repairs to Wharf, 5615 (ii).

New Harbour, Breakwater, 7590 (ii).

North River. St. Anne's Wharf at Seymour's Point, 5616 (ii).

Petit de Grat, Dredging, &c., 7589 (ii).

Pictou Light, Beach Protection, 7631 (ii).

Port Hillford, Breakwater, 7628 (ii).

Port Joli Wharf, 5628 (ii).

Port Latour Breakwater, 5628 (ii).

Sandford Breakwater, 7630 (ii).

Swim's Point Wharf, 7629 (ii).

Tancock Island Wharf, Repairs, 7629 (ii).

Upper Port Latour, Wharf, 7629 (ii).

Upper Woods Harbour. Wharf, 7629 (ii).

West Arichat Wharf, 7589 (ii).

Whycocomagh Wharf, 5622 (ii).

Windsor Harbour, Deepening Channel, &c., 5619.

Ontario :

Collingwood Harbour, 5886 (ii).

Kingston Harbour, 7242, 7641 (ii).

L'Original Wharf, 5922 (ii).

Meaford Harbour, 5927 (ii).

North Bay Wharf, 5927 (ii).

Owen Sound Harbour, 5889 (ii).

Port Burwell Harbour, 5922 (ii).

Port Stanley, Repairs, &c., 5326 (ii).

—— Harbour Improvements, 5927 (ii).

Rainy River Channel, 5888 (ii).

River Ottawa, Channel Improvements, conc., 7819 (ii).

Thornbury Wharf, 5926 (ii).

Toronto Harbour, 5891 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Public Works—Income—Con.*Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Prince Edward Island :

Belfast Pier, 5632 (ii).

Brae Breakwater, 5633 (ii).

China Point Pier, Reconstruction, 7636 (ii).

Creosoted Piles, Purchase of, 5633 (ii).

General Repairs to Piers, &c., 5630 (ii).

Red Point Wharf, 5633 (ii).

Souris Breakwater, 5630 (ii).

Summerside Harbour, 7637 (ii).

Tignish Breakwater, 5632 (ii).

West Point Wharf, 5632 (ii).

Quebec :

Anse à Beaufils Harbour, 5658 (ii).

Baie St. Paul Wharf, Repairs, &c., 7639 (ii).

Chicoutimi, Saguenay River, Dredging, 7639 (ii).

Coteau Landing, Dredging, 7226 (ii).

Doucet's Landing, Dredging, 7639 (ii).

Grand Rivière Wharf, 5648 (ii).

Isle Perrot Wharf, 5659 (ii).

Laprairie Ice Piers, &c., 5753 (ii).

Maria Wharf, 7638 (ii).

Point Claire Wharf, 5659 (ii).

Rivière la Pipe Wharf, 5660 (ii).

Rivière Richelieu, Guide Piers, 5653 (ii).

St. Anicet Wharf, 5656 (ii).

St. Anne de Sorel, Ice Piers, 5660 (ii).

St. Irène Wharf, 5656 (ii).

St. Jean des Chaillons Harbour, 5659 (ii).

St. Lawrence River, Removal of Rocks, 5656 (ii).

St. Roch des Aulnaies Wharf, 5658 (ii).

Miscellaneous :

Architects, &c., payment to W. C. Harris, 7243.

Monument, late Alex. Mackenzie, 6105 (ii).

National Art Gallery, 6103 (ii).

To cover balances of Expenditure for Works for which Appropriations are insufficient, 6244.

Temporary Clerks, &c., 6104 (ii).

Roads and Bridges :

Bridge across Saskatchewan, Edmonton, 6100, 6245, 6268, conc., 7822 (ii).

Dom Traffic Bridges Throughout Canada, 6100.

Maria St. Bridge, Ottawa, 6100 (ii).

Sappers' Bridge, Ottawa, 6100 (ii).

Slides and Booms, 6099 (ii).

Telegraph Lines :

Cape Beale and Carmenah (B.C.) alternative lines, 6102 (ii).

North Shore, St. Lawrence, 6101 (ii).

North-west Territories, 6316 (ii).

Quarantine :

Cattle Quarantine, 5988 (ii).

Gratuity to Wm. McK. McLeod, 6995 (ii).

Slaughter of Hogs and Sheep, Compensation, 7003.

William's Head, B.C., Quarantine, 7514 (ii).

Railways and Canals :

Canals :

Beauharnois, Repairs, &c., 7189 (ii).

Chambly, Swing Bridge, 6553 (ii).

—— Culverts, &c., 7651 (ii).

Cornwall, Claims of J. G. Snetsinger, 7650 (ii).

—— Enlargement, 6532, 6554 (ii).

Farran's Point, Enlargement, 6532 (ii).

Galops, Straightening, &c., 6538 (ii).

General Expenses for Investigations, 7194 (ii).

Grenville, Enlargement, 6552 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Railways and Canals—Con.*Canals—*Con.*

- Lachine, Enlargement, 6551 (ii).
- Lake St. Francois, Removal of Boulders, 6538 (ii).
- Murray, Floating Landing Stage, 6554 (ii).
- North Channel, Straightening, &c., 6535 (ii).
- Rideau, 7182 (ii).
- River Reaches, 6538 (ii).
- St. Pierre River, Deepening, 6551 (ii).
- Sault St. Marie, Construction, &c., 6550, 7105 (ii).
- Soulanges, Construction, 6446, 6510 (ii).
- Trent Valley, Construction, 6538, 6553 (ii).
- Welland, 7652 (ii).
- Williamsburg, Lock Gates and Stone Lifter, 6554.
- Gratuity to Geo. Reid, 7192 (ii).

Railways:

Canadian Pacific Railroad:

- Land Damages, &c., 6382 (ii).
- To pay Balance for Work under Award, 6381 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass R.R.:

- Salary of Superintending Engineer, 7110 (ii).

Intercolonial Ry., 6564 (ii).

- Dalhousie Wharf, Improvements, 7084 (ii).
- Drummond Co. Ry. and G. T. Ry., Rental, 6553.
- Salary of Superintending Engineer, 7181.
- Extension to Deep Water, North Sydney. C.B., 6386 (ii).

Fire, Damages by, 7183, 7373 (ii).

Increased Accommodation at Halifax, 6382 (ii).

—— at Moncton, 6388, 7084 (ii).

—— at Mulgrave, 6428 (ii).

—— at St. John, 7645 (ii).

—— at Various Points, 6433 (ii).

Increased Strength of Iron Bridges, 6388, 6564.

Indiantown Branch, Land Damages, 7078 (ii).

Land Damages, Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton Divisions, 6385 (ii).

Masonry Culvert and Embankments, 7085 (ii).

Original Construction, 6385 (ii).

Passenger and Freight Shed, Richmond, 6427.

Rolling Stock, 7643 (ii).

Snow Fences, Eastern Extension, &c., 6427 (ii).

To Dredge at Pictou and Landing Wharf, 6427.

Prince Edward Island Ry.:

Additional Rolling Stock, 6434 (ii).

Straightening Curves on Main Line, 6434 (ii).

Miscellaneous:

- Survey of an All-Canadian Route to the Yukon, 6562 (ii).

Railway Subsidies:

- Subsidy to Central Railroad of New Brunswick, 7653 (ii).
- Subsidy to Halifax Banking Co., 7807 (ii).

Scientific Institutions:

- Hydrographic Surveys, 5000 (ii).
- Meteorological Service, 5001, 7285 (ii).
- Toronto Observatory, 5002, 7284 (ii).

*Steamboat Inspection, 5003 (ii).**Trade and Commerce:*

- Administration of Chinese Immigration Act, 6690 (ii).
- Commercial Agencies, Expenses, &c., 6690 (ii).
- International Customs Bureau, 6690 (ii).

*Unprovided Items, as per Auditor General's Report, 7351 (ii).*SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Yukon Provisional District:*

- Maintenance of Mounted Police Force, 7333, 7353 (ii).
- Salaries, &c., of Administration, 7323 (ii).
- [See "Govt. of Yukon, &c."]

CONCURRENCE:

- Bridge across Saskatchewan at Edmonton, 7322 (ii).
- Customs, 7818, 7852 (ii).
- Dom. Lands, Surveys, &c., 7822 (ii).
- Miscellaneous Printing, 7850 (ii).
- Public Works, Channel at Pembroke, 7819 (ii).

Supply B. No. 174 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1st, 7854; 2^d and in Com., 7857; 3^d, 7858 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 1.)

SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6860 (ii).

SURVEY, INDIAN RESERVES: in Com. of Sup., 6847 (ii).

—— PRINTING PLANS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7307; conc., 7882 (ii).

SETTON, LT., INSTRUCTIONS *re* MILITARY COURSE IN ENGLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1782 (i).

SWIM'S POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7629 (ii).

SYDNEY AND NORTH SYDNEY QUARANTINE PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1781 (i).Tamagamingue Ry. Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *McHugh*) 1st, 1465; 2^d, 1775 (i); in Com. and 3rd, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 87.)TANNER, JOHN E., DETENTION BY SPANISH GOVT. AT PORTO RICO. Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 6011 (ii).TARTE, HON. MR. AND THE SENATE, PAR. IN *Le Soleil*: Remarks (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3319 (i).

TELEGRAPH LINES, GODBOUT AND POINTE AUX ESQUIMAUX: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (ii).

—— NORTH SHORE ST. LAWRENCE, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7123 (ii).

—— NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: in Com. of Sup., 6316 (ii).

—— NOVA SCOTIA, RAIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 6006 (ii).

TELEPHONE SERVICE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 5605.

TÉMISCOUATA ELECTION: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 5447 (ii).

TENDERS FOR COAL ON DREDGES: in Com. of Sup., 5059 (ii).

TENNANT, J. F., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret., 3670 (i) 4182 (ii).

TERREBONNE EXCISE DIVISION, MR. PREVOST'S REP. *re* COLLECTOR: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1837.

TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION (N. W. T.), ACCOUNTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (ii).

—— MISS CUMMINGS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).—— OUTSTANDING INDEBTEDNESS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 486 (i).—— PAYMENT OF PRIZES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 976.—— P. LAMONT'S ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2431 (i).TESLIN LAKE WAGON ROUTE AND GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2700 (i).THESSALON POINT LIGHTHOUSE, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1932 (i).

THORNBURY WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5926 (ii).

TIDAL SERVICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7732 (ii).
 — SURVEYS · in Com. of Sup., 4955 (ii).
 TIDES AND CURRENTS, REPS. OF SURVEYS: M. for Copy (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1835 (i).
 TIGNISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).
 — TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1074 (i).
 TIMBER BERTHS IN N.W.T. AND YUKON: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 504 (i).
Tobique Manufacturing Co's B. No. 129 (Mr. Taylor) 1st, 2nd, 5050; in Com. and 3rd, 6266 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 116.)
 TOBIQUE RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7633 (ii).
Toronto and Hudson Bay Ry. incorp. B. No. 77 (Mr. Clarke) 1st, 1839; 2nd, 1949 (i); M. for Com., 4562; in Com. and 3rd, 4606; Sen. Amts., 5906, 6268 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 88.)
Toronto Board of Trade B. No. 43 (Mr. Osler) 1st, 970; 2nd, 1214; in Com. and 3rd, 2122 (i). (61-62 Vic., c. 117.)
 TORONTO HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4771 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 7231 (ii).
 — LIABILITY INCURRED: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 971.
 — EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 5891.
 — IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNTS PAID W. E. PHIN: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 1337 (i).
 — OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5002, 7284 (ii).
 — PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5448, 7217 (ii).
 TRACADIE, ADDITIONAL PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (ii).
TRADE AND COMMERCE:
 ATLANTIC EAST SS. SERVICE, CONTRACT: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7385 (ii).
 — NEGOTIATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Ives) 600 (i).
 — PETERSEN & TATE'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 829 (i).
 — Remarks (Mr. Dobell) 3297 (i).
 — Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3313 (i).
 — Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6600 (ii).
 — TELEGRAM FROM LONDON re CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 7356 (ii).
 ANGLO-FRENCH TELEGRAPH CO. PETS., &c.: M. (Mr. Fraser, Guysboro') 5143 (ii).
 BADDECK, &c., AND IONA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7723 (ii).
 CANADA AND SOUTH AFRICA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (ii).
 CANADIAN AND ENGLISH MAIL, BEAVER LINE STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. Ives) 2844 (i).
 COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4575, 6690.
 FRENCH LINE OF STEAMERS, NEGOTIATIONS: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6465 (ii).
 GASPÉ BASIN AND DALHOUSIE MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).
 — AND QUEBEC MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).
 — LINE OF STEAMERS, SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7120 (ii).
 — STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7685 (ii).
 HALIFAX, ST. JOHN AND YARMOUTH MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).
 HAWAIIAN VESSELS NAVIGATING CANADIAN WATERS: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 603 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—Con.

MAGDALEN ISLAND MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1575 (i).
 MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7282 (ii).
 MONTREAL, QUEBEC AND MANCHESTER MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7659 (ii).
 NEWFOUNDLAND AND CAPE BRETON MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7282 (ii).
 PACIFIC CABLE, CAN. AND AUSTRALIA: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 5232 (ii).
 — IMPERIAL GOVT'S REP.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Casey) 3668 (i).
 — on M. for Com. of Sup., 6186 (ii).
 — M. to print papers (Mr. Casey) 6226 (ii).
 — Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 7125, 7384 (ii).
 PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S CONTRACT, TEL. FROM LONDON: Remarks (Mr. Davin) in Com. of Sup., 7356 (ii).
 PORT MULGRAVE, &c., TO IRISH COVE MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7723 (ii).
 ST. JOHN, HALIFAX AND LONDON MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7282 (ii).
 — W. INDIES AND S. AMERICA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6686 (ii).
 STEAMSHIP SERVICE, CAN. AND FRANCE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 456 (i).
 STEAMSHIP SERVICE, ST. JOHN, &c., TO GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 504 (i).
 SOUTH AFRICAN TRADE WITH CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 6691 (ii).
 SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE WITH CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 6688 (ii).
 TRADE AND COMMERCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4560, 4598 (ii).
 — CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 7483.
 — Rep.: Presented (Sir Richard Cartwright) 935.
 U.S. VESSELS IN CANADIAN WATERS, RIGHT TO EXCLUDE: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 824 (i).
 VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).
 WEST INDIAN TRADE, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1339 (i).
 — Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2844 (i).
 [See "CUSTOMS," "WAYS AND MEANS," &c.]
Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. B. No. 61 (Mr. Bertram). 1st, 1387; 2nd m., 2842 (i); in Com and 3rd, 4208 (ii).
Transit of Grain in Man. and N. W. Ter. Regulation B. No. 19 (Mr. Douglas). 1st, 450; 2nd m., 2059; ref. to Com. on Rys., 2083 (i).
 TRANSLATORS OFFICE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 7218 (ii).
 TRANSPORT OF MERCHANDISE IN U. S. VESSELS: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 1076 (i).
 TREASURY VAULT (B.C.): in Com. of Sup., 5493 (ii).
 TREASURY BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS, NON-PRODUCTION OF RETURNS: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1077 (i).
 TRENT VALLEY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 6538 (ii).
 — GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. Corby) 2817 (i).
 — REMOVAL OF ROCK: in Com. of Sup., 6553 (ii).
 TROUT COVE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 3824 (i).
 "TRUDEAU," STR.: in Com. of Sup., 6072 (ii).

- TRUNKS FOR MEMBERS : in Com. of Sup., 7035 (ii).
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Gibson*) 7047 (ii).
- TYANDENAGA INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 7754 (ii).
- Union Bank of Canada Amt. B. No. 24** (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1st, 743 ; 2nd and in Com., 824 ; 3rd, 2122 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 118.)
- UNITED COUNTIES RY., PAYMENTS TO : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3658 (i).
- UNITED STATES AND CANADA, JOINT COM., PROP. CONFERENCE : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6609 (ii).
 — CUSTOMS IN ALASKA, BOUNDARY LINE : Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 407 (i).
 — TELEGRAM IN MONTREAL *Gazette* : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 405 (i).
 — REGULATIONS AT FORT WRANGEL : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1086 (i).
 — REGULATIONS AT SKAGWAY AND DYEA : Explanation (Mr. *Paterson*) 264 (i).
 — Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 101 (i).
 — REGULATIONS ON THE STIKINE : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 720 (i).
- U. S. AND GREAT BRITAIN IMPORTS : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3663 (i).
 — OCCUPATION OF DYEA AND SKAGWAY : Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 829 (i).
 — Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 619 (i).
 — RELIEF EXPEDITION TO THE YUKON : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 102 (i).
 — MILITARY ESCORT : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 970.
 — SS. "FREDERICK J. GERRING," SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT : M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2823 (i).
 — SS. "YANTIC" AND "LA CANADIENNE" COLLISION ; Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 4451 (ii).
 — PASSAGE UP ST. LAWRENCE : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 830 (i).
 — Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1336 (i).
 — VESSELS IN CANADIAN WATERS, RIGHT TO EXCLUDE : Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 824 (i).
 — WARSHIPS IN CANADIAN CANALS : Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 4350 (ii).
- UNIVERSITY OF MAN. AND GOVT. GRANT OF LAND : M. for O. C.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3670 (i).
- UNPROVIDED ITEMS AS PER AUDITOR GEN.'S REP. : in Com. of Sup., 7351 (ii).
- VACANCIES : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2, 1079 (i).
- Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64** (Mr. *Maxwell*). 1st, 1573 ; 2nd, 1775 (i) ; in Com. and 3rd, 4387 (ii). 61-62 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- VANCOUVER DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).
- VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. BELT, SETTLER'S CLAIMS, REP. OF MR. ROTHWELL : Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 4452 (ii).
- VENNER, INDIAN AGENT AT RESTIGOUCHE, SUSPENSION : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McAlister*) 2839 (i).
 — Remarks (Mr. *McAlister*) 1786 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 4611 (ii).
- VERGE, J. ALBERT, FISHERY OVERSEER, DISMISSAL : in Com. of Sup., 5304 (ii).
- VETERINARY INSPECTORS, APPTS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Montague*) 2821 (i).
- Victoria Fire Insurance Co.'s B. No. 59** (Mr. *Quinn*). 1st, 1380 ; 2nd, 1509 ; in Com. and 3rd, 2957 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 119.)
- VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).
- VICTORVILLE PUBLIC BUILDING, ERECTION ; Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 7120 (ii).
- VOLUNTEERS OF 1866, MEDALS GRANTED : Remarks (Mr. *Heyd*) 6613 (ii).
- VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, RECORD OF VOTE, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) 2850 (i).
- VOTERS' LISTS (ONT.) REVISING OFFICERS, COST OF PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2845 (i).
- WALSH, ADMINISTRATOR IN YUKON, INSTRUCTIONS AND COMMISSIONS : Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1174 (i).
 — NON-PRODUCTION OF INSTRUCTIONS (Mr. *Foster*) 1387 (i).
 — INSTRUCTIONS : Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 1341 (i).
 — APPNT. AS ADMINISTRATOR IN YUKON : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 479 (i).
 — APPTS. TO FORCE : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 480 (i).
 — COMMISSION AND INSTRUCTIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1777 (i).
 — M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2839 (i).
- WALSH, E. J., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. : Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 6324 (ii).
 — CLAIM AGAINST LEeward ISLANDS : M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2841 (i).
- WALTON, T. M., INDIAN AGENT AT PARRY ISLAND, DISMISSAL : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McCormack*) 3670.
- WAVERLEY POSTMASTER, REMOVAL : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 598 (i).
- WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF :
 Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 449 (i).
 BUDGET, THE, Financial Stmt. (Mr. *Fielding*) 3104 (ii).
 Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 3208 ; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3242 ; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3262 ; (Mr. *Paterson*) 3220 ; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3369 ; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3392 ; (Mr. *Craig*) 3428 ; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3458 ; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3477 ; (Mr. *McMillan*) 3489 ; (Mr. *Kloepfer*) 3499 ; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3505 ; (Mr. *Frost*) 3517 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3533, 3554 ; (Mr. *Tarte*) 3564 ; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3569 ; (Mr. *Clancy*) 3574 ; (Mr. *Davin*) 3593 ; (Mr. *Roche*) 3626 (i).
- PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE : In Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 3756, 3781 ; (Mr. *Davin*) 3756, 3786 ; (Mr. *Ives*) 3757 ; (Mr. *Maclean*) 3758 ; (Mr. *Clancy*) 3759, 3791 ; (Mr. *Craig*) 3762 ; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3763, 3792 ; (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) 3765, 3783 ; (Mr. *Henderson*) 3765, 3782 ; (Mr. *MacPherson*) 3766 ; (Mr. *Foster*) 3767, 3794 ; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3770 ; (Mr. *Hughes*) 3771, 3795 ; (Mr. *McDougall*) 3772, 3780 ; (Mr. *Clarke*) 3773 ; (Mr. *Powell*) 3775 ; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3785 ; (Mr. *Oster*) 3796 ; (Mr. *Maxwell*) 3796 ; (Mr. *McNeill*) 3797 ; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3804 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) 3804 (i).
- TARIFF CHANGES : In Com. (sugar) 3805 ; (tobacco) 3812 (i).
- WEATHERBEE, MR. JUSTICE, ABSENCE FROM PROVINCE Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3166 (i).

- Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. No. 60** (Mr. Fortin). 1^o m., 1380, 1387; 2^o m., 2842 (i). Deb. (Mr. Fortin) 1380; (Mr. Ethier) 1382; (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) 1384; (Mr. Penny) 1384; (Mr. Chauvin) 1384; (Mr. Wallace) 1385; (Mr. Monk) 1386; (Mr. Sproule) 1386; (Mr. Talbot) 1386 (i).
- **B. No. 71** (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). 1^o, 1737; 2^o, and in Com., 2113, 2123, 3097 (i) 6582; 3^o*, 6582; Sen. Amts., 7783 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 30.)
- WELLAND CANAL, DISMISSALS**: in Com. of Sup., 7206.
- **EMPLOYEES DISMISSED, NAMES, &c.**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Montague) 2839 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 7652 (ii).
- WELLINGTON BRIDGE ACCIDENT, MR. MATTISON'S SERVICES**: Remarks (Mr. Quinn) 4775 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. Quinn) 4604 (ii).
- WEST DEPTL. BLOCK, REFACING WALLS**: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3319 (i).
- WEST INDIAN TRADE, EXTENSION**: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1339 (i).
- WEST INDIES TRADE**: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2844 (i).
- WEST POINT PIER, P.E.I., TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION**: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1075 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).
- WEST PRINCE (P.E.I.) VACANCY, APPOINTMENT OF RETURNING OFFICER**: Ques. (Mr. Montague) 2040 (i).
- Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1481 (i).
- **ISSUE OF WRIT**: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2241 (i).
- **ISSUE OF WRIT** (Mr. Speaker) 1173 (i).
- **NOTIFICATION** (Mr. Macdonald, King's) 1079.
- WHARFS, REPAIRS, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 5000, 5633.
- WHARFS AND PIERS, GOVT. EXPENDITURE**: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Martin) 6581, 7241, 7665 (ii).
- WHEAT GRADED IN ELEVATORS AT FORT WILLIAM**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Richardson) 2839 (i).
- WHISKY FOR THE KLONDIKE, MANAUNSE'S CARGO**: Remarks (Mr. Guillet) 1188 (i).
- WHITE, MR., EX-DEP. POSTMASTER GENERAL, SUPERANNUATION**: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 474 (i).
- WHYCOCOMAGH WHARF**: in Com. of Sup., 5622 (ii).
- WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, GRATUITY TO GEORGE REID**: in Com. of Sup., 7192 (ii).
- **REPAIRS, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).
- WILLIAMS, W. W., POSTMASTER AT SEELEY'S BAY, DISMISSAL**: M. (Mr. Taylor) to Adju., 3409, 3416.
- in Com. of Sup., 6701 (ii).
- Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. No. 79** (Mr. Gibson). 1^o*, 1839; 2^o*, 1949; 3^o*, —. (61-62 Vic., c. 120.)
- WINDSOR HARBOUR, RIVER AVON**: in Com. of Sup., 5619 (ii).
- Winnipeg Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Transportation Contract B. No. 148** (Mr. Blair). 1^o*, 5867; 2^o and in Com., 6232; 3^o*, 6446 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 10.)
- WINSTANLEY, MR., MAIL CLERK**: in Com. of Sup., 4866 (ii).
- WINTER MAIL SERVICE**: in Com. of Sup., 4964, 7284.
- WINDSOR, (N.S.) DRILL SHED**: in Com. of Sup., 7214.
- WOOD, H. W., WELFORD POSTMASTER, N.B., DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7120 (ii).
- WOOD, W. F., INDIAN AGENT, DISMISSAL**: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Wallace) 7526 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 7303, 7760 (ii).
- WOODS, J. P., EX-JUDGE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE**: Ques. (Mr. Erb) 825 (i).
- **SUPERANNUATION**: in Com. of Sup., 7486 (ii).
- WOOD ISLAND (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, DREDGING**: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2350 (i).
- WOODSTOCK P. O.**: in Com. of Sup., 5464 (ii).
- WRITS OF ELECTION, ISSUE**: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
- WYEBRIDGE, WYVALE POSTAL SERVICE**: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 598 (i).
- YALE COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INQUIRY re JUDGE SPINKS**: M. for Copy of Rep.* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3668 (i).
- "YANTIC" SS., CLEARANCES, ENTRIES, &c., AT CANADIAN PORTS**: M. for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1834 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4348.
- Yukon Overland Transportation Co.'s B. No. 107** (Mr. Donville). 1^o*, 2844; 2^o*, 3084 (i).
- Yukon Provisional District Administration B. No. 154** (Mr. Sifton). 1^o*, 6439; 2^o, and in Com., 6727; 3^o*, 6747 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 6.)
- YUKON CANADIAN RAILWAY, CONTRACT, &c.**: Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 102 (i).
- **REF. IN SPEECH FROM THRONE**: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7 (i).
- YUKON PROVISIONAL DISTRICT, ACCOUNTS ASKED FOR PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.**: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4354 (Mr. Wallace) 4350; (Mr. Sifton) 4350 (ii).
- **BANKING BUSINESS**: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1071, 1467 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 5311 (i).
- **CUSTOMS COLLECTION, AMOUNT**: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 825.
- **CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, PAR. IN OTTAWA Citizen**: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 4451 (ii).
- **CUSTOMS REGULATIONS**: M. for Ret. (Sir Charles Tupper) 2822 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 453 (i).
- **Dredging Leases, Advertisement in Chicago Record**, 409 (i).
- **GEOLOGICAL SURVEY**: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 3312 (i).
- **GOLD DREDGING LEASES**: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1074 (i).
- **GOVT. CLAIMS, NUMBERS, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5133 (ii).
- **GOVT. SUPPLIES, CONTRACT, &c.**: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 4602 (ii).
- **HOMESTEAD LAND LAWS**: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1338 (i).
- **HOMESTEAD PRIVILEGES**: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1784 (i).
- **IMMIGRATION, MAJ. WALSH'S INSTRUCTIONS re**: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 601 (i).

- YUKON PROVISIONAL DISTRICT, MAJOR WALSH'S INSTRUCTIONS: M. for Ret. (Sir Charles Tupper) 2839.
- Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1777 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 479 (i).
- COMMISSION: PRESENTED (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1174 (i).
- INSTRUCTIONS: PRESENTED (Mr. Sifton) 1341 (i).
- NON-PRODUCTION OF: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1387 (i).
- APPNMTS. TO FORCE: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 480.
- LIQUOR PERMITS, M. ON ORDER PAPER: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 3092 (i).
- PAR. IN SASKATCHEWAN *Times* re LIQUOR PERMITS; Remarks (Mr. Davis) 1174 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Craig) 1781 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2434, 3088, 3092 (i).
- LIQUOR PERMITS GRANTED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 473 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2813 (i).
- Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2846 (i).
- remarks (Mr. Davin) 2269 (i).
- remarks (Mr. Foster) 745 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Richardson) 1472 (i).
- personal explanation (Mr. Domville) 2039 (i).
- MANN AND MACKENZIE'S SLEIGH ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1777 (i).
- MILITARY CONTINGENT, COST, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4604, 4774 (ii).
- EXPENDITURE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, King's) 4795 (i).
- remarks (Mr. Foster) 1577 (i) 4604 (ii).
- PURCHASE OF PROVISIONS FOR N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1931 (i).
- SUPPLIES, &c., H. N. BATE'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 6009 (ii).
- TRANSPORTATION OF SUPPLIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7056 (ii).
- remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 6580 (ii).
- MINING LEASES: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6894, 6895 (ii).
- MINING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 2036 (i).
- YUKON MOUNTED POLICE FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 7338, 7353 (ii).
- MR. JENNING'S REP. re ROUTES: Presented (Mr. Sifton) 409 (i).
- MUNICIPAL REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 1747 (i).
- PLACER MINING, CLAIMS ENTERED: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6006 (ii).
- PLACER MINING AND TIMBER LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 460, 504 (i).
- QUARTZ MINING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Montague) 1341 (i).
- remarks (Mr. Montague) 2000 (i).
- ROTHSCHILDS' AGENT: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 486 (i).
- ROUTES AND PASSES, EXPLORATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 482 (i).
- ROUTES THROUGH N.W.T. PLANS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 5139 (ii).
- SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7323 (ii).
- SERVICES OF N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 6858 (ii).
- STEAMERS AND LAUNCHES, &c., PURCHASE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7769 (ii).
- TELEGRAPH CONNECTION WITH YUKON: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 1472 (i).
- TIMBER BERTHS, NAMES OF TENDERERS: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 485 (i).
- M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 504 (i).
- TIMBER LIMITS GRANTED H. DOMVILLE: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 474 (i).
- TIMBER SALES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1784 (i).
- TROOPS SENT AS REINFORCEMENTS: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1577 (i).
- U.S. REGULATIONS, &c.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 6 (i).
- WAGON ROAD CONSTRUCTION, &c.: (Mr. Sifton) 1341 (i).
- Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1184 (i).
- See "Canadian Yukon." "U. S. Customs Regulations, &c."